



HARVARD

Department of the Classics

## PERSEPHONE

The Harvard Undergraduate

Classics Journal

Vol. 2, No. 1, Spring 2017

## Table of Contents

Letter from the Editors   Talia Boylan and Nick Ackert, Harvard College.....	1
The Greeks at Gettysburg   Hannah Szapary, Brown University.....	2
The <i>Aeneid</i> and Archaism   Keita Kashima, Oxford University.....	5
Brides of Death, Brides of Destruction   Isabella Levy, Smith College.....	18
Dionysus as Metaphor   Erynn Kim, Princeton University.....	29

*Cover portrait, Narcissus by John William Waterhouse (1912), accessed from Wikimedia Commons under public domain.*

Dear readers,

It has been a pleasure and a privilege for us to serve at the helm of *Persephone* over the past two years, and we proudly present the final issue of our tenure as Co-Editors in Chief. We have cherished our time here not only because of our interest in the Classics, but also because the publication has offered the opportunity to connect with enthusiastic and talented students from all around the world to celebrate the humanities for the humanities' sake.

Once again, we have done our very best to select a varied collection of articles that we hope will represent the creativity, passion, and diversity of thought in the undergraduate community of aspiring classicists. This final issue will take readers from the plains of Gettysburg to the Greek tragic theatre, from the epic narrative of the *Aeneid* to the mysteries of the Homeric hymns, and beyond. We are proud to showcase the work of four excellent authors from Brown, Oxford, Smith, and Princeton.

We hope that you enjoy the Spring 2017 edition, and that you are as excited as we are about the future of the journal as it forges ahead in its third year of this new, online (and hopefully more accessible) format. Much still remains to be done - including the full digitization of past issues - but we believe that the journal's new leadership has the passion, vision, and commitment to bring *Persephone* to even greater heights.

Before we depart, we would also like to thank the Harvard Department of the Classics for their unflagging support over the past two years as we tested new waters; the transition from a print to a digital publication was a challenging one, and had it not been for the tech support of Preceptor Ivy Livingston, the flexibility of Harvard Web Publishing, and the faith and confidence of Departmental Chair Mark Schiefsky and Director of Undergraduate Studies Kathleen Coleman, we could not have made progress. We are so grateful for all of your support.

Valete,

Talia Boylan and Nicholas Ackert, '17  
Co-Editors in Chief

The image shows two handwritten signatures in black ink. The top signature is for Talia Boylan, written in a cursive style with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right. The bottom signature is for Nicholas Ackert, also in cursive, with a large, rounded loop at the end.



HARVARD  
Department of the Classics

The Greeks at Gettysburg: An  
Analysis of Pericles' Epitaphios Logos  
as a Model for Abraham Lincoln's  
Gettysburg Address

By Hannah Szapary, Brown University

Persephone: The Harvard Undergraduate Classics Journal  
Vol. 2, Spring 2017 p. 2-4

# The Greeks at Gettysburg: An Analysis of Pericles' Epitaphios Logos as a Model for Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address

Hannah Szapary  
Brown University

Many people view the key documents in presidential history as being purely American, and while this is true in some respects, they often overlook the influence that the Western canon has had on them. The impact is not always obvious because the content of these American documents often sets a precedent, but subtle links to the Greco-Roman writing style can have a large effect on the message a president sends to his audience or reader. With its structural incorporation of remarks on *prognoi* and *arete*, that is, restraint in expression and use of antitheses, Pericles' *epitaphios logos* serves as a model for Abraham Lincoln, allowing him to utilize his *Gettysburg Address* as a means to convey the paramount importance of the Declaration of Independence and its principle of universal equality.

Though his address is shorter than that of the typical Greek genre, Lincoln manages to link his speech to Pericles' *epitaphios logos* by composing his message with a compressed but similar structure. He begins by writing a sort of *epainesis*, a praise of the dead that includes some of the same major themes found in the funeral oration of Pericles, chiefly the deceased men's descendants and their excellence. The *epainesis* of Pericles begins with a comment on *prognoi*, a tribute to the relatives of the fallen:

I make the ancestors my opening theme, since it is right, it is appropriate here, to pay them memory's tribute. They, who dwelt nowhere but here, passed this land down to us, generation by generation, kept free by their valor (Pericles, 19-20).

The choice to place these sentences before everything else does seem "right" and "appropriate," as Pericles believes it. When he depicts the ancestors of the fallen as noble and brave first, having fought for the freedom of the land, the deaths of the men seem more heroic later in the oration: they are now put in the context of a longer and greater battle to maintain the land's liberty.

Lincoln also touches on the descendants of the Civil War soldiers, with the opening "Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." Here, the noble ancestors are not the writers of the Constitution, but of the Declaration of Independence, and the men become soldiers having fought on behalf of this document. By following the starting structure of the *epitaphios logos*, Lincoln uses the opportunity to underscore the notion of the Declaration's supremacy.

The *epainesis* in Pericles' oration continues with a remark on *arete*, that is, the excellence of the dead in battle:

But the valor of these men and their peers gave the city her beauty... The death of these, in my judgment, revealed the courage of some at their first encounter, or conformed the others' established record (Pericles, 21).

He extolls the courage of these men, in keeping with the conventions of the *epainesis*, but also extends praise to Athens, the city of "beauty" and the reason for the soldiers' deaths. Therefore,

the words of the *epitaphios logos* shape the funeral oration into a celebration of the men who have died as well as the cause of their fight. Though his address is shorter, Lincoln includes a statement on *arete* when he describes the fallen at Gettysburg as those “who here gave their lives that that nation might live.” When he indicates the bravery of the soldiers by their willingness to give away their lives, he, in the method used by Pericles, also values their cause, as he implies that it is worth thousands of casualties. The phrase “that nation” reminds the listener or reader of the beginning of the address: this nation is the one founded on the Declaration of Independence rather than the Constitution, as Lincoln proposes earlier. He is therefore able to reinforce this point by following the Greek *epitaphios logos* structure to give the *arete* a dual purpose.

Pericles displays some restraint in his oration, another key component of the *epitaphios logos*, when he avoids individualizing the dead men and the citizenry of Athens, his addressee:

Such was the city these men fought for, rather than lose to others; and shall we, their survivors, not take up the labor (Pericles, 21)?

He makes no specifications about the soldiers, calling them “these men,” and uses the plural “we” when speaking to everyone else. The change from the third to the first person with the same use of generalizing pronouns is sudden and dramatic. By forming a sharp distinction between just two groups, the dead and the living, Pericles emphasizes that the surviving citizens must continue to fight for their city. In addition, the pronoun “we” is inclusive and links the audience with Pericles, adding more passion to his message.

In a similar way, Lincoln chooses to make no specifications regarding those who have died at Gettysburg and those who are mourning them:

It is for the living, rather, to be dedicated to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us... (Pericles, 22).

Again, a shift from the third person “they” to the first plural “us” is evident, forging a clear connection between the fallen and survivors who must still be dedicated to their cause. In this case, the “unfinished work” is described earlier in the address as the principle of equality outlined in the Declaration. Thus, the divide creates a call to action that prioritizes the Declaration as the document that must be protected in order to save the country. By bringing the listeners into his oration and connecting himself with them, Lincoln presents his opinion of the Declaration’s supremacy with greater vehemence.

A final hallmark of the *epitaphios logos* is the use of antithesis, in particular that between the mortal and immortal. Pericles refers to the way these two interact in the following sentences:

In a joint offering of their bodies [the men] won their several rewards of ageless praise... their glory is laid up imperishable, recallable at any need for remembrance or example... Strive then, with these, convinced that happiness lies in freedom (Pericles, 22).

Here, the mortal and immortal interlock on the battlefield: though the men are killed, their glory remains “imperishable”; Pericles implies that the path to immortality lies in the death of those dedicated to the protection of the city’s freedom. This statement would appeal to any audience and gain followers for his cause because by nature humans long for an everlasting legacy.

Through this connection of the two opposites, Pericles can convince his listeners that liberty is of the utmost importance to the survival of Athens and its people.

Lincoln uses the same technique in his writing, constructing a relationship between the mortal and immortal in his final exclamation:

...these dead shall not have died in vain, that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

He illustrates that through the death of soldiers, the government, rather than the men themselves, will attain immortality. This is a different message than Pericles'; Lincoln does not appeal to the human desire for glory, but nevertheless tries to accomplish the same goal. The phrase "of the people, by the people, for the people" refers to the idea that Lincoln believes the government is founded on the Declaration. By this reference, he asserts that the government's survival depends on the fight for the protection of the document's core principle of equality.

Through the addition of remarks on *prognoi* and *arete*, his restraint in expression and inclusion of antitheses, Abraham Lincoln uses Pericles' *epitaphios logos* as a model to illustrate the supremacy of the Declaration of Independence and its value of unanimous equality in his *Gettysburg Address*. Perhaps most interesting is the effect this kind of analysis has on a reader of presidential documents: after conducting one close reading of the address with the Greek *epitaphios logos* in mind, numerous links between the two become evident, as well as connections with speeches of other presidents. Recognizing that many presidents draw from the Western cannon makes Lincoln all the more special, because he did not have the education in the Classics that others in his office had. His genius is unparalleled, and a look at his work through the Greco-Roman lens can only confirm this.



HARVARD  
Department of the Classics

## The *Aeneid* and Archaism

By Keita Kashima, Oxford University

Persephone: The Harvard Undergraduate Classics Journal  
Vol. 2, Spring 2017 p. 5-17



The *Aeneid* and Archaism  
Keita Kashima  
Oxford University

## Overview

This paper examines linguistic archaism in the *Aeneid*. Particular attention is paid to archaic morphology from the perspective of Augustan poetry, that is to say, forms of words that belong to older strands of the Latin language and are therefore not so frequently encountered in Classical Latin we are used to reading.

Section §1 lists methodological problems and considerations. In Section §2, I examine how archaism, especially archaic morphology, may contribute to the thematic complexity of the *Aeneid*. In particular, I attempt to answer the following three questions:

- (1) What does archaism add to the reader's understanding of temporal relationship in the *Aeneid*?
- (2) Are there discernible patterns in the use of archaism?
- (3) Does archaism contribute to characterisation?

Quite a few of the answers I give are either negative or inconclusive, mainly because there are not enough archaic forms in the *Aeneid* to make definitive statements about them. But some usages of archaic forms are interesting from the thematic perspective of this poem. Moreover, the general lack of archaic forms may be useful in understanding the position of the *Aeneid* within the Roman literary history, and perhaps even Virgil's attitude towards the contemporary era.

## §1 Preliminary remarks and methodological restrictions

Virgil's fondness of antiquity is suggested by Quintilian's comment (*Inst.* 1.7.18) that the poet was *amantissimus vetustatis* ('most fond of antiquity'). Quintilian describes Virgil in this way when explaining the presence of the old genitive ending  $-\bar{a}i$ <sup>1</sup> in *pictai vestis* (9.26) and *aquai* 7.464) in the *Aeneid*. He also praises Virgil for his use of fossilized forms such as *olli*, *quianam* and *moerus* (*Inst.* 8.3.25). Archaism brings, according to Quintilian, *orationi maiestatem aliquam non sine delectatione* (*Inst.* 1.6.39). Therefore, at least Quintilian was 'delighted' with the presence of archaic forms in the *Aeneid*. In this short paper, I shall examine whether one could go further than Quintilian's statement that they are merely 'delightful' for their ancient solemnity by attempting to answer the three questions which I raised in the overview.

Before surveying Virgil's archaism, it is necessary to introduce some limiting factors. This is because one definition of 'archaism' would be too broad in our examination here. 'Archaism' in poetry may be taken to mean any linguistic feature that makes the author's language old and solemn, and this is usually achieved by employing linguistic forms, style, and vocabulary which are obsolete and are therefore associated with older language (e.g. *thou* for modern English *you*). To examine every aspect of 'archaism' in the *Aeneid*, as defined above, would be difficult in this short paper.

Therefore, to simplify my examination, I do not take into account, in most cases, the characteristic features of pre-Augustan poetic language that are mentioned by Palmer, including asyndeton, tricola, assonance and, most notably, alliteration to the extent that it has no

correspondence in Greek poetry.<sup>2</sup> Three other possible methods of archaizing are the use of obsolete vocabulary preserved in the language of ancient law-codes and religious texts, the use of obsolete syntactic features, and the employment of fossilized paradigmatic forms. I shall concentrate on the latter two aspects, but especially on the last.

Despite having narrowed down the term ‘archaism’ in this paper mostly to its morphological aspect, numerous problems still remain. I give a summary of seven factors, labelled (a) – (g), which are relevant to archaic morphology:

(a) *Metrical constraints.* Many specialties of poetic diction must have risen under the constant metrical pressure, and the *Aeneid* is no exception to this. For example, the conjunction *uti*, which is found in 1.466, 2.507, 7.528 and 12.488, though archaic morphologically and frequent in Cato and Lucretius,<sup>3</sup> is metrically convenient. In such cases, the possibility that Virgil used archaic forms for various literary effects could be reduced to an *argumentum e silentio*.

(b) *Textual transmission.* Archaic forms, which have the same metrical structure as their more recent counterparts, may have been altered through ‘normalisation’ by later scribes. Examples include *divum* and *illi* from *divom* and *olli*, or even vice-versa through ‘hyper-correction’.<sup>4</sup> A thorough consideration of this problem involves a meticulous examination of various manuscripts, which cannot be done here. I follow the text provided by ‘Brepolis-Library of Latin texts’, and when an archaic form appears in the text, I shall accept its authenticity.

(c) *Colloquialism.* Archaic forms may have been retained as colloquialisms avoided in high prose literature. For example, the dative and ablative plural relative pronoun *quis* (e.g. 5.511, 8.316) may be conversational.<sup>5</sup> Therefore, the appearance of the dative-ablative plural *quis* in the poem does not necessarily mean that Virgil used it to emphasise the inclusion of such archaic forms in his poetry.

(d) *Archaism embedded in fixed phrases.* The phrase *paterfamilias* and its inflected forms, for example, are common in Classical Latin, including Cicero.<sup>6</sup> Fixed expressions are likely to persist through the medium of legal and religious phrases (within the *Aeneid*, see for example 5.174 *sociumque salutis*) in both the spoken and the written language, even when its endings become obsolete. In such cases, archaic forms are not necessarily employed specifically for literary effects.

(e) *Indirect archaic syntax through Graecicism.* For example, the retention of the archaic use of the prolativ infinitive instead of the gerund construction (e.g. 2.10 *tantus amor casus cognoscere nostros*) is influenced by Greek authors, especially Homer.<sup>7</sup> In this case, it cannot be accepted straightforwardly as genuine archaism. Such grammatical constructions are superficially archaic, but it remains uncertain whether Virgil *consciously* employed them more for archaic effects by reproducing old Latin syntax than for his imitation of the Greek poetic style.

(f) *Innovation resembling archaic syntax.* Penney observes that *ne* + the present imperative in Old Latin has an inhibitive function, whereas *ne* + the subjunctive a more prohibitive

one that includes future reference.<sup>8</sup> *Ne* + the present imperative is found in Virgil, but the construction now also includes future reference (e.g. 6.95 *tu ne cede malis*).

(g) *Latin poetic tradition and selective archaism*. This is perhaps the most significant factor and therefore requires closer attention. Archaism is often a trait of historic Latin poetic tradition that (as far as we know) begins with Andronicus, Naevius and then Ennius, whose literary impact is illustrated by Virgil's numerous references to the *Annales*.<sup>9</sup> Equally important is the activity of the *neoteric* school in the late Republican period, whose members rejected many linguistic features of earlier poetry. Examples include the omission of the final *-s*, because it was considered a characteristic *rusticitas* associated with boorishness, ruining the *urbanitas* that they aimed for.<sup>10</sup>

Yet Catullus does retain obsolete forms,<sup>11</sup> not only because of factors (a) and (c) above, but also as a result of the *mimesis* of previous poets and the continuation of the traditional Latin *Dichtersprache*. Imitation of the established poetic language manifests itself most clearly in the case of Lucretius who, according to Skutsch, uses the genitive singular ending *-ae* 153 times, but the obsolete alternative *-ai* more (166 times).<sup>12</sup> The degree to which old Latin forms are employed differs according to the poets' preference, their school of thought and their degree of imitation of earlier poetry, and some forms are fully rejected,<sup>13</sup> whilst others are not.

## §2 Answering questions (1), (2) and (3)

Archaic morphology in the *Aeneid* must be considered against this background of Latin poetic tradition (g) and the factors which I have listed in (a)-(f), many of which are not always easy to take into account. I begin with question (1), before moving onto questions (2) and (3), which I asked in the overview.

### ***(1) What does archaism add to the reader's understanding of temporal relationship in the Aeneid?***

At this point, it is worth quoting from Wilkinson 1990. He cites Cordier's work, who makes the claim that words which are 'reserved to certain spheres such as religion' and are 'used in archaic constructions'<sup>14</sup> occur approximately once every 40 lines.<sup>15</sup> This statistic leads Wilkinson to conclude that 'an average of 2.52 different archaisms per hundred lines seems too low a percentage to diffuse a markedly archaic flavour throughout'.<sup>16</sup> Given the ratio, it is reasonable to conclude that archaism is not frequent in the *Aeneid*.<sup>17</sup>

But what if one were to suppose that the poem contained archaism less frequently than the Latin hexameter poems that were widespread at the time of its 'publication'? It could be suggested, indeed cautiously, that the *Aeneid* defied the hexameter tradition and introduced a new poetic language that had less intense Republican linguistic colouring than its predecessors.

This hypothesis may be supported by an observation on the high proportion of the attributive genitive (G) that precedes the preposition (P) and the governing substantive (S). Penney 1999: 263-5 demonstrates that the structure G-P-S is found 42.5% of the time (in contrast to, say, P-G-S or P-S-G) in the *Aeneid*, in comparison to the remarkably lower proportion in Lucan (24%), which perhaps indicates Virgil's conscious effort to include the structure G-P-S.<sup>18</sup> Since the

structure G-P-S is not a feature found in Early Latin poetry, Penney raises the possibility that it is a Virgilian innovation, though Homeric influence cannot be excluded.

Perhaps one may find in this syntactic structure some modern, linguistic attitude that is fitting for the socio-political atmosphere of the compositional era of the *Aeneid*, the post-civil-war decade of 20s B.C., when there was surely ambivalence of hope and anxiety for the political future, as well as idealization of and regret for the past. Virgil's infrequent recourse to archaism perhaps indicates his discouragement that his contemporary readers idealize their past, as it proves to be harmful to the future of New Rome under Augustus. Therefore, this possibly new *Dichtersprache* for Roman epic hexameter poetry<sup>19</sup> is perhaps Virgil's poetic-linguistic message to stress the requirement of New Rome to distance herself from her old Republican image.

Nevertheless, it remains true that Virgil was *amantissimus vetustatis*, for otherwise it is unconceivable, for example, why the poet would wish to use the 3<sup>rd</sup> person perfect plural ending -*ēre*, which is archaic and has a ritualistic tone, far more frequently than the endings -*ērunt*/-*ērunt*.<sup>20</sup> Here, one can argue that Virgil does accommodate some old morphological forms into his new *Dichtersprache*, and when he does so, he respects them by using them frequently. This may have a thematic correspondence to Aeneas' accommodation of the past into the present, which one can discern, for example, in the imagery of the colours gold and purple and its Oriental, 'Eastern' association: Aeneas uses one of the two robes of gold and *purple* made by Dido (cf. 11.72-75) to wrap Pallas' body and keeps the other for his personal use,<sup>21</sup> symbolically depicting the suppression of his Oriental identity [his Trojan origin, i.e. the past] but also its continuation in the Roman background [i.e. the present]. Virgil's use of archaism may suggest that, just as the language of Republican poetry before the development of the *neoteric* school must continue to be respected but in a suppressed manner, likewise the image of old Rome and her relationship with old Italy must not be erased entirely as the Romans move onto their next chapter of politics. Therefore the first question I posed – whether Virgil's use of archaism has any thematic significance in terms of temporal relationship – seems more than possible, although to *prove* this point is impossible: one would need to know how Virgilian Latin was received by his early readers, but there is simply not enough evidence on this matter. Moreover, and crucially, our evidence for Roman literature, especially pre-Virgilian literature, is too fragmentary to derive any secure linguistic argument.

**(2) Are there discernible patterns in the use of archaism?**

**(3) Does archaism contribute to characterisation?**

I now move onto questions (2) and (3), but I make some general comments on the results of the forthcoming enquiry. In many instances, the occurrence of archaism in the *Aeneid* is probably due to one or more factors in (a)-(g) or purely due to mere chance, therefore there are not, generally speaking, strongly systematic patterns in their employment (cf. question (2)). More disappointingly, the evidence is not substantial enough to come to a satisfactory conclusion for the role of archaism in terms of characterisation (cf. question (3)). But there are possible instances of literary effects – and perhaps very strong effects – which derive from archaic morphology, evanescent though they are. As for factor (g), I make no distinction between archaism that results from the imitation of previous poets<sup>22</sup> and one which the poet has chosen of his own accord.<sup>23</sup>

## Question (2)

I begin first with the forms *olli/illi* and *ollis/illis*.<sup>24</sup> The form *olle* and its inflected forms fully ceased to be used by 200 B.C., and are not found even in Plautus and Terence.<sup>25</sup> It is likely to be an archaic feature revived deliberately by Ennius and then passed over to the *Aeneid* (as well as to Lucretius). *Olle* is restricted to the dative singular, the nominative plural (both *olli*) and the dative/ablative plural (*ollis*). These are the most frequent archaic forms in the *Aeneid*, and in the table below I have counted their occurrence and analyzed their position in the hexameter line (initially, internally or at the end of the line), and compared them with the data for *illi* and *illis*:<sup>26</sup>

	Initial	Internal	Final
<i>Olli</i>	18 <sup>27</sup>	2 <sup>28</sup>	1 <sup>29</sup>
<i>Illi</i>	10 <sup>30</sup>	34 <sup>31</sup>	5 <sup>32</sup>
<i>Ollis</i>	0	2 <sup>33</sup>	0
<i>Illis</i>	0	6 <sup>34</sup>	3 <sup>35</sup>

Two observations can be made from the table above concerning *olli/ollis*:

- (A) Initial *olli* is found more frequently than initial *illi*.
- (B) Other uses of *olli* and *ollis* are very rare.

The five instances for (B) are 5.197 and 12.300 for internal *olli*, 5.358 for final *olli*, and 6.730 and 8.652 for internal *ollis*, and the following feature is shared in common: all are used to describe mortal figures (in one case, spoken by a mortal) in an elevated manner. Yet there seems to be no overwhelmingly strong correlation that connects the instances of their occurrence: 5.197, 5.358 and 12.300 can be regarded *Iliadic*,<sup>36</sup> 8.659 is about the dress and the appearance of old Gauls, and 6.730 is a part of Anchises' speech about the reincarnation of mortal soul. Apart from the possible sense of solemnity given to mortals in various contexts, there is no systematic pattern.

Initial *olli* (A), however, in addition to its elevated sense, does seem to exhibit some patterns. First, *olli* is never elided, unlike *illi* which is always elided except in two occasions (1.210 and 2.86). Secondly, it is true that *olli* is often used when an Olympian talks to another Olympian (1.254, 4.105 and 12.839). The grandeur of the Olympian language is established firmly in the first occurrence of *olli*, when Jupiter addresses Venus (1.254: *olli subridens hominum sator atque deorum*). The poetic use of *sator* is followed by an etymological wordplay of *fabor* and *fatorum* (1.261-2), which intensifies the intellectuality of Jupiter. Therefore, early in the poem his 'divine' language distances the god from mortal characters. Indeed, the phrase *olli subridens* is used more by Jupiter (cf. also 12.839) than anyone else. And here it is possible to make a speculation; if the hexameter tradition confined the phrase to Jupiter only, one can say that Turnus' use of the same phrase in 9.470 (*olli subridens sedato pectore Turnus*) points to his hubristic character, which has been exemplified earlier in the book, for example in his reaction to the metamorphosis of the Trojan ships into nymphs (9.128-158).<sup>37</sup> However, because the phrase itself is too rare in the *Aeneid*, there is no secure evidence that Virgil consciously wished to attribute the phrase to hubristic mortals, as in Turnus' case.

Other uses of initial *olli/illi* seem to display no strong pattern: minor, non-Olympian gods can be described as *illi* (1.55), but they can also be involved in scenes where *olli* is found (cf. Allecto in 7.456-8); Aeneas and his men are both described at *illi* (e.g. 1.210, 11.461) and *olli* (e.g. 8.94, 8.594); Aeneas and Turnus are both *olli* (12.788) and *illi* (12.720, in a simile); and perhaps

paradoxically for an epic poem, warriors are described as *illi* (e.g. 2.86, 2.420) and farmers as *olli* (7.505).<sup>38</sup> Most occurrences of initial *illi* and *olli*, apart from the small proportion of *olli* when it is attributed to the Olympians, are perhaps influenced by Virgil's mood as he composed his lines.<sup>39</sup> The most sensible answer to question (2), therefore, is to accept the elevating effect of archaic forms in the context they are used, but to doubt the presence of definitive patterns, with the possible exception of initial *olli/illi*.

### **Question (3)**

The poem is marked by the absence of passages containing a lexical cluster of archaic forms apart from (as far as I can find) one instance in the description of the delegates led by Venulus returning from Diomedes (11.225-251). In these lines, the neuter supine construction with a direct object (11.230: *pacem...petendum*), *olli* (11.236), the possible archaism in *introgressi* (11.248)<sup>40</sup> and the archaic infinitive *farier* beside *infit* (242) are found, which does enhance the formality of the scene leading up to Venulus' declaration of Diomedes' response. But since the scene has no other correspondence in its unusual frequency of archaic morphology, any attempt to derive patterns from this single sample is hazardous. The passage from the council of the Italians is remarkable in its high usage of archaism, most likely in order to depict the Italians as rustic people who have long settled in Italy, in contrast to the Trojans, the wandering newcomers.

The paucity of evidence is directly relevant to the question of characterization I have posed in question (3): not enough archaic forms are uttered by or are ascribed to Aeneas, Turnus or any other character in the poem. For example, even if Virgil grants Dido to utter a sentence containing an inverse relative attraction in 1.573 (*urbem quam statuo vestra est*), an early syntactical feature found nowhere else in classical literature,<sup>41</sup> in order to emphasise the solemnity of her diplomatic pronouncement, the only other occasion of her use of archaic morphology is *accingier* in 4.493. It is therefore difficult to see how archaism alone can contribute to characterization continuously.

One remark on Turnus and Aeneas, however, may be fascinating. Only these two characters have the privilege to utter what is probably the short-vowel subjunctive of the sigmatic aorist of the verbal root *\*fak-* (cf. *facio*), that is, *faxo*, in contrast to Classical *faciam*.<sup>42</sup> Essentially, *faciam* displaced *faxo* whose use became marginalized to certain grammatical constructions, which too were eventually constructed with *faciam*. Examine the grammatical constructions of *faxo* in Aeneas and Turnus' speeches:

Turnus (9.154-5): *haud sibi cum Danais rem faxo et pube Pelasga/esse ferant...*

Aeneas (12.315-6): *... ego foedera faxo/firma manu...*

Turnus' lines in prose would go as follows: *faxo ferant sibi haud rem cum Danais et pube Pelasga esse. Faxo* here governs the present subjunctive *ferant* ('they know, realise' in this context) without the subordinating particle *ut*, and this construction is not infrequent in early authors such as Plautus and Terence.<sup>43</sup>

What about Aeneas' lines, which in prose syntax are *ego foedera firma manu faxo*? Here, *faxo* takes a direct object (*foedera*) which, as de Melo 2007: 364 suggests, is probably due to the merger of the verb's function with the more familiar form *faciam*. According to my research, this is the only example of the construction *faxo* + the direct object in the entire corpus of Latin literature. Though tentative, therefore, I think one could argue that Turnus' conservative use of *faxo* gives him a Republican, Old Italic character,<sup>44</sup> in order to depict him as a figure ill-equipped

for the imminent political change in Latium, whereas Aeneas proves himself to be a ‘modern’ figure, and a leader who can simultaneously respect a memory of old Italy through his innovatory syntax of the extra-paradigmatic *faxo*,<sup>45</sup> and through the initial alliteration (*foedera faxo/firma*).

Are there other linguistic traits like this for Aeneas and Turnus? Apart from Turnus’ other use of the sigmatic future, *iusso* (11.467), which may be an intensification of his Republican image, there is no discernible difference between the two characters as far as the morphology, syntax and the vocabulary of their speech are concerned. In this case, then, one could argue that Virgil did not want to polarize too greatly the two characters even from the linguistic perspective, in order to maintain the disturbing imagery of fratricide, which may be implied already in the name ‘Turnus’.<sup>46</sup>

## Conclusion

Archaic morphology is rare in the characters’ speeches, and even when archaic forms are employed their literary impact is mostly to evoke an evanescent sense of antiquity. The conclusion I therefore come to is that archaic forms contribute only temporarily and marginally to characterization (cf. question (3)) and that they are used without fixed patterns, with potentially a few exceptions in the case of *olli/illi* and *ollis/illis* (cf. question (2)). Modern forms pervade the poem, but certain archaic forms are still persistent, and this may indicate some thematic significance as argued in my answer to question (1). Overall, I feel that Quintilian is probably right in concentrating on the *maiestas* and the *delectatio* of archaism, without seeing any strongly systematic thematic concerns developed by the use of archaic morphology. But what one can appreciate from a survey of archaic forms in the *Aeneid* is the development of Latin poetry and its diction, and how remnants of the archaic language are combined with Virgil’s initiative to compose a new type of Roman hexameter poetry that is set in the heroic age but is also contemporary and national.<sup>47</sup>

## Notes

1. This is the ending before the familiar *-ae*. The long  $\bar{i}$  in  $-\bar{a}\bar{i}$  is analogical to the 2nd declension nouns, which have the genitive ending  $-\bar{i}$ . For the form  $-\bar{a}s$ , which is older than  $-\bar{a}\bar{i}$  and which derives from reconstructed Indo-European  $*-eh_2-(e)s$ , see endnote 13.

2. Cf. Leonard R. Palmer, *The Latin Language*, (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1954), p.109.

3. Cf. Roland G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber primus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), *ad loc.*

4. In the case of *olli/illi*, one has Quintilian's statement above and therefore can be confident that Virgil used the form *olli*, but the case of *divom/divum* is more obscure, and similarly *edit* and *edat* in 12.801. Cf. Richard J. Tarrant, *Aeneid. Book XII*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

5. Manu Leumann, "Die lateinische Dichtersprache", *schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft* (=Schweizerische Geisteswissenschaftliche Gesellschaft, *Museum Helveticum*. Basel:BSchwabe), Band 4 (1947): p.127.

6. E.g. Cic. Ver. 2.3.120.

7. For example, John H. W. Penney, "Archaism and innovation in Latin poetic syntax", *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, Proceedings of the British Academy 93 (1999): p.256, quotes Homeric δῶκε δ' ἄγειν (e.g. *Il.*1.347).

8. John H. W. Penney, "Archaism and innovation in Latin poetic syntax", *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, Proceedings of the British Academy 93 (1999): p.253.

9. Otto Skutsch, *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (Oxford : New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 1985), p.13.

10. Cf. Robert Coleman, "Poetic diction, poetic discourse and the poetic register", *Aspects of the Language of Latin Poetry*, Proceedings of the British Academy 93 (1999): p.33 and Leonard R. Palmer, *The Latin Language*, (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1954), p.109. Catullus 116 has therefore encouraged a philological debate, as it contains numerous archaic features (the old instrumental *qui* for *ut* in line 3, which is wholly spondaic, and the loss of *s* in *dabis* in line 8). Some argue for the early date of its composition, but Catullus is possibly mocking Gellius, who cannot appreciate the *urbanitas* of Callimachus' poetry, through the language of the *rusticitas*.

11. For a list of non-classical forms, see the introduction (xxviii-ix) of Kenneth Quinn, *Catullus - The poems*, Rev ed. (London: Bristol Classical Press, 1996).

12. Otto Skutsch, *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (Oxford : New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 1985), p.61. The *Aeneid* restricts  $-ai$  to only four occasions (see endnote 39).



13. For an example, cf. Leonard R. Palmer, *The Latin Language*, (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1954), p.98. Of the instances of the genitive *-as* quoted by Priscan (1.198f), three come from the *Odyssey* of Andronichus, two from the *Bellum Poenicum* of Naevius, and one from the *Annales* of Ennius. The ending *-as* is never found in classical poetry, which suggests that there is some limit to archaizing.

14. L. P. Wilkinson, "The language of Horace and Virgil", *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid* (1990): p.419.

15. I was unable to find Cordier's work and see how Cordier categorized archaic words and whether the work took into account the factors which I have listed above. At any rate, the statistics are sufficient enough for my argument below.

16. L. P. Wilkinson, "The language of Horace and Virgil", *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid* (1990): p.419. Perhaps the only instance that defies this is the Council of the Latins in Book XI, for which see my answer to question (3).

17. Indeed the overuse of archaic words seems to have been disapproved, as Quintilian (*Inst.*1.7.18) writes: *sed utendum modo, nec ex ultimis teneris repetenda*.

18. Alternatively and/or at the same time, Lucan's conscious effort to distance himself from Virgilian Latin.

19. I stress that it applies only to epic hexameter poetry, because in the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* the use of archaic forms is comparatively less frequent.

20. Cf. Robert D. Williams, *Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quintus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960) on 5.580. See also Charles F. Bauer, *The Latin perfect endings -ēre and -erunt* (Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America, 1933), who states that the ending *-ēre* is found 231 times, in contrast to 29 times for *-ērunt/-ēerunt*. In fact, *-ērunt* never appears in the hexameter poetry of Virgil, Horace (*Satires*) and Juvenal, which may be indicative of the marginal status of *-ērunt* in poetry. Whilst metrical convenience cannot be rejected in some examples, the fact that Horace and Juvenal in their hexameter poetry have *-ērunt* far more frequently clarifies Virgil's elevated language within its 'modernness'.

21. James D. Reed, *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the Aeneid* (Princeton, N.J.; Woodstock: Princeton University Press, 2007), p.82.

22. As mentioned in various commentaries.

23. Once again, the paucity of samples from Latin literature is problematic in deciding when the use of archaic forms is *not* an imitation.

24. As I have mentioned above, *olli/illi* (and *ollis/illis*) have a high chance of scribal corruption (Section §1, point (b)). I regret that I have been unable to look at various manuscripts

and the works of editors. But I hope that the general correlation found in observation (A) has not been distorted.

25. Otto Skutsch, *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (Oxford : New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 1985), p.64.

26. I used “Brepolis-Library of Latin texts” to gather the data.

27. 1.254, 4.105, 5.10, 5.284, 5.580, 6.321, 7.458, 7.505, 8.94, 8.594, 9.740, 10.745, 11.236, 12.18, 12.309, 12.537, 12.788 and 12.829.

28. 5.197 and 12.300.

29. 5.358.

30. 1.55, 1.210, 2.86, 2.420, 8.452, 10.146, 11.445, 11.461, 12.172 and 12.720.

31. 1.138, 1.397, 1.416, 2.139, 2.212, 2.503, 4.261, 4.698, 6.162, 6.479, 6.879, 7.538, 8.118, 8.358, 8.466, 9.377, 9.754, 10.130, 10.172, 10.202, 10.219, 10.335, 10.355, 10.494, 10.572, 10.619, 11.73, 11.120, 12.52, 12.140, 12.333, 12.617, 12.710 and 12.951.

32. 5.644, 6.472, 8.443, 9.221 and 10.858.

33. 6.730 and 8.659.

34. 2.342, 3.214, 7.144, 7.685, 10.238 and 11.422.

35. 3.98, 7.730 and 10.757.

36. 5.197: Mnesteus’ men after being incited by a speech of exhortation that reminds them of the final glory of Troy (5.189-191). 5.358: Aeneas smiles at Nisus and presents him with a gift, perhaps reminiscent of Achilles in Book XXIII of the *Iliad* (23.555). 12.300: *olli* as a possessive dative, describing Ebyesus’ burning beard in an Iliadic battle.

37. Philip R. Hardie, *Aeneid. Book IX*, Cambridge Greek and Latin classics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994) *ad loc.* simply comments that ‘it adds to the awesomeness of Turnus’ appearance’, and this seems to have been Servius’ opinion too: *magnam confidentiam virtutis ostendit*.

38. One could, however, as my tutor has pointed out, make a counterargument here and claim that Virgil almost ennobles rustic life (cf. Philip Thibodeau, *Playing the Farmer: Representations of Rural Life in Vergil’s Georgics*, Joan Palevsky Imprint in Classical Literature (Berkeley ; London: University of California Press, 2011). The use of *olli* in 7.505 may be indicating the continuation of the spirit of the *Georgics* in the *Aeneid*.

39. Likewise, apart from their vague ancient feeling, there is no correlation in the four instances of the genitive singular in *-ai* (3.354, 6.747, 7.464 and 9.26).

40. See Nicholas Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 11: A Commentary*, Mnemosyne, Bibliotheca Classica Batava. Supplementum. 244 (Leiden: Brill, 2003) *ad loc.* There is no way of telling if *introgressi* is a Virgilian coinage or an archaic verb, because there is no attestation of the word apart from in literature.

41. See Roland G. Austin, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber primus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971) *ad loc.*

42. Since I do not wish to get into the details of the problem of *faxo-faxim*, I refer to Wolfgang D. C. de Melo, *The Early Latin Verb System: Archaic Forms in Plautus, Terence, and Beyond* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), and Michael L. Weiss, *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin* (Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press, 2009), p.419.

43. Cf. Wolfgang D. C. de Melo, *The Early Latin Verb System: Archaic Forms in Plautus, Terence, and Beyond* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007) for more details.

44. There are numerous ways in which Turnus in the second half of the *Aeneid* is given an old Italic image, which cannot of course be examined here.

45. But it remains possible that *faxo* could take a direct object, but that examples of this construction are lacking.

46. Turnus' characterization as Aeneas' antagonist appears to be a traditional one, found for example in Livy 1.2. But whether all Roman authors were aware of the possible etymology of the name of Turnus remains uncertain. Since what I write below is not all relevant to the purpose of my work, I write an extensive footnote here. Those not interested in the Etruscan language should skip the paragraph immediately below.

It is probably true (given the archaeological evidence; see below) that the Etruscan equivalent of the god Cupid was 'Turnu', perhaps deriving from *Turan*, who is the Etruscan equivalent of Aphrodite/Venus, with some kind of suffix added. This may possibly be Etruscan *-iu* < IE *\*-ios*. According to this assumption, the formation of 'Turnu' may have been something like *Turnu* (< *\*Turnnu*, if the sequence *\*-ni-* perhaps underwent assimilation or palatalization to *\*-nn-*) < *\*Turniu* (vowel syncope) < *\*Turaniu* (with loss of final *\*-s* and interpretation of /o/ as Etruscan <u>) < *\*Turan-ios*. But this derivation would be an *ad hoc* and, moreover, contradictory explanation, if Etruscan *-ie*, found e.g. in **tarxunie**, were from the same *\*-ios* suffix. Alternatively, still advocating an etymological connection between Turnu and Turan, one may assume a purely Etruscan development, using the *\*-u* suffix (*Turnu* < *\*Turan-u*), found in participles such as **mulu** and agent nouns such as **zicu** ('writer'). A third possible alternative would be to assume that an archaic inscription on the *Aryballos Poupé* from Caere preserves the archaic variant **turannuve**, which may be analysed as *\*Turan-nu-*, with *\*-nu-* suffix, which is possibly to be connected with other suffixes like *-na*. But this alternative would have to assume that <turannuve> is not a scribal error, as in the same text <turanuve> appears twice, without the double <n>. Overall, it remains difficult to speculate given the scarcity of relevant epigraphic evidence, and a simple derivation from *Turan* is in fact not guaranteed, if this name too is derived with a suffix (e.g. *\*Tur-an*).

The sole evidence for the identification of Turnus with Etruscan Cupid comes from a bronze mirror excavated near Orvieto. On the mirror, a young boy (=Turnu) is sitting on the left with **Turan** (=Venus), **Atunis** (=Adonis) and **Aplu** (=Apollo) depicted in the central part, and all the divinities are labeled (cf. Erika Simon, "Greek myth in Etruscan culture", *The Etruscan World*: pp.505-6).

The reason why I think that Virgil knew that the Etruscan equivalent of Cupid was **Turnu** is based on line 76 in Book 10. A goddess named *Venilia* is said to be the *mater* of Turnus, and her name resembles that of Venus. This genealogy of Venilia-Turnus seems to be, based on the available literary evidence, a Virgilian innovation, perhaps to intensify the imagery of fratricide: Aeneas is like Cupid, Venus' son, and Turnus is like Etruscan Cupid and is born of a mother who resembles Venus. For more details on this theme, see Sarah L. McCallum's PhD dissertation, *Taking Love Seriously: Amor and Erotic Elegy in Vergil's 'Italian Iliad'*, (University of Toronto, 2012), pp.92-95.

47. I wish to thank my tutor Dr. Antony Smith for his suggestions in our tutorial in Hillary Term 2016, and the editors of *Persephone* for making stylistic suggestions and improvements. All other possible errors, whether factual or stylistic, are of course my own responsibility.

## Bibliography

- Austin, Roland G. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber primus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- Bauer, Charles, F. *The Latin perfect endings -ēre and -erunt*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America, 1933.
- Coleman, Robert. "Poetic diction, poetic discourse and the poetic register", *Aspects of the language of Latin poetry* (J.N.Adams and R.G.Mayer (eds.)), Proceedings of the British Academy 93 (1999): pp.21-91.
- Hardie, Philip R. *Aeneid. Book IX*. Cambridge Greek and Latin classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Horsfall, Nicholas. *Virgil, Aeneid 11: A Commentary*. Mnemosyne, Bibliotheca Classica Batava. Supplementum. 244. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Leumann, Manu. "Die lateinische Dichtersprache", *schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Alterumswissenschaft* (=Schweizerische Geisteswissenschaftliche Gesellschaft, *Museum Helveticum*. Basel: BSchwabe), Band 4 (1947): pp.116-140.
- de Melo, Wolfgang D. C. *The Early Latin Verb System: Archaic Forms in Plautus, Terence, and Beyond*. Oxford University Press, 2007.
- McCallum, Sarah L. *Taking Love Seriously: Amor and Erotic Elegy in Vergil's 'Italian Iliad'*, University of Toronto, PhD dissertation, 2012. (Available online at [https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/67293/3/McCallum\\_Sarah\\_L\\_201211\\_PhD.pdf](https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/67293/3/McCallum_Sarah_L_201211_PhD.pdf)).
- Palmer, Leonard R. *The Latin Language*. Great Languages. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1954.
- Penney, John H. W. "Archaism and innovation in Latin poetic syntax", *Aspects of the language of Latin poetry* (J.N.Adams and R.G.Mayer (eds.)), Proceedings of the British Academy 93 (1999): pp. 249-268.
- Quinn, Kenneth. *Catullus - The poems*. Rev ed. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1996.
- Reed, James D. *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the Aeneid*. Princeton, N.J. ; Woodstock: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- Simon, Erika. "Greek myth in Etruscan culture", *The Etruscan World* (Jean M.Turfa (ed.)). London: Routledge, 2013: pp.495-512.
- Skutsch, Otto. *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford : New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Tarrant, Richard, J. *Aeneid. Book XII*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Thibodeau, Philip. *Playing the Farmer: Representations of Rural Life in Vergil's Georgics*. Joan Palevsky Imprint in Classical Literature. Berkeley; London: University of California Press, 2011.

Weiss, Michael L. *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin* (Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press, 2009).

Wilkinson, L. P. "The language of Horace and Virgil, in Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid", *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid* (Stephen J. Harrison (ed.)). Oxford; Oxford University Press (1990): pp.415-428.

Williams, Robert D. *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quintus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.



HARVARD  
Department of the Classics

# Brides of Death, Brides of Destruction: The Inverted Wedding in Aeschylus' Agamemnon

By Isabella Levy, Smith College

Persephone: The Harvard Undergraduate Classics Journal  
Vol. 2, Spring 2017 p. 18-28

## Brides of Death, Brides of Destruction: The Inverted Wedding in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*

Isabella Levy  
Smith College

### Overview

Of brides and marriage in Greek literature, Richard Seaford wrote that “wedding ritual in tragedy tends to be subverted,”<sup>1</sup> This maxim certainly holds true of Aeschylus' *Oresteia*, especially the *Agamemnon*. Marital imagery pervades the play, but there is none of the typical cheer of weddings. Brides-to-be meet untimely deaths and men are laid low by ruinous marriages. This paper will examine the details and goals of subverted wedding and marriage imagery in the *Agamemnon*, particularly focusing on two motifs: brides of death, whose corrupted marriages end in their own demise, and brides of destruction, whose corrupted marriages end in the demises of others. Both types of marital corruption contribute to the larger sense of disrupted order in *Agamemnon*, particularly gender order, which is ultimately righted with the successful incorporation of the Furies into the institution of marriage in *Eumenides*.

### Brides of Death: Iphigenia and Cassandra

Ancient Greek literary sources frequently draw on the trope of marriage as death, especially for young women. This is motif, which receives ample attention in tragedy, is drawn from the peculiarities of Ancient Greek marital and funereal traditions, between which there was a great deal of similarity. To quote Seaford more extensively:

[I]n both wedding and funeral the girl is washed, anointed, and given special πέπλοι [gowns] and a special στέφανος [crown] in order to be conveyed on an irreversible, torchlit journey (on a cart) accompanied by song, and to be abandoned by her kin to an unknown dwelling, an alien bed, and the physical control . . . of an unknown male.<sup>2</sup>

In fact, girls who died before they could be married were buried in their wedding clothes and given the title “brides of Hades.”<sup>3</sup> The abundant resembling and intermingling of these two rites of passage, marriage and death, inspired writers to create their own literary brides of Hades, young women whose expected marriages are wrenched away and supplanted by their deaths.<sup>4</sup> The pathos comes from more than just a gloomy reversal. Marriage in Ancient Greece, as in many other cultures across time and space, was a celebration and affirmation of community and social order.<sup>5</sup> The rite was meant to ensure gender harmony, reproductive fertility, and social incorporation of a bride into her new household. The tragic bride of death trope can negate or subvert any or all of these associated positive elements. Through the connection of marriage to social order generally, corruptions of marriage can become indicative of larger disorder in the tragic narrative. Aeschylus takes just this approach in the *Agamemnon*, the plot of which is barely set in motion before a bride of death appears.

Although Aeschylus does not explicitly name Iphigenia as a bride-to-be in his portrayal



of her sacrifice, his choice of imagery would bring to mind other versions of the myth in which she is lured to Aulis on the pretense of marriage to Achilles. One key association, repeated both at the tragedy's opening and its close, is that of Iphigenia with a livestock animal. Not only does such imagery highlight the grotesqueness of human sacrifice, it also evokes language often used of virgin brides who are frequently depicted as beasts to be tamed. The chorus notes at 232 that as Iphigenia is hoisted over the altar, she resembles a she-goat (δικὰν χυμαίρας). Clytemnestra asserts, triumphing over Agamemnon's corpse, that her husband had little regard for Iphigenia's fate, which he treated "just like the death of a beast" (ὥσπερ εἰ βουτοῦ μόρον, *Ag.*, 1415). When Iphigenia is gagged so that she cannot curse her father, the gag is literally referred to as "the force of bridles" (βίαι χαλινῶν, *Ag.* 238). Sacrificial language mingles with marital language in ways that pervert both. Iphigenia's sacrifice is a wedding "in reverse," which brings the young bride toward her father instead of away from him.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, it is this very father who will be the agent of her death. Sacrificial language again joins marital language when Iphigenia's death is named a "preliminary sacrifice for the ships" (προτέλεια ναῶν, *Ag.* 227). Although the προτέλεια can be any sacrifice preliminary to an event, it is in its most specific definition a sacrifice made before a wedding. Such an offering would usually be made, at least in part, to Artemis, as brides would be leaving her sphere of influence as goddess of young girls. Artemis is indeed heavily involved in Iphigenia's sacrifice, but as the goddess who mandated the girl's death. Artemis' role as benevolent protector is subverted, and so are the mechanics of the sacrifice itself. The bride-to-be who makes an offering to ensure Artemis' good graces becomes the offering herself. The use of the word προτέλεια is also uniquely important, as it taps into a linguistic theme throughout the trilogy, one that Anne Lebeck refers to as "the τέλος of marriage and the τέλος of death."<sup>7</sup> The association of those two τέλοι, or "ends," is linguistically reinforced throughout the *Oresteia* by repetition of τέλ- stem words. This linguistic motif will appear alongside more and more bridal figures as the trilogy progresses (e.g., *Ag.* 745, 908, 934, 974, 1459; *Cho.* 212, 541; *Eum.* 214, 85).

Another particularly poignant image is that of Iphigenia's saffron-dyed robes (κρόκου βαφάς, *Ag.* 239). The garments' bright coloration makes them stand out and carries the suggestion of bridal vestments.<sup>8</sup> David Armstrong and Elizabeth Ratchford argue that the reference is specifically to a bridal veil and that κρόκου βαφάς δ' ἐς πέδον χέουσα ("spilling the crocus-dyed fabric to the ground") (*Ag.* 239) does not describe robes spilling down when Iphigenia is lifted over the altar but rather a removal of a veil. Grammatically, this would make χέουσα ("spilling" or "dropping") a facultative participle in relation to ἔβαλλε ("she threw") in the next line, with one explaining the other.<sup>9</sup> That is, instead of the passage describing how Iphigenia threw the darts of her eyes at spectators while her robes flowed to the ground, it explains how Iphigenia was *able to* throw the darts. It is *because* her veil has been removed. This interpretation and the reading it posits reveals a tightness of cause and effect that adds to its viability.

Furthermore, there are extant iconographic representations of Iphigenia removing a veil at her sacrifice, although they come from Roman art.<sup>10</sup> There is also literary precedent both for the use of χέω to mean taking off clothing or removing a veil; χέω makes an appearance in Book 22 of the *Iliad* when Andromache removes her veil after sensing that Hector has died.<sup>11</sup> In Iphigenia's case, removing a veil would amount to a subverted *anakalupteria*, or "lifting of the veil," the point in the Athenian wedding ritual where the bride's veil is pushed aside so that she can look at her groom. Iphigenia "casts aside her veil and looks directly at the men, as she would have put it aside and looked directly at her new husband Achilles if the wedding had

been real and not a marriage to death.”<sup>12</sup> This perverted *anakalupteria* further ramps up the *pathos* of the scene, intensifying the bride of death trope’s *pathos* with a breach of *aidos* (shame or decency), for at this point in the Athenian wedding ceremony the stress would have been on the bride looking directly at her husband in a way that would not normally be appropriate.<sup>13</sup> Iphigenia is made to bestow upon the accomplices to her sacrifice a glance that should have been reserved for her husband. The proper marital proceeding is perverted and then supplanted entirely by Iphigenia’s death. Aside from heightening *pathos*, the recurrence of perverted marriage imagery including this *anakalupteria* sets an ominous tone of disorder for the rest of the play.

That Cassandra is the next bridal figure to appear in *Agamemnon* would be immediately apparent to Greek audiences from her entrance. She has been led away from her father’s home and brought to a new house in a procession that draws on elements of the Athenian wedding (Ag. 783 ff.). Clytemnestra’s signal fire relay provides the symbolic torchlight for this conveyance, and Cassandra’s position in a wagon with Agamemnon would likely have evoked the cart that brought bride and groom to their home.<sup>14</sup> The entire episode is heavy with the “vocabulary of leading.”<sup>15</sup>

One of Cassandra’s first utterances is a question to Apollo: “Where have you led me?” (ποῖ ποτ’ ἤγαγές με; Ag. 1087). The same question is repeated and amplified at 1138: “Where indeed have you led wretched me?” (ποῖ δὴ με δεῦρο τὴν τάλαιναν ἤγαγες; Ag. 1138). Cassandra refers to her ἀγωγή, “abduction” or simply “leading,” as a motivation for Clytemnestra’s murder of Agamemnon (1263). When she prepares to enter the house, having acquiesced to the fate she will find within, she states that Apollo “has led his prophetess away” (ὁ μάντις μάντιν ... ἀπήγαγ’; 1275-1276). All of this leading would certainly bring weddings to mind and would conjure an image of Cassandra as bride. Indeed, so would Cassandra’s comment that she will lift the veils (καλυμμάτων) from her prophecies like a bride (νεογάμου νόμφος δίκην, Ag. 1178- 1179). As with Iphigenia, in the absence of a literal marriage ceremony Aeschylus still manages to tap into the bride of death trope by repeating imagery intimately associated with Athenian marriage. Both the imagery and the symbolic wedding, of course, will be subverted in Cassandra’s case as it was in Iphigenia’s. Cassandra will enter the household, not as a wife but as a sacrifice, and her symbolic marriage will be “consummated in her death.”<sup>16</sup> Therein lies another inversion; while Ancient Greek brides might sing at their weddings in lamentation over their symbolic or figurative death, Cassandra sings at a symbolic wedding in lamentation over her very real death to come.

Another subtler evocation of Athenian marriage comes in the chorus’ reference to the myth of Itys. The unfortunate boy is described as ἀμφιθαλῆ (Ag. 1144), a word that literally means “blooming on both sides” but is usually used to denote that both of a child’s parents are living. In Athenian wedding, the presence of a παῖς ἀμφιθαλής (literally “a child that blooms on both sides,” but often simply “a child with two living parents”) is propitious, and sometimes one would sleep in the bride’s bed on the night before the proceedings to ensure good luck.<sup>17</sup> However, Itys is not a fortunate παῖς ἀμφιθαλής with two living parents. He is an ill-omened child whose parents both had a hand in his death, a death that reminds the audience of Thyestes’ children who met with the same fate. What might be a very positive marital element is here inverted.

There is more mixed imagery when, after Agamemnon’s entrance into the house, Clytemnestra calls Cassandra to the “lustrations” (χερνίβων, Ag. 1037) at the hearth which evoke at once purification before sacrifice, ritual incorporation of slaves, and the

*katachysmata*. The *katachysmata* was an element of the Athenian wedding in which newlyweds are showered with dried fruits, nuts, figs, and dates upon arrival at the groom's house.<sup>18</sup> Here, however, the incorporation of the bride is mixed with a preparation for sacrificial violence that will lead to Cassandra's death, as the sacrificial again becomes associated with the marital. Multivalent animal vocabulary returns when both the chorus and Clytemnestra compare Cassandra to untamed beasts. In the eyes of the chorus, she is "like a newly captured animal" (θηπὸς ὡς ωεαιρέτου, *Ag* . 1065). Clytemnestra adds more menacingly that Cassandra "does not know how to bear the bit before she has foamed out her passion in blood" (*Ag*. 1066-1067). The blood can refer on a most surface level to the blood drawn by punishment of a disobedient slave, on another to the blood drawn by the consummation of a marriage, and on a third to the blood drawn in the double murder Clytemnestra is about to commit.<sup>19</sup> The same mixture of sacrificial and marital imagery from Iphigenia's death at the hands of Agamemnon persists with Cassandra's at the hands of Clytemnestra.

Clytemnestra's position in this symbolic marriage is ambiguous and difficult to pin down. Certainly Clytemnestra occupies the literal role of Agamemnon's wife, and thus Cassandra's figurative marriage, not to mention her literal concubinage, provides further motivation for the murder of Agamemnon. However, Clytemnestra's position onstage when she greets Agamemnon and Cassandra, the bridegroom and his bride, is more visually evocative of the role of the bridegroom's mother.<sup>20</sup> In an even more perverse turn of events, Clytemnestra ultimately takes on the role of husband, at least as far as she symbolically consummates the marriage of Cassandra. Paula Debnar argues that Clytemnestra "metaphorically violates [Cassandra] – behind the *skene* with her weapon and before the audience of the theater with her coarse sexual accusations."<sup>21</sup> Such a complex role, that of insulted wife as well as bridegroom's mother and consummator of the marriage, is particularly fitting for Clytemnestra, a woman with an ἀνδρόβουλον κέαρ ("a heart that gives counsel like a man," *Ag*. 11). The gender inversion is particularly notable, lending the episode a doubly grotesque nature. There is the perversion of marriage iconography that would normally evoke positive associations of social harmony generally, as well as the marked reversal of gender order more specifically in Clytemnestra's gender transgressive behavior

### **Brides of Destruction: Helen and Clytemnestra**

There is another type of bride in *Agamemnon*, one whose marriage brings about not her own death but the deaths of others. Aeschylus' brides of destruction, Helen and Clytemnestra, bring ruin through their marriages, the former on a grand scale and the latter within the household. Although this kind of bride is not nearly as prominent of a type character in the rest of tragedy as the bride of death, in *Agamemnon* it plays a powerful role in both exemplifying and reinforcing the disorder that dominates the tragedy. The marital vocabulary surrounding brides of death is just as pronounced when applied to brides of destruction. The third choral ode, which deals extensively with Helen and the devastation left in her wake, is replete with the language of brides and marriage. Helen is described as a "bride of battle" (δορίγαμβρον, *Ag*. 686); the προκαλυμμάτων ("curtains") away from which she sails share linguistic similarity and common imagery with the bridal veil (c.f. Cassandra's καλυμμάτων at 1178); there is wordplay around Helen's κῆδος (*Ag*. 699), which could be translated as either

“marriage contract” or “cause for grief.” Troy welcomes Helen with a ὑμέναιον (“song”; Ag. 707) that “honors the bride” (νυμφότιμον, Ag. 706), but in the aftermath of the war waged on her behalf it must learn a new song of mourning (ῦμνον ... πολύθρηνον, Ag. 709-711). The Trojans curse Paris, who was “fatally wedded” (αἰνόλεκτρον, Ag. 712). Although the thematic connection here is still, as with the bride of death, between death and marriage, there is a crucial difference in the way Aeschylus treats Helen. Her marriage *does* lead to death, but not her own. The reversal is not tragic for the bride, but for her husband and his house.

The parable of the lion and its comparison to Helen further explores the destructive reversal she brought about at Troy, highlighting the dissonance between pleasing initial appearance and dangerous reality. The tale of cub that first seems tame and then wreaks havoc is juxtaposed with the chorus’ portrayal of Helen arriving at Troy. She is pictured as “a spirit / of windless calm, / a delicate ornament of wealth, / a gentle dart of the eyes, a flower of desire that bites the heart” (Ag. 739-743). However lovely, this vision of Helen does not last, just as the once charming little lion soon reveals its true nature. The next sentence unfolds:

παρακλίνας' ἐπέκραναν δὲ  
γάμου πικρὰς τελευτάς,  
δύσεδρος καὶ δυσόμιλος  
συμένα Πριαμίδαισιν, πομπᾷ  
Διὸς ξεωίου,  
νυμφόκλαυτος Ἐρινύς. (Ag. 744-749)

The slow progression of the sentence, delaying the subject until the very end, replicates in its very form the revelation that it describes. The delicacy and levity of the previous lines slowly unravels and finally, Helen’s true nature is revealed: a Fury, a “bride who brings weeping.” The τέλος of marriage/death has a prominent place in this passage too, as the lion’s deceptively tame youth is called the προτελείοις (“preliminary rituals”) of its life (Ag. 720).

The τελ- vocabulary of marriage returns and reinforces the link between the lion’s tale and Helen’s marriage, which is equally deceptive in its initial stages (προ- τέλος) but leads to ruin in the “bitter end” (γάμου πικρὰς τελευτάς, Ag. 745), Helen’s deceptive prettiness is also typical of certain Greek literary and mythological trends that imbue brides with “irresistible powers of seduction” that can be misleadingly deployed.<sup>22</sup> The paradigm for this trope, and perhaps for the bride of destruction more specifically, is Pandora, “the Deathly Bride who brings calamity.”<sup>23</sup> As the bride who brought sorrows to the earth in her jar, Pandora is a trap that seems beautiful and pleasant externally but conceals danger and destruction within.<sup>24</sup> The image of that infamous jar is even conjured up by Aeschylus when his chorus tells of the funerary urns sent home to wives of soldiers who died fighting for Helen in Troy (Ag. 227 ff.). Pandora is also an instrument of Zeus’ plans to punish humans, and after her wicked women through the mythological ages, particularly wives, become the channels through which ruin manifests itself. The same holds true for Aeschylus’ brides of destruction, who are considered to be the instruments through which the *daimon* of the house of Atreus brings about its ends. The τέλος of death reappears when the chorus describes Helen as bedecking herself with a “final” (τελέαν, Ag. 1459) crown upon Agamemnon’s death. Clytemnestra, claiming to speak as the *daimon*, points to Agamemnon as her “full-grown” sacrificial victim (τέλειον, Ag. 1504).

The concentration of τελ- words is particularly high around Clytemnestra, and because

it has already acquired multivalent associations with marriage and death the vocabulary of τέλος lends a sinister air to Clytemnestra and Agamemnon's reunion-as-wedding. Indeed, the language in this scene connects the τέλος both of Helen's disastrous marriage and Iphigenia's marriage-like sacrifice to the moment of Agamemnon's return. The two events are προτελείαι, "preliminary rituals," for the king's death.<sup>25</sup> When Clytemnestra orders her household slaves to spread out the fabrics of the notorious carpet scene, she calls the action a τέλος (Ag. 908). Agamemnon picks up on the word and, in his hypothetical justification for trampling the fabrics were it to be ordained by a seer, he also describes it a potential τέλος (Ag. 934). Clytemnestra's invocation to Zeus Teleios as Agamemnon enters the house, however, is the dramatic climax of the τέλος of marriage and the τέλος of death. The prayer itself has marital connotations, both because of the god's role in wedding ceremonies and because of the sheer number of times that the τελ- root is repeated. Clytemnestra calls out, "Ζεῦ Ζεῦ τέλειε, τὰς ἐμὰς εὐχὰς τέλει. / μέλοι δὲ τοῖ σοι τῶν περ ἄν μέλλης τελεῖν" ("Zeus, Zeus the fulfiller, fulfill my prayers. / May you see to that which you intend to fulfill," Ag. 974-975). The sonic effect of the repetition drives home the multitude of associations that have already gathered around τέλος and related words, including the perverse intermingling of marriage and death.

The subverted marital imagery reappears when Agamemnon's corpse is displayed at the play's close and his death rehashed for the audience. The bath in which Clytemnestra trapped and killed her husband recalls the ritual bathing of the bride and groom in Athenian weddings.<sup>26</sup> The convention is meant to encourage purification and fertility, but here becomes the very scheme by which Agamemnon meets his doom. His bath, which should be a source of vitality and cleansing, becomes his coffin.

Lynda McNeil, in her article "Bridal Cloths, Cover-ups, and Kharis: The 'Carpet Scene' in Aeschylus' Agamemnon," takes the perversion of marital tradition one step further. She argues that the fabric of the so-called carpet scene could be suggestive of both ritual marital robes and coverlets for the marriage bed. In terms of the language used to describe these fabrics, it is not unlikely that they are a type of clothing, given that they are referred to as εἴματα (Ag. 960). Their ornateness (ποικίλοις, Ag. 923) could suggest a ritual function. Agamemnon seems to give them some ritual import when he protests his wife's suggestion of treading on them, noting that "it is necessary to worship the gods [rather than to honor mortals] with such things" (Ag. 922). In actual Athenian marriages, both bride and groom wore special clothing to highlight their important roles in the ceremony, so it is not absurd to suggest that Aeschylus' εἴματα are rich garments of ritual importance specifically as they pertain to the wedding. This reading is attractive in that it can allow for Agamemnon's trampling of the fabrics to take on even more symbolic meaning than it is traditionally ascribed. His actions thus become a symbol both of his disregard for his marital ties, evidenced by his bringing a concubine home, and of the corrupted wedding he prepared for his own daughter.<sup>27</sup> In fact, when Cassandra alludes to the infidelities in the house of Atreus' history, she describes Thyestes as "trampling" (πατοῦντι, Ag. 1193) his brother's bed, the same language used of Agamemnon in this scene. The repetition of the word would seem to suggest a connection in theme as well. Furthermore, if the εἴματα of the carpet scene are meant to evoke a "nuptial cloth" of some kind, be it a marital robe or the coverlet of the marriage bed, Clytemnestra's offer would serve much the same purpose as the bath. That is, it would be an invitation to Agamemnon to participate in an action that, while in the surface might appear to represent the restoration of the marriage bond, will lead to his ultimate demise. The positive marital suggestions of the εἴματα and the bath reveal themselves as

outwardly pleasing artifices that lure Agamemnon in with the promise of nuptial reconciliation but are no more than instruments of his downfall. In this way, Clytemnestra's behavior is very much like Helen's, as both women are initially pleasing to their husbands but are in fact brides who bring destruction. In Agamemnon's demise, one might recall αἰνόμετρος Paris and his disastrous bride. The wife is again the instrument of ruin.

The breakdown of the marital relationship and the motif of the ruinous wife coexists in the *Agamemnon* with a gender role reversal that is typified in Clytemnestra's corruption and inversion of bride and groom in her relationship with Agamemnon. There are two conspicuous moments in which gender expectations for a scene evoking marriage are swapped, where Agamemnon becomes the bride and Clytemnestra his groom. The first is Agamemnon's ceremonious removal of his shoes before stepping on the garments that will lead him into the house. The action is a reversal of the Athenian marital tradition of the *nymphides*, the fastening of the bride's sandals.<sup>28</sup> The association is particularly poignant in its gender inversion because it is Clytemnestra who waits to welcome Agamemnon into the house, as a groom might do to his bride, rather than the other way around. Once Agamemnon does enter the house, cries ring out. One might expect these to be a woman's shouts, perhaps Cassandra's, since she has just barely crossed the threshold. It was apparently common during Athenian weddings for the bride to cry out in pain or fear when the marriage was consummated, or at least common enough that attendants were stationed by the doors of the bedchamber to pound on them and sing loudly enough to drown out any noises the bride might be making inside.<sup>29</sup> That Agamemnon is uttering these cries puts him in a feminized position and that Clytemnestra is the figurative penetrator who causes Agamemnon to cry out puts her in a masculinized one. What Robin Mitchell-Boyask calls the "dual 'grotesque marriage' of Agamemnon and Agamemnon with Cassandra" swaps gender expectations at the very last minute.<sup>30</sup> Indeed, after Agamemnon's murder, the chorus repeatedly expresses their shock, not merely at his death, but at the fact that a woman perpetrated it. Even before the deed is done, Cassandra reels at the anomalous atrocity inherent in a woman killing a man. The idea is so foreign to the chorus that they cannot even fathom her comments on the cow that kills the bull (Ag. 1125-1126) and the female murder of the male (Ag. 1231) until it is too late. The marriage, perverted and inverted in every way, has already become the channel for destruction.

### **Conclusion: Marriage, Gender, and Order**

Although marriage in the *Oresteia* is to a significant degree representative of the state of social order or disorder in general, it has particular importance as an indicator of gender hierarchy and balance of power between the genders. Clytemnestra's perverted and inverted reunion-as-marriage with Agamemnon, the climactic event up to which the three other corrupted marriages build, demonstrates the reversal of gender order that characterizes the *Agamemnon*. Froma Zeitlin argues that the "pacification of the Erinyes becomes the ideological effort to solve the dilemma of the inextricable connection between female fertility and female sexuality."<sup>31</sup> Marriage is so intimately associated with gender order because of its role in regulating women's behavior, particularly their sexual behavior. Clytemnestra is no exception, for her disruption of marriage comes alongside an illicit affair with Aegisthus. Marriage as an institution controls fertility and channels it productively into the *polis*, institutionalizing women's sexuality for the social good. Apollo's articulation of marriage and

motherhood also demonstrates how the marital bond reinforces patrilineal succession and male political power in its subordination of the mother's role. The subordination of kinship ties generally is emphasized in Apollo's brand of marriage, as these are the spheres both in which women have more influence and where blood retribution takes precedence. The supremacy of the marriage bond ensures that potentially threatening female elements are pacified and incorporated in a way that serves the social needs of the *polis*. This is just what occurs with the Furies at the close *Eumenides*. Thus, in *Agamemnon*, the wedding gone wrong becomes symbolic of disorder in systems of gender, politics, and even justice. The restoration of marriage in the *Eumenides* represents the righting of these systems in the establishment of male supremacy, democratic governance, and legal courts. That Apollo refers to marriage as "guarded by Justice" (τῆ δικῆ φρουρουμένη, *Eum.* 218) indicates its important role in relation to other major themes of the trilogy. Like these other themes, it follows a trajectory from destruction to restoration, from pollution to cleansing, and from disorder to order.

## Notes

1. Richard Seaford, "The Tragic Wedding," *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 107 (1987), 106.
2. *Ibid.*, 107.
3. *Ibid.*, 107.
4. *Ibid.*, 107.
5. John Howard Oakley and Rebecca H. Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens* (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1993), 9.
6. Nicole Loraux, *Tragic Ways of Killing a Woman* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987), 36.
7. Anne Lebeck, *The Oresteia: A Study in Language and Structure* (Washington, Center for Hellenic Studies; Distributed by Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1971), 68.
8. Paula Debnar, "The Sexual Status of Aeschylus' Cassandra," *Classical Philology* 105.2 (2010), 135.
9. David Armstrong and Elizabeth A. Ratchford, "Iphigenia's Veil: Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 228-48," *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 32.1 (1985), 6.
10. *Ibid.*, 8.
11. *Ibid.*, 7.
12. *Ibid.*, 7.
13. *Ibid.*, 9.
14. Oakley and Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens*, 27.
15. Robin Mitchell-Boyask, "The Marriage of Cassandra and the Oresteia: Text, Image, and Performance," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 136.2 (2006), 275.
16. *Ibid.*, 279.
17. Oakley and Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens*, 12.
18. *Ibid.*, 26.
19. Debnar, "The Sexual Status of *Aeschylus*' Cassandra," 135.



20. Ibid., 135.
21. Ibid., 137-138.
22. Oakley and Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens*, 19.
23. A. Doyle, "Aeschylus' Pandora – Helen in the Agamemnon," *Akroterian* 54 (2005),
- 11.
24. Ibid., 12.
25. Lebeck, *The Oresteia: A Study in Language and Structure*, 70.
26. Oakley and Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens*, 15.
27. Lynda McNeil, "Bridal Cloths, Cover-ups, and Kharis: The 'Carpet Scene' in Aeschylus' Agamemnon." *Greece and Rome* 52.1 (2005), 9.
28. Ibid., 3.
29. Oakley and Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens*, 37.
30. Mitchell-Boyask, "The Marriage of Cassandra," 274.
31. Froma Zeitlin, "The Dynamics of Misogyny: Myth and Mythmaking in the 'Oresteia,'" *Arethusa* 11 (1978), 159.

## Bibliography

- Armstrong, David and Elizabeth A. Ratchford. "Iphigenia's Veil: Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 228-48." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 32.1 (1985): 1-12.
- Debnar, Paula, "The Sexual Status of Aeschylus' Cassandra." *Classical Philology* 105.2 (2010): 129-45, accessed December 1, 2015, doi: 10.1086/651713.
- Doyle, A. "Aeschylus' Pandora -- Helen in the *Agamemnon*." *Akroterion* 54 (2009): 11-17, accessed December 2, 2015, doi: 10.7445/54-0-24.
- Goldhill, Simon. "Two Notes on τέλος and Related Words in the *Oresteia*." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 104 (1984): 169-76, accessed December 6, 2015, doi: 10.2307/630291.
- Lebeck, Anne. *The Oresteia: A Study in Language and Structure*. Washington: Center for Hellenic Studies; Distributed by Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1971.
- Loroux, Nicole. *Tragic Ways of Killing a Woman*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- McNeil, Lynda. "Bridal Cloths, Cover-ups, and Kharis: The 'Carpet Scene' in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*." *Greece and Rome* 52.1 (2005): 1-17.
- Mitchell-Boyask, Robin. "The Marriage of Cassandra and the *Oresteia*: Text, Image, Performance" *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 136.2 (2006): 269-97, accessed December 2, 2015, doi: 10.1353/apa/2006.0011.
- Oakley, John Howard, and Rebecca H. Sinos. *The Wedding in Ancient Athens*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1993.
- Raeburn, David and Oliver Thomas. *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus: A Commentary For Students*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Seaford, Richard. "The Tragic Wedding." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 107 (1987): 106-30, accessed December 5, 2015, doi: 10.2307/630074
- Zeitlin, Froma. "The Dynamics of Misogyny: Myth and Mythmaking in the 'Oresteia.'" *Arethusa* 11 (1978): 149-84.



**HARVARD**  
Department of the Classics

# Dionysus as Metaphor: Defining the Dionysus of the Homeric Hymns

By Erynn Kim, Princeton University

Persephone: The Harvard Undergraduate Classics Journal  
Vol. 2, Spring 2017 p. 29-44

Dionysus as Metaphor: Defining the Dionysus of the *Homeric Hymns*  
 Erynn Kim  
 Princeton University

Branded as “sub-epic” and “sub-Homeric,”<sup>1</sup> the *Homeric Hymns* have long lingered in the shadows of literary scholarship. Although attention has recently been paid to the longer hymns of the corpus, the three *Hymns* to Dionysus have continued to be victims of scholarly neglect. This is, to some extent, understandable, as *Hymn* 1 to Dionysus exists only in fragments and *Hymn* 26 to Dionysus offers a mere thirteen lines. Regarding *Hymn* 7 to Dionysus, T.W. Allen, W.R. Halliday, and E.E. Sikes bluntly comment, “the artistic merit of the hymn is not high.”<sup>2</sup> Perhaps the *Hymns* to Dionysus lack the sublimity of the greater epics of Homer, but as Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui states, the three hymns together represent one of the first attempts to “define Dionysos”<sup>3</sup> and for this reason alone are worthy of attention. By regarding the three *Hymns* to Dionysus as a unit in the context of the hymnic corpus, one can follow Jenny Strauss Clay in reading the *Hymns* as a unified literary body central to Panhellenic Olympian tradition<sup>4</sup> and thus better understand the image of Dionysus projected by the hymns, particularly by *Hymn* 7, the longest of the three. By reading *Hymn* 7 in the context of the other *Hymns* to Dionysus, one can see the function of the epiphany in *Hymn* 7 as the explication of Dionysus’ power and thus a key aspect of his identity within the greater Panhellenic narrative of the hymnic corpus. By looking at the way the divine epiphany in *Hymn* 7 differs from other epiphanies in the *Homeric Hymns*, one can perceive how epiphany structures the hymn in order to mirror Dionysus’ power as a metaphor—that is, a subject whose literal identity is made clearer through the non-literal, in this case, through illusion. Ultimately, the poet creates a narrative persona separate from himself to create a metapoetic space in the poem that allows Dionysus and his metaphorical power to transcend the poem and come to life through the text.<sup>5</sup>

Before one can interpret the function of the *Homeric Hymns*, one must evaluate the place of the *Hymns* in the tradition. Much ink has been spilled over dating the hymns, which seem to vary considerably in both their age and place of origin. As Richard Janko points out, these differences make it difficult to treat the *Homeric Hymns* as a cohesive corpus from a linguistic standpoint.<sup>6</sup> Furthermore, the uncertainty of the dates given to Homer and Hesiod makes the relative dating of the *Hymns* even more problematic. However, Janko’s linguistic method provides a systematic way to estimate the dates of texts by calculating the frequency of archaisms and innovations in poems to figure out whether these reflect a consistent pattern of evolution.<sup>7</sup> Due to the oral nature of the *Hymns*’ transmission, it is only possible to date when the *Hymns* were fixed in writing rather than when they were actually composed. Overall, the evidence points to a later date than the *Odyssey* and closer to Hesiod’s *Theogony*, sometime approximately within the seventh century.<sup>8</sup> According to Janko’s method, the language and style of *Hymn* 7<sup>9</sup> correspond to a relatively early but still post-Homeric date within the seventh century.<sup>10</sup>

From a historical perspective, *Hymn* 7 to Dionysus is particularly difficult to date on account of its lack of historical references.<sup>11</sup> Most scholars have generally cited evidence of Panhellenism to explain the lack of details that might orient the reader to a certain time or place in the *Homeric Hymns* as a corpus. Jenny Strauss Clay asserts that “a clear sign of the Panhellenic Olympian orientation of the Homeric Hymns resides in their self-conscious avoidance of local legend.”<sup>12</sup> As Janko writes, “only by considering [the *Hymns*] above all as literary works fully in the epic tradition do we see how profoundly they transcend the

parochialism of local cults.”<sup>13</sup> The fact is that very little is known about the composition and performance of the *Hymns*. Therefore, Clay’s unified approach, which examines the *Hymns* in their “rightful and central place in Greek poetic thought concerning the Olympian order and its meaning for mankind” as “a necessary complement to the Panhellenic epic and theogonic poetry of Homer and Hesiod,” appears to be the most productive strategy.<sup>14</sup>

Scholars have heavily debated whether Panhellenism in the *Homeric Hymns* is “due to an explicit theological effort to unify the Greek pantheon, or [if] it is a by-product of the poets’ ability to adapt their songs to different audiences.”<sup>15</sup> Clay postulates that “the Homeric Hymns were created in order to fill the perceived gap between Hesiod and Homer” within the Panhellenic Olympian narrative, although she admits that like the Epic Cycle, the *Hymns* also probably had a lengthy prehistory.<sup>16</sup> The *Hymns* do seem to play a complementary role within the Panhellenic narrative; while the Homeric epics focus on heroes with whom the gods sometimes have relations and Hesiodic theogonic poetry focuses on the deities and the divine realm, the *Hymns* straddle the two, focusing on the deities who sometimes interfere with mortals. Clay argues that “each hymn describes an epoch-making moment in the mythic chronology of Olympus and, as such, inaugurates a new era in the divine and human cosmos.”<sup>17</sup> The major concern of these *Hymns* revolves around “the acquisition or redistribution of *timai* [honors] within the Olympian cosmos” and involve “a point of crisis in the Olympian hierarchy,”<sup>18</sup> although some disagree over the extent to which the longer *Hymns* concern the cosmic hierarchy. Rather than attempting to piece together a cohesive story of the Olympian cosmos, one can focus on piecing together what the *Hymns* have to say about a particular god within the overarching Panhellenic Olympian narrative.

For the most part, the *Homeric Hymns* offer a cohesive picture of each individual god. Most of the gods mentioned in the *Homeric Hymns* have only one hymn of considerable length dedicated to them. Any additional hymns about that god are short and consequently offer material too insubstantial to contradict the information the long hymn presents. In fact, most of the gods mentioned in the corpus have only one or two short hymns dedicated to them, or at most a single medium-length hymn. Dionysus is the exception. With one medium-length hymn in addition to one long hymn<sup>19</sup> and one short hymn, he is the only god in the hymnic corpus who has two separate sources of substantial information. Thus, it is particularly important to read the *Hymns* to Dionysus in connection with one another and to understand their differences. This approach attempts to reconcile Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui’s analytical method, which focuses more on the complementariness of the three *Hymns* and less on the epiphany in *Hymn 7*,<sup>20</sup> with that of Dominique Jaillard, who focuses solely on the epiphany of *Hymn 7* rather than on the character of Dionysus by reading *Hymn 7* in the context of the other instances of epiphany in the hymnic corpus.<sup>21</sup> After grasping how the three *Hymns* work in conjunction with one another, one can isolate the function that *Hymn 7* has in defining Dionysus and see how it uses epiphany in a unique way to fulfill that function.

All three *Hymns* involve Dionysus’ relationship to power, but they focus on different aspects of that power at different stages of his narrative timeline. It is most unfortunate that among the three *Hymns* to Dionysus, the first, and likely the longest, hymn has only survived in two short fragments. However, the fragmentary state of the *Hymn 1* to Dionysus does not mean that it has nothing to offer. The first fragment begins with a priamel, an unusual construction in the *Hymns*,<sup>22</sup> which locates Dionysus’ birthplace at the mystical Nysa. Although details of Dionysus’ birth are difficult to extract from the fragments, West asserts that *Hymn 1* most likely tells the story of Dionysus’ reception in Olympus and acceptance by Hera, details taken from a

myth evidently well known from before 600 BCE.<sup>23</sup> According to this myth, when Hephaestus traps sends his mother a magical throne that traps her with invisible bonds, Dionysus succeeds in freeing her by bringing a drunk Hephaestus back to Olympus to undo his trick. Hera rewards Dionysus by admitting him as one of the Twelve Gods of Olympus. Although West's proposed origin story for *Hymn 1* appears as a connected account only in late sources, a series of fragments by Alcaeus confirm Homer's familiarity with the story.<sup>24</sup> *Hymn 1* to Dionysus is an origin story in two senses: it covers Dionysus' birth and his original designation as one of the Twelve Olympians. Although West's belief that the myth may have started with *Hymn 1*<sup>25</sup> cannot be definitively proved, the idea that the *Hymns* were created or at least collected for a specific purpose is certainly compelling. Together, the three *Hymns* to Dionysus reveal different aspects of Dionysus' character. By establishing Dionysus as one of the Twelve, *Hymn 1* tells the story of Dionysus' rise to power, a theme shared by the other two *Hymns*. In the shortest hymn, *Hymn 26*, Dionysus is depicted as being raised by the nymphs in Nysa (ὄν τρέφον ἠϋκόμοι νόμφοι, "whom the beautiful-haired nymphs reared," 1.3), but by the end of the hymn he is their leader (ἐξηγεῖτο, "he led," 1.19). In *Hymn 7*, Dionysus is kidnapped by pirates and is seemingly at their mercy until he reveals his divine nature and turns the pirates into dolphins, saving only the helmsman, who suspected his divinity from the beginning. Thus, each hymn begins with Dionysus at the bottom of a power structure but ends with his ascension to the full height of his power. Ultimately, the story is the same in all three hymns, but each one has a different point to make. *Hymn 1* explains Dionysus' origin; *Hymn 26* describes his relationship with his followers; and *Hymn 7* defines his divine abilities.

The form of *Hymn 7* is essentially question and answer. The first half of the hymn posits questions about Dionysus' identity, and the second half endeavors to answer them. The location of *Hymn 7* sets the tone for the poem, which takes place in a markedly different setting from the other two hymns. *Hymn 1* rejects various places before finally settling on the mythical Nysa, the same location where *Hymn 26* takes place, and then moving to Olympus. *Hymn 7*, on the other hand, deliberately avoids specifying the local of the action. The shore upon which Dionysus is initially discovered remains unnamed, and the majority of the hymn takes place in the middle of the sea. Herrero de Jáuregui argues that "there could not be a better place to symbolize the universality of Dionysos' relation to men."<sup>26</sup> Delocalization, then, is a means to Panhellenism. However, Herrero de Jáuregui agrees with Jaillard's suggestion that rather than taking *Hymn 7* to Dionysus purely as a model Panhellenic poem, one should recognize that "the process of distillation or delocalization of the narrative may have proved to be easier since the dionysiac sea is an 'elsewhere' that can be represented more abstractly."<sup>27</sup> As Marie-Claire Beaulieu points out, the sea is "the meeting point of the human and divine spheres,"<sup>28</sup> causing it to be the traditional locus of divine epiphany. Thus, though perhaps the greater function of the *Hymns* is to espouse panhellenism, it is not inappropriate to focus here on the symbolic function of the sea as the junction between mortal and immortal.

The contrast between mortality and immortality is emphasized by Dionysus' mixed familial background. Each hymn emphasizes a different aspect of Dionysus' parentage. *Hymn 1* addresses Dionysus as δῖον γένος ("divine stock," 1.3), linking him closely to his immortal father. *Hymn 26* ties Dionysus equally to his parents, addressing him as Ζηνὸς καὶ Σεμέλης ἐρικυδέος ἀγλαὸν υἱόν ("the splendid son of Zeus and glorious Semele," 1.2). In *Hymn 7*, on the other hand, it is only Semele who is mentioned explicitly. It must be acknowledged, however, that there is some dispute over Semele's mortal status, for there is no mention of her fatal love for Zeus before the fifth century.<sup>29</sup> Not until the Hellenistic era is there is agreement that Semele is struck

by Zeus' lightning bolt but that Dionysus is saved from a shared destruction. According to M.L. West, Semele can be connected to the Indo-European Earth-goddess whose name has been reconstructed in Proto-Indo-European as *\*d<sup>h</sup>ǵ<sup>h</sup>m-*, which underwent metathesis to form the Greek *χθών*.<sup>30</sup> "Semele" is generally believed to be a Thracian name from *\*g<sup>h</sup>em-elā* for the Earth-goddess, also recognizable under the name Plataia.<sup>31</sup> Based on this connection, Jan N. Bremmer insists that Semele was not a purely human girl but "that Dionysos' human birth is not really human because of the lightning that killed his mother, which turned her into a goddess."<sup>32</sup> In any case, there is some human element to his birth, and although Dionysus is an immortal, it is his mortal origins that are emphasized here. In this way, within the first line of the hymn, mortality and immortality come into conflict within the character of Dionysus. Indeed, Dionysus' mixed mortal-immortal parentage forms the common thread among the three *Homeric Hymns* to Dionysus; in all of them, he must, as Herrero de Jáuregui puts it, "assert his divinity, which is not immediately recognized."<sup>33</sup> This emphasis on Dionysus' mortality conflicts with the logic that his connection to Zeus would be more heavily stressed in a poem chiefly about his power as a god. Although there is no doubt regarding the nominal identity of the god, to define the god more precisely—who he is, where he came from, what his powers are—is another matter entirely. *Hymn 7* immediately confronts the reader with the seemingly paradoxical nature of Dionysus' essence. The hymn's setting on the sea is not merely acceptable but is in fact essential as a reflection of the character of Dionysus, the god from mortal and immortal stock. This is a hymn that is meant to make sense of the apparent contradictions that constitute Dionysus' character. The sea could not be a more appropriate setting, for, as a place located in between the human and divine spheres, it immediately and effectively lays out the problem of paradox central to Dionysus' nature.

It is not only Dionysus' mixed background that is thrown into conflict but his physical appearance as well. Only in *Hymn 7* does his physical appearance receive any description: the speaker states that Dionysus seems like a young man in the prime of youth (*νεηνίη ἀνδρὶ ἔοικώς / πρωθήβη*, "seeming like a young man in the prime of youth," ll.3-4). At no other time in the *Homeric Hymns* is the word *ἔοικώς* used to describe a god who looks or seems like a man. There are several instances of the word *ἔοικώς* taken together with god. In the *Hymn 4* to Hermes, for example, Hermes is compared to black night (*μελαίνη νυκτι ἔοικώς*, "looking like black night," l.358) and explicitly denies that he looks like a cattle rustler (*οὐ τι βοῶν ἐλατῆρι... ἔοικα*, "I do not at all look like a rustler of cattle," l.265; *οὐ τι βοῶν ἐλατῆρι... ἔοικώς*, "I, looking not at all like a rustler of cattle," l.377). In *Hymn 3* to Apollo, Apollo takes on the appearance of a dolphin (*δελφῖνι ἔοικώς*, "looking like a dolphin," l.400). In the *Hymns* to Aphrodite and Apollo, the god has taken on human appearance but still seems like an immortal (*γύναι εἰκυῖα θεῆσιν*, "O woman looking like the goddesses," 5.153; *καταθνητοῖσιν ἔοικας*, "you look like the immortals," 3.464). Mortals are compared to gods in the *Hymns* to Aphrodite and Demeter (*ἄθανάτοισιν ἔοικώς*, "looking like the immortals," 5.55 and 2.241), but gods are never compared to mortals, with the exception of Dionysus in *Hymn 7*.

Dionysus is the only god in the *Hymns* who deceives mortal vision without any obvious metamorphosis, and yet, by describing what appear to be plain facts, the initial lines of the hymn further complicate Dionysus' character. This complexity is reinforced when the helmsman states that Dionysus is *οὐ θνητοῖσι βροτοῖσιν εἶκελος, ἀλλὰ θεοῖς* ("not like mortal men but like the gods," ll.20-21), a statement that is in direct opposition to the initial description of Dionysus as a young man. *Hymn 7* describes Dionysus' physical appearance in great detail—his general aspect (*νεηνίη ἀνδρὶ ἔοικώς πρωθήβη*, "looking like a young man in the prime of youth," ll.3-4), his

hair (καλαὶ δὲ περισσεῖοντο ἔθειραι κυάνεαι, “beautiful, dark hair flowed around him,” ll.4-5), his clothes (φᾶρος δὲ περὶ στιβαροῖς ἔχεν ὤμοις πορφύρεον, “he had a crimson cloak around his strong shoulders,” ll.4-6), his eyes (ὄμμασι κυανέοισι, “dark eyes,” l.15). Despite all of this description, however, the narrator cannot make sense of what should be a concrete fact: Dionysus is like a man, but he is not like a man. What, then, is one to make of him?

Epiphany is the vehicle through which the poet chooses to express Dionysus’ power, and it is by the uncertainty of Dionysus’ identity that *Hymn 7* differs from the other epiphanic *Homeric Hymns*. With the exception of *Hymn 20* to Hephaestus, epiphanies occur in the *Hymns* whenever birth is not involved, namely in *Hymn 2* to Demeter l.188ff., 275ff.; *Hymn 3* to Apollo l.440ff.; and *Hymn 5* to Aphrodite l.81ff., 173ff.<sup>34</sup> In each case, the actions of the deity in disguise are attributed to the god or goddess by name: Demeter is the old woman, Apollo is the dolphin, and it is Aphrodite whom Anchises does not recognize. The myth of each hymn is related by some omniscient third-person narrator. This convention follows the principle<sup>35</sup> emphasized by Gerald F. Else regarding Homeric utterances, namely that “the poet always knows what god is present in or responsible for a given situation, while the human characters usually do not” and, moreover, that “the poet’s knowledge of the divine nature and behavior is precise, encyclopedic, binding.”<sup>36</sup> This is not the case in *Hymn 7*, which begins instead with a memory; from the very start, the members of the audience are aware that what they are about to hear is a subjective telling of a story in the speaker’s past rather than an objective, “encyclopedic” description of an event. Dionysus’ first physical appearance occurs within an indirect statement (μνήσομαι... ὥς, “I will remember how...” l.2), which distinguishes it structurally from the majority of the other *Homeric Hymns*; in these, a relative clause begins the central mythic section of each poem.<sup>37</sup> Meanwhile, Dionysus’ name and identification as the son of Semele are stated outside of the indirect statement—that is, before the mythic narrative actually begins. Once the story commences, Dionysus is not mentioned by name until the very end of the poem, when he speaks for the first time to reveal his true identity to the helmsman. Thus, the audience almost seems to experience the epiphany from the perspective of the sailors.

However, this is not a hymn told from the perspective of a third party as the events described take place. In all of the other *Hymns*, the word μνήσομαι is used at the very end in a variation of the phrase αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ’ ἀοιδῆς “but I will remember you and another song.”<sup>38</sup> In every other hymn, the word is a promise of future remembrance. Only in *Hymn 7* does it introduce the story as a memory. This introductory word suggests that *Hymn 7* is a story told by a narrator recounting only of the subjective interpretation of the event. Instead of overtly describing the god and his actions, the omniscient poet separates himself from the narrative persona, who recalls the event from a subjective perspective.

The subjectivity of the narration is apparent in the way the narrator hints at but never explicitly names Dionysus or calls out his presence throughout the first half of the hymn. The nominal absence of Dionysus is especially noticeable when the helmsman attempts to persuade the rest of the crew that their captive is a god and tries to name which god their captive might be. In lines 19ff., he proposes Zeus, Apollo, and finally Poseidon before giving up and simply asserting that whoever this is, he must be one of the gods who live on Olympus (θεοῖς οἱ Ὀλύμπια δώματ’ ἔχουσιν, “[similar] to the gods who hold Olympian homes,” l.21). By this withholding of Dionysus’ name, the poet heightens the dramatic irony; the god is absent, yet ever present.

Indeed, hints of Dionysus’ presence are scattered throughout the first half of the hymn. One such hint is the formulaic expression ἀνδρεσσι μελήσει in line 27. Modern scholarship has



tried to understand what Lucia Prauscello calls “the apparent lack of any specific reference, direct or indirect, to a female dimension, either in myth or cult, within the narrative of Dionysus’ epiphany” in this hymn.<sup>39</sup> The description of Dionysus as a long-haired youth wrapped in a red cloak could potentially allude to the femininity that is so often present in later accounts of Dionysian epiphany, but this is a weak connection. In an endeavor to find an allusion to Dionysus’ feminine dimension within this hymn, Prauscello shifts attention from Dionysus to the other figures of the poem, analyzing the reaction of the pirates to Dionysus.<sup>40</sup> In so doing, she shows that hints of the god exist even in places where he is not explicitly mentioned. Prauscello first tracks down the times the formula ἄνδρεςσι μελήσει is used in Homeric epic in order to underscore the associations evoked by the phrase, which is used specifically in the speech type-scene in which a man, having felt his authority threatened, addresses a woman.”<sup>41</sup> Thus, when the captain in *Hymn 7* says, ὄδε δ’ αὐτ’ ἄνδρεςσι μελήσει (“this one (Dionysus) will be a concern to men,” l. 27), he feminizes the helmsman, the only one to believe that Dionysus is a god.<sup>42</sup> Prauscello argues that a formulaic expression like ἄνδρεςσι μελήσει would alert the audience, familiar with Homeric epic, to the gender-ambiguous aspect of Dionysus’ world.<sup>43</sup> Just as the distinction between immortal and mortal is blurred by Dionysus’ mistaken identity, so too is that between male and female. Even though the captain does not realize Dionysus’ identity, the formula in his speech turns the one person on the boat who follows Dionysus into a woman, the gender of Dionysus’ traditional company. Thus, although Dionysus is not explicitly mentioned by name throughout the poem, as the other gods are in their epiphanies, perhaps Dionysus is present all along; even before the pirates realize it, “the womanish man-god was already there.”<sup>44</sup>

The possibility of Dionysus’ presence in the first half of the hymn can be taken further, specifically by studying the use of the word δαίμων throughout the corpus of the *Homeric Hymns* and the way its use in *Hymn 7* differs from the rest of the hymns. In most of the hymns, δαίμων is used simply to mean “deity” and is essentially synonymous with θεός.<sup>45</sup> In its adjectival form, δαίμωνι-, it is used to mean “divine” and describes a deity.<sup>46</sup> However, in *Hymn 7*, the adjectival form is used twice and in each case means not “divine” but rather “possessed by a divinity” or “strange.” The helmsman first addresses the rest of the crew as “δαίμόνιοι” (l.17) when pleading with them to release their captive whom he alone thinks is divine. The captain retorts by addressing the helmsman with the same adjective: δαίμόνι’ (l.26). Superficially, δαίμωνι- is a common word of reproach. However, taken in the context of the hymn, it is not a stretch to argue that the audience would see the irony in this word, the root of which implies that the men are possessed by a δαίμων. Generally in Homer, “even after the gods have been differentiated, the idea of power lingering in the vaguer *daimon* often provides an easier explanation of the divine cause of things than could some more departmentalized god in human form.”<sup>47</sup> In this case, the audience knows the god is there, so the dramatic irony is heightened with these forms of address and reinforced when the captain says, ἡμῖν ἔμβαλε δαίμων (“a deity cast him [the captive] on us,” l.31).

Admittedly, all of these phrases are found in dialogue, so it could be argued that it is merely the characters of the *Hymn* who are confused about Dionysus’ identity, not the narrator himself. There are several features of the hymn that refute this contention. First, the hymn is introduced as a memory not only in word but also in structure; the narrative of the hymn begins in indirect statement and is related not as objective fact but rather as subjective description. Moreover, although the poet is omniscient, by creating a separate narrator he suspends his knowledge of Dionysus’ identity once the narrative begins in indirect statement in line 2. Instead, he presents the story from the eyes of someone remembering it and trying to comprehend the

incomprehensible wonder of the experience and the ambiguity of Dionysus. Thus, the direct speech of the characters could conceivably be tainted by memory and its attendant deficiencies; for if the narrator is not omniscient, his subjective perspective would inevitably bleed into the dialogue. Furthermore, there are phrases outside the dialogue that hint at the influence of a divinity. The mention of fate would by itself be of little consequence. However, while Homer more often uses the concept of the δαίμων in cases of misfortune caused by a vague entity, he does make “an occasional recourse to *Moirai*” to stand for the same idea of δαίμων—that is, “what is external to a man’s will, what he does in passion or infatuation.”<sup>48</sup> Taken in the context of these other instances of Dionysian innuendo, the narrator’s mention of fate in line 8 (τοὺς δ’ ἦγε κακὸς μόρος, “evil fate led them”) can reasonably be considered another hint at the god’s presence. The idea of an evil fate causing these events is reiterated in line 51 (κακὸν μόρον ἐξάλυοντες, “escaping an evil fate”). Ultimately, the effect of these Dionysian innuendos is to create three narrative levels: that of the poet, that of the narrator, and finally that of the characters themselves. This is an epiphany unlike any other found in the *Homeric Hymns*; it is a story told by a persona explicitly separate from the omniscient poet.

If, however, the point of *Hymn 7* is to reveal Dionysus’ power, it seems counterproductive for the poet to go to such great lengths to create a narrative persona that is not omniscient. The poet could just as easily narrate the Dionysian epiphany from the omniscient point of view and unambiguously describe Dionysus’ identity and power. In order to understand why the poet sets up this third-person subjective narrator in the first half of the poem, one must examine how Dionysus demonstrates his power in the second half of the poem at the moment of epiphanic revelation.

The complex nature of Dionysus’ power manifests itself on many different sensory levels. Immediately following the shift in the poem at line 34, the sailors are hit by a barrage of sensory experiences. Wine flows over the swift black ship (οἶνος μὲν πρώτιστα θοὴν ἀνὰ νῆα μέλαιναν, l. 35), “sweet to drink” (ἠδύποτος, l.36), but also “fragrant” (εὐώδης, l.36) with an “ambrosial smell” (ὀσμὴ ἀμβροσίη ll. 35-36). Wine is a substance that distorts humans’ senses, much like the god with whom it is associated. In this case, however, the distortion is twofold; wine normally causes illusion, but here it is illusion itself. The sailors see the wine, they taste it, and they smell it. This is an illusion that plays not with a single sense but with the entire mind. The third-person subjective narrator forces the audience to experience these phenomena just as the sailors do. The narrator does not describe how a god is causing these illusions to appear. Instead, the audience experiences each blow to the senses in quick succession with no explanation, only description. With this barrage of sensory experiences, Dionysus mentally possesses not only the characters in the poem but also the audience of the poem.

Dionysus manipulates the visual sense in particular by using both illusion and actual transformation. After the sea turns to wine, vines are stretched out along the mast, and many bunches of grapes hang on it. As Herrero de Jáuregui points out, Dionysus “has the power to break boundaries between land and sea, between living nature and dead wood.”<sup>49</sup> Not only can bonds literally not hold him (τὸν δ’ οὐκ ἴσχανε δεσμά, “the bonds did not restrain him,” l.13), but Dionysus actively breaks the metaphorical bonds that separate immortal from mortal, as he creates life on the barren sea, intertwining the living vines on the dead wood.<sup>50</sup> It is not just the sea but Dionysus himself that is the juncture between the mortal and immortal realms. Through him, the immortal and mortal can coexist. This concept is reinforced by Dionysus’ transformation of the sailors into dolphins. Associated with life and death, dolphins are often depicted as leaping, occupying “the space immediately above the waves, a space conceptualized

by the Greeks as an intermediary location between mortals and immortals.”<sup>51</sup> Thus, they “act as intermediaries between different states of existence, a function they share with the sea”<sup>52</sup> and, more importantly in this case, with Dionysus. Although dolphins’ affinity to music is not explicitly attested until Pindar in the fifth century,<sup>53</sup> this attribute need not be disregarded, as “sentiments towards animals are slow to change.”<sup>54</sup> Thus, the dolphin in *Hymn 7* can conjure up images of “dolphins leaping in a circle around the ship like a dancing chorus.”<sup>55</sup> Dionysus subdues his adversaries by turning them into a chorus, making them his followers, who, like him, dance on the line between immortal and mortal.

Although he is himself a god, in every one of the Homeric hymns dedicated to him Dionysus must prove his place among his fellow immortals. In *Hymn 7*, he must resolve the tension between the immortal and mortal parts of himself and prove that they can coexist within his person. Paradoxically, what makes Dionysus’ character shift from incomprehensible to comprehensible is illusion; this device, usually used to deceive, instead clarifies the identity of god who balances mortality and immortality within himself. Dionysus’ power is made manifest through paradox because he is paradox. The poet’s strategy of using a subjective narrator to tell the story is effective, for it prevents the audience from being detached from the narrative. As Jaillard states, this poem deals “not only with the narration of the divine epiphany, but with the epiphanic structuring of the narrative.”<sup>56</sup> Because the narrative is structured around epiphany, the first half involves a situation of identity that is yet to be understood and the second half reveals that identity. The structure thus mirrors metaphor: first, something literal is presented that warrants explanation; this element is then it is compared to something else that is not literally applicable but makes the first literal concept easier to understand. The vividness of the epiphany that comes from the third-person subjective narration reinforces the concept of Dionysus as metaphor. Thus, Dionysus can be seen as an intermediary figure in more than one sense—he is the intermediary between immortality and mortality but also between reality and illusion.

Although Dionysus also conjures up the image of a bear, another terrifying vision that serves to subdue the pirates and emphasizes his power, he himself becomes a lion, an animal that is not traditionally associated with him but that is the “king of similes” in Homer.<sup>57</sup> Steven H. Lonsdale states that “the symbol of the kingly, quasi-divine, lion from the Near East has been recreated in the similes in the image of the Homeric hero with all his strengths and weaknesses.”<sup>58</sup> However, ὀρούω is the word generally associated with the attacking lion in Homeric simile<sup>59</sup> and is the word used here to describe Dionysus leaping at the captain (ἐπορούσας, 1.50).<sup>60</sup> Although there are instances of the cowardly lion in Homeric simile, ἐπορούσας is a word specifically used to describe the flight of a weapon and the attack of a warrior.<sup>61</sup> Thus, the purpose of *Hymn 7* is to allow Dionysus to show his powers, and he accomplishes this as a metaphor come to life. He is metaphor rather than simile because he blends reality with illusion, as opposed to simile, which is marked off by certain signifying words, such as ὡς... ὥς “just as... so too” or “like.” He blurs the line between real and unreal. By being metaphor, he shows his true essence.

The concept of Dionysus as intermediary can also extend to his position between the literal and the figurative, a position that is created as a result of the poet separating himself from the narrative persona. He is metaphor in that illusion makes sense of the literal facts of his nature, but he is metaphor also in that the literal experience of the poem makes sense of figurative words and phrases in the text, particularly epithets and other epic formulae. Indeed, seen in a certain light, all three *Hymns* to Dionysus endeavor to explain an epithet related to the god. *Hymn 1*’s location of Dionysus’ birth at Nysa is no doubt an attempt to derive through folk

etymology the origin of Dionysus' name, "Dio-" from his father Zeus and "-nysus" from Nysa, his birthplace. Another possible case of folk etymology in *Hymn 1* may be found with the epithet Εἰραφιῶτα, "bull god" in West's translation (Fragment A, 1.3 and Fragment D, 1.8), perhaps meaning "stitched-in one."<sup>62</sup> Since the hymn is evidently about Dionysus' origin and addition as the last of the Twelve Olympians, it would not be aberrant for this epithet, which occurs at the beginning and end of the hymn, to derive its meaning from the story, just as Dionysus' name does. Dionysus is stitched into the Twelve Olympians just as he was stitched into Zeus' thigh. Although Dionysus is connected to the bull in later tradition, perhaps this was a false derivation from the epithet. At any rate, the fragmentary nature of the hymn makes it impossible to reach a definitive conclusion. *Hymn 26*, on the other hand, is a clear case of a poem being used to explain two epithets, namely Κισσοκόμην ("ivy-haired," 1.1) and ἐρίβρομον ("mighty roarer," 1.1).<sup>63</sup> Dionysus is Κισσοκόμης because he is wreathed in ivy (κισσῶι, 1.9) and ἐρίβρομος because noise (βρόμος, 1.10) pervades the woodland in which he and his followers roam.

Given the folk etymology present in *Hymn 1* and *Hymn 26*, that *Hymn 7* has the function of providing folk etymology for epithets and other formulae is unremarkable. *Hymn 7*, however, differs from the other two *Hymns* to Dionysus in the way folk etymology is presented. In most cases, the epithet is introduced first and then its folk etymology is explained. In this way, the poet can describe the situation that incorporates the epithet. This sequence occurs in *Hymn 1* and *Hymn 26*. In *Hymn 7*, however, the poet does not introduce the epithet first. Instead, the narrator describes how the transformed Dionysus roars loudly (μέγα δ' ἔβραχεν, "he roared loudly," 1.45), and then reveals himself with the epithet ἐρίβρομος ("loud-roarer," 1.56). Unlike the other two *Hymns* in which the poet explains the epithets associated with Dionysus, *Hymn 7* presents Dionysus the character showing how his story provides the folk etymology for his epithet. In this way, the folk etymology in *Hymn 7* works on a metapoetic level. The poet is no longer alone in recognizing the function of the hymn as a way to folk etymologize a formulaic phrase. Dionysus transcends the barrier between poet and character to explain the epithet. Thus, Dionysus not only conquers the sailors but also controls the text itself by subsuming the voice of the poet.

Dionysus' dominance over the text can be seen in the illusion of the sea turning into wine, a phenomenon that would certainly lead the audience to think back to the epithet οἴνοπα πόντον "wine-dark" in line 7. The "wine-dark sea" is an utterly commonplace formula in epic poetry and is not associated with the god Dionysus in particular. The epithet "wine-dark" refers to the color of the sea and has parallels in other Near Eastern traditions.<sup>64</sup> In *Hymn 7*, however, Dionysus takes the epithet and makes it his own. Dionysus is metaphor in two senses: he is metaphor in that he uses illusion to make sense of the literal facts about his person, but he is also metaphor in that the literal experience of the poem brings to life figurative textual formulae. The narrative persona acts as a bridge between the poet and Dionysus the character, muting the poet's power to provide explicit explanations of formulae and instead allowing Dionysus to transcend the text and take over the poet's voice. His power is all-consuming; he is metaphor personified, and the text, structured as metaphor, mirrors this. The shape of the poem is the shape of Dionysus; Dionysus is in the poem but is also the poem itself. On a macro level, Dionysus' power as metaphor overtakes the structure of the text. On a micro level, it overtakes the formulae of the text. Thus, *Hymn 7* is a poem about Dionysus' power, a "mental possession"<sup>65</sup> that begins with the very first action of the poem, the poet's remembrance. Introducing the poem with the word μνήσομαι in line 2, the poet begins the hymn with a root derived from Proto-Indo-European \*men- "think," a poetic and religious root associated with singing and mental

activity.<sup>66</sup> Thus, from the very beginning, the poet not only yields to the narrator but also surrenders himself to Dionysus, who comes to life in the text and as the text.

Overall, the existence of a narrative persona separate from the poet confers upon the poem three narrative levels: that of the characters, that of the narrative persona, and that of the poet. On one level, Dionysus takes over the minds of the characters in the story in order to assert his power over them. On the second level, through the narrator, the story is told from a subjective perspective, causing the story of epiphany to shape the structure of the hymn. In this way, the narrative persona acts as the bridge between the poet and the characters. Dionysus not only takes over the minds of the sailors but also possesses the minds of the audience. His power is mirrored by the structure of the text, creating a parallel between the audience and the sailors and between the powerful effect of the textual structure and the power of illusion within the story. Finally, on the third level, the function of the poet, limited by the persona that narrates the poem, is also taken over by Dionysus as he transcends the boundary between character and author to dominate the text itself by taking control of the epithets and formulaic phrases that the poet writes. *Hymn 7* to Dionysus is a poem about power. As metaphor personified, Dionysus asserts his power both at the poetic and at the metapoetic level. Through the text, he comes to life.

## Notes

1. Cora Angier Sowa, *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns* (Chicago: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1984), 1.
2. T.W. Allen, W.R. Halliday, and E.E. Sikes, *The Homeric Hymns* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936), 379.
3. Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui, “Dionysos in the *Homeric Hymns*: The Olympian Portrait of the God,” in *Redefining Dionysos*, ed. Alberto Bernabé, Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui, Ana Isabel Jiménez San Cristóbal, and Raquel Martín Hernández (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), 235.
4. Jenny Strauss Clay, *The Politics of Olympus*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 16.
5. The Greek I quote throughout this paper is from M.L. West’s *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer* (2003). All translations are my own.
6. Richard Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 1.
7. *Ibid.*, 189.
8. *Ibid.*, 184.
9. *Hymn 7* to Dionysus is just long enough to reasonably receive the same linguistic scrutiny that scholars have applied to the longer *Hymns*.
10. Janko, *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction*, 184.
11. Andrew Faulkner, “Modern Scholarship on the *Homeric Hymns*: Foundational Issues,” in *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretive Essays*, ed. Andrew Faulkner (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 14.
12. Clay, *The Politics of Olympus*, 10.
13. Richard Janko, “Review: The Homeric Hymns,” *CR* 41, no. 1 (1991): 12, accessed April 17, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/712554>.
14. Clay, *The Politics of Olympus*, 16.
15. Herrero de Jáuregui, “Dionysos in the *Homeric Hymns*: The Olympian Portrait of the God,” 241.
16. *Ibid.*, 269.

17. Ibid., 10.
18. Ibid., 15.
19. According to West, the fragmentary *Hymn 1* to Dionysus would have been approximately 400 lines (West, “The First *Homeric Hymn* to Dionysus,” 30).
20. Herrero de Jáuregui, “Dionysos in the *Homeric Hymns*: the Olympian Portrait of the God,” 236.
21. Dominique Jaillard, “The Seventh *Homeric Hymn* to Dionysus: An Epiphanic Sketch,” in *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretive Essays*, ed. and trans. Andrew Faulkner (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 136.
22. Richard Janko, “The Structure of the Homeric Hymns: A Study in Genre,” *Hermes* 109, no. 1 (1981): 12, accessed February 25, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4476188>.
23. M.L. West, “The First *Homeric Hymn* to Dionysus,” in *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretive Essays*, ed. Andrew Faulkner (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 31.
24. Ibid., 32.
25. Ibid., 35.
26. Herrero de Jáuregui, “Dionysos in the *Homeric Hymns*: The Olympian Portrait of the God,” 242.
27. Jaillard, “The Seventh *Homeric Hymn* to Dionysus: An Epiphanic Sketch,” 145.
28. Marie-Claire Beaulieu, *The Sea in the Greek Imagination* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), 167.
29. Jan N. Bremmer, “Walter F. Otto’s *Dionysos* (1933),” in *Redefining Dionysos*, ed. Alberto Bernabé, Miguel Herrero de Jáuregui, Ana Isabel Jiménez San Cristóbal, and Raquel Martín Hernández (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), 9.
30. M.L. West, *Indo-European Poetry and Myth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 174.
31. Ibid., 175.
32. Bremmer, “Walter F. Otto’s *Dionysos* (1933),” 10.
33. Herrero de Jáuregui, “Dionysos in the *Homeric Hymns*: The Olympian Portrait of the God,” 245.

34. Janko, “The Structure of the Homeric Hymns: A Study in Genre,” 13-14.
35. Else draws this principle from Ove Jørgensen, “Das Auftreten der Götter in den Büchern τ-μ der Odyssee,” *Hermes* 39 (1904) 357 ff.; E. Hedén, *Homerische Götterstudien* (diss. Uppsala, 1912) 16ff.; and Erland Ehnmark, *The Idea of God in Homer* (Uppsala, 1935) 64-5.
36. Gerald F. Else, “God and Gods in Early Greek Thought,” *TAPA* 80 (1949): 26, accessed March 3, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/283509>.
37. Janko, “The Structure of the Homeric Hymns: A Study in Genre,” 10-11.
38. Variations of the line αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ’ ἀοιδῆς occur at the end of the following hymns: *Hymn 2 to Demeter* (1.495), *Hymn 3 to Apollo* (1.546), *Hymn 4 to Hermes* (1.580), *Hymn 6 to Aphrodite* (1.21), *Hymn 10 to Aphrodite* (1.6), *Hymn 19 to Pan* (1.49), *Hymn 25 to the Muses and Apollo* (1.7), *Hymn 27 to Artemis* (1.22), *Hymn 28 to Athena* (1.18), *Hymn 29 to Hestia* (1.14), *Hymn 30 to Earth* (1.19), *Hymn 33 to the Dioscuri* (1.19).
39. Lucia Prauscello, “‘Dionysiac’ Ambiguity: *HomHymn* 7.27: ὄδε δ’ αὐτ’ ἀνδρεσσι μελήσει,” *MD* 58 (2007): 209, accessed March 8, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40236354>.
40. *Ibid.*, 210.
41. *Ibid.*, 214.
42. *Ibid.*, 215.
43. *Ibid.*
44. *Ibid.*
45. Instances of θεός used to mean δαίμων are found in the following hymns: *Hymn 2 to Demeter* (1.300, 1.338), *Hymn 3 to Apollo* (1.11), *Hymn 4 to Hermes* (1.138, 1.343, 1.381, 1.551), *Hymn 19 to Pan* (1.22, 1.41), *Hymn 30 to Mother Earth* (1.16).
46. The word δαίμωνι- used to mean “divine” occurs in *Hymn 4 to Hermes* (1.97).
47. William Chase Greene, “Fate, Good, and Evil, in Early Greek Poetry,” *HSPH* 46 (1935): 5, accessed March 3, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/310720>.
48. Greene, “Fate, Good, and Evil, in Early Greek Poetry,” 4.
49. Herrero de Jáuregui, “Dionysos in the *Homeric Hymns*: The Olympian Portrait of the God,” 246.
50. *Ibid.*



51. Beaulieu, *The Sea in the Greek Imagination*, 144.
52. Ibid.
53. Ibid., 217.
54. Steven H. Lonsdale, *Creatures of Speech: Lions, Herding, and Hunting Similes in the Iliad* (Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1990), 19.
55. Jaillard, “The Seventh *Homeric Hymn* to Dionysus: An Epiphanic Sketch,” 148.
56. Ibid., 150.
57. Lonsdale, *Creatures of Speech: Lions, Herding, and Hunting Similes in the Iliad*, 1.
58. Ibid., 105.
59. Hector is compared to a lion in Book 15, ll.630-6 of the *Iliad*. The attack of a lion is described within this simile in lines 635-6: ὁ δὲ τ’ ἐν μέσσησιν ὀρούσας / βοῶν ἔδει “[the lion] leaping in the middle devours a cow.”
60. Ibid., 46.
61. Ibid.
62. M.L. West, “The First *Homeric Hymn* to Dionysus,” 30.
63. Herrero de Jáuregui, “Dionysos in the *Homeric Hymns*: The Olympian Portrait of the God,” 239.
64. Cyrus H. Gordon, “The Wine-Dark Sea,” *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 37, no. 1 (1978): 51, accessed February 22, 2016, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/544295>.
65. Herrero de Jáuregui, “Dionysos in the *Homeric Hymns*: The Olympian Portrait of the God,” 246.
66. Joshua T. Katz, “Gods and Vowels,” in *Poetic Language and Religion in Greece and Rome*, ed. J. Virgilio García and Angel Ruiz (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013), 18.

## Bibliography

- Allen, T.W., W.R. Halliday, and E.E. Sikes. *The Homeric Hymns*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936.
- Beaulieu, Marie-Claire. *The Sea in the Greek Imagination*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2016.
- Bremmer, Jan N. "Walter F. Otto's *Dionysos* (1933)." In *Redefining Dionysos*, edited by Alberto Bernabé, Miguel Herrero de Herrero de Jáuregui, Ana Isabel Jiménez San Cristóbal, and Raquel Martín Hernández, 4-22. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013.
- Clay, Jenny Strauss. *The Politics of Olympus*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989.
- Else, Gerald F. "God and Gods in Early Greek Thought." *TAPA* 80 (1949): 24-36. Accessed March 3, 2016. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/283509>.
- Gordon, Cyrus H. "The Wine-Dark Sea." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 37, no. 1 (1978): 51-52. Accessed February 22, 2016. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/544295>.
- Greene, William Chase. "Fate, Good, and Evil, in Early Greek Poetry." *HSPH* 46 (1935): 1-36. Accessed March 3, 2016. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/310720>.
- Faulkner, Andrew. "Modern Scholarship on the *Homeric Hymns*: Foundational Issues." In *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretive Essays*, edited by Andrew Faulkner, 1-28. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Herrero de Jáuregui, Miguel Herrero de. "Dionysos in the *Homeric Hymns*: the Olympian Portrait of the God." In *Redefining Dionysos*, edited by Alberto Bernabé, Miguel Herrero de Herrero de Jáuregui, Ana Isabel Jiménez San Cristóbal, and Raquel Martín Hernández, 235-249. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013.
- Jaillard, Dominique. "The Seventh *Homeric Hymn* to Dionysus: An Epiphanic Sketch." In *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretive Essays*, edited and translated by Andrew Faulkner, 133-150. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Janko, Richard. *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Janko, Richard. "Review: The Homeric Hymns." *The Classical Review* 41, no. 1 (1991): 12-13. Accessed April 17, 2016. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/712554>.
- Janko, Richard. "The Structure of the Homeric Hymns: A Study in Genre." *Hermes* 109, no. 1 (1998): 9-24. Accessed February 25, 2016. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4476188>.

- Janko, Richard. “πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον αἰὲν ἀεΐδειν: Relative Chronology and the Literary History of the Early Greek Epos.” In *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*, edited by Øivind Andersen and Dag T. T. Haug, 20-43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Katz, Joshua T. “Gods and Vowels.” In *Poetic Language and Religion in Greece and Rome*, edited by J. Virgilio García and Angel Ruiz, 2-28. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013.
- Liddell and Scott. *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889.
- Lonsdale, Steven H. *Creatures of Speech: Lions, Herding, and Hunting Similes in the Iliad*. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1990.
- Murray, A.T. *Iliad, Volume II: Books 13-24*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.
- Prauscello, Lucia. “‘Dionysiac’ Ambiguity: HomHymn 7.27: ὄδε δ' αὖτ' ἄνδρεςσι μελήσει.” *MD* 58 (2007): 209-216. Accessed March 8, 2016. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40236354>.
- Sowa, Cora Angier. *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns*. Chicago: Bolchazy-Carducci, 1984.
- West, M. L. “The First *Homeric Hymn* to Dionysus.” In *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretive Essays*, edited by Andrew Faulkner, 29-43. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- West, M.L. *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- West, M.L. *Indo-European Poetry and Myth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

#### Acknowledgments

Very many thanks to Professor Joshua Katz for his invaluable guidance throughout the researching and writing process.