

UC Berkeley

Cabinet of the Muses: Rosenmeyer Festschrift

Title

Between City and Country: Cultic Dimensions of Dionysus in Athens and Attica

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5xt4952c>

Author

Henrichs, Albert

Publication Date

1990-04-01

Peer reviewed

BETWEEN COUNTRY AND CITY:
CULTIC DIMENSIONS OF DIONYSUS IN ATHENS AND
ATTICA

Albert Henrichs
Harvard University



The Attic Dionysus has left an immensely rich and diverse record in art and literature.¹ He appears first on Sophilos' vase and in the poetry of Solon, both times as the wine-god. His connection with the grapevine remained his dominant trait throughout the fifth and fourth centuries, despite an occasional emphasis, especially in drama, on two of his other provinces, maenadism and the afterlife. Tragedy as well as comedy was a Dionysiac event, performed in his honor and, as it were, in his presence. Maenadism in its magnified mythical form looms large in the *Bacchae* of Euripides, which is always the first Attic text that comes to mind when one thinks of Dionysus in Attica.

In many discussions of Dionysus, the *Bacchae* has all but effaced other sources of information, which reveal additional and equally important aspects of the god's place in Athenian society, especially his prominence in cult. The recent monograph by Maria Daraki does not ignore the cultic Dionysus, but her preface sets the tone for the entire book by invoking the parodos of the *Bacchae* to establish a series of interpretive categories, which include "l'expérience psychologique du dionysisme," "l'inversion des normes sociales," "le paradoxe de Dionysos," and the concept of "un dieu aussi étrange" and "son paradis sauvage."² I do not question the validity of these categories for the study of Dionysus; I have used some of them myself. What I find problematic is the almost exclusive dependence on them by a whole generation of scholars, mostly French and American, whose combined efforts have already added a new dimension to the modern view of Dionysus. Their perception of the god is intellectually exciting and consistent with his portrayal in Euripides and, to a lesser extent, in vase-painting, but it is also reductive and threatens to obscure the regional and functional diversity of Dionysus, and the fundamental difference between his mythical and cultic manifestations.

Though written by an Athenian playwright and probably for an Athenian audience, the *Bacchae* is based on a Theban, not an Athenian, myth, and its Dionysus is anything but typical of the way the god was perceived, let alone worshipped, in Attica and other parts of Greece between 500 B.C. and A.D. 200. The maenadic ritual that is the core of the Pentheus myth is a divinely-

induced perversion of actual cult. Genuine cultic elements are not entirely lacking in the *Bacchae*, but they are so completely incorporated into the dramatic reenactment of the myth that myth and cult become virtually [258]inseparable.³ The myth of the *Bacchae*, like many other myths, portrays a worst-case scenario characterized by a disturbed relationship between men and gods, and by the temporary suspension of normal civic and social mechanisms, including cult. By contrast, the practice of religion in cult is designed to circumvent the sinister element highlighted in myth; cult regards the gods as beneficent and proceeds on the expectation of a mutually beneficial reciprocity between the divine and human realms.⁴ To understand the full range of facets, functions and levels of meaning that attached to the Attic Dionysus in the classical period, it is necessary to go beyond the *Bacchae* and the resistance-myth on which it is based and to look at the cultic dimension of Dionysus.

Even the most casual examination of Dionysiac cult will produce results essentially different from those obtained through study of Dionysiac myth. The chapter entitled "Dionysus in the Life of the Athenians" in Hans Oranje's monograph on the *Bacchae* may serve as an example. He omits a substantial part of the evidence for the cult of Dionysus in Attica, including the cult-calendars (below, I), the Dionysiac connotations of the Apatouria and Oschophoria, the mysterious Lenaia vases, and Aristophanes' reenactment of the Country Dionysia (below, III). But he implicitly corrects some of the present misconceptions by drawing attention to the role of "aischrology and *phallophoria*" in the Attic cult of Dionysus, and by emphasizing "that the orgiastic Dionysus was not so integral a part of Athenian life as the wine-god."⁵

Myth and cult are two autonomous yet complementary Greek modes of defining and conceptualizing the gods and their individual identities. While revealing distinct and often opposite attitudes towards Dionysus, myth and cult were never meant to exist in complete isolation from each other. The two often converge to invest Dionysus with a consistent if contradictory divine identity. They place Dionysus in the same provinces of wine, maenadism, afterlife and the theater, and they share a set of associations which cut across these various departments. Dionysus has long been recognized as a complex figure composed of, and associated with, polarities such as god/man, man/beast, male/female, sanity/madness, joy/terror, wild/mild or foreign/indigenous, to mention only the more obvious pairs. The trend began with Euripides, was revitalized by Nietzsche and Walter F. Otto, and continues to flourish in the social structuralism of Jean-Pierre Vernant or Marcel Detienne and the literary structuralism of Charles Segal.⁶

The mythical Dionysus of Euripidean drama in particular has lately been viewed against the background of these and similar pairs of conceptual opposites, including that of "city" and "country." The Thebes of the *Bacchae*, for instance, has been perceived as the conceptual antonym of Mt. Kithairon, where Pentheus, the defender of "*polis*-values," meets his challenger, the "foreign" god and his "mad" female companions, the mythical maenads.⁷ This contrast between the civic center of the *polis* and its hinterland does not

function solely on the level of myth. It has also a distinct cultic dimension which is relevant to the Attic Dionysus and which has received next to no attention. I propose to consider it here from an exclusively Athenian perspective. The cultic paradigms which follow may serve as a reminder that the Attic Dionysus had many faces and that the focus on his mythical identity needs to be [259]supplemented by closer scrutiny of his cultic manifestations before a complete Attic profile of the god can be drawn.

The distinction between city and country invites consideration from the point of view of cult because it meets three requirements. The first is a documented connection with Dionysus, which can be found in the official Athenian designations for two of the four Attic festivals of Dionysus, the *Διονύσια τὰ κατ' ἀγρούς* as opposed to the *Διονύσια τὰ ἐν ἄστει*.⁸ By differentiating between the City Dionysia and the Country Dionysia, the Athenians recognized the distinctive cultic identities of the city and of the surrounding country with its inland and coastal regions. At the same time the city remembered the rural roots of its major Dionysiac cults and renewed the link with the country each year at the Anthesteria, when the casks of new wine from the wine-growing demes were ceremonially opened in the city, and again a month later at the City Dionysia, when the statue of Dionysus Eleuthereus was carried from the northwestern outskirts of Athens, as if from the border town of Eleutherai, into the heart of the city and the theater of Dionysus.⁹ Still, the most important Dionysiac cult-sites of the Athenian state lay within the Themistoclean wall, the oldest known boundary of Athens proper. Not only were the theater and temple-precinct of Dionysus Eleuthereus situated inside this perimeter, but also, whatever their exact location, the mysterious Boukoleion, where the annual “marriage” of Dionysus to the wife of the Archon Basileus took place, and perhaps the elusive sanctuary of Dionysus ἐν Λίμναις.

The second requirement is a demonstrable historical dimension to ensure that I am not building castles in the air but remain firmly grounded in the actual world of classical Athens. Historians of Attica are familiar with the geographical, social and political division between the *astu* or *polis* proper on the one hand and the *agroï* or *chôra* on the other hand. This dichotomy of city and country underlies Thucydides' account of Theseus' reorganization of Attica and his description of the impact of the first year of the war on Attic families (2.14-17); it also lies behind the Cleisthenic division of the *phylai* into *trittyes* of city, inland and coastal demes which Aristotle reports in Chapter 21 of the *Athenaiôn Politeia*.¹⁰

“City” and “country” are terms that suggest different things to different people.¹¹ I use “city” in the narrow geographical sense of “downtown” Athens and its suburbs rather than in the political sense of Athens as a city-state. In my discussion of the deme-calendars (below, I), however, the geographical and political connotations merge: state festivals took place in the “city” (*astu*). It must also be borne in mind that many of the so-called city-demes retained a distinctly rural character, which is well illustrated by Sophocles' Kolonos ode.

Finally, I was looking for a contrast that had been recognized as such by the poets of tragedy as well as comedy. Their perspective transcends the other two and extends the tangible historical distinctions between country and city and between Athens and the demes into the more distant realm of the imagination.

It would not be difficult to multiply examples that illustrate the interplay of country and city in the Attic definition of Dionysus, a god who according to Athenian tradition was more than once brought into the city from outside.¹² I limit myself to three paradigms: the sacrificial calendars from Attica, the [260]Dionysus ode in *Antigone*, and the celebration of Dionysiac festivals by Dikaiopolis in the *Acharnians*. I hope to show that these texts furnish different Dionysiac articulations of the country/city contrast that reveal aspects of the Attic Dionysus not found in the *Bacchae* and rarely considered in contemporary scholarship. In Aristophanes and Sophocles, a Dionysus associated with a particular deme takes center stage, while the calendars illustrate the overall relationship between city and deme in the cult of Dionysus.

I. DIONYSUS IN THE CULT-CALENDARS OF THE ATTIC DEMES.

A very prosaic and down-to-earth attitude towards Dionysus emerges from the sacrificial calendars of the Attic demes, which were found on stone in various locations throughout Attica. There came to light between 1961 and 1983 the calendars of three demes, Teithras (1961), Erchia (1963), and most recently Thorikos (1983). In addition, we have fragments of the calendars of the Marathonian Tetrapolis and the deme Eleusis, as well as small portions of the extensive state code of Nikomachos, which recorded, among other things, all the sacrifices performed in the city of Athens. The publication and especially the interpretation of several of these calendars owe much to the industry and cooperation of Georges Daux, Sterling Dow and Michael Jameson, and the most recent addition, the calendar from Thorikos, found its way to the United States and is now in the Getty Museum.¹³

These calendars are unique documents which have added a new dimension to our knowledge of religion as practiced in all three geographical regions of Attica, the city, the inland and the coast, even though the coastal demes are much better represented than the other two regions. Students of the regional aspects of Greek religion are now in a position to consider many specific details of the cults and festivals of Attica in more concrete terms than was possible fifty-seven years ago when Ludwig Deubner published his *Attische Feste*, which still remains the fundamental study on the subject. Robert Parker's recent article on deme-festivals represents an accurate measure of the progress that has been made already, especially in the crucial area of the relationship between the cultic activities of the demes and those of the city proper.¹⁴

The sacrificial calendars record the occasions and the modalities of several hundred animal sacrifices in the chronological order of the Attic year. The individual entries typically comprise the following pieces of information,

some of which may be omitted in a given instance: the date and occasion of the ritual; the divine recipient; the place of sacrifice; a description of the kind of animal required for the sacrifice; an indication of the type of sacrificial ritual to be followed, sometimes with additional comments on technical aspects of the ritual process; instructions concerning the distribution of the sacrificial meat, including the perquisites for the priests or other officials; and finally, the price of the victim, that is the expenditure budgeted for each sacrifice.

Three of the deme-calendars date from the first half of the fourth century B.C.; the specimen from Thorikos has been assigned a much earlier date in the 430s or 420s;¹⁵ the fifth text, the Eleusinian stone, is later than the others, circa 300 B.C. Taken together this epigraphical corpus stands out by virtue of its specificity. No other type of documentation provides an equally vivid and [261]detailed illustration of the cultic side of Attic religion on the deme level and on a month-by-month basis. These texts have been studied from two perspectives, the financial administration of deme-cults and the relationship between the cultic activities of the deme and those of the city. It is the second perspective, the broader issue of deme-cults versus city-cults, that is particularly relevant to my topic. Jon D. Mikalson and Robert Parker have raised the question of how the religious festivals of the demes were coordinated with those celebrated in the city.¹⁶ Did the demes maintain a measure of autonomy in cultic matters? And how are the major city-festivals reflected in the sacrificial calendars of the demes?

As to the first question, it appears that the demes retained their religious independence from the city in the three prominent areas of agrarian, hero and domestic cult.¹⁷ These cults reflect a vital concern with the life-cycle of the farm and of the family, which is naturally local. Whereas festivals such as the Theogamia that primarily concerned the family were held independently in the demes as well as the city, the cult of local heroes and agrarian deities was a distinctive feature of deme-religion.

A substantial number of hero-cults are attested for the first time in the sacrificial calendars, especially at Thorikos. They are conceptually related to the agrarian as well as the domestic cults. Shrines of minor "domestic heroes" existed in many Greek cities, including Athens; occasionally such shrines were even attached to private residences.¹⁸ Public hero-cult was a different matter. As an institutionalized form of ancestor-worship it often centered on the alleged tombs of local heroes. Heroic tombs were normally located outside the city-boundaries and in the rural demes, as in the case of Oedipus at Kolonos (a city-deme with a distinctively rural character).¹⁹ We do not know how many of the local heroes of Erchia and Thorikos had their own tombs or shrines, but their special prominence in the demes illustrates the principle that they "had firm roots in local soil."²⁰

This is even more true of the cults of Demeter and Dionysus, which reveal a rural dimension of deme-religion that distinguishes it from the religion of the city.²¹ The divine inventors of agriculture and viticulture are naturally more at home in the country than in the city. Demeter's main cult never left the deme

of Eleusis and the Rarian Plain, and the rural Dionysus was worshipped in the demes each winter at the Country Dionysia. Both gods paid periodic visits to the city. The Dionysus of the Country Dionysia and his phallic companion, Phales, entered the city only in the imagination of Aristophanes (below, III), but as the wine-god he literally arrived in Athens each spring for the Anthesteria in liquid form, and perhaps on a ship-like wagon as well. As god of the theater he presided over dramatic performances both in the city and in the demes.

There are no easy answers to the second question, that of local observances of city-festivals by the demes. As Mikalson put it, “Did the demes hold local celebrations of state festivals, or did the demesmen travel to Athens to participate in the state celebrations?”²² I will reconsider that question briefly with particular attention to Dionysus. If the epigraphical record is not misleading, no other deity was as popular in the demes as Dionysus, who is the incorporated fully in the sacred calendars and the everyday religious routines of [262]demes. Far from distancing themselves from Dionysus, which is an attitude peculiar to myth rather than cult, the rural population of Attica appears to have been on excellent ritual terms with the god.

The calendars from Erchia and Thorikos list a total of five sacrifices to Dionysus; no such sacrifice is recorded in the fragments of the other calendars. The dates of four of these sacrifices coincide with three of the four festivals of Dionysus in Attica, the Country Dionysia, the Anthesteria and the City Dionysia. The Anthesteria is the only Dionysiac festival mentioned in both inscriptions. It is perhaps accidental that none of the calendars records any sacrifice in connection with the fourth Dionysiac festival, the Lenaia, about which we are singularly ill-informed. Before I draw some conclusions, I present the four principal entries in their calendrical order and add brief comments on each text.²³

(1) Thorikos, line 31: Ποσιδειῶνος, Διονύσια. “Posideon. The Dionysia.”

The Country Dionysia were celebrated in Posideon (December/January) throughout Attica.²⁴ The festival is explicitly attested for more than a dozen demes and was doubtless observed in many others as well. The Thorikos calendar tends to abbreviate, which explains the absence of both the day of the festival, which differed from deme to deme, and any description of the sacrifice or the victim (doubtless a kid or goat).

(2) Erchia Γ 42-47: [A]νθηστηριῶνος δευτέραι ἰσταμένου, Διονύσῳ, Ἐρχι(ᾶσιν), ἔριφος προπτόρθι(ος), (πέντε).²⁵ “Anthesterion, on the second of the month, for Dionysus, at Erchia, a kid in the first growth of horns (?), five drachmas.”

(3) Thorikos 33f.: Ἀνθηστηριῶνος, Διονύσῳ, δω[δεκάτη], αἶγα λειπεγνώμονα πυρρὸν ἢ [μέλανα]. “Anthesterion, for Dionysus, on the twelfth, a tawny or [black] kid that lacks milk teeth.”²⁶

The Anthesteria, during which the wine of the previous vintage was broached, were held in the city on three successive days, Anthesterion 11-13. The Erchia calendar assigns the sacrifice to a date which precedes the city-festival by as many as nine days. It looks as if at least some of the Erchians were warming up for the main event in the city by having an early party in their deme.

The date in the Thorikos calendar corresponds to the main day of the city-festival, the Choes, which was named after the pitchers used during the extraordinary dinner parties that were held on that day in the Thesmotheteion and in private homes as well. What made these dinners special was a drinking contest and separate tables for the participants, who had to bring their own provisions.²⁷ Festive dinners required the meat of sacrificial victims. Although sacrifices in the city are not explicitly attested for the Anthesteria, they must have been the rule rather than the exception. Dikaiopolis' extravagant menu for the dinner at the Choes includes not only thrushes, eels, a hare, sausages, cuttlefish and a pigeon, but also the meat from a wedding banquet, which arrived in the nick of time as a gift from the groom (*Ach.* 1049ff.).

[263]Where did the Thorikians sacrifice their goat? Since no location is given in the inscription, it is not at all clear whether the sacrifice took place in the deme or in the city. Robert Parker has argued for a local celebration. He proceeds from the assumption that a Thorikian's own home was a more natural place for his drinking-party than the city, and concludes that the sacrifice represented "a modest public supplement to festivities being conducted privately throughout the deme."²⁸

Parker's conclusions may well be right, but other scenarios are equally possible. The parties held in private homes and the public sacrifice were separate events which took place in different locations and did not necessarily involve the same demesmen. We are ill-informed about the typical course of events at the Choes, but it is not very likely that every Thorikian stayed at home for the festivities. In fact some of the best information suggests that it was not unusual to invite guests for the drinking contest and the dinner. In the *Acharnians* (1085ff.) Dikaiopolis is invited by the priest of Dionysus to join the official party hosted by the *polis*-administration. According to Callimachus and Eratosthenes, private Choes parties in Alexandria followed the Athenian model and were attended by invited guests.²⁹

If the same custom was observed in fourth-century Attica, some Thorikians might have gone to Athens for the Choes to stay with relatives or friends. Let us suppose that Thorikos did contribute to a city-sacrifice. In that case the deme would have been represented at the Athenian festival by a small delegation, perhaps consisting of the demarch and a few of his fellow demesmen, while the vast majority of the Thorikians were free to go about their own business. A single baby goat does not fill many stomachs and, as Parker saw, numerous private sacrifices must have accompanied the public sacrifice of the deme. In any event, the sacrifice commissioned by the deme on behalf of its members added a public dimension to the festivities of the private households, and it did so under the aegis of the deme rather than the city.

(4a) Erchia Δ 33-40: Ἐλαφηβολιῶνος ἕκτῃ ἐπὶ δέκα, Διουύσῳι, Ἐρχιά(σιν), αἶξ, παραδό(σιμος) γυν(αι)ξί, οὐ φορά, ἱερέαι τὸ δέρμα, (δώδεκα). “Elaphebolion 16; for Dionysus; at Erchia; a goat; to be handed over to the women; no removal; the skin to the priestess; 12 drachmas.”

(4b) Erchia A 44-51: [Ἐ]λαφηβολιῶνος ἕκτῃ ἐπὶ δέκα, Σεμέλῃ, ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ βωμοῦ, αἶξ, γυναιξὶ παραδόσιμος, ἱερέας (sic) τὸ δέρμα, οὐ φορά, (δέκα). “Elaphebolion 16; for Semele; on the same altar; a goat; to be handed over to the women; the skin for the priestess; no removal; 10 drachmas.”

To judge by its date, the two sacrifices on the 16th of Elaphebolion seem to have been a follow-up to the City Dionysia, which started around the 8th of Elaphebolion and did not extend beyond the 14th. The entries provide an interesting ritual detail. I do not mean the familiar prohibition on removal of the sacrificial meat,³⁰ but the prominent role certain women played in these joint sacrifices for Dionysus and his mother.

[264] These women were entitled to receive the entire animals from both sacrifices, a generous perquisite at the deme's expense. The price of twelve drachmas for male and of ten drachmas for female goats is consistent throughout the inscription. The sacrifices for Dionysus and Semele, though distinct, had to be performed on the same altar, a ritual detail which sheds new light on Eur. *Ba.* 998f. (joint *orgia* for Dionysus and Semele).³¹

Several questions arise at this point for which I have no answer. Who were these women? What was their ritual role? Were they among the Athenian women who went to Delphi every other year to join the Delphic Thyiads and their rites on Mt. Parnassos?³² The complete absence of ritual maenadism within the borders of Attica raises further questions. There were several suitable mountains in Attica, but no maenads climbed them in ritual *oreibasia*, even though Pentelikon (1109 m) and Parnes (1413 m) would have been an easy climb, a *κάματος εὐκάματος* (“a toil of easy toil,” Eur. *Ba.* 67), for women accustomed to scaling the slopes of Parnassos (2459 m), which is almost twice the height of the highest Attic mountain. Attic vase-painters portrayed hundreds of mythical maenads. Did they ever see real maenads in Attica? Did the Attic maenads who went to Delphi lose their maenadic identity when they returned to Athens? Did they participate in other Dionysiac rituals during the intervals that separated their trips to Delphi? Again I do not have the answers.

Perhaps the puzzle could be solved if we knew more about the women who are summoned to a *βακχείον*, or Dionysiac cult-place, in the first line of Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*.³³ They may well have been the ritual ancestors of the women of Erchia who played such a prominent part in the sacrifices for Dionysus and Semele. Whatever their exact ritual role, the Dionysiac women of Erchia are an integral part of the regular deme-religion. The attention they receive in an official document of the religious administration of the deme

argues against Marcel Detienne's notion that Dionysiac cult in general and maenadic rites in particular represented a deliberate departure from the normal religion of the *polis*.³⁴

I return to the relationship of deme-cults and city-cults in connection with Dionysus. The Erchia and Thorikos calendars suggest that the demes did indeed take note of the Dionysiac festivals held in the city, and that they sometimes did so by scheduling sacrifices to be held in the demes either immediately before or after the grander celebration in the city. This would give the demesmen an opportunity to go to Athens to participate in the larger festivals. The city-cults apparently took precedence, with the exception of the Country Dionysia, which were celebrated exclusively in the demes and which serve as a reminder that the Dionysus of the city and his festivals originated in the country.

II. REGIONAL CULT AND POETIC INTENT: THE DIONYSUS ODE OF SOPHOCLES.

My next paradigm, taken from tragedy, has to do with the wider geographical dimension or regionality of Dionysiac cult and with its poetic appropriation by Sophocles. The fifth and last stasimon of *Antigone* (1115-52) takes the form of an urgent prayer to Dionysus cast in conventional hymnic style, with emphasis on the god's most prominent cult-places rather than his [265]divine names and epithets, which are summarily dealt with in the opening invocation: "You of many names (*πολυώνυμε*), pride of the Cadmeian maiden and offspring of deep-thundering Zeus."

Placed in pivotal position at the tragic turning point of the action, this ode marks the transition from the brief prospect of a happy resolution of the conflict between Creon and Antigone to the ultimate catastrophe, which results in the destruction of his entire family.³⁵ While Polynices' body lies unburied, a constant source of pollution for Thebes and her citizens, while Antigone is prepared to die in the confinement of her rocky tomb, and while Haemon contemplates suicide, Creon attempts to reverse the inevitable course of events and rushes to the outskirts of Thebes to bury Polynices and to set Antigone free.

The audience knows that Creon and his family are doomed, but the chorus still hope for last-minute salvation and divine intervention. Its hopes center on Dionysus, the local divinity *par excellence*, who is invoked to make his epiphany, to leave his distant haunts and to come to his native Thebes from afar "with his cathartic foot" in order to heal the city's ills, the "violent disease" that is holding Thebes in its grip: *καὶ νῦν, ὡς βιαίας ἔχεται / πάνδαμος πόλις ἐπὶ νόσου, / μολεῖν καθαρσίωι ποδὶ Παρνασσίαν / ὑπὲρ κλιτῶν ἢ στουόεντα πορθμόν* (1140-45).

Earlier poets such as Homer, Sappho and Aeschylus liked to embellish prayers for divine epiphanies with the conspicuous trappings of concrete physical appearance inherent in the Greek concept of anthropomorphic gods. Two features in particular receive frequent attention: the way the gods move from place to place, be it on foot, in a chariot, or propelled by wings, and the

places which they favor as their haunts and abodes, whether mountains, meadows, rivers, cities or sanctuaries. The longer the catalog of favored locations where they can be expected to be reached, the more effective is the prayer. Sophocles too employed both conventions with extraordinary skill as he envisaged Dionysus en route to Thebes and his eventual arrival there.

The striking phrase *μολεῖν καθαρσίωι ποδί* (“come with cathartic foot”) evokes the graphic image of the god’s pedestrian progression and of his fleeting presence, two traits which are equally present in the Elian cult-song in celebration of a Dionysus who makes his local appearance in theriomorphic disguise, “with his bull’s foot rushing” (*βοέωι ποδι θύων*).³⁶ Yet the feet of Sophocles’ Dionysus are more than mere vehicles of physical movement. Like divine eyes and healing hands, they are endowed with supernatural power and with the life-renewing touch that restores the health of the ground on which they tread.³⁷ How benign and salutary is *this* Dionysus and his imagined return to Thebes in comparison with the vengeful and violent homecoming of the god dramatized in Euripides’ *Bacchae*!

The initial invocation of Dionysus, with its distinctly Theban focus, is separated from the concluding prayer by two stanzas which comprise a catalog of five distinct cult-places of Dionysus: first Italy, a very remarkable beginning; then Eleusis, described in chthonic terms as “Demeter’s all-embracing womb” (1120f. *παγκοίνοις Ἐλευσινίας / Δηοῦς ἐν κόλποις*), an allusion not only to the local mystery cult but also to the afterlife and to Earth [266] as the universal receptacle of the dead and the source of new life; Thebes is next, “the metropolis of Bacchic women” (1122 *Βακχᾶν ματρόπολιν Θήβαν*), followed by Delphi, the haunt of the Korykian nymphs and the locale of Dionysiac night-festivals; finally “the mountains of Nysa” (1131), presumably on Euboea, whence Dionysus is summoned to Thebes as the city’s tutelary divinity, “the one who oversees the roadways of Thebes” (1135f. *Θηβαίας / ἐπισκοποῦντ’ ἀγνιάς*, a word which carries the connotation of civilized space and *polis*-life, as opposed to the open country). Significantly, the prayer remains unanswered: Dionysus does not return to the city.

The catalog of cult-places confirms the familiar paradox that the Dionysus of Attic tragedy is more at home in Thebes and Delphi than in Attica.³⁸ Yet by assigning such a prominent role first to Eleusis and then to the Eleusinian Iakchos, who was a mere cult-figure without a mythical identity, Sophocles paid his tribute to the Attic Dionysus.³⁹ His choice is revealing. He did not choose the rustic god of the vintage and the phallus celebrated in the Country Dionysia and the Anthesteria, nor did he turn to the Dionysus of the theater and the City Dionysia, at least not explicitly. Ignoring the more obvious candidates, he chose the most mysterious and chthonian of all the Attic manifestations of Dionysus, the Eleusinian consort of Demeter and Kore, whose local cult-name appears in prominent position at the very end of the ode: *τὸν ταμίαν Ἰακχον* (1152), “Iakchos the steward” of Demeter’s treasures, which include the bountiful fruits of the earth as well as the innumerable souls of the dead with their dual power to help and to harm the living.⁴⁰

This particular articulation of the Attic Dionysus, with emphasis on his Eleusinian dimension, should guide our understanding of the death-theme that forms the conceptual framework of Sophocles' *Antigone*, and of Dionysus' prominence in the play.⁴¹ The search for ambivalence and polarity in *Antigone*, which began some twenty years ago with Gerhard Müller's commentary, has obscured the intricate makeup of the Dionysus of the fifth stasimon, who is widely believed to make an incorporeal epiphany *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* in the final scene of the play as a decidedly "negative" force and as the ultimate bringer of death and destruction.⁴² But violence and suffering are hardly the hallmarks of Sophocles' Dionysus. His "dark" side manifests itself more tangibly and less categorically in the Eleusinian tenor of the ode, which is integral to the tragedy as a whole and which is far from negative.

Eleusis taught the Greeks to accept the finality of death, but it also promised "brighter hopes" (*ἡδίων τὰς ἐλπίδας*) for the hereafter and thus a continuation of life after death. Sophocles echoed the Eleusinian creed in one of his lost plays: only the initiates have true life in the underworld, the rest suffer nothing but evil.⁴³ It is this Eleusinian glimmer of hope, I believe, that shines through the darkness of *Antigone* and informs the Dionysus ode, where it belies the shortsighted expectations of the chorus while at the same time confirming Antigone's own hopes.

In her last speech (894) Antigone mentions the name of Persephone as queen of the dead, an unmistakable anticipation of the Eleusinian theme. While Creon's family is separated and destroyed, Antigone harbors high hopes (883-902, esp. 897 *κάρτ' ἐν ἐλπίσιν τρέφω*) of being reunited with hers through [267]her death, which marks the ultimate fulfillment of her progressive self-identification with the world of the dead. Antigone does not want to die prematurely, but like the Eleusinian initiates she knows that there will be life for her after death. Charles Segal is one of the few critics to recognize the Eleusinian tenor of the ode, but he construes a stark contrast between the "cyclical renewal of nature associated with Demeter and Iacchus" and Antigone's "sterility as bride of Hades," since unlike Persephone she "will not ascend from the dark Underworld to the bright sky."⁴⁴ It is true that Antigone will not return from the dead, but then neither will the initiates. If I read Sophocles' hints aright, which have to do with cult rather than myth, he alludes to the Eleusinian answer to man's mortality without denying that hope to Antigone. Most members of the Athenian audience were initiates themselves, and will have understood Antigone's allusive remarks and the nature of her hope.

Modern opinion on the Dionysus of the hymn is sharply divided. At one extreme we find Sir Richard Jebb's unequivocally optimistic characterization of the god, whose Victorian innocence is transformed into a divine virtue: "Hence this strain, full of gladness, invoking the healing presence of the bright and joyous god who protects Thebes."⁴⁵ The other extreme is reflected in the more ambivalent reading of George Steiner, whose dependence on schematic

polarities illustrates the pitfalls of the powerful modern trend that served as our starting point:

Dionysus is “myriad-named” [πολυώνυμος] precisely because the common logic of designation cannot comprise his transcendent, internally antinomian manifold of phenomenal presences and functions—Dionysus, who is “also Hades,” said Heraclitus (if we translate rightly). In this last choral ode of the play, the sixth, Dionysus (as in the *Bacchae*) has the potential and attributes of both life and death, of instauration and of devastation. He finds expression both in trance and in lucidity. ... If the epiphany of Dionysus can bring purification, it can also bring ruin.⁴⁶

Steiner projects the polar configuration of the Euripidean Dionysus of the *Bacchae* back into the equally complex but less “antinomian” Dionysus of Sophocles. On this point I part company with him. The Dionysus of the *Antigone* ode has a recognizable affinity not with death and devastation but with the dead and with the afterlife, the two overriding concerns of *Antigone* as a dramatic character.

The juxtaposition of Italy (the Greek name for Magna Graecia) and of Eleusis in the catalog of cult-places supports the conclusion that the Dionysus-Iakchos of the epiphany ode cannot be separated from the burial of Polynices and the deaths of *Antigone* and *Haemon*. It was in Southern Italy, as well as in Eleusis, that the Greek Dionysus emerged as a champion of the dead and a guarantor of a personal afterlife. Numerous South Italian vases illustrate various aspects of the belief in a Dionysiac hereafter, and their testimony has been corroborated by the discovery of the gold tablet from Hipponion which contains a guided tour of the underworld for initiates of Dionysus.⁴⁷

[268]Two exciting new tablets from a late fourth-century tomb in Thessaly, which are closely related to some of the tablets found in Italy, have now confirmed the Dionysiac ambience of these afterlife texts. Furthermore, their opening lines, unparalleled in any other source, reveal an Eleusinian dimension which is comparable to the tenor of the Sophoclean ode: “Now you have died and now you have been born, thrice-blessed, in this one day. Tell Persephone that it was the Bacchic One himself who set you free.”⁴⁸ The certainty of death, but also the certainty of another life after death, a promise sustained by Persephone and Dionysus—this is exactly the conceptual and cultic substratum that underlies Sophocles’ dramatic profile of *Antigone* and of the two divinities that the dramatist brings into play to give substance to her hope.

Students of Greek tragedy and of Greek religion are grateful to Sophocles for having put Italy on his map of Dionysiac cult-places, thereby introducing into his *Antigone* a fundamental dimension of Dionysus rarely mentioned on the Attic stage outside the *Frogs* of Aristophanes. And yet several attempts have been made to remove Italy from the Sophoclean text by conjecture. The most recent one is Roger Dawe’s, in whose Teubner edition (1979) Ἰταλίαν has

been ousted by, of all places, *Οἰχαλία*, a thoroughly un-Dionysiac town on Euboea which derives its poetic status from its role in the Heracles epics.⁴⁹ The incongruous name still mars his revised text of 1985.

Better inspired was an earlier conjecture which goes back to the 19th-century scholar Robert Unger, who replaced *Ἰταλία* with *Ἰκαρία*, the name of the most Dionysiac of all Attic demes, in a misguided attempt to reduce the Panhellenic cult-topography of the ode to more Attic proportions. The Dionysiac claims of Ikarion (the more authentic form) are indeed considerable.⁵⁰ It was the native deme of Thespis, the traditional founding father of Attic tragedy. What is more, Ikarion boasts a fifth-century deme-decree (*IG I³ 253-254*) recording the sacred funds for Dionysus and for the deme's eponymous hero Ikarios; the same stone attests dramatic performances in the deme, and remains of a small theater were discovered south of the agora. Finally, there is the sinister myth of Ikarios, the first recipient of the gift of Dionysus, who shared the pleasures of the new wine with his fellow demesmen and was killed in retaliation when the revellers collapsed in drunken stupor, apparently dead. Ikarios' blood mixed with the red wine.⁵¹ The myth illustrates the ambivalent qualities, *χάρμα καὶ ἄχθος* ("delight and burden," Hesiod fr. 239), of the wine and its god.

The Ikarios myth is not attested before Eratosthenes, who will have found it in one of the local historians of Attica. True, Ikarion was a prominent wine-growing village long before it became associated with the theater, and the local myth about the first wine may well have come to the attention of Sophocles. Even so, nobody who is familiar with the central concerns of *Antigone* and its Dionysus ode would want to pour more wine into it, beyond the brief mention of Euboea's "green cliffs, heavy with grape-clusters" (1132f.) provided by Sophocles.⁵² The MSS reading *Ἰταλία*, with its connotation of distant mystery cults and the afterlife, is infinitely more appropriate than the parochial vision of *Ἰκαρία* with its vineyards and winepresses.

[269]Italy and Eleusis are only two of the cult-places touched upon in the ode, and the promise of a life after death is but one of the dimensions of its Dionysus. Throughout the ode he is a god on the move, traversing long stretches of open country on his way to a city which he never seems to reach. The country conceived as a separate conceptual entity and in opposition to the city is not very prominent in extant tragedy before Euripides. Yet Sophocles was equally well aware of Dionysus' tendency to leave the confines of the city and to inhabit the open country (*OC* 668-80). Although the word *polis* occurs three times in the ode, and always in reference to Thebes, the notional residence of Dionysus, the god qua *πολίτης* ("citizen") takes second place to the itinerant Dionysus of the epiphany theme, who passes rivers, rocks, springs, mountains and coastlines covered with ivy and grapes on his way to Thebes, and who finally disappears into the darkness and the torchlight in the company of his maenads, who dance through the night: *αἶ σε μαινόμεναι πάννυχοι / χορεύουσι τὸν ταμίαν Ἰακχον* (1151f.).

Like the dead, the maenads are night-wanderers, *νυκτιπόλοι* (Aesch. fr. 273a.9 Radt, Eur. *Ion* 717), whose world functions as the antonym of the city. The Dionysus of myth and tragedy, in Sophocles as well as Euripides, does not take up permanent residence anywhere, least of all in the *polis*, not even Thebes. His comings and goings, his sudden epiphanies and general elusiveness, are integral constituents of his mythical identity which underlie the modern definition of the tragic Dionysus as the foreign god, the stranger or, to borrow the *mot juste* of current Parisian parlance, as the absolute Other, *l'Autre*.⁵³ Such a self-conscious and self-questioning portrayal of Dionysus is derived exclusively from Dionysiac myth and belongs to the realm of the imagination, both ancient and modern. It is a valid portrayal which adds an important facet to the overall conception of the Greek Dionysus, but its validity is far from universal; even in the fifth stasimon the god is associated with hope rather than with fear or alienation. The ambivalent Dionysus of tragedy was a Dionysus for special occasions.

III. THE COUNTRY IN THE CITY: AN ARISTOPHANIC CODA.

Dionysus is more complex in tragedy than in comedy. The simple country roots of Dionysus were very much on Aristophanes' mind in the *Acharnians* of 425 B.C., my last paradigm, which does not require a lengthy treatment. It is here, on the comic stage and under the eye of Dionysus the theater-god, that the physical and conceptual boundaries separating country from city are temporarily set aside and the two realms merge into one to create yet another Dionysiac dimension.⁵⁴

Performed at the Lenaia before an exclusively Athenian audience of citizens and metics (*Ach.* 504 *αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἔσμεν*), the play incorporates two other Dionysiac festivals, the Country Dionysia (195-202, 237-79) and the Choes (1000ff.), the second day of the Anthesteria, as ritual symbols of Dikaiopolis' longing for peace. The wine that flowed so generously during both festivals becomes an antidote against war and a palatable token of peace. The Country Dionysia, with their strong phallic associations, preserved something of the original spirit of comedy. That spirit, along with the comic [270]stage, had in the not too distant past moved from the country and its demes to the city. But now, after six years of war and urban confinement, Dikaiopolis hates the city and longs for his native deme: *ἀποβλέπων εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν εἰρήνης ἔρω, / στρυγῶν μὲν ἄστρ, τὸν δ' ἐμὸν δῆμον ποθῶν* (32f.).

The play begins with a meeting of the *ekklésia*, an instrument of war, but proceeds immediately to a series of short scenes which culminate in Dikaiopolis' private peace-treaty with Sparta. The peace reflects the aspirations of the country-dweller, and it has an Eleusinian as well as a Dionysiac dimension. It is negotiated by Amphytheos, who claims to be immortal and a direct descendant of Demeter and Triptolemos (47ff.). Amphytheos returns from Sparta with a choice of three peace-treaties, of five, ten or thirty years' duration, each of which is represented by a wine of a different vintage and fragrance (175ff.). The conclusion of the peace is followed by an on-stage

reenactment of the Country Dionysia that includes a prayer to Dionysus, the phallic procession and the Phales-song, activities that convey a vision of peace and rural tranquillity (237-79).

The Country Dionysia were suspended during the war years, but now, having made his separate peace, Dikaiopolis enters his house for the explicit purpose of celebrating them (202 ἄξω τὰ κατ' ἀγροῦς εἰσιὼν Διονύσια). When he emerges some forty lines later, he tells us that he has returned to his native deme Cholleidai (266f., 406), a wine-growing region (512) located somewhere in the northern outskirts of Athens, so that he is holding his Dionysia in the country, where they normally take place. The shift in location brings the playwright's freedom to create his own world in line with actual cultic practice.⁵⁵ By incorporating the ritual reenactment of the Country Dionysia in the dramatic performance, Aristophanes focuses the attention of his audience on the festival κατ' ἀγροῦς, and thus adds visual as well as ritual urgency to his point that the rural Dionysus of the countryside is the divine embodiment of peace, tranquillity and the pleasures of country life, epitomized in the wine and the phallus.

The Dionysus of the country reorients the city toward its rural roots and thus toward peace. By bringing the Country Dionysia under the eye of the city, Aristophanes provides a poignant reminder that the *polis* comprises both *astu* and *agroï*. Through the agency of Dionysus, the city thus rediscovers its true dimensions, in spatial as well as in spiritual terms.

It is this Aristophanic vision of the country Dionysus as the wine-god, the peacemaker, the cultivating force and even the matchmaker bringing the sexes together that prevailed in postclassical antiquity. In the course of the fourth century, the ambiguous and disturbing Dionysus of Attic tragedy lost his grip on the Greek imagination and gradually became defunct. His memory was barely kept alive by the professional performers known as the Artists of Dionysus, whose guilds emerged in the early third century; ultimately his enfeebled image survived only in non-tragic adaptations of his myths.

At the same time the popularity of the Dionysus of rural cult continued to grow. Enhanced by mythical trappings and surrounded by his harmless entourage of maenads, satyrs and Pans, the Dionysus of the vineyards and the winepress eventually conquered the Hellenistic cities and acquired an ubiquitous [271]presence in art, literature and urban cult. I am thinking not only of the multifaceted and cultivated concept of Dionysus that found visual expression in the procession of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, but also of the rustic Dionysus of Virgil's *Georgics* (2.7, *huc pater o Lenaee veni*), of the well-balanced Dionysus of Horace's *Odes* (2.19.27f., *sed idem / pacis eras mediusque belli*), of the well-organized and well-behaved Athenian symposiasts who produced the Iobakchoi inscription, and especially of that epitome of the Dionysiac spirit, the rural Dionysus of Longus, who keeps pace with the natural rhythm of the seasons and who makes his annual epiphany at the time of the vintage.⁵⁶

The Hellenistic and Roman Dionysus was benign, pastoral and peaceful, a recipient of cult and a divine example of a relaxed lifestyle who offered physical and mental escape from the burdens of the day and the ills of progressive urbanization. Two rebels against convention, Euripides and Nietzsche, did more than anyone else to create and to perpetuate the opposite notion that Dionysus represents nature in its raw state, wildness rather than civilization, violence, not peace. For more than a century the prevailing conception of the god has adopted this model. The modern Dionysus is primarily an unsettling god of emotional turmoil, of violence and of social disorder, a one-sided portrayal which owes infinitely more to the mythical record and its modern reception than to Greek cult.

It is difficult to choose between the Dionysus of myth and the Dionysus of cult, between the Euripidean and the Aristophanic Dionysus, or as Plutarch and Nietzsche called the two divine faces, between Dionysus *ἀγριώνιος* and Dionysus *μελίχιος*.⁵⁷ For the vast majority of ancient authors and artists, the two opposite sides of Dionysus, in all their various manifestations, were separate entities that did not mix easily, and they much preferred the “mild” Dionysus of the wine and the good life. Nowadays there is unprecedented interest in the tragic Dionysus of Sophocles and especially Euripides, precisely because he is a contradictory and difficult figure. “Wild” and “mild” are the opposites which have time and again created the magnetic field and the polar tension that keep Dionysus on his feet and on the move. And that, after all, is because he is both.⁵⁸



NOTES

1. This is the text of a paper presented in New York City on December 29, 1987, to the Joint Session of the American Philological Association and the Archaeological Institute of America, as one of four contributions to a discussion of “Cults and Politics in Classical Attica.” I offer the expanded and annotated version to Tom Rosenmeyer in gratitude for a long friendship, and in the secure knowledge that he cannot have heard my oral presentation because he was presiding over another session at the same hour.

2. M. Daraki, *Dionysos* (Paris 1985) 9-18. Daraki compares the “collective experience” of Dionysus with the carnival-like periods of sanctioned license found in other cultures, an anthropological model which does not explain the specific features of the vast majority of Dionysiac festivals and contexts.

[272]3. Cf. A. Henrichs, “Greek Maenadism from Olympias to Messalina,” *HSCP* 82 (1978) 121-60, esp. 121f. and 147-52; J. N. Bremmer, “Greek Maenadism Reconsidered,” *ZPE* 55 (1984) 267-86.

4. For a definition of standard Athenian attitudes towards the gods, including reciprocity based on cult, and for an analysis of how adherence to, and deviation from, that norm are treated by Euripides, see H. Yunis, *A New Creed: Fundamental Religious Beliefs in the Athenian Polis and Euripidean Drama* (*Hypomnemata* 91, Göttingen

1988). Yunis' discussion of the *Bacchae* focuses on Pentheus' refusal to recognize the divinity of Dionysus, which is an explicit challenge of the first fundamental belief of Athenian *polis*-religion, namely the belief that the gods exist.

5. H. Oranje, *Euripides' Bacchae: The Play and Its Audience* (Leiden 1984) 101-13. On the Apatouria and the aetiological myth of Dionysus Melanaigis of Eleutherai see F. Kolb, "Die Bau-, Religions- und Kulturpolitik der Peisistratiden," *JdI* 92 (1977) 99-138, esp. 125-28, and P. Vidal-Naquet, "The Black Hunter and the Origin of the Athenian Epehebeia," in R. L. Gordon, ed., *Myth, Religion and Society* (Cambridge 1981) 147-62, esp. 150-53. Oschophoria: L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin 1932) 142-47; Vidal-Naquet, "The Black Hunter," 156-58; E. Simon, *Festivals of Attica: An Archaeological Commentary* (Madison 1983) 89-92. Lenaia vases: A. Pickard-Cambridge, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, rev. by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis (corr. ed. with suppl., Oxford 1988) 30-34; Simon, *Festivals* 100f.; F. Frontisi-Ducroux, "Images du ménadisme féminin: Les vases des 'Lénéennes,'" in *L'association dionysiaque dans les sociétés anciennes (Collection de l'École française de Rome 89, Rome 1986)* 165-76.

6. Cf. A. Henrichs, "Loss of Self, Suffering, Violence: The Modern View of Dionysos from Nietzsche to Girard," *HSCP* 88 (1984) 205-40, esp. 234-40. Since the publication of this article, the study of Dionysus by Detienne and Vernant has entered a new phase; see infra notes 12 and 53.

7. Most explicitly by C. P. Segal, *Tragedy and Civilization: An Interpretation of Sophocles* (Cambridge, Mass. 1981) 30-42, 48-52, and *Dionysiac Poetics and Euripides' Bacchae* (Princeton 1982) 78-124.

8. Διονύσια τὰ κατ' ἀγρούς (or τὰ κατ' ἀγρούς Δ.), the collective name for the sum total of rural Dionysia as seen from the viewpoint of the city rather than the demes, occurs in Aristophanes (*Ach.* 202, 250), Aeschines (1.157) and Theophrastus (*Char.* 3.5); cf. Isaeus 8.15 εἰς Διονύσια εἰς ἀγρόν. For Διονύσια τὰ ἐν ἄστει see, e. g., Dem. 21.10; Aesch. 1.43, 2.61 and 3.68; *IG* II² 851.11f., 958.29f.; cf. Thuc. 5.20.1 ἐκ Διονυσίων εὐθὺς τῶν ἀστικῶν. Plato (*Rep.* 475d) differentiates between Διονύσια κατὰ πόλεις (a difficult plural, unless he was looking beyond Athens) and κατὰ κώμας; cf. Pickard-Cambridge (supra n. 5) 43. Διονύσια tout court, which is the usual designation in inscriptions, can refer to either festival; on stones erected by the demes it refers almost always to the Dionysia of the local deme (e. g., *IG* II² 1183.36f., and the cult-calendar from Thorikos quoted in section I infra). The rural Dionysia of Piraeus, which acquired a special status, were called Διονύσια τὰ ἐν Πειρα(ι)εῖ (e. g., *IG* II² 1496 A (a) 70; 1672.106). The Διονύσια τὰ ἐπὶ Ληγαίωι (*IG* II² 1496 A (a) 74), or Lenaia, are distinct from both the City and the Country Dionysia. The fourth Dionysiac festival of Athens, the Anthesteria, appear under the name τὰ ἀρχαιότερα (v. l. -τατα) Διονύσια at Thuc. 2.15.4. Cf. Deubner (supra n. 5) 123-42; Pickard-Cambridge (supra n. 5) 25-101; Simon (supra n. 5) 100-104; D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica, 508/7-ca. 250 B.C.: A Political and Social Study* (Princeton 1986) 212-22 (the rural Dionysia only).

9. On the Pithoigia, the first day of the Anthesteria, see Phanodemus *FGrHist* 325 F 12, and W. Burkert, *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth* (Berkeley 1983) 216-18. Dionysus Eleuthereus: Pickard-Cambridge (supra n. 5) 57f., 60; Kolb (supra n. 5) 125-33 (with excessive emphasis on the [273]Apatouria). Eleutherai was situated in the Parnes region of northern Attica, near the border with Boeotia.

10. The political and social divisions of *phylai*, demes and *trittyes* cut across geographical boundaries. Almost two thirds of the attested Attic demes were located

outside the city proper in various parts of the *chôra*. Cf. J. S. Traill, *Demos and Trittys: Epigraphical and Topographical Studies in the Organization of Attica* (Toronto 1986) 125-40, illustrated by the invaluable deme-map in the back of the book.

11. Cf. R. Osborne, *Demos: The Discovery of Classical Attika* (Cambridge 1985) 8: "The dangers inherent in the use of 'city' in a Greek context are indeed great, greater than is generally admitted, and perhaps greatest of all in the case of Athens, where it may be totally unclear whether 'the city of Athens' refers to the *astu* or to the *polis* as a whole." To complicate matters, Thucydides uses *polis* (2.15.3-4, 17.1) in the sense in which Osborne uses *astu*, while using *astu* (2.17.1) to differentiate the city proper from the country (2.14.1 ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν, cf. 2.14.2). In the same context Thucydides informs us that in local usage the term *polis* could also refer to the Akropolis (2.14.3, 6), and suggests that the refugees who left the country and crowded into the city felt that they were abandoning their own *polis* (2.16.2), i. e. the demes, a feeling shared by the Dikaiopolis of the *Acharnians* (infra, section III).

12. On the myths of Dionysus' arrival in Attica see Philochorus *FGrHist* 328 F 5-7, with F. Jacoby's commentary, and M. Detienne, *Dionysos à ciel ouvert* (Paris 1986) 45-65.

13. Whitehead (supra n. 8) 185-208, with full bibliography.

14. R. Parker, "Festivals of the Attic Demes," *Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Boreas* 15 (1987) 137-47.

15. D. M. Lewis, *ZPE* 60 (1985) 108 n. 3; M. H. Jameson, "Sacrifice and Animal Husbandry in Classical Greece," in C. R. Whittaker, ed., *Pastoral Economics in Classical Antiquity (PCPS Suppl. 14, 1988)* 115 n. 7 (I owe this reference to Robert Parker).

16. J. D. Mikalson, "Religion in the Attic Demes," *AJP* 98 (1977) 424-35; Parker (supra n. 14) had the advantage of drawing on the new data of the Thorikos inscription.

17. Mikalson (supra n. 16) 429, 433f. and Parker (supra n. 14) 138f., 141-43 treat these three cultic areas separately because the deme/city relationship is different in each case. But all three cults address the same concern, the survival and continuation of the *oikos* and the deme.

18. J. S. Rusten, "ΤΕΙΤΩΝ ΗΡΩΣ," *HSCP* 87 (1983) 289-97.

19. Cf. A. L. Edmunds, "The Cults and the Legends of Oedipus," *HSCP* 85 (1981) 221-38.

20. A. D. Nock, *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* (Cambridge, Mass. 1972, repr. 1986) 593.

21. Cf. Parker (supra n. 14) 141-43.

22. Mikalson (supra n. 16) 426.

23. Erchia: *SEG* 21.541; F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrés des cités grecques* (Paris 1969) 36-44, no. 18. Thorikos: G. Daux, "Le Calendrier de Thorikos," *L'Antiquité Classique* 52 (1983) 150-74, and "Sacrifices à Thorikos," *The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 12 (1984) 145-52; *SEG* 33.147. The fifth entry (Thorikos, lines 45-46) records a sacrifice of a billy-goat to Dionysus at a specified location under Mounichion. The occasion does not correspond to any known city-festival of Dionysus.

24. See supra n. 8.

25. Parentheses in the Greek text indicate abbreviations on the stone. Προπτόρθιος, of very uncertain meaning, occurs only here in an identifiable context; the neuter plural is attested for the Solonian Axones (Hesych. π 3643 Schmidt = F 61 in E. Ruschenbusch, *ΣΟΛΩΝΟΣ ΝΟΜΟΙ, Die Fragmente des solonischen Gesetzeswerkes [Historia [274] Einzelschriften 9, Wiesbaden 1966]* 92). The adjective is derived from the botanical term πτόρθος ("young shoot or branch, offspring" in Attic authors;

“shooting” of trees at Hes. *WD* 421). As used in the Erchia inscription, it probably defines the young goat’s exact age within its age-group. The point of reference is either the weaned animal’s more advanced diet (cf. Longus 2.4.3 and 4.14.1 *ἐρίφους γαλαθηνούς* versus 1.21.1 *φυλλάδα χλωράν κόπτοντα τοῖς ἐρίφοις τροφήν μετὰ τὴν νομήν*, similarly 2.20.2) or, more likely, the first sprouting of horns at the age of two months (inconclusively considered by G. Daux, *BCH* 87 [1963] 626f.). Compare Longus 2.8.1 *ἔριφον ἤδη κεράστην λαβών*, and for the plant metaphor implicit in *προπτόρβιος*, Ael. *NA* 7.39 *θῆλυν ἔλαφον κέρατα οὐ φύειν*.

26. Read *λειπογνώμονα*. The rare veterinary term, which occurs twice in the Thorikos calendar, four times in the Nikomachos calendar of ca. 400 B.C. and repeatedly in various lexicographers, describes the age of young animals with reference to the incisors (*γνώμονες*) of their first dentition. A goat that has not grown its first teeth is less than four or five weeks old. See H. Hansen, “The Meaning of *λειπογνώμων*.” *GRBS* 14 (1973) 325-32.

27. On the Choes see Burkert (supra n. 9) 217-20; Simon (supra n. 5) 94-98.

28. Parker (supra n. 14) 142.

29. Callim. fr. 178.5f.; Eratosth. *FGrHist* 241 F 16.

30. This prohibition, which occurs twenty-two times in the Erchia calendar alone, stipulates that the meat had to be consumed on the spot. Cf. S. Dow, *BCH* 89 (1965) 208-12.

31. Altars for Semele are mentioned in Theocr. 26.5f.; an annual sacrifice for Semele on Lenaion 11th is attested for Mykonos, followed by one for Dionysus on the 12th (Sokolowski, *LSCG* [supra n. 23] 96.22-24, ca. 200 B.C.); she had a sacred precinct in Thebes (Eur. *Ba.* 6-12).

32. On Attic maenads, see Henrichs (supra n. 3) 152-55; on the Thyiads, infra n. 36; on the mentality of cultic maenads, Bremmer (supra n. 3) 268-75.

33. Jeffrey Henderson *ad loc.* translates more loosely “a place of Bakchic revelry” and adds: “There is no unambiguous evidence for ‘official’ maenadism at Athens, nor was there an official shrine of Dionysos.” Even if one sets aside the temple *ἐν Λίμναις* as a special case, as Henderson does, there remains the highly official temple of Dionysus Eleuthereus in the theater-precinct. But as Henderson points out, Lysistrata refers “to privately organized celebrations,” which left no trace in the archaeological record.

34. M. Detienne, *Dionysos mis à mort* (Paris 1977) 149-55, and his contribution to Detienne and J.-P. Vernant, eds., *La cuisine du sacrifice en pays grec* (Paris 1979) 188, where the Erchia sacrifice is treated as an “exception.” But its inclusion in the demecalendar suggests that it was rather the norm. Detienne’s initial concept of “le Dionysisme” was entirely based on the mythical record; in his most recent book on Dionysus (supra n. 12), however, cult is no longer ignored.

35. Discussions of the Dionysus ode include G. Müller, *Sophokles, Antigone* (Heidelberg 1967) 244-50; P. Vicaire, “Place et figure de Dionysos dans la tragédie de Sophocle,” *REG* 81 (1968) 351-73, esp. 358-65; Segal (supra n. 7) 201-206; K.-D. Dorsch, *Götterhymnen in den Chorliedern der griechischen Tragiker: Form, Inhalt und Funktion* (diss. Münster 1982) 66-78. In addition, I have benefited from unpublished treatments of the fifth stasimon by Anton Bierl (in his Munich Magisterarbeit of 1986 on Dionysus in Greek tragedy, and in his article “Was hat die Tragödie mit Dionysos zu tun? Rolle und Funktion des Gottes am Beispiel der *Antigone* des Sophokles,” forthcoming in *Würzburger Jahrbücher*) and Scott Scullion (Harvard Ph. D. dissertation on the gods of Sophocles, in progress).

36. Plut. *Qu. Gr.* 299B = *PMG* 871 Page (who prints $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\omega\nu$, apparently an anonymous conjecture); cf. C. Brown, *GRBS* 23 (1982) 305-314, and M. L. West, [275] *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1982) 146f. The word $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\omega\nu$ in the Elian invocation recalls the agitated and swift movement of the mythical and cultic maenads, who were called $\theta\upsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota$ (*Soph. Ant.* 1151) or, especially in Delphic cult, $\theta\upsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\delta\epsilon\varsigma$. Their name was not derived from $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\omega$ "to sacrifice," as R. C. Jebb thought (on *Ant.* 1151), but from $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\omega$ "s'élancer avec fureur" (P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* [Paris 1968, repr. 1983] 448). On the Thyiads see H. Jeanmaire, *Dionysos. Histoire du culte de Bacchus* (Paris 1951, repr. 1970) 187-98; M. C. Villanueva Puig, "À propos des thyiades de Delphes," in *L'association dionysiaque* (supra n. 5) 31-51. The *Antigone* ode surely envisages an anthropomorphic god with human feet, but like Aeschylus and Euripides, Sophocles was familiar with the concept of a taumorphic Dionysus: in fr. 959 Radt he makes Nysa (cf. *Ant.* 1131), the personified mountain, the foster-mother of $\beta\omicron\nu\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\varsigma$ "Ἰακχος" (cf. *Ant.* 1152, as discussed below).

37. Beneficent eyes: Callim. *Hymn Ap.* 51f., *Dian.* 129; K. Meuli, *Gesammelte Schriften* I (Basel/Stuttgart 1975) 253 n. 2 on Verg. *Georg.* 2.392. Healing hands: Aesch. *Cho.* 1059f., with G. Thomson's note (Apollo's cathartic touch that cleanses Orestes), Ar. *Plut.* 728 (healing hand of Asclepius); O. Weinreich, *Antike Heilungswunder* (Gießen 1909) 1-45. The "cathartic foot" of Dionysus, which is unparalleled elsewhere, is comparable to later cases of supernatural feet that heal by contact; see Weinreich 67-73 (king Pyrrhus, Christian saints, and similar examples from other cultures) and A. Henrichs, *ZPE* 3 (1968) 68-71 (the emperor Vespasian as Neos Sarapis). Alternatively, the "cathartic foot" of Dionysus may be a poetic translation of ecstatic dancing (the theme of the "hyporchematic" close of the hymn) and its cathartic effect (inferred, by E. R. Dodds and others, from Eur. *Ba.* 76f. and Plat. *Laws* 815c) from the human worshippers to the god, a suggestion made in passing and independently of each other by several scholars (S. Eitrem, *Opferritus und Voropfer der Griechen und Römer* [Kristiana 1915] 92f.; L. Moulinier, *Le pur et l'impur dans la pensée des Grecs* [Paris 1952] 116; Vicaire [supra n. 35] 363f.). A substantial case for this view has been made by Scullion (supra n. 35), but it requires a drastic reinterpretation of the nature of the $\nu\acute{o}\sigma\omicron\varsigma$ that afflicts Thebes. I am less convinced by explanations which derive the god's cathartic power from his role as tutelary deity of Thebes (thus most recently R. Parker, *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* [Oxford 1983] 290 n. 45), from his Delphic connection (J. C. Kamerbeek on *Ant.* 1144) and from the precarious concept of Dionysus "the Purifier and Healer" (R. C. Jebb on *Ant.* 1143ff.). They ignore the significance of the *foot* of Dionysus (on the poetic function of divine feet in connection with epiphanies see E. Fraenkel, *Horace* [Oxford 1957] 204 n. 4, F. Williams on Callim. *Hymn Ap.* 3, and now Scullion).

38. See most recently F. Zeitlin, "Thebes: Theater of Self and Society in Athenian Drama," in J. P. Euben, ed., *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory* (Berkeley 1986) 100-41, who perceives the mythical Thebes of the tragedians appropriately as "anti-Athens" and as "the site of displacement" (102), including that of Dionysus. The Delphic Dionysus had a more pronounced and Panhellenic cult-identity than the Theban god and serves a different dramatic function, but in drama as well as in actual cult Athenian maenads went to Delphi to perform their rites (supra notes 32 and 36), another form of "displacement."

39. Vicaire (supra n. 35) 359f. and 365 elaborates the obvious when he insists that the Theban Dionysus of *Antigone* (and, one might add, of tragedy in general) is seen through Athenian spectacles. In doing so he exaggerates the "Athenian" connotations of the references to Italy (foundation of Thourioi "quelques mois avant la représentation

d'Antigone") and Euboea (within Athenian purview, in geographical as well as political terms). The common denominator that connects these two places as well as the others is their prominent association with various forms of Dionysiac cult familiar to the Athenian audience.

[276]40. On Dionysus-Iakchos, who was invoked as *πλουτοδότης* at the Lenaia (schol. Ar. *Frogs* 479 = *PMG* 879 Page; M. L. West on Hes. *WD* 121-26), see F. Graf, *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit* (*RGVV* 33, Berlin/New York 1974) 51-58. For the chthonic connotations of τὸν ταμίαν Ἰακχόν, Scott Scullion (supra n. 35) compares the self-description of Aristophanes' Ἡρώες in the play that bears their name (fr. 322.3f. Kassel-Austin): ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν οἱ ταμίαι / τῶν κακῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν. On the dual power of the chthonians, including cult-heroes such as the Sophoclean Oedipus, I refer to my forthcoming paper "Namenlosigkeit und Euphemismus: Zur Ambivalenz der chthonischen Mächte im attischen Drama" (in *Fragmenta Dramatica*, a volume of papers offered to Stefan Radt and edited by Heinz Hofmann and Annette Harder); on the life-and-death cycle associated with Eleusinian Demeter see W. Burkert, *Greek Religion* (Cambridge, Mass. 1985) 161, and the classic study of A. Dieterich, *Mutter Erde* (3rd ed., Leipzig/Berlin 1925); on the "countless souls" of the dead, thus described in the Derveni papyrus (cf. Soph. *Ant.* 893f.), see A. Henrichs, "The Eumenides and Wineless Libations in the Derveni Papyrus," in *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia II* (Naples 1984) 255-68, esp. 262f.

41. Dionysus is mentioned twice before the epiphany hymn, as the leader of Theban dancers (153f.) and in connection with the Lykourgos myth, which illustrates the god's punitive power (955ff.). Both passages point beyond their immediate context. The first reference in particular is echoed in the hymnic evocation of Dionysus as "chorus-leader" (1146f. ἰὼ πῦρ πνευόντων / χοράγ' ἄστρον).

42. Most recently by Th. C. W. Oudemans and A. P. M. H. Lardinois, *Tragic Ambiguity. Anthropology, Philosophy and Sophocles' Antigone* (Leiden 1987) 158f.

43. Isocr. 4.28 *περὶ τε τῆς τοῦ βίου τελευτῆς καὶ τοῦ σύμπαντος αἰῶνος ἡδίους τὰς ἐλπίδας ἔχουσι*, and Soph. fr. 837.3f. Radt *τοῖσδε γὰρ μόνοις ἐκεῖ / ζῆν ἔστι, τοῖς δ' ἄλλοισι πάντ' ἔχειν κακά*. See N. J. Richardson on *Hom. Hymn Dem.* 480-82.

44. Segal (supra n. 7) 180f. and 203.

45. Jebb on *Ant.* 1115-54.

46. G. Steiner, *Antigones* (Oxford 1984) 259f., cf. 101f. Steiner draws heavily on the spirit as well as the letter of Müller's commentary (supra n. 35), where the Heraclitus fragment (fr. 15 DK, fr. 50 Marcovich) is adduced to similar effect. For the opposite claim, which is equally far from the truth because it contradicts the Eleusinian coloration of Sophocles' Dionysus-Iakchos, see S. Benardete, "A Reading of Sophocles' *Antigone*, III," *Interpretation* 5 (1975) 148-84, at 173: "Dionysus ... has nothing to do with Hades."

47. H. R. W. Smith, *Funerary Symbolism in Apulian Vase-Painting* (*UC Publ. Cl. St. 12*, Berkeley 1976); M. Schmidt, "Beziehungen zwischen Eros, dem dionysischen und dem 'eleusinischen' Kreis auf apulischen Vasenbildern," in C. Bérard, C. Bron and A. Pomari, eds., *Images et société en Grèce ancienne. L'iconographie comme méthode d'analyse* (Lausanne 1987) 155-67; S. G. Cole, "New Evidence for the Mysteries of Dionysos," *GRBS* 21 (1980) 223-38 (on the Hipponion tablet); H. Lloyd-Jones, "Pindar and the After-Life," *Pindare* (Fondation Hardt, *Entretiens* 31, Geneva 1985) 245-83.

48. K. Tsantsanoglou and G. M. Parássoglou, "Two Gold Lamellae from Thessaly," *Hellenika* 38 (1987) 3-16, combined text (unmetrical) of lines 1-2: *νῦν ἔθανες καὶ νῦν ἐγένου, τρισόλβιε, ἄματι τῶιδε. / εἰπεῖν Φερσεφόνοι σ' ὅτι Βάχ(χ)ιος αὐτὸς ἔλυσε*.

The publication of the new gold tablets, shaped like ivy-leaves, marks a turning point in the study of these controversial texts.

49. Cf. Soph. *Tr.* 74, 354, 478, 859. Lloyd-Jones (supra n. 47) 263f. makes a strong case for Ἰταλίαν. Dawe's Οἰχαλίαν is a desperate attempt to duplicate the rhyming of Ἰταλίαν (1119) with Κασταλίας (1130), which occupies the corresponding position of the antistrophe. Dawe used the rhyme against Unger's Ἰκαρίαν, but the same [277]argument had been used before by Benardete ([supra n. 46] 173 n. 131) to defend the transmitted text: "Κασταλίας confirms Ἰταλίαν." Müller (supra n. 35) 244 rejected Ἰταλίαν because he felt that the name of an entire country could not function as a cult-place; but in a similar kletic hymn to Dionysus, Pieria is mentioned after Nysa, Parnassus and Olympus (Eur. *Ba.* 556ff.).

50. Whitehead (supra n. 8) 215-17; Pickard-Cambridge (supra n. 5) 48f., 54, with fig. 29 (remains of the theater).

51. Burkert (supra n. 9) 223.

52. Sophocles described the miraculous Euboean vine that puts forth its shoots, bears fruit and produces grapes ripe for harvesting and wine-making all during a single day in his *Thyestes* (fr. 255 Radt). Cf. H. Usener, *Der heilige Tychon* (Leipzig/Berlin 1907) 30-34.

53. This is essentially the role of the tragic Dionysus as perceived, with different emphases, by J.-P. Vernant, "Le Dionysos masqué des *Bacchantes* d'Euripide," in Vernant and P. Vidal-Naquet, *Mythe et tragédie* II (Paris 1986) 237-70; Zeitlin (supra n. 38); and S. Goldhill, *JHS* 107 (1987) 58-76, esp. 75f. (on "the interplay between norm and transgression" that makes tragedy a "Dionysiac occasion"). On the whole, this perception of the tragic Dionysus and his "cathartic" social function is valid, but it applies only to the Dionysus of tragedy, and if there are degrees of truth, it is more true of Euripides than Sophocles.

54. A. L. Edmunds, "Aristophanes' *Acharnians*," in J. Henderson, ed., *Aristophanes: Essays in Interpretation* (YCS 26, 1980) 1-41, esp. 26-32 argues that "the city at war" (the contemporary Athens of Aristophanes) is "regenerated" and transformed into a "city of peace" (the "Just City" embodied by Dikaiopolis, an identification rejected by E. L. Bowie, *JHS* 108 [1988] 183-85) through wine festivals and dramatic performance. I agree, but would add that the ideal city envisaged by Dikaiopolis is a larger and less tangible entity than either the "country" or the "city" as used in this paper. What is more, the "Just City" defines itself in terms of the "country" rather than the "city."

55. In the *Acharnians* Aristophanes takes even greater liberty with time (Country Dionysia and Anthesteria fell two months apart) and place (country/city) than in most of his other plays. On this point see U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Kleine Schriften* I (Berlin 1935) 308f. (the effective "poetic unity" of *Acharnians*); C. H. Whitman, *Aristophanes and the Comic Hero* (Cambridge, Mass. 1964) 62f.; M. Landfester, *Handlungsverlauf und Komik in den frühen Komödien des Aristophanes* (*Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte* 17, Berlin 1977) 40-43.

56. For the full spectrum of Hellenistic and Roman manifestations of Dionysus I refer to R. Merkelbach, *Die Hirten des Dionysos. Die Dionysos-Mysterien der römischen Kaiserzeit und der bukolische Roman des Longus* (Stuttgart 1988) and to my "Changing Dionysiac Identities" in B. F. Meyer and E. P. Sanders, eds., *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition III: Self-Definition in the Graeco-Roman World* (London 1982) 137-60, 213-29.

57. Cf. Henrichs (supra n. 6) 236f. n. 88.

58. I am very grateful to Scott Scullion, who discussed the concept of this paper with me and whose criticism improved my argument in numerous places.