The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Phoenicians in Arcadia *Essai de Méthode en Mythologie Grecque: De l' Origine des Cultes Arcadiens*: Victor Béraed. Paris: Thorin. 1894. 12fr.50.

E. E. Sikes

The Classical Review / Volume 9 / Issue 01 / February 1895, pp 67 - 71
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00201157, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00201157

How to cite this article:

E. E. Sikes (1895). The Classical Review, 9, pp 67-71 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00201157

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

construction of $\mu\eta\ \sigma\upsilon$ with inf., e.g. $\sigma\upsilon\delta'\ \alpha\nu\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\iota\ \mu\eta\ \sigma\upsilon$ (or $\mu\eta$) $\sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota\nu$.

The treatment of prepositions is altogether too meagre even for a school grammar. The general scheme: 'Time—Place—Other meanings' is inadequate, and gives undue prominence to time and place as compared with the other meanings of equal or greater importance. For instance the all-important *instrumental* force of $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ with gen. comes under the heading 'other meanings,' placed side by side with the adverbial expressions $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\omega\upsilon\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$, $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, instead of forming a special class, 'instrumentality,' which is undoubtedly the most common meaning of $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ with gen. All the numbers 448—461 will simply have to be rewritten.

The various idiomatic usages connected with the pronouns $\delta\delta\epsilon$, $\sigma\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ and the oblique cases of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ are practically not

dealt with. On turning to the index at the word $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ to see if it be elsewhere discussed, one is referred to § 567 where this pronoun is not even mentioned.

Space will not allow of a detailed examination of other portions of this valuable work. The reviewer cannot do better than conclude by stating the general impression its perusal has left on his mind. He feels the more entitled to do so as he has not been sparing in pointing out shortcomings, for some of which no doubt the personal equation would account. He believes it his duty then to record his opinion that this is the best book of the kind with which he is familiar. For system, plan, graphic presentment and accuracy of exposition it is admirably adapted for school use; its method is that of the future.

J. DONOVAN.

THE PHOENICIANS IN ARCADIA.

Essai de Méthode en Mythologie Grecque: De l'Origine des Cultes Arcadiens: VICTOR BÉRARD. Paris: Thorin. 1894. 12 fr.50.

No part of Greece is more interesting to the mythologist than Arcadia, the home of beliefs and customs which seem to belong to the earliest *strata* of Greek religion. Hence Arcadia, with its stone-worship and were-wolves and human sacrifice, has been a kind of happy hunting-ground for the student of folk-lore and anthropology. Following quite different methods of interpretation, W. Immerwahr has recently produced a valuable monograph on Arcadian religion.¹ Immerwahr is an adherent of the 'local' school, who, working on lines laid down by H. D. Müller, try to disentangle the local and tribal elements from the national 'Olympian' religion. The service which Wide, Immerwahr, Tumpel, and others are rendering in this direction cannot be too highly estimated; when the religious systems of every Greek country, city, and sanctuary have been examined as fully as Arcadia has been treated by Immerwahr, or Laconia by Wide, we shall have a proper arrangement of materials for the general study of Greek myth and ritual. In the present learned and lucidly

written volume, M. Bérard, while fully appreciating the work of these scholars in classification, declares himself dissatisfied with the theories which they deduce from their materials. Immerwahr, like Roscher and his collaborators, works on the 'Aryan hypothesis,' assuming that the bulk of Greek mythology was evolved without the aid of foreign influence. M. Bérard, on the other hand, is one of the uncompromising Orientalists, the most prominent of whom is Otto Gruppe. When the second part of Gruppe's great work appears,² mythologists will be in a better position to examine the theory of wholesale and universal borrowing of Greek religion from the East.

In his *Essai de Méthode* M. Bérard has attacked the very stronghold of the Aryan school. The Arcadians, who lived before the moon, have hitherto been supposed to have developed their religious customs and beliefs with little, if any, direct foreign contamination. Their isolation in the centre of the Peloponnese, their pastoral non-maritime life, as well as the many primitive and savage elements in their religion, seem strong arguments in favour of the generally accepted theory. It is, indeed, admitted by historians that at some early period the Phoenicians

¹ *Die Kulte und Mythen Arkadiens*. I. Band. *Die Arkadischen Kulte*. Leipzig. 1891.

² *Die griechischen Kulte und Mythen in ihren Beziehungen zu den Orientalischen Religion*. Bd. I. 1887.

had trading settlements on the coasts of Greece,¹ although the extent of their influence and the date of their occupation cannot be estimated with any certainty. Probably, however, a certain amount of the Semitic religion survived the departure of the Phoenicians from Greece, and became incorporated with the Hellenic religion. Semitic influence has been pointed out in the mythology of Thebes (Cadmus and Europa, Ares and Harmonia, Heracles, &c.), Corinth (Aphrodite, Melicertes), Cythera (Aphrodite), Attica (myths of Theseus' combat with the Minotaur and the Marathonian bull, the Amazons, &c.). In the Peloponnese, survivals of Oriental cults have been traced, with more or less probability, at Patrae, Sparta, Amyclae, and Olympia (see Abbott p. 54). But the historians seem to have excepted Arcadia from the sphere of Phoenician influence. At the most, they have suggested that the names of a few Arcadian places (*e.g.* Macariae, near Megalopolis) have a Phoenician sound. M. Bérard, however, boldly claims a Semitic origin for nearly all the Arcadian gods with the ritual and mythology attached to them. Pan and Selene alone appear to be excluded from his list, as primitive 'Pelagic' deities.² In an interesting introduction he urges that the theory of a Phoenician settlement in the heart of Arcadia presents no difficulty; his arguments are partly philological and rely on the supposed traces of Semitic names of persons and places in Arcadia;³ but none of these names are very conclusive, and we may reasonably doubt the direct Phoenician origin of Macareus (son of Lycaon), the rivers Syros and Malous, and some other place-names for which the same claim is made.

M. Bérard argues that there is no inherent improbability in his assumption that a Phoenician trade-route passed through Arcadia, the foreign merchandise being exchanged for Arcadian cattle, timber, and slaves. The traders went up along the Eurotas and followed the course of the Alpheus to the sea, thus skirting Mt. Lycaeus. The first section of the book (pp. 49–93) is devoted to the principal god of this region—Zeus Lycaeus—whom the author identifies with a Phoenician Baal. He draws attention to the following points of similarity in the character of the two

deities. (1) Human sacrifice is inseparable from the cult of Zeus Lycaeus, and may be compared with the like sacrifices to Semitic gods (*e.g.* at Melcart at Tyre, &c.). To this it may be replied that human sacrifice is not confined to the Semites, but is a common feature of savage religions. (2) No image of Zeus is mentioned at any of his three sanctuaries, on Mt. Lycaeus, at Megalopolis, and at Tegea. This is an *ex silentio* argument; but granting that the god was worshipped in the form of a stone, as M. Bérard suggests, it does not by any means follow that this stone was a Phoenician betyl. Stock and stone worship is so universal that it is dangerous to draw any ethnological conclusions from its occurrence, unless, as in the case of the Paphian Aphrodite, worshipped under the form of a conical stone, the Semitic origin of the cult can be proved on other grounds. (3) Zeus Lycaeus had no ναός or temple proper, but only a τέμενος and βωμός. M. Bérard gets rid of the difficulty in Thuc. v. 16 (ἤμουν τῆς οἰκίας τοῦ ἱεροῦ τότε τοῦ Διὸς οἰκοῦντα) by the explanation that Pleistoanax occupied half the house belonging to the τέμενος: 'l'autre moitié fut réservée sans doute pour le matériel, le personnel, ou les commodités du culte.' He compares Thuc. i. 134 ἐς οἶκημα οὐ μέγα ὃ ἦν τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐσελθών. The same criticism applies to this argument; the absence of a temple may be a common feature of Semitic worship, but almost any page of Pausanias shows that an altar, without a temple, sufficed for the ritual of genuinely Greek gods, if the Orientalists will allow that any god is genuinely Greek. (4) There is more weight in the argument which M. Bérard draws from Pausanias' description of the altar on Mt. Lycaeus: πρὸ δὲ τοῦ βωμοῦ κίονες δύο ὥς ἐπὶ ἀνίσχοντα ἐστήκασιν ἥλιον, ἀετοὶ δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἐπίχρυσοι τὰ γε ἐτι παλαιότερα ἐπεποιήντο.⁴ In these two pillars he sees Jachin and Boas, the columns which stood before a Semitic temple; while the eagles sculptured in relief upon them (ἐπεποιήντο, not κάθηνται) are really winged sun-discs. At Megalopolis, the precinct of Zeus contained two altars, two tables, and two eagles.⁵ Both at Megalopolis and on Mt. Lycaeus the precinct was an ἄβατον; the author compares the sanctity of certain mountains, among the Semites, as Sinai and Carmel, but the idea is, of course, by no means peculiar to the Semitic peoples.

⁴ Paus. viii. 38, 7.

⁵ Paus. viii. 30, 2 βωμοὶ τέ εἰσι τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τράπεζαι δύο καὶ ἀετοὶ ταῖς τραπέζαις ἴσοι.

¹ Mover's *Phoenizier*, pp. 47 ff., Curtius I. ch. ii., Duncker *Hist. Greece* I. ch. iii., Holm I. ch. ix., Abbott I. pp. 50 ff.

² P. 323.

³ Pp. 17–20.

On the whole, it must however be conceded that M. Bérard has made out a strong case for his Semitic theory, as far as Zeus Lycaeus is concerned; and if Zeus Laphystius (at Alos and in Boeotia) and Zeus Apomyius (at Olympia) are often identified with Phoenician Baals, there is at least as much probability for the same identification in the case of the Arcadian god. And yet there are serious difficulties, which should prevent us from too hastily accepting M. Bérard's theory. From a historical point of view, it might be thought curious that no hint has been preserved of the foreign origin of the cult, as in the story of Cadmus; nor is there any philological evidence, such as has been adduced for the Oriental origin of Melicertes (*i.e.* Melcarth), Heracles (? Archal), or Zeus Apomyius (Baal Zebub). For we can hardly doubt that Zeus Lycaeus means the Wolf-Zeus or at least Zeus of the Wolf-mountain, although M. Bérard and Immerwahr both favour the old derivation from *√luc*, 'Light-god.' But it must be allowed that the Wolf-god might still be Phoenician, as Robertson Smith (*Rel. of the Semites*, p. 88, new edition, quoted by Bérard) shows that the belief in were-wolves was held by the Semites.

I have examined the case of Zeus Lycaeus at some length, because the theory of his Semitic origin is at least tenable, though it would appear to be by no means proved. But the author is not content with an isolated Baal; he argues (p. 93) that Semitic deities were worshipped in trinities, consisting of a god, a goddess, his wife, and a young god, their son; *e.g.* at Sidon we find Baal Astarte and Eshmun, at Tyre, Baal Astarte and Melcarth. The origin of most of the Arcadian gods and goddesses is to be sought for in one or other of the members of this trinity. Again, each member of the Semitic trinity has a triple aspect;¹ but the Greeks formed a separate deity out of each separate aspect or title, so that Zeus, Dionysos, and Poseidon are really one and the same Baal. Hera, Aphrodite, Demeter, and Artemis are all forms of the great goddess in her celestial terrestrial and infernal aspects. The young god (Adonis, Thammuz, Eshmun, or Melcarth) divides his functions and powers between Hermes, Heracles, and Asclepius. The *nomina* have become *numina* with a vengeance. Even the 'black Demeter' of Phigaleia resolves herself into an Astarte. The transformation was effected by the following steps. Originally Astarte rode on horseback, in her

aspect as a warrior goddess. Now Syrian, like Egyptian gods, often bore the head of their sacred animal *en guise de coiffure*, *e.g.* Aphrodite carries a dove on her head in Cyprus; M. Bérard therefore concludes (p. 120) that the human face of the goddess gradually disappeared, and the head of the animal descended on to the shoulders of the goddess. This theory seems hardly likely to supersede the explanation of the anthropologist, that the horse-head is the last relic of a goddess who was incarnate in the form of a horse. We need not be surprised, after this, to find from the author's Introduction (pp. 44-45) that he has a very qualified admiration for the methods of folklorists. In fact, M. Bérard has tried to prove too much; he has been carried away by his anxiety to find a place for each Arcadian deity in some aspect of a 'triple triad' of Oriental mythology. Let us consider, for example, his treatment of *Le dieu fils*. His theory, as I have already mentioned, is that different characteristics of one Semitic god produced Hermes, Heracles and Asclepius. 'Arcadia,' he says, 'is the country of Heracles; it is the scene of a great number of his exploits, and the Arcadians are his usual companions in all his enterprises.'² Now it may be granted that Heracles became readily acclimatized in Arcadia; but there can be no doubt that he was a Theban god before he became Arcadian: in other words Heracles, like Aphrodite, may have been originally Semitic, but he was introduced into Arcadia after he had become hellenized; his presence in Arcadia has nothing to do with the assumed Phoenician occupation of that district. With regard to the Arcadian Hermes and Asclepius, there is no authority for the theory of their Oriental origin. Hermes in Arcadia was primarily a phallic shepherd-god, giver of increase to the flocks and of luck to men; if he was borrowed from the Phoenicians his Semitic prototype must also have been a god of flocks and fertility. Yet we are asked to believe that 'il représente, dans le panthéon hellénique, une conception très voisine du Verbe sémitique,' p. 276. Such points of similarity as may exist between Hermes and Merodach (*e.g.* both were patrons of letters) are no proof that the Arcadians borrowed Hermes from the Babylonian god. A likeness to Merodach might be traced in the Olympian or Pan-hellenic character of Hermes, but it certainly cannot be extracted from his Arcadian aspect. This likeness is probably

¹ P. 174.² P. 272

accidental: but granted that the conception of a Merodach or a Nebo may have influenced the Greek Hermes, the fact that his special Arcadian characteristics are not those of his assumed original proves that the Arcadians did not borrow him directly from foreign sources. Lastly, it is true that Asclepius is sometimes a juvenile deity and is generally affiliated to Apollo; so M. Bérard calls him a 'dieu fils.' But, as Miss Harrison points out,¹ this idea was only developed when the cult of Asclepius came into conflict with that of the Dorian Apollo. It was necessary to find a connexion between the two gods of healing; so the old dream-oracle god gave way to Apollo, and became his son. Asclepius, moreover, was not originally Arcadian, as M. Bérard appears to claim,² but Thessalian.

The conclusions which the author draws from his study of Arcadian religion are summed up on p. 323. He distinguishes three periods in its development:—

(1) It appears that originally there was a simple Pelasgic religion in which Pan and Selene, the sun and moon, were the only gods worshipped.

(2) A Semitic religion succeeded this primitive nature-worship: Zeus Lycaeus took the place of Pan upon his mountain.

(3) Hellenic period. The Greeks rationalized and analysed the Oriental religion and so produced the anthropomorphic pantheon of the historic Arcadians.

The 'Semitic period' cannot be considered as proved, or even probable, if the above criticisms on M. Bérard's arguments are accepted. As to the 'Pelasgic period' we know as little about the religion as about the race of the Pelasgi. There is no objection to calling Pan Pelasgic if that term is preferred to 'Hellenic.' But a protest must be made, when not only M. Bérard³ but Immerwahr⁴ follow Preller⁵ and the old school of mythologists in assuming a solar origin for Pan. For if Mannhardt did not write in vain, he surely proved beyond dispute that Pan, like the Satyrs and Fauns of Italy, the Urisks of Scotland, and the Ljeschie of Russia, was a wood spirit conceived of in the form of a goat.⁶ But, as there seems to be a perpetual recrudescence of the solar theory in connexion with Pan, in spite of Mannhardt and Mr. Frazer, it may not be useless

to examine the arguments which Immerwahr and his supporters bring forward. Pan has his flocks in Arcadia; Helios and Apollo have their herds; therefore Pan is a sun-god. But Pan, as the god of a shepherd people, naturally protects the flocks of his worshippers. The herds of Helios or Apollo are no parallel, whether they belong specially to the Sun-god, or whether (as in Hom. *hymn. Merc.* 71, θεῶν μακάρων βόες) they are the common property of the gods, and are merely tended by Apollo. Again Pan is the son of Ether, according to one tradition (Mnaseas); but this does not appear to be an early genealogy; and indeed the parentage of the god is too indiscriminate to draw any conclusions therefrom. His father is Uranus, Zeus, Hermes, or Apollo; his mother Callisto, Oenoe, Penelope or the daughter of Dryops, according to various accounts (see Preller-Robert, where an even longer list is given). His epithet αἰόλος in Macrobi. *Sat.* i. 23 may refer to the sun in the mind of Macrobius himself, but is certainly no proof of an original solar character. Immerwahr points out that Helios and Pan were worshipped together at Sicyon; but unless the men of Sicyon, like Pentheus, saw two suns, this fact might as easily show that Pan was *not* the sun. It may be true that Helios and Apollo were little worshipped in Arcadia,⁷ but this is purely negative reasoning and does not concern Pan; nor is a developed sun-worship by any means universal. The solar theorists make much of the fact that Pan and Selene were worshipped together in Arcadian caves⁸ and that Pan won the love of Selene by an artifice.⁹ But both Pan and Selene¹⁰ inhabit caves, so that there is nothing wonderful that the two deities should have a cave in common. I find that this obvious explanation is also given by Roscher (*Selene*, p. 151), who suggests an additional link between Pan and Selene; in his view, Pan is merely a divine counterpart of the Arcadian shepherd-hunter, and is connected with the moon because a moon-lit night is favourable for watching the flocks and for nocturnal hunting expeditions.¹¹

⁷ Immerwahr, p. 205; Bérard, p. 62.

⁸ Porphy. *de Antr.* 20.

⁹ Macrobi. *Sat.* v. 22, *niveis velleribus se circumdedit.* Cf. Virg. *Georg.* iii. 391.

¹⁰ Selene visited Endymion, the shepherd and hunter, in a cave on Latmos. The absence of the moon was accounted for by the primitive explanation that the moon-goddess was hidden in her cave. Preller-Robert I.² p. 445.

¹¹ *op. cit.* pp. 162 ff.

¹ *Myth. and Mon. of Ancient Athens*, p. 324.

² P. 270.

³ Pp. 61–62 &c.

⁴ *op. cit.* p. 204.

⁵ Preller-Robert I.² pp. 738 ff.

⁶ *Antike Wald- und Feldkulte*, ch. 3.

If Pan, therefore, as seems certain, had no connexion with the sun, there is little or no evidence to support the theory that the 'Pelagic' religion was confined to a simple worship of the heavenly bodies. M. Bérard's

reconstruction of Pelagic beliefs is as dubious as his theory of a 'Phoenician period,' influencing the whole of Arcadian ritual and mythology.

E. E. SIKES.

RECENT EDITIONS OF HYPERIDES.

Hyperides, the Orations against Athenogenes and Philippides, edited with a Translation by F. G. KENYON. London, George Bell and Sons, 1893. 5s. net.

Hyperidis Orationes Sex cum ceterarum fragmentis edidit F. BLASS; ed. tertia, insigniter aucta. Leipzig, Teubner, 1894. 2m. 10pf.

MR. KENYON has earned the gratitude of many scholars at home and abroad by the skill with which he has deciphered, and the promptitude with which he has published, the important Greek *papyri* which have recently been secured by the British Museum. The object of his present volume is to 'make available for readers, in an accessible form, the two most recently recovered orations of Hyperides.' Of these, the oration *against Athenogenes* has been published by M. Revillout and others, while the fragment of that *against Philippides* was first edited by Mr. Kenyon in a volume,¹ which he modestly describes as 'containing a large quantity of other matter, which a reader may or may not desire to possess.' Mr. Kenyon now supplies us with an interesting Introduction, a fairly satisfactory Text, and an eminently readable Translation, while the general attractiveness of the book is further enhanced by a Facsimile of nineteen lines of the Speech against Athenogenes from the *papyrus* in the Louvre. This MS is not later than the end of the second century B.C.; it is thus the oldest extant MS of any classical Greek work yet discovered, with the exception of the fragments of the *Antiope* and the *Phaedo*.

The recovery of the Speech against Athenogenes is particularly welcome as the author of the treatise *On the Sublime* couples it with the defence of Phryne as an example of a style in which Hyperides was superior even to Demosthenes. Athenogenes is an Egyptian resident in Athens, who has a slave named Midas (probably a Phrygian).

Midas, who has two sons, is manager of a perfumery belonging to his master. Hyperides' client wishes to acquire possession of the younger son, and is informed by the slave-boy's master that, if he wants to buy the boy, he must buy his brother and father as well. The original proposal to pay for their freedom only is cunningly changed by their master into one for buying them right out. When the transaction is completed, the purchaser finds himself saddled with heavy liabilities incurred by Midas, the full extent of which he now learns for the first time. He accordingly brings against Athenogenes an action which has, with great probability, been identified as a *δίκη βλάβης*. The intermediary in negotiating the bargain, in its original form, is a person of questionable character named Antigona, whose success in deluding the plaintiff is complete. The plaintiff's own character is obviously not high; and, having formally consented to the purchase and actually paid the money, he has in point of law a weak case. There was all the more reason why, in a matter requiring skilful and delicate handling, he should seek the aid of an expert like Hyperides.

The Speech *against Philippides* is concerned with a *γραφὴ παρανόμων*. Philippides had moved a vote of thanks to a certain body of *πρόεδροι* for the manner in which they had discharged their duties as the presiding committee of the *ἐκκλησία*. The *πρόεδροι* had put to the vote a proposal in honour of Philip. The proposal was irregular, but it had been put and carried under pressure. To screen the *πρόεδροι* from the consequences of this irregularity, Philippides, a member of the Macedonian party, proposed to vote a crown to the *πρόεδροι* 'for their upright and legal action.' Hyperides attacks this proposal as illegal. A point of interest may be found in the fact that among the friends of Philippides is one Democrates of Aphidna, who belongs to the same *deme* as Harmodius, and is a descendant either of Harmodius or (less probably) of Aristogeiton. In a

¹ *Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum*, 1891.