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](#)

Questions Concerning Attic Topography and Religion with Reference to Thucydides II. 15

L. R. Farnell

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 07 / October 1900, pp 369 - 376

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00083220, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00083220

How to cite this article:

L. R. Farnell (1900). Questions Concerning Attic Topography and Religion with Reference to Thucydides II. 15. The Classical Review, 14, pp 369-376 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00083220

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

books, summaries of new theories or results, would have been easier to compile and would have proved more useful to the student. It is only natural that many of the works (especially those not by German scholars) should be cited at second hand. In the

main justice is done to the contributions of English scholars, especially in the sphere of Archaeology, but it is surprising that Mr. Frazer's edition of Pausanias should be dismissed with the briefest mention.

LEONARD WHIBLEY.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

QUESTIONS CONCERNING ATTIC TOPOGRAPHY AND RELIGION WITH REFERENCE TO THUCYDIDES II. 15.

MANY vital questions concerning Attic topography and some questions of interest touching Attic religion depend on the interpretation of the 15th chapter of the second book of Thucydides, in which the prehistoric City of Athens is contrasted with the Athens of his day. I venture reluctantly and diffidently to approach the thorny topographical problem. I am constrained to do so because many of the inquiries in which I am more specially interested depend upon it; and also because a certain theory has been put forward in recent years by Dr. Dörpfeld concerning that chapter, which claims acceptance or refutation. Hitherto it has met with little acceptance; the criticism has been mainly hostile, but not sufficiently searching and conclusive. The question at issue is at first purely literary, a question of translation or of paraphrase. Beginning with the words § 4 τὸ δὲ πρὸ τούτου Dr. Dörpfeld would translate this and the following section somewhat in this manner. 'In the days before Theseus that which is now the Acropolis, together with the district at its foot that lies more or less towards the South, constituted the City. The proof that the Acropolis with this small outlying portion was the ancient city, is that the temples on the rock itself are dedicated to (...? Athena) as well as to other deities, and the temples that lie outside (the wall of the ancient Acropolis) are situated in the main near to this latter portion of the city (viz. near to the ancient Acropolis), and there are other ancient shrines situated near to the ancient Polis (ταύτη)...§ 7. And the fountain now called 'Ερνεάκρονος, but formerly Kallirrhoe when the springs were above ground, was used by our ancestors for all the

most important purposes as being conveniently near to the Burg-gate, and even now from ancient tradition its water is customarily employed for the religious preliminaries of the marriage ceremonies and for other ritualistic purposes, and the Acropolis is still called the Polis by the Athenians, owing to the original settlement here.'

Dr. Dörpfeld, in accord with the modern editors (e.g. Klausen), assumes in § 5 a lacuna after the words καὶ ἄλλων θεῶν ἐστὶ; and the logic of the passage may seem to justify this assumption.¹ But his version is at variance with the received interpretation in all the essential points. As regards the mere translation, the controversy turns mainly on the meaning of the sentence τὰ ἔξω πρὸς τοῦτο τὸ μέρος τῆς πόλεως μᾶλλον ἰδρύνται: as regards interpretation, it turns mainly on the intention of the words τεκμήριον δέ. What is it that Thucydides wishes to prove and ought to prove? According to Dr. Dörpfeld, he only succeeds in proving, or making probable that the old Polis was confined to the rock of the Acropolis, and this was all that he desired to prove; the additional statement made in § 4 that the old city extended below the rock in a southerly direction, becomes a matter of indifference to Thucydides the moment after he had uttered it: it was merely added to show that he was aware that the ancient Polis was of rather larger compass than the rock itself; the extension towards the south is not established by any kind of proof; the temples that are

¹ This article was written before I had the opportunity of reading Dr. Verrall's paper in the May number of the *Classical Review*. Dr. Verrall is right, I think, in rejecting the theory of the lacuna. His criticism is confined to the textual interpretation. But no criticism is satisfactory that does not take account of the archaeological difficulties as well. Another paper on the same subject has just appeared in the *American Journal of Philology*, which I have not yet been able to consult.

mentioned as proof of ancient settlement are not to be located towards the south, but rather to the west and north-west and as near to the rock itself as possible, although outside the Pelasgic wall and therefore called τὰ ξέω ἱερά.

The rival, and as it may be called, the received interpretation of the controverted passage may be thus expressed. 'In the days before Theseus the city consisted (a) of the present Acropolis (b) of a portion extending more or less towards the south, *μάλιστα πρὸς νότον* (including the southerly points of the compass S.S.E., S.S.W. and even S.W. and S.E.): these two statements may be proved as follows: the most ancient temples are on the Acropolis itself: and the ancient temples off the Acropolis, ξέω, lie mainly towards the southern portion of the city—the temple of Zeus Olympios etc...and there are other temples also in this southern quarter (ταύτῃ).'

The object of this paper is primarily to consider these two theories of an important passage, and then to raise a question concerning τὰ ἀρχαιότερα Διονύσια.

Looking then at the two interpretations first from a purely literary and textual point of view, we may admit that the Greek words, taken by themselves, allow of Dr. Dörpfeld's rendering: but most of us will feel that *a priori* the nexus of the sentences is strongly against it. Thucydides makes two quite distinct statements, one that the ancient Polis was partly the present Acropolis, and then that it included a portion below the Acropolis stretching more or less towards the south. The second statement would probably require even more substantiation than the former for the ordinary Athenian reader, whose city had extended towards the north and north-west. Thereupon Thucydides produces his proofs; and the proof at once takes a dual form, as though he was aware that he had two separate propositions to prove. The two proofs seem also skilfully phrased so as to be naturally accepted as proofs of the two statements, and if they are intended only to prove the first and to ignore the second, as Dr. Dörpfeld would have us suppose, we must charge Thucydides with artfully constructing his sentences so as to deceive his readers. To this I only wish to add that Dr. Dörpfeld's rendering of τὰ ξέω ἱερά appears to be strained and unnatural; the word ξέω in such a context can only be naturally interpreted in relation to the words ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἀκροπόλει and as meaning 'outside the Acropolis', the Acropolis of the fifth century.

Turning now to the archaeological side of Dr. Dörpfeld's exposition, I feel constrained to say that his argumentation, which I have laboriously considered, appears to me weak and sophistical, and that in dealing with the religious designation of temples, he writes and judges in the fashion of an amateur. Before we deal with the topographical question concerning each of the temples mentioned, we may stop for a moment to consider whether there is any real value at all in Thucydides' main argument. He argues that the locality of ancient temples proves the locality of ancient settlement. Taken in a very general sense, we may admit that this principle might hold good in most cases. We know that the temple was often the germ of the Polis, and often gave its name to the settlement that arose around it. But the ancient city-temples (the phrase is used advisedly) might not always be within the city-wall; where they were found outside the aboriginal frontier of the city, they could hardly be regarded as evidence of the demarcations of that frontier, but rather as indications of the directions in which the original city was tending to grow. Thus if any of the temples mentioned by Thucydides is admittedly to be located at some appreciable distance from the Acropolis, and this is the case, even on Dörpfeld's theory, with the temple of Dionysos ἐν Λίμναις, then it could not reasonably be quoted as evidence that the primitive city was on the rock, but rather in support of his other statement that the city before Theseus had already extended somewhat away from the rock in a southerly direction. How far he conceives the original extension to have gone, the vague phrase τὸ ὑπ' αὐτὴν leaves an open question. Again, whatever temple Thucydides quotes in this connection he must believe to date from the period before Theseus, or at least to occupy the site of one that belonged originally to that period. We are not obliged to show that the belief was justified; but only that it was tenable.

Coming now to the details of the topography, we may mark at the outset that three out of four of the shrines mentioned are the names of famous temples that are actually known to have existed on the south or south-east of the Acropolis towards the Ilissos. In each case Dr. Dörpfeld labours to show that it is not the well-known temple that Thucydides has in his mind, but another of the same name on the actual slope of the Acropolis rock.

The first-mentioned is the ἱερὸν Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου. We naturally think at once of the

sacred spot on the south-east, where Deucalion was fabled to have erected a shrine to this deity, and where Peisistratos laid the foundations of a temple which was carried on by Antiochus Epiphanes, and afterwards completed by Hadrian. Thucydides might of course apply the term *ιερόν* to the sacred inclosure, although no building had as yet risen above the ground: and the great antiquity of the site is attested by the legend of Deukalion attaching to the spot and by the sacrifice of the barley-cake that was thrown once a year into the cleft of the ground. Here then is an *Ὀλυμπεῖον* which Thucydides would have the right to believe was aboriginal. What evidence have we of any other shrine of Zeus *Ὀλύμπιος* in Athens? Dr. Dörpfeld is led to imagine that there must have been another, merely because Plato in the *Phaedrus* (p. 227) speaks of the house of Lysias *ἐν ᾧσται* as being *πλησίον τοῦ Ὀλυμπίου*, and he maintains that the *Ὀλυμπεῖον* of Peisistratos was outside the Themistoclean wall. I do not know on what grounds he maintains this: but even if he were correct in this point, I do not understand why a house that may have been just within the wall, might not be described as near a very famous locality that was just outside. But Curtius places the *Ὀλυμπεῖον* within the wall of Themistocles; and there is this reason for doing so, a reason ignored by Dr. Dörpfeld, that a late Attic inscription (*C.I.A.* 3, 291) refers to a *Φαιδωντῆς Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου ἐν ᾧσται*: *Φαιδωντῆς* must designate the official who was charged with the care of the chryselephantine image of Zeus which Hadrian dedicated in the *Ὀλυμπεῖον* near the Ilissos. The spot which Dr. Dörpfeld selects as the site of the oldest *Ὀλυμπεῖον* is on the north-west of the Acropolis wall, a little eastward of the most ancient Python that he believes to have discovered near the same spot. The latter hypothesis will be examined directly. For the moment it is enough to note that there is not a particle of independent evidence for assuming an *Ὀλυμπεῖον* on or immediately adjacent to the Acropolis. He quotes an inscription with a dedication to Zeus found on the Acropolis (*C.I.A.* 3, 198). Such inscriptions are liable to be found in any locality of the Greek world: it is needless to say that they give us no right to assume a *τέμενος*, unless they occur in considerable numbers; still less ought we to assume a temple of Zeus *Ὀλύμπιος*, on the ground of a single monument dedicated vaguely to Zeus. Still worse is Dr. Dörpfeld's suggestion that this Zeus Olympios, whose house

he imagines as on the slope of the Acropolis rock, might be the same as the Zeus *Μετρίχιος*, whose feast was held, according to Thucydides, *ἔξω τῆς πόλεως* (1, 126). Dr. Dörpfeld might not have known that *Ὀλύμπιος* and *Μετρίχιος* are almost antithetical terms, the former expressing the heavenly, the latter the nether or chthonian character of Zeus. But it is difficult to understand how he could have come to identify a worship whose centre was outside the city with one whose home was on the slope of the Acropolis. For it is obvious that *πόλις* is not being used in any technical sense in 1, 126, and *ἔξω τῆς πόλεως* must mean outside the Thucydidean, not merely the prehistoric city.

The next temple adduced by way of evidence is called *τὸ Πύθιον*. The reader is naturally, and as I hope to show rightly, led to think at once of the celebrated *τέμενος* on the south-east of the Acropolis not far from the Ilissos, and near to the *Ὀλυμπεῖον*, but, according to Curtius, separated from it by the wall of Themistocles. The locality was fixed by the fortunate discovery in 1877 of the inscription on the altar dedicated *Πυθίον ἐν τεμένει* by the younger Peisistratos, mentioned by Thucydides 5, 54. It was here, according to Plato and Isaeus, that the tripods, the prizes won in the contests of the Thargelia, were dedicated (*vide* Suidas, *s.v.* *Πύθιον*), and both the literature and the inscriptions from the fifth century onwards speak of *τὸ Πύθιον* without any special designation as though there was no possibility of any confusion. If this place was first consecrated by Peisistratos to the worship of the Pythian god, then of course the *τέμενος* could not be regarded by Thucydides as proving anything about prehistoric Athens. But we have no reason for supposing this. Hesychius and Suidas attribute the construction of the *ναός* called *τὸ Πύθιον* to Peisistratos. It is possible that they are merely enlarging on the statement of Thucydides that the younger Peisistratos dedicated an altar in the inclosure; or they may be correct, and the *ναός* may well have been one of the architectural works with which the Peisistratidae embellished the city. But the cult of Apollo *Πύθιος* was certainly not introduced into Athens by Peisistratos, but was probably planted some centuries earlier on the banks of the Ilissos: the cult-names *Πύθιος* and *Δελφίνιος* are closely connected, and, as we gather from Pausanias, the temple of the latter stood near the Python in the same south-east quarter of the old city, and was connected in legend

with the arrival of Theseus. Is it likely, we must now ask, that there was some other Python in Athens which would better suit the purposes of Thucydides' argument? Dr. Dörpfeld appears to think that there were even three. *A priori*, it is extremely improbable that there were three or even two, as every one familiar with the nomenclature of Greek cult will allow.¹ The list of the Greek states that worshipped Apollo Πύθιος is exceedingly large; but in none of them is there any record of more than one Python. And further we may venture to dogmatise about Athens itself, that city of shrines, that there was no single known instance of a double place of worship of the same deity designated by the same cult-name. The temples of Athena, Demeter, Apollo were numerous indeed, but they severally possessed their special and distinguishing appellatives, by which they are referred to in exact descriptions or in state documents. What then are the traces pointing to the existence of other Pythia in Athens? There may seem at first sight some evidence in the description given by Philostratus of the route followed by the sacred ship which was rolled along in the Panathenaia bearing the peplos of Athena (*Vita Soph.* ii. 1, 5); 'starting from the Ceramicus, it proceeded to the Eleusinion, and having encompassed that temple it went along the Pelasgic wall and arrived *en route* at the Python, where it is now at anchor.' Philostratus is a late writer, not particularly versed in Athenian ritual, still his account may be accurate as far as it goes, though apparently incomplete. Curtius (*Stadtgeschichte von Athen*, p. 85) finds no embarrassment in it, and naturally interprets it to mean that the ship passed along the northern side of the Acropolis, rounded the eastern extremity, and visited the Python on the south-east. And in fact this circuitous route may have been dictated by ritualistic reasons easy to understand. Wachsmuth, who anticipated Dörpfeld's theory about the Python and utterly rejected it (*Stadt Athen*, p. 296), finds the passage in Philostratus altogether corrupt. Dörpfeld maintains its accuracy and clear-

ness and finds in it an inevitable proof that there was a Python near the entrance to the Acropolis, and he discovers it in the cave in the north-west face of the rock, where there are three caverns. The middle one has been proved by recent inscriptions to be the cave of Apollo (*Eph. Arch.* 1897, p. 6, Πίν. 2, 1 B) hitherto called the cave of Pan. Dr. Dörpfeld believes that Apollo was here worshipped as Πύθιος, and therefore the holy place was a Python. But the inscriptions found just before the entrance show that the official name of the god was here Ὑπακράιος or Ὑποακράιος or Ὑπὸ Μακραίς, Μακραί being the name recorded in Euripides for the long ridge of the Acropolis on the north. However, Dr. Dörpfeld presses the lines of Euripides (*Ion* 285) into the service of his argument, and here as elsewhere he handles his literary sources in an unscientific fashion. The poet touches briefly on the story of the love of Apollo for the Athenian princess Creusa, and of the union which took place in the cave near Μακραί, and of which Ion was the fruit. 'Therefore the Pythian god and the lightnings from Pytho honour that place.' To understand this language we must read the passage in Strabo, p. 404, which tells us that for three months the Πυθαῖοι watched near the altar of Zeus Astrapaïos, that stood on the wall between the Python and Olympieion, until they saw lightning in the sky above Harma, near Phyle.² It would be indeed a grave difficulty, if careful topographical investigation were to show that Harma must have been entirely invisible to the watchers on the wall in the south-east, near the famous Python and the famous Olympieion. And Dr. Dörpfeld seems hesitatingly to imply that it was, or at least that his 'Python,' the cave on the north face of the Acropolis, was a much better place of observation. When it is a question of observing lightning above a peak some twelve miles away, it is a matter of indifference whether one's standpoint is three hundred yards nearer or further. It is merely a question whether the peak is visible or not from that point. And Dr. Dörpfeld might have tested this, but does not appear to have done so. Curtius (*Hermes* 12, p. 489) clearly implies that Harma could be seen from a high point on the Themistoclean wall on the south-east near the Python of Peisistratos. Having

¹ Dr. Verrall, in his article in the May number of the *Classical Review*, misunderstands the point in saying 'that Athens should have contained more than one such sanctuary (of Zeus Olympios), and more than one Python, is as little surprising as that in a mediaeval city there should be more than one church of St. Mary.' The analogy would only suggest that there might be several temples of Apollo in Athens. We know that there were. What we want is evidence or analogy for the theory that there were several temples there of Apollo Pythios.

² The lightning was a sign sent to the Python in Athens that the god was ready to receive the Athenian *θεωπία*, and the holy procession started thereupon.

failed to make the observation myself and desiring explicit testimony, I have recently consulted the Director of the British School at Athens. His kind communication sets the matter at rest. From careful experiments that he was good enough to make, he concludes that 'from the wall (near the Peisistratid temples), still better from a tower on the wall, the whole of Parnes and Harma was visible.' Therefore we can now understand the statement in its only natural sense; and can perfectly well explain the Euripidean lines, as signifying that the Pythian god graciously sends the sign to the watchers in Athens, because he is associated by the closest ties with the Athenian people, and because he holds in loving remembrance and honour the spot on the Acropolis where Ion was begotten. To force his words into meaning that the cave on *Μακρά* was the Pythion, is to misunderstand the value of the evidence from poetry. But what has given the *coup de grâce* to Dr. Dörpfeld's theory is the discovery of the inscriptions *in situ* which have been found since he promulgated it. Equally unsound is his dogma that the temple of Apollo *παρῶς* in the market-place was also a Pythion. This he maintains on no other ground than that Demosthenes (18, 141) speaks of Apollo *Πύθιος* as the ancestral god of the state. So he certainly was, for the legend of Ion's birth especially associates Athens and Delphi. But Apollo *παρῶς* who lived in the market-place, was never officially in any certain record styled *Πύθιος*, nor was the *Παρῶν* styled a *Πύθιον*. Poets and private dedicators, especially in later times, show a tendency to accumulate epithets in addressing the divinity, the poets in order to display their learning, the private dedicator to capture the god, if not by one name, then by another. But the general rule of religious economy prescribed that the public shrine should have one name, and that there should not be two public shrines in the city dedicated to the deity under the same name.

We next find the temple of *Γῆ* adduced by Thucydides as proof of his main thesis concerning the locality of the ancient Polis. She is mentioned without any qualifying name; and this would only be natural if there was no other *Γῆς ῥέμενος* among the *ἑξω ἱερά* with which this one might be confused. Now there was a *ῥέμενος Γῆς Ὀλυμπίας* within the precincts of the Olympieion on the south-east as Pausanias attests. The worship of the earth-goddess might well have been regarded

as *primaeval* in this spot, on account of the legend of Deukalion and the yearly offerings flung into the chasm. But Dr. Dörpfeld is able to point to a *ἱερὸν Γῆς Κουροτρόφου* standing near the entrance to the Acropolis and associated with the worship of Demeter Chloë. The earliest authority for this is Pausanias; but there is reason for believing that, in the fifth century at least, the name of the goddess was merely *ἡ κουροτρόφος*. An ancient boundary stone with archaic characters gives the name as *κουροτρόφος*; and no inscription yet discovered designates her as *Γῆ*. The official name of the shrine was *Κουροτρόφιον*, and Aristophanes in the formula of prayer given in the *Thesmophoriazousai* names her *Ἡ κουροτρόφος*.¹ In the Attic Tetrapolis we have found the cult of the same mysterious figure. It is then in the highest degree improbable that Thucydides would have given her the unqualified personal name of *Γῆ*.

Before considering further points, we may thus summarise the argument against Dr. Dörpfeld's interpretation of the Thucydean statement. After telling us that the old city extended in a southerly direction, the historian mentions the names of four temples among the *ἑξω ἱερά*; three temples standing in close proximity to each other in the south-east answer to three of these names; two of these, the Pythion and Olympieion, were as well known in Athens as Westminster Abbey in London; there is not the slightest trace of any Pythion or any Olympieion existing anywhere else in or near the city; *a priori*, for reasons shown, it is as improbable that there should have existed two temples of each of these names as that there should be two Westminster Abbeys. We may maintain, in spite of Dr. Dörpfeld, that Thucydides was bound to prove that the ancient city extended southwards; and on the interpretation of the passage which is here being defended, he has proved it after his own fashion. He may not have marshalled his arguments in perfect order; in fact he gives evidence first for the first part of his thesis, then for the second, then for a moment at the close of the argumentation he returns to the first proposition. And Dr. Dörpfeld makes this a strong objection against the traditional interpretation. Others may be allowed to consider that a slight laxity in the arrangement of arguments is a trifling peccadillo

¹ L. 299: the words *τῇ Γῇ* which follow in the MS. are evidently an interpolation; the scholiast's comment proves that he read *τῇ κουροτρόφῃ* merely and was not sure about the proper name.

in comparison with the utter viciousness of style which the new theory imputes to Thucydides. Dr. Dörpfeld further objects, that if the historian conceived of the ancient Polis extending as far to the south as these shrines near the Ilissos, he would be refuting his own contention, which was that the ancient city was much smaller than that of the fifth century. Even if this be admitted, the objection falls; for Thucydides need not be supposed to maintain, on our interpretation, that the old city actually extended towards the south as far as these shrines: temple buildings may be pushed forward beyond the frontier-line of the dwellings; but a number of ancient temples in the south would indicate that the primæval city tended to spread away from the rock in this direction.

Into the great controversy concerning Enneakrounos I do not propose to plunge. If the cisterns discovered by Dr. Dörpfeld near the Pnyx are really the Enneakrounos-Kallirrhoe of Thucydides, then the fountain is mentioned as being near to the Acropolis and as therefore indicating that the settlement on the rock was in the main the ancient city. But if Kallirrhoe is still to be sought in the Ilissos, then the fountain, as being near to the southern suburb of the ancient city, is mentioned as indicating that the city had extended in ancient times somewhat towards the south. The evidence on both sides is ably stated and estimated by Dr. Frazer in his Commentary on Pausanias. I can add nothing to his exposition, and merely express my own opinion that the evidence is in favour of placing the fountain in the Ilissos.

Of greater interest perhaps, and certainly of greater difficulty, is the question concerning the temple of Dionysos ἐν Λίμναις, mentioned by Thucydides last of the four *ἔξω ἱερά*. It would appear, according to the interpretation of the whole passage which I have been maintaining, that this temple also must be looked for in the south: and this has been the opinion of many writers on the topography of Athens, Curtius placing it near the theatre, Wilamowitz-Möllendorf nearer to the Ilissos. That there is a marshy region between the theatre and the Ilissos appears to be proved by recent investigation. But in 1894 a very interesting discovery was made by Dr. Dörpfeld, of a *τέμενος* lying west of the Acropolis, between the Areopagus and the Pnyx, east of the former and north of the latter. The excavations, penetrating to the lowest stratum, revealed a large peri-

bolos with a small temple and an altar, which he pronounces, on the evidence of the architecture and fragments of potsherds found with them and belonging in part to the geometrical period, to be probably older than the sixth century. He discovered also within the precincts a wine-press which he attributes to the fourth century, but under which he believes to have found traces of one still older. The whole peribolos was overlaid with a structure dating from the Roman period, which an inscription found within it shows to have been a place of meeting for the guild of the Iobacchoi. This fact and the presence of the wine-press seems to justify him in regarding the archaic peribolos with its shrine and altar as consecrated to Dionysos. This then is one more brilliant discovery which we owe to the skill of the accomplished excavator. The problems which we are challenged to solve are very intricate, and have not yet been adequately treated, so far as I can discern. The discoverer himself identifies the temple with that of Dionysos ἐν Λίμναις and at first with the *Λήναιον*, but afterwards distinguishes it from the latter, which he regards as originally no temple of Dionysos at all, but as an old dancing-place named after the wine-press (*ληνός*) and situated near to this ancient peribolos. But he adheres most firmly to the belief that he has discovered the habitation of Dionysos ἐν Λίμναις: for the cisterns which he found near the Pnyx are sufficient proof in his eyes that the place was once marshy. His argumentation is certainly stronger here than in the question about the former temples. But a doubt at once arises. Granting his view, we must wonder why Thucydides should have quoted the temple of Dionysos ἐν Λίμναις in proof of his thesis: for a shrine situated so near to the Pnyx and Areopagus is scarcely evidence either that the ancient Polis was mainly confined to the Acropolis or that it extended some way towards the south; for the geographical position of the peribolos has in relation to the Acropolis scarcely one point of south, but lies almost due west: we must be content then to say that either *μάλιστα πρὸς τὸν νότον* is a phrase used with the greatest laxity or that Thucydides has in some way got his orientation a little wrong. But we ought only to say this if we find it to be the only way or the easiest way out of the difficulty.

I fear one cannot do justice to Dr. Dörpfeld's theory without raising the whole question of the Dionysiac festivals at Athens.

I will endeavour to summarise the conclusions at which, after a long and bewildering study, I have been able to arrive, and indicate the reasons for them as briefly as possible, reserving a fuller discussion for another occasion.

(a) The usual fourfold classification of the festivals, as Διονύσια κατ' ἀγρούς in Poseideon, the Lenaea in Gamelion, the Anthesteria in Anthesterion, the μεγάλη Διονύσια or the Διονύσια ἐν ἄρτει in Elaphebolion, is erroneous: setting aside the Δ. κατ' ἀγρούς, not properly a city-festival at all, we must identify the Ἀθήαια with the Anthesteria and leave only two city-festivals; (b) the Ἀθήαια is not derived from the word ληνός—a wine-vat—and is not the festival of the wine-god but is the festival of the wild women Ἀῆναι, the followers of the wild Thracian Dionysos; (c) Dionysos entered Athens as Ἀῆναιος from Eleutherae, and his oldest temple ἐν Λίμναις is also the Ἀῆναιον, and also the most ancient temple of Dionysos Eleuthereus.

In regard to the first proposition, I find myself at variance with Mommsen's views expressed in his *Feste der Stadt Athen*, but in agreement with Gilbert (*die Festzeit der attischen Dionysien*) and many other scholars. Its main support is the passage in Thucydides we are debating. In a context where he was most likely to be exact in his phrases, he tells us that the temple ἐν Λίμναις was that in which τὰ ἀρχαῖότερα Διονύσια were held on the twelfth of Anthesterion. The use of the comparative seems inexplicable, if there were three city-festivals of the God. But Mommsen finds an easy solution. 'Thucydides does not count the Lenaia among the Dionysia because their official name was Ἀθήαια &c. and not Διονύσια.' This is like saying that the festival of Christmas is the only Christian festival in the year, because Easter and the others are not called by the name of Christ. But in fact, in later Attic inscriptions we find the term τὰ Διονύσια τὰ ἐπὶ Ἀθναίῳ; and we know that official language was singularly conservative. Therefore in the time of Thucydides the Ἀθήαια not only were Διονύσια but might have been so called. Thucydides is worth a host of lexicographers and scholiasts. And even these never explicitly distinguish the Ἀθήαια from the Anthesteria, but usually speak of two Dionysiac festivals in the city in contrast to the Διονύσια κατ' ἀγρούς. The scholiasts who place the Ἀθήαια in Gamelion may have been led astray by the fact that the old Ionic cities were in the habit of celebrating their Ἀθήαια in the month Ἀθναίων which was probably identical

with the Attic Gamelion. (This confusion appears in Hesychius s. v. Διονύσια). The two festivals were perhaps originally distinct at Athens, as the separate Ionic months Ἀθναίων and Ἀνθεστηριών prove the distinction of the two festivals in Ionia. It may have been in consequence of their coalition, owing to exigencies of the Attic ritual calendar that the name of the month Ἀθναίων disappeared from Athens. A testimony worth mentioning in corroboration of Thucydides is the statement of the scholiast on Aristophanes (*Acharn.* 960) that the singular practice at the Χόες in the Anthesteria which was associated with the story of Orestes and his reception in Athens was first instituted at the feast of Dionysos Ἀῆναιος.

The next point of importance is the meaning of the name. The first, I believe, to suggest the right view was Ribbeck in his *Anfänge und Entwicklung des Dionysos-Kult in Attika* (p. 13) who derived the name from Ἀῆναι = Μαινάδες. He does not attempt however any philological proof. It has not yet so far as I know been observed, that the derivation from ληνός is a philological solecism. It is an invariable rule that substantival stems in 'ο' produce the adjectival form εος, never αος. The adjectival forms in αος can only come from nouns of the α (η) stem. Therefore Ἀῆναιος must be derived from the stem Ἀῆνα, the word attested and explained by Hesychius, and giving rise to the verb ληναΐζειν. Thus we can understand why the Ionic festival could be held in January, a month when nothing happens to the wine worth commemorating by a festival, but when Mainades were particularly active to evoke the magical powers of the vegetation-god. The epithet Ἀῆναιος then attests for the earliest Dionysiac cult, as it was imported into Attica, the orgiastic element and the prominence of ecstatic women, which is a marked and peculiar characteristic of the religion in Thrace and many Hellenic communities, but which was almost obliterated by the spirit of Athenian sanity with tendency to suppress the female. But the shadow survived in the part played in the Anthesteria by the wife of the king Archon and her fourteen ministrants, the Ἱεραπαί, the sobered descendants of the wild Mainades.

In them and their ministrations we may discern the influence of the Ἀθήαια which were engrafted upon the Anthesteria, a festival perhaps originally non-Dionysiac. Again, the great antiquity of the Ἀθήαια,

which was perhaps, like other Dionysia, a mystic cult in origin, is attested by the practice of excluding strangers: we may compare the inscription found at Myconos ordaining the sacrifice to Διώνυσος Δηγεύς on the 12th day of Lenaion and forbidding strangers to take part. Finally we must cease to regard a wine-press as certain evidence of a Lenaion, though popular etymology may have come to associate Dionysos Δήναιος with a ληνός.

Thirdly, we have fairly clear proof afforded by legend and ritual that Dionysos came to Athens from Eleutherae. The scholiast on Aristophanes (*Acharn.* 242) explains the phallic ritual in the Athenian cult as instituted to propitiate the μήνιμα of the god to which the Athenians were exposed when they refused to receive Pegasus from Eleutherae, the apostle of the new religion. The legends concerning Dionysos Μελαναγίς point to the same fact of origin. And once a year the image of Dionysos, apparently the only ancient idol of the god at Athens, was taken from the shrine of Eleuthereus by the theatre to a chapel in Academia, as though to the last halting-place of the god coming from the north-west (Paus. 1, 29, 2, Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* 2, 1, Kayser p. 235). Again, we are told by Hesychius that the Δίμναι was the place in Athens where the Δήναια were performed, and by the scholiast on Aristophanes (*Ran.* 218) that the Δίμνη or the peribolos of Dionysos ἐν Δίμναις contained 'a house and a shrine of the god.' The temple ἐν Δίμναις was the 'most ancient and holy of all' his temples at Athens, according to the pseudo-Demosthenes. But Pausanias tells us that the temenos of Eleuthereus by the theatre was the most ancient habitation of the deity, and that it contained two shrines, a younger by the side of the older. Shall we not say then that this is the Διμναῖον and that the two buildings mentioned by the scholiast on Aristophanes are the same as the two shrines mentioned by Pausanias? *A priori*, I think we should expect the Διμναῖον to lie on the south of the Acropolis, and that the theatre, which was also a religious place, would arise near the holy place where the plays of the Δήναια had long been performed. Moreover, the Anthesteria, which were undoubtedly celebrated ἐν Δίμναις, are associated with the legend of Deukalion's flood which was localised in the south by the Ilissos. Or are all these indications misleading, and was Pausanias wrong in calling the temple by the theatre the most ancient in Athens? Must we look for the Διμναῖον elsewhere, and

then believe that that ancient temple which excavation has revealed near the theatre, and which was the temple of Eleuthereus, gradually effaced the memory of a still older temple, the Διμναῖον, which was on Dr. Dörpfeld's newly discovered site by the Pnyx? In affirming this, he explains that this Διμναῖον of his was destroyed long before the time of Pausanias, and therefore the traveller judged according to his lights. But we know how tenacious was Greek conservatism of the association of holy sites. To change a temple's position, the Delphic oracle might have to be consulted, and might refuse its sanction. I need not consider the argument derived from the statements about the ἱκρία in the ancient market-place and the poplar from which the dramas were witnessed before the erection of the theatre: for the views concerning the position of the old ἀγορά are still conflicting, and may agree with either theory of the position of the Δήναιον or temple ἐν Δίμναις. And one ancient authority places the poplar near the theatre.

To conclude, if Dr. Dörpfeld's designation of the peribolos discovered near the Pnyx is correct, we must say that this was the Δήναιον, this the temple ἐν Δίμναις and this the temple of Dionysos Eleuthereus. Then we must also reckon with the fact that in the time of Peisistratos, or much earlier, as Curtius would maintain, another temple was built on the south of the Acropolis in honour of Eleuthereus. The question then remains—why at so comparatively early a time did Dionysos Eleuthereus change his habitation in Athens? or why were two ancient temples erected to the same god? The difficulty of this question does not seem fully appreciated by Dr. Dörpfeld. I cannot pretend to solve the problem, nor am I anxious to maintain that the old temple by the theatre was in very truth the oldest. But I can better understand its construction, if it arose near a Διμναῖον in the south which became gradually disused owing perhaps to the marshy nature of the soil. Still this very ancient Dionysion recently discovered by the Pnyx, whatever was its special designation, would perplex us none the less. But is a wine-press, the only evidence, evidence sufficient, and is it a Dionysion at all? The result of Dr. Dörpfeld's admirable work has been so far the increase of our difficulties.

L. R. FARNELL.