FARNELL'S *CULTS OF THE GREEK STATES*.

The Cults of the Greek States. By L. R. Farnell, D.Litt. Vol. V. Pp. xii+496, with 19 collotypes and 41 other illustrations. Price 18s. 6d. net. Clarendon Press, Oxford. 1909.

THE concluding volume of Dr. Farnell's *Cults of the Greek States* maintains the high level of accuracy and achievement which marked the former volumes. Yet the work which the editor undertook is still incomplete; five volumes have not sufficed to permit of the inclusion of an account of the cults of the dead and the worship of heroes, and, though Dr. Farnell promises to make good the omission elsewhere, it is unfortunate that it has not been possible to extend the work to six volumes, for these cults stand in the most vital relation to the religious life of the Greek States. But we must be grateful to the Delegates of the Press for having given us so much, and to Dr. Farnell for the untiring industry which has collected practically exhaustively the material bearing on his subject, and for the sane and discriminating judgment which gives us an account of Greek religion in which the problems presented by it are illumined by all the light derivable from anthropology and comparative religion, but in which the interpretation of the facts is not distorted by the adoption of far-fetched theories of matriarchy or totemism.

Of the gods dealt with in the present volume, Hermes presents some clearly aboriginal features. The phallic emblem is decidedly one of these, and Dr. Farnell (p. 8) underestimates the evidence in favour of attributing the phallus to a non-Hellenic stratum of religion when he cites it as found among the Vedic Indians. In point of fact phallus worshippers are twice mentioned in the *Rigveda*, but in both cases with hostility, and it is practically certain that the worshippers were aborigines, as in later days also the most prominent centres of phallic worship were found in the Dravidian south among the Śivaïtes.¹ Then, too, Hermes is in Greek religion the patron of thieves, and in the *Yajurveda* Rudra-Śiva is likewise the lord and protector of every kind of robber—in both cases very possibly a reflex of the special relation of the god of the earlier race to the conquered people.² It is not of course necessary to assume that Hermes was not a Hellenic deity; Rudra is a Vedic

¹ Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde*, 1², 934; Zimmer, *Altindisches Leben*, p. 116.

² Zimmer, *op. cit.*, p. 179; Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 76.

deity, but later he seems clearly to have assumed traits from an aboriginal god, and the same fate may have befallen Hermes.

Dionysos, on the contrary, is no doubt a Thracian-Phrygian deity which has been introduced from the north into Greece. Dr. Farnell seems clearly right (p. 85) in rejecting Bather's theory (*J. H. S.*, 1894, pp. 244-246) of a primitive Greek Dionysos; the name is the important consideration, and it is likely that it is not Greek, though Aryan. More doubtful is his acceptance (p. 110) of the explanation of the second birth of Dionysos from the thigh of Zeus as a relic of adoption by the father, a trace of the advance from matrilinear to patrilinear descent. This seems a far-fetched hypothesis, for the invention may either be a freak of the savage imagination, or a reminiscence of the fact—attested for many parts of the world by the examples cited in Crawley's *Mystic Rose*—that the father on the occasion of childbirth treats himself and is treated as if he were the actual producer of the child. On the other hand, Dr. Farnell has a very satisfactory explanation (p. 181) of the trieteric Dionysiac festivals; he connects them with the primitive mode of agriculture which changes fields periodically. To secure the fertility of the new lands the Mainads must refresh their magic powers by an act of solemn communion with the god, an act quite different from the ordinary annual ritual connected with the death and revival of the vegetation god or his representative.

Much light is also thrown by the author on the origin of tragedy. He rejects the traditional derivation of tragedy from the dithyramb and the satyric drama, the proposed interpretation of tragedy as the 'beer-song,' and the supposed origin of the drama in the solemn mimetic funeral dances performed in honour of the dead, as seen in the tragic choruses which were performed in honour of Adrastus at Sikyon. He insists (pp. 235 *et seq.*) that the 'goat-song' was the song of worshippers dressed as goats, who thus put themselves in contact with the god who was at times incarnate in the goat, and he compares the goat-men who take part in the modern Dionysiac carnival in Thrace. He also lays stress on the legend of the slaying of Xanthos by Melanthes, and sees in this with Usener¹ a variation of the struggle between winter and summer or spring, and he points out that there are here all the elements from which tragedy could be developed. His theory may be illustrated by a fact to which we have called attention elsewhere in its bearing on dramatic origins. The earliest notice of the Indian drama which we certainly possess is that contained in the *Mahābhāṣya*, or 'great commentary' on the grammar of Pāṇini, a work of about 145 B.C.² In illustrating the use of the present of the causative, the commentator alludes to the story of Kāṁsa's death at the hands of Kṛṣṇa. He tells us that it was represented by actors who actually killed Kāṁsa—we may hope merely in show, the whole being a sort of Punch-and-Judy show with human actors—

¹ *Archiv f. Religionswiss.*, 1904, 303-313.

² See Weber *Indische Studien*, xiii. 354, 488 *et seq.*; Keith, *Aitareya Āraṇyaka*, pp. 21 *et seq.*

and also that it was represented by rhapsodists (*granthika*) who reproduced in dialogue the feelings of the person concerned in the whole episode of the relations of Kāṃsa and Kṛṣṇa, part taking one side, part the other, and the supporters of Kāṃsa having black faces, the supporters of Kṛṣṇa having red faces. The notice is of importance, for it suggests that Dr. Farnell may be premature in rejecting the development of the drama from the dithyramb. The performance of the rhapsodists seems to show a stage intermediate between the dithyrambs and the drama proper, which would eventuate when the element of acting was superadded to the recitation. There must have been dialogue in the recitation, and the conflict of 'black' and 'red' men is clearly a remnant of a nature conflict between the representatives of winter and spring or summer, in which the 'black' man is in this case the victim. Moreover, in the Hindu version the play cannot have been altogether tragic, for Kāṃsa is killed and the young Kṛṣṇa is preserved. It is fair to suppose that the primitive Attic drama combined both elements of tragedy and comedy, and it may well be that after all Aristotle is right in holding that the early drama was only slowly developed into the solemn tragedy which no doubt marks one side of the Attic drama; the practice of writing 'satyric' dramas can thus best be accounted for, and it is admitted that Æschylus is not adverse to an admixture of somewhat broad comedy with his tragedy. Dr. Farnell argues that the Greek drama was essentially a sad one, for it commemorated the death of the god in winter, not his triumph in spring; but this is perhaps doubtful, and it may well be that the legends of Pentheus and Lykourgos contain some recollection of the opposition of the winter and the spring and the triumph of the latter. The *Bacchæ* is indeed a tragic work, but it celebrates the triumph of the god, not his death.

It must suffice to allude briefly to one or two other points of special importance. The Lenaia is correctly explained (p. 218) as a festival of the Lenai or Mainads, and the Anthesteria receives a satisfactory explanation as a wine festival which was combined with a worship of the spirits of the dead, a view much more plausible than Miss Harrison's theory of a wine festival superseding and transforming a festival of the dead. In the treatment of the Erinyes great importance is laid (p. 440) on the clear signs that the Erinys was more than a mere curse; the Tilphousian Erinys of Haliartos and the Demeter Erinys of Thelpousa point to the earth goddess herself as lying beneath the later conception. The pale figure of Hestia stands in strange contrast to the Vedic Agni, a fact doubtless due in no small measure to the fact that Agni is connected with the sun, and the sun in India is a greater divinity than in Greece, where Rhodes alone is devoted to his worship. Dr. Farnell is probably right in recognizing in Crete in the period of its greatness a pre-Hellenic stock (p. 389), though it is unwise to make any assertion about Pelasgians; but it seems difficult to contend that Hephaistos is not really Greek, and we are inclined to doubt whether the historic method has cast more light on the problem of the Amazons (p. 405) than the theory of *ιερόδουλοι*: its appli-

cation so far seems to us more speculative than sound. But in general the treatment of the minor cults such as those of Ares and Pan or the Charites is extremely satisfactory and convincing.

Considering the length of the book and its nature, misprints of a serious type are very rare, but the author shows a curious inconsistency in his method of citing the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, and it is much to be regretted that he has not supplied a complete index. The few pages of index supplied will be found if relied upon merely to be misleading and confusing; the work of index-making is no doubt tedious and uninteresting, but a great and standard treatise cannot be satisfactorily used unless an adequate index is provided.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.