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The number of subjects in connection with the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius, on which a dissertation can profitably be written, is limited to a large extent by the various writings which have already appeared. Most of the problems of general application have already been fully discussed. Many writers, for instance, have dealt with the relation of the Argonautica to the Aenid; mythology in particular has been fully dealt with by de la Ville de Nizmont. In the department of language also, there is little scope for original or profitable work. Peculiarities of grammar and vocabulary have been discussed by the various editors of the poem, and in many separate articles in the Classical Journals; and it did not seem to be an attractive or profitable occupation to enlarge on the manifest deficiencies of such works as Goodwin's curiously inaccurate list of words peculiar to the Argonautica.

Even with regard to the figure of Medea, the ground has to a large extent already been worked over. Innumerable people have treated the subject from the romantic standpoint, and have discussed the relation of the Medea of Apollonius to the Medea of Euripides or to the Dido of Virgil. On such subjects, there is very little left to be said; and it would therefore have been pointless to add to the number of those who have already dealt with them. Especially with regard to the portrayal of Medea herself in the Argonautica, and to the literary value of the passages where Apollonius turns aside from the account from the logographers and is content to be a real poet, it would be little short of presumption to attempt to compete in any way with the charming and brilliant study of the Medea of Apollonius by S. C. F. Emenee.

I have taken as the subject of this dissertation the treatment of Argonautica mythology, with reference particularly to the figure of Medea; I have endeavoured to treat it in connection with her development as a figure of Argonautica mythology from the earliest period of the myth. I have discussed at some length various theories which have been put forward with regard to her origin, which seemed to me to be entirely insupportable. Groppi, for instance, sees in the original Medea a figure of Cretan extraction, quite dissociated from the legend of the Argonauts, whose original function was the slaying of Talos. I am well aware with what difficulty one should approach the question of Cretan influences on things Greek; but of such influence on this peculiarly Thessalian legend I can find no authentic trace whatever. Moreover, the location of Creta was so vaguely known even in definitely historical times, in spite of its earlier ascendency, that any argument, whose essential postulate is a definitely eastern or definitely western location of this island, rests on the most insecure foundations. It is by no means established that the Cretan adventures either formed part of the original Argonaut legend at all, or that it was originally an exploit of Medea at all.

The problem of Talos, and of his connection with Medea, has been almost completely shelved by Robert, who, having once assumed a Corinthian origin of his heroine, has given rather scant treatment to the other possibilities. Guided by the very convincing reconstruction by Burlemp of the legend of Talos, I have endeavoured to state the case against the theory of a Corinthian extraction of Medea; and I think that I am justified in claiming my line of opposition to be for the most part original.

The same applies to the section on Diomedes. In addition to the influence of the Cretan figure of Medea, Groppi maintains that a further effect on the growth of the legend in Greece proper was made by the legend of Diomedes,
and his "Erautfahrt" in search of a conjectural partner Diosœdia. I have nowhere found this remarkable theory discussed, not even in Reoucher and Pauly-Wissowa. To
my own mind, it is manifestly unsupportable; and in the same sense as before, I may
claim my own line of opposition to be original.

With regard to the Corinthian Medea, I have been persuaded to show that for
the theory of Robert, that the Medea of the Argonautica was originally a Corinthian
figure, there is no support. At the same time, I have shown how the rival theory of
Seeliger has completely disregarded the unwelcome features of the local Corinthian
legends. I have endeavoured to show that their apparently opposite theses have
their origin in the same group of facts, and that they are not irreconcilable; I
have found the means of reconciling in an assumption, to which the evidence of
the Corinthian legends points, of a figure existing in Corinth previously to the
adoption of the Thessalian Medea, whose characteristic features were such that the
coalescence of the two figures, although the one was of ethnopoi and the other of
solar origin, was comparatively easy. The introduction of the foreign element,
however, brought about the almost complete suppression of the autochthonous figure,
who has only managed to live on in a few fragmentary legends surviving in various
scholiæ, where her identification with the great Medea does not seem to have been
called in question by their authors. It is only on this assumption, as far as I
can see, that it is possible to explain certain features of the Corinthian legends.
I am not aware, however, that the suggestion has previously been put forward.

I have found myself completely unable to assent to the Robertian theory
of the adoption into the Argonaut legend of a Corinthian heroine, and of the
originally western location of Aea. It is only on the assumption of the absolute
reverse — and it is no great assumption, as it is attested by the whole of Greek
Argonautic literature as the belief of the Greeks themselves — that it was an
originally Thessalian figure that was adopted by Corinth, that the later development
and degradation of Medea becomes intelligible. I am well aware that in this I
have reverted to a considerable extent to what was believed by a previous generation
of scholars; but it does seem to me that Robert has by no means proved his case.

In the section which deals with the trials of Jason, I have endeavoured to
establish the theory that in the original form of the legend, he had no more than a
single trial to undergo. The question, which is at no time very clear, is further
obscured by the extraordinary duplicity of Robert, which I have there discussed.
I have endeavoured to reconstruct in that connection the version of the Neapæa;
it is not clear from the collection of the fragments in Kinkel, and it is further
obscured by Robert. The conclusion that I have there reached is that the original
legend told only of a single trial, and that that account survived in the Neapæa.

Attention is made in several places, particularly in connection with Talos
and Absyrtus, of the suggestions of Professor Rose. These have reference to a paper
of his, read some fifteen years ago before the Anthropological Society at Oxford,
on "Anthropology and Folk-Lore in Apollonius Rhodius." It is not published, but
he had the great kindness to allow me to read the manuscript. It may perhaps seem
from the references to it in this dissertation that I have mentioned it only to
condemn it; but though I have not been able to assent to it in its entirety, there
are several theories which I have found most suggestive. That is especially the
case with the legend of Absyrtus: I have nowhere else seen or heard of an
explanation from the point of view which he adopts, of the curiously puzzling legend
of Absyrtus; and his suggestions do certainly seem to illuminate some points in it which, from the standpoint of purely literary investigation, are quite obscure. I have not, however, gone into this point to any great extent.

In the third part, there is little that is actually original. It is meant to supplement the list of the Greek magicians who were discussed at the outset in connection with Medea, to show the development of her patroness Eecate as the presiding deity of the magic art, and to illustrate the degradation of Medea which came about in connection with her general practice of magic, in the light of her degradation from the position of a helpful heroine, as is discussed in the second part.

In the fourth section, I have, of course, made considerable use of the various writings by Farrell on the subject of Purification. In certain small points, which I think I have made clear in the text, I have ventured, with all due diffidence, to differ from him. I have been particularly concerned to show that, in view of the period to which the poem is referring, Apollonius is perfectly correct,—perhaps more correct than he knew,—in attributing not to Apollo, but to Zeus himself, the impulse to purificatory ritual. To a large extent, I have followed the article on "Purification" by Farrell in the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics; but I venture to claim that I have done more than merely plagiarise from Farrell, and that my own opinion will be found expressed on several points, where a consideration of the evidence seems to me to point to a different conclusion than that which he has adopted.

The object as a whole of this dissertation is to maintain the originally beneficent character of Medea, the originally easterly location of her home, and the absolute impossibility of her Corinthian origin; and, incidentally, the inseparability of the legend of Medea from that of the fleece. All this was believed, though on less evidence than we have at our disposal today, by a previous generation of scholars; but at the present day it has become the fashion to call in question any or all of the above statements. I do not think that I have done nothing more than serve up the Arguments of past generations in a new disguise; I hope that I may be considered to have added something, if only a little, to the evidence against those, in whose eyes the wanton transportation and subdivision of the heroic legends of the Minyae seems to be the sign and token of erudition and scholarship.
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Part 1.

The False Medes.

1). The Four Devising Women.
2). Diomedeia.
3). The Cretan Medea.
4). The Corinthian Medes.

M.E.D.E.A.
Many people have never read Euripides, and many more have never even heard of Apollonius the Rhodian; but there must be very few, whose memories are not in some degree stirred by the name of Medea. The Voyage of the Argo was a well-known story as early as the time of Homer, and since that time, the Legend of the Golden Fleece has persistently occupied a prominent place in the literature of the world. Even at the present day, a book of fairy tales for children is noticeably incomplete, if it does not make some mention of Medea, the greatest sorceress of the ancient world.

In classical literature, she is a very popular figure. Alas in Greece and in Alexandria, epic poets, tragedians, comedians and prose-writers have sung her praises and denounced her crimes. To her, they have attributed not only the practice, but even the very origin of all Greek magic. Latin authors in particular have laid to her charge the accomplishment of every act which they could consider to lie within the scope of the magic art, and the perpetration of the most horrible crimes to which the imagination of imperial Rome could rise.

Many a great man has risen to fame only through the suppression of his competitors; and it is not surprising to find that the reputation of several obscurer rivals has been swallowed up in that of Medea. Yet even she was at one time nothing more than one of a number of wise women, whose names are all similar in form and meaning, and all expressive of unusual powers of mind. She herself, Medea, is the "Devising One"; but there are others who must not be forgotten, Agamede, Perimede, Megamede and Meestra. It is to be observed that all these, like Medea, stand in close relation to the Sun; he is, of course, the original source of every magic power.

The first of these wise women is known only from the Iliad. There we read of Agamede, the daughter of
Augeias, and wife of the warrior Moulios; and it is said of her that "she knew every drug which the wide earth produces." Her father is king of the Eleians, or, as they are called in one passage, the Heleians. He is usually known as the son of Helios, and his chief title to fame is in connection with the labour of Heracles in cleansing the stables, in which he housed the mighty herds of cattle which he had received from his father. Variations of his paternity are not important; but one may notice in passing that he is given in one account a mortal father, Phorbas, to compensate, presumably, for the remoteness of his celestial sire, whereas the tradition of Apollodorus makes his father Poseidon. Hyginus, on the other hand, makes Poseidon the husband of Agamele, and father through her of Dictys and Actor. There remains still another version, that of Pausanias, according to which Eleios is his father, and Poseidon his grandfather. Eleios is, as one would expect, the hero eponymous of the Eleians, and opportunity is given for pretty play on the words "Ἡλίος" and "Ἡλιος".

From his herds of cattle, Augeias gained considerable wealth; and there is a story that Trophonius and Agamele built for him in Elis a treasure-house, similar to the one which they had constructed for Hyrieus in Boeotia. This is clearly a version of later origin; but one is tempted at first sight to find a deep significance in the fact that the name of the builder Agamele is the double of that of his employer's daughter. This is, however, quite unnecessary. In the first place, the name is of a purely "generic" character, and in its expression of great ingenuity is applicable as well to a famous builder as to a clever sorceress; and in the second, a perfectly rational explanation is forthcoming of the processes by which the great builders became connected with Elis.

This is given by Müller. 1). He shows that the legend of their doings in Elis is a complete double of that which connected them with Hyrieus, but with certain

1). Orkomenos und die Minyer. B44. pp.33-32
additional features. Thus Charax, on whose authority the Elean version is given in the above mentioned scholium, makes out Agamedes himself to be an Arcadian king, with a son Kerkyon and a stepson Trophonius. Also, it is not the king Augeias himself who lays the snares to catch the dishonest builder, but Daedalus, who happens providentially to be at his court at the time, in exile from Crete. Otherwise, the story follows the same lines as its Boeotian original. When we take into consideration the fact that there was a Minyan settlement in Tryphylia, hard beside the Eleans, it is not hard to find a rational explanation of the transference of a Boeotian legend to Elis. Even the person of Augeias himself was subjected to Minyan influence. His mother Hyrmine, who is properly a daughter of Nycteus Neleus, is, in another version, the daughter of Nycteus, who is a son of the Boeotian Hyrieus; and even Phorbas, his alternative father, is a Lapitho-Minyan figure.

Thus there is no need to see in this legend a significant doubling of names. It is not to Elis, but to Boeotia, that Agamedes the builder properly belongs; and it is in Boeotian Lebadea, according to Pausanias, that he is invoked conjointly with Trophonius at the oracle of the latter. Like many other heroes who belong properly to North and Middle Greece, these two were transferred to Arcadia and Elis; and for these transferences, the Minyan colonizing activities are principally responsible.

The Elean Agamedes, therefore, stands alone and unconnected as sorceress and grand-daughter of the Sun. Her identification with Medea is actually made by Eustathius in his commentary on Dion Periegetes, and by the scholiast on Inocritus. This has arisen out of the shortened Alexandrine form of the name Medea, - MHM - a form which actually occurs in a fragment of the Dionysus of Ephorion, quoted by the scholiast on the Odyssey.

The name Agamede is known also from Lesbos. It is the name of a place near Pyrra; and it is referred to by Stephanus Byzantius s.v. Agamede, and by Pliny, to an Agamede who was a daughter either of Pyrra or Macaria. It
is also the name of a fountain which is mentioned by Nicolasi Damascenus. A clue to the origin of this Agamede is found in the name of her mother Macaria, and in the legend that Macaria was the name which was given to the island of Lesbos after it had been used as a place of refuge by Macer. The latter was the son of Rhodos and Helios; and he was expelled from his native island along with his brothers after the murder of Tenages. There is nothing to show whether or no this Agamede also was in possession of magic powers; but it is at least clear that she, like her Elean homonym, stood in close relation to the Sun.

MEGAMEDE likewise is known only from a single reference. Apollodorus mentions her as the wife of Arnaeus the king of Thebess, and the mother of the fifty daughters whom their father put at the disposal of Heracles when that hero came to kill the lion of Citherson. Nothing else is known of Agamede; but some light seems to be thrown on the subject by variants in the genealogy of Vegamedes, the father of Pallas. In a disputed passage in the Homeric Hymn to Heroes, there is a reference to Selene as "Daughter of Pallas, the son of Vegamedes." Now the usual tradition with regard to Selene, the tradition which is attested by Hesiod, Hyginus and Apollodorus, is that she, like Hes and Helios, was a child of Hyperion and Theia. In the Hymn to the Sun, it is Euryphaessa — not Theia — and Hyperion who are the parents of Helios; while according to Quintus Smyrnaeus, the mother of Hes is Night. The Orphic hymns give Helios as father of Selene in place of Hyperion, but that is no great change. Now Ovid on five occasions speaks of Pallas as the father of Hes; and Pallas has already been noticed as the father of Selene. Roscher wishes to explain the name of his father Vegamedes in connection with the enormous male of Oceanos, which is, of course, a possible solution. But when his son is found to be occupying a place which belongs properly to Hyperion or Helios, it is perhaps more reasonable, from the analogy of similar names already noticed, to look for the meaning of the name in mental rather than physical powers. If this is admissible, we may then see in this mysterious figure Vegamedes an addition to the group of wise women to which Medea, Agameme and Perimea have already been assigned.
The last member of this group is Maestra; here again the history of her origin lies shrouded in darkness. The version of Ovid makes her out to be the daughter of Erysichthon, the king of Thessaly. Her father, it is said, had offended Demeter by cutting down an oak which was sacred to her, and was punished in consequence with the infliction of an insatiable hunger. In order to buy food to appease this terrible hunger, the unfortunate man sold all his possessions, and finally parted with his daughter Maestra as well. She, however, was beloved of Poseidon; and she had received from him a power peculiar to himself and to those connected with him, (e.g. Periocyrenus Arg. 1.156f.) of changing her form whenever she desired. By means of this gift, she was able to elude her pursuers on each occasion when she was sold, and to return to her father; this took place on several occasions, and it is regrettable to find that her efforts were all in vain. In the attempt to provide himself with a sufficiency of food, the wretched man ended by pulling off his own limbs for that purpose, and died.

Now Zielinski has shown that Poseidon, and likewise Erysichthon who is closely connected with him, are not originally pertinent to his legend. 1) Some light is thrown on the original form by the alternative name of the father, Aithon. This word occurs in the Iliad as an adjective applied to a lion; and Kustathius, in his commentary on the passage, is at great pains to show that it is not a proper name, but merely an adjective expressive of greed. This idea is not originally his, for it can be traced back to Hellenicus; and in this significance, it would suit very well the father of Maestra. The word has, however, a much wider significance than that; it occurs elsewhere, not only as a proper name of eagles, dogs and horses, - in particular of the horses of the Sun - but also as an adjective suggesting dazzling light or speed, and as such it is appropriate to the Sun himself. There seems to be no reason to doubt that Aithon is a real figure of 1).

1). Bocher's Lexicon s.v. Erysichthon.
mythology, and that, like Augeias, he is an apostacy of the Sun. The name Maestra is obviously, like those already noticed, to be derived from μηθώς. Beyond a doubt, Zielinski is right in recognizing her as originally being a daughter of Aithon, and a grand-daughter in consequence of the Sun; and though information is not available as to her marvellous powers, when she is separated from the legend of Poseidon, there is no doubt something on which that addition was based. It is not without significance that she lives in Thessaly, which is the home "par excellence" of the magic art.

It is clear, therefore, that the names of these four sorceresses are of similar significance; and it has been shown that in two cases at least, the relationship of their bearers can be traced back in the second generation to the Sun. It is probable that in early times the connection was still closer, and these figures were originally, like Circe, daughters of the Sun. This is true, at any rate, of Maestra and Agamede; for the name Augeias is clearly no more than a personification of the word which describes the rays of the Sun; and Aithon too was an attribute before it became a proper name. The parentage of Perimede and Megamede is not known.

Medea, then, was not by any means the only early Greek sorceress; but her fame has so far outshone that of the others that they are in danger of being forgotten, or at least ignored. She owes her reputation to her position as sorceress in the legend of the golden Fleece. That legend, as will presently appear, was originally quite local, restricted to Thessaly and the borders of Boeotia; but it was adopted by Corinth, and under the influence especially of tragedians, passed into the literature of Greece and of the world. In the epic of Apollonius Rhodius, Medea plays a very complicated part; in the earlier legend it must have been much simpler, and she herself must have been originally a sorceress of good repute, and not the revengeful haridan of a later age.

It will be the purpose of this dissertation to sketch the processes by which, in her development as heroine in the legend of the Argonauts, Medea gained the world, but lost her own soul.
(Gruppe's contention is disputed, that Diomedes and Diomedes, his imaginary wife, were the originals in Greece of Jason and Medea; they are here shown to be quite independent of the legend of Medea.)

Otto Gruppe, in the reconstruction which he gives of the early development of the legend of the Argonauts, professes to see the traces of two quite separate legends. He distinguishes the "Recovery of the Fleece" from the "Wooing of Medea," and in connection with the latter legend, he makes this remarkable statement: "Thus Jason gradually takes the place of Diomedes; that was the name by which the Wooer of Medea, corresponding to the full form of her name, would originally be known."

This statement, however, cannot be allowed to stand. Gruppe himself has produced very little in the way of evidence to support it; and it will here be shown that the few occasions where the legend of Diomedes coincides with that of the Argonauts are due to nothing more than chance, and provide no authority for Gruppe's theory. It will be necessary first to discuss in some detail the personal history of Diomedes.

He appears to have been originally a Thracian hero, and to have been famous especially for his horses. There is a legend which makes the capture of these horses one of the labours of Heracles, and it tells that in the process, Diomedes himself was killed; that, however, is a purely local version. The influence of Diomedes had already begun to spread southwards, and the first stage in the reception into Greek heroic society of this outlandish hero was, of course, to provide him with presentable parents. At first, like that Thracian Orpheus, he was king of the Bistones; but a definite stage in his advancement is marked by the isolated but sound tradition of Apollodorus, by which he is recognised as a son of Ares, and of the eminently reputable, highly respectable, Thessalo-Minyan heroine Cyrene. It must have been somewhere about this period that he was adopted by Argos; and from that time, he becomes a person of considerable importance.

Argos married their adopted hero to their daughter of their own great local figure, Adrastus, Aigialeia by name,
and brought him into close connection with Athene. Troezen, however, was jealous, and set up an independent tradition that he married their local heroine Hermione. From Argos as centre, his reputation spread over the whole Peloponnese.

To this is due his connection at Mothone with Athene Anemotia, and the story recorded by Pausania that, at the request of Diomedes, the goddess put a stop to the winds which were working great havoc in the district.

Now Sicyon had adopted the Argive hero Aigialeus, and had converted him into a local hero; it was then affirmed that the original name of the city was not Sicyon, but Aigialeia. But in the Argive tradition, Aigialeia is the daughter of Adrastus and wife of Diomedes. Aigialeus appears as the name of the brother of Medea in Pausania, whose authority Robert 1), considers to have been a Mägor of uncertain authorship, founded on the Cresphontes of Euripides. But what is there in all this to support the contention that Jason was originally Diomedes, or that Medea is identical with Diomedeia? Surely it is nothing more than a confluence of traditions which are in themselves quite distinct, but which in combination have led to a confusion of the figures of the Thracio-Argive Diomedes, the Argivo-Sicyonic Aigialeus, and the adopted heroine of the neighbouring Corinth, Medea the Thessalian. It is much more reasonable to suppose that this is so, than to contend that here in Sicyon is found, in a shortened form, the conjecturally original wife of Diomedes, the hero whom Argos had adopted from Middle and Northern Greece, in the same way as Sicyon had adopted Aigialeus from Argos, and had already provided with a wife Aigialeia.

Certainly the Medea whose charms are used in Titane to stop the winds, was the great sorceress; she, as will later appear, had been adopted by Corinth from Thessaly, and identified with a (possibly) homonymous heroine on the spot. It is to be observed that Diomedes in his own person had no more power over the forces of nature than King Canute had; it is Athene at his request, and not by Diomedes or his own resources, who put a stop to the harmful

1) Robert: die griechische Heldensage. 2723.1.
winds in Messenian Wothone, and it was to her, and not to Diomedes, that worship was given under the name of Anemotis. There is no reason in the world to refer it to his influence and intervention that the greatest sorceress of the ancient world had also charms which could control the winds of heaven. The tradition of Paus. already mentioned, that the name of the brother of Medea was Aigialeus, must have arisen from a confusion on the part of himself or of the authority whom he followed with regard to the cycle of Argive legends. It is no more valuable than that of Diodorogenes, recorded in the scholia to the " Medea," that his name was Vetepontius; or that of Ibycus, who found in the Lesbian Medea, - whom incidentally Eustathius gives in the lengthened form Diomedea, - a convenient transition to his own version of the Argonautic legend, that Achilles, when he came to the Elysian Fields, married Medea. It is clear that it is not to the Argive or Sicyonic legends that we must look, to find any support for Gruppe's hypothesis of the pre-Argoautic "Brautfahrt" of Jason-Diomedes.

With this contention established, vanishes also the last remnant of the Jason-Diomedes tradition in Corcyra. The influence of Diomedes appears to have spread from the Peloponnese to Italy by way of Corcyra; and in Italy, he attained a position of far greater importance than ever he reached in Greece proper. Timaeus records that he fled to Italy with his wife Aigialeia, and that in Phaesacia on the way he killed the Colchian dragon. This tradition appears in its proper form in the narrative of Heracleides Ponticus, where it is merely told that the Corcyreans summoned Diomedes to kill their dragon. The traditions which attach to Corcyra in respect of the Colchians are not old; they belong to the period in the development of the legend of the Argonauts, when Corinth had moved the scene of the action as far as possible within the range of her own dependencies in the west. It must be an account dating from this period of contamination which has been followed by Timaeus, and which after him misled the commentator Tzetzes, who is our primary authority for this account. The Colchian dragon has nothing whatever to do with the story of Diomedes; but Tzetzes has prudently failed to explain how the Colchian dragon had come to be so
far from home. One would also liked to know how he would have reconciled this story with the standard account of the trials of Jason in Colchis, and the killing of the dragon there; perhaps the point of contact is to be found in the version of Apollonius that Jason did not actually kill the dragon, but merely left it stupefied, under the influence of Medea's drugs! This would, at any rate, give it an opportunity to recover and make its way to Corcyra, there to take on a new lease of life, and provide a heroic exploit for Diomedes!

There are still two small points in connection with the legend of Diomedes to be dealt with. It is stated by the mythographer Natalie Coxe that the original name of Jason was Diomedes; and in the "Medea" of Attius occur these words:- "tum Diomedes es, cuius adventum expectans pervixi eduo?" The trouble is that in neither of these cases is the text sound. It is probable that "Dolomedes" should be read in the former passage, while the accepted reading in the latter changes the whole aspect of the case by altering "Diomedes" to "dis Medea's" and transferring the address of welcome from Medea to Jason himself.

Moreover, the arguments which Gruppe has attempted to draw from the portrayal of a sacrifice on two red-figured vases, are very, very dubious indeed. It is by no means established, in the first place, that the incident there portrayed has any connection with the Voyage for the Fleece at all; and in the second, it is manifestly stretching the point to assume, from the inscription 'Αρχεωσαίης on the one, and Αίματος on the other, that the bearded figure there portrayed is Jason.

It would therefore appear that Diomedes was originally a Thracian figure, and that his fame, as in the case of so many other heroes of Northern Greece, is due to the fact that he was adopted by Argos, when that city was at the height of her prosperity. It was under Argive influence that he was brought into connection with Athene; and it was through her that he won promotion to godhead, as witness Pinder. Even so, god though he became, he
is not found in any manifestation of divine activity until his influence reaches Italy. So long as he remains in Greece proper, it is not he himself, but his divine patroness at his request, who performs the actual wonders.

Further, there is no evidence at all that he was in any way connected with the original legend of the Argo-
nauts, or that Medea was originally his wife, or that Medea was originally Diomedea. These errors have come into being through purely literary channels; and they depend for their authority on nothing sounder than a patent confusion of Sicynic legends, supported by a dubious reading in the text of a late mythographer.

Finally, for the assertion that Jason was origi-
- nally Diomedes and originated in a cult of Helios as a deity of friendly winds, as Gruppe maintains, there does not appear to be any evidence of any kind whatever.
The Cretan Medea.

(An examination is made of the figure of the Cretan Medea, whom Gruppe maintains to be prior to the Thessalian and to have affected the development of the latter. It is found that the so-called Cretan Medea is none other than the Cretan at a later stage.)

Gruppe, however, is not content to have found the germ of the legend of the Colchian Medea in the story of Diomedes; he has attempted to trace back the history of Medea to a still earlier source. He would have us see in her a figure of Cretan origin, who, when introduced into Greece, took the place of his protegée Diomedeis as the wife of Diomedes, while at the same time the latter was supplanted by the figure of Jason. There are four legends in particular which he considers to be of Cretan origin, and to have formed the substructure of the story of the Argonauts. One of them is a development from the cult of Helios Ialaos. "After him," says Gruppe, "is called the bronze man Ialos; in the cycle of these legends, we meet for the first time....the Heliad Medea, who freed the land from the pest by drawing the brazen nail from his foot and thereby killing him. That is original; Ialos is the prototype of the brazen-footed bulls, which in the later legend Jason slew with the help of Medea."

Various reasons are given by the Greek writers 1) to account for the presence of Ialos in Crete, and they are all rather unsatisfactory. He is said to be the last of the bronze generation, and to have been given by Zeus to Europe to be a guardian for Crete; or to have been made by Hephaestus, and given by him as a present to Minos for the same purpose. These are merely the efforts of Greek mythologists to explain him in connection with their own deities. Some light on his original character is thrown by the legends which connect him with Sardinia. The explanations of the expression Ἠπέρανίος γαλός are collected in "Zeus," and point to the conclusion that there was in Sardinia a practise of human sacrifice to a gigantic statue of Ialos. In Sardinia, he was identified by some

authorities with the Phoenician Cronos; but in Crete, he was considered to be the same as the Sun. Τάλως, according to Hesychius, means the Sun; and Τάλος is an adjective meaning "Zeus in Crete."

"The most convincing reconstruction of the legend of Talos is that of Buslepp. 1) He sees in Talos the figure of an aboriginal Cretan deity, whose cruel worship was superseded by the worship of the milder Helios, just as in the mythology of Greece proper, the power of Cronos gave way to the sway of the milder Zeus. It is a legitimate inference from the stories which attach to the Sardinian Talos, that in his ritual, human sacrifice took a definite place. Such sacrifice to the Sun is found also in legends of definitely un-Hellenic origin; it occurs, for instance, in the Samoan and Mexican origin-myths. 2) This cruel practice died out when his worship gave way to that of the gentler Helios; but it is known to have prevailed at one time even in Greece proper, as a means of pacifying the deity of the raging summer heat. In the legend of Athamas, for instance, there are clear indications that the offering of a ram has taken the place of an earlier custom of human sacrifice to Lapynstian Zeus.

The worship of Talos in Crete appears to have been conducted on the mountains; and it is suggested that there was a huge bronze statue to which the cruel sacrificers made their offerings. When robbed of his actual divinity through his supersession by Helios, Talos did not vanish from mythology; he lives on in a subordinate position, as a huge bronze statue endowed with life and movement. He is, in fact, his own original statue come to life; but in his humbler capacity, he still preserves some of the cruel characteristics of the former god. The Greeks, as has been observed, imagined him to be the guardian of the island; and it is an easy transition from this to the rationalistic idea of Plato, who saw in him the person of a Minoan tax-collector, who made the rounds of the villages of Crete three times in the year, bearing the laws of Minos inscribed on tablets of bronze.

1) Roscher's Lexikon. s.v. Talos.
It is in his humbler position as the brazen guardian of the island that Telos is associated with the legend of the Argonauts. It is not definitely known, whether, in the original form of the legend, the episode of Telos belongs to the outward journey or to the return. There is a version recorded by Apollodorus, that it was not Medea at all who was responsible for his death, but the hero Poias, who wounded him with an arrow. It is very probable that this is the original form of the legend which connects Telos with the Argonauts. It is difficult to see how it could have gained currency, after the exploit had been associated with the wonder-working Medea. If, on the other hand, the original duty of Poias has been taken over by Medea in the course of her development as a magician, it is quite natural to find that the older account has not completely vanished from mythology. It is not very likely that a simple story of killing by means of an arrow, even from the bow of Poias, would have gained currency, after magic methods had taken a definite place in the legend.

Robert insists that the episode belongs to the earliest period, when the situation of Aea was supposed to be in the distant west. It is certainly true that the situation of Crete was only quite vaguely known, except to a limited society of traders, even in definitely historical times; and it is an argument which at first sight appears to support Robert's hypothesis of a western Aea, that, at any rate in religious circles, Crete seems occasionally to have been confused with the Islands of the Blest, 1). whose situation is undoubtedly in the furthest west, on the borders of the world, where the souls of the departed go down with the setting sun. Thus there is a statement in the "Liber Glossarum";: "Macharon Neson; Creta insula primum sic appellata est.\^\, a statement which is further confirmed by Pliny. But it is not safe to build any argument on the vagueness of position in this respect; an isolated gloss and a little faith could lend an air of great presentability to a theory that Crete was in the equally distant east.

Robert's idea, moreover, of a western position of Aea depends completely on his insupportable hypothesis that Medea was
originally a Corinthian figure. There is no need to assume arbitrarily with him a false location of Aea, in order to make it possible that this adventure, with Poias as the central figure, should have taken place on the out-ward voyage, of an expedition directed towards an eastern Aea.

This difficulty vanishes, of course, as soon as Medea becomes the central figure of the account; the adventure can then belong only to the return. There are various accounts of the methods which she employed against Poias; according to one, she drove him mad with her poisons. This belongs quite obviously to the later period of the legend, when the reputation of Medea as a sorceress had covered the whole field of the magic art. The same period belongs also in all probability the combination of the poison motif with the idea which survives in the Argonautics: the combination is shown in the account of a vase which was discovered on the acropolis of Ruvo, of which a representation is given in 'Zeus.' Telos is shown, captured by Castor and Polydeuces, and brought within the circle of the magic spells of Medea; she is glaring fixedly at him, and he is swooning away; in the background is shown the nymph Crete, flying away in terror at the death of her guardian.

The earlier legend is concerned exclusively with his heel. It is here, we may assume, that the archer Poias wounded him; and it is through his heel in one way or another that he meets his doom at the hands of Medea. The most probable explanation of this weakness is to be sought, as Cook suggests, in the cire-perdue method of hollow-casting in bronze. It would be by this process that the original statue of the god on the mountains would be cast; and it is more than probable that the weakness in the heel which is the direct result of this process has been passed on, by a sort of mythological heredity, to the living figure of bronze which took the place of the god.

Apollodorus relates that Telos was generally considered to be a man of bronze; but that there were some who regarded him as a bull. This is a significant statement.
aid has a considerable bearing on the legend of the trials which Jason had to undergo in Colchis. Cook regards Talos as representing a stage of transition to the anthropomorphic from the theriomorphic conception of the Sun-god. Supported by the parallel of the bull-headed deity of the Phoenicians, with whom Talos was identified, he concludes that Talos was actually represented with a bovine head on a human body. The parallel between such a fiery, bull-headed, brazen figure, and the fire-breathing brazen bulls of Aeetes, is forced on one's notice.

The taming of these fiery bulls was one of the trials which Jason had to undergo in Colchis; but it is a comparatively late addition to the legend. The whole episode into which these trials enter is an obvious copy of the Boeotian legend of Cadmus and his trials; and in the latter, the bulls have no place. The teeth of the dragon are sown at once by Cadmus, and there is no talk of ploughing the ground first with bulls either ordinary or extraordinary. An investigation of the legends leads inevitably to the conclusion that the bulls are an addition to the earlier legend, and that they are a development from the story of the brazen men of Crete. It is unwise, however, to lay stress, as Gruppe does, on the fact that in both cases it is Medea who comes to the rescue. The bulls are a late addition to a series of trials in which she had already appeared as helper; and in any case it is forcing the facts to assume that the original slayer of Talos was she. It may well, as we have seen, have been Poias; and if that was so, Gruppe's parallel loses most of its force.

Both Talos, when he had been degraded from his position as god to the lower level of guardian, and the brazen bulls of Aeetes, when they were brought into the legend were naturally attributed to the workmanship of Hephaestus. From the earliest period of Greek literature, this god had a reputation for the construction of ingenious things. The Iliad knows him as the maker of wonderful tripods, twenty in number, which have ears and move on wheels, and go of their own accord to and from the assembly of the blessed gods. He also made statues of gold, like to living maidens,
which served him as maidservants; they were endowed with intelligence, voice, and strength, and knew the works of the blessed gods. More of the type to which the brazen bulls belong are the hounds which he made to guard the palace of Alcinous. These were made, not of bronze, but of gold and silver, and were deathless and unageing for ever. Deiphatus obviously, and he alone, was marked down to be the mythical creator of the wonderful, fire-breathing brazen bulls of Aeetes.

Thus, from the consideration of the legends of the bulls of Aeetes, and the figure of Talos, several truths have emerged. In the first place, the legend of the death of Talos, the man of bronze, must not be thought to belong to the remotest and earliest period of Cretan civilization, before Boeotia had learnt the use of words. In that period, the figure of Talos the Sun-god may, perhaps, belong; but Talos the Man of Bronze, and the account of his death as an episode of the journey for the Golden Fleece, can belong only to the time when that legend had in all essentials reached its full development, and was in a condition to assimilate features of other legends as episodes of the journey. Secondly, the death of Talos took place originally, not through the exercise of Medea's magic arts, but from the less romantic, though more heroic, arrow of the hero Poias. Finally, and what for the main theme of this dissertation is most important of all, there is not a shred of evidence for the existence of a Medea in the primitive mythology of Crete at all, much less, as Gruppe maintains, a Hellenised Medea. The Medea who brought about the death of Talos was none other than the daughter of Aeetes, the sorceress of Aea and Thessaly.

There is still one point in connection with the legend of Talos as it appears in the Argonautica, which is worthy of further notice. Apollonius quite clearly credits Medea with the possession of the evil eye. What she proposes to do is to mesmerise Talos to his doom, even though made of bronze; and she is confident that if he is not actually immortal, she will succeed. This throws
some light on the meaning of an earlier passage, where it is told that, as Medea drove through the streets, the people made way for her, "shunning the eyes of the royal maiden." This has generally been interpreted in terms of the adjective 'royal,' and has been taken as an example of Alexandrine deference in the presence of royalty. Professor Rose, 1) however, takes this passage in conjunction with the other, and suggests that there is a deeper meaning in it. The Greeks do not appear to have had a scientific knowledge of hypnosis; but there are signs that they were not ignorant of the phenomenon. Thus in the Bacchae of Euripides, Dionysus appears to hypnotise Pentheus. It is very probable that it is some such power as this that Apollonius is hinting in the earlier passage, and definitely describing in the later.

There are other persons in Greek literature who seem to have been possessed of the evil eye. Ovid tells of Dipea, who had a 'double eye'; Eriphyle had the power to kill with a look any animal that crossed her path; Apuleius was thought to have mesmerised an unfortunate woman whom he was treating for epilepsy. 2) Apollonius of Tyana, as is told in his life by Philostratus, knew of a certain Saturnius of Ephesus, who could kill with a look; and, finally, Danascius tells of Maximinus, at whom it was not safe for people to look, for when they did, they were "lost," and had to remove their gaze. Similarly, as Seligmann shews, a power of this sort was supposed to belong to some of the gods, such as Zeus and Athena, and in particular to Nemesis and the Erinyes.

Apollonius, at any rate, clearly credits Medea with the power of hypnotising, and with the possession of the evil eye.

1) For these ideas of Professor Rose, see the Preface.
2) Seligmann, die Zauberkräft des Auges, pp. 101-2.
The Corinthian Medea.

(The theory of Robert is discussed, that the original of Medea is a very old Corinthian goddess; and it is shown that, while there was no doubt such a figure as he suggests, it cannot be identified with the Argonautic Medea.)

"The story of the Argonauts," says Robert, 1) arose from the blending of Thessalian legends and a Corinthian goddess. In the oldest account, Jason's task was to fetch the fleece of a ram from Pelion; and this was taken to be the fleece of the ram which was sacrificed to Zeus in place of Phrixus, either by Phrixus himself, or by Athamas. The change effected by Corinth consists in the transference of the fleece from Pelion to Aea, the land of mystery in the west, to which Phrixus betook himself on the ram, in order to escape from the machinations of his evil step-mother, and in which Medea was considered to dwell."

Seeliger, on the other hand, takes precisely the opposite view. 2) "Ephyra," he says, "was the ancient name of Corinth. ... It is not necessary to go back to a pre-Corinth colonisation by Thessalo-Minyans, or to a transference of the legend by Chalcidian sailors, to make it clear that the Corinthians chose Medea as their heroine from the celebrated story of the Argonauts. ... The most important authority for the "Corinthian" Medea is Hesiodus."

The account of Hesiodus is as follows: 3) Ephyra is the ancient name of Corinth, from Ephyra the wife of Epimenedes. Aloeus and Aeetes were sons of Helios and Antiope; their father allotted Arcadia to the former, and to the latter, Ephyra. Aeetes, however, was not satisfied with his portion, and went away to Colchis; as regent for himself and his dependents, he left the son of Hermes and Alcidamia, Sounos by name. On the death of Sounos, the throne was occupied by Sceous, the son of Aloeus, who had a son Marathon, to whom he was so violent that he fled to Attica. On the death of his father, however, he returned; and he divided the kingdom between his own two sons, Sceous 1), op. cit. p.78); 2) ap. Roscher 2.2.2437.20. 3) Epicoros Graecorum Fragmenta ed. Kinkel. p.137.
and Corinthos. When the latter died and left no successor, the Corinthians naturally sent to Iolcus for Medea the daughter of Aeetes to come and be their queen.

This is quite obviously a composite legend. The first claim of Coni,th that the daughter of Aeetes was their own princess is certainly made by Eumelus; it was all to the glory of the city to be able to claim the heroine of that famous legend as a princess of their own royal house. The importance of the sun-cult in Corinthian tradition would make it an easy matter for the ingenious compiler of Corinthian history to concoct an attractive legend, by which Aeetes becomes the son of Helios, and the locally venerated goddess Antiope, and ruler in the first place, not of Aea, but of Corinth. On this assumption, Medea has of course a claim to the throne of Corinth as soon as she sets foot in Greece; and the legend naturally tells that she and Jason betook themselves to Corinth as soon as they had handed over the fleece to Pelias in Iolcus.

This evidence seems to go all in favour of the view adopted by Seeliger, that Medea is really a Thessalian heroine who was adopted by Corinth; and the connection of Aeetes with Corinth in that account seems to be somewhat forced. There is reason, however, to believe that the task of Eumelus was rendered still easier by the presence already in Corinth of a figure akin in some respects to Medea, and that his reference to the "Corinthian" Medea may be unduly sceptical. There are legends with which Medea is connected at Corinth which cannot be explained away in the manner of Seeliger, by an airy reference to Euripides, and his well-known partiality to the use of local legends in the construction and embellishment of his dramas. These legends are concerned especially with her children.

In the "Medea" of Euripides, after the murder by Medea of her children, Jason implores at least to be allowed to take the bodies up for proper burial. He is met with a refusal, in these words:-- "No. For I myself with my own hands shall bury them, taking them to the precinct of Hera across the goddess ... and to this land of Sisyphus, we shall appoint a holy feast and rites for ever, to atone for this impious murder."

The celebration to which Euripides here refers is
spoken of by various authorities. The scholiast on the above passage says that the "Acraea is celebrated by the people of Corinth as a πανηγυρι, a festival of mourning; and the scholiast on Pindar also tells of the honour paid to her children after death. Further confirmation of these statements is given by Philostratus and Pausania. Fuller information is given by the scholiast on the passage of the "Medea," who cite as his authority Parnaisus. He states that, year by year, it was the custom for seven youths and seven maidens of the noblest birth to spend a year in the precinct of the goddess, clad in black, and with their hair cropped close. Their function was to offer sacrifice, which was intended to appease the spirits of the slain children, and the wrath of the goddess on their account. In his account of the death of the children there are some new features. The Corinthians, far from encouraging the rule of Medea, object to her as being a barbarian; and they resolve to slay her and her fourteen children. How the mother fared, we are not told; no doubt she was equal to the emergency. The children fled into the precinct of Hera Acraea, and there, in spite of the sacred character of the place, they were slain by the Corinthians. As a result of this murder, Corinth was visited by a plague; and the Delphic oracle was consulted, and advised the institution of these rites.

This ιεροποιία is supposed by Wecklein 1) to point to an older custom of human sacrifice which has been superseded. It is a striking parallel, from the point of view of numbers, to the annual tribute of seven youths and seven maidens who were sent annually by the Athenians to Minos in Crete; and indications are not wanting in other cults of the supersession of such sacrifice by a mimetic ritual. His interpretation is almost certainly right. At any rate, whatever its origin, the facts do at least point to this, to a Corinthian belief in a local Medea, a priestess of Hera, and mother of fourteen children. It is not easy to reconcile this with the character of the heroine of the legend of the Argonautica.

In opposition to this account, the same scholium gives, on the authority of Didymus, the version of Creophylus. - This latter is in all probability the epic
poet the author of the "Capture of Dechalia;" but Wilmovitz feels uncertain on this point, and does not give him a definite date. - He seems to be the first to introduce the name of Creon, King of Corinth, who belongs, of course, to the later account. He relates as follows; Medea killed Creon by means of magic; and from fear of his friends and relations, she betook herself to Athens. Her children, who were too young to follow her, she left on the altar of Hera in the hope that their father would protect them. They were, however, slain by the infuriated relatives of Creon; and these latter spread the story, that Medea had killed not only the king, but also her own children before she left. This is the first sign of the version which later prevailed to the exclusion of all other accounts. Medea is here no queen of Corinth in her own right; she is a mere barbarian, and she murders Creon, not because he is occupying a throne which is properly hers, but because he has given his daughter as wife to her husband Jason. There is nothing in this account to show that she is at all connected with Hera officially; the altar of the goddess is used, merely because it is the obvious place of sanctuary for her children. The guilt of the murder of the children, which belongs in the first place to the whole body of Corinthians in general, is here transferred to the relatives of Creon in particular; and the way is now open for later writers to lay the whole burden of the blame on Medea herself.

Eunelus also has a legend of Medea and her children; but it is of a very different character. It is as follows; - every time when she gave birth to a child, Medea used to take it to the temple of Hera and conceal it there, in the hope that the goddess would make it immortal. The infant, however, died on each occasion; and at last her husband discovered what she was doing, and left her. The reason for such a hope on the part of Medea might easily be guessed at; but it happens to be recorded by the scholiast on Pindar. It is that Medea had resisted the advances of Zeus, and that Hera in gratitude had promised to make her children immortal.
In the account as given by Eumelus, the name of the father is, of course, Jason; but there is reason to believe that there is an older form of the legend than this. According to Apollodorus, the founder of Ephyra was the hero Sisyphus. It is to him, according to Eumelus, that Medea hands over the throne of Corinth after her breach with Jason; and it was said by Theopompus that Medea was in love with Sisyphus. Before his famous and lamentable lapse from grace, the hero Sisyphus must have been a figure of considerable importance in the mythology of Corinth. It seems to be indicated by these legends, that among the accounts with which Eumelus had to deal when he set out to write his history of Corinth, was one which told of Sisyphus and the heroine Medea as man and wife, and joint rulers of the land.

This, however, was all changed with the introduction of the worship of Hera, - introduced, in all probability under Argive influence, - and with the inevitable complications which took place in female heroic society with the appearance of Zeus. Medea, who may perhaps have been herself originally divine, is degraded from her high estate to serve as the priestess of the new goddess, and becomes, as is to be expected from the outset, the object of the ejections of Zeus. Sisyphus, the original husband, is lost sight of altogether. Medea refuses the advances of Zeus, and is rewarded by Hera with a promise that she will make her children - presumably by Sisyphus - immortal.

This legend is an obvious double of the story of Zeus and Thetis. In that legend, the original account seems to be that which has survived in the scholia to the Argonautica as the version of the Aeginians, that Thetis used to put her children into a basin of water to see if they could swim. The process is later altered to that of testing in fire, under the influence probably of the type of legend to which that of Demeter and Demophon belongs. The Corinthian heroine conceals hers in the temple. It is possible that this type of legend may have originated in Thessaly, and that under the influence of the legend of the Corinthian lepontis, it has in this case been adapted to the story of the now degraded wife of Sisyphus, the new priestess of Hera. If it could actually be shown
that this form was brought into Corinth under Thessalian influence, it would be another nail in the coffin of Robert's Corinthian Medea; but in default of further evidence, this point must remain unsettled.

Why the attempt to make the children immortal did not succeed, may be due to a number of causes. There is the persistently recurring story of the Peleus and Thetis type, where the rite of regeneration is in progress, when the husband blunders in, and in a panic puts a stop to it. Then there is the idea which is at the bottom of the various legends of regeneration, and which in a higher religious sphere takes on a mystical significance, that the person concerned must die before he can be born again; he is therefore cut up, boiled, or buried, as a preliminary rite. The process which Medea used to do this to her children was to conceal them in the temple; this is a close approximation to actual burial. Perversion of such a legend is, of course, only too easy. Finally, whatever its origin, we have the Corinthian ιερωπόλη, which would help, if nothing else, to confuse the original story.

So far, for the sake of convenience, the heroine concerned in these legends of Corinth has been referred to by the name of Medea. But there are certain traces of a chthonian character in the history of the Corinthian figure, which are not at all appropriate to Medea the Helied. The preliminary rite of regeneration in this case takes the form of concealment in the temple; this is a close approximation to actual burial. Another trace is in the account given by the scholiast on Pindar, that the saved Corinth from a famine; that it was by a sacrifice to Demeter and the Leborean nymphs is probably an independent addition. On this evidence, Robert goes so far as to make her out to be a primitive earth-goddess, wife of Zeus and patron deity of the city; this, however, is another - and a doubtful - matter.

It would therefore appear that there was in Corinth the figure of a local heroine, whether heroine in origin, or a goddess degraded from her high estate, before it occurred to Corinthian patriots to claim the wife of the Thessalian Jason as a Corinthian
heroine. A circumstance which must have helped the adoption of a Thessalian is the family history of the Cypselides. This family ruled at Corinth in the second half of the seventh century, and traced their descent on one side to the figure of Caeneus, the Thessalian Lapith. This adoption of a Thessalian ancestor by the ruling family would help to explain, if explanation were still necessary, how the identification of the Corinthian and the Thessalian heroines took place so easily. Whether we are to regard the Corinthian figure, with Wecklein, as the original deity of the Phoenician Ephry, supplanted by and reduced to the service of the Greek Hera, or as the wife of Sisyphus and ruler in Corinth before the arrival of Hera, is a matter of comparatively minor importance. It is far more vital to realise that not only is Robert wrong to deny the Thessali-Colchian origin of the Medea of the Argonautica, but that Beeliger also, in his uncompromising rejection of the idea of a separate Corinthian figure, is fighting against the facts.

Vallinger, in his Médée, appears to agree that the legend as given by Æsop involves the adoption of a Thessalian heroine; but he hardly does more than touch on the point. He is more concerned to shew, - what will shortly be discussed, - that Médée was originally a figure of kindly disposition, whose actions were performed from motives other than those of malice. 1). In this, he is undoubtedly correct.

Mention has already been made of four persons, who were found to resemble in name and function the Colchian Médée. Perhaps a great deal of the trouble has here arisen from the fact of the Corinthian heroine bearing a similar name, and thus leading to an easy identification on the one hand with Médée, and to confusion among the commentators on the other. It would be rash to assert that those which have been already mentioned are the only "thoughtful" homonyms of Greek mythology. That, however, is nothing more than a suggestion. It is sufficient for the object here in view to have shown that there is such a difference in character between the legends of Médée in Corinth, and those of her elsewhere, that the assumption is required, that they are really separate figures.

MEDEA:

Part 2:

The Real Medea:

1). Her Parentage, Home, and Function.
2). The Trials in Colchis.
3). The Murder of Pelias.
4). The Murder of Absyrtus.
The Real Medea:

Her Parentage, Home, and Function:

( The home of Medea is shown to have been in the East from the beginning 
and the legend of Medea is shown to be inseparable from the story of the Fleece: )

So far, the tendency of this enquiry has been to show, not who Medea is, but who she is not. Three figures in particular, who are supposed by different writers to have been connected in the first place with her origin, have been discussed, and have been shown to be entirely independent of it: Diomede or Diomede is a quite separate person altogether; the nameless Corinthian heroine has no original connection with the real Medea, though she became identified with her, and the so-called Cretan Medea is none other than the great Thessalian herself:

Who, then, Medea actually is, is a question which cannot be briefly answered: She is usually known as a Thessalian; but that is due in a large degree to the influence of Latin writers: Thessaly is only her adopted home. Originally, she came from the remotest east, flying from the wrath of her father, because she had helped the Argonauts behind his back: Pinder, though he is actually speaking with reference to Corinth, is really giving the most primitive form of the legend, when he speaks of 

"Medea, who brought about her own marriage, against her father's will, and was the saviour of the Argos and her crew." 

It is as the Helper of Jason that she first came into existence; apart from the Legend of the Golden Fleece, she would never have been known at all:

The history of Medea begins only when the legend of Phrixus and the ram had reached its full development: It is not within the scope of an enquiry into the history of Medea, to deal with the processes by which that myth came into being: Shadowy rumours of horrible human sacrifices to the god of the raging summer heat, followed by the offering of a ram in place of the eikalmiorka human victim, - the crude belief in a theriomorphic ram-god, and
later the Fleece as the symbol of his peculiar powers,—
the Cloud-wife of Athamas and her Dionysiac successor, with
all the horrors that follow in the train of Dionysiac in-
fluences, — the practice, not peculiar to Greece alone, of sacrificing a victim from the royal house, exemplified
in the family of the Athamantids at Orchomenos, and the
derangement on the eldest son if he should set foot in the
town hall, — all these have blended with one another,
and have developed into the legend of Parius, who fled
from his step-mother's malice to the ends of the earth,
rescued in a wonderful manner by a ram which had a fleece
of gold and the gift of speech.

There is, further, no need to confuse the issue
with a long discussion of the personal history of Jason.
We may put aside the legends on which Gruppe lays so much
stress, of the relation to Demeter and Iasion, as well as
the dangerous reconstruction by Robert of what he considers
to be the original story of Jason. Robert finds the germ
of the later account in a legend not otherwise attested,
that Jason, by grace of Hera, climbed Mount Pelion, and
brought down from the summit a fleece of gold. The family
history of Jason is of importance here, only in so far as
it shows how he was brought at every turn into connection
with local celebrities, and how, when the problem of the
recovery of the fleece arose, everything combined to
indicate him as the obvious person to be entrusted with
the task. The name of his mother is not quite certain:

In Apollodorus, it is Polymede; in Hesiod, Polymele; and
in Herodorus, it is Polyphone. The latter two variants
are in all probability corruptions of Polymede, the first
name; if that is so, it is very interesting to find that
it was still another of the 'thoughtful' women of Greece
who was the mother of the hero of Iolcus. Fraser, in the
Loeb edition of Apollodorus, erroneously refers to the
passage referred to above as authority that the name
was Perimede:

But the pride of Iolcus was not satisfied even
with this. A great deal of shady dealing with the family
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
1. p. 290 f.
tree has still to take place, and at last Jason emerges into the full light of publicity as a through-and-through Minyan-Aeolid hero. His parents after his final overhauling are Alcimede, the daughter of Minyas, and Aeson, the grandson of Aeolus; everything possible was done, as far as nobility of race was concerned, which would increase his qualifications to be the restorer to Hellas of the family fleece.

When Phrixus was rescued by the ram, he was carried over the ocean to Aea, and there the fleece was dedicated to Zeus, the god of escape. In Aea, it was in the possession of, and under the protection of, the king Aeetes, the son of Helios. This place was undoubtedly in the east from the beginning; Robert has tried to prove that it was originally in the distant west, established there by Corinthian influences. His theory, however, stands or falls by the truth of his assumption that Medea was originally a Corinthian princess; it has already been shown that for such an assumption, far from there being any positive authority, there is evidence which disproves it.

The attempt to place Aea, and other places which came into prominence on account of the voyage, in the west among the dependencies of Corinth, dates from the period when Corinth had identified her local heroine with the better-known Medea, and was trying to claim the legend in its entirety as Corinthian. If, indeed, Aea was originally in the distant west, it is remarkable that the rival theory, dating from a period presumably later than the Corinthian ascendancy, should have managed to hold its own against Corinthian influence, and finally suppress the original story altogether. Just as Corinthian legends were naturally located in the west, following the lines of the trade routes, so also a Thessalian legend would find the goal of a romantic legend in the distant east. To a very large extent, as Dr. Giles has pointed out, the story of Jason is only the glorified narrative of an Aeolian rover who braves the dangers of the Golden Horn, and voyages in the Hellespont.

The east, moreover, is the natural objective for one who seeks to win a treasure from the family of the sun, or from the Sun himself. The west is the land of darkness, where
light gives way to gloom, and where the soul of men go
down with the sinking sun to the islands of the blest,
beyond the borders of the world. The east, on the other
hand, is the land of light and radiance. It is in the east
that the light of day breaks through the darkness of night;
the east is the daily scene of the triumph of the sun, and
it is to the east that men instinctively turn to see the
triumph, whether physical or symbolical, of the powers of
light. Beyond a doubt, it was to the east that Jason went,
to recover from the representative of the Sun the fleece,
in which, according to the Vatican Mythographer, Zeus
himself once climbed the sky, and which was thought of as
a symbol of the Sun himself.

As regards the derivation of the names Aeës,
Aeetes, and Aeaeës, there is such a variety of meanings
available, that, with sufficient lack of scruple, it is not
difficult to find one which will bolster up the maddest
theory. Thus Scawyscer 11 has proved, to his own and
Weiliger's satisfaction, that Ἀφοιν means the "Land of the
sunrise." This is, of course, very comfortable support
for those who believe in the idea of an eastern Aeës, until
the regrettable truth emerges, that he has derived it, with
the timely aid of a digamma, from a word in the Lesbian
dialect for "Dawn." Still more preposterous, however,
is the idea of Gruppe, that the name Aeës should be re-
garded as the singular form of a presumable plural
Ἀφοῖντων, which he takes to mean the "Men who were born from
the earth." Aeës, in that event, is nothing more than
the representative of the men who came into existence when
the teeth of the dragon were sown in the ground; If that
is so, the original king of Aeës must have been nameless;
for the whole episode of the sowing of the teeth, and the
birth of the men from the ground, belongs properly to
the Boeotian legend of Cadmus, which was transferred in its
entirety to the legend of Jason, after the latter had assumed
a definite form. It is difficult to believe that, in the
original version, the owner of the fleece was a nameless
king, or that his earlier name, if he had one, has been
suppressed under the influence of an addition from a later
legend: "Lord of the Earth-born Men," on the whole,
must go the same way as Schwyzter's "Lord of the Dawn."

The proper derivation, in fact, is the simplest, most obvious and straightforward one. 'Aea is to be regarded as a mythical island in the furthest east, lying on the border of Ocean.' Thus, at any rate, Winnecke seems to have pictured it; according to Strabo, he seems to have believed it to lie in the east, actually in Ocean.-

In τῇ Ὀκεανῷ ποιήσας τὴν οἰκνοσ τού διατοῦ πρὸς τοῖς ὑπολοίς. The name of it seems nothing more than 'Aea' as opposed to 'water,' and is very properly, applied to a mystic island which rises up at the very end of the earth in the midst of a vast expanse of Ocean. Μῆτης means nothing more than 'Lord of Aea,' and the island of Aea, νῆος Ἀλση, is nothing but another name for Aea itself. Eumelus is the first to identify this mysterious land with Colchis, which was the furthest known place on the eastern coast of the Bucané. The old name Aea still lives on, although by its identification with a place on the coast it has lost its original significance, when no longer regarded as an island.

Zeus p. 241:

Thus the same island of Aea belongs also the sorceress Circe. She is a figure of independent solar origin, the personification of the hawk, which is of course a solar bird. An indication of her earlier ornitho-nomical state is found in the curious Homeric description of her as a "Dread goddess, endowed with human speech," as though there were something curious in her possession of this very ordinary faculty. Unless there is something of this sort behind it, the description is, as Cook points out, a piece of gratuitous impertinence. When personified, she was naturally classified as a daughter of the Sun, and it is in this capacity that she belongs to the solar island of Aea. This is clearly where the tradition followed by Homer placed her: He speaks of the Aesean island as her home, "where are the houses and dancing-places of the Dawn, and the risings of the Sun." It is difficult to see on what grounds Merry and Riddell explain this as meaning that Homer regarded the distant east and the distant west as meeting in space, and that a place definitely described as being in the land of the sunrise is therefore really in the furthest west. It was
the later tradition, of which the first trace is in Hesiod, that transferred her to the west, and finally located her on the promontory of Circei on the western coast of Italy. To effect this change of address, the solar chariot was called into use; and Hesiod, and after him Apollonius, told how she made the journey from east to west in the chariot of her father; the sun. Tradition made for her there a "home from home," and gave her a western "Island of Aeac" to dwell in; from this arose the name Aeaea as a proper name of her abode. It is interesting to notice in this connection that Apollonius follows the oldest tradition of Circe's original dwelling in the far east.

Not only does Circe herself belong properly to the far east, but there is some reason for believing that the complete section of adventures in the Odyssey, which embraces the adventures of the Laestrygonians, the visit to Circe, the passing of the Sirens, the Plenotae as opposed to the Scyllis and Charybdis, and Thrinacia, was originally located in the east as well. Finsler and others regard it as borrowed in its entirety from an old Argonautic account, and suppose that the places referred to were originally imagined to be situated on the Thracian Chersonnes, in the Euxine, and vaguely in the east. Others, while adopting the substance of this idea, are inclined to assign it less precisely than Finsler, and refer it to an "old Thessalian Ship-Saga." Such opinions, of course, come spontaneously to Teutonic scholars, who are ever prone to regard the pronouncements of Wilamowitz as ipso facto established facts.

Since first that great critic threw out the suggestion that the original of these legends was a lost Argonaut saga, there have been many who have definitely laid it down that it was so in truth. No further evidence, however, has been produced since the time when Wilamowitz first made the suggestion.

There is, indeed, very good reason to believe that the scene of these adventures was originally laid in the east; but it is quite unjustifiable to lay it down so explicitly that it was an Argonaut saga and none other that...
must have embraced them. There must have been many other cycles of legends, other than the Fall of Troy and the Voyage for the Golden Fleece, that were known before the time of Homer, and which must have dealt with the places situated east of Troy.

It is worth noting, at any rate, that the latest writer on this subject, Karl Meuli, still holds to the old dogma that it was an Argonautic legend which formed the foundation of the Homeric account. This contention, however, he pushes to quite unjustifiable extremes, when he proposes, on the ground of the un-Homeric character of the grotto mentioned by Pausanias, and the fact that there is no other Homeric episode represented in the description there given of the chest of Cypselus while there are several of an Argonautic character, to see in the episode there portrayed the marriage, not as Pausanias supposed of Circe and Odysseus, but of Circe and Jason.

Circe, at any rate, came originally from the east, and shared at one time with Aeetes her brother the mystic island of the rising Sun. Aeetes in the legend is nothing more nor less than the ruler of Aea. In this capacity, like Aithon and Augias, who have been already noticed, he represents the Sun in a heroic phase, and like them is considered to be a son of Helios. His mother is Perse or Perseis, the Oceanid; Oceanos, is, of course, the eponymous ruler of the world-surrounding stream on the borders of which the island of Aea lay. Even in the name of his mother there is an indication of his solar origin. Perse, though she is actually called a daughter of Ocean, is obviously closely connected with Perseus, which is nothing else than another name for the Sun. In the Corinthian form of the legend, Aeetes is the son of Helios and Antiope; but that version is due entirely to Eumelius, who wanted to make it clear that he was a brother of the Sicyonic Aloeus, and suppressed the original name of his mother in favour of the Sicyonic version. The sun-cult was very much in evidence at Sicyon, just as it was in Corinth.

Aeetes has a daughter, Medea by name, and she is a sorceress. It has already been seen how frequently names of similar form are given to direct descendants of
the sun, and how often their bearers are supposed to be in possession of magic powers, which belong in the first place properly to the Sun himself. Her mother is Eidyia, the "Knowing One," and she, like Perse the mother of Aeetes, is an Oceanid. She is undoubtedly the earliest mother of Medea, earlier than the rival figures of Neaira, Eurylyte, Hecate and others. Moreover, the relation of Medea to Aeetes is probably earlier than that of Circe; for the latter was originally of independent origin, and later, when recognized as a daughter of the Sun, was classified as a sister of Aeetes, and given the same solar island to inhabit.

Medea, like her father Aeetes, owes her very existence to the story of the Argonauts; and the whole of her later reputation has arisen out of her intervention in this legend on behalf of Jason. When finally the Argonauts arrived at Colchis, or rather Aea as it could then be called, Jason went to Aeetes, and demanded the golden Fleece for which he had come, and which was in the possession of Aeetes. As inevitably happens in legends of this type, the king challenged the hero first to prove his merit, and set him a task or tasks beyond the ordinary powers of men. It is not necessary to see in this any malice on the part of the king; he is only behaving as is usual in this type of story — it is too common a these to require detailed references — and it is at this point that Medea enters the story.

Aeetes in the Argonautica is to a great extent the double of Pelias. It is probable, that as long as Pelias remained the good monarch that he was at the beginning, Aeetes too confined himself to the usual functions of his position. When, however, the character of Pelias changes, and he becomes the enemy of Jason, so too the character and function of Pelias, Aeetes alters in sympathy. Thus in the narrative of Apollonius, he is roused to anger through hatred of the Aeolids, and means like Pelias, to do his best to destroy the race, not from general, but from personal reasons.

A problem which has caused a great deal of unnecessary trouble in certain quarters is that of deciding whether or no the story of Medea is separate from
that of the Fleece. Jensen in particular, in the article on Jason in Pauly-Wissowa, has maintained that the "Home Bringing of the Bride" is the earliest part of the legend, and that the story of the Fleece has been added to it; "The root of the whole saga of Jason" he says, "remains the winning of Medea." The same view, as we have seen, is that of Rademann. Gruppe also considers that the winning of Medea by Jason belongs to a different cycle of legends than that from which the Recovery of the Fleece developed. This theory, however, he soon finds to involve many difficulties, and he concludes—with wonder—that "The History of the Winning of Medea is not exactly clear." The opposite idea, as has been seen, has been maintained by Seeliger, and rightly so. He shows that the idea of Jason, that the winning of the bride is the original form, depends entirely on his supposition that Medea is originally a Corinthian heroine. If that were so in fact, we should have to regard the Thessalian legend of the Fleece as a later addition, for to a Corinthian legend, it is utterly irrelevant. We have seen, however, that the theory that a Corinthian heroine is from the beginning the central figure of the story, is quite untenable, and that it was under Thessalian influence in the first place that Medea was ever brought to Greece.

It is, in fact, a mistake to separate the two legends at all. It is for the Fleece that Jason sails, and always did sail; but in order to obtain it, he has to fulfill certain tasks. Assistance of some kind is obviously essential to him; and it must be given by someone who is in possession of more than usual powers. since a Greek hero would naturally be able to perform any task that lay within the range of ordinary human ability.

The various methods which appear in this type of legend fall into three groups. In the first, the hero is assisted by some god or goddess. In the second, various members of the animal kingdom come to his assistance, in grateful remembrance of some service which the hero has previously rendered them. The third is of a more romantic character; the daughter of the king is fired with love for the hero in his distress, and gives him the assistance
of which he stands in need. Either she has inside information and can tell the hero of the pitfalls which await him, or she has magic powers, and helps him in the actual accomplishment of the trials. Here it is the latter means; it is Medea who comes to the rescue with her magic powers behind her father's back, and was "the saviour of the Argo and her crew."

The most famous example in Greek literature of this type is the help which Ariadne gave to Theseus when he came to slay the Minotaur; so famous, indeed, that, although the sequel was not all that it should have been, Jason in the Argonautica is moved to hold it up to Medea as an example. Ariadne rescued Theseus by means of a wonderful ball of thread; but in the case of Medea, it is by the exercise of her own peculiar powers that she helps Jason, and not with wonderful instruments obtained from others. How Jason is supposed to have fared in the trials by those who separate the story of the fleece from the legend of Medea is nowhere suggested; perhaps it was a forgotten "Helpful Beast!" There can be little doubt that Medea was the saviour and deliverer of Jason from the earliest period of the legend.

With regard to the original location of Aea, which was discussed earlier in this section, it is no small support for the believer in an eastern situation from the first to have the authority of Postovtseff. The latter believes in a pre-Hellenic, probably Carian version of the Argonaut legend, dating from the time when the development of the mining industry on the southern shores of the Black Sea began, and when Achaeans and Carians made their first expeditions in search of gold. "We do not know," he writes, "the Carian adventure of the Argonaut myth; but we do know the Ionian or Milesian version, which existed as a separate poem, and was incorporated into the story of the hero-mariner Ulysses."

With some of these statements it is a little difficult to agree. I cannot see, for example, on what the Iranians and Greeks in South Russia, esp. pp. 61-2:
grounds he assumes so explicitly a Carian legend of a
definitely Argonautic character: Undoubtedly there must
have been many wonderful legends of the first travels of the
Carians in the Black Sea, and they must have exerted a con-
siderable influence on a Thessalian legend whose scene
was laid in the east. But the story of the Argonautica
is most definitely that of the Thessalian Jason and his
voyage for the Thessalian Fleece; and no matter how many
Carian, or how many Milesian, legends may have affected the
character of this particular myth, it is misleading to refer
to them as Argonautic. The author hopes, he says, to return
to this and cognate subjects in a special article; in the
passage under discussion he is dealing in a very summary
manner with the subject; and one can only hope that he will
later make it clear that the expression was used loosely
at the moment for convenience’ sake.

He does, however, “insist on the high probability
of the theory, pretty generally accepted in the most recent
works on the subject, that the adventures of Jason . . . are
to be localised in the Black Sea.” He holds also to the
theory that part of the Wanderings of Odysseus are supposed
to have taken place in these regions; but very sensibly
deprecates the excesses of those who identify, for example,
the harbour of the Laestrygonians with Balaklava, and the
island of Circe with the Taman peninsula.

The author makes no mention of the theories of
Robert. The section of the former’s Heldensage dealing
with the Argonautica was published in 1921; the introduction
to the former’s book was written in November of the same
year. In view of Rostovtzeff’s unique knowledge of
all that bears on Pontic colonization, one feels inspired
to hope that his promised article on the Argonaut legend
will deal the death blow to the theories of those who
persevere in the idea of a Western Aegean.
The Real Medea:

The Trials in Colchis:

( 1) Jason originally and only a single trial to undergo;

2. This account probably survived in the version of the Vespertiae:

3. The influences under which the other two trials were introduced:

The standard account of the trials in Colchis which Jason had to undergo before he was allowed to take the fleece, is that which is found in the last hundred lines of the third book of the Argonautica and the beginning of the fourth. Here the trials are three in number; the third and last is the overcoming of the dragon which guarded the fleece, and this was accomplished secretly and in the darkness of night, with the assistance of Medea. Previous to that, however, there were two other tasks; these had to be undertaken in the full light of day, in the presence of Aeetes and all the people. The first was to yoke the fire-breathing bulls, and with them to plough the field of Ares; the second was to sow the teeth of the dragon in the furrow, and to overcome the earth-born men who sprang up from them:

This is, however, a full-dress Alexandrine version, and it contains many elements which cannot possibly belong to the original account. It is a very common feature of stories of this type, that the hero should have three tasks to perform before he can obtain the prize; it is all the same, whether the prize be booty or bride. But it is by no means certain that in the original legend of Jason there was more than a single trial appointed.

The earliest account which has come down to us is in the Theogony of Hesiod. It gives information of no great value, as it is so clearly influenced by later ideas; and the date of the passage itself is open to grave suspicion. It appears to be later than the main body of the poem; and the same applies to more than one of the sections at the end. The account is as follows:

"From Aeetes, the heaven-nurtured king, the son of Aeson led away his daughter, by the will of the immortal gods, when he had accomplished the many grievous tasks which were put upon him by the mighty arrogant king, Pellias, the
presumptuous and outrageous worker of violence." With great labour, the son of Aeson accomplished them, and came to Iolcus; and on his ship he brought with him the bright-eyed maiden, and made her his wedded wife. She was subject to Jason, the shepherd of the people, and bore him a son Medeios, whom Chiron the son of Philyra brought up in the mountains; and the will of great Zeus was fulfilled."

The whole passage is too vague in content to be of any great value. The "accomplishment of grievous tasks" is a stock Hesiodic expression for any great achievement; and it may be taken to refer to nothing more than the dangerous voyage of the Argo, and not to the trials of Jason in Colchis at all. The latter, after all, were laid on Jason by Aeetes, and only in the second degree by Pelias; he could not possibly have known what measures the king would take to protect his treasure. Moreover, the uncomplimentary references to Pelias must date from a time when, as will later be shown, the fetching of the fleece was no longer a simple errand of poetry, but an ingenious device on the part of Pelias to do away with Jason by forcing him into danger.

Both of the trials which come first in the account of Apollonius are open to suspicion. The sowing of the teeth in the furrow, and the battle with the earth-born men to whom they gave rise, is a clear adoption from the Boeotian legend of Cadmus. In that story, Cadmus first slays a dragon, and extracts its teeth; then, at the bidding of Ares, he sows them in a field, and overcomes the armed men who are born from them by the simple device of throwing a stone among them, and driving them to a quarrel in which they take the matter out of his hands by slaying each other in anger. It is at the bidding of Ares that he sows the teeth; the god is acting in his capacity as father of Harmonia, who is the object of the exertions of Cadmus. So too, in the Argonautica, it is Aeetes who orders the sowing of the teeth; but his duty as father of Medea is overridden by his personal feelings and political enmities. His primary function is that of guardian of the Fleece; the fact that he is also father of Medea is incidental to that, and does not assume the same
importance as the relationship of Ares in the Boeotian legend of Cadmus.

Moreover, in the Argonautic account, the slaying of the dragon comes last. So it cannot, obviously, be the dragon whose teeth Jason has to sow in the first trial. A gloriously simple explanation of how Aeetes came to be in possession of such remarkable teeth, is found in the narrator's narrative that Cadmus did not sow all the teeth of the dragon which he slew, but gave half of them over to Ares, who in turn gave them as a present to Aeetes. The Colchians were a warlike race, and held Ares in great esteem; so he doubtless thought that it was up to him to make some sign of his pleasure; his gratitude took the form of presenting the king with these remarkable teeth, which Aeetes apparently preserved against an emergency, and found in them a convenient way of putting Jason's prowess to the test. The debt of the legend of Jason to the story of Cadmus is more than obvious; it forced itself upon the notice of the Greeks long ago, when they invented this very thin story of the division of the teeth to account for the similarity. The first known authority for the legend in this form is Phercydes.

But the embellishment of the story of Jason's trials does not end here. It was not, apparently, enough for a full-blown Colchian hero to do as Cadmus did, scratch a furrow in the ground to receive the teeth, or even to plough with a pair of unusually intractable, but ordinary, oxen. A pair of fire-breathing oxen with brazen hoofs is called into being to add to his troubles. With these, he must first plough the field of Ares; one is suspicious here of a further reminiscence of the Cadmus, Ares, and Harmonia legend; and Aeetes assures him that though the task is hard, it is not impossible, since he himself can accomplish it. The comparison is hardly fair, since Aeetes is a son of Helios, and immortal; but that it what Jason has to do. These bulls we have already seen to be a development from the legend of Telos; and they date in all probability not from the original version of that legend, but from the secondary one which arose when Medea had taken the place of Pola as his destroyer.
These brazen bulls are mentioned among the trials of Jason by Pindar, in the fourth Pythian Ode, by Sophocles, in the Colchian Women, and by Pherekydes; Antidusus, followed by Apollonius says explicitly that they were constructed by Hephaestus. It is not at first sight quite clear, whether or no these bulls had a place in the version of the Naupactiae. This is a poem, whose author was held by Pausanias following Charon of Lampsa, to have been Carcinus of Naupactiae. Its content, we are told, was Ἐπὶ περιελήξαι τοὺς θυσίας, and it is clear that one of the heroines whose praises were sung in it was Medea. On one passage of the Argonautica, the scholiast gives the account of the Naupactiae, that the Colchians had feasted with Acestes and had retired to rest; that Acestes had planned to burn the Argo, but was prevented by Aphrodite, who sent on him a feeling of sleepiness and a desire for the company of his wife Eurylyte, "in her anxiety that after the contest ἔπη ὡδον, Jason and his company should return safe and sound." In an earlier passage, the scholiast is discussing the number of heroes who offered to yoke the bulls in place of Jason. The scholiast of the Codex Parisinus says "According to Apollonius, only the three offer to yoke the bulls" (in the text, six heroes actually offer to do so; probably, as in the other scholia on the same passage, one should read in place of ΤΟΣ ΤΡΕΙΣ, ΤΟΥΣΟΥ;) - "but the author of the Naupactiae enumerates all those who had come on the Argo." (reading in place of ΑΡΓΟΥ. 'ΑΡΓΟΥ;) Apollonius however says that it was Acestes who feasted the heroes who were willing to undergo the contest, but in the Naupactiae, it is Idmon who rises and bids Jason himself undertake the task ὡδον. "It is noticeable that in the Naupactiae, it is persistently "trial" in the singular, and never "trials," that is referred to;"

We are further told by the scholiast that, in the Naupactiae, the fleece was not guarded by the dragon, but was in the house of Acestes. It was brought out from there by Medea as the Argonauts were about to set sail. In view of this, it is a tempting and attractive inference from the comments of the scholiasts that the Naupactiae told of one trial only, and that the slaying of a dragon. Both scholiasts
on 3.112, refer consistently in the singular to the
γόνον ὁρῶνος of the Naupactia. This is of all the more
significance, when it is realised that it is not the nature
or the number of the trials which is under discussion.
The question at issue is whether all the heroes, as in
the Naupactia, or only a few, as in the Argonautica, offered
to undergo the trial in place of Jason; and whether it was Argos, as in the Naupactia, Argonautica,
who dissuaded them by holding out the prospect of help from
the magic of Medea, or as in the Naupactia, Idmon, who
merely called on Jason to perform his own task in his own
person.

If this is so, the account of the Naupactia must
be as follows: Jason and the Argonauts arrive at Colchis
and demand the fleece. This is safely kept in the palace.
The king first calls on Jason to show his merit; and he
orders him to kill a dragon, which is in the vicinity.
Jason is diffident of his powers, and grows despondent;
and all the crew rise up without exception, offering to
take his place. Idmon, however, restrains them, and calls
on Jason to perform the task himself; this he ultimately
does, one presumes with the help of Medea. Aetres, however,
refuses to give over the fleece, perhaps on the ground of
the help obtained in the trial from his daughter. He
holds a council of the Colchians, at which it is decided
to burn the Argo and to cut off the escape of the heroes:
Aphrodite, however, intervenes, and turns the mind of Aetes
to pleasanter things, to a desire for his wife Enyalius:
Idmon, realising what is happening, advocates instant flight;
Medea brings out the fleece from its place of concealment
in the palace, gives it to Jason, and accompanies him to
Iolcus as his promised wife.

It is very gratifying to find this authority for
the theory of a single trial, particularly since Robert,
in his reconstruction of this part of the legend, has made
a singular departure from his usually demeaning policy.
It is not that the learned writer, confronted with the
alternatives of a single trial or a larger number, has
found it agreeable to hold to the one and despise the other;
he wants to have it both ways. He assumes that it is the
yoking of the bulls that is referred to in the Naupactia.
when the scholiast says that all the heroes were willing to undergo the trial; and he says that (p. 793): "In the Nauspactia, and probably always in the older legend, all the heroes are willing to undergo the trial." Yet in spite of this, on the very next page he says that "the legends fall into two groups, according as the fleece is, or is not, guarded by the dragon." The latter appears to be the older version; and to it belongs the account of the Nauspactia, where Jason had probably only one task to perform, namely to slay a dragon. When so eminent an authority as Robert is found to be playing the part of Mr. Fawcett Both Ways, and that, too, flagrantly on two successive pages, it seems worth while to try to discover the solution of the difficulty. The scholia to Apollonius, on which alone depends the evidence for the account adopted in the Nauspactia, are admittedly in a very corrupt condition; even in the passage under discussion, we have seen that two alterations of the text are required. However, in default of a clearer allusion to the yoking of the bulls, it seems not unreasonable to refer the Ὄλος of both the Parisian and the Laurentian scholiast to the slaying of the dragon, which is definitely known in the Nauspactia not to have been the guardian of the fleece.

In one respect, Apollonius has made a clear departure from the narrative of the Nauspactia; that is in respect of Idmon. In deference to the local Pontic legend, Apollonius had already told of the death of Idmon on the outward journey among the Merianidyni. It is interesting to find that even in the Nauspactia, Jason has the same diffidence which is his main characteristic in the account of Apollonius. In the latter, however, it is Peleus and not Idmon, who is the life and soul of the merry when their leader falls then.

This version, according to which the slaying of a dragon is the task on the fulfilment of which depends Jason's chance of acquiring the fleece, is attested by a red-figured vase to which Robert refers. On it, the serpent is shown under a tree; but there is no sign of the fleece. Medea is quietening the creature with her magic drugs; while Jason is advancing with drawn sword to kill it. The usual
account; however, makes the serpent also the guardian of the fleece. As a cthulhian animal, the serpent is the natural guardian for treasure, which is so often hidden in the ground; it is in accordance with this belief that the giant in the "Rainigold" metamorphoses himself into a serpent in order to better to guard the gold. This is the account of the Medes of Euripides, the fourth Pythian ode of Pindar, the Argonautica of Herodorus, and is shown also on several vases: Robert cites four in particular; one shows Jason with drawn sword, and behind him Medes, advancing on the dragon, which is protecting the fleece with its body. In the majority of cases, moreover, the dragon is actually killed by Jason, not, as in the Argonautica, merely stupefied. This is the account of Pindar, Pherecydes and Euripides; in the latter, it is actually Medes who claims to have slain the dragon. It is further confirmed by several vases, which are mentioned by Robert. The version of Apollonius, that the dragon was not actually, but merely stupefied, cannot be traced further back than the "Lyde" of Antimachus, which is cited in agreement with the narrative of Apollonius by the smallest.

There is one very curious tradition with regard to the dragon, for which the only authority is a vase from Ceere: On the left is shown a scaly dragon; from his enormous mouth is hanging out a man, whom the inscription shows to be Jason. On the right stands Athene, obviously watching the dragon returning her unfortunate protegee to the light of day; it is a natural inference that it was through her agency that Jason was ever returned at all. One noteworthy feature of this account is that it is Athene and not Medes who plays the part of rescuer to the hero in his hour of need. This in itself shows that the account cannot be very early. Here is the first divine patroness of the expedition; Athene comes in later still, as the patron goddess of sea voyages, and as the particular deity of many of the Pontic cibonies which later claimed a place in the fully developed legend.

In comparison with this story, Rademascher cites the Biblical account of the prophet Jonas, who was swallowed by a sea-monster and later restored to light; and the Finnish legend of Ilmarinen the smith. This ingenious man resolved to win the hand of the fair Cari...
resolved to win the hand of the fair Catrina, the daughter of the King of All the DevilEs. He was given the usual three tasks to perform, and accomplished the first two with ease; but the third was harder. He was required to go and fetch a treasure-chest, which had lain buried since time immemorial on the sea shore, and was watched over by a very, very, old man, Ukko Untano. Ilmarinen found himself swallowed by the old man; but, nothing daunted, he took off his shirt and made an anvil of it, and forged on it a bird with claws of iron and a beak of steel. By a magic process, he was able to bring this bird to life; and it flew round and round in the vitals of the old man, and wrought such havoc that he finally cried out for mercy, returned Ilmarinen from his dark abode, and showed him how to get the chest.

It is quite unknown on what authority this representation of Jason is founded; the same scene is shown on a cameo. There are various accounts, which in one way or another do not allow Jason to return to Greece. Thus TimoXæus, who wrote a Scythica, and appears to have been older than Apollonius, tells that he remained in Colchis and was king there. Euripides also in the Hypsipyle seems to have told that Jason met his end in Colchis. These forms are probably only developments of the romantic version, which is auxiliary to the main theme. The fleece is more and more subordinated, and the figure of Medea is elevated to ever greater prominence. This does not, however, explain the legend of Jason being swallowed by the dragon. Unless we are to regard it as a curious importation under the influence of some other legend, and as altogether secondary to the original account, it is quite impossible to account for it.

We may, however, in the light of the other evidence, regard as established the contention that the original helper of Jason was the daughter of Aeetes himself, Medea, and none other.
Exposed to the natural anger of her father, though guilty as yet of no greater crime than that of having, like Ariadne, done all that lay in her power to save the life of the men with whom she was in love, Medea can, of course, no longer be left in see. To her alone was due the salvation of the Argonauts in general, and of Jason in particular; and it is his obvious duty to rescue her from the anger of her father. As a hero and a gentleman, he can hardly do less than offer her a passage on the Argo, and take her back to Hellas as his promised wife.

It is a curious fact, that no writer in Greek literature has recorded what was done with the fleece that was the cause of all the trouble. Apollodorus is the only one even to record that it was actually handed over by Jason to Pelias; and he does no more than record the bare fact. The sole corroboration of his account is the painting on a solitary late vase mentioned by Robert, on which the handing over of the fleece is actually represented. Even the later history of the Argo is very little spoken of; and what little we do hear of has come under the influence of the Corinthian legend. Thus Apollodorus records that it was dedicated to Poseidon at Isthmus by Jason; and in Euripides, Medea, before her flight from Corinth, prophesies death for Jason from a fragment falling on his head. But all these date from the time when Corinth had taken possession of the legend; of its fate so long as the legend remained a purely Thessalian influence, there is no indication at all.

Although the winning of the fleece was the original and only motive of Jason in sailing to Colchis, its history from the time when it was actually given over to Jason by Aeetes, or seized by the former, is completely lost sight of, under the influence of the more romantic story of Jason and Medea and their love. There is, for instance, no indication that in any tragedy it occupied so prominent
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of Medea, and Acestes in the sight of his father is driven to hurl himself into the sea. In the third play, Medea buries the fleece, partly as a symbol of the curse, partly as a symbol of the wicked magic practices that she has resolved to renounce forever; but later, at the bidding of Jason, she sends it as a gift to Creusa, accompanied by the poisoned robe. In the last act of this play, it is introduced for the last time with tremendous effect. Jason has fled into the desert, and is confronted in his humiliation and despair with Medea, who is on her way to Delphi, to return the fleece to the god from whose altar Phrixus originally took it; and she hopes by the restoration of the fleece to win pardon for her crimes, and to put an end to the evil working of the fleece itself. Ever since the day when Acestes stabbed Phrixus so as to obtain the fleece, it has been in her eyes the symbol of the curse which was pronounced on her father by the dying Phrixus:

That is a most powerful scene, to which a bare prose summary cannot possibly do justice; but the romantic motif has suppressed all traces of any such treatment in Greek literature. It must be taken for granted that the fleece was brought safely back to Iolcus, and handed over to Pelias. The usual account makes of this monarch a wicked tyrant, who is occupying a throne which belongs by right to his brother Jason, the father of Jason; who, on the pretext of an errand of piety, has sent his nephew off to what he hopes will prove his doom; and who, in the absence of his nephew on that expedition, has killed his father, the rightful ruler of the land, and in his turn meets
a well deserved death at the hands of Medea.

There are, however, clear indications that this legend of the enmity and unrighteous tyranny of Pelias does not belong to the original myth. The earliest mention of him is in the Odyssey; there it is told that Tyro conceived by virtue of the embraces of Poseidon, and bore two sons, Pelias and Neleus; Pelias dwelt in broad Ilion, and Neleus on Pylos. To her mortal husband, she bore three sons, Aeoleon, Pheres and Amythaon. There is no indication of any discord between the sons of Poseidon and those of Creteus; that Creteus had originally no doubt as to the legitimacy of the first two seems to be indicated in a tradition surviving only in the Cithaerides, to the effect that Tyro was already pregnant by Poseidon when she became the wife of Creteus, and that her children as a result of this liaison were claimed as his own by her mortal husband. By virtue of this genealogy, Aeoleon, whom the later myth has taught us to regard as the rightful ruler of Iolus, is actually junior to Pelias; and he naturally acquiesces in the rule of his newer brother.

What the precise event was, which originally moved Pelias to concern about the fleece, is nowhere stated. Pelias in the fourth Pythian ode, asserts that, in a wonderful dream, confirmed by the oracle at Castalia, he has been ordered to prepare an expedition to recover the fleece from Aeetes. It is very tempting, to see, with Weisssenber, the original impulse to the expedition in this dream, and to regard as of a later date the sinister interpretation which it receives at the hands of Pindar. To whom, of course, Pelias is the wicked tyrant of the later legend. At any rate, whatever the cause, Pelias, as lawful ruler of the land, had every right to appoint a sacred envoy for this task; and such an appointment was one of honour, and far from burdensome.

An interesting interpretation of the function of the fleece is suggested by Professor Rose. He suggests that there must have been some definitely valuable quality in the fleece, and that it possibly had magical powers, so that its possession would be well worth the surrendering to Aeoleon by Pelias of a kingdom held on an insecure title. He further suggests that the exhibition of its magical
powers on the return journey may have been displaced by the
greater magic of Medea. This, however, implies a separation
of the legend of Medea from that of the fleece, which, as
we have seen, it does not do to press too far:

It should be noticed that it is not the House of
Paríxus for which anxiety is felt by Pelias, but his soul:
Jason is required to bring, ἐγκινητέω, back the fleece, and to
σῶροι of the soul of Paríxus. This must mean that the
soul of Paríxus was ill at ease so long as the fleece was
away from its proper land; and that, although his own
body lay in a foreign land, his soul would be at rest when the
fleece was restored to its own country. The restoration
of the fleece is, in fact, a pious obligation, to "lay"
the soul of Paríxus. This agrees well with the idea of
Vellmecker, that the fleece was the original cause of the
expedition. It must never be forgotten that the whole
legend is essentially a Mycenaean tradition, of which
the Iolcian Minyma were the nearest heirs. It is safest
in such a case to seek the original causes within the
narrowest limits, and not to go too far abroad in the
fields of mythology for their explanation:

If, then, the leading of the expedition was a
privilege and not a burden, the question arises, why Pelias
did not send his own son Acastus in charge of the expedition
rather than his nephew Jason? It is very likely that the
version of Diodorus and Vöres of Choræce dates back to
the original account, that Pelias was actually without male
issue. Daughters he had in abundance, as he later learned
to his cost; but, if he had no son, this pious duty would
naturally devolve on the son of his brother, the nearest
in the male line of succession. Jason, too, was
probably a figure not without glory in the annals of
Iolcos; and though the expedition was fraught with danger
and hazard, it had the prospect of glory beyond measure for
its leader, and was essentially an honourable task. It is
most improbable that the legend would have allowed Pelias
to pass over his own son in favour of his nephew for such
a task, if he had had one:

This hypothesis make more intelligible the later
enmity of Pelias towards Jason, when the legend had provided
...him with a son: At this point, the expedition is disguised as a task of glory, honour, and piety; but it is really a deliberate attempt on the part of Pelias to do away with Jason by sending him on what its author hopes will prove his last journey: Acastus. In this event, if he goes at all, must, as he does in the Argonautica, take part in the expedition without the knowledge of his father: He himself as an Argonautic hero is of no importance whatever; he is better known in connection with the separate legend of Peleus:

It must have been originally to a peaceful and united family that Jason brought back his foreign bride: To this period alone of the legend can belong the account of her rejuvenation of Jason, which is preserved in a fragment of the Nostoi. In the later legend, Aeson is put to death by Pelias, during the absence of his son: The same authority the writer of the Argonaut to the Medes of Euripides, says that, according to Pherecydes and Simonides, Medes carried through the same process in the case of Jason:

It is not necessary to see a sinister interpretation in the tradition that Jason was educated away from home in the cave of Chiron: Later legend, of course, said that he was sent there to keep him out of the way of Pelias: The cave of the old Centaur, however, was a great deal more than a home of refuge for Thessalian youths of noble blood, whose uncles had criminal intentions against them: It was the most famous place of education in the heroic age; and to it went in their early days most of the most prominent figures of northern Greece, such as Achilles, Ajax, and his son Ajax: As a Thessalian hero, Jason would naturally be sent there; and the Theogony, as we have seen, tells of a son of Jason, Medea, who, like his father before him, was entrusted to the care of the wise old Centaur: The education of Jason by Chiron is all part of the process by which the Iolian tradition was thrusting Jason into the limelight:

As early as Hesiod, however, there are signs that Pelias has begun to fall from grace: There he is the wicked tyrant who imposes tasks on Jason; the tasks must refer rather to the expedition in general than to the trials...
in Colchis in particular. To what period of the legend this belief is to be assigned, is uncertain. At any rate, it represents an obviously younger tradition than that reported in the 
Nostoi. Any more definite statement would be sheer speculation. The first complete account of the trickery and evil intentions of Pellas is that of Pindar; and there the legend has reached its full development, for the fate of Pellas himself is shown in the description of Medea as Ἔκλειστος ἃθροιστός;

The question now arises, whether Medea was alone guilty of the murder of Pellas in the earliest account of that act, or if some share of the blame must be attributed to Jason and the Argonauts. In the description given by Pausanias of the chest of Cypselus, an account is followed which clearly laid the whole blame on Medea. The games are there portrayed, which took place at the funeral of Pelias, and the daughters of Pellas are looking on: It is hardly conceivable that they would have been allowed to be present, if any share in the guilt of the murder had attached to them. Jason, too, is shown, engaged in a boxing contest with Acastus, the son of Pellas. It is most unlikely that any of the Argonauts would have been allowed to take part, if, in the tradition followed by the designer, they had been considered to have had a share in the murder.

According to the tradition of Hyginus, the daughters of Pellas fled, and their graves were actually shown in Ventimia. The usual legend, however, exculpates them, and allows them to remain at home; this is where the Medea of Euripides knows of them. In the Ristotai of Sophocles, and again in the Peliades of Euripides, it is Medea herself who is told blame; and the same account is followed on some vases mentioned by Robert. It must be Medea, and she alone, who was considered the guilty party; and it was only because of his connection with her that  

40. 1: Jason was forced to flee. The tradition of Eiodorus, that Pellas in the absence of Jason had murdered his younger brother Pronaion, or of Apollo王者, that he had driven
his father Aeson in despair to take his own life, would have given Jason sufficient excuse to execute the vengeance in his own person, if the legend had so required it. These accounts, however, must be comparatively late. In the original legend, there is no sign of a brother of Jason, and his father was alive on his return, and was rejuvenated by Medea. There seems to be no valid reason to doubt that it was Medea, and she alone, who was the murdrress of Pelies from the earliest times.

What exactly was the motive of Medea in doing this to Pelies, can only be guessed at. Weissecker has reconstructed this legend also, and again his reconstruction is most convincing: He proposes to place the beginning of the period which followed the return of Jason and Medea, the rejuvenation of Jason, and possibly of Jason as well. To the same period, he assigns the marriage of Admetus to Alcestis, the daughter of Pelies. Soon, however, there would arise differences between Medea on one side, and Jason and his kin on the other; she was, after all, for all her royal blood and solar descent, a mere barbarian in the eyes of any one who cared to regard her in that light; and it culminated in the murder by her of Pelies, the head of the family and leader of the opposition, by the cruel device of inducing his daughters to cut him up, in the belief that she would rejuvenate him as she had done to the others. Some share of the responsibility for the actions of his wife would be attributed to Jason, and together they would be forced to flee the land.

In fact, the degradation of the legend is to be traced principally to the feeling which was ever present in the Greek mind, that the foreigner of any sort, however clever or talented, however nobly born, was always inferior to the native-born Greek. It is the practical outcome of this state of mind, that a legend whose heroine was a foreign princess could not end with her successful arrival in Greece and triumphant adoption into Greek society, but must inevitably have a sequel to show the baseness of the foreigner as opposed to the Greek. In the case of Medea, a wise magician and successful rejuvenator of the
aged, she must inevitably develop into a wicked sorceress and ingenious murderer.

One difficulty which lies in the way of an explanation is the fact that its acceptance would make quite unintelligible the claim of Corinth, that the Veles of the legend of the Argonauts was a Corinthian princess. At some point in the history of the legend, Corinth must have been sufficiently impressed by the character of the sorceress of Iolcus to have been willing, or rather anxious, to claim her as a Corinthian heroine and give her a local origin. Thus they invented for her and her father a Corinthian pedigree, and brought her from Thessaly, and identified her, as has been already shown, with a heroine already famous in the mythology of the city. Corinth could not have adopted her with such readiness when she was a known murderer; she must have been taken over at a time when she had still a reputation to lose.

This adoption, however, would not satisfy Thessalian ideas; with the removal of their heroine to Corinth, they would invent a reason of their own to account for her departure, and a spiteful one at that. With the recognition of the fact that their one-time heroine was, after all, only a barbarian, there would arise a version of the legend which had formerly sung her praises, telling of her cruel murder by Pelias. At the same time, it would be realised that Pelias, for all his Poseidonian origin, is, when compared with Aeson, a mere bastard; and that the rightful ruler of Iolcus is Aeson the father of Jason. It would not be possible to suppress the old legend completely; but a reason for the occupation of the throne by Pelias, which they were once glad to have him occupy, is found in the story that he had seized it by force from Aeson, and had kept the latter in subjection. With it arises the story that, in the absence of his son, Aeson was driven to take his own life; and that Jason himself in his early days was sent to the cave of Chiron, so that his uncle would not be
able to harm him. Medea, under the influence of Here, the
divine patroness of her Corinthian double, has now the
authority of the goddess for her murder of Pelias; and
naturally she flies to Corinth with Jason after the murder.
The reason of Here's anger is that Pelias has angered her
by neglect of her worship.

This theory explains several obscure points.
It shows how Medea was adopted by Corinth, and became in
consequence a dreedess, and that too not only in Corinth
of her own children, but also of Pelias in Iolcus. It
explains how there are in existence two legends of Jason:
one, that the old men was rejuvenated by Medea when the
Argonauts returned, the other, that in their absence he was
driven by the machinations of Pelias to take his own life;
It explains the reason why there are two legends in currency
about Jason; now, on the one hand, he was able to take part
along with the Argonauts and the daughters of Pelias in the
funeral games over that monarch, and now, on the other hand,
he was so deeply involved in the guilt of his wife that he
was forced to flee the land in company with her. All
these variations of the legend it explains to a large extent;
in fact, on its acceptance, the absence of many of them
would be a matter for remark. Its essential postulate is
a purely Thessalian character for the legend in general,
and a Thessalo-Colchian character for Medea in particular;
and it has been shown in the earlier part of this
dissertation that these assumptions may safely be made.
The Real Medea.

The Murder of Absyrtus.

(1) The story of Absyrtus is not original to the main legend.

(2) In that separate story, the older version is that which makes him a child.

(3) The influence of Hesiodic legends, belief in immortality, and the "Escape" motif in folklore.

The story of Absyrtus, and of his brutal murder by his own sister, is one of the most irrelevant and most puzzling features of Argonautic mythology. We have seen the processes by which Medea, the kindly helper of Jason in his hour of need, took to the murder of her husband's kin. It is well-known, too, now in Corinth, when Jason was provided with a consort from the royal house to take the place of the now disgraced Medea, she took a natural but fiendishly devised revenge on her rival. Little light, however, is thrown by this on the causes which drove her to brother-murder:

Absyrtus is in the Argonautica a full-grown man. As becomes a son of the royal house and a grandson of Helió, he is preeminent among the Colonians, and is known to them as Phaethon, the "Glorious One." He lives in a separate palace of his own, and serves his father as charioteer. To him is entrusted the pursuit of the Argo; and he meets his doom at the hands of Jason and Medea, on an island at the mouth of the Ister in the Adriatic sea. He was buried there he was slain, on the island of Artemis; it was one of a group of islands whose inhabitants were known in Alexandrine times as Absyrtians.

This account of Apollonius is quite foreign to the tone of the early legend; in it, there is no sign of a brother of Medea at all. Aeetes, Jason and Medea are the only persons concerned; and the first sign of his existence is in Phercydes. Here it is Aeetes himself who pursues the Argo; and the story is that Jason advised Medea to take her brother from his bed, and that, during the pursuit, she dismembered his, and cast the pieces into the river, so that her father might stop to gather them.
up, and thereby give the Argonauts time to get away.

Much trouble has been caused in certain quarters by a scholium to the Medea of Euripides, to the effect that "In no passage does Euripides mention him by name; but Pherecydes does, Οίκο Τού Ζ. This has generally been taken to mean that Pherecydes called him Asyrtus, which would mean, presumably, the "unshaven one". Now if Medea was able to lift her brother from his bed, and carry him to the sea, he must clearly have been of an age when hair on the face would have been nothing short of a phenomenon, and when comment on the fact that he did not use a razor would be a piece of irrelevant impertinence. The genuineness of this name is accepted with a certain apparent reserve, but with ill-concealed joy by Knaack, as one "good prophet" deems Solis filium," — which incidentally Absyrtus is not — and without comment by the learned writers in Pöschel and Pehl-Wissowa. If that is what Pherecydes wanted to say, or rather, if that is what the scholiast wanted to say about Pherecydes, he has chosen a most peculiar way of saying it; and the fact that all the other references to Absyrtus occur in the seventh book of Pherecydes have given rise to the suggestion that the proper reading is Οίκο Τού Ζ. This is a most convincing emendation, which should certainly be accepted. This correction makes intelligible the comment of the scholiast, that whereas "Euripides makes no mention of him by name, either in the Medea or in the Hecuba, Pherecydes does so throughout the third book." The obvious implication is, that the name under which he passed in the pages of Pherecydes was the usual Asyrtus.

There is a slight variant in the account of Apollodorus and Zenobius, that it was not in the Pelasgian but in Ponto, that the murder actually took place. Latin writers, especially Ovid, identified a place on the Scythian coast as the spot where the limbs of Absyrtus were thrown up by the waves; — Aetetes must apparently have failed to collect some of them for all his care. This difference in locality is of purely literary origin, and is not for the purpose in hand of any importance. The essential feature remains, that the brother who was so wantonly slain by Medea was mere youth.
Corinth, however, was not content to have adopted the heroine of the legend of the Argonauts from Thessaly, and to have perverted her character: Her own influence was largely in the west, and it was natural that she should try to locate some of the principal scenes of her adopted legend among the scenes of her own activities. Her colonies on the western shore of Greece, in particular Corcyra, all were anxious to be identified in some way with the story. We have already seen how the task of altering the geography of the legend from one side of the world to the other was rendered easy by the "authorized version" of the Odyssey. From whatever source the framework of the story of the wanderings of Odysseus was taken, it is clear from the words in which Homer refers to Circe that some part at least of the return journey of the Argonauts was popularly located in the west. Desidius, as we have seen, was the first who definitely located her there. Supported by this interpretation of the poet's words, Corinth had every inducement to make her own colonists in the west the scene of some of the adventures of the Argonauts.

One of the episodes which Corinth fathered on her colonies was the death of Absyrtus. This came to be associated particularly with Corcyra and her dependencies; Gruppe supposes that the legend had been established there, previous to the arrival of the Corinthians, by Chalidian settlers; but this is a quite unnecessary assumption. The marriage of Jason and Medea was established in Corcyra; and the scene of the death of Absyrtus was sought to the north of the island.

This, of course, implies a complete change in the character of Absyrtus himself: He can no longer be the infant torn from his bed, but must now be a full-grown man; it is merely to be supposed that the Greeks troubled to carry the infant Absyrtus from one side of the world to the other, on the chance that he might some in useful for tearing to pieces somewhere. To him is now entrusted the pursuit of the Argo, as the representative of his father. When the legend made him give his name to the Absyrtian islands, it is not clear: Timaeus, we are explicitly told by the scholiast, was the first author to use the mythical
second arm of the Ister as a route to the Adriatic; and he appears to have been the authority followed by Apollonius: His date, however, is quite uncertain. The islands are supposed to be situated at the mouth of this arm. In the earlier legend, if they existed at all, they must have been much more indefinitely located. The name of the youth is derived by Miller from that of the islands where he met his death; but this is quite the wrong way round. It is rather they that take their name from the fact that the murder took place there.

This version of the death of Absyrtus is known only from the Argonautica, and from Hyginus: In both these cases, it is not Medea, but Jason, who commits the actual murder; Why this should be so, is not quite clear; the magic of the former would have been enough for any young man; It may have been because the guilt of Medea would appear to be lessened if the murder were committed by her only in the second degree. The narrative of Hyginus is to a great extent the same as that of Apollonius; but there are certain points of divergence. In Istrias in the Adriatic sea, according to Hyginus; Absyrtus overtakes the Argonauts and pursues them to Corcyra. In spite of the judgment of the king, he renewed the pursuit next day, and overtook them on the island of Minerva, where Jason was engaged in sacrifice. He was slain by Jason; and the Colonians who had accompanied him remained there, and founded a city called Absyrtis.

It is not said whether Hyginus regarded the pursuit by Absyrtus as having taken place through the Ister or not. It would be a natural inference, were it not for the account of Apollonius, with whom he so often agrees, that he regarded the Colonians as having reached Corcyra, like the second body of the Colonists in the Argonautica, by the usual route. It may well be, that the account which is followed by Hyginus represents the first stage in the development of the Corcyraean legend, and that, long before Timagetes had used the second arm of the Ister to bring Absyrtus and the Argonauts to the Adriatic, there was a story that Jason was diverted from the direct route home, and reached Corcyra with the Colonists hot on his trail. Such an account would be much more convincing than that of
This is, however, a later version than the one which makes him a child. Moreover, it destroys the original significance of his name, which is derived from ὦνδ and οὐρα. The early history of the nameless Corinthian heroine whose wedes supplanted would lead one to expect that the atrocity would be performed on the children of Wedes; but as she is still a virgin when Jason comes to Colchis, and the destined bride of Jason, a brother is invented to take their place.

There is an island in Pontos called Ἀσαρύα, which, according to Stephanus Byzantius, was originally known as Ἀβςυρύα. From this circumstance, and from the fact that in the Argonautica he serves his father as charioteer, and is called there and by Timonax by the alternative name of Phaethon, some authorities have sought to deduce that this name of Phaethon goes back to the legend of the other Phaethon, who fell from the chariot of the Sun. Kneissel in particular regards the name of Ἀσαρύα as forming a link; he assumes a legend in connection with this island, to which, on account of the similarity, the Greeks added the legend of Phaethon, and concludes that in both cases, the death of the principal character of the legend took place in the same way. This however has no authority. No doubt the legend of Phaethon suggested itself to Apollonius or his authority, when he lays stress on the fact that Abysurus, like the real Phaethon, serves his father as charioteer; but there is no reason to assume that the Pontic island Ἀσαρύα - which is spoken of by Arrian and Artemidorus, and is not mentioned by Scolax - was known at all to the Greeks till quite a late period. And, even if it were known to them from further back, there is no justification, solely on the ground of a statement in Stephanus that "there is an island in Pontos called Ἀσαρύα, formerly called Ἀβςυρύα," to assume in connection with it a legend of any kind, much less a pseudo-Pathanistic-barbarian legend. Kneissel's assertion offers still another instance of the Mr. Facing-Both-Ways policy; he wants to have the same Abysurus both in the character of the charioteer and as the murdered baby. Of these alternatives, the former is beyond
a doubt the latter, and is due entirely to Corinthian influence. Even the latter does not necessarily go back to the original stratum of the myth; it is more probably a comparatively late development of the main legend.

It appears, however, that Greek opinion enshrined in making Abystus the full brother of Medea, and although our authorities differ considerably in regard to the name of the mother, they are all consistent in making him the son of a different mother than in the case of Medea; Tzetzes alone, in the scholia to Lycophoron, makes Eidyia the mother not only of Medea but of Abystus as well. In face of all the other evidence against this view, one is disposed to regard it with suspicion. In the Neopactites, on p. 1342 fr. and 1344 fr., Medea is his mother; in Apollonius and Dioptryntus, it is Asterophila in the Oceanid; and in Sophocles, it is Nestria. The fact that in Homer, the latter, in the mother of the Helleads Lycophron and Phaethonius has worried Knaack not a little; but it probably arose from that very circumstance, that she had already borne children to Helios, that Sophocles chose her to be the mother of Abystus, when a second wife was required by the myth for Aeetes; also the mother of Phaethon would be a very plausible mother of Phaethon. To proceed, as Knaack does, on this evidence to prove that Abystus is the Morning Star, is quite uncalled-for."

So far, the object has been to show how easily the degeneracy which took place in the character of Medea could involve her in the crime of brother-murder; it remains to notice the influences, under which the crime itself assumed so revolting a character. Here Knaack has got on the right tack; "Be versi pausi fœda eoedes," he says. "quae ex Bacchiolis mythis translatae Pherecides prius narrasse videtur alicetit veteres fabulae." The dismembering of a human victim was a very prominent feature of the ritual of Dionysus, as far as the evidence of mythology goes; it was even carried out on the person of the god himself. Vossius relates that Zeus in the form of a serpent visited Persephone, who bore him Dionysus-Zagreus, a horned infant; the babe was scarcely born, when he ascended the throne of his father, and imitated him by brand-
- sampling the lightning in his hand.) He was attacked by the
Titan with knives, when he was looking at himself in a mirror
and after he had evaded their assault by assuming various
forms, he was finally cut to pieces in the form of a bull.
A similar story is told in connection with Crete, of how
Dionysus the bastard son of Zeus was cut to pieces, boiled,
and eaten by the treacherous Titans at the instigation of
Hera: According to one account, the severed limbs were
placed together by Apollo at the command of Zeus, and buried
on Parnassus; while a Théban variant recounts that he was
was torn to pieces at Thebes and buried there; Two kings,
moreover, we find to have been torn to pieces on account of
their opposition to the rites of Dionysus; Pentheus, like
the god himself, was murdered at Thebes, by frenzied Bacch-
ians; while Cycurges was torn to pieces by his horses:
For the same reason, Dionysus in Argos drove the daughters
of Protesilaus mad with drink, and cesed them to devour the flesh
of the children which they were carrying at their breasts:
It was not, however, only children who were sacri-
ficed in the ritual of Dionysus: full grown men were also
offered: In Cucus, according to Porphyrius, there was a
custom of rending a man in pieces, and sacrificing then to
Dionysus Dràdon; the same was done at Tenedos and Lesbos.
Plutarch, in the life of Theseus, relates that before
the battle of Salamis, Theseus was driven by the seer
to sacrifice three Persians of noble blood to Dionysus
Daestes:

Some light on the legend of the Titans is thrown
by an Athenian vase of the fourth century, which shows
Zagreus being devoured by the Titans in the presence of
Dionysus: The most significant feature is that they are
wearing the dress which is invariably used in Greek art to
characterize the inhabitants of Thracia; and it appears
from Hesychius that the word Titan means originally "King"
and nothing more: This accords well with the Thracian
origin of the orgiastic worship of Dionysus:

But it is not only the death of the god that is
told of in this cycle of legends: they tell also of his
resurrection: The accounts, of course, vary; there is
one in which he appears as a son of Zeus and Demeter, and
it is told that his mother put together his mangled limbs, and made him young again: Elsewhere, it is told that after his burial he arose and ascended to Heaven; or that Zeus restored him as he lay mortally wounded; or that Zeus swallowed the heart of Dionysus and begat him again by Semele: or that his heart was pounded up and given as a potion to Semele, who thereupon conceived him. These legends throw some light on other accounts of rejuvenation: Not only did Medea renew Jason and Jason, and pretend to do so with Peleus, but we find her also as a figure of Dionysiac mythology, carrying through with fire and sword the rejuvenation of the nurses of the god and their husbands: This recalls the restoration of Demos in the Knights of Aristophanes, and the boiling up of Pelops in a cauldron; and the similar process used by Thetis, to make her children immortal.

These legends, however, of atrocious murders are not based purely on wanton orgies; there is a deeper significance behind them: Not only is there, in the accounts of rejuvenation and restoration, an indication of a higher symbolical and religious meaning, the craving of the human soul for immortality and the life beyond the grave, but there are signs as well that they are influenced by the ideas which govern primitive rituals of fertility: It is for this reason that the figure of Demeter is so often found among them, as in the cases above mentioned, and in the legend of Demophon in particular. This theory has, of course, like so many others which are, at bottom quite sound, been pushed to quite unjustifiable extremes; There is no need to jump to the conclusion that every murder recorded in Greek literature is a degraded version of a fertility myth, or that the murdered man himself is the apotheosis of a dying god of vegetation. "One the less, one wonders if some curious remnant of this belief has not strayed into the legend of Absyrtus, where it is related by Sophocles in a fragment of the Erythraen that the limbs of Absyrtus were scattered "throughout the fields." Whatever else Absyrtus may be, and whatever may actually be at the back of this statement, there is no reason to prove on the strength of it that Absyrtus is the mortal counterpart of a dying god."
Thus from an examination of the evidence as attested by literary tradition, the following suggestions would appear to have been established:

2: The whole myth of Absyrtus is an addition to the original legend of the Argonauts, and dates from the time when the once worthy Medea had lapsed very badly indeed from grace.

3: At the time of his first introduction into the story, Absyrtus is a mere infant; and he is consistently described as the son of a different mother than is the case with Medea.

4: He was brutally murdered by Medea as a means of delaying the pursuit of her father; either in the house of Aeetes, as Euripides told, or in the early stages of the pursuit.

4: Later still than any of these is the form which represents him as a full grown man, entrusted with the pursuit in place of his father; this is due in general to Corinthian influence, and in particular to that of Corcyra.

5: Finally, though he is referred to by Timonax and Apollonius by the secondary name of Phaethon, it does not mean that in the original legend, he was the morning-star; Absyrtus is no more that than the Orphic Phaethon, whom Lactantius calls

οὔτως τέθησαν περιμνήσαντες τοῦ γενέτερον

There remain two curious versions of the death of Absyrtus which have not yet been discussed; for they are neither of any great importance: One is that of the Orphic Argonautica, which is a combination of accounts already mentioned. The hero is here, as in the earlier versions, dismembered by Medea; his limbs are thrown into the Phasis, and are carried round until they come to rest on the Absyrtam islands. The other is that of the Orator Leon, as told by the scholiast on Euripides, that he was killed by poison. This is of no great importance, except in so far as it illustrates the great influence which was exerted on later tradition by the exaggerated accounts of Medea's magic powers.

There is, however, another aspect from which a legend of this type can be regarded; that is from its position as a common episode in folk-lore; Medea dismembers
her brother and casts the pieces into the river with the intention of delaying the pursuit; we find that efforts of a similar character occur frequently in fairy stories.

In those where the romantic idea is prominent, there is almost consistently the abduction of the princess by the hero, and the pursuit of his daughter by the infuriated king. The king is infuriated because he is doubly deceived: first by the fact that his daughter has dared to help the hero in tasks which unaided he could never have accomplished; and secondly, by the hero adding to his crime by running away with the disobedient princess. Now although the daughter of the king may be herself a sorceress of no mean repute, as in the case with Medea, it follows by all the standards of folklore that the magic of her father is greater than hers, and that in fair an open pursuit he must catch up to the fugitives, whether the chase be over land or sea.

If they try to escape by land, he will pursue them with steps, it may be of seven paces each; if the pursuit is over the sea, he chases them in a boat, which, like that of Jason the Cottager’s son, can fold up when not required, so as to go into a pocket, or travel with unabated speed even in the teeth of a hurricane.

In short, the father, be he wise man, sorcerer, or ogre, must inevitably overtake them, unless strong measures are taken to delay him. One way to make him stop is to appeal to his cupidity; such instances are found in every child’s book of fairy tales. As an example of this in Greek mythology, there is the story of Atalanta and the golden apple, a legend where the pursuit of Atalanta is probably a graceful adaptation of an ugly folk tale, in which the pursuer was taken the place of some horrid monster.

Still better than this, is by some means or other to convince the would-be pursuer that his quarry has not yet started. The usual way is to leave some part of one’s person behind, - a drop of blood is sufficient, - which will speak with the voice of its owner and create the impression that the flight has not yet begun. There is a Swedish legend of this type, which tells of a maiden fleeing from the clutches of a mermaid, who took three dollars, and smeared them with blood from a cut which was made in her
The result was that they began to talk, and their voices in conversation were mistaken for her own; and gave her time to get away.

A variant of the first form, in which the quickness of the pursuer is appealed to by throwing something of value in his way, is what might be termed the "obstacle race."

In such legends, it occurs that the maiden throws down a hair-brush, and it turns into a forest; a pebble, and it becomes a mountain; a mirror, and it changes into a sea.

If a strikingly similar type is the form which sometimes tells how the maiden helps the hero by detaching some portion of her person, and turning it into something to serve in an emergency; thus we hear of a maiden with conveniently detachable fingers, in which the hero is able to climb in place of a ladder; and of another who allowed herself to be decapitated, and performed various feats of magic in this unsparing condition.

It would be an unprofitable speculation to attempt to define with any particularity how far any of these curious beliefs may underlie the legend of Absyrtus. But they do seem to throw some light on a problem, which from the standpoint of purely literary tradition, is insoluble; it is not possible on that line alone to make intelligible the transition from the unintentional murder of her children by the Corinthian figure, to the deliberate and filthily executed murder of her young brother or half-brother by Medea herself, a tradition which dates in prose literature to Pherecydes, and in verse to Semonides. But in the light of these three extensively known variants of the "escape" motif in folk-lore, taken in conjunction with the literary tradition, one can more easily understand how, as a result of progressive degradation in the character of Medea, the legends which were originally concerned only with the baulking of the pursuer came to be so corrupted as to end in the story of a deliberate and cold-blooded murder by Medea of her brother, by tearing his body into pieces, and casting them into the sea.
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The Greek Magicians.

(: A short sketch of the Greek magicians not already discussed, and the reasons for their possession of magic powers: )

With the deposition of Medea from her place in the legend as the kindly maiden and the benevolent restorer, there comes about also a change in the point of view from which she was regarded in her capacity as a magician.

For the exercise of her art, Medea has every qualification: she is, in the first place, a woman; she is, moreover, of Colchian origin, and what is more important still, she is, by virtue of her Colchian birth, a foreigner. Among the Greeks, the practice of magic by one of their own number was regarded as something not quite seemly; and the result of their unwillingness to be found using it themselves resulted in this, that the expert in magic was almost always a foreigner. This was further accentuated by their secret respect for the foreign cult; for it, by virtue of its unorthodoxy, was from the Greek point of view not religion but magic.

Very potent, too, were the magic powers which the primitive inhabitants of any country were supposed to possess. Such powers were attributed by the Greeks (to the Greeks) to the Colchians, who were, according to Strabo, the earliest inhabitants of Rhodes; to the Dactyls, the masters of music and medicine, who were the first to dwell on the isles Cretean or Parygian Ida; and to the Cretans. These last belong to Greece proper; they came from Ibernia, and were considered to be the founders of prophecy with its esthetic states of mind. Their powers may be due to some extent to the fact that Ibernia was at one time a sufficiently remote and barbarous country to be regarded as foreign; but they are based more securely on their claim to be the first inhabitants of that land.

But the sage from whom in the Odyssey Helen receives the οὐσίως φάρσον is Polydemos, a woman of Egypt, which Homer describes as the land of drugs both good and evil. Medea, the greatest of all magicians, is herself a foreigner, for she comes from the distant country of the
rising sun; the same is true of Circe, though Homer would seem to have located her in the equally distant west. In
the Pharmacopoeia of Theophrastus, Sinetoe announces that she has in her possession many drugs, the use of which
she has learnt from an Assyrian mistress. The native-born practitioner, in short, has absolutely no chance against
the foreigner, and was almost completely suppressed; it is only here and there that scanty traces of native Greek
magicism have managed to survive.

The legend of Demone gives an instance of the
native-born expert in drugs, who has only just been able
to avoid extinction. It is told by Apollodoros, that she
advised Alexander not to sail to Troy; she had learned the
art of prophecy from Phesia, and knew what his fate would be.
Failing to persuade, she gave him the advice at least to
speed to Troy if he should be wounded, since she alone could
cure him. He was shot by Philoctetes with the bow of
Hercules, and returned to her as me had said; but she
remembered that she had a grievance, and at first refused
to heal him. So he was carried to Troy and died; but
Demone repeated and came in search of him, bringing with
her the healing drugs. She found him dead, however, and
in her grief she hung herself — a stern example to all of
her sex who carry their place too far. Her magic, or
rather knowledge of medicine, comes from Phesia, who is closely
connected with the Decylis, the masters of music and medecine.

In two occasions, Melampus was brought to
exhibit his knowledge of prophecy and medicine. It is told
by Apollodoros, that when he was confined in a cell, he
happened to overhear the conversation of some worms which
were gnawing at a beam, to the effect that it was about to
collapse. He asked to be transferred to another cell,
and shortly afterwards, the old one fell in. His captor,
realising that he was indeed a man of magic, released him. He
further invited him to procure the solution of a most
urgent family problem, and to tell by what means his son
might be enabled to beget children. Melampus, through
information conveniently received from a vulture, was able
to tell the father that once, when gelding rams, he had laid
the knife, still covered with blood, beside his son, who ran away in terror; and that, after that, he had stuck the knife into the sacred oak, where it had now become overgrown by the bark. He advised the father to find the knife and scrape off the rust, and give it to his son in the form of a drink for the next ten days. This curious drink, the ancestor of the modern "iron tonic," had the desired effect; it is interesting further to note the parallel between this story and modern psycho-analytic ideas.

In brief in the same passage, and in greater detail in another, it is described how he healed the madness with which Dionysus had afflicted the women of Argos, and caused them to flee to the hills. He is there described as a prophet, and the "first to discover the process of healing by means of drugs and purifications," the means by which he acquired the power of prophecy and taking auspices are described in the paragraph which precedes the above-mentioned story of Iphicles. Still more noteworthy is the fact that he is a son of Anytus, the brother of Aeson and Phereus, and was born in Pylos; that is to say, he came of a Thessalian stock. Thessa is the home "per excellente," of magic and magicians, to which come also the great sages themselves.

Also the wise and kindly Prometheus, the giver of all good gifts to men, has certain powers: From his blood, according to the narrative of Apollonius, there grew up a wonderful plant whose roots had magic qualities.

The first known mention of this plant is that which is made by Apollonius; and hence the reason why it is described by him at such length is that he is the first to speak of it at all. The scoliast knows of no other reference to it, and says that Apollonius is alone in his description of its marvellous powers. It is alluded to by Propertius, and described by Valerius Messala; the latter, however, does little more than paraphrase the passage of Apollonius.

Ausonius calls it aconite. Nothing is known of it previous to its description by Apollonius, and nothing is added to that description by later writers. The magic powers thus attributed to Prometheus are partly due to his
As was the case with the Curetes, Daedyle and Telchines — and partly as in cases already discussed, to his elder origin, for he is a son of the Titan Iapetus.

The magic which is generally found in vogue in ancient Greece falls into three types, άγωγή, γνωστία, and θαύματα. The former refers in its strictest sense to "the religion, learning, and occult practices of the Persian Magi, or priests of the sect of Zaraster;" it was accepted, however, at least as early as the time of Aristotle, as an expression for magic in general. The second, according to some authorities, refers properly to nothing more than the trade of the professional sorcerer; but it appears to mean rather the "necromancy," the raising-up of the dead; this practice is best known in Greek literature from the Perse of Aeschylus. Such necromancy, as Lobek shows, occupies an intermediate position between magic and religion in Greece; it is of a religious character when used in a family cult or sanctioned in that of a hero; but under any other circumstances, it was magic of the most formidable character. A similar position is that of divination. Sometimes this seems to be nothing else than a synonym for magic; yet it is freely employed in officially sanctioned processes of divination by means of dreams. A distinction can be drawn only on the basis of official recognition.

The third type of magic is the one which is of especial interest because of its connection with Helen. As is implied in the name, it consists in the use of drugs; but these are not necessarily of a malignant character. Homer, for instance, refers to them continually as healing agents; and he is careful to make it quite clear that the opposite is meant. Instances of their use are the balsam which Helen gave to Theseus; the beneficent drugs which Circe mixed in the food of her victims in order to turn them into swine; and the occasional use of them in the form of potions by Helen; their use is generally accompanied by incantations. As external applications, their use is still common. It is a salve which Circe uses to restore her victims to their original form: and it is by the same means
in the Argonautica that Medea makes Jason immune to the dangers of the fiery bulls; and lulls to sleep the guardian dragon of the fleece; - in technical parlance, the latter is an "aspiration." Similar in character is the constantly recurring poisoned smelt; and the salve, an alabaster box of myrrh, which, in the narrative of Helia, was given by Aperdite to Phaen, and by means of which she became the most beautiful of men, beloved of all the ladies of Mitylene; a circumstance which makes the unpleasant manner of his death as a common adulterer the more regrettable. The most exaggerated instance is that of Penelip in the Metamorphoses of Apollonius; this lady had a box which contained a number of smaller caskets; in each of these was a salve, which, when properly applied over the whole person, could effect a different transformation.

It is pleasant to find that the magic wand of the modern entertainer can be traced back as far as Homer. It is used by Circe to make the transformation of her victims into swine, after they have swallowed her drugs; and by Athene, to bring about the rejuvenation of Alcyoneus. It is the wand by which Hermes lulls to sleep or wakens those whom he wills, and though there is no definite mention of it in literature in connection with Medea, it occurs continually in art. The method by which in the Argonautica she lulls the dragon to sleep is curious; she uses a spray of juniper to sprinkle the drugs on the monster's eyes, accompanying the operation with the usual incantations. It has escaped the notice of the commentators that, in this apparently irrelevant sprig which is brought into such prominence, we are meant to see the magic wand of the sorceress. The poet, however, in his usual anxiety to leave two stories where formerly there was only one, has obscured its function by putting it to an additional use. Properly, it has no place in the preliminary ritual, and should be used only to mark the effect; here, however, is is used in the former, and is used again to mark the effect as well.
Hecate and the Magic Art.

(Magic in the Argonautica is seen to be contrary to the usual idea, under religious protection; and the development of Medea is discussed.)

It comes as something of a surprise to the reader of the Argonautica to find that magic is in that book quite definitely under divine protection. Here, there is a patroness of the magic art in Hecate; Medea in her priestess, consecrated to spend her days not in the palace of her father but in the temple of the goddess. It was only by special dispensation of Hecate, we are told, that she remained in the palace on the day when the Argonauts arrived at Colchis and sent a deputation to Hecate. Medea was taught a great deal by Hecate. It was through her that she was skilled in the use of drugs; from her, she had learned the use of all the magic herbs which the earth and the flowing water produce, and with them to calm the blast of unwearyed fire, to check in a trice the cassevered rushing rivers in their racey course, and to blind the paths of the stars and the bearded moon. In the fourth book, the moon complains in her own person that many a time she has been brought down from heaven, in order that in the darkness of night Medea might be able to use her charms as she wished. She exults over the secret flight of Medea with Jason, saying that some god of affliction has sent him to be her war. It is on Hecate that Medea calls when she invokes the aid of sleep against the guardian dragon of the fleece. It is by grace of Hecate that she is able to carry the rushing hounds of night, and to bring against Talos the visions that afflict him. It is in the name of Hecate, conjointly with that of her grand sire Helios, that she makes her oath to Aretes in Phaeacis; when she implores the protection of the queen against the Colchians who have come to take her away to her father; "Be my witness the holy light of Helios," she cries, "and may witness the maiden who wanders by night, the daughter of Perseus." Jason is well aware of this. It is in the name of her own patroness that he wisely makes his appeal to Medea for her assistance in the trials; and it is on Hecate that he too must call, when he performs the rites preliminary to
the application of the magic slave.\footnote{4.249.} The last act of Medea, when she leaves her father's house and before she wanders into the unknown, is to land in Paphlagonia, and there to offer thanks to Hecate for having enabled her to bring her lover safely through the trials, and to propitiate her with a sacrifice which the poet does not venture to describe. The scholiast cites the account of Nymphis, that Medea not only offered sacrifice to Hecate in Paphlagonia, but also built a temple in her honour as well. So too it is by Hecate her mistress that the rejected Medea of Euripides swears to take her revenge: \"I swear by the mistress whom beyond all others I revere, by Hecate who dwells in the inner shrine of my heart, that none of them shall vex my soul, save to his hurt.\" It is not without significance that it is beside the temple of Hecate that the first meeting between Jason and Medea is arranged to take place; in the words of the \textit{romantic de Mirandol}, it is \"as though we wished to present her lover to the goddess, and to put her love under the divine protection.\" \footnote{Le Mythologie de Mirandol, p. 312.}

Hecate in the \textit{Argonautica} makes an appearance which is fully in keeping with her position as patroness of magic. When Jason and performed the rites appointed by Medea, he kindled the logs for the sacrifice, and called on Eris to aid him in the trial; \"and when he had called her, he withdrew; and from the utmost depths the goddess heard him, and came to receive the offerings of the son of Aeson.\" Around her, horrible serpents entwined their coils among the oaken shoots; there was a gleam of countless torches and all around her with piercing howls bayed the hounds of hell. All the seers' hearts trembled at her sight; and the nymphs of the nereid and of the river trebled in terror, as many as danced around that meadow of Amaranthine Pandias.\footnote{1.121.} And the son of Aeson too was seized with fear.\" The authority followed by Apollonius in the description of this terrifying appearance is shown by the scholiast to have been Sophocles, who makes the chorus of the \textit{Euripides} invoke her in the following words: \"O sacred fire, sacred sword of Hecate, who is the guardian of the ways, which she bears on Olympus in her ministrations (reading with Pearson \textit{promolougo}) and on earth when she haunts the holy crossings
of the ways, covered with ice, and with the coils of serpents entwined round her shoulders." This crown of serpents seems to be a purely literary invention;—Gruppe denies that she is represented in art either as wreathed with serpents, or in serpent form—but it has been quite ousted by the proposal of Blaydes to transfer her attendant animals to a higher sphere, and by reading in place of ὧδως, ὧδον, to give the goddess a truly terrifying garland of hell-bounds.

It is by no means clear by what processes Hecate became patroness of the magic art: She is not referred to either in the Iliad or Odyssey; and even in the Hymns, the first mention of her is in the Hymn to Demeter, which must at any rate be later than the establishment of the mysteries at Eleusis. In the Theogony of Hesiod, there is a long passage of some 40 lines in which her praises are sung with considerable fulsome ness, but which is generally admitted to be an Orphic interpolation. There are some authorities, notably Pearson, who believe that Hecate is a figure of Thracian Origin, introduced under Orphic influence. Robert, however, gives excellent reasons for regarding the name as nothing more than the feminine form of the adjective ἱερός, which occurs so frequently as an epithet of Apollo: He regards it as an epithet applied in the first place to his sister Artemis; and this view is supported by the fact that in Athens, Delos and Epidaurus, Artemis is actually worshipped by this name, and that in the Supplement of Pherecydes, she is invoked by the chorus as Artemis Hecate. From its original significance as an epithet of Artemis, the word develops into the name of a separate deity; and it is noticeable, that a close relationship is maintained between the two goddesses, and that the parentage of Hecate, though it is seriously given, varies always in relation to that of Artemis.

Like Artemis, Hecate came to be regarded as the patroness of doors and ways; and sacrifices were offered to her in the latter capacity at places where three roads met. Such sacrifices were referred to by Aristophanes in the Plutus, when he says that monthly offerings were made to Hecate at the cross roads, but were usually snapped up by beggars; But these places are connected with unsavoury
notions as being the meeting place of spirits and men, especially in the light of the moon when all is still. It is from this circumstance that all the later ideas have arisen, of her position as a chthonian goddess and protectress of sorcery, in its benevolent and malevolent forms alike. Parnell would seem to have 'put the cart before the horse' in his assumption that she was originally a goddess of crossways, very likely because she was a mistress of ghosts and the crossways were haunted.

Magic, accordingly, in the Argonautica is represented as a definitely organised branch of religion: just as in the Iliad, medicine is a branch of religion under the protection of the great Asklepios, so also is magic in the Argonautica, under the protection of Hecate. It has not, however, been able to free itself from the superstitious notions which have been accumulating since time immemorial around the forbidden art: it is fully recognised that it is not a thing to be undertaken lightly or by any one. Its priestesses are ledes, and much other χαρακτήρες, as are accustomed to go out at night in the search for corpses and roots of irresistible magic powers: They are under the protection of Hecate in such the same way as the sorcerer of the modern fairy tale is supposed to be under the protection, and very often also by the power of the Devil.

Apollopolis is careful to present Hecate as a figure with her own individuality, unlike his imitator Virgil, who confuses inextricably the figures of Diana, Trivia and Hecate. Also in regard to magic, he avoids all expressions which are obviously not of an early date: he confines himself to those which have the sanction of the Iliad or Odyssey. He avoids, for instance, such a word as μάγος, which, though it had the authority of Sophocles and Euripides, and obviously external associations, and whose introduction into the vocabulary of Greece dates in all probability only from the time of the Persian Wars.
(All the processes of the magic Art were put into practice by Medes; the decline of her character in this respect is parallel to her degredation as the heroine of the Legend of the Golden Fleece.)

All the branches of the magic art were practiced by Medes. She could, as we have seen, draw down the noon from heaven; this was regarded as an accomplished peculiar to Thessalian witches. Plato in the Corges speaks of "Thessalianwomen who drew down the noon;" and Aristophanes makes Strepsilades propose in "Clouds" to hire a Thessalian witch to bring the noon down, and prevent it from bringing round the day when payment of interest was due. Remember, according to Pliny, represented at length in the "Theselies"- the charms and incantations by which the women of Thessaly were able to perform that rite; and from the belief that the charms injured those who indulged in it, arose the proverb of "drawing the noon down on one's own self." Many parallels from our own literature are collected by Rogers in his note on the passage of Aristophanes.

The ritual of calling down the noon affords an excellent example between religion and magic; for to call down the noon was magic pure and simple, whereas the absolutely parallel practice of calling out the gods from a conquered city, so beloved by the Romans, was an official process, and therefore religious.

Medes was also accustomed to go out at night in search of corpses, under cover of darkness. Apollodorus, unfortunately, does not tell us whether the virtue of a male or female corpse was greater: in view of the Colchian custom of burying women in the ground, and suspending the corpses of men from the tops of willow and cedar trees, it would have been interesting to know whether she preferred to climb or to dig.

Her powers, at any rate, were mainly based on the use of drugs. These were extracted from the roots of any kinds of plants, - from the root in particular, because it is in closest contact with the earth and the underworld.
The proper method of gathering then was a matter of considerable importance. It is described in detail in the passage which describes the cutting of the dread Titanian root. Seven times she bathed in running water, in the darkness of night; and seven times, clad in dark clothes, she called on Erino in her four capacities as nurse of youth, the wanderer by night, the goddess of the underworld and the mistress of the dead. Still more complicated are the instructions which Jason receives from Medea, as to the ritual which he must perform before he applies the charms; it is founded, to a large extent, on those which Circe in the Odyssey gave to Odysseus before his journey to the other world. He must begin the ritual at the point where the night divides equally, when the stars of Arctus and Hecate have declined. Like Medea, he must first bathe in running water—the number of times is not specified—but the significance of this is, will shortly appear, in connection with purification. Like her, he must wear dark clothes and must go alone; and precisely as Odysseus did, he must dig a ditch. He must sacrifice a female lamb, and lay it raw and entire upon the bottom of the ditch; then he must pour a libation of honey and call upon Hecate. Finally, he must leave the scene of the sacrifice without turning back or looking round; this done, he may proceed to apply the charm itself.

The importance of these observances in the ritual of the dead and of the chthonian powers will shortly be discussed. Here it is of interest to notice that the sacrifice of milk and a female lamb to Hecate is not unique; for the usual offering is a dog. This departure from the customary ritual serves to mark the importance of the occasion. It is also worthy of notice that, in the parallel passage of Sophocles, Medea herself is made to conform to the ritual of sacrificing to the chthonian powers with averted head and leaving the place without looking back.

Great and mighty sorceress that she is, the powers that she invokes are greater and mightier than she, and she must not venture to look upon them.

Her powers, moreover, are exercised not only on objects close at hand, but on those at a distance.
names of incantations and charms scattered to the breezes; charms whose power could have brought down the wild beast from the mountains, she is able to lure her brother to his doom. It is on the same principle that Sisemne in Theocris uses the wriggles to bring her defaulting lover to her door: The most striking exhibition of her power is made in connection with Talos. She propitiates with incantations the Spirit of Death, the Devourer of Life, that should dwell upon the living. Kneeling in supplication, she called on them to arise with incantations and thrice with prayers. Then, stealing her soul to mischief, she cast the evil eye of hatred upon him; she gnashed her bitter anger at him, and sent forth deadly phantasms against air in the fury of her rage.

This is a natural development of the idea which gave rise to the version of the Kovo vassal already mentioned; there Medea stands with her magic breast and brings the whole force of her spells and mesmeric powers to bear on the unfortunate Talos, who is swooning away in the arms of the Discorri. We have seen in connection with the Cretan Medea that this is best explained by the possession of the "evil eye." Here proximity is of no importance to the sorceress of the Argonautica.

It must have been only a very particular circumstance that would find Medea in want of the charms appropriate to the occasion. Even when she was confronted with the unique requirements of Jason, she was able to rise at once to the emergency; for the dread Ithemen root, the one charm which had the power to protect a man from fire and sword, was already in her possession, and did not even have to be sought for. It was among the contents of her magic breast.

This breast of drugs will not readily be forgotten by any one who has read the third book of the Argonautica; for it is introduced in the course of what is undoubtedly the finest passage in the whole four books, and, indeed, one of the best things in Greek literature. The poet, for here at least the much-abused Apollonius is indeed a poet—has been describing the thoughts that surged in the mind of Medea as she lay sleeplessly tossing
on her bed, torn between her desire to help the men who had fired her heart, and fear for her own reputation. Finally she resolves to take one of her own poisons, and to end the agony by death. She went to fetch her casket, in which lay many drugs, some for healing, and others for killing. She dropped it on her knees, and wept. She dressed her bosom with the ceaseless tears which flowed in torrents as she sat, bitterly bewailing her own fate. She longed to choose a deadly drug and swallow it; and she was actually loosening the bands of the casket to take it forth, unhappily said. But all at once there came over her heart a deadly fear of mortal deeds, and for a while she held back in speechless horror, while all around her thronged visions of the pleasing scenes of life. She thought of all the pleasant things that fell to the lot of the living, and of her own happy companions, as a maiden would; the sun grew sweeter than ever to look upon, for in truth her soul was yearning for them all. Changed by the promptings of her heart, she put the casket again upon her knees, and wept no more in purpose. Powerful as her sorrows were proved to be, there was not one in all her great array strong enough to free the great enchantress from the pains of love.

It is from this same casket of drugs that we have won her reputation for good and evil in classical literature. Apollonius and Apollodoros both tell how she used them to bring slumber upon the dragon which was guarding the fleece, and it is well known from Herodotus how by their agency she has brought about the destruction of the Corinthian princess who had dared to expel her in the effects of her husband. The master Leon, as has been already observed, is our authority for a statement that it was not, as usually appears, Jason, who murdered Absyrtus, but Medea who destroyed him with her poisons. It is related in the epithalamion of Apollodoros, that when she came to Athens, Medea maliciously persuaded Aegeus to offer Theseus a draught of poison, and was only prevented in her evil design at the last moment, by the sudden recognition by the father of his son. The scholiast on the Clouds of Aristophanes records that in her flight from Theseus, Medea lost her casket of
drugs, and that they took root and grew in great profusion, to the eternal reprobation of Theseus as a land of magic drugs.

The most curious legend of all is one which is attributed to Hyllus by the smalllest of the Argonauts, to the effect that Medea bore a grudge against the women of Lemnos, to gratify which, she threw into the island a drug as she was sailing past, which caused them all to smell offensively and lose favour in the eyes of their husbands. This is a very obvious adaptation of the older legend, made in order to bring it into connection with the great Medea.

There are, of course, one or two cases where the charms and talents of Medea are found put to better use. Thus there is the tradition recorded by Servius, that she went to Italy and taught the Hannibals the art of fascination and debilitating serpents; as a result of this, she was worshipped by them and identified with the Bella Dem. Nicodorus, too, tells how by means of her drugs, she cured the wounded heroes and stopped Hercules from his madness. Instances of this sort, however, are but merely set in with the later writers. By processes already discussed, it has come about that Medea is almost invariably depicted as the evil sorceress. It was only to a limited number, a number which would become more limited as time went on, that she would remain attractive in her original character as heroine, prophetess and giver of beneficent charms.

The kind of magic exhibition that was expected of a sorceress by the later Greeks and Romans is clearly shown by the description given by Tullius of a witch at work; in it are concentrated all the forms of the magic art that are associated with Medea: "I have seen her drawing down the stars from heaven, and turning by her spells the course of the rushing river. By her incantations she cleaves the ground, fames the spirits forth from their toasts, and summons the bones down from a pyre not yet cold. Now by her magic cries she holds in her control the bottlings of the grave, and now she sprinkles them with milk and commands them to depart; she drives the clouds from the frowning heavens at her desire, and summons at will the snow in the summer skies. She, and she alone, new say, holds the secret of Medea's deadly herbs; she alone has learned to her will the burning sounds of decate."
"MEDEA."

Part 4.

The Purification of Medea.
The Purification of Medea.

On arrival at Aea, the Argonauts found Circe engaged in a ceremonial purification on her own behalf. She was bething her hair and garments in sea-water, in order to dispel the terror of a greatly dream which she had been visited in the night. She bade the heroes follow her; but they "remained steadfast at the bidding of Jason's son. He drew with him the Colchian sword, and they went together by the same road till they reached the hall of Circe. She, perplexed at their coming, bade them sit on burnished seats; but they sped silent and speechless to the hearth, and sat there, as is right for wretched suppliants to do. Medea hid her face in both her hands, and Jason fixed in the ground the mighty hilted sword, with which he had slain the son of Leetes; they did not raise their eyes to meet her look, but their eyelids covered them. Straightway Circe perceived that it was the doors of exile and the guilt of blood. Therefore, in reverence for the ordinance of Zeus, the god of suppliants, who, though his anger is great, is yet a mighty aid to the murderer, she began to offer the sacrifice by which ruthless suppliants are cleansed when they approach the hearth.

1. First, to stone for the irreparable. 2. The deed of blood, she held over their heads the offering of a calf, whose teats were still swelling from the young just delivered from her womb; and, revering its neck, she sprinkled their hands with the blood. Then she made propitiation with other aims—offerings, calling on Zeus the Cleanser, the protector of suppliants, who are guilty of murder. Her attendants, the veiled nymphs, ministered all things to her. Here forth from the palace all the defilements together; and Circe within, standing by the hearth, kept turning the sacrificial cakes and the expiatory offerings, uttering the prayers that accompany wretched sacrifices, so that the night stay the terrible Furies from their wrath, and so that Zeus himself might be smiling and gentle to them both, whether it should

1. See the translation unnecessarily, "alter";
2. The word "propitiation" is still unexplained."
be with heads stained with blood of a stranger that they
implored his grace, or as kinmen stained with a kinmen's
blood."

This passage is one which, on account of its
fullness of description, is of considerable interest for
the history of purification; and as it is the theme of this
part of the dissertation, it seemed advisable to quote it
in this point at full: It is of interest to compare with
it the gloriously copious, though none too accurate, rendering
of Greene, the first English translator of the Argonautica. 1
They, lost to speech, the hearth's low centre stirs,

\textit{Barn of the wretched suppliants' holy hall.}

Came, in each hand her face, the royal maid
Christene solemnly: he the noisy sword displayed
In Christene's hand, that pierced the Colchian boy;

\textit{If I'm}

their radiant eyes no lifted look employ.

\textit{If my} encounters well the scene of murder they,

those Korres to 


\textit{Sever'd the justice of eternal love,

Those landless are the fiends of slaughter grave,

Though, still the suppliants' shield, as spreads the rites

Sacrificed, to purge the guilty night}

\textit{3:2}

If such for pardon at the hearth we stand:

The close offering still'd, with joy bearing and

She prostrates at their feet, to execute the crime

Of as inverted with the breath of Life:

The new-born offering of the Male her spoil,

Those swelling teats proclaim the mother's toil.

\textit{Her arm distain'd with gore, the rev'rend knife

Wield to their ways, expels the victor's life;

She pours to purifying love the strain

To whom our suppliants wonders plead in vain.

\textit{Her failed train, the household tears the eye,

Sustain the mixed afflicts from a mistress' eye.}

\textit{With notes, that boast no treasures of the wine,

The enter vot'ry 

\textit{loads

\textit{To bid the vengeance of the buried cease.}

\begin{footnotes}

1: The Argonautica Expedition, translated from the Greek of Apollonius Rhodius

2: The text could not here confidedly with \\

\textit{Ephraim (stemm) in the place of Ephraim (stemm) Greene p. 361) ! !}
\end{footnotes}
And so the silent from of Love to peace;  
If drenched their ruthless hands in alien gore,  
Or gilt of kindred blood their vows deplore."

The ritual of purification from murder, then, as it is described by Apollonius, consists of the following parts:

1. The murderer enters, fixes his sword on the point in the ground, and sits speechless and with downcast eyes at the necrota.

2. The person to whom he turn appeals for purification takes a young pig; the expiatory holds, cut his heads — this has been totally misunderstood by Greene — and the neck of the victim is so cut that the blood shall fall on his outstretched hands.

3. Invocation is made of Zeus the Cleanser, and 

4. The Aptrite, the defiled elements, are carried out; these consist for the most part of the blood of the victim which is poured off the expiatory's hands.

5. The celebrant proceeds to burn ἁρώνια, and to offer wineless libations; their purpose is to pacify the Furies, and to win for the expiatory the favour of Zeus Ἀπολλώνιος.

With this form of the ritual, then, in mind, we may proceed to a consideration of the problem of blood-guiltiness in general, and of specific instances which will throw a good deal of light on the significance of the processes employed by Circe in the purification of Jason and Medea from the death of Meirton.
Purification in general is known to Homer; but he does not refer to purification from the guilt of murder: It is probable that the later ideas are a reminiscence and not a fresh growth.

It has been maintained by some writers that the ritual of purification is entirely non-Hebraic. This, however, is a very strong statement, which can be shown to be contrary to the facts; for Homer gives examples both of private and public purification.

An undoubted instance of a public purificatory ceremonial is given in the first book of the Iliad. The 

Aulaco was cleansed with plague; and a purification of the people is ordered by Agamemnon. This done, sacrifice is offered to Jove. The words used in the description of the ceremony are important:


Not the washing of the hands as a preliminary to sacrifice in a ceremony well-known to Homer. This too is a preliminary to sacrifice; but it is something more than the ordinary ceremonial with its ideas of personal cleanliness. By Aulaco is implied not merely ordinary grime washed off the hands, but there is a further suggestion that the defilements which are thrown into the sea are tainted with the curse or names from which the plague has arisen; and the word applies equally to the materials with which the soldiers in the camp purified themselves and their belongings, and to the polluted elements which were removed in the course of purification. In fact, the throwing of the infected Aulaco into the sea was tantamount to consigning the plague itself to the waters. It is, however, considerably more than mere sympathetic magic: it is on a different level than the Irish practice of sending a kitten into a child’s bedroom to take away the needles; as a preliminary to a sacrifice, it taxes in itself something of a higher religious value: It is, in short, not merely a sanitary act; it is a ceremonial of definitely religious purgation.

In the same way as these defilements are consigned to the waters of the sea, so we find later in the Iliad, with
regard to the boar on which Agamemnon took the catum-curse in respect of Erisin, that, after its neck had been wrung by the king, it was cast by Telanybuly into the sea. G ease, in his commentary on this passage, says that "the catum-victims is neither burnt nor eaten, but devoted to the Nordic gods:" but this interpretation would seem to be excluded by Iosar's own description of it as a βοῦς λυθείς. It would be very attractive, certainly, if we could see in the casting away of the animal, male except for the ritual severing of the neck, the usual offering of unenured victims to the powers below; but such an offering was normally a holocaust. Iosar, at least, in calling it "food for TIMES," cannot possibly have regarded it in this light; one would require stronger evidence than this to attribute to him a belief in imithnymomiotic catum-gods.

It is best to follow 1ernell 1. in regarding the custom of casting away the boar as parallel to the case of the λύθος. The pleasant feasting andorriment, which are the usual accompaniments to the isaeitic sacrifice, are here absent, not because of any association with cattum-ritual, but because the victim is infected with the spirit of a curse expressly stated, and is therefore unfit for human consumption.

The next notice, further, in connection with catum-victims, that in the third book of the Fied, Priam actually puts them into his chariot and carries them off. The excellent rexercizes that it was customary for natives to bury the catum-victims, and for strangers to cast them into the sea, but these sooner to be deductions of his own from the passage already quoted. Persuaded also remarks that at Nola, it was a custom for athletes to take their catum over the cat pieces of a boar, and though he unfortunately forgot to point out was done with the pieces afterwards by the authorities, he says that it was a custom with the ancients that as raised on which on catum had been taken should not be eaten by man. In support of this, he quotes from the Iliad the above-mentioned passage about Agamemnon.

---

This would seem to favour Rennell's view, but it should be noticed in the case of the curious Hebrew and Greek custom of passing between the pieces of the slain animal or standing upon them, that the sacramental or purificatory explanation which is suggested by Robertson-Smith and supported by Fraser is the most satisfactory. Thus a


e xecution of purification was to cut a dog in two and pass between the pieces; and a similar ritual was observed in the purification of the sacrificial army. In the capture of Soloi, a human victim was used; he slew the king's wife Nestor, cut her in pieces, and sent the army to search between the pieces into the city. Probably the purification was rendered more effective than ever by the use of a human victim.

We have seen, in the purification of the camp, an illustration from closer of a public cathectic ceremony, but we find that purification of a private character was also known to him. Thus in the Odyssey, Odysseus after the slaughter of the suitors purified his hall with fire and salamander. It would be rem to attempt to define with any particularity now the sense of religious impurity is at the bottom of this action; it is possible that it may be a purely sanitary act. The former idea, however, is clearly shown in the statement of Hector that "he来临s from pouring a libation to Zeus with unwashed hands; it is not right for one whose hands are stained with blood and prime to pray to the Son of Cronus." It is in accordance with this feeling that Achilles washes his hands in water before raising them in prayer to Zeus; that Telenaus washes his hands in sea-water before he prays to Athena; and that the κάθρυ  is found on several occasions in the Odyssey in association with libation and sacrifice.

Thus it would appear that purification of a strictly ceremonial character was firmly established in Egyptian ritual. In respect of purification in general, however, the Egyptian hero seems to have taken his duties very lightly. For one thing, he was not ghost-ridden.

1. Folk-Lore in the Old Testament 1:49.
like the later Greeks; and it is noticeable that it is with
the vengeance of the gods, not his own, that the ghost of
Olympos threatens Telemachus, if he should fail to give his
body the rites of burial. "For the Sirens here, "in short
the underworld and its ghosts had comparatively little
terror and interest."

As a direct consequence of this attitude towards
the other world, it follows that the blood feud also had
comparatively little terror and interest for him. There
is one occasion where the silence of Homer is valuable, and
gives positive evidence on this point. It is in the Odyssey;
Telemachus had slain a man of his own tribe, and had fled
in consequence from his home. He approached Telemachus at
a time when that hero was engaged in sacrifice, and asked
for his assistance. There is no hint of any stein attempting
to him, or suggestion that his presence would in any way
pollute the sacrifice, as would most assuredly have
occurred to a Greek of a later period. Telemachus, however,
takes him on board without question. Odysseus, too, in the
fictitious tale which he relates to the disguised Athena,
says that he had to flee from Crete, after he had killed
Orysiax on a dark night; and he tells without any feeling
of shame of the way in which he lay in wait for his victim
at the roadside, and treacherously springing out and
murdered him. Telemachus, also, killed Liogynias, his
father's uncle, and had to flee from the wrath of Xanthe
to Ithaca; and both Telemachus and Athena in the Odyssey hold
up to the admiration of Telemachus, as an example of a faithful
son, the case of Odysseus, who killed Aegetodes, his father's
murderer; and Telemachus further remarks, what an excellent
thing it is when a son survives to avenge his father's
death.

Even Penelope, who slew his father and married his
mother, was apparently under no strain, and still continued
to be king in Ithaca. His mother, however, hung herself,
and left behind for his own evil a "such as are brought to
cperse by the Frisyes of a mother." These Frisyes are of
a widely different character from the Frisyes of Ithaca:
In Homer, they are the agents of the gods below, especially
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Frisy of Greece and Babylon p. 2394.
of Zeus punishes, and Persephone. They accompany poor and aged persons, whose rights they are ever ready to defend; and their punitive powers are especially directed against those who commit perjury, or have come under a person's care. Telemaque, for example, says that if he sends his mother away as the suitors demand, she will "bring down on him by her curses the general Brines." An echo of this is found in the statement made by the Larises in Hesiod, "In our houses beneath the earth, we are known Curses." The idea of the Brines as powers of moral retribution which curse the guilty is, as far as the literary evidence goes, a comparatively late development.

It would appear that the Brines were originally a form of God, and that in this capacity they were brought into connection with other deities of a cyclical character, such as Demeter, and Zeus of the Underworld. From her have developed the Brines as a separate body: in homer, however, their vindictive powers are restricted to the fulfillment of a person's curse — which is purely a familial affair — and to the sentence of the perjurer: in other respects, their nature is positively beneficent.

There is, accordingly, no reason to believe that the blood-feud was Known to Homer in all the horror in which it is depicted by the dreamer. It is the obvious duty of any son, who finds himself in the position of Orestes, whose father had been treacherously slain, to avenge the death of his father on the person of his murderer; but that is as far as it goes. There are no grim relentless powers of retribution to force on the task of vengeance.

When once his body has been burnt, the soul of the deceased is confined to Hades; whereas the prophet, and he alone, preserves entire beyond the grave the faculties which he possessed in life. It is likewise a natural precaution for a man who had slain another man to leave the land, and to avoid any complications with the kinmen of the deceased; unless, of course, he prefers to pay blood-money, and to remain at home. In my case, no moral stain of blood-guiltiness attaches to him; as he has been seen, he can even interrupt a sacrifice with the recital of his woes, and not be considered to have brought the taint of impurity on the scene.
But although religious purifications of the murderer are no place in the Homeric poems, there are analogies from the religious practices of other peoples so convincing as to leave no doubt, as Boede maintains, that the primeval superstitions which gather round the manifestations of the other world, must have applied in Greece also, and in part-

-locular to the case of bloodshed. The account in the Theogony of Helen of the early generations of men points clearly in the case of the first two classes to a deep-rooted belief in the power, both for good and evil, after death of the deserted. It is too soon to believe that the soul of a man who had died a violent death, and whose body was buried in the earth, would refrain from using the scene at his dis-

-belief to base things so ill for his assailant. That power, however, was manifested only in the land in which the body lay; and it is in this circumstance that we must look for the germ of the belief, later so prevalent, that the mur-

-derer must flee the land. In Homeric times, he does so to avoid the vengeance of the dead man's kin; but the orig-

-inal motive was to escape from the vengeance of the dead man himself.

Thus it is suggested by Boede that this Homeric feeling may be a temporary, and not an original stage of thought, and that the post-Homeric development in the sphere of cethartic ideas may be really a renaissance, "a reenactment of forces that were active enough in the second millennium." He suggests further that Attica may be the one where the pre-Homeric traditions survived, and ascend to the accentuated activity of such cethartic rites as the head-pulling, and the trial for murder of the axe that slew the victim at the Echeion. He suggests, too, that Crete may have been the source of cethartic ideas regarding purification from bloodshed, and the propriety of cethartic ritual in general. This last proposal he bases on the position of eminence which was held by Crete in respect of cethartic rites in historic times, and instances the coming of Apollo Delphinios from there, the divine purifier for excellence, the coming to the island of Apollo and his sister Artemis to receive purification from the death of Python, and the definitely historical cethartic mission to Athens of the Cretan
prophet and purifier Ephesians.

This is, at least, more natural than to suppose that the ritual of purification from blood-guiltiness was introduced into Italy from Lydia, as Grote suggests; certainly Herodotus tells us that in his time, the Lydians used the same methods of purification as the Greeks, but that is by no means to say that the methods referred to are original there. It is equally probable, as Farrell suggests, that the practice was introduced into Lydia from Delphi in the times of Ayes jetes or Creuses, unless, indeed, it may happen to have survived there, as in Crete, as a tradition of the early Minoan period.

However that may be, it is at least clearly clear that in the period in which our literature begins, the burden of purification did not lie very heavily on the heroic conscience; the purifications in which the Homeric hero takes part seem to be undergone as much from a sense of ordinary decency as anything else. What is even more important for the present purpose, there is no trace in this period of any strong moral feeling on the question of murder, or of any terrifying belief in a relentless pursuit of the murderer by ghosts or Furies. In particular, there is no indication of the duty which was in later times incumbent on those whose kinsmen had been slain, to commence a vendetta against the murderer, and to carry it on generation after generation, to the bitter end.
The _Purification of Agesia._

(Purification by means of water is known from the time of Homer:)

It was already been noticed that purification by means of water was a standard feature of Ionicic ceremonial. Incidents have been noticed where stress is laid on the propriety of washing the hands in water before raising them in prayer to the immortals; and it will be seen that the ceremonial use of water was also a prominent part of the ritual of sacrifice.

Thus, in the third book of the Odyssey, when all has been made ready for the sacrifice, it is told that Nestor says:

χερωνισμον δ' ἀκετο και οὐλοχότος άνθωντο
τοιον ὑμάς ἱράς μεγάλ' ἀκετον.

before proceeding to the ritual of the sacrifice proper:

1.443. So too, in the Iliad, when the sacrificial victims stand ready at the altar,

χερωνισμον δ' ἀκετο και οὐλοχότος άνθωντο
toιον ὑμάς ἱράς μεγάλ' ἀκετον.

before the victims are killed. This use of the _χερνισμος_ is obviously a simple rule of ceremonial purity. It is the same word which is used to describe the water which the servant brings to pour over the hands of Athena and Telethusa before food in the first book of the Odyssey, and again in the fourth book, where exactly the same words are used of Telethusa as a guest in the house of Menelaus.

On the subject of the Lustral bowl as a means of cleansing the hands before a meal, it is obviously unnecessary to say more; but the development of its use as a feature of religious ceremonial is worthy of notice. There are numerous references in Pindarides 1. to the use of water at the beginning of a sacrifice, which correspond with the passages of Homer which have already been quoted. It should be noticed, too, in passing, that it is not now the singular _χερνισμος_ that is used, but the plural _χερνισμοι_:

Aristophanes also speaks of the _χερνισμο_ as part of the ritual of sacrifice; and Xenophon uses the words _χερνισμοω_ καλωσομα of Cessenra, to signify her position as a member of the family.
of the household of Agamemnon, i.e., one who takes part in the sacrificial rites of the family, and is consequently a participant in the preliminary instructions: With this we may compare the Homeric expressions χερνίζων ναὸν, and the exact opposite, to exclude from the religious preliminaryeries, χερνίζων ἄλγες, used by Demosthenes.

All these expressions are exactly parallel to Homeric usage, but a new development in the ritual is shown by the statement of Ionigenes, that it is her duty as priestess χορτὴν χερνίζον, while the actual slaughter of the victim was undertaken by her within the temple. This can only mean - to purify the victim by sprinkling water on its hair. There is no positive indication in Homer that such purification of the victim as well as the participants in the ritual was considered desirable; nor would Homer have realized the force of the term which, in the Creates of Euripides, ἔνεμης φλέγα τὴν Ζευς, that, in his present condition of bloodstainedness,

καὶ ήμιν θεριάς ὢς χερνίζων,

a duty which would devolve upon him as ruler of the land of offering sacrifice for the army before battle. We have seen that the murderer was not excluded from the Homeric sacrifice.

A further development in the idea of purification by water consists in the belief that certain water was holy in itself, and should be reserved for a definite purpose. This may not necessarily have been the case with the water with which those who had been in the presence of death cleansed themselves, but there are quite clear instances where the water is holy in itself: It was customary, we gather from the Acestis, that when a death had occurred in the house, a stop of water should be left at the door, in order that those who had attended the funerary rites should purify themselves from the pollution of the contact with death, before entering the house. Thus the change in the Acestis between the palace, in the belief that the funerary rites of the dead will be by now concluded; but to their surprise, it is evidently not so, and they say...
There appears also to have been in the Hierophanion a spring of holy water, but to what purpose it was supplied is not quite certain. Whether it was parallel to the above instance, in that it stood at the door of the sanctuary and was used by those who were about to enter, or whether it was only in the sense that it was used in the course of the sacrifice by those who actually performed it, cannot be deduced from the context.

We know that in the great temple of Delphi, there were two reservoirs for the sprinkling of water in the floor to left and right of the altar, and it may have been something of the same character here; certainly, if it were of the latter quality, holy in itself, it would give greater force to the indication of by the

when he complains in his speech against Andocides that the sacrifice and omitted the ceremony of entering the Hierophanion and washing out of the holy basin. It was clearly, at any rate, water of a definitely holy character, used for religious purposes of some sort.

Another instance of the use of holy water is given in the account in Herodotus of the interchange of messages which took place between the Boeotians and the Athenians, with regard to the occasion of the letter of the sanctuary of Delphi, and the various sets of inscriptions which were committed in connection with the occasion. The chief consistent was that they had drawn for the common use water which they themselves used only for the holy χέρνας. The Athenians replied that they had certainly made such use of the water, but pleaded extreme necessity, complaining that the fault lay at the door of the Boeotians, who had driven taxes to that course by cutting off the ordinary sources of supply.

Of a similar character to the ceremonial washing of the hands, was the ritual bath, the most important part of the pre-sacral ceremony. In Troy, for instance, it was a custom that the bride-to-be should bathe in the river Scamander, saying as she did so, "Take thus my maidenhood, Scamander." Heoons, curiously enough, cites this important part of the ceremony from his list of γυναίκων, but something of the sort is probably implied in his statement that it was customary to send water
jers to a wedding; it was usually an account of their connection with the rites which symbolized the entrance to the married state and the transition from a state of maidenhood, that such waterjerbs were placed, as Herodotus continues to inform us, over the graves of those who had died unmarried.

In Athens, water of a special character was supposed to be appropriate to the ceremonial bath. Thucydides tells of the spring which was known in his time as Annesocrates, but formerly as Alliance, whose waters were used by people in the time of the tyrants for the most important ceremonies. He proceeds to relate that, in his time, the water was still used, "in accordance with ancient practice." in the rites preliminary to marriage and other sacred ceremonies.

One looks expectantly for a reference to the preliminary bath in the account which Apollodorus gives of the marriage of Jason and Medea; but there is nothing of the sort. Important as the ceremony was, it was deemed advisable to omit it, on account of the haste in which it was necessary to perform the whole ritual of the marriage in this particular case. Sacrifice, we are told, was necessary and appropriate here; but rendered by a triumphal car of the nymphs of the forest, river and woodland. But no reference is made even to the caisison of the rite of the bath; if the author found time to digress for several lines on the legend of Theseus, he surely ought to have been able to spare a line or two to account for this caisison. If we be that it was so obvious and orthodox a part of the ritual that content on it seemed to him to be altogether unnecessary, either in respect of its caisison or occurrence; his main theme at this point is the festive preparation of the nuptial couch, and how the fleece of gold was used to adorn it.

There is, however, an important instance of purification by water in the Argonautica. It is related that when the Argonauts arrived at Lea, they found Circe engaged in bathing her head in sea-water, "so sorely had she been troubled by visions of the night." This is a definite piece of ritual; it is not done merely in order to secure the feeling of relief which is the result of the application of moisture to a fevered brow. Circe, moreover, bethes
not only her need, but subjects her clothes as well to the cleansing process. It is instructive to compare it with the Roman process of purification already mentioned, and its casting into the sea of the defiled elements. and an even closer parallel is found a few lines farther on, where it is related that the defilements which resulted from the purification of the guilty couple were carried out during the process by the maid servents of Circe. Circe, in fact, is seen away the physical defilement which was supposed to be left on a person by evil dreams; in this case, it is to the sea rather than the river that she goes, as being in her case the most conveniently accessible water for the purpose.

Similar examples of purification by means of water from dreams of evil import are found from other sources; for instance, in the Persae of Eschylus, tells the story of her evil dream, and says: "I rose and dipped my hands in a clear flow ing stream, and stood before the altar with incense in my hand." Here, it is only her hands that she cleanses. The action, moreover, fulfills a double purpose. It is, in the first place, intended to wash away the physical defilement of the dream; and, in the second, it offers still another example of ceremonial washing before sacrifice. It is to the same effect that Eschylus, in the Frogs of Aristophanes, places his servant in the imitation of Eriboides' tragic style, "Light the lanterns, my attendants, and draw me up the stair, and warm the water so that I may wash away this supernatural vision." One may notice in passing that the heating of the water has properly nothing to do with these cer emonial ablutions; the expression ἀφέσθαι ὕδατος is probably, as Rogers suggests, nothing more than an epic tag introduced with complete irrelevance in order to round off a complete Eriboides' quotation.

In the Heabe of Eriboides, it is to Earth that Hermes prays to avert the evil tidings of the night; there is no mention of actual purification by water, but the quotations made by Eschylus in the Frogs make it clear that the practice was elsewhere mentioned by Eriboides.
Purification by water was, moreover, an important part of the ceremonial of the mysteries at Eleusis. We are told by descurius that one of the days of the mysteries at Athens was called θάνατος μουρων; and the bathing of the celebrants in the sea was obviously supposed to have a cathartic value. We learn further from the same author that only water was used from the wells of Eleusis. These were wells near the sea, of which the one nearest the sea was supposed to be sacred to the elder god, the one nearer the city to the younger. Pausanias farther tells us that the water was salt; and he suggests that they are really underground streams coming from the Boeotian.

Use was made both of salt and fresh water in the purification of the Eleusinian Pythia. Pausanias in his life of Pythia relates that he went to Crete and was purified by the mysticus of Agare, one of the Idaean Dactyls. The actual instrument of purification was a thunder stone, a thing of considerable magical value, but part of the process was that he should lie stretched out prone, at daybreak beside the sea, and during the night beside a river. This legend of the cathartic expedition to

Crete

is not unimportant, in connection with the theory of Herodotus, of which mention was already been made, that Crete was the original home of cathartic ceremonies.

From these references, therefore, it is quite clear that there is nothing in the ritual of purification by water which is in any way peculiar to the narrative of

Pseudo-Plutarch. We have seen that the use of such rites as a preliminary to prayer and sacrifice was known to Homer and that it continued to be observed from the time of the Iliad onwards. It would be seen, as some have done, to attribute its use as a purificatory medium from evil dreams, solely on account of its employment by the Persian queen Atossa in the play of Lesbia, in an un-Athenian source.

It is more reasonable to regard it as a natural development of the uses to which it was put in the Homeric poems: and it must also be borne in mind that, though Homer does not actually mention its use in this connection, we are not entitled to extract positive evidence from his silence, as was possible in the case of Ino and the guilt of blood.
The Purification of Achilles

So far, it has been established that, while catechetical rites of a certain character were undoubtedly practised in the time of Homer, there was not considered to be any necessity for purification from the shedding of blood. The first indication in the literature of Greece of the belief in the propriety of such a ceremony is found in the "Etichicis" of Arctinus. The actual text of the passage bearing on this question does not appear to have come down to us, which is a great pity; details of the ceremony at that time would have been very acceptable. We are dependent on the summary given by Pindar:

The story is that Achilles was tanted by Thersites with his affection toward the Amazon Penthesileia, and that in anger he slew his taenter. As a result of the murder, revolt broke out among the Amaenas, and finally Achilles sailed to Lesbos, offered sacrifice to Apollo, Artemis, and Leto, and was purified from the stain of murder by Odysseus.

This legend serves a distinct advance on the Homerian conception: It is hard to imagine that any hero of the Iliad would have been greatly troubled if Achilles or any one else had killed Thersites. In the first place, he was in public ailience, and on these grounds alone, any of them might have felt justified in removing him. In the second, whatever their personal feelings in the matter, it is certain that no one would have felt Achilles to stand in need of any ceremonial purification as a result of the murder. Thersites, moreover, is not even related to Achilles; yet the author of the Etichicis makes his death out to be a cause of concern to the whole army. The killing of Achilles in the Iliad served a cur Hearl over the price due for a man who had been slain; but this legend serves the transition to a higher level of morality from the sphere of mere monetary recompense. It is quite possible, as Pindar suggests, that it represents the contemporary state law of Miletus in the 6th century, and that we are to imagine that state as having advanced to
A state of culture wherein it was believed that the murder of any person brought a stain on the sayer, and a peril to the whole community, against which it must take measures to protect itself.

This, however, is nothing more than a suggestion, and it is impossible to bring any more direct evidence in support of it. But whether or not this legend actually does reflect dilemmas of that period, vast it actually does do, is to show a very distinct advance in the sphere of moral feeling. In fact, the advance is so marked that one expects it of representing more than a single step forward. Therefore, it must be remembered, is a sin of families.

It is significant that mythology tells of Ixion as the first murderer; his crime was the murdering of kindred blood, for he treacherously slew his sister-in-law. But the same Ixion was also the first suitor to be avenged by Zeus the God of Vengeance, and to be purified by him. Bellerophon slew his brother by accident, and was purified by Crete; Theseus slew Sinis, his own cousin, and had to be purified from the murder; though, if ever murder was justifiable, the murder by Theseus of the robber Sinis was. The most famous case of all is of course that of Orestes, who slew his own mother, and, according to the post-classic legend, was purified by Apollo.

These legends lend colour to the belief that the first stage in the development is that which is represented by the legend of Ixion, and that purificatory ritual was instituted in the first place for the crime of kindred murder. The family was in early times a clearly defined and powerful unit; and the murder by one man of another would naturally bring down upon the head the combined wrath of the kinsmen of the deed man. Leaving moral considerations on one side, one can easily imagine with what resentment murder actually within the family would be viewed, if only from the purely practical standpoint, that a potentially useful member of the unit had been removed. It must have been realized very soon that such a divided against itself would be unable to stand; and the incapacity of discussion and bloodshed within the family must have been keenly realized at a time when the family was a real fighting unit, and when its very existence depended upon its being able to present an unbroken front to
its adversaries.

From such an idea as this, there must have developed the higher moral feeling that the murder of a kinsman was actually repugnable, and the belief that such an act left on its perpetrator a stain which could only be removed through the religious processes of purification.

Plato mentions as a very old Greek belief the idea that the murderer must go into exile, and not return until sacrifices had been offered and ceremonies of purification performed. As a natural development of this, the idea must have grown up that just as a family consists of members whose murder by one another is a thing abhorrent, so too the State consists of a number of units, each of which is represented by a family, and that the murder by one member of another within the State was tantamount to kindred murder. This idea, however, must not be pressed too far; the Greeks of the early post-Dorician epoch had an advanced belief in the kinship and brotherhood of the whole race of men, or in the sacredness of life in general.

There is, for instance, no evidence that purification was required in the case of a man who had slain an alien in foreign lands. This would only be necessary if he should happen to desire initiation to one of the Greater Mysteries, and if he, happening to have a tender conscience, were to request it of his own volition.

Similarly, in the Mysteries of the Cabeiri, we find mention of a priest called ἀρτεμις, whose function, according to Deschenaux, was to give purification to murderers. It would appear from this that there was a council which tried cases of homicide, in order to be sure that the pollution was not to great for the temple to be able to offer them up to the gods.

Lucius Atellius says why "no canis praestat securnam ex auribus non sit purem sensum aceret" they have allowed their sanctuary to be defiled with the pollutant body of a murderer, and he proceeds to mention the council whose chief magistrate was a "rex."

Frazer quoted an interesting parallel from an African savage tribe, where a homicide incurred ceremonial pollution only through the slaughter of a man of his own clan; there is no ceremonial pollution incurred by the
slaughter of a man of another clan or another tribe.

There is, farther, no indication that in Greece purification was required for an army on its return from battle, or as a precautionary measure before the campaign; as was the case with the Macedonian army in 332 B.C. (Plutarch, incidentally, tells us that the method of purifying the Macedonian army was to cause it to pass between the cut pieces of a dog.) Only such purification would be required on such occasions as was essential for the ordinary ritual of sacrifice. Here is also nothing to show that the killing of animals for food was regarded as an act of impurity; though Xenien does, in a passage where the text is by no means sound, appear to recommend the purification of hounds and huntmen after the case in "accordance with ancestral rule." There is no suggestion that butchers or sacrificers incurred the stain of impurity, on account of the killing involved in the performance of their duties. Only the priest who slew the ox in the Attic Bouphonia need to retire for the year; but in this case, the ox was a mystic animal, and it is probable that there was some sort of feeling that the priest and in reality shed divine blood, and must pay the penalty for it.

It was not, therefore, the mere act of slaughter which brought the man under the necessity of ceremonial purification. Had that been so, the killing of even an ordinary ox would have been regarded as something reprehensible. It was only the shedding of human blood that was regarded with horror, and that, moreover, as we have seen, within certain limits only. The worst offence of all was the shedding of kindred blood - oivx oivqov; that is the exression which is used by Sophocles to describe the murder by Democles of his own foster-brother, and by Sophocles in the Iphigenia, where he sarcastically says the Argonauts if it is that which is causing them from their country, and causing them to delay so long in Greece. The supreme case of kindred blood is, of course, suicide; and at no time, however, do we find attempted suicide condemned by Attic Law as a penal offence; it was probably on religious grounds that public opinion condemned it.
The Homeric view of murder, as has been seen, and of the penalties appropriate to the murderer, was very lenient. The kinsmen were only bound to exact the penalty if the murderer remained at home, in order to satisfy the spirit of the dead man. Thus after the assassination of Idanereus, Oedipus merely goes away, and in so doing, he is free from the vengeance of the dead man’s kin: It is in a similar spirit that the Argonauts, in the fourth book, avenge the murder of Cætus, under the peculiar conditions which brought them together and restrained them from their own people, there is a feeling that they stand morally in the relation of kinsmen towards each other. But apart from that, the feeling that

The enemy of one

is a very natural feeling to find among a body of people united by such a bond of unity of purpose and experience as the Argonauts:

Helius, on the other hand, after the murder of his own children, went like Oedipus into exile and was purified by death. It was a wise precaution, however, for even an involuntary exile sadder to be into exile. But at all times in the heroic period, there appears to have been a chance that the relatives of the murdered man would accept a money payment, and leave the murderer in peace; thus in the Iliad remark that many a man has been offered money to compensate for the murder of his brother or son, and has accepted it.

In Athens, however, there was a very clearly defined scale of punishments, and there were separate courts to try the various grades of murder. There were five in number: the Areopagi, the Eleusinian, the Helolian, the presiding


day of Penia, and the Prytaneum. The first of these, the Areopagi, was intended to try cases of wilful murder; the penalty on conviction was death, with confiscation of goods by the State. It also tried cases of wounding with intent to kill, and poisoning; for the former of these offences, wounding with intent to kill, if death did not actually result, the death-penalty was committed to banishment. Three days in the month were set apart for murder trials in the Areopagi, and on each of these special

reverence was paid to one of the three Dread Goddesses.
It was to the Priests, one remembers, that the prayers of Circe on behalf of Jason and Medea were offered with the sacrifices of propitiation.

The Court of the Peleusidion was for cases of involuntary suicide, and conspiracy; and it took notice of such offences as the murder of slaves, resident aliens and foreigners.

The penalty in this case was that the murderer should go into exile and stay there, either for a definite period of time, or until the relatives of the dead man should be appeased.

The Court in the Delphic, bearing the name of one of the divinities of Apollo, tried cases where a plea of justifiable homicide was put forward.

The Court in the Precinct of Pachyte was where a person already in exile for involuntary suicide was tried on charges of murder or malicious wounding, dating from before his period of exile. Such a person, as being already in exile, was not allowed to land, but had to bleed his case from a boat. This was considered to avoid a breach of the penalty of exile for his previous offence.

Finally the Court of the Pythien undertook the ceremonial trial of living objects, and animals, which were, on being found formally guilty, thrown out of the State.

The regulations which governed the operations of this last court are very odd: they are given by Aristotle in the "Athenian Politeia." As regards animals, they ran as follows: "If a beast of burden or other animal cause the death of anyone, except in the case of anything of that sort happening in the public games, the kinmen of the deceased shall prosecute the slayer for murder: and the warden of the country, shall as many as the kinmen shall appoint, shall try the case, and let the beast when condemned be slain by them, and cast beyond the borders." The kinmen, in fact, are to treat the unfortunate animal exactly as they would a human being; and the corpse, as being polluted thing, is to be cast out of the land, in the same way as the domestic pest-victims were thrown into the sea. Similar treatment was accorded to inanimate objects. "If any lifeless thing shall deprive a man of life, except in the case of a thunderbolt or other fatal dart sent from the gods, whether a man is killed by lifeless objects falling
upon aim, or he on that, the nearest of kin shall appoint the nearest neighbour to be a judge; and he shall thereby obtaiut himselt and the whole family of guilt: And he shall cast the guilty thing beyond the borders;"

This we hear in Greece of the trial and conviction for murder of the bronze statue in Thessal of Theogenes, which was trespassed for several nights by an envious rival of the deceased, and retaliated by falling on the offender and causing aim. It was thrown into the sea.

Also in the case of the bronze ox at Olympia, against whom a child knocked its head with fatal effect, it was decided to remove it from the precincts, as being guilty of wilful murder but the Delphic oracle took a more lenient view of the case, and brought in a verdict of manslaughter: the authorities, therefore, in compliance with the oracle, performed over the statue the rites of purification which were customary in

1. Cases of involuntary homicide.

Similar cases are found in Greek law.

In the case of this last mentioned type of trial, the ceremonial trial of inanimate objects that had caused a death, one statement of Aristophanes is worthy of particular notice: "The nearest of kin shall appoint the nearest neighbour to be a judge; and he shall thereby obtain himself and the whole family of guilt."

Here, - and the same applies to most laws on this subject - the law takes official cognizance of a belief that must date from very early times, the stigma which attached to the nearest kinman of the deceased, if he should fail to avenge the murder, was borne in the first place by him, but to a considerable extent it affected the family as a whole; just as every nerve in the body is affected by the excitation of a limb, so too is everyone in the family concerned in the loss of a member. This is one way in which, though based on the crudest of primitive superstitions, Attic law has been able to affirm the sanctity of the family and the mutual interdependence of its members as a matter of high morality.

Certain points in the actual procedure of these courts are worthy of further notice: -

1. The prosecution must always be undertaken by the nearest kinman of the deceased. This was the legal counter-part of the duty which in primitive times devolved auton-
-ically upon the cinema, of avenging the murdered men, on the principle of "blood for blood." This is laid down as a sound principle by the writers of Numbers 35:30, who say: "Bible, let pollute the Land; and no expulsion can be made for the Land for the Blood that is shed therein; save by the Blood of him that shed it."

2. Even the involuntary homicide was expected to undergo a ceremonial purification.

3. The Court of the Areopagus was intimately associated with the Kiners: how close this connection was, is shown by the speech of Demosthenes against Aristocrates, and the Fenides of Areopagus.

4. The accused person was at liberty to retire from the trial and to go abroad, provided that he did so not later than after the conclusion of the opening speech; thus in exile, he was safe; but if he returned to Athens, he could be killed at sight.

5. The trial was always held in a temple. This was a reminiscence of the power of asylum which was vested in these places, where the murderer was originally able to take refuge, until the "blood-money" had been agreed on.

6. The trial was always conducted in the open air.

This last point is elaborated by Otto Weinreich, in an article in "Hermes" on "Hesiod, Iliad, and Odyssey." The reason for such procedure is given by Aeschylus, in his scene on the murder of Iepow: "As you all well realize, all law-courts judge cases of murder in the open air: the reason is to protect the judges from close association with those whose heads are anlem, and to prevent the prosecutor from being under the same roof as the murderer." Aristophanes further says that they were conducted in a sacred spot, and that the accused man was not allowed to enter the sacred place, or to participate in sacrifice.

It is possible, however, that this was not the only reason why such trials were conducted in the open air. Weinreich lays stress on the antithetical influence of sunlight and rain, both of which are of course prevented from exercising their full effect by a roof. He quotes to this effect a statement from the Questions of Xenophon of Plato:

-
and a record from Persia, of an open-air worship of Zeus Hyetos. He quotes from the temple chronicle of Athens, with regard to the purification which was carried through on an occasion when a suicide had hung himself in the temple of Athena Lindia. The goddess herself, it is recorded, appeared to her priest in a dream, and advised him to open that part of the roof which was above the statue, and to expose it for three days to the purifying influence of the Hebler, according to which would probably be read, but the text at this point is not absolutely certain; and then to replace the roof, on the completion of which the temple was to be purified in the usual way, with the usual sacrifices to Zeus. Parallel to this, is the dream of the daughter of Polycester, as recorded by Pausanias, when she saw her father in a vision, weaned by Zeus, and sanctified by the Sun. What actually happened, of course, was that his corpse was exposed, and weaned by Zeus whenever it rained, and sanctified by the Sun, in the sense that the heat caused the perspiration to rise on the skin, and cover it, as though with an application of oil.

Sacrifices added light on this practice of judgment in the open air, as thrown by the story of the statement Persia. Pausanias tells us that he fled to the sanctuary of Athena of the Blessed Ones, and there to a small building belonging to the holy area, and that his pursuers met him, built up the door, removed the roof, and finally carried him out when at the point of death. The motive of this last act was obviously to prevent pollution of the sanctuary by a dead body; but that does not explain why they took off the roof. It can hardly have been "quod celerius addi divo interret," as Neps suggests, nor can it have been so as to watch his better, for a hole in the door would have been more suitable for that purpose. To remove the roof, too, would be an act of piety, unless it was done so as to avoid some greater pollution. It must have been done, as Weinroth suggests, from the same motives as the carrying out of the body, by way of precaution in the event of unexpected death.
to neutralise by some of the same influences the effects that the death would cause: he compares with reference to this the custom which prevails among many peoples, of uncovering the roof, either completely, or by removing a few tiles on the principle of "pers. mort. + reliq. anim. mort. in the house." Such a person would tend to make unclean the house in which he lay; but a precaution of this character is imposed to have the same effect as if they were actually to carry him out into the open to die, as was done in the case of Perseus.

A corpse, in fact, by the mere fact of its being a corpse, is a tainted object; and in can infect its neighbours, if steps are not taken to neutralise its evil influences by exposing it to Sun and Rain. It would appear to have been this principle which led the Athenians to avoid the taint which attached itself to the murderer, - to communicate both to themselves and to the sacred buildings, - by conducting the trial in the sacred buildings, in some part which was exposed to the open air, where no roof intervened to unfit the beneficent and purifying influences that come from heaven.

Q. In τῶν ἈΚΡΕΙΝ, i.e., "in fact, as Weirincon concludes, "an act of ritual hygiene."
The Purification of Medea

(* Purification from blood-guiltiness was probably first instituted as an account of kindred murder; answer of circumstances requiring purification, and means of obtaining it *)

So far, an examination has been made of the suggested progress of ideas, by reason of which the act of murder came to be regarded as a serious breach of discipline. It has been shown that a murder committed outside of the family would bring down upon the murderer the combined wrath of the dead man's kin; and it follows that the perpetration of a murder actually inside the family would unite against the murderer in a spirit of still more determined revenge the people of his own kin.

How mythology relates that the first person to incur the guilt of kindred murder was Lycon, and that he was likewise the first applicant to be admitted by Zeus the God of Suppliants! Here, as has been already observed, is a distinct advance in the moral feeling with regard to murder. The murder of an outsider is a purely secular matter; yet, one which concerns only the kinmen of the dead man: morality has not yet reached the point marked by the Hellenic legend of families: but the slayer of a kinsman is ostracized from the community, and is definitely under a divine ban.

The God of Vengeance under whose ban the slayer lay, was none other than Zeus himself, in his capacity as avenger of wrath. That worship was actually paid to Zeus in the letter of society would appear from a single record, a statement by Clement of Alexandria, that is, "Zeus the avenger was worshipped in Crete and Cyprus." Whereas also mentions that Zeus Hiketeus was also known as the Avenger.

The ancient source in Greece for purification from bloodedness was Zeon Hekatean. We are told by Poseidon that it was on his altar that theese received purification from the descendents of Pythoetis and that it was an altar to this Zeus that was set up by the Argives, in order to purify themselves from the guilt of kindred blood after an internal fray. The name in Hellenic ΖΕΩΝ ΗΚΑΤΕΑΣ-

ΝΗΑΜΑΙΩΣ shows a doubling of name and function, such as
tax place in the case of the Etruscan-Hellenides. The festival of the Iliaea, as we know from Thucydides, was that of Zeus Delficicus: it was celebrated in the month of Anthesteria: i.e., the first month from a solemn on the Gods of Aristophanes, and was observed with "milly glance." It was to this Zeus Delficicus that Xerxes used to sacrifice, when his return was being delayed.

The fact that, indeed, goes still farther back into the past. Certain features in the ritual of this Zeus seem to her to point to the presence of a still older deity. The sacrifice to Zeus Delficicus, for instance, as we know from the passage of Xenophon referred to above, was a focostasis of ollus. the ollus is the animal sacred to the ritual of the nether deities, and a focostasis is entirely inappropiate to the worship of the Olympian Zeus, whose sacrifice is properly a meal suffred. Further, a Pireean relief records the dedication to him of a statue but Zeus is one of the few gods in Greece who is never found attended by a statue. From this and other evidence, one concludes that the cult of Zeus has been superimposed on that of a still older deity Delficicus, an ancient Catanian deity who was figured as a man - so often the Catanian symbol - who had the characteristic of an Etruscan, whose sacrifice was a focostasis offered by night, and whose principal function was the evening of stained blood.

Here, however, we may put aside the problem of an earlier Delficicus underlying the familiar figure of Zeus. To the Greeks, it was Zeus Delficicus who was the original purifier, and it is in this light that we must study their ideas. From the ordinary associations of the epithet, his title appears in literature as an ordinary adjective, and as entirely from cult associations. Thus an unknown epiagrammatist in the Palestinian Anthology speaks of aia as


while an Etruscan seems to celebrate aia as


In both these cases, the epithet is purely general, and has no association with the one-time purificatory powers of the kindly Zeus. The adjective would naturally continue
to be applied to Zeus, even after the promotion to catarrtic existence of his successor Apollo; but it is also such a word as might be applied to any worshipper to any deity at any time. It would be seen to regard as a survival of ancient feeling the juxtaposition in the Ionic hymn of the epithets θεός and κατάρτιος: such contrast is a time-

conspicuous persistent feature of these hymns, and carries with it nothing of any ritual significance.

It is certain, however, that the catarrtic deities Zeus θεός, θεος κατάρτιος, were catarrtic deities. Zeus θεός κατάρτιος is worshipped along with deities θεος κατάρτιος, θεος κατάρτιος, and θεος κατάρτιος. The offerings by night at Arcadia, θεος κατάρτιος and θεος κατάρτιος appear in an oracle quoted in Herodius in contrast with the "happy heavenly care." Further instances of this character will be found in Hoek's note on 1:27:1 of his book.

The feature of catarrtic ceremonies, which is by no means restricted to the cult of Zeus, in the "fleece of Zeus." This fleece, we are told by guides, was used in various rituals of purification. It was the fleece of the ram which was sacrificed to Zeus θεός, and was used particularly at Iressia, where it was cut under the feet of those whose guilt was to be purged away. Probably this was only done in order that the applicant for purification might put himself in nearer contact with the god whose favour he was anxious to regain; it is doubtful if there is any justification for seeing in it a mere sacrifice preceded by a kindlier ritual, or any belief that the "sick god" was being doped with a substitute offering, in place of the applicant's life which was really due to him. This is, however, a costly disputed point; and it would be rash to dogmatise on it at present, in view especially of other cases previously noticed, where supersession of an ancient by a kindlier ritual has certainly taken place.

Eustathius tells us that a ram was sacrificed to Zeus θεός at the end of διήμερον, and that the skin was used for the purification of the city, whose offences, by some ceremonial means, were removed into
certain objects; then these objects as being tainted with
the contamination of sin, were taken to the cross-roads. It is
on the same principle that inanimate objects tried and found
 guilty of murder were cast out of the city. The reason
here was no surrogation offering: the process is a simple in-
stance of contageous magic, coming in the course of an
ordinary straightforward piece of ritual. So too a rea-

is found in the purificatory ceremonies of India and
Persia. When new-born children are consecrated, the god
is exhorted to carry the rea on his shoulders around the walls
of the city, and now the youngest youth was appointed to
carry a lamb on his shoulders in the same way at the yearful
festival of the rea. Some machines this, though even
more magical in character, was the custom that the
priestesses of Athena at Athens should visit newly-married
families with the goat-skin; this was done partly in order
to purify and partly to fertilize the union.

It is perhaps appropriate at this point, before
entering on a discussion of fire, the cleansing of which must
mostly be said, to notice a few of the other occasions
both public and private, on which purification was consid-
ered appropriate, and the means by which such purifications
were carried through. The ceremonial use of water has
already been sufficiently discussed; corresponding examples
are found of the use of fire. Water and fire are, of course,
the earthly equivalents of rain and sunshine; and these
were probably the original censural modes, for public and
private ceremonies alike.

On two occasions, it is recorded that a general
extinction of fires was ordered by the deity; and that the
fires were then replenished from the sacred hearth. Thus
Plutarch in the life of Aristides, relates that after the
battle of Plataea the extinction of all fires was ordered
by the deity, as having been polluted by the barbarians;
and that new fire was ordered to be fetched from the tem-

plon hearth;” Hence also, on account of the murder by
the mother of their husbands, by the law, the family
had to be purified once a year. One looks in vain for any refer-
ence to this in the account given in the Argonautica of the visit
to Lemnos, especially as we are told that the massacre
had taken place shortly before the visit of the Argonauta.
All fires were extinguished at this annual purification; and a ship was sent to fetch a fresh supply from Delos. If the ship should happen to return during the celebration of the rites, it was not allowed to enter, but had to wait outside the harbour, for fear that the new fire might suffer pollution. A similar custom is shown by inscriptions found at Delphi: to have been practised by the Athenians: a censer was sent with the sacred tripod, accompanied by the πυρόφοροι to Delphi. We hear, however, of no general extinction of fires in Athens: it was presumably required for some individual ceremonial, perhaps that of Apollo, within himself at theergelia.

Branches and boughs of various sorts seem to have been used for purificatory purposes: Hippocrates tells of their use in the expiation of the pharmace, "to strike with branches and to purify the city." In one fragment: "holding branches in their heads like pharmaces." Is another: Herodotus, also, in Καὶ Πάντα Νομισμάτων says that there was a song called the "Song of the Branches" which was played on the flute during the expiation of the pharmaces, and that during the playing they were beaten with branches and fig-sprays; and he adds that the pharmaces was actually called "ace of the branches." That such beating was of a purely ceremonial character, would appear from a passage in the frage of Aristophanes, where the real pharmaces tells Aeaces to beat the pretended pharmaces not with a leer or with a young oinian, but in the ordinary way, i.e., to give him a real, not a ceremonial, flogging: Leers, as we know from Isocrates, were among the things used in the beating of the pharmaces.

Another kind of tree, the withy, seems to have been used by women in the celebration of the thespornoria. Their practice was to cover their couches with its leaves: "castitatem castitatem" says Pliny. But it is questionable if this is a catheretic ceremony at all, and not merely a piece of care magia: the name of this tree was Withy, from "or sometimes on account of its connection with these ideas of cheality: possibly the pronounced odour of the leaves, or, as Pliny suggests, the pleasing fragrance of the withy, and something to do with it;
This, however, can hardly be the case with the Laurel, which is the distinctive mark of the Apolloine purification. The Laurel in Troizen was said to have sprung up from the material used in the cleansing of Croesus, which were afterwards buried in the ground; and the sentences which men Apollo officiating as Cleanser constantly shew the Laurel bough as his attribute. It is hardly likely, that the purity of the air surrounding the Laurel grove and anything to do with it; possibly, as is suggested by Parnell, the motive is purely religious. The carrying of the bough in processions, the lifting of the bough from the altar of the god, may have been supposed to put the worshipper into divine communion with the god; but one feels inclined to disagree with Parnell, that the object of that communion was to clear the air of evil influences. Surely this is a mixture of cause and effect! The object of a Greek in getting closer to his deity was, frankly stated, to get as near as he could to him; and the applicant for purification in the ritual of Apollo used the Laurel, not from any belief in its catalectic powers per se, but in the hope that the ritual use of the god's own tree would bring him into closer contact with the deity, with consequent-ly greater hopes of placating the god and receiving the absolution which he desired; he used it, in short, because he thought the god would like it.

That this is so, would seem to be understood by the ritual which preceded the bringing back of the crown for the victors in the Pythian games, these were made of the sacred Laurel. The ritual has been reconstructed by Parnell as follows:— On a certain day in spring, a noble Delphian boy proceeds with a band of youths chosen from the best families, under the escort of sacred women called Olene, and carry torches and conduct the youths in silence to a cabin which was constructed near the Pythian temple in the form of a gable, and which was considered to be the shade of Python. They set fire to the cabin, and overturn the table, and fly without looking round through the doors of the temple. The leader signifies to go into exile, or even servitude; then they proceed to Temple together and are purified at an altar. Then they place the sacred Laurel
and make crowns for themselves with its leaves, and return along the sacred Pythian way. At a village in Laconia called Delphi, the leader peddles of a solemn meal. From there, they return to Delphi to the music of flutes, and the sacred laurel which is thus brought back is used to make the crowns of the victors in the Pythian games.

Farnell suggests that the ritual is not naievie, but purificatory; and he compares the cabin in which we are told by Pausanias, Orestes in Iroeaen lived alone when he came there for purification, and no one could dare to take him in; he suggests that the cabin was used for preliminary illumination; and that then, as being infected with the same excelled from the person of the purified one, it is destroyed and burnt; in the same way, savages at the present day destroy the furniture of a house in which a child has been born; then, in order to avoid evil influences, they flee without looking round. This, to a certain extent, is convincing: the boy is for the moment an incarnation of the youthful god, and is repeating in ritual what the god did in earnest when he slew Pythion. It must be assumed that the actual killing had previously taken place: the youth are taken and purified, like Orestes, in a solitary cabin, then the leader, like Apollo, goes into exile. But must then he goes to Tempe, and after the purification, he places the laurel? If purification is necessary before the real or pretended Apollo can place the laurel, now can the laurel itself be properly an instrument of purification? The assumption that it is Edwin, taken in conjunction with the above ritual, would make the process of purification a quite inattainable one. The applicant for purification must first appear Apollo with a laurel bough, but he must be purified before he can place the laurel bough. It resolves itself into a vicious circle.

The laurel in fact has a place in the purificatory ritual of Apollo only because of its intimate connection with the god, and not because of any cathartic power acquired to reside in it. Even the laurel that grew in Iroeaen from the materials that were used in the cleansing of Orestes was cathartic only in origin; there is no evidence that it was so in function also.
Therefore it would appear that purificatory power was not supposed to reside in laurel branches, or even in the leaves with which the Phaenicians were ceremonially blessed, or in the leaves with which the Athenian aeternÆs strewed their beds.—a conclusion which is not, on the whole, very surprising. The belief that any such power did actually belong to them, and particularly in the case of the laurel branches, can only be due to this, that a distinction has not been made with sufficient clearness between the parts of the ceremonial which are ministic, and those which are properly purificatory.

There were also certain events normally occurring in the life of a man being which were supposed to require purification; child-birth was one. We know from Aristophanes that even to touch a woman who was in travail made any one impure. For this reason, it was customary to remove from Delos any woman who was approaching her time, we are told by Thucydides, and likewise anyone who was about to die. We do not know if the birth of twins made the necessity for purification more immediate, as is the case with certain savage tribes.

Only the birth of Zeus himself was pure. Callimachus in the iambic to Zeus says that the place of his birth was holy, and that no beast or woman about to give birth approaches it. But he sees, apparently, that it was the place rather than the actual birth that was pure; for he goes on to tell how even the mother of Zeus had to go down to the river to wash the body of her newborn child, and to purge herself of the annoyance of the birth. We may have learned from Homer to regard this word as implying something more than mere physical uncleanness.

The period of impurity varied in different places. In Greece, it appears to have been 20 days; but another authority would seem to suggest that it was 40 days in all, 40 before, and 40 after, the birth. It is of interest in this connection to notice that the word still used in Greece at the present day for the Chaldaic of women is ἑνδοθρύειν, from ἑνδόθρυειν, “forty.” The enormous number of priestesses in the Greek temples is probably the reason why no trace
has been found of any restrictions imposed on menstruating women; on this account the writer of Leviticus is so severe in this respect. Greek ritual is never too rigid; and it is always prepared to stretch a point for any practical purpose.)

As regards sexual intercourse, feeling on this point arises rather from a regard for decency, than from any code of morality. Irregularity of any sort was, however, abominable — the eunuchs in Athens were, for example, permanently excluded from temple worship. Also the use of temple grounds for this purpose was a very serious offense, and the whole community suffered till excommunication was made.

Pausanias tells of the disaster which was brought on the community of Nemea, Messene, and Patrae, on account of the irregular conduct of the priestesses Cestus and her lover Melampus in the temple grounds. Such an offence, however, comes rather under the heading of sacrilege, which brings in its train the wrath of the deity offended, rather than in a host of the occasions when purification was required.

One remembers, too, now in the Fros of Aristophanes, Aesopus reproaches Arripides for introducing women who give birth in temples, and pits them on the same level as those who are guilty of incest. The orthodox view as to the necessity for purification under ordinary circumstances was very lenient. The restrictions, for example, which were imposed on the worshippers of Zeus and Artemis at Delphi in this respect were on the same level as those which required abstinence from meat and salt fish at the same time.

The necessity for purification after contact with a dead body has already been discussed. We have seen how every possible precaution was taken to prevent a death from occurring on the island of Delos; and now Pausanias tells the statement was carried when at the point of death out of the sanctuary of Athena of the Brazen Horse. It was feared that death would pollute the building. That is quite a natural belief; but it is interesting to find that even the ordinary mourner incurred a certain taint of impurity by his contact with death. Plutarch records that the period of mourning for a death in the family was thirty days at Argos. It would appear that during this period the mourners were regarded as impure, but that they regained their lost status of purity on the thirteenth day by means of a sacrif-
office to Apollo.] As Apollo is the last god in the Greek Pantheon to be connected intimately with death, one assumes that an sacrifice was made to him in his capacity as giver of purification."

The person who was supposed to be dead, and for whom in his absence funeral rites had been performed, was after all returned to his kin; created a problem, which was solved by the pretence of a second birth. Till that ceremony had been enacted, the Greeks used to treat such persons as if under a curse, refused to associate with them, and excluded them from all religious rites, and forbade them in particular to enter the sanctuary of the Eleusinian. The ritual was traced to a certain Aristides, for whom in his absence funeral rites had been performed, and was advised by the Delphic god to go through the rite of the new birth. No doubt the rite which was thus attached to his name has really come down from the remotest antiquity.)

For a somewhat similar reason, because of the association with death, it was occasionally forbidden to wear sandals in the precincts of a Greek temple. These, as being made from the hide of dead animals, were considered to carry with them the pollution of death. Thus it was ordained at Athens that neither shoes nor any leathers garment should be brought into the sanctuary; and the regulations which governed the mysteries at Eleusis decreed that women must wear sandals and garments of wool. Wool is taken from the living animal, and no objection can be brought against it; but leather by its very existence as leather implies the death of an animal. Thus it is the universal rule in Jewish communities that sandals should be removed from the feet, before entering into the holy place; and we are reminded in connection of the Biblical story of the Voice from the Burning Bush that be the Moses: "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place wherein thou standest is holy ground."

It was probably, however, as much from a feeling of ordinary decency as from any striving after ceremonial purity that the defilement of the precepts with the evocations of the human body was forbidden; for the same reason, there was occasionally an ordinance which forbade
the introduction of cattle into the sacred places.

But there is one feature which is noticeably absent from Greek oesmantic ceremonies: that is, the confession of sins. A general confession was demanded only of those who sought initiation into the mysteries of Samothrace, and it is significant that these are essentially un-Hellenic in origin. The only authority for the practice of the confession is that it is Plutarch, who records it as one of the sophistiages of Socrates that, when asked at his initiation by the priest what was the most lawless act that he had ever committed in his life, he in his turn asked whether it was at the bidding of the priest or at the desire of the gods that he must answer. When the reply was "The gods," he said to the priest, "Then do you stand down and get out of the way: if they see me, I will tell them." It is significant that our only authority for this practice mentions it only to condemn it.

Otherwise, the only approach to it is the curious form of vicious confession that took place in Alexandria. Soides, e.g. in his memoirs records that there, it was the custom in old days for the neighbours to go round in threes and to proclaim outside various houses the sins and misdeeds of their occupants. That this was considered to have a catechetical effect is shown by his statement that it was done so as to rid the city of impure.

A similar use of personalities and ceremonial abuse is found in the ritual of the Hesperides, where the men abused the men and the men in their turn. This is the well known ritual of the "abscondyge", the set metopes of statues: One man is recorded by Aristotle, as having taken place when the Argonauts landed in Phocis. He speaks of men's ritual of abuse and beatings in the cult of 'kulo' (klyto), and traces its origin to the statement of the attendants of Cedesc, when they saw the Argonauts pouring water in place of wine over the sacrifice.

The best known of all, of course, is the exchange of personalities that took place between the spectators and the celebrants, as the sacred procession to Hermes passed.
over the bridge across the Cephissus. It is questionable, however, how far this ceremony is religious in origin; it may well have sprang from the low moods of irreligious spectators who were standing, as loungers do, on the bridge, as the procession went past, and it is easy to imagine that the pious pilgrims, on the road from Athens to Heraia, considered themselves to be relieved for the moment from higher responsibilities, and eagerly seized the opportunity of lightening the tedium of the procession by making a self-centered reply in kind to their abusers; at any rate, it grew to be a custom; and it seems to have been connected as a consequence in popular superstition with the averseion of the evil eye.

The reverse of the ceremonial abuse is the ambiguous which was proclaimed before a celebration: As no one could be absolutely sure what was or was not ambiguous to say on a given occasion, it came to be interpreted as a demand for silence; so, too, during the actual celebration, unravelling and altercation of all sort was forbidden; they were too strongly suggestive of fighting and bloodshed to be tolerated. Such a prohibition was actually embodied in law, during the Heraia, no legal action could be taken; it was not even permissible for a person who considered himself aggrieved by the state to place a complaint on the altar, since that implied strife, and no creditor was allowed to distress.

A similar law is found to govern the ritual of purification in Babylon. During the purification of the city, a seven days' truce was proclaimed; no matter might strike a slave; no action at law was forbidden; no bad word was uttered; no wrong could be redressed; it is interesting to notice that the Babylonianathletic ceremonial included the confession of sins, a practice which has been seen to have been repugnant to the Greek and excluded from all rituals.

As an example of the impiety involved in unravelling and altercation, we have a record of the purification of the city of Mantinea, after the visit of the empresses of the Macedonian village of Cynoetos, whose
inhabitants were well known for their quarrelsome tendencies, which at that moment resulted in a great massacre. Athenaeus tells us that whenever their representatives went to any other of the Arcadian cities, they were driven by public proclamation to depart. To some extent, this was done on account of the guilt which attended to them as the perpetrators of a massacre, but no doubt also it was a precautionary measure, in view of their notorious proneness to fighting and quarrelling.

How popular the ceremony of purification was among the ancient Greeks is shown by some lines from the Festi of Ovid, quoted by Pindar:

One naves aeneoceo, ali purgating cares
Credebat morti tollere passiones;
Greciae principis mortis fulles illas nocentes
Melis lustratos ponere facta potest
Animas facilest, all ties crines cedilis
Flamines tolli posse potestis.

[Ovid, Fasti, 4.78-80]
One of the most splendid conceptions in all Greek religion is that, whereby the means of escape, through purification, from vengeance, is provided by the very God of Vengeance himself. Zeus the Avenger was also Zeus the God of the Suppliant; and he bore in this connection the titles ἵκτηρ, ἰκέσιος, φόειος, προστρέκατος, and καθάριος.

This double function of Zeus has been totally misunderstood by Greene, in his translation of the Argonautica, in the lines

Ζηνὸς ἔδωκ’ ἰκέσιοίοις,  
δὲ μέγα μὲν κατέστη, μέγα δ’ ἄνδροφόροιοι ν ἀργίας,

where he proposes to read in place of ἀργίας: " auxiliatur " ἰκέσιοι - " sternit. ", on the grounds that the text would thereby run less confusedly." It has, fortunately, received no support from any quarter. The idea that the Avenger could also be the refuge and purifier of the suppliant, is one of the most noble beliefs in the Greek system of ideas; and fortunately it requires more than a puzzled translator's imptecuous emendation to obliterate its traces from Greek literature.

It was to Zeus Phyxius, in his wider capacity as giver of escape from any danger, that Phrixus, as we are told by both Apollonius and Apollodorus, sacrificed the ram which had carried him safely over the sea to Aea; and it is on this same Zeus Phyxius that the Alexandra of Lycoiphron gloomily forebodes that the Dorian host shall one day have to call. The scholiast on the Argonautica explains the title as of Thessalian origin, and as having originated in the flight, either of Deucalion, or of Phrixus; but these are obviously purely local explanations.

Preller 1. finds the origin of the cathartic cults and epithets of Zeus in his capacity as god of light and clearness. To a certain extent, this will undoubtedly...
be the case; we have already considered the evidence for the purifying powers that were supposed to reside in air, rain and sunlight. His explanation, however, of the ἐπεθετος ὄξιος, however, in this connection, is not completely acceptable. "Als gutiger Gott des Lichts und des Frühlinges" he says, "wo die Sonne wiederkehrt und befruchtende Regengüsse das Land erquicken, ist er (Zeus) ὄξιος, ein Gott der Gnade und der Zuflucht, der das ihm bestimmte Opfer in das ferne Sonnemland des Lichts entrückt, oder es durch die Dazwischenkunft wohltaetiger Herzen errettet." He suggests that Zeus the God of Flight was originally a god of flight in general, and the inference is, that his position as a God of Suppliants is a secondary development. But is in not more probable, that the exact reverse is the case, and that his original function was to protect and succour the suppliant? And is it not significant, that mythology first tells of him in this connection as the protector of the suppliant Ixion?

In his capacity as God of the Suppliant, Zeus is known as early as the Odyssey. Odysseus has been put ashore on his native land, but does not recognise it, and thinks that his Phaeacian escort has brought him to the wrong place. In his rage; he calls down on them the wrath of Zeus "Ἰχ νο κεος; " may Zeus the god of the Suppliant requite them" he cries, "he who watches over all men, and punishes him who sins." In another passage, the aged hero Echeneos suggests to the king Alcinous that it is not right to leave Odysseus sitting in suppliant posture at the hearth, but that he should welcome him as a guest, and order that wine should be mixed for a libation to Zeus, δὲ τ’ Ἰχνος ούι αἰθαίοι ὅμηροι.

Aeschylus, of course, in the Suppliantes, "Suppliants", continually mentions him with various titles of similar meaning; " Heavy is the wrath of Zeus the suppliants god" says the chorus of maidens to the Argive king; - Ἐννος Ἰχ νον -; and the warning is repeated in the same words by the king to his people, as Danaus later tells. " The wrath of Zeus the suppliants god - "Ἰχ νον - awaits those who are slow to be moved by the laments of the sufferer" says the chorus again to the king; and " I must respect the
wrath of Zeus, the god of suppliants " says the King a hundred lines further on. Ἡμεῖς ἴς τὴν ἑρμῆν θέα, says Polyxena contemptuously to Odysseus, in the Reouba of Euripides, as she seem him manœuvring to avoid her supplicant gestures.

These examples will serve to show how early and how firmly established in Greece the idea of Zeus in this capacity was. They lend some colour to the suggestion that the worship of him as such is by no means secondary to that of him as a god of flight. It is significant that no mention of him is found in the latter capacity until the time of Lycophron. Apollo, in the course of his evolution as a god of purification, naturally took over many of the duties of Zeus the god of suppliants; and it would appear that the duty of safeguarding the escape of the suppliant also devolved upon him. Certain manuscripts of Suidas present after the words ζητεῖν. θυγαῖν, the statement θητητι οὗ ο Ἀπόλλων, εὐχαρία σοῦ Ἀπόλλωνι Ἀνδρί τε καὶ ἀνέμω. These words are deleted as an interpolation by Gaisford in his edition; but it is very well possible that they may represent an early belief in the attribution of this power to the great cathartic god. Bruchmann 1. does not record this as an epithet of Apollo; but he deals, of course, only with those which are found among the poets. Some indication of this belief would seem to be given by the following dialogue in the Suppliæ of Aeschylus:-

Chorus;— We call upon the waving beams of the Sun.
Danaus;— And pure Apollo, who, though a god, was exiled once from Heaven.

Chorus;— He has known our present lot; it may be that he has compassion on mortals.

It is not difficult to see how the idea of Apollo as θητητι οὗ would arise; though it is not positively expressed in the above passage, it is very clearly implied.

Apollo, however, will have none of those late and shadowy beliefs. The purification of which he tells is supposed to have taken place a generation before the Trojan War;— Euenos in the Iliad, one remembers, was a son of Jason and Hypsipyle— and for him, the god who presides
over flight and purification is Zeus and Zeus alone. The absolute lack of reference on his part to Apollo in this connection is all the more marked by the fact that Apollo is the presiding deity of the whole poem, and that it is to Apollo that worship is paid by the Argonauts at every turn. Yet it is Zeus, who ordains that the Argonauts must go to Circe for purification; it is the sons of Zeus who areidden by the speaking figure—head of the Dodonian oak to pray for guidance through the gloom, and whose safe conduct of the Argo was celebrated when they reached the Stoechades by the institution of altars and rites in their honour for ever. It is in obedience to the ordinance of Zeus, the God of Supplicants, that Circe begins the ritual of purification; and it is on Zeus the Cleanser that she calls as the rite proceeds. Finally, it was the grace of Zeus that was implored on their behalf, that he might be disposed to be kindly and gracious towards them.

There can be only one explanation of the insistence of the poet on the cathartic authority of Zeus, and of his complete and significant silence in this connection with regard to Apollo. He must have had reason to believe in the antiquity of the legend which established Zeus as the original god of purification, with Iaion as his first suppliant. Apollo, to the Greek, was indeed the Great Purifier; but Zeus was still to him the first purifier of all. The propriety of this belief is attested by the whole of Greek literature and mythology; and it is interesting to find that it is represented in a poem which, in the department of mythology at any rate, is a deliberate study in conscious archaism. 1.

1. It would be tedious to quote examples from the scholia to show how often Apollonius has deliberately followed the older form of a legend; this tendency is well shown by de Mirmont to be one of the main characteristics of the poem.
Posthumous Greece, as we have seen, believed that purification of a ceremonious character was required by the blood-guilty, and in particular by those whose crime consisted in kindred murder; and it has been observed that this is probably a recrudescence of an earlier belief. The question now arises, to what port of refuge was the suppliant supposed to betake himself, and who was entitled to perform for him the ceremony which would make him clean again in the sight of Heaven?

On the first point, the whole of Greek literature establishes the fact, that the murderer was required to seek purification in some country other than that in which the crime was committed. This is a natural corollary to the Homeric idea, that the murderer was safe so long as he fled the land, but that if he remained in the country, the kinmen of the dead man could take vengeance on him. Normally, it appears that any country would do. The extreme instance is that of Alcmaeon, as recorded by Thucydides; he slew his mother Eriphyle, and was told by Apollo that he must find a country which had not seen the sun and was not even land at the time when the crime was committed, as the whole of the world had been polluted by him. He settled, the legend tells us, on the silt-formed islands at the mouth of the river Achelous; his wanderings had spread over such a period of time that the islands had come into existence since the commission of the deed. Croesus, we are told by Herodictus, received Adrastus at his court, and gave him purification; and when he heard that the crime for which he was in exile, the murder of his brother, had been committed unwittingly, he bade his suppliant be of good cheer and advised him to bear his misfortunes as lightly as he could.

Even the god Apollo had to leave the land. We are told by Pausanias that after killing Pytho, he came with his sister Arémis to Aigialeia to obtain purification; but fear came upon them while they were there, and they
went on to Carmanor in Crete. There is, however, a Thessalian form of the legend, according to which he does not appear to have gone further abroad than Tempe. This version would seem to be confirmed by the ritual which has already been discussed, - that which preceded the plucking of the laurel for the Pythian victors' crowns, - in which there is no indication that the god went further abroad than Tempe.

Thus it has come about that the scene of the purification of Creantes, who is probably the most famous murderer of the Hellenic world, has been fixed in many different localities. It would be tedious to enumerate here all the places that are associated with the event; they are collected and discussed in Roscher s.v.Crestes. Athens in particular traced back to him the ceremonial of the separate drinking-cups at the festival of the Choecs. It is related that he came to Athens at the time of the festival, while he was still unpurified from the murder of his mother; that the king, wishing to shew hospitality to the stranger while avoiding the contagion which he carried, gave to every man, including Creantes, a separate cup; and that he shut the sanctuaries, and carried out this part of the ceremony in the open spaces of the Limnae.

Purification in foreign lands was naturally performed in most cases by the king. He was supposed, in virtue of his position, to be in closer touch with Heaven than his fellows, and to be able to perform religious rites with greater effect than they. Thus it is to Ceditus the King that the stricken people pray for some release from their calamities; "Find us some succour" is their cry, "whether thou hast heard the voice of some god, or knowest it of man." The temples of the city reek with incense to the gods; yet it is to Ceditus the King, the Man of Wisdom, the mortal like themselves, yet greater, that the people, headed by the very priest of Zeus himself, appeal; in this extreme case, it is at his hearth, rather than at that of any god, that they are suppliants in their distress.

Bellerophon, like Adrastus, slew his own brother, and was purified by Proitos; Theseus, with every justification, slew the robber Sinis, his own cousin, and was
purified in exile. Such a ceremony, we find, could also be performed by any person of exceeding wisdom. Thus it was Odysseus, in his capacity as wise man rather than as king, who purified Achilles from the murder of Thersites; Macris, the nurse of Dionysus, who purified Hyllus from the murder of his children; Circe, who purified Jason and Medea after their murder of Absyrtus. Apollo, on the other hand, according to the above mentioned Thessalian legend, purified himself; but, be it noted, even this was done at the command of Zeus. Zeus the purifier is still pre-eminent, and takes rank above the younger Apollo.

But the ceremony of purification does not completely wipe out the effect of a murder. To this crime, there are two sides. In the first place, it is the greatest possible injury to the murdered man; and in the second place, it is a source of pollution to other people. The pollution, which is primarily a state of religious disability, can be removed by the religious ceremony of purification; the wrong done to the dead man was requited originally by the sufferings which he in turn imposed on his murderer.

Even Delphi claimed no more than the power to cleanse, and though Apollo gives to Orestes religious purification, he acquiesces in the exile required by Attic law. Purification no more exempted the suppliant from making reparation to the dead man, than absolution from sin in the Christian Church can free from the legal consequences of a crime. Plato told that, according to a very ancient Greek belief, the ghost of a dead man who had just been slain was angry with his slayer, and troubled him, because it was enraged at the homicide stalking about in his victim's own peculiar haunts; therefore it was necessary for the homicide to depart from his country for a year, until the wrath of the ghost had cooled down; and he had not to return until sacrifices had been offered and rites of purification performed. If the victim should happen to be a foreigner, the slayer must shun the land of the dead man as well as his own, and must follow a prescribed road into banishment; for "clearly it would never to let him rove about the country with the angry ghost at his heels."
The punishments which were inflicted by the dead man, either on his murderer, or on the next of kin, if he should fail to avenge him, are told by Aeschylus. They have been interpreted with a certain freedom by Lawson 1. in the light of modern Greek folk-lore. In this case, the powers of the dead Agamemnon are not exerted against his murderer. Like Nestor in the Odyssey, he knows "how good a thing it is when a son is left to avenge the death of his father," and he is more concerned to stir his son up to a sense of his responsibilities as the next-of-kin, than to act on his own behalf; moreover, as will shortly be shown, he had been rendered incapable of the latter by maiming. That vengeance, however, he can direct against the son, if he remains idle; and he will inflict on him the punishments which would otherwise be inflicted on the actual murderer.

Apollo in the Choephoroi tells Orestes of five ways in which the dead man can afflict him:—

1). "Blains that leap upon the flesh, and with savage jaws eat out the ancient vigour." This would seem, if Lawson is right, to mean that the murdered man is going to return in person, and drain the blood of his victim, if the blood of his murderer is not given to him. "Leprosy" is a thin dramatic disguise for the popular belief that the dead man will come back, not as a wraith, but in his own person, and will drain his victim's blood. That for one purpose or another the dead man was considered to be able to return in his own person, would seem to be indicated by the advice which Electra gives to her sister in the "Electra" of Sophocles:—

αὶ ἄρετο ὑμῖν ζώην ὑπερασπίζεται καὶ ἀδίκως μολέαιν.

Here αἰρέτο is the most emphatic word in the sentence; and is almost meaningless, if it does not mean "in his own person," "as his very self."

2). "Madness and vain fear by night...." That is, the dead man will have his revenge for the "terror and confusion" which once came upon him; his victim must suffer even as he has wrought. (Here, it seems to me that...)

1. Lawson. Modern Greek Folklore and ancient Greek Religion, p. 453f.
Lawson has unduly forced the meaning to make the theory fit his assumptions; but it does not affect the main thesis, that the punishment was returned in kind.)

3). He must wander outcast; no one will admit him to libations, or receive him in his house; he will be kept away even from the altars of the gods by the "unseen wrath" of the dead.

This corresponds to the year's exile which was required of a purified murderer by the provisions of Attic law; and we have seen what interpretation Plato put on it. It is possible that there is behind it a still deeper significance. The murdered man, so long as he is unavenged, is himself outcast; he is no longer among the living, and he is debarred from the company of the truly dead. In the same way, his victim must also be outcast; and a similar fate will come on him whose duty it is to avenge, if he should fail to fulfill his obligations. It is in the same spirit, that Plato in his "laws" lays it down that parricides must be put to death and thrown out of the city unburied. Thus they are, according to popular belief, condemned in the next world to a penalty of wandering and exile, a penalty which, for a less heinous crime than that of parricide, they would have had to undergo in exile, alive. Parricide is, according to Plato, beyond all remedy.

4) "At last to die." This is in accordance with the doctrine of "blood for blood." This does not sound a very fearful punishment; but there is more to come. Even in death, we are told, he is "none too free."

5). He is to die friendless and in dishonour, "damned to incorruptibility in the doom that destroys all else." This is the severest punishment of all.

What exactly, then, does this last punishment imply? ταρχήων means "to preserve the body," and it is used as early as Homer. It covers the processes of "kippering," drying, and embalming. Thus Hector in the Iliad announces that, if he dies, his body must be recovered in order that it may receive due rites of cremation; but that if his adversary dies, he will give it back

and similarly, later in the poem, the body of Sarpedon is
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to be sent home for the same purpose. The word there means that the body is to be preserved whole and entire for burial; but as used by Aeschylus, it has a much more sinister meaning than that. What it is, we learn from the Furies themselves in the Eumenides. As ministers of the dead mother, it is their duty to carry out on her behalf the vengeance which Creastes has escaped in one direction by slaying her. "In return for the blood that thou hast shed," the Furies say, "thou shalt give me to suck the red juices from thy living limbs; thou thyself shalt be my meat, my horrid drink." So too they say that their "binding song" is οὗτοι βρότοις, which the scholiast properly translates as ο ἐνανθων τοις βροτοῖς. The Furies, that is to say, will suck his blood; they will leave him as a corpse that has had the blood drained out of it and has been preserved; and by these signs we can recognise the taint of vampirism. He is fated to come back after death and do to others as the Furies have done to him.
"In death he is none too free" is only too true.

The Furies of the play are the ministers of the slain mother; but, according to Lawson, they are mere dramatic doubles of Clytemnestra herself. Dramatic propriety forbade Aeschylus to bring her on the stage in the character of a horrid vampire; she herself can appear only as a ghost, as helpless ef as the ghost of the Homeric man. Similarly, Agamemnon does not appear to spur on the pursuit; one reason for this lay in the fact that he was mutilated for this very purpose, to hinder the pursuit; but even if this had not taken place, dramatic propriety would have forbidden Aeschylus to represent him in such horrid character on the stage. It is Apollo who acts on his behalf, and it is he who threatens Creastes with the horrors referred to above, if he should fail to carry out his task of vengeance.

The description of the Furies is given most graphically by Aeschylus himself at the beginning of the Eumenides; it is necessary, for they are of a repulsiveness which he would probably be unable to portray on the stage. Every word of that description accords well with the modern notions of the real vampire, which, in places where
belief in the vampire is still found, are probably no fresher now than in the time of Aeschylus. Vampirism is found in various parts of central Europe, and, according to Professor Myres, is supposed to arise from a relation supposed to exist between two diseases found there, adipocere and galloping consumption. A person is carried off suddenly with the latter, or it may be more than one; a grave is opened to receive the bodies, and the last occupant is found with his body as well preserved through adipocere as it was on the day when it was put in. The mourners jump to the conclusion that he has been "walking" at nights, blood-sucking, and causing the spread of vampirism; and a procession is formed in the dead of night to exorcise his evil spirit, and to stake him to the ground through the heart, to prevent him walking about. Such belief in the returning dead, in all this condition of horror, coupled with the severest ideas in relation to the blood-feud, are found to this day among the Mariotes.

But it is highly probable that we are not entitled to assume on the evidence before us so well-developed a belief in vampirism as Lawson would have us do. It is enough for the immediate purpose of this dissertation to have evidence that the dead man was able, or at least believed, to exact his revenge in his own person. That is why an early Hesiodic generation on death turned into "local daemons;" the dead were buried in their own country, and were potent influences there either for good or evil.

The influence of Agamemnor, however, was curtailed, and he was prevented from taking his own revenge by a very simple process; ἐπαυχαλοτρ. His only hope of vengeance was that some higher power should intervene on his behalf, and spur on the pursuit of him on whom the duty of retaliation now devolved, his son Orestes.

The same treatment is accorded to the body of Absyrtus in the Argonautica by Jason. Apollonius, however, makes it cut to be a kind of horrid sacrifice to the murdered man, rather than a maiming from reasons of spite. The real reason for doing this is given by the scholiast on Sophocles, that it was done "in order to take away the force of the dead, so that later they should suffer nothing
fearful from them." Popular belief, in fact, cut out the Furies as the avengers, and made the dead man return and exact his own vengeance in person. A dead man whose limbs were cut off would, it was felt, be prevented from, or at the least hindered in, the pursuit.

Jason, moreover, licks up some of the blood of his victim and spits it forth, in order that he may rid himself of the pollution. This manoeuvre, however, is of no avail, because the dying man has already put some of his blood on his sister's veil and robe, and has consequently branded her with the guilt of the crime. Apollonius says that it "was customary for murderers" to lick up the blood and spit it forth "ὁλοκτονιά ἐλάσθαι". Surely this cannot mean, as Seaton translates, to atone for a treacherous murder?; it is rather "conciliate; and it means rather "to keep quiet the man who had been treacherously slain." ἕμει, moreover, is wrongly translated "right" in the same passage; it means rather "custom," and Apollonius is referring, not to some obscure ceremonial in a chthonian cult, but to a popular superstition.

Something of the sort was done by Clytemnestra in the passage of Sophocles already mentioned. Miss Harrison translates it:

"She lopped his limbs as though he were a foe,
And for libations wiped upon his head
The Bloodstains."

but in any case, it is impossible to extract the meaning "for libations" from the words ἐν λουτροῖς; - the word recalls the "washing" of the corpse in the temple chronicle previously quoted: - and Jebb is probably correct in referring the expression, not so much to the ritual washing of the corpse, which would be the pious duty of the relatives, and which should have been done by his wife, as to the fact that she did it in order to clean her hands. It is not "in place of ritual washing," but is a gruesome way of translating into action the words "On thy own head be it, not mine."

With regard, however, to the outrage done on the body of the victim in cutting off the limbs, the commentators on Sophocles are by no means decided as to
the underlying notion of the act. In the scholia, there are three comments by different hands pieced together. The first says that murderers were wont to wipe their swords on the heads of their victims, to avert the pollution of the murder; this scholiast, like Apollonius, and possibly following him, makes a sort of religious – or at any rate magical – ceremony of it. In Suidas s.v. ἀμφαιλισθένη the motive is likewise expressed in the words τὸ ἔργον ἀφο- 
-οσιομένοις; and the Etymologicum Magnum s.v. ἄπορματα attributes to the murderer a similar intention. The scholiast on the Argonautica explains the licking up of the blood as being done ἐξ ἱλαστέως τὴν δολοφονίαν, which does not add anything to the text. Finally, Photius and Suidas s.v. μαχαλίσματα quote Aristophanes of Byzantium as authority for the statement that this action was deliberately done by murderers as a means of averting τὴν μίνων; but whether of the gods or of the murdered man, they do not say. All these interpretations would appear at first sight to favour the interpretation of the first scholiast; but it should be noticed that there is nothing in them, not even the statement of the critic Aristophanes, which may not be a mere inference from the text of Apollonius. There is nothing to show whether Apollonius was the first or not to interpret this gruesome action in the light of an apotropaeic ritual. Even if one assents to the idea of Rhode, that Apollonius is actually following Aristophanes in this, still, with all due diffidence, one may hesitate before accepting his identification of μαχαλίσματα with ἰμοταστούμενα, for which Aristophanes is the first authority, as representing the oldest belief.

The second scholiast on the passage of Sophocles says that the murderers of a kinsman were wont ἀκρωτηρίζειν τοὺς άναπτέντας ... ἡπέρ ὧν ὁμαν ἐκείνων ἀφαιρομένοι. The third scholiast explains μαχαλίσαν as the cutting off of the extremities, and hanging them round the dead man's neck," in order, as they say, that he may be weak when it comes to vengeance on the murderer." and he quotes the expression of Apollonius ἰδρύματα τέμενε ἓκανόντος.

These two scholiasts have undoubtedly hit the nail
on the head. The original idea of this horrible action can only have been to mutilate the body of the dead man in such a way as to hinder him in the pursuit which he would most certainly institute. The dead man, as we have seen, was supposed to return in person, and he would presumably return in the form in which his dead body was left. It was not everyone who could emulate the lady already mentioned who could perform feats of magic with her head cut off; the average ghost would be severely hampered in a race by the amputation of his legs and limbs. It would appear that Apollonius is the first to suggest that a desire to propitiate is at the bottom of it;—if indeed that is what the words ὀλοκτονοῦσας ἱλάσεται really mean. There is, at any rate, no reason to believe that his account embodies any old-established belief in the ritual value of ἀφρωτομαχίας.

Shaw's note on this passage is most extraordinary. "'Απάμορφα; τανquam macatas ad aram pescudis. Veteres tam anili maduerunt superstitiones ut a caedis poena tutos se sperarent si ἀφρωτα, hoc est extremas corporis interfecti particulas resectas axillis suis (!? their own, !?, or, 'of a rig?') appendissent, quod est ψευδωνυμοχαλίζειν in Soph. Electra."

1. At any rate, whether Apollonius intended this horrible form of mutilation to be a criminal's precaution against pursuit, or to be suggestive of some form of apotropaic ritual, the effect is the same. As soon as Absyrtus had been struck down, and had breathed his last, the "all seeing, powerful pitiless Erinys saw with eyes askance the deed that they had done."

It is noticeable that he refers to Erinys in the singular. Reference is made eight times in the course of the poem to the Furies, on five occasions in the singular. The other four are as follows:-

1. Phineus laments that the Fury has set foot on his eyes.
2. Chalciope threatens to her sister that she will die, and come back to her from Hades as a hateful Erinys.
3. Medea laments that some god or Erinys has brought the Argonauts to trouble her.
4. Medea warns Arete that if she falls into her father's hands and is slain, she will have to fear the Erinyes of suppliants.

The three instances of its use in the plural are as follows:

1. Medea replies to Chalciope, "What horrible curses and Erinyes are these of which you speak."

2. Medea says to Jason, in the event of treachery, "May my Erinyes drive thee from my fatherland."

3. Circe, in the cathartic rites, prays, to stop the Erinyes.

Now the Erinyes of Phineus was an avenging spirit sent on him by Zeus for his impiety; there is no hint in the account of Apollonius of the more common story which connects him with murder. The Erinyes which brought the Argonauts to Medea would be of the same kind; she jumps to the conclusion that something that she has done has caused a god or fury to send her trouble. It is different, however, when she herself threatens to return as an Eriny from the dead, when she warns Arete against her Eriny if she should be delivered up to death, and when the Eriny marked the death of Absyrtus. In the first two cases, the Erinyes is quite clearly the personal avenger, the literary apology for the returning man himself; and one may probably assume without presumption that in the third case, it is actually the Erinyes of the dead Absyrtus that is referred to.

In the other group, where the Erinyes in the plural are referred to, the first is purely general; "Speak not to me of such things as Furies."; but in the second, where Medea speaks of her own Erinyes, and in the third, where Circe prays to the Erinyes — whether in general, or those of the dead Absyrtus — there is a reversion to the idea which is first expressed in literature by Aeschylus, of the Erinyes as a body of avenging spirits, who, by reason of their number, can no longer be thought to be the incarnation of the dead person, but have been transferred to a higher plane as avenging deities in general. Medea speaks of both her Eriny and her Erinyes. We have, in the Fury of the Argonautica, the result of a long development of ideas; and we are able to trace the workings of three distinct
stages of thought. In the first, the Erinys is the personal avenger;—originally, one suspects, none other than the personal embodiment of the murdered person. In the second, the Furies are the avengers in general of anyone who has been slain. Finally, the conception of them so develops, due in no small part to the milder Homeric outlook on this question, that they are supposed to be the spirits of retribution in general. Not only is it the Erinys that punishes Phineus for impiety, but it is to the same influence that Medea at once attributes the origin of all her troubles. In her disordered state of mind, the bringing of the Argonauts to trouble her seems to be the definite act of an avenging spirit, to punish her for some offence not known to her.

It is, at any rate, with the Fury,—whether of the dead man personally, or in general,—that Jason and Medea will have to contend. Whether it was as the personal embodiment of the murdered man, coming into existence simultaneously with the removal by violence of his mortal self, or whether it was quite vaguely as a spirit of retribution, the Fury noted the crime, and noted it with displeasure.

---
The Purification of Medea.

(The Flotation of the Ghost, the function of the Pig, and the contrast with Ouranian sacrifice.)

It was towards the spirit of the dead man that the process of purification was directed. "First, in order to atone for the irreparable deed of blood, she held above their heads the offspring of a sow; then, severing its neck, she sprinkled their hands with the blood."

The meaning of this ceremony, so briefly described here, is made clear by means of a record of the process of ἐναγισμός, which has been preserved by Athenaeus. "The word ἀπόνιμμα " he says, "is specially applied to all ceremonies in honour of the dead, and to those which take place in the purification of the polluted -τὸς ἐναγείς - Cleidemus, in his treatise called Exegeticus, writes on the subject of ἐναγισμοῖς as follows:—Dig a trench to the west of the tomb; then look along the trench towards the west of the tomb, and pour down water, saying these words 'Ἡμῖν ἀπόνιμμα οίς χρῆ μαλ οίς τέμις.' " To this is added a quotation from Dorytheus, which is reported to be written in the ancestral rites of the Eupatridae concerning the purification of suppliants;—"Next, having washed himself, and the others who had disembowelled the victim having done the same, let him take water and make purification, and WASH OFF THE BLOOD from the suppliant who is being purified; and afterwards, having stirred up the washing -τὸ ἀπόνιμμα—pour it in the same place."

From these two quotations, it is amply clear what the meaning of Circe's action was. The ritual of ἐναγισμός is addressed to the dead. If that had not been expressly indicated by Athenaeus himself, it would have been clear from the instructions of Cleidemus which he quotes. The trench near the tomb, the looking towards the west, (the land of the dead,) the cautious formula "to you to whom it is meet and right", all make this quite certain. Dorytheus has further made it clear in what the actual ritual consists. The victim is slain, and the blood is put on the hands of the suppliant; this is as far as the account in the Argonautica goes. It is then washed off.
him and poured into the tomb. This can only mean one thing; it is the ghost who demands the blood of the victim, washed off the hands of the murderer.

Now we find that the ghosts of Homer drink the dark blood and renew their life; but that is the blood of ordinary sacrifice, with no sinister circumstances. Why should the ghost of a murdered man demand polluted water washed off the hands of his murderer, before he can be appeased? It can only be that the victim is a surrogate for the murderer, and that by the putting on the suppliant of the victim's blood and washing it off and giving it to the ghost, the spirit of the dead man is thereby placated. Add to this too, that the murder, both literally and metaphorically, stained the hands of the murderer with blood; — Absyrtus in his dying agony made every effort to put some of his blood on his sister and associate her irrevocably with the guilt of murder; — and the ghost wants, no doubt, his own blood as well.

According to Andrew Lang, "the idea at the root of the purification of manslaughter by a bath of blood is not that his sin is removed by the sympathetic magic action of new blood, but that the swine's blood poured over him throws the avenging ghost of his victim off the scent, confusing the trail; or that the angry ghost accepts the pig's blood washed from the slayer as atonement." The latter idea is unquestionably the right one. There is nowhere any suggestion of throwing the ghost off the trail; that is what the murderer attempts to do by flight. When, however, he resorts to the religious process of purification, his chief anxiety is to appease the dead man, and to pacify his once and for all with an offering which he will be content to accept.

With the institution of the beneficent ritual of purification, the blood-feud ceases to be a necessary practice. Religious purification satisfies the requirements of those who would otherwise be tainted by the presence of the polluted person; and the spirit of the dead man is appeased by an acceptable compromise for the life of his murderer. Blood, however, the spirit of the dead man, or the avenging furies, must have, whether willingly given.
or forcibly taken. "The smell of human blood attracts me" is the cry of the Furies of Aeschylus as the come on the stage in pursuit of Creastes; and they threaten later, as we have seen, to drain the dark blood from his limbs.

From other sources, still more details as to the process of ἐναγισμὸς are available. Normally, the scholiast on the Argonautica tells us, it was performed at evening, whereas sacrifice to the immortals took place for the most part at dawn. Thus the sacrifice to Dolops was at evening; so too Clytemnestra sacrifices to the Furies νυκτὸς ἐξίνα, at an hour that was ὀδεντὸς κυνήν θεῶν.

The victim, moreover, is dedicated entire. The ceremony is no pleasing sacrifice, as to the Heavenly Gods. The ritual is one of sacrifice to those who are below, dark and potentially malignant beings. Pausanias tells that Phaeestus visited a sanctuary of Heracles at Sicyon, and found them ἐναγίσαντας to him as to a hero; but he insisted on proper sacrifice, ἐναγίσαντας ἐν αἰχμῇ σέρρεις, ἔσειν, as to a god.

The result was, that in future sacrifices, it was the custom to "slay a lamb and burn the thighs on the altar, and eat a portion of the flesh, as though it were a sacrificial victim; and another portion of the flesh they ἐναγίσων to him as to a hero."

There is a similar contrast in the Argonautica. The Argonauts landed and burned thigh bones to Apollo, but to Sthenelus they ἑγνασάμεν ἄνωθεν μύδων. It was the same that was burnt in sacrifice to Dolops at evening.

The same distinction is shown by another passage of Pausanias; at a sanctuary of the Eumenides, when they were driving Creastes mad, they appeared to him to be black, but when he recovered his senses, they seemed to him to be white. So he did sacrifice, ἠεῖσε, to the white ones, and to those that were black ἐνήγινεν.

Again, we are told by Apollonius that Circe ἀλλοις μείλασεν χύτλοισιν. This again is addressed to the dead man. So too Sthenelus, in the passage already referred to, receives χύτλα. These were reserved exclusively for the ritual of the dead, and they correspond in function to the libation - λοιπή - of Ouranian sacrifice.
In one passage of the Argonautica, we find libations actually poured to the souls of dead heroes; Jason poured into the river libations of honey and pure wine, to earth, and to the gods of the country, and to the souls of dead heroes. Wine was used in the ordinary sacrifice to the departed; but in the glomy, expiatory ritual of purification, it has no place. Thus we find that Clytemnestra says reproachfully to the sleeping Furies:

So too Circe, as she stood by the hearth, burnt cakes and expiatory offerings without wine;

Wine is the concomitant, on the one hand, of joyous Ouranian sacrifice, on the other, the due of the dead man who desires at periodical sacrifice some share of the good things which were his portion in life. But in the solemn service of expiation to the angry dead and to the Furies, it is out of place.

The whole spirit of the ritual is expressed in such constantly recurring words as μελικτρα, μειληματα, μειλδοσειν. The purpose of the ceremony is ΕΜΠΑΤΙΟΝ. The powers below, as we have seen, were supposed to be able to bring on their victims such punishments as no man could contemplate with equanimity. Such powers were obviously to be approached only in a spirit of placation and appeasement.

It was not everyone who was able to treat the ghost which pursued him in the summary way in which the statesman Pausanias, according to his namesake the Periegete, did. He attempted, the story goes, to enter the sanctuary of Athena of the Brazen House; but failed because he was defiled with the stain of blood. He appealed to the God of Flight, and had recourse to the Ghost-compellors of Phigalia, without success. Finally he sent to Italy for professionals, who, according to Plutarch, "wrenched the ghost out of the sanctuary, after they had done sacrifice. The sacrifice was presumably by way of apology to the goddess for the use to which they were putting her shrine; the force was for the ghost."
The Purification of Medea.

It is noticeable that it is always the pig which is supposed to be the proper victim in the ritual of purification. It is the pig which was used, according to Aeschylus, in the purification of Creseis; and it is the same animal which appears on vases representing scenes of purification, such as that of Creseis by Apollo, or of the daughters of Proetus by Melampus.

The pig was the animal sacred beyond all others to the nether powers. Its sacrifice to the Ouranians, as Farrell shews, is rare, and occurred probably only in agricul-tural communities where a better victim was not available, and where plenty of pigs were to be had. In the worship of Aphrodite, it was definitely debarred, on account of the boar which killed Adonis; it was only in Pamphylia and in Cyprus that it was used to any great extent in her worship.

Beyond any doubt, the reason for the employment of the pig was its amazing fertility, which caused it to be used in the service of Demeter and Persephone; and from the chthonian connection thus established, it came to be recog-nised as the proper sacrifice to the nether powers. It was argued too, that his practice of scratching up the ground in search of food was an invasion of their domain, and that it was therefore right and proper that he should fall a victim to them.

Thus the description given by Apollonius of the purification of Jason and Medea has served as a theme round which to construct a dissertation on purification in general in Greece. It has been seen in the course of the enquiry that purificatory ritual was not unknown to Homer, but that belief in the propriety of purification from guilt of murder is of a later date, unless, as is more likely, we regard it with Rhode and Farrell as the recrudescence of a temporarily submerged morality. The processes have been examined, by which the various beliefs which cluster round this ceremonial came into being; and it has been seen that there is ever present a notion, either expressed or implied, that the murdered man is pursuing his murderer in person,
and must be disabled from the pursuit, thrown off the track, or better still, placated for good and all. Finally, as a result of this belief, it has been seen that the whole atmosphere of the various ceremonials which undertook the placation of the ghost was one of horror, chilly gloom, and murkiness.

How far Apollonius reproduces in his description the beliefs of his own time, is another matter. All that can be said is, that there is at least nothing in his account which cannot be paralleled from the records of an earlier period. There can at least be no doubt, whether or no we are to regard these beliefs as Alexandrian also, that Apollonius has faithfully reproduced the most ancient traditional beliefs of Greece with regard to this rite.

As a consequence of the treacherous crime in which they had been associated, Jason and Medea were driven by a route previously unheard of, through perils all unknown, to the other end of the world, there to receive purification at the hand of Circe, at the command of Zeus, from the sister of Medea's own father and the father of Absyrtus. Bound as they were by the age-long ordinance, that the unpurified murderer must not open his mouth, they entered the house in silence, shewing by their very silence for what purpose they had come. They were the central figures in a ceremony of gloomy ritual and of grim significance; and at the last, purified as they were, they were expelled from the house by their purifier, as having committed a crime of such magnitude as to make ordinary hospitality impossible.

How different, under ordinary circumstances, the reception of such far-voyaging strangers would have been, is keenly shewn by the pleasant ritual which governed the ordinary sacrifice on such occasions. In view of the contrast which it presents at every point, both in detail and in general character, with the ritual with which we have been concerned so far, it is of interest to compare the following description which Farrell has reconstructed of the usual Homeric sacrifice. It is founded for the most part on Il.1.447f., and Od. 8.440f.; and it has been transferred in its entirety from the article on Sacrifice...
in the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.

"The victim, one or many, was brought near the altar; holy water, barley stalks in a basket, and a vessel for catching the blood were held in readiness; the sacrificers purified themselves with the holy water, and formally raised up in their hands the barley stalks, which had been sanctified by some preliminary rite. The chief officiator, the king or chieftain, or, more rarely, the priests, cut off some of the victim's hair and threw it into the fire, at the same time or immediately afterwards uttering the prayer to the deity for blessing or for special aid. At this point, the sacrificers threw forward the shredded barley (or barley stalks); the victim, if it was a powerful one like an ox or a bull, whose struggles would be embarrassing, was smitten with the axe in such a way as to render it impotent. Then, if women were present, they raised the ἐλαυγη, which was an auspicious appeal to the deity by name to grace the ritual with his or her presence. The animal, if the oblation was to the Olympians, was lifted off the ground, its head drawn back so that its face was turned towards the sky, and its throat cut; the blood was probably collected in the sacred vessel, though we do not know for what purpose; the dismembering of the carcass began, the thighs were cut away and wrapped in fat, and with portions of the meat cut probably from every portion of the victim, were placed on the altar and roasted, while a libation of wine was poured over them. While these were roasting, the worshippers ceremonially partook of the inward parts - σαλάγχα - which had been cocked; then the other parts of the victim were cut up and roasted on spits, and provided a common feast for the worshippers. The feast was followed by a wine-drinking, inaugurated by a libation to the deities, and in certain cases the rite might close with religious singing and dancing."
Such, then, was the manner of the rise and fall of Medea. First, she was the wise and kindly maiden, who took pity on the hero in his extremity, and gave him the help which he required, behind her father's back. From this position, she is gradually degraded until she becomes, on the one hand, the most famous example in all literature of the rejected and revengeful wife, and on the other, the most powerful and malignant sorceress of the ancient world. To the student of the classics, she is known mostly from Apollonius and Euripides, as the loving maiden and the revengeful wife. In this dissertation, it has been the object to study her development as a figure of mythology, to notice in this connection rather than from the purely romantic standpoint the processes which led to her fall from grace, to shew briefly how the degradation of her character was reflected in the practice of her own peculiar art, and to notice how on her have accumulated the virtues and the vices of a host of obscurer rivals.

It was said at the outset that "there must be very few, whose memories are not in some degree stirred by the name of Medea." It is interesting to see that she still lives on in the memory of her own people. M. Venizelos, on his retirement from the public life of Greece, issued a very grave warning to his countrymen against the dangers of party strife and a spirit of personal revenge. To bring these dangers home to the minds of his hearers, he illustrated them from the history of Medea. "There must," he said, "be only one watchword throughout Greece, 'Cessation of Party Strife and Restoration of the normal functioning of the Constitution.' ... If only we can manage to keep down our political passions, if each one of us Greeks ceases to be a Medea, 'who was perfectly conscious of the evils she was going to commit, but whose passion was master of her reason,' we may look forward to the future with confidence...."