MARY MANTZIOU

EURIPIDES FR. 912 N² (INC. FAB.)*

σοί τού πάντων μεδέοντι χλόην
πελανόν τε φέρω, Ζεύς εἶδ' Ἄδης
όνομαζόμενος στέργεις· σὺ δὲ μοι
θυσίαν ἄπυρον παγκαρπείας

5
dέξαι πλήρη προχυταῖαν.
σὺ γὰρ ἐν τε θεοῖς τοῖς οὐρανίδισις
σκήπτρον τὸ Δίος μεταχειρίζεις
χθονίων θ' Ἀδη μετέχεις ἀρχῆς.

τοῖς βουλομένοις ἀθλους προμαθεῖν

10
τίνι δὲ μακάρων ἐκθυσάμενους
eὑρεῖν μόχθων ἀνάπαυλαν.

Εὐριπίδης τοῖς προειρημένοις ἡμῖν συνωδοὺς διὰ τοῦτων εὑρίσκεται, πατέρα καὶ γιόν ἄμα
οὐκ ὡς ὁπως συνωδός σοὶ — προχυταῖον, ἀλκάρπωμα γὰρ ὑπέρ ἦμων ἄπυρον (ἀ-
πυρον Valckenaer Diatr. [1767] p. 44 B) ἄναψεν ἄρχεις, καὶ ὅτι τὸν σωτήρα αὐτὸν
οὐκ εἰδῶς λέγει, σκέφθεις ποιήσαι ἐπάγων σὺ γὰρ — ἀρχῆς. ἐπειτα ἀντικρυς λέγει· πέμψον
περιείληφεν τὸν Ἀνάξιλον [Διάκοσμον (59 A 20c D. - K.) [ἐπειτα] τρισὶν περι-

1 χλόην Sat. (coniecerat Bergk): χοήν Clem. 2 φέρ[ω] Sat. (coniecerat Gro-
tius Exc. [1626] p. 431):-ων Clem. εἰθ' Dindorf: ετε' Clem.: ει[.] Sat. 3 ὀνομαζό-
μενος στέργειςClem.: όνομ[α]ζη Sat. 4 ἄπυρον Abresch, Animadv. ad Aesch. [1743]
p. 256: ἄπυρον cod. παγκαρπείας Grotius:- πίας cod. cf. Soph. fr. 398.3 R. 5 προ-
χυταῖον Heath, Notae...ad Eur. [1762] p. 185: —τίαν cod.: προχυκέας Valcken-
aer p. 42 C ('paulo forsan audacius') vid. LSJ s.v. προχυταῖος et H. - R. Schwyzer,

8 0' Sylburg [1592] p. 248, 31: δ' cod. 9 δ' ἔς Nauck, Eur. Stud. ii (1862)
p. 151 (cf. Mél. Gr.-R. iii, 1874, 337 sq.): μὲν cod. — ἐνέρων Nauck: ὁν- cod. 10 προ-
μαθεῖν Grotius: προσμ- cod. 12 τίνι δεῖ Grotius: τίνα δη cod. cf. Strab. VI 2,11 ἐκ-
θυσαθαι...καταχθονίους θεοὺς ἐκθυσαμένους Valckenader ad Hdt. VI 91 (ed. Wesse-

* I present a new text with apparatus. I am grateful to Dr. Colin Austin for
his generous help.
The fragment quoted above has come down to us through Clement; the first three lines are also quoted by Satyrus in his Life of Euripides. It describes a ritual act by which appeal is made to an unnamed god to send up the souls of the departed to give information and advice to those on earth who are experiencing conflicts and distress.

Clement and Satyrus quote the fragment in order to support different arguments: the former argues that Euripides was a precursor of Christian religion as he is identifying the Father with the Son, the Saviour; the latter argues for the influence of Anaxagoras upon Euripides and he quotes the beginning of fr. 912 N² along with E. fr. 593 N² (Pirithous)² and Tr. 866. These quotations comprise, in Satyrus’ opinion, the Anaxagorean cosmic system.

The influence of Anaxagoras upon Euripides has been discussed by several scholars who reached the conclusion that we find little evidence of it in his existing plays and fragments. Satyrus apparently connected the universal deity addressed in this fragment with Anaxagoras’ Mind which governs the Universe. In the quotation which precedes fr. 912 in the Papyrus (fr. 593) we probably find an echo of Anaxagoras’ theory of Mind. But the Pirithous is generally considered a spurious play. In what follows fr. 912 in the Papyrus Satyrus states that the poet καὶ ἀλλῇ γέ /πη διαπορεῖ/τί πότ* ἐστι/τό

---

2. Fr. 912 has been attributed to the Kretes or to the Pirithous, see J.U. Po­well - E. A. Barber, New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature, Oxford 1921, 149 f., R. Cantarella, Euripide I Cretesi, Milano 1964, 89f., Arrighetti, op. cit., 109f. For the number of Satyrus’ quotations in fr. 37 of the Papyrus see Arrighetti, loc. cit..
4. See Masqueray, op. cit., 197 n. 1, Parmentier, op. cit., 74.
προεστη-κός τῶν φώ&omicronον and he quotes E. Tr. 886. The biographer in regard to Euripides presents the poet sceptical towards the traditional Greek beliefs about the divinity. Indeed, Euripides often applies a rational and philosophical meaning to the name of Zeus (mainly identical to the aither). The unknown god addressed in our fragment might have been conceived of as the one God, the all-controlling power, the philosophical god of Euripides.

R. Wünsch classified the fragment under examination among the anapaestic hymns of Euripides «mit philosophischem, namentlich physikalisch Einschlag». Evidently he regarded the god addressed as a unitary cosmic power; this is in accordance with Satyrus’ philosophical interpretation of the passage. For the present, we may note that in the fragments cited by Wünsch (n. 5) we clearly discern a mention of some parts of the Universe, in particular of the aither which plays a central role in Pre-Socratic natural philosophy. Fr. 912 lacks a similar mention.

Before we discuss Clement’s view (see above p. 210) it is necessary to comment on the invocation to the god. In Greek prayers the correct invocation to the god (γνώσις ὄνοματος) was of specific importance; this is also characteristic of magical invocations. Sometimes the god is not mentioned by name but he is identified by epithets or by his parentage. Another way of addressing him is the use of a summarising term «ὁστις ποτ’ εἴ σὺ». In Hecuba’s philosophical prayer to Zeus at Tr. 884 ff. we have various alternatives listed and we find the use of a summarising term. Here Zeus is identical to the aither and

1. For the influence of Pre-Socratic speculation on Hecuba’s prayer see K. H. Lee, Euripides Troades (1976) ad loc., Parmentier, op. cit., 72, Wilamowitz, Analecta, 163, Nestle, op. cit., 50 with H. Diels, RhM 42 (1887) 12f., Masqueray, op. cit., 188f.; here the aither of Diogenes of Apollonia is equated with Anaxagoras’ Nous. Diogenes applied the names god and Zeus to the air, this ‘eternal and immortal body’ which pervades everything and rules over everything, see W. Burkert, Greek Religion. Archaic and Classical (transl. by J. Raffan), 1985, 319.
4. RE IX.1, s.v. Hymnos, 163.
5. These are frs. 593, 594, 839 and 1023 N².
6. For the Pre-Socratic cosmic theology and its reproduction by Euripides see Burkert, op. cit., 317-20.
7. See E. Fraenkel on A. A. 160 and Lee on E. Tr. 884-8.
9. See Fraenkel on A. A. loc. cit.
10. See Lee ad loc.
the Νοῦς; he is the supreme being who orders mortal affairs¹. In fr. 912 the god is addressed as πάντων μεδέων, Ζεὺς εἴθ’ Ἄδης / ὑνομαζόμενος στέργεις²; on this cf. Plato, Crat. 400e ὅσπερ ἐν εὐχαίς νόμος ἐστὶν ἡμῖν εὐχεσθαι, οὕτως τε καὶ ὑπόθεν χαίρουσιν ὑνομαζόμενοι... and P IV 1610 (PGM I, p. 124) ἐπικαλοῦμαι σου τά τερα καὶ μεγάλα καὶ κρυπτά ὄνοματα, οὓς χαίρεις ἄκοιον. Cf. also E. Ba. 275f. Δημήτηρ θεά — / γῇ δ’ ἐστὶν, ἄνωμα δ’ ὑπότερον βούλῃ κάλει, with Dodds ad loc.³: «In cult Demeter and Ge were always distinct, though in many respects parallel. For the indifference as to names cf. Aesch. PV. 209f. Ὀτμις/ καὶ Γαῖα, πολλῶν ὄνομάτων μορφη μία». The god addressed as Ζεὺς εἴθ’ Ἄδης is strictly neither Zeus nor Hades⁴; nor is he the personification of any physical element. He is defined at ll. 6-8: he is the king among the gods of Heaven handling Zeus' sceptre and shares with Hades the kingdom of the nether powers. He is a supreme being, Clement speaks of the Father and the Son who are one God (this is how he interprets ll. 1-3), who was ὀλοκάρπωμα υπέρ ήμών like Jesus (he refers to l. 4 where L's reading is θυσίαν άπορον); commenting, finally, on ll. 6-8 Clement believed that Euripides alludes to the Saviour.

In discussing our fragment, J. Harrison refers to Clement's interpretation which she expands as follows⁵: before Euripides, Orpheus divined the same truth, only he gave to his Father and Son the name of Bacchos and to the Son in particular the title of Zagreus. This leads to the myth of the infant-god who was destined to be the successor of his Father Zeus and was dismembered by the Titans (cf. Clement's comment: ὀλοκάρπωμα υπέρ ήμών). In Harrison's opinion, the god invoked in this fragment is a monotheistic divinity, half Zeus, half Hades, wholly Ploutos. This, however, appears to be rather confusing. Evidently the unnamed god is not assimilated to Ploutos here who is only a chthonic god (cf. ll. 6-8). Apart from Harrison, several

1. See Lee ad loc.
2. For the use of εἴτε...εἴτε or πότερον...ἡ in invocations see Keyssner, op. cit., 47 (the γνώσις ὄνοματος).
other scholars have regarded the fragment as Orphic. Masqueray\(^1\) points out that we have a direct allusion to the Orphic mysteries and to the Orphic god Zagreus. Nevertheless, he did not furnish any evidence to advance his view. I.M. Linforth offers a good discussion of the Orphic mysteries and rites\(^2\): they were believed to procure remission of sins and to secure happiness after death, or to provide cures of disease and methods of averting divine wrath\(^3\). The ritual performed in our fragment is related to the souls of the deceased and the realm of the dead; it is a necromantic ritual (see below). Such a ritual is not attested in the Orphic tradition\(^4\).

Before we discuss the identity of the unnamed god in E. fr. 912, it should be noted that the name of Zagreus, whom the Orphics identified with Dionysus and the dismembered by the Titans Divine Child, does not appear in the Orphic Fragments or in the Orphic Hymns or in the references to the myth in the Neoplatonists\(^5\). Nevertheless, W. Fauth\(^6\) identifies this unnamed god with Dionysus - Zagreus; in his opinion, he is not entirely identical either with Zeus or with Hades: he is the successor of Zeus (cf. ll. 6-7). Fauth relates E. fr. 912 to E. fr. 472 N\(^2\) = fr. 79 Austin (Kretes) in which the chthonic Zeus, Zagreus and Dionysus Bacchos are joined. But opinions vary as to the interpretation of this fragment from the Kretes. Several scholars regard it as Orphic\(^7\). Dodds rejects such an interpretation\(^8\); in his opinion, this fragment shows Euripides' interest in or-

---

3. Magic was not alien to Orphism, see Linforth, *op. cit.*, 137, Guthrie, *op. cit.*, 172, 17.
4. The author of the Derveni Papyrus writes about initiates rightly sacrificing to the Erinyes who are really souls, and he makes payment of a penalty a metaphor for the devotees' giving of offerings, which include χοάς consisting of δωρ and γάλα and numerous ritual cakes (άνάριθμα πόπανα). But these sacrificial rites are concerned with the afterlife; see the publication of the full text in *ZPE* 47 (1982) after p. 300 (Columns I, II), M. L. West, *The Orphic Poems*, Oxford 1983, 78, 81, M. Henry, *TAPhA* 116 (1986) 152.
giastic religion. It describes nocturnal mysteries in Crete. West admits that there is an affinity between Dionysus and Zagreus in E. fr. 472, while the rites described must have seemed plausible to his Athenian audience. At all events, the ritual described in it makes the comparison with E. fr. 912 rather unfounded. Nestle, who identifies the god of fr. 912 with Zagreus, notes, however, that the text we possess does not offer any aid for the interpretation of fr. 472.

Euripides' acquaintance with «Orphism» has been discussed by several scholars. West rightly warns: «To say that an idea which we find stated in Pindar or Euripides is Orphic means nothing unless it means that it was derived from a poem or poems bearing Orpheus' name; and even if we know that a given idea occurred in an Orphic poem, we cannot always assume that it originated in or was peculiar to Orphic verse». Be that as it may, in what follows me shall attempt to trace Orphic traits in E. fr. 912.

The first three lines (notably τῶ πάντων μεδέοντι, Ζεύς εἴθ* δής) point to a concept of monotheism, that is to a god of many functions and many names: this is a principal Orphic idea. The «Orphic» god is generally considered to be Dionysus. Nevertheless, there is no clear evidence before the third century B.C. that Dionysus was the principal divinity of Orphism. West argues for the association of Orpheus with Dionysiac cult in the Classical Age; the evidence for this consists of literary allusions (Aeschylus, Herodotus, Euripides) and a fifth century bone tablet from Olbia. To these

Austin ad loc. remarks: «poeta varios cultus in unum contraxit». In Linforth's view, op. cit. (n. 2, p. 213) 311 n. 4, the name of Zagreus does not bring the fragment into association with Orpheus because it was not a characteristic feature of the Orphic story.

1. See Euripides Bacchae, (2160), xlii.
2. See op. cit. (n. 4, p. 213) 170.
5. Op. cit. (n. 4, p. 213) 3. The term «Orphic» is misleading; as Linforth points out «the Orphic religion still remains nebulous and ill defined. Perhaps no two persons would agree upon what belongs essentially to it», see op. cit., X.
7. See Guthrie, op. cit., 41, 251.
we may add the gold leaf from Hipponion. As Burkert points out «Orphic and Bacchic circles coincide in their concern for burial and the afterlife and probably also in the special myth of Dionysus Zagreus». In the Protagonos and Derveni Theogonies, however, which West dates to the Classical Age, Zeus is the ultimate king. The Derveni Papyrus stops short of the birth of Dionysus. West suggests that in the Derveni poem Kore and Dionysus received instruction about their future destinies as saviours of mankind. But H. Jeanmaire raises the following question: is the Son of Zeus, Dionysus, destined to reign with his Father or will he succeed him when order will be established? In Orphic literature the epithet πάντων μεδέων is applied to Zeus, as we see in the Orph. Fr. 245. 16 (Kern). On the other hand, this epithet also points to a concept of universality, of a god who governs the Universe: this is also an Orphic idea. In the Orphic hymnbook this concept applies to various deities: Helios κοσμοκράτωρ, ἄθάνατος Ζεύς (Orph. H. 8), Pan κοσμοκράτωρ, ἄληθης Ζεύς (H. 11), Sabazios βασιλεύτατος πάντων (H. 48), Daimon παμβασιλεύς, Ζεύς μέγας. Outside Orphic literature, the only god who could become an all-embracing god of the Universe, the all-powerful god was Zeus (for magical texts see below). In B. Dith. 17(16) 66 he is ἄρχων μεσάν (ν με)8[έων]; in S. OT 904 Ζεύς is πάντα ἄνδρασσων. But Sophocles in the same play makes Helios τον πάντων θεόν πρόνοιαν τον πρόμον (OT 660); as Kamerbeek comments ad loc. «the deity invoked is often exalted among his peers».

For the indifference as to the name of the god addressed (Ζεύς εἰς "Ἀδης") we may consider Orph. Fr. 239: εἰς Ζεύς, εἰς Ἀδής, εἰς

4. See Burkert, op. cit., 298.
7. In the Derveni Papyrus (Col. XV I. 10) Zeus is called ἄρχων ἄνδρασσων.
9. The author(s) of these hymns were probably familiar with earlier Orphic poetry, see Linforth, op. cit. (n. 2, p. 213) 188, Guthrie, op. cit., 258, West, op. cit. (n. 4, p. 213) 29. Yet there is no reference in them to the Orphic belief in immortality, see Guthrie, op. cit., 259.
10. See Burkert, op. cit. (n. 1, p. 211) 131 with A. Supp. 524 ff., fr. 70 R.
11. Nestle, op. cit. (n. 3, p. 210) 143, believes that the identification of Zeus with Hades here is Orphic and consequently the unnamed god is Zagreus who gov-
"Ηλιος, εἰς Διόνυσος, / εἰς θεός ἐν πάντεσι; this is said of Helios. At ll. 6-7 of our fragment the god is defined as the king among the heavenly gods handling Zeus' symbol of kingly power, the sceptre. In Orphic literature the royal sceptre is the formal symbol of kingship. In Orphic Theogonies we find a line of kingship running from Phanes or Protogonos, or some other deity, down to Zeus and finally to Dionysus, Zeus' son, see Orph. Frr. 101, 107 (Kern, p. 171), 207, 208, 218. These gods held the government of the Universe. For σκῆπτρον μεταχειρίζεσθαι (l. 7) cf. Orph. Frr. 101 σκῆπτρον δ' ἀριθμείετον εἰς χέρεσιν/θεάς Νυκτός, 102 σκῆπτρον ἐχουσ' ἐν χερσὶν ἄριστες Ἡρακλεαίου.

In the Orphic hymnbook this notion of kingly power applies to various deities who bear the title σκηπτοῦχος, see Orph. Hs. 15 (Zeus), 18 (Plouton), 27 (The Mother of the Gods), 52 (Trieterikos = Dionysus), 55 (Aphrodite). Outside Orphic literature the sceptre of Zeus is mentioned at Pi. fr. 70b 7 (M.), A. Pr. 171, etc.; of particular interest for our investigation is Hes. fr. 144.3 (West) in which King Minos is handling Zeus' sceptre.

Before we draw any conclusions about the identity of this unnamed god, it is best to examine the remainder of the invocation. The successor of Zeus shares also with Hades the kingdom of the nether powers (l. 8). G. Zuntz rejects the view that he is Dionysus: «This is a facet of the religious thought - not of some nebulous 'Orphic', but- of Euripides (cf. Tro. 886, etc.)». In his opinion the god addressed is a universal deity. He is sceptical about the chthonic connections of Dionysus in the religion and myth of the Classical Age and his equation with Zagreus who was a chthonic deity. In the myth of the Divine Child Dionysus was the son of Zeus and Persephone, the earth goddess, before she was ceded to Hades. The evidence for an «infernal» Dionysus is non-existent; Dionysus is a giver of immor-

1. See West, op. cit. (n. 4, p. 213) 231 ff.
2. For the successive generations in the divine dynasty of the Orphic Theogonies see Guthrie, op. cit. (n. 5, p. 212) 82, West, op. cit., 207, 234.
6. See Zuntz, op. cit., 81, 162.
tality and eternal bliss, not a god of the underworld. In discussing the content of the Derveni poem West suggests that the future destiny of Dionysus was to rule in the upper world. He has in fact chthonic connections in the Orphic hymnbook: in H. 53 he «sleeps by the house of Persephone», but as a god who returns to the earth every other year; in Hs. 29, 30, 52 he is identified with Eubouleus. In Orph. Fr. 237, though, Eubouleus is a name for the universal deity personified in the sun-god of late antiquity (cf. II. 3f. ἐν δὴ νῦν καλέωσι Φάνητά τε καὶ Διόνυσον/ Ἐὔβουλητά τ’ ἀνακτὰ καὶ Ἄνταύγην ἁριδηλον). Be that as it may, we are not entitled to identify with Dionysus the unnamed god addressed in Euripides’ fragment. On the other hand, as noticed above p. 215, the divine monarchs of Orphic Theogonies govern the Universe. This god is defined both as a heavenly and a chthonic god. It is not clear if the epithet πάντων μεθέων does imply that he governs the Universe (see also above p. 211). We are on safer ground if we consider him as a supreme god rather than as a universal one.

In his interpretation of fr. 912 Clement (see above p. 212) evidently thought of the Orphic doctrine of palingenesis (connected with the myth of the Divine Child) and the identity of opposites which it implies: of life and death, of Father and Son. The foregoing discussion, however, raises two questions of great importance: first, Has Clement’s interpretation any foundation? second, Is the context of the fragment related to the Orphic doctrine about the souls? Let us now concentrate on this point. This fragment reveals a belief in the immortality of souls which was a common Greek speculation adopted by the Orphics, who turned it to their own use in their own way. A prominent feature of Orphism is the concern about the

3. See Zuntz, op. cit., 408 and 167 n. 5: this presumably means that he lies there as dead.
4. See Zuntz, op. cit., 310. Eubouleus is another name of the god of the Netherworld; sometimes he is called Zeus Eubouleus, see Zuntz, op. cit., 311.
5. See Zuntz, op. cit., 311.
6. In some form this myth must be as early as the sixth century B. C., see Linforth, op. cit. (n. 2, p. 213) 355, Burkert, op. cit., 298, Zuntz, op. cit., 398.
7. See further Guthrie, op. cit. (n. 5, p. 212) 227 f.
afterlife; hence their rites were primarily intended to secure blessedness in life after death.

The text which has come down to us through Clement, shows no hint of the Orphic eschatological beliefs which include the doctrine of the transmigration of souls and also the judgement of the dead, their punishments and rewards, their discrimination in initiated and not initiated, purified and unpurified, just and unjust. In fact, Nestle noticed this and argued that in this fragment we have a conjuration of the souls of the deceased, which dwell in the realm of Hades. Furthermore, in my opinion, this text reveals a common Greek belief that the dead are «blessed», free from worries of earthly life, and also that they are capable of listening to the prayers of those on earth, of helping them and even of appearing as ghostly images before them. In Greek tragedy we find many illustrations of these ideas. In Euripides see Alc. 937ff., HF 490 ff., Hec. 1ff., 534ff., El. 677ff., Heracl. 593ff., Tr. 607, 1304ff., Or. 119, 796f. This fragment likewise reveals another Greek common belief that the dead were not entirely cut off from the affairs of the upper world. Therefore, it becomes evident that the poet is here reproducing certain popular beliefs for which no evidence exists that they have been absorbed by the Orphics.

Let us now examine fr. 912 from a different point of view. The text we possess recalls the necromantic ritual performed by Atossa

---

1. See Guthrie, op. cit., 43.
7. See Decharme, op. cit. (n. 5 above) 125, Masqueray, op. cit. (n. 3, p. 210) 283ff.
8. See Rohde, op. cit., 526.
9. Accepting Nauck's emendation at l. 9; L's reading is πέμψον μὲν φῶς ψυχάς ἀνέρων.
and the Chorus at A. Pers. 623ff.: the Queen is pouring the libations to the chthonic powers and Darius², while the Chorus are performing the evocation. The god addressed at fr. 912 is asked to send up³ the spirits of the dead⁴ (l. 9, cf. Pers. 628 ff. ἀλλὰ, χθόνιοι δαίμονες ἁγνοὶ,/ Γῆ τε καὶ Ειρήν, βασιλεύ μὲν ἐνέρων, / πέμψατ' ἐνερθεν ψυχήν ἐς φῶς), to reveal the reason for their conflicts⁶ (ll. 10ff.) and advise them to which god they must sacrifice⁶ in order to secure remedy⁷ (ll. 12f.). The necromantic ritual in the Persae has a successful outcome. The ghost of Darius appears and explains the reason of their misfortunes (II. 725ff.) and also advises them about the future, answering the question put by the Chorus (πῶς αὖ τῶν έτι / πράσσοιμεν ὡς ἀριστα Περσικὸς λέως; ll. 788ff.). In the necromantic ritual in the Persae we have offerings and appeals to the dead, prayers to the mighty deities of the nether world and prophetic utterances⁸. In our fragment we have offerings and a prayer to an unnamed god only, performed by the same person(s)⁹; the offerings are made to him here to procure his favour, because it is under the competence of the

1. For a brief survey of Necromancy see H. D. Broadhead, The Persae of Aeschylus, Cambridge 1960, 302-309 (Appendix III); for this particular necromantic scene see also S. Eitrem, SO 6 (1928) 1-16.
2. See Broadhead, op. cit., 307.
4. Probably of the local heroes, see West on E. Or. 119-20 (Aris & Phillips 1987), Henrichs, op. cit., 192, Eitrem, art. cit., 14. In the Persae Darius himself would tell them the remedy (ll. 631ff. ἐγὼ τι κακῶν ἔκος οἴδε πλέον, / μόνος ἀν θνητῶν πέρας εἴποι). As Broadhead remarks, op. cit., XXIV «from him alone could salvation come, the ruler who was godlike in counsel and never brought ruinous war to the Persians». See also Eitrem, art. cit., 6 n. 2, 13f.
6. Cf. X. An. 3. 1. 6-7 ἐλὴν θ' ἐνοφορῷ ἐπήρετο τὸν Ἀπόλλων τίνι ἀν θεῶν θόων καὶ ἐνεχθής κάλλιστα καὶ ἀρίστα ἐλθει τὰ ὄνομα ἐν ἐπινοεῖ καὶ καλῶς πράξας σωθεῖν, καὶ ἀνείλεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἀπόλλων θεοῖς οἷς ἔδει θεοῖς.
7. In E. Kresphontes fr. 453 N²= 71 A Harder we have a prayer to Eirene on behalf of the city which lives under civil strife; cf. also fr. ad. 1018 (b) PMG which is a prayer to the Fates on behalf of the city to send Εὔνομαν, Δίκαιαν and Εἰράννης. In both examples the prayer is for remedy.
8. See Broadhead, op. cit., 303.
9. The normal necromantic practice was that the person pouring the libation should also make the appeals, see Broadhead, op. cit., 306.

---

1. For a brief survey of Necromancy see H. D. Broadhead, The Persae of Aeschylus, Cambridge 1960, 302-309 (Appendix III); for this particular necromantic scene see also S. Eitrem, SO 6 (1928) 1-16.
2. See Broadhead, op. cit., 307.
4. Probably of the local heroes, see West on E. Or. 119-20 (Aris & Phillips 1987), Henrichs, op. cit., 192, Eitrem, art. cit., 14. In the Persae Darius himself would tell them the remedy (ll. 631ff. ἐγὼ τι κακῶν ἔκος οἴδε πλέον, / μόνος ἀν θνητῶν πέρας εἴποι). As Broadhead remarks, op. cit., XXIV «from him alone could salvation come, the ruler who was godlike in counsel and never brought ruinous war to the Persians». See also Eitrem, art. cit., 6 n. 2, 13f.
6. Cf. X. An. 3. 1. 6-7 ἐλὴν θ' ἐνοφορῷ ἐπήρετο τὸν Ἀπόλλων τίνι ἀν θεῶν θόων καὶ ἐνεχθής κάλλιστα καὶ ἀρίστα ἐλθει τὰ ὄνομα ἐν ἐπινοεῖ καὶ καλῶς πράξας σωθεῖν, καὶ ἀνείλεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἀπόλλων θεοῖς οἷς ἔδει θεοῖς.
7. In E. Kresphontes fr. 453 N²= 71 A Harder we have a prayer to Eirene on behalf of the city which lives under civil strife; cf. also fr. ad. 1018 (b) PMG which is a prayer to the Fates on behalf of the city to send Εὔνομαν, Δίκαιαν and Εἰράννης. In both examples the prayer is for remedy.
8. See Broadhead, op. cit., 303.
9. The normal necromantic practice was that the person pouring the libation should also make the appeals, see Broadhead, op. cit., 306.
nether powers to grant that the spirits come up\(^1\). Thus, what we possess is only a part of a necromantic ritual since it lacks a direct evocation of the spirits\(^2\). A similar example is A. \textit{fr. 273a R (Psychagogoi)}\(^9\): here we find an animal sacrifice and an invocation to Chthon, Hermes Chthonios and Zeus Chthonios; this ritual would be performed at an Oracle of the dead.

In the \textit{Persae} ritual the offerings are the regular ones made at the tombs of deceased persons, i.e. drink-offerings and other gifts\(^4\). Offerings to the dead are also destined for the chthonic gods\(^5\). Atossa’s \textit{χοαί} consist of milk, honey, water and wine; she is also offering \textit{ἄλαξας καρπόν} (which is either olive oil or an olive branch with berries on it)\(^6\) and \textit{ἄνθη πλεκτά}. A rite of this kind is performed at S. \textit{OC} 466-927. In our fragment we have a fireless offering too consisting of \textit{χλόη, πελανός}\(^8\) and \textit{παγκαρπεία}. Although \textit{χλόη} is the \textit{lectio difficilior} (solid offering), \textit{χοή} (liquid) is also a possible reading (see apparatus). \textit{Χοή}, libation, is outpoured to the dead and the chthonic gods\(^10\). In A. Ch. 87ff. the offerings of Electra are described as \textit{χοαί, πελανός, στέφη}. At Pers. 524 Atossa spoke of \textit{πελανός} as \textit{δώρημα} to \textit{γη τε και φθιτοίς} in order to win their favour in the hope that things may be better in the future\(^11\). Finally, we might connect \textit{χλόην} with the \textit{ἄνθη πλεκτά} at A. Pers. 618 and the \textit{κλώνας έλαίας} at S. \textit{OC} 483f. In this case the solid offerings are outpoured as though they had been a libation.

In a ritual as described in our fragment the audience would probably expect the appeal to be made to a chthonic god\(^12\). Since Zeus chthonios and Hades are excluded (see above p. 212) one naturally

---


4. See Broadhead, \textit{op. cit.}, 160.
5. See Burkert, \textit{op. cit.} (n. 1, p. 211) 71.
6. See Broadhead, \textit{op. cit.}, 162.
7. See Burkert, \textit{op. cit.}, 71f.
8. For the accentuation see Fraenkel on A. A. 96.
9. One might connect this sacrifice with the vegetarian life led by the Orphics, see Pearson on S. \textit{fr. 398} and Orph. \textit{test.} 212 (Kern p. 61=Pl. \textit{Leg.} 782 c).
10. See Burkert, \textit{op. cit.}, 70.
11. See Broadhead, \textit{op. cit.}, 307 n. 1.
12. See above n. 1.
thinks first of all of Hermes chthonios and πομπαΐος, cf. A. Pers. 629 Γη τε καὶ Ἐρμῆ, βασιλεύ τε ἐνέρων, Ch. 124 ff. ἐνθύμε νέφσει τῶν ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω / Ἐρμῆ κρῆνε, κηρύξας ἐμοί / τοὺς γῆς ἐνερθε δαίμονας κλύειν ἐμᾶς... Cf. also A. fr. 273a R, Hom. Od. 24. 1ff. (the second nekyia). Hermes is a chthonic and a heavenly god, a god of boundaries and of the transgression of boundaries between the living and the dead; he escorts the souls to Hades, while the way back is known by him alone. According to popular beliefs, Hermes is the leader (ἡγεμόν) of the souls. At the Anthesteria, during the All Souls’ Day (Χύτροι) a service was offered to Hermes alone on behalf of the dead; the gods of the city were excluded, only Dionysus and Hermes were present. Hermes, along with the Earth - Mother, was the intercessor on behalf of the souls of the departed. None the less, in official Greek religion he was never conceived of as a supreme god nor was he addressed as Zeus ἄλλος or Ἀδής ἄλλος. But Hermes belongs to heaven and to the underworld; he might be conceived of as a supreme god according to poetic interests (cf. also Kamerbeek’s comment on S. OT 660, p. 215 above). As we see in Hymn. Mag. 15/16 (PGM II, p. 249) this god is addressed as a universal deity: l. 1 Ἐρμῆ κοσμοκράτωρ, ll. 15f. σταυρεῖον σὺ κρατεῖς, πυρός, ἄερος, ὕδατος, αἰών / ἱερὰ, πτησινοῦχος ἐφυς κόσμῳ ἀπαντος. Harrison associates Hermes with the Agathos Daimon and refers to Photius s.v. Ἐρμῆς: πόσεως ἐλδός where he is equated with the Agathos Daimon and Zeus Soter.

If one wished to identify the unnamed god addressed in our fragment with Hermes, then the sceptre which he handles might be the equivalent of his magical staff (the ῥάβδος, see e. g. Hom. Od. 5. 47) which causes men to sleep or wake; in the Jena lekythos Hermes is illustrated with his magical staff and the kerykeion to summon the

---

2. See Burkert, op. cit., 157f.
6. See Burkert, op. cit. (n. 1, p. 211) 157. It also secures wealth and protection, like the σκῆπτρον, see Stein, RE VIII, s.v. Hermes, 760 with h. Hom. to Hermes l. 529.
souls from a grave - pithos. It is worth noting here that at Pi. O. 9.33 we read that Hades rules the ghosts with his ράβδος. The sceptre which this unnamed god handles might also be taken literally to be the heraldic stick of Hermes, given to him by Zeus; the σκήπτρον was also borne by heralds, see e.g. Hom. Il. 7. 277. Finally, the epithet πάντων μεδέων in the case of Hermes might imply his function as ψυχαγωγός.

Before we close our investigation one further point needs to be made. Necromancy was an essential part of magic. W. Headlam maintains that the necromantic rituals in the Persae and E. fr. 912 have the nature of a magical practice. This is rejected by Broadhead, following J.C. Lawson, as far as the ritual in the Persae is concerned: there is no trace of magic in the ceremony; Aeschylus conceived of it as a purely religious and not as a magical rite. This is also true of our fragment, which is cast in the form of an ordinary prayer with an actio sacra. In E. Ion 1048ff. we have a prayer to Hecate which also bears no trace of magic; it has, however, a magical background as it accompanies Creusa's enterprise to kill Ion by magic poison. F. Graf, in surveying some prayers from the Magical Papyri, points out that there is no essential difference between the magical and religious prayer and ritual as far as general structure, content and context are concerned. The main distinction of magic lies in the function of the ritual.

In what follows we shall attempt to trace features from the Magical Papyri in our fragment. The avoidance of the god's name and his description as a supreme deity recall features of magical invocations, see P XIII (PGM II, p. 122) 762ff., P XXI (PGM II, p. 146)

1. See Harrison, op. cit. (n. 5, p. 221) 295.
4. CR 16(1902) 55; see also Hopfner, art. cit. in preceding note, 2222, Lowe, op. cit., 55f.
6. CQ 28(1934) 82.
8. See Graf, op. cit., 196.
1ff. In these examples the god appealed to is described as a supreme deity but his name is χρυστός and ἀρρητός. Some further examples from the Magical Papyri might illustrate their relation to our fragment. In *Hymn. Mag. 4* (*PGM* II, p. 239) Helios is addressed by an accumulation of epithets among which are τὸν οὐρανοῦ ἔγχομον / γαίης τε χάες τε καὶ Ἀιδός, δέσποτα κόσμου. Helios is implored ἤν γαίης κευμίδων μόλις νεκύων ἐν χώρω, / πέμψυν δαίμονα τούτον ἐμοί· μεσάταιν ἐν ὁρίοις / ...καὶ φρασάτω μοι ἀπὸ τε χέλω γνώμησιν, ἄληθείην καταλέξας (ll. 11 ff.). In a necromantic rite (κενοσχογγή) described at P IV 223ff. (*PGM* I, pp. 78-80) Typhon is involved δν τρέμει γῆ, βυθός, Ἀιδης, οὐρανός, ἡλιος, σελήνη, χορός ἄστρων ἐπιφάνης, σύμπας κόσμος, ὑπὲρ ὄνομα ἡγήθην θεοὺς καὶ δαίμονας ἐπὶ αὐτό βίχ φέρει. In *Hymn. Mag. 6* (*PGM* II, p. 242) Typhon is invoked as τῆς ἀνω σκηπτούχιας / σκηπτοῦχε καὶ δυνάστα, θεέ θεών, ανάξ, and in *Hymn. Mag. 7* (*PGM* II, p. 243) he is addressed as τὸν ἐπουράνιων σκήπτρον βασίλειον ἔχοντα... Likewise, in *Hymn. Mag. 18* (*PGM* II, p. 253), ll. 38ff. Hecate, not Zeus, is the successor as lord of the universe. Finally, in the address to a dead man at P LVIII 10ff. (*PGM* II, p. 186) we read: ἐπιτάσσοι σοι ὁ μέγας θεός, ὁ ἐχων ἄκω τὴν κατεξουσίαν καὶ τὸ βασίλειον τῶν νεκτέρων θεῶν.

Parallels to the magical passages quoted above can easily be traced in our fragment. The chthonic god who is invoked, is described as a supreme god, but this needs not be taken literally, as the magical texts suggest. On the other hand, Hermes also belongs to the powers which are addressed in magical necromancy (see above, p. 221).

In conclusion it might seem best to regard the fragment as above all a powerful poetic evocation, with magical, philosophical and Orphic connotations.

---

1. Helios is one of the powers which are addressed in magical necromancy, see Hopfner, *art. cit.* (n. 1, p. 221) 2220.
2. Seth - Typhon, the Egyptian god of the dead, is one of the powers which are addressed in magical necromancy, see Hopfner, *loc. cit.* in preceding note.
ΕΥΡΙΠΙΔΗΣ ΑΠΟΣΠ. 912 Ν°

Το ἀπόσπασμα 912 τοῦ Εὐριπίδη, ἀπὸ ἄγνωστη τραγωδία του, διέσωσε ὁ Κλήμης ἀπὸ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρεια ὁ ὅποιος ὑποστηρίζει ὅτι ὁ ποιητής γίνεται πρόδρομος τῆς Χριστιανικῆς θρησκείας, καθὼς ταυτίζει τὸν Πατέρα μὲ τὸν Γίδα, τὸ Σωτήρα. Τοὺς τρεῖς πρώτους στίχους παραθέτει ἐπίσης ὁ Σάτυρος στὸ Βίο τοῦ Εὐριπίδη ὡς παράδειγμα τῆς ἐπίδρασης τοῦ Ἀναξάγωρα στὴ σκέψη τοῦ ποιητῆ. Μεταγενέστεροι μελετητές τὸ ἐρμήνευσαν ποικιλοτρόπως:

α) Ἀπεικονίζει τῇ φιλοσοφικῇ σκέψῃ τοῦ Εὐριπίδη.
β) Πρόκειται γιὰ ὥρφικη προσευχῆ στὸ Διόνυσο - Ζαγρέα.
γ) Ἐχει μαγικὸ χαρακτῆρα.

Στὴν ἐργασία αὐτῇ ἐπιχειρεῖται μιὰ διεξοδικὴ ἐξέταση τοῦ ἀποσπάσματος, μὲ ἀφετηρία τῆς παραπάνω ἐρμηνείας, καθώς καὶ ἡ βελτίωση τοῦ κειμένου. Τὸ συμπέρασμα εἶναι ἃτι στὸ ἀπόσπασμα αὐτὸ μποροῦμε νὰ διακρίνομε στοιχεῖα φιλοσοφίας, ὥρφικῆς διδασκαλίας καὶ μαγείας, ἐφόσον πρόκειται γιὰ ποιητικὴ προσευχὴ. Ὁ θεὸς στὸν ὅποιο ἀπευθύνεται ἡ προσευχὴ δὲν εἶναι ὁ Διόνυσος - Ζαγρέας· ἐξετάζεται ἡ περίπτωσι τοῦ ψυχαγωγοῦ Ἐρμῆ. Τὸ ἀπόσπασμα περιγράφει μιᾷ πράξει νεκρομαντείας μὲ κοινὴ στοιχεῖα ἀπὸ τὴν ἀντίστοιχη σκηνὴ στὸν Πέρσας τοῦ Αἰσχύλου. Τέλος, οἱ Μαγικοὶ Πάτυροι προσφέρουν πλοῦσιο υλικὸ γιὰ τὴν κατανόηση τοῦ ἀποσπάσματος.

ΜΑΙΡΗ ΜΑΝΤΖΙΟΥ