THE PLACE OF THE 'SONDER-GÖTTER' IN GREEK POLYTHEISM

By L. R. FARNELL, D. Litt.

It has been said that all study of popular religion is a study of popular psychology; and this is true so far as our main object is to discover the feelings or ideas that underlie the ritual or external act of worship, the early and often prehistoric thought that inspired it, as well as the later thought of any given historic period. This is especially difficult in regard to a class of cult-figures in Greek religion that may seem to belong, and have been explained as belonging, to an older stratum of national belief than that with which the Greek student is familiar, a 'polydaemonism' rather than a polytheism. These figures are in some sense nameless, in that they seem to have possessed no substantival proper names but merely appellative epithets which usually reveal the narrow function or department to which their daemonistic agency may have been confined. As a rule, there is little legend attaching to them, they have rarely a genealogy or family history, but appear as barren and isolated personalities standing apart from the warm life of Greek polytheism. They seem at first sight nothing more than shadowy potencies of the field and fold, of the human household or state, or sometimes of the arts and higher functions of life, and they are called indifferently Θεοί, Δαίμονες, Ἥρωες. For the purposes of a general survey, we may classify them according to their departments. As powers of the field and the crops the record gives us Εὔνοστος at Tanagra, the hero who brings a good yield of corn, Ἐχετλαῖος ἥρως, the well-known 'hero of the ploughshare' at Marathon, Κυαμίτης, the bean-hero, whose shrine was on the sacred way to Eleusis; with these we may consider Αὐξησία of Aegina, and Θαλλώ and Καρπώ, the Attic Hours, and Ἐρίβοια, the cattle-goddess of Lesbos, and perhaps we may bring into this company the δαίμων ἐπιδώτης of Sparta, 'the giver of good gifts.' With the guardianship of the life of the family and the fostering of children

are associated certain doubtful personages such as Κουροτρόφος, 'the nurse of children,' Καλλιγένεια, 'the giver of fair offspring,' Ἀμφίδρομος, a δαίμων whose personality was perhaps invented by Aeschylus and who arose from the Ἀμφιδρόμια, a ritual at which the new-born child was solemnly carried round the hearth-fire and named in the presence of the kinsmen ; we may also remember that Charondas speaks of certain δαίμονες ἑστιοῦχοι, powers of the sacred hearth. Sometimes a hero or daimon might protect the gateway of the house or city or the city-walls or the entrance to the temple, as we hear of a ἥρως πρὸ πυλῶν in Thrace, of an ἐπιτέγιος ἥρως and τειχοφύλαξ at Athens, the guardian of roof and wall, of Κλαϊκοφόρος, the 'holder of the temple-keys', at Epidauros. At the banquet, not only were the high gods remembered, but possibly such personages as Δαίτης at the later Ilium, Ἀκρατοπότης at Munychia, Δειπνεύς in Achaia, Κεράων and Μάττων at Sparta, and if we had only the name to guide us we might associate with these the δαίμων ἰσοδαίτης, the daimon who presided 'over the equal feast'. Again, the potter's art at Athens seems to have required a ἥρως κέραμος, the medical a ἥρως ἰατρός at Marathon, Athens, Eleusis, the nautical a ἥρως κατὰ πρύμναν at Phaleron, and a ἥρως στρατηγός is mentioned in an Athenian inscription. The enigmatical name Βλαύτη occurs on an inscription of a late period found on the Acropolis, from which we learn that she shared a shrine with Κουροτρόφος. We might be tempted to accept Köhler's suggestion that the word is really Βλάστη, an appellative of a spirit of vegetation. But the letters as they are given in the Corpus Inscriptionum Atticarum appear to have been correctly transcribed. If we may trust a gloss in Pollux, there was a ἥρως ἐπὶ βλαύτῃ at Athens, and βλαύτη was the name of a kind of sandal, and we seem to be dealing with the patron saint of shoemakers, though why such a person should have shared the shrine of Κουροτρόφος is not easy to explain. Such figures appear to have been comparatively numerous in Attica, for to those already mentioned must be added the ἥρως Στεφανηφόρος at Athens, the Σπουδαίων δαίμων on the Acropolis, a kindred personage to the δαίμων ἐπιδώτης or the Ἀγαθὸς δαίμων, and Τελεσίδρομος at Eleusis, apparently a hero presiding over the athletic contest in the Eleusinian festival. At Delphi, a parallel figure to Τελεσίδρομος has been discovered in Εὔδρομος, whose chapel is attested there by a fifth-century inscription, the hero to whom the runners prayed. At Lesbos we recognize a daimon of the weather, whose function possibly

was to give the favourable breeze, in Ἐτηφίλα or Πνιστία Ἐτηφίλα, mentioned with Poseidon in a long ritual inscription. And at Knidos the Ἐπίμαχος mentioned in an inscription already noticed may belong to the adjacent name of Pluto, though it does not seem to be an epithet natural to this god, or it may be the appellative of a distinct cult-figure. The list closes with the names of two whom we should rather expect to find in the Roman Indigitamenta than in a catalogue of Greek heroes, the hero 'who frightened horses' in the race-course at Olympia and on the Isthmus, and the 'Fly-catcher' at Aliphera in Arcadia, Ταράξιππος and Μυίαγρος.

To the same stage of religious psychology at which these cult-figures might seem likely to have developed may have belonged those vague groups of divine personages that are also characterized by a functional appellative rather than by a proper or substantival name; for if the single functional daimon appears to lack individuality and concrete personality, compared with the high gods and goddesses of polytheism, groups of such characters united only by a single functional name will be likely to be still more shadowy and amorphous. While detailed criticism of these may be reserved for the present, the following list presents them in alphabetical order.

The Θεοὶ Ἀποτρόπαιοι were worshipped at Sikyon near the grave of Epopeus, the mythic ancestor; and, as Pausanias tells us, rites were performed to them such as were usual among the Greeks 'for the turning aside of evils': his words imply that there were images of them erected near the grave: the Θεοὶ Γενετυλλίδες and Κωλιάδες were deities of childbirth much worshipped by Attic women, greatly to the sorrow and cost of the husbands, if we may trust Lucian: the Εὐδάνεμοι appear to have been a group of weather-daimons or wind-charmers, to whom an altar was consecrated in the Kerameikos and apparently another at Eleusis. The Θεοὶ Καθαροὶ at Pallantion in Arcadia are the subject of a very interesting note in Pausanias: 'there is a temple of Θεοί still standing on the top of the ridge: they are called Καθαροί, and oaths on matters of the greatest import are taken before them. The people do not know their names, or knowing them are unwilling to pronounce them. One may conjecture that they were called Καθαροί because Pallas offered to them a different kind of sacrifice from that which his father (King Lykaon) offered to Zeus Λύκαιος.' Pausanias has probably the Delian altar in his mind that was called Καθαρός because no blood was ever shed

upon it. The Θεοὶ Μειλίχιοι at Myonia in Lokris may have been a similar concept: we can gather that they were chthonian powers, to whom rites of purification for sin, probably the sin of bloodshed, were performed by night. Certain Θεοὶ Μυλάντειοι are mentioned by Hesychius and defined as 'deities of the mill'; but his explanation is very doubtful; he elsewhere speaks of a Προμυλεύς, a goddess whose statue was erected in corn mills. More important is the worship of the Θεοὶ Πραξιδίκαι on Mount Tilphossion, near Haliartos. Pausanias mentions their hypaethral temple there and adds that the oaths taken in their name had the most binding force. It may have been a Minyan migration from this part of Boeotia that brought the cult to the shores of Laconia near Gythion, where Pausanias found in the popular tradition the reminiscence of a Θεὰ Πραξιδίκα, whose cult was associated with the return of Menelaos from Troy. The significance of the name is obvious; the Πραξιδίκαι are local variants of the Ἐρινύες, their appellative expressing more clearly the abstract conception of moral retribution. The Φαρμακίδες at Thebes may once have been the vague personages of an early cult, and akin to the Εἰλείθυιαι, the divine powers that could aid or retard childbirth.

Before raising any further question about such groups, or considering how the conception of divinity that attaches to them differs from that of ordinary polytheism, it may be well to put oneself on one's guard. A divine group united by some common appellative may have consisted merely of some well-known high gods, whose figures were as concrete and well defined within the group as without it. For instance, the term Θεοὶ Ἀγοραῖοι certainly describes no shadowy company of half-formed δαίμονες, but denotes the deities whose statues happened to stand in the Ἀγορά, and these were usually Zeus, Hermes, Apollo, Athena. Or again, the Θεοὶ Προδομεῖς, who were worshipped at a ἑστία in Megara, may indeed have been a group of nameless 'functional' δαίμονες, who had to be appeased before the building of cities; for, according to the legend, sacrifice was offered to them by Alkathous, the founder of Megara, before he began to erect the wall: but the context suggests that Apollo, the god who was pre-eminently the city-builder, was one of them, and that we should explain them differently, as the deities whose statues 'stood before the houses', such as Apollo, Artemis, or Hekate. Similarly the Θεοὶ Φρήτριοι at Naples, known to us only through inscriptions of the Roman period, appear to have been worshipped, not as the heroic ancestors of the clans, but as the deities who

presided over the organization of the phratry. In other parts of Greece these were certain well-defined divinities such as Zeus, Athena, even Poseidon : and perhaps the group at Naples consisted merely of such figures as these. Or the designation may have acquired a certain quasi-Roman vagueness, and connoted, for instance, Zeus, Athena and 'some others', the vaguely comprehensive term being chosen so that no deity might be offended by inadvertent neglect.

Finally, we can say nothing positive about the Ἀλκίδαι, the name of 'certain gods in Lacedaemon', as we learn from the doubtful authority of Hesychios. If the gloss is correct, we may have here either the appellative of vaguely conceived divinities, who never acquired proper names, and were known only as the 'mighty ones', or the complimentary title of certain ordinary and well-known personages of Greek polytheism.

It is quite possible, then, that in these latter instances there is no distinct religious fact that wants explaining. The case may be otherwise in regard to the other groups : and we must consider these in connexion with the cults of those separate δαίμονες or ἥρωες above enumerated, who are known to us only through adjectival appellations, not by any proper or substantival names. The important question is whether all or some of these are the products of an earlier prehistoric stage of religious thought, a stage of what may be hypothetically called 'polydaemonism', a conception preceding in the history of our race the emergence of such articulate and concrete individualities as are the anthropomorphic figures of Greek polytheism. Before going further in the examination of this question, it is proper to consider whether the name δαίμων, which is attached to many of these indeterminate figures, affords us any clue. The etymology of this word, even if it were certain, is no sure guide. Its literary and popular usage may be shortly stated thus : in the Homeric poems it is synonymous sometimes with Θεός and designates a personal deity: frequently it expresses for Homer the more abstract divine force, especially fate or the destiny of man's life, and, in a narrower sense, the doom of death. Hesiod twice employs it in this sense, and twice applies it to individual men or demigods who have become glorified after their death or during their life : he nowhere clearly uses it as a synonym for the personal higher gods. In a fragment of Alcman (69) it occurs in an impersonal sense, meaning apparently the distribution of human lots. Empedocles uses the term—not

indeed as an equivalent for the ordinary human soul, as Rohde supposes—but for the immortal prenatal soul which, having offended some divine law, is cast out from heaven, and, descending into a man, passes through a long cycle of existences: with this view we may connect the later application of it, which is sometimes found, for instance, in Pindar and Menander, to a man's personal genius. On the other hand, from the fifth century downwards, it bears two senses, both of which are concrete and anthropomorphic; the Tragedians can designate as δαίμων the deceased hero or heroine, Darius or Alkestis; and the popular usage was often in accord with them, for the ferocious spirit of Temesa was a δαίμων, but he was also the Ἥρως, the companion of Odysseus who was slain by the inhabitants. Finally, the word came often to denote an inferior or subordinate deity, as in a Dodonaean inscription we find θεοὶ ἥρωες δαίμονες given as a full classification of all the divine powers to whom prayer or sacrifice might be offered. In this sense Attis and the Korybantes are called Δαίμονες.

It may be that Θεοί and Δαίμονες have both been handed down from an equally ancient stage of Hellenic speech, both applicable in the same sense to 'gods': and we may find instances in other languages for the co-existence of synonyms expressing the same idea of divinity. The terms will probably tend to differentiation, as, in fact, δαίμων became variously differentiated.

But the origin of terms does not concern us here. It is sufficient to note that when applied to these cults which we are examining—of which the record is comparatively late—it need not be regarded as investing the cult-figure with a vaguer or more impalpable or abstract character than that of the Olympians themselves. On the other hand, we must lay stress on the fact that most of these personages in the scanty list given above, which I have endeavoured to make complete, are designated as ἥρωες: and the value of this term for the popular imagination is at least clear: it denoted a glorified man once existing upon the earth. Therefore the Ἥρως Ἐπιτέγιος or Ἐχετλαῖος is *qua* Ἥρως as real and palpable a personage as Apollo or Hermes. If his personality is to be regarded as a survival from a period of vaguer and more amorphous religious conception, it must be on the ground of his designation by a mere appellative and the absence of a personal and concrete name.

The facts so far set forth have been made part of the foundation of a far-reaching theory promulgated by Dr. Usener in a

treatise on the Götternamen, a work of importance and value, of which the main results appear to have been rather widely accepted. This is no place for detailed criticism, but some consideration of his leading principles and conclusions is essential here. He correlates the Greek facts with the Roman Indigitamenta and certain phenomena he has observed in the Lithuanian religion; and the conclusion towards which he draws is that the Indo-Germanic nations, on the way to the higher polytheism, passed through an earlier stage when the objects of cult were beings whom he designates by the newly-coined words 'Augenblick-Götter' and 'Sonder-Götter'; that out of these the 'Olympian order', the concrete anthropomorphic gods of Greece and Italy, of the Indo-Iranians, the Persians and Slavs, were evolved, whose more vigorous personalities absorbed the earlier and vaguer forms, and whose concrete proper names now attracted to themselves the mass of adjectives and epithets that were once the independent and sole designation of the older divine beings; finally that traces of this evolution can be found in certain later survivals of the historic cults.

Now the importance of the theory very much depends on what we mean by a 'Sonder-Gott'. Dr. Usener develops his definition from Varro's phrase—certi dei—which occurs in a passage of Servius[1]: 'pontifices dicunt singulis actibus proprios deos praeesse, hos Varro certos deos appellat.' He finds the essential characteristic of a Sonder-Gott, first, in the narrow limitation of his nature or concept, which seems relative only to a particular act or state, or even to a particular moment in that act or state; secondly in the open transparency of the name which, whether substantival or adjectival, expresses just the single function that the divine being exists to perform.

So far we may accept this as prima facie a fair account of the complex Roman system which is presented in the Indigitamenta. We owe the statement of this system to the Christian Fathers, Arnobius and Augustine, who reproduce Varro, and Varro appears to have drawn from the pontifical books. As regards the absolute authenticity of this record, I cannot express an opinion: it may be that some of these appellatives in the Indigitamenta are only thin disguises of well-known concrete gods, such as Faunus and Jupiter, as an American scholar, J. B. Carter, has endeavoured to prove in a treatise 'de deorum Romanorum cognominibus'. But, if we

[1] *Aen.* ii. 141.

accept the main account of Varro as authentic, we may well sympathize with St. Augustine's humorous protest against the abnormal 'religiosity' of the Romans that seemed to leave nothing to unaided human initiative. And it is very difficult to find the right expression by which to designate this system in terms of the ordinary nomenclature of anthropology. It cannot be called fetichism, still less pantheism. If it really was to the Roman as it appears to us, we may be tempted to regard it as a very abstract and spiritual form of animism. If it be a right account of animism that it endows inanimate and material objects with quasi-human consciousness and emotions, and sometimes with a supra-human power and volition which suggests worship, we may perhaps extend the term to cover a religious system that imagines an immanent semi-conscious or subconscious divine potency to reside in passing acts and states of man or fleeting operations of nature.

This leads us to the next consideration, which is of still greater importance. Are these 'Sonder-Götter' conceived as personal gods? Dr. Usener does not always speak quite clearly on this point; he maintains, on the one hand, that a few of them can be proved to have had a personal reality for the Italians, yet his tendency is to distinguish this Roman system, which he finds also in Greece and Lithuania, from the polytheistic belief in personal gods. If this distinction on the ground of personality is justified, it is vital; because in tracing the evolution of religion, and in classifying recorded or existing forms, the most far-reaching principle of classification is the distinction between the anthropomorphic and non-anthropomorphic forms of belief, the personal and the impersonal or half-personal objects of reverence.

Supposing, then, that the above-given account of the Sonder-Götter is correct, have we the right to regard them as belonging always and everywhere to that more primitive stage of belief which preceded polytheism and led up to it? Looking first at the minute specialization of divine functions on which the system is based, we cannot regard this as a decisive test of primitiveness. Such specialization may indeed be found among early races, nor am I inclined to believe in the neo-totemistic dogma 'one clan one totem-god'. Some of Dr. Usener's Lithuanian parallels may be accurate illustrations of the species that he is formulating, though I do not recognize the value of all of them; certainly 'the Fly-Buzzer God', a Lithuanian form of Μυίαγρος, the 'God of the Besom', the 'God that makes the grass

green', the 'God who makes the beer sour', these are deities with a distinctly Roman flavour about them. Having tried to go further afield I have been able to find only a few exact parallels. Dorsey, in his 'Study of Sioux cults', mentions the Indian's invocation of his hunting-trap and all the various parts of it, and his prayers to the tent-pole, which are quite after the fashion and spirit of the Roman Indigitamenta. Traces of the same system seem to appear in the religion of the Kenyahs, a tribe on the Baram river in Borneo, described by Messrs. Hose and McDougall[1]: 'Balli Atap (Atap = roof) is the spirit or god that protects the household from harm of all sorts,' and reminds us of the Ἥρως Ἐπιτέγιος at Athens; and in the prayers of certain heathen tribes in Russia we may detect the same 'Indigitamenta' style.[2] But I imagine we should find this rigorous apportionment of special functions, this minute articulation of the divine world, at least as frequently in the latter days of a well-organized polytheism, of which it is often a mere by-product. While many of the personal gods in Greece expanded their individualities and widened their range of functions, many were obliged to contract and to specialize. Ares and Pan were once more manifold gods than they afterwards became; and the same is true of Aphrodite and Eros, and in some degree of Artemis. And such personal deities as Eros and Asklepios beget such transparent and limited personages as Himeros and Pothos, Iaso Akesis, Panakeia: while Νίκη, Πειθώ, Νέμεσις, most absolute Sonder-Götter, are late products of polytheism, and the first two, if not the third also, are probably emanations of concrete and personal deities.

The specialization of functions, then, is not a test that helps us to distinguish the 'Sonder-Götter' system from personal polytheism, or to assign the former of necessity to a more primitive stage. But the greater or less degree of anthropomorphism in these strange Greek, Roman, and Lithuanian forms, if we could appreciate it, would be a much more important clue. And it is in dealing with this question that Dr. Usener's work appears least satisfactory.

It is obvious, as Mr. Warde Fowler and other writers on Roman religion have often pointed out, that it was far less anthropomorphic than the Greek, that it presented less concrete individualities to the imagination. The chief deities of the Italic tribes were personal and anthropomorphic in so far as they were distinct in sex and were

[1] *Journ. Anthrop. Inst.*, 1901, pp. 174–5.

[2] *Archiv fur Religionswissenschaft*, 1906, p. 284.

worshipped occasionally with idols; but the high powers of the Roman religion seem to stand apart, each for himself or herself, in a cold aloofness. Little or no myth is told of them, rarely a legend of marriage or affiliation. Were, then, Inuus, Occator, Dea Panda, Deus Lactans, Dea Mena, and all the crowd of deities of procreation, nutrition, and birth, invested with a personality very much vaguer and thinner than were Vesta and Minerva? And, if so, are they to be regarded as the survivals of an older stratum of religion, or rather as the late development of a certain logical tendency in Roman religious thought? The record is late, and gives us little more than a bare list of names; and no clue is offered by any tradition or any reported ritual. Nor is this a place to attempt the solution of the Roman problem.

As regards the Lithuanian evidence, the exposition of it by Dr. Usener fails to show the different degrees of strength with which the various functional agencies in his list were personified, or to distinguish between the more concrete and the vaguer forms. It is very interesting in itself, but I do not think it solves this particular problem of Greek polytheism.

We can now confine our attention exclusively to the Greek evidence. We have every reason to believe that the Hellenic perception of divinity had become concrete and precise at a very early period[1]; even if theriomorphism occasionally prevailed, the clear outlines of the divine personality need not have been much impaired; there is nothing necessarily vague or nebulous about a horse-headed Demeter. Moreover, the chief divine personalities had at an early period become anthropomorphic. The view is quite tenable that many of the anthropomorphic deities were already the common possession of the Greek tribes before the migration into Hellas. The extreme antiquity and obscurity of most of their personal names would itself support this view. And the impulse in Greek religion towards the creation of clearly outlined personal forms was a devouring impulse that might well have obliterated the traces of a previous more amorphous animistic system. Yet such traces may be found, and in other directions more clearly perhaps than in the domain of the 'Sonder-Götter'. The worship of the stone, the pillar, the tree-trunk, even the axe, is proved of the prehistoric period, and it survived in the historic. It is sufficient to observe here that such aniconic cults are compatible and often contem-

[1] Dr. Usener himself admits this, p. 302.

poraneous with an anthropomorphic and personal conception of the divinity, though they may have arisen under the influence of animism, fetichism, or from mere 'teratology'.[1] Thus the 'Mycenaeans' possessed human and personal gods, though their ἀγάλματα were the pillar, the tree, or the axe: as witness we have the sacrificial scene on a Mycenaean gem, possessed and recently published by Dr. Arthur Evans, where a god is seen hovering above his own pillar, having been evoked by the prayers or the ritual. But the Arcadian cults of Ζεὺς Κεραυνός, Ζεὺς Καππώτας, in which Zeus was actually identified with the thunder and the meteor-stone, and the fetich-worship of the sceptre of Agamemnon at Chaironeia, seem to belong to some primitive stratum of pre-anthropomorphic religion. We must believe in the existence of this stratum in the buried soil of the Hellenic or pre-Hellenic religions as a 'vera causa' that might explain certain anomalies among the religious facts of the historic period.

But it is very doubtful if we need invoke the aid of this hypothesis to explain the facts upon which Dr. Usener has built his theory; and there are some that it would fail altogether to explain. There is one important point that we must insist on at the outset. A god is not necessarily nameless because he is not named or is usually addressed by a simple appellative. There are many reasons for concealing the proper name. One is the superstitious fear that the enemy may come to possess it, and work evil through the magical power that the possession may give him. For the same reason many savages conceal their own true name and the names of their friends; and this is occasionally found even in civilized communities; as, for instance, it was improper to mention the personal name of the δᾳδοῦχος at Athens on account of his sacred character. Again, it was ill-omened to use the name of the deities of the nether world, because of their associations with death. Thus arose euphemisms for the name of Hades; and the designation

[1] Statements about the animistic worship of stones and trees are often deceptive; the words of Miss Alice Fletcher in the *Peabody Museum Reports*, vol. iii, p. 276, 'Careful inquiry fails to show that the Indian actually worships the objects that are set up or mentioned by him in his ceremonies. The earth, the four winds, the sun, moon and stars, the stones, the water, the various animals, are all exponents of a mysterious life and power encompassing the Indian and filling him with vague apprehension and desire to propitiate. . . . These various objects are stopping-places of the god,' may serve as a correction of hastily gathered impressions.

of the god and goddess of the lower world as ὁ Θεός and ἡ Θεά, which came into vogue at Eleusis in the fifth century B.C., may be due to the same motive, and need not be supposed to have descended from a system of nameless deities of dateless antiquity. A similar feeling prompted the habit of passing the graves of the dead, and especially of the dead hero, in silence; and from this practice the buried hero at Oropus received the name Σιγηλός. And as many heroes came thus to be designated simply as ὁ Ἥρως, the personal names could easily pass out of recollection. What was superstition in one age becomes merely respectful reserve in another; and the modern man rarely speaks of God by any personal name, but most frequently by some vaguer title such as 'the Deity'. At Bulis, near Phokis, the chief god was always addressed merely by the worshipful title of Μέγιστος, and never by any proper name, according to Pausanias[1]: but there is no reason to suppose that they had not advanced as far in the evolution of anthropomorphic and concrete divinities as their neighbours, or to gainsay the view of Pausanias, that Μέγιστος was none other than Zeus himself.[2]

We may next observe that many of the divine appellatives that Dr. Usener presses into the support of his theory are no signs of any earlier and distinct religious stage at all, but are as anthropomorphic in their connotation as any individual proper name, and many have a generally descriptive and no functional sense whatever, and therefore are by no means to be compared with the Roman Indigitamenta. For instance, we find in him the strange suggestion (which is almost a *reductio ad absurdum* of his theory) that Demeter Ξανθή derived her appellative from an old god called Ξανθός; the only person so named was a secular hero, and there is no evidence of a divine personage so called except for those who hold, like Dr. Usener, the almost obsolete and very narrow theory that all popular heroes of epic and legend were the faded forms of forgotten gods. But let us grant a god Ξανθός, or a goddess Ξανθή. There is nothing 'functional' about

[1] 10, 37, 3.

[2] It is particularly in the Eastern Hellenized world, in various districts of Asia Minor, especially Phrygia, that we mark the tendency gaining force in the later period to designate the divinity by a vague descriptive name of reverential import, such as 'the Highest God': two newly discovered inscriptions of the Roman period at Miletus show the existence there of a cult of ὁ ἁγιώτατος θεὸς Ὕψιστος Σωτήρ, who was a god of divination and served by a προφήτης.—*Arch. Anz.*, 1904, p. 9.

the adjective name, nothing vague: it has more obvious anthropomorphic connotation than the names Apollo, Athena, &c. It no more marks a distinct stage in religious thought than two such formally different names of individual men as 'White' and 'Wright' mark two different stages in the development of our personal consciousness concerning our fellows.

Still less relevant to the hypothesis of 'Sonder-Götter', or a system of specialized functional divinities vaguely and almost impersonally conceived, are such popular titles of divinities as Σώτειρα, Δέσποινα, Βασίλη. Was there ever an imaginable stage in Aryan religion when deities were brought forth immaturely with nothing more concrete to cover them than the vague 'function' of 'Ladyship', 'Queenship', 'Saviour Power'? Surely such names are the natural adjuncts of personal religion, and belong to the ceremoniousness of personal worship. Σώτειρα is here Kore, there Artemis, elsewhere Athena; it is certainly difficult to imagine her before she was any one at all in particular. And if we could, we still could not call her a Sonder-Göttin according to the definition. In many parts of the Mediterranean, long before Christianity, a virgin-goddess Παρθένος was worshipped and known by no other name. Yet she need not have been evolved to fulfil no other 'function' than to be maidenly, but probably had in the people's imagination as marked an individuality and as concrete a character as the Holy Virgin in our own religion. We should scarcely say that the proper name 'Mary' and the appellative 'Holy Virgin' reveal two distinct stages of religious thought. The Goddess Ἀρίστη, 'the Best,' may have been worshipped at Athens, Metapontum, and Tanagra, without a proper name, but may have been as personal an individual as Artemis.

In fact, apart from the above considerations, the number of deities and heroes in Greece who can be proved to have existed in cult without a proper name is exceedingly small. Dr. Usener endeavours to enlarge the stock by what appears to me to be faulty logic; by the suggested rule, for example, that when two or more deities have the same epithet in common we should conclude that the epithet had a separate previous existence as the appellative of a 'Sonder-Gott'. The cogency of this does not appear; every personal deity was liable to be called Ἀλεξίκακος, every goddess or heroine Λιπαράμπυξ or Βαθύκολπος. More than one Greek divinity was called Μειλίχιος, a term usually connoting the character of the

nether-god, and we have a cult-record of ὁ Μειλίχιος, as we have of ὁ Θεός alone. But this is no reason for supposing that Zeus Μειλίχιος became so by absorbing an older and vaguer 'numen' called 'Μειλίχιος' who had once half-existed in shadowy independence; for we note that Μειλίχιος is a word of later formation within the same language than 'Zeus'.

Again, his theory does not sufficiently appreciate the important fact, of which, however, he is cognisant, that we can already discern the bright personal deities of Greek polytheism throwing off their epithets as suns may throw off satellites, the epithets then becoming the descriptive names of subordinate divinities or heroines. Examples of this process have often been given and discussed. It is a tenable belief that Aphrodite threw off Peitho, Athena Nike, Poseidon Aigeus; the most transparent fraud of all was the emanation of a useless and colourless hero Πύθιος from Apollo Πύθιος. In Thera the people were especially prone to call the high gods by their appropriate appellatives. The inscriptions[1] show an Apollo Δελφίνιος styled Δελφίνιος, Zeus Ἱκέσιος Στοιχαῖος Πολιεύς Ὅρκιος invoked by these epithets alone. The nether-world god becomes addressed as 'the Rich One', 'Πλούτων', 'He of good counsel,' Εὐβουλεύς, the 'Placable One', 'Μειλίχιος'. Adjectives are more affectionate and the people love them; they are also a shorter style. The process of detaching an epithet from a deity and forming from it a new divine personality is found also in the Vedic religion. 'Rohita, originally an epithet of the sun, figures in the A V. as a separate deity in the capacity of a creator.'[2]

Bearing these facts in mind, we may now consider again in detail the short list of 'functional' and appellative heroes, daimones, or gods, which was given at the beginning of this paper. We shall rarely find that they accord with the definition of Sonder-Götter or betray a pre-anthropomorphic imagination. The heroes of the drinking-bout and festive meal, Ἀκρατοπότης, Δαίτης, Δειπνεύς, Κεράων, and Μάττων, are functional, but being heroes are conceived as personal and human; and none can be said to savour of prehistoric antiquity, but are obviously late creations. As there was no high god that had charge of the banquet, Greek polytheism, following its natural instinct, creates Δαίτης and Δειπνεύς, and obeying its overpowering bias towards anthropomorphism and con-

[1] *C. I. G.*, *Ins. Mar. Aeg.*, iii, p. 80. [2] Macdonell, *Vedic Ritual*, p. 115.

crete forms conceives of them as heroes; and as it was necessary to invent a name it was more natural to choose appellative descriptive names than to coin irrelevant proper names. Nor is it inconceivable that Ἀκρατοπότης was a distant descendant of Dionysos Ἀκρατοφόρος, who was known at Phigaleia. As regards Κεράων and Μάττων, I venture this explanation: the guild of cooks, like other guilds and like clans of kinsmen, would be tempted to invent for themselves an eponymous ancestor; so fictitious heroes arise, whose names stamp them as the patron-saints of the arts of cooking. We can similarly explain Κέραμος as the eponymous hero of the potters' guild, who gave his name to a deme of the Akamantid tribe. Nor must we take these fictions too seriously.

Ἀμφίδρομος we may regard as a pure literary invention, created to explain the Ἀμφιδρόμια, as Ἔρση has been supposed to have been evolved to explain the Ἑρσηφόρια. The δαίμων ἐπιδώτης of Sparta, a vague figure with a semi-functional name, certainly seems to answer somewhat to the description of a true Sonder-Gott; but the record of Pausanias suggests that his title is of late creation. The δαίμων Σπουδαίων on the Acropolis at Athens may be regarded as another form of the Ἀγαθὸς Δαίμων, a late growth of the polytheistic period. As regards such personages as Βλαύτη, Ἥρως Ἐπιτέγιος, we have no clue at all as to their character, period, or *raison d'être*. More interesting are the figures of Εὔνοστος at Tanagra and Ἐχετλαῖος at Marathon, popular local heroes of the field and crops, to whom certain vivid legends are attached that place them on a different plane from the shadowy figures of the Indigitamenta. The Marathonian tradition is well known; it is probably a pseudo-historic aetiological story invented to explain a name and a half-forgotten cult, and should not be regarded as proof that the latter originated in the fifth century B.C. We have still more reason to believe that the Tanagran Eunostos belonged to a very early period of European belief, and the study of his legend and the names associated with it reveals an old-world agricultural story and ritual. Eunostos is the power that gives 'a good return' to the crops[1]; and, if we may trust the Etymologicum Magnum, he had a sister Εὔνοστος, a mill-goddess, who looked after the measure of the barley, and whose image stood in the mills. Plutarch tells us that the holy grove of the Tanagran hero was strictly guarded against the intrusion of women. We know this to have been a taboo enforced in many ancient shrines; but Plutarch,

[1] Cf. the use of *νόστος* in Athenae—618 C.

drawing from a book by Diocles περὶ τῶν ἡρώων and ultimately from the Boeotian poetess Myrtis, gives a curious story to explain the fact. A maiden of the country woos the virtuous Eunostos in vain, and thereupon hangs herself in grief. To requite her death one of her brothers slays Eunostos, whose ghost then becomes a scourge to the territory until he is pacified with cult and a shrine where no women might enter. The rule was once infringed, with the result of earthquakes, famine, and other prodigies, and Eunostos was seen hastening to the sea to cleanse himself from the pollution. This genial tale of despised love doubtless arose out of a quaint agricultural or horticultural ritual. Eunostos is the hero of the cornfield, who is slain like John Barleycorn is slain. His parents are Ἐλιεύς of the marshes and Σκιάς of the shade; the wicked brother is Βουκόλος; the hapless maiden is Ὄχνα, the 'Pear-tree', and these hanging-stories of personages, whose names or legends convey an allusion to the fertility of the trees and the crops, arose, as I have pointed out before, from the old agrarian ritual of hanging images on trees. We may then regard Eunostos and Echetlaios, possibly also Ἐρεχθεύς, 'the ground-breaker', as descendants or survivals of a very old stratum of European agricultural religion, when the personages of worship were simpler in their structure and less individualized than the high gods of Greece; yet as we know them these Greek heroes of the field and the tree are of the same concrete life as that which quickened the forms of Hermes and Dionysos. Going back as far as we can, we have not yet found among them the shadowy impalpable forms that seem to float before us in the Indigitamenta. Κυαμίτης, the bean-hero, whose shrine stood on the sacred way, may have had the same descent and character as Εὔνοστος; or he may be a late product, a personage who grew up artificially within the area of the Demeter-cult, at a time when the passion for hero-worship had reached the pitch that it had attained in the seventh and sixth centuries, and culture-heroes were needed for many departments of life; he may also have been called into existence because the culture of beans could not be imputed to Demeter, who happened to loathe them. Telesidromos, the hero of the Eleusinian racecourse, is obviously a late and transparent fiction, and we may believe the same of Εὔδρομος of Delphi. Again, we must reckon with the possibility that the theory of Euhemeros may occasionally have been true. The worship of real people of flesh and blood is a living force, as Sir Alfred Lyall has emphatically pointed out, in India and China to this day. He

records the case of the very real Indian, Hurdeo Lala, becoming after his death the 'functional' god of cholera.[1] It would be quite natural, from the Greek point of view, that when an individual was deified or 'heroized' after his death a new and functional name should be then attached to him, expressive of the benign influence which he was called upon to exert in behalf of his worshippers. This would explain such family cults as those of Epimachos at Knidos and Erythrai, and of Symmachos at Pharsalos. That these are the cults of real men is certain in the latter[2] case and probable in the former. Similarly, the cult of the Ἥρως Στρατηγός at Athens, of which we have proof in the first century B.C., may well have been the cult of a real historical personage whose name was concealed and lost. The Ἥρωες Ἰατροί in different parts of Attica may with perfectly good reason be supposed to have been real men, who had an existence apart from their 'function', or at least ancestors imagined and worshipped as real, who take over the art of healing, as every 'hero' always could if he wished. And of two of these glorified Ἰατροί personal names are actually recorded. The ἥρως κατὰ πρύμναν at Phaleron need not originally have been the functional demon-impersonation of steering, but a buried and sacred personage whose name was lost, and who was believed to have been the steersman of Theseus, and thus came to be an occasional patron-saint of mariners. Greece was full of forgotten graves belonging to an immemorial past. Many were believed to be, and very likely were, the resting-places of ancestral chiefs, and cults consecrated to them may often have arisen or been revived after the name had been forgotten. We know that tombs were frequently near or within the precincts of temples, and from this local accident the buried ancestor might acquire a new descriptive name, such as Κλαϊκοφόρος, the 'porter of the temple'. A clear instance of an apparently functional cult which may be thus explained, and to which Dr. Usener's theory can be proved inappropriate, was that of the hero Ταράξιππος at Olympia and on the Isthmos. Near the entrance to the racecourse at Olympia was an altar which appears to have been erected over a grave, where

[1] *Asiatic Studies*, 2nd ser., p. 287.

[2] *B. C. H.*, 12, p. 184. On a relief found at Pharsalos, of the fourth century B. C., Symmachos is seen standing by his horse, and his type is common for that of the 'heroized' dead; near him is a seated goddess, whom the remains of letters prove to be Hestia. As the writer of the article points out, this is a unique instance of the figure of Hestia being used as the divine symbol of a family cult.

we may suppose that some one had been really buried, and at this place horses habitually shied. What was more natural than to account for their fear by supposing the ghost to be the cause of it? It was most important, then, to know the name of that ghost, but though various theories as to his personal name were put forward, none could prevail, and the most reasonable course was adopted of calling him Ταράξιππος. As the institution of the races at Olympia is comparatively late, Ταράξιππος at least is not a remnant of a prehistoric religion.

Again, there are other appellatives in this list that we may quite reasonably explain as the sheddings and leavings of concrete high divinities, Ἐρίβοια, for instance, in Lesbos, being very probably an epithet of Demeter, Εὐβοσία or Εὐποσία in Phrygia of Agrippina-Demeter. And what are we to say of Ἰσοδαίτης? We can understand the creation or evolution of a 'daimon of the banquet', but the 'daimon of the equal banquet' seems a somewhat stranger fiction. The record in Harpokration gives us a clue to a different explanation. We are told that he was a ξενικὸς Δαίμων at Athens, who was worshipped by women of doubtful character. Now, there were certain foreign cults of Dionysos, mystic and disreputable, that were in vogue at Athens from the fifth century onwards, and were specially attractive to women, and Plutarch tells us that in mystic circles Dionysos was called Ἰσοδαίτης.

More important are the cults of Καλλιγένεια and Κουροτρόφος, both of whom are 'Sonder-Gottheiten' in Dr. Usener's list. Καλλιγένεια may be interpreted as the goddess of fair offspring, or as she who gives fair offspring. The ancient writers, both learned and popular, were doubtful about her, but all associated her with Demeter; and it is in the company of this goddess that we meet with her both at Athens and in Sicily. The name must be considered in close relation to the ritual of the Καλλιγένεια, which took place in the great festival of Demeter, the Thesmophoria, on the day after the Νηστεία. Wherever the Thesmophoria was held in Greece, the Καλλιγένεια must have usually formed part of it, for Plutarch specially notes its non-existence at Eretria. It is a legitimate conjecture that on this day the goddess was believed to have been reunited with Kore, and that the women then prayed for fair offspring to the goddess of fair offspring, the Θεσμοφόρια being specially a festival of married women. But Kalligeneia herself was almost certainly a later fiction like Amphidromos, an imaginary personality invented to explain the

name of the festival-day, τὰ Καλλιγένεια.[1] As regards Κουροτρόφος at Athens, we cannot be sure that she did not once possess a more concrete proper name. Many goddesses were called by this adjective, and the type of a female divinity holding a child in her arms, or giving suck to it, was widely spread over the Mediterranean at a very early time, and it has recently been discovered that Aphaia in Aegina was thus represented. The very multiplicity of the proper names that might claim the epithet might be a reason for a cautious cult preferring to use the epithet alone. But in any case the Κουροτρόφος at Athens was a robust and personal figure closely akin to the earth goddess, and whether the earth-mother is called Ge or Κουροτρόφος, or Πανδώρα, the conception may be equally anthropomorphic and personal in each case, and this is really the important fact to bear in view.

I have reserved for the close of this short critical account the consideration of Μυίαγρος, the Fly-Catcher, at Aliphera; for Dr. Usener's theory might really make more out of this humble personage than out of any of his *confrères*. The facts that illustrate the cult are interesting. At Leukas and Actium they sacrificed to the flies before the great ritual in honour of Apollo began. This was perhaps the simplest and most primitive thing to do; it does not imply fly-worship, but the preliminary offering to them of a piece of cooked meat was a bribe to the flies to go away and not disturb the worshippers at the solemn function that was to follow, where any disturbance would be ill-omened, and where the flies were likely, unless pacified first, to be attracted by the savour of the burnt-sacrifice. As thought advances, a hero, Μυίαγρος, is evolved at Aliphera, to look after the flies before the sacrifice to Athena. We have traces of the same hero at Olympia, though here his function was at last absorbed by Zeus Ἀπόμυιος. Here then in Μυίαγρος is almost the true Sonder-Gott, almost the 'Augenblick-Gott'; for his function is very limited, and his value for the worshipper was probably little more than momentary, nor are any stories told about him. Yet he is a late invention, implying the pre-existence of the higher gods, for whose better ministration he was created and ordained. Likewise he is called a ἥρως by Pausanias, and therefore by him at least regarded as personal.

It seems, then, that scarcely any figure in this brief catalogue entirely satisfies Dr. Usener's definition of a Sonder-Gott; those that

[1] Vide my *Cults*, vol. iii, pp. 95–6.

may be supposed to have descended from a remote past yet possess a personal character which betrays the same religious thought as that which produced the personal gods of polytheism. Many of the figures imply the high gods, and some are probably emanations from them. The more shadowy and impalpable forms can be sometimes proved, and often suspected, to be the products of the latest period. The ancestor of a personal deity may be often more limited in function, but appears sometimes to be more complex than his descendant. An adjectival name may have been originally chosen to designate the Godhead; the name 'Christ' was adjectival, and originally 'Zeus' may have only signified 'the Bright One'. But such names may in thought have been connected with many other qualities that make up personality, and may have at once denoted full concrete individuals. Doubtless a divine individuality often grows in the course of time more complex and more intensely conceived, and sometimes we can mark the stages of its growth. But Dr. Usener's learned and, in many respects, valuable treatise has not proved, or even made probable, its theorem that in the immediate background of Greek polytheism, out of which much of it developed, was a shadowy world of functional, half-impersonal 'numina'. Greek religion early and late had always its animistic and daemonistic elements; and in the history of our race animism probably preceded theism and polytheism; but our present knowledge points to the belief that the ancestors of the historic Greeks brought with them a personal religion of concrete divinities, and found a personal polytheism in many respects differing from their own, but in other ways akin, on the soil that they conquered.