



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Bespreking van: R. Parker, Miasma. Pollution and purification in early Greek religion (1983)

Horstmanshoff, H.F.J.

Citation

Horstmanshoff, H. F. J. (1986). Bespreking van: R. Parker, Miasma. Pollution and purification in early Greek religion (1983). *Mnemosyne*, 39, 538-543. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/8887>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/8887>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Magnus Maximus — das Zeugnis der Münzen, Chiron 14 (1984), 175-192 and S. Elbern, *Usurpationen im spätrömischen Reich*, Bonn 1984) to the controversy over the Mother of God. He has certainly succeeded in offering new insights into the functioning of the eastern court in the fifth century.

ROTTERDAM, Lijsterlaan 37

H. C. TEITLER

R. PARKER, *Miasma*. Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1983. XVIII, 413 p. Pr. £ 30,—.

Robert Parker has written a very scholarly and intelligent book on the broad concept of *miasma*. In the *Introduction* he defines the concept which he intends to consider and distinguishes it from related ideas, such as *agos*. He limits his treatment to the religious aspects of *miasma*: "This is not a book about Greek ideas of dirt and defilement in general but about certain **dangerous conditions** to which the **metaphor of defilement** is often applied" (p. 4). The terms "dangerous conditions" and "metaphor of defilement" need to be explained. The former recalls Mary Douglas's *Purity and Danger* (London 1966), whose influence can clearly be traced in P.'s book, even though he differs from her on a number of points (p. 61 n. 101, pp. 62-3). Pollution occurred when the protective enclosure surrounding the holy was pierced as the non-holy (the profane or the polluted) approached the holy. In early Greece, religious danger was rarely limited to individuals but was considered to find expression in disasters effecting the collectivity, such as epidemics, famines, earthquakes, tidal waves, defeats and shipwrecks. To answer the question "...how the early Greeks, individually and collectively, responded to the afflictions that befell them" (p. 2), P. has to straddle the frontiers between literary history (tragedy) religious history, the history of science (medicine!) and the history of the value system. He is concerned with "the complicated process by which belief is translated into behaviour" (p. 17). This is in essence a historical question.

In Chapter 1 *Purification: a Science of Division*, insights gathered from anthropology, and especially from the work of Mary Douglas, are applied to the Greek material. Her thesis is: "dirt is essentially disorder. There is no such thing as absolute dirt: it exists in the eye of the beholder" (Douglas, *Purity*, 2). Parker too sees the origin of views on contamination rather in the quest for order than in fear

or guilt (p. 325-326). As will be shown below, this has important historical consequences.

What Parker means by the "metaphor of defilement" is shown by the development of the concepts of purity and defilement in the various areas of life. Chapters 2 *Birth and Death*, 3 *The Works of Aphrodite*, 4 *The Shedding of Blood*, 5 *Sacrilege* and 6 *Curses, Family Curses and the Structure of Rights* are concerned above all with the causes of defilement. In Parker's interpretation they represent points on a line from very concrete, physical impurity (by birth and death) to entirely metaphysical impurity (sacrilege). In the former case concrete impurity is also a symbol of a metaphysical danger, in the latter physical dirtiness was used as a visible sign to express metaphysical danger. In both cases, defilement is seen as a metaphor.

Chapter 7 *Disease, Bewitchment and Purifiers*, 8 *Divine Vengeance and Disease*, 9 *Purifying the City* and 10 *Purity and Salvation* are largely concerned with the consequences of defilement and the possible ways of being purified. Chapter 11 *Some Scenes from Tragedy*, applies the conclusions so gained to various tragedies. An *Epilogue*, more an ending than a conclusion, closes this part of the book.

The work is completed by a number of *Appendices*, which deal with, 1 *The Greek for Taboo*, 2 *The Cyrene Cathartic Law*, 3 *Problems concerning 'Enter pure from....'*, 4 *Animals and Food*, 5 *The Ritual Status of the Justified Killer at Athens*, 6 *The Ritual of Purification from Homicide*, 7 *Exile and Purification of the Killer in Greek Myth*, 8 *Gods particularly concerned with Purity*. An *index locorum* and a general index to proper names and key subjects make the volume easily accessible. I will limit my comments to the following notes.

—*Pollution in Thucydides*. P. stresses the important role pollution plays for Thucydides (p. 1 with n. 1, pp. 183 f., pp. 276 ff.). We should however note that Thucydides always puts comments regarding *miasma* into other people's mouths and seems to maintain a certain critical distance from them (*pace* N. Marinatos, *Thucydides and Religion*, Königstein/Ts 1981). This attitude is clearly shown in Thuc. I 128: the Lacedaemonians believe (νομίζουσι) that the earthquake is a consequence of sacrilege. Cf. also V 1: the Athenians thought that there had been an ancient crime (ἡγησάμενοι) and thought that they had done right by cleansing the island of graves (ὀρθῶς ἐνόμισαν ποιῆσαι). Thucydides twice mentions the purification of Delos in the winter of 426/5 (I 8, 1 and III 104, 1), but on neither occasion does he relate this to the epidemic of plague which

preceded it. Diodorus (Ephorus) does however make quite clear that the plague was the reason for the purification. Cf. also I 23 and II 17, where Thucydides again does not claim any relationship between defilement and plague, although this was clearly accepted by other contemporaries. P.'s comment on p. 271, that "Thucydides ... says nothing of what was said or done (on religious interpretation of public disaster) at Athens during the great plague", is thus not entirely correct.

—*Human sacrifice and the scapegoat.* P. argues that two contradictory but nevertheless interwoven patterns of thought lay behind the Greek human sacrifices (p. 260). On the one hand there were individuals of royal blood, the leading figures in the state or their close relatives, who sacrificed themselves or were sacrificed for the good of the state as a whole on the occasion of a specific disaster in the mythical past. On the other hand, there were the pariahs, the community's eyesores, who took its crimes upon themselves by leaving it. The latter cases did not occur during incidental crises, but rather formed a regular (generally annual) ritual, which was considered to have a prophylactic effect. These scapegoat rituals were not placed in the mythical past but can be attested historically. The *pharmakos* was not actually killed, but was consecrated and driven out. These two patterns of thought, however, are only apparently in contradiction. There are elements which unite the two extremes. In his article for the *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique* XXVII (Vandœuvres-Geneva 1981), 135-194, on *Le Sacrifice dans l'Antiquité*, H. S. Versnel has drawn attention to the concept of the substitute sacrifice. Plague and famine were, with enemy invasions and civil war, the greatest threats to the ancient state. If the survival of the community as a whole was at risk, there were those who were prepared to sacrifice humans, or indeed to make the greatest sacrifice a person can make, that of his own life. The king represented the people, but the king could in his turn be represented by a soldier, a sacrificial animal, a jewel or a doll, as a *pars pro toto*. The *pharmakos* who was driven out during the Athenian Thargelia was a substitute for the original royal sacrifice.

The second linking element is then the crisis in the life of the community or individual, the transition from one phase to another, with all the dangers which accompany that. The crisis unites the single mythical human sacrifice with the ritual, repeated expulsion of *pharmakoi* in historical times.

The third linking element is formed by the concept of compensation. Disasters, such as plagues, harvest failures and defeats, and also the portents which preceded them, indicate a disturbance of the equilibrium between Gods and man. Experts, such as miracle workers and oracles, are then required so as to show how this disturbed equilibrium can be restored.

Throughout antiquity, every collective disaster was explained as divine wrath which had been precipitated by human failings. However, in crude terms two divergent interpretations were possible. The first, which can be found in Homer, was that divine justice was entirely amoral. "The Gods" was a term to represent the immanent principle, the natural force which controlled poverty and wealth, war and peace, sickness and health. The second interpretation, which gained strength during the Archaic period, considered that the Gods actually interfered to restore moral equilibrium. Human failings, for instance negligence of religious duties, provoked divine wrath, which struck not only the guilty themselves but also the community to which they belonged.

—*Healing Gods*. P. notes (on p. 248, n. 70) that "a scholarly account of Greek healing gods in general seems not to exist". However, one should point out W. A. Jayne, *The Healing Gods of Ancient Civilisations* (Yale U.P. 1925; reprinted New York 1979). In the near future J. H. Croon's article on 'Heilgötter' will appear in the *RAC*. Moreover, in H. S. Versnel (ed.) *Faith, Hope and Worship* (Leiden 1981, 1 ff.), F. T. van Straten provides a catalogue of the so-called anatomical *ex voto*'s, that is votive offerings representing parts of the human body, in the Greek world. Such *ex voto*'s were offered as a thanksgiving for healing and /or to prevent sickness.

—*Transformation or Continuity?* As early as p. 2, P. makes it clear that he rejects E. R. Dodds's theory on the development of the Greek value system from a shame culture to a guilt culture as a consequence of an increased fear of infection. In the course of the book, this theme regularly returns, e.g. on pp. 15-16, 189, 251-252. P. rejects this theory by arguing that it is based on an optical illusion caused by Dodds's use of data from literary works which belonged to different genres. P. in contrast considers that the literary genre is largely determinant of the religious content of a particular work. Comparing information from epics, lyrics, tragedies and comedies, and doing that for different centuries, is for P. equivalent to adding up apples and pears. Naturally, 'shame culture' and 'guilt culture' are relative concepts. Elements of guilt can certainly be present in

a society which stresses the maintenance of prestige, and the converse is also true. In *The Justice of Zeus* (Berkeley 1971) H. Lloyd-Jones argued for this modification of Dodd's opinions.

Nevertheless, it is notable that no lyric poetry, for instance, has survived from the 'Homeric' period. That genre did not yet exist, and thus there was no specific mentality linked to it. This sort of literature was not yet felt to be needed. The successive emergence of the literary genres thus does indeed indicate a change in mentality, and is thus a legitimate argument in a historical discussion.

Where P. stresses continuity (pp. 136, 66-70), I would tend to pay more attention to the distinctions. P. recognises that "it has been impossible to centre this study on a particular time and place" and that "this book has not been a history (since) the evidence for significant change in attitudes to pollution is too sparse" (p. 322). This I would dispute. It is above all the organisation of material—descriptive rather than narrative—which prevents any appreciation of historical development. With all respect for the enormous richness of the material displayed in this work and for the author's erudition and acumen, the history which the concept of *miasma* deserves still has to be written. Such a study would have to include the Hellenistic period which P.'s intention precludes. In a number of remarks P. provides the basis for a sketch of this development:

1. The function of ritual cleansing from pollution caused by murder was slowly taken over by legal procedures. The rise of the centralised state facilitated such charges. "If Orestes had been taken in charge by a policeman, there would have been no need for the Erinyes." (p. 125).
2. The size of a community must certainly have influenced the nature of reactions to religious danger (p. 13). A village was more likely to believe in collective punishment than an urban society like Athens, which in 430 had some 155,000 inhabitants according to A. W. Gomme's estimate.
3. Certain forms of sacrilege, such as cutting wood within temple's grounds, were no longer punished by a collective disaster but by an individual fine.
4. The moralisation of ritual cleanliness became more and more pronounced. Inner purity was considered more important than hecatombs.

Naturally, demands for purely formal ritual purity continued into Hellenistic times, and indeed even increased, while on the other

hand there are a number of early demands for inner purity known (e.g. Pythagoras, Sophocles, Plato).

Thus, I cannot avoid the impression that, despite both considerable continuity and social or regional diversity, the main elements of the development of the collective mentality can be sketched. This will however require much research and this cannot be limited to the studying of a single ancient author or of a single inscription. Rather, "our endeavour should, indeed must be to study a *series* of documents in order to get at the common characteristics of the world of religious experience in a given society or group" (H. W. Pleket in Versnel (ed.), *Faith, Hope and Worship*, (152).

The encyclopedic work of Robert Parker has fulfilled this fundamental requirement. Thus he has made an important contribution to the 'Science of Division' in what is for us, and probably also was for the ancient believer, the chaotic world of pollution and purification in early Greek religion.

LEIDEN, Department of Ancient History

H. F. J. HORSTMANSHOFF

JON D. MIKALSON, *Athenian Popular Religion*. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1983. XIV, 172 pp. Pr. \$ 26,—.

ERIKA SIMON, *Festivals of Attica*. Madison, University of Wisconsin Press, 1983. XX, 122 pp. Pr. \$ 26.90.

In his well-written study, Mikalson investigates "what might be termed the consensus of popular religious belief, a consensus consisting of those beliefs which an Athenian citizen thought he could express publicly and for which he expected to find general acceptance among his peers" (p. 12). Moreover, the author is concerned first and foremost with "what the Athenians said about their religion and treats what they did only to the extent that it clarifies or illustrates what they said" (p. 6). To this end, he excludes from consideration poets and philosophers as being possibly too individualistic, and restricts himself virtually to the material supplied by the fourth-century orators, Xenophon, and inscriptions. In other words, this is a study of *religion conçue* rather than *religion vécue*.

This procedure is debatable. Participation in religious festivals, worship in great and small sanctuaries, and enjoyment of the stories of gods and heroes also, surely, formed part of Athenian popular religion. Moreover, the inclusion of comedy would at least have