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Abstract.

The thesis examines the three most comprehensive episodes in the Dionysiaca - the Indian war, the sojourn in Lebanon, the return to Thebes - with special attention to Nonnus' use of his predecessors' works. The first shows a striking degree of interaction with the Iliad, the third a close dependence on Euripides' Bacchae, while the second displays the poet at his most eclectic, drawing on sources as diverse as Philo's Phoenician History and Claudian's De rapto Proserpinae. Nonnus' imitation of Homeric passages is closer than that of other epic poets, involving duplication down to the minutest details and is lacking genuine innovation, though displaying a tendency to expansiveness through the proliferation of characters, incidents and speeches. Homeric themes are often rendered twice and sometimes even three times. The poet is also prone to reusing his own passages but avoids verbatim repetitions in the Homeric manner by almost invariably effecting some minor changes in expression or word order. The influence of technical rhetoric is quite palpable throughout, as is the influence of the Orphic terminology. A parodic streak somewhat reminiscent of Ovid is detectable in a number of passages. Some consideration is given to the vexed question of Nonnus' familiarity with the Latin poets and it has generally been found prudent to err on the side of caution. Claudian's Derapto Proserpinae, is seen to provide the strongest argument for Latin influence, as Nonnus is observed to have inherited a compositional shortcoming peculiar to that poem.
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Introduction.

Nonnus of Panopolis is an author little read to-day even by those whose profession is the study of ancient Greek literature. His claims to attention seem to rest solely on his having written the longest poem that has come down to us from antiquity, and in being the first of the ancient poets to systematically take cognisance of stress accent in composing his hexameters. When literary historians comment on Nonnus' good fortune in having his huge Dionysiaca transmitted to posterity whole, it is, more often than not, to express their regret that this has come about at the expense of earlier poets, whose works they would rather have seen preserved. Few to-day would be prepared to extol the Dionysiaca for literary qualities, though Nonnus did find a champion earlier in the present century in the German poet Stefan George, who confessed to having at one time preferred him to Homer.¹ Among literary critics only Maurice Croiset seems to have discerned the poem's positive features, when he speaks of its ebullient vitality of spirit, a quality that in his view compares favourably with the frigid correctness of Quintus'
Posthomerica.² If Nonnus is largely forgotten to-day as a poet, this has not always been the prevailing attitude, the Dionysiaca having encountered a favourable reception in Western Europe for several decades from its first printing in 1569. Its style and subject matter were especially congenial to the baroque literary taste of the time. Giambattista Marino, the most prominent of the Italian baroque poets, is believed to have modelled his Adone directly on the Dionysiaca.³ Nonnus' other work, the Paraphrase of John's Gospel, enjoyed even greater popularity, with thirteen editions published between the years 1501 and 1623. The ruthless criticism, which Daniel Heinsius in 1627 directed at the Paraphrase and at Nonnus' poetic ability in general, led to a quick downturn in popularity, that ended with the poet being consigned to virtual oblivion until the 19th century.⁴ Assessed in accordance with Aristotle's criteria for epic poetry, the Dionysiaca with its myriad inconsistencies and rambling digressions was judged deficient, an attitude which persisted into the 19th century, when Nonnus came under renewed scrutiny. More sympathetically disposed than Heinsius, nineteenth century critics sought to excuse the Dionysiaca's shortcomings on the assumption that the poet, in the course of revising and expanding the work, had been unable to apply finishing touches to it.⁵ The analytic methodology, which over the past hundred years had been applied to the Iliad and Odyssey, was now brought to bear on the Dionysiaca as well, a development that Nonnus, who boasted of being the new Homer, would undoubtedly have found gratifying. The analytic approach was further refined in the earlier half of the present century by Keydell ⁶ and Collart,⁷ who endeavoured, as far as it was possible, to disentangle the various additions and interpolations, by which they assumed the poet to have expanded and altered what was originally


⁴ Cf. his "Aristarchus Sacer sive ad Nonni in Joannem metaphrasim exercitationes". Lugduni Batavorum, 1627 (reprinted in Migne, Patr. ser. graeca, t. 43, col. 941ff.)

⁵ Cf. for example A. Scheindler "Zu Nonnus von Panopolis", WS II (1880) 33-46.


⁷ In his "Nonnus de Panopolis. Études sur la composition des Dionysiakes," Cairo, 1930.
conceived as a much smaller work. The poem's inconsistencies were seen as stemming from its unfinished state rather than from the vagaries of the manuscript tradition, with Nonnus presumably abandoning work on the project upon his conversion to Christianity, an hypothesis that acquired canonical status with Keydell's celebrated article on Nonnus in the RE (XVII, 1936). But as in the case of Homeric criticism, a reaction against the analytical approach subsequently set in.

Vian in his introductions to the Budé edition of the Dionysiaca, which commenced publication in 1976, has questioned the validity of the analytical hypothesis, pointing out a number of features in the poem that he sees as giving it an underlying unity. The parts of the poem that his predecessors had viewed as mere digressions assume a distinct relevance in his interpretation of the narrative, which he sees as a well-structured unity based on Dionysus' progression toward apotheosis, albeit conceding that some segments (notably book 39) are lacking a final recension. He has in particular endeavoured to explain away many of the conflicting statements in the narrative by claiming that the poet meant them to be understood symbolically rather than literally.8 Further unifying features in the poem have recently been highlighted by Hopkinson.9 A variant viewpoint has been expressed by Livrea in his recent edition of book eighteen of the Paraphrase,10 where he contends that the inconsistencies in Nonnus' narrative are merely symptomatic of the general tendency of the late poets to place the achievement of maximum effect in the immediate context before overall narrative consistency. He cites Claudian and Colluthus as parallels. Livrea thus concurs with Keydell and Collart in accepting the Dionysiaca's contradictions at face value, but differs from them in that he makes no attempt to exculpate the poet for his lack of narrative consistency. In the present work I have taken a stance approximating to the latter position. While not denying the validity of Vian's observations, I find that his explanations account for only a fraction of the vast number of inconsistencies that occur with an almost wanton abandon throughout the poem. The idea of Dionysus' progression toward

---

9 See for instance his explanation (introduction to book 24, Budé ed.) of the significance to the poem as a whole of the episode of the weaving of Aphrodite (24.237-326), which earlier commentators had dismissed as a mere digression based on the moicheia theme from the Odyssey.
apotheosis, if representative of the poet's purpose, is, in my opinion, obfuscated beyond recognition, seeing that Dionysus is portrayed from the start as possessing those very divine powers that he is meant to acquire only upon his apotheosis.

The present study aims to examine in some detail the three most extended episodes in the Dionysiaca, the Indian war, Dionysus' sojourn in Lebanon and his triumphant return to Thebes, with special emphasis on Nonnus' use of the works of his predecessors. The first episode shows overwhelming indebtedness to Homer's Iliad, the third to Euripides' Bacchae, while the second shows the poet at his most eclectic, drawing on various sources which include Claudian's De Raptu Proserpinae and Philo of Byblos' Phoenician History. It may be noted that whereas Nonnus' indebtedness to the last two works has been the subject of several specialised studies, his relationship to Homer and Euripides, possibly because of its self-evident nature, does not appear to have engaged the attention of commentators beyond the briefest indication of verbal correspondences. The present work aspires, in a modest way, to remedy this situation, by examining Nonnus' use of Homer, Euripides and the Alexandrian poets in some detail.

The length of the segment chosen for study (books 21-46) dictated certain omissions: the catalogue in book 26 on the ground that it had already been exhaustively examined by Chuvín and Vian, and the story of Phaethon in Book 38 in that it is basically a digression, which is not essential to the narrative sequence. The present study is greatly indebted to the observations of all of the above writers, as well as to those made by the authors of the various monographs and articles dealing with specific aspects and segments of the poem. For the first part it has been possible to utilize the Budé commentary, which has been published up to book 29. While much of that commentary is concerned with language and expression, textual and interpretative problems, the present discussion will be largely confined to examining the literary influences that operated on Nonnus, and the ways in which he accommodated the works of his predecessors to the

11 For his relationship with Claudian see Braune's "Nonno e Claudiano", Maia 1 (1943) 176-93, and with Philo, Dostálova-Jeníšková's "Tyros a Bejrút v Dionysiakách Nonna z Panopolie", Listy fil. (1957) 36-54.
12 For which see Keydell's apparatus to his 1959 ed. of the Dionysiaca.
requirements of his own narrative. The Budé introductions for books 20-24 (Hopkinson) and 25-29 (Vian), with their emphasis on literary rather than grammatical and lexicographical features, have been found particularly enlightening in the course of writing the present work. The corresponding Budé notes have been helpful in pointing out Nonnus' sources, especially some of the more unusual kind that have only come to light in recently published papyri. Keydell's references in the *apparatus criticus* of his 1959 edition of the poem, have, needless to say, been indispensable, though they are confined in the main to precise verbal correspondences. Except in the case of the more esoteric sources, I have not acknowledged the very numerous instances in which I have had recourse to his *apparatus*, for reasons of space rather than for want of gratitude. The same policy has been followed with regard to Vian and Hopkinson, acknowledgment being largely confined to those cases where the parallels indicated are with some little read or unexpected author. The great majority of Nonnus' borrowings are of course from extremely well known works (Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Apollonius' *Argonautica*, Callimachus' *Hymns*, and Euripides' *Bacchae*), and are, as such, immediately obvious to the reader. The works of Keydell and Collart referred to above have been especially useful in elucidating the compositional aspects of the *Dionysiaca*. While their hypothesis concerning the previous drafts of the poem may no longer be universally accepted, there is of course no question as to the value and validity of their observations in regard to the irregularities and contradictions in Nonnus' narrative. I must also mention my indebtedness to the works concerned with specific aspects of the poem, such as Gigli-Piccardi's book on Nonnus' metaphors,\(^{15}\) which is especially commendable for having drawn attention to Nonnus' relationship with the so-called *Chaldean Oracles*, a relationship that seems previously to have been largely overlooked. Chuvín's above mentioned treatise on the geographical aspects of the *Dionysiaca* has been found particularly valuable for the segment of the poem concerned with Lebanon. Failure to mention here the numerous other works referred to in the text should not be seen as a reflection on their degree of usefulness to the present undertaking.

---

Chapter I: Dionysus' invasion of India.

The conquest of India receives privileged treatment among Dionysus' exploits in Nonnus' poem, being accorded truly epic proportions, embracing books 13 to 40, albeit with lengthy digressions¹, while other episodes, such as the confrontation with Pentheus on his return to Thebes (books 44-46), do not exceed the dimensions of epyllia. A war of conquest, in that it places Dionysus in the role of slayer of men, may at first sight be a little difficult to reconcile with the personality of a god whom Homer calls a joy to mankind (χάριν βροτῶιν, Ξ325), and whose mission, as Nonnus himself periodically reminds us, is to provide respite from cares and offer consolation to the aggrieved (Δικαρός άνιθης, 7.76). His unflattering portrayal in the Iliad as a coward fleeing before Lycurgus (Z135-7) would seem to further emphasise his non-bellicose nature, but at the same time there appears to have existed a tradition of long standing concerning his feats on the battlefield. Macrobius speaks of him being frequently identified with Ares and tells us that his statue in Sparta bore a spear in place of the thyrsus: 'plerique Liberum cum Marte coniungunt, unum deum esse monstrantes. unde Bacchus 'Ενυδίλλος cognominatur quod est inter propria Martis nomina, colitur etiam apud Lacedaemonios simulacrum Liberi patris hasta insigne, non thyrso' (Sat. 1.19.1). Dionysus' military associations are twice alluded to in Euripides' Bacchae, firstly in Dionysus' threat to subdue the Thebans by armed force (cf. συνάψω μανάσι στρατηλάτων, 52), should they prove un receptive to his overtures, and then more explicitly in Tiresias' remark that Dionysus shares a part of Ares' rights (ι' Αρεώς τε μοίραν μεταλαβών έχει τινά, 302), and the dramatist is undoubtedly reflecting a pre-existing tradition in this regard. When Alexander demanded to be recognised as a god, Dionysus' connexions with the orient together with his military associations would have suggested that he was the

god to whom Alexander bore the greatest affinity. The affinity, if obvious in retrospect, was not immediately apparent at the time that the request was made.\textsuperscript{2} It was only belatedly, in Ptolemaic Egypt, that the wine-god and conqueror were brought together, Alexander's conquests providing the foundation for a novel extension of the Dionysus myth, with the god portrayed as the forerunner of the historical conqueror. Nock, in his study of the Alexander-Dionysus relationship, summarises its genesis as follows: 'first Dionysus is given some of the characteristics and achievements of Alexander, then Alexander is represented as following Dionysus'\textsuperscript{3} Alexander's Indian campaigns in particular provided the inspiration for a new and glorious episode in Dionysus' earthly career, one in which the wine-god is portrayed as the conqueror of India, its novelty constituting a challenge to the inventive faculties of poets and mythographers. While the Alexander histories provided them with the general framework on which to pattern their story, they needed for the most part to call on the resources of their own imagination to fill in the details of Dionysus' Indian exploits. The new theme came to overshadow to some extent the god's earlier, more traditional exploits in the poetic consciousness, judging from the prominence given to it by the Roman poets in their references to Dionysus. Thus Vergil for instance, in comparing the achievements of Augustus to Hercules and Bacchus, extols the latter solely on account of his Indian victory (\textit{Aen.} 6.804-5), and Propertius, when he proposes to sing of Bacchus' deeds, places 'Indica Nysaeis arma fugata' (3.17) at the top of his list. Valerius Flaccus, who likes to compare the Argonauts' journey to Colchis with Bacchus' expedition into India, speaks of 'eo oorantes sanguine thyrsoe' (5.76), which could well serve as a caption for some of the middle books of the \textit{Dionysiaca}. By the time Nonnus came to write his version of the Indian war, the topic had been enriched through the collective imagination of generations of poets and mythmakers. The theme seems to have been treated at considerable length in the eighteen-book \textit{Bassarica} of Dionysius (2nd century A.D.), a work whose extant fragments lead us to believe that our poet was heavily indebted to it (cf. the close correspondence between 26.50-9 and frag. 1.1-7, Livrea). It is probable that

\textsuperscript{2} Nock (1928) 21-2 points out that the Athenian Boule, when faced with the prospect of having to recognise Alexander as a god, debated whether to make him a son of Zeus or of Poseidon.

\textsuperscript{3} Cf. Nock (1928) 25.
Nonnus used the *Bassarica* as his basic model for the Indian war, modifying Dionysius' narrative by additions modelled on episodes in the *Iliad*. All later epic poets went to some lengths to contrive situational parallels with the Homeric poems, but none quite to the same extent as Nonnus. His Indian war encompasses all the standard Iliadic set pieces: the κατάλογος (13.43ff. : Β494ff.), the μάχη παραποτάμιος (22-23 : Φ), the ὀπλοτοιχία (25.387-562 : Σ483-608), the Δίως ἀπάτη (31.24-32 : Ξ153-361), the θεομαχία (36.1-133 : Υ66 ff.), and the funeral games (ἄθλα ἐπί Ὁφέλτη (37) : ἄθλα ἐπί Πατρόκλῳ (Ψ)).

The theme of the Indian war is announced at 13.21-34, where Zeus has Rhea convey to Dionysus the terms for his admission to Olympus. Dionysus is to give proof of his eligibility by bringing the impious Indians to heel, the reader being at this point made aware that Dionysus, though persistently called a god by the poet, is merely an aspirant to the status of god, who has yet to show his mettle by fulfilling a task set him by Zeus.\(^4\) The situation thus differs from that in the *Bacchae*, where Dionysus appears as a god and not as a mortal aspiring to godship, though a god who has yet to convince the Thebans of his divine credentials. Nonnus does not adhere to the notion of god in the making with any consistency, portraying Dionysus as one already in possession of the powers and prerogatives of an Olympian, in that, like Hephaistus, he can burn up a river (book 23), excel Zeus himself in the number of giants he slays (25.96-7), or vie with Poseidon on equal terms over the hand of a maiden (book 43). It is only in his confrontations with Hera that Dionysus acts as anything less than a god. Nonnus' portrait of Dionysus as a god in the making is thus noticeably less consistent than the traditional portrayal of that other son of Zeus by a mortal mother to be made a god, Heracles, who was prior to his apotheosis never other than human, albeit one endowed with superhuman qualities. The idea of Dionysus' progression towards apotheosis, which Vian sees as providing the poem with coherence and underlying logic, is obscured and rendered largely irrelevant by a narrative where he regularly

\(^4\) Zeus reminds Dionysus of his own labours and those of the other Olympians, all of whom had to earn their place in the heavenly abode. We are reminded of a similar passage in Valerius Flaccus, where Jupiter, addressing Hercules and the Tyndaridae, warns them of the travails ahead, at the same time reminding them of those which he himself, Apollo and Bacchus needed to accomplish to merit their places in Olympus (cf.1.561-7).
has recourse to the very powers which, properly speaking, he is to acquire only after admission to Olympus.5

Apart from the catalogues in books 13 and 14, sustained parallels with the *Iliad* commence only with book 22, which marks the beginning of the *Indiads* properly speaking, the narrative being thenceforth continuous (allowing for the story of Phaethon) up to the demise of Deriades and the submission of the Indians halfway through book 40. Dionysus' early encounters with Astraeis and Orontes correspond schematically to Alexander's battles with Darius' satraps, but they are of a decidedly magical or supernatural cast that bears little resemblance either to the latter or to Homer's battle scenes. It is only when Dionysus and his followers are approaching the Hydaspes that Nonnus eschews the magical and supernatural for battle-depictions of a more conventional kind. In place of nymphs and satyrs, Dionysus' human followers, notably Oiagrus, Erechtheus and Aiacus, who are all cast in a consciously Homeric mould, now take the centre stage.

Books 22 to 24 are a peculiar amalgam of Alexander's battle against the Indian king Porus on the banks of the Hydaspes with Homer's μάχη παραπόταμος. The segment is characterised on the one hand by the unmistakable parallelism between Dionysus and Alexander, and on the other by the explicit comparison of Aiacus with his grandson Achilles. As Bornmann notes in his study of the parallels between Nonnus and Arrian, Dionysus for the time being puts aside his magical powers to assume the appearance of the historical conqueror.6 Nonnus shows himself to be not insensitive to the humorous side of this sudden conversion of wine-god into prudent general, when he has Dionysus tell his followers to abstain from wine and drink instead from the river, lest they be overcome through intoxication (cf. 22.128-30), an injunction which goes against the grain of everything that Dionysus represents and at the same time conflicts with Hera's warning to the Indians a little earlier in the narrative, not to drink from the river because Dionysus has turned it into wine (22.80-1).

The sequence of events leading up to the crossing of the Hydaspes may be said to commence from 21.196, when Scelmis brings joyful tidings to Dionysus'
followers of their leader’s imminent return from his undersea refuge, where he had fled from Lycurgus. Phereondus, a satyr, is sent as envoy to Deriades with the demand that the king accept the gift of wine in his land, which the latter, predictably, rejects out of hand. The floppy ears and shaggy tail of the envoy occasion the mirth of Deriades, who would have him wait at his table so that he can fan him with his long ears. Phereondus had been despatched much earlier by Dionysus, even before the debacle with Lycurgus, but it is only now that he reaches Deriades, bearing the written message: κοίμασαι, νοσφί μάχης. ἦ δέχυσο δώρα Λυκίου, ἢ Βρομίω πολέμιζε καὶ ἔσεατί ἵσος Ὄροντη (18.318-9). Deriades’ reaction is typical of a θεομάχος, who places the efficacy of his weapons above the gods and their gifts: οἶνος ἐμὸς πέλεν ἔγχος, ὁ δ’ αὐτὸς πότος ἐστι βοσίη (21.259).  

7 He recognises no gods apart from Earth and Water (21.264), professing ignorance of the Olympians (a claim that is not borne out by his later speeches, which show him to be well informed concerning them) and in the typical manner of a despot tells the envoy to depart lest he should no longer be able to contain his anger and slay him.  

8 His written message to Dionysus is even briefer than that which the latter had sent him: εἰ δύνασαι, Διώνυσε, κορύφασο Δηριαδή (21.277).

Dionysus, who has by now rejoined his followers, reacts to Deriades’ reply not, as we would expect him to do, with a frenzied assault of his Bacchantes and Satyrs, but by attending to the contingencies of the impending hostilities like a prudent general. It is from this point that the influence of the Alexander histories begins to manifest itself. In anticipation of a naval engagement with the Indians, he orders the Rhadamans to build a fleet, having been alerted to this course of action by Rheia (21.308), who herself had been told by Zeus (through Iris) that the Indians were to be vanquished in a naval engagement (13.5-6).  

9 though it is only much later in the narrative that the prophecy that the final defeat of the Indians shall take place on water is explicitly spelt out: δῶτι τέλος πολέμιο παρήγεται,

---

7 Cf. the remarks of Pentheus later in the poem (44.155ff.) and Idas in Apollonius (1.467ff.)
8 Cf. Agamemnon’s threats to Chryses (A26-32) and Aeetes’ address to the Argonauts in Apollonius (3.372-80).
9 The Rhadamans, descendants of Rhadamantes, who was exiled by his brother Minos from Crete and settled either in Gaza or the eastern littoral of Arabia (cf. Diod. Sic. 5.84.2 and Plin. N.H. 6.158).
The idea that the Indians were vanquished by Dionysus in a naval engagement occurs also in Arrian, and may have originated from a wish by the mythmakers to take account of the spectacular naval expeditions carried out under Nearchus for Alexander, though the latter involved no warfare. Dercides posts a detachment of his army on the west bank of the Hydaspes under Thureus to lie in wait for Dionysus in a densely wooded grove, while he himself remains on the east bank with his main force (21.317-25). Bornmann adduces Arrian (Anab. 6.2.2) as a possible model for Nonnus in the present instance, while Hopkinson cites 2.8.5, which involves a similar stratagem by Darius on the banks of the Pinarus. It is not certain, however, whether Nonnus acquired these ideas from Arrian or from some other, no longer extant, Alexander historian.

The grove, in which Thureus and his men hide, accords Nonnus the opportunity to compose an ἐκφρασις ἀλυτος. The grove description had become an essential ingredient of Hellenistic and Roman epic, as we may gather from the Roman satirist Persius, who scoffs at would-be epic poets who, besides other deficiencies, are ‘nec ponere lucum/artifices’ (1.17). Homer’s depiction of the two intertwining olive trees under which Odysseus sheltered on coming ashore in Scherie, which shut out rain and sun alike (ε476-81), seems to have engendered a copious progeny, beginning with Callimachus’ grove description in the Hymn to Demeter (6.24-9). Nonnus has imitated Homer’s depiction and borrowed a feature from that of Callimachus, but his grove resembles in the main the sacred grove of the Druids, as found in Lucan’s Pharsalia, which incorporates the sorts of exaggerations we have come to expect in rhetorical declamations. Thus we find that ἵν δὲ τις αὐτόθι χώρος ἐύσκιος, ὀππόθι πυκνοὶς / ἐρυμεινοὶ παντοῖοι ἐμιτρώθη βάξις ὑλῆς / εὑρυτενής (21.326-8) is similar to ‘lucus erat ... / obscum cingens consecis aera ramis’ (3.399-401). The grove is so dense as to be impenetrable by arrows: ἰπτάμενος δὲ / οὐ ποτὲ δενδρεά κεῖνα

10 Cf. Anab. 6.3.4: τῶν Διονύσου ἐπ’ ἱνδοίας στόλων... γενέσθαι ναυτικών.
11 (1974) p.63
12 (1994) p.56 n.4
κατέγραψεν ἰδὲ ἁλήτης (21.328-9), which echoes Callimachus’ ἄλος ... διὰ κεν μόλες ἤρθεν ὀστός (6.25-6). Nonnus seems at the same time to have had in mind the passage in the Odyssey where the height of Scylla’s cave is described as being so great as to be out of reach of an arrow shot from below (μ.83-4), a supposition supported by the fact that the grove is, in the previous line, referred to as a κοῖλον ... σπέος (21.328), echoing Homer’s κοῖλον σπέος (μ.84). It is, furthermore, impervious to the elements: οὗ ποτὲ μεσσάθι θάμνων / ἡέλιος πεφόρητο ὀξεί παλμῷ / ἐνδομίχοις ἀκτίσιν ὁμόπλοκα φύλλα χαράξας, / οὗ χύσις ἡρόφωτος ἐδύσατο δάσκλου ὑλῆν / ἐκ Δίῳς ὑετίοιο (21.330-4), a notion found also in Lucan: ‘alte summotos solibus (3.401) ... nec venus in illas / incubuit silvas excussaque nubibus atris / fulgura ’(3.408-10). These lines are evidently based on Homer’s τοὺς μὲν ἄρ οὔτ’ ἀνέμων διά μένος ἱγρὸν δέντων / οὔτε ποτ’ ἡέλιος φαέθων ἀκτίσιν ἐβάλεν, / οὔτ’ ὀμβρος περάσακε διαμπερές (ε.478-80). The idea of concealing an army in such a place derives, as Bornmann has demonstrated, from Alexander’s crossing of the Hydaspes. According to Arrian, Alexander had moved a part of his forces onto a thickly wooded headland in the river, in the hope of making the crossing undetected by Porus’ scouts. Arrian describes the place as δασεῖα ἰδὴ παντοίων δενδρων, which accorded Alexander the opportunity κρύψαι τῆς διαβάσεως τὴν ἐπιχείρησιν (Anab. 5.11.1). Hopkinson adduces a similar situation from Anab. 2.8.5, where Darius, waiting for Alexander on the Pinarus, dispatches a part of his cavalry to the opposite bank to intercept him. He likewise draws attention to Diodorus Siculus 3.65.4-5, where Lycurgus plans to surprise Dionysus by a nocturnal assault.14 Nonnus remarks on the composure and self-discipline of the Indians as they lie in ambush in language reminiscent of Idomeneus’ speech in the Iliad, where those lying in ambush are portrayed as being in a state of anxiety. The Indian troop wait silently, οὐ ποσὸς ὁκλαζοῦτος ἐχόων φόβοι, οὐ λάλον ἡχῶ / χείλει βαιμάνουτι, καὶ οὐ χλόον ἄμφοι προσωπῆ (21.241-2). In Idomeneus’ speech, it will be recalled, waiting in ambush is the test that sorts out the cowardly from the brave: ἐνθα μάλιστ’ ἀρετῆ διαείδεται ἄνδρων ...τοῦ μὲν γάρ τε

14(1994a) p.56 n.4 and p.57 n.1
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κακού τρέπεται χρώσ ἀλλοσ ἀλη ... μετοκλάζει καὶ ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρους τόδας ζεῖ, ἐν δὲ τε ὁι κραδιή μεγάλα στέρνοισι πατάσσει / κῆρας ὄιομένω, πάταγος δὲ τε γίγνετ' ὄδωρων / τοῦ δ' ἄγαθον οὐδ' ἃρ τρέπεται χρώσ οὔτε τι λίθν ἃραβεῖ (N278-85). The Indians are portrayed (by way of oppositio in imitando) as showing none of the signs of timidity listed in the above passage.

Book 22 begins with a virtual quotation of the first line of book 21 of the Iliad, inaugurating the extended paraphrase of Homer's μάχη παραπτόμενος, which will take up much of the the next three books. Nonnus does not, however, arrive at this theme immediately, prefacing it with seventy lines devoted to Bacchic revelry and miracles, depictions of which occur intermittently throughout the poem, culminating in the detailed depiction at 45.273 ff., all of which are, in varying degrees, indebted to Euripides' Bacchae 677-768. One of the Indians, resembling the messenger in the Bacchae, spies on the festivities and reports to Thureus the marvellous happenings he has just witnessed. His peering through the bushes is compared to a warrior's looking through the eyeholes of his helmet or a tragic actor's staring through the eyepiece of his mask (22.58-63), the latter comparison perhaps underlining the analogy with the Euripidean scene. Overawed, the Indians contemplate submission but are dissuaded from this course of action through Hera's timely intervention. Appearing to Thureus in disguise - Nonnus somewhat uncharacteristically fails to inform us what that disguise is, stating only that she appeared μεταλλάθεσα δέμας (22.74, contrast ἔειδομένη δέμας ... Μελανή at 14.303-4) - she deceives him by saying that the Hydaspes had been poisoned by Dionysus through Thessalian spells and cautions the Indians against drinking from its stream (22.80-1). As we have already noted, this statement is patently at odds with Dionysus' instruction to his troops to abstain from wine and drink from the river instead, μὴ στρατῶν εὐνῆσει μέθη καὶ κώμα καὶ ζήτη (22.30). This is only the first of a string of contradictory statements regarding the state of the Hydaspes, which is in some instances spoken of as having been turned into wine, but in others only threatened with this

---

15 Cf. also 18.51-61, 24.123-42 and 45.285-322; similar miracles occur in connexion with the birth of Beroe, 41.185-203.
eventuality. Thus, while at 25.280 (cf. also 29.291-2), ὁνῷ κυματόεντι μέλας κελάρυζεν Ἕδασπης, at 27.178-80 and at 35.356 Dionysus merely expresses his intent to convert it into wine. Keydell and Collart view the references to the Hydaspes having been converted into wine as remnants of an earlier draft of the poem, where the Hydaspes shared the lot of lake Astacid (14.411-6), a version of events which Nonnus later suppressed, replacing it by one modelled on the twenty-first book of the Iliad, where the Hydaspes, like the Scamander, is subdued by fire. With characteristic disregard for narrative consistency, Nonnus has failed to expunge traces of the earlier version, where the Hydaspes, converted into wine, placidly submits to being traversed by Dionysus' followers.

The Indians, encouraged by Hera, are about to burst out of the grove and fall upon the unsuspecting followers of Dionysus, but the latter is opportunely alerted to the danger by an Indian hamadryad. This incident brings to mind the action of Charops in Diodorus Siculus' account of Lycurgus' intended nocturnal assault on Dionysus, referred to above. Dionysus' reaction to the situation is more akin to that of a cautious general than thyrsus-wielding wine god, as he instructs his men τεύχει θωρηκτένας ἀνὰ δρύας εἰλαιπνάζειν ... μὴ σφυν ἐπιβρίσων ἀθωρήκτουσι μαχηταί, / εἰσεῖ δαιμομένους κατὰ στρατόν (22.121-4), echoing Priam's words to the Trojans during a truce in the fighting νῦν μὲν δόρπον ἐλεσθε κατὰ στρατὸν ... καὶ φυλακῆς μυσίσομεθε, καὶ ἐγρήγωρθε ἐκαστος (H370-1). We might note that the κατὰ στρατὸν conveys the notion of 'armed and in combat formation', as Homer makes clear a few lines later: δόρπον ἐπετίθ' εἰλοντο κατὰ στρατὸν ἐν τελέεσοιν (H380). It is thus a self-contradiction to refer to men dining κατὰ στρατὸν as ἀθωρήκτου, but Nonnus is evidently not concerned with observing the precise sense of Homeric terms. The Indian plan is thwarted by Zeus, who brings torrential rain and thunder during the night: Ζεὺς δὲ πατὴρ δολόεντα μετατρέψας νόσον ἱνδοὺν / ἐσπερίην ἄνέκοψε μάχτιν μικῆτοι βόμβῳ, / ἀφίμμου πανύχιον χέων ἀπερείσιον ηχοῦ (22.133-5). These lines correspond to Zeus' portent to the warring sides in the Iliad of hardships to come: πανύχιος δὲ σφυν κακὰ μῆδετο μητίετα

16 (1927) pp. 393-434  
Zeus / σμερδάλεα κτυπέων, τοὺς δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ἤρει (H478-9). The idea of a thunderstorm occurring at this point of time appears, again, to come from Alexander's crossing of the Hydaspes. According to Arrian, as Alexander was readying the forces on the wooded headland for the crossing, a thunderstorm broke out, which lasted throughout the night. The thunderstorm, far from being a hindrance in Alexander's case, facilitated his plan by rendering inaudible the sounds of troops on the move (Anab. 5.12.3). Nonnus' Indians, like Alexander, attack at dawn when the storm had abated (cf.136-9 and Anab. 5.12.4). The battle description is commenced with a near-quotation from the Iliad, the δυσμενέες προάστασιν διλέες, ἤρει δὲ Θουρέως (22.139), corresponding to Τρώες δὲ προάστασιν διλείς, ἤρει δ' ἔφη Ἐκτώρ (N136). As the Indians attack, Dionysus, displaying the attributes of a cautious tactician in place his usual impetuosity, draws back in feigned retreat εἰσόκεν ἵνα δι / ἐς πεδίον προχέωντο (22.144-5). While the phrase is borrowed from Homer (B465), the idea of a tactical retreat so as to make the enemy fight in a place of his own choosing, recalls Porus' manoeuvre of giving battle to Alexander where he could deploy his cavalry to best advantage (Anab. 5.15.5). Echoes from the Iliad intermingle here with ideas drawn from Alexander's crossing of the Hydaspes, this segment of the Dionysiaca providing a good example of how Nonnus blends poetic with historical sources.

As battle is joined, however, the historic elements give way to stereotyped battle descriptions, based on those in the Iliad, but with marked concessions to the taste for the bizarre and macabre that manifested itself in the time of the Empire. The aristeias of Oiagrus, Erechtheus and Aiaacus, closely patterned on the aristeias in the Iliad, are interspersed with general battle scenes (where the protagonists are anonymous and the emphasis is rather on the various types of wounds inflicted or received) in the style of the rhetorical ἐκφράσεις πεζωμαχίας. Nonnus' propensity for the grotesque (e.g. cf. p.14) - a trait which he shares with the Roman poets Lucan and Statius - is, however, less in evidence here than in some of the later books, and the treatment appears on the whole to be more consciously Homeric than anywhere in the poem other than the first half of book 40. Nonnus prefaces the aristeias with brief references to other warriors. Firstly, an unnamed
Lydian is singled out for his golden armour (22.146-53), which is explicitly likened to that which Glaucus gave to Diomedes in exchange for the latter's armour of bronze (Z235-6), a transaction to which earlier reference was made at 15.165-8, where Hymenaios deprives a Lydian of his golden armour. It is not uncommon for Nonnus to imitate any given Homeric passage more than once, as we shall have ample opportunity to point out. Nonnus, in common with other late poets, has a penchant for describing precious objects, proceeding subsequently to the depiction of the silver accoutrements of a chieftain from Alybe. Then follows a picture of Dionysus wreaking havoc amongst the Indians with thyrsus and ivy. This depiction, which never develops into an aristeia properly speaking, is perhaps intended to highlight Dionysus' difference from the three Homeric-type heroes, whose aristeias follow forthwith. The οὐ γυμνὸν ἔχον ξίφος, οὐ δόνυ πάλλων, / ἀλλὰ ... θύρων ἀκοινίζων δολχόσκλων ... ἔχει κυστήν τι διαφάσιζων νέφος Ἰνδών (22.160-4) serves to remind us of the god's unusual weapons, which were depicted at 14.230-45. The use of δολχόσκλων, the Homeric epithet for the spear, to describe the thyrsus, which is by all accounts a short instrument, does not seem quite apposite, but, as we have just noted regarding the δαινυμένουται κατὰ στρατὸν, Nonnus pays little heed to the literal significance of such terms, using them merely for their Homeric associations.

The remainder of book 22 is taken up with the aristeias of Oiagrus, Erechtheus and Aiacus, the last overlapping with the beginning of book 23. The aristeias of Oiagrus and Aiacus are each divided into two separate segments, while the brief aristeia of Erechtheus is presented whole. The overall arrangement is as follows: Oiagrus lines 168-217, general battle description 218-52, Aiacus 253-92, Erechtheus 293-319, Oiagrus again 320-53, Aiacus again 354-89 and 23.11-78 (the latter segment in association with Dionysus). Collart draws attention to the structural similarity between the two segments of Oiagrus' aristeia. Both commence with a mention of Calliope (187-90, 320-3), followed by a massacre of

18 Cf. for example 32.18-26 where the gemstones in Hera's accoutrement are depicted in detail.
19 (1930) p.158. Collart believes that Nonnus wrote the second segment "le premier ne l'ayant pas satisfait". Keydell, on the other hand, marks the whole of the second segment with the marginal bar, which he uses to designate lines "a Nonno compositi neque cum carne contexti", that is, he regards it as the less appropriate of the two passages.
the Indians, in the first with sword and spear (191-212), in the second with bow and arrows (324-36). Oiagrus' action is in both instances so devastating as to leave in his wake a field devoid of the enemy: μεσάτων γυμνόσατο χάρμην (22.217) and μεσσατίης δὲ φάλαγγος ἀλευμένης ... χώρος ἐγγυμώθη (22.347-8). Oiagrus resembles Aiacus in having a descendant more renowned than himself, being the father of Orpheus, as the latter is the grandfather of Achilles. While Aiacus' martial prowess is understandable in view of his grandson's, heroic attributes being considered hereditary, it is difficult to see why Oiagrus, father of the peace-loving bard, should be portrayed as a slayer. He would function far more appropriately as minstrel, a role which Nonnus indeed assigned to him earlier in the poem, when he had him defeat Erechtheus in the song-competition at the funeral games of Staphylus (19.100-17). It is perhaps in anticipation of the present passage as well as on account of his Thracian antecedents, that Nonnus designates him as the son of Ares in the catalogue (13.429).

The first segment introduces Oiagrus by way of an agricultural metaphor, as reaping the black harvest, inexorably mowing down row upon row of attacking Indians (22.168-70). The metaphor is especially apposite, seeing that the poet regards the Indians as earthborn, even if they do not literally spring from the ground, as had the Σπαρτοί, whom Cadmus had mowed down earlier in the narrative (4.441-54). The analogy between slaying on the battlefield and reaping, would of course suggest itself independently of any association with the Σπαρτοί. Homer, indeed, compares in a celebrated passage the mutual slaughter of Greeks and Trojans to the reaping of corn (Ἀ67-71), and it is from here that Nonnus, in all likelihood, drew his inspiration. The blackness of the Indians is continually emphasised by Nonnus, to the extent that κυάνος becomes an epithet as inseparable from them as μέλανα is from ships in Homer.20 A series of Homeric reminiscences, some of them in the form of similes, of which an unusual concentration is encountered in the present segment, is used to describe the feats of Oiagrus (and later of Aiacus). Oiagrus' onslaught is likened to a torrent rushing down into the plain from the mountains: ως δ' ότε τις προχέων ποταμός

20 The ancients deemed the Indians the darkest of all races barring the Ethiopians, cf. *Arrian, Anab. 5.4.4.*: μελαντέρου των ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων, πλὴν Ἀθηνών, and *Indica* 6.9. Cf. also *Lucan* 4.678-9: 'concolor Indo Maurus'.
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δυστέμφελον ἰὸωρ / ἀϑατος ἐκ σκόπελοι σχαδῆμεντι ἱεθρῷ / ἔρχεται ἐς πεδίων πεφορμῆνος, οὐδὲ μιν αὐταὶ / ἔρκειςιν ἀργαγέοις ἀναστέλλουσιν ἀλωάι / λαίνῆς μέσα νῦτα διαζύοντα γεφύρης/πολλῇ μὲν κεκύλιστο πίτυς, πολλῇ δὲ πεσοῦσα / ἱβιφανῆς προθέλιμον ἑσύρετο χεὶματι πεύκῃ (22.171-7). This simile is a composite of two Homeric similes depicting the onslaught of Diomedes (E87-92) and Ajax (Λ492-6). From the first, Nonnus has used θύνε γὰρ ἄμ πεδίων ποταμῷ πλῆσαντες ἐνίκως /. / τὸν δ’ οὐτ’ ἄπ τε γέφυρα ἐερμέναι ἰσχανώσοι, / οὐτ’ ἀρα ἔρκεα ἰσχεὶ ἀλωάν ἑριθηλέων / ἔλθοντ’ ἕξαπινης, from the second ὡς δ’ ὅποτε πλῆσών ποταμόν πεδίωθε κάτεις / χειμάρρους κατ’ ὄρεσιν ... / πολλὰς δὲ δρός ἄξαλεας, πολλὰς δὲ τε πεύκας / ἔσφερεται. We might note here a typically Nonnian usage, namely the periphrasis νῦτα γεφύρης for γεφύρην, which is one of a number of number periphrases in the poem consisting of νῦτον or νῦτα followed by the genitive of the object denoted.  

Oiagrus is alone in the midst of the enemy, who throng around hedging him in with a wall of shields: καὶ μιν ἐκυκλώσαντο, καὶ ἂν καλέουσα μαχηταὶ / μιμηλὴν σακεέσσιν ἐπυργύσαντο χελώνην (22.180-1). The term χελώνη or ‘testudo’ refers normally to the Roman technique of interlocking shields to protect the crews operating battering rams from missiles thrown from the battlements during sieges, but is used occasionally to denote συνασπισμός in the Homeric sense (cf. Livy 10.29.6). In the present instance the Indians seem to use this technique to protect themselves against Oiagrus striking them from above, the latter being on horseback (ἀρεσσιλόθοι καθῆμενοι ἠφόδεν ἱπποῦ, 22.212), while they, presumably, are on foot. Nonnus mentions it to usher in his own paraphrase of the famous συνασπισμός passage from the Ἰλιάδ: ἤκνεσι μὲν στατὸν ἤξνον ἐρείδετο, κεκλημένη δὲ / ἀσπὶς ἐμω προθέλιμος ἀμοβαδίς ἀσπίδων γείτων / στεινομένη, καὶ ἐνευ λόφω λόφος, ἀγγιαφανῆς δὲ / ἀνδρὸς ἀνήρ ἐφαίνε (22.182-5), echoing φράζαντες δόρυ δουρί, σάκος σάκει προθέλιμων / ἀσπίς ἀρ’ ἀσπίδ’ ἐρείδε, κόρυς κόρων, ἀνέρα δ’ ἀνήρ’ / ἱπποῦ δ’ ἵπποκομοι κόρυθες

---
21 For other examples, cf. νῦτα χαλάζης (2.246), νῦτα βοείς (4.451). Nonnus' mannerisms recur with an almost formulaic regularity.
Nonnus imitates the passage a second time somewhat less pointedly at 28.29-34. We might note the typically Nonnian expressions ἀστιὰ γείτων and ἀγχιαφανῆς, which the poet appears to introduce quite deliberately, almost as if to leave his signature on the paraphrase.

Another Homeric echo follows in the form of the question: ἦθα τίνα πρῶτον, τίνα δ' ὑστατον Ἁιδι πέμπων / ... Οἰαγρος ἀπέθρισεν; (22.187-8), echoing ἦθα τίνα πρῶτον, τίνα δ' ὑστατον ἐξενάριξεν / Ἐκτωρ; (E703-4, repeated at Λ.299-300 and Π.692-3 (Patroclus)). One would expect a list of the names of the slain to follow as in Homer, but this is not the case, Nonnus opting instead to specify the injuries that Oiagrus inflicts on a number of unnamed Indians (22.191-5). Wifstrand has pointed out the affinity of such passages of anonymous carnage in Nonnus to the rhetorical ἐκφάσεις πεζομαχίας, citing an example from Libanius, which exhibits very similar characteristics. The following excerpt will suffice to demonstrate the similarity: καὶ τοῦ μὲν ἀπεκόπτῃ χεῖρ, τοῦ δὲ ὀφθαλμὸς ἐξεκόπη, ὃ δὲ ἐν τῷ βουβωίν πληγεὶς ἔκειτο, τοῦ δὲ τῆς ἀνέρρηξε τὴν γαστέρα (Libanii opera, ed. Foerster, v.8, p.462). Perpetrators and victims remain anonymous in such descriptions (designated by τῆς, ἄλλος etc., with which we may compare Lucan's nameless 'miles'), though in the present passage only the latter are so, their slayer being named. The physical manifestations of death on the battlefield are conveyed by Nonnus in gory detail verging on the grotesque, his descriptions recalling the exaggerations of Lucan. Nonnus reserves the more extreme instances for book 28, but the present segment gives an adequate foretaste of what is to come. A recurrent theme is that of severed hands continuing to twitch and jump about the battlefield in reptilian fashion. Thus when Oiagrus lops off the hand of an opponent, ἥ δὲ πεσοῦσα / αἰμοβαφῆς ἔσπαρεν ἐπὶ χθόνος ἀλλομένη χεῖρ (22.197-8). The severed hand of the

---

22 The passage was often imitated, cf. for example Euripides, Heracle. 836-7, Vergil, Aen. 10.360-1.
23 The question appears to have been much imitated. Vergil asks the same of Camilla: 'Quem telo primum, quem postremum, aspera virgo, / delici?' (Aen. 11.664-5).
Athenian in book 28 displays even greater mobility: ἥ δὲ κυβιστήρασα φόνου βητάρμου παλμῷ ... / ξανθὰ διαστίζουσα κατάρρυτα νώτα κονίς (28.128-30). The most extended depiction is found earlier, when one of the many hands of Typhoeus, cut off by Zeus' hail, μάρτυρι καὶ πίπτουσα, διατίζουσα δὲ γαίης / ἄλμασιν αὐτοκύλιστος ἐπάλλετο μαίνομενή χείρ, / ἀλα βαλείν ἐθέλουσα κάτα εἰκός / κύκλων 'Ολύμπου (2.433-5). All these examples are based on the incident in the Iliad, where Euryalus cuts off the hand of Hypsenor: ἀπὸ δ’ ἔξεσε χεῖρα βαρείαν / αἴματόσεσα δὲ χείρ πεδίω πέσε (E81-2). 25 The rhetorical exaggerations of Nonnus tend to diminish rather than augment the inherent horror of such scenes. There is, nevertheless, some Homeric precedent for the grotesque, especially in the scenes where a blow to the head results in the victim's eyes popping out and falling to the ground (cf. N616-7, P741-2), scenes which Nonnus does not imitate directly but which set the tone for the rhetorical reservoir of stock battlefield horrors from which he derives his imagery. Mixed with the grotesque are touches of genuine pathos, such as that of the soul longing for the youthful body it has been forced to leave: ψυχῆ δ’ ἡμελόφοιτος ἀναζεσα θανόντος / συμπλεκέος ποθεσέον ἑθήμονα σώματος ἢβην (22.21-2), echoing: ψυχῆ δ’ ἐκ θεόνων πταμένη 'Αιδώσι βεβήκει, / ἐν πότμον γούστα, λιποῦσ’ ἀνδροτήτα καὶ ἡβην, a statement used in the case of both Patroclus (Π856-7) and Hector (Χ362-3).

Further use of simile follows, with Oiagrus described as clearing the field of Indians in the way that with the onset of spring the cloudy skies of winter are cleared to display unimpeded the glow of the stars: ὡς δ’ ὁτε ρωγαλέων σκειρην μετὰ χειματος ύφρη / φαίνεται άσκεπέων νεφέων γυμνούμενος ἀθρ / φέγγεως ελαρινοί δειδαμόνοι αἰθροις αὐγήν (22.213-5). The notion of wintry clouds being cleared away to reveal the shining stars is used also by Apollonius in his depiction of the emergence of the earthborn warriors (3.1359-63). Nonnus is concerned only with the first half of the simile, that is, the clearing

25 Lucan has a cut-off tongue perform similar gymnastics: 'exsectaque lingua / palpitat et muto vacuum ferit aera motu' (2.181-2), which scene too, is based on one in the Iliad, where Mages' spear severs Pedatus' tongue: ἀντικρῖς δ’ ἄυν ἀδῶνας ἐνδ ι γλώσσαν τάμε χαλκός (E74).
away of the clouds to leave an open sky, since he is depicting the disappearance as opposed to the appearance of warriors from the field. The reference to the ἀλθρου ἄγλην is merely gratuitous, a left-over from the Apollonian simile. We note that as Nonnus uses the simile to describe a situation that is the reverse of that for which it was originally intended, its effectiveness is somewhat diminished.

In the second segment of the aristeia Oiagrus reappears as an archer, fighting with bow and arrows in place of spear and sword. With unerring markmanship he despatches nine arrows, killing an Indian with each: ἐννέα μὲν προέκε ταυνυλώχυνας ὄιστούς,  ἐννέα δ' ἄνδρας ἐπεφευ (22.324-5), one more than Teucer in the Iliad, who ὃκτῳ δὴ προέκε ταυνυλώχυνας ὄιστοὺς,  πάντες δ' ἐν χρόνῳ πῆχθεν ἄρηθων αἰζητίων (2.927-8). The μισοτριφονία in the Odyssey also has a bearing on the Nonnus passage in that Oiagrus' deadly use of archery in one concentrated bout of shooting resembles that of Odysseus. The speed of the action is exaggerated by Nonnus, displaying his usual propensity to hyperbole: ἐκ δὲ φαρέτρης ἄλλω πεμπόμενῳ κατέδραμεν ἄλλος ἐπ' ἄλλῳ / ἣρια στροφάλγυ γατάσσατος δυμβρός ὄιστῶν (22.334-6). This statement leads to yet another simile, with the arrows from Oiagrus' bow compared to sparks flying from a piece of copper that the blacksmith pounds on his anvil: ὥς δ' ὄτε χαλκεῖ ὑσ ἐπ' ἀκμών χαλκῶν ἑλαύνων / ἀκαμάτῳ ραίστηρι 

26 (1976) p.148
λαμπρόν, τοῦ δὲ τε πολλοὶ ἀπὸ σπυρῆρες ἴενται (Δ75-7). 27 Oiagrus is as effective in clearing the field with his arrows as he had been previously with spear and sword: χῶρος ἐγκυμνώθη, κεφάλη ἵππαμα Σελήνης, ἀμφιθάλης ὁτὲ βαίνω ἀποστάλβωσα κεφάλης ἀκρα διαπλήσσα δώο νεοφεγγέως αύγυλης / κεκλεμέναις ἀκτίσι μέσον κύκλοιο χαράσσει, ἀμφιθάλης ἀμφιθάλης μαλακῶν πυρώ, μεσσαφίν ὑπὲρ γυμνῶς χαρασσωμένης ἐπί φαίνετο κύκλα Σελήνης (22.348-53). As in the first segment the space cleared is likened to some happening in the sky, whether it be the clearing of clouds or the filling out of the moon. The line-ending κεφάλης ἵππαμα Σελήνης has been imitated from Moschus' κεφαλής ὁτὲ κύκλα Σελήνης (2.88), a poet of whom Nonnus has made considerable use in composing his own version of the abduction of Europa. The horns of the moon was a topos which lent itself to a variety of uses. Moschus in the above instance compares the horns of Zeus masquerading as a bull to those of the new moon. In Nonnus the bull which Typhoeus hurls at the moon is described as ἱσοφυές μύθῳ Σελήνης (1.215). Apollonius likens the curving fins of Triton's cleft tail to the moon's horns: οἷς σκολιοῖς ἐπινειόθη κέντρος / μήνης ὡς κεφάσιν ἐειδόμεναι διχώντο (4.1614-6).

The aristeia of Ereclethys (22.293-319) is confined to a single incident, which takes the form of a confrontation between horseman and infantryman, with Ereclethys on horseback engaging an unnamed Indian fighting on foot. Ereclethys slays his opponent, but not before meeting unexpectedly obdurate resistance. As Hopkinson points out, Nonnus was, in this instance, quite likely to have been influenced by iconography, in which the horseman-infantryman confrontation appears to have been a popular theme. 28 We note that Nonnus returns to the theme a second time at 36.221-36, where both adversaries are anonymous and the outcome is the opposite, with the infantryman emerging as the winner. The theme derives ultimately from the Iliad, where confrontations between one warrior on foot and the other in a chariot accompanied by his charioteer are of common

---

27 Nonnus uses the image of sparks issuing from the eyes at 18.261-2 (Campe), 29.195-6 (the Cabeiri), and Par. 5.135 (John the Baptist). For sparks flying from Euryomedon's shield, cf. 29.210.

28 Cf. Hopkinson (1994a) p.90 n.3.
occurrence, as for instance, Diomedes' encounter with Phegeus and Idaius: τὼ μὲν ἄφ' ἔποιε, ὁ δὲ ἀπὸ χρύνοις ὠφυντο πεζοῖς (E13). The Indian possesses a shield like that of Ajax: Ἰνδικὸν ἐππαβάσειον ἐχῶν σάκος, εἰκόνα πύργου (22.305), recalling: Ἀλς δ' ἐγγύθεν ἤθελε φέρων σάκος ἤπετε πύργου / χάλκεον ἐππαβάσειον (H219-20). Transfixed by Erechtheus' spear, he is likened to a tumbler as he falls headlong to the ground: ὁ δὲ στροφάδεσσιν ἐρωτιν / ἕρόθεν προκάρμον ἑπωλίσθη πολυε/ κράτα κυβιστήτηρα φέρων / βουτάρμον παλμῷ (22.315-7). Nonnus has imitated Homer's description of the death of Mydon: ὁ γ' ἀσθμαίνων ἐνεργεός ἐκπέσε δίφρου / κύμβαχος ἐν κοινήσω (E585-6), but the imitation is not altogether appropriate to the present context, seeing that the Indian is not falling from a horse or chariot, having fought from the ground. We note that Nonnus imitates the same Homeric passage again at 28.216-20 to describe Deriades' fall from his chariot on being struck by a rock thrown by Halimedes.

The aristiea of Aiacus is remarkable in that its latter half is almost entirely patterned on Achilles' μάχη παραπτάμοις in Iliad 21. Aiacus is not only endowed with the the same pre-eminently heroic virtues as Achilles, which is understandable seeing that such qualities were considered hereditary, but partakes as well of his grandson's inexorable μὴν. Aiacus' anger is difficult for the reader to comprehend in the absence of any indication on the poet's part as to what might have given rise to it. Achilles' fury was the direct result of the slaying of Patroclus, prior to which he entertained no special hatred of the Trojans (cf. A152-3, Φ100-2). Aiacus has no score to settle with the Indians, but in spite of this, his fury is described as exceeding that of Achilles: οὐχ ἕνα μοῦνον ἐπεφιε Λυκάονα ... καὶ πολὺν Ἀστεροπαιὰν ἐδέξατο νεκρῶν ἦδοςπής (22.380-3). It may be noted, by way of comparison, that Statius, in his version of the μάχη παραπτάμοιος, has Hippomedon display similar fury on the banks of the Isemus, but, like Achilles, he has good cause to vent his hatred on the Thebans, who have just slain Tydeus (Theb. 9.299). The feats of Aiacus are described by the poet as presaging those of Achilles: οἶα προθεσπίζων ποταμοῦ παρὰ χεῖμα / Καμάνδρου / φύλοποι ἡμιτέλεστον ἐπεσομένην Ἀχιλῆι / καὶ μόθον
νιώνοιο μέθος μαυτίσατο πάππου (22.387-9). Achilles’ achievement is described as incomplete, the poet obviously thinking of the ruse whereby Apollo, in the shape of Agenor, distracts him at the end of Iliad 21, enabling many of the Trojans to reach the safety of their walls. In the Dionysiaca, on the other hand, all the enemy contingent on the near side of the river are slain, Thureus alone being spared, so that he could convey the news to Deriades (23.116).

The aristeia begins with Aiacus pictured in a precarious situation, surrounded on all sides by the enemy. His armour is not adequate to guarantee his safety and he is indeed only saved by the intervention of Athena, who shelters him with her father’s unbreakable clouds, clouds that had formerly slaked the thirst of his parched fields. Throughout the aristeia Aiacus’ present deeds are juxtaposed by way of antithesis with those he had previously effected in Aegina. Clouds are normally assembled by gods to render their proteges invisible (cf. η14-7, ν189-90 and Apollonius 3.210-2), but here it seems as if Athena is according Aiacus the protection of her aegis. Divine intervention of a direct physical kind is not common in the Dionysiaca. Beside the present case there are six instances in books 28 to 30 and one in book 40.29 In the Iliad, on the other hand, there are some forty instances such intervention. Commenting on the negative perception that the modern reader would have of divinely assisted victories, James, in his study on divine intervention in the Iliad, has emphasised the difference between Homeric and modern value judgments in this respect. Referring to the divinely assisted slayings of Patroclus and Hector, he observes that "we naturally see this as detracting from the achievement first of Hector and then of Achilles. The poet’s intention, on the other hand, seems to be precisely the opposite, to underline the significance of those achievements with the seal of divine support”.30 The divine assistance rendered to Aiacus is thus to be understood as enhancing rather than

29 Viz. 28.212-3 Hydaspes on behalf of Deriades, 29.76 / Zeus o.b.o. Dionysus, 29.82/ Aphrodite o.b.o. Hymenaios, 30.76ff./ Hephaistos o.b.o. Alcon and Cabeiros, 30.87/ Hydaspes o.b.o. Morheus, 30.320ff. / Hera o.b.o. Melanios, and 40.70ff. Athena o.b.o. Dionysus.

30 (1993) p.10. Libanius in his syncriosis of Achilles and Ajax seems inclined to the modern value judgment, when he rates Ajax’ victory over Hector above Achilles’ on the grounds that Ajax had to do without divine help, which in his case was accorded to his opponent Hector: δ’ αὐτῶς αὐτὸς μεμηχανός τῆς Ἑκτόρος τελευτῆς τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐμφανές Ἀχιλλείς συμμαχοῦν ὁμοίως. Ἀλλ’ ἰδίᾳ ἐκφάτωσιν Ἑκτόρος θεοῦ παράτιτος Ἑκτόρα, τοῦ δ’ αὐτοῦ παλιοῦ Ἀχιλλεῖς θεοῦ βλαπτόντος Ἑκτόρα (Foerster v.8, p.342).
diminishing his stature, and indeed, as a confirmation of his greatness as warrior. Protected by Athena's cloud, he proceeds to slay the Indians all and sundry, with spear, sword or rocks, using whatever best serves his purpose in any instance: καὶ μέσος ἀντιβίων κυκλομέμενος ἔθος ἀνήρ / τοὺς μὲν ἀπηλόξε ἦν ὑπὸ δορί, τοὺς δὲ μαχαίρη, τοὺς δὲ λίθους κρανασάς. πέδων δ' ἐρυθαίνετο λύθρω / ἵνδων κτεινομένων (22.263-6). Aiaces' exploits bear a resemblance to those of a warrior in the Blemomachy, who wreaks similar havoc among the Blemyes: ἔφερε δ' ἡχῇ / τῶν μὲν ἀπολλυμένων, τῶν δ' αὐθεντός ὑπόσω / θειόντων ἐφεσίν τε καὶ ἐγχεοίν. ἐκτυπε δ' αἰθήρ / καὶ χθόνια ἀβραχε πάσα, πέδων δ' ἐρυθαίνετο λύθρω / πολλῶν νυλεμέσις κταμένων πληγήσι σιδήρου / αἰεὶ δ' ἀντάχης ὕμνου τερπνὸν μέλος ἡχῶ (frag.4.10-5).

Wifstrand's supposition that the Blemomachy was too insignificant a poem to have warranted Nonnus' attention is hard to sustain in view of the obvious correspondences between this portion of Aiaces' aristeia and the the above quoted lines. Beside the phrase πέδων δ' ἐρυθαίνετο λύθρω, common to both poems, we should also note the μέλος ἡχῶ, which is used by Nonnus in two line endings in the general battle description preceding Aiaces' aristeia: μέλος πολεμήην ἡχῶ (22.231) and ἐγερσιμόθοι μέλος ἡχῶς (22.248). We might also note that the second segment of Aiaces' aristeia begins with the words οὔδε μάχης ἀπέληγε (22.354), which echo Homer's ἀλλ' οὔδ' ὑπ' ἀπέληγε μάχης (A.255), words which are also imitated in the Blemomachy (frag. 5, 1). These coincidences and the fact that Nonnus earlier devotes twelve lines to the story of Blemys (17.385-97), whom he calls Βλεμύς σα τροήνποι ἰγεμόνη (397), suggest that he was familiar with the Blemomachy. It is indeed tempting to ask whether Nonnus did not derive his woolly-haired black image of the Indians from that of the Abyssinian Blemys. Even if the poem and the campaign were, as Wifstrand believes, of local interest only, they were surely pertinent to Nonnus as a native of Panopolis, a city on the Abyssinian frontier.

The Earth, out of pity for her Indian sons, chides Aiaces, addressing him as ζείδωρε μιαφόνε (22.276). The attributes are mutually contradictory, the first
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31 (1933) p.185
indicative of Aiacus' previous role as life-giver, the second, which is an epithet traditionally reserved for Ares, corresponding to his present role as slayer. Nonnus is rather fond of using oxymoron for effect (cf. for example, ὦ ἀπάτερ 30.167 and σιγῆ ... βοῶν 36.380-1). The appeal falls on deaf ears, as Zeus spurs Aiacus to even greater bloodshed (22.285-6). Aiacus is subsequently wounded by an Indian's arrow, but his wound, owing to Athena's intervention (the second time in the course of this aristeia) turns out to be merely superficial: καὶ τις ἐν ἀντιβίοισιν ἐς Αιακὸν δίμα ταυτόσας / πέμπε βέλος, καὶ βαιὼν, ὅσον χρόσα ἄκρον ἀμύξαι, / μηρὼν ἐπιγραφαίτα παρέτραπεν ἰδον 'Αθηνή (22.287-9). The incident is inspired by the wounding of Menelaus by Pandarus in the Iliad (Δ112-40). In both cases Athena deflects the arrow with the result that the intended victim receives a mere scratch, cf. βέλος ἢπτετο μηρὸν / λεπτὸς δινε ἀτε φωτός, ὅτε χρόσα ἄκρα χαράξῃ (22.291-2) and ἀκρότατον δὲ ἀπ᾽ ἀυτὸς ἐπέγραψε χρόα φωτός (Δ139). Nonnus imitates Homer's passage for a second time and at greater length at 29.68ff. (wounding of Hymenaius), where the Iliadic parallels are spelt out even more explicitly.

The second part of Aiacus' aristeia corresponds closely to Achilles' slaughter of the Trojans in Iliad 21. Aiacus drives the Indians from the plain in the direction of the river: καὶ ἐκ πεδίου διώκων / εἰς προχοᾶς ποταμοῦ μετήγαγε λαὸν ἀλήτην (22.356-7), corresponding to τοὺς μὲν πεδίουδ᾽ ἐδίωκε / πρὸς πόλιν ... ἡμίσεις δὲ ἐς ποταμὸν εἰλεύντο βαθύρροον ἀργυροδύνην (Φ3-8). Nonnus cannot of course follow Homer to the letter and split the fleeing Indians into two groups, seeing that here the river and city do not constitute alternative destinations, being both in the same direction in relation to the action, the river needing to be crossed before the city is reached. Geographical considerations aside, Nonnus is bent on duplicating the situation in Iliad 21, a further echo of the same occurring at 29.295-7: ἀσταθεῖς δὲ / ξανθῶν ἀλυσκάζουσις ἐπὶ ἐρῶν ὡκλασάν 'Ινδοί / ἀλλοί δ᾽ ἐν πεδίῳ, where the geography is closer to that in the Iliad, as the fighting takes place between the river and the city. As at the beginning of the first segment of his aristeia, Aiacus is encircled by the enemy (22.358), but unlike then, when he needed Athena's intervention to save him, he is now in-
vincible. The Indians strike him with everything at their disposal, but to no avail, as he slays them all. The imagery of harvesting is used again, Aiacus described as mowing down the Indians: ἑπασσυτέρησι δὲ ἔπαιας / κυκλέες ἦμησε στάνεα λήμα χάρμης / κραπνὸς ἀνήρ καὶ πάσιν ἐμάρνατο, τοὺς μὲν ἐπ’ ἔχναις, / τοὺς δὲ κάτω ποταμοῖο μαχημουν χειρὶ δαίζων (22.360-3). Homer is rather more fastidious in descriptions of this kind, stating that Achilles left his spear on the bank, as he proceeded to slay the Trojans in the water φάσαγαν ολον ἔχων (Φ19), the spear being clearly deemed unsuitable for fighting at close quarters in the water. Nonnus, on the other hand, pays scant regard to technicalities of this sort.

The river is filled with the slain and reddened by their blood: καὶ νεκύων ἐπήλθεν ὅλων ρόων· ὀλλυμένων δὲ [αἴματι] ἑρωκαίνετο λευκὸς ὑδάτης (22.364-5), reflecting ἑρωκαίνετο δ’ αἴματι δώφη (Φ21), πλήθει γὰρ δὴ μοι νεκύων ἑρατεινά ἐλεύθρα (Φ218) and μορμύρων ἀφρώ τε καὶ αἴματι καὶ νεκύεσσιν (Φ325). Aiacus ἀντιβίοσιν ἀκαμπέα μηνυν δέξων, (22.378) is as inexorable as Achilles and will not accept surrender, rejecting mercilessly the entreaties of those attempting to do so. The book ends with one of the sea-nymphs appealing to Aiacus, as kinsman of the river and the Naiads (in that he is a son of Zeus, nourisher of rivers, and of Aigina, daughter of a river) to cease defiling the Hydaspes with blood. The emphasis on kinship recurs in Hydaspes' entreaty to Dionysus in book 24 (cf. 22.392-3 and 24.10). Nonnus is rather fond of giving expression to complaints by nymphs and hamadryads (cf. 2.92ff. and 37.20-1). The present appeal is paralleled later in the poem by Psamathe's plea to Zeus to prevent Poseidon's defeat by Dionysus (43.361-71). The nymph's entreaty, like that previously made by the Earth, goes unanswered as Aiacus (soon to be joined by Dionysus) continues the slaughter unabated. Many of the Indians take to the water, but their inability to swim precludes their escape: καὶ πολὺς ... θελεν πότιμον ἀλοξαὶ / χειρὶν ἀπειρήτουσι ποταμήα χεῦματα τέμιων· / ἀλλὰ ρώ χεκάλιπτο (23.7-9). The notion of the orientals' inability to swim is clearly borrowed from Herodotus (cf. 8.89) and recurs in the naumachy, where the Indians are described as χειρὶς ἐρετμώσαντες ἀθάναι (39.366). Dionysus' participation in the slaughter (23.11ff.) appears to conflict somewhat with his role
as redeemer and consoler of mankind. It is difficult to see why he should be so merciless here, when in the earlier battle at lake Astacid, where he, in conformity with this role, ἀντιβους δ' ὕκτειρε ... φιλοπαιγμον θυμῷ (14.411). Now Thureus alone is spared and only in order that he could inform Deriades of the extent of Dionysus' victory (23.116). A further reminiscence from Homer's μάχη παραπτώμασσ follow. An Indian wielding a spear in each hand takes aim simultaneously at Aiakos and Dionysus: ὄν ὁ μὲν αὐτῶν / δρόμος ἱλύοντι πόδας οἰκηχάτο τηλῷ ... καὶ Βρομίπ ολέμμεξεν ἐν ὅδασι μᾶλλον ἀρούρης, / ἀμφοτέραις παλάμαις διδυμάνα δουράτα πάλλων/καὶ τὸ μὲν αἷμαξεσκεῖν ἐς ἥνας ὑφόσε πέμπων / Αιακὸν ἀντικέλευθον ἐχων σκοπόν, ἀλλο δὲ σείσας / ἐγχος ἁνωτίτιον κατηκοντιζε Αιαίον (23.28-36). We are not told of the outcome of this ambidextrous effort, but may assume it ended the same way as Asteropaius' confrontation with Achilles. Asteropaius too, it will be recalled, fought from the river: τῷ δ' Ἀχιλείους ἐπόρουσαν, ὅ δ' ἀντίους ἐκ ποταμοῖο / ἐστὶ ἐχων δόω δοῦρε (Φ144-5), and threw two spears at once (missing with both): ὅ δ' ἀμαρτῇ δοῦρασον ἀμφιδ' / ... ἐπεὶ περιδέξιος ἐν (Φ162-3). Another Indian, distraught at the slaughter of his countrymen, commits suicide, μυμούμενος Ἰνδόν Ὀρόντην (23.59) and shows himself to be another (albeit sane) Ajax or Mencceus. Nonnus intimates that committing suicide in the manner of Orontes is a barbarian characteristic (cf. 23.60: βάρβαρον αἴμα αέρων καὶ βάρβαρον ἡδος ἁέξων), a notion that may have been inspired by the suicide of Boges, Persian governor of Eon, who preferred this course of action to returning to Asia, when the city was about to fall to the Athenians (Herod. 7.107). The comparisons with Ajax and Mencceus suggested by the poet are not entirely apposite owing to the difference of circumstances, Ajax being mad and Mencceus needing to immolate himself in order to save Thebes. The Indian, like Orontes, takes his own life from a sense of shame at being worsted through the θηλεί θόριον (23.68) of an unworthy foe. A third Indian now addresses the Hydaspes, upbraiding the river for its passivity in the face of the enemy and even accusing it of complicity in the deaths of the Indians, who are drowning in its waters. The speech (as often in Nonnus) assumes the form of a
rhetorical syncrisis, in which the Hydaspes is compared unfavourably to a number of other rivers. Events and customs associated with each of the latter are delineated, as for instance the role of the Rhine in determining the legitimacy of offspring, a theme presented at greater length in Dionysus' speech to Pentheus (46.54-62). The Indian ends with an outright accusation: σείο βόος Βρομίων κακώτερος, γιάτι με θύρονσι ού κλονεί Δίόνυσος, δι' ου κλονείς με βρέθηροις (23.102-3).

The *Iliad* provides no pretext for such recriminations, as the Scamander is presented actively abetting the Trojan cause, firstly setting Asteropaius on Achilles out of pity for those the latter had slain (Φ145-7), and when that fails rebuking Achilles directly (Φ211ff.). Hippomedon's μάχη παραπτάμοις in Statius' *Thebaid* does, however, accord a parallel, when the Ismenus is chided by its daughter Ismenis for having allowed the slaying of Creneus in its waters (9.376-98). The Ismenus, like the Hydaspes in Nonnus, is accused of passivity and of helping the enemy: 'το πιγερ, et trucibus facilis servire Pelasgis' (9.396). The Ismenus in its turn, chides Zeus for permitting the slaughter to take place in its waters, reminding him of the services it had rendered him in the past, and adducing the names of a number of rivers, including the Hydaspes, which though less deserving, had been spared such profanation. Bearing in mind the rhetorical influences which operated on both poets, the similarities of treatment are to be expected.

The carnage in the water, as depicted in Nonnus, exhibits further parallels with Statius. Both supply a detailed list of the weapons to be seen floating on the water, whereas Homer is content with a general statement (Φ301-2). Both Nonnus and Statius display a lack of concern for verisimilitude, depicting the weapons and bodies as floating on the water, while the river is yet placid. Homer, with greater realism, speaks of them of as being churned up when the Scamander attacks Achilles. The following parallels between Nonnus' and Statius' descriptions merit quoting: ἡμφασε θάλασσα λόφω πορθητῆς τῆς θάλασσας / δυσμένη κατὰ βαίων (23.107-8) / galeasque vetant descendere cristae (9.262), ἐφελκὸμεναι δὲ βρέθροις ... νηχομένως τελαμώνια ἐναυτίλλουτο βοεῖα (23.108-10) / clypeosque leves ... / unda vehit (9.261-2), and βαρυνόμενον δὲ σιδήρῳ / εἰς βυθὸν ἱγροχίτωνα κατέσπασεν ἄνερα θώρηξ (23.111-2) / madidus deducit
pectora thorax (9.241). Nonnus will reuse these details in the naumachy in book 39.

With the Indian detachment wiped out, Dionysus' cohorts can cross the river unimpeded. The narrative now resumes the distinctly magical character associated with scenes of Bacchic revelry. Dionysus drives his chariot, drawn by a team of panthers, unwetted across the stream. Pan simply runs across, skimming the surface: αἰγείος δὲ πόδεσσι διέτρεχε Παρράσιος Πάν / ἄκρα γαληναίοι διαστείχων πτωμοί (23.151-2), a description that may have been inspired by Apollonius' description of Euphemus, who possessed the same ability: ἄκροι / ἔχεσι τεγγόμενος διερή πεφόρητο κελεύθῳ (1.183-4). Lycus and Scelmis, like Dionysus, drive their chariots across, unwetted wheels, feats which a little later elicit from Hydaspes the complaint: ὅτι στρατὸς ὑγρὸς ὀδίτης / ἀρμασι χερσαλοισι βατῶν ποιήσεις· Ὑδάστην (23.172-3). We may note that Nonnus reuses the above passages in describing Christ's walk on water in the Paraphrase: Χριστὸν ἐκείνον διαστείχων θαλάσσης / ἄμορφοι ἔχοντα, βατῆς ἄλος ὀξὺν ὀδίτην (6.75-6). Another of Dionysus' followers rides across on the back of a bull: ἄλος ὑπὲρ νύκτοιο θορὼν ... / εἰς πλοῦν ἑρυχεὶ καλαύροπος ταύρον ὀδίτην (23.157-8), recalling Europa's journey earlier in the poem, where Eros Κυπραδήν ποιμαινε καλαύροποι νυμφῶν Ἡρης (1.82). Nonnus is, as we have noted, often inclined to reuse his own imagery and expressions in both the Dionysiaca and the Paraphrase when depicting analogous situations. Unlike Homer, however, he studiously avoids precise repetition, invariably effecting some change (albeit at times quite minor) in the such cases.

The merely human followers of Dionysus have of necessity to improvise more mundane ways of making the crossing. Some commandeer Indian rafts and boats, others build their own craft: ὅπος ὁ μὲν ἵππος σχεδόν ἐφίππωσην ἔρεόσων ... δὲ ... ἐνδάπιον σκάφος εἰς τι λισσαραβέων ἄλτην / ἀρπάζας· ἔτερος δὲ νόθη ναυτιλλετο θεσμῷ / καὶ ξύλον αὐτόπρεπου ὄμοιον ὁλκάδι τεῦχῳ, / ἕκτος χαλίβου, δίχα λαίφεος, ἔκτος ἐρεμών ... εἰς βυθίον κενεώνας ὑποβρύχιον πέμπων, / Ἀρεος ὑγροπόρου δορυσσόσος ἔπλεε ναυτῆς (23.129-38). Nonnus has an obvious fascination with the raft-building
scene in the *Odyssey* (c. 247-55), which he imitates in more detail at 36.403-11 and 40.446-54. He has, at the same time, made use of the Alexander historians. Thus when he describes the foot-soldiers crossing on inflated wine-skins (23.128-38), he could well be thinking of the skin-rafts employed by Alexander's troops in traversing the Hydaspes (Arrian, *Anab.* 5.12.3). Another crossings using his shield for a boat: καὶ πλωτῆς ἄξιαντος ἐπὶ ἀσπίδας οἴδιμα τέμνων / ... σακέσπαλον εἶχε πορείν, / ξείνην ναυτιλίην ψευδήμον υἱὸς χαράσσων (23.139-41). This idea is not as outlandish as it might seem, since Arrian reports an actual instance where the Milesian mercenaries of Darius employed such a means of crossing: ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ ὀπίσω διετήθηστο (Anab. 1.19.4).

The narrative at this stage leaves a distinct impression that the crossing has now been accomplished, that Dionysus and his followers have negotiated a placid stream without incident. This turns out, however, not to be the case, for the poet now informs us that the Hydaspes, offended by the way in which Dionysus and his followers are treating it, addresses an unnamed fellow river, to voice its resentment: σοὶ καὶ ἐμοὶ πέλεν αἰχὼς, ὅτε βρομίοι καταβατι / ἀβρέκτος ἐμὸν οἴδιμα διασχίζουσι πεδίλως (23.168-9). In Homer, owing to different circumstances (the river not being trampled upon), the question of shame does not arise at all. If anything, it is Achilles who feels shame at the prospect of dying an unheroic death by drowning like some swineherd (Φ279-82). The Hydaspes forthwith assails Dionysus and his followers, who, it appears, have been caught midstream. It is remarkable that Hydaspes later gives Dionysus somewhat different reasons for its behaviour, stating that it had acted out of loyalty to Deriades and was moved by the plight of the Indians dying in its waters: Δηριάδη γὰρ / ὑπὶ πιστὰ φέρων ῥοθίων ἐλέυθερον ἀπελήν, / ἵνα σιδηρώμενοι βοηθῶν οἴδιμα κυλίνδων (24.15-17) and feared that its bloodied stream would give offence to the sea and Poseidon (cf. 24.18-20). The latter reason conforms more or less to Scamander's complaint to Achilles, that it cannot pour its stream, choked with the bodies of the slain, into the sea (Φ219-20).

Homer's μάχη παραπτάμος consists of two segments: first we have Achilles' desperate struggle with the Scamander, which is then followed by the
scorching of the river by Hephaistus at Hera's behest. Statius and Nonnus have imitated different halves of Homer's account, Statius duplicating the struggle and dispensing with the scorching, Nonnus concentrating on the scorching and all but omitting the struggle. Statius' Hippomedon thus corresponds to Achilles, while Nonnus' Dionysus parallels Hephaistus. The element of suspense associated with the hero's desperate fight for survival against a river bent on drowning him is thus completely absent from Nonnus' account. At no time is Dionysus imperilled by the river's attack but goes on the offensive immediately upon seeing that the latter has ignored his speech, and proceeds to burn it up with his νάρθηξ. The Hydaspes, unlike the Scamander, launches its attack without any prior address to Dionysus, there being no dramatic exchange of words between the two as in Homer. There are other differences as well: unlike the Scamander, who calls the Simoeis to its aid only after Hera has given Achilles the strength to withstand its initial onslaught (Φ304), the Hydaspes calls on its unnamed brother to assist it prior to launching the attack. A similar situation obtains in Statius, where the Asopus comes to Ismenus' aid before the commencement of the attack (9.449-50). The Hydaspes forthwith rushes upon Dionysus: ἀλτο δὲ Βάκχῳ / αἰχμᾷζων ῥοθίοιοσ· ἀελλή-εσσα δὲ πολλῇ / μαρναμένων ὕδατων διερῆ μυκήσατο σάλπιγξ (23.192-4). The μυκήσατο σάλπιγξ may have been inspired by μεμυκῶς ἴτε ταύρος (Φ237), used of the Scamander, and by σάλπιγξεν μέγας οὐρανός (Φ387-8), which occurs in the context of the theomachy, but it should be noted that the metaphorical use of σάλπιγξ is commonplace in Nonnus (cf., for example, 2.635 and 43.288-9). 32 The effect of the river's attack on Dionysus' followers is described in farcical terms: drunken Maron is merely parted from his wine-flask, Pan from his flute (206-13), while Dionysus himself does not appear to suffer any inconvenience at all. The feeling of mortal danger that we find in Homer is conspicuously (and perhaps intentionally) absent here. Dionysus, like Orpheus in the Orphic Argonautica, is portrayed by Nonnus as one who is always in control of the circumstances (except when facing Hera) and immune to worldly dangers.

The river's attack is described in rather hyperbolic language: καὶ ἄος ἑγρεκόδομος ἔχων ἀντιπνοον αὖρην / ἀγχισφης ἰψούτο, διάβροχον

32 Cf. Gigli -Piccardi (1985) pp.138-9, for further examples.
Hopkinson views these lines as another manifestation of Nonnus' desire to give Dionysus' engagements a cosmic dimension. The exaggeration could, just as likely, be deemed merely a stylistic trait of the late, so-called baroque poets. Statius describes the Ismenus' attack on Hippomedon in similarly inflated language: 'avidus tollens ad sidera vultus / humentes nebulas exaurit' (9.453-4). In another direct reference to the *Iliad* the poet tells us that Hydaspes' attack far surpassed that of the Simoeis and Scamander in ferocity (23.221-4). At this point the reader, anticipating a tremendous conflict, if not exactly as in the *Iliad*, then something on the lines of the Zeus-Typhoeus battle earlier in Nonnus' own poem, will find himself cheated of his expectations. Dionysus responds to the attack firstly with a measured piece of school rhetoric, and when that fails to have the desired effect, lights up his torch and proceeds to burn up the river. The address takes the form of a disquisition on the superiority of fire to water and of Dionysus' superiority to the Hydaspes, the son of Zeus being mightier than the son of Oceanus. A similar line of reasoning is found in Dionysus' challenge to Deriades at 29.304-6, where he considers himself as much superior to the latter, as his father Zeus is superior to the latter's father Hydaspes. The fire-water opposition is a leitmotiv in the poem, and comparison of himself to his adversaries a common element in the speeches of Dionysus (and in those of his principal opponents). In speaking of the superiority of his lineage to that of the Hydaspes, Dionysus' address resembles Achilles' remarks in the same vein to Asteropaius (cf. 23.226-9 and Φ184ff.). Achilles, we may recall, tells Asteropaius that it is futile for him, son of a river though he be, to fight one descended from Zeus, adding that not even the might of Oceanus could stand up to Zeus.

With the Hydaspes taking no notice of Dionysus' speech (we note that hardly any of the speeches in the *Dionysiaca* elicit a response, verbal or otherwise, there being, in contrast to the *Iliad*, very little of dialogue in the poem), the latter brings the power of his νικηφόρης to bear. Dionysus uses the sun's heat to light it up, then places it in the stream making it boil. Nonnus, though generally indifferent to verisimilitude, does appear to have a penchant for advancing scientific explana-

33 (1994a) pp. 120-1, 257.
ations, an interest that he may have derived from didactic poetry (cf., for example, 2.482-507, 25.178-9, 518-9 and 37.56-69). The present passage evinces the same tendency. At the same time echoes from the *Iliad* abound (cf. 23.259 and Φ349, 23.260 and Φ356, 361, 23.262-3 and Φ351, 23.267-8 and Φ353, 23.269 and Φ365). Nonnus makes no attempt to duplicate Homer's simile of the boiling cauldron, but adds a comment of his own about the river-nymphs, who are forced to leave their boiling abode (23.274ff.). The poet has referred to the discomfort of the nymphs on two preceding occasions, firstly at the end of book 22, when one of them decides to leave the river as it was becoming polluted with blood (22.392-402), and then through the mouth of Hydaspes, who describes their anguish as they hear the sound of horses' hooves overhead (24.24-30). The theme of the displacement of deities from their habitat is a recurrent one in Nonnus, the hamadryads suffering a similar fate at the hands of Typhoeus (2.92ff.) and as a result of the inroads of the woodcutters (37.20-1). Nonnus is fascinated by the thought of the established cosmic order being turned on its head, a notion first set out in Typhoeus' speech at 2.258ff. and subsequently repeated in various guises throughout the poem.

Oceanus, dismayed at the treatment meted out to the Hydaspes, delivers a long menacing speech, similar in tone and intent to the speech of Typhoeus to which we have just referred. Oceanus' manner of speaking is conveyed through effective use of metaphor: Ὅκεανος δ' ἱάχησεν ἀπειλεῖων Διονύσῳ, / ἱδατόεν μύκημα χέων πολυπίδακι λαμψὶ, / καὶ ρόον ἄεναίων στομάτων κρουντήδων ίάλλων / ἡμώνας κόσμοιο κατέκλυσε χεύμασι μύθων (23.280-3). The notion of 'flowing' had for long been used to describe the voice (cf. the mellifluous speech of Nestor, A249). Here Nonnus uses it simultaneously in its primary (flow of water) and secondary (flow of speech) sense, seeing that the speaker is a body of water. The expression is used again of Oceanus at 43.287-8: καὶ ἄεναίων ἀπὸ λαμψὶ / ἱδατόεν μύκημα κεκηνότος Ὅκεανοίο, and is partially echoed at 36.138-9 (used of Deriades): ἀπειλήν / βάρβαρον ἐσμαράγγησε μεγεθύνγων ἀπὸ λαμψὶ. As mentioned previously, reuse of expressions and ideas, always in slightly altered form, is a regular feature of the poet's compositional technique. Oceanus, like Typhoeus earlier, threatens a cosmic cataclysm, to swamp the
constellations with its waves (cf., for instance, 23.294-5 and 2.279-80). Oceanus' threats, like those of Typhoeus, are directed at Zeus himself rather than at Dionysus, elevating what was up to now a local conflict onto a universal plane. Book 23 ends with Oceanus' speech, Zeus' response being described at the beginning of book 24. Zeus accedes to the demand, signalling to Dionysus with thunderclaps to desist (24.1-2), an action in which he is joined by Hera (24.5-6). We note that in Nonnus Zeus shows himself rather compliant in face of threats or pleas: he backs down over Beroe at being threatened by Poseidon (41.247-9), he answers Psamathe's plea to stop Dionysus, when the latter is about to defeat Poseidon in their war over the maiden (43.378-80, where Zeus again signals his intent with thunderclaps).

The Hydaspes now supplicates Dionysus in a way reminiscent of the Scamander's pleas to Hephaistus and Hera. In Nonnus' context Hydaspes' pleas are gratuitous, seeing that Zeus has just stopped Dionysus (24.3-4), but our poet is oblivious of such points of logic. Hydaspes, as we have already mentioned, adduces his paternal loyalty to Deriades and pity for the Indians, as well as the fear of defiling the sea and offending Poseidon, as reasons for his attack. This is followed by the argument that Dionysus, by burning the reeds on its banks, is depriving his followers of the source of panpipes. Dionysus is also reminded by Hydaspes that it was in its waters that the baby Zagreus had been washed (24.43-6). We note that in Statius the Asopus reminds Dionysus of the same service it had provided him as an infant (9.439-41).

Dionysus forthwith withdraws his torch (24.62), and the crossing can commence anew. The first attempt to cross was presumably aborted with the river's attack and subsequent scorching, but we are not told so. Indeed, lines 24.109-11 seem to continue quite naturally from 23.161, at which point the Hydaspes decided to launch its attack. It is highly probable accordingly, that the whole episode of the river's attack was intercalated into a previous version of events, where (as Keydell and Collart suggest), the river had been converted to wine and the crossing was unimpeded. This previous version need not have necessarily been contained in a draft composed by the poet himself but may have come from one of Nonnus' now lost sources, perhaps even from Dionysius' Bassarica.34 Nonnus shows overall a

remarkable indifference towards coordinating his sources so as to create a logically consistent narrative. The μάχη παραποτάμιος, which with its merciless slaughter ill befits Dionysus’ role as redeemer of mankind, appears to be one of a series of adaptations from the Iliad, whereby the poet strove to give a distinctly Homeric colouring to a purely magical account of the crossing derived from Dionysius’ Bassarica or from some other now lost poem. The second markedly "Homerian" duel between Dionysus and Deriades in book 40, which the poet has appended to a decidedly magical first encounter, is another example of his intercalation of Iliadic parallels into the narrative.

Deriades readies his forces for combat as Dionysus’ followers approach the shore (24.68-72), the situation recalling Porus’ moves at Alexander’s approach (Arrian, Anab. 5.14.3). Deriades cannot conceal his preparations from Zeus’ ὄμα πανόψιον, and his plan is circumvented by the gods, who convey Dionysus and his cohorts safely behind the Indian lines (24.73ff.). Each god sees to the needs of his particular protégé. The idea derives ultimately from the Iliad, where Aphrodite whisks Paris, Apollo Hector and Agenor away from the battle (Γ380-2, Υ443-4 and Φ596-8 resp.). Thus Zeus in the form of an eagle carries Aiaccus across in his talons, that is, in a way normally associated with the rape of Ganymede; Apollo transports Aristaius in his chariot, Hermes carries his son Pan, and Urania Hymenaius because he is her son’s namesake. Calliope carries Oiaigrus on her shoulders: Καλλιόπη ὁ Ολαγρον ἐός ἀνεκούφισεν ὁμοίος (24.92), recalling Jason’s carrying of Hera across the Anaurus in Apollonius: καὶ μ’ ἀναεῖρας / αὐτὸς ἐός ὁμοίοι διὲκ προαλεῖς φέρεν ὀδωρ (3.72-3). The Cabeirs are conveyed by their father Hephaistus, Erechtheus by Athena, the hamadryads by Apollo and Leto, and the Bassarids by the daughters of Cydnus. The poet somewhat puzzlingly adds that the latter had been schooled in warfare by Typhoeus (24.107-8), there being no previous mention in the poem of any naiads having been allied with the monster. The rest of the troop are led across by Dionysus riding in his chariot with unwetted wheels.

The followers of Dionysus mark their arrival by engaging in their usual revelries. Thureus, reporting to his king, informs him of the disaster and cautions him against making a nocturnal assault on Dionysus’ camp, suggesting instead that
he consult the Brahmins regarding the true nature of Dionysus. Thureus' cautious advice resembles that of Polydamas in the *Iliad* (Σ254-83), but Deriades, unlike Hector, does heed it, even if grudgingly, and withdraws to the safety of his battlements. In contradistinction to the festivities in Dionysus' camp, the Indian city is given to mourning their slain kin. The same contrast is found in book 40, when Dionysus' troops celebrate their final victory and the Indians mourn the death of their king. The scenes of mourning depicted in the present book indeed foreshadow the more extensive treatment in book 40. In both instances the scenes are depicted with a compassion and pathos unusual for the *Dionysiaca* (of which the lament of Eerie for her father Tectapus in book 30 is perhaps the only other genuine example), manifesting the strong influence of the mourning scenes in *Iliad* 22 and 24. Nonnus gives a rather moving account of a woman soon to give birth, who learns of her husband's death. The scene is a variant of those based on the death of Protesilaus in the *Iliad* (Β697-702) such as Ovid, *Heroides* 13. The woman asks to whom shall she point when her child is old enough to ask for its father (24.212), recalling Andromache's lament about Astyanax' sorrowful fatherless future (Χ484ff.). Another mourns her bridegroom to be and the wedding denied to her: ἄλλη δ' ἑστενάχιζεν ἀνυμφεύτως ὑμεναίους / ὀλλυμένον μυστήρος, ὅν ὦκ ἦδεν εἰθαμος ὤρη / στέμματι μυμφιδίῳ πεπυκασμένον (24.214-6), lines which have been inspired by Homer's comment on the death of Iphidamas: ὃς ὁ μὲν αὖθι πεσὼν κομὴσατο χάλκεον ὑπὸν / ὀκτρός, ἀπὸ μυστής ἀλόχου ... / κοιμιδῆς, ἤς οὖ τι χάριν ὄδε (Λ244-6). The tragic story of Cyzicus and Cleite in Apollonius (1.961ff.) may be cited as a further example of this theme.

The followers of Dionysus in the meantime are treated to ballad recitations by the singers Leucus and Lapethus. Leucus, who is referred to as ἀὐτοδίδακτος (24.231) in imitation of Phemius in the *Odyssey* (χ346), sings of the war between the gods and Titans, the contents being conveyed by Nonnus only in passing, as Apollonius does in the case of Orpheus' cosmogony (1.496-511). Nonnus' interest is plainly in the second ballad, recited by Lapethus, which is a delightful variation on the moicheia of Ares and Aphrodite sung by Demodocus in the *Odyssey*. Nonnus appears fond of the episode, proceeding to compose a further variation at the
end of book 29. In both adaptations he endeavours to turn the original story on its head in the manner of rhetorical exercises. In book 29 Ares, now the husband of Aphrodite, is informed (falsely) by Rheia of his wife's adultery with her former husband, Hephaistus, in order to lure him away from the battlefield. In the present episode Aphrodite takes up Athena's spindle, attempting to weave a tapestry, but does a botched job. As in the *Odyssey* episode, she draws on herself the ridicule of the others, this time not on account of excessive sexual zeal but for the lack of it. Nonnus is rather fond of the notion of the reversal of roles and abandonment of habitual duties. We note that later in the narrative the Bassarids taken captive by Deriades abandon Dionysus' thyrsus for Athena's loom (34.352-6), precisely the reverse of what happens in Thebes, where the womenfolk dispose of Athena's tools to take up the thyrsus (45.48-9), a theme derived from Euripides' *Bacchae* (117-9, 514, 1236-7). Lapethus' recitation is introduced by virtually the same phrase as that of Demodocus in the *Odyssey* (cf. 24.242 and 8266). Hopkinson lists further verbal echoes of the Homeric passage: 24.256 / 8307, 24.292 / 8321, 24.314 / 8342, 24.321 / 8326 and perhaps 24.273 / 8275.\(^\text{35}\) Two recurrent motifs of the poem are observed in the tale. Firstly, when Hermes asks Aphrodite not to weave a shield in her tapestry, saying that she has no need for such things, implying of course that her charms are a far more effective weapon. This is an allusion to the theme of the superiority of Aphrodite's weapons over those of Ares, a leitmotiv in the poem. Secondly, the idea that *Aphrodite's dereliction of her normal duties is upsetting the cosmic order: ἀρχέγονος γὰρ / πλάζεται εἰς ἔτη κόσμος, ἔως ἐτι πέπλου ὑφαίνεις* (24.319-20). Similar sentiments are conveyed by Hera in her address to Zeus, when she affects concern at the consequences of Eros' supposed dereliction of duty: καὶ ἐπελευνὸς κόσμος ἀλήτης, / καὶ βίος ἄρχηστος ἀποκριμένων ὑμεναίων (32.54-5, cf. also 2.220-4). Nonnus is influenced by the Orphic concept of Eros as the life-force of the universe (cf. the Orphic *Argonautica*, 12-6).

We may now briefly recapitulate the observations made in the course of this chapter. The poet has, generally speaking, not assimilated the divergent sources he has used into the texture of his narrative. The source materials remain largely
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undigested and visible. Thus, when he uses the Alexander histories, his Dionysus acts like a prudent general seeing to all the contingencies, in other words, like Alexander himself. When he uses the *Iliad* the scene becomes consciously Homeric, and when he turns to Euripides' *Bacchae*, ritual frenzy and magic take the stage. His use of rhetorical set-pieces (as we shall observe more fully in the next chapter) is likewise, quite undisguised, the speeches often being little more than versified forms of the rhetorical exercises that we find in Libanius. One encounters also a palpable measure of narrative inconsistency, though not to the extent that it occurs in some of the later books. The problem of the interrupted crossing and the remarks about the Hydaspes having been turned into wine seem to be well accounted for by Keydell's and Collart's hypothesis that the whole μᾶχη παραπόταμος is a later addition. The poet in intercalating it has simply not modified the original version to an extent adequate to obviate the resulting inconsistencies.
Chapter II: book 25, a statement of the poet's objectives.

Book 25 presents the second major exordium of the *Dionysiaca* in two segments (1-30, 253-70), which are separated by a lengthy tripartite synecrosis of Dionysus with Perseus, Minos and Heracles. Whereas the first exordium (1.1-44) was concerned with the enunciation of Nonnus' poetic principles (notably the idea of ποικιλία in composition), the second elucidates his relationship specifically with Homer. Midway between the two major exordia at 13.43-52 is a shorter proem to mark the beginning of the Indian war, in which the poet asks for Homer's assistance in the task ahead. Further calls for assistance occur at 32.184, where Homer's Muses are asked (Ὅμηρίδες εἴπατε Μοῦσαι) to help him list the victims of Deriades, and at 41.10-2, where he similarly enjoins the Lebanese Muses (Λαβανηίδες εἴπατε Μοῦσαι) to help him relate the story of Beroe. The exordium at the beginning of book 25 rather abruptly breaks off the series of events that commenced with the unceremonious rejection of Dionysus' embassy in book 21 and reached a critical point with the crossing of the Hydaspes in book 24. The reader, led by the obvious parallels with Alexander's crossing the Hydaspes to expect an imminent showdown between Dionysus and Deriades, on the lines of that which took place between Alexander and Porus, is told, somewhat to his surprise, at the beginning of book 25 that the war in India has now been in progress for six years and that the poet, following Homer's lead, will undertake to sing only of the events pertaining to its seventh and final year. Half-way through book 25, though, the narrative as the poet left it at the end of book 24 is fleetingly resumed, when the festivities in Dionysus' camp and the scenes of grief in Deriades' capital are recalled (25.271-6). We are subsequently informed of Deriades' consternation at reports that the Hydaspes had been turned into wine and of the terror of his subjects in the face of strange portents, as a result of which they no longer dare venture outside their walls. The anticipated battle with Dionysus, whom Deriades had wanted to attack on the night the latter was celebrating his successful crossing of the Hydaspes, but had (on Thureus' advice) reluctantly agreed not to attack till sunrise (24.166-9), seems now to be put off indefinitely. From this point the narrative
becomes rather attenuated, with the poet conceding only scattered glimpses of what transpired in the first six years of the war in India. The repeated mentions of Dionysus' frustration at not being able to bring the campaign to a head (25.305-10, 332-3, 342-6) suggest that the intervening period was largely one of inactivity, something which the poet himself later confirms when he speaks of Dionysus' shield gathering cobwebs for six years (38.12-4). In contrast to the preceding books, which depicted an army on the move reminiscent of Alexander's on his way to India, the situation is from now on more akin to that in the Iliad, with Dionysus laying siege to the enemy, who are largely confined to making sorties from behind the impregnable fortifications of a city, to which they are always able to withdraw in adverse circumstances.

Nonnus thus deems it appropriate to open this second, Iliadic, phase of the war with a new exordium in which he voices his intention to pattern his narrative on Homer's. His attitude to Homer is remarkable for the streak of irreverence with which he tempers his otherwise extreme deference towards his predecessor. While on the one hand he addresses Homer as if he were more god than human, he does not hesitate, on the other, to rate his hero and topic above Homer's. Influenced perhaps by an overly favourable perception of his own abilities as a poet, he sees himself as both Homer's successor and his rival. The syncrises of Dionysus with Perseus, Minos and Heracles are inserted to demonstrate his protagonist's superiority to these traditionally accepted exponents of ἄρετή and, by implication, to Homer's heroes. We recall that in the preceding μάχη παραποτάμιος segment the poet noted with some insistence the extent to which the challenges confronting Dionysus and Aiakos exceeded those facing Achilles.

Illustrative of his intention to imitate Homer by confining his narrative to the events of the final year of the war, Nonnus has chosen to paraphrase from the Iliad Odysseus' description of the sparrow and its nine chicks, devoured by a snake, which foretold the fall of Troy in the tenth year of the war (B308-17). The paraphrase is purely a literary reference and does not represent an actual event in Nonnus' story: δράκοντειόν τεθηπότες ἄκρα γενείου / Ἦνδωης πλατάνωο

---

1 These lines do not fit the context in which they occur (cf. Collart (1930) pp.167-8), but there can be no doubt that they refer to the first six years of the war, seeing that they are followed by the antithesis: ἀλλ' ἄτε δὴ πολέμων ἔτος ἔβδομον Ἡγανον Ὄμαι (38.15).
πάλιν κλάξουσι νεσσοί / Βακχείου πολέμου προμάντις
(25.4-6), the πάλιν 'a second time' excluding it from the context of a narrative of events that took place two generations before those in the Iliad. The Indian war is assigned a seven-year duration to accord with the seven gates of Thebes, the birthplace of Dionysus. Mythographic sources are not agreed as to the duration, Diodorus Siculus, for instance, assigning a time-span of only three years for the conquest (3.65). Thebes and Cithaeron are personified, the one depicted grieving at the remembrance of Pentheus, the other pleading with the poet not to sing of Oedipus. The mention of Thebes, Cithaeron and Pentheus is appropriate, seeing that Nonnus will devote three later books to that topic. In association with Thebes Pindar is made the subject of a brief tribute, being besides Homer the only poet to be mentioned by name in the Dionysiaca: τίς πάλιν 'Αμφίων λίθου δίνου εἰς δρόμου ἔλκει; / ὀλίγα πόθεν κτύπος οὕτως: ἀειδομένης τάχα Θήβης / Πινδαρέης φόρμιγγος ἐπέκτυπτε Δώριος ἱκώ (25.19-21), which contains a recollection of a well-known line from the first Olympian ode: ἄλλα Δωρίαν ἄπο φόρμιγγα πασσάλου λάμβανε (1.17). The modern reader may be puzzled as to why Pindar should be accorded this distinction and not Euripides, whose Bacchae has had a more palpable influence on the composition of the Dionysiaca (books 44-45 being a virtual paraphrase of the play). The answer is most likely to be found in the Theban poet's high standing among the Orphics, who ascribed to his verse the same magical power that they did to Homer's, and in Nonnus' admiration for his 'variegated song' or ποικίλος ύμνος (the term is Pindar's own, Nem. 5.41-2). It was that ποικίλα which he aspired to reproduce in his own work, as it tended in a way to symbolize Dionysus' many-faceted and changeable nature. Pindar's influence manifests itself in other ways as well: in Nonnus' rather un-epic habit of making explicit references to Homer and his work (something that Pindar does frequently in his odes) and in his use of "narrative truncation", remarkable instances of which, as Hopkinson points out, are the brief anticlimactic account of the demise of Deriades and again in the mere five lines accorded the apotheosis of Dionysus at the end of the poem. In Pindar this type of truncated anticlimactic ending is perhaps most conspicuously apparent in the story of the Argonautic
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expedition in the fourth Pythian ode.

It is, however, principally from the supernatural powers of Homer's utterance that Nonnus seeks sustenance for the task ahead. Homer is addressed, like the Muse, as an immortal (Ἄχαῖδος δῆθι τε κήρυξ, 25.253), and his book declared to be eternal (διόμορφον ἡρωευξή, 'coeval with the dawn', 25.254). He pleads with Homer to transmit his divine inspiration to him: πνεύσον ἐμοὶ τεσσάμα θεόσαμον (25.261). Such deference to Homer, if remarkable, is by no means exceptional. As Brink points out, divine status had been conferred on Homer in Hellenistic times, if not earlier, and temples dedicated to him (Homerea) had been erected in at least five locations, including Alexandria. Brink cites several instances where divine inspiration is sought by poets directly from Homer. Antipater of Sidon (1st century B.C.) uses language similar to that of Nonnus, referring to Homer as ἰρών κάρυκ ἀρεταῖς and ἀγηραυντόν στόμα κόσμον (A.P. 7.6), and the author of a papyrus dated to the next century speaks of his δήθι τοι αὐδήν. Ennius' mystic vision of himself as inheritor of Homer's mantle (Ann. frag. 6) may be seen as a variant of the same tradition. A comparable example, where a predecessor other than Homer is so addressed, is provided by Lucretius' addresses to Epicurus, who is also called god ('deus ille fuit, deus', 5.8) and provider of intellectual sustenance (3.9-12). Nonnus' address to Homer is couched in the technical vocabulary of Orphism, which imparts to it an unmistakably religious colouring. Thus he calls on the Muse to lend him the ἐμπνευσμένος ἔγχυσ ... καὶ ἀσπίδα πατρὸς Ὀμῆρος (25.265), undertaking at the same time to listen attentively to the κτύπον οὗ λήγοντα σοφῆς σάλπιγγος Ὀμήρου (25.269), so that he may kill off νοερῶ δορί the remainder of the Indians. The use of mental attributes to qualify inanimate objects could be said to be a hallmark of Orphic writings. With the latter expression of Nonnus we may compare Proclus' νοερόσιν ... βελέμνοις (Hym. 2.4) and the Chaldean Oracles' νοερῶ πυρί (375). Orphic terminology is employed frequently throughout the Dionysiaca and

---

3 Cf. Brink (1972) p.530. In an interesting article, strangely overlooked by Vian, Brink traces the evolution of Hellenistic Homer-worship with reference, among other things, to contemporary papyrological evidence.

4 Quoted by Brink op.cit. 554.
Paraphrase. The fact that Nonnus employs it as well in his rendering of the Christian text has led Vian to assume that the poet attached no religious significance to it, using it in a purely ornamental capacity. Its use in passages like this, nevertheless, cannot simply be dismissed as a mere literary affectation, since Nonnus' remarks appear to manifest a genuine religious zeal. The present passage attributes the same magical powers to Homer's words that had earlier been attributed to the utterance of the Lydian priest, who, as we recall, ties down Typhoeus σοφὸ ... δεσμῷ (13.486) and overcomes him ἑμφρονι λογχὺ (13.487) merely through the act of speaking. In the Paraphrase Jesus' speech exhibits the same magical power when Caiaphas' retainers, coming to arrest him in the garden of Gethsemane, are bowled over λαίλαττι φωνής (18.6), as he inquires the purpose of their mission. The common feature in all three cases is the supernatural power of the word that certain humans, who are privileged to partake of divinity, have at their disposal. Nonnus is asking Homer to grant him that power to enable him to sing worthily of Dionysus' conquest of India.

The devotional character of Nonnus' address is, nevertheless, sullied by an almost hysterical boastfulness: he asserts that his own chosen hero and topic are superior to Homer's and chides the latter for not having taken upon himself to sing of Dionysus' conquest of India in place of the Trojan war. The assertions οὐδὲ τόσος στρατός ἠλθεν ἐς 'Ιλιον, οὐ στόλος ἄνδρων / τηλίκος (25.26-7) and οὐ γὰρ ἐλεκώ / Αἰακίδῃ Διὸνυσον ἢ 'Εκτορι Δημιαδῇ (25.256) echo his earlier intimations about Aiacus' and Dionysus' superiority to Achilles (22.380, 383; 23.221-4). While undertaking to fashion his account after Homer's (τελέσας δὲ τύπον μιμηλὸν Ὅμηρον, 25.8), Nonnus says at the same time that he intends to go about his task νέοις καὶ ἀρχεγόνοισιν ἐρέζων (25.27), hinting that his stance in relation to Homer - the ἀρχεγόνοισιν may be taken to include Homer - will not be one of unquestioning servility. Lucretius, in contrast, disavows any intention of competing with his model: 'non ita certandi cupidus quam propter amorem / quod te imitari aveo' (3.5-6). In a later passage Nonnus goes so far as to make an imputation of mendacity against his model, claiming that ἐφεύσατο βιβλίον Ὅμηρου (42.180-1) by telling πάντων μὲν κόρος ἐστὶ, καὶ ὑπ'ου

καὶ φιλότητος / μολυπὴς τε γλυκερῆς καὶ ἀμύμονος ὀρχημοῦ (N636-7), whereas in truth a philanderer knows no satiety of desire. This obviously good-humoured rebuke is, however, used for effect only, to emphasise the extent of Dionysus’ passion for Beroe, and is surely not intended as a rebuke to Homer.

The three syncrises of Dionysus with Perseus, Minos and Heracles (25.31-252) are a visible example of the influence of school rhetoric on poetry. The use of rhetorical set-pieces is a common enough phenomenon in imperial epic, but while his predecessors (e.g. Lucan, Statius) make some effort assimilate them to the tenor of their narrative, Nonnus does little more than convert them into his own brand of hexameters, retaining even phrases such as ἀλλὰ φίλοι, κρίνωμεν (25.98), which belong properly to the school-room debate, used by the speaker whenever he wished the audience to join him in adjudging a point at issue. In the present instance, Lucretius again furnishes a parallel with his tripartite syncrisis of Epicurus with Ceres, Bacchus and Hercules (5.13-54), but his comparisons are much shorter and focus on a single issue, namely the benefits that each has brought to mankind. The rhetorical exercises composed by the fourth century rhetorician Libanius to serve as models for the elucidation of his students contain a number of syncrises of Homeric characters that may plausibly be compared with those of Nonnus. Such exercises obviously are not meant to arrive at impartial assessments, but are designed to test the student’s ingenuity in reversing accepted notions about the individuals compared, of which the earliest extant examples are the Helen and Palamedes of Gorgias. Thus Achilles, the ἀμετρος Ἀχιλλός by universal consent, is shown in the syncrises with Diomedes and Ajax, to be a lesser man than they. These conclusions are reached through use of evidence from the Homeric poems selected in such a way as to favour the speaker’s contention. Nonnus goes one step further in that he not only manipulates the evidence, but quite obviously invents some of it as well. The vague, poorly detailed nature of Dionysus’ exploits in fighting the giants accords an author considerable freedom to use his own imagination in depicting them, whereas the well-defined deeds of Perseus and Heracles, fixed by long-standing mythographic tradition, obviously do not. Nonnus exploits this situation by invariably inflating Dionysus’ adversaries to cosmic dimensions and then compares these products of his own fantasy with the
traditional foes of Perseus and Heracles, arguing that as Dionysus needed to overcome more formidable opponents than the other two, he must be superior to them. Thus Geryon, the three-headed adversary of Heracles is compared to the giant Alpus, to whom Nonnus generously assigns a hundred heads to demonstrate his superiority to Geryon, something he appears to have forgotten when he comes to describing Dionysus' actual fight with Alpus later in the poem, where the latter seems endowed but with one head (45.205-7). As Heracles had only to deal with an opponent who had three heads compared to the hundred with which Alpus menaced Dionysus, his achievement is necessarily inferior to that of Dionysus. Not only are the monsters confronting Dionysus more formidable than those with whom Perseus and Heracles had to contend, but Dionysus, unlike the other two, who often enjoyed the benefit of outside help, invariably slew his foes single-handedly. What is more, Perseus and Heracles faced one foe at a time, but Dionysus fought a multitude. While their foes were often female, Dionysus had always to contend with males. In other words, Dionysus' tasks were on all counts more arduous than those of his rivals. On top of all this, Nonnus tries to foist Dionysus' inherently effeminate personality traits on his rivals, at the same time making him out to be the embodiment of traditional male ἄρση τῆ. Overall, the arguments are so vacuous and the logic so flippant as to make it impossible to believe that Nonnus meant the syncrioes to be viewed in anything but a humorous light.

The syncria with Perseus (117 lines) is longer than those with Minos (27 lines) and Heracles (79 lines), and the prominence given to it is understandable in view of Perseus having an actual role to play later in the narrative (book 47), whereas the other two are introduced merely by way of example. The present syncria, which self-evidently favours Dionysus, is counterbalanced by another, placed in the mouth of an Argive citizen (47.498-532), extolling Perseus over Dionysus. Nonnus displays his rhetorical versatility in turning the present encomium of Dionysus into a veritable psogos in the later book. By way of comparison we may adduce Libanius' encomium and psogos of Achilles (Foerster, op. cit. pp. 235-43, 283-90), where the unquestioning praise levied on the hero in the first instance is cancelled out by the relentless vituperation to which he is subjected in the second. Perseus' slaying of Medusa and rescue of Andromeda,
had, as Gigli-Piccardi notes, long been a favourite theme for pantomime.\(^6\) That such performances often verged on parody may be gathered from pictorial representations showing a little timid-looking Perseus cautiously tiptoeing towards his adversary. This impression is supported by the obviously parodic light in which Ovid treats the episode (\textit{Met.} 4.662-802). Nonnus avails himself of this long-standing tradition of parody to ridicule Perseus’ feats in the present synecrisis. Perseus is depicted, not as he is represented in legend\(^7\), but as a dancer would portray him on the stage: Περσεύς μὲν ταχύγωνος, ἐύπτερον ἴχνος ἐλίσσων, ἀγχινεφή δρόμον εἰς εἰν ἑρή πεζὸς ὀδίτης / εἰ ἑτεὸν πεπότητο. τι δὲ πλέον, εἰ σφύρα πάλλων / ξείνην εἰρεσίην ἀνεμώδει νήχετο ταρσῷ ... ἀφοφον ἀκροπόρων πεφυλαγμένος ἀλμα πεδίλων (25.31-7). The dancer simulates flight by leaps and bounds and his performance is convincing enough to give the impression that he is actually flying. Those witnessing the performance question the veracity of that impression and seek an explanation (such as the action of some concealed piece of stage machinery) for what they imagine they have seen, hence the rejoinder εἰ ἑτεὸν πεπότητο. The words πάλλειν, παλμός, ἐλίσσων, ταρσός are elsewhere used by the poet to depict dancers in action (cf., for example ἴχνος ἐλίσσειν 5.111, used with reference to Nike’s dance). The parodic depiction is extended to Dionysus as well, when the two finally confront one another in book 47, with Perseus taking to the air to attack Dionysus from above, the latter foiling the stratagem by inflating himself to cosmic dimensions: ἵψωσας δ’ ἱόβακχος ἐὼν δέμας, αἰθέρι γεῖτων / ... ἀείρετο ... ὑπαμένου Περσηφός ὑπέρτερος (47.657-9). The echo from the \textit{Bairachomymachy}, βάτραχος ἵψωσας ἄχρον δέμας (40), indicated in Keydell’s apparatus, appears to be quite deliberate and effectively underlines the comic nature of this confrontation. One can visualise Perseus in the air flapping his wings, while Dionysus puffs himself up like a frog to outreach him. Nonnus appears, at the same time, to parody his own depiction of the second Dionysus-Deraiades duel (where Dionysus likewise expands himself, 40.82-3).

Nonnus proceeds to deprecate Perseus’ slaying of Medusa by drawing

\(^6\) (1981) p.183
\(^7\) For a conventional representation cf. the Αστῖς Ἡρακλέους, 216ff.
attention to her female sex and to the fact that she is alone (he conveniently ignores for the moment her sisters Sthenno and Euryale): ὄμιοι ἐχιδνίηντα μὴς ἡμιοι Ἄμοιος (25.38). The petrification of Ariadne is cited as a parallel: οὐκ ἄγομαι Περσήν μίαν κτείναντα γυναικά (25.111), foreshadowing the actual event in book 47. Medusa is made out to be a defenceless female, pregnant (25.40) and unarmed (ἀθροικτός, 25.65), just as Ariadne is harmless and unarmed (οὐκίθανη, ἀσίθηγος, 25.110). Dionysus, on the other hand, δρακοντοκόμων καλάμην ἡμιοι Γλαύκων (25.87), outdoing Zeus himself: καί οὐ πυρόεντι κερανῷ / τηλίκος ἐσμὺς ἐπιπτεν, ὅπου ῥήξηνορι θύρασ (25.96-7). As Pegasus (and Chrysaor) emerge from the severed neck of Medusa, Perseus becomes in effect a mid-wife: ἔγκυον αὐξένα νύμφης / Γοργόνος Ἑλείθωνα μογοστόκος ἔθρισεν ἄρπη (25.40-1), a description, as Keydell indicates, modelled on Nicander's αὐξένα ἀπομήνης ἄρπη γενόεντα Μεδούς (Alex.101). In short, Perseus is no fighter of men: οὐ στίχεν ἄραςιν χάρμη (25.41). His task accomplished, Perseus makes an undignified exit, terrified of the Gorgons, despite enjoying the benefit of Hades' cap, Athena's sickle, Hermes' wings and Zeus as a father (cf. 25.53-7). It is quite probable, as Vian suggests, that Nonnus composed this segment thinking of the famous passage in the Ἄστις Ἡρακλέους depicting the slaying of Medusa.8

Nonnus reiterates the substance of his remarks on Medusa's decapitation through a series of negative comparisons for which, as we have observed previously, he shows such a liking: ἀλλ' οὐ τοῖς ἕνῳ Βρομίῳ μόθος' οὐ ποιεῖν ἔρπων /Βάκχος ἐρθυρήθη δολῶεις πρόμος, οὐδὲ λοχήσας /... κύκλων ὀπωπῆς /Πορκίδος... ήμυσε θῆλων ἀεθλον ἀθροικτοῖο Μεδούς (25.615). This must surely be said with a touch of irony, for it is in precisely the same manner and using very similar language that Nonnus describes Dionysus himself sneaking up on Nicea and Aura. In Nicea's case, δολῶεις Διόνυσος ἀδουπίτοκαι κοθόρνους /εἰς γάμον δύοφος εἰρπε ποδῶν τεχυήμοι παλμῷ (16.265-6), and in Aura's he approaches δύοφος ἀκροτάτοις ἀσάμβαλοι ἵχνεσιν ἔρπων (48.623). The fact that Dionysus had on those occasions amatory rather than

8 (1990) p. 242
military conquest on his mind is irrelevent. Not only does Nonnus foist Dionysus' conduct on Perseus, but he conveys it with a denial, by saying that Dionysus would not behave in such a way (note the contradiction οὐ .. ἔρπων Βάκχος and Διόνυσος ... εἶπε). The epithet δολόεις is quite deftly transferred from Dionysus to Perseus. We note that the Argive's speech in book 47 redresses the anomaly by restoring to Dionysus his customary deceitfulness and effeminacy. The Argive tells Perseus (in language that seems deliberately intended to recall both 25.61-5 and 16.265-6) not to sully his sickle and arm fighting such an effeminate opponent, but rather to let Andromeda fight him: Γοργοφόνῳ δρεπάνη μή μάρναι θήλεϊ κίσσῳ / μη σέο χείρα μίανε γυναικείοις κοθόρνοις ... / 'Ανδρομέδην θώρηξον ἀθώρητω Διόνυσῳ (47.522-6).

Perseus' second feat, the rescue of Andromeda, is dealt with in a more cursory fashion. In Nonnus' version Perseus does not kill the sea-monster with the weapons he had been given to slay Medusa (as in earlier accounts, cf. for instance Ovid, Met. 4.711-2) but petrifies it by displaying Medusa's visage (as in Lucian's 'Ενάλιοι Διάλογοι 14.3). Nonnus has chosen the latter version to make the point that Perseus, with such a formidable weapon at his disposal, slays but one sea-monster, while Dionysus mows a whole crop of giants down with his meagre thrysus (ὀλίγῳ ... θόρσῳ, 25.88). He would have us believe that compared to Perseus, Dionysus was at a great disadvantage, conveniently forgetting the miraculous powers that he elsewhere assigns to his thrysus. Nonnus also questions the efficacy of Andromeda's rescue, pointing out that, even as a constellation in the heavens, she is still being menaced by the sea-monster. He has Andromeda reproach Perseus to that effect: Κῆτος ἔτι κλονεῖ με καὶ ἐνθάδε ... εἰσέτι ἔσῳ έχω καὶ ἐν ἄστρασι (25.128-30), the idea deriving from Aratus' ἀλλ' ἐμτης κάκείθε διωλείνη τετάνυσται / ἔσμα δε οι κρίται καὶ ἐν οὐρανῷ (202-3). In book 47 the matter is taken a step further, when he has Dionysus refer sarcastically to Andromeda's celestial chains as Perseus' wedding gift to her (47.449-51).

Not content to assess the feats of both on the basis of intrinsic merit, Nonnus brings circumstantial factors into play as well. The locations at which the feats were performed are taken by the poet to be indicative of their relative importance. This is
demonstrated by seemingly rigorous application of syllogistic argument: as Dionysus' feats were performed in the east and those of Perseus in the west, the former were witnessed by the sun and the latter by the moon. Therefore Perseus' feats pale by those of Dionysus, as the moon pales by the sun. The premise is dubious and the deductions preposterous in what is clearly a parody of sophistic argument. Nonnus, like Ovid, is rather fond of capricious associations. Thus in a later segment Night, Sleep and the Indians are made out to be victimised by Dionysus on account of their shared attribute of darkness (cf. Iris' argument to co-opt the services of Hypnus at 31.140ff.: just as his torches offend black Night and his revels banish black Sleep, so his thyrsus now wreaks havoc among the black Indians). The other circumstance to be considered is birth and parentage. As Zeus is the father of both, Nonnus will concentrate his attention on the mothers, Danae and Semele. The way each was treated by Zeus is taken to signify the relative merit of their sons. As Danae does not gain admission into Olympus while Semele does, Perseus must be less important than Dionysus (25.113-7). We note that a similar argument is used in the Argive's speech, who belittles the golden shower that greeted Danae in comparison with the thunderbolt that incinerated Semele (47.516-9).

The synecrisis with Minos (25.148-74) concerns the issue of outside help: Minos captures Megara only with the help of Aphrodite, but Dionysus captures the Indian capital unaided (Nonnus conveniently overlooking the service Aphrodite renders Dionysus' forces, when she removes Morpheus from the field during his bout of madness, 33.216ff.). The synecrisis of Minos and Dionysus provides the poet with the opportunity at the same time to tell the story of Scylla and illustrate the theme of Aphrodite's superiority to Ares in war, a leitmotif in the Dionysiaca, which he has borrowed from Claudian's Greek Gigantomachy (43-52), as the close imitations at 35.39-43 and 35.168-73 demonstrate. The story of Scylla, cited in antiquity as an example of reprehensible female conduct, is told at some length in the pseudo-Vergilian Ciris (possibly an adaptation of an Hellenistic original), and in Ovid's Metamorphoses (8.14-151). Scylla, beholding Minos' naked beauty from the walls, infatuated cuts off the pink city-saving lock from her father's head, bringing about the capture of Megara: Μήνυις μὲν πτολίπορθος ἐὼ ποτε καλλεῖ γυμνή / ὑμίνιης τέλος εὕρε, καὶ οὐ νίκης σιδήρω, ἄλα πόθω καὶ ἔρωτι
Dionysus attains his objective without this kind of help, and does not rely on δόλος ἵμερόνις (25.172) as does Minos. As in the case of Perseus, the notion of δόλος is transferred to Minos, Dionysus being left to shine forth as the exemplar of unsullied ἀρετή.

The syncretism with Heracles (25.174-252) is left till last by both Nonnus and Lucretius, and with good reason, for comparison with one who was unquestioningly deemed ὑπερστός ἀνδρῶν would be seen to provide the ultimate measure of one’s virtue. 9 Heracles nevertheless had his detractors, both in myth and among the interpreters of myth. In Euripides’ Ἡρακλῆς Μαυρόμενος Lycus accuses him of misrepresentation for claiming that he killed the Nemean lion with his bare hands, alleging that he had actually disposed of it by snaring it in a trap (144ff). Lycus points out that Heracles is wont to use bow and arrows, a coward’s weapon. Nonnus puts forth similar claims, accusing Heracles of usurping sole credit for the slaying of the Hydra by failing to acknowledge the assistance he had received from Iolaus. But overall he is more inclined to minimise Heracles’ achievements than to question their authenticity. He presents Heracles’ feats in as pedestrian a way as possible, while elevating those of Dionysus onto a cosmic plane. Lucretius, it may be noted, while not questioning the spectacular nature of Heracles’ feats, emphasises their irrelevance to mankind as a whole, stating that they were mostly performed in remote places ‘quo neque noster adit nec barbarus audet’ (5.36). Nonnus more pejoratively refers to the deeds as the useless labour of a backwoodsman: ἀθλα μὲν Ἡρακλῆς ... οὐτίδανὸς πόνος ἦν ὑπερστόφος (25.242-4). Only six of Heracles’ twelve labours are dealt with descriptively, the remainder being mentioned merely in passing. Several short descriptions corresponding to... Nonnus’ presentation of the last six labours are found in the Anthology (e.g. 16.94 and 92), attesting to the stereotyped nature of the theme. Nonnus’ longer descriptions may be contrasted with those of Quintus, who presents Heracles’ labours in the form of engravings on the shield of Eurypylus (6.260-93). While Quintus’ descriptions are of a dignified nature consonant with the heroic tradition, those of Nonnus reflect the banality of the Anthology pieces.

---

9 Cf. Aristophanes, Nub. 1048-50, where a character asked who is the best of Zeus’ sons replies: ἐγώ μὲν οὐδέν Ἡρακλέως βελτίων ἄφρα κρίνω.
which if not openly derogatory, do seem to reduce Heracles to a mere fairground strongman. Thus while Quintus' description (6.208-11) of the strangling of the Nemean lion recalls the style of the Shield of Heracles, Nonnus portrays the event using the language of the wrestling ring. Indeed, his description (25.176-9) of how Heracles strangled the lion is quite similar to which he uses to depict Aias' attempt to throttle Aristaius in the wrestling match at the funeral games for Opheltes (37.570-3). The anatomical description of the lion's windpipe (25.178-9) adds further to the sense of the prosaic and commonplace. Nonnus depreciates Heracles' feat even further by juxtaposing it with that of a woman, Cyrene, who likewise subdued a lion, a male one with her female hands (25.183). Dionysus, while still a child, had gone one better, having captured a lion alive and dragged it playfully (αὐθάυρων, 25.184) by the throat with one hand (χειρὶ μιᾷ, 25.185), to give it to Rheia to include in the team harnessed to her chariot. In other words, Heracles had accomplished with difficulty a feat that was mere child's play to the infant Dionysus. The Erymanthian boar, which Heracles captured alive (cf. Apollonius, 1.126-7), is merely mentioned without further elaboration other than the comment that to young Dionysus boars and lions were no more than playthings (25.194-5). To the slaying of the hydra at Lerna, properly the second labour, Nonnus devotes considerably more attention. It was this feat that Eurystheus had refused to recognise on account of help received from Iolaus (cf. Apollodorus, Bibl. 2.5.2.). Nonnus turns to Iolaus directly, as if to apologise for Heracles' failure to acknowledge his role in the slaying of the hydra: ἱλίκοις... ἰόλαυς σὺ γὰρ δέμας ἑφλέγεις ὀξείς, καὶ μόνος Ἡρακλέης, μόνος ἤρπασεν οὖνομα νύκης (25.211-2). Heracles' integrity is implicitly called into question for his claiming sole credit for a feat which he could not have accomplished without help from Iolaus. The feat is of little account, as it takes two to kill a single harmless female: ἐγὼ δ'A. οὔκ οἶδα γεραῖεν οὐτίδαν ὤν φῶτας ἐρίζουσιν 'ὑπ' (25.203-4). The result too is insignificant: ὀλίγην ὄφιωδα λύσατο Λέρνην (25.197), while Dionysus μοῦνος ἀποτάμης ὄφιωδος ὤσις ἀφούρης / ... ἔχον τὰστι (25.206-7). The snakes on the giants' heads alone are ὀξείς Ἰνακλῆς πολύ μείζονες, ἀντὶ δὲ Λέρνης / ἀστάθεις σύροιον ἐν αἰθέρι γεῖτονες ἄτρων (25.209-10). The hydra shrinks into insignificance beside the cosmic monsters slain
by Dionysus.

The poet declines to speak of Heracles' capture of the hind of Ceryneia: συγήσω κεμάδος χρύσεων κέρας, ὅτι καλέσσω / τηλίκον Ἡρακλῆα μυῆς ἐλάφων φοιήμα (25.223-4). Nonnus misrepresents the feat, which consisted in catching rather than killing the swift animal.\(^{10}\) He scoffs at Heracles' deed, saying that hunting deer was but a trifling diversion (βαλὼν δύρμα) for Dionysus' Bacchantes (25.225-6). The fire-breathing bull of Crete is disposed of next, with the remark that any Bacchante could be expected as a matter of course to slay a whole herd of bulls (25.230-1). Both here and in the case of the Ceryneian hind Nonnus chooses to ignore the fact that the animals which Heracles overcame possessed supernatural qualities, while those killed by the Bacchantes were quite ordinary. The fight with Geryon is not described. Nonnus presenting instead a comparison of Geryon and Alpus, based on their number of heads. As Geryon had only three, compared to Alpus' hundred, Dionysus' feat of slaying Alpus was far greater than Heracles' slaying of Geryon. As we noted earlier, Nonnus' assignation of a hundred heads to Alpus is quite arbitrary, to suit the present occasion, there being no mention of the hundred heads when the poet comes to depict Dionysus' confrontation with him in book 45. Nonnus concludes the syncria, as he had done previously in the case of Perseus, by differentiating Dionysus' exploits from those of Heracles through a disclaimer: έργα δὲ Βάκχου / ἡ Γίγας πολύπτωχος ἡ ωφελόμεν πρόμος Ἰνδών, / οὐ κεμάς, οὐ βοηθής ἁγέλης στίχες, οὐ λάσιος σος, / οὐδὲ κόσμον, οὐ ταῦρον, οὐ αὐτόπρεμον ὀφάρη / χρυσοφαίης, οὐ κόπτος, / οὐ δαστατος ὄρνις ἀλήτης ... οὐ γένεις ἱππεῖη ξεινοκτόνος, οὐ μία μίτη / Ἰππολύτης ἑλάχεια (25.244-51). This synopsis of Heracles' labours is similar to those in the Anthology (cf., for instance, 16.91).

On completing the syncria Nonnus continues the exordium, as we have already noted. After that, he briefly resumes the narrative that he left off at the end of book 24. He subsequently confirms Hera's warning to the Indians (22.80-1) that

\(^{10}\) Cf. Anth. 16.92, which though mistaken with regard to the Erymanthian boar (Erymanthōn ἕταν κάτριον) in contrast to Apollonius' ζωϊν φέρε κάτριον, 1.126, correctly states in the case of the Ceryneian hind that Heracles caught it alive (Ἰθυρεκε, 92.4). Yet Euripides too says that he killed it: τάν τε χρυσοκάρανων δόρκαν ... κτένας, θηροφόνον θεάν ... ἀγάλλει (Her. 374-8).
the Hydaspes had been turned into wine: θέσκελον ἐλίδος ἀνέφισας / οὗ ὁμοιότατον μέλας κελάρωκεν Ἅδασπης (25.279-80). The conversion of water into wine is one of a number of instances in which Dionysus' exploits parallel the miracles performed by Christ. Nonnus seems acutely aware of these parallels and uses similar language in depicting the actions of Dionysus and Christ. Thus his earlier depiction of the conversion of lake Astacid into wine, χιονέῃ ἤμειψε φυμέν ξανθόχροον ὤῳρ (14.413), is closely mirrored in his depiction of water changing into wine at the wedding feast at Capharnaum: χιονέῃ ἤμειψε χρόνον ἐτερόχροον ὦῳρ (Par. 2.46). We may note, by way of comparison, that the similarities between Dionysus and Christ were not lost on the author of the dramatised version of Christ's passion, entitled Χριστὸς πάσχαν, who shows no hesitation in exploiting situational parallels with Euripides' Bacchae. A further Christian parallel follows forthwith. A blind old man, sprinkling his eyes with the wine from the river, miraculously regains his sight, recalling Christ's bestowing of sight on a man blind from birth by rubbing spittle in his eyes. The depiction of the old man proceeding along the river bank ἔδων πόδα νυμβρόν ἔλισσαν (25.281) is identical with that which the poet later gives of Tiresias (45.60). As noted earlier, ἵχνος/πόδα ἔλισσειν is a phrase more or less synonymous with χορεύειν, which is appropriate in Tiresias' case, seeing that both he and Cadmus have been caught up in Bacchic fervour and are on their way to Cithaeron in the wake of the womenfolk of Thebes. The description is less apposite in the present instance, as the old man has no reason to dance (afterwards he does indeed have cause to do so, 25.286-7). The poet appears to have somewhat mechanically reused here the description intended in the first place for Tiresias. The fact that this scene occurs later in the narrative sequence is not necessarily indicative of later composition. It is indeed reasonable to assume that book 25, by virtue of its being the cornerstone of the whole work, wherein the poet explains his intentions, was one of the latest parts to be composed. The correspondences between the present scene and that describing Jesus' action in the Paraphrase may be briefly noted. The man's blindness is indicated by the phrase ἵχνον ἀλαστόν ὀμίχλην (25.282), with which we may compare ἀλάσας ἀλαστόν ὀμίχλην (Par. 9.72). The old man's sight is
restored through the λυσίπονος μέθη (25.283), the curative power of which is emphasised sporadically throughout the Dionysiaca (cf., for example, 17.82 and 47.42). In the Paraphrase Jesus’ λυσίπονος ἄφρος δδύντων (9.26) serves the same purpose. On regaining his sight the old man sings the praises of the ἀλεξικάκου ποταμοῦ (25.257), which is echoed by ἀλεξικάκῳ δὲ ἰρεάθρῳ in the Paraphrase (9.63). The old man fills skins with the sweet-smelling liquid and erects an altar to Zeus and Dionysus: χεροὶ δὲ γηραλέησι βόου νεφεληδῶν ἄφύσσων / πορφυρέης ἐπλησε μέθης εὐώδεας ἄσκοις, / καὶ Διὸ βμοῦ ανήψε καὶ οἰνοχύτῳ Διονύσῳ / ἀθήντος ἄθρεος ὄμισιν αγγέλη (25.288-91). The first and last parts of this description are echoed by the Paraphrase: τυφλὸς ... χεροὶ βαθυνομένησι φαεσφόρον ἱψυσεν ἱδὼρ (9.39), the ἀθήντος κ.τ.λ. being repeated verbatim at 9.43. It is remarkable that Nonnus should in the Paraphrase refer to the river as ἄλεξικακος and its water as φαεσφόρον, seeing that the river there has no function other than to provide the means of washing off the φαεσφόρον πηλός (9.28) that Jesus’ makes from his ἄφρος δδύντων (9.26). It is in the latter and not in the river that the curative power resides. In extending that power to the river as well Nonnus is mechanically duplicating details from the Dionysiaca passage where the Hydaspes, converted into wine, does indeed possess it. In reworking the evangelist’s rather basic narrative, Nonnus makes use of passages in the Dionysiaca which describe analogous events, using his own epic in much the same way as the author of Χριστός πᾶσχων uses the Bacchae of Euripides. Thus when he speaks of Christ turning water into wine, he employs the phrase φύσιν χιονωτόν ἀμείπτας (4.46) to describe the transmutation, which echoes that used to describe Dionysos’ conversion of the Astacid lake to wine: χιονών ἤμεινε φυήν ξανθόχροον ἱδὼρ (14.413). As we shall observe below, his depiction of the resurrection of Lazarus echoes some of the details from his account of the resuscitation of the snake and Tulus at the end of the present book. The erection of an altar to Zeus and Dionysus, an improbable event in the circumstances, since the old man being Indian could have known neither (cf. Deriades' earlier declaration of his ignorance of the Olympian gods, 21.254-6), anticipates Morrheus' promise to erect an altar to
Aphrodite and Dionysus (33.243-5) and Cadmus' erection of an altar to Zeus and the Hadryads (44.100-1). The present reference to altar-building is likely to have been prompted by the these latter passages, even though it precedes them in the narrative sequence. The news of Hydaspes' conversion into wine is brought to Deriades by a hunter, whose dogs have become intoxicated lapping from the stream (25.292-6). Nonnus seems rather fond of the notion of man learning from animals. In book 12 the secret of making wine from grapes is revealed to Dionysus through the actions of a snake (12.321ff.), in book 40 a dog staining its jaws purple as it eats a shell-fish reveals the secret of the purple dye (40.306-10), the founders of Tyre learn the art of navigation by observing a nautilus fish (40.506-12) and obtain the idea of ballast-stones from cranes, who carry stones in their beaks to steady their flight (40.513-8). Later in the present book Moria revives her brother Tylus with a life-restoring herb that shortly before she saw a snake use in reviving its mate.

As Deriades withdraws to the safety of his lofty fortifications, Dionysus voices his frustration, not, as we might have expected, at Deriades placing himself beyond reach, but rather surprisingly on account of winds sent by Hera, which took away any prospect of victory for the next ten months (25.305-7). Bornmann sees a recollection here of Arrian's ἐτήσιοι ἄνεμοι (Anab. 6.21.1), which rendered Indian coastal waters unnavigable for ten months of the year and delayed Nearchus at Patalene for the summer and autumn of 325 B.C. How these winds could delay a campaign on land defies comprehension. Nonnus, with characteristic disregard for verisimilitude, has transposed Arrian's observation into a context to which it is entirely unsuited. Vian draws attention to the parallels this segment of book 25 exhibits with the beginning of Triphiodorus' Ἀλωσις Ἰλίου, which contains a number of references to the frustration of the Greeks at their inability to bring the long drawn-out conflict to a head. The similarities of thought are reinforced by verbal correspondences. Thus when Nonnus speaks of Dionysus' army standing idle ἀμβολὴ πολέμου (25.273) and of Dionysus accusing Hera of having engineered the delays, ἀσχαλῶν Διόνυσος ἐμέμφετο πολ λάκις Ἡρῃ (25.303), he seems to have in mind Triphiodorus' statement, ἀμβολὴ δ' ἡσχαλε
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δυσαξθέω λαός Ἀχαιῶν (42). More telling still is the correspondence between λέοντας ἀφηγημένη παρὰ φάτνη (25.306) and Triphiodorus’ ἵπποι ... ἀφηγημένες ἐπὶ φάτναις (14). Attis’ complaint to Dionysus, κυδωνίῳ ... ἀφναμά ... ἐτέων στροφάλλυγγα κυλίνδεις, and the later echo of the same phrase, τόσων μετὰ κύκλα κυλινδομένων ἑναυτῶν (36.395), have some affinity with Triphiodorus’ ἢ βλέπων δικάτω αὐτοῦ κυλινδομένου λυκάβαντος / γηραλέη τετάνυστο ... Ἑνώ / Τρωσί τε καὶ Δαναοίς (6-7).

Attis, the messenger of Rhea, chides Dionysus for his dilatory attitude and for not having lived up to her expectations. Dionysus’ reply, beginning with a near quotation of Calypto’s words from the Odyssey: σχέτλιοι εἰσὶ θεοί ζηλήμονες (25.340 = ε118, with εἰσὶ for ἐστε), is a catalogue of complaints, not directed only at Hera but at Zeus as well: ἀλλὰ μὲ νίκης / μητρωνῆς δέκοντα παραπλάξει φθόνος Ἠρῆς ... ἀπειλήσας δὲ Κρονίων / βρονταίοις πατάγοσαν ἔμπνευσε ἀνεσείρασεν ὀρμήν (25.343-7). Zeus has intervened twice previously with thunderclaps, both times on Dionysus’ behalf (14.406-7 and 22.133-50); later he intervenes in like manner to save Poseidon from defeat by Dionysus in their battle over Beroe (43.374-80). While Zeus’ defence of his brother in the latter instance is understandable by virtue of his previous undertaking to grant Beroe to him, his opposition to Dionysus in the present passage is difficult to comprehend, especially in view of his statement at 27.314-6 that his support for Dionysus in the Indian war had, unlike that of the other gods, never wavered. Borrmann seeks to explain the present statement as a purely meteorological reference, a recollection of the monsoonal storms described in Arrian (Anab. 5.9.4-10). Seeing that Dionysus speaks of the thunder as persisting over an extended period, claiming that he could defeat Deriades if it subsided even for one day, Borrmann’s explanation appears quite plausible.

Attis’ reply to Dionysus encompasses a prophecy: ἐςομένῳ δὲ / ἐβομάτῳ λυκάβαντι διαρραίσεις πόλιν Ἰνδῶν (25.366-7), which corresponds to Helenus’ prophecy in Triphiodorus, the Trojan who ἱππεύεται ἰδέθρου ἤς μαντεύσατο πάτρῃ (48). As Vian observes, the prophecy in both cases comes at a

---
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time of despondency, renewing the will of the addressee to persevere with the campaign to what he is now assured will be a felicitous outcome. The main purpose of Attis' visit is, however, to deliver to Dionysus a magnificent shield, which Rheia has commissioned from Hephaistus as gift for her grandson. As to why Dionysus, who, as the poet was earlier at pains to point out, spurned conventional armour, wielding instead his thrysus and nebris (14.230-2), should now be presented with a piece of this armour is, to say the least, a little puzzling. Vian sees the presentation of the shield as a purely symbolic act, like the later gift of the ἄστραπος χιτῶν from the Tyrian Heracles (40.575ff.), regarding the two presents as signs of divine recognition and as important milestones on Dionysus' road to apotheosis. The shield is according to Vian "a talisman intended to guard Dionysus against his divine adversaries Hera and Ares, as well as against his human enemies". If this is indeed the purpose of the shield, then it does not fulfil it at all effectively, for no sooner has the war with Deriades got underway than Dionysus is so frightened by the sight of Deriades invigorated by Hera as to contemplate flight, being only prevented from doing so by the timely intervention of Athena (30.247ff.). The shield has no effect, nor will it protect him from the Fury that Hera sets on him (32.98ff.). The most compelling reason for the presentation of the shield, which incidentally is almost entirely forgotten in the ensuing narrative (being mentioned only once, and even then in a none too glorious context, as gathering cobwebs: ἐκεῖτο δὲ τηλῆθι χάρμης /Βακχιάς ἐξετηρος ἀρχισσαβοειν, 38.13-4), is undoubtedly of the literary kind: no epic depicting warfare from the Iliad onwards was deemed complete without a shield description, and Nonnus was not one to let the opportunity to indulge in such an exercise pass him by.

Nonnus does not appear to have made any discernible use of the shield descriptions of his predecessors apart from Homer's. He does, however, borrow a scene from Jason's cloak as described by Apollonius, and has supplemented Homer's astronomical details by adapting a passage from Aratus. Nonnus has gone to some length to ensure that the scenes depicted on the shield have some relevance to the person of Dionysus, though the connexion is at times tenuous. His personal predilections are reflected in the attention bestowed on astronomical features and in
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the inclusion of a myth, which would be incapable of pictorial representation on an object of limited size such as a shield (it would require a veritable Bayeux tapestry to do it justice). The first seven lines (25.388-95) are a virtual paraphrase of Σ483-5. Nonnus supplements Homer's brief listing of the heavenly bodies represented on the shield (Σ486-9) by paraphrasing Aratus 26-9 at 25.398-401. The exposition of the seasonal variations in terms of the relative positions of the constellations is of little relevance to the theme at hand, but, as usual, Nonnus' fascination with astronomy has the better of him. We note further that 25.402-4 correspond to 45-8 in Aratus, and 25.410-3 seem to have been inspired by 56-7. From this astronomical excursion the poet proceeds to the segment depicting the building of Thebes, this time making use of another Hellenistic poet, Apollonius. The scene, which appears on Jason's cloak (a present to him from Athena), is understandably congenial to Nonnus, since it exemplifies the magical power of Amphion's lyre over both animate and inanimate nature. Nonnus is rather taken by the Orphic notion of the mind being able, by means of utterance or some kindred means, such as musical expression, to exercise control over the physical forces of nature. We recall that Typhoeus was checked both by the playing of Cadmus (1.409ff.) and by the Lydian priest (13.474ff.). While Zethus toils with the building blocks, Amphion plays the lyre, his playing making a hill dance, seemingly bewitched even in effigy:

καὶ Ζήθος ἐν περὶ πατρίδι κάμινων, ἑθιμομένη πετραίον ἐπωμίδε φόρτων ἀείρων ἔφασε τελευτάων λυροκτύπος· ἀμφί δὲ μολῆ / ἔλεγε δρόμον αὐτοκύλιστον ἐλείς ἐχόρευε κολώνη, ἀ δὲ τεθλημένη καὶ ἐν ἀσπίδι (25.417-21). Nonnus' rendering dilutes the contrast that is so well brought out in Apollonius, namely that the playing of Amphion is twice as effective as the physical toil of Zethus: Ζήθος μὲν ἐπωμαδὸν ἕρταξεν/οἴβεος ἦλιβατοι κάρη, μογένουτι ἔοικός· ἀμφίων δὲ ἐπὶ οἱ χρυσῆ φόρμυγγι λυγαίνων / ἤμε, δὲς τόσον δὲ μετ' ἰχνα νίσσετο πέτρη (1.738-44). Apollonius rounds off the final scene represented on the cloak, Phrixus and the ram, with the observation, that one beholding it would tarry a long while beside it, expecting to hear their voices (1.765-7). Nonnus has aptly transposed this touch to the Theban scene, saying that one would tarry long by the shield in the hope of hearing Amphion's lyre (25.424-8).
The next segment comprises two distinct scenes, the rape of Ganymede and a celestial banquet, with Ganymede serving at the table of the gods in place of Hebe, whose role he has usurped. The Hebe:Ganymede and nectar:wine antitheses are recurrent themes in the poem (cf. for example, 19.225-62, 31.235-48 and 39.64-8). Hera's hatred of both Ganymede and Dionysus is well documented in the poem, mostly in the form of recriminations against Zeus for having entrusted the dispensing of nectar to a Phrygian shepherd, and for promising residence in Olympus to the purveyor of that noxious beverage, wine, which (she fears) will, on his being admitted, supplant nectar at divine banquets. Ganymede and Dionysus are directly compared in Deriades' speech at 39.64-8, Ganymede being deemed the better on two counts, firstly because he dispenses nectar which is superior to wine,14 secondly because he dines in the company of the gods, while Dionysus has to content himself with that of satyrs. The Ganymede scenes are as a result of the above associations entitled to their place on the shield. The first scene conveys the anxiety of Zeus, who in the form of an eagle holds Ganymede in his talons as he crosses the Hellespont, lest he drop his charge and deprive Helle of the honour of having it named after her (γέρας πεφυλαγμένον Ελλή, 25.441). The latter concern may appear flippant, but Zeus is, along with the other Olympians, the guardian of the pre-ordained sequence of events which the world must experience in the course of its existence. Zeus will not permit any departure from the set path: we note that in book 43 Dionysus is compelled by Zeus to relinquish his claim to Beroe, because the nymph had from time immemorial been promised to Poseidon (διεροίσιν ὀφειλομένην ὑμεναίοις, 41.247). The same idea is found in Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica, where Jupiter, on being asked by the Sun to divert the Argonauts from Colchis, refuses, pointing to the fixed order of things, of which he is the author and guardian: 'vetera haec nobis et condita pergunt / ordine cuncta suo rerumque a principe cursu / fixa manent' (1.531-3). Subversion of the established order, as threatened by the earthborn giants, of the universe being turned upside down, is a favourite theme of Nonnus (cf. Typhoeus' bluster at 2.258ff. and similar boasts by Pentheus at 44.174ff.). The concern expressed over Aphrodite's and Eros' dereliction of duty (24.319-20 and 32.54-5 resp.) is yet another reflection of the Olympian preoccupation with maintaining the established order. In the second

14 Wine is earlier described as νέκταρος ουρανίου χόλος τύπος (14.158)
scene Hera's anger is depicted, as she points out to Athena that θουκόλος Ganymede (25.449, cf. also 8.95 and 39.64) engaged in the tasks that are rightly Hebe's.

We now come to the least conventional part of the shield description, consisting of a narrative of over a hundred lines (25.451-552) inserted into the framework of the ephrasis. The story itself, which is about the death and subsequent resurrection of Tylus by means of a magical herb, has no ostensible connexion with Dionysus other than that the events take place Maeonia, where Dionysus had spent his boyhood. We note that Dionysus too is a magical healer, restoring the sight of the old man earlier in the present book and bringing his favourite Hymenaius back seemingly from the verge of death by healing his λοίγιον ἐλκόγος (29.150). A scene depicting resurrection is thus not entirely out of place on Dionysus' shield. Tylus is attacked and killed by an enormous snake, an event witnessed by his sister Moria, who calls in the giant Damasen to save her brother from being devoured. Damasen kills the snake with an uprooted tree after a protracted struggle, but it is shortly afterwards revived by a magical herb fetched by its mate. Moria, taking note, revives her brother with the same herb as soon as the snakes have gone. The notion of man learning from animals is commonplace in folklore and is, as we have noted, congenial to Nonnus. The only specifically Maeonian or Lydian element in the story is the giant Damasen, alternatively referred to in ancient sources by his Lydian name Masdnes (of which the Hellenised form Damasen, built on the root of δαμάω, like Damastor and Hoplodamas, is almost an anagram, cf. Vian *ad. loc.*). Numismatic evidence indicates that this Masdnes was commonly identified with Heracles. Nonnus does not mention Heracles in the present instance, though, interestingly enough, he later refers to another Lydian strongman, Sandes, as Σάνδης Ἡρακλέης, identifying him at the same time with Morrheus (34.192). The earliest description of the resuscitation of Tylus is found in the elder Pliny, who cites Xanthus as his source: 'Xanthus, historiarum auctor, in prima earum tradit occisum draconis catulum revocatum ad vitam a parente herba, quam balin nominat,
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15 Vian (1990) p. 36 draws attention to coins minted in Sardis during the reigns of Alexander Severus (222-235) and Gordian III (238-244), that display a Heracles-like figure, with subscript "Masdnes" killing a snake. He notes also that Hyginus (Astr. 2.14.2) attributes to Heracles the killing of a snake which had ravaged Lydia. It is to Nonnus' credit that he distinguishes the two.
eademque Thylomem, quem draco occiderat, restitutum saluti' (N.H. 25.5). Aeneas of Gaza, who seems to identify Masdnes with Heracles, names a certain Tymon the Lydian as one of a list of individuals whom Heracles had retrieved from Hades: ὃς τὴν Ἀλκηστίν Ἡρακλῆς, καὶ τῶν Θησέα, καὶ Τύμωνα (τῶν) Λυδῶν, καὶ Τιμοσθένην τῶν Ἀθηναίων, Εὐδόξῳ τὰ τοιαύτα συγγράφοντι πείθεσθε (Migne, v.85 col.993). Clearly, Pliny's Thylo, Nonnus' Τύλος and Aeneas' Τύμων refer to the same individual, who as it seems may also be identified with Tyllus, the eponymous founder of the Lydian and Etruscan nations (cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 1.27). Nonnus' tendency to proliferation through the introduction of characters additional to those in the original story, a tendency that is very much in evidence in his reworking of Homer's Διὸς ἀπάτη (31.4ff.), is encountered as well in the present episode. Two additional players appear in his version: an unnamed Naiad, who is merely a passive witness to the killing of Tylus, and the victim's sister Moria, who seeing the attack from further away, seeks Damasen's help. Nonnus dwells on the previous ravages of the snake, a killer of men and animals and uprooter of many trees (25.472-7). Its actions resemble those of the snake described in the Homeric hymn to Apollo (302-4) and also those of the Boar of Calydon in the Iliad (1540-2). Uprooting of trees is unlikely for a snake, but, as usual, Nonnus is concerned with effect rather than verisimilitude. Depictions of monstrous snakes became a set-piece in later poetry, perhaps the most famous being that which guarded the golden fleece in Apollonius (4.127ff.). Even the snake which attacked the shepherd in the pseudo-Vergilian poem Culex is described as 'immanis' (161ff.) in spite of the fact that the shepherd was able to dispose of it with a tree-trunk (190). The Culex, in that it features a fight between a man and a snake, anticipates in outline the attack on Tylus and the killing of the snake by Damasen. Nonnus supplies us with some particulars regarding that giant: he is described as emerging from mother earth bearded and armed, resembling in this respect the Σπαρτοῖ, but differing from them in that he emerges from the soil not as an adult but as an infant (despite bearing his arms and sporting a beard). Like the infant Heracles (cf. the Anth. 16.90) he exhibits his warlike prowess when still in swaddling clothes: ἐγχεα δ’ αὐτῷ / μαζὸς ἐν καὶ χύτα φόνοι καὶ σπάργανα θώριξ, / καὶ δολιχῶν μελέων βεβαρημένος εὐρεῖ φόρτῳ / νήπιος
αἰχμάζων, βρέφος ἄλκιμον, αἰθέρι γείτων / ἐκ γενετῆς δόρυ πάλλεν ὀμόγγυν, ἀρτιφανὴς δὲ / ὀπλισεν Εἰλείθυκα λεχών ἀσπιδιώτην (25.489-94). This is yet another adaptation of the depiction of the weapons of Aphrodite in Claudian's Gigantomachy, whose superiority to the arms of Ares Nonnus has made a leitmotiv in his poem (cf. for example 35.21-6, 171-9, 42.234-7). In the present instance the imitation pertains purely to expression, involving the substitution of the unusual for the conventional: εἶχε γὰρ αὐτῇ / πλέγμα κόρων, δόρυ μαζών, ὀφρύν βέλος, ἀσπίδα κάλλος, / ὀπλα μέλη (Gig. 51-2). For similar use of substitution cf. the depiction of Dionysus' weapons at 14.230-45, 22.161-4 and the accoutrements of the boxer Eurymedon at 37.508-10. The infant is already colossal (αἰθέρι γείτων) and wields the spear with which he was born, resembling in this respect Athena (cf.25.493 and 27.290).

The reanimation of corpses, whether temporary or permanent, is a topic that engaged the attention of a number of ancient writers. Thessalian witches were credited with the ability to resurrect the dead with their spells (cf. Lucan 6.750-60 and Apuleius, Met. 2.40). Nonnus' portrayal of the resurrection of Tylos resembles the scene in Lucan in that the revivification is made out to be a gradual and drawn out process, even though in his case the magical ritual is replaced by a magical herb. We note that the resurrection of Lazarus in the Paraphrase is likewise made into a protracted affair, indicating a fascination on Nonnus' part with such procedures. After the snake has killed Tylos, it is confronted by Damasen, who uproots a tree to use as a weapon, something that we would perhaps not expect from one born with a full complement of hoplite armour. The snake, despite spitting πίδακας ἱοῦ (25.510) in Damasen's face, at length succumbs to the giant's superior power, its neck broken by a blow with the tree-trunk. Damasen, like a good conservationist, replants the tree (25.520). Straightway a female snake, seeing its mate dead, rushes off to pluck a life-restoring plant. The plant is placed in the dry nostril of the dead snake: νέκυος δαστής ὢν ἄλκες ἀπέλθεραν ὀλέθρου / ἀξαλέω μικτήρι· συνήμουσις (25.529-39). The revivification takes effect in stages: καὶ νέκυς αὐτοκλιτος ἐπάλλετο· καὶ τὸ μὲν αὐτοῦ / ἀπνοοῦ ἤν, ἐτερον δὲ διέστηκεν, ἄλοι ἀθείν / ἡμιτελής νέκυς ἤν ἔχων αὐτός ὁ πόμην / καὶ ψυχρᾶς γενότες παλίμπυννον ἀσθία τιταῖνων /οἰγομένης κατὰ βαιόν
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Moria subsequently administers the plant to her brother following the same procedure: ἐνδομόχως μεκτηρίᾳ φερέσθαιν ἡμοσε ποίην (25.540). As in the snake's case, the revival takes place in stages: ἐνδομόχως δὲ ἐν ψυχρῷ ἀσοστηρίᾳ δείμας θερμαίνειστο πυραύ; / καὶ νέκυς ἀμφιέτων βιοτῆς παλινάγρετον ἀρχήν, / δεξιεροῦ μὲν ἐπάλλε ποδῶς θέναρ, ἀμφὶ δὲ λαυῷ ὀρθώσας στατὸν ἔχωσ δῶρ ἀναρίζετο ταρσῷ, / ... καὶ πάλιν ἰέσειν αἵμα νεοπτεύοντο δὲ νεκρῶ / χεῖρες ἐλαφρίζουσιν καὶ ἁμομίη πέλε μορφῇ, / ποσσίν ὀδοιπορίη, φασι δύμασι, χείλεσι φωνῇ (25.543-52). In Lucan the process is similar: 'protinus as strictus caluit cruar atraque fovit / volnera et in venas extremaque membra cucurrit / ... tunc omnes palpitat artus / tenduntur nervi' (6.750-5), but the corpse jumps up suddenly: 'nec se tellure cadaver / paulatim per membra levat, terraque repulsam est / erectumque semel ... nondum facies viventis in illo ... remanet pallorque rigorque' (6.755-9). The same elements are found in the Lazarus scene in the Paraphrase. Lazarus marches out from Hades still corporeal: τυφλὴν ἰθυκέλευθον ἔχων ἀντώπιον ὀρμήν / αὐθηεῖς νέκυς ἐρκε (11.168-9), which corresponds to ἡμιτελῆς νέκυς ἢν ἔχων ἀντόσσυτον ὀρμήν (25.534θ). Nonnus has, as often, reused his own expression, the αὐθηεῖς being merely a metrical substitution for ἡμιτελῆς. We note that whereas ἡμιτελῆς is functional in the context in which it appears, referring to the parts of the snake in various stages of revivification (viz. τὸ μὲν ... ἐτερον δὲ ... ἄλλο δὲ), the αὐθηεῖς is gratuitous, even inappropriate in its context, as we can hardly imagine Lazarus to have been talkative, seeing that he was bound like an Egyptian mummy from head to foot in strips of linen (11.169-70). The ἔχων ἀντώπιον ὀρμήν is, likewise, a somewhat strained substitution for ἔχων ἀντόσσυτον ὀρμήν. Whereas the ὀρμή in the first instance refers to the setting in motion of the snake, in the second it does not appear to pertain to Lazarus at all, but on the contrary, to the linen wrappings obstructing his vision as he walks. The Paraphrase contains two further echoes of the Tylus episode, the first being used in relation to Lazarus, the second in an entirely different context: thus while the ἐμπινου ἐπίχωσε (25.542 and 41.57) is used to refer to the latter at 12.41, the

16 A distich on Lazarus in the Anthology contains two echoes of this passage: ἡμερα
Λαζαρος ἀθνῆ / αὐθηεῖς μικτήρα πάλιν σῶν ἀναμα κομίζων (1.49).
line Ψυχρόν δωσιτήρι δεμας θερμαίνετο πυρω (25.544) is transferred to a new context, to describe Simon keeping himself warm by a fire in the courtyard as Jesus is being interrogated by Annas: Ψυχρόν ἐπ’ ἀνθρακῶντι δεμας θερμαίνετο πυρώ (18.117). We may note that the shared phrases are more contextually relevant to the Dionysiaca passages than they are to those of the Paraphrase where their use tends to be merely ornamental, even otiose, which suggests they were originally coined for the Dionysiaca passages and later reused in the Paraphrase. Vian, it should be noted, takes the contrary view, arguing that as the Paraphrase passages are the more elaborate ('plus développé'), they are original and those in the Dionysiaca merely condensed adaptations.17 This is in line with his contention that the Paraphrase was a juvenile work, in which Nonnus' particular talents had not yet come into full bloom.18 And yet, in commenting on 25.544, he holds Par. 18.117 to be a 'réminiscence' of that line, auguring a possible turnaround in his position.

The last scene to be depicted on the shield is that of Cronus being fed a rock in place of baby Zeus by Rheia (25.553-62), a theme to which Nonnus returns later in connexion with the foundation of Beirut by Cronus (41.67-76). The story is based on Hesiod (Theog. 485-502) but differs from it in two respects. In the Theogony Rheia does not come upon the idea herself but is advised to do so by Gaia, and the stone does not cause Cronus to regurgitate the offspring whom he had previously swallowed, the regurgitation being forced on him much later by a grown-up and now powerful Zeus, aided by Gaia (493-6). The stone was the first to be disgorged and was placed by Zeus at Python (497-500). In Nonnus and later tradition in general the stone itself acts as an instant emetic: καὶ λίθον ἐν λαγόνεσσι μογοπτοκόν ἐνδων ἀείρων / θαμβομένην πολύτεκνον ἀνηκόντιζε γενέθλιν, / φόρτον ἀποπτῶν ἐγκύμονος ἀνθερεϊόνος (25.560-2, cf. also 41.70-4). The ἐγκύμονος ἀνθερεϊόνος recalls the ἐγκυνον αὐχένα at 25.40, which, as indicated earlier, is imitated from Nicander. We may note that whereas in Hesiod the credit for the feat is shared by Gaia and Zeus, with Rheia playing a somewhat ancillary role, in Nonnus Rheia is made both author of the plan and sole saviour of her

17 (1990) p.30
18 (1976) p. xiii
children. We note that Rheia is eulogised along with Dionysus throughout the poem, being referred to as θεομητωρ (25.334), a 'mother' who first communicates to him Zeus' orders to conquer the Indians (13.19-34), and to whom he subsequently sees himself accountable for his progress. The epithet recalls θεητόκος, which is applied to Mary in the Paraphrase (2.9, 66; 19.135). As the evangelists offer no precedent for the epithet, it is reasonable to assume that it was co-opted into the Christian lexicon from the mother goddess cults of Cybele-Rhea and Isis along with the quasi-deification of Mary herself in the fifth century.\(^{19}\) Likewise the epithet ταυκυργός, used of Christ in the Paraphrase (13.18), is borrowed from Isis worship, where it is applied to her son, Horus.\(^{20}\) The depiction of Rheia on the shield is quite relevant in view of the special relationship between Dionysus and her.

We may conclude by saying that book 25 is indispensable for understanding the Dionysiaca as a whole. In it the poet clarifies his objectives by telling us that his task is similar to Homer's but his theme even nobler. Dionysus' superiority to the recognised paragons of traditional ἀρετή is forthwith demonstrated by means of three formal syncriises, but the argumentation employed is capricious in the extreme, which deprives the comparisons of any validity. There is a mock-serious Ovidian tone about it all, leaving at times the impression that the poet is making fun of his hero. The sexually ambivalent nature and cowardly disposition of Dionysus at once set him apart from the traditional representatives of ἀρετή, and the very incongruousness of portraying him as one of them contains in itself the seeds of parody. It is this parodic streak that distinguishes Nonnus' portrayal of Dionysus from that of Euripides, but this is not to say that his treatment is irreligious, for Dionysus is after all the god among whose tasks it is to replace grief and despondency with jollity and laughter. A light-hearted Ovidian treatment is thus

\(^{19}\) Cf. Livrea, p. 25 of his ed of Paraphrase 18. The term θεητόκος was officially sanctioned by the Council of Ephesus in 431 at the prompting of Cyril of Alexandria, whose commentary on John's gospel, dating from 425-8 has been shown by Livrea to have had a decided influence on Nonnus' Paraphrase. Livrea notes at the same time that Nonnus is careful to avoid the notion of 'illioque', which was accepted by Cyril but repudiated by the Council of Chalcedon in 451. This has the effect of putting Nonnus' poems somewhere in the middle of the latter half of the 5th century, but still within the timeframe proposed by Keydell and Vian.

\(^{20}\) Ibid. n.16.
consonant with that aspect of the manifold character of Dionysus. There is clearly a more serious side to the poem as well, manifested in reiterated pronouncements drawn from Orphic hymns. Nonnus' earnestness in voicing Orphic beliefs recalls that of Lucretius in expounding the tenets of Epicureanism. In view of this it is difficult to concur with Vian's opinion that Nonnus' attitude to Orphism and Dionysiac ritual is merely that of a dispassionate antiquarian. Livrea takes quite the opposite viewpoint when he speaks of 'il sincero sforzo sincretistico' (op. cit. p.27) that pervades and unites the two works of our poet. Book 25 is not only important in the context of the Dionysiaca, where it serves as compendium or précis of Dionysus' feats (all of which are adumbrated in the three syncriises), but it serves also as a bridge to the Paraphrase. We saw how the poet adapts passages describing the miracles performed by Dionysus to describe the miracles performed by Christ. It is not surprising that he should have elected to paraphrase John's gospel in preference to the others, as it is the one which has most visibly been influenced by Orphic notions, beginning as it does with an exposition of the λόγος, and being hence the one most capable of being subsumed by the Orphic syncretism to which he so plainly subscribes in the Dionysiaca. Nonnus' relation to Orphism and Christianity is admirably summed up by Livrea, who says that the poet "tende ad un'ardita ed eroica sintesi culturale sincretistica che lo vede paladino entusiasta allo stesso tempo di un dionisismo misterico e soteriologico ... e di un cristianesimo intriso di elementi neoplatonici e profondamente affascinato dalla divinità miracolosa e polimorfia del Logos-Cristo" (op. cit. p.31). Nonnus makes John's gospel more Orphic still, by often dressing Christ's pronouncements in a distinctly Orphic garb. If, as seems likely, his object was to accommodate Christianity to the wider context of Orphic pantheism by reducing it to a manifestation of the latter, then no one reading his two works could deny that he was at least partially successful in this endeavour.

\[21\] (1988) pp. 406-7. Vian argues that since Nonnus uses the same Orphic terminology in the Paraphrase as he does in the Dionysiaca, its use is purely ornamental and 'banal', devoid of all original meaning.

The 341 lines of book 27 are taken up for the most part by the speeches of Deriades (114 lines), Dionysus (54 lines) and Zeus (79 lines). Books 26 and 27 belong together in so far as both are concerned with preliminaries to the battle proper that commences in book 28. Zeus announces the imminent carnage of the Indians with a shower of blood: ἀμφὶ δὲ γαῖῃ / αἰμαλέης ξένων δύμβρον ἀπ' ἱκμάδος ὑέτιος Ζεὺς / οὐρανόθεν κατέχευε, φόνον πρωτάγγελον 'Ἰνδῶν (27.12-4), which echoes Zeus' portent in the Iliad, as Patroclus is about to confront Sarpedon: αἰματοέσσας δὲ ψιάδας κατέχευεν ἔραζε / παῖδα φίλον τιμῶν (Π459-60, cf. also Λ52-5, where the shower of blood presages heavy casualties in the forthcoming battle).

Deriades, oriental tyrant as he is, addresses his followers as διμῶσ᾽ ἐμοί (27.22, but cf. 45.220 where Pentheus, though a Greek ruler, does likewise), asking them to put their faith in the victory that is customarily theirs (ἡθόδι Νίκη, 27.22). The speech with its series of boasts alternating with threats, followed by a syncrisis of the speaker and his adversary, is similar in tone to Typhoeus' address to Zeus (2.258-356), Pentheus' speech (44.134-83), and Deriades' other speeches at 21.216-26, 241-73, 34.199-220, 36.140-60 and 39.33-74. Dionysus' speeches follow much the same pattern and display the same features, even if his emphasis is more hortative and his utterance a trifle less vituperative than those of his opponent. Unlike the speeches that Nonnus puts in the mouth of Hera in his two imitations of Homer's Δίός ἀπάτη (14.153-360, 31.24-32.101), which are sophisticated exercises in the rhetoric of persuasion, the speeches of Dionysus and his foes are purely of an iterative nature and display little rhetorical complexity. The repetitiveness of the speeches, if not unexpected in an author for whom repetition,
ranging from the briefest of motifs to entire episodes, seems to be a principle of composition, is particularly palpable and becomes a little tedious after a while. The present speech begins with Deriades' boast of making Dionysus his servant (27.23-4), a boast that is repeated at 34.205-6 and 36.140. The same threat was previously issued by Orontes, who promised to make Dionysus a lackey of Deriades (17.182-4). A little later in the same speech he states that he shall kill Dionysus (27.131), a threat repeated at 39.39, but we note that Dionysus is hardly more accommodating, threatening to fix Deriades' horned head on his Lydian porch (27.219-200). Dionysus, who is ostensibly on a civilizing mission, exhibits the same barbaric savagery in his speeches as does Deriades (who enjoins his followers to nail the horned heads of satyrs on their thresholds, 36.147-50; cf. the similar actions of Lycurgus, 20.171-5). The failure to distinguish the behaviour of Dionysus from that of his barbaric opponents must be ranked among the many compositional shortcomings of the poem. How different the situation is in Apollonius, where Jason's balanced and conciliatory address (3.387-95) stands in such sharp contrast with the furious brutality of Aetes' outburst that precedes it (3.372-81)! Deriades continues, declaring that the Pans too are to become his servants. The idea of making the adversary's followers one's own servants is another recurrent feature of the speeches, which is given special prominence in the addresses of Dionysus and Poseidon in book 43 (70-142, 145-91). Many a follower of Dionysus will exchange the Sangarios for the Hydaspes, an idea which recurs in a different context, when Chalcomeda falsely promises to Morpheus to do the same (35.128-38). Dionysus' ignominious flight from Lycurgus is next recalled, with Dionysus advised to seek refuge this time in the Indian sea, where he will, however, find no Indian Thetis to welcome him. In the syncrisis that follows, Deriades compares his chthonian ancestry with the uranian ancestry of Dionysus. The speech presently assumes the character of a debate, with Deriades addressing Dionysus as if engaged in an argument with him: άλλ' ἐρέεις: Ὑπεράπνων Οὐλμπίου αἷμα κομιζω. / Αἰθέρα Γαία λόχευε ... / Ὑπανθεῖν γένος ἐσχεῖς: ἐμὴ δὲ σε Γαία καλύψει (27.49-51). ² Speaking now as one of the race of giants, Deriades threatens to break off cliffs and bloody Athena's head with a rock or his bold spear.

²We note that Typhoeus in his speech calls Uranos a brother, a fellow offspring of Gaia (2.235-6).
Dionysus he will wound in the thigh with an arrow (μηρον ... ὀστεώσ 
Διονύσου, 27.67), a threat repeated later by Pentheus with sexual overtones (ἐ 
tῷψω / ἕγχει Ἀλκηώ τετορμένον εἰς πτύχα μηροῦ, 44.160-1). The threats 
are meant to mock the modes of Athena's and Dionysus' birth from the head and 
thigh respectively of Zeus. Deriades, like Typhoeus and Pentheus, displays a 
remarkable degree of hybris, declaring his intention to subvert the cosmic order and 
reduce the Olympians to subservience. Hephaistus he will press into his service, as 
he will the Cyclopes (71-2, 89-99). His aspiration to be the equal of Zeus is similar 
to that of Typhoeus (2.344-9). The idea of Zeus' thunderbolts being wielded by 
someone else - whether it be Typhoeus, Deriades or the Cyclopes - holds an 
obvious fascination for Nonnus. 3 The enemies of Deriades are not exclusively 
heavenly progeny, the Cyclopes being, as he is himself, of chthonian origin 
(Γηγενέας Κύκλωπας, 27.86), and two Olympians, Hera and Ares, are 
steadfastly by his side, though as an Indian worshipping earth and water, he never 
appeals to them and indeed seems to be unaware of their presence. Aiaccus he 
promises to dispatch to Hades, where, if he so wish, he can sit in judgment over the 
dead (a role more usually associated with Minos, 27.82, cf. also 7.361). The 
Cyclopes, too, are mentioned by name and shall be put to work manufacturing 
imitation thunderbolts which will make him, Deriades, an earthly Zeus (Zeίς 
χθόνιος, 27.93), an idea which surfaces in a different guise in the next book, 
when the Indians are likened to Salmoneus (28.184). Deriades, by virtue of the 
Sun being his maternal grandfather, feels justified in fighting with fire as well as 
water (27.99-101), a possibility that Dionysus likewise takes into consideration, 
when he says that should the Sun attack him, he will call on Poseidon to help him 
quench its flames (27.189-94). He next enjoins the Indians to cut down the 
Telchines and bring their chariot and horses as trophy to him. Let them slay 
Erechtheus as well, and send him (i.e. his ashes) in a box to Athena, this being a 
reference to the box in which Athena had hidden the first Erechtheus (i.e. 
Erichthonius) as an infant (27.110-7). The story of Erichthonius, whom Nonnus 
appears to confuse with Erechtheus, and the way in which he was begotten through 
Hephaistus' unsuccessful attempt at sexual union with Athena, is a recurrent theme

---

3 Beside Zeus, only Hera and Athena are privileged to use the thunderbolt, cf.22.346-8 
where Hera frightens Dionysus with thunder; for a Homeric precedent cf. Λ.45-6.
in the poem (cf. 13.171-9, 27.317-23, 29.334-9, 41.63-4). The Corybants are to be taken captive, but the Cabeiroi are to be slain, enslavement or death being the alternatives that both Deriades and Dionysus present to their opponents. Let Hephaistus behold him, Deriades, riding in the chariot of his sons. Aristaius is left to be slain by Morrheus, while he himself, the horned son of a river, will take care of Dionysus, the horned son of Zeus.

The Indians march into battle forthwith, some on elephants, others on horseback, followed by a great number of infantry. The description, employing the anonymous τις, ὁ, ἄλος κτλ., is reminiscent of the technique of the rhetorical ἐκφάζεις πεζομαχίας used previously at 22.191-5 and then intermittently throughout the battle scenes. Dionysus divides his army into four parts: καὶ πνεύμων ἀνέμων ἄφωγης ἀντώπιον Ἡδός ὁ, / τέταρτα τεμνομένη στρατηγὸς Εὔκτιστος (27.148-9). The disposition of Dionysus' army (27.150-63) is subsequently outlined in relation to the four geographical features that, according to Dionysius Periegetes, define the sub-continent of India: the Caucasus (meaning the Himalayas), the Indus, the Erythrian Sea (Indian Ocean) and the Ganges (1130-4). We note that Nonnus' knowledge of India appears to be entirely derivative based on Dionysius Periegetes and whatever he may have gleaned from the Alexander histories. His vague depiction of the capital of Deriades, which corresponds schematically to Homer's Troy in that the battle is being fought in front of its walls, contrasts markedly with his detailed and accurate descriptions of Tyre and Beirut (40.311-580 and 41.14-154), that are undoubtedly based on personal acquaintance. The number four is much used in Nonnus on account of its special significance in the Orphic cosmology (cf. his description of Harmonia's residence at 41.278ff. and our discussion thereon). Vian understands the four-fold division to symbolise Dionysus' taking possession of India in its entirety.

Whatsoever the case, Nonnus is clearly exploiting the opportune coincidence between the four geographical features depicted in Dionysius and the Orphic symbolism of the number four. We note that the naumachy too, is fought between four pairs of opposing squadrons: καὶ στόλος ἀμφοτέρων τετράζυγων ἔχεν ἔνω (39.348), but in the war with Poseidon, the four-part division is replaced by a five-

---

part one: καὶ στρατιῆς Διόνυσος ἐκόσμεεν ἤγεμονίας, / στίςας πέντε
φάλαγγας ἐς υδατοῦσαν ἐνω (43.52-3). The change is not merely fortuitous,
as the number five was, likewise, held to be of special significance in the Orphic
religion (particularly in relation to the cult of Aion). The poet does seem to attach
considerable importance to such numbers. But with typical disregard for
consistency, no sooner has he outlined the disposition of Dionysus' forces than he
forgets about it. In book 30 he speaks as if the army had been divided into two,
Dionysus commanding the right wing and Aristaius the left (30.10-2). A similar
arrangement holds for the Indians, with the command shared between Deriades and
Morroheus, with Deriades fighting against the women and Deriades against the men,
implying that Dionysus' army is divided on gender lines (34.269-72). It is futile to
seek a connecting logic between these statements, as the poet has quite clearly made
them with a view solely to his immediate context.

Dionysus' speech, which now follows, is similar in tone and content to that of
Deriades, the poet's failure to distinguish the civilizer from the barbarian being,
as mentioned earlier, a shortcoming. He begins by urging the Bassarids to pit their
thyrsoi against the spears and swords of the enemy: καὶ ἔγχεσι μίξατε θύρσους,
/ μίξατε καὶ ξίφεσι (27.168-9). He next turns to the Hydaspes, telling the
river that if it remains submissive and does not mobilise its waters for the Indian
cause, he will convert them into wine, but should it persist in its recalcitrance, he
will dam it up and march across its dusty bed. We note that conversion into wine is
proffered to the river as reward rather than as means of bringing about its
submission, in contrast to Dionysus' later speech at 35.353-6, where the
submission of India is equated to an Hydaspes flowing wine instead of water and a
suppliant Deriades. Neither of these statements seems to take in consideration that
the Hydaspes had already been turned to wine at 25.279-80. Vian has cautioned
against attaching a too literal a meaning to the statements about the Hydaspes turned

---

5 Stegemann in his generally discredited astrological interpretation of the Dionysiaca, has
gone as far as to suggest that the 48 books were meant by the poet to be viewed as
combinations of the numbers one, four and five, viz. 5 (bks 1-5) - 1 (bk 6) - 5 (bks 7-11) - 1
(bk 12) - 4+4+4=12 (=no. of the signs of the Zodiac) (bks 13-24) - 1 (bk 25) - 4+4+4=12
(bks 26-37) - 1 (bk 38) - 5 (39-43) - 5 (bks 44-8). Stegemann tried to force the poem into
this numerical Procrustean bed much in the same way that he endeavoured to fit the
narrative into the framework of a rhetorical encomium as defined by Menander. His overtly
sensationalist theories were rejected out of hand by Keydell and Collart, cf. D'Ippolito
(1964) pp. 24-6.
into wine, claiming that they are meant either to demonstrate Dionysus' ability to cause hallucinations (presumably as at 25.279-80) or else are purely symbolic, a sort of metaphor for the submission of India (as at 35.353-6). Whatever the case, one thing appears certain, namely that the poet in making each statement is concerned solely with its relevance to and effectiveness in its immediate context and quite unconcerned with what he may have said previously in another context. As we shall have ample opportunity to observe in the course of this discussion, Nonnus' striving for effect invariably takes precedence over narrative consistency. The injunction to dam up a refractory Hydaspes, if he should assume a human form and come to the aid of Deriades and the Indians (27.181-8), is not acted upon, however, even when the river, ταυροφυής νόθον εἴδος ἐκεῖν γροτειλέτι μορφή (30.89), does precisely this and succours Morrheus, who has been beset by Hephaistus. The poet could not have failed to notice the contradiction, seeing that 27.184 and 30.89 have, clearly, been composed in parallel. We note that some of the phraseology of Dionysus' injunction is reused in Deriades' speech, when in horror at the Hydaspes having been turned into wine he declares that he would fill it with earth, were it not his own father: καὶ κεν ἐγὼ τὸδε χεῦμα χυμής ἐπλησα κονίης / ... προκόην μεθύουσαν ἐμοὶ γενετήρους ὀδέων / τοσσὶ κοπούμενοι διέτρεχον ἀβροχον ὑδῷ, / ... ὡς 'Ενοσίχθων / ἐχθρὸν ὕδωρ ποίησε, καὶ αὐσταλέου ποταμῶ / Ἰναχίνη ιππείως δυνὴ ἑχαράζε κονίην (39.46-53). The two passages, as the verbal similarities indicate, have obviously been composed in parallel. Nonnus is not only aware of the frequent repetitions in his poem, but has composed them intentionally, always ensuring that the repeated

6 Cf. (1990) 29ff. Vian, responding in part to Keydel and Collart, who took Nonnus' inconsistencies to indicate the unfinished state of the Dionysiaca has sought to iron out many of the contradictions in the poem, by ascribing a metaphoric rather than literal meaning to the contradictory statements and generally interpreting them in such a way as to render them mutually compatible. But, like his two predecessors, he is excusing the poet, only in a different way; while they excused Nonnus for his inconsistencies on the grounds that he did not have the opportunity to put the finishing touches to his work, Vian attributes them rather to our failure as readers to grasp the symbolic meaning of poet's statements. Livrea, (1989) p. 25 n. 9, takes a totally different view by accepting the contradictions as they stand, saying that they are simply representative of compositional practice at the time, citing Colius' 'Ἀρταγηνής Εἰλένθης and Claudian's De raptu Proserpine as other examples of this tendency. Indeed, as we shall note later in our discussion on the Beroe episode, Nonnus seems to have duplicated the very inconsistencies found in Claudian's poem, a circumstance which Braut has used to demonstrate Nonnus' acquaintance with the Latin poet.
passages differ in some details.

Dionysus next calls on his followers to fight fire with water in a reversal of the usual roles, to which we have already referred in relation to Deriades' speech. On their defeat the Indians will be obliged to whiten their black faces with chalk, implying initiation into the Bacchic rites, but at the same time deriding the blackness of the Indians. Remarks of a racial nature abound in the Dionysiaca, and there can be little doubt that they represent the poet's personal prejudices in this regard. But the chalking of faces is used to deride Dionysus' followers as well: in book 30 Morrheus taunts the fallen Phlogius with the comment that he has no need to chalk his face when he goes to dance for Persephone, seeing that it is well enough covered with dust as it is (30.121-5). Deriades, bending a submissive knee, shall exchange his armour for Bacchic apparel, though a little later he promises to attach Deriades' horns to his Lydian porch: παρὰ προσώπλαυα δὲ Λυδῶν / πήξω μαίνομενοι κεράτα Δημιαδής (27.219-20). Vian interprets those statements as foreshadowing the fate of Pentheus later in the narrative: like Pentheus, Deriades is first injected with Bacchic frenzy and then killed. He may, however, be reading too much into the passage, seeing that bondage and death are touted fairly interchangeably in the mutual rantings of Dionysus and Deriades. In book 36 Deriades enjoins his followers to affix the horned heads of the Sileni and Satyrs on their houses: στέψατε πάντα μέλαθρα βοοκράροισι καρίνωις (36.150), but then almost with the same breath promises to make them, along with Dionysus, his slaves.

Dionysus' speech predictably charges his followers with Bacchic frenzy. Testifying to his excited state, a glow shines forth from the brow of Silenus: Σιληνοῦ δὲ γέρουτος ἀτέ εύκεραίοιο μετώπου / μαρμαρυγή σελάγιζεν (27.234-5), recalling the glow that issued from the infant Dionysus, lighting up his dark hiding place: καὶ Διός αὐτοβότος ἀπαγγέλλουσα λοχείνω / μαρμαρυγή σελάγιζε, καταγαγόεισα προσώπου (9.103-4). A similar glow, indicative of the presence of Dionysus, facilitates the Bacchantes' escape from Pentheus' prison: καὶ δόμων ἀχλαόντα θεόσυντος ἔστεφεν αἰγή/Βασσαρίδων ζωφερόν καταγαγόεισα μελάθρου / καὶ σκοτίου πυλεών ἀνεπτύσσοντο βερέθρου /

(1990) p.131
The same language is employed to render the evangelist's καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ ὁδ κατέλαβεν in the Paraphrase: ἐν ἀχλωσενὶ δὲ κόσμῳ, / οὐρανίας σελάγυζε βολαῖς γαύροχος αὐγή, / καὶ ζόφος οὗ μίν ἦμαρπε (1.11-3). Nonnus is quite obsessed with magical glows and fires, owing to the importance of the light-darkness and fire-water oppositions in the Orphic writings, and the obvious connexion with Dionysus' fiery birth. In book 29, when Dionysus' followers are again filled with Bacchic ardour, a flame plays around a Bassarid's head and neck but does not burn her: ἀπὸ πλοκάμοιο δὲ Βάκχης / ἀφλεγέος σελάγυζε κατ᾽ αὐχένοις αὐτόματον πῦρ (29.280-1), a phenomenon which is observed again during the battle between Dionysus and Poseidon: ἀπὸ πλοκάμοιο δὲ νύμφης / ἀφλεγέος σελάγυζε κατ᾽ αὐχένος αὐτόματον πῦρ (43.356-7). These images appear to derive from Euripides' Bacchae, where the Bassarids in Dionysiac frenzy sport on their hair a fire that does not burn them: ἐπὶ δὲ βοστρύχως / πῦρ ἐφερον, οὔτε ἐκεῖν (757-8), but the same imagery is found in other writers in a non-Bacchic context. Thus in Vergil's Aeneid a similar flame plays about the head of Iulus by way of a divine portent: 'ecce levis summum de vertice Iuli / fundere lumen apex, tactum inoxia mollis / lambere flamma comas et circum tempora pasci' (2.682-4). Nonnus has other magical fires that are unrelated to Bacchic ecstasy. The flames which Hera makes issue from Derades' shield and helmet 30.234-6 are imitated from E1-4 and Σ203-6, where Athena performs the same service for Diomedes and Achilles respectively. Other unrelated instances are the γάμου σέλας (27.319) that watched over the infant Erichthonius, and the emblematic burning tree of Tyre (40.473-5), derived from Phoenician mythology. There are also magical fires of a baleful sort, as that with which Hephaistus scorches Morpheus at 30.78-85 and Dionysus Deriades at 40.323-8.

The Satyrs make war with whitened faces and masks: καὶ Σάτυροι πολέμουν ἐλευκαίνοντο δὲ γύψῳ / μυστιπόλῳ, καὶ φρικτῶν ἐπηράτης παρείας / ἕκενδεκάνου νόθον εἶδος ἀφωνίτοιο προσώπου (27.228-30). Vian adduces a parallel from Herodotus, who refers to the Ethiopians smearing their bodies with chalk and ochre, as they go to war: τοῦ δὲ σώματος τὸ μὲν ἰμαρυ
εξηλείφοντο γύψω ιόντες ἐσ μάχην, τὸ δ’ ἐτερον ἡμιου μίλω (7.69). As to the use of disguises in war, the only other occurrence of it seems to be that in Valerius Flaccus, where Armes, a Scythian, takes to the battlefield disguised as Pan to strike terror into the enemy: 'frontem cum cornibus auxit / hispidus inque dei latuit terrore Lycaei. / hac tunc atonitos facie defixerat hostes' (6.532-4). Nonnus shares with Flaccus (and other post-Augustan Latin poets) a penchant for the bizarre and theatrical in battle-description, as the ensuing books will demonstrate. The poet leaves the battle scene for now, returning to it at the start of book 28, and devotes the rest of the present book to an assembly of the gods, called by Zeus to canvass greater support for Dionysus in his war with the Indians. Apollo, Athena and Hephaistus are upbraided for their indifference, and Hera and Ares for siding with the Indians. Zeus sees himself as having up to now been the only one to help Dionysus (27.314-6), and intends to broaden the basis of support for him by calling on the first three to come to the party. In the case of Apollo and Athena, their kinship with Dionysus is emphasized. Apollo is reminded of his shared tenancy of Parnassus with Dionysus, and of the revels held there for them both. The argument is grossly anachronistic in the context of the narrative, as Dionysus is yet to return to Greece to establish his cult. Here we have an example of an inconsistency which quite obviously cannot be attributed to the unfinished state of the text or explained away and rationalized on the basis of symbolic meaning. Nonnus is, quite clearly, concerned with the effectiveness of Zeus' speech in its immediate context and will not sacrifice what seems to him a telling point in the argument for considerations of narrative consistency. Another such deliberate anachronism occurs at 42.142-4, where the poet in an authorial comment expresses surprise that Dionysus, δι' ἐτρεμε φόλα Γηγάντων, should fear Beroe, even though the confrontation with the giants does not take place until book 48. Nonnus simply will not permit chronological exigencies to restrain him from making an effective point. Zeus reminds Apollo of the tribulations endured by Leto at Hera's connivance, when she was about to give birth to him and Artemis (27.269-77). This passage is a free, much abbreviated paraphrase of Callimachus' depiction of Leto's woes in his Hymn to Apollo, 55ff. Intimidated by Hera, all shirked from helping, until finally Leto takes pity on her: ὄππότε Πηνελόε φυγάς ῥόος, ὄππότε Δίρκη / μητέρα σήν.
ἀπέειπεν, ὅτε δρόμον εἶχε καὶ αὐτὸς Ἀσωπὸς βαρύγυνος ὀπίστερον ἰχνὸς ἔλισσων, / εἰςκόκε Δήλος ἠμυνε μογοστόκος, εἰςόκε Λητὼ / οὐτιδανοὺς πετάλουσι γέρων μαιώσατο φοῖνιξ (27.273-77). The anaphora ὀππότε ... φυγᾶς ... ὀππότε corresponds to the φεύγε ... φεύγε in Callimachus: φεύγεν δ' ὁ γέρων μετόπισε Φενείος (71) ... φεύγε καὶ Ἀονίη τὸν ἔνα δρόμον, αἱ δ' ἐφήπτοντο / Δήρη πε Στροφή πε ... / ...ὁ δ' εἵπετο πολλὸν ὀπισθεν / Ἀσωπὸς βαρύγυνος (75-8) ... φεύγε δὲ καὶ Πηνείος ἐλισσόμεμος διὰ Τελπέων (105). The φοῖνιξ echoes ὁ Δήλος ... φοῖνιξ (4), and the γέρων is possibly a recollection of ν.71 above, but, as Vian notes, the γέρων ... φοῖνιξ is, at the same time, a comic inversion of the φοῖνικος νέου ἐρνος that Odysseus saw on Delos (3.162-3). We note the considerable caricatural seam in the Dionysiaca, which in the books that follow manifests itself most perceptibly in puns on names. Zeus, turning to Athena, asks her - unfairly perhaps seeing that she had shielded Aiacus, when the latter was beset by the Indians from all sides (22.257-8) - not to stand idly by while the sons of Attica die. The analogy between her manner of birth from Zeus' head and that of Dionysus from Zeus' thigh is emphasized: this is seen as forming a special bond between the two (cf. also 27.67). A debt of gratitude is owed to Pan as well, for tending the goat Amaltheia and on account of his help in the struggle with the Titans.

Dionysus' role in securing the victory of the Athenian Melanthius over the Boeotian Xanthus - another gross anachronism but excusable, perhaps, on the ground that it is Zeus, who knows the future equally with the past and present, that is speaking - is adduced as a further reason why Athena should be helping him now. Hephaistus is, likewise, obliged to lend assistance. He, the father of Erichthonius, should protect his Athenian progeny as well as his sons the Cabeiroi. Hephaistus is reminded of his attempted sexual union with Athena, of the goddess's breastfeeding of Erichthonius ἄφοιομαζώ (27.323), of the γάμιον σέλας (27.325) that watched over the infant, and of the axe with which he opened Zeus' head to give birth to Athena.

In the books that follow, Athena and Hephaistus will be seen to be actively

8 Vian (1990) p.309 believes that Nonnus is referring to an alternative version of the Typhononomachy, where Pan played the part assigned to Cadmus in his own account.
involved on behalf of Dionysus and his followers, though Hephaistus' contribution is confined to helping the Cabeiroi. Hera and Ares will, in defiance of Zeus, continue to help the Indians. Apollo appears to play no role, but Aphrodite, after helping Hera, will lend some succour to Dionysus' beleaguered followers by effectively removing Morpheus from the battlefield, and Hermes will rescue the Bacchantes from Indian captivity in the absence of Dionysus. The definitive splitting of the gods into two opposing camps is seen by Vian as forming a prelude to the theomachy in book 36, but the latter is, like Homer's, a detached tabloid with little bearing on the course of events on the ground. More importantly, the present episode prepares us for the frequent instances of divine intervention in books 28-30. The instances of direct physical intervention in the Homeric sense are, apart from Athena's shielding of Aiaceus at 22.257-8 and her standing by Dionysus at 40.74-5, all confined to books 28-30.

Books 28-30 resemble 22-24 in being almost entirely devoted to warfare (except for the Dionysus-Hymenaius episode in 29). The pathos of the Tectaphus scene in book 30 recalls the pathos of the mourning scenes in book 24. But whereas the fighting in 22-24 was directed towards a definite objective, the crossing (or, from the Indian viewpoint, its prevention) of the Hydaspes, that in 28-30 does not seem to be channelled toward the attainment of any specific goal. It is rather the sort of literary gladiatorial show that we find in the post-Augustan Roman poets Lucan, Statius and Valerius Flaccus (cf. especially the latter's gratuitous book 6), replete with gruesome and often bizarre descriptions of death on the battlefield, that bear so little resemblance to reality as to be wholly devoid of credibility. Such descriptions, nurtured in the schools of rhetoric, had long been stereotyped. Nonnus, however, outdoes his predecessors' already exaggerated descriptions to such an extent as to leave the unavoidable impression that he is (like Ovid) parodying this mode of writing. Mixed in with these rhetorical bizarries are certain gigantomachy elements, scenes of Bacchic frenzy and conventional Homeric battle depictions.

Book 28 begins with Phaunus, Aristaius and Aiaceus marching into battle, the last having slung from his shoulder a πολυδαιδαλος ἄρης, which had been fashioned on the Lemnian anvil (presumably, like Achilles' shield, by Hephaistus). From this the reader might infer that the three will play a prominent part in the
forthcoming battle, an expectation that is, however, not realized. The aristeia of Aiacus has already been presented (books 22-3), and he will have no further part to play until 32.281-3, where he is described as the only one to withstand the Indian onslaught during Dionysus’ madness. Aristaius, though, will be the subject of a short aristeia in the impending battle (29.179-92), but Phaunus misses out altogether, his sole claim to distinction being to lead the woodchopping party for Opheltes’ funeral pyre in book 37. Leaving the three conventional warriors aside, Nonnus proceeds to describe Dionysus’ contingent of Satyrs and Bassarids as they make their way to the battlefield in chariots drawn by lions or panthers, or riding on the backs of bears and bulls, armed with clusters of vine and ivy, and wearing the nebris for breastplate. The poet is bent on giving us a paraphrase of the famous Homeric passage at N128-33 as at he did previously at 22.182-5, only this time arraying Bacchus against conventional weaponry: στέμματα μὲν κορυφεσίν, ἑπέκτυπε δ’ αἰγίδα θώρηξ, ἐγχεσει θύρας ἔθυσε, καὶ ἵσαζον τὸ κοβόρνος / ἀντίτυπον κυνηῆς. ὁμοζυγεῖν δὲ φορῆν / στοιχάδες ἀλλῆλου ἐπηρείδοντο βοεία. / καὶ πρυλέες πρυλεέσσιν, ἀεριολόφῳ δὲ καρῆς / Μυγδούνιν πήλικα Πελασγίας ὠθεε πήλης (28.29-34). It is puzzling why the Mygdonians and Pelasgians should be arrayed one against the other, as neither could conceivably be understood to fight for Deriades and the Indians, with whom they have no connexion. Vian believes the whole segment (28.29-34) was originally composed for the Dionysus-Perseus confrontation in book 47, but then for some reason was transposed to its present location. A segment of generalised fighting follows, introduced by the phrase καὶ κλόνος ἡ προμάχων ἑτερόπτρος (27.35), a statement which is used again (in expanded form) at 36.206-7: καὶ πολὺς ἐγκεκόδωμος ἦν κτύπος, ἀντιβίων δὲ / ὠτειλή κταμένων ἑτερόπτρος, to introduce a similar battle scene involving multiple anonymous participants. The contrasting modes of fighting between the Bacchantes and Indians are highlighted: καὶ τελετῆ Βρομίον συνεσμεράγηεν Ἑνυχ, / εδιὰ δ’ ἔλεγε ὀπτηρα, καὶ ἣγητειρα κύδοιμω / λαον ἀναλίζουσα συνέκτυπε

9 (1990) p.170. Vian thinks it plausible that Nonnus worked simultaneously on various parts of the Dionysiaca. This is apparent from the reuse, always in slightly altered form, of expressions in the depiction of thematically analogous situations. The present passage seems to have found its way into the wrong pigeon-hole.
Πηκτίδι σάλπιγξ, ᾧ σπονδῇ λύθρον ἐμὶξε, φόνον δ' ἐκέρασσε χορείη

(2841-4). These lines are in a way a fitting synopsis of all the battle scenes in the

Dionysiaca with their blend of magical and conventional.

Nonnus, though he views the Indians with contempt, bestows considerable
attention on deeds of valor performed by their champions. Corymbasus, whom the
poet describes as ἔξοχος Ἰνδῶν, ἐξοχος ἰμορεῖν μετὰ Μορρέα καὶ
βασιλέα (28.97-8), is made the subject of an aristeia, the first of several assigned
to Indians. As in the aristeias of Oiagrus and Aiacus depicted earlier, the fighting
assumes a conventional Homeric character with numerous echoes from the Iliad.
The aristeia is introduced gradually in the midst of a number of shorter encounters,
the first of which is Phalene’s attack on Deriades: ἔθα πολύ πρώτιστος, ἐψ
ποδὶ κούφος ὀρούςας, ἀντὶ Δημιάδαο κατικόντιζε Φαληνεύς (28.45-6),
the description being patterned on ἔθα πολὺ πρώτιστος Ὀμήνος ταυς Ἄλας /
Σάτυνον οὔτασε (Ξ442-3). Phalene misses: οὐ δὲ τεταυομένη χρόνος
ἱματο λοίγος αὐχή, ἀλλὰ παραθίνας πάγη χθοῦν (28.48-9), which is
patterned on expressions such as ἢ δ’ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ / γαῖα ἐνεστήκετο,
λαλομένη χρόνος ἁσαί (Φ167-8), where the spear is anthropomorphically
endowed with the power of volition. The echoes appear to be randomly selected
from the Iliad without any contextual parallel in mind. Phalene is then slain by
Corymbasus, who cuts off his head (28.53-4). A number of other Homeric
vignettes follow. Dexiochus attacks Phlogius, who retreats, taking shelter behind
his brother’s great shield: αὐτὰρ ὁ ταρβήσας, ὀλίγον γόνυ γουνὸς ἀμείβων, ἀπέρ αὐτοῦ /
μηκεδανή κεκάλυπτο κασιγνήτωι φοείη, /
Δαρβάνις ἄτε Τεύκρον
οἰστεύσεα γενέθλης / εἰς σάκος ἐπταμβείουν ἐδέχυτο σύγγονος Ἀλας, /
πατρώῃ συναέθλον ἀδελφόν ἀστίδι κεῦθων (28.58-9,61-2). Here we have a
conflation of two Homeric recollections. The ὀλίγον γόνυ γουνὸς ἀμείβων
(which Nonnus, incidentally, imitates again at 32.265-6 and 42.55-9) is taken from
the depiction of Ajax’ slow retreat before the Trojan onslaught at Λ.546-7, whence
comes also the σάκος ἐπταμβείον. The passage, as the poet himself indicates, is
essentially an evocation of the scenes where Teucer takes shelter behind Ajax’
shield while shooting at the enemy: Τεύκρος δ’ εἰνατος ἦλθε παλάγτονα τόξα

75
The Indians, far from being presented as earthborn monsters, are here likened to some of the greatest of the Greek heroes. The explicit reference to another literary work, especially in the middle of the narrative, is quite astounding, seeing that other epic poets, though imitating Homer at every turn, did not actually refer to him by name even in their proems. As already noted, Nonnus appears to have derived this practice from Pindar, who cites Homer by name six times in his odes (cf. for example, Nem. 7.29-31). Corymbasus lays Dexiochus low with his sword (28.64). Clytius rushes upon Deriades, but Hera turns his spear aside in what is the first of a series of direct interventions by the gods on the battlefield (28.68-72). The spear, missing Deriades, kills his elephant instead, an idea borrowed from the Sarpedon-Patroclus confrontation in the Iliad, where Sarpedon, missing Patroclus, kills the latter's outrunner (παρηόρος), Pedasus. The driver quickly cuts the straps by which the car was attached to the elephant's neck: ἀλλὰ πολικάλκαστον ὑπὸ ζυγὸν δορὶ κάμψας / αὐχενίων ἀνέκοψεν ὀμόζυγον ὀλκόν / ἤνεχος ταχυργὸς (28.77-9), recalling the action of Automedon, who σπασσάμενος τανύκες δόρο παχέος παρὰ μηροῦ, / ἄξις ἀπέκοψε παρηόρον (Π1743-4).

Clytius calls out to Corymbasus in consciously Iliadic language: στήθι, κύων, μὴ φεῦξῃ κορυμβαςε, καὶ ἐς διδάξω, / οἷοι ἀκοντιστήρες ὀπάνες εἰς Λυκίου (28.84-5), promising to make Deriades a servant of Dionysus. He is described as speaking ὑβριστηρὶ ... ἀνθερεων (28.83), the imputation of hybris to someone fighting on Dionysus' side being somewhat unusual. He resembles Idas, who displays similar character traits in Apollonius' Argonautica (cf. his speech at 1.463-71, which earns Idmon's rebuke). Clytius' head is shorn off by Corymbasus while still speaking (φθεγγομένου Ἐλαύνοι, 28.92), recalling the death of Dolon at the hands of Diomedes (φθεγγομένου δὲ ἀρα τοῦ γε κάρῃ κονίσαι ἐμίχθη, Κ457). The headless body rolls on the ground, an ὀρχηστήρ παλινδίνητος (28.96). Nonnus is fascinated by the idea of the dance of death (for other instances cf. 17.213-4, Centaur slain by Orontes; 22.315-7, Indian slain by Erechtheus;
30.118-25, Phlogius slain by Morpheus; 37.741-2, dove shot down in archery contest; and 39.336-7, dolphin killed by Deriades' spear), a gruesome variant on the other dance depictions in the Dionysiaca. The aristeia is curtailed at the end, Nonnus simply listing Corymbasus' other victims: Sebes, Oinomaus (who is to be distinguished from the king of Elis of the same name and from the other Oinomaus mentioned at 43.60), Tyndarius, Thoon, Austesion and Onites. Nonnus now leaves Corymbasus, to indulge depictions of a more grotesque sort. He firstly concerns himself with the postures of the slain, describing warriors who, though dead, remain standing in battle-readiness, poised as if to draw a bow or hurl a spear: καὶ πολίς ἀρτιδάκτος ἑμμ νέκυς ... θανῶν ἀτίνακτος ἐπεστηρίζετο γαίη, / μαρναμένῳ προμάξῳ πανομοίοις, ώς δόρυ πάλλων, ἵππων θά τόξα καὶ ὅς βέλος εἰς σκοτόν ἐλκὼν (28.113-7). This macabre gallery of warriors frozen in death seems to have been imitated from some poem on Perseus petrifying his assailants with the head of Medusa. Thus in Ovid, Thescelus, as he prepares to throw his spear at Perseus, is frozen in this posture: 'utque manu iaculum fatale parabat / mittere, in hoc haesit signum de marmore gestu' (Met. 5.182-3). It is only in such a context that the scene is intelligible. One dead warrior, pierced with arrows from head to foot, is referred to as Ἀρεως ὄρθων δαίμονα (28.122), a phrase that the 12th century Byzantine writer Michael Italicus applies to the living, when he calls the emperor Andronicus Comnenus τὸ ἐμπνοια Ἀρεως δαίμονα (cf. also 'Ἀρεως εἰκόνων βαρεως at 28.156).¹⁰ We note that in Ovid, Eryx, rushing on Perseus, becomes an armed statue: 'immotusque silex armataque mansit imago' (Met. 5.199).

Next follows a standard rhetorical set-piece, the warrior who fights on despite having his arms lopped off. This topos originated from a real life occurrence during the Persian wars, when Cynaigeirus, the brother of Aeschylius, had his arm lopped off as he seized the prow of an enemy ship (recorded in Herodotus 6.114: τούτο δὲ Κυναίγειρος ὃ Εὐφορίωνος ἐνθάντα, ἐπιλαβόμενος τῶν ἀφλάστων νησώς,

¹⁰Vian (1990) pp.158-9 has found the phrase used by the rhetorician Polemon (2.52), who, however, uses it purely figuratively, as a variant of Homer's διος 'Ἀρεως, i.e. to denote valour rather than to depict appearance.
The rhetoricians and later poets blew this incident out of all proportion, as we may see from Lucan's version (where it has been transposed to the context of an engagement between the Roman and Phoecean fleets). A Phoecean (one of two brothers) 'ausus Romanae Graia de puppe carinae / iniectare manum, sed eam gravis insuper ictus/amputat ... crevit in adversis virtus ... fortique instaurat proelia laeva / rapturusque suam procumbit in aequora dextram:/ haeque quoque cum toto manus est abscisa lacerto ... tum ... sanguine et hostilem defecit nervis / insiluit solo nociturus pondere puppem' (3.610-26). The Phoecean thus out-performs Cynaigeirus, losing not one but two arms and still continuing the fight. The situation borders on the absurd but Lucan presents it in all seriousness. In Nonnus the same topos is taken beyond all limits of credibility in a way strongly suggestive of parody. In a manner reminiscent of Ovid, Nonnus both uses the rhetorical exaggerations and parodies them at the same time. He has taken the scene out of its naval context but has maintained the link with Athens by making his protagonist Athenian. The man loses his right arm, which rolls on the ground in a dance of death, marking the yellow dust: ἦ δὲ κυβιστήσασα φόνον βητάρμου παλμῷ / ἡρεπεν ἀρτιδάκτος, ὁμήλικι σύμπλοκος ὠμῷ / ξανθὰ διαστίζουσα κατάρρευτα νῦτα κονίης (28.128-30; cf. also 22.197-8 for a similar depiction of severed limbs jumping about in reptilic fashion). He seeks to recover the spear from the severed hand (cf. the Lucan passage above, where he endeavours to retrieve the hand itself), but loses his left arm as well in the process, which like the right goes through even more elaborately choreographed movements, clutching the soil as if wanting to grip the shieldstrap once more (28.138-42). The situation depicted is so patently untrue to life as to verge on the ridiculous. It is at this point that the Athenian decides to give a speech, expressing the wish that he had a third hand, ὁφρα τελέσσω / τρικαθάδαις παλάμήσην ἐπάξια Τριτογενείν (28.138-42). He is punning now, playing on the similarity (difference of quantity notwithstanding) of the number three and the first syllable of the epithet of Athena. Armless, he fights on with his feet, ὁφρα τις εἰπῇ / εὖχος Ἀθηναῖων περιδέξουν, ὀττί καὶ αὐτοῖς / ποσοίν ἀριστεύουσα δαῖζομένων παλαμάων (28.147-9). Further word-play results from the contradiction between the περιδέξιον and the δαίζομένων παλαμάων.
(28.147-9). To describe an armless man as being περιδεξιός, which has the primary meaning 'ambidextrous', is singularly inappropriate in his present circumstances and therein lies the pun. The Athenian eventually succumbs to the many blows from the enemy, who surround him on all sides, the poet remarking: Ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν Ἀρεως εἰκῶν / ὑφιγνώνυμα ναετήρι φυλασσομένη Μαραθώνος (28.156-7). Vian's reading of Κυνεγεῖρω in place of Μαραθώνος makes the reference to the historical figure even more explicit.

Nonnus now proceeds to depict the slaughter among the cavalry. A rider, thrown by his wounded horse, is compared to Bellerophon falling off Pegasus. Another, his feet caught around the belly of the horse, is dragged head first along the ground (28.168-71), a scene which, based on the death of the charioteer Cebriones in the Iliad (Π1740-3), had become a standard set-piece in later epic (cf. Silius Italicus 4.255-8 for the same). The poet returns to this scene at 30.118ff., where Morpheus repeats in essence Patroclus' mocking comments on the fallen charioteer. After this brief anonymous segment Nonnus proceeds to narrate the feats of the Cyclopes at some length, the fighting assuming somewhat the aspect of a gigantomachy. Gigli-Piccardi has drawn attention to the quasi-comical nature of this segment, with the poet punning, in a manner reminiscent of Aristophanes, with the names of the Cyclopes. II The Cyclops' actions are made to represent their names, beginning with: καὶ βραχοῦ Κύκλωπες ἐκουκλώσαντο μαχητὰς, / Ζηνὸς ἀροσσητήρες (28.173-7). Argilipus (lit. 'the dazzling white one'), raising a torch lights up the dusky Indians: ὁμιχλήντι δε λαῷ / Ἀγγίλιπος σελάγιζε / φεραυγέα δαλὸν ἀείρων, / καὶ χθονίῳ κεκόρυστο πυργιλώχιμν κεραυνῷ / μυράμενος δαιδεσσι καὶ ἐρεμον αἰθοπες Ἰνδῶι / οὐρανῶ προστηρι / τεθηπότες αὐτίτυπων πῦρ (28.173-7). It may be noted that Dionysus has recourse to the same weapons in his fight against the giants (and the poet recourse to the same vocabulary in depicting it): ἐπὶ αὐτιβίων δὲ καρῆνων / Βάικχος / ἀνιδρόποτο μαχήμανα δαλὸν ἀείρων, / καὶ χθονίῳ προστηρί δέχας, θέρμανε / Γιγάντων / αὐτίτυπων μίμημα Διοβλάττου κεραινοῦ (48.63-6). Argilipus burns the aἰθοπες Ἰνδῶι (we note the play on the primary and secondary

---

**(1995) pp.140-1.** Nonnus is rather keen on nomina significantia - for an earlier example cf.24.70: Δημιαίδης ἐπὶ δῆμον ἑπώτην ὁμπλουκεῖν Ἰνδῶις.
meanings of ἀθοπές), chastising more than one Salmoneus: καὶ ὃπετον ὄλλω ἐπ᾿ ὀλλῳ / ἰδιόν ὁιστευτὴρι κατέφλεγεν ἀνέρα πυραφ., / οὐχ ἐνα Σαλμωνῆα νόθῳ πρήνιζε κεραυνῷ (28.182-4). Argilipus is seen here to outdo Zeus in the way that Aiacus in an earlier segment outdoes Achilles: οὐχ ἐνα μούνον ἐπέφυε Λυκάωνα (22.380). The Indians are somewhat undeservedly equated with Salmoneus, who was punished by Zeus for wielding a νόθος κεραυνός. They are guilty of no such transgression; on the contrary it is Argilipus who wields it, committing the very offence for which Salmoneus paid with his life. The Indians are also compared to Capanes, who like Salmoneus, had been struck down by Zeus for his hybris: οὐ μία μούνον / Θυάσῃ στενάχιζε μαρανομένον Καπανῆος (28.185-6). This mention of a second victim of Zeus parallels the reference to Asteropaius, the second victim of Achilles, at 22.383. The Argilipus passage has been modelled on the Aiacus passage, and it in turn serves as a model, as far as the weaponry is concerned, for the passage in book 48 to which we referred above. Reuse of his own passages (imitatio sui) is almost as vital a part of Nonnus' compositional technique as is his use of passages from the works of his predecessors (though it must be admitted that "reuse" may not be quite the appropriate term here, as it is likely that Nonnus worked on the analogous passages simultaneously, writing them in parallel, cf. also p. 72n.).

Steropes, like Argilipus, lives up to his name αἰθερίας στερόπησι φέρων ἀντίκτυπον αἰγήν (28.188). Brontes does likewise, βρονταῖος πατάγοισι χέων ἀντίκτυπον ἦχώ (28.196). Brontes is a νόθος ... ἄννεφελος Ζεὺς (28.199), as Typhoeus had been earlier (Ζεὺς νόθος, 1.295 and ἄννεφελον ... Γίγαντος 1.299), but proves to be far more adept than the latter at handling the thunderbolt. Brontes uses other weapons as well: breaking off a boulder from a cliff-face, he hurls it at Deriades (28.206-7), which recalls Polyphemus' action in the Odyssey (1.206ff.). Nonnus returns to boulder-throwing in the naumachy, when Halimedes throws one at the Indian fleet (39.340-1). Deriades, stunned by the blow, lets go of his spear and shield: ἀκαμάτων δόρυ θοῦρον ἔων ἀπεσείασατο χειρῶν, / χάλκεου εἰκοσιπηχυ, πέδω δ' ἐρμιφε βοεῖν / αἰδομένας παλάμησε (28.214-6). This whole incident is inspired by the Ajax-
Hector confrontation in the *Iliad*, where Hector, hit by a rock thrown by Ajax, lets drop his spear: χειρός δ’ ἐκβαλεν ἤγχος, ἔπ’ αὐτῷ δ’ ἀστίς ἐάφθη / καὶ κόρυς, ἀμφι δὲ οἱ βράχει τεῦχεα ποικίλα χαλκῷ (*Σ419-20*). Deriades falls gasping from his chariot: καὶ ἄδρανες ἄσθμα τεῖαλων ... ἦρόθεν προκάρ̣μ̩ν̣ος ἀπ’ ἡμβάτου πέσε δίφρου, / ὡς ἐλάτη περιμέτρος ὑπέρλοφος, ἢ τε πεσοῦσα / ἀσπετον εὐρείης περιδέρομε κόλπον ἄροφης (28.216-20). We recall that Hector too falls like a tree, though like one that has been struck by lightning: ὡς δ’ ὄθ’ ὑπὸ πληγής πατρὸς Διὸς ἔξεριπτη δρός (*Σ414*). Nonnus also has in view an earlier scene in the *Iliad*, where Antilochus downs Mydon, the charioteer of Pylaimenes, with a rock. Mydon lets go of the reins, which drop to the ground: ἐκ δ’ ἄρα χειρῶν / ἡνία λεύκ’ ἐλέφαντι χαμαί πέσον ἐν κούλησιν (*Ε582-3*), and, struck with the sword on the head, falls headlong from the chariot: δ’ γ’ ἄσθμαίνου εὐεργεύος ἐκπεσε δίφρου / κύμβαχος ἐν κούλησιν (*Ε585-6*). Deriades, like Hector, is saved from further harm by his companions, who crowd around him and place him in a wagon: ἀμφὶ δὲ μιν προχυθέντες ἐσ ἀρματα κούφισαν Ἰνδόι (28.221), corresponding to: τὸν δ’ ἄρ’ ἑταῖροι / χερσίν ἀειραυτὰς φέρον ἐκ πόνου, ὄφρ’ ἱκεθ’ ἱπποὺς / ὑκέας, οἱ οἱ διποθε μάχης ἓδε πτολέμοιο / ἐστασαν ἤμισχον τε καὶ ἄρματα ποικίλ’ ἔχοντες (*Σ428-31*). We note that a further echo of this Homeric passage occurs at 32.215-8, in Morrhæus’ mocking speech to the fallen Echelaus.

Brontes’ appearance frightens the Indians, who mistake his one round eye for the moon, rising in his face instead of the sky, to lend succour to Dionysus: καὶ βλοσυροῦ Κύκλωπος ὑποπτήσασσετε ὁπωπήν / θαμβαλεψ δεδονητο φόβῳ κυκάρχρος Ἰνδόι, / οὐρανόθεν δικέοιτε ὁλομπιαδις ὅττι Σελήνη / Θηγενέος Κύκλωπος ἑναιτέλεουσα προσώπῳ / πλησιαφῆς ἠπτραπτε, προσπίζουσα Λυκίον (28.228-32). This is clearly a comic exaggeration of stock poetic comparisons of the Cyclops’ eye to a heavenly body, such as Vergil’s lumen ... quod torva sub fronte latebat,/Argolici clipei aut Phoebæae lampadis...

---

12 The falling tree simile is commonplace, cf. Apollonius 4.1682-8 for an elaborate example.
instar' (Aen. 3.635-7). Nonnus refers to Zeus' bemusement at the sight of Brontes' attempts to mimic himself, a reference which underlines the comic nature of the Cyclopeia as a whole. Other Cyclopes join the fray. Trachius prepares to do battle as does his brother Elatreus, who in accord with his name, wields an ἐλάτημα περιμήκετον, with which he proceeds to cut off the heads of the enemy. Euryalus too lives up to his name by driving a troop of the enemy toward the sea: διατμήζας δὲ κυδομῷ / ἐκ πεδίου φεύγοντα πολίν στρατὸν ἀχριθαλάσσης (28.242-3), which is reminiscent of Achilles' action at the beginning of the twenty-first book of the Iliad: ἕθη σπάτμηζας τοὺς μὲν πεδίων δ᾽ ἐξωκε / πρὸς πόλιν ... ἡμίσεες δὲ ἐς ποταμὸν εἰλεύντο (Φ3-8). The Homeric passage was used previously by the poet to describe the action of Aiacaus in his own equivalent of the μάχη παραπτάμος at 22.356-7. Having driven them into the sea, Euryalus hurls a rock at the Indians, who face a two-fold death, through being crushed by the projectile and at the same time drowning in the brine (28.248-9). The idea of the two-fold death recurs at 34.238-9, where the Bassarids, thrown into a well, meet their doom as they are simultaneously buried by the mud and drowned by the water. We may recall that Ajax Oileus succumbs to a similar two-fold fate in Quintus, γαῖῃ ὡμῶς δμηθέντα καὶ ἄτρυγετῷ ἐνι πόντῳ (14.589). Halimedes takes up the fight alongside his fellows, taking care to protect his eye with a shield: φυλασσόμενος δὲ προσώπου / κυκλάδος ὀμφαλόντα προίσχανε νῶτα βοείης (28.259-60). The poet may have been prompted here by the comparison of the Cyclops' eye to a shield (cf. the above Vergil example), which is understood to be just adequate to cover the eye. As with other shields in Nonnus, no sooner is it mentioned than it is forgotten, with Halimedes being forced to duck in order to avoid an arrow, which Phlogius aims at his eye, as if the shield did not exist. Halimedes retaliates by hurling a jagged missile at Phlogius, who escapes harm by sheltering behind Deriades' chariot. The Cyclops vents his frustration at Phlogius' escape with a mighty shout which kills twelve men (28.270-3), a passage that is obviously modelled on that in which the voice of Achilles, divinely augmented by Athena, kills twelve Trojans in the Iliad (Σ228-31). Nonnus is rather fond of such supernatural shouts; we note that Dionysus also issues them on two occasions (17.225-8 and 29.291-5) and Ares
once (32.176), all in imitation of E860 and Ξ148. His preoccupation with the physical effects of the voice has not been engendered by the Iliad alone, but also by Orphic notions of the magical power of the spoken word. It is notable that in the Paraphrase he ascribes this power also to the voice of Christ, when the followers of Annas, who have come to arrest him, are bowled over by the sound of his voice: καὶ ὃς ἐφθαγατο λαῷ ἀβροχίτων, ἀσίδηρος δὲναξ ῥηξήνωρι φωνῇ, / πάντες ἐπ’ ἀλλήλου σαλήμονες ἀσπιδίῳ / αὐτόματο πίπτοντες, ἐπεστορυνύστε κοινῇ / προνέες, οὐστρηθέντες ἀτευχεὶ λαίλαπι φωνῆς (18.34-8).

The feats of the Corybants, who had once protected the infant Zeus and were now helping the cause of Dionysus, are described forthwith. The play on names continues: ἐλαφροτέροισι διεπτοίησε μαχητάς / Ωκύθοος (28.277-9). Ocythoos is compared to Iphiclus, ὅς τις ἐπείγων / ταρσα ποδῶν ἀβάτιο κατέραφεν ἀκρα γαλήνης, / καὶ σταχύων ἐφύπερθε μετάρσιον εἶχε πορείαν, / ἀνθερίκων στατὸν ἄκρον ἀκαμπέα ποσσὶν ὀδείων (28.284-7). These lines have been inspired by Homer's description of the horses of Boreas, αἱ δὲ ὅτε μὲν σκιρτῷεν ἐπὶ ξείδωρον ἀρουραν, / ἄκρον ἐπὶ ἀνθερίκων καρπῶν θέον οὐδὲ κατέκλων / ἄλλα ὅτε δὴ σκιρτῷεν ἐπὶ εὔρεα νῦτα χαλάσσης, / ἄκρον ἐπὶ ρηγμίνως ἀλὸς πολιοῦ θέσκον (1226-9), a passage which, incidentally, also inspired Apollonius' depiction of the Argonaut Euphemus (1.182-4). Mimas dances into battle ἐξων μυμηλὼν ἐνόπλιον ἄλμα χορείης (28.296). His mode of fighting is compared to the war-dance of the Corybants, which had screened the infant Zeus, in a passage (28.292-5) adapted from Callimachus' Hymn to Zeus (51-4). The phrase σάκος ξιφέσασιν ἀράσιων (28.293) is, however, an echo of σάκεα ξιφέσασιν ἐπέκτυμοι from Apollonius' description of the Argonauts' war-dance to propitiate Rhea (1.1134-8), while σκαρβιῶν ... ἐνόπλιον (28.293) reflects σκαίροντες βηταιμὸν ἐνόπλιον (1.1135). We note that Nonnus has previously imitated the Callimachus and Apollonius passages at 14.30-3 in connexion with the same theme.
Idaius likewise dances onto the battlefield - he is referred to as ὀξυφαίης, which Vian suspects is meant to reflect the similarity between the name and the verb 'to see' (ἰδεῖν). Melisseus stings like a bee: ἐπιωνυμήην δὲ φυλάσσων / φρικτὰ κορυφοσφομένης μιμήσατο κέντρα μελίσσης (28.307-8). Acmon fights like an unshakable anvil: μάρνατο δ' ἀστυφέλικτος ἀτε σφυρήλατος ἀκμῶν (28.311), carrying a shield on which the infant Zeus had often slept. A brief description of Zeus' childhood follows (28.314-8), which echoes sections of Callimachus' Hymn to Zeus (cf. esp. 33-5, 47-9 and 52-4). The reference to Amalthea as άλεξ ἱερή is borrowed from Aratus (163). Nonnus' use of his Hellenistic predecessors is quite transparent, the unambiguous references to Callimachus, Apollonius and Aratus being to all appearances intentional; it is as if Nonnus desired that his audience mentally juxtapose with his own lines the passages he is imitating. Morrhueus hurls a rock at Melisseus but misses, owing to Rhea's intervention, who considers it unseemly that a Corybant should be killed by stone, for it was by the help of the Corybants that she was able to feed that stone to Cronus which saved Zeus. The book concludes with a scene where the Corybants dance around the chariot of Deïades, striking their shields, of which the sound reaches the abode of Zeus. Nonnus is somewhat fond of the Corybants, returning to them briefly in the following book (29.215-24).

Book 29 is ostensibly a continuation of the battle scenes of the previous book, but Nonnus has interwoven a romance with the fighting. Almost half of the book is given to the depiction of Dionysus' affection for the youth Hymenaios, which parallels the earlier, more extensive, Dionysus-Ampelus episode (10.175-12.137). The theme of ἐρως παιδών, involving pueri dilecti superis (Ampelus, Calamus, Carpus, Hymenaios), parallels that of the παρθένων φυγὸδεμιον (Nicaia, Aura, Chalcomede, Beroe) in the poem. The love of Dionysus for Hymenaios is introduced in the guise of battlefield camaraderie in imitation of the Achilles-Patroclus relationship in the Iliad, but Nonnus has given his episode an unabashedly homosexual colouring. As in the earlier Ampelus episode, which has been visibly influenced by Bion's Επιτάφιον' Ἀδώνιδος, Dionysus' lamentations in the aftermath of Hymenaios' wounding are infused with a distinct air of lugubriousness, even though the injury is, in the present case, only minor. Bucolic
elements are combined with details drawn from the *Iliad*, resulting in a not very well integrated whole, where Hymenaius, though only slightly wounded, is lamented by Dionysus as if he were already dead. The Hymenaius episode is followed by the short aristeia of Aristaius, the exploits of the Cabeirs and of the Corybants (who, as we mentioned, get a second airing), and finally by the feats of the Bacchantes, which are presented in a way that parallels in outline the Hymenaius episode, in that a number of wounded Bacchantes are brought back from death’s door by the healing hands of Dionysus. Book 29 also signals the commencement of Hera’s substantive interventions in favour of the Indians, which begin to have a deleterious effect on Dionysus in book 30, culminating with the Διος ἀπάτη and the maddening of Dionysus in book 32. Book 28 ended with Dionysus’ forces in the ascendancy, a situation which Hera sets about reversing at the beginning of book 29. She proceeds to instil new martial vigour into Deriades, who has up to now been peculiarly inactive (29.1-2). A re-invigorated Deriades rallies the Indians, combining persuasion with menaces: προμάχοις δὲ χέων λυσιώδεα φωνὴν / κυανῆν στοιχηδὸν ὄλην περιβέβομε χάμην, / λαὸν ὅλον φεύγοντα παλίσσυτον εἰς μόθου ἐλκὼν, / ἄλον ἐνηείη μετανεύμενος, ἄλον ἀπειλῇ (29.4-7). The passage is a condensation of the scene in the *Iliad* where Athena bids Odysseus check the flight of the Greeks after Agamemnon, in order to test their resolve, has granted them permission to abandon the siege and return home. Odysseus goes from ship to ship alternately cajoling and chiding the commanders: τὸν δ’ ἄγαν τάς ἐπέεσσιν ἐρητύσασκε παραστάς (B189) ... τὸν σκῆπτρῳ ἐλάσασκεν ὁμοκλήσασκε τε μύθῳ (B199). Morrheus rallies to his monarch’s call, fighting now with bow and arrows, now with spear, recalling the earlier passage where Oiagrus consecutively employed the two normally diverse modes of fighting (22.168-217, 320-53). Nonnus chooses to overlook the Homeric tradition, where archers are distinguished from spearmen, with only Paris acting in both roles. Morrheus wreaks havoc among the Satyrs and Sileni, who (along with the Bacchantes) are portrayed somewhat ambiguously throughout the poem as being now invincible and invulnerable, now quite susceptible to defeat and injury, even to death. The line of demarcation between divine and mortal is rather blurred overall as far as
these followers of Dionysus are concerned.

Hymenaius fights on horseback, Ἰνδοῦς κυανέους ἤδειείθει χειρὶ ὀδηγῆν (29.17). The contrast between white and black, light and darkness (and, by extension, good and evil) is strongly brought forth in this passage: ἀγλαάθ' δ' ἕστρατπτν ξῖος δὲ μὲν εἷς μέσου Ἰνδῶν / φωσφόρον αἰγληντα δυσειδείν συνδρομον ὁρφυ (29.18-9). The lines recall other instances of light-darkness opposition in Nonnus (cf. 9.103-4, 45.280-3, and Para. 1.11-13), but are at the same time reminiscent of the contrast between Amycus and Polydeuces in Apollonius, where the former is representative of chthonian darkness and the latter of heavenly light: ὁ μὲν ἡ ὅλωδοι Τυφώνος, ἥ καὶ αὐτῆς / Σαΐς εἶναι ἔκτο πέλωρ τέκος, σὰ πάροβεν / χωμόνην Διὶ τίκτεν· ὁ δ' οὐρανίῳ ἄταλαντος / ἀστέρα Τυνδαίδης, οὐκερ κάλλισται ἔασιν / ἐσπερίν ποῖα νύκτα φαεινομένου ἀμαρυγαί (2.38-42). These lines of Apollonius have exerted an appreciable influence on Nonnus, who sees the whole of the Indian war in terms of light-dark, white-black, Olympian-Earthborn dichotomy. A little later in the narrative we have a direct verbal echo of the Apollonius passage, when Morpheus is compared to Typhoeus: ίσοφυῆς Τυφώνι πέλωρ βακχευτο Μορφεύς (30.58, cf. also 34.183 and 22.41, where Thureus is similarly compared). Dionysus is infatuated with Hymenaius' beauty and prefers the help of his spear to that of Zeus' thunderbolt: καὶ συμάειός εἶναι οὐκ ἡθελε χάρμης / ἀστεροπην Κρονίωνος, δοσον μελίν τ' Ἰμναιόν (29.23-4). This may well be an unconscious echo of Idas' words in Apollonius, οὐδὲ μ' ὀφέλει / ζεὺς τόσου, ὀσσάτω περ ἐμὸν δόρυ (1.467-8), although no hybris is implied in the present case. Dionysus keeps close to Hymenaius at all times, οἵ ἀεὶ παρέμιμνε (29.34), just as he does later to Beroe, παρθενικὴ παρέμμυνε (42.177), guarding him like a father, πατήρ ἀτε παιδα φυλάσσων (29.34). It may be noted that in Theocritus idyll on Hylas, Heracles behaves in the same manner towards his protégé: καὶ νῦν πάντ' ἔδίδασκε, πατήρ ὦσει φίλον ὕλον ... ἥιος δ' οἴδατοκ' ἔ (13.8-10). Dionysus enjoins Hymenaius to hurl his spear to strike Deriades, just as he had already struck him, Dionysus, with his beauty, and give someone cause to remark: "ἀμφοτέρων ἔτύχησε βαλὼν
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'Τμέναιος διστὰ, / εἰς χρόνα Δημιάδακ καὶ ἐς κράδην Διονύσου " (29.43-4). Nonnus is rather fond of such epigrammatic quotations (cf. for example Morrheus' description of his and Orontes' fates: "Μορρέα κεστὸς ἐπεφευ, καὶ ἐκτανε θύρος Ὀρόντην ", 33.262, reflecting once more the theme of the all-vanquishing weapons of Aphrodite).

Now follows a series of reminiscences from the fourth book of the Iliad, from which Nonnus paraphrases virtually in entirety the story of the wounding of Menelaus by Pandarus. An unnamed Indian, corresponding to Athena disguised as Laodocus in the Iliad, persuades the archer Melaneus to take a shot at Dionysus, a feat which, should he accomplish it, would be generously rewarded by Deriades. Like Athena, the Indian exploits the archer's avarice, who is described as φιλοκτέανος (29.50 and 79). He tells Melaneus: δεῦρο βέλος προαλλε καὶ ἐς σκόπον αἱ κε τυχήσω, ἰ δέχυσαι σπετα δώρα βαθυπλούτων βασιλῆς, / αἱ κεν ἵδι Διόνυσου, ἀγνορα παῖδα Θεόνης, / πυρκαίης ἐπιβάντα τεῳ δημηθέντα βελέμνω (29.58-61), which echoes: τινίς κεν Μενελάω ἕπετεγεν ταχυν ἰόν, / πᾶσι δε κε τρώσοι χάριν καὶ κόδος ὄρου, / ἐκ πάντων δε μάλιστα Ἀλεξ ἀνδρῳ βασιλῆ. / τοι κεν δη πάμπρωτα παρ' ἄγλαα δόρα φέροι, / αἰ κεν ἵδι Μενέλαον ἀρήμων Ἀτρέως υἱόν / φω βέλει δημηθεντά τυρῆς ἐπιβάντ' ἀληγεινή (Δ94-9). The correspondence with Homer both in content and expression is extremely close, bordering on plagiarism. It is difficult to reconcile such servile copying (of which the Dionysiaca provides numerous examples, especially in book 37) with Hopkinson’s general observation that Nonnus’ stance vis-à-vis Homer is basically one of emulation and rebellion.

The Indian reminds Melaneus to offer thanksgiving to Water and Earth, sacrificing a bull to the Hydaspes and a black ram to Gaia, which corresponds to Athena's reminder to Pandaros to offer a hecatomb of firstling sheep to Apollo on returning to his native Zeleia. The Indian, like Athena, convinces the archer (cf.29.68 and Δ104). The way in which the arrow is chosen from the quiver, the bowstring pulled back and the arrow dispatched are all taken from Homer, but

43 Hopkinson visualises Nonnus as a literary son of Homer, who "works within that blend of imitation and anxiety, obedience and rebellion, which so often distinguish the offspring of famous fathers" (1994b) p. 32.
Nonnus appears to be uninterested in technical details of this sort and he has considerably abridged Homer’s account (cf. 29.70-4 and Δ116-26). This is remarkable in a poet normally so prone to expansiveness. In the present instance he omits the two points that Homer would have considered the most important: the prayer and the actual dispatch of the arrow with a mighty twang of the bow-string. Melaneus, unlike Pandaros, misses his intended victim, hitting Hymenaius instead. As in the case of Menelaus, the arrow inflicts only superficial injury owing to divine intervention. The wound, though only minor, arouses grave concern in Dionysus, as it does in Agamemnon. In Homer, Athena guides the arrow to ‘where the fastenings of the belt were clasped and a doubled armour met it’ (Leaf’s translation), that is, to a spot where his body-armour accorded maximum protection. Nonnus, with his typical flair for proliferation (for another example of this characteristic cf. the proliferation of actors in his version of the Διός ἀπάτη in books 31-32), makes intervention threefold: Zeus deflects the arrow, Dionysus (acting now every inch as a god, though ostensibly still on the way to becoming one) slows its flight, and Aphrodite sees to it that the barbs do not enter the flesh. Dionysus and Aphrodite are brought into the picture as if Zeus were not equal to the task of saving Hymenaius on his own. Nonnus is, clearly, out to glorify Dionysus. But why is Aphrodite introduced as well? The reason appears to be one of convenience: Nonnus, keen to render Homer’s famous simile of the mother driving the fly from her sleeping child, needs a goddess for the part, and who better than Aphrodite, the sister of Dionysus and protectress of lovers (homosexual though they be . . . in the present instance). Aphrodite βέλος ἐτρατε τόσον ἀπὸ χροός, ὥς ὤτε μῆτηρ / παιδὸς ἔτι κυνόσοιτος ἀλήμοιν μυῖαν ἐλάση / ἥρμα φάρεος ἄκρον ἐπαιθύσουσα προσώπῳ (29.84-6), corresponding to Athena’s action in the case of Menelaus: ἢ τοι πρῶθε στᾶσα βέλος ἔχεπεν ήμνεν. / ἢ δὲ τόσον μὲν έεργεν ἀπὸ χροός, ὥς ὤτε μῆτηρ / παιδὸς ἐέργη μυῖαν, δὴ ἡδει λέξεται ὑπνῷ (Δ129-31).

Although Hymenaius’ (like Menelaus’) wound is superficial, it sends Dionysus into a paroxysm of despair, as if the injury were indeed mortal. His attitude reflects Agamemnon’s disquiet with Menelaus’ condition, but he expresses his anxiety differently, through mournful lamentations which recall his behaviour on the death
of Ampelus. He bears away Hymenaius (who, like Adonis in Bion, has been wounded in the thigh), seating him at the foot of an oak: καὶ μὲν ἄγων ἀπάνευθε πολυφλοίβοιο κυδομοῦ / νωθρόν ἐπὶ σκαίεντι πέδῳ παρὰ γείτονι φηγὺ / θήκε καρπαρέουτα (29.93-5), a scene which is repeated in the following book, where Hephaistus performs the same service for Eurymedon: ὑψωθὶ δ᾿ ἀμοὺ / ὑὸν ἐλαφρίζων ἐπερέεσατο γείτονι φηγὺ / νόσφυν ἀπό φλοίβοιο (30.101-3). These scenes have been inspired by the wounding of Sarpedon in the Iliad, who is borne away from the battle by his companions, who seat him under an oak: οἶ μὲν ... Σαρπηδόνα ... ἐταῖροι / εἰσαύν ὑπ᾿ αἰγιόχοιο Δίως περικαλλέτι φηγὺ (E692-3). Dionysus, tearing his hair, sobs over Hymenaius, as did Apollo over Hyacinthus (29.95-9), an association which is made also in the Ampelus episode (11.257). His behaviour seems to imply that the youth is already beyond help, but despair gives way to hope when he discovers that the barbs have not penetrated the flesh. Dionysus' despair and subsequent relief are modelled on Agamemnon's reaction at Δ151-2, but they are in his case ill-founded, seeing that he himself had participated in the preceding act of divine intervention, which ensured that the wound would be little more than a scratch. Nonnus, as often when imitating Homer, is forgetful of the particular circumstances of his own narrative. Dionysus proceeds to tend the wound, and beholding the youth's tearful visage vents his anger on Ares and Melaneus in a lengthy speech, beginning with a statement which again leaves the impression that Hymenaius is on the point of death: ᾨμπελοῦ ἐκτανε ταῦτος, Ἀρῆς ὑμέναιον ὀλέσσει (29.108). This is all the more surprising in view of the fact that he has just discovered the wound to be superficial. The remainder of the speech indicates the depth of his affection for the youth, for he would sooner have all his followers perish than see him dead: αὐθὲ δὲ πάντας ἐπέφυεν (Ἀρῆς), ὡσοὺς ἐκόρυσσα μαχητὰς (29.109), which recalls in essence Achilles' words to Patroclus: αὕτη γὰρ ... μήτε τις ὄνων ἔρων θάνατον φῶνα, ὡσοὶ ἔσσαι, / μήτε τις Ἀργεῖων νών δ᾿ ἐκδύμεν ὀλέθρων (Π97-9). Aristaius specifically he cares little for, seeing that the latter values the travails of the bee over the harvest of the vine (the honey-wine opposition, like that of nectar/wine, being a recurrent theme of the poem, cf.
He accuses Hera of inducing Ares, disguised as Melaneus, to shoot Hymenaius, and, echoing Agamemnon’s statement at Δ170-1, declares that, were Hymenaius to die, he would call off the whole campaign (29.130-1). Then, turning to Hymenaius, he promises that he will slay his killer Melaneus (τεὸν Μελανῆα φονῆα, 29.133), recalling his similar promise to Ampelus to kill the bull which had caused his death (τεὸν ... φονῆα, 11.266). He pleads with Aphrodite to send his brother Apollo to heal Hymenaius, but then abandons the idea for fear of reminding Apollo of his own loss of Hyacinthus, settling instead for Paieon (whom Nonnus, to his credit, distinguishes from Apollo, cf. also 40.401 and 407). He, Dionysus, has also been wounded by the wounding of Hymenaius: ἐν κραδή ἐκ λοίγον ἐλκος ἔχοντι συνυπηθὴν Ὄμεναῖῳ (29.148-9), the λοίγον ἐλκος again intimating that the latter was about to die. The idea has been borrowed from Bion, from where Vian adduces: ἄγριον ἄγριον ἐλκος ἐχει κατὰ μηρὸν Ἄδωνις, / μεῖζον δ’ ἀ Κυθέρεια φέρει ποτικάρδιον ἐλκος (Fun. Adon. 16-7). The appeal to Aphrodite to send one of those great healers turns out to be somewhat gratuitous, as Dionysus forthwith shows himself quite capable of curing Hymenaius without their help: κοῦρον ἀνεζώγρησεν εἰς παιήνοι κισσῷ, / οἶνον ἀλεξητῆρα περιρραίνων Ὅμεναῖῳ (29.155-6), the ἀνεζώγρησεν 'resurrected' suggesting once more that the youth was dead or near death. The παιήνοι κισσῷ appears to be a deliberate reference to Paieon above (29.144) to emphasize Dionysus' powers as healer (cf. also παιήνοι μύθῳ, used of the healing effect of Dionysus' words at 46.361 and 48.234, and of those of Christ at Par. 3.13 and 12.161). The speed with which the cure takes effect is illustrated by a simile copied from Homer: ως δ’ ὕτ’ ὅπος ταχυεργός, ἐπειλομένων γάλα πίθας, / χιονέστης κυκών ἀπαμείρεται ἱγρὸν ἑρσης, / ὅφρα μὲν ἐνυνελε πεπηγμένοις ἀἰτόλος ἀνήρ / κυκλώσας ταλάρους τύπω τροχοειδεί ταρσῶν / ὄς ὄ γε φοίνον ἐλκος ἀκέσσατο Φοιβαδί τεχνῇ (29.157-61). The Φοιβαδί τεχνῇ is, like the παιήνοι κισσῷ, an affirmation of Dionysus' curative powers. In Homer, Paieon heals the wound that Diomedes had inflicted on Ares ως δ’ ὕτ’ ὅπος γάλα λευκόν ἐπειλομένος συνέπθησεν / ἱγρόν ἑόν, μάλα δ’ ὅκα περιτρέφεται κυκώντι, / ως ἄρα
καρπαλίμως ἦσαντο θεοῦ Ἀρη (Ε902-4). Nonnus has in effect glossed Homer's κυκώματι, by specifying the type of person doing the stirring (αἰτόλος δίνηρ). A tendency by the poet to gloss and explain the passages he imitates is evidenced both in the Dionysiaca and Paraphrase, the most conspicuous examples of it being perhaps the ship- and raftbuilding scenes at 36.403-11 and 40.446-54, where in imitating ε247-55 Nonnus has incorporated words in his passages from the scholia to the Homeric passage (cf. Keydell app. crit. ad loc.).

Hymenaius, cured, returns to the battlefield, following Dionysus everywhere like his shadow (ὡς ... τις σκάλεως τύπος διέρος, 29.169), in a sort of reversal of roles (as Vian notes, cf. Not. de ch. 29 pp.202-3), since it was previously Dionysus who followed him. He pays back Melaneus, wounding him with an arrow. Dionysus in the meantime transfixed an Indian and holds him up in the air for Hera to see: ἐν ἡρίη δὲ κελεύθομ / ἵναν ἐλαφρίζων ἡρίημοιν δεικώνον Ἡρη (29.178-9). The word-play ἡρίη / Ἡρη appears to be quite intentional. It may be noted that the name 'Hera' was, according to the Orphics, derived from ἄηρ, in the same way that they deduced 'Athena' from αἰθρ. Vian observes that Dionysus is, in a manner of speaking, getting even with Hera, seeing that the arrow which wounded Hymenaios came ἀπ' ἡρίης (29.78).

The poet now turns his attention to Aristaius, who, being Dionysus' uncle by marriage, is also his rival as a benefactor to mankind, having invented apiculture. His gift to man, honey, vied with Dionysus' wine (cf. 5.242-57, 13.253-77), and he was credited as well with the inception of hunting (5.229-41), the tending of sheep and cattle, and the invention of the olive press (5.258-79). With such impressive accomplishments to his name, it is surprising that he is not accorded more attention in the poem. Nonnus, nevertheless, concedes him a brief aristeia, where he is shown fighting with the tools of the various trades that owe their inception to him: the shepherd's crook, the stone of the olive press, and the beekeeper's bull-roarer (φόμβος). There is, however, no mention of the hunting dogs that he took along with him to use in battle (13.299), though we find Pan fighting with his pack later in the narrative (36.195-6). The Cabeirs, Eurymedon and Alcon, ride into battle on a chariot of adamant drawn by horses of bronze, which their father Hephaistus had fashioned. The eyes of both warriors emit
sparks that bespeak their fiery lineage: Ἡφαίστου δὲ τοκῆς ἐρευνθόμεναι πυρὸς ἄτμῳ / συγγενέας σπυρῆρας ἀνηκόντιζου ὑπωπαί (29.195-6). The notion of eyes emitting sparks, used here (and at 18.261-2 w.r.t. the monster Campe) in their physical sense, is more often used by Nonnus figuratively (cf. 30.254-5, where Hera is described as νοεροῖς σπυρῆρας ἐπιπείοντας Λυαῖοι, and Par. 5.135, where John the Baptist is similarly depicted: κείνος ἱωάννης νοεροῖς σπυρῆρας ἰάλλων).

The description of the Cabeirs' chariot and horses (29.197-204) is inspired jointly by Pindar's (Pyth. 4.225-6) and Apollonius' (3.229-31) depictions of the bulls and ploughshare of Aeetes (cf. for example, χαλκεῖν κροτέωνες ἀρασομένην κόμνην ὀπλῆ, 29.198 and Pindar's χαλκέοις δὲ ὀπλαῖς ἀράσεσκον χόδων ἀμειβόμενοι, 4.226). Eurymedon holds the reins with his left hand and a Lemnian spear in his right. A flashing sword hangs from his side: τὸ εὐφειέσσιν δὲ/μηροῖς/φάσαγιν ἓρωτο σελασφόρον (29.206-7), which statement, Vian notes, appears to be based on μάνθην αἰματὶ/μηροῖ/εὐφεῖς κυήματε (Δ146-7) of the wounded Menelaus. Here we have an example of Nonnus adapting a Homeric description to a context unrelated to the original. Homer's μηροὶ / εὐφεῖς is simply inverted with the metric pattern remaining unchanged. Alcon fights with less conventional weapons, wielding a fiery bolt and swinging a festal torch of Hecate (29.214-5, cf. 32.203, where Echelans fights with a Bacchic torch). Nonnus will return to Eurymedon and Alcon in the next book, but for now returns briefly to the Corybants, whose exploits were described at some length in the previous book. They are introduced in the same way as before, line 29.216 being identical to 28.276. As in the earlier segment, they do battle dancing, war being for them an imitation of the war-dance: φερεσακέος δὲ χορείν / ὅ ἄρεσαν βακχευτῶντα (29.219-21). They are identified with the Curetes, and nearly all of the verses used here seem to have been lifted whole or as half-lines from the passage depicting the feats of the latter by the Astacis lake (14.386-402). This transfer of lines or half-lines is continued even after the poet has finished with the Corybants and passed.

---

14 For the Orphic connotations of these expressions, cf. Gigli -Piccardi (1985) pp. 223-4.
on to describe the feats of the Bassarids (29.225 through to 229). Collart believes that the passage in book 29 is the original and that in book 14 derivative.

Vian is of the opinion that the repetitions are a deliberate attempt to give the text a quaintly Homeric flavour, seeing such verbatim repetitions are commonplace in the Iliad. If this was indeed the poet's intention, it is indeed remarkable that the practice is not evidenced elsewhere in the poem. As we have noted previously, Nonnus is inclined rather to avoid exact verbatim repetition, almost invariably making some change, however minor, in the lines that he reuses. It is thus reasonable to assume that the finishing touches have not been applied and that, given more time, Nonnus would have effected his usual cosmetic changes on the repeated verses, either in book 14 or in book 29.

The Bassarids attack, killing many Indians with their θόρσοι. Leneus cuts off a mountain-top and hurls it at the enemy (29.229-30), this gigantomachy element being a recurrent motif in the Dionysiaca (cf. 28.206-10, 30.227-30, 39.218-9 and 39.340-1). Eupetale smashes iron with ivy: κέντορα κισσόν ἐπευμεν ἄλοιπήρα σιδήρου (29.235), the last two words being a pun on the cliché ἄλοιπήρα σιδήρως, with the destroyer becoming the destroyed. Stesichore dances amid the fighting and, clashing her cymbals, produces a greater noise than the rattle of Heracles (29.240-2), Nonnus possibly having in mind Apollonius 2.1052-7. A comic interlude follows. Trygie (τρυγία 'lees, sediment of wine', L.S.J.), an elderly female tippler, heavy-kneed, gets left behind, her feet frozen with fear. She receives no sympathy from Maron, who wishes rather that she fall by Deriades' spear, for all she could do was hinder the dances of the Corybants and Satyrs. Calyce ('flower-cup', cf. κισσόο ... καλύκεσσι, Theocr. 3.23) fights beside Dionysus, but Oinone is too drunk to be of much use. The tide of battle now turns in favour of the Indians, something that we would not expect to happen while
Dionysus was present, for the Bacchantes are elsewhere shown losing their invincibility only in his absence (as in books 32-35, during his bout of insanity and in book 45, during his purported imprisonment by Pentheus). Astraia's chases Staphyle, Celaineus ('the black one') Calyce, while Morpheus wreaks havoc among the Sileni. One shout from Morpheus suffices to dizzy Astraia, put Maron to flight and make Leneus (who a little before showed himself capable of shearing off mountain tops) collapse. As earlier in the case of Hymenaius, Dionysus tends to the wounded. Vian draws attention to a parallel case of the commander-in-chief tending to his wounded in Lucan's Pharsalia, where Caesar is described doing likewise (7.566-7). Some of Dionysus' wounded Bacchantes appear to be divine, others mortal. Thus Dionysus stays the flow of ichor from Eupetale's wound, but blood from Staphyle's. Calybe's life is saved, but for Lycaste Dionysus can do no more than mourn her passing. The play on names continues where possible. Thus Myto is healed with myrtle: Μυρτοὺς δ' ουταμένην παλάμην ἱήσατο μύρτω  
(29.270). Having healed his wounded followers, Dionysus fights with renewed vigour. A flame playing in the hair of a Bacchante testifies to her Bacchic ardour (29.280-1), a phenomenon which we have discussed above (p. 70). The Indians refuse to be dislodged at first, countering the din of the Corybants' cymbals and Pan's pipes with noise of their own. The battle rages: λίγξε βίος, βομμησε λίθος, μυκήσατο σάλπιγξ (29.290), echoing Homer's λίγξε βίος, νευρή δὲ μέγ' ἱαχεν, ἄλτο δ' ὀστόσ (Δ125). We note that Nonnus has inserted two of his favourite sound words βόμβησε and μυκήσατο, of which he will soon to make much use in book 43. The impasse is broken by a mighty shout from Dionysus (29.291-5), Nonnus being rather fond of this Homeric motif, as we have indicated earlier (pp. 82-3 ). The rally of Dionysus' followers is prefaced by the statement: ἄλλ' ὀτε δὴ πόρων ἰζον, ὅτι πεφορημένοις ὀλκῷ / λευκῶν ὑδρο μεθύοντι ῥῶς φοίνιξεν ῶδάσπης (29.291-2), in what appears to be a conscious echo of Φ1.2. The Homeric statement, which ushers in the μάχη παραπτάμος in the Iliad, was previously used by Nonnus to introduce his own version of this event at 22.1-3. The present segment, too, has a vague resemblance to the μάχη παραπτάμος theme in that some of the Indians are said to meet their doom in the river, others in the plain: στρατὶ δ' ἐμερίζετο Βάκχου, / δυσμενέας
κτείνωσα καὶ ἐν δαπέδῳ καὶ Ὑδάσπη (29.297-8), reflecting Φ3-10. The theme is not developed further. Dionysus issues a challenge to Deriades to meet him in single combat, the challenge being preceded by a brief synecisis, in which Dionysus considers himself to be as superior to Deriades as Zeus is to the Hydaspes. He boasts too of his ability to ride to the clouds and strike the moon. There is almost a touch of comedy in the concluding words εἰ δὲ μέγα φρονέεις μεθέτων κεραλκέα μορφήν, / εἰ δύνασαι, προμάχιζε βοοκραίρῳ Διονύσῳ (29.309-10), which conjure up images of two bulls locking horns.

Dionysus and his followers now forge ahead unstoppably, Pan tearing open the belly of Melaneus, who though wounded a little while before by Hymenaius' arrow, seems to have rejoined the battle. His death in this fashion parallels the way in which Dionysus vowed to kill the bull that had gored Ampelus (11.268-70). Dionysus now lives up to his boast to expand himself to such prodigious size as to touch the clouds: ἄλοτε μηκόνων ταναῦν δέμας, αἰθέρι γείτων / καὶ νεφέων ἔφαυσε καὶ ἦματο χερσὶν Ὀλύμπου / καὶ χοιλῆς ταρσοῦ ἐπῆξε καὶ ἴρα τύπτη καρῆς (29.319-22). He appears prone to such displays: at 40.83 he is ἱσος Παρνησιδῆ πέτρη as he faces Deriades; at 45.134-5 he is ἱφυσίλεον ἄχρις Ὀλύμπου, / νύσσων ἦριὼν νεφέων σκέπασα as he confronts the Tyrrhenian pirates; and finally, in his showdown with Perseus at 47.657-61: ἱψώσας δ᾽ ἱόβακχος ἐὼν δέμας, αἰθέρι γείτων ... αἰθέρι χείρα πέλασσε, καὶ ὑμίλησεν Ὀλύμπῳ, / καὶ νεφέλας ἐθλίψε. There is a comic streak to these depictions, an observation that is underlined by the fact that (as noted previously, p. 42), the ἱψώσας δ᾽ ἱόβακχος ἐὼν δέμας is clearly intended to recall βατράχος ἱψώσας χρυσόν δέμας in the Batrachomyomachy (40), a comic poem. The topos derives from Homer's depiction of Eris: ἦ γ᾽ ὁλίγη μὲν πρώτα κορόσσεται, αὐτάρ ἐπεῖτα / οὐρανῷ ἐστηρίζε κάρη καὶ ἐπιχθοῦ βαίνει (Δ442-3), but Nonnus seems rather to have been influenced by Callimachus' rendering of it: Δαμάτηρ δ᾽ ἄφατον πτι κοτέσσατο, γείνατο δ᾽ ἁ ἥθεος / ὑματα μὲν χέρσω, κεφαλά δὲ οἱ ἄφατ᾽ Ὀλύμπῳ (6.57-8). At this stage it seems that Dionysus will, once for all, crush Deriades and the Indians and bring the war to a close. This is not to be, however, as nightfall interrupts the
hostilities (29.323–4). The idea of κόλος μάχι, which, incidentally, recurs at 36.391, is borrowed from Θ487-9, where Hector's apparently unstoppable advance on the Greek camp is stayed by nightfall.

The book ends with an episode that is essentially a digression, the deception of Ares. Like the story of the weaving of Aphrodite at the end of book 24, it is inspired by the moicheia in the Odyssey (θ266-366), but is at the same time a counterpart of the deception of Zeus in books 31-32. The removal of Ares from the battle seems somewhat inadequately motivated at the present stage, seeing that he has so far done little to influence its outcome. It is only after his return that he assists the Indians in any tangible way, with his mighty shout (32.176) and by actively slaying the Bassarids (35.98-9). The story, which portrays Hephaistus as the adulterer and Ares as the deceived husband, has all the hallmarks of a rhetorical exercise of the kind where the student is required to prove his adeptness in writing the converse of some well known episode from epic or from history. Rheia informs Ares in a dream that through Athena's connivance Aphrodite has returned to the embraces of her former husband Hephaistus, Athena having brought about this reconciliation in order to avert another attempt on her virtue by the latter (i.e. like that which had resulted in the birth of Erichthonius). Ares is advised to trap Hephaistos in the same way that the latter had trapped him. Rheia nettles him by recalling what the other gods had said as they witnessed his predicament on that occasion. Her statement ἀνδροφόνον γὰρ ὅ βραδὸς ὅκιν Ἀρης παρέδραμε (29.346-7) echoes the remarks of one of the bystanders as he beholds Ares tied down in bed with Aphrodite: κιχάνει τοι βραδὸς ὅκιν ὅς καὶ νῦν Ἡφαίστος ἔως βραδὺς εἶλεν Ἀρης ὅ κυτατόν περ ἕοντα θεῶν οἱ Ὀλυμπὸν ἔχουσι ξελὸς ἔως τέχνησι (θ329-32). He should ask the Cyclopes to contrive a trap, ποινητοὶ δεσμοῦ (29.255), similar to the one that had been used on him (the ποινητοὶ probably alluding to the payment of the μοιχάγρια (θ332), which Hephaistus stipulated as the condition for freeing Ares). Ares on waking takes off in his chariot together with Phobus and Deimus. He fears that Aphrodite's face may be so covered by soot from Hephaistus' forge as to be unrecognisable, a comic touch in the manner of Lucian, who (Dial. Deorum 5.4) speaks of Hephaistus' visage being so black with soot that no one would dare kiss
him.

Book 30 opens with the resumption of hostilities that had been interrupted by nightfall. Dionysus dances into battle to reap a black harvest of Indians: ἀκοντιστήρι δὲ θυρσῷ / κυκάνης ἡμησε θαλώσια δημοτήτος (30.5-6), recalling the earlier action of Aiacus, who κυκάνης ἡμησε σκηνέρα λήμα χάρμης (22.361). Morreus, distraught at the apparent invincibility of Dionysus and his followers, voices his concerns to Deriades, expressing the wish that he could exchange his weapons for those of the enemy (30.24-6), a wish that he later repeats in different circumstances to Chalcomeda (35.153-4). Deriades' laconic reply is both mocking and threatening: τί τρομεῖς Διόνυσον ἀπευχέα, νησίε Μορρεῦ; / ἡδυς ὁ δεμαίνων Σατύρων παίζουσαν ἐνυῖ (30.41-2). He is a ruler who obtains compliance with his wishes through fear, ἀπειλῆ being the operative word in his relations with his subjects. His speech to his commanders in book 36 is referred to by that word (36.138), as is his short reply to Morreus in the present instance (30.43). We might note that in book 40 the roles are reversed, this time it being Morreus (i.e. Athena disguised as Morreus) who does the mocking and chiding (40.11-30) and Deriades the complaining (40.37-60). Morreus is emboldened to the point of invincibility by Deriades' reply, wreaking havoc among Dionysus' followers. He is described as being of monstrous proportions: ἰσοφυὴς Τυφών πέλωρ βακχεύετο Μορρεύς (30.58), something which the poet reiterates at 34.180-3: οὐ γὰρ ἐπικθονίοσων ὁμοίως ἐπέλευ Μορρεύς, / ... / ἡμβάτων Τυφώνος ἐχῦν αὐτόχθονα φύτην. These descriptions are clearly inspired by Apollonius' depiction of Amycus: ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν ἢ ὀλοοὶο Τυφώεος, ἢ καὶ αὐτῆς / Γαῖς εἶναι ἐκτὸ πέλωρ τέκος (2.38-9). Morreus is accorded a lengthy aristeia during which he is well nigh irresistible (if we allow for the temporary set-back at the hands of Hephaistus). Dionysus' presence on the battlefield being apparently insufficient to infuse his followers with enough Bacchic fervour for any of them to take him to task. He attacks and wounds Eurymedon; Alcon promptly comes to the aid of his stricken brother. The theme of brother protecting brother occurs previously at 28.58-62, where Phlogius takes shelter behind his brother's shield, the incident being explicitly likened by the poet to that where Teucer takes shelter behind Ajax' shield in the Iliad. As we have
already noted, Nonnus not infrequently imitates the same Iliadic passage twice, sometimes more often. He echoes Homer rather closely here: Ἄλκιων οὖκ ἀμέλησε κασιγνήτου πεσόντος, ἀλλὰ βιαζόμενῳ πρόμος ἠμιθεὺν ἔχος ἀεὶρων / καὶ σάκος εὐδίνητων ὀλον δ’ ἐκάλυπτε μαχητήν, ἀσπίδα πυργώσας δέμας ἀνέρος ... γνωτῷ γνωτός ὄμων (30.49-54), which corresponds to Ἀλας δ’ οὖκ ἀμέλησε κασιγνήτου πεσόντος, ἀλλὰ θέων περίβη καὶ οἱ σάκος ἀμφικάλυψεν (θ330-1). Ajax's shield is elsewhere described as being ἀμφί πυργος (cf. for example H219), a notion which Nonnus has sought to indicate with his πυργώσας. Another Homeric reminiscence follows in the form of a simile: καὶ οὐταμένῳ περιβαίνων, /οὰ περὶ σκύμνοις λέων, βρυχήσατο λαμψή (30.54-5), which is taken from the other memorable scene where Ajax shields the body of Patroclus from Hector: Ἀλας δ’ ἀμφὶ Μενοιτάδη σάκος εὐρὰ καλύψας / ἔστήκει, ὡς τὸς τε λέων περὶ οἰσι τέκεσθιν (P132-3). Morrheus now attacks both brothers at once, but Eurymedon calls on their father Hephastus to help, reminding him how he had once protected his anvil and tongs from Demeter. Hephastus responds by scorching Morrheus, whose body is engulfed in flame (30.78-85). As we have noted previously (p. 28), this scene, like that of the scorching of the Hidaspe and of Deriades (40.323-8), is an expression of the fire-water opposition, which is a leitmotiv in the poem. In the present instance the Hidaspe, who has been watching the fight from the top of a cliff ταυροφυῆς νόθων ἔδος ἔχων βροτοειδεὶ μορφῇ (30.89), comes to the rescue of Morrheus, χέων ἄντιπνοον ὄδυρον το δουσε τινά τινα The Hidaspe protects him by covering his suffering limbs with a dark cloud, πορφυρῆς ἕφελγη κεκαφηντά γυῖα καλύψας (30.94), which is an echo from the Homeric hymn to Hermes, where Apollo searches for the stolen cattle πορφυρῆς ἕφελγη κεκαλυμμένης έυξεος ὄμων (217). Hidaspe does not wish to see Deriades lose both his sons-in-law, having lost Orontes earlier (30.97-9). The present segment is peculiar in that it has two mutually opposed acts of

48 We note that one of the three shapes assumed by the river Achelous in Sophocles' Trachiniae was that of a man with a bull's visage: ἄλλωτ’ ἄνδρεως κύτει / βοῦππωρος (12-3); cf. also Statius' depiction of the Ismenus: steit arguus alto / amne manuque genas et nixa virentibus ulvis / comua concutiens (Theb. 9.418-20).
divine intervention, representative of the fire-water opposition. It is unusual also in that here water emerges as the winner, Morpheus being saved to continue the fight. Morpheus, undaunted by his experience, takes to the field at once (30.105-7). We note that Dariades acts with similar defiance after his first duel with Dionysus (36.386-9). He slays the dancer Phlogius (who is to be distinguished from the Indian of the same name), and, as he beholds his death agony, addresses his victim with a mocking speech, suggesting that he entertain Persephone with his art (30.118-24).

The poet leaves Morpheus to wreak havoc among the Sileni and turns his attention to another Indian, Tecaphus, who has likewise been distinguishing himself on the battlefield. Tecaphus, whose imprisonment in an underground dungeon and rescue from death by starvation through the inventiveness of his daughter Eerie, who breastfeeds him, thereby eluding the watchfulness of his jailers, is the highlight of book 26, meets his fate at the hands of Eurymedon.\(^9\) Tecaphus' story, a quintessential example of filial piety, was well known in antiquity in various forms.\(^9\) The present scene, involving his daughter's inability to save him a second time, forms a tragic sequel to the events narrated in book 26, and resembles in its pathos the scenes of Indian lamentation in books 24 and 40. The tragic tone of these passages stands in marked contrast with the generally mock serious character of the poem as a whole. Eurymedon strikes Tecaphus on the forehead, splitting it open, but that notwithstanding, Tecaphus has time to address Eerie, who witnesses the slaying from the walls, with a carefully constructed speech. Mindful of the role she had played during his subterranean confinement, he addresses her as μητέρ ἐμή καὶ μαία, which elicits the response υἱὲ πάτερ from Eerie. Employing an antithetic mode of speech he asks his daughter why she does not come to him as he lies dying as she had when he was alive: ἵ ἀνα φιλάσσεις / πιστὰ τε ἐν ἡμῶν καὶ οὐ θυσίσκομεν τοκῆ; (30.153-4). Having once outwitted Dariades' guards, she should now seek a way to outwit

---

\(^9\) Tecaphus' involvement in the Indian war is attested in Dionysius: καὶ τότε Βαλιγναμι 

\(^9\) Pliny recounts the story of a Roman woman who saved her mother in this fashion (Nat. Hist. 7.36). Hyginus speaks of Xanthippe saving her father in like manner (Fab. 254)
Hades, as if there were a way to return from *that* pit, whence no one returns: *eí têle vóstimos õímos ánostítito berêbrou* (30.159). The speech is marked by the antitheses ζώοντι / θνήσκοντι and νóstimos / ánostítito, which give the address a distinctly rhetorical flavour. He refers to Eerie as δύσγαμε (30.150), which is rather puzzling, seeing that she is losing a father and not a husband. Nonnus appears to have been influenced by Andromache’s remarks on the death of Hector (cf. ἐγὼ δύστην Ξ477 and σὺ τ’ ἐγὼ τε δυσάμωρον Ξ485). Eerie makes the usual physical gestures of grief, putting ashes on her head, ripping her dress and tearing her hair (30.163-5), which are later repeated by Orsiboe as she grieves for Deriades (40.104-7), both passages being inspired by Χ78-9 and 406-7, where Hecuba manifests her grief in the same way. Not even in tragic scenes of this sort will Nonnus forego the opportunity to remark on Indian racial characteristics (cf. σκολιὴν ... κόμην 30.163 and σκολιῆς ... ἡθείρης, κυανέους ... βραχίονας 40.104, 106). She voices her despair in rhetorical clichés that detract from the pathos of a situation which demands spontaneity and naturalness, not studied juxtapositions: ποίον ἔχω γλάγος ἄλλο φερέσθην, ὦ ἐπι δειλή / ψυχήν ὑμετέρην παλινάγρετον εἰς σὲ κομίσω ; / ποίον ἐγὼ πάλιν ἄλλον ἁρηγόνα μαζ&omicron;ν ὀρέξω ; (30.169-71). The speech is marked by the anaphora of ἄλλο and πάλιν, so as to juxtapose all the steps she takes now with those that she took on the previous occasion. She promises to kill herself so that she can accompany him to the nether regions: σοί, πατέρ, ἐν γέρας ἄλλο φυλάσσεται ... σὺ δὲ κταμένης σέο κούρης / δέξο καὶ αὐχένος αἶμα μετὰ προτέρου γάλα μαζ&omicron; (30.173-5), appeals to Deriades’ guards to show her another subterranean dungeon from where she might retrieve her father a second time: δείξατε μοι μυχῶν ἄλλον ἔσω χθονός, ἥχι μολούσα / νεκρόν ἐμον γειετήρα πάλιν ζώοντα τελέσσω (30.177-8), and concludes her speech with the wish that her father’s killer slay her as well, so that somebody might say: "καὶ γειέτην καὶ παίδα μὴ πρῆγε μαχαίρη ", the pithy quotation adding further to the overall artificiality of the speech. Overuse of rhetorical devices notwithstanding, the speech is free of the flippancy that characterises so many of the speeches in the poem, and conveys something of the sense of tragedy
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demanded by the situation.

Nonnus now returns to the aristeia of Morrhueus, who continues his devastating forays into the ranks of Dionysus' followers, killing Dasyllius and the maiden Alcimacheia, who had brought Hera's rage on herself by thrashing her statue with her thyrsus. The beautiful Codone meets the same fate at Morrhueus' hand, the Indian paying no attention to her ἀνατείλοντος δάφνεως (30.219). Her youth is recalled at 33.53, where she is judged to have departed πρωταίρως before attaining the fulness of womanly beauty. Both her and Alcimacheia are recalled at 35.376-7. Ravaged female beauty forms one of the recurrent themes in the poem, especially in the segment dealing with the Indian war. Nonnus dwells on the suffering endured by the Bassarids at the hands of the Indians, the depictions, more often than not, having sexual overtones (cf. for instance, 34.223ff. and 35.21ff.). Morrhueus forthwith slays Eurypyle, Sterope, Soe and Staphyle, all of whom are no more than names, appearing only in the present passage. He wounds Gigarto, who is previously mentioned in relation to Lycurgus (21.76-9) and again at 33.15-6, 52-3, where she is spoken of conjointly with Codone as if already dead or in the thraces of death. Also wounded is Melictaine, who is like the first three, merely a name, appearing only here. It is difficult to understand how the Bacchantes, who are susceptible to such outrages only in Dionysus' absence, could be depicted as being at the mercy of Morrhueus, when (as the narrative leads us to believe) Dionysus is present among them. Seeing that traditionally the very presence of Dionysus sufficed to make his votaries invincible, it would seem logical for Nonnus to have postponed the aristeias of the Indians till after the removal of Dionysus from the field in book 32. The poet has, quite clearly, chosen not to do so, indicating once again his indifference in matters of narrative consistency.

Now follows another gigantomachy segment, this time involving the Telchines, who had once fulfilled the same role for Poseidon as the Corybants had for Zeus. Their mode of fighting with boulders and mountain tops (30.227-30) parallels that of the Cyclopes in book 28 (28.240 and 266) and of Leneus(29.299). Single out in Deriades' speech along with the Cyclopes (27.105-9), the Telchines play no further role in the narrative, except that one of them, Lycus, is mentioned at 39.12-
3, riding into the naval battle, having earlier been appointed admiral of Dionysus' fleet (36.417-21). Hera now intervenes to turn the tide of battle decisively in favour of the Indians. She bolsters the self-assuredness of Deriades and makes a flame glow about his helmet and shield to strike terror into his opponents: "Ἡρη δ' ἐπιβρίζουσα Λυαίω / δόκε μένος καὶ θάρσος ἀγήνορι Δηριαδῆι, / καὶ οἱ ἀριστεύσαντες σελασφόροι ύπασεν αἰγλην / εἰς φόβοιν ἀντιβιοστικοῦσμενον δὲ φορηὸς / ἀσπίδος Ἰνδήσης ἀμαρώσατο φοίνος αἰγλη, / καὶ κυνής σελάγιζεν ύπὲρ λόφου ἀλλομενην φλόξ (30.231-6). Nonnus has imitated the scenes from the Iliad where Athena bolsters the stature of Diomedes (and later, of Achilles) in this manner. We note that Athena Διομήδηι ... / δόκε μένος καὶ θάρσος ... δαίε οἱ έκ κόρῳς τε καὶ ἀσπίδος ἀκάματων πυρ (Ε1-4). Dionysus, sensing Hera's involvement, takes fright, relapsing into that state of timidity which he had experienced in his earlier confrontation with Lycurgus. In both instances Hera is described as ἐπιβρίζουσα Λυαίω (30.231 and 20.347). The glow about Deriades has the same effect on Dionysus as did the sound of thunder which accompanied Lycurgus' onslaught. He makes for the woods (30.247), as he does later when overcome by madness (32.125-6), but Athena's prompt intervention ensures that his disgrace is short-lived this time. At the behest of Zeus, Athena comes down from heaven to check Dionysus' flight and restore his spirits; standing behind him she grasbs him by his blond hair: ἡλθε δ' Ἱθήνη / οὐρανόθεν πρὸ γὰρ ἤκε διάκτορον ύψιμέδων Ζεύς, / ... στη δ' ὀπίθεν, ξανθῆς δὲ κόμης ἐδράξατο Βάκχου, / μοῦνω φαινομένη βλοσυρήθεις (30.249-54). This is an evocation of the scene from the first book of the Iliad, where Athena holds back Achilles by the hair to stop him from attacking Agamemnon: ἡλθε δ' Ἱθήνη / οὐρανόθεν πρὸ γὰρ ἤκε θεὰ λευκώλενος / Ηρη / ... στη δ' ὀπίθεν, ξανθῆς δὲ κόμης ἐλε Πηλείωνα, / οἶοι φαινομένῃ (A194-8). We note that the situations depicted are diametrically opposed: whereas Achilles is being restrained from attacking, Dionysus is being held back from fleeing. It is possible that Nonnus has deliberately used the Homeric passage to highlight the inherent cowardice of Dionysus, by placing his action in direct contrast to that of Achilles. In the speech which follows, Athena compares
Dionysus' behaviour adversely with that of Aiacus, who exemplifies the traditional heroic qualities and acts as a foil to Dionysus at various stages of the narrative. Athena upbraids Dionysus for his cowardice and expresses dissatisfaction, at the same time, with the lack of progress shown hitherto by his campaign (30.261-2), her remarks recalling the earlier recriminations of Rheia (25.327ff.). Perseus and Aiacus are shown forth as examples, the first for his achievements, the second for his valour. We note that Perseus' achievements were previously used by Staphylus as means of stirring Dionysus to action (18.289ff.), though more by way of exhortation than recrimination as here. Athena continues with references to her own and Dionysus' father Zeus, who never shirked battle, and to Rheia, who is still waiting to see Orsiboe and Cheirobie captive. Athena will not deign to call a fleeing Dionysus her brother (30.287-8), a tactic she will again employ later, when, disguised as Morrheus, she upbraids the fleeing Deiriades in the same way, expressing shame at being known as his son-in-law (40.23-4).

Athena's speech induces Dionysus to return to the fray, his courage restored. A brief aristeia follows, introduced in the Homeric manner: ἔνθα τίνα πρῶτον, τίνα δ' ὑπατον ἐκτανε Βάκχος; (30.296), echoing ἔνθα τίνα πρῶτον, τίνα δ' ὑπάτων ἐξεναρικαν (E703) and used previously with respect to Oiaurus (22.187). A list of wounded or slain Indians follows, whole contingents of the enemy being thrown into disarray. One Indian, Meilanion, he wounds as the latter, concealed in a tree (somewhat like Pentheus later in the narrative), shoots at the Bassarids κρυφύσον... ἑλέμυνοις (30.319). He is saved by Hera as a recompense for his previous stealthy attacks on the Bacchantes. The Indians are now in overall disarray, a situation that propels Hera toward taking more radical measures in the books that follow.
Chapter 4: books 31-35.

Books 31 to 35, encompassing the period of Dionysus' insanity, form a self-contained segment, which exhibits a considerable measure of dramatic unity, within the broader framework of the *Indicad* as a whole. Unlike the preceding books, which depict events in a linear way, we have here a genuine plot: Hera displays all her powers of persuasion, marshalling the assistance of various gods to deceive Zeus and temporarily remove him from the action by putting him to sleep; she then secures from Persephone the services of Megaira to induce insanity in Dionysus, removing him from the fray. Dionysus, without Zeus to protect him, quickly falls victim to Hera's machinations, but the traffic is not all one-way, as Aphrodite, responding to the pleas of one of her attendant Graces to help his beleaguered followers, effectively removes the Indian champion Morrheus from the field by overwhelming him with passion for the nymph Chalcomeda. Nonnus has quite adeptly combined the theme of Dionysus' madness with the Homeric Διός ἀπάτη, at the same time incorporating a romance modelled on the Apollo-Daphne theme into the narrative. The Morrheus-Chalcomeda story is, as the poet himself intimates (33.210ff.), a replica of that of Apollo and Daphne. Seeing that Ovid has left us a radiant version of the latter, it is tempting to assume that Nonnus used it as the model for the Morrheus-Chalcomeda episode, especially seeing that several of Ovid's witty turns of phrase appear to be echoed in the latter. As appears to be his usual practice in respect of the Homeric passages that he imitates, Nonnus has imitated the Διός ἀπάτη twice (or three times, if we count the little story of the ἀπάτη Ἀρεώς at the end of book 29). The first instance involves Hera's use of the girdle of Apare or Deceit to persuade Semele to insist that her lover Zeus reveal himself in his full might to her, which results in her incineration and in the first, premature, birth of Dionysus (8.109-77). The present instance is a much closer and more extensive rendering of the Homeric theme. Nonnus has both paraphrased and amplified the original, introducing, in his usual manner, additional speeches into the story. As in the earlier adaptation in book 8, Hera's speeches are studied examples of the rhetoric of persuasion, in which the personal grievances of the addressees are cleverly exploited to demonstrate why it is in their interest too
that they lend a hand to her. The tendency to multiply the participants of the action is also in evidence, with Nonnus assigning active roles to characters who are merely peripheral to Homer's account. Thus Iris, who in Homer only makes an appearance at the very end of the episode, to convey Zeus' message to Poseidon to withdraw from the fray (O55-8), is assigned an active role from the start, being given firstly the task of finding Hypnus, and then, disguised as his mother Night, of persuading him to put Zeus asleep on Hera's behalf. Nonnus appears quite obsessed with the notion of false identities. Whilst it is expected that the gods should assume various guises in their relations with mortals, it is somewhat less believable that they should be able to conceal their true identities in this way from their fellow immortals.

The story commences with Hera observing the suffering of the Indians on the banks of the Indus, and the λείψανα of the deeds of that other bastard son of Zeus, Perseus, sights which so incense her that she embarks on a plan to divert Zeus' attention from the battlefield by putting him to sleep for a day, so that she carn deliver a telling blow to Dionysus' cause. The situation is thus the converse of that in the Iliad, where Hera, elated at seeing Poseidon fighting for the Greeks, embarks on this course of action to forestall the possibility of Zeus noticing his brother and ordering him to desist. Nonnus has closely entwined Hera's deception of Zeus with her visit to the underworld to enlist the services of the Furies. Evidence for such a visit occurs elsewhere in extant literature only in Vergil and Ovid. Hera is portrayed in the former as one who would stop at nothing to destroy those who had offended her, as had the Trojans, even if it meant canvassing the support of the infernal gods: 'flectere si nequeo Superos, Acheronta movebo' (Aen. 7.313). Here again the possibility that Nonnus was influenced by the Latin poets presents itself. The correspondences with Vergil and Ovid may be observed at: 31.5-7 (Hera beholding a sight that rouses her anger), 31.30-97 (her visit to Persephone) and 32.98-109 (the assault of the Fury). Braune, the great proponent of Latin influence on Nonnus,¹ does not examine the above passages, but Otis in his book on Ovid is convinced that they constitute the most tangible indication yet of direct Ovidian influence. Commenting on Braune's omission of this episode from his list of Ovidian parallels, he deems it "a far more impressive demonstration

¹ See his 'Nonnos und Ovid', 1935 and 'Nonno e Claudiano', 1948.
of his general thesis of Nonnus' dependence on Ovid than the episodes he does treat." 2 Otis assumes that the visit to the underworld is an invention of Vergil's, which Ovid subsequently adapted for his Athamas and Ino story, which in turn served as the source for Nonnus. Owing to the loss of so much ancient literature, the assumption is somewhat debatable, nor is there anything to indicate that Nonnus obtained his version exclusively from Ovid. His version seems indeed to share some features with Vergil's that do not appear in Ovid. We note that in both Nonnus and Vergil Hera is depicted flying through the air, when she beholds, far below, a scene that so angers her as to impel her to seek the assistance of the infernal powers: κατέγραφεν ἥρα ταρσῷ / αὐτόθι παπταίνουσα ... στρατὸν ἱνδῶν / θύροιοι ... ἀλοιθέντα Άυαν (31.5-7), which corresponds schematically to: auraque inventa tenebat, / et laetum Aenean classemque prospexit .../ moliri iam tecta videt, iam fidere terrae, / deseruisse rates (Aen. 7.287-91). There is no corresponding scene to trigger Juno's visit to the underworld in Ovid, where she simply acts out of long-standing resentment. In both Nonnus and Vergil she addresses a particular individual there (Persephone/Allecto), while in Ovid she speaks to the Furies collectively. The correspondences with Ovid, on the other hand, reside in the fact that in both poems it is Dionysus who is at the root of Hera's resentment and in the way that the Fury is depicted. Nonnus' καὶ κεφαλῆς ἔλειξε, δρακοντείων δὲ κομάων / φρικτὰ τινασσομένων ἐπεσύρισε λοίγος ἥξῳ / καὶ σκοπῆν ἐρραινὸν ἐρημάδα πῖδαξ ίου (32.104-5), parallels Ovid's 'caesariemque excussit, motae sonuere colubrae. / ... / sibila dant saniemque vomunt linguasque coruscant' (Met. 4.491-3). As the details relating to the onset of the Furies were likely to have been of a stereotyped nature, no great store can be set by the above correspondence on its own, but when placed within the context of other coincidences between the Dionysiaca and the Metamorphoses, it is indeed significant. Hera, on arriving in Hades, gives two speeches, one addressed to Persephone, the other to Megaira. The speeches have little in common with Juno's brief address to Allecto in Vergil, and her even briefer address, relayed in indirect speech, to the Furies in Ovid. The twin notions of injustice and outrage, which permeate Hera's addresses in Nonnus, do, however, have a precedent in
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Juno's monologue prior to the visit in Vergil (Aen. 7.293-322). Hera portrays herself as the affronted goddess to Persephone, telling her how fortunate she is to reside in her underworld realm and not have to witness the inroads of mortals, by Zeus' connivance, into Olympus. Zeus' indifference to Ares being confined in a jar by Otos and Ephialtes and to the fate of Zagreus, the legitimate Dionysus, are adduced as examples of his injustice. Hera then reminds Persephone that she, too, has cause to be offended, seeing that her mother Demeter had been upstaged on the banks of the Nile by yet another mortal upset, Io. Then, somewhat in contradiction to her original remark about Persephone being fortunate to be in Hades, Hera tells her that she had been given a raw deal in being consigned there, when the mortal upset, Semele, is allotted a place in the starry heavens: Κρονίδης πόλων ἄστρων / ἔδων πόρευ Σεμέλη καὶ Τάρταρα Περσεφονεῖ (31.50). Persephone, swayed by Hera's words, grants her Megaira's services, and as the two fly off, Hera draws the Fury's attention to the plight of the pious Indians and to the injustice of Zeus, who allows the Tyrrhenian pirates and the murderous Dryopes to thrive, while consigning the former to destruction. We note that Hera's view of the Indians is the very opposite of Zeus', who, as we recall, assigns Dionysus the task of bringing to heel the δίκης ἀδίδακτον ἰπερφιάλων γένος Ἤσσων (13.3).

Megaira (presumably briefed by Hera of her plan) assumes the shape of an owl and hides in a cleft in the Caucasus until such time as she knows Zeus to be asleep (31.98-102). One is immediately reminded of Hypnus in the Iliad assuming the appearance of a bird and biding his time in a tall pine until called to put Zeus to sleep (II 286-91). With Megaira in hiding, Hera seeks out Iris, who, when found, is told to look for Hypnus in the west and in Lemnus (31.112-3). Lemnus is, incidentally, where Hera finds Hypnus in the Iliad (II 225-30). Iris is to impersonate Hypnus' mother Night and promise him the hand of Pasithea in return for his cooperation. Nonnus omits mentioning Hera's initial offer of chair and footstool in the Iliad, which Hypnus rejected. Iris finds Hypnus at Orchomenus, paying court to Pasithea, and assumes the form of Night as instructed. Night figures in Homer's account only by way of a retrospective mention, as having interceded on behalf of Hypnus when Zeus had threatened to hurl him into the sea.
for putting him to sleep on a previous occasion at Hera's behest (Ξ256-61). Iris's speech to Hypnus resembles Hera's speech to Persephone, in so far as she draws his attention to the affronts suffered by him and his mother Night, in the way that Hera had drawn Persephone's attention to the affronts suffered by her and her mother Demeter. Dionysus' followers offend Night by the light of their torches and Hypnus by their sleeplessness. The speech is punctuated by a mocking refrain: ἡπτενε, τι πανδαμάτωρ κικλήσκεαι; (31.143 and 158), and evinces Nonnus' liking for contrastive juxtapositions, viz. ἡματίη Νύξ (151), ἀθέλγεα θέλεων (154). The kinship of the Indians with Hypnus and Night is deduced from their shared attribute of darkness (cf. Γηγενέων δ' ἐλέαιρε γονήν μελανόχρουν ἱνδὼν ... ὑμετέρης γαρ ὁμόχρος εἰς τεκοῦσθα, 31.173-5) and they face a common enemy in Dionysus. Hypnus and Deriades are kinsmen, seeing that Hypnus is the neighbour of Tethys, the spouse of Oceanus, who is the grandfather of Deriades. We recall that Nonnus used a similar geographical argument in his syncrisis of Dionysus and Perseus, when he gave as one reason for the deeds of Dionysus being superior to those of Perseus the fact that they were performed in the east rather than in the west (25.98-104). This type of flippant logic, based on capricious associations, is reminiscent of the style of Ovid's Metamorphoses, the similarity being further underlined by the use of clever juxtapositions of the sort indicated above. Tethys and Oceanus, whose alleged falling out was Hera's excuse to Zeus for undertaking her journey in the Iliad (Ξ301-11), will be mentioned again at a later stage, in Hera's speech to Zeus (32.52-5), that is to say, in the context in which they are referred to in the Iliad. Hypnus is told not to be afraid of Zeus in what is obviously an allusion to Hypnus' speech to Hera in the Iliad, where he voices his misgivings about putting Zeus to sleep again in view of what had happened on the previous occasion he had done so (Ξ247-62). Eros, the other god enjoying the epithet πανδαμάτωρ, is adduced as the model to emulate, since he is not afraid to shoot his little arrow into Zeus.

Hypnus is so completely won over by Iris' arguments that he even offers to put Zeus to sleep for three days, an offer which Iris prudently declines. We would expect him to accompany Iris back to Hera, so that the two of them could go to
Zeus as in Homer (Ξ281-3), but Nonnus somewhat inexplicably states that he stayed where he had been all along (at Orchomenus): ἄψεσθι δ' ἵππος ἐμὶ μὲν, δεδεμένος εὐγαμον ὑπνόν (31.196). We note that Homer Hypnus waits concealed in a tall pine close to Zeus; ἵππος μὲν ἐμείνει πάροι Διὸς ὁσε ἰδέσθαι (Ξ286). Iris returns alone to Hera (31.197-8), who sets out to find Aphrodite (the gods appear to be continually roaming about in Nonnus' account, having invariably to be searched for, cf. 31.106, 113, and 202). Aphrodite greets Hera with feigned concern, mixed with a good deal of Schadenfreude, asking her whether she has come to announce yet another marital infidelity on Zeus' part: Ἡρ, Ζηνὸς ἄκοιτι, τί σ σει χλοόουσι ταρειαί ; / νίππε τεαί, βασίλεια, κατηφέες εἰσίν ὅπωται ; / ἥ ρα πάλιν πέλεν ὁμβρος ἐπίκλοτος ὑέτιος Ζειος; (31.212-4). Nonnus has reused phrases from his earlier adaptation of the Διὸς ἀνάτη in book 8. We note that there Hera greets Semele with the same question: εἰπέ, πόθεν, βασίλεια, τεαί χλοόουσι ταρειαί ; (8.207). Aphrodite recalls Zeus' past infidelities through a series of rhetorical questions, but her list (31.214-24) differs from Zeus' so-called 'Leporello catalogue' in the Iliad (Ξ315-28), having only Danae, Europa and Semele in common with the latter. Nonnus, in his version of the 'Leporello catalogue' (32.63-74), seems to be at pains to produce a list even more remote from Homer's than the present one, having only Io in common with it. Nonnus, influenced perhaps by Apollonius' depiction of her (3.52ff.), has made Aphrodite's behaviour a good deal more sarcastic than it is in Homer. The mocking tone of Semele's speech to Hera (9.208-42) is echoed throughout her address. She nevertheless offers to help Hera to the best of her ability (31.227) corresponding to her offer in Homer (Ξ195-6).

Hera makes no comment on Aphrodite's address (unlike Apollonius' version, where she retorts with κερτομέεις, 3.56), replying with a speech carefully contrived to win over the addressee. She intimates her fear that Zeus, not content merely with admitting mortals to Olympus, may expel her from there in the wake of Cronus (31.232-5, cf. 8.152-4, where she expresses similar fears to Apathe). Olympus would indeed become a drinksodden place, were Dionysus to get his way and introduce the vine (31.235-48). The nectar-wine anathesis, of which the
present passage presents a rather colourful exposition, is, as we have stated earlier, a recurrent theme in the poem. The speech, like those that precede it, is a studied rhetorical construct (note the anaphora of δείδετα, 31.234, 238, 244). Aphrodite is, first of all, put into a frame of mind in which she would be likely to respond favourably to the request for the use of her cestus. As in the other speeches, the suffering of the Indians is made out to be a matter of personal concern to the addressee: Aphrodite owes it to the Indians, who have always received her hospitably, to help them. In contrast to the Iliad, where Hera gives Aphrodite a spurious reason for needing the cestus, namely the reconciliation of Tethys and Oceanus, in Nonnus she divulges her true reason, which is to grant the Indians respite from their suffering at the hands of Dionysus. Hera’s exercise in persuasion is somewhat inadequately motivated, seeing that Aphrodite, in her address, had already signalled her willingness to comply with Hera’s wishes (31.227). The request is made at the very end: δός μοι κεστόν ιμάντα βοηθόν, ψ `ειν μούνω / θελγείς είν εύ πάντα (31.280-1), corresponding to δός νῦν μοι φιλότητα καὶ ίμερον, ό τε συ πάντας / δαμαὶ ἀθανάτους ἥδε θητοῖς ἀνθρώπους (Ξ198-9) and ἀπὸ στῆθεσθιν ἐλύσατο κεστόν ιμάντα / ποικίλον, ἐνθα τε ὁ θελκτήρια πάντα τέτυκτο (Ξ214-5). The Homeric passage is previously imitated in Hera’s speech to Apatē, from whom she likewise requests her girdle: δός μοι ἔχειν ζωστήρα βοηθόν, ὅφρα φυγόντα / θέλξω θούρων Ὄρες (8.163-4). Hera justifies her use of the cestus by virtue of her role as guardian of conjugal love (31.281-2), a role that she would have been fulfilling, had she in fact been on her way to reconcile Tethys and Oceanus, as she claimed in her address to Zeus in the Iliad.

Book 32 begins with Hera beautifying herself in preparation for her meeting with Zeus. In Homer this scene is presented at the beginning of the episode, and Nonnus has quite aptly transposed it to just prior to the meeting with Zeus, seeing that the beautification is for his benefit alone. Nonnus has paraphrased the Homeric passage rather closely, as the following examples demonstrate. Hera arranges her hair: πολλάκις δ’ ισάζουσα καθειμένου ἄχρι μετώπου / πλαζομένης έστησε μετήλυδα βότρυν ἐθείρης (32.12-3), which transforms into typically Nonnian terms the simple Homeric statement: ἰδὲ χαῖτας / πεζαμένη, χερὶ πλοκάμους
έπλεξε φαεινοὺς / καλοὺς ἀμβροσίους ἐκ κράστος ἀθανάτου (Ξ175-7).

Βότρυς, 'cluster, bunch (of grapes)', used with reference to hair is commonplace in Nonnus (e.g. 15.230, 16.16; the verbal adj. ΒΟΤΡΥΟΕΝΤΑΣ 34.308 is probably imitated from Apollonius 2.677). ΠΛΑΣΙΩΜΕΝΗΣ, 'wandering', used of an inanimate object such as hair is another such affectation. She moistens her plaited hair with an unguent, the scent of which permeates the universe: καὶ πλεκτὴν θυόετε κόμην ἐδύηνεν ἑλαίῳ, / τοῦ καὶ κινημένοιο μετ’ αἴθερα καὶ μετὰ πόντον / γαῖαν ὅλην ἐμέθυσε μύρων δολιχόσκιος ὀμμὴ (32.16-8), which is another close paraphrase, though Homer has her use the oil to cleanse her body rather than moisten her hair: ἀπὸ χρῶς ἰμερόεντος / λύματα πάντα κάθηνεν, ἀλείφατο δὲ λίπ’ ἑλαίῳ / ἀμβροσίῳ ἐδανῷ ... / τοῦ καὶ κινημένοιο Δίὸς κατὰ χαλκοβατές δῶ / ἐμυθὴ ἐς γαῖαν τε καὶ ύφανον ἰκετ’ ἀυτὴ (Ξ170-4).

Nonnus, not content with cestus alone, has Hera don a headband adorned with an assortment of precious stones, to which the poet attributes the power to induce amorous passions in the beholder, and entwine in her hair a myrtle twig that Aphrodite had worn in her meetings with Adonis. Curiously, Nonnus rounds off his depiction of Hera's accoutrements with the statement that Hera put on the robe which she had worn on the occasion of her first sexual intimacy with Zeus and which still bore the blood marks testifying to her virginity at the time (32.32-5). Nonnus was most likely prompted by Zeus' remark to Hera in the Iliad that she seemed to him now as she had on that first occasion (Ξ294-6).

Hera flies off ὅς πτερόν ἦ νόημα (32.37), a phrase taken from η36 but corresponding at the same time to Ω80-2, which is the simile developed from the same comparison. Zeus is inflamed with passion as he catches sight of her (32.38-41), which is a restatement in Nonnian terms of what Homer says at Ξ293-4. Typically Nonnian are the phrases ιμάσσετο κεντορι κεστῶ and Δίος εἰσορόωντος ἐδουλώθησαν ὑπωπαι, which are used to render Homer's μην ἐρος πυκναὶς φρένας ἀμφεκάλυψεν. Zeus asks: 'Ἡρ, τίπτε βέβηκας ἐωὶν εἰς κλίμα γαῖης; τίς χρεως σε κόμιζε; τί σήμερον ἐνθάδε βαίνεις; (32.42-3), again echoing 'Ἡρ, τὴ μεμαυλὰ κατ’ Ὀὐλύμπου τὸδ’ ικάνεις; (Ξ299). In

---

³Coffey (1957) p. 121, suggests that η36 is derived from Ω80-2.
Nonnus the dialogue loses some of the point that it has in Homer, in that Zeus divines that the true purpose of Hera’s visit is to fight Dionysus and help the Indians (32.44-5). Hera denies this, claiming instead that she has come to recall Eros to his duties, who, overwhelmed with love for Oceanus’ daughter, is tarrying about Tethys’ abode. As a consequence of his dereliction of duty the universe is out of kilter: Ροδότης δεδομένος άδεστρω / συζυγίην ἀπέειπε· καὶ ἐπλετοκόσμος ἁλήτης, / καὶ βιος ἄχρηστος ἀποιχομένων ἰμεναίων (32.53-5). Nonnus has maintained the link with Hera’s speech in the Iliad (Ξ301-6) by mentioning Tethys and Oceanus, but they are only incidental in his version, the attention being focussed instead on Eros. Nonnus, as earlier at 24.319-20 (p. 33), gives the passage a distinctly Orphic colouring by referring to Eros as the primal cosmic force that he is in the Orphic system.4 Zeus replies, asking Hera to put strife aside - he appears to ignore completely Hera’s stated reason for coming - and invites her to bed with him (32.60-2). In Homer Zeus accepts Hera’s explanation at face value and, asking her to put off the reconciliation of Tethys and Oceanus for another time, invites her to bed (Ξ313-4). Nonnus copies the passage in which Zeus details his past infidelities in the Iliad, but, as we have mentioned previously, seems to have made some effort not to duplicate Homer’s list. As in Homer the list is inserted almost by way of parenthesis into the statement that never had his passions been aroused to such heights as they were now (cf.32.62-73 and Ξ315-28). Except for the names, Nonnus has imitated Homer’s structure (οὗ γάρ ... τόσον - the list - ως σεό νῦν) almost exactly.

In Homer Hera baulks at the prospect of sexual intimacy in so exposed a place as the summit of Ida, and Zeus allays her concerns by forming an impenetrable bower of clouds. Nonnus, who appears to have little inclination or aptitude for scenes involving dialogue, omits this amusing exchange, stating simply that Zeus assembled the bower (presumably of his own accord and not in response to any prompting from Hera): ως εἴπων χρυσέας νεφέλας πυρηνίδων ἐλίξας / δυνατὴν ἐπίκυρτον ἐνεσφαίρωσε καλύπτρην (32.76-7), which recalls Zeus’ words to Hera in the Iliad: τοῖον τοι ἐγὼ νέφος ἀμφικαλύψω / χρύσεον (Ξ343-4). The hierogamy of Zeus and Hera derives from a remote past when Zeus

4 Cf. the Orphic Argonautica, 12-6.
(like the Vedic Dyaus) represented the sky itself (which was later to be designated
eponymously by Ouranos), the union of sky and earth (Gaia) causing vegetation
to spring up. In the Homeric version Hera has replaced Gaia, but the latter is still
present, albeit in an ancillary role, making vegetation spring up as bedding for the
couple. Nonnus (32.83-101) has again closely paraphrased Homer (Ξ346-52), his
dependence on his model being quite self-evident, but he has, at the same time,
added a distinctive touch of his own, by making the plants, which spring up,
behave like sentient beings, entwining in passionate embrace as if to mimic the
loving couple. Thus the narcissus leaping upon the anemone portrays with
meaningful silence (νοημον ... σεγή, 32.93) the passion of Zeus. Nonnus had
earlier represented plants anthropomorphically at 12.272-4 in a non-sexual context,
where trees bow their tops in homage to the vine.

Nonnus leaves the blissful scene for one of horror, the assault of Megaira on
Dionysus. We have already commented on the similarities between Nonnus’ and
Ovid’s portrayals of the Fury, noting that the similarity may in large measure be
attributed to the stereotyped nature of such depictions. Megaira metamorphoses into
various animal shapes and attacks Dionysus in the shape of a lion: ἄλοτε
θηρείον τύπον φαίνοντα προσώπον / αἰνομανῆς ἔφριξε λέων πυκνότριχι
λαιμῷ, / χάσματι φοινιήντι καταίσσουν Διονύσου (32.107-9). We note that
Dionysus himself later attacks Deriades in the same way: ἡσσυφες μίμημα
λεοντείον προσώπον / ὑβρίζων ἤρπταξε μετάρμων ἀνθρεών, / ἱππαλέον
βρύχημα κέων πυκνότριχι λαιμῷ (36.300-2). Artemis attempts to protect
Dionysus, but is frightened off by Hera wielding a firebrand. The most she can do
is to see that her own dogs cause him no harm (32.116-8). This may be a
reminiscence of Ω19-21, where all that Apollo can do for Hector is to protect his
body from being mangled, having been unable to prevent his death. As madness
takes hold of him, Dionysus rushes about like a bull stung by the gad-fly (32.125-
9). The scene has obviously been inspired by Apollonius’ description of Heracles’
behaviour following the disappearance of Hylas (1.1265-9). As may be expected,
Nonnus imitates the Apollonius passage a second time to depict Dionysus’
infatuation with Beroe (42.185-93). As with the Διὸς ἀπάτη, the second imitation

\Cf. Puhvel (1987) p.130
is rather closer to the original than the first. The application of the stung bull simile is especially apposite to Dionysus’ case, seeing that he is often depicted with horns in visual representations and accorded the epithet βοόκραυρος (45.250).

Dionysus’ madness sends his followers into disarray, allowing the Indians to gain the ascendancy on the battlefield. One cannot help noticing the schematic parallelism between maddened Dionysus and dazed Hector (as a result of being struck by a stone hurled by Ajax, Ξ409-20) in the Iliad. The parallelism is especially noticeable in book 35, where Zeus on waking reacts to the sight of Dionysus in the throes of madness in a way similar to his reaction on seeing Hector unconscious. Nonnus has been influenced by or made use of scenes in Ξ and Ο beside the Διος απάτη itself. The rock-throwing scene, where Ajax knocks Hector unconscious, may have prompted Nonnus to compose one of his own, involving Morrheus and Echelaux. He has, however, elected to use the earlier Diomedes-Aeneas confrontation rather than the present encounter for a model. Echelaux, stuck on the hip by a boulder thrown by Morrheus, rolls in the dust:

πληγείς ἵσχιον ἄκρων, ὅπη χρόνος ἡμικι δεσμῷ / συμφερτήν κοτύλην
φύσις ἑρμοσεν ἰξοῦν μὴροῦ (32.204-5), which is a close paraphrase of τῷ βάλεν Αἰνείαο κατ’ ἵσχιον, ἐνθα τε μὴρος / ἰσχίῳ ἐνστρέφεται, κοτύλην
dé τε μν καλέουσι (E305-6). Morrheus’ taunts to the dying Echelaux include a remark that Aphrodite had not favoured him with a long life and a mule-drawn waggon to convey him out of harm’s way (32.215-8). Unlike his fellow Cypriot Pygmalion, on whom Aphrodite had conferred these favours, Echelaux was destined to die young. But Nonnus is, quite clearly, not thinking only of Pygmalion here, but of Aeneas as well, who is likewise saved by Aphrodite, and of Hector, who is carried to safety in similar fashion (Ξ430-1). Echelaeus is portrayed at the same time as one too young to die, Nonnus voicing pity for him (32.201-2), as Apollonius does for Cyzicus (1.972-3) and Vergil for Euryalus (Aen. 9.435-7). The pathos of these scenes derives from the Iliad where death on the battlefield is portrayed on many occasions with a palpable sadness, with the poet lamenting the cutting off of the lives of young men in their prime. Especially pitiable is the case of Polydorus, a mere lad who wished to show off his running skills on the battlefield. He is slain by the inexorable Achilles (Γ407-18), whose
mercilessness is highlighted by the childishness of his victim.

With Dionysus out of the way, Deriades and Morrheus are having a field day. This is not to say that they were exactly doing poorly when Dionysus was present. As we have noted previously (pp. 934, 97), Nonnus by according aristeias to the Indians in books 28-30, when Dionysus was present at the head of his forces, has somewhat blunted the difference that the presence or absence of Dionysus was meant to make on the battlefield. His followers were traditionally invincible in his presence and vulnerable in his absence. If Nonnus had followed that tradition consistently, he would have postponed Corymbasus' and Morrheus' aristeias until after the removal of Dionysus from the battlefield. Now, in his absence, Morrheus and Deriades are accorded further aristeias, though in abbreviated form, with the poet simply listing the names of Dionysus' followers slain by each. For Deriades two lists are given, the first preceding the slaying of Echelaus, the second following Morrheus' list (i.e. Deriades, 32.184-98, 228-39; Morrheus, 221-8). Announcing the first list of Deriades' victims, Nonnus appeals to Homer's muses to tell him who they were: 'Ομηρίδες εἶπατε Μόδσαι / τίς θάνει, τίς δούπησεν ὅτι ἕγχει Δηριαδῆς;' (32.184-5), which corresponds to ἑσπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι 'Ὀλυμπία δῶματ' ἔχουσαι, ὅς τίς δὴ πρῶτος βροτόεντ' ἀνδράγρη 'Ἀχαιῶν ἰδρατ', ἐπεί ἤ' ἐκλίνε μάχην κλητὸς ἐνοσίγαλος (Ξ508-10). This is yet another example of Nonnus' continued use of Ξ and O outside the Διὸς ἄπατη proper - the appeal to the muses, made at the corresponding stage of developments, reinforces the parallelism of book 32 and the second half of 35 with Ξ and the first half of O respectively. Nonnus not only duplicates from the Iliad the theme of the deception of Zeus, but also the developments that it specifically engendered on the battlefield. Erechtheus and Aiaacus are unable to stem the Indian advance, their prodigious fighting qualities notwithstanding. Erechtheus gives ground with hesitant foot: ὁκαλέους δὲ πόδεσσιν ἐχαζετο υφθός Ἐρεχθεὺς ἐντοπαλιζομένην ταυών εὐκυκλον ὀπωτήρ (32.265-6), a depiction that is reused in the case of Poseidon in the Beroe episode: ὁκαλέουν ποδὸς ἔχονς υποκλέπτων Ἐνοσίχθων ἐντοπαλιζομένης βαρυρειθεὶς χαζετο ταρω (42.56-7). These descriptions have been inspired by the retreat of Ajax before the Trojan onslaught in the Iliad, who gives ground
ἐντροπαλιζόμενος, ὅλεγων γόνυ γουνὸς ἀμείβων (Λ547). Aiacus alone holds his ground, but he, too, sorely misses the presence of Dionysus.

Book 33 sees the beginning of the Morrheus-Chalcomeda episode, which, interspersed with further battle scenes, occupies the poet’s attention up to 35.222. The episode is ushered in rather contrivedly: one of the Graces attending on Aphrodite - the same Pasithea, we are duly informed, whom Hera had promised to Hypnus - while gathering flowers for her mistress, witnesses the madness of Dionysus and the plight of his followers, in particular of the beautiful Chalcomeda fleeing before the fury of Morrheus. Chalcomeda is so beautiful that Pasithea is afraid to draw attention to her, lest she defeat Aphrodite in a beauty contest: καὶ φθονερῆ δεδόντω ροδώπεδος εἶνεκα κούρης, ἵνα ποτὲ νυκῆσειν ἐς ἀγαλὴν 'Αφροδίτην (33.19-20). Hollis cites Rufinus (Anth. 5.73), who mistakes his beloved Rhodoclea for Aphrodite, as according a parallel to this motif. We note that the motif recurs in Pan’s speech at 42.226, where Beroe is considered superior to Aphrodite, and in Poseidon’s speech at 42.459ff., where she is said to surpass Aphrodite and the three Graces in beauty. Aphrodite, observing Pasithea’s distress, suspects that she is dismayed at the prospect of marriage to black skinned Hypnus and reassures her that she has no intention of forcing her into such a union: οὐδὲ συνάψω / λευκάδι Πασιθέη μελανόχροον Ἐπινον ἀκοῖτην (33.39-40). Nonnus displays throughout the Dionysiaca a deep-seated prejudice against dark-skinned races, an attitude which is perhaps attributable to the poet having passed his formative years at Panopolis on the very confines of Abyssinia. His οἶλοκάρηνοι Indians seem, if anything, born from recollections of the Abyssinians. He usually rationalises his attitude by identifying blackness with the earthborn, but in the Morrheus-Chalcomeda episode his dislike assumes an undisguisedly personal character. His ironic asides at regular intervals betray his repugnance for the idea of a black man making amorous advances to a white woman. We are reminded throughout of Morrheus’ presumption and temerity in believing that Chalcomeda would be attracted to one of his skin colour, the poet’s feelings being perhaps best summed up in the comment: κοῦφος ὅνηρ, ὡς παῖδα σαῦφονα δίζετο θέλγειν / κυανέως μελέσσι, καὶ οὐκ
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7We recall that Odysseus describes his herald Eurybates as μελανόχροοσ, οἶλοκάρηνος (r.240), which is generally assumed to denote Ethiopian origin (cf. J.Russo, Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey, Oxford, 1992, note ad loc.)
Pasithea subsequently reveals to her mistress the true cause of her anguish, addressing her through a stereotyped Orphic formula: ἀενάου κόσμου φυτοσπόρε, μητέρ Ἐρώτων (33.42). Aphrodite, who by acceding to Hera's request for the cestus was indirectly responsible for the situation giving rise to Pasithea's dismay, will now make amends for her deed by inducing in Morpheus an all-consuming passion for Chalcedea, incapacitating him from causing further harm to Dionysus' followers. She sends Aglaia to fetch Eros, who, as it happens, is engaged in a contest with Hymenaius: εὑρε δὲ μιν χρυσέοι περὶ ρίου ἄκρον ὁλύμπου / νεκταρεάς βαθάμιγγας ἀκουτίζοντα κυπέλλους / πάρ δὲ οἱ ἱστατο κούρος ὀμέψιος ἀβρόν ἀθύρων. / εὐχαίτης Ἰμέναιος (33.64-7). This is an adaptation of the scene in the third book of Apollonius, where Aphrodite finds Eros similarly occupied: βῆ ὅ' ἤμεν οὐλύμποιο κατὰ πτύχας, εἴ μιν ἐφεύροι. / εὑρε δὲ τόνυ' ἀπάνευθε Διὸς θαλερῆ ἐν ἀλωθή, / οὐκ οἶον, μετά καὶ Γανυμήδα ... ἀμφ' ἀστραγάλουσι δὲ τῶν ἔρσειος, ἄτε κούροι ὀμήθεες, ἐφιώντω (3.113-8). Nonnus' περὶ ρίου ἄκρον ὁλύμπου has been extracted from Θ25, but corresponds thematically to Apollonius' οὐλύμποιο κατὰ πτύχας. Other correspondences are εὑρε δὲ μιν / εὑρε δὲ τόνυ' and κούρος ὀμέψιος / κούροι ὀμήθεες ἐφιώντω. The presence of the word χρύσεος in both passages (though used differently) should also be noted. Hymenaius has been substituted for Ganymede, but the latter has not been forgotten. Indicative of Nonnus' tendency to proliferate characters, Ganymede as well is brought into the picture to referee the contest. The contest itself consists of throwing wine from a goblet at a statue of Hebe. The scene appears to confirm the fears expressed earlier by Hera in her speech to Aphrodite regarding the introduction of wine to Olympus. Hebe, the legitimate dispenser of nectar to the gods is being pelted, even if only in effigy, with wine in a contest adjudicated by the mortal upstart Ganymede, who has usurped her prerogative. The two contestants each put up a prize, with the winner to collect
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8 For another instance of ancient perceptions of race, cf. Petronius, Satyricon 102, where negroid features are equated with extreme ugliness.
9 Cf. Orphic hymn to Aphrodite, 55.4-9 and Proclus' hymn to Aphrodite, 2.15-6, for similar language.
both, Eros a golden necklace of Aphrodite's and Hymenaius a globe resembling the speckled form of Argus (σφαίραν ... τροχόσαυν ... Ἄργου δαιδαλέης ἀντίρρουν εἰκόνα μορφῆς, 33.69-70). The reference to the many-eyed form of Argus is yet another indication of Nonnus' fascination with spotted objects, which like the oft-mentioned στικτὸς νέβρις of Dionysus, are viewed by him as μυμήματα of the starry vault of the heavens. The idea of a sphere as prize comes, however, from Apollonius, where Aphrodite promises Eros a σφαίραν ἑυτρόχαλον (3.135), which likewise has astronomical associations. Eros emerges the winner in both poets, in Apollonius through deceit, in Nonnus because he offers a prayer to Aphrodite prior to making his throw (Hymenaius failing to do likewise with regard to his mother, the Muse). Nonnus has in mind here the foot-race in the Iliad, in which Odysseus beats Ajax because he, unlike the latter, offers a prayer to Athena (ψ768-9, cf. also ψ861ff., where Meriones, promising a hecatomb to Apollo, defeats Teucer, who fails to do likewise, in the archery contest). Nonnus uses this Homeric motif at 29.62-7 with regard to the archer Melaneus, and again at 37.638ff., where Erectheus offers a prayer to Boreas before the foot-race, but omits it from his version of the archery contest (p. 189). Eros, collecting the prize, draws his sorrowful opponent's hand from his face (33.103-4). In Apollonius, Ganymede is likewise described as downcast, as he prepares to make his last throw (3.122-3).

As Aglaia begins to tell him of Aphrodite's troubles, Eros with the impatience of youth urges her to dispense with the preliminaries and come to the heart of the matter (33.114-6), which may be seen as a subtle adaptation of Eros' impatience, in Apollonius, to get the gift promised to him by Aphrodite at once (αὐτοχεδόν, 3.148), even before embarking on his mission. Eros, on being told Aphrodite's message that she has been forsaken by all her attendant Graces, is stung by a perceived affront to his mother and launches into a plethora of boasts and threats against the other gods, which is reminiscent of the tirades of Typhoeus (2.258ff.) and Pentheus (44.134ff.) starkly discordant with the otherwise pleasantly rococo scene inspired by Apollonius. He flies off with Aglaia and is welcomed by Aphrodite, who sits him on her lap, kissing his mouth and eyes (33.144-6). This affectionate scene is again drawn from Apollonius, where Eros is likewise kissed.
by Aphrodite as he demands to see the toy promised him (3.148-50). The parallels with Apollonius do not end here: the task that Aphrodite sets Eros is essentially identical in both poets, namely to inject all consuming passion into a designated individual (Morrheus in Nonnus, Medea in Apollonius). But, whereas in Apollonius Aphrodite speaks to Eros as mother to child, in Nonnus she launches into a lengthy diatribe against Deriades and the gods helping him, accusing Hera of inciting Ares to become "Ἰνδώψι βασιλής συνεμπορός" (33.159). Her speech, like Eros' earlier bluster, grates with the mother-child imagery borrowed from Apollonius. Aphrodite proffers Eros a gift, as she does in Apollonius, if he does her bidding. This gift needs to be different from that in Apollonius, which Nonnus has already used as one of the prizes in the contest with Hymenanus. It is a gleaming garland wrought by Hephaistus (33.174-6). Eros takes off at once, armed with his bow and quiver (33.180-3), a scene again inspired by Apollonius (3.154-7). Eros' arrow pierces Morrheus with the same effect as it does Medea in Apollonius (cf.33.194 and 3.286-7).

It is obvious from the correspondences in substance and expression, sustained over nearly two hundred lines, that Nonnus has been following Apollonius' text rather closely. For the ensuing romance, however, he has turned to sources other than Apollonius, henceforth using the latter only in a few isolated instances. As he himself intimates, the Morrheus-Chalcomeda story is a repeat of that of Apollo and Daphne, and some commentators are convinced that Ovid's version of it has been used by Nonnus as his model. Braune's 1935 thesis that Nonnus modelled his episode on Ovid's has more recently been endorsed by D'Ippolito (1964) and Otis (1966). Earlier, Castiglioni in his "Epica nonniana" (1932) had examined the Nonnus-Ovid relationship with specific reference to the Morrheus-Chalcomeda episode, but he discounted the possibility of direct influence. As Braune, D'Ippolito and Otis have not brought to bear on the question any evidence additional to that already adduced by Castiglioni, the question is purely one of interpretation, the debate being as to what sorts of conclusions we are entitled to draw. Compared with the lengthy parallels with Apollonius in the preceding segment, the parallels with Ovid are limited to three isolated but exact verbal correspondences, consisting of statements whose contrived cleverness possibly bespeaks a rhetorical origin. Otis, commenting on the nature of Ovidian influence
on Nonnus in general, appears to concede that the character of Nonnus' relationship to Ovid is different from that to his Greek predecessors, when he says Nonnus "imitates Ovid in the most eclectic manner, using motifs rather than whole episodes from the *Metamorphoses*... He is in fact not influenced by Ovid's narrative or plot so much as by the piquantly Ovidian motifs." He makes no attempt to explain why Nonnus' imitation of Ovid should have assumed a character so different from his imitation of say Homer or Apollonius. When we consider how minutely he had just before duplicated details from Apollonius, it is difficult to see why he should not continue in the same vein with Ovid. D'Ippolito puts the difference down to Nonnus' conscious desire to hide his indebtedness to Ovid, speaking of "il desiderio del Nostro di mascherare il suo debito verso il latino sia col variare e con l'amplificare, sia soprattutto nella diversa impostazione dei racconti, nelle differenti versioni mitiche volutamente seguite, nel tacere di taluni tratti essenziali per seguire talora l'accessorio o la sfumatura che il testo latino presenta". He does not, however, elaborate as to why Nonnus should have adopted such a stance in relation to Ovid. The long-held belief that Greeks deliberately ignored the literature of their Roman conquerors seems hardly relevant to the case of so conspicuous an admirer of things Roman as Nonnus shows himself to have been in book 41.

Compared with Ovid's concise and pointed presentation of the Apollo-Daphne story, Nonnus' Morrheus-Chalcomeda episode is crammed with the long speeches and marred by the narrative inconsistencies that we have almost come to expect from our poet. In Ovid the situation is very clear-cut: Cupid dispatches two arrows, one into Daphne and the other into Apollo, the first designed to banish love, the second to promote it ('fugat hoc, facit illud amorem', 1.469). In Nonnus, Morrheus alone is targeted, while Chalcomeda is described as being δολοφονέωσα (33.201) and bent on leading Morrheus astray by pretending to reciprocate his passion (οἶδα περ' ἵμεροις, 33.202). Morrheus is buoyed by vain hope, ἐλπίδι μαψιδῇ πεφορημένος (33.204), resembling Ovid's Apollo, who, in the same situation, 'sterilem sperando nutrit amorem' (*Met*. 1.496).
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Chalceda recounts the story of Apollo and Daphne to Morrheus, to point out the futility of his quest, but succeeds only in spurring the latter to greater effort, lest he suffer Apollo's fate and let her slip from his grasp. At this point the narrative becomes somewhat unclear. Chalceda goes into the woods to look for Dionysus, and Morrheus, presumably, follows her, but why he should do so ὅκυναλέοις ... πόδεσσι (33.233) is difficult to understand. We note that Poseidon in pursuit of Beroe is similarly described as ὃκυναλέου ποδός ἵπποις ὑποκλεῖτων (42.56), the meaning there being likewise obscure. A little later Morrheus pursues Chalceda φειδομένοις ... πόδεσσιν (34.310), but in that instance we are given to understand his reasons for doing so. Morrheus declares that he will abandon the Indian deities of Water and Earth, and set up an altar to Aphrodite and Dionysus, throwing away the brazen spear of Ares and Athena (33.243-5). The construction of an altar serves here as visual confirmation of one's conversion to the new faith (cf. also 25.290, where an aged Indian sets up an altar to Zeus and Dionysus out of gratitude for having his sight restored). Morrheus voices his intentions in the darkness of night, which is described in a manner reminiscent of Apollonius 3.745ff. The narrative sequence is not entirely clear, Morrheus seeming to abandon his search for Chalceda and return to his bed-chamber, only to venture out again into the night (33.280-2). It looks as if Nonnus wants him back, sleepless in his bed-chamber, to reinforce the parallel with Medea in Apollonius. Morrheus, like Medea, is alone sleepless (cf. 33.280 and 3.751), when others slumber and darkness envelops the land. The depiction of the nocturnal scene has obviously been composed with a view to eliciting comparison with the celebrated passage in Apollonius, with Nonnus adding some touches of his own. Nonnus' inflated idiom stands out in an almost comic manner against the sober language of Apollonius. Nightfall is described as follows: ἦν γὰρ σκότων θόρυς αὐτόκθονι παλμῷ / ἄμφοτερ ἀμφεκλον μελανύντο κῶνος ὀμίχλης / καὶ τρομηρῆ ξυπαντά μη̄ ξύπωσε σωμῇ (33.266-8), recalling νῦν μὲν ἐπελίτ᾽ ἔπι γαῖαν ἄγεν κνέφας (3.744) and συγῇ δὲ μελαιομένην ἔχεν ὅρφιν (3.750). No wayfarer walks through the city: οὐδὲ τις ἵπποις ἐπελεγε δὲ ἀστεος ἰωδὸς οἴδιτς (33.269), partly contradicting ὑπονοοῦ δὲ καὶ τις οἴδιτις / ἦν καὶ πυλανός ἐξέλετο (3.746-7). Nor does a working woman persevere in spinning by her lamp: οὐδὲ
γυνὴ χερνήτης ἐθήμονος ἦπτετο τέχνης, / οὐδὲ οἱ ἐν παλάμησι
φιληλακάτῳ παρὰ λύχνῳ / κύκλων ἐς αὐτοελικτὸν ἰὼν ἄτρακτος ἀλήτης / ἀστατος ὀρχηστῆρι πταίνετο νήματος ὀλκῷ, / ἄλλα ἀραηβαρέουσα
φιλαγρύπνῳ παρὰ λύχνῳ / εὐθεῖ γυνὴ ταλαεργός (33.270-5). The above
passage recalls both Apollonius’ earlier simile of the poor working woman, ὃς δὲ
γυνὴ μαλερῷ περὶ κάρφεα χεύατο δαλῳ / χερνήτης, τῇ περ ταλασσία ἐργα
μέμηλεν, / ὃς κεν ὑπωρόφιον νόκτωρ σέλας ἐντύνατο (3.291-4), and the
Homeric original, which (though used in a different context) provided Apollonius
with his inspiration: ὃς τε τάλαντα γυνὴ χερνήτης ἀληθής / ἦ τε σταθμόν
ἐξούσα καὶ εἵριον ἀμφὶς ἀνέλκει / ἵσαζονς, ἵνα παισὶν ἀεικέα μισθὸν
ἀργὶα (M433-5). Nonnus has sought to vary the τόποι by having the woman
actually fall asleep at the loom. In place of Apollonius’ sleeping dogs Nonnus has a
sleeping snake and elephant.

About to make his second sortie into the night, Morrheus engages in a further
monologue, voicing his envy of Zeus, who by assuming the shape of a Satyr had
won over Antiope. The speech contains the same brand of flippant argumentation
exhibited by the speeches in books 31 and 32. Morrheus sees himself victimised
by Aphrodite for being an Indian, because as such he is a neighbour of the Sun,
whom the goddess has not forgiven for witnessing her adultery with Ares. He
appeals to the stones to speak (33.312), which, as Keydell points out, recalls
Jesus’ words in Luke, 19.40, this being one of number of correspondences with
evangelical texts to be found in the Dionysiaca.

Chalcomeda too is pictured as plagued by sleeplessness, though for different
reasons from Morrheus. Though described a little while before as δολοφρονεύουσα
(33.201) and as fostering false hopes in Morrheus in order to lure him from the
battlefield, she is now depicted as so terrified of her would-be lover, that she wants
to throw herself into the sea like Melis fleeing from Damnameneus. She is only
dissuaded from doing so by the timely appearance of Thetis, who advises her
to distract Morrheus from the battlefield by engendering in him the delusion that he
may eventually overcome her intransigence. As Chalcomeda by her actions has
anticipated much of what Thetis is now telling her, the advice is accordingly to a
large extent otiose. If the segment comprising Chalcomeda’s terrified flight and Thetis’ advice were placed at the beginning of the episode, the narrative would make much better sense. A similar situation is encountered in book 42, where Pan’s advice is rendered largely gratuitous through Dionysus having by his actions anticipated most of its content. Book 34 begins with Morrheus engaged in a Hamlet-like monologue, should he or should he not kill Chalcomeda. The idea of such an introspective monologue derives again from Apollonius, where Medea is likewise beset by a dilemma, should she or should she not help Jason (3.772-801). Morrheus’ speech stands in marked contrast with the posturing and bluster of the other speeches in the poem in that it reveals his true character. There is very little character delineation in the Dionysiaca, the little that there is being accorded to the person of Dionysus. Here Morrheus’ character emerges from the thoughts that he voices. The only thing that keeps him from killing Chalcomeda is the fear that his subsequent yearning for her will kill him also. At the same time fear of Deriades’ injunction not to meddle with enemy women and compassion for his wife Cheirobie deter him from marrying Chalcomeda. He is moved almost exclusively by considerations of self-interest and self-preservation, the only mitigating feature being his pity for Cheirobie (but note that at 34.295-6 he wishes her dead).

Morrheus’ erratic behaviour is noticed by Hyssacus, who correctly divines its cause. Morrheus subsequently discloses his infatuation for Chalcomeda in a speech encumbered by the usual clichés. He asks how he can resist Aphrodite, who scorched the Sun with a flame more searing than its own: εἰ φλογερὸν Φαέθοντα κατέφλεγε μεῖζον πυρὸς / καὶ κλονεύει πυρόεντα, τί κεν ρέξοιμι σιδήρῳ; (34.63-4). The notion, which has the appearance of a rhetorical cliché, occurs previously at 33.186-7, and again at 38.116-7, where the poet uses the phrase κάμνε πυρὸς ταμίης ἐτέρῳ πυρὶ, which bears an uncanny resemblance to Ovid’s ‘nempe tuis omnes qui terras ignibus uris, / ureris igne novo’ (Met. 4.194-5). Morrheus then returns to his bed-chamber and, falling asleep, dreams that Chalcomeda comes to him a willing bride (34.89-98). Chalcomeda addresses him, saying: ἔστι καὶ ὑπαλέολο γάμου χάρις, ἔστι καὶ αὐτῶν ἱμερόεις γλυκὸς.
Nonnus seems to have a fascination with erotic dreams: at 40.402-6 he tells us how the god Γάμος was begotten by Zeus as a result of such a dream, and at 42.323-45 Dionysus has a similar dream with regard to Beroe. Morrheus on waking is deluded into believing that Chalcomeda is actually enamoured of him, ἀπατήλιον ἑπίδα βόσκων (34.102), a phrase reused in a slightly different sense in the Zeus passage (cf. τελέων ἀπατήλιον ἱμερον εύνής, 40.403), indicating that the passages were in all likelihood composed in parallel. He addresses the absent Chalcomeda with an ode to her beauty (34.106-13), which stands out as an element of love lyric in epic. Chalcomeda's beauty will bloom as the Seasons wane, which is an inversion of the traditional theme of beauty fading with the passing of the Seasons.

Dawn recalls Morrheus to the battlefield, his infatuation with Chalcomeda not having extinguished his martial ardour to quite the extent we were led to believe from the preceding segments. Morrheus not only fights with his habitual zeal, but treats the females whom he takes captive with exceptional cruelty, the latter theme being subsequently pursued at some length in all its objectionable details. The acts of cruelty, perpetrated invariably on females, appear to be of a premeditated nature, rather than spontaneous outbursts of barbarian savagery. Their sexual connotations appear to be quite intentional. Morrheus takes alive eleven of the most comely Bassarids after Chalcomeda and ties their hands behind their backs (34.163-5), an action corresponding to Achilles' treatment of the twelve Trojan youths at Φ27-30 (cf. χείρας ὀπισθοτόνους ἀλώτω σφήκώσατο δεσμὺ, and δῆσε δ' ὀπίσσω χείρας ἐυτμήτοις ἤμαστι). Even though the girls are presented as handmaidens to Deriades for Morrheus' bride-price, a fate no less cruel than that which the Trojan youths met awaits them. Deriades drags them by the hair, handing them over to his underlings Phlogius and Agraius. Some them are strung up in front of the palace, others being cast into a deep well, where they face the prospect of a twofold death, by being buried alive in the mud and drowning at the same time. One of the Bassarids muses with remarkable detachment that the two gods of the Indians, Earth and Water, have decided to assail her simultaneously (34.236-40).

For similar use of anaphora, cf. Vergil's 'sunt hic etiam sua praemia laudi; / sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt' (Aen. 4.461-2)
Her composure in mortal danger recalls that of Ovid's Andromeda, who is more concerned with her modesty when accosted by Perseus than with the imminent prospect of being devoured by the sea-monster (Met. 4.680ff.).

Morrheus drives the whole of the Maenalid host (Μαιναλίδων ... ὀλον στρατόν, 34.250) into the city, prodding with his spear as the shepherd uses his staff: ὦς δὲ ὀτε μηλονόμος ... συμμεγέων ὀλον σποράδας στίχας εἰς ἐν ἑλαύνων / εἰροπόκων ἦννε καλαύροπι πώεα μήλων ... (34.252-4). This long simile, embracing altogether seven lines, is unusual for Nonnus (but cf. also 35.245-52, eight lines). It has most likely been inspired by Homer's δόσον τίς τῷ ἔρρυσε καλαύροπα βουκόλος ἀνήρ: / ἢ δὲ ἐλισσομένη πέτεται διὰ βοὸς ἀγελαίας (Ψ845-6), though the latter is used in an entirely different context. Morrheus' cruel treatment of Chalcomeda's comrades contrasts sharply with the tenderness of feeling that he displays toward her in the preceding segments. But his callousness extends to Chalcomeda as well, as he now plans to make her his servant-woman during the day and bed-partner at night: ἄφρα οἷς αἰεὶ / ἡματίᾳ θεράπαινα καὶ ἔνυνχος εὐνέτης εἶ, / καὶ διδύμων τελέσειν ἀμοβαδίς ἔργα θεάων, / λάθρα Κύπριδος ἔργα καὶ ἀμφαδὼν ἱστὸν Ἀθῆνης (34.265-7). These lines are obviously a recollection of Agamemnon's words to Chryses, who had come to ransom his daughter: τὴν δ' ἐγὼ οὖ λόσω ... ἡμετέρῳ ἐνι οἴκῳ ... ἱστόν ἐποιχομένην, καὶ ἐμὸν λέχος ἀντιόωσαν (A29-31, cf. also A113-5, where Agamemnon states that he prefers Chryseis to his wife). The Athena / Aphrodite opposition, like that of Athena / Dionysus, is a popular motif with Nonnus (cf. esp. 24.242ff.).

Morrheus now assails the Bassarids again (34.269ff.), the poet forgetting his statement some twenty lines before that he drove them all, like a shepherd his flock, into the city (34.250ff.). He comes face to face with Chalcomeda, who appears to be unaffected by the malaise that has taken hold of the other Bacchantes as a result of Dionysus' absence, for she picks up a huge rock and hurls it at him. The rock strikes Morrheus' shield, damaging the image of Cheirobie embossed on it. Morrheus addresses Chalcomeda, telling her that he would the rock had rather hit Cheirobie herself (34.295-6). He then sets out in pursuit of Chalcomeda in front
of the city walls. This scene is partly patterned on Achilles' pursuit of Hector around the walls of Troy, which Nonnus imitates a second time at 40.84ff., where Dionysus pursues Deriades. Nonnus has not taken care to adapt the Homeric scene to the peculiar circumstances of his own narrative. We recall that Hector kept close to the walls in the hope that the Trojans could accord him cover with missiles (εἰ τῶς οἱ καθύπερθεν ἀλάκκοιεν βελεῖσσιν, X196). There is no reason for Chalcomeda to do so; quite the contrary, she should run away from them, seeing that they belong to the enemy. Nonnus, as often, copies a Homeric theme oblivious of his own context. The chase itself, though placed in a Homeric setting, is nevertheless depicted differently, bearing a close resemblance to Apollo's pursuit of Daphne in Ovid. As to whether Nonnus actually used Ovid or some now lost Hellenistic source - the story is one which by its very nature would have inspired many poetic renderings - is a question which cannot be definitively answered.

Nonnus is rather fond of depicting female beauty in a state of rapid movement - as Castiglioni remarks "la bellezza delle eroine nonniane è belleza di donna in rapido movimento". This mode of depiction is also employed in the present passage, Chalcomeda's beauty being displayed to best advantage as she runs: η δὲ φυγοῦσα / ἡρίας ταχύγυρνος ἑπέτρεχε σύνθρομος αὐραίς. / τῆς δὲ ταυταιομενής ἀνεμώδει γούνατος ὀρμή / πλοχμοῦς βοτρυόντας ἀνερρηπτικοῖς ἀήται, / αὐξένα γυμνώσαυτες ἐριδμαίνοντα Σελήνη (34.305-9). This passage consists largely of descriptive elements previously used by other poets. Lines 305-6 correspond to Ovid's 'fugit oior aura / illa levi' (1.502-3), line 308 to Apollonius' πλοχμοῦ βοτρυόντας ἑπερρώντο κάτωτι (2.677), employed in his depiction of the epiphany of Apollo, and also in sense to Ovid's 'et levis impulsos retro dabat aura capillos' (1.529). Morroheus runs after θειομένοις δὲ πόδεσιν ἐκούσιος (34.310), the reason for which only becomes clear when the action is viewed in conjunction with Apollo's words to Daphne in Ovid: 'moderatius, oro./curre, fugamque inhibe; moderatius insequar ipse' (1.510-1). The usefulness of Ovid's text in clarifying Nonnus' meaning does not necessarily prove that Nonnus' version is derived from it. Ovid simply states the facts with greater clarity than Nonnus, facts which both poets may have
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garnered from previous Hellenistic versions of the Apollo-Daphne story. Morpheus calls out to the fleeing girl μή μοι με, Χαλκομέδεια ... δήσος ου γενόμην, μη δειδοθή (34.316-9), which corresponds to Ovid's 'nympha, precor, Penei, mane: non insequar hostis' (1.504). Nonnus has interwoven with this simple plea his oft-repeated theme of the superiority of Aphrodite's arms to those of Ares (especially 319-23). Morpheus' pleas are of no avail, and the girl escapes him, slipping away into the ranks of her fellows. Other Bacchantes are in the meantime driven beneath the battlements by Deriades and thence through the gates into the city itself. Once inside the girls lose their martial ardour and long to resume their normal womanly duties and exchange the thyrsus of Dionysus for Athena's spindle (34.352-6). The converse takes place later in Thebes, where Bacchic fervour induces that city's womenfolk to abandon the spindle for the thyrsus (45.48-9), an idea expressed a number of times in Euripides' Bacchae (117-9, 514, 1236-7).

Book 35 begins with a massacre of the Bassarids trapped in the city. Old men watch the scene from the walls (35.11-2), and women behold the thyrsus-wielding throng from the rooftops, a girl leaning on her nurse pitying the slaughter of her agemates. Now follows a scene evocative of the Achilles-Pentesilea encounter: an unnamed Indian slaying a Bacchante is inflamed by the beauty of his victim. Nonnus' treatment of the theme has little in common with Quintus' dignified account of Achilles' wonderment at the beauty of the slain Penthesilea (1.659-68), being characterised by a vulgar prurience, which is doubly reprehensible seeing that its object is a corpse. Unlike Achilles, who was struck by remorse at having slain one so beautiful and whom he now wished he had made his wife instead, the Indian is driven by a desire for actual sexual gratification, being restrained from violating the body only through fear of Deriades' injunction forbidding intimacy with enemy women. We are told that the Indian θάλει καὶ φιλότητι μυγήμεναι (35.35), and in the speech which follows, he does indeed admit to having an unusual passion: ξείνον ἰχνω καὶ ἄπιστον ἐγὼ πόθον, ὀτίν διώκω / κόμης νεκρὸν έρωτα καταφθιμένων ὑμεναίων (35.44-5). Grotesque elements aside, the episode serves as vehicle for depicting the theme of Aphrodite's superiority to Ares. As the dead girl's anatomy is revealed it becomes a weapon by which she conquers her slayer: παρελκομένου δὲ χιτώνος / ἀγλαίη κεκόρυστο καὶ
ιμείροντα φονῆ / οὐτασεν οὐππείσα, βέλος δὲ οἱ ἔπλετο μορφῆ, / καὶ φθιμένη νίκησε κατ’ ἀντίβιον δὲ γυμνοὶ / μηροὶ ζηωρήθησαν, ὀυστευτήρες ἐρώτων (35.22-6). These lines clearly echo Claudian: Κύπρις δ’ οὐτε βέλος φέρειν οὐθ’ ὀπλον, ἀλλ’ ἐκόμιζεν / ἀγαληὴν ... λεπτὰς εὐανέμοιο ραβᾶς χαλάσσα σιτῶνος, / πορφυρέων οὐ κρύπτειν ὕφ’ εἶμασιν ἄθεα μαζών, / ὅματος εἰς ἁγρὴν ὑπλωμένην, εἰχε γὰρ αὐτή / πλέγμα κόρυν, δόρῳ μαζών, ὀφρίου βέλος ... εἰ δὲ τις αὐτῇ / δίμα βάλοι, δέδιμτο, βέλος δ’ ἀπὸ χειρὸς ἐάδας / ὡς Ἄρεως αἰχμῇ τῇ Κύπριδος ὀλυτὸ μορφῆ (43-54). Later in the present book, Nonnus again recalls Claudian’s lines, when Aphrodite boasts to Ares of her superiority to him, after making Morpheus renounce war for love: ἔγχος ἐμὸν πέλε κάλλος. ἐμὸν χίφος ἔπλετο μορφῆ, / καὶ βλεφάρων ἀκτίνες ἐμοὶ γεγάσαις ὀιστοῖ. / μαζός ἄκουτις ἐπέσεν ἔγχος ... οὐ τόσον αἰχμαξίεις, οὐς ὀφρὺς. οὐ τόσον / αἰχμαί / ἀνέρας οὕταζουσιν, οὐσον κάλλουσιν ὀπωπαί (35.171-9; for a further instance of the same cf. 42.234-7). The theme of resuscitation from the dead is also touched upon when the Indian, after expressing his regrets for not having the hairy Satyrs and Sileni as victims in place of the girl, longs for a Chiron to revive her and appeals to Glaucus to point out to him a μπατάνην ἔφαρκες (35.75), by which to restore her to life.

The Indian women vent their fury on the Bacchantes: Προτονοε στειάχουσα καὶ εἰσέτι νεκρὸν Ὁρόντη (35.80) fights like another Atalanta, Cheirobie, seizing the shield and spear of Morpheus, resembles Gorge, and Orsiboe takes to the field by her husband's side like another Deianeira. The tale of Gorge defending Calydon as Meleager sulked is only recorded in the present passage, while Deianeira's taking up arms by Heracles' side is mentioned in only one other source, the scholion to Apollonius 1.1212. Some of the Indian women attack the Bassarids on the ground, others showering them with rocks from rooftops.

Morpheus in the meantime resumes his pursuit of Chalcomeda, who carries her game of deception a step further, suggesting that her pursuer take off his armour, if he is serious about consummating their relationship. She reciprocates Morpheus' previous declaration (33.254-6) of renouncing his fealty to Deiades and becoming
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a follower of Dionysus by promising to forsake Maeonia for India (35.151-2). Morrheus does her bidding and removes his armour, which leads Aphrodite to boast of her victory over Ares (35.171-9). He bathes in the sea to cleanse himself of the gore of battle, but his skin remains black as before, however much he wished it to become snow-white. He is in the end denied his prize by the guardian snake that the Bassarid wears for a belt. The snake predictably assumes fearsome proportions, the rocks resounding with its hiss (35.212-3), recalling the snake which guarded the Golden Fleece in Apollonius (4.129-30). Its attack on Morrheus (35.216-22) is similar to that on Tylus (25.457-67), coiling about his neck and showering him with poison. We are not told how Morrheus extricates himself, only that the girl's virtue is preserved.

The Bacchantes held captive in the city are now freed through the intervention of Hermes, who, assuming the appearance and voice of Dionysus, Βοκχείην ἐκάλεσσεν δὴν στίχα μύστιδι φωνῇ (35.229). This appears to be a recollection of the scene in the Bacchae, where the captive Bacchantes, hearing the call of Dionysus, shake off their fetters and escape from Pentheus' prison (443ff. and 576ff.). In Nonnus' rendering of the latter event (44.17ff.) Dionysus' followers accomplish their escape from Thebes without outside help. Hermes gets frequent laudatory mention in the Dionysiaca: it was he who conveyed the infant Dionysus to the care of Ino (9.17ff.), and it is between Apollo and Hermes that Dionysus takes his place at the celestial table in Olympus (48.979). In the present episode he appears in his habitual role of guide, as he does in the twenty-fourth book of the Iliad, displaying at the same time his incomparable gifts of trickery and theft (cf. the epithet φωίνος, 35.236 and λάθροιος ἰγεμόνευε, 239). He puts the Indians to sleep with his ὑάδος and opens the heavy lock of the towering gates to lead out the Bacchantes: καὶ φυλάκων στοιχῆδον ἀκομήτοισιν ὀπωσαίς | νήδυμον ὑπὸν ἐχευεν ἐῇ πανθελγεὶ ὑάδοι δὲ θεσπεσίᾳ βραρῆν κληίδα πυλῶν / ἡλιάδων ὑξε (35.235-41), which recalls his action in the Iliad, as he guides Priam into the Greek camp: τοῖσι δ’ [sc. φυλακτήρεσι] ἐφ’ ὑπὸν ἐχευε ... τάσιν, ἄφαρ δ’ ὑξε πύλας καὶ ἀπώσειν όχιαι (Ω445-6, cf. also μεγάλην κληίδα θυράων, 455). He subsequently dispels the ἰματίη νόξ (35.242, a term previously used at 31.151) from the
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Indians, and Deriades wakes to find the Bacchantes gone. A long simile follows, in which Deriades is compared to one who in a dream has acquired great wealth only to find on waking that he has nothing (35.245-52).

Nonnus now returns to the theme of the Δίος ἀπάτη, by which the whole train of events described in the foregoing books had been set in motion. Zeus wakes to discover the effects of Hera’s trickery, the scene being closely patterned on Homer’s: ἔγρετο δὲ Ζεὺς / Ἐκάκουον ἐν κορυφήσιν ἄπορρίφος πτερόν Ἡπειροῦ (35.262-3), corresponding to ἔγρετο δὲ Ζεὺς / Ἡῆς ἐν κορυφήσι παρὰ χρυσοδρόνου Ἡῆς (O4-5). Zeus realizes that he has been tricked by Hera as he views the scene below: καὶ δόλον ἥπεροτῆ µαθὼν κακοεργήσει Ἡῆς / Σιλπυράος ἐδόκεε πεφυκότας ... καὶ Σατύρους κείροντα καὶ ἀµώντα γυναίκας / Νηριάδῃς ἐνόνευν ὁπίστερον, ὅρχαµον Ἰνδόν, / ὦ ἴα ὦ ὅ ἐν δαπέδῳ κατακείµενον ἀµήν δὲ νύμφαι / ἐγγυς ἐσαν στεφανηδόν γι ὁ δὲ στροφάληγγι κοῦν ἦς / κεῖτο καρπαρεῖν, ὀλυγοδρανές ἀσθηµα τιτανῶν, / ἀφὸς ἄκουντός πεθαίνεια, µάρτυρα λύσης (35.264-72), which is freely patterned on ἰδε δὲ Τρώας καὶ Ἀχαιοὺς, / τοὺς µὲν ἄριστοµους, τοὺς δὲ κλονέουτας ὑπεσθῇ / Ἀργείους· µετὰ δὲ σφί Ποσειδάωνα ἀνακτα. / Ἐκτορὰ δ’ ἐν πεδίῳ ἱδὲ κείµενον ἀµήν δὲ ἔταιροι / εἶαθ’· ὦ δ’ ἄργολερ ἔχετ’ ἀσθµατι, κηρ ἀπινόσων, / αἰµ’ ἐμέων (06-11). The parallels Dionysus: Hector and Deriades: Poseidon are clearly discernible. Zeus’ reaction is given forthwith: καὶ φθονερῆς ἠλευξὲ δόλου δυσµήχανον Ἡῆς, / καὶ δολίνη παράκοιτην ἐµέψατο κέντορι µῆθω· / καὶ νῦ κεν ἀχλύφεντος ὁµέστιον ἱµπετόο / Ἡπειροῦ ὁµιλλήστε κατεκλίσει βερέθριφ, / εἰ µὴ Νὺξ ἵκετευ, θεῶν δµήτερα καὶ ἀνδρῶν (35.273-7). The δόλον δυσµήχανον Ἡῆς echoes Zeus’ first words to Hera in the Iliad: ἡ µάλα δὴ κακότεχνος, ἄµήχανε, σὸς δόλος, Ἡῆς (O14), the remainder being drawn from Hypnus’ earlier speech to Hera: καὶ κέ µ’ ἄδιστον ἀπ’ αἰθέρος ἐµβαλε πόντῳ, / εἰ µὴ Νὺξ δµήτερα θεῶν ἔσασσε καὶ ἀνδρῶν (Ξ258-9). Zeus’ speech in Nonnus is in the main a paraphrase of his speech in Homer with a few inessential additions: ἄξεος σοῦς προτέρους πάλιν ἄκμονας· εἰσέτει κεῖνοι, / εἰσέτει µοι.
parēasen ārṇgones, ods poioi dēsas / úmeteirous ēsfugxai: σu δ' āstatos
ψωδι γαῖς / αἰθέρι καὶ νεφέλησι μετάρσιων εἴχεσ ἀνάγκην (35.284-7),
which echoes ἥ ὀφ μέμνη, ὅτε τ' ἐκρέμω ψώθεν; ἐκ δὲ ποδοῦν / ἄκμονας
ἡκα δῶ (O18-9) and σὺ δ' εὖ αἰθέρι καὶ νεφέλησιν / ἐκρέμω (O20-1).
Hera's two sons, Ares and Hephaistus, had been powerless to help her (35.288-
91), reflecting the situation in Homer, where all the other gods, though they pitied
Hera in her plight, were deterred from coming to her assistance for fear of being
hurled down from Olympus (O21-4). We note that in Nonnus, Zeus speaks in the
past tense up to line 292, changing at that point to the future, switching from
merely reminding to actually threatening. He promises to bind Hera's hands: δήσω
σας παλάμας χρυσέω πάλν ἠθάδε δεσμῇ (35.293-4), something that he did in
Homer as he affixed the anvils to her feet: περὶ χερσὶ δὲ δεσμὸν ἡμα / χρύσειον, ἄρρηκτον (O19-20).
In Nonnus, Zeus extends his menaces to Ares, threatening to tie him up and whip him, should he entertain thoughts of coming to
Hera's assistance (35.293-4). Nonnus may have been prompted here by Homer's
reference to Otus and Ephialtes' tying up of Ares (E385-7).

Unlike Homer, Nonnus, demonstrating his habitual disinclination to include
dialogues in his narrative, omits any attempt on Hera's part to exculpate herself.
Zeus does not wait for any reaction to his threats, but orders Hera to breastfeed
Dionysus so as to cure him of his madness, promising by way of recompense, to
place her milk among the constellations (35.308-11). The restoration of Dionysus'
sanity through breastfeeding recalls the Tectaphus episode (26.101ff.), and the
poet has, predictably, reused some of the phrases employed in the latter.
Tectaphus, deprived of food and water, keito dypatheoi ... όλυγοδρανες
δόθμα τιταῖνων (26.113-4), a statement repeated in the present instance as keito
καρηβαρέων, όλυγοδρανες δόθμα τιταῖνων (35.271). Eerie feeds Tectaphus
αλεξικάκων γαλα μαζών (26.137), a phrase that recurs in Zeus' speech as
αλεξικάκου σεο μαζῴ (35.311).

Dionysus, ἤγιοσθείς, harangues his followers with a lengthy speech, telling
them that Zeus is again their leader and Hera no longer begrudges their cause.
Displaying feelings reminiscent of Achilles' sentiments on the death of Patroclus,
he declares his anguish at seeing Deriades alive and Opheltes lying unburied (35.372-5). Achilles, we recall, would not rest before he had avenged Patroclus (cf. his remarks to Hector, X331-6). Opheltes, little more than a name, is artificially made into another Patroclus by our poet, so as to provide a reason for the funeral games in book 37. With the close of book 35 the stage is now set for Dionysus to bring his campaign to a successful close, without encountering further obstruction from Hera.

In this chapter we propose to examine the final phase of the Indian war, postponing the funeral games for separate treatment in chapter 6. Book 36 commences with another famous Homeric set-piece, the theomachy. In Homer the theomachy precedes the Achilles-Hector duel, its somewhat farcical nature serving to heighten the tragic impact of the latter. Later poets came to view the theomachy as the harbinger of some momentous development in the war being fought out between mortals. Thus in Quintus it heralds the entry of the wooden horse into Troy (12.157ff.), in Silius it ushers in the battle of Cannae (9.287ff.). One would expect Nonnus to observe the same convention and have the theomachy directly precede the demise of Deriades. This does indeed appear to be the case initially, seeing that Dionysus and Deriades meet in single combat in the battle which follows. The expected slaying does not take place, however, Deriades being, rather inexplicably, pardoned to fight another day. Nonnus has decided to prolong the proceedings, inserting another Homeric set-piece, the funeral games, and a naumachy, before he has Dionysus again meet Deriades, this time resulting in the death of the Indian king.

Leaf has characterised, unfairly perhaps, Homer's theomachy as "an early parody" and a "precursor of the Battle of the Frogs and Mice", believing it to be a late insertion into the Iliad.¹ Undeniably the theomachy is a lighthearted diversion, providing comic relief before the tragic scenes of the following book. Silius and Quintus, in contrast to Homer, have painted their theomachies in sombre

¹ In A.Lang, Homer and the Iliad (Lond. 1893) p. 207. Lang on the contrary sees the theomachy and Zeus' crude bullying of Hera as remnants of a primeval cosmogony.
tones more akin to Hesiod's gigantomachy, viewing it as a grim portent of the events to follow. Nonnus, on the other hand, retains Homer's lighthearted tone, though he has dispensed with some of the more farcical elements, such as Hera's boxing Artemis' ears. His version, as Campbell observes, is remarkably free of Hesiodic "gigantomachy elements", which characterise those of his two predecessors. 2

Only in Homer are the causes of the conflict properly set out. Zeus convenes a great assembly of gods telling them that they must now actively partake in the war and array themselves into two opposing camps according to their respective sympathies. For now that Achilles has rejoined the fray, their participation is essential, lest he preempt the Fates and capture Troy prematurely (126-30). Zeus not only enjoins the gods to fight among themselves but takes obvious delight in watching them do so (389-90). In none of the later versions does Zeus behave in quite this way. In Quintus the fight breaks out in his absence (12.161-2), occasioning his displeasure when he returns to find them so engaged (12.190-200). In Nonnus the conflict likewise begins in his absence, but far from condemning it, Zeus signals his approbation by assuming the role of regulator (36.6-7). It may be noted that in the Iliad, though Zeus proposes the theomachy to a general assembly of all the gods (bar Oceanus), only a handful - the major gods - actually end up fighting. The gods face each other in pairs, Athena confronting Ares, Poseidon Apollo, Hera Artemis, Hermes Leto, and Hephaistus Scamander (66-74). Silius and Quintus mention only the first pair, but Nonnus gives us the full Homeric complement, except that the Hydaspes has been substituted for the Scamander. Their allegiances are different though, with Hera, Ares and Poseidon being on the Indian side - Poseidon's position appears somewhat ambiguous, seeing that in the naumachy he is presented as sympathetic to Dionysus (39.95-7) - while Athena, Hephaistus, Apollo and Artemis support Dionysus. The position of the last pair, Hermes and Leto, is difficult to ascertain. One would imagine that both (particularly Hermes) would want to side with Dionysus. Nonnus seems to lose sight of who is supposed to fight for which side, imitation of Homer being foremost in his mind. As often when imitating Homer, he becomes so engrossed in

---

2 Campbell (1981) p.57
the theme at hand as to forget whether it fits accurately into the context of his own narrative.

Ares attacks Athena - this attack is described by all the poets, but Homer is the only one to enlighten us as to his reason for doing so: he is annoyed at Athena for enabling Diomedes to wound him (E855ff.) and uses the present situation to get even with her (Φ394-9). In Nonnus, as in Quintus and Silius, Ares' assault on Athena comes unannounced. Athena is victorious in all instances, though it is only in Nonnus that we meet anything resembling a full Homeric treatment. Ares hurls his spear, striking the locks of the image of Medusa on Athena's shield (36.15-20). The action is similar to that where Chalcomeda damages Morpheus' shield with a rock (34.284ff.), and, as usual, there has been some reuse of expressions (cf. for example, 36.20 and 34.287). Athena retaliates by striking Ares with her ἑγχος ὀμόγνιον. Ares, stunned, sinks down on one knee - the impression is that he has been hit by a rock rather than pierced by a spear, and this is indeed what happens in Homer. Nonnus likes to see Athena fight with her spear but at the same time copies the result of her action from the Iliad. Nonnus, clearly, has little regard for verisimilitude or consistency of any kind, writing purely for effect. Ares is described as being ἐπταπέλεθρος (36.14), which corresponds to the length of ground he occupies as he lies sprawled on his back after being hit by Athena's rock (cf. ἐπὶ τὰ δ' ἐπέσχε τέλεθρα τεσσων, Φ407). Athena pulls him upright and delivers him back to his mother, Hera (36.26-7). In Homer he is led away by Aphrodite (Φ416-7).

The confrontation between Artemis and Hera is taken out of order by Nonnus, and again no reason is given for the attack: Artemis simply starts shooting arrows at Hera. In Homer it is Hera who attacks Artemis and does so because she is enraged at her for upbraiding Apollo for not having stood up to Poseidon. Hera protects herself with a νέφος ... ἄρραγες (36.31-2, cf. the ἀρρήκτος νεφέεσσα, 22.258, with which Athena protected Aias). This unbreakable cloud supposedly corresponds to the άλγις of Athena in the Iliad (Φ400-1). The arrows stick, harmless, in the cloud and Hera throws a jagged lump of ice at Artemis, breaking her bow and knocking her to the ground. We note that Hera's weapons are of a distinctly meteorological kind, which bespeaks her identification.
with ἄνδρος (similar to the way in which Athena was associated with αἴθρος). Nonnus shows himself to have been influenced by these Orphic notions, which may have derived from the superficial similarity of the names of the two goddesses to ἄνδρος and αἴθρος respectively (for another example cf. the pun at 29.177-8). Nonnus spares Artemis the undignified punishment that Hera metes out to her in the Iliad, opting instead for a mocking address. Hera's remarks in Nonnus reflect the remarks she makes in the Iliad prior to boxing Artemis' ears. Artemis is advised to confine herself in future to hunting (36.48-56), this admonition reflecting in essence Hera's words to Artemis in the Iliad (8481-3 and 485-6). Artemis' role of inducing birth pangs in women is likewise alluded to (36.63-6), again reflecting Hera's words in the Iliad (8483-4). Apollo clasps Artemis with both arms and escorts her from the fray (36.79-81), his action resembling that of Aphrodite with regard to Ares in the Iliad (8416-7).

The next engagement is that between Apollo and Poseidon. We recall that in the Iliad Apollo declines the challenge, for which he is rebuked by Artemis. In Nonnus, on the other hand, a full battle ensues, involving not only the two gods, but a number of lesser deities as well, all of them belonging to Poseidon's retinue, namely Triton, Nereus and the Nereids. The engagement anticipates the battle between Dionysus and Poseidon over Beroe, in which all their followers participate. The description of Triton (36.93-4) is repeated in much the same language at 43.205-8, and echoes that given by Apollonius (4.1610-4). The descriptions reflect the sculptural representations of this biform deity, half-man, half-fish, from Hellenistic times. For Nonnus the Apollo-Poseidon conflict is yet another variant of the fire-water opposition, that would be more naturally represented by the last pair of adversaries, Hephaistus and the Hydaspes, whose duel does not get off the ground in Nonnus. We note that Nonnus, in common with other late poets, identifies Apollo with the sun, in contrast to, say, Apollonius, where the two are clearly separated, Apollo favouring the Argonauts, Helius his son Aeetes. It is for this reason that Nonnus has Apollo fight with lighted torch as well as his customary bow and arrows, matching the waves and trident of Poseidon (36.84-7). We recall that in the earlier Dionysus-Hydaspes confrontation the role torch-wielder had devolved upon Dionysus, who in the fluid
world of Orphic pantheism could also be identified with the sun. The involvement of Poseidon's coterie of sea-deities in the fight is out of character with the otherwise limited and intimate nature of the theomachy, which in Homer has, more than anything, the appearance of a family squabble.

It is at this stage that Hades, fearing that Poseidon will open the nether world to light, voices his anxiety (36.97-105), reflecting the scene in the Iliad, where he expresses the same concern (156-65). The theme also occurs in Hesiod's Theogony, where Hades is subject to the same anxiety, as Zeus blasts Typhoeus with lightning bolts (850-2), a passage which is imitated by Quintus (12.178-80). In both Hesiod and Quintus Hades' misgivings are, somewhat paradoxically, shared by the imprisoned Titans. Why the Titans should dread their place of confinement being rent open, defies comprehension: one would rather expect them to be elated at the prospect of being able to escape. Nonnus, in Hermes' plea to Apollo and Poseidon to desist from their fight, quite rightly observes that the giants would rejoice at this eventuality (36.112-4). We note that Nonnus has quoted directly from the Iliad the line describing the din accompanying the fighting: τόσσος ἄρα κτύπως ἀρτο θεῶν ἐρίδα χυλόντων (36.106 = 166).

We recall that in Homer Hermes declines to fight his opponent Leto, who is more concerned with picking up Artemis' bow and arrows than engaging in battle. In Nonnus Leto is no longer even mentioned, Hermes appealing instead to Apollo and Poseidon to stop fighting, lest the giants take advantage of the Olympians' intestine strife (36.110-32). Hydaspes is also cautioned not to take on the fire of Hephastius, having already experienced the torch of Dionysus (36.130-2). As we noted above, Nonnus has transposed the fire-water opposition in this instance to the Apollo-Poseidon confrontation. The gods abide by Hermes' advice and with this the theomachy comes to a close.

As the theomachy ends, events on the ground get under way, with Deriades haranguing his fleeing troops with threats: εἰς ἐνοπῆν οἰκτρησε πεφυζότας ἣγεμονᾶς / καὶ ξυνή προλέεςκαι καὶ ἵππησσιον ἀπελήν / βάρβαρον ἑσμαράγχει βαρυφόγγων ἀπὸ λαιμῶν (36.137-9). Deriades is the quintessential oriental tyrant, whom his subjects fear more than the enemy, his manner of speech recalling that of Typhoeus, to whom he is compared on several
occasions (cf. ὄμογλώσσων ἀπὸ λαμβῶν / εἰς ἔνοπτην πολύτηχος ἐπεβρυχάτο Τυφωνέας, 2.244-5). The Indians are enjoined to decorate their halls with the horned heads of the Satyrs and Sileni (36.147-50), recalling the earlier threat by Dionysus with regard to Deriades himself (27.219-20). He, for his part, shall lead Dionysus to captivity, with torn nebris and thyrsus cast aside.

The battle itself is the usual blend of the conventional with the bizarre and magical, except that here animals too are assigned a role. The Bassarids hurl poisonous snakes at the enemy in imitation of Phidaleia, who overcame the assailants of Byzantium in this way (36.176ff.). Panthers leap on the necks of elephants, lions and bulls roar, with bears joining in the fray. Pan fights with his pack of dogs (36.195-7), something that we would have expected Aristaius to do as well, seeing that he came to the war with his fighting dogs (13.299), as indicated earlier (p.91). The zoological extravaganza is followed by a typical πεζομαχία segment, where the poet lists the various kinds of wounds inflicted (36.206-20), those affected being referred to according to . . . rhetorical convention by an anonymous τίς, ὁς, ὁλος κ.τ.λ. Similar passages occur previously at 22.191-5, where wounds inflicted by Oiagrus on a number of unnamed Indians are specified, and at 22.232-46, where injuries sustained on the battlefield are depicted anonymously. A confrontation between an infantryman and a horseman follows, a situation analogous to that at 22.299ff., except that here it is the former who emerges the victor. He tosses sand in the horse's eyes, which throws its rider, who then becomes easy prey for his opponent. Returning to the realm of fantasy, the poet now tells how the gigantic Colletes, comparable in size to Otus and Ephialtes, is felled by a rock from the Bacchante Charopeia. Deriades forthwith assails Charopeia, who falls back to take up position alongside Dionysus. Deriades slays Orithallus, one of the Curetes, whose chief Melisseus kills Cyllarus by way of retribution. Cyllarus, here qualified by the patronymic Λωγασιδῆς, though previously referred to as one of the two sons of Brongus in the Catalogue (26.220), is singled out by the poet as being, on account of his wise counsels, esteemed by Deriades second only to Morrheus. He is a sort of Indian Polydamas, but makes an appearance only to be slain. The name of his father, Λωγασος, derived from λόγος, seems a typical Nonnian formation, the difference in quantity
being no barrier to associations of this kind (cf., for example, Homer’s pun on the name Odysseus, when Athena, remonstrating with Zeus regarding the latter’s fate, asks τί νῦν οί τόσον ωδύσαο, Ζεῦ; α63).

The battle now enters a crucial phase, with Dionysus meeting Deriades in single combat. The duel has two distinct stages, the first of which sees Deriades take the fight to Dionysus, but all his attempts at striking a telling blow come to nought owing to the latter’s continual form-changes. In the second, Dionysus ties his hapless adversary down with vines and ivy strands, which he makes suddenly spring up from the ground under him. Nonnus has a noticeable obsession with form-changes: two extended passages are devoted to Dionysus’ form-changes, the present duel (36.291-334) and Deriades’ later inaccurate recollection of it (40.37-60), while Proteus, the quintessential form-changer, gets his due at 43.225-52. We recall that Nonnus sees himself too as a sort of literary form-changer in that he sets out to compose a poem whose sudden thematic alternations are meant to rival Proteus’ form-changes (1.11-34). Nonnus derives his inspiration from Menelaus’ account in the Odyssey, how he and his companions, disguised in seal skins, tried vainly to apprehend Proteus: ἡμεῖς δὲ ἱάχοντες ἐπεσσόμεθ’, ἀμφὶ δὲ χεῖρας / βάλλομεν· οὖδ’ ὁ γέρων δολίης ἐπελήθετο τέχνης, / ἄλλ’ ἡ τοι πρώτη στα λέων γένετ’ ἡγένειος, / αὐτὰρ ἐπείτα δράκων καὶ πάρδαλις ἢδε μέγας σύς· / γίγνετο δ’ ἴγρον ὕδωρ καὶ δένδρεον ῥυπέτηλον. / ἡμεῖς δ’ ἀστεφέως ἔχομεν τετληπτὶ θυμῷ (δ454-9). Nonnus has expanded this passage in a number of ways. Of the three passages, that devoted to Proteus in book 43 is the most faithful to the Homeric prototype, but even there Nonnus has added gratuitous touches of his own. Thus when Proteus assumes the form of a snake, Nonnus cannot refrain from adding ἀποπτών δὲ γενείων / ἵδων ἀκουστήρα κακὴν σύρισε λαιμῷ (43.240-1). By way of deliberate reference to Homer, Nonnus has Proteus appear in a seal-skin (43.226), though it is his would-be captors who wear the seal skins in the Odyssey. The shapes assumed by Proteus correspond to those in the Odyssey passage, but in the case of Dionysus Nonnus takes greater liberties, Dionysus becoming in addition fire, water, a lion, then a tree touching the heavens. The fire-water theme is, as we have noted, a favourite with Nonnus, but it occurs also in Ovid’s depiction of Proteus:
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'interdum, faciem imitatus aquarium, / flumen eras, interdum undis contrarius ignis' (Met. 8.736-7). Hitherto the changes have been instantaneous, but Dionysus' turning into a tree seems to come about by a more gradual process: ἄμεθομένου δὲ καρήνου / μμήλοις πετάλωσι νόθην δευνδρώσατο χαίτυν, / γαστέρα θάμνον ἔχων περιμήκετον ἀκρεμόνας δὲ / χείρας ἐὰς ποίησε, καὶ ἐφλοίωσε χιτώνας, καὶ πόδας ἐρρίζωσεν (36.307-11), which recalls the metamorphosis of Daphne in Ovid: 'in frondem crines, in ramos bracchia crescent; / pes, modo tam velox, pigris radicibus haeret. / ora cacumen obit' (Met. 1.550-2; cf. also Myrrha's metamorphosis, 10.490-8). Dionysus then becomes a panther, which leaping on the elephant's neck, impels it to throw its ὑμημάχον ἡμιοχή (36.317) to the ground. Then, becoming in turn a lion and a boar, he further exasperates Deriades, who, perhaps justifiably, accuses him of using cowardly, deceitful tactics and promises to counter his magic with that of his own Brahmins, who, he claims, have it in their power to stop the sun and the moon.

Deriades remounts his elephant, but Dionysus induces vines and ivy to spring up and envelop both beast and rider. Deriades, like Lycurgus previously, is tied to the spot, unable to move. In both instances Nonnus compares the immobilised warrior to a ship held fast by the remora or echeneis. In the earlier episode, Ambrosia, addressing Lycurgus, gives a description of the ship-detaining ability of the fish: ἐκλυεσ εἰναλίην ἔχενηδα, πῶς ἐνὶ πόντῳ / ἠχθες βαιὸς ἀναλκίς ἐπέχραε πολλάκις ναύταις / ἄψ ἀνασειράζων, ὕλιγ ς ὃ ὑπὸ χάσματι λαμοῦ / μηκεδαμὴν ἀνέκοψε κατάσχετον ἀλκάδα δεσμῷ ; / δέξο με χερσαίην ἔχενηδα, δέξο πετήλων / αὐτοπέδην ἀσίδηρων ἐρισταφύλου κυδοῦμοι (21.45-50). Deriades is held down even more securely than a ship by the echeneis: οὗ τόσον ἀλκάδα πόντῳ / θηκτὰ περιπλεκέων ἐχενηίδος ἀκρα γενεῖων / δεσμῷ καρχαρόδοντι διεστίριζε θαλάσση (36.367-9). Nonnus has in mind the passage in Oppian's Halieutica where a ship is described as being held fast by this little fish: ἦχθος ὀὐτιδανοῦ κατὰ στόμα ρίζωθείσα (1.234; cf. also Pliny, N.H. 9.41). Deriades seeks and obtains clemency, but in place of expressing gratitude, reaffirms his stated intention either to slay Dionysus or to take him captive.
Nonnus now turns his attention to the building of the fleet for the forthcoming naval engagement, an event forecast at 21.306-9 but which, nevertheless, appears to have been added by way of afterthought by the poet. The process of shipbuilding is described in a manner reminiscent of Odysseus’ raft-building in Homer. The shipbuilders remain anonymous, being designated by the usual ὄ, ὄς, ἄλλος κ.τ.λ.: ὁ μὲν τορπώσατο γόμφους, / ὄς δὲ μέσην πεπόνητο περὶ τρόπιν, ἵκρια δ’ ἄλλος / ὀρθὰ περὶ σταμύνεσιν ἁμοιβαίζουν ὕφαίνων / ὀλκάδι τοῖχον ἐτευχεῖν ἐπηγκενίδας τε συγάπτων / μηκεδανάς κατέπηξε, βαθυνομένη δὲ μεσόδημη / ὕψωγαν μέσον ἵστον Ἀραψ ὑφβώσατο τέκτων / λαίφε ὑπεπαμένη πεφυλαγμένον· αὐτὰρ ἐπ’ ἄκρη / δουρατέν ἐπίκυρτον ἐτορπώσατο κεράτην / ἰδιομελές εὐπαλάμοιο καὶ Ἡφαίστου καὶ Ἀθήνης (36.403-11). Odysseus performs these tasks on his own: τέτρημεν δ’ ἀρα πάντα [sc. δούρατα] καὶ ἆκμοσεν ἀλλήλοισιν: / γόμψαις δ’ ἀρα τήρησε καὶ ἀμοιβήσεν ἄρασσεν: / ... ἵκρα δὲ στίθας ἁραφών θαμέσι σταμύνεσιν, / ποιεὶ ... ἐν δ’ ἰστόν ποιεὶ καὶ ἐπίκυριον ἄρμενον αὐτῷ: / πρὸς δ’ ἀρα πηδάλιον ποησάτο, δὴρ’ ἴθυνοι (e247-55). The Odyssey passage is imitated a second time at 40.446-54, where Heracles Astrochiton tells Dionysus how he taught the founders of Tyre the art of raft-building. Keydell notes in his apparatus that Nonnus has in each instance borrowed a word from the scholia to the Homeric passage, namely ὀρθὰ (36.405) and πυκνὸς (40.446), which may be taken to indicate that Nonnus experienced as much difficulty with understanding the Homeric passage as does the modern reader.

The ship-building is understood to take place after the first duel between Dionysus and Deriades, but at the same time we are told that the fleet is being built in the sixth year of the war (36.422-3), which seems to suggest that the events described from book 26 to the present have taken place before the final or seventh year. This clearly cannot be the case, as it would go against the poet’s stated intention at the beginning of book 25 to sing thenceforth only of the last year of the war. The often ambiguous and misleading nature of the poet’s remarks indicates his lack of concern for narrative consistency and it is futile to press him too closely on points of logic. Book 36 ends with an address by Morrheus to the Indians, in
which he expresses his confidence in their superior prowess in naval warfare (36.464-6). Deriades dispatches a messenger to Dionysus with a declaration of sea war (36.474-5), but when the narrative is resumed at the beginning of book 39 the Indians show none of their pugnacious stance, and the declaration of sea war appears to be entirely forgotten. They are, on the contrary, cowed and astonished at the sight of Dionysus' fleet, as if its arrival were something unanticipated, nor is Deriades himself exempt from fear (39.21-3). It is only now that Deriades orders the mobilisation of his naval forces, to counter what seems an unexpected and imminent threat. Disguising his anxiety ποιητή γέλωτε, he summons his fighters from the three-hundred islands of his realm and has them assemble for combat, all in the time it takes Dionysus' fleet to draw near, from the moment that it was first sighted. This is the second overall muster of the Indian forces (39.24-30), the first having taken place thirteen books earlier (26.38-43).³

Deriades addresses his assembled forces, enjoining them to light firebrands and burn Dionysus' fleet (39.34-6). This tactical directive apart, the speech is the usual congeries of taunts and threats to which the reader must by now be accustomed. Irritated by the ὀδυτή βωτρυώσα of the Hydaspes - here we have yet another recollection of the original conversion of the river into wine - he declares that he would block it up with earth were it not his father (39.40-52), echoing Dionysus' earlier threat to make it bone dry (27.185-8). Deriades questions Dionysus' claim to be a god - a theme borrowed from Euripides' Bacchae - and compares him adversely with Zagreus, who was given the use of the thunderbolt instead of the humble thyrsus (39.59-60), a notion reappearing in Poseidon's speech at 43.176-8, where Dionysus is challenged to match with thunder and lightning the latter's trident. A comparison of wine with nectar follows, which, as we have noted, is another recurrent motif in the poem.

Dionysus' speech is presented next, commencing with a rousing exhortation to his followers to rout the Indians on water as they had previously done on land:

³If the remarks which the poet makes in the course of the Indian war narrative were taken at face value, we would have the following unacceptable time-frame: crossing of the Hydaspes - 6 year period of inactivity - first muster of the Indians (26.38ff.) - land battles - first duel - second six year period of inactivity (38.10-4) - shipbuilding for Dionysus - second muster of the Indians - naumachy - second duel. As Collart observes (pp. 167-8), this would extend the Indian war to 13 instead of the stated 7 years.
These lines, similar in tone to the battle hymn of the Greeks as they prepare to engage the Persian fleet at Salamis in Aeschylus' *Persae* (402-5), hardly seem to befit the Satyrs and Sibyl, whose life of carousing and amorous pursuits was anything but ἔργα μόθοι καὶ ἀγώνες. Dionysus, who appears to have divined Dierades' intentions, tells his troops to keep the enemy at bay with sea-pikes, to prevent the enemy setting fire to their ships (39.82-7). Nonnus is thinking here of the scene in the *Iliad* where the Greeks used their sea-pikes to keep the Trojans from setting fire to their beached ships (O386-9). In view of all this, it is perhaps somewhat ironic that in the end it is Dionysus who sets fire to Dierades' ships (39.391-401).

The Mimallones are urged to fight fearlessly (νόσφι φόβου μάρνασθε, Μιμαλλόνες, 39.88), as they can count on the sea-deities to lend them succour. It is ironic that Dionysus should in book 43 urge the Mimallones, using similar language, to fight those same sea-deities, of whose help he assures them in the present instance (cf. ἀλλὰ πάλιν μάρνασθε, Μιμαλλόνες, κ.τ.λ. 43.133). Melicertes will immerse Dierades' ship (39.102), yet in book 43 the same Melicertes is deemed no match for drunken Silenus (43.80). The sea-deities extolled here are correspondingly depreciated in book 43, along the lines of rhetorical encomia and psogoi. Dionysus concludes by boasting that he could at any time call on the winds to scuttle the Indian fleet, but chooses not to, so as not to deprive his νησοθόρα θύρα of that distinction.

A brief interlude of fighting ensues, followed by two more speeches, one from Aiacaus and the other from Erechtheus. Some of the descriptive elements used here recur in book 43. For example, Echo replies to Pan's voice as it carries over the waves: ἀντὶ δὲ πετραίης πολέμηα λείψανα φωνῆς / Παύλας ὑστερόφωνος ἄμειβετο ποντίας Ἡχώ (39.129-30), a motif repeated in book 43, where Pan's πολέμου μέλος likewise elicits a response from Echo: ὑπηνέμος δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ / τικτομένη σύριγγι διώκετο ποντίας Ἡχώ (43.220-1). Dionysus' ships encircle the Indian fleet (39.132-5), an idea which seems to have been borrowed from Aeschylus' *Persae*, where the Persian ships, trapped in the narrows, are
similarly encircled by the Greeks (415-8). We note that in both Nonnus and Aeschylus they are likened to fish caught in a net (cf. 39.135 and Pers. 424-6). There can be little doubt that Nonnus was influenced by Aeschylus, even though his language differs from that of the dramatist.  

Aiacus' speech is addressed to Zeus, who is asked to respond to the speaker's plea as favourably as he had on that previous occasion when he had ended the drought on Aegina, so that it might be said: ως ἐνι γαίη / Ζεὺς ἐδον νία γέραιρε, καὶ ἐν πελάγεσοι γεραίρει (39.143-4) and that he χάρμα πόρεν Δήμητρι καὶ εὐφροσύνην Διονύσῳ (39.148). Nonnus is fond of such quotations, introduced by ὄφρα ... τις, μὴ ... τις εἰπη, ἐνίψῃ κ.τ.λ. (cf. 33.262, 40.156-7, 48.549 and, for a Homeric precedent, cf. X105-7). Aiacus asks Zeus to indicate a favourable disposition by means of the portent of an eagle, appearing on his right and carrying in its talons a dead horned serpent, and at the same time to presage their demise to the enemy, by another eagle, black in colour and appearing on their left (39.158-64). This is an adaptation of the omen of the snake and eagle in the Iliad, which boded ill for the Trojans (M200-6). Nonnus' νεκρῶν ὄφιν stands in conscious opposition to Homer's δράκουτα ... ζωὸν (M201-2), the device of oppositio in imitando corroborating the situational parallel.

Erechtheus' speech follows forthwith, without any intervening battle scenes. His address is directed to his son-in-law Boreas, whom he reminds of the bride-price owing to him, the debt that he can now repay by scattering Deriades' fleet. Erechtheus is confident that Boreas can overcome the east and south winds, who are more likely to side with Deriades. There is lack of agreement with Dionysus' speech, in that Dionysus boasts of having all the winds on side, should he wish to call for their services. While Erechtheus calls on Boreas in all earnestness, Dionysus dispenses with their help so as not deprive his thyrsus of the glory of destroying the Indian fleet. Erechtheus is confident that Poseidon and Athena will take up the fight alongside Boreas, as will Hephaistus.

*The reconstituted Persian empire under the Sassanids posed a continual threat to the eastern provinces from the 3rd century, a circumstance which led to renewed interest in literature on the Persian wars of the 5th century B.C., as evidenced by the number of epigrams on Medic themes in the Anthology.*
Erechtheus' speech is followed by a passage depicting the carnage on the waves, there being many slain on both sides: καὶ φόνος ἦν ἐκάτερβε, καὶ ἔξεε κύματα λόθρω / καὶ πολὺς ἀμφοτέρων στρατὸς ἤρπεν ἄρτιχύτω δὲ / αἰματι κυνέης ἐρυθάειτο νῶτα θαλάσσης (39.225-7). These lines echo Aeschylus' description of the slaughter at Salamis: θάλασσα δ’ οὐκέτ’ ἦν ἰδεῖν / ναυαγίων πλήθουσα καὶ φόνου βροτῶν (Pers. 419-20). We note that Herodotus likewise states that many perished on both sides (8.1). Nonnus is typically inconsistent with his statement of facts, as we are given to understand a few lines later that the slain were all Indians (39.235-7). Some of the details are repeated from books 22 and 23. Thus οἴδαλέω πλωτήρες ἐναυτίλλοντο θαλάσσῃ (39.230) is a rewending of καὶ πλὸς ἦν εὔπολος· ἐκοψίζοντο δὲ λαοὶ / οἴδαλεος μελέσαν (23.105-6). The πολλοὶ δ’ αὐτοκύλιστον ... / εἰς τοὺς οὐρον ἐλίθοθαν ... βριθδομενοι θωρήκι (39.232-5) echoes καὶ τις ἀνήρ ... / κύμβαχος αὐτοκύλιστος ἐπιλάθησε ὀεέρθω (22.366-7) and εἰς βυθὸν ... κατέσπασεν ἄνερα θώρηξ (23.112). Helmets and shields float about: νεοσφαγέος δὲ φορήσω / αὐτομάτη λοφόεσσα δὲ ὀθέατο ἐπλείε πῆλην (39.243-4), recalling ἀποκθημένου δὲ φορήσω / ἤμιθαν ἀποκτήτω πῆλην (23.106-7). The ἐπενῆχετο κύκλα βοείς / σὺν διερῶ τελαμώνι (39.239-41) echoes νησομένους τελαμώνας ἐναυτίλλοντο βοεῖαι (23.110). Many find their tomb in the jaws of carnivorous fish: ἐτυμβεύοντο δὲ πολλοὶ / κητείός γεινέσσιν, ἐν ἱκνοῦντι δὲ λαμῖ / ἄρηνον αἰθύσουσα νέκυν τυμβεύσατο φύκη (39.239-41). The notion of a gullet or stomach furnishing a last resting place occurs earlier at 21.121-3, where as one of the horrors visited on Lycurgus' subjects is that male offspring are eaten by their own mothers, whose stomachs become their children's tombs (ἄτροφον ἀρσενόπαιδα τόκον τυμβεύσατο γαστήρ, 21.123). The idea most likely originated in the schools of rhetoric (cf. Gorgias frag. 5a D: γύπες ἐμφυξοι τάφοι). We recall also that the fear of being devoured κύνεσσιν / ὀλονοίσθι τε (A4-5) is strongly voiced in the Iliad (cf. Priam's apprehension about being eaten by his own dogs, X74-6). The line, ἀφρός ἐρευνόμων πολιθὶς ἀνεκήκεν ἄλμης

145
(39.248), depicting the bloodied state of the waters, echoes Apollonius' δφρω δ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα κホテεν ἄλμη (1.542), who uses it in an entirely different context, namely to describe the Argo as it ploughs its way through the sea.

The sea deities are stained with blood (e.g. καὶ φονίας λιβάδεσσαν ἐϕοινίχθη Μελικέρτης, 39.250), but unlike their reaction in the earlier Hydaspes episode (cf. the representations of an unnamed Indian to the Hydaspes, which is αἱμαλέας λιβάδεσσα φόνον πλημμυρίδα σύρων, that it will defile Oceanus and Poseidon, 23.98-103), they do not appear to be overly concerned at the defilement of their abode. Galatea fears lest she encounter Polyphemus fighting in the ranks of Dionysus' followers. Poseidon, on the other hand, reproaches Dionysus for not having enlisted Polyphemus' services, who, he asserts, would have made short work of Deriades and the Indians: στήθεα βοσκέραντο διέβλασε Δηραδήδος, καὶ ... εἰς μίαν ἤργενειαν δλον γένος ἐκτανεν ἴνδων (39.284.283), recalling Dionysus' earlier boast to Attis, that were it not for the obstructionism of Hera and Zeus, εἰς μίαν ἤργενειαν διστάζοι πόλιν ἴνδων ... δυνήσομαι (25.341-2). Poseidon continues, telling Dionysus that Polyphemus would help him just as Aigaion, who was also a son of his, had helped Zeus.

At this point the narrative becomes extremely fragmented, losing what little cohesion it may have previously possessed. Collart's characterisation of the present book as "non pas comme un amas de ruines, mais comme un étalage de matériaux disparates, préparés pour un construction"; is especially pertinent to the last third of it, which is no more than an assemblage of unconnected tableaux.

Nereus and Poseidon are astounded at (but apparently not offended by) the ξανθής ... νώτα θαλάσσης (39.297) and the πληθύ νεκρῶν ... ἄβροχα νώτα γεφυρωθέντα θαλάσσης (39.298-9), statements which, like 39.225-7, are a recollection of Aeschylus, Pers.419-20. The overuse of νώτα is, as mentioned previously (p.13), a mannerism of our poet. A segment depicting the types of wounds inflicted (introduced by the usual anonymous τις etc.) follows. Phlogius aims at Deriades, but misses, the arrow hitting the ship's deck. Deriades then hurls his spear at Dionysus, but strikes a dolphin instead, which does a dance of death in

---
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the water (39.331-7). Halimedes raises a cliff from the sea and hurls it at the Indians, sinking a ship (39.218-9), like Polyphemus in the Odyssey (1481ff.). Such gigantomachy elements are, as noted earlier, interspersed with Nonnus' battle scenes (cf. 28.206-10, 29.229-30 and 30.227-30). The disposition of the opposing squadrons is now given (39.348-51), something that one would rather have expected to be supplied at the outset of the hostilities. The opposing squadrons are aligned with the four winds in much the same way that Dionysus' land forces were at 27.148-63. Morrheus makes a brief appearance, only to be wounded and retire to have his wounds tended by a Brahmin (39.351-60). Another segment of generalised fighting follows, in which the poet attributes the Indians' greater loss of life to their inability to swim (χείρας ἑρτὼμαχοντες ἄθρες ἐς μέλαιν ὕδωρ, ἦχεσιν ἀσταθέσσιν ἑτυμβεύοντο θαλάσση, 39.366-7), while Dionysus' followers, being proficient swimmers, escape a similar fate (39.368-71). This is, clearly, a reminiscence of Herodotus 8.89, where the Persians, in contrast to the Greeks, perish for the same reason.

Zeus now tilts the battle in favour of Dionysus, somewhat gratuitously perhaps, as the latter's forces appear to have had the upper hand all along. The winds enter the fray, οἱ μὲν Δηριαδῆς ἀργώνεις, οἱ δὲ Λυσίου (39.381). The idea of the winds taking sides is in accord with Erechtheus' words (39.193-201) and belies Dionysus' claim that they are all at his call should he need their help (39.11-6). Eurymedon sets his ship alight and sends it adrift toward the Indian fleet. With their ships on fire, the Indians panic and withdraw to land.

Book 40 finds Deriades on land, despondent and about to flee for his life. Athena, seated on a rock in the sea, decides to convince him to make a stand and fight, lest he should elude death at Dionysus' hands. Assuming the form of Morrheus, she upbraids him for his cowardice, an idea borrowed from the Iliad, where Athena in the shape of Deiphobus convinces Hector to stand and fight Achilles. Morrheus' role has been portrayed somewhat ambiguously in the preceding narrative. On the one hand, he is a great champion, haranguing the Indians to defeat Dionysus on the sea (36.430-69), and his wounding and withdrawal from the fray spell disaster for the Indians (39.357-60). On the other, his infatuation with Chalcomeda has made him a traitor to his native land and a
willing tool of Dionysus, something that is subsequently highlighted in Cheirobie's speech (40.167ff.). The continued representation of Morrheus as the invincible champion of the Indians long after his dereliction constitutes a serious flaw in the narrative, of which the poet must surely have been aware, but (as often) makes no attempt to amend. Morrheus' speech corresponds schematically to that of Deiphobus in the *Iliad*, but differs in tone and content, being delivered κερτομίους ἐπέεσσον in the usual Nonnian fashion. \(^6\) Athena begins by asking: φεύγεις, Δημιάδη; τίνι κάλλιπες ὀρεα νηών; (40.11), echoing the question she had on a previous occasion put to Dionysus, as he fled before Deriades: τῇ φεύγεις, Διόνυσε; τί σοι φόβος ἀντὶ κυδομοῦ; (30.258). Athena asks Deriades how he could bear to face his subjects (40.12), an idea which was perhaps suggested to Nonnus by Hector's determination to remain outside the walls and face Achilles for fear of reproach should he do otherwise (X99ff.). Deriades is told, furthermore, that he will be held to shame beside his wife Orsiboe, a warrior in her own right, and daughter Cheirobie, who accompanies her husband to battle. The make-believe Morrheus then asks that the command be turned over to him and promises to slay Dionysus. He voices his shame at being known as Deriades' son-in-law, calling for another to take his place as Cheirobie's husband. He will go to the land of the Medes, to Scythia, to escape the stigma of being related to Deriades, and find himself another warrior-wife (to replace Cheirobie) from the ranks of the Amazons.

The speech draws protestations from Deriades, who seeks to excuse his conduct by saying that he could not overcome an opponent, try as he might, who was forever assuming different shapes. He subsequently recapitulates in detail, but inaccurately, the various form-changes of Dionysus during their first duel. We note that Deriades' reply skirts around the point at issue, namely his forsaking his fleet in the present instance. Pseudo-Morrheus' reproaches nevertheless have the desired effect, with Deriades now resolved to stand and face Dionysus for a second time.

The second duel is patterned rather closely on the Achilles-Hector confrontation in the *Iliad*, though with some modification of the sequence of events

\[^6\] For chiding speeches in the *Iliad*, cf. Hector's rebuke to Paris at Z329ff. and to Polydamas at M231ff.
and a noticeable curtailment of the actual fight-scene, which in Hopkinson's words "provides a grotesquely disproportionate climax to the more than twenty-four books of conflict."⁷ Such narrative truncation is attributable to Pindaric influence, as noted previously (pp. 37-8). The events are ordered differently than the Iliad. Thus, as we have just seen, Athena's intervention is made to take place at the very beginning, when Deriades is simply fleeing from the battle, rather than later, when he is running, like Hector from Achilles, specifically from Dionysus. Deriades throws his spear at Dionysus thrice, falling wide of the mark each time; on the fourth attempt he calls out to Morpheus to lend him a hand, only to find that he has been deceived by Athena: τρίς μὲν ἐδοὺ δόρυ πέμπτε, καὶ ἢμβροτεν ἥρα βάλλων· ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε δὴ τὸ τέταρτον ἐπέδραμεν οἷνοπ Βάκχῳ / εἰς σκοτίν ἀχρῆστον ἐπόμορον ἔγχος ίδίων / Δημιάδης ὑπέροπτος, ἐόυ συμάθωλον ἄγωνος / γαμβρόν ἐδόν καλέσσε, καὶ οὐκέτι φαλεντο Μορφεὺς· ἀλλὰ μεταστρέψασα δολοπλόκον εἴδος Ἀθήνη / δαίμονι βοτρύδεντι παρίστατο (40.69-75). This passage is a composite of Homeric reminiscences, the first part being based on Diomedes' attack on Aeneas: τρίς μὲν ἐπείτε ἐπόρουσε, κατακτάμεναι μενεάινων / τρίς δὲ οἱ ἐστυφέλεξε φαείνην ἀσπίδ' Ἀπόλλων. ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε δὴ τὸ τέταρτον ἐπέσυντο, δαίμονι ἵσος / δεινὰ δ᾽ ὀμοκλήσας προσέφη ἐκάργος Ἀπόλλων (E436-9), but Nonnus' imitation is not strictly accurate. He has Deriades hurl his spear three times, an improbable scenario seeing that his adversary would be unlikely to allow him to retrieve it for each successive throw. We note that in Homer Diomedes attacks three times, but does not part with his spear. The second half is drawn from Hector's duel with Achilles, when he turns to the make-believe Deiphobus to borrow his spear, only to discover that the latter is no longer there: Δηφόβον δ᾽ ἐκάλει λευκάσπιδα μακρὸν αὐσας, ἀπίε μὲν δόρυ μακρὸν· ὀ δ᾽ οὐτὶ οἱ ἐγγύθεν ἦν (X294-5). Hector then realises that Athena has deceived him: Δηφόβον γὰρ ἐγὼ γ᾽ ἔφαμην ἥρωι παρεῖναι· ἀλλ᾽ ὅ μὲν ἐν τείχει, ἐμὲ δ᾽ ἐξεπάτησεν Ἀθήνη (X298-9). Hector never beholds Athena physically, but intuits her presence from what he has just experienced and knows that his moment of doom has
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arrived. Nonnus has deprived this tragic scene of its impact, turning it into something quite banal, even parodic. Not only does Deriades see Athena physically, but Dionysus at the same time puffs himself up to outlandish proportions (as he does later in his confrontation with Perseus, cf. 47.657-61). Seeing Athena and a much-expanded Dionysus, Deriades entrusts his future to his feet, running off with Dionysus in hot pursuit. A much abbreviated version of Achilles' pursuit of Hector is now given. Deriades, on reaching the Hydaspes, decides to make a stand in the expectation that the river, his father, will come to his aid: ἀλλ' ὅτε χύρων ἰκανον, ὅπη πολεμητόκον ὄδωρ / κύματι λυσώντι γέρων κελάρυζεν ἦδασπης / ἦτοι ὁ μὲν ποταμὸ ο παρ' ἥσον μπλετος ἔστη, / ὡς γενέτην συνέθηλον ἔχον κελάδουντα μαχητήν (40.86-9). This corresponds to the point in the Iliad at which Zeus decides to bring the matter to a close: ἀλλ' ὅτε δή το τέταρτον ἐπὶ κρουνοις ἀφίκοντο, / καὶ τότε δὴ χρύσεια πατήρ ἐπίπλαυται σαλαντα κ.τ.λ. (X208-9), though the initial phrase is modelled on οἱ δ' ὅτε χύρων ἰκανον, ἃ δι σχοι πέφρας Ἀχιλλεύς (Ψ138), referring to the place designated for the pyre of Patroclus. The slaying of Deriades is quite anticlimactic. Dionysus has merely to graze Deriades' skin with his thrysus to cause his death: ἀκρότατον χρόα μοῦνον ἐπέγραφε Δηριάδης (40.92), whereupon the latter slips into the Hydaspes, bridging it with his enormous limbs: πατριῶς προκάρηνος ἐπιλίσθησε ρεέθρω, / μηκεδανοὶ μελέσσοι γεφυρώσας ὄλων ὄδωρ / αὐτόματος (40.94-6). His death recalls that of Orontes, who commits suicide and slides into the river named after him (17.287-9). Collart understands 40.92 to mean that Deriades was flayed alive ('écoroché viv') and sees the reference at 1.42-3 to the flaying of Marsyas as auguring a similar fate for Deriades. There is, however, nothing in the present passage to justify such an interpretation. The gods return to Olympus, signalling the end of the Indian war. Dionysus' followers pierce Deriades' body with their spears, as the Greeks do that of Hector.

The lamentations of Deriades' widow, Orsiboe, and his two daughters,

---

8 One wonders whether Nonnus was not prompted by Homer's simile at X162-4, likening Achilles' pursuit of Hector to an athletic event in honour of a dead man, to go to ψ in the present instance.
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Protonoe and Cheirobie, are next presented. The speeches reflect the lamentations of Priam, Hecuba and Andromache in both Iliad 22 and 24, but exhibit marked rhetorical tendencies. Too visible a use of rhetorical artifice, exemplified by symmetrical antithetical statements, detracts from the the gravity of the situation and robs the speeches of much of their genuineness and pathos. Orsiboe indicates her grief through gesture, but is not accorded the opportunity to express it verbally before her daughters have had their say. The physical manifestations of her grief (40.103-7; cf. also 40.160-1 and the similar scene at 24.181-4) are modelled on those of Hecuba (X405-7), but even here Nonnus cannot forgo the opportunity to remark on the mourner’s racial characteristics (esp. 40.104 and 106). Protonoe’s speech follows forthwith, her grief being seen to be the greatest, as she has not only lost her father but her husband as well. Although Orontes had died many years previously, before Dionysus’ arrival in India, Protonoe speaks as if she had but now lost him: ἀνερ, ἀπ’ αἰώνος νέος ὑλεό. καὶ δὲ με χήρην /κάλλιπες ἐν μεγάροις ἅπειρήτην τόκετοι οὐ τέκον υἱὰ παραίφασιν (40.113-5). This is an explicit reference to Andromache’s words: ἀνερ, ἀπ’ αἰώνος νέος ὑλεό, καὶ δὲ με χήρην /κείτες ἐν μεγάροις παῖς δ’ ἐτι νηπιος αἰθως, ἐν τεκομεν σῷ τ’ ἔγω τε (Ω725-7). Nonnus has changed one key detail, the alteration contrasting with the original phrase (oppositio in imitando), by saying that no child is left behind. While Andromache voices her anxiety regarding Astyanax’ future, Protonoe bewails the fact that she does not have one to remind her of Orontes. The theme was touched on at 24.209-12, where an unnamed Indian, who is expecting a child, expresses her sorrow at her husband’s death and pities the child, who is never to know its father. Nonnus presents two alternatives to Andromache’s situation in a manner reminiscent of rhetorical exercises in which the student, confronted with the above contingencies, had to determine which of them constituted the worse predicament. Protonoe then proceeds to compare her situation with those of Orsiboe and Cheirobie, by way of two rather frigid synreses, where the misfortunes of each are compared in a calculated manner that accords ill with the emotive circumstances in which the speech is made. Orsiboe is less unfortunate than herself, having seen her daughters grow up and marry, and Cheirobie even less so, since her husband Morpheus is
still alive. Protonoe again expresses her longing for a son, who could take her to kiss the waves of the Hydaspes and, better still, to the vale of Daphne, where she could embrace the river that was once her husband. She wishes that she too could become a stream or a fountain hard by the Orontes. She would be like Comaitho (referred to previously at 2.143-6), who loved the river Cydnus and still holds him in her arms. She would not be like Periboia, who drew her stream away from her watery husband. Hollis suggests that Periboia could be a variant name of Meliboia, who evaded the embraces of the river Orontes in ps.-Oppian's

*Cyneggetica*, 2.115-20. Nonnus is quite clearly referring to some myth of Near Eastern provenance, something that he will be doing to a greater degree later in the present book and in books 41-43. Should her wishes remain unfulfilled, she pleads, then let the Hydaspes cover her with its waters, so that she may be spared the embraces of some horned Satyr and the sight of Dionysus' revels. The speech concludes with a quotation (toward which Nonnus evinces such partiality): μὴ τις ἐνίψῃ κοῦριν Δηνίδας δορικαρασέως βασιλῆς / ληπίη μετὰ δήριν ὑποδρήσει Διονύσῳ' (40.156-7).

Cheirobio's speech is more of a diatribe against Morrheus than a lament for Deriades; to quote the poet's own words, γενετήρα / οὗ τόσον ἐστειλάξειν, ὅσον νεμέσις αἴκοιτα (40.162-3). She counters Protonoe's remark that ἀμφιέπει μὲν / Χειροβίη ζύωντα φίλον πόσιν (40.127-8), with Πρωτονή πόσιν ἔσχεν ἀσοστήρα τιθήνις, / Χειροβίη πόσιν ὑπάλληλου πάτρως (40.177-8). She foresees the most humiliating of fates for herself, as the bonded servant of her husband's paramour (40.285-6). The final word is with Orsiboe, who, like Protonoe, speaks with dignity and pathos. She wishes that the city of the Indians (which remains forever unnamed in the poem) be sacked and that Dionysus hurl her into the Hydaspes, so that she might see Deriades again and not have to witness her daughters being dragged into servitude. She wants to become one of the Naiads, to be another Leucothea, whom Poseidon received still living. The speech ends with a reference to her race: ἀντὶ δὲ λευκῆς / ἄλλη κυανόπεζα φαντάζομαι ὑδραίας 'Ινώ (40.211-2).

Dionysus' followers send forth a victory shout (40.217), following which the dead are buried with the appropriate rites. Modaius is made king of the Indians, and partakes of the same meal with the victors and drinks of the Hydaspes, which is (once again) flowing wine.

Book 37, containing the funeral rites of Opheltes and the games held in his honour, is but the latest in a series of ancient imitations of the twenty-third book of the \textit{Iliad}. Apart from the funeral and games for Achilles in Quintus Smyrnaeus (Posthom. 3 & 4), all of the other surviving versions are to be found in the Latin poets, Vergil (Aeneid 5), Statius (Thebaid 6) and Silius Italicus (Punica 16). Individual events from Homer's games have, however, been imitated in contexts other than that of funeral games by later poets, notably the chariot-race in Sophocles' \textit{Electra} (680-760) and the boxing-match in Theocritus (Id. 22.80-134), Apollonius (2.45-97) and Valerius Flaccus (4.250-314). Nonnus himself earlier imitates the wrestling match at 10.339-82 and the foot-race at 10.383-430, though these are more representative of homosexual love-play between Dionysus and Ampelus than of genuine athletic contests. The contests at the exequies of Staphylus in book 19 are confined to song and dance, anticipating the Athenian Dionysia and unrelated to the Homeric funeral games. Book 37 does not manifest the influence of these earlier imitators of Homer, except in the case of the boxing-match, where some use appears to have been made of Theocritus and Apollonius. According to his usual practice the poet has reemployed some descriptive elements from book 10 in the present book. There is no indication that Nonnus was familiar with any of the versions of the Latin poets, but it is nevertheless useful to adduce them by way of comparison, so as to highlight the extraordinary closeness of his imitation of Homer. With Statius in particular our poet shares many of the tendencies that characterise the so-called baroque style of the imperial period: a tendency to hyperbole and deliberate searching for effect by way of unexpected juxtapositions of words and ideas and other rhetorical devices. Like Statius, he is little concerned to recreate the archaic ambience that his subject matter would seem to warrant. In depicting athletic contests he seems unable or unwilling to distinguish Homeric practices from those of his own time. His chariot race with trackside betting resembles more a hippodrome spectacle than the Homeric event in spite of massive borrowings from the
Iliad, and his boxing- and wrestling-matches are of the gladiatorial 'no holds barred' type that had supplanted the classical modes of boxing and wrestling in the amphitheatres of the Empire. Nonnus commences the book with the same phrase as Homer: Ὅς οἱ μὲν ..., referring to the Indians as Homer does to the Trojans. The parallelism with Homer's account is, as it were, indicated from the outset. Nonnus likes to usher in his imitations of Homeric episodes by using either the same phrase or one very similar to that used by Homer (cf., for instance, 24.1 and Φ1, and 37.104 and ψ258). The arrangement of Iliad 23 is duplicated with minimal alteration, almost as if the poet intended to facilitate comparison of the corresponding passages. In referring to the Indians in the present instance, Nonnus takes the opportunity to comment on their peculiar attitude to death, an attitude which, as transpires from his remarks, is grounded in Orphic tenets. Contrary to the tearfulness of the Trojans (ψ1), the Indians go about burying their dead δμιασιν ἀκλαύτοισιν (37.3), their inability to shed tears being a characteristic which they share with Dionysus, who a little later is seen to groan tearlessly at the pyre of Opheltes: ἔστενε Βάκχος ἀπευθείως προσώπου / δμιασιν ἀκλαύτοισιν (37.41-2). Nonnus sees the Indians' absence of grief in the event of death as stemming from a belief that death is no more than the release of the soul from its corporeal fetters, enabling its return κυκλάδι σειρῆ / νύσσαν ἐς ἀρχαίην (37.5-6). The idea of the soul returning to the ἄρχη (i.e. rejoining the divine νοῦς of which it is a minuscule fragment), and the language which Nonnus uses to describe it, are borrowed from the Orphics, the present instance constituting one of many references to Orphic beliefs in the Dionysiaca.¹ It is interesting that he should attribute to the Indians, of whom he invariably speaks pejoratively as primitive worshippers of the physical manifestations of nature, of the sun, earth and water (cf. 17.271ff.), the ability to transcend grief through the firmness of their belief in an abstract Orphic notion derived ultimately from the philosophy of Plato.

After this brief excursus into Indian religion Nonnus takes up the narrative from the point in the Iliad at which Agamemnon orders the procurement of timber for

¹See the Chaldean Oracles (ed. R.Majercik, 1989) for examples of this notion.
Patroclus' funeral pyre. Our poet devotes less space to the funeral than does Homer (102 lines as against 261), his version having nothing to correspond to scenes that depict Achilles' grief for Patroclus. Even though Dionysus groans with tearless eyes for Opheltes, there is no indication in the poem of any such special bond having existed between the two as existed between Achilles and Patroclus. Opheltes, like his namesake in Statius' Thebaid, is a pallid figure, a sort of surrogate Patroclus, created merely for the purpose of staging the funeral games. If there is a real counterpart to Patroclus in the Dionysiaca it is Hymenaius rather than Opheltes (29.15ff.), but he is spared Patroclus' fate. Nonnus has no parallel to Achilles' addresses to Patroclus, through which the hero reveals the depth of his feeling toward his dead friend, and which greatly intensify the sense of tragedy attached to the occasion. Achilles' utter desolation stands in stark contrast to the sporting events later in the book, which constitute a reaffirmation of life over death. No such contrast is brought out in Nonnus. His account is merely mechanical, exhibiting none of the pathos which we encounter in Homer's.

Homer's wood-cutting scene appears to have been much imitated in antiquity, judging from the number of renderings that have come down to us. Quintus mentions the wood-cutting for Achilles' pyre in passing (3.372-7), reserving fuller description of this operation for when the Greeks return to the slopes of Mount Ida to procure timber for building the wooden horse (12.124-6). The remaining examples are all from Latin poetry, from Ennius, Vergil and Statius. Overall, Nonnus devotes 30 lines (37.7-36) to the cutting and transport of the wood, almost double that in Homer (Ψ110-26, i.e. 17 lines) and slightly less than Statius (6.84-117, i.e. 34 lines). Phaunos is appointed overseer of the timber-getters, corresponding to Meriones in Homer and to Epeius in the later Quintus passage. Both Nonnus and Quintus (in the second passage) have followed Homer closely, but Nonnus more closely than Quintus. His description of the wood-cutting is closely linked to Homer's through use of the same or similar expressions: ἐρυθώμω στοιχηδὸν ἐτέμυε τὸν δέντρα σιδηρῷ / πολλὴ μὲν πτελέη ταυρῆκε τάμυνε τὰ καλὰ, / πολλῇ δ' ὑψιπέτηλος ἐπέκτυσε κοπτομένη δρῦς / καί πολλῇ τετάνυστο πίτυς, καὶ ἐκέκλιτο πεύκη / αὐχμηροῖς πετάλουσι (37.14-8). This is
based on Homer's αὐτίκ’ ἅρα δρῦς ὑψικόμους ταναήκει' χαλκῷ / τάμουν ἐπειγόμενοι ταῖ δὲ μεγάλα κτυπέουσαι / πίπτον (Ψ118-20). The correspondences are somewhat obvious: ἐτέμνετο, τάμνετο / τάμυνι, ἐπέκτυσε / κτυπέουσαι, ὑψπέθηλος ... δρῦς / δρῦς ... ὑψικόμους, and ταναήκει' ... χαλκῷ / ταναήκει' χαλκῷ. Nonnus, like the Roman poets, has diversified the picture, naming other species of tree as well as the oak (cf., for example, Vergil, 6.180-2). The anaphora of πολλή may have been suggested by Homer's use of it in the Iliad to indicate the great numbers of different animals slaughtered for Patroclus' funeral feast (Ψ30-2). All the later poets tend to exaggerate the effects of the wood-cutting on the landscape: in Nonnus, ἐγυμνώθησαν ἐρίπναι (37.19), in Quintus, νάτη 'δ ἀνεφαίνετο πᾶσα (12.127), in Statius it has the same effect, 'lucosque ostendere Phoebo' (6.89). The discomfiture of the forest deities as a result of the wood-cutting is noted by Nonnus (37.20-1) and Statius (6.96-113). Nonnus is brief here, since he has already given us a full description of the woes of the silvan deities in the wake of Typhoeus' forays (2.77-93). A hamadryad takes refuge with a fountain nymph in her watery abode, the association of the two being a recurrent motif (cf. 2.94-7, 37.20-1, and 44.11-4). We may note that the ἰδέα of the established order of things being turned topsy-turvy is a favourite one of our poet's, appearing in various guises throughout the work (cf., for instance, Typhoeus' boasts to this effect, 2.258ff., and those of Pentheus, 44.174-83).

The timber, as it is being cut, is conveyed at the same time to the site of the funeral pyre. Nonnus is by now so engrossed in imitating Homer as to forget that Dionysus and his forces are by the Hydaspes in India and speaks as if they were at the foot of Mount Ida. The topography quite imperceptibly takes on the appearance of that with which we are familiar from the Iliad. The timber-getters are pictured meeting up with one another as they go up and down the mountain slope on criss-crossing paths: καὶ πολὺς ἐρχομένουσιν ὀρίδρομος ἤμεν ἀνήρ / ὀθρεος οἷς έχουν ἐτερότροπον ἦν δὲ νοήσαι / ύψοφινὴ προβλήτα κατήλυσα λοξόν ὀδίτην / ποσσὶ πολυπλακέσσιν (37.22-5), which is an expansion of Homer's πολλὰ δ'
The impression of simultaneous movement in all directions, so effectively conveyed by Homer, is diminished by Nonnus' rendering, owing to the transfer of the verb denoting the movement of the timber-getters to the previous sentence and the dilution of the emphatic ἄνα-κατά-παρά contrast. In Homer the timber is felled, split and tied into bundles, which are then transported on the backs of mules to the site of the pyre. Nonnus omits the splitting altogether, speaking as if the logs were tied together whole (cf. his εὐπλέκτοιο δὲ σειρῆς, 37.25, corresponding to Homer's σειράς τ' εὐπλέκτους, Ψ115) and placed in this condition on the backs of mules (37.25-7), which is of course an impossibility. He subsequently speaks of the logs being dragged along the ground by the mules (37.29-30), which is indeed a practical alternative to the procedure employed in the Iliad. Nonnus has befuddled the issue by confusing the two modes of transporting the timber. As we have noted on previous occasions, Nonnus is, in contrast to Homer, somewhat remiss in his depiction of technical procedures. The Satyrs and Pans are hard at work ὑλοτόμως παλάμησιν ἀμοβαίων ἀπὸ δέντρων ... ἐκ τρούσι ἀκαμάτοισιν ἐλαφρίζοντες ἁγοντοῖς (37.32-3), the description echoing Homer's πάντες δ' ὑλοτόμων φιτρούς φέρον (Ψ124). The timber is unloaded at the place designated by Dionysus for Opheltes' tomb: καὶ τὰ μὲν ὑλοτόμων χθονί κάτθεσαν, ἥχι τελέσας /Εὔιος ἐν δαπέδῳ σημίνατο τύμβων 'Οφέλτη (37.35-6), corresponding in substance to καὶ δ' ἐπὶ ἀκτῆς βάλλων ἐπισχερώ, ἐνθ' ἀρ' Ἀχιλλεὺς /φράσσατο Πατρόκλῳ μέγα ἥριον ἤδε οἱ αὐτῷ (Ψ125-6). Nonnus, though using different words, has retained the pattern of Homer's sentence: κάτθεσαν replacing καὶ ... βάλλων, χθονί - ἐπὶ ἀκτῆς, ἥχι - ἐνθα. Εὔιος - Ἀχιλλεὺς, σημίνατο - φράσσατο, τύμβων - ἥριον, 'Οφέλτη - Πατρόκλῳ.

Nonnus has no counterpart to the ritual whereby fully armed Myrmidons carry Patroclus' body to the place designated for the cremation (Ψ128-34). Opheltes' body is surrounded by a throng of mourners, each of whom cuts a lock of his hair to place on it, the body being blanketed by hair as they file past (37.37-40), corresponding to the scene in Homer (Ψ135-6), which Quintus likewise reproduces (3.685-6). The building
of the pyre and the various offerings placed on it are described by Nonnus in 12 lines (37.44-55), compared to Homer's 16 (Ψ161-76). This segment shows Nonnus at his least original, containing, among a number of close echoes, two lines which have been transferred from Homer without any alteration. He begins with one of the duplicated lines: ποίησαν δὲ πυρὴν ἕκατομπεδον ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα (37.44 = Ψ164). Such wholesale copying is uncharacteristic of Nonnus, who normally takes care to maintain a margin of originality by making some change, however slight. The body is placed on the pyre: ἐν δὲ πυρὴ μεσάτη στόρεσαν νέκουν (37.46), corresponding to ἐν δὲ πυρὴ ὑπάτῃ νεκρὸν θέσαν (Ψ165). Here we have an instance of minimal alteration within the same metrical scheme. Twelve Indians are subsequently killed by having their throats cut and their bodies are placed around that of Opheltes on the pyre (37.48-9). We recall that Achilles in his address to Patroclus at the beginning of Iliad 23 vows to kill twelve Trojans in this fashion (Ψ22), but in the passage where he gives effect to this undertaking, the method of killing is not specified, with only Patroclus' two hounds stated as being disposed in this manner (Ψ174-6). Nonnus has used this theme previously, when Morpheus delivered eleven of the most comely Bassarids to Deriades, who subsequently put them to death (34.162ff.). Jars of honey and oil are placed on the pyre, Nonnus again transposing one of Homer's lines in entirety: ἐν δ᾽ ἔτιθει μέλιτος καὶ ἀλείφατος ἀμφίφορης (37.50 = Ψ170). In Homer, sheep, cattle, horses and dogs are placed on the pyre, the first two for the fat that will be extracted from them and put around the corpse, the last two presumably to accompany and serve the departed in the nether world. Nonnus ignores these distinctions, omitting any mention of the dogs and, quite mistakenly, lumping in the horses with the cattle and sheep as a source of the fat (37.51-5). Apart from this, Nonnus' description is again a rather close paraphrase of Homer's (Ψ166-9), as is obvious from the correspondences ἐπενήθη εὐνέμενος τρισύχους / πρόσθε τιρήσ / πρόσθε τιρήσ, σώσατα / σώσατα, δημοσιάν ἀπαντα λαβών / ἐκ ... πάντων δημοσίων ἐλών.

Nonnus alone of the later poets has duplicated a particular circumstance from Homer's account, namely the difficulty encountered in setting the pyre alight (cf. 37.70
and Ψ192). In Quintus, by contrast, there is no such problem, with Zeus, unsolicited, sending Hermes to Aeolus with orders to fan the flames, a task that is subsequently seen to by Boreas and Zephyr (3.696-704). Nonnus, speaking now in a didactic vein, describes how the flame was kindled by rubbing together two stones smeared with sulphur, but in referring to the stones as ἀφρός and ἠλιός (37.67) he appears to be confusing this method of making fire with an alternative one, which consisted of rotating a hardwood stick in a hole bored in softwood. We note that in an earlier didactic segment, where he explains the origin of lightning, Nonnus compares the effect of clouds rubbing together to that of two fire-stones, to which he again refers as male and female (2.495). When Dionysus sees that the fire would not envelop the pyre, he turns to the sun and calls to the east and south winds to help (37.71-3), corresponding to Achilles' plea to the north and west winds (Ψ194-5). Hard by, the Morning Star, on hearing Dionysus' plea, sends forth his brother the south wind to help him (37.74-6). The east wind blows all night (πάννυξ, 37.79), corresponding to the actions of the north and west winds in Homer, who are likewise described as πάννυξερ (Ψ217). In Homer, Achilles' prayer is heard by Iris, who betakes herself to the west wind's abode, where the other winds are seated at dinner, and tells them of the hero's plight. Nonnus' scheme thus parallels Homer's, there being a petitioner (Dionysus/Achilles), an intermediary (Morning Star/Iris) and helpers (the winds). He has varied Homer's treatment by bringing the Sun and the Morning Star into the picture, and does so quite appropriately in view of their associations with fire and flame, but has incurred an inconsistency in having the east wind blow all night (in imitation of Homer), in spite of referring to it as the dawn wind (Ἐαυξ, Ἑυρος, 37.72) and having Dionysus make his appeal at sunrise to the Morning Star. What he is in effect saying is that the dawn wind remained idle all day long and, contrary to its name, started blowing at dusk, a difficulty which he could easily have avoided by using Quintus' πᾶν ἤμαρ καὶ νύκτα (3.713) in place of πάννυξ. As in Homer, the cremation ends with the dawn of a new day, when the pyre has burnt itself out. The embers are quenched with wine poured by the mourners as they file past (37.86-9), corresponding to Homer's statements to that effect.
at Ψ226-8 and 250. Quintus, it may be noted, depicts the same scene at Achilles' pyre of (3.719-23), and Nonnus appears to have been influenced by him in his use, the δὲ ... δὴ τὸτε construction. Our poet seems, for reasons unknown, to be at pains to disguise his use of the work of his immediate predecessor in the field of epic. The details pertaining to the wine-pouring ritual are copied by Nonnus from Homer (cf. 37.82-5 and Ψ218-21). Nonnus with his characteristic love of hyperbole renders Homer's δὲ ... δὲ γαίαν (Ψ220) by χυτὴν ἐμέθυσε κονίθη (37.84). The bones of the deceased are enveloped in a double layer of fat and placed in a golden box: Ἠστέριος δὲ / ὅστεα συλλέξας κεκαλυμμένα διπλακι δημῳ / εἰς χρυσὴν φιάλην κατεβήκατο λείψανα νεκροῦ (37.91-3), corresponding to: ἑτάροιο ἐνήος ὅστεα λεικα / ἄλλεγον ἐς χρυσὴν φιάλην καὶ διπλακὰ δημῶν (Ψ252-3). The same procedure is conveyed by Quintus with more originality (3.730-2). A tomb is erected: καὶ τροχαλοὶ Κορύβαντες ... ἡ τύμβων ἑτορνώσαντο (37.94-5), echoing Homer's τορνώσαντο δὲ σῆμα (Ψ255). The remains are interred: βαθυμένων δὲ θεμέλιων / νεκρῶν ἑταρχύσαντο πεδοσκαφέος διὰ κόλπου ... καὶ κόλυν ἄθνειν πυμάτην ἐπέχευσαν Ὁφέλτη (37.95-8), corresponding to θεμελιά τε προβάλοντο/ἀμφὶ πυρὴν· εἴθαρ δὲ χυτὴν ἐπὶ γαίαν ἔχευαν (Ψ255-6). We note that the bones of Patroclus are not interred, the box containing them being taken back to Achilles' tent (Ψ254), an action prompted by Patroclus' wish, communicated to Achilles in a dream, that their bones should not be separated (Ψ83). The funeral rites are concluded with the composition of an epitaph to Opheltes (37.101-2), which is one of the many instances of anachronism in the poem. In summary it may be said that Nonnus has followed closely in Homer's footsteps as far as the depiction of the proceedings is concerned, but Achilles' grieving over his friend, illustrated by a moving simile (Ψ222-5), finds no counterpart in Nonnus. The repeated foreshadowing of Achilles' own imminent demise combined with his seemingly inconsolable grief envelops the funeral scene in an oppressive fog, which lifts suddenly and dramatically with the opening of the games. In Nonnus, on the other hand, the transition from the one to the other is merely mechanical, without the contrast of death and life, grief and joy that marks it in Homer.
The games are announced by Dionysus: αὐτόθι λαῦ ἔρυτε καὶ ζηνέν εὐρύν ἄγωνα (37.104), which is virtually identical to the phrase used by Homer of Achilles (Ψ258), with only the initial αὐτοὖ changed into αὐτόθι. The individual contests are presented in much the same order as they are in Homer, and are of comparable length, beginning with the chariot race, 37.103-484 (382 lines) : Ψ262-657 (396 lines), followed by the boxing match, 37.485-545 (61 lines) : Ψ658-99 (42 lines), the wrestling match, 37.546-613 (68 lines) : Ψ700-39 (40 lines), the foot-race, 37.614-66 (53 lines) : Ψ740-801 (62 lines), the throwing of the σώλος, 37.667-702 (36 lines) : Ψ826-49 (24 lines) - Nonnus has postponed the φιλίη δῆρις, which comes fifth in Homer, to the end - the archery contest, 37.703-49 (47 lines) : Ψ850-83 (34 lines), and the φιλίη δῆρις, 37.750-78 (29 lines) : Ψ802-25 (24 lines). The final event in Homer, the javelin-throw, for which the prize is awarded to Agamemnon uncontested, is omitted by Nonnus.

The later imitators of Homer's chariot race tend to visualise it in terms of contemporary hippodrome racing, which involved a set number of runs (usually twelve) by four-horse chariots around two turning-posts separated by a disttther of one stadion (cf. Pindar's ἄνδρεα τεθρίππων δυνοθεκαδρόμων, Ol. 2.50). In Homer, on the other hand, the chariots, drawn by two horses, go once around a single turning-post, which is so far from the starting-line as to be out of sight for the spectators. The four-horse chariot was unknown in the Heroic Age and is mentioned by Homer only in a simile (ν81-2), though its origins were later projected back to mythological times (cf. for example, Vergil, Geo. 3.113-4). While Sophocles depicts the race in the form that it had acquired in the Panhellenic games of his own times (El. 680-760), even though it was set in the Heroic Age in the play, later poets tried to arrive at some compromise between the Homeric and contemporary modes of racing. Silius Italicus and Nonnus have somewhat incongruously tried to fit elements of the latter into the Homeric pattern of once around the post and back. Although they follow the Homeric pattern, they speak as if every stage of the race took place within full view of the spectators, something that would only be the case if it were held in the confined space of a hippodrome. Nonnus
indeed employs the terminology associated with the later type of racing, such as βαλβίς (37.242) and στάδια (37.246), and has two turning stones (37.105-13), in place of Homer’s single stump, which would seem to indicate that the course was meant to be traversed more than once.

In Homer the layout of the course is divulged only as part of Nestor’s advice to his son Antilochus. Nonnus, even though he later copies Nestor’s speech, has extracted the part concerning the course layout and placed it at the beginning of his account. His description of the turning posts as two stones which an old craftsman had rounded in preparation for carving into statues is quite original and constitutes yet another indication of Nonnus’ fascination with round objects. One of them is described as ἴμιτόμου κύκλου φέρων τύπον, εἰκόνα μήνης / ... αὸν ἱφαίνων /ἐργοπόνοις παλάμησι γέρων τορνώσατο τέκτων, / ἐνθεον ἀσκήσας ποθέων βρέτας (37.107-10). Nonnus reused this passage to describe the garden of Gethsemane in the Paraphrase: ἄνεος ὅπερ δονάκεσσιν ἀμοιβαίοις συνάσπτων / πυκνὰ μεριζομένοις γέρων κυκλώσατο τέκτων, /ἀστερόεν μίμησα, καὶ εἰκελον ὄξει κόσμῳ (18.19-21). Similar language was employed earlier for the depiction for the sphere which Eros set up as a prize in his competition with Hymenaius in book 33, which was described as Ἄργους δαιδαλέας ἀντίρροπον εἰκόνα μορφής (33.70), with the same cosmic connotations. The stone had been put there by a Cyclops to serve as a turning post, νύσσης λαϊνέως ἀντίρροπον (37.112), with another like it, ἰσον ἐκεῖνη, placed at the opposite end.

The prizes on offer for the contestants in all the events are listed as in Homer (37.114-5, cf. Ψ 259-61), Nonnus using asyndeton, a common device in later poetry, to enhance the cumulative effect (for another example cf. 40.334-6). He has, somewhat inexplicably, placed this general prize list for all the events at the games after his course-description for the chariot race. In Homer the list is presented immediately after the announcement of the games. The prizes reserved specifically for the chariot-race are described almost contiguously with the general list (37.116-8), and they correspond partly with those in Homer (Ψ 263-5). For the first prize Nonnus has substituted an
Amazon for Homer's working woman, which is anachronistic in the context of his narrative, seeing that Dionysus has yet to defeat the Amazons (cf. 40.291-4). Such contextual anachronisms are common in Nonnus, who will not allow his imagination be held in check by the exigencies of the narrative (cf. also 42.143-4). The second prize is, as in Homer, a pregnant mare, κυέουσαν ἐτί βρέφος (37.123), echoing βρέφος ἡμίονον κυέουσαν (Ψ266). The third prize is a breast-plate, τὸν μὲν ἀριστοπόνος τεχνήσατο Λήμυνος ἄκμων (37.126, cf. τά περ κάμε Λήμυνος ἄκμων, used of the shields of Dionysus, 25.337, and Aiaces, 28.6). In Homer the breastplate is not among the announced awards, but is given as a consolation prize to Eumelus (Ψ560-2). The fourth prize is a shield, in place of Homer's δῶ χρυσοῦ τὰλαντα (Ψ269), which are offered as the fifth prize in Nonnus (δοιά τὰλαντα, 37.129) instead of the ἀμφιθέτον πυάλην (Ψ270).

Dionysus stands up to address the drivers: ὁθώεις δ' ἀγόρευεν ἐπιπερχὼν ἐλατήρας (37.130), duplicating Achilles' action: στῇ δ' ὁθῶες, καὶ μᾶθον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἐπιπέτειν (Ψ271). While Achilles announces the prizes and his decision not to compete, Dionysus by way of an aetiological excursus delivers a lecture on the origins of the various Panhellenic games and the prizes associated with them (37.131-53). The discourse, resembling in substance Pindar's remarks in Ol. 9.84-99 and 13.98-113, is both anachronistic in the present context and inaccurate in some details. Thus Dionysus states that the prize for winning the chariot race at Marathon was a κάλπις πιαλέης ἑρων (37.147), whereas we are informed by Pindar that it was not oil but silver cups (cf. ἐν Μαραθῶνι ... μένεν ἀγώνα ... ἀμφ' ἀργυρίδεσιν, Ol. 9.89-90). The rather unusual prize of a woollen cloak accorded the winner at Pallene was bound to be mentioned by Nonnus (37.149-51, cf. Pindar, Ol. 9.97-8 and Nem. 10.44 regarding the same). The allusion to the story of Pelops and Oinomaus (37.138-43) is to be expected in a scene concerned with chariot racing (37.138-43, cf. also Quintus, 4.526-9), and is repeated three more times in the present book (37.308-9, 338-41, 428-30).

As in Homer, the summons elicits a swift response (cf. 37.154 and Ψ287).
Erechtheus is πρωτιστός to yoke his horses, as Eumelus in Homer is πολύ πρῶτος to take up the challenge, but this initial correspondence is not borne out by subsequent events, which reveal Scelmis and not Erechtheus to be the parallel of Eumelus. The names of Erechtheus' horses are likewise taken from the Iliad, Xanthus being the name of one of Achilles' horses, and Podarge the Harpy who gave birth to them (Π149-50). Nonnus' story that Erechtheus received the horses as a gift from Boreas by way of compensation for the abduction by the latter of his daughter (37.155-61) is not found elsewhere. The horses do not appear to have met the full amount of the bride-price, seeing that Erechtheus demands additional favours from his son-in-law in the foot-race (37.640-1) and, later, in the naumachy (39.174-6). The second charioteer to present himself is Actaion, the son of Aristaius, the third is Scelmis, a son of Poseidon, the fourth is Phaunus, who, in imitation of his grandsire the Sun, drives a four-horse chariot, and the fifth is Achates from Sicily.

Nonnus is alone among the imitators of Homer's chariot race to give a full rendering of Nestor's advice to Antilochus. We note that in Statius, Adrastus in entrusting the steed Arion to Polynices, does also give words of advice to the recipient, but his directions are concerned solely with handling the horse (6.317-20). Nonnus, on the other hand, has Aristaius counsel his son on tactics and the nature of the course in much the same way as Nestor does in the Iliad. In each case the father begins with a few words of encouragement, reminding the son of his descent from Apollo, as in Nonnus (37.179), or of his tutelage under Zeus and Poseidon, as in Homer (Ψ306-8). In Nestor's speech these initial remarks are soon tempered by the sobering reminder ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἵππου ἐβαρέσθη τὸ θεῖον (Ψ309-10), and it is this disadvantage that the advice is intended to remedy. This handicap may be overcome through skill and cunning by the charioteer, especially in negotiating the turning-point, and Nestor proceeds to brief his son as to the nature of the course, of which he appears to have prior knowledge, and regarding the tactics he should adopt. The advice is, in short, meant to compensate for the inferiority of Antilochus' horses. Nonnus appears to have overlooked the reason behind Nestor's speech, seeing that Aristaius, in direct contrast to Nestor, tells his son
that his horses are superior to those of the others: ἰμέτερα δὲ κρέισσονες ἀλεούν ἔτι δρόμον Ἀρκάδες ἵπποι (37.179-80). Aristaius' speech thus becomes no more than a caution to his son against becoming complacent in the knowledge of the superiority of his horses. Skill and cunning are required as well, if victory is to be attained. The idea that μητις κερδοσύνη matter as much if not more than σθενος (37.181-3 and ψ315-8) is fundamental to both speeches. It has long been a source of puzzlement to Homeric commentators why the turning-point, on which Nestor bestows such attention, is all but ignored when the poet comes to describe the race itself. Nonnus makes no attempt to remedy this inconsistency in his version, the turning-point getting no further mention once the race is under way. The only recollection of Aristaius' speech during the race occurs when Actaion tries to ram Phaunus' chariot, at which point he is described as Ἀρισταῖον μεμνημένον εἰσέτι μύθων κερδαλέων (37.349-50), but the reference is misleading, for at no point does Aristaius specifically recommend such a tactic. We note that Sophocles, on the other hand, does portray Orestes putting into practice at the turning point the very ideas that Nestor conveyed to Antilochus, the connexion with Nestor's advice being made quite explicit through the use of the same vocabulary (cf. El .720-2 and ψ334-40). Aristaius, sensing that his son is lacking in κερδοσύνη, proceeds to pass on to him knowledge distilled from a lifetime's experience (37.185-6). He exhorts Actaion to match his efforts in the coming race with his attested prowess on the battlefield (37.189-91). Aristaius' instructions are virtually a paraphrase of Nestor's. Actaion is to use cunning (37.195-6, cf. ψ313-4); the untutored man will have his horses wandering all over the track (37.197-201, cf. ψ219-21), while the one possessing τεχνη will always keep on course, though his horses be inferior, keeping his eye on the driver in front and never scraping the turning-post (37.202-6, cf. ψ322-5).2 Aristaius' τεχνη ενεντ ὄλω (37.202), which sounds like an outright invitation to cheat, is apparently how Nonnus

2 In Quintus the efficacy of this advice is demonstrated in Sthenelus' case, who having the best horse nevertheless does not win, as he lets the horse run wide of the course (4.563-6), ignoring technique and putting his faith solely in his horse's feet (4.575).
understands Nestor's κέρδεα (Ψ302). It should be noted that the reference to ἐλάσσονας ἔποιεσ (37.203), which is a direct echo of ἔσσονας ἔποιεσ (Ψ322), is hardly pertinent to Nonnus' context, seeing that Actaion's horses are κρείσσονας (37.180). Nonnus, as often, becomes so engrossed in imitating Homer as to forget his own earlier statement. It is at this point that Nestor interrupts his driving instructions to give a description of the layout of the course, something which, as we have noted, Nonnus has divorced from the speech and placed at the beginning of his account (37.105-13). The instructions as to how Actaion should negotiate the turning-point are a close paraphrase of those conveyed to Antilochus (37.207-13, cf. Ψ335-40). Actaion is to take especial care not to touch the turning-stone, lest he break his axle and destroy the chariot and horses (37.214-5), which corresponds to Nestor's caution to Antilochus at Ψ340-1. We note that it is Orestes' failure to observe these precautions on the final turn which proves his undoing in Sophocles (El. 743-5). Aristaius concludes his speech with a nautical simile, comparing the charioteer to a steersman, with the charioteer's mind being likened to a rudder: ἔσσο κυβερνήτη πανομοίον ἃρμα νομεύων / εἰς δρόμου ἱθυκέλευθον, ἐπεὶ τεχνήμον βουλή / πηδάλιον δείροθε πέλει νόσ ήμιοχής (37.221-3). This comparison seems to have been inspired by one of the examples given by Nestor to illustrate the use of μῆτις: μὴ ἵππος κυβερνήτης ἐνι οὖσιν πόνῳ / νήμα βοιν ιθύνει ἐρεχθομένην ανέμοιο (Ψ316-7).

Nonnus' rendering of Nestor's speech is thus, for the main part, little more than a paraphrase, characterised by close copying in identical contexts. He makes no attempt to remedy the absence in Homer of any application of that advice during the race, but he has, by removing the course description from the speech and placing it in the body of the narrative, at least resolved the problem in the Iliad of how Nestor had obtained this knowledge. He has, by designating Actaion's horses as superior, missed the whole purpose behind Nestor's speech, which was to overcome the handicap of inferior horses by driving skills. Now Hopkinson, speaking of the Dionysiaca as a whole, asserts that Nonnus was concerned "not only to imitate Homer, but in the course of his
imitation to subsume, contain, and ultimately surpass his poetic ancestor.\footnote{3} It is
difficult see how such a claim could be borne out by the present passage, or, indeed, by
the description of the games as a whole. While adding some amusing touches here and
there, Nonnus has generally given us a rather flaccid and less coherent rendering of the
original.

Aristaius having spoken withdraws, his task of instruction completed (37.224-5),
corresponding to Nestor’s action in the Iliad (Ψ349-50). The contestants draw lots
to determine their respective positions on the starting line, Nonnus comparing the
drawing of lots to the casting of dice: οἶδα τις ἀνήρ / εἰς κύβον ἄλλοπρόσαλλον
ἐκθόλα δάκτυλα πάλιν (37.228-9); the phrase δάκτυλα πάλιν comes from the
vocabulary of mime and dance (for its use in that context cf. 19.219). Erectheus, the
eventual winner, draws the last place (37.234-5), just like Diomedes, who wins in the
Iliad (Ψ356-7). Erectheus, like Diomedes, is qualified in advance as the best
(φέρτατος / δ’ ἄρατος). A four-line portrait of the umpire Aiacus follows (37.238-
41), corresponding to the description of Phoenix, to whom this task is allotted in the
Iliad (Ψ359-61). The charioteers are drawn up at the starting line, raising their whips
(37.242-3), as is the case in Homer (Ψ358, 362). In Homer the race
starts as the drivers strike with the whips and shout in unison (Ψ363-4), but in Nonnus
the act of striking and the shout are deferred incomprehensibly to a later stage, when the
race has been under way for some time (37.287-8). We note that Sophocles (El. 711-3)
renders Ψ363-4 in its proper place at the start of the race; so also Quintus (4.558-60).
The shout is meant to jolt the horses into motion, once the signal to go is given. Such
apparent displacement of passages out of their natural context is a feature of the poem as
we have it (cf. for example, 39.348-51, where the dispositions of the opposing
squadrons are given long after the battle has started). In describing the shout as being
sharper than the whip, Nonnus once more evinces his preoccupation with the
supernatural power of the voice, to which we have referred previously (p.39). His
depiction of both the charioteers and onlookers is lively and amusing, and is no doubt

\footnote{3}{1994b} p. 26
drawn from personal acquaintance with such events at the local hippodrome. The rather phrenetic activity of the charioteers is representative of Nonnus' animated word-pictures (37.249-55). The reactions of the spectators are likewise conveyed with lively realism, as their mood fluctuates between exhilaration and despondency, depending on the fortunes in the field of their favourite driver (37.271-8). This passage owes something to Homer's portrayal of the behaviour of the onlookers at the foot-race (Ψ 766-7) - the correspondence ἐλατήρι κελεύων (37.272-8) / σπεύδοντι κέλευν (Ψ 766) deserves to be noted - but there can be no doubt that Nonnus has the hippodrome crowd before his eyes. A very similar picture is found in Silius Italicus (16.320-4). Nonnus turns his attention to the spectators a second time as the race nears completion, his remarks intimating that bets were placed at these meetings, as they are at their modern counterparts (37.439-41).

A description of the chariots hurtling at great speed along the stretch is now presented. The chariots now fly through the air, now skim the dust (37.279-81), as they do in Homer (Ψ 368-9). A difficult sentence follows: καὶ ταχύως ψαμμόδες ἔδος τροχειδεῖ κύκλω / ἀματας ἐπιπόροιο κατέγρφεν ὀλὸκος ἀλήτης (37.282-3), which can only be translated as 'the wandering furrow left by the fast-rotating wheel of the straight-moving chariot marks the sandy soil'. The apparent contradiction in the idea of a straight moving chariot leaving a wandering track may be attributed to Nonnus' habitual disregard for consistency. The description seems to have been inspired by Homer's description of Diomedes' chariot (on account of its speed) leaving not much in the way of wheel marks in the dust as it neared the finishing line: οὐδεὶς τι πολλή / γίγνετ’ ἐπισαύτρων ἀματροχή κατόπισθέν / ἐν λεπτῇ κοινῇ (Ψ 504-6), which Nonnus predictably imitates in the corresponding segment of his own account: καὶ οὐ τροχόειντι σιδήρῳ / λεπταλές ἀτίνακτα τυνάσσετο νώτα κοινής (37.459-60). Dust rises to the horses' chests, their manes moved by the wind: στίθεσιν ἰππείοσιν ἀντρόητο κοινή, / χαῖται δ' ἰερίσσων ἐπερρόωντο θεῖλας (37.285-6), corresponding to ὑπὸ δὲ στέρνοις κοινῇ / ἵππατ’ ἀείρομεν ὡς τε νέφος ἦ τιε θύελλα, / χαῖται δ’ ἐρρώσμεν μετὰ πνοῆς ἀνεποί (Ψ 365-7). As in Homer, the
incidents all occur on the home stretch, after the turning-stone has apparently been negotiated uneventfully. Nonnus has, in his usual manner, proliferated the number of incidents and verbal exchanges taking place during the race. He introduces his account of the return lap with a statement transferred from Homer verbatim: ἄλλ᾽ ὅτε ὅτι πῶματον τέλεον ἄρομον (37.289 and Ψ373). Nonnus has not only increased the number of incidents but given them a different complexion: the strategy of overtaking in the narrows, for which Antilochus is censured in the Iliad, is replaced by more blatant forms of interference, with drivers intentionally setting out to disable their rivals’ chariots. Aias, though called a οὐκοπός ἐτήτυμος (37.238), seems to be a totally ineffectual umpire since he remains silent in the face such infractions. Whereas in Homer Menelaus challenges Antilochus to state under oath that he did not wilfully execute a dangerous tactic in order to get in front of him, no such appeals are made in Nonnus in response to much more obvious instances of fouling. It may be noted that the charioteers behave in a similarly reckless manner in Statius, again earning no reprimand for their conduct. It appears likely that Nonnus and Statius are giving us pictures of the hippodrome spectacles of imperial times, coloured by their shared tendency to exaggeration and theatricality. Silius and Quintus are, on the other hand, somewhat more restrained in their treatments (though too much of Quintus’ account has been lost to allow us to speak with certainty).

In Homer the return stretch is marked by two incidents: Eumelus’ accident, and the near-collision occasioned by Antilochus’ failure to yield right of way to Menelaus. Nonnus has replaced them by three incidents involving Scelmis and Erechtheus, Phaunus and Actaion, and Achates and Phaunus, with the first member of each pair becoming the victim of some form of interference contrived by the second. Homeric parallels are portioned out among the three incidents: Scelmis and Erechtheus are made schematically parallel to Eumelus and Diomedes (though there is no conflict between the latter), Phaunus and Actaion to Menelaus and Antilochus (though Phaunus’ discomfiture resembles more that of Eumelus than that of Menelaus, differing only in that he is able to resume the race), and Achates and Phaunus to Menelaus and
Antilochus. Scelmis, like Eumelus, takes the early lead but is closely pursued by Erechtheus, as Eumelus is by Diomedes. Erechtheus' chariot looks as if it is about to mount that of Scelmis (37.292-3), which reflects the situation in the *Iliad*, where Diomedes' horses appear about to mount Eumelus' chariot (Ψ379), a motif also imitated by Silius (16.379). One of Erechtheus' horses is warming Scelmis' back with its breath (37.294-6), just as Diomedes' horses warm Eumelus' back with their breath (Ψ380-1). The notion of 'breathing down one's back' recurs in the foot-race (37.628-30), again in imitation of Homer (Ψ765-6). The idea is also used in Statius' foot-race (*Theb.* 603-5). It is at this point that the opportunity to engage in underhand tactics first presents itself. The fact that Erechtheus' horses are close enough to breathe down Scelmis' back, gives the latter the opportunity to grab one of the horses by its mane so as to make it spit out the bit (37.297, 299, 303). Nothing of the sort happens in Homer, even though Eumelus is in exactly the same position as Scelmis. In Homer premeditated interference appears to be the prerogative of the gods (for example, Apollo making Diomedes lose his whip and Athena breaking the yoke of Eumelus' horses in retaliation, Ψ382-92). Antilochus' action of cutting in front of Menelaus only poses the possibility of harm if Menelaus were to prevent him from doing so by not slowing down, and is not aimed specifically at disabling Menelaus' chariot. It is only in the later poets that contestants engage in deliberate acts of interference (cf. Vergil, *Aen.* 5.334-8, where Nisus intentionally falls in front of Salius to enable his friend Euryalus win the foot-race, and Statius, *Theb.* 6.615-7, where Idas grabs Parthenopaeus by the hair to prevent the latter from crossing the finishing line first; and Silius 16.517-23, where Hesperus seizes Theron's hair, enabling Eurythys to win). The outrageous behaviour of Nonnus' contestants is thus not wholly unprecedented. Scelmis is, nevertheless, prevented from giving effect to his nefarious design by the quick action of Erechtheus, who anticipating the sudden danger, reins back the horse. The opportunity for mischief having slipped his grasp, Scelmis addresses Erechtheus, telling him that he will win regardless, that his father Poseidon will see to it just as surely as he had in the case of Pelops' victory over Oinomaus. *A σύγκροσις* of Poseidon with Athena, the patroness
of Erechtheus, follows, wherein Poseidon, as the κυβερνητήρ ἱπποσύνης, is considered a better sponsor to have on the racetrack than ἱστοτέλεια Athena. Incensed by these remarks, Erechtheus utters a prayer to Athena, which takes the form of a refutation of Scelms' remarks. Addressing her as ἱπποσσός and reminding her of her victory over Poseidon in their contest for the possession of Attica, he asks her to grant her subject a similar victory over Poseidon's protégé. Having said his prayer Erechtheus pulls alongside his rival and seizes the bridle of one of Scelms' horses, holding it back as he spurts past. He then mocks Scelms, resuming the Poseidon-Athena comparison and highlighting the male-female opposition. Just as θηλυκὸς 'Ἀθήνη had overcome ἄρσεν Ποσειδάωνα, his mare Podarge has out-run Scelms' stallion Balius. As to Pelops, he had really only won because Oinomaus' charioteer Mytilus had replaced his master's axle-pin with one made from wax.

The second incident involves Phaunus and Actaion, who is meant to parallel Antilochus. But whereas Antilochus merely risks a collision, Actaion purposely engineers one. The incident does not take place on a narrowing of the road, that detail being reserved for the next incident involving Phaunus and Achates. Actaion, described by the poet as mindful of his father's advice (even though Aristaius suggests no such thing in his speech) rams Phaunus' chariot, scraping his horses' legs with his wheel. Three of the horses tumble to the ground, the fourth being left standing, while Phaunus rolls in the dust beside the wheel of his overturned chariot (37.365-8), the description corresponding to what happened Ἐυμέλος in the Iliad (8.394-6). Phaunus falls in the same way as Eumelus, κεκύλιστο παρὰ τροχῶν, just as the latter παρὰ τροχῶν ἐξεκύλισθη, and suffers the same injury, θρύπτετο δ' ἄκρα μέτωπα - θυμίζει δὲ μέτωπον, but unlike the latter is able to rejoin the race and mete out to the hapless Achates treatment similar to that to which he himself had been subjected by Actaion. Actaion taunts Phaunus, telling him that he will inform Dionysus that his arrival will be delayed (37.377-8). He will come in late after all the rest ἄρματα σύρων, the description recalling that of Eumelus, who likewise comes in last of all ἐλκων ἄρματα (8.532-3).
Phaunus, dragging his horses up by their tails, re-harnesses them and takes off after Achates, the tail-ender of the bunch. He sees the road ahead narrowing and decides to pull alongside Achates at that point (37.394-6). This corresponds to the situation in the Iliad where Antilochus sees the road narrowing (Ψ418-9), after telling his horses that he will try to overtake Menelaus on a narrow stretch (Ψ415-6). The explanation for the narrowing of the road is again paraphrased from Homer (37.397-400, cf. Ψ420-1). The ornate, somewhat bombastic description of Nonnus contrasts with the naturalness and simplicity of the original, Homer's χειμέριον ... ὑδώρ being rendered by χειμερίῃ μάστιγι Διὸς μετανάστιον ὑδώρ ἡρόθεν προχέιντος, and ἀλευ by ἐργόμενον ἰέεθρο/ διήθρον γειοτόμολο. Such use of disproportionately grandiloquent expressions to render simple concepts is especially noticeable in the Paraphrase, where the sayings of Jesus are deprived of much of their effectiveness by being dressed in similarly bombastic garb. As to the incident itself, Nonnus has changed the order of things somewhat. Whereas in Homer Menelaus calls out to Antilochus to give way and, getting no reply, is forced to pull up to avoid a collision, in Nonnus Achates first pulls up, then addresses Phaunus. We note that Silius, who also paraphrases this incident, adheres to the order in Homer, with Atlas, the threatened party, shouting out to Durius, who is about to cut him off. In both Silius and Nonnus the collision does actually take place, in Silius because Atlas, unlike Menelaus, cannot stop in time (16.409ff.), in Nonnus for no apparent reason. The sequence of events in Nonnus is improbable in the extreme in that the collision occurs after Achates has pulled up and addressed Phaunus. The speech seems inordinately long (37.404-21, i.e. 18 lines), when we take into consideration the circumstances in which it is made, but even more incredible is the fact that, in spite of having the time to hear out this extended diatribe, Phaunus still crashes into Achates. In his address Achates chastises Phaunus for his folly in not yielding right of way and warns him that he may be in for a whipping at the hands of Actaion (an illogical rejoinder, seeing that it was Actaion who wronged Phaunus and not the other way around). He appears to treat Phaunus as a social inferior, reminiscent of the way in which Odysseus addressed Thersites (cf. esp. 37.409-11 and B261-4). Lampooning
him mercilessly, Achates predicts what a laughing-stock he will be to the Satyrs and Sileni, when he returns all soiled and scratched. Phaunus reacts by ramming Achates' chariot, which has its axle broken like that of Oinomaus (37.425-30). Now follows a rather puzzling passage. Achates waits in the narrows until Phaunus, whipping his horses, passes him as if he did not hear: στεινωτὶν δὲ κέλευθον ἐχων ἀνέμμυνεν Ἀχάτης, / εἰσόκε ... / ὠκυτέρη μάςτηγι παρήλυθε Φαύνος Ἀχάτην, / οἷά περ οὐκ δίων (37.431-4), which echoes 'Ἀντίλοχος δ’ ἐτι καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἐλάυνε / κέντρῳ ἐπισπέρχων, ὡς οὐκ ἄλοιτε ἐσκὼς (Ψ429-30). With a broken axle Achates would no longer seem to have the option of waiting only so long as to let Phaunus pass, but he would, on the contrary, be immobilised for the duration of the race. The οἷά περ οὐκ δίων, which can only refer to Phaunus pretending not to hear Achates' speech, seems peculiarly out of context, now that the collision has already taken place. It seems as if Nonnus had originally intended to copy the Antilochus-Menelaus incident more closely, with lines 431-4 following directly on from line 404, but had subsequently decided to expand what must have been a short warning shout from Achates (cf. τρομερὴν ... φωνήν, 37.404) into a full-blown speech and insert yet another collision. The original order would have been as follows: Achates' warning - Phaunus' reaction (οἷά περ οὐκ δίων κ.τ.λ.) - Achates pulling up and waiting (lines 401-2 and 431-2) - Phaunus speeding past, with no collision. Phaunus finishes fourth, trailing Aetaionόσσα θορώτος / δίσκου πεμπομένου πέλει δολιχόσκιος ὀρμή, / δυν βρασὴ παλάμη δονέων αἰζήνα ἱδαλεί (37.436-8), which corresponds to the distance that Antilochus succeeded in putting between himself and Menelaus as the result of his underhand manoeuvre: ὄσσα δὲ δίσκου οὐρα κατωμαδίοιο πέλουται / ἀφ' ὅν τ' αἰζήνα ἀφήκεν περιμένος ἱβης (Ψ431-2). Nonnus, in common with other late poets, has extended the use of δολιχόσκιος to objects other than the spear (cf. αὐχήν, 12.181, πομήν, 40.370) and even to actions (as ὀρμή here), where it can no longer be rendered in its literal meaning of 'casting a long shadow'.

Our poet now turns his attention once more to the spectators, telling how they placed bets on who they thought would come in first. In naming the objects wagered
Nonnus has imitated the passage where Idomeneus offers to wager a tripod or cauldron to settle the point with Ajax regarding who, Eumelus or Diomede, was in the lead on the home stretch (cf. 37.441-2 and Ψ485-7). The lively altercation between Idomeneus and Ajax has no counterpart in Nonnus, who, as we have noted previously (pp.28-9), is averse to including dialogue in his narrative.

Erechtheus comes in first, incessantly whipping his horses, κατωμαδόν αἰέν ἰμάσσων (37.454), which recalls the arrival of Diomede, who likewise μάστι δ᾽ αἰέν ἔλαυνε κατωμαδόν (Ψ500). He is speckled with dust: καθ᾽ ἰμόχοιο δὲ πυκναὶ / αὐχημηραὶ ραθάμιγγες ἐπερρώντο κονίς (37.456-7), as is Diomede: αἰεὶ δ᾽ ἧνιοχον κονίς ραθάμιγγες ἔβαλλον (Ψ502). The chariot follows hard on the horses' heels: ἄρματα δ᾽ ἀγχιπόροισαν ἐπέτρεχεν ἰχνεοὺ ἵππων (37.458), echoing ἄρματα δὲ ... ἵππων ὑκυπόδεσσιν ἐπέτρεχοι (Ψ503-4). Sweat streams in profusion down the neck and sides of the horses: καὶ πολὺς ἵππεοιδο δ᾽ αὐχένος ἔρρεεν ἱδρὺς / καὶ λασίου στερνό (37.455-6), corresponding to πολὺς δ᾽ ἀνεκήκειν ἱδρὺς / ἵππων ἐκ τε λόφων καὶ ἀπὸ στέρνου χαμάζε (Ψ507-8).

The surface of the dirt hardly shows any wheelmarks (37.459-60), as is the case in Homer (Ψ504-6), a correspondence already noted (p.169). Erechtheus alights from his chariot and leans his whip against the yoke: καὶ ταχὺς ἐκ διήφοιο κατῆμεν μηκεδανὴν δὲ / εἰς ζυγὸν εὐποίητον ἐγὼ ἐκλινὲν ἰμᾶθην (37.464-5), again corresponding to Diomede’s action: αὐτὸς δ᾽ ἐκ διήφοιο χαμαι θόρε παμφανώνωτο, / κλίνε δ᾽ ἄρα μάστιγα ποτὶ ζυγὸν (Ψ509-10). The above passage is indicative of the close nature of Nonnus’ imitation, which embraces the minutest of details. The second to arrive is Scelmis, and he is only as far behind Erechtheus as the wheel of the chariot is from the hind quarters of the horse drawing it: κύκλος δὲν τροχόεις ἀπολείπεται ὠκέος ἵππου, / τοῦ μὲν ἐπάθσοςποι ἐπισωτρύν ὑγίς ἄκρων / ἐκταῖς ψαύουσιν ἐλισσομένης τρίχες οὐρής (37.422-4), which is equal to the distance that Menelaus is from Antilochus at the finish: δὲ τροχοὺ ἵππος ἀφιστάται ... τοῦ μὲν τε ψαύουσιν ἐπισωτρύν τρίχες ἄκραι / οὐραίαι (Ψ517-20). Not even the detail about the tips of the horse's
tail hairs touching the rim of the wheel has been passed over, demonstrating once more the closeness of the imitation. The third and fourth places go to Actaion and Phaunus respectively, Achates arriving last βραδυδύνεός ἐγγυθι δίφρου (37.482), that is to say, on foot like Eumelus (Ψ532-4).

The next contest, the boxing-match, was, like the chariot-race, a favourite set-piece, judging by the number of renderings of it that have come down to us. Besides the two accounts in Homer (Ψ683-99 and the fight between Odysseus and Irus (σ89-99), we have those of Theocritus (Id. 22.80134), Apollonius (2.45-97), Vergil (Aen. 5.421-84), Valerius (4.504-45), Statius (Theb. 6.750-825), Quintus (4.341-404) and Nonnus (37.504-45). Of his predecessors, Nonnus is discernibly influenced only by Homer and, to a lesser extent, by Theocritus and Apollonius. Unlike the other poets following Homer, Nonnus has not expanded on the original, keeping his version within the Homeric proportions. Dionysus puts up the boxing contest: οἱ πυγμαχίς χαροπής ἐστησεν ἀγώνα (37.485), just as Achilles does in the Iliad: αὐτὰρ ὁ πυγμαχίς ἀλεγευνῆς θήκεν δεθλα (Ψ653). The winner will receive a bull, the loser a shield, as against a mule and chalice in Homer. Melisseus rises at once in answer to the call (37.494-5), as Epeius does in Homer (Ψ664-5), and, taking hold of the bull, dares anyone to come forward and fight for the second prize: ἐλθέτω, ὅς ποθεί σάκος αἰόλον· οὐ γὰρ ἐάσσω ἀλλω πίονα ταῖρου, ἐως ἐν χείρας ἀείρω (37.497-8), which echoes Epeius' bravado: ἀσσον ἤτω, ὅς τις δέποις οἰσταί αἰμφικύπελλον· ἠμίονον δ᾽ οὐ φημὶ τιν’ ἀξέχεμν ἄλλον 'Ἀχαιῶν / πυγμῆ νυκήσαν', ἐπεὶ εὐχομαι εἶναι ἀριστος (Ψ667-9). Epeius' bravado also finds an echo in Vergil, where Dares demands that he be given the first prize uncontested (5.382-5), but the imitation is not nearly as close as that in Nonnus. We note that Epeius takes to the ring again at Achilles' funeral games in Quintus, though without repeating his boastful challenge. In Homer Epeius tempers his brashness with the admission that he is not much of a warrior: ἦν οἶχ ἄλης, ὀτι μᾶχις ἐπιθεύομαι (Ψ670), a shortcoming also noted in Quintus, who describes him as πολέμου δ᾽ οὐ πάγχυ δαήμων / ... λευγαλέου (4.327-8). Nonnus, somewhat surprisingly, considering his close imitation
of Homer, passes over this feature, but he takes note of another, namely Epeius' poor performance in the the discus throw, by having Melisseus also perform poorly in that event. The challenge is met by anxious silence: ὃς φαμένοι ξύμπαντος ἐπεσφρίγισσε σιωπή (37.499), which reflects the situation in Homer: ὃς ἔφαθ', οἰ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἄκην ἐγένοντο σιωπή (Ψ676). Statius imitates this Homeric touch as well, saying that on Capanes' challenge 'obstupuere animi, fecitque silentia terror' (6.738). A lone contender nevertheless soon appears: Εὐρυμέδων δὲ οἱ οἷος ἀνίστατο (37.500), as in Homer: Εὐρύσθαλος δὲ οἱ οἷος ἀνίστατο (Ψ677). In imitation of Homer both Nonnus (37.500ff.) and Statius (6.740ff.) lavish more attention on the second contender, elaborating on his credentials as a boxer and supplying details of his training, than they do on the first. With such a build-up the second contender would seem the obvious candidate for victory - one would not like to see arrogance triumph - but quite surprisingly this is not to be: in all three instances it is the boastful first contender who wins. Only in Vergil is the result otherwise, with the insolent Dares being defeated by the aging Entellus. In Quintus, Epeius is better behaved and the match ends in a draw. Eurymedon's brother Alcon readies him for the contest (37.505-7), corresponding to Diomedes' action, who performs the same service for Euryalus (Ψ683-4). Eurymedon steps forth like an armed warrior, his left arm being described by the poet as a σάκος ἐμφυτον and his thongs as taking the place of the spear (37.508-10). Nonnus is fond of such depictions where the unusual takes the place of the usual, cf. his earlier description of Dionysus, who wields a thyrsus instead of a spear and wears the nebris in place of a breastplate (14.235-9). The equating of two unlike objects in this way appears to have been a mannerism with the late poets. Tryphiodorus, for instance, equates Helen's arm to a charioteer of fire: οἴνοπα πίχυν ἀνείλκε φίλου πυρὸς ἐμαχη (521), and that after having already called the arm a χρυσέην ... πεύκην (513), more effective than Sinon's firebrand.

Eurymedon is portrayed as being ever watchful of his adversary's moves to avoid a blow from the latter's caestus. The deleterious effects of such blows are then listed in gruesome detail (37.512ff.). Among other things, Eurymedon must beware lest
his opponent strike him on the forehead and make his eyes pop out (διμάτα γυμνόσει λυπογήνυν προσώπου, 37.517), a situation more commonly referred to in battle scenes (cf. N616-7, Π741-2). In Apollonius, Polydeuces lands a similar blow on the forehead of one of the Bebrycians, who attack the Argonauts after Amycus' death, removing the eyelid so as to leave the eye exposed: δρόψε δέ οἱ βλέφαροι, γυμνή δ’ ὑπελέιπτ’ ὀπωτὶ (2.109). The line ending λυπογήνυν προσώπου recurs in the Paraphrase as ἀγλήνυν προσώπου (9.31), used to describe the visage of the blind man given sight by Christ. The horrors of ancient boxing are documented in other poets as well: for example, Vergil speaks of the caestus of Eryx as 'sanguine ... sparsoque infecta cerebro' (Aen. 3.413, cf. also Val. Fl. 4.153), which is in itself testimony to the lethal nature of the contests. In describing the fight Nonnus has availed himself of both Theocritus and Apollonius besides Homer. Eurymedon, acting defensively at first, subsequently goes on the offensive and is struck on the chest by Melisseus: ἐνα μὲν Εὐρυμέδωντος ἐπεσυμένων Μελισσεὺς / στήθως ἀκρον ἐλασσεν (37.520-1), which seems an imitation of Theocritus' τοῦ δ’ ἄκρον τύψε γένειον / Τυναρίδις ἐπιόντος (22.88-9). A blow to the chest was not considered effective, but Eurymedon's countermeasure is even less telling: going for Melisseus' face he strikes only air (37.521-2). This is to be distinguished from feinting, where the boxer purposely strikes the air to intimidate and disorient his opponent (cf. Theocr. 22.103 and Verg. 5.376-7). Eurymedon then lands a right under the exposed breast of Melisseus, another useless blow by Greek standards. The boxers come together delivering blows at close quarters: ἄλογος ἐπ’ ἄλλων / Ἀχιλεῖ φεῖδομένοιο ποδὸς πόδα τυφῶν ἀμείβον (37.525-6). Hands mix with hands: χερσὶ δὲ χεῖρας ἐμεῖξαν (37.527), as when Polydeuces parries Amycus' attack in Apollonius: χερσὶν ἐναυτία χεῖρας ἐμεῖξεν (2.78), which in turn echoes Homer's σὺν δὲ σφι βαρέια

4Cf. Gow's note to Theocritus 22.109-10. Gow cites Philostratus Gymn. 9, where it is stated that in Greek boxing the head alone was the target. In Val. Fl. likewise, Amycus' attack fails in that he only manages to strike Pollius on the chest: 'nec spes effecta. sed ambae/in pectus cecidere manus' (4.300-1).

5The phrase indicating movement from one foot to the other, used by Homer in describing Ajax' lingering retreat before the Trojans (Ἀ.547), is used in relation to boxing by Apollonius (2.94) and Quintus (4.947).
There is a frightful banging of leather on leather: ὑμοπλεκέων ἐπεβομβίζει δοῦπος ἰμάντων (37.528), something also mentioned by Valerius Flaccus: 'infictaque late / terga sonant' (4.282-3). Straps are spattered with blood from cut cheeks, and jaws resound with blows: χαρασσωμένης δὲ παρειῆς / αἰμαλέως λιβάδεσθαι ἐφοινίχθησαν ἰμάντες· / καὶ γενύων πέλε δοῦπος (37.529-31), which corresponds in substance to Apollonius' τοῦτο παρημή τ' ἀμφοτέρωθεν / καὶ γένυες κτύπεον, βροχὴ δ' ὑπετέλλετ' ὀδόντων/ἀσπετος (2.82-4), which is, in turn, an elaboration of Homer's δεινὸς δὲ χρόμαθος γενύων γένετ' (Ψ688). It may be noted that Apollonius, Vergil and Quintus illustrate the action with similes, Apollonius likening the blows to those of shipwrights' hammers, in keeping with his nautical theme (2.79-82), Vergil comparing them to hailstones striking a roof (5.458-60), and Quintus to lightning flashes issuing from two thunder-clouds coming together (4.349-54). Nonnus, whose poem is notable for its overall paucity of similes (except when imitating Homeric passages containing a simile), abstains from employing one here. Cheeks swell up, eyes close in: ἐπιθρωσμῷ δὲ προσώπου / εὐρυτέρου γεγαυῶτος ἐκμαίνοντο παρειαί, / ὀφθαλμοί δὲ ἕκατερθεν ἐκουλαῖνοντο προσώπου (37.531-3). Theocritus depicts Polydeuces' jabs as having a similar effect on Amycus' face: διματα δ' οἴδησαντος ἀπεστείνωτο προσώπου (Id. 22.101). Eurymedon is being tired out by Melisseus' skilful manoeuvring, as a result of which he is forced to fight with the sun in his eyes (37.534-6), a situation similar to the one in which Amycus finds himself in Theocritus (Id. 22.83-6). Melisseus now comes in for the kill: ἄφω γυαθμὼν ἐτυψεν ὑπ' οὐατος (37.538). This is how Odysseus floors Irus: ὃ δ' αὐξέν' ἔλασσεν ὑπ' οὐατος (σ96), and in Apollonius, Polydeuces finishes off Amycus with a similar blow ὑπὲρ οὐατος (2.95). Eurymedon falls on his back, rolling in the dust like one inebriated, μεθύοντι πανεκέλος (37.540), his condition recalling that of Irus, who is likewise μεθύοντι ἐφικώς (σ240). His plight is elaborated further: εἰξε δὲ κόρην / κεκλιμένην ἠτέρωσε, καὶ αἵματος ἐπτυνεν ἄχυνην / λεπτὰ παχυμομένου (37.540-2), which corresponds to Euryalus' state in the Iliad: αἵμα παχύ πτύοντα, κάρη βάλλουθ' ἠτέρωσε (Ψ697).
It is plain that Nonnus' presentation of the boxing-match is largely a composite of ideas and phrases drawn from Homer, Theocritus and Apollonius. The renderings of Quintus, Valerius and Statius exhibit a similar lack of inventiveness, though not quite to the same degree, nor is their dependence on Homer so transparently obvious. Theocritus, Apollonius and Vergil have, on the other hand, enriched Homer's account, each according to his particular talents: Theocritus through the technical virtuosity of his description, Apollonius by his remarkable similes, which are at the same time so apposite to his overall nautical theme, and Vergil by providing a psychological dimension to the contest, by revealing the inner feelings of the contestants and the effect that these (e.g. pudor, ira) have on their performance. Nonnus' account is by comparison mediocre and derivative, possessing no special feature to commend itself to the reader.

He is more effusive in his coverage of the next event, wrestling, dedicating some 48 lines to it (37.554-602), four more than Quintus (4.220-64), only nine less than Statius (6.847-904), and more than twice as many as Homer (Ψ710-32). Nonnus' interest in this sport - which he incidentally calls καλὸς ἀγών (37.552) in contrast to Homer's πάλαισμοσύνη ἀλεγετινή (Ψ710-32, Θ126) - is indicated by the fact that the present contest is but the second of three in the poem, the others being the bouts that Dionysus has with Ampelus (10.339-77) and Pallene (48.106-71). These other matches are not serious contests, being of an overtly erotic nature - we note that the poet ἄρξει the contestants in the first δεθλητήρες Ἐρώτων - but they share some details with the present bout. The type of wrestling depicted in Nonnus (and, we may add, in Statius) is very different from the classical ἀρτη πάλη, which consisted of three consecutive bouts (τρία παλαίσματα), victory going to whoever achieved the most throws. The Homeric contest was based on the same principles, with the first round going to Odysseus and the second to Ajax, but the contestants forego the third and deciding round in favour of a draw. As earlier in the case of the chariot race, Nonnus has attempted to combine a later form of sport with the Homeric type, even though the two are not compatible. The contest starts off in a distinctly Homeric fashion, but then develops into a form of
ground wrestling, in that the bout continues on the floor after a throw until such time as one of the contestants is incapacitated to the point of being unable to offer further resistance (cf. Statius, 6.901-4) or signals his wish to surrender (37.608-9).

The prize offered the winner is a tripod as in Homer, with the loser to receive a cauldron (instead of Homer's woman 'versed in many tasks'). The contestants are Aristaius and Aiacus, corresponding, broadly speaking, to Ajax and Odysseus in Homer, Ajax and Diomedes in Quintus, and Agyleus and Tydeus in Statius. The two gird loincloths, being naked apart from that: ζώματι δὲ σκεπάσματες αθηνίτου φύσιν αἰδοὺς / γυμνοὶ αδελφούς ἐφέστασαν (37.556-7), which is an expansion of Homer's ζωσαμένω δ' ἁρα τῷ γε βάτην ἐς μέσον ἄγωνα (Ψ710). In Quintus, the participants in the foot-race gird their loins out of respect for Thetis (4.188-91). Nonnus reuses 37.556 in the Paraphrase, when he refers to Peter girding his loins with a skin as a mark of respect for Jesus: δέρμα, τόπερ ... ἵρυφολοι φορέονσιν ἀθηνίτου σκέπασιν αἰδούς (21.41-2). Pallene does likewise: ἀμφί δὲ πιροὶ / ἡμοι ἄρκτοι ὑψαμμα, γυνακεῖας σκέπας αἰδούς (48.119-20). The match begins with the contestants pulling and tugging: ἐν δ' ἀμφίδρομος ἀνήρ ... ἐλκὺν ἐλκόμενος τε (37.561-3), recalling the language used in the Dionysus-Ampelus bout, where Dionysus is described as δειρομένος καὶ δείρων (10.346). The two clasp, head butressed against head: μεσσατίῳ δὲ κάρυην ἐπηρείδουτο μετώπω / ἀκλανές (37.565-6). This corresponds to the situation in the Iliad which Homer illustrates with his famous two-rafters simile, but Nonnus will not use the simile here, reserving it for a later stage in the bout. Sweat pours from the wrestlers: ἐκ δὲ μετώπων ... ἔρρεεν ἱδρῶς (37.566-7), echoing κατὰ δὲ νότιος ὑεῖν ἱδρῶς (Ψ715). Weals come up from flesh being tightly gripped: σμώδεις δ' αὐτοτελεστος ἀνέδραμεν, αἴματι θερμῷ / ἀίδολα πορφυροῦσα (37.574-5), again echoing Homer: πυκναί δὲ σμώδιγγες ἀνὰ πλευρᾶς τε καὶ ώμους / αἴματι φοινικόσσαι ἀνέδραμον (Ψ716-7). The contestants make a display of their skills: οἱ δὲ παλαμοσύνης ... μάγγανα τέχνης / ἀλλῆλοις ἀνέφαϊν ἀμοβαδίς (37.576-7), the action being now at the stage when Ajax proposes to Odysseus that they should take
turns lifting one another. The pattern of action that follows: ἀντίθην ἐν πρῶτος Ἀρισταῖος ... πηχύνατο ... ὀχλιζεῖν ... δεύτερος ἥερταζε ... κουφίζειν ... ὑπὰ Κυρήνης Αἴακος conforms to that in Homer [πρῶτος Αἴας] ἀνάειρε ... δεύτερος ... ἀνάειρε ... Ὑδυσσεύς, but his second round is developed very differently, according to the rules of the later gladiatorial-type ground wrestling. Aristaius lifts Aiaacus, but the latter gets the better of him by striking him in the hollow of the knee: δολίης δ᾽ οὗ λήθητο τέχνης / Αἴακος αἰολόμητης, ὑποκλέπτοντι ἐν τάρσῳ / λαῖδον Ἀρισταῖοι ποδὸς κωλήτα πατάξας ὑπίτου αὐτοκύλιστον ὅλων περικάββαλε γαίη (37.579-82), which is precisely the tactic used by Odysseus against Ajax: δόλου δ᾽ οὗ λήθητ’ Ὑδυσσεύς: / κόψ᾽ ὑπεθεν κωλήτα τυχίων, ὑπέλυσε δὲ γυῖα./ κάδ ᾗ ἐπεσʼ ἐξοπίσω (Ψ725-7). Ampelus uses the same stratagem in the earlier bout: ὁ δὲ Βρομίοι τυχήσας / κόψῃ ποδὸς κωλήτα καὶ Εὔλογος ... ὑπίτου αὐτοκύλιστος ἐπώλισθησε κονίη (10.353-6). Nonnus has thus copied Homer closely not once but twice. Quintus displays more inventiveness, devising a different stratagem whereby Diomedes discomfits Ajax: Τελαμώνον ... ὑδα ... ἀνάειρεν ὑπὸ μυών ἔρείσας ὤμοιν (4.227-9). Aiaacus hurls Aristaius to the ground ἣλματῳ πρησῶν πανεῖκελον (37.583), which resembles Ajax' action in Quintus, when he throws Diomedes in the second round ἥντε πέτρην (4.260). In the second round Aristaius has no opportunity to redress his loss in the first, being lifted and held high in the air by Aiaacus. It is this image, of one wrestler holding the other above his head, that Nonnus has chosen to illustrate by Homer's rafters simile: ἵσον ἄμειβόντεσσιν ἔχων τύπον, οὐς καίμε τέκτων / πρησῶν ἀνέμοιο θυελλήσασαν ἀνάγκην (37.593-4), corresponding to ὅτ᾽ ἄμειβοντες, τοὺς τε κλυτός ἥραρε τέκτων, / δώματος ὑψηλοῦ βίας ἀνέμων ἀλείφων (Ψ712-3). As used here by Nonnus the simile is not entirely appropriate to the situation which it is meant to illustrate. Findar's image of a beam held aloft by columns (Pyth. 4.267-8) could perhaps have been accommodated to the present context to provide a more accurate analogy. Greene, commenting on the unsuitability of the simile to its present context, suggests that lines 588-94 'should be placed after line
557, with a change of εχουν to εχουν'. 6 Keydell notes and rejects this conjecture in his apparatus. In view of Nonnus' habitual disregard for consistency, it is better to abstain from improving the text through transpositions of this kind. Aiacus forthwith hurls his hapless opponent to the ground and, jumping on top of him, proceeds to strangle him in true gladiatorial fashion: αυχένα δεσμον ἐβαλε βραχίον, δάκτυλα κάμψας (37.601), a stratagem Dionysus later repeats on Pallene: εὐπαλάμῳ σφήκωσεν ὀμόξυγον αὐχένα δεσμῷ (48.171). Aristaius' imminent death is only prevented by the timely intervention of the heralds, since, as the poet explains, the tapping signal whereby the defeated party signalled surrender had not yet been invented (37.605-9). We note that Pallene too is saved by the timely intervention of her father (48.172-6).

The depiction of the next event, the foot-race, is little more than a paraphrase of Homer's, so closely does Nonnus follow his model here. The depictions of Vergil, Statius, Silius and Quintus, if dependent on Homer's and coinciding with it in a number of particulars, manifest at least some endeavour to be innovative by introducing fresh nuances and elements not encountered in the original. Nonnus, after displaying a more eclectic approach in his boxing and wrestling matches, resorts now to straight paraphrasing, following Homer alone to the exclusion of other influences. The episode is introduced with the statement that Dionysus ἄθεηκε τοδὼν ταχυτήτως ἁγώνα (37.614), corresponding to the action of Achilles, who likewise πιθεὶ ταχυτήτως δέθλα (Ψ740). The prize designated for the winner is a silver bowl made in Sidon, exactly as in Homer, Nonnus adding a woman captive for good measure. The second prize is a dappled Thessalian horse in place of Homer's fattened ox, and the third a sword with strap instead of the gold half-talent in Homer. Dionysus invites fleet-footed men to compete for the prizes as does Achilles. The runners are Ocythous corresponding to Ajax son of Oileus, Erechtheus corresponding to Odysseus, and Priasus corresponding to Antilochus. Nonnus signals the start of the race with the phrase used earlier to signal the start of the chariot race: τοιςι μὲν ἐκ

---

6(1911) p.131
βαλβίδος ἐν δρόμος (37.625 and 242). There the phrase had no Homeric precedent, but here it has one: τοῖς δ᾽ ἀπὸ νύσσης τέτατο δρόμος (Ψ758). We might observe how conveniently the line-ending at 37.625, Ὀκύθοος δὲ, substitutes for line-ending at Ψ758, ὥσ τ᾽ ἔπειτα, which may give Nonnus the idea for the name 'Ocythous'. Ocythous is quickest off the mark, followed closely by Erechtheus. The distance between Ocythous and Erechtheus is illustrated by the same simile that is used by Homer: φιληλακάτοι δὲ κούρης / ἀνα κανών στέρνοι πέλει μέσος, ὅ ἕν μέτρῳ / παρθένοις ἱστοπόνος τεχνήμον χειρὶ ταύτης, / Ὀκυθοῦν πέλε τόσον ὑπόστερος (37.630-3), which corresponds to Ὑστε τίς τε γυναικὸς ἐυξώνοι / στήθεος ἕστι κανών, ὅ τ᾽ ἐν μάλα χερσὶ ταυτήσῃ / πηνίου ἐξέλκουσα παρὲκ μίτον, ἀγχόθι δ᾽ ἵσχει / στήθεος· Ὑστε ὁδοὺς θέεν ἐγγύθεν (Ψ760-3). The simile was used earlier in shorter form by Nonnus in the foot-race between Kissus, Leneus and Ampelus, who trailed the first two by ὑπόσοον ἱστοπόνοο κανῶν πρὸς στήθει κούρης / μεσοσφανῆς λάχε χώρον ἀκαμπτὲι γείτωνα μαζὶ (10.411-2). Nonnus is alone among the later poets in using Homer's simile, demonstrating once again how much closer his rendering is to Homer than those of the others. Erechtheus treads in Ocythous' footsteps before the dust has had a chance to settle: ἤχυνα τύπτε πόδεσσιν, πάρος κοίνιν ἀμφίωθηναι (37.634), which has been copied verbatim from Homer (Ψ764). Of the other poets, only Vergil echoes this detail, rendering ἤχυνα τύπτε πόδεσσι by 'calcemque terit iam calce' (5.324). Erechtheus appeals to Boreas for assistance, having already called on him during the chariot race (37.155-62). His appeal (37.640-3), in which he reminds Boreas of his obligations to him, corresponds thematically to Odysseus' prayer to Athena (Ψ770). Boreas grants his wish by making him swifter than the wind: καὶ μὲν ἑπταχλάοι ταχίσσων θήκεν ἀπόλλης (37.645), and presumably faster than Ocythous, who is previously referred as taking off ἀπὸλληντι ποδῶν ... παλμῷ (37.626). Despite this, Erechtheus seems unable to overtake Ocythous, the relative positions of the runners remaining unchanged, with Ocythous in the lead, then Erechtheus followed by Priasus (37.646-50). In Homer, on the other hand, Athena's intervention is decisive, not only making
Odysseus' limbs lighter, but more importantly, causing Ajax slip on bull dung as he is about to cross the finishing line ahead of Odysseus. Nonnus copies the slipping incident from Homer, but in his version it occurs purely fortuitously, without any divine involvement: ἐσσυμένων δὲ ἐπιπότε λοίπθος ἤεν ἔτι δρόμος ἁλματι ταρσών, Ἡκόθοος ταχύγυουνος ἐπωλίσθηκε κονίη, ἡ δὲ βοῶν πέλεν ὀθος ἀδεσφατος, οὐς παρὰ τύμβῳ Μυνδονίη Διόνυσος ἀπηλόησε μαχαίρῃ (37.650-4), corresponding to ἀλλ' ὁτε δὴ τάχα ἐμελλον ἐπαξίζοσαι δέθλου, ἤν' Ἀιας μὲν δισθε θέων, βλάψεν γάρ Ἀθήνη, τῇ ῥᾷ βοῶν κέχυτ' διὸς ἀποκταμένων ἐρμύκων, οὐς ἐπὶ Πατρόκλῳ πέφυεν πόδας ὦκις Ἀχιλλεὺς (Ψ773-6). 7 The accident occasions the mirth of the onlookers (37.664-6), as it does in Homer (Ψ779-81). Ocythous, undeterred, gets up and would have overtaken Erechtheus: εἴ τότε βαιὸς ἦν ἐτι ποι δρόμος, ἡ τάχα βαιύνων / ἡ πέλεν αμφηριστος ἡ ἐφασεν ἄστον Ἀθήνης (37.655,58-9,56-7,60). Nonnus appears to have contrived Ocythous' recovery solely for the purpose of being able to insert yet another Homeric echo - we are reminded of Menelaus in the chariot race, who after being put out by Antilochus' stratagem, makes up lost ground so rapidly that he would have not only caught up but even passed him had there been a little more of the course left to traverse: εἴ δὲ κ' ἐτι προτέρῳ γένετο δρόμος αμφωτέρους, τῷ κέν μιν παρέλασα 'ουδ' αμφηριστον ἐθηκεν (Ψ526-7).

Nonnus' treatment of the next event, the discus throw, is likewise closely patterned on Homer's. This contest, the second last in Homer, has been brought forward to take the place of the ἐλινὴ δήρας, which Nonnus has moved to the last place. In Homer the prize for the winner is the σόλος itself, which was apparently deemed to be of considerable value for its metal content. It was clearly distinct from the stone δίσκος, with which Odysseus displayed his mettle at the Phaeceans' games (6186-90). Nonnus, confusing the σόλος with the δίσκος (to which no particular

7In Vergil's rendering of the above, the slipping is likewise brought about fortuitously: 'iamque ... sub ipsam / finem adventabant, levi cum sanguine Nisus / labitur infelix, caesis ut forte iuvencis / fusus humum vindisque super madefecerat herbas' (Aen. 5.327-30). In Quintus, Teucer trips over a tamarisk root instead, the accident being attributed to the will of the δᾶνατος (4.291), though for no apparent reason.
value could be attached), opts for more conventional fare: πρώτη μὲν δύο δούρα σὺν ἵπποκόμῳ τρυφαλεῖῃ / θήκεν ἄγων, ἐτέρῳ δὲ διαυγέα κυκλάδα μίτρην (37.669-70), which bears an unmistakable resemblance to the second prize in Quintus' horserace: δῶκε δ' ἄρα Σθενέλω βριαρὴν κόρυν / χαλκεῖν καὶ δοῦρε δῶ καὶ ἀτερέα μίτρην (4.587-8). The correspondences τρυφαλεῖ / κόρυν, δύο δούρα / δοῦρε δῶ καὶ κυκλάδα μίτρην / ἀτερέα μίτρην cannot be purely coincidental.\(^8\) The third and fourth prizes are a bowl and a fowlskin respectively. Dionysus proclaims the contest: καὶ σόλον αὐτοχώρων ἄγων ἐπέθηκεν ἄγων / δισκοβόλους Διόνυσος ἀκοντιστήρας ἐπείγων (37.667-8). The first line echoes αὐτὰρ Πηλείδης θήκεν σόλον αὐτοχώρων (Ψ826); the second is indicative of the failure to distinguish between σόλος and δίσκος. The two terms are used interchangeably by the poet in describing Halimedes' throw: ἡκοντείζεν ἐν ἡρι δίσκον ἀλήτην / καὶ σόλος ἡρίζεστε ἔπερροιζεσεν δέλαιας (37.668-78), despite the scholion to Ψ826 clearly stating: διαφέρει δὲ σόλος καὶ δίσκος, ὅτι ὁ μὲν δίσκος πλατύς ἐστι καὶ κοιλότερος, ὁ δὲ σόλος στρογγύλος καὶ σφαιροειδής. Status is similarly oblivious to the distinction, speaking at one moment of a discus (cf. 'emisso ... disco', 6.646), at another of a mass of bronze ('aenae lubrica massae / pondera', 6.648-9).

Quintus alone seems to understand the true meaning of the σόλος, when he makes the one used at Achilles' funeral games so heavy that only Ajax can throw it (4.436ff.).

As in Homer, there are four contestants and they stand in a row (στοληθόν εφέστασα : 37.678 / ἔξεισι δ' ἱσταντο, Ψ839). Melisseus, like Epeius in Homer, throws first, and his poor performance, like that of Epeius, rouses the mirth of the onlookers (cf. 37.679-80 and Ψ839-40). His present humiliation may be seen as belated poetic justice for his arrogance in the boxing-match. Eurymedon, who corresponds to Homer's Leonteus, throws next, without any comment from Nonnus regarding his

---

8Nonnus seems to wish to disguise his use of Quintus, but his procedure is quite transparent: he changes δῶκε δ' ἄρα 28. to θήκεν ἄγων, substitutes the latter for χαλκεῖν in the next line, transfers δοῦρε δῶ to the previous line, changing it to δῶ δοῦρα to suit the new metrical position, and retains the line ending with minimal change (κυκλάδα το προ ἀτερέα). With a little in-fill the rest falls into place quite effortlessly.
performance. Earlier editors assumed that something had been lost here, but as Keydell notes in his apparatus, Nonnus is merely following Homer to the letter, in that Homer likewise records Leontetus' throw without any comment (Ψ841). Acmon, who corresponds to Ajax, throws next, bettering Eurymedon's mark: καὶ σκόπου Ἐὐρυμέδοντος ὑπέρβαλε μείζονι μέτρῳ (37.685), which echoes Homer's comment on Ajax' throw: ὑπέρβαλε σήματα πάντων (Ψ843). Halimedes, the parallel of Polypoites in Homer, throws last, his throw bettering all previous marks: σήματα πάντα παρέδραμεν (37.694), just like that of Polypoites παντὸς ἀγώνος ὑπέρβαλε (Ψ847). Nonnus has omitted Homer's picturesque analogy between Polypoites and a shepherd throwing his staff, electing instead to liken the discus flying from Halimedes' hand to an arrow shot forth from a bow.

The archery contest is the next event and involves only two contestants, Asterius and Hymenaius, corresponding to Teucer and Meriones in the Iliad. The target is, as in Homer, a pigeon tied by the foot to a masthead. Nonnus is seeing things in the Homeric context, where the contest takes place on the sea-shore, by the beached ships of the Achaians, forgetting that Dionysus' army is landbound and without a ship in sight. Vergil, likewise, has a bird attached to a masthead as the target (5.486-7), but his context is similar to Homer's, the games taking place in the vicinity of the cove where Aeneas' ships are berthed. Nonnus and Vergil alone among the later poets have treated the archery contest at length, Statius and Quintus giving only very cursory accounts. While both are closely indebted to Homer, they diverge considerably in the way that they have used him. Vergil has increased the number of contestants to three, the first of whom hits the mast, the second severs the string and the third transfixes the bird. The vibration caused by the first archer's arrow hitting the mast scares the perching bird into taking to flight, thereby extending the string, which is then severed by the second archer's arrow, freeing the bird. The third archer transfixes the bird as it soars towards the clouds. Vergil has endeavoured to render the scene more realistic than it is in Homer, where we have to visualise the bird flying about the mast on the end of a string, without any suggestion as to why it should have taken flight in the first place.
Nonnus, unlike Vergil, makes no attempt to improve on the original, being content to merely paraphrase.

For the prizes offered in Homer, namely ten double-edged axes for the winner and an equal number of single-edged axes for the loser, Nonnus has substituted something less specialised, a mule and a cup respectively. The mule, it will be recalled, is in Homer the prize offered to the winner of the boxing-match (Ψ654), replaced in Nonnus by a bull (37.492). By a rather strange piece of anticipation the second prize in Homer is designated for the archer who should hit the string, by which the bird is attached to the mast. Hitting the string was fortuitous coincidence, the archers aiming at the bird and not the string, which could not have been foreseen at the time the prizes were allocated. Vergil avoids the difficulty by not specifying beforehand the criteria whereby the prizes were to be allocated, saying simply that Aeneas 'praemia dicit' (Aen. 5.486). Only after the contest are we informed that the first prize (naturally) went to the archer who brought down the bird, the second to the one who severed the string, and the third to the one who hit the mast. Nonnus merely duplicates the Homeric depiction, without any attempt to make it more believable.

The target is set up: Εὐρύαλος δὲ / νῆλον ὀρθώσας περιμήκετον ἵστων ἀρούρη / στήσει ὑπὲρ δαπέδου ψαμμάθωδεος, ἰψφανή δὲ / δέσμιον ἰώρησε πεκτόδα σύμπλοκον ἱστώ / λεπταλέου δυσσοσία μίτων περὶ ποσσίν ἐλίξας (37.707-11), which corresponds rather closely to ἵστων δ’ ἐστηκεν νηὸς κυανοπῦροιο / τηλοῦ ἐπὶ ψαμμάθωδος· ἐκ δὲ τρήρων πέλειαν / λεπτῇ μηρίδῳ δὴσεν ποδός, ἦς ἄρ’ ἀνώγει / τοξεύειν (Ψ852-5). The way in which Dionysus announces the prizes (37.714-9), including the reference to the severing of the string, is likewise closely imitated from Homer (Ψ855-8). The contestants are then introduced, Nonnus foregoing the drawing of lots, though intimating later, when the contest was already underway, that it had taken place (37.726). One would imagine that the drawing of lots was of paramount importance in an event of this kind, seeing that if the archer who gets to shoot first succeeds in bringing down the bird, the contest would be over, with the other archer deprived of the chance to compete. Another detail in Homer that
Nonnus passes over is Teucer's failure to promise a hecatomb to Apollo, an oversight which costs him the victory. Asterios shoots first, having obtained that privilege by lot, and hits the string (37.726-9), which corresponds in substance to Homer's representation of Teucer's attempt (Ψ862-9). We may note a minor discrepancy: whereas Homer says that the string on being cut hung downward towards the ground (παρελθῃ μὴρωθος ποτὶ γαῖαν, Ψ869), which is natural seeing that it was attached to the masthead, Nonnus with typical disregard for verisimilitude says that it fell to the ground (καὶ μῆτος εἰς χόνα πίπτε, 37.729). Vergil on the other hand makes the picture more explicit, saying that the arrow severed the knot by which the string was tied to the bird's foot (Aen. 510-1). Hymenaius shoots next and brings down the bird (37.729-33), his feat corresponding to that of Meriones (Ψ870-4), except that Meriones also promises that all-important hecatomb to Apollo. Nonnus does, however, speak of Hymenaius' arrow as having been guided on target by Apollo, implying that Hymenaius may have given the undertaking after all. Both Nonnus and Vergil have overlooked another apparently important detail in Homer's account, namely that both contestants use the same bow (so as to eliminate any possible advantage either one could derive from possessing a superior instrument). Meriones, having his arrow at the ready, quickly takes the bow from Teucer's hand (ἔξειρπσε χειρὸς τόξον, Ψ870-1), before the bird can fly out of reach. Hymenaius' arrow pierces the bird's chest and it falls half-dead to the ground at the feet of Dionysus and does a dance of death in his honour before expiring (37.734-42). Nonnus has not followed Homer's account, in which the arrow falls back at Meriones' feet and the bird lands first on the mast with hanging neck and drooping wings, before falling to the ground dead (Ψ875-9). Nonnus' βαρυνυμένου δὲ καρήνου (37.739), used to describe the dying bird, is apparently a rendering of Homer's αὐχέν' ἀπεκρέμασεν (Ψ879), but otherwise our poet seems to have distanced himself from his model. We might note that in Vergil the bird dies on being struck, there being no prolonged death agony as in Homer. Onlookers are astounded at Hymenaius' feat: ἄγχινεσάμεν θαμβησαν ἐκηβολὴν ἤμεναιον (37.746), which echoes Homer's λαοὶ δ' αὐθευτῷ τε θαμβησάν τε (Ψ881).
Nonnus has left what is potentially the most hazardous of the contests, the φιλίν δῆρις, till the last. The other poets have seen fit to curtail this event or find reasons for not having it take place: in Quintus, Euryalus, fearful of Ajax' superior prowess, forfeits the contest before it could begin, in Statius, Adrastus cancels it with the words 'manet ingens copia leti', with reference to the impending war, while Vergil omits it altogether. Only in Silius do two brothers engage in it, killing themselves in the process (16.527-50). Nonnus follows the scheme of Homer's bout, in which Ajax puts his spear through Diomedes' shield but does not penetrate to the skin, and Diomedes then aims at Ajax' neck, at which point the contest is stopped as too dangerous. Asterius corresponds to Ajax, and Aiacus to Diomedes. Asterius hurls his spear, wounding Aiacus on the arm, whereupon Aiacus threatens to strike Asterius on the chin, the fight being stopped at this point and adjudged in Aiacus' favour, though he did little more than constitute a potentially mortal threat to his opponent.

We may conclude with the general observation that of all the later renderings of the twenty-third book of the Iliad, that of Nonnus is closest to it in layout and substance, if not in tone and atmosphere. His near-obsessive preoccupation with duplicating passages down to the minutest details leads him at times into conflict with the peculiar circumstances of his own narrative. A tendency to bombast and hyperbole, combined with his inability or unwillingness to differentiate the Homeric age from his own time, distances his account from that of his model.
Chapter 7: Dionysus in Lebanon (40.298-43.449).

The three and a half books which Nonnus devotes to Dionysus' sojourn in Lebanon consist of material that is largely extraneous to the body of myths traditionally associated with the god. Aside from Tyre being his ancestral home, there seems little to link Dionysus directly with Lebanon and one suspects that Nonnus has made extensive use of his inventive faculty in co-opting Phoenician traditions to create yet another amorous episode in the life of his hero, in which he depicts Dionysus' pursuit, in competition with Poseidon, of the nymph Beroe, the supposed eponymous heroine of Beirut. In contrast to the foregoing books on the Indian war, in which Nonnus patterned his narrative on the Iliad, and the three books on the return to Thebes, for which Euripides' Bacchae served as the model, the present segment is not based on the work of any one literary predecessor and shows our poet at his most eclectic and resourceful. The subject matter falls into two thematically distinct segments: the first (and by far the smaller) comprises descriptions of Tyre and Beirut, together with their foundation myths (Tyre: 40.311-580, Beirut: 41.14-158), and the second, though purporting to represent an alternative, more recent (ὅπλοτέρη), foundation myth of Beirut, is in fact the story of Dionysus' and Poseidon's rivalry over the maiden Beroe, which constitutes yet another variant of the παρθένοι φυγόδειμοι theme, exemplified elsewhere in the poem by the stories of Chalcedona, Nicaia and Aura. The ecphrases of Tyre and Beirut display an admiration and enthusiasm that bespeak personal acquaintance on the poet's part with the two cities. Special praise is lavished on Beirut and its law school, though its connexion with Dionysus is at best tenuous. It seems as if the poet is intent on giving voice to personal experiences of an agreeable kind that he may have had with the city at some stage of his life, at the same time adapting its local traditions to form a new episode in the life of Dionysus. Nonnus' excursion into Phoenician mythology attracted the attention of the celebrated Semitist, O. Eissfeldt, who in 1939 examined his
foundation myths of Tyre and Beirut in relation to the Φωνική Ἱστορία of Philo of Byblos and the then recently discovered Ugaritic texts. His study was later supplemented by R. Dostálová-Jenistová, who in 1957 published a survey of evidence pertaining to the foundation myths of the two cities that could be gleaned from literary sources, and by P. Chuvín, who in his 1991 monograph on Nonnus’ geography supplements the literary sources with archaeological and numismatic material illustrative of the myths. Chuvín sees a close interaction on Nonnus’ part with Philo’s text, being of the opinion that our poet was not only familiar with it (as verbal coincidences seem to suggest) but actively set out to refute it on certain points. The story of the two gods’ wooing of Beroe appears nevertheless to be almost completely of the poet’s own making, recalling in many ways the earlier Chalcomeda episode and, as Braune has demonstrated, showing clear evidence of having been partly modelled on Claudian’s De raptu Proserpinae. The war between Dionysus and Poseidon over Beroe does, however, seem to have some precedent in Phoenician mythology, as the investigations of Eissfeldt and Chuvín indicate.

Dionysus’ journey from India to Lebanon is described in a most cursory fashion. He returns by way of the Caucasus, where he fights a war with the Amazons - an event on which the poet expends but one line (40.293) - and passes through Arabia, whose inhabitants he introduces to viniculture. He examines the handiwork of Babylonian Arachne on cloth dyed with Tyrian purple. This leads to the story of how the dye was first discovered, when a dog, eating a shell-fish, stained its jaws purple (40.304-10), a story recounted in somewhat more detail by Achilles Tatius (2.11.5-8). Nonnus, incidentally, omits the most important element in the tale, namely that the purple stain was found to be indelible, a property essential for its use as a dye. Dionysus, anxious to visit his ancestral home, heads for Tyre, which the poet now proceeds to eulogise by means of a lengthy ecphrasis, using all the conventions germane to such compositions. Dionysus beholds the panorama of the city and its environs with a feeling of elation: καὶ πόλιν ἄθρασας ἐπεγήθεεν, ἂν Ἐνοσίχθων / οὐ διερῆ μιτρώσεν δῶς ζωστήρι θαλάσσης, / ἄλλα τύπον λάχε τοῖον Ὀλύμπιον, οἷον ὕψαίνει / ἄγχιτελής λείψουσα μὴ γλωχῖνι σελήνη (40.311-4). This description exhibits
some of the typical features of the ἐκφρασις λιμένος (cf. for comparison Libanius, 'Ἐκφράσεις', η', 3, where a harbour is described likewise as an incomplete circle, κύκλον οὐχ ὄλον, ἀλλ' ὀσον στόμα τῷ λιμένι καταλαμπεῖν). In attributing the particular configuration of Tyre to Poseidon the poet fails, of course, to take account of the fact that the city only acquired it with the building by Alexander of his famous causeway from the mainland in order to facilitate its capture. The depiction is thus anachronistic in the context in which it is presented. The topography is likened to a girl about to undertake a swim, with her upper body in the water whilst her feet are still touching the shore: νησομένη δ' ἀτίνακτος ὁμοίος ἐπλευτο κούρη / καὶ κεφαλή καὶ στέρνα καὶ αὐχένα δῶκε θαλάσση, / ... καὶ πόδας ἀμφοτέρους ἐπερείσατο μητέρι γαίη (40.319-23).

The comparison, which reflects Nonnus' fondness for depicting females engaged in athletic activities such as running or swimming, has possible emblematic significance, representing the dual role of Tyre as a centre of maritime and land-based industries, something on which the poet will dwell shortly. Somewhat paradoxically, Beirut too appears to be depicted as having a long ridge whopped on both sides by the sea: ἔστι πόλις Βερόν ... οὐ ράχις ἱσθμοῦ / στενὴ μῆκος ἔχοντος, ὅτη διδύμης μέσος ἀλμης / κύμασιν ἀμφοτέρουσιν ἰμάσασται ὀρθὸς αὐχήν. / ἄλλα τὰ μὲν βαθύδενθρον ὑπὸ ράχιν αἰθώσας Εὐφρο, / Ἀσσυρίω Λυβάνῳ παραπέπταται ... ἄλλα δὲ παρ’ πελάγεσιν ἔχει πόλις, ἧς τιταίνει / στέρνα Ποσειδάων (41.14-29). It looks at first sight as though Nonnus is duplicating for Beirut the topographical features he had first assigned to Tyre, an impression that is reinforced by the use of similar expressions (e.g. στέρνα ... δῶκε θαλάσση / τιταίνει στέρνα Ποσειδάων). Chuvin points out that such a description is wholly incompatible with the actual topography of Beirut and has come about through the preference for the reading οὖ over ὦ (41.15) by textual critics (Koechly, Rouse, Keydell) unfamiliar with it. The reading οὖ, for which there is some justification in the ms. tradition (cf. Keydell's apparatus), would, on the other hand, make the whole segment from ράχις to αὐχήν refer to the topography of Tyre, to which that of Beirut is contrasted (i.e. Beirut (unlike Tyre) does not have a long narrow ridge ... but (on the contrary) extends...). This
reading not only makes good sense geographically, but improves the syntax, restoring the contrast ὅπερ (41.15) ... ἀλλὰ (41.18). We may note a similar contrast at 41.63-5, indicating Nonnus’ liking for negative comparisons.

The convergence in Tyre of maritime with agricultural and pastoral activities is emphasised by extended use of asyndeton, a common device in the later poets: τῇ ἐνὶ μοῦνῃ / βουδόλος ἀγχικέλευθος ὀμίλει γείτονι ναύτῃ / ... καὶ αἰτόλος ἱχθυβοληθεὶς ἐναλίθης δ᾽ ἀριστοὶ / ἐγγέθει λόχης / ποιμένες ὑλοτόμοις, καὶ ἔβρεμεν εἰν ἐνὶ χώρῳ / φλοῖοβος ἄλος, μύκτημα βοῶν, ψιθύρισμα πετήλων, / πείσμα, φυτὸν, πλόος, ἄλος, ἄμωρ, νέες, ὀλκάς, ἔχετη, / μήλα, δώναξ, δρεπάνη, σκαφίδες, λίνα, λαίφεα, θώρηξ (40.327-37). The juxtaposition of maritime and agricultural activities appears to have been a rhetorical commonplace. Achilles Tatius in his depiction of the Nile uses the same technique: καὶ ποταμὸς καὶ γῆ καὶ θάλασσα καὶ λίμνη καὶ ἐστὶ τὸ θέαμα καίνων, ναὸς ὀμοῦ καὶ δίκελλα, κώπη καὶ ἄρτοτρον, πηδάλιον καὶ πτόνον, ναυτῶν ὀμοῦ καὶ γεωργῶν καταγωγῆ, ἱχθύων ὀμοῦ καὶ βοῶν. ὁ πέπλευκας, φυτεύεις. Καὶ ὁ φυτεύεις, τούτῳ πέλαγος γεωργοῦμενον (12.1). Nonnus employs it as well (if somewhat less pointedly) in the case of Beirut, the contrasting elements being drawn this time from pastoral and agricultural activities: δὴ πολλάκις ἐγγύθη λόχης / Παινὶ ... ἤντετο Δημή, / καὶ τις ἑφ' ἱστοβοηθή γεωμόρος αὐχένα κάμψας ... γείτονι μηλοβοτήρι ... ὀμίλει κυρτὸς ἀροτρεύς (41.22) and also σύννομος ἱχθυβοληθεὶς γέρων ἐμελιζετο ποιμὴν (41.50). Acting like any traveller, Dionysus expresses his amazement at the peculiar configuration of Tyre: νῆσον ἐν ἴππειρῳ πόθεν ἐδρακον. εἰ θέμις εἶπεν, / τηλίκον οὗ ποτὲ κάλλος ἐσεῖδρακον (40.338-9). Achilles Tatius likewise refers to this peculiar illusion, which, incidentally, Tyre only presents to one approaching it from the sea: καὶ γίνεται τὸ θέαμα καίνων, πόλις ἐν θαλάσσῃ, καὶ νῆσος ἐν γῇ (2.14.4). As Dionysus was approaching the city from land he could not have obtained this view, but Nonnus, as often, will not let logical niceties deprive him of the opportunity to use an effective phrase. The pleasantness of the climate, due to a cooling breeze from the hinterland, is

1 Cf. Curtius (1953), pp. 265-7 for a discussion of this feature.
noted (40.342-5), an observation later also made concerning Beirut (41.19-21).

Dionysus now turns his gaze from the natural features to the streets and buildings of the city, beholding the palace of Agenor, Cadmus' bedroom and the maiden-chamber of Europa. He sees three remarkable fountains - a feature of Old Tyre on the mainland which Nonnus with poetic licence has transposed to the island city - named after the nymphs Abarbaree, Callirhoe and Drosera, who as Heracles Astrochiton later informs Dionysus, were induced to mate with the earthborn, giving rise to the Tyrian nation (40.538ff.). The scene is reminiscent of those in the Odyssey where Odysseus first beholds the city of the Phaecians (η43-5) and where the springs in Alcinoos' vineyard are described (η129-31), as well as of that in Apollonius (3.209ff.), where the Argonauts marvel at the palace of Aeetes and the four magical fountains nearby. On completing the tour, he takes himself to the house of Heracles Astrochiton, a god whose name and identity call for some explanation. The name of the Dorian strongman had long been used by the Greeks to refer to the Tyrian Melkart 'Lord of the City' (Μελκτός, Καρτα=πόλις), who, supposedly with the growth in importance of Tyre, was elevated to the more exalted station of 'Lord of the Universe', in which capacity he is represented in the present passage. The cognomen 'Astrochiton', which is incidentally encountered in the Orphic Argonautica as a purely ornamental epithet of the moon (μήνη δ' ἀστροχίτων, 513), is, outside the Dionysiaca, associated with Heracles in only one other ancient source. Heracles, it appears, is in the first instance no more than a statue in the temple dedicated to him, which on being addressed μύστικα φωνή (40.368) by Dionysus, assumes the characteristics of the god himself: ἐξαπίνης δὲ / ἐνθεον εἴδος ἐχων θεοδεμένος ἐνδοθυ νηοὺ / Ἀστροχίτων ἦσταιφε: νηρυγληθν ὁ δοσωπου / μαρραυγην ὁδόσεαν ἀπηκόντιζον ὀπωπαί (40.411-4). Dionysus' address has all the

---

2 Cf. Chuvín (1991) p. 228
3 Chuvín (1991) p. 229 n. 22 refers to two goblets, found in Malta, bearing the dual inscription Μιργ η' λ' and Ἰικλέης ἰκανιστής.
5 Cf. the Orphic Argonautica 983-4, where the statue of Artemis comes to life in a similar manner at the sight of the Furies conjured up by Medea.
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hallmarks of an Orphic hymn, resembling in both form and content the hymn to
Helius (Hymni Orphici, 8) and Proclus' hymn to Helius (Procli Hymni, 1). It has
also some affinity with the Orphic hymn to Heracles (Hymni Orphici, 8), who had
come to be partially identified with Helius in the Orphic system. We note that in
the Orphic pantheon Helius acquired a status far above that which he had
possessed in the traditional Olympian hierarchy, being raised to parity with Zeus
and even identified with him (cf. H.O., 8.13). In the Phoenician pantheon, on the
other hand, Helius or Beelsamen had always enjoyed such pre-eminence (Philo,
2.5). In Tyre the role of sun-god had apparently devolved on Melkart, who, as
mentioned above, was in the first instance merely the city's tutelary god but came
later to be venerated as lord of the universe. The somewhat fluid lines of
demarcation between the various gods in the Phoenician pantheon seem to have
accorded well with the Orphic system, in which, as we may observe from the
Orphic hymns, the traditionally distinct functions of the gods are often confused
and the gods themselves identified with one another and share the same epithets.
Dionysus' address demonstrates that Melkart had been wholly assimilated to the
Orphic system: ἄστροχίτων Ἡρακλῆς, ἄναξ πυρὸς, ὀρχαμε κόσμου, / Ἡλίες, βροτεόλι βίου δολιχόσκε πομήν, / ἱππευόν ἐλκηδὸν δλον πόλον
ἀθοπτά δίκυκλο, / νύα χρόνου λυκάβαντα δωδεκάμην ἐλίσσων / κύκλων
γεις μετὰ κύκλον (40.369-73). The epithets used above (or their near
equivalents) occur in the Orphic hymn to Helius: πυρόεις (8.6), κοσμοκράτωρ
(8.11), δέσποτα κόσμου (8.16), φερέσβε (8.12), ζωῆς φῶς (8.12), χρόνου
πάτερ (8.13, and also in the Orphic hymn to Heracles, 12.3), and κυκλοέλικτε
(8.11). Proclus has πυρὸς νοεροῦ βασιλεύ (1.1), πυροστεφές (1.33), which,
incidentally, is used by Nonnus to describe the nuptial bed of Hera at 8.289, and
φάους ταμία (1.2). Some of the epithets refer merely to the physical properties of
the sun, others ... to Helius' role as the beneficent provider of sustenance to
mankind. Dionysus continues: παμφαιές αἰθέρος ὄμμα, φέρεις τετράζυγι
δίφω / χείμα μετὰ φθινόπωρον, ἄγεις θέρος εἰς ἀμείβων (40.379-80),
again reflecting πανδερκεῖς ἔχων αἰώνιον ὄμμα (8.1), κράσιν ἔχων ὄρων
(8.5) and τετράδρομον ὄμμα διώκων (8.19). He then proceeds to identify his host
with various gods, ending with the invocation: εἴτε Σάραπις Εὖς, Ἀλγύττιος ἄναβελος Ζεῦς, / εἰ Κρόνος, εἰ Φαεθήν πολυμινήσιος, εἴτε σὺ Μήδης, / Ἦλεος Βαβυλώνος, εὖ Ἑλλάδι Δελφὸς 'Απολλών, /εἰ Γάμος ... εἴτε σὺ Παυήνων ὅδυνήφατος, εἰ πέλες Αἴθηρ / πούκιλος, 'Αστροχίτων δὲ φατίζεαι - ἐνύχιοι γὰρ ἀορανόν ἀστερόεντες ἐπαυγᾶζοντοι χιτώνες (40.399-409). The disjunctive form of expression appears to have been normal in invocations of this kind. In Apuleius, Isis is addressed in similar fashion: 'regnā caeli, sive tu Ceres alma ... seu tu caelestis Venus ... seu Phoebi soror ... seu nocturnis ululatibus horrenda Proserpina' (Met. 11.2). Another example of this formula occurs in Plutarch: λέγεται δὲ καὶ κατὰ τοὺς ὑπνοὺς αὐτῷ Σύλλα φανήμα τεθαν ἣν τιμώση. 'Ρωμαῖοι παρὰ Καππαδοκῶν μαθόντες, εἴτε δὴ Σελήνην οὔσαν εἴτε 'Αθηνᾶν εἴτε 'Ενυώ (Sulla, 9.31-4), although here it may simply indicate the author's own uncertainty as to the precise nature of the god involved. Nonnus will use this form of address again in Dionysus' speech to Selene, another of the multiform Orphic deities, at 44.193-204. The reference to Gamus, a god of Priapic associations, and in particular to the way in which he was conceived ἐκ Διὸς ὑπνώωντος ὅτε γλωχίνι μαχαίρῃς / αὐτογάμῳ ἀπόρον ἐπιζύσαντος ἄροιρῃ / οὐρανίας λεβάδεσσιν ἐμαιώθησαν ἐρίττναι (40.404-6), seems somewhat out of character with the reverential tone of the address. Rouse suggests that Nonnus may have been prompted to include Gamus through recollection of the wedding song beginning with the line Γάμε θέων λαμπρότατε (quoted in Athenaeus, 1.6), the λαμπρότατε, though used purely metaphorically in relation to Gamus, supplying the link with Helius. We have noted Nonnus' fondness for bringing together individuals on the basis of capricious associations, as for instance at 31.173-5, where Night is identified with the Indians on the basis of their shared attribute of darkness. The reference to Gamus thus appears to be a typical Nonnian pun, but this is not how all commentators see it. Keydell suggests that Nonnus may have been thinking here of Χαμώς, mentioned in the Suda as a Tyrian god and venerated by Solomon (Kings, 3.11,7), a suggestion which is not implausible in itself, bearing in mind
Nonnus’ rather free interpretation of Phoenician mythology. The identification of Helius with Apollo was commonplace in late antiquity, though this was not the case earlier. We note that in Apollonius and Valerius Flaccus they are not only distinct, but favour opposite sides, Apollo being invoked by the Argonauts and Helios by his son Aeetes. In Valerius Flaccus Sol humbly beseeches Jupiter not to allow the Argonauts to reach Colchis, lest his son Aeetes should come to harm (1.505ff.). In the Orphic hymn, as in Nonnus, Helius is identified with Apollo (cf. ἔρυσολύξει, 8.9), but Proclus makes Apollo, along with Paion and Dionysus, son of Helius (1.18-24), which is understandable seeing that Helius is identified with Zeus.

Heracles feasts Dionysus on nectar and ambrosia, a scene which together with the exchange of gifts at the end of the visit (40.575-8), is understood by Vian to constitute the second milestone on Dionysus’ path to apotheosis, the first having been the presentation of the shield from Rhea (25.352ff.). Dionysus asks his host to tell him the story of the city, its buildings and fountains, with which the latter all too gladly obliges. The visit thus follows the Homeric scheme, where the guest is first treated to the table, followed by a narration of events by the host and ending with an exchange of gifts (cf. Telemachus’ visit to Menelaus in the Odyssey). The city, says Heracles, is coeval with the creation of the world: ἐνθάδε φῶτας ἐναυον, ὅμοπορος οὗς ποτε μούνους / ἄεναον κόσμιο συνήληκας ἐδρακεν Αἰών, / ἀγνόν ἀνυμφέουτοι γένος χθονός, ὃ ποτε μορφήν / αὐτομάτην ὤδινεν ἀνήροτος ἄπορος ἱώς (40.430-3). The origins of Beirut, we may note, are described in a parallel fashion, albeit with an overlay of Orphic terminology: ἐνθάδε φῶτας ἐναυον ὑμήληκε Χρισανθῆς, / οὗς Φύσεισ αὐτογένεθλος ἀνυμφεύτῃ τοι δεσμῷ / ἡροει νόσαφ γάμων, ἀπάτωρ, ἀνεχεύεσσος, ἀμήτωρ, / ὧπποτε συμμεγένων ἀτόμων τετράζυγι δεσμῷ ἱδατι καὶ πυρήσουν πεφυρμένου ἡρόει ἀτμῷ / σοῦζα εἰρηκώσασα σοφοῖν τόκον ἄπορος ἱώς / ἐμποίουν ἐφύχωσε γονήν ἐγκύμοι πηλῷ, / οὗς Φύσεισ εἶδος ὅπασσε τελεσφόρον (41.51-9). The expressions τετράζυγι
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δεσμῷ, σοφῶν τόκων, ἐμπνεοῦν ... γονηίν, ἐγκύμοιν πηλῷ and τελεσφόρον are all part of the Orphic lexicon, as are ἀπάτωρ, ἀλόχευτος, ἀμήτωρ, which, as Keydell indicates, are also used by Gregory Nazianzen as epithets of Christ: αὐτοπάτωρ, ἀλόχευτος, ἀμήτωρ ἔστιν ἐκεῖνος (Carmina II, 2.7.254, Migne v.37, p.1571). The passages echo the Phoenician creation myth as presented in Philo, according to which the first living beings emerged from a substance engendered from the primeval πνεῦμα or χάος called Μῶτ, which, as the author tells us, some call mud (τοῦτο τινές φασίν ἠλών, 2.1). We have thus a point of contact between Nonnus and Philo, but the two diverge when it comes to depicting these first beings. According to Nonnus, they were, unlike Cecrops and Erechtheus (=Erichthonius), fashioned in the very image of the gods (θεῶν ἰνδαλμα γονηίς, 41.65). Philo's depiction is quite different, comprising two generations of beings, the first yet incapable of perception, the second possessing intelligence but formed in the shape of eggs (ζώα νοερά ... καὶ ἀνεπλάσθη ὀμοίως ψοῦ σχήματι, 2.2; cf. the εἴδος στρογγύλον attributed to the first humans in Plato, Sympos. 189E). Chuvint suggests that Nonnus meant his assertion that these first beings were formed in the image of gods to be understood as a direct refutation of Philo, this being but one of a number of such contradictions arising from what he calls "cet antagonisme implicite entre les deux auteurs".² It is difficult to imagine why Nonnus should harbour such antagonism for the author of a prose text, who lived some three centuries before his time, unless it be out of mere rhetorical bravado, with Nonnus, having taken upon himself to champion Beirut, challenging Philo, whom he sees as being too partial to the claims of his native Byblos. Most of the supposed contradictions of Philo do indeed occur in the segment concerned with the first foundation myth of Beirut, where, as if to redress a perceived imbalance in favour of Byblos in Philo's account, Nonnus is claiming for Beirut what Philo had claimed for Byblos. When Philo claims primacy for Byblos, viz. ὁ Κρόνος τεῖχος περιβάλλει τῇ ἑαυτοῦ οἰκίσει, καὶ τόλμην πρῶτην κτίζει τῇ ἐπὶ Φωικής Βύβλον (2.17), Nonnus counters with assertions of his own in favour of Beirut, viz. ἵν Κρόνος αὐτὸς ἐδείμε (41.63)

² (1991) p. 213
and πόλις Βερόν προτέρη πέλεν (41.83), the second claim being made in relation to several other ancient cities, but, somewhat surprisingly, Byblos does not feature among the latter. If, as Chuvin believes, Nonnus is specifically contradicting Philo, then surely one would have expected him to have included Byblos among the cities that Beirut is supposed to predate.

Heracles continues by saying that these first men, who emerged from the primeval ἴλος, built a city of stone on foundations of rock: οἷς πολίν ισοτύπων δαπέδων αὐτόχθονι τέχνη / πετραίως ἀτίνακτον ἐπηργώσαντο θεμέθλοις (40.434-5), and explains how they came to do this with his guidance. Firstly, he taught them how to build a raft so that they could reach the rocks out at sea, which were to become the site of their city. The instructions for building the raft, which Heracles gave to these first men and now repeats for Dionysus, are based on the raft-building scene in the Odyssey (42ff.); they have already been mentioned in conjunction with the shipbuilding at 36.403ff., which is based on the same Odyssey passage. There is no talk now of that long narrow isthmus, which the poet had a little earlier attributed to Poseidon's handiwork, despite it being common knowledge that it was built by Alexander so that he could move his siege-engines to the walls. In speaking of the island city as the first ever to be built, Nonnus overlooks completely the existence of Old Tyre (Παλατύρως) on the mainland, though he mentions it as a point of reference, when he says that the moving rocks, which were to provide the foundation for the island city, came to rest opposite Tyre by the sea (ἄγχι Τύρου παρὰ πόντου, 40.533). Besides, some of the features he attributes to the island city, such as the fountains referred to earlier, are part of the mainland topography. The correspondences with Philo may be briefly noted: According to Philo, two brothers, Hypsouranius and Ousous, were the first to settle in the environs of Tyre (it is to be assumed that he means Old Tyre on the mainland). Ousous was the first man to venture out to sea on a tree, which he had shorn of its foliage (2.1), but it was Chrysor (whom Philo equates with Hephaistus), a descendant of Hypsouranius, who first learnt how to build a raft and make fishing implements: εἶναι δὲ τούτων τῶν Ἡφαιστοῦ, εὑρεῖν δὲ καὶ ἀγκιστρον καὶ δέλεαρ καὶ ὀρμίαν καὶ σχεδίαν, πρῶτον τε πάντων ἀνθρώπων πλεύσαι (2.9). Chrysor had two sons, Technites and Autochthoron,
who discovered the arts of brick-making and roof-building. Nonnus has telescoped all this into the space of a single generation, replacing Philo's "inventors" with divine instructions. The αὐτόχθονι τεχνη at 40.434 seems, nevertheless, to be an unconscious reminiscence of Philo's Τεχνητής and Αὐτόχθων. Heracles refers to the raft which the earthborn built according to his instructions as σχεδήν πρωτόπλουν (40.449), which (as Chuvín points out) appears to be a condensation of Philo's σχεδίαν, πρώτον τε ... πλεύσαι, but could be simply an echo from the Odyssey, where πρωτόπλουν (935) is used to describe the Phaeacian ship by which Odysseus is to be conveyed to Ithaca (though with a different meaning, that of 'sailing for the first time', instead of 'first to sail' as here). The earthborn are told to sail until they reach two wandering rocks, on (one of) which they will observe an olive tree, on top of which perches an eagle beside a silver bowl. The tree is burning but remains unscathed by the flames: δωρατέω κενεών χαράζετε νῦτα θαλάσσης, / εἰσόκε χώρον ἱκουσθε μεμορμένον, ὄπποθε δισσάι / ἀσταθεὶς πλώουσιν ἀλήμονες εἰν ἂλ πέτραι, / ὡς Φύσις Ἀμβροσίας ἐπεφήμιμην, αἰς ἐν τόλλει / ἕλικος αὐτόρριζον ὀμόζυγον ἔρνος ἑλαῖς, / πέτρης ἵγοσπόρου μεσόμφαλον ἀκροτάτως ἐθ / αἰετῶν ἀθρήστη παραδρήσοντα κόρυμβοι / καὶ φιάλην εὐτυκτον· ἀπὸ φλογεροῦ δὲ δέντρου / θαμβαλέως σπωβῆρας ἐρεύγεται αὐτὸματον πῦρ, / καὶ σέλας ἀφλέγεσθε περιβόσκεται ἔρνος ἑλαῖς (40.466-75). A snake writhes around the trunk, but does not threaten the eagle, which likewise poses no threat to the snake: καὶ φυτὸν ὑψιπέτηλον ἐλιξ ὅφις ἀμφοχορεῖ / ... οὗ γὰρ ἀεί σπαρτότητον ἐσ αἰετῶν ἀφοφος ἐρπὼν ... ὑπὸν ἆστ γενέσσαι κατεσθίει, οὐδὲ καὶ αὐτὸς / αἰετῶς ἄρηστηρα πολυπελτητῶν ἀκάνθαις / ἀρπάζει ρύχεσο μετάρασιος ἥρα τέμνει / οὐδὲ μν ὀξυδοῦντι καταγράφειε γεγενεῖ (40.476-84). The scene depicted here corresponds to the emblem of Tyre represented on coins issued by the city in Roman times. Chuvín (planch 3) provides photographs of a number of coins displaying elements related to the above scene, two of which fit Nonnus' description almost exactly. The first (no. 27) shows an olive tree between two rocks; the second (no. 28) has, likewise, an olive tree, but in place of the two rocks are two steles with the legend
AMBROSCIE ΠΑΙΤΡΕ. The rocks and steles are thus symbolically equivalent, though they appear to have originally been distinct entities, as we may gather from Philo's reference to Ousous erecting two steles to fire and wind, and making sacrifices before them: ἂνερώσαι δὲ δῶο στῆλας πυρὶ καὶ πνεύματι, καὶ προσκυνήσαι, αἰμά τε σπένδειν αὐταῖς ἐξ ὧν ἦγερε τηρίων (2.8). Eissfeldt⁹ adds a passage from Achilles Tatius depicting a sacred enclosure in Tyre that appears to symbolise the burning tree. In the enclosure grows an olive tree, around which an underground fire sends up flames (2.14). This seems to have been a cleverly contrived piece of engineering, designed to create the illusion in anyone viewing it from the outside that the tree was actually alight. Chuvín¹⁰ describes a bas-relief from Roman times, consisting of an olive tree with a snake around its trunk and an eagle by its side. The tree is alight with the wind pushing the flames to the left. We see, then, that all the elements of the Nonnus passage can be accounted for from other sources, attesting to its authenticity. The comment in Rouse's edition, "where, if anywhere, Nonnos found this extraordinary tale of the founding of Tyre is unknown"¹¹, which intimates that our poet made the story up, is thus wholly unjustified. Nonnus, while giving a faithful rendering of the Tyrian foundation myth, has added some literary allusions of his own: the reference to the eagle not wishing to grasp the snake by its talons, and the snake not wishing to thrust at the eagle, brings to mind the portent in the Iliad (M200-6), where precisely the opposite takes place, the eagle seizing the snake in its talons, the snake biting the eagle (Nonnus has already used the Iliad passage at 39.158-64).

Heracles tells the earthborn to sacrifice the eagle, which will deliver itself into their hands, to Poseidon. Chuvín¹² links this act of sacrifice on the Ambrosian rocks with Ousous' animal sacrifices before the two steles referred to by Philo. The earthborn are told to pour the blood of the sacrificed eagle on the two rocks, which will then unite and become rooted to the sea-bottom. Once this has been carried out, they are to build their city on the now united and stabilized rocks.

¹⁰ (1991) p. 241
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Heracles makes a nautilus fish come to the surface to instruct (by example) the earthborn in the art of navigation. The earthborn subsequently learn the function of ballast-stones from cranes, who carry them in their beaks. As we have noted previously, Nonnus is rather fond of the idea of man learning from animals. When the earthborn have carried out Heracles' instructions, the rocks come to rest near Tyre by the sea (40.533). As we mentioned above, this reference to an apparently pre-existing Tyre on the mainland undermines the claim that the island city of Tyre was coeval with the creation of the world (40.430-5), but, as we have often had occasion to note, Nonnus is not one to be unduly concerned about such inconsistencies.

Heracles next recounts to Dionysus the story of how the three fountains, which had earlier caught the visitor's eye, came to acquire their names. It was by these fountains that Heracles found the earthborn asleep as he was about to address them (πηγαίνοι παρ' εὐώδροις χαμευνάις ... εἴσον ὤμοι (40.436-9). In the fountains resided three nymphs, Abarbaroe, Callirhoe and Drosa, who (like most of the females in the Dionysiaca) had a strong attachment to the maiden state, an attitude that angered Eros, who addressed one of them with a long speech, arguing that as inhabitants of a watery abode they owed allegiance to sea-born Aphrodite rather than to Artemis (40.542-73). A similar line of reasoning is employed by Poseidon in his address to Beroe, when he tells her that, as the daughter of sea-born Aphrodite, it is only fitting that she should marry him rather than Dionysus (42.468f.). Eros subsequently shoots his arrows into the three nymphs, who then join in amorous union with the earthborn, giving rise to the Tyrian race. Chuvin sees a connexion between the nymphs' apparent promiscuity in the present passage and the promiscuous women who, in Philo, mated with giants to give birth to Hypsouranious and Oousos, who received their names from their mothers. Referring to the giants, Philo says that ἐκ τοῦ τῶν ... ἐγεννήθη Σαμημορούμος, ὁ καὶ Ἰψουράνος, <καὶ Οὔσσος> ἀπὸ μητέρων δὲ ... ἐρημιμάτιζον τῶν τότε γυναικῶν ἀνέδην μισγομένων ὀῖς δὲν ἐν ἐπτύξοεν (2.7). Hypsouranius and Oousos were in a sense the first Tyrians, the
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first members of that race which in Nonnus sprang from the union of the fountain nymphs with the earthborn. Thus even the story of the fountains, though embellished with poetic adornments and given a Hellenised garb, can be linked to authentic Phoenician traditions. With the story of the fountains Heracles' speech to Dionysus comes to an end. The two exchange gifts and part company.

Books 41-43 are ostensibly concerned with Beirut, but, as we have noted, only the first 150 lines, comprising the ekphrasis and the first foundation myth, are devoted to this end. The so-called second and more recent foundation myth (ἀλλ' τις ὀπλοτέρη πέλεται φάτις, 41.155) is the story of the rival courtship of Dionysus and Poseidon for the nymph Beroe, who is referred to as the eponymous heroine of Beirut or Beroe, as Nonnus prefers to call the city (probably after the same-named city in Macedonia, modern Veria). We would expect an eponymous hero or heroine to be born before the city bearing his or her name. Yet in this instance Beroe is a contemporary of Dionysus, while the city bearing her name has existed from time immemorial. We are to assume then that the city bore her name by way of anticipation and that Beroe's birth augured a specific epoch in its history, that was to come about many centuries later, in the reign of Augustus, when it became a Roman colony and a centre for the teaching of Roman law. The connexion with Beirut is merely incidental to Nonnus' real purpose, which is to present the story of yet another παρθένος φυγόδειμος, that parallels in many ways the earlier Chalcedea episode. Nonnus previously used the technique of presenting two variants of a story in the case of Ampelus, though in that instance it was the second version which was deemed the more ancient (ἀλλ' πρεσβυτέρη πέλεται φάτις, 12.294). The ὀπλοτέρη φάτις, being further removed in time from the events it purports to describe, would seem to be almost by definition further from the truth than the older version. It is, more than anything, a convenient device designed to enable the poet to give free flight to his imagination, without having to account for lack of truthfulness. And this is precisely what Nonnus has done: the story of Beroe is largely his own compilation, partly modelled on Claudian's De raptu Proserpinae, partly on his own Chalcedea story. The story is nevertheless not entirely unprecedented, resembling in concept the myth of Amymone, who was likewise forced to become
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wife to Poseidon, and exhibiting certain points of contact with Phoenician traditions recorded in Philo.

Nonnus regards Beirut and its two foundation myths sufficiently important to warrant a new invocation of the Muses: ἄλλα θεμποτοπολού Βερόνης παρά 

氛围πάντα Μούσας / καὶ βυσίοι 


κρονίδου καὶ θεόρου 


νοικία και άμπελόδεσσαν 

ένω (41.10-4). It is noteworthy that the invocation is directed almost entirely to the second foundation myth and that Beroe is actually called Amymone. Rigler suggests that Nonnus is identifying some Phoenician tale with the story of Amymone, though the scant fragments of Phoenician mythology transmitted to us by Philo lend no support to such a supposition. The correspondences between Nonnus' story of Beroe and the traditions recorded in Philo are of a much more circumstantial nature. Philo does indeed mention a woman named Beruth, the consort of one Elioun or Hypsistus, but associates the couple with Byblos rather than Beirut: κατά τούτους γίνεται τίς Ἔλιου καλούμενος "Τύμωσις, καὶ 


θηλεία λεγομένη Βηρούθ εἰ καὶ κατόκουν περὶ Βυζίλου (2.12). We note that in another instance he speaks of a woman called Sidon, but does not associate her in any way with the city of the same name (2.21). The similarity of the names in both cases is too overwhelming to be ignored, and the two women may be assumed to be connected with the cities bearing their names, but apart from that nothing is known about their relation to Beirut and Sidon. Chuvin has photographs of coins minted by Beirut in Roman times, showing a female figure, sometimes together with Poseidon (18a-b, 19a-b and 23), but it is likely that this female figure is simply that of Τύχη or Fortuna, rather than a representation of the eponymous heroine. As for Dionysus, who is given such prominence - the poet expends on his courtship of Beroe about three times the number of lines that he does on Poseidon's - there is no evidence whatever of any special connexion that he may have had with Beirut. Rigler cites Pliny (N.H. 14.75 and 15.86), who describes Beirut as a producer of quality wines, but that hardly constitutes testimony of
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Dionysus having played a special role in the city's mythology, Chuvin identifies Dionysus with the Phoenician Baalmarqod on the basis of numismatic evidence, but again there is nothing to indicate the latter's relationship to Beirut. Indeed, the only major god who can be securely associated with Beirut is Poseidon (Philo, 2.25). The possibility that Nonnus invented Dionysus' connexion with Beirut is further strengthened by the glaring embarrassment of his role as the unsuccessful rival in the quest for Beroe.

Since we have already remarked on the description and first foundation myth of Beirut in conjunction with those of Tyre, it remains here to consider a few additional details. With reference to the foundation of Beirut, Nonnus makes the comment: Zeús tòte kóðos ēn, ētì tou βρέφος· ou tòte πυκνῷ βερμόν ἀναςχίσσασα νέφος βητάρμουν παλμῷ / ἄστερωτη σελάγιζε, καὶ οὐ τὴν ἀχρί / Ζηνός ἀνοσητήρες ἀπεθάνου ἱεραυνῷ· / οὐδὲ συνερχομένων νεφέων μυκήτωρ ὅμβῳ / βρονταῖν ψαρίδους ἐβόμβεεν ὄμβρος ἱχώ (41.77-82). This is similar to the cosmogony sung by Orpheus in Apollonius, where referring to Cronus and Rhea, Orpheus says: οἱ δὲ τέως μακάρεσσα θεοὶ Τιτῆναν ἄνασσον, / ὁφρα Ζεὺς ἔτι κόρος, ἔτι φρεσι νῆμα εἰδὼς, / Δικταῖον ναῖσκεν ὕπο σπέος· οἱ δὲ μιν οὖπω / γηγενεῖς Κύκλωπες ἑκατόναντο κεραυνῷ, / βροντῇ τε στεροτῇ τε (1.507-11). Lines 81-2 recall Nonnus' own earlier explanation of lightning (2.483ff.) and are couched in the resonant vocabulary usually reserved for the depiction of Bacchic rites: ὅμβῳ, ἐβόμβεεν, ὄμβρος ἱχώ. 18 Stressing the primacy of Beirut, the poet goes on to say: οὐ τὸτε Ταροῦς ēn τερπάμβροτος, οὐ τὸτε Θήβη, / οὐ τὸτε Σάρδιες ἡδαν ... Σάρδιες, 'Ἡλίοιο συνήλικες ... οὐ γένος ἀνδρῶν, / οὐ τὸτε τις πόλις ἦν Αχαιάς, οὐδὲ καὶ αὐτῇ / Ἀρκαδίᾳ προσεληνός· ἀνεβλάστησε δὲ μοῦνη / πρεσβυτέρη Φαέθουτος, οὗτος φᾶος ἐσχε Σελήνη (41.85-91). Nonnus' lines allude to Argus' speech in Apollonius, who had said how Tritonian Thebes in Egypt predated all other ancient cities and nations, including the Arcadians, who had existed before the moon, a statement which
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18 The Roman satirist Persius ridicules poets who overuse such vocabulary, cf. 1.99-104.
Nonnus sets out to correct in favour of Beirut. The similarities with the Apollonius passage are rather self-evident: ἔστιν γὰρ πλόος δῖλλος, ὃν ἄθανάτων ἱερῆς / πέφραδον, οἱ Θηβῆς Τριτωνίδος ἐκγεγάσασιν. / οὕτω τείρεα πάντα, τὰ τ' ὀφρανῇ εἰλίσσονται / οὐδὲ τί πω Δαναῶν ἱερὸν γένος ἤν ἄκούσαί / πευθομένοις: οἷοι δ' ἔσαν 'Αρκάδες, 'Απιδανής, 'Αρκάδες, οἱ καὶ πρόσθε σεληνάης ὑδέοντα / ζῶειν, φηγοῦν ἐδοὺτες ἐν οὐρασίν οὐδὲ Πελασγίς / χθῶν τότε κυδαλύμεαισιν ἀνάσσετο Δευκαλιδῆσιν (4.259-66).

We might note the schematic correspondence: οὐ τότε Σάρδες ἦσαν ... Σάρδες, Ἡλλόοι συνήκες / οἷοι δ' ἔσαν 'Αρκάδες, ... 'Αρκάδες, ο' κ.τ.λ. Beirut is not only the oldest city; it is also the place where Aphrodite first came ashore upon emerging from the foam. The rival claims of Paphos, Corinth, Byblos, Colias and Cythera are dismissed: καὶ θεὸς ἵκινεσαι δι' ὄδατος ἄφοον ἀκτήν / οὐ Πάφου, οὐκ ἐπὶ Βύβλου ἀνέδραμεν, οὐ πόδα χέρσων / Κωλίαδος ῥηγμῖνος ἐφήμωσεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτῶν / ὦκετήρι στροφάλλυγι παρέτρεξεν δοστιν Κυθήρων (41.106-9). Byblos' association with Aphrodite may be inferred from Philo's statement: ο Κρόνος Βύβλου μὲν τὴν πόλιν τῇ θεῇ Βαρλίδι, τῇ καὶ Διώνῃ, δίδωσι (2.2), Dione being the mother of Aphrodite in the alternative legend of the goddess' birth (E370). Astarte, the direct Phoenician counterpart of Aphrodite, is mentioned by Philo only in connexion with Tyre, as having consecrated a meteorite on its island site (2.24). It is not clear on what tradition Nonnus bases his claim for Beirut. Chuvin adduces a coin from Roman times featuring the facade of a temple of Aphrodite with the legend COL IVL AUG FEL BER (planche III, no. 20), which he believes to be indicative of some special relationship between the goddess and the city. Nonnus makes his case on behalf of Beirut with ostentatious self-assurance, accusing the inhabitants of Cyprus of lying, when they point out to visitors what they claim to be the footprints that Aphrodite left as she waded ashore after emerging from the sea: ποδών δ' ἐπιβαρθα θεαίνης / ἐξ ἄλος ἐρχομένης ναέτης ἐφεύσατο Κύπρου (41.117-8). This is a pointed reference to Callimachus' claim on behalf of Delos: ἦν ἐπευθέστε Κύπρις / ἐξ ὀδατος τὰ πρῶτα, σαοὶ δὲ μιν ἄντ' ἐπιβαρθὼν (4.21-2). The accusation of mendacity is copied from Callimachus'
hymn to Zeus, where the poet muses as to which of the claimants to the birthplace of Zeus is lying: Ζεῦς, σὲ μὲν ἱδαίοις ἐν οὐρεί φασι γενέσθαι, / Ζεῦς, σὲ δὲ ἐν Ἀκαδίης πότεροι, πάτερ, ἐφεύσαυτο; (1.6-7), and then quotes a popular saying about the Cretans: "Κρήτες δεῖ ψεύσται " (1.8), in response to the claim by the latter to possess the tomb of Zeus. Nonnus had previously referred to this Callimachus passage, when speaking about Apatē, who δεῖ παρέμμενε Διὸς ψευδὸς τύμβῳ / τερπομένη Κρήτησσιν, ἐπεὶ πέλον ἠπερατής (8.117-8). As already noted, Nonnus is rather prone to make more than one allusion to such well known passages in the course of his narrative.

As Aphrodite steps ashore in Beirut, the meadows spring into flower on all sides, roses redden the shore line and wine bubbles forth from the rocks (41.123-5). This goes counter to the underlying theme of the whole poem that the gift of wine was conveyed to mankind by Zeus exclusively through the agency of Dionysus. The sudden blooming of nature resembles that which accompanied the hierogamy of Zeus and Hera (32.84-90). Aphrodite forthwith gives birth to Eros, who is described in solemn Orphic verbiage as γονὴς πρωτόστορον ἀρχήν / ἀρμονίης κόσμου φερέσβιον ἣμοχήν (41.129-30), which contrasts with the rococo depiction of the birth: κυβιστητῆρι δὲ παλμῷ / διανεών πτερὰ κούφα πῦλας ὃς λοχείνς. / καὶ ταχὺς αὐγήλειν τὸρὼν ἐπὶ μητρὸς ἁγαστῷ / ἀδατος ἀκλυνέσσαι ἴρως ἀνεπάλλετο μαζώς / στήθει παιδοκόμῳ τετανυσμένος (41.135-9).

An address to the city of Beirut, composed in the form of an Orphic hymn, follows: ΰζα βίου, Βερόπη, πολίων τροφός, εὐχος ἀνάκτων, / πρωτοσπανής, Αἰώνος ὑμετορο, σύγχρονο κόσμου, / ἐδρανον Ἐρμεία, Δίκης πέδων, ἁπτο θεμίστων, ἐνδιδω Εὐφροσύνης, Παφίς δόμος κ.τ.λ. (41.143-6). The role of the city as a centre for the teaching of Roman law is one to which Nonnus returns in more detail at the end of the book (41.364ff.). There the poet makes ample reference to the reconstitution of Beirut as a Roman colony, an event which resulted in a great upsurge in the city's fortunes and prestige. He now proceeds to recount the second foundation myth, beginning with a rather emblematic depiction of Beroe's birth. The city's future legal role is pre-ordained at Beroe's birth.
Hermes, holding aloft a Latin tablet, and Themis, with a scroll of Solon's laws in her hand, act as midwives. The child is brought forth on a scroll, just as Spartan women deliver their offspring on a shield, and is bathed by the four winds with water provided by Oceanus. Aion is depicted as shedding the burden of age, like a snake shedding its skin, as he proceeds to swaddle the newborn: γῆρας ἄχθος ἀμείβων, ἐν ὑμίαν ὀφεὶς ἀδρανέων φολίδων σπείρη σα σινάζας ἐμπάλων ἕβησε δε λελομένος οἴδεμα θεσμών (41.180-2). The notion that a snake is rejuvenated when it sheds its skin is borrowed from Nicander, a poet who more than once has left his mark on Nonnus: ῥυκην διὰ φολίδων περὶ γῆρας ἀμέρσας ἀπό ἄναφοιτήσῃ νεαρῆς κεχαρημένος ἔβη (Ther. 137-8). Nonnus has used the comparison by way of allegorical reference to Beirut, a city previously described as old as time itself, which recovers its youth once it has been refurbished as a Roman colony.

The birth of Aphrodite's daughter is greeted by the animals, who for the occasion put aside their natural dispositions to celebrate the child's arrival in friendly harmony. Traditionally it is the song of Orpheus that induces animals to behave in this manner (cf., for example, Euripides, Bacch. 561-4, Apollonius 1.569-79 and the Orphic Argonautica 435-7), though it is occasionally found in other contexts. In the fourth Eclogue of Vergil the birth of Pollio's son is greeted by animals in like manner (18ff.). Nonnus himself paints a similar scene to mark Dionysus' arrival in India (22.28-38). The predators and their prey frolic together amicably (41.191-9), recalling the earlier passage. Astraie takes on herself the duties of wet-nurse, feeding Beroe ἐμφροιν μαζί· παρθενίῳ δὲ γαλακτί ροϊς βλυτουσα θεμιστῶν ἔνειλα παιδός ἔδεεσε (41.215-7). Nonnus shows a fondness for breastfeeding scenes (cf. 9.30-1, 57-8; 26.103, 137; 35.326-7), the present scene recalling Hera's breastfeeding of Dionysus, where she brings about the latter's recovery βλυτουσα χῦσιν ζηλήμον μαζί (35.327). We cannot fail to note that, notwithstanding the impressive circumstances of her birth and nurture, Beroe when she grows up is, apart from her beauty, quite ordinary, displaying none of the mental attributes we would expect to find in one fed laws in place of mother's milk. She is indistinguishable from the other παρθενοι φυγόδεμνοι in the poem, a huntress fashioned in the image of Artemis (ομόδρομος ἱοχεαῖρη, 209
41.230), resembling Nicaea, who is συνεδρίας ἵος (15.179), and Aura, who is Ἀρτεμίς ἦλθ (48.245). Nonnus, in extolling the circumstances of the girl's birth, is quite clearly not thinking of her so much as of the Roman city of Beirut with its law school.

Beroe, having blossomed into maidenhood, attracts Zeus' attention, as had Persephone (5.600ff.), but Zeus, fearful of a confrontation with Poseidon, who has likewise taken an interest in the girl, yields in the face of his brother's threats: Βερόην δειηράειν ὀφειλομένην ὑμεναίος / γνωτῷ λείπειν ἄκοιτιν, ἐπιχθονίας περὶ νύμφης / ἱσμίνην γαμίνην πευταγμένος Ἐννυσιαίοι (41.247-9). This rather inglorious backdown by Zeus recalls his equally inglorious backdown from Hades' demand that Persephone be given to him for wife in Claudian's Drapte Proserpinae. In Claudian's poem, Pluto threatens to turn loose Saturn and the giants from Tartarus if his demand is rejected (1.89-121). Zeus has on two other occasions been compelled to reach a compromise with other gods in the Dionysiaca so as to preserve cosmic harmony: firstly, in conceding to Hera's wish that Lycurgus be deified, he had to be content with punishing Lycurgus with blindness while still on earth (21.148-69); secondly, when he acquiesced to Oceanus' plea to stop Dionysus burning the Hydaspes, in order to avert the threatened deluge (24.1-6). The present situation is quite different, however, involving a disagreement over a female between two brothers, an idea which Braune attributes to Claudian: "ambedue le volte vediamo Zeus in una situazione poco gloriosa: l'idea di una lotta fra gli dei per il raggiungimento di uno scopo privato come quello di un matrimonio, proviene da Claudiano". It is not so much the situational or verbal parallels of Nonnus' portrayal of Poseidon with Claudian's portrayal of Pluto, as the fact that the plots of both poets exhibit precisely the same compositional failing, which lends strength to Braune's contention that Nonnus imitated the Latin poet. The fault is most glaring in Nonnus: Poseidon demands Beroe from Zeus with menaces, and yet, in spite of this, needs to be injected with passion for the maiden by an arrow from Eros. The same inconsistency, if a little less obviously, runs through the De raptu Proserpinae. As Braune has demonstrated, the inconsistency originates in
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Claudian's somewhat misguided attempt to combine two mutually incompatible versions of the Persephone legend. In the first version, recounted in the Homeric hymn to Demeter, Persephone is given to Hades by Zeus seemingly as part of a preordained course of events: Ἡμ Ἀδωνίας / ἤπαξίν, ἰδόντε με βαρύκτυπος εὐρυόνα Ζεὺς (2-3), an idea that Claudian adopts as his basic theme: 'candida Tartaro nuptum Proserpina regi / iam dudum decreta dari' (1.217-8). In the second or Sicilian version - so-called because the abduction took place there - Aphrodite, not Hades, is the prime mover. In this version, represented in Ovid (Met. 5.341-437), the abduction is the result of Aphrodite's desire to extend her sway to the nether regions, with Hades himself becoming the unwitting instrument of her expansionist aspirations. Emerging above ground in Sicily after an earthquake for no reason other than to ensure that no cracks have developed in the firmament, which might admit light to his underworld domain, Pluto is spotted by Venus, who has Cupid shoot an arrow into him to infect him with love for Proserpina. Claudian, as we have said, has chosen to follow the first version, but has at the same time adopted some features from the second, by having the abduction take place in Sicily and by assigning a role to Venus which in his context is entirely otiose, as Pluto certainly stands in no need of encouragement. And yet Jupiter addresses Venus as if Pluto did indeed need some prodding, almost reproaching her for laxity in not extending her influence to the nether world, by asking 'cur ultima regna quiescunt?' (1.224). Now, as Braune points out, Claudian has taken the question 'Tartara quid cessant?' (Met. 5.371) from Venus' address to Cupid in Ovid, and placed it, in slightly altered form, into the mouth of Jupiter, who, menaced by Pluto's demand for Proserpina, should be the last to complain about the lack of passion on his brother's part. This illogicality is faithfully duplicated (and indeed, aggravated) by Nonnus, who has Aphrodite direct Eros to shoot an arrow not only into Dionysus, but also into Poseidon (as if that were necessary!). The fact that Nonnus duplicates an artistic failing peculiar to the De raptu Proserpinarum appears to provide incontestable evidence for Braune's contention that he was familiar with the poem. It is interesting that Zeus, so anxious himself to avoid conflict with Poseidon, is not at all averse to witnessing his brother do battle with Dionysus: ἡματι μειδόμοιτι πατὴρ κεχάρητο Κρόνων, / δῆμων
This is obviously a reminiscence of Zeus' joy in the *Iliad* at watching the gods fight among themselves: ἐγέλασσε δὲ οἱ φίλοι ἦτορ / γηθοσύνη, ὥθ' ὀρᾶτο θεός ἔριδι ξυπνόντας (Φ389-90). Nonnus, as we have noted previously, gathers ideas from diverse sources, without sufficient regard as to whether or not they fit consistently into his narrative.

Aphrodite betakes herself to Harmonia's abode to find out which city shall have the distinction of bearing Beroe's name. The visit parallels Demeter's earlier visit to Astraius 6.15ff.) in that in both cases we have a mother determined to ascertain the future in so far as it concerns her daughter. Harmonia's residence is described in some detail, the poet drawing heavily on Orphic imagery. Aphrodite hurries εἰς δόμον Ἀρμονίης παμμήντορος ὑπέστη νυμφῆ / ἐκείνων οἴκων ἴνα τύπῳ τετράζυγι κόσμου, / αὐτοπαγή: πίσυρες δὲ θύραι στυβαροί μελάθρου / ἀργαγεῖς πυσύρεσσιν ἐμιτρωθησαν ἄηται (41.277-80). One cannot but notice the emphasis on the number four, an emphasis which is also evident in the earlier Astraius passage, where the four winds act as servants: πίσυρες λαγόνες καθαφάμενοι τελαμώνας / πατρὸς ὑποδρηστήρες ἐμιτρωθησαν ἄηται (6.37-8). As expected there has been some reuse of earlier material here. The τέσσαρες ἄηται also bathe the newborn Beroe (41.173-4) and earlier Dionysus aligns his forces with the four winds: καὶ πισύρων ἀνέμων ... τέτραχα τεμνομένην στρατιὰν ἐστήσατο θάκχων (27.148-9). The Orphic symbolism of the number four is extended to the *Paraphrase* as well. Livres draws attention to Nonnus' use of it in the scenes associated with the Crucifixion, where Nonnus renders the evangelist's λάβετε αὐτὸν ὑμεῖς καὶ σταυρώσατε (18.6) by ὑμεῖς τετραπόρφι σφηκάωσαε τοῦτον ὀλέθρῳ (18.31, cf. also 18.74 and 91-2). Harmonia is engaged in weaving a tapestry of the universe. Braune points out that Proserpina in Claudian is engaged in weaving a tapestry on exactly the same subject. Not only do the tapestries correspond, but in both instances work on them is abruptly suspended with the unexpected arrival of a visitor or visitors: καὶ πυμάτην παρὰ πέζαν ἐυκλώστοιο χιτώνος / ὑκεάνων κόκλωσε

---
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Harmonia greets Aphrodite with a string of Orphic epithets: ἔλπις δόλου, Κυθέρεια φυτοφόρε, μαία γενέθλης, / ἐλπὶς δόλου κόσμου, τεής ὑπὸ νεῦματι βουλής / ἀπλανεῖς κλώθουσι πολύτροπα νήματα Μοίραι (41.315-7). The notion that the Fates are subservient to Aphrodite's will also occurs in the Orphic hymn to her (cf. καὶ κρατεῖες τρισσῶν μοιρῶν, 55.5). The epithet ἐλπὶς κόσμου is also used of Christ by Nonnus, when he says that Judas pareidochēn ἀτέρμονος ἐλπίδα κόσμου (Par. 18.32). Aphrodite responds in an equally stilted manner with a string of epithets of her own: εἰρόμενη θέσπιζε, καὶ ὃς βιότοι ποιήμα, ἐως τρωφός ἀθανάτων, ὃς σύγχρονος ἦλικος κόσμῳ, / εἰπέ· τιν πτολίων βασιλείδος δραγάνα φωνῆς / λυσιπονῶν ἀτίνακτα φιλάσσεται ἤμια θεσμῶν; (41.318-21). That laws share with wine the epithet λυσιπονὸς is perhaps indicative of the importance that Nonnus attaches to jurisprudence. The eulogising of Beirut as a seat for the study of law complements the main theme of the poem, as Nonnus sees the laws as another medium beside wine through which mankind is relieved of its cares (by deriving comfort from the knowledge that justice will prevail). Harmonia replies by telling Aphrodite that the answer to her question is to be found in the seven tablets of Ophion (the first ruler of Olympus according to the Orphic creed, cf. Apollonius 1.503-40). These tablets, bearing the names of the seven planets, have inscribed on them events past and those yet to come. The tablet of Cronus reveals that the guardianship of the laws is to be assigned to Beirut, an event which will take place σκήπτρον ἀληθινοῦ Ἀθηναίων ὅτε χθόνος ἤξιοικεύσει, / Ῥώμη μὲν ζαθέη δωρήσεται Ἀθήνας Ζεὺς / κοιναίνην. Βερόν δὲ χαρίζεται ἤμια θεσμῶν, / ὑπὸ γὰρ θυρησθείσα φερεσσακέων ἐπὶ νηῶν / φύλοποι ἔγραμμοθα κατευθύνει.
Kleopatra (41.389-93). Nonnus is fond of prognostications (cf., for example, 7.1-135 and 12.1-117). With Zeus' revelations of the future to Aion at 7.73-105 we may compare his revelations to Helius in Valerius Flaccus 1.531-67. Harmonia's tablets in the present passage presage the future of Beirut in similar terms to Anchises' speech to Aeneas in Vergil's Aeneid (especially 6.791ff., where Augustus is associated with peace and the rule of law). Having ascertained this, Aphrodite returns to her own abode. Her subsequent actions have little connexion with the foregoing: she will have Eros inject both Dionysus and Poseidon with love for Beroe, but the poet does not enlighten us as to what motivates her to do so. Nonnus appears to be mechanically copying the scene at the beginning of the Morrheus-Chalcomeda episode, with Aphrodite having again to bribe Eros to make him do her bidding. Lines 41.402-5 are a verbatim repetition of 33.143-5, bar one minor change (ἄμφοτερον ἐς, 41.404 replacing ἐξομένον ἐς, 33.145). As in the previous episode, Ἀφροδίτη has for Eros a present, a χρυσίη κέλυς (41.425), corresponding to the εὐποίητον στέφος (33.175).

Book 42 begins with the flight of Eros to Lebanon, a flight which is likened to that of a meteor: ὃς δὲ ὁπότ' ἄνυφελοι δότι' αἰθέρος ὄξος ὀδίτης / ἐκταδίω σπινθήρα τιταίνεται ὀρθος ἄστήρ / ἡ στρατῇ πολέμου φέρων τέρας ἥ τιν ναύτη (42.6-8), which is an adaptation of οἷον δ' ἀστέρα ἦκε Κρόνου παῖς ἄγκυλομήτεω, / ἡ ναύτην τέρας ἡ στρατῶ εὐρέι λαῶν (Δ75-6). The two recipients of Eros' arrows are not given equal exposure: compared to Dionysus, who is allotted four hundred lines (42.40-441) to express his love for Beroe, Poseidon has to make do with only fifty-five (42.441-96). They arrive at the same place simultaneously, Poseidon emerging from the sea, Dionysus journeying from Tyre (although verses 41.1-4 give the impression that he is already in Beirut). Maron unbridles the sweating panthers from Dionysus' chariot and takes them to water: ἀπὸ βλοσυριοῦ δὲ δίφρου / πόρδαλιν ἰδρώντα Μάρων ἀνέλυε λεπάδων, / καὶ κόνιν ἔξετάναξ καὶ ἐκλύσεν ὀδατὶ πηγῆς / θεμὼν ἀναψύχων κεχαραγμένον αὐχένα θηρῶν (42.19-22). This echoes the following passage from Callimachus' hymn to Athena: πρὶν κόνιν ἵππειάν ἔξελάσαι λαγώνων ... πολὺ πράτιστον ὑφ' ἄρματος αὐχένας ἵππων
It is here that Eros shoots at Dionysus and Poseidon - why the two should have come together is left unexplained - leaving them infatuated with Beroe. Poseidon subsequently disappears from view, reappearing briefly at 42.55-9, this time coming εκ Λιβάνου (42.55), only to vanish once again before making a final dramatic re-entry from the sea at 42.441-6. Nonnus takes no interest in him, being primarily concerned with depicting Dionysus' unrequited love for Beroe. His assignment accomplished, Eros flies off κυκλώσας βαλίσαιν ὄμόδρομον ἵνας ἀήτας (42.36), which (as Keydell indicates) is an echo of Callimachus' ἰετο κυκλώσας βαλά πτερὰ θῆλως ἀήτης (frag. 110.53), used of the action of Zephyr as it swirled picking up the lock of Berenice.

The Dionysus-Beroe relationship corresponds to the Morrheus-Chalcomeda episode in much the same way as the Aura episode corresponds to that of Nicaea. Whilst Dionysus' attraction to Nicaea and Aura is purely physical, his infatuation with Beroe, like Morrheus' passion for Chalcomeda, is of an all-consuming nature, affecting mind as well as body. Here, even more than in the case of Morrheus, Nonnus concerns himself with the thoughts and feelings of the lover, the pangs of unrequited love being minutely described. Whereas Morrheus appears to act mostly on impulse, Dionysus exhibits a remarkable degree of mental composure in the throes of love, deliberating on various ways of ingratiating himself with the girl. Thus, while Morrheus reveals his predicament to Hyssacus only on the latter's prodding, Dionysus of his own accord approaches Pan, seeking advice on ways of getting Beroe to respond favourably to his advances. In its emphasis on the techniques of amatory persuasion, the story of Dionysus' quest for Beroe stands apart from the Morrheus-Chalcomeda episode, showing at the same time a distinct affinity with Ovid's Ars Amatoria. Pan's speech in particular shares a number of precepts with that work as well as with Tibullus 1.4, where Priapus dispenses similar advice. Pan's advice to Dionysus is clearly designed to be the centrepiece of the whole episode, but this notwithstanding, it is not well integrated with the action, seeing that some of the things Pan instructs Dionysus to do he has been doing all along, while he fails subsequently to act on other pieces of advice. Pan's advice, like Thetis' advice to Chalcomeda (34.316-37), is thus rendered largely
gratuitous in the context of the narrative.

It is remarkable that Dionysus, unlike Mortheus, who has only to cope with the intransigence of the girl, has also to overcome the added obstacle of his own inhibitions, which gives the episode a psychological dimension. On the strength of the foregoing episodes, it is difficult to visualise Dionysus inhibited and tongue-tied, but this is how Nonnus, possibly under the influence of Alexandrian love-elegy, chooses to portray him here. But he is inconsistent even in this: while Dionysus is described as being shy and frightened of the girl, his addresses to Beroe, with their double entendre and sexual innuendo, create quite the opposite impression. Dionysus traces Beroe’s steps in the forest, observing her discreetly from a distance. Each sighting only intensifies his infatuation: οὐδὲ οἱ εἰσαφώντι κόρος πέλεν ἵσταμένην γὰρ / παρθένου δόσσον ὄπως, τόσον πλέον ἦθελε λεύσσειν (42.47-8). The poet returns to the notion of insatiability later in the episode with a good-humoured retort to Homer: πάντων γὰρ κόρος ἐστὶ παρ’ ἄνθρακι, ἡδέος ὑπνου / μολπῆς τ’ εὐκελάδοιο καὶ ὀπτότε καμπτεται ἄνηρ / εἰς δρόμουν ὁρχηστήρα: γυναιμακάνειν δὲ μούνιν / οὐ κόρος ἐστὶ πόθων· ἐφεύσατο βίβλος Ὀμήρου (42.178-81). The reference is to Menelaus’ comment on the Trojans’ insatiable lust for battle: πάντων μὲν κόρος ἐστὶ, καὶ ὑπνοῦ καὶ φιλότητος / μολπῆς τε γυλικης καὶ ἀμύωνος ὀρχηστήριο ... Τρῶες δὲ μάχης ἀκόρητο έσσιν (N636-9). Dionysus pleads with Helios to hold back his steeds (so that he may have more daylight in which to observe Beroe): Ἦλειον λιτάνευε, ὀπισθότων ἐπὶ δίφων / αἰθερίῳ στατόν ἵππου ἀνασφίγγοντα χαλική / μηκύνευ λυκυκ φέγγος (42.50-3). This is yet another echo of Callimachus, from the hymn to Artemis: ἐπεὶ θεὸς οὐκ ἐκεῖνον / ἴλθε παρ’ Ἦλειον καλὸν χορὸν, ἀλλὰ βεθέαι / δίφων ἐπιστήσας, τὰ χαμάξα μηκύνονται (3.180-3). Poseidon now makes a brief appearance: ἐκ Αἰβάνου δὲ / ὀκνάλεω ποδὸς ἤχος ὑποκλέπτων ἐνοσίκθων / ἐντροπαλιξομένω βραδυπείτει χάζετο ταρσώ, / καὶ νόον ἀστήρικτον ὁμοῖον εἶχε θαλάσσῃ, / κύμαι παφλάζοντα πολυφλοίοβοι μερίμνης (42.55-9). These lines have been adapted from the earlier passage depicting Erechtheus’ retreat before the Indian onslaught: ὀκναλέως δὲ
πόδεσαιν ἔχαζετο ὑμηθρός, ἵππη οὐτροπαλιζομένην τανύων εἰκυκλον ὀπωτῆν (32.265-6), which is an imitation of the passage depicting Ajax' retreat in the Iliad (Ἀ544-7), as previously indicated (pp. 75-6). It is unclear from what Poseidon is withdrawing - he will not be heard of again before 42.441ff., when he makes his dramatic re-entry from the sea. The poet now devotes all his attention to Dionysus' pursuit of Beroe. Lines 65-70 seem to indicate that he has already succeeded in making contact with the girl and is on familiar terms with her. Affecting a serious demeanour, δολήν ... ἔχων ἀγέλαστον ὀπωτήν (42.65), anticipating thereby Pan's instruction to that effect (cf. ὁ ᾠα σακροφονέωσαν ἔχων ἀγέλαστον ὀπωτήν, 42.218), Dionysus approaches her and enquires about her father, behaving ὃς φίλος, ὃς ὁμοθραυος ὁδηρομος (42.67). Keydell places a marginal bar alongside lines 65-70 to indicate their unsuitability to the context in which they occur. Koechly and Ludwich (followed by Rouse) transpose them to follow line 274, so as to make it seem that Dionysus was carrying out Pan's instruction. Such radical transpositions to improve the logical coherence of the narrative are not countenanced by Keydell and Collart, who see them as amounting to tampering with the text as left by the poet. Besides, as Collart points out, this would still leave a number of other anticipations of Pan's advice, which could not be removed by transposition.21 At 42.71ff. we find Dionysus again stalking the girl, as he had been doing up to 42.55. He drinks from a fountain from which he had seen Beroe drink, and is mocked by a nymph, who tells him that no amount of water will quench his passion. With the somewhat peculiar logic that is a hallmark of our poet, Dionysus deduces from the fact that Beroe had drunk water instead of wine, that she prefers Poseidon to himself, and is tormented by jealousy. He then addresses her in her absence, reminding her of the fate of Tyro, who had been seduced by Poseidon on the banks of the Enipeus (42.117-20), a warning which he later succeeds in conveying to her, this time citing the fates of Amymone, Scylla and Asterie, who upon succumbing to Poseidon's advances were changed respectively into a fountain, a rock and an island (42.406-13). Dionysus forthwith assumes the identity of a young hunter so as to have a pretext for conversing with Beroe, the huntress. He puts on an air of fake modesty: ἄκλινες ἄμφι προσώπῳ /

again anticipating Pan's advice: μιμημα σαφονος ἐπλασεν αἴδοὺς (42.128-9). Dionysus is described as being overcome by anxiety to the extent of being unable to speak (as if indeed he had not only acquired the young hunter's visage, but his bashfulness as well): σχεδον ἠλθε καὶ ἤθελε μῆθον ἐνίψαι, ἀλλὰ φόβῳ πεπέδητο (42.138-9). The poet then proceeds to chide him for his fear: φιλεύε, πῇ σεὸ θυρσοι / αὐθροφόνοι; ... πῃ στομάτων μύκημα παρύβρομον; ἄ μέγα θάμα, / παρθένου ἐτρεμε Βάκχος, δὲν ἐτρεμε φῦλα Γυγάντων: / Γηγενέων ὀλέτημα φόβος νίκησεν Ἠρώτων (42.139-44). These lines may be interpreted alternatively as a monologue in which Dionysus makes self-recrements for fearing the girl. We note that the reference to the giants is anachronistic in the context of the narrative, as Dionysus is yet to do battle with them (48.31ff.). Pan in his speech will be seen to assuage these fears: ἀλλὰ φόβοι μεθέπει σε σαφονος ἐγγύθε κοφρης: / εἴπε, τὶ σοι βέξει μία παρθένοι; (42.233-4). But when Dionysus does at length manage to speak, his speech betrays no sign of timidity, and he addresses the girl with deceitful glibness: καὶ Βερόην ἐρείει χέων ψευδήμων φωνήν (42.157). He begins by asking: Ἀρτεμι, πῇ σεὸ τόξα; (42.158), a question later posed to Artemis herself by Nemesis (48.397).

The likening of Beroe to Artemis is yet another anticipation of Pan's advice, who tells Dionysus to compare her favourably with the Graces, Artemis or Athena (42.224-5). Dionysus utters his words in fake astonishment: ἐνπτε θάμβος ἐχων ἀπατήλιου (42.164), again anticipating Pan's advice: ψευδαλέον σεό θάμβος ἐχέφροι δείκνυε σιγῆ (42.233). The flattery of being likened to a goddess has the girl lift her head with pride (42.166-7), something that Pan will be telling Dionysus (42.227-8).

Caught in the throes of passion, Dionysus' condition superficially resembles his bout of insanity earlier: καὶ μογέων Δίωνυσος ὑπεβρυχάτο σιψη / δαμουνή μάστιγε τετυμένοις, ἐνδοθή πέσσων / κρυπτών ἀκοιμήτων ύποκάρδιοι ἐλκος ἐρώτων (42.182-4). In the earlier episode his behaviour was compared to that of a bull stung by the gadfly (32.125-9), and we noted the influence of Apollonius on Nonnus' imagery. In the present instance he makes
even more extended use of Apollonius' comparison of Heracles to a bull stung by the gadfly. The love-crazed Dionysus is depicted ως δ’ ὡτε βοῦς ἄκίχητος ἔσω πλαταμώνος ὕδεων / ἐσμύν ὄφεσινόμων παρεμέτρεεν ἠδάα ταύρων / οἰστρηθεὶς ἀγέληθεν, ὅν εὔπετάλῳ παρὰ λόχη / βουτύπος ἰφυὸν ἀφικασαι κέντρῳ / ἀπροῖδης, ὅλῳ, δὲ δέμας βεβολημένος οἰστρῳ / τηλίκος ἐστυφέλικτο, καὶ ὅρθιον ὑψόθι νότον / ἄφι ἀνασειράζων παλνάγρητον ἐκλασεν ὑφρὴν / κυρτὸς ἐπιπρήβων οκόπελὼν βάχιν, ἀντίτυπον δὲ / ἰδύ κέρας δόχυωσεν ἀνούτατον ἱέρα τύπτων (42.185-93).

In Apollonius the maddened bull simile is used to illustrate Heracles' frantic rushing about in his futile search for Hylas, as the realization that the lad has come to harm progressively takes hold (1.1265-9). The simile does not seem quite appropriate in Dionysus' case, seeing that he is anything but aimless and frenzied, pursuing the girl according to a preconceived plan of action. It may well be, however, that Nonnus means to depict Dionysus' state of mind rather than his outward actions, in which case the simile is indeed fitting.

When all his efforts to win over the girl have come to nought, Dionysus seeks the advice of Pan, the traditional praecceptor amoris. Other instances of Pan dispensing advice to lovers are found in Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 5.25 and in Longus 2.7, but neither of these prose versions compares in length and thoroughness with that which we find in Nonnus. Similar in conception and scope to Pan's speech in Nonnus is Priapus' speech in Tibullus (1.4), where that god issues precepts of amatory persuasion (albeit of a homosexual nature) to the poet himself. The closest parallels to the individual precepts aired by Pan are, however, to be found in Ovid's *Ars amatoria* and *Amores*. D'Ippolito draws attention to the following: Pan's observation πάσα γυνὴ ποθεῖ πλέουν ἄνερος (42.209), corresponding in idea to 'parcior in nobis nec tam furiosa libido' (*Ars Am. 1.281*); the notion that women conceal their passion more effectively (cf. 42.210 and 212-4) corresponding to Ovid's 'tectius illa cupid' (*Ars Am. 1.276*). The idea that the lover's pretence of modesty should be accompanied by a serious expression, μυθήσει έρυθημα φέρων ἀπατήλιον αἶδος / οία σοφοράσσαν ἔχων
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agelastov oμωτήv (42.217-8), occurs likewise in Ovid: 'tantum ne pateas verbis 
verbis simulator in illis./ officie, nec vultu destrue dicta tua' (Ars Am. 2.311-2).
The lover should partake of the activities of his beloved, which happens to be the 
hunt in the present instance, praising her beauty at the same time: καὶ λίνα πάλλων 
/θαύματι μὲν δολίω ῥοδοειδέα δέρκεο κούρην / κάλλος ἐπαυνήσας (42.219-
21), which corresponds in sense to Ovid's 'attonitum [sc. te] forma fac putet esse 
sua' (Ars Am. 2.296). He should charm her with silent play of the eyes: 
παρθενικήν δὲ ἐς ἐρωτα νοήμων θέλγε σιωπή, / κινιμένων βλεφάρων 
ἀντώπα νεύματα πέμπων (42.231-2), which again corresponds to Ovid's 
'atque oculos oculis spectare fatentibus ignem / saepe tacens, verbaque vultus habet' 
(Ars Am. 1.573-4). Even the κινιμένων βλεφάρων may be accounted for: 
'multa supercilio vidi vibrante loquentes, nutibus in vestris pars bona vocis erat' 
(Aniores, 5.14-5). Pan tells Dionysus not to be afraid of the girl, as her weapons 
are only her eyes and rosy cheeks (42.233-7), the theme of Aphrodite's weapons 
being one which Nonnus never seems to tire of reiterating. Pan further assures 
Dionysus that his youthful beauty will carry far more weight with the girl than any 
presents he cares to give her, an idea also found in Tibullus (1.4.27ff.). Dionysus, 
as we see later, will not heed this piece of advice, lavishing presents upon Beroe.

When Dionysus returns, Beroe asks him in her youthful innocence who he is. 
Dionysus answers her with a long speech crammed with sexual double entendre. 
Gigli-Piccardi interprets the whole speech as an extended metaphor, whereby 
Dionysus intimates his designs on the girl in the language of viniculture. He begins 
by saying εἶμι τεόν Λιβάνου γεωμόρος: ἃν ἐθελήσης / ἄρδευω σέο γαῖαν, 
ἐγὼ σέο καρπὸν ἀξέω (42.283). According to Gigli-Piccardi, Dionysus is 
telling Beroe in a thinly disguised manner that he plans to get her with child. She 
links ἄρδευω with the frequently occurring δμβρος 'Ερώ-ων (to which one 
might add γαμία ἑρπη, 16.351, and γαμία μαθήματι, 48.656). The καρπός, 
understandably, denotes 'offspring'. Dionysus drives home his intended message, 
stating that he will donate the first fruits of the harvest to Aphrodite instead of 
Demeter (42.299-300). He will caress his unripe grapes: ὀμφακα γυνώσκω 
νοοθηλέα χερσὶν ἀφάσσων (42.306), meaning of course the young girl's

---

breasts, the word δυσφάξ 'unripe grape' being commonly used by the late poets to mean 'immature breast' (cf. Triphiodorus 34, and 48.365 and 369). Dionysus makes known his horticultural expertise, depicting plants as if they were sentient beings capable of giving expression to their sexuality, with some species being ascribed a male, others a female role: ἡνίδε, πῶς ὑδάκτυλος ἐπέτρεχε γείτονι μύρτῳ, / πῶς γελάς νάρκισσος ἐπιθρώπικων ἀνεμώνι (42.301-2), which echoes the earlier description of plants behaving in an animated fashion at the hierogamy of Zeus and Hera: θηλεὶ δ' ἀφενα φύλλα συνέπλεκε γείτονι ποίη ... καὶ ... / ἵμεροὶς νάρκισσος ἐπιθρώπικων ἀνεμώνι (32.87-92). Dionysus demands no monetary remuneration for his work: οὐ χρέος ὀλβοῦ· / μισθὸν ἔχω δῶ μῆλα, μήτις ἐνα βότρυν ὀπώρης (42.311-2). Μῆλα, as we learn from Theocritus (27.49-50), is a colloquialism for μαζοί. The rest may be construed from Nonnus' own later statement: Αὐρή πεναλέης γαμήν ἐκλεψεν ὀπώρην (48.632).

Beroe remains unmoved by Dionysus' speech, apparently ignorant of its insinuations (42.313-4). Dionysus takes the nets from her hand, with feigned astonishment at her skill (42.316-7). He may in this regard be seen to be translating Pan's advice into action, but we recall that he acted also with feigned astonishment before consulting Pan (42.164). Beroe's reaction is not stated. Now follows a passage where Dionysus (like Morrheus previously) dreams that Beroe comes to him in bridal robes, with the poet making the comment that one often sees in dreams what he has been engaged in during the day (42.325-35). Dionysus on waking beseeches Eros and Aphrodite to prolong his dream, but his wish is not granted. We next find Dionysus taking part in the hunt with Beroe and Adonis. The passage (42.346-52) is similar to 42.124-35, with Dionysus casting furtive glances at the girl, who covers her face with a veil to avoid them. Dionysus now resumes his divine form (we recall that he has been masquerading as a young hunter from 42.126), and addresses Beroe with a lengthy speech in which he appeals to her not to disappoint her parents Aphrodite and Adonis by turning her back on love. He argues that her loyalty should be to her mother, not to Artemis and Athena, with whom she has no ties of kinship. The argument is essentially the same as that previously used by Eros in his address to Abarbarie (40.563-7).
Turning his attention now to Poseidon, he is depreciative of the presents that his rival is likely to offer her. Poseidon would make her a marriage bed of foul smelling seal skins: στορέσει πνεύματα δυσώδεα πόντιον ὀθύμην / δέρματα φωκάων (42.398-9), seal-skins having been mentioned previously by the poet in a pejorative reference to Homer’s theme in contrast to his own (1.36-8). The same comparison is made here: just as Nonnus’ theme is redolent of nectar and Homer’s of seal-skins, Dionysus’ gifts are fragrant, while Poseidon’s smell of the sea. Dionysus concludes by reminding Beroe of the fates of Poseidon’s previous spouses, Amymone, Scylla and Asterie. Beroe reacts to all this by putting her hands on her ears.

Poseidon arrives anew, making a dramatic entry from the sea: ἄνεσθιμενος ἐὰν θαλάσσης, ἡ γκμα διπέλεως δὲ οὐρεός Ἔχει αὖτα δόλων, / παρθενική μάστευε Ποσειδάων μετανάστης, ἡβροχον ἱδατούμεν περιρραίνων χθόνα ταρσῳ. καὶ οἱ ἐτε οπεύθουν παρὰ κλέτας εὐθύτων ὄλως / οὐρεός ἄκρα κάρυνά ποδών ἐκλείζετο παλμώ (42.441-6). The description has been imitated from Poseidon’s arrival on the battlefield in the Iliad: ἦθος ὁ γ᾽ ἐξ ἀλὸς ἐξετ᾽ ἵνα ... αὐτικὰ δ᾽ ἐχθρος κατεβίσετο παπαλόεντος / κραυνα ποσὶ προβιβᾶσ᾽ τρέμε δ᾽ οὐρέα μακρὰ καὶ ὄλη / ποσοίν ὧν ἀθανάτουσι Ποσειδᾶνων ὄντος (N15-9). Braune’s contention24 that Nonnus has been influenced by Claudian’s description of the emergence of Pluto (De raptu Proserpinae, 2.151ff.) is somewhat otiose, seeing that the Homeric passage accounts for all that Nonnus has to say. Poseidon eyes Beroe ἐκ ποδῶς ἄξιος καρήνου and addresses her with a lengthy speech replete with blandishments. He calls her a fourth Grace: ὀπλοτέρη γάρ / τρισσάων Χαρίτων Βερόη βλάστησε / τετάρτη (42.466-7), which recalls Pan’s advice to Dionysus: χαρίτας κύκλησκε χερείνας (42.224). Poseidon then tells her that since her mother Aphrodite had emerged from the sea, it is only fitting that she herself be wedded to the sea-god (an argument which Eros used on the fountain nymph Abarbarie, 40.563-7). He promises to make all the sea-deities her servants, including Ino, the nurse of Dionysus. Beroe is as indifferent to Poseidon’s overtures as she had been to those.
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of Dionysus, walking away before he can finish.

Aphrodite, unaware, it appears, that Beroe has already been promised to Poseidon, invites the two suitors to fight over her, demanding sureties that the loser, should he be Poseidon, not shatter the πατρίς of Beroe with his trident, and, should he be Dionysus, not destroy its vineyards. Both are obliged to take an oath to that effect: αμφι δε νύμφης / αμφόω ἀθελεύολετε γάμου προκέλευθον ἄγωνα: / ὅς δε κε νικήσει, Βερόνη ἀνάδειν άγεσθω ... ἀμφοτέροις φίλοις ὅρκος (42.512-5). These lines are imitated from the Iliad, from the passage where Paris proposes to Menelaus that they fight over Helen in single combat: ὁππότερος δε κε νικήσει κρείσσων τε γένηται, / κτήμαθ' ἐλὼν εὗ πάντα γυναῖκα τε οἰκαδ'. ἀγέσθω: / οἱ δ' ἄλλοι φιλότητα καὶ ὅρκια πιστά ταμώντες ναίοντε Τροϊῇ ἐρυθάλκα (Γ'71-4). The book closes with a portent favouring Poseidon: a falcon descending on a pigeon has its prey snatched from under it by an osprey. Dionysus, when he sees this, loses all hope of victory, but enters the fray regardless.

Book 43 is wholly devoted to the battle between Poseidon and Dionysus. It is essentially a themochaly, as it does not seem to involve any of Dionysus' mortal followers, though at one point the Indians, who are now his allies, are depicted in action against Proteus. The fighting does not conform to the traditional themochaly pattern, in that at no instance do Dionysus and Poseidon fight one another. We have instead a confused mêlée between the lesser deities. This type of battle, involving all the deities making up the retinue of the two adversaries, is foreshadowed in the earlier Apollo-Poseidon confrontation, where Poseidon marshals his sea deities to fight by his side (36.94-6). The war between Poseidon and Dionysus appears to have some precedent in Phoenician mythology. Philo refers to an incident in the struggle between Ouranus and Cronus, where Demarous (a son of Ouranus, 2.16, and the father of Melkart, 2.22) attacks Pontus (the father of Poseidon, 2.21, and ally of Cronus), but is defeated: ἐπεισὶ τε Πόντῳ ό Δημαροῦς, τροποῦται τε αὐτὸν ό Πόντος (2.22). There is no mention of Beirut in connexion with this battle, but we are informed a little later that Cronus assigned Byblos to Dione and Beirut to Poseidon, the Cabeirs, the Hunters and the Fishers, and that the remains of Pontos were hallowed there (2.25). Nonnus'
Poseidon can conceivably be identified with Philo’s Pontus, but the relation between Dionysus and Demarous is more tenuous. According to Philo, Demarous was co-ruler of the world with Astarte under the auspices of Cronus (2.24). He was in some respects the Phoenician equivalent of Zeus (cf. Ζεύς Δεμαροῦς, ὁ καὶ Ἄδωδος βασιλεύς θεῶν, 2.24), but he never seems to have toppled Cronus, who retained overall control. We note that in Philo’s account Demarous took the fight to Pontus (cf. the ἐπεισοδί), as Dionysus does in Nonnus, the battle taking place on the sea (i.e. in Poseidon’s domain). It seems as if Nonnus has made rather free use of the events recorded in Philo: in his version Pontus and Poseidon become one and the same, Dionysus is substituted for Demarous, and the acquisition of Beirut (in the form of the maiden Beroe) is made out to be the cause of the conflict between the two gods.

Beroe stands in dread of Poseidon, preferring Dionysus, just as Deianeira, the poet reminds us, feared Achelous and preferred Heracles (cf. Sophocles, Trachiniae, 15ff.). Poseidon and Dionysus rush into battle roaring like bulls, Poseidon βλοουρὸν μύκημα χέων λυσσώδει λαιμῷ (43.18) and Dionysus τρηχαλέον μύκημα σεσπρότι χειλεῖ πέμπτων (43.27), resembling monsters rather than gods. Considerable emphasis is placed on sounds in this episode, the roar of the waves, the howl of the gales and the way in which the voices of the combatants carry over the watery medium. It seems that the opposing sides are vying with one another to see who can generate the most noise. Dionysus assures his followers he will match any sounds Poseidon shall make: αὐλὸς ἐμὸς πολεμήτων ἤχου ἀφάσσων / ἀντίτυπον φθέγχαιτο μέλος μυκήτωρ κόχλῳ / καὶ διδύμοις πατάγοισι μόθου χαλκόθρου ἤχῳ / τυμπανὰ δουπῆσειεν (43.71-4). Dionysus drives Rhea’s chariot toward the sea, his body covered with vines and ivy that spring from its rim (43.23-5). An elephant drinks dry a nearby spring; καὶ βραδὺς ἐρπὺζων ἐλέφας παρὰ πηγῆς ἄφην / δήμβροις ἀζαλέασιν ἀνήφυσε χείλεσιν ὑδρῷ, / καὶ προχοῦς ξύραιε (43.29-32). The notion is probably borrowed from Claudian’s Greek Gigantomachy, a work which has so conspicuously influenced Nonnus. There a giant drinks a river dry: ἄριστε πηγάων ὑπεδέχητο μυρίον ὑδρῷ / ἐσπόμενος προχοῦς ἀπολυμένου
ποταμοῖο (28-9). Nonnus has already used this motif in book 40, where Cronus, to ease his birth pangs, drinks a whole river dry: χανδῶν δὲν ποταμοῖο ρόου νεφεληδόν ἄφυσσων (40.72). Dionysus whips the abode of Poseidon with vine-clusters, while Poseidon wreaks havoc on land, shaking mountains and uprooting vines. The Bassarids attack a herd of black cattle belonging to Poseidon, the sparagmos (43.40-51) anticipating that at 45.287-93. The scene, which will be discussed in the next chapter along with the latter, is inspired by Euripides' Bacchae 660-774. The disposition of Dionysus' forces is outlined next. The disposition is analogous to that at 27.148-65, except that here a five-fold division obtains: καὶ στρατηγὸς Δίωνυσος ἐκόψειεν ἠγεμονίας, / στῆσασ πέντε φάλαγγας ἐς ὑπάτεσσαα ἐνυχ. / τῆς πρώτης στιχὸς ἤρχε Κίλιξ εὐδιάμπελος Ολείς / υῖος Ἐρευναλίωνος, ὁποῖον ἑγγούς Ταύρου / Φυλλίδος ἀγραφοισιν ὑμηλήσας ὑμεναιοῦσι. / τῆς δ' ἐτέρης ἤγεσι τελερχάπης Ἐλικάων ... Οινοπίων τριτάτης, Στάφυλος προμάχησε τετάρτης ... πέμπτης δ' ἠγεμόνευε Μελάνθιος, ὅρχαμος ἄνδρῶν, / ὅπο τέκεν Ὀλυμπιὰ Κῆσπης (43.52-63). The first half of the passage has been imitated from Homer's depiction of the chieftains of the Myrmidons: τῆς μὲν ἰῆς στιχός ἤρξε Μενέσθιοις αἰολοθυρής, / υῖος Σπερχειόου ... / ὅπο τέκε Πηλῆς θυγάτηρ ... τῆς δ' ἐτέρης Ἐδώρως ἀρήμος ἠγεμόνευε (Π173-9).

As the leaders and their divisions play no part in the ensuing action, the passage is quite irrelevant in the context of the narrative. Their names are fanciful formations of the kind found in the Batrachomyomachy - we may for instance compare Οινοπίων to Τρωξάρης in the latter poem. One cannot help thinking that Nonnus is punning here. Μελανθιος would surely call for the reading ὅρχαμος 'Ινδῶν rather than ὅρχαμος ἄνδρῶν (cf. Keydell's apparatus). The Indians are the only mortals to have a role in the ensuing action, attempting, on Dionysus' orders, to apprehend Proteus (43.225ff.).

As may be expected, both Dionysus and Poseidon harangue their associates with long speeches, in which each promises to make the other's followers his servants, an idea already familiar from the Dionysus-Deriades harangues. The theme of turning the established order of things on its head is a recurrent one in the
Dionysiaca, beginning with Typhoeus' speech in book 2. Thus Dionysus tells his followers: ἀπειρήτησι δὲ Νύμφαις / κύμβαλα Νηρείδεσσιν ὀπάσσατε -
μίχατε Βάκχαις / Ὑδράδας (43.93-5), and Poseidon responds in kind: ἐν
εὐδόρῳ δὲ μελάθρῳ / Βασσαρίδες στορεύειν ἐμὸν λέχος ἀντὶ Λυαίου
(43.154-5). The two adversaries are selective in regard to whom of the other's
followers they will co-opt. Dionysus rejects Nereus' daughters (43.107-8), and
Poseidon, almost as if he had heard Dionysus' speech, responds by rejecting the
Satyrs and Maenads (43.156-7). Both conclude their speeches with personal
taunts, Dionysus inviting Poseidon to sing at his and Beroe's wedding, Poseidon
enjoining Dionysus to put aside the thyrsus and fight with the thunderbolt, if he is,
as he claims to be, the son of Zeus. All of Dionysus' adversaries, from Deriades to
Pentheus, at some stage accuse him of being an impostor, and the same allegation
is implicit in Poseidon's taunt in the present instance. Poseidon promises to swamp
the constellations in a manner reminiscent of Typhoeus' boasts in book 2. He
recalls how in his previous confrontation he had done just that, raising the sea to
the skies, washing the Wain in the Ocean and having his dolphins come face to
face with the celestial Dolphin. Poseidon's entry into battle is conveyed in language
evocative of sea sounds: τριόδοντι μυχοῖς ἐτίναξε θαλάσσης, / καὶ ῥοθίῳ
κελάδοντι καὶ οὐδαίνοντι ἰεθρῷ / ήέρα μαστίζοντες ἐβόμβεον ὀδατος
ὄλκοι (43.193-4). The language, if hackneyed, is nevertheless effective in
conjuring up images of a menacing squall at sea. A depiction of Triton (43.205-9),
similar to that at 36.93-4, and that in Apollonius 4.1610-6, follows. Such
depictions appear to have been inspired by Hellenistic sculptures of this biform
deity. A number of isolated vignettes follow. Glaucus assails the Satyrs, Pan
cavorts over the waves, chasing the echo of his own pipes: ὑπνέμιος δὲ καὶ
αὐτὴ / τικτομένη σύργγγι διώκετο ποινίας ἡχώ (43.220-1). The sound of
the pipes carried by the wind and echoing off the water is well represented by the
poet's choice of words. Proteus appears forthwith on the scene to be confronted by
the αἶθαὶ τ'/Ινοὶ (43.227), erstwhile enemies and now followers of Dionysus.
Their conversion from enemy to ally does not exempt them from being referred to
in a racially depreciative manner by the poet, who persists in calling them
οὐλοκόμων στίχες ἀνδρῶν (43.228). Proteus baffles his hapless foes with
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multiple form-changes, just as Dionysus had baffled Deriades in their first duel. Nereus takes to the fray next, accompanied by his daughters. Ino also makes an appearance, λευκὸν ἐρευγομένη μανιώδες ἀφρὸν ἠπίης (43.263), a slightly unkind portrait considering that she had nursed Dionysus. We note that Dionysus tells his followers not to capture Thetis because of the hospitality she had shown him when fleeing from Lycurgus (43.95-6), but does not extend the same consideration to Ino, to whom his debt is just as great. Eido rides on the back of a pilot fish, her riding skill being illustrated by a long simile drawn from chariot-racing: ὃς δὲ τις ἰππεύων ἐλατήρ ὑπὸ κυκλάδα τέχνη, / δοξιῶσας δὲν ἰππὸν ἀμαρτέρον ἐγγύθη νύσσης, / δεξιότερον κάμψει, παριεμένοι χαλινῷ / κέντρῳ ἐπιστήκτων, προχέων πλήξιππον ἀπειλήν, / ὀκλάζων ἐπικυρτός, ἐν’ ἀντυγι γούνατα πτίξας, / ἱεύκα καμπτομένῃ, καὶ ἐκουσόν ἰππὸν ἐλαύων / φειδομένη παλάμη τεχνήμου βαίνων ἰμάσσει, / δίμα βαλῶν κατόπισθε, παρελκόμενον δὲ προσώπου / δίφρον ὀπισθοπόροι φιλάσσεται ἵνωχάς (43.270-8). As Collart 25 points out, the simile is little more than a pastiche of lines and phrases from the chariot race in book 37, collation with which yields the following: line 271=208, 272 differs only slightly from 220, 273=218, 274=355, 275-6=252-3 and 277-8 approximate to 254-5. The simile is not particularly apposite to the situation it is meant to illustrate, as Eido cannot be seen here as racing against or being pursued by anybody.

The rivers and Oceanus now join the fray - even though the battle has been in progress for some time, the poet somewhat confusingly speaks as if it were only now starting (43.286-9). We are not told what effect their combined onslaught has on Dionysus' followers. Nonnus turns instead to the feats of the individual members of each god's entourage. Even the animals seek out their opponents, an elephant taking on a seal (43.337-9). A Bacchante, with hair aflame with a fire that does not burn her, dances over the water οἷα Ποσειδάων έπινοκάρφουσα καρήνῳ (43.353). Psamatho, fearing that Glaucus will be killed and Nereus and Thetis be made servants of Dionysus, appeals to Zeus to intervene, though the foregoing narrative gives no indication that Poseidon is losing the battle. Zeus grants her prayer: ὃς φαμένης ήκουσε δι᾽ αἰθέρος ὑψιμέδων Ζεὺς / καὶ
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25 (1930) pp. 245-6.
Beroës ύμέναιον ἐπέτρεπεν Ἱννοσιγαίῳ / καὶ μόθον ἐπρήμων
γαμοστόλον· οὐρανόθεν γὰρ / νυμφιδίην ἀτέλεστον ἀναστελλόντες ἐνω / Βάικχον ἀπειλητήρες ἐκυκλώσαντο κεραυνοί (43.372-6). Braune sees the
above lines as an imitation of the passage in the De raptu Proserpinae where
Minerva is warned off by Jupiter as she is about to obstruct Pluto's chariot:
'libratur in ictum / fraxinus et nigros illuminat obvia currus. / missaque paene foret,
ni Lupiter aethere vulso / pacificas rubri torsisset fulminis alas, / confessus
socerum. nimbis Hymenaeus hiulcis / intonat, et testes firmane connubia flammae' (2.226-31). Dionysus, like Minerva in Claudian, must not be permitted to abort a
course of action previouly agreed to by Zeus and his brother. In both poems Zeus' command is obeyed with some reluctance: Dionysus ὁκναλέως δὲ πόδεσσιν
ἐχάζετο νυθρὸς ὠξίτης, / στυγνὸς ὀπισθοβόλω δεδοκημένος δματι
κούρην (43.381-2); in Claudian likewise 'invitae cessere deae' [sc. Minerva and
Venus] (2.232). Nonnus has used elements of the above passage previously: at
25.346-7, it will be recalled, Dionysus complains about being restrained by Zeus'
βρονταίος πατάγων, and at 33.233 Morheus pursued Chalcomeda
ὁκναλέως δὲ πόδεσσι (used in the same metrical position). The conjunction of
the elements - Zeus stopping with a show of thunder and lightning a conflict
between his brother and another god that is likely to upset the pre-arranged
marriage of his brother - is common to Claudian and Nonnus. This
correspondence, when viewed alongside the parallels already cited, places beyond
reasonable doubt the case for direct acquaintance.

The book concludes with the wedding feast of Poseidon and Beroe, which is
schematically parallel to the wedding feast of Pluto and Proserpina in Claudian. In
both cases the anticipated gloom is dispelled by the splendid festivities put on by
the bridegroom. In place of the unpleasantly smelling seal skins, which Dionysus
had foretold would greet her (42.398-403), Beroe is given all manner of precious
ornaments (43.398-403). The depiction of the ornaments is inspired by the passage
in the Iliad, where Hephaistus tells how during his nine-year undersea sojourn
with Eurynome and Thetis he fashioned many precious objects (Σ400-1). Some of
these very same ornaments are now given to Beroe, with Nonnus proceeding to
comment directly on the Homeric passage by explaining how Hephaistus had used
his implements under water (43.403-7). We have noted previously an exegetical tendency on Nonnus' part with regard to certain Iliadic passages that he imitates. The present is one such instance, functioning more as a commentary on Hephaistus' words in Homer than as a necessary part of his own narrative. The lines are nonetheless significant as an example of the fire-water opposition (ἐν ῥόθιος ἄσβεστον ἐβόμβευ ἐνδόμιχον πῦρ, 43.407), which, as we have seen, is a leitmotiv in the poem.

Dionysus, consoler par excellence, stands himself in need of consolation, which he promptly receives from Eros, who promises him another bride, Ariadne, who is even daintier than Beroe. Reassured, Dionysus sets off for Thebes, to the site of his fiery birth.
Chapter 8: Dionysus' return to Thebes.

The events associated with Dionysus' return to Thebes, to the site of his first, premature birth from lightning-consumed Semele, comprise the subject of books 44 to 46 of the Dionysiaca. Nonnus' treatment of the theme, comprising a total of 1035 lines of narrative and speeches, is comparable in length to Euripides' Bacchae (1392 lines in its present state), a work to which he is heavily indebted and which he may have sought to emulate. Though he does not mention Euripides by name as he does Homer (25.8 and 264-9), his dependence here on the Bacchae is no less close than was his dependence on the Iliad in the books devoted to the Indian war. Tyrrell, in a reference to Nonnus in his introduction to the play, even goes so far as to dismiss books 44 to 46 as "little more than a paraphrase of the Bacchae in hexameters"¹, and this assessment, if a little exaggerated, does underline the remarkable correspondence between the two works.

The correspondence is, nevertheless, not total, for a really close parallelism can only be said to exist between Dionysiaca 45.56 - 46.319 and Bacchae 170-1326, the earlier segment from 44.1 to 45.55, consisting in part of an elaboration of events referred to in retrospect in the prologue of the play, partly of a series anticipations of later developments, and the segment 46.320-69 consisting of the consoling of Cadmus and his daughters by Dionysus, an element absent from the play. The different endings are indicative of a difference of emphasis in the two authors' depiction of Dionysus. Whereas Euripides ends his play with a disconsolate Cadmus and daughters undertaking their separate paths to exile and Dionysus aggravating Cadmus' anguish with the prophecy that he and Harmonia will be turned into snakes and lay waste to Hellas at the head of a barbarian host (1330-6), Nonnus has Dionysus assuage their grief as he had done previously for Botrys and Methe (19.1-58), emphasising the god's consolatory role. It needs to be noted, however, that even where Nonnus has elected to differ from Euripides, the

¹ (1871) p. xiv
latter's influence remains paramount. This is especially true of the anticipatory passages in book 44, where the rending of Pentheus as depicted in Agave's dream is as much dependent on *Bacchae* 1095-1136 as is the description of the actual sparagmos in book 46.

In the segment from 45.52 to 46.319, which parallels *Bacchae* 170-1326, Nonnus has, in place of Tiresias' philosophical discourse on the importance of Dionysus to mankind (266-327), substituted two cautionary tales, illustrative of the god's powers: the stories of the Tyrrhenian pirates (45.105-68) and of Alpus (45.169-215). These substitutions are indicative of Nonnus' partiality to the miraculous and magical, instances of which, though present in the *Bacchae* - Dionysus is, after all, the god of sudden epiphanies and magical transformations - have been proliferated beyond the requirements of the plot in the *Dionysiaca*. The psychological element, so crucial to Euripides' carefully tailored progression of events, has largely been eliminated from Nonnus' version of the story. The process whereby Dionysus subtly elicits Pentheus' curiosity and voyeuristic tendencies to lure him to his destruction has no counterpart in Nonnus. Instead, Pentheus' decision to go and spy on the Bacchantes is brought about through the joint efforts of Dionysus and Selene, who simply instil λύσια in the king's mind, effecting an instant transformation. Pentheus, sane and obdurate in his opposition at one moment, becomes a frenzied Bacchant at the next (46.97-105). There is no gradation, no inner struggle such as we encounter in Euripides. Dionysus simply suggests that Pentheus spy on the Bacchantes and the king complies without hesitation.

Nonnus shows himself unappreciative of the underlying pattern of cause and effect, which gives Euripides' exposition of events a strong semblance of probability and renders the actions of his characters plausible. For example, whereas the earthquake that shakes Pentheus' palace is introduced by Euripides for a specific purpose, as a diversion to facilitate Dionysus' escape from custody without compromising his disguise as a merely human choir leader, in Nonnus it is relegated to the ranks of the miracles heralding Dionysus' approach at the beginning of book 44. Thus an element, functional in Euripides, has been rendered largely ornamental in Nonnus. Dionysus' action of shaking the palace in a threatening way, before Pentheus has even had an opportunity to display his ὑπόθεσις, seems
somewhat pointless in the narrative context.

In the portrayal of character Nonnus may be seen to be equally insensitive to the subtle gradations of Euripides. For instance, while in the Bacchae Pentheus is credited with some redeeming features, his steadfast resistance to a new cult which he perceived as a threat to the moral fabric of the state (215ff.) being singled out as a praiseworthy characteristic by some critics,² in the Dionysiaca he is pictured as an unregenerate villain, like his fellow earthborn, Typhoeus and Deriades, all of them uncompromisingly evil chthonian foes of the Olympian order, represented by Zeus and Dionysus. His anger and hostility toward Dionysus spring from envy at the latter's feats (44.131) and from the belief that he has come to deprive him of his throne (46.63-70). Pentheus is himself portrayed as a usurper (κουρανίην πατρώου ἠπασέ, 44.50), something that he most certainly is not in Euripides, where we are told on two separate occasions (43-4, 213) that Cadmus voluntarily relinquished the throne in favour of his grandson.

Nonnus' tendency to model his speeches on hackneyed rhetorical stereotypes leaves them devoid of the spontaneity and immediacy that we find in Euripides. In the Bacchae only Tiresias' address to Pentheus is cast in such a rhetorical mould, and as his purpose is to persuade, the use of rhetorical devices is quite apposite. But the use of studied rhetoric is quite out of place in some of the situations in which Nonnus employs it, as for example when it is put in the mouth of Pentheus about to be torn to pieces or in the mouth of Agave on discovering that she has killed her own son. Agave's anguish and Autonoe's attempt to console her sister are presented in the form of studied synrises (46.282-352), which detract considerably from the pathos of the moment. By over-long and partly irrelevant speeches, as well as by his already noted tendency to anticipate key elements of the story in seemingly unnecessary detail, Nonnus deprives the plot of Euripides of its inherent suspense, but enough of the genius of the original survives in the imitation to render books 44 to 46 among the most engaging in the Dionysiaca.

Editors of the Bacchae, from Hermann in 1823 to Dodds in 1960, have drawn attention to the correspondences between the play and the Dionysiaca, but have, quite understandably, confined their observations to those instances where Euripides' meaning stood in need of elucidation and where Nonnus' imitation was
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believed to cast some light on textual problems. Where the text of the *Bacchae* posed no such difficulties, there was no need to refer to the work of a late imitator. In the present chapter, it is proposed to look at all the correspondences between the two works from the vantage point of the *Dionysiaca* and arrive at an assessment of the extent of Nonnus' indebtedness to the dramatist. Seeing that the present segment of the *Dionysiaca* also contains an episode, the story of the Tyrrhenian pirates, where our poet is presumed to have been influenced by Ovid, we have an opportunity to compare Nonnus' relationship to the Roman poet with his relationship to Euripides.

Nonnus' account of Dionysus' arrival in Thebes differs from that of Euripides in a number of details. While in Euripides Dionysus comes to Thebes in the guise of a mortal, as leader of a band of fifteen female votaries of the god from Lydia, in Nonnus he arrives in all his divine glory at the head of a vast host of nymphs and satyrs, with whom he had accomplished the conquest of India (there is no further mention of his mortal followers, who presumably went their own ways after the conclusion of the Indian war). In Euripides the approach of Dionysus occasions Bacchic frenzy in the womenfolk of Thebes (cf. Dionysus' remark καὶ πᾶν τὸ θῆλυ σπέρμα Καδμείων ὅσαν ἡναῖκες ἤσον ἐξέμνη δωμάτων, 35-6), the men being exempt, apart from Cadmus and Tiresias, who join the procession, one from political expediency, the other out of respect for religion (195-6). We may note that Euripides is not entirely consistent here, as he seems to imply in two other instances that the frenzy was universal (cf. the chorus at 114: αὐτίκα γὰ πᾶσα χορεύσει and Agave's remark at 1295: πᾶσα τ' ἔξεβακχεύθη πόλεις). In the *Bacchae* the onset of frenzy comes about surreptitiously with the arrival of the Lydian choir leader and his fifteen female followers at Thebes. In Nonnus, on the other hand, Dionysus' approach is heralded by grand portents and upheavals of nature. Nonnus, with characteristic love of hyperbole, speaks of the rivers Asopus, Dirce and Ismenus swirling in dance and hamadryads emerging from their trees to sing his praises (44.8-14). As on his arrival in India (22.16-38), predatory beasts put aside their normal dispositions and frolic with their would-be prey (44.30-4). Pentheus alone stands apart from the universal rejoicing and orders the gates of Thebes to be shut. A series of miraculous happenings prevents him from putting his
orders into effect (44.20-45), happenings which recur on two further occasions (44.123-9 and 45.323-31). The depiction of these supernatural events is clearly modelled on the passage in the Bacchae where Dionysus induces similar happenings in order to make good his escape from Pentheus' custody (622ff.), but in Nonnus they are taken out of their proper context and made merely to signal the god's arrival. Nonnus, it may be noted, has jettisoned the scene of Dionysus' captivity, perhaps viewing it as too undignified for a god to be imprisoned by a mortal. The gates which Pentheus ordered shut open miraculously of their own accord, with Pentheus' men described as fighting the winds in their efforts to keep them closed: ἐξαπίνης δὲ / αὐτόματα κληθεὶς ἀνωίγματο πυλῶν, / καὶ δολιχοῖς πυλεῶι μάτην ἑπέβαλλον ὄχησ / ἥριοις θεράποντες ἐριθμαίοντες ἀίταις (44.20-3). Nonnus has undoubtedly been influenced by the passage in Quintus depicting the portents accompanying the death of Laocoon, where among other things, αὐτόματοι δ' ἄρ ὄχησ ἀνωίγματο πυλῶν (12.511), though the idea also occurs in Euripides, who describes the freeing of the Bacchantes imprisoned by Pentheus in similar terms: αὐτόματα δ' αὐτάις δεσμὰ διελύθη ποδῶν, / κληθεῖς τ' ἀνήκαν θύρετρ' ἄνευ θυητῆς χερῶς (447-8), a description which Nonnus imitates when he comes to give his own account of the freeing of the Bacchantes (45.278-83). The futility of resisting a divinely ordained event, such as the attempt by Pentheus' men to keep the gates closed, is likewise alluded to in Euripides, when the king's servants vainly try to put out the magical fire in his palace: ἄπας δ' ἐν ἕργῳ δοῦλος ἦν μάτην ποδῶν (626). When Pentheus' men see that they are no match for the aged Sileni, they disobey his orders and join in the Bacchic revelry, turning into the very image of the noise-loving Corybants (44.33). As we have noted, in Euripides the only men to join the festivities are Cadmus and Tiresias. Portents of a more menacing nature follow, which have the effect of terrifying the inhabitants (δείμα φέρων ναέτησι, 44.44, καὶ ναέται δεδόγμητο, 44.46). Why Dionysus should seek to terrify them in this way, when Pentheus alone is deserving of his ire, one is at a loss to understand. Nonnus, as often, is interested in immediate impressions and not overly concerned to assign plausible motives for the actions of his characters.

The palace is shaken: αὐτοέλικτος ἐσείετο Πενθέος αὐλῇ / ἀκλινών σφαίρηδον ἀνασάσσουσα
θεμέλων / καὶ πυλεών δεδόντο θορῶν ἐνοσίχθων παλμῷ,/πίματος ἔσσωδέναιο προάγγελος (44.35-8). This is an echo, reworked in typically Nonnian language, of Euripides' ἐν δὲ τῷδε τῷ χρόνῳ / ἀνετίναξ ἐλθὼν ὁ Βάκχος δῶμα (622-3). The depiction of frenzied circular motion, properly used of dancers smitten by Bacchic frenzy, is in the present instance applied to a building shaken by an earthquake. Athena’s altar, too, is described as spinning around (44.38-9), a portent which may be interpreted variously as a sign of the goddess’ annoyance at the womenfolk abandoning the spindle for the thyrsus (a recurrent theme in Euripides, 117-9, 514, 1236-7, echoed by Nonnus at 34.353-6 and 45.49), or merely as another threat directed at Pentheus by Dionysus. The thyrsus-spindle opposition would seem to imply a conflict of interest between Dionysus and Athena, which would make Pentheus an ally of Athena, but the theme is not developed further in either Euripides or Nonnus. Next we have two instances of animated statues, recalling the animated statue of Artemis in the Orphic Argonautica, who let drop her torches and turned her eyes skyward at the sight of Hecate (983-4), and also the statue of Heracles in Tyre that came alive on being addressed by Dionysus μῦστικα φωνῇ (40.368). Here the δακρύα πολισσόχοιο θεαίνης (presumably Athena) is seen to perspire and the statue of Ares is covered ἐκ τοῦδός δξρι καρήνοι in gore (44.42-5). The last two omens would appear to indicate that a major catastrophe is pending for the city as a whole, though in the event Pentheus alone will be called to account.

These portents revive in Agave the memory of a dream she had when Pentheus seized the throne, a dream for which there is no precedent in the play. Dreams had long been used in epic and tragedy as means of foreshadowing some catastrophic event. Such dreams needed to be perplexingly vague in order to generate a sense of foreboding. Too explicit a preview of the coming events would deprive the audience of that feeling of suspense, as they would be informed in advance of the denouement. Nonnus, by making Agave's dream an accurate and detailed preview of the sparagmos of Pentheus, as it were gives the plot away, thereby diminishing the impact of the actual event. Agave's dream differs from the actual event only in that the roles of man and beast are reversed. Whereas in the actual event Agave sees the spying Pentheus as a lion, here she sees him as himself, beset by wild animals,
one of which, a lioness, proceeds to attack her son. Nonnus has, on both occasions, made considerable use of Euripides' sparagmos scene. As far as the present passage is concerned, the following correspondences with Euripides may be noted. Agave seems to see Pentheus perched on top of a tree: καὶ μιν ἵδειν ἐθάκησε ... ἐξόμενον σκιερὸν μετάραιον ὑψὸθα δενδρόν (44.58-9), which recalls ὡς δ' εἶδον ἐλάτη δεσπότην ἐφἴμενον (1095). The beasts encircle the tree: φυτὼν ... θῆρες ἐκκυκλώσαντο (44.60-1); in Euripides Agave enjoins the Bacchantes to encircle the tree: περιστάσαι κύκλῳ/πτόρθων λάβεσθε (1105-6). The beasts try to bring the tree down by levering up its roots: δενδρόν ἀπειλητήρι μετοχλίζοντες ὀδόντι, / τρηχαλέας γενύεσσι (44.62-3), which is precisely what the women try to do in Euripides: πίς ἀνεσπάρασσον ἀσυδήρας μοχλαῖς (1104). The beasts tear the fallen Pentheus to pieces in a manner which fairly accurately anticipates the actual sparagmos at 46.209-20, with the lioness biting off his head, presenting it to Cadmus and saying in a human voice that she is Agave. Telling him that she has just slain a lion, she asks him to receive the head as the firstfruits of her strength and to hang it up for a trophy: λεοντοφόνοι δὲ νίκης / δέχυσο τοῦτο κάρπουν ἐμῆς πρωτάγμοι νικής / ... σὺ δὲ σύμβολα παιδὸς 'Αγαύης / Ἀριστοτόπου νεοὺ προπάραθε μελάθρου (44.74-9). These words recall Agave's in Euripides: αἰρέσθω λαβῶν / τηκτῶν πρὸς οίκους κλιμάκων προσαμβάσεις, / ἡς πασσαλεύσῃ κράτα τριγλύφως τόδε / λέοντος δὲ πάρεμι θηράσασ' ἐγὼ (1212-5) and ἡ δ' ἐν ὀλέναις, ὡς ὀρὰς, τόδε / λαβῶνα τάριστεία, σοσία πρὸς δόμους / ὡς ἐν κρεμασθήν: σὺ δὲ πάτερ δέξαι χερῶν (1238-40). Agave's dream is thus an accurate précis of the sparagmos and its aftermath. Why Nonnus should present us with such an elaborate anticipation of the real event is difficult to gauge. One can only point to the even more elaborate anticipation of the Argonauts' voyage in the prophecy of Phineus in the second book of Apollonius (317-407).

Agave seeks to assuage her disquiet on waking by consulting Tiresias, who instructs that a bull be sacrificed to Zeus beside a tall tree on Μεστίαρε. The reference to the μηχεδανή ἐλάτη (44.87) contains a hint of its future role. A little later we are informed that Erinys buries the Attic knife at its roots (44.272-3)
further compounding its sinister associations. At the outset of the sparagmos scene
the tree is depicted once again in all its threatening majesty (46.150-1). As the bull
is slain, a jet of blood spouts toward Agave, staining her hands (44.106), which
provides yet another hint of the impending sparagmos. Two snakes, one male and
the other female, coil themselves around Cadmus and Harmonia. The snakes are
friendly, and the one which has attached itself to Cadmus licks his chin: μείλιχος
eιλικόεντι δράκων μιτρούμενος όλκῳ, / ... καὶ γλώσσα πέριξ λίχαζεν
ὑπήνην (44.109-11). This detail is borrowed from Euripides, who describes
snakes licking the chins of the Bacchantes (who use them as girdles): ἀφεσί.
cατεξώσαντο λιχμῶσιν γένυν (698, cf. also 767-8). The snakes are then turned
into stone, betokening the future role of Cadmus and Harmonia as stone snakes at
the head of the Illyrian gulf (46.364-7). Nonnus makes no mention of the
deleterious role that they will play as real snakes, a role that is forecast for them in
Euripides (1357-60).

Nonnus now resumes the depiction of miracles left off at 44.45. The endemic
nature of the Bacchic fervour is once again emphasized: οὖδὲ τις ἦν ἀχώρευτος
ἀνά πτώλων (44.125). The sacred precinct marking the site of Semele's wedding
chamber is covered with green vine-clusters: καὶ θάλαμον Σεμέλης χλοερῷ
σκιώσα κορύμβῳ / νυμφαίῳ σπινθήρῳ ἐτι πνείουτα κεραυνῶ /
αὐτοφυής ἐμέθυσσεν ἐλιξ εὐώδει καρπῷ (44.127-9). These lines are a
reminiscence of Dionysus' words in the Bacchae: ὁρῶ δὲ μητρὸς μνήμα τῆς
κεραυνίας / τόδ' ἐγγὺς οἴκων καὶ δόμων ἑρείπτα / τυφώμενα Δίου πυρὸς
ἐτι ζῶσαι φλόγα (6-8) ... ἀμπέλου δὲ νῦν / πέριξ ἑγὼ 'κάλυψα βοτρυώδει
χλόῃ (11-2). Euripides refers to the precinct again at a later stage in conjunction
with the miracles facilitating Dionysus' escape from custody, stating that the flames
appeared to be rekindled from the smouldering ashes (597-9, 623-4).

The miracles have the effect of arousing Pentheus' envy and suspicions, and he
orders his men to apprehend Dionysus and his followers. Nonnus seems now to
visualise Dionysus as he appears in Euripides, at the head not of a great army but a
small band of followers. Pentheus is, however, moved by envy for the newcomer,
and not, as in Euripides, out of concern for the welfare of the polis. Nonnus, as we
have noted already, is not prepared to ascribe to him any redeeming features. Pentheus appears to have forgotten the futility of his earlier attempt to apprehend Dionysus (44.25ff.) and launches a torrent of abuse against him (44.134-83) that is reminiscent of Typhoeus' speech (2.258ff.) and of the speeches of Deriades. The influence of Euripides is nevertheless discernible in several ways. Firstly, Dionysus is addressed as a θηλυκός ἀλῆτης (44.134) from Lydia, echoing Euripides' θηλύμορφος ξένος (353). At the same time we find a reference to the ἀμφιπόλους Βρομίου συνήλυσας (44.142), who appear to correspond to the chorus in the Bacchae, whom Dionysus calls his παρέδρος καὶ ξυνεμπόρος (57). So, despite all the miracles and portents that have occurred, Pentheus still sees Dionysus as no more than a mortal wanderer from Lydia, that is, exactly as he sees him in the Bacchae, where no such events have as yet taken place and where the god has purposely assumed a human disguise. In Euripides the mortal disguise is removed gradually, as the divine nature of Dionysus unfolds to the background of the miracles, with Pentheus realising that he is dealing with a god only just prior to his sparagmos (1069). Nonnus, by placing the miracles at the beginning and then having Pentheus still address Dionysus as a vagrant impostor, shows himself wholly insensitive to the gradual process whereby Dionysus reveals his divinity in Euripides. Other inconsistencies are apparent as well: Pentheus threatens to flog his aunt Autonoe (44.137-8), echoing his threat in the Bacchae to hunt down his aunts (228-30), but whereas there the aunts have already been smitten by Bacchic frenzy, in Nonnus they have yet to be seduced by the god (44.283ff.), a circumstance which renders the threat entirely unjustified at the present stage of developments. One idea is lifted almost verbatim from Euripides, namely Pentheus' threat to cut off Dionysus' hair: πλοκάμως τιμῆξωμεν ἀκροπικόμου Διονύσου (44.147), corresponding to πρῶτον μὲν ἁβρῶν βόστρυχον τεμό σέθεν (493). Pentheus threatens to strike Dionysus with his chthonian thunderbolt which he claims to be as devastating as that of Zeus, which had killed Semele (44.150-3). Nonnus classes Pentheus as an earthborn, an idea which is emphasized also in the Bacchae (Πενθεύς, ὃν Ἐχλών ἐφύτευσε χθόνος, / ἄγριωπον τέρας, οὐ φῶ- / ta

3 Cf. Deriades' boast at 27.89 of forcing the Cyclopes to make a thunderbolt for him so that he can become an earthly Zeus - Nonnus is rather fond of the idea of pretenders to Zeus' role as wielder of the thunderbolt.
βρότειον, φόνον δ’ ωστε γίγαντ’ ἀντίπαλον θεοῖς, 540-4, and τὸν ὄθεαν
ἀνομόν ἄθλουν Ἐχίνονος / τόκων γηγενὴ, 995-6). In the Bacchae, however,
these remarks are confined to the choral interludes, and at no point does Pentheus
act otherwise than as an ordinary mortal. In Nonnus, on the other hand, he assumes
the poses and bluster of a Typhoeus (especially 44.168ff.). Dionysus shall
experience the might of his chthonian spear: γνώσεται, ὄθον ἔχω χόνον δόρυ
(44.156). Pentheus then lists the ways in which he does not intend to kill him. He
will not cut off his head, οὐδὲ διατιμῆσω μέσον αὐχένος (44.160), which is
precisely what he does threaten to do in the Bacchae: παύσω κτυποῦντα θόρσων...
τράχηλον σώματος χωρίς τεμών (240-1), but will instead kill him with a
blow to the thigh ὅτι Δίος μεγάλοο γονήν ἐφεύρατο μηρῶν (44.162). The
end of Pentheus' tirade contains an extended and seemingly intentional echo of
Euripides, with Pentheus telling Dionysus in absentia: ἐλεγεν ὁ Ἑσελήν οὖκ
ἐφεύραν υἱαν ἐμός, / παίδες ἑξὶ δεῖ μωμον ἔδω ὅμοιν ἐφεύρει Κάδμος,
ἀστεροπην δ' ἐκάλεσε χαμαγενεὶς ἀπτόμενον πῦρ, / καὶ δαδων ὄντων
σέλας σπειθήρα κεραυνοῦ (44.180-3). The idea that Semele's pregnancy resulted
from an indiscretion with an ordinary mortal and that her relationship with Zeus and
death by lightning were a charade, concocted by Cadmus to save the family's
honour, is taken from Euripides, where Semele's sisters are described as
entertaining the same notion: Διόνυσον οὖκ ἔφασκον ἐκφύει Δίος, / Ἑσελῆν
δὲ νυμφεμεθέσαν ἐκ τησσοῦ τυν / εἰς Ζῆνν' ἀναφέρειν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν
λέχους, / Κάδμου σοφίσμαθ', ὄν νῦν ὄνεκα κτανεῖν / Ζῆνν' ἐξεκαυχώθ',
ὅτι γάμους ἐφεύσατο (27-31), of which a slightly different variant is later given
by Pentheus, who claims that Zeus killed both mother and unborn child, because
she had passed off her illicit union with a fellow mortal onto the god: δς
ἐκπυροῦται λαμπάσιν κεραυνίοις, / σὺν μητρί, Δίους ὅτι γάμους ἐφεύσατο
(244-5). Whereas Semele's sisters in the first passage point to Cadmus as party to
the affair, who on discovering Semele's indiscretion, induces her to make up the
story of her relationship with Zeus, a fabrication for which she pays with her life,
Pentheus notably does not implicate Cadmus in the matter. Nonnus, on the other
hand, places a more cynical explanation in Pentheus' mouth, according to which
there was no involvement of Zeus in the matter at all, either as lover or punisher, but Cadmus himself had kindled the flames to expunge the family’s shame, concocting at the same time the story about Zeus. We have here a rather uncharacteristic piece of realism on Nonnus’ part. It is of some interest to note that the sixth-century writer Malalas, bent on discrediting the Dionysus myth, even names the mortal, a Bocotian called Polymedon, who had fathered Semele’s child.4 In his later address to Dionysus (46.33-9) Pentheus no longer voices this extreme view.

When Pentheus has concluded his speech, his troops go in search of Dionysus, but, as on the previous occasion (44.23), their efforts come to naught κενεοίειν ἐρειδμαίνοντες αἵτας (44.185). Dionysus in the meantime seeks Selene’s aid in his struggle against Pentheus. It is difficult to understand why Dionysus, who in the previous book could fight Poseidon on his own, should have to request assistance from another god in order to overcome a mere mortal. Selene is not a goddess in the traditional sense, but a complex entity, Artemis-Hecate-Persephone, who also appears in the Orphic Argonautica (934-87). Dionysus’ speech to her is similar to the one he previously directed to that other multiform Orphic deity, Heracles Astrochiton, involving the same disjunctive form of address: εἰ σὺ πέλεις Ἐκάτη πολιαῶνυμος ... "Αρτεμίς εἰ σὺ πέλεις ἐλαφηβόλος ... εἰ δὲ σὺ Περσεφόνεια νεκυσός (44.193-204). The appeal to Selene is couched in Orphic terms, with Zagreus-Dionysus (44.213) pitted against Pentheus, a son of the Earth, whom Hera has armed as yet another Titan against that god. Dionysus still sees Hera as his enemy, notwithstanding the apparent reconciliation in book 35, when she breastfed Dionysus at Zeus’ bidding to cure him of his madness (35.319-35). The present conflict with Pentheus is meant to be viewed in the context of the primeval struggle between Zagreus and the Titans described earlier in the poem (6.174-99).

Selene tells Dionysus not to fear the race of weakling humans (44.223-4). She then draws attention to her other function besides that of regulating time, which is to instil madness into men, a function which she in fact shares with Dionysus: ἵσα δὲ Βάϊκχω / κολπανέω μανήσ ἑτέροφρονος (44.226-7). The partnership of

Dionysus and Selene is instrumental in bringing about Pentheus' madness later in the narrative (46.99-100). In Euripides, Dionysus fulfills that task himself, the personified Lyssa, to whom the chorus appeals at 977-81, being no more than an instrument at his disposal. Selene further encourages Dionysus by reminding him of his past exploits, of his victory over Deriades, and of how he turned the Tyrrhenian pirates into dolphins, a feat not previously described in the poem though briefly alluded to at 31.89-91. This exploit will be narrated at length by Tiresias as an example of Dionysus' power (45.103-68). Nonnus, with his already noted fondness for anticipation, supplies us with a short précis of the episode, placing it in the mouth of Selene (44.240-9).

The Furies now invade Pentheus' palace, a scene for which there is no precedent in Euripides and which contains further anticipations of Pentheus' eventual demise, such as the placing of the Attic knife, which had been used in the murder of Itylus, at the roots of the tall pine on Cithaeron (44.272-3) and the drenching of Agave's rooms with water from the Styx (44.262). Dionysus then enters the palace himself, to instil Bacchic frenzy into Autonoe, to whom he tells the seemingly absurd story that Actaeon, far from being dead - the report of his death as a result of being attacked by his own hounds being merely a malicious fabrication of jealous herdsmen - has become the bridegroom of Artemis. If she wishes to see her son hunting beside Dionysus on Cithaeron, she has only to take herself there. The notion of the marriage of Artemis is most peculiar and recalls the boasts of Typhoeus earlier in the poem that he will make Artemis marry (2.305-6) and Athena become a mother (2.313). As we have noted previously, Nonnus is rather taken by the idea of the established order of things being turned topsy-turvy, and the present remarks may be taken to be a manifestation of it. Cadmus, in the knowledge that his grandson has become bridegroom of Artemis, is described as rejuvenated and celebrating on Cithaeron: χάρματι δ' ἡβίσκοι σέθεν ύπατο εἰνεκε νύμφησις / κωμάζει σέ Κάδμος ὀρεσσαύλῳ παρὰ παστῷ, / σεῖν ἰερίως αὐτοίς χιονώδεα χαίτη (44.306-8). The idea of Cadmus' rejuvenation is borrowed from his conversation with Tiresias in the Bacchae, which takes place as the two are about to set off for Cithaeron. Cadmus asks Tiresias: ποί δεῖ χορεύειν, ποί καθιστάναι πόδα / καὶ κράτα σείσαι πολιόν; (184-5), adding, ἐπιλειπόμεθα'
To which Tiresias replies: ταῦτα ἔμοι πάσχεις ἄρα, κἀ γὰρ ἡ βοῶ καταχειρήσω χροῖς (189-90).

Book 45 begins with Autonoe rushing off to Cithaeron accompanied by Agave, who likewise has been smitten with Bacchic fervour. Agave gives a boastful speech, in which the sparagmos is again foreshadowed: ἢν ἑθελήσω, καὶ γυμνάς παλάμησιν ὅλον Πενθῆ δαμάσσω, καὶ στρατηγὸν εὐσπλήν ἀτευχέλει χειρὶ δαξίω (45.10-2). She is rejoicing here in her newly acquired strength, but her boast of overcoming Pentheus has an ominous ring to it. She renounces her erstwhile aversion towards Dionysus: οὐκέτι βοτρυκέντος ἀναίνομαι ὀργία βάκχου, οὐκέτι Βασσαρίδων στυγέω χορόν (45.25-6). Thus we are now at the stage of the story at which the action commences in the Bacchae, and Nonnus will henceforth be following Euripides closely. Agave concludes her speech, remarking that she is forsaking Athena's yarn for Artemis' nets: ἐσσομαι ὡκυπέδιλος, ὃμηλυδος ἱσχειρής / δίκτυα κουφίζουσα, καὶ οὐ κλωστήρας 'Αθήνης (45.29-30), which corresponds in substance to her remark to Cadmus, when she returns with Pentheus' head in the Bacchae: τάς παρ' ἱστοῖς ἐκλυτόνσα κερκίδας / εἰς μείζον ἡκα, θήρας ἀγρεύειν χερόιν (1236-7).

Next follows a brief segment describing the festivities on Cithaeron. Nonnus has moved perceptibly closer to Euripides by depicting the participants exclusively as women. A maiden stung by Bacchic fervour leaves her chamber for Cithaeron, abandoning Athena's spindle: καὶ τῆς ἄνοιστρηθείσα / ... κοῦρ ... διέσυντο παρθενείνοις, κερκίδα καλλεύσασα καὶ ἱστοτέλειαν 'Αθήνην (45.47-9). This bears a verbal similarity to Euripides' θηλυγενής ὀχλός / ἀφ' ἱστῶν παρὰ κερκίδων τ' / ἱστρηθεῖσα Διονύσῳ (117-9). That Nonnus must have had Euripides' first choral ode before him when he composed the above lines is borne out by other echoes as well, cf. εἰς ὅρος (116 / 45.46); the specific mention of αὐλὸς (45.43) and κτύπος... βοεῖν (45.44), corresponding with βυρρότοιον κύκλωμα (124) and αὐλῶν πνεύματι (127-8), was probably inspired by Euripides' explanation of how the two instruments came to be used at Bacchic feasts (120-9). The female gender of the celebrants is again emphasized at the end of the passage: μίσχετο Βασσαρίδεσσι καὶ 'Αοιν έπλετο βάκχη (45.51).
The statement appears also to echo Euripides’ distinction between the Ἄσιάδες Βάκχαι (1168), the fifteen Lydian women forming the chorus, and the Βάκχαι Καδμεία (1160) or Theban converts to the Bacchic religion. In Euripides only the latter revel on Cithaeron, the Lydian chorus remaining in Thebes.

Tiresias is next described building an altar and sacrificing to ἀλεξηκάκω Διονύσῳ, but his effort is in vain as the Fates have already wove their thread (45.52-5). This detail yet again foreshadows Pentheus’ demise. From 45.56, at which point Tiresias invites Cadmus to worship Dionysus, the correspondence with the Bacchae, properly speaking, begins. Cadmus, decked out in Bacchic regalia, dances with heavy foot: βριθομένως δὲ πόδεσσι γέρων ὑφιστάτω Κάδμος / στέφασ ’Αμινώς χιομάδει βάστριχα κίασοί (45.58-9). The second line is an echo of Tiresias’ words στέφανον τε κράτα κισσίνως βλαστήμασι (177) and perhaps, by association, of the chorus’ στέφετε λευκώτσιον πλοκάμων / μιλλοῖς (112-3), Nonnus having transferred the idea of whiteness from wool to hair. Nonnus conveys in narrative form what transpires in the dialogue between the two old men in the play, and succeeds in preserving to some degree the unmistakably comic tone of the original. Pentheus appears on the scene and expresses his revulsion at the old men’s behaviour. Nonnus passes over the first, monologue, portion of Pentheus’ speech (i.e. the segment from 215 to 247), the contents of which he will place in shortened form at the end of Pentheus’ address, and begins his rendering from the point at which the king catches sight of Cadmus and Tiresias. Pentheus pleads with Cadmus to remove the ivy from his hair and put down the fennel: Κάδμε, μαίνομένης ἀποκάθεω κισσόν ἑθείρης, / κάθεο καὶ νάρθηκα νοσπλανέος Διονύσου (45.67-8), echoing his plea in Euripides: οὐκ ἀποτινάξεις κισσόν; οὐκ ἔλευθεραν / θύρσου μεθήσεσις χείρ’, έμης μητρὸς πάτερ; (253-4). Pentheus enjoins Tiresias to do likewise, adding the remark: αἰδέομαι σέο γῆρας, ἀμετροβίων δὲ καὶ αὐτῶν / μάρτυρα σῶν ἐτέων πολλήν πλοκαμίδα γεραίρω (45.73-4), the first part of this statement being clearly modelled on Euripides’ ἀναίνομαι, πάτερ, / τὸ γῆρας ὑμῶν
Pentheus adds menaces to his request, telling the seer: εἰ μὴ γὰρ τὸ πλησίον δέσμιον ἀλκυστὸν κατεσφηγίσασα μελάθρῳ (45.75-7), echoing his threat in the play: εἰ μὴ σε γῆρας πολιῶν ἔξερρυετο, /καθὸ ἂν ἐν Βάκχαισι δέσμιος μέσας (258-9).

Nonnus' ἀλκυστὸν μελάθρῳ may have been prompted by Euripides' σκότιοι κνέφας (510), used of the stables where Pentheus has Dionysus imprisoned. Pentheus accuses Tiresias of having been swayed by promises of Lydian gold by Dionysus to make that impostor out to be a god through mendacious oracles (45.78-81), echoing similar recriminations of venality levelled by him against Tiresias in the play (255-7). Pentheus proceeds, through a series of suppositions and denials, with an imaginary interlocutor, to probe the reasons behind Tiresias' siding with Dionysus. Firstly he repeats his imaginary interlocutor's suggestion that Tiresias' commitment to Dionysus stems from the latter's having invented the vine: ἀλλ' ἐρείς, ὅτι Βάκχος ἐποίησεν εὐρεν ὅπωρν (45.82). This suggestion reflects Tiresias' statement in the play: ὁ Σεμέλης γόνος / βότρυνος ἑγρόν πῶμ' ἀποίηκτο, / κειστηριάσατο / θυταῖς (278-80). Pentheus then counters by adducing that wine engenders moral laxity: οἶνος δε ἐθνοῦσας ἐφέλκεται εἰς Ἀφροδίτην, / εἰς φόνον ἀσταθέος νόον ἀνέρος οἶνος ἑγείρει (45.83-4). This statement accords with Pentheus' remarks in the play (221-5), but takes no account of Tiresias' celebrated refutation of the same: οὔχ οὐ διόνυσσι σωφρονεῖν ἀναγκάσει / γυναῖκας εἰς τὴν Κύπριν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ φύσει / τὸ σωφρονεῖν ἐνεστιν εἰς τὰ πάντα ' ἐδεί (314-6). Pentheus concludes by questioning Dionysus' claims to be a god, challenging him to fight with the aegis of Zeus (instead of the fawnskin) if, as he claims, he is the latter's son (αἰγίδα καὶ σὺ

---

5 The ἀλκυστὸν troubled earlier editors of the Bacchae. Porson suggested that it should be changed to αἰδόδιαμα. Nonnus quite obviously thought likewise, and his rendering was adduced by Hermann in support of Porson's emendation (though Hermann himself rejected it). Dodds finds no difficulty with ἀλκυστὸν provided it is read in conjunction with εἰσφορῶν, yielding the meaning 'it shrinks from seeing'.

6 The popular association of wine with Aphrodite is voiced later in the Bacchae by the Messenger, at the end of his account of the happenings on Cithaeron: οἶνον δὲ μὴ ἔρρυεν οὐκ ἔτσι ἔστιν Κύπρις / οὐδ' ἄλλα τερπόν οὐδὲν ἀνθρώποις ἔτε (773-4). Here the connexion appears to be presented in a positive light.
títaiwe teoú Krouidó a tockhós, 45.94, which recalls the earlier taunt of Poseidon: kai stereopíh kóphiçe kai aígía pállle tockhós, 43.178).

Tiresias replies, commencing with a reaffirmation of the second birth of Dionysus from Zeus' thigh, this being all that Nonnus retains of Euripides' attempted rationalization of this event through the mouth of Tiresias. Dionysus is then coupled with Demeter: óntos ámalloikóiv Dímíteri moúdos érizei / ántítyhpov staxwésaiv éxωm evbortwv òpórewv (45.101-2). The same association is made by Tiresias in the play: δοκ γάρ, ὃ νεανία, / τά πρῶτ' ἐν ἀνθρώποις: .... δς δ' ἡλθ' ἐπειτ' ἀντίπαλον ὁ Σεμέλης γόνος .... ὅ παυεί τούς ταλαιπώρους βροτούς / λύπης, ὅταν πλησίωσιν ἄμπελου ροής (274-81). Tiresias now tells Pentheus two cautionary tales illustrative of Dionysus' powers, in order to dissuade him from opposing the god. The first of the two, the story of the metamorphosis of the Tyrrenian pirates into dolphins, was one of long-standing popularity, judging from the number of renderings of it that have come down to us. The three principal extant poetic versions of it are those in the Homeric hymn to Dionysus (59 lines), Ovid's Metamorphoses (3.582-691, i.e. 109 lines) and the present passage (45.103-68, i.e. 66 lines). The story appears briefly in the prologue of Euripides' Cyclops, but the Bacchae contains no allusion to it. Another brief version is found in Seneca's Oedipus (449-66). Proponents of the Ovidian hypothesis, notably D'Ippolito, have expressed the belief that Nonnus was influenced by Ovid's version, a belief that James has shown to be based on an erroneous premise. The premise, which D'Ippolito accepts without qualification, stems from Keydell's assumption that in both Ovid and Nonnus the story is told in the context of a warning to Pentheus. James has pointed out that this assumption is in Ovid's case quite untenable, there being nothing in his version to suggest that Acoetes, the narrator of the story, meant it to serve as a warning to Pentheus. The misconception that Acoetes tells the story to Pentheus arises most likely from the fact that the passage in which it is presented immediately precedes that which recounts the death of Pentheus. By juxtaposing the two the poet simply wished to convey the idea that he who fails to take cognisance of the fates of those who oppose the power of a god will suffer the same fate. If there is a warning here,
it is a warning from the poet to his audience, a warning which the stories of both the pirates and Pentheus serve conjointly to illustrate, and not a warning directed by Acoetes to Pentheus. In Nonnus, on the other hand, Tiresias tells the story to Pentheus, specifically to caution him against resisting Dionysus. D'Ippolito\textsuperscript{8} adduces two putative verbal correspondences in the way that Nonnus and Ovid depict the pirates' demise: 
\[\text{έβακχευόντο ἃς λύσση / εἰς φόβου ολυπρήνειτες} (45.248) \text{and 'exsiluere viri, sive hoc insania fecit / sive timor' (3.670-1); } εἰσέτι κωμάζουσι καὶ ἐν ῥόδοις Διονύσῳ (44.248) \text{and 'inque chori ludunt speciem' (3.685). These correspondences, imprecise at best, amount to paltry evidence when compared with the precise and sustained parallels that Nonnus has with the \textit{Bacchae}. The situation here is analogous to that which we noted previously regarding Ovidian influence in the Chalcomeda-Morrheus episode, where parallels with Ovid were likewise minuscule compared with the extensive borrowings from Apollonius. To the Homeric hymn, on the other hand, Nonnus evinces an indebtedness of a rather more palpable kind. He follows the underlying theme of the hymn, the punishment of the pirates for their misdeeds, a theme entirely absent from Ovid's version, and indeed places Dionysus' punitive undertaking into even sharper focus. As James observes, "Nonnus' version reads like an interpretation of the hymn in this respect, an interpretation designed to show Dionysus in the best light".\textsuperscript{9} As the various correspondences between Nonnus and the Homeric hymn have been examined in detail by this author, it is not proposed to repeat them here.

The second cautionary tale, involving the confrontation between Dionysus and the giant Alpus, is connected to the first in that Alpus, like the Tyrrenian pirates, is a brigand, and like them operates in Sicily or its vicinity. The confrontation serves, at the same time, as yet another instance of the Olympian-chthonian opposition. Alpus is described as a υψινεφής περίμετρος ... υίὸς 'Αρούφης (45.195), that is to say, one akin to Typhoeus. In a previous reference to this story, Alpus is described as έχιδναίοις ἐκατόν κομώντα καρήνοις, / Ἡλίου ψαύοντα καὶ αὖ ἐρύοντα Σελήνην (25.239-40), a description matching the poet's earlier description of Typhoeus. Dionysus in defeating him is shown to have powers

\textsuperscript{8} (1964) pp. 176-7
\textsuperscript{9} (1975) p. 30
rivalling those of Zeus. Beaten by Dionysus, Alpus falls ἡμιθανής into the bay, as a result of which the sea-level rises, cooling the scorched body of his brother Typhoeus (45.211-3). The fire-water opposition, a recurrent motif in the poem, finds yet another echo here. Tiresias concludes his speech, cautioning Pentheus to heed these examples, lest the same fate befall him (45.214-5).

After this diversion Nonnus returns to his close dependence on the Bacchae. Pentheus, unconvinced by Tiresias' examples, orders his men to bring back Dionysus in chains: στείχοντες ἐν ἄστει καὶ μέσον ύλης / ἀξιεί μοι βαρύδεσμον ἀνάκαυτον ἀλήτην, / ὅφα τυπελός Πεινηθός ἀμοιβαίασιν ἰμάσθλαισ / μηκέτι φαρμακόντει ποτῶ θέλξει γυναικὰς, / ἄλλα γόνι κλίνειεν (45.220-4), which corresponds to his order in Euripides: οἱ δ᾽ ἀνὰ πόλιν στείχοντες ἔξιχνεύσατε / τὸν θηλύμορφον ξένον, ὅς εἰσφέρει νόσον / καυνὴ γυναικὶ καὶ λέχη λυμαίνεται (352-4). Pentheus' remarks are similar to those he made in his previous speech (44.135ff.), when he had likewise ordered Dionysus to be apprehended. This time Pentheus' men make contact with Dionysus, but the latter, unlike his reaction in the Bacchae, where he delivers himself to his captors, proves to be an elusive quarry. He foils Pentheus' soldiers by assuming the identity of one of them and seizes a bull by its horns, calling out to Pentheus (who, it appears, accompanied his men) that the bull is Dionysus and should be shackled (45.239-51). Pentheus orders that the animal be bound, but then proceeds to perform the task himself: εἶπε καὶ ἀγραύλοιο πόδας ταύροι πιέζων / σφίγγεν ἀλυκτόπεδον: λαβών δὲ μν αὐτὶ Δυαίου / ἤγαγεν ἵππεις πεπεδημένον ἐγγύθη φάτνης, / ὡς Σεμέλης θραύσην υἷα καὶ οὐ τινα ταύρον ἐξέγυω (45.262-5). This idea is taken from Euripides, from the scene in which Dionysus makes good his escape from Pentheus' stables. There the Lydian, explaining to the choir how he had escaped, says that the king had tied up a bull thinking that it was he: ταύτα καὶ καθύβρια αὐτὸν, ὃν μὲ δεσμεύειν δοκόν / οὔτ᾽ ἐθνεγεν οὐθ᾽ ἡμαθ᾽ ἡμῶν, ἐλπίσαι δ᾽ ἐβόσκετο. / πρὸς φάτναις δὲ ταύρον εύρων, οὐ καθείρζ᾽ ἡμαίς ἄγων, / τῷδε περὶ βρόχους ἐβάλλε γόνας καὶ χηλαίς ποδῶν (616-9). Pentheus had previously ordered Dionysus to be imprisoned in the stables: καθείρζατ᾽ αὐτὸν ἵπποις πέλας /
φάτνασιν, ὡς ἀν σκότιον εἰσορᾷ κνέφας (509-10). Nonnus continues, saying that the Bacchantes were likewise bound by the king and confined in a dungeon described as Κιμμέριων μίμημα δυσέκβατον, ἀμμοῦ οὐδος (45.269). This rather fanciful description, which seems to echo the reference to the Cimmerians in the Orphic Argonautica, Κιμμέριοι ... οἷς τε μοῦν τε / αἰγλῆς ἀμμοῦ εἰσα πυριδρόμου ἡλίου (1120-2), answers to Euripides' σκότον κνέφας, the idea of darkness being transferred from the stables to the women's place of confinement. The women thus imprisoned must correspond to those whom Pentheus in the Bacchae has succeeded in apprehending (διος μὲν οὖν ἐλήφα, δεσμίους χέρας / σφιγύσαν παιδήμους πρόπτολοι στέγαις, 226-7), and who are reported by the θεράπων, who brings the captured Dionysus to the king, to have escaped in a miraculous way: ὡς δ’ αὐ σὺ βάκχας εἰρέας, ὡς συνήρπασας / κάθησας ἐν δεσμοῖς παιδήμου στέγης, / φρούδαι γ’ ἐκεῖναι λειμέναι πρὸς οργάδας / σκιρτῶι Βρόμου ἀνακαλούμεναι θεόν / αὐτόματα δ’ αὐταῖς δεσμὰ διελύθη ποδών, / κληδεῖς τ’ ἀνήκαν θύρετρ’ ἄνευ θυτῆς χερὸς (443-8). Nonnus' women escape with similar ease: θυελλήσσα δὲ βάκχη / ... ἀρραγεῖν ἀνέκοπτε παλάλλυτον ὅλκον ἵμαντων, / ... χαλκοβαρῆς σφριγώσα ποδῶν ἐσχίζετο σειρή. / καὶ δόμον ἀχλυόεντα θεόσυντος ἐστεφεν αἰγλῆ / Βασσαρίδων ζοφεροῦ καταστάξουσα μελάθρου / καὶ σκοτίου πυλεών ἀνεπτύσσουσοι βερέθρου / αὐτόματοι (45.274-83).

The idea of fetters falling away from the captives' hands and feet derives from the Homeric hymn to Dionysus, which tells of the pirates' vain efforts to tie up the god: τὸν δ’ οὐκ ἐσχανε δεσμά, λύνοι δ’ ἀπὸ τηλός ἐπιπτον / χειρῶν ἴδε ποδῶν (13-4). Nonnus does not convey the idea exactly, since his Bacchantes actually break the chains, though they do this effortlessly. As at 44.21, αὐτόματοι is applied to the gates. The θεόσυντος αἰγλῆ indicates the spiritual presence of the god. We may recall that the gloomy lightless chamber, in which Ino hid the infant Dionysus on Hermes' instructions, was likewise lit by the luminescence emanating from the child's visage (9.103-6), a passage which the poet later reuses in the Paraphrase (1.11-3) to render the evangelist's καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ φαίνει (Joh. 1.5). The same idea is used metaphorically in the case of Tectaphus'
dungeon, which is lit by the visit of his daughter, who is described as ὁρφανῖα γενετήρι φαεσφόρος (26.136).

Nonnus now proceeds to give his version of the women's activities on Cithaeron (45.285-322), corresponding to Bacchae 660-774. Nonnus' description does not include the attempt by the herdsmen, one of whom is conveying the account to Pentheus as the Messenger, to apprehend Agave. He begins his version with the slaughter of a herd of bulls and the rending of a flock of sheep (45.287-93). The incident corresponds to the slaughter of the cattle tended by the herdsmen in Euripides, who have themselves barely escaped a similar fate after their unsuccessful attempt to capture Agave. Nonnus presents a slightly more detailed version of the sparagmos of the cattle at 43.40-51, in the context of the Dionysus-Poseidon confrontation. Both passages are indebted to Euripides, as the following correspondences indicate: the ἡμιβανής δὲ ὑπτυλος αὐτοκύλιστος ὑπώκλασε ταῦρος ἀροῦρη (43.46-7) corresponds in idea to ταῦροι δ' ὑβρισται κεῖς κέρας θυμοῖμενοι το πρόσθεν, ἐσφάλλοντο πρὸς γαῖν δέμας (743-4); ἄλλη πλευρὸν ἐτεμνεν δλον βοῶς (43.46) recalls εἴδες δ' ἄν ὅ πλευρ' ἢ δίχηλον ἐμβασιν ἢ ἐπτόμεν' ἀνε τε καὶ κάτω (740-1). Nonnus does not forget the hooves, saying that another Bacchante πολυστροφάλυγγι δὲ ῥιὴ / ὅρθυν ἐσφαίρωσεν ἐς ἄρα δίζυγα χηλῆν (43.50-1). The verbal correspondences πλεύρ' - πλευρὸν, δίχηλον ἐμβασιν - δίζυγα χηλῆν, and ἐπτόμεν' - ῥιὴ warrant noting; the ἐσφαίρωσεν may be compared to διεσφαίριζε (1136), used in the sparagmos of Pentheus. The ταῦρος ὁ μὲν ἐφαπτομένη ῥάχιν ἐσχίσεν (43.42-3) and the ταυρεῖν ὄνυχας διασχίζουσα καλυτρην / τρηχαλέην (45.289-90) are probably inspired by Euripides' more colourful διεφοροῦντο σαρκὸς ἐνυπτά (746). At 45.290-3 sheep and goats are described undergoing a similar fate and the women ᾧ reddened with the blood of the slaughtered animals: ἐφοινίσσουσα δὲ λίθρου ἀιμαλέας λιβάδεσσι δαίζομένης ἀπὸ ποίμης (45.292-3). In Euripides, snakes are described as licking droplets of blood off the women's cheeks (767-8). This takes place not immediately following the sparagmos of the animals, which Nonnus takes to be the cause of the Bacchantes' defilement, but after their raid on
two villages, from which they make off with the villagers' children, repulsing an attack by the villagers, in which only the latter suffer casualties. Oranje, in his commentary on the *Bacchae*,\(^\text{10}\) believes that Nonnus either failed to understand or did not wish to acknowledge the sinister import of the Euripides passage, namely that the blood on the women's cheeks was that of the children whom they had abducted. What Oranje does not mention is that the blood could have been that of the villagers wounded or slain in the skirmish. Still, the fact that the bloodstains are described as being specifically on the women's faces seems to lend credibility to the supposition that they resulted from the ωμοφαγία of the abducted children.

Euripides appears to have been deliberately ambiguous here, possibly inserting the battle scene to provide the more squeamish in his audience with an alternative rationalization for the bloodstains. That ωμοφαγία of humans did indeed take place at such Bacchic rites is attested by the *Bassarica* (frag. 19 recto), and it is possible that Nonnus, who wished to portray Dionysus' sojourn on earth in terms of a civilizing mission, shied away from associating his hero with such horrific practices. We may recall with what revulsion he described the Nysian women's action of eating their offspring under Megaira's goad (21.105ff.), comparing them to Agave. His Bacchantes will not spill the blood of innocents; only the evil Penteus is destined suffer that fate. He imitates Euripides in that he has a Bacchant snatch a three-year-old child from its father and sit him on her shoulders without restraints of any kind: ἄλλη δὲ τριάτηρον ἀπαρπάξασα τοκής / ἄτρομον ἀστυφέλικτον ἀδέσμον ψόθεν ὑμῶν / λευτοτο κοιφίζουσα μεμηλώτα παιδα θυέλλας, / ἐγκυμενον γελόωντα καύ oυ πίπτοντα κοιη (45.294-7), corresponding to ἡρπαξον μὲν ἐκ δόμων τέκνα, / ὅπόσα δ' ἐπ' ὑμοίς ἔθεσαν, οὐ δεσμῶν ὑπὸ / προσεσχετ' οὖθ' ἐπιπτον εἰς μέλαν πέδου (754-6). Nonnus quashes any speculation as to the intentions of the woman, by introducing one of his recurrent breastfeeding scenes, with the Bacchante suckling the infant, her maiden breasts miraculously filled with milk (45.298-300). In Euripides too, the women give suck, but to animal cubs and for a very practical reason: having abandoned their own newborn, they need some way to dispose of their milk (699-702).

---

\(^{10}\) (1984) ad loc.
Nonnus now resumes the depiction of the miracles which had been taking place ever since Dionysus' arrival in Thebes, giving us a sequel to the happenings described at 44.2-45, 123-9. Dionysus sends forth a shout, roaring like a bull, that reaches the stars (45.332-4); we note that in Euripides, Dionysus speaks with a supernatural voice only as he is about to draw the Bacchantes' attention to Pentheus spying on them (1077-83), this being the moment when he abandons his mortal disguise to resume his divine persona. Whereas previously Pentheus' palace had been shaken, now the whole city is subjected to the same (45.326-8). A fire rages through the palace, but causes no damage (45.336-40). Nonnus, as we have had occasion to note previously, is rather fond of such magical fires, but this one is clearly inspired by the inextinguishable palace fire imagined by Pentheus in Euripides (622-6). In Nonnus, too, the fire resists all attempts to put it out by Pentheus' servants, who in their efforts to do so are described, with typically Nonnian exaggeration, as emptying out all the cisterns and the river itself (45.354-6). In Euripides the shaking of the palace and conflagration are, as already noted, a distraction to enable Dionysus to slip away; in Nonnus they have no purpose other than to astound Pentheus and his subjects. Euripides, with characteristic realism, treats the fire as a purely mental phenomenon, as an hallucination planted by Dionysus in the king's mind (ὅ δ' ὑς ἔσείτο, δῶματ' αἰθεσθαι δοκῶν, 624), akin to the λύσσα which is later to take hold of his mother Agave. While Euripides consigns the fire to the realm of the imagination, Nonnus presents it as one of a number of physical (albeit preternatural) events signalling the god's presence. Euripides sought to find a rationale for the miraculous events, which those affected by Bacchic fervour seem to have experienced, in the recesses of the mind. Nonnus, who composed his poem for readers conditioned by Orphic mystery religion and Christianity, both of which subscribed to miracles and miracle workers as an article of faith, had little reason to occupy himself with such concerns.

In Euripides, Dionysus escapes from the stables and confronts his erstwhile captor in front of the palace, where another dialogue (the previous one having been at 415-518, when he had been captured and brought before the king) takes place between the two, in the middle of which comes the herdsman's account of the happenings on Cithaeron. It is in the course of this dialogue that the king succumbs
to the persuasive power of Dionysus, who gains ascendancy over his mind through skilful manipulation of his latent voyeuristic tendencies. Pentheus, who was initially resolved to attack the Bacchantes with all his forces, is induced by Dionysus to first spy on their rituals. In the *Dionysiaca*, as we recall, Pentheus, tricked into believing the bull to be Dionysus (45.239ff.), has not succeeded in capturing him at all, but a dialogue nevertheless takes place, presumably in the palace. The μία ιδών ... παλανδρομον (46.6) seems to imply not only that Dionysus had been in the palace before - which he had, clandestinely, to instil Bacchic frenzy in Autonoe (44.278-82) - but that Pentheus was already personally acquainted with him, something of which there is no indication in the foregoing narrative. The only time Dionysus had previously spoken to Pentheus was, when disguised as one of his soldiers, he had misled him into apprehending the bull, but on that occasion Pentheus was of course not to know that he was being addressed by the god. Nonnus is simply duplicating a situation from the *Bacchae*: without taking into account the particular circumstances of his own narrative.

Pentheus, on seeing Dionysus, launches a tirade of insults, claiming that he is as deceitful as his mother Semele and warning him that, by incurring the wrath of Zeus, he is likely to suffer a fate similar to hers. He again voices the idea of collusion with Tiresias (cf. 45.78-81 and *Bacchae*: 255-7). Pentheus then proceeds to show, by means of a σύγκρισις of Semele with the other mortal loves of Zeus, such as Pasiphae and Europa, that Dionysus cannot be the son of Zeus. For it is absurd to assume that a god could be born from Zeus' thigh: ζευς γενέτης πότε φοῖβου ἡ 'Αρεά γείνατο μηροῖ; (46.41). The mockery of such a double birth was, it will be recalled, imputed by Tiresias to Pentheus in the *Bacchae*: καὶ καταγελάς νῦν, ὥς ἐνερράφη Διός μηροῖ; (286-7).

Dionysus replies with a σύγκρισις of the Celtic method of testing the authenticity of one's offspring in the waters of the Rhine and the test which he himself had undergone in the fire of Zeus' thunderbolt. The idea that the Celts would cast their newborn into the Rhine, on the assumption that a legitimate one would float but a bastard would drown, has already been referred to by the poet in a different context at 23.94-6. Here this water test is compared to the fire test undergone by Dionysus, with the latter being adjudged the more exacting. The
theme is yet another variant of the fire-water opposition, which, as we have noted, is a leitmotiv in the poem. Dionysus assures Pentheus that he, being a god, has no interest in usurping his throne: οὐ χατέω Πενθής ἐπιχωθείον μελάθρου / δῶμα Διωνύσου πέλει πατρίως αἰθήρ (46.63-4), the last remark having a distinctly Christian ring to it. Dionysus tells Pentheus that his very name is emblematic of the manner of his death: ἔθεντο προμάντεις οὐνόμα Μοῖραι / ἵμετέρου θανάτου προσγγελον (46.73-4). This detail, too, is taken from Euripides, from the first stichomythia between the king and Dionysus, where the latter makes the comment: ἐνθυστυχήσαι τοῦνοι ἔπιτηδείως εἶ (508). Then follows a restatement of the Olympian-chthonian opposition, with Dionysus predicting that he will vanquish Pentheus just as Zeus vanquished the earthborn giants (this theme, as we have noted, is also highlighted in the Bacchae, 264, 538-44, 995-6). A rather abrupt change of subject now occurs, with Dionysus proposing to Pentheus that he should dress up as a woman and spy on the Bacchantes on Cithaeron. There is no gradual build-up to this proposition, no subtle bringing out of the king's voyeuristic tendencies, to help overcome his initial resistance at having to don women's clothes, as in Euripides. Dionysus simply tells Pentheus to exchange his armour for female garments since it is futile to try to fight the Bacchantes (46.89-93). What Dionysus appears to suggest is that, since it is impossible to prevail over the Bacchantes by force of arms, Pentheus should spy on them instead. The idea of spying is introduced as it were out of the blue, as a preferred alternative to military intervention, without any prior indication that the king would be amenable to this course of action.

Pentheus is now driven completely insane through the combined efforts of Dionysus and Selene (46.97-105) and is found prancing through the streets of Thebes, making his way to Cithaeron decked out as a Bacchante (οὰ γυνὴ παῖζουσα χοροίτυπος, 46.120). In Euripides he is only dressed as a Bacchante and there is no indication that he makes a spectacle of himself as Nonnus would have him do. In Euripides his progressive dementia manifests itself through his remarks: καὶ μὴν ὅραν μοι δύο μὲν ἡλίους δοκῶ, / δισσάς δὲ Θήβας καὶ πόλισμ' ἐπιπάσττομον (918-9). Nonnus echoes this: καὶ διδόμους Φαέθοντας ἐδέρκετο καὶ δύο Θήβας (46.125), adding ἔλπετο δ' ἀκαμάτων ἐπικείμενον.
但他还说，欧里皮德斯的原句是：“彼曰：‘今吾已知此人为提坦巨神之子，即为其家族之族长的表亲。’” (945-6)。

故事即将进入高潮，随着Penethus和Dionysus的到来。The sparagmos of Penethus was apparently a popular set piece in antiquity and two other versions, beside those of Euripides and Nonnus, have come down to us, namely those of Theocritus (Id. 26) and Ovid (Met. 3.701-33). Ovid's version is appended to the story of the Tyrrhenian pirates, which is the main focus of his attention, providing as it does the example of metamorphosis. All the later versions are to varying degrees indebted to Euripides, that of Nonnus more so than the others. Nonnus does not appear to have used Theocritus or Ovid at all, concentrating solely on Euripides. He begins with a description of the scene, drawing special attention to the pine tree which Penethus will presently ascend. The tree is so tall that it overshadows the surrounding hills, which themselves are described as γυνεφεῖς (46.151); beneath it Cadmus had made his sacrifice to Zeus after Agave's dream (44.86-7), and at its roots Erinys had buried the Attic knife (44.272-3). Dionysus draws its top level with the ground, so as to enable Penethus to clamber on, and then lets it resume its vertical position. The use of repetition by Nonnus to depict the gradualness of the process of bending down the tree is conspicuously imitated from Euripides: ἀκρότατον δὲ κόρωμβον ἀφεῖδει χεῖρι πέζων / εἰς πέδου, εἰς πέδου ἀλκε (46.152-3), corresponding to: λαβῶν γὰρ ἐλάτης οὐραῖον ἄκρων κλάδου / κατήγειν, ἤγειν, ἤγειν εἰς μέλαν πέδου (1064-5). The Bacchantes are about to commence their dances (46.157-60), something not mentioned in Euripides, where the women are simply engaged ἐν τερπίνατι πόνοις (1053). In Theocritus, on the other hand, they are grouped in three companies of dance led by Autonoe, Agave and Ino (26.56), while, in Ovid they are engaged in singing (3.702-3). In Theocritus, as well as in Nonnus, the women pull up their robes (26.17 and 46.159 resp.), but, unlike Nonnus' version, they do so only when they are about to give chase to Penethus.

Nonnus' version alone has Agave addressing the Bacchantes and exhorting them to dance. She is described as foaming at the mouth: ἀφρόκόμοις στομάτεσσαι ἀπερροβόθησεν ἱωή (46.161). In Euripides she likewise foams at
the mouth, but only after she notices Pentheus and is about to attack him: ἢ δ᾽ ἀφρὸν ἐξεῖσα καὶ διαστρόφους / κόρας ἐλίσουσ’ (1122-3). As noted at a number of previous points, Nonnus has transposed a notion borrowed from Euripides into a less appropriate context: it is hard to imagine Agave in such a state of fury when she is as yet unaware of the presence of a spy. It is only as she is nearing the end of her address that she notices what she believes to be a lion sitting high up in the tree. In the Bacchae a voice from the sky, clearly that of Dionysus, draws the women’s attention to the spy in the tree: ἐκ δ’ αἰθέρος φωνή τις, ὡς μὲν εἰκάσαι / Δίονυσος ἀνεβόησεν (1077-8), which provides a dramatic introduction to the final horrific series of events. In Euripides Agave sees a beast in the tree which she later identifies as a lion (1215) and Nonnus has copied this detail. In Ovid she sees instead a boar roaming in the field (ille aper in nostris errat qui maximus agris, 3.714), and in Theocritus she sees Pentheus as himself, crouching under a bush on a high cliff (26.10-1).

Agave with superhuman strength uproots the tree (46.183-5). This contrasts with Euripides’ account (and also with Nonnus’ own anticipatory passage, 44.58-65), in which it presents a considerable obstacle to the besiegers, resisting the women’s efforts to lever it up by the roots. It is only when the Bacchantes bring their combined efforts to bear under Agave’s leadership that the tree is finally uprooted and Pentheus tumbles to the ground (1109-13). The actual sparagmos is described by all four poets with only minor discrepancies. In Euripides, Ovid and Nonnus, Pentheus pleads with his mother to spare him, but she neither recognises nor hears him. Only in Ovid and Nonnus does he appeal for help against Agave, in the former from Autonoë, who is asked to remember the fate of her own son Actaeon (3.720), in the latter from the hamadryads. In both Ovid and Nonnus, Pentheus then delivers a speech replete with all the rhetorical niceties, an extremely improbable feat in the circumstances. Pentheus concludes his address by beseeching Agave that, if he has to die, he would rather it be by her hand than the νόθας παλάμισσων of the Bacchantes (46.207-8). Why Pentheus should refer to the Bacchantes as νόθατι is somewhat puzzling when viewed in the context of Nonnus’ narrative alone. A glance at the Bacchae will resolve the difficulty, where we find that Pentheus refers to them in the same way: οὐκ ἔξεικνοῦμαι Μαινάδων δόσοις
νόθων (1060). We know from an earlier passage in the play why Pentheus should refer to the Bacchantes as 'sham': in his very first speech he chides them for having forsaken their homes for πλαστάισι βακχείασιν (218), alleging that the women have gone into the woods to give effect to their licentious impulses under the pretext (πρόφασιν, 224) of religious worship. In Nonnus' account Pentheus uses the notion without giving any prior indication why he should do so. The women assail Pentheus, tugging at his feet and right arm. Autonoe detaches his left arm, while Agave, placing her foot on his chest, cuts off his head with her thyrsus. In Euripides, Agave takes hold of Pentheus' left arm and, placing her foot on his chest, rips off his shoulder. Ino works on the other shoulder and Autonoe joins in the attack, followed by the rest of the women. Theocritus has Ino place her foot on his stomach and tear off a shoulder, while Agave takes the head (κεφαλὰν ... ἔλοισα, 26.20). Ovid has Autonoe tear off the left arm and Ino the right, while Agave severs the head and holds it by her fingers (avulsusumque caput digitis complexa, Met. 3.727). We may observe, that while details vary with each poet, two elements remain constant, namely that the mortal blow is in all cases delivered by Agave, and that (with the sole exception of Ovid's version) one of the women places her foot on Pentheus' chest, presumably to acquire the necessary leverage, before pulling off the limb. Gow in his commentary on Theocritus notes (ad loc.) that this was the common practice of warriors pulling their spear from a fallen enemy.

The return of Agave to Thebes with the head of Pentheus is depicted by Nonnus in a way reminiscent of Euripides. Agave, convinced that she has slain a lion, shows the head to Cadmus and says: Κάδμε μάκαρ, καλέω σε μακάρτερον (46.221), echoing her statement in Euripides: μακάριος γὰρ εἶ, / μακάριος, ἡμῶν τοιάδ' ἐξειργασμένων (1242-3). Nonnus, ever fond of synecrisis, makes Agave boast that even Artemis must envy her for killing a lion χερσάν ἄθωρηκτος (46.222), which echoes θήρας ἄγρεῦειν χερσάν (1237), uttered by Agave in the same context in Euripides. Nonnus appears to have forgotten that a few lines earlier he had Agave slay her quarry δέξει θύρω (46.216). Agave asks for Pentheus, so that she might display her trophy to him and arouse his jealousy (46.229-31). She makes the same request in the Bacchae (1255-8). She then orders
the servants to affix the head of Pentheus at the porch of Cadmus' house: παρὰ προπύλαια δὲ Κάδμου / πῆξατε τούτο κάρφων ἐμῆς ἀναθήματα νίκης (46.232-3). She gives the same order in Euripides: αἱρέσθω λαβὼν / πηκτῶν πρὸς οἶκους κλημάκων προσαμβάσεις, ὡς παπασαλέυῃ κράτα τριγλύφως τόδε / λέοντος ὅν πάρειμι θηράσσα’ ἐγὼ (1212-5). She finishes by holding aloft her φίλον βάρος (46.239), which corresponds to the ἄθλον βάρος (1216) used by Cadmus in referring to Pentheus' remains.

In Euripides, Cadmus, realizing that his daughter is deranged, undertakes a step by step psychotherapy, first subjecting her to a series of questions designed to test her perceptual faculties, and when satisfied that they are no longer impaired he asks her: τίνος πρόσωπον δὴτ’ ἐν ἀγκάλαις έχεις; (1277) to which Agave replies: λέοντος, ὡς γε ἐφασκόν αἰ θηρώμεναι (1278), but she no longer appears to speak with absolute certitude, needing to defer to the opinion of others for confirmation. Cadmus asks her to look again, and it is now that the true nature of the object she is holding begins to impinge on her consciousness: ἐὰ, τι λεύσσω; τί φέρομαι τὸδ’ ἐν χερσίν; (1280). It is only gradually that the full realization of her deed hits her (1285-95). In Nonnus, on the other hand, Cadmus simply addresses his daughter with a speech tinged with irony, which makes no allowance whatever for her disturbed state. In reply to Agave's request that he call Pentheus, Cadmus replies sarcastically πῶς καλέσω Πειθήα, τὸν ἐν παλάμησιν ἄθρεις; (46.250). Then turning to Dionysus he voices his bitterness: καλὰ ψέψεις, Διόνυσε, τεῷ θρεπτήρια Κάδμῳ (46.253), reflecting his complaint in the Bacchae: ὡς ο θεὸς ἡμᾶς ἐνδίκως μὲν, ἀλλ’ ἄγαν / Βρόμιος δ’ ἄναξ ἀπώλεσ’ οἰκεῖος γεγος (1249-50). The idea that Dionysus has acted with excessive severity against his kinsfolk has, clearly, been borrowed by Nonnus from Euripides. Cadmus bemoans the calamity that has overtaken his house and his uncertain future: εἰς τίνα φεύγω, / Πειθήας ὀλυμένου καὶ ὀξομένου Πολυδώρου; / τίς πόλις θεοὶ με βεβηκεται; (46.260-2). In Euripides, Cadmus is similarly resigned to the prospect of exile: νῦν δ’ ἐκ δόμων ἄθροις ἐκβεβλήσσωμαι / ὁ Κάδμος ὁ μέγας, ὡς τὸ Ἐνθαίων γένος / ἐστειρἀ καζήμησα κάλλιστον θέρος (1313-5), a bitter irony manifesting itself in the old
man's comment on his own fate and achievement.

Agave is, in Nonnus, restored to sanity by Dionysus on the completion of Cadmus' speech, out of respect for Cadmus' age and pity on hearing his groans: πολλὴν δὲ κόμην ἔδεσσατο Κάδμου / καὶ στοναχήν Δίονυσος ... / ... νόον μετέθηκεν Ἀγαύης, / καὶ πάλιν ἐμφρόνα θήκεν, ὅπως Πενθή γοής (46.268-71). Agave, restored to sanity, stands silent for a while, then realising what she has done succumbs to a paroxysm of lamentation and mourning, holding Dionysus responsible for her actions. She asks to be driven mad a second time: νηλείνις Δίονυσε, τεῖς ἀκόρητε γενέθλις, / δος προτέρυν ἐτί λύσσαν ἐμοὶ πάλιν ἄρτι γὰρ ἄλλην / χείρονα λύσσαν ἕχω πινυτόφρονα. δος μοι ἑκείνην / ἀφροσύνην, ἵνα θηρὰ τὸ δεύτερον νηα καλέσαω (46.283-6). The notion that Dionysus treated his own family cruelly is, as already mentioned, in Euripides. The idea that Agave would be better off remaining insane derives likewise from Euripides, from Cadmus' remark to Agave: φονῆσασαι μὲν οἱ ἐδράσατε, ἀλγῆσετ' ἄλγος δεινὸν' εἰ δὲ διὰ τέλους ἐν τῷ στ' ἀεὶ μενεῖτ' ἐν ὃ καθέστατε, / οὐκ εὐτυχοῦσαι δοκεῖτ' οὐχὶ δυστυχεῖν (1259-62). The remainder of the speech is of the nature of a syncrisis, with Agave comparing her situation to Autonoe's, much in the manner in which Deriades' daughters compared one another's misfortunes (40.113ff.). She remarks how fortunate Autonoe is in not having killed her own son: ὠλβη Αὐτονόη βαρυδάκρυος, ὅτι θανόντα / ἔστενεν Ἀκταίωνα, καὶ οὐ κτάνεν υὲα μήτηρ (46.289-90). Then, in contradiction to Pentheus' last wish that better his mother slay him than the other Bacchantes (46.207-8), she wishes that some other Bacchante had been his slayer (46.306-7). She proceeds to exculpate herself as the unintended instrument of Dionysus' wrath, blaming the god for all that has transpired. She laments that Pentheus died unwedded and vows to build a tomb for him with her own hands, where she will deposit his headless body: τύμβον ἐγείρω / χερσίν ἑμαῖς ἀκάρπην ἐνικρύψασα κούρη / σὺν δέμας (46.315-7). Why the body should be buried headless, when Agave has all the while been holding the head, defies comprehension. Autonoe in her speech implies the direct opposite, when she says that instead of her son's head (ὑέος ὡτι καρήμου, 46.327) she has only antlers
to bury.

Autonoe's speech, by which she endeavours to console Agave, turns into a catalogue of her own woes, which she deems worse than those of her sister. Whereas Agave has her son's body, albeit dismembered, to bury, she had been left with nothing but the remains of a stag: μοῦνη δ' ἔδρακον υπά νόθον νέκυν, ἀλλοφυὴ δὲ καὶ στικτὴν καὶ ἀναυδὸν ἐκώκυν εἰκόνα μορφῆς, / καὶ μήτηρ ἐλάφου καὶ οὐκέτι παιδὸς ἀκούο (46.332-5). The lament over her son's conversion to a stag recalls Inachus' lament over Io's conversion to a heifer in Ovid (Met. 1.651-60). Ovid contrived a situation with unmistakably comic overtones, and although the same cannot be said of our poet's intention in the present case, Autonoe's predicament does resemble that of Inachus. Autonoe's exaggerated sense of grief over the long dead Actaion parallels Protonoe's wailing over the long dead Orontes in book 40: just as Protonoe wished to become a fountain to join Orontes who had become a river, so now Autonoe wishes to be made a stag so that she too could share Actaion's fate. She bids farewell to the pinetree (as if that were still standing) and to Cithaeron (46.344-5), echoing perhaps Agave's farewell to her home in the Bacchae (1368-9). Overall, the speech is characterised by an excessive bathos that detracts somewhat from the sense of tragedy demanded by the situation.

As Agave buries Pentheus, Dionysus, witnessing the desolation of Cadmus and his daughters, erases their anguish with sweet wine as he had done earlier for Botrys and Methe to help them overcome their grief on the death of Staphylus (19.16ff.). Nonnus has, in accordance with his usual practice, reused elements of the earlier passage, making the necessary changes in order to avoid literal repetition. Thus Βάκχος ἀναξ ἐλέασκα (46.357) takes the place of the metrically equivalent ὡς φαμένην ἐλέασκα (19.16) and πένθιμον ἐπηνυε γόγον παιήνοι μύθῳ (46.361) replaces the metrically identical καὶ στοναχὴν πρήνωε. Μέθῃ καὶ Βότρυς ἀνίην (19.21). We are not told how Dionysus appeared on the scene. In the play he is presumed to reappear in his divine persona during Agave's speech and then to address Cadmus and his daughter (as we now have it, the text resumes from about mid-way through Dionysus' speech). In Nonnus, Dionysus takes his leave fulfilling the prophecy referred at 44.115-8: 'Ἰλυρίην δ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἐς Ἑσπερίου χθόνα πόντου / Ἀμονίην λιπόπατριν ὁμόστολον ἦλικι Κάδμων /
άμφοτέρους πόμπευειν ἀλήμονας, οἷς χρόνος ἔρπων / ὑπασε πετρήσοσαν ἔχειν ὁμώδεα μορφήν (46.364-7). This corresponds to Dionysus' statement in the Bacchae: δράκων γενήσει μεταβαλῶν, δάμαρ τε σή / ἐκθηρησθείσα ὅφεος ἀλλάζει τύπον (1330-1), but, as Cadmus subsequently intimates, the couple will play a role far other than that of innocuous stone snakes, invading Greece as real snakes at the head of a barbarian host (1355-61). In Euripides, Cadmus remains in a state of absolute desolation, ending his speech with the words σοῦ δὲ παύσομαι / κακῶν ὁ τλήμων, σοῦ τὸν καταβάτην / Ἀχέροντα πλεύσας ἱσυχὸς γενήσομαι (1355-63). The Bacchae comes to an end in an atmosphere of hopelessness engendered by this crushing prediction. Nonnus, the dire omens at 44.35-45 and 45.326-9 notwithstanding, ends his version on a happier note, an ending which accords well with his emphasis on Dionysus' consolatory role.

We may now briefly recapitulate the observations made at various points during our discussion. Broadly speaking, three characteristics emerge. Firstly, Nonnus is heavily indebted to the Bacchae, not only for the contents of his narrative but also for minor details and artistic touches. At no point does his much touted dependence on Ovid exhibit a comparable degree of closeness. Secondly, Nonnus has wrought changes in the story, depicting Dionysus at all times as his divine self and not as a god masquerading as a mortal, as he appears in Euripides; his Dionysus is more benign than Euripides', and his Pentheus correspondingly more evil. In accordance with his differing conception of the two principal characters, he has made changes in the sequence of events as they occur in the Bacchae, changes which do not seem to have been well thought through, resulting in a number of inconsistencies. Thirdly, Nonnus' own peculiar predilections, in particular his obsession with the magical and marvellous, combined with his habitual use of rhetorical cliches, have left their imprint on his presentation.
Conclusion.

It is convenient to summarise the observations made in the foregoing chapters and to cite page references to where they may be located. First, so far as Nonnus’ imitation of preceding literature is concerned, it is apparent that although his coverage of literary works is quite broad, embracing much of Greek and possibly some of Latin literature, only a few select works are imitated on an extensive scale. In the Indian war books the poet is principally indebted to the Iliad, and to a lesser degree to the Odyssey and Apollonius' Argonautica (for the Odyssey cf. pp. 31-4, 95-6, 141; for Apollonius, pp. 117-9, 121-2). Pindar's influence is evidenced in the technique of 'narrative truncation' which is particularly apparent in the rather anticlimactic demise of Deriades in book 40 (pp. 37, 150), while that of Ovid is limited to a few select motifs drawn from the first half of his Metamorphoses (pp. 119-20). While the case for Ovidian influence may not have been conclusively proven, that for another Latin poet, Claudian, seems to be on a firmer footing (pp. 210-1). In his rendering of the Pentheus episode, Nonnus is as heavily indebted to Euripides' Bacchae as he is to Homer's Iliad in the books on the Indian war, his dependence being if anything even closer (pp. 230-2). As far as his imitation of Homer is concerned, we have noted that passages from the Iliad are often paraphrased and inserted with insufficient consideration given to ensuring that they are compatible with the particular circumstances portrayed in Nonnus' own narrative (for example, pp. 18, 67, 89, 126, 134, 162-3, 167). In imitating Homeric scenes concerned with specific activities, Nonnus is often remiss in matters of technical detail and generally unconcerned with verisimilitude (pp. 9, 18, 24, 88, 149, 158, 189). Homeric epithets are used rather freely by Nonnus as by other late poets. For instance, the epithet δολιχόσκολος, 'casting a long shadow', which is used exclusively to qualify 'spear' in the Iliad, is applied by Nonnus to various disparate objects, to Bacchic paraphernalia such as 'thysus', to parts of the body such as 'neck', to persons such as 'shepherd', and even to actions such
as 'a throw (of the discus)' (pp. 11, 174). A tendency to gloss the Homeric passages paraphrased is occasionally evidenced (90-1, 229). We noted also that, while Nonnus' imitation of Homer is closer and generally less innovative than that of other poets (pp. 154ff.), the tone of his narrative is the least Homeric of all the later imitators of Homer, being characterised by a distinctly parodic streak reminiscent of such works as the Batrachomyomachia and Ovid's Metamorphoses (pp. 42, 45). In adapting Homeric set pieces such as the Deception of Zeus and the Funeral Games, Nonnus shows a remarkable propensity to multiply characters and incidents and insert lengthy speeches (pp. 57, 104-5, 170), but he is distinctly averse to including dialogue similar to that found in the Iliad: the long speeches of his characters rarely elicit a reply, and when they do, the reply usually fails to address the concerns raised by the first speaker or does so only in passing (pp. 28-9, 110, 112, 131, 148). Regarding his imitation of the Bacchae, we have noted that Nonnus was unappreciative of the underlying pattern of cause and effect in the play and insensitive to Euripides' subtle psychological gradations (pp. 231, 252-4, 257).

A second feature which we have frequently noted is the very considerable amount of repetition and duplication in Nonnus' poem, ranging from the briefest of motifs, such as the fire-water (for example, p. 253), thyrsus-spindle (pp. 127, 242), wine-nectar (pp. 109-10) oppositions, and the superiority of Aphrodite's weapons over those of Ares (pp. 127-8), to whole parallel episodes, such as the stories of Nicaea and of Aura, of Ampelus and of Hymenaius, where the story-line is analogous and considerable reuse of descriptive elements is evidenced. It is remarkable that Nonnus extends his tendency to repetition to his borrowings from the Iliad, the repetitions ranging from short passages, such as the συνασπισμός (p.13), to whole episodes like the Δίς ἀπάτη (p. 104). From Euripides he imitates the sparagmos scene twice, firstly as Agave's dream and then the actual event (pp. 236, 255-6).

A third feature which comes to the reader's attention are the seemingly wanton contradictions and inconsistencies endemic to the narrative as a whole. We have already mentioned the sometimes inapposite duplication of details from the Iliad that do not match Nonnus' own narrative. This problem has elicited differing
explanations and responses from editors and commentators (p. 68 n.) Most
(notably Keydell, Collart and Vian) have tried to exculpate the poet, by attributing
the inconsistencies either to the unfinished state of the poem (Keydell, Collart and
their nineteenth century predecessors) or to our own misguided reading of the text
in assigning too literal a meaning the poet's statements, when the poet meant them
to be understood in a symbolic way only (Vian). An alternative view, proposed by
Livrea, is that inconsistency was an accepted stylistic trait among the late poets (he
cites Claudian and Colluthus as parallels), and that Nonnus simply made use of a
practice that gave precedence to achieving effect in the immediate context over
narrative consistency. The conversion or non-conversion of the Hydaspes into
wine is the most prominent example of such contradictions (pp. 31, 48-50, 67-8,
142, 152-3), which Keydell and Collart attribute to a previous draft that Nonnus
expunged in favour of a Homeric battle with the river, without, however, removing
all traces, and which Vian interprets as a metaphor for the subjugation of India. But
there are other blatant contradictions that cannot in any wise be explained away,
such as the portrayal of Morrheus simultaneously as the saviour of and traitor to his
country (pp. 147-8, 152) or the boast by Dionysus in book 43 that he had slain the
giants, though this event has not yet taken place, being described only in book 48
(p. 217). We have noted Keydell's and Collart's objections to the previous editors'
practice of transposing lines and passages to make the narrative more coherent and
logical, which they see as tantamount to tampering with the text as left by the poet
(pp. 183, 216-7).

A fourth aspect which strikes the reader is the conspicuousness of rhetorical set
pieces in the poem. While other poets made some attempt to assimilate them to the
poetic medium, Nonnus does little more than versify them, even retaining debating-
chamber rejoinders of the kind, \( \delta\alpha\lambda\alpha\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\omicron\omicron\lambda\upsilon \), \( \kappa\rho\upsilon\nu\omega\mu\epsilon\upsilon \) (p. 40). Too visible a use
of rhetorical devices deprives Nonnus' speeches of genuineness and pathos (p.
151). His version of the standard rhetorical battlefield horrors is so extreme in its
exaggerations as to verge on caricature (p. 73).

A fifth important feature to be noted are the numerous passages of a distinctly
Orphic coloration. We have noted that this feature, prominent in both the
Dionysiaca and the Paraphrase, is not merely ornamental, but seems, on the
contrary, indicative of a genuine commitment, on part of the poet, to some form of
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Orphic syncretism, to which he may have sought to assimilate the Christian gospels (pp. 61-2).

We may now quickly summarise other observations made in the course of this discussion. Nonnus is prone to certain verbal mannerisms, like the periphrasis ἀντικείμενος, κύκλος, νότον plus genitive of object depicted, the adjectives ἄγχυστος, γειτων (pp. 13, 146) and oxymoron (cf. pp. 21, 108). He likes epigrammatic quotations (p. 87, 144, 152). He is partial to depicting breastfeeding scenes of various sorts (p. 209); to the notions of a world turned topsy-turvy (pp. 226, 241), of gods taking unusual roles upon themselves (pp. 33-4) and of the dispossesssion of nymphs and hamadryads from their haunts (pp. 29, 157); to the idea of man learning from animals (pp. 51, 202); to the ideas of ravaged female beauty (p. 101), erotic dreams (p. 124) and failed sexual encounters (p. 65). He occasionally takes it on himself to explain natural phenomena, an idea derived from didactic poetry (p. 160). Along with other late writers he evinces a penchant for describing precious objects (pp. 10, 111, 229). Finally, a feature which commentators seem to have passed over are the repeated and clearly derogatory references to dark-skinned races, which appear to reflect the poet's personal views (p. 116).
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