Mystica Vannus Iacchi.

‘Tis thou, alone, who with thy Mistick Fan,
Work’st more than Wisdom, Art, or Nature can
To raise the sacred madness.’

Herrick.

Virgil in the first Georgic, at an early stage of his enquiry into the service of Ceres, enumerates first various heavy agricultural implements, the ‘ponderous strength of the plough-share,’ the ‘slow-rolling waggon[s] of the Eleusinian Mother,’ ‘hurdles’ and ‘harrows,’ and the ‘grievous weight of the mattock.’ Next he passes on to tell of the husbandman’s lighter gear.

Virga praeterea Celei vilisque supellex,
Arbuteae crates, et mystica vannus Iacchi.¹

The object of the following paper is to discuss three questions that arise out of Virgil’s statement.

1. The exact nature of the ‘fan,’ its shape and use.²
2. The precise sense in which the ‘fan’ is called ‘mystic.’
3. Classed as it is among the instruments of Ceres, how and why did the ‘fan’ pass into the service of Iacchus?

Virgil takes the fan, its mysticism and its connection with Iacchus as known; but, happily, by the time when Servius wrote his commentary (fourth century A.D.), the fan, and still more its mysticism, had become matter


² The ‘fan’ has been discussed by Blumner, Technologic, p. 8, and the processes of winnowing by Schrader, Real-lexicon, s.v. ‘Worfehn.’ To both of these authorities I owe many references, but neither appears to be aware that a ‘fan’ of substantially the same shape as that in use in classical days is in use to-day, nor do they accurately describe the method of its use. I should like to say at the outset that what is new in my discussion so far as it relates to the shape and use of the ‘fan,’ is entirely due to the kindness of Mr. Francis Darwin, to whom this paper owes its inception.
for antiquarian enquiry. His note, though somewhat confused, is the locus classicus on the fan and must be given in full at the outset.

The mystic fan of Iacchus, that is the sieve of the threshing-floor. He calls it the mystic fan of Iacchus, because the rites of Father Liber had reference to the purification of the soul, and men are purified in his mysteries as grain is purified by fans. It is because of this that Isis is said to have placed the limbs of Osiris, when they had been torn to pieces by Typhon, on a sieve, for Father Liber is the same person, he in whose mysteries the fan plays a part, because, as we said, it purifies souls. Whence also he is called Liber, because he liberates, and it is he who Orpheus said was torn asunder by the Giants. Some add that Father Liber was called by the Greeks Liknites. Moreover the fan is called by them liknon, in which he is currently said to be placed after he was born from his mother's womb. Others explain its being called 'mystic' by saying that the fan is a large wicker vessel in which peasants, because it was of large size, used to heap their first-fruits and consecrate it to Liber and Libera. Hence it is called 'mystic'.

Servius is mainly concerned to explain the mysticism of the 'fan.' This he does, after the fashion of his day, by noting all the current opinions (ἐνδοξά) that he happens to know and leaving the reader to sort them as best he may. All the portion of his commentary that relates to mysticism must stand over till our second enquiry is reached. For the present we have only to ask what Virgil and his commentator contribute to the solution of the initial problem.

1.—The exact nature of the fan, its shape and use.

From Virgil himself we learn only two things, (a) the 'fan' is an agricultural implement, (b) it is a light implement made of some wicker-work. The word itself 'fan' (vannus) of course implies that it was used for 'fan-ning,' i.e. in some way ventilating, exposing to, or causing wind. Our modern 'fan' is an instrument for causing wind, but as will later be seen (p. 311), the modern 'fan' is by no means coextensive in meaning with its earlier form 'fan.'

Turning to Servius: he defines the 'fan' at the outset as 'cribrum areale' the 'sieve of the threshing floor.' We shall find later that this is true, but by no means the whole truth; a sieve might be used as a 'fan' but every 'fan' was not necessarily a sieve. The function that sieve and 'fan' have in common is that they are both implements employed in the purifying of grain by winnowing. At the end of his commentary Servius impartially states another current opinion somewhat incompatible with the

---

The connotation of our modern 'fan' has been the source of much confusion; even Mr. Andrew Lang (Custom and Myth, p. 36) is led by it to conjecture that the use of the mystica vannus was a mode of raising a sacred wind 'analogous to that employed by the whirls of the turridum or bull-roarer. The same confusion prompted the charming lines by Herrick that stand at the head of this article. See also p. 312.
'sieve'-theory. According to this other view the fan is a large wicker vessel to contain first fruits. Finally (midway in his discussion) he states a fact all-important for our inquiry: the fan of the Latins is the same as the implement known among the Greeks as a liknon and this liknon gave to the Liber of the Greeks (i.e. to Dionysus) the title Liknites. Dionysus was called Liknites, 'He-of-the-liknon,' because on his birth he was placed in a liknon.

The substantial identity of vanus and liknon is of great importance. References in Latin authors to the vanus are few and scanty, whereas of the nature of the Greek liknon we have adequate evidence both in literature and art. Hence assuming for the moment that Servius is correct in identifying the two we shall best elucidate the vanus by examining the extant evidence as to the use and shape of the liknon.

(a) The liknon was used as a cradle.—This is definitely stated by Servius, and his statement is confirmed by earlier evidence both literary and monumental. The instance from literature may suffice. In the Homeric Hymn to Hermes we read

\[
\text{\'esu\mu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu\n
given in Fig. 2. In the coin of Nicaea to the left the child Dionysus is seated in or rather on a liknon; he has both hands raised; behind him is his emblem the thyrsos. In the coin of Hadriani, to the right, the child in the liknon wears a petasos, and is therefore certainly Hermes. The shape of the
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liknon on the two coins varies considerably, but both are obviously made of wicker-work and both have the characteristic shovel-like outline, high at one end and low at the other, a shape essential as will later be seen to the primary function of a liknon, and convenient though not absolutely necessary for a cradle.

Fig. 3.—Child in Liknon. (Terracotta Plaque.)

No handles are visible on the liknon of the coins, though in designs of so small size they might, even if supposed to exist, be omitted. That handles were not an integral part of the liknon is clear from the design in Fig. 3
from a terracotta plaque in the British Museum. This representation, the subject of which will be discussed later, is of special value because it is one of the rare cases in which we get a front view of a liknon. The high curved back and the shallow open front are well shown.

An excellent instance of the liknon as a cradle is given in the design in Fig. 4, the right end of a sarcophagus now in the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge. The liknon here is carried by its two handles, that to the left

![Child in Liknon](image-url)

being clearly in view. It is made of closely plaited wicker-work; the weaving is obviously too close to allow of the liknon being used as a sieve. The mystical intent of the scene will be discussed at a later stage of the argument (p. 323), but one point must be noted: the liknon contains not only a child but fruit. On the original three round fruits, probably apples, are clearly to be made out; in the photograph reproduced in Fig. 4 they are obscured. This brings us to the second point.

(b) The liknon is used as a basket for firstfruits. Servius, it will be remembered, said that this was one of the uses of the *vannus*. Hesychius

---

7 No. 11. From a photograph. The design has been frequently published before, but always from slightly inaccurate drawings.

8 No. 31. See Michaelis, *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain*, p. 252. Fig. 4 is from a photograph. The sarcophagus was found at Arvi on the South coast of Crete by Pashley and figured by him, though inadequately, in his *Travels in Crete*, ii. pp. 18-19. The design in Fig. 4 occurs also at the end of the Farnese sarcophagus (Gerhard, *Antike Bildwerke*, Pl. 111. 3); it may have been from the Farnese sarcophagus, Prof. Colvin suggests, that Raphael borrowed his design. In the Kestner Museum at Hanover there is a majolica plate on which the design in Fig. 4 is substantially reproduced. The two men carry the child in the liknon, but in the background a little Renaissance landscape is added. This interesting plate will it is hoped be published by Dr. Hans Graeven, who kindly drew my attention to it.
defining λείκνα says 'baskets in which they place the grain, for that is what they call wheaten crops.' The liknon in use as a basket for fruits frequently appears in Hellenistic reliefs. The design in Fig. 5 is from a relief\(^9\) in the Louvre Museum. A liknon piled high with fruits is carried on the head of a small boy. An old man—whether priest or peasant is uncertain—holds it behind and helps to balance a weight that looks too heavy for the child to support. Between them they are about to place it on the altar near which a priestess expects them. Hiding in the tree stem to the right a rabbit waits till the holy rite is accomplished and his turn comes. The liknon in this case seems to be of wood, not basket-work, but its form has all the essential points, i.e. the high raised back and low open front.

The liknon with firstfruits was not only brought to the altar, but also formally dedicated and set up in sanctuaries. This is clear from the design in Fig. 6, the upper portion of a Hellenistic relief in the Glyptothek at Munich.\(^10\) In the middle of a circular shrine surmounted by votive disks is

\(^{9}\) Schreiber, Hellen. Reliefsbilder, lx.

\(^{10}\) Schreiber, Hellen. Reliefsbilder, lxxx. This design, as regards erection of the liknon, does not stand alone. On a relief in Copenhagen in the Thorvaldsen Museum (Schreiber, lxix.) a liknon is seen erected on a similar structure; above it is a great goat's head, no doubt as a προβασκάνιον. In a relief in Vienna (Schreiber, xcviii) a liknon is represented as set up in much simpler fashion. It stands on a plain pillar; near it are masks, a lyre, and other Dionysiac gear. In an unpublished relief in the Campo Santo at Pisa the liknon is accompanied by a youth ringing a bell.
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a high erection crowned by a liknon containing a phallos, leaves, and fruits. From the pedestal which supports the liknon are suspended two bells, set there no doubt with prophylactic intent. The liknon in this case has no handles but is furnished with holes at the side. It is clearly open at the left end, as the grapes and leaves fall over.

![Fig. 6.—LIKNON ERECTED. (Hellenistic Relief in Munich.)](image)

This relief is of considerable importance, because it enables us to understand a reference to the liknon in Sophocles. In one of the fragments the following injunction is issued to, presumably, the craftsmen of Athens:

\[
\text{βατ' εἰς ὁδὸν δὴ πᾶς ὁ χειρόναξ λεως,}
\]

\[
\text{oι τὴν Δίως γοργώτιν Ἑργάνην στατοῖς}
\]

\[
\text{λίκνοισι προστρέπεσθε.}^{11}
\]

The Ergane worshipped with the service of liknai is, as I have elsewhere\(^{12}\) suggested, goddess of Ἐργα in the Hesiodic sense of tilled land, rather than of the needle and the loom, and even the 'craftsmen folk' worship her with her accustomed agricultural rites, with the offering of firstfruits in likna formally set up somewhat after the fashion of the liknon in Fig. 6. Of course in primitive days the likna would be set up in a simpler way, without the elaborate architectural surroundings.

So far then we have clearly established that the liknon was a basket of peculiar shape used as a cradle and for firstfruits. But the word liknon itself is evidence that both these uses are secondary. The word λικνoν is derived\(^{13}\) from a root which means to clean grain by winnowing. The

---

\(^{11}\) Soph. Frg. 724.

\(^{12}\) Cl. Rev. 1894, p. 270 f.

\(^{13}\) The etymology of λικνον is discussed later, p. 311.
question at once arises: have we any evidence that a basket such as that used for a cradle and for firstfruits was used for the actual operation of cleaning grain, and if so how?

Happily baskets of precisely the same shape as the liknon of the Greek monuments just discussed are still in use for winnowing, and the process, though almost obsolete owing to the introduction of winnowing machines, can still be seen.14

In Fig. 7 we have the side view of a winnowing basket now in the Fitzwilliam Museum. The side view is given that it may be compared with the liknon seen in profile in Figs. 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6. The comparison will show that the shapes are closely analogous.

In Fig. 8 the liknon is in use. The photograph was advisedly taken so as to show the winnowing basket in as nearly as possible the same position as the basket in Fig. 3. The basket in Fig. 3 has, as already observed, no handles, otherwise the analogy is seen to be very close.

The art of winnowing with this form of basket is difficult to describe

14 The 'fan' in Fig. 7 was obtained from France by Mr. Francis Darwin. It is now in the Ethnographical Department of the Fitzwilliam Museum Inv. E. 1903. 309. The shape is the same as that depicted by Millet in his ‘Winnower.’ Such fans are still in use to-day in Cambridge as baskets and are regularly imported. Mr. Darwin’s gardener, who is represented winnowing in Fig. 8, states that the ‘fans’ were in use for winnowing when he was a boy, but the art of winnowing with them is now only known to a few old men. At Skelwith Fold near Ambleside in Cumberland, Mr. Darwin tells me, a basket of slightly different shape is still made of thin laths of willow and used occasionally as a winnower. A specimen is now in the Fitzwilliam Museum together with the fan in Fig. 7.
and by no means easy to acquire. The winnower takes as much of grain and chaff-mixed as he can conveniently hold and supports the basket against the knee. He then jerks and shakes the basket so as to propel the chaff towards the shallow open end and gradually drives it all out, leaving the grain quite clean. The difficult art of the winnower consists in a peculiar knack in shaking the basket so as to eject the chaff and keep the grain. The beginner usually finds that he inverts the procedure. The wind plays no part whatever in this process. It can be carried on with success on a perfectly still day, but it is necessarily a somewhat tedious method and requires a highly skilled labourer.

It has been repeatedly noticed that the characteristic form of the liknon is that it is shovel-shaped, high at one end, low at the other. This is a foolish shape for a fruit-basket, but essential to the process described. The grain and chaff can be scooped up in the basket itself, the high back prevents the escape of the grain, the low wide open part facilitates the escape of the chaff. The handles are convenient though perhaps not quite indispensable.

The process described explains, I think, an illustration used by Aristotle.\(^\text{15}\)

\(^{15}\) Arist. Meteor., 308\(b\), 29. σεισμοὺς γενομένου σπιτάλας πλήθος λίθων ζωπτώ τῶν ἐν τοῖς λίκνοις αὐαβραττομένων.
He says ‘after an earthquake has taken place a number of stones came up to the surface like the things that are seethed up in likna.’ When the winnowing basket is agitated the chaff rises up and sprays over the shallow end. Liddell and Scott explain the passage as meaning the ‘scum left in sieves,’ but a liknon is not a sieve, and if it were it would offer no analogy. The object of the process is of course the complete elimination and abolition of the chaff. It is of this that Clement of Alexandria is thinking when he takes the liknon as a symbol of utter destruction: ‘let us then flee from convention . . . . it chokes a man, it turns him away from truth, it leads him away from life, it is a snare, it is a pit, it is a gulf of destruction, it is a liknon, an evil thing is convention.’ In Egypt, if we may trust Plutarch, winnowing was actually used as a method of utter destruction. In his discourse On Isis and Osiris he says on the authority of Manetho that in the dog days they used to burn men alive, whom they called Typhonians, and ‘their ashes they made away with by winnowing them and scattering them asunder.’ Hence to Christian writers the fan became the symbol not only of purification, but for the ungodly of perdition; but this symbolism is happily unknown in classical times.

Evidence both literary and monumental has clearly proved that the liknon was used as a basket for fruits and as a cradle in classical days. A basket of almost precisely the same form is, it has also been shown, used in many countries to-day for the purpose of winnowing. There is, therefore, practically no doubt that the liknon was actually used as a winnower among the Greeks. None the less, however, is it certain that the liknon was not the only or perhaps the most frequent implement employed.

The implement employed in Homeric days, or at least one of the implements, was of such a shape that an oar or rudder could be mistaken for it. Teiresias in Hades foretells to Odysseus what shall befall him after the slaying of the suitors; he is to go his way carrying with him a shapen oar or rudder till he comes to a land where men have no knowledge of sea-things, and a sign shall then be given to him where he is to abide. Teiresias thus instructs him:

The word translated ordinarily ‘winnowing-fan’ is not liknon but ἀθηρητλογός ‘chaff-destroyer.’ Such a word, suitable enough to the obscurity

---

16 Clem. Al. Protr. xii. 118. φύγωμεν οὖν τὴν συνθείαν . . . ἄχει τῶν ἀνθρώπων, τῆς ἀλθείας ἀποκρίτης, ἄφαιτη τίς ζωῆς, παγιά δικτύων, βραθρός δικτύων, βαθρὸς δικτύων, λίκνον δικτύου, κακοὶ ἡ συνθεία.
17 Plut. de Is. et Os. 73. 380 D: ζώνας ἀνθρώπου κατεκίματο παραγὰς, ὡς Μακεδὼν ἰστόρικε, Τυφυνέαν καλοῦντες, καὶ τὴν τέφραν αὐτῶν λιμωύτες ἡφάλαφος καὶ διάσπειρον.
19 Hom. Od. xi. 127.
20 Sophocles in the Acanthopæus called the winnowing fan ἀθηρητλογός ἀργανοῦ. The line is preserved by Eustathius ad Od. xi. 128. ἄθροι ἀθηρητλογοῦ ἀργανοῦ φέρων. The variant form makes it doubly clear that the name was a fanciful oracular epithet.
of an oracle, is obviously not one in common use; it is too cumbersome for daily handling; but none the less the main fact stands out clearly that it was an implement that could be carried over the shoulder, that roughly speaking it looked like an oar, and hence that it must be a thing perfectly distinct from the cradle-basket.

There was then a form of winnowing-fan similar in shape to an oar and oracularly called a ‘chaff-destroyer.’ What was its ordinary name and what do we know of its precise shape and method of use?

As to the shape of the winnower: Eustathius in commenting on the word ‘chaff-destroyer’ says that it is a shovel, and he adds that the analogy is explained by the fact that both the things compared are also called blade, the ‘oar’ is the blade of the sea, the ‘shovel the blade of the dry land.’ That the ‘chaff-destroyer’ was a shovel is also expressly stated by the Venetian scholiast, who says ‘ἀθηρολογούν (sic)’ with acute accent on the last syllable; it means the shovel (πτύου).

The ‘chaff-destroyer’ then is a form of shovel. Of the use of the shovel (πτύου) in winnowing we learn more from another Homeric passage. Hector lets fly an arrow against Menelaus, it strikes his corset and rebounds:

\[\text{ὁς δ' ὃτ' ἀπὸ πλατέος πτυόφιν μεγάλην κατ' ἀλώνιν θρόσκωσιν κύμαι μελανόχροσες ἢ ἐρέβινθοι πτοιῇ ὑπὸ λεγυρῇ καὶ λικμητήρος ἐρωῇ.}\]

Here clearly the shovel (πτύου) is used to toss up the grain against the wind; the wind is the natural winnower and man helps it by exposing the mixed seeds and husks for the wind to sift. It is a process wholly unlike that described in relation to the winnow-basket (λίκνον). This comes out yet more clearly in another Homeric simile:

\[\text{ὁς δ' ἀνέμος ἀχνας φορεῖ ιερὰς κατ' ἀλώνις ἀνδρῶν λικμωτῶν, ὡτε τε ξανθὴ Δημήτηρ κρίνῃ ἔπειγομένου ἀνέμου καρπῶν τε καὶ ἀχνας.}\]

Here the winnowing instrument, the πτύον or shovel, is not mentioned as an oar or rudder: the Greek ἐπετρός, Latin remus, our rudder all came from the same root. Oar and rudder seem at first not to have been clearly distinguished. See Schrader Reol-lexicon s.v. ‘Rudern.’ Odysseus with the oar or rudder is represented on two gems: see my Myths of the Odyssey Pl. 30 a and b.

\[\text{Eust. ad loc. τοῦτον δὲ οὗ δὲ οὐ γὰρ ἀναρρίττουσιν ἀλλὰ λικμητικοῦ ἀναβάλλοντος τὰ ἡλισφένα τοῦ καὶ εἰς τόπον ἐχθρησιμένον χειρὸς δακτύλων . . . διδ τῇ ἑκτὸς βασιλικοῦ θάρακας ἀποπλαγής τοῦ Ωἰστῶν ἔχει κατὰ τὴν ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ Ἐλευθέρων ἐπακοῦν συνδιανοεῖται βοληῖ, δόξαι ἣν ἀ ποτήρις μυκτερίζειν ἦς οὐν ἀπὸ ξύλης καὶ δυνατῶς λεγομένης χειρὸς εἰς ἀφειμένου τοῦ βέλους, κ.τ.λ. Schol. Ven. ad loc. πτυόφιν. πτύου, πτυον δὲ ἔστιν εν τῷ λατρεύων γεννήσαταν ἀναβάλλουσι χωρίζοντες τῶν ἄχρων . . . πῶς τὰς μὲν σιδηρὰ πτώσα, τὰ δὲ ξύλων καὶ πρὸς ἄκρις χειρὸς ἔχοντα οἰς καὶ τὴν γῆν μεταβάλλουσι καὶ τοὺς οὐσάμας ἀναρρίττουσι δρῦνακας φασί. Παρὰ δὲ Ἀστικοῖς πτῦα.}\]

21 An oar or rudder: the Greek ἐπετρός, Latin remus, our rudder all came from the same root. Oar and rudder seem at first not to have been clearly distinguished. See Schrader Reol-lexicon s.v. ‘Rudern.’ Odysseus with the oar or rudder is represented on two gems: see my Myths of the Odyssey Pl. 30 a and b.

22 Eust. ad Od. xi. 128, 1676. 49 ἐπετρολογόν, ὡς τοῦ πτύου, λικμητήροι τὸ τῶν ἄθερων ἀλθρευτικῶν.

23 Schol. Ven. ad Od. xi. 128 ἐπετρολογόν ἀμυτόνως δῆλοι δὲ τὸ πτύον. The scholiast goes on οἴ δὲ νεάττερο τῷ κίνητρῳ τῆς ἄθερας οὐκοται. I do not know exactly what he means by a κίνητρῳ, it must be some instrument for shaking the grain. Possibly οἴ νεάττεροι confused the liknon-basket with the shovel.


25 Il. v. 199. No scholia on this passage are extant.
but the process is clear. The grain is tossed up, exposed to the air and wind as the hay is with us in haymaking; the wind carries the chaff to a distance and the heavier grain falls short in a growing heap.\textsuperscript{25a}

The scholia on \textit{Iliad} xiii. 588 are instructive, if at first sight somewhat startling. Eustathius after praising the apposite elegance of the simile proceeds to explain πτυών. ‘It is not the kind (of shovel) with which they throw up earth but a winnowing sort for casting up threshed grain, and is shaped in the form of the fingers of a hand. . . . Hence the poet seems to be sniffing at the glancing of the arrow from the king’s corslet; conceived as importing the ineffective discharge from the hand of Helenos, as though the shaft were sent at random from a wooden hand that bore the like name.’

Eustathius, it is quite clear, holds that the \textit{ptyon} is in shape like a hand, though in his desire to emphasize the hand he confuses the metaphor. Homer is thinking of the swift vain glancing of the arrow from the corslet; he says and cares nothing for the shape of the thing from which it glances; but the over-subtlety of Eustathius is of great use to us, as it emphasizes the fact that he believed the \textit{ptyon} to be hand-shaped.

The Venetian scholiast confirms Eustathius, and adds a useful clue. He says a \textit{ptyon} is ‘that in which they threw up products of the threshing floor, clearing them from chaff.’ So far we should think that by a \textit{ptyon} was meant an ordinary shovel in which the grain was thrown. But his next remark shows that the \textit{ἐν, in}, means rather \textit{by} than strictly \textit{in}. ‘Some call those made of iron \textit{ptya}, but those made of wood and having the shape of a hand and with which they turn over earth\textsuperscript{25b} and throw up stalks of grain they call \textit{thrinakes}. But in Attica they are called \textit{ptya}.’

Ordinary implements were in Homer’s days not made of iron, so we may dismiss the iron \textit{πτυών} from the question. A thrinax, \textit{i.e.} a trident, or thing with three prongs, has some faint resemblance to the fingers of a hand, but a thrinax as we understand it, \textit{i.e.} a three-pronged fork, does not commend itself as the ideal winnower. Excellent for haymaking, it would obviously allow mixed chaff and grain to slip through before it was tossed against the wind.

\textsuperscript{25a} The process is very clearly explained in Xenophon’s \textit{Oeconomicus} xviii, but Xenophon does not name the implement used.

\textsuperscript{25b} Mr. Bosanquet points out that the words of the Venetian scholiast must have got misplaced; \textit{his ὅστις θην μεταβάλλωνεi} corresponds to the \textit{δι’ ὁτ θην ἀναρριστοῦσι} and must have belonged to \textit{σιδηρά}. To this day in Greece \textit{πτέα} (\textit{i.e.} \textit{φυαρά}) are used only for moving earth already dug and there is no such thing as a spade driven in with the foot.
Happily the difficulty, which from classical evidence alone would be well-nigh insuperable, is instantly solved by the witness of the winnowing implement in use to-day in Crete and elsewhere in Greece. In Fig. 9 we have a thrinax, and a glance at the illustration will show that it is neither fork nor shovel, but an ingenious blend of both. The specimen from which the drawing is made was bought by Mr. Bosanquet at Khandra, and is now in the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge. Mr. Bosanquet kindly tells me the name by which the instrument is now called was written down for him by his Greek foreman, who spells phonetically, as θυρνάκι. As pronounced by the Greek θυρνάκι is absolutely indistinguishable from θυρνάκτι which is therefore probably the form that would be given by the educated. θυρνάκι is of course θυρνάκτιον, the diminutive of θυρνάξ = θυρνάξ. The fondness of modern Greek for diminutives is well known. The operation in which the θυρνάκτι is used is known as ἄλλωττα, not áλλωτσσα. The gloss adds significantly, 'it was a corn shovel, with teeth, and was also called five-fingered: the which is a likmètèrion.' Wooden trinakos, a writer in the Anthology says, are the 'hands of field labourers,' and the five-pronged thrinax or trinax would of course present the closest analogy.

In fact so well established was the five-pronged form of the winnowing implement that Eustathius uses it as an illustration to explain other five-pronged instruments. Thus in commenting on the passage in the Iliad

---

28 Now in the Anthropological Department of the Fitzwilliam Museum. My grateful thanks are due to the Director, Byron Annette von Hügel, for his kind permission to publish the θυρνάκτι and to Miss Edith Crum for the accurate drawing reproduced in Fig. 9.

27 Since the above was written Mr. Bosanquet kindly tells me that not only in Crete but quite recently he has seen at Sicyon the process of winnowing with the θυρνάκτι. The forks there used were of two types: the home-made, usually 3-pronged, cut from a tree with twigs in that form, and the shop-made, usually a 4-pronged spade, and very 'hand-like,' cut from a plank.


30 Anth. Pal. vi. 104 καὶ τριάκασ ξελίνας χειρᾶς ἀργυρόπορων. Such a 'fan' Mr. Bernard Darwin kindly reminds me, points a comparison in the 'Arabian Nights.' In the 'Story of the Second Royal Mendicant,' Jarjarees appears 'in a most hideous shape with hands like winnowing forks.'
when at a banquet following after sacrifice Homer says: 'And by his side the young men were holding five-pronged forks'; he says: 'according to the ancients other people used three prongs for spitting which might be called *triobola.* The Cumaeans alone who were of *Æolic* race used *pempobola*; the word pempobolon is *Æolic* like the usage . . . . and this pempobolon in use among the Cumaeans resembles the fingers of a winnowing shovel or the teeth of a trident.'

The Cretan *θυρυάκι* looks to our modern eyes like a spade. But the spade, familiar though it is to us, is not, it would seem, a very primitive implement. A wooden spade will not penetrate hard earth. Until iron comes into general use, and even after with a people who work unshod, the ordinary method of digging is to break up the earth with a pick and then if need be shovel it away with a shovel. Our wooden spade is a combination of pick and shovel in one, but a wooden spade like the Cretan *θυρυάκι* is a shovel only, of no possible use for digging. For winnowing, however, it is an admirable instrument; the prongs help to penetrate into and pick up the mixed mass of stalks and grain, and the broad curved surface is an excellent shovel.

It is then I think abundantly clear that Eustathius believed the *ptyon* of Homer to be an instrument with either three or five prongs, and that this instrument was substantially the same as the Cretan *θυρυάκι*. We are so accustomed to associate the trident with the sea that it is a mental effort to transport it inland. Hesychius knew of the two uses; he defines *θρίναξ* as 'the *ptyon* of grain or the trident.' Whether the actual implement confused by the landsman with an oar had teeth like the Cretan *θυρυάκι* or was a simpler form of shovel with a long handle, it is of course impossible to determine, nor is it for the present discussion a matter of great importance.

It has been seen that the *λικνον* was 'set up' in the service of Athena goddess of tilth. The *ptyon* in like fashion was erected at harvest festivals, perhaps in token that the work was ended. It has been suggested by Mr. R. 0. Bosanquet (J.H.S. 1902, p. 389) that the trident implements carried by the procession of men in the remarkable steatite vase found at Hagia Triada near Phaestos are *θυρυάκια*, and that the whole scene depicted is a Harvest Home. Sig. Savignoni who published the vase (Monimenti dei Lincei, 1903, Tav. 1) believes the implement to be a weapon of war. After comparing the implements on the vase with the Palestine winnow-fork figured by Hastings (Dict. of the Bible, s.v. Agriculture) I believe Mr. Bosanquet's conjecture to be correct. In this case the supposed 'axe' tied to the 'winnow-forks' must be some form of sickle. I propose to return to this question at a later date, after examining extant forms of pre-historic sickles.
close of his harvest Idyll, in which the festival of Demeter, the Halaia, has been described, prays


Here the word usually rendered ‘fan’ is πτύον. The verb used for the operation of fixing or planting it is πάρνημι; the word used for setting up the liknon was it will be remembered ἵστον. The scholiast explains: ‘when they winnow and heap the grain up, they plant the πτύον in the middle, and deposit the θρίνακας, ὑπὸ τοῦ πτύου πεπλεγμένην.’

The liknon, it has been seen, was made of wicker-work, the ptyon of wood, and later of iron. In a fragment of the Proetus of Æschylus some one tells of

\[\text{Σιτουμενήν δύστην άθλινν φάβα, μέσακτα πλευρά πρὸς πτύοις πεπλεγμένην.}\]

The liknon would be no danger even to a dove, but a bird rashly feeding might easily be caught and crippled by such an instrument as the Cretan θυρνάκι.

The thrinax we may then take it was a form of ptyon; but all forms of the ptyon were assuredly not thrinakes. The word ptyon could be used of any instrument used to ‘throw off,’ to cast away impurities. The root of ptyon is probably onomatopoeic like our ‘spit.’ The shovel-shape was a convenient form for this purpose. But the shovel, though it took its name from this function of ‘throwing off,’ had other uses. It was used as a grain measure.

nowing as it takes place to-day in Teneriffe. The account, vouched for by Mr. Holford Bosanquet, F.R.S., is of special interest as showing that the planting of the πτύον is a custom still maintained in modern times and also because in Teneriffe, it appears, three forms of winnowing implements substantially identical with the θρίναξ the πτύον and the liknon are still employed. The process is described as follows. 1. Threshing takes place on a circular floor partly by hoofs of freshly shod ponies or of oxen, partly by a sledge studded with sharp stones—the straw is turned over with a wooden 3-pronged fork cut from twigs in that form. 2. Winnowing is performed with a prongless wooden spade. Thus where the Greek has one implement, the θρίναξ, the inhabitant of Teneriffe has two, the prongless πτύον for actual winnowing and the true θρίναξ for turning over and heaping together the masses of straw and grain over which the sledge or the line of horses go round and round. 3. On finishing his task with the prongless spade (πτύον) the winnower plants it in the centre of the heap of grain as a sign that his task is done. About this time or a little earlier the women set to work on the mixture of the grain and chaff which lies beside the main heap. They winnow the dregs of the threshing-floor in a basket which is to all intents and purposes a λίκνον except that it has no open side. The worker gives a rotatory motion to the contents and as they move round and round the difference of weight appears to the chaff, etc., which are then thrown out by the hand.

34 Theocr. Id. vii. 155. Schol. ἰδίων δὲ λικμῶνται καὶ σφαίρως τὸν πυρὸν κατὰ μέσον πηγνύοντα τὸ πτύον καὶ τὴν θρίναξαν κατέθετο. Τὴν δὲ αὐτίαν ἑπεξ ἐκ Τριπόλεμον. 35 Æsch. frg. 194 (ap. Athen. ix. 394a). 36 Αἰσχ. Μαγ. s. n. πτύον. παρὰ τοῦ πτύου, τὸ ἄποκταν καὶ ἀπορρίπτει τῶν καρπῶν τὸ ἔχυρα, τὸ δὲ πτύον σημαίνει τὸ ἀπορρίπτειν καὶ ἐκβαλλεῖν, ἔθελεν καὶ τὸ ἄποσταν.
Hesychius\(^{37}\) in explaining the word *diptyon* says: the Cyprians give this name to a measure, others say it is half a medimum. Obviously the Cyprian measure was twice the contents of a standard *ptyon*, a scoop or shovel; whereas a *thrinae* could never have been used as a measure.

The two instruments *thrinae* and *ptyon* are separately mentioned in the list of agricultural implements in the Edict of Diocletian.\(^{38}\) The *ptyon*, obviously the same as the earliest form *ptyon*, costs 12 denarii, the *thrinae* only 8. Both prices are so low that presumably both implements were of wood.\(^{39}\)

Bearing in mind that the *ptyon* is a scoop or shovel like its modern descendant the φτώπι, it is easy for us to see how it might be confused by lexicographers with the *liknon*-basket. The *liknon* indeed, if we may trust the *Etymologicum Magnum*, was called a *ptyon*, \(^{40}\) i.e. a small *ptyon*. 'The ancients,' the lexicographer adds, 'made the sons of their house sleep in *ptynia* for the sake of fertility.' The wooden corn-scoop, like the wicker winnowing basket, would be quite suitable for a cradle.

Although the *liknon* might easily be called *ptyon* from its shovel-shape, the cardinal distinction between the processes of winnowing by the two implements, the *liknon* and the *ptyon*, remains. With a *ptyon* you throw grain and chaff together into the air and they are separated either by the wind or by their own specific gravity. With a *liknon* you shake the mixture in the vessel itself; the chaff gradually escapes but the grain remains in the *liknon*. The processes have nothing in common except that they both seem to purify corn. The operation of throwing the grain is naturally best performed with a long-handled implement like the *thrinae*, the operation of shaking it needs either two handles or none at all. As regards the advantages of the two processes it is clear that the *throwing* of the grain is a more rough and ready, and much more rapid process, the shaking operation is tedious but thorough. If stalks have been left with the grain, the throwing operation is the only one practicable.

Besides these two methods of winnowing, the throwing and the shaking carried on respectively with the *ptyon* and the *liknon*, there remains a third

---

\(^{37}\) *Hesych. s.v. Σπτων. Κύπρου μέτρον. οί δὲ τὸ Χμιμέλιον.* In late Latin *rampus* is also a measure; see Ducange s.v.

\(^{38}\) *J.H.S. xi. 1890 p. 309.* In the Edict the word ἄλαβρα is given as the equivalent of *πτών.* ἄλαβρα is obviously the Latin *dolabra.* This looks as if the *πτών* of the inscription were more 'like the θηβιάς than an ordinary scoop; but clearly the two are distinguished.

\(^{39}\) In Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, s.v. *Agriculture*, two instruments are figured and said to be in use in Syria, which correspond very closely to the *πτών* and θηβιάς. One of them is a fork with four prongs, the other a shovel with a long handle. These two instruments are said to correspond to the two Hebrew words translated in our version of the Bible by fan and shovel; Isaiah xxx. 24, 'clean provender which hath been winnowed with the shovel and with the fan.' Unfortunately the Dictionary does not state any facts as to the provenance of the implements figured. Vogelstein, *Landwirtschaft in Palæstina*, p. 68, states that in Palestine a fork with three prongs is used for a preliminary single tossing, then a fork with seven prongs, and then a still finer implement; the final purification is effected by a sieve as in modern Greece.

\(^{40}\) *Etym. Mag. Λείκνον σημαίνει τὸ πτυόριον... καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἄρχαι ἐν τοῖς πτυορίοις ἐπολοῦν τοὺς οἰκείους νιόδες καθεύδειν, διὰ τὸ πολύγονον.*
method, that of cleansing through a sieve, *i.e.* a vessel the bottom of which is pierced by holes. Servius, it will be remembered, defined the *liknon* as a *cribrum areale*, a ‘sieve of the threshing floor.’ In the Edict of Diocletian already referred to (p. 307) there is a separate heading ‘concerning sieves.' Sieves are regarded as quite distinct from the *ptoion* and *thriuax.* Among the various sieves one is called ‘a sieve of the threshing floor made of hide,' and we learn to our surprise that it cost 250 denarii. The passing through a sieve was of course a more delicate process than the tossing up with the *ptynon.* Mr. Bosanquet kindly tells me that in Greece to-day, after the mixed grain and chaff has been winnowed by the men with the *θυρώνιον,* the women further cleanse it by passing it through a sieve. The sieve appears to be a very peculiar implement. In the stone-age pierced jars were used for sifting. The bottom of the sieve of modern Greece is not infrequently a pierced petroleum tin. The *koskinon* or round sieve is, Mr. Bosanquet says in use in every modern cottage and—an interesting point—it is used as a vessel for carrying as well as for sifting. At a modern Greek inn the feed of oats for your horse is often brought and rattled about before you in a *koskinon* to show that it is all good grain, no chaff; whereas, as Mr. Bosanquet reminds me, in an English stable corn is brought from the bin to the manger in a wooden tray with sloping sides open at one end, a vessel oddly like a *liknon.* A ‘fan’ of this tray-shape is, Dr. Haddon kindly tells me, used for winnowing by the agricultural peoples of the East Indian Archipelago.

The real distinction between *liknon* and sieve, a distinction overlooked by Servius, is that the liknon is open at one side. This is an impossible shape for a sieve, as the grain when rattled would fly out, but it is clear that either could be used to carry firstfruits. Hence the confusion of Servius.

The modern Greek uses then the *θυρώνιον,* a special form of *ptynon,* to throw his grain; he uses also the *koskinon* to cleanse it more completely. Of the use of the *liknon,* Mr. Bosanquet again kindly tells me, he can find no trace. It is indeed rare to find all three varieties of winnowing implements in use in one country. The only country known to me in which all three exist, though in different districts, is Finland.41

For more convenient comparison the winnowing implements of Finland are collected together in one illustration (Fig. 10).

In the right hand bottom corner of Fig. 10 is the winnow shovel used throughout Finland for the preliminary tossing of the grain. The shovel here figured is of wood; its blade is 28 cm. long, its handle 14 cm. The shovel was in use in the province of Savolak and is now in the Museum of the Institute at Mustiala.

The sieve immediately above the shovel is from the parish of Jorvis also in the province of Savolak. After the grain has been tossed and piled

---

41 The particulars as to Finnish methods of winnowing and the drawings reproduced in Fig. 10 were sent to Mr. Darwin by Prof. Grotenfelt, who most kindly allows me to make use of them. Three of the illustrations are figured in Prof. Grotenfelt's book on Finnish primitive methods of agriculture: *Det primitiva Fylodrubets Metoder i Finland.*
in a heap, a woman takes a sieve, places herself in the doorway, where there is a considerable draught, and shakes the sieve with some violence. The seeds of weeds, etc., fall through the sieve and the dust is blown away. Pieces of stalk, husks, lumps of earth and the like collect on the top of the grain, and the woman picks them off.

In West Finland this secondary purification is performed not by a sieve but by the vessel reproduced at the top of Fig. 10, obviously the same in form as the Greek liknon. The specimen here figured came from the parish of Sibbo in the province of Nyland and is now in the ethnographical Museum of Helsingfors. It is 0.9 inches long by 0.6 broad by 0.15 high. The bottom is ordinarily made of birch-bark, and the sides of aspen. The front, as shown in Fig. 10, hangs forward, the back is vertical. It is furnished with handles at the side like the liknon. A woman takes the vessel, fills it with grain, and shakes it; the dust is blown away, and bits of straw and husks, etc., slide off over the front edge. In some parishes the grain is emptied from this vessel into a sieve, to be purified.

Here it is seen very clearly that for sieve and liknon alike the operation is one of shaking, but the method of escape of the impurities is different.

These Finnish methods of winnowing, combining as they do all three implements, the ptyon or shovel, the liknon or basket, the koskinon or sieve, enable us to understand the confusion of all three by the lexicographers; and Suidas is no longer obscure, though certainly inaccurate, when he says:

Liknon, a koskinon or a ptyon.
All three are different forms of an implement for one purpose, i.e. winnowing.

Fortified by a fairly complete understanding of the form and use of the liknon we are able to return to Servius and the vannus. The Latins had like the Greeks three main different forms of winnower, and these were the ventilabrum, the equivalent of the ptyon or spade-shovel; the vannus, the equivalent of the liknon or basket-winnower; and the cribrum, the equivalent of the koskinon or sieve.

About the cribrum, the discerner or sieve, there is no difficulty. As to the first and second, the vannus and ventilabrum, a word must be said.

First, the vannus and the ventilabrum are distinguished by Latin writers as separate implements. Varro in his discussion of agricultural matters writes of the process of winnowing thus: 'the ears having been threshed, it is needful to throw them up into the air with valli or ventilabrum when there is a gentle wind . . . . This is done that the lightest part of them, that which is called chaff, may be fanned away beyond the threshing floor, and the grain which is heavy may come pure to the basket.' The word vallus is of course vannulus, the diminution of vannus. All that we learn from this passage of Varro is that there were two implements, the vallus or vannulus and the ventilabrum. Elsewhere he says valli were made of wicker-work.

Columella is more explicit. After stating that the west wind is the best for winnowing he adds that to wait for that wind is the sign of a slothful husbandman, and concludes: 'If for several days the wind be low in all quarters let the corn be cleaned by vannus, lest after an ominous calm a furious storm destroy the labours of the whole year: Here clearly the vannus is the implement to be used when there is no wind, the ventilabrum, as indeed its name would suggest, is the implement for utilizing the wind, i.e. a ptyon or thrinax. We have already seen that the liknon is independent of the wind, and we may therefore conclude that Servius is right in his identification of liknon and vannus.

Throughout the present discussion, especially in translating quotations from poets, the word ‘fan’ has been freely used. It is necessary now to enquire what precisely is meant in English by a ‘fan.’
Most educated persons now-a-days, provided they are neither farmers nor antiquaries, if asked what a 'fan' is, would answer: 'an instrument with which to cause wind, to ventilate.' They would also, if acquainted with the Bible, add that in ancient days it was the name given to an instrument used in winnowing: 'His fan is in his hand and he will throughly purge his floor.' If they are classical scholars they will without compunction translate λικνον and πτυνον by the same word 'fan,' without reflecting that an instrument that resembles an oar is scarcely likely to have been a convenient cradle for a child. The word 'fan' in English covers and conceals a two-fold ambiguity; it is the common name for a ventilator, with no sense of winnowing; it further is the name applied indifferently to any and every form of implement used in winnowing.

The German language has two distinct words for the two distinct winnowing instruments, and thus avoids much confusion. Schwing or Getreide-Schwing is the word for the liknon-basket. Schaufel or Worfshaft for the ptyon or shovel. According to Dr. Schmidt, in Lithuanian the two processes are expressed by two words nearly akin, but from the beginning distinct, nekšči which means to clean by shaking, liška, to clean by throwing.

It is unnecessary to dwell on the modern use of the word 'fan' for an instrument with which to cause wind; it lent a metaphor to Milton, who tells how Raphael

'Winnows the buxom air.'

And again in the Endymion of Keats

'to fan
And winnow from the coming step of time
All chaff of custom.'

These passages are worth noting because instinctively each poet adds the word winnow, as though without it the metaphor might not be clearly intelligible; the word 'fan' is passing away, at least in literature, from the domain of agriculture.

In Fig. 10 we have left unexplained the fourth instrument on the left. It completes the series of winnowers. The specimen figured is in the Ethnological Museum at Helsingfors and comes from the parish of Sibbo in the province of Nyland. It is not a shovel but a 'fan' in the modern English sense, a sort of hand-broom made of birch-bark. In England also, before the introduction of winnowing-machines, a rude instrument made of sacking stretched on a frame was used to 'raise wind,' and was called a Barn-fan.

It is more important for our purpose to note that the word fan or, as it was often spelt, van was used to denote a large shallow wicker basket with handles used for cleaning corn by shaking, and practically the same as the basket in Fig. 3. Chaucer says of one of his characters he 'strouted as a

46 Matth. iii. 12. σύ τδ πτυνον και τη χειρι αρσων.
47 Schrader, Real-lexicon, s.v. Worfsha.
48 Schmidt, Sonantentheorie, p. 108.
49 Milton, P. L. v. 270.
fanne large and brode.' Trapp in his commentary on Psalm xviii. 8 (1654) says 'chaff will get to the top of the Fan while good Corn lieth at the bottom.' This clearly shows that the process of winnowing of which the commentator is thinking is that described above (p. 300).

Happily as regards the shape of the English 'van' in the 14th century we are not left to the vague witness of literature; we have monumental evidence. The Church of Chartham contains a memorial brass (Fig. 11) to Sir Robert son of Sir Robert de Setvans. The date is about 1306. On the knight's surcoat, ailettes, and shield are emblazoned the family arms, the seven fans. Schematised as they are for heraldic purposes it is quite clear that the 'fans' are wicker baskets with handles, with one side open, like the 'fan' in Fig. 7.

In closing this portion of my discussion of the shape and form of the *vannus* I should like to make a practical suggestion. The word 'fan' is a beautiful word of almost magical associations, and in poetry must and will always hold its own, since in poetry the atmosphere of the word is of far greater importance than its precise scientific association. But in prose and for purposes of exact construing, its use as a uniform rendering for *vannus*, *ventilabrum*, *línov* and *πτών* is misleading, and has already caused abundant confusion. If some general word is essential I would suggest that 'van' be employed; its slight archaism arrests attention and the misleading modern connotation is avoided. Some further precision might however be with advantage attempted. Could not *θριαξ* and *λικνον* be rendered by winnow-corb? The archaism of *corb* is unobjectionable, since the instrument described is all but obsolete. The words *πτών* and *ventilabrum* might be rendered in prose winnow-shovel, in poetry 'van.' The word *θριαξ* remains, and is perhaps best rendered *winnow-fork*; though this is not quite satisfactory because the *θριαξ* is half-shovel, half-fork.

50 This quotation and some of those above I owe to the English Dialect Dictionary. The description there given of the operation of winnowing in a basket-fan is as follows. 'Originally it was used to separate the chaff from the wheat by tossing it up into the air and catching it as it fell down, thus allowing the wind to fan out the chaff.' This description reads as though it had been invented *a priori* grounds; the actual operation as described on p. 300 is one of shaking not tossing; the grain never leaves the fan, nor is the wind necessarily utilized. The Dictionary further states that the word 'fan' as meaning a basket-shovel-winner is obsolete except historically. As already stated the word and the implement are familiar to old people to-day.

51 Boutell's *Monumental Bronzes* p. 35. My attention was called to this interesting monument by Professor Bendaill.
Now that the exact nature of the 'fan,' its uses and various shapes have been determined, we are able to pass to the second division of our discussion.

2. _The precise sense in which the 'fan' is called 'mystic.'_

The 'mystic' character of the 'fan' is a fact, not merely the vague fancy of a Latin poet. Harpocration 52 in discussing the _liknon_ says that it was 'serviceable for every rite and sacrifice.' The word translated 'rite' (τελετή) always implies a mystic ceremony of initiation, as contrasted with a mere ceremony of sacrifice (θυσία).

At the outset it should be noted that the only form of winnowing-fan used in mysteries was the _liknon_. The _ptyon_ and the _thrinax_ might be, and were 'planted' at harvest festivals, but not even an Orphic attempted to mysticize the shovel or the fork: it was about the liknon only that mystic associations gathered.

It is necessary at this point to say a word as to what the Greeks meant by a 'mystery.' I have shown elsewhere 53 in detail and can only here briefly restate what I believe to be the essential factors of ancient mystery rites. They are two:

(a) The seeing, handling, and sometimes tasting of certain sacred objects.

(b) Ceremonies of purification, after which, and only after which, these sacred objects could be safely seen, handled, or tasted.

The liknophoria belongs to the class of purification ceremonies.

---

Fig. 12.—_The Liknon in Use in Eleusinian Mysteries._ (From a Cinerary Urn at Rome.)

Fortunately this is no matter of mere conjecture; we have monumental evidence. The design in Fig. 12 is part of the decoration of a cinerary urn

---

52 Harpocrat, s.v. _λικνοφόρος_: τὸ _λικνὸν_ πρὸς πᾶσαν τελετήν καὶ θυσίαν ἐπιτίθειν ἐστίν.

53 _Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion_, p. 153. I have here sought to establish that the word _μυστήρια_ is connected rather with _μύσος_ than with _μύω_.
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found in a grave on the Esquiline Hill and now in the Museo delle Terme at Rome. The scenes represented are clearly rites of initiation. On one portion of the urn (not figured here) we have a representation of the final stage of initiation; the mystic is admitted to the presence of the goddess herself, Demeter, and handles her sacred snake. The remainder of the design (Fig. 12) shows two scenes of preliminary purification: (1) the familiar sacrifice of the 'mystic' pig; (2) purification by the liknon. It is on this last that attention must be focussed.

The candidate is seated on a low seat; he holds a torch, also for purification, in his left hand; he rests his right foot on a ram's head, obviously part of the 'fleece of purification'; his head is veiled, and over his head a priest holds the liknon. What is contained in the liknon it is not possible to say with certainty. It does not I think contain fruits. When the artist wishes to show fruits in a sacred vessel he is quite able to do so, as is seen in the dish of poppy-heads held by the priest to the right, where perspective is violated to make the meaning clearer. Moreover fruits do not symbolize purification, and therefore cannot magically induce it. The liknon is I think either empty or holds a little grain and chaff. Anyhow it is clearly part of the apparatus of purification.

The symbolism of the liknon is simple and very beautiful, and it should not be hard for us to realize its ritual significance. The Anglican Church still prays in her Baptismal Service that water may be sanctified 'to the mystical washing away of sin.' She believes that in some mysterious way the water is not only the symbol of purification but its actual vehicle. The Greek believed that the 'fan' which physically purified grain had power mystically to purge humanity.

This doctrine Servius states quite clearly. Virgil, he says, calls the vannus mystic 'because the rites of Father Liber had reference to the purification of the soul, and men are purified in his mysteries as grain is purified by fans.'

The first element then in the mysticism of the 'fan' is 'mystical purification'; the second, next to be considered, is the 'magical promotion of fertility.'

Mystical purification might have been, though it apparently never was, effected just as well by the pylon or the thrinax as by the liknon. A winnow-shovel or fork held over the head would have induced sympathetic magic equally with a winnow-basket. But when we come to the magical induction of fertility, the basket that can contain fruits is essential, the fork or shovel that merely tosses and shakes them is not enough. The fact that only the liknon, never the pylon or thrinax, was mysticized makes us suspect that the mysticism grew up primarily in relation to the symbolism of fertility rather than of purification.

---

55 See Prolegomena, p. 152.
56 loc. cit., see p. 292.
The liknon, we have seen (p. 294), served as a cradle. About this simple use a primitive mysticism of the 'sympathetic magic' kind speedily and naturally grew up. The Scholiast on Callimachus in explaining the liknon-cradle of Zeus says: 'in old days they used to put babies to sleep in winnow-baskets as an omen for wealth and fruits.' The child was placed in the winnow-basket or sieve for luck, and the luck was probably regarded as mutual. The fruitful basket helped the child, the child helped the fruitfulness of the basket.

The placing of the child in the liknon at birth was probably rather a casual custom than a rite. But the carrying of the liknon full of fruits was a regular part of the ceremonial of marriage. The author of the 'Proverbial Sayings of Alexander' says 'it was the custom at Athens at weddings that a boy, both of whose parents were alive, should carry a liknon full of leaves and thereon pronounce the words "Bad have I fled, better have I found."'

---

57 Schol. ad Callim. Hymn. i. 48: ἐν γάρ λικνοῖς τῷ παλαιῷ κατεκομμένοι τὰ βρέφη πλοῦτον καὶ καρποῖς ὁμοιόμενοι. The Scholiast on Aratus Phaen. 268, adds that this was done at birth, τα γάρ βρέφη τῷ πρώτῳ γεννώμενα, κ.τ.λ.

58 The Scholiast on Callimachus thus defines the liknon: λικνοῖν ὰμός τῷ κόσμῳν ἐν τῷ Κόψιν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳν ἐν ὑ τὰ παιδία τίθαις. He is probably vague in his conception of a λικνοῦ. Mr. Haward of King's College, Cambridge, kindly tells me that he learnt from a Cornish farmer that in olden days a corn-sieve served among poor people as a cradle, but whether it was so used 'for luck' or from necessity did not appear. A number of instances of the custom of carrying a new-born child in a 'corn-sieve' are collected by Mannhardt in his valuable chapter 'Kind und Korn' in his Mythologische Forschungen, p. 366.

59 Ps. Plut. Proc. Alex. xvi. νόμος ἦν Ἀθηναῖοι ἐν τοῖς γάμοις ἀναφθαλή παιδα λικνοῦ Βασσάλων ἅρτων πλέον εἶτα ἐπίλεγεν ἑφάγων καικόν εὐρον ἐμείνον. And see Zenob. Proc. iii. 98. Eustath. ad Od. xii. 357. Suidas, s.v. ἑφάγων καικόν.

60 Hermann (Lehrb. iv. 275) states on the authority of Wachsmuth (Das Alte Griechenland im Neuen, p. 153) that among the modern Greeks a boy with both parents alive (μονοκαρποθέτατοι) still carries the bride cakes to the bride.
Zenobius and Eustathius in discussing the custom and the saying add the detail that the boy was crowned with acanthus and acorns. Eustathius and Suidas both explain the custom as symbolic of a transition from rude to civilized life. It is abundantly clear that here again the liknon is used as an 'omen for wealth and fruits'; it brings luck to the newly married pair. The loaves of fermented bread (ἄρτος) are of course a late element; in primitive days their place would be taken by cakes and earlier by uncooked grain and fruits.

Our literary evidence is late, but fortunately we have monumental evidence that goes back to the sixth century B.C. The design in Fig. 13 is from a black-figured vase now in the British Museum.\(^61\) The reverse of the vase only is published here; the obverse represents Theseus slaying the Minotaur, and has no connection with the present discussion. The scene represented on the reverse is, as Mr. Walters in the Catalogue rightly explains, a wedding procession. A quadriga carries the bridal pair; the bride is veiled; behind the quadriga stands the parochos, who strictly speaking ought to be in the chariot. The procession is preceded by a bearded man, possibly the proeqetes. The chariot is accompanied by three women; it is their function that concerns us. The first and third carry vessels that are obviously likna. On this point, if the vessel carried by the hindmost woman be compared with the 'fan' in Fig. 7, there can be no shadow of doubt; the shape is the same, the handles and the material, wicker-work. The vessel carried by the front woman is obviously the same as that carried by the hindmost one, but the vase-painter has not troubled to indicate by incised lines the wicker-work material.

The exact significance of the vessel carried by the middle woman must remain uncertain. As Mr. Walters points out, it may be a sieve. Pollux states that the bride carried a sieve. If she did it was, like the liknon, a symbol of fertility rather than as Pollux\(^62\) suggests the 'symbol of her proper work.' As we do not know the exact shape of the Greek sieve, it is perhaps safer to interpret the flat-shaped vessel as merely a basket (κανοῦς).

As to the contents of the two likna we are left, as in the Hellenistic urn, (Fig. 12) in complete uncertainty. They may hold grain, fruits, or cakes, or leaves, or a mixture of all. Whatever the exact contents, they were symbols of fertility.

It may perhaps be objected that marriage is not a 'mystery.' The Anglican Church no longer includes marriage in its sacraments and from her marriage service all symbolism save that of the ring is now excluded. She still however prays that the married state may be consecrated to an 'excellent mystery' and in this respect follows Greek precedent. The Greeks conceived of mar-

\(^{61}\) Cat. B. 174. Published by kind permission of Dr. A. S. Murray. The carrying of the liknon at the marriage of Eros and Psyche is also depicted on the famous 'Tryphon' gem formerly in the Marlborough collection and now in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. As its authenticity is doubted by some competent judges I have decided not to reproduce it here. See my Prolegomena, Chap. x. p. 533.

\(^{62}\) Poll. On. iii. 37 ἐν τῶν δὲ ἔξω ἐνδού τοῦ θελάμου ἀντιστατέσθην καὶ νῶσσος ἡ παις ἔφε, σημεία ἃς εϊκός αὐτούργια.
riage as a rite of initiation, and as an initiation-rite it was preceded by elaborate purifications. The word τέλη in its plural form was used of all mysteries, and the singular form τέλος was expressly applied to marriage. In any case the carrying of the liknon at marriage was mystical in the sense that it was magical, an endeavour by sympathetic magic to compel fertility.

The two mysticisms of the liknon, i.e. purification and the fertility charm, may seem to our modern minds very far asunder. To the primitive Greek mind they are very near together, nay, almost inseparable. Fertility can only be promoted by purification, i.e. by the purging away of all evil influences that impede birth and growth. It is also abundantly clear how the purest spiritual mysticism may have its root deep down in the most rudimentary magic. You carry a basket of fruits at marriage that by sympathetic magic you may induce fertility, and the basket of fruits becomes the symbol and sacrament of the whole moral and spiritual field covered by the formula: 'Bad have I fled, better have I found.'

We pass to our third and last enquiry.

3.—Classed as it is among the instruments of Ceres, how and why did the 'fan' pass into the service of Iacchus?

First it must be established clearly that the 'fan' was used in the service of Iacchus, and that the words of Virgil are not merely a vague poetical attribution. An epigram in the Anthology records the dedication by a worshipper of his Dionysiac gear. After the enumeration of various instruments, rhombos, cymbal, thyrsos, and the like we have:

καὶ κούφοιο βαρὺν τυπάνου βρόμου, ἦδὲ φορηθὲν πολλάκις μιτροδέτου λίκνου ὑπὲρθε κόμης.

The carrying of the liknon on the head was clearly an ordinary feature in a Dionysiac revel.

Plutarch in his life of Alexander states that Olympias in her enthusiasm for barbaric orgies introduced as a new element large tame serpents, and these used to creep out of the ivy and out of the mystic likna and twine round the thyrsi and garlands of the women, and frighten the men out of their senses. Here the new element is the serpents; the likna are a regular part of the orgies of Dionysus from very ancient days (ἐκ τοῦ πάνυ παλαιοῦ).

Monumental evidence again confirms the testimony of literature. The
design in Fig. 14 is from the fragment of a relief now at Verona. The two objects depicted, the mask and the liknon, are obviously both of them equally symbols of Dionysus. The liknon here, as in Fig. 6, contains fruits. How inconvenient a basket it is for fruits is shown by the way they fall out over the shallow end.

When used in the service of Dionysus the liknon ordinarily contains not only fruits but the symbol of human life and growth, the phallos. Sometimes as in Fig. 6 both phallos and fruits appear, sometimes the phallos only.

![Fig. 14.—Liknon and Dionysiac Mask.](image)

The designs in Figs. 15 and 16 are from the obverse and reverse of a votive disk now in the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge. How precisely these disks were set up is not quite clear. They are usually perforated as though for suspension, and in Pompeian paintings similar objects appear suspended between columns. In Fig. 6 disks of this kind are seen decorating the circular shrine in which the liknon is set up. If these are really disks they must have been attached at the base to the wall.

67 Michaelis Anc. Marbles, p. 261, Nos. 70 and 71. The designs on this disk have been very indifferently published in the Museum Disceyanum Pl. 37, 1 and 2. Figs. 15 and 16 are from drawings kindly made for me by Mrs. Hugh Stewart. The very low and somewhat indistinct character of the reliefs made photographs impossible. A disk obviously from the same workshop may be seen in the basement of the British Museum (No. 31). It is somewhat more coarsely executed. The design on the obverse represents an old Satyr holding a thyrsos in the left hand and supporting with his left a liknon on his head; on the reverse is Pan with pedum and mask. An altar appears in both scenes.
MYSTICA VANNUS IACCHI.

Fig. 15.—Obverse of Disk. (Fitzwilliam Museum.)

Fig. 16.—Reverse of Disk. (Fitzwilliam Museum.)
The subject of these disks is frequently Dionysiac. On the obverse of the Cambridge specimen a bearded man with floating drapery approaches an altar. In his right hand he bears an object that I am unable to make out clearly; it is probably a bundle of twigs. Held as it is horizontally it can scarcely be a torch. In his uplifted left the man bears a liknon. On the obverse it is not clear what the liknon contains. On the reverse an old man carries with both hands a liknon that contains a phallos.

On Graeco-Roman sarcophagi and on late Hellenistic reliefs (e.g. Fig. 6) the phallos is openly paraded by worshippers both male and female in Dionysiac revels; but it is important to note that, in actual ritual scenes where a definite religious ceremony of initiation is going on, the liknon containing the phallos is always veiled, or, in instances where it has just been unveiled, the worshipper himself is veiled.

The design in Fig. 17 is from the stucco decoration of the Farnesina palace in Rome; the stucco reliefs are now in the Museo delle Terme. The scene is clearly one of initiation: the boy's head is veiled. The ceremony has some connection with Dionysus, as the candidate holds a thyrsos. A priest is in the act of unveiling the liknon. It is of the usual shape, and the priest holds it by one of the handles. The priestess behind the boy is probably touching his head, but the stucco at this point is broken away. Still further to the right a priestess stands near a sacred cista; her right hand is extended and the left holds a timbrel. The whole scene takes place in a precinct marked by two columns and a tree. The design in Fig. 18, from a blue glass amphora in the Museo Civico at Florence, represents an analogous scene. Again we have the veiled boy, but here he bears the liknon itself closely veiled upon his head. He carries this time not a regular thyrsos but a branch of a tree decked with a taenia.

When the liknon is veiled it is of course impossible to say with certainty what it contained. It is, however, probable that among the sacra was the phallos. On a 'Campana' relief, figured by Baumeister but

---

63 Diodorus (iv. 6) emphasizes the use of the phallos among agriculturists as a prophylactic against the evil eye and says that it is employed εν ταῖς πηλταῖς οὗ μῦνον ταῖς Διόνυσιακαῖς ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς ἀλαΐσι σχῆδαν ἀναδαις.

64 The liknon occurs very frequently on Graeco-Roman sarcophagi. I noted two instances among the sarcophagi in the Campo Santo at Pisa, and three in the sculpture galleries of the Vatican. The φαιλαθοφία is clearly shown in a sarcophagus in the entrance hall of the Museum at Naples, of which there is an indifferent drawing in Gerhard's Antike Bildwerke. For a complete collection of these sarcophagi we must await the volume of Dionysiac subjects promised in Dr. Roberts' official publication of these monuments.

70 Helbig Führer 2nd edit., p. 237, No. 1122 (4). The official publication Monumenti dell' Inst. suppl. T. 35 (=Lessing and Mau T. 15) gives no idea of the delicate beauty of the original reliefs. Fig. 17 is from a photograph.


72 The scene is clearly one of Dionysiac worship, as is shown by the portion of the design not figured here. Behind the boy on a pedestal is a Herm with thyrsos attached, and behind it a mask with pointed ears.
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not reproduced here, we have a scene of initiation represented with the liknon unveiled. It contains fruits and phallos. The candidate is still veiled; his head is supported by an attendant-woman, probably a priestess. Behind him a Bacchante strikes her timbrel.

So far we have established, from literary and monumental evidence, the facts that the liknon was certainly used in the worship of Dionysus, and that a phallophoria formed a part of Dionysiac mysteries. We can now return to the evidence of Servius.

Servius states that Father Liber was called among the Greeks Liknites i.e. ‘He-of-the-liknon’: the liknon in this case being, as he goes on to explain, used as a cradle. Liknites is Dionysus as a babe in a cradle. Fortunately Plutarch confirms this statement. In speaking of the worship of Dionysus at Delphi he says the Delphians hold that they possess the relics of Dionysus buried by the side of their oracular shrine, and the Hosioi make a secret sacrifice in the sacred precinct of Apollo when the Thyiads raise up Liknites.

How exactly the Thyiads ‘raised up’ or wakened the child-god we do not know; but the design in Fig. 4 already discussed in relation to the cradle-liknon may represent the ritual of the wakening. Some act in a ‘mystery’ is evidently depicted. The two men holding the liknon seem to emerge hurriedly from behind the curtain; the flaming torches show that the scene takes place at night, the usual time for the mysteries of Dionysus. It may be conjectured that, at a given signal, the birth of the sacred child was announced and the attendants, possibly the Hosioi themselves, issued from behind a screen or veil, bearing the new-born child in the liknon.

Servius says that Father Liber was the same person as Osiris, and he further states that Isis carried the limbs of the dismembered Osiris on her head in a sieve. Father Liber, too, was torn to pieces, and he leaves us to infer that in the contents of the mystic fan the dismembered Dionysus is also symbolized. It is worth noting that Plutarch, in the passage already cited makes substantially the same statement. ‘You, Clea,’ he says, ‘if any one, should know that Osiris is the same as Dionysus, you who are president of the Thyiads at Delphi, and were initiated by your father or mother into the rites of Osiris.’ The central act of the cult of the Egyptian god was his death, dismemberment, and subsequent resurrection; the central

---

71 Plut. de Isid. et Osir. xxxv. 365 a. καὶ θάνατον αὐτῷ Ὀσίου θυσίαν, ἀπόρρητον ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἀκάλλωνος, δην αὐτοὶ θυάνες ἑγείροντο τὸν Λικνίτην.
72 loc. cit. (364 c).
act of the cult of the Cretan and Orphic Zagreus was the dismemberment of a bull who was held to be the vehicle of Zagreus. In this dismemberment the Orphic saw the means of purification and renewal of his own spiritual life. At Delphi the waking of the child Liknites was accompanied by a ‘secret sacrifice’ in which we may conjecture with all but certainty was enacted, whether symbolically or otherwise, the death and dismemberment of the god who was to be born anew as a child in the cradle. In a sense therefore to the mystic the liknon which contained the new-born child contained the dismembered god from which he was reborn.

Thus to the old symbolism of the basket of fresh fruits and the winnowing of grain from chaff was added the new, and perhaps Egyptian, mysticism of the palingenesis, ‘the death unto sin and the new birth unto righteousness.’ Charged with such a complex sacramentalism, we cannot wonder that the liknon was, as Harpocration said, in the words cited above, ‘serviceable for every rite of initiation and every sacrifice.’

The fact that the liknon was used in rites of Dionysus has been clearly ascertained. The particular mystic significances that were associated with it in the cult of Dionysus have been in so far as is possible elucidated. There yet remains the cardinal problem: why did the liknon, in its origin an instrument for winnowing and always inconvenient as a basket for grapes, come to be the characteristic token of the wine-god?

The answer is very simple and I think convincing. Dionysus before he became the wine-god was the beer-god, the god of a cereal intoxicant. As the god of a cereal intoxicant he needed the service of the winnowing-fan as much as it was needed by Demeter herself. When the cereal intoxicant, beer, was ousted by the grape intoxicant wine, the fan that had once been a winnower for grain became a basket for fruit. Its mysticism, as has already been seen, contained both elements, the symbolism of purification by winnowing, the symbolism of fertility in the fruit-basket.

The worship of Dionysus, it is now I believe acknowledged on all hands, came to Greece from Thrace, and the national drink of the Thracians was barley-wine (οἶνος ἀνὰ κηρθής). The god took one of his titles, Bromios, from the cereal bromos, which lives on in the modern Greek word βρόμιο. Another of his titles, Sabazios, he took from sabaia which is Illyrian for beer. When the Emperor Valens was besieging Chalcedon, by way of insult they shouted to him ‘Sabaiarius,’ beer-man or ‘brewer.’ Ammianus Marcellinus, in telling the story, added in explanation: ‘sabaia is a drink of the poor in Illyricum made of barley or corn turned into a liquid.’ The Dalmatian Saint

76 The evidence for the use of a cereal intoxicant among northern peoples in primitive days is fully collected by Hehn, Kulturpflanzen, 7th edition, pp. 142-153, though he draws of course no conclusions for mythology.

77 For a full discussion of the titles Bromios and Sabazios and the whole question of the origin and nature of the worship of Dionysus, I must refer to my ‘Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion,’ chapter viii, ‘Dionysus,’ p. 414.

78 Ammian. Marcell. 26, 8, 2: est autem sabaia ex ordeo vel frumento in liquorem conversis paupertinus in Illyrio potus.
Jerome, who must have known the practice of his own country, says in his commentary on Isaiah, there is a kind of drink made from grain and water, and in the provinces of Dalmatia and Pannonia it was called in the local barbarian speech sabatium. It is this god of a cheap cereal intoxicant, despised by the rich, who brings sleep to the eyes of the slave in the Wasps of Aristophanes.

It was the wine-god, not the beer-god, who came down from Thrace in triumph into Hellas; but though it was the grace and glory of the grape that won all men's hearts, the earlier ruder cereal drink is never quite forgotten, and the memory of it is preserved for ever in the

\textit{mystica vannus Iacchi}.  

\textit{Jane E. Harrison.}