Kernos

Revue internationale et pluridisciplinaire de religion
grecque antique

15 | 2002
Varia

Cassandra's Prophecy between Ecstasy and Rational Mediation

Sabina Mazzoldi

Electronic version

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/kernos/1373>

DOI: 10.4000/kernos.1373

ISSN: 2034-7871

Publisher

Centre international d'étude de la religion grecque antique

Printed version

Date of publication: 1 January 2002

ISSN: 0776-3824

Electronic reference

Sabina Mazzoldi, « Cassandra's Prophecy between Ecstasy and Rational Mediation », *Kernos* [Online], 15 | 2002, Online since 21 April 2011, connection on 01 May 2019. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/kernos/1373> ; DOI : 10.4000/kernos.1373

Cassandra's Prophecy between Ecstasy and Rational Mediation

The literary evidence concerning Cassandra highlights a coherent representation of the figure of the Trojan *mantis* and of her way of divining. It is an intuitive divination (μαντεία ἄτεχνος), which includes the *mantis*' possession by Apollo (ἔνθεος, θεοφόρητος-θεοφορουμένη, φοιβόληπτος) and the condition of θέλα μανία, which is the ground of the mantic inspiration. But the feature of Cassandra's divination is the alternation of two main phases, which are well detectable in many texts and represent two different psychological states. In the former Cassandra is presented in ecstasy and affected by visions, which she conveys verbally without rational mediation; in the latter the character seems to be self-possessed and she communicates her prophecies keeping her words under the control of rationality¹.

Evidently, the main help to define the features of Cassandra's divination comes from the texts paying attention not only to the character, but also to divination as a religious and social phenomenon, and they become a possible key of interpretation. The presence of literary filter, the use of a poetic language, the revival (or the change) of a mythological tradition are data, which we must constantly remember not to imprudently consider the character a trustworthy transposition of the historical *manteis*. But it is true that Cassandra's figure falls consistently within the divination, historically attested², of the ecstatic and visionary type, and that some texts, which describe her or attribute her prophecies, become a precious reflection of an historical phenomenon – so prominent in the Mediterranean and Near East cultures³.

¹ Cf. S. MAZZOLDI, *Cassandra, la vergine e l'indovina. Identità di un personaggio da Omero all'Ellenismo*, Pisa/Roma, 2001, p. 94-95, 184-215.

² Cf. A. COOPER, "Imagining Prophecy", in J.L. KUGEL (ed.), *Poetry and Prophecy: the Beginnings of a Literary Tradition*, Ithaca, 1990, p. 26-44: 31 and n. 32.

³ Visions and experiences of ecstatic type connected to prophecy are testified in texts of many cultures and it is debated if they are a reflection of real experiences or if they have only traditional and literary character: cf. A. HULTGÅRD, "Ecstasy and Vision", in N.G. HOLM (eds.), *Religious Ecstasy*, Uppsala Stockholm, 1982, p. 218-225, with regard to Jewish and Iranian texts (p. 218: "there is therefore some justification in scrutinizing the texts in order to find evidence reflecting the seer's genuine experiences").

In this paper it is my aim, first of all, to examine Cassandra's divination in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, then I shall consider a passage of Plato's *Timaeus* about divination showing the same alternation of psychological states.

In the Aeschylean scene it is possible to reconstruct a particular divining process with the alternation of ecstasy and rationality. In fact, in this scene Cassandra seems subject to a *climax* of mantic ecstasy four times, less and less intense, which develops in four stages: A: cries and ritual invocations, B: clairvoyance without mediation, C: clairvoyance with mediation, D: rational prophecy. The first and second stages represent the first phase of divination, that is the conveyance of mantic knowledge from the divinity to the *mantis* (we will call it perceptive); the third and fourth stages represent the second phase of divination, when the prophetess is in contact with the audience of her prophetic message (we will call it communicative). Linguistical, syntactical and rhetorical features characterize each of these stages and justify their individuation (*cf.* schema I).

1) The first stage, preceded by silence and immobility⁴, is characterized by the phenomenon of glossolalia⁵, which in fact appears usually in the ecstatic states; its function is to put the person in communication with the divinity and to give expression to his non-mediate presence. In Cassandra's divining process this stage constitutes the initial part of the clairvoyance, that is the contact with divinity, and it introduces the mantic visions. The cries⁶, only apparently incoherent, seem to mark out the beginning of her clairvoyance; they develop into invocations to Apollo of ritual type and then into rhetorical questions characterized by monological modulation.

2) The second stage consists of the visionary-access, which allows the knowledge of the past and of the future. In this stage the clairvoyant perceives the past and future reality through her whole person and her

⁴ *Cf.* AESCH., *Ag.*, 1035 *sq.* In all sequences stage's beginning coincides with verse's *incipit* and so is marked by a pause.

⁵ It is possible to define glossolalia as an "unintelligible extemporaneous post-babbling speech that exhibits superficial phonologic similarity to language without having consistent syntagmatic structure and that is not systematically derived from or related to known languages" (W.J. SAMARIN, "Variations and Variable in Religious Glossolalia", *Language in Society* 1 [1972], p. 121-130). The first who recognized in v. 1072 and 1076 the transcription of glossolalic utterances was L.J. HEIRMAN, "Kassandra's Glossolalia", *Mnemosyne* 28 (1975), p. 257-267; afterwards Cassandra's glossolalia has been studied by S. CRIPPA ("Glossolalia. Il linguaggio di Cassandra", *Studi italiani di linguistica teorica e applicata* 19/3 [1990], p. 487-508; "Un genere oracolare? Ipotesi per un'analisi del linguaggio delle visioni", in E. BANFI (ed.), *Atti del secondo incontro internazionale di Linguistica greca*, Trento, 1997 (*Labirinti*, 27), p. 121-142), who points out the ecstatic and religious character of the glossolalic phenomenon.

⁶ In most texts Cassandra begins her prophecy with a cry: PIND., *Pae.*, 8a, 10 (ἐκλαγξέ); EUR., *Andr.*, 297 (βόασε); TrGF, fr. *adesp.* 649 (ἀνέκλαγε); LYC., *Alex.*, 5 (βοήν); QUINTUS SMYRN., XII, 530 (ἔλαχεν), 539 (στονάχησε καὶ ἔλαχε); TRIPH., 375 (ἀνέλαχε); Tz., *Posthom.*, 709 (βοάσκει).

senses (sight, hearing, smelling, taste, touch)⁷ and she conveys it without mediation and interpretation, that is without using rationality. The conveyance of the visions is simultaneous with the perception; so the visions themselves seem present and actual, and there is no separation between the different temporal levels. The sentences – a simple description by the clairvoyant of visions sent by the god⁸ – are often badly-constructed⁹ and founded on a persistent use of the demonstrative adjective and pronoun and on the use of present tense alone (oracular synchronic tense)¹⁰. The use of the *Deixis am Phantasma* and the temporal non-coherence are frequent in oracular contexts¹¹. Since the difference between the divine language and the human language is by no means minimized, the oracular message appears obscure and ambiguous in the highest degree and so any interlocution with the chorus is impossible: in fact the verbal modulation of Cassandra appears substantially monological. The chorus, on the other hand, does not understand her words¹², distorts their meaning¹³, refuses the message¹⁴, and when it concerns something well-known or understandable, is afraid of it¹⁵.

⁷ Of course for the clairvoyant the sight is the most important sense and her mantic knowledge comes from it: the visions, which are in front of Cassandra's eyes, are thick and overcome one another; she is able to understand what they mean step by step (cf. v. 1100, 1107, 1114). But the mantic experience involves the physiological sphere as a whole: on hearing cf. v. 1117-1118, on smelling cf. v. 1092-1094, 1309; on taste cf. v. 1097, 1222; on touch cf. v. 1256, 1277-1278 (for a detailed analysis of these passages cf. MAZZOLDI, *o.c.* [n. 1], p. 204-210). An extraordinary and abnormal sensorial perception is a Delphic prerogative: cf. HEROD., I, 47: κωφοῦ συνίημι καὶ οὐ φωνεῖντος ἀκούω (Q99 Fontenrose); PLUT., *De def. orac.*, 432b: κωφοῦ τ' ἀκοὴν τυφλοῦ τε δέρεϊν (L77 Fontenrose). On clairvoyants' possibility to perceive by senses what common people can not cf. W. BURKERT, *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche*, Stuttgart, 1977, p. 178.

⁸ Cf. PLUT., *De Pyth. orac.*, 397: ἐκείνος (sc. Apollo) δὲ μόνος τὰς φαντασίας παρίστησι καὶ φῶς ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ ποιεῖ πρὸς τὸν μέλλον· ὁ γὰρ ἐνθουσιασμός τοιοῦτόν ἐστι.

⁹ Noun sentences and participial phrases without finite verbs: v. 1091-1092, 1096-1097, 1108-1109, 1115-1116, 1214, 1219-1220; lack of subject or change of subject without notice: v. 1100, 1102, 1110-1111, 1127-1128.

¹⁰ I *climax*: τοῖσδε, v. 1095; τάδε, v. 1096; μήδεται, v. 1100; τόδε, v. 1101; τοῖσδε, v. 1102; μήδεται, v. 1102; ἀποστατεῖ, v. 1104; τόδε, v. 1107; τόδε, v. 1110; προτείνει, v. 1110; τόδε, v. 1114; φαίνεται, v. 1114; τύπτει, v. 1128; πίτνει, v. 1128; II *climax*: τοῖσδε, v. 1217; πρέπουσι, v. 1222; III *climax*: ἐπέρχεται, v. 1256; IV *climax*: πνέουσιν, v. 1309; πρέπει, v. 1311.

¹¹ Cf. CRIPPA, "Un genere oracolare", *supra* (n. 5), p. 135-136, and *ead.*, "La voce e la visione. Il linguaggio oracolare femminile", in I. CHIRASSI COLOMBO, T. SEPPILLI (eds.), *Sibille e linguaggi oracolari. Mito Storia Tradizione. Atti del convegno, Macerata-Norcia, settembre 1994*, Macerata, 1998, p. 159-189: 179-181.

¹² Cf. v. 1112-1113: οὐπω ξυνῆκα· νῦν γὰρ ἐξ αἰνιγμάτων / ἐπαργέμοισι θεσφάτοις ἀμχανῶ; v. 1130-1131: οὐ κομπάσαιμ' ἂν θεσφάτων γνώμων ἄκρος / εἶναι; v. 1177: τέρμα δ' ἀμχανῶ; v. 1245: τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἀκούσας ἐκ δρόμου πεσὼν τρέχω.

¹³ Cf. v. 1251: τίνος πρὸς ἀνδρὸς τοῦτ' ἄχος πορσύνεται; v. 1253: τοῦ γὰρ τελοῦντος οὐ ξυνῆκα μηχανήν, from this passage we see that the chorus has not even understood

3) The third stage constitutes the transition from visionary-ecstasy to rational prophecy: Cassandra still lives in the vision context, but communicates it through her rationality. Sentences are well-constructed and the use of verbal tenses is consistent¹⁶. The use of metaphors and similes in her communication, typical of oracular language represents the *clairvoyant's* attempt to approach the meaning of visions step by step and through the association of ideas¹⁷. In this stage Cassandra interprets the events, which have become known to her, by using similes, finding causal nexus and mourning them. Now the communication with the chorus does become possible, and a kind of dialogue does begin, initially hesitant and frequently cut, then more and more permanent and close.

4) The fourth stage is the real prophecy: Cassandra turns all her attention to the communication¹⁸ and intervenes by rationality to render the message as understandable as possible. The exposition of prophecies in a clear style is the result of programmatic choices and statements and corresponds to the return of a normal use of verbal tenses and to a complete autonomy of interpretation and judgement. The predicted events are connected by strong temporal and causal consequence. The dialogue with the chorus becomes closer and closer up to the *stichomythia*.

In the Aeschylean scene these four stages do follow each other, as it were, in a descending *climax* of ecstasy four times, so that it is possible to single out four sequences A-D; each of them starts with a new cry, of glossolalic type, which marks the access of ecstasy and the conscience leap

that Agamemnon's murderer will be a woman; v. 1310: καὶ πῶς; τόδ' ὄζει θυμάτων ἐφ' ἑστίων; v. 1312: οὐ Σύριον ἀγλαΐσμα δώμασιν λέγεις.

¹⁴ Cf. v. 1099: προφῆτας δ' οὐτινας ματεύομεν; 1247: εὐφημον, ὦ τάλαινα, κοίμησον στόμα.

¹⁵ Cf. v. 1120-1121: οὐ με φαιδρύνει λόγος. / ἐπὶ δὲ καρδίαν ἔδραμε κροκοβαφῆς / σταγῶν; v. 1133-1135: κακῶν γὰρ δια / πολυεπεῖς τέχναι θεσπιῶδων / φόβον φέρουσιν μαθεῖν; v. 1243: ξυνηκα καὶ πέφρικα, καὶ φόβος μ' ἔχει.

¹⁶ Cf. ξυθανουμένην, v. 1139; μέμνει, v. 1149 (in the latter case the future is implied by the meaning of the verb itself); ἡνυτόμαν, v. 1159; θεσπιωδήσειν, v. 1161; ἐπήρκεσαν, v. 1170; ἐχρήν, v. 1171; βαλῶ, v. 1172; οἶδεν, v. 1228; τεύξεται, v. 1230; ἐπωλολύξατο, v. 1236; κτενεί, v. 1260; ἐνθήσει, v. 1261; ἀντιτείσσεται, v. 1263.

¹⁷ I *climax*: Clytemnestra = cow, Agamemnon = bull (v. 1125-26); II *climax*: Aegisthus = lion (v. 1223-1225); Clytemnestra = dog (v. 1228); Clytemnestra = monster, Amphibaina, Scylla, Hades' mother (v. 1232-1236); III *climax*: Clytemnestra = lioness, Aegisthus = wolf, Agamemnon = lion (v. 1258-1259); IV *climax* Cassandra = bird (v. 1316). Cf. E. GRASSI, *Potenza dell'immagine. Rivalutazione della retorica*, Milano, 1989, p. 97-98 (on Cuman Sibyl of Vergil): "il linguaggio semantico della Sibilla è intessuto di metafore, immagini, che appaiono sempre quando la profetessa vuole rendere comprensibile il significato di qualcosa che si palesa direttamente. La metafora sostituisce la chiarificazione razionale... L'unità, la sintesi tra le diverse *immagini* nasce per 'associazione' non per 'spiegazione', in un'improvvisa visione di similitudini".

¹⁸ Cf. v. 1178: ὁ χρησμός οὐκέτ' ἐκ καλυμμάτων; v. 1183: φρενώσω δ' οὐκέτ' ἐξ αἰνιγμάτων.

in the clairvoyance. But, since in the scene Cassandra's divination develops into a more intelligible degree, the stages repeat themselves with different extension and have different importance in each *climax*, as it comes out from the scheme II, where the verses of each stage and the total number of them are indicated.

It is possible to find out the four stages reconstructed in the *Agamemnon* also in other texts concerning Cassandra, either in the same sequence or alone¹⁹, for the feature of her divination, as we have said before, is just the alternation of ecstasy and rational mediation. By simplifying the complex development of divining process as presented in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, we could say that Cassandra is either *ἔκφρων* (that is *ἐνθεος*), when she is represented in state of ecstatic-visionary inspiration and conveys visions without rational mediation, or she is *ἔμφρων*, when she is represented not in ecstasy and interprets her own visions²⁰, puts them into a temporal and logical succession, communicates them through intelligible words and well-constructed sentences to render them understandable by the audience. This does not mean that in the first phase Cassandra is thought of as 'irrational': it does only mean that *phren* and *logos* work at a level which is consistent with the divine, but it is different in comparison with that of human rationality, so her message is consistent with visions sent by divinity, but seems irrational and incomprehensible for man. In the second phase, on the contrary, the prophetess' effort to make her *logos* consistent with the audience's *phren* emerges clearly.

This alternation of psychological states seems to find a remarkable expression in Platonic *Timaeus*²¹. In fact, in his famous monologue Timaeus,

¹⁹ The most evident examples are in late epic poetry: both in Quintus Smyrnaeus and in Triphiodorus we can find the initial cry, the stage of visions in the present tense (QUINTUS SMYRN., XII, 540-543, 548-549; TRIPH., 391-394), the stage of mediate clairvoyance in the future tense and the metaphors (QUINTUS SMYRN., XII, 546; TRIPH., 382-390, 398-407), finally the stage of rational prophecy with awareness of surrounding reality (QUINTUS SMYRN., XII, 549-551; TRIPH., 410-416).

²⁰ Also P. MURRAY, in an article on poetic inspiration ("Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece", *JHS* 101 [1981], p. 87-100: 94), attracts attention on the difference between ecstatic inspiration of visionary type and non-ecstatic inspiration; A. IRIARTE (*Las redes del enigma. Voces femeninas en el pensamiento griego*, Madrid, 1990, p. 104-114, 118-119) believes that these two states, which provide two different ways of expression, agree with female and male genders.

²¹ Cf. PLATON, *Tim.*, 71d-72b: ἱκανὸν δὲ σημεῖον ὡς μαντικὴν ἀφροσύνη θεὸς ἀνθρωπίνῃ δέδωκεν· οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἔννοος ἐφάπτεται μαντικῆς ἐνθέου καὶ ἀληθοῦς, ἀλλ' ἢ καθ' ὕπνον τὴν τῆς φρονήσεως πεδηθεὶς δύναμιν ἢ διὰ νόσον, ἢ διὰ τινα ἐνθουσιασμόν παραλλάξας. ἀλλὰ συννοῆσαι μὲν ἔμφρωνος τὰ τε ῥηθέντα ἀναμνησθέντα ὄναρ ἢ ὕπαρ ὑπὸ τῆς μαντικῆς τε καὶ ἐνθουσιαστικῆς φύσεως, καὶ ὅσα ἀν φαντάσματα ὀφθῇ, πάντα λογισμῷ διελέσθαι ὅπῃ τι σημαίνει καὶ ὅτῳ μέλλοντος ἢ παρελθόντος ἢ παρόντος κακοῦ ἢ ἀγαθοῦ· τοῦ δὲ μανέντος ἔτι τε ἐν τούτῳ μένοντος οὐκ ἔργον τὰ φανέντα καὶ φωνηθέντα ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ κρίνειν, ἀλλ' εὖ καὶ πάλαι λέγεται τὸ πράττειν καὶ γινῶναι τὰ τε αὐτοῦ καὶ ἑαυτὸν σῶφρονι μόνῳ προσήκειν. ὁθεν δὴ

when he describes the function of the body's different organs, dwells upon the liver and particularly on the soul's part that stays in the region of the liver and is endowed with divination, since it has part neither in λόγος nor in φρόνησις²². It is the baser part of us (τὸ φαῦλον), and it is redeemed and set on the right path, because it might have some apprehension of reality and truth: in fact, divination is the gift of divinity to human unwisdom (ἀφροσύνη). In order to explain what it means, Timaeus seems to appeal to a common experience (γάρ): "no man indeed - he goes on - in his normal senses (ἐννοῦς) deals in true and inspired divination, but only when the power of understanding is fettered in sleep or he is distraught by some disorder or, it may be, by divine possession. It is for the man in his ordinary senses (ἐμφρων) to recall and construe the utterances, in dream or in waking life, of divination or possession, and by reflection (λογισμός) to make out in what manner and to whom all the visions of the seer betoken some good or ill, past, present, or to come. When a man has fallen into frenzy and is still in that condition, it is not for him to determine the meaning of his own visions and utterances; rather the old saying is true, that only the sound in mind (σώφρων) can attend to his own concerns and know himself"²³. From the passage we can clearly observe the distinction between the man οὐκ ἐννοῦς (ὁ μανείς), endowed with a true and inspired divination (μαντική ἐνθεὸς καὶ ἀληθής), who speaks (τὰ ῥηθέντα, τὰ φωνηθέντα) in state of frenzy and subject to visions (φαντάσματα, τὰ φανέντα), and the man in his ordinary senses (ἐμφρων, σώφρων), who is able to understand (συννοῆσαι) utterances and visions, to construe them (διελέσθαι) in relation to the temporal consequence (future, past and present), to interpret and to give them the correct meaning (κρίνειν). Thus it seems that utterances and visions become accessible to human comprehension. But the point is that Timaeus is referring evidently to two psychological phases of the *same* person (ὕφ' ἑαυτοῦ; τὰ τε αὐτοῦ καὶ

καὶ τὸ τῶν προφητῶν γένος ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐνθέοις μαντείαις κριτὰς ἐπικαθιστάναι νόμος· οὓς μάντιες αὐτοὺς ὀνομάζουσιν τινες, τὸ πᾶν ἡγνοηκότες ὅτι τῆς δι' αἰνιγμῶν οὗτοι φήμης καὶ φαντάσεως ὑποκρίται, καὶ οὗτι μάντιες, προφήται δὲ μαντευομένων δικαιοτάτα ὀνομάζονται ἄν.

²² On divination in Plato cf. P. VICAIRE, "Platon et la divination", *REG* 83 (1970), p. 333-350.

²³ Transl. by F. M. CORNFORD, *Plato's Cosmology. The Timaeus of Plato*, transl. with a running comm. by-, London, 1935, p. 288-289. On soul's sensitivity to phantasy and pre-cognitions, when it is free from reasoning cf. also PLUT., *De def. orac.*, 432c-d: ταύτην οὖν ἔχουσαι τὴν δύναμιν αἱ ψυχὰι σύμφυτον μὲν ἀμυδρὰν δὲ καὶ δυσφάνταστον ὅμως ἔξανθοῦσι πολλάκις καὶ ἀναλαμβάνουσιν ἐν τε τοῖς ἐνυπνίοις καὶ περὶ τὰς τελευτὰς εἶναι καθαροῦ γιγνομένου τοῦ σώματος ἢ τινα κράσις οἰκεῖαν πρὸς τοῦτο λαμβάνοντος, ὥστε τὸ λογιστικὸν καὶ φροντιστικὸν ἀνέσθαι καὶ ἀπολύεσθαι τῶν παρόντων, <τῷ> ἀλόγῳ καὶ φαντασιαστικῷ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἐπιστρεφόμεναι. [...] ἀλλ' οὗτος ἐμφρων μὲν ἀνὴρ καὶ τῷ νοῦν ἔχοντι τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ μετ' εἰκότος ἡγουμένῳ καθ' ὁδὸν ἐπόμενος, τὸ δὲ μαντικὸν ὥσπερ γραμματεῖον ἄγραφον καὶ ἄλογον καὶ ἀόριστον ἐξ αὐτοῦ, δεκτικὸν δὲ φαντασιῶν πάθεσι καὶ προαισθήσεων, ἀσυλλογίστως ἄπτεται τοῦ μέλλοντος, ὅταν ἐκστῇ μάλιστα τοῦ παρόντος.

ἐαυτὸν): so Plato's passage constitutes a strong parallel with the divination of Cassandra.

Up to now I have discussed two literary texts. Do Cassandra's and Timaeus' divination have a recognizable historical background? In continuing his discourse, Timaeus does make a remarkable terminological distinction, which is unparalleled in literary evidence²⁴, between two classes of people, who are presented as historically existing (ὅθεν... ἐπικαθιστάναι νόμος): the προφῆται, who are judges on inspired divination (ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐνθέοις μαντείαις κριτάς), and interpreters of riddling oracle or vision (τῆς δι' αἰνιγμῶν φήμης καὶ φαντάσεως ὑποκριταί), and the μάντις, who are the real diviners²⁵. No doubt examples of μάντις ἔκφρονες, that is claivoyants in ecstatic state (we can think of Pythia figure or of Sibylline model)²⁶, as well as examples of προφῆται ἔκφρονες, that is self-possessed and under the rational control, are present in Greek literary tradition and much probably both existed in historical reality. Even if Delphi is not mentioned, various scholars have already thought that Plato, when he describes the divining way as involvement of the diviner, who *sees*, and of the prophet, who *exposes*, is keeping in mind the different functions of the Pythia, inspired μάντις, and of the Priests, her spokesmen²⁷. On the other hand, the connections between Cassandra's language and the Delphic formulary (lexicon, animal metaphors, concrete instead of abstract, periphrasis) are so prominent that Parke and Wormell assert that "the Cassandra's language is modelled on that of the Delphic responses, and there can be little doubt that she herself is in part the dramatic representation of the Pythia in ecstasy"²⁸. Moreover, the mantic *climax* structure itself, I detected in the *Agamemnon*, has the same thematic sequence which Fontenrose has found in the typical structure of Delphic responses: the evocation formula, of glossolalic type²⁹, and the invocation –

²⁴ But cf. PIND., fr. 150 Maehler: μαντεύεο, Μοῖσα, προφατεύσω δ' ἐγώ.

²⁵ Cf. G. NAGY, "Ancient Greek Poetry, Prophecy, and Concepts of Theory", in J.L. KUGEL (ed.), *Poetry and Prophecy: the Beginnings of a Literary tradition*, Ithaca, 1990, p. 56-64: 60: "from the standpoint of the Platonic passage at hand, the inspiration of the *mantis* is a given, a matter of Greek religious institutions. The noninspiration of the *prophetes* is also a given, again a matter of Greek religious institutions".

²⁶ On a comparison between the figures of Cassandra, the Pythia and Sibyl cf. MAZZOLDI, *o.c.* (n. 1), p. 99-107; more specifically on the differences between Pythia's and Sibyl's prophetic inspiration cf. CRIPPA, "La voce e la visione", *supra* (n. 11), p. 162-163, 176-182, 186-187.

²⁷ Cf. ARCER-HIND, *The Timaeus of Plato*, London, 1888, *ad loc.*; A.E. TAYLOR, *A Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*, Oxford, 1928, p. 514; P. AMANDRY, *La mantique apollinienne à Delphes. Essai sur le fonctionnement de l'oracle*, Paris, 1950, p. 55; M. DELCOURT, *L'oracle de Delphes*, Paris, 1981², p. 228 n. 1.

²⁸ H.W. PARKE, D.E. WORMELL, *The Delphic Oracle I-II*, Oxford, 1956, II, p. xxxv. On this argument cf. also CRIPPA, "Un genere oracolare", *supra* (n. 5), p. 123-127, 134.

²⁹ A reference to Pythia's glossolalia seems to be EUR., *Ion*, 91-92: θάσσει δὲ γυνή τριπόδα ζάθεον / Δελφίς, δαίδουσι' Ἑλλήσι βοάς, / ἄς ἂν Ἀπόλλων κελαδήσῃ. In

typical elements of the so-called salutation to divinity³⁰ – are followed by the recalling of past and critical events ('condition precedent', it may be expressed in a participial phrase), then by the prophecy itself and by the assertion of mantic authority (*vaticinium ex eventu*); finally by the 'explication', that is the interpretation and judgement on prophecies³¹. By noting the constant presence of oracular situations in all tragedies, which we can read entirely (with the exception of Aeschylus' *Suppliants*), and by comparing some tragic linguistic features with the formulary of oracular responses, it is possible to assume that the Delphic sanctuary wielded a clear cultural influence over the Athenian theater. Particularly in Aeschylean texts the purpose of the resorting to oracular technic vocabulary seems to be the evocation of foresight's sacral feature and it gives evidence to the ritual's strong permanence³². We can conclude that in 458 B.C., in the Athenian theater of Dionysos, Aeschylus meant to represent the divination in a rather realistic way as a religious and social phenomenon. In his Cassandra – endowed with the dual nature of μάντις and προφήτης, a literary figure of an unbelieved foreteller – we can see the reflection of an oracular practice, which was a part of Athenians' common experience and which found the most famous concrete form in Delphi, where the institution itself provided the co-existence of the Pythia and her interpreters³³.

Sabina MAZZOLDI

Via Sagginalese 2,
I – 50032 Borgo S. Lorenzo (FIRENZE)
e-mail: smazzoldi@univr.it

TAYLOR's opinion (o. c., p. 513), γλωσσολαλία itself could be a good model of what Timaeus does mean by saying prophetic νόσοι. On the interpreter figure in relationship with glossolalia cf. CRIPPA, "Glossolalia", *supra* (n. 5), p. 499 and n. 19 with bibliographic references. The analysis of Pythia's and Cassandra's language allows to reconstruct the true nature of it, which testifies the presence of glossolalic phenomenon in Greek culture too (cf. CRIPPA, "Glossolalia", *supra* [n. 5], p. 500-501).

³⁰ Cf. CRIPPA, "Un genere oracolare", *supra* (n. 5), p. 137.

³¹ Cf. J. FONTENROSE, *The Delphic Oracle*, Berkeley, 1978, p. 175-185.

³² Cf. M. CAVALLI, "Tragedia e cultura oracolare. Alcune osservazioni", *Dioniso* 62 (1992), p. 49-68; 49-50, 64; S. VOGT, "Delphi in der attischen Tragödie", *AA* 44 (1998), p. 30-48: 34, 41-44, 48.

³³ Cf. EUR., *Ion*, 414-416: ἡμεῖς τὰ γ' ἔξω, / τῶν ἔσω δ' ἄλλοις μέλει, / οἱ πλησίον θάσσουσι τρίποδος, ᾧ ξένη, / Δελφῶν ἀριστῆς, οὗς ἐκλήρωσεν πάλος.

Schema I

<p>I phase 'perceptive': ecstasy, visions, in contact with divinity</p>	<p>Stage A: glossololia (preceded by silence, immobility) • cries, ritual invocations</p> <p>Stage B: clairvoyance without mediation • visions and perception by senses # soliloquy without interlocution * badly-constructed sentences <i>Deixis am Phantasma</i> and present tense</p>
<p>II phase 'communicative': consciousness, knowledge, in contact with human audience</p>	<p>Stage C: clairvoyance with mediation • rational interpretation of visions # awareness of audience's presence * well-constructed sentences causal nexus, use of metaphors for visions, past and future tense</p> <p>Stage D: rational prophecy • rationality, interpretation and judgement on prophecies # will to communicate, dialogue (<i>stichomythia</i>) * temporal and causal consequence normal use of tenses</p>

Schema II

	stage A glossolalia: cries and ritual invocations	stage B clairvoyance without mediation	stage C clairvoyance with mediation	stage D rational prophecy
<i>I climax</i>	1072-73 1076-77 1080-82 1085-87 = 10 verses	1090-92 1095-97 1100-04 1107-11 1114-18 1125-29 = 26 verses	1136-39 1146-49 1156-61 1167-72 = 20 verses	1178-97 1202-03 1206 1208 1210 1212 = 26 verses
<i>II climax</i>	1214 = 1 verse	1215-22 = 8 verses	1223-38 = 16 verses	1239-41 1246 1248 1250 1252 1254 = 8 verses
<i>III climax</i>	1256-57 = 2 verses	1256 = 1 verse	1258-78 = 21 verses	1279-94 1299 1301 1303 1305 = 20 verses
<i>IV climax</i>	1307 = 1 verse	1309 1311 = 2 verses	 = 0 verses	1313-20 1322-30 = 17 verses