Mythological Innovations in Corinna’s Asopides Poem (fr.654.ii–iv PMG)

Brian D. McPhee

If Corinna’s date is notoriously uncertain,¹ at least one thing about the lyric poet is beyond question: she is a proud native of Tanagra, writing in a distinctive Boeotian dialect of Greek and treating mainly Boeotian myths in her verse.² Earlier critics tended to overemphasize these features of her poetry and consequently imagined an isolated, parochial, and conservative Corinna. She was a poet “little influenced by” and with “little influence on Greek poetry,”³ “interested only in


³ G. M. Kirkwood, Early Greek Monody: The History of a Poetic Type (Ithaca 1974) 186.
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transmitting received tradition, not in challenging it.” Recent scholarship, however, has emphasized Corinna’s engagement with the broader Panhellenic mythical and literary traditions, which frequently provide the counterpoint from which her innovative epichoric versions derive their significance. For instance, Corinna’s version of the Teumessian fox myth seems to have replaced the Athenian hero Cephalus with the Theban Oedipus, evidently out of patriotic Boeotian feeling (fr.672).

In this paper, I seek to apply these recent insights to the interpretation of certain mythological peculiarities in the longest fragment of Corinna that we possess, her Asopides poem (654.iii.12–51). After a brief review of scholarly assessments, I will propose that two details in the poem reflect previously unidentified mythological innovations. The first concerns the

---


7 Forty lines of the poem are legible in col. iii, but traces of 105 more can be seen in coll. ii and iv and the top of col. iii. The original poem may have been even longer: D. L. Page, Corinna (London 1953) 24.
elevated position of Poseidon in the divine hierarchy; the second, the curious reference to Orion’s “regaining his own land.”

1. Previously identified mythological innovations

The poem as we have it picks up part way into the speech of a seer whose identity is not agreed upon in the scholarship. For ease of reference, I will follow the majority opinion in referring to him as Acraephen, eponym of the Boeotian town Acraephia, without necessarily endorsing this identification.8 In any case, our seer is in the process of informing the river god Asopus of the fate of his nine daughters, who have recently vanished. He relates that they have been abducted by Zeus, Poseidon, Apollo, and Hermes,9 and are destined to become immortal and bear

8 Most editions print Wilamowitz’s supplement Ακρηφεύς at iii.31, capitalized to denote a proper name, but some have interpreted the word as an adjective, the Boeotian equivalent of ἀκραφωνής, “unmixed, pure”: Lobel, Hermes 65 (1930) 363; P. Guillon, “Corinna et les oracles béotiens: La consultation d’Asôpos,” BCH 82 (1958) 47–60, at 51 with n.2; A. Schachter, Cults of Boiotia I (London 1981) 63. A name ending in -eiv (or -ey) is not impossible as a dialectal form of Ακρηφεύς (a name given by Steph. Byz. s.v. Άκραφεια), though it is unparalleled in surviving Boeotian Greek (Schachter 62, and “The Prophet of Korinna, fr. 654 PMG: Glaucus Pontios?” in A. Ch. Christopoulou [ed.], Επετηρίς της Εταιρείας Βοιωτικών Μελετών 2.2 [Athens 1995] 1063–1072, at 1063–1065). Other identifications for the seer have been proposed, including the sea god Glaucus (Schachter, in Επετηρίς and Mt. Parnes (B. Gentili and L. Lomiento, “Corinna, Le Asopidi (PMG 654 col. III 12–51),” QUCC 68 [2001] 7–20, at 14–16). Naturally, the identification of the seer has ramifications for the identification of the setting of his oracle. Mt. Ptoion is assumed largely based on its proximity to Acraephia, but a change in seer would leave the location of Asopus’ consultation in question. For other possible oracles and seers see Schachter, Cults 63–64. In any case, these precise identifications are immaterial to the arguments of this paper; cf. n.59 below.

9 The abduction was narrated in the missing beginning of the poem, where the names of the nine Asopides were given. For their identifications see W. Schubart and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Berliner Klassikertexte V.2 Lyrische und dramatische Fragmente (Berlin 1907) 49–52; C. M. Bowra, “The Daughters of Asopus,” Hermes 73 (1938) 213–221; Page, Corinna 26–27; J. Larson, “Corinna and the Daughters of Asopus,” SyllClass 13 (2002) 47–62, at 56 n.23.
heroic offspring (12–25a). To vouch for his prophecy, Acraephen rehearses the history of his mantic office at Mt. Ptoion (25b–43), where a sanctuary to Apollo was located. He concludes by exhorting Asopus to stop grieving and to rejoice at becoming a father-in-law to gods (44–46). The papyrus becomes badly damaged just before Asopus’ reply (47–51), but Acraephen’s words seem to have somewhat consoled the bereft father, who responds “happily” (ἀσπασίως, 48) even amidst his tears (δύκρου τ’ ὀκτάλων προβολ[όν, 50]).

Several scholars have already noted mythological innovations in Corinna’s narrative. There were at least two rivers called Asopus with claims to being the river god mentioned in the myth, one Peloponnesian and the other Boeotian. C. M. Bowra long ago observed that Corinna has appropriated the Asopus myth for the Boeotian river, thereby linking the nine locales across the Greek world named for the Asopides back to her own homeland. As to Acraephen, Derek Collins has argued that Corinna selects this particular seer for her narrative in order to connect his father Orion, a figure with Panhellenic appeal, to the local oracular seat at Mt. Ptoion, which Acraephen claims Orion had occupied in the previous generation (37–41).

Outside of Corinna, Orion is nowhere associated with prophecy, nor are any of his children seers. What is more, Acraephen claims to be but one of the fifty sons of Orion (28–29; cf. fr.655.1.15–16). Albert Schachter sees in this detail an effort to raise the Tanagran hero to the level of Heracles, who similarly fathered fifty sons with the daughters of the Boeotian king Thespius. Orion and his family appear to have been frequent

---

13 Schachter, in Επετηρίς τῆς Ἐπαρείας Βοιωτικῶν Μελετῶν 1069–1070.
subjects of Corinna’s poetry (655.1.14, 656, 662, 673) and will be discussed further below.

Most significantly, Corinna has radically altered the Panhellenic version of the (Peloponnesian) Asopus myth, which was already well established by the fifth century and remained relatively consistent throughout Greek and Latin literature.14 Pseudo-Apollodorus provides a representative rendition of the story (Bibl. 3.12.6):

...εἴκοσι δὲ θυγατέρας, ὧν μὲν μίαν Αἴγιναν ἥρπασε Ζεὺς, ταύτην Ἀσωπός ζητῶν ἠκένει παρὰ Κόρινθον, καὶ μανθάνει παρὰ Σισύφου τὸν ἤρπακότα εἶναι Δία. Ζεὺς δὲ Ἀσωπόν μὲν κερουνόσας διόκοντα πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ οἰκεῖα ἀπέπεψε ρέθρα (διὰ τούτο μέχρι καὶ νῦν ἐκ τῶν τούτων ρείθρων ἀνθρακὸς φέρονται).

[Asopus sired] twenty daughters, of whom one, Aegina, was carried off by Zeus. In search of her Asopus came to Corinth, and learned from Sisyphus that the ravisher was Zeus. Asopus pursued him, but Zeus, by hurling thunderbolts, sent him away back to his own streams; hence coals are fetched to this day from the streams of that river.15

The differences between the mainstream version and Corinna’s are considerable, to say the least. Alexander Hall has noted in particular the peaceable resolution of Corinna’s narrative and its presentation of the nine unions in matrimonial language, changes that enhance Asopus’ dignity and legitimize divine

Pallas (Apollod. Epit. 1.11), not to mention Thespius himself. Orion’s fifty sons by local nymphs serve the further function of allowing Corinna to people the towns of Boeotia with descendants of the hero’s eponymous sons: J. Larson, Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore (Oxford 2001) 142. A good introduction to such eponymous figures and the political significance of their myths can be found in M. P. Nilsson, Cults, Myths, Oracles, and Politics in Ancient Greece (Goeteborg 1986 [1951]) 65–80.


15 Text and translation of Pseudo-Apollodorus are taken from Frazer, Apollodorus.
rape. Moreover, the singular abductee Aegina has been multiplied nine times over, the further to spread Boeotia’s genealogical renown. Indeed, the prophecy that the Asopides “shall give birth to a race of heroes half-divine” (γενέθλαν / ἐσγεννά-σονθ’ εἰμ[ι]τ[ὸ]ι[ν], 654.iii.22–23) links a host of important heroes, including the Aeacidae, back to Boeotia. Finally, Asopus’ informant has been changed from a Corinthian hero—a detail in keeping with a Peloponnesian Asopus—to a Boeotian one, Acraephen. In so doing, Corinna has also availed herself of the opportunity to replace the arch-deceiver Sisyphus with a prophet who is at pains to stress the truthfulness of his oracular pronouncements (ἀψεύδιαν, 31; ἀτ[ρ][εί][αν χρε[ι][σ]µ[ο]λό[γ]ον, 43).

These examples effectively illustrate Corinna’s innovative approach to myth. Her revisions are consistently animated by feelings of Boeotian patriotism and piety, evident in her concern

16 A. E. Hall, “Love and Marriage in Corinna’s ‘Daughters of Asopus’ (PMG 654),” presented March 31, 2012, at the 108th Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South in Baton Rouge, and graciously shared with me by the author. On the marriage theme see also Lardinois, in *Archaic and Classical Choral Song* 167–168; cf. Larmour, in *Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome* 50–51. Notably, Statius may have recognized this distinctive dimension of Corinna’s account as well. His *Thebaid* offers a brief treatment of the mainstream, Peloponnesian version of the Asopus myth (7.315–329), but he appears to acknowledge Corinna’s alternate version by identifying Asopus as the Boeotian river (7.424–425) and by calling Jupiter the god’s son-in-law (generum, 318; cf. ἑκουρ[εύων, Corinna 654.iii.46). Statius would doubtless have known his Corinna, for in an oft-cited passage, he claims that his father had taught her works as part of his “syllabus” of Greek poets (*Silv.* 5.3.158).

17 The text at ii.33–34, if reconstructed correctly (ὧν Ἤγιαν – – γενεθλαν / Δεύς – – ἄγαθον), would make Aegina the first daughter mentioned in the list of abductees. Her priority in the list would constitute a clear nod to the Panhellenic version of the myth.


to present her gods and heroes in a more decorous light than the Panhellenic alternative provides.\textsuperscript{21} I would now like to focus on two further moments in Corinna’s narrative, where I argue that additional instances of mythological innovations are at work, and in which the same impulses to mythological revision can be discerned. As it happens, both occur in catalogues, a form that seems to have been a staple of Corinna’s poetry.\textsuperscript{22}

First, however, a word on methodology. Working with fragments is always fraught, and Corinna in particular presents special challenges. In view of her mythological innovations, D. L. Page once warned: “Corinna must be treated as a law unto herself; we must never make inferences from the common tradition to Corinna, unless they can be verified by reliable testimony.”\textsuperscript{23} Doubtless he exaggerates her idiosyncrasies, but it is true that she is willing to make major revisions to Panhellenic myth in order to exalt her native Boeotia. Moreover, Corinna presents us with some material that is completely unparalleled, such as Orion’s connection to an oracle or the strange notion of his “regaining his own land.” As a result, scholars responding to puzzling features in Corinna’s poems must be wary of making undue assumptions and should try instead to respond to the internal logic of her narratives and the broader tendencies observable in her extant work. Arguments of this sort are necessarily speculative—doubtless too speculative to satisfy some—but they are necessitated by poetry as fragmentary and innovative as Corinna’s.\textsuperscript{24} In this realm of probability and incertitude I submit the following arguments.


\textsuperscript{22} See Kousoulini, \textit{GRBS} 56 (2016) 82–110.

\textsuperscript{23} Page, \textit{Corinna} 39.

\textsuperscript{24} I am reminded of a carefully-weighed conclusion made by W. J. Henderson (“Corinna of Tanagra on Poetry,” \textit{AClass} 38 [1995] 29–41, at 30), apropos of a deduction he draws from another of Corinna’s fragments: “Although there is no external evidence for this view, it is not intrinsically impossible, and internal indications make it probable.”
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2. *The place of Poseidon in the divine hierarchy*

Our fragment begins with a breakdown of the number of Asopides abducted by each god (12–18):

```
τὰν δὲ πήδω [ν τρὶς µ]ὲν ἔχι
Δεὺς πατεὶ [ρ πάντω]ν βασιλεῦς,
τρὶς δὲ πόντ[ω γὰμε] µέδων
Π[οτιδέων, τ]ὰν δὲ δουίν
Φῦβος λέκτ[ρα] κρατούνι,
τὰν δ᾽ ἵαν Μή[ας] ἄγαθὸς
πῆς Ἑρµᾶς.
```

And of your daughters father Zeus, king of all, has three; and Poseidon, ruler of the sea, married three; and Phoebus is master of the beds of two of them, and of one Hermes, good son of Maia.

This miniature catalogue is skillfully crafted to reflect the descending status of each of its gods. Zeus is presented as “king of all”; Poseidon’s domain is limited to the sea; Apollo’s mastery appears only in the verb that denotes his relationship to his Asopides (κρατούνι); and Hermes, whose verb must be supplied, is characterized by his maternity, in keeping with his position as the youngest of the gods who appear here.

---

25 J. Larson (*SyllClass* 13 [2002] 53–54) notes that Pindar’s catalogue of Argonauts is similarly organized according to the importance of the heroes’ fathers, and includes an identical sequence of deities: Zeus, Poseidon, Apollo, Hermes, and Boreas (*Pyth.* 4.171–183). Probably the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* was organized along similar lines (Larson 53).

26 My argument depends on the supplement πάντω [ν in line 13, which seems, however, quite likely to be right. Notably, Zeus also receives the greatest allotment of lines, with two full verses (12–13) compared to the other gods’ roughly one-and-a-half.

27 Poseidon’s superiority to Apollo is memorably illustrated in the Iliadic theomachy by Apollo’s refusal to fight his uncle (21.435–469). The wisdom of his decision is illustrated immediately thereafter by his sister Artemis’ parallel duel with Hera, her aunt, which ends in humiliation (21.470–496).

28 Μή[ας] … πῆς may also represent a desire to maintain *variatio*, as Hermes’ father Zeus has just been mentioned; cf. Ἀτριδὰς in line 32. Even so, Hermes’ junior status is also conveyed by the fact that he is the only god whose name does not appear in an emphatic position at the beginning of the...
numbers listed in the catalogue generally align with this downward progression as well. As Marilyn Skinner observes, “For each divinity, the number of brides obtained corresponds to his fixed place in the Olympian hierarchy.” We are not far from Iliadic notions of status reified in the form of captured women, though here the language of marriage adds an air of legitimacy to divine raptus, whose benefits (to both Asopus and his daughters) are stressed in Acraephen’s prophecy (22–25, 46).


30 For different views on the ‘patriarchal’ sensibility of the poem, see, in addition to the scholars cited in the previous note, Snyder, The Woman and the Lyre 49; Rayor, Arethusa 26 (1993) 228; Lardinois, in Archaic and Classical Choral Song 167–168.

31 In addition to the conflict in Il. 13–15, see Il. 1.394–412, Pind. Isthm. 8.26a–29, Orph.Argon. 1277–1283, and Bacchyl. 17, which stages a sort of proxy war between the gods through their sons, Minos and Theseus. See also S. de Haas (“Zweisamkeit am Schwarzen Meer,” NumAntCl 18 [1989] 55–77, at 61, 70–71) for the motif on coins from Greek colonies on the Black Sea,
equality with his older brother on the grounds that both of them were allotted one third of the cosmos (15.184–200), in stark contrast to the Hesiodic vision of a monarchical Zeus who distributes divine τιμαί of his own accord (Thw, 73–74, 881–885). In fact, in the Iliad, too, Poseidon’s minor rebellion against Zeus’ authority in Books 13–15 ultimately resolves into an affirmation of Zeus’ supremacy (13.355; 15.165–167, 181–183, 201–219) and on this score Corinna is in agreement. Indeed, she seems to reject the myth of the division of the cosmos even as she recalls it: Poseidon may rule the sea, but Zeus rules all. Nevertheless, by allotting the same number of nymphs to both Zeus and Poseidon, she implicitly endorses the argument that the latter makes in the Iliad: he receives the same honor (ὁµότιµον, 15.186) and portion (ἰσόµορον, 209) as Zeus himself. Corinna’s catalogue thus embodies a tension between two contradictory impulses in the mythic tradition: the acknowledgement of both the subordination of Poseidon (and all other gods) to Zeus almighty and the ἰσοτιµία that obtains among the sons of Cronus. Why does the poet choose to hew this line and thereby muddle the hierarchical organization of her list?

Corinna might have easily avoided this problem by adjusting the number of Asopides in her narrative. After all, the tradition surrounding the names and numbers of the Asopides is highly fluid. Other sources know of five, seven, twelve, or even twenty

and A. Teffteller (“Helikon’s Song, Korinna fr. 654 PMG,” in A. Ch. Christopoulou [ed.], Επετηρίς της Εταιρείας Βοιωτικών Μελετών 2.2 [Athens 1995] 1073–1080, at 1077–1079), who argues that Helicon’s losing song in the missing part of Corinna’s mountains poem concerned Poseidon, in which case the contest with Cithaeron’s winning song about the birth of Zeus would also engage with the Zeus-Poseidon rivalry.

32 On these myths and the different attitudes toward Zeus that they imply, see R. Janko, The Iliad: A Commentary IV (Cambridge 1994) ad 15.185–193.

nymphs, while yet more daughters of the river god, named in none of these sources, can be found scattered throughout the literary record. Whatever Corinna’s reason for limiting herself to nine Asopides, her choice has an interesting consequence for her narrative: nine daughters cannot be divided among four gods without at least two of those gods receiving the same num-

34 For lists of Asopides, see R. L. Fowler, Early Greek Mythography II (Oxford 2013) 443; see further J. Larson, Greek Nymphs 140–141 with nn.46–52. Paus. 5.22.6 mentions a Phliasian statue group dedicated at Olympia that depicts five daughters. Seven are listed in schol. Pind. Ol. 144e, and twelve in Diod. 4.72.1, though at 4.73.1 he mentions a thirteenth. Apollod. Bibli. 3.12.6, quoted above, claims that there are twenty Asopides, unless M. Papa-thomopoulos Απολλοδώρου Βιβλιοθήκη [Athens 2010] is correct in emending to “twelve.” Bacchylides’ ninth epinician contains a now-fragmentary list of Asopides (47–65) that would not, however, have pinned down an exact number even if it were complete (63–65). The Hesiodic Catalogue might also have supplied a valuable list; see M. L. West, The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Its Nature, Structure, and Origins (Oxford 1983) 100–103.

35 Antiope appears as a daughter of Asopus already at Od. 11.260. An Isme menace is mentioned in Apollod. Bibli. 2.1.3 and appears alongside Thebe in artistic sources (see J. Larson, Greek Nymphs 304 n.54); other sources also give Asopus a son named Ismenus (Diod. 4.72.1, Apollod. 3.12.6). Herodotus identifies Oere (9.51), Pausanias Plataea (9.1.2), as further Asopides. Philyra is an Aspid in Acesander (FG2Hist 469 F 2 = schol. Pind. Pyth. 9.27b). Schol. Od. 17.208 makes Rhode a daughter of Asopus, citing an unknown tragic source; see B. D. McPhee, “The Parentage of Rhodes in Pindar Olympian 7.13–14,” CP 112 (2017) 228–232, at 228 with n.5. An Iliadic scholium adds Pronoe to the Asopides’ ranks (schol. A 2.517). Finally, Thisce appears as an Aspid in Steph. Byz. s.v. Θίσβη and in Eust. ad Il. 2.502, as does Euboea in Eust. ad Il. 536. Bowra (Hermes 73 [1938] 216) cites [Clem. Al.] Recognitions 10.21 for Eurynome as an Asopid, but in fact she appears there as Asopus’ wife.

36 It is suggestive that the word “Pleiades” seems to appear at col. iv.33—in the context of a comparison between the nine Asopides and nine Pleiades? The reference could equally be to the catasterized Orion of iii.40 (Page, Corinna 27 n.3). The Moses provide a more familiar example of the mythological motif of nine daughters (cf. Larmour, in Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome 33–34); cf. Niobe’s nine daughters (and sons) in Hes. fr.183 M.-W. and Sappho fr.205 L.-P.
ber of consorts.\textsuperscript{37} If, conversely, Corinna had chosen an even ten Asopides, the allotments could have fallen very neatly into a hierarchical pattern: four for Zeus, three for Poseidon, two for Apollo, one for Hermes. Given that no other extant source numbers the Asopides at nine and that their ranks are easily expanded or contracted, the selection of this total, which necessitates the numerical equality of at least two gods, should be regarded as a deliberate decision on the part of the poet.

Corinna’s Boeotian nationalism has provided invaluable clues for interpreting other mythological peculiarities found in her poetry, and I suspect that this case is no different. Poseidon played a vital role in the religious life of Bocotia, possessing an important shrine at Onchestus that is already mentioned in the Catalogue of Ships (\textit{Il.} 2.506). Indeed, Aristarchus reportedly took for granted that all of Boeotia was sacred to Poseidon.\textsuperscript{38} In the Hellenistic period he appeared on Boeotian coinage and was, with Zeus, Hera, and Athena, one of the gods by whom oaths were sworn in the ratification of treaties.\textsuperscript{39} The sea god plays an equally important role in Boeotian genealogical myth, which in fact makes him the father of Boeotus himself, the region’s eponymous hero.\textsuperscript{40} This tradition surfaces in Corinna’s own poetry, in a fragment from her \textit{Boeotus:} “you, blessed son of Cronus, you, lord Boeotus (fathered by?) Poseidon…” (τὸ δὲ

\textsuperscript{37} The possible distributions are: a) 6+1+1+1; b) 5+2+1+1; c) 4+2+2+1; d) 3+3+2+1.

\textsuperscript{38} Schol. B \textit{Il.} 5.422 (III 253.19 Dindorf), ὡς ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος βούλεται, ἐπεὶ ἡ Βοιωτία ὅλη ἱερὰ Ποσειδῶνος.

\textsuperscript{39} See A. Schachter, \textit{Boiotia in Antiquity: Selected Papers} (Cambridge 2016) 188.

\textsuperscript{40} On this tradition see the first chapter of S. Larson, \textit{Tales of Epic Ancestry}; for a summary of ancient sources see the list provided by J. G. Frazer (\textit{Pausanias’s Description of Greece} V [London 1898] 1), adding Euripides’ \textit{Mela-nippe the Wise} test. i, iia; fr. 481.23–24 (in C. Collard and M. Cropp, \textit{Euripides: Fragments: Aegeus–Melanippe} [Cambridge (Mass.) 2008]). According to Paus. 9.1.1, however, Boeotus is the son of Itonus, though the latter appears in Diodorus rather as Boeotus’ own son (4.67.7); cf. Corinna fr.670 and Fowler, \textit{Early Greek Mythography} II 189.
Even in the scanty fragments of Corinna’s ouvre that we possess, Poseidon’s genealogical role in Boeotian lore comes into view in several other places. Indeed, earlier in the Asopides poem, Poseidon had probably appeared with the epithet “father” (Ποτιδάων κλέυε πατείρ, ii.38), in what is perhaps an acknowledgement of his pivotal place in Boeotian genealogies. Later in the poem, Poseidon reappears as the father of Hyrieus (iii.37), the occupant of Acraephen’s office before Orion. Moreover, other figures who appear in Corinna’s poetry have traditional links to Poseidon, such as his son (or grandson) Minyas (fr. 665). Of particular interest is his consort Libya, who appears in a genealogical context in a poem that has been regarded as programmatic for Corinna’s poetics (655.1.12–17).  

41 In this context, the son of Cronus is probably Poseidon himself, though Zeus could be meant. S. Larson, however, interprets Κρονίδη as “descendant of Cronus” and applies the epithet to Boeotus: Tales of Epic Ancestry 20, 29.

42 The epithet is attached to Zeus, as is more usually done, in iii.13 (Δεὺς πατείρ), where it has special point in emphasizing his seniority among the gods. Indeed, the third and fourth members of the divine quartet, Apollo and Hermes, are his children.

43 For various traditions see Fowler, Early Greek Mythography 192. In addition, a son of Aegeus—possibly Theseus, whose true father is Poseidon—appears in 694.1.7.

44 For ancient sources on this relationship see Gantz, Early Greek Myth 200, to which add Tzetzs. Chil. 7.349–350.

Often I adorned our ancestor Cephus with my words, often great Orion and the fifty sons of high strength whom [he fathered] by intercourse with the nymphs, (and fair) Libya...

It is regrettable that the text breaks off at this point, before Libya’s relationship to Corinna’s Bocotian themes could be clarified; David Campbell suggests that she is relevant as ancestor of Cadmus, the founder of Thebes. In any event, what does seem clear is Poseidon’s integral role in the genealogies of the Bocotian heroes and heroines with whom so much of Corinna’s poetry is concerned. Very likely, Poseidon’s heightened status in fr.654.iii.14–15 reflects his importance in Bocotian religion and myths of common ancestry, which explains Corinna’s choice to interrupt the hierarchical flow of her catalogue with a brief nod toward a different tradition of isotimía between Poseidon and Zeus.

3. Euonymus’ expulsion and Orion’s return

Much of the poem as we have it is taken up with Acraephon’s attestation of his oracular credentials, which he presents in the form of a catalogue of his predecessors at Mt. Ptoion (654.iii.32–41):

πράτοι [μὲν] ἵ[ρ]ο Λατιοίδας
δῶκ’ Ἐὐωνούμοι τριπόδον
ἐς ἰόν [χρε]ισμός ἐνέπειν,
τὸν δ’ ἐς γάς βαλὼν Οὐριεύς
tiμᾶντν) δεύτερος ἱσχεν.


46 Campbell, Greek Lyric IV 37 n.6; West (CQ 20 [1970] 284 n.1) seems to have had the same thought.
πῆς [Ποτ]δάωνος· ἐπὶ
Ω[ρ]ίων ὀμός γενέτωρ
γῆ[ν]φλάν ἀπασάμενος·
χό μὲν ὄροι[ν]ον ὀμφέπτι,
τιμάν δ’ ἔλλαξον ούταν.

For Euonymus was the first to whom Leto’s son granted the utterance of oracles from his tripods; and Hyrieus, throwing him out of the land, was the second to obtain the honour, son of Poseidon; and then Orion, our father, having regained his own land; and he now dwells in the sky, and (I obtained) this honour.

Scholars have been puzzled by the reference to Orion’s “regain[ing] his own land.” As Page remarks, “How he had lost it, we do not know.” It is a myth found nowhere else. The same could be said of Hyrieus’ banishment of Euonymus, a shadowy figure explained in late sources as a son of Cepheus and father of Aulis. Page continues: “Behind the story of the Ptoian oracle we may seem to detect an era of violent strife for control of one of Boeotia’s most important institutions.” Here, I offer a reconstruction of the mythic events that might underlie Corinna’s mysterious references—an enterprise that necessarily entails a fair amount of speculation, but which, I think, has good support both in the text of this catalogue and in Corinna’s larger oeuvre.

First, though Corinna’s references are lost on us, the casual way in which she makes them is worth noting. It is as if she assumes that her audience will already be acquainted with the stories that she outlines. And indeed, she appears to have treated elements of this myth elsewhere. Fr.655.4 reads, “I [or “they”] 47

47 Page, Corinna 25.
49 Schol. D II. 2. 496, Steph. Byz. s.v. Αὐλίς. Euonymus probably figured in more of Corinna’s poetry, however, as she is credited with writing a poem about his daughters (fr.660).
saw ... foreign ... and Hyrieus, having come ..., dragged (him) out...” (3 τ᾿ ἐφίδουν [, 4 βάρβαρον κ] 6 βὰς δὲ Ὕριε[ύς 6ς. ἐσ] σείλκουσε, ν[...]). This looks like a description of the same event alluded to in the Asopides poem: Hyrieus expelling Euonymus from the land (τὸν δ᾿ ἐς γὰς βαλὼν Ὀὑριεύς, 35). Doubtless much of Acraephon’s abbreviated account of this incident would be clarified if we possessed the full narrative glimpsed in this fragment.

The notion of Orion’s “regaining” his land implies that he had been dispossessed and apart from it for some period of time before returning to it. And again, Corinna seems to have treated just such a story in another poem, whose title Apollonius Dyscolus gives as Cataplus (Κατάπλους), or “Voyage Home” (frr. 662, 663). One fragment gives us some slight sense of its contents (662):

νίκασ᾿ ὃν μεγαλοσθενεῖς
Ὡαρίων χώραν τ᾿ ὀπτ᾿ ἐός
πάσαν ὄνομήνεν.

whom mighty Orion conquered, and named all the land after himself.

If the land that Orion names after himself is the same as the hero’s “own land” from 654.iii.39—an uncertain, but hardly improbable inference—then Page’s vision of a violent retaking of Mt. Ptoion and environs is confirmed. On this interpretation, the antecedent of the relative pronoun ὃν would presumably be

50 Cf. fr.691, where Euonymus’ name may have appeared and where Ares is mentioned. See also Kousoulini (GRBS 56 [2016] 90) on fr.660, which she speculates could refer to troubles undergone by one of Euonymus’ daughters after his exile.

51 The imperfect tense may imply that Orion “was for naming” the land after himself (so Campbell, Greek Lyric IV 43 n.3), but ultimately did not. Indeed, otherwise it is unclear what land named after Orion Corinna could have in mind.

52 Schubart and Wilamowitz (Berliner Klassikertexte 53) assume that the Cataplus narrates Orion’s return to reclaim his birthright at Mt. Ptoion.
Hyrieus, the previous possessor of the oracle. Such a picture would dovetail nicely with Corinna’s characterization of the hero as a mighty warrior and hunter. Another fragment adds to our picture of Corinna’s Orion (673 = schol. Nic. Ther. 15):

οἱ δὲ πλείους Ταναγραίον εἶναι φασὶ τὸν Ὡρίωνα. Κόριννα δὲ εὑσεβέστατον λέγει αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπελθόντα πολλοὺς τόπους ἠμαρόσαι καὶ καθαρίσαι ἀπὸ θηρίων.

Most authorities say that Orion was from Tanagra. Corinna calls him most pious and says he visited many places, taming the land and clearing it of wild beasts.

Probably this fragment reveals the activities of Corinna’s Orion abroad between the time he left his land and returned to it. If so, this description could refer to parts of the Cataplus.

This fragment also shows that Corinna was concerned to present Tanagra’s hometown hero in a favorable light. He is “most pious,” and his famed prowess as a hunter (cf. Od. 11.572–575) is here directed to the noble purpose of rendering the land safe and habitable for humans (cf. ἠμαρόσαι). In Panhellenic myth, conversely, Orion frequently cuts quite an unsavory figure, as appears, for instance, from David Larmour’s list of the hero’s “better-known adventures”.

53 Cf. Larmour, in Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome 34, who raises the possibility that Corinna’s Orion might have taken his land back from Hyrieus with violence.

54 Cf. the description of his “fifty sons of high strength” (πεντείκοντα ὑψιβίας / πῆδα, 655.1.15–16), “fifty strong brothers” (πεντείκοντας ὁμήμων, 654.iii.28–29)—traits they inherit from their father.

55 Campbell translates ἠμαρόσαι as “reclaiming the land,” which I have altered to avoid confusion with Orion’s “regaining his own land” (γῆαν ἀποκατασάμενος, 654.iii.39) in the Asopides poem. In Greek there is no semantic overlap between these verbs.


57 Larmour, in Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome 36, summarizing Gantz, Early Greek Myth 271–273, and emphasizing Corinna’s idiosyncrasies; see also Page, Corinna 35. In addition to Gantz, see the first chapter of J.
His love affair with Eos, which ended in death on the point of one of Artemis’ arrows when the gods became jealous; his journey to Chios, where after getting drunk he raped Oenopion’s daughter Merope and was then blinded and exiled; his hybristic hunting boast on Crete, which caused Gaia to kill him with a giant scorpion; and finally his being placed among the stars by Zeus, as requested by Artemis and Leto.

Of these myths, only the one that flatters Orion—his catasterism—is visible in Corinna’s fragments (654.iii.40). Corinna’s procedure in revising the Asopus myth for specific moral and patriotic aims is a good comparandum for her reverent handling of Orion. I am thus inclined to doubt Timothy Gantz’s idea that the Cataplus related the myth of Orion’s blinding on Chios and his eventual recovery of sight as a gift from Helius.\(^5\) Given Corinna’s emphasis on Orion’s superlative piety, such a tale of drunken rape could hardly have found a place in her poetry—at least not without serious revision.

With this background from the rest of Corinna’s poetry in mind, we may return to Acraephen’s catalogue of seers. There is a tension in Corinna’s succession narrative that, I suspect, scholars have often felt but only rarely articulated. On the one hand, there is a marked symmetry between Euonymus’ expulsion from the land in line 35 and Orion’s reclaiming of the land in line 39. Just as Hyrieus violently drives Euonymus from the oracle (cf. fr.655.4), so it appears that Orion retook his own land with violence (cf. 662), presumably from Hyrieus himself, the previous occupant of the oracle. If we had no other information about these figures, it would be natural to assume that Euonymus was the rightful prophet of Mt. Ptoion, invested with this honor by Apollo himself, whereas Hyrieus plays the part of the villainous usurper. On this view, Orion would represent something like Euonymus’ protégé, or even his son. The land is somehow Orion’s own, seemingly his birthright, and he appears


\(^5\) Gantz, *Early Greek Myth* 272.
to regain it by returning to the land, avenging Euonymus, and taking his rightful place as the Ptoian seer. In the next generation, orderly succession resumes, as Orion passes the office on to his own son Acraephen.\textsuperscript{59} This interpretation would assimilate Orion’s story to the familiar pattern of Jason, Orestes, Cresphonites, and other heroes who return to their native lands to avenge their fathers and reclaim their paternal prerogatives.

On the other hand, there is the fact that Orion is associated with Euonymus in no extant sources, whereas according to one of the two mainstream Panhellenic traditions concerning Orion’s birth, his (foster) father is none other than Hyrieus, the usurper of the Ptoian oracle. In the older tradition attributed to Hesiod and Pherecydes, Orion is the son of Poseidon and Euryale, daughter of Minos. In the later-attested version, he is the son of a trio of gods, usually Zeus, Poseidon, and Hermes, who repay a childless Hyrieus for his \textit{theoxenia} by providing him with a son. To produce this child, they collectively ejaculate or urinate on the hide of an ox and bury it in the earth, whence Orion emerges after a gestation period of ten months.\textsuperscript{60} The story plays on a folk etymology connecting \textit{Ὠρίων} with \textit{ουρον}, “urine”; it is also possible that Orion was originally connected to Hyrieus because of the similarity of their names in certain dialect forms.\textsuperscript{61}

Orion follows immediately after Hyrieus in Corinna’s catalogue of seers, and as a result scholars regularly assume that

\textsuperscript{59} As mentioned above (n.8), the precise identity of this seer is uncertain. Even if we knew this information, however, it would be unlikely to shed light on the genealogy that Corinna gave for Orion, because in no other source is Orion connected to an oracle or given a prophetic son.

\textsuperscript{60} For ancient sources see Fontenrose, \textit{Orion} 24–25 nn.2–3. In view of this story, Gentili and Lomiento (\textit{QUCC} 68 [2001] 16 with n.40) take Orion’s “regaining his own land” (γῆα νὰ αππασάµενα, 39) to be a reference to his taking possession of the earth from which he was born, but I find that this interpretation strains the Greek; in particular, it gives no force to the ἀνα-prefix in ἀππασάµενα.

\textsuperscript{61} Fontenrose, \textit{Orion} 25 n.3.
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Corinna makes Orion the son of Hyrieus.\textsuperscript{62} In fact, she nowhere makes this connection explicit.\textsuperscript{63} Nevertheless, it is this assumption, together with the unseemliness of Orion’s violently deposing his own father, that has probably prevented scholars from discovering the common mythical pattern of usurpation, recuperation, and restoration of order that underlies Corinna’s catalogue.

I would contend that there is no reason to connect Corinna’s Orion with Hyrieus, and even positive reasons to resist doing so. First, depending on our poet’s date, it is possible that a tradition connecting Orion to Hyrieus was entirely foreign to Corinna and her original audiences. The earliest possible attestation for the Hyrieus paternity myth is Pindar fr.73 S.-M., but our source for this fragment, Strabo 9.2.12, only mentions, in the course of a discussion of Hyria, that Pindar speaks of the birth of Orion in a dithyramb; no further details are offered.\textsuperscript{64} Second, even if she did know the story, it is questionable whether Corinna, who so ennobled Orion’s character, would have wanted to attribute such a scatological origin to her hero. Finally, the same consideration applies to the narrative of Acraephen’s catalogue itself. Would Corinna have leagued her “most pious” (ἐὐσε–

\textsuperscript{62} E.g., Schubart and Wilamowitz, \textit{Berliner Klassikertexte} 52; Page, \textit{Corinna} 25; Gerber, \textit{Euterpe ad 35}; Snyder, \textit{Eranos} 82 (1984) 131; Collins, \textit{CQ} 56 (2006) 25. Crönert (\textit{RhM} 63 [1908] 182) even argues that Parthenius 20.1 took the tradition of Hyrieus’ paternity from Corinna, while Schachter (\textit{Επετηρίς της Εταιρείας Βοιωτικών Μελετών} 1070) wonders if Corinna herself might have invented it. I would rather wonder if a misinterpretation of Corinna’s catalogue could have given rise to the Hyrieus-Orion connection. J. Larson (\textit{Greek Nymphs} 142) is more cautious (“Corinna seems to subscribe to the tradition that Orion was fathered by Hyrieus”). Interestingly, W. B. Ingalls (“Ritual Performance as Training for Daughters in Archaic Greece,” \textit{Phoenix} 54 [2000] 1–20, at 17) assumes that Corinna rather makes Orion the son of Cepheus, evidently because the hero follows him in another of the poet’s catalogues (655.1.12–14).”

\textsuperscript{63} Cf. the transition from Orion to Αcraephen in the catalogue of seers, in which case the genealogical connection is marked explicitly (ἐμὸς γενέτωρ, 38).

\textsuperscript{64} Gantz, \textit{Early Greek Myth} 273.
Orion with a man who appears to have violently expelled Apollo’s chosen prophet? Acraephen himself says that the son of Leto granted (δῶκ`, 32) Euonymus the privilege (cf. τόδε γέρας, 27) of delivering prophecies from the god’s tripods. Corinna’s Hyrieus seems nothing like the pious man who hosts gods unawares in the birth myth summarized above, whereas Euonymus, the man with the “good name,” blessed by Apollo, would make a fitting father for her upright Orion. Again, I must admit that there is no evidence in the ancient sources connecting Orion to Euonymus—just as there is no external evidence for Orion’s “regaining his own land,” his connection to an oracle, or his fathering of a prophetic son. Corinna’s treatment of her local hero appears to have been highly innovative, and the evidence of her own poetry, from the internal logic of Acraephen’s catalogue to her characterization of Orion in other fragments, seems to go against the Panhellenic tradition that makes the hero Hyrieus’ son.

In sum, I would suggest a reconstruction along the following lines for the narrative that may have underwritten Corinna’s catalogue—a cycle of stories that will have been narrated or referred to, in whole or in part, in her other lost works, especially the Cataplus (frs.662, 663) and perhaps also the Daughters of Euonymus (660):

Apollo establishes Euonymus as the first seer of the Ptoian oracle (654.iii.32–33);
Hyrieus violently expels him from the land and usurps his prophetic office (654.iii.34–37; cf. 655.4, 691). Presumably the young Orion is dispossessed along with Euonymus, his (adoptive mortal?) father.
Orion would then grow up in exile, honing his skill as a hunter as he travels to many lands and clears them of dangerous beasts (cf. 656).

In this connection I cannot help but wonder if the son and mother mentioned in 660, from Corinna’s Daughters of Euonymus, could be Orion and his mother in a description of his family’s flight from the land.

Corinna might have regarded Euonymus as Orion’s human father, retaining Poseidon as his divine sire, along the lines of Amphitryon’s relationship to Heracles.
In the fullness of time, the adult Orion returns to reclaim the oracle that is his birthright. He defeats Hyrieus (cf. 662) and “regains his own land” (654.iii.37–39).

At some point, Orion fathers fifty sons with nymphs (654.iii.28–29, 655.1.14–17) and is eventually catasterized. With normal order restored to the Ptoian oracle, his son Acraephen inherits his mantic seat (654.iii.40–41).

To my mind, the principal merit of this schema is that it offers an economic explanation of the obvious symmetry in Corinna’s catalogue of seers between Euonymus’ expulsion from the land and Orion’s “regaining of his own land.” It also fits nicely with other references to Orion and Hyrieus in Corinna’s fragments and would reflect her positive characterization of the former.

I conclude this argument with a final reflection on Corinna’s innovative take on the Orion myth. I noted above that this mythic pattern of dispossession and return is common to the biographies of several heroes, but it is perhaps worth dwelling on one in particular: Heracles, that other great Boeotian hero, in whose case the same pattern plays out not in his own life, but over the course of several generations. Already in Homer, Heracles is robbed of a kingdom that by rights should have been his, were it not for Hera’s machinations to promote the inferior Eurystheus in his place (Il. 19.95–125); and when Heracles dies, it is left to his descendants to take their revenge on Eurystheus and eventually “return” to claim the Peloponnese for their own. Indeed, I have already had occasion to compare Corinna’s catalogue of seers between Euonymus’ expulsion from the land and Orion’s “regaining of his own land.” It also fits nicely with other references to Orion and Hyrieus in Corinna’s fragments and would reflect her positive characterization of the former.

I conclude this argument with a final reflection on Corinna’s innovative take on the Orion myth. I noted above that this mythic pattern of dispossession and return is common to the biographies of several heroes, but it is perhaps worth dwelling on one in particular: Heracles, that other great Boeotian hero, in whose case the same pattern plays out not in his own life, but over the course of several generations. Already in Homer, Heracles is robbed of a kingdom that by rights should have been his, were it not for Hera’s machinations to promote the inferior Eurystheus in his place (Il. 19.95–125); and when Heracles dies, it is left to his descendants to take their revenge on Eurystheus and eventually “return” to claim the Peloponnese for their own. Indeed, I have already had occasion to compare Corinna’s catalogue of seers between Euonymus’ expulsion from the land and Orion’s “regaining of his own land.” It also fits nicely with other references to Orion and Hyrieus in Corinna’s fragments and would reflect her positive characterization of the former.

---

67 Orion might have also sired his sons while abroad, in phase 3 of this narrative, but presumably most of these nymphs will have been Boeotian.

68 This discussion is much indebted to one of the journal’s anonymous reviewers.

69 As per Frazer (Apollodoros I 281 n.4), “[I]n the invasion [sc. of the Heraclidac] is commonly spoken of as a return, because, though their father Herakles had been born at Thebes in Boeotia, he regarded Mycenae and Tiryns, the kingdom of his forefathers, as his true home.” For the myths in question see Frazer, as well as Gantz, Early Greek Myth 463–466.
na’s prolific Orion to Heracles in the court of Thespius, and further parallels between their careers suggest themselves. For instance, both heroes find their way to heaven, and we might recall that Heracles, too, attempts to appropriate an oracle for himself with violence—from no less than Pythian Apollo himself!

Corinna’s motive in assimilating Orion to the example of Heracles is not difficult to fathom—how better to raise the stature of her Tanagran hero than by likening him to the Panhellenic celebrity from Thebes? But I would add that Heracles also presented the patriotic and decorous Corinna with a convenient model for an innovative revamping of an often-problematic figure. In the archaic period, the two are already similar sorts of heroes, both of the “grotesque” type, as Joseph Fontenrose puts it, distinguished by the superhuman feats and appetites that fill out their morally checkered vitae. Eventually, however, a counter-tradition emerges seeking to rehabilitate Heracles as an avenger of injustice, a benefactor of humanity, and a paragon of virtue—a tradition perhaps epitomized by Prodicus’ famous fable. This Heracles ethicus already has antecedents, however, in sixth- and fifth-century authors, and particularly in Corinna’s countryman Pindar, who is on one account “almost obsessively eager to justify all the actions of Heracles in terms of high moral standards.”

---

70 See n.13 above.

71 I refer to Heracles’ apotheosis, but it is also true that Heracles was sometimes identified with the ‘Kneeler’ constellation, though our evidence is late. See T. Condos, The Katasterismoi of the Pseudo-Eratosthenes (Los Angeles 1970) 26 n.3.

72 For the myth see Gantz, Early Greek Myth 437–439.

73 Fontenrose, Orion 20–21.

Similarly, we know from a scholiast’s comment that Corinna characterized Orion as “most pious” (εὐσεβέστατον), and that she reframed his habitual hunting as a civilizing mission, cleansing the land of dangerous beasts (πολλοὺς τόπους ἠμερώσατο καὶ καθαρίσατο ἀπὸ θηρίων, 673). It is probably no coincidence that Pindar praises Heracles repeatedly in similar terms (Nem. 1.62–63, 3.23–26; Isthm. 4.55–57), reimagining his battles with beasts on land and sea almost as acts of philanthropy. Pindar’s approach to Heracles could have provided Corinna with a splendid (and homegrown Boeotian) model for the process of transforming an archaic “grotesque” into an ethical ideal. Regrettably, none of Corinna’s poetry directly depicting Orion survives, so that we have no detailed illustration of what her novel characterization might have looked like in practice. Nevertheless, if my reconstruction of the power struggles surrounding the Ptoian oracle is essentially accurate, we are afforded a schematic view, at least, of this new Orion in action. He is a holy prophet of Apollo and, what is more, an agent of justice and order, punishing the hubristic Hyrieus and restoring his line to its rightful office.

By setting Corinna’s mythic narratives in dialogue with those of the greater Greek world, it is possible to recover a sense of the striking novelty of her treatments of myth. From a Panhellenic perspective, the ἰσοτιμία that she attributes to Zeus and Poseidon is baffling, while her reference to Orion’s recovery of his land is completely obscure. But read in light of Corinna’s constant concern to dignify and exalt her native Boeotia and Tanagra, these singular details take on new life as tantalizing glimpses into the poet’s creative engagement with the broader

75 See also G. W. Bond, Euripides: Heracles (Oxford 1981) xxvii n.37 and ad 400–402. Schubart and Wilamowitz (Berliner Klassikertexte 53) comment on this similarity: “Ist es nicht einleuchtend, daß Herakles, der in Böotien überall ein Fremdling ist, den Orion ersetzt hat? Wobei nicht zu vergessen, daß die Vorstellung von dem Helden, der die Erde reinigt und sich so den Himmel erwirbt, nur mit anderem Namen vorhanden war.”
tradition. Scholars have adduced Corinna’s claim to “hav[e] adorned (with my art?) stories from our fathers’ time” (λόγια δ’ ἔπ’ πατέρων / κοσμείσασα α’τιδιο, 655.1.9–10) as evidence for a conservative poet, content to transmit traditional Boeotian myths in verse.76 I would argue, however, that this view over-emphasizes Corinna’s avowed links with the past and under-estimates the extent of her poetic “adornment.”77 Corinna’s innovative approach seems to have been one of her chief attractions, and fully justifies the scholar who recently dubbed her “the Boeotian mistress of mythology.”78
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