

Xenomedes of Keos

George Huxley

AFTER RELATING in the *Aetia* the story of Akontios of Keos and Kydippe, Kallimachos remarks that he has taken it from “old Xenomedes who once set down a memorial of the whole island’s lore.”¹ The poet evidently held a favourable opinion of Xenomedes, whom he calls “careful of truth,”² and he provides a valuable survey of the Keian’s local history which reveals the scope of the work; but there is no reason to think that all subjects treated by Xenomedes are mentioned by Kallimachos. The purpose of this paper is not to suggest what else the Keian’s history may have contained, but to reexamine problems presented by the Kallimachean summary and to propose solutions to them.

Xenomedes, says Kallimachos, dealt with the mythology of the whole island; so he wrote about all four cities, but not necessarily about their entire history down to his own time, the second half of the fifth century B.C.³ As the words of Kallimachos *μνήμη μυθολόγος* suggest, the work is more likely to have been a *Ktisis* or *Archaiologia* of Keos than *Horoi*.⁴ Xenomedes began with remotest mythical origins and reported the tale of the Korykian nymphs who, having been driven from Parnassos by a lion, settled in the island and called it Hydroussa. Then somebody whose name is damaged in the papyrus is said to have “dwelt at Karyai.” Next came the Karians who lived with the Leleges in the island, “whose sacrifices Zeus Alalaxios ever receives to the sound of the trumpet.” Then Kallimachos mentions Keos, son of Apollo and Melia, who gave the island a new name.

¹ Kallimachos fr. 75.54–55 Pf.: *παρ’ ἀρχαίου Ξενομήδεος, ὅς ποτε πάσαν | νῆσον ἐνὶ μνήμῃ κάθητο μυθολόγῳ.*

² Fr. 75.76: *πρέσβυς ἐτητυμῆ μεμλημένος.*

³ Dionys. Hal. *De Thuc.* 5: *ὀλίγω τε πρεσβύτεροι τῶν Πελοποννησιακῶν καὶ μέχρι τῆς Θουκυδίδου παρεκτείναντες ἡλικίας Ἑλλάνικός τε ὁ Λέσβιος . . . καὶ Ξενομήδης ὁ Κεῖος (Xios codd. corr. Wil.).*

⁴ F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* III B Komm. Text p. 288.

Thereafter we are told of the Telchines who for their sorcery were struck to death by lightning, of the impious folly of Demonax, and of Dexithea with her mother the aged Makelo, whom alone, mother and daughter, the gods spared when they ruined the Telchines. There follow the four builders of walls about each of the island's cities, and one of these heroes is called the child of a heroine or demigoddess. Here the summary of Kallimachos ends, but somewhere Xenomedes must have found room for Euxantios son of Minos because he stated that Akontios was of his line;⁵ and the history was brought down to an epoch later than the Ionian migration because Kydippe the Naxian, whom Akontios married, was said by Xenomedes to be of the line of Kodros,⁶ who was reputed to be the father of emigrant leaders of colonists from Attica to the Cyclades and Asiatic Ionia.⁷ Somewhere Xenomedes also mentioned Amisodaros the Karian father-in-law of Bellerophon,⁸ perhaps in connexion with the Karians of Keos. Let us now take a closer look at the matters alluded to by Kallimachos.

The story of the lion recalls the archaic image of a lion near Ioulis inland in the island,⁹ but it is not clear that the two are to be connected. Pausanias also mentions the Parnassian lion (1.27.9), but Herakleides Lembos,¹⁰ following Aristotle, stated that a lion drove the nymphs from Keos to Karystos, "wherefore there is a promontory called Leon in Keos." (The promontory may however have got its name from its shape.) There need be no contradiction between Aristotle and Xenomedes, especially since Aristotle may well have made use of the Keian's work in writing a *Polity of the Keians*.¹¹ The local myth perhaps told how the Korykian nymphs, having fled from Parnassos to Keos and settled there, again fled from the—or, better, another—lion to Karystos. They returned from Karystos however, as Herakleides shows: for he reports that they taught the god or demigod Aristaios how to tend sheep and cattle, and adds that the Brisai

⁵ Kallimachos fr. 67.7.

⁶ Kallimachos fr. 75.32 and fr. 67.7.

⁷ E.g. Pausanias 7.3.3.

⁸ Schol.T Hom. *Il.* 16.328 (FGrHist 442 F 3).

⁹ Savignoni, *Ἐφ Ἀρχ.* 1898, p. 231 and pl. xiv, 1.

¹⁰ FHG 2.214 (Aristotle fr. 611.26–29 Rose³): ἐκαλεῖτο μὲν Ὑδροῦσα ἡ νῆσος· λέγονται δὲ οἰκῆσαι Νύμφαι πρότερον αὐτὴν· φοβήσαντος δ' αὐτὰς λέοντος, εἰς Κάρυστον διαβῆναι. διὸ καὶ ἀκρωτήριον τῆς Κέω Λέων καλεῖται.

¹¹ Cf. FHG 2.155 for a possible allusion to this work of Aristotle. I feel less confident than Jacoby that Aristotle's account of the lion contradicts Xenomedes or Kallimachos here (FGrHist III B Komm. Text p. 288).

(who may be the nymphs under another name) taught beekeeping to him.¹² The context implies that the instruction was given in Keos.

The seeming omission of Aristaios from the Kallimachean précis as we have it is remarkable in view of the prominent part he had in Keian myth and cult. Xenomedes did at least allude to Aristaios, however, as Kallimachos himself shows, because Akontios in the Keian story reported by the poet was declared by Apollo to be one of the priests of Zeus Aristaios, bringer of rain (*Ikmios*),¹³ whose duty it was to soften the fierceness of the Dog Star and to pray to Zeus to cause the Etesians to blow. The obvious place for a mention of Aristaios in Kallimachos is after the nymphs in the damaged verses,¹⁴ and both Gunning¹⁵ and Storck¹⁶ aptly proposed therefore to read *Κυρή[νης/υί]δ[ς]* here, Aristaios according to one myth being a son of Apollo by the nymph Kyrene.¹⁷ In the preserved letter spaces only the *κ* and *ρ* are clear in the photograph, the *ο* is not quite certain, and there is very little space for more than one letter before it; moreover, the surviving mark between *κ* and *ρ* is closer to *ι* than to *υ*.

Hunt, the first editor, declared with confidence that *Κάρυστος*, which Wilamowitz had suggested, is not to be read;¹⁸ and the *Χίρωνος* of Diels,¹⁹ though superficially attractive because Cheiron was by some said to be the father of Aristaios²⁰ (or the father of *an* Aristaios—Bacchylides²¹ once asserted that there were four Aristaioi) is unlikely, because the first syllable of Cheiron, *Χίρων*, is usually long and because the first letter here in the papyrus is clearly *κ*. The *Κιρώ[δης]* of Murray, with which the Odrysian name *Κιρόαδης* may be compared,²² and the name of Karian type *Κίρω[μης]*, proposed by Sitzler,²³ give little

¹² FHG 2.214.ix.2: 'Αρισταίων δέ φασι μαθεῖν παρὰ μὲν Νυμφῶν τὴν προβάτων καὶ βοῶν ἐπιστήμην, παρὰ δὲ Βρισῶν τὴν μελιττουργίαν· φθορᾶς δὲ οὐσης φυτῶν καὶ ζώων, διὰ τὸ λείπειν ἐτησίας. . . . It is noteworthy that there was a place called Melissos in Keos (IG XII 5 no. 544, B2.54).

¹³ Fr. 75.34–35. See Nilsson, *Griechische Feste* (repr. Darmstadt 1957) 6–8 for an account of the cult.

¹⁴ Fr. 75.58–59. Schirmer in *Myth. Lex.* I.I (1884–1886) 547–551 and Hiller von Gaertringen in *RE* II (1896) 852–859 s.v. ARISTAIOS 1 are still helpful.

¹⁵ P. G. Gunning, *De Ceorum Fabulis Antiquissimis* (Amsterdam 1912) 13.

¹⁶ K. Ch. Storck, *Die ältesten Sagen der Insel Keos* (Diss. Giessen, Mainz 1912) 7.

¹⁷ L. Malten, *Kyrene* (Berlin 1911) 8ff.

¹⁸ *POxy* VII (1911) p. 66.

¹⁹ See *FGrHist* 442 F 1 *app. crit.*

²⁰ Schol. Ap. Rhod. 2.498 (p. 169, 8 Wendel).

²¹ Malten, *Kyrene* 78 n.3.

²² Anth. Plan. 1.5.24. See *POxy* VII (1911) p. 66.

²³ *FGrHist* IIIB p. 373.

help, though they suit the preserved letters in the papyrus. Hunt's words are still true: "who it was that lived at Caryae and what this has to do with Cean tradition remains a problem."²⁴

We need not invent an otherwise unknown place in Keos called Karyai,²⁵ although the name may have occurred in many places where there were nut-trees. The most famous Karyai lay in southern Arkadia. From it the Karyatids took their name (Vitruvius 1.1.5), and the place was conquered by the Lakedaimonians during their Arkadian wars,²⁶ thus becoming part of Lakonia. The other Arkadian Karyai near Stymphalos was of little significance (Pausanias 8.13.6). Karyai (or Karya) in the marches of Lakonia and Arkadia was so famous for its honey that a Karyatid bee meant a Lakonian one.²⁷ Such a place was a most suitable home for the demigod beekeeper Aristaios, who was worshipped as Zeus Aristaios by the Arkadians;²⁸ and to him the verses of Kallimachos may well refer here.

Now Pindar, who knew the local lore of Keos well and, as his description of the rocky island and its oaks in *Paeon IV* shows, may even have visited it,²⁹ believed that Aristaios left Keos to settle in Arkadia (fr. 266 Bowra); but from Apollonius Rhodius we learn that the hero, having started in Phthia, came *from* Arkadia to Keos and brought a Parrhasian host with him.³⁰ The original legend in Xenomedes may well have told how Aristaios brought Arkadians (or specifically Parrhasians) to Keos, whence he later returned to settle at Karyai—though it must be remarked that, at least in historical times, Karyai did not lie in Parrhasia. Thus to conclude the discussion of lines 58 and 59 of the papyrus fragment, the middle of the pentameter remains incurable, but *Κυρή[νης]/υῖ*ὀ[s makes sense, since Kallimachos is likely to be mentioning here the return to Arkadia of Aristaios son of Kyrene.

The words of Kallimachos suggest that in Xenomedes the "Karians and Leleges," *Κἄρες ὁμοῦ Λελέγεσσι* (fr. 75.62), settled the island simultaneously, even if the Keian historian regarded them as distinct

²⁴ POxy VII (1911) p. 66.

²⁵ Cf. Büchner, *RE* X.2 (1919) 2244.

²⁶ Photius *s.v.* *Καρνάτεια* (*Lexicon* ed. Naber p. 314). Cf. Thuc. 5.55.3.

²⁷ Steph.Byz. *s.v.* *Καρυά*. See also A. Meineke, *Analecta Alexandrina* (Berlin 1843) 361.

²⁸ Schol. *ad Verg. Georg.* 1.14.

²⁹ L. R. Farnell, *Pindar I* (London 1930) 303. The poem was perhaps commissioned from Pindar because Bacchylides was then in exile (A. Körte, *Hermes* 53 [1918] 146–147).

³⁰ Ap.Rhod. 2.519–521 and cf. Schol. Ap.Rhod. 2.498–527a and s (pp. 168–171 Wendel).

peoples. But Kallimachos does not show that Xenomedes held the eponymous hero Keos to have been leader of the two groups of barbarian settlers. Herakleides Lembos (*FHG* 2.214) however, following Aristotle, stated that Keos the hero came to the island from Naupaktos in Lokris, a land associated in legend with Leleges as early as the time of Hesiod.³¹ So perhaps in Xenomedes, Leleges were said to have come with Keos to the island from Lokris; and Karians may have accompanied them.

The eponymous hero Keos may have been displaced by Aristotle or by Herakleides (or by a copyist of Herakleides) from his position in the book of Xenomedes, for Herakleides mentions him before Aristaios and after the flight of the nymphs to Karystos. When the nymphs had fled, and again when the Dog Star had parched the island, the name Hydroussa was no longer apt; hence, perhaps Xenomedes argued, the change to Keos, though Ioulis continued to be renowned for its springs,³² and the activities of Aristaios and his successors in the priesthood of Zeus Ikmios perhaps did much to counter the baleful influence of Sirius.³³

The alleged presence of Karians in Keos recalls the names of Anatolian type in the island—*Sminthian* Apollo, *Probalinthous* and *Koressos* for instance, and the martial rites in honour of Zeus of the War Cry (*Alalaxios*) are reminiscent of the brandishing of weapons in the worship of Zeus *Stratios* in Karia described by Xenomedes' elder contemporary Herodotos (who also wrote of Karians in the Cyclades).³⁴ Since the priests of Zeus Ikmios in Keos were said to have been instructed by Aristaios to observe the rising of the Dog Star *under arms*³⁵ and to sacrifice to him, the cults of Zeus *Alalaxios* and Zeus Ikmios may well have coalesced. There were thought to have been descendants of Aristaios in Keos (Diodoros 4.82), left behind perhaps when the hero moved house to Arkadia, and the family may well have provided the priests of Zeus Ikmios, but it is noteworthy that *Akontios*, who was an Euxantid, was also said to be of priestly line devoted to Zeus Ikmios (Kallimachos fr. 75.34–35).

³¹ Fr. 115 Rzach³. See also Storck, *op.cit.* 16.

³² Kallimachos fr. 75.72: *εὐκρηνον πτολίεθρον Ἴουλίδος*.

³³ Theophrastos, *De Ventis* 14.

³⁴ 5.119 and 1.171.2. In the latter passage Herodotos states that the Karians of the islands were called Leleges. Xenomedes seems to have been more exact in his terminology, as befits a specialist local historian. Thucydides however (1.4 and 1.8.1) couples insular Karians with *Phoinikes*—a tacit disagreement perhaps with both Herodotos and Xenomedes.

³⁵ Schol. Ap.Rhod. 2.498–527w (p. 172 Wendel).

By Euphorion³⁶ and Nonnos³⁷ the wicked sorcerers were called Phlegyes, not, as in Xenomedes, Telchines, but the name Phlegyes seems to be secondary. Pindar mentioned the magicians' wickedness and their punishment (*Paeon* 4.35–38), but we do not know that he called the evildoers Telchines. Bacchylides wrote of Telchines and gave the names of four Telchines, whom he asserted to be sons of Nemesis;³⁸ but we do not know that the four—Aktaios, Megalesios, Ormenos and Lykos—were in his version inhabitants of Keos. The Telchines in Keos seem to have been a part only of the entire people, which was widely dispersed when it was expelled from Rhodes (Diodoros 5.56).

Demonax (or, as he is also called, Damon) is not stated to have been a Telchin by Kallimachos, but other authors assert,³⁹ and the context in Kallimachos suggests, that he was. Some held him to be the father of Makelo,⁴⁰ but Kallimachos is not explicit; and the beginning of *Ode I* in which Bacchylides may have given his view of the matter is missing. So we have no idea what Xenomedes may have said about Demonax, though presumably he was punished for his impiety in company with the Telchines, whose name, a likely emendation suggests, the Keian historian may have plausibly linked with *θέλγειν*.⁴¹ Kallimachos mentions death by thunderbolt, which was, it seems, the means of the Telchines' ruin, but Nonnos (18.37) speaks of Poseidon splitting the whole island with his trident, and Euphorion⁴²

³⁶ Fr. 115 Powell. Cf. Euphorion(?), *POxy* 2526 fr. 3.

³⁷ *Dionys.* 18.35ff (1.378 Keydell):

35 Ζῆνα καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα μῆ ξεινίσσε <τραπέζῃ>
35^a Μακελλώ·

καὶ Φλεγύας ὅτε πάντας ἀνερρίζωσε θαλάσσης
νῆσον ὄλην τριόδοντι διαρρήξας Ἐνοσίχθων,
ἀμφοτέρας ἐφύλαξε καὶ οὐ πρήνιξε τριαίνῃ.

τραπέζῃ *add.* Collart. θαλάσσης Keydell, –ση L.

ἀμφοτέρας shows that Dexithea was mentioned in the lacuna. On the use of *πρήνιζειν* in Euphorion and Nonnos, see Meineke, *Analecta Alexandrina* 51.

³⁸ Fr. 55 Jebb (Tzetzes, *Theogon.* 81).

³⁹ Shorter scholium on Ovid, *Ibis* 475. See R. Ellis's edition of the *Ibis* (Oxford 1881) 83 and A. E. Housman, *JPhil* 35 (1920) 300–304.

⁴⁰ Shorter and longer scholia on *Ibis loc.cit.*, the latter said there to be from Nicander (p. 218 Gow/Scholfield).

⁴¹ *FGrHist* 442 F 4a,b.

⁴² Fr. 115 Powell (Serv. *ad Aen.* 6.618): *Phlegyae . . . secundum Euphorionem populi insulani fuerunt, satis in deos impii et sacrilegi; unde iratus Neptunus percussit tridenti eam partem insulae quam Phlegyae tenebant et omnes obruit.* Cf. Pindar, *Paeon* 4.35–37 (pp. 251–2 Turyn) [Zeus and Poseidon]: *χθόνα τοί ποτε καὶ στρατὸν ἀθρόον | πέμψαν κεραυνῶ τριόδοντί τε | ἐς τὸν βαθὺν Τάρταρον.*

described Poseidon striking that part of the island occupied by the wizards; so Xenomedes too may have had something to say about an earthquake. It need not be the same as the cataclysm mentioned by Pliny⁴³ which was said to have split Keos from Euboia; indeed the summary of Kallimachos implies that Xenomedes thought of Keos as an island from the time of the nymphs onwards (fr. 75.55ff), that is to say from the remotest beginnings of its history, long before the arrival of the Telchines.

Xenomedes said that Makelo and Dexithea her daughter alone escaped the destruction of the Telchines, but since others believed that there were descendants of Aristaios in the island, they too must in another version of the myth somehow have escaped, or have been absent at the time; what, if anything, Xenomedes wrote about them is not known. Unfortunately the brief remarks of Kallimachos do not help in elucidating the local tradition in Xenomedes about Makelo, whom Bacchylides in *Ode I* almost certainly mentioned.⁴⁴ The damaged account in Nonnos shows that Makelo (and Dexithea too whose name is lost in the lacuna) entertained Zeus and Apollo, for which kindness they were spared when the Phlegyes were cast into the sea by Poseidon (*Dionysiaca* 18.35ff). Jebb suggested that in return for their kindness to the gods the two ladies had been warned by a dream of the impending ruin.⁴⁵ So they left their old city⁴⁶ and settled by the shores of the sea before the Telchines met their fate. Poseidon's actions must have caused much disturbance in the sea, however; and the ladies would perhaps have been better advised to keep away from the sea shore. Thus they may, on the contrary, have been made to say by Bacchylides "let us go to the old city [i.e. Ioulis]; let us flee from our houses upon the seashore," an interpretation which suits the preserved fragments quite well.⁴⁷ In Pindar's fourth *Paean* we are told by Euxantios her son that Dexithea and her house were saved from the ruin;⁴⁸ but it is not certain that in Pindar's view Makelo too was saved, as Xenomedes and Nonnos believed.

⁴³ NH 2.206, 4.62. See Jacoby on *FGrHist* 442 F 1, 64–69.

⁴⁴ *Ode* 1.73: -- Μα]κελῶ δὲ τ[υ --. See Jebb, *Bacchylides* (Cambridge 1905) p. 439.

⁴⁵ Jebb, *Bacchylides* p. 447, with inference from the supplement in *Ode* 1.50: -- υ] μελίφρονος ὕ[πνου.

⁴⁶ *Ode* 1.52: -- υ] ἀρ]χαίαν πόλιν. Cf. 1.139f: πόλ[ιν ἐς νέα]ν (?) βαθυδείελον (p. 5 ed. Snell).

⁴⁷ E.g. *Ode* 1.53–54: -- υ] --] γοιμεν οἴ--] κους ἐπ'] ἀνδῆροις ἀλός. Cf. R. Jockl, *WS* 37 (1915) 151.

⁴⁸ 37–38 (p. 252 Turyn) Zeus and Poseidon . . . ἐμὰν ματέρα λιπόντες καὶ ὄλον οἶκον εὐερκέα.

Since Xenomedes mentioned the Euxanti(a)dai he can hardly have omitted to explain how the family began with Euxantios, whose birth is recounted in *Ode I* by Bacchylides. The Keian poet states that Minos came to Keos and wedded Dexithea; then he returned to Crete but left half his force behind in Keos. In the tenth month Dexithea brought forth Euxantios, who became Lord of the island. The story is taken up by Pindar who maintained that Euxantios declined to go to Crete to take a *seventh* share in the kingship there with the sons of Pasiphae;⁴⁹ and, according to a scholium on *Paeon* 4.50, sons of Euxantios settled in Keos (the scholium is damaged but the sense is clear). A son who did not settle in Keos was Miletos, an eponymous hero of the city, who lived there according to a scholium on Apollonius Rhodius.⁵⁰

The problem here is to decide whether the four fortifiers of the four Keian cities mentioned by Kallimachos are sons of Euxantios, as Storck (*op.cit.* 24) suggested, or Ionians, as Jacoby was inclined to believe.⁵¹ The name of Megakles does suit an Ionian or Attic origin, but gives no proof that he was an Ionian. It is evident that the four fortifiers are not eponymous founders of the cities, which may there-

⁴⁹ *Paeon* 4.32. The fraction $\frac{1}{7}$ is a puzzle, since we are not told that Minos had six sons by Pasiphae, and Pindar is innovating (as the scholiast seems to have thought), or we must suppose that some sons had more than a $\frac{1}{7}$ share, or there was an ancient tradition, now lost, that Minos did have six sons by Pasiphae. Pindar's words could be taken to mean that the sons of Pasiphae, Euxantios, and other princes—seven persons in all—were to share the government of the hundred cities; but that is not the obvious meaning of the sentence. If $\delta\iota\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\sigma\iota\sigma\alpha\iota$ means children, the problem disappears, for six offspring of Minos by Pasiphae can be found: Ps.-Apollodoros, *Bibl.* 3.1.2 states that Minos married Pasiphae and Perseis, or, according to Asclepiades, Krete. His sons were Katreus, Deukalion, Glaukos and Androgeos. His daughters were Akalle, Xenodike, Ariadne and Phaidra. He also had four sons by a Parian nymph (for the presence of Minos in Paros see Kallimachos fr. 3–7¹⁴ Pf.) and Euxantios by Dexithea. From the list in Apollodoros one may suppose that Minos had six children by Pasiphae, but whether Pindar thought the invitation of Euxantios to Crete to have been given before or after the death of Androgeos in Attica is not clear. In Bacchylides 1.112–3, “on the third day” perhaps means on the third day after Minos left Crete—fast but not impossibly fast sailing and rowing to Keos over about 190 miles. In line 42 Euxantios says $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\iota\omicron\nu$, which is often taken to refer to Ida (e.g. by E. T. Vermeule, *Greece in the Bronze Age* [Chicago 1964] 154), but the scansion – $\dot{\iota}\delta$ – tells against that interpretation. The meaning seems to be “Verzichte auf ein Revier zwischen Feinden!” (Wilamowitz, *Pindaros* 475).

⁵⁰ 1.185–188a (p. 23 Wendel).

⁵¹ *FGrHist* IIIB Text p. 290, 7–10. The Scholium on Pindar, *Paeon* 4.11 calls Karthaia one of the cities of the Keian *pentapolis*. What is the fifth city? There could be a confusion perhaps with Arsinoe, which has been identified with Koressos (Graindor) or Poieessa (Wilamowitz) [see *FGrHist* IIIB Text p. 290]; or the scholiast may have in mind the city abandoned by Makelo. It is just possible that here is a faint allusion to a fifth settlement, that at Hagia Eirene, where J. L. Caskey's excavations show that a cult may have continued on the site of the Minoan settlement until at least into the fourth century B.C. (*Hesperia* 33 [1964] 334).

fore have been said by Xenomedes to have existed before their time. That there were fortifications in Keos before the epoch of the Ionian migration is shown by the remains at Hagia Eirene, where the defensive walls date from the time of Minoan influence in the island *ca* 1500 B.C.;⁵² but this fact in its turn does nothing to prove that the fortifiers named by Xenomedes were grandsons of Minos. However the name of the Ionian “founder” of Keos is recorded: he was Thersidamas, who brought settlers from Athens.⁵³ This detail tells against the view that the four heroes in Kallimachos are Ionians, or at any rate Ionian founders; but unfortunately we cannot be sure that they were Euxanti(a)dai, a branch of which family, the Akontiadaï, survived at Ioulis until the time of Kallimachos.⁵⁴ In Keian lore one eponymous hero of a city is mentioned: Karthios (or Karthaios?) whose name was commemorated in Karthaia.⁵⁵

The mother of the fortifier Eup(y)los, herself a heroine or demigoddess, is according to Hunt *Χρησους* or *Χρρυσους* in the papyrus, which is sadly obscure at this point. Various attempts to supply a name have been made. Wilamowitz suggested *Χρυσοὐς* or *Κρρυσοὐς* and compared Hesychius *s.v.* *Χρρυσώ· δαίμων*; and *Χρρυσοὐς* was favoured by Pfeiffer, although this reading takes no account of the clear *iota* in the name in the papyrus. Since a name of a demigoddess is needed, *Βριζώ* the Delian comes to mind,⁵⁶ especially since, as Wilamowitz suggested in another context,⁵⁷ she may well be related to the *Βρἰσαι*, who were at home in Keos (*FHG* 2.214). In line 71 we may perhaps therefore read *Βρρρσοὐς* or *Βριζοὐς Εὐπ[υ]λος ἡμιθέης*. Whether a fortifier with demigoddess for mother is more appropriate to a colonial Minoan myth than to the age of the Ionian settlement in the Cyclades I cannot judge. Eupylos, as the wording of Kallimachos shows, was the only one amongst the four to have Chryso (?) or Briso (?) as his mother; and, strictly, we cannot assume that all four fortifiers were contemporaries.

There may be an allusion to other sons of Euxantios in the scholia on Pindar's fourth *Paean*. The damaged note on line 51 was restored

⁵² J. L. Caskey, “Excavations in Keos, 1963” *Hesperia* 33 (1964) 320–322. For the walling of the cities of classical times in Keos see F. G. Maier, *AthMitt* 73 (1958) 6–16.

⁵³ Schol. Dionys. Per. 525.

⁵⁴ Fr. 67.5 with fr. 75.51–52.

⁵⁵ Steph. Byz. *s.v.* *Κάρθαια*.

⁵⁶ Semos of Delos, *FGrHist* 396 F 4.

⁵⁷ *Homerische Untersuchungen* [Philol. Untersuch. 7] (Berlin 1884) 409 n.8.

by Wilamowitz⁵⁸ $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron<\varsigma> \text{Τηλ}[\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda]\omicron<\upsilon> \text{'Ονειτ}$]. He compared Strabo 8.4.4 (360), in which a Teleklos is mentioned; but the context in Strabo suggests that the activities of the early Spartan king Teleklos at Nedon and elsewhere in Messenia are there meant; the passage need have nothing to do with the temple of Athena Nedousia in Keos.⁵⁹ Besides, other supplements are possible, e.g. $\text{Τηλ}[\acute{\alpha}\gamma\rho]\omicron<\upsilon>$; or we could for instance supplement $\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron<\acute{\iota}> \text{Τήλ}[\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda]\omicron<\varsigma> \text{'Ονειτ}[\eta\varsigma]$ and suppose that the scholia gave a list of sons of Euxantios. With 'Ονειτ may be compared the hero 'Ονίτης in Naxos,⁶⁰ and, more appositely, since Euxantios had a son Μίλητος , the Milesian priestly group, or family, the 'Ονιτάδαι .⁶¹

Unfortunately, the time when Xenomedes composed his local history cannot be exactly determined. Dionysius of Halikarnassos (*De Thuc.* 5) places Xenomedes in his third group of historians with Hellanikos, Damastes, “and many others” in the period between the years immediately before the Peloponnesian war and the *floruit* of Thucydides, after his second group which includes Hekataios, Akousilaos, and Charon. As Bury wrote,⁶² 450 B.C. would roughly mark the division between groups 2 and 3, but that brings us no closer to Xenomedes’ *floruit*. 400 would be an appropriate lower limit; and there is no reason to think that Dionysius’ dating of him close in time to Hellanikos is erroneous.

Dionysius remarked that the aim of the early Ionian historians was to compile and publish traditions and records without adding or subtracting anything. What Kallimachos preserves from Xenomedes

⁵⁸ Pindaros (Berlin 1922) 476; schol. *Paeon* 4.51 (ed. Turyn).

⁵⁹ Strabo 10.487: $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\acute{\xi}\nu\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \dot{\iota}\epsilon\rho\acute{\upsilon}\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \text{Ποιήσεως}\ \acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\iota\omega\nu\ \tau\omicron\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \text{Νεδουσίας}\ \text{'Αθηνᾶς}\ \dot{\iota}\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu,\ \dot{\iota}\delta\rho\nu\sigma\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon\ \text{Νέστορος}\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\eta\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \text{Τροίας}\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\delta\omicron\nu.$ The mention of Nestor and the existence of a Keian name $\text{Νεδ}[\acute{\omicron}\nu]\tau\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (IG XII 5 no. 608.18) suggest a tie between Athena Nedousia in Keos and Nedon in Messenia, but nothing more. The text of Strabo 8.4.4 (360) is: $\mu\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \text{Φηράς}\ \text{Νέδων}\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\ \beta\acute{\rho}\epsilon\omega\nu\ \delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \text{Λακωνικῆς},\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\omega}\nu\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \text{Νέδας}\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\ \delta'\ \dot{\iota}\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta\mu\omicron\nu\ \text{'Αθηνᾶς}\ \text{Νεδουσίας}\ [\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \text{Ποιᾶεσση}\ \delta'\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\ \text{'Αθηνᾶς}\ \text{Νεδουσίας}\ \dot{\iota}\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu,]\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\omega}\nu\mu\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\pi\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\iota\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \text{Νέδοντος},\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\ \omicron\upsilon\ \phi\alpha\sigma\iota\nu\ \omicron\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\iota\ \text{Τήλεκλον}\ [\text{Ποιᾶεσσαν}\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}]\ \text{'Εχειᾶς}\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \text{Τράγιον}.$ The first group of bracketed words is an intrusion from a gloss made by somebody with Keian knowledge; the second group seems to be an attempt to adjust the text after the intrusion. For Τήλεκλος Brønsted proposed to read Τεῦκλος , the name of an Ionian settler in the Cyclades, but the change is needless (cf. A. Boeckh, *Kleine Schriften* 7 [Leipzig 1872] 356 with Pridik, *De Cei Insulae Rebus* [Berlin 1892] 9, and see also my *Early Sparta* [1962] 31).

⁶⁰ *Αρχ.* *Εφ.* 1914, 133.

⁶¹ F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure* (Paris 1955) no. 50.

⁶² *The Ancient Greek Historians* (Dover ed. New York 1958) 25 n.3. Cf. Jacoby, *FGrHist* IIB Text p. 288. In fr. 75 the emphasis of Kallimachos on the antiquity of Xenomedes ($\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu,\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\nu,\ \pi\rho\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\beta\upsilon\varsigma$) implies that the historian wrote in old age.

shows clearly that the Keian worked within the chosen limits of these early historiographers, who wrote concisely and, Dionysius observes, not without grace.

THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST

January, 1964