

# Melanthus, Codrus, Neleus, Caucon: Ritual Myth as Athenian History

*Noel Robertson*

## I. The Problem

Melanthus, Codrus, and Neleus are the leading figures in Athens' second dynasty of kings, the Neleids from Pylos who displace the ancient line of Cecrops and Erechtheus. The Cauconians and their eponymous hero are other refugees from Pylos who come to Athens at the same time. Neleids and Cauconians bring important changes, for they soon go forth from Athens to found the cities of Ionia. In modern accounts of the Ionian migration this tradition, if tradition it is, is sometimes cited with respect. Others are sceptical, and a few have offered reasons.

A century ago, apropos of the *genos* (as it then seemed to be) Medontidae, Toepffer argued strongly that this second dynasty was contrived by Athens in order to authenticate her claim to be the mother city of Ionia—a claim, he further argued, that was false and belated. For it is Pylos, not Athens, which the Ionian poet Homer treats with all the interest and affection due to one's place of origin; and the Ionian poet Mimnermus recalls the exodus from Pylos to Colophon. A short while after, Wilamowitz discounted Codrus and Neleus on rather different grounds, as creatures of Ionian aetiology. Eduard Meyer, like Toepffer, gave more to Athenian invention. As for Caucon, Toepffer found it easy to show that the *genos* Lycomidae usurped this hero at a late stage; but he did not ask why the Cauconians were brought to Athens in the first place. Since then the figures of the second dynasty, but not the Cauconians, have been examined more than once with impressive learning, as by Jacoby. Yet after all, the results are far short of explaining the origin and development of the story.

The connected story of the second dynasty is not attested before the fifth century, but at least part of it goes back to the sixth. Solon speaks of Attica as “the most revered land of Ionia” (fr.4a West); Peisistratus claimed to be a Neleid (Hdt. 5.65.3f). Pherecydes tells of Codrus' sacrificial death and of a son who founds Ephesus (*FGrHist* 3F153f); the Codrus Painter shows the king departing to meet his fate (*ARV*<sup>2</sup>

1268.1), and he stood beside other Attic heroes on the Marathon Base at Delphi (Paus. 10.10.1) Panyassis spoke of Codrus and Neleus as Ionian ancestors (*Suda* s.v. Πανύασις=test. 1a Matthews). Herodotus knows Melanthus and Codrus as Neleids who ruled Athens and whose descendants ruled the cities of Ionia; Neleus founded Miletus, and a companion instituted the cult of Eleusinian Demeter on Mycale (1.147.1, 5.65.3, 9.97, cf. 4.148.4). Hellenicus recounted the Athenian exploits of Melanthus and Codrus, and the founding of Ionian cities by Neleus (*FGrHist* 323aF11=4F48, 323aF23=4F125).

The story was common coin thereafter. We find details in Ephorus (*FGrHist* 70FF22, 125–27), in Democritus (327FF1, 22), in Apollodorus as the presumed source of Strabo (9.1.7 [393]), and in the chronographers (Castor *FGrHist* 250F4). In the wider world Codrus is held up by Plato, Aristotle, and Lycurgus (Pl. *Symp.* 208D; Arist. *Pol.* 5.8 [1310b36f]; Lycurg. *Leoc.* 84–88), so that his gallantry becomes proverbial (Zenobius Ath. 2.6 Bühler). Hellenistic poets allude to Melanthe and Melanthus (Callim. *Hecale* fr.266 Pfeiffer, whence Rhianus *FGrHist* 265F8, Stat. *Theb.* 12.619, Nonn. *Dion.* 26.88; Euphorion, *Suppl.Hellenist.* fr.418.25–27; cf. Nonn. 27.301–05); also to Neleus' voyage overseas (Callim. *Dian.* 226f; cf. Σ *Jov.* 77).

In outline the story runs as follows. The Neleid Melanthus left Pylos in consequence of the Dorian invasion; he obtained the kingship at Athens by answering a challenge which the former king, Thymoetes, declined. A border district was in dispute between Athens and Boeotia, and Melanthus met and vanquished the Boeotian king in single combat; the cult of Dionysus *melanaigis* and the festival Apaturia commemorate this exploit. In the reign of Melanthus' son Codrus the Dorians invaded Athens from Megara, and Codrus turned them back at the cost of his life. Both sides had learned from the Delphic oracle that for Athens to be saved her king must die at the hands of the enemy, and Codrus managed this by going forth in disguise; the spot where he fell is still shown. Codrus' son Medon succeeded, and the line continued for generations after that, though by some accounts the kingship was changed to a life-archonship in the time of Medon. More importantly, Codrus' son Neleus and other sons or grandsons led the Ionian migration and founded Miletus, Ephesus, and other cities.

None of these persons or adventures is heard of in early poetry or even in tragedy. Surely they are figments, but how were they made up? The explanations already in the field do not take us very far. Though the advancement of Melanthus makes use of a commonplace motif, a combat between champions which is decided by a trick, all the details

point away from the issue of royal power. It has always been obvious that the episode is somehow aetiological. For Melanthus gains the place Melaenae; and his enemy is also an antonym, Xanthus; and the cult of Dionysus *melanaigis* is now established at Eleutheræ nearby; and the festival Apaturia is allegedly named from Melanthus' trick, ἀπάτη. But the several things to which the aetiology refers do not belong together. In particular, the border district Melaenae and the cult of Dionysus at Eleutheræ have no discernible connection with the festival Apaturia, a reunion of phratry members which was celebrated at phratry lodges throughout Athens and Attica. Nor does one see why it should be a newcomer from Pylos who is associated with Melaenae, Dionysus *melanaigis*, and the Apaturia.

Codrus too is a recognizable type, the self-sacrificing leader, but again the motif explains nothing by itself. The other Athenians to whom this motif attaches, Erechtheus and Leos, have strong roots in cult, and we may suspect, even if we cannot demonstrate, that the sacrificial daughters as well as Erechtheus himself have been projected from ritual. Though Codrus is joined with Neleus and Basile in a shrine near the Ilissus (*IG I<sup>3</sup> 84*), no one has been able to say what cult function he might have. On the prevailing view he was added to the shrine because of his pre-existing rôle in myth; as a mythical figure, a *Sagengestalt*, he has been variously assigned to Attica, or to Ionia, or to Pylos or Messenia. But there is no trace of Codrus anywhere but at Athens, in the story of his self-sacrifice. An alternative view makes him the embodiment of a royal title in Ionia; yet the title is illusory.

Neleus' rôle in cult has been more readily granted, since he gives his name to a shrine in Athens, the Νηλεῖον, but attempts to define it are not convincing. It is even harder to grasp the relationship between the figure of cult and the two mythical bearers of the name, the ancient king of Pylos and the founder of Miletus. Despite the shrine the younger Neleus has nothing to do in Athens except to leave. It is a surprising but almost unregarded fact that at Miletus Neleus gives his name to a festival of Artemis, the Νηληϊς.

The Cauconians, by contrast with the figures of the second dynasty, are seldom heard of and have not been much attended to. Herodotus refers to them quite offhandedly as fleeing from Pylos, just like the Neleids, and as ruling in Ionia, where he equates them with the Neleids (1.147.1, 4.148.4). Later the Cauconians were caught up in Homeric exegesis, as we see from Strabo; but Strabo also seems to hark back to the same migration as Herodotus (7.7.1 [321]=Hecataeus *FGrHist* 1F119). The eponym Caucon was marked out for the

strangest fate of all, to serve as the linchpin of the antiquarian theory that derives the mysteries of Andania from Eleusis and Phlya (Paus. 4.1.5–9, *etc.*).

Such are the puzzles posed by the evidence. Scholars working from the historiographic point of view—and they include the great names already mentioned—have left them unsolved. Melanthus, if not the other elements of the story, also has a fascination for students of myth and religion. In the border exploit Usener saw a conflict of light and dark, summer and winter; and Farnell saw goatskin mummers, a *primaeval* “masque of the seasons” that became tragedy; and Jeanmaire and Brelich saw the initiation of young warriors; and, in a recent and notorious variation, Vidal-Naquet has seen a structuralist paradigm of Athens’ *ephebeia*, a frightening ordeal which is the opposite of adult life. These larger theories may have some larger value, but in Melanthus’ case they do not fit the evidence.

Some will be content to leave the matter here, and to dismiss the background of Melanthus and the others as either unknowable or not worth the knowing. Unknowable it is not. The origins of Athens’ second dynasty are not hid in the distant past; the story was invented not long before our earliest witnesses, literary and documentary, and it was elaborated further in the course of the fifth century. All these figures, not Melanthus alone, derive from aetiological myths; real-life customs and institutions give rise to the different elements of the story. When the several elements have been accounted for, we can see why they were brought together as a kind of charter for Athens’ rôle in the Ionian migration. We can also identify the literary hands that helped to shape the story, and this is a point of some importance in Athenian historiography.

A word is needed about the method adopted here. The connected story is interpreted as a tissue of myths—mainly of the type we call aetiological, because they purport to explain the origin of some peculiar custom that was however felt to be no less important than peculiar. The aetiology presumes that the abiding custom is also the momentary action of long ago, an action of Melanthus, Codrus, Neleus, or Caucon. The customs thus explained are for the most part magic rites in the service of the gods, rites which are always misunderstood, and therefore destined to be a fertile source of myth—or of ‘history’, for aetiology is a large part of Greek writing about the past, even the recent past. Aetiological myths are freely accepted or invented by most Greek historians; collections of exciting episodes in Greek history, such as we find in Plutarch or Polyaeus or Aelian, are largely aetiological myths. In the eyes of many moderns, intent on a

literal narrative, this is a dismal showing. But Greek historians had other interests, and it is possible for us to share them.

The different elements of the story are best considered in the following order. The episode of Melanthus has been made to answer several preoccupations—Athens' control of a remote border district (§II); her control of Eleutherae, with its distinctively Boeotian cult of Dionysus (§III); the festival Apaturia, common to Attica and Ionia (§IV). Codrus reflects a duty of the Basileus at Athens (§V). Neleus is at home in Miletus, and his function there explains why he was brought to Athens (§VI). The Cauconians are emblematic of the worship of Demeter, which Athens shares with their reputed homeland (§VII). The rôle of Caucon is embroidered further in the antiquarian theory of the Andanian mysteries, something entirely distinct from the realities of cult (§VIII). After the different elements, the connected story (§IX).

## II. Melanthus and Melaenae

Melanthus fights for a place which is disputed between Athens and Boeotia.<sup>1</sup> The name most often given, a name which poets evoke, is *Μελαιναί*; nearly everyone agrees that this is the original setting. It is true that the scholiast who cites Hellanicus F23, our earliest source, also records a difference of opinion about the setting: "some say it was over Oenoe and Panactum, others say it was over Melaenae" (Σ Pl. *Symp.* 208B). The mythographer Conon mentions only Oenoe.<sup>2</sup> As the scholiast is mainly reproducing Hellanicus, the first variant, Oenoe and Panactum, must be his; no doubt Conon has Oenoe from Hellanicus, though Hellanicus is not his only source, or his immediate source. Now Hellanicus' account is indeed the earliest to survive, but it was not the first to circulate; for Melanthus is well known to Herodotus (1.147.1, 5.65.3). In fact Melanthus' combat has been somewhat

<sup>1</sup> For Melanthus see J. TOEPFFER, *Attische Genealogie* (Berlin 1889: hereafter 'Toepffer') 231f; *RE* 1.2 (1894) 2672–75 s.v. "Apaturia (2)"; H. Usener, *RhM* N.S. 53 (1898) 365–69=*Kleine Schriften* IV (Leipzig 1913) 293–97; *ARW* 7 (1904) 303–13=*Kl.Schr.* IV 439–49; Farnell, *Cults* V 234–37; A. Ledl, *Studien zur älteren athenischen Verfassungsgeschichte* (Heidelberg 1914) 225f; W. R. Halliday, *CR* 40 (1926) 179–81; W. Kroll, *RE* 15.1 (1931) 434f s.v. "Melanthos (2)"; M. Guarducci, *L'istituzione della fratria I* (*MemLinc* SER. VI 6 [1937]) 30–32; H. Jeanmaire, *Couroi et Courètes* (Lille 1939) 382f; Jacoby on Hellanicus F23; M. B. Sakellariou, *La migration grecque en Ionie* (Athens 1958) index s.v. "Melanthe"; A. Brelich, *Guerre, agoni e culti nella Grecia arcaica* (Bonn 1961) 55–59; F. Kolb, *JdI* 102 (1977) 125–30; F. Prinz, *Grundungsmythen und Sagenchronologie* (Munich 1979) 348–51; F. Schachermeyr, *Die griechische Rückerinnerung im Lichte neuer Forschungen* (*SBWien* 404 [1983]) 137–47; P. Vidal-Naquet, *The Black Hunter* (Baltimore 1986) 106–28, and *PCPS* 212 (1986) 126–44.

<sup>2</sup> *FGrHist* 26F1 §39; cf. *Syn.Lex.* 416 Bekker; Σ Pl. *Tim.* 21B.

rationalized by Hellanicus; there is no mysterious apparition as in Conon and other reports. He has also rationalized the scene of combat by naming Oenoe and Panactum, two strategic fortresses that were constructed during the Peloponnesian War. The scholiast adds the variant Melaenae—it is the only variant he records—because Melaenae was the traditional name.

Other evidence shows that Melaenae was a district in its own right, not to be identified with either Oenoe or Panactum, nor yet with Eleutheræ. The notice in Stephanus, “a deme of the tribe Antiochis” (*s.v.* Μελαινέϊς), is no doubt mistaken, for Attic inscriptions do not suggest that Melaenae was ever a constitutional deme.<sup>3</sup> In the fourth century it appears as a place-name in a property record (*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1602.14); only in the Late Roman period, when constitutional demes had lost significance, are persons described as originating in Melaenae (*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 2119.55, 6823.3). The other places mentioned in the story of Melanthus have all been identified on the ground—Eleutheræ with the fortress at Gyphtokastro, beside the road to Plataea; Oenoe with the fortress at Myoupolis, on the east side of the Mazi plain; Panactum with the fortress above Kavasala, on the south side of the Skourta plain.<sup>4</sup> As Melaenae was not a deme, and as there is no other settlement site in the area, it must have been a district sparsely occupied. The Skourta plain was such a district, a remote upland plain enclosed by mountains, more heavily wooded once than it is now.<sup>5</sup> In its isolation it is not a necessary part of either Attica or Boeotia. The Skourta plain has also been proposed as the Δρυμός, ‘Woodland’, which on the evidence of literature and documents was near Panactum and had always been divided or disputed between Athens and Boeotia (Arist. fr.612 Rose<sup>3</sup>; *cf.* Thuc. 5.42.1). Melaenae and ‘Woodland’ cannot be quite the same, since both names were used concurrently; perhaps ‘Woodland’ is a more inclusive term. Part of ‘Woodland’ was cultivated (*IG II<sup>2</sup>* 1672.271f), and this might be Melaenae.

Nearly every place has its eponymous hero or nymph; it is obvious that Μέλανθος (or Μελάνθιος), ‘The Dark One’, is the eponymous hero of the ‘dark’ place Μελαιναί. Melanthus is also linked with Dionysus *melanaigis*, god of the dark goatskin, but this link is secondary. Dionysus *melanaigis* belongs not to Melaenae but to Eleutheræ (Σ

<sup>3</sup> W. Wrede, *RE* 15.1 (1931) 387 *s.v.* “Melainai (1)”; J. S. Traill, *The Political Organization of Attica* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 14 [1975]) 91, 95f, 118.

<sup>4</sup> E. Vanderpool, *CSCA* 11 (1978) 227–45; J. Ober, *Fortress Attica* (Leiden 1985) 152–55, 160–63, 223–25, and *Hesperia* 56 (1987) 209–20, 225–27.

<sup>5</sup> E. Kirsten, *RE* 20.2 (1950) 2261 *s.v.* “Plataiai (1)”; J. R. McCredie, *Fortified Military Camps in Attica* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 11 [1966]) 83–83; Vanderpool (*supra* n.4) 232f; Ober (*supra* n.4) 115f, 225f.

Ar. *Ach.* 146, whence *Suda s.v. μελαναίγυδα*). The place-name Melaenae and the epithet *melanaigis* are quite unrelated. Other place-names too are colour words in the feminine plural (Ἐρυθραί, Κνανεαί, Κέλαιναι), and each is doubtless taken from some feature of the landscape. On the other hand Dionysus *melanaigis* is also found at Hermione (Paus. 2.35.1), and the ritual business that gives rise to the epithet, the sacrifice of a black goat and the use of its skin, can be discerned at other places too (more on this in §III). Furthermore, the black goat or goatskin would not produce a hero Melanthus by any normal kind of myth-making.

It follows that the original story of Melanthus was entirely dictated by the topography of Melaenae. Since Melaenae is in dispute between Athens and Boeotia, its eponymous hero must be responsible for winning the dispute. To do so he overcomes an enemy champion, the opposite of himself, ‘The Fair One’, Ξάνθος or Ξάνθιος. The Boeotian king is unknown outside our story, unless we count a small piece of embroidery in Pausanias (9.5.16)—and even this has been inspired by subsequent events on the Athenian side. After Xanthus was slain, says Pausanias, the Thebans changed their government from kingship to the rule of a larger number. Athens saw a similar development two generations later, under Medon; so according to Pausanias’ source, presumably a Boeotian source, Thebes took the lead in constitutional reform.<sup>6</sup>

If two equal but opposite heroes, ‘The Dark One’ and ‘The Fair One’, are pitted against each other, and if ‘The Dark One’ prevails, it is natural to say that he did so by a trick. About the simplest trick of all is to call out, “Look behind you!” Melanthus, as reported by Hellanicus, says rather, “You do wrong to come against me with a second,” ἀδικεῖς, ὦ Ξάνθιε, σὺν ἐτέρῳ ἐπ’ ἐμὲ ἤκων—which is the Greek version of the trick. When the king of the Aenianians fought the king of the Inachians in single combat, Φήμιος against Ὑπέροχος, he used the same trick, in much the same words, and won possession of the new land (Plut. *Mor.* 294b). Though the enemy king is ‘Pre-eminent’, he is overmastered by the trick, which consists in a ‘lucky utterance’, φήμη. The transparent names show that here too the combat and the trick are merely a narrative motif.

Another detail is significant for the evolution of our story, and again it will help to compare Plutarch on the Aenianians. Phemius calls out when he sees Hyperochus advancing with a dog, so that Hyperochus tries to drive the dog away—and while he turns to do so,

<sup>6</sup> In Pausanias’ account the name ‘Andropompos’ for Xanthus’ adversary also has a Boeotian flavour, for it derives from the ritual of Dionysus at Eleutherae (§IV).

Phemius throws a stone. Perhaps it was more an opportunity than a trick; the interpretation is left open. Now as Hellanicus tells it, Xanthus has no actual second; it is indeed a 'trick', ἀπάτη, to be commemorated by the festival Apaturia. Yet this is not the original story; Hellanicus has dropped an actual second so as to make it all a trick. For he says that the festival Apaturia was at first called Ἀπατηνόρια, a form which is more truly derived from ἀπάτη, and which belongs to the worship of Dionysus *melanaigis*, as we shall see below (§IV). Hellanicus therefore knew the form of the story that serves as an *aition* for Dionysus *melanaigis* at Eleutherae; in this form of the story, a mysterious apparition, someone in a black goatskin, appeared beside Xanthus and caused Melanthus to call out. Yet this is not the original story either: we have just seen that the link with Dionysus *melanaigis* is secondary. The original story that we must now postulate told of some actual second like Hyperochus' dog. When Dionysus *melanaigis* was brought in, the second became the mysterious apparition; when the Apaturia was brought in, the second was suppressed.

So much then for the original story of Melanthus and Melaenae. It has nothing to do with Dionysus *melanaigis* or with the festival Apaturia. Or with the Neleid dynasty, whether of Pylos or Athens or Ionia. Melanthus and Xanthus are simply the eponym and antonym of one of the remotest areas in Attica and Boeotia. They have no historical context; it would be idle to canvass the attested conflicts on this border. The local tale might have been told at any time when people lived in these parts, and for long ages before it entered the literary record.

### III. Melanthus and Dionysus *melanaigis*

It is said that the cult of Dionysus *melanaigis* at Eleutherae commemorates Melanthus' victory.<sup>7</sup> The earliest direct mention occurs in a papyrus fragment of Euphorion, perhaps from the *Chiliades*, which happens to coincide with two lines already known from the lexica (*Suppl.Hellenist.* fr.418.25–27). In Euphorion Dionysus' epithet is not *melanaigis* but *apatenor*, recalling the festival name Apatenoria in Hellanicus F23, and the place of combat is as usual Melaenae. Yet the words ἱερῆς δεικῆλα σισύρνης allude to the strange apparition that followed Xanthus, someone dressed in a black goatskin (Conon F1 §39; Σ Ar. *Ach.* 146; Σ Ar. *Pax* 890; *Syn.Lex.* 417 Bekker; Apost. 3.31=Arsen. 4.60, *Corp.Paroem.Gr.* II 294). The god of the black

<sup>7</sup> For Dionysus *melanaigis* see the studies of Melanthus cited in n.1 *supra*; also G. Kruse, *RE* 15.1 (1931) 385 s.v. "Melaina (1)"; H. W. Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians* (London 1977) 90; A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia* I (=BICS Suppl. 38.1 [1981]) 175.



goatskin, Dionysus *melanaigis*, received an altar or a shrine in consequence (Conon, *Σ Ach.*, *Syn.Lex.*). That this cult belongs to Eleutheræ, not Melaenæ, does not emerge from the story of Melanthus but rather from a rival *aition* in which the eponym Eleuther establishes the cult to cure his daughters' madness (*Σ Ach.*; *Suda s.v. μελαναίγυδα*; Hyg. *Fab.* 235).

Eleutheræ was a small but important place on a main road leading north from Attica and southern Greece, a road that also served as a processional route to Delphi.<sup>8</sup> Because of this location the myths and cults of Eleutheræ are well known to literature.<sup>9</sup> Melaenæ by contrast was thoroughly obscure, and not so very close to Eleutheræ, if we are right to think of the Skourta plain. Three reasons can however be discerned for attaching the story of Melanthus and Melaenæ to Dionysus *melanaigis* at Eleutheræ. First, Eleutheræ like Melaenæ came into dispute between Athens and Boeotia, and therefore the cult of Dionysus, a god who personified the traditions of Eleutheræ, also came into dispute. Second, the dark goatskin of Dionysus called to mind the dark champion Melanthus. Third, the goatskin was used in ritual to perform a 'trick' which called to mind Melanthus' trick.

In early days Eleutheræ like the rest of Mount Cithaeron was firmly Boeotian, not Attic; all her myths and cults have a Boeotian colour, and in a standard genealogy, which doubtless comes from the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, the eponym Eleuther is nestled among other Boeotian eponyms.<sup>10</sup> The town had come under Athenian control by 519, when Plataea formed an alliance with Athens; for a Boeotian outpost could not stand between these allies. We can take it back a little further, to the middle of the sixth century or not long after.<sup>11</sup> It is fair to assume that Dionysus *Eleuthereus* was brought to Athens at the moment Eleutheræ was annexed (*cf.* Paus. 1.38.8); his festival, the civic Dionysia, was very likely instituted not long before the traditional date for Thespis' *acme* or first performance, one of the years from 536/5 to 532/1 (*Marm.Par. FGrHist* 239A.43; *etc.*); the archaeological evidence for the first temple roughly agrees.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>8</sup> For Eleutheræ see the works cited in n.4 *supra*; for the processional route, A. Boethius, *Die Pythais* (Upsala 1918) 47–51.

<sup>9</sup> *E.g.* Hes. *Theog.* 54, on the cult of Mnemosyne; Eur. *Antiope* fr.179 Nauck/Snell= Strab. 8.6.16 (375), the Vatican palimpsest, on the birth of Zethus and Amphion; Plut. *Mor.* 300A–B, on a purification rite connected with Zeus *Lykaios*.

<sup>10</sup> Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.10.1; Paus. 9.20.1; *cf.* [Hes.] fr.251a.10f M./W.

<sup>11</sup> Kirsten (*supra* n.5) 2260; R. J. Buck, *A History of Boeotia* (Edmonton 1979) 99, 113.

<sup>12</sup> Kolb (*supra* n.1) 124; R. E. Wycherley, *The Stones of Athens* (Princeton 1978) 183.

In one respect the festival Dionysia plainly agrees with Boeotian custom and departs from Attic. The main business, the dramatic competition, owes nothing to Eleutherae, but the calendar date, towards mid Elaphebolion, can only come from this quarter. For Athens and rural Attica fêted Dionysus in the months Poseideon, Gamelion, and Anthesterion, but never so late as Elaphebolion. In Boeotia, on the other hand, Dionysus' commonest festival, the Agrionia, gives its name to the month equivalent to Elaphebolion, Agrionius.<sup>13</sup> This innovation is reflected in the tale of Pegasus, the oddly-named missionary who brought a statue of the god from Eleutherae to Athens (Paus. 1.2.5; Σ Ar. *Ach.* 243). The nearest celestial indication of the festival date is the acronychal rising of the constellation Pegasus, which takes place about March 7.<sup>14</sup> Although this constellation is not mentioned before Eudoxus, it must have been observed from of old, for its commoner name Ἴππος is like other animal names for stars which have a long history in Greek and related languages.<sup>15</sup>

Eleutherae then honoured the god in the fashion of Boeotia, which included the festival Agrionia. The ritual appertaining to Dionysus *melanaigis*, though distinctive in its way, was only one item among many. It was not reproduced at Athens, but the Athenians laid claim to it in the person of Melanthus. As already mentioned, the ritual has another *aition*, and the parallels that can be cited show that this *aition* is true to native belief, and that the festival Agrionia is behind it. When the daughters of Eleuther see an apparition of Dionysus, they scoff and are driven mad; to cure their madness Eleuther institutes the cult. At Orchomenus in Boeotia the daughters of Minyas scoff and are driven mad; here the tale goes with the festival Agrionia (Plut. *Mor.* 299E–300A). At Argos the daughters of Proetus scoff and are driven mad; here the tale goes with the corresponding festival in the Dorian domain, the Agriania (Hsch. s.v. Ἀγρίανια). Athens or Attica, it may be added, has no story of this kind.

The story of Melanthus, as applied to the cult of Dionysus *melanaigis*, is a very makeshift *aition* which is meant to assert Athenian control. Melanthus of Melaenae sees the apparition beside the Boeotian king Xanthus, and is able to kill him after calling out, and wins possession of the disputed territory. This is the earliest datable element that we shall find: the story of Melanthus and the goatskin

<sup>13</sup> A. E. Samuel, *Greek and Roman Chronology* (Munich 1972) 67.

<sup>14</sup> Ov. *Fast.* 3.449–58; Colum. 11.2.24; cf. Plin. *HN* 18.237.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. F. Boll, in Roscher, *Lex.* 6 (1924–37) 928–31 s.v. "Sternbilder"; W. Rathmann, *RE* 19.1 (1937) 62–64 s.v. "Pegasos (3)"; A. Scherer, *Gerstirnnamen bei den indogermanischen Völkern* (Heidelberg 1953) 186.

apparition was first told when Athens seized Eleutheræ or soon after, at all events in the second half of the sixth century.

To understand the apparition in the story, and more importantly, to understand the epithet *apatenor* (§IV), we must ask just what was done with the goatskin. The daughters of Eleuther see “an apparition of Dionysus with a black goatskin,” *φάσμα τοῦ Διονύσου ἔχον μέλαιναν αἰγίδα* (Σ *Ach.* 146; *Suda s.v. μελαναίγίδα*). Melanthus sees “a sort of apparition, a man following Xanthus, of a boy’s age,” *φάσμα τι τῷ Ξάνθῳ ἄνδρα ἐπόμενον ἀγένειον* (Conon F1 §39). Someone appears beside Xanthus “dressed in the skin of a black he-goat,” *τραγῆν ἐννεμένον μέλαιναν vel sim.* (Σ *Ar. Ach.*; *Syn.Lex.* 417; *Apost.* 3.41). Or it may be Dionysus himself who appears beside Xanthus, as he appeared before the daughters of Eleuther, “with a rustic form,” *i.e.* dressed in the goatskin, *τὸν Διόνυσον παραστήναι . . . σὺν ἀγροικικῷ σχήματι* (Σ *Ar. Pax* 890).

The two stories, of Melanthus and of the daughters of Eleuther, tell us what was done in the cult of Dionysus *melanaigis*, for, like every *aition*, they start from the assumption that what happened once long ago is re-enacted in the rite forever after. Someone was dressed in the skin of a black he-goat; it was a pre-pubescent boy; and to judge from the story of the daughters of Eleuther, he was presented to nubile girls.

To dress in goatskins was fairly common in the worship of Dionysus. The god has the same epithet, *melanaigis*, at Hermione (Paus. 2.35.1), but we cannot be sure that the skin was again worn by a boy. For the word *τραγηφόροι*, obviously a cult title, is explained by the notice “the girls performing secret rites for Dionysus would put on the skin of a he-goat” (Hsch. *s.v.*). A cult at Argos was reputedly established when the Argives returning from Troy were shipwrecked on Euboea, and killed some wild goats and dressed in their skins to keep warm (Paus. 2.23.1); here the wearers are men. At Megara and its colony Callatis Dionysus has the epithet *δασύλλιος*, ‘shaggy’,<sup>16</sup> which like *melanaigis* points to the wearing of a skin—a goatskin, for an inscription from Callatis, where the cult of Dionysus was to the fore, speaks of conducting a he-goat in procession and then of operating with its skin at a shrine called *Δασυλλιεῖον*.<sup>17</sup> We shall see below that the cult at Megara resembles ours in yet another detail (§IV).

<sup>16</sup> Paus. 1.43.5; *Etym.Mag. s.v.*; *LSCG* 90. Cf. Nilsson, *Feste* 310f; Farnell, *Cults* V 96, 118, 282; K. Hanell, *Megarische Studien* (Lund 1934) 100, 181f; Sokolowski *ad loc.*

<sup>17</sup> Sokolowski presents lines 4ff as follows: on the 12th of the month Dionysius, *Διονύσωι τ[ρά]γον πέ[μ]πειν*], then *ἐ]ντελέ[ς τὸ δέρ]μα σὺν τῶι κεφαλῶι καὶ τ[οῖς ποσὶ κ]αὶ τ[οῖς κέρασι πωλεῖν*] ἐν τῶι *Δασυλλιεῖωι*. The verb *πωλεῖν* is not a likely restoration, for

These goatskins, like other skins and fleeces used in ritual, come from freshly slaughtered victims: so at Eleutheræ a black he-goat was sacrificed. At Potniae south of Thebes, not far from Eleutheræ, Dionysus had the epithet 'Goat-slayer', *αἰγοβόλος*, in virtue of a portentous goat-sacrifice (Paus. 9.8.2). The *aition* recounted by Pausanias has been variously interpreted;<sup>18</sup> we can now recognize the same practice as at Eleutheræ. Long ago, after a murder and a plague, an oracle bade the people sacrifice a boy to Dionysus, a boy close to puberty, *παῖς ὠραῖος*; but after a few years a goat was allowed as a substitute for the boy. At Potniae too, we infer, a pre-pubescent boy was dressed in the skin of a freshly slaughtered goat; observers said that it was done because the goat had been sacrificed in place of the boy.

There is no lack of parallels for the wearing of goatskins, but one element of the rite at Eleutheræ is still unexplained, and this element is precisely the point of attachment for the story of Melanthus. The boy wearing the goatskin was presented to nubile girls with alarming effect; he seemed a sudden apparition, perhaps an apparition of the god himself. The girls were driven mad by the apparition, and by means of it Xanthus was distracted and overcome. As already said, other girls were driven mad by Dionysus at Orchomenus and Argos; likewise the women of Thebes, and by one report those of Sparta and Chios too (Ael. *VH* 3.42). Were there goatskin apparitions at any or all of these places? It is possible, but not very likely. The goatskin apparition is a magical means of directing the god's fertilizing power, and ritual has many such means. The notoriety of Dionysus *melanagis* at Eleutheræ suggests that he was more or less unique. For other goatskin apparitions we turn from Dionysus to Athena.

The goatskin, *aigis*, is best known as an attribute of Athena. Nonnus plays on the likeness of Athena's attribute and Dionysus' epithet: "Shake your *aigis*," says Zeus to his daughter, "and help your brother *melanagis*, who will save your land by driving out the Boeotian chief" (*Dion.* 27.301–03). Like all such attributes Athena's *aigis* derives from ritual. It was typically an instrument of weather magic, as we see from the stories of its origin and above all from descriptions of either Athena or Zeus, her partner in cult, shaking the *aigis* to bring clouds and storm.<sup>19</sup> But it was also used very much like the black

---

the skin appears in a context of ritual actions, and is described as if it were destined for ritual use, and we expect it to be so used in the place named after it, the *Δαυυλιεῖον*.

<sup>18</sup> See Schachter (*supra* n.7) 182 and the works there cited.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. W. Fiedler, *Antiken Wetterzauber* (Stuttgart 1931) 49f. Nowadays the *aigis* is

goatskin at Eleutherae. Consider the following instances, the first a ritual directly reported, the others aetiological myths.

At Athens “the priestess,” certainly a priestess of Athena, went round to new brides “carrying the holy *aigis*” and begging too.<sup>20</sup> Though the proverb in question has been combined with a lexical definition in which the *aigis* is a “network of fillets,” “the holy *aigis*” in the hands of the priestess can only be the skin of a freshly slaughtered goat. A goat was brought up to the Acropolis and sacrificed to Athena on one occasion only, as “a necessary sacrifice” (Varr. *Rust.* 1.2.20); the explanation of the proverb expressly says that the priestess “started from the Acropolis.”<sup>21</sup> The priestess was doubtless she of the *genos* Buzygae, and the occasion Athena’s festival in Maemacterion, when the Buzygae officiated.<sup>22</sup> This is the time to summon rain for the crops just sown: rain magic is unmistakable in the bathing of the *palladion* in the sea, and in the mock combat that ends with a display of the *palladion* and the *aigis*. Weather, sex, and combat: these ingredients recur in the myths about the *aigis*, such as the following.

In a passage of Ps.-Apollodorus that may be interpolated from another source, but will still have the same value for us, the *aigis* is in effect presented first to nubile girls, then to new brides.<sup>23</sup> Athena, it is said, grew up with another girl, Pallas daughter of Triton, and they practised combat with each other; as Pallas was about to strike, Zeus

---

commonly explained as a primitive shield, which is loony rationalism; sometimes as a totem or a bogey, which is no explanation at all. Ever since weather magic was thrown out along with nature mythology, a large part of ancient religion has been closed to understanding. From Homer to Virgil and beyond, the shaken *aigis* brings sudden lowering skies; in a vase-painting Salmoneus operates with the *aigis* as with other instruments of rain magic (Chicago 1819=*ARV*<sup>2</sup> 585.29); a fire-breathing monster named *Αἰγίς* causes parching drought until Athena kills him and adapts the hide to its proper use (Diod. 3.70.3–5=Dion. Scytobrachion *FGrHist* 32F8); another monster whose hide becomes the *aigis* is the giant “*Ἀστερος* or *Ἀστήρ* (*Meropis*=*P.Köln* III 126; [Arist.] *Peplous* fr.637 Rose<sup>3</sup>), i.e. the Dog-star, τὸ ἄστρον; the verbs ἐπαιγίζειν, καταγίζειν, are formed from the noun αἰγίς and are used accordingly—winds ‘up-aegidize’ because the *aigis* makes them blow.

<sup>20</sup> *Paris.gr.* 676 s.v. αἰγίς περὶ πόλιω, ed. L. Cohen, *BreslPhilolAbh* 2.2 (1887) 65=*Corp.Paroem.Gr.* Suppl. I 65. Cf. Robertson, *TAPA* 113 (1983) 162–64.

<sup>21</sup> Varro’s goat-sacrifice has been claimed by Burkert for the Arrhephoria, which he regards as an initiation rite for girls: *Hermes* 94 (1966) 20; *Homo necans* (Berlin 1972) 172; *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche* (Stuttgart 1977) 349. For a different view of the Arrhephoria, Robertson, *HSCP* 87 (1983) 241–88.

<sup>22</sup> This festival is studied by Burkert, *ZeitschrReligGeistesgesch* 22 (1970) 356–68, but he misses the purpose of it, which is rain magic; and what he calls “the deed of blood,” i.e. the violent encounter described in the myths of Demophon and the Argives, is not an ox-sacrifice but a prognostic mock combat.

<sup>23</sup> Apoll. 3.12.3; cf. Tzetz. Σ *Lycoph. Alex.* 355.

interposed the *aigis*, so that she looked up at the object, and Athena dealt a fatal blow; afterwards in sorrow Athena made a wooden image of Pallas and hung the *aigis* upon it. In the sequel Electra is assaulted by Zeus as she takes refuge at the image with the *aigis*. Finally Zeus flings it into Troy, where, as everyone knows, it witnessed the rape of Cassandra, and was therefore instrumental in raising the storm which destroyed Ajax.<sup>24</sup>

Another companion whom Athena killed in combat, how we are not told, is Iodama daughter of Itonius (Σ Lycoph. 355); Iodama is elsewhere a maiden priestess of Itonian Athena who meets her end when she sees the statue at night, with its Gorgon-head (Paus. 9.34.2). On this showing the ritual was very likely conducted at the sanctuary at Coroneia. Or again, when Athena's father Pallas assaulted her, she killed him and his skin became the *aigis*.<sup>25</sup> Or the curling snakes on Athena's breastplate, *i.e.* the *aigis*, recall the day when Poseidon raped Medusa in sight of her statue (Ov. *Met.* 4.798–801). Or Chryse daughter of Pallas received the *palladia*, plural, as a wedding present from Athena when she married Dardanus; Dardanus left Arcadia because of rain and flood.<sup>26</sup>

In sum, Athena's goatskin is presented to nubile girls, like Dionysus' goatskin, and also to new brides. At Athens the priestess carried the goatskin, but the myths indicate that it was often placed on a wooden image, so that it becomes a constant feature of the *palladion* and of Athena's iconography. Some myths further imply that the girls saw the image and its goatskin within a shrine, others that it was carried out of doors. We should note that all these methods were in use, and are reflected just as clearly in other stories in which Athena's accoutrement, it may be the helmet or the Gorgon-head rather than the *aigis*, serves as an instrument of terror. When the Aetolians attacked Pellene in Achaea in 241 B.C., they were routed by a terrifying apparition that is reported in three variants. Either the priestess came out of the temple wearing Athena's panoply (Polyaen. *Strat.* 8.59); or a maiden who had just been lodged in the temple ran out wearing a helmet (Plut. *Arat.* 31.4, 32.1f—Plutarch confuses Athena and Artemis); or the priestess carried forth the dread image of the goddess (32.3f).

Knowing the ritual, we also know why the story of Melanthus was attached to it at second hand. In the original story Melanthus won

<sup>24</sup> Seneca and Quintus tell how Athena caused the storm—and made use of the *aigis* (*Ag.* 530; *Posthom.* 14.452–58); they doubtless draw on some early source.

<sup>25</sup> Cic. *Nat.D.* 3.59; Clem. *Protr.* 2.28; Firm. *Mat. Err.prof.rel.* 16.2; Σ Lycoph. 355.

<sup>26</sup> Dion. Hal. *Ant.Rom.* 1.68.3, citing Callistratus (*FGrHist* 433F10) and Satyrus (20F1).

Melaenae by calling out to Xanthus, "You do wrong to come against me with a second!" This is a narrative motif, which we also meet in the guise of Hyperochus' dog, and which we might call the 'distracting companion'. Now, the girls of Eleutherae encountered the goatskin figure in frightening circumstances; according to the myth he scared them to madness. Some of Athena's myths speak of sudden fright and sudden death (the girl Pallas and also the girl Iodama, whether playmate or priestess; Pallas the licentious father); the priestess at Athens must have accosted the brides suddenly, perhaps flapping the *aigis* as in rain magic, since her action was proverbial for "those going round in a rush," οἱ ἀνέδην περιμόντες (*Corp. Paroem. Gr. Suppl. I* 65). So the goatskin figure who startled the girls became a distracting companion for Xanthus.<sup>27</sup>

#### IV. The Apaturia and Dionysus *apatenor*

The ritual we have just surveyed enables us to interpret another curious item in the tradition. Hellanicus, while recounting the combat without mention of Dionysus *melanaigis* or the apparition, says that the Athenians commemorated Melanthus' victory by establishing a festival "which they once called Apatenoria, but later Apaturia, as if from the trick that was used," ἦν πάλαι μὲν Ἴ�πατηνόρια, ὕστερον δὲ Ἴ�πατούρια ἐκάλουν ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς γενομένης ἀπάτης (F23). For Hellanicus the victory has two great results, control of those strategic fortresses Oenoe and Panactum, and the institution of the phratry festival Apaturia, which came to be shared by Attica and Ionia. Everyone is aware that the festival name Ἴ�πατούρια means 'the rites for those begotten by the same father', \*ἀπατορφος = ὁμοπάτωρ, an etymology that was recognized in ancient times and was even imprinted in the festival business.<sup>28</sup> To derive the name from ἀπάτη is perverse ingenuity;

<sup>27</sup> We should allow for the possibility that contamination has occurred among our myths. Both Pallas and Iodama engage in single combat with Athena, and are distracted by the *aigis*, and killed as a result. The *aigis* interposed by Zeus is perhaps an odd use of the narrative motif, and these myths are very like the developed story of Melanthus and Xanthus, which, as we saw at the outset, had a wide currency from the fourth century onward; and *aigis* and *melanaigis* are readily associated, as in Nonnus. Even so our conclusion stands, that the ritual use of the black goatskin first attracted Melanthus and Xanthus from Melaenae to Eleutherae.

<sup>28</sup> Σ Αρ. *Ach.* 146: "some say that since fathers meet together for the enrolment of their children the festival is called as it were Ὀμοπατόρια. Just as we speak of the ὁμόλεκτρος as ἄλοχος and of the ὁμόκοιτις as ἄκοιτις, so we also speak of Ὀμοπατόρια as Ἄπατόρια." The copulative ἀ-, however, refers not to the concurrence of fathers but to the consanguinity of children. It was remarked by Wilamowitz, *Hermes* 21 (1886) 112 n.2 (= *Kl. Schr.* V.1 22 n.2), that the true meaning of Ἄπατούρια "could not be forgotten in the clan-state," i.e. down to Cleisthenes' reforms; but in fact that meaning must have been obvious as long as the festival was celebrated.

Hellanicus sees himself obliged to give an intermediate term, ‘the rites of trick-man’, Ἀπατηνόρια < ἀπάτη + ἀνήρ. It has been said that Hellanicus simply invented the term,<sup>29</sup> but other evidence forbids this suggestion.

Euphorion in his three-line allusion to the combat treats ἀπατήνωρ as an epithet of Dionysus: ἀλλὰ Διωνύσου ἀπατήνορος, ὅς ρα Μελαινὰς ὤπασε Κεκροπίδαις κτλ. (*Suppl.Hellenist.* fr.418.25f). The lexical entry which preserves the first two lines starts from the form ἀπατήνορα (*Etym.Gen. s.v.*), so that the accusative has been excerpted from some other writer.<sup>30</sup> Nonnus, who shows acquaintance with the story of Melanthus (*Dion.* 26.88, 37.301–05), uses the phrase ἀπατήνορι μύθῳ in the same part of his work (26.118), and in a context of Dionysiac ritual, as we shall see below.

To be sure, the lexical entry informs us, after quoting the lines of Euphorion (without his name), “It is not Dionysus but Zeus who is called *apatenor*, and the festival Apaturia is conducted for Dionysus for the following reason,” because of the combat and the help given by Dionysus *melanaigis*. Euphorion is contradicted, but the contradiction reverses the truth. Dionysus’ epithet *apatenor* is here equated with Zeus’ epithet *apatourios*, and is said to belong to Zeus alone; but it was only in virtue of the like-sounding epithets that Dionysus could be connected at all with the Apaturia. Elsewhere in the lexica we find various attempts to mediate between Zeus and Dionysus, between *apatourios* and *apatenor* or *apatenorios*; it is said that Melanthus prayed to Zeus *apatourios*, or to Zeus and Dionysus together. These are later elaborations of the view first propounded by Hellanicus.<sup>31</sup>

The epithet ἀπατήνωρ is not unparalleled. Dionysus ψευδάνωρ, ‘false-man’, commemorates a stratagem by which Argaeus king of Macedon routed Illyrian invaders (Polyaen. 4.1). Macedonian Bacchants rushed down from the mountains in sight of the enemy, and were mistakenly thought to be men; Argaeus then founded a shrine for Dionysus under this title and also caused the Bacchants to be called Μιμαλλόνες “because of their imitation of men.” Two strands are wound together in the aetiology. Literary and lexical sources have much to tell of the Mimallones,<sup>32</sup> and commonly say that they ‘imi-

<sup>29</sup> Jacoby n.13 on Hellanicus F23.

<sup>30</sup> Tryphiodorus has the same form, perhaps echoing the earlier poet. But his use of the word is merely fanciful: the Trojan Horse is “the trick-man device of the fearful goddess” (*Il.Rapt.* 137).

<sup>31</sup> To produce a thorough recension of these lexical entries would take several pages of close work. Cf. Jacoby nn.1, 10, 12 on Hellanicus F23; Brelich (*supra* n.1) 55–59.

<sup>32</sup> W. Baege, *De Macedonum sacris* (Halle 1913) 81–85, 87.



tate' men in their fearsomeness, less commonly that they 'imitate' the madness of Dionysus; Callimachus told a "Macedonian story" to explain the name (*Etym.Gen. s.v. Μιμαλλόνες*=fr.503), but this was hardly the prosaic stratagem of Polyaeus. In Polyaeus the cult of Dionysus *pseudanor* is adduced in further support of that unlikely etymology of Mimallones. Dionysus *pseudanor* may have nothing to do with Macedon; it is possible, but no more, that the epithet is borrowed from Argos, the reputed homeland of the Argead dynasty.<sup>33</sup>

A similar term was probably in use at Megara. In Megara's sanctuary of Dionysus Pausanias saw two ancient cult images, of Dionysus *patroos* and of Dionysus *dasyllios*, which respectively derived from Polyidus son of Coeranus and from Polyidus' grandson, as he is here alleged to be, Euchenor son of Coeranus (Paus. 1.43.5). Polyidus and his line are associated with Dionysus at Byzantium too,<sup>34</sup> and the association is at least partly due to ritual nomenclature. Cults of Dionysus are always traced to mythical 'kings',<sup>35</sup> presumably because the ritual was always conducted by a like-named magistrate, such as Athens' Basileus; Polyidus was well known as *Κοιρανίδας* (Pind. *Ol.* 13.75), but this is not the usual paternity for Euchenor, and was plainly contrived by the Megarians. *Εὐχήνωρ* himself is a mere cypher, named in the *Iliad* only to be taken off by Paris.<sup>36</sup> 'Vaunting-man' is an heroic-sounding name, but it must have suited the cult of Dionysus *dasyllios* as well: it resembles *apatenor* and *pseudanor*.

We come back to *ἀπατήνωρ* and the context in Nonnus. 'Trick-man speech', *ἀπατήνορι μύθω*, is employed by the dutiful daughter of Tectaphus to deceive the guards who keep her father penned, starving and squalid and corpse-like, in an underground chamber; the daughter, who happens to be a nursing mother, is allowed to pass, and within the chamber she suckles her father at her breast (*Dion.* 26.101–45).

<sup>33</sup> We might be more disposed to think of Argos if King Argaeus were the first of this name, the eponym of the dynasty, as Hammond supposes, *A History of Macedonia* II (Oxford 1979) 21. But it seems just as likely that he and his adversary, Galaurus king of the Taulantians, belong to the early fourth century, and that the *aition* embroiders an historical event, as so often. The Bacchantes are said to have been called *Κλώδωνες* before they became *Μιμαλλόνες*, and there is no particular reason why the change of name should be ascribed to the distant past.

<sup>34</sup> *Dion. Byz.* 14 (p.7 Güng.); cf. *Hyg. Fab.* 136.3. Hanell (*supra* n.16) 100f, 188.

<sup>35</sup> Often enough it is an eponymous king, a 'Minyas' or an 'Amphictyon', who is scarcely heard of otherwise. Or consider such strange cases as the *βασιλεύς ξένος* at Patrae (Paus. 7.19.6), or the *δυναστής ἀνὴρ* of Amphicleia (10.33.9f), or the *ἀνάκτορον* at Mytilene, dwelling of a mythical priest (Ael. *VH* 13.2).

<sup>36</sup> *Il.* 13.663 with Σ=Pherecyd. *FGrHist* 3F115. He was doubtless invented for the purpose: W. Kullmann, *Die Quellen der Ilias* (=Hermes Einzelschr. 14 [Wiesbaden 1960]) 125, 309.

Tectaphus is now released by his tormentor, the king of India, and serves in the king's army until he is slain, to be lamented sorely by his daughter (30.127–86). Father and daughter have names appropriate to that strange predicament: Τέκταφος 'Joiner' (as if he built the chamber himself) and Ἡερίη 'Darkling'. It is obvious at once that Tectaphus and Eërië have been transposed to India from some other setting, like so many figures who fill up the ranks either of Dionysus' army or of the enemy. Tectaphus is already named as an Indian commander in Dionysius' *Bassarica* (fr.9.4 Heitsch, a papyrus fragment which jibes with a line in Stephanus); whether Dionysius told of his confinement does not appear.

The story belongs to a recurring type, *die säugende Tochter*: a father is shut up in prison, and his daughter comes and suckles him. Anciently the story is told several times with different names, and is also rendered in wall-paintings and terracottas; the type continues with wider variations in the Middle Ages.<sup>37</sup> It has become a folktale—it was already such when attached to the shrine of *Pietas* at Rome—but it originates as a ritual myth, the older species that often passes into folktale.<sup>38</sup> None of the ancient versions save that of Tectaphus and Eërië is told in sufficient detail for us to identify the rite, although one version gives Μύκων as the father's name,<sup>39</sup> and so points to agricultural magic; for Hesychius glosses μύκων as σωρός, θημών, i.e. a heap of corn. In the story of Tectaphus and Eërië the prison is described as an underground chamber, dark and close and mouldy, and the father is described as a virtual corpse, wasted and reeking of death: οἶα δὲ νεκροῦ ἐκ χροῦς ἀζαλέοιο δυσώδεις ἔπνεον αὔραι (*Dion.* 26.115f). These details remind us of other fathers who were strangely used: Oenopion of Chios, Oeneus of Calydon, Icarus of the deme Icarium, and of course old Oedipus.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>37</sup> Stith Thompson, *Motif-Index of Folk-Literature* (Bloomington 1957) V 275, R 81: "Woman suckles imprisoned relative through prison wall." For the ancient sources, and older folktale studies, see Höfer, in Roscher, *Lex.* 5 (1916–24) 214f s.v. "Tektaphos (2)"; van der Kolf, *RE* 5A.1 (1934) 170f s.v. "Tektaphos (2)."

<sup>38</sup> For the general rule see R. Merkelbach, *HSCP* 82 (1978) 1–15, apropos of the Turkish tale of "The girl in the rosebush," which he traces to the ritual of a west-Anatolian tree-goddess. Whether this case is allowed or not—and Merkelbach's closing arguments are to my mind quite convincing—the rule is exemplified by innumerable folktales deriving from the ancient world.

<sup>39</sup> Hyg. *Fab.* 254.3, and a wall painting at Pompeii; cf. Val. Max. 5.4 ext. 1 "Cimon."

<sup>40</sup> Oenopion: K. Keyssner, *RE* 17.2 (1937) 2272–75 s.v. "Oinopion"; F. Graf, *Nordionische Kulte* (= *BiblHelvRom* 21 [1985]) 125f. Oeneus: C. Robert, *Die griechische Heldensage* I (Berlin 1921) 85–87; R. Hanslik, *RE* 17.2 (1937) 2193–2204 s.v. "Oineus (1)." Icarus: R. Merkelbach in *Miscellanea di studi alessandri in memoria di A. Rostagni* (Turin 1963) 469–526. Oedipus: L. Edmunds, *Oedipus: The Ancient Legend and Its Later Analogues* (Baltimore 1985) 6–17, 225–28.

When Orion assaulted Oenopion's daughter, he suffered for it, and afterwards threatened to take revenge on Oenopion; the dutiful father was therefore hidden away beneath the earth—whether Poseidon did it, or the people of Chios, or Oenopion managed it himself; in the fullest version the hiding place is said to be “an Hephaestus-built chamber” fashioned by Poseidon, Ποσειδῶν Ἡφαιστότευκτον ὑπὸ γῆν κατεσκεύασεν οἶκον (Apollod. 1.4.4), *i.e.* a bronze chamber. As for Oeneus, he was shamefully mistreated by his usurping brother Agrius, and by one account the mistreatment occurred while he was penned up, καθείρξαντες ἠκίζοντο (1.8.6); in a tradition going back to Peisander, Oeneus had relations with his own daughter Gorge (1.8.5). It is also said that the daughter was given in marriage after Oeneus was set free (1.8.6). The remains of Icarius, brutally done to death by shepherds, were either thrown into a well or buried beside a tree, and his daughter found them after long search (Hyg. *Astr.* 2.4; Nonn. *Dion.* 47.141–47, 211–17). Oedipus after the discovery of the incest was confined in the palace at Thebes, whether by Creon or by his sons or by the Thebans at large; this is such a constant feature of the story that it is probably referred to by Homer, who says that Oedipus “suffered woe” at Thebes, even while he continued to bear rule (*Od.* 11.275f). The plight of Oedipus strikingly resembles the plight of Tectaphus: he is confined in a dark recess, stretched on a cot perhaps, aged and helpless, a picture of squalid decay (*e.g.* Eur. *Phoen.* 327–36, *Stat. Theb.* 1.49–51). At the last he is brought forth by his daughter.

Our instances do not all come from the same ritual background. Oenopion, Oeneus, and Icarius are associated with Dionysus, Oedipus with Demeter.<sup>41</sup> The ritual origin of the Oedipus story is perfectly transparent, and will help us to understand the other instances. The palace of Cadmus at Thebes, the palace where Oedipus was confined, was equated with the Theban sanctuary of Demeter; Oedipus' ‘grave’ was shown at still other sanctuaries of Demeter, at Eteonus and Colonus and on the northeast slope of the Areopagus; at the end of Sophocles' play Oedipus vanishes into a bronze chamber in the earth at or near a sanctuary of Demeter (*OC* 1590f, 1600–02, 1661f). Demeter's sanctuaries typically contain an installation called the *megaron*, the ‘hall’ or even ‘palace’, a flattering or auspicious term for a dark, close underground chamber which was opened only twice a year, to begin and to conclude a drastic rite of agricultural magic.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>41</sup> On Oedipus and Demeter *cf.* L. Edmunds, *HSCP* 85 (1981) 221–38.

<sup>42</sup> L. Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin 1932) 40–45; W. Burkert, *Hermes* 94 (1966) 7f; A. Henrichs, *ZPE* 4 (1969) 33–36; B. C. Dietrich, *RivStorAnt* 3 (1973) 1–12; J. Prytz Johansen, *Temenos* 11 (1975) 78–84; Burkert, *Griechische Religion* (*supra* n.21)

During the hot dry summer, after the threshing and before the ploughing and sowing, the earth was replenished by the offering or infusion of a pig, Demeter's animal. The pig, an ungelded male, was slit open for its whole length so as to expose the inwards, and then thrown into the *megaron*;<sup>43</sup> at the end of the summer the remains were removed with anxious ceremony. *Οἰδίπους*, 'Swell-foot', is a riddling name for the pig and its knobby hocks;<sup>44</sup> 'Swell-foot' is embraced by his 'mother', either Demeter or the earth, and is also shut up in the 'palace', the *megaron* as an underground chamber, and undergoes a ghastly mutilation; afterwards he is brought forth by his 'daughter', the female officiants who remove the decayed remains. A profound and fascinating story has been inspired by an ancient and obsessive ritual.

Of the other anguished fathers 'Mycon', to judge from his name, belongs to the cult of Demeter. At the same time it is very clear that a similar rite was performed in the cult of Dionysus; some animal victim was placed in the earth and was tended by women. The cult of Dionysus is notorious for a form of animal sacrifice in which the victim was torn apart, or chopped up, and tasted raw by the worshippers: the rite called *omophagia*.<sup>45</sup> Different victims are attested—a bull-calf, a ram, also an he-goat;<sup>46</sup> the he-goat was used at Eleutheræ and in some other versions of the Agriana canvassed above (§III). It goes without saying that the whole animal was not consumed as raw meat by the celebrants; it was a matter of drinking the blood and tasting the inwards, especially the heart, or simply of dabbling and smearing. What was done with the rest? We now learn that after the

---

366f; Robertson (*supra* n.21) 255–57. The season or duration of the rite is not agreed; the view taken here is close to Deubner's, though I do not reason quite as he does.

<sup>43</sup> The treatment of the pig is clearly seen in the Thasian terracottas published by F. Salviat, *BCH* 89 (1965) 470 figs. 30f. It is implied in a few sanguinary myths which are studied from another point of view by M. Detienne in Detienne and J.-P. Vernant, *La cuisine de sacrifice* (Paris 1979) 183–214.

<sup>44</sup> Everyone allows that the ancient explanation of the name, the pinning of the infant's feet, is a very lame one (if I may put it so), but moderns have not found a better—Edmunds (*supra* n.41) 234 suggests it is a plant name. Shelley however saw the true meaning, in his satire "Swellfoot the Tyrant" (George IV, at the time of his attempt to divorce Queen Caroline). 'Swellfoot' rules a swinish multitude of Boeotian pigs; his name, says Shelley in the Advertisement, leaves it doubtful "whether a swelling of the hind or the fore feet of the Swinish Monarch is particularly indicated."

<sup>45</sup> A. Henrichs, *HSCP* 82 (1978) 150–52, and in B. F. Meyer and E. P. Sanders, *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition III* (London 1982) 144, 159f; J. N. Bremmer, *ZPE* 55 (1984) 274f. Burkert, *GRBS* 7 (1966) 87–121, appears to think of Dionysus' he-goat as cooked and eaten in the usual style of sacrifice; this goes against the evidence.

<sup>46</sup> Lactant. *Plac. ad Stat. Theb.* 5.159; Arn. *Adv.nat.* 5.19; pictorial Maenads rend goats as well as deer, doubtless wild goats.

animal was torn and tasted, the parts were gathered up and placed in the earth. These ritual actions are most plainly reflected in the fate of Icarius, for the shepherds first dismember him with their implements, then gather up the pieces for burial.<sup>47</sup> In still other mythical transcripts the remains of Pentheus or of Dionysus himself are gathered up for burial.

The proceeding is quite straightforwardly described in an inscription of Miletus which regulates the civic cult of Dionysus (*AbhBerl* 1908 [=LSAM 48], of 276/5 B.C.): “no one is permitted to throw in raw flesh, ὠμοφάγιον ἐμβαλεῖν, until the priestess throws it in on behalf of the city.” As the original editor observed, the destination that is left unspoken can only be an underground chamber; scholars have since been oddly reluctant to accept this conclusion, despite the clear analogy of Demeter’s pigs.<sup>48</sup> Just the same language is used of the pigs: χοίρους ἐβάλλουσιν (Clem. *Protr.* 2.12.1), ῥιπτείσθαι τοὺς χοίρους εἰς τὰ χάσματα, and τῶν ἐμβληθέντων εἰς τὰ μέγαρα, and ἐβάλλονται δὲ καὶ εἰς τὰ μέγαρα . . . χοῖροι (Σ Lucian *Dial. Meretr.* 2.1, pp.275f Rabe), ἐς τὰ μέγαρα . . . ἀφιᾶσιν ὕς (Paus. 9.8.1). Furthermore, a chamber called μάγαρον is epigraphically attested for the cult of Dionysus, though its use does not appear;<sup>49</sup> the variant spelling also occurs in the cult of Demeter. In the light of the myths we may now accept the inscription of Miletus at face value, as indicating standard practice in the cult of Dionysus.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>47</sup> Since the shepherds assail their victim with all the implements that are to hand (Nonn. *Dion.* 47.119–24), we infer that in the actual rite each celebrant had his own knife. As Henrichs observes (*supra* n.45: 151 n.97), the Maenads of Greek and Roman art have their own swords and knives to dismember animals. Despite Merkelbach (*supra* n.40) 497, 503, the details of Icarius’ death and burial do not at all suggest the pressing of the grapes; and the whole story is played out at three festivals earlier in the year: at the Anthesteria (Icarius’ tour with a wagon-load of skins, and the first tasting of wine), the Dionysia in Elaphebolion (the death of Icarius), and the Aeora in Metageitnion (the roaming and swinging of Erigone): cf. Robertson, *MusHelv* 44 (1987) 38f.

<sup>48</sup> The range of opinion is as follows. The victim or part of it was thrown into a pit (Wiegand, Haussoullier); the flesh was placed in a basket (Festugière); the live victim was thrown from a roof or platform into a waiting crowd, who tore and ate it (Eisler, Dodds, Jeanmaire); the victim was somehow presented to Dionysus ‘Raw-eater’ as a special form of sacrifice (Henrichs); it is quite impossible to know what was done (Wilamowitz, Kern, Nilsson). For references and further discussion see Sokolowski *ad loc.*; Henrichs (*supra* n.45) 150–52; J.-P. Vernant et al., *Le sacrifice dans l’antiquité* (=EntrHardt 27 [1981]) 37–39 (*loquuntur* Henrichs, Vernant, Versnel).

<sup>49</sup> L. Robert in *Mélanges Bidez* (Brussels 1934) II 811f (=Opera Minora Selecta II [Amsterdam 1969] 1006f); J. Bousquet, *BCH* 62 (1938) 51–53; Henrichs (*supra* n.42) 35f; Sokolowski on *LSCG* 10.B.20.

<sup>50</sup> One would like to know whether the word ὠμοφάγιον, which is an *hapax*, refers to a dismembered animal in the hands of each celebrant or to single pieces of a dismembered animal which is shared by the celebrants.

It is not surprising that the same kind of magic is used for both the corn and the vines: a prepotent male animal is converted to elementary blood and flesh, and is laid within the earth. And since these are secret rites, *orgia*, it is not surprising either that there is no direct evidence for the bestowal of Dionysus' victim save that inscription of Miletus: the bestowal of Demeter's pig is expressly mentioned only by a few late sources. For the present purpose we need go no further. Our concern is with the nubile girls who join in the rite, the daughters of Eleuther and the daughter of Tectaphus, and with the epithet *apatenor*.

The daughter of Tectaphus deceives the guards with 'trick-man speech', *ἀπατήνορι μύθῳ*, and enters the chamber to suckle her father. She is like other young nursing mothers in the myths of Dionysus—like the Nymphs who suckle the infant Dionysus, or like the daughter of Minyas who suckles a child of her own. In the story of Tectaphus and in the others we surveyed, the nursling is not a divine or human infant, but an aged father, wasted and decayed, because the stories are focussed on the underground chamber and the horrid remains within. The mythical Nymphs or royal daughters stand for actual girls of like age who perform another magic action on behalf of the vines and the grapes: they pretend to give suck, so as to make the grapes swell with juice.<sup>51</sup> The mimic suckling in the cult of Dionysus recalls the mimic childbirth in the cult of Demeter, the rite called *kalligeneia*, 'fine-offspring'. The matrons who resort to Demeter's sanctuary at the festival of the sowing pretend to conceive and to grow big and give birth, so as to make the earth bear crops. About this rite of Demeter something more is said below, apropos of Neleus and his daughter Elegeïs (§ VII).

The matrons' fertility was enhanced by magic means, *e.g.* by the eating of pomegranate seeds. The girls' milk was also stimulated by magic means, and one of the means employed was the goatskin apparition at Eleutherae. So we see why Dionysus was called *ἀπατήνωρ* and the ritual *ἀπατηνόρια*. A prepubescent boy dressed in the skin of a black he-goat is a 'trick-man'; in Conon's version as already quoted the apparition is described as both man and boy, *φάσμα τι . . . ἄνδρα . . . ἀγένειον*. We may be reminded of other customs associating boys with nubile girls or brides—for example, the custom of putting a boy to bed with the bride on the first night, surely another 'trick-man'.

<sup>51</sup> The correspondence is implicit in the Greek language, for *σφριγᾶν* is used literally, not figuratively, of both breasts and grapes, and of other swelling animals and plants. In Dionysiac imagery milk spouting from the earth portends an abundant vintage; *cf.* Eur. *Bacch.* 708–10 and Dodds *ad loc.*

Here it is the goatskin that makes the boy a man; it comes from the he-goat freshly slaughtered, which is used to fertilize the earth and make the vines grow. The goatskin works upon the girls, and they in turn work upon the earth. Such is the magic link between the fertility of the vines and that of men and animals.

Returning to Melanthus, we observe that 'trick-man'—the term and the outlook—suits the motif of the distracting companion; so it was all the more natural to reuse the story of Melanthus as an *aition* at Eleutherae. 'Trick-man' also explains another element of the tradition: the name Ἀνδρόπομπος which is borne by the father of Melanthus (Hellanicus F23). Andropompus moreover takes the place of his son in one version of the border exploit. In his account of Theban kings Pausanias speaks of Andropompus, not Melanthus, as the opponent of Xanthus (9.15.16), and just because the substitution is unexpected—Melanthus and Xanthus being antonyms—it is much more likely to be a variant than a mistake. The name, an odd one for a hero, means 'He who conducts the man', just as Θεόπομπος means 'He who conducts the god', *scil.* Dionysus at his advent festival.<sup>52</sup> 'The man', ἀνήρ, who is conducted is again the boy dressed in the skin of a black he-goat. The nearest analogy is the term διοπομπεῖν, literally 'to conduct Zeus', which describes the business of the Athenian festival Πομπαῖα; the actual object here conducted is a fleece, δῖον κώδιον, as an instrument of rain magic.<sup>53</sup> When Melanthus was brought from Melaenae to Eleutherae, a local father was invented for him, the ritual personification Andropompus. Since the ritual is Boeotian, the name will be so too; hence it was preferred by Pausanias' Boeotian source.

Melanthus of Melaenae was attracted to Eleutherae by the 'black' goatskin and the 'trick-man' apparition. At a later stage, in Hellanicus' account of Melanthus, 'trick-man' made a stepping-stone to the festival Apaturia. But why did Hellanicus think of the festival Apaturia in the first place? This question is much more acute than any modern study has allowed. It has been surmised that Dionysus must have some rôle or other at the Apaturia.<sup>54</sup> He does not. The deities of kinship honored at the phratry festival are, at least in the Ionian

<sup>52</sup> Wilamowitz, *Aristoteles und Athen* II (Berlin 1893) 129, renders the name as "der die Männer auf die Fahrt bringt," with reference to the Ionian migration. This is a poor way of explaining the element ἀνδρο-; the meaning would be better expressed by \*Λεώπομπος. Jeanmaire (*supra* n.1) 382 was partly right to say that "the name evokes the leader of a procession."

<sup>53</sup> Eustath. *ad Od.* 22.481. Cf. Deubner (*supra* n.42) 157f.

<sup>54</sup> Toepffer, *RE* (*supra* n.1) 2677; Deubner (*supra* n.42) 233; Guarducci (*supra* n.1) 30–32; Parke (*supra* n.7) 90.

domain, Zeus and Athena, sometimes Apollo as well.<sup>55</sup> No doubt a given phratry in a given place might take charge of a local sanctuary of whatever deity; but a merely local tradition would not reflect on phratries at large, or on the festival Apaturia.<sup>56</sup> Moreover, no such tradition is ever hinted at in the story of Melanthus; we hear only of his trick, *apate*.

Hellanicus like Herodotus before him regarded Melanthus' descendants, the Neleids of Athens, as the founding family of Ionia. After speaking of Codrus, the scholiast on Plato concludes, "And his younger son Neleus became the founder of the Ionian *dodekapolis*" (F23). Among the criteria by which Ionians may be recognized, Herodotus mentions the kings they chose, including the line of Melanthus and Codrus (1.147.1). But there is only one real criterion, he says immediately after. "They are all Ionians who originate in Athens and keep the festival Apaturia"; Ephesus and Colophon, however, have dropped the festival because of some matter of blood guilt (1.147.2f). We may suspect that even this real criterion is one that Herodotus had heard from others. It is not however the same criterion as having kings of the line of Melanthus and Codrus. Herodotus knew Melanthus as the first Neleid king of Athens (5.65.3), and hence he doubtless knew also of his border exploit; yet he did not know of the Apaturia as a commemoration of this exploit. But once it was observed, as it is by Herodotus, that the festival is common to Attica and Ionia, it was natural, indeed inevitable, to say that it was instituted by the Neleid family, in fact by the first family member who came to Athens. The inevitable step was taken by Hellanicus. Perhaps he had his eye on this very passage of Herodotus; or perhaps the two criteria were so commonly mentioned together that he did not need Herodotus.

#### V. Codrus the Wood-cutter

When an oracle declared that Athens must fall to the Dorians unless they killed her king, Codrus went forth to meet his death disguised as a wood-cutter.<sup>57</sup> The story was told by Panyassis,<sup>58</sup> and by Pherecydes

<sup>55</sup> D. Rousel, *Tribu et cité* (Paris 1976) 133–37.

<sup>56</sup> A decree of the later third century awarding honors to an Athenian general calls for them to be announced at different places on different occasions (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 1299.28–32); at Panactum the occasion is the Apaturia—not because Dionysus *melanaigis* is at home nearby, but because the Apaturia is the chief festival celebrated by the garrison of this remote outpost.

<sup>57</sup> For Codrus see Toepffer 230–35, 239f; Wilamowitz (*supra* n.52) 129–31; E. Meyer, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte* II (Halle 1899) 533–35; Wilamowitz, *SBBerlin* 1906, 71 (= *Kl.Schr.* V.1 166); Ledl (*supra* n.1) 226–35; T. Lenschau, *Bursians Jahreshb.* 44 (1916–18) 187f; Scherling, *RE* 11.1 (1921) 984–94 s.v. "Kodros



(*FGrHist* 3F154, from Pollux, where the enemy is not identified), and alluded to by Herodotus (5.76), and told again by Hellanicus (F23). Pherecydes, like Herodotus and Hellanicus, knew of Codrus' posterity as ruling in Ionia (F155, from Strabo); so did Panyassis. Codrus was included in the odd assortment of Athenian heroes whom Pausanias names as standing on the Marathon Base at Delphi, said to be the work of Pheidias (10.10.1f). On a red-figure cup of the later fifth century, the name-piece of the Codrus Painter, Κόδρος is a young warrior in full armour who takes leave of an older man Αἰνείος (*ARV*<sup>2</sup> 1268.1). It is not that the painter knows a different version of Codrus' death, but that the king is here assimilated to the type of the departing hero (two others are shown elsewhere on the cup, Theseus and Ajax).

Plato puts Codrus beside Alcestis and Achilles (*Symp.* 208D, where the scholiast cites Hellanicus), and Lycurgus expatiates on the oracle and on the manner of his death (*Leoc.* 84–87). Thereafter his story is famous (some sources speak as if he died in battle, but only through inadvertence), and his gallantry proverbial (ἐὐγενέστερος Κόδρου).<sup>59</sup> While touring the Ilissus, seemingly its right bank, Pausanias says that “the spot is shown where the Peloponnesians killed Codrus son of Melanthus as king of Athens” (1.19.6). Lycurgus evidently knew the spot, for he tells how Codrus “slipped outside the gates and was gathering wood in front of the city” when accosted by the enemy (*Leoc.* 86; cf. *Anecd.Gr.* 1.192 Bekker, “in front of the wall”). In the Augustan period the spot was marked by a relief or statue depicting the moment of death; for we have a four-line epigram which begins, Κόδρου τοῦτο πῆσημα, “Here is Codrus in the act of falling” (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4258)—it must have labelled the monument.

Codrus' rôle in cult is known solely from the decree of 418/7 which deals with the *hieron* of Codrus and Neleus and Basile and with the

---

(1)”; Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* III<sup>2</sup> (Stuttgart 1937) 399f; F. Brommer, in *Charites: Studien . . . E. Langlotz* (Bonn 1957) 161; F. Cassola, *La Ionia nel mondo miceneo* (Naples 1957) 84–88; Sakellariou (*supra* n.1) index s.vv. “Codrides” and “Codros”: Prinz (*supra* n.1) 323–25, 327–33, 348–53; W. Bühler, *Zenobii Athoi proverbialia* IV (Göttingen 1982) 80–85; P. Carlier, *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre* (Strasbourg 1984) 360–72; Schachermeyr (*supra* n.1) 137f, 146–48.

<sup>58</sup> *Suda* s.v. Πανύασις = test. 1a Matthews. I accept the notice of Panyassis' *Ionica* as more likely true than false. A further reason for belief is that Herodotus presupposes some such contribution in verse (§VII).

<sup>59</sup> Zenobius Ath. 2.6 Bühler. Bühler thinks that the proverb properly refers not to Codrus' gallantry but to his lineage, which according to Hellanicus F23 went back to Deucalion. This would be distinctly odd, since Codrus is praised everywhere for his gallantry, and since moreover Plutarch speaks of him as one who came to the kingship from the obscurity or privation of an exile family (*Mor.* 607B; cf. *Hdt.* 5.65.3). The term ἐὐγενής, as Bühler himself allows, can denote character just as well as lineage.

extensive *temenos* of Neleus and Basile.<sup>60</sup> As the purpose of the decree is severely practical, to improve the condition of the place by leasing it to someone who will be made responsible, it tells us nothing about the nature of Codrus or his partners. The pedimental relief shows a bearded man sitting with a sceptre and a younger man on horseback; who they might be we do not know, unless it is Codrus and his younger son Neleus; if it is, we are still no wiser. The stone was found south-east of the Acropolis, not so far from the right bank of the Ilissus; to judge from the decree, which mentions several landmarks, our *temenos* did indeed lie in this quarter. Quite recently the boundary stone of a nameless shrine emerged *in situ* not far from the reported finding place of *IG I<sup>3</sup> 84*, and has been claimed for Codrus *et al.*; but this is quite uncertain. Whether the sanctuary included the site of Codrus' death is impossible to say. If it did, it lay outside the city wall (for we can hardly believe that Lycurgus thinks of an earlier wall with a narrower circuit); the landmarks mentioned in the decree are within the wall, but they delimit a catchment area for water, not the sanctuary, which must have occupied distinctly lower ground.

It has also been supposed that the grave of Codrus was on display.<sup>61</sup> No such grave is indicated by the opening words of the epigram, as quoted above, though they were for long subject to misunderstanding.<sup>62</sup> The epigram however goes on to say, in the second couplet, that "the body of one who raised his fame to the heavens was carried off and buried beneath the Acropolis by the people of Athens," σῶμα δ' ὑπ' ἀκροπόλει φέρων τάρχυσεν [Ἀθήνης] λαὸς ἐς ἀθανάτους δόξαν ἀειραμέ[νον]. Lycurgus too says that the Athenians sent a herald to the enemy to ask for the body, and that the Peloponnesians gave it back (*Leoc.* 87). The story dwelt on the retrieval of the body, but an actual grave is not attested.

One point on which broad agreement has been reached is that the sanctuary of *IG I<sup>3</sup> 84* once belonged to Neleus and Basile alone, and that Codrus was added later.<sup>63</sup> Codrus has no part in the *temenos* as

<sup>60</sup> *IG I<sup>3</sup> 84*. For the sanctuary see W. Judeich, *Topographie von Athen<sup>2</sup>* (Munich 1931) 387f; R. E. Wycherley, *BSA* 55 (1960) 60–66; J. P. Barron, *JHS* 84 (1964) 47; P. Stavropoulos, *ArchDelt* 20 (1965) Chron. 68–70; D. Behrend, *Attische Pachturkunden* (Munich 1970) 55–61; J. Travlos, *Pictorial Dictionary of Athens* (New York 1971) 332–34; Wycherley (*supra* n.12) 168f.

<sup>61</sup> *E.g.*, Scherling (*supra* n.57) 986; Judeich (*supra* n.60) 387; Wycherley (*supra* n.60) 65f; Travlos (*supra* n.60) 332.

<sup>62</sup> The misunderstanding was exposed by A. Wilhelm, *AnzWien* 1950 366–70 (= *Akademischeschriften zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde* I [Leipzig 1974] 380–84). Wycherley (*supra* n.60) 66 overlooked this.

<sup>63</sup> *E.g.*, Wilamowitz (*supra* n.52) II 130; Scherling (*supra* n.57) 991f; Wycherley (*supra* n.60) 61. But Toepffer (240 n.2) was of a different mind. If Neleus and Basile

distinct from the *hieron*; the place where the decree is posted, *i.e.* the most prominent part of the sanctuary, is called τὸ Νηλεῖον (lines 27f);<sup>64</sup> Neleus and Basile, it is said, make a natural pair as underworld deities. A different view of Neleus and Basile will be argued below (§vi), but as to Codrus the conclusion may stand. It seems to follow that Codrus originates in myth or legend, but how and where?

The posterity of Codrus are all, except his son Medon, founders and kings of Ionian cities: is not Codrus an Ionian *Stammesheros*?<sup>65</sup> But whereas Codrus' sons and grandsons have various ties with Ionian institutions—some are eponyms, some have tombs—Codrus himself has none; his whole story is played out at Athens. As a variant of the Ionian hypothesis it has been held that the name Κόδρος is a personification of royal power, another form of *κυδρός*; hence his partner *βασίλη*, and his son Κύδρηλος, and the patronymic *Κοδρίδαι*, equivalent to *Βασιλίδαι*.<sup>66</sup> This ingenious construction fails on both linguistic and substantive grounds. The *upsilon* of *κῦδος*, *κῦδιμος*, *κυδάλιμος*, *etc.*, is always long, and an alternative form *κοδ-* is inconceivable.<sup>67</sup> *Κοδρίδαι* is a literary name for the line of Codrus (*cf.* Ἐρεχθεῖδαι, Θησεῖδαι, *etc.*)<sup>68</sup> and has nothing to do with the institutional *Βασιλίδαι* of Ephesus. Let him be a Pylian, then; it has been firmly said of late that in the original legend of the Ionian migration Codrus was at home in Messenia and Pylos, as the *Stammvater* of all the founding heroes of Ionia.<sup>69</sup> But no trace of him exists in the myths or the history or the institutions of these places.

As Eduard Meyer saw long ago,<sup>70</sup> there is no escaping the conclusion that Codrus is a figure of Athenian belief. The question is why he comes to view so late, why Athenian belief did not enrol him among the ancient kings who start with Cecrops, a numerous and disparate company. The answer must be sought in the details of his story, which have never been attended to. We shall not understand any Greek myth unless we consider those details that are most peculiar and most persistent. The story of Codrus is full of such details. As one destined

---

came before Codrus, then Barron (*supra* n.60) is wrong to suggest that in 418/7 the construction of Neleus' shrine had just begun.

<sup>64</sup> As Wycherley (*supra* n.60) 63 says, "the use of the name has more point if it refers to the particular cult-spot of Neleus."

<sup>65</sup> Toepffer 239.

<sup>66</sup> Wilamowitz (*supra* n.52) II 129–31; Toepffer, *RE* 3.1 (1897) 96 *s.v.* "Basilidai"; Scherling (*supra* n.57) 990.

<sup>67</sup> Wilamowitz's theory is unmentioned by either Frisk or Chantraine in their etymological dictionaries *s.v.* *κῦδος*.

<sup>68</sup> *Cf.* Toepffer 233f (this before he succumbed to Wilamowitz).

<sup>69</sup> Prinz (*supra* n.1) 351–53.

<sup>70</sup> Meyer (*supra* n.57) *Forschungen* 533f; *Geschichte* 399f.

by an oracle for sacrifice, as a king on whom his country's fortune hangs, Codrus is a common type. But nothing else is typical—not his dress, or his instrument, or his occupation, or the manner of his death.

Codrus goes to his death in disguise, and from Pherecydes onward the disguise is always described in the same terms. He dresses in the homespun of a humble wood-cutter, and takes up a bill-hook useful for cutting sticks, and goes out of the city to gather wood, and on meeting two of the enemy strikes down the one and is himself struck down by the other. All these details are mentioned by Pherecydes (F154), by Hellanicus (F23), by Lycurgus (*Leoc.* 86), and in an explanation of the proverb *ἐὺγενέστερος Κόδρου* which cites Demon and perhaps derives from Pausanias the Atticist.<sup>71</sup> They were undoubtedly depicted in the relief or statue of Codrus which has left us the epigram of Augustan date (*IG II*<sup>2</sup> 4258): we should imagine Codrus wearing homespun, and holding a bill-hook, and falling beneath the enemy stroke.<sup>72</sup> Another detail mentioned by Lycurgus and the epigram is that the Athenians were at pains to recover the body.

Codrus' disguise is the main preoccupation of the story. Codrus is a wood-cutter, as Syleus (say) is a vine-dresser (Eur. *Syleus* frs.687–94 N., *etc.*). A wood-cutter's toil is quite literally enacted when Codrus goes forth with his bill-hook; it is also represented figuratively when Codrus hews down an enemy and is hewed down himself. Thus did Heracles use a mattock first to dig the vines, then to strike down Syleus (Diod. 4.31.7). It is not only that Codrus is a wood-cutter, but that he personifies the very act of cutting wood. This is the usual style of Greek myth; one does not need the prompting of any particular theory of myth or magic in order to think of innumerable figures whose life and death personify a sacrificial victim or some staple crop.<sup>73</sup> Just as Codrus' death at the hands of an enemy is the act of cutting wood, his body is the result; the Athenians are concerned to recover the body and bring it within the walls, or "beneath the Acropolis," as the epigram says, because this is the destination of the wood which he gathered.

In myths like ours the names are often transparent. *Συλεύς* 'De-

<sup>71</sup> Demon *FGrHist* 327F22=Paus. Att. ε 79 Erbse=Zenobius Ath. 2.6 Bühler, test. iii.

<sup>72</sup> Wilhelm (*supra* n.62) 370 also imagines the other enemy lying dead and a bundle of sticks at Codrus' feet.

<sup>73</sup> The danger is that in citing any examples at all, one will be lumped together with the school or doctrine that happens to dwell on those examples. Burkert, *Homo Necans* (*supra* n.21), treats myths about sacrificial victims; Mannhardt and Frazer treat myths about the crops.

spoiler' presumably refers in the first instance to the rough work of a vine-dresser, to digging and lopping and burning; Ἐρεχθεύς is 'Thresher', Οἰνεύς is 'Wine-grower'. Other names are simply the crop or plant (Λίνος, Στάφυλος, Δάφνη, Ὑάκινθος) or its desired condition (Ἀνθεύς 'Blooming', Φριξός 'Bristling', like an ear of ripe corn). Now, some of the commonest shrubs and trees in the Mediterranean are denoted by the term κέδρος, 'juniper'.<sup>74</sup> Κόδρος shows a normal alternation of vowels (*cf. e.g.* πεδ-/ποδ-); the proper name was thus differentiated from the generic noun.

The wood-cutting that gave rise to the myth of Codrus had special significance. To grasp its significance we should recall that Codrus the wood-cutter is also Codrus the king, responsible for his city's welfare. Wood was required for every sacrifice, but it was not always easy to obtain, especially in an urban setting. Many sacrificial calendars inscribed on stone make provision for the requisite wood or sticks, ξύλα or φρύγανα.<sup>75</sup> Athens' public sacrifices were mostly the concern of the Basileus ([Arist.] *Ath.Pol.* 3.3, 57.1). "The laws of the Basileus" quoted by Athenaeus from Crates and other Hellenistic sources show that the Basileus had charge of supplies such as barley meal (*Ath.* 235c). Though the text may not be quite sound, it appears to say what we should anyway assume, that the supplies were kept in the Basileus' official quarters, the Bucoleium.<sup>76</sup> The Bucoleium like some other public buildings stood in the older city-centre that was in use long before the Agora at the northwest (*Ath.Pol.* 3.5; Paus. 1.18.3). This city-centre is now firmly located on the east side of the Acropolis, for the shrine of Aglaurus which was part of it has yielded an inscription *in situ*;<sup>77</sup> the east side of the Acropolis is the steepest (*cf.* Hdt. 8.53.1, on the unexpected ascent of some Persian soldiers), so that the city-centre was in the very shadow of the citadel.

These facts explain the myth of Codrus. The king who goes out of the city to gather wood is the Basileus who must find wood for sacrifice; the remains that are carried back to a point "beneath the

<sup>74</sup> R. Meiggs, *Trees and Timber in the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Oxford 1982) 47, 410–16.

<sup>75</sup> The Attic instances are *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 129.5, 241.15, 246C.25f; II<sup>2</sup> 1356.3, 8, 22; 1363 b.24; *LSCG Suppl.* 19.87f, 91f. The Cyrenaean purification law, *LSCG Suppl.* 115A.8–10, authorizes the use of certain wood for sacred and also secular purposes.

<sup>76</sup> τοὺς δὲ παρασίτους ἐκ τῆς βουκολίας ἐκλέγειν ἐκ τοῦ μέρους τοῦ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστον ἐκτέα κριθῶν κτλ. *Cf.* Wilamowitz (*supra* n.52) I 216 n.55, II 43; Robertson, *Historia* 35 (1986) 163 n.35. R. Schlaifer, *HSCP* 54 (1943) 51–55, 60f, interprets βουκολία as a sacred herd of cattle and assumes a lacuna after ἐκλέγειν, to be supplemented *e.g.* <βοῶν, καὶ ἐκ [nomen loci] ἐκλέγειν>.

<sup>77</sup> G. S. Dontas, *Hesperia* 52 (1983) 48–63; Robertson (*supra* n.76) 158–68.

Acropolis” are the supply of wood that is kept at the Bucoleium. Codrus is not the only king of Athens who personifies an essential action and an essential thing. Erichthonius, earth-born offspring of Athena and the fire-god, personifies the kindling and fetching of new fire at the festival Panathenaea. Erechtheus, sprung from the corn-field and stricken by Poseidon’s trident, personifies the threshing of the corn at the festival Scira.<sup>78</sup> All these myths were once told separately for their own sake, not as successive episodes of Athenian history. Erichthonius and Erechtheus, the new fire and the new crop, are much more important than Codrus and the wood for sacrifice, and so it is natural that they, and not Codrus, found a place in the original line of Athens’ kings. Erechtheus even became an object of cult, distinct from the god Poseidon, who could also be styled ‘Thresher’. Codrus too will have received or shared a sacrifice at the sanctuary of IG I<sup>3</sup> 84, but as already said, this is a secondary development.

Codrus had been enrolled in the second dynasty by the time of Panyassis and Pherecydes and the Marathon Base. Yet there was a time when only Neleus and Basile were honoured at the sanctuary. If the Neleus of the sanctuary was always thought of as a Neleid (so to speak), whether as the ancient king and eponym or as the founder of Miletus, then there was also a time when Athens acknowledged the second dynasty but did not include Codrus within it. Neleus and Basile deserve a closer look.

## VI. Neleus and Miletus

Neleus son of Codrus is the founder of Miletus and sometimes of other Ionian cities, and by far the leading figure in most accounts of the Ionian migration—as we might expect of one who bears the same name as the ancestor of his line, that ancient king of Pylos;<sup>79</sup> Mimnermus evokes the mother city as Πύλος Νηληΐος (fr.9 Bergk/West). The younger Neleus first appears, so far as the record shows,<sup>80</sup> in Panyassis’ *Ionica* (*Suda* s.v. Πανύασις=test. 1a Matthews), but whether he was credited with other settlements besides Miletus we cannot tell. Among

<sup>78</sup> For Erichthonius and Erechtheus see Robertson, *RhM* n.F. 128 (1985) 254–69.

<sup>79</sup> For Neleus son of Codrus see Toepffer 235–40; Jacoby, *Das Marmor Parium* (Berlin 1904) 91f; Wilamowitz (*supra* n.57) 67f; van der Kolf, *RE* 16.2 (1935) 2280 s.v. “Neleus (2)”; Meyer, *Geschichte* (*supra* n.57) 400f; Jacoby *ad FGrHist* 323aF 11, on Hellanicus; Cassola (*supra* n.57) 88–94; Sakellariou (*supra* n.1) index s.v. “Nélée”; Prinz (*supra* n.1) 325–34; Schachermeyr (*supra* n.1) 297–300, 303–05.

<sup>80</sup> On the Marathon Base the three heroes whom Pausanias names after the eponymous heroes are Codrus, Theseus, and Φιλεύς or Φυλεύς, a name which calls for emendation; but Νηλεύς (Goettling) is a rather long shot. Cf. Vidal-Naquet, *Black Hunter* (*supra* n.1) 304f, 309.

surviving sources Herodotus first describes him as founder of Miletus (9.97, *cf.* 1.146.2). He has the same rôle in Ephorus (F127, from Strabo), in Callimachus (*Dian.* 226f), in Strabo (14.1.3 [633]), and in Pausanias (7.2.4, 6). Members of the royal house of Miletus are called *Νηλεῖδαι*,<sup>81</sup> and Milesians at large are “the people of Neleus” (Callim. *Iamb.* fr.191.76). In Hellanicus on the other hand, and in the Parian Marble, Neleus founds all twelve cities of Ionia;<sup>82</sup> in Aelian he founds these and “later, many other cities on the continent” (*VH* 8.5).

On the first view the other cities of Ionia are founded by other sons of Codrus or by grandsons. Each city had its own tradition,<sup>83</sup> and we may suppose that as a rule the founder’s name derived from some local institution. Not surprisingly, Neleus and Miletus were not always allowed first place. According to Pherecydes “Androclus led the Ionian migration, and later the Aeolian, as a legitimate son of Codrus king of Athens; he became the founder of Ephesus” (F155, from Strabo). Some said that Myus was the first city to be founded, if Pliny has it right (*HN* 5.113). It would be interesting, but impractical, to consider the other Ionian founders. For the present purpose, a study of Athens’ claim to be the mother-city, Neleus will suffice.

Neleus belongs to cult, both at Athens and at Miletus. It is not obvious at the start whether this Neleus of cult is the ancient king of Pylos, or the founder of Miletus, or some god or hero, of whatever function, who stands behind both.

To take Athens first, the *temenos* of Neleus and Basile known from the decree of 418/7 was very large, large enough to be planted with 200 or more olive trees, and requiring a catchment area that was extensive too.<sup>84</sup> As the decree calls for the *hieron* to be made secure, it has been plausibly conjectured that the area was occupied by squatters during the Archidamian War. Moreover, the *temenos* can hardly have been left empty and unused before this time; no doubt the squatters destroyed an earlier plantation. As we saw apropos of Codrus, the sanctuary cannot be closely located; it lay somewhere near the south-east edge of the city, perhaps outside the city walls.

The decree tells us almost nothing about the cult proper. At the spot where the stele was displayed, the cult-site of Neleus called *τὸ Νηλεῖον*, there were wooden structures called *ἴκρια* (line 28), presumably a

<sup>81</sup> Arist. fr.556 Rose<sup>3</sup>=οἱ τὰ Μιλησιακά *FGrHist* 496F1, from Parthenius; *cf.* Plut. *Mor.* 253F.

<sup>82</sup> *FGrHist* 323aFF11, 23=4FF48, 125; *Marm.Par.* 239A.27.

<sup>83</sup> *Cf.* Sakellariou (*supra* n.1); C. Habicht, *Classical Antiquity* 3 (1984) 43–46.

<sup>84</sup> *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 84. The points that follow are mostly taken from Wycherley (*supra* n.60) 60–66.

stand for spectators at some contest or other performance. As already said, the pedimental relief shows an older man seated and holding a sceptre, and a younger man on horseback, perhaps Codrus and his son Neleus; but these iconographic types will have little to do with the real nature of the cult.

The sanctuary is not heard of again at Athens. To be sure, a shrine of Basile is mentioned as a place of note by Plato (*Chrm.* 153A), and a priestess of Basile is honoured by a decree of 239/8 (*Hesperia* 7 [1938] 123 no. 25). If we took these references by themselves, we might be tempted to suppose that Basile, not Neleus, was the dominant partner, even though the decree gives the opposite appearance.<sup>85</sup> But other Athenian and Attic evidence puts it beyond doubt that the transparent names Basile and Basileia were employed elsewhere as titles of cult.<sup>86</sup> A votive relief of the fourth century shows Zeuxippus and Basileia as a conjugal pair (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4645). At Erchia a goddess Basile receives sacrifice on Boedromion 4, and is the only deity honoured on this date throughout the calendar (*LSCG* 18B.14–20). At Eitea another local shrine of Basile is disclosed by a decree of 332/1 which was posted there; the relief above the inscription shows the goddess proffering the honorary wreath (*SEG* XXVIII 102). And just because the name Basile is more widely current, any reference to our sanctuary should not omit Neleus. The silence that envelops this large and opulent sanctuary after the decree of 418/7 is likely to be significant. The cult must have faded, so that the ground or much of it was relinquished to other use.<sup>87</sup>

Despite such meagre evidence modern studies of Neleus and Basile are nearly all agreed in describing them as deities of the underworld.<sup>88</sup> Yet the heroine whom we see abducted in the Echelus relief from

<sup>85</sup> And tempted all the more, because a palaestra such as Taureas', the setting of the *Charmides* that Plato describes as "right opposite the shrine of Basile," should be sought at the edge of the city. From Curtius down to Travlos (*supra* n.60: 233 fig. 435), the sanctuary of Neleus and Basile and the palaestra of Taureas have been linked together.

<sup>86</sup> H. A. Shapiro, *ZPE* 63 (1986) 134–36, draws attention to a red-figure pyxis of ca 420–410 B.C. depicting the babe Erichthonius and the erring Cecropids on the lid and the body respectively; a figure labelled *Basile* appears in the first scene, and another labelled *Basileia* in the second. These are *ad hoc* personifications of Athenian kingship.

<sup>87</sup> Whether or not the sanctuary included the site of Codrus' death, the cult was not focussed on it, for the site was still shown in the Augustan period and even in Pausanias' day.

<sup>88</sup> Wilamowitz (*supra* n.57) 67f; Scherling (*supra* n.57) 991; Judeich (*supra* n.60) 387f; van der Kolf, *RE* 16.2 (1935) 2277–79 s.v. "Neleus (1)"; Ernst Meyer, *RE* 23.2 (1959) 2136f s.v. "Pylos (5)"; Wycherley (*supra* n.60) 61f; Sokolowski on *LSCG* 14 (*IG* I<sup>3</sup> 84); Wycherley (*supra* n.12) 168.



Phalerum is Ἰασίλη, not Basile;<sup>89</sup> so that even if this pair resemble Pluto and Persephone, the same does not follow for Neleus and Basile. For the rest, if we think of Pylos 'The Gate', where Hades was shot by Heracles, and of Neleus' horses, and of his father Poseidon, and of the likeness of Νηλεύς and νηλεής 'pitiless', can we doubt that Neleus is lord of the underworld? Such vague and wishful notions should not weigh in the balance. At most we might concede that, when so little is known of the Athenian cult, there is room for almost any hypothesis, even for underworld deities. But when we turn our gaze from Athens to Miletus, light dawns.

At Miletus the ritual background of Neleus and the Neleids has not been much noticed, though it is in fact conspicuous.<sup>90</sup> Neleus the founding hero is here associated with the goddess Artemis at a festival of note that drew worshippers from other cities, including Myus and Samos. The myths to which the festival gives rise (by way of aetiology) are recounted by several sources, Callimachus and Apollonius among them. The festival name is given as Νηληίς, *scil.* ἑορτή, the adjective formed from Νηλεύς; but this is only a descriptive term, not the true name of the festival.<sup>91</sup> Other evidence shows that the festival was the Thargelia, celebrated at Miletus, as elsewhere, in the late spring and addressed to both Artemis and Apollo. The Milesian version of this common Ionian festival was called 'Neleus' festival' because he seemed to typify the festival business. The business which struck observers like Callimachus and Apollonius or their sources was the ceremonious betrothal of noble youths and maidens.

The range of direct evidence can be briefly indicated. Callimachus in the *Hymns* speaks of Artemis *chitone* as a goddess distinctive of Miletus, whom Neleus took as guide in his voyage overseas (*Dian.* 226f), and who is patron of fishermen, as much as Ares is of warriors, and Apollo of musicians, *etc.* (*Jov.* 77f).<sup>92</sup> The scholiast on the latter

<sup>89</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 4546=Athens Nat. Mus. no. 1783; the true reading was insisted on by Wycherley (*supra* n.60) 60, but he did not draw the consequences. Sokolowski (*supra* n.88) seems to confuse the Echelus relief with the relief of *IG* I<sup>3</sup> 84. For Echelus, see S. Benton, *BSA* 67 (1972) 13–19 (her conclusions however are eccentric).

<sup>90</sup> Nilsson, *Feste* 242f.

<sup>91</sup> Nilsson takes the name as evidence that the festival was once addressed to Neleus alone.

<sup>92</sup> ἐπακτῆρας δὲ χιτώνης Ἀρτεμίδος (ὀδεύομεν). Although ἐπακτῆρες are 'hunters' in Homer (and this meaning is ascribed to Callimachus in *LSJ* Suppl.), Apollonius uses the word of 'fishermen' (*Argon.* 1.615, with schol.). Callimachus probably intends the same sense, since his other mention of Artemis *chitone*, as guide to Neleus, dwells on her connexion with the sea. For this side of Artemis, see Preller-Robert 317f. Were hunters in view, Callimachus would have chosen an epithet of Artemis characteristic of this domain; moreover, the festivals of Artemis that promote the hunt fall in early spring, earlier than the festival at Miletus.

passage explains that Neleus set up a *xoanon* for Artemis made from a special tree that bore all kinds of fruit; the story will reflect a custom of setting out all kinds of fruit before the statue, or even of hanging them on the statue, a custom that agrees with others attested for the Thargelia.<sup>93</sup> The title *χιτώνη*, or rather *κιθωνέα*, the Ionic form (Hsch. s.v.), equates the goddess with her worshippers; the marriageable girls who gathered at her sanctuary were so dressed, in simple tunics.<sup>94</sup>

In the third book of the *Aetia* Callimachus told the love story of Phrygius and Pieria as an *aition* of the festival;<sup>95</sup> Plutarch gives another version, perhaps using the same source as Callimachus, who might be Leontiades.<sup>96</sup> Myus and Miletus are at war, and Pieria a girl of Myus comes to the festival of Artemis at Miletus, and Phrygius the Neleid king of Miletus falls in love with her, so that Myus and Miletus are united thereafter in friendship and in common observance of the festival. When Phrygius promises anything that Pieria desires, she does not ask for any of the usual feminine adornments, as we are told at great length; this reminds us that the girls attending the festival dressed plainly, in the tunics which provide Artemis with her epithet. That Phrygius is a Neleid is stated in all accounts, and the family is also alluded to in Callimachus' remark, echoed by Aristaenetos, that love is more persuasive than Nestor himself. The name *Πιερία*, evoking the Muses, indicates that Apollo, as well as Artemis, is concerned in the festival, and so does *Πύθης* as the name of the girl's father.

Apollonius recounted a different *aition* in his *Foundation of Naucratis*.<sup>97</sup> Ocyrrhoe a girl of Samos comes to "a certain festival of Artemis at Miletus" and is almost overcome by the god Apollo, who loves her. The rest of the story takes place at sea. Apollo appears as

<sup>93</sup> For the offering of first-fruits at the Thargelia, see Nilsson, *Feste* 110–15; Deubner (*supra* n.42) 188–93; V. Gebhard, *RE* 5A.2 (1934) 1289, 1302f s.v. "Thargelia (1)."

<sup>94</sup> According to Σ Eur. *Hec.* 934 (and being irrelevant the information is likely to be authentic), "Dorian girls would come to the temple of Artemis and fall into a frenzy and dance with just a single chiton," *ἐνθουσιῶσαι μετὰ ἐνὸς μόνου χιτῶνος ἄρχουτρο*. The custom doubtless belongs to Artemis *χιτώνη*, who was worshipped in Dorian cities too, notably at Syracuse, with a special dance performed to the flute (Ath. 629E; Steph. Byz. s.v. *χιτώνη*=Epicharmus fr.127 Kaibel=Parmeno fr.7 Powell). At Corinth, the mother-city of Syracuse, a sanctuary has been excavated in which the staple offering was a handmade terracotta group representing dancers linked round a flute-player: *AJA* 68 (1964) 200. Σ Callim. *Jov.* 77 has useful information about the cult statue at Miletus, but also some beguiling nonsense, *viz.* that Artemis *chitone* was named from Chitone as an Attic deme (Σ *Cer.* 15 says that Callichorum was not only a well but an Attic deme), "or because when babies were born they would dedicate the clothes to Artemis." Nilsson, *Feste* 242, was right to dismiss this out of hand.

<sup>95</sup> *Aet.* fr.80–83; whence Aristaenetos *Ep.* 1.15.

<sup>96</sup> *Mor.* 253F–254A; whence Polyæn. 8.35. Cf. R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* (Oxford 1949–53) I 501 *add.*, II 113f *add.*

<sup>97</sup> Ath. 283D–F=Ap. Rhod. fr.7–9 Powell; cf. Ael. *NA* 15.23.

Ocyrrhoe is being transported home by Pompilus, a friend of her father; he makes Pompilus a pilot fish and has his way with Ocyrrhoe. As we saw, the festival also brought to mind the voyage of Neleus; and to reach Miletus from Myus Pieria will have sailed across the Latmian Gulf. At Miletus both Apollo and Artemis have much to do with seafaring; witness the Delphinium beside the Bay of Lions, where they were worshipped jointly as *delphinios* and *delphinia*.<sup>98</sup>

We should be aware that this festival of Miletus belongs to a type common in the Ionian domain. Similar stories are linked with similar festivals on Naxos, Delos, and Ceos.

The Naxian story was very widely told. Parthenius, Plutarch, and Gellius as our immediate sources have it from Aristotle, Theophrastus, and the local historians of Naxos, among whom Andriscus is named.<sup>99</sup> Naxos is under siege by Miletus and Erythrae—it is no doubt the famous siege of *ca* 500 B.C.<sup>100</sup>—and Polycrite a girl of Naxos finds herself outside the city wall in the *Δήλιον*, *i.e.* at a sanctuary used for celebrating the Delia as a festival of Artemis and Apollo;<sup>101</sup> the enemy commander Diognetus falls in love with her, so that Polycrite is able to arrange a surprise attack by the Naxians that saves the city. When the attack is made, the Milesian camp is said to be celebrating the Thargelia; this gives the season, and also intimates that at Miletus the festival Thargelia is equivalent to this festival of Naxos. In plighting faith Diognetus swears by Artemis. Thereafter a cake or a loaf is sent to Polycrite's brothers in the city (for the sake of the story a secret message is concealed within), obviously a betrothal custom: on Naxos a suitor might send a cake or a loaf to the girl's *kyrios*, and if it was accepted, so was his suit. The Naxian festival, like the Thargelia elsewhere, was also concerned with the purification of the community; this concern emerges elsewhere in the story,<sup>102</sup> and

<sup>98</sup> F. Graf, *MusHelv* 36 (1979) 7–9; N. Ehrhardt, *Milet und seine Kolonien*<sup>2</sup> I (Frankfurt 1988) 130, 142f, 148, 154.

<sup>99</sup> Parth. *Amat.Narr.* 9=Theophr. *Πολιτικά πρὸς τοὺς καιροὺς*=Andriscus *FGrHist* 500F1; Plut. *Mor.* 254B–F=Arist. fr.559 Rose<sup>3</sup>=*FGrHist* 501F2; Gell. 3.15.1=Arist. *ibid.*; Polyæn. 8.36, from Plutarch.

<sup>100</sup> Hdt. 5.28–35.1. Jacoby, n.1 on Andriscus F1, will not have it, because the details of our story do not match Herodotus; but we expect the *aition* to make free with history.

<sup>101</sup> The excavated Delium on Paros helps us to picture the Delium on Naxos, for both the site and the furnishings are just what the story requires: O. Rubensohn, *Das Delion von Paros* (Wiesbaden 1962); N. M. Kontoleon, *Gnomon* 38 (1966) 202–11; *IG XII.5* 210, a dedication to Delian Artemis found *in situ*.

<sup>102</sup> The story and the ritual are otherwise interpreted by Burkert, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Berkeley 1979) 72f, and still otherwise by the previous writers he cites at 173 n.1. It should be said in passing that festivals conducted by women outside the city wall often go with exciting stories of enemy attack:

again in a separate *aition* which introduces Neleus himself. On his way to Miletus the winds blew him to Naxos and kept him there until he managed to identify those of the company who were tainted by blood guilt; these he left to settle Naxos (Ael. *VH* 8.5).

A festival on Delos forms the setting for the story of Acontius and Cydippe, which like the story of Phrygius and Pieria was told by Callimachus in the third book of the *Aetia*.<sup>103</sup> Yet Cydippe's home is Naxos and Acontius' is Ceos, intimating that these islands shared in the worship; Callimachus' source was the local historian Xenomedes of Ceos,<sup>104</sup> and a later variant of the story which we shall consider in a moment actually takes place on Ceos. Acontius and Cydippe come from their respective homes to Apollo's sacred island to attend a festival of the god referred to as "the ox-slaughter" (Callim. fr.67). There Acontius sees Cydippe, and the oath which he makes her swear inadvertently is overheard by Artemis. A festival associating Apollo and Artemis can only be the Delia of Thargelion 6–7.<sup>105</sup>

The later variant is much more explicit about the ritual background (Ant. Lib. *Met.* 1). Ctesylla a girl of Ceos is dancing at Apollo's altar at Carthea during the festival Pythia, when Hermocrates a youth of Athens sees her and falls in love. Ctesylla too is made to swear by Artemis, but Hermocrates, a more prudent lover than Acontius, applies afterwards to the girl's father, who swears by Apollo, "taking hold of the laurel." The laurel is emblematic of Apollo's spring festival.<sup>106</sup> The Ceans were well known for observing the formalities of wooing and betrothal.<sup>107</sup> Girls of Ceos would spend the day in a

---

*e.g.* the Thesmophoria at Cape Colias or Eleusis with a Megarian attack; the Thesmophoria at Ephesus with a sequel to the battle of Lade; the Nonae Caprotinae at Rome with the menaces of various enemies, Latins or Gauls or Etruscans. This is a narrative motif, not so much a pointer to the ritual action.

<sup>103</sup> Callim. fr.67–75; *cf.* Aristaenetus *Ep.* 1.10; Ov. *Her.* 20, 21. *Cf.* Pfeiffer (*supra* n.96); P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford 1972) I 725–27, II 1013–17; H. Herter, *RE Suppl.* 13 (1973) 201–03 *s.v.* "Kallimachos (6)"; *Suppl.Hellenist.* fr.301.

<sup>104</sup> *FGrHist* 442 F 1=Callim. fr.75.50–77.

<sup>105</sup> Pfeiffer on Callim. fr.67.6, Apollo's *βουφονίη*, cites the Delian month-name *Βουφονιών* (=Boedromion), but the *βουφόνια* is a festival of Zeus, not of Apollo or Artemis. P. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos* (Paris 1970) 65f, identifies Callimachus' festival with the Apollonia of Hierus=Anthesterion, on the ground that Apollo had no other festival of note during the period of Delian independence, 314–166 B.C.; this is to forget that Callimachus draws on an earlier source and evokes an earlier time. At 87–91 Bruneau refuses to date the festival Delia to Thargelion, or to fix any date at all, but this is misguided: Robertson (*supra* n.20) 152.

<sup>106</sup> The festival for which Pindar composed his *δαφνηφορικά* took place in the spring (fr.94b.16–20); records of the festival Thargelia were kept in the *δαφνηφορεῖον* at Phlya (Ath. 424F=Theophr. *Περὶ μέθης*).

<sup>107</sup> Plut. *Mor.* 249D. W. Nachstädt *ad loc.* appears to confuse Ceos with Cius in

sanctuary where suitors would see them dancing and sporting; at evening the girls would go to one another's houses and minister to fathers and brothers, even washing feet.

In the light of these parallels we can interpret the festival at Miletus and the rôle of Neleus within it. Throughout Ionia the spring festival of Artemis and Apollo was the occasion for large-scale formal reunions, whether of a single community and its visitors (as at Miletus and on Naxos and Ceos), or of many communities together (as on Delos). As part of the festivity marriageable girls danced and sported in the sanctuary of Artemis; young men came from afar to offer bride-gifts and compete in the games; finally, in the drinking parties that followed the sacrifices to Apollo, the girls were publicly betrothed by fathers or brothers. This ostentatious manner of wooing and betrothing, so typical of early aristocratic society, gives us the several love-stories we have surveyed—the stories of Pieria and Phrygius, of Ocyrrhoe and Apollo, of Polycrite and Diognetus, of Cydippe and Acontius, of Ctesylla and Hermocrates.<sup>108</sup>

At Miletus the festival of Artemis and Apollo is called *Νηληϊς*, and in one *aition* the suitor is a Neleid king. The reason is that Neleus himself, as a mythical figure, is the projection of this betrothal custom. Consider the elder Neleus of Pylos. In a story already known to Homer (*Od.* 11.287–97), his daughter Pero is wooed by all, but Neleus demands an extravagant bride-price, which is almost the undoing of the great seer Melampus. The younger Neleus too has a nubile daughter Elegeïs, whose desire for a mate produces an omen that directs Neleus to Miletus; this is a burlesque of the older story (Elegeïs was also called Pero, by one account), and we shall examine it below (§ VII). Another variation is cited from Euphorion (fr.26 Powell=Parth. *A. Nat. Narr.* 13). Harpalyce a priestess of Argos is betrothed to “Alastor, one of the Neleids,” *i.e.* of the dynasty of Pylos, and the marriage is celebrated with an opulent feast; the horrors that ensue belong to an Argive aetiology, but the marriage is clearly inspired by the famous alliance between the Pylian Pero and the Argive Bias.

Neleus then personifies the father who bestows his daughter at the

---

Mysia, for he adduces Σ Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.1177=Arist. fr.514 Rose<sup>3</sup>, referring to the latter; but Plutarch undoubtedly means Ceos.

<sup>108</sup> Of course the custom is not confined to the Ionian domain; witness *e.g.* the wooing of Alcaeus at Megara and of Heracles at Oechalia, and the matching of Tydeus and Polyneices at Argos, all inspired by festivals of Apollo; witness too the festival setting of Cleisthenes' betrothal feast in Herodotus (6.126ff), evidently the Sicyonian Pythia.

spring festival of Artemis and Apollo. We are now in a position to explain the name Νηλεύς, which also occurs in the forms Νειλεύς and Νείλεως.<sup>109</sup> The betrothal is sealed by an oath adjuring Apollo or Artemis; such an oath is mentioned in most of our stories, and two of them turn upon it, the stories of Cydippe and Acontius, and of Ctesylla and Hermocrates. The particle used in adjuring deities is νή, which also occurs in the form νεί; hence the two forms of the name, Νη- and Νει-. The rest of the name is formed from that expressive stem or sound -λ- denoting any utterance, as in λαλέω, *lallo*, *balo*, βάβαλον· κραύγασον (Hsch.), βαυκαλάω, and other words. Νηλεύς is 'νή-sayer', one who promises on oath.

It is natural that such a figure should be regarded as a founder of cities and a royal ancestor. The elder Neleus founded Pylos and established the Pylian dynasty. The younger Neleus founded Miletus and established another dynasty.<sup>110</sup> In the course of time he became a hero of cult: his grave was shown on the processional way to Didyma (Paus. 7.2.6). The story that Neleus came to Miletus under the guidance of Artemis *chitone*, and bearing her magic statue, plainly originates at Miletus, not at Athens. And when the story was first put out, Athens was surely not regarded as the point of departure, for Athens has no cult of Artemis *chitone*.

The Athenian shrine of Neleus and Basile, inexplicable by itself, must be inspired by Neleus' reputation at Miletus. At this shrine there is no sign of the larger ritual background, of Artemis and Apollo. Conversely, Artemis and Apollo have many cults and festivals at Athens, and there is no sign of Neleus. At the shrine of Neleus and Basile Athens pays tribute to Neleus as founder of Miletus, and the consort Basile is meant to evoke the Neleid dynasty abroad.

It is hardly surprising that such a peculiar cult did not flourish for long. We hear of it once only, in 418/7. But when did it begin? Panyassis, Herodotus, and probably Pherecydes already know of Neleus as

<sup>109</sup> For ancient and modern etymologies, all very fanciful, see van der Kolf (*supra* n.79) 2278f, and add L. R. Palmer, *The Greek Language* (London 1980) 35: "the shortened form of *Nehe-lawos* 'saving the folk.'" It is true that 'Neleus' belongs to a series of older mythical names which have monosyllabic stems and the ending -εύς: M. P. Nilsson, *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology* (Berkeley 1932) 26f, after Kretschmer. But it does not follow that such names will be inscrutable; 'Oeneus' is quite transparent.

<sup>110</sup> At Miletus the office of Basileus was traced back to the Neleid dynasty. Whereas inscriptions show that the Basileus had charge of the procession to Didyma (*Milet* I.3 no. 133.18f, 22 [*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 57, *LSAM* 50]; cf. no. 31a.3 [*LSAM* 41]), an *aition* recounted by Nicolaus of Damascus speaks of a Neleid king as leading the procession (*FGrHist* 90F52); for the ritual behind the *aition* see Robertson, *Phoenix* 41 (1987) 369f. The Basileus also had charge of the Thargelia: *Milet* I.3 no. 133.20, 22.

a son of Codrus who starts from Athens. Yet as we saw (§v), this Athenian cult of Neleus and Basile did not at first include Codrus. The cult goes back to a time when Neleus was said to have started from Athens, but was not yet a son of Codrus.

## VII. The Cauconians and Eleusis

Melanthus, Codrus, and Neleus are now accounted for, and we turn to the other elements mentioned by Herodotus: the ethnic name ‘Cauconians’ for the descendants of Codrus ruling in Ionia, and the cult of Eleusinian Demeter established on Mycale by a companion of Neleus. There is no indication that the two elements belong together, although both are quite obviously derived from some earlier authority or authorities.

To take the Cauconians first, they appear in two passages describing migrations of old, the Ionian and Minyan respectively. In Herodotus’ rather scornful account of the Ionians, the line of kings descended from Codrus son of Melanthus are oddly designated as “Pylian Cauconians,” *Καύκωνες Πύλιοι* (1.147.1); *i.e.* they are virtual barbarians, just like the other line of kings descended from Glaucus son of Hippolochus, who are “Lycians.” Elsewhere Herodotus explains that the Cauconians were the first inhabitants of Triphylia and were driven out in the time of Eurysthenes and Procles by Minyans invading from Laconia (4.148.4). Where they went he does not say, but some are found thereafter in Athens and Ionia, as the family of Melanthus and Codrus. Now, although Herodotus has views of his own about the native stock of Greece, notably the Pelasgian theory which he develops at length, these notices of the Cauconians are so incidental and elliptic that he plainly took them from an earlier authority.

The authority can only be Hecataeus.<sup>111</sup> For it was a doctrine of Hecataeus that the Peloponnesus was once inhabited entirely by barbarians, and of the four barbarian peoples whom Strabo names in illustration the Cauconians are second.<sup>112</sup> We also know that Hecataeus dealt with Macistus (F122=Steph. Byz. *s.v.* *Μήκιστον*), after

<sup>111</sup> So F. Bölte, *RE* 11 (1921) 65 *s.v.* “Kaukonnes”; F. Kiechle, *Historia* 9 (1960) 31 (but he appears to forget this on page 32).

<sup>112</sup> 7.7.1 (321)=Hecataeus *FGrHist* 1F119. It is true that after mentioning the doctrine Strabo goes beyond it, and says that “the whole of Greece” was in fact barbarian, and adds some other barbarian names; yet he also speaks of the Peloponnesus as divided among “Dryopians and Cauconians and Pelasgians and Lelegians and other such peoples,” and it is precisely this series that must come from Hecataeus. Bölte (*supra* n.111) further suggests that Hecataeus has contributed to the extended account of the Cauconians at 8.3.17 (345); this is very likely, but not susceptible of proof.

Lepreum the second city of Triphylia, which according to Herodotus was founded by the Minyans when they drove out the Cauconians (*cf.* Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Μάκιστος). On this showing Hecataeus said that the kings of Pylos, elsewhere called the Neleids, belonged to an earlier stock, here identified as Cauconians, who were displaced by the Dorian migration and its immediate sequel. Such a notion is very like Hecataeus; he is full of folk migrations intended to explain why the present landscape differs from the epic.

The Cauconians were known from Homer as neighbours of Nestor (*Od.* 3.366), as a people of Triphylia or thereabouts.<sup>113</sup> Why did Hecataeus bring them to Athens? The warrant for this as for other hypothetical migrations will be some custom of note that is shared by the old homeland and the new. The Pelasgians, for example, can be traced through the ithyphallic gods common to Athens and Samothrace (*Hdt.* 2.51). And it seems almost certain that this criterion of ithyphallic gods has been borrowed, rather ineptly, from Hecataeus (*cf.* *Hdt.* 6.137=Hecataeus F127, on the Pelasgian settlement at Athens); for the criterion is in fact unsuited to Herodotus' Pelasgians, ubiquitous as they are, but tallies perfectly with the stages of Hecataeus' Pelasgian migration: Arcadia (another land of herms), Athens, and Samothrace. We therefore ask, what custom of note, what token of the Cauconian presence, did Hecataeus find both at Athens and in Triphylia? The question admits of only one answer.

Strabo says of Triphylia, "the rites of Demeter and Kore are held in highest honour here"; and he reports a grove of Demeter above the fertile Pylian plain (8.3.14f [344]). Pausanias found Lepreum much decayed, with no sanctuaries at all—save a very modest one of Demeter (5.5.6). In earlier days the tomb of Caucon was pointed out; a statue or relief showed Caucon holding a lyre (*Paus.* 5.5.5; *cf.* *Strab.* 8.3.16). The significance of this emerges elsewhere, in Pausanias' pseudo-history of Messenia, where Caucon figures as a very ancient missionary of Eleusis who first established the cognate rites of Andania (4.1.5, 8f, *etc.*). At the founding, or re-founding, of Messene

<sup>113</sup> Kiechle (*supra* n.111) 26–38 thinks that by "Pylian" Cauconians Herodotus means to distinguish Cauconians of Messenia from those of Triphylia, and that the name "Cauconians" authentically denotes a native people of Messenia who were briefly subjected by "Achaean" Greeks, and who are traceable archaeologically from Neolithic times to the Late Bronze Age. Yet the archaeological evidence is nothing but Valmin's interpretation of Malthi, which is no longer accepted; and our literary sources cannot be made to serve any such hypothesis of prehistoric origins. As for Herodotus, it is very clear that he regards the Cauconian homeland as precisely Triphylia (4.148.4).



Caucon appeared in dreams to both Epameinondas and the Argive commander Epiteles: he looked just like a hierophant of the mysteries (4.26.6–8). Now it was the business of a hierophant to sing or chant, witness *e.g.* the names Eumolpus and Musaeus, and witness too the epitaph of a hierophant contemporary with Pausanias (*IG II*<sup>2</sup> 3639.4, *Εὐμόλπου προχέων ἱμερόεσσαν ὄπα*). So Caucon's tomb at Lepreum depicted him as a hierophant or musical priest.<sup>114</sup>

Admittedly the Caucon of the pseudo-history is not a Triphylian but an Athenian, at home in both Eleusis and Phlya (4.1.5, 9, *cf.* 14.1), the first of three Athenian missionaries to Andania. Something of this rigmarole, but certainly not the whole of it, was known to Strabo, for in speaking of the monument at Lepreum he makes it a question whether Caucon is a local ancestor, *εἴτ' ἀρχηγέτου τινός*, which is the natural assumption, or "someone who for some other reason bore the same name as the people," *εἴτ' ἄλλως ὁμωνύμου τῷ ἔθνει* (8.3.16). The lore of the three Athenian missionaries is obviously drawn from an Athenian source (Pausanias quotes a poem displayed at Phlya); moreover, since none of this lore was to be found in Myron and Rhianus, the third-century authorities whom Pausanias cites for the bulk of the pseudo-history, it is no doubt of later origin. We may reasonably suppose that Caucon the hierophant was once indigenous to Triphylia. When the story was first told of the dreams of Epameinondas and Epiteles, the phantasmagoric figure who called for the refounding of the mysteries was very likely the Triphylian Caucon; for as we shall see, the legendary rôle of the Argive Epiteles agrees with the attested Argive oracle of 92/1 B.C. which gave instructions for the mysteries of Andania—without any reference to Eleusis.

It is also worth noting that Triphylia plays a part in the story of the Athenian missionaries. The second of these missionaries is Lycus son of Pandion. Lycus, we are told, went first to Arene, that ancient city, and imparted the mysteries to the ruling family, including the eponymous queen Arene; he then proceeded to Andania, where Caucon, he of Eleusis and Phlya, had already instructed an earlier generation of the family, in the person of the eponymous queen Messene (Paus. 4.2.6, *cf.* 1.5). Arene is a legendary town in Nestor's domain (*Il.* 2.591, 11.722), which in the pseudo-history is said to have been founded, and occupied for two generations, by the ruling family of Messenia (Paus. 4.2.4–6, 3.7). Homeric scholars fixed Arene, if at all, either at Samicum in Triphylia or at Erana in Messenia, both about equidis-

<sup>114</sup> So S. Eitrem, *RE* 11.1 (1921) 63f *s.v.* "Kaukon (2)."

tant from Andania; there is no doubt, however, that the pseudo-history looks to the site in Triphylia, the usual identification;<sup>115</sup> for Queen Arene also gives her name to a spring at Lepreum nearby (Paus. 5.5.6). The reason why Arene becomes, in the pseudo-history, another early capital of Messenia, after Andania and before Messenian Pylos, is that it happened to be known already as the home of Aphareus and his sons.<sup>116</sup> At the same time we get an explanation of Demeter's cult at Lepreum or thereabouts: Arene as well as Andania receives a visit from the missionaries of Eleusis.

Triphylia then was renowned for its worship of Demeter, and the worship was embodied in the priestly Caucon, eponym of the Cauconians. The Cauconians were merely a name in Homer, and so far as we can see, they or their eponym never acquired any distinctive trait but this, the Triphylian worship of Demeter. Hecataeus was presumably the first to conjure with the name; he certainly helped to form the later tradition. It follows that in bringing the Cauconians to Athens he pointed to the worship of Demeter, both the Triphylian and the Athenian, *i.e.* Eleusinian. The strange confection which we find in Pausanias, about Caucon of Eleusis and Phlya and other Athenian missionaries to Arene and Andania, can only be understood as a very late development, as a final twist to the story, after the Triphylian Caucon or his people had long been connected with Eleusis (as in Hecataeus), and after they had also been connected with the so-called mysteries of Andania (as in the Argive oracle). We shall come back to this (§viii), but let us first consult Herodotus on the cult of Eleusinian Demeter.

In 479 B.C. the Persian encampment on Mycale was situated at "Gaeson and Scolopoeis, where the shrine of Eleusinian Demeter is, which Philistus son of Pasicles established when he came with Neleus son of Codrus to the founding of Miletus" (Hdt. 9.97). The location is thus specified because of a strange coincidence, *scil.* that the battles of Mycale and Plataea were both fought beside a shrine of Eleusinian Demeter (9.101.1). We may think it curious that the shrine near Miletus was established not by Neleus himself but by a follower named

<sup>115</sup> Strab. 8.3.19 (346); *cf.* Paus. 5.6.2f. Modern scholars are likewise agreed in placing Arene here, in virtue of important Mycenaean remains: *e.g.* F. Böhle, *RhM* 83 (1934) 322, 326; J. Sperling, *AJA* 46 (1942) 82, 86; R. Hope Simpson and J. F. Lazenby, *The Catalogue of Ships in Homer's Iliad* (Oxford 1970) 83.

<sup>116</sup> Pherec. *FGrHist* 3F127; Ap. Rhod. *Argon.* 1.152; Apollod. 3.10.3. Aphareus and the Apharetiadae were also assigned to Pharae "a city of Messenia" (Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Φαραί), *i.e.* to Homeric Pherae, whether as real or as bogus eponyms; *cf.* Robert (*supra* n.40) I 311. This would be easier to understand if Pherae lay on the upper Alpheius, as argued by Ernst Meyer, *MusHelv* 14 (1957) 81–88, and (*supra* n.88) 2144f.

Φίλιστος—not a mythical name of the usual sort, nor yet an Athenian name of common or notable occurrence (*cf.* *PA* 14458–60). Why did ‘Dearest’ sail with Neleus, and why was he prompt to honor Eleusinian Demeter?

Philistus is not the only link between Neleus and Demeter. Neleus left Athens for Miletus because of an omen produced by his daughter’s lewd behavior,<sup>117</sup> and this behaviour can be recognized as a fertility rite in the service of Demeter. As we saw above (§vi), the myths of Neleus, and even his name, reflect the old custom of betrothing girls with high ceremony at a public festival; the elder Neleus is best known for his nubile daughter Pero. Conformably with this pattern, Neleus son of Codrus has a nubile daughter Elegeïs (by one account her real name was Pero), but her story takes a different turn, as follows. When Medon instead of Neleus became king of Athens, Neleus asked the Delphic oracle where he should now go, and was told that his daughter would show the way. And so it was that Neleus overheard Elegeïs as she smacked her privates and cried out, “Find yourself a big man, who will bring you to Miletus, a bane to the Carians!”

As others have remarked, such demonstrative indecency, as also the name Ἐλεγγίς, derives from ritual;<sup>118</sup> it is the sort of women’s magic that was practiced at festivals of Demeter, especially at the autumn festival of the sowing. With the bluntest words and gestures nubile girls made a pretence of desire, and matrons made a pretence of conceiving and bearing children, all this so as to stimulate the goddess of the corn. Such magic is very widely documented in cults of Demeter (and of her congener Damia or Bona Dea). Eleusis is no exception: witness the antics of Iambe in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, and even more those of Baubo in Orphic literature.

The antics of Elegeïs, daughter of Neleus and Codrus, are the mythical projection of a civic cult at Athens: it can only be Eleusis. Elegeïs must have found her man, and he and she must have sailed with Neleus to Miletus, and the cult that gave rise to the omen must

<sup>117</sup> Lycoph. *Alex.* 1385–88, Σ 1378, 1385; *Etym. Magn.* s.vv. ἀσελγαίνειν, Ἐλεγγίς.

<sup>118</sup> See O. Crusius, *RE* 5.2 (1905) 2258–60 s.v. “Elegeïs”; M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin 1974) 9. West however spoils his own argument by suggesting that at a certain stage the name Ἐλεγγίς was wrongly substituted for the epithet Λελεγγίς. In a similar vein Wilamowitz, *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie* (Berlin 1889) 58 n.18, asserted that ‘Pero’ was the original name. For Iambe and Baubo as equivalent figures, see N. Richardson on *Hymn. Hom. Cer.* 192–211; F. Graf, *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens* (Berlin 1974) 168–71; Robertson, *CQ* n.s. 34 (1984) 16. On the manifold obscenities in the worship of Demeter, H. Fluck, *Skurrile Riten in griechischen Kulturen* (Endingen 1931) 11–33, 52–59, 66–70.

have been transplanted to the new land. Philistus, 'Dearest', is her man; for he established the shrine of Eleusinian Demeter on Mycale.

The story of Elegeïs has been pieced together from Herodotus, Lycophron, and comment on Lycophron. The general sense of the story is clear, but the details of transmission are not, particularly in the early stages. As we saw before, Hecataeus feigned that the Cauconians brought the mysteries of Demeter from Triphylia to Athens and Eleusis. But Hecataeus need not have feigned that the Cauconians went on to Ionia, still less that they brought Demeter across the sea; and the story of Elegeïs seems quite beyond his scope. When Herodotus scornfully describes the line of Codrus ruling in Ionia as "Pylian Cauconians," this is very likely his own extension of Hecataeus' doctrine. Philistus, however, founder of the cult on Mycale, must come from an earlier source. After Hecataeus linked Demeter with the migration from Pylos to Athens, something further was sure to be said, especially since Eleusinian Demeter was also worshipped at a few places in Ionia. The next step was taken before Herodotus, but by whom?

If Herodotus stood alone, we might suppose that he had only heard the story, not read it. But the story was handed down later; indeed more than one version was current. To say that Elegeïs was seduced by a Carian, as a scholiast does and as Lycophron perhaps implies, is to embroider the tradition that the first Ionian settlers took Carian wives (Hdt. 1.146.2f). One or more of the Attic chroniclers may have told the story in one or other of these versions.<sup>119</sup> All that matters here is that later writers must depend in the first instance on the same source as Herodotus.

The story turns on the words which Elegeïs addressed to her privates. The two verses are not uniformly reported in the scholia and the lexica,<sup>120</sup> but the following seems the most basic form:

δίξεο δίξεο δὴ μέγαν ἄνδρ' . . .  
ὅς σ' ἐπὶ Μίλητον †κατάξει† πῆματα Καρσίν

The first line can be completed in different ways to yield the required sense, "Find yourself a big man [at Athens]." In the second line *κατάξει* spoils the metre and is almost certainly a gloss on some other verb, a verb which needed glossing—and which in the context must

<sup>119</sup> And so may 'Cadmus of Miletus', as Crusius suggests (*supra* n.118).

<sup>120</sup> For the variant readings see H. Lloyd-Jones, *CQ* n.s. 17 (1967) 168; V. J. Matthews, *Panyassis of Halikarnassos* (Leiden 1974) 146–49. To the conjectures which they report add West's *Μιλητόνδε*, said to be supported by *Etym.Gen. cod. A* (*supra* n.118).

have been an obscene equivocation. If only the verb is amiss, the line is more easily restored as a pentameter, e.g. ὅς σ' ἐπὶ Μίλητον πῆματα Καρσὶν ἐλάῃ, “who will ‘row’ you to Miletus, a bane to the Carians.”<sup>121</sup>

Between Hecataeus and Herodotus the only writer known to have treated the Ionian migration, apart from Pherecydes, is Panyassis.<sup>122</sup> His poem *Ionica* was in elegiac metre and dealt with “Codrus and Neleus and the Ionian colonies.”<sup>123</sup> None of Panyassis’ fragments is cited from this work, but two have been plausibly ascribed to it (frr. 24f Kinkel/Matthews). They are respectively concerned with a point of Eleusinian genealogy, the eponym Eleusis as father of Triptolemus, and with the liaison between Aphrodite and Adonis, a “shameless” liaison, as Philodemus called it. Panyassis is the likely source for Elegeis.

One other offshoot of Hecataeus should be mentioned. In his account the removal of the Neleids from Pylos to Athens becomes a folk migration which explains the larger changes in Triphylia:<sup>124</sup> whereas the Cauconians were “Pylian,” in Herodotus’ phrase, the Minyans founded the towns existing later, Lepreum and the rest. This aspect was of little interest to the Attic chroniclers who afterwards recounted the story of Melanthus, and we never hear of the Cauconians apropos of Melanthus. Yet Demon obviously had his eye on the Cauconians when he brought Melanthus to Eleusis:<sup>125</sup> Melanthus, said Demon in his fourth book, was responsible for a sacrificial custom at Eleusis. When he fled from Messenia, the Delphic oracle told him to settle “wherever he was first honoured with a hospitable meal and they set out for his dinner the feet and head of the animal. And this happened at Eleusis. For the priestesses were then celebrating a local festival

<sup>121</sup> For this sense of ἐλάτνειν see Ar. *Eccl.* 39; Pl. *Com.* fr.3 Kock.

<sup>122</sup> *Suda* s.v. Πανύασσις = *FGrHist* 440 = Panyassis p.253 Kinkel = test. 1a Matthews.

<sup>123</sup> Matthews (*supra* n.120) 26–31 defends the *Suda* notice against various doubts, on the whole successfully. The reported length of 7,000 lines is somewhat easier to credit in the light of E. L. Bowie’s arguments for a *genre* of long narrative elegy that was devoted to the foundation of cities: *JHS* 106 (1986) 27–34. The *Ionica* takes its place beside Mimnermus’ *Smyrneis*, Tyrtaeus’ *Eunomia*, Semonides of Amorgos on Samos (two books), Xenophanes on Colophon and Elea (2,000 lines), and conceivably Simonides on Salamis and Ion of Chios on his native island. It must still be admitted that at 7,000 lines, which might easily run to ten books, Panyassis’ poem is much longer than any of the others, and nearly as long as the *Heracleia*, 9,000 lines in fourteen books; yet unlike the *Heracleia* the *Ionica* has disappeared almost without trace. So the possibility remains that the numeral is an error or a fiction.

<sup>124</sup> Hecataeus also dealt in genealogy, but whether he traced the Neleid line to Athens and Ionia, either apropos of the Cauconians or in some other context, does not appear. It is arguable however that he invented ‘Caucon son of Celaenus’ (§ VIII), who excludes Melanthus.

<sup>125</sup> *FGrHist* 327 F 1, from Athenaeus.

and had consumed all the meat, so that only the feet and head were left, and these they dispatched to Melanthus." Inscriptions show that after sacrifice priests or other cult officials sometimes received the head and the feet of the victim as perquisites.<sup>126</sup> Some priest or other at Eleusis received them, and the practice was traced back to Melanthus. The assumption is that Melanthus passed this way before he reached Eleutheræ or Athens, and that as an exile he was in desperate need and would welcome even the feet and the head.

The occasion is not the Mysteries but some other festival of Eleusis, *πάτριόν τινα ἑορτήν*—evidently a festival for women, since priestesses are in charge.<sup>127</sup> "The priestesses" of Eleusis are heard of elsewhere as officiating at the Calamaea, Demeter's harvest festival, and at the Proerosia, her festival before the ploughing, and at the Haloea, a festival of early winter honouring Demeter, Poseidon, and Dionysus.<sup>128</sup> So far as our information goes, the Haloea would do very nicely, inasmuch as the women feasted by themselves on a grand scale; it is also a festival distinctive of Eleusis, as the Calamaea and the Proerosia are not.<sup>129</sup> The civic authorities who had charge of the festival, οἱ ἄρχοντες as they are called in a scholium to Lucian, remained outside while the women and priestesses conducted their festivity (*Σ Dial. Meretr.* 7.4, p.280 Rabe). Perhaps it was to one of these outsiders that the priestesses "dispatched" (*ἀπέστειλαν*) the head and the feet. As Melanthus gave Athens its second and final dynasty of kings, he might stand for the Basileus. Dionysus, moreover, with whom Melanthus was associated at Eleutheræ, was to the fore at the Haloea. Yet these are only possibilities, and having mentioned them we must leave the occasion undecided.

### VIII. Caucon and Andania

The last piece in the puzzle, already briefly noted, is Pausanias' account of Eleusis and Andania. Pausanias asserts a connexion between them that goes back almost to the beginning of time, back to Caucon son of Celaenus son of Phlyus son of Earth. Two of Pausanias' details, the aspect of Caucon the hierophant and the secondary

<sup>126</sup> See P. Stengel, *Opferbräuche der Griechen* (Leipzig 1910) 87–89.

<sup>127</sup> Since "the priestesses" fit the context here and are mentioned as a body by other sources, it was very wilful for Jacoby on Demon F1 to suggest that τῶν ἱερείων somehow means "the priests collectively."

<sup>128</sup> For "the priestesses" at Eleusis see P. Foucart, *Les mystères d'Eleusis* (Paris 1914) 214f; O. Kern, *RE* 16.2 (1935) 1226 s.v. "Mysterien"; S. Dow and R. J. Healey, *A Sacred Calendar of Eleusis* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1965) 30; K. Clinton, *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Philadelphia 1974) 22, 27, 69f, 88f, 98.

<sup>129</sup> See Robertson (*supra* n.118) 2–6.

mission to Arene, were canvassed above as evidence for the Triphylian worship of Demeter, a worship as striking as the Eleusinian, so that Hecataeus was led to attribute both to migrating Cauconians (§vii). Andania however is no part of the traditional homeland of the Cauconians, and it is remote indeed from Athens and Eleusis. We must consider the story of those Athenian missionaries to Andania, a story which Pausanias had directly from an Athenian source and which he then knitted into the pseudo-history of Messenia. It is true that the cults and myths of Andania have been long and learnedly discussed without any agreed result.<sup>130</sup> But we approach them now with a fresh perspective.

Caucon brought the mysteries from Eleusis to Andania when Messenia was first settled; later these mysteries were raised to greater honour by Lycus son of Pandion; later still they were advanced again by Methapus, another Athenian (Paus. 4.1.5–9). Lycus also brought the mysteries to Arene (4.2.6), and Methapus also established the mysteries of the Cabeiri at Thebes (4.1.7). At the end of the First Messenian War, when those Messenians who could fled from Spartan domination, the priestly family of Andania went to Eleusis (4.14.1); they returned to fight in the Second Messenian War (4.15.7, 16.2). After Leuctra Caucon appeared in dreams, looking like a hierophant, and delivered a riddling message which led to the discovery of a bronze jar and a tin scroll with the text of the mysteries (4.26.6–8); the text was transcribed by the priestly family (4.27.5), and the bronze jar was afterwards preserved in the sanctuary (4.33.5). At the foundation ceremonies in the new city of Messene the priests sacrificed to the Great Goddesses and Caucon (4.27.6). Throughout the narrative Pausanias speaks always of “the Great Goddesses,” with the clear implication—which is made explicit elsewhere (8.31.1)—that this is a title of Demeter and Kore, used in the mysteries of both Eleusis and Andania.

A strange confection, as already said; all the stranger for being quite perverse. The evidence does not suggest that the actual worship at Andania was ever touched by Eleusinian influence, or that it was even addressed to goddesses of the corn who could be feasibly equated with the Eleusinian pair. The long regulations that were published on the

<sup>130</sup> Cf. Toepffer 214–23; Nilsson, *Feste* 337–42; L. Ziehen, *ARW* 24 (1926/7) 29–60; Wilamowitz, *Der Glaube der Hellenen*<sup>3</sup> (Basel 1955) II 528–36; M. Guarducci, *SMSR* 10 (1934) 174–204; Kern (*supra* n.128) 1267–69; A. Wilhelm, *ÖJh* 32 (1940) 49–62; B. Hemberg, *Die Kabiren* (Uppsala 1950) 33–36; Nilsson, *GGR*<sup>2</sup> (Munich 1955–61) I 478 n.5, II 96–98; R. Stiglitz, *Die grossen Göttinnen Arkadiens* (Vienna 1967) 25–28; Burkert, *Gr.Rel.* (*supra* n.21) 417f; P. K. Georgounyzos, *Πλάτων* 31 (1979) 3–43; A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia* II (=BICS Suppl. 38.2 [1986]) 105f.

site in 92/1 B.C. are indeed concerned with mysteries, but very sociable mysteries, with much food and drink, quite typical of the age.<sup>131</sup> The festival takes place in high summer, in the eleventh month of the Messenian calendar (line 11), which is Metageitnion or August, not a usual time for a festival of Demeter. Demeter is one of several deities who are honoured (33f, 68f), but the others point to quite different concerns. Furthermore, though three local cults of Demeter are distinguished (30f), there is no mention of her daughter. We should note too that in the dream of Epiteles as recounted by Pausanias, “the old woman,” *scil.* Demeter, appears alone, without her daughter, just as she does in the worship at Andania.

Pausanias must have felt this last difficulty when he visited the sanctuary, for he declares that Kore is here called Hagne—but then gives himself the lie by associating Hagne with a local spring (4.33.4). The inscription confirms that Hagne is the deity of a like-named spring, worshipped in her own right, and not as a companion of Demeter (lines 84–89, *cf.* 34, 69). For the rest, Pausanias assures us that “for them too,” *καὶ ταύταις*, *scil.* the Great Goddesses, the worshippers conduct secret rites in the sanctuary (4.33.5); more than this he will not divulge. Strangest of all is the title “the Great Goddesses,” which is unknown at Eleusis, or anywhere else but in two cults of southwestern Arcadia, at Trapezus and Megalopolis, for which Pausanias himself is our authority (8.29.1, 33.1–8). Here they are an undoubted pair of native Arcadian goddesses, known from other indications too;<sup>132</sup> when Pausanias says that the ritual at Megalopolis imitates Eleusis (8.33.7), we can dismiss out of hand this predictable and cursory remark.

Because of Pausanias’ reticence, or is it evasion, we must draw our knowledge of the worship mainly from the inscription, which though intent on practical arrangements names the deities and offerings and priesthoods. Among the deities are “the Great Gods” (34, 68f), a title oddly like “the Great Goddesses,” and oddly different. In these regulations they are mentioned only in company with the other deities, including Demeter, but a contemporary stone at Argos, which records an oracle of Apollo Pythaeus authorizing the mysteries of Andania, singles out the traditional offerings for “the Great Gods Carneian,” *Μεγάλους Θεοῖς Καρνεῖους καλλιεροῦντι* (dat. sing., referring to the hierophant) *κατὰ τὰ πάτρια* (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 735). Modern discussion has quite

<sup>131</sup> *IG* V.1 1390 [*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 736; Sokolowski, *LSCG* 65].

<sup>132</sup> Stiglitz (*supra* n.130); M. Jost, *Sanctuaires et cultes d’Arcadie* (Paris 1985) 337f, 340–45.



unwarrantably fixed on “the Great Gods” vis-à-vis “the Great Goddesses,” and the worship at Andania is aligned with the Spartan and Messenian Dioscuri, or with the Theban Cabeiri, or even with the Great Gods of Samothrace. But although “the Great Gods” as authentic local deities have undoubtedly contributed to Andania’s renown, they are not a very useful clue for research, inasmuch as the title—unlike the feminine form—was widely used for almost any deities who were deemed “great” at one place or another.<sup>133</sup>

“The Great Gods” are of little consequence beside the other indications. The mysteries take place in an extensive sanctuary called τὸ Καρνείσιον (56, 59f, 63); Pausanias describes it as “a grove mostly filled with cypresses,” and uses the term rather as if it were a tract of territory.<sup>134</sup> The grove has much open space as well, for within it the celebrants are lodged in tents or booths, σκηναί (34–39). The same accommodation is used in the festival Carneia at Sparta (Demetr. Sceph. *ap.* Ath. 141F). The season of the mysteries is the same as for the festival Carneia, *scil.* the summer month corresponding to the Attic Metageitnion (line 11). The Argive oracle begins by reaffirming the traditional offerings to “the Great Gods Carneian.” The regulations include Apollo Carneius among the several deities receiving sacrifice (34, 69), and also mention both a shrine of Carneius in which an oath is sworn (7) and a special priestess of Carneius (96f). Carneius *tout seul* is plainly distinct from Apollo Carneius, a ‘hero’ like Carneius or Carnus elsewhere; at Sparta the pair Carneius Βοικέτας and Carneius Δρομαιεύς are likewise served by a priestess.<sup>135</sup> There can be no doubt

<sup>133</sup> See Hemberg (*supra* n.130) 26–49, 270–302. “The Great Gods” may include a feminine deity, and are rather often a male and female pair. Since the Great Gods of Andania receive a female victim, we might think of a ‘hero’ and one or two of his womenfolk; *cf.* n.135 *infra*.

<sup>134</sup> 4.2.2, 33.4f, 8.35.1. The festival Carneia quite typically gives its name to upland woods and rivers: at Pharae, a grove Κάρνιον with a spring, just the same setting as at Andania (Paus. 4.31.1, emended by Sylburg to give Apollo’s epithet); on the upper Alpheius, a river Καρνίων with its source beside a shrine of Apollo Cereatas (Paus. 8.34.5; *cf.* Plin. *HN* 4.20; Callim. *Jov.* 24, as emended by Arnaldus); near Las, a district Κάρνιον (Polyb. 5.19.4); near Phlius, Καρνέατης as “a part” of the mountain Celossa (Strab. 8.6.24 [382]); near Pellene, a river Κριός (Paus. 7.27.11). The setting is dictated by the festival business, as sketched below: weather magic is performed on high ground, and the long-distance race was doubtless run as far as a boundary, such as a river.

<sup>135</sup> *IG* V.1 589, 608. Carneius as distinct from Apollo Carneius is not named among the deities receiving sacrifice (33f, 68f). The Great Gods, who are so named, receive “a two-year-old female pig,” δάμαλιν διετην σὺν (69, *cf.* 34), a victim more appropriate to a female deity than a male; this oddity has been remarked but not explained by A. Festugière, *REG* 64 (1951) 316 n.1; Nilsson, *GGR* II 78 n.1; Stiglitz (*supra* n.130) 25 n.32. Carneius has a priestess, and the victim offered to the Great Gods is female, and they are called “Carneian” in the Argive oracle: is not Carneius one of those

that the “mysteries” of Andania are a version of the festival Carneia, the most solemn and universal of Peloponnesian festivals.<sup>136</sup>

Current notions of the Carneia are tangled and inconclusive; another may be offered, which is no more than a *prima facie* reading of the evidence. The festival is concerned with the ripening of the grapes: by August the grapes are almost at full size, but the fruit is not yet moist and sweet, and for this result calm clear weather is essential. The festival lasts for nine days, which correspond to the waxing moon of August. At the full moon a white ram is sacrificed, and the “grape-runners,” *staphylodromoi*—youths chosen to represent the whole community—pursue another virtual ram, a man garlanded as a victim and called the “garlanded ram”; to catch him is the surest token of fair weather. At Rome the *Vinalia rustica* serve the same purpose at the same season, August 19th.

As the race portends either good or ill for the community, the myths reflect this doubtful outcome. The Dorian invaders of the Peloponnesus repeatedly encounter a seer named “Ram,” Carnus or Crius, and their fortunes turn on this prognostic figure.<sup>137</sup> The festival of the grapes is not confined to Dorian cities, and its aetiology embraces the earlier dynasties of the Peloponnesus. Olympia, for example, exhibits the same ritual and mythical pattern:<sup>138</sup> at just the same season, the full moon of August, a ram is sacrificed in the vineyards, and Pelops is pursued by Oenomaus, “Dark-face” by “Wine-seeker,” mythical projections of the “garlanded ram” and the “grape-runners.”

It is this momentous festival, renowned as no other for actually inhibiting the conduct of war in Greece, which became the chief observance of Messenia after the liberation. The ritual of the Carneia accounts for most of the deities and offerings named in the regulations. Rams and other sheep are traditional instruments of weather magic; a ram is here offered to Hermes, the pastoral god, and an ewe to Hagne the deity of the spring, also potent for the weather (lines 33f, 69). Demeter receives a gravid sow (33, 68) because she too has a rôle

---

Great Gods? It is also possible that Carneius has a doublet in the Apolline hero Eurytus, whose bones were kept in the sanctuary and who received sacrifice just before the mysteries (Paus. 4.2.2f, 3.10, 27.6, 33.5).

<sup>136</sup> For the Carneia see S. Wide, *Lakonische Kulte* (Leipzig 1893) 63–65, 73–87, 369, 373; H. Usener, *RhM* 53 (1898) 359–65, 377f (= *Kl.Schr.* IV 287–92, 304f); Nilsson, *Feste* 118–29; Prehn, *RE* 10.2 (1919) 1986–88 s.v. “Karneia”; Adler, *RE* 10.2 1989–92 s.v. “Karneios (1)”; Ziehen, *RE* 3A.2 (1929) 1458–60, 1494f, 1513f s.v. “Sparta”; Bölte, *RhM* 78 (1929) 141–43; Burkert, *Gr.Rel.* (*supra* n.21) 354–58; Robertson, *CP* 75 (1980) 1–22.

<sup>137</sup> For Carnus see Robert (*supra* n.40) II 659f; for Crius, Paus. 3.13.3f.

<sup>138</sup> For the myth and ritual of Pelops, see Robert (*supra* n.40) I 207–17; Burkert, *Hom.Nec.* (*supra* n.21) 108–19; L. Lacroix, *BCH* 100 (1976) 327–41.

in the Carneia. As the goddess of the corn, whose season brings wet and stormy weather, she is asked to avert such weather for the present. Elsewhere we find an expressive ceremony in which a black ram, embodiment of the unwanted weather, is offered to Demeter, while none of the Carneia officiants partakes. Hence the myth of the dismembered Pelops; hence too the complex of monuments described by Pausanias on the road from Mycenae to Argos—the sacrificial ram disputed between Atreus and Thyestes, and a sanctuary of Demeter Mysia (2.18.1–3).

The festival Carneia was celebrated on a large scale, and many members of the community will have played a part: but there were no ‘mysteries’ in any proper sense, and it is most unlikely that the worship at Andania was so called in the fourth century, or even in the early Hellenistic period. The term may well have been adopted for the first time in the early first century B.C., as also the term “hierophant” for the magnate Mnasistratus who then reorganized the worship (in *IG V.1 1532* Mnasistratus, presumably the “hierophant,” is the first and by far the largest contributor in a long list of Messenians who gave money for whatever cause). Since the Carneia are Apollo’s festival, it was natural for Mnasistratus to apply to the oracle of Apollo Pythaeus at Argos.

“Mnasistratus the hierophant” asks the oracle about two items, “about the sacrifice and the mysteries”; the answer, so far as preserved, first confirms the traditional offerings and then passes to “the mysteries” (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 735). The regulations at Andania speak of “the mysteries” quite insistently, as also of “the *protomystai*” (14, 50, 68) and of “baskets containing mystic objects” (30: both baskets and objects are indefinite). Mnasistratus is prominent, and we hear of “the box and the books which Mnasistratus gave” and which are now to be used in the rites, together with “whatever else may be arranged for the sake of the mysteries” (11–13). Pausanias reports that Epameinondas and Epiteles found a bronze jar and a tin scroll, that the text was copied into books by contemporary members of “the priestly clan,” and that the jar was preserved in the sanctuary (4.26.8, 27.5, 33.5). As others have said, Pausanias’ books and relics must be substantially the same as the box and books of Mnasistratus. They probably originate with Mnasistratus, and the priestly clan as well.<sup>139</sup>

In Mnasistratus’ day mysteries were much in vogue. At Andania “the Great Gods” gave a handle, evoking as they did the Great Gods

<sup>139</sup> Burkert, *Gr.Rel.* (*supra* n.21) 416–18, treats the mysteries of Andania, and the mysteries of Phlya as well, as “family and clan mysteries” of Archaic and Classical times; this shows more faith than reason.

of Samothrace. Demeter stood beside them, and it is the mysteries of Demeter which are in view in the dream ascribed to the Argive commander Epiteles (Paus. 4.26.7f). He was bidden to dig at an appointed spot so as "to rescue the old woman," who was fainting from confinement in the bronze chamber; he dug and found a bronze jar with the text of the mysteries, Demeter's mysteries. In Pausanias' account both Epameinondas and Epiteles see the hierophant Caucon in their dreams; Epameinondas is to restore Messenia, the wrath of the Dioscuri having ended, and Epiteles is to revive the mysteries of Andania. "Epiteles son of Aeschines," whom "the Argives chose as commander with the duty of refounding Messene" (4.26.7), may or may not be an historical figure;<sup>140</sup> yet for reasons already given we cannot suppose that this dream about the mysteries is contemporary propaganda on behalf of the newly founded Messene. Epiteles' dream belongs to the same initiative as the Argive oracle of Apollo Pythaeus.

It follows that the hierophant Caucon also belongs to this initiative. Epameinondas' dream about the Dioscuri had no doubt been told long before this, but without the hierophant, who now serves to link the two dreams, not very aptly. The Dioscuri are certainly not to be equated with the Great Gods of Andania, as some have thought; for Epameinondas' dream does not concern Andania, and there is nothing in Pausanias to suggest this equation, either in the pseudo-history or in the record of cults. Caucon's new rôle is duly reflected in Strabo. Strabo has heard of the monument at Lepreum, but doubts whether Caucon is a local ancestor or, in words already quoted, "someone who for some other reason bore the same name as the people" (8.3.16). The doubt arises because Caucon has been claimed by the Messenians as founder of the mysteries of Andania.

Such was the dispensation of Mnasistratus: the festival Carneia became the mysteries of the Great Gods and of Demeter, mainly a change of nomenclature. The mysteries were still celebrated in the early second century, when an eminent Messenian was honoured as "priest of the Great Gods,"<sup>141</sup> probably the same office as hierophant. The genitive form τῶν Μεγάλων Θεῶν could just as well be feminine, but there is no likelihood that the Messenians ever took cognizance of the story which Pausanias relates about the Great Goddesses and the three Athenian missionaries.

Pausanias cites as his authority an epigram at Phlya, displayed on

<sup>140</sup> There are two other instances of the name Aeschines at Argos, but none other of Epiteles: M. T. Mitsos, *Ἀργολικὴ Προσωπογραφία* (Athens 1952).

<sup>141</sup> N. S. N. Valmin, *Inscriptions de la Messénie* (Lund 1929) 140.

the statue or painting (*eikon*) of Methapus and recounting his missionary exploits in the first person; the six lines about Andania mention Caucon and Lycus as well (4.1.7–9). Elsewhere in the poem Methapus took credit for instituting the mysteries of the Cabeiri at Thebes. “Methapus was an Athenian by descent, and a priest and deviser of all sorts of mysteries,” says Pausanias; and scholars dispute his date.<sup>142</sup> But Pausanias could not be so vague about an historical person commemorated by an epigram. The epigram is in truth a kind of aretology, and Μέθαπος is as mythical as Caucon and Lycus; his name is formed from μέθη, as Ἀλθηπος is from ἀλθ-, the stem of ἀλθαίνω.<sup>143</sup> The *eikon* was no doubt as merry as the painting of Μέθη at Epidaurus (Paus. 2.27.3), or as the *prosopon* of Ἀκρατος in the Cerameicus (1.2.5). Methapus did not teach men to be unduly sober either at Andania or at the Cabeirium of Thebes.

Pausanias saw the *eikon* in the κλίσιον of the Lycomidae (4.1.7), surely the same building as the παστάς described by Plutarch,<sup>144</sup> and surely too a successor of the τελεστήριον burnt by the Persians and restored by Themistocles, also described by Plutarch (*Them.* 1.4). The *genos* Lycomidae were active in Plutarch’s day, for it is just at this time, in the early second century, that they and the Eumolpidae jointly honour some man or woman officiating at the Haloea of Eleusis and in a cult on Samos.<sup>145</sup> These late-born Lycomidae conducted mysteries of “the Great Goddess,” τῆς λεγομένης Μεγάλης, more ancient even than the Eleusinian Mysteries (so Plutarch *apud* Hippolytus), and they recited a hymn of Musaeus for Demeter and also hymns of Pamphus and Orpheus for other deities, including Eros.<sup>146</sup> The mysteries were depicted somewhere in the *pastas*; among the scenes was a winged ithyphallic daemon pursuing a dark-visaged woman.

<sup>142</sup> To the studies cited *supra* n.130 add Nilsson, *Hessische Blätter für Volkskunde* 41 (1950) 8 (= *Opuscula Selecta* III [Lund 1960] 183).

<sup>143</sup> Cf. also ἄρναπον τὸν ἄρνα (Hsch.). As to Ἀλθηπος F. Bechtel, *Hermes* 56 (1921) 228, holds that the form ἄλθηφος is primary, the other showing a dissimilation of the aspirate, and that the second element is -φάων; but this seems a very unlikely etymology.

<sup>144</sup> Εἰς Ἐμπεδοκλέα fr.24 Sandbach=Hippol. *Haer.* 5.20.5=Orph. fr.243 Kern.

<sup>145</sup> *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3559. The phrase τὴν δεῖνα ἱέρειαν is restored *in vacuo* in *IG*, but it could as well be a man. The eponymous priestess who dates the honours was connected by marriage with the family of Ammonius, Plutarch’s teacher: C. P. Jones, *HSCP* 71 (1966) 205–13. Plutarch doubtless had it from the Lycomidae of his acquaintance that Themistocles himself was a member of the *genos*: F. Bourriot, *Recherches sur la nature du genos* (Lille 1976) II 1260–63, is right to query the truth of Plutarch’s statement, but not its meaning.

<sup>146</sup> Paus. 1.22.7, 4.1.5, 9.27.2, 30.12.

It is a fair conclusion that the Lycomidae invented and promoted the story of the three Athenian missionaries who brought the mysteries from Eleusis to Andania. “The Great Goddesses” of Eleusis and Andania, that surprising title, are inspired by the “Great Goddess” of Phlya. The invention was no doubt assisted by some actual similarity between the rites at Phlya and Andania. Pausanias in his notice of the deme Phlya lists the local deities in two groups of five each; the first five are deities of the vine, Apollo Διονυσόδοτος *et al.*, and the other five are deities of the corn, Demeter ἀνησιδώρα *et al.*<sup>147</sup> “The Great Goddess,” said to be a title of Earth, is last among the deities of the vine. So her mysteries, or at least one set of mysteries, probably came round in the same summer month as the mysteries of Andania. Methapus, we should observe, was well suited to propagate these mysteries.

The Lycomidae were lettered men, chanting hymns of Musaeus, Pamphus, and Orpheus.<sup>148</sup> The missionaries Caucon and Lycus are borrowed from literature. It was ingenious to think of Lycus son of Pandion. Rhianus had referred to a “Wolf-thicket” somewhere in Messenia, δρυμόν τε Λύκοιο (Paus. 4.1.6=*FGrHist* 265F45=fr.55 Powell); here then is Lycus, who was exiled by Aegeus (4.2.6; *cf.* 1.19.3, 10.12.11). As for Caucon, the Triphylian hierophant had been claimed for Andania in the time of Mnasistratus. The Lycomidae now recalled that Caucon or the Cauconians had once been brought to Athens and Eleusis—by Hecataeus, and by no one after him, so far as we can see (§VII). Did Caucon the eponym appear in Hecataeus, as well as his people? A detail in Pausanias suggests that he did, and that Melanthus was also in the background. The missionary whom the Lycomidae exalt is Caucon son of Celaenus son of Phlyus son of Earth. In Caucon’s ascending line Phlyus and Earth are taken from the local mysteries; for at Phlya Earth was worshipped as “the Great Goddess,” and a hymn of the Lycomidae made Phlyus son of Earth (4.1.5). But Κελαινός? The name is synonymous with Μέλανθος. Since later writers did not associate Melanthus and the Cauconians, “Caucon son of Celaenus” probably comes from Hecataeus.

<sup>147</sup> 1.31.4. All these gods have altars, but in two separate temples. The similarities between Phlya and the small altars of the Demeter sanctuary at Pergamum are not so striking that we need postulate any direct connexion, despite A. Ippel, *AthMitt* 37 (1912) 288; Kern (*supra* n.128) 1251, 1266; Nilsson (*supra* n.142) 8, 10.

<sup>148</sup> Hymns are a regular feature of the later mysteries, but these are almost the only such ascriptions canvassed by Pausanias.

## IX. The Development of the Connected Story

The connected story of Athens' second dynasty is made up of several shorter stories which have separate origins. The story of Melanthus' trick was first inspired by an age-old dispute over the border district of which he is the eponym, probably the Skourta plain or part of it. Then the story was transferred to the border town of Eleutherae when it was seized by Athens towards the middle of the sixth century; Melanthus and his trick became an *aition* for the cult of Dionysus *melanaigis*. A variant of this local *aition* speaks of Andropompus instead of Melanthus. The story of Codrus the woodcutter, a king in disguise who cuts down his enemy and is himself cut down, is the projection of an ancient customary duty of Athens' Basileus, of providing wood for sacrifice. The story of Neleus, of how he made a magic statue of Artemis *chitone* and was guided safely across the sea, is deduced from the festival Thargelia as conducted at Miletus.

Two other stories presuppose something of the connected story. The story of Cauconians migrating from Triphylia to Athens can be regarded as an *aition* to the worship of Demeter which was nearly as prominent in Triphylia as at Athens; but the Cauconians of Triphylia were singled out only because Neleids of Pylos had preceded them to Athens. The story of Elegeis daughter of Neleus is an *aition* of the ribaldry which was common to Eleusis and the shrine of Eleusinian Demeter on Mycale; but ribaldry is not at all peculiar to these two cults, and the story must have arisen after Hecataeus drew attention to Demeter.

We should not forget that the connected story has other elements barely touched on here—the ascending line at Pylos; brothers and other sib of Neleus in Ionia; the long descending line at Athens. To attempt an explanation of all the elements would take us much too far, and if the results obtained above are more or less secure, it is unnecessary. We have the means to reconstruct the over-all development.

The very beginning of the connected story can only be recovered by conjecture. Let us first move backwards, step by step. Hellanicus gives a final twist to the connected story by introducing the festival *Aparturia*. Herodotus knows of Melanthus, Codrus, and Neleus, of the family that originates in Pylos and bears rule in Ionian cities; with this family he also links Cauconians and Eleusinian Demeter. Pherecydes knows of Codrus' gallantry and of a son who leads the Ionian migration, and hence of the family's Pylian origin. Panyassis tells of Neleus' founding Miletus, and also of Codrus. The connected story is presup-

posed by the Marathon Base and the Codrus Cup; for it is only when Codrus the wood-cutter is enrolled in the second dynasty that he acquires a definite place in Athens' past. Hecataeus knows of the Pylian family, since the Cauconians are his substitute or complement. Herodotus says that Peisistratus and his sons claimed the Pylian family as their own, a claim that was certainly not invented later than 510 B.C., the end of the tyranny. Before this, Solon knows something of the story.

Yet we have a *terminus post quem* for the connected story that is contemporary with Solon. The Hesiodic *Catalogue* intertwines the local genealogies of many parts of Greece, and Pylos and Athens are far from being neglected. Neleus' offspring are all named, and so are Nestor's, but there is no link with Athens (fr.33-37, 221 M.-W.). At Athens the first dynasty, as we think of it, is well represented, but nothing points to a second (fr.10a, 145-47, 223-28). When the *Catalogue* was composed, Athens had not yet professed a connexion with the Pylians of old. And the *Catalogue* can be no earlier than the sixth century.<sup>149</sup>

Solon speaks of Attica during its troubles as *πρεσβυτάτην . . . γαίαν Ἰαονίης* (fr.4a West, from [Arist.] *Ath.Pol.*). Though he is said to have composed the lines before his archonship and his reforms, [Aristotle] could not know this for a fact, and it is surely possible that Solon uses the present tense for dramatic effect, and that the poem is retrospective; if so, it cannot be dated more closely than the first quarter of the sixth century. Whether we render *πρεσβυτάτην* as "the most revered" or as "the eldest," it comes to the same thing.<sup>150</sup> Solon undoubtedly thinks of Athens as the mother city of Ionia, as the starting point of the Ionian migration. He cannot mean that Athens is the only Ionian city that is autochthonous;<sup>151</sup> for Cecrops the first Athenian was not Ionian, and Athens did not become Ionian until the arrival of a common ancestor.

In Solon's day Miletus was by far the most powerful and prosperous of Ionian cities; Solon could not speak thus of Athens without an eye on Miletus. This is probably the time when the sanctuary of Neleus and Basile was laid out on the south-east side of Athens. The sanctuary did not at first include Codrus (§v), *i.e.* it antedates the connected story as we know it later. Neleus and Basile stand for the royal

<sup>149</sup> M. L. West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford 1985) 13, 136, 164, 169-71, argues further that the Athenian section was composed after 570 B.C., and that an Athenian poet gave the *Catalogue* its final form.

<sup>150</sup> Cf. Prinz (*supra* n.1) 354f, reviewing previous opinion.

<sup>151</sup> This is suggested by R. Meiggs, *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford 1972) 294.



line of Miletus (§vi); to institute a cult of these figures was to acknowledge the importance of Miletus. At this early date space could be found in the city or just outside for an extensive *temenos*. The location is convenient to the old city-centre east of the Acropolis; had the cult been adopted later, we might expect to find it nearer to the new Agora at the northwest, which dates from the first years of the tyranny.

The next step can safely be ascribed to Peisistratus. Herodotus says of the tyrant family, at the moment of their overthrow, that “they were by descent Pyliaus and Neleids, of the same line as the family of Codrus and Melanthus, who in former days, though newly settled here, became kings of Athens. Therefore too Hippocrates harked back to the same nomenclature by calling his son Peisistratus; he gave him the name of Nestor’s son Peisistratus” (5.65.3f). The tyrant family must have professed to be Pyliaus and Neleids while they were yet in power.<sup>152</sup> We cannot assume without further ado that they also spoke of Codrus and Melanthus; Herodotus mentions the names because they were familiar in his own day (*cf.* 1.147.1, 5.76, 9.97).

Peisistratus the tyrant was born in *ca* 605–600 B.C., or not long before or after.<sup>153</sup> But most assuredly the name Peisistratus did not then evoke any Neleid heritage. For the archon of 669/8 B.C., a man born by the year 700 at the very latest, was already so named (Paus. 2.24.7, where the date can be restored with assurance).<sup>154</sup> Another seventh-century bearer of the name, unless it happens to be the archon again, appears in a retrograde graffito, Πισίσ<τ>παρος.<sup>155</sup> In the light of the Hesiodic *Catalogue* it is impossible to believe that Athenians as early as these professed to be Neleids from Pylos. Moreover, they need not even belong to the same family as the tyrant, who comes a full three generations after the archon; the name may have been commoner in early days than it was later. We should also note that the name was not in fact borne by any of the mythical Neleids ancestral to Athens’ royal house; the line descended through Neleus’ brother Periclymenus, and Peisistratus had no issue at all (Paus. 2.18.9). When Hippocrates stood by the cradle he chose a fine aristo-

<sup>152</sup> H. A. Shapiro in W. G. Moon, ed., *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography* (Madison 1983) 87–96, thinks that the Peisistratid claim stimulated interest in pictorial renderings of the Pyliau heroes Nestor and Antilochus, and even of Poseidon and of Heracles fetching Cerberus. But these subjects have other, more obvious associations.

<sup>153</sup> J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families 600–300 B.C.* (Oxford 1971) 445.

<sup>154</sup> T. J. Cadoux, *JHS* 68 (1948) 90.

<sup>155</sup> E. Vanderpool in *Commemorative Studies in Honor of T. L. Shear* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 8 [1949]) 405–08; L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (Oxford 1961) 70.

cratic name, but not a programmatic name. It was many years later that Peisistratus declared himself a Neleid. Athens' claim to be the mother city of Ionia is the precondition for Peisistratus' claim to be a Neleid. And the former claim goes back to Solon's day.

To support the original claim it was perhaps enough to say that the younger Neleus started from Athens; the cult of Neleus and Basile bears witness to this fundamental connexion between Athens and Miletus. How Neleus came to be in Athens was less important. But when it was further said that the line continued in Attica and produced the family of Peisistratus, the claim turned into a question of genealogy, and it was necessary to supply the right ancestors. Not as many as we hear of later, after genealogy had been tested and refined by chronology. But Peisistratus must have named at least the Neleid who migrated from Pylos to Athens. This was Melanthus, as all our sources agree. Now in the time of Peisistratus Melanthus had just come to general notice as the champion who won Eleutheræ and established the cult of Dionysus *melanaigis*. And since Melanthus was in origin merely the eponym of Melaenæ, he had no genealogy of his own and no agreed place in Attic history. This was the time to enrol Melanthus in the story. The step was not taken until Athens had seized Eleutheræ; but it was taken before the end of the tyranny, for the tyrant family was bound to name the first Pylian in Athens.

Hecataeus of Miletus is the first writer who can be seen to have treated our story (unless Pherecydes is as early). No doubt he was at work after the tyranny, but within the next generation, while the tyrant family was still a threat. By his account the Cauconians migrated from Pylos to Athens soon after the Dorian settlement of Laconia, and brought with them the worship of Demeter which prospered forever after at Eleusis (§vii). It is likely too that Hecataeus presented the eponym Caucon as son of 'Celaenus', a doublet of Melanthus (§viii). To suppress the Neleids and the name Melanthus was perhaps a reaction, whether at Athens or at Miletus, against the claims of the tyrant family. *Ca* 499 B.C. Aristagoras is said to have reminded the Athenians that Athens was the mother-city of Miletus (Hdt. 5.97.2); on this outlook the Peisistratid genealogy was of moment in Ionia as well. But we do not know the details of Hecataeus' account, and any political implications are guess-work. It is more important to observe the rôle of the Cauconians in the general development.

Another Ionian, Panyassis, wrote a poem of uncertain length on Codrus and Neleus and the settlement of Ionia. Hecataeus having pointed to Demeter as a Pylian heritage, it was natural to say that

Neleus, or rather his daughter and her man, brought the cult of Eleusinian Demeter to Ionia. Panyassis lived and died during the earlier and, on the orthodox view, the happier period of the Delian League; we may suppose that Neleus was not neglected by spokesmen for the League.<sup>156</sup> But Codrus, also attested for Panyassis' account, has no particular attraction for Ionians.

Codrus is part of the connected story in all our fifth-century sources after Hecataeus—in Panyassis, Pherecydes, Herodotus, and Hellanicus; he was added to the cult of Neleus and Basile before 418/7, and is shown on the Codrus Cup and was included in the group on the Marathon Base at Delphi. Since Pherecydes cannot be closely dated,<sup>157</sup> Panyassis and the Base give the *terminus ante quem*, ca 450 B.C. Panyassis was killed by the tyrant Lygdamis, who seems to have ruled for about a decade down to ca 450.<sup>158</sup> The Base is usually dated to Cimon's lifetime but near the end of it (*ob. ca 450*), because Pheidias is said to be the sculptor and because Miltiades, the only historical figure in the group, would not have been so honoured before this time nor perhaps after it.<sup>159</sup> To be sure, Pheidias attributions are often suspect; but Pausanias had an eye for sculpture,<sup>160</sup> so that the attribution should at least be true in spirit.

The Marathon monument gives Codrus an unexpected prominence, as if the hero and his victory were of topical interest. There is indeed a *terminus post quem* for Codrus' admission to the connected story. The enemy whom he defeats by his death are the Dorians, now advancing from Megara (only the *Schwindelautor* Sostratus, *FGrHist* 23F2, describes him as a general elected against the Thracians, thus recalling Ion and Erechtheus). Codrus the wood-cutter had once encountered nameless enemies, for the encounter personifies the very task of cutting wood; but the connected story took him up at a time when the Dorians were a menace. It is true that Melanthus was uprooted from Pylos by the Dorian invasion, directly or indirectly. Yet

<sup>156</sup> Barron, *JHS* 82 (1962) 6 and (*supra* n.60) 46–48, thinks of the Neleus story as propaganda for the Delian League and for Athens' hold on Miletus. There is however no warrant for the view, adopted by Barron from Glotz, that a powerful family or faction in fifth-century Miletus called themselves Neleids: M. Piérart, *AntCl* 38 (1969) 368f; H.-J. Gehrke, *Historia* 29 (1980) 26f.

<sup>157</sup> For different suggestions see Jacoby, *Mnemosyne* SER. III 13 (1947) 33 (= *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung* [Leiden 1956] 116); G. L. Huxley, *GRBS* 14 (1973) 137–43.

<sup>158</sup> Matthews (*supra* n.120) 12–19.

<sup>159</sup> W. Gauer, *Weihgeschenke aus den Perserkriegen* (*IstMitt* Beih. 2 [1968]) 25, 65–70; U. Kron, *Die zehn attischen Phylenheroen* (Berlin 1976) 215–27; Vidal-Naquet, *Black Hunter* (*supra* n.1) 302–24.

<sup>160</sup> C. Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Berkeley 1985) 131f, 144, 159.

the movements set in train by the Dorian invasion are a general theme, and Melanthus' part in it should not inspire a sequel in which the Dorians march north against Athens.

Round 510 B.C. Sparta and the Peloponnesian League attacked Athens twice to overthrow the tyranny; in the years that followed they attacked again, and yet again they threatened to attack. Before this time Athens had no reason to fear or even to imagine a Dorian invasion of Attica. The threat abated when Corinth stood with Athens. After the Persian Wars, however, Athens came to mistrust Sparta more than ever and to dispute her leadership. And in the late 460's Corinth turned into a bitter enemy; shortly after, she invaded Megara; the lines were drawn which lasted down to the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 1.89–106). Codrus entered the story after 510, and he speaks directly to the preoccupations of the period after *ca* 460.

Some have held that Codrus was inserted as a filler in the genealogy, but this could not be a prime consideration and probably did not weigh at all. The connected story has only one firm chronological *repère*, the return of the Heraclidae, which led in due course to the expulsion of Melanthus from Pylos; the Ionian migration will find its place as a consequence of Melanthus' relationship to the Heraclidae. The relationship, it seems, was first worked out by Hellanicus (F23); for Melanthus' ascending line includes some very pale figures. On the Athenian scene our story occupies a slot between the first dynasty of kings ending with Thymoetes (himself a mere foil to Melanthus) and the long descending line of kings, or life-archons, and ten-year archons; there is general agreement that both lists were first elaborated by Hellanicus. It is hard to see how Codrus could have served chronology when he was first recruited, by *ca* 450 at the latest.

Nor has he been deduced from any other element in the story. We saw above that Codrus has nothing to do with Ionia (§v), and that Neleus alone provides the link with Miletus (§vi). The Athenian kings or life-archons are *Μεδοντίδαι* who trace their line to another son of Codrus; *Κοδρίδαι* is a literary name, not an institution (§v). In short, the only reason for enrolling Codrus in the connected story is his adventure, the oddly triumphant death of a king disguised as a wood-cutter. The old story had not earned him a place in the first dynasty, but it was well suited to the second, if the baffled enemy were identified as Dorians.

We have now accounted for as much of the connected story as can be discerned in Herodotus. Since Herodotus makes only passing reference to the story, while discussing the Ionians or the Peisistratids, the Minyan settlers of Thera, or the setting of the battle of

Mycale, he may well have known some other elements—the sons and grandsons of Codrus who founded cities other than Miletus, the long posterity who ruled in Athens.

Hellanicus set the story in a larger historical context by compiling a full genealogy of Pylian kings down to Melanthus and of Athenian kings after Codrus. He also linked the Apaturia with Melanthus' 'trick', *apate*, and thus showed why the founding family of Ionia brought this festival from Athens—a surprising innovation which was assisted by the title *apatenor* in the cult of Dionysus at Eleutherae (§iv). The innovation enjoyed great success, being reflected in various ways in all subsequent accounts of Melanthus. If Hellanicus had such authority, it must be that no earlier writer offered any comparable treatment of the connected story. Hecataeus, Panyassis, and Pherecydes played a certain part; there is nothing to suggest that any other literary hand was at work before Hellanicus. Our reconstruction is complete down to *ca* 400 B.C.

BROCK UNIVERSITY  
*July, 1988*