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Abstract

Pseudo-Apollodoros' *Bibliotheke* is undeniably the most useful single source for the mythical tradition of Greece. Enclosing in a short space a remarkable quantity of information, it offers concise and comprehensive accounts of most of the myths that had come to matter beyond local boundaries, providing its readers with their most popular variants.

This study concentrates on the most familiar stories contained in the first book of the *Bibliotheke* and their proper place in the overall structure of Greek mythology. Chapter One is dedicated to the backbone of Apollodoros' work: the chronological organisation of Greek mythical history in genealogies. It discusses the author's individual plan in the arrangement and presentation of his material and his conscious striving for cohesion.

Chapters Two and Three are closely linked together: they deal with different stages of the unique narrative of the succession-myth, an account which ultimately comes from a single, archaic source (with minor reworkings to agree with the prevailing tradition of the myth from the Hellenistic period onwards), thus reaffirming Apollodoros' predilection for early accounts.

The fourth Chapter discusses the myths concerning on the family of Oineus and the participants in the Kalydonian Boar Hunt, while the final Chapter concentrates on the first part of the Argonautic expedition, the voyage to Kolchis, as an indication of how Apollodoros reports the whole of the expedition. This study concludes that the mythographer's main aim is to reproduce a cohesive and faithful summary of the canonical versions of the myths he records, but not necessarily of his sources.

Every myth is discussed in the context of the long Greek mythological tradition, giving us a rare insight to Apollodoros' main preoccupations in structuring his work and the handling of his sources, and rewarding us with tantalising glimpses of many Greek myths that are otherwise lost.
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Introduction

As a comprehensive and concise handbook of Greek mythology, the Bibliothèque is in many respects unique. Coming at the end of a long and extensively varied tradition of mythological literature, this is the only work of its kind to survive. As such, the work is of seminal importance to everyone who wishes to approach the notoriously difficult subject of Greek myth. A labour of astonishing systemisation, the Bibliothèque records in a continuous narrative the whole span of Greek mythical history, from the birth of gods and the establishment of divine power to the aftermath of the Trojan War and the fates of the last of the heroic race. In it, most of the traditional tales relevant to Greek society as a whole, beyond local or temporal constrains, find a permanent, fixed position. The significance of such a synthesis becomes evident if we view Greek mythology as an intertext.

Greek mythology is “a fund of motifs and ideas ordered into a shared repertoire of stories”, which should be understood in comparison and contrast with other stories in the system. “Greek mythology is an ‘intertext’ because it is constituted by all the representations of myths ever experienced by its audience and because every new representation gains its sense from how it is positioned in relation to this totality of previous representations”. Greek mythology is, in effect, “an accumulated and accumulating system of narratives and perceptions which determine the interpretation of any individual text within, or added to, the collection”. The same attitude, I believe, can be adopted for individual myths.

1 See Bremmer 1987, 1-9, who modifies thus Burkert’s definition. I found both Bremmer and Graf 1993, 1-8, extremely helpful.
2 Thus Dowden 1992, 8.
3 Dowden 1995, 47.
Every myth can be seen as a system of narratives, interpreting and interpreted by every individual articulation of the myth, whether literary, artistic, or oral. Thus e.g., the intertext of the Argonautic myth is a flexible structure, to which every new text (and I use the term loosely, to incorporate oral texts and artistic representations) could potentially add a new perspective. Every new detail added to the body of material that forms “the Argonautic myth” obviously carries with it the idiosyncrasies of its creation (time, locale, form or genre, artist). However, “the Argonautic myth” exists over and above its individual tellings, and remains surprisingly constant in its fluidity. The individual articulations of the myth are evidently more remarkable, but one cannot hope to discover their context without resorting to “the myth”. In a sense, the Bibliothèke’s main objective must have been to approach “the myth” as much as possible. In the discussion that follows I shall try to highlight this effort whenever it becomes evident.

Its author’s effort to produce such a comprehensive - if brief - synopsis of Greek “myth” is, in fact, distinctly recorded. Photios, the prolific scholar and patriarch of Constantinople in the ninth century, apparently read the work and reviewed it in his own Bibliothèke, the record of practically all the books he had read up to that date kept for the benefit of his brother Tarasios. At the end of his brief but favourable review, Photios quotes an epigram which he found at the beginning of his copy of the work. The epigram does not survive in any extant manuscript, not surprisingly considering that all of them are descended from a

---

4 On the date of Photios’ Bibliothèke (most likely 845 A.D.), its nature and the peculiarities of form and content, see Treadgold 1980, passim.

5 As Treadgold 1980, 103, points out, when he stresses the usefulness of a reference work (as in the cases of Stobaios, Sopatros and the Bibliothèke), “Photios implies that he had used them himself in his teaching and writing, and presumably in compiling his own lexicon when he was younger”.
single, defective original, a fourteenth-century manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (Parisinus gr. 2722, henceforth designated by the siglum R), which breaks off abruptly in the middle of Theseus' journey from Troezen to Athens. Photios' fortuitous inclusion of the poem offers us a unique insight to the work's motivation and goals. In it, the book itself directly addresses its readers like this:

οὖνος πειρήματι ἄφυσσόμενος ἀπ' ἐμείο,  
παιδείτης μύθους γνώθι παλαιγένεας.  
μηδ' ἐς 'Ομπρείτην σελίδ' ἐμβλεπε μηδ' ἐλεγείν,  
μη τραγικήν Μοῦσαν, μηδε μελογραφίν,  
μη κυκλίκων ζήτει πολύθρου στίχου εἰς ἐμὲ δ' άθρών  
eπιρήσεις ἐν ἐμοί πάνθ' ὅσα κόσμος ἔχει. 

The message of the epigram, which Photios rightly finds ὁμο ἄκοσμον, is clear: the aim of the work is to render the consultation of the poems listed in the epigram

---

6 The independent discovery at the end of the last century of two epitomes of the Bibliothēke (Vaticanus gr. 950= Epitome Vat., published in its totality by Wagner in 1891, who argues, persuasively I think, that its author is Ioannes Tzetzes; Sabbaticus Hierosolymitanus 366 = Epitome Sab., published in its totality by Papadopoulos-Kerameus also in 1891) provides us with an extremely useful summary of the lost portion of the work. For the text of Bibliothēke I rely on Wagner's edition (1926), which also includes the parts of Epitome Vat. and Epitome Sab., which correspond to the lost section of the work. Following Frazer's example, by the simple Epitome I designate the sections where the text of the two epitomes corresponds exactly. On the text, I have also consulted the two valuable articles by Diller 1935, 296-313 (who offers valuable insights to the text history of the Bibliothēke) and Papathomopoulos 1973, 18-40 (for a new collation of the most important mss.).

7 πειρήματι: Alan Griffiths in a communication to me (1997); πειρήμα: mss. (Photios Bibli. cod. 186, 142c Bekker = III 40 Henry); σπειρήματι: Cameron 1995, 398. Griffiths rightly points out that Photios might paraphrasing the poem when he writes that the Bibliothēke contains τὰ παλαιότατα τῶν Ἐλλήνων διὸ τα περὶ θεῶν καὶ ηρώων ὁ Χρόνος αὐτοῖς δοξάζειν ἔδωκεν.

8 παλαιγένεας Griffiths.

9 κυκλίκων: Cameron l. c.; κυκλίων mss.
obsolete by including all the relevant information within its covers in a straightforward form. Its date appears to be early (i.e. pre-Byzantine). Like Cameron, I believe that it may have been composed by the actual author of the \textit{Bibliotheke}, who in this manner also delineates his method: "drawing upon" early sources to record a definitive version of the stories of old. Even if the epigram was composed at a later date, its claims indicate the value that the \textit{Bibliotheke} had for the students of Greek mythical history, at a period of no easy access to early (archaic or classical) sources.

Since the publication of Carl Robert's pioneering work on the \textit{Bibliotheke}, which set the platform for a serious discussion concerning its authorship, its date and the calibre of its material, well over a century has passed. On the first two questions we have not progressed much since Robert: it is generally accepted that the mss.' attribution of the work to \textit{Apollodoros of Athens, the Grammarian} (also accepted by Photios) is definitely in error; recently however, Huys, based on the arguments of Vladimir Boruchovic, suggests that the possibility of a connection between Apollodoros of Athens' \textit{Ilepi Qeœu} and the \textit{Bibliotheke} cannot be disproved. Huys bases his discussion on studies of the papyrus fragments of Philodemos' \textit{Iept \epsilon\nu\sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma} which show correspondences between the mythological material used by Philodemos on the one hand, and the \textit{Bibliotheke} and Apollodoros of Athens' \textit{Iept \thetae\omega\nu} on the other. Philodemos'
work is exceptionally rich in mythological material and the imminent publication of its mythological section by D. Obbink\textsuperscript{16} will certainly enhance our knowledge of Greek mythological tradition in all its “mutations”, from the Archaic period to the Hellenistic one and the early Empire. Indeed, in my discussion of the Theomachia, I have used Philodemos to shed some light to the tradition recorded by Apollodoros, while the opposite has also been successfully attempted.\textsuperscript{17} However, I find the possibility of a connection between the Bibliotheca and the mythological contents of the Περὶ θεῶν improbable. There is definitely no direct connection between the two.\textsuperscript{18} Huys accepts the existence of an intermediate stage between Apollodoros of Athens and the Bibliotheca, presumably a mythological compendium which summarised the mythological elements of the Περὶ θεῶν (obviously without any reference to the Grammarian’s highly individual rationalistic approach to myth interpretation),\textsuperscript{19} contaminated with other, more mainstream, sources of myth, but which retained its connection with the author of the original source. I find such a suggestion rather farfetched, though “should it prove to be correct”, as Graf points out,\textsuperscript{20} it would confirm the importance of his work for “those ancients who concerned themselves with myths and gods”.

\textsuperscript{15} Henrichs 1975, 5-38.  
\textsuperscript{16} See Obbink 1996, passim, for the first part of Philodemos’ treatise.  
\textsuperscript{17} Thus Henrichs 1977, 127-28.  
\textsuperscript{18} The reference to Kastor as an alternative source for Io’s parentage (2.1.3) gives a terminus post quem for the work. Suida s. v. Καστόρα informs us that he was a contemporary of Cicero and that his Χρονικα, the work mentioned in the Bibliotheca, contained historical tables down to the year 61 B.C. As Apollodoros of Athens lived and worked at Alexandria c. 140 B.C. (see Robert 1873, 27; Schwartz, RE Ia, col. 285ff.), a full century or more before the composition of Kastor’s Chronicles, it becomes apparent that Apollodoros cannot have been the author of the Bibliotheca.  
\textsuperscript{19} Already Robert 1873, 12ff. points out the many discrepancies between the surviving fragments of Apollodoros of Athens (FGHist 244) and the straightforward simplicity of the myths recorded in the Bibliotheca.  
\textsuperscript{20} Graf 1993, 194.
I am of the opinion that the answer to the quandary is far simpler: it is conceivable that the author of the work was called Apollodoros (it is after all a fairly common name) and was only later confused or indeed deliberately identified with the famous author of the same name, a circumstance which must have certainly added to the work's appreciation and may have contributed to its survival. It is possible that the work was launched under the name of Apollodoros of Athens, exactly because of the prestige that the Grammarian had as a student of myths. In any case, the name Apollodoros is as good as any; and since we know nothing definite about the author of the Bibliotheke we may as well retain the traditional attribution and call him Ps.-Apollodoros or indeed simply Apollodoros. Henceforth all references to Apollodoros are to the author of the Bibliotheke, unless otherwise indicated.

The uncertainty about the authorship of the work enhances the problem of its date. The reference to Kastor which we have already mentioned provides us with a fairly certain terminus post quem: the work cannot have been composed before the first half of the first century B.C. Things become infinitely more ambiguous when it comes to determining a terminus ante quem. To quote Frazer: "so far as the external evidence goes, our author may have written at any time between the middle of the first century B.C. and the beginning of the ninth century A.D."

"See however Arce 1985, 8-15, who believes that Photios does not refer to our mythological handbook, but to another, wider in scope, and actually written by Apollodoros of Athens: "quedan, pues, hasta ahora abiertas dos posibilidades derivadas de la aparente inadecuación del resumen de Focio y la obra que comentamos: a) que la Biblioteca de Apollodoro que leyó el patriarca no sea el texto que aquí se estudia; y b) que el texto aquí presentado se titulara originariamente Geneelogia" (15). The evident condensation of this view is indicative of the
important to note that the *Bibliotheke* is cited frequently in the scholia; however, the dating of the relevant sources is either tentative, or else, they were written much later than the ninth century.\(^{24}\)

The overview of the external evidence may prove unproductive, but linguistic and stylistic criteria indicate that it must have been written in the first or second century A.D. Again Robert’s proposal for a date in the first half of the second century seems to me not to be far off the mark,\(^{25}\) although more recently earlier\(^ {26}\) and later\(^ {27}\) dates have been put forward.

The question of the work’s quality and its use of pre-existing material is inseparably linked to its specific character and its author’s intentions and aspirations and is thus pivotal to any discussion that refers to it in a more than a casual way. Consequently, it will be addressed throughout this study. In brief and in anticipation of the discussion that follows, I would like at this point to make certain statements regarding the scope of my investigation, the methodology adopted, and the general viewpoint on which my discussion in based.

\(^{24}\) See van der Valk 1958, passim, for the use of the *Bibliotheke* by the scholiasts; also his discussion of the use of the *Bibliotheke* as a possible source for the D Scholia (1963, 305-7). I believe that a date of about 500 A.D. for the D Scholia is not far off the mark. This would make them our earliest source mentioning the *Bibliotheke*. For a new text for the D Scholia see http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/ifa/vanthiel/scholiaD.pdf

\(^{25}\) Robert 1873, 40-41: “quod tamen studium cum minime Tiberii morte terminatum sit, sed usque ad Hadriani Antoninorumque aetatem perduraverit, bibliothecae natales ad posterius quam ad prius tempus referre malo. ... Quare eum priore fere alterius post Chr. saeculi parte vixisse suspicor”.

\(^{26}\) Van der Valk 1958, 167: "we see that the argument of the idiom does not offer certain and incontestable indications. It might be possible that [the *Bibliotheke*] already belonged to the first century B.C. However, I should be inclined to think, on account of the idiom, that it belongs to the first century A.D.”.

\(^{27}\) Carrière and Massonie 1991, 11-12: “de sorte qu’on est tenté de se dire que la *Bibliothèque* a fait son apparition entre Pausanias et Philostrate l’Ancien, c’est-à-dire entre 180 et 230 ou sous les Sévères (193-235)”. However, while it is probable that Pausanias was not familiar with the *Bibliotheke*, that does not mean that the work had not yet been composed, as the two scholars maintain.
As the title indicates, I approach Apollodoros within the context of the long mythological tradition that came before him. In every respect, the Bibliotheka is the product of an exceedingly long process that can already be traced to the earliest recorded Greek literature, the Homeric and Cyclic epics and, more importantly, the Hesiodic Theogony and the Catalogue of Women. Through a process of selection and systematisation of the epic tradition, these epics were the first contributors to the formation of the Greek mythological tradition, and are used frequently as sources by Apollodoros. Indeed, the contribution of the Theogony and the Catalogue in the formation of the tradition cannot be stressed enough. Their pattern of arranging the mythical world through genealogy, which conveniently allowed the inclusion of narrative episodes, was subsequently taken up by the earliest prose mythographers and became the form of mythical narration. It is a pattern governing the whole of Apollodoros’ composition. I shall return to this presently.

The works of the sixth and fifth-century genealogists and local historians signal the beginnings of Greek mythography. The largely coherent and coordinated schema that we now possess for the heroic period was more or less crystallised in these works. By viewing myth as early history, they sought to eradicate all chronological impossibilities and narrative inconsistencies by copious systematisation, refinement, and manipulation of the material at hand. The relatively few fragments and testimonies from the works of Akousilaos of Argos and Pherekydes of Athens reveal works of a large scale and scope. Using the Catalogue as a model, Akousilaos (fl. at the end of six century) purported to provide a systematic account of the whole of the heroic tradition with a strong Argive flavour. Genealogical arrangement in a small number of families played a
crucial role in the structure of his work, as it does in the *Bibliotheke*. Though less keen on genealogical systematisation, Pherekydes, who composed his work in the first half of the fifth century, brings together a exceedingly large amount of often disparate material in his attempt to record as many as possible of the traditional myths. It is difficult to obtain a clear idea of his working methods and his principles from the surviving fragments, but it is clear that his work was valued by later mythographers, including Apollodoros, who thirteen times cites him by name as a source. To these we should add Hellanikos of Lesbos (fl. in the second half of the fifth century), who, although less interested in myth, was considered an authority in certain mythical narratives, most notably the story of the Trojan War.\(^{28}\)

The Greek mythological tradition continued to develop, with Greek lyric and tragic poetry making substantial contributions, and, in many cases, providing what was to become the canonical version of a myth. In the fourth century, Asklepiades of Tragilos, a pupil of Isokrates, summarised the mythical subject matter of Athenian tragedies and compared them with earlier versions of the relevant myths. In this, as Henrichs points out,\(^{29}\) Asklepiades became “a distant ancestor” of the *hypotheseis*, the anonymous summaries of the plots of the tragedians which became a major source of information for later mythographers (and modern scholars).

The Hellenistic period marks a further development in the process of formation of the Greek mythological tradition. By continuing to rely on mythical subject matters, Greek poetry continued to enrich the tradition with attractive

\(^{28}\) See Van der Valk 1958, 134-143, who argues that Hellanikos must be considered one of the sources of the *Bibliotheke*.

\(^{29}\) Henrichs 1987, 267, n. 3.
variants. Indeed, the Argonautika of Apollonios of Rhodes, although written relatively late, in the third century BC, managed almost to displace earlier versions of the journey and became the canonical account. On the other hand, the mythographical literature of the period is heavily influenced by the general quest for erudition: Hellenistic mythographers begin to approach the myth in a typically scholarly fashion, with critical attitude and rationalistic tendencies: the Argonautika of the third-century BC Dionysios Skytobrachion falls into this category.

Mythography becomes a tool for the interpretation of the major literary works. It is not surprising that the ancient scholia to all major authors are littered with mythological material. Numerous collections of learned and obscure mythical variants, of summaries of epic and tragic plots (the aforementioned hypotheseis and the Kallimachean diegeseis are but two examples), but also works that purported to amplify a specific theme circulated throughout the Hellenistic and early Roman period. A number of collections belonging to the latter category have come down to us: star-myths were collected in the Katasterismoi of pseudo-Eratosthenes; Parthenios composed a collection of unhappy love stories, the Erotika Pathemata (c. 52-26 BC), to be used as material for poetry; Antoninus Liberalis (second century AD) recorded in his Metamorphoses mythical narratives that ended with the transformation of a mythical character. Such adaptations of myths in a new context are indicative of the multiple contributions that Hellenistic and post-Hellenistic scholarship made to the mythological tradition.

The Bibliotheke not only stands at the end of this long process, it stands out as the only example of its kind to survive. Its material is drawn from a wide

---

variety of sources, all of which formed part of the mythological tradition. Consequently, our understanding of Apollodoros’ methods and working patterns must start from this context. Of course, it must be clearly stated that the extant information on important elements of this tradition is, at best, inadequate. Consequently, certain conclusions reached may appear tenuous. However, I believe that even a discussion limited on surviving evidence, especially the Catalogue and the works of the two great early mythographers, vastly enriches our perception of the nature of Apollodoros’ work. And not only that: an overview of the extant mythological tradition is crucial when we are dealing with an account that survives in its totality only in Apollodoros. In cases such as the account of the succession-myth (discussed in part II of this study), our perception of what would otherwise be dismissed as an eccentric and later variant is greatly enhanced, because we can identify where this particular selection came from — namely an archaic poem, probably part of the Epic Cycle.

Although a product of the post-Hellenistic mythography, the Bibliotheke retains the scope and form of the early contributors to the mythographical tradition, on whom it relies heavily for its structure and most of its material, albeit at a much smaller scale. However, one must never lose sight of the fact that Apollodoros, unlike the early epic poets and prose mythographers, does not purport to present us with a new mythical version of a traditional tale. He is by no means an independent author aiming at creating an original mythical account, but a competent compiler who conscientiously brings together often disparate material in his attempt to construct a comprehensive guide of Greek mythology. What is more

31 See Chapter III, section (vi).
important, I believe, is that his purpose is to “tame” an often idiosyncratic material into suitable mythical narratives. As was already noted at the very beginning of the preface, the discussion that follows concludes that Apollodoros’ purpose is to present his audience with a summary of the Greek “myth”, which, freed from any inconsistencies, can exist beyond the individual articulations of a story. In this he tends to prefer the most popular versions of the myths that he records, even if this means that certain elements of his source have to be changed to accommodate the well-established (usually earlier) tradition.

It becomes evident that in certain cases Apollodoros must go beyond the role of a simple arranger of material and make choices that affect the character of the account he records. In this selective investigation on the most important stories of the first book of the Bibliothèque (i.e. the succession-myth, the Kalydonian Boar Hunt, and the Argonautic expedition), this tension is in evidence especially in the account of the journey of the Argonauts. In the discussion of the Lemnian episode,\(^{32}\) for instance, Apollodoros records not the version included in his main source for this section, the Apollonian Argonautika, according to which it were the men that provoked the wrath of Aphrodite, but the more widespread account of the story which had the women offend the goddess and suffer the consequences of their actions. In this case the process of selection on Apollodoros’ part works smoothly, and would have passed undetected had we not possessed the Argonautika. This does not mean, however, that the mythographer does not make mistakes: the inconsistency between the catalogue of the participants in the Argonautic expedition and the subsequent narrative concerning the death of

\(^{32}\) See Chapter Five, section C (i).
Tiphys, is an obvious example, and has been used as an argument for judging the work as second-rate. Consequently, one needs to bear in mind that the picture is not always clear cut: as I shall argue in the section concerning Meleagros, it is probable that certain details of Apollodoros' account do not go back to Euripides' tragedy. Hence the use of Apollodoros for the reconstruction of tragic plots demands due caution.

The reference to Meleagros brings me to another point: Apollodoros may strive to record "the myth", but that does not mean that he does not include alternative versions in his work. These variant accounts fall into two categories: they may deal with alternative parentage and localisation of popular figures (cf. the case of Atalante in Chapter Four, section (iii)); as such they do not affect the main narrative of the story. In other cases, where disparate versions concerning a mythical detail have acquired popularity (cf. the reasons for Phineus' blindness, discussed in Chapter Five, section (iv), or the alternative traditions concerning Herakles' participation in the Argonautic expedition, Chapter Five, section (iii)), and consequently could not easily be ignored, the mythographer simply records all of them without any comment, before or after his main narrative. Thus his predilection for the most popular version is never abandoned. In this respect, the story of Kalydonian Boar Hunt is unique: as far as I can tell, it is the only case in which the variant is not a matter of detail but a question of the whole myth, with two complete versions recorded side by side, again without any comment. Obviously, the popularity of both accounts (the "Homeric" and the "Euripidean") was such that required their simultaneous inclusion.

---

33 See Chapter Five, section (iv).
34 See Chapter Four, section (ii).
On the whole, Apollodoros takes full advantage of the long tradition that came before him, and produces a work whose value does not lie in the originality of its material but in the sheer amount of information it contains and the economy of its presentation. It is true that Apollodoros relies heavily on the work of the early mythographers for the structure of his work; however, I believe that certain elements in the arrangement of the genealogical material are the result of a conscious effort by the mythographer.\textsuperscript{35} It is equally true that the large number of names included in the work also goes back to patterns already established in the earliest strands of Greek mythology. However, it is possible that such completeness is indicative of the work’s encyclopaedic aspirations. This brings us to the question of Apollodoros’ intended audience, admittedly a difficult one. The work’s didactic qualities have been recognised from very early on; indeed, as was pointed out, it is probable that Photios’ favourable review was the result of the work’s utility for educational purposes. Consequently, a number of scholars, from Robert onwards,\textsuperscript{36} have argued that the work was destined for school use. Van der Valk\textsuperscript{37} argues that the author of the \textit{Bibliotheke} altered his material for the sake of decency and concludes therefore that the work “was originally destined for young readers let us say for use in school” (102). However, the examples he offers are arbitrary and unreliable: e.g. he apparently argues that Apollodoros, when dealing with the death of Medeia’s children, records only the version according to which the children died at the hands of the Korinthians, because he thought that the death of the children at the hands of their mother was too crude for schoolchildren. This

\textsuperscript{35} See Chapter One, sections B and D.
\textsuperscript{36} Robert 1873, 35.
\textsuperscript{37} Van der Valk 1958, 101-2.
is obviously untrue. In fact, Apollodoros deals with the murder of Medea's children in typical fashion: since there existed two popular versions of their demise, the mythographer simply records them side by side, without attempting to criticise or evaluate them. He actually disproves his own theory when he argues that the mythographer replaced Apollonios' version of the murder of an adult Apsyrtos by Jason with the slaying and cutting to pieces of a child Apsyrtos by Medea because the latter version was more fascinating to a young audience (117). Van der Valk's inconsistency in his approach to these two similar myths is evident. Nor can he get past the fact that for every example of possible modification of material for decency, there are many more passages that should have been altered, yet were not bowdlerised. In my view, it is more probable that the Bibliotheke was intended as a popularising work of reference aimed at a general audience.\(^{38}\) Indeed, Carrière and Massonie have recently pointed out the work's encyclopaedic aspirations;\(^ {39}\) this of course, does not disprove the possibility that teachers and students also took advantage of its utility.

The usefulness of the Bibliotheke has never been in doubt. However, there has been a tendency to underestimate the material contained in it. From Robert onwards, the Bibliotheke is almost invariably dismissed as a second-rate compilation, which further abbreviated material found in Hellenistic handbooks.\(^{40}\) Söder, studying the sources of book one reaches the conclusion that Apollodoros did not consult any of his sources from the original (even Homer is said to be only indirectly consulted!), but relied on already contaminated accounts taken from

\(^{38}\) See Mactoux 1989, passim.

\(^{39}\) Carrière & Massonie 1991, 15-16.

\(^{40}\) Thus Robert 1873, 49ff.; Bethe 1897, 17ff.; Schwartz in RE I2, 2875-2886; Wendel in RE XVI. 2, 1365-66; Söder 1939, passim.
earlier handbooks. On the other hand, van der Valk, in his pivotal study of the *Bibliotheke*, concludes (admittedly without being aware of the existence of Söder’s dissertation) that, for its most part, Apollodoros goes back to original sources. He is followed more recently by Carrière and Massonie. But on the whole, the vast majority of scholars discussing the *Bibliotheke* usually assume that the work’s compilatory nature means only indirect access to ancient poetry and mythography. “The more one sees in him the late epitomator, the less one is tempted to credit him with direct access to original sources”, asserts Huys, while accusing Carrière and Massonie of “sentimental attachment to the subject”.

The compilatory nature of the work cannot be doubted. Indeed, I believe that, as Söder suggests, in some sections of the work, a handbook (or several) was used, e.g. for adding names in the catalogues, or for access to tragic plots. However, the use of earlier handbooks by the mythographer does not preclude the simultaneous use of earlier sources from the original. I will argue that the mythographer had direct access to major works of Greek mythography. My discussions of the succession-myth and the Argonautic expedition lead me to the conclusion that Apollodoros did read the original works, ultimately selecting from them those accounts that preserved a cohesive, logical account and reproducing them in a manner that reflected the most popular, and thus often earlier, version.

---

41 Söder 1939, 164.
43 Huys 1997c, 347.
44 Ibid. 346.
Part I:

(Re-)Structuring the mythical world
Chapter One

Genealogies, Human and Divine.

A. Introduction

The nuclear family, consisting of man, wife and children, originating in and based upon the concepts of marriage and common ancestry, always played a most distinctive role in human relationships. As a fundamental institution, the family has provided us with an uncomplicated, unambiguous medium for approaching and understanding other social conventions. Hence, it is not surprising that "[t]he language of intrafamiliar relations is used to define and describe relations between persons in different families and between groups of persons ... The pedigree or genealogy, 'the account of one's descent from an ancestor or ancestors by enumeration of the intermediate persons', ... is a statement of the way in which individuals are, or assert they are, connected with one another through marriage and common parentage." The connexions stated in the genealogy are the grounds for assigning specific rights and duties, membership and status, to specific persons."

Obviously, "[t]he characteristics of all kinship derive logically from the simple premises on which these systems are built ... These premises entail relationships between any individual and his (or her) mother, father, brother, sister, husband (or wife), son, and daughter, and by compounding these relationships we

\footnote{This type of "dialogue" not only defines and connects members of the same group, but, perhaps more importantly, differentiates and, ultimately, excludes the non-members, identifying them as "other". This process of segmentation (cf. Fowler 1998, 3) supplies ancient societies with the justification for specific, often intricate rules for behaviour, and legitimises the social structure. In the end, those excluded are excluded from society.}

\footnote{Barnes 1967, 101.}
can specify as long and complicated a link through the kinship web as we wish".47

In a family, a person can potentially hold only a few, prearranged positions. Relations between kinsfolk are limited. These limitations give to kinship systems the quality of formal regularity and precision48 that "renders a complicated reality surveyable by connecting and distinguishing at the same time".49 Though family relationships, the world acquires an orderly, hierarchical form, and its structure becomes more comprehensive and economical. Thus, using the simple pattern "parent-child", one could progress in a single line far back in time to reach a distant (primo)-genitor. Single linear series could be then constructed and linked together to define the relationships between people at a local, national or international level.

Simplicity and order are not the only reasons for valuing pedigrees. As has been shown,50 the Greek way of thought is often based upon the past; very often, the past provides a proof of or explanation for many present situations.51 As was suggested above, genealogising puts things into their proper perspective. The position of a person in society is explicitly linked to the importance of his family in the past. Its future unknown and uncertain, the *genos*, says van Groningen, "is anchored as firm as rock in the past. It stretches out into the past".52 Significantly, it is the beginning of the family that is thought to characterise it later. Hence the importance of its founder is paramount. The whole family owes its existence to him; he is the one who determines the family's merits. It is evident that, for a family

47 ibid. 102.
48 ibid. 101.
49 Van Groningen 1953, 48.
50 ibid. 48.
51 Thomas 1989, 176.
52 Van Groningen 1953, 49.
that strives after status and prestige, its founder cannot but embody the qualities and merits of the family to the optimum degree. What better proof of a family’s status than a lineage that goes back to a legendary hero, or, even better, to a god? "The gods possess the highest quality and the heroes follow immediately after them. A pedigree is in perfect order, as soon as it goes back to the mythical world of gods and heroes". In Greece, the emphasis lies upon the idea of inheritance from the original family ancestor and the importance of family relationships – especially those of the heroic past. Consequently, genealogical information was primarily concerned with the legendary period. One more reason for the preference to the heroic genealogies should be added: as R. Thomas has pointed out, legendary ancestry could not be disproved. It is thus hardly surprising that it was heroic pedigree (which could easily be attained, changed or manipulated) that was regarded as the significant ancestry by Greek aristocrats, not recent genealogies of historical times!

What might seem surprising at a first glance is the fact that in most cases these pedigrees did not extend beyond the generation of the sons of those who fought at Troy. If we consider, however, the significance given to ultimate descent from a divine or semi-divine figure, it becomes obvious that the formation

---

53 It is usually thought that “with genealogy we are shifting our attention back to a more archaic period ... a world of predominantly aristocratic values” (Thomas 1989, 155). Aristocratic families were certainly extremely keen on establishing a prestigious family line. However, as van Groningen points out (61), even after the aristocratic oligarchies yielded power to democratic regimes, the ardent desire to establish a genealogical connection is ever-present; the genealogical formula continues to exist, although modified to apply not only to a single family, but to a polis, to a nation, to the whole of mankind.

54 Van Groningen 1953, 50.

55 Thomas 1989, 177.

56 cf. Apollodoros 1.9.13, where the offspring of the Aiolid Amythaon, son of Kretheus and Tyro, are recorded: the statement that Παρθένοπατίων ἐν Πρόμαχος γένετο, ἕς μετὰ τῶν ἐπιγόνων ἐπὶ Θήβας ἐστρατεύθη, Μησιστάοις ἐν Εὔρυστος, ἕς ἤθεν εἰς Τροίαν rounds up the family tree. The heroic age reaches its end with the monumental wars beneath the walls of Thebes and Troy; with it comes the end for heroic genealogies and for Apollodoros’ work.
of any link between mythical past and historical present was deemed unnecessary, possibly even harmful to the family’s goals.

It is now clear why the great number of genealogical poets and prose “legendary historians” usually stopped short of incorporating historical figures into their accounts. Certain of the relevance of the heroic past to their present audiences, their genealogies grow backwards. “Their overwhelming concern seems to be in tracing legendary genealogy, not in reaching down to the present day”. Their ambition was to organise the multiplicity of local genealogical traditions into a coherent and orderly pan-Hellenic system. Organising such a mass of confused and often contradictory material could not have been an easy task. Rigorous systematisation on a genealogical basis surely simplified matters: most of the legendary heroes “are assigned to one or other of a small number of important families, and the history of each of these families was narrated separately from beginning to end”. As with the Greeks of historical times, the prestige of legendary heroes was very much influenced by their forebears: “Greek myth focuses on the individual hero, whose status depends as much on his ancestry as on his ability to deal successfully with other heroes”. Especially in Greek mythology, the actions of the head of the family are thought to predetermine the future of his descendants (e.g. Tantalos – Atreidai). The main characteristics of an ancestor are thought to reappear enhanced in a later stage of the family history: thus Odysseus

---

57 On the considerable mass of early Greek genealogical literature and its implicit relevancy to their audience cf. West 1985, 2-11.
58 The earliest mythographers did consider themselves historians, since they obviously accepted myth as a reliable historical truth. See Thomas 1989, 181ff.
59 Hard 1997, xxii.
60 Henrichs 1987, 248.
possesses to the highest degree the cunning intelligence of his maternal 
grandfather, Autolykos, and his great-grandfather, Hermes.

Indeed the tradition which made Odysseus the product of the illicit affair of 
his mother, Antikleia, with Sisyphos, preserved first in Aischylos' lost "Οπλων 
Κρίσις (TrGF III fr. 175 Radt), is a good example of genealogical manipulation. 
This family connection, embodied in the work of tragic writers, put a slur upon 
Odysseus, usually cast in the role of the "baddie", but also neatly incorporates into 
a single family all the tricksters of Greek myth. Hermes sets the tone, Autolykos 
and Sisyphos develop different types of cunning and Odysseus possesses cunning 
intelligence to a supreme degree. Surprisingly, Apollodoros does not record 
Odysseus' parentage in an explicit manner, i.e. he does not give a full family tree. 
His ancestry can be derived through the listings of the participants in the 
Argonautic expedition (1.9.16) where Akrisios is the father of Laertes, who is then 
mentioned, both in the catalogue of Helen's suitors (3.10.8) and in the list of the 
leaders of the Greek contingents in the Trojan war (Epitome 3. 12), as the father of 
Odysseus. Unsurprisingly, the possibility of a father-son connection between 
Sisyphos and Odysseus is not even hinted at by Apollodoros. The mythographer 
remains faithful to the Homeric tradition and never links Odysseus with Sisyphos, 
despite the fact that their relationship "became a staple of the Odyssean 
tradition".  
In fact, when dealing with Sisyphos (1.9.3), the mythographer records 
the traditional version of his family tree as was already established in II. 6.153-55: 
a son of Aiolos, Sisyphos is the father of Glaukos, and the grandfather of 
Bellerophon, the hero who slew Chimaira (δε ξέτευε τὴν πυράνων Χιμαίραν,

---

1.9.3). Apollodoros then continues with the story of Sisyphos’ punishment in Hades and the reason behind it: he must push a stone uphill with his hands and head in the effort to heave it over the top, but it always rolls back again (a punishment devised by Hades to prevent Sisyphos from running away from the underworld, as Pherekydes [FGrHist 3 F 119] notes), for revealing to Aisopos that the abductor of his daughter Aigina was Zeus. This explanation of Sisyphos’ misdeeds appears firstly in Pherekydes (FGrHist 3 F 119 = Sch. on Hom. II. 6. 153) and is followed by Paus. 2. 5. 1., Eust. ad II. 6. 153, Sch. on Hom. II. 1. 180, Sch. in Lykophron Alex. 175. Apollodoros refers to the same story again in 3.12.6, as part of the story of Aisopos. The focus of this passage is on Aisopos and his family, and Apollodoros adds nothing new on Sisyphos. However, the mythographer records only the first stage of the complicated story already found in Pherekydes (FGrHist 3 F 119), in which Sisyphos contrives to bind Thanatos, so for a while nobody can die, and then, manages to escape from the underworld by deceiving Hades. The various plays dealing with Sisyphos (TrGF III, p. 337 Radt, TrGF IV, p. 415 Radt, and TrGF p. 572 Nauck) must have also drawn upon this elaborate tradition, but nothing can be deduced with certainty. Unlike them, Apollodoros records a simple version of events, which preserves nothing of Sisyphos’ cunning.

62 Thus already in Od. 11. 593-600.
64 Apollodoros makes no reference to the story of Glaukos’ marriage to Mestra, the daughter of Erysichthon found in Ehoiai fr. 43a M.-W. In fact, he mentions Erysichthon in the Athenian section of his work, but notes that this only son of Kekrop’s died childless (Kêkropōs . . . παῖδες ἔσχεν Ἐρυσικῆθεσιν, βιὸς ἄτεκνος μετήλλαξαξ, 3.14.2). Bellerophon’s story is recorded in detail at 2.3.1-2, as part of the long account about Proitos and his family, with whom he is closely associated. Apollodoros does the same thing with another member of the Aiolid family, Melampous. The sheer is logically mentioned in his proper genealogical place, as a son of Amythaon, and the mythographer records how he acquired his powers of divination that helped him cure Iphiklos of Phylake and gain the hand of Pero for his brother Bias (1.9.11-12). However, the story of how he cured the women of Argos from madness is only fleetingly
To return to our main discussion, the greatest problem envisaged by the mythographers was, obviously, that of synchronisation between the families. Historical impossibilities or chronological inconsistencies were eradicated by the copious survey, refinement, and manipulation of the material. The largely coherent and co-ordinated schema which we now possess for the heroic period is the product of an enterprise which started with epic poetry and was more or less crystallised in the works of the early prose historiographers.

The activity of the Greek genealogists was by no means concentrated on the production of comprehensive genealogical catalogues in and for themselves. They were interested in the correct recording and placing of all these names, but for a very specific reason: behind nearly every name there lies a story that needed telling. After all, heroic lineage usually incorporates famous figures who played an irreplaceable role in mythical tradition. Many narrative episodes are thus conveniently interspersed with the genealogical data. Thus heroic pedigree becomes more than a mere chain of names with limited appeal: it becomes the form of mythical narration. As Graf points out, by means of genealogical data Greek myths become discernibly interconnected; they become links in a chain. Through genealogy, the quantity of diverse mythical material collected acquires unity; through it, it was possible to locate each figure and its story at its designated place and time, and to survey the development and interaction of related persons and circumstances.

---

mentioned at this point. The work’s economy demands for the story to be related in full in the section devoted to Proitos, when all its characters are introduced and its setting is accurately established.

Graf 1987, 125.
B. Genealogy and Apollodoros: the family of the Deukalionids.

Apollodoros comes at the end of this long tradition, and takes full advantage of its achievements. Dominated to an unusual degree by heroic mythology, the Library could not but organise its material on a genealogical basis, the only reliable system of chronological organisation which also allowed the incorporation into the narrative of all the main stories, “each situated in its proper place in the overall structure.”^ ^ Most probably aimed at an unsophisticated public — and, as was already argued in the preface, it is probable that the Bibliotheke was written for a general audience, and not specifically for schoolchildren — the work offers an incredible amount of information, incorporating a vast number of stories and characters in quite a brief summary. The great value of the work lies in its economy. It depends heavily on the prosopography of heroic families, yet its whole scheme is surprisingly simple: only six main families are recorded. As in the work of the early mythographers, whose work Apollodoros obviously uses, this simple structure allows each character or event to be placed at its definite position in mythical time and space. To quote Hard: “[t]he histories of the heroic families are interspersed with genealogies which list the full succession in each family, even if no significant stories are associated with the figures in a particular generation, and usually catalogue all the known children of each marriage, even if most are not mentioned again (and may be otherwise unknown). In this way, complete family trees are built up for each ruling line, partly as a matter of record, . . . and partly because these genealogies provide the main principle of organisation in mythical

^7 Hard 1997, 15.
Only when plausible family trees had been constructed was it possible to locate each figure or mythical episode at its appropriate position in time, and thus construct a history in which these could be viewed in due relation.\(^{68}\)

The profusion of names in Apollodoros is indeed surprising, considering that his work is not on the scale of his predecessors. This becomes more surprising in the midst of the usually bare and brief summary of myths that accompany it. The attempts at synchronization between the families probably provide the explanation: the names are there to fill the gaps in a family line. Another possible solution can be offered: that Apollodoros aims to provide his readers with a summary of the most important stories of Greek myth. In his many sources he must have certainly come across many accounts, of local or limited importance, which were deemed unsuitable for incorporation into his account. However, he records all the names of figures associated with the traditions that he does record, despite their limited or non-existent mythological function.\(^ {69}\) Such completeness is an indication of the work's encyclopedic aspirations.

One last observation should be made. The division of the work into four books does not invite the reader to make overall observations.\(^ {70}\) Each family is dealt with separately from the others; and for each account Apollodoros most probably used a different source. Akousilaos, for instance, is used for the Inachid family, and perhaps Pherekydes for the Deukalionids. Each of these genealogists used a variant set of local traditions to produce accounts that were different and often contradictory. The unity that characterizes Apollodoros' work is impressive,
and should be seen as a conscious attempt by the compiler. As we shall see, only minor inconsistencies remain, which the plan of the work allows to pass undetected.

The structure of Apollodoros' work presents obvious similarities with the plan of the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women, as it has been reconstructed. In fact, it has been argued that “the Catalogue seems to have provided the model for the whole order of presentation”,\(^1\) i.e. the division into six main families. The adoption of the general outline of the Catalogue by Apollodoros is obvious in many parts of his work on heroic genealogies; however, the number of discrepancies between the two works, already pointed out by Robert,\(^2\) indicate that the Bibliothèque does not summarize or paraphrase the Catalogue, and, in fact, may not have even drawn upon it directly.

The Catalogue is described as \(\text{ἀπὸ γυναικῶν ἀρχόμενος καταλέγων τὰ γένη}\) (Testimonia 8\(^3\) = Max. Tyr. xxvi. 4, p. 312 Hobein). Apollodoros does not give such prominence to women: his accounts do not begin from a woman loved by a god. The main families are headed by men: the offspring of each marriage are usually incorporated into the family of the father. This is the case with the daughters of Théstios, Althaia, Leda, and Hypermnestra (1.7.10). In the Catalogue their descendants are presented together: first Leda and her children (fr. 23 M.-W.), then Althaia and hers (fr. 25.1-33 M.-W.), and finally Hypermnestra and hers.

\(^{71}\) West 1985, 45.

\(^{72}\) Robert 1873, 71: “Non negabo equidem aut re vera magnam inter bibliothecam et Hesiodi catalogum intercedere similitudinem aut summa cum fructa Markscheffelium hoc opusculum ad catalogi fragmenta explicanda adhibuisse. Hoc tantum concedere non possum, Apollodorum ex ipso Hesiodo hausisse cum in singulis rebus eam inter utrumque diversitatem esse videam, quam Apollodori libidini tribuere nequaquam ausim . . .”.

\(^{73}\) These testimonia are included in the first edition of the Hesiodic fragments by Merkelbach and West (1967, 2).
In Apollodoros the daughters of Thestios are mentioned by name only in the Deucalionid family: Hypermnestra is never mentioned again, while Leda's story is dropped, only to be picked up by the author in 3.10.6-11.2, when he records the family tree of Tyndareos, Leda's husband. Only Althaia's children are mentioned near their mother; Althaia is of course married to her uncle once removed, Oineus, whose genealogy directly follows that of Thestios (1.8.1). In this way, Althaia's children are presented in their correct patriarchal line.

The patrilineal orientation of Apollodoros' account is made manifest by the fact that, as becomes apparent from the genealogical Tables that accompany this Chapter, in a number of cases Apollodoros does not record the female offspring of a union, although he is aware of their existence, as these females appear in his narrative as "building blocks" of his genealogy, usually as parties in endogamic unions with close relations. Typical examples are Amythaon's daughter, Aiolia, who marries Kalydon, and Xanthippe, daughter of Doros, who marries Pleuron, the other eponymous mythological figure of Aitolia (1.7.7); Bias' daughter, Anaxibia (II), who marries Pelias (1.9.10); and Pronax's daughter, Amphithea, who marries her paternal uncle Adrastos (1.9.13).

However, the orientation of the Catalogue influences Apollodoros' stemmata in one respect: in a family with both female and male issue, the daughters' descendants are taken up before the sons'. Thus, Aiolos' daughters are discussed before his sons (cf. fr. 30ff. M.-W.), with the last one mentioned (Perimede) being the first one to be taken up. In the same way, the children of

---

74 On the figure of Doros see below.
75 Following Apollodoros I do not list these females in their proper genealogical position, but at the place they first appear in the narrative, i.e. where their marriage is listed, adding the name of their father to help to their identification.
Demonike, products of theogeniture (1.7.7) are presented before those of Porthaon, her brother.

In the last case, however, another consideration must be taken into account: in Apollodoros' account of Aiolos' female descendants, the genealogies are arranged according to length. The shortest genealogies are dealt with at the beginning of the account, leaving for the end the genealogy of Kalyke, a figure with numerous and important progeny. Among these, the family of Oineus, son of Porthaon, is by far the most interesting, and is, thus, left to the end.

This is a common practice in Apollodoros. Thus the first part of the Aiolids' genealogy ends with the narration of the story of the Kalydonian Boar (1.8.3), the hunt *par excellence* of Greek mythology and one of the great expeditions of the generation before the Trojan War. Again, the whole account of the Deukalionids (the Aiolids constitute the largest branch of this family) ends with the Argonautic expedition (1.9.16-1.9.28). Moreover, the Belids conclude with the huge account of Herakles' exploits (2.4.5-2.8.5), the Agenorids with the expedition of the Seven against Thebes and the Epigoni (3.4.1-3.7.7), and the Attic genealogies with the exploits of Theseus. Finally the whole account is brought to completion with the narration of the Trojan War and the returns of the heroes (*Epitome* 3. 1-7. 40). It becomes obvious that, in the case of Porthaon and Demonike, the grandfather of Meleagros had to be discussed last so that the story of his family, and thus of the hunt, could occupy its deserved position of prominence at the end, in addition to balancing the plan of the whole of the *Bibliotheke*.76

---

76 See the more detailed discussion in Chapter Four.
A few observations concerning the Deukalionids should be made. Apollodoros offers “a miniature résumé of a vast mythical Chapter”, 77 the *anthropogonia* and the story of the flood. His account could not have been taken from the *Catalogue*; as West remarks, “there is no reason to suppose that the myth of the great flood which Deukalion and Pyrrha alone survived was alluded to in the *Catalogue*”. 78 Scarpi points out that “[n]ella tradizione mitologica arcaica non sembra esservi traccia di una anthropogonia, forse intenzionalmente esclusa, come sembra lasciare intendere Esiodo, per quanto persistente in varianti locali”. 79 We may not have a detailed extant account of the flood in archaic sources, since the first reference to the myth of Deukalion is found in Pindar *O* 9. 44–56, where the characteristically Greek myth of repopulation of Earth from stones also appears; but what about those obviously very old myths, also recorded by Apollodoros, about the founders of the six primal families? 80 Far from being local variants, these myths were accepted as alternative, equally plausible, suggestions about the first beginnings of humankind. In Apollodoros we find a number of suggestions. Most of the first men are *autochthones* (cf. Pelasgos at 3.8.1 and Kekrops at 3.14.1); 81

77 Aldrich 1975, 118.
78 West 1985, 55.
79 Scarpi 1996, 452.
80 There is actually a fragment of what appears to be an archaic lyric poem that lists in rapid succession a number of first beings (fr. 943 PMG). The fragment will be discussed in relation to the Gigantomachy, and, in particular, in relation to Alkyoneus; it actually proves the antiquity of the myth of conditional immortality of the first-born Giant, also recorded in Apollodoros 1.6.2. The poem contains not just a simple *anthropogonia*, but, as its references to the Kouretes and Alkyoneus prove, it also incorporated the first beginnings of species with a conditional or dubious status of mortality, but a close relationship to the divine.
81 Apollodoros notes that Deukalion’s Flood happened during the reigns of Nyktimos, son of Lykaon (3.8.2), and Kranaos, son of Kekrops (3.14.5), in an obvious attempt at synchronisation. The first and last accounts contradict each other, since, in his account of the flood, Apollodoros points out that the whole of Greece, above the Korinthian Isthmus, was affected by it (Zeüs δὲ πολὺν ἄρετον ἔρχετο μέρη τῆς Ἑλλάδος κατέκλυσεν, ὡστε διαφθορήκατα πάντας οὐρανοὺς... καὶ τὰ ἔκτος Ἀθηναίων και Πελοποννήσου συνεχόθη πάντα), whereas in the Athenian genealogy he gives the impression that Athens was totally unaffected (cf. Parian Marble *FGrHist* 239 I. 4–7). An attempt to connect the Athenian kings and
we do find, however, the occasional water-man (cf. Inachos, 2.1.1). The Deukalionid myth is certainly not unique in Apollodoros’ account, but merely the most interesting of them all.

Prometheus appears as the creator of mankind only in later sources (cf. Pausanias 10. 4. 4), but the lateness of this tradition cannot be established. Moreover, in Apollodoros’ version, Prometheus does not hold the title for long: the human beings that he created are all but destroyed in the Deluge (in fact, the story of the flood presupposes the existence of a – defective? – race of human beings). Ordinary human beings are then recreated from stones by Deukalion and Pyrrha, while the race of the heroes descends from Deukalion’s (or Zeus’) and Pyrrha’s birth children and the occasional union with a god (every other generation or so – see below).

In Apollodoros the story of the flood is completely disconnected from Prometheus’ creation of humans, his punishment for bestowing on them the gift of fire, and the creation of the first woman by the gods. The reason given by the mythographer for the flood (ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀφανίσας Ζεὺς τὸ χαλκοῦν ἔθελησε γένος, 1.7.2) reminds us of a tradition already present in Hesiod: the succession of the five ages, and, more specifically, the destruction of the χαλκοῦν γένος (cf. Erga 143-156). There are obvious differences in the particulars of the two versions, since in Apollodoros Prometheus creates men by mixing earth and water,
while in Hesiod the bronze race is made from ash-trees (ἐκ μελιῶν, Erga 145-6).\textsuperscript{83}

Moreover, the flood does not spell the end of close relationships between them. On the contrary, it signals the beginning of a close relationship, previously non-existent, between men and gods. The end of the flood brings forth the age of heroes, whose genealogies Apollodoros is about to start recording.

A discussion of the structure and function of the story of the five races in the Hesiodic Erga is beyond our scope. However, Apollodoros’ account incorporates some elements that recall the Hesiodic account: the creation of the first human race by Prometheus takes place during Zeus’ reign – in Hesiod the three races of mankind are created by Zeus, after he replaced Kronos. In a sense, the first human beings belong in the bronze age (and this is how Apollodoros understood it, even though he attributes to the men of his bronze age different origins and a different type of death). The earliest two ages, the gold and the silver, are excluded from Apollodoros’ account, either because they are perceived as non-human, or because, in the mythographer’s view, human beings could not exist before the establishment of universal order and the reign of Zeus. In Hesiod, the men of the age of bronze (Erga 143-55) kill themselves off and, as true human beings, after death they dwell in Hades. Presumably Apollodoros’ χαλκοῦς γένος goes to Hades as well. In both cases, the destruction of the men of the Bronze Age brings forth the age of heroes. In Apollodoros the heroes live side by side with ordinary mortals (those born of the stones thrown by Deukalion and Pyrrha, and whom, I presume, Hesiod would include in the age that followed that of heroes,

\textsuperscript{83} For a discussion that combines – successfully, I believe – the view of the sequence of the ages as a continuous deterioration with that of a cyclical structure, in which “the cycles combine into progressive linear time” (7), see Koenen 1994, 1-34.
that of iron). Eventually the heroes also disappear (cf. Epitome 3. 1-2: αὖθεν δὲ Ἐλένην Ἀλέξανδρος ἀρπάζει, ὥς τινες λέγουσι κατὰ βουλήσιν Δίως, ἵνα Ἐθνόπτις καὶ Ἀσίας εἰς πόλεμον ἐλθόντις [sic Epitome Sab., ἐλθοῦσά φης Fraser] ἡ θυγατρὶς αὐτοῦ ήνδοξας γένηται, ἢ, καθὰπερ εἴπων ἄλλοι, διὸς τὸ ἥμιθέων γένους ἀρηῇ), leaving behind only the ordinary mortals, cut out from any close, personal contact with the gods. The heroes’ demise separates them from the rest of mankind, gloriously and finally.\(^{84}\) As restored by West, the admittedly-tantalisingly fragmented passage from the Catalogue (fr. 204 M.-W.)\(^{85}\) points in this direction: while pretending to destroy the demigods, Zeus is actually protecting their uniqueness, apparently in danger from contact with ordinary human beings. The latter, living until that point with the demigods and presumably partaking to a degree in their way of life, are left behind in obscurity, another form of destruction.

To return to our discussion of the Deukalionids, Apollodoros runs through the first generations, presenting us in effect with a catalogue focused “on a constellation of north Greek tribal groups”,\(^{86}\) who in Apollodoros divide the land and spread far and wide (1.7.3). However, the fact that there are two references to Athenian ancestry (Amphiktyon and Ion) in such a short paragraph is curious. Apollodoros makes no attempt at this point explicitly to link Amphiktyon and Ion with Athens. Amphiktyon is presumably located geographically in Lokris (as his descent from Deukalion would demand), and is strongly connected to the league that bears his name. He appears, relocated to Attika in Apollodoros’ list of

\(^{84}\) In Apollodoros, as in Homeric tradition, most of the heroes go to Hades when they die and not to the island of the Blest; the mythographer reserves this fate only for Achilles and Medea (Epitome Sab. 5), and for Telegonos and Penelope after the death of Odysseus and their marriage (Epitome 7. 37).

\(^{85}\) See the discussion of Koenen 1994, 28-30.

\(^{86}\) West 1985, 53.
Athenian kings (3.14.6), ruling for twelve years after the second king, Kranaos. His late introduction to the list is marked by the fact that he is the only king to acquire kingship by ousting his predecessor, only to be ousted himself in turn, to disappear without trace. Unsurprisingly, Apollodoros records no marriage or offspring for Amphiktyon, nor indeed for Ion and Achaios, the other eponymous heroes of this part of the narrative. This is because they need no children: their function is fulfilled by lending their name to the inhabitants of the areas they inhabit.

Apollodoros does not make anything of the possibilities of the association of Ion (and Xouthos) with the ethnic groups whose eponymous ancestor he became and with Athens. Ion has no place among the Athenian kings. The elaborate list of Athenian kings recorded by Apollodoros does not hesitate to reduplicate the shadowy figure of Kekrops as Erechtheus' son and successor, yet excludes Ion, a figure important in terms of origins and actual historical relationships between the Athenians and the other ethnic groups. In this list, after a long list of autochthonous beings, the succession proceeds only through the patrilineal line; no son of a daughter ever succeeds. For the mythographer, Ion's, and to a lesser degree Kephalos', connection with Athens is of minor importance, as it is through matrilineal descent and marriage. Indeed we find no reference to

---

87 He is the father (Σ Pind. O 9.96), grandfather (Plut. Quaest. gr. 15, Eust. Comm. ad II. 277. 18) or great-grandfather (Ps. Skymnos 587f.) of Lokros; he is also said to be the grandfather of Boiotos (Steph. Byz. s. v. Βοιωτας).

88 Apollodoros seems to have problems with the figure of Kephalos, whom he found in his sources both as son of Deion and as an Athenian: in 1.9.4, he a son of Deion who marries Prokris, daughter of Erechtheus, and is abducted by Eos. Yet, in the Attic genealogies, the figure splits in two: the Aiolid Kephalos remains married to the unfaithful Prokris, whom he eventually inadvertently kills; he is condemned to perpetual banishment (3.15.1) and is thus removed from the Athenian mythical foreground. Another, Athenian Kephalos, a son of Herse and Hermes, is abducted by Eos, becomes the father of Tithonos (!) and becomes eventually the ancestor of Kinyras, establishing a connection between Athens and Kypros. The same version establishes an Athenian pedigree for Adonis, who, however, is no longer the lover of Aphrodite, but still dies at the hands of Artemis. The prevalent version of the incestuous birth of Adonis and of his association with Aphrodite is then recorded by Apollodoros (3.15.4).
traditions that gave Ion an active part in Athenian myth: in Apollodoros' account of the battle of the Eleusinians with the Athenians, the battle is won through the sacrifice of Erechtheus' (unmarried?) daughters. Thus the Pherekydean version (*FGrHist* 3 F 119, also found in Paus. 7. 1. 2-5) that made Ion assist Athens in the war is not mentioned.

In Apollodoros Xouthos is firmly located in the Peloponnese: of his sons, Achaios gives his name to the area around Patras, and, subsequently, becomes one of the eponymous heroes of the Achaians. The association of Ion with the Ionian race is also firmly established in Apollodoros, but the mythographer never exploits the possibilities of his connection with Athens.

If the sketchy relationship of Amphiktyon and Ion with Athens is due to an Athenian effort, then the effort is a good example of an attempt to have your cake and eat it. Through Amphiktyon in particular, Athens establishes its rights as a member of the amphiktyony; the Athenian ancestry of Ion reaffirms the city's links with its Ionian allies. On the other hand, however, the Athenian claim to autochthony is never seriously jeopardised. This elaborate effort to produce a genealogy that stresses a certain affinity to other groups (especially their neighbouring races descended from Hellen and their Ionian allies) without compromising the all-important independent ethnic identity of the Athenians is the

---

89 For the transfer of the tradition from Ion to Xouthos in the Euripidean *Ion* see Lee 1997, 39.
90 On the significance that the relationships between the eponymous figures—had in the construction of "a system of ranked relationships between the groups" which measured the varying degrees of affinity between different groups and their status as members within the system, see Hall 1997, 43-48. As he points out (43), by "depicting Doros and Aiolos, or Akhaios and Ion, as brothers, the Hellenic genealogy projects the idea that Dorians are more related to Aiolians than they are to Akhaians, while Akhaians share a closer affinity with Ionians than they do with Aiolians. At the same time, by having Doros and Aiolos as sons, but Akhaios and Ion as grandsons, of Hellen, the genealogy is implicitly stating that Dorians and Aiolians possess a higher status by being somehow more Hellenic".
result of a long evolution. It is evident that the earlier attempt of the Athenians to establish a connection with the Hellenic genealogy prevailing in their region became of secondary importance as the Athenians began to rely on the uniqueness of *autochthony* as a means of ethnically defining themselves;\(^9^1\) the subordination of the first tradition to the second is evident in Apollodoros’ account. Finally, in Euripides, Ion’s membership in the Hellenic *genos* is terminated: in the *Ion* he becomes the product of a theogeniture. As an offspring of a divine father and an autochthonous mother he is set apart from the rest of the eponymous figures of the Hellenic group, and any Athenian affinity with other ethnic groups (especially the Dorians) is shattered.

The function of the early stages of the genealogy of Hellen is to bring together the major races of the Greek world and subordinate them to Aiolid Greece through their eponymous ancestors. Places that were not originally associated with the Aiolid expansion, but had become important after the initial formation of the genealogy, such as Argos, were also claimed through relocation and formation of marital links. Thus the Aiolids, originating from a small area at Lokris, come to dominate mainland Greece, from Messene to Thessaly (though in Apollodoros we have no reference to Makednos, ancestor of the Makedonians, who in the *Catalogue* held a position of prominence by being son of Zeus and grandson of Deukalion, fr. 7 M.-W.). As can be seen on the map describing the geographical diffusion of the Deukalionid family as recorded by the mythographer,\(^9^2\) Apollodoros’ geography does not extend north of the Peneios

---

\(^9^1\) See also Hall 1997, 53-8.
\(^9^2\) Apollodoros locates geographically all the male members of the Deukalionid family. The members of the family’s female branch are not explicitly placed, but their location can be inferred from their marriages (e.g. Perimeide’ marriage to Acheloos places her at his banks). As can be
River, remaining in the area that the Romans would call the province of Achaia. It is worth repeating, however, that only the ancestors of the major Greek ethnic groups are mentioned in Apollodoros' account. Magnes, the only figure mentioned in the later stages of the Hellenic genealogy who could be perceived as the ancestor of an ethnic group, is in Apollodoros the son of Aiolos, and has no apparent eponymous function (1.9.6). In the *Catalogue* (fr. 7 M.-W.) Magnes and Makednos are the offspring of Zeus' union with Thuya, daughter of Deukalion; Graikos is Zeus' son by another daughter of Deukalion, Pandora. Neither of these unions is mentioned by Apollodoros. Only Aethlios, the product of Zeus' union with Protogeneia, the firstborn of the sisters, is recorded by Apollodoros, obviously because of his connection with Kalyke (1.7.5). As West has pointed out, all three of Zeus' unions with the daughters of Deukalion were specifically designed to subordinate to the Hellenic family major ethnic groups situated at the edges of area covered by its genealogy. As this is beyond the scope of a compendium of mythology such as the *Bibliotheke*, and since Makednos and Graikos have no mythological function or offspring of significance, they are omitted; Magnes is pushed further down the family tree, being no longer the product of a theogeniture, but only the father of Diktys and Polydektes. Only Aethlios retains his position of importance, owing to the extensive length of his family and the mythological importance of his offspring.

The narrative concerning Aiolos' offspring is, we have argued, divided into two parts, with his five daughters taken up before his seven sons. In the first part,
each collateral branch is followed to its end before the next is taken up; the branches are presented according to their length, with Perimele’s family dealt with in one line, while Kalyke’s offspring take up eleven paragraphs.

In the build-up to the story of the Kalydonian Boar Hunt, Apollodoros records genealogical data spanning nine generations (to which we should add a tenth, that of Diomedes, whose intervention in the interests of his grandfather neatly rounds off the story of Oineus). As I already pointed out, none of the previously recorded branches of the family of Aiōlos is presented at such length. The family of Kanake is followed up for four generations, while Apollodoros catalogues only the names of the children of Perimele and Peisidike. Alkyone does not have children: Apollodoros intersperses in his genealogy the narrative of her and her husband’s metamorphosis into birds ‘because of their arrogance’ (1.7.4).

Most of the figures belonging to Kalyke’s family are actually associated with significant stories, which have to be placed at a definite position in mythical time and space, so that they could be viewed in relation to the general structure of the mythical history of Greece. Even in its simple cataloguing of names and their relations to other names, the family of Kalyke can offer valuable information on the structure of mythological families and the human relations they describe.

The families of Aiōlos’ male offspring are not dealt with in the same way as the female branch of the family. Apollodoros builds his genealogy around the Argonautic expedition, forming a circle:
1. Athamas and his family (the background of the expedition, 1.9.1-2)

2. Sisyphos (sinner against the Gods, 1.9.3)

3. Deion (father of Kephalos, 1.9.4)

4. Perieres (founder of Messene, 1.9.5; according to Apollodoros, he fits better with the Atlas family, and is discussed at 3.10.3)

5. Magnes (father of Diktys and Polydektes, 1.9.6)

6. Salmoneus (another sinner, whose position is established by his link to Kretheus through Tyro, 1.9.7-10)

7. Kretheus (Argonautic expedition, 1.9.11-28)  

The three brothers in the middle have the shortest genealogies, and would otherwise have been placed at the beginning of the account. The account of Tyro (1.9.8-10) also offers an interesting point. Children with a double (divine and mortal) or a dubious parentage are put with the family of their mortal father, or of the father with whom they are most commonly linked. Only in cases such as Tyro's, when the divine parentage is not doubted, are the children discussed with the family of their mother, and in any case separately from any children whom the mother might have from a marriage to a mortal. This arrangement has as its main purpose the facilitation of the recording of the Argonautic expedition. The placing of Pelias before his half-brothers means that, when Iason enters the narrative, all its other characters, both at Iolkos and at Kolchis, have already been brought in, and

---

95 On the most recent reconstruction of the Aiolid family tree in the Catalogue see Dräger 1997, 78-9, who suggests the following order for the families of each of the male offspring of Aiolos: Sisyphos-Athamas-Perieres-Magnes-Deion-Salmoneus-Kretheus.
the background of the expedition has been dealt with at its appropriate position in time.

In conclusion, it is evident that the arrangement of the genealogical material about the Deukalionids is the result of a conscious effort by Apollodoros, which allows him to produce a coherent and economical account, which retains the semblance of unity, despite the disparate material it brings together.
C. The divine genealogy

An extensive genealogical digression of the gods and their offspring (1.2.2 - 1.5.3 [8-33]) divides in two the narration of the succession myth, the first part of which contains two successful attempts to overturn the established divine order, the second two unsuccessful bids for divine kingship. As well as a genealogical arrangement of the main divinities of the Greek pantheon, this digression incorporates a number of well-known stories about mortals, which one would not normally expect at this point, given that the aim of the narrative is to acquaint the readers with the main deities. Some of these tales are totally dependent on how Apollodoros arranges and presents his genealogies: the planning of the gods’ family tree is not simple, and the rule of treatment by generations is not strictly followed. At first glance, it seems that we have the following chronological order, where each branch is introduced separately and completed independently from the others, while each generation is dealt with before the next is taken up: first the children of the Titans, then the children of Pontos and finally the Olympians.

The members of the latter family are introduced according to the importance of their father: first we have a list of the offspring of Zeus’ several marriages (1.3.1-1.4.5), then a reference to Poseidon’s marriage to Amphitrite (1.4.5), and finally the story of Persephone’s rape (1.5.1-1.5.3). Since Zeus’

---

96 The structure of the Theomachia narrative will be discussed in detail in part II.
97 In the Theogony (West 1996, 34-35), the genealogies place a special emphasis on matriarchy, and the succession of genealogies is basically matrilinear. Thus, “when it comes to Zeus’ marriages, the children are much more closely connected with their mothers than with him - he steps in to take the credit for them” (cf. Theogony 901ff.). In contrast with the Theogony, Apollodoros does not give precedence to the mother. Zeus’ impressive number of marriages results in his offspring being identified by their mothers. However, in Apollodoros the emphasis is given to Zeus’ participation, as the active γενον (1.3.1) indicates. Zeus takes an active and conscious part in bringing forth all the forces that are necessary for the establishment of a pleasant and orderly life.
marriage to Mnemosyne has issue beyond the first generation, a chronological treatment by generations is not feasible; consequently, and since all of the Muses’ offspring remain childless, each collateral branch is followed to its end before the next is taken up. Moreover, each family is arranged in the same order as that in which the divine mother is first introduced (with the exception of the children of Melpomene). As a result, the mortal offspring, or those with a dubious status of mortality produced by unions of a divine mother with a mortal (as in the cases of the Muses Kalliope and Kleio), take precedence over the immortal issue of the other branches. The main episodes in the lives of these children are then included in the narrative. This arrangement explains the incorporation into the narrative of such stories as Orpheus’ *katabasis* to the Underworld for the retrieval of Eurydike, and the life and death of Hyakinthos. When a person appears as a character in such a story, his life too is narrated, unless otherwise stated. This is the case with Thamyris, who is neatly introduced as a lover of Hyakinthos, but whose contest with the Muses and subsequent death is also given. In other cases, an independent story, i.e. a story with no genealogical connections, is included in the narrative because it is logically linked to the account that directly precedes it. This, as we will see presently, is the case with Orion.

98 Apollodoros specifically states that he will narrate the story of the Sirenes in the familiar context, in relation to Odysseus, 1.3.4: περί δὲν ἐν τοῖς περί Ὀδυσσέας ἔρρομεν. This explains why the issue of Melpomene’s marriage to Acheloos is moved to the very end of the paragraph.

99 On the parentage of Orpheus and Linos and the significance of κατ’ ἐπίκλησιν for the establishment of the real father (Apollo) see Carrière and Massonie 1991, 165. This would mean that we should introduce another family combination, analogous to that in *Theogony* 945-62: parents divine, offspring mortal or with dubious status of mortality. In the same category we should include the union of Euterpe with the river Strymon (1.3.4): their offspring, Rhesus, is mortal [cf. ll. 10.47ff. where, however, Eioneus is named as his father (10.435), and Euripides’ *Rhesos* passim.]. The mortality of the Sirens, children of Melpomene and Akheloos, is conditional: cf. *Epitome* 7. 18.
So far, all the divine births conform to the laws of human procreation. As we shall point out in our discussion of the succession myth, Apollodoros does not make any reference to the parthenogenetic mode of birth of Ouranos and Aphrodite, and altogether avoids mentioning any of the offspring of the Night.

In the earlier stages of Greek theogonic myth a number of parthenogeneseis, creation by a female entity alone, take place: two great mothers, Gaia and Nyx, appear from the formlessness of Chaos and bring forth a number of children. Nyx, "born of the primordial cleft and aware of nothing but division, gave birth - without love, by fusion only - to a progeny encompassing everything negative in the Greek imagination". Loraux is right that "the idea of a divine femininity closed upon itself and separate from the outset" was for the Greeks, with their legendary fear of female fertility and their obsession with gender-definition, "a threatening idea if ever there was one." Note, however, that Gaia puts an end to this exclusively divine mode of procreation as soon as she brings forth Ouranos, a son singularly similar to her but, at the same time, by definition different from her. His extreme masculinity will eventually collide with Gaia's femininity and lead to Ouranos lose both gender and generative capacity. The birth of Aphrodite (a parthenogenesis itself, although a total reversal from the pattern witnessed in the birth of her father Ouranos, since now we have a male giving birth to a female) completes the separation and subsequent definition of genders which started with the castration of Ouranos. As Rudhardt points out, "c'est seulement après la castration d'Ouranos par Kronos et la distance qu'elle établit entre le

---

100 On the structural connections between the births of Aphrodite and Athena, see Arthur 1982, 66.
102 Rudhardt 1986, 6.
masculin et le féminin, que l’acte sexuelle va prendre un nouveau caractère et
devenir véritablement fécond en produisant à partir de deux un troisième, différent
de ses géniteurs” (my italics). ... “Dès alors que le masculin et le féminin se son
disjoints, leur union ... requiert l’intervention d’un autre principe”; Aphrodite is
thus born to assume the functions that Eros had before her. From the moment of
her birth, the parthenogeneseis should stop. All unions should happen ἐν φιλότητι
diὰ χρυσέην Ἀφροδίτην (Theogony 822). I use this line as an example despite
the fact that it not found elsewhere in the undisputed parts of Hesiod.¹⁰³ In this
context the line expresses exactly the position that Aphrodite holds in the new
order: even primordial deities like Gaia and Tartaros succumb to her powers.¹⁰⁴

To return to Apollodoros, his treatment of parthenogenesis is interesting.
In the earliest stages of his genealogy, and despite well-established tradition, his
gods appear not to be “free to experiment with a range of other possibilities not
available in the human sphere.”¹⁰⁵ At its later stages, however, procreation by
parthenogenesis appears: the married couple par excellence, Zeus and Hera,
whose marriage and progeny appear first in this long list, embark on a series of
births without the participation of a partner.¹⁰⁶ The births of both Hephaistos and
Athena are said to have occurred in this way. One might argue that this is not at all
significant; Apollodoros simply follows a source (another handbook, a genealogical

¹⁰³ West 1966, 383, considers this as “a considerable argument against the verse, in view of the
amount of genealogy in the Theogony”.
¹⁰⁴ On the expressions used in the Theogony to denote sexual unions see Bonnafé 1985, passim.
¹⁰⁵ Zeitlin in Loraux 1993, xiii.
¹⁰⁶ Zeus’ progeny include Athena and Dionysos; on the other hand, all the children of Hera are
considered in one or another source to be products of parthenogenesis: Hephaistos is the one most
often cited as Hera’s parthenogenetic son (apart from Apollodoros in Theog. 927-8 and Hesiod fr.
343 M.-W. [= Chrysippus fr. 908; on the fragment and its possible position in the Hesiodic
corpus see West 1966, 401-2]). In Ovid Fasti 5. 229-58, Ares takes the place of Hephaistos.
Finally Typhon is Hera’s parthenogenetic son in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo 300-55 and in
Stesichoros’ fr. 62 PMG.
catalogue?; and, of course, in the case of Athena, the story of her birth from her father's head was the only tradition, and because of its popularity, Apollodoros could not simply ignore it, as he did with the story of Ouranos' giving birth of Aphrodite. However, he could have avoided mentioning the variant of the parthenogenetic birth of Hephaistos, choosing to refer only to the Homeric genealogy, as he did in the case of Aphrodite's birth – suppressing the Hesiodic version (was this more popular due to its use in Aphrodite's cult?). The reason for this is, I believe, the fact that the births of Athena and Hephaistos were closely related (cf. Hom. Hym. to Apollo 301-55) not only to each other but also to the succession myth, which in Apollodoros has not yet reached its final conclusion (contrast the Hesiodic account, in which the narration of the birth of the children of the Olympians begins after the defeat of Typhoeus). One could argue that the connection of the two births is made out of context, as part of a genealogical list which pays no particular respect to the notion of time; but the appearance of both gods in the battle of the Giants (1.6.2-3), which, in Apollodoros, precedes the Typhon story, indicates the list is strategically positioned in the work.

The study of the succession-myth shows that Gaia and Rhea, the all-powerful divine mothers, protect their last-born sons against their fathers, and, in a way, become the agents of their husbands' dethronement. But when Zeus accedes to power this comes to an end. Zeus manages to nullify the power of his wife-mother (in this case Hera, since Apollodoros reverses the order of Zeus' marriages and makes Hera his first wife, 1.3.1.) by becoming himself the Father,

---

107 On Aphrodite's birth see more below Chapter Two, section C (v).
108 On this see Frazer 1921, 22, n. 1.
109 On the position of Rhea in Apollodoros' account of the succession myth, see Chapter Three.
and surrounding himself with a number of daughters and sons who resemble him and not her (this is, I think, the function of the Typhon story in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, 300-55). In this way, Hera cannot continue the tradition of complicity between mothers and their younger sons; she has no chance of bearing a son more royal than his father. Small wonder that Hera's children are found lacking in comparison with the other children of Zeus, especially Athena and Apollo, just as Hera's behaviour is found lacking in comparison with the behaviour of his other wives, especially Leto at the beginning of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 1-13).

Her only chance is to resort to the old method of parthenogenetic procreation: but what was excused in the beginning, when parthenogenesis was necessary for the birth of a male, now no longer works: without the seed of a father, Hephaistos flatly fails to continue the precedent set by Kronos and Zeus, just as Hera fails in her attempt to become another Gaia or Rhea. There is no doubt that Hera is herself a resounding failure as a mother-agent of power. None of her children, whether born with Zeus' participation or without it, attain the predominance that the next set of Zeus' progeny in this catalogue, i.e. Athena, Apollo and Artemis, acquire from the moment of their birth. Hera might be the wife, but the role of mother in Greek myth is reserved for others, namely Leto and, more importantly, Demeter.

---

110 It has been suggested (Rudhardt 1986, 22-23) that during the formation of the cosmos "les enfants qui naissent alors d'unions prodigieuses sont à la fois plus nombreux que leur parents et différent d'eux", while at the end of the cosmogony, when the order of Zeus has been established and the τιμήσι have been (re-) distributed, "il faut en outre que les enfants ressemblent à leurs parents."

111 Strauss Clay 1989, 73-4, makes this comparison between Leto and Hera. I would take it a step further: the very beginning of the poem (1-13) presents us with the correct behaviour for a wife of Zeus. When Apollo enters the palace and the gods fear that the next phase of the succession myth has come, Leto does not behave as Gaia, Rhea or Hera do; she does not take the side of her son but remains faithful to Zeus, resolving the situation before it begins.
Apollodoros, however, refrains from narrating the story, already found in *Il. 18. 395-405* and verified by Hera herself in *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 316-21, which had her throw her son into the sea because he was crippled in his legs. This version presupposes that Hephaistos was born lame, confirming from its outset the futility of Hera’s attempt at parthenogenesis. In Apollodoros, Hephaistos is born healthy, but is also a defender of his mother. He comes to his mother’s rescue when Zeus punishes her for sending the storm that took Herakles off course when he was sailing to Troy: as a result Zeus casts Hephaistos out of Olympos and

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{πεοῦνα Ἡφαίστου ἐν Λήμνῳ καὶ πτωθέναι τὰς βάσεις διέσωσεν ἡ Θέτις.}
\end{align*}
\]

Apollodoros presumably adapts freely the version recorded in *Il. 1. 590-94*, where Hephaistos remembers the occasion when he attempted to aid his mother against Zeus and was hurled from the threshold by the latter for his troubles; he then fell for an entire day before crashing on Lemnos, where its inhabitants took care of him. Nowhere in the story is it stated that Hephaistos was crippled as a result of this fall (and, in fact, such assertion would contradict the account in *Il. 18*, also narrated by Hephaistos); nor is the reason for the quarrel recorded. However, for someone who was aware of the events narrated in *Il. 15. 18-30*, where Zeus hung Hera up in the air with anvils tied to her feet as a punishment for pursuing her hatred against Herakles, and where Zeus specifically stated that he would hurl to earth anyone who tried to help Hera, it would have been easy to construct a coherent and plausible explanation for Hephaistos’ lameness, without having to allow for two markedly separate events that ended in an identical type of punishment. As a result, the story acquires a additional meaning: not only is Hera unable to gain any power against her husband’s wishes, but her son is also unable
to pose any serious threat to her husband or even defend her. Both are severely punished with afflictions to their feet (a remnant perhaps of the chthonic nature of both gods and a suitable punishment inflicted by a sky-god). All this happens on account of a mortal, the offspring of an illicit affair of her husband. Such an offence would certainly merit vindictive action against the father, since it is a direct transgression against the mother. The actions of Ouranos and Kronos that prompted Gaia and Rhea to dethrone them were directed at their children. Zeus' actions are an offence against the mother herself, but Hera's position in relation to her "foremothers" is so diminished that she cannot even act against the mortal son, let alone against her husband. As for her son, whether the offspring of parthenogenetic procreation or of the sexual union of a male and a female, he is totally ineffectual.

Artemis and Apollo, together with Persephone, whose story is related with details which are surprisingly numerous for Apollodoros, occupy the largest part of the list of Zeus' children. The twins' prominence is stressed by the fact that only they are given specific functions and characteristics. The familiar story of their birth is followed by a catalogue of exploits, in which the story of Orion features prominently.
D. Orion

The figure of Orion, hunter par excellence, is as bewildering as it is interesting: his life is a collage of unrelated episodes, of which no single, standard version exists. As Fontenrose points out, the “sources reveal a confusing variety of traditions concerning nearly every episode of the hero’s life.” Only in later mythographers do we find attempts to produce a coherent and complete version of it; however, some of the episodes of his biography remain completely unintegrated.

Apollodoros starts his account Orion’s deeds by offering two possible origins. According to Pherekydes (FGrHist 3 F 52) he is the son of Poseidon and Euryale. The same parentage is attested by Ps.-Eratosthenes (Katasterismoi 32), who ascribes it to Hesiod (fr. 148a M.-W.). The whole account seems to go back to the Hesiodic Astronomia. This narrative is very close to that of Apollodoros. Both include the detail of Orion’s ability to walk upon (or in later versions wade through) water, an ability common to other sons of Poseidon. It would seem, however, that this particular detail was closely linked to his gigantic stature. This

---

114 Thus Virgil, Aeneid 10. 763-7:
quam magnus Orion,
cum pedes incedit medi per maxima Nerei
stagna viam scindens, umero supereminet undas,
aut summis referens annosam montibus ornum
ingrediturque solo et caput inter nubila condit.
Also Servius (Σ Aen. 10. 763): non autem incongrue fingitur ire potuisse per medium pelagus,
 quasi filius pro patre Neptuni. ... alii hunc Orionem tantae magnitudinis dicuntuisse, ut nulla
eum alitudo maris ingrediat potuerit morari.
115 Cf. Euphemos in Apollonios’ Argonautika 1. 179-84: κείνος ἄνηρ καὶ πόντου ἐπὶ γλαύκοιο θέσει (182). This ability must have been attributed to Euphemos quite early, since Pindar included him in the crew of the Argo (P 4. 173-5) which went back to the original story in which each participant had a special skill that made him an irreplaceable member of the crew (see below in Chapter Five the discussion of the Argonautic Catalogue).
116 Fontenrose, ibid. 19, is right in suggesting that Orion’s ability to wade through the sea was the earlier version of the myth. This was changed as early as Hesiod to an ability to walk on the surface of the sea (we should note that Hesiod does not mention Orion’s gigantic height; Orion is
brings us to the second parentage recorded by Apollodoros: Orion is said to be γηενης. Nonnos also refers to Orion as δυοσίμερον υιός γαίης, perhaps alluding to another late-appearing version of Orion's birth, which is found for the first time in Palaiphatos 51:117 Hyrieus entertained the gods Zeus, Poseidon and Hermes.118

As a reward for his hospitality he asked for a son. The gods took the hide of the sacrificed bull and covered it with semen.119 They then instructed Hyrieus to bury the hide in the ground for ten months; thus Orion came to life.120 Apollodoros could also be referring to the same myth. However, in 3.10.1, Hyrieus is presented as having two sons, Lykos and Nykteus (the father of Antiope), by the nymph Klonia. Apollodoros does not refer to Orion at this point. In fact, it more probable that Apollodoros follows a source that made Orion a son of Gaia because of his gigantic height; for all giants are children of Gaia. Another giant, Tityos, (who, in Apollodoros, is linked to Orion) is born of Elare and Zeus, but can be called a descendant of Earth, since Zeus hid his mother in the ground, and it was from it that Tityos came forth to light (1.4.1). The mythographer points to this explanation

portrayed as a human being, who suffers and dies for his own hybris). Only later, when the size of Orion becomes gigantic again, given his popularity owing to the identification of his constellation with Mithras (see Speidel 1980, passim) do we hear again of his ability to wade through water.

117 The story is also found, apart from the sources mentioned above in Hyg. Fab. 195, and in Euphorion fr. 105 van Groningen, 175.
118 Zeus and Hermes in Hyg., Astr. 2.34.1, Zeus, but Hermes and Ares in Servius ad Aen. 1. 535, and Zeus, Poseidon and Apollo in Σ Nikandros Ther. 15.
119 Or urine, thus offering an etymological explanation of Orion's name, cf. Hesiod fr. 148b M.-W., Σ Nikandros Ther. 15.
120 The story is also ascribed to Hesiod (fr. 148b M.-W.) by the Scholia to Germanicus' Aratea, p. 93.13 Breisig. However, this attribution contradicts Orion's descent from Poseidon and Euryale, attributed to Hesiod by Ps.-Eratosthenes, Sch. in Nikandros Ther. 15, and Hyg. Astr. 2.34.1. The last two sources clearly distinguish Hesiod's version of his parentage (followed in both texts by a reference to Orion's ability to walk on water) from the story about Hyrieus, which is clearly an attempt to etymologise Orion's name. In Hyginus, in fact, Antimachos and Hesiod, who are said by the scholiast to Germanicus to give the same story about Orion's miraculous birth (similem originem reperit Hesiodus) are used as sources of conflicting material. The scholiast's reference to Hesiod must be a mistake.
by linking Orion’s parentage with his gigantic stature: γηγενη λέγουσιν ὑπερμεγέθη τὸ σῶμα.

The next detail found in Apollodoros, the reference to Orion’s marriage to Side, is unique. Only Ovid makes a passing reference to Orion’s yearning for her:

\[ \text{pallidus in Side silvis errabat Orion} \] (Ovid, Ars Amatoria 1.731). This gives a hint about Orion’s Boiotian origin, since σιδη is the Boiotian word for pomegranate; in fact, the banishment of Side to the Underworld at this point neatly puts the fruit in the nether lands before the arrival of Persephone. Otherwise, we would have, for the moment, to accept Fontenrose’s assertion that the marriage seems to have no significance for the Orion myth.\(^{121}\)

Apollodoros then turns to the most popular episodes of Orion’s life. First he deals with his sojourn in Chios, his drunkenness and assault on Merope, Oinopion’s daughter,\(^ {122}\) and his punishment. The story shares many elements with that ascribed to Hesiod. A number of details, however, prevent us from identifying of Hesiod as Apollodoros’ source. In Hesiod, Orion first gets drunk and then attacks Merope. In Apollodoros, Oinopion uses wine as the means to incapacitate Orion so that he can blind him. There is a vagueness about Apollodoros’ account. Orion is said to woo Merope. The word used, ἐμνηστεόσατο, does not indicate the use of any force. In fact, throughout Apollodoros, it is used to denote a betrothal without any nuances of violence. As it is, Apollodoros’ account does not explain Oinopion’s reaction. Even if we accept that an account like that of

\(^{121}\) Fontenrose 1981, 7.

\(^{122}\) Hesiod points out that Euryale was a daughter of Minos, thus forging a bond between Orion and Oinopion, the son of Ariadne and Dionysos (Epi
tome 1. 9). Apollodoros (and Pherekydes) do not refer to Euryale’s parentage. In Apollodoros neither Orion nor Oinopion have a close connection with Krete; only Hesiod seems to exploit this part of Orion’s origin, by having him hunting with Leto and Artemis on the island of Krete, where he meets his death.
Parthenios (*Narrationes Amatoriae* 20) is implied, where Merope is promised to Orion but the marriage is delayed by Oinopion’s reluctance, whereupon Orion takes matters into his own hands, the drunken assault comes before Oinopion’s action. In all other accounts of the story, wine is the catalyst for the rape. In Apollodoros, wine is used after Orion has offered violence to Merope. We can accept Fontenrose’s suggestion that Apollodoros inverted the sequence of events. But, if we accept the sequence of events as it is, a more gruesome image of Orion surfaces. We are dealing with a cold-blooded rapist with no excuse for his attack. In some accounts, we find references to Orion’s ability to hunt and use of this ability to woo Merope (cf. Parthenios *NA* 20: διὰ ταύτην [the daughter of Oinopion, called Lero by Parthenios] τὴν τε νῆσον ἔξιμερόδαια τότε θηρίων ἀνάπλεων οὖσαν λείαν τε πολλὴν τῶν προσχώρων ἔδω αἰδώναι). Parthenios indicates that Orion was in love with the girl. In Apollodoros, surprisingly, we have no reference to his unique skill of hunting. All the episodes in his narrative show Orion in a negative light. Even though he is allowed to recover his sight, Oinopion is not punished. One could well argue that Oinopion was justified in his actions; for Apollodoros seems not to allude to a story in which Oinopion, driven by an incestuous passion, blinded her suitors without a reason. This would mean that we had to detect this unmentioned attack on Merope in the innocuous verb ἐμνηστεόσατο. Van der Valk argues for such a solution by referring to several incidents in the *Bibliotheke*, in which raw sexual emotions and actions are disguised for the sake of decency. In the same paragraph Apollodoros refers to

---

123 In the same way, wine causes the deaths of Ikarios and Erigone (3.19.7).
124 Fontenrose 1981, 8.
125 See Lightfoot 1999, 493-496.
126 See Speidel 1981, 36, where the association of Mithras and Orion with the sun is discussed.
127 Van der Valk 1959, 101.
Orion’s attempt against Opis, the Hyperborean Maiden. The word \( \beta\iota\alpha\zeta\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron \) does not have to entail sexual violence: however, in the light of the previous episode, this is how one should understand it. But since we are told that this attempt is unsuccessful, there is here no need to disguise the events.

Orion recovers his sight and returns to punish Oinopion.\(^{128}\) At this point, Apollodoros offers a curious detail that is difficult to reconcile with the previous narrative. Poseidon hid Oinopion in an underground chamber made by Hephaistos. The reference to Poseidon does not make sense, especially if we take into account his relentless pursuit of those who harmed his sons, e.g. Odysseus for blinding Polyphemos. We would not expect Poseidon to take pity on Oinopion, because his son was to blame. I do not accept Fontenrose’s suggestion that we are meant to understand that “Poseidon ended Oinopion’s life and sent him in a special prison in the abode of the dead”.\(^{129}\) Obviously, the underground chamber is an allusion to Oinopion’s impressive tomb on Chios (Paus. 7. 5. 13). However, had Poseidon taken the law into his hands, Apollodoros would have stated that Poseidon killed him, not that he saved him. Perhaps we are dealing with a conflation of two contradictory accounts (cf. 1.9.21, where Poseidon appears to have blinded his son Phineus). One would have expected Dionysos, as the father of the king, to be his saviour; in Hesiod, however, and in the Scholiast to Nikandros Ther. 15, is it said

\[^{128}\text{For a treatment of the part of the myth concerning Orion’s recovery of his sight, see Fontenrose 1981, 9-11. On the choice of punishment, Kerényi 1951, 202-3, faithful to his Jungian ideas, mistakenly suggests that Orion suffers the punishment of all those who commit incest (namely Oidipous). He bases his suggestion on the facts that Servius 10. 763 mentions Oinopion as Orion’s father (a statement Servius discredits in the same paragraph), and that Pindar (fr. 72) mentions that Orion raped Oinopion’s wife. To return to the recovery of Orion’s eyesight: the fact that Apollodoros does not name the helper whom he snatched up at the smithy of Hephaistos may be a further indication that his account does not go back to Hesiod (who names Kedalion). As for Sophokles’ satyric Kedalion (TrGF IV 328-333 Radt), its plot is difficult to reconstruct, and we cannot say whether any part of Apollodoros’ account derives from it. See Pearson II 1917, 8-13.}\]

\[^{129}\text{Ibid. 12.}\]
that Oinopion ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτῶν ὑπὸ γῆν ἐκέκρυτο (Hesiod fr. 148a M.-W. = Ps.-Eratosthenes 32).

The final episode of Orion's life is his death at the hands of Artemis. It has been suggested that the episode was taken up by Euphorion, who also mentions that Orion attacked Opis (fr. 106 = Σ Od. 5.121). However, as van Groningen points out, since in fr. 105 it is clearly stated that Artemis killed Orion because he tried to violate her, "par Oupis" (an epithet attributed to Artemis) "le poète n'entend personne d'autre qu'Artemis". This could imply either that Apollodoros misunderstood his source, which gave the popular account of Orion's death, i.e. his attack on Artemis, or that he deliberately chose to use a source in which Orion's victim was someone other than the goddess. The attack on Artemis need not have entailed a personal relationship with Orion (something stated by most of the sources). Apollodoros makes no reference to Orion's hunting skills, thus disregarding all those sources (including Hesiod) that have him find death because of it, and removing the setting for an attempted rape against Artemis (cf. Palaiphatos 51).

The reasons given for Orion's death fit the pattern set by the deaths that precede this account. Apollodoros must introduce Apollo's main skill, his art of prophecy. In order to do so, he has to mention the death of Python. However, this leads him to a list of Apollo's other exploits in the area of Delphi. The murder of Tityos, another rapist, leads quite logically to the death of Marsyas, who challenges Apollo's dominance in the field of music. Tityos' murder was a common

---

130 On his snatching by Eos, also mentioned by Σ Od. 5. 121, see Gantz 1996, I, 272-3. On the meaning of the abductions by Eos, see Vermeule 1979, 163-5.
132 Van Groningen 1977, 177.
endeavour of Apollo and Artemis, but Marsyas was killed by Apollo alone; so the balance of the narrative demands a similar deed by Artemis. This is how the story of Orion is incorporated into the narrative. Orion must die either because he challenged Artemis' ability at something (hence the elsewhere unattested challenge to a match of quoits), or because he tried to violate someone from the goddess' entourage (with Opis, a "citizen" of Delos, taking the place of Leto). This narrative plan, of course, works, even when Artemis is the victim of the assault.

We have already suggested that Apollodoros' purpose is to show Orion in a negative light; the link established with the stories that precede means that Orion too must be punished because of his *hybris*. The first rape establishes a pattern, that of a violent, impetuous character, lacking in self-control, and marked by excess. In this light, the inclusion of his marriage to Side makes absolute sense: even his extended family is characterised by *hybris*. Orion's negative side is stressed by something that is not included in the account: his final *catasterism*. Apollodoros says nothing of this most famous of Orion's myths (already found in *II* 18.486). To do so would mean that he would have to explain what Orion did to deserve immortalisation in the sky. As he is seen in Apollodoros, Orion deserves punishment after his death, not reward (cf. however the narrative of Hesiod, in which Orion is rewarded because he is a great hunter). One could argue that Apollodoros leaves all reference to catasterisms out of his narrative (as in the case of Aigipan, which will be discussed in Chapter Three). However, this is not true. In the story of Kallisto, where the catasterism is also firmly incorporated into the

---

133 For a view of Orion as a civiliser see Renaud 1996, 86.
134 See ibid. 88.
135 Surely the listing of Orion before the great sinners in *Od* 10.573-5 indicates a negative feeling about him, apart from the fact that, together with the other great hunter, Herakles, he frames the narrative (thus Griffiths 1986, 66, n. 48).
traditional story, the mythographer does mention her metamorphosis into a star (3.8.2). Apollodoros consciously chooses not to mention Orion’s metamorphosis (despite the popularity which these myths had in the Roman period), and, with it, any reference to mythical versions related to it. Thus we find no mention to the scorpion that in most sources killed him (and which, by the way, is not a new version, as D. Kidd suggests,\textsuperscript{136} since it already appears as the instrument of Orion’s death in Hesiod – where, however, it is sent by Gaia); nor is there a reference to another story with amorous connotations, his continuous pursuit of the Pleiades, (found already in the \textit{Titanomachia} fr. 14 Bernabé),\textsuperscript{137} one of whom was also named Merope, sharing a name with the daughter of Oinopion. The Pleiad Merope is the wife of Sisyphos,\textsuperscript{138} another figure that, as we saw, is presented in a totally negative light by the mythographer. Are we dealing with a conscious effort to present all the figures that challenged gods in an identical fashion?

\textsuperscript{136} Kidd 1997, 396.
\textsuperscript{137} See also Σ to Aratos \textit{Phainomena} 254; also Σ to Pindar \textit{N} 2. 10, Hyg. \textit{Astr.} 2. 21.4, Σ to Apoll. Rhod. 3. 225, and Athenaios 11. 490d-e, for a version where the object of the amorous pursuit is Pleione, the mother of the Pleiades (cf. Apollodoros 3. 10.1).
\textsuperscript{138} See Pherekydes (\textit{FGrHist} 3 F 19) and Hellanikos (\textit{FGrHist} 4 F 19), Apollodoros 1.9.3 and 3.10.1.
The divine genealogy

**Ouranos – Gaia**

- Erinyes (Alekto, Tisiphone, Megaira)

**Hekatoncheires**
- Briareos
- Gyes
- Kottos

**Kyklopes**
- Arges
- Steropes
- Brontes

**Titanes**
- Okeanos
- Koios
- Hyperion
- Kreios
- Iapetos
- Kronos

Kronos – Rhea

- Hestia
- Demeter
- Hera
- Plouton
- Poseidon
- Zeus
Part II:

"Theomachia": The struggle for divine supremacy and the three stages of the succession-myth (1.1.1-6.3)
Chapter Two

The world before Zeus: from Ouranos to Kronos

A. Introduction

"In the wonderful song of the soul's high adventure", as J. Campbell called the marvellous world of myth, traditions of origin and creation hold an unparalleled position. In fact, they are considered by M. Eliade and his disciples to be the basis for all myth. Cosmic myths, concerned with the great facts of existence, and theistic myths, describing cultural hierarchies which derive from the establishment of the universal order, are conscious attempts to offer the answer, ever elusive to humankind, to the inevitable question of beginnings. Consequently, they are firmly rooted in the mythical and religious systems of many cultures: accounts of the origin of the κόσμος and the birth of the gods that people it "are to be found over a very wide area, from Iceland to Pacific". It is thus hardly surprising that the corpus of Greek myth preserves a considerable number of versions of the creation and first beginnings. A number of ancient literary sources (both poetic and in prose) are known or assumed to have contained information on these earliest stages of the universe. We are fortunate to possess the work of the authority whom "the Greeks themselves most revered, Hesiod, whose Theogony [...] offers a brief account of the origins of the cosmos as preface to the extolling of Zeus' rule". Hesiod's work, the representative of the genre best known to us, was by no means unique; unfortunately, however, there is very little that remains extant of the other works of this context (cosmogonies attributed to poets such as Orpheus,
Mousaios, or Epimenides, as well as the material ascribed to the great mythographers of the sixth century, mainly Akousilaos of Argos and Pherekydes of Athens, or to such poems as the one that held the initial place in the Epic Cycle). Still, the mere enumeration of these works indicates the important position which the genre held in Greek mythology and literature.

Palpably, Apollodoros' compendium is dominated to an unusual degree by heroic mythology: we have already noted that it presents us mainly with a systematisation of the traditions concerning Greek myths, organised on a genealogical basis, family by family, beginning with the family of Deukalion and ending with the wanderings and returns of the Achaians after the fall of Troy. However, the long cosmogonic tradition described above is by no means neglected: the work's first six paragraphs are dedicated to the earlier stages of the world and its gods. And not only that: as we shall see, the version of the succession-myth offered by Apollodoros is in many respects unique. The accounts of the castration of Ouranos and of the Titanomachy offer a brief, but "corrected" variant of the theogonic myth; moreover, the extensive account that brings to its conclusion this first section of the Bibliotheka, narrating Zeus' battle against Gaia and her offspring, the Giants and Typhon, preserves mythical versions which are totally unknown from other sources.

It is generally assumed that, in composing this section, Apollodoros blended material taken from more than one source. Moreover, Apollodoros himself is not considered bold enough to have created a new, original account, by rearranging, simplifying and evaluating the mythical versions which he had at his disposal. It is usually suggested that the author chooses one source for each section of the succession-myth, which he then follows faithfully to the end of that
specific narrative. Thus, the section on the Titanomachy is thought to have been taken from a source different from that on the Typhonomachy, or that on the Gigantomachy. A closer study of the narrative, however, reveals the existence of an impressive number of recurrent themes that link together the three accounts of the struggles for divine kingship, and amplify their meaning. I shall argue that such an elaborate scheme cannot be accidental, nor can it be the work of a compiler who jumps from one source to another at the end of each divine conflict. Rather, it is part of the conscious effort of an author to present the succession-myth in a single, painstakingly worked narrative, and one full of unique details.

In the following section, following Apollodoros’ paradigm, we shall study, firstly, the brief account of the first two stages of the succession-story: first, Ouranos versus Kronos (1.1.1-4), and then Kronos and the Titans versus Zeus and Olympians (1.1.5-1.2.1). Then we shall turn to the more detailed accounts of the Gigantomachy and the Typhonomachy, which will be treated as two complementary parts of the same stage of the succession-struggle. Since we only become aware of the existence of this elaborate “knitting” together of motifs upon their reappearances in the narrative, we will discuss their importance in Chapter Three.
B. The first two stages of the succession-myth. Remnants of an Orphic poem?

One of the most interesting problems concerning Apollodoros’ work has to do with the sources upon which he draws. Not having to comply with copyright laws, Apollodoros is not keen on letting his readers know the origins of the versions of myths which he uses; rarely does he mention by name the author from which he takes his information. In the whole work (including the *Epitome*, on which we have to rely for the lost last part of the *Bibliotheke*), we may count 83 allusions to 30 authors. A survey of these quotations makes clear that they all have to do with alternative mythical accounts: the quoted authors offer versions that depart from Apollodoros’ main sources. Usually, they offer alternative genealogies: thus 51 out of 83 references, = 61%, give variant versions of parentage and kinship. However, some present differences in mythical details (31 out of 83, = 38%), and one, at 2.1.3 offers the mythical justification of a belief (it explains why, according to Hesiod, a lover’s vow is not valid).

Such references to specific sources are completely missing from the first part of the work, where the theogonic and succession-myths are narrated. It is impossible to determine with certainty what prompted Apollodoros completely to conceal the source or sources which he uses: the study of the text clearly demonstrates that he attempts to give a brief and comprehensive version of the cosmogonic myth. It is thus possible that he felt that a story which explained the establishment of current socio-cultural institutions should come in one single version, which would not hinder his readers’ understanding of it. The recording of
different versions of this, the most important of myths, would undermine its importance. This could explain why he chose to begin his narrative with the marriage of Ouranos and Gaia, a rather late stage in the Greek creational stemma as recorded in the Hesiodic *Theogony*.

We have to take into account the fact that Hesiod and Apollodoros had different reasons for composing their works: the mythographer purports to give a brief and coherent version of the theogonic myth. His efforts are concentrated on the harmonisation of the material at hand and, consequently, on the creation of a fluent and consistent account of a mythological system fixed for all time, and free from anything that could jeopardise its logic and coherence. The varying and confusing narratives about the primeval elements and origin of the world offer no firm ground for someone with Apollodoros' aims of uniformity, coherence and brevity. This fact may have prompted him to omit any discussion of the myths concerning the coming-into-being of the first divine beings. Instead, he chose to begin his narrative from a later stage of the theogony, namely the marriage of Heaven and Earth, one which was widely accepted and easily comprehensible by the general, unsophisticated audience, or indeed he chose a source that did not contain such a discussion.

Hesiod's main reason for composing his *Theogony*, on the other hand, was to narrate the formation of the present order and to celebrate the establishment of Zeus' rule by contrasting the present dispensation with the past: "Hesiod begins with the beginning of things; but he is not interested in cosmogony for its own sake. He hurries over it, anxious to get to the sons of Ouranos and their story".141

141 West 1966, 192.
And not only that: he was also concerned to explain, by means of genealogies, every force which, in one way or another, affected human life, and its position in the new divine order.

All the different kinds of gods, as distinguished by West, have their place in the Hesiodic pyramid. This is not the case in Apollodoros: he naturally incorporates a great number of genealogical lists (cf. 1.2.2-1.5.3), but refers only to the fully anthropomorphic generations of gods that come after Ouranos and Gaia (with the notable exception of the family of Styx, cf. 1.2.4), i.e. to those beings who have a closer relation with the human race, either as objects of cult or as ancestors of human families. As Caldwell points out regarding the omission of all Hesiod's "abstractions" (abstract entities like Mórōς, Θάνατος, Υπνός, Μόμος etc., Theogony 211ff.), Apollodoros "is simply not interested in anything that did not play a mythological role". This may also explain why he never mentions Nyx (an important figure in Hesiod and Homer, and even more so in the Orphic theogonic fragments OF 98-113 Kern), let alone her offspring. I would also suggest that Apollodoros does not mention Eros at all (even as a child of Aphrodite) because, since the power of Love is represented by Aphrodite herself,

---

142 Caldwell 1989, 143.
143 West 1966, 31.
144 Styx and her family play a significant role in Hesiod's version of the Titanomachy:

ηλθε δ' ἄρα πρώτη Στώξ ὁφέτος Θεολογία
σὺν σφόδρα παθέσας φίλου διὰ μὴνει πατρός
τὴν δὲ Ζεύς τιμησε, περίσσα δὲ δῶρα ἔδωκεν (Theogony 397-99).

Their importance is echoed by Apollodoros: ταῦταν αὐτὴ τιμήν διδοὺς ἄνθρωποι αὐτῷ κατὰ Τετάκοι τῶν τέκνων συνεμάχησε. Significantly enough, however, their contribution is only mentioned in the genealogical digression (1.2.4), which is heavily influenced by the Theogony, and not in the actual account of the battle, which, as we shall see, is somewhat different from Hesiod's version.
145 Caldwell 1989, 143.
146 See Ramnoux 1959, passim.
he considered Eros to be a supplementary secondary force, and thus an unnecessary complication.\footnote{147}

Hesiod's \textit{Theogony} was the closest the Greeks came to having an “official” account of the origin of the universe; the poem was indeed the “basic textbook of Greek religion”,\footnote{148} and thus its influence cannot be underestimated.\footnote{149} The mirroring in Apollodoros (especially in the genealogical lists) of nearly all the constituents of Hesiod's narrative is indisputable. Yet the beginning of Apollodoros’ account (1.1.1-1.1.3 & 1.1.5) differs considerably from that of Hesiod's. The mythographer follows a mythical version that in a way “corrects” the story told by Hesiod. It is true that many of the apparent differences and disagreements between the two versions “are explicable on the assumption that the mythographer has reworked his source and changed it by the processes of omission, rearrangement, and simplification”.\footnote{150} Such cases will be discussed presently. Still, a number of details in Apollodoros’ narrative are completely absent from Hesiod, which leads to the conclusion that he must have made use of some source other than Hesiod.

A Byzantine author offers a possible solution to the puzzle of Apollodoros' other source. In Photios' recapitulation of Proklos' \textit{Chrestomathia} or \textit{Summary of Useful Knowledge} we read:\footnote{151}

\begin{verbatim}
diavolambanei de kai peri toh leugomenou epiko Kuklou, de orxetai mene ek tis Ouranoj kai Ghes muthologoumenes mixeos, ezi tis autw
\end{verbatim}

\footnote{147} On the importance of Eros in Greek cosmogonic myths see Rudhard 1986, passim.\footnote{148} Burkert 1985, 122.\footnote{149} Cf. Gantz 1996, 1, 2; West 1983, 123.\footnote{150} Davies 1989, 13.\footnote{151} See Davies 1989, 6-8.
καὶ τρεῖς παιδας Ἐκατοντάχειρας καὶ τρεῖς γεννώσι Κύκλωπας
(Theogony I Bernabé = T 1/ Titanomachia F 2 Davies).

It has been established that Apollodoros knew the poems whose relatively early date, subject and style caused them to be included in the edition of the Epic Cycle\(^{152}\) (whether his knowledge came from the actual poems or from a prose summary of them is irrelevant to our discussion at this point); so it is possible that he drew, at least for his first part of his Theomachy, on a now lost poem once situated at the beginning of the epic Cycle.

However, the identification of this poem is in doubt. We know that at the beginning of the Cycle there was a Titanomachia attributed to Eumelos of Korinth or Arktinos. This poem certainly contained theogonic information: Αἰθέρος δ' υἱός Οὐρανός, ὡς ὁ τὴν Τιτανομαχίαν γράψας (F 1\(^{A}\) Davies = F 2 Bernabé) and ὁ δὲ τὴν Τιτανομαχίαν γράψας ἔξ Ἀιθέρος φησὶν (scil. τὰ πάντα) (F 1\(^{B}\) Davies = F 1 Bernabé). Hence, one can identify Apollodoros’ source as the Titanomachia, as does Davies: “[i]n other words, just as Hesiod’s Theogony included a Titanomachy (at lines 617ff.), so the Cycle’s Titanomachy seems to have included a Theogony, or details relevant thereto, near its beginning.”\(^{153}\) This conclusion would imply that Apollodoros himself omitted all discussion about the coming-to-being of the first divine beings, or that he drew his narrative not from the actual poem, but from a secondary source, which, for reasons similar to the ones discussed above, chose to omit every reference to the first stages of the theogonic myth. It is impossible to prove that Apollodoros did not read the original

\(^{152}\) See Davies 1986, 105-6.

\(^{153}\) Davies 1989, 13.
himself; indeed it would be rather uncharitable to rush to such a conclusion. In my view, he must have access to the original poem from which he selected the material included in his account. In any case, I find this discussion rather futile: whoever is responsible for summarising these works, whether it was Apollodorus or some previous mythographer, upon whom Apollodorus relied heavily, the truth is that it has been proven, time and time again, that for the most part the Bibliotheke reproduces faithfully original works. Hence, the question of who actually did the summarising seems to be irrelevant.

West, however, offers a new, quite different solution to the problem of Apollodorus’ sources. He links Apollodorus’ account with Orphism, based on a number of features common to Apollodorus’ narrative and the Orphic Rhapsodies. These are:

b) The Kyklopes and the Hundred-Handers are born before the Titans, not after them, as in Hesiod. It is their imprisonment that incites the Titans to castrate him. Cf. Οὐρανὸς δὲ Γῆ μειχθείς γεννᾷ θηλείας μὲν Κλώθῳ Λάχεσιν Ἀτροπόν, ἀνδρας δὲ ἔκατογχειρας Κόττον Γύγην Βριάρεων, καὶ Κόκλωπας Βρόντην καὶ Στερόπην καὶ Ἀργην: οὕς καὶ δήσας κατεταρτάρωσεν, ἐκπεσεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν παιδῶν τῆς ἀρχῆς μαθόν· διὸ καὶ ὀργισθεὶσα ἡ Γῆ τοὺς Τιτᾶνας ἐγέννησεν (OF fr. 57 Kern = Athenag. Pro Christianis 18).

c) In Apollodorus Ouranos is expressly designated first ruler of the world:
Οὐρανὸς πρῶτος τοῦ παντὸς ἐδυνάστευσε κόσμου. This qualification is

---

154 West 1983, 121ff.
155 In Apollodorus the Moirai are the children of Zeus and Themis and belong to the cluster of female offspring that identify and consolidate the new-found divine power of Zeus. See Chapter One for more details.
also found in OF fr. 104 Kern = Prokl. in Plat. Tim. E proem. III 169, 15, διο τὴν Οὐρανοῦ πρώτην καὶ Γῆς ἐξουμνεῖ βασιλείαν, συνηθεστέρα τοῖς Ἐλλησιν ὁδὸς (the italics are mine), OF fr. 107 Kern (= Prokl. in Plat. Tim. 40e), Οὐρανός, δς πρῶτος βασίλευσε θεῶν μετὰ μητέρα Νόκτα (a phrase also found in OF fr. 111 Kern), and in the Derveni papyrus, Οὐρανός Εὐφρονίδης δς πρῶτιστος βασίλευσε (col. XIV in the translation of Laks & Most = col. X in ZPE 1982).\

\[
\text{d) In both sources Dione appears in the list of Titans in addition to the Hesiodic twelve. Cf. OF fr. 114 Kern = Prokl. in Plat. Tim. 40e:}
\]

\[
\text{ἐπτὰ μὲν εὐειδεῖς κόρας ἀγνάς,ἀγνάς}
\]
\[
\text{ἐπτὰ δὲ παιδᾶς ἀνακτὰς ἐγείνατο λαχνήνεντας.}
\]
\[
\text{θυγατέρας μὲν <τίκτε> 157 θέμιν καὶ ἐὐφρονα Τηθῶν}
\]
\[
\text{Μνημοσύνην τε βαθυπλόκαμον θείαν τε μάκαιραν,}
\]
\[
\text{ηδὲ Διώνην τίκτεν ἀριτρεπές εἴδος ἐχουσαν}
\]
\[
\text{Φοίβην τε Ἱείνῃ τε, Δίος γενέτειραν ἀνακτός,}
\]
\[
\text{παιδᾶς δὲ ἄλλους τοσοῦτος:}
\]
\[
\text{Κοιὸν τε Κρίδν τε μέγαν Φώρκν τε κραταίον}
\]
\[
\text{καὶ Κρόνον Ὁκεανὸν Θ' ὑπερίσκα τ' ἱπετόν τε.}
\]

Here we have fourteen Titans, including Dione but also Phorkys,\textsuperscript{158} who in Apollodoros (1.2.6), as in Hesiod's \textit{Theogony} (237), is one of the offspring of Gaia and Pontos.

\textsuperscript{156} See below section C (I).
\textsuperscript{157} <τίκτε?> Kern.
e) In Apollodoros, Okeanos is explicitly excluded from the assault on Ouranos.

Cf. OF fr. 135 Kern = Prokl. in Plat. Tim. 40e:

τῶν γὰρ ἄλλων Τιτάνων εἰς τὴν κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐπιβουλὴν ἑιμένων ὁ Ὀκεανός ἀπαγορεύει τε πρὸς τὰς μητρὸς ἐπιτάξεις καὶ ἐνδοιάζει περὶ τῆς πράξεως:

ἐνθα αὐτ' Ὁκεανός μὲν ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἐμιμνεν ὅρμαίνων, ποτέρωσε νόον τράποι, ἣ πατέρα δὲν γυ<ι>ώση τε βίης καὶ ἀτάσθαλα λαβήσαιτο σὺν Κρόνῳ ἃδ' ἀλλοισιν ἀδελφοῖς, οἷ πεπίθοντο μητρὶ φίλη, ἢ τοὺς γε λιπὼν μένοι ἐνδὸν ἐκηλος. πολλὰ δὲ πορφύρων μένεν ἡμενος ἐν μεγάροισιν σκυξόμενος ἢ μητρὶ, κασιγνήτουισι δὲ μᾶλλον.

μένει οὖν οὗτος ἀμα καὶ πρόεισι μετὰ θυγὸς συνεξευκται γὰρ αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν πρώτην ἀπογέννησιν. οἷ δὲ ἄλλοι Τιτάνες εἰς διάκρισιν ἐπείγονται καὶ πρόδον, ἤγείται δὲ αὐτῶν ὁ μέγιστος Κρόνος, ὡς φησιν ὁ θεολόγος (see below section iv). In Hesiod, however, only Kronos attacks his father (Theogony 167ff.).

f) Zeus is nurtured by the nymphs Adrasteia and Ida, daughters of Melissos, and guarded by the Kouretes (1.1.6-7; cf. OF. frs. 105, 162 Kern = Prokl. in Plat. Tim. 41e: καὶ γὰρ ὁ δημιουργὸς, ός ὁ Ὄρφεὺς φησι, τρέφεται μὲν ἀπό τῆς Ἀδραστείας...).

g) Finally, the division of the universe among the three sons of Kronos is described in the Bibliothèque (1.2.1), as it is also in the Orphic fragments:

158 Cf. Plato, Timaeus 40c: οὕτως οὖν κατ' ἐκείνους ἡμῖν ἡ γένεσις περὶ τοῦτον τῶν θεῶν ἔχεται καὶ λεγόμενον Τῆς τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ παϊδείς Ὅκεανος τε καὶ Τηθύς ἐγενέσθην, τοῦτον δὲ Φόρκυς, Κρόνος τε καὶ Ὅρεα καὶ δεῖ αυτὰ τοῖς τοῦτον...; see below section C (iii).
see OF fr. 56 Kern = Rufin. Recognit. X 19, primus ergo procedens descendit Orcus, et inferiora, hoc est inferna, occupat loca. secundus utpote illo superior super aquas detruditur, is quem Neptunum vocant. tertius qui arte matris Rheae superfuit, ab ipsa caprae superpositus in coelum emissus est.

Based on these similarities between Apollodoros and the Orphic corpus, West proceeds to identify the source of Apollodoros as a theogonic poem which was situated at the beginning of the Epic Cycle, artificially constructed to serve as an introduction to the edition, and which went under the name of Orpheus. According to West, Apollodoros drew on a prose summary of the Cycle, which, in his view, was organised as an entity in the third century B.C. This poem was, in all probability, a creation of the compiler of the Cycle, “a contaminated account”, which attempted to reconcile the earlier Orphic Protogonos and Eudemian theogonies.

West’s work on the Orphic poems is admirable: it is not easy to take such different and sometimes contradictory material and create from it a coherent and attractive theory. Yet I have to agree with those who believe that his arguments are obviously stronger at the beginning (the Protogonos Theogony) and at the end (the Rhapsodic Theogony) than in the middle. The part concerning the existence of an Orphic “cyclic” Theogony contains a fair amount of guesswork and is based on very slim evidence. The existence of such a poem depends only on the testimony of Philo of Byblos:

---

159 West 1983, 129.
160 West 1983, 128.
161 Gantz 1996, 2, 742; Richardson 1985, 89.
Philo's testimony can be interpreted in more ways than one: it does not have to mean that there actually was a theogonic poem at the beginning of the Cycle.\(^{162}\) The theogony could be a part of the Titanomachia, which, as we saw, contained theogonic material.\(^{163}\) Anyway, it seems to me improbable that there existed another poem – attributed to Orpheus or not – at the beginning of such a popular literary work, for which no testimony survived. Moreover, such a poem as is described by West, of such small extent and limited content, starting from the marriage of Ouranos and Gaia and ending before the Titanomachia (since Eumelos' poem covered that area),\(^{164}\) composed in the third century to serve as an introduction to a group of poems created around the sixth century,\(^{165}\) with no reference to any of the major Orphic characteristics, such the importance of Nyx and the existence of Protogonos-Phanes, seems more likely to be a modern fabrication than an actual fact.\(^{166}\) What West proposes is not a drastic tailoring of

---

\(^{162}\) Thus Bernabé 1987, 10.

\(^{163}\) So Davies 1988, 17.

\(^{164}\) If the "Cyclic" theogony stopped before the Titanomachy, it could not have contained the division of the universe among the three sons of Kronos, which follows the defeat of the Titans and their imprisonment in Tartaros. This detail must have been taken from another source, probably from Homer's Iliad (15. 185ff., especially 187-93): τριχθα δὲ πάντα δέδοσται, ἔκποτος δ' ἔηεορε τιμῆς. On this see Janko 1992, ad loc.

\(^{165}\) Davies 1989, 4.

\(^{166}\) West (1983, 129), justifies this lack as follows: "[t]he arranger of the cycle aimed to construct an omnibus mythology out of the mass of ancient poems available. He needed an account of the gods' genealogies, an account of the Titanomachy and so on. Some editing was necessary for the sake of continuity and consistency, and it appears that some of the Troy epics at least, were
an existing work: it is the artificial construction of a new poem. And this was not part of the plan of the compiler of the Cycle. As Davies writes:¹⁶⁷ "[t]his is not to infer (what some have supposed) the existence of an edition of the Epic Cycle which achieved total consistency and continuity ... What the Alexandrian editors did was merely to edit a group of epic poems whose relatively early date, subject-matter and style had previously led to their being largely attributed to the author of the Iliad and Odyssey".

The problem with the Orphic material is that the ideas incorporated into it are connected only by the fact that they derive from a poem bearing Orpheus' name. "There was no doctrinal criterion for ascription to Orpheus, and no copyright restriction".¹⁶⁸ As a result, even if a certain idea was part of such a poem, we cannot assume beyond doubt that it originated in an "Orphic" context. This applies equally to the elements common to Apollodoros and the Orphic Rhapsodies (as we shall see, we can trace parallels between Apollodoros and theogonic traditions like those recorded in the Iliad and – possibly – in Akousilaos). The common material (which mainly gives a more logical version of events, correcting Hesiod), is not peculiar or unique, as are the stories concerning Protagonos or Dionysos. Hence we cannot conclude that it originated in an "Orphic" environment. It could have originated somewhere else and then been taken up by "Orphic" authors. Thus we cannot deny the possibility that both works tailored to fit each other. Now it is hardly likely that the editor would have wished to include a special Orphic gospel in his scheme. His poem stood under the name of Orpheus only because it had drawn from Orphic sources. Nor did he care, perhaps for the monstrous Protagonos and all the complexities associated with him. He was content to begin with the marriage of Ouranos and Ge, and to take the story only as far as the deliverance of Zeus' brothers and sisters from Kronos' stomach and the establishment of the Olympian regime under Zeus".

¹⁶⁷ Davies 1989, 2.
¹⁶⁸ West 1983, 3.
used a common source. Unfortunately, the scarcity of information concerning the content of most theogonic works\textsuperscript{169} makes the likelihood of a positive identification of this source very small.

To conclude, although I do not dismiss the possibility that Apollodoros used a source containing "Orphic" material (whether it originally belonged in that environment or not), I disagree with the hypothesis that there was ever an Orphic \textit{Theogony} situated at the beginning of the \textit{Epic Cycle}. Since we have no clues as to what was contained in the archaic \textit{Titanomachia} of Eumelos, so the proposed identification of Apollodoros' source with that poem,\textsuperscript{170} although possible, is far from certain. I believe, however, that this poem (whether it was the \textit{Titanomachia} or another theogonic poem which included the battle against the Titans) was the source of the strange story about the role of Metis in the liberation of the Olympians later in Apollodoros (1.2.1), and of the subsequent accounts of the battles against the Giants and Typhon. We shall return to this discussion shortly.

\textsuperscript{169} For a survey see Sorel 1994, passim.
\textsuperscript{170} Brisson 1985, 407, and Carrière and Massonie 1991, 163.
C. Cosmic variations: unique details in the divine struggle.

(i) Ouranos as sovereign: the first generation of divine kingship (1.1.1).

The beginning of Apollodoros' narrative marks the mythographer's first departure from the Hesiodic version. Apollodoros explicitly designates Ouranos first ruler of the world. The Hesiodic text is different: at no point is Ouranos called "king". The poet reserves the title "king" for Kronos (Ὁδρανίδη μέγ' ἀνακτί, θεῶν προτέρῳ βασιλῆι [codd.: προτέρων West], 486), and, of course, for Zeus (Ζεὺς δὲ θεῶν βασιλεύς, 886). It is Kronos who becomes the first king of the gods for the simple reason that, before the castration of Ouranos, the world cannot be seen as existing. In Apollodoros' version this distinction is not necessary: the world is conceived as pre-existing and no mention to its creation is made. His reference to Ouranos as sovereign could then be seen as a simplification of the text of Hesiod. In Apollodoros, Ouranos is imagined as a fully anthropomorphic figure, not as a primeval cosmogonic power, and the world is as stable as ever. There is no reason for him not to be king.

We have already seen that Ouranos' kingship is mentioned in the Orphic fragments. It would be mistaken to think that this reference is the only possible source of Apollodoros' account. A survey of the theogonic myths of several

---

171 For reasons of interpretation I prefer the reading of the codices προτερῳ βασιλῆι "the first king of the gods". West 1966, 301, points out that this expression is not be found elsewhere in epic: therefore he claims that the text should be corrected, but in so doing he departs, unnecessarily I think, from the reading of all the manuscripts.

peoples makes apparent what Vernant points out: "[i]n the theogonies, then, the problem of origin in its strict sense is, if not wholly implicit, at least present in the background. The myth does not ask how an ordered world could arise out of chaos; it answers the question of who was the sovereign god, who had obtained dominion over the universe. ... [The myth] retrac[es] those avatars of sovereignty down the line of the divine generations until the moment when a definite supremacy brings an end to the dramatic elaboration of the dynasteia". Apollodoros' account fits this pattern exactly: his three generations of gods, with their three consecutive sovereigns mark the progress to the establishment of Zeus' eternal reign.

To digress for a moment, the cosmogonic poetic tradition which Hesiod (and consequently Apollodoros) follows, "where the succession of divine rulers culminates in the everlasting reign of Zeus and the stabilization of the universe", has such striking parallels in oriental mythology that a relationship seems inevitable. A connection is most commonly drawn between the Hesiodic myth and the so-called "Kingship in Heaven" narrative, which is recorded in Hittite, but whose mythical content and dramatis personae are predominantly Hurrian (a non-Indo-European, non-Semitic people, who moved into Assyria at the beginning of the second millennium and eventually settled in Syria) and Mesopotamian (namely

174 Scarpi 1996, 419, argues that "la regalità attribuita a Urano, una instituzione che i Greci avevano relegato nel tempo del mito, può essere dipesa molto banalmente dal contesto storico in cui viveva il compilatore, che se non aveva conosciuto i sovrani ellenistici, certo conosceva gli imperatori di Roma". However, it obvious that the basic motif in the cosmogonic myths of many peoples (especially in the Levant) is the establishment of an autocratic king of the gods by defeating or disabling a previous ruler. Kingship is essential in this type of myth which usually reads as a dynastic history, a progression from more primeval types of sovereignty to the definite establishment of universal order under one ruler, ostensibly for eternity. Hence, I see no reason to attribute the reference to the sovereignty of Ouranos to the influence of the historical context of the work's composition.
175 Edmunds 1990, 141.
Babylonian). The parallels between the "Kingship in Heaven" (ANET 1963, 120-1) and the Hesiodic tradition, clear once we eliminate the reign of Alalu from the Hurrian version and a number of Greek (Hesiodic?) innovations (such as the birth of the Erinyes and Aphrodite), are neatly set out by Burkert.

It is true that the parallels between the two accounts cannot be pushed too far. What is more, there are analogous ideas in the stages of the succession-myth as recorded in both the Greek and Hurrian versions, "but extant narrative correspondences to neither", which makes it difficult, if not impossible, "to identify definite channels [of transmission] in a complicated network". It seems to me that the best approach to the question is that adopted by Mondi. The Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos has been considered to have preserved at least traces of such a potential – Phoenician – source, but Baumgarten has raised objections based on the date of Philo’s Phoenician source and the influence of Hesiod on the composition of work. Since no text can be singled out as the ultimate source of the Greek version, and it does not seem reasonable “to suppose the existence of a single hypothetical protomyth, from which our attested versions have descended”, Mondi posits the existence of various “mythic ideas” circulating around the Mediterranean at least as early as the Bronze Age, “particularly within

---

177 Burkert 1979, 21; for a more recent comparison of the Song of [Kumarbi] with Hesiod, see West 1997, 279-80.
178 Mondi 1990, 150.
180 Mondi 1990, 156.
181 Baumgarten 1981, 238-42. See also the discussion in West 1997, 283-6, who, while pointing out that “it is generally admitted that there is a genuine Phoenician work behind Philo’s, albeit a much less ancient one than he claimed” (284), concludes that “Sanchuniathon-Philo contains, buried under perhaps several layers of re-elaboration, a kernel of genuine Phoenician mythological tradition going back to the late Bronze Age. The significance of this for Hesiod is the implication that a form of the Succession Myth akin to the Hurro-Hittite remained current in the Levant throughout the first half of the first millennium” (286).
the triangle formed by Greece, Egypt, and eastern Mediterranean coast”. Thus the myth does become “a textbook of Near Eastern diffusionism”, not of myths as narratives but of “conceptual foci that may be, but are not necessarily, expressed in narratives”.

This hypothesis can also explain the similarities, less striking but nevertheless strong, between the Hesiodic cosmogonic account and that of the Akkadian-Babylonian creation epic, the *Enûma Elish* (“when above”, the first two words of the poem). The parallels between the two works which have been pointed out thoroughly by Walcot, and, more recently by West, will be discussed later in relation to Okeanos and Typhoeus.

The reason for this long digression is simple: Apollodoros’ view of Ouranos as the first king of the gods brings his version closer to the Near Eastern text (both in the Hittite and the Sumerian versions of the “Kingship in Heaven” theme) and to the narrative of Philo of Byblos (*FGrHist* 790 F2 § 15-41) than to that of Hesiod, who made many innovations in his use of oriental material.

(ii) The offspring of Ouranos and Gaia and their order of birth (1.1.1-3)

Apollodoros’ second departure from the Hesiodic account has to do with the inconsistency that the incorporation of the birth of the Kyklopes and the Hundred-
Handers introduces into his narrative: one of the biggest compositional problems in the *Theogony* has to do with the fact that the appearance of these two sets of children of Ouranos and Gaia after the Titans (*Theogony* 139-53) is hard to reconcile with the narrative that follows. Both groups are said to have been released by Zeus from bondage: cf. ἀδεσμῶν ὑπὸ Ὀυρανίδας, ὁδὲ δῆσε πατήρ ἀεισιφροσύνης (*Theogony* 501-2, using Ὀυρανίδας to refer to the Kyklopes, a term with distinguishes them from the other two kinds of Kyklopes, cf. Σ to *Theogony* 1. 139), and Ὀβριάρεφ δ' ὡς πρῶτα πατήρ ὀδύσσατο θυμῷ/ Κόττω τ’ ἠδὲ Γώγη, δῆσε κρατερῷ ἐνι δεσμῷ (617-8, referring to the Hundred-Handers). In return, both the Kyklopes and the Hekatoncheires assist him in his battle against the Titans (the folktale element in this story is very strong). This indicates that, although all the children of Ouranos were concealed (πάντας ἀποκρύπτασκε καὶ ἐς φάος οὐκ ἀνίεσκε, *Theogony* 157), only the Titans were released after their father’s castration, something not explicitly recorded in the *Theogony* (which means that by πατήρ in 1. 501 and 617 one must understand a reference to Ouranos and not to Kronos).

---

188 See Mondi 1986, 29ff.

189 The recent editors of the *Theogony* (namely West and Solmsen) suppose that v. 139-53 are a later addition by Hesiod to his original work, which included only the Titans; the poet must have thought that by this addition he explained satisfactorily the position of the Kyklopes and the Hundred-Handers, and did not realise that their continuous imprisonment needed further clarification. See West 1966, 206; Solmsen 1982, 4. However, Vernant, in Detienne and Vernant 1978, claims that the references to the binding of the Kyklopes and the Hundred-Handers are always made “in one particular context: the struggle for sovereignty between the old Titan gods led by Kronos, and the claimants of power, under Zeus’ command. No mention of them is made so long as the story remains on the cosmological level of the relations between Gaia and Ouranos. The theme of binding is an integral part of the myths about sovereignty” (72-3). But since, as we saw, in Hesiod Ouranos is not envisaged as king, Vernant finds no reason why there should be a specific reference to the bondage of the Kyklopes and the Hundred-Handers in relation to Ouranos. Since we take 1. 501 and 617 as references to Ouranos, this explanation becomes unsatisfactory. Nevertheless, Vernant’s interpretation fits Apollodoros’ narrative very well: in it, the bondage of the Kyklopes and the Hundred-Handers is closely related to sovereignty. The monstrous appearance of the two sets of brothers (ἐκατόγχειρες ... χεῖρας μὲν ἀνὰ ἐκατόν κεφαλὰς δὲ ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα ἐχοντες, cf. *Theogony* 150-3: Κύκλοπες ... ἄν ἐκατός εἶχεν ἕνα ὀφθαλμόν ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου, cf. *Theogony* 142-6) and their formidable power (μεγέθει τε
In Apollodoros' version, however, the difficulty is easily dealt with: the Kyklopes and the Hundred-Handers suffer a double bondage. Their first imprisonment is by their father: ἀλλὰ τούτοις μὲν Οὐρανὸς δῆσας εἰς Τάρταρον ἔρριψεν (1.1.2). This action provokes the reaction of Gaia, namely her collaboration with the Titans and Ouranos' castration (ἀγανακτοῦσα δὲ Γῆ εἶπ τῇ ἀπολείᾳ τῶν εἰς Τάρταρο ῥιφέντων παιδῶν [i.e. the Kyklopes and the Hekatoncheires, since the author does not mention the location of the Titans before they castrate their father] πείθει τοὺς Τιτᾶνας ἐπιθέσθαι τῷ πατρὶ 1.1.4). After their father's castration the Titans liberate their brothers (τῆς δὲ ἀρχῆς ἐκβαλόντες καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν Κρόνῳ παρέδοσαν [1.1.4]), only to be shut up once again in Tartaros by Kronos (ὁ δὲ τούτοις μὲν <ἐν> τῷ Τάρταρῳ πάλιν δῆσας καθείρξε, 1.1.5). They are finally released by Zeus (ἡ Γῆ τῷ Διὶ ἔχρισε τὴν νίκην, τοὺς καταταρταρωθέντας [note how this characterisation applies only to the Kyklopes and the Hekatoncheires] ἄν ἔχοι συμμάχους: ὁ δὲ τὴν φρονοῦσαν αὐτῶν τὰ δεσμὰ Κάμπην ἀπόκτεινας ἔλυσεν, 1.2.1). In this way, at the cost of making a few changes in the sequence of events, coherence is introduced.

We have already seen that this particular order was preferred by the "Orphic" account. Can we trace these changes in any other account? It is most

---

110 ἀνωπέρβλητοι καὶ δυνάμεις καθειστήκεσαν, 1.1.1) makes them a considerable threat to both Ouranos and Kronos and thus they are treated accordingly.

190 In Hesiod Tartaros, like most of the early cosmogonic beings, is both a location and a (barely) anthropomorphic deity (Theogony 119, 720-25). In Apollodoros, as in all subsequent literature, Tartaros retains only the former meaning, being localised as that part of the underworld reserved for the punishment of famous sinners (for Tityos at 1.4.1 (see Chapter One), Sisiphos at 1.9.3, Ixion at Epitome 1. 20, and Tantalos at Epitome 2. 1). Apollodoros' mini-Tartarographia is very similar to that of Homer in the Iliad 8: τόσσον ἐνερθ' Αἴδεῳ δεσον οὐρανός ἐκτ' ἀπὸ γαίης (16). This in turn resembles the description given by Hesiod in 720-1, τόσσον ἐνερθ' ὑπὸ γῆς δεσον οὐρανός ἐκτ' ἀπὸ γαίης/ τόσσον γὰρ τ' ἀπὸ γῆς ἐς τάρταρον ἤφρόνετα. On the cosmography of Homer in relation to the description of Tartaros see Kirk 1990, 297-8.
unfortunate that we possess only scanty fragments of the *Genealogies* by Akousilaos of Argos. But his account seems to have followed that of Hesiod, and in fact ancient sources saw him more as a compiler:

\[
\text{τὰ δὲ Ἡσιόδου μετήλλαξαν εἰς πεζὸν λόγον καὶ ὡς Ἴδια ἔξηνεγκαν}
\]

\[
\text{Εὐμηλὸς τε καὶ Ἁκουσίλαος οἱ ἱστοριογράφοι (FGrHist 2 T 5 =}
\]

\[
\text{Ευμέλος Τ 6 Берна́бэ = Еумелос Korinthiaka T 2 Дэйвис).}
\]

One fragment, however, (*FGrHist* 2 F 8) seems to refer to the bondage of the Hekatoncheires by Ouranos:


The reference to Akousilaos is not certain (Gomperz gives the text τὸν/ δὲ Οὐρανὸν .../ ... δείσαντα τοὺς/ Ἐκατόνχειρας μὴ [...)]νται ταρτα/ [ρῶσαι], διότι το[...] ...)δε το[...] , but all recent editors include it in the text.\(^{192}\) It seems valid to take this special reference to the bondage of the Hundred-Handers as an indication that the attempts to correct Hesiod go at least as far back as far back as Akousilaos.

\(^{191}\) Philippson, *Hermes* 55 (1922), 255.

\(^{192}\) See most recently Fowler 2000, 8.
(iii) The second generation of gods: the Titans

This is another echo of Akousilaos: οὕτωι δὲ, ὡς Ἀκουσῖλαος, Τιτάνες καλοῦνται καὶ Τιτανίδες (Σ ad Theogony 134, p.30 = FGrHist 2 F 7). The main characteristic of the Titans is that they represent the former generation of gods, the πρότεροι θεοί (Theog. 425), who are now banished to Tartaros (τοὺς ὑποταρταρίους, οἱ Τιτῆνες καλέονται, II. 14. 279) and are simply treated as a collective group, an indication of their original status. For this reason the number and names of the Titans varies from source to source. Usually they are twelve in number, yet, as we saw, the Orphic poems raise their number to fourteen. The names given by Hesiod are more or less canonical, but different sources contain other figures, the most celebrated addition being that of Prometheus in PV (18, 209-10, 351-2). Hyginus' list, on the other hand, differs considerably: ex Aethere et Die ... Titanes Briareus Gyges Steropes Atlas Hyperion et Polus, Saturnus Ops Moneta Dione (praef. 3). However, in his account of the Titanomachy he gives prominence to Atlas: hi cum conarentur in caelum ascendere, eos Iovis cum Minerva et Apolline et Diana praecipites in Tartarum deiecit. Atlanti autem, qui

193 The etymology of Τιτῆνες remains obscure: the many suggestions, varying from Hesiod's (τοὺς δὲ πατὴρ Τιτῆνας ἐπίκλησιν καλέσκει/ παιδὰς νεικεῖν μέγας Οὐρανός, οὗς τεκνικὸς/ φάσκε δὲ τιταῖονται ἄτασθαλίη μέγα ἡμέ/ έργον, τοῦ δ' ἐπειτα τίσιν μετόπισθέν ἔσθεσι [207-10]), to that of the Orphic poems (fr. 57 = Athenag. Pro Christianis 18, κοῦρος δ' Οὐρανίων ἐγείνατο πότνια Γαῖα, οὗς δὴ καὶ Τιτῆνας ἐπικλήσαν καλέοντι/ οὕνεκα τείσασθην μέγαν Οὐρανόν ἄστερέοντα, and from Hesychios' Τιτῆναι βασιλίδες to Diodoros' euhemeristic explanation ἐκ Τιτανίας δῶμα μὲν δίδων ἐχοντας ἐκκάτωτος ... ἀπὸ τῆς μητρὸς ὁμοιαζόμενους Τιτάνας (3. 57), and to the modern orientalising hypothesis of the titi-people “men of clay” (see Burkert 1983b, 54, and 1992, 95; West 1966, 199-201). All lack the evidence necessary for verification.


dux eorum fuit, caeli fornicem super umeros imposuit, qui adhuc dicitur caelum sustinere.¹⁹⁶

The striking heterogeneity of the list and lack of individuality characterises most of the Titans. As Solmsen remarked, "[t]hey are a medley [sic] crowd, heterogeneous in origin, background and character. It would cost an effort to imagine Okeanos and Tethys, or Mnemosyne ... being urged to use a sickle against their father or to be locked in a war of ten years..., how should Themis or Mnemosyne if carefully guarded in Tartaros achieve the signal honor of becoming wives of Zeus?".¹⁹⁷ This makes plausible the hypothesis that the Titans were given individual identities rather late (indeed I think that West is right to suggest that those of the Titans who had connections with Boiotia,¹⁹⁸ who, by the way, are the most colourless of the lot, might be Hesiod's own additions.¹⁹⁹

The collectivity of the Titans is in one way stressed in Apollodoros: in this narrative all the offspring of Ouranos – with the exception of Okeanos – take part in his castration (οὶ δὲ Ὀκεανὸς χωρὶς ἐπιτίθενται, 1. 1. 4, on which more below). In Hesiod, however, only Kronos performs the task (Theogony 170ff.). Thus in Hesiod we have the paradox of a collective punishment of an innocent group (Theogony 207-10 already cited above, with the Titanomachy as a

¹⁹⁶ On the list of the Titans, their numbers, and the names preserved in different sources see Kroll and Mittelhaus, RE VI A2, 1506-8.
¹⁹⁷ Solmsen 1989, 419.
¹⁹⁸ West 1985, 174-5.
¹⁹⁹ I fail to understand why the reference to Kronos and Iapetos in Homer (8. 479) "would then be a new indication of Hesiod's priority", as West argues (1985, 175). We cannot be certain of the number or names of Homer's Titans. Homer preserves a variant version concerning the position of Okeanos and Tethys in the mythical world (see below), so it is very probable that his knowledge differed from the later version created by Hesiod. The reference to Iapetos in connection with the arch-Titan is another indication that Homer is familiar with more myths than those which he narrates: Iapetos' offspring Prometheus (and secondarily Atlas and Menoitios) was one of the main opponents of Zeus, and it is plausible to think that his father was also seen in this light and "became important on account of his sons" (West 1966, 202). On the oriental connection of Iapetos (Japheth) see West 1966, 202-3; also West 1997, 289.
It is the view of the Titans as a group that demands their treatment as a unit even in punishment. Apollodoros once again offers a "corrected", that is a simplified, version.

Dione is Apollodoros' addition to the canonical twelve. She certainly owes her elevated position to the author's decision not to follow Hesiod's narrative of the birth of Aphrodite. Since the goddess of love is not born from the severed parts of Ouranos she needs a father and mother of exalted origin: so Dione, whose name is the feminine version of that of Zeus,\textsuperscript{201} is provided. In Hesiod Dione is just one of the daughters of Okeanos and Tethys, ἔρατη τε Διώνη (353); yet her association with Aphrodite at the very beginning of the \textit{Theogony}, in a context which suggests a reference to the parents of the major gods (Dione is paired with another great matron-wife of Zeus, Leto, cf. \textit{Hom. Hymn to Apollo} 93), is to me an indication that Hesiod knew of this alternative parentage of Aphrodite but chose to suppress it.\textsuperscript{202} The relationship of Dione and Aphrodite goes as far back as Homer's \textit{Iliad} (5. 370ff.); it is true that in Homer there is no reference to the parentage of Dione. This does not exclude that such a detail originated in other sources, and, given their divergence concerning the names of the Titans, it is highly plausible that Apollodoros found Dione's parentage in his (archaic?) source, which also provided the detail for the Orphic fragment.

Dione's place among Apollodoros' Titans is, to say the least, surprising. Like her sisters, Mnemosyne and Themis, Dione is added to the list only because this lineage is considered a suitable one for the consorts of the new lord of the

\textsuperscript{200} Solmsen 1989, 417.
\textsuperscript{201} One may detect a parallel ("linguistic analogue", Mondi 1990, 146) with the parentage of Ishtar, the Mesopotamian goddess of Love.
\textsuperscript{202} See West 1966, 156.
universe. It is also possible that Zeus' reign receives even more legitimacy through marriages to members of the older establishment.

(iv) The attack on Ouranos: the role of Okeanos (1.1.4).

Okeanos' explicit exclusion from the attack on Ouranos – quite significant in itself because of the weight given to the collectivity of the Titans by Apollodoros (see above section iii), is consistent with how he is portrayed in Greek myth. Okeanos, the great earth-encircling river, is characterised by a curious aloofness from what goes on in the world. He does not seem to have played a direct part in the succession-struggle. Thus Hesiod does not specify which Titans were involved in the battle against Zeus and his allies. In Homer II. 14. 200-4, however, Hera claims to have been handed over to Okeanos and his wife Tethys during the Titanomachy, which implies that the couple, though not actively participating in the battle, were on Zeus' side, and were powerful enough to protect his supporters. Nevertheless, Hesiod states that Okeanos and Tethys' descendants fought on Zeus' side following his advice (ὅλθε δ' ἀρα πρώτη Στήξ ἄφθιτος Οὐλυμπόνδε/ σὺν σφοίσιν παῖδεσσι φίλου διά μήδεα πατρός, Theogony 197-8).203 After the establishment of Zeus' sovereignty, Okeanos does not follow his siblings to their place of incarceration, but remains on earth,204 yet is still surprisingly uninvolved in

---

203 On the role played by the Okeanid Metis to Zeus' victory in Apollodoros' version see below.
204 Okeanos' aloofness from the entire succession struggle ensures that he, as an important element of the world-picture (see Kirk, Raven, Schofield 19832, 11), retains his position in the world even after the older generation of which he was a member was deposed. Other personifications of elements are treated differently: in the Homeric epics Hyperion is an epithet for the Sun (e.g. II. 8. 480, Od. 1. 8). At some point, this association made this a suitable name for one of the as yet nameless Titans. However, the Sun cannot be a member of this group because of its eventual imprisonment in Tartaros. Thus Hyperion becomes the father of the Sun, a
what the other gods are doing: thus he is the only one who does not participate in
the assembly of gods at II. 20. 7 (οὐτε τις σὺν ποταμῶν ἀπέην, νόσφ' Ὡκεανόλο). 205

“[L’]auteur de la Theogonie”, writes Rudhardt, 206 “n’a pas lieu de définir
la personnalité d’Okeanos plus clairement que celle de ses frères ou de ses sœurs.”
Still, even in Hesiod’s limited discussion of Okeanos and Tethys shows that the
two figures have characteristics which differentiate them from the other Titans. 207
This couple is by far the most fertile in Greek myth: 208 they give birth to six
thousand life-giving children (Theogony 337-370). In some accounts (i.e.
Akousilaos’ Argive genealogy, mentioned above) Okeanos and Tethys become the
ancestors of the human race. More than any other anthropomorphic figure of his
generation, Okeanos and his female equivalent, Tethys, possess a cosmic
presence. 209 This idea of a couple of primeval waters, from which originated every
form of life, can be found in cosmogonic myths around the world, 210 from Egypt to
the American tribes, and in texts as different as Genesis and the Enûma Eliš. 211

205 In Aischylos’ Prometheus, Okeanos puts aside his aloofness for a while and comes to offer
advice and some support to Prometheus. His appearance is not a integral part of the mythical
tradition, but an innovation of Aeschylus, who used Okeanos because of his close connection to
Prometheus, his position in the new establishment (the opposite of Prometheus) and perhaps the
role that his descendants play in the tragedy (even Io could be considered his offspring; cf.
Akousilaos’ account of the Argive genealogy recorded in 2.1.1- 2.5.1). Still, l. 330-1, ζηλῶ σ’ ἕθωνεκ’ ἐκτός αἰτίας κυρείς/ πάντων μετασχῆν [sic mss.] καὶ τεταλμηκῶς ἐμοί, which
could be understood as an admission of Okeanos’ active role in the Titanomachy, “have a sense
hard to reconcile with the context of the play and the trilogy” (Griffith 1983, 147); so the lines
must refer to Okeanos’ present visit to Prometheus, and not to a previous partnership with the
cunning god. Still, his attempt to reconcile Prometheus with Zeus shows a firm orientation
towards the younger generation of gods which ill fits the description “Titan”.
207 On the etymologies of these names see Sorel 1994, 10-14 and n.25.
208 Rudhardt 1971, 52.
209 Rudhardt 1971, 27.
210 See Leeming 1990, 15-42.
211 The Enûma Eliš shares so many elements with the Homeric version of the creation myth to
legitimize the idea of an oriental influence on the latter (“it looks as if Homer were alluding to
Furthermore, a study of Greek cosmogonic narratives outside the influence of Hesiod indicates the existence of a theogonic tradition wherein Okeanos and Tethys formed the first divine generation, the primeval parents of all gods.

This tale, first encountered in the Διός Ἀπάτη (Ὠκεανόν τε, θεών γένεσιν, καὶ μητέρα Τηθῶν, 201; ᩩκεανοθ, ὡς περ γένεσις πάντεσσι τέτυκται, 246), is again mentioned in Plato, Crat. 402b (Ὠκεανός πρώτος καλλίροος ἦρξε γάμοιο/ ὡς ἡ κασιγνήτην ὁμομήτορα Τηθῶν ὀπτεύειν) and in the Orphic poems (Orphic Hymn 83 Kern, 1-2: ᩩκεανόν καλέω, πατέρ / ἀφθιτον, αἰεν ἑόντα, ἀθανάτων τε θεῶν γένεσιν θνητῶν τ' ἀνθρώπων). See also the variant recorded in Plato, Timaeus 40e, οὐδεὶς οὖν κατ' ἐκείνους ἡμῖν ἢ γένεσις περὶ τούτων τῶν θεῶν ἐχέτω καὶ λεγέσθω: Γῆς τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ παῖδες ᩩκεανός τε καὶ Τηθῶς ἐγενέσθην, τούτων δὲ Φόρκυς, Κρόνος τε καὶ Ρέα καὶ ὅσοι μετὰ τούτων . . . which makes Okeanos and Tethys children of Ouranos and Gaia, but parents of the Titans.

If we see Okeanos in this light, his exclusion from the attack of Ouranos makes more sense. Either as the primeval ancestor, or as the child of Ouranos,
Okeanos is not justified in performing such a dreadful deed as a castration. What emerges beyond doubt is the fact that Okeanos does not fit in the group into which he has been squeezed by Hesiod.

(v) The attack proper and its outcome (1.1.4)

This is a key-passage, as details included in the Hesiodic account of this stage of the divine struggle are brought together with others which are distinctly un-Hesiodic, while elements contradicting the subsequent narrative are apparently left out.

After stating that all the Titans save Okeanos attacked Ouranos, Apollodoros proceeds to say what happened to the severed part of the emasculated king and has Kronos throw the genitals into the sea. The narrative ends with the birth of Erinyes from the blood that fell on the earth. Hesiod’s narrative contains a number of details not found in our text: Apollodoros totally ignores the Meliai Nymphs, a prudent omission, if he found himself in the same position as modern scholars who do not know what they represented exactly, or if he, rightly, saw them as insignificant abstractions with no real mythological significance. As for the Giants, Scarpi is right when he notices that “nemmeno sono [le Erinni] associate,

---

213 Jacobsen 1976, 187, notices, in relation to the Enûma Eliš, that in an effort to soften the motif of parricide of Apsû (on the remarkable detail of his death see tablet I, 1. 69, and Cassin 1993, 317-8), “the author has the warring parents and sons separated by many generations, so that the parricide becomes the slaying of remote first ancestors rather than the direct killing of a father and mother”. This could be the case with the source in which originated the exclusion of Okeanos from the castration of Ouranos (of course this would mean that we accept that this source contained the version used in Plato’s Timaeus).

214 See West 1966, 221. I tend to agree with those who think that they are tree-nymphs, without particular reference to a special kind of tree. The fact that these creatures drew their origin from the drops of blood of Ouranos could explain their sub-divine nature. See also my discussion of the “conditional immortality” of the Giants in Chapter Three, section (iii).
come in Esiodo (Theog. 185) con i Giganti, né con le ninfe Melie (Theog. 187). Yet, I think that Apollodoros’ account helps in rightly interpreting the Hesiodic expression περιπλομένων δ’ ἐναντίων (Theog. 184) as not referring to a simultaneous birth for the Erinyes, the Giants and the Nymphs: these offspring of Gaia were produced when she thought that the time was appropriate, which means that whereas the Erinyes must have been born fairly soon after the castration, the Giants were produced many years later, after the second part of the succession myth, when the sovereignty of Zeus was first established. It is true that Apollodoros does not specify the exact manner of conception of the Giants (Γῆ δὲ περὶ Τιτάνων ἀγανακτόσα γεννᾷ Γίγαντας ἐξ Οὐρανοῦ, 1.6.1), but the castration and subsequent fate of Ouranos’ genitals does not leave many other options open.

When it comes to the fate of the severed part of Ouranos, Apollodoros cuts a long story short by having Kronos throw the genitals into the sea, never referring to them again. In Hesiod of course the discarded genitalia rove over the sea (which acts as amniac fluid? could it be seen as the actual mother?) until they turned into Aphrodite, the goddess of love. Apollodoros, however, could not ascribe to this variant Aphrodite’s birth, because he has already decided to follow the version in which the goddess was the daughter of Zeus and Dione (hence the latter’s exalted position in the narrative – see above on 1.2.4). Apollodoros could have completely ignored the detail of the disposal of the genitals; for some reason (presumably the popularity of the Hesiodic version of the story) he felt that he had to refer to what
happened to them; the result is rather embarrassing, and could be seen as a justification of his critics.\textsuperscript{215}

This choice of variant has some consequences: it has been noted that “by imagining Aphrodite at the very beginning of the process of the creation when Heaven and Earth are parted - as the Orphic myth does with Eros - love is drawn in the greater perspective of humanity’s longing for reunion with the whole.”\textsuperscript{216} I should add that the existence of an anthropomorphic figure of love at the beginning of the rule of a totally anthropomorphic divine dynasty is as essential for the plan of Hesiod as was the existence of Eros for the first non-anthropomorphic generations. Love is essential to the procreation and evolution of the world. In Apollodoros’ (and Homer’s) version Aphrodite’s importance is much diminished. She now belongs to the last generation of divine creatures; her honors are no more \textit{εξ ἀρχῆς},\textsuperscript{217} but are generated and depend upon Zeus’s will.

The nature and original functions of the Erinyes have been fully researched - though not totally explained, in a number of recent studies of Aischylos’ \textit{Eumenides}.\textsuperscript{218} It has been noted repeatedly that they are born at the moment of Kronos’ greatest triumph; they are the instruments of his father’s curse (Th. 209-10; the curse is not mentioned in Apollodoros) that will eventually bring about his fall. As Solmsen points out, “the Erinyes come into being at the first act that calls for their activity and provides a reason for their existence. It is the first occasion in the history of the world when a father might curse his son; Kronos will later have

\textsuperscript{215} Cf. Frazer 1921, xvii.
\textsuperscript{216} Baring and Cashford 1991, 353.
\textsuperscript{217} ταύτην δ’ εξ ἀρχῆς τιμὴν ἔχει ἤδε λέγοιτο ὁ παρθένιος τ’ ἄρος μειδήματα τ’ ἐξεπάτας τ’ ἔριστιν τε γλυκερῆν φιλότητα τε μειλίχιν τε. (Theogony 202-6).
\textsuperscript{218} See Sommerstein 1989, 6-12.
to expiate ‘his father’s Erinyes’.\textsuperscript{219} Their existence, however, does not threaten
Zeus’ sovereignty. Through a process of ‘evolutionary theology’,\textsuperscript{220} evident in the
works of Aischylos (especially in \textit{Prometheus}, where the possibility of an
alternative future is hinted at, with the Erinyes deposing a selfish, violent and
unlawful Zeus \textit{[PV 514-7]}, and in the \textit{Oresteia}, where the succession myth serves a
parallel, “a paradigm of the human events of the trilogy”, cf. Ag. 167-178), Zeus is
seen as continuously evolving through knowledge. He uses the experience of his
predecessors to establish his power for ever and at the same time acquires wisdom,
which enables him to create a new world. The establishment of Zeus’ sovereignty
comes through change. Zeus “learns through experience” (it matters little whether
it is his own experience or the experience of others) how to deal with every
situation, how to be a king. This is what keeps him in power; it is not the support
of Gaia, as Thalmann suggests.\textsuperscript{221} The behavior of Gaia does not change: she tries
unsuccessfully to overthrow Zeus not once but twice. Moreover, in Apollodoros’
version of events (1.4.1), Zeus manages to overcome the danger posed by Metis by
himself (and not with the help of a twice-defeated Gaia, as in Hesiod), by
improving on the procreative methods of his father and grandfather. In order to
forestall his replacement by his children, Ouranos resorted to continuous
intercourse. Kronos tried to stop his replacement by “imitating pregnancy”.\textsuperscript{222} Both
failed, since their challenge to female fecundity comes too late: their actions only
delay the emergence of their already born children. As a result, both male gods find
themselves “giving birth” (following an upwards motion, Ouranos’ castration

\textsuperscript{219} Solmsen 1949, 180.
\textsuperscript{220} Thus Sommestein 1996, 383-390.
\textsuperscript{221} Thalmann 1984, 44.
\textsuperscript{222} Thus Zeitlin 1995, 61.
results in the generation of Aphrodite from his genitals and a number of offspring from his blood, while Kronos disgorges his children through his mouth, just as Zeus will bring forth his child, Athena, from his head). Zeus simply absorbs the source of danger, the actual female, before any children are actually born. He brings together male and female to give birth not to a male danger to the established order, but to a child, Athena, who exemplifies the merger of male and female attributes to the advantage of his patriarchal order. The absorption of Metis brings to an end the generational succession of male gods, and subordinates the dangerous female procreative powers by establishing a patriarchal control over them. In addition it endows Zeus with supreme intelligence (of which Metis is the embodiment) and allows him to ensure the consolidation and, eventually, the permanence of his rule.
Table I: THE THREE STAGES OF THE SUCCESSION MYTH (Apollodoros 1.1.1-1.6.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMON ELEMENTS</th>
<th>1. OURANOS v. TITANS</th>
<th>2. TITANOMACHY</th>
<th>3a. GIGANTOMACHY</th>
<th>3b. TYPHONOMACHY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instigator of events</td>
<td>Gaia</td>
<td>Gaia</td>
<td>Gaia</td>
<td>Gaia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>Ill-treatment of all her children</td>
<td>Ill-treatment of her children (Ouranidai)</td>
<td>Ill-treatment of her children (Titans)</td>
<td>Ill-treatment of her children (Giants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical appearance of contenders</td>
<td>unspecified (presumably anthropomorphic)</td>
<td>anthropomorphic</td>
<td>anthropomorphic v. μεμημένη φωσις ἀνδρός καί θηρίου</td>
<td>anthropomorphic v. μεμημένη φωσις ἀνδρός καί θηρίου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons Used</td>
<td>ἀρπη ἀδάμαντινη</td>
<td>The Olympians acquire thunderbolts, trident &amp; κονέη from the Kyklopes</td>
<td>The Giants hurl rocks &amp; flaming oak trees. Each god uses a specific weapon</td>
<td>Typhon hurls flaming rocks, gushes fire from his mouth. Zeus uses thunderbolts &amp; the ἀρπη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>immortal</td>
<td>immortal (the status of the Ouranidai remains unspecified)</td>
<td>conditional immortality (special reference to Alkyoneus)</td>
<td>immortal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swallowing of Food</td>
<td></td>
<td>φάρμακον (emetic): eaten</td>
<td>φάρμακον (of immortality): not eaten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allies</td>
<td>Metis/ Ouranidai</td>
<td>Herakles</td>
<td>Aigipan-Hermes/ Moirai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means used for the acquisition of power</td>
<td>violence (castration)</td>
<td>deceit/ violence</td>
<td>violence</td>
<td>deceit (twice) [violence unsuccessful]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bondage</td>
<td>The Ouranidai are confined in Tartaros</td>
<td>The Ouranidai are imprisoned in Tartaros</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zeus temporarily imprisoned in the Korykian cave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guards</td>
<td></td>
<td>She-dragon? Kampe guards the Ouranidai. The Hekatoncheires appointed guards of the Titans</td>
<td></td>
<td>She-dragon Delphyne guards Zeus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of battle</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>Phlegrai/ Pallene</td>
<td>all four corners of the Mediterranean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Outcome</td>
<td>successful</td>
<td>successful</td>
<td>unsuccessful</td>
<td>unsuccessful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Three

After Zeus: Gigantomachy and Typhonomachy (1.6.1-3). An archaic source for a unique account?

After his long digression on the structure of the divine family discussed in Chapter One (1.2.2 - 1.5.3), Apollodoros resumes his main narrative with an account, extensive in comparison with that of the Titanomachia (1.2.1), of Zeus' battles against Gaia and her offspring, the Giants and Typhon, thus bringing to a conclusion the first part of his work, the succession-myth and establishment of Zeus' reign. Both accounts are exceptional: the battle of the Giants is the only complete narrative of the story that we possess, while the part about Typhon preserves a version totally unknown from other sources, and is "the only text to mention a passing moment of weakness on the part of Zeus and a temporary eclipse of his sovereign power".\(^223\)

(i) The role of Gaia.

The narrative begins with Gaia assuming her role as "kingmaker", devisor of plans of usurpation, and instigator of change: she now turns against Zeus and plots his downfall by bringing forth her own children, the Giants and Typhon, to challenge his sovereignty. In Apollodoros the part played by Gaia in the different stages of the succession-myth remains consistent throughout, unlike Hesiod's account of the Typhonomachy (820-80), in which "Gaia's part in producing an enemy to Zeus'
regime is at variance with her benevolence towards Zeus in the rest of the
*Theogony*. If we look at the role played by the female goddesses in the
succession-myth, we shall see that Gaia and Rhea, the all-powerful mothers,
protect their children against their fathers, and, in a way, become the agents of
their husbands' dethronement. But, as has been rightly pointed out, in Hesiod,
Rhea's position is diminished when compared to the power of Gaia. However, in
Apollodoros this is not so: Rhea does not demand her parents' help, as at
*Theogony* 469ff. She alone, like another Gaia, tricks Kronos. In fact, the language
used to explain Rhea's decision to act against her husband falls under the category
of words denoting anger (ὑγιοσθεὶσα 1.1.5), not sorrow ('Ρένν δ' ἔχε πένθος
ἀλαστον, *Theogony* 467), and corresponds to the words used to describe Gaia's
emotional state in the different stages of the succession-myth (ἀγανακτόσα at
1.1.3 for the Kyklopes and Hekatoncheires and at 1.6.1 for the Titans, μᾶλλον
χολοθεῖσα at 1.6.3 for the Giants). Gaia's role in Apollodoros is always that of
the mother who, in order to protect her children, brings forth a new set of
challengers to remove the current hostile sovereign: the fate of the Ouranidai

---

224 West 1966, 381. In fact, this inconsistency in Gaia's role is one of the arguments formerly advanced against the authenticity of the Typhonomachy. However, West is right that it would be naive to assume multiple authorship behind any apparent mythological contradictions. It seems to me that the original version of the myth is that preserved by Apollodoros; Hesiod changed Gaia's role in agreement with his main aim, the glorification of Zeus. When it comes to Typhon and the challenge which he poses to the Olympian rule, Hesiod simply reverts to the original version of the myth.


226 In Apollodoros' account of Athena's birth (1.3.6: μὴν γονοταὶ ἡ Ἡθὶς Μήτεις, . . . καὶ οὐτῆς γενομένης ἑγκυνον κατατίναν φθάσας, ἐπείπερ ἔλεγεν <γῆ> γεννήσειν παῖδα . . .) Heyne's addition of <γῆ>, accepted by the majority of editors, is unnecessary. The portrayal of Metis in Apollodoros (1.2.1) justifies her presentation as an all-knowing deity, who brings her fate upon herself by revealing why she herself constitutes a danger for Zeus' power. This is in accord with my conclusion that Gaia is a goddess who acts only to defend her children from confinement inside herself. See Chapter One, section B, for the role played by Hera, and her failure to resume Gaia's role.
prompts the creation of the Titans, the defeat of the Titans\textsuperscript{227} provokes the birth of the Giants, and the death of the latter initiates Typhon's bid for power. All four sets of offspring have the same fate: like autochthones, they are brought forth from the earth and in the end they are returned to it. The Ouranidai suffer confinement, as guards of their would-be avengers, rather unjustly (surely because of their monstrosity, which renders them unsuitable for the new, totally anthropomorphic world), while the younger offspring, whose "conditional immortality" I shall discuss below, become part of Earth, either, as in the case of most of the Giants, by the simple fact of their death, or more importantly because, for Enkelados, Polybotes and Typhon, death is a part of Earth that covers them and confines them beneath its surface.

(ii) The Giants and Typhon: two sides of the same coin

Gaia’s role is not the only theme linking the various stages in the succession-myth in Apollodoros’ narrative. I believe that the strong similarity among some of the themes that structure his accounts of the Gigantomachy and Typhonomachy is a strong indication that the two accounts should not be seen as two different stages in the bid for universal kingship, but as two parts of the third and last stage, in which Zeus’ power is challenged unsuccessfully by violent chthonic powers: for the children of Gaia share, apart from their raison d’être and their common goal, a similar physical appearance. The Giants had a serpentine lower half (ἐξοµ δὲ τὰς

\textsuperscript{227} One would not be wrong to assume that Gaia’s prophecies (1.2.1) that lead to the eventual victory of Zeus also have to do with the unprovoked imprisonment of the Kyklopes and the Hundred-Handers. It evident, however, that in the ensuing battle the Hekatoncheires are a decisive factor in the acquisition of sovereignty by Zeus.
bάσεις φολίδας δρακόντων) while for Typhon, both the upper and lower parts of his body result in the equivalent serpentine parts (ἐκ [χειρῶν] δὲ ἐξεῖχον ἐκατὸν κεφαλαὶ δρακόντων. τὰ δὲ μηρῶν σπέιρας εἶχεν ὑπερμεγέθεις ἐχιδνῶν)

Their serpentine shape is evidently derived from their common origin as autochthonous beings; it is obvious that the μεμιγμένη φύσις ἄνδρος καὶ θηρίου (1.6.3,3) is indicative of the return to disorder that a potential victory of Gaia’s offspring would mean, since regression from the totally anthropomorphetic appearance of the Olympians to earlier hybrid forms would also mean regression to primordial chaos. It has already been shown that the whole appearance of the Giants and of Typhon is suggestive of the “chaotic power” they possess and the state of confusion they bring. Their unkempt hair, their supernatural bodies, the hissing (συριγμός) which Typhon emits on his way to heaven (clearly influenced by Theogony 829-30, φωναὶ δ᾽ ἐν πάσησιν ἔσαν δεινῆς κεφαλῆς, πάντοιην ὄπ᾽ ἰεσαι άθεσφατον), even the weapons used (the Giants ἕκόντιξον δὲ εἰς οὐρανὸν πέτρας καὶ δρῶς Ἡμένας, while Typhon Ἡμένας βάλλων πέτρας ἐπ’ αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανὸν . . . ἐφέρετο) show the degree of “barbarism” that characterises Gaia’s offspring. This pairing of the physical descriptions of the

---

228 For the problem that the serpentine form of the Giants creates for the identification of the source of Apollodoros’ narrative see below.

229 I have already mentioned that Apollodoros has no place in his narrative for the previous – non-anthropomorphetic – stages of cosmic evolution. There is no reference to primordial chaos, which makes this detailed precision in the physical aspect of Zeus’ opponents more significant, since it gives the readers a glimpse of a maybe previous, but certainly potential alternative world.


231 Ibid. 118: “the evil which would have resulted for the cosmos and the gods ... would have been a return to ... a state of chaos resembling the directionless” [the reference is to the confusion of different directions of space that his huge mass brings] “space formed beneath the earth by Tartaros”.

232 As Mondi 1986, 31, rightly points out, in the popular conception of the Titanomachia the rocks thrown by the Hundred-Handers were seen as the weapon decisive for the defeat of the Titans.
Giants and Typhon, and of their use of weapons, supports my argument that the two accounts are meant to be seen as complementary. The basic difference between the two sets of Gaia’s offspring is one of quantity, not of quality: the Giants have the characteristics of Typhon only to a lesser degree, and if the danger of the Giants lies in their sheer number, which demands the participation at the ensuing battle of all the Olympians, Typhon’s furious violence makes him an almost lethal opponent for Zeus.

The different degrees of powers bestowed on the Giants and Typhon has to do with their manner of conception: it is the strangeness of their birth that puts the Giants in such a peculiar position, which often appears in folktale, and causes them to be bêrotoi and ἄμφροτοι at the same time. For they can be killed only if they suffer blows by both a mortal and an immortal adversary in rapid succession; they are invincible against any other combination of opponents, whence the importance of Herakles in the victory of the gods. Although it is not explicitly stated by Apollodoros, the Giants are products of Ouranos’ blood and not of his semen; consequently, their status cannot be as clear-cut as that of the other offspring of Gaia (the case of the Erinyes, who are also born of Ouranos’ blood, is not the same, since they are incorporated into the Olympic pantheon and, as members of this group, enjoy ambrosia and nektar, the divine food and drink which bestow immortality).

In Apollodoros’ account, both episodes, but especially Zeus’ struggle against Typhon, acquire an amplified meaning, which is lacking in earlier versions

---

233 Vian 1952, 193.
234 On the importance of the theme of swallowing of food in this myth, see below.
of the story, i.e. in the *Theogony*: as West points out, in Hesiod "the Typhoeus episode is subsidiary". In Apollodoros the three stages of the succession-myth involving Zeus have an equal importance. Moreover, the Typhon narrative, as preserved for us by Apollodoros, contains cosmic connotations not evident in the two previous stories. Nowhere in the other sources do we have a reference to such a close encounter between Typhon and Zeus: elsewhere the battle is conducted from a distance and Zeus usually has no difficulty in smiting Typhon with his thunderbolts (cf. *Theogony* 853-857; Epimenides *FGrHist* 457 F 8; Nonnos' *Dionysiaka* 2. 508ff.). In Apollodoros the battle escalates to a duel at close quarters between the two opponents, with Zeus choosing a very significant weapon: this is the ἀδαμαντίνη ἀρπη, the same weapon used by Kronos for the castration of Ouranos (1.1.3.), the instrument which separated Earth and Sky and thus created the existing world. Zeus is using the sickle which created the present order as an instrument for its protection, to avert the return to its previous shapelessness. It is very tantalising that Apollodoros does not elaborate on what happened after Typhon managed to immobilise Zeus by cutting his sinews with this same sickle (τὴν ἀρπην περιελόμενος τὰ τῶν χειρῶν καὶ ποδῶν διέτεμε

[236] Nonnos in *Dionysiaka* 1. 510ff. has Typhon possess the sinews of Zeus, but the story is obscurely told and the context of this statement difficult to establish. It would seem, however, that Nonnos is following a source very similar to that which Apollodoros follows, very probably the same.
[237] Cf. II. 2. 781-3, where Zeus not only emerges victorious but his victory is seen as a recurrent phenomenon.
[238] It is true that at the beginning of its narrative Apollodoros perceives the world as pre-existing and makes no reference to its creation. We have already discussed the reasons for this discrepancy in Chapter Two, section C (i). It is also possible that the usage of the sickle should be explained as an oriental element, like those found in the story of Illuyanka (see West 1997, 304 with bibliography). I feel that one explanation supplements the other: the sickle is transferred from Hittite myth to Greek exactly because it has these connotations.
One would expect Typhon to establish himself as king. One may compare the badly fragmented theogony ascribed to Epimenides: according to the ingenious supplements of Diels (D.-K. 3 B 8 = FGrHist 457 F 8), Typhon occupies Zeus' palace while he is asleep (... [παρ' Ἐπιμνιδῆι [δ'] ἀναβάς] Τυφῶν [καθεδονήτος Διός ἔπι τὸ βασίλειον, ἐξηκρατησάς δὲ τῶν πυλῶν] καθι[κέσθαι μὲν ἔσω; παραβοθήσας δὲ] ὃ Ζεὺς [καὶ τὸ βασίλειον ἰδὼν ληφθὲν, κτεῖναι λέγεται κεραυνῷ]). The fact that he leaves his female counterpart, Delphyne, to guard Zeus, suggests such an act. Apollodoros, however, refrains from narrating in detail an incident so embarrassing for the ruler of the world. He does not even elaborate on how Hermes and Aigipan managed to steal his sinews, or on the fate of Delphyne; judging by what happened to Kampe (ὁ δὲ [Zeus] τὴν φρονοῦσαν αὐτῶν τὰ δεσμὰ Κάμπην ἀποκτείνας ἔλυσε, 1.2.1), and by the fate of Pytho in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo 356-74, one must assume that the dragoness too met her death in the hands of Hermes and Aigipan.

(i) "Conditional immortality" and other themes.

The "conditional immortality", to use Vian's term, which characterises the Giants, closely linked with the following theme of the search for the φάρμακον of immortality, appears in reverse order in the Typhon narrative. Apollodoros does

---

239 It is well accepted that a wound in the thigh equals castration: cf. Genesis 32, 24-25. In a way, Zeus suffers the fate of his grandfather, Ouranos, but for the fact that his sinews and his potency are restored.
241 The close resemblance between Delphyne and Kampe (1.2.1) is one of the most striking connections between the first and last stages of the succession-myth. See Fontenrose 1959, 243-5.
not make any statements concerning Typhon's status. It would appear that he is immortal, and that it is his encounter with the Moirai and subsequent consumption of the ephemeral fruits (ἐγεόσατο τῶν ἐφημέρων κορπῶν) which reduce him to mortal status, the exhaustion of his strength and the inevitability of death. The recurrence of the theme throughout Apollodoros' account of the succession-myth has been excellently demonstrated by Detienne & Vernant. I will only repeat their conclusion: "[i]n the accounts of Zeus' struggle for sovereignty, Apollodorus' text lays a decided emphasis on the role of swallowing of food – sometimes deceptive and sometimes authentic.".

The theme of swallowing is only one of several recurrent themes, motifs and folktale elements which not only link the stories of the Gigantomachy and the Typhonomachy, but also elaborate, emphasise and build upon themes already found in Apollodoros' account of the preceding stages in the struggle to acquire universal kingship, creating an internal link that connects all the different stages of the narrative. They are presented in a manner that emphasises the links which they create in the narrative in the Table that accompanies this Chapter. The most important among them are the role played by dolos and deceit in the acquisition and retention of sovereign power, the importance of bondage as the final indication of the loss of power, and the folktale-motif of the critical assistance rendered to Zeus by one or more helpers at decisive moments of divine warfare. All these appear once again, adding new nuances to their original meaning. To be more precise: in Apollodoros' account of the Titanomachia Zeus enjoys the help first of Metis, who with the pharmakon manages to trick Kronos and liberate Zeus'...
siblings,245 and then that of the Kyklopes and Hekatoncheires, who with their sheer physical strength turn the battle in favour of the Olympians. In Zeus' confrontation with the children of Gaia, the sequence is reversed: the Gigantomachy, where Herakles offers the physical help necessary for victory, concentrates on the violent battle; in the Typhonomachy, the concept of wily intelligence is brought into prominence, since there are two sets of helpers, the trickster par excellence Hermes with his son Aigipan, and the Moirai, who collectively assume the role of Metis and manage to deceive the monster not once, but twice. The comparison of the Gigantomachy and Typhonomachy with the Titanomachy makes it obvious that the two accounts are meant to be considered as the two complementary parts in the last stage of the succession-myth. It also makes more than probable the assumption that the whole account of the succession-myth derives from the same source, for the links among the different stages are too elaborate to assume that the account is the product of a compiler who brought together different sources. Hence our next task is to argue that the version of the Gigantomachy and the Typhonomachy come from the same source as the account of the Titanomachy – in all probability an archaic epic.

(iv) Archaic elements in Apollodoros' account of the Gigantomachy

As we saw, the scanty extant fragments of the Titanomachia by Eumelos give no indication that the poem contained any such account. Yet a Scholium on

245 The role played by Metis at this stage is of course reversed when it comes to the myth relating the birth of her daughter, Athena. It is she that is deceived and eventually swallowed by Zeus. On this see also the discussion in Chapter One.
Apollonios Rhodios (Σ 1. 554, p. 47, 20 Wendel) contains information attributed to a Gigantomachy:

ο δὲ τὴν Γιγαντομαχίαν ποιήσας φησίν ὅτι Κρόνος μεταμορφώθηκε εἰς ἵππον ἐμίγη Φιλόφρα τῇ Ὀκεανοῦ, διόπερ καὶ ἱπποκένταυρος ἑγεννήθη Χείρων. τούτου δὲ γυνὴ Χορικλώ (Titanomachia F 10 Bernabé = F 9 Davies).

Arguing against the inclusion of a Gigantomachia in the work of Eumelos, Vian points out\(^\text{246}\) that “Chiron n’a aucun rapport avec les Géants”. He notes that Clement of Alexandria (Strom. 1. 73. 3 = Titanomachia F 11 Bernabé = F 6 Davies) attributes the references to Cheiron to the author of the Titanomachia, and concludes that we are dealing with a “confusion banale depuis l’époque hellénistique”.\(^\text{247}\) It is indeed possible that the scholiast attributed his information to a Gigantomachia by error. However, it is also possible that, as Gantz suggests\(^\text{248}\) in the light of references in Xenophanes and Philo of Byblos,\(^\text{249}\) “a war between the

---

\(^{246}\) Vian 1952, 171.

\(^{247}\) The syncretism between the groups of the Ouranidai in general (including the Hekatoncheires, especially Briareos, already in Kallimachos [hymn 4. 141-7, where Briareos takes the place of Enkelados under Aitna]) and the Giants becomes the norm in later Hellenistic and Imperial times, when authors merge Titans, Gigantes and Typhon together into a single set (cf. Claudian, Gigantomachia 32-5: . . . rapiat fulmen sceptrumque Typhoeus;/ Enceladi iussis mare serviat; alter habenas/ Aurorae pro Sole regat; te Delphica laurus/ stringet, Porphyrian, Circhaque templum tenebis). See Vian and Moore, 1989, 192-6.

\(^{248}\) Gantz 1996, 447.

\(^{249}\) Xenophanes’ diatribe against epic recitations (fr. 1, p. 21sq. Gentili-Prato, ο’ τι μάχας διέπειν Τιτάνων οὖδ’ Τιτάνων/ οὖδ’ <τι> Κεντάρακον, πλάσμα<ον> τῶν προτέρων [Titanomachia T1 Bernabé]), or the aforementioned extract from Philo of Byblos (FGHist. 790 F 2 [40], apud Euseb. Praep. Evang. 1.10.40), ἔθεσε Ἰσίδωρος τ’ ἑκατοντευξάς καὶ τίτανομαχίας ἐπλάσαν ἰδίας καὶ εὐκομῆς, οἷς συμπεριφέρομεν ἐξενίκησαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν [Titanomachia T1/ Cycle T6/ Theogony T 1 Bernabé = Titanomachia T 1 Davies]), indicate that there was some sort of early epic that contained an account of the conflict. In fact, Hesiod’s reference (Theogony 50-1, αὖθεσι δ’ ἀνθρώπον τὰ γένος κρατηράν τὰ Γιγάντων ὄμνεος τέρποιντι Διὸς νόν ἐντὸς Ἡλόμπου), is certainly allusion to a traditional song about the Gigantomachy.
gods and the Gigantes formed a coda to the *Titanomachia*, thus justifying an alternative title*. This means, at least, that a possible attribution of Apollodoros’ account to the *Titanomachia* cannot be ruled out *a priori*.

Both the Gigantomachy and the Typhonomachy preserve a number of details that seem too primitive to represent later inventions. In the Gigantomachy, elements such as the food of immortality and the Giants’ status of “conditional mortality”, the total darkness brought on by the prohibition on the shining of Dawn, the Moon and the Sun, and the chthonic immortality of the autochthonous Alkyoneus, all point towards an archaic source with a love for the incredible and the fantastic. The helmet of Hades with its power to render the wearer invisible already appears in Homer (*Iliad* 5. 844-5, cf. *Shield of Herakles* 226-7); elements such as Poseidon’s attack on Polybotes with a large mass which he broke off from Kos (cf. Athena’s similar action against Enkelados discussed below), repeated in the early representations, would, in Gantz’s words, “hardly ever be comprehensible in artistic terms alone, and thus there must have been some sort of detailed early narrative”. In fact, the more concrete evidence from the study of iconography seems to corroborate the possibility of an archaic epic as Apollodoros’ source: as Vian and Moore conclude, “*son récit concorde à bien des égards avec les monuments figurés des VIe et VVe s.***”

The same conclusion can be reached about the Typhonomachy, because of the coincidence in details such as the swallowing of deceptive food and the subsequent loss of power (in this case both physical and temporal), bondage as the final punishment for the loss of power, the presence of “divine assistants”, the use

\footnotesize

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{250} Gantz 1996, 453.
  \item \textsuperscript{251} Vian and Moore 1989, 192.
\end{itemize}
of deceit in the struggle for the acquisition of divine power (which, in the case of Typhon, reminds us of the frequent portrayal in folktale of the credulous giant who is bested by trickery), the use of the world-creating sickle in the cosmic battle between Zeus and Typhon, even the metamorphosis of the gods into animals (which I will discuss below), the doubling of the female dragon as a guard, and the use by Zeus of a chariot with winged horses.

(v) "Non-Archaic” elements of Apollodoros’ account

This sheer profusion of details of archaic colouring in the Gigantomachy and Typhonomachy supports my suggestion of an archaic source – if not the Titanomachia itself, at least an epic poem of more or less the same period and based upon the same traditions. Unfortunately, a number of details found in both narratives appear not to be archaic, hence contradicting any such identification and pointing towards a Hellenistic source. What I will try to do in the following section is to approach each such element and discuss whether it can be attributed to an archaic source, and if not, to consider whether it can be otherwise explained.

While not denying the existence of a strong archaic background for the Gigantomachy, the authors of the LIMC article on the Giants list the elements that could not, according to them, be part of an archaic account:²⁵² "distinction entre Phlégrai et Palléné, G[éants] anguipèdes, épisode d'Alkyoneus (qui paraît provenir d’une Géryonide), Pallas écorché, Encelade enseveli sous l’Aitna". To these one should also add the presence on the side of the Olympians of Hekate (who does

²⁵² Vian and Moore, 1989, 192.
not appear in iconography before 460) and of the Moirai, who are portrayed, most unbecomingly, as charging against two otherwise unknown Giants, Agrios and Thoon, using bronze clubs.\textsuperscript{253}

Some of these details can easily be explained: the inclusion of Hekate in the battle can be seen as addition made by Apollodoros.\textsuperscript{254} The author is aware of other variants of the story and in his familiar manner adds them. This would mean that, in the part of the text where Hekate is mentioned, one should keep the text of the manuscript (\textit{Κλυτίον δὲ, φασίν (ː mss.), Εκάτη, μᾶλλον δὲ Ἡφαίστος βαλῶν μύδροις}), without the emendations \textit{Κλυτίον δὲ, δασίν Εκάτη, Μίμαντα}\textsuperscript{255} δὲ Ἡφαίστος βαλῶν μύδροις. Apollodoros reports that some allege (φασίν) that Hekate killed Klytios, but he rather (μᾶλλον) prefers the (more archaic) version that has Hephaistos do the killing. In that way we do not have to accept the invention of a Giant Μίμας as the opponent of Hephaistos.

This explanation creates another problem: this expression of preference would be one of the rare occasions when Apollodoros prefers one version of a myth to another.\textsuperscript{256} Usually he either chooses the sources that he wants to follow for each episode and moves from one source to the other without any indication,

\textsuperscript{253} On the Moirai in the frieze of the altar of Zeus in Pergamon (their first definite appearance in iconography) see Simon 1975, passim, and De Angeli 1992, 642.

\textsuperscript{254} Apollodoros seems unaware of the identification of Phlegrai with Pallene; however, such a connection was already well established in Herodotos 7. 123.1: αὕτα γὰρ εἶναι αὐτὸν Παλλήνην, πρῶτον δὲ Φλέγην καλεσμένην, νεμόμεναι. See also Aischylos' \textit{Eum.} 295, where Phlegrai is obviously geographically identified with Pallene. This means that any episode of the Gigantomachy specifically linked with Pallene need not be a later addition. See our discussion below.

\textsuperscript{255} The words in italics have been offered as emendations of the text already by Mayer 1887, 204-5, and have been subsequently accepted by Wagner 1894, and Frazer 1921. Scarpi 1996, 24-5, who also prints the text, accepts Mayer's δασίν, but retains the reading of the mss. μᾶλλον.

\textsuperscript{256} See also 2.5.11: ταύτα δὲ ἐν ῥήματι οἷς ὄψιν ἔτειν ἐν Ἀιγύπτῳ, ἀλλ' εἰπ' τοῦ Ἀτλαντοῦ ἐν Ὡρπερμέασι; 3.14.1: γενομένης δὲ ῥεῖδος ἀμφότερος ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας, Ἀθηνᾶ καὶ Ποσειδώνι διαλύσας Ζεύς κρίτας ἐδικαίων, σύν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸν τιμῆς, Κέκροπα καὶ Κροκάτον, οὐδὲ Ἐρυσίχθους, θεός δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα.
or he faithfully reproduces different versions of an episode paratactically (normally a simple δὲ after the name of the quoted author is enough). Could this peculiar syntax be an indication that Apollodoros is not using the actual archaic source, but is simply copying from another handbook,\(^{257}\) whose author was more daring in his handling of material? A suggestion of this type would explain the embarrassing lack of details such as what happened to the world during Typhon's reign, and how Hermes and Aigipan managed to free Zeus from the Korykian cave; it could also explain the presence of elements that we cannot assign to an archaic source. In this case, Apollodoros uses throughout a abbreviated version of the archaic epic, a version mostly faithful to the original source but with a number of minor reworkings to incorporate different – not necessarily later – details of the story.

Setting this suggestion aside for a moment, let us see if we can recognise the existence of any of the familiar conventions of epic form in Apollodoros' account. If we exclude the references to Hekate and the Moirai, the account of the gods who take part in the battle produces the effect of a kind of ring-composition which incorporates all the traditional episodes:

\(^{257}\) Thus Söder 1939, 167.
a] The battle begins with Herakles shooting Alkyoneus, who has started the Giants' attack by stealing Helios' cattle; the Giant is killed with the help of Athena.

b] Zeus (and Herakles) fights Porphyreon and, using Hera as a decoy, kills him with his thunderbolts.\textsuperscript{258}

c] Apollo (and Herakles) blinds Ephialtes.\textsuperscript{259}

d] Dionysos kills Eurytos with his thyrsos.

e] <Hekate or> Hephaiostos kills Klytios by throwing μυδροί at him.

f] Athena fights against \textit{two} Giants, Enkelados, on which she throws Sicily and Pallas, whom she skins.

e] Poseidon kills Polybotes by throwing Nisyros at him.

d] Hermes disposes of Hippolytos while wearing Hades' κυνη.

c] Artemis fights Gaeon (?).\textsuperscript{260}

<Moirai use their bronze clubs against Agrios and Thoas>.

b] Zeus smites the rest of the Giants.

a] Herakles shoots arrows against all the Giants as they are dying.

\textsuperscript{258} On Zeus' fight with Porphyreon, the βασιλεύς Γιγάντων of Pindar (P 8. 17), see Cook III, 1940, 55-8, Vian 1952, 197-8. On the iconographic representations of Zeus in the context of Gigantomachy see Vian 1952, 47-51, 127-9, 156-7; Arafat 1990, 9-29.

\textsuperscript{259} On Apollo in the iconographic Gigantomachies, see Lambrinoudakis et al., in \textit{LIMC} II, especially p. 327. In iconography, Apollo is usually accompanied by his sister Artemis, obviously for reasons of identification. In extant literary versions of the Gigantomachy Apollo uses a bow (Pindar P 8.18). However, despite the fact that, whenever Apollo is equipped with a weapon, in other episodes depicted on black- or red-figure vases it is almost invariably a bow, in artistic representations of this battle he is often presented holding a sword or a spear (see Vian 1952, 80). The representation of Apollo as \textit{hoplite} in the iconographic representations of the Gigantomachy obviously corresponds to the portrayal of the Giants as human warriors, and is an indication that literary accounts do not comply with iconographic conventions and vice versa. On Dionysos' portrayal in the artistic representations of the Gigantomachy see Vian 1952, 83-90, and Carpenter 1997, 16-21. For the iconographic representations of Athena in artistic Gigantomachies, see Vian 1952, 56-68, 131-3; Demargne and Cassimatis, in \textit{LIMC} II, 1984, especially p. 1023.

\textsuperscript{260} See below.
This leaves us with another problem: how are we to explain the presence of the Moirai in the Gigantomachy? The fact that the Moirai spoil the ring makes it possible that they are an addition to the original tradition. The question now becomes who added them and why. This last point is the easiest to explain: the Moirai are introduced in the battle because of the role which they play in the following Typhon episode. In it, the daughters of Zeus fit perfectly into the action: who else but the guardians of universal order, the deities who decide the span of life of each being, could convince Typhon that they possessed fruits that would replenish one's strength?

This latter episode is structurally linked to the narrative in two ways: a) it is the last variation of the theme of food, and b) the Moirai play the role of Metis in the Titanomachy, while Herakles undertakes the role of the Hekatoncheires. Therefore it is another indication that the Gigantomachy and Typhonomachy were composed together and with an eye to the previous stage of the succession-myth. Consequently this episode must have been part of the original narrative. Someone who wanted to balance the role of the Moirai in the subsequent deceit of Typhon with a more active role in the previous stage of the succession-myth incorporated them into the Gigantomachy. Since it is not the work of a compiler to insert unattested elements in his narrative, I would argue for the attribution of this change to the archaic author of the account. This explanation for the inclusion of the Moirai in the Gigantomachy elucidates why such a reference remains unique until the Hellenistic period when all the forces of the universe – even Okeanos who remains totally uninvolved in the battle with the Titans – become entangled in a
Gigantomachy which has by now taken on cosmic proportions (cf. the iconography on the altar of Zeus in Pergamon). 261

The Moirai could be two, since they fight two Giants. 262 Vian suggests that we are dealing with a couple, and points to the existence of a pair of Moirai in Delphic context. 263 Indeed, Pausanias (10. 24. 4) records the existence at Delphi of the statues of two Moirai, in a complex of four statues: the presence of two goddesses, instead of the usual three, balances the presence of two male gods, Zeus and Apollo, and appears deliberate: ἔστηκε δὲ ἀγάλματα Μοιρῶν δύο· ἀντὶ δὲ αὐτῶν τῆς τρίτης Ζεὺς τε Μοιραγέτης καὶ Ἀπόλλων σφίσι παρέστηκε Μοιραγέτης (also cf. Plutarch, Moralia 385C). In view of the number of their opponents in Apollodorus, the suggestion that there was a tradition that envisaged the Moirai as a pair and not with a triad is attractive. It is possible, however, that they are given two opponents, not because they are thought of as a couple, but because they are seen as a group regardless of their number.

Vian argues that the two Moirai take the place of two other gods, namely Aphrodite and Ares, in order to keep the number of participants on the Olympian side to twelve. 264 Although I find the suggestion of an account that included a reference to a dodekatheon interesting, I am rather doubtful, since I believe that the inclusion of Hekate was not part of the original account but a later addition. Consequently, we are left with eleven gods instead of the necessary twelve. This would mean that, if we count the Moirai as a pair and not as a triad, we would

261 See Simon 1975, passim.
262 Note, however, that the mss. have μοῖρα. This is obviously a mistake, since the epithet μοιχείαnas that follows makes clear that we are dealing with more than one deity. Aegius’ correction to μοῖρα is accepted by all subsequent editors of the work.
263 Vian 1952, 208.
have to give the twelfth place to Herakles (who presumably takes the place of Demeter, who is also missing from the account) as an indication perhaps of the subsequent apotheosis of the hero. However, the mortality of Herakles is essential to the account (the Giants cannot be killed without the presence of a mortal) and its importance should not be underestimated. If we are to argue that Apollodoros listed twelve gods, then we have to allow for three Moirai. Thus, we are left with an account that included all the major gods in a vicious battle for survival, and complied with the general view of the Moirai as a triad (as recorded by Apollodoros 1.3.1).

That the Moirai fight with clubs sounds extremely peculiar and archaic. We must accept Heyne's emendation μοχόμενα (followed by Westermann, Mayer and Frazer) and not the reading μοχομένοις found in RR or the μοχομένοις of the rest of the mss. It must be the Moirai who fight with clubs, since the Giants fight with rocks and burning oaks, while each deity is introduced fighting with a different kind of weapon, usually indicative of his/her function. The only deity not to have a weapon is Artemis, a further indication of the corruption of the text at that point.

265 Note that the names recorded in Apollodoros follow very closely the names that the scholiast to Pindar O 5. 10, who, quoting Herodorus (FGrHist 31 F34a), mentions the names of the gods to whom Herakles dedicated six double altars: Zeus-Poseidon, Hera-Athena, Hermes-Apollo, Charites-Dionysos, Artemis-Alpheios, and Kronos-Rhea. Ares, Aphrodite, and Demeter are not included in this list either.

266 The mss. Τραίανα as the name of Artemis' opponent is obviously corrupt. However, I have been unable to successfully emend the text to give a weapon for the goddess (a bow? some other, unique weapon?) and/ or the name of her opponent. A number of emendations have been proposed: Ἀγρίας (Gale, Heyne, Mayer, Puchstein); Εἰστείσας (Heyne); Εὐρυτιάνα (Pyl); Κριτείσας (Schwenck); Ρατίας (Hercher); Ρατιάς (Faber); Ρατίας (Lefèvre, Jahn). Of these, Pyl's Εὐρυτιάς is ingenious, my only objection to it being that we already have a Giant with a similar name, Ἐὔρυτος, fighting against Dionysos. I would prefer the conjecture Γατίνα, since we already have an occurrence of a Giant by that name fighting against Artemis (on a cup now in Berlin, Staatl. Mus. F. 2531; see Vian and Moore, l. c. 269, and item 318). On the iconographic representations of Artemis in the Gigantomachy see Vian 1952, 79-82, and Kahil, in LIMC II, especially p. 327 (for the archaic period) and 750 (for the V and IV c.).
Athena plays a very significant role in Apollodoros’ account of the Gigantomachy: not only is it she who advises Zeus to summon Herakles (Zeôç ... Ἰτανάκαια δὲ σῶμαχον δι’ Ἀθηνᾶς ἐπεκαλέσατο), an action which ensures the final victory for the Olympians, she also advises Herakles on how to kill the autochthonous Alkyoneus (Ἀθηνᾶς δὲ υποθεμένης ἔξω τῆς Πολλήνης εἶλκουσεν αὐτῶν. κάκεινος οὕτως ἐτελεύτα), a death which initiates the actual battle between the gods and giants. She is, moreover, the only god who fights against two giants, Enkelados and Pallas. Scholars have considered both episodes to be later innovations, with Enkelados’ fate probably being influenced by the story of Typhon and attested for the first time in Kallimachos (Aitia fr. 1. 35-6 Pfeiffer, ... τὸ μοι βάρος δοσον ἐπεστη/ τριγλαώττω δίλωτι νήσος ἐπ’ Ἔγκελαδῳ). Vian\(^\text{267}\) believes that the reference to Enkelados’ burial under Sicily\(^\text{268}\) is a Hellenistic addition to the original archaic poem, since we have no iconographic evidence for Enkelados’ fate such as we have for Polybotes, which is indeed suspicious. But, as he notes, in Euripides’ Herakles Amphitryon refers to Enkelados and Athena in a context similar to ours (ἡ ἡ τί δρᾶς, ὡς Διὸς ποτέ, μελαθρὼς/ τάραγμα ταρτάρειον ως ἐπ’ Ἔγκελαδῳ ποτέ, Πολλὰς/ ἐς δόμος πέμπεις). Vian interprets this as a reference to Enkelados’ imprisonment in Tartaros, again influenced by the fate of Typhon. Yet, as Bond points out,\(^\text{269}\) “the simile points to what Athena really does, the hurling of a stone against Herakles\(^\text{270}\) just as she hurled Sicily at Enkelados”. Clearly, we are dealing with “a parallel too

\(^{267}\) Idid. 201.

\(^{268}\) In his reconstruction of the archaic Gigantomachy, Vian 1952, 221-2, accepts that Enkelados must have been Athena’s main opponent since, as he points out (201), “l’exploit majeur d’Athéna est la défaite d’Encélide. Le Géant est déjà associé à la déesse au milieu du VIe siècle.” It is to the action performed by Athena (the hurling of Sicily) that he objects, not the name of her opponent.

\(^{269}\) Bond 1981, 305.

\(^{270}\) Clearly, Athena’s action is designed to stop Herakles from committing parricide.
apt to be ignored”. And the fact that Euripides uses such an allusion in a simile (and we must remember that in the *Herakles* the Gigantomachy is used constantly as a reminder of Herakles’ power) must mean that the story which placed Enkelados underneath Sicily was already known.

Athena’s duel with Pallas is somewhat more complex: in contrast with the slaying of Enkelados, the objections raised against this episode do not have to do with the actual skinning of the Giant (*Πάλλαντος δὲ τὴν δορὰν ἐκτεμόθοσα ταύτῃ κατὰ τὴν μάχην τὸ ἵδιον ἐπέσκεπτε σώμα*). An objection of this kind could easily be disproved: apart from the tales about the acquisition of the impenetrable hide of the Nemean lion by Herakles (a version attributed to either Stesichoros [229 PMG] or Pisander of Camiros [Suda s.v. = Pisander T 1 Davies = T 1 Bernabé, Eratosthenes *Catast.* 12 = Pisander F 2 Davies = F 1 Bernabé]),

Athena herself is found performing the same action in similar contexts. In a version of the Gigantomachy found in Euripides’ *Ion* (987-97), Athena kills Gorgo, the monster whom Gaia brings forth to help the Giants, and takes her skin (*xabxτιγ’ Αγαβαν ὑπὸ ἑπτικατά (τολμηθεὶς, Παλλάδιος στολήν, 995-6)).

Vian regards this version as an original feature of the archaic Gigantomachy, which the skinning of the giant Pallas came to replace in the later versions (from around the 3rd cent. B.C., when Apulian medals show Athena

---

271 See Huxley 1969, 101; also Lloyd-Jones 1984, 149. For a more detailed treatment of the myth of the Nemean Lion (narrated by Apollodoros in 2.5.1) see Chuvin 1992, 205-10.

272 See Dionysios Skytobrachion *FGrHist* 32 F 8 = Diod. 3. 70. 3-6, where Athena kills and takes the skin of the monster Aigis, a child of Gaia, who in revenge brings forth the Giants, οδὲ ωστετυρον ὑπὸ Διὸς ἄνειρεθήκαι συναγογεὶσαμενὸς Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ Διονύσου μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν (70. 6. 19). The same three gods are present in the *Ion* (205-19): Athena fights Enkelados, Zeus kills Mimas with his thunderbolts and Bromios an unidentified giant. Are the two authors relating the same version of the myth? See also *Orphic hymns* 32. 8.

273 Vian 1952, 199-200.
fighting two giants, whom Vian identifies as Enkelados and Pallas).\textsuperscript{274} We have no iconographic evidence for the skinning of Gorgo by Athena; Vian, usually conscious of such facts, chooses not to comment on this lack. He also suggests that we make much of the fact that the Gorgo is strongly linked with the Perseus saga, “car la matière mythique est mouvante”. The possibility of an old version of the Gigantomachy, in which this alternative story of the slaying of the Gorgo was an episode, cannot be disproved. But, as Gantz points out,\textsuperscript{275} in Euripides’ account the whole plot is probably peculiar to the \textit{Ion}, so it is unlikely that this story was included in the archaic Gigantomachy which Apollodoros follows. It would seem really peculiar if someone replaced a generic episode of the Gigantomachy (because of the strong connections of the Gorgoneion with Perseus?) with the skinning of a giant, despite (or rather suppressing, which is, Vian argues, what the author of Apollodoros does) the connotations that the name Pallas evoked, since it was so similar to Athena’s own epithet. Vian makes much of the later version that makes Athena the daughter of Pallas (Cic. \textit{De Nat. Deor.} 3.59, \textit{[Minerva] quinta Pallantis, quae patrem dicitur interemisse virginitatem suam violare, cui pinnarum talaria adfigunt}).\textsuperscript{276} Surely this version of Athena’s parentage must have arisen from an earlier association between the two figures in some context. In Apollodoros the name Pallas does not seem to mean anything more than “an

\textsuperscript{274} See Vian and Moore 1989, 256, no. 61.

\textsuperscript{275} Gantz 1996, I, 448.

\textsuperscript{276} See Pease 1958, 1129-31, who he cites all the sources that mention this peculiar parentage of Athena (Clem. \textit{Protr.2} 28.2; Arnob. 4.14; Ampel. 9.10; Firm. \textit{De Errore} 16; and more importantly Tzetz. on Lykophron 355, who links the two versions, and explains the peculiar reference to the wings on her heels, by having Athena attach Pallas’ wings to her feet and using his skin like an aegis: \textit{Πάλλας ὁ Ἁθηνᾶ . . . ὃς ἐπὶ ἑταῖρας ἐχθροὺς ἐκ τῆς κόρας τῶν Γιγάντων καὶ τῶν θεῶν Πάλλας, ἔχον ἰδίων Γιγάντων, ἀνείλει. ὁ Πάλλας, τὸν ίδιον πατέρα, πτεροτόπον ὑπάρχοντα καὶ ἔστρων ἡταίρων, ὃς θέλοντας αὐτὴν σεβαστὴν, ὡς τὴν παρθενίαν τιμῶν, τοῦτον ἀνείλε καὶ τὸ δέρμα αὐτοῦ ὡς αἰγίδα περιεβάλλετο καὶ τὰ πτερὰ τούτου τοῖς ποσὶ ταύτης προσήψεως.}
autochthonous being from Pallene”. It is very probable that he firstly became associated with Athena Pallas in a mêlée in the context of Gigantomachy. In *Etym. Magn.* 649.52 s. v. Παλλάς, one reads: Ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ· ἤ παρὰ τὸ ἀναπεπάλθαι ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ Διός· ἤ ὅτι Πάλλαντα, ἔνα ἐκ τῶν Γιγάντων, ἀπέκτεινεν· ἢ ... The same explanation for the acquisition by Athena of the epithet Pallas is given by Epicharmos: 277

ἐκ τὰς τῷ Διός

φαντὶ κεφαλὰς ἀπολέσαι πράτιστα πάντων ἐμ μάχα

tάι γενομένα κατὰ Κρόνον Πάλλαντα, τὸ δὲ τοὐτὸ δέρος

πῶς τὸ φοβερὰν εὔθυς εἶμεν περιβάλειν αὐτῷ κύκλων·

dιόπερ αὐτὰν Παλλάδ' ὄνομασθήμεν ὅπο πάντων τόκα.

Epicharmos’ reference to the battle against Kronos probably means that he attributes the episode to a Titanomachy (although the possibility of a confusion between the Titans and the Giants cannot even here be excluded). It is possible that the similarity of the two names brought the two figures together in the Gigantomachy, and later generated a number of aetiological stories. 278 What is more important is that Apollodoros of Athens in his Περὶ θεῶν, from which this fragment is taken, 279 connects the skinning of Pallas with the very important epic fragments of the *Meropis*, 280 an epic of the archaic period, which preserves the

---

277 Firstly published in *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta in papyris reperta* fr. 85a Austin = *P. Colon.* 5604 col. II, 8-15. The text is attributed to Epicharmos because his name appears in 1. 5. See now Kassel and Austin 2001, Epicharmos fr. 135, whose text I follow.

278 It would indeed be strange if Apollodoros chose to omit any aetiological references, when his whole account is full of them (see e.g. the naming of Haimos 1.6.3).

279 Found in no. 126, Kolner Pap. 3, 1980.

280 Cf. Bernabé 1987, 131-5; *Suppl. Hell.* no. 903 (pp. 405-8).
otherwise unknown story of Athena coming to aid Herakles by slaying Asteros and taking his impenetrable hide. The poem seems to be conflating elements found in the narratives about the Nemean lion, the battle with the Meropes, and the Gigantomachy. In fact the two latter stories and the first sacking of Troy by Herakles are firmly connected as early as the Hesiodic Catalogue (fr. 43a. 61-65):


The association of the sacking of Troy by Herakles with a perilous adventure on the island of Kos is already found in Homer's Iliad (14.250-61, 15.26-30). Despite the fact that these references lack many details, which surely indicates that the tale, probably taken from an early Gigantomachy or Herakleia, was well known to the audience, the account offers some interesting points which we should keep in mind. Herakles arrived at Kos νόσφι φίλων πάντων (14.256), and found himself in such a predicament that Zeus had to intervene and transport him safely to Argos (τοῦ μὲν ἐγὼν ἐνθεὶν ροσάμην καὶ ἀνήγαγον αὐτις Ἄργος ἐς ἵπποβοτον καὶ πολλὰ περ ἀθλήσαντα, 15.29-30). Apollodoros (2.7.1) records this same tradition, most probably following Pherekydes (FGrHist 3 F 87 = Σ AB Gen. in

282 Thus Lloyd-Jones 1984, 143: “in Meropide leonem cum gigante, pugnam Coam cum pugna Phlegraeam commixtam reperimus”.
Hom. II. 14. 255), as Frazer suggests. Apollodoros links the sack of Troy, the battle with the Meropes (where he relates the tale of Hera’s persecution of her stepson and her subsequent punishment by Zeus, already narrated in the aforementioned Homeric passages), and the battle at Phlegra. Once again, the Meropes turn out to be extraordinary opponents: Herakles is wounded by Chalkedon and has to be snatched away by Zeus. It is only after his father’s intervention that Herakles is able to sack Kos, after which he is led by Athena to Phlegra: πορθήσας δὲ Κῶ ἤκε δι’ Ἄθηνᾶς εἰς Φλέγραν, καὶ μετὰ θεῶν κατεπολέμησε Γίγαντας (2.7.1).

Incidentally, a similar sequence of events – but with the omission of the battle with the Meropes – is found in Ephoros of Kyne (FGrHist 70 F 34): οἱ δὲ περὶ τὴν πάλαι μὲν Φλέγραν, νῦν δὲ Παλλήνην ὄνομαζομένην κατοικοῦντες ἔσαν ἄνθραποι ὅμοι καὶ ἰερόσυλοι καὶ ἀνθρωποφάγοι, οἱ καλούμενοι Γίγαντες, οὓς Ἰακόβης λέγεται χειρόσασθαι τὴν Τροίαν ἐλών καὶ διὰ τὸ κρατῆσαι τοὺς περὶ τὸν Ἰακόβηα οἰκίους ὄντας τῶν Γιγάντων πολλῶν ὄντων καὶ ἀσεβῶν θεῶν ἔργον ἀπασίν ἐδόκει γεγονέναι τὸ περὶ τὴν μάχην. It is evident that the rationalisation of the myth is well under way, but Ephoros preserves what must have been the traditional sequence of events.

To return to our main argument, the fact that Pindar twice mentions Herakles’ sack of Troy, the battle with the Meropes and the giant Alkyoneus in this same order (N 4. 25-7, I 6. 31-3) might indicate a closer link between the two mythical versions which involve Alkyoneus and Herakles, that of a Gigantomachy and that of an independent battle. The slaying of Alkyoneus is the episode which

284 Frazer 1921, 247.
285 The impression that the episode of Alkyoneus might have been an independent athlon is given – apart from the iconographic evidence, which has Herakles attacking Alkyoneus in a single duel, not as a part of an orchestrated battle (see Olmos and Balmaseda in LIMC I 1, 558-64) – by
seems, in relation to the iconographic evidence – most ill-suited to the context of the archaic Gigantomachy. I hesitate to exclude the episode from Apollodoros’ original source, despite evidence that Alkyoneus’ involvement in the Gigantomachy is Hellenistic, because of the strong structural link which this episode appears to have with the rest of the narrative: Alkyoneus’ theft of the cattle initiates the hostilities between the Giants and the Olympians. Indeed, in an anonymous lyric fragment, which has a strong Pindaric flavour and links together a number of traditions about autochthony, Alkyoneus is said to be the eldest of the Giants: εἴτε Πελλάνα Φλεγραίον Ἀλκυονήα, γιγάντων πρεσβύτατον (PMG fr. 985 = Hippolytos refut. omn. haeres., v. 17). This explains why Alkyoneus alone of all the giants should be awarded autochthonic immortality in addition, and why it is he who steals the cattle of Helios; as a result of doing so, he is the first to be attacked and killed by Herakles with Athena’s help.

In fact the episode bears a strong resemblance to the battle with Asteros narrated in the Meropis. In both cases, Herakles cannot overcome his opponent without the intervention (physical or advisory) of Athena. Once Athena intervenes, the battle escalates with Herakles being attacked, in the typically epic way which makes the victor of a duel be instantly attacked, by the king of the Giants.

Pindar’s account, which makes Herakles fight alongside Telamon, a version that is later taken up and enhanced with further details by the scholiasts on the two passages. The presence of Telamon creates problems for any attempt to argue that Pindar considers the episode with Alkyoneus part of a Gigantomachy; Telamon cannot take part in a divine battle. Only Herakles is appropriate to help the gods, because of his background and eventual apotheosis. Yet the reference to Alkyoneus in a place traditionally reserved for the Gigantomachy surely indicates that the episode should be seen in this light. Telamon’s inclusion in the battle with the Meropes (where the majority of our sources, starting with Homer, stress that Herakles was alone) and in the Alkyoneus episode is explained once we realise that both poems are in honour of Aiginetan victors: Pindar changes the myth, and incorporates the Aiginetan hero in all three accounts (traditionally he took part only in the sack of Troy) in an attempt to glorify him.

286 Ibid. 564.

287 In other versions (influenced by a Geryoneis?) it is Porphyreon who steals the cattle of Herakles ἄχοντος αὐτοῦ (Σ Pind. P 8. 17).
Porphyreon, who also meets his doom at the hands of Zeus and Herakles. If, therefore, the Alkyoneus episode were a later addition to the Gigantomachy, it would follow that the whole account belongs to a later date. This is what Vian argues. He finds problematic the reference to Erytheia, which forms a link with the cattle of Geryoneus, also situated on the same island. Indeed one source records that, at the isthmus of Korinth, Alkyoneus tried to steal the cattle which Herakles had brought from Erytheia (Σ Pind. N. 4. 25). Based on this tradition, Vian, following Mayer, proposes that Apollodoros bases his account of the Gigantomachy on a post-classical Geryoneis, the author of which blended archaic and Hellenistic elements. However, I think that the strong structural links between the stages of the succession-myth in Apollodoros disprove this theory. The Gigantomachy is too complicated in structure and too elaborately connected with the previous and following narrative to be derived from a Geryoneis. It is probable that the cattle of Helios and the cattle of Geryoneus, originally two different stories, were blended in later versions of the story. This would have happened for two reasons first, they shared the same location: Erytheia, which also contained the flocks of Hades, was probably one of the traditional places for keeping divine animals. Secondly, Herakles was involved in both incidents. In fact, a scholiast to Pind. 1 6. 32 (= 3. 254f. Drachmann), alludes to exactly the tradition preserved in Apollodoros, as follows: Φλέγρα τῆς Ὀρθάκης χωρίων διέτριβε δὲ ὁ Ἀλκυονεύς κατὰ τὸν Ὀρθάκικὸν Ἰσθμὸν. βουβότατον δὲ τὸν βουκόλον φησί, παρ᾽ ὂν τὰς Ἡλίου βούς ἀπήλασεν ὃθεν καὶ ὁ πόλεμος πρὸς τὸὺς

Vian 1952, 220.
Thus in both sources Alkyoneus drove off Helios' cattle, and this became the cause of the war between the gods and the giants. This scholium also offers the solution to the problem of the reference to the isthmus of Korinth by showing that in fact the Isthmus of Pallene is meant. From the Thracian isthmus, the action was later moved to Korinth, the best-known isthmus of Greece. All these facts make it highly unlikely that the episode did not belong to the original account of the Gigantomachy.

To return to the Pallas episode, the *Meropis* offers us the closest parallel to the skinning of Pallas that we can find: it contains the same protagonists, the same action and is situated in a place closely linked with the Gigantomachy. It is possible that the action in the *Meropis* takes place just before the battle with the Giants. Apollodoros' version hints that Athena fetched Herakles from somewhere (1.6.1): in view of 2.7.1, Kos is the only possibility. It is obvious that we are dealing with a tradition in which Athena took the hide\(^{290}\) off a giant,\(^{291}\) the only difference being his name. Apollodoros' version does contain a number of names previously unheard of:\(^{292}\) the fact that we have not encountered them before does not mean that they had not been used earlier. Nor does the fact that we find the name Pallas given to an opponent of Athena in Hellenistic times mean that it was not used before. What better name for an adversary could there be than one that reminds us

\(^{290}\)The acquisition of the hide of Asteros fits the condition of the possession of a magical weapon before the battle, in the same way as does that of Gorgo in Vian's reconstruction.

\(^{291}\) We have no reference in the surviving fragments of the "*Meropis*" to the physique of Asteros; a reference to an Aster, a giant opponent of Athena (in Aristotle's fr. 637 Rose, δεύτερα δὲ τὰ Παιονιδήνα ἐπὶ Ἀστέρα τῷ γίγαντι ὧν Ἀθηνᾶς ἀναπροσθέντοι) seems, together with the other similarities between the account of the Gigantomachy and the "*Meropis*", to point to Asteros being a giant. Besides, Philostratos (Her. 289) says they were once Giants on Kos. See Janko 1992, 191-2.

so much of the most common epithet of the goddess, a name already in use by the epic poets (even if it is associated with the earlier generation of the Ouranidai at Apollodoros 1.2.4-5)?

Of all the proposed Hellenistic innovations, the serpentine form of the Giants most suggests a serious reworking. Against it can be advanced the following considerations: the shape which Apollodoros gives his Giants is not unusual when it comes to children of Gaia; in fact, in the vast majority of myths autochthones have their lower parts shaped as snakes (cf. Kekrops in 3.14.1). Moreover, as I hope to have shown, the complicated internal links that hold together the accounts of the Gigantomachy and the Typhonomachy are enhanced by their common origin and physical appearance, which add cosmic connotations to the story. The inclusion in the narrative of snake-footed Giants is consistent not only with the mythological data, but more importantly with the concept of the narrative.

The problem arises from the study of the iconography of the archaic period. Although representations of snake-footed creatures are common in archaic art, and some of them may portray Giants, even so, as Gantz points out, a number of criteria indicate that these figures must be seen as images of Typhon and not of the Giants, whom the many iconographic representations of archaic and classical...
period never show as anything but human. In early art (the earliest certain representations of a Gigantomachy date from the second quarter of the sixth century), the Giants are regularly depicted as normal-sized hoplites with full armour. Infrequently, we find the “type sauvage”, which reminds us of the description of the giants found in Apollodoros: “le G[éant] barbu, à visage bestial et à cheveux longs”, who fights with rocks, “est bien attesté dès l’époque archaïque”. The first time when we can positively identify a Giant with snakes in place of legs is on an Apulian lekythos of about 380 B.C.

Hesiod seems to corroborate the artistic evidence which suggests a conception of the Giants as anthropomorphic. Gaia brings them forth equipped with armour and spears:

\[
... \text{περιπλομένων δ' ἑνυαυτῶν} \\
\text{γείνατ' Ερινύς τε κρατεράς μεγάλους τε Γίγαντας} \\
\text{τεῦχεσι λαμπομένους, δολίχ' ἔγχεα χερσίν ἔχοντας (Theog. 184-6).}
\]

The birth of the Giants in full armour, reminds us of the birth of the Spartoi at Thebes and at Kolchis (cf. Pherekydes FGrHist 3 F 22, taken up by Apollodoros 3.4.1: Φερεκύδης δὲ φησιν ὅτι Κάδμος, ἓδων ἐκ γῆς ἀναφυομένους ἐνόπλους, ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἔβαλε λίθους, οἱ δὲ ὑπ' ἄλληλων νομίζοντες βάλλεσθαι εἰς μάχην κατέστησαν). As West points out, this birth certainly implies military activity. We cannot be sure that Hesiod alludes to a Gigantomachy.

---

296 On depictions of the Giants in archaic art see Vian and Moore 1989, 251-54.
298 Now in Berlin, Staatl. Mus. V. I. 3375.
300 West 1966, 220-1.
In fact, West argues\(^301\) that, apart from a reference to Herakles at *Theogony* 954 (δῆλος, δὲ μέγα ἔργον ἐν ἀθανάτοις ἀνόσσας), which could be seen as an allusion to his participation in the war against the Giants, there are no references to the Gigantomachy in literature before Xenophanes. Surely, however, Hesiod’s reference to the Giants (*Theogony* 50-1, οὕτις δ’ ἀνθρώποιν τε γένος κρατερῶν τε Γιγάντων/ ὑμνεῖσαι τέρπουσι Διός νόν ἐντός ὸλύμπου), must be an allusion to a traditional song about the Gigantomachy, and to Zeus’ victory over the Giants. West has difficulties in explaining the combination of men and Giants in the Muses’ song: “[a]fter [the Muses’] divine genealogies one would expect heroic genealogies... but the Giants had neither ancestry nor descendants, nor even individual names”.\(^302\) He links this reference to the bronze generation of the Myth of Ages (*Op.* 109ff.), which shares a number of the Giants’ characteristics, though its members are not called Giants. Yet one need not go that far: the Muses sing of the whole world, events past present and future (εἰρούσαι τὰ τ’ ἐόντα τὰ τ’ ἐσσόμενα πρὸ τ’ ἐόντα, 38), the gods (especially Zeus), the Giants, and the human beings. In their song all different stages of being have their place. Already in Homer the Giants occupy an intermediate place between gods and men (*Od.* 8.119-20). Unfortunately we cannot even be certain that Homer understood the term Γιγάς as Hesiod did, or indeed subsequent literature.\(^303\) But such a reference can be better understood in the light of Apollodoros’ narrative: born from the blood of a god, they possess a conditional immortality, that distinguishes them from the βροτοί and the ἀμβροτοί, and puts them on a different level of existence.

\(^301\) West 1966, 419. In any case, West thinks that even this allusion is post-Hesiodic, since he thinks that the original work of Hesiod ended at 900 (see p. 398 for his arguments). He accepts, however, a sixth-century date for the section. Against this theory see Janko 1982, Appendix C.

\(^302\) This last detail corresponds with my argument on Pallas’s naming.

\(^303\) Gantz 1996, 446.
It is thus more than plausible that Hesiod makes throughout his work references to a Gigantomachy, which contained, moreover, a number of elements found in Apollodoros.

As far as the physical appearance of the Giants is concerned, the two accounts differ considerably. So are those who argue for a Hellenistic source or, at least, a reworking, correct? A very interesting piece of information found in a scholium to *Odyssey* may suggest otherwise: τὰ δὲ παρὰ τοῖς νεωτέροις οὐκ οἴδεν, οὐθε ὡς ἦσαν εὐτράπελοι τινες καὶ ὀφιόποδες, οἷονς αὐτῶς ἀναξιογραφοῦσιν, οὐτε ὡς Φλέγραν ὕκησαν, οὔτε ὅτι θεοὶ ἐμαχέσαντο (Σ PQ ad Od. 7. 59.). Severyns uses this text to argue that “il reste ainsi une possibilité pour les Neopterot visés par Aristarque aient eu parmi eux l’auteur de la Titanomachie”. He argues that it is possible that the artists of the seventh and sixth centuries may have found it easier to depict the Giants as anthropomorphic even when the epic source presented them as serpentine monsters. But this would not explain why Hesiod chose to follow not the traditional epic form but that of art. Kuhnert argues that, when the artists started to represent the Giants as anthropomorphic, they inspired epics, which in their turn gave the Giants a human look. Hesiod could have been one of the first to follow this new style. It is thus possible the scholium preserves an version of a Gigantomachy which followed the tradition and presented the Giants as serpentine. Unfortunately, this information has to be treated very carefully, since the word ἀναξιογραφοῦσιν makes us uncertain whether the scholiast took this particular detail from paintings (which, in
view of the artistic evidence, would have been post-classical anyway). The fact that
the scholiasts rarely refer to art in their works is encouraging, but not conclusive.

It would be very nice if we could accept without reservation the scholiast’s
evidence and argue for the antiquity of the serpentine form of the Giants. However,
the fact that art and literature give us primary evidence which supports the
anthropomorphic form (with the equation of the Spartoi and the Giants as groups
that come forth from earth as hoplites as an additional argument), leads me to
believe that the reference to a serpentine lower part is after all a latter addition to
the narrative.

\[(vi)\text{ The Typhonomachy and the archaic tradition}\]

Let us now turn to the second part of the third — unsuccessful — stage of the
succession-myth, the Typhonomachy. Scholars who have studied Apollodoros’
account (1.6.3) take two different approaches to the source of this unique
tradition. Most feel that the mythographer is following one or more Hellenistic
accounts. They argue for “a quilt of variegated patches”, with elements acquired
at different stages of the reshaping of the myth, and features that cannot be earlier
than Hellenistic. To quote Vian: “le récit de la Bibliothèque est également récent:
... dans son ensemble, il se présente comme un roman syncrétiste à épisodes
(Cilicie, Egypte, Casios, Corycos, Nysa, la Thrace et l'Hémos, la Sicile) où

\[306\text{ Athanassakes 1988, 54.}\]
l'auteur a eu le souci de rassembler le plus grand nombre possible de variantes locales".  

On the other hand, some, albeit fewer, scholars consider the version of the Typhonomachy recorded in Apollodorus to be the earliest and the most significant variant of the myth. Fontenrose, in his pioneering work on the myth of the god/hero against the dragon, bases his whole argument on the assumption that this most complex version is in fact older than the more widely known Hesiodic one. He argues that "we find but two main versions of the Typhon tale, and the later, which appears first in the extant literature, and which we may call Hesiodic, differs from the earlier mainly in omitting an episode discreditable to Zeus... It may be correct to say that the Typhon myth of the Greeks had only one form, the narrative as found in Apollodorus, and that some authors chose to leave out the central and most significant part of the story."  

We have based most of our discussion on the suggestion that the impressive number of recurrent themes, motifs, and folktale elements which form an internal link connecting all the different stages of Apollodorus' account for divine sovereignty are the conscious work of a single author. The structural coherence and correspondence which characterise the successive episodes are too elaborate to be the product of a chance compilation of various versions. Obviously, the attribution of the Typhonomachia to the Hellenistic period would automatically mean that an ascription of the whole narrative to an archaic source would be impossible. We would have to accept that Apollodorus is drawing on a source

---

308 Fontenrose 1959, 70ff.
309 Ibid. 75-76.
whose author "weave[s] a tersely-told story which aligns the various versions", and manages to incorporate into a coherent narrative a vast number of archaic elements, with colourful details taken from local traditions and folktales of a period that was fond of this type of exotic tales. As in the case of a possible archaic source, we would have no means of establishing whether Apollodoros is using an actual literary work composed in the Hellenistic period, or is simply following the account he found in an earlier (a Hellenistic?) mythological handbook.

Evidently, such a hypothesis solves the problems of chronology created by details such as the reference to snake-footed Giants. But is it consistent with Apollodoros' usual practice with regard to his sources? As van der Valk has shown, Apollodoros usually goes back to the original author whom he directly reproduces (usually in abridgement). The vast majority of his sources are archaic. The list of the 83 citations of authorities mentioned by the mythographer (usually when he departs from his main source, giving a second variant differing in details) contains only six passages from Hellenistic sources. Are we then to agree with Fontenrose and argue that since "almost nothing in Apollodoros' Library is derived from Hellenistic writers", and since "almost everything in the Library appears to be derived from fifth-century mythographers, and they in turn, got their material largely from epic poets", this version of the succession-myth is by default archaic? Apollodoros is, to say the least, erratic in his references to his sources, so it is possible that a number of Hellenistic authors have been used without receiving any credit. Moreover, it has been proven that the long narrative of the Argonautic
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310 Athanassakes 1988, 53.
311 Van der Valk 1958, passim. See our discussion in Chapter Five.
312 See Fontenrose 1966, 75-6.
expedition that covers the last part of the first book of the *Bibliotheka* (1.9.16-27) follows the *Argonautika* of Apollonios of Rhodes.\(^{313}\) This disproves Fontenrose's argument that "the Library takes no complete narratives from Hellenistic narratives". In any case, since we do not have sufficient evidence we cannot accept this argument. The account of the succession myth could easily be the one exception that proves the rule.

Nor, on the other hand, can we accept the argument that, since Apollodoros' version of the Typhon story is recorded nowhere else in extant Greek literature, it must be a late and eccentric variant of the myth.\(^{314}\) The key word here is, of course, extant. We possess but a tiny fraction of Greek literature; in fact, we cannot be certain of what appeared and what did not appear in archaic literature. It is often the case that a later author (e.g. Pausanias) incorporates into his work undeniably ancient traditions that are unattested in previous authors. It is true that the idea of Zeus facing so much trouble and humiliation during his battle with Typhon appears strange to those who are used to the powerful Zeus of the Hesiodic and Homeric epics. Yet it is obvious to me that such a story is firmly established in the tradition of Zeus' accession to the divine throne. As I have argued above, the theme of the divine helper is prominent throughout the mythographer's account. In every stage of his struggle for the acquisition of divine kingship Zeus has to secure the help of an assistant (be it the Ouranidai, Metis, Herakles, Aigipan and Hermes, or the Moirai), who will be the decisive factor in each victory. In a "background of such typological parallels"\(^{315}\) the presence of

\(^{313}\) Van der Valk 1958, 106, quoting C. Robert.

\(^{314}\) Athanassakes 1988, 54. He bases this assumption on the idea that Apollodoros' account is a compilation of different versions which do not appear together before or since.

\(^{315}\) Mondi 1986, 30-1.
Hermes, Aigipan and the Moirai elaborates and amplifies the theme. Since Zeus confronts the most serious challenge to his kingship, his opponent must pose the deadliest threat, and the situation must appear as the most dangerous ever. What better way of achieving this effect than having the young Zeus actually lose the first battle. Moreover, if we accept the role of e.g. the Hundred-Handers in the Titanomachy or of Herakles in the Gigantomachy as part of the archaic tradition, we must also accept that there may be a place for divine aids in the early tradition of the Typhon story. I find plausible Fontenrose’s argument that someone (Hesiod?) modified the tradition by omitting the defeat and maiming of Zeus as inconsistent with his power and majesty. In the ensuing centuries, most authors followed Hesiod’s account, which embraced the generally accepted idea of an omnipotent god; this would explain why we find no other reference to this episode until much later, when it becomes fashionable to resort to exotic, eccentric tales about divinity.

Thus one should view Nonnos’ reference in Dionysiaka 510-12, καὶ τοῖς εἰς ἑν ἀντρον ἐπείγετο κείθεν θείας/ νεύρα Διός δολὸντι πόρον κηνήμα Ἰακωμω, τὰ πέρ χθονὶ πίπτε Τυφαονίη ποτὲ χάρμη, in this light. It is true that the story of Typhon possessing the sinews of Zeus is obscurely told, and the context of this statement difficult to establish. It is probable, however, that

316 Ibid. passim.
317 It has been suggested that Theogony 853, Ζεὺς δ’ ἐπει σοιν κόρον ἐν μένος, εἴλετο δ’ ἵπτα γαλ adjecto a story like the one in Apollodoros, in which Zeus was temporarily deprived of his strength (see West 1966, 391-2, where Goettling is quoted). Leaving aside for a while the circular argument that such a reference is impossible, because the myth of Zeus’ temporary incapacitation is a later (Hellenistic) addition to the Greek mythological corpus (evidently influenced by the Hittite myth of Illuyanka), it is obvious that such a remark is part of the traditional introduction to a crucial battle (cf. also Theogony 687 with West’s note): Zeus gathers up his strength in a “sudden upsurge in the quality of μένος”, which characterises every epic aristeia (Mondi 1986, 39-41). We are dealing with a poetic convention, not with a disguised admission of a humiliating incident.
318 Fontenrose 1959, 74.
Nonnos followed a source similar to that which Apollodoros used, probably the same one. And there is no way of establishing beyond doubt that this source was not archaic.

So far we appear to be unable to reach a definite conclusion: it is seems possible that Apollodoros resorted to a Hellenistic account which drew upon some local tradition (influenced [as we shall see] by Asiatic legends), or that he stumbled across an old but rarely mentioned source which related the Typhonomachy as part of a broader story, in a consistent and rational way. This coherence rendered this narrative preferable as a source to the inconsistent Hesiodic account. Neither suggestion can be disproved with certainty.

Before we turn our attention to those details of the story that go against the attribution of the Typhon narrative to an archaic source, we should discuss whether any parts of it that can be safely attributed to an earlier period. We have already established that the great number of recurrent themes which run through the whole account of the succession-myth can be attributed to an archaic literary work. This leaves us with the first episode\textsuperscript{319} of this complex sequence of events which involves the flight of the gods before Typhon and their transformation into animals. Far from being a “certainly not very old feature”\textsuperscript{320} the story, which even Diodoros (1. 86.3) found μυθόδη παντελῶς καὶ τῆς ἀρχαίης ἀπλότητος οἰκεῖον, goes back at least as far as Pindar (fr. 91 = Porphyr. \textit{De abst.} 3. 16): πάντας τοὺς θεοὺς ..., ὅτε ὑπὸ Τυφώνος ἔδιωκοντο, οὐκ ἄνθρωποις ὀμοιωθέντας, ἄλλα τοῖς ἄλλοις ζῴοις. Obviously, this detail acts as an

\textsuperscript{319} With regard to the description of Typhon which heads Apollodoros' account, it suffices to add to what we have already said the observations of Vian (1952, 15): “En bref Typhée a été conçu sous un aspect qui a peu varié et c’est la \textit{Bibliotheque} qui conserve le mieux la vulgate”.

\textsuperscript{320} Thus Athanassakes 1988, 54.
aitiological myth, intended to explain the animal form of the Egyptian gods. As Griffiths points out,\textsuperscript{321} the Greek tradition has taken over and modified the myth of the conflict of Horos and Seth, "one of the earliest Egyptian myths, in which the motif of metamorphosis is prominent". The identification of Seth and Typhon is first attested in Hekataios (\textit{FGrHist} 1 F 300, apud Hdt. 2. 144) and in Aischylos (\textit{Suppl.} 560), but it has been shown that this syncretism was operating already by the sixth century.\textsuperscript{322} The inclusion of such an episode in an archaic account of the \textit{Typhonomachia}, at a period when the Greeks began to be aware of Egyptian myth, is thus very plausible.

The metamorphosis of the gods into animals is sometimes linked with Pan. In fact, in a number of late sources, Pan plays a significant role in the Typhon story, although his involvement varies in the different accounts. He offers valuable help which allows Zeus to retrieve valuable stolen objects (in Apollodoros his sinews, in Nonnos his thunderbolts – though indirectly through Kadmos [1. 368-75]) or he offers valuable advice by suggesting the transformation of the gods\textsuperscript{323} that brings about the monster's final defeat. In Oppian's \textit{Halieutika}, in a weird variant that presents Typhon being tricked with a promise of a banquet of fish, Pan is proclaimed \textit{Zeitoc μὲν ρυτήρα, Τυφαόνιον δ' ὀλετήρα} (3. 17). The passage also refers to Hermes in his capacity as Pan's father.

Hermes appears in Apollodoros' account as one of the deities who saves Zeus' throne by stealing his sinews from the Korykian Cave. His role in this episode is well justified: as the trickster god, protector of thieves, he is the natural

\textsuperscript{321} Gwyn Griffiths, 1960, 374-6.
\textsuperscript{322} Kranz 1940, 335.
\textsuperscript{323} See P. Nigidius Figulus, \textit{Sphaera Graecanica} 98, p. 87, 11sqq. and p. 156, 3 sqq., in Swoboda 1964, 122-4; Ampelius II, 10 (also in Swoboda, 122); Hyginus' \textit{De Astronomia} 2.28.
choice for an operation of this kind. Aigipan, his companion, is an obscure figure. Are we to see him as a by-form of Pan, as most modern mythographers do?\textsuperscript{324} The odd name Aigipan appears four more times in Greek and Latin literature: of these references, one (Plutarch \textit{Parallel.} 22) has no connection with the Typhon story: this Aigipan is only a different name given to Silvanus, the product of the incestuous relationship of Valeria of Tusculum and her father Valerius. In Nigidius Figulus it is name given to Pan in commemoration of his part in the fight against Typhon:

\begin{quote}
posteaquam Typhonem desidem poena adfecerunt quamque consilio sine turba tumultuque interfecerunt, Pana sancta astrorum memoria decoraverunt et ei nomen Aigipana imposuerunt, quod cum ceteri se in bestias convertissent, Pan se in capram transfigurasset, oppidumque magnificentum in Aegypto aedificaverunt idque Panopolin nominaverunt.
\end{quote}

The last two sources seem to allude to the same myth; in his list of Zeus’ children, Hyginus adds “Aigipan ex capra”. The same genealogy, at least as far as his mother is concerned, is mentioned in Eratosthenes’ \textit{Katasterismoi} 27, which very significantly goes back to Epimenides’ \textit{Kretika} (D.-K. 3. 24 = \textit{FGHist} 457 F 18):

\begin{quote}
οὐτὸς ἐστὶ τῷ εἶδει ὁμοίος τῷ Ἀἰγιπάνῳ ἐξ ἐκείνου δὲ γέγονεν ἤχει δὲ θηρίου τὰ κάτω μέρη καὶ κέρατα ἐπὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ ἐτιμήθη δὲ διὰ τὸ σύντροφος εἶναι τῷ Δίι, καθάπερ Ἑπιμενίδης ὁ τὰ Κρητικὰ ἱστορῶν
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{324} Only Smith, in his \textit{Dictionary} (1870, vol. I), dedicates a separate article to the figure of Aigipan.
Ampelius and Hyginus in *Astron.* end their accounts of the participation of Pan/Aigipan in the struggle against Typhon with the creation of Capricorn. Vian actually combines the information found in all the aforementioned authors to compile an “astronomical” version of the myth, which had Pan playing the crucial part in the council of war against Typhon. As a result of his advice, which led to the assumption of animal forms by the gods, Typhon is somehow defeated (only Hyginus’ *Fab.* 196 refers directly to the thunderbolts of Zeus, the rest of the sources being very vague). In recognition of this contribution the gods (or Zeus) place Capricorn in the sky.

The “astrological” version of myth as reconstructed by Vian does seem Hellenistic. Yet, with the exception of the *katasterismos,* which, in any case, does not appear in Apollodorus’ narrative, all its elements can be traced to the archaic period. Aigipan, the all-goat god who helped Zeus in the Titanomachy, could have easily been introduced in a story of a similar content. The iconography of the period may give us the reason for his incorporation, as well as indicate how the sinews were stolen. In his *LIMC* article, Boardman writes: “the evolution of
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325 Diels prints Αἴγα, regarding it as a proper name. Fowler 2000, 81, prints only up to οἱ Τιτάνες ἔφυγον, as Epimen. fr. 2.
326 In Hyginus’ account the word Aigipan appears in the part that is obviously indebted to Eratosthenes, while in the rest of the narrative the name Pan is used.
327 Vian 1960, 30.
328 Boardman, “Pan” in *LIMC* VIII 1997 (Suppl.).
Pan’s image is deceptively like that of the Satyr. The satyr begins mainly human, with a few equine characteristics, ears, tail, very occasionally legs. Pan’s starts as all-goat in form, gradually becoming more human and through his nature and associations enjoying a mutual relationship with the satyr in terms of appearance and behaviour. He is the nearest the Greeks had to an all-animal deity.” The name Aigipan then is indicative of the actual form of the god, and the myth of his birth by a goat confirms it. It is obvious that this is the decoy that tricks the dragoness (and Typhon?) out of the cave. The use of a goat as a mean of getting a dragon to leave his hiding place is frequent in fairytales. In this way, Hermes, whose relationship to Aigipan in this story is impossible to establish, managed to steal Zeus’ sinews.

In Apollodoros’ version, the metamorphosis of the gods and the active role of Aigipan are two unconnected episodes in a complex narrative. A number of sources which mention the transformation do not refer to Pan, e.g. Antoninus Liberalis 28, attributed by the manchette\textsuperscript{329} to Nikandros of Kolophon),\textsuperscript{330} Oppian and Nonnos mention no transformation at all. I believe that Apollodoros preserves the original source which kept the two incidents unconnected. In later versions, the two episodes, found in a single narrative, were finally put together. Pan, who by now had acquired his final form, became one of the gods that changed their shape. And the active role he played in an unpopular episode was somehow changed into the advisory role he plays in the “astrological” versions. As a result of the acquisition of a different form, the name Aigipan became a term needing explanation, and thus we reach Nigidius’ version.

\textsuperscript{329} On the manchettes in Antoninus and their authenticity, see Papathomopoulos 1969, xv-xix.
\textsuperscript{330} For a full list of the sources of the flight of the gods to Egypt, see Griffiths, 1960, 374.
The Localisation of the Typhon myth.

Of all the three different stages of the succession myth, as narrated by Apollodoros, only the last, complex stage of the Gigantomachy and the Typhonomachy contains details of geographical localisation. The primordial battles that led to the dethronement of each divine generation were fought at unspecified locations, and seem, in a way, almost unrelated to earth; however, the last two, unsuccessful challenges to Zeus’ rule, are firmly situated on terra firma, gaining a close association with the present, and thus stressing the potentiality for a recurrence of such events. The Gigantomachy is confined mostly to the Hellenic world – the actual battle is fought at Phlegrai, the pursuit of the Giants that follows takes place mostly across the Greek mainland and the Aegean, with Enkelados reaching as far as Sicily, itself regarded as Greek territory. On the other hand, Apollodoros’ account of the Typhonomachy has no connections with mainland Greece: in this complicated sequence of events, the action is mostly localised in the East, i.e. the Asiatic part of the Mediterranean. More importantly, the narrative takes us to places as far apart as Egypt and Thrace, Cilicia and Sicily. I shall argue that, far from being unintentional or random, this compilation of events is not “a quilt of variegated patches”, whose geographical details were acquired at different stages of the reshaping of the myth, and whose features cannot be earlier than Hellenistic. Rather, we are dealing with the conscious attempt of an archaic author to stress the severity of the threat posed by Typhon, by having as the mythical scene of the battle the whole of the then known world. By involving
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331 Athanassakes 1988, 54.
places at all four cardinal points of the compass, he succeeds in making the cosmic undertones of the episode even more apparent.

As was noted, scholars who have studied Apollodoros' account of the Typhonomachy (1.6.3) feel that the mythographer is following here one or more Hellenistic accounts. The multiple localisation of the episode is one of their main arguments against the antiquity of this version. To quote Vian, whose arguments are followed by those who favour a Hellenistic origin for this account: "le récit de la Bibliothèque est également récent: ... dans son ensemble, il se présente comme un roman syncrétiste à épisodes (Cilicie, Egypte, Casios, Corycos, Nysa, la Thrace et l'Hémos, la Sicile) où l'auteur a eu le souci de rassembler le plus grand nombre possible de variantes locales".  

Vian's complicated arguments against the antiquity of the narrative rely mostly on his claim of an Indo-European origin for the myth of Typhon. According to him, the original three-headed monster who fought against Zeus was influenced in the seventh century or later by Levantine myths, namely the Hurrian myth of the stone monster Ullikummi, and the Egyptian battle between Seth and Horos.

The Asiatic contributions continued over a long period of time; the association of Typhon with oriental figures led to Cilicia becoming the scene of the Greek Typhon-Zeus battle, despite earlier (mainly Lydian) and later localisations of the myth. Finally, in Hellenistic times the Hittite myth of the battle between Tešub

---

332 Vian 1960, 31.
333 ANET 1963, 121-5.
334 See above.
335 Based on Xanthos FGrHist 765 F 13.
336 cf. Strabo 13. 4. 6 (626): ἄλλοι δὲ ἐν Κιλικίᾳ, τινὲς δὲ ἐν Συρίᾳ πλάττοντο τὸν μύθου τοῦτον, οἱ δὲ ἐν Πιθηκουσίᾳ (note that the last eruption of Pithekousai/Ischia was in c. 470 B.C.). Also Σ Pind. P 1. 32: ἐρευνηθέραζεν ὃτι ἐν Σικελίᾳ Ζεὺς τὸν Τυφώνα κατεταράσθησεν, οἱ δὲ ἐν Λαδίᾳ, ἄλλοι ἐν Κιλικίᾳ καὶ ἄλλοι ἐν Φροτίᾳ καὶ ἐν Βοιωτίᾳ λέγουσιν ἔτεροι τοῦτον ταρταρωθήναι.
and the serpentine monster Illuyankas,\textsuperscript{337} which survived in Oriental local traditions, became known to the Greeks, and was combined with the Typhon myth. It is this version of the story, first recorded by a Hellenistic poet, familiar with local traditions of Cilicia, that Apollodoros preserves.

Vian argues that the first localisation of the Zeus-Typhon story to the East, especially Cilicia, happened some time after 600 B.C.: “[o]n peut dire en gros que les VI\textsuperscript{e} et V\textsuperscript{e} siècles furent la période des localisations géographiques. Après avoir d’abord cherché les sièges de Typhée en Grèce propre, en Béotie et à Delphes, les Grecs l’installèrent en terre asiatique en raison des liens qui l’unissaient dorénavant à l’Orient.”\textsuperscript{338} He concludes that “les localisations asiatiques sont des créations plus ou moins artificielles, imaginées pour suppléer à l’imprécision du texte homérique.”\textsuperscript{339} The Homeric version, Typhon’s first appearance to the myth, connects Gaia’s son with the mysterious Arimoi: γαῖα δ᾽ υπεστενάχιζε Διὸ ὡς τερπικεράνων/ χωμένω ὅτε τ᾽ ἀμφὶ Τούφωεὶ γαῖαν ἰμάσσῃ/ εἶν Ἀρίμοις, ὃθι φασὶ Τούφῶεος ἐμμεναὶ εὖνάς (II. 2. 781-3). Hesiod also links Typhon with the Arimoi: Echidna, Typhon’s mate, lives in a cave εἶν Ἀρίμοισιν (Theogony 304-6). The vagueness of the term εἶν Ἀρίμοις (is it a place, or a people?), the ignorance about the Arimoi expressed by the poet’s use of φασὶ,\textsuperscript{340} led Leaf to argue that in reality Homer (and Hesiod) had in mind an imaginary land, not a fixed geographical reality.\textsuperscript{341} Vian is also convinced that, for Homer and Hesiod, the

\textsuperscript{337} ANET 1963, 125-6; Gaster, 1950, 317-336. On the striking resemblance parallels between the version of the Typhon myth found in Apollodoros and the Hittite myth, see Burkert 1979, 27-31.
\textsuperscript{338} Vian 1960, 36.
\textsuperscript{339} ibid. 21.
\textsuperscript{340} See however Sancassano 1997, 80: “in entrambi I testi φασὶ ... è senza dubbio spia dell’esistenza di una tradizione preomerica su Tifeo sentita come remota, e, probabilmente, anche come estranea”.
\textsuperscript{341} Leaf 1900-2, vol. 1, 108.
Arimoi were simply a fairyland people: "[i]l est fort probable qu’au temps d’Homère et d’Hésiode, le terme d’Arimes ne correspondait à aucune réalité géographique". According to Kirk "it is clear that ancient critics did not know which particular region [eiv 'Aρίμοις] signified, and that local claims were made on behalf of several different apparently lightning-blasted or generally volcanic areas. Strabo 13.626 (perhaps partly from Apollodoros [of Athens, my addition], according to Erbse 1, 337 who quotes the passage) mentions various suggested locations".

The possibility that Homer and Hesiod had in mind an imaginary land does not affect the argument for an archaic source for Apollodoros’ account: soon after the composition of the epics, the myth is found firmly established in the East. Vian himself refers to an original poem in which a Cilician Typhon was in the end confined under Aitna, and accepts that this poem was used as source by both Aischylos (Prom. 351-371) and Pindar (P 1. 16-21, Τυφώς ἐκατοντακάρανος· τὸν ποτὲ/ Κιλλίκιον θρέψεν πολυφόνουν ἀντρον· νόν γε μάν/ ταί θ’ ὅπερ Κύμας ἀλλερκέες ὤχθαι/ Σικελία τ’ αὐτὸπ πέξει/ στέρνα λαχνάεντα· κίων δ’ ὀυρανία συνέχει/ νιφόεσσ’ Αἴτνα, πάνετες χιόνος ὃξειας τιθήνοι). Since these localisations were already part of a well established tradition by the time of the two poets, it seems probable that they were already contained in an archaic epic poem which dealt with the struggles for the acquisition of divine sovereignty,

---

342 Vian 1960, 23 Cf. also p. 19, where he states: "il n’est pas illégitime de pencer que les Arimes sont... une contrée fabuleuse". ... Bref Homère et Hésiode paraissent ignorer toute d’une localisation précise et le second rejette même en termes exprès son Echidna à la périphérie des terres habitées."

343 On the term see West 1966, 251.


345 Vian 1960, 20.
written around 600 (Vian's *terminus post quem* for the localisation of the myth in Cilicia).

There are, however, indications that the Arimoi should not be seen as an imaginary land: West points out that Typhon is usually put under some mountain in the inhabited world, so it seems likely that the Arimoi were thought as being inside the circle of Okeanos.⁴⁶ Fontenrose goes on step further:⁴⁷ all the fabulous people found in the *Iliad* live not in imaginary lands, but in real geographical locations. The fact that Echidna, according to Hesiod, lives ἡλικά ἀπ' ἀθανάτων τε θεῶν θνητῶν τ' ἀνθρώπων (*Theogony* 302), does not necessarily mean that the Arimoi are situated on the periphery of the earth; rather, it indicates the absence of direct neighbours, no doubt because of the recurrent lashing of Typhoeus by Zeus and the evident destruction of the area; in any case, dragons' lairs are usually situated far from inhabited areas.

Much has been made of the equation “Arimoi-Aramaians”, already found in Posidonios (Strabo 784-5), who connected the name Arimoi with the inhabitants of Syria, of which Cilicia was originally part. Vian's⁴⁸ arguments against such a suggestion are successfully refuted by Fontenrose.⁴⁹ More recently C. Bonnet⁵⁰ has taken up this identification, explaining the phrase εἰν Ἄρμοισιν from the Assyrian *mat A-RI-MI* “the land of Aram”. This is a further indication that Homer and Hesiod located the Arimoi in the East. It is possible that such localisation was not precise, but it pointed to the right direction.

---

³⁴⁶ West 1966, 251.
³⁴⁸ Vian 1960, 20-1.
³⁴⁹ Fontenrose 1966, 70-1.
³⁵⁰ Sancassano 1997, 80.
Like Homer and Hesiod, later authors continued to situate the Typhon story outside mainland Greece. Sancassano makes an interesting point: "il fatto che si sia sviluppata in area greca tutta una letteratura mitico-geografica che rintracciava constantemente questa terra nella medesima zone, e cioè fra Misia, Lidia, Meonia e Siria settentrionale, sarebbe ... una prova della validità della sua lettura: anche in età antica, in altre parole, si cercava l'origine del mito di Tifeo nel Vicino Oriente." Such attempts, of course, have their root in the obvious Asiatic contributions to the Typhon story. The numerous oriental occurrences of the combat myth of a god/hero against a dragon make clear why not only the Typhon story but other myths as well, namely the shooting of Chimaira by Bellerophon, are located in the East. The case of Typhon is, however, unique: we are dealing with multiple cultural interrelations that brought together different elements of variant civilisations at a very early period. There are obvious analogies between Seth, Baal-Saphon, and Typhon. Sancassano does not hesitate to call them a triad; indeed, the relations between Baal-Saphon and Seth go back to the second millennium B.C. It is possible that their connection with Typhon begins at the same period. However, even if we accepted that Vian were right to suggest that the date for the initiation of contact of the Greek myth with the Anatolian, and even Egyptian ones (Ullikummi, Saphon=Hazi=Kasios, Seth), should be not earlier than the seventh century (a date already disproved by the epics), the possibility of an archaic poem based on an already established tradition of Asiatic localisations remains attractive. Vian argues that the long process of interrelation ends with the

---

351 Sancassano 1997, 81.
352 Sancassano 1997, 83; see also West 1997, 303.
353 Seippel 1939, 18.
354 Bonnet l. c. suggests the end of 12th century B.C.
interaction between the Typhon myth and the story of Illuyanka. He accepts that
the influence of the story of Ullikummi is early, because its obvious traces on the
Hesiodic version. He denies the antiquity of the influence of the Illuyanka story,
because no surviving version older than Apollodoros contains the necessary
elements of Zeus' defeat and of his temporary loss of power. However, since we
only possess a small fraction of Greek literature, it is equally possible that Greeks
became familiar with the story of Illuyanka at the same period that they learned
about the other stories.\footnote{Burkert 1979, 27-31, actually argues for a later Hittite version which links the original Illuyanka text with the source of Apollodoros.}

The multitude of locations mentioned in Apollodoros' account could easily
be seen as the work of an archaic poet, who, confronted with more than one
location, at a point when the localisation of the myth, although roughly situated in
East, was not firmly fixed, chose to incorporate in his narrative as many places as
possible. Cilicia becomes the birth-place,\footnote{The manuscripts have Σωκελίς, an obvious palaeographical mistake, emended by Heyne and accepted by all editors.} Kassios, the actual battlefield of
Saphon and Ullikummi, retains its role, and Aitna becomes his place of burial. With
the addition, however, of Haimos and Nysa (already situated by the seventh
century in Arabia,\footnote{Thus Cássola 1975, 464.} with Herodoros\footnote{FGrHist 31 F 61.} locating it in the vicinity of lake Serbonis, another burying place for Typhon, the action is no longer confined to the line East-
West. The action is spread all over the known world. The multiple localisation of
the myth becomes the strongest indication of the threat posed by Typhon; Zeus has
to fight multiple battles, both physical and mental, all around the world, if he wants
to keep his rule of the universe intact.
Incidentally, note that in Apollodoros’ version Zeus’ enemies are buried in different layers. The earliest generation is situated in Tartaros, the Giants are found under islands, while Typhon is buried under a mountain directly underneath the surface of the earth. Obviously, the closer one is to the surface of the earth the more dangerous he is for the universal order.

It is by now obvious that Apollodoros offers an account of the Gigantomachy and of the Typhonomachy, which, for the most part, goes back to an original archaic source. Occasional reworking of the narrative to incorporate elements that came to be essential to the account cannot be excluded, although it is significant that it is because of iconography, and not literature, that we cannot ascribe the snake-footed Giants to the archaic period. One could argue that literary accounts do not have to comply with iconographic conventions and *vice versa*. But even if we accept that Apollodoros’ account was subject to some alterations (and as we shall see in Chapter Five, the mythographer’s treatment of the Argonautic myth dictates that we do), they do not diminish, but actually enhance the account’s significance, as in the case of the cosmic connotations that the Gigantomachy acquires due to the serpentine shape of the Giants’ bodies. Whether this reworking should be attributed to Apollodoros himself or to an earlier mythographer (whose account Apollodoros followed, presumably drawing upon a summarised version) is impossible to say. The intriguing fact remains: far from being a late product of mythographic tradition, the account of the succession-myth recorded by Apollodoros preserves its exceptional archaic character, and offers an story unique in its simplicity and cohesion, making the loss of its original tantalising.
Part III:

The World of Heroes
Chapter Four

The Family of Oineus and the Kalydonian Boar Hunt (1.8.1-6).

"For the Greeks the hunt is an alien world. The search for edible flesh entails dangers and risks that render the hunter a marginal and threatened character. The hunt is a troubling domain, entered at one's peril. The fundamental instability of the world of hunt is marked by its reversibility: the hunter becomes prey, the hunted is transformed into a savage beast."359 In a society as fundamentally agricultural as that of Greece, the activity of hunting "with its unforeseen developments, its reversals, the role of the marvellous and the strange, lends itself admirably to the tangled webs of meaning that run though the myth".360 Greek heroes are primarily heroes who hunt.361 Most of these mythical hunters are solitary figures who fight against the savagery of beasts, affirming the human ability successfully to resist nature's forces.362 But in the process, the savagery of their victims becomes an integral part of the hunters' character. Hunting is situated at "the intersection of the powers of life and the forces of death",363 the hunter's terrain is a liminal area, firmly linked with the eschatiai, the uncultivated borderlands of Greek cities;364 in traversing this wilderness, a hunter is separated from society, becoming a potential

---

359 Schnapp, 119.
360 ibid. 121.
361 See Orth, "Jagd" RE IX, c. 559.
362 Cf. Anderson 1984, 15: "[t]o sum up it would seem that Homer's heroes were not "big-game hunters" in the sense of deliberately seeking out and destroying large and dangerous beasts for amusement and the securing of trophies. They did take pleasure in hunting, and trophies were taken and valued. (The tusks of the Kalydonian Boar were preserved in the temple of Athena Alea at Tegea in Arkadia until Augustus carried them off to Rome [Paus. 8. 46. 1]). But men did not deliberately engage in combat with dangerous beasts except in defence of themselves, their fields and their flocks."
363 Detienne 1979, 24.
threat to it. This balancing between savagery and civilisation leaves its mark on the
mythical solitary hunter. His arbitrary ability to adopt a "natural" behaviour
alienates him from society. The same aggressivity, which allows him successfully to
defend civilisation, excludes him from it. There lies one of the fundamental
ambiguities of hunting. It differentiates between men and beasts; but in the process,
it may turn men into beasts.

Much has been made of the connection between hunting, sacrifice and war.
"In the triangle of relationships that unite hunting, war, and sacrifice, hunting
partakes of war in the training it demands, but also it partakes in the sacrifice
because, like the sacrifice, it is a means of obtaining food."^{365} Hunting performs a
double function: "in relation to sacrifice, it helps define the position assigned to
men in their search for meat; through its ties with the world of eroticism, it
expresses the tensions between licit and illicit sexuality.\(^{366}\) To this double role must
be added the hunt's ambiguous position with regard to war. Hunting is regarded as
the best training for war. . . . But war and hunting are not separated by a precise
and impassable boundary. It is always possible to pass from the one to the
other".\(^{367}\) In one myth, these functions are inseparably intertwined: the story of the
Kalydonian boar begins with a sacrifice that did not take place, followed by a hunt

\(^{365}\) ibid. 119. On the relation between hunting and sacrifice see Burkert 1983, 15ff. On hunting as
a preparation for war see Detienne 1979, 25: "[b]y confronting wild animals, [the male child]
prepares himself more or less directly to become a warrior initiated into the unshared privilege of
men: violent bloodshed." On the importance of hunting in the upbringing of young children see

\(^{366}\) Outside the city limits, the hunter's wild terrain is also outside of marriage and thus
welcomes deviant forms of sexuality or those that are simply considered strange by the city-state.
Thus a system of relations seems to form between hunting and sex" (Detienne 1979, 25). Moving
in a liminal area, "open to the subversion of amorous pursuits", hunters adopt marginal sexual
behaviour, "whether it be masculine or feminine denial of marriage or, inversely,
experimentation with censured sexual behavior" (ibid. 26). This interplay of love and hunt, found
at the root of various Greek myths, is intensified by the fact that both are situations in which the
roles are reversible. In love, as in hunt, the hunter can become the prey.

\(^{367}\) Schnapp 1991, 121.
in which *Eros* played a decisive part, and whose result was a war that annihilated a whole family, that of Oineus.

A. **The family of Oineus**

(i) **Endogamy**

Let us turn our attention to the figures who constitute the family of Oineus, and in whose lives the hunt plays a fatal part. Oineus, king of Kalydon, is a member of that branch of the vast Aiolid family which was descended from Kalyke. We have already noted that, as the story of his family is the longest and the most important, it is situated at the end of the account of the daughters of Aiolos, thus corresponding to that other important pan-Hellenic undertaking narrated in the first book, the Argonautic expedition.\(^{368}\)

In Apollodoros' genealogical structure the families are headed by men, and the children of each marriage are usually included in the family of the father (their "agnatic" line), unless they are the offspring of a god. In the case of theogeniture, however, the children are included in the family tree of their maternal grandfather, i.e. they continue their "uterine" line: the cases of Hermes (3.10.2) and Dionysos (3.4.3) are the most obvious examples of maternal filiation. In this branch of the Aiolid family the offspring of theogeniture are recorded first (i.e. Oxylos, son of Ares and Protogeneia, is mentioned before the children of Protogeneia’s sister Epikaste).\(^{369}\) When it comes to the children of Epikaste, Apollodoros records first

---

\(^{368}\) On the structure of the female branches of the Aiolid family, see above.

\(^{369}\) In the story of Tyro (1.8.1), her offspring by Poseidon are mentioned before and separately from her children by Kretheus, her paternal uncle - one of the many endogamies found in the first book of the *Bibliotheke*. However, the implication in this case is that she had the children by Poseidon *before* her marriage to Kretheus. On the other hand, later on (1.16.1) Apollodoros
the offspring of her daughter Demonike and Ares, and then the descendants of Porthaon, her brother. Consequently, Althaia, the mother of Meleagros, wife of Oineus, and granddaughter of Demonike, is mentioned near her children but before her husband is introduced, even though he belongs to a previous generation (being the son of Porthaon). There may be a small disruption to the chain of generations, but it means that patriliny is preserved and Meleagros is presented in his correct agnatic line, i.e. in the family of Porthaon, with both his parents having been named before him. This arrangement has the additional advantage of putting the story of the marriage of Idas and Marpessa in its proper chronological place, before the Kalydonian Boar Hunt. The offspring of this marriage, Kleopatra, becomes Meleagros’ wife and, consequently, plays a significant part in the story of the hunt.

In the second version of the myth recorded by Apollodoros, she is the one who persuades her husband to return to the battle, bringing about his death.\(^{370}\) In the folktale version, Meleagros’ scorn of Kleopatra adds further dishonour to his wife’s maternal relatives, who are also his own maternal relatives (however, we nowhere hear of a reaction from Idas, who also participated in the hunt).

The marriage of Oineus and Althaia, a standard endogamie union between an uncle and a niece once removed, is in fact typical of this branch of the family:\(^{371}\) Oineus’ grandfather and grandmother, Agenor and Epikaste, are also cousins; moreover, like Oineus and Althaia, they come from the two Aitolian cities of

---

\(^{370}\) On the role played by Kleopatra and its relation to the plot of the \textit{Iliad}, see Hainsworth 1993, 138.

\(^{371}\) In fact, endogamy appears in other branches of the family of Aiolos as well: the marriages of Tyro and Kretheus, and Amythaon and Eidomene (1.9.11) resemble that of Oineus and Althaia; see the genealogical Tables that accompany Chapter One.
Pleuron and Kalydon, forming another link between them. Meleagros follows the family tradition by marrying a cousin, strengthening the link between Aitolia and the southern part of the Peloponnese. Moreover, later in his narrative, Apollodoros amplifies further the themes of endogamy and exogamy in his account of Oineus’ second marriage. This marriage is either an indication of extreme endogamy, the incestuous relationship of Oineus with his daughter Gorge, or an example of extreme exogamy, Oineus marrying the already pregnant Periboia, and thus adopting her son, Tydeus, as his own; both myths stress the urgent need for an heir for the continuation of the line.

The myth of the incestuous relationship of Oineus with his daughter Gorge forges a link between the figures of Oineus and Oinomaos; both are implicitly associated by their names with Dionysos. Both are said to have initiated marriage-contests for their daughters Deianeira and Hippodameia (cf. TrGF IV fr. 636 ff. Radt = 1130 Lloyd-Jones, Mythographus Vaticanus II 190). However, in

372 Note that, in a case of uxorilocality, Agenor, although a descendant of Pleuron, becomes a king of Kalydon through his wife, Epikaste, who holds the position of an épíklhros κόρη. The throne of Pleuron passes to Théstios, offspring of the union of Ares and Demonike, who, as a product of theogeniture, continues his uterine line.

373 The mythical connection between Eleans and the Aetolians, “an acknowledgement”, as West 1985, 141, points out, “by the Eleans of their kingship with the Aetolians ..., and their annexation of the Aetolian heroic saga tradition”, is exemplified, in Apollodoros, as in Hesiod, by Aitolos’ descent from Endymion. Both figures assume the role of the dynastic type of culture-hero, the Stammvater (i.e. a figure who arrives and attaches himself to a region from outside, see Hall 1997, 87), expanding the geographical limits of the Aiolid family from Thessaly to the north-west Peloponnese and the corresponding territory across the straits, claiming regions not covered by the migrations of other culture-heroes of the family.

374 Note the similarity of the birth of Tydeus with that of Aigisthos (Epitome 2. 14, Θεός τός δὲ κατὰ πάντα τρόπους ἔφεσεν Ἀτρέα μετελθεὶν ἐκκαταστάσεως περὶ τοῦτου καὶ λαμβάνει χρησιμόν, ὡς εἰ παῖδα γεννῆσαι τὴν θυγατέρα συνεδράν. ποιεῖ σον οὖν καὶ γεννᾷ ἐκ τῆς θυγατέρας Ἀργοσθον, δεὶς ἀνδροθεῖς καὶ μάθης, διὶ Θεότου παῖς ἐστί, κεῖνας Ἀτρέα Θεότη τὴν βασιλείαν ἀποκατάστησεν). The two stories share a number of common elements: both Tydeus and Aigisthos take revenge upon their kin who plotted against their father (for Tydeus cf. Hes. fr. 12 M-W); moreover Tydeus dies at the hands of his cousin Melanippus, and is avenged by his son Diomedes (Apollodoros 1.8.6), in a story reminiscent of that of the Atreidai.

375 See Lloyd-Jones 1996, 418 for arguments for the attribution of this fragment to Sophokles’ satyr play Oineus. The fragment has been also been attributed to an Atalanta. As Lloyd-Jones points out, Atalanta used to challenge her suitors herself, “which does not fit with the situation described in this fragment.” Given the connection between Oineus and Dionysos, the satyrs
Oineus’ case the contest seems to be an attempt to avoid marrying his daughter to a terrifying figure like Acheloos. In this, he resembles Oinopion, at least in Parthenios’ version of events (NA 20).\(^{376}\) Oinopion actually uses wine to get rid of Orion; Oineus has to rely on the kindness of strangers (probably because he is already too old, and does not have any grown sons, see below). In contrast with the myth of Oinomaos, Oineus does not fight with the suitor himself; it is Herakles who wrestles with the river, and gains Deianeira’s hand. Uncharacteristically, we have no reference to a possible contest between Deianeira herself and her suitors, although her pre-Sophoklean image, preserved in Apollodoros, could well justify it: αδεη δ’ ήνιόχει καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον ἔσκει. Deianeira is an Amazon in Diodoros (4. 16. 3), and in Nonnos (Dionysiaka 36. 75). The tradition recorded by these authors certainly contradicts the image of “gentle womanhood”.\(^{377}\) The scholium to Ap. Rhod. 1. 1212 has her fight alongside Herakles καὶ εἰς τοσσότην ἀνάγκην κατέστη ὁ Ἡρακλῆς, ὥς καὶ τὴν γυναίκα Δηιάνειραν καθοπλίσαι, καὶ λέγεται καὶ κατὰ τὸν μαζὸν τότε τετράσθηκα. Moreover, her name Δηιάνειρα “slayer of men” confirms her Amazonian character. March argues that “the Deianeira who lay behind the lines of Hesiod in 25 MW was traditionally a bold-hearted and courageous woman, one very different from the later Sophoklean Deianeira”.\(^{378}\) Furthermore, Hoey argues that the Amazonian characteristics of Deianeira found in later mythographers were part of the traditional version, “so strongly entrenched that not even Sophocles could supplant it.”\(^{379}\) Thus Deianeira

---

\(^{376}\) See Massenzio 1970, 28-35.
\(^{377}\) Jebb 1892, 31.
\(^{378}\) March 1987, 49-52.
\(^{379}\) Hoey 1979, 219.
properly belongs to a martial family. Each of her kin hides a savage side. Pozzi,\footnote{Pozzi 1996, 104-8.} while unpersuasively arguing that “Deianeira’s name represents accurately an epithet of Oineus” (107),\footnote{The only known victims of Oineus are his sons: Toxeus in Apollodoros, and Ageleos (see below), Meleagros in John Malalas Chronographia 6. 21 Thurn (165 c-d Dindorf): καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἄναρπεσιν τοῦ θηρὸς τὸ δέρμα αὐτοῦ ἔχαρισατο ὁ Μελέαγρος τῇ Ἀταλάντῃ, εἰς ἔρωτα αὐτῆς βλητεῖς, ἀπελθὼν δὲ ὁ Μελέαγρος πρὸς τὸν ξανθὸν πατέρα Οίνεα, ἀπητθῆθη παρ’ αὐτοῦ τὰ νυκτήρια τοῦ θηρὸς καὶ μαθὼν δεῖ τῇ Ἀταλάντῃ τὸ δέρμα ἔχαρισατο, ὄργησεις κατὰ τοῦ ἱδίου υἱοῦ, δὲν ἔχει θαλλόν ἔλαιας ... εἰς πῦρ ἔβαλε, καὶ ἐκάθεσε ἵππων κτένεις κατὰ τοῦ ἱδίου υἱοῦ καὶ παραχρῆμα ὁ Μελέαγρος ἐπελέυσθην, ὡς ὁ σοφὸς Εὐρίπιδης δράμα περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Μελέαγρου ἐξέβασε. For a discussion of this variant in connection with the story of Oineus’ birth as recorded by Hekataios (FGHist 1 F 15) see Detienne 1973, 293-306.} points out that “each time that Deianeira is addressed as “daughter of Oineus” in the Trachiniai, she fails to conform to the model of a submissive female” (108). Pozzi is certainly right in suggesting that the reference to Oineus emphasises the Dionysiac destruction of Herakles’ household.\footnote{See now Schlesier 1993, 87-114.} The reference to Oineus, moreover, serves as a reminder of Deianeira’s traditional past, and reaffirms the audience’s expectations. Still, Deianeira is not another Atalante (however, in Nonnos [Dionysiaka 36. 75ff.], Atalante, Gorge and Deianeira are regarded as Amazons – see below). But like Atalanta and Hippolyte, Theseus’ Amazon wife (Epitome 1. 16), their antisocial gifts are neutralised once they marry. Actually, their expertise in warfare is put in the service of their husbands. Hippolyte fights with Theseus against her own people (first mentioned by Diodoros 4. 28. 1-4), and Deianeira fights next to Herakles (Σ to Ap. Rhod. 1. 1212). Admittedly, these variants are recorded by later authors who wished to neutralise the threat which they posed to their husband’s household, and with good reason: compare Deianeira’s reaction to Iole (2.8.7), and Hippolyte’s reaction to Theseus’ marriage to Phaidra (Epitome 1. 17); with their marriage threatened or dissolved, both women revert to their traditional behaviour by turning against their husbands.
(ii) God in the family: Ares and the parentage of Meleagros

This is a particularly famous passage from the scene of the teichoskopia, in which the Servant describes to Antigone “the strength and fearsomeness (and partly ferocity) of the attacking army and its leaders”. As Antonnetti has pointed out, “le dialogue entre Antigone et le vieil esclave dépeint la figure de Tydée d’une façon si incisive qu’on comprend bien comment il est devenu, avec celui du livre III de Thucydide, le passage le plus connu sur les Etiolien.” Naturally, it is the term μειξοβάρβαρος that attracts our attention. The word, further emphasised by the description of the unusual weaponry used by the Aetolians that immediately follows, is coined by Euripides “to attest contemporary judgment of the Aetolians as culturally backward”.

383 Thus Mastronarde 1994, 167.
384 Antonnetti 1990, 93.
385 3. 94. 4-5: 4. Τὸ γὰρ ἔθνος μέγα μὲν εἶναι τὸ τῶν Αἰταλῶν καὶ μάχημον, οίκους δὲ κατὰ κόμιας ἀτειχίστως, καὶ τάννας διὰ πολλῶν, καὶ σκευὴ ψιλῆ χρόμενον οὐ χαλεπῶν ἀπεφαινον, πρὸν ἐμίλοιθησαι, καταστροφῆσαι. εἰπεὶ ἐξερευνήσαι, εἰπερευνήσαι, δὲ ἐκέλευσον πρὸ τοῦ μὲν Ἀκοδοτοίς, ἔπειτα δὲ Ὀμονείκες καὶ μετὰ τοῦτος Εὐφυτάς, δὲπερ μέγιστον μέρος ἔστι τῶν Αἰταλῶν, ἀγνωστότατοι δὲ γλάσσαν καὶ ὠμοφάγοι εἰσίν, ὡς λέγονται. τοῦτον γὰρ ληφθέντων ῥάδιας καὶ τέλλα προσχωρήσειν. Cf. also 1. 5.3-6.2.
386 Mastronarke 1994, 190.
387 In fact, as Moreau points out (1980, 77), “Tydée... pousse la sauvagerie à son paroxysme”.

³8³ Τις δ` ἔστιν οὗτος; Θε. παῖς μὲν Οίνεως ἔφυ. Ὁ ἄρης δ` ἀιταλὸν ἐν στέρνοις ἔχει. Αὐ. οὗτος ὁ τὰς Πολυνείκεος, ὁ γέρον, αὐτοκασιγνήτας νύμφας ὀμόγαμος κυρεῦ; ὡς ἀλλόχρας ὀπλοῦσθε, μειξοβάρβαρος. (Ευρ. Φοινίσσαι 133-38).
cannibalism is already attested in the epic tradition (cf. *Thebais* F 5 Davies = F 9 Bernabé), must surely have contributed to the creation and elaboration of the idea of the Aetolians as a primitive, warlike people. Antonnetti describes how Greek perception of the Aetolians changed from being members of the original Hellenes, with mythical (through the Aiolids), historical and religious links to the rest of the Greeks, to being a violent, barbarous people who lived for and by waging war against the Greeks (thus Polybios 30. 11.2-6). This was a long process. We find its first traces in Aischylos' portrayal of Tydeus in *Seven against Thebes* (375-96); it would not be completed before Livy (34. 24.3-4):

Linguam tantum Graecorum habent, sicut speciem hominum; moribus ritibusque efferioribus quam ulli barbari, immo quam immanes beluae vivunt.

Euripides is found somewhere in the middle of this transition: to express the ambiguity surrounding the Aetolians (certainly Greeks, and yet backward and military unorthodox) the tragedian has to coin this entirely new term which actually conveys the notion of mixture of cultural elements.

---

388 Bernabé records all the sources that refer to the episode with Melanippos' head, i.e. Σ Hom. 5. 126, Pherekydes *FGHist* 3 F 97, Σ Pind. N 10, 12b, Σ and Tzetz. on Lykophr. *Alex*. 1066, and, of course, Apollodoros *Bibl.* 3. 6. 8. To these one should add references found in Sophokles (*TrGF* 799, 5-6 Radt) and in Euripides' *Meleagros* fr. 537 Nauck: εἰς ἀνδροβρότας ἡδόνας ἀφίεται κάρηνα πυρσάς γένυτι Μελανίππου σπάσας. These verses are very important for our understanding of the play, since they indicate that it ended with someone (probably a *deus ex machina*, perhaps Artemis herself) prophesying the future of the main characters.

389 Antonnetti 1990, 45-143.

390 Idid. 68: "Les Sept contre Thèbes marquent un tournant dans la considération des Grecs à l'égard des Etoïens: l'historiographie de ce peuple n'oubliera pas l'image menaçante de Tydéé, qui crie devant la porte Proïtide."
Throughout this long, negative process, the Aetolians remain firmly associated with Ares. Their warlike nature is already attested in Homer (II. 9. 529 Αίτωλοι μενεχάρματα); their military ability is always stressed, no matter how negative the source is (e. g. Livy 35. 12. 1). The “Aetolian Ares” becomes a synonym of martial prowess. Aetolian genealogy stresses this strong connection to the god. In the genealogy recorded by Apollodoros, Ares is the ancestor of the royal family of Pleuron (he is the father of Euenos, Molos, Pylos and Thestios by Demodoke); he has also links with Kalydon (Protogeneia (II), daughter of Kalydon, bore Oxylos by Ares). In other sources (Antoninus Liberalis 2. 1, and Mythographus Vaticanus I 201, both quoted below) Ares is also the father of Porthaon, which makes him the grandfather of Oineus. Gantz argues persuasively that Meleagros was probably not a son of Oineus in the Ehoiai, but the offspring of Ares. Euripides is also said, in a damaged context, to have made Ares the father of Meleagros (ap. Plut. q. d. parall. Gr. et Rom. c 26 = fr. 3 Jouan & Van Looy): ‘Ἀρης Ἀλθαίας συνήλθε καὶ Μελέαγρον ποιήσας ἄς ὡς Εὐρυπίδης ἐν Μελεάγρῳ. Τύδεος is also a child of Ares in Diodoros (4. 35. 1-2): ἰμα δὲ τοῦτος πραττομένοις Ἱππόνοι ἐν Ὁλένῳ πρὸς τὴν θυγατέρα Περίβοιαν, φάσκουσαν αὐτὴν ἐξ Ὀρεος ὑπάρχειν ἔγκυον, διενεχθέντα πέμψαι ταύτῃν εἰς Αἰτωλίαν πρὸς Οἰλέα καὶ παρακελεύσασθαι ταύτῃν ἀφανίσαι τὴν ταχύστην. The end of the story resembles that of the variant recorded by Apollodoros: Oineus, who had recently lost his wife and son, married Periboia and begat Tydeus.

391 Gantz 1996, 328. In later mythographers, Meleagros’ parentage takes on a Heraklean flavour: Hyginus, perhaps recognising the futility of such an enterprise, does not even attempt to identify his real father (Fab. 171): cum Althaea Thestii filia una nocte concubuerunt Oeneus et Mars, ex quibus cum esset natus Meleagros, subito in regia apparuerunt Parcae Clotho Lachesis Atropos. 392 Published by Nauck in his introduction to the fragments of Euripides’ Meleagros (TrGF p. 525 Nauck).
If we consider the important role which Ares plays in the formulation of this branch of the family, the attribution of Meleagros’ or Tydeus’ parentage to Ares should not be seen as a simple misunderstanding of the adjective 'Ἀρηίφιλος' found in an epic poem. The connection between Ares and this branch of the Aiolid family is regularly renewed (at a rate of every other generation). For a family that encourages endogamy, in an attempt to avoid the problems that exogamy could create (since it entails the introduction to the household of a foreigner, who would compromise its existence), unions with a god are the best solution. Through the constant “endogamic” unions with Ares, military prowess never wanes; moreover, it passes to the female progeny as well (see above). For this *eschatia* of the Greek world, Ares is the perfect progenitor.

(iii) **Oineus’ other offspring, Agelaos.**

According to Apollodoros (1.8.1), Althaia bore Oineus a number of children. Apollodoros records the following names: Toxeus, Thyreus (see below), Klymenos, Gorge and Deianeira. Surprisingly his list is not complete. The *Ehoiai* add to these the name of Agelaos:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{τοὺς δ’ ἄλλους Οὐνή [τέκ’] Ἀλθαίη κυα[ν]ή[π]ις,} \\
\Phiηρέα θ’ ἱπόδαμ[ί]ν καὶ ἐυμ[ι]ελί[τ]ίν Ἀγέλαον \\
\text{Τοξέα τε Κλυμενόν τε ἄνακτ’ ἀτάλαντ[η]ν] Ἀρη
\end{align*}
\]

Γόργην τ’ ἕχκομον καὶ ἐπίκρονα Δημάνειραν (fr. 25. 14-17 M.-W.).

---

393 See Visser 1986, 149-65.
394 Cf. the simplified (?) version of *Mythographus Vaticanus* I 201 (entitled *De genealogia deorum vel heroum*), 1. 46-50 Kulcsár: *Item Mars genuit Partaonem, Partaon genuit Oeneum. Cestius (a corruption for Thestios) genuit Althaean, Toxium et Plexypum (on the names of
Antoninus Liberalis (2.1), whose account is attributed to Nikandros in the mss., goes further: ὁ Πορθέως τοῦ Ἀρεως ἑβασίλευσεν ἐν Καλυδώνι καὶ ἐγένοντο αὐτό π τις Ἐρετάς τῆς Θεσσάλου Μελέαγρος, Φιρέως, Ἀγάλεως, Ττετέως, Κλώμενος, Περίφας, θυγατέρες δὲ Γόργην, Εὐριμηδή, Δημάνειρα, Μελανίππη. It is not clear whether Antoninus used Nikandros’ Heteroioumena for the first part of his narrative, taking the names of the members of Oineus’ directly from his source, or whether, as Papathomopoulos believes, this part of the account came from a mythological handbook which would seem to have followed the account of the Ehoiai, recording the common names in the same order.

To the names recorded above, the scholia T to II. 9.584 add:

δόνα<ν>ται δὲ συλληπτικῶς μετὰ τῶν ἀρσέων καὶ αἱ θηλειαι ἀκούεσθαι, Γόργη καὶ Δημάνειρα, Πολυξώ καὶ Αὐτονόη.

Obviously, Apollodoros’ genealogy is closer to that recorded in the Ehoiai. However, the exclusion of Agelaos creates a significant problem. It indicates first of all that the Catalogue could not have been Apollodoros’ source (at least not directly). Agelaos’ position as son of Oineus is further established by his inclusion in Bakchylides 5. 115-120:

_Thestios’ sons see below_. Oeneus de Althaea genuit Meleagrum et Tydeum, Gorgen et Deianiram. Meleager genuit Part<en>opium, Tydeus Tydudem (the patronymic is used in place of the actual name for Diomedes) qui fuit dux in Troiano bello. In Mythographus Vaticanus I 79, however, Tydeus is the son of Oineus and Passiope, and father of Diomedes. 395

Thus Papathomopoulos 1968, 73: “Pour la première partie de ce chapitre, qui présente de grandes ressemblances avec Apollodore [1,7,10 sqq.], Ant. Lib. doit être tributaire des recueils mythographiques de ce genre plutôt que des Heteroioumena de Nicandre pour qui, certes, il ne présente aucun intérêt de raconter tous les préliminaires trop banals de la transformation des Méléagrides”. I find this argument rather weak; indeed, I think that it would be essential to establish the background of the episode that involved the whole family.

396 Erbse prints ὁδοιποτα. I think that δόνα<ν>ται is the most plausible emendation.
σὺς ἐρυθρόχας ἐπαίσσων βία
ʿΑγκιαῖον ἐμῶν τ᾽ Ἀγέλαον
φέρτηκτον κεδνών ἀδελφεῖν
οὐς τέκεν ἐν μεγάροις
.... ἦς Ἀλθαία περικλείτοισιν Οἰνέος:

It does not seem probable that Apollodoros himself left out the name because he later followed a source that did not include Agelaos among the victims of the boar. The mythographer could have easily incorporated the name simply for record purposes, as he usually does, without mentioning him again. Hypermnestra, sister of Althaia and mother of Amphiaraos, is a valid example of this; indeed Ageleos’ brothers Thyreus [see below] and Klymenos have themselves no mythological function. The only probable solution is that his source simply left out Agelaos.

The problem with the otherwise unattested name Thyreus seems to go back to this source. As we saw, the Catalogue (25. 14-17 M.-W.) and Antoninus Liberalis (2.1) mention a Phereus. The name Phereus is, of course, the Aeolic form of Thereus.397 So it is possible that Apollodoros found the etymologically transparent form Θηρεύς in the account that he was following (firstly inserted as a marginal explanation?). This would mean that the change to Θυρεύς is a simple case of etacism,398 a mistake made by a Byzantine copyist, that found its way into the archetype which all the surviving manuscripts of the Bibliothèke must have followed.399

---

397 See Paphathomopoulos 1969, 73.
398 Against this see Renaud 1993, 42, who argues, unpersuasively in my view, that Θυρεύς has a chthonic meaning, and should be retained unchanged.
399 As we have already noted, Wagner singles out the fourteenth century manuscript now found in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris (Par. gr. 2722 = R) as the archetype from which all the other
As we already noted, Agelaos' inclusion in Apollodoros' version would have given the narrative an interesting twist. His death in Bakchylides fits the pattern of a member of the royal family being the victim of the monster that ravishes the area (e.g., Haimon, the son of Kreon, is the last victim of the Sphinx in Apollodoros 3.5.8). Actually, Bakchylides goes one step further: H. Maehler suggests the following supplements for 5. 121-124.\(^{400}\)

\[\text{τοὺς δ' ἀψεσε μοὶρ' ὀλοῖ} \]
\[\text{πάντας' οὐ γάρ πω δείκωραν} \]
\[\text{παύσεν] χόλον ἀγροτέρα} \]
\[\text{Λατοὺς θυγάτηρ' περὶ δ' αἰθωνος δορᾶς} \]
\[\text{μαρνάμεθ' ἐνδυκέως} \]
\[\text{Κονρῆσὶ μενεπτολέμιος'} \]

Bakchylides makes clear that the death of Agelaos at the hunt and the deaths of his remaining brothers in the ensuing battle are the direct result of Artemis' wrath. In Apollodoros' version, no such appeasement is offered to Artemis.\(^{401}\) There is no indication that, in Euripides' *Meleagros* (an account which follows chronologically extant manuscripts are derived. However, this manuscript is also a copy of one defective original, which had lost the last part of the work.

\(^{400}\) Maehler 1997, 111.

\(^{401}\) Rubin and Sale 1984, 217-8, argue that "[t]he boar destroyed trees and killed men, enough, one would suppose, to have appeased even the savage Artemis Laphria. In any case, when the goddess strikes again and destroys Meleager, we expect her to have been provoked a second time. And Meleager's sulllying his initiatory hunt by using it to court Atalante is a splendid, apt provocation for the Virgin goddess". It is not clear to me why the goddess would require a second provocation to act against Meleagros. His lust for Atalante simply adds further insult to injury. Atalante, one should add, in Euripides at least, does not seem to be interested in Meleagros, or in any other for that matter, being explicitly against marriage (cf. *TrDF* fr. 525 Nauck):

\[\text{εἰ δ' εἰς γάμους ἔλθοιμ', δὲ μὴ τόχοι ποτὲ, τῶν ἐν δόμοιςιν ἡμερευοισθίων ἄει} \]
\[\text{βελτίων' ἀν τέκναμι λήμματι τέκνα} \]
\[\text{ἐκ γὰρ πατρὸς καὶ μητρὸς δυτις ἐκπονεῖ} \]
\[\text{σκληράς διαίτας οἰ γόνοι βελτίωνες.} \]
that of Bakchylides), Artemis was the instigator of the quarrel between Meleagros and his maternal uncles; rather, the fight is the direct consequence of Meleagros’ improper fixation on Atalante. Euripides makes much in his play of family relations, especially of marriage relations. Apollodoros clearly points out that, despite being married to Kleopatra (an indication, as we have noted, of the importance of endogamy for this branch of the Aiolid family), Meleagros wants to have children by Atalante (1.8.2): Μελέαγρος ἔχων γυναῖκα Κλεοπάτραν τὴν Ἱδά καὶ Μαρπήσσης θυγατέρα, βουλόμενος δὲ καὶ έξ 'Αταλάντης τεκνοποιήσασθαι, συνηνάγκασεν αὐτούς ἐπὶ τὴν θηραν μετὰ ταύτης ἐξέναρ. The surviving fragments of Euripides’ Meleagros show a similar preoccupation with the suitability of a partner when it comes to bringing forth children (cf. e.g. fr. 520):


dηγησάμην οὖν, εἰ παραζεύξει τις
χρηστῷ πονηρόν ἕλκτρον, οὐκ ἂν εὐτεκνεῖν,
ἔσθλοιν δὲ ἀπ’ ᾧμφοῖν ἐσθλὸν ἂν φύναι γόνον.

---

402 On the problems that marriage creates in Greek myth see Vernant, “Marriage”, in 1980, 55-77; more recently, the excellent article by Seaford, (1990, 151-76). Seaford makes the following observation concerning Meleagros and Althaia (166): “[t]here is here a poignant combination of opposites: the symbol of Meleager’s belonging to the hearth and the household of his father, the brand, is used by his mother in such a way as to put her loyalty to her natal family, her brothers, above her loyalty to her family by marriage, her son. Meleager, on the other hand, rates the sexual tie above kinship.” Certainly, in Apollodoros’ first variant Meleagros’ and Althaia’s responsibility for their actions is stressed. Unlike other versions, Meleagros kills his maternal uncles deliberately, as a result of his wrath (ὁργισθέεις 1.8.3), not in an accident or incident of war, for which the sons of Thestios were responsible (as in the second variant recorded by Apollodoros).

403 This insistence on the importance of a good partner for the birth of suitable children clearly disproves van der Valk’s suggestion (1958, 118) that Apollodoros is playing down Meleagros’ lustful intentions towards Atalante because the work is targeting young susceptible schoolchildren.
Artemis' wrath seems in this version to provide the background for the clash between relatives. It is certainly not the reason behind it, at least from what we can reconstruct of Euripides' work.

One last thing should be added concerning Euripides' version of events: the initiatory nature of the hunt for the Kalydonian Boar has been repeatedly stressed. No one can actually deny that the myth contains a number of striking initiatory details. However, in Euripides these details have been downplayed. Indeed, Meleagros seems to be married. This means that he is already past the adolescent period of his life. Consequently, the hunt loses its initiatory character and becomes the background for a domestic tragedy which shares numerous characteristics with other Euripidean tragedies.

Apollodoros preserves traces of a version, in which all the male offspring of Oineus and Althaia are destroyed (presumably because of the hunt). He records nothing concerning the other two sons of Oineus, Thereus and Klymenos; moreover, he records that after the death of Tydeus Oineus has no one to protect his and loses his throne. When Diomedes comes to save him, he finds that

---

404 See Bremmer 1988, 42 who argues, unpersuasively, for the seniority of the Homeric version of the myth.
405 The problem of the age of the participants in the hunt has been noticed by Bremmer, l. c. 48.
406 It is probable that Euripides' portrayal of Althaia is ultimately modelled upon Stesichoros' treatment of the myth. Fragments of Stesichoros' treatment of the myth of the Kalydonian Boar Hunt and the death of Meleagros have been published recently (P. Oxy. 3876, frs. 1-36; also published in an appendix to PMGF, p. 307-25) reinforcing Croiset's suggestion (1898, 73-80) that Althaia's depiction as a powerful but tragic character, encountered in Bakchylides and tragedy, has its roots in Stesichoros. See Garner 1994, 27-38.
407 See the similarity between the myths concerning Meleagros and Tydeus: they both kill their uncles. But while Meleagros kills his maternal uncles, unearthing the hidden danger that lurks in his household, his mother's affiliation to her natal family (see above), Tydeus kills his paternal uncles, or his cousins, who, moreover, plot against his father. Meleagros breaks the family rules, in his attempt to create a new family, discarding the old one (a double injury, given his relationship to Kleopatra); Tydeus tries to preserve the family's status. Consequently, Meleagros is killed whereas Tydeus is simply exiled, the usual punishment for similar heroic crimes (see Bonner and Smith, vol, 1, 1930, 32).
that there is no male relative to whom to give the throne. The kingship thus passes to the husband of Gorge, who acts as an epikleros. Thus it would seem probable that all of Oineus' sons, and especially those with names obviously related to hunting were usually thought to have perished either during the hunt or in the subsequent fight with the Kouretes.\textsuperscript{408}

(iv) Toxeus.

When it comes to the other sons of Oineus, Apollodoros incorporates in his narrative a unique detail concerning Toxeus, Oineus' first son. This son, with a name so appropriate for a family so closely linked to hunting (the bow being the weapon of the goddess of hunting, Artemis, and of Herakles), appears in two other contexts which are not genealogical records.\textsuperscript{409} Nonnos, some centuries after Apollodoros, gives us this tantalizing glimpse of what has been lost to us (\textit{Dionysiaka} 36. 83-7):

\textsuperscript{408} The connection of Apollodoros' accounts of the story of Meleagros with the versions recorded by Euripides (\textit{TrGF} frs. 515-39 Nauck) and Sophokles (\textit{TrGF IV} frs. 401-6 Radt) respectively has been repeatedly pointed out (already from Robert 1873, 53). I have nothing new to add to the subject. I believe that the use at this section of a manual which reproduced tragic plots is probable (see the arguments of Söder 1939, 91-94). The similarities of Apollodoros' account with the extant fragments of Euripides' Meleagros are obvious; however, it is evident that the mythographer's account is interested in the core of the myth rather than the particular twists of a tragedy. Thus features specific to tragedy are ignored (cf. frs. 533-4, 537), while details found in Apollodoros (especially those relating to the hunt) may not go back to Euripides. What is certain, however, is that, as Huys 1997b has recently shown Apollodoros' source was not "the tales from Euripides", a collection of hypotheses falsely attributed to Dikaiarchos (see Rusten 1982, 357-67). See also Rossum-Steenbeek 1998, 25-32, who argues that the mythographer's direct dependency on collections of hypotheses cannot be proven.

\textsuperscript{409} This is an additional affirmation of the appropriateness of the name Phereus for a brother of Meleagros, "cacciatore forse già nel nome" (thus Brelich 1958, 178). At least, this is how Euripides understood Meleagros' name (\textit{Meleagros} fr. 517): \textit{μελέαγρε, μελέαν γάρ ποτ' γρεάες ἄγραν} (cf. Proklos' rejection of this etymology, comm. in Plat. \textit{Cratyl.} 83c).
One can deduce two pieces of information from this narrative: Nonnos is following the epic tradition of the episode (also recorded by Apollodoros 1.8.3), in which the Kalydonian Boar Hunt was connected with Meleagros’ death only to the extent that it triggered the fighting between Kouretes and Aetolians. This tradition, built around a local war between two neighbouring cities, gave a prominent role to the wrath of Meleagros (whose introduction in the story is obviously a Homeric manipulation, in an attempt to create a paradigmatic story for the Iliadic plot). The fact that Gorge assumes an active role on the battlefield might be an indication that she shared her sister Deianeira’s rejection of female norms as it is recorded in Apollodoros.

The passage makes clear that at the time of the battle Toxeus is dead. Apollodoros actually records the manner of his death: οἶνες δὲ βασιλεύων Καλυδώνος παρὰ Διονύσου φυτῶν ἀμπέλου πρῶτος ἔλαβε. γῆμας δὲ Ἀλθάιαν τὴν θεσσιών γεννᾷ Τοξέα, δὴ αὐτὸς ἐκτείνει ὑπερπηδήσατα τὴν τάφρον (1.8.1). P. Oxy. 2463 also records the same story, though it adds nothing.

---

410 In Pausanias’ account (10.31.3) αἱ δὲ Χοίλαι τε καλοῦμεναι καὶ Ἡ Μινώας ὑμολογήσασιν ἄλληλας (F 3 Davies = F 5 Bernabé) Ἄπολλονα γὰρ δὴ αὐτὴ φασίν αἱ πατήσεις ἀμέναι Κοῦροιν ἐπὶ τοὺς Αἰτωλοὺς καὶ ἀποθανεῖν Μελέαγρον ὕπο Ἄπολλονας, is obviously modeled upon the heroic death on the battlefield of Patroklos and Achilles. In this version, there is no room for slayings of kin, curses, and firebrands. This tradition is straightforward: a warrior is so formidable that only the intervention of a god can stop him. On the identification of the Μίνυαι with Hesiod’s Πειρήθου Κοτάβασις (where the detail that Apollo killed Meleagros is also found, fr. 280 M.-W., 1. 1-2), see Janko 2000, 336-7.
to our knowledge of what actually happened. The papyrus, which contains, according to its editor J. Rea, a commentary on a poetic text, links Toxeus’ death with the death of Ephippos at the hands of his father Poimandros for jumping over the ditch. The story is of course reminiscent of Remus’ death at the hands of his brother Romulus for jumping over the new city wall in defiance of his brother.

The question of a father’s infanticide of his son(s) in Greek myth is extremely interesting. The Table that follows lists all the attested attempts at infanticide and yields some very illuminating results:

---

411 For Rea the papyrus contains a hypomnema on Lykoph. *Alexandra* 326-9; however, Livrea 1989, 141-147, argues that we are dealing with the remnants of a commentary on Kallimachos’ *Victoria Berenices, Suppl. Hell.* no. 256-7 (possibly written by Theon). Livrea discusses in detail the reasons for the association of Amphitryon with Poimandros in the papyrus, but does not comment on the inclusion in it of the Oineus-Toxeus myth. It is evident that all the mythical examples recorded in the papyrus deal with heroes who caused the death of a close relative. In the case of Amphitryon, the murder of his father-in-law Elektryon was unintentional; cf. Apollodoros 2.4.6, where the death of Elektryon is caused by the accidental throwing of a club. In Plut. *Mor.* 299C = *Aet. Gr.* 37, where a somewhat different version of Poimandros’ murder of one of his sons is recorded, the death is also caused by the accidental throwing of a rock. *P. Oxy.* 2463 breaks off at the crucial moment, but could it be that the death of Ephippos (and perhaps even the death of Toxeus) was also caused by the throwing of something? However, the confrontation of Poimandros with his son in the papyrus indicates that we would have to assume that Poimandros intended to hit his son, reacting angrily to some sort of provocation. See below.

412 The papyrus records the members of Poimandros’ family attributing the information to Rhianos (part of his *Herakleia?):* see *Suppl. Hell.* 715. However, the particulars of the death of Ephippos at the hands of his father are ascribed to Aristophanes of Boiotia (included in *FGrHist* as no. 379). See more below.

413 See the extensive if inconclusive discussion in Bremmer 1987b, 34-38.
### Table II:

**Fathers against sons: Infanticides**

#### a. successful attempts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Son(s)</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oineus</td>
<td>Toxeus</td>
<td>act of defiance?</td>
<td>death of Toxeus (Apollodoros 1.8.1, also recorded in <em>P. Oxy. 2463</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poimandros</td>
<td>Ephippos</td>
<td>act of defiance?</td>
<td>death of Ephippos (cf. <em>P. Oxy. 2463</em>, which should be included in the fragments of Aristophanes of Thebes, <em>FGrHist</em> 379; for a different version see Plut. <em>Mor. 299C = Aet. Gr. 37</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkathous</td>
<td>Kallipolis</td>
<td>distortion of normal practices of sacrifice (Alkathous mistakenly thought that his son wanted to offend the gods when he inadvertently disrupted a sacrifice wishing to announce his brother's death).</td>
<td>death of Kallipolis (his father struck him to death with a burning log from the pyre, cf. Paus. 1. 41. 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumelos</td>
<td>Botres</td>
<td>distortion of normal practices of sacrifice (during a sacrifice to Apollo, Botres divided the brain of the sacrificial lamb before placing on the altar).</td>
<td>death (the father, enraged by what he perceived as sacrilege, struck the son with a burning log from the pyre, and was turned into a bird by Apollo; cf. Ant. Lib. <em>Met. 18</em>.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maiandros</td>
<td>Archelaos</td>
<td>distortion of normal practices of sacrifice (Maiandros takes an oath to the Mother of Gods to sacrifice, if victorious, the first person to congratulate him: it turned out to be his son, daughter and wife).</td>
<td>death (sacrifice of the son, daughter and wife; Maiandros, in despair threw himself in the river which now bears his name; cf. Pseudo-Plut., <em>De fluvius</em> ix. 1, citing as ultimate sources Timolaos of Kyzikos <em>FGrHist</em>).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Alleged Victim</td>
<td>Alleged Accuser</td>
<td>Alleged Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theseus</td>
<td>Hippolytos</td>
<td>plotting stepmother</td>
<td>death of Hippolytos (by a bull that Poseidon, invoked by Theseus, made appear from the sea; cf. Euripides Hippolytos; Apollodoros Epitome 1. 17-19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phineus</td>
<td>two sons (whose names are usually given as Plexippos and Pandion).</td>
<td>plotting stepmother</td>
<td>blindness or death (or incarceration in a tomb) for the sons; blinding of Phineus by the Argonauts; see below. Chapter Five, section C (iv).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amyntor</td>
<td>Phoinix</td>
<td>plotting stepmother</td>
<td>blindness (cured by Chiron; cf. Apollodoros 3.13.8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lykourgos</td>
<td>Dryas</td>
<td>madness sent by Dionysos (due to Lykourgos' impiety).</td>
<td>death of Dryas (his father mistook him for a vine and struck him with an axe). His death caused the land to become barren and at the oracle's instigation the people of Thrace killed him on Mount Pangeus by having four horses tear him to pieces. cf. Apollodoros 3.5.1).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Herakles sons by Megara (usually three, Kreontiades, Therimachos, Deikoon; cf. Apollodoros 2.4.11) | madness (sent by Hera = plotting stepmother) | death of the children; imposition of the twelve labours on Herakles; cf. Apollodoros 2.4.12, and for a different
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athamas</th>
<th>Leearchos and Melikertes</th>
<th>madness sent by Hera (Athamas and his wife, Ino, took care of baby Dionysos, immediately after his birth).</th>
<th>death of Leearchos (shot by an arrow). Ino threw herself and Melikertes in the sea. (see Apollodoros 1.9.2 and 3.4.3, where she apparently unsuccessfully tries to perform an act of resurrection by throwing her already dead son into a boiling cauldron, just as Medea does in the story of Pelias’ rejuvenation.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Odysseus</td>
<td>Eurypylos (son by Evippe).</td>
<td>plotting stepmother (Penelope accused Eurypylos of wanting to murder Odysseus).</td>
<td>death of Eurypylos at Odysseus’ hands (who did not realise who Eurypylos was), cf. Parthenios NA 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**b. unsuccessful attempts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Athamas</th>
<th>Phrixos</th>
<th>plotting stepmother (due to a false oracle, fabricated by Phrixos’ stepmother, Ino, Athamas’ subjects forced Athamas to sacrifice his son = distortion of normal practices of sacrifice).</th>
<th>Phrixos, with the help of his mother, Nephele, escapes to Kolchis on the back of the Golden Ram. (cf. Apollodoros 1.9.1).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aigeus</td>
<td>Theseus</td>
<td>plotting stepmother (Medea convinces Aigeus that Theseus plans to usurp him).</td>
<td>recognition of father and son, exile of Medea, who returns to Kolchis (although later Theseus will unwittingly cause his father’s death);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c. attempts attested in Roman sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idomeneus</td>
<td>unnamed son (or a daughter, Kleisithera)</td>
<td>distortion of normal practices of sacrifice (Idomeneus takes an oath to sacrifice to Neptune the first human being who would welcome him to his kingdom, if he survived a storm at sea).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>death (sacrifice) of the son; banishment of Idomeneus from Crete (a pestilence that broke out after the perverted sacrifice was seen a sign of divine displeasure against him; Servius on Virg. Aen. 3. 121, 11. 264; Mythogr. Vaticanus I 195, II 210).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Iunius Brutus</td>
<td>two sons</td>
<td>treason (attempt to reinstate monarchy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>execution of sons (cf. Livy Annales 2. 3-5, where the conflict of emotions felt by Brutus is emphasised to underline the triumph of public duty over family ties; cf. Polybios 6. 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Manlius Torquatus Imperiosus</td>
<td>T. Manlius (adolescent son)</td>
<td>violation of military orders (the son successfully engages the enemy, in violation of his father/general’s order that no one may engage the enemy without permission).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>execution of the son (it should be noted, however, that the penalty is imposed by Manlius the commander, not the paterfamilias exercising his potestas vitae ac necis in a story perhaps already present in Ennius Ann. fr. 156 Skutsch; cf. Sall. Cat. 52. 30; Livy Annales 8. 7).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before we proceed to discuss this Table, I should add that, while I included in it the story of Idomeneus and his son which is attested only in Roman sources, because the lateness of the story is far from certain, I have excluded from it the story of Oineus' murder of Meleagros (attested only in Malalas Chronographia 6. 21 Thurn [165 c-d Dindorf])\textsuperscript{414} as an obvious remodelling of the story of the death of Meleagros at the hands of his mother, as well as the story of Tenes and his father Kyknos (already recorded in Euripide's Tenes, but also found in Lyk. Alex. 232. Diod. 5. 83. 4, Konon FGrHist 26 F1, Paus. 10. 14. 2-3, as well as in Apollodoros Epitome 3. 24). Tenes and his sister Hemithea are falsely accused by their stepmother Philonome (or Phylonone), and would fit perfectly with the other stories of the Table under the heading of 'plotting stepmother'. However, Kyknos' reaction to the accusation is different from that of the other fathers in the Table; he casts his children adrift in an ark, in an obvious attempt to avoid spilling kin blood, leaving thus his children's fate in the hands of the gods, as in the case of Hypsipyle and her father Thoas. Hence Kyknos' action should not be seen as an unsuccessful attempt against his children's life; consequently I have omitted the story from Table II.

It becomes apparent that the stories included in Table II can be organised into three categories according to the motivation for the father's action against his son. The plotting stepmother is the theme that appears in most of the stories. From the 5\textsuperscript{th} c. onwards, malevolence and stepmother become synonymous in Greek myth.\textsuperscript{415} Turning against her invariably innocent stepchildren (even in the case of Phoinix, despite the more familiar Homeric variant), a stepmother's wickedness is

\textsuperscript{414} See above section (i) for a quotation of the relevant passage.
\textsuperscript{415} See the excellent discussion of Watson 1995, 20-49 with appendices.
manifested as plotting murder because of the threat the stepson poses to her own child. Jealousy (in the case of Penelope, sexual jealousy originating from Odysseus' infidelity) and fear play a significant and consistent part in myths of this type. At the opposite extreme of the spectrum of human emotions, we find stepmotherly hatred stemming from uninhibited sexual passion. In these “amorous stepmother” tales the woman turns on her stepson when he rejects her advances, denouncing him falsely to her husband who then turns on his unfortunate son.

Two of the three tales included in the Table under the heading “madness” originate in the malevolent stepmotherly behaviour of Hera. Hera, motivated by sexual jealousy due to Zeus' constant philandering, causes Herakles to go mad and kill his children. She inflicts the same fate on Athamas and Ino, who took care of baby Dionysos. Finally, Dionysos himself causes the madness of Lykourgos because of the latter's persecution of the god and his impiety – though this is a madness different in kind from that caused by Hera, originating as it does from the god of ecstasy.

Finally, the reason behind a father's murder of a son may be religious – the son, usually inadvertently, commits an act of sacrilege that enrages the father (whose close connection with the offended god is sometimes emphasized, i.e. the connection of both Eumelos and Alkathous with Apollo), or the father himself commits sacrilege by promising a human sacrifice, and is punished by having to fulfil his oath though his son (in the case of Athamas, who is compelled to sacrifice his son by a false oracle, neither father or son come to any harm).

---

416 On the story of Phrixos, originally an aition for rites in Thessaly, but later connected with the theme of the malevolent (amorous?) stepmother, see Watson 1995, 247-1.
To these myths, I have added the stories of L. Iunius Brutus and T. Manlius Torquatus: although believed by the Romans to be actual historical events that took place in the early days of the Republic\textsuperscript{417} and during the Latin War (341-0 B.C.), the stories are obviously exemplary and, in fact, the later was used (already by Sallust) as an example of a Roman father’s \textit{potestas vitae necisque}. A Greek father did not have such a right, and indeed, as Shaw recently argued, persuasively in my view, nor did a Roman; his power was, in actuality, restricted to normal discipline (sometimes harsh) within his household.\textsuperscript{418} Besides, it is apparent in both versions of the story of Torquatus that he is acting as a general (since he punishes those who fought the enemy \textit{contra imperium}) and not as a father, while Livy makes clear that Brutus thought that his role as a defender of the Republic superseded that of father. As such, the stories cannot be compared with the other myths of male infanticide, nor can they give us an insight into the situation cryptically recorded by Apollodoros.

To return to our discussion of Toxeus’ death, it is obvious that it was not provoked by a sexual or other misdemeanour by a stepmother, nor does it seem to have been caused by an act of madness or fear on Oineus’ part. The possibility that we are dealing a religious misdemeanour on Toxeus’ part (since it is apparent that it is his action that causes Oineus’ reaction) is extremely difficult to prove. However, Kerényi argues that Oineus killed his son because “he neglected his father’s vineyard and leaped over its ditches”.\textsuperscript{419} Obviously, Oineus belongs, as his name denotes, to the circle of Dionysos. Apollodoros himself states that the king

\textsuperscript{417} See Ogilvie 1965, 241-43.
\textsuperscript{418} Shaw 2001, 56-77.
\textsuperscript{419} Kerényi 1959, 113.
was given the vine by the god, and that Althaia bore Deianeira to Dionysos. Hyginus records the following very significant version (Fab. 129):

*Liber cum ad Oeneum Parthaonis filium in hospitium venisset, Althaeam Thestii filiam uxorem Oenei adamavit. quod Oeneus ut sensit, voluntate sua ex urbe excessit simulatque se sacra facere. at Liber cum Althaea concubuit, ex qua nata est Deianira; Oeneo autem ob hospitium liberale muneri vitem dedit monstravitque quomodo sereret, fructumque eius ex nomine hospitis ‘oenon’ ut vocaretur instituit.*

Oineus goes to extraordinary lengths to ensure that the god feels welcome, in contrast with other royal households, notably that of Thebes, that are destroyed by their inability to recognise Dionysos’ divinity. If indeed Toxeus’ action turned against the god as Kerényi suggests, whether deliberately or not, (and, in the light of the other stories of religious misdemeanour in Table II, it would have probably been accidental), it would endanger Oineus’ newfound relationship with the god. The situation becomes more terrifying if we take into account the fact that, as Leinieks points out, “it becomes clear that Dionysos in his earliest form is not the god is the wine or even the god who brings wine, but rather the god who is the vine.” Oineus would have to act swiftly to protect his family and subjects from the wrath of that most liminal of all gods. But while he seems to secure the

420 On the similarity of this myth with the Anthesteria ritual see Seaford 1993 135ff. Are we dealing with a myth made to fit the pattern of the Athenian ritual (perhaps a late tragedy)?


423 Even without Toxeus’ death, the invasion of the household by a stranger destroys the autonomy which the family tried to preserve through endogamy. See Seaford’s observations (1993, 135).
goodwill of Dionysos, he does not escape the wrath of the other liminal deity, Artemis.\(^{424}\) It is this wrath that will eventually destroy his family.

The discussion so far was based on Kerényi's attractive supplementation of the myth, but not on any strong evidence. As a matter of fact, the close link between the stories of Toxeus and Ephippos assumed by \(P. \text{Oxy.} \, 2463\) leads me to believe that Toxeus', like Ephippos', is most probably an act of defiance against authority. The papyrus preserves a story in which Ephippos' death was a direct result of his (?)\(^{425}\) jumping over the ditch dug by his father. It is not clear why the jumping over the wall or a ditch would deserve such a severe punishment. The most probable answer would be that it was thought that such an action destroyed the magic powers of the wall or ditch. Both constructions were thought to form a magic circle that protected all that were in it.\(^{426}\) Consequently, any action jeopardising this ability deserved the penalty of death. This is certainly true for the Romans, but I am not sure that the Greeks saw things in exactly the same way. Otherwise, how can we explain the custom that the victors of the Olympic games entered their city through its walls, specially demolished for the occasion? In any case, this explanation would imply that Oineus kills his son for disregarding (wittingly or not) his will and the laws of community, just as Althaia puts Meleagros to death for breaking family rules. A minor obstacle to this explanation is created by the fact that Plutarch records a different variant (\(Moralia \, 299C\)), in which the victim of the murder is not Ephippos but his brother Leukippos. In this version the intended victim is not Poimandros' son but the architect Polykrithos,

\(^{424}\) On Artemis and Dionysos in relation to the myth of Meleagros, see Renaud 1993, 127-35.

\(^{425}\) The syntax of passage is not very clear but I follow Turner and Lloyd-Jones 1963, 450 in accepting τὸν Ἐφίππον as the subject of ἀφέσκευσιν contrary to Rhea's edition.

\(^{426}\) See Zonaras 7. 3 and the connection with Miltiades and his death.
who taunts Poimandros’ architectural efforts and jumps over his ditch. Poimandros tries to hit him with a rock, but misses and kills his son instead. The motive of jumping over a ditch as an act of defiance is, however, present in both versions of the tale. It is easy to assume that these are modifications to the story (whether to amplify the tragedy of the death of a son at the hands of his father or not) since its core remains essentially unchanged. Like Poimandros (but also like Alkathous and Eumelos, who committed infanticide on religious grounds), Oineus read Toxeus’ actions as defiance, and punished his son with death, setting an example for his wife to follow.

(v) Other members of the family: Hyleus/Pylos

However, the victims of the boar recorded in Apollodoros, namely Hyleus and Ankaios, present us with another problem. While Ankaios is a victim of the boar in all the sources, Υλεύς is an emendation proposed by Aegius, and accepted by all editors ever since. This alteration, based on Ov. Met. 8. 312 (Hyleusque, a reading itself uncertain, as Huys points out),\(^{427}\) replaced the reading Πύλος of the manuscripts, presumably because the name was not found in the catalogues of the participants in the hunt recorded by Apollodoros or other authors. This means that they have replaced a name not found in the catalogue with another name, which is also not found in it! Huys argues that the problem is found in the catalogue and, very correctly, proposes to correct the manuscripts’ πύλος to the

\(^{427}\) Huys 1997, 205 note 12. In Ovid’s mss we read:  illustrate; supra ras. s M; ilesus M^2; silusque N. See Bömer 1977, 116. It is possible that Silus is a corrupted form of Pylus and Ovid is actually recording the same version as Apollodoros.
palaeographically compatible πῆλος, and to drop the emendation Dryas from it.\[428\]

We should replace both emendations (i.e. Hyleus and Dryas) with Pylos. This suggestion makes sense: first, it preserves at least one of the readings of the manuscripts. Pylos, a son of Ares by Demonike, a brother of Thestios, is already mentioned in Apollodoros 1.7.10. In the catalogue he would be linked to Meleagros, and rightly so, since he is his great-uncle (or, as we shall see below, his paternal uncle). This could create a minor problem: Pylos does not belong to the same generation as the rest of the participants. He is two generations older than the rest. The sons of Thestios, presumably together with Eurytion (and Idas?), the oldest of the hunters, are his nephews. Apparently, he is too old to participate in such a hunt. However, Hesiod (Catalogue fr. 10) mentions that he was the youngest of Oineus' brothers. There appears to be some confusion in the sources that Apollodoros transmits. Pylos cannot be a son of Ares and an inhabitant of Kalydon\[429\] (as a brother of Thestios he should be one of the Kouretes),\[430\] and young enough to participate in the hunt. However, despite this confusion, Pylos' inclusion actually solves more problems, textual as well as genealogical, that it creates. Either way, he is a member of the family, belonging to a generation young enough to participate in the hunt (balancing the participation of Thestios' sons?) and, as a member of the family, he is killed in the hunt. If in fact he is a member of

\[428\] See Huys' objection to the incorporation to the catalogue of Dryas, son of Ares (1997, 203): "the Dryas who participates in the Kalydonian hunt [in the other catalogues] is one of the Thessalian Lapiths, already known from Il. 1.263 and Hes. Shield of Herakles 179, and must not be identified with the Thracian Dryas, son of Ares and brother of Tereus". See Table III.

\[429\] As we saw in the previous note, Dryas cannot be connected with Kalydon. Pylos' inclusion in the catalogue resolves the geographical problem. Dryas, the son of Ares, came from Thrace; no other participant comes from so far away. In fact, the hunters come from specific areas of the Peloponnese and Thessaly, the exception being Theseus from Athens, who is drawn into the account because of Perithous.

\[430\] Note, however, Il. 14. 116, where it is said that the sons of Porthaon resided both in Pleuron and Kalydon.
Thestios' family, then, his death justifies, in a way, the demand made by Thestios' sons for the hide of the boar.
B. The participants in the Hunt

The Kalydonian Boar Hunt belongs to the second type of hunting: rather than describe the exploits of a solitary hero, “it symbolises the collective values of the hunt.”\(^{431}\) In this collective hunt, the abilities of the solitary hunter are a liability. A boar hunt requires the participation of many hunters: “several hunters should cooperate, for the beast is taken with difficulty and by many men”, wrote Xenophon, describing the elaborate preparation and equipment required for such a dangerous undertaking.\(^{432}\) Herakles, the solitary hunter, lacks the necessary social skills; unable to with others, he is excluded from the catalogue of the participants (similarly, he had to be excluded from the Argonautic expedition).\(^{433}\) In Apollodoros’ catalogue, he is replaced by his rather undistinguished mortal twin, Iphikles; on the other hand, Theseus, a figure clearly modelled upon Herakles, but who is not characterised by his constant internal conflict and unsociability, is included in all the literary catalogues of the participants in the Hunt (i.e. Apollodoros 1.8.2, Hyginus Fab. 173, and Ovid Met. 8. 299-317).

A. Brelich has put the Kalydonian Boar Hunt into its correct context: “ma come mentre molti eroi hanno da affrontare una prova (δοθλος), vi è qualche prova eroica che coinvolge il fior fiore della generazione eroica, qual’è l’impresa

\(^{431}\) Schnapp 1991, 121.
\(^{433}\) Thus Apollodoros 1.9.19. His main source is Apollonios of Rhodes’ Argonautika I. 1207ff. He also records that Διονυσίως μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν καὶ ἡγεμόνα φησὶ τῶν Ἀργοναυτῶν γενέσθαι (Dionyssios Skytobrachion F 14 Rusten). This points to the second issue that a mythographer has to address if he decides to incorporate a prolific character into his narrative. In an expedition of this kind, Herakles could not but assume the role of the leader. However, no other hero should stand out in the way that Meleagros or Iason do in the Kalydonian Boar Hunt and the Argonautic expedition respectively. Otherwise, both stories would have taken a different course (cf. the prominence given to Herakles by Dionysios Skytobrachion FGrHist 32 F 14 = fr. 14 Rusten). On Herakles and the Argonautic expedition see below, Chapter Five.
argonautica; mentre molti eroi partecipano ad agoni, vi è qualcheagine - p. es. quelli per Pelias e per Azan - che costituiscono un evento d'importanza centrale nell'epoca degli eroi; così, mentre episodi e imprese di caccia ricorrono nella vita di molti eroi, vi è almeno una grande partita di caccia che trascende il significato episodico o, sia pure, fatale che altre simili possono avere nella carriera di uno singolo eroe, assurgendo essa stessa a mito autonomo che richiama la partecipazione di numerosi grandi eroi: la caccia di Caledonia".\textsuperscript{434}

"The paradox of the hunt at Calydon is", as has been pointed out,\textsuperscript{435} "that it supplied the Greeks with the heroic model for the collective hunt, but it was a hunt that was cursed, impious, the story of an impossible initiation. It is the myth that is exemplary, not the heroes".

A few words about the table that follows: the main focus of the comparison is Apollodoros' catalogue. All the other columns are structured to correspond to Apollodoros' arrangement of names. Names present in the other lists but not in Apollodoros are listed in order of appearance and are similarly compared with the lists on their left (and, ultimately, with Apollodoros' catalogue). The numbers in these columns indicate the position of the names in their specific list. As for the symbols: ❖ is used in lists that are derived from poetic versions and indicates that this name is linked with either the preceding or the following name(s), since they are part of the same verse. * accompanies figures that have been or will be discussed in this Chapter.

\textsuperscript{434} Brelich 1958, 179.
\textsuperscript{435} Ellinger 1991, 148.
### Table III

The participants in the Kalydonian Boar Hunt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apollodoros (1. 8. 2)</th>
<th>Ovid Met. 8. 299-317</th>
<th>Hyginus Fab. 172</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Μελέαγρος Οινέως έκ Καλυδῶνος</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πύλος άρεας έκ Καλυδῶνος</td>
<td>Hyleus</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰδας άφαρεως έκ Μεσσηνῆς</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λυγικεύς άφαρεως έκ Μεσσηνῆς</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κάστωρ Διός καὶ Λήδας έκ Λακεδαίμονος</td>
<td>(Tyndaridae gemini)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πολυδεύτης Διός καὶ Λήδας έκ Λακεδαίμονος</td>
<td>(Tyndaridae gemini)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θησεύς Διός έξ Αθηνῶν</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αδμητός Φέρητος έκ Φερῶν</td>
<td>Pheretiades</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αγκάλιος δυκαλόγου έξ Αρκαδίας</td>
<td>Parrhasius Ancaeus</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κηφέης δυκαλόγου έξ Αρκαδίας</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ιάσων Αισιόου έξ Ιωλκοῦ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ιφικλῆς άμφιτρώνος έκ Θηβῶν</td>
<td>Iolaus Hyanteus</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περίθοδος άξιονος έκ Λακησίς</td>
<td>Iolaus Iphicli</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πηλεύς Αιακοῦ έκ Φθίας</td>
<td>creator magni Achillis</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τελεμῶν Αιακοῦ έκ Σαλαμίνος</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ευρίπων Ακτορος έκ Φθίας</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αταλάντα Σουνέως έξ Αρκαδίας</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αμφιάραος ά Οικέλων έξ Αργας</td>
<td>Oiclides</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ τοῦ Θεστίου παιδεῖς (ἐκ Πλευρῶνος)</td>
<td>duo Thesiadae</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ιφικλῆς, Εὐυππος, Πληξυππος, Ευρύπυλος</td>
<td>(Plexippus l. 440, Toxeus l. 441)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plexippus, Ideus, Lynceus</td>
<td>18, 19, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Thestii filii, fratres Althaeae)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1.7.10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caeneus</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leucippus</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acastus</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippothous</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryas*</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Amyntore</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actoridae pares</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyleus ab Elide</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echion</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narycius Lelex</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panopeus</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hipposus</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestor</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippocoontidae (Enaesimus l. 362)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penelopae socer (Laertes)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampycides sagax (Mopsus)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurytus Mercurii Sparta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesculapius Apollinis</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcon Martis, Thracia</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphemus Neptuni</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deucalion Minois</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(i) **The Thestiadai**

Apollodoros offers us a list of the participants in the Hunt. Surprisingly, however, when compared to the other two completed literary catalogues of participants (Hyginus *Fab.* 173, and Ovid *Met.* 8. 299-317), this list contains only 22 names: 18 participants are mentioned by name, father's name, and place of origin, while Iphiklos, Euippos, Plexippos, and Eurypylos, referred to by name in 1.7.10, are mentioned collectively here as *οἱ Θεστίατοι παιδές*. It is most unfortunate that Apollodoros does not state the individual names of the Thestiadai. As Henrichs points out, "authors mentioning the Thestiadai as part of a long catalogue of Calydonian hunters usually prefer the brevity of the generic name, whereas the individual names prevail in texts that are primarily interested in family history." Moreover, "the treatment of their names by poets and mythographers is far from uniform". Earlier sources, while agreeing on the number of brothers (two), reflect distinct name-traditions, which are, moreover, completely ignored by later authors. Of the names recorded in Apollodoros only one goes as far back as Bakchylides (5. 128: ἐνθ' ἐγὼ πολλοὶς σὺν ἄλλοις/ Ἰφικλον κατέκτανον/ ἐσθλόν τ' Ἀφόρητα, θοῦς μάτρωας). Iphiklos is also named in Apollodoros' list of the Argonauts, as the only one of the Thestiadai who took part in the expedition. The name Plexippos is attested in all the late literary sources (see Table III). Eurypylos is mentioned in Sch. A on Hom. II. 9. 567 (III p. 521 Erbse), together with Iphiklos and Plexippos: ἄδελφοι δὲ Ἀλθαῖς Ἰφικλῶς,

---

437 See the extensive treatment of the tradition by Bömer 1977, 111-2.
Полиоантиς, Φάνης Εὐρύπυλος, Πληξιππος. Еуиппос, on the other hand, is unattested outside Apollodoros. The names Plexippos and Eurypylos cannot be traced beyond the Hellenistic period. In fact Plexippos is grouped with the name Toxeus in Ovid (*Met.* 8. 260–546). As we have already noted, in Apollodoros the latter name is given to the eldest son of Oineus, a tradition that goes back to the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 25. 14-17). It would seem natural to assume that, due to the obvious fluctuations of the tradition, the name passed from one figure to another in the same myth. Apollodoros does not include in his narrative the names Klytios and Prokaon, who are attested in Stesichoros (*Syotherai* fr. 222 4-5), nor the names Kometes and Prothoos, who are recorded in the description of sculptures by Skopas by Paus. 8. 45. 6. As these are our earliest preserved groups of names, the use of a Hellenistic source is more probable. However, considering the fluctuation of the tradition and the lack of substantial evidence, any such conclusion is, to say the least, tenuous.

---

438 Van der Valk’s suggestion (1958, 103-14) that the scholiasts used the *Bibliotheke* as a source, to which they added further information may be applicable here.

439 Also in Bakch. 25.29. The number of possible variants offered by the same author illustrates the fluidity of the tradition.
(ii) **Kepheus and Iphikles**

The rest of the list is quite straightforward (excepting the reference to Dryas which we have already discussed above, section v). It contains the most popular participants in the Hunt. The stories of these heroes are closely linked together; most of them appear in the catalogue of the Argonauts as well (exceptions being Peirithous and Eurytion, who is drawn into the hunt because of his connection with Peleus). However, unlike the other two complete lists in Table III (and unlike the list of the Argonauts that Apollodoros records in 1.8.16.), Apollodoros does not purport to present us with a list of the heroes of the generation previous to the Trojan war. Rather, he records the names of the participants that are common to all the versions of the hunt, and hold a crucial role to the development of the narrative. With the exception of Kepheus and Iphikles, all the other names are common to all the lists. Kepheus is of course included because of the role he plays in the subsequent narrative: he and his brother Ankaios object to the participation of their niece, Atalante, in the hunt. This friction between Atalante and her paternal family that had rejected her before the hunt balances the quarrel between Meleagros and his maternal uncles after the hunt. In Apollodoros’ version of Atalante’s story at 3.9.2, Atalante was reunited with her family because of the glory that she gained after her participation in the games in honour of Pelias and the Kalydonian Boar Hunt (παρεγένετο δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἀριστέων καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Καλυδώνιον κάπρον, καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἐπι Πελίας τεθέντι ἄγων ἐπάλαιας Πηλεῖ καὶ ἐνίκησεν. ἄνευρόσα δὲ ὑστερον τοὺς γονέας). On the other hand, her participation in the hunt, at least in the first version narrated by Apollodoros, brought about the destruction of both branches of the Aitolian
royal family. We shall return to Atalante presently. Note, however, that the inclusion of Kepheus in the list indicates that the list may have been part of Apollodoros' main source.

As for Iphikles, only Apollodoros mentions him in this context. All the other sources, including Skopas (Paus. 8. 46. 1), prefer Iolaos, his son. Iphikles is a singularly "unheroic" figure. The only other expedition in which he takes part is the battle against the sons of Hippokoon. Strangely enough, the latter story links Iphikles with a Kepheus (the son of Aleus, brother of Lykourgos, king of Tegea 3.9.1): both perish in the battle fighting for Herakles. The inclusion of Iphikles in this list is probably an attempt to give the twin brother of Herakles and father of Iolaos some additional credentials. Similarly, the inclusion of names like Laertes and Menoitios in the lists of the Kalydonian Boar Hunt (Laertes is mentioned by both Ovid and Hyginus) and of the Argonautic expedition (1.9.16) is an attempt to equip Odysseus and Patroklos with a heroic pedigree.

The list begins, quite naturally, with Meleagros and ends with his opponents, the Thestiadai. The two other important figures in the hunt, Atalante and Amphiaraoi, who manage to shoot the boar, thus facilitating its eventual

---

40 There is some inconsistency in the genealogical details recorded by Apollodoros. In the list of the Argonauts Kepheus is said to be the son of Aleus and thus is the uncle, not the brother, of Ankaios, who is the son of Lykourgos. Apollodoros' list of the Kalydonian boar-hunters chose to present Ankaios and Kepheus as brothers because of the subsequent narrative and the role they both played in relation to Atalante. In any case, there is here some clear conflation of the myth.

41 There is an additional reason for the inclusion of Amphiaraoi in the catalogue of the participants in the Kalydonian Hunt. The catalogue contains a number of closely related heroes: the Dioskouroi, for instance, are related not only to Meleagros and Amphiaraoi through their mothers, but also to the Apherids (Idas is also the father-in-law of Meleagros, 1.7.8-9). In Apollodoros' version Amphiaraoi is one of the three who wound the beast (the other two being Atalante and Meleagros). Renaud 1993, 79, argues that the manner of death of the boar corresponds to the manner of death of Patroklos in Iliad 16: it is firstly struck by Atalante, a figure strongly reminiscent of Artemis (Patroklos is struck by Apollo), then by Amphiaraoi, a Apollonian figure (who corresponds, according to Renaud, to Euphorbos), and finally, by the actual hero, Meleagros (in Patroklos' case, Hektor). Hektor and Meleagros are obviously the
killing, are grouped together near the end of the list. In the other literary lists, Atalante is always the last to be mentioned. Due to the importance of her role in killing the boar in the artistic depictions of the hunt, her place is always next to the boar.\footnote{Wachter 1991, 91.} Obviously, the pictorial representations include fewer names, due to lack of space. Thus both the François vase and the sculptures by Skopas record only the most popular participants. As Wachter points out,\footnote{Ibid. 92. He goes on to discuss the inclusion of at least two Kimmerians (Κυμι(μ)έρως and Τόξωμες) -- the third archer with a barbarian outfit has a Greek name, Ευθύμιος-- in this Panhellenic expedition (94). He suggests that “this could have to do with a personal predilection of the painter” or that it could illustrate some friendly feelings of the Greeks towards this people, due to recent political circumstances. Is then the boar an allusion to Gyges and his Lydians, the common threat to both the Greek colonies in Asia Minor and the Kimmerians?} “it is obvious that the painter [of the François vase] grouped those names that he could remember next to the boar.” With two exceptions, Akastos and Melanion, these names are also included in Apollodoros’ catalogue. As we shall see, Melanion makes particularly good sense next to Atalante. Wachter also points out that “[o]n the other hand to the far left and to the far right the painter added names for which we know of no connexion with the Kalydonian boar-hunt, while other illustrious hunters are not named (Dryas, Eurytion, Iason, Idas Iolaos, Lynkeus, Telamon, Theseus, and the sons of Théstios). Why he chose these other names we do not know.”\footnote{See Boardman in LIMC II 1, 940-50.}

In other cases, local tradition dictated which names were included in list: this was the case with Epochos, included in the list of Skopas’ sculptures on the temple of Athena Alea at Tegea (a temple connected with the hunt, cf. Paus. 8. 46.1); Apollodoros lists him as a brother of Ankaios (also in Σ Apoll. Rhod. 1. 164) and of Iasos (father of Atalante in most versions). Thus he has taken the place of principal heroes in their respective episodes, but the rest of Renaud’s parallelisms do not convince me.
Kepheus. Hippothous, on the other hand, appears in both Latin literary catalogues;\textsuperscript{445} this is an impressive example of continuity in a long mythographical tradition, another example being the name of Akastos occurring on an Attic black-figure dinos (\textit{ABV} 23,\textsuperscript{446} c. 580 BC), the François vase (\textit{ABV} 76.1, c. 565 BC) and Ovid's \textit{Metamorphoses} (8. 306).\textsuperscript{447} However, Hippothous' exact connection with the other hunters is uncertain.

Most of the other names in Apollodoros' list are grouped together by association: thus Meleagros is followed by Pylos,\textsuperscript{448} a figure from his native Kalydon and then by his father-in-law Idas; the latter is linked to his brother Lynkeus; both are followed by their cousins and arch-enemies, the Dioskouroi. Theseus, who is next, is linked to the sons of Zeus through Helen. The sons of Lykourgos appear together, as do those of Aiakos. These last are accompanied by Eurytion, father-in-law to Peleus. Theseus, however, is separated from Peirithous, although one would expect to find them together, as in Ovid (\textit{Met.} 8. 303). Finally, the places of origin of the hunters do not play any particular role in the structure of the list. Since it contains no obscure names, one would think that a simple reference to the patronymic of the heroes would be enough (thus, in the list of the Argonauts we are only given the names of the participants and the names of their fathers). However, the reference to their places of origin indicates the extent of the mobilisation necessary for the successful outcome of the enterprise, and consequently, its central importance as one of the few Panhellenic myths.

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotesize
\item[445] Our main source of information concerning Hippothous [or Hippothoon, Hippothoos] is Hyg. \textit{Fab.} 187 (narrating a story found in Euripides' \textit{Alope}); see Gantz 1996, I, 253.
\item[446] See Beazley 1956.
\item[447] cf. Henrichs 1987, 252.
\item[448] See above.
\end{footnotes}
(iii) Atalante

The identification of the hunters by the names of their fathers and their place of origin brings forth an interesting discrepancy: Atalante is said to be the daughter of Schoineus, and to come from Arkadia. However, Apollodoros does not include Schoineus among the offspring of Lykourgos: Λυκούργος δέ καὶ Κλεοφύλης ἦ Εὐρυνόμης Ἀγκαίος καὶ Ἑποχος καὶ Ἀμφιδάμας καὶ Ἰασος. The only Schoineus mentioned in Apollodoros is also an Aiolid; he is the son of Athamas by his third wife Themisto: Ἀθάμας δέ κτίσας τὴν χώραν Ἀθαμαντίαν ἄρ' ἐαυτοῦ προσηγόρευσε, καὶ γῆς Θεμιστώ τὴν Ὀψέως ἔγεννησε Λεύκωνα Ἐρύθριον Σχοίνεα Πτώον (1.9.2). In the version of Atalante's story which Apollodoros records (3.9.2) Atalante is the daughter of Iasos: Ἰάσον δέ καὶ Κλυμένης τῆς Μνύδου Ἀταλάντη ἔγενετο. The mythographer goes on to give a brief but straightforward account of an eventful life: Atalante is rejected because of her gender and exposed, is nursed by bears and grows up to become a virgin huntress. She manages to avoid all the perils of the wilderness, such as the attempted rape by the Centaurs Rhoikos and Hylaios, first mentioned by Kallimachos hymn 3. 22-24; rape, of course, is a danger which all females who wander outside the normal bounds of civilised society have to face. She plays a major role in two enterprises, namely the Kalydonian Boar hunt and the funeral games in honour of Pelias; compare how she is also included in the list of the Argonauts (1.9.16, Diod. 4. 41. 2).449 She is then reconciled with her family; in an attempt to avoid her father's wish that she marry, she races against her suitors. The

449 See our discussion in Chapter Five, section B.
prize for the victor is marriage, while defeat meant death at the hands of the would-be-bride. Only Melanion, son of Amphidamas (3.9.2) and thus a cousin of Atalante (another example of endogamy in Apollodoros), manages to overcome the maiden with the help of three apples given to him by Aphrodite. The marriage is successful, and the couple continues to lead a life of hunting until one day they commit sacrilege by making love in the precinct of Zeus and are changed into lions.

As presented in Apollodoros, the story of Atalante is coherent: “her refusal of the world of women marks Atalanta’s destiny from the start”, writes Detienne.\(^\text{450}\) Rejected because of her gender, she overcompensates by rejecting normal female activities, i.e. marriage. She strives to retain her liminal state, apparent in all the myths she participates: she is both male and female. “She is a participant in many traditional male activities and has masculine attributes. For example she carries armor; she participates in athletics, such as wrestling and the footrace (an armed race); she hunts; she competes with the suitors; she is depicted exercising in the nude like an ephebe. Yet she partakes of the “normal” feminine sphere - she participates in a prenuptial race and also the inverted world of the female Amazon and maenad. ... In short, Atalanta is a study in ambiguity and the blurring of gender distinctions”.\(^\text{451}\) Her activities before her reconciliation with her family mark her as an outsider, an *ephebe* hunter who participates in a number of *male* initiatory rites. Her acceptance by her father, who rejected her because of her gender, means that she has been successfully initiated into a new stage in life. However, the role she is expected to play is not that of a male; rather, she is expected to become what she always tried to avoid: a woman, fulfilled in

\(^{450}\) Detienne 1979, 31.
\(^{451}\) Barringer 1996, 74-5.
marriage. She thus devises a way to conflate what she knows and what is required of her. In Apollodoros' version, the prenuptial footrace, already established in myths related to marriage, becomes a deadly hunt. An armed Atalanta assumes the role of the hunter, and hunts down her unarmed suitor. At the same time, the hunter becomes once again the hunted: as Boardman has noted, when discussing a lekythos by Douris (c. 500/490 BC) now in the Cleveland Museum of Art, on which Atalante (named) is pursued by three Erotes, “here we have the bride Atalanta rejecting, but hopelessly, the wreath of wedlock, running, it might be, from the bridal finery for the better-loved dress for hunt or race. But Eros has wings and Eros has a whip, and where Aphrodite dictates none escape, even though, as it was to prove for Atalanta and her lovers, the escape was ultimately to their deaths”. Atalanta has realised what a number of women in Greek myth learned the hard way: for a female, marriage is death. She tries to avoid it by hunting down those who endanger her maidenhood. Finally, the female hunter is trapped by the use of feminine guile. In Apollodoros' version of the footrace the roles of the couple are completely reversed. The golden apples bring about marriage, but with it comes death (in this case through metamorphosis). Atalante thinks that she might continue her previous life even after marriage. This is not so: sex complicates matters. Atalante succumbs to desire and ignores the rules. Sex in the wild is always dangerous. She managed to avoid it as a maiden (cf. the unsuccessful rape attempts), but she cannot as a married woman. In other versions

---

452 On the homology between γάμος and τέλος, and their connotations in the story of Atlanta, see Detienne 1979, 31-2.
453 Ibid. 33.
454 Boardman 1983, 18.
456 On the use of apate in this myth and the importance of hunting imagery in the entrapment of Atalanta, see Detienne 1979, 40ff.
(Ovid *Met*. 10. 681-704, Hyginus *Fab.*185), Aphrodite is the cause of her transformation into a lion. In Apollodorus’ version, Atalante and Melanion mate in a temple of Zeus, and it is he, as preserver of order, who transforms them. As lions they are no longer able to mate with each other (as Hyginus first suggested); they will be able, however, to hunt. Through transformation Atalanta will regain what she lost through marriage, her identity as a hunter.

Apollodorus’ account presents us with a totally consistent character, whose main characteristics remain the same throughout. This was not always the case. Most recently Gantz has shown that the figure of Atlanta, who, Apollodorus would have us believe, was a single person, was in reality a product of conflation. Ancient authors refer to an Arkadian and a Boiotian Atalanta. The first was the daughter of Iasos and a keen huntress, finally participating in the Kalydonian boar hunt; the other was the daughter of Schoineus, who did not wish to marry and who with her father’s help sets up the race (this myth is first recorded in Hesiod’s *Catalogue of Women*, frs. 72-76 M.-W.). This separation explains the diversity of variants concerning the names of her father and of her husband which Apollodorus records. Melanion, himself Arkadian, was the suitor of the Arkadian Atalanta, while Hippomenes was the suitor with the apples, already mentioned in Hesiod fr. 76 M.-W. I agree with Huys that that Apollodorus’ reference to Hippomenes should not be related to Euripides but to “Hesiod and others”). Apollodorus obviously offers a conflated account of Atalante’s story, linking Melanion with the footrace; he is the first to call the winner of the race Melanion, whereas in all the

---

457 ibid. 45.
458 Gantz 1996, I, 335-9 with sources.
459 Huys 1997b, 313.
other sources the name of the suitor is Hippomenes. The same conflation exists in
the list of the participants in the boar-hunt. The list preserves a rather late stage in
the progress of the conflation. The Arkadian huntress is linked to the Boiotian
father.\(^{460}\)

\(^{460}\) See Paus. 8. 35. 10, who informs us of an Arkadian plain called Schoinous after the Boiotian
father of Atalanta, whom the author assumes migrated there.
Chapter Five

The Argonautic expedition: Sailing to Kolchis (1.9.16 – 23)

περάσαμε κάβους πολλούς πολλά νησία τη θάλασσα
που φέρνει την άλλη θάλασσα, γλάρους και φώκιες. ...
Μα δεν τελειώναν τα ταξίδια.

(G. Seferis, Αργοναύτες, a poem from the collection Μυθιστόρημα)

A. Medeia

The adventures of Iason and the Argonauts in their quest for the Golden Fleece, and Iason’s association with Medeia, the foreign princess whose witchcraft assured the successful conclusion of the voyage, but who eventually brought about Iason’s deplorable end, belong to the earliest strata of Greek myth. A very complex myth, it raises various issues, which remained current and challenging in the Graeco-Roman world;\(^\text{461}\) furthermore, a number of themes, recurrent in Greek myth, are elaborated in it. The greatest adventure for a whole generation of heroes, the Argonautic expedition raises, from its outset, questions concerning relationships within families, marriage and parenthood, and identity – in terms of gender, ethnic origin and culture; it explores issues such as the effects of supernatural powers and magic on human lives, of divine and human vengeance and its justification, of heroism, human ἄμηχαλια and the value of cooperation. Incorporating universal folk-tale motifs, its “intertextual”\(^\text{462}\) narrative explores the problematic of themes

\(^{461}\) Braund 1995, 8.

\(^{462}\) For my use of the term see the discussion in the introduction.
such as the acquisition and preservation of kingship, the justification and the legitimization of heroic quests, the opposition of physical and mental abilities, and, more importantly the power of *Eros* and the contrast of the male with its vital 'other', the female. It also demonstrates in a most atrocious manner the frightful outcome of such deviations as perversion of sacrifice and insolence against gods, violation of oaths and defiance of family loyalties; the myth, especially in the *prolegomena* and the *epilegomena* of the quest proper, investigates alternatives that society so abhors "that it refuses to regard [them] as anything but the rarest and most outrageous of deviations".  

Originally an initiatory journey to the unknown, evolving in a mythical universe, the story becomes, in its later literary incarnations, a myth of world geography, linking the Greek centre with the barbarian periphery, and seeking to accommodate terrifying mythic locations of the world of the unknown in the real world of the Mediterranean and of central Europe; the Greek waves of colonisation might not have been the reason behind the creation of the myth, which was evidently much older than the huge colonising eruption between the eighth and sixth centuries, but they certainly contributed enormously to the enrichment of its narrative. With its "mixture of 'scientific' and fabulous geography", the

---

463 Thus Easterling 1977, 186, on infanticide. She points out that, despite the attempts to consider infanticide as something "quite outside the experience of civilized people", modern statistics (i.e. sociological literature from the United Kingdom and Denmark) show that a large proportion of murder victims are in fact children and that their killers are predominantly their parents. However, Segal 1996, 16, points out that "the violence of Medea differs in significant ways from the twentieth-century models, but it also has elements in common with [their] motivations".


465 Vian 1987, 277.

466 Hunter 1993, xxi.
voyage of the Argonauts becomes "emblematic for all (past and future) sea-
voyages";\textsuperscript{467} from the age of colonisation onwards, "the Argonautic expedition
took on a new significance, for each colonist was in a sense an Argonaut".\textsuperscript{468} The
acquisition of a new \textit{Weltanschauung} from the growth of geographical knowledge
left a visible mark on the myth of the Argonauts; it became a myth of foundation
and aetiology,\textsuperscript{469} a guide for similar historical ventures.

The significance of the story of the Argonautika within the early literary
repertoire is made manifest by the famous allusion at \textit{Od.} 12. 70 (\textquoteleft Argô πόσι
μέλανσα) and Homer's constant borrowings from the Argonautic saga, already
acknowledged in antiquity.\textsuperscript{470} As Vian points out,\textsuperscript{471} "beaucoup de modernes, non
sans raison, admettent . . . que les navigations d'Ulysse s'inspirent pour une large
part des aventures d'Argô. Bien entendu, il convient d'être prudent, car
Apollonios, qui est l'une de nos sources principales, est à son tour tributaire de
l'\textit{Odyssee}, notamment dans son chant IV." Reservations put aside, he points out
elsewhere "au moins depuis la dissertation de Karl Meuli, qui date de 1921, nul . . .
ne conteste que des \textit{Argonautiques} prehomériques sont une des sources des
navigations d'Ulyssè".\textsuperscript{472} On the other hand, Graf asserts that "it is scarcely proper
to think of that much-cited, imaginary 'old Argonautica' as a model, if one seeks a
defined narration of the myth; . . . The fact that we have received no epic version
of the Argonautika from the archaic period proves how much less authoritative the

\textsuperscript{467} ibid. xxiii.
\textsuperscript{468} Braund op. cit., 16.
\textsuperscript{469} The aetiological dimension, apparent in varying degrees in all literary reincarnations of the
story, was fundamental for the myth as a whole, not just a casual offshoot of it, even if, as we
shall see, in Apollodoros one can detect only traces of it.
\textsuperscript{470} Cf. Severyns 1928, 180-2, on Aristarchos' affirmation that Homer knew of the Argonautic
expedition; also Strabo 1. 2. 38 (45), who followed Aristarchos' reasoning.
\textsuperscript{471} Vian 1974, xxvii.
\textsuperscript{472} Vian 1982, 275.
individual versions of the myth must have been than the myth itself, and how free in its details the tradition was. If nothing else, the casual references in both epics to persons and places connected with the Argonautic adventure indicates that the basic parameters of the myth where already set and an extensive familiarity with it had already been established. As for the latter part of Graf's argument: we have already argued that individual versions of a myth are obviously more idiosyncratic than the myth proper, but one cannot base such a conclusion on the fact that - perhaps purely by chance - no early epic version of the Argonautic saga survives, especially if we take into account the factor of oral composition. Indeed, the statement in Simonides (fr. 564 PMG = Stesichoros fr. 179(ii) PMGF) that Homer referred to the victory of Meleagros in the Athla epi Pelia indicates the existence of an early epic tradition dealing at least with part of the myth (the events surrounding the death of Pelias).

A survey of all the versions of the story, both old and more recent, demonstrates the innate conservatism of the principal narrative. Indeed, in all its manifestations, although nothing hindered continuous variation in detail, its basic storyline retained its constancy and relative simplicity throughout. By isolating the primary narrative from the numerous - mainly geographical - later additions, it will become apparent that its basic structure falls into the category of the "quest(-initiation) type of narrative", a very popular pattern in Greek myth. A young man

---

474 Cf. ll. 2. 715 (Pelias); 8. 467-471, 21. 40, 23. 745-747 (Euneos); 14. 230 (Thoas); Od. 10. 135-139 12. 3-4 (the location and the genealogy of Kirke); 11. 235-259 (the story of Tyro and her family); 12. 59-111 (the itinerary proper).
475 Beye 1982, 42-43, who notes the universal folktale elements included in the story describing them as "a commonplace around the world". Also Green 1997b, 45: "the many features from Märchen it (i.e. the Argonautic myth) contains give it a archetypical validity". On an analysis of the "quest myth" and its links to initiation, see Propp 1968. The initiatory background of the
(be he Iason, Perseus, Bellerophon, or even Theseus) is sent on an apparently
impossible quest by a hostile sovereign who regards the young man’s presence as a
serious threat. After prevailing over severe trials, aided by helpers with remarkable
abilities (or by the possession of magical objects), he reaches the residence of a
hostile being, in whose possession the object of his quest is found. The hero
manages to win the affections of the daughter of his host, whose help against her
family he enlists. After succeeding at his task, he elopes with the girl. In the
ensuing pursuit, they escape unharmed by throwing things behind them that have
some significance for the pursuer(s), and must, therefore, be collected. On his
return, he overcomes the final obstacle of his original foe, and—in most cases—
acquires his rightful position. On these straightforward foundations from folktale,
the numerous mythical themes mentioned above are constructed. However, this
myth differs from all the others of the same pattern because the narrative
includes a particular element, namely the central position given to Medeia. Fully
absorbed into the Argonautic enterprise, Medeia exceeds the limits of folktale; she
“seems naturally at home in myth”. Although she retains her folkloric powers of
magic, or perhaps because of this, Medeia becomes “an appropriate center of so
many experiences in the areas of love, infidelity, and vengeance”. She becomes
the quintessential embodiment of the several fears which the Greeks felt about the

prolegomena and the journey proper is undeniable and has been repeatedly stressed, from Brellich

476 Cf. the story of Theseus and Ariadne (attested for the first time in Od. 10. 320, and in its
totality in Pherikydes FGrHist 3F148 = Schol. Od. ad loc.) Their story, like those stories of
Minos and Skylla (cryptically referred to in Aischylos’ Choephoroi 613-22, and elaborated in
Ovid’s Metamorphoses 8. 6-151; cf. also Apollodoros 3.15.8), and that of Amphitryon and
Komaito (recorded only in Apollodoros 2.4.5-7), is part of the “Tarpeia” story-type (on the
Roman myth see Bremmer and Horsfall 1987, 68-73), which ends in another familiar folktale-
pattern: after successfully completing the task imposed on him, the hero abandons the girl who
had been so instrumental in his accomplishment, and/or causes her death.

477 Parry 1992, 44.
other’: she is seen as a female, with a dangerous, aggressive appeal that renders her threatening to the male, as a barbarian stranger, alien to the Greek way of life, as a manipulator of supernatural powers and as a possessor of superior mental abilities. Consequently, she is the perfect figure to explore questions concerning many aspects of the problem of identity.

Medeia’s first appearance in Greek literature comes at the end of the Theogony (992-1002). In this passage, where she is immortal, it appears that the relocation to Greece of Medeia was the main objective of Jason’s quest, in accordance of Zeus’ plan:

\[
\text{ήγε παρ' Αἴτητα, τελέσας στονόντας ἁθλούς,}
\text{τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπέτελε μέγας βασιλεὺς ἰπερήνωρ,}
\text{ιβριστῆς Πελίας καὶ ἀτάσθαλος ὀβριμοεργός·}
\text{τοὺς τελέσας ἐς Ἰωλκὸν ἄφικετο πολλὰ μογήσας}
\text{ἀσκείσ ἐπὶ νησὸς ἄγων ἐλικώπιδα κοῦρην.}
\]

The Theogony brings together all the elements – admittedly unconnected - found in later versions: presumably, the references to an ἄβριστῃς and ἀτάσθαλος Pelias in connection with his inimical relations with Iason and the relocation of Medeia point to the version of the myth recorded in Apollodoros (1.9.16), which connect the reason for the quest with Pelias’ eventual death: θεασάμενος δὲ Πελίας αὐτῶν καὶ τὸν χρησμὸν συμβαλὼν ἠρώτα προσελθὼν, τί ἂν ἐποίησεν ἐξουσίας ἐχων, εἰ λόγιον ἦν αὐτῷ πρὸς τινος φονευθήσεσθαι τῶν πολιτῶν. ὁ δὲ,

478 Her superior mental powers are alluded to in her own name (deriving from the root *med- popular in Greek myth); the question and quality of Medeia’s sophia are repeatedly debated, like so many other of her characteristics, in Euripides’ homonymous play. See Easterling 1977, 182,
A similar version of events is recorded in Pindar (P 4. 249-50), and Pherekydes (FGrHist 3 F105, ταύτα δὲ τῷ Ἱήσουν Ἡρη ἐς νόον βάλλει, ὡς ἔλθοι ἡ Μήδεια τῷ Πελίᾳ κακὸν) and Apollonios (4. 241-43, οἱ δ’, ἀνέμου λαυψηρα θεῆς βουλήσιν ἄντος/"Ηρης, διφ’ οἰκίστα κακὸν Πελίαο δόμοισιν/ Αἰαίῃ Μήδειᾳ Πελασγίδα γαῖαν ἴκηται). In the last two versions, as in Apollodoros, Hera’s anger is the cause behind Medea’s relocation and her assuming the role of the agent of Pelias’ death. All three works point to the problem of double motivation, on human and divine levels; however, in terms of concrete motivation, Medea, as in the Theogony, becomes the actual reason for the expedition. The original object of the quest, the Golden Fleece, retreats as Medea assumes a more central role in the myth: it now becomes the pretext.
To digress for a moment, most scholars, recently Moreau and Johnston, agree that Medeia (at least in her Korinthian guise) was initially immortal. However, I find Johnston’s view of an early Medeia taking on the part of Mormolyke unappealing. Medeia embodies the danger that the introduction of a foreigner could mean for a family: the main unifying characteristic of Medeia’s persona is that she is always portrayed as a foreigner who comes to the city or household from outside, destroys (or attempts to destroy) it, and then departs for another distant place. Her destructive powers are focused on the male element of the family – the death of Glauke is a later addition to the myth and is aimed at Iason and Kreon, while, in earlier versions of the murder of her children, it is stated (Kreophylos of Samos fr. 9 Bernabé [dubium] = Oechalii Halosis fr. Spurium Davies or Kreophylos of Ephesos FGrHist 417 F3) that the Korinthians committed the murder in retaliation for the murder of Kreon by Medeia. Although no reason is given for Medeia’s wrath its main target was Kreon, minimising the possibility that Medeia’s motive was jealousy at Jason’s new marriage, and thus eliminating the need for the murder of Glauke. The question of immortality is more difficult to answer in relation to the Kolchian Medeia (cf. Graf’s statement: “the Corinthian Medea has little to do with Medea whom epic located in Colchis and Iolcus”): again her obvious initiatory role and her attempts at rejuvenation would fit well with a divine character. Rejuvenation is a covert process of bequeathing immortalisation, applied to their mortal loved-ones by many Greek goddesses (cf. Hypoth. A to Euripides’ Medeia 11-14 Diggle = Simon. fr. 548 PMG = FGrHist 3

---

481 See Moreau 1994, 101-115, although I do not subscribe to the conclusion that Medeia was originally an agrarian Mother-Goddess.
482 Johnston 1997, 44-70.
483 Graf 1997, 35.
F 113, with a curious reference to the rejuvenation of Iason). However, in all our extant narratives, except the *Theogony* (since I believe that Pindar's reference to her immortal mouth in *P 4. 11* is metaphorical, as she is uttering an prophecy), she is a mortal, albeit a very powerful one. It is exactly this dangerously powerful mortality that renders her more sinister and thus more fearsome.

To return to our discussion, the early stages of the tradition need not have given Medeia such an important role in the expedition: the crew of the *Argo*, originally consisting of men with supernatural powers, may have played a more crucial role in its successful outcome. Men like Orpheus, the Boreads, and the Dioskouroi are the protagonists of a number of episodes during the voyage. Apollodoros even records a tradition that Poias, and not Medeia, slew Talos with his arrows (1.9.26). However, from very early on, Medeia takes the initiative more than the traditional maiden of the "Tarpeia-type" would.\(^{484}\) This obviously has to do with the presence of two elements in the story: the erotic element, evidently present in the earliest narrations of the story, and the ἀμηχανία of the main hero.\(^{485}\) From the moment that an erotic element enters the picture so pronouncedly, the story takes on a colouring of its own that alters its perspective. The "hero" (and by this I mean the main character) becomes the woman. In the case of the powerful Medeia, she naturally dominates the story.

\(^{484}\) The tensions between Medeia and the other accounts of the "Tarpeia-type" have been observed by Graf 1997, 25. He concludes that "Medea's story originally ran somewhat differently: Medea was not always a little maiden of the Tarpeia-type". Medeia, as we know her, could never be compared to the other women of this sort. Even in Apollonios' young, infatuated Medeia there lurks another Medeia of immense intelligence and power, who will eventually dominate both the *persona* and the story. If nothing else, Medeia is forced to acquire a dominant part, because so much is required of her. See Clauss 1997, 149-177.

Surprisingly, in Apollodoros the family of Aietes is not presented in a single genealogy, as one would expect: Aietes and his sisters, Kirke and Pasiphae (but without his brother Perses, who was a later addition to the original offspring of Helios by Perseis), with his daughter Chalkiope, are introduced in 1.9.1, as part of the story about the Phrixos; Medeia appears in her familiar genealogy as daughter of Eidyma and Aietes in 1.9.23; finally, at the end of that paragraph, Apsyrtos is introduced, but only as Medeia’s brother, without any reference to his parentage, an indication that he is, in this version, a full brother of Medeia, thus making her crime more horrid.

The importance of Medeia’s is apparent even in the abbreviated version recorded by Apollodoros. He portrays a thoroughly consistent Medeia: a pharmakis (the adjective emphatically follows her name when she is first introduced), she consistently takes the initiative: it is she who approaches Iason and offers him help, in a do ut des arrangement that deviates from Apollonios’ version. It seems, however, that Apollodoros reverts to an earlier tradition, since the arrangement between Iason and Medeia is found in Sophokles’ Kolchides (TrGF IV 339 Radt: ἤ φης ἑπομνύος ἀνθυπουργῆσαι χάριν;).
Apollodoros’ account firmly establishes Medeia as the instigator of events; it is she who puts the dragon to sleep and brings the fleece to the Argo, Iason acting as a humble companion. More importantly, it is she who devises and executes her brother’ murder (cf. Pherekydes FGrHist 3 F32, who also records the murder of the child Apsyrtos in a similar manner, but has the members of the crew perform the gruesome task); it is she who overcomes Talos with her magic or her sophia (1.9.26). Finally, on their return to Iolkos, Iason exhorts Medeia to devise a plan of vengeance against Pelias. It is not surprising then that the end of the story is devoted to Medeia’s other adventures (in Athens, Persia, and finally, Kolchis), while we hear nothing of the fate of Iason, whose story we are supposed to follow. Only snippets his life after his return to Greece and exile (but, presumably, before the murder of his children) are recorded elsewhere in the Bibliotheke: at 1.8.2, Iason participates in the Kalydonian Boar Hunt, and at 3.13.7, he plays a auxiliary role in a story about Peleus:

Obviously, Jason’s participation in this expedition against his cousin and former comrade on the Argo builds upon the long standing feud between the two branches of the family that reached its climax with Pelias’ death and Jason’s subsequent exile. Yet the episode is part of the story of Peleus: it is Peleus and not Jason who ends up as ruler of Iolkos (cf. Hes. Ehoiai fr. 211 M.-W., Pindar N 3. 32-4 & 4. 54-6, and Pherekydes FGrHist 3 F 62, who offers the same information, and seems to be the source of Apollodoros’ account). Akastos’ death obviously offers Iason nothing but revenge. The gruesomeness of Pelias’ murder evidently meant that Iason could never return
to Iolkos in any capacity other than its destroyer, and, of course, could never claim it as his realm (in any case, in Apollodoros, Iason never had any legitimate right to it). The sack of Iolkos is the final outcome of a story that follows the Potiphar motif, and effects Peleus' transfer to Thessaly. Iason remains at Korinth and in that vicinity, at the Isthmus, meets his deplorable death, after the murder of his children. Apollodoros creates the setting for this episode, by recording that Iason and the Argonauts dedicated the Argo to Poseidon at Isthmus (1.9.27). However, neither his killing by a rotten timber from the ship, described in Medeia's *deus ex machina* speech, presumably a Euripidean innovation, nor any other kind of death is ever mentioned. The death of Iason's children and new wife brought about his total destruction. From that point onwards, it is as if Iason is himself physically dead, as his life has no point, once he has lost every opportunity to have an heir, and thus a posterity. In the end, the story of Iason becomes the story of Medeia.

Apollodoros' account preserves none of the long process of how Medeia became the "Medeia" whom Apollonios describes in his account. Apollodoros' Medeia is already a complete, complex character: a manipulator of formidable powers that can be used both for good (she provides the *pharmakon* that renders

---


489 I.e. suicide by hanging, Neophron TrGF 15 fr. 3 Snell and Diodoros 4. 55. 1.

490 This process is part of Apollonios' poetic design. Throughout the two last books, Apollonios describes a process of psychological change that transforms Medea from a young lovesick girl to Euripides' tragic heroine. As Hunter points out (1993, xxii), "the epic shows us why the action of the tragedy was inevitable and the central events of that tragedy... are foreshadowed both in the general shape of the epic and more specifically in the language and images of its text." This is a gradual process: Medea passes from white magic (used to protect Iason) to her participation in the death of her brother and the killing of Talos. The image of Medea θεμένη δι κακον νόον, ἄχωδοτϊς ὁμοιοι χαλκείου Τάλω ἑμέγχων ὀποτάτος (4. 1669-1670), and thus defeating the bronze man Talos ὡς ὡς, χάλκεος περ ἕναν, ὅποιες δεμήνας Μηδείης βρίθη πολυσφαιράκου (4. 1676-7), dominates the last part of the epic; it signifies the completion of Medea's evolution, and cannot but remind the audience of the gruesomeness that is to follow.
Iason unassailable, and that which puts the dragon to sleep\(^{491}\) and, mostly, for evil. In Ἀπολλώνιος, Medea becomes an accomplished murderess through a gradual process of killing; every time, her resolve is more pronounced and more eager: each time makes the further step easier to take. In Ἀπολλώδης Medea is from the beginning a potential murderess: her first attempt is against her — apparently — full brother, a mere child, and she performs it without hesitation. Ἀπολλώδης’ Medea is thoroughly consistent as a character: she is “Medea” from beginning to end.

As a pharmakis, a foreigner and a woman, Medea does not fit in at any of the Greek cities that she visits. She remains untamed and thus dangerous, offering death and destruction to those near her. Eventually, Ἀπολλώδης has her returning to her country and restore the kingdom to her father (perhaps a trace of a tradition according to which the Golden Fleece was a talisman of Kingship, so that its loss by Aietes also meant loss of power). By finishing his narration at this point,
without mentioning her eventual heroisation and relocation to the island of the
Blest (recorded in *Epitome 5. 5*),<sup>492</sup> Apollodoros makes a point: at the end, if
Medeia is to remain Medeia, she needs to be returned to the place from which she
should have never been taken in the first place.

---

<sup>492</sup> This tradition, already recorded above, goes back to Ibykos and Simonides (Σ Apoll. Rhod.
810-15A = Page *PMG* 291 and 558); cf. also Lykophr. *Alex.* 174-5.
B. The Catalogue of the Argonauts (1.9.16)

Having dealt with the “prolegomena” to the expedition, Apollodoros now turns to its particulars: the building of the ship and the catalogue of the crew that will accompany Iason to Kolchis. This is a joint endeavour: Iason could never have dreamt of recovering the Golden Fleece without the help of some of the greatest heroes of his age, the ἀριστοί. As in the other great collective ἀθλος of the generation, the Kalydonian Boar Hunt, the participants in the Argonautic expedition are seen as a group: as Vian points out, Apollonios usually designates the Argonauts as νεόι, a collective term, if a rather improper one, since it is obvious that the expedition brings together men of different ages. The term, a remnant of an earlier stage in the development of the myth, indicates that this is a gathering conditioned by equality and solidarity, without, of course, disregarding the necessity for individual leadership. In Apollonios, as in all other versions of the myth, the very frame of the expedition, a sea journey to the far ends of the earth on a πεντηκόντορος νοῦς, demands close collaboration.

493 cf. Apollonios’ Argonautika 1. 336-7:

494 This term is introduced for the first time in the context of the Argonautic expedition in Apollodoros 1.9.16: ὡς δὲ ἡ ναῦς κατεσκευάσθη, χρωμένῳ ὁ θεὸς αὐτῷ πλεῖν ἐπέφερε συναντούσαι τοὺς ἀριστοὺς τῆς Ἑλλάδος, and again in 1.9.20 and 1.9.27. The same term is used by Apollodoros to designate the participants in the Kalydonian Boar Hunt (1.8.2): τοὺς ἀριστοὺς ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος πάντας συνεκάλεσε, κατ’ τῷ κτείναι τῶν θηρίων δορᾶν δώσειν ἀριστεῖον, and again in 3.9.2 in the same context; it is Apollodoros’ convenient way of referring to the gatherings of the heroes of this generation.

495 Vian 1982, 279.

496 Cf. Moreau 1994, 120-1, who bases his discussion on Vian (l. c.). He points out that the youth of the participants in the Argonautic expedition is a common feature of the myth and is stressed by all the major sources, indicating the undeniably initiatory character of the original myth.

497 See our discussion below, section C (i).

498 Cf. Vian 1974, 16-7, who points out that solidarity amongst the Argonauts is actually one of the most important leitmotives of the myth.
Yet it has been rightly pointed out that, although we are dealing with the deeds of a group of men bound together in a common enterprise, "it would be illogical and confusing to deal with such a group without identifying who formed it". The Argonauts might be conceived and appreciated as a large single unit, but one of a highly diversified individuality; as already noted, the members of the crew were figures traditionally endowed with distinctive or unusual qualities and abilities. A list of the participants would actually draw attention to these attributes, enhancing the importance of the whole enterprise, without distinguishing certain members of the group and thus spoiling the notion of community and solidarity. Thus a catalogue would serve to amplify the difficult and dangerous nature of the journey, and emphasise the importance of the "Argo" and of the solidarity of the group.

Greek mythology, at the same time, is replete with catalogues of names. This traditional epic topos, particularly rich in background mythical material and thus essential to our understanding of mythical narratives, quickly became an indispensable feature of the mythographical landscape. "Valued as a matter of record", sources of invaluable practical information for legendary "history", and greatly appreciated for their entertainment value, their appeal continued from oral poetry and oral tradition to written poetry and prose.

---

500 First observed by Meuli 1921, 1-24.
501 Hard 1997, xvi.
502 Thus MacLeod 1982, 110, discussing the catalogue of Priam's sons at Il. 24. 249-51, notes: "the long list of names which follows is certainly meant to have the feel of history, and is probably believed to be history."
504 On list and catalogues in oral poetry, their composition and reception, see Minchin 1996, passim.
It is thus hardly surprising that all the extant versions of the Argonautic myth and some of the fragmentary ones contain a list of the participants. It is regrettable that the fragmentary nature of the latter narratives does not let us reconstruct any of them in their entirety; yet a simple listing of what remains is very informative, as it demonstrates the disparate, if often conflated, material available to draw upon. Thus, we learn that Hesiod (presumably in the *Catalogue of Women*, fr. 63 M.-W.) did not include Iphiklos of Phylake among the participants in the expedition: ὁδὲ ὅμηρος (some kind of early epic poem?) ὁδὲ Ἡσίοδος ὁδὲ Φερεκόδης (*FGrHist* 3 F 110) λέγουσι τὸν Ἰφικλὸν σὺν τοῖς Ἀργοναῦταις (Σ Ἀπολλ. Ῥόδ. 1. 45). The information implies that there was some sort of catalogue of Argonauts in the *Catalogue*, which certainly dealt with the stories surrounding the quest at some length.505 Pherekydes (*FGrHist* 3) lists Philammon (instead of Orpheus, F 26), Tiphys (F 107), Idmon (F 108), Aithalides (F 109), but not Iphiklos of Phylake (see above F 110); Aischylos in his *Kabeiroi* apparently provided a full list of the Argonauts (*TrGF* III fr. 97a Radt), as did Sophokles in his *Lemnioi* (vel -ai) (*TrGF* IV fr. 385 Radt, apud Σ Pindar P 4. 303b, πάντας Σοφοκλῆς ἐν τοῖς Λημνιάσι τῷ δράματι)506 καταλέγει τοὺς εἰς τὸ Ἀργόφων εἰσελθόντες σκάφος, καὶ ὁ Ἀἰσχύλος ἐν Καβεΐροις. Unfortunately, from these two catalogues only a small reference to Admetos and Koronos survives (indicating perhaps some sort of geographical arrangement?):

505 Cf. fr. 241 M.-W. describing different stages of the return route taken by the Argonauts. As one might expect from a work that sought to organise traditional myths through heroic genealogy, other surviving fragments fill in information necessary to our understanding of the "prehistory" of the Argonautic expedition (frs. 30-37 M.-W.: the story of Tyro and her offspring by Poseidon; frs. 38-42 M.-W.: Iason’s family; fr. 68 M.-W.: a brief mention of Phrixos’ attempted sacrifice). On the structure of the Aiolid family in the *Catalogue* see most recently Dräger 1997, 43-90, especially 78-9, who reconstructs quite compellingly the family tree pertaining to the male offspring of Aiōlos (already mentioned in our discussion in Chapter One); see also West 1985, 60-76.
Herodoros (end of the 5th c. B.C., FGrHist 31) mentions Orpheus (F 42-23a), Idmon (F 44), Zetes and Kalais (F 46), while the very useful Scholia to Apoll. Rhod. (on 1.77-78) indicate that Kleon of Kourion (an earlier contemporary of Apollonios) also included a catalogue in his Argonautika: τὸν Κάλτον καὶ ὁ Κλέων καταλέγει.

To these we should add scattered references to names of Argonauts that are mentioned in an Argonautic context but not as part of a list. Thus, in the Naupaktia we find a reference to the prophet Idmon (F 5, 6 Davies = F 5, 7 Bernabé), who is mentioned in a similar context in the Korinthiaka by Eumelos (F 4 Davies). In the Megállai Ἡσίαι we have a reference to the family of Euphemos (fr. 253 M.-W.). The same work also mentioned that Phineus had been blinded (by Poseidon?) because he had shown Phrixos the way to Kolchis (fr. 254 M.-W). It also gave the names of the sons of Phrixos (fr. 255 M.-W), while fr. 255 M.-W referred to the family of Argos (Phrixos’ firstborn). Thus we can reasonably assume that the Argonautic expedition was recorded in detail in the Great Ehoiai, and that the reference to Euphemos was part of this account.

Akousilaos mentioned Zetes and Kalais (FGrHist 2 F 30-31, γίνονται δὲ αὐτῷ παῖδες ἐξ αὐτῆς (sc. Oreithyia) Ζήτης καὶ Κάλας, οἴ καὶ δι’ ἀφετήν μετὰ τῶν ἡμιβέων εἰς Κόλχους ἐπὶ τὸ νάκος ἔπλευσαν ἐν τῇ Ἀργοί. ἡ δὲ ἱστορία παρὰ Ἀκουσιλάῳ). Pindar, who made use of the Argonautic myth in several poems,

---

506 An obvious gloss which I delete accordingly.
507 See Pearson II, 1917, 51-56; also Lloyd-Jones 1996, 204-5.
508 Cf. Weinberger in RE XI 1, col. 719.
509 On this see our discussion of the Phineus episode in section C (iv). This overlapping of information is of course an indication that the Catalogue and the Great Ehoiai were in reality the same poem. See Cohen 1986, passim.
mentions Peleus and Eurytion in such a context (frs. 172 and 48 respectively), while in O. 4. 19-22 he refers to the son of Klymenos (Erginos) χαλκέοιος δ' ἐν ἔντεσι νικῶν δρόμον at the games held on Lemnos during the sojourn of the Argonauts there. Aischylos dealt with various episodes of the expedition in a number of his plays (Argo, Kabeiroi, Lemnians, Hypsipyle: a tetralogy?). The only certain fact we know about his Argo is that he called the helmsman Iphys (TrGF III fr. 21 Radt). Another fragment, from the Phineus this time, may have referred to the Boreads (TrGF III fr. 260 Radt), but the role of the Argonauts in the play, like, in fact, its whole plot is uncertain. The same story is taken up by Kallimachos in fr. 668 Pfeiffer. Peleus is a victor in pentathlon at the same games in Philostrat. Gymnast. 3. Peleus' journey on the Argo is mentioned in Eur. Andromache 792-94, while in the Hypsipyle, the homonymous queen quite naturally refers (in a monody) to the arrival of the Argonauts at Lemnos, naming Peleus and Orpheus (fr. I. iii Bond). To the list of Herodoros we should add Tiphys (F 54-5) and Erginos (F 55), who took Tiphys' place at the helm, after the latter's death. In his description of the episode at Anaphe, when total darkness overwhelms the returning Argonauts, Kallimachos emphasises the impossible position in which the heroes find themselves by referring to the powerlessness of Tiphys, Polydeuces, and possibly Lynkeus and Idas (fr. 17 Pfeiffer, fr. 250 SH = fr. 19 Massimilla).

- - Pausanias records several local traditions about figures thought to have taken part in the adventure; most importantly, in describing the chest of

510 On its possible structure see Deforge 1987, passim.
511 See Bond 1963, 27-8, with commentary, 70-2.
512 See Apollodoros I. 9.23 and below.
513 E.g. 2. 12. 6: parentage of Phleious; 3. 24. 7: Kastor and Polydeukes and the temple of Athena Asia at Las; 9. 32. 4: Tiphys and his birthplace.
Kypselos, including some specifically designated as Argonauts (Asterion son of Kometes, Euphemos), others who were universally thought of as such (Polydeukes, Admetos, Peleus) and, Iason himself. Pausanias' report, the earliest evidence (together with Stesichoros' lost \textit{A\theta\lambda\alpha \epsilon\pi\iota \Pi\epsilon\lambda\iota\varsigma}, fr. 178-80 \textit{PMG}) of a mythical celebration of funeral games in honour of Pelias, is of paramount importance, since, even by the simple identification of some participants, it opens up a whole new group of myths, firmly associated with the Argonautic circle, which would otherwise be totally unknown to us.

To digress for a moment, the only reference to the \textit{A\theta\lambda\alpha \epsilon\pi\iota \Pi\epsilon\lambda\iota\varsigma} found in Apollodoros is at 3.9.2: [Atalanta] \textit{\pi\ar\var\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\varv\epsilon\tau\omicron \delta\epsilon \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha \tau\omicron \nu\sigma\iota\tau\epsilon\omicron\omega\nu \kappa\alpha\lambda\nu\delta\omicron\nu\iota\nu\iota \kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\nu}, \kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\nu \tau\omicron \epsilon\nu \epsilon\rho\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota\sigma\epsilon\varphi\epsilon\nu \Pi\eta\lambda\epsilon\iota \kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\nu \kappa\iota\kappa\iota\rho\sigma\epsilon\nu.\footnote{See the reconstruction by Schefold 1966, 72-3; also Vojatz 1982, 65.} On the other hand, Hyginus (\textit{Fab.} 273) records the names of no less than 17 victors in these, the twelfth Greek games. Surely the notion of Iason participating in the funeral games in honour of Pelias, whose death he caused (1.9.27), is unpalatable. Apollodoros does not refer at length to this traditional narrative, traces of which we find in several authors, especially since, as Hyginus' account proves, there was a long list of victors, of whose existence

\footnote{Pausanias also records a similar representation on the Throne of Amyklai (3. 18. 16), but in this case he gives no details of any help.}

\footnote{See also the curious variant of Possis Magnes (\textit{Supp. Hell.} 710 = Athen. VII 296D) who has Glaukos, builder and helmsman of the Argo, eventually become a sea-daimon. For other late (Roman - Byzantine), or local references to individual names of participants in the quest see Seeliger, in Roscher 1884-1890, col. 508-526; also Jessen 1889, 25-31. For the references to Herakles' participation in the journey see below.}

\footnote{For the representations of Argonauts in monumental art see Blatter in \textit{LIMC} II (1984), 1, 591-99, 2 430-33; specifically for the earliest illustrations of the myth, see Vojatz 1982, 28-126.}

\footnote{Stesichoros' \textit{A\theta\lambda\alpha \epsilon\pi\iota \Pi\epsilon\lambda\iota\varsigma} fr. 179ii \textit{PMG}; Simonides 564 \textit{PMG}; Ion \textit{Agamemnon TrGF} fr. 1 Snell; Kallimachos \textit{Hymn} 2. 206-8.}
Apollodoros was aware, as the reference to Atalanta above proves. There is an obvious difficulty in reconciling the performance of lavish funerary games in memory of Pelias with the widespread notion of his insolence and villainy. The lack of any complete early account for the story makes speculation difficult, but in later sources the reference to the manner of Pelias’ death precludes a reference to the funeral games in his honour. I believe that the downplaying of the story of the funeral games in Apollodoros is the result of this difficulty. Pelias’ villainy is stressed throughout the account. Consequently, his funeral is a much smaller affair, organised by his son, and attended by the people whose rightful sovereign he was (1.9.27, "Ἀκαστός δὲ μετὰ τῶν τὴν Ἡλίκιαν θεού πατέρα θάπτει").

To return to our discussion of the chest of Kypselos: once again it becomes apparent that early artistic representations of the myth, especially if they identify the figures illustrated, often offer insights immensely helpful to our understanding of existing narratives or alert us to the existence of previously unsuspected ones.

The earliest relevant monument is the ship metope from the Sikyonian treasury at Delphi (c. 560, 58 cm), which features the Argo, flanked by two horsemen, and with apparently three figures on deck, two of them holding lyres. Inscriptions identify the left horseman as Polydeuces, and the central figure with the lyre on deck with Orpheus. The Argonautic theme apparently continued on the metope to the right, perhaps with some other episode from the expedition. The representation establishes the tradition of doubles in the expedition (two horsemen, two bards); is the second figure with the lyre Philammon, in a combination of the usual version of the myth where Orpheus is included with the tradition recorded in

---

Pheretikes, *(FGrHist 3 F 26)*? As Schefold points out, this promotion of the Argonautic saga on a public building was obviously part of the attempt by Kleisthenes to "free Sikyon from the cultural hegemony of Argos." This was not the only metope linked with the Argonautic adventure: a fragment has been preserved showing Phrixos on the ram's back. It is thus possible that all the representations on the metopes were somehow linked. This is very important as it establishes a link with the Kalydonian Boar Hunt, also illustrated on a metope. The same connection is established on the chest of Kypselos, and on Korinthian (cf. *LIMC* Amphiaros 3*; Baton I 3*), Attic and Etruscan vases that also combine Amphiaros' departure to join the Theban expedition with the funeral games for Pelias. If a link was established between the great expeditions of the generation before the Trojan War (as it clearly was), then the participants in them would soon become interchangeable, especially in the ones where large numbers were required, i.e. the Argonautic expedition and the Kalydonian Boar Hunt. I shall return to this presently.

Apollodoros (1.9.16) contains one of the few "complete" catalogues of the names of the Argonauts. The others are: Pindar *P* 4. 171-91 (our earliest extant account of the Argonautic adventure); Apoll. Rhod. I 23-227; Hyginus *Fab.* 14; Valerius Flaccus I 353-483; and the Orphic *Argonautika* 1. 118-229. To these we should add the catalogue recorded by Diodoros 4. 41, which is obviously taken from the *Argonautika* of Dionysios Skytobrachion (= fr. 14 Rusten). He does not mention the names of all the participants, but he notes that they were 54 in number. Instead, he concentrates on what he calls the ἐνδοξότατοι among them: τούτων δ'
In this main catalogue there is a conflation of the participants of the Argonautic expedition with those in the Kalydonian boar Hunt. Otherwise how can one explain the inclusion of Atalanta and the sons of Thestios among the ενδοξότοται? 

In the following line Diodoros adds Argos, while offering alternative etymologies for the name “Argo”, this time taken not from Dionysios Skytobrachion, but from some other mythographical source, possibly a manual: In this account Herakles sends to Thebes two and not three of his sons - in this account Herakles sends to Thebes two and not three of his sons - immediately after the completion of Herakles' labours, and stresses the leading role of Iolaos in the expedition (see also Frazer’s note on Apollodoros’ text). Their existence was an affirmation of the excess that characterises every aspect of Herakles’ life. Apollodoros records their names with those of their mothers in a catalogue of the Herakleidai (2.7.8), but their participation in the return of the Herakleidai, which is subsequently narrated, is doubtful, since Eurystheus’ wrath seems to be directed solely at the children of Herakles by Deianeira. There is no indication that they should be linked with any other enterprise other than the colonisation of Sardinia. 

523 Obviously a mistake, probably by an early confusion of Π and Τ. I think it should be emendend Θεσπίου, as the connection with Atalanta indicates. Thespios’ fifty sons that Herakles had by Thespios’ daughters could have easily taken on the enterprise by themselves; after all, they did make up the numbers. It is, however, unlikely that they ever played any active part in a mythical context that did not concentrate primarily on Herakles. At Apollodoros 2.7.6, we find the only other reference to Thespios’ sons in a mythical narrative: through them, Herakles becomes the ancestor of the inhabitants of Sardinia: [Herakles] πέμπτας πρὸς Θεσπίον ἐπτα μὲν κατέχειν ἔλεγε παιδας, τρεῖς δὲ εἰς Ἐθηκας ἀποστέλλειν, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς τεσσαράκοντα πέμπειν εἰς Ἑρᾶδο τῆς νήσου ἐπ’ ἀποκτείναι. Diodoros, puts the colonisation of Sardinia by forty-one of Thespios’ sons – in this account Herakles sends to Thebes two and not three of his sons – immediately after the completion of Herakles’ labours, and stresses the leading role of Iolaos in the expedition (see also Frazer’s note on Apollodoros’ text). Their existence was an affirmation of the excess that characterises every aspect of Herakles’ life. Apollodoros records their names with those of their mothers in a catalogue of the Herakleidai (2.7.8), but their participation in the return of the Herakleidai, which is subsequently narrated, is doubtful, since Eurystheus’ wrath seems to be directed solely at the children of Herakles by Deianeira. There is no indication that they should be linked with any other enterprise other than the colonisation of Sardinia. 

524 In Diodoros’ (i.e. Skytobrachion’s) highly rationalised version of events, the initiative for the enterprise is entirely Iason’s (Diodoros 4. 40. 1-5 = Dionysios Skytobrachion FGHHist 32 F14 = fr. 14 Rusten). It is he who is eager to perform a deed worthy of memory (ἠρευνήσας τι πράξαι μυθημένης άξιαν) and asks for his uncle’s permission to go on such an undertaking. Pelias readily gives his approval and suggests the quest for the Golden Fleece. Pelias’ motives are far from innocent, as Diodoros is quick to point out (in this version Pelias, though king by right, is without male heir, and, thus fearful of losing his kingdom to his brother and his son); still, throughout this part of the account it is clear that Iason is by no means pushed into anything; on the contrary, the final decision and the responsibility for the expedition are his own. Obviously, then, with this expression Diodoros refers to Iason, who, although sends the expedition, is not its leader, this honour having been bestowed on Herakles κατ’ ἄνδρεταν. See also below our discussion of the account of the episode in Apollonios. 

525 Cf. Bethe 1887, 17.
tor to the skáphos arxitektoníshantas Ἀργοῦ kai sümpleósamantos éneka toû therapeêuven àei tâ ponoúnta mére tîs neôs, ócs δ’ énios léguoûsin ápò tîs peri tò táchos úperbolîs, ócs án tîn árхáíon ἄργον tò tachû prosagoreuvôntaì. Meleagros (Diodoros 4. 48. 4 = fr. 28 Rusten), Iphis or Iphitos (frs. 29a-b Rusten),526 Laertes and Jason (Diodoros 4. 48. 5 = fr. 30 Rusten) should be added, as they are reported to have played a part in the battle between the Argonauts and the Kolchians. Finally, the Mythographus Vaticanus I 24 lists Jason, Pelias [sic],527 and Hercules, while Mythographus Vaticanus II 159 mentions, apart from Jason, Hercules, Castor and his brother, and Tiphys.528

Obviously, a comparison of all the names found in the catalogues is of great interest, not only because it gives an overview of the tradition, despite the profusion of names,529 but, more significantly for our purposes, because it gives an insight into the background, and possibly origin, of Apollodoros’ own list. Thus, in Table IV I have listed all the names of Argonauts found in the complete catalogues I mentioned above. To these I have added the list of the participants in the Kalydonian Boar Hunt as recorded by Apollodoros in 1.8.2. There are a number of strong similarities between the two catalogues, and their comparison may shed light on their composition.

526 There is an obvious conflation between the Iphitos and Iphis in the Σ. Apoll. Rhod. 4. 223-30a-d (= frs. 9a-b Rusten).
527 Obviously a mistake for Peleus.
528 To these we should add Hypsipyle’s account of the arrival of the Argonauts at Lemnos in Statius’ Thebaid (5. 335-485). Of the fifty aboard the Argo (l. 422: quinquaginta illi), Hypsipyle recalls the names of the most important, i.e. Orpheus, Telamon and Peleus, Ancaeus, Iphitus, Heracles, Jason, Meleager, Idas and Talaus, the sons of Tyndareus, Calais and Zetes, Tiphys, Mopsus Theseus, Admetus and Hylas. Statius reverts to the original account of the episode, which had the Lemnian women, like typical Amazons, fight a battle against the Argonauts. His catalogue of Argonauts lists figures present in almost all the accounts of the story, so we cannot comment on its antiquity. However, the inclusion of Theseus in the expedition reinforces the conclusion that Apollonios deliberately excluded him from an enterprise of which he was an original member.
529 One counts some hundred names vying with each other for a place at the benches of the Argo.
A few words about Table IV: again, the main focus of the comparison is Apollodoros' catalogue: all the other columns are structured to correspond to his arrangement of names. As in Table III, names present in the other lists of the Argonautic expedition but not in Apollodoros are listed in order of appearance and are similarly compared with the lists on their left. The numbers in these columns indicate the position of the names in their specific list. There are some variations in name or patronymic; in most cases we are dealing with the same person, so I have simply noted the variant in the relevant column, in the same row as the name given by Ἀπόλλωδορος (i.e. Eurytos-Erytos). When different heroes share a name (as in the case of the two figures called Ankaios, the Arkadian and the son of Poseidon), they are treated separately. In the case of Asterios son of Kometes, it was obvious from the patronymic that he should be listed with the Asterion of Apollonios' catalogue and not with the Asterios son of Hyperasios of the same catalogue. The symbols perform the same function: ✽ is used in lists that are derived from poetic versions and indicates that this name is linked with either the preceding or the following name(s), since they are part of the same verse. * accompanies figures that will be discussed in this Chapter.
### Table IV

The Catalogue of the Argonauts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Τάσσων (outside)</td>
<td>Τάσσων (outside)</td>
<td>Τάσσων (outside)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jason (outside)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τίφσις</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Όρφεύς</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Όρφεύς (outside)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ζήστης</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>♣ 47</td>
<td>♣ 9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>♣ 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κάλαζ</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>♣ 48</td>
<td>♣ 10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>♣ 47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κάστορ</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>♣ 3</td>
<td>♣ 2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πολυδεύκης</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>♣ 4</td>
<td>♣ 3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τελαμών</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πηλεύς</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ηρακλῆς</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31 (Alcides)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Τιμικλῆς</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θησεύς</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σίδας</td>
<td>♣ 34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λυκέας</td>
<td>♣ 35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αμφιάρας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Καστακ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Παλαίμων</td>
<td>Παλαιόμοιος</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κυφές</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Κηφεύς Λυκούρ.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>outside 4.48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λαέρτης</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αυτάλκης</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αταλάντη</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μενόκτιος</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ακτιός</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Outside 4.48.5*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>outside l. 224</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aδμητος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ακαστός</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εὔρυτος</td>
<td>ΗΣοτος</td>
<td>φ6</td>
<td>ΗΣοτος</td>
<td>φ8</td>
<td>ΗΣοτος</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μελέαγρος</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αγκαίος</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εὐφήμος</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ποιάς</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βούτης</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φάνος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Στάφυλος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εργίνος</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Περικλόμενος</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αὐγέας</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰσικλός θεσίου</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άργος Φρίδου</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εὐράκλας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πηνέλειος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λήμνος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τειτος Νευβόλ.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ασκάλαρος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τάλμενος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Άστερίος</td>
<td>Άστερίαν</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Άστερίαν</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Asterion Pyre mi</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πολύφημος</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τίμων (1. 9. 21)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Υλας (1. 9. 19)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Ισικλος (Φ.) | 4 | 12 |               | 5 | 49 |   |
| Έχιος        | Φ7| Φ9 |               | 7 | 8  | 39 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Αιθαλίδης</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Κανενίδης</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>⬤11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μόσχος</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Βυριουδάμας</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εύρυτιον φ13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εριβότης φ14</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ουλέας</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κάνθος</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κλήτιος φ17</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ιοτός φ18</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φάληρος</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φλειας 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φλιας 37</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ταλαός φ25</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αρήσος φ26</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λεώδοκος 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ναυάλος 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αμφιδάμας 37</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αστέριος φ41</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αμφιαν φ42</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αγκαλός (Π.) 45</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λαοκόων φ47</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αργος (Αρ.) 54</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peirithous 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ixition (Canthus) 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrianome 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocus</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priasus</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurymedon</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thersanon</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippalcimus</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asclepius</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neleus</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iolaus</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deucalion</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philoctetes</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caeneus alter</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

† Ἴνειός 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clymenus</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iphiclus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caphareus</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestor</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tydeus</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iphis</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Πύλος 2

Thestioi paiideis 18

Thespios' sons
Apollodoros calls the Argo a πεντηκόντορος ναός, following a long-established literary tradition concerning the number of the participants to the enterprise. Fifty is a typical number for catalogues, and Apollodoros never misses an opportunity to record them: apart from a catalogue of those aboard the Argo, we find lists of the fifty Nereids (1.2.7), the fifty daughters of Danaos, their fifty suitors, and the names of the mothers of both groups (2.1.5), the fifty sons of Thespios and their respective mothers (2.7.8), and the fifty sons of Lykaon (3.8.1). The inclusion of such thorough records, surprising though it might seem to modern readers, was definitely not gratuitous; for a work that purported to offer its readers “all that the world contains”, such information was of paramount importance. Still, typically, Apollodoros does not always quite reach the desired number of fifty. He lists the names of only 44 Argonauts (to which one should add Iason, Idmon, and Hylas), compared to the 53 of Apollonios, the 50 (plus Iason and Orpheus) of the Orphic Argonautika, the 51 (plus Iason) of Valerius Flaccus, and the 69(!) of Hyginus. However, “les noms des Argonautes... sont, dans les manuscrits, peu sûrs, déformés, aberrants”. Yet, there is no evidence of a substantial lacuna, although the possibility of a haplography cannot be ruled out (in fact, this may be the best explanation why the names are missing); nor does it pay to try and fill the benches with names from other sources (i.e. Apollonios). From

---

530 The same phraseology is used in Pind. P 4. 245: ὅς πάχει μᾶκει τε πεντηκόντορον ναόν κρέτεν.
531 Of all the surviving sources, only Theokritos suggests that the Argo had thirty rowing benches, and thus accommodated sixty and not fifty oarsmen (13. 74-6): Ἡρακλέην δ’ ἱροὺς ἐκερτήμεν χιλιονάτταν/ οὖνεκεν ἄρθησε τριακοντάζουν Ἀργο/ πεζὰ δ’ ἐς Κόλχους τε καὶ ἔξενον ίκετο Φάτην.
533 In the case of the sons of Thespios we have to reckon with a catalogue full of lacunae. When recording the names of the impious sons of Lykaon, Apollodoros lists only forty-nine names, only to add the missing name (Nyktimos, the only survivor) a few lines later. In the catalogue of Nereids he simply records 46 names. See Wachter 1990, 19-31, who argues for an archaic source for Apollodoros’ catalogue of the Nereids.
Table IV it becomes apparent that Apollodoros and Apollonios part company at this specific part of the narrative: they share only 28 names, those which are present in all the complete catalogues as well as in most of the fragmentary evidence. These are the figures that played some specific role in the course of the journey or had some kind of special ability (and who, as Meuli pointed out, must have composed the original crew), like Orpheus, the Dioskouroi, the Acharidai, the Boreadai, the Aiakidai, Euphemos, Periklymenos, and perhaps a seer, probably Mopsos. Apollodoros’ list contains a number of names which Apollonios consciously omitted from his narrative (for Theseus see 1. 101-104, for Atalante 1. 769-772, admittedly outside the catalogue, but still evidently referring to a process of selection that took place before the final formation of the crew), while Apollodoros includes a surprising number of names otherwise unattested in this context. Two things may have happened: the lack of a lengthy canonical list of names must have led Apollodoros to draw upon several sources, or, more probably, to use a catalogue he found in a mythographical manual, a list that perhaps contained only 44 names (although, as was already noted, the probability of a scribal error is high); the list in question contradicted Apollonios’ account on more than one issue. Otherwise, if he did try to draw on his memory for the names of the Argonauts, he must have run out of steam by the time he reached forty-four — a highly unlikely suggestion considering Apollodoros’ devotion to written

---

535 In fact, it becomes apparent that for the opening and the final stages of the account Apollodoros is following sources other than Apollonios. The Apollonian Argonautika are used as a main source for only part of the Argo’s actual journey. I shall return to this presently.
536 Meuli 1921, 3.
537 Unsurprisingly, Pindar’s catalogue contains most of these figures, the exceptions being Idas and Lynkeus, who are not sons of a god and consequently are not included in the list.
sources, but one that would explain the composition of the list which we suppose that Apollodoros used as a source.

As for its order, Apollodoros’ list seems to have been based to a degree on name-association. I cannot find a tightly organised, logical pattern behind Apollodoros’ account. Apollonios chose to present his heroes in a *Periplous of Greece,* Valerius according to their seating arrangements on the ship. Both authors offer valuable information about every member of the crew, in an attempt to characterise and differentiate their heroes upon their first introduction, to emphasise the distinctive qualities traditionally associated with them, and to give information about their past and future. Apollodoros, on the other hand, offers no more than a list of names and patronymics, without even the merest geographical localisation (as he does in the case of the participants in the Kalydonian Boar Hunt). First, he lists members of the crew with a specific job on board ship: the helmsman Tiphys and *keleustes* Orpheus. The Thracian origin of the latter prompts the reference to the Boreadai, who are followed by four further groups of two (the Dioskouroi, the Aiakidai, Herakles and Theseus, the Apharidai). A few names later, the reference to Admetos is followed by one to Akastos, while the reference to Laertes is followed by one to Autolykos; each pair is associated by marriage. An Autolykos is added to the crew only later in Apollonios’ *Argonautika* (2. 955-
where he is said to have been a son of Deimarchos, who had been separated from Herakles during his expedition against the Amazons. Vian sees the reference to Autolykos in Apollodoros as a mistake, a confusion of the Apollonian Autolykos with Odysseus’ maternal grandfather; it is probable, however, that Apollodoros was not confused, but simply recorded a catalogue that included Autolykos, grandfather of Odysseus, as part of the original crew. This son of Hermes, a most successful thief, would have been essential for the capture of the fleece. Autolykos’ capacity to make things invisible, or somehow alter their markings to make them unrecognisable, was recorded already in the Ehoiai (fr. 67b M.-W.), and Pherekydes (FGrHist 3 F 120): εἶχε γὰρ ταύτην τὴν τέχνην παρὰ τοῦ πατρός, ὡστε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὅτε κλέπτοι τι λαυθάνειν, καὶ τὰ θρέμματα τῆς λείας ἀλλοιοῦν εἰς ὅ θέλει μορφής, ὡστε πλείστης αὐτῶν δεσπότην γενέσθαι λείας. This talent would have been extremely useful if Medeia did not have her prominent role in the acquisition of the Golden Fleece. We should not disregard Autolykos’ kinship with the bard Philammon (he was his twin brother by a different divine father, Apollo), whom, as I have already pointed out, Pherekydes had as a participant in the expedition. Apollodoros could have made use of another strong bond of kinship when introducing Autolykos: according to his account, Autolykos was the father of Polymede, mother of Iason (1.9.16, cf. also Herodoros FGrHist

541 See Apollodoros 2.5.9: εἰς τοὺς ἄθλους Ἀρακλεῖ ἐπέταξε βουστήρα κομίζειν τὸν Ἰππолύτης. ... παραλαβὼν οὖν ἐθελοντὰς συμπάχους εἰς μιᾷ νην ἐπέλει. Apollodoros does not record the names of his companions; these are recorded, with minor variations, apart from in Apollonios, by Valerius Flaccus 5. 114-20, Plut. Lucullus 23. 4-5, Hyginus Fab 14, 30, and Skyrmnos 989-991. 542 Vian 1974, 281. 543 Strabo 12. 3. 11 [c546], also includes an Autolykos among the Argonauts: καὶ τὸν μὲν ἄλλον κόμιον τῆς πόλεως διεπέλαξεν ὁ δεύτερος, τὴν δὲ τοῦ Βυθάρου σφαῖραν ἦρε καὶ τὸν Ἀυτολύκου, Σθείνδος ἔργου, ὃς ἐκεῖνος αἰκιστῇ εἰνόμιζαν καὶ ἐτίμαν ὡς θεόν· ἐνὶ δὲ καὶ μαντείον αὐτοῦ δοκεῖ δὲ τῶν Ἰάσσων συμπελευσάντων εἶναι καὶ κατασχέιν τοῦτον τὸν τόπον. 544 Cf. also Ovid Met. 11. 301-27, Hyginus Fab. 201.
The reference to Autolykos' divine parentage brings forth another characteristic of Apollodoros' account. It seems to me that we have a conscious attempt to include in the catalogue children of all the major gods (Pindar, whose catalogue of the Argonauts contains only sons of gods, successfully pursued this aim). Thus Zeus has three children in the crew, Hermes, Poseidon, Ares and Dionysos have two each, and Hephaistos and Helios have one. Dionysos' children are otherwise unattested in an Argonautic context; they have, in fact, no mythical tradition to speak of, unlike other children of his (i.e. Oinopion and Thoas). It is surprising that one would choose these particular sons of Dionysos.
over others who were connected with the expedition, i. e. Phleias, son of Dionysos and Araithyrea, who appears in three of the complete lists (see Table IV). Presumably, Staphylos and Phanos were chosen because their connection to Dionysos is obvious. If nothing else, their inclusion in the catalogue proves my point.\textsuperscript{549} What is most surprising is that no heroes participating in the enterprise have any link with Apollo, apart from Admetos (who is present because of his family connection to Iason)\textsuperscript{550} and Amphiaraos, who does not appear in any other complete catalogue.\textsuperscript{551} In all other catalogues, the Argonauts enjoy the services of not one but two seers:\textsuperscript{552} Mopsos and Idmon. In Apollodoros’ list neither appears. One possible suggestion about Mopsos might shed light on the most curious omission in Apollodoros’ narrative, that of the entire of the Libyan expedition. If the omission was deliberate, then obviously Apollodoros would have had to avoid any reference to people who played a role in it. Thus Mopsos and Kanthos, who die in Libya, are omitted from the catalogue.

But of course, such an action would require more independence on Apollodoros’ part than scholars have been prepared to accept. For a few

\begin{flushright}
that the Oinopion on Exekias’ vase would have been identified with the Chian king who blinded Orion. As we saw in Chapter One, Apollodoros makes no reference to Dionysos when recording his encounter with the giant. However, a figure with such a suspiciously grape-laden name, which points to an original divine title, closely connected with the cultivation of the vine-tree and the production of wine, must have been associated with the Dionysian entourage at a fairly early stage. This suggestion renders the assignment of Oinopion and Staphylos to Ariadne and Theseus (Plut. \textit{Thes.} 20. 2 = Ion of Chios fr. 29 W) highly suspicious, an attempt by Athenian mythographers to expand Athens’ mythical control in areas of the Aegean.\textsuperscript{549} The children of Ares create a more complicated problem, since they belong to the next generation of heroes, that of the Trojan war. See below.\textsuperscript{550}
\end{flushright}

On the five categories from which the figures are drawn to form the Argonautic crew see Robert 1920-24, 783-791.\textsuperscript{551} See however Dei(l)ochos (\textit{FGrHist} A 471 F 2) who includes Amphiaraos in the expedition.\textsuperscript{552} We have already noted the duality that characterises many aspects of the story. The same duality appears to have played a role in the formation of Apollodoros’ catalogue, although it is unlikely that it was a conscious arrangement, based perhaps on the seating arrangements on the \textit{Argo}. In my view, we are dealing with mental linkages, arising either from the same parentage or other relationships between the two members.
paragraphs after the catalogue (1.9.21),\textsuperscript{553} he quite naturally announces the death of Idmon (who is not mentioned in the catalogue) and his replacement at the helm by Ankaios. This piece of information is uncritically taken from Apollonios (2.720-898). Apollodoros simply records it without realising that he should add in his catalogue both Idmon and another Ankaios, the son of Poseidon this time; it would be really improbable for a Arkadian to assume a responsibility obviously reserved for a person with nautical associations.

To return to Amphiaraos, Σ Pind. P 4. 338a indicates that there was a tradition that included him among the crew: κατ’ ἔνιος δὲ τρισὶν ἐξορθάντο μάντεσιν οἱ Ἀργοναύται, Μόψῳ τῷ Ἀμπυκοῖ, Ἰδμονὶ τῷ Ἀβαντοῖ, Ἀμφιαράῳ τῷ Ὀικλέον. How early is this tradition? The other two seers are primarily linked to the Argonautic expedition, but Amphiaraos is not. His inclusion must have happened at a period when the figures that participated in the expedition, the Kalydonian Boar Hunt and the War against Thebes became interchangeable. We have seen that a connection was established by the sixth century B.C. (it is already present in the metopes of the Sikyonian treasury at Delphi and the Chest of Kypselos); so Amphiaraos could have been included in the crew at this time, although his role could not have been prominent. What is puzzling, however, is the fact that Apollodoros includes him, while excluding those better established in the tradition, i.e. Mopsos and Idmon. Obviously, the exclusion of these names could be attributed to a scribal error. The two prophets could had been grouped together as sons of Apollo, which would explain why they were both

\textsuperscript{553} Before this, Apollodoros has recorded the Hylas episode (1.9.19). Again Hylas is not included in the list of participants, although he is in all the other catalogues that share a debt to Apollonios. However, this omission can be justified by the fact that Hylas, an adolescent Ἡρακλέους ἐρώτησαν, was not a full member of the crew and thus should not be listed with the participating heroes.
omitted. However, Mopsos is a son of Apollo only in Val. Fl. 1. 383-4; in all other versions (including Apollonios' *Argon*. 1. 65-6, and the accounts of the Kalydonian Boar Hunt in Ovid *Met.* 8. 316 and Hyginus *Fab.* 172 in Table III) he is the son of Ampyx. As for Idmon, his divine parentage is already accepted by Pherekydes (*FGrHist* 3 F 108 = Σ Apoll. Rhod. 1. 139); Apollonios (*Argonautika* 1. 139-145) records both the mortal and the divine father, adding that the true father was Apollo, and he is followed by the Orphic *Argonautika* 187-9. It is probable that Idmon’s divine parentage, a consequence of his prophetic abilities, would have been accepted by Apollodoros. However, Ampyx is well-established in tradition as Mopsos’ father; therefore, if I had to guess which parentage of Mopsos Apollodoros would have chosen, I would choose Ampyx. Had Apollodoros listed Mopsos and Idmon together, he would have done so on the basis of their shared profession. But what if we are dealing with a deliberate exclusion and not with a scribal error?

Table IV shows that there is a strong similarity between the catalogues of the Kalydonian Boar Hunt and of the Argonautic expedition recorded by Apollodoros The surprisingly short catalogue of hunters is reproduced almost in its entirety in the list of Argonauts, with only four names missing, names that were especially linked to the Hunt, and, thus, could not have easily been included among the Argonauts. These are Pylos, the three lesser known of the sons of Thestios (Evippos, Plexippos and Eurypylos, who appear under the collective name Θεστίων

---

554 Cf. however Herodoros’ version (*FGrHist* 31 F 44), recorded in Σ Apoll. Rhod. ad l., where the name of Idmon’s father is Abas.

555 This would help differentiate between the two figures with the name Mopsos, as the second is always referred to as a son of Apollo and Manto. cf. Apollodoros *Epitome* 6. 3: ἀποκαθήκτων σὺν τῷ Μόσοι μαντεως, δὲ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Μαντώς παῖς ὑπήρξεν, οὗτος δ’ Μόσος περὶ μαντικῆς ἡρεσε Κάλχαντι. cf. Apollodoros *Epitome* 6. 3-4 and 6. 19.
παιδες), Eurytion, one of the two victims of the Hunt, who, however, is included in Apollonios' list, and Peirithous, the most telling omission of all, as his name could have been one of those missing from the catalogue due to a lacuna. Otherwise, this omission could indicate that the expedition is set after Herakles' labours, since, it was during his sojourn in Hades that Herakles liberated Theseus but had to leave Peirithous behind.556

To digress for a moment, the Lapiths are represented in the list of the Argonauts by Kaineus, the invulnerable man (cf. Apollodoros Epitome 1.22). In most other catalogues (see Table IV), his family is represented by his son Koronos and Polyphemos, his brother (by Elatos), who is also the last name in Apollodoros' list, as he plays a role in the following narrative, being abandoned with Herakles in Mysia.557 The patronymic ascribed to Kaineus in Apollodoros' list is Koronos, which indicate a scribal error, as in all other versions Kaineus is the son of Elatos. In fact, it has been suggested that we should reverse the cases of the two names to include Koronos in the list, i.e. to read either Καινεως Κόρωνος (thus Aegius), or Κόρωνος Καινεως (thus Clavier and Hercher). If, however, as I argue,

---

556 cf. Apollodoros 2.5.12: τληςτου δε των Ἀιδοι πυλῶν γενέμενοι Θησέα εὑρε και Πειρίθου τόν Περσεφόνης μνηστευμένον γάμου και διά τούτο δεθέντα. Θεασάμενοι δε Ἡρακλέα τάς χείρας ὕφεγον ως ἀναστηθούσαι διά τῆς ἱκείου βίας. δε Θησέα μὲν λαβόμενος τῆς χειρός ἠγείρε, Πειρίθου δὲ ἀναστήσαι βουλόμενος τής γῆς κινομένης ἀφήκεν (see also Epitome 1.24). However, a few paragraphs later (2.6.3) Apollodoros notes the inconsistancy that characterises the chronology of the part of the mythical narrative that concentrates on Theseus, when he points out that during Herakles' servitude to Omphale there took place the major enterprises of the Argonautic expedition (cf. Apollodoros 1.9.19, who attributes this detail to Herodoros (= FGrHist 31 F 41a) and of the Kalydonian Boar Hunt (explaining his substitution in that list by his mortal twin brother, Iphikles), while a young Theseus (παίς ως εγένετο τέλεος 3.16.1) was completing his journey from Troizen to Athens: καὶ δ’ ὠν δε χρόνον ἐλήφθη παρ’ Ὠμφαλη, λέγεται τοῦ ἐπι Κόλχους πλοῶν γενέσθαι και τήν του Καλυκώνιον κάρπου θάρσαν, και Θησεία παραγενόμενον εκ Τροιζήνω τοῦ Ἰσμίου καθάραν. This passage, although it proves my argument concerning the chronology of the Argonautic expedition, demonstrates Apollodoros' fluidity in the comparative placing of events and figures in time, and consequently, argues for a more cautious approach.

Apollodoros' intention in recording this list was to accommodate the most illustrious heroes of that generation, then Kaineus was a better choice than Koronos (as his inclusion in Hyginus' extended list indicates). The one thing that is certain is that the figure named was not thought to have been a brother to Polyphemus; otherwise they would have been grouped together, as is the case with all the other brothers in the catalogue.

To resume our discussion, unsurprisingly, in the catalogue of the Hunt Apollodoros is reproducing the names of the most famous figures of their generation, heroes whom anyone would expect to participate in every major enterprise of the period. Is this what Apollodoros is doing when recording the participants in the Argonautic expedition? Yes, in part. His Argonautic catalogue is an amalgam meant to rival the catalogue of heroes who in the next generation will gather beneath the walls of Troy. For that purpose, the fathers of well-known heroes of the Trojan War (Menoitios, father of Patroklos, Poias, father of Philoktetes and Laertes, father of Odysseus) are included in it, a trait also present in the account of Dionysios Skytobrachion. To these, add those figures that possess some kind of special abilities and were specifically linked to the expedition, such as the Boreadai and Euphemos. The importance of the expedition is further emphasised by the inclusion of sons of all the major gods. In the context of the major heroes of a generation, Mopsos and Idmon were not important enough; and, considering that, in Apollodoros' narrative, they did not play the significant part which they played in other versions (cf. e.g. the important role of Idmon at Kolchis in the Naupaktia [F 5, 6 Davies = F 5, 7 Bernabé], and in Eumelos' Korinthiaka [F 4 Davies]), they could easily have been omitted.
But if the catalogue’s main function was to present us with a list to rival the heroes of the Trojan War, what are we to make of Peneleos and Leitos, Askalaphos and Ialmenos, and Euryalos? All five are included in the *Iliad*’s Catalogue of Ships: Peneleos and Leitos at 2. 494-5, Askalaphos and Ialmenos at 2. 512, and Euryalos at 2. 565-6; he is the most curious addition, since he is the grandson of Talaos, one of Argonauts of Apollonios, and one of the three Argive Epigonoi. It has been suggested that these names were originally part of the pool of names that provided poets with fillings for their verses, so they could have been used in a very early versified catalogue of Argonauts. Later, “Homeri ... auctoritas eos postea e catalogis Argonautarum exclusit”. I am not quite convinced by this argument. The catalogue does contain elements of the early Argonautic tradition: it includes both Theseus and Atalanta – Theseus at the expense of the cohesion of the last part of the narrative, and Atalanta at the expense of the erotic element in the Argonautic story. But we have traces of this tradition elsewhere: Apollonios made an effort to remove both of them at the start (Theseus 1. 101- 104; Atalanta 1. 769-773). The fact that he tries to justify their omission is an indication that there existed, at his time, other narratives that included both figures in the expedition, and so he has to explain to his readers why they had to be excluded. Both Theseus and Atalanta are included in catalogues in later sources (Theseus, apart from Apollodoros, appears in Statius *Theb.* 5. 432, and Hyg. *Fab.* 14, whereas, as we saw, Atalanta takes part in the expedition in Diodoros 4.48.5 and in Apollodoros), which surely reflect earlier accounts. Atalanta’s participation in the funeral games of Pelias, recorded in literary sources only by Apollodoros (3.13.3 quoted above in

558 Jessen 1889, 14.
the notes), but much in evidence in iconography, is an indication of her participation in the Argonautic expedition, since most, if not all, of the participants in the games were also Argonauts. Apollonios is obviously being ironic when he makes Jason refuse to include Atalanta in the expedition, fearing ἀργαλέας ἔρωτας φιλανθρος ἔχωμεν (1. 773). Considering the great importance given to the works of Eros in the Apollonian narrative, such an exclusion is amusing. Atalanta’s inclusion in the crew might not have created the same problems that her participation in the Boar Hunt caused, but would have certainly created a certain awkwardness when Medea came aboard. The fact that Jason raises these objections ominously foreshadows his future fate, when his life will be destroyed by “the terrible conflicts which love causes”. As for Theseus, we have already pointed out that Apollonios, like Apollodoros, is inconsistent in his chronology: in his poem Theseus’ adventures are set in the past (cf. 1. 40-44, where the war between Lapiths and Centaurs is situated in the distant past, 3. 996-1007, 1100-1, 4. 430-434), and provide – especially the last reference – an ominous example for the relationship between Jason and Medea. The idea of a middle-aged Theseus, who pays for his hybris in Hades, certainly contradicts the idea of an adolescent Theseus, who has just started his heroic career, and almost dies at Medea’s hands (cf. Apollodoros 1.9.28 and Epitome 1. 5-6).

Clearly, elements from the early Argonautic tradition are present in Apollodoros’ catalogue. On the other hand, our discussion has shown that Apollodoros brings together different elements of the tradition, old and new, and thus we could not argue that the catalogue has a very old source. Peneleos and

---

559 cf. Boardman in LIMC II, 1, 945-6, and Blatter in LIMC IV, 1, 279.
Leitos, Askalaphos and Ialmenos, and Euryalos are only ever mentioned in a Trojan War context: for Peneleos and Leitos see Apollodoros’ catalogue of Helen’s suitors at 3.10.8,\(^{560}\) while at 1.9.14, it is specifically stated that Euryalos went to Troy: Μηκιστέως δὲ Εὐρυαλος, δς ἤκεν εἰς Τροίαν.\(^{561}\) If someone wanted to use fill-in names he surely could have used many others. The two groups of two names do have a geographical connection with the Argonautic expedition. Peneleos and Leitos are from Boiotia, Askalaphos and Ialmenos from Orchomenos;\(^{562}\) both towns are linked with the Argonautic myth through Athamas, so someone who might have wanted to stress the prominence of the area chose to use them just Homer had.\(^{563}\) Had all five names been found together, I would have suggested that Apollodoros, while using a mythographical manual which contained the catalogues of the Argonautic expedition and the Greek leaders of the Trojan war, simply crossed over from the one catalogue to the next. But as it is I can give no explanation for their inclusion.

Note one last peculiarity of the catalogue: Apollodoros attributes the naming of the Argo to Argos, eldest son of Phrixos, whereas in Apollonios the ship is built by Argos, son of Arestor, under the guidance of Athena, and is named after him (1. 111-2). The same tradition seems to be recorded by Pherekydes (\(FGrHist\) 3 F 106 = Σ Apoll. Rhod. 1. 4): ‘Ο ’Απολλώνιος καλεῖ τὴν ’Αργῷ, ἀπὸ ’Αργοῦ τοῦ κατασκευάσαντος: Φερεκτίης δὲ ἀπὸ ’Αργοῦ τοῦ Φρίξου υἱοῦ. Gantz

\(^{560}\) At 3.10.8 we should change the name of Peneleos’ father - added by Heyne – from Ἰππολίτου to Ἰππόλιτου to correspond with this section.

\(^{561}\) See our discussion of this branch of the Aiolid family in Chapter One.

\(^{562}\) On a detailed discussion of the genealogical traditions concerning this five figures, see González García 1997, 48-52 for Peneleos and Leitos, 52-56 for Askalaphos and Ialmenos, and 79-84 for Euryalos.

\(^{563}\) See, however, more recently García 1997, 42-3: “como ocurre con el supuesto origen beocio, non se trata mas que de una simple hipótesis imposible de demostrar.”
suggests,\textsuperscript{564} following Robert,\textsuperscript{565} that the phrasing implies that Pherekydes did not make Phrixos' son the builder. He goes on to say that Apollodoros "would here seem to have conflated two different versions". But why would Pherekydes have named the ship after a person who had nothing to do with it, and who appears to have played no significant role in the expedition? It seems probable that, at this point, Apollodoros simply follows the tradition recorded by Pherekydes, and like him, names the ship after its builder, the son of Phrixos.\textsuperscript{566} In any case, in this version Argos was in Greece before the beginning of the expedition, as the reference to his name in the catalogue of the Argonauts that follows proves. As a result, Apollodoros avoids any reference to the meeting of the Argonauts with the sons of Phrixos at the island of Ares, near Kolchis, found in Arg. 2. 1093ff.

Both Apollonios and Apollodoros ignore the tradition that the Argo was the first ship ever built.\textsuperscript{567} Apollonios was clearly aware of the tradition,\textsuperscript{568} which he chooses to ignore for reasons of plot: Kolchians too must be familiar with the rules of shipbuilding, for Argos and his brothers to be able to begin their journey to Greece (and conveniently sink at the first sight of bad weather), and for Apsyrtos and the Kolchian contingent to be able to follow the Argo on her dangerous return journey. On the other hand, Apollodoros specifically states elsewhere that the first ship was that used by Danaos and his daughters on their journey from Egypt (2.1.4): τησκεκασε πρώτος καὶ ταῖς

\textsuperscript{564} ibid. 343.
\textsuperscript{565} Robert 1920-24, 774.
\textsuperscript{566} In this light, the Apollonian Argos' complaints about being given a unseaworthy vessel (3. 340-6) are amusingly ironic.
\textsuperscript{567} Cf. Jackson 1997, 249-257.
\textsuperscript{568} Cf. 1. 547-52, where the mountain nymphs look in wonder at Athena's creation, while the sight is novel enough to arouse the interest of the gods from Olympos, and 4. 316-322, which comments on the fear that this novelty still caused to people.
θυγατέρας ἐνθέμενος ἔφυγε. The expression ὑποθεμένης Ἀθηνᾶς is used both in the case of Danaos' vessel and in that of the Argo and stresses the uniqueness of both ships, expressed by the role played by Athena in their design. The Argo, of course, is equipped with a further sign of divine benevolence: the speaking beam comes, as in Apollonios (1. 526-7), from Dodona (1.9.15): κατὰ δὲ τὴν πρὸς ἅγιον ἐνιακούσεν Ἀθηνᾶ φωνῆν φηγοῦ τῆς Δωδώνιδος ξύλου. The beam, obviously a traditional component of the magical ship, has in Apollodoros, as in Apollonios, a very limited role. It later informs the Argonauts of Zeus' wrath caused by Apsyrtos' death and advises them on their course of action. Apollodoros also records that Pherekydes (FGrHist 3 F 111a-b) had the beam demand that Herakles disembark at the very beginning of the expedition.570

Finally it should be added that the oracular activity at the first stages of the myth is essential to the formation of its plot: in Apollodoros an oracle warns Pelias of the imminent danger posed by the monosandalos;572 Apollonios of Rhodes, who


570 See 4. 580-91, for the beam's only activity in the poem.

571 cf. Aristotle Pol. 1284a23, where it is noted that the Argonauts left Herakles behind, since the Argo refused to carry him because of his weight; also Antimachos Lyde fr. 69 Matthews (= 58 Wyss, apud Σ AR 1. 1289-91a): Ἀντιμάχος δὲ ἐν τῇ Δώδῃ φησίν ἐκβιβαζόμενον τῶν Ἦρακλέω διὰ τὸ καταφρονθήσαι τὴν Ἀργόν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἱππότος μ. καὶ Ποσείδιππος τὸ ἔπιγραμματογράφος (fr. 4 Schott Posid. epigr., Diss. Berol. 1905, 106) ἥκελοῦσαν, καὶ Φερεκόθης. As Matthews points out, chronologically it is impossible that Pherekydes followed Antimachos; it is more probable that the opposite has happened, and that the addition of καὶ Φερεκόθης has been added carelessly, "indicating only that Pherekydes gave the same story as Antimachus". On the other explanations given about Herakles' disembarkation or abandonment see our discussion of the episode.

572 See also Braswell 1988, 6-23, and 166, for variants regarding the oracular descriptions of Jason as a source of danger to Pelias; Dräger 1993 devotes the entire book to a discussion of the opening stages of the expedition. Despite the occasional lapse, i.e. his suggestion that Phrixos had some sort of tree-burial (analogous to those recorded in Apoll. Rhod. 3. 200-9) with his body wrapped in the Golden Fleece (!), I find most of his arguments quite convincing. Those
refers fleetingly to the story of the *monosandalos* (1. 8-11), when listing the reasons that forced Jason to take up the expedition, mentions not only Pelias’ determination to drive Jason out of his homeland and his possessions – the first time in the poem that such a unambiguous statement concerning the causes of the expedition is made (3. 336-339, repeated in 3. 388-90; cf. also 1. 287, 411) – but also refers to the existence of Zeus’ curse against the *Aiolides* γενέτης (3. 339), which presumably would have been revealed in an oracle, and which adds another twist to the already intricate setting of the expedition. Zeus’ μὴνίς καὶ χόλος (3. 337-8), which recalls the curse against the eldest of the Athamantidai, as recorded in Hdt. 7. 197, appears to be an Apollonian invention, designed to reinforce and justify Jason’s demand. It foreshadows, however, the situation later in the poem (4. 557-627), when Zeus’ anger over the murder of Apsyrtos, will be the reason behind the wanderings of the Argonauts in the Mediterranean.

Neither Pelias’ attempt to acquire Jason’s possessions nor the curse against the Athamantidai appear in Apollodorus’ account. The mythographer, however, mentions the existence of another oracle, also given before the beginning of the journey to Kolchis. Piously, Jason asks for god’s permission before sailing, and is permitted to put to sea (cf. the relevant versions in Apoll. Rhod. 1. 207-210; 1. 411-416). Such piety comes in sharp contrast with Pelias’ characterisation concerning the original legitimacy of Pelias’ rule at Iolkos and the pivotal role of the oracle(s) in the instigation of the Argonautic voyage find me in complete agreement. As Apollodorus includes both details in his account, it is not surprising that Dräger’s attempt to reconstruct the plot of the pre-Homeric *Argonautika* (p. 357-60, in the first of the five versions of the myth recorded in this final section of the work) “reads like an extract from Apollodorus” (Hunter 1995b, 48; see however the justified criticism by Beye 1994-5, 310-1: Dräger faults Preller-Robert’s myth synthesis for being a compilation and then proceeds to compile a pre-Homeric version of the myth extracted from the preserved versions). Like Dräger, I believe in the antiquity of most of the mythographer’s sources. I hope that in the discussion it will become clear that this persistence was deliberate, and even in cases where a more popular, but more recent, account was preferred, the mythographer’s devotion to older versions was never abandoned.
throughout the mythographer’s account as irreverent, even if it is a standard act before engaging in a dangerous undertaking.\textsuperscript{573} As was already noted, and despite the apparent divine sanction of the expedition, the divine factor, with the exception of Hera who pursues her own agenda through the Argonauts, remains conspicuously absent in Apollodoros’ account, as in Apollonios;\textsuperscript{574} the mythic action takes place mainly on the human level, with the gods (namely Hera) offering much needed help when required.

In conclusion: although it is impossible to explain the inclusion of some of its names, Apollodoros’ list of the participants in the expedition is specifically designed to accommodate those heroes who would have been considered the most famous of their generation, for reasons of parentage, ability or even because of their offspring. Moreover, despite minor discrepancies, the catalogue is consistent with the following narrative, although it is evident that it draws upon different sources.

\textsuperscript{573} See Apollodoros Epitome 3. 15 for the departure of ships for Troy; cf. also the consultation in historic times of an oracle before the undertaking of a colonising expedition.
C. The Journey to Kolchis (1.9.17-23)

With the Argo built and the oracular commands fulfilled, Jason and his newly assembled crew embark on their expedition to Kolchis. The journey to and from the land of Aietes occupies the next ten paragraphs of Apollodoros' account; the Argonauts' adventures during their expedition turn into the core of the narrative. As Vian points out, this is "ce sont les navigations et les épisodes annexes qui passent au premier plan, surtout à partir du moment où l'itinéraire d'Argô s'inscrit dans un cadre géographique réel . . .". We already noted at the beginning of this Chapter how the acquisition of a new Weltanschauung from the growth of geographical knowledge enormously enriched all accounts of the expedition. In many ways, like the Kavafian journey to Ithaka, the Argonautic voyage - especially in its Apollonian variation - becomes, in its mythological context, a journey for the journey's sake: through precision in the geographical reconstruction of the myth and the use of aitiological evidence that purports to prove the truth of particular myths, it offers a credible explanation of how things came to be as they are, and a knowledge of things past and present that brings together the four corners of the world.

Apollodoros' account of the journey is one of the most intriguing passages of the Bibliothèke, as it provides us with a rare insight into his construction of his narrative and use of sources. We have the good fortune to possess in its entirety Apollodoros' main source, Apollonios of Rhodes' Argonautika. The extensiveness

---

575 Vian 1982, 283.
576 See Zanker 1987, 113, who argues that these were two of the four main forms that the quest for realistic effect took in the Alexandrian movement, the other two being "the use of a wide acquaintance with mythical traditions in order to select the most credible myth . . . and the employment in poetry of science more as we understand the word nowadays, especially medicine".
of Apollodoros' debt to this learned third-century epic is obvious, as we shall see, but not in the least surprising: the episodes narrated in the *Argonautika* soon became the canonical version of the story, and for later authors the work defined the narrative of the expedition (and of any expedition, cf. its influence on the *Aeneid*). This is perhaps the only time in this study where we need not deplore the loss of an early source, although nobody doubts that, had such material survived, we would be in a better position to appreciate the undeniable influence that it had in the moulding of the Apollonian *Argonautika*.

In a way, Apollonios performs a mythographer's task: he fashions a synthetic amalgam, drawing upon many different, and sometimes conflicting, approaches to the myth. In fact, as Hunter notes, "Apollonios makes visible the process of selection between variants, either by referring to the rejected version in the course of telling the selected one or by combining previously competing versions". 577

At first glance it appears that, on the whole, Apollodoros follows the *Argonautika* faithfully. However, a closer look reveals that his account contains a number of departures from Apollonios' narrative. These changes, which range from the insignificant to the omission of whole episodes or the rejection of part of Apollonios' narrative in favour of another account, may provide valuable information about the reasoning and purpose of the *Bibliotheke*, and Apollodoros' ability as a compiler of different, sometimes contradicting material. In the following section we shall discuss each episode of the long journey to Kolchis, examining the
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577 Hunter 1989, 21. See above our discussion of the construction of the catalogue of the Argonauts, especially the section concerning Apollonios' omission of Theseus and Atalante.
distinctive details recorded by Apollodoros, in an attempt to discern a pattern behind these divergences.

(i) **The departure from Iolkos and the Lemnian episode.**

As one would expect, considering that this is an account aiming at concision, the description of the final preparations that occupied the Argonauts on their last day before embarking (i.e. the launch and distribution of seats [Apoll. Rhod. 1. 363-401], the sacrifice to Apollo [Apoll. Rhod. 1. 402-47], the actual sailing out [Apoll. Rhod. 1. 519-79]), and the details of the journey from the place of assembly (presumably Magnesian Pagasai) to Lemnos (Apoll. Rhod. 1. 519-608), were judged as immaterial, and, consequently, were entirely omitted from Apollodoros' account. With a single sentence, he brings the ship to the island: οὕτωι ναυαρχοῦντος Ἰασώνος ξύσχεται προσέχοισιν Λήμνῳ. The reference to Jason's assumption of the leadership does not seem to be a veiled reference to his pitiful attempt at a democratic process found in Apollonios (1. 331-62). Jason's opening up the leadership to his own mission has been justly described as "something of an anomaly among ancient epics". This ingenious episode brings to the fore a theme that appears again and again in the poem and forms part of the backbone of its narrative: the undermining of the notion of the traditional hero (in the figures of both Jason and Herakles). Apollonios' Argonauts break with tradition (οὕτως ὅτις ἔκφειτο καὶ ἀρχεῖσθαι διάδοχο, 1. 347) and, in effect,
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578 On Apollonios' account of the journey from Pagasai to Lemnos, its structure and the geographic and textual problems that it poses, see Livrea 1979, 146-54, and more recently Clauss 1993, 88-105.
579 Clauss 1993, 62.
appoint as leader the person they deem more suitable for the leadership, Herakles. Only upon the latter’s refusal (a decision that, in my view, also undermines the concept of the traditional hero) does control revert to Iason. The election is Apollonios’ way of subverting his own narrative, since up to that point we were led to assume that Iason was the leader of the expedition, as well as the poet’s way of conversing with the tradition in which Herakles assumed command of the enterprise, while still including him in the crew. This is an innovation in the original myth, in which, as in every other myth of the quest-type, the leadership belongs by default to the instigator of the endeavour (cf. the position held by Meleagros and Agamemnon in the Kalydonian Boar Hunt and the Trojan War respectively). It is not surprising that Apollodoros chose to revert to the original, uncomplicated version of the myth, although he was aware of the question that Herakles’ participation in the enterprise already posed for earlier authors. We shall return presently to the traditions about Herakles and the Argonautic expedition.

---

580 Diodoros (4. 41. 3) has Herakles accept the leadership of the expedition when, in a very similar context to that in Apollonios τὸς δ’ οὖν ἄριστος συνελθόντας ἑλέσθαι σφῶν αὐτῶν στρατηγὸν Ἡρακλέα, προκατανυσθαί κατ’ ἀνθρεμίαν.

581 On Apollonios’ delaying tactics and the constant oscillation of his narrative in the first book of the Argonautika see Wray 2000, passim. As he points out, “[t]he entire book, and especially its first half, has the rhythm of a wild repetition-compulsion that asks insistently ‘have we begun yet?’ and answers, with some insistence, ‘just one more thing before we can begin’ (248).

582 Vian 1978, 1028-9, argues that the election was not necessary, but Iason acted out of courtesy towards the rest of the group, especially to Herakles, in an attempt to unify it at the beginning of the expedition. If he was trying to unify his comrades, he succeeded, but by behaviour unflattering to himself. One of Iason’s skills is the ability to promote harmony in the group so that they can succeed in their communal effort. The episode of Idas’ argument with Idmon that follows some 100 lines after the election exemplifies this ability (1. 448-95): by having Iason successfully put an end to the νείκος (1. 492-94), Apollonios indicates once again that in this expedition the necessary skills for the leader of the expedition will not be physical strength (provided by Herakles), or mental ability (provided by Medeia), or autocratic implementation of despotic power (exercised by Aietes in Kolchis, and proven equally unsatisfactory; see Clauss 2000, 27-8; on Aietes’ character see Vian 1980, 19-21, who sees him as an oriental despot, Williams 1996, passim, for a very favourable view of Aietes, which, however, is obviously unsupported by Apollonios’ narrative). But this is something that the crew of the expedition do not realise. In their eyes Iason falls “short on heroics”, and the expedition begins with a leader who does not have the confidence of his comrades but is imposed on them by the man who has it (but who proves not to have the necessary social skills to even be part of the expedition for long).
The Lemnian episode is, in Apollodoros (1.9.17) as in almost all accounts, the crew’s first adventure on their way to Kolchis. When the Argonauts encounter the Lemnian women on what Apollodoros calls γυναικοκρατουμένη Lemnos, what should have been a short stop-over becomes a sojourn for an unspecified period which threatens the continuation of their enterprise even before they have left the Greek world. The meeting of the group of young heroes with this quasi-Amazonian society with a dangerous past, which offers, not war and death, but pleasure, is an entry to an alien world, the first step into the unknown, where distraction could be fatal.

The many versions of the story preserved to us indicate the popularity of a story which explored the “otherness” of women, their potential threat to man, and the need for their final submission for the creation of a harmonious society. From allusive references in Homer onwards, the fascination with the proverbial Λημνικην κακήν (thus Aischylos, Choëphoroi 631-34; cf. also Herodotos 6.138 and Zenobios 5.85), the Argonauts’ subsequent visit, the repopulation of the island, and the final fate of Queen Hypsipyle remained unchanged.

— Distinctively, in Pindar's P 4. 251-261 the episode becomes the climax of the whole expedition: in a rearrangement of the sequence of events, the Argonauts arrive at Lemnos on their return journey, disregarding the presence of Medea on the ship and the awkwardness it creates, since Pindar still has the Argonauts cohabit with the Lemnian women. The Lemnian women are explicitly referred to as ἀλμυναν τ’ έθεει γυναικών κακοφόνων, but the deed is glossed over; the Argonauts arrive, hold athletic contests (also mentioned in O 4. 19-22, again without any explanation for the reasons behind such an engagement - where they funeral games, as the Schol. to Pind. P 4. 450a suggest? cf. also Simonides fr. 547 PMG), and have no qualms about the sexual union that follows. Other authors also saw the possibilities created by Medea's presence: Myrsilos in Book I of his Lesbiaka (FGrHist 477 F 1a apud Σ Apoll. Rhod. 1. 609-19e) has Medea rather than Aphrodite afflict the Lemnian women with δισεπτομήν δικ ζηλοτοπίνων which led to the annual ritual separation of the sexes on the island; for an ingenuous study of this ritual, see Burkert 1970, passim.

— Indeed, the reference to Euneos and his parents, Jason and Hypsipyle, at Iliad 7.467-71 (cf. also 14.230 with Σ ad 14.236 for a reference to Thoas as the ruler of Myrina) indicates that Homer was familiar with at least the part of the story concerning the visit of the Argonauts to the island.
Apollodoros’ account of the Argonauts’ encounter with the Lemnian women abbreviates Apollonios’ (1. 609-909). Both accounts have the Argonauts arrive at an island inhabited only by women (ἐνυχε δὲ Ἰήμιος ὁμθρών τοῦτο σύνοι ἔρτη, 1.9.17). Its inhabitants accept the crew of the Argo willingly and, as in all other versions of the story, have intercourse with the men; obviously as their ulterior motive was the repopulation of the island, something not specifically stated by Apollodoros, although the reference to the twin children born to the union of Iason and Hypsipyle highlights that need (see however Arg.1. 675-696). Apollodoros offers minimal information about the particulars of the encounter: the intervention of Herakles that brings about the Argonauts’ departure is omitted, just as the intervention of Odysseus’ crew that results in their departure from Aiaie is left out of the very detailed account of the Kirke episode (Epitome 7. 14-17). Both episodes have their significance in their narrative context, but add no substantial information to Apollodoros’ account. However, without the reference to Herakles’ role Apollodoros’ account acquires a meaning somewhat different from that advanced by Apollonios. The sojourn at Lemnos is no longer a real threat to the

585 The report in Aischylos’ Hypsipyle (TrGF III, p. 352 Radt, apud Σ Apoll. Rhod. 1. 769) that the Lemnian women, armed with weapons, refused to allow the crew of the Argo to land until they had promised to sleep with them. This indicates that in Aischylos, as in Apollonios, sex for procreation and repopulation of the island was their main motivation (cf. also Nikolaos of Damaskos, FGrHist 90 F 11). It is deplorable that the surviving fragments of the play offer little information about its plot. The significance of the loss of all the plays but one which dealt with the events of the Argonautic expedition and its aftermath becomes even more lamentable, if we consider the constant allusions and reworking of the Euripidean Medea in the Argonautika. Plot-elements such as the one which we have just mentioned, or the arming of the women at the sight of the ship, which alludes to an earlier version of a fiercer race of women who attempted to preserve the separation of sexes by force, and goes at least as far back as Sophokles’ Lemnian Women (TrGF IV frs. 384-389, p. 336-8 Radt) where a μάχη ἑχεξακα was fought between the men and the women, indicate the extent of Apollonios’ debt to earlier versions of the myth. Undeniably, the Hellenistic poet subverts the tradition of the Amazonian women of Lemnos by emphasising their fear and φιλανθροπία; this is just another example of his productive communication with his sources.
completion of the expedition, but a simple distraction, with the Argonauts always intending to depart, once the repopulation of the island is under way.

Both in the Argonautika (cf. Hypsipyle's μεθοδο... συμβλέπων (792) at 1. 793-826) and in Apollodoros, the Argonauts remain unaware of the real fate of the men of the island. The mythographer devotes the major part of his account to the events before the Argonauts' arrival. In his account, the women refuse to honour Aphrodite for unspecified reasons, and are thus afflicted with δυσσομία, an unpleasant bodily smell. This is the reason for their men's disaffection which led to the proverbial Λήμνικα πτώματα: the women murdered their fathers and husbands in retaliation for their rejection in favour of slave-girls from the nearby Thrace. Only Hypsipyle, alone of all the women, saved her father, Thoas, by hiding him. We shall shortly return to this last detail of Thoas' rescue.

The account of the murder of the Lemnian men as recorded by Apollodoros is followed by other authors, "and thus presumably this was the tradition known in earlier times". Many critics have read this mythological vulgate (i.e. Apollodoros' version), which puts the blame on the women, into Apollonios. However, Apollonios makes no reference to any δυσσομία afflicting the women; this omission has been explained as a sign of decorum on Apollonios'
part. The view that Apollonios relates the same story as Apollodoros is found already in the Scholia to Arg. 1. 609-19a; yet it is apparent that the poet records a story that puts the blame on the men (1. 611). Vian makes a persuasive case that is the men who refuse to honour Aphrodite and are thus punished with a sexual craze that eventually leads to their death. It would not be the first time that Aphrodite uses female agents to punish a man who transgresses against her: the most celebrated case is that of Hippolytos (cf. Euripides’ Hippolytos 1-57), but there is also Diomedes, whose wife she entices to take a new lover, as punishment for the wound which he inflicted on her on the plain of Troy (already in Mimnermos fr. 22 West, Lykophron Alex. 610ff. and Σ ad II. 5. 412). The fact that Hypsipyle, in her speech to Jason (1. 793-833), puts the blame squarely on the shoulders of the men (l. 802-3) points in this direction. Indeed, Hypsipyle’s speech is characterized as wily (l. 792, μ’θωτος ομυκλότος), since she is trying to make him abort the expedition and keep him on the island forever. However, there is no reason for her to mislead Jason about the reasons for the men’s behaviour; it is enough to gloss over the horrid truth of the murder, and pretend that the men are still alive and living in Thrace with their concubines.

people afflicted by an awful bodily smell that separates them from their community. Thus Philoktetes is taken from Tenedos to Lemnos to be abandoned because the smell from his bitten leg had become insufferable (Epitome 3. 26).

Green 1997, 213.

Indeed, the vague lines 1. 614-15 (\. έπεις χιλόςς ουλόςς ομπαζθι Κύπριδος, "ούκεκα μιν γεράκων ἐπὶ δηρεν έπισικονομον) fit their context better if we read μιν as masculine; the men transgress against the goddess and pay the penalty. Besides, this explanation nullifies the question of when and how the women ceased to be malodorous, since on their arrival the Argonauts have no such preoccupations (in 1. 850-2, Aphrodite’s intervention incites desire in the Argonauts, and does not seem to affect the women).

Vian 1974, 26-7, who notes that Asklepiades of Tragilos (FGrHist 12 F14 apud Σ ad II. 7. 468), and possibly Aischylos in his Lemnians (TrGF III, frs. 123a-b, p. 233-4 Radt) put the blame for angering Aphrodite on the men and not on the women who only react to the rejection. He concludes that “si on lit sans idée préconçue le récit d’Apollonios, c’est bien la même version” (i.e. the one found in Asklepiades), “ignorant la dysosmie, qu’on y retrouve” (27).

It is obvious that Apollodoros is not following Apollonios' account. As we have already noted, the mythographer chose to record the more widespread tradition instead of that found in Apollonios, who probably made it his own choice partly because of the opportunity it offered to further explore the gender inversion that would take centre stage in the whole of the episode, but mainly because of the added pathos of having women who had transgressed through no fault of their own assume roles to which they were not accustomed and which they did not want. This would explain the eagerness that the women show to resubmit themselves to male domination and to re-establish themselves as a normal society.

All accounts of the episode which refer to survivors of the massacre agree that the only survivor was the aging king of the island, Thoas, who was rescued by his daughter Hypsipyle. However, there are conflicting versions of what happened to him after the murders. Apollonios and Apollodoros follow two altogether different versions. In Apollonios, Thoas is set adrift in a λάρυξ by his daughter, and manages to land on the island of Oinoe, which was renamed Sikinos, after the son Thoas had by the naiad Oinoe. This version plays with the theme of exposure by reversing its components: it is the daughter who exposes the father in an attempt to escape the miasma of murdering her kin. Such a reversal fits the structure of the episode perfectly and is thus preferred.

---

596 See also Herodotos VI 138-9, and Σ ad Eur. Hec. 887, where the myth of the Lemnian women is balanced by the crime committed by the Pelasgian inhabitants of Lemnos against their Athenian concubines and their offspring, which was used to forward the imperialistic aspirations of Athens. In this version, Thoas was killed by the Lemnians, apparently during the massacre. In the hypothesis b to Pindar's Nemeans (Drachmann 1927, p. 1-2) Hypsipyle saves her father by hiding him in a κοτόνα only to be set to drift over the sea by the Lemnian women when discovered. Other versions, including that of Valerius Flaccus (2. 300-305), obviously blend this myth with the myth of the Iphigeneia at Tauri, due to the homonymy of the two kings; cf. Hyginus Fab. 15 and 120. Sansone 2000, 170, points out that the name Thoas may have been chosen for the Taurian king because of the many common elements between the Argonautic myth and the Iphigeneia-story, and discusses the possibility that not only Euripides, but also Sophokles belong to a tradition that conflated the two stories.
On the other hand, Apollodoros’ version is far simpler: Hypsipyle tries to save her father by hiding him on the island, an action very risky for both parties. In typical fashion, Apollodoros does not mention at this point what happened to them after the departure of the Argonauts. However, at 3.6.4 he relates the end of the story as part of the narrative of the expedition against Thebes. As one might have expected, upon discovering that Thoas had been saved, the Lemnian women put him to death and sold Hypsipyle into slavery (presumably sparing her life out of female solidarity). Hypsipyle became the slave of Lykourgos, king of Nemea, and nursemaid of his infant son Opheltes, whose death she unintentionally causes. Apollodoros then records the foundation of the Nemean games in the dead child’s honour and the winners in each of the contests in those first games, but not what happened to Hypsipyle (just as Jason’s fate after the death of his children is completely glossed over). Consequently, Apollodoros’ account looks forward to subsequent episodes in Hypsipyle’s life, whereas Apollonios’ version, while mentioning Thoas’ rescue, leaves the fate of Hypsipyle and the Lemnian women open to speculation.

In conclusion, for the account of the main episode Apollodoros selects the more popular version of events which is also chosen by Apollonios. But in following the same principle for the story of the murder of the Lemnian men he reverts to an account that seems to be the more popular one, in contrast to Apollonios, who chooses different versions that amplify the structure and themes of his narrative.

Contrary to this, see hypothesis b to Pindar’s *Nemeans*, for a version in which Hypsipyle had to flee for her life after the other women had discovered and killed her father.
The initiation at Samothrake and sojourn among the Doliones.

In Apollonios' version (1. 915-21), after leaving Lemnos, the Argonauts put in at the island of Elektra (Samothrake), where on Orpheus' instructions they are initiated into the mysteries (i.e. those of the Samothrakian gods, but Apollonios refrains from mentioning anything concerning the specifics of the mysteries or the gods worshipped in them, τὰ μὲν οὐ θέμις ὄμμιν ἀπεθανεῖν, 1. 921). The tradition of an association of the Argonauts with these deities goes back at least as far as Aischylos' Kabeiroi. This is our first reference to these gods in an Argonautic context, though their role in the play is uncertain. Since we cannot be certain of the type of the play and of its position in the Aischylean tetralogy, it is impossible to establish whether the tradition of the initiation of the Argonauts into the Kabeirian mysteries was equally old, or whether it was a later, probably Hellenistic, addition to the myth, or even Apollonios' own innovation (to complement the rites on Mount Didymon which the Argonauts establish, 1. 1124-1150). However, it appears, as Gantz points out, that the play takes place at Lemnos, a major centre for the worship of the Kabeiroi. The connection between the deities worshipped on Lemnos and those worshipped on Samothrake is difficult to establish. Cole points out that Herodotos (2. 51) and Stesimbrotos of Thasos (FGrHist 107 F 20) are the earliest writers who call the gods worshipped on Samothrake Kabeiroi.

---

598 See however the contrary view of Clauss 1993, 153.
600 On the descent of the Kabeiroi from Hephaistos and their connection with Lemnos, see Strabo 10. 3. 19, who cites several variants concerning their parentage and place of origin, including the accounts of Pherekydes (FGrHist 3 F 48), and Akousilaos (FGrHist 2 F 20); cf. also Herodotos 3. 37, who confirms their association with Hephaistos, but who elsewhere (2. 51) locates them on Samothrake.
601 Cole 1984, 2.
She notes that the Samothrakian gods appear to be different in function from the Kabeiroi worshipped elsewhere. It becomes apparent however, that, while not the same in origin, there must have been similarities between the Lemnian Kabeiroi and the gods worshipped on Samothrake which eventually ensured their identification (traces of which can be detected already in the 5th century B.C., as the reference in Herodotus indicates). It follows that the episode of the Argonauts with the Lemnian Kabeiroi was only later transposed to Samothrake. As Delage points out, the reference to Samothrake in the Argonautika is probably due to the fact that the island was a possession of Ptolemaic Egypt from the 3rd century B.C., and to the importance that the cult of the Samothrakian gods had acquired in the Hellenistic period, when the mysteries of the Μεγάλα Θεοί became widely popular. However, whatever their position or function in Hellenistic cult, these gods have no mythical connections as far as we know. The Argonauts' initiation into the Samothrakian mysteries looks forward in time, foreshadowing the cultic practices and spheres of political influence of Apollonios' time. Nevertheless, the Argonauts' stop-over at the island of Elektra adds nothing to the mythological itinerary of the account and is omitted by Apollodoros.

602 Delage 1930, 85-86.
603 Scalinger (mentioned in Hemberg 1950, 318) realised that the word "Kabeiroi" is derived from the Phoenician root kbr and means "great gods." See Collini 1990, 237-287, who argues that this derivation does not mean a Semitic origin for the Samothrakian gods.
604 See Cole 1984, 21: "[t]he Hellenistic period is also a period of expanded activity ..., something which is a direct consequence of the growing popularity of the mysteries"; see also Kakridis 1986, 304-5; Burkert 1985, 281-85.
605 The stop-over at Samothrace is not recorded only by Apollonios, as Gantz 1996, 346, maintains. For the account of the Argonautic expedition by Diodorus contains not one, but two references to the gods of Samothrace and their mysteries (at 4. 42. 1, near the beginning of the expedition, and at 4. 43. 1-2, on their return journey), while Valerius Flaccus also includes an account of the initiation in his poem (2. 431-42); finally, in Orphic Argonautika 465-47 the Argonauts' initiation is set at the start of the journey, before any other adventure. It is worth comparing the accounts of Diodorus and Apollodoros up to this point in the expedition: while Diodorus omits the episode because of its impropriety in a rationalistic context, Apollodoros excludes it because of its unsuitability in a mythological one.
Their next journey brings the Argonauts to the land of the Doliones.\textsuperscript{606} Apollodoros records the dominant version of the myth, following Apollonios, whose account (1. 946-1077) is a unique and brilliant blending and reworking of several, sometimes contradictory, traditions.\textsuperscript{607} The mythographer neatly summarises the core of the main narrative: the Argonauts arrive at the land of the Doliones and are welcomed by their king, Kyzikos (οὔτος αὐτοῖς ἔπεδεξατο φιλοφόροντο, 1.9.18). However, at their first attempt to leave the island, adverse winds blow them back. The Doliones, erroneously thinking that this is a night raid by their enemies, the Pelasgoi, attack the returning Argonauts. In the ensuing battle, the Argonauts kill many of the Doliones, among them Kyzikos. When, in the morning, the mistake is discovered, the Argonauts lament Kyzikos’ death and prepare a luxurious funeral.

Obviously, several elements of Apollonios’ version are absent from Apollodoros. The complexity of the encounter at the land of the Doliones in the Argonautika is obvious. In this episode of “uncanny and ill-omened repetition”,\textsuperscript{608} the poet surrounds the main episode (the double arrival of the Argonauts at the land later to be named Kyzikos) with traditions of aitiological, topographical and antiquarian interest. Local traditions previously unrelated to the story of the Argonauts, concerning the account of the battle of Herakles with the monstrous

\textsuperscript{606} On the geography of the area see Delage 1930, 92-113.
\textsuperscript{607} I agree with Clauss 1993, 148, who contrary to some scholars’ condemnatory judgements finds the episode “a brilliant tour de force”. The debt of Apollonios to the Kyzikian chronicler Dei( Lochos is accepted by most. However, as the discussions in Vian 1974, 28-38, and, more recently, Clauss 1993, 148-50, prove, the poet successfully brought together elements from versions, sometimes unrelated to the main account, to produce a new, original version of the story.
\textsuperscript{608} Wray 2000, 261, who, relying on Vian’s discussion of the doublets that dominate the account (1974, 29), makes some interesting remarks about the role of Herakles. See also Clauss 1993, 148-75.
Gegeneis roughly in the region of Kyzikos, recorded by Herodoros and Agathokles of Kyzikos, are interwoven into the narrative (1. 989-1011). They not only add to the complicated structure of the episode (the battle forms a doublet with that against the Doliones), and offer a mass of topographical and cultural information, but also remark again on Herakles' status and function in the poem, foreshadowing and commenting on Iason's battle with the earthborn at Kolchis. The two ascents of Mount Dindymon and the foundation of the mysteries of Rhea (1. 1117-52), which successfully appeases the wrath of Rhea (who, in this account, is cast in the role of Gaia), one of the many cults associated with the Argonautic journey, is also linked with the rest of the episode internally, as well with the episode that precedes it (the initiation to the Samothrakian mysteries).

This section of Apollonios' narrative greatly enriches the whole of his poem and opens up for the reader a multitude of new perspectives for its appreciation. However, despite of their significance for its structure, these parts of the narrative are completely omitted from Apollodoros' account. The mythographer consistently avoids recording topographical, ethnographical and aitiological information that in Apollonios purports to establish a sense of continuity between the mythical past and the rational present. In this second journey within a journey, Apollonios acquaints his readers with the topography, history, culture and literature of the lands visited by the Argonauts. However, Apollodoros avoids any reference to present (or even to the historical past), trying to preserve a strictly mythological

---

609 Herodoros (FGrHist 31 F 7) described the battle of the Gegeneis with Herakles in an episode presumably unrelated to the Argonautic expedition (since Herodoros [F 41a-b] did not include Herakles in the crew of the Argo, maintaining that he was a slave of Omphale at the time, on which more below). On the Gegeneis, see Agathokles of Kyzikos (FGrHist 472 F 2); also Vian 1951b, 14-25.

610 See Vian 1974, 95.

611 See Clauss 1993, 168.
setting for his account. Hence he excludes from his narrative all the mass of information contained in the Hellenistic poem (including the founding of the mysteries of Rhea), which would also compromise the brevity of his account. This, however, does not explain his omission of the actual battle with the Gegeneis or of Kleite's death. Perhaps these subsidiary episodes were not in the source which Apollodoros summarises - an indication that the mythographer is not using Apollonios' poem directly from the original, but some sort of mythological handbook, or else that he deemed them unnecessary in a brief account of the expedition, as they add nothing to the main narrative.

Kleite's death is linked in Apollonios with the aition of the creation of the fountain that bore her name (1. 1062-1069), which could be an additional explanation for its omission. As we have already noted, the battle with the Gegeneis is designated by the narrator as another of Herakles' labours (δὴ γὰρ τὸν καὶ κείνα θεά τρέφειν ἄνω πέλαργον Ἡρη, Ζηνὸς ἅγνως, ἀκόλουθον Ἡρακλῆ. 1. 996-7), a battle against earthborn creatures similar to the many others he had fought (it actually resembles a small, almost mock Gigantomachy, because of the ease with which Herakles disposes of his opponents with Hera cast in the role of Gaia). As such, it could be conceived of as linked only indirectly to the Argonautic expedition, and thus unnecessary to an account of the Argonautic expedition, which, incidentally, already contains a battle of this type - that of Iason with the

---

612 The other discrepancy between the accounts of the Bibliothèke and of the Argonautika is also due to brevity: in Apollonios the Argonauts depart from the land of the Doliones and travel for a day, before opposing winds bring them back to the same shore at night (1. 1013-1021). In Apollodoros, the day of sailing is omitted: the Argonauts depart at night, and return totally unexpectedly to the place of their departure some hours later. The addition to Apollodoros' narrative of the cutting of hair of Kyzikos' mourners, a typical funerary custom which reminds us of the funeral of Patroklos, as Scarpi points out (1996, 476), is not included in Apollonios' account, but is entirely in the spirit of the account, added by the mythographer to emphasise the regret felt by the Argonauts.
Spartoi. Apollonios' use of Herakles as a foil for Iason and the hero of an alternative plot is essential to the poem's development. However, in Apollodoros' narrative it is inconsequential. This, of course, explains the downplaying of Herakles' role in the mythographer's account. We always need to bear in mind that Apollodoros records a summary of the "Argonautic myth", and not of the Apollonian Argonautika; therefore, not all the episodes of the poem have found their way into the mythographer's account.

(iii) The sojourn at Mysia and the abandonment of Herakles

From the land of the Doliones, the Argonauts follow the southern coast of the Propontis until they reach Mysia, where they experience their first loss of comrades. As Apollodoros proleptically points out, εν τοῖς δὲ Ἡρακλή καὶ Πολλάρησον κατέλαβαν (1.9.19). This is a devastating loss: Herakles' presence aboard the Argo offered reassurance and confidence to his comrades, and his impressive dynamism guaranteed the success of the expedition (cf. 2. 145-50). As was pointed out already, in Book I of the Argonautika Herakles repeatedly stands out as a heroic model, dominating this first part of the journey with his actions, rekindling the impetus for adventure at a point when the Argonauts' lingering in the company of the Lemnian women seriously undermined the expedition's future. Yet it is exactly his prominence that makes his participation in the journey anomalous. His super-heroic self-sufficiency is out of place in a collective expedition: it is abundantly clear that Herakles could have managed the quest for

---

613 Feeney 1986, 54.
the Golden Fleece completely alone. The battle with the Gegeneis gives us a first
glimpse of his ability to overcome every obstacle, and the rowing incident (1. 1153-71), in which he manages to propel the ship by himself until his oar breaks, discredits his comrades (and, in the process, endangers the structural integrity of the Argo, 1. 1163). With Herakles aboard, the great collective expedition of a generation threatens to become another, rather insignificant, Herakleian parergon.

Herakles’ participation was not part of the tradition; Apollonios explains why it cannot be part of his story. With him aboard, the poem’s continuation is threatened.614 Herakles must return to his own story, which he abandoned in order to participate in this expedition: the twelve labours. As Glaukos, who emerges from the depths of the sea to explain why Herakles is not to reach the city of Aietes, points out (1. 1315-20), his participation in the expedition delays his own destiny (μοῖρα, 1. 1317) and threatens his final apotheosis. His removal from the ship is a necessity for everyone involved.

The reason for this long introduction is simple. Apollodoros’ account of Herakles’ abandonment at Mysia follows Apollonios’ faithfully. On their arrival at Mysia, Hylas, the son of Theiodamas and eromenos of Herakles, is abducted by nymphs while fetching water. Polyphemos, a fellow Argonaut, who hears the boy’s cry, draws his sword and goes in search of the boy, thinking he is being abducted by bandits. He meets Herakles and informs him of the situation. While both are looking for Hylas, the Argo sails away, leaving them behind. Polyphemos remains

---

614 See Wray 2000, 261: “Medea’s love for Jason and her magic ointment would accomplish nothing that Heracles’ arrows and club could not have done with essentially no effort – and consequently no δέος, no plot, no readerly pleasure, but rather a rushed, premature end to the narrative”.
in the area and founds the city of Kios,\(^\text{615}\) while Herakles returns to Argos, presumably to continue his labours.\(^\text{616}\) Apollodoros, in typical mythographical fashion, ends his account with a list of several diverse versions regarding the participation (or non-participation) of Herakles in the expedition.\(^\text{617}\)

A closer look at Apollodoros' account reveals similarities to that of Apollonios. The reference to Polyphemos drawing his sword (σπασάμενος τὸ ἔξως, cf. Apoll. Rhod. 1. 1250, αὕων ὡς ἐρωσάμενος μέγα φάσανον ὠρτο διέσωσα) thinking that he was abducted by bandits (ὑπὸ ληστῶν ἄγεσθαι νομίζων, cf. Apoll. Rhod. 1. 1251-2, ηὲ μὴ ἄνδρες/μοῦνον θών ἐλάχισταν, ἕνοσι δὲ λπὶ δὲ τὸ μήν), points directly to the poetic text. Two minor discrepancies with that text can easily be explained: Hylas is abducted by one nymph in Apollonios (1. 1228-33), while Apollodoros mentions that he διὰ κάλλος ὑπὸ νυμφῶν ἠρπάγη. While the poet personalises the incident, emphasizing the power of Kypris (1. 1233) and foreshadowing the meeting between Iason and Medeia, the mythographer gives preference to a wording more in tune with popular belief: Hylas is abducted by nymphs.\(^\text{618}\)

The second apparent divergence is more significant. Apollodoros explicitly states that Hylas was Herakles' lover: 'Ἡρακλέους δὲ ἐρωμένος. The relationship

---

\(^\text{615}\) On the diverse traditions about the founding of Kios, see Delage 1930, 115-6; Vian 1974, 45-6.

\(^\text{616}\) The reference in the last sentence to Argos is balanced beautifully by the reference to Kios. Both heroes, excluded from the society of the Argonauts, become members of new ones, Herakles by returning to the ancient city of Argos and Polyphemos by founding a new one.

\(^\text{617}\) There is scant evidence for the episode before the Hellenistic period: Aischylos (Per. 1054) and Aristophanes (Pl. 1127) allude to it, while Hellanikos (FGrHist 4 F131) mentions Hylas' father as Theomenes instead of the usual Theodamas; on Hylas' parentage see more below. Autocharis (FGrHist 249 F1) provides us with the earliest extant tradition, in which Polyphemos founded the city of Kios and Hylas was a local god; see also the accounts of Val. Fl. (3. 509-740) and the Orphic Argonautika (639-857).

\(^\text{618}\) Thus Vian 1974, 40-1, discussing Theokritos' version, where Hylas is abducted by three nymphs. The tradition of young men being abducted by νεταλές (the modern Greek equivalent of the ancient nymphs) remains vivid in modern Greek folk tradition. See Kyriakides 1965, 194-9.
between Herakles and Hylas is never defined in the epic so explicitly.\textsuperscript{619} This has led scholars to speculate on the relationship between them, in order to justify what appeared to be an exaggerated or even uncalled-for reaction.\textsuperscript{620} It is likened to a father-son relationship,\textsuperscript{621} or to a bond of close camaraderie,\textsuperscript{622} or even to a master-servant association.\textsuperscript{623} Yet Apollonios' description of Herakles' frenzied reaction to Hylas' disappearance clearly highlights that he is profoundly in love with the boy. As Palombi points out,\textsuperscript{624} "[m]algrado la 'discrezione' del poeta, quindi, il παιδικὸς ἔρως che lega Eracle ad Ila è riconoscibile anche nel poema di Apollonio". It is precisely because Herakles has behaved as he has behaved up to this episode - refusing to accept the centrality of the role played by \textit{Eros} in the poem and compromising its greatest triumph, Medea's love for Iason - that dictates that Herakles should be removed from the plot exactly at the moment when he discovers the overwhelming power of passion: the hero, whose presence

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Contrary to the famous account in Theokritos 13; Herakles is also explicitly the \textit{erastes} of Hylas in a fragment of a 2\textsuperscript{nd} c. B.C. elegiac poem (\textit{P. Oxy.} 3723).
\item Thus Galinski 1972, 110, who finds Herakles' reaction totally without motive.
\item See Carspecken 1952, 120: "above all the intensity of [Herakles] grief for the lost Hylas, to whom he is bound not only by personal affection but also by a heavy sense of obligation, since it is he who slew Theodamas"; Levin 1971b, 24: Herakles "acts more in less in \textit{loco parentis}"; Pulbrook 1983, 29: "the only credible answer . . . is to see Apollonius' description of Herakles the lover as accidental, as being owed to the persuasive and unavoidable centrality of love in the Hellenistic consciousness. I can see no alternative to accepting the general truth of D. N. Levin's analysis: it seems inescapable that in the end Herakles is eliminated from the poem because he does not harmonize well enough with the overall ethos of the poem and of its characters." Ancient authors also tried to "exonerate" Herakles: thus Valarius Flaccus (3. 735-6) explicitly states that Herakles is the guardian of Hylas, whose father is alive. Taking the tradition one step further in this direction, Antikleides in his \textit{Deliaka} Book II (\textit{FGHist} 140 F2) has Hylos, the son of Herakles with a name similar to that of Hylas, becoming lost while fetching water, forcing his father to look for him.
\item Thus Vian 1974, 41: "[r]ien, non plus, ne suggère explicitement qu'Héraclès éprouve pour Hylas un sentiment autre que la virile affection qu'un héros doit porter au jeune «page» . . . dont il a la charge morale (v. 1211). Imaginerait-on d'ailleurs Héraclès amoureux, après les sarcasmes qu'il a lancés naguère à l'amant éphémère d'Hypsigyle (v. 865-874) ?"\textsuperscript{621} Cf. Gow 1938, 11: "In Apollonius [Hylas] is a squire and servant to Herakles, and a more tender relation is only to be inferred from the commotion caused by his loss".\textsuperscript{624} Palombi 1985, 81, who discusses the ways in which Apollonios makes clear that what Herakles is experiencing, is rage stemming from erotic passion.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
at Kolchis would not have given to Eros the opportunity to blossom, is removed from the narrative by that same force.

On the basis of Herakles’ speech at Lemnos, it has been suggested that he cannot assume the role of lover in the episode of his abandonment; however, it is exactly this episode that gives us the key to understanding his reaction to the loss of Hylas. The hero, who would not give in to love and would never lose sight of his goal – even when his comrades had momentarily done so – is now completely overwhelmed and permanently loses sight of the expedition. Herakles is excluded from the rest of the expedition because he does not conform to the concepts of the poem, as Levin and Pulbrook argue, but not because he never accepts the centrality of love; on the contrary, he is excluded because, when he does experience love, he reacts – as always – excessively.\(^{625}\) As Clauss remarks,\(^{626}\) the presence of Polyphemos, which points to the tradition where Polyphemos, and not Herakles, was the lover of Hylas,\(^{627}\) acts as a foil and emphasizes the excess and irrationality of Herakles’ reaction. Even at the moment of his exit from the narrative his behaviour stands out.

Hence, Apollodoros’ account does not diverge – at this point – from the Apollonian account. Rather, he understands its context and explicitly states what

\(^{625}\) The episode of the rowing competition that directly precedes the abandonment of Herakles exemplifies this excess.

\(^{626}\) Clauss 1993, 194-6.

\(^{627}\) Thus Euphorion (fr. 76 Powell = fr. 81 van Groningen) links Polyphemos with the boy by claiming that Hylas was his lover (although Σ ad Theocr. 13 7-9, mentions that, in Euphorion, Hylas was the eromenos of Euphemos, son of Poseidon, a confusion which stems from the homonymia of the Argonaut Polyphemos with the Odyssean Polyphemos, another son of Poseidon). So too Sokrates of Argos in his Πρὸς Ἐφορον (FGrHist 310 F15). This was perhaps the original version, and I think that Apollonios’ account of Polyphemos reacting as a lover ought to react to his eromenos’ abduction not only enhances the excessiveness of Herakles’ reaction, but also stresses the specific anomaly of Herakles’ association with Hylas, on a mythical and not a homoerotic level, since, as Sergent points out (1987, 157), homosexuality is essential to the myth and more important than the identities of the parties.
Apollonios did not. A number of suggestions have been put forward regarding Apollonios' omission. Thus Vian argues that it is probably due to the restrictions of the epic genre that he refrained from explicitly stating Herakles' homoerotic love for the boy. He points out that, despite the importance of Aphrodite and Eros in the Argonautika, the erotic themes are dealt with the utmost discretion. This is true in the case of actual sexual contact, into which category fall both of the examples he uses to make his point, the Lemnian episode and the wedding of Iason and Medeia. However, throughout the work the poet proves extremely adept at describing in detail the reaction of characters to love (cf. Medeia's and Iason's reactions in books 3 and 4). And this is what he is doing in this section. Consequently, even if we accept Apollonios is not explicit because epic convention, it does not mean that Herakles feels for Hylas only a manly affection, as Vian concludes. I believe, however, that Vian's reference to poetic restrictions is probably true, even if it is impossible to say with any certainty what exactly were these epic conventions with which Apollonios had to comply, based on the scarce evidence we have, or how restrictive they were, since it is obvious that Apollonios throughout his work plays with his audience's expectations and constantly subverts these traditional notions.

On the other hand, Cameron, in his monumental work on Alexandrian poetry, points out that "it was not because he was writing epic that Apollonius failed to develop the erotic motivation latent in his version, but because his focus, quite properly in a narrative of the Argonauts, was on Herakles' departure from the expedition". It has become apparent from our discussion so far, that, far from

---

628 Vian 1974, 41.
being latent, love (in this instance, homoerotic love) is essential to the episode, as it is to the whole of the poem. It is impossible fully to comprehend the significance of Herakles’ departure without taking his erotic motivation into consideration. In the end, whether one accepts Vian’s argument about epic decency, or whether one still feels puzzled that Apollonios choose not to explicitly name an emotion that he extensively described, it is evident that we are meant to read Apollonios in the same way that Aischines (1. 142) read Homer: ἄγετο δὲ πρῶτον μὲν περὶ Ὀμήρου, δὲν εἰς τοὺς πρεσβυτάτους καὶ σοφωτάτους τῶν ποιητῶν εἶναι τάττομεν. ἐκεῖνος γὰρ πολλαχοῦ μεμημένος περὶ Πατρόκλου καὶ Ἀχιλλέως, τὸν μὲν ἐρώτα καὶ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν αὐτῶν τῆς φιλίας ἀποκρύπτεται, ἡγομένος τὰς τῆς εὐωδίας ὑπερβολὰς καταφανεῖς εἶναι τοῖς πεπαιδευμένοις τῶν ἀκροατῶν.

Incidentally, unlike Apollonios (1. 1211-20), the mythographer does not refer here to the background of Hylas’ story, i.e. the murder of his father Theodamas by Herakles. He only refers to it in the section on Herakles (2.7.7), where Herakles is said to have met Theodamas, but much later in his life and certainly not before the completion of the labours. In Apollonios, the story of Theiodamas’ death over a ploughing ox is the pretext for war against the Dryopes, an unjust act to initiate a just war against unjust people. His account, in which, as Vian suggests, “le poète a tenté une synthèse entre la version de Callimaque et des traditions antérieures” (48), emphasises the death of an innocent

---

632 The priority of Kallimachos Aitia I-II to Apollonios’ Argonautika is, I believe, established. See Cameron 1995, 249-253, and more recently Massimilla 1996, 34-40. While I find most of Cameron’s arguments concerning Kallimachos and Apollonios convincing, I fail to understand his claim that both Kallimachos and Theokritos wrote prior to Apollonios because the latter poet juxtaposes the two episodes from Kallimachos (the Anaphe episode from Aitia I and the Hydrophoria story at Hydra from lamb 8), and the two in Theokritos (the Hylas and Amykos episodes) by recording them consecutively. “This must be”, according to Cameron (252), “deliberate structuring by Apollonios”. He argues that there was no need for the two episodes also
Theiodamas and the subsequent carrying off of Hylas. The story of the slaughter of the ox in Apollodoros, which shares elements with that in Kallimachos' Aitia (frs. 22-5 Pfeiffer; cf. also Hymn to Artemis 160ff.), puts emphasis on the Herakles the glutton, who, ἀπορών τροφῆς, does not hesitate to sacrifice a ploughing ox (τῶν ἐτερον τῶν ταύρον θύσιος εἰσωχθέστατο), mocking and distorting the meaning of sacrifice. This telling of the story does not result in the death of Theiodamas, and Hylas is not mentioned. The fact, however, that Herakles' war against the Dryopes is related immediately afterwards (ὅς δὲ ἠλθεν εἰς Τροχίνα πρὸς Κήνακα, ὑποδεχθεὶς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ Δρύσας κατεπολέμησεν), points to the variant found in Kallimachos to be put together, as the adventure with Talos could just as easily have been placed after as well as before the Anaphe episode. (253). The Talos episode does separate the Anaphe and Hydra episodes in Apollodoros. It is a peculiar inversion, grouped as it is with the omission of the entire Libyan section of the expedition. However, I suggest that such an inversion makes no sense, as it cannot be supported by geography or narrative requirements (despite Van der Valk 1958, 114). The Argonauts' itinerary demands that these two episodes be presented in the order in which Apollonios records them. As for Theokritos, the same argument has been put forward to support the opposite conclusion (Hutchinson 1988, 192)! I agree with Sens 1997, 25, that in any case such an argument "does not carry the full force of cogency". Based on the arguments of Hunter 1996, 59-63, about Idyll 13, and Sens 1997, 25-35, about Idyll 22, I believe that it is likely that both idylls were written by a Theokritos who knew the first two books of the Argonautika in some form.

634 I find it very interesting that in Valerius Flaccus the name of the nymph who abducts Hylas is Dryope (3. 529). The fact that Hylas episode has an initiatory character is evident (see most recently Sergent 1987, 158-9); it is evident that Valerius Flaccus chose for the nymph a name that recalls the female population of Hylas' tribe, who would have played the same role played by the nymph in Hylas' promotion to adulthood, had he not followed Herakles on this expedition. 635 See however Ant. Lib. 26 (in an account attributed to Nikandros, an attribution supported also by S Theokr. 13. 7-9a) who names Keyx as father of the boy, toying with the well-established tradition of the friendship between Herakles and Keyx (cf. also the fact that in the Hesiodic
of the story preserved in the scholium, of which it appears to be a briefer version. This is quoted below; could it be that the whole section, and not just the information on the Dryopes, is taken from Pherekydes?

Apollodoros completes the account of the Argonauts’ sojourn in Mysia by listing four different versions of Herakles’ participation in the expedition. The list is well thought out and balanced: it contains two versions which explain why he did not take part in the expedition at all, and two according to which he arrived in Kolchis with the rest of the crew. Thus Herodoros (FGrHist 31 F 41a and F 41b = Σ Apoll. Rhod. I 1289 makes Herakles be with Omphale at the time of the Argonautic expedition; cf. Ephoros of Kyme (FGrHist 70 F 14), who also refers to the same tradition; in Pherekydes Herakles was left behind at Aphetai (see above); but he sailed to Kolchis according to Demaratos (FGrHist 42 F2) and, in Dionysios Skytobrachion, he was the leader of the expedition. Indeed, in this last account, the Hylas episode is entirely omitted as unsuitable (DS 4. 40. 1-5 = Dionysios Skytobrachion FGrHist 32 F14 = fr. 14 Rusten).

(iv) Surviving without Herakles: the encounters with Amykos and Phineus.

The loss of Herakles turns the expedition into what it should have been from the beginning, a fully communal affair. In the following episodes, members of the crew

Keyx’s Wedding [fr. 263 M.-W.; also Hdt. 7. 193, 2] it was mentioned that the Argonauts left Herakles on Aphetai while he was fetching water, in an episode that corresponds to the episode at Mysia, but with no reference to Hylas, and which may have contributed to the latter episode’s structure). In this case, the transference of Hylas’ parentage to a friend of Herakles’ instead of his enemy reduces the cruelty of the prevailing account. See also Hyg. Fab. 14 for Hylas’ maternal parentage.
take centre stage in overcoming the obstacles they encounter: in their finest hour, their communal effort will bring the Argo through the Clashing Rocks. In this final leg of the journey, the journey really becomes an Argonautic expedition. The division of the Argonautika into books underlines this change: if the first book is the book of Herakles (set up as the model hero, only to be shown to be unsuitable for this type of expedition), and the third is the book of Iason (in which he performs his ἀεθλον – not just the yoking of the fire-breathing bulls and the overcoming of the Spartoi, but especially enlisting Medeia’s help by making her fall in love with him), and in the final book Medeia takes central stage, usurping the poem just as she usurps the end of Apollodoros’ narrative, the second book belongs to the crew, whose individual abilities and collective μήτις bring to a successful end the first part of the expedition.

As Feeney points out,\(^{636}\) “the second book ... shows the Argonauts, in varying ways, coming close to Heracles, or falling short of him. Polydeukes comes closest of all”. Indeed, in the land of the Bebrykes, Polydeukes encounters one of the “wild sons of Poseidon”,\(^{637}\) in a reduplication of Herakles’ encounter with Antaios, already attested in Pindar (I 4. 52-55), and Pherekydes (FGrHist 3 F 6 & 17).\(^{638}\) For the boxing match with Amykos, the mythographer closely follows Apollonios’ account: Amykos challenges “the best of the Argonauts” to a fight; Polydeukes accepts the challenge and during the bout (I accept Wagner’s emendation κατά τοῦ ἀγῶνα instead of the κατά τοῦ ἀγκώνα of the mss., contrary to Scarpi, as the general phrase “during the match” seems more logical and in tune

\(^{636}\) Feeney 1986, 61.
\(^{637}\) Thus E. Roussos in Kakridis 1986, II, 122.
\(^{638}\) Cf. Apollodoros 2.5.11.
Amykos is killed; in the mêlée that follows, the Argonauts kill many of the Bebrykes.

At their next stop-over, the Argonauts encounter the blind seer Phineus: Apollodoros gives what is, by his standards, a detailed account of the encounter, which contains several variants and departs significantly from Apollonios' version. In fact, part of the story found in the poem — the ultimate fate of the Harpyiai — is recorded by Apollodoros as a second variant. We shall return to this presently.

The mythographer begins with Phineus' genealogy and the reasons that caused his condition. Some of these variants are obviously very old. Poseidon's blinding of Phineus goes back to the *Megalai Ehoiai* fr. 254: πεπηρόωσαί δὲ Φινέα φησίν Ἡσίοδος ἐν μεγάλαις Ἡοϊαῖς, ὅτι Φρίξῳ τὴν ὄδον ἐμήνυσεν.

---

639 Scarpi 1996, 477: “più che la posizione anatomica è dunque il “colpo” inferto che appare decisivo e tanto più è paradossale l’anatomia tanto più il colpo è carico di forza e potenza”.

640 This is the tradition that survives in extant versions of the myth (Val. Flac. 4. 99-343; Hyginus *Fab.* 17; *Orphic Argonautika* 658-61; Pliny *Hist. Nat.* 16. 239; Ps. Oppian *Kyneg.* 1. 363), except for Theokritos' *Idyll* 22, who has Amykos bar access to a spring, following an obviously early tradition, and opts for a seemingly lighter ending, with the Dioskouroi exercising clemency and persuading Amykos to mend his ways, although it is obvious that this version is dependent on the outcome of the story of the second part of the *Idyll*, the brutality shown to the Apharidai; the juxtaposition of the Dioskouroi's behaviour towards barbaric strangers and fellow Argonauts is crucial to our understanding of the poem (cf. Hunter 1996, 58), it is probable that the link between the two episodes was suggested to Theokritos by the reading of the *Argonautika*. It has been suggested that Theokritos is in fact returning to the early tradition about the episode, unlike Apollonios who innovates by ending the episode in a brutal, “Heraklean” fashion. It is true that the scarce evidence for the treatment of the episode before the Hellenistic period points to a lenient treatment of Amykos: thus Sophokles wrote a satyr play *Amykos*, of which little is known; Epicharmos wrote a comedy (frs. 6-7 Kaibel), in which Polydeukes bound his opponent to a tree; the story was also included in the work of Dei(?)ochos (*FGrHist* 471 F 1), although we cannot know what was its outcome. The episode appears in the iconographic tradition, which from 420 B.C. onwards persistently presents Amykos as bound, or in the process of being bound, to a rock by a stream (whether this was inspired by a literary version – Sophokles' *Amykos*, as suggested by Howe and repeated by Gantz 1996, 349, or was part of an earlier tradition we cannot be certain). The lighter ending of these earlier sources may be due to their comic character. In any case, Apollonios’ version of events, equally justified by its context, as Vian 1974, 134, points out, is the one that became canonical.

641 Phineus already appears in Hesiod's *Ehoiai* (fr. 138 M.-W.) as the grandson of Agenor (a tradition found also in Apollodoros 1.9.21; Pherekydes *FGrHist* 3 F 86; Antimachos fr. 59 Wyss; Asklepiades of Tragilos *FGrHist* 12 F 22). He is a son of Agenor in Hellanikos (*FGrHist* 4 F 95), or a son of Agenor's brother, Belos, a tradition recorded by Apollodoros (2.1.4) and Σ ad *Suppliantis* 318 as being found in Euripides (*TrGF* fr. 820 Nauck).

---
According to Apollodoros, of course, it is the help rendered by Phineus to the sons of Phrixos that caused Poseidon's anger: προκεκαλαγμένος φασιν αίτεν ...τινές δὲ ὁπο Ὄσειδώνος, ὅτι τοῖς Φρίξου παισὶ τῶν ἐκ Ἐκείνων εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα πλοῦν ἐμήνυσεν.\[62\] I accept that we should emend the fragment of the Megalai Ehoiai to have Phineus help the sons of Phrixos;\[63\] I find improbable the suggestion that Phrixos, on the back of the Golden Ram, would require Phineus' help to find his way. The suggestion, however, that Phineus was blinded for revealing the way to Greece to the sons of Phrixos is attractive, especially since it agrees with the tradition alluded to by Apollodoros in his list of the Argonauts, according to which Phrixos' sons, or, at least, Argos were already in Greece at the time of the preparations for the journey. Argos, who had already successfully attempted the journey once, would have been the perfect person to undertake the building of a ship suitable for such a perilous voyage.

In any case, Poseidon's angry reaction to the invasion of his domain is reminiscent of his measures against the Phaiakians (Od. 13. 125-87), and in fact belongs to the large group of stories about gods' retribution against those who - willingly or not - transgress boundaries. In the same group we should include the variant that Phineus was blinded by the gods\[64\] or by Zeus himself (thus Arg.2. 178-86), because, in Apollodoros' words, προέλεγε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ μέλλοντα.

\[62\] Iströs (FGrHist 324 F 67) had Helios blind Phineus at Aietes' instigation, because he had helped the sons of Phrixos with his prophesies. Additionally, Ps.-Oppian (Kyneg. 2. 615-628) notes that Helios punished Phineus for preferring divination to his sight by sending him the Harpyiai, while Asklepiades of Tragilos (FGrHist 12 F 31) mentions that Zeus, enraged by Phineus' treatment of his sons, offered him the choice of his life or his sight. His choice angered Helios, who sent him the Harpyiai.

\[63\] As was already suggested, based on the text of the Bibliotheca, already by Robert 1873, 82, who is followed by Schwartz 1960, 163, in an argument which makes a case for identifying the Megalai Ehoiai with the Ehoiai; see also the more cautious Vian 1974, 142.

\[64\] See Scarpi 1996, 477.
A brief look at the traditions about Phineus is enough to prove how multifaceted this figure is. One of the traditions recorded by Apollodoros concerning his loss of sight adds a further twist: Phineus is said to have been blinded by the Argonauts and Boreas, because he had previously blinded his own sons at the instigation of their stepmother. The story is related twice. A slightly more detailed version of the background to the story is given in 3.15.3: by his marriage to Kleopatra, daughter of Boreas, Phineus had two sons, whose names are recorded as Plexippos and Pandion. He later discarded his wife in favour of Idaia, daughter of Dardanos. She, in turn, falsely accused her stepsons of violence (attempted rape?), and convinced Phineus to blind them. When the Argonauts arrive, they punish Phineus with Boreas' assistance. The tradition in which Phineus is not aided, but rather punished, by the Argonauts goes back to the tragedians. We have scant information concerning Aischylos' Phineus, we know more about the treatment of the myth by Sophokles, but we still have problems establishing the number of the tragedies of this subject written by him, and the exact plot of each of them. Suffice it to say that the version recorded by Apollodoros has close similarities with the treatment of the story by Sophokles.

---

646 See also Diodoros (4. 43. 3-44. 4.), where the Argonauts arrive to find Phineus' sons imprisoned in a tomb and continually beaten, falsely accused by their stepmother of attempted rape. The Boreads free their nephews, Herakles kills Phineus and the Argonauts free Kleopatra from prison and the restore her sons to their rightful place. Diodoros also adds that some versions made Boreas blind Phineus (as in Apollodoros). In Orphic Argonautika 671-76 the Boreads save the blinded sons of Phineus from exposure to wild beasts and cure them, then blind Phineus as a punishment. Cf. too the version of Asklepiades quoted above, and the epigram (AP 3. 4) in which the sons kill their stepmother to the delight of their mother.
647 Cf. also Eum. 50-1, for a reference to the Harpyiai stealing Phineus' food.
648 See Gantz 1996, 351.
649 Sophokles wrote two plays called Phineus: one of them offers a previously unattested tale, according to which Phineus, persuaded by his slanderous second wife Idaia, blinds the two sons he had from his first marriage to Kleopatra, Boreas' daughter (TrGF IV fr. 704 Radt). The information that Phineus was blinded because he killed his sons, also attributed to Sophokles (TrGF IV fr. 705 Radt), must then come from another play with the same subject matter, perhaps
Indeed, the detail about Boreas' active part in exacting revenge for the treatment of his kin seems to have its provenance in tragedy: unlike Gantz, who improbably suggests that the version, which Apollodoros adopts, had Boreas sail with the Argonauts as part of the crew, I think that Boreas appeared in the course of the play whose plot Apollodoros summarised, perhaps after the first meeting of the Argonauts with Phineus, revealing the falsity of the accusations against his grandchildren and exacting his revenge from Phineus; otherwise, he could have been the deity who, in Euripidean fashion, arranged the encounter of the Argonauts with Phineus with a view to the latter's punishment.

In any case, Phineus is explicitly connected with the Argonautic expedition and the Harpyiai. His "association" with the winged creatures is already established in Hesiod (frs. 150-6 M.-W.). In the usual version of the myth, the Argonauts arrive at Salmydessos to find Phineus already blind and tormented by the Harpyiai: the Boreads, also winged, undertake the task of driving off the creatures, in a do ut des exchange for information concerning their journey. Apollodoros seems at this point to preserve the original purpose of the visit, a deliberate encounter with a figure with prophetic skills before the undertaking of an especially perilous expedition, or even before a katabasis to the underworld. The tradition is at this

the other Phineus? (cf. the version twice recorded by Apollodoros (1.9.21 and 3.15.3), according to which, Phineus is punished [κοκολώτης] by the Argonauts and Boreas for his treatment of his sons); a cure of someone's blindness by Asklepios was also part of the plot of one of the Phineus plays (fr. 710). In Ant. 96-87 the stepmother herself blinds her stepsons; cf. Σ ad loc., which attributes the story to Sophokles' Tympanistai, adding that the stepmother - Eithothea or Idaia - imprisons the blinded sons in a tomb (TrGF IV fr. 645 Radt). The same scholium also offers the strange story that, when Phineus put aside Kleopatra to marry Idaia, the daughter of Boreas blinded her own children in anger. Finally Aristotle (Poet. 16,4) refers to the Phineidae; this must have been a well-known play, but one of which nothing is known today.

650 On the similarities of the passing of the Symplegades with an entry to the other world see Beye 1982, 112-3.
point divided: other versions (including Apollonios) have the Boreads catch up with the Harpyiai while giving chase, but be prevented from killing them by a god (Iris in Apollonios, Hermes in the *Ehoiai*) on the understanding that they would cease tormenting Phineus. Others have the Boreads give a final solution to the problem by killing the Harpyiai.

Apollodoros preserves a unique version: according to their *moira*, the Harpyiai were fated to die in the hands of the Boreads, while the twins would die if they ever they failed to catch what they pursued. The mythographer goes on to say that, while the first Harpyia fell from exhaustion in the river Tigris in the Peloponnese (offering thus one of the few *aitia* of his account, and one which, ironically, is not taken from Apollonios), the second one reached the Strophades islands (traditionally associated with this pursuit), where she collapsed of exhaustion with her pursuer (γενομένη κατά τὴν ἡμέρα ὑπὸ κομικτοῦ πιπτει σῶν τῷ διώκοντι). Exactly what this means is unclear, but presumably the second Harpyia managed to outrun the Boread (leading to the death of both twins), but also died from exhaustion. This explanation is strengthened by the fact that elsewhere Apollodoros mentions that the Boreads died while pursuing the Harpyiai during the Argonautic expedition (3.15.2).

Apollodoros seems aware that his account, which contained the archaic elements of *moira* and the motif of a figure that could never be caught being pursued by a figure that always captured its quarry – a motif found in the Epic

---

651 Thus also in Hesiod' *Ehoiai* (frs. 150-6 M.-W.); Pherekydes (*FGrHist* 3 F29) and Antimachos (fr. 60 Wyss) essentially follow the version found in Apollonios (2. 273-300), and have the Harpyiai escape unscathed on the promise that they would stop tormenting Phineus. The *Naupaktia* (fr. 3 Bernabé) and Pherekydes (1. c.) had them go to Krete to recover.

652 Indeed, a passage in Philodemos (*De Pietate* p. 18 Gomperz) lists a number of versions in which the Harpyiai die at the hands of the Boreads: Ibykos (fr. 292 PMG), Aischyllos (*TrGF III* fr. 260 Radt, presumably part of the Aischylean *Phineus*) and Telestes (fr. 812 PMG).
Cycle in the story of the Teumessian fox and the dog of Kephalos (this is usually attributed to the *Epigonoi*, fr. 5 Bernabé, but could also belong to the *Thebais* or even the *Oidipodeia*), is not unique. Thus he offers the version recorded by Apollonios, according to which the Boreads and Harpyiai reach an agreement over the Strophades islands and escape unharmed. Apollonios is mentioned here by name, mainly because his version is not the preferred one; why the mythographer chose to depart from his account cannot be established without doubt – although my belief is that he found more impressive a version in which *moira* plays such a part and both sets of participants die – but the fact that he also refers to the version of Apollonios, offering a single variant and not a list of variants (as he does in all other instances in his account of the expedition when variants of a story are introduced), indicates that he is conscious of his debt to the poem.

For the next two episodes, the crossing of the Symplegades and the sojourn at the land of the Mariandynoi, Apollodoros follows Apollonios’ account. They provide an opportunity to view the mythographer at his best and his less good: in the episode of the Symplegades, Apollonios has Athena offer – literally – a helping hand to the struggling Argonauts. No reader of the *Argonautika* can ever forget

---

653 Thus Davies 1989, 30. In his edition of the epic cycle he prints the fragment as *fr. incert. loc. intra Cycl. 1*.

654 As for the tradition about the Symplegades, Kirke’s reference (*Od*. 12. 59-72) to the Planktai, rocks negotiated by the Argo, mentions no clashing rocks. Their danger lies in the terrible waves and blasts of fire. Kirke, however, mentions that doves are unable to pass through (probably providing the inspiration for Phineus’ instruction to the Argonauts to use doves), and that the Argonauts were helped by Hera. The first references to the Symplegades myth as we know it appear in Simonides (who calls them *synormades*, *fr*. 546 *PMG*) and Pindar (*P*. 4. 207-11), who gives them no name, but describes them as clashing rocks that came together at a speed faster than the wind; the Argonauts meet them on their way to Kolchis and have to pray for help to Poseidon. The first reference to the name Symplegades is in Euripides’ *Medea* (1-2). The name Kyaneai (used by Apollonios) is found already in Herodotos (4. 85). For the name Plegades, *cf*. *P. Oxy*. 2819, fr. 4. In extant versions, the story develops similarly to the version of Apollonios and Apollodoros: *cf*. Asklepiades of Tragilos (*FGH* 12 F2 and 31) and Hyginus *Fab*. 19. In Val. Fl. 4. 637-702, Athena and Hera hold one rock each to stop them from clashing; in *Orphic*
that scene. Yet the predominant version of events, already established in the *Odyssey* (12. 59-72), is that it was Hera who helped the Argonauts in their endeavour. And not only that: even Apollonios refers to this version, by having Hera claim that she herself helped the Argonauts (4. 786-88), in a passage that has perplexed many. Apollodoros follows the predominant tradition by having Hera help the heroes. He then reverts to Apollonios’ narrative to relate the deaths of Idmon and Tiphys and the latter’s replacement at the helm by Ankaios. At this point a minor discrepancy occurs with his list of the Argonauts some five paragraphs before. Idmon is never mentioned in the list, an omission that we could perhaps explain if we accepted that there was a lacuna in it and that Idmon’s name was among the four (?) that have dropped out. Ankaios, however, who, in Apollonios volunteers to be the helmsman, is not the son of Lykourgos who is mentioned in Apollodoros; no one would expect an Arkadian to take charge of sailing a ship. Apollonios’ Ankaios is the second Argonaut of this name participating in the expedition, and is appropriately a son of Poseidon. Apollodoros seems unaware of the discrepancy and records the story found in the *Argonautika* without alteration.

So, how faithful is Apollodoros to his sources? If we did not have the *Argonautica*, would we not have thought that Hera was the one who pushed the ship through the Symplegades, or that Apollonios recorded a story that put the blame for the Lemnian crime on the women (although we should take into account *Argonautika* 680-711, Athena helps the Argonauts at Hera’s instigation and the bird used is a heron. See also Theokritos 13. 21-4; Strabo 1. 2. 10, 3. 2. 12, 6. 1; Pliny *Nat. Hist.* 6. 32.

655 The Argonauts’ visit to the land of the Mariandynoi and the events surrounding it are also mentioned in *Orphic Argonautika* 717-32; Hyginus *Fab.* 14 and 18; Val. Fl. 4. 733-62, 5. 1-72. All of them follow Apollonios’ account (Val. Fl. makes the oak choose Erginos as helmsman). For the rest of the journey, there is a wealth of diverse traditions. It is beyond of the scope of this
the fact that, as we already noted, even with the text preserved many still think that that is the version put forward by the poet)? The answer, I think, has to do with the popularity of the version that Apollonios chose for his account. If it is not the better-established version Apollodoros does not include it in his account. He is aided in this by the episodic nature of the narrative, which allows him to take whole episodes from another source without creating major problems for his narrative. To this we should add the fact that he omits all elements that are not explicitly mythological (and thus the greater part of the second book remains unrecorded), creating a narrative that is faithful to the gist of the Argonautika, but not to its particulars.

study to record them all, as there is no reference to them in Apollodoro's. However, for a discussion of the sources used in Apollonios see Vian 1974, 156-175.
Conclusions

Although by necessity selective, our discussion of the first book of the *Bibliotheke* reaffirms Apollodoros' intentions as they were defined in the preface. The mythographer produces a concise and comprehensible guide to Greek myth, fixed for all time, and, for the most part, free of anything that could jeopardise its logic and coherence. Despite its brevity, this is a remarkable labour of synthesis and systematisation. The work's astonishing economy is certainly modelled upon the long genealogical tradition, established by the early epic poets and fifth-century prose mythographers and further broadened and refined by their erudite Hellenistic counterparts; however, the author's individual plan is also in evidence in the arrangement and presentation of his material. Through a sequence of genealogical data interspersed with the appropriate mythical accounts, Apollodoros brings together material from different and often contradictory sources. Notwithstanding its compilatory nature, the *Bibliotheke* is cohesive, and this is the result of its author's conscious effort. In the genealogical information only minor inconsistencies remain, which the plan of the work allows to pass undetected. The mythographer is in control of his material throughout, and manages to introduce each story not only in its correct genealogical position but also in its proper mythical place (e.g. the stories of Bellerophon and Hypsipyle). The catalogues included in his narrative not only function as a record, but also represent the tradition accurately and, despite minor discrepancies, are consistent with the subsequent account, even if they are obviously drawn from different versions. Following this pattern, Apollodoros produces a work
that crystallises the corpus of Greek myth in a quasi-canonical form, while at the same time it incorporates appealing variants and unique details otherwise lost to us.

The *Bibliotheke* is by no means a specialist study: written in simple, unartistic prose, the work aspires, as Lightfoot points out, to the opposite of the aim of works such as Parthenios' *Ἐρωτικά Ποιηματα*: the latter’s aim is to amplify curious and often obscure myths and to turn them into material suitable for poetry. In contrast, Apollodoros aims to turn the idiosyncratic literary material into mythical narratives suitable for a summary aimed at the general public. As we saw in Chapter Five, the comparison of Apollodoros' account of the Argonautic expedition with its main source, Apollonios' *Argonautika*, demonstrates this process, while providing valuable information about the reasoning and purpose of the *Bibliotheke*, and Apollodoros' ability as a compiler of different, sometimes contradicting material. In Apollodoros' account, all non-mythological information, e.g. references to aitia, and to geographical and ethnographical details, which the Alexandrian had incorporated into the framework of the journey in order to establish a sense of continuity between the mythical past and the rational present, are omitted. The mythographer avoids any reference to the present (or even to the historical past), trying to preserve a strictly mythological setting for his account. Even mythological details that are essential to the poem's development (such as the use of Herakles as a foil for Iason) are omitted from Apollodoros' narrative. Apollodoros records a summary of the "Argonautic myth",
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and not of Apollonios' *Argonautika*; therefore, not all the episodes of the poem have found their way into the mythographer's account.

The use of the *Argonautika* as the mythographer's main source for this section is easily explained when we consider that the episodes narrated in the *Argonautika* soon became the canonical version of the story, and for later authors the work defined the narrative of the expedition. For most of his narrative Apollodoros faithfully reproduces Apollonios' account. However, in a number of occasions, in which the poet innovates by putting forward an idiosyncratic version of events, the mythographer reverts to the more common, usually early, version. Thus, for example, the version of a child Apsyrtos slain by his own sister somewhere on the Phasis replaces the Apollonian version of an adult Apsyrtos killed by Iason, while Hera resumes her rightful place as the protector of the Argonauts when they negotiate the Symplegades. Thus Apollodoros reproduces a faithful account of the myth of the expedition, but not necessarily of the *Argonautika*. Consequently, caution is necessary when using Apollodoros for the recreation of lost sources, as it is possible that not all the details belong to the same account. On the whole, however, where Apollodoros and the *Argonautika* concur, he reproduces the poem clearly and accurately, providing us with a reliable summary (a conclusion confirmed by the comparison of Apollodoros with his other of his surviving sources). It becomes apparent that the position of the *Argonautika* at a late stage of mythological production meant that certain elements
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657 This of course explains why, in some cases, Apollodoros includes more than one version of a myth side by side without any attempt to reconcile them: the mythographer records all versions that had acquired a certain popularity, as in the case of the story of Meleagros, where both accounts of his death, the "Euripidean" and the "Homeric" one, are noted.
had to be changed to accommodate the earlier, well-established tradition, upon which, as the epigram found in Photios' copy observes, the *Bibliotheke* mainly draws.

Throughout the work, Apollodoros' predilection for early accounts is reaffirmed. Indeed, I have tried to show in Chapters Two and Three that the unique account of the succession-myth recorded at the beginning of the work is taken from a single, archaic source, with minor reworkings to agree with the prevailing tradition of the myth from the Hellenistic period onwards (i.e. the serpentine form of the Giants). The account preserves its exceptional archaic character, and offers a story unique in its simplicity and cohesion rendering it extremely useful for a mythographer. On the whole, although caution is needed since we are dealing with an otherwise unattested account, it has been established that the great number of recurrent themes which run through Apollodoros' whole account of the succession-myth cannot be the accidental product of a random concoction of different versions, but result from the conscious effort of a single author.

The value of Apollodoros' work lies precisely in the fact that it preserves early material, often otherwise lost. Had his original sources been saved, things would certainly have been different. But, as it is, its usefulness should not be underestimated. Our discussion has shown that our knowledge of Greek myth is vastly superior for its existence. Indeed, the fact that Apollodoros had no specifically literary aspirations, but was content with meticulously summarising mythical accounts with a high degree of accuracy, further adds to its quality.
However, from Robert onwards, there has been a tendency, especially among German scholars, to dismiss the *Bibliotheke* as a second-rate compilation which reproduces in abbreviated form handbooks from the Hellenistic period. The use of earlier handbooks by the mythographer for certain information cannot be disproved. However, I fail to understand why reliance on a handbook for certain information (for use e.g. in the catalogues, or for access to tragic plots) immediately bars its user from direct access to any original source. Indeed some of the arguments advanced by Robert, Söder and others, have been disproved by van der Valk, who shows that Apollodoros is usually directly dependent on his sources. Based on my discussion of both the succession-myth and the Argonautic expedition I too am inclined to believe that most of the material in the *Bibliotheke* ultimately goes back to original sources and retains its archaic flavour. The fact that Apollodoros is a late epitomator does not presuppose that he had only indirect access to early material. It is impossible to prove that Apollodoros did not read the original himself; indeed it would be rather uncharitable to rush to such a conclusion. In any case, I find this discussion rather futile: whoever is responsible for summarising these works, whether it was Apollodoros or previous mythographers whose works the author of the *Bibliotheke* found in mythographical handbooks and upon whom he relied heavily, the truth is that it has been proven, time and time again, that for the most part the *Bibliotheke* reproduces original works faithfully. Hence the question of who actually did the
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658 Thus Robert 1873, 49ff.; Bethe 1897, 17ff.; Schwartz in *RE* I2, 2875-2886; Wendel in *RE* XVI. 2, 1365-66; Söder 1939, passim.
659 Van der Valk 1958, passim.
660 As Huys 1997c, 347, asserts.
summarising seems hardly relevant. The fact remains that Apollodoros manages successfully to produce a representation of Greek myth of high quality, an indispensable source for students of Greek mythology, or as the epigram puts it, for those interested in learning πάνθ' ὅσα κόσμος ἔχει.
Abbreviations

The following abbreviations have been used throughout:


**OF ... Kern** Kern O., *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, Berlin 1922.


**PMGF** Davies M., *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*,


Bibliography


Beaumont R. L., “Greek Influence in the Adriatic Sea Before the Fourth century B. C.”, *JHS* 56 (1936), 159-204.


Boardman J., “Pan” in *LIMC* VIII (Suppl.) 1, 923-941 and 2, 612-635, Zurich and Düsseldorf 1997.


Dindorf L. (with Ducang C.), Zonaras Io.: Epitome Historiarum, Leibzig 1868-1875.


Dowden K., "Approaching women through myth", in Hawley and Levick 1995, 44-57.


Edmunds L., Approaches to Greek Myth, Baltimore 1990.


Fontenrose J., “Typhon among the Arimoi”, in Wallach (ed.) 1966, 64-82.


Graham A. J., “Patterns of Early Greek Colonisation”, *JHS* 91 (1971), 35-47.


Green P., “These fragments have I shored against my ruins’: Apollonios Rhodios and the Social Revalidation of Myth for a New Age”, in Cartledge, Garnsey, and Gruen 1997, 35-71. [1997b]


Hemberg B., *Die Kabiren*, Uppsala 1950.

Henrichs A., "Philodemos *De pietate* als mythographische Quelle", *Chronache Ercolanesi* 6 (1976), 5-38.


Horsfall N. M., “From History to Legend: M. Manlius and the Geese” in Bremmer and Horsfall 1987, 63-75.


[1997b]


Κακρίδης Ι. Θ., (επ.), Ελληνική Μυθολογία, t. 1-5, Αθήνα 1986.


Kranz W., “Typhon und Seth”, *Hermes* 75 (1940), 335.


Kroll W., Mittelhaus K., “Titans”, *RE* VI. A2 (1937), col. 1491-1508.


Lloyd-Jones H., review of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part 27 (Edited by E. G. Turner, John Rae, L. Koenen and Maria Fernandez Pomar) in Gnomon 35 (1963), 433-455.


Orth F., “Jagd” *RE* IX.1 (1914), col. 558-604.


Parlama L., "Staphylos", in *LIMC* VII 1, 807-8, 2, 575-6, Zurich/ Munich 1994.


Robert C., *De Apollodori Bibliotheca*, Berlin 1873.


Scott Littleton C., "The 'Kingship in Heaven' Theme", in Puhvel (ed.) 1970, 83-121.


Seippel G., Der Typhonmythos, Greifswald 1939.


Van der Valk M., "On Apollodori Bibliothecae", *REG* 71 (1958), 100-68.


Van Dijk J., "Existe-t-il un “Poème de la Création” sumérien?" in Eichler (ed.) 1976, 125-34.


