

3. Armenidas

SALVATORE TUFANO – Sapienza Università di Roma, Roma
 salvotufano@gmail.com

3.1. Armenidas F 1

Previous editions: *BNJ* 378 F 1; *EGM* I F 1; *FGrHist* 378 F 1 (Schol. Ap. Rhod. I 551a [p. 81 Wendel]).

ἔργον Ἀθηναίης Ἴτωνίδος] Ἴτωνίας Ἀθηνᾶς ἐστὶν ἱερόν ἐν Κορωνεαίᾳ τῆς Βοιωτίας· ὁ μὲντοι Ἀπολλώνιος οὐκ ἂν λέγοι τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν ἐπὶ κατασκευῇ τῆς Ἀργοῦς ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν Κορωνεαίᾳ κλήσεως, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀπὸ Θεσσαλικῆς Ἴτωνίας, περὶ ἧς Ἑκαταῖος μὲν ἐν τῇ ἁ τῶν Ἱστοριῶν λέγει. Ἀρμενίδας δὲ ἐν τοῖς Θηβαϊκοῖς Ἀμφικτύονος υἱὸν Ἴτωνον ἐν Θεσσαλίᾳ γεννηθῆναι, ἀφ’ οὗ Ἴτων πόλις καὶ Ἴτωνίς Ἀθηνᾶ. μέμνηται καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ἐν τῷ ἁ τῶν Κορίννης Ὑπομνημάτων.

5-6 ἀφ’ οὗ Ἴτων... μέμνηται P *om.* L 7-8 ἁ τῶν Κορίννης L ἁ Καρικῶν P

“Work of Itonis Athena.] The sanctuary of Itonian Athena is in Koroneia, in Boiotia. However, Apollonius must not be referring to the Athena associated with the epiclesis of Koroneia, during the construction of the (ship) Argo; this Athena must rather be associated with the Itonian goddess of Thessaly: Hekataios speaks about her, in the first book of his *Histories*. Armenidas, then, says in his *Theban Histories* that Itonos, Amphiktyon’s son, was born in Thessaly, and that the city Iton, and Itonis Athena, were named after him. This is also recalled by Alexander, in the first book of his *Commentary on Corinna*” (tr. S. Tufano).

3.1.1. Textual Transmission and Context

The scholium concerns the epithet Ἴτωνίς of Athena, who helped build the ship Argo used by the Argonauts.⁴⁴³ A learned tradition assumes that the reader falsely imagines the Itonian Athena worshipped in Koroneia, whereas here, according to the scholium, Apollonius refers to the Athena worshipped in Iton, in the Achaia Phthiotis (in Southern Thessaly, not far from Iolcos).⁴⁴⁴ The scholium then adds three sources (Hekataios, Armenidas, and Alexander) and lists them in an apparently chronological order: these authors dealt with these two different Itonian Athenas.⁴⁴⁵ The scholiast is particularly careful when he quotes his sources, because he always mentions the number of the book and the title.

Hekataios probably treated the cult of Athena in the first book of his *Histories* (BNJ 1 F 2), but we cannot be sure whether Athena was also instrumental in this case for the building of the ship Argo.⁴⁴⁶ The third source, Alexander Polyhistor (BNJ 273 F 97), probably agreed with Armenidas on the parents of Itonos, in his *Commentary on Korinna*, since the conjunction καί immediately follows this piece of information.⁴⁴⁷ Nonetheless, the fact that Alexander mentioned Itonos does not necessarily imply that Korinna also did it in her

443 On the construction of the ship, see Ap. Rhod. 1.18–9.721.768. For other formal variants of this epithet, cp. *ThGL* IV 723 CD–724 A and Burzacchini 1996: 87 n.1. The toponym and the epiclesis do not have a Greek etymology (Fowler 2013: 68), even if the personal noun Ἴτων (*i-to*) occurs in Mycenaean Greek (Bearzot 1982: 43 n.1, 44 n.6; see *ibid.* 47–8 on the Athena who was involved in this expedition).

444 Located in the valley formed by the Kuralios/Kuarios, a tributary of the Penaeus, Iton was one of the oldest cities in the Thessalios (Hom. *Il.* 2.696; Str. 9.5.14.435; Paus. 10.1.10; on the sanctuary, see Schachter 1981: 119 n.4; Bearzot 1982: 43–4 n.4; Kramolisch 1998; Zizza 2006: 122; Fowler 2013: 64 n.245). The exact collocation in Thessaly is disputed, however, and an identification of the Thessalian sanctuary with Philia, as distinguished by the site in the Achaia Phthiotis, was recently suggested by Mili 2014: 230. There probably was more than an Itonion in Thessaly: Graninger 2011: 50–1.

445 Apart from these Athenas worshipped in Koroneia and Iton, there were other Itonian Athenas in Greece, and they were often linked to the movements of the Thessalians. On these other Itonian Athenas, cp. Nilsson 1906: 89 and Fowler 2013: 67 n.257. There might be an association with the presence of a group of Thessalians in Amorgos (*IG* 12.7,22–3.33–6; see Lagos 2009 on this attestation): cp. Moretti 1962: 100; Roesch 1982b: 220 and n.74; Kowalzig 2007: 362 n.72.

446 Hekataios dealt with the Argonauts (BNJ 1 FF 17–8), but we cannot be sure, on the basis of this fragment, that it belongs to the same part of the work.

447 See Burzacchini 1996: 88–9, against the previous thesis that it was Alexander Polyhistor, and that this author did not comment on Korinna. On the textual transmission of this fragment, see Burzacchini 1996. The verb μυνήσκω, in this diathesis, means “mention, quote” (*LSJ s.v. B*), from the Archaic Age. Therefore, it cannot be misunderstood as implying that Korinna referred to Itonos with the alternative name of Alexander (Larson 2007: 24–5; cp. Lachenaud 2010: 82: “Alexandre, *Hypomnemata* consacrés à Corinne, livre I, en fait aussi mention”).

work: our same scholium shows how a character (here, for instance, Amphiktyon) may be present in the commentary of the text of an author, Apollonius, who does not name it.⁴⁴⁸

This fragment is the only one that gives us a title for Armenidas' work, *Theban Histories* (Θηβαϊκά), and it is therefore puzzling that we immediately read a detail which concerns not Thebes, but another city, Koroneia. A possible link between this material and the ancient history of Thebes may be found if we associate this fragment with the other two (FF 3 and 7) where “the connection with Thebes is not immediately apparent” (Schachter 2011a *ad BNJ* 378 F 3). According to Schachter, Armenidas drew on the foundation myth of the Theban sanctuary of Dionysos Lysios, which was a thanksgiving, by some Theban prisoners, who escaped from the Thracians and freed themselves. The flight happened in a place which Herakleides Pontikos (F 143 Schütrumpf) identified as Lebadeia, although Pausanias claims it was in Haliartos (9.16.6). As far as the place where these Thebans were captured, two later sources connect the event with the celebration of a rite for Itonian Athena, not far from Lake Kopais, or else directly in Koroneia.⁴⁴⁹ According to Schachter (2011a), then, the fragment came from the description of the sanctuary of Dionysos Lysios, since Armenidas' work, in general, consisted of a study of Theban monuments.⁴⁵⁰

Such a scenario forces us to think, however, that only a part of Armenidas' work was still circulating in the Hellenistic period, the one on the topography of the city, and that even this was fragmentary. A further problem in our appreciation of the fragment is raised by the possibility that this information came to the scholiast on Apollonius only from Alexander's commentary.⁴⁵¹ A more prudent option is to see Armenidas' Θηβαϊκά as

448 Korinna treated, instead, or referred to the sanctuary of Koroneia, on the basis of F 667 *PMG*, where she mentions the “rash shield of Athena” (Olivieri 2010–1: 87). On the limits of these ascriptions, cp. Fowler 2017: 160: “The story may be ‘in’ Pherekydes only in the sense that he treated the subject; Pherekydes' details might have been completely different.”

449 Not far from Lake Kopais: Polyaeus, *Strat.* 7.43 (here the Boiotians, happy for the truce, sacrifice τῆ Ἀθηνᾶ τῆ Ἰτωνίᾳ). In Koroneia: Zen. 4.37, Θρακία παρεύσις. However, the indication of the place, περὶ Κορώνειαν, is not necessarily cogent for the placement of the event in the sanctuary; the syntagm is absent in part of the tradition, namely in the ms. Par. 3070.

450 Schachter (1981: 119 n.1) previously mentioned the “Thracian ruse”, arguing for a different thesis: “The story of the “Thracian Ruse” [...] might be connected with an early stage of the sanctuary's history, but any attempt to try to pin it down would be fruitless.”

451 According to Slater (2008; cp. Berman 2013: 11), when there is a sequence of two authors in a scholium, if the second author is preceded by the conjunction καί, the scholiast may actually be referring to, or have just read, this second

similar to Pausanias' ninth book, a composition where Thebes is the fulcrum of a narrative which can open itself, via the gates, and expand to other Boiotian towns (if with less details).⁴⁵² Itonos, for example, may also be quoted as Boiotos' father, and it is extremely unlikely that a figure like Boiotos was absent in a study of Theban history. The connection with Koroneia, therefore, is not mandatory, when we limit the extent of the fragment to the genealogy of Itonos.⁴⁵³

3.1.2. Itonos and the Hellenic Side of Boiotia

The sanctuary of Athena Itonia in Koroneia was a very popular center in Boiotia, already in the Archaic period.⁴⁵⁴ It hosted horse tournaments and, likely, military dances,⁴⁵⁵ because

author. In our case, Alexander would be the source both of Armenidas and of Hekataios. In the absence of further witnesses on the direct transmission of Armenidas, this hypothesis is likely and in line with the other occurrences of Armenidas in the scholia of Apollonius (F 2).

452 For this reading of the Boiotian book, cp. Musti 1988b; Pretzler 2007: 9; Gartland 2016b: 85. I do not agree with Kühn 2014a: 232, that "Boiotia is depicted as an extension or annex of Thebes": in fact, the organization of the material might also depend on the availability of sources for the other Boiotian places.

453 Diod. Sic. 4.67.7; Paus. 9.1.1. In his *Περί Θηβῶν*, Lykos of Thebes (BNJ 380 F 2) might share the genealogy Amphiktyon > Itonos > Boiotos, if we accept Schmidt's correction of κατὰ Λύκων for the transmitted κατ'αὐτόν in Stephanus' lemma Βοιωτία (β 116). However, Atenstädt (1922: 26), after Maas, suggests that, behind the pronoun αὐτόν in the transmitted text of the lemma, there may be a hint of Alexander Polyhistor. Atenstädt apparently ignored the fragment by Armenidas and the existence of a *Commentary on Korinna*; the scholar was convinced of Alexander's originality, in his genealogy Itonos > Boiotos, because he was aware that Korinna saw Poseidon as Boiotos' father (F 658 PMG, from Korinna's *Boiotos*). In any case, the poetess did not assume a kinship between Itonos and Boiotos, as is sometimes believed (Larson 2007: 25). The commentary on the genealogy of Boiotos, however, may be where scholars of their texts, like Alexander, could mention other hypotheses, which also included Itonos. On Boiotos, see *supra* 2.2.2 *ad* ἡ Βοιωτία.

454 On the sanctuary, see Schachter 1981: 117–27, Kühn 2006: 286–7; Larson 2007: 133–6; Manieri 2009: 96–7; Olivieri 2010–1. The exact position is debated: some scholars assume that the Itonion was in Metamorphosis, for the high number of proxeny decrees, which generally date to the Hellenistic period (Pritchett 1969: 85–8; Fossey 1988: 330–1; Deacy 1995: 92; Olivieri 2010–1: 81 n.1); others suggest an area to the north of the acropolis of Koroneia, where a building of the middle sixth century BCE, and coterminous pottery, have been excavated (Roesch 1982b: 221; Schachter 1981: 119). See an updated overview of this debate in Larson 2007: 136 n.33 and Moggi – Osanna 2012: 408–9.

455 Horse tournaments: *IG* 7.3087; *SEG* III 354 and 355. There were not, probably, musical contests, but more probably, following the witness of a hyporchema by Bacchylides (F 15 PMG), performances resembling "un canto culturale eseguito anche con movimenti orchestrici per accompagnare la processione diretta al santuario" (Olivieri 2010–1: 86).

the military character of the goddess was particularly relevant here.⁴⁵⁶ The representations of Athena found on local vases confirm these traits and concur with the seeming fame of the sanctuary outside the region.⁴⁵⁷ The same impression results from a consideration of the relevant literary sources.⁴⁵⁸

In Strabo's reconstruction, the cult came to Boiotia from Thessaly, when the Boiotians migrated to the region after the Trojan War.⁴⁵⁹ This hypothesis is important, because it is

456 Already from the middle of the sixth century BCE, however, there was a further deity worshipped on the spot, a snake, which is represented on an interesting *lekane* at the British Museum (BM B 80; Ure 1929: 167–71). Here there is a procession for Athena: the representation of a crow (Gk. κορώνη) on this *lekane* was considered a reference to the city of Koroneia (Ure recalled Paus. 4.34.4, on the foundation of Korone in Messenia, where a statue of Athena reproduced the bird; sometimes, however, the bird is understood as a raven, Gk. κόραξ; cp. Schmidt 2002: 51–62). As stated by Schachter (1981: 119–21), the second deity was later identified, during the fifth century, with Zeus, namely a chthonian Zeus (Bearzot 1982: 51). In the Hellenistic period, this Zeus was seen as Zeus Karaios, thus forming a couple with Athena, which is attested elsewhere in Boiotia (the picture is complicated, nevertheless, by the worship of Ares in the same sanctuary: Olivieri 2010–1: 83–4; it seems that, in a divine couple with Zeus, Athena Itonia was worshipped also on Amorgos: Lagos 2009: 83). The military character of Athena is also present in the Thessalian manifestation (Bearzot 1982: 44–5 and nn.; Olivieri 2010–1: 82–3; the Thessalian Zeus Laphystios may be a counterpart of the Boiotian Karaios, but he did not form a couple with Athena, as in Koroneia: Schachter 1994b: 73–5). The *lekane* of the British Museum was first associated with Athena Itonia by Harrison (1894) and Ure (1929), on three grounds, in the absence of indications on its findspot: the Boiotian fabric, the military character of the goddess on the vase, and the resemblance of the Athena of the *lekane* with representations of the Thessalian Athena Itonia on coins of the second century BCE. Further studies (Scheffer 1993; Paleothodoros 2016) link the *lekane* to the “Silhouette group”, whose workshop is located in the area of Koroneia.

457 The first literary source on the cult is, in fact, a fragment by Alkaios (F 325,2 V.: cp. Page 1959: 268–9 and Olivieri 2010–1: 81): Fowler 2013: 65: “[T]his already is pan-Hellenic fame.”

458 We can remember, here, two vases found close to Koroneia: a *lekythos* of the middle of the sixth century BCE (Musée du Louvre, CA 3329), where a lyre player is depicted next to two dancers; and a *skyphos*, with athletes and comasts on one register (Maffret 1975: 433). The figures in procession on the *lekane* at the British Museum (BM B 80: see n.459) carry garlands, and some of them play flutes, according to the interpretation of some scholars (Larson 2007: 135; further references to the rich figurative scenario on the spot in Schachter 1981: 122 nn. 5–8 and Ure 1929; Ure 1935). All this supports the view that in the Archaic and Classical period there could be military dances in the context of rites in Koroneia, whereas the Hellenistic *Pamboiotia* did not systematically include musical contests (Manieri 2009: 140; for a partial exception in the middle second century BCE, see Schachter – Slater 2007). The literary sources are considered by Kowalzig (2007: 373–4), who mentions two fragments of *hyporchemata* by Bacchylides (FF 15 and 15a PMG; see already Schachter 1981: 123 on their pertinence to a “musical competition”), and two other fragments of a *partheneion* composed by Pindar for the Theban Daphnephoria (FF 94 a–c S. – M., not an *epinikion*, as in Larson 2007: 134 n.23; on the Daphnephoria and their importance for reconstructing the Thessalian origins of the Boiotians, see Schachter 2000; Kowalzig 2007: 379–82).

459 Str. 9.2.29.411: κατελάβοντο δ' αὐτὴν ἐπανιόντες ἐκ τῆς Θετταλικῆς Ἄρνης οἱ Βοιωτοὶ μετὰ τὰ Τρωϊκά, ὅτεπερ καὶ τὸν Ὀρχομενὸν ἔσχον (“It [Koroneia] was conquered by the Boiotians, after they came back from Thessalian Arne, after the Trojan Wars, when they also took Orchomenos”, tr. S. Tufano).

in line with other meaningful cultural isoglosses between the two regions, like the common names of certain months.⁴⁶⁰ Modern scholarship tends to accept this scenario,⁴⁶¹ which is of the utmost interest, because the story of the migration became part of the national story of Boiotia from an early stage (Kühr 2014). The Itonia would later become a pivotal knot of the political geography of Hellenistic Boiotia, when it hosted the federal festivals of the *Pamboiotia*⁴⁶² and reached a regional role, as a religious pole, which could be defined as “national” in contemporary terms.⁴⁶³

Armenidas and Pausanias (9.34.1) explain the link with Thessaly through Itonos, father of Boiotos. In both the sources, moreover, he is Amphiktyon’s child. Only Armenidas, however, explicitly asserts that Itonos was born in Thessaly; the resulting genealogy implies that Thessaly dominated both Boiotia between the seventh and the sixth centuries BCE,⁴⁶⁴ and the amphiktyony of Anthela. The Boiotians belonged to this Archaic amphiktyony, which had as its eponymous figure Amphiktyon, Itonos’ father. Amphiktyon’s parents, Deukalion and Pyrrha, were a good link for the Boiotians to officially associate themselves with the Aiolians and, through Hellen, with the Hellenic community as a whole.⁴⁶⁵ Armenidas’ quick information may then be a limited insight,

460 Cp. Trümper 1997: 246; Fowler 2013: 68; see *infra* (spec. 4.4.1) on the month *Homoloios* and 6.1.3. for an assessment of the local discourse on the relationship between Boiotia and Thessaly.

461 On Thessalian influences in Boiotia, see Moretti 1962: 100; Schachter 1981: 119; Bearzot 1982; Roesch 1982b: 220–4; Schmidt 2002: 57; Kühr 2006: 264–9.

462 Cp. e.g. Pol. 4.3.5, as the first witness of this *panegyris*. On the history of the *Pamboiotia*, see Olivieri 2010–1 and Tufano i.p. ii.

463 The first document that confirms regional importance in the Hellenistic period is a treaty among the Boiotians, the Aitolians, and the Phokians, dating to the end of the fourth century BCE (*IG IX² 1,170*, probably 301 BCE: cp. Schachter 1981: 123.127 n.2: “[T]he sanctuary was regarded as the sacred heart of Boiotia”; cp. Roesch 1982b: 39–41 [on the month *Pamboiotos*] and 357–9 [on the cult]; Larson 2007: 135–6; Olivieri 2010–1). For the previous period, the mentioned regional (and transregional) fame of the sanctuary does not necessarily imply a political role: the only indirect witness to this may be a verse by Pindar (*Ol.* 7.84) on the ἀγῶνες [...] ἔθνομοι Βοιωτίων. The scholiasts wonder what these contests were, but no definite answer was ever reached (Giannini in Gentili *et al.* 2013: 499); however, “non si può escludere un riferimento ai *Pamboiotia*, [...] occasione di incontro dei Beoti tutti, dal momento che essi, e non le singole *poleis*, sono espressamente rievocati attraverso l’etnico Βοιωτίων” (Olivieri 2010–1: 85).

464 See Fowler 2013: 67; 187.

465 On Amphyktion, who could also be Deukalion’s uncle, see Hdt. 7.200 with Vannicelli 2017 *ad loc.*; Wagner 1894; Graf 1996; Graninger 2011: 48. Itonos is Amphiktyon’s son also in Paus. 5.1.4, which could mean, in Maddoli’s (2007: 185) opinion, an attempt by the Delphic amphiktyony to join the Elean community. The political implications of this kinship of the Boiotians with Hellen were already recognized by Jacoby 1955a: 164, in his commentary on *FGrHist* 380 F 2 (a fragment by Lykos of Thebes, which may imply a genealogy “*in maiorem gloriam* Thebens”). Lykos also considers

linked to a specific Boiotian place, where we can see how local Boiotian traditions resulted in vaster conclusions. To an ethnos, thinking about such a relevant genealogical tree is of immediate momentum, and the sixth century BCE, when the tree of Hellen was more and more influential in the definition of ethnic boundaries, is a likely scenario for such a definition (probably in the years after the First Sacred War).⁴⁶⁶

Itonos might have first given his name to the Thessalian city and to its relative sanctuary, before moving south and justifying, with this movement, the existence of an Athena Itonis in Koroneia. Armenidas probably differed from Strabo (9.2.29.411) because he explicitly claimed the priority of the Itonian sites in the North, which could explain the relevance of the detail ἐν Θεσσαλίᾳ.⁴⁶⁷ Two passages in Pausanias' ninth book confirm the spread of the tradition, whereby Itonos was Boiotos' father (9.1.1; 34.1). This idea was probably accepted by another local historian of Boiotia, Lykos of Thebes (*BNJ* 380 F 2).

It is therefore remarkable to observe how the Boiotians accepted a genealogy, which included in an original way genuinely local information: the movement of the Boiotians from Thessaly. This local tradition was simultaneously used to convey a connection to the history of central Greece (ties with Thessaly and with the Amphiktion of Anthela),⁴⁶⁸ and to the genealogy of Hellen, which may have farther implications, even in a work explicitly centered on the local perspective.⁴⁶⁹ Armenidas' *Theban History* shows how, from within, another reflection on the Boiotian ethnogenesis may coincide with the belief that they had

Amphiktyon as Deukalion's son (*BNJ* 380 FF 2 and 4); despite the absence of Itonos, then, Amphiktyon could prove instrumental to link the Boiotians to Hellen, since Boiotos can be Aiolos' son (Fowler 2013: 190; cp. Paus. 10.8.4, on the Boiotians as Aioliens).

466 Cp. Fowler 1998. I am aware of the vexed issue of the historicity of this event, as shown, for example, by the thorough analysis by Franchi (2016: 199-230) and by the overview by Mari (2014: 116-9). These document how the likely creation of the tradition in the fourth century BCE does not rule out the stratigraphic feature of the history and a likely connection with drastic changes in the Delphic area at the beginning of the sixth century BCE. At the same time, I refer here to the "First Sacred War" as a period (say: early sixth century), when it is legitimate to assume a strong impact and Panhellenic influence of the genealogical tree around Hellen (on ethnicity and federalisms, in particular, see the overview by Hall 2015).

467 Visser 1998: "Als eponymer Heros wird I[tonos] allerdings nur im Zusammenhang mit der boiot[ischen] Siedlung erwähnt."

468 According to Mackil (2014: 51-2), the presence of the migration motif in Armenidas and in Thucydides confirms the formation of a strong ethnicity in Boiotia, only in the second half of the fifth century BCE.

469 Armenidas was therefore "frei auch von übertriebenem lokalpatriotismus" (Jacoby 1955a: 158).

not been autochthonous: once their migration became part of Boiotian self-description, the Boiotians drew all the necessary conclusions to get the best out of this tradition.

3.2. Armenidas F 2

Previous editions: *BNJ* 378 F 2; *EGM I* F **2; *FGrHist* 378 F 2 (Schol. Ap. Rhod. I 740–1a [p. 56 Wendel]).

ὅτι δὲ ἠκολούθησαν τῆι Ἀμφίονος λύραι οἱ λίθοι αὐτόματοι, ἱστορεῖ καὶ Ἀρμενίδας ἐν ᾧ. τὴν δὲ λύραν δοθῆναι Ἀμφίονι ὑπὸ Μουσῶν φησι, Διοσκορίδης δὲ ὑπὸ Ἀπόλλωνος· καὶ Φερεκύδης δὲ ἐν τῆι ἰ ἱστορεῖ ὑπὸ Μουσῶν

2 Ἀντιμενίδας *codd.*

“Armenidas, too, narrates in his first book that the stones spontaneously followed Amphion’s lyre. He says that the lyre had been given to Amphion by the Muses, whereas Dioscorides says it was from Apollo; Pherekydes, too, in the tenth book, narrates (that it was given) by the Muses” (tr. S. Tufano).

3.2.1. Textual Transmission and Context

The restitution of the name of Armenidas in this scholium is based on the content and on another occurrence of his name in the *corpus* of the scholia on Apollonius Rhodius.⁴⁷⁰ The restitution must be kept, because we indirectly know that none of the people called

470 Fiorillo 1801: 17. Cp. Armenidas’ F 1 and 2.2.1.

Antimenidas wrote on the subject of the present fragment.⁴⁷¹ The name “Armenidas” appears here in a list of sources, as in the other fragment from these scholia (F 1). If we understood the order of the names as being in a chronologically decreasing order (from the most recent author, to the most ancient one), Armenidas would even predate Pherekydes. However, only Pherekydes can be dated with an acceptable degree of probability to sometime around the middle of the fifth century BCE. The other name, Διοσκορίδης, has been identified with a pupil of Isocrates who lived between the fourth and third centuries BCE.⁴⁷² Consequently, this material may very well come from an early, Hellenistic commentary where the names were associated, and we cannot use the scholium as evidence to date Armenidas.⁴⁷³

The commented verse belongs to an *ekphrasis* on the cloak given to Jason by Athena (Ap. Rhod. 1.763–7). This cloak showed a representation of the foundation myth of Thebes, through the joint act of the twins, Amphion and Zethos (735–41), Antiope’s children. They appear here, just as in the first literary witness on them (Hom. *Od.* 11.260–5), both as founders (Ap. Rhod. 1.737–8: βάλλοντο δομαίους / ιέμενοι) and as builders of the walls (736: ἀπύργωτος γ’ἔτι Θήβη). This double characterization draws on an archaic view, which understands the foundation of a city as the moment when a space is surrounded by fences and defined by fortifications.⁴⁷⁴

The perspective adopted by Apollonius Rhodius distinguishes the two twins according to a trend which surfaces in our sources at the end of the fifth century BCE. The first known occurrence of the differentiation is in the *Antiope* of Euripides, performed at the beginning

471 We know two Antimenidas, (1) the brother of the poet Alkaios, a mercenary who lived between the seventh and the sixth century BCE (*LGPN* V 1 *s.v.*; Alc. F 350 V.), and (2) a Spartan ambassador, active around 420 BCE (*LGPN* III A; Thuc. 5.42.1).

472 Dioscorides, *BNJ* 594 F 12. It is, however, difficult to identify a specific work among the works ascribed to Dioscorides. The name Dioscorides is very frequent in the literary sources: it is almost impossible to infer either the production or the identity of the historiographical fragments, which have been assigned to a Dioscorides (Jacoby 1955a: 629–30). As a mere hypothesis, this material may appear in a work on *Nomima*, which is actually attested among the many titles written by a Dioscorides (*BNJ* 594 F 5; on its characteristics, see still Jacoby 1955a: 632).

473 *Contra* Hurst 2000: 65, who considers Armenidas a Hellenistic author on the basis of this fragment, and Berlinzani 2004: 56, who assumes that Armenidas and Pherekydes were contemporary. See the commentary on Armenidas’ F 3 (3.3.3) and the suggested date at 1.3.2.

474 Cp. Hom. *Od.* 11.263–4: οἱ πρῶτοι Θήβης ἔδος ἔκτισαν ἑπταπύλοιο, / πύργωσάν τε [ε] [...]; see Kühn 2006: 120 and Prandi 2011: 242–4. Double characterization: Kühn 2006: 119.

of the Dekeleian War (412/407 BCE).⁴⁷⁵ This drama proved influential, judging from the popularity of the traits of the single characters in the later sources, which seem to draw on Euripides.⁴⁷⁶ Amphion was considered a “second Orpheus”,⁴⁷⁷ as a civilizing hero prone to music, and as a possessor of the lyre, the instrument which symbolizes his intellectual aura. Zethos, conversely, did not possess the magical arts of his brother, and usually had to do the hard work: he carries the stones and the masonry from which Thebes was constructed.⁴⁷⁸

The relationship between the foundation myth of Amphion and Zethos and the one of Kadmos has been the subject of a long debate. Even if this fragment of Armenidas does not directly address the concurrent myth, the presence of this detail on Amphion, in the first book of a work on Thebes, is in line with the chronological order of the material in a history of Thebes. We cannot infer from these few words whether Armenidas adhered –if he ever needed to– to a specific order between the two myths.⁴⁷⁹ In Homer (*Od.* 11.263), Amphion and Zethos are the first inhabitants of the city, with a stress on this precedence –

475 Eur. *TrGF* 179–227. The date of the *Antiope* is a debated issue: cp. Jouan – van Looy 1998: 220–1 (on the tragedy in general, see Kambitsis 1972 and Collard – Cropp 2008: 170–5). A potential previous witness to such a differentiation of the twins may be found in a fragment of Panyassis of Halicarnassos (*ca.* 500–450 BCE), but the authorship is uncertain (F dub. °32 Bernabè: see Olivieri 2011: 26).

476 On the reception of the *Antiope*, see Jouan – van Looy 1998: 214 and Berlinzani 2004: 58. Euripides interacted with the coeval discussion on the divergence between a contemplative and an active life: his reading of the myth of Amphion and Zethos inspired Plato, in a passage of the *Gorgias* (41.485E), which is commonly used to reconstruct the fragmentary verses of the *Antiope* (on the relationship between the philosophical climate and the Boiotian twins, see Dodds 1959: 277–9; Nightingale 1992; Georgiadou 1995; Berlinzani 2004: 61–2). According to Moleti 2011: 330, the *Antiope* of Euboulos (middle of the fourth century BCE) tried to shed new light on this contraposition, because the twins Amphion and Zethos represented Epameinondas and Pelopidas. A consequence of this specific reading is the intellectual superiority of Athens, through Amphion, in contrast with Zethos, as a symbol of the mundane world of Thebes (cp. *infra* n. 477).

477 Kühr 2006: 120. Ap. Rhod. I 26–31; Merriam 1993: 75. The comparison with Orpheus is already in Paus. 6.20.18.

478 Amphion is defined μουσικώτατον in a fragment (F 10 Hunter) of the *Antiope* of Euboulos. According to a reprise (Moleti 2011) of a previous reading (Edmonds 1959: 86–8), this definition echoed the political relationship between Attica and Boiotia in the first half of the fourth century BCE (Amphion, as a Pythagorean philosopher, alluded to the Pythagoreans, active in Thebes at the time, and, therefore, to Epameinondas: Moleti 2011: 333). Compelling as this interpretation might appear, it seems to underestimate doubts concerning the real presence of Pythagoreans in Thebes at the time, and the serious issues concerning the appreciation of the sources on the Pythagorean background of Epameinondas: his alleged teacher, Lysis of Tarentum, might not have been as influential, in his circle, as it would appear from a first reading of the witnesses. The actual “pythagoreanism” of Epameinondas contrasts with the little we know on this philosophical school in this period. The “myth” of Pythagorean Thebes, well summed up by the article of Lévêque – Vidal-Naquet (1960), has been seriously scrutinized, among others, by Buckler (1993).

479 See *infra* and 6.1.2 for the frequency of foundation myths in our fragments of local Boiotian historiography.

πρῶτοι-, which may imply a contraposition with later occupations of Theban soil.⁴⁸⁰ Only later, in the fifth century, do we detect a clearer attempt at systematization, with Pherekydes (*BNJ* 3 F 41a-c), who may have started from Homer, to antedate the action of Amphion and Zethos to before Kadmos.

Pherekydes' position remains isolated in our sources, which generally postdate the twins, especially if we take into account the mythological handbooks of the Imperial Age. Nonetheless, these two foundation myths likely originally coexisted and were subject to distinct and diverse additions around their original Indoeuropean traits.⁴⁸¹ Later sources tried to explain this richness in the foundation myths of Thebes. It was claimed, for example, that the first foundations on the Kadmeia, in line with the participation of the “Kadmeans” in the Trojan Wars, was followed by the later building of the walls, when the lower town was constructed. Such a systematization is summarized at its best in the following chapter of the Boiotian book of Pausanias (9.5.6-7):

“While Lycus was regent for the second time, Amphion and Zethus gathered a force and came back to Thebes. Laius was secretly removed by such as were anxious that the race of Cadmus should not be forgotten by posterity, and Lycus was overcome in the fighting by the sons of Antiope. When they succeeded to the throne they added the lower city to the Cadmeia, giving it, because of their kinship to Thebe, the name of Thebes. What I have said is

480 Vian 1963: 70-1. Kühr (2006: 130-1) denied that the Kadmos myth might be implied in these verses, because in the eighth century BCE (the date she accepts for the *Odyssey*) it would be hard to posit the preexistence of this tradition; moreover, the building of the walls would be in contrast, according to this scholar, with a second, new foundation of Thebes by Kadmos. Nonetheless, this section of the *Odyssey* has a particularly late date, which may be the beginning of the sixth century BCE (Hirschberger 2004: 42-51; Most 2006: XLVII-LV; *contra* Gazis 2015, with further scholarship). At the same time, we must explain the superlative πρῶτοι, which, according to the same Kühr, can refer “auf weitere Gründe.” Now, Prandi (2011: 244-5) has suggested that the specific context may be Delphic intervention in the foundation myth of Thebes, with the addition of the Delphic oracle in the myth of Kadmos: these verses on Amphion and Zethos, then, would be a reaction to this Delphic innovation. The uncertain chronology of the verses of the *Catalogue of the Heroines* raises doubts about a direct dialogue with another text, the oracular response to Kadmos, which is not directly documented for this period (despite recent attempts at confirming the relationship of this section with the rest of the *Odyssey*: Gazis 2015). It is only a possibility that Delphi highlighted the necessity of a Delphic “authorization” in the narrative of the myth. A recent explanation, in fact, highlights the place of these verses in the *Odyssey*, and it may also be safe to assume, with Gazis 2015: 80, that “Antiope [...] remembers, or chooses to remember, only the version that elevates her children whereas the rivaling tradition is silenced”.

481 Kühr 2006: 126-7; Prandi 2011: 244. They can actually be read as complementary myths (Kühr 2014a: 233-5).

confirmed by what Homer says in the *Odyssey* [quote of Hom. *Od.* 11.263-5]. Homer, however, makes no mention in his poetry of Amphion’s singing, and how he built the wall to the music of his harp. Amphion won fame for his music, learning from the Lydians themselves the Lydian mode [...]” (tr. W.H.S. Jones).

Since they are Antiope’s children, and this woman is Asopos’ daughter (i.e., daughter to a river flowing in the Parasopiad, in Southern Boiotia), Amphion and Zethos may embody Boiotian ambitions against the hegemonic stance of Thebes.⁴⁸² Kadmos, instead, despite his Phoenician origins, was the central hero of a myth that focused on Theban autochthony, exemplified by the birth of the Spartoi (also known as “the Earthborns”) on Theban soil. It is therefore possible that this second foundation myth has another origin and explanation, which pivots on the exact moment of the birth of the city and sees in it a cultural moment, with consequences on the whole community, instead of being merely for defense.⁴⁸³

Despite, therefore, the recent tendency to imagine the genesis of these foundation myths as being in distinct places and moments,⁴⁸⁴ the two stories are actually complementary:

482 The Boiotians were not completely intertwined with Theban legends, since they did not completely join the dynastic lines of Theban kingship: they also represented a parenthesis in the inclusive narrations of the origin of Thebes, where their external origin is always remarked. The principal sources on Amphion and Zethos are discussed by Hurst 2000, Berlinzani 2004: 70-92, and David-Guignard 2006. On the complex interplay between the Theban tier of the foundation myth and the Boiotian one, see Vian 1963: 69-75; Kühr 2006: 123.

483 According to a telling summary of a scholium BCMI on Eur. *Phoen.* 114, “Kadmos founded Thebes, whereas Amphion and Zethos fortified it” (tr. S. Tufano). However, this scholium does not show a clear and definite opposition of meaning between *τειχιζω* and *κτιζω* (Kühr 2006: 121 n.197), because, when used alone, *κτιζω* can also imply the building of the walls. Other sources credit Kadmos with the fortification of Thebes, without finding this fact puzzling: Eur. *Bacch.* 172; Ephoros, *BNJ* 70 F 119; Ov. *Met.* 3.13; Str. 9.2.3.401. On the Earthborns, see shortly *supra* 2.2.2 *ad* βουλόμενος δὲ Ἀθήναι....

484 Kühr 2006: 121-2; 131-2. Berman 2004: 16-9 argued that the myth of Amphion and Zethos may be parallel to those Indoeuropean foundation myths centered on the common action of a couple of twins. Since it may be associated to an LH cumulus, the *Amphieion*, it would then be earlier than the story of Kadmos, whose later origin would be further proved by a possible etymology of the *Καδμεῖοι* as “Men from the East”, betraying a colonial context of the early archaism. This demonstration seems to undervalue the limited extent of the local sources from Thebes: all we know, for example, is that Pindar confirmed the relevance of Kadmos, at Thebes, in the first half of the fifth century BCE, but there is no certain evidence of a heroid cult at the *Amphieion*. The twins Amphion and Zethos are often associated with Southern Boiotia, which complicates the reconnaissance of a purely “Theban” interest in the myth.

they may both have developed in the centuries of Middle Archaism.⁴⁸⁵ Subsequent rationalistic combinations, especially in those fields and cultural poles like the Athens of Pherekydes, enacted and operated an artificial order between the two myths, whereas, from a local perspective, they could both coexist in a “fluid” way.

The mention of Amphion and of the enchanting power of the lyre⁴⁸⁶ does not isolate Armenidas, then, from the other sources on the founding twins of Thebes, because he is in line with the aforementioned specialization of the twins. If we accept, nonetheless, an early date for Armenidas, he may be the first local voice to explicitly mention Amphion, who is absent from the surviving verses of Pindar. Despite the limited nature of the evidence on this author, we know that Pindar was not reticent of the great characters of the Theban past. The absence of Amphion invites perplexities, especially since it is not fully compensated by the ephemeral occurrence of Zethos, who is generally “a shadowy character”.⁴⁸⁷

485 On the possible independence of the two myths, see Gantz 1993: 467–8. A further proof against the antiquity of the myth of the twins may consist of the late nature of the Homeric verses on Amphion and Zethos (*Od.* XI 261–3): these lines actually belong to the so-called “Catalogue of the Heroines”, a series of women encountered by Odysseus during his journey in the Underworld. A long tradition of studies assumed a derivation of this part of the *Odyssey* from the pseudo-Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, but recent research tends to recognize the many differences between these epic catalogues (see a discussion of the scholarship in Heubeck 2007: 278–9 and Gazis 2015: 69–70; cp. *supra* n.479). Nonetheless, even if we did not want to accept a Pesisstratid context for the origin of these verses, in light of the peculiar interest they seem to show for the Boiotian myths (Larson 2014), using the *Odyssey* as evidence for the antiquity of the myth remains questionable: the poem reached its final stage only in the Late Archaic period and this arch is not enough to prove the priority of the story of the twins over the tale of Kadmos.

486 Amphion’s lyre could also attract stones, animals, plants, or, more generally, inanimate objects: cp. e.g. Eumelos, F 30 West, *GEF* and Philostr. *Imag.* 14.2.

487 Schachter 1994a: 92. On the opacity of Zethos, see Schachter 1981: 29 and Olivieri 2011: 39–42. The only certain quote by Pindar is in his fragmentary *Paeon* 9, for Thebes, where the city is described in this verse: Κάδμου στρατὸν ἄν Ζεᾶθου πόλιν (F 52k,44 S. – M.); Olivieri (*ibid.* 40–1) understood this verse as the emphasis of the poet on the role of Zethos as a builder, contrasted with Kadmos as the founder of the Theban noble families. Scholars have hypothesized two other hints at the founding twins of Thebes among Pindar’s extant verses: first of all (1), in the adjective λεύκιππος (Pind. *Pyth.* 9.83), which may refer to the epithet λευκοπόλω, adopted by Euripides to describe the twins as future, divine Dioskouroi of Thebes (*HF* 29–30; *Phoen.* 606; *Antiope TrGF* 223.127; on these passages, see Schachter 1981: 29, Kambitsis 1972: 124–5 and Rocchi 1986: 272–3. However, we cannot rule out that Euripides was innovating here by deliberately assigning to Amphion and Zethos an epithet more common for the Spartan Dioskouroi, especially in light of the fame of the Theban horse games: see Ephoros, *BNJ* 70 F 119). A second, potential allusion in Pindar (2) is seen in a mention of the wedding of Niobe, Amphion’s wife (F 64 S. – M. = [Plut.] *de mus.* 15.1136C; see *infra* 3.3.2). These references are not enough, however, to prove that, already at the beginning of the fifth century BCE, the association of

In order to explain the isolation of Armenidas in the present fragment, Schachter (2012b) suggested that the fragment belonged to a commentary on the Theban *Amphieion*. This was the name of what has been identified with an LH II cumulus to the north of the Kadmeia, where the Thebans allegedly worshipped the corpses of Amphion and Zethos. However, the sources generally concentrate more on Amphion than on Zethos,⁴⁸⁸ in connection with this site. It is interesting to combine this literary “obsession” with Amphion with the toponym of this sacred space, where a cist grave has been associated with a cult of the twins.⁴⁸⁹ This cist grave may have acquired an exceptional status, since it is the only Late Helladic tomb of this kind in Thebes, until now.⁴⁹⁰ This fact does not prove, on its own, that it was a cult site for the two brothers, as might be indicated by a superficial reading of two passages in Pausanias (9.17.4; 10.32.11), where the Tithoreans from Phokis take some handfuls of terrain (a phenomenon, then, more linked to the cultural practices of other areas).

Pausanias recalls how these Tithoreans followed an oracle of Bakis, according to which every year they had to take a handful of terrain from the grave of the twins in order to have a fertile crop. The origin of the story is probably associated, as maintained by Rocchi (1986), with a dispute between Thebes and Tithorea around the place of the graves of the twins and of their mother, who was buried in Tithorea. The Tithoreans were likely trying to “host” the sacred corpses of the twins too (and a local tradition may have actually

Thebes with Amphion and Zethos was felt as compromising, or meant at advocating a hegemony over the rest of Boiotia.

488 Only Horace (*Ars* 4: *Thebanae conditor urbis*) and Kephalion (*BNJ* 93 F 5: κτίζει πόλιω) seem to ascribe solely to Amphion the foundation of the city, but I would not stress the importance of this tradition. For example, in Kephalion, immediately after, the name of the city is a common decision of the brothers.

489 See Aesch. *Sept.* 528 (τύμβος Ἀμφίωνος; on this reference, cp. Berman 2007: 103-4); Eur. *Supp.* 663 (μνήματα Ἀμφίωνος); Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.8 (τὸ Ἀμφεῖον); Arr. *Anab.* 1.8.6-7; Plut. *de Gen.* 4.577B; Schachter 1981: 28. Only Eur. *Phoen.* 145 imagines Zethos in this tomb.

490 The site is behind the contemporary Archaeological Museum of Thebes and has been thoroughly studied, because its conical size, with four layers, was suspected to betray an Oriental plan. If it is undeniable, as Loucas-Loucas (1987: 101 and n.56) claimed, that we cannot dismiss the possibility of an actual cult on the spot, we lack positive evidence which confirms it: the ceramics found and published by Spyropoulos 1981 are mostly of common use, so that it seems more likely that the site was conceived, in its early development, as a funerary grave of distinguished figures (as Loucas-Loucas 1987 correctly argue). The mound was considered sacred only later by the local population (see further scholarship on the site in Berman 2004: 6-8; Kühr 2006: 214-5; Moggi – Osanna 2012: 312-3).

achieved such an accomplishment, in the local mindset at least).⁴⁹¹ The marginal placement of the site, when compared with the Kadmeia, may indicate a liminal status, which argues against an ancient cult of the founders: these cults are generally placed at important crossroads.⁴⁹²

In other words, the only evidence we have for a heroic cult of the founders at the Ampheion may come from external sources (Athenian playwrights) and from an author, Pausanias, who may be attaching a local tradition to Thebes that was probably more meaningful for the Tithoraeans. The Thebans might have considered the Ampheion as a sacred *lieux de mémoire*, only from the Classical period on: it is in this context that we must understand both the content of Armenidas' fragment and the focus on Amphion to the detriment of Zethos.

3.2.2. Amphion and the Origins of Boiotian Poetry

The association of the fragment with a description of the *Ampheion* remains a fascinating scenario, which highlights the relevance of Amphion. At the same time, we should also be aware of the uniqueness of what is being assigned to Armenidas in the present fragment: apart from Hesiod, who mentions another instrument,⁴⁹³ in the other sources on Amphion he plays the lyre. Only the current text specifies that this lyre was a gift of the Muses to Amphion: the tradition is assigned to Armenidas and to Pherekydes (*BNJ* 3 FF 41d-e). The

491 Cp. Steph. Byz. τ 123, *s.v.* Τιθοραία on the alleged presence of a tomb of the twins in Tithoraia (not after Pausanias 10.32.11, as Rocchi 1986: 259 maintains, because Pausanias does not claim that there was such a monument in Tithoraia: is it possible that our *Epitome* of Stephanus has omitted a local source or historiographer?).

492 Only on a comparative basis (heroic cult: Antonaccio 1995: 169; typology of the male couple in Boiotia: Schachter 1972: 20; divine status of distinguished figures: Loucas-Loucas 1987), could we suggest that there was an actual cult of the twins in Thebes. The passage of Aeschylus on the *Ampheion* (*Sept.* 256-8) confers a highly emblematic meaning to the spot, in the internal narrative of the tragedy (Kühr 2006: 214 n.73; Berman 2007: 103-4). On the usual collocation of the *heroa* see Schachter 1992: 53.

493 Hes. F 182 M. – W.: κιθάρα τὸ τεῖχος τῆς Θήβης ἐτείχισαν. However, the name of the instrument may depend on the source of the fragment (Berlinzani 2004: 58 and n.35). As far as the “lyre” is concerned, the names used for this string instrument –κιθάρα, φόρμιγξ, and λύρα– refer to different objects, because the κιθάρα and the φόρμιγξ were considered proper to professionals, and the λύρα a more likely instrument for amateurs; David-Guignard (2006: 152) observes that they seem to be used without such attention, in these versions of the myth of Amphion.

other authors, in fact, claim that Amphion received the instrument from Hermes, probably because Hermes was considered the inventor of this instrument.⁴⁹⁴

The straightforward cultural reference for this tradition, is the cult of the Muses on the Helicon in Boiotia. The episode here echoed by Armenidas has therefore been tentatively associated with this area.⁴⁹⁵ The immediate context of the fragment, however, does not support this local reference, whereas we might learn more from observing that the variation of Dioscorides, on Apollo as the giver of the lyre, is as isolated as the one on the Muses.⁴⁹⁶ This interpretation of Amphion, surrounded either by Apollo or by the Muses, suggests a rereading of the foundation act that shifts the characteristics of the founder, making him a poet and not a simple musician.⁴⁹⁷ He becomes a poet, through a process of initiation, which is seen here in the pivotal moment of the granting of a symbolic gift: according to modern studies of poetical initiation in the ancient world, this gift is one of the six recurring motifs, which mark the transformation of a common man into an endowed artist.⁴⁹⁸

The gift of a lyre from the Muses, in particular, also appears in the Mnesiepes inscription on the poetical initiation of Archilochus.⁴⁹⁹ According to this text, around midday⁵⁰⁰ the poet met a group of maidens, who, after a joyful correspondence with Archilochus,

494 Cp. *Hom. Hymn Herm.* 24; Eur. *Antiope TrGF* 190 (Apollo invents the lyre and gives it to Hermes); Prop. 1.9.10; Hor. *Ars* 391-6; Apollod. 3.43.

495 Berlinzani 2004: 61.

496 The only other source where Apollo likely gives the instrument is Hyginus (*Fab.* 9), who does not focus on Apollo and speaks of a common action (*iussu Apollinis Thebas muro circumcinxerunt*). Moreover, we should consider the possibility that, in line with a Hellenistic representation (Callim. *Hymn* 2.55-7), Apollo was seen in these cases as an Apollo Archegetes, and then master of the walls, as protector of the colonization.

497 Amphion is a civilizing hero, endowed with a magical aura: because of these traits, it was easy to list further qualities, and we actually read that he was also seen as an inventor (Plin. *HN* 7.204; Paus. 9.5.7: introduction of the Lydian harmony in Thebes; 8.4: invention of the last chord of the lyre, called *νήτη*, whence the Neistian Gates got their name).

498 In the list of Dornseiff (1937: 232-5), the object which symbolizes the initiation is the fifth element, the others being: the encounter with a deity (1), a setting on a mountain (2), the identity of the poet as a shepherd (3), the reproach of mankind (4), and the new eloquence of the man (6). For a reconsideration of the initiation of Hesiod and of the peculiarities of this tradition, see Andolfi 2016.

499 *SEG* XV 517 = T 4 T.; m. III a.C. (edition: Clay 2004: 104-10).

500 This chronological indication is not explicit in the text, but internal data and comparisons with other sources confirm the collocation of the event during this meaningful time of day (on which, see Brillante 1990).

disappeared, only to let him find a lyre out of thin air.⁵⁰¹ Archilochus realized the identity of the givers from this gift. These anecdotes must be understood in the literary context that expressed them.⁵⁰² It remains true, however, that the frequency of the lyre as a symbol of poetic initiation, is a widespread phenomenon, confirmed also in the fine arts. It occurs, for example, on a relief of the so-called “Archilochus *heroon*”, with other symbols that mention the military commitment of the poet.⁵⁰³ There are also vase paintings,⁵⁰⁴ among which we signal a remarkable *pyxis* by the Hesiod Painter, dating to the central decades of the fifth century: here the poet is represented close to the lyre, even if the exact moment of the delivery is not explicit.⁵⁰⁵

The meeting of Archilochus has been specifically paralleled with another poetical initiation, the one evoked by Hesiod in the proem to his *Theogony* (22–4):⁵⁰⁶ the encounter with the Muses and the inspiration are symbolized, also on this occasion, by a gift to the poet of a laurel sceptre (30; cp. *Op.* 658–9). The real identity of the Muses met by Hesiod bewilders scholars, because the *Theogony* portrays both the Olympian Muses and the “Boiotian” Muses of the Helikon⁵⁰⁷ (probably for the open status of the Hesiodic *epos*,⁵⁰⁸ and not for poetical syncretism).⁵⁰⁹

501 E₁ I 1.38. Aloni (2009: 75–6; cp. Aloni 2011) argued that this tradition developed from the gift, which Archilochus claims to have received from the Muses, in a fragment which could constitute a self-representation of the poet (F 1 West, *IE*², tr. D.E. Gerber: “I am the servant of lord Enyalios and skilled in the lovely gift of the Muses”).

502 According to Ornaghi (2009: 136), for instance, the inscription would describe “una situazione rituale organica e facilmente assimilabile (soprattutto da parte di una *audience* paria) a manifestazioni proprio del rito demetriaco, in particolare tesmoforico.”

503 Kontoleon 1965; Gentili 2006: 268.

504 Cp. Clay 2004: 120.

505 *ARV*² 775.1. The poet portrayed on the *pyxis* has been identified either with Archilochus (Berranger 1992; Kivilo 2010: 95–6) or with Hesiod (Clay 2004: 120 n.652). Peek 1955: 23–6 and Corso 2007: 15 n.19 express skepticism on the possibility that the vase expresses a poetical initiation, but this hypothesis seems to be strengthened by the Panhellenic circulation of Hesiod, together with the more limited circulation of the traditions on Archilochus (Nagy 2009: 309–10; Rotstein 2010: 233–4 n.16; Rotstein 2016: 106).

506 Cp. Gentili 2006: 271–2 and Ornaghi 2009, with previous scholarship.

507 Doubt on the identity of the Muses is caused by the ambiguity of the text: Hesiod calls upon both the Olympian Muses (Hes. *Theog.* 22), and the Helikonian ones (Hes. *Theog.* 1). A possibility is that these sections have different origins: for instance, the Homeric model of the Olympian muses influenced the later reworking and additions of the “pseudo-Hesiodic” stage (Pinsent 1985). Alternatively, this coexistence may depend on the specific characteristics of the two groups of Muses (Pascal 1985); Nagy 2009: 277–8 suggested that the shifting identity of the Muses would depend on the “process of initiating Hesiod as a panhellenic poet” [278]: only gradually is he able to introduce himself as a valid voice

In any case, the model of the poetical initiation through a gift received from the Muses, apart from being a common Mediterranean model,⁵¹⁰ was already active in the imagery of the *epos*, as we see in the *Odyssey* when Demodocus, a pupil of the Muses, is inspired by them when he sings and plays his φόρμιγξ (Hom. *Od.* 8.261–81). According to Pinsent (1985), the *topos* may also be an echo, in Boiotia, of an actual rite of passage in a local poetical school: however, there is probably no need to infer a professional school of Boiotian poetry (*ibid.* 121) to accept and appreciate the similarity of this archaic model of representation of the poetical initiation through a symbolic object such as the lyre.

Furthermore, the main regional poets from Boiotia, Hesiod and Pindar, confirm the “necessity” to be called and inspired by the Muses:⁵¹¹ whereas in Pindar this consecration is not explicitly marked by a concrete gift,⁵¹² we have anticipated how Hesiod himself recalls the encounter with the Muses. The anecdote also found its way in the biographical tradition on the poet, who usually also receives a laurel σκῆπτρον.⁵¹³ An interesting *lapsus calami*⁵¹⁴ in Virgil might support the belief that the Muses actually gave Hesiod a musical instrument: in the sixth *Eclogue*, Virgil mentions a reed-pipe (69: *calamos*) in the group of verses dedicated to Cornelius Gallus (64–73). The reed-pipe was given by Linos to Hesiod and finally reached the Roman Gallus,⁵¹⁵ an author of elegies, who is described here as a

for all of Greece through the appeal to the Olympian Muses, and not only to the local, Boiotian world of the Helikonian Muses.

508 Cp. Ercolani 2010: 14–5, on the Boiotian debate on the authorship of the first verses of the *Theogony*, referred by Pausanias (9.31.4).

509 Pucci 2007: 54–6.

510 This pattern of the *Dichterweihe* has been compared with the prophetic calls in the *Bible*, where the prophet receives a concrete symbol, which signals his identity as a divine nuncio (Bertolini 1980: 129).

511 On the voice of the Muses, see Brillante 2013–2014.

512 Only the Muses can make a man σοφός (F 52f,51–3 S. – M.; *Ol.* 11.10); in the seventh *Olympian Ode*, poetry is explicitly defined as Μοισᾶν δόσιον (8).

513 Hes. *Theog.* 30; cp. e.g. *AP* 9.64.2. The object has a thaumaturgical value (Bona 1995: 118–9).

514 The definition of *lapsus calami* was used by Bonanno (see *infra* in text). Scholiastic tradition seems to share the perplexities of assigning to Hesiod an instrument, the bagpipe, commonly associated with bucolic poetry. This is proved by an ethopea, where Hesiod refuses to play a bagpipe, donated by a group of goatherds (*POxy.* 3537r, 21–2).

515 It is not uncommon to see a poet being recognized as such, when he receives an object that originally belonged to a great poet (Clausen 1994: 203).

bucolic poet.⁵¹⁶ The Virgilian novelty was understood by Bonanno (1990: 183–93) as a *Leitfehler*, a “guiding error” which would imply, in Virgil, a reference to the *Thalians* of Theocritus. Alternatively, we may also recognize a return of the “paradigma esiodeo”,⁵¹⁷ in the form of a poetical initiation, which may present a variation on the actual identity of the instrument given by the Muses to the mortal poet.⁵¹⁸

It is therefore more likely that the variation proper to Armenidas, namely the provenance of the lyre of Amphion from the Muses, transforms the founder into a legendary poet, or at least into an artist, whose accompanying instrument, the lyre, may come from a deity of the world of poetry, such as Apollo (Dioscorides), or the same Muses.⁵¹⁹ A later reverberation of the myth of Amphion has Hermes introduce his invention, the lyre, first to Apollo, and then to the Muses and to Amphion (Philostr. *Imag.* 1.10,1): Philostratus could mention here the mythical connotations of the lyre and be aware of the characterization of Amphion as a famous λυρικός.⁵²⁰ At Thebes, this poetical and musical elaboration was probably enhanced by the number of the chords of the lyre and of the gates (seven). The result, in Philostratus, is an Amphion who sings a hymn to Gea and is described as a contemplating lyrical poet.⁵²¹

If we accept this reading of the fragment, the text likely becomes something more than an excerpt from a topographical commentary on the Ampheion. Such a presentation of the founder Amphion supports the local and learned character of Armenidas’ *Theban Histories*. The text showed an unusual perspective on Amphion, probably in tune with the rest of the

516 “In questo contesto si comprende bene l’investitura di Gallo sui monti delle Muse: è Gallo il poeta degno di diventare (anche perché in parte già lo è) l’alter Hesiodus” (La Penna 1985: 387; on the presence of Hesiod in Latin literature, see Rosati 2009, with previous scholarship, and other examples in Kivilo 2010: 18).

517 Agosti 1997: 3, in a paper on a much debated ethopea (*POxy.* 3537r), whose anonymous author personifies Hesiod at the moment of initiation (late third – early fourth century CE). On the text, see further West 1984; Bona 1995; Agosti 1997; Most 2008 and Hunter 2014: 290 and n.21.

518 It seems that in Armenidas and, with all probability, in Philostratus (see *infra*), the characterization of Amphion as a lyrical poet went through a generic indication of the instrument, without a clear indication of the genre.

519 Pindar defines the *phorminx* as “joint possession of Apollo and of the dark-locked Muses” (*Pyth.* 1.1–3: Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ ἰοπλοκάμων/ σύνδικον Μοισᾶν κτέανον).

520 Cp. Kephalion *BNJ* 93 F 5, who, however, sees both the twins as μουσικοί. Kephalion also claimed that τὸ δὲ τεῖχος ἐπτάπυλον, ὅσοι τῆς λύρας οἱ τόνοι (F 3).

521 Philostr. *Imag.* 1.10.4: κάθηται δὲ ἐπὶ κολωνοῦ τῶ μὲν ποδὶ κρούων συμμελές, τῇ δεξιᾷ δὲ παραπλήττων τὰς νευράς (“[Amphion] is seated on a low mound, beating time with his foot and smiting the strings with his right hand”, tr. A. Fairbanks).

work, which seems to be open to poorly attested and rare variations on important local myths. Amphion, as a musician, strengthened his nature as a founder and, probably, of a mythical lawgiver, as this characterization is in line with other representations of memorable lawgivers of the Archaic period, who were also described as prophets and musicians.⁵²²

3.3. Armenidas F 3

Previous editions: *BNJ* 378 F 6; *EGM I* F **6; *FGrHist* 378 F 6 (Schol. A Pind. *Ol.* 6.23a Drachmann).⁵²³

ἐπτὰ δ' ἔπειτα πυρᾶν] τῶν διαβεβοημένων ἐστὶ καὶ τοῦτο, πῶς ἐπτὰ φησι γενέσθαι πυρᾶς τῶν ἐπτὰ ἐπιστρατευσάντων, καί<περ> οὐ πάντων καέντων· Ἀμφιάραος μὲν κατεπόθη σὺν τοῖς ἵπποις ἐν Ὑρωπῶι, Πολυνείκης δὲ οὐκ ἐτάφη (ἄταφος γὰρ ἔμεινεν), Ἄδραστος δὲ ζῶν εἰς Ἄργος ἀπῆλθεν· καταλείπονται δ, Τυδεύς, Καπανεύς, Παρθενοπαῖος, Ἴππομέδων. ὁ μὲν οὖν Ἀρίσταρχός φησιν ὅτι ἰδιάζει καὶ ἐν τούτοις ὁ Πίνδαρος ὡς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις· ὁ δὲ Ἀριστόδημός φησι τὰς ἐπτὰ πυρᾶς *** ἀπολομένων· οὕτως [καὶ Ἴππομέδων] καὶ Ἀρμενίδας γράφει· “καὶ πυρᾶς ποιεῦντες ἐπτὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς τέρμεσιν† ἐνταῦθα ὅπου καλεῦνται Ἐπτὰ Πυραί, ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπτὰ ἐπὶ Θήβας, ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐπτὰ παίδων Νιόβης ἐκεῖ καυθέντων” [ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδ χωρισθεισῶν τῶν συζυγιῶν].

7 καὶ Ἴππομέδων *del.* Boeckh καὶ Ἰππίας Bergk *** A εἶναι τῶν στρατιωτῶν τῶν Boeck *coll.* Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 6,23d 8 Ἀρμενίδας Bergk Ἀρμονίδας A Ἀρτέμων Boeckh γράφει Boeckh γράφουσι *codd.* 9 ἔρμασιν Drachmann ἔρμεῶσιν Schroeder ἔρμασιν Boeckh *fortasse recte* ἔρκεσιν

522 On this ambiguity of the lawgiver, see Camassa 1986 and Andolfi 2016: 117-8.

523 It is here contended that this text might indicate, apart from a reference to the Seven Pyres of Thebes, a possible link to the myth of Amphion (cp. F 2 and 3.2.2), since Amphion was Niobe's husband; for this reason, I anticipate its usual placement in the succession of the fragments of Armenidas.

Schachter 10-1 ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδὲ χωρισθεισῶν τῶν συζυγιῶν *secl.* Drachmann: “*fortasse posterius addita*”

“And the Seven Pyres] Among the debated issues, there is also the problem of why he claims that there were seven pyres for the seven commanders, even if everyone was not cremated. Amphiaraios, in fact, was swallowed by the earth with his cart at Oropos, whereas Polyneikes was not buried, as he remained unburied, and Adrastos came back alive to Argos. Four are left: Tydeus, Kapaneus, Parthenopaeus, and Hippomedon. Now, Aristarchos claims that on this matter, as on other topics, Pindar is peculiar; Aristodemos, on the other hand, claims that the seven pyres *** of the deceased; so [and Hippomedon]. Armenidas, then, writes: ‘And after realizing seven pyres, by the pillars, in the place which is called “Seven Pyres”, either from the Seven against Thebes, or from Niobe’s seven children, who were cremated there [from fourteen, subdivided in couples]’” (tr. S. Tufano).

3.3.1. Textual Transmission and Context

The *Sixth Olympian* was written to commemorate the victory in the mule-cart race won by Hagesias of Syracuse, celebrated in the Arcadian city of Stymphalos in 472 or in 468 BCE: this man was a soothsayer and belonged to the Syracusan branch of the Iamidai.⁵²⁴ Since the Iamidai focused on military prophecies, Pindar quotes Amphiaraios as an *exemplum* at the end of the beginning of the ode. In the words uttered to him by Adrastos, Amphiaraios becomes “the pupil of my army” (27). The seer Amphiaraios survived his Argive comrades, who tried to conquer Thebes through a siege, and had prepared seven pyres in Thebes (23-5): as the commenter Aristarchos (216-144 BCE) soon noticed, Pindar distinguishes himself (ἰδιάζει) because he locates the last burial of the Seven in Thebes, and not elsewhere.

524 Hubbard 1992: 94 e n.41; Giannini in Gentili 2013: 142.

Two main problems concern the tradition of the unsuccessful attack of the Seven Argives against Thebes: their number and their identity, both subject to variations, and the location of the corpses, variously imagined between Attica and Boiotia. As with the Seven Wisemen,⁵²⁵ an oscillation in the identity of the single commanders should not surprise us, because the figures who were not further enhanced by individual myths were often subject to variations in the canonical lists. The Seven Argives who fought against Thebes represent a partial exception, since five names are almost always present.⁵²⁶ The total number was always the same, despite the actual presence of eight figures: the additional name is then variously explained, for example, by assuming that one of them survived as Adrastus.⁵²⁷

This contradiction between the survival of a few names and the association with seven, and not eight or six pyres, is the main issue that is studied in the present scholium. Pindar himself was aware of such a complication, because he refers to seven pyres (*Ol.* 6.23), while assuming that Amphiaraios had disappeared (20–2) and that Adrastus had survived. Moreover, as the scholium recalls, since Polyneikes was not buried, the actual dead numbered four. The contemporary explanation of this difference of numbers is based on a Vatican scholium (23d), which claims that the seven pyres were actually for the seven subunits of the Argive army and not for the commanders. In this way, we may also understand how they could all be posited in a single place, such as Thebes.⁵²⁸

The exact location, however, was the second issue at stake, and the scholiast recalls, for this reason, Aristarchos' view, according to which Pindar was providing a very original opinion on the subject (ιδιάζει).⁵²⁹ Aristarchos wrote what is probably the first complete

525 Cp. *infra* the commentary on Daimachos' F 4 (5.5).

526 Adrastus, Amphiaraios, Polyneikes, Tydeus, and Kapaneus. Cp. Cingano 2002 on the other figures.

527 In Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes* (50), Adrastus' chariot is adorned with the memories of the Seven, which implies his survival; on the contrary, he belongs to the Seven Argives and dies in Euripides' *Phoenician Women* (1134).

528 See Symeonoglou 1985: 192; Hubbard 1992: 96; Schachter 2011a *ad BNJ* 378 F 6.

529 The verb *ιδιάζει* does not necessarily imply a unique and isolated position on a topic, as if Aristarchos were accusing Pindar of being the only advocate for a Theban collocation (Hubbard 1992: 79; Steinbock 2013: 167, on the verb as proof for Pindar's invention of this tradition). In the statement of an opinion, *ιδιάζει* can also mean a generic distinction (*LSJ s.v.* II 1), without systematic research, in advance, on the entire lexicon of Pindar. It is then better to speak, in line with the analogous uses of the adverb *ιδίως* in conjunction with *verba dicendi*, of the indication of "elementi di originalità sul piano lessicale, narrativo o strutturale" (Merro 2015: 214; it is moreover always dangerous to claim that an author invented or created a tradition, in the absence of explicit proof in this direction).

commentary on Pindar’s works,⁵³⁰ and he is the grammarian who is mentioned most often in the *scholia vetera*.⁵³¹ After Aristarchos, a new generation of scholars in Pergamon and in Alexandria, introduced a different approach with a focus on the *Realien* of Pindar. This new reading of his verses was particularly enhanced by Aristodemos of Thebes, a grammarian and a historiographer.⁵³² he notably contradicts his teacher Aristarchos in many scholia, where the two names are matched together. Our scholium confirms this trend and indicates, despite the tormented textual transmission,⁵³³ that Armenidas was probably quoted by Aristodemos against Aristarchos.⁵³⁴ Armenidas, consequently, was quoted from this intermediate source, even if this does not allow us to extensively doubt the quality of the citation.

530 Merro 2015: 214.

531 Aristarchos is mentioned sixty-nine times in the corpus of the *scholia vetera* (Deas 1931: 5). It is not easy to understand the originality of Aristarchos’ method, since the commentary was vastly reused and reworked by later scholars. In general, it is assumed that he was particularly careful in the wording of the text, but not reliable in the study of historical and mythic material present in Pindar (as our scholium seems to prove). On this feature of his method, see Deas 1931: 8; on the limits of this approach, cp. the criticisms in Irigoien 1952: 54; Muckensturm-Pouille 2009: 88; Vassilaki 2009: 124. However, Aristarchos was able to detect the difficulty, which might have been the starting point of the later scholarship on Pindar and the Seven Pyres (Merro 2015: 229).

532 See on this Deas 1931: 16; Hubbard 1992: 94 n.42.

533 The final interpolation is an example of the many problems of the Ambrosian *recensio* (A) of Pindar’s *scholia vetera*. This *recensio* shows greater attention to the names of the sources than the Vatican *recensio*, and is also more detailed for the paraphrases and other linguistic details (Deas 1931: 58–61; on the textual tradition of this scholium, see also Merro 2015: 214–6). Fowler (2013: 367–638), for example, suspects that the fragment ends at ποιῆντες and that it might have the form Ἐρμαῖω: the adverb οὕτως, after the memory of the Argives, would then be Aristodemos’ way to indicate and present the third approach to the topic.

534 Aristodemos may be the source for Armenidas, because he shared his interest in myths and was probably chosen, here, as another “local” erudite, who objected to Armenidas on other grounds (cp. *BNJ* 383 F 3: οὐδαμοῦ φησιν ἐν ταῖς Θήβαις τῶν Νιοβιδῶν εἶναι τάφον). Jacoby (1955a: 159) suggests that this debate may derive from Aristodemos’ Θηβαϊκά, which may confirm Pindar concerning the link between the Seven Pyres and the Argives, in the missing portion of the text of the scholium. We would then have an opposition between (1) Aristarchos, puzzled by the singularity of Pindar’s position on the seven pyres (and, possibly, arguing for the identification of the spot with the Niobidai), and, secondly, Aristodemos (2), who suggested an identification of the site as the burial of the Seven (thence, his utter denial of the presence in Thebes of a burial of the Niobidai). Armenidas, between these two positions, may have then be quoted by Aristodemos, to confirm the certainty of his understanding. This reconstruction is extremely likely, despite the common view that the historical fragments in this corpus actually come from Didymos, the final “collector” of the *scholia vetera* (Deas 1931: 22; on him, cp. Irigoien 1952: 67–75; Negri 2004: 218–25; Braswell 2013: 114–6; Merro 2015: 216 and n.19; *ibid.* 231, on the mythographical interests of Didymos).

This critical debate in the *scholia vetera* testifies to a difficulty of proceeding on the steep terrain of a local and isolated tradition.⁵³⁵ Unfortunately, we miss the relative scholium, in the Ambrosian *recensio*, for the other verse, where the pyres are set in Thebes (*Nem.* 9.24: ἐπτὰ [...] πυραΐ), but this scholium to the *Sixth Olympian* is sufficient to instigate a debate, where Armenidas represents an important place for the local traditions he echoed.⁵³⁶

3.3.2. Parallel Traditions and Myths in Contrast

Between the fifth and the fourth centuries BCE, Athenian support of the Seven Argives became a constitutive element of the catalogue of Athenian mythical merits that the city earned in the past.⁵³⁷ This myth may have been quoted for the first time by the Athenians in the speech given before the battle of Plataia (*Hdt.* 9.27.3), when Athens argued that they should occupy the right wing of the Greek army. This *Tatenkatalog* may depend on the fortune of these motifs in the Athens of the third quarter of the fifth century, but it has been argued that already in the sixties, the burial of the Seven was part of this public discourse. In fact, the stress on the burial of the Argives has been associated both with the military alliance between Athens and Argos in the late sixties, and with the specific honours paid to the Argives who fell at Tanagra (458/7 BCE) while fighting with the Athenians (*IG* 1³.1149).⁵³⁸

The benevolent gesture of Athens put the city in contrast with the “inhuman” treatment that the defeated Argives received in the mythical past from the Thebans: in Athens, this uneven stance was read as a telling, mythical precedence for the isolation of Thebes against an alleged common culture of values in the Greek world. Only the Thebans, who had

535 On the *scholia vetera*, see Deas 1931: 27–42; On the textual transmission of Pindar, cp. Irigoin 1952, Negri 2004, and the scholarship quoted by Merro 2015.

536 The *Sixth Olympian* and the *Ninth Nemean* are strictly linked and share many topics (Hubbard 1992). On *Pind. Nem.* 9.24, see Olivieri 2014: 39.

537 Cp. e.g. *Lys.* 2.7–10; *Isoc. Paneg.* 4.53–8 (with Clarke 2008: 270–1); *Panath.* 168–72; *Pl. Menex.* 239B.

538 On the Athenian *Tatenkatalog*, see Proietti 2015, with a convenient list of the single motifs and their occurrences in Athenian public discourse (*ibid.* 523 on the burial of the Seven). For the possibility that the motif was particularly popular in Athens in association with *IG* 1³.1149 and a possible use of the myth as an *exemplum mythicum* on the *Stoa Poikile*, see Papazarkadas – Sourlas 2012: 607 and Proietti 2015: 523.

recently medized, could be expected to be so “un-Greek” in the past.⁵³⁹ The location of the burial of the Seven represents, therefore, a pivotal moment in the justification of a gesture that played an important role in Thebes and Athens: this myth involved three cities (Argos, Athens, and Thebes) and had been part of their public discourse well before its first literary attestation.

The limits of an interpretation that excessively focuses on Athens are shown by the fact that the first literary source, a fragment from Aeschylus’ *Eleusinians*,⁵⁴⁰ records a tradition that placed the bodies of the Seven Argives in Eleusis.⁵⁴¹ This version, where there is a peaceful agreement between the parties, has been linked to the discovery of a series of nine MH tombs on the spot. For three of them, Mylonas (1975) produced evidence of a Late Geometric heroic cult, allegedly confirmed by a *peribolos* around them (eighth century BCE *ex.*). The contemporaneity of this cult with the circulation of the first oral tradition on the attack of the Seven may prove an early and independent interest in this myth at Eleusis. The literary evidence is extremely obscure on this,⁵⁴² more likely, an original local cult was reread in this direction, in the light of the Argive re-evaluation of the middle sixth century BCE.⁵⁴³

539 Cp. Steinbock 2013: 155–8; on the Theban medism, see *infra* 4.7.2 and 4.7.4.

540 The most important witness to this work is Philochoros (*BNJ* 328 F 12). See, in general, Steinbock 2013: 174–86. The play has been tentatively dated to 475 BCE (Culasso Gastaldi 1976: 70). It certainly predates the *Seven Against Thebes* (467 BCE).

541 Cp. on this version Steinbock 2013: 177. Pausanias (1.39.2) claims to have visited this burial in Eleusis.

542 On the Eleusinian discovery, see Steinbock 2013: 161 and n.25. The interpretation has been debated, nonetheless, because the same number of tombs is uncertain (Antonaccio 1995: 114 counts eight and a half; Burkert 1981: 34–5 seven); all that can be positively assumed is that the site had “a special importance for the local population” (Papadimitriou 2001: 87); it has even been argued that, in light of the uncertainties, the link with Eleusis might have only been established by Aeschylus (Anderson 2015).

543 In the middle sixth century, the Argives established a heroon for the Seven Argives who were buried in Thebes (Pariante 1992); this may also have been the moment when, in Thebes, there already was an association with the burial of these figures, if they could be recalled in this way: ΕΡΟΟΝ | ΤΟΝ ΕΝ ΘΕ-| ΒΑΙΣ. This *lieu de mémoire* has been used to argue for the antiquity of ascription to Thebes of the tombs of the Seven. A further proof of the Theban setting is recognized in a verse of the *Iliad* (14.114), which mentions a tomb of Tydeus in Thebes. However, this verse was athetized by Zenodotus (schol. *A. Il.* 14.114 Erbse: even if Steinbock 2013: 167 n.54 expresses doubts on this choice, because Zenodotus may have been influenced by Athenian playwrights). The Eleusinian findings do not represent a solid scenario to argue for the preexistence of the Eleusinian connection with the Seven, but they certainly enlarge the picture. All our early literary sources date to the fifth century BCE, but it would definitely seem that, from the middle

In the late Archaic period, in general, such a new interpretation of ancient monuments was not uncommon: for this reason, there are no compelling grounds to suggest that Aeschylus' own representation of the myth and the replacement of the burial at Eleusis indicates anti-Theban malice. In fact, Aeschylus may have been referring to different local traditions that were not centered on Athens or on Thebes.⁵⁴⁴

In Thebes, and in other parts of Boiotia, different places were associated with the burial of the Seven.⁵⁴⁵ The doubts of modern scholars on the antiquity of the connection with the “Seven Pyres” seems disproved by Pindar's mention of the toponym: if we consider that both the epinician odes where he quotes it (the *Sixth Olympian* and the *Ninth Nemean*) were composed for an external audience, it is hard to see how he could be inventing such a tradition to reply to Aeschylus' collocation of the Seven in Eleusis.⁵⁴⁶ The Sicilian commissioning would represent, in those years, the only possible common ground between Aeschylus and Pindar. Pindar and Armenidas are the only sources to recall this Theban setting, with an uncertainty in the second author that can only be understood in connection with the contrasting tradition that considers the Pyres to be the tomb of Niobe's children, as Pausanias also knows (9.17.2). It would therefore seem that local sources, namely Pindar and (partially) Armenidas, were conveying a tradition with its own life, independently from other versions circulating in the same years.

sixth century, Thebes, possibly Eleusis, and Argos were all actively engaging in local reflections on the fate of these characters well before the Athenians addressed this point.

544 This peaceful resolution of the conflict was probably a version of the myth, without a direct political *raison d'être* (Steinbock 2013: 158, against the skepticism of Nouhaud 1982: 18-9, who thought that Isocrates' use of the Eleusinian collocation in the *Panathenaicus* (12,168-9) was an invention of the orator and proof of the fortuitous manipulation of the myth).

545 Thebes showed the tombs of the Theban defenders (Paus. 9.18.3). Thebes rivaled Harma (Str. 9.2.11.404; Paus. 9.19.4) and Oropos (Paus. 1.34.2), whose communities also identified as the place where Amphiaros was swallowed by the earth. An inscription from the Museum of Thebes (MΘ 40933; Papazarkadas 2014b: 233-47) confirms Theban interest in the fourth century BCE (either halfway through the century, or, more probably, after 316 BCE: *ibid.* 246 n.87), to repeat the link with Apollo Ismenios and with Amphiaros. The text is a rewriting in the Ionic alphabet of an Archaic original, which was written in the epichoric alphabet, and indicates Theban interest to insist on a mythical memory that still held importance to the local community (Papazarkadas 2016: 135-6; cp. *infra* 4.6.2-3 and, specifically on the Theban interest in this text, Thonemann 2016). Pausanias visited the tombs of Polyneikes and Tydeus (9.18.1-3; cp. Hom. *Il.* 14.114).

546 Bethe 1891: 98-9; Jacoby 1955a: 455; Podlecki 1966: 150-1; Culasso Gastaldi 1976; Hubbard 1992: 99-100; Mills 1997: 233; Steinbock 2013: 166. Cp. Schachter 1994a: 24 n.4.

The same criterion of independence would seem to apply to the other option considered by Armenidas in his work, namely, the identification of the spot with the burial of Niobe's children. The myth of Niobe was centered on the *hybris* of Amphion's bride: she had dared show off in front of Letho the great number of her children, and Artemis and Apollo, Letho's offspring, massacred Niobe's children in revenge. The narrative is already present in the *Iliad* (24.604–20) as a consolation *exemplum* from Achilles to Priam, who lost Hektor; the association of the Niobidai with Thebes is a constant that is not directly confirmed in the figurative arts,⁵⁴⁷ but is present in literature from at least the sixth century BCE.⁵⁴⁸ Already in the *Catalogue of Women* (F 183 M. – W.), in fact, Niobe is Amphion's wife; their wedding was then at the center of a Pindaric paean (*13 = F 64 S. – M.), which is all the more surprising once we consider Pindar's relatively scarce interest in the figures of Amphion and Zethos as the twin founders of Thebes.⁵⁴⁹ As with the location of the burial of the Seven Argives, delving into this emic perspective also allows us to see who really mattered in the internal discourse of these communities and of their audiences, and on which grounds, which may not coincide with what external sources would suggest.

Only Aristodemos of Thebes explicitly denied the existence of a burial of the Niobidai in Thebes (*BNJ* 383 F 10). This position was hardly based on the actual conditions of Thebes at the time of his activity, since, during his lifespan, the lower part was in ruins and badly

547 Schmidt 1992: 912 and *passim*.

548 Schachter (1994a: 23) considers a likely original association with the city. Among the playwrights, Aeschylus and Sophokles wrote a *Niobe*: they confirm the general location of the death of her children in Thebes; Niobe, transformed in stone, came back to Lydia, according to Sophokles (*TrGF* 441a–451; on Aeschylus' and Sophokles' plays, see Totaro 2013 and Carpanelli 2017). This myth was subject to a number of local variations, which do not directly touch the belief that the Niobidai died in Thebes. There were local versions in Argos (Apollod. 3.45–7) and in Lydia (Xanthos *FGrHist* 765 F 20). The myth of Niobe was represented on the Throne of Zeus in Olympia, created by Pheidias, even though it is not certain whether Amphion was also there: here, Niobe was a symbol of a punished *hybris*, but did not necessarily refer to Theban medism, as maintained by Geominy 1992: 924 and Papini 2014: 185–6, who underlines the parallel with the other relief on the armrest of the throne with a Sphynx. The political interpretation of the iconography derives from Thomas 1976: 31, whereas Ganter (*ad BNJ* 381 F 1) remembers that only on the Athenian stage was a political meaning more likely. It is uncertain whether we can read the motif of the punishment of Niobe on two clay reliefs (Stilp 2006: 187–8) found on Melos and dated to the fifties of the fifth century BCE. The general variety of myths of this group of reliefs from Melos, dated from the seventies to the forties, and a male figure who could be a pedagogue (*ibid.* 93: after the theatre?) seem to confute an anti-Theban reading.

549 Pindar's paean *13 = F 64 S. – M. = [Plut.] *de mus.* 15.1136C. Cp. Olivieri 2011: 41–2 and D'Alessio 1997: 43–4 for the suggestion that the two fragments we possess from another paean (22) might refer to the same myth. On Pindar's disinterest on the founding twins, especially for Amphion, see 3.2.1.

preserved.⁵⁵⁰ More probably, Aristodemos, in his *Θηβαϊκά*, was defending the opposite interpretation that the spot was actually the burial of the Seven.⁵⁵¹ Only Armenidas accepted both traditions, which must therefore refer to the same spot: Pausanias, who, contrary to Pindar, knows about the burial of Amphion’s children in Thebes (9.17.2: ἡ πυρά), does not refer to the different reading that identified the spot with the burial of the Seven Argives.

The ambivalence of the spot known as the “Seven Pyres” is proved by the fact that the number also seems to have played a part in the debate on the historical memory of this place. The number (and the gender) of the Niobidai are subject to great variations in our sources:⁵⁵² Homer counts twelve of them (*Il.* 24.602–4), whereas the playwrights⁵⁵³ and other sources of the fifth century BCE⁵⁵⁴ refer to fourteen children, seven boys and seven girls.⁵⁵⁵ Armenidas must have kept the same number of children accepted by Hellanikos (*BNJ* 4 F 21), which is not surprising, considering the importance of this number in Theban folklore, from the chords of Amphion’s lyre to the gates of the city. The final remark of the scholium on the “couples” may derive from the necessity to align the later witnesses to the local historian. Under this respect, Armenidas differed from Pindar, who counted twenty Niobidai. The local historian may have drawn on another local tradition that is also reported by Hellanikos, who usually accepts rare and isolated information for Boiotian traditions. Hyginus, too, mentioned seven daughters born of Amphion and Niobe.⁵⁵⁶ It would be interesting to know the gender of the children, in Armenidas’

550 Jacoby 1955a: 159; Mastronarde 2005: 195.

551 Cp. Radtke 1901: 49–50 n.1; Hubbard 1992: 95 n.45; Schachter 1994a: 22 n.4; Steinbock 2013: 168.

552 A complete list of variations in Hubbard 1992: 95 n.46; Gantz 1996: II 536–40; Fowler 2013: 366 n.51; Oliveri 2014: 39 n.7.

553 Aesch. *Niobe TrGF* 167b Radt; Eur. *Cresphontes TrGF* 455; Ar. *Niobus* F 294 K. – A.

554 See Apollod. 3.45; Diod. Sic. 4.74.3; Ov. *Met.* 6.182.

555 In the Imperial Age, this *ridicula diversitas fabulae* (Gell. 20.7.1) raised a debate, which prompted Aelian (*VH* 12.36), Gellius (20.7.1), and Apollodoros (3.45) to mention the early interest of Archaic lyrical poetry on this detail.

556 Jacoby 1955b: 108 n. 20 and Ambaglio 1980a: 120. Hubbard (1992: 95–6 n.47) argued that this was a “late fabrication of mythographers”, but Armenidas contradicts this, as any possible ambivalence could only be argued if the audience was already aware of the possibility of seven children. If we consider that Hellanikos’ fragment belonged to the *Atlantis*, where the same author associated a Theban gate to Elektra (*BNJ* 4 F 22), we could think that the innovation of the mythographers consisted in this association with the gates. Maybe Hellanikos distinguished three boys and four girls, to set himself apart from the Attic playwrights (Pownall 2016 *ad BNJ* 4 F 4).

version, even if the witness does not really help us with that.⁵⁵⁷ This was probably a detail of minor importance, as the focus lay in the number, because any possible double interpretation of the spot had to adapt both to the Seven Argives and to the idea of Seven Niobidai: if a larger number for the Niobidai was accepted, any identification with the location would have probably been lost.

Wilamowitz (1886: 163 n.3) once suggested that Pindar was drawing extensively on the *Thebaid*, because a scholium says that the poet was echoing, for a lemma, this epical poem.⁵⁵⁸ Nonetheless, it is not necessary to *find* literary evidence for the probability that Pindar was accepting a local tradition on the Pyres as the burial of the Argives. We are more accustomed today to the possibility that a local community could possess a variety of contrasting traditions; at the same time, the opposing tradition recorded here by Armenidas (on the Seven Pyres as the tomb of the Niobidai) might not necessarily be a pure reception of the Athenian/Panhellenic location of this burial: Thebans too may genuinely have believed in both of these versions and identifications.

This alternative explanation may refute modern attempts to distinguish the site of the Pyres from that of the monument for the Niobids,⁵⁵⁹ whereas it would seem to add new evidence in support of Symeonoglou's identification⁵⁶⁰ of the spot with the contemporary Pyri. This is a complex of two hills (*Mikrò* and *Megàlo*) east of the Kadmeia and west of the Ismenos river. The Archaic and Classical votive pottery on the spot is not quantitatively enough to suggest a large scale cult; the site was, therefore, more a "landmark" than an

557 The generic παῖς in Armenidas does not allow us to understand the gender of Amphion's and Niobe's children: when other sources, like Hellanikos (*BNJ* 4 F 21), reproduce the same number (7), the children are both male and female. Hyginus' isolation, on the presence of seven *filiae* (*Fab.* 66), seems to be preceded by a verse of Euripides' *Phoenician Women* (159), on the παρθένων τάφος. This verse is usually compared to a fragment of the *Cresphon* (*TrGF* 455) quoted by Gellius (20.7.1) and by a scholiast to Euripides (schol. *MTAB Phoen.* 159): in this other text, there are fourteen children, but we cannot rule out the possibility that the τάφος was built for female offspring (and it is not entirely impossible that Hyginus, in *Fab.* 66, draws on an ancient tradition). For Pausanias (9.16.7), there were different graves for the men and for the women, with a clear reminiscence of the model of Attic drama, where the συζυγίαί were often underlined.

558 Schol. A Pind. *Ol.* 6.26. Cp. Hubbard (1992: 96–7 n.51) on necessary prudence before assuming that all the mythical references in the Sixth Olympian Ode derive from the *Thebaid*. On this cyclical poem, see Torres-Guerra 2015 and 1.1.2.

559 Keramopoulos 1917.

560 Symeonoglou 1985: 250–1.25. Further scholarship in Schachter 1994a: 22.

actual heroon.⁵⁶¹ If this identification is correct, we have confirmation that such a spot could never properly disappear: it was vested with a number of different meanings throughout the history of the local community, which at times could coexist (Armenidas). At the opposite pole, we find the less equivocal positions of those like Pindar and Pausanias, who could only accept one history for this landmark of the Theban landscape.

3.3.3. Ionic Forms in Armenidas and Their Value

The alleged ionisms of this fragment, namely ποιεῦντες and καλεῦνται, have been used to date Armenidas, given the absence of further witnesses on him.⁵⁶² Wilamowitz and later commenters considered his use of the Ionic dialect as an archaic feature: Armenidas was choosing to write in Ionic to have a vaster audience, and his forms, in any case, would be rare after the end of the fifth century BCE.⁵⁶³ However, if we consider, first of all, that the epichoric form Ἀρίαρτος (F 6) coexists with Ἀλίαρτος until the second century BCE, it becomes obvious that these arguments are particularly dangerous in the absence of a rich original sample of texts.⁵⁶⁴

The issue concerns three main problems: (1) first, why and whether literary ionic could be used in a genre like Boiotian local historiography. Its production is so poorly attested in a direct form that we are forced to turn to the situation of Herodotus' dialect, and, in general, to post-Classical Ionic. Second (2), the scholium is textually troublesome, and it would be wrong to intervene on the transmitted forms, which are different from the overall language of learned *koine*. Finally (3), it would be misleading to include in our reflection the form Ἑρμαῖον, a modern correction of the transmitted ἔρμεσιν. By doing so, we assume that when the codices of the Ambrosian scholia were written (eleventh century CE), there was a process of homography.⁵⁶⁵ This correction brings a further disadvantage, because it adds two details to the text, namely the presence of the Herms on the site of the

561 Pyri: Symeonoglou 1973: 79 n.32. It would be the only toponym in the region to preserve a puzzling continuity, from the second millennium BCE on, together with *Thevai* (Symeonoglou 1985: 192). “Landmark”: Schachter 1994a: 22.

562 Another alleged ionism is Ἀρίαρτος, in F 6 (cp. 3.6.2), but see *infra* in text.

563 Wilamowitz 1922: 35 n.1.49 n.3; Jacoby 1955a: 160; Jacoby 1955b: 107 n.2; Schachter 2011a; Fowler 2013: 639.

564 Cp. Schachter 2011a and 2.2.6.2.

565 For the date of the ms. A (= Ambr. gr. 886), see Mazzucchi 2003, with a refusal of the previous suggestion of 1280.

Seven Pyres and a long dative in $-\alpha\iota\sigma\upsilon\omega$ that could be deceptive for our comprehension of the fragment.

1. During the Hellenistic period, Herodotus' text was enriched with a number of hyperionisms,⁵⁶⁶ which were added to the preexisting Ionic forms in the original text. These hyperionisms, however, were distant from the everyday Ionic dialect: in fact, between the fifth and the fourth centuries BCE, the inscriptions also attest to the use of the contraction $-\sigma\upsilon-$ ⁵⁶⁷ against the often artificial diphthong $-\epsilon\upsilon-$ of Herodotus and of the literary Ionic dialect.⁵⁶⁸ Moreover, since local historiography may also have other prosaic models, such as Attic and Doric prose,⁵⁶⁹ we do not need to consider these forms with a contraction in $-\epsilon\upsilon-$ as univocal hints of how Armenidas used a learned and archaizing Ionic dialect: even if the use of the Ionic dialect seems more probable (also for the circulation in Boiotia of the text of Herodotus), the absence of clear information on the date of Armenidas and of long excerpts suggests that we must have great prudence. Together with the literary influence, we should also consider whether the Attic dialect might find its way into the creation of the language of Boiotian historiography.

The coexistence of Ionic and Attic forms is confirmed by an important witness of the Classical Ionic dialect, the Derveni Papyrus, which has both forms with an “Ionic” contraction and short datives of the declension in $-a-$ ($-\alpha\iota\varsigma$, not “typically” Ionic).⁵⁷⁰ Now, we must assume that Aristodemos (third and second centuries BCE) could still read Armenidas, and that Armenidas, being less popular outside Thebes than other “universal” historians like Herodotus and Thucydides, was less subject to dialect transformations: this fact hinders those phenomena of strong corrections and modifications that we can imagine

566 Heraclitus' and Hippokrates' works suffered from the same consequences: see Cassio 1996: 148 and *passim*.

567 Cp. e.g. $\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\eta\tau\alpha$ (Schwyzer 1923: 767, ll. 1–2, from Ceos, fifth century BCE *ex.*). In general, the contraction is attested from the middle fifth century BCE (Horrocks 2010: 62). Already in the sixth century, the letters $-\epsilon\omicron-$ reflect a probable diphthong $[\epsilon\upsilon]$ (cp. $\mu\theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$ on a bronze letter from Berezan of the late sixth century [SEG XXVI 845] and $\Delta\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ on the statue of Nikandre, where the last syllable must have a synizesis, because it falls on a strong tempo [IG 12.5,2]; see on these texts Horrocks 2010: 37–9 and Corcella 1989: 245, for the possibility that Herodotus used both forms in $-\epsilon\omicron-$ and in $-\epsilon\upsilon-$).

568 The contraction between two equal vowels has different results (Miller 2014: 172–3). See, in particular on the result $-\epsilon\upsilon-$ from $\epsilon+\omicron$ in other dialects, Buck 1955: 40.

569 On the variety of dialects in prose, see Vessella 2008.

570 Cp. Cassio 1996: 152–3 and Horrocks 2010: 75.

more easily for “successful” texts. It follows that that the short-transmitted text 1) had less possibilities to be reworked and transformed, and 2) must not necessarily convey archaic forms of the fifth century BCE. In fact, it may also be an early example of the “atticization” of literary Ionic.⁵⁷¹

2. Consequently, imagining a further original status of the texts, with forms like ποιέοντες and Ἐρμῆσιον,⁵⁷² would imply imposing to the text a view of the dialect that contrasts with our evidence. Literary Ionic did not have a linear and clear evolution in our sources, and we also ignore how the Boiotians may try to adopt it in a historiographical work. From the little that we do know, their language could develop independently from great models like Herodotus, and be closer to other plain prose authors of the fourth century BCE.⁵⁷³ Ctesias, for example, seems to have shifted between a closer adhesion to literary Ionic, in his *Indika*, and the reception of the “langue savante gagnante” in his *Persika*, probably for the variety of the preexisting models.⁵⁷⁴

It may be interesting, however, to note how local reception in Boiotia of the Ionic alphabet, in the seventies of the fourth century BCE,⁵⁷⁵ may be seen as a local and final chapter of the “Panhellenic” success of the Ionian epigraphic alphabet, beyond a strict chronological arrangement.⁵⁷⁶ Armenidas’ use of sparse, but seemingly Ionic forms, may be proof, then, of a receptivity that is a historiographical and erudite penchant⁵⁷⁷ in a general

571 “C’est surtout la prose ionienne du début du IV^e siècle qui nous donne à nous modernes une impression de ‘reddition’ à l’attique” (Cassio 1996: 152).

572 Fowler 2013: 639–40; the second form is particular risky because it is a conjecture.

573 Atthidographers, too, referred to the Ionic model, in the final stage of the genre (Horrocks 2010: 64).

574 Cassio 1996: 153–5.

575 This chronological span has been suggested by Vottéro (1996) and is commonly accepted by current scholarship on the region (cp. Papazarkadas 2014: 232 and n.40), even though the method of introduction is still debated (Iversen 2010: 262–3). Papazarkadas (2016; see *ibid.* 135 for a short overview of the debate) suggests that Thebes, intervening in an ongoing process, imposed this new epigraphic habit. In general, on the introduction of the Ionic alphabet, see *supra* in 1.2.1.

576 The use of the Boiotian dialect, in the inscriptions, does not imply a simple passive reception of “pan-Hellenic literature” (Levin 1972: 54; cp. Luraghi 2010 on the value of epichoric alphabets).

577 Fowler (2001: 111–3) argued that the use of literary Ionic was a common phenomenon in local historiography, because it appealed to a wide audience. This inference, however, assumes the Panhellenic popularity of this dialect, and an almost indistinct audience for all the species of local historiography, which may be reconsidered by moving the perspective to a local subspecies.

change of the Theban and Boiotian epigraphic habit in the years of the hegemony.⁵⁷⁸ The connection with this broader internal process also seems to liberate Armenidas from an exclusively literary perspective, whereby only authors like Herodotus or local historians from other regions could help forge the tools of the nascent Boiotian historiography.

3. Finally, the transmitted ἔρμεσιϋ makes no sense, whereas Drachmann’s correction ἔρμαῖσιϋ implies locating the Seven Pyres “close to the Herms”. This correction would imply the existence of Herms, in Thebes, in a place where this element is not normally found: herms were commonly found in a square or at a crossroads. We can accept this conjecture, only if the area of the *Kastellia* was considered to be on the borders, where the Herms were usually built, or by assuming that they were actually monuments, like the ones that Pausanias associates with the Niobids (9.16.7; this hypothesis, nevertheless, would partially force the usual meaning of the word). A better conjecture would then be ἔρμασιϋ (Boeckh): this word can have a rare meaning, once endorsed by Boeckh, as “on the piles”. This interpretation has only one other occurrence in Classical literature, and even there the variation ἔργμα is preferred.⁵⁷⁹

Boeckh’s ἔρμασιϋ may be accepted if we keep the more common sense of “pillars, props” (*LSJ s.v.* I 1), and imagine an absolute expression, as in ἔρματα τῶν θεμελίωϋ (“foundation pillars”). This interpretation removes a long dative from the text (a dative, moreover, of artificial and not etymological nature), which would not lose its main texture, i.e. that of a non-Attic prose for the presence of not exclusively Ionic forms.⁵⁸⁰

578 I would then be closer to those who tend to date Armenidas to the first quarter of the fourth century BCE (Radtke 1901: 42).

579 *Soph. Ant.* 848. See Schachter 1994a: 24 and n.2; Griffith 1999: 271.

580 ἔρματα τῶν θεμελίωϋ: *Diod. Sic.* 5.70. The great diffusion of the movable -ϋ in Ionic dialect may have influenced this case (Vessella 2008: 294).

3.4. Armenidas F 4

Previous editions: *BNJ* 378 F 3; *EGMI* F 3; *FGrHist* 378 F 3 (Ath. 1.56.31A–B).

καλεῖται δ' οὕτως (*scil.* ὁ Βίβλινος οἶνος) ἀπό τινος χωρίου οὕτω
προσαγορευομένου [...]. Ἐπίχαρμος δὲ ἀπό τινων ὀρών Βιβλίνων φησὶν
αὐτὸν ὠνομάσθαι. Ἀρμενίδας δὲ τῆς Θράικης φησὶν εἶναι χώραν τὴν
Βιβλίαν, ἣν αὖθις Τισάρην καὶ Οἰσύμην προσαγορευθῆναι. ἐπικικῶς
δὲ ἡ Θράικη ἐθαυμάζετο ὡς ἡδύοινος, καὶ συνόλως † τὰ ἀπὸ πλησίον αὐτῆς
χωρία.

“The Bibline wine takes its name from a territory which was thus named [...] Epicharmos says that it takes this name from some Bibline mountains. Armenidas, instead, says that Biblia is a region in Thrace, and that it was previously named Tisare and Esyme. Thrace, to be honest, was admired for its good wines and so were, in general, the territories close to it” (tr. S. Tufano).

3.4.1. Textual Transmission and Context

The fragment is quoted in the epitome of the first book of Athenaeus’ *The Learned Banqueters* (56.31A–B).⁵⁸¹ Armenidas appears in a list of authors who mentioned the Bibline wine in their works. The Bibline wine was an extremely popular variety that is attested in literature, for example, by Hesiod (*Op.* 589) and Euripides (*Ion* 1195). There were various speculations on its exact place of origin: Hippys suggested a connection with Italy;⁵⁸² he thought that the Bibline wine coincided with the Sicilian “Pollios” wine and that it had taken its name from the fact that the vine that twists itself (εἰλέον) is called βιβλία.⁵⁸³ Pollis

581 On the textual tradition of the *Learned Banqueters*, see shortly *infra* n.1040.

582 Cp. Arist. F 585b Ross and Vanotti 2003: 525–6.

583 This etymology suggests that we doubt the connection to the adjectives βυβλίαν and βυβλίαναν, which are found on a Table of Herakleia (*IG* 14.645 I 58 and 93). The comparison is not fitting, as maintained by Ghezzi 2004: 44, because the two adjectives actually refer to a μασχάλα, which defines a palustrine wetland where papyrus grow (Uguzzoni – Ghinatti 1968: 63–4).

of Argos, then, imported this variety to Syracuse. His figure, however, is obscure, and his name might have been created based on that of the wine.⁵⁸⁴ Armenidas, instead, suggested, together with the comedian Phylillus (fifth and fourth centuries BCE), that this wine came from Thrace.⁵⁸⁵ Even if Epicharmus is mentioned between Phylillus and Ibycus, we cannot be sure that he shared their point of view on this, since other sources set the ὄρη βίβλινα⁵⁸⁶ on the Upper Nile, not far from the city of Βύβλος.⁵⁸⁷

In any case, the Thracian origin of the Bibline wine was considered the most likely one. The actual discussion of the sources concerns the exact point of where the toponym could be located in this region. The name of the vine, in fact, should be βίβλια, from the root βιβλ-, combined with a suffix -ινος for the materials (West 1978: 306). This etymology implies the existence of an original Βίβλος, which is mentioned by a scholium on Hesiod (*Op.* 589: ὡς φασι, ποταμὸς ἢ πόλις Θρακικῆ). Despite this exact identification with either a river or a city, both Armenidas and the later Stephanus (β 92, *s.v.* Βιβλίνη) refer to a Thracian region, the Βίβλινη, which must coincide with the centres quoted by Armenidas.

584 So, Jacoby 1955a: 485. Later scholarship tried to find more precise events that may lie behind Hippys' explanation: Italian scholars, for instance, suggest that Pollis belonged to a noble family that reached Syracuse at the moment of its early colonization (Manni 1989), and that Pollis, in particular, was a prytanis, who advocated for the title of *basileus* for himself (De Sanctis 1958: 7-8; Sartori 1997: 52; Ghezzi 2004: 44). Vanotti (2003: 529-30) argued that the fragment comes from Hippys' Σικελικά and that it originally referred to an oracle of foundation for the city of Rhegium. Hippys records a Messenian tradition, biased towards the tyrant Anaxilaos of Rhegium (494-76 BCE); Epicharmus, on the other hand, reasserted the Thracian origin of the wine, because of his political closeness to the Deinomenids of Syracuse, who fought Anaxilaos (F 96 K. – A.: Epicharmus' position, therefore, should be understood against Hippys and not as a fruit of his own inquiry). If a Sicilian context is likely, in the appreciation of a political connection, the extent of the witness of Epicharmus invites more prudence.

585 Cp. *Et. Gen.* β 114 *s.v.* Βίβλινος οἶνος (p.63 Berger); Ghezzi 2004: 42 and n.78.

586 The form in βι- alternates with that in βυ-. The first one prevails in the ancient sources, and in fact the second one might be influenced by the word βύβλιον (West 1978: 306). The vowel is diriment, because the form Βύβλιος forces us to imagine a reference to the Phoenician Byblos (Βύβλος), like in a fragment by Arcestratus (59 Douglas Olson – Sens); however, even if, in this case, the link with wine seems certain (so Ercolani 2010: 357), the adjective βύβλιμος only rarely definitely refers to the Phoenician city (*Luc. Syr. D.* 7).

587 Schol. Aesch. *PV* 807. On this tradition, see Ghezzi 2004: 42. Semus of Delus (*BNJ* 396 F 13) thought that the origin of the name of this wine lay in a river of Naxos. Since Athenaeus probably still read Semus, scholars suggest that Semus was also the source on the other authors, because he dealt with the same topic (Zecchini 1989: 158 and Zecchini 1997: 189). Athenaeus was probably drawing on a lexicon or on a Hellenistic *Book of Wines* (Wilamowitz 1884b), as he explicitly mentions Semus only for the Pramnian wine, and not for the Bibline (Bertelli 2009 *ad BNJ* 396 F 13b).

Thrace was already a well-known region for its wine in the *epos*;⁵⁸⁸ the Bibline wine represented one of its peak productions, not necessarily hard to find and therefore expensive: its mention by Hesiod does not betray an inclusion among luxury goods.⁵⁸⁹ As a consequence, this common association with Thrace suggests some prudence before immediately accepting that the vine was historically imported to Boiotia and Thrace from the Phoenician city of Byblos during the eighth century BCE:⁵⁹⁰ the link with this eastern Byblos is not immediately straightforward in our sources. It is interesting that some of them, like our Armenidas, could actually insist on the Greek origin of the vine, in possible opposition to other theories (Ghezzi 2004: 44): the oriental link, then, is not immediately transparent to the ancient scholars.

3.4.2. A Theban Scenario

Armenidas included under the toponym “Biblia” two centers, which were opposite of Thasos: the first one, Antisara, is also known as Tisara and has been identified with a settlement of the sixth century BCE on the promontory of Kalamitsa. The settlement was a Thracian emporium and never became a proper *polis*.⁵⁹¹ The second center, Oisyme, lay on Cape Vrasidas and was a more important spot than Antisara. It also showed clear trading interests, since it is the only place of the Thasian *peraia* that is already mentioned by Homer (*Il.* 8.304). Oisyme was a Thasian colony and enjoyed political independence in the fourth century BCE, as is evident from a series of autonomously issued coins.⁵⁹² The absence of the city on the Athenian tribute lists demonstrates its dependent status towards Thasos, directly confirmed by the common iconography shown on the coins of Oisyme.

588 On the prestige of Thracian wines, see Hom. *Il.* 7.467 (νήες δ' ἐκ Λήμνοιο παρέσταν οἶνον ἄγουσαι); *Od.* 9.196–8 (Odysseus has the Cyclops drink wine from Ismaros, just like the one mentioned by Archilochus in our F 2,1–2 West, *IE*²: ἐν δορὶ δ' οἶνος/ Ἴσμαρκός; cp. Ghezzi 2004: 36–7 and Ercolani 2010: 35).

589 Cp. Ercolani 2010: 357.

590 Salviat 1990: 466–7.

591 Cp. Steph. Byz. α 336, *s.v.* Ἀντισάρα and Loukoupoulou 2004: 856.

592 On Oisyme, see the voice in the *LACP* by Loukoupoulou (2004: 864–5). Thasian colony: Thuc. 4.107.3; Diod. Sic. 12.68.4. The issues seem to be associated to a series of turmoil after the Thasian expansion on the continent: Picard 1993.

Armenidas then gave literary recognition to these Thracian harbours, and to the particular stress displayed by the Thasians in the commerce and regulation of wine trade.⁵⁹³

Unless we posit another work for Armenidas, different from his *Θηβαϊκά*, the fragment poses difficulties, for it is hard to imagine the original context of this information on Thrace in a work allegedly centered on Thebes. According to his reconstruction of the work as a topographical commentary on Thebes, Schachter (2011a *ad BNJ* 378 F 3) believes that the mention of the Bibline wine refers to the *aition* for the foundation of the temple of Dionysos Lysios not far from the Theban temple close to the Proitidian Gates.⁵⁹⁴ A group of Boiotians was once captured through a ruse by the Thracians, but managed to free themselves by surprising the Thracians who were asleep: the Thracians were suffering from the after-effects of the wine they had been served by the Boiotians. The Boiotians, then, dedicated a cult to Dionysos in Thebes.⁵⁹⁵ Both the place where the Boiotians were captured⁵⁹⁶ and the location of where they freed themselves⁵⁹⁷ are subject to many variations. Aristophanes (F 4) is a partial exception, since he claims that the cult of Dionysos Lysios was established after the Theban abduction of *Ampelos* (the vine, or a mythical character): in his reconstruction, the local explanation for the epithet *lysios* focuses on the act of salvation, not on an exact toponym.⁵⁹⁸ The connection between the anecdote and the fragment may simply be that the Thracians served Bibline wine (or had already drunk it, for the fame of the wine), since a generic association with the region, in the context of a short anecdote, seems excessive.

However, we can imagine a different organization of the materials in the *Theban Histories* of Armenidas (with a possible inclusion of contemporary events in the work) and follow a

593 On the coins of Oisyme, see Picard 1993: 13. On the Thasian regulations, see Koerner 1993: 66 and 68–9.

594 Paus. 9.16.6. On the cult, see Casadio 1999: 124–43. Schachter (1981: 191) suggested that the cult of Dionysos was an emulation of the Athenian model, because its position in connection with the theatre resembles the Athenian temple of Dionysos Eleuthereios. The theatre of Thebes has possibly been identified (but see Germani 2012); there are no clearly associable structures for the temple, which is mentioned by an inscription, with a dedication by Eumenes II (*SEG* XV 328; cp. Symeonoglou 1985: 190 and Moggi – Osanna 2012: 306–7).

595 This plot emerges from the combination of Aristophanes F 4 (4.5); Herakleides Pontikos F 143 Schütrumpf; Ephoros, *BNJ* 70 F 119; Paus. 9.16.6; Zen. 4.37; Polyaeus, *Strat.* 7.43.

596 Polyaeus: Lake Kopais; Zenobios: Koroneia (not a real variation, probably, but maybe only a detail, in relationship with the lake). On this variety, see *supra* 3.1.1.

597 Herakleides: Lebadeia; Pausanias: Haliartos.

598 Casadio 1999: 126; Pausanias often refers to anecdotes, to explain single epithets (Gaertner 2006: 483).

date of the second quarter of the fourth century BCE.⁵⁹⁹ Another scenario then becomes possible, one that is linked to Theban politics in the sixties of the century. The remoteness of Thracia may be explained by the fact that Epameinondas was sailing in the region, in the context of the sea campaign,⁶⁰⁰ and used the harbors quoted in Armenidas' fragment.

The mention of Antisara and Oisyme may then acquire a new meaning in this context: these centers were, with Thasos, on an important route for any ship returning to Greece from the Hellespont.⁶⁰¹ The context of the fragment might then be a distorting mirror, since it is Athenaeus who quotes the cities for the Bibline wine; their original appearance in the *Theban Histories* had a different meaning. The historiographical tradition on the naval side of the Theban hegemony is nowadays dispersed and generally poor in detail, but the sources on Epameinondas and the traditions on him were probably richer and vaster than the ones we know directly.⁶⁰²

The fragment might then derive from a narrative of the events of the sixties of the fourth century BCE, even if such a scenario naturally conflicts with the (hypothetical) contrasting view that Armenidas lived at the end of the previous century. The absence of further “historical” fragments hinders our interpretation, and it is true that a date of Armenidas in the second quarter of the century does not necessarily authorize us to consider our interpretation as the only valid one. However, it is not less likely than any forced attempt to consider Armenidas as an early mythographer who could only refer to the wine as an erudite detail.

599 See *supra* (3.3.3) for this date.

600 See 7.3 for a short overview of this campaign.

601 The reconstruction of Carrata Thomes (1952: 37; cp. the map at Vela Tejada 2015: 54) suggests a diagonal crossing of the Thracian Sea with the direct arrival in the Malian Gulf. However, it is not necessary to suggest that Thasos was directly touched by Epameinondas: the island, in the context of a coasting navigation, just like the two centers mentioned in the fragment, may also be the object of a connection.

602 On these traditions, see Carrata Thomes 1952: 8–11. Cp. e.g., on Epameinondas' arrogance, Plut. *de Laude ipsius* 9.542C: “Hence Epameinondas said when Menecleidas derided him as prouder than Agamemnon: ‘But it is your doing, men of Thebes; with your help alone I overthrew the Spartan empire in a day’” (tr. P.H. de Lacy – B. Einarson).

3.5. Armenidas F 5

Previous editions: *BNJ* 378 F 5; *EGM I* F **5; *FGrHist* 378 F 5 (Hsch. μ 110 [II 363 Latte] = Phot. [g, z] μ 44 [II 533 Theodoridis] = *Suda* μ 58, *s.v.* Μακάρων νήσοισιν = *Com. adesp.* *PCG* F 386 K.-A.).

Μακάρων νῆσος· ἡ ἀκρόπολις τῶν ἐν Βοιωτίαι Θεβῶν τὸ παλαιόν, ὡς Ἄρμενδας.

1 μακάρων...θηβῶν Hsch. νήσοισιν *Suda* 2 ἀρμένδας g z Ἄρμεν<ί>δας Fiorillo 1801,117 Jacoby Fowler Παρμενίδης *Suda*

“Isle of the Blessed: once upon a time the acropolis of Thebes, according to Armendas” (tr. S. Tufano).

3.5.1. Textual Transmission and Context

Hesychius omits the name of the source, Armenidas; this omission might be due to the nature of the only preserved manuscript of his work, an abridged and interpolated version of the *Lexicon*, originally written in the fifth or sixth century CE. The version on the *Suda* also presents reasons for controversy, since its author probably misunderstood the name of the author as it was recorded on Photius’ *Lexicon*. The *Suda* drew on Photius “*suo Marte*”,⁶⁰³ because the text presents the trivialization Παρμενίδης instead of the transmitted Ἀρμένδας. This is the form of the personal name on the ms. z of Photius, without the iota integrated by Fiorillo (1801: 117).

This form of the personal name is particularly interesting, because it is the only instance where the name of the historian is reported as ending in -νδας and not in -ίδας; since the suffix -νδας, etymologically Greek, is particularly evident in Boiotia, it is advisable to

603 Theodoridis 1998: 533. Cp. Dickey 2007: 90.

accept the transmitted form *Armendas* (Ἀρμένδας).⁶⁰⁴ This may have been the real name of the historian, because it is easy to imagine how, from a very early stage, it could quickly be trivialized with the Ionic suffix *-ίδας*.⁶⁰⁵ In the rest of the work, however, I adopt the generally accepted form *Armenidas*, which is now common for his name.

The interest of the lexicographers is probably due to the singular identification of the Isles of the Blessed in Thebes, which were normally placed in an ultramundane area. This ultramundane place had no univocal location in the mental geography of the Greeks: Pherekydes (*BNJ* 3 F 84),⁶⁰⁶ for example, claimed that Alkmene's burial was in Thebes and that the woman was buried by the Heraklids; however, Zeus sent Hermes to move her body to the Isles of the Blessed, where the woman married Rhadamanthys. This example clearly shows the general tendency of the interpreters to detach an imagined place from a specific individuation, such as Thebes in this narrative.

The Isles of the Blessed are παρ'Ὠκεανὸν βαθυδίνην, “along the shore of the deep-swirling Ocean”, in the first literary source that mentions them, Hesiod (*Op.* 171).⁶⁰⁷ In the *Works and Days*, the islands host those blessed heroes (172) who fought against Thebes

604 I wish to thank Prof. A.C. Cassio for this suggestion.

605 The personal name Ἀρμενίδας is only known through literary sources. The only potential documentary evidence may derive from an inscription in Delphi of the fourth century BCE (*FD* III 4, 394, l.3), but here the suffix of the name is reconstructed as Ἀρμεν[ίδας]. In Lokris, in Phokis, and in the Megarid, we know of other personal names formed from the same root, such as Ἀρμενισᾶς, Ἀρμενίων, and Ἀρμενος (cp. *LGPN s. vv.*). The suffixes *-ίδης* and *-ίδας* have a different origin (Kereuntjies 1997: 397), as the first one is made of the pre-Greek element *-ιδ-*, which received a further suffix *-ας* to specify the masculine member of a group or of a family (*Maskulinisierung*: Meier 1975: §66; Ruijgh 1992: 559-60). The other suffix, *-ιδας*, i.e. *-ιδα-*, is a parallelism from pre-Greek roots and words. The suffix *-ιδας* is highly prolific in Boiotian and in the north-western dialects, mainly from roots of *-ν-* (Clinton Woodworth 1932: 344). It is possible, on the basis of other similar proper names, that *Armendas* (Ἀρμένδας) came from a root in epsilon, not dissimilar to the parallel case Ποιμενδαο (Te Riele 1975: 77-82; cp. also *SEG* XXXII 538): “il apparaît donc vraisemblable de considérer que les finales *-αδας*, *-ωνδας* (et on y ajoutera *-ενδας*) sont des combinaison de *-α + -ιδας*, *-ων + -ιδας* et *-εν + -ιδας*” (Vottéro 2017: 616).

606 The ascription of the fragment to Pherekydes has been contested by Jacoby (1923a: 415) and by Fowler (2013: 343), who think that the witness, Antoninus Liberalis (*Met.* 33), draws on a mythographical handbook. For the present discourse, we might accept, however, the name of “Pherekydes” as a sign of the great antiquity of the tradition, which is confirmed by Plutarch (cp. *infra*).

607 Cp. *POxy* 2510.2, and Bravo 2001: ἐς μακάρων νῆσοις π[ί]ν[ειν] πόμ[ατ'] Ὠκεαν[οῖο]. If we accept Bravo's suggestion that the fragment comes from the *Small Iliad*, the poem and Hesiod might both be drawing on the Homeric verse ἐς πείρατα ἴκανε βαθυρρούο Ὠκεανοῖο (Hom. *Od.* 11.13), which locates the World of the Dead beyond the Ocean (Manfredi 1993: 28).

(162-3) and Troy (165). Even if the substantive μάκαρες originally refers to the gods,⁶⁰⁸ Hesiod uses it for these men, as is confirmed by a verse that helps us imagine the location of the Isles: they were a place inaccessible to other mortals, beyond a possible mythical geography.⁶⁰⁹ The location by the river Oceanus distinguishes the world of the dead from that of the living,⁶¹⁰ and all we can posit is a generic position in the West.⁶¹¹

After Hesiod, later speculation on this mythical spot highlighted its exclusive character, because the Islands were slowly reserved for privileged figures, like the initiates of a mystery. This is the picture that emerges, for instance, from what Pindar says in his Second *Olympian Ode* (61-83). Nonetheless, many contemporary speculations are constantly based on the myth of Rhadamanthys, whose earthly connections include the region of Boiotia and Crete.⁶¹² Of these two locations, the Cretan one is the more common: the poet Cinaethon defined Rhadamanthys as a Cretan, whereas the *Iliad* simply attests an association with Europa, which only indirectly alludes to a Boiotian setting.⁶¹³ This would emerge from the association with Europa, who had been hidden by Zeus in a cave in Teumessos, according to one tradition.⁶¹⁴ We cannot rule out, however, that this Europa was a namesake of the girl kidnapped by Zeus and chased by Kadmos, and that the original Boiotian myth of the “other” Europa was only later bound with the Cretan myth

608 M.L. West 1978: 193; S. West 2003: 380.

609 Ercolani 2010: 192. In the Archaic period, apart from this representation, other people may be imagined on the Isles of the Blessed, like those semidivine heroes who are mentioned in a fragment of the *Small Iliad* (*POxy.* 2510 = F 32 Bernabé). Here, a god (Hermes, Athena, or Iris; see Bravo 2001: 62) invites the Achaeans to recover Achilles’ body, so that his corpse might be later moved by Rhadamanthys to the Isles of the Blessed (ll. 2-3). Rhadamanthys, the son of Zeus and Europa (Hom. *Il.* 14.322; see commentary on Aristophanes FF 9 A and B), was often placed in this imaginary place. The Isle(s) of the Blessed was also assimilated, and sometimes identical with, the Elysian fields, where Menelaus finally goes, according to what Proteus claims (Hom. *Od.* 4.561-9; cp. Bravo 2001: 96-7 and, on the association, Manfredi 1993: 5 and n.1; S. West 2003: 380-1). After Homer, the adjective ήλύσιος reappears, in the extant literature, only in Apollonius Rhodius (4.811)..

610 West 1981: 364 mentions on this Hom. *Od.* 10.508; 11.157; 24.11.

611 Cp. Manfredi 1993: 25-33 and Debiasi 2008: 96. The general location έκαστέρω [...] Εύβοίης (Hom. *Od.* 7.321) confirms the western place of the Isles and can be explained as being from the point of view of Asia Minor.

612 On Rhadamanthys, see also the commentary on Aristophanes FF 9A and B.

613 Cinaethon F 1 West, *GEF* (according to Diod. Sic. 5.84 and to Apollod. 3.6, he ruled over the island and over the Aegean islands); Hom. *Il.* 14.322.

614 Schachter 2011a *ad BNJ* 378 F 5, with reference to Antimachos FF 2-3 Wyss. Further sources on Rhadamanthys in Boiotia are discussed *infra* (4.10.3); in general, it is fair to admit that “Eurôpé est chez elle en terre béotienne” (Bonnehère 2003: 299).

of Rhadamanthys (for example, by considering Minos and Sarpedon as Europa’s children).⁶¹⁵

3.5.2. The Sacred Space of the Kadmeia, between Tradition and Propaganda

Jacoby (1955a: 158-9) suggested three possible scenarios, which may explain the association of the Isles of the Blessed with the Theban acropolis. According to him, this might imply:

1. a reference to the birth of Zeus in Thebes, because Thebes was also the Διὸς γοναί, the “Birthplace of Zeus”,⁶¹⁶
2. a mention of the cenotaph of Hektor, sometimes imagined in Thebes,⁶¹⁷
3. a link with the traditions on Rhadamanthys’ presence in Boiotia, because he had either married Alkmene and died in Haliartos,⁶¹⁸ or had reached the region as an exile from Crete, before stopping at Oichalia,⁶¹⁹ where he married Alkmene.⁶²⁰

615 Hes. *Cat.* FF 140-1 M. – W. On this hypothesis, see West 1985: 147. As a consequence of this syncretism, Plutarch records, in his *Life of Lysander* (28.4-5), that the Cretan storax-shrub grew at the Cissousa spring, which was considered proof of Rhadamanthys’ stay in the region. Here this figure had a cenotaph, the Alea (on the identification of the two figures, suggested by Plutarch but debatable for modern scholars, see Schachter 1981: 9 and Parker 2010: 131 and n.9).

616 Aristodemos *BNJ* 383 F 7 (“For the Thebans in Boiotia, who were pressed by evil, consulted an oracle about deliverance. The oracular response they were given was that the terrible things would stop, if Hektor’s bones were carried over from Ophryinion in the Troas to the place which was called by them *Birthplace of Zeus*. After they had done it and they were released from the evil, they esteemed Hektor, and during pressing times they invoke his appearance. The story is according to Aristodemos”; tr. Ganter – Zgoll); schol. *vet. Lycoph. Alex.* 1204.

617 Aristodemos *BNJ* 383 F 7; Paus. 9.18.5; schol. *vet. Lycoph. Alex.* 1204. Cp. Vian 1963: 123 nn.2-3; Federico 2008.

618 Plut. *Lys.* 28; *de gen.* 3-5.577E-578B.

619 The mention of Haliartos may be a simplification of the less-known Oichalia between the sanctuary of Poseidon in Onchestos and Haliartos (Schachter 1981: 13 and 2011a *ad. BNJ* 378 F 5, after *Hom. Hymn. Ap.* 239-43 and Str. 9.2.26.410). Other scholars suggest that, instead of the most known Haliartos, a more erudite option was chosen for the prestige attached to it by the Homeric verses: Schachter 1994a: 25: “Eventually, to give the tale a proper Homeric colour –or perhaps because by this time Haliartos had ceased to exist, that is, after 171 B.C. – the scene was shifted to Okaleia”; cp. Kühr 2006: 195 n.165).

620 Apollod. 2.11; Tzetz. *ad Lycoph. Alex.* 50. These hypotheses do not agree with the reading, suggested by Kühr (2006: 118 n.182), that the inscription *IG* 7.2452 (ἡαρὸν| Γ[αί]α|ς [Μα]καίρα-| ς Τελεσσφόρο), might betray a reference to the acropolis as the Isle of the Blessed. Other interpretations held in the past, however, deserve mention here, like the

The further association with Herakles, resulting from the wedding of Rhadamanthys with Alkmene (3), suggested to Schachter (2011a) that this last scenario was more likely for a local history of Thebes. We know that another local historian, Aristophanes (FF 9A–B), named Rhadamanthus as a teacher of Herakles:⁶²¹ in that case, however, as shown by the commentary, it is possible that, already, Rhadamanthys was not Herakles' stepfather. The traditions linking Rhadamanthys with Boiotia have a relatively recent development, from indirect indications in the *Iliad* (see 3.5.1).

The first two hypotheses have the advantage that they can be clearly identified both in the imagined and in the experienced Thebes, from what we know of the ancient city.⁶²² However, the relevance of Herakles in Thebes is probably an important detail that we cannot escape, and Jacoby's aporetic conclusion should probably be espoused.⁶²³ The real uniqueness of this fragment lies, in any case, not generally in the presence of the Isles of the Blessed in Thebes, but in their presence on the Kadmeia. Since all the other "Panhellenic" sources tend to repeat a western identification of the isles, we must understand the originality of this local tradition and imagine how strong this connection could be felt in Thebes, to the point that a local historian decided to accept it in his work.

The lexicographers, in point of fact, link the Islands to the Kadmeia and specify that it was an ancient identification (τὸ παλαιόν, "once upon a time"). Whether this comes from learned scholarship (lexicographical sources), or from Armenidas, it forces us to historicize and locate in the tangible world, the ultramundane reality of the Blessed Islands. From a local point of view, this association may depend on the necessity to pinpoint in Thebes the presence of a figure who could be imagined, in general, as finishing her or his fate on the

one by Burkert (1961), who argued for a misunderstanding of the adjective ἐνηλύσιος, "struck by lightning", originally referred to by Armenidas as the place where Semele had been struck by Zeus. K. Latte linked the lemma to an anti-Theban *boutade* of an Athenian comedian, but it is hard to imagine how derogatory such an association could prove for Thebes (Latte 1966: 623: "[i]ocus comici Atheniensis ab Armenida vel excerptore male intellectus"). This last suggestion is considered plausible by Fowler (2013: 500).

621 Cp. *infra* 4.10.

622 However, Fowler (2013: 500) observes that the birthplace of Zeus and the cenotaph of Hektor were usually placed outside the walls and not on the Kadmeia (Paus. 9.18.5; schol. Lycoph. *Alex.* 1194).

623 Jacoby 1955a: 159 ("[D]ie beiden ersten möglichkeiten haben den vorteil, dass sie den τόπος καλούμενος Μακάρων νῆσοι [...] direkt für Theben bezeugen. [...] [E]s ist nicht möglich, sich für eine von ihnen sicher zu entscheiden").

remote Isles of the Blessed (or, far from Thebes): this vagueness became an actual, close space in this local imaginary.

A possible candidate for this is Alkmene, who dies in Thebes (in the aforementioned fragment by “Pherekydes” [BNJ 3 F 84]) under the domain of the Herakleidai. Zeus, as we have seen, sent Hermes to move the corpse to the Isles of the Blessed, where the woman married Rhadamanthys. In the meantime, the Herakleidai discovered that the divine messenger had substituted the corpse with a stone, and they dedicated this object in a grove (ἐν τῷ ἄλσει),⁶²⁴ which became the seat of the ἡρώϊον τὸ τῆς Ἀλκμήνης ἐν Θήβησι. The same story is mentioned in Plutarch’s *Life of Romulus* (28), even if there is no explicit mention of Thebes, but only the missing corpses and the discovery of the stone.

Alkmene’s body was then the object of a theft during the Spartan occupation of Thebes, aimed at gaining its propitiatory aspect, according to what Plutarch says elsewhere (*de Gen.* 3–5.577E–578B). In this dialogue, Phidolaus of Haliartos recalls the impious action of the Spartan king Agesilaos (whose presence in Thebes and freedom of movement suggest a fictional date of 382–79 BCE for the dialogue).⁶²⁵ It seems that Agesilaos also wanted to open the grave but found other things instead of the corpse: (possibly) a part of it or a stone,⁶²⁶ a bracelet, two amphorae, and a tablet written in an ancient script.

⁶²⁴ The correction ἄσται (Wilamowitz 1891: 210 n.2) seems trivial and we do not have strong evidence to support it.

⁶²⁵ Schachter 1981: 13 and n.2; Parker 2010: 135–7. Brugnone (2008: 46–9) suggests an earlier date, because she connects the quarrel to the events following the death of Lysander in the battle of Koroneia (394 BCE). Agesilaos took revenge upon the Haliartians, because a citizen from this city killed Lysander (Plut. *Lys.* 29.9; Paus. 9.32.5). The violation of the burial of Alkmene, in this scholar’s reconstruction, would then be an almost personal revenge, all the more impious because it was not sanctioned by a divine performer. A further private aspect of this was the anti-Theban policy of Agesilaos, who, as a Heraklid, had every reason to recover the remains of Herakles’ mother. The main issue with this reconstruction lies in the utter refusal of Plutarch’s version in the *de Genio Socratis*: Brugnone claims that Agesilaos did not control Boiotia, since Phidolaus was able to express his indignation. However, this same character maintains to have been absent when the events occurred (5.577E: οὐ γὰρ παρέτυχον). The god’s discontent for the inaction of the Haliartians, moreover, can only be understood if they were actually inhibited from reacting in the years of Spartan rule.

⁶²⁶ The text has a lacuna, which makes the exact nature of the findings hard to understand: εὐρέθη δ’ οὖν <...> σώματος (5.577F). The lacuna has been variously supplied with actual indications of what was found (Schachter 1981: 14, for instance, suggested τὰ λείψανα, “the remains”), but the most prudent conjecture is still, probably, the one suggested by Wilamowitz, <λίθος ἀντὶ τοῦ> (cp. Russell in Nesselrath 2010: 86 n.52: as Pherekydes and Plut. *Rom.* 28 confirm, something else was found “instead of the body”). The limit of this conjecture is that it transfers to the Haliartian setting

The episode was carefully studied and understood as an echo of the mythical *memorabilia* policy, already attested in the Archaic Age (just think, for instance, of the removal of Theseus’ bones around the half of the seventies from Skyros to Athens).⁶²⁷ Even Alkmene’s bones, or what remains of them, receive libations meant at granting benefits to those who enact them. This is shown by Lysanoridas’ absence from the dialogue in the *de Genio Socratis* (5,578A), since he is in Haliartos to fill in the grave. The arrival of the woman in the Isles of the blessed, mentioned by Pherekydes before Plutarch, was probably rationalized in Thebes and given a close – and experienceable – setting; other places in town were credited with a cenotaph of Alkmene,⁶²⁸ but the acropolis naturally held a special place in the local topography.

The Theban acropolis had already accommodated a rare moment of cohabitation of mortals and humans, with the wedding of Kadmos and Harmonia.⁶²⁹ Therefore, it was the natural candidate for a singular destination for Alkmene, since the Kadmeia resonated with that ultramundane association and was clearly identifiable, at the same time, in Thebes. Secondly, the acropolis is the middle point in Classical gestaltic geography: its symbolism echoes an ideal city, which thus becomes the centre of the world.⁶³⁰

In his *de Genio Socratis* (5.578A), Plutarch mentions a draught followed by the flood of Lake Kopais in Haliartos. The event was considered as divine vengeance, because the local population allowed the sacrilegious theft.⁶³¹ If we accept the historicity of this episode, but

what is originally set in Thebes, but we cannot rule out that the “places of Alkmene” shared details in single aetiologies. Moreover, we will see (*infra* in text) that the Thebans may likely have been the ones who were inspired by the (previous?) Haliartian setting.

⁶²⁷ Parker 2010. See, on this topic, McCauley 1999; Patterson 2010: 38-44; Zaccarini 2015 (the story might actually be a tradition arising in the fourth century BCE).

⁶²⁸ Diod. Sic. 4.58.6; Paus. 9.16.7; Schachter 1981: 15-6. Pausanias (1.41.1) recalls another version where the remains of Alkmene were placed in Megara; on the cult of Alkmene, see Larson 1995: 83-5. For her association with Thebes, see Larson 2000: 199.

⁶²⁹ Paus. 9.12.3. Cp. Rocchi 1989: 41-58 and *supra* 2.2.2 *ad ἕκαστον δῶρον* for the meaning of the presence of the gods in Thebes during this event.

⁶³⁰ Kühr 2006: 118 n.182.

⁶³¹ Plut. *de gen.* 5.578A: “At Haliartus the great failure of crops and encroachment of the lake are held to have been no mere accident, but a judgement on us for having allowed the excavation of the tomb” (tr. P.H. de Lacy – B. Emerson).

imagine it in Thebes and not in Haliartos,⁶³² the tradition may be understood as justification for the non-intervention of the Thebans when Agesilaos tried to recover this disputed corpse. The story of the actual presence of Alkmene may have served as a national apology: the Spartan king only found fake remnants, while the real Alkmene was laying in peace (and hidden?) on the Kadmeia.⁶³³ Armenidas, in this reading, is witness to a recent tradition aimed at defending the Thebans from an accusation of impiety: the hypothesis does not explicitly contrast the identification of Rhadamanthys' corpse in other areas of Boiotia.⁶³⁴

Finally, it might be worth considering the role of the Kadmeia and the possible association with the tradition that imagined the final fate of Kadmos and Harmonia on the Isles of the Blessed after they had been transformed into snakes. Even in this other interpretation, the location of these legendary figures in a mundane spot could grant the site the presence of a figure, Kadmos, who was actually a *genius loci* for Thebes.⁶³⁵ Just like in the tradition of the final fate of Alkmene, we should understand this location as an innovation, because the sources on the final journey of Kadmos and Harmonia imagine the couple moving to a place completely beyond the historical boundaries of the Earth. In one version of this section of the myth, they reach the Elysian Fields on a cart.⁶³⁶

However, both the fate of Alkmene and that of the founders have the same possibility of being linked with Armenidas' identification of the Kadmeia as the Isle(s) of the Blessed. Both these interpretations may be imagined in a history of Thebes, and they actually both agree in the social meaning that underlies this fragment: these Isles were located in time and space in Thebes by a local historian, who elsewhere (F 3, on the Seven Pyres) acknowledges the possibility of plural meanings for the same spot. The advantage of this

632 On the possible historicity of the episode, cp. Parker 2010. Mazzarino (1966: 430-1) suggested that an indirect proof may be the image of Agesilaos as an impious and sacrilegious king, which significantly contrasts the common view in the other sources of an "Agesilao religiosissimo" (Brugnone 2008: 45).

633 According to Ziehen (1934: 1495; cp. Schachter 1981: 15 and Larson 1995: 84; Kühr 2006: 195), the Theban *heroon* inspired the aition, mentioned by Pherekydes, because Alkmene had an "aniconical" representation here.

634 Fowler 2013: 500.

635 This hypothesis is recorded by Fowler 2013: 356. On this tradition, see Pind. *Ol.* 2.24-38 and 86; *Pyth.* 9.1; Eur. *Bacch.* 1330-9; Apollod. 3.39; schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 3.153b Drachmann; schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 9.1 Drachmann. On the heroization of this couple, see Vian 1963: 122-4 (*ibid.* 123 for Kadmos as a *genius loci*) and Kühr 2006: 117-8.

636 Schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 3.153b Drachmann.

reading lies in its direct association with the short text of the fragment and in its complete focus on the implications of the association of the Kadmeia with the Isles of the Blessed; further interpretations might distract us from a more direct explanation.

3.6. Armenidas F 6

Previous editions: *BNJ* 378 F 7; *EGM* I F 7; *FGtHist* 378 F 7 (Steph. Byz. α 203 *s.v.* Ἀλιάρτος, and Eust. *ad Il.* II 503, p. I 410,27 van der Valk).

Ἀλιάρτος· πόλις Βοιωτίας, ἀρσενικῶς. Ὅμηρος “ποιήενθ’ Ἀλιάρτον” (*Il.* II 503). λέγεται δὲ κτισθῆναι ὑπὸ Ἀλιάρτου τοῦ Θερσάνδρου. τὸ ἔθνικόν Ἀλιάρτιος ὡς Βοιώτιος. Ἀρμενίδας δ’ ἐν τῷ ρ Ἀριάρτόν φησι.

1 Ἀλιάρτος *ed.* Aldina (1502): Ἀλιάρτος *codd.* ἀρσενικῶς R Eust. *ad Il.* II 503, p. I 411,1-2 van der Valk -κόν P *compendio* Q Ἀλιάρτου Fowler Ἀλι- R 3 Βοιώτιως Fowler Βηρύτιος *dub.* Meineke ἐν τῷ *codd.* δὲ τῷ Fowler δὲ καὶ τῷ ρ Holste δὲ διὰ τοῦ ρ Billerbeck Ἀρι- R

“Haliartos: Boiotian city. Gender: masculine. Homer has: ‘grassy Aliartos.’ Allegedly founded by Haliartos, Thersander’s son, the ethnic of the city is Haliartios, as in Boiotian. Still, Armenidas says ‘Ariartos’, with the *rho*” (tr. S. Tufano).

3.6.1. Textual Transmission and Context

The voice of Stephanus of Byzantium includes a short mention of the city of Haliartos, with an anonymous reference to the tradition of its founder. This indication cannot be automatically assigned to Armenidas, because it is directly followed by a note on the local

ethnic (Ἀλιάρτιος ὡς Βήρυτιος).⁶³⁷ The original form of Armenidas which follows could be corrected to Ἀριάρτ<ι>ον, but it is not mandatory to think that Stephanus mentioned Armenidas for the ethnic form; it is likelier that the transmitted form was chosen because it closes the lemma in a ring composition: it alludes with two differences (the aspiration and the liquid consonant) to the initial Ἀλιάρτος.

Müller and later editors of Stephanus dismissed the possibility of an indication of the number of the book of Armenidas' work, which would follow if we had ἐν τῷ ρ (unanimously transmitted); instead, they preferred reading the lemma, as if Stephanus were underlining the peculiarity of the form chosen by Armenidas (“with the *rho*”). The correction, however, seems unnecessary because this detail in the spelling can also be expressed with the transmitted text (“with the *rho*”), i.e. with the preposition ἐν.⁶³⁸ This reading seems better, in any case, than the indication of the number of the book, which should be ruled out, for the attention to the language that seems to characterize the whole lemma.⁶³⁹ Stephanus must draw on a lexicographical source, as the specific use of the instrumental ἐν indicates, but it is not easy to identify it.⁶⁴⁰

Haliartos was on the Southern coast of Lake Kopais, to the east of Koroneia and to the north-west of Thebes.⁶⁴¹ For this reason, it has been assumed that from an early period Haliartos was dependent on one of these two big cities. A further indication of this dependence comes from a passage of Herodotus (5.79.2), where the Thebans only define

637 On the founder of Haliartos, cp. Paus. 9.34.7. On the form Βήρυτιος, instead of the transmitted Βοιώτιος, see Billerbeck 2006: 158 n.288.

638 See Billerbeck 2006: 158 n.289, who, nonetheless, accepts in the text a new conjecture, διὰ τοῦ ρ. The instrumental use of the preposition ἐν is attested in Apollonius Dyscolus and in the grammarians of the Imperial period (Alpers 1981: 65-6). Together with a sound following of the transmitted text, this fact argues against a correction. In the *addenda* to the first volume of the edition of Stephanus (Billerbeck – Zubler 2011: 308), Billerbeck accepted a suggestion from S. Radt, who recommended the transmitted text, through a comparison with a few passages in Strabo (e.g. 9.4.5.426: ἀφ' οὗ Βησαιεῖς οἱ δημόται λέγονται, ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ σίγμα, “whence its citizens are called Besaieis, with a single sigma”, tr. S. Tufano). I wish to thank Prof. A. Corcella here for kindly indicating this problem.

639 Zecchini (1997: 189 and 196 n.4) also doubts that the source might refer to the number of the book.

640 We cannot be sure of the identity of this source, because the text of the other sources who record the form with the *rho* is here reconstructed through Stephanus: Herodian (*De pros. cath.* 1.222.13), because the section on Haliartos was supplied by Lentz with the text of the *Ethnika*; Eustathius (*ad Il.* 2.503, p. I 410,17-8 van der Valk), on the other hand, explicitly quotes Stephanus (*ibid.* I 410,17 van der Valk: κατὰ τὸν τὰ Ἐθνικὰ γράψαντα).

641 See the surveys in the *IACP* (206) and Knoepfler 2008: 646-9.

the citizens of Koroneia and Thespias as their neighbours.⁶⁴² This dependent status probably lasted for the whole fifth century: in the middle of it, the city produced a series of notable silver coins, approximately in the years of the Athenian domination of Boiotia (456–46).⁶⁴³ In 424 BCE Haliartos participated with the other Boiotians in the Battle of Delion (Thuc. 4.93.4): in this period, it formed one of the eleven regional districts (*H. Oxy.* 19.3 Chambers) along with Lebadeia and Koroneia.

3.6.2. A Rare Form in Armenidas

The toponym Ἀρίαρτος, with a *rho*, is commonly attested on the documentary sources of the city.⁶⁴⁴ It appears, for instance, on inscriptions, amongst other forms of evidence.⁶⁴⁵ However, the literary sources tend to use the form with the lambda, which is thence commonly used in the modern languages.⁶⁴⁶ The isolation of the form “Ariartos” in Armenidas, then, is momentous, because it indicates that he used a local form of the toponym in a work generally characterized (very probably) by Attic prose, with occasional Ionisms.⁶⁴⁷

642 Hansen 2004: 442. Knoepfler (2008: 498) read, in Herodotus, an *argumentum e silentio*, for the inexistence of Haliartos before the Persian Wars. This skepticism seems, however, exaggerated, because there are ruins of a temple of Athena on the acropolis (Hansen 2004: 442); the city is also quoted in the *Catalogue of Ships* (Hom. *Il.* 2.503) and, even if such a verse may be a later interpolation, it would be extremely doubtful that an interpolation in the Boiotian army occurred after the beginning of the fifth century.

643 Pausanias (9.32.5; 10.35.2) claimed that the visible ruins of his time were still those caused by the destruction of Xerxes, since the city did not align with the Persians. Modern scholarship, however, starting from Holleaux (1895), doubts this tradition, which is based on the common motif of the Persian sack and on a probable confusion of the expression *περσικὸς πολέμος*. This syntagm could also mean the conflict between Rome and Perseus (Pol. 3.3.8 *et al.*), when Haliartos suffered greatly, without ever recovering (cp. Moggi – Osanna 2012: 400–1).

644 Probably until the second century BCE (Schachter 2007: 97). Cp. e.g. *SEG* XXV 554 (fifth century BCE); XXVIII 453, 8 (fourth century BCE *ex.*). There are, of course, rare exceptions: we find the ethnic Ἀλιάρτιος (*IG* 7.2724,4–5: 280–70 BCE), whereas an inscription dated between the end of the second and the beginning of the first century BCE has the form Ἀλίαρτος (*IG* 7.2850).

645 For general surveys on the use of the ethnic, see Knoepfler 2008: 646 and Schachter 2011a *ad BNJ* 378 F7. See Hansen 2004: 442 on the local legends.

646 Apart from the aforementioned chapter by Thucydides, see e.g. Xen. *Hell.* 3.5.17–8; Str. 9.2.33.412; Paus. 9.33.4.

647 See 3.3.3 on the language of Armenidas.

This epichoric choice was noted and possibly appreciated by the lexicographical source(s) behind Stephanus. In fact, we also see in Haliartos, from the end of the fourth century BCE, the form with the lambda beginning to appear on a few pieces of evidence, such as on *IG* 7.2724,4-5 and in a series of bronze coins with the legend ΑΛΙ, minted between 338 and 315. Nonetheless, since the form with the *rho* continues to be vital until the full Hellenistic period, as we have seen, we cannot infer anything from this toponym on Armenidas' date.

A possible context for the mention of Haliartos was seen by Schachter (2011a) in the foundation of the Theban temple of Dionysos Lysios, according to the general interpretation given by the scholars for fragments 3 and 5 of Armenidas. This is certainly a likely scenario, even if further context in a work on Thebes can be found. The absence of Haliartos from Herodotus' narrative, for example, does not mean that the city could not be mentioned in a local/different narration of the Persian Wars from the Boiotian point of view. It has been suggested that the protecting deity of Haliartos was Athena Itonia (Schachter 1981: 116): this may provide a potential alternative, if the mention of Haliartos came in the same context of our F 1 on Itonos.

3.7. Armenidas F 7

Previous editions: *BNJ* 378 F 8; *EGM I* F **8; *FGrHist* 378 F 8 (Suet. *Περὶ βλασφημιῶν* 4.92 [p. 54 Taillardat]).

Τελχῖνες· οἱ <φθονεροὶ καὶ> ψογεροὶ καὶ γόητες καὶ φαρμακεῖς. [...] ὧν δύο γένη φασὶ γεγονέναι, τὸ μὲν βάναυσον καὶ χειρωνακτικόν, θάτερον δὲ λυμαντήριον τῶν καλῶν. τούτους οἱ μὲν θαλάσσης παῖδάς φασιν, Ἀρμενίδης δ' ἐκ τῶν Ἀκταίωνος κυνῶν γενέσθαι μεταμορφωθέντων ὑπὸ Διὸς εἰς ἀνθρώπους· <τοῦτο δὲ διὰ τὸ ἀγρίως ἔχειν ὡς καὶ μυθεύεσθαι σκηπτοὺς ἀφιέναι καὶ ποτήριον δοκεῖν ἔχειν ἐν ᾧ ρίζας κυκῶντες ἐφάρμασσον γοητευτικῶς. ἀνατίθεται δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡ κατασκευὴ τῆς κατὰ τὸν Κρόνον ἄρπης ἧ τὸν πατέρα Οὐρανὸν εὐνούχισε>. ἄλλοι δὲ τοὺς τὴν Ῥόδον

οικοῦντας, ὅθεν καὶ Τελχινία ἢ νῆσος ἐλέγετο· τινὲς δέ, ὧν ἔστι καὶ Σιμμίας, τοὺς τῆς Κρήτης οἰκήτορας.

1 φθονεροὶ καὶ Eust. II 789,18 2 “Stesichori F 265 P. [280 Fing]lass] *omisi ex* Eust. [*ad* Il. IX 529, p.] II 789,19-20 [van der Valk]” (Fowler) 3-4 φασὶ Παρμενίδης Μ Ἐπιμενίδης Nauck φασὶν Ἀρμενίδης Bergk 4 Ἀκταίωνος Eust. *ad* Il. IX 529, p. II 789,6 van der Valk Ἀκταίου Μ 5-8 τοῦτο δὲ...εὐνούχισε. *ad* Il. IX 529, p. II 789,6-10 van der Valk

“Telchines: the <envious>, the despicable, the cheaters, and the wizards. [...] It is claimed that there were two kinds of Telchines: the first one was made of artisans and handicraftsmen, whereas the second one destroyed all good things. Some sources claim that this second species of men were children of the Sea, but Armenidas claims that they were born from the hounds of Aktaion, when these were turned into men by Zeus: <this occurred for their rude behaviour, as it is also retold that they would throw thunderbolts; it also seems that they had a cauldron, where they minced roots and prepared potions, just like the magicians. It is added that they had worked on the sickle of Kronos, with which he castrated his father Ouranos.> Other authors claim that they lived in Rhodes, whence the island was also called ‘Telchinia’: others, finally, including Simias, record that they were Cretan inhabitants” (tr. S. Tufano).

3.7.1. Textual Transmission and Context

The Περὶ βλασφημιῶν καὶ πόθεν ἐκάστη (*On Swearwords and their Origin*) of Suetonius⁶⁴⁸ was originally assigned to Aristophanes of Byzantium.⁶⁴⁹ This original essay on swear

648 This title is attested on the most complete codex of excerpts, the manuscript **M** (on this ground Taillardat 1967: 3 suggested using it). However, the indirect tradition presents other titles (*Etym. Magn. s.v. ἀρχολίπαρος*, p. 151,35 Gaisford: περὶ βλασφημιῶν; *Suda* τ 895, *s.v.* Τράγκυλλος: περὶ δυσφήμων λέξεων ἦτοι βλασφημιῶν καὶ πόθεν ἐκάστη), which might indicate a shorter original form.

649 Boissonade 1819; Nauck 1848 (for the presence, on the codex **P**, of a work of Aristophanes immediately before the Π. βλασφ.). The present discussion of the textual tradition extensively draws on Taillardat 1967: 8-11.

words is known in an indirect form from two lemmata, which support the ascription to Suetonius,⁶⁵⁰ along with, in a direct form, three codices of Byzantine excerpts.⁶⁵¹

Bergk was the first to reconstruct the name of Armenidas, instead of the transmitted Παρμενίδης, on the basis of a possible wrong separation of the sequence ΦΑΣΙΝΑΡΜΕΝΙΔΗΣ.⁶⁵² The restitution of this name is convincing, because Suetonius probably quoted Armenidas through an intermediate source and not from the original: the later tradition simplified the sequence by supplying the name of a much more common author, Parmenides.

In the section of the text printed here with this fragment, Taillardat included a long passage (τοῦτο δὲ διὰ τὸ ἀγρίως [...] τὸν πατέρα Οὐρανὸν εὐνούχισε), which is mentioned by Eustathius (*ad Il.* 9.529, p. II 789, 6-10 van der Valk). The fact that it only appears on this secondary source of the text convinced Fowler (*EGM*) and Schachter (*BNJ*) to remove it from the fragment. Indeed, the section cannot relate to the contents of Armenidas' work, because Eustathius most probably took these observations from Suet. Π. βλασφ. § 92, but the wording indicates that he also considered further sources.⁶⁵³

It is almost certain that Eustathius suggests an explanation of the myth of the metamorphosis of the dogs into Telchines, which is based on the proverbial wild behavior

650 *Etym. Magn. s.v.* ἀρχολίπαρος, p. 151,35 Gaisford; *Suda* τ 895, *s.v.* Τράγκυλλος. See *infra* n.745 on the *Etymologicon Magnum*.

651 Among these three codices, the edition of the text provided by Taillardat (1967) favours the ms. **M** (=Par. suppl. gr. 1164, XIV c.), which was only discovered and appreciated for the *constitutio textus* after the previous edition of Miller (1868). Suetonius wrote this work in Greek, the same language he used for his *Περὶ παιδίων*. These two pamphlets echo the linguistic interests of the author, who was inspired by previous lexicographical collections. This inspiration indicates that he did not personally read all the sources which he found under the lemmata (see Taillardat 1967: 23; on the sources of the essay and on its place in the production of Suetonius, see Wallace-Hadrill 1983: 44-6). Eustathius used the *On the Swearwords*, in the twelfth century, through an abridged version of the text, which belongs to a branch of the tradition (ε) distinct from the branches α (codices **M** and **L** =Laur. plut. LXXX 13, s. XIV), and π (a further ramification represented by the manuscript **P** =Par. gr. 1630: cp. the *stemma codicum* in Taillardat 1967: 22, and, for Eustathius, *ibid.* 12-5). This short survey of the textual tradition confirms the relevance of the manuscript **M**, which is better than **L** because it usually respects the χρήσεις, i.e. quotes from the single authors (Taillardat 1967: 16).

652 See Taillardat 1967: 134.

653 My translation of the apparatus at p. II 789 van der Valk (Eusth. *ad Il.* 9.529, p. II 789,1-20 van der Valk: πολὺς δὲ ὁ περὶ Τελχίνων λόγος καὶ παρὰ πολλοῖς κτλ.).

of these characters. The subsequent remarks on the throwing of the thunderbolts,⁶⁵⁴ the use of a *poterion* for their potions, and the realization of the sickle of Kronos,⁶⁵⁵ are common traditions on the Telchines, which Armenidas may have ignored.

Suetonius confirms the use of “Telchines” as a swear word: there is, therefore, the transformation of this proper name into an antonomasia, with the formation of a παροιμία.⁶⁵⁶ The derogatory use was common in the Hellenistic period, as the notorious attack of Callimachus on the Telchines shows: the Telchines of the prologue to the *Aitia* (F 1 Pfeiffer) have often been identified with specific malevolent scholars.⁶⁵⁷ Originally, the Telchines were associated with the Cheres and were maleficent and envious demons (Stesichoros, F 280 Finglass). Their amphibious nature, a mixture of bird and fish, suggested a parallel with the seals⁶⁵⁸ and could reflect a double pertinence to two worlds, the sea and the earth.⁶⁵⁹ They were often imagined as being in Rhodes,⁶⁶⁰ but other islands like Crete or Cyprus concurred with that setting, since the Telchines were born either of Poseidon or of *Thalatta* (Sea).⁶⁶¹

3.7.2. Aktaion and the Boiotian Telchines

The events around Aktaion are constantly placed on the Kithairon. Other details further support the connection of Aktaion with a work on the history of Thebes, or on Boiotia: he

654 Diod. Sic. 5.55.3.

655 Str. 14.2.6.654; Eusth. *ad Dionysium Periegetam* 504 and Musti 1999: 71-2.

656 Alkiphron, *Letter* 1.15.5 Benner – Fobes; Eust. *ad Il.* 9.529, p. II 789,18 van der Valk; *ad Od.* 19.247, p. 1864,38 Stallbaum (εἰς παροιμίαν ἔκειντο).

657 On the Telchines of Callimachus there is now an overwhelming amount of scholarship: see at least Musti 1999: 59-65 and 93-105; Petrovic 2006.

658 See Musti 1999: 8-10.

659 On this double pertinence, cp. Musti 1999: 13. This scholar generally argues, in this book, that there is a functional affinity with the Sirens, who share the ambiguity of the Telchines and an evil side, for the negative effects of their θέλγειν.

660 Van Gelder 1900: 49; Musti 1999: 13 and 23-4; Davies – Finglass 2014: 567-8. These last scholars doubt that the presence of the Telchines in Stesichoros may depend on Rhodian participation in the foundation of many Sicilian cities (Blinkenberg 1915: 293-4 n.1), “but more probably there were familiar figures of myth across the Greek world by his time.”

661 Poseidon: Nonnus, *Dion.* 27.109. Thalatta: Diod. Sic. 5.55 (an excursus where the Telchines are Poseidon’s brothers-in-law, because Poseidon marries Halia, their sister). On this passage, cp. Musti 1999: 67-71.

was considered the son of Aristeus (Apollo and Cyrene’s offspring) and of Autonoe, one of the daughters of Kadmos and Harmonia.⁶⁶² This genealogy shows the close relevance of Aktaion for a Boiotian audience, beyond his mere location on the Kithairon: shown by a possible understanding of Armenidas’ F 5, the coupling of Kadmos and Harmonia represents a convenient link, in a work on Thebes, for a role in the cultural archaeology of Thebes.⁶⁶³

On the other hand, it seems that the Telchines had a connection with Boiotia, only in a tradition which locates an Athena Telchinia in Teumessos.⁶⁶⁴ Since Teumessos was to the north-east of Thebes, Schachter’s suggestion that Armenidas dealt with this myth in the description of the oriental part of the city may be accepted (even if the placement of Aktaion on the Kithairon remains more convincing). The more secure “foreignness” of the Telchines in Thebes confirms the suggestion that they could be mentioned as a violent population, who raided Boiotia, just like the Phlegyans.⁶⁶⁵ If, nevertheless, their origin from dogs explains the negative picture of the Boiotian Telchines, the singularity of Zeus’ intervention must still be understood: in what is probably the earliest version of the myth,⁶⁶⁶ Zeus sends Artemis to punish Aktaion for the violence he used against Semele. In this case, the goddess simply rouses the dogs against their owner, who is ripped to shreds by them, but there is no hint at what happens to the animals after the intervention of Artemis.

A possible explanation for the further development on the metamorphosis of the dogs, lastly echoed by Armenidas, may come from a tradition which gives the names of all of

662 Setting on the Kithairon: Paus. 9.2.3. Genealogy: Hes. *Theog.* 977; F 217 M. – W.; Eur. *Bacch.* 230.

663 There is a possibility that the couple was actually mentioned in the context of Armenidas’ F 5: see *supra* 3.5.2.

664 Schachter 2011a *ad BNJ* 378 F 8, and Paus. 9.19.1. Schachter (1981: 129) also suggested that the epithet refers to the protection of the artisans, whereas Pausanias’ comments on the arrival of a group of Telchines from Cyprus to Boiotia would be Pausanias’ original aetiology, without further precedents. On the contrary, Musti (1999: 24–5) maintained that the association preserves the characterisation of the Telchines as *glaukopeis* and, therefore, close to the bird dear to Athena, the owl: “l’animale malevolo riserv[a] ad altri la sua forza malefica e all’interessato il rovescio della medaglia di potenza, per lui stesso benefica (come nel caso di Atena, rispettivamente per i nemici di Atene e per Atene stessa)” (24).

665 Fowler 2013: 48. The cruelty of the Phlegyans is already attested in the Homeric *Hymn to Apollo* (277–80; their violence, according to Pherekydes’ *BNJ* 3 F 41, forced the Thebans to build their walls).

666 Hes. F 217 M. – W.; Stesichoros, F 285 Finglass; Akousilaos, *BNJ* 2 F 33. On this version, see Schachter 1981: 99 and Schachter 2011a *ad BNJ* 378 F 8; Fowler 2013: 370.

Aktaion's dogs.⁶⁶⁷ It was told that the hounds returned to Cheiron, Aktaion's teacher, who built them an *eidolon* for their master, whom they had just torn to pieces (Apollod. 3.31). Apollodoros considers this version later than the one according to which Artemis excites the dogs after having been seen naked. The author then adds a few hexameters (3.32), which mention the names of the dogs that tore Aktaion Διὸς αἰνεσίησι, “with the approval of Zeus”.⁶⁶⁸ These verses were first considered a Hellenistic epyllion and have consequently been variously dated to the Hellenistic period. Alternatively, it has also been suggested that they belong to a Hesiodic *Ehoia*. However, the explicit taste for the contradictory nature of the scene (with the beasts hunting the hunter), and additional metrical and stylistic observations give stronger credit to the hypothesis that these verses find a better setting in Hellenistic literature.⁶⁶⁹

The catalogue of the hounds of Aktaion was apparently a literary tradition which may have earlier attestations,⁶⁷⁰ and remained vital in Latin literature.⁶⁷¹ This curious tradition on their metamorphosis may be a local extension on this part of the myth, collected by Armenidas, who, starting from the repentance and remorse mentioned by Apollodoros, ignored the role of Aktaion's teacher and transformed the dogs into the craftsmen of the *eidolon*.

Wherever the Telchines were placed in Boiotia, the immediate reference was always to their master, Aktaion, and his impiety. Nikander of Kolophon also speculated on the later destiny of the dogs and had them reach India (*BNJ* 271-2 F 37). In the absence of further details, the fragments must be appreciated as a singular and interesting acknowledgement of local reflections on this myth. By focusing on this tradition of the Kithairon, local

667 On the dogs of Aktaion, cp. Forbes Irving 1990: 199.

668 Cp. Scarpi 2010: 550-1.

669 Epyllion: Powell 1925: 71-2; a *Ehoia*: Malten 1911: 20; Casanova 1969: 42; Gallavotti 1969; Janko 1984: 306-7. On the peculiarly Hellenistic style, see the observations by Grilli 1971: 363-7.

670 Twenty-one hexameters on the *POxy* 2509 (second century CE) were once assigned to Hesiod by Lobel (1964), Casanova (1969), and Janko (1984): here, a goddess goes to the cave of Cheiron and predicts that the hounds of Aktaion will be guarded by Dionysos. The style, however, has been considered “sub-Homeric rather than pseudo-Hesiodic” by West (1985: 88).

671 Further examples include Hyginus (*Fab.* 181), with two lists of personal names, one of which (181.3) is identical with *Ov. Met.* 3.206-25 and 232-5. The other list of Hyginus (181.5-6), textually tormented, finds relevant parallels, according to Daris (1970) and Grilli (1971), with a list on P. Med. inv. 123 (second century CE *ex.*).

historiography also engaged in a Panhellenic myth and offered an original, local pendant to an old story.

3.8. [Armenidas] F 8

Previous editions: *BNJ* 378 F 4; *EGM* I F 8A; *FGrHist* 378 F 4 (Hsch. ε 3231 [II 106 Latte]).

Ἐνοδία: Ἄρτεμις. καὶ κυνηγετικά, ὡς Ἄνδρομενίδης.

1 Ἄρμενίδας Valesius apud Albertum (ed. Hsch. 1746)

“Of the Crossroads’: Artemis. [It also means] ‘Of the Hunting’, according to Andromenidas” (tr. S. Tufano).

3.8.1. Artemis Enodia

The voice of Hesychius represents a possible interpretation of the epithet ἐνοδία, which originally refers to the identification of a deity at a crossroads. According to the source mentioned by Hesychius, this adjective was both used as a possible epithet for Artemis and to describe hunting tools. The second value is confirmed by previous sources, where τὰ ἐνοδία can mean the webs that were assembled at crossroads to block prey.⁶⁷²

As an epithet, *enodia* may also be attested in the Classical period for Persephone. However, it seems that, from quite an early period, εἰνοδίη mostly characterized a peculiar aspect of Artemis.⁶⁷³ This Artemis Enodia is imagined with a torch and a horse; the only other

⁶⁷² Xen. *Cyn.* 6.9; Poll. 5.27. In fact, Xenophon is among the principal sources of the fifth book of Pollux’s *Onomasticon* (Tosi 2007: 5); it is possible that the venatorial theme is an indirect homage, from Pollux, to Emperor Commodus, under whose rule and cultural politics Pollux was working (Zecchini 2007b, *spec.* 19-20).

⁶⁷³ Cp. already Hes. *Cat.* F 23a,26 M. – W. On (Artemis) Enodia, see Kahil 1984: 688-9.

goddess who could act in the same sphere was Hekate, confirmed by other lexicographical sources.⁶⁷⁴

Artemis En(n)odia⁶⁷⁵ could also be known as Φεραία and her cult was correspondingly particularly popular in Thessaly and in Pherae.⁶⁷⁶ In the reconstruction provided by Robert (1960: 591 n.4), the original goddess was Enodia, who either kept her local name Pheraia outside of Thessaly, or attached herself to a more popular and “Panhellenic” deity, like Artemis.⁶⁷⁷ The Thessalian origin, however, seems the most likely one.⁶⁷⁸

3.8.2. A New Authorship

The name of Armenidas was tentatively suggested, in the present fragment, by Johannes Alberti in his edition (1746) of Hesychius’ *Lexicon*. Later, the main editor of the same text, Kurt Latte, preferred to print the transmitted Ἀνδρομενίδης. Jacoby (1955a: 168) prudently numbered the fragment in the corpus of Armenidas, because he could not think of any Andromenidas who worked on hunting techniques, despite a relatively high number of sources on Artemis Enodia and her epithet.

However, since then the scenario has changed, after the publication of the Herculaneum papyri of Philodemus’ *Περὶ ποιημάτων*.⁶⁷⁹ In the first book, the author extensively draws, probably through Crates of Mallus,⁶⁸⁰ on an Ἀνδρομενίδης who worked on both grammatical subjects and on poetry. This Andromenides was a peripatetic grammarian who lived in the third century BCE⁶⁸¹ and may have mentioned the cult of the goddess in a commentary on Xenophon, or in a more general way in a poetical work (we have seen,

674 *Etym. Magn. s.v.* Ἐνοδία, p.344,42 Gaisford assigned the information to a Neronian grammarian, Herakleides Pontikos (a namesake of the more famous predecessor). His *Περὶ ἔτυμολογιῶν* must often also be subsumed for the many ascriptions that wrongly referred to his more popular namesake (cp. Matthaios 2015: 224-5, for a short profile).

675 On the form of the epithet, see García Ramón – Helly 2007: 292-5.

676 Cp. e.g. *IG* 9² 358; 575; 578 and the various hypotheses on the Thessalian connections, as outlined by Mili 2014: 169-70.

677 This process seems confirmed by what we know of the cult in Demetrias (Mili 2014: 207).

678 See the general study by Chrysostomou (1998).

679 The reference edition of this text is Janko 2003.

680 Cp. Janko 2003: 144 and n.1.

681 See Janko 2003: 152.

for example, in Armenidas' F 2, how a commentary could imply a reference even to figures absent from the main text). We can therefore agree with Fowler (2013: 640) on the necessity to close this debate, once we can assign this fragment to Andromenidas⁶⁸² and delete it from the corpus of Armenidas.

682 This Andromenidas is still absent from the online corpora of the *LGP*N. If we had not known this papyrus, we could have temporarily accepted its ascription to Armenidas, either, with Schachter (2011a *ad* *BNJ* 378 F 4), by connecting Artemis to Armenidas' treatment of the myth of Aktaion (F 8), or, perhaps wiser, by focusing on the association of this Artemis with the Thessalian area.