

2. Hellanikos

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

2.1. Hellanikos F 1

Previous editions: *BNJ* 4 F 50; *EGM* I F 50; F 136 *Ambaglio*; *FGrHist* 4 F 50 (Schol. R/Bar Ar. *Lys.* 36 (p.6 Hangard)).

ἐν γὰρ τῇ Κωπαίδι λίμνη μέγισταί εἰσιν ἐγγέλεις ὥκουν τε τὴν Βοιωτίαν καὶ οἱ λεγόμενοι Ἐγγελεῖς, περὶ ὧν καὶ Ἑλλάνικος ἐν τοῖς Βοιωτιακοῖς φησιν.

1 ὥκουν – Βοιωτίαν *omisit* Bar ὥκουν – Ἐγγελεῖς Γ 2 Βοιωτικοῖς Bar

“In the Lake Kopais, there are very big eels. Also, the so-called ‘Encheleis’ were living in Boiotia. Hellanikos speaks about them in his *Boiotian Histories*” (tr. S. Tufano).

2.1.1. Textual Transmission

The scholium²²⁰ focuses on v.36 of Aristophanes’ *Lysistrata*, a line pronounced by Kalonika. This woman has just met Lysistrata and they both long for a warless future, one without the Peloponnesians (33) and with the Boiotians finally destroyed (35: Βοιωτίους τε πάντας ἐξολωλέναι). Kalonika, however, is worried about this last wish, as it would imply the end of the importation to Athens of a much-appreciated delicacy: eels: μὴ δῆτα πάντας γ’, ἀλλ’ ἄφελε τὰς ἐγγέλεις (36: “But not all of them, please: spare the eels!”).

220 It belongs to the corpus of scholia transmitted by the Ravennas codex of Aristophanes (*Rav.* 49, *olim* I 374a, c. X^{ex}-XIⁱⁿ).

Verses 35–36 exploit two particularly frequent themes connected to Boiotia in Attic comedy: the first, more general one, is the traditional Athenian hostility towards Boiotia, a theme which supersedes contingent wars and represents a *topos* in literature.²²¹ More specifically, the eels fished in Lake Kopais were a largely appreciated and talked-about product in Attica and abroad.²²² This second theme suggests a link with Hellanikos' Βοιωτικά, for the curious detail of the previous presence in Boiotia of the “so-called Ἐγγελεῖς.”

The majority of our sources place the Encheleis in Southern Illyria.²²³ The name of the group, “Encheleis” (ἐγγελεῖς), as in the text of the fragment, differs from the plural nominative of ἔγγελυς, “eel (*Muraena anguilla*: pl. ἐγγέλεις)”, only in the accentuation.²²⁴ The etymology of the ethnonym must obviously go back to the name “eel”, ἔγγελυς.²²⁵ Thus, the proper translation of the ethnic should be “Eel-men”.²²⁶

In the fifth century BCE there was a well known tradition concerning the movement of Kadmos and Harmonia to the North among the Illyrians: the couple was escaping from

221 Cp. e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 623–5; 720–2; F 380 K. – A. and Henderson 1987 *ad loc.*

222 See the relevant passages in Douglas Olson 2002 (*ad Ar. Ach.* 880). This freshwater fish probably represented the most famous Boiotian speciality; some scholars, however, wonder how the eels could grow up in a closed basin, without access to a sea necessary for the eels to breed. It is possible that a channel went underground to the Kephisos river (Pownall 2016 *ad BNJ* 4 F 50).

223 It should be noted that the exact placement of the Encheleis in Illyria was subject to a range of alternatives (Philippson 1905; cp. the sites associated to Kadmos' Illyrian epilogue in Edwards 1979: 263).

224 Other attested forms of this ethnonym are ἐγγελέαι (Hekataios, *BNJ* 1 F 103; Hdt. 5.61.2; 9.43.2; Str. 7.7.8.326 [the transmitted form is actually Ἐγγελέους and the plural in –έαι is a conjecture by Kramer, recently refused by Radt (2003: 332)]; Steph. Byz. ε 10, *s.v.* Ἐγγελεῖς) and ἐγγελείοι (Ps.-Scymn. 436). According to Hammond (1967: 467 n.3), the use of the form ἐγγελέαι in Herodotus (5.61.2; 9.43.2) proves that Herodotus was drawing on Hekataios for this material. For a complete overview of all the variants, see the apparatus of *loci similes* on the lemma ε 10 (ἐγγελεῖς) of Stephanus of Byzantium's *Ethnika* in Billerbeck – Zubler 2011: 126. The same lemma has further etymologies on the single variations of the ethnic, but it seems that the most commonly used and known form was Ἐγγελεῖς; see further ε 6, *s.v.* Ἐγγελάνες.

225 Chantraine (*DELG s.v.*) suggested a relationship of ἔγγελυς with ἔχις, “snake”, but it is uncertain if the first name may be considered a diminutive form of the second one (conversely, in Latin, as argued by Ernout and Meillet in their voice on the *DELL*, *anguilla* can literally mean a “small *anguis*”). Durante (1974: 402–7), while accepting Chantraine's interpretation of the word, added that as an ethnic, Ἐγγελεῖς may be the translation of an epichoric ethnic form, effectively related to the eels (*ibid.* 407: “un *Sammelname* di genti illiriche meridionali”: see n. 227 *infra*).

226 Hammond 1967: 466 n.3: “The name ‘eel-men’ has reference to the eel-breeding lakes of Ochrid and Presba; there were Enchelei in the vicinity of Lake Copais in Boeotia.”

Thebes, which was under siege by the Argives.²²⁷ After their arrival, Kadmos and his wife ruled over the local Encheleis, a population which was to later engage in a harsh expedition towards the central regions of Greece.²²⁸ Among the possible explanations of this mythical relationship between Boiotia and Southern Illyria, is the idea that there was an actual migration of Boiotians to Illyria:²²⁹ the Boiotians took their own folktales and myths with them, and enhanced the proliferation of memory sites, such as the so-called Kadmos Stones, which depicted Kadmos and Harmonia during their metamorphosis into snakes (a possible acquisition of chthonic attributes).²³⁰ With his Boiotian Encheleis, then, Hellanikos could provide a “historicizing variant of the Kadmos and Harmonia story”.²³¹ It has been suggested that our short scholium was part of a separated section of the *Phoronis*, on Kadmos and Harmonia, and that Hellanikos was talking about the migration of the couple to the Illyrians.²³²

This reconstruction was accepted, among others, by Koehler (1898), who added that the tale of the presence of Kadmos in Illyria was a political invention to support the kingdom

227 Sources: Hdt. 5.61.2 (the Καδμείοι are expelled by the Argives and go to the Encheleis) and 9.43.1 (oracle on the arrival of the Illyrians and the Encheleis in Greece; cp. Flower – Marincola 2008: 186-7); Eur. *Bacch.* 1330-9 and 1355-60. See Vannicelli 1995a on Hdt. 5.61.2; 9.43.1 and the unease caused by the chronological setting of these passages, which cannot be aligned with Hdt. 1.56.3. Later sources claim that Kadmos and Harmonia were fleeing for other reasons: for example, because Kadmos was escaping from Ares, after having killed his son, namely, the dragon which had once protected a Theban spring (Ares could also be angry at him, for the death of the Spartoi; see *infra* the commentary on Hellanikos’ F 2); the couple could also decide to move after the death of Pentheus (see a complete list of these later interpretations in Vian 1963: 124-33 and Castiglioni 2010: 18-9).

228 On the Illyrian epilogue of Kadmos, and on the many myths which linked this character to Illyria, see in general Vian 1963: 124-33; Edwards 1979: 33-4; Kühr 2006: 117-8.

229 Vian (1963: 132) argued for the existence of a “substrat historique”. There have been further attempts to document these contacts between Boiotia and Illyria, for example, (over)interpreting a series of archaeological evidence (Šašel Kos 1993). Vian, however, thought that the two regions were in mutual contact and that the Illyrians had also once moved to Boiotia. This possibility was rationally studied, with prudent skepticism, by Lepore (1983: 129). Nonetheless, it is hard to accept at face value the different explanations in our literary sources on the origins of the Illyrian tribe of the Encheleis, as outlined by the overview of Proeva 2006: 563-4.

230 A possible acquisition of chthonic attributes, according to F. Pownall 2016 (*ad BNJ* 4 F 50). Sources on the Kadmos Stones and the metamorphosis episode: Ps.-Skyl. 23-24; Ap. Rhod. 4.516-8; Nonnus, *Dion.* 44.107-18. On the site, see Lisičar 1953 (summary in Latin at 261), Vian 1963: 126-8, and Edwards 1979: 34.

231 Fowler 2013: 357.

232 Pownall 2016 *ad BNJ* 4 F 50. The independent circulation of this narrative was first suggested by Pearson (1939: 170), who did not believe in the independent existence of many local histories by Hellanikos (see a list of the preserved titles *supra* at 1.3.1).

of a foreign ethnos (the Boiotians) over the Illyrians. The Kadmeids, in fact, were commonly believed to have ruled over the Encheleis,²³³ and the story of an original preexistence of Encheleis in their original region, Boiotia, may have helped them support their right to rule the Illyrians. Nevertheless, while we can imagine a more or less coherent route from Boiotia to Illyria, from an initial tradition on Kadmos to a subsequent proliferation of toponyms and further details and variations, we lack positive terms for comparison for the Encheleis in Boiotia and what was once defined “The Return of the Kadmeians” in Boiotia. In fact, an oracle quoted by Euripides (*Bacch.* 1355–60) only refers to Kadmos *and* the Encheleians in the context of a violent expedition to Greece.²³⁴ Therefore, it cannot be used as a telling parallel.

There are only three, relatively late sources that support Hellanikos on the existence of these Boiotian Encheleis, as Koehler (1898: 226–30) and Jacoby (1923a: 451–2) recognized. Such a collocation cannot be escaped, because the imperfect ὤκουν marks a continuity of presence in Boiotia rather than a temporary stay. Even if, as in the first source, which will be shortly analyzed, the arrival of the Encheleis in the region results from aggression, the dynamics slightly differ from the prophecies referred to by Herodotus (9.43.1)²³⁵ and by

233 Str. 7.7.8.326. On this passage, see the observations by Radt 2007: 325 and Hammond 1967: 463–7.

234 “The Return of the Kadmeians”: Schachter 1994b: 68. Oracle: Eur. *Bacch.* 1354–61: [...] βαρβάρους ἀφίξομαι/ γέρων μέτοικος, ἔτι δέ μουστί θέσφατον/ ἐς Ἑλλάδ’ ἀγαγεῖν μιγάδα βαρβάρων στρατόν,/ καὶ τὴν Ἄρεως παῖδ’ Ἄρμονίαν, δάμαρτ’ ἐμήν,/ δράκων δρακαίνης <τύπον> ἔχουσαν ἀγρίας/ ἄξω ἔπι βωμούς καὶ τάφους Ἑλληνικούς,/ ἠγούμενος λόγχασιον (“An old man, I must go to live a stranger among barbarian peoples, doomed to lead against Hellas a motley barbarian army. Transformed to serpents, I and my wife, Harmonia, the child of Ares, we must captain spearmen against the tombs and shrines of Hellas”; tr. W. Arrowsmith).

235 P. – W. 98; Fontenrose Q 150. The oracle is indirectly quoted at Hdt. 9.42.3 (ἔστι λόγιον ὡς χρεόν ἐστι Πέρσας ἀπικομένους ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα διαρπάσαι τὸ ἱρόν τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖσι, μετὰ δὲ τὴν διαρπαγὴν ἀπολέσθαι πάντας, “There is an oracle, to the effect that the Persians are fated to come to Greece, sack the sanctuary at Delphi, and afterwards perish to a man. Armed with this knowledge, we’ll bypass the sanctuary without making any attempt to sack it, and so avoid this occasion for destruction”; tr. R. Waterfield). It is actually Herodotus’ commentary that associates this oracle with the Encheleis: τοῦτον δ’ ἔγωγε τὸν χρησμόν, τὸν Μαρδόνιος εἶπε ἐς Πέρσας ἔχειν, ἐς Ἰλλυριούς τε καὶ τὸν Ἐγχελέων στρατόν οἶδα πεπονημένον, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐς Πέρσας (43.1: “Now, I happen to know that the oracle which, according to Mardonius, referred to the Persians was not designed for them, but for the Illyrians and the army of the Encheleis”; tr. R. Waterfield). Flower – Marincola (2008: 187) remember that the same oracle quoted by Herodotus was associated by Pherekydes to another population of invaders, the Phlegyans (*BNJ* 3 F 41e). The relationship between the versions provided by Herodotus and by Pherekydes suggests that Herodotus deliberately stressed (οἶδα) his interpretation of an allusion to the Encheleis (see also Asheri – Vannicelli 2006: 237). At the same time, this example of oracular reuse confirms the violent traits of the occupation of the land, which cannot co-occur with a conflict-free, permanent seizure of Boiotia (or of any affected region).

Euripides (*loc. cit.*). In these texts the Encheleis are mere destroyers with no interest in remaining in Boiotia (nor is there any specific sign of an attack on Boiotia as isolated from other parts of Greece). A second, possible interpretation of the fragment might imply seeing whether these “Eel-men” may be an invented label for a group of people derived from the common and widespread tradition of the Boiotian eels, on which Aristophanes is drawing in his *Lysistrata*. Both opportunities need to be assessed in order to understand the place and the meaning of this Boiotian ethnos.

2.1.2. Echoes of a Submerged Tradition

Our earliest source on the Boiotian Encheleis, as a distinct group in the history of the region, is the historian Diodorus. In a passage of his *Library* (19.53.3-8), he sums up the many and great vicissitudes of Thebes (53.3: πλείσταις καὶ μεγίσταις [...] μεταβολαῖς), from Deukalion’s deluge (4) to the destruction in 335 BCE (8). Diodorus’ narrative is extremely concise in this chapter, but the presence of alternative versions of single details, such as, for example, the identity of the comrades of Kadmos during the foundation of Thebes (53.4: the Spartoi or the *Thebageneis*),²³⁶ suggests that there may have been more than a single source behind the excursus.²³⁷

236 This alternative, in fact, may betray an awareness that the ethnic Θηβαγενεῖς may imply something more than the autochthony of this population. For example, Ephoros (*BNJ* 70 F 21), as maintained by recent scholarship (Breglia 2011: 301), considered the *Thebageneis* a mixed ethnos. The group arrived from the outside and was already in Boiotia when it was subsumed by Thebes in a new political union (on the *Thebageneis*, see also Prandi 2011: 246-7).

237 It has been suggested that all this material may come from only one source, namely, Hieronymus of Cardia (Jacoby 1955a: 158 *ad FGrHist* 379 F 2) or Duris of Samos (Landucci Gattinoni 2003: 109-10; Breglia 2011: 306-7). Landucci Gattinoni argues for the second name, because Duris looked at Kassandros, the new founder of Thebes in 316 BCE, in a hellenocentric, positive way, and the rebirth of the city was a much needed creation. Hieronymus of Cardia, on the contrary, favoured the Antigonids and was against the policies of Kassandros, as they are described in Diodorus’ 17th book. However, the specific section of the *excursus* on the remote origins of Thebes may have a different origin from that which can be assumed for the narrative of the refoundation of Thebes by Kassandros: the representation of the original foundation, with the order Kadmos > Amphion, follows a relatively recent pattern (attested from the fourth century BCE) and does not necessarily betray a political understanding. The section Diod. Sic. 19.53.3-8 may be considered, on a small scale, proof of what a work of *Thebaika* may have looked like, from the foundation of the Kadmeia to the destruction of Thebes. The particular nature of this section is signalled by the introduction (53.3: περὶ ὧν οὐκ ἀνοίκειον ἐν κεφαλαίοις εἰπεῖν), which refers to a lexicon proper of those *excursus* where the use of external, further sources is highly likely. In particular, the adjective ἀνοίκειος, “incongruous” (McDougall 1983 *s.v.*), can be compared to the Latin parallel *incongruens*; Diodorus uses it to signal mythographic digressions, clearly detached from the main

After the mention of Kadmos and his comrades, Diodorus focuses on a further development (19.53.5; tr. R.M. Geer, slightly adapted):

These people [the Spartoi, or the Thebageneis] then settled in the city, but later (ὑστερον) the Encheleis defeated them in war and drove them out, at which time (ὅτε δὴ) Kadmos and his followers also were driven (ἐκπεσεῖν) to Illyria. Later on (μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα) Amphion and Zethos became masters of the site and then built the lower city (ἄστν) for the first time, as the poet say the inhabitants of the place were exiled (ἐξέπεσον) a second time, for Polydoros, son of Kadmos, came back.

This passage is not immediately clear, as there seems to be a different, continuous interchange of focuses on the various fates of the Kadmeid house and of the local inhabitants of Thebes.²³⁸ Since at 19.53.4, Diodorus has just mentioned the *Thebageneis*, and the temporal clause which follows the main one at 53.5 *in*. (ὅτε δὴ...) is on the same chronological plan, we can think of a subdivision: Kadmos, Harmonia, and the other people went to Illyria, while the Encheleis, after their military victory, reached Boiotia. The later presence of Amphion and Zethos coincides with a new fight, as is indicated by the verb κρατέω which documents their accession to power.

If we leave aside the problem of the potential refoundation of Thebes,²³⁹ the settlement of the Encheleis in Boiotia lasts, in Diodorus, only a relatively short span of time. After their

context. Cp., e.g., Diod. Sic. 2.44.3 (the Scythian rout of Cyrus opens the way for an ethnography of the Amazons, immediately followed –47.1– by the μυθολογούμενα on the Hyperboreans); 3.56.1 (from the African ventures of Myrina, queen of the Amazons, to a digression περὶ τῆς τῶν θεῶν γενέσεως, meaningfully interspersed with verbal forms at the third plural person); 4.25.2 (from Herakles' labours to the life of Orpheus, whose conclusion sheds light on the degree of authorial presence in these excursus: 25.4: ἡμεῖς δ' ἐπεὶ περὶ Ὀρφέως διεληλύθαμεν, μεταβησόμεθα πάλιν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα); 3.34.1 (Deianira's first husband, Meleagros, will be remembered, for it is appropriate to focus on his disgraces).

238 Moreover, the use of τόπος in this case does not help us to distinguish between Thebes and Boiotia. Such a distinction is important, because the diverse perspectives found in the foundation myths may indirectly constitute a hint for the chronology of the source that is followed. Looking for a synchronisation between the history of Thebes and that of Boiotia, as in Sturz (1826: 70), may be a deceiving, centralized version of this set of myths, which are not meant to be read in a continuous, rationalistic way.

239 In a remark omitted in the previous quote, Diodorus quotes Hom. *Od.* 11.263 in a verse which claims that Amphion and Zethos were the first, “real” founders of Thebes. See *infra* on the double foundation of Thebes: 3.2.1.

arrival in Boiotia, we are only told that some time later (μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα) Amphion and Zethos first reach Thebes, followed by the arrival of Polydorus (53.5). Moreover, on the basis of this short abstract in Diodorus (and in his source), the real inhabitants of Thebes and Boiotia (κατοικήσαντες)²⁴⁰ are first the Spartoi or the Thebageneis, expelled by the Encheleis, and, finally, the descendants of Amphion and Zethos, as probably united to one of the previous groups (this last conglomerate, in fact, can be referred to in the expression τὸ δεύτερον οἱ κατοικήσαντες τὸν τόπον ἐξέπεσον). Diodorus, then, does not explicitly support Hellanikos on the presence of Encheleis in Boiotia,²⁴¹ at least on the resident character of their presence:²⁴² they were there, but not explicitly as part of the local culture or among the ancient inhabitants of the region.

Our second source is a passage in a long fragment from Kephalion's *Various Histories* (BNJ 93 F 5 = Mal. *Chron.* II 16 Thurn). Kephalion probably lived under Hadrian²⁴³ and we know of him particularly from a few passages (FF 3-7) in John Malalas' *Chronography* (fifth and sixth century CE).²⁴⁴ Kephalion draws on the Classical myth of the birth of the founding twins Amphion and Zethos, Antiope's children. The story is attested in literature in the Homeric *Catalogue of Women* in *Odyssey* 11 (260-5), and was subject to many variations in terms of the fathers of the woman and in the plot.

In fact, the poet of the *Odyssey* is already aware of the opposite tradition, where Thebes was founded by Kadmos and not by the twins. Amphion's and Zethos' role, however, will

240 The verb κατοικέω means here “se fixer dans une ville dont on n'est pas originaire” (Casevitz 1985: 162), because the λαός encountered by Kadmos joined him (Diod. Sic. 14.53.4: συνῆλθε).

241 Koehler was also skeptical of a relationship, albeit mediated, between Hellanikos and Diodorus on this matter: “*Nego igitur ea, quae [Diodorus] de ipsis Encheleis memoriae prodidit, ex Hellanico hausta esse*” (Koehler 1898: 230).

242 This residential status is implied by the imperfect indicative ὄκουν used by the scholiast of Aristophanes, who quotes the fragment from the Βοιωτικά. The verb οἰκέω simply describes the permanence, in a site, and not its colonization (Casevitz 1985: 75-81). When used in the aorist, the verb can imply movement, but the imperfect tense, in Hellanikos, does not allow such a dynamic. As a consequence, there can hardly be a connection between the tradition followed by Diodorus and what we can reasonably infer from the short language of the scholium.

243 Jacoby 1921 was almost sure of this date; earlier dates have been suggested by later scholarship on Kephalion (cp. Squillace 2012).

244 Jacoby (1926b: 298) argued for the use of intermediate sources in John Malalas (“zwischenquellen”), whereas Squillace (2012) has recently argued that Malalas may have directly known Kephalion's writings. For our present commentary, if we consider the minimum, possible distance between Hellanikos and Kephalion, and that between Hellanikos and any intermediate source between Kephalion and Malalas (second through fifth centuries CE), there is no sensible difference in the appreciation of how such a tradition may have reached Malalas.

always remain central, even in those mythical histories of Thebes that repeat and assert the priority of Kadmos. The twins are always the builders of the Theban walls and they possess superior musical abilities. Among the twins, it is Amphion who is especially endowed with this talent.²⁴⁵ Kephalion focuses on this peculiar divine gift:

Amphion, the lyre-player (ὁ λυρικός), founds quite a big city, with twelve doors (δωδεκάπυλον),²⁴⁶ which was a village, in the past, known as Encheleia (τὴν πρώην μὲν οὔσαν κώμην λεγομένην Ἐγχέλειαν).²⁴⁷ The brothers call this city Thebes, from their father's name, following the advice of Antiope, their mother.

Kephalion is the first author who names Θεόβοος as Amphion's and Zethos' father. Theoboos was allegedly a noble fellow citizen of Lykos, Antiope's uncle, and king of Argos. Since Kephalion usually refers to allegories, this Theoboos may be a later hypostasis of Zeus: he is the new eponym of a preexisting center, if not a big (κώμη) one, like Encheleia, which must have had an indirect connection with the Encheleis.²⁴⁸ If, in

245 On Antiope, Amphion, and Zethos, see in general Rocchi 1989: 47-52; Hurst 2000; Kühn 2007: 118-32 (on their foundation myth as an example of “boiotische Konkurrenz”) and Moggi – Osanna 2012: 247-8 (on Paus. 9.5.6). On the twins, see *infra* 3.2.1.

246 The epithet δωδεκάπυλος is surprising when applied to Thebes, which was always a “Seven Gated” city, from Homer (*Il.* 4.406; *Od.* 11.263) on (on this epithet, and on its use, see Cingano 2000: 141-3). Wilamowitz (1891) opened the contemporary debate on the existence of Seven Gates in Thebes. In recent years, more and more scholars have reached a consensus on the skepticism around this configuration of the ancient city (see, among others, Osanna 2008 and Moggi – Osanna 2012: 263-8 on Paus. 9.8.4-7). The adjective δωδεκάπυλος is therefore a *hapax legomenon* for Thebes and may have an intensive meaning, as was suggested for the form δυωδεκατειχέος in *Timoth. Pers.* F 791,235 (Hordern 2002: 245-6: “Alternatively, *δυωδεκα-* may be equivalent to ‘many’, like *ModE* ‘dozen’; cf. *δωδεκαμήχανος* of a prostitute in *Ar. Ran.* 1327, where the sense is presumably ‘having many tricks’ rather than having exactly twelve”).

247 It was Dindorf who first corrected the transmitted Ἐνχιλία with Ἐγχέλειαν.

248 Theoboos as hypostasis of Zeus: Vian 1963: 72 n.6. When Kadmos, as in Kephalion, founds the only Kadmeid (*BNJ* 93 F 3), and the name of Thebes is linked to the second foundation of Amphion and Zethos, different characters can be mentioned to explain the new name. In the chapter on the mythical history of Thebes (9.5), Pausanias adheres to the version of the double foundation, and explains, without quoting any source: “[Amphion and Zethos] added the lower town to the Kadmeia (τὴν πόλιν τὴν κάτω προσώκισαν τῇ Καδμείᾳ) and called it Thebes, for their kinship with Thebe (κατὰ συγγένειαν τὴν Θήβης)” (tr. S. Tufano). However, the identity of this Θήβη is not clear (Moggi – Osanna 2012: 248 suggest that she might either be Asopos' daughter, mentioned elsewhere by Pausanias [2.5.2; 5.22.6; cp. Kühn 2006: 207 n.48], or Zethos' wife, as in *Apollod.* 3.5.6). The general impression is that this Thebe attracted more interest, or had a richer tradition on her kinship, than the male equivalent Theoboos in the Theban foundation myths (Theoboos descends from Pikos Zeus and may be a metempsychosis of the god).

Diodorus (19.53), the Encheleis do not spend a long time in Boiotia and reach the region during Kadmos' lifespan (in fact, he flees from them), Kephalion seems to pre-date their settlement in Boiotia: the context explicitly refers to the events following the death of Kadmos, with the accession to the throne of Nykteus, Antiope's father. But the village Encheleia already exists, when Amphion reaches it (πρώην μὲν οὔσαν).

Even though this tradition is attested later than Hellanikos, we cannot completely dismiss the possibility that Kephalion possessed good intermediate sources, ones of a local nature, on this subject. As far as Hellanikos is concerned, he mentioned him, for example, on Assyrian history.²⁴⁹ In other words, this tradition of a “pre-Theban” Encheleia is not necessarily a later, collateral story that is associated with the exile of Kadmos to Illyria. In its extreme conciseness, Kephalion reassures us about the possible association of the Encheleis with Boiotia, without a direct link to the personal legend of Kadmos.

The third source, which was quoted by Koehler and by Jacoby on the Encheleis in Boiotia, is a passage from John of Antioch's *Historia chronike* (seventh century CE *in*). This passage belongs to a series of fragments of the *History*, which scholarly tradition has actually assigned to Malalas.²⁵⁰ There are indeed some details which indicate the possible use of a further source, because this fragment, also on the foundation of Thebes, differs from the version of Kephalion/Malalas: the mother of the twins is Kalliope, not Antiope, and the brothers attain power with violence, whereas in Kephalion the succession is a peaceful moment (Nykteus dies from a disease, not as a victim: νόσῳ βληθεὶς τελευτᾷ). On the village of Encheleia, nonetheless, John of Antioch is particularly close to Malalas:

Where there was already a village, called Encheleia (τὴν πρώην οὔσαν κώμην καὶ καλουμένην Ἐγχέλειαν), they founded a city and called it Thebes, from the name of their father.

249 Kephalion, *BNJ* 93 F 1, quoting Hellanikos, *BNJ* 4 F 177. Cp. *BNJ* 93 T2a (Photius on Kephalion's library, a collection of 570 books).

250 *FHG* IV 545, 8 = Par. gr. 1630, f. 237r, 29-31; F 15 Roberto (Mariev 2008 does not take into consideration this material in his edition of John of Antioch, because he considers this passage spurious). On the relationship between Malalas and John of Antioch, see Roberto 2005: xi-xx and xlv-liii (on the textual transmission of F 8,1); Roberto 2016.

The transmitted toponym is Εὐθάλειαν, but the wording and the sequence of events are so similar that we can accept Müller’s correction to Ἐγχέλειαν. The only source, therefore, which can possibly support Hellanikos on these Boiotian Encheleis is Kephalion, because John of Antioch is drawing on Kephalion.

A second possible reading of the Encheleis may be that they were, for Hellanikos, “Eel-men”, meant as a derogatory or infamous label. In fact, the personification of the eels, in Archaic Comedy, is a frequent phenomenon, as the same Aristophanes shows, but this does not equate it with a proper piece of ethnography. Middle Comedy continued this *topos* of mocking Boiotia as a land of eels, and there are fragments, such as one from Antiphanes’ Φιλοθήβαιος,²⁵¹ which suggests to Kock (1884: 106) that “*immo Enchelys aptissimum meretricis cognomen [est]*”. The eels were, in a general sense, associated with beautiful women all over the Greek world,²⁵² and this comic flair for the association with Boiotia does not seem to improve our understanding of Hellanikos’ fragment.

In two fragments by Euboulos (FF 36,3; 64 K. – A.), the eels are considered divine, but the context is not clear enough to use these verses²⁵³ in order to prove the existence, in Boiotia, of a cult of eels.²⁵⁴ Apart from a potential parallel with Cos, where there was a monster *Enchelys*, the only possible proof for such a cult in Boiotia comes from a fragment of the second century BCE polygrapher Agatharchides of Knidos (BNJ 86 F 5; tr. S.M. Burstein):

Agatharchides says in the sixth book of the *European Histories* that the Boeotians, after putting wreathes and throwing barley corns on them like sacrificial animals, sacrifice, while praying to the gods, the largest of the eels

251 F 216,1-2 K. – A.: [...] ἢ τε γὰρ συνώνυμος/ τῆς ἔνδον οὔσης ἔγχελυς Βοιωτία, “The Boeotian eel, whose name is the same as the woman’s inside” (tr. S. Douglas Olson). Antiphanes was the most productive poet of Middle Comedy, but many doubts concern both his exact date (he seems to have lived in the first half of the fourth century BCE, but some fragments refer to events and figures of the second half) and the exact extent of his production: see an introduction in Nesselrath 1990: 193–4.

252 On the eels as symbols of beautiful women, cp. Pellegrino 2008: 207–8.

253 In the first fragment, the divine eels come immediately after the θύνων [...] ὑπογάστρια; in the second, the θεά actually is a παρθένος Βοιωτίας Κωπαίδος.

254 Cult of eels: Tümpel 1905: 2550,1–17. Other scholars claim that Antiphanes (F 216 K.–A.) and Euboulos, in his *Medea* (F 64 K.–A.), refer to a character in their comedy who is really called “Eel” (Schiassi 1955: 14; Pellegrino 2008: 207–8).

from Lake Copais (τὰς ὑπερφυεῖς τῶν Κωπαίδων ἐγχέλεων). And to the stranger, who was puzzled by the strangeness of the custom (τὰ προγονικὰ νόμιμα) and inquired about it, a Boeotian said that he knew only one thing, and he declared that it is necessary to maintain ancestral customs and that it is not appropriate to defend them to other people.

If we put aside the aforementioned sources on the Encheleis as an independent population or memory of Boiotia and focus instead on the actual knowledge and spread of eels in Boiotia, we detect a clear awareness of the economic importance of this good to the region. This aspect underlies, e.g., the so-called Boiotian Price Decree of Akraiphia (*SEG* XXXII 450), which lists a series of fresh and saltwater fish with their prices in the beginning of the second century BCE.²⁵⁵ However, the recognition of the impact of eels in the internal production of the area does not in itself represent positive evidence of the narrative of Agatharchides.

This scholar reproduced a series of details on Boiotian history that are of the utmost interest to us: in another fragment of the *European Histories* (*BNJ* 86 F 8), for instance, he mentioned a site, Sidai, whose location is completely obscure, apart from some general indications on it being between Attica and Boiotia. The second century BCE scholar, therefore, had rich material on the subject, and it would be hard to deny any reliability of his anecdote on the sacrifice. At the same time, the story of τὰ προγονικὰ νόμιμα puzzled the same observer (F 5: παράδοξον), and it is not enough to improve our understanding of the features and the place, in Boiotia, of the “Eel-men” of Hellanikos.

2.1.3. The Limits of Our Evidence: Boiotian Encheleis Reconsidered

It is hard to go beyond the simple consideration of Hellanikos’ witness of the Encheleis. Since there were complex and varying series of explanations on why the Boiotians fought at Troy, even if they allegedly came to Boiotia only sixty years after that war,²⁵⁶ we cannot exclude that these Encheleis were not Boiotians, because the identity of this population

255 See on this text Roesch 1974; Lytle 2010; Mackil 2012: 268-9.

256 See on this Hornblower 1991 *ad loc.*, Larson 2007: 52-64 and *infra* 2.2.2 *ad* ἡ Βοιωτία [...].

shifts from an aggregative process to a definition per exclusion.²⁵⁷ Jacoby (1923a: 452), for instance, puts stress on a passage in Pausanias, where, after having mentioned the autochthonous Ektenoi, the author specifies that the newcomers Hyantes and Aones were Boiotian, not foreign, tribes:

“in the original history of Boiotia of Paus. 9.5.1 [...], they [*i.e.* the Encheleis] and the Τέμμικες [Steph. Byz. τ 87, *s.v.* Τέμμικς], as well as Kadmos [who is remembered afterwards], are missing” (tr. S. Tufano).²⁵⁸

It is impossible to know to which period of Boiotian history Hellanikos refers when he mentions this population.²⁵⁹ It is probably better to stick to the hypothesis that the presence of the Encheleis in the region was interpreted and clarified²⁶⁰ (in ways unclear to us) in relationship to the famous goods that came from Lake Kopais. These Encheleis are one of the many populations that lived in a region where the Boiotians would later represent only the most relevant ethnic component.

2.2. Hellanikos F 2

257 Cp. Vian on Diodorus: “Les faits sont rapportés autrement par Diod. Sic. XIX 53, 4 s.: les Encheleis (béotiens?) chassent en Illyrie Cadmos et ses concitoyens (les Spartes ou Thébagènes); puis le fils de Cadmos, Polydoros, revient (aidé par les Illyriens?) chasser à son tour Amphion qui avait usurpé le pouvoir entre temps” (Vian 1963: 125 n.2). On the relationship between the Boiotians and these mythical populations, cp. Kühn 2014a: 229–30.

258 This fragment has been recently studied (Breglia 2011: 298) to prove how the Encheleis were one of the many “Pre-Kadmean” populations, imagined in Boiotia before the foundation of Thebes (for a complete list, see *ibid.* 298 and n.32).

259 Cp. Meineke’s observations, mentioned by Koehler (1898: 230), on a lemma in Stephanus of Byzantium (π 247): Προνάσται ἔθνος Βοιωτίας. Βοιωτῶν δέ τινες τὸ πάλαι {ἔθνος} Προνάσται καλέονται. Meineke thought that the *ἔθνος καλέονται* may derive from a source like Hekataios or Hellanikos (“*videntur Hecataei vel Hellanici verba esse*”; “wohl Hellanikos”: Kirsten 1957). This proposal was viewed with skepticism by Koehler because of a lack of further evidence on this population. The debate is still remarkable, for it highlights a lemma where another Boiotian *ethnos* is recalled, and, in this way, it shows the risks that derive from refusing apparently isolated traditions, like the one on the Encheleis (for instance, Buck 1979: 51, ignores these Pronastai, in a table on an alleged reconstruction of the single populations that lived in Boiotia). It may be accepted, with Prandi (2011: 248), that “la Beozia è una terra in cui [...] sono stati posizionati molti etnonimi: [...] essi sono segno non soltanto di presenze prebeotiche (senza intendere con questo che fossero tutte preelleniche), ma anche di permanenze, coesistenze, stratificazioni [...]”.

260 Fowler (2013: 357; 687) also emphasises the link with Hellanikos’ etymological interests.

Previous editions: *BNJ* 4 F 51; *EGMI* I F 51a; F 137 Ambaglio; *FGrHist* 4 F 51 (Schol. A, D codd. ZYQL *ad Il.* 2.494).

a. Βοιωτῶν μὲν Πενέλεως] ἡ Βοιωτία τὸ πρότερον Ἄονία ἐκαλεῖτο ἀπὸ τῶν κατοικούντων αὐτὴν Ἄονων. μετωνομάσθη δὲ Βοιωτία κατὰ μὲν τινὰς ἀπὸ Βοιωτοῦ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος καὶ Ἄρνης, καθ' ἑτέρουσ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλαθείσης κατὰ πυθόχρηστον ὑπὸ Κάδμου βοός. Εὐρώπης γὰρ τῆς Φοίνικος θυγατρὸς ἐκ Σιδῶνος ὑπὸ Διὸς ἀρπαγείσης, Κάδμος ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτῆς κατὰ ζήτησιν πεμφθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ὡς οὐχ εὐρήκει αὐτήν, ἦκεν εἰς Δελφοὺς ἐρωτήσων τὸν θεόν. ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ περὶ μὲν Εὐρώπης μὴ πολυπραγμονεῖν, χρῆσθαι δὲ καθοδηγῶι βοῖ καὶ πόλιν ἐκεῖ κτίζειν, ἔνθα ἂν αὐτὴ εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ πέσει καμοῦσα. τοιοῦτον λαβὼν χρησμὸν διὰ Φωκέων ἐπορεύετο εἶτα βοῖ συντυχῶν παρὰ τοῖς Πελάγονος βουκολίοις ταύτη πορευομένη κατόπιν εἶπετο ἢ δὲ διεξιούσα πᾶσαν Βοιωτίαν ὀκνήσασα ἀνεκλήθη ἔνθα νῦν εἰσιν ἡ πόλις Θῆβαι. βουλόμενος δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν βοῦν καταθῆσαι πέμπει τινὰς τῶν μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ ληψομένους χέρνιβα ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀρητιάδος κρήνης. ὁ δὲ φρουρῶν τὴν κρήνην δράκων, ὃν Ἄρεως ἔλεγον εἶναι, τοὺς πλείονας τῶν πεμφθέντων διέφθειρεν. ἀγανακτήσας δὲ Κάδμος κτείνει τὸν δράκοντα καὶ τῆς Ἀθηναῖας αὐτῷ ὑποθεμένης τοὺς τούτου ὀδόντας σπείρει ἀφ' ὧν ἐγένοντο οἱ γηγενεῖς. ὀργισθέντος δὲ Ἄρεως καὶ μέλλοντος Κάδμον ἀναιρεῖν ἐκώλυσεν ὁ Ζεὺς καὶ Ἀρμονίαν αὐτῷ συνώικισε τὴν Ἄρεως καὶ Ἀφροδίτης· πρότερον δὲ ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ἀντὶ τῆς ἀναιρέσεως τοῦ δράκοντος ἐνιαυτὸν θητεῦσαι. ἐν δὲ τῷ γάμῳ Μούσας ἄισαι καὶ τῶν θεῶν ἕκαστον Ἀρμονίαι δῶρον δοῦναι. ἱστορεῖ Ἑλλάνικος ἐν Βοιωτιακοῖς καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρος ἐν τῷ Γ.

a 2 αὐτὴν ZU ἐν αὐτῇ YQ ἐπ' αὐτῇ A 3 Βοιωτοῦ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος Z Βοιωτοῦ τινος καὶ Ἄρνης YQ Βοιωτοῦ υἱοῦ Ἰτώνου ἢ Ποσειδῶνος καὶ Ἄρνης L ἔτι δὲ καὶ (*om.* L; καὶ <νῦν> *dub.* De Marco) Βοιωτοὶ τιμῶσι τὸν προπάτορα αὐτῶν (αὐτὸν Y) Βοιωτόν, υἱὸν ὄντα (*om.* L) Ποσειδῶνος· καθ' ἑτέρουσ δὲ κτλ. *addunt* YQL “*quae manifesto in mg. initio adnotata postea in textum illata sunt*” De Marco 4 <τὸ> πυθόχρηστον A 5 ὁ *om.* YQAU 6 εὐρήκει Z^s(c) εὐρίσκει Z(U) εὔρεν A ἦλθεν AU 7 ἐρωτήσων ZAU πρὸς YQL 9 Φωκέων Z Φωκείων A Πελάγονος Z Πελαγόνος AQ Πελάγοντος **b** 11 ὀκνήσασα Z ὠκνήσασα A ὀκλάσασα Barnes (*ed.* 1711) Hercher ὀκνήσασα Z^s(c) ἀνεκλήθη ZA εἰσιν αἱ πόλεις A ἡ πόλις εἰσι L *del.* Ludwich (*cf.* **b**) 12 τινὰς UL τινὰ ZYQA *cf.* **b** ληψομένους UL ληψόμενον ZYQA 13 Ἀρητιάδος YQ Ἀρείας **b** 13 *et* 16 Ἄρεως YQ 15 σπείρειν ἀφ' οὗ A 17 συνοίκησεν Z “*qui fortasse –κι- voluit; Ionicus aoristus οἰκισα apud Herod. V 42 legitur; fieri igitur potest ut Ionicus aoristus συνοίκισε ab Hellanico huc fluxerit*” De Marco συνώικισε Q *teste Ludwich* 21 ἐν τῷ γ' *om.* QL

a: “Peneleus and Leithus led the Boiotians.] Boiotia was called Aonia in the past, after its inhabitants, the Aones; it was renamed Boiotia, according to some sources, after Boiotos, the son of Poseidon and Arne. According to others, it was because of the cow which had been led by Kadmos, as declared by the Delphian oracle. Since Europa, the daughter of Phoenix, had been kidnapped in Sidon by Zeus, and her brother Kadmos, sent by his father to look for her, could not find her, he came to Delphi to inquire about Europa. The god told him not to trouble himself about Europa, but to be guided by a cow, and to found a city wherever she would fall, weary. After receiving such an oracle he journeyed through Phokis; then falling in with a cow among the herds of Pelagon, he followed behind it. And after traversing Boiotia, the animal lay down where is now the city of Thebes. Wishing to sacrifice the cow to Athena, he sent some of his companions to draw water from the spring of Ares. But a dragon, which some said was the offspring of Ares, guarded the spring and destroyed most of those who had been sent. In his indignation, Kadmos killed the dragon, and by the advice of Athena sowed its teeth and from them came the Earthborns. Because Ares was angered and was going to kill Kadmos, Zeus forestalled him and had him marry Harmonia, the daughter of Ares and Aphrodite; still, he ordered him to serve him for a year, for his killing of the dragon. During the wedding, the Muses sang and every god gave gifts to Harmonia. That is what Hellanikos in his *History of Boiotia* and Apollodoros in his third book tell” (tr. S. Tufano).

****b.** Apld. 3.4.1 (21-25)

Κάδμος δὲ ἀποθανοῦσαν θάψας Τηλέφασσαν, ὑπὸ Θρακῶν ξενισθεὶς, ἦλθεν εἰς Δελφοὺς περὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης πυνθανόμενος. ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἶπε περὶ μὲν Εὐρώπης μὴ πολυπραγμονεῖν, χρῆσθαι δὲ καθοδηγῶι βοί, καὶ πόλιν κτίζειν ἔνθα ἂν αὕτη πέση καμοῦσα. (22) τοιοῦτον λαβῶν χρησμὸν διὰ Φωκέων ἐπορεύετο, εἶτα βοὶ συντυχῶν ἐν τοῖς Πελάγοντος βουκολίοις ταύτηι κατόπισθεν εἶπετο. ἡ δὲ διεξιούσα Βοιωτίαν ἐκλίθη, {πόλις} ἔνθα νῦν εἰσι Θῆβαι. βουλόμενος δὲ Ἀθηνᾶ καταθῦσαι τὴν βοῦν, πέμπει τινὰς τῶν μεθ’ ἑαυτοῦ ληψομένους ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀρείας κρήνης ὕδωρ· φρουρῶν δὲ τὴν κρήνην δράκων, ὃν ἐξ Ἄρεος εἶπόν τινες γεγονέναι, τοὺς πλείονας τῶν πεμφθέντων διέφθειρεν. (23) ἀγανακτήσας δὲ Κάδμος κτείνει τὸν δράκοντα, καὶ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ὑποθεμένης τοὺς ὀδόντας αὐτοῦ

σπείρει. τούτων δὲ σπαρέντων ἀνέτειλαν ἐκ γῆς ἄνδρες ἔνοπλοι, οὓς ἐκάλεσαν Σπαρτούς. οὗτοι δὲ ἀπέκτειναν ἀλλήλους, οἱ μὲν εἰς ἔριν ἀκούσιον ἐλθόντες, οἱ δὲ {ἀλλήλους} ἀγνοοῦντες. (24) Φερεκύδης δὲ φησιν ὅτι Κάδμος, ἰδὼν ἐκ γῆς ἀναφυομένους ἄνδρας ἐνόπλους, ἐπ’ αὐτούς ἔβαλε λίθους, οἱ δὲ ὑπ’ ἀλλήλων νομίζοντες βάλλεσθαι εἰς μάχην κατέστησαν. περιεσώθησαν δὲ πέντε, Ἐχίων Οὐδαῖος Χθονίος Ὑπερήνωρ Πέλωρ. Κάδμος δὲ ἀνθ’ ὧν ἔκτεινεν αἰδίου ἐνιαυτὸν ἐθήτευσεν Ἄρει· ἦν δὲ ὁ ἐνιαυτὸς τότε ὀκτῶ ἔτη. (25) μετὰ δὲ τὴν θητείαν Ἀθηνᾶ αὐτῶ τὴν βασιλείαν κατεσκεύασε, Ζεὺς δὲ ἔδωκεν αὐτῶ γυναῖκα Ἀρμονίαν, Ἀφροδίτης καὶ Ἄρεος θυγατέρα. καὶ πάντες θεοὶ καταλιπόντες τὸν οὐρανόν, ἐν τῇ Καδμείᾳ τὸν γάμον εὐωχούμενοι καθύμνησαν. ἔδωκε δὲ αὐτῇ Κάδμος πέπλον καὶ τὸν ἠφαιστότευκτον ὄρμον, ὃν ὑπὸ Ἡφαίστου λέγουσιν τινες

b 3 αὕτη Hercher αὐτὴ *codd.* 5 Πελάγονος **a** 6 ἔνθα κτίζει πόλιν, ὅπου νῦν εἰσὶν αἱ Θῆβαι Epit. Vat., *cf.* **a** πόλις *del.* Hercher 7 τινὰς ληφομένους Epit. Vat., *singularia cett. cf.* **a** 8 Ἀρητιάδος **a**, *cf.* Steph. Byz. α 411, *s.v.* Ἀρεία κρήνη ὁ δὲ φρουρῶν Hercher 12 ἐκούσιον Epit. Sabb. ἀλλήλους *del.* Heyne² 554 = Heyne³ 254 14 ἔβαλλε Epit. Sabb. 16 Πέλωρ *apogr., epit., Tzetz.* Chil. 10.432 (*qui ex Apld. pendet*) Πέλωρος R αἰδίου: Ἄρεος υἱὸν Hercher Ἄρεος ἰδίου Ludwich ἀνδρῶν *anon. apud Wagner, prob. Wil.*³ 18 βασιλείαν Epit. Sabb. τὴν βασιλείαν Epit. Vat. βασι(λ-) R *unde* βασιλεῖ *rell.*

****b:** “When Telephassa died, Cadmus buried her, and after being hospitably received by the Thracians he came to Delphi to inquire about Europa. The god told him not to trouble about Europa, but to be guided by a cow, and to found a city wherever she should fall down for weariness. After receiving such an oracle he journeyed through Phocis; then falling in with a cow among the herds of Pelagon, he followed it behind. And after traversing Boeotia, it sank down where is now the city of Thebes. Wishing to sacrifice the cow to Athena, he sent some of his companions to draw water from the spring of Ares. But a dragon, which some said was the offspring of Ares, guarded the spring and destroyed most of those that were sent. In his indignation Cadmus killed the dragon, and by the advice of Athena sowed its teeth. When they were sown there rose from the ground armed men whom they called Sparti. These slew each other, some in a chance brawl, and some in ignorance. But Pherecydes says that when Cadmus saw armed men growing up out of the ground, he flung stones at them, and they, supposing that they were being pelted by each other, came to blows. However, five of them survived, Echion, Udaeus, Chthonius, Hypereneor, and Pelorus. But Cadmus, to atone for the

slaughter, served Ares for an eternal year; and the year was then equivalent to eight years of our reckoning. After his servitude Athena procured for him the kingdom, and Zeus gave him to wife Harmonia, daughter of Aphrodite and Ares. And all the gods quitted the sky, and feasting in the Cadmea celebrated the marriage with hymns. Cadmus gave her a robe and the necklace wrought by Hephaestus, which some say was given to Cadmus by Hephaestus, but Pherecydes says that it was given by Europa, who had received it from Zeus” (tr. J. Frazer).

This fragment must be analysed from three perspectives: first, we need to consider the stratification of the witnesses, the *D Scholia* to the *Iliad*. This is a class of scholia specific to the *Iliad*, resembling a building that was modified and expanded over the centuries.²⁶¹ After clarifying the uniqueness of this scholium inside its main *corpus*, we need to interpret what correlation exists among the three sources. Apart from the two names quoted at the end, Hellanikos and (Pseudo-)Apollodoros,²⁶² we should pay attention to the intervention of the scholiast.²⁶³ Finally, after attempting to provide a temporary selection of the information that may go back to Hellanikos, we can speculate on it. We must start from the observation, however, that this long scholium cannot betray in its entirety Hellanikos’ version on the arrival of Kadmos to Thebes and on the ensuing events.²⁶⁴

261 van Thiel 2000: 8.

262 Fowler (2013: 378-84) examines the correspondences between thirteen D Scholia to the *Iliad* and as many passages from Apollodoros’ *Library*. He thus demonstrates that it is possible to accept that the authors of the scholia really drew on Apollodoros. Here and afterwards, no mention is made of “Pseudo”-Apollodoros, since I agree with Fowler (*ibid.* 383-4; Fowler 2000: xxvii n.2) and, indirectly, with Pagès (2017: 68 n.13): we should accept the data of the tradition and not compare the later namesake with the learned Apollodoros, who lived in the second century BCE (*FGrHist* 244: Scarpi 2010: xi-xii has doubts on the onomastics and prefers to think of the *Library* as an anonymous text).

263 Sturz (1826: 68) assigned this fragment, for example, to the *Phoronis*: “*Haec [...] ita, ut Hellenici narrationi immixta sint verba Scholiastae, qui eam seruavit, et Apollodori.*” In any case, it is technically improper to consider the existence of just one scholiast for this fragment, since it is transmitted by five manuscripts (Z, Y, Q, A, R). Each of these manuscripts has its own characteristics. Nevertheless, for convenience, I will refer to this stage of the transmission by mentioning “the scholiast”.

264 In his entry on Hellanikos for the *RE*, F. Jacoby suggested investigating the ethnographic interests of this author, without studying only the ones with an explicit mention of such a work (Jacoby 1912b: 136,1-6; cp. *ibid.* 135,22, on the dissimilarity in treatment of the same myth in different works, according to an adjustable “lokale Ersteckung”). Jacoby’s direct precedent was the scientific output by Koehler, who had already applied a similar approach when dealing with

2.2.1. The *D-Scholia* and the Subscriptions: A Stratified Fragment

The *D Scholia* to the *Iliad* are also known as *scholia minora* or *vulgata* and were the first scholia published by Lascaris in 1517. They take this name, albeit improperly, from Didymos, a grammarian who lived under Augustus. Didymos' actual contribution merged in the so-called *Viermännerkommentar* ("The Commentary of the Four Men"), behind the *A Scholia*, on the Ven. Marc. 454.²⁶⁵ The two main characteristics of the *D Scholia* are the great antiquity of part of their content, the lexicographical part,²⁶⁶ and their isolated presence, as a full and independent commentary on a number of manuscripts.²⁶⁷ Finally, it is generally also assumed that other scholia, transmitted by other codices, belong to the *D Scholia*, in particular, some of the scholia on the Ven. Marc. 454 (**A.**).²⁶⁸ For the study of our fragment, it is important to note that some *D Scholia* originally derive from the *Mythographus Homericus*, a mythographical commentary on Homer, which can probably be dated to the first century CE.²⁶⁹ This commentary, not transmitted in its direct form, is

Hellanikos' Boiotian studies, in the chapter "De Thebanis fabulis" of his *Analecta Hellanicea* (Koehler 1898: 213-44). This scholar, after considering our fragment and its complex stratification, reached this conclusion: "*Quae singulis Hellanicis prodiderit de Cadmi in Boeotia rebus gestis si quaeramus, remittamus oportet schol. B 494*" (*ibid.* 221). For a specific history of the scholarship of this fragment, see 7.2.

265 For an introduction to Homeric scholarship, see the concise profile by Dickey 2007: 18-23 (19-21 on the *D Scholia*; specifically on these, cp. Montanari 1979: 3-27 and van Thiel 2000).

266 According to van Thiel (2000: 5-8), the first element that entered this *corpus* was the series of *Wörterlisten*, which, judging from merely literary hints, can be postulated as existing from the fifth century BCE.

267 Here and later, I adopt the sigla used by van Thiel (2014), which differ from the ones suggested by de Marco (1946). Among the manuscripts of the *D Scholia*, we distinguish two families. The most important witness of the first family is **Z** (Bibl. Naz. Centr. Gr. 6 + Matrit. B. N. 4626, IX c.: see van Thiel 2000b: 9-10, for a short overview of the story of this manuscript, which is split today between Rome and Madrid; especially on the Roman half, now in the Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Roma, see Schimberg 1890: 423-7). The main manuscripts of the second family are **Q** (Vat. gr. 33, XI c.) and **Y** (Vat. gr. 32, XII c.); see van Thiel 2000: 8-13 and van Thiel 2014: 10-5 for a list of the main witnesses. Inside the second family of codices, van Thiel isolates a further group, formed by a version amplified through material coming "aus exegetischen Scholien ("T-Scholien"), Porphyrios und Etymologica" (2000: 2).

268 Dickey 2007: 19 n.1: "Identification as a *D scholion* takes precedence over identification as an *A scholion*, so material found in the main *D-scholia* manuscripts is considered to be *D-scholia* material even if it also occurs in *A.*" The "Einbeziehung des Venetus A" (van Thiel 2000: 2) is one of the main features, which distinguish van Thiel's edition (2014) from the one by de Marco (1946), limited to the first five books.

269 Montanari 1995: 165.

reconstructed thanks to a series of papyri,²⁷⁰ and as a part of the aforementioned corpus of scholia.²⁷¹

The scholium on *Il.* 2.454 belongs to this last category of D Scholia, since it has all the features of the *historiae*,²⁷² short mythical narrations, which together constitute the *Mythographus Homericus* (= *MH*). First of all, we have an introductory clause opened by a specific lemma (Βοιωτικά), followed by the body of the narrative. Finally, there is a subscription of the D-Scholia, which assigns all the previous story to Hellanikos and to Apollodoros. Such subscriptions have long been considered unreliable, especially by those scholars who thought that the origin of this material was a mythological digest written in the first centuries after Christ.²⁷³ Nevertheless, the discovery of a series of papyri has improved our understanding of the characteristics of the *MH*, along with a few D Scholia; the papyri often show some variants from the manuscript tradition of our material, and this fact has imposed a reappraisal of the subscriptions.

It is in fact possible that, starting from an original text, there soon developed a textual fluidity that gave rise to numerous variations and versions of the circulating *MH*. From the point of view of the textual tradition, then, we cannot think that our scholium appeared exactly in the way we read it today, in its original version, as a fragment of the *MH*. There were different “degrees of abridgement” (Pagès 2017: 67) and this was possibly due to the success of this mythological handbook.

A second, meaningful point is the role of these subscriptions: according to Lünstedt (1961: 35–6), these cross-references do not aim to bestow reliability to the reported version, but they might imply a suggestion of a parallel text or an erudite comparison. Montanari (1995: 166) went even further and, from a few cases where we can compare the version on the papyri with the manuscripts, he argued that a subscription can refer to the knowledge of a *commentary* on the text of the named author. The scholarship on the D Scholia,

270 The most updated inventory is van Rossum–Steenbeck 1998: 278–309, which considers these papyri as ὑποθέσεις, along with the papyri with the summaries of the single books of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (*ibid.* 53–5). Cebrián 2007: 26–35 and Montanari 2012 offer a further update on the general state of the art.

271 See Montanari 1995; Dickey 2007: 26.

272 Cp. Montanari 1995: 136–7; Wilamowitz (1921: 64 = 1971: 442 n.1) was among the first scholars to include our scholium in the *MH*.

273 See, among the others, Schwartz 1881 and Panzer 1892. Cp. the *status quaestionis* in Cebrián 2007: 36–9.

therefore, allows us to be less skeptical towards the material they convey. It also recommends particular prudence since these scholia can communicate otherwise unknown information, which actually derives from the authors mentioned in the end, despite the multilayered tradition of their excerpts (text > commentary/note > *MH* > D Scholia).

From a personal reading of all the D Scholia in the recent edition by van Thiel (2014), it was possible to isolate 326 scholia which can be classified as *historiae*. 176 of these being specifically quoted in literary sources.²⁷⁴ Hellanikos is quoted four times,²⁷⁵ and in three of these instances there is mention of a specific book.²⁷⁶ At the same time, among the six references to Apollodoros' *Library*,²⁷⁷ four of them also specify the book.²⁷⁸ A further observation is that Apollodoros is only quoted with Hellanikos in our present scholium, representing an interesting case where a degree of detail coexists between both sources.

If we include the scholium in the material of the *Mythographus Homericus* while keeping in mind the independent and diversified nature of this commentary,²⁷⁹ we then have to explain this matching of Hellanikos with Apollodoros. The *Library* was probably written in Late Antiquity, but the first mention is in Photius (*Bibl. cod.* 186, p. 142 a-b), who defines it as a βιβλιδάριον. The Apollodoros who appears as its author cannot be the Athenian namesake who lived in the second century BCE (*FGrHist* 244): there is only a shallow connection as far as the content is concerned, and Apollodoros of Athens gave a euhemeristic reading of the myths.²⁸⁰ It is not impossible that anonymity was intentionally chosen by this author, who may belong to the Second Sophistic.²⁸¹ Carrière and Massonie (1991: I 11) have proposed the Severan Age because of the Greek language adopted in the text; the *Library* does not actually quote authors later than Castor (*FGrHist* 250) and Zenobios.

274 The most frequent opening formulas are the expression ἡ ἱστορία παρά (67 times) and the verb ἱστορέω, which occurs 27 times. Cp. Cameron 2004: 91 for the topical character of these expressions.

275 Schol. D *ad Il.* 2.105 (Z: BNJ 4 F 157), 494 (Zc: BNJ 4 F 51); 3.75 (ZQ: BNJ 4 F 36), 144 (Z: BNJ 4 F 134), 151 (Z: BNJ 4 F 140), 250 (Z: BNJ 4 F 139); 12.1 (Z: BNJ 4 F 145); 18.486 (Zc: BNJ 4 F 19); 20.145 (Z: BNJ 4 F 26b).

276 Schol. D *ad Il.* 2.494 (ἐν Βοιωτικαῖς); 3.75 (ἐν Ἀργολικοῖς); 18.486 (ἐν τῶι Α τῶν Ἀτλαντικῶν).

277 Schol. D *ad Il.* 1.10 (Z), 42 (Z), 195 (Z); 2.103 (Z), 494 (Zc); 12.117 (Y).

278 These scholia are the first proof of an internal subdivision of this text (Scarpi 2010: x n.14).

279 Montanari 1995: 140-1.

280 The distinction became canonical after Robert's work (Robert 1873).

281 Fowler 2013: 384.

In Photius we have no sign of an internal subdivision of books, which first appears in the D Scholia to the *Iliad*: this signposting, however, is not confirmed by our manuscripts of the *Library*. The distinctiveness of the relationship between this class of scholia and the *Library*, therefore, supports the likeliness of an original tripartition of the collection,²⁸² as well as forcing us to see, in a different way, the attribution to Hellanikos. Either we suggest that another text of the *Library* made reference to Hellanikos, since this text offers references to Pherekydes and, in general, to other fragmentary historians,²⁸³ or Hellanikos had to be signalled in a *historia* of the *MH* and, since it seems verisimilar, we must then decide how to judge this second scenario.

This scholium, then, alludes to one of the most riveting features of the *MH*: those “myhographische Historiai” (van Thiel 2000: 2) that accompany the Homeric text, according to the papyri that we have, from at least the second century BCE. The complexity of the tradition of this fragment demands that we see it as a *unique* text, where the probable acquaintance with Apollodoros and other material (*MH* and, *perhaps*, Hellanikos, directly or, more likely, indirectly) constitutes a unity that can be compared, for the variety of its contents, to the Homeric *Kunstsprache*.

2.2.2. Commentary

ἡ Βοιωτία [...] ὑπὸ Κάδμου βοός. The introductory clause focuses on a much-vexed subject: the etymology of the region of Boiotia. The theme is relevant because of the participation of the Boiotians in the Trojan War being considered in contradiction to the tradition that had them migrate to Boiotia sixty years after the end of the conflict (Thuc. 1.12). Not only do we detect here the general interest of the author(s) of the D Scholia for the μετωνομασία²⁸⁴ (i.e. how a region would change its name over the course of time), but there is also a peculiar attention to this important aspect of Boiotian history.

In fact, in our fragment, the toponym Aonia is strictly connected to the problems related to the Boiotian ethnogenesis, since elsewhere the connection with the Aones is explained

282 Cp. Scarpi 2010: xiv n.3 and Fowler 2013: 383.

283 Cp. Scarpi 2010: 687–8 for a list of the sources quoted in the *Library*.

284 Cp. Cebrián 2007: 259.

by an explicit recourse to the noun Aonia or to a connected adjective.²⁸⁵ The alleged former name of Boiotia, Aonia, first occurs among our sources in the Hellenistic period in the works of Callimachus²⁸⁶ and Apollonius Rhodius (3.1178; 1185). However, we should remember that our general picture of local populations is extremely poor:²⁸⁷ consider, for example, a passage in Pausanias' Boiotian book (9.5.1), where we read a few names of the original people of Boiotia, people who are otherwise completely unknown.²⁸⁸ Besides, both Callimachus and Apollonius must have had a precedent for this toponym (it is hard to believe that a toponym would be a complete invention).²⁸⁹ In our fragment, the toponym Aonia is strictly connected to the problems related to the Boiotian ethnogenesis, since elsewhere the connection with the Aones and their link with the Boiotians is explained by an explicit recourse to the noun Aonia or to a similar adjective.

285 Cp. Schol. Ap. Rhod. 3.1177-87a, where the scholiast questions why the dragon defeated by Kadmos is defined Ἀόνιος by Apollonius.

286 Callim. *Hymn* 4.75; F 572 Pfeiffer. Cp. Pfeiffer 1985: 401 (on Callimachus' F 572): “*Nominis Αόνων nullum certum exemplum ante Call[imachum]*”, exactly because the subscription in our fragment is considered doubtful; see Breglia 2011: 309 on Callimachus as a scholar “ben esperto di tradizioni locali beotiche.”

287 On the so-called “Pre-Kadmeans”, see in general Breglia 2011. In the Classical period, both Herodotus (5.57) and Thucydides (1.12.2) acknowledge that the toponym “Boiotia” was not original: Kadmos, for example, came ἐς γῆν τὴν νῦν Βοιωτὴν καλεούμενην (Hdt. 2.49.3; 5.57), whereas, for Thucydides, the preceding name was Kadmeis (*loc. cit.*). Neither Herodotus nor Thucydides offer a clear etymology for the new name, which in Thucydides is simply a consequence of the arrival of the Boiotians in the region. I agree with Hornblower (2013: 177; Hornblower 2015: 272) that later traditions, like the one on the Temmichia and on the Temmiches, might offer an example of the narratives which were spread concerning the region, before its “final” name Boiotia (Str. 7.7.1.321; 9.2.3.401; Lycoph. *Alex.* 644 and 768; Menelaos *BNJ* 384 F 1, with Jacoby 1955a: 179 and Ganter – Zgoll 2014 *ad BNJ* 384 F 1; *Suppl. Hell.* 994 F 1, for a possible presence of a [Τεμ]μίκειο[ν], according to Lobel). Contemporary scholarship has sometimes set these local populations in the period immediately before the arrival of the Phoenicians and of the so-called “Kadmeans”, assuming that the Ektenes and the Hyantes lived in Boiotia between LH I-II A and LH II B, and that they were later substituted by the “Boiotian” Aones (Buck 1979: 45-6; Symeonoglou 1985: 77-80; Pownall 2016 *ad BNJ* 4 F 51; see the reasonable objections by Breglia 2011: 296). On the early population of Boiotia, see *supra* 2.1.3 (Hellenikos' contribution to this field) and *infra* 6.1.1 (Boiotian populations in Boiotian historiography).

288 Stephanus of Byzantium has a voice (α 347) on the Ἄοες: “Boiotian ethnos, whence Aonia [has its name]; ethnic forms are Aon, Aonios and Aonia” (tr. S. Tufano). The last part of the lemma must be read with prudence, as it may also be an autoschediasm from the name of the region.

289 Valckenaer suggested reading Ἀόνων *pro* δόμων at Eur. *Phoen.* 644. Metrical reasons (the length of the alpha) inhibit the acceptance of this conjecture, as Mastronarde 2005 *ad loc.* reminds us (cp. further Breglia 2011: 297 n.25). It is improbable that the other reason he adds is in itself sufficient, because the Hellenistic occurrence might use preexisting materials (see the prudence shown by Mineur 1984: 111 on Callim. *Hymn* 4.75 about Ἄοινή: “As a possible source one could think of the ancient Thebaid or of the version of Antimachos, from which Statius may have derived the patronymic *Aonides* (*Theb.* 9, 95).”)

The second etymology mentioned here for Βοιωτία links it to the word for “cow”, βούς, and was particularly successful in the Augustan age, judging from its presence in Ovid’s *Metamorphoseon libri* (3.10–4)²⁹⁰ and in Castor of Rhodes (*FGrHist* 250 F 19). The following, explicative γάρ might suggest that the sources of the *historia* embraced this theory, but it is more likely, on the basis of the strong presence of the voice of the scholiast in this first section, that the connection between the pursuit of the cow and this etymology derives from the scholiast himself. The scholar cites two explanations: the first one on Aonia may be his own inference, on the basis of his working materials. This connection may very likely be seen as a trace of the lexicographical material that made its way into the D Scholia or, later, in the *Mythographus Homericus*,²⁹¹ whose first development is coterminous with the first Imperial Age. A likely scenario for the creation, or the promotion, of this paronymological link may have been the Thebes of the hegemony years, when the city pushed its hegemonic cultural power on the rest of the region²⁹² (the myth of the leading city, thus, became interwoven with the story of the entire region), but this hypothesis is not strongly supported by the literary evidence. It can thus only rest on our understanding that it promotes a strong connection between Kadmos’ journey in Boiotia, renamed after the cow, and the foundation of Thebes: this narrative inevitably assumes that Theban prehistory is a short chapter of the longer history of the whole region – but a political reading can only be a working hypothesis.

Despite the role of the scholiast, the first etymology (i.e. that Boiotia was named after Boiotos, son to Poseidon and Arne), has often been accepted as a genuine piece of

290 This is the Classical interpretation of Apollo’s warning to Kadmos (Bömer 1969; Barchiesi in Barchiesi – Rosati 2007 *ad loc.*): the appeal starts with a reference to the *bos*, which will guide the hero, and finishes with the injunction to call the entire region *Boeotia* (cp., on this episode, Hardie 1990: 226–7, who suggests that Ovid might be alluding, at the same time, to Virgil’s representation of the foundation of Rome).

291 The same link between the pursuit of the cow and this etymology is mentioned in another scholium, Schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 638, where the etymology closes the commentary. Other interesting parallels occur in the later sources: Stephanus of Byzantium, in his voice on Βοιωτία (β 116), recalls the two etymologies already attested in our scholium to Hom. *Il.* 2.454 (Boiotos and the cow), but adds further references for these theories and has another genealogy for Boiotos. Another useful example is offered by the scholium *ad* Ap. Rhod. 3.1177–87a, since, in the relevant passage, Apollonios explicitly focuses on Kadmos’ fight.

292 Cp. Breglia 2011: 294 and 297 n.24. If Antoninus Liberalis (*Met.* 25) took from Korinna the mention of Aonia (*ibid.* 308), we might infer that Korinna, too, had mentioned the toponym. Still, this scenario is highly conjectural and the probable mediation of a secondary source, between Korinna and Antoninus, further precludes its acceptance.

information from Hellanikos.²⁹³ This other theory serves the same purpose to explain whence Boiotia received its name. In order to understand this, we need to briefly return to the aforementioned chapter of Thucydides' *History* (1.12.2), which describes the movements of populations after the end of the Trojan War. Among these we have the Boiotians arriving in Boiotia because they were pushed out of Thessalian Arne by the Thessalians. This picture is hardly reconcilable with the Boiotian army in Troy,²⁹⁴ but Thucydides consciously adds that these Boiotians at Troy were already living in Boiotia (he claims that, even before the final migration from Thessaly, a Boiotian ἀποδοασμός settled in the region).

A theory not directly connected with the story of Kadmos, that of Boiotos, highlights the importance of Arne as the mother of Boiotos and as the namesake of that city.²⁹⁵ This is strengthened by the existence of a Boiotian site named Arne, a fake center with only literary attestations.²⁹⁶ Its existence testifies to the Boiotian efforts to accept and, at the same time, reuse in a new way, the story of a migration from Thessaly by adding internal details in reaction to Thessalian elements. Finding their eponymous hero, a mother Arne or inventing a local Arne, possibly as antecedent to the historical Arne of Thessaly, are different strategies with the same consequence: building a national story with preexisting materials.

Boiotos was a relevant figure in the Boiotian ethnogenesis at least from the sixth century BCE. His parents were, as usual, of strategic importance:²⁹⁷ already in the *Catalogue of*

293 Cp. Fowler 2013: 190 and Pownall 2016 *ad BNJ* 4 F 51. The second family of the codices (Y and Q) records a cult of Boiotos in the region, which is not attested elsewhere (it is also absent from Schachter's *Cults of Boiotia*). A fragment of Euripides' *Melanippe Desmotis* (TrGF 489), quoted by Stephanus (β 116, *s.v.* Βοιωτία), may be the first literary occurrence of a link between Boiotos and Boiotia (see *infra* in text on this tragedy).

294 See Prandi 2011: 241 and Fowler 2013: 191: "The thing that made matters especially difficult for the Boiotians [...] was the need to believe that Boiotoi had fought at Troy."

295 There were two homonymous sites in antiquity, one in Thessaly and the other in Boiotia, but the second one was very probably a fictitious one, a literary creation: Bakhuizen 1989: 70; Hornblower 1991 *ad Thuc.* 1.12; Vannicelli 1996; Beck – Ganter 2015: 134. Ancient scholarship was already looking for the Boiotian Arne (cp. Schol. D *ad Il.* 2.507/Z^s Ἄρνη). This passage says that since it was not possible to locate a centre with this name in Boiotia at the time of the Trojan War, some identified it with Ἄσκη.

296 The sources are more interested in the Thessalian site than in the southern one, which only occurs, elsewhere, in a fragment from the *Catalogue of Women* F 218 M. – W. (with Larson 2007: 40–4).

297 See, on this figure, Tümpel 1897; Schachter 1997; Kühr 2006: 263 n.9; Larson 2007: 18–22; Kühr 2014a: 236–7.

Women (F 219 M. – W.), Boiotos is indirectly associated with Poseidon, since Onchestos, Boiotos' son,²⁹⁸ establishes a cult for Poseidon on a Boiotian site, later named Onchestos after him. More significantly, in Korinna's *Boiotos*, Boiotos was explicitly named Poseidon's son (F 6 P.).²⁹⁹ In any case, there were many variants on Boiotos' parents and children³⁰⁰ and he is not always associated with other foundation myths of Boiotian cities: in a fragmentary tragedy by Euripides, the *Melanippe Desmotis*,³⁰¹ and in a tradition collected by Diodorus (4.67), Boiotos was associated with the city of Metapontum. It could be that this was a consequence of Boiotian interests in this region, but a clear explanation is still far from being reached.³⁰² It seems that the Italian setting was not an echo of the Boiotian participation in Achaean colonization.³⁰³ More probably, Metapontum was mainly the fruit of Euripides' reception of a local, Italian tradition, because in this period Metapontum was trying to stress its Aiolian past against Taras' Doric ties.³⁰⁴

The epic poet Asius and Euripides, in his tragedies *Melanippe Sophe*³⁰⁵ and *Melanippe Desmotis*, identified Boiotos' mother as Melanippe, a representative of Aiolos' family.³⁰⁶ In contrast, among the τινες who reported the parents as Poseidon and Arne, were

298 Cp. Schol. D *Il.* 2.506/Z' Ὀγχηστόν.

299 Page 1953: 45; cp. Berman 2010 and Olivieri 2010-1: 87.

300 For an introduction to these variations, see Tümpel 1897, *s.v.* *Boiotus* 3. If it is undeniable that by the end of the fifth century BCE, Poseidon's fatherhood reached a "traditional" status (Pownall 2016 *ad BNJ* 4 F 51), it is less clear how much of a "canonical version" (*ibid.*) of his genealogy may exist in the first century BCE, as his motherhood was particularly subject to variations.

301 *TrGF* 489-96.

302 Schachter 1997, on the Boiotian interests. Useful observations on the relationships between Boiotia and this town in Mele 1998.

303 Boiotian participation in colonization was posited by Pais (1894: 542-3), but Bérard (1957: 332) remarked the absence of clear indications on Boiotian and/or Theban involvement. A possible hint might be the attestation of a *Thebae Lucanae* (Cato F 54 Cornell), albeit even later mentions of this toponym do not confirm its identification with Metapontum or a specific Italian centre (Steph. Byz. θ 40, *s.v.* Θήβη, with Cornell 2013 III: 103; Musti 1988a: 139; Castiglioni – Pouzadoux 2014: 15 and n.26).

304 See Castiglioni – Pouzadoux 2014 for a recent discussion on the Italian implications of the myth of Melanippe and Boiotos. The same discourse would also be detectable in a debated fragment by Antiochos of Syracuse (*BNJ* 555 F 12), who is actually contrasting Euripides. See helpful considerations in Nafissi 1997 and Corcella 2007 on Antiochos' fragment quoted above.

305 Asius, F 2 West, *GEF*; Euripides, *TrGF* 480-8.

306 Cp. Larson 2007: 21 and Breglia 2011: 294.

Nikocrates, who wrote local history at the end of the third century BCE,³⁰⁷ the poet Euphoriion of Chalkis (second century BCE),³⁰⁸ and Diodorus.³⁰⁹ If we consider the kinship ties of Melanippe and Arne with relevant characters of Aiolos' family tree,³¹⁰ it is remarkable that Hesiod was the first author to possibly see Arne as Boiotos' mother,³¹¹ but this does not grant more probability to the idea that this kinship may *also* be present in Hellanikos.

The most puzzling aspect of the etymology that linked Boiotia and Boiotos, is the underlying message that he was *Arne's* child: this is a genealogy that recalls the Thessalian past of the Boiotians. The parentage sums up, therefore, a paternal side, with Poseidon, purely *Boiotian* for his local connections, and a maternal side, with Arne, clearly *Thessalian*. Now, two contexts can be imagined to explain the emphasis on this interconnection, either the Thessalian expansionism of the middle sixth century, or the years of the Theban hegemony. The ambivalence of Arne does not grant any clear answer.

The overture of the scholium is therefore an insight into Homeric scholarship, inspired by the ancient problem of the domination of Boiotia. The two contraposed theses on Boiotos and on the cow, may have different origins and, especially for the second one, it is highly likely that it was already common knowledge in the Classical period.³¹² Nonetheless,

307 *BNJ* 376 F 5 = Steph. Byz. β 116, *s.v.* Βοιωτία. Billerbeck (2006: 357 n.105) accepted Jacoby's conjecture (Jacoby 1955a: 156) of Νικοκράτης of the manuscripts **QPN** against the variant Νικόστρατος on the Rehdigeranus 47, preferred by Meineke.

308 F 96.2 Powell, *Coll. Alex.* According to van Groningen (1977: 168 n.1), the relationship between Arne and Boiotos may imply that Arne wanted to be seen as the most ancient centre of Boiotia, but there are no certain indications of this Boiotian centre.

309 Diod. Sic. 4.67.2. Compare the important scholium B *ad Il.* 2.494, 137 Dind.: Ἄρνης τῆς Αἰόλου καὶ Ποσειδῶνος Βοιωτός, ἀφ' οὗ ἡ Βοιωτία κτλ. This class of scholia can only be read in Dindorf's edition (Dindorf 1877) and offers an interesting witness of how information not immediately pertinent to the context of the commented verse may only be connected in a second moment (Arne only occurs later on: *Hom. Il.* 2.507). The text goes on to offer a genealogy of the Boiotian leaders mentioned at vv. 494-5. The attention of the scholiasts behind the D scholium, instead, is on the etymology.

310 Larson 2000: 206. Arne is often considered a direct daughter to Aiolos (Diod. Sic. 4.67.3-6; Paus. 9.40.5), and, if Hellanikos mentioned this genealogy, it could be that he was maintaining the "Aiolid identity" of Boiotos (Pownall 2016 *ad BNJ* 4 F 51).

311 Schachter 2011c *ad BNJ* 376 F 5.

312 Etymology was a frequent tool among the mythographers and, more generally, among Herodotus' and Thucydides' contemporaries. Hellanikos was particularly fond of this system (Fowler 1996: 72-3; Fowler 2013: 687). Pownall (2016 *ad*

neither one is more likely than the other to have been used by Hellanikos. This section must hence be seen as a learned step in the reflection of the scholars on this vexed issue of the *Catalogue of Ships* and, more generally, on Boiotian archaeology. It provides us with two explanations on Boiotian ethnogenesis that tackle the same problem from different points of view: Hellanikos certainly dealt with it, but it is not certain that he adhered to either of these two theories.

Εὐρώπης [...] τῆς Φοίνικος θυγατρὸς: This Europa is the girl kidnapped by Zeus, a different character from the namesakes of other myths.³¹³ The narrative of her rape and of her father's appeal to Kadmos to look for her, constitutes a prelude to the *historia* and not the scholiast's autonomous output. Consequently, from this point on, particular attention must be paid to see if the overall similarity with the text of the *Library* does not inhibit us from recognizing relevant divergences.

In Apollodoros (3.2), Agenor has four children: Europa, Kadmos, Phoenix, and Kylix; however, the author also reports another tradition where Europa is the daughter of Phoenix. Nevertheless, in the narrative strand followed by Apollodoros, this second option (Phoenix>Europa) is not considered: Phoenix will give his own name to a region, Phoenicia, just like the other brothers who travelled to look for the sister (4). In the scholium, instead, Europa is described *only* as the daughter of Phoenix. This could be due to the synthetical style of the scholastic tradition, or it could also be related to the fact that the chosen variation is the first one attested in literature, specifically in the *Iliad*.³¹⁴ Since in another D scholium (*ad.* 14.321), the Homeric version of Phoenix as Europa's father is contrasted with the other one on Agenor,³¹⁵ it is possible that the scholium *ad Il.* 2.454

BNJ 4 F 51) finds it unlikely that this etymology derives from Hellanikos, because she supports genealogy as a Hellenic rationalization.

313 Still, prudence is always necessary, as Bühler 1968: 7 and Olshausen – Harder 1998 remind us. In the course of time, a conflation of the different data on the single Europas was inescapable: for example, a scholium on the *Timaeus* (24e) enumerates, among the different Europa fathers, Agenor, Phoenix, and Tytius, who was linked to another Europa in Boiotia, to be distinguished from our heroine in the scholium (Hom. *Od.* 7.324; Pind. *Pyth.* 4.46).

314 Hom. 14.321: Φοίνικος κούρης τηλεκλειτοῖο. Cp. Vian 1963: 25; Bühler 1968: 9; West 1985: 83.

315 There is no internal coherence in the *corpus* of the D scholia (Lünstedt 1961: 29 n.2), partially because of the different underlying sources of this corpus.

focused on this fatherhood not only for the sake of brevity, but also to respect the Homeric text.

After brevity and the weight of the Homeric tradition, moreover, we must take into account that the specific genealogy, reported as less diffused by Apollodorus, also serves to explain, in the scholium, the matching of the kidnapping of Europa and the foundation myth of Thebes by Kadmos. Only Herodotus, before the first century BCE, describes Europa as the daughter of Agenor (like Apollodoros).³¹⁶ While, however, the scholium may seem to prefer the older genealogy of Europa where she is the daughter of Phoenix, the idea that Kadmos is also the son of Phoenix is not as old; in fact, this genealogy of Kadmos only occurs in later and erudite sources.³¹⁷ At the end of the fifth century BCE, Kadmos was often considered Agenor's child,³¹⁸ whereas Europa was described as the daughter of Phoenix.³¹⁹ This picture must be kept in mind, as the presentation of Europa provided in the scholium does not conflict with the possible antiquity of this tradition:³²⁰ using a more recently affirmed tradition on Kadmos' genealogy is useful to directly link his involvement in the quest of Europa with his final landing in Boiotia.

The two themes (the quest for Europa and the foundation of Thebes) were not originally associated: the oldest literary witnesses to the myth of Europa³²¹ focus more on her kidnapping and do not directly associate her story with the myth of Kadmos.³²² This reciprocal independence might explain the incompatibility of the genealogies of Europa and Kadmos that prevailed until the end of the fifth century. Before Herodotus and

316 See Bühler 1968: 8 and Tiverios 1990: 863 on Hdt. 4.147.4 and *infra* in text.

317 Cp. West 1985: 83; the sources are Conon *BNJ* 26 F 1, XXXII and XXXVII; Schol. Ap. Rhod. 3.1177-87f. An isolated and almost certainly late tradition (Phot. *Lex.* II 658 Porson *s.v.* Ὠγύγια κακά) mentions Ogyges as Kadmos' father. This may be a late attempt from the Boiotian side to credit one of the most important figures of this region, Kadmos, with autochthony.

318 Bacch. 19.46; Pher. *BNJ* 3 21; Soph. *OT* 268; Hdt. 4.147.4; Eur. *Phrixos B' TrGF* 819.2 (Ἀγήνορος παῖς); *Phoen.* 281; *Bacch.* 171.

319 Asius F 7 West, *GEF*; Hes. FF 140 and 141.7 M. – W.; Bacch. 17.31 and F 10 S. – M.; Eur. *Cret. TrGF* 472.1 (Φοινικογενεοῦς παῖ; cp. Merro 2008: 156); Ant. F 3 Wyss.

320 See Pownall 2016 *ad BNJ* 4 F 36b.

321 Hom. *Il.* 14.321; Hes. FF 140-1 M. – W.; Asius F 7 West, *GEF*. For further sources, see Fowler 2013: 359 n.32. Olivieri (2011: 20) suggested that the Homeric version, with Europa as the daughter of Phoenix, influenced Hellanikos, but this cannot completely explain the stratification of the scholium.

322 As stated by Fowler (2013: 350), until the fifth century BCE, “[o]ne can easily imagine Kadmos without Europe – and Europe without Kadmos.”

Euripides, the only indirect witnesses to a possible interweaving of the two storylines are a fragment from Stesichoros' *Europa*,³²³ on the sowing of the teeth by Kadmos, and a series of fragments by the poets Asius and Eumelos.³²⁴ It may be that Kadmos was mentioned in the *Catalogue of Women*, even though his name does not appear in the surviving excerpts: if so, Kadmos might have been Agenor's son but not necessarily the brother of Phoenix.³²⁵ All we know for certain is that the *Catalogue of Women* dealt with Europa's kidnapping: even if a mention was made of the foundation of Thebes, at this stage there was no need to combine the two stories, as in the scholium, with an overarching genealogy that explicitly connected Europa and Kadmos.³²⁶

Our scholium can be understood in this complex and fluid tradition where two branches have apparently been reunited. Here, Kadmos is explicitly Europa's brother as part of the coherent story, but until the Imperial Age, the pursuit of the cow could still be re-narrated without any reference to the girl (Paus. 9.12.1-2). Two further comparisons, one with Herodotus, who is chronologically closer to Hellanikos, and another with Apollodoros, suggest that the phraseology of the scholium reflects a particular stage of the tradition on the origins of Thebes, later merged in an intermediate source (the *MH?*).

Herodotus recalls the quest for Europa: her brothers left from Tyre³²⁷ after their father's appeal (4.147.4). From his sparse remarks, there are no explicit references to the

323 Stesichoros, F 96 Finglass. See Vian 1963: 26.

324 Asius: F 7 West, *GEF*; Eumelos: FF 26, 28 and 30 West, *GEF* Davies – Finglass (2014: 355 n.6) state that another fragment, from Eumelos' *Europa*, can be detected in F 4 (P.Herc. 1629) of Philodemos' *De Pietate* (Obbink 2011: 28).

325 Cp. West 1985: 83. It is not completely correct that, since some sources describe Kadmos as Agenor's son, and Phoenix as Agenor's and Europa's son, Kadmos can be considered Europa's uncle (Edwards 1979: 23-24). These two kinship ties (Kadmos' fatherhood; the parents of Phoenix) may be combined only in the scholium on the *Rhesus* (29), whose reading by R. Edwards (1979: 24 n.33) is not acceptable. In fact, Pfeiffer (1985: 423, on Callim. F 622) put forward a conjecture, which results in an alternative: Europa is not the daughter of Phoenix, Agenor's son (Φοίνικος τοῦ Ἀγήνορος), but either of Phoenix *or* of Agenor (Φοίνικος <ῆ> τοῦ Ἀγήνορος, with Merro 2008: 155-6; cp. Bühler 1968: 8, for a more nuanced and careful consideration of the other evidence). Moreover, the two pieces of information on Kadmos and on Phoenix do not necessarily mean to focus on Europa, so drawing consequences from two disparate sets might give a deceiving impression of a narrative on Europa.

326 Hes. FF 140-1 M. – W. Cp. Davies – Finglass 2014: 355-6, on the context of Stesichoros' *Europa*.

327 Hdt. 1.2.1 (Europa, daughter of the king of Tyre, is kidnapped); 2.44.3 (Phoenicians in Thasos looking for the girl); 49.3 (arrival of Kadmos and his comrades, from Tyre, to Boiotia); 4.45.4-5 (Europa comes from Tyre, but she never actually made it to Europe); 4.147.4 (Kadmos, Agenor's son, left his country to look for his sister); 5.57 (Phoenicians in Boiotia); 6.47.1 (the Phoenician Thasos gave his name to the Greek island); 7.91 (Kylis is Agenor's child).

consultation of the oracle, which inspires Kadmos to found Thebes after the pursuit of the cow and the birth of the Spartoi. Despite the absence of a separate Theban *logos* in the *Histories*, Herodotus describes the arrival of the Phoenicians and their settlement in Boiotia (5.57–8) as a peaceful occupation, close to the Ionians (58.2). If we take into account the other local inhabitants, the Gephyreans, and how these people react (57.1), we have a picture of a peaceful division of the territory. Herodotus reports, then, the original link with Europa and the arrival of Kadmos to Greece, but he does not mention the other elements that become common in the comprehensive narrations of the myth (from the kidnapping of the girl, to the wedding on the Kadmeia). Euripides' *Phoenician Women* presents the richest narration of the foundation myth of Thebes (vv. 638–75), but it also sacrifices a relevant piece of the story, i.e. the initial drive of the quest for Europa (a theme which Euripides touched, very probably, in his *Phrixos B': TrGF* 819).³²⁸ In conclusion, at the end of the fifth century BCE, the main knots of the story were all known and used in literary production, even though, for reasons both internal to the genres and sometimes depending on the fragmentary nature of our sources, it is impossible to find a reproduction of the myth that is as complete as it is in Apollodoros or in the scholium. This hinders our appreciation of the possible presence of an old, say “Hellanic” layer.

The essential version of the scholium, moreover, has an internal coherence that is lost through the desire for comprehensiveness in Apollodoros' *Library*. In Apollodoros, for instance, the initial quest for Europa is in vain and their desperation brings stable settlements by the many members of her family (3.4):³²⁹ Kadmos went with his mother Telephassa to Thrace. After this, the author follows other narrative options, and only later does Apollodoros add that, after Telephassa's death, Kadmos again started looking for his sister (22). The Phoenician went to Delphi to ask about her and received the well-known prophecy. The structure of the *Library* offers a useful example of the unnecessary direct relationship between the prelude of the kidnapping and the Theban appendix: the conciseness of the scholiast is not just a stylistic difference, but a different perspective and focus on the same material. Different materials and narratives are put together to better

328 V.4: ἡ δ' ἦλθ' ἀνάγκη πεδία Φοινίκης λιπῶν. Cp. Ogden 2013a: 50.

329 An alternative explanation for the otherwise obscure abandonment of the initial outset was the demand of the father: his sons must not come back before they find their sister (Hyg. *Fab.* 178; schol. Aesch. *Sept.* 486a).

show, from a local (Theban/ Boiotian) perspective, the connection between the myth of Europa and that of the foundation of Thebes.³³⁰

The inspection of the most ancient sources on Europa and Kadmos and an overall insight into Apollodoros do not indicate that the scholiast drew on Apollodoros for Europa's genealogy. It is not impossible that a relatively early stage of the tradition has been recovered. It is therefore meaningful that the version where Kadmos and Europa are the children of Phoenix and not of Agenor (as in Herodotus), is less common among the sources: we need to consider its ancient attestation, even if, in this instance, the scholium depended on the *MH*. The likely referral to the *MH* indirectly shows what a connection might have looked like at an ancient stage, with materials and narratives that were already circulating during Hellanikos' lifetime but have not otherwise been preserved.

ἐκ Σιδῶνος: The sources of the fifth century BCE are not consistent in associating Europa's cradle and Kadmos' origin with Tyre³³¹ or Sidon,³³² since both these cities probably espoused a general provenance from Phoenicia.³³³ Indirect support comes from the later sources, which preserve an all-inclusive reference to the East. We have, for example, a Kadmos ruling in Tyre *and* in Sidon, or Europa kidnapped by Zeus in a centre which is between the two.³³⁴

330 Delattre (2017) has shown that, in general, this “combination of list and narration, each expanding off the other” (193) derives from the specific readership of the *Library*: this text can be read on specific topics and did not necessarily expect from its audience “a continuous act of reading” (Pàmias 2017: 2).

331 Europa in Tyre: Hdt. 1.2.2; 4.45.4; Eur. *Hypsipyle TrGF* 752g, 21-2. Kadmos in Tyre: Hdt. 2.49 and 4.147.4; Eur. *Phoen.* 639 (with Mastronarde 2005 *ad loc.*, on the reuse of a verse from the parodos, namely v. 202, where the Phoenician Women claim to come from Tyre).

332 Eur. *Phrixos B' TrGF* 819; *Bacch.* 171 and 1025. See Bühler 1968: 9-10 and Edwards 1979: 46 n.49 for a list of the later sources on this detail.

333 Bühler 1968: 10.

334 Kingdom in Tyre and in Sidon: Euseb. *Chron.* 46 Helm. Europa in Sarepta: Lycoph. *Alex.* 1300. Bühler (1968: 10) argued that Lykophron chose Sarepta as an equally distant city from Sidon and Tyre. Nevertheless, this is topographically incorrect (Hornblower 2015: 457): it is indeed more plausible that the author of the *Alexandra* just wants to repeat a general origin from Phoenicia (Wilamowitz 1924 I: 157).

Both Tyre and Sidon tried to attach themselves with Europa and Kadmos from the late Hellenistic Age onwards.³³⁵ However, the interchangeable character of the adjectives *sidonius* and *tyrius* among the Latin poets³³⁶ makes it hard to recognize which city was more successful in communicating this link with the myth. Moreover, between the sixth and the fifth centuries BCE, the ethnic “Sidonius” was used generally by the Greeks and the Assyrians in reference to the Phoenicians,³³⁷ even though there were separate royal dynastic lists for Tyre and Sidon. This makes Bühler’s case of Tyre’s precedence over Sidon definitely less convincing. In contrast, if we focus on which city first valued this mythical kinship, we find that Sidon is first, according to an interesting series of coins from the late Hellenistic Age. Tyre apparently publicly sponsored these associations only from Elagabalus’ reign on.³³⁸

In the absence of unambiguous indications in the sources contemporary with Hellanikos and even later, the presence of Sidon cannot shed light on the date of the scholium. In any case, the omission of a version with a compromise on this detail in our scholium, is a further argument to the probable adaptation of a single source, for this part, likely in the Imperial Age (in line with Europa’s genealogy).

ὥς οὐχ εὐρήκει αὐτήν, ἦκεν εἰς Δελφούς. In the scholium, the arrival of Kadmos to Delphi is the direct consequence of the impossibility of finding his sister, whereas Apollodoros has him staying in Thrace for a period. This point is momentous, since it constitutes, in this scholium and in all the narrations of the myth, the link between the quest for Europa and the foundation of Thebes. From Homer on,³³⁹ Thebes was “Kadmean” by means of antonomasia: even if we do not agree with the thesis by Schachter (1985) that Kadmos took his name (i.e. “was born”) from the toponym “Kadmeia”, Thebes must have quickly developed a narrative of its origins which included this character.

335 Vian 1963: 43–44; Bühler 1968: 10; Edwards 1979: 48; Tiverios 1990: 875–6 (with a specific reference to coins of the Severan Age).

336 Bühler 1968: 10; Virgil, e.g., calls Dido *Sidonia* (*Aen.* 1.446), despite the unanimous tradition on the Tyrian foundation of Carthage (on the Virgilian use of *sidonius* and *tyrius*, see Austin 1982 on *Aen.* 4.75; on Ovid, where Kadmos is a *Sidonius* over a group of *Tyrii*, cp. Hardie 1990: 228).

337 Albright 1975: 519; Boyes 2012: 38.

338 Cp. Hirt 2014.

339 Cp. e.g. Hom. *Il.* 4.385.588.391; 5.804 and 807; 10.288; *Od.* 11.276.

The mythical archaeology of Thebes is different from that of the other Greek cities because it resembles a colonization myth.³⁴⁰ Moreover, the origin of the city is a foreign hero, whose provenance is not in line with the early efforts, by Pindar, to highlight the autochthonous nature of the Spartoi, the “Earthborns”, for the city.³⁴¹ Delphi represents the complete inclusion of Theban history in the Greek world and the Apolline indication does not have the typical function of the other foundation myths, where a Greek sets off from a Greek city and has the authorisation to go elsewhere. In Thebes, a foreigner is accepted in traditional Greek heritage and, with his companions, peacefully becomes a part of it. This mixture conciliates the traditional view of the city (the relationship with Kadmos and his origins) with the possible limits deriving from the occupation of Greek soil by a foreigner.³⁴² This picture is supported by local sources and had an impact on the external investigation of the origins of the region: in Herodotus’ short remarks on the occupation of Boiotia by the Kadmeans, their arrival and their introduction of the alphabet do not represent a moment of violence or of contrast with the preexisting situation of the region (5.57–8).

The genesis of this foundation myth is probably quite early, not much later than the formation of the nucleus of traditions on the foreignness of Kadmos³⁴³ and the diffusion and perception of the role played by Delphi in the colonization movement. If we understand this tradition in a political fashion, we could then posit advantages for Thebes, which saw a balance between the infamous implications of a foreign hero and inclusion in

340 For this observation, cp. Nilsson 1932: 122–7; Vian 1963: 231; Schachter 1996: 25–6; Kühr 2006: 94 (on the Argive implications of Kadmos’ genealogy) and 115: “Durch die Befragung der Pythia wird die Gründung Thebens zur Kolonisationsgeschichte”; Olivieri 2011: 19: “L’opera di κτίσις [...] conferisce alla città di Tebe una leggenda eroica di fondazione che può essere in qualche modo considerata l’archetipo delle leggende di fondazione greche.” The closest parallels are probably Cyrene and Naxos (Berman 2004: 18 n.57). It has been argued that this “carattere ‘coloniale’” is a fake impression, because the Delphic prologue from which it derives is a later addition (Prandi 2011: 244–5); nonetheless, even if we did not have the oracle, the sacrifices of foundation would confirm the peculiar traits of this *ktisis*, by a character inherently different from the town.

341 Pind. F 29,2 S. – M. (Σπαρτιῶν ἱερὸν γένος ἀνδρῶν). Cp. Aesch. *Sept.* 412–4; Eur. *HF* 797; *Phoen.* 1006–8 and, on Pindar, Olivieri 2011 (*spec.* 38–9).

342 Kadmos is both a founder and a cultural hero, according to the studies by Brelich (1958: 172) and Nilsson (1932: 122). He is a “cultural hero lifting regional culture to a new level” (Kühr 2014a: 230).

343 Kadmos’ genealogy, in fact, dates back to the Argive Io, but this link does not make his arrival to Greece a “ritorno nelle terre di origine” (Brillante 2001: 256). It should be remembered that the myths around him always stress his foreign character when he lands in Greece.

Greek culture. This interpretation also implies that we should not consider the entire Delphian prelude and other internal parts of this foundation myth in direct antithesis with Delphi:³⁴⁴ this foundation tale can be read from within, in an emic perspective, rather than in political contraposition. It has been observed that, in local (and not local) histories, “stories of origin were always far too important to remain wholly loyal to original happenings.”³⁴⁵

Modern scholarship has often emphasized the value of certain texts, such as the so-called “Pythian Suite” (the second part of the homeric *Hymn to Apollo*), where Apollo, on his way to found the Pythian oracle, crosses Theban territory and finds it uncultivated and deserted (*Hom. Hymn. Ap.* 225–8). This observation is considered a literary answer by Delphi to Thebes, since it stresses the chronological precedence of Delphi (Thebes is uncultivated when the Delphian oracle is founded by Apollo).³⁴⁶ Nevertheless, we should recognize that “l’influsso di una prospettiva di matrice delfica” can coexist with the view that Delphi was not inventing, or adding a prelude to the narrative, since (likely in the same years) we have indirect evidence that both foundation myths of Thebes coexisted at an early age. In fact, the *Catalogue of Women* in the *Odyssey* introduces the founding twins Amphion and Zethos as πρώτοι (11.260–5), *the first founders*, probably as a result of an awareness of the myth of Kadmos.³⁴⁷ Their status can thus be understood only if the poet has in mind another version or another character, which allows and justifies their being “the first” to settle in Thebes.

From a local perspective, furthermore, we should consider that the oracular sites of Thebes were considered as relatively recent, from the outside, whereas their history goes back to the Mycenaen period.³⁴⁸ In particular, the sanctuary of Apollo Ismenios in Thebes offers traces of cultic activity from the Geometric period. It also underwent, with significant investment, a change in the late sixth century BCE. Its oracles were particularly important for the local community of Thebes, as a reinscription of the fourth century BCE of a late-

344 *Contra* Berlinzoni 2004: 16.

345 Thomas 2014a.

346 See e.g. Sordi 1966 and Prandi 2011: 242–4; cp. Vian’s caution: Vian 1963: 83.

347 Quote from Prandi 2011: 243. See the useful observations on *Hom. Od.* 11.260–5 in Prandi 2011: 243–4.

348 Cp. on this perspective Bonnechere 2003: 72.

sixth century BCE dedication proves.³⁴⁹ I wonder whether the importance of Apollo as an oracular numen of this sanctuary did not have an impact on the acceptance of an oracle by the same god (even if from Delphi) in the central myth of Kadmos.

The exceptional character of the myth of Kadmos is marked by other factors that granted Thebes an importance hardly touched upon by these verses. Already in Homer, the conflict of the Seven precedes the Trojan War, a chronological place that assured an antiquity as Panhellenic as Homer.³⁵⁰ Kadmos' "caractère préapollinien" might then explain the typical nature of the founding narrative that soon emerged, probably between the end of the seventh and the beginning of the sixth century BCE, in the probable context of the Theban *epos*.³⁵¹ Recent research on Greek colonization, moreover, tends to exclude a constant and direct influence of the Delphic sanctuary on the process. Instead, priority is put on the local traditions of the colonies (even in the Greek West)³⁵², even though there are other examples of the motif of the oracle being consulted for one reason but ending in the invitation to found a new site.³⁵³ This switch from the initial quest for Europa to a foundation myth may be a more recent adaptation (in the fifth century BCE) to conciliate the traditions of Kadmos and Europa with the foundation of Thebes. This impression is

349 On this sanctuary, see the overviews by Schachter 1981: 77-82 and Mackil 2012: 167-8. I refer here to the thoroughly discussed inscription of Amphiaraios, published by Papazarkadas 2014b and the object of a number of studies in recent years (see e.g. Porciani 2016; Thonemann 2016; Tentori Montalto 2017). This inscription has been properly investigated both for its fascinating connection with Herodotus, who probably saw the original Boiotian text (1.52), and for the text itself. It remains to be underlined, as Thonemann 2016 partially does, what the consequences were in Thebes of the choice of the *thespistai* to rededicate the votive gifts at the end of the sixth century BCE and two centuries after (even if the exact dating of the rewriting in the fourth century is unclear). L. 7 of the text defines Croesus' memorial a [Θε]βαίοισι δὲ θάμβος: the sanctuary probably also acted as a place where Theban collective memory was influenced and directed by the personnel, who might have been able to endorse specific versions of the Theban archaeology and of the ancient role of Apollo in the history of the city. It cannot be ruled out that the connection between Apollo and Delphi only occurred at a later stage, to explain why the Thebans had this memory of a Kadmos following Apollo's oracle.

350 Cp. Kühr 2006: 116 n.171.

351 "C]aractère préapollinien": Vian 1963: 83. On this topic, see Fontenrose 1978: 360; Parke – Wormell 1956: 151-2; Cappelletto 2003: 356; Kühr 2006: 115 n.165.

352 Among the overwhelming scholarship, see a concise summary of the issue in Mari 2014: 114 and n.52 for previous studies.

353 This is the case for Cyrene, Gela, and Croton (P. – W. 37-40, 43, 71 and 410; Vian 1963: 77; Fowler 2013: 358-9).

strengthened by a later tradition, which may derive from earlier sources, where Kadmos directly asks the oracle where to go (no mention is made of his sister).³⁵⁴

ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἶπεν [...] Θῆβαι: Here, the text of the scholium is almost identical with the parallel section in Apollodoros (3.22).³⁵⁵ There is only the added detail of the direction in which the cow falls (ἐπὶ τὰ δεξιὰ). Whereas the motif of the quest for Europa could only be attached relatively late, it is possible that Musaeus (*VS*⁶ 2 B 1) already quoted a longer version of the oracle given to Kadmos.³⁵⁶ The attached commentary of the scholiast might reflect Mnaseas' aetiology in his *Περὶ χρησμῶν*,³⁵⁷ or simply echo the Hellenistic debate on the Egyptian origin of Kadmos.³⁵⁸ This Egyptian provenance was supported by the toponym Thebes, attested in Greece and in Egypt. The natural outcome was a contraposition between this eastern link and the Phoenician storyline, as Pausanias recalls in a passage of his *Periegesis* (9.12.2). Here, the pursuit of the cow becomes the aetiology or the epithet *Onka* of Athena, who was honoured in the spot where Kadmos stopped.³⁵⁹

If we try to fix a textual tradition for a text, an oracle, which by its nature escapes linear stemmatics, we might recall Müller's suggestion that the *Θηβαϊκὰ παραδόξα* by Lysimachos of Alexandria (*BNJ* 382 F1a) were the principal means of knowledge on Theban oracles in subsequent periods. Nevertheless, a similar hypothesis can be applied to

354 Schol. Aesch. *Sept.* 486a-c; schol. *MTAB Eur. Phoen.* 638. Cp. Ov. *Met.* 3.9 (*quae sit tellus habitanda*), where Kadmos' father Agenor threatens him with exile, should he not find his sister.

355 The *Epitome Vaticana* of the *Library* adds a detail on the first name of Thebes (ἔνθα κτίζει πόλιν Καδμείαν), which is commonly accepted by the editors of Apollodoros. For further, smaller discrepancies, see *infra* in text.

356 [Mnaseas] F 61 Cappelletto = 374 P. – W. Musaeus is not a historical figure: Mnaseas, in the preparation of his collection of oracles, started from epic sources (Parke – Wormell 1956 I: 151-2; Fontenrose 1978: 368).

357 Schol. *MTAB Eur. Phoen.* 638. The scholium does not quote its source, which is thought to be Mnaseas by Müller, Parke, and Wormell (see *prec. n.*); Cappelletto (2003: 356-8) doubts this identification.

358 On the Egyptian origins of Kadmos, see Edwards 1979: 48-9 and Berman 2004: 13-4; 14 n.40. They both refer to Spyropoulos' thesis (1972) that the Ampheion on the north of Thebes was a pyramid built by the Egyptians who came to Greece during their Middle Kingdom Period (see on this site *infra* 3.2.1). We know that Hekataios of Abdera (*BNJ* 264 F 6) supported this view, but it is not impossible that earlier historians demonstrated or reported it (Brillante 2001: 268; Cappelletto 2003: 357-8).

359 It is also possible that this Hellenistic debate derives from the Hellenistic tendency to consider many Greek traditions of Egyptian origin. For instance, a long and complex tradition declared that Athens was an Egyptian colony; on this "atteggiamento filoegiziano" (124), see in general, with a particular focus on Athens as an Egyptian colony, Roberto 2010.

Pausanias, but not to our scholium: the slight differences with the text of Apollodoros, in fact, can also be understood with the use of a copy of another *recensio* of the *Library* (if not, less likely, through the intervention of the scholiasts). This other *recensio* has been judged “better” than the version of the *Library* we read today, but such a judgment is both unfair and scientifically unsound. All we can reasonably infer is a different language texture and, possibly, the presence of more details.

Πελάγονος: The genitive form of -ονος is unanimously transmitted by the codices of the D Scholia, whereas the other sources on this name present the longer form *Πελάγοντος*.³⁶⁰ We do not know much about Pelagon: his father, Amphidamas, is only mentioned by Mnaseas.³⁶¹ Vian (1963: 92) evocatively interpreted this Pelagon as a symbol of Kadmos’ peaceful settlement: this irenic trait is best shown by the delivery or the purchase of cattle: the symbol of the acquisition of the territory.

Pelagon might coincide with the namesake child of Asopos, who is mentioned elsewhere by Apollodoros (3.156). In this case, two variants are transmitted for his name, *Πελάσγοντα* and *Πελάγοντα*, with the first one possibly hinting at an etymological relationship with the Pelasgians (Vian *loc. cit.*). This name may carry a historical hypotext³⁶² (Kadmos, new inhabitant, occupies the place of the previous Pelasgian culture); however, the identity of the shepherd and Asopos’ child is far from being certain, and is definitely less firm than the setting of the meeting with Kadmos in Phokis, the first region crossed by the Phoenician hero.³⁶³ The name can be a typically Phokian ethnic.³⁶⁴ From a geographical point of view, it seems natural to imagine Kadmos and the cow crossing the entire region (a 10: διεξοῦσα πᾶσαν κτλ.), before arriving to Thebes, immediately north of the Asopos river.

360 [Mnas.] F 61 Cappelletto; Apollod. 3.22; Paus. 9.12.1.

361 Cappelletto 2003: 357 n.1363.

362 Fontenrose (1959: 315) suggested an etymological link with *πέλαγος*, but this is not completely convincing. Hellanikos (*BNJ* 4 F 4) agreed to this use of the Pelasgians as a blanket term for the pre-Greek, autochthonous population of Greece.

363 Kallisthenes of Olynthos (*BNJ* 124 F 1; cp. Prandi 1985: 66-8) mentions the kidnapping of the daughter of a Phokian king, Pelagon (= *LGPN* IIIb s.v. 1). Jacoby (1930: 416) also thought that there might be an association between the cowherd who helps Kadmos and Phokian onomastics. On Kallisthenes, see generally Prandi 1985 and *infra* in 5.1.3.

364 Prandi 1985: 67.

The form Πελάγονος is one of the nine differences from Apollodoros signalled by Vian (1963: 21–2). The parallel with Pausanias (9.12.1) corroborates his idea that the form in –οντος is due to following the oracular tradition,³⁶⁵ where the genitive has to form a sequence –υ. Hence, the slight divergence of the language of the scholium confirms a degree of independent choice by the scholiast that invites particular caution before asserting an assumed passive stance to him.

κατόπιν. This form is significantly different from the adverb κατόπισθεν found in Apollodoros (3.22).³⁶⁶ Apollodoros reports, then, a variation which is more frequent in poetry;³⁶⁷ κατόπιν, on the other hand, only occurs in poetry in Aristophanes,³⁶⁸ but appears frequently in Polybius³⁶⁹ and in Imperial prose. As for the other variations of the oracular text, the adverb could either be a sign of another *recensio* of Apollodoros, or an autonomous modification by the scholiast, who may have read a text not dissimilar from the oracle transmitted by Mnasiar (F 61 Cappelletto).

Apollodoros and his predecessors were more influenced by the poetical language of the oracle, even when they offered a mere paraphrase. The scholiast belongs, instead, to a stage of the tradition more prone to accepting contemporary innovations and uses. It might be more than a mere accident that, if there are no relevant parallels for Πελάγονος, the adverb κατόπιν is quite recurrent in scientific Imperial prose and, in general, from the first century CE on.

ὀκνήσασα ἀνεκλίθη: It has been suggested to correct this form to ὀκλάσασα, since this second verb is also in Pausanias (9.12.2).³⁷⁰ The lesson of the D scholia must instead be accepted, since the meaning of ὀκνέω, “to shrink, to hesitate, to hang back” (*LSJ s.v.* II), better fits the context than ὀκλάζω, “to crouch down” (*LSJ s.v.* I1). The movement of the

365 Vian 1963: 23 n.3.

366 κατόπισθεν has a more markedly poetic colour. “Poétique”: Vian 1963: 23 n.3.

367 Hom. *Il.* 23.505; *Od.* 22.40.

368 Ar. *Eq.* 625; *Av.* 1150. 1497; *Plut.* 13.757.1094.1209; F 493,1 K. – A.; cp. Philem. F 124,2 K. – A.

369 1. (24; 26–7; 33; 46; 50–1; 76); 2 (25; 27; 30; 32–3; 66–7); 3 (19; 65; 68; 74; 82–3; 90; 93; 104); 4 (12; 71; 78) 5.40 and 82; 6 (29; 31; 33; 40; 55); 7.16; 8.18 and 20; 9.7; 12.4 and 18; 14.8; 15.11 and 13–4; 16 (18; 23; 37); 18 (26; 29; 35); 30.25.

370 Vian 1963: 88 n.4.

animal should be autonomous and spontaneous,³⁷¹ and this idea must be combined with the act of ἀνακλίνω, “to lean back, to recline” (*LSJ s.v.* I1). Traditionally, the cow falls down, fatigued (καμουῖσα), on the spot where Kadmos must stop; when, as in Pausanias, the verb used is ὀκλάζω, the act of falling is referred to without a preverb (ἐκλίθη).

βουλόμενος δὲ Ἀθήναι τὴν βοῦν καταθῦσαι: It is impossible to say whether and how Hellanikos introduced this dedication. In Apollodoros and in the scholium, the god associated with it, Athena, is chosen as the typical mistress of snakes, since in this aspect she is frequently matched with anguiform figures and helps the heroes in their battles against monstrous wardens.³⁷² Jacoby (1923a: 431) used the current *BNJ* 4 F 1a of Hellanikos, where Kadmos sows the teeth of the dragon κατὰ Ἄρεος βούλησιν (“in accordance with the advice of Ares”), to show how the absence of a fight among the Spartoi in the scholium implies Ares’ closeness and benevolence to Kadmos for the duration of the story in Hellanikos.

The later moment of the sowing, however, must not be confused with this initial sacrifice, which is directly associated with the foundation act and must be read in the spirit of other colonization stories. The sacrifice of the cow represents a sacred premise to the entire myth:³⁷³ it could even be argued that the epithet γηγενής (“earthborn”) for the dragon³⁷⁴ implies an original sacrifice to Gea, later substituted with Athena.³⁷⁵ This specific reading might depend too much on Euripides’ representation of the myth, since in this playwright the ransom motif is explicit (*Phoen.* 937–8: χθῶν δ’ ἀντὶ καρποῦ καρπὸν ἀντὶ θ’ αἵματος

371 Cp. Schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 638: οὗ ἂν αὐτόματος πέση κτίξειν πόλιν, “founding the city where it [the cow] would fall of its own accord” (tr. S. Tufano).

372 On this aspect, see Ogden 2013a: 195–8; Ogden 2013b: xxii.

373 Kühn 2006: 107.

374 See Vian 1963: 106–7. Eur. *Phoen.* 931–5. The scholium MTA on v.934 suggests a relationship between the genealogy, where the dragon is Gea’s and Ares’ child, and the later birth of the Spartoi, since these literally “Earthborns” (i.e. γηγενεῖς in the first meaning of the adjective; cp. Gourmelen 2005: 24–8), are described in the following way: ῥητέον ὅτι ἡ Γῆ ἀνέδωκε τοὺς Σπαρτοὺς πρὸς τὸ ἐκδικῆσαι τὸν φόνον τοῦ δράκοντος, “it should be added that the Earth begot the Spartoi, to avenge the killing of the dragon” (tr. S. Tufano).

375 Cp. Gourmelen 2005: 384.

αἶμα, “the land [receives] fruit against fruit, blood for blood”). A later tradition,³⁷⁶ and the rest of the narrative of our scholium,³⁷⁷ make the reconstruction of an original stage of the myth slippery, on the sole basis of the foundation sacrifice; more generally, we are now cautious when speaking about the original nature of a myth, and the reflections on the disparate genealogies of Kadmos and Europa show how different variations may coexist from ancient times.

Therefore, it is likely that the scholium, particularly close here to Apollodoros, reflects a stage of the tradition where the oecistic character of Kadmos’ arrival³⁷⁸ was further implemented through the explicit mention of Athena. This detail probably owes more to the external reading of the myth in Athens than to a local (Theban) origin of the motif. This seems to point to the conspicuous iconographic vase production in the second half of the fifth century BCE.³⁷⁹ The absence of Athena in Hellanikos’ *BNJ* 4 F 1a does not imply a complete absence of the goddess in the entire myth, since she is pivotal as the dedicatee in the foundation. We have no positive evidence, in fact, to argue that in Hellanikos, “the role of Athena as helpmate is conspicuously absent” (Pownall 2016 *ad BNJ* 4 F 51). The existing material simply focuses on different moments of the story and, in its current version, the identity between Apollodoros and the scholium does not allow us to say anything specific about how Hellanikos saw the connection between Kadmos and Athena.

πέμπει τινὰς τῶν μεθ’ αὐτοῦ ληψομένους: The dispatch of the companions is a detail of the narrative that entered the myth only from the third century BCE on.³⁸⁰ All the literary and iconographic sources in our possession for the sixth and fifth centuries BCE depict

376 The dragon is sometimes presented as Ares’ offspring: *Ov. Met.* 3.32; *Hyg. Fab.* 178; schol. *MTA Eur. Phoen.* 638. Derkylos (*BNJ* 305 F 6) and Palaephatos (3) add to this genealogy the personification of the dragon. It was a Theban, Drakon, who firstly fought against the invader, but was then defeated in battle.

377 Here Ares punishes Kadmos for killing the monster.

378 As the scholiast on v. 662 of the *Phoenician Women* comments, ἐβούλετο γὰρ θῦσαι τοῖς θεοῖς, ὅτι σύμβολον αὐτῶ ἀπτόθι γέγονε τοῦ κτίσαι τὴν πόλιν (see Vian 1968: 60 on Kadmos’ “activité [...] essentiellement religieuse”).

379 Cp. Tiverios 1990: 875 for this motif in Athens. Robertson (1996: 423-7) argued that the presence of the goddess during this myth is an *aition* for the cult of Athena Onca, confirmed by the literary sources (mainly Paus. 9.12.2; cp. also *Soph. OT* 20; *Eur. Phoen.* 1372-3; schol. *MTAB Eur. Phoen.* 1062; schol. *Aesch. Sept.* 486a). Still, the precise place of the *agalma* and of the temple on the Kadmeia remains doubtful (cp. Berman 2007: 100-1). It might be dangerous to read the entire foundation myth from Pausanias’ passage, because the real focus of the narrative is on Thebes and on Kadmos.

380 Cp. Gourmelen 2005: 381 and Kühn 2006: 106 and n.125.

Kadmos *alone* as he collects water for the sacrifice (see, for example, Pherekydes' *BNJ* 3 F 88: ἐπὶ χέρνιβας μολῶν Κάδμος). The artistic representations only focus on Kadmos' comradry in those areas, such as the Etruscan world,³⁸¹ where these companions were claimed to have founded new towns. It is then likely that their presence was fostered by the necessity to imagine a group of colonizers that would not completely isolate the single oecist.

χέρνιβα: The scholium has a more specific word here than the *Library*, which uses the less marked substantive ὕδωρ. The noun χέρνιψ is already in Homer and is particularly recurrent in poetry,³⁸² in tragedy, and, less often, in comedy (*LSJ s.v.1*). It indicates water used for the ablution of the hands before a sacrifice, as the etymology confirms (χείρ and νίζω, “to cleanse”). It is likelier that the scholiast drew on a more sophisticated version of Apollodoros, even though the Homeric nuance should not be ruled out. This variant confirms the general impression, with the previous penchant for the Homeric genealogy of Europa, that the scholiast was particularly careful when he used his sources, and that different linguistic features might betray a different status of the text of the *Library*.

Ἀρητιάδος: This form with the dental extension –τιαδ– is a variation, as Apollodoros (3.22) has Ἀρείας, probably more than a mere “forme poétique” (Vian 1963: 23 n.1). The dental extension, in fact, strengthens the association of the spring with Ares, whose theonym is documented on Knidos with a dental inflection (Ἄρης, -τος).³⁸³ Contrarily, the adjective ἄρειος does not always refer to Ares, since it can be used as an epicleris for other gods too, such as Zeus³⁸⁴ and Athena.³⁸⁵

381 Tiverios 1990: 887.

382 See Vian 1963: 23.

383 Cp. Eust. *ad Il.* 5.31, p. 2.15.20–4 van der Valk. Eustathius quotes Herodian and explains the form for metrical reasons (the necessity of a further syllable, in an iambic context).

384 *IG* 5.2.343 C 7; Plut. *Pyrrh.* 5; Paus. 5.14.6.

385 *IG* 5.2.343 C 8.27 (IV sec.); *OGIS* 229,70 (= *LSmyrna* 573; 245/3 a.C.); Paus. 1.28.5; 9.4.1. Among the other gods, there was an Enyalos Areios (*IG* 5.2.343 C 9) and an Aphrodite Areia (Paus. 3.17.5).

Gallavotti (1957) associated ἄρειος with ἄρος, “profit”.³⁸⁶ The adjective possibly originally indicated the propitious character of the spring guarded by the dragon. Only later, when, as in our scholium, the idea of the dragon as the son of Ares took root, there was a re-semanticization of the adjective. This process further fostered the affirmation of variants with a dental inflection, which imply a focus on the relationship between the dragon and Ares.³⁸⁷ An indirect confirmation comes from a lesson from a fragment of the local historian Lykos (*BNJ* 380 F 5): here, Kadmos defeats τὸν τὴν Ἀρείαν κρήνην τηροῦντα δράκοντα; the scholium of the class ACMT on *Phoen.* 659 further proves our line of argument: λέγει δὲ περὶ τῆς Ἀρείας οὕτω καλουμένης πηγῆς.

Contrarily, the adjective ἀρητιάς always implies a reference to Ares.³⁸⁸ There was also an island, not far from Pharnakeia (on the southern coast of the Black Sea),³⁸⁹ whose name Aretias was sometimes associated with Ares, to the point that Timagetos (*JCV* 1050 F 4), a geographer who lived before Apollonius Rhodius, called it Ἄρεως νῆσος, “the Island of Ares”.³⁹⁰ Apollonius Rhodius (3.1180) is the first source to define “Aretiad” as the spring of the dragon defeated by Kadmos. It is not impossible that the language of the scholium, neither “Hellanic” nor poetic here, is due to the later origin of the source used here. This could either be, more probably, a different version of Apollodoros’ *Library* or, less likely, the medium of the *MH*.

386 Cp. Aesch. *Supp.* 884 and Maddoli 2007, on the epithet when it is applied to Zeus (Paus. 5.14.6).

387 A probable result of this process is the isolated position reported by the scholium on v. 105 of the *Seven Against Thebes*, which mentions a cult of Ares in Thebes, otherwise unknown (Schachter 1981: 91: “His connection with the town may have been early, but hard evidence of actual worship is not to hand”; cp. Vian 1968: 55). This attestation might be a sort of autoschediasm, conditioned by the tragic context (Hutchinson 1985 *ad loc.*). It is therefore hard to agree with Vian (1963: 108) and Kühn (2006: 108-9) that there are more reasons to affirm etymologically a possible original meaning of “Quelle der Krieger” (Kühn *ibid.*).

388 Cp. e.g. Hes. [*Sc.*] 57; *Cat.* F 150,32 M. – W.; Ap. Rhod. 2.966.1031. The only exception is a passage in the *Odyssey* (16.395 = 18.413), where Nisus is Ἀρητιάς since he is Aretias’ son. The context of the scholium confirms the reference of the adjective to Ares; a possible link with other figures does not seem, therefore, necessary, especially if they are absent from the rest of the tradition (see, e.g., Berman 2013: 41: “The spring of Aretias”).

389 On this identification, see Counillon 2004: 108-10.

390 The other sources are quoted by Meyer 2013 in the commentary on Timagetos (*JVC* 2050 F 4). Among these, we cannot count the passages in the anonymous *Periplus Ponti Euxini* (*FGrHist* 2037 F 36), which has been transmitted under Arrian’s name. The form Ἀρητιάδα is Müller’s conjecture, but it should remain ἀρητιάδα. The conjecture Ἀρείας, suggested by Snell and Maehler in Pind. *Nem.* 9.41, is doubtful and has not been unanimously accepted.

ὅν Ἀρεῶς ἔλεγον εἶναι: Both the scholium and Apollodoros agree on this point, without explicitly supporting it. Their knowledge of this hypothesis can nevertheless shed light on the narrative, since Kadmos' slavery is an office ἀντὶ τῆς ἀναιρέσεως τοῦ δράκοντος, “for his killing of the dragon”.³⁹¹ Only the *Library* and a fragment by Lykos (*BNJ* 380 F 5), a local historian of the Hellenistic age, report this same version, where the slavery becomes the expiation for the killing of the dragon, be this Ares' son or somehow otherwise connected to the god.

In his commentary on Lykos' *BNJ* 380 F 5, Schachter (2011b) suggests that this later author reported an ancient development of the myth. The detail on this fatherhood is not completely in line with the later wedding party on the Kadmeia (incoherently preceded by this expiation).³⁹² Moreover, it cannot be reconciled with one of the few sure details of Hellanikos' narrative, i.e. that Ares ordered Kadmos to sow the teeth of the dragon.³⁹³

This last piece of information from Hellanikos must be considered here, since it is indirectly pertinent to the fatherhood of the dragon. In a passage from Euripides' *Herakles* (252-3), Ares personally sows the teeth of the dragon. On the basis of this passage and of Hellanikos' fragment, Wilamowitz and Jacoby inferred that in a version of the myth Ares was a close, if not utter supporter, of Kadmos.³⁹⁴ Along this line, an interesting fragment by Pherekydes (*BNJ* 3 F 22a) has Ares and Athena conjointly give the teeth of the dragon to Kadmos and Aetas, after Kadmos' settlement in Thebes. We cannot know whether in these versions Ares was the dragon's father, but this option seems less likely, since the god protected Thebes mainly as Harmonia's father (*Aesch. Sept.* 135-42) and as a rescuer of Kadmos (*ibid.* 412). In other words, when there is a collaboration between Kadmos and

391 A later version, which has been rejected by Castiglioni (2010: 18-9), considers the later metamorphosis of Kadmos and Harmonia into snakes as Ares' revenge for the death of the dragon (*Hyg. Fab.* 6; Nonnus, *Dion.* 2.671; 4.420).

392 Vian 1963: 24-5.

393 *BNJ* 4 F 1a. The emendation from Ares to Athena, therefore, as suggested by Fowler (2000: 180; 2013: 360 n.35, after Kaye 1826: 104 n.1), does not seem necessary. Despite the apparent absence of a fight among the Spartoi, the nature of the scholium and his perspective do not confirm that “no danger was envisaged” (and that Ares should be excluded).

394 Wilamowitz 1895: 65: “Allein da dem Kadmos dieser ihr [of the Spartoi] selbstmord zum heile gereicht hat, so lag es nahe, dem gotte, der den mord bewirkte, auch die aussaat zuzuschreiben.” Jacoby 1923a: 431: “Da bei H[ellanikos] Spartenkampf und damit die gefahr für Kadmos fehlt, muß Ares diesem fremd gewesen sein, wie sonst Athena (Stesich. F 15 [...].)” The fragment is our F 96 Finglass: ὁ μὲν Στῆσιχορος ἐν Εὐρώπῃαι τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν ἐσπαρκέναι τοὺς ὀδόντας φησὶν, “Stesichoros claims, in his *Europa*, that Athena sew the teeth” (tr. S. Tufano). Cp. nevertheless Davies – Finglass 2014: 357, for the possibility that these verses should be understood in a literal meaning.

Ares, be it in the form of Ares' presence at the moment of the sowing or in Ares' benevolence towards Kadmos, Ares is not connected with the dragon of the spring.

Vian (1963: 107-8), in an isolated version, interpreted the original association of the spring with Gea as a local reminiscence, where the dragon is Ares and Tilphossa's child.³⁹⁵ This version would also redound to a minor importance of Ares, even though his role is hardly questionable in all the variants of the foundation myth. Apollodoros and the scholiast testify to the complexity of this tradition, which could either present Ares as an antagonist and punisher of Kadmos, or as a helping figure who can not be the father of the dragon killed by the hero. Since this passage depends on Apollodoros, it shows that it was hardly reconcilable with an explicit reference, for this part of the story, to materials from Hellanikos.

τούς πλείονας τῶν πεμφθέντων διέφθειρεν. If the myth of Kadmos originally presented the hero in isolation when he arrived to Greece, later developments introduced comrades (cp. *supra*). These figures are constantly killed by the dragon: in the scholium (a 17: ἀγανακτήσας) and in Ovid³⁹⁶ their presence directly explains the subsequent action by Kadmos, who acts to avenge their deaths.

A further possibility is that the myth might follow an Indoeuropean pattern, consisting of a semantic limit:³⁹⁷ the hero can either kill the dragon with a weapon or together with a companion, but these options must be separately justified and cannot coexist (furthermore, normally all the companions are killed if the main hero uses a weapon). At the same time, it is not immediately perspicuous why only a few companions survived after the killing of the πλείονες, because in the following part of the story these other men do not play any significant part. It could be that this “window” offered a few available slots, in this Phoenician foundation, from which a noble kinship could be deduced. If part of the families drew their genealogy from the Spartoi, another part counted on this Phoenician heritage. The detail, overall, refutes the hypothesis that the initial, exclusive

395 Schol. Soph. *Ant.* 126 (Tilphossa is an Erynis).

396 Ov. *Met.* 3.58-9: *aut ultor vestrae, fidissima pectora, mortis, / aut comes ero*, “I will either revenge your death, you most trustworthy men, or reach you” (tr. S. Tufano).

397 Watkins 1995: 361.

presence of Kadmos was meant to explain the survival of the Spartoi and a total break with the past.³⁹⁸

κτείνει τὸν δράκοντα: Other sources specify the weapon used by Kadmos to kill the dragon: it can be either a stone³⁹⁹ or a knife⁴⁰⁰ in the first sources, sometimes with both objects present;⁴⁰¹ there are also instances where he wears a generally richer outfit.⁴⁰² The recapitulatory character of the scholium and of Apollodoros⁴⁰³ cannot rule out the possibility, in this case, of a scarce interest in this tradition for this detail. We know that Hellanikos reported that Kadmos killed the dragon with a rock (λίθω). This could either be as a sign of bravery or be in connection with the later discovery of bronze in Thebes and Kadmos' first use of this metal for weapons – even though this would assume a specific relationship between events which cannot be assessed with the current evidence.⁴⁰⁴

τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς αὐτῶι ὑποθεμένης: Athena's injunction is in line, in Apollodoros' *Library*, with her previous entrusting of part of the teeth to Jason (1.128).⁴⁰⁵ If we omit the almost obligatory mention, in a summary, of the possible fatherhood of the dragon, the story seems to ignore any role by Ares, since Kadmos has just sacrificed the cow to Athena and then sows the teeth of the monster in accordance with the advice of the goddess. Apollodoros' version is here followed by the scholiast and distinguishes itself from that of Hellanikos, where only Ares invites Kadmos to sow the teeth (*BNJ* 4 F 1a), and from that of Pherekydes (*BNJ* 3 F 22a-b), where both Ares and Athena prompt Kadmos to sow

398 Kühr 2006: 106 n.125.

399 Hell. *BNJ* 4 F 96; Eur. *Phoen.* 663-5 e 1061; Hyg. *Fab.* 178. Mastronarde (2005 *ad loc.*) argued that the use of the stone, a chthonic symbol, fits with the killing of a monster that belongs to that world. The first artistic representations of the event prefer the stone, certainly from the forties of the fifth century BCE (Tiverios 1990: 877-8).

400 Pherekydes, *BNJ* 3 F 88.

401 Nonnus, *Dion.* 4.408.

402 Ov. *Met.* 3.53-4.

403 Cp. Hyg. *Fab.* 6.

404 Hellanikos, *BNJ* 4 F 96. See Ogden 2013: 177-8 and Pownall 2016 *ad BNJ* 4 F 98.

405 Cp. Scarpi 2010: 546. Pherekydes (*BNJ* 3 F 22a) has Ares and Athena distribute half of the teeth to Aietes. It is indeed possible that, already in the fifth century BCE, the myth of Kadmos was being overlapped/intertwined with the saga of the Argonauts (Kühr 2006: 109 and n.137). This interpretation is more in line with a natural development and spreading of the storyline, than thinking that Hellanikos might have chosen "to avoid the awkward doublet of having Kadmos and Jason both fight sown men" (Pownall 2016 *ad BNJ* 4 F 1a).

them. The later mention of Pherekydes, in Apollodoros, is limited to the narration of the fights among the Spartoi (BNJ 3 F 22c), and this fact confirms the singular characteristics of the version provided in the *Library* and in the scholium.

Many sources claim that Athena invited Kadmos to sow the teeth.⁴⁰⁶ It is indeed possible that Stesichorus, in his *Europia* (F 96 Finglass), provided a similar version of the myth, with this fragment being read as an injunction to the hero by the goddess.⁴⁰⁷ If the goddess is, as Ovid says, *uirifautrix* (*Met.* 3.101) during the battle between Kadmos and the dragon, her action in Stesichorus' fragment confirms the antiquity of her interference in the episode. This core still forms an important part of the narrative conveyed by the scholium and by Apollodoros, but hardly made its way in Hellanikos, where Kadmos acts κατὰ Ἄρεως βούλησιν.

ὀργισθέντος δὲ Ἄρεως [...] θητεῦσαι: A second genitive absolute, in contrast with Athena's will: the form remarks, if necessary, the simple syntax of the scholium, whose excessive use of participles resembles the style of *hypotheseis* (Pagès 2017: 77). The scholium is different from Apollodoros, because it omits the version provided by Pherekydes (BNJ 3 F 22c), according to whom Kadmos provoked the civil fight among the Spartoi by throwing a stone at them. A second omission concerns the names of the five Spartoi that survive. This second indication, in Apollodoros, still belongs to the quotation in Pherekydes,⁴⁰⁸ since we know from another fragment (BNJ 3 F 22a) that he also named the five Spartoi. Furthermore, in Apollodoros, Kadmos has to serve Ares ἀνθ' ὧν ἔκτεινεν (b 16). This clause immediately follows the list of the survivors and the quote from Pherekydes, where the

406 Eur. *Phoen.* 667; Ap. Rhod. 3.1183–7; Ov. *Met.* 3.101–5; Hyg. *Fab.* 178 (*Minerua monstrante*). See further schol. *MTAB* Eur. *Phoen.* 1062. A fragment by Sostratus (BNJ 23 F 5) adds an interesting coda to the story: after the killing of the dragon, Kadmos hit his foot on the ground, κατὰ πρόνοιαν Ἀθηνᾶς, and thereby generates a river, “Kadmos' foot”. This would be the later Ismenos (on Sostratus' genealogies and on the learned and incongruous character of Sostratus, quoted by Pseudo-Plutarch in his *De fluuiis*, see Ceccarelli 2010).

407 So Vian 1963: 26. Davies – Finglass (2014: 357), on the contrary, agree with R. Kassel that we have an application of the principle known as “*qui facit per alium facit per se*”: we should then read Stesichorus' fragment as the remains of a tradition where Athena was the one who sowed the teeth.

408 Vian 1963: 23. It is certain that, already in the fifth century BCE, the names of the five Spartoi had become canonical (Morison 2011 *ad* BNJ 3 F 22a; Pownall 2016 *ad* BNJ 4 F 1a).

Spartoi engage in an internecine battle. As such, the fragment from Pherekydes becomes important to understanding why Kadmos undergoes punishment.

In this part of the scholium, we can detect a neat difference from the text of the *Library*, which derives precisely from the omission of the material of Pherekydes and may imply the use of another source. Unless further evidence to the contrary exists, the ascription to Hellanikos of part of the content must be kept, even with the intermediation of the *MH*. A probable conflation of traditions has resulted in an incoherent narrative progression. In the scholium, Ares' wrath is followed by Zeus' intermediation, an act which consists of Zeus allowing Kadmos to marry Harmonia. Before the ceremony/party, nevertheless, the same Zeus imposes on Kadmos a one-year period of slavery, to expiate his crime.

This crime, however, cannot consist of the killing of the Spartoi, which is absent in the scholium. Instead, the text refers to the nature of Kadmos' crime with a clear causal clause: ἀντὶ τῆς ἀναιρέσεως τοῦ δράκοντος (a 19–20). The *Library* presents a sequence of events, where the hero has to atone for the killing of the Spartoi, despite the fact that it is not clear how he was responsible for their death. Before the quote in Pherekydes, in fact, Apollodoros claims that, in another version, the Spartoi ἀπέκτειναν ἀλλήλους (b 12), “killed themselves”. Pherekydes too (Φερεκύδης δέ, b 13), mentioned the throwing of a stone at the Spartoi, but immediately added that the Earthborns, after being hit, believed that they were hit by their own brothers (ὑπ’ ἀλλήλων νομίζοντες βάλλεσθαι, b 14–5).

Therefore, if the only reason Kadmos had to serve Ares was because he killed the dragon, we have a line of events (killing of the dragon > birth of the Spartoi > expiation), which is partially preserved by Apollodoros. This means, however, that we have to consider the relative clause ἀνθ’ ὧν ἔκτεινεν (b 16) as a deviation⁴⁰⁹ caused by the matching of the fragment by Pherekydes. In the scholium, Kadmos' expiation is preceded by Zeus' reconciling act, which is not completely in line with the period of slavery. If we add to this that Zeus appears in Apollodoros only *after* the slavery period, we can infer that the scholium conflated two narratives. The first narrative, which we will call “Apollodorean”, has the following sequence of events:

409 If we follow the syntax, the plural necessarily refers to the Spartoi (so Scarpi 2010: 546; *contra* Carrière – Massonnie 1991: III 24,1).

- Kadmos kills the dragon, in accordance with Athena’s instruction
- birth of the Spartoi
- expiation
- wedding/reconciliation, thanks to Zeus and Athena’s offices

The second narrative can be defined “Hellanic” and it only emerges in backlight:

- killing of the dragon
- birth of the Spartoi
- Zeus’ reconciliation
- Kadmos sows the teeth, in accordance with Ares
- wedding

Vian (1963: 25) was the first to suggest that this second sequence might belong to Hellanikos’ presentation of the events: the sowing of the teeth, according to Ares’ will (*BNJ* 4 F 1a), happened after the successful reconciliation,⁴¹⁰ achieved through Zeus. This hypothesis can only be accepted if we consider the high degree of contamination of the two narratives in the scholium. This degree also explains other discrepancies, such as Harmonia’s genealogy (different from the one in Hellanikos’ *BNJ* 4 F 23)⁴¹¹ and the sowing according to *Athena’s* will (only understandable in a version where Ares is overtly hostile to Kadmos, i.e. the “Apollodorean” narrative). The text of the scholium mostly depends on a strong analogy with Apollodoros, which probably derives from the common use of the *MH*. Despite this, the *MH* probably also referred to the variations that can be traced back to Hellanikos’ *Boiotian History*. It is hard to accept that the scholiast directly read and copied our text of Apollodoros’ *Library*, because the linguistic differences highlighted so far force us to at least posit a different stage of the *Library*. The most economic explanation, therefore, is that these differences depend on the fact that both Apollodoros and the D Scholia extensively used the *MH*, by variously adapting its text (cutting, merging, modernising or changing the lexicon).

410 Ogden 2013b: 110: “The sowing of the dragon’s teeth to produce a crop of indirect children may also be seen as a form of restitution.”

411 Cp. *infra* the commentary *ad* Ἀπολλοδώρου.

Ἀρμονίαν: The scholium follows the widely diffused genealogy of this figure, who is already recognized as the daughter of Ares and Aphrodite in the time of Hesiod (*Theog.* 937; 975). Apart from this parentage, there was another version, whose first extant witness is Hellanikos (*BNJ* 4 F 23). He contends that Harmonia was Elektra’s (actually, in his version, Elektryon’s) daughter and Dardanos and Eëtion’s sister. In this variant, she was born in Samothrace and then moved to Thebes, where she would later marry Kadmos.⁴¹² In this fragment from his *Trojan History*, then, Hellanikos accepts a double innovation: not only is Harmonia, elsewhere, the daughter of Ares and Aphrodite,⁴¹³ but in other sources Zeus and Elektra, in Samothrace, beget only two children, Eëtion and Dardanos.⁴¹⁴ Other discrepancies are noticed between the picture conveyed by the present *BNJ* 4 F 23 and other fragments from Hellanikos’ *Atlantis*.⁴¹⁵ A telling one is the same difference in the name of Europa’s mother, since we know that in the *Atlantis* Hellanikos called her Elektra and not, as we see here, Elektryon (*BNJ* 4 FF 19a and 135).

The “Einführung der Harmonia” among Elektra’s children was fostered, in Jacoby’s view, by the oriental traits of the cult of the Kabyroi in Samothrace⁴¹⁶ and by the existence of the Elektran Gates in Thebes.⁴¹⁷ Since the fragment belongs to a *Trojan History*, its place in the book may be explained by the importance of the island of Samothrace in the *Iliad* (13.10–

412 According to Kühr (2006: 102–3), it is possible that this association has something to do with the characterisation of Kadmos as a travelling hero – from which many other links with this hero derive in other centres of Greece and Asia Minor. A decisive role was also played by Hellanikos’ well-known penchant for etymology (Fowler 2013: 687).

413 See Thgn. 15–8; Aesch. *Sept.* 135–42; Eur. *Phoen.* 7; *Bacch.* 1332; *Ov. Met.* 3.131; *Hyg. Fab.* 179; *Plut. Pel.* 19.

414 *Hom. Il.* 20.215–20; *Hes. FF* 177–80 M. – W.; *Str.* 7 F 20b Radt; *Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom.* I 61; *Conon, BNJ* 26 F 1,37; *Apollod.* 3.138.

415 See Pownall 2016 *ad BNJ* 4 F 23 for a list of these discrepancies. The local perspective could justify her conclusion that “Hellanikos may have revised the elaborate genealogies he constructed in his earlier works on the basis of new information, or to suit the immediate purposes of the work he was composing.” On the coexistence of variations in different works, and on the feasibility of this plurality, see Fowler 2017: 161–2.

416 Jacoby 1923a: 442. Probably through the name *Kad(s)milos*: cp. Cole 1984: 3–4; Rocchi 1989: 34; Musti 2001b: 147; Clinton 2003: 66–70 (*spec.* 68).

417 Paus. 9.8.4. The Elektran Gates are the only gates to have been identified with certainty and are located to the southwest of the Kadmeia, in the lower section of Thebes. The Elektran gates, in particular, were the principal entrance from the south (Osanna 2008: 246.252; Osanna – Moggi 2012: 269–70, with further references). The association with Elektra, Harmonia’s alleged mother, is not the only one found in the sources, who also associate her to (1) an Elektra who was Kadmos’ virgin sister (Paus. 9.8.4; see Zeitlin 2009: 44 n.53 on the possible relationship with Eteokles’ appeal to Artemis in *Aesch. Sept.* 449–50); (2) Elektron, Alkmene’s father (schol. *MTAB Eur. Phoen.* 1129); (3) and an Elektra, who was Amphion’s daughter (*ibid.*; on the diverse etymologies of the Theban gates, see Kühr 2006: 212 and Olivieri 2014: 42 n.6).

6). It could also be that Hellanikos chose to convey this version in order to make a connection between Kadmos and Kasmilos, the father of the Kabeiroi worshipped in Samothrace. A further point of contact is the cult of the Kabeiroi, present both in Boiotia and on the island.⁴¹⁸

The few later sources on Harmonia as Elektra and Zeus' daughter,⁴¹⁹ offer a glimpse of the local interest, in Samothrace, to nourish this mythical memory of the territory.⁴²⁰ In any case, the Samothracian variant remained isolated, as Diodorus Siculus remarks,⁴²¹ against the principal version of Harmonia as Aphrodite and Ares' child.⁴²² This second option was chosen by the scholiast(s) and owes much, here, to the "Apollodorean" and not to the "Hellanic" narrative of the myth. We may actually expect Hellanikos, assuming that he only followed one version on Harmonia, to have also considered the daughter of Elektra/-ion in his *Boetian History*: if her father was Zeus, as is most common in the sources (even though *BNJ* 3 F 23 is not explicit on this), his reconciliation act and the choice to give his own daughter to Kadmos fits Hellanikos' version. This hypothesis, nonetheless, is no more likely than the opposite option that Hellanikos accepted another genealogy, since the choice of having Kadmos marry the daughter of his previous enemy, Ares, would not collude with the version of Hellanikos.

418 See a complete list of the hypotheses on this choice in Pownall 2016 *ad BNJ* 4 F 23.

419 On Samothrace in the *Iliad*, see further Rocchi 1989: 25. Ephoros, *BNJ* 70 F 120; Ap. Rhod. 1.916; Mnaseas F 41 Cappelletto; Idomeneus from Crete *BNJ* 547 F 1; *IPriene* 69 = *BNJ* 548 F 6 (on Herodes, who sang a poem in Samothrace on Kadmos and Harmonia); Demagoras *FHG* IV 378, F 1; Diod. Sic. 5.48.2; schol. *MTAB* Eur. *Phoen.* 7 and 1129. On the northern pediment of the building known as the *hieron* (but see Clinton 2003: 61-2 on its function) of the Sanctuary of the *Megaloi Theoi* in Samothrace, there was a representation of Kadmos and Harmonia (Rocchi 1989: 36), which may be considered a form of ritual drama (Nielsen 2000: 121-3). The nuptial dance shown on the frieze of the "Hall of Choral Dances", furthermore, has been associated with their wedding. For this goddess, there were dances during the enthronment that preceded the actual initiation (Clinton 2003: 67).

420 Further details of Mnaseas' version (F 41 Cappelletto) confirm an adjustment of the tale through a local perspective (Cappelletto 2003: 292). Ephoros' version reflects a Theban perspective, to be set in the sixties of the fourth century BCE, when the sea policy of the hegemony might have stressed Kadmos' portrait as a seafarer (Breglia 2011: 302).

421 Diod. Sic. 5.48.5: τὴν ἀδελφὴν τοῦ Ἰασίωνος Ἀρμονίαν, οὐ καθάπερ Ἕλληνας μυθολογοῦσι, τὴν Ἄρεος ("[Kadmos married] Harmonia, Hyasion's sister and not, as the Greeks say, Ares' daughter").

422 The parentage Ares – Aphrodite might be original, as the first Hesiodic attestations of Harmonia (Hes. *Theog.* 933-7; 975-8) form the basis of this family tree in Boiotia from a very early date (cp. Sittig 1912: 2380,18-20).

συνώικισε: De Marco and Fowler accept *συνοίκησεν* from the manuscript **Z**, instead of *συνώικισεν* (**Q**).⁴²³ Classical literary Ionic dialect ignores the temporal augment (cp. e.g. Hdt 3.91: οἴκισα), but textual reasons suggest that we respect the language of the scholium and accept the form with the augment. In fact, this form has attestations in the literary Ionic dialect of the Imperial period (cp. Arr. *Ind.* 1.5).

The verb *συνοικίζω* is the only one that fits the syntax of the clause, and it cannot be substituted by the intransitive *συνοικέω*. The form in Hellanikos might have been *συνοίκισε* (so, for example, de Marco *ad loc.*), but it is self-serving to look in the scholium for signs of the literary Ionic of the fifth century BCE. The previous case of *κατόπιν* confirms that prudence must be taken, as the intervention of the scholiast and the use of the commentaries of the *MH* have played a decisive role.

ἐνιαυτὸν θητεῦσαι: The scholion simplifies the forms of the expiation differently from Apollodoros, insofar as the scholiast depicts the slavery as being of one year when Apollodoros calls it an *αἰδίων ἐνιαυτὸν*: an “eternal year”, usually eight years in this context (3.24). Despite doubts raised on the adjective *αἰδίων*, a generic, emphatic meaning has Archaic attestations (Hes. [Sc.] 310).⁴²⁴ This one-year slavery represents a temporary death for the hero, since it prepares him for the necessary expiation and recovery of balance with the gods.⁴²⁵ Its levelling to a “big year” of eight years equates to the period necessary for the revolutions of the sun, the moon, and the other planets to return to the same point (Cic. *Nat. D.* 51). This understanding of the expression is also confirmed by the other principal source on this detail in connection with Kadmos, the local historian Lykos (*BNJ* 380 F 5).

We miss relevant parallels, because the supposition that there might be a link with the slavery of Herakles by Admetos does not consider the detail that this other period lasted eight years *and a month* (Apollod. 2.113). At the same time, the more fitting comparison with the banishment of eight years for the perjured gods (Hes. *Theog.* 801), recently

⁴²³ On these two mss., see shortly *supra* n.268.

⁴²⁴ See Scarpi 2010: 546, against the previous conjecture by Herscher Ἄρεος ὑτόν. On the *Shield of Herakles*, whose attribution to Hesiod was already doubtful for Aristophanes from Byzantium (*Hyp.* A 2), see shortly *infra* 4.9.2.

⁴²⁵ On this aspect, see Vian 1963: 114–8.

suggested by Fowler (2013: 361), does not agree completely with the heroic status of Kadmos. The mention of this specific length of time, consequently, may be part of the myth of Kadmos not touched by external influences.

ἕκαστον δῶρον: The wedding of Kadmos and Harmonia in Thebes represents both a hierogamy and a new foundation act of the city. In fact, it symbolizes the reconciliation with Ares, when the god is angry with Kadmos, since the girl is often Ares' daughter. It is also a recovery of the order broken after the killing of the dragon by Zeus (where, as it might be the case for Hellanikos, Kadmos is helped by the king of the gods; as stated above, it might even be that Harmonia is Zeus' niece). The contemporary emphasis on the symbolic etymology of Harmonia's name has relevant precedents in the Classical sources;⁴²⁶ it confirms the pivotal role of the wedding for the foundation of the new civic order associated with Kadmos.⁴²⁷

Since this union has relevance on its own, it was also portrayed and retold without connection to previous moments of the story.⁴²⁸ Pindar, for example, mentions the wedding in the list of the *καλὰ ἐπιχώρια*, the local Theban glories that open his first *Hymn* (F 29,6 S. – M.). In the second *Dithyramb* (F 70b,29 S. – M),⁴²⁹ the voice of Zeus that Kadmos hears marks the intervention of the god in the local representation of one of the founding Theban myths.⁴³⁰ In the second century CE, Pausanias recorded that in Thebes there were still *lieux de mémoire* associated with the couple: for instance, their bridal-chamber (9.12.3) and three *xoana* depicting Aphrodite and dedicated to Harmonia (16.3).⁴³¹

426 "Schutzgöttin des bürgerlichen Verbandes" (Kühr 2006: 114): cp. *Hom. Hymn. Ap.* 194-6; Aesch. *Supp.* 1039-42; Plut. *Pel.* 19.2 (and Georgiadou 1997: 159).

427 Schachter (1981: 40) defines this wedding party as, "an allegorical representation of the formation of the community by a fusion of its destructive and generative, or its male and female, elements."

428 The wedding party is the first subject connected to Kadmos in the figurative arts (Tiverios 1990: 881). The presence of the motif on the Throne of Amykles (Paus. 3.18.12) might actually derive from the decision of the Spartan commissioners to exploit Boiotian connections, because of the kinship between Sparta and Thebes through the Aegeids (Musti – Torelli 1997: 240).

429 The intercession of Zeus predates Hellanikos (Vian 1963: 25; Olivieri 2011: 32 and n.69).

430 Cp. Villarubia 1992: 21. On the presence of the motif in Pindar, see further *Pyth.* 3.89-95 and Olivieri 2011: 28-32.

431 On these statues, see Moggi – Osanna 2012 *ad loc.* and Brillante 2001: 273-5.

The scholium also reports two elements consistently linked with this event: first, the singing of the Muses, which is attested in the *Corpus Theognideum* (1.15–8) as a moment of metapoetic reflection to mark the appeal to the gods who previously visited the Earth on this occasion.⁴³² Secondly, the gods offered the couple nuptial gifts not explicitly mentioned by the scholium. Other sources give more details on them: among these gifts, a golden necklace was to have great importance for its inauspicious character. This object belonged to the wife of one of the figures who joined Polyneikes on his expedition against Thebes,⁴³³ and it cast a shadow on the outcome of the foreign fighters.

As we read in a fragment (*BNJ* 4 F 98), Hellanikos knew that Harmonia was given two specific gifts, a chiton and the famous necklace.⁴³⁴ The isolated traits of this tradition suggest that it could either be an invention of Hellanikos or the recovery of an ancient *Märchenmotiv*.⁴³⁵ Nothing rules out the possibility that it was reported in Hellanikos' *Boiotian History*, as Ambaglio (1980: 108) once suggested. This hypothesis is strengthened by the presence of two other isolated versions in the fragments we possess, that of the Boiotian Encheleis (F 1), and the conciliatory version of the relationship between Kadmos and Ares (*BNJ* 4 F 1a and the present fragment).

It is not impossible that Hellanikos also reported the peplum and the necklace given by Ephestus in the list of the gifts (Apollod. 3.25).⁴³⁶ Unfortunately, in our *BNJ* 4 F 98

432 Cp. Olivieri 2011: 28–9.

433 In Apollodoros (3.60–1), the necklace is given by Polyneikes to Eriphyle, Amphiaros' wife. In Hellanikos (*BNJ* 4 F 98), Polyneikes gives it to Argea, Adrastos' daughter. This disagreement between the sources may not be reduced to a unique version and it is better to accept this variation, instead of believing, with Fowler (2013: 409), that "the scholiast is mistaken in saying Polyneikes gave both gifts to Argeia."

434 The same fragment is also often studied for its specific version on the relationship between Polyneikes and Eteokles. In terms of the success of the *συνθήκη* between Eteokles and Polyneikes, Hellanikos differed from other versions, where the initial agreement is soon broken, either as a result of not rotating power (Apollod. 3.57), or for the immediate banishment of Polyneikes (Pher. *BNJ* 3 F 96). According to Vian (1963: 150), the necklace and the chiton resemble, as symbols of wealth and fertility, the kingship granted to Eteokles, but Hellanikos has Polyneikes give them as presents to Argea soon after, a detail that breaks this balance.

435 Fairytale *topos*: Jacoby 1923a: 460.

436 Hellanikos would thus be in contrast with Pherekydes (*BNJ* 3 F 89), who claimed that Europa received the necklace from Kadmos. In Statius (*Theb.* 2.265–305), Ephestus planned revenge against Aphrodite for her cheating on him, and gave Harmonia, Aphrodite's daughter, an ill-omened present (on this version which describes the *ἄρμος* as a "présent malefique", see Vian 1963: 147 n.3). The other sources which connect this gift with Ephestus seem to ignore the personal vendetta (Diod. Sic. 4.66.3; Hyg. *Fab.* 148; schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 3.167a Drachmann).

Hellanikos only says that the necklace was a present from Aphrodite and the chiton from Athena. Both are singular descriptions, in line with the presence of more gods (τῶν θεῶν ἕκαστος) in our scholium.⁴³⁷ The section on the wedding, therefore, has only been subsumed in the scholium on a general basis, which can only give us an imprecise, although not unclear, depiction of the event that this historian was to give in his *Boiotian Stories*.

2.2.3. A Fragmentary Authorship

This commentary shows that the scholium presents an overlapping of two narrative tiers: the first one, “Apollodorean” for its resemblance with the text of the *Library*, offers a traditional representation of the myth of the foundation of Thebes. The second tier, which we call “Hellanic” *ex antithesi*, can only be read between the lines. Apart from these tiers, attention should be paid to the intervention of the scholiast, who probably integrated his main source (*MH*) with Apollodoros and caused disharmony between the tiers, with the result that the tale looks like a syncretic summary of the myth.

The first section, on the etymology of Βοιωτία, is inspired by an ancient lexicographical commentary on the Homeric text, since the information it provides on Boiotos and on Aonia already attracts the interest of literary sources in the Archaic and Classical periods. This material probably made its way to the D Scholia through the *Mythographus Homericus*, whose initial development in the early Imperial period explains the number of variants and relevant consonances between the scholium and the literature of this period (Ovid, Hyginus). It is suggestive that Hellanikos might have been aware of Aonia as a former name for this region, but ultimately not clearly demonstrable.⁴³⁸

The sources of the *historia* are probably, therefore, two: the *MH*, which is also the basis of those significant variants against Apollodoros, and the likely, occasional use of the *Library*. The single linguistic texture of the scholium differs from Apollodoros (cp. e.g. χέρνιψ for ὕδωρ, or ἀρητιάδος for ἀρείας), but a single explanation is not valid for all of these

⁴³⁷ The most detailed list of the gifts received by Harmonia (even though the context is different with the wedding party set in Samothrace), is in Diod. Sic. 5.49.1.

⁴³⁸ “Suggestive”: Pownall 2016 *ad BNJ* F 51.

differences. If, for example, χέρνιψ belongs to a more elevated and technical lexicon, the adverb κατόπι in the scholium is more in tune with an Imperial and later use, in the prose, in contrast to the poetical κατόπισθεν of Apollodoros. This fluid character makes it harder to think of a different version of the text of the *Library* in front of our scholiast(s).⁴³⁹ We should acknowledge a high degree of intervention by the scholiast in this middle part, the previous part, and in the final *subscriptio*.

The final section of the scholium presents, in terms of the actual evolution of the story, a *hysteron-proteron*: the wedding is followed by the mention of slavery, as if Zeus' help did not actually succeed in granting Kadmos his acquittal. In Apollodoros, in fact, the slavery is a consequence of the crime and, just like in Lykos, it is not Zeus who wants Kadmos to serve Ares: there, the period of slavery is the necessary condition for the happy ending to occur. The “Hellanic” version is more in line, in fact, with the picture that we can detect from Pindar on, where Zeus acts like a mediator and a supporter of the wedding. The final part of the scholium, then, indirectly confirms the use of a further, mythographic source (*MH*), that explains in a clearer way why, in another version of the myth, Kadmos does not serve Ares and, most of all, why there is no hostility between the god and the hero. We owe to this *MH* the survival of another version of the story, in line with local tradition, as it was retold by Hellanikos.

The “Hellanic” vein is therefore only present in the scholiastic tradition indirectly *through the MH*. In this commentary, the subscriptions have often been proved right.⁴⁴⁰ The presence of this vein is the cause of the not-immediately-clear expression which mentions the expiation in this scholion. The syntactic unease of this passage has often been recognized,⁴⁴¹ but more attention should be paid to the reasons underlying this. What we know from other sources on Hellanikos' representation of Boiotian history and myths

439 Kenens (2013) also excludes the use of a different text of the *Library* and suggests that the Apollodoros of the *Library* read the Apollodoros who wrote the *Commentary on the Catalogue of Ships* (see *ibid.* p. 108 and in general 103–8). Even though I disagree with her view that the scholia are independent from the *Library*, I share her prudence towards the existence of an alleged “Apollodoros alter”, unknown to us. See *infra* 7.2. on the critical debate on the fragment.

440 In an essay on the Ovidian representation of Boiotian myths, Schachter (1990: 106) suggests that the poet might have used a “mythographical handbook”: through this source, Ovid took themes that were originally present in Korinna's production. If we accept this hypothesis, we gain indirect evidence of the role played by this learned production as a mediator of local historiography in the first imperial age.

441 Vian 1963: 25; Gantz 1996: II 470.

explains why ancient scholars and learned people may be interested in him: Ares' friendly attitude towards Kadmos, the absence of an internecine fight among the Spartoi, and the settlement between Eteokles and Polyneikes, are all versions which detach Hellanikos from the main trends followed in Athens and in other parts of the Greek world, when dealing with the same plot. Hellanikos' *Boiotian History* was most probably characterized by a unique version of the subjects, and it therefore shows how an external perspective could accept a local narrative around figures as important as Kadmos and Harmonia.⁴⁴²

Unfortunately, we are missing too many details to be able to give a complete overview and explanation of how Hellanikos described the archaeology of Thebes and its foundation myth, from the beginning to the end. A careful analysis of the scholium may still help us understand the reasons for the fortune of Hellanikos as a “local” historiographer: he may have been an “iconoclast” (Pownall 2016 *ad BNJ* F 51) in his *Boiotian History*, but it is certainly true, as the same F. Pownall concedes, that space must be allowed for eventual contradictions in his works on some details of the saga.

442 The scholium on Eur. *Phoen.* 71 wonders whence Euripides took inspiration for the version he provides on the Theban cycle: Hellanikos or Pherekydes? See on this von Fritz 1967 I: 483–4.

This page is left blank intentionally.



TE I R E S I A S
S U P P L E M E N T S
O N L I N E