

Apostolos Pierris

ON ASCLEPIUS' PARENTAGE, BIRTHPLACE
AND CULT-LOCALISATION

There were two chief accounts regarding Asclepius' parentage according to Apollodorus III, 118, the one making him the son of Arsinoe the daughter of Leucippus in Messenia, the other of Koronis the daughter of Phlegyas in Thessaly. But this is not very exact, since the Phlegyans were inhabiting Boeotia in standard mythology. Things are considerably improved if we excise ἐν Θεσσαλίᾳ with Hercherus; although the possibility of one more group transference from Thessaly to Boeotia is not unlikely. But still the second account seems bedeviled by awkwardnesses and inconsistencies and ensnared in structural unclarity, especially as Apollodorus seems to prefer the former account, which he gives *simpliciter*, while the second he introduces by a *τινές*. There is a further erroneous preference in his making Ischyous brother of Kaeneus, the Thessalian Argonaut, contra Pindarum (Pythia III, 26 Christ), who speaks of him as Arcadian although he poetises the Thessalian account. Pausanias, on the other hand, is, as usually, accurate and circumspect (II, 26, 3-7). He mentions, but considers unlikely the Arsinoe-legend, especially as it is flatly contradicted by the Pythian God himself, when questioned on this very matter by Apollophanes the Arcadian in Delphes: οὗτος ὁ χρησμὸς δηλοῖ μάλιστα οὐκ ὄντα Ἀσκληπιὸν Ἀρσινόης, ἀλλὰ Ἡσίοδον ἢ τῶν τινὰ

ἐμπεποιηκότων ἐς τὰ Ἡσιόδου τὰ ἔπη συνθέντα ἐς τὴν Μεσσηνίων χάριν [1] (§7 = Fr. 50 Merkelbach et West).

There is a problem, though, concerning the Hesiodic testimony. The Scholia ad Pindarus, *Pythia* III, 14 inform us: τὸν Ἀσκληπιὸν οἱ μὲν Ἀρσινόης, οἱ δὲ Κορωνίδος φασὶν εἶναι. Ἀσκληπιάδης (= Fr. 32 Fr.Gr.H.; from Tragilos, the author of the famous *Τραγωδούμενα*) δὲ φησι τὴν Ἀρσινόην Λευκίππου εἶναι τοῦ Περνήρους, ἧς καὶ Απόλλωνος Ἀσκληπιὸς καὶ θυγάτηρ Ἐριῶπις. <Ἡσίοδος> [2]:

ἦ δ' ἔτεκ' ἐν μεγάροις Ἀσκληπιὸν ὄρχαμον ἀνδρῶν
Φοίβῳ ὑποδμηθεῖσα, εὐπλόκαμόν τ' Ἐριῶπιν.

Καὶ Ἄσιος [3] ὁμοίως:

Ἀρσινόη δὲ μιγεῖσα Διὸς καὶ Λητοῦς υἱῶ
τίκτ' Ἀσκληπιὸν υἱὸν ἀμύμονά τε κρατερόν τε.

καὶ Σωκράτης (the Argive perieget and antiquary) γόνον Ἀρσινόης τὸν Ἀσκληπιὸν ἀποφαίνει, παῖδα δὲ Κορωνίδος εἰσποίητον (a syncretising approach). ἐν δὲ τοῖς εἰς Ἡσίοδον ἀναφερομένοις ἔπεσι (Fr. 60 Merckelbach et West) φέρεται ταῦτα περὶ τῆς Κορωνίδος:

τῷ μὲν ἄρ' ἦλθε κόραξ, φράσσειν δ' ἄρα ἔργ' ἀΐδηλα [4]
Φοίβῳ ἀκερσεκόμνη, ὅτ' ἄρ' Ἴσχυς ἔγημε Κορωνίν
Εἰλατίδης Φλεγύαο διογνήτοιο θύγατρα.

ἐν δὲ τοῖς Ὀμηρικοῖς Ὑμνοῖς (XVI, 1):

ιητῆρα νόσων Ἀσκληπιὸν ἄρχομ' ἀεΐδειν,
υἱὸν Απόλλωνος, τὸν ἐγείνατο διὰ Κορωνίς

Δωτίω ἐν πεδίῳ, κούρη Φλεγύου βασιλῆος.

Ἀριστείδης δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ Κνίδου συγγράμματι φησιν οὕτως:
 Ἀσκληπιὸς Ἀπόλλωνος παῖς καὶ Ἀρσινόης. αὕτη δὲ παρθένος οὔσα
 ὠνομάζετο Κορωνίς, Λευκίππου δὲ θυγάτηρ ἦν τοῦ Ἀμύκλα τοῦ
 Λακεδαίμονος (another harmonizing attempt).

As Hesiod could not have contradicted himself so blatantly in the same work, and as the Messenian account is mentioned by the reliable Pausanias as Hesiodic account, and given finally that he considered *Ἡοῖαι* as *Hesiod's work*, but not the so-called *Μεγάλαι Ἡοῖαι*; it follows that the *εἰς Ἡσίοδον ἀναφερόμενα ἔπη* must be the *Μεγάλαι Ἡοῖαι*, where the Coronis account was adopted. Stylistically, the four verses are Hesiodic no doubt, but I think I discern a certain slight *ἀμηχανία* in mimesis; there is, as it were, the artifice, but not as much of the art and spirit of Hesiod. - Fragm. 59 (Merkelbach et West) does not, I think, relate to Coronis, being truly Hesiodic (Strabo, IX, 442 and XIV 647). The appearance of *Ερμῆς* at the end of v. 15 in the all but destroyed papyrus, makes me connect the passage to Propertius II, 2, 9 sqq.:

Qualis et Ischomache Lapithae genus heroine,
 Centauris medio grata rapina mero
 Mercurio Ossaeis fertur Boebeidos undis
 virgineum primo composuisse latus.

The Lapithes in the Dotion field are well attested (cf. Strabo IX, 442: they expelled the former inhabitants Aenianes; in XIV 647 he speaks of

the Magnesians in Asia minor as Δελφῶν ἀπόγονοι τῶν ἐποικησάντων τὰ Δίδυμα ὄρη ἐν Θετταλία, but I doubt whether he correctly interprets them to be the Hesiodic δίδυμοι κολωνοί). That Turnebus changed *primo* to *Brimo*, is ingenious but erroneous; the copulation was here perfected unlike Hermes' *attempt* at the Hadic Brimo. Burmann's proposal *Ossaeis* pro the mss. *satis* is very probably correct, in view of Lucan's *Phars.* VII, 176:

ire per *Ossaeam* rapidus *Boebeida* Sanguis

and Valerius Flaccus' *Argon.* I, 448:

- ubi *Ossaeae* captaret (sc. Apollo) frigora quercus,
perderet et pingui miseris *Boebeide* crines,

both of which passages are adduced by him in confirmation of his proposal. - However this does not affect my point here, and well one can retain in the Propertian passage the old vulgate *et sanctis*, which, though, gives a too latin turn to the flow of the ultragraecanic Roman poet. - The views of Socrates and Aristeides are paradeigmatic attempts to combine the two genealogies; significantly both consider the *Messenian account as fundamentally correct*; and try, within its context, to accommodate somehow the diverging story.

Hesiod, we saw, adopted the Messenian account. But the God himself, the divine father, when asked, uttered the oracle (Pausanias II, 26, 7):

ὦ μέγα χάσμα βροτοῖς βλαστῶν Ἀσκληπιέ πάσιν,
ὄν Φλεγυηῖς ἔτικτεν ἐμοὶ φιλότητι μιγεῖσα

ίμερόεσσα Κορωνίς ἐνὶ κροναῖ Ἐπιδαύρω.

It is important that this squares with the local Epidaurian account as detailed by Pausanias (*loc. cit.* §§3 sqq.): Φλεγύαν Ἐπιδαύριοί φασιν ἐλθεῖν ἐς Πελοπόννησον πρόφασιν μὲν ἐπὶ θεᾷ τῆς χώρας, ἔργω δὲ κατάσκοπον πλήθους τῶν ἐνοικούντων καὶ εἰ τὸ πολὺ μάχιμον εἶη τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ἦν γὰρ δὴ Φλεγύας πολεμικώτατος τῶν τότε, καὶ ἐπιῶν ἐκάστοτε ἐφ' οὓς τύχοι τοὺς καρποὺς ἔφερε καὶ ἤλαυνε τὴν λείαν. ὅτε δὲ παρεγένετο εἰς Πελοπόννησον, εἶπετο ἡ θυγάτηρ αὐτῶ, λεληθυῖα ἔτι τὸν πατέρα ὅτι ἐξ Ἀπόλλωνος εἶχεν ἐν γαστρὶ. ὡς δὲ ἐν τῇ γῆ τῇ Ἐπιδαυρίῳ ἔτεκεν, ἐκτίθησι τὸν παῖδα ἐς τὸ ὄρος τοῦτο ὃ δὴ Τίτθιον ὀνομάζουσι ἐφ' ἡμῶν etc. –

The common dramatic and poetic story of Coronis' copulation with the glorious God, her subsequent audacity to adulterate the divine sperm with that of her human elect lover, and the terrible punishment that she, Ischyos her husband and all inhabitants by Boebeis in the Dotion plain suffered at the hands of Artemis are well known. The premature embryo was saved by Apollo and carried to Cheiron the Magnesian Centaur, for him to grow up and educate the child in medicine. This is the substance of the common account magnificently told by Pindar in *Pythia* III, 1 sqq., and with slight variations by Apollodorus, III, 118-9; Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, II, 605 sqq.; "Hesiod" Fr. 60 (which I have argued belongs to the non-Hesiodic *Μεγάλαι Ἡοῖαι*); Hyginus, *Astr.*, ii, 40; Pausanias II, 26, 6; *Homeric Hymn* XVI. Not all details are identical in the various forms of this

common and poetic account, but some seem distinct: Coronis, the daughter of Phlegyas, lives in the Dotion field, conceives by the God, and then, in consequence of a major delict of hers in preferring a human to a divine lover is destroyed there, the child from her womb being saved by divine intercession and entrusted to Cheiron, in Pelion.

This, however, is essentially contradicted by the Pythian oracle in all but the Phlegyan parentage of Coronis, Delphes officially confirming the official doctrine of Epidaurus. Nevertheless the story gained widespread acceptance by virtue of its dramatic colour; instrumental in its authority must have been the *Μεγάλαι Ἡοῖαι* and, probably, other non extant epics. Pherecydes from Syros upheld the account (Sch. Pindarus, *Pythia*, III, 59 = Fr. 3a Fr.Gr.H): ὅτι ἐν Λακερεΐᾳ ᾧκει Κορωνίς Φερεκύδης ἐν ᾧ ἱστορεῖ πρὸς ταῖς πηγαῖς τοῦ Ἀμύρου. καὶ περὶ τοῦ κόρακος διηγεῖται (the older account, not the improved theistically Pindaric version of divine omniscience, as Artemon had observed): καὶ ὅτι Ἄρτεμιν ἔπεμψεν ὁ Απόλλων, ἥ πολλὰς ἅμα γυναῖκας ἀπέκτεινε. Ἴσχυον δὲ Απόλλων ἀποκτείνει (very orthodox: sudden death in women caused by Artemis, in men by Apollo), τὸν δὲ Ἀσκληπιὸν δίδωσι Χείρωνι. – Acusilaos shared the view (sch. Pindar, *Pythia* III, 25 = Fr. 17 Fr.Gr.H.).

There may be, very likely, some local tradition serving as foundation. Comparable to the one that made Tricca the birthplace of Aesculapius (Strabo, XIV p. 647: ἕτερος δ' ἐστὶ Ληθαῖος (sc. ποταμός) ὁ ἐν Γορτύνη καὶ ὁ περὶ Τρίκκην, ἐφ' ᾧ ὁ Ἀσκληπιὸς

γεννηθῆναι λέγεται etc.); this squares with the dominion of the Aslepiads in the Homeric catalogue as supra. But when the Arcadian Apollophanes presumed to ask the God about the motherhood of his Son, his was not a merely literary interest: Arcadia's itself claims were at stake – in its religious community and phyletic continuity with Messenia. In the region of Thelpoussa called Ὀγκειον (from Ὀγκιος son of Apollo, prince of the place) south of the sacred sanctuary of Demeter Erinys, on the right sight of Ladon, shortly before its confluence with Touthoa where the boundary between Thelpoussa and Heraea lied, there was a sanctuary of Ἀσκληπιοῦ Παιδός, on the opposite side of which across the river the temple of Ἀπόλλων Ὀγκαιάτης was located. In the Aesculapian sanctuary there was the tomb of Trygon: τροφὸν δὲ Ἀσκληπιοῦ τὴν Τρυγόνα εἶναι λέγουσιν· ἐν γὰρ τῇ Θαλπούσῃ τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ παιδί ἐκκειμένῳ φασὶν ἐπιτύχοντα Ἀυτόλαον Ἀρκάδος υἱὸν νόθον ἀνελέσθαι (I correct from ἀναθέσθαι) τὸ παιδίον, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ Παῖδα Ἀσκληπιὸν <τιμᾶν· ἃ δ'> εἰκότα εἶναι μᾶλλον ἡγούμην [ὁ καὶ] ἐδήλωσα ἐν τοῖς Ἐπιδαυρίων (some such restitution needs to be supplied since Pausanias adopts primarily the Epidaurian account), Pausanias VIII, 25, 11. We are not told who the mother was; but I have little doubt that the Messenian story prevailed to that extent.

Further. In the surviving lists of distinct hypostases in the case of each godhead we meet various Aesculapiuses, all of which relate to Arcadia and Messenia. Thus Cicero, *de Natura Deorum*, III, 57:

Aesculapiorum primus Apollinis, quem Arcades colunt, qui specillum invenisse primusque vulnus dicitur obligavisse; secundus secundi Mercurii frater; is fulmine percussus dicitur humatus esse *Cynosuris*; tertius Arsippi et *Arsinoae*, qui primus purgationem alvi dentisque evulsionem, ut ferunt, invenit, cujus in *Arcadia non longe a Lusio* flumine sepulcrum et lucus ostenditur. The same account exists in Lydus, *de Mensibus*, IV, 142: Ἀσκληπιοὶ τρεῖς λέγονται γενέσθαι πρῶτος Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Ἡφαίστου, ὃς ἐξεῦρε μῆλην· δεύτερος Ἴσχύος τοῦ Ἐλάτου καὶ Κορωνίδος, <ὃς ἐν τοῖς Κυνοσουρίδος> [5] ὀρίοις ἐτάφη· τρίτος Ἀρσίππου καὶ Ἀρσινόης τῆς Λευκίππου· οὗτος εὔρε τομὴν καὶ ὀδοντάγραν, καὶ τάφος αὐτῶ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ· οἱ δὲ ἀστρονόμοι αὐτόν φασιν εἶναι τὸν ὀφιοῦχον τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ σκορπίου ἐστῶτα. The last detail makes him the chief Asclepius, as the common tradition held the καταστερισμός of the fulminated Hero (v. Hyginus *Poet. Astr.*, ii, 14). However the second one is thunderstruck according to Cicero; a clear indication of the artificiality of the arrangements, which however cope with a real problem, v. p. 37.

The Arsippus personage is unheard of. Ampelius' lemma is totally corrupt (9 §6): ...tertius +*Aristeti et Alcippe*+ filius. Maybe *Arsinoae et Alcippi* (with erroneously reversed order) was meant; but there is a ms. variant +*Arisippi*+ in Cicero's text. Perhaps *Aristippi* stood originally; perhaps there was an initial misplacement and misunderstanding of Leucippus; perhaps, on the other hand, Arsippus

or whoever is referred to by this fluid “onomatopoeia” was the human husband of Arsinoe.

Aesculapius’ grove and tomb by Lusius (the tributary of Alpheius) in Arcadia probably is the same with the sanctuary in Gortys (Pausanias V, 7, 1 and VIII, 28, 1) with a temple of Aesculapius from Pentelic marble and with statues of him as ephebus (οὐκ ἔχων πω γένεια) and of Health, the works of Scopas; everything, including the reputed dedication of a θώραξ and spear by Alexander the Great, bespeaks of the ancient importance and eminence of the worship. Tomb and Temple make clear the *Deified Hero* or *Humanized God*.

In the Asclepieion of the primeval Titane (located between Sicyon and Phlius in northeastern Peloponnesus) there was a stone statue of Asclepius under the epitheton *Γορτύνιος* (Pausanias II, 11, 8). The preeminence of the Gortynian god and sanctuary is rendered thus strikingly manifest. But equally emphasized is the connection of the Cyllenian mountainous district (proximate to Titane) with the Cynouric Gortys. For Stymphelos, the son of Elatos, had a son Gortys; *Γόρτυς δὲ ὁ Στυμφήλου πόλιν Γόρτυνα ᾤκισεν ἐπὶ ποταμῷ· καλεῖται δὲ Γορτύνιος καὶ ὁ ποταμός* (Pausanias VIII, 4, 8); it is the same river who at its sources is called *Λούσιος* (VIII, 28, 2). On the Cyllenian dimension of Aesculapius more will be said *infra* (p. 16). Her mother in Titane was apparently held to be *Coronis*; her *ξόανον* – statue, though, was not consecrated in the Temple of her son, but was carried to the sanctuary of Athena and there worshiped when the *suotaurovilia*

were sacrificed to the God (§7; XII, 1). It is inept to take this as suggesting that the connection between Asclepius and Coronis was superimposed on independent cults; it only proves some role of goddess Athena in their aboriginal relationship. Which role I cannot specify and determine without more information, although I could offer various possibilities (see further, on these topics, below pp. 36sq.).

The second Asclepius is the son of Ischys and Coronis; precisely the God of the common account with the human father in the place of the divine. The second Mercury that Cicero holds to be brother of the second Aesculapius is described as follows (§56): *Mercurius... alter Valentis et +Phoronidis+ filius, is qui sub terrie habetur idem Trophonius. Valens = Ἴσχυς; hence we must emend to Coronidis, with Davies, from Phoronidis. Κυνοσουρίς, tells us the scholion to the Clementine passage above quoted, is κώμη Λακεδαίμονος. And indeed Pausanias mentions what is evidently four districts of Sparta, III, 16, 9; speaking of the place or quarter (χωρίον) Λιμναῖον, where the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia was, examines the question of the genuineness of the ξόανον there (the one that Orestes and Iphigeneia brought from Tauris according to the local account) and resolves it in the affirmative enumerating his cogent reasons and marvelous signs, one of the latter being this: τοῦτο δὲ οἱ Λιμναῖται Σπαρτιατῶν καὶ Κυνοσουρεῖς καὶ ἐκ Μεσόας τε καὶ Πιτάνης θύοντες τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι ἐς διαφορὰν, ἀπὸ δὲ αὐτῆς καὶ ἐς φόνους, προήχθησαν, ἀποθανόντων*

δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ βωμῷ πολλῶν νόσος ἔφθειρε τοὺς λοιπούς. Hesychius s.v. Κυνόσουρα· φυλὴ Λακωνική... καὶ πᾶς χερσοειδῆς τόπος. Similarly Photius s.v. And Herodianus, *Περὶ μονήρους λέξεως*, p. 13.23 Di: τὸ Κυνόσουρα ἐπὶ τῇ λακωνικῇ φυλῇ (sc. κεῖται).

The *tribal* division of the *genuine Spartans* (and not of the Laconians generally) corresponded to the *regional* one in the four *κῶμαι* which always, unintegrated into an obnoxious coalescing, formed the singular “city” of Sparta; as exactly described it Thucydides in the memorable passage (I, 10): Λακεδαιμονίων γὰρ εἰ ἡ πόλις ἐρημωθείη, λειφθείη δὲ τὰ τε ἱερά καὶ τῆς κατασκευῆς τὰ ἐδάφη, πολλὴν ἂν οἶμαι ἀπιστίαν τῆς δυνάμεως προελθόντος πολλοῦ χρόνου τῆς ἔπειτα πρὸς τὸ κλέος αὐτῶν εἶναι· καίτοι Πελοποννήσου τῶν πέντε τὰς δύο μοίρας νέμονται, τῆς τε ξυμπάσης ἡγοῦνται καὶ τῶν ἔξω ξυμμάχων πολλῶν· ὅμως δὲ οὔτε ξυνοικισθείσης πόλεως οὔτε ἱεροῖς καὶ κατασκευαῖς πολυτελέσι χρησαμένης, κατὰ κώμας δὲ τῷ παλαιῷ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τρόπῳ οἰκισθείσης, φαίνοιτ’ ἂν ὑποδεεστέρα· Ἀθηναίων δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο παθόντων διπλασίαν ἂν τὴν δύναμιν εἰκάζεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς φανεραῆς ὄψεως τῆς πόλεως ἣ ἔστιν. Revelatory indeed, and of the Thucydidean viewpoint, as well. As regards the distribution of the four districts, I shall give without argument the likeliest: Pitane to the west and north-west, Limnae to the east, Kynosoura to the south-west, Mesoia to the south, south-east.

Callimachus has this passage, *Hymnus in Dianam*, 93-5:

----- ἑπτὰ δ' ἔδωκε

θάσσονας αὐράων κυνοσουρίδας, αἶ ρα διῶξαι

ῶκισται νεβρούς τε etc.

On which word the *Scholia* observe: τὰς ὑπὸ κυνῶν καὶ ἀλωπεκῶν τικτομένας κύνας. Ἡ τὰς Λακωνικάς. Κυνοσουρίς γάρ, τόπος Λακωνικῆς. Not simply and merely Laconic, but Spartan specifically; although by extension a dog-breed of quality among the famous Laconic one could presumably be so called by excellence. The first Hesychian explanation would verge on the absurd, unless fox-adulteration caused increased perfection in the smell-, running- and cunning faculties. Yet it is supported by Aristotle's authority, *Historia Animalium*, Θ, 607a1: γίνεται δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἐκ μίξεως μὴ ὁμοφύλων, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν Κυρήνῃ οἱ λύκοι μίσγονται ταῖς κυσὶ καὶ γεννῶσι, καὶ ἐξ ἀλώπεκος καὶ κυνὸς οἱ Λακωνικοὶ etc. Pollux V, 38 refers the monstrous copulation to the initial formation of the kind: λέγουσι δὲ τὰς μὲν Λακαίνας ἐξ ἀλωπέκων τὸ ἀρχαῖον καὶ κυνῶν γενομένας κληθῆναι ἀλωπεκίδας. That incident was historicized and two kinds were identified by Nicander the Colophonian, apud Pollux V, 39-40: αἶ δὲ Καστορίδες Κάστορος θρέμματα, Απόλλωνος τὸ δῶρον· ταύτας δ' ὁ αὐτὸς οὗτος ποιητῆς εἶναι τὰς ἀλωπεκίδας λέγει, μιξαμένου τὸ γένος ἀλώπεκι Κάστορος.

The Laconic breed did possess the qualities that I noticed above; as to velocity the Callimachian passage is a worthy testimony, but weightier is Vergilius' *Georg.* III, 405: *veloces Spartae catulos*. Silius

Italicus, *Punicorum*, III, 294-5 refers to it by *pernix venator Lacon*. Sophocles comments its sagacity in smelling and following the chaze, *Ajax*, 7-8:

----- εὖ δέ σ' ἐκφέρει
 κυνὸς Λακαίνης ὡς τις εὖρινος βάσις.

- Aglaosthenes, the author of *Ναξιακά* (Fr. 1 FHG vol. II p. 293) was the source from which Eratosthenes in *Catasterismi* II; Hyginus *Poet. Astron.* II, 2; Germanicus sch. ad *Aratus* 24; speak of a Cretan Cynosoura, one of the Idaean Nymphs and Zeus' nutrix in the company of Curetes; she was astralized as *Arctos Minor*. The harbor and a large field of a Cretan town *Ἰστοί* (cf. Strabo XIV, 639 for a synonymous station in Icaria) founded by a Nicostratus and his companions, was called Cynosoura in remembrance of the Nymph. –

A Cretan analogue of a Lacedaemonian element is nothing surprising, although we know nothing of the true reason behind the Laconian name. But significantly we are carried back to Arcadia by a differing account preserved in one ms. of the *Catasterismi*, Olivieri's S: λέγεται δὲ κυνὸς εἶναι εἰκῶν (the *Arctos minor*): ἥτις ἦν Καλλιστοῦς, ἥτις συγκυνηγὸς ἦν τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι ἀποθανούσης δὲ αὐτῆς διὰ τὸ φθαρῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Διός, καὶ φωραθείσης τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι ἔγγυον εἶναι καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀποθηριωθείσης, συναπέθανε. Τὸ δὲ ὄνομα ἔχει διὰ τὸ κυνὸς οὐρανὸν ἔχειν. (And indeed we are not told in the ordinary account what to make of the *κέρκος* with its three bright stars that are there mentioned – Olivieri p. 3.7). Thus the faithful dog

accompanies still in heaven her (ἦτις supra) animalized hunting mistress.

The Cretan location is out of the question in a clearly Arcadic tradition, especially in view of the tenuity of its testification, and the lack of plausible, convincing detail in the corresponding astralization. On the other hand, the Spartan place is possible – and at any rate well-authenticated. There would in fact be no reasonable doubt concerning it, but for an isolated information supplied by Stephanus Byz., s.v. Κυνόσουρα· ἄκρα Ἀρκαδίας ἀπὸ Κυνοσοῦρου τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Κυνοσουρεὺς καὶ Κυνοσουρὶς θηλυκόν. Mercury, we have seen, is the brother of the Aesculapius in question; and their father is a thorough Arcadian, Ἴσχυς of Elatus [6]. There is then no option left, but that we postulate the tomb of this Aesculapius by the Arcadian Cynosoura. I suggest that we further connect that height (ἄκρα supra) with the Arcadic *Kynouria*; after all it is but the same word in another form. When Thucydides speaks of the Lacedaemonians settling the expelled Aeginetans in Thyrea (when, in the first year of the Peloponnesian War, the Athenians thought fit to secure Aegina to their interest by such violent measure as wholesale expulsion of the inhabitants and colonization, Thucydides II, 27 ; v. Pausanias II, 29, 5. [7]) he calls the coastal area between Argolid, Arcadia and Laconia *Thyreatis* (*loc.cit.*) but also *Κυνοσουρία* (so the mss. in IV, 56) in place of the commonly accepted *Κυνουρία*. And Strabo, referring to this very passage of Thucydides, speaks (according to the mss. tradition) of

Κυνοσουρία (VIII, 376). Lucianus, *Icaromenippus*, 18 (II p. 773) has also *Κυνοσουρία*, as well as the *scholiast ad. loc.*; Herodotus (VIII, 73), Pausanias (III, 2, 2), Stephanus Byzantius s.v. give the form *Κυνουρία*.

Pausanias recensing the regions and cities which combined in the foundation and population of Megalopolis, mentions (VIII, 27, 4): ἐκ δὲ Κυνουραίων τῶν ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ [8] Γόρτυς καὶ Θεισόα ἢ πρὸς Λυκαίῳ καὶ Λυκαιᾶται καὶ Ἀλίφειρα. This is the area to the north and north-east of mount *Λύκαιο*; Gortys is represented as near to the eastern boundary of the district. And it, or its acropolis, was built, as the remains show, on a lofty, precipitate and rugged hill by the Lusios river. This might be the ἄκρα of Stephanus called Cynosoura; but any height near by could do for a hypothesis that we rediscover the tomb of Aesculapius by the river Lousios, most probably near or in the famous Gortynian *Asclepieion*. –

However, there is a difficulty which appears to cast a slight shadow on such an attractive combination as the above detailed. For under the division of Arcadia among the three sons of Arcas, Elatos took the north-eastern part, round Kyllene (Pausanias VIII, 4, 4). The names of two of Elatos' sons (Κυλλήν and Στύμφαλος) (*ibid.*) as well as the location of the tomb of another son, Aipyros, unmistakably point to the same area. Aepyros reigned after Cleitor the son of Azan (*ibid.* §7) and his burying place was in a height called Σηπία named after σήψ, the putrefaction, a kind of snake there abounding in former times (and some few of which there still existed in Pausanias' time as

he was told by the locals); such a serpent killed Aepytyus there, and the body was decomposing with such rapidity that the people buried the king on the spot. Pausanias made a point of visiting the tomb which existed even in his time, as it was mentioned by Homer in the Arcadic catalogue, *Ilias* B, 604: Αἰπύτιος τύμβος ὑπὸ Κυλλήνης ὄρος αἰπύ. It consisted of a tumulus of earth not particularly large, encircled by a stone low-wall or foundation (ἔστι μὲν οὖν γῆς χῶμα οὐ μέγα, λίθου κρηπίδι ἐν κύκλῳ περιεχόμενον). Pausanias VIII, 16, 2-3. Σηπτία was just in front and before (to the west as we approach from the Pheneatis) the main expanse and summit of Cyllene (*ibid.*). The renowned worship of Hermes *Cyllenios* squares nicely with the above; there was a temple dedicated to him on the summit of Cyllene, and the synonymy of the three, the God, the mountain and Elatus' son is meaningful, just as Pausanias holds (VIII, 17, 1). More than this: in Tegea there was a temple dedicated to Ἑρμῆς Αἰπυτος (VIII, 47, 4) – and after all Αἰπυτος seems to be a symbolic representation of the *peaky* mountainous region that he inhabited, another Κυλλήν so to speak; and Homer wonderfully plays on this in his: Αἰπύτιος τύμβος ὑπὸ Κυλλήνης ὄρος αἰπύ. Κυλλήνη is the highest mountain in Arcadia, Pausanias VIII, 17, 1. Hermes Aipytos is an aspectual identification which renders this personification of Hermes a divine actual brother of Ἴσχυς, and thus uncle of the Aesculapius in question. The brotherhood of which, as Cicero speaks, would represent a variant

tradition of the same sort and pointing to the same direction: a *Cyllenian* parental origin for our Asclepius (cf. supra p. 9).

Elatos reigned for some time in the Cyllenian district. But afterwards he migrated to Phocis, shielded the inhabitants there from *Phlegyan* expansion and war incursions, and founded *Elateia* (Pausanias VIII, 4, 4), to the north of the Orchomenian northern Boeotia, the chief city of Phocis together with Delphes (Strabo IX, 424; 417-8; Pausanias X, 34, 1), at a key position for entrance to Southern Greece from Thessaly (cf. Strabo *loc.cit.*, who mentions in p. 424 Demosthenes' account of the alarm and consternation caused in Athens when a messenger arrived and told the Prytaneis that Philip has captured Elateia and proceeded with the restoration of its fortifications; Demosthenes, *de Corona* p. 284; Aeschines, *Contra Ctesiph.* p. 73; Diodorus XVI, 84). The Elateians themselves claimed their Arcadic provenance and confirmed the Arcadic account, Pausanias X, 34, 2: Ἀμφισβητοῦσι δὲ οὗτοι ξενικοῦ γένους, καὶ Ἀρκάδες φασὶν εἶναι τὸ ἀρχαῖον· Ἐλατον γὰρ τὸν Ἀρκάδος, ἥνικα ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερόν Φλεγῦαι τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἐστρατεύσαντο, ἀμῦναι τε τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐν τῇ Φωκίδι ὁμοῦ τῷ στρατεύματι αὐτὸν καταμείναντα Ἐλατείας οἰκιστὴν γενέσθαι.

There can be no doubt that Phlegyas, whatever the ultimate origination of his people (and the fact that it bore his name, makes him the symbolic representative of its character and history), was reigning in the Orchomenian area. And the words of the Homeric Hymn to

Apollo Pythius are conclusive (v. 100 sqq. = v. 278 sqq. of the unified version of a single Hymn to the god of Delos and of Delphes):

Ἴξες δ' ἐς Φλεγύων ἀνδρῶν πόλιν ὑβριστάων,
οἱ Διὸς οὐκ ἀλέγοντες ἐπὶ χθονὶ ναιετάασκον
ἐν καλῇ βήσση Κηφισίδος ἐγγύθι λίμνης.

By the famous Copais lake; which was Orchomenian in its entirety as is clear from Pausanias narration of origins, Haliartus and Coroneia belonging to the same territory (Pausanias IX, 34, 7-8); Lebadeia (37, 7). The sanctuary of Poseidon Ὀγχήστιος was most probably the boundary to the Theban territory, both on geographical reasons and in view of the story of the killing of Clymenos in Pausanias IX, 37, 1 sqq. The Homeric Catalogue, restricting the Minyans to Orchomenos and Aspledon on a relatively limited area to the north of Copais, represents the state of affairs at a later time. Even then, though, the Minyans contributed with thirty ships to the Iliadic expedition, as against the fifty of the entire rest of Boeotia. Although territorily restricted, however, they remained proverbially rich, as Pausanias observes, IX, 38, 8: ἐπεὶ μηδὲ ἄχρι τῶν Τρωϊκῶν χρήμασιν ἀδυνάτως εἶχον. μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι καὶ Ὅμηρος ἐν Ἀχιλλέως ἀποκρίσει πρὸς τοὺς παρὰ Ἀγαμέμνονος πρέσβεις:

οὐδ' ὅσ' ἐς Ὀρχομενὸν ποτινίσσεται, (*Ilias* I, 381)

δήλα δήπουθεν ὡς καὶ τότε προσιόντων τοῖς Ὀρχομενίοις χρημάτων πολλῶν. The Homeric passage is indeed impressive as the

next mentioned sole other example of mythic wealth is that of the Egyptian Thebes itself. –

Copais was formed by the confluence in the natural basin of the Orchomenian plain of the various rivers that descend all around (but for the East side) from the mountains, chief by far among whom is Cephissos. The geographical view is clear now that the lake has been totally dried up. The water was flowing subterraneously away under the mountains away through a number of natural catabothres at the east side, many of them uniting in their progress to form main channels or conduits of efflux before appearing at the other end. Three outlets had been discerned by the sea: one (from North to South) just south of the southern long walls of Opus. Next, the chief one, which carries the greater part of the waters of Cephissus, emerges as a wide and rapid stream at upper Larymna, runs overground for more than 2 km and finally flows into the sea by the Boeotean Larymna. The third is located by Anthedon. A fourth natural main channel carries excessive waters to the SE lying lake Ὑλίκη under the eastern extensions of the Sphinx mountain (Smith). The second one is explicitly mentioned by Strabo as the chasm which stopped the increase of the level of water in Copais (IX, 406); it was the only one visible by the lake, the others quietly drawing the water under the extensive marshes (IX, 407: ...αἱ δὲ ἐκρύσεις οὐδαμοῦ φαίνονται πλὴν τοῦ δεχομένου τὸν Κηφισὸν χάσματος καὶ τῶν ἐλῶν). In the vast swamps that the lake really consisted in [9], the path of the river

could be discerned by its slow movement and the reed clearances; and so one could rightly say that the chasm at the eastern side carried away the excessive amount of the waters of the river flowing in at the other end.

A Theban tradition held that Hercules, punishing the Orchomenians for their subjugation of Thebes, chocked the great chasm and thus flood the plain (v. Diodorus IV, 18: ἐν δὲ τῇ Βοιωτίᾳ τοῦναντίον (from what he did by freeing through Tempe the flow of Peneios, but similar to his work on behalf of Augeas in Elis) ἐμφράξας τὸ περὶ τὸν Μινύειον Ὀρχομενὸν ρεῖθρον, ἐποίησε λιμνάζειν τὴν χώραν, καὶ φθαρῆναι τὰ κατ' αὐτὴν ἅπαντα. ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν κατὰ τὴν Θετταλίαν ἔπραξε εὐεργετῶν τοὺς Ἕλληνας, τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν Βοιωτίαν, τιμωρίαν λαμβάνων παρὰ τῶν τὴν Μινυάδα κατοικούντων διὰ τὴν τῶν Θηβαίων καταδούλωσιν. V. Pausanias IX, 38, 7 (where the story is ascribed to Theban tradition); according to Polyaeus I, 3, 5, Hercules blocked the chasm by a wall and flooded the plain in order to render useless the Minyeian cavalry, but restored the free flow of the water after his victory. (It is significant in this connexion that ἦσαν δὲ ἵππομαχεῖν ἐν πεδίῳ Μινύαι δεινοί; and it was an epic standing epitheton of Phlegyas εὐῖππος. There must have been very extensive plains in the area by the lake). Pausanias (IX, 38, 7-8) criticizes the story first by appealing to Homer who (*Ilias* E, 709) refers to the lake not as anything but natural; and secondly he considers it unlikely that the Orchomenians given their immense

resources did not afterwards discovered the blockage of the chasm and freed it from whatever obstructions Hercules had created. Strabo (IX, 406) similarly refers the formation of Copais to the action of physical causes: the level of water was rising gradually and the town Κῶπαι (from which comes the predominant name of the lake, a town located at the lowest level of the ground, like in a μυχός, a nook, v. IX, 2, 27) was on the brink of being submerged when a large chasm was created and the process arrested.

I notice with satisfaction how less plausible and pragmatic the more apparently rationalistic account is. For we want a cause for the beginning of the gradual rising, unless one naively thinks of the beginning of things, the lake taking so long to emerge; and certainly a cause for the creation of the chasm. The mythological account, after all, has more explanatory power. Combining therefore Gods, History and Nature, this is how I reconstruct the sequence of events. Whether there was a tendency for the water to concentrate there over a long period in more and more volume or not, the Minyans controlled the situation by extensive and for the narrowminded progressionists almost incredible for the age works, including extensive drainage, developed canal system, and artificial embarkment of the three chief river flows, from the North and NW, the W and the South sides of the plain. More stupendous than all else: they formed some natural passages into a continuous artificial subterranean channel running approximately parallel to the main natural one above mentioned and emerging at

about the same place in upper Larymna; and they effected the same, on a smaller scale, to the lake Ὑλίκη underneath the Acraephion plain, lying between Ptoon and Sphinx Mountains. There are vertical shafts let down into the channels in both cases, twenty in the former case (with square apertures on top) and from eight to about fifteen in the second case (Smith from Forschammer's *Hellenica*). I suppose this marvelous work to have been done just after the disaster that befell the Phlegyans.

But Phlegyan impious arrogance and martial ferocity, the stupendous audacity of those wise warlords, when it reached its climax in a godlike unimpeded exercise of their Iron forging will (of which the assault on Delphes is the majestic outrage that scandalizes most), excited the divine Wrath; the God destroyed Phlegyans, the flower of the nation, *κεραυνοῖς συνεχέσι καὶ ἰσχυροῖς σεισμοῖς* as we have seen (Pausanias, IX, 36, 3). Those tremendous earthquakes probably disrupted the unimpeded flow of water in the subterranean passages, while the continual storms, fiery thunderbolts and torrential rains created a cataclysm; the guilty were destroyed, and their towns sunk under water. Phlegya, the country of the Phlegyans, disappeared, and with it the reputed Boeotian Athens and Eleusis (Pausanias IX, 24,2: Λέγουσι δὲ οἱ Βοιωτοὶ καὶ πολίσματα ἄλλα πρὸς τῇ λίμνῃ ποτέ, Ἀθήνας καὶ Ἐλευσῖνα, οἰκειῖσθαι, καὶ ὡς ὥρα χειμῶνος ἐπικλύσσασα ἠφάνισεν αὐτὰ ἡ λίμνη).

In Alexander's time and doubtlessly by his high and great-minded command, Crates a metal mining engineer from Chalcis, undertook to free the blocked passages and had proceeded so far as to dry up the shallowest southwest parts of the lake to the extent of making appear the ruins of submerged towns. The Boeotians however revolted to the idea of such an outrage committed on nature and the natural state of things and the infamous, glorious but sacrilegious work, had to stop [10]. Strabo, IX, 407: *πάλιν δ' ἐγχουμένων τῶν πόρων* (this is Strabo's rationalization, of the same sort as the previous one), *ὁ μεταλλευτῆς Κράτης, ἀνὴρ Χαλκιδεύς, ἀνακαθαίρειν τὰ ἐμφράγματα ἐπαύσατο, στασιασάντων τῶν Βοιωτῶν, καίπερ, ὡς αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον ἐπιστολῇ φησιν, ἀνεψυγμένων ἤδη πολλῶν, ἐν οἷς οἱ μὲν τὸν Ὀρχομενὸν οἰκεῖσθαι τὸν ἀρχαῖον ὑπελάμβανον, οἱ δ' Ἐλευσίνα καὶ Ἀθήνας παρὰ τὸν Τρίτωνα ποταμόν. λέγεσθαι <δ' οἰκίσαι> Κέκροπα, ἠνίκα τῆς Βοιωτίας ὑπῆρξε, καλουμένης τότε Ὠγυγίας, ἀφανισθῆναι δὲ ταύτας ἐπικλυσθειῖσας ὕστερον. Triton was a riverlet, or rather torrent, by Alalcomenae, (Pausanias IX, 33, 7), with glorious religious significance: *Ρεῖ δὲ καὶ ποταμὸς ἐνταῦθα, οὐ μέγας, χεῖμαρρος· ὀνομάζουσι δὲ Τρίτωνα αὐτὸν ὅτι τὴν Ἀθηναῖν τραφῆναι παρὰ ποταμῷ Τρίτωνι ἔχει λόγος, ὡς δὴ τοῦτον τὸν Τρίτωνα ὄντα καὶ οὐχὶ τὸν Λιβύων, ὃς εἰς τὴν πρὸς Λιβύη θάλασσαν ἐκδίδωσιν ἐκ τῆς Τριτωνίδος λίμνης* [11].*

It is evident that Pausanias is somehow skeptical about the contention. And it is true that the weightier evidence connects the Goddess with Libya. However *meaning takes precedence over geography* without excluding or compromising the latter's point. Cf. Scholia in *Apollonius, Argonautica*, IV, 1311: Τρίτων ποταμὸς Λιβύης, ἔστι δὲ καὶ Βοιωτίας. Δοκεῖ δὲ ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ παρ' ἑτέρω αὐτῶν γεγενῆσθαι, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ Τριτογένεια λέγεται. οὕτω τινές· οἱ δέ, ἢ τὸ τρεῖν, ὃ ἔστι φοβεῖσθαι, τοῖς δι' ἐναντίας ἐμποιοῦσα. (Scholia A in *Ilias*, Θ, 39 ascribe the latter meaning to Homer (πολεμικὴ γὰρ ἡ θεός), and the former to οἱ νεώτεροι). Ἡ ὅτι γεννηθεῖσαν ἔτρεσαν αὐτὴν οἱ θεοὶ add the scholia A, B in *Ilias*, Δ, 515. The derivation from τρεῖν is impugned by τῆε γρεατ γραμμαριαν Herodianus according to Choeroboskos apud *Et. Magnum* s.v. Τριτογένεια (767.52 sqq.): ἐπειδὴ (ὡς φησιν ὁ τεχνικός) τὰ τοιαῦτα εἰς πάθη ἀναλύονται, καὶ οὐκ εἰς ἐνέργειαν· οἷον λυκηγενῆς, ὁ ἐν Λυκίᾳ γεγεννημένος, ἠριγενῆς, ὁ ἐν τῷ ἔαρι γεννηθείς. οὕτως οὖν καὶ τριτογένεια, ἢ ἐκ τοῦ τρεῖν γεννωμένη, οὐ μὴν ἢ τὸ τρεῖν γεννώσα. Χοιροβοσκός. But this, with due respect, is too rigid; certainly it is potent and sufficient to understand *her whose birth was perpetrated in terror, her of the Fearful Birth*. It should always be borne in mind the Hesiodic account of the goddess' geniture, either in the extant form (*Theogonia*, 886-900 and 924-6) or in the form preserved by Chrysippus apud Galenus, *de plac. Hippocr. et Plat.*, III 8 p. 318, 3 M (V. 349 sqq. K), which was read either in a final non extant part of *Theogony* or, rather, in the *Hoīai*. The story

is a marvel of divine magic, assimilative anthropophagy and monstrous birth. Cf. also the very significant interpretation in Clemens Romanus, *Homiliae*, IV, 16: τοῖς δὲ ἀρρητουργεῖν θέλουσι τὴν Μητριν γεννήσας κατέπιεν· ἦν δὲ ἡ Μητις γονή, he swallowed his own semen (cf. V, 12; 23; VI, 2 where Dionysus' birth from the "thigh" is connected to the same idea; 20). However I do not decide the intricate question here.

Furthermore, there was a temple of Athena as the chief sanctuary there in Boeotia with an elephantine antique statue, plundered by Sulla; the name of the place (κώμη), (Pausanias IX, 33, 5), was taken according to some from Alalcomenes, an autochthon who reared Athena; or as others thought, from Alalcomenia, daughter of Ogygus – another Athenian connection. (Ogygus the king and Ogygia the country, (both Boeotia and Attica, but with the focus in the former rather than the latter), point unmistakably to the primeval unity of the two regions and the phyletic community or affinity of the inhabiting peoples [12]: Ἄονες, Ἰάονες and Ἴωνες, the same tribal group, were common aboriginal inhabitants of the two districts).

Nearby, before we reach Coroneia, there was the famous sanctuary of Ἴωνία Ἀθηνᾶ, ἀπὸ Ἰώνου τοῦ Ἀμφικτυόνου, καὶ εἰς τὸν κοινὸν συνίασιν ἐνταῦθα οἱ Βοιωτοὶ σύλλογον (Pausanias, IX, 34, 1); cf. Strabo IX, 411.

I consider as very likely that the primeval Boeotian Athens was by the river Triton. As to Eleusis, it might have been by Κῶπαι, in the

NE, where *Δήμητρος καὶ Διονύσου καὶ Σαράπιδός ἐστιν ἱερά* (Pausanias, IX, 24, 2); especially as Pausanias chooses this very place to inform us about the primeval sunk cities. But as Athens is on the other side, and in drying up the western shallower ground would first appear, one might think of the river Hercyna, which, having its sources in a cave within the Trophonian grotto in Lebadeia, flows into western Copais, Pausanias IX, 39, 2. The water was found by a young lady Hercyna, a nymphic personage who was there playing with Core (*ibid.*). But Hercyna was an epitheton of Demeter herself as well, v. Lycophron, *Alexandra*, 152 sqq., where he relates Demeter's sacred and ritual eating of Pelops' shoulder:

οὗ πάππον (sc. Pelops) ἐν γαμφαῖσιν Ἐνναία ποτὲ
 Ἔρκυνν' Ἐρινὺς Θουρία Ξιφηφόρος
 ἄσαρκα μιστύλασα τύμβευσεν φάρω
 τὸν ὠλενίτην χόνδρον ἐνδατουμένη.

Scholia and Tzetzes *ad loc.*: Ἐρκυνα ἢ Τροφωνίου θυγάτηρ ἐν Λεβάδι τῆς Βοιωτίας ἰδρύσατο τὴν θεὸν καὶ ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς ὠνόμασεν Ἐρκυναν. (It is significant of the Boeotian character that: ἐν τῇ Βοιωτίᾳ ἰδρυται ἡ Δημήτηρ ξίφος ἔχουσα ὅθεν ξιφηφόρον αὐτὴν εἶπεν). There was also a feast called Ἐρκύνια, Hesychius s.v. Ἐρκύνια (*pro* Ἐρκήνια)· ἑορτὴ Δήμητρος.

There was a place nearby on the sides of a height called *Κόρης θήρα* with a temple of *Zeus Basileus* (§4), whom I believe to be the chthonic Zeus. Just as in Coroneia Pausanias (IX, 34, 1) speaks of

the bronze statues of Ἀθηνᾶς Ἰτωνίας καὶ Διός made by Pheidias' favourite and beloved (παιδικά) Agoracritus, while Strabo (IX, 411) relates that συγκαθίδρυσται δὲ τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ ὁ Ἄδης κατὰ τινα, ὡς φασι, μυστικὴν αἰτίαν. Athena as Maiden was aspectually identified with Κόρη par excellence, Persephone and Artemis being equally well various personages of the same holy, high, virginal *Triad, three hypostases and personae of the same Coric essence and Virginal substance.*

Lower down there was a sanctuary of Δήμητρα Εὐρώπη (*ibid.*) who was considered as τροφός, *nutrix, of Τροφώνιος* (§5). A Cadmeian connection is indicated by Εὐρώπη (= Σελήνη, the broad-faced, in full moon), but Trophonius was of veritable Orchomenian stock, combining high wisdom in artistry with primeval horrors; v. Pausanias IX, 37, 4-7 for his progeny and enormities; and the stunning narration in 39, 5-14 about Trophonian divination. This appears to have been grafted on an original worship of the divine Mother and the raped Daughter. Eleusis could be, thus, indeed and appropriately by the Hercyna river. -

Strabo, speaks finally of an ἀρχαῖος Ὀρχομενός reemerging according to some during the Cratetian drying up of the lake in Alexander's time. And in IX, 416 he repeats: πρότερον μὲν οὖν οἰκεῖσθαι τὸν Ὀρχομενὸν φασιν ἐπὶ πεδίῳ, ἐπιπολαζόντων δὲ τῶν ὑδάτων, ἀνοικισθῆναι πρὸς τὸ Ἀκόντιον ὄρος, παρατεῖνον ἐπὶ ἑξήκοντα σταδίους μέχρι Παραποταμίων τῶν ἐν τῇ Φωκίδι. A very accurate description of the actual geographical situation. The location

on Acontion gives the extant place of the submerged city. The old Orchomenos might be the city of Phlegyas that the God destroyed by cataclysms and earthquakes. The two other towns might have been submerged in Deukalion's time. It is by the way very significant that both main mythological cataclysms in the Greek area concentrate around the *Boeotian* basin; which is already indicated as the true source, cradle and center of Hellenism, together with Peloponessus and Crete. –

The stupendous works relating to the artificial channels may have been occasioned by Phlegyas' destruction; or their very audacity might have contributed to the divine danger. They may be safely however placed thereabout, as they actually are. For there followed the enormous concentration of wealth (which is also indicated by the very names *Χρύσης* and *Χρύση* and *Χρυσογένεια*), part of which no doubt resulted from the methodical intensive overcultivation of an extremely fertile plain, as Strabo observed (IX, 415: λέγουσι δὲ τὸ χωρίον, ὅπερ ἢ λίμνη κατέχει νῦν ἢ Κωπαῖς, ἀνεψύχθαι πρότερον καὶ γεωργεῖσθαι παντοδαπῶς ὑπὸ τῶν Ὀρχομενίων πλησίων οἰκούντων (or ὑπὸ <τῶν> τοῖς Ὀρχομενίοις πλησίον οἰκούντων; for the transmitted ὑπὸ τοῖς Ὀρχομενίοις ὧν πλησίον οἰκοῦσι is corrupt; and ὧν I take to be an initial superscripted *ων* meant to correct the datives (not impossible but unlike for Strabo's κοινή) to genitives). But a principal source was due also to the military supremacy and prowess of the Orchomenians. As it is connected to the royal names of

Minyas and Orchomenos; and is typified in the construction of the monumental Thesaurus (for Pausanias; or tomb for the moderns) of Minyas; of which Pausanias most appositely comments: Πρόσοδοι δὲ ἐγίνοντο τῷ Μινύα τηλικαῦται μέγεθος ὡς ὑπερβαλέσθαι τοὺς πρὸ αὐτοῦ πλούτῳ· θησαυρόν τε ἀνθρώπων ὧν ἴσμεν Μινύας πρῶτος ἐς ὑποδοχὴν χρημάτων ὠκοδομήσατο. Ἑλληνες δὲ ἄρα εἰσὶ δεινοὶ τὰ ὑπερόρια ἐν θαύμασι τίθεσθαι μείζονι ἢ τὰ οἰκεῖα, ὅποτε γε ἀνδράσιν ἐπιφανέσιν ἐς συγγραφὴν πυραμίδας μὲν τὰς παρὰ Αἰγυπτίοις ἐπῆλθεν ἐξηγήσασθαι πρὸς τὸ ἀκριβέστατον, θησαυρόν δὲ τὸν Μινύου καὶ τὰ τείχη τὰ ἐν Τίρυνθι οὐδὲ ἐπὶ βραχὺ ἤγαγον μνήμης, οὐδὲν ὄντα ἐλάττονος θαύματος (IX, 36, 4-5).

So much regarding those futile people of Pindar mentioned above, when by proliferation they become a national menace. The high artistry of the Orchomenians is also manifested by the capacities and works of the brothers Trophonius and Agamedes. Τούτους φασίν, ὡς ηὔξηθησαν, γενέσθαι δεινοὺς θεοῖς τε ἱερὰ κατασκευάσασθαι καὶ βασιλεία ἀνθρώποις· καὶ γὰρ τῷ Απόλλωνι τὸν ναὸν ὠκοδόμησαν τὸν ἐν Δελφοῖς καὶ Ὑριεῖ τὸν θησαυρόν. Pausanias IX, 37, 5. The following story regarding the latter monument testifies to their amazing craftsmanship. The extant prehistoric magnificently enormous fortifications at Gla in the northeastern extremity of lake Copais prove the tales of the Minyan wonders to be true history. The site is located next to the wondrous drainage works that kept in those earliest times under control the water level. All conspires to turn myth into history.

The coming of Elatos to Phocis is connected, as we have seen, with his support to the Delphian oracle against the Phlegyan onslaught, but his final settlement in Eleateia to the north, but both near and with open communication (along the plains of the Cephissus river) to Orchomenian territory, need not have been in unmitigated hostility to them. The very story of the marriage of his son with Phlegyas' daughter points to some pacific arrangement in equilibrium. If there has been one (or one major) actual attack (as distinct from continuous pressure or sporadic incursions) of the Phlegyans on the Pythian Sanctuary with the purpose of plundering, as Pausanias' phrasing indicates and as is in itself likely, then we must combine Elatos' arrival to Phocis with Philammon's presence there to the same purpose and effect (*Paus.* IX, 36, 2): τέλος δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερόν συλήσοντες στρατεύουσι τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς, ὅτε καὶ Φιλάμμων λογάσιν Ἀργείων ἐπ' αὐτοὺς (sc. τοὺς Φλεγύας) βοηθήσας αὐτός τε ἀπέθανεν ἐν τῇ μάχῃ καὶ οἱ τῶν Ἀργείων λογάδες. (Philammon, the holy man and singer, was singularly connected with Argos; he instituted, according to the local tradition, the Lernaian Mystic Telete, Pausanias II, 37, 2. He resided in Parnassos, v. especially scholia in *Odyssea*, τ, 432, from *Pherecydes*, where he impregnated with *Thamyris* the nymph Argiope (Pausanias, IV, 33, 3); he sung and won in primeval Pythic celebrations, Pausanias, X, 7, 2).

If Philammon's and Elatos' defence of the Sanctuary coincided, the latter's foundation of Eleateia seems rather as the balancing gift to

the compromised lessened party than as the result of war acquisition. After all Elateia protected the Orchomenian territory from Northern incursions to Boeotia. Remarkably the same shielding function seems to have played Ἰηττός, another foundation by an Argive leader (Paus. IX, 36, 6-7), indubitably paeaceful this one and under the aegis of Orchomenos, as the *Μεγάλαι Ἡοῖαι* testify (apud Pausanias). Ἰηττός lied on the high mountainous road to the coast, v. Pausanias, IX, 24, 3-5. The highway (λεωφόρος) from Ὀρχομενός to Opus passed through Ἰάμπολις (the aboriginal Ἰαντες of Southern Boeotia founded it, after having been expelled by the Cadmeians); by this road, remarkably as part of the same shield, lied Abae: οἱ δὲ ἐν ταῖς Ἄβαις ἐς γῆν τὴν Φωκίδα λέγουσιν ἀφικέσθαι ἐξ Ἄργους, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα ἀπὸ Ἄβαντος τοῦ οἰκιστοῦ λαβεῖν τὴν πόλιν, τὸν δὲ Λυγκέως τε καὶ Ἰπερμνήστρας τῆς Δαναοῦ παῖδα εἶναι (Pausanias, X, 35, 1).

Elatos went to Phocis and founded Elateia. His son, Ischys may have tempted Coronis the daughter of Phlegyas. And hence probably sprung the destructive form of the story on Boeotian soil; which was then transplanted to Thessaly based on synonymies and supported by poetic usages, but chiefly founded on the general projection of *Aeolicism from eastern central Greece to those vast plains in its north*. Thessaly, consonantly to her nature, too, was the fertile receptor and

nourisher of Graecanism, not the initial originator and progenitor. The transplantation of stock happened at two main steps: first with the coming of the brothers Pelasgus, Achaeus and Phthius (Dionysius Halicarnasseus, *Antiqu. Rom.*, I, 17); secondly with the arrival, after Deucalion's deluge, of Hellen.

But, nonetheless, the tradition regarding the Phlegyan connection of Asclepius, such as I have explained it above in detail, was and remained undoubtedly *Peloponnesian*.

It is highly significant that in all Boeotia Pausanias does not mention a single sanctuary, temple or statue dedicated to Asclepius [13]. In Ἰηττός the healing function is assumed by Hercules, as not unfrequently is the case (Pausanias IX, 24, 3). The divine Image is no work of art but *λίθος ἀργός κατὰ τὸ ἀρχαῖον* – a proof of extreme antiquity. Nor was there anything worth of mention in the entire Phocis, but for the exception of precisely *Elateia* with its temple to the God (Pausanias X, 34, 6 [14]) and of the unique Asclepieion in the district, honoured by all Phoceans, 70 stadia (~ 12 km) from Tithorea in

an unspecified (but I believe SE) direction (X, 32, 12). This is again the Cephissian plain, indeed not far from Elateia [15].

On the other hand Peloponnesus teems with places of importance consecrated to the Healing God [16].

In Epidaurus, and according to the divine revelation from Apollo himself, the Phlegyan connection is pure and without the dark colours of the common, poetic (and Thessalian) account. But in the tradition of the second Ciceronian Aesculapius born from Ischys (so far as the human fathership is concerned) and Coronis we probably have the sign of that other variation. Perhaps the gloomy aspect was elaborated in Phlegyan territory; and the story of divine vengeance only too eagerly seized on by Aeolic hybristic arrogance, and too well cultivated and propagated in Thessaly, the country of fantastic magic, monstrous cruelty and of boiling, boistering magnificent vanity.

The second Mercury, born of the same parents, is the one, Cicero tells us (§56), *qui sub terris habetur idem Trophonius* (cf. Arnobius IV, 14, who, unfortunately, does not give the parentage of this Trophonius-Hermes). This again stresses the Phlegyan dimension. For Trophonius, according to the common story, was the son of Apollo on the divine, or Erginus on the human, level, the famous king of *Orchomenus* (Pausanias IX, 37, 4-5). Furthermore, Charax from Pergamus (probably in his voluminous *Ἑλληνικά*) gave a fully Arcadian, and indeed Cyllenian, setting to the dark, fatidical, hero, by identifying his associate Agamedes with the Arcadian synonymous

hero. Apud *Scholia* in Aristophanes *Nubes*, 508: Agamedes is husband of Epicaste, mother (from some divine, no doubt Apollonian, agency) of Trophonius and (truly from Agamedes) of Cercyon – this Agamedes being a chief and lord in Stymphalos of Arcadia. We recognize here, according to the detailed Arcadian genealogies in *Pausanias*, the Agamedes, father of Cercyon indeed (5, 4), brother of *Gortys* and son of Stymphalos (VIII, 4, 8), who was son of Elatos and brother of *Ischys* (4, 4). If we correct Charax by making Trophonius' coadjutor Agamedes his *brother* according to the ordinary account, we can easily accommodate the Ciceronian testimony as to the *Ischyian* fathership (whether nominal or real) of Trophonius-Hermes (we have already noticed the worship of Aipytus-Hermes). After all, Ἀγα-μήδης, like Γανυ-μήδης, connotes phallic magnificence and virility, glowing in the latter, grandiose in the former: Agamedes is, in a sense, the Cyllenian tumescent and erect, chthonian Hermes. While Trophonius' statue in his Lebadeian Temple, the work of Praxiteles, was made in the likeness of Asclepius, Ἀσκληπιῶ καὶ τοῦτο εἰκασμένον, just as the images in the sacred cave are ἀγάλματα ὀρθά, περιειλιγμένοι δέ εἰσιν αὐτῶν τῆς σκήπτροις δράκοντες. Ταῦτα εἰκάσαι μὲν ἂν τις Ἀσκληπιοῦ τε εἶναι καὶ Ὑγίειας, εἶεν δ' ἂν Τροφώνιος καὶ Ἔρκυνα, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ τοὺς δράκοντες Ἀσκληπιοῦ μᾶλλον ἢ καὶ Τροφωνίου νομίζουσιν ἱεροὺς εἶναι (Pausanias IX, 39, 3-4).

The *Cyllenian* centering and focusing of this account of Asclepius has been rendered unmistakeable. And thus we have seen that in

antique Titane, *Coronis* was acknowledged, albeit peculiarly. Her xoanon was not consecrated within her son's temple; when the great sacrifice of *suovotaurlia* was offered to Asclepius, the aboriginal statue was carried to the temple of Athena on the hill, and there honoured (Pausanias, II, 11, 7). This singular ritual distancing, does not imply any *external* conjunction of independent traditions (as ignorant moderns were prone to imagine), but stems from the *divine and chthonic nature* of Aesculapius; for greater emphasis on the *human mother*, would tend to indicate *heroic* character. His uncompromised divine status, right from the beginning, is acutely and elegantly stressed by Pausanias, II, 26, 10: θεὸν δὲ Ἀσκληπιὸν νομισθέντα ἐξ ἀρχῆς, καὶ οὐκ ἀνὰ χρόνον λαβόντα τὴν φήμην, τεκμηρίοις καὶ ἄλλοις εὐρίσκω, καὶ Ὅμηρου μαρτυρεῖ μοι τὰ περὶ Μαχάονος ὑπὸ Ἀγαμέμνονος εἰρημένα (*Ilias* Δ, 193-4):

Ταλθύβι' ὅττι τάχιστα Μαχάονα δεῦρο κάλεσσον
φῶτ' Ἀσκληπιοῦ υἱόν,

ὡς ἂν εἰ λέγοι θεοῦ παῖδα ἄνθρωπον. Nicely and exquisitely. –

His chthonicity, furthermore, is evidenced in the very passage referred to (II, 11, 7) by the *burning entire* of the sacrificial victims on *the surface of the earth* (thus in an *ἐσχάρα*), and not on the altar (except for the birds): ὅποσα δὲ τῶν θυομένων καθαγίζουσιν, οὐδὲ ἀποχρᾶ σφίσιν ἐκτέμνειν τοὺς μηροὺς <ἀλλ' ὀλοκαυτοῦσι>, χαμαὶ δὲ καίουσι πλὴν τοὺς ὄρνιθας, τούτους δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ. What I conjecturally added in clarification of the obvious sense, is not

really necessary for Pausanias' tense and moderately *closed*, *recherché*, and *removed* style [17]. –

The connection of Coronis with Athena in Titane, may very likely relate to some unknown local mythological story and account. But nonetheless the *general tutelage* on health was in Attica entrusted to Athena: on the Acropolis there were statues of Hygieia, daughter of Asclepius, and of *Athena Hygieia* (Pausanias I, 23, 4) [18]; in Acharnae there was an altar of *Athena-Hygieia* (I, 31, 6); a statue of *Ἀθηνᾶ Παιωνία* existed in the infamous house of Poulytion, exquisitely and appropriately consecrated to Διόνυσος Μουσηγέτης by the religious Athenians afterwards (I, 2, 5); finally, in the renowned altar of Amphiaraus in Oropus the fourth part and potency was devoted jointly to Ἀφροδίτη and Πανάκεια and Ἴασώ and Ὑγίεια and *Ἀθηνᾶ Παιωνία* (I, 34, 3). On the symbolic level, the goddess of *War* and *Wise Artistry* would, both by virtue of her general *shielding*, *preserving* and *protective* function, and because of her tutorship of all non-mechanical non-manufacturing arts, naturally extend her care and discipline to the area of health. Furthermore, the connection with the eminently Boeotian Goddess may also signify, on the phyletico-historico-cultural level, once more the Orchomenian dimension of the Cyllenian Asclepius.

But this Cyllenian Aesculapius is brought in a certain connection with Gortys in the arcadic Kynouria. For the city was founded by *Gortys the son of Stymphelus*, brother of *Ischys*, these brothers being *sons*

of *Elatys* (Pausanias VIII, 4, 8). And in the Στοά in the Asclepieion of Titane there was a statue of *Ἀσκληπιὸς Γορτύνιος* (II, 11, 8). It is naïve to suppose that this eponymy entails the transfer of the Aesculapian cult from Gortys to Titane; such epitheta may equally well denote exactly the reverse, i.e. the *origination* of the worship signified in them at the place where it is located, or, also, a varied band of connectednesses ranging from *appropriation through assimilation to subordination*.

In the present case, the Messenian and Cyllenian-Epidaurian Aesculapii met appropriately in Gortys, and found each other the same with himself in essence though differing in origin. This provides the key to the entire question.

It also removes the difficulty noticed above (p. 16) regarding the identification of *Κυνόσουρα* with a height in the area of Gortys, and the location of the searched for Aesculapean tomb probably near or in the Gortynian Asclepieion. The present hypothesis would nicely suit the constraints of the problem: there was *one tomb* existing, and *two* traditions of origin living, in Arcadia. The distinguisher or discriminator of the various hypostatic personages of each divinity (from whom Cicero and the other later writers drew) assigned the one burial place under two descriptions to the two candidates. –

However, obnoxious details stand in the way of the practical certainty desired in such suppositions. *For one*, both Cicero and Johannes Lydus seem to imply by their phrasing on its most natural acceptance that the tomb of the second, as opposed to that of the third, Asclepius did *not* lie in Arcadia (v. pp. 7-8) – not to mention the Scholiast on Clemens Alexandrinus who explicitly translates the relevant and wanted Cynosoura to the Spartan district. Of course their source wants *two* tombs, but not necessarily one outside Arcadia. Yet we must recollect that no burial place of Asclepius was widely and surely known in antiquity; Cyrillus of Alexandria, *Contra Julianum*, VIII p. 288B (ed. Spanheim): τί γὰρ τῶν Ἀσκληπιοῦ γέγονεν ἀξιάκουστον; (it takes quite some nerve to ask this even rhetorically!) μᾶλλον δὲ τίς οὕτω διόλωλεν οἰκτρῶς; κατεπρήσθη γὰρ κεραυνῶ, καὶ μὴν καὶ εἰς δεῦρο κεῖται νεκρός, οὐδὲ ὅποι ποτε γῆς ἐστὶν εἰδότες τῶν προσκυνούντων αὐτῶ (or αὐτόν) [19]. And indeed no other source indicates *any* resting place for Asclepius *despite his fulmination*. Pausanias gives not the slightest intimation in his detailed periegesis. He naturally would disapprove and discredit any such information given his insistence on the pure and whole divinity of the God; yet it is not consistent with his mode and manner to simply withhold such local relation, should he knew of it, without at the very least giving notice of his reticence. (The thunderstriking was a *poetic* and not a *localized* feature of the story; he does no mention what, being repugnant to his belief, finds no occasion to narrate).

I conclude amidst such dearth of direct and incontrovertible evidence, that two well-defined burial spots for Asclepius are too many; that the one in Arcadian Kynosoura by the Lousios river was remote and restricted in ἐμβέλεια; and that the two tombs of the hypostases-distinguishing source is an Alexandrian erroneous inference, or more probably of harmonizing syncretism, probably from two distinct and different mentions of the same spot in older texts. –

Secondly, the sheer extent and weight of the Aesculapian presence in Sparta particularly and in Laconia generally tends by itself to support Spartan Kynosoura as the location of his Memorial. Pausanias mentions three (III, 14, 2; 14, 7; 15, 10) important Asclepian sanctuaries in the city and one just outside, on the left bank of Eurotas (III, 19, 7). Though the district Λίμναι extended on that other side; v. Strabo VIII, p. 364: Μεσσόαν δ' οὐ τῆς χώρας εἶναι μέρος <ἀλλὰ> (added correctly by Coraes) τῆς Σπάρτης, καθάπερ καὶ τὸ Λιμναῖον κατὰ τὸν <Θόρνα>κα (according to Meineke's suppletion, vastly preferable to the alternative <Θοῤῥα>κα), the mountain just opposite Sparta to the N-NE towards Sellasia (at the foot of which lied Therapnae).

The way Pausanias describes the third sanctuary is significant: τῶν δὲ Ἀσκληπιείων τὸ ἐπιφανέστατον πεποιήται σφισι πρὸς τοῖς Βωωνήτοις. And he has, at the beginning of the Spartan periegesis, just heralded his unflinching determination to relate the most important and significant things among those that he saw or heard (III, 11, 1). In

fact, the matter can be pushed even further. For this Asclepieion lied probably at the interior boundaries of Κynosoura towards Limnae, and, perhaps, Mesoa. It is mentioned in Pausanias' march from Δρόμος at the west to the east (beginning at III, 15, 6); the sanctuary of Orthia Artemis on the east side is reached in the course of this description (16, 7 sqq.), whose location has been found and identified. The Asclepieion in question is by the famous Βοώνητα; which latter lie along the road Ἀφεταῖς (12, 1) and, to judge from the context, near the beginning of the street, at the Agora; Ἀφεταῖς being the main avenue to the south, continued outside the city by the road to Amyclae, and roughly representing probably the division line between Κυνόσουρα and Μεσόα. The agora lied just to the west of the excavated theater (14, 1). Drawing a line to the west from the Λιμναῖον, and to the south from the Agora we get the approximate position of Βοώνητα, where the major Asclepieion was, at the *boundary of Κυνόσουρα*, as foretold.

The first mentioned sanctuary was in Πιτάνη (14, 2), ἐν Ἀγιαδῶν as the spot was called from the tombs of the royal race of Agiads lying there. The Δρόμος was further down to the south and at the west extremity of the town; for there it was the Πλατανηστᾶς, circumflown by the river (Ποτάμι τῆς Μαγούλας), 14, 8. To the *right* as one walks from the burial place of Agiadae to the δρόμος (v. 14, 7 in conjunction with 14, 6), therefore at the *very exterior boundary of Κυνόσουρα*, lied the sanctuary of Ἀσκληπιὸς Ἀγνίτας, so called according to Pausanias because the xoanon of the God was made from

the wood of the plant of chastity, ἄγνος. We further learn from an inscription (n. 1444 in the Böckhian *Corpus I.G. = IG, V 1, 602*; S. Wide, *Lakonische Kulte*, p. 182) of an Ἀσκληπιὸς Σχοινάτας: Πονπ[ω]νίαν Καλλ[ι]στονεΐκην Ἀρίστου ἰέρεια[ν] διὰ [β]ίου [καὶ] διὰ γένους τῆς ἐπιφ[ανε]στάτης θεοῦ Ἀρτέμιδ[ος] Ὀ[ρ]θείας κ[αὶ] τῶν συνκ[α]θειδρυμένων αὐτῇ θε[ε]ῶν καὶ Μοιρῶν Λαχέσεων κ[αὶ] Ἀφροδείτης Ἐνοπλίου καὶ Ἀσκληπιουῦ Σχοινάτα ἐ[ν] τῷ Ἐλει καὶ Ἀρτέμιδ[ος] Πατριώτιδος ἐν Πλείαις καὶ Δ[ιο]σκούρων etc. Whether by Ἐλος the famous old town is meant or marshes in Sparta [20], the cult no doubt existed in the capital. Swamps abounded in the Eurotas' section of the city (as the very name *Λίμναι* typically clarifies), but also, probably on the western side, by the river of Magoula, where the Ἀγνίτας was worshipped. It may well be that the Σχοινάτας was co-honoured with the Ἀγνίτας, or even that the two were aspectually identified, ἄγνος and σχοῖνος being both characteristic watery plants. Now a valuable but corrupt Hesychian gloss runs thus s.v. σχινάτας· σχινατίων ἄγών τις ἐπιτάφιος ἐν Λακεδαίμονι. The unmeaning beginning should I believe be restored to health as follows:

Σχινάτας· <Ἀσκληπιὸς ἐν Ἐλει *vel.* Λακεδαίμονι>

Σχινατίων· ἄγών τις ἐπιτάφιος ἐν Λακεδαίμονι.

The feast and games were called τὰ Σχινάτια. Connecting the two lemmata we could have positive if indirect proof of the existence of Asclepius' memorial in Sparta and, very likely, on the very boundary of Cynosoura, as required. Σχοινάτας is but an incorrect writing of

Σχινάτας. For in the few lines of the inscription we have, besides the understandable but still overdone substitution of ει for the simple ι (Καλλιστονεΐκην, ὀρθείας, συνκαθειδουμένων, Αφροδείτης), the ominous Ἀσκληπιοῡ. Σχοῖνος was furthermore more common than σχῖνος, which on the other hand is more religiously appropriate in view of the *cathartic properties of σκίλλα*, another name for the same plant, v. Plutarchus, *Pericles*, 3; Hesychius s.v. σχῖνος; *Scholia ad Aristophanes, Plutus* 720, although Theophrastus differentiated between the two appellations. The *purificatory σχῖνος* and the *sanctifying ἄγνος* go well together.

All this is undoubtedly strong, but it sensitively rests on a number of combinations which any small dischanneling information can disrupt. Thus we hear of another ἐπιτάφιος ἄγων in inscription CIG 1417 (= Griechische Dialekts-Inschriften 4472 = IG, V 1, 660): Ἀ πόλις Κλέωνα Σωσικράτους ἀγωνισάμενον τὸν ἐπιτάφι[ον Λεωνίδα] καὶ Πausαν[ία καὶ τῶν λοι]πῶν ἡρώω[v ἀγῶνα καὶ (?) στεφα]νωθέντ[α etc. That the two old hero-kings are honoured here is made certain by Pausanias III, 14, 1: τοῦ θεάτρου δὲ ἀπαντικρὺ Πausανίου τοῦ Πλαταιᾶσιν ἡγησαμένου μνημᾶ ἐστι, τὸ δὲ ἕτερον Λεωνίδου· καὶ λόγους κατὰ ἔτος ἕκαστον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς λέγουσι (remarkable given Laconic reservedness and mistrust to speeches but they naturally trusted that even rhetoric cannot but sublimize itself if expended on such resplendent subjects) καὶ τιθέασιν ἀγῶνα, ἐν ᾧ πλὴν Σπαρτιατῶν ἄλλω γε οὐκ ἐστιν ἀγωνίζεσθαι. Should the

victors, e.g. be wreathed by crowns of σχῖνος, the name of the games would be accounted for. One fact, to be confessed, weights heavily on the mind, causing reluctance to admit what otherwise, by virtue of the elegant concatenation of things and information, would have been fervently embraced: Pausanias' absolute silence. –

A third nicety in the situation reveals itself as follows: Strabo, VIII, 370 writes: ρεῖ δ' αὐτῆς (sc. the city of Argos and its acropolis, *Larisa*) πλησίον ὁ Ἴναχος, χαραδρώδης ποταμός, τὰς πηγὰς ἔχων ἐκ Λυρκείου, τοῦ κατὰ τὴν Κυνουρίαν ὄρους τῆς Ἀρκαδίας. An incredible fuss has been raised over this simple, straightforward sentence (v. e.g. the critical note in Kramer's edition). That Stephanus Byzantius s.v. Λύρκειον, Hesychius s.v. Λύρκιον and the *Scholia* ad Apollonius, *Argonautic*, a A, 125 call it an *Argolic* mountain, is easily reconciled: it lied on the very boundaries of Arcadia and Argolis, being the one immediately to the north of Artemision (v. also *infra* p. 44). Significantly, both these groups of sources confirm, the one explicitly, the other inferentially, the Inachian procreation from this mountain. Stephanus in particular has: Λύρκειον, ὄρος Ἄργους. Καλλίμαχος Ἐκάλῃ. Τὸ τοπικὸν «Λυρκήϊον ὕδωρ», καὶ Λυρκήϊος τὸ ἀρσενικόν, καὶ Λύρκειος ὡς Ροίτειος. As Meineke saw, Λυρκήϊον ὕδωρ must in all probability be Inachus itself, whether the expression was Callimachean, or, as I think, not. Sophocles in his *Inachus*, very likely (Blomfield), glorified the turbulent river by combining it with the synonymous Epirotic tributary of Achelous (Fr 271 Radt = Fr. 265 Di,

apud Strabo VI, 271) making the one the miraculous continuation of the other: εἰ δὲ τοῦτο δυνατόν, τά γε προειρημένα ἀδύνατα, καὶ τῷ περὶ τοῦ Ἰνάχου μύθῳ παραπλήσια·

ρεῖ γὰρ ἀπ' ἄκρας

Πίνδου (φησὶν ὁ Σοφοκλῆς), Λάκμου τ' ἀπὸ Περραιβῶν

εἰς Ἀμφιλόχους καὶ Ἀχαρνᾶνας,

μίσγει δ' ὕδασιν τοῖς Ἀχελώου·

καὶ ὑποβάς,

ἐνθένθ' εἰς Ἄργος διὰ κῦμα τεμῶν

ἤκει δῆμον τὸν Λυρκείου .

Hesychius explains the very expression s.v. Λυρκείου (Schmidt pro Λυρκίου cod.) δῆμον· τὸ Ἄργος, ἀπὸ Λύρκου (Schmidt pro Λυρκίου cod) τοῦ Λυγκέως. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ὄρος, καὶ πόλις; as regularly and normally, with eminent clearness. Strabo (IX, 424) mentions a river Κηφισσός, τὰς πηγὰς ἔχων ἐκ Λυρκείου. It must be probably some tributary of Inachus. It is true that Pausanias locates the sources of Inachus in *Artemision*, II, 25, 3: ἐν τούτῳ (sc. τῷ Ἀρτεμισίῳ) δέ εἰσι τῷ ὄρει καὶ αἱ πηγαὶ τοῦ Ἰνάχου· πηγαὶ γὰρ δὴ τῷ ὄντι εἰσὶν αὐτῷ, τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ οὐκ ἐπὶ πολὺ ἐξικνεῖται τῆς γῆς (that is, what reaches further down comes from rain-water, then as now. Inachus is more of a torrent than a proper river. Cf. the formulaic expression Ἄργος πολυδίψιον). Still Lyrkeion as the lesser mountain can be taken as part of the main mountainous mass of Artemision.

We further read in Strabo VIII, 6, 6: Ἡ δὲ ὑπολειπομένη τῶν ὁδῶν (sc. from Argolis to Arcadia, the middle one is meant) στενωτέρα ἐστὶ τῆς προτέρας (the most northerly) καὶ ἄγει διὰ τοῦ Ἀρτεμισίου. Τούτου δὲ ἐπεμνήσθην καὶ ἔτι πρότερον τοῦ ὄρους, ὡς ἔχοι μὲν ναὸν καὶ ἄγαλμα Ἀρτέμιδος, ἔχοι δὲ καὶ τοῦ Ἰνάχου τὰς πηγὰς. Ὁ δὲ Ἰναχος ἐφ' ὅσον μὲν πρόεισι κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν διὰ τοῦ ὄρους, τοῦτό ἐστιν Ἀργείοις καὶ Μαντινεῦσιν ὄρος τῆς χώρας· ἀποστρέψας δὲ ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ τὸ ὕδωρ διὰ τῆς Ἀργείας ἤδη τὸ ἀπὸ τούτου κάτεισι, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ τὸν Ἰναχὸν ἄλλοι τε καὶ Αἰσχύλος ποταμὸν καλοῦσιν Ἀργεῖον. It is clear as daylight. What on the other hand Pausanias emphasizes is that there is indeed a permanent supply, rising from the mountain, of water for Inachus, only inadequate to feed the river but for a rather small distance; for the rest, the river depends on what comes from heavens. And in truth today it is characterized as coming from the region between northern Artemision and Lyrceion mountains, collecting the rain-water of their eastern ridges.

There remains of course the difficulty of accepting Kynouria as located around Lyrceion [21]. But Herodotus, in an incredibly maltreated famous passage, confirms such extension. He analyses the phyletic texture of Peloponnesus, affirming that only the Arcadians and the Kynourians are truly *autochthonous*. Regarding the latter he specifies, VIII, 73: οἱ δὲ Κυνούριοι αὐτόχθονες ἐόντες δοκέουσι

μοῦνοι εἶναι Ἴωνες, ἐκδεδωρίευνται δὲ ὑπὸ τε Ἀργείων ἀρχόμενοι καὶ τοῦ χρόνου, ἐόντες Ὀρνεῆται καὶ [οἱ] περίοικοι.

Concerning the exact location of Orneae there exists some difficulty however, compounded by a curious mention by Strabo (VIII, 376) of a double site. Pausanias (knowing of one place alone) gives the distance of Orneae from Lyrcea as about the same to that of Lyrceia from Argos, namely 60 stades = 10.8 km (II, 25, 5). From the Argive gate on the Δειράς (between Larissa and Aspis) two roads started, the southerly leading to Oenoe at the foothills of Artemision (II, 25, 1-3) and then, through a passage over this mountain called Πρίνος, descended to Mantinea (VIII, 6, 4-6); the other, more to the north went to Lyrceia (II, 25, 4) and eventually crossed the Lyrceion mountain through the passage called Κλίμαξ with the same ultimate destination (VIII, 6, 4-6). Now the first difficulty is the site of Lyrceia on this road. Remains by the villages Σχινοχώρι, Σκάλα, Στέρνα and Κάτω Μπέλεσι have been suggested severally as possible candidates. Without need, or probability indeed, of exactly locating a site which, as Pausanias relates, was basically extinct already in Homer's time (thus being unrecensed by him, II, 25, 5) [22], it may be determined that the distance computed by Pausanias restricts us to the vicinity of Σχινοχώρι-Σκάλα. This, it is true, removes too far away Λύρκεια (or Λύρκειον) from the synonymous mountain. But the valuable Pausanias again supplies the means of resolving the problem: for the place was called *Λυγκεία* initially and only afterwards *Λυρκεία* on

account of the residence there of Lyrcus, a bastard son of Abas (II, 25, 5). His name, presumably, was then given to the mountain on account of some other characteristic event or exploit of his there.

In any case, these questions do not affect the substance of my argument regarding the pattern and order of localization of the Aesculapian worship. The enigma concerning two locations in Peloponnesus bearing the same or equivalent names (Cynouria or Cynosouris – dog's tail), is the same with the problem of the two Achaean peoples in Peloponnesus and southern Thessaly respectively, or with the one regarding the two Locrians, western and eastern, in central, mainland Greece. Whatever the resolution of this question is with reference to the Cynourians (and important conclusions can be drawn from a deeper investigation of the subject, some of which I have already foreshadowed above), Asclepius is connected to the western ones, and this by virtue of their country providing the meeting place of Aesculapian influences stemming on the one hand from Messenia - Laconia and on the other from Epidaurus – Delphi. The role of the Beotian – Phlegyan connection in this polarity I have analysed in this antiquarian treatise. Thessaly is also certainly marginalized according to the argument and account presented here.

NOTES

[1] That it was a marked and strong local tradition is evident from Pausanias III, 26, 4: εἰ δ' ἄρα ἀπὸ Λευκίππου τοῦ Περιήρου, ὡς οἱ Μεσσηνιοὶ φασί, τούτου μοι δοκοῦσιν ἔνεκα οἱ ταύτη (in the Laconic Leuctra, Messenian of old according to the Messenians and near Φαραί) θεῶν μάλιστα Ἀσκληπιὸν τιμᾶν, ἅτε Ἀρσινόης παῖδα εἶναι τῆς Λευκίππου νομίζοντες. In the pictures at the back side of the Temple of Messene in Messenia γέγραπται δὲ καὶ Ἀσκληπιός, Ἀρσινόης ὧν λόγῳ τῶν Μεσσηνίων καὶ Μαχάων καὶ Ποδαλείριος, ὅτι ἔργου τοῦ πρὸς Ἴλιῳ καὶ τούτοις μέτεστι (IV, 31, 12), besides Leucippus and his three daughters and other Messenian leaders. The Dorian king Sybotas, according to the general policy of the Messenian Dorians to emphasise and revitalise autochthonous cults and customs τῷ δὲ ποταμῷ κατεστήσατο τῷ Παμίσῳ κατὰ ἔτος ἕκαστον θύειν τὸν βασιλεύοντα, καὶ Εὐρύτῳ τῷ Μελανέως ἐναγίζειν ἐν Οἰχαλίᾳ πρὸ τῆς τελετῆς τῶν Μεγάλων Θεῶν ἀγομένης ἔτι ἐν Ἀνδανίᾳ.

Παυσανίας IV, 3, 10. And in more detail: IV, 3, 1-2: ...ἐς δὲ Νέστορα τὸν τοῦ Νηλέως περιῆλθε Μεσσηνίων ἢ ἀρχὴ τῶν τε ἄλλων καὶ ὄσων πρότερον ἐβασίλευεν Ἴδας, πλὴν ὅσοι τοῖς Ἀσκληπιοῦ παισὶν αὐτῶν ὑπήκουον. καὶ γὰρ τοὺς Ἀσκληπιοῦ παῖδας στρατεῦσαί φασιν ἐς Ἴλιον Μεσσηνίους ὄντας· Ἀρσινόης γὰρ Ἀσκληπιὸν τῆς Λευκίππου καὶ οὐ Κορωνίδος παῖδα εἶναι. καὶ Τρίκκαν τε καλοῦσιν ἔρημον ἐν τῇ Μεσσηνίᾳ χωρίον καὶ ἔπη τῶν Ὀμήρου καταλέγουσαν ἐν οἷς τὸν Μαχάονα ὁ Νέστωρ τῷ οἴστῳ βεβλημένον περιέπων ἐστὶν εὐνοϊκῶς· οὐκ ἂν οὖν αὐτὸν μὴ ἐς γείτονα καὶ ἀνθρώπων βασιλέα ὁμοφύλων προθυμίαν τοσήνδε γε ἐπιδείξασθαι. τοῖς δὲ καὶ μάλιστα ἤδη βεβαιοῦνται τὸν ἐς τοὺς Ἀσκληπιάδας λόγον, ἀποφαίνοντες ἐν Γερηνίᾳ Μαχάονος μνήμα καὶ τὸ ἐν Φαραῖς τῶν τοῦ Μαχάονος παίδων ἱερόν. – Whether or not Τρίκκη and Οἰχαλία were names of places in Messenia, too, like Ithome, Homer in *Ilias* B, 729-33 considers them as located in Thessaly, under the leadership of the Asclepiads. On the other hand that passage is perhaps out of order in the systematic description of Thessaly within the Catalogue. But I shall not expatiate on this as there is a serious and obvious difficulty for the Homeric text regarding the mythically difficult to locate Oechalia (V. on Oechalia).

[2] So Böckh, correctly, reminding us of the habitual utilization of Hesiod by Asclepiades as, e.g. in Scholia ad Pindarum, *Pythia*, IV; for their agreement v. Sch. Euripides, *Alk.*, 1 (Fr. 9); schol. *Apollonius Rhodius*, II, 178 (Fr. 22).

[3] The manuscript tradition has *Ἀρσινόης*. Böckh again thought rightly that the name of a poet is there hidden, which Kalkman supplied as above, properly. The character of this distich, in its *simple but impressive tenuity* differs from the *expansive floridity* of the former, exactly as Asius' and Hesiod's styles respectively differ.

[4] This is two verses compressed in one; the fuller form is given in the *scholia ad Pindarum, Pyth., III, 52*, from Artemon. It runs so (Fr. 60 Merkelbach – West):

τῆμος ἄρ' ἄγγελος ἦλθε κόραξ ἰερῆς ἀπὸ δητὸς
 Πυθῶ ἐς ἠγαθήην καὶ ρ' ἔφρασεν ἔργ' ἀΐδηλα
 Φοίβῳ ἀκερσεκόμη, ὅτ' ἄρ' Ἴσχυς γῆμε Κορωνίν
 Εἰλατίδης Φλεγύαο Διογνήτοιο θύγατρα.

[5] This has been correctly supplied by Hase, with reference to Clemens, *Protrepticus* I p. 26 §30: Ἀσκληπιὸς κεῖται κεραυνωθεὶς ἐν τῆς Κυνοσουρίδος ὀρίοις.

[6] Even Pindar, though adopting the Thessalian-Dotion account, is forced to make the human antagonist of Apollo explicitly the son of the *Arcadian* Elatus; so strong was the Arcadian dimension of the story. *Pythia* III, 25. Equally doubtless is Pausanias; cf. VIII, 4, 6 with II, 26, 6. – Pindar comments unfavourably to that strange preference that some futile people conceive of things alien, uncertain, removed or future over their own tested, available and present familiar persons, evident facts and traditional mores, in such language absolute and defining for Hellenism : (*Pythia* III, 19 sqq.)

----- ἀλλά τοι

ἦρατο τῶν ἀπεόντων· οἷα καὶ πολλοὶ πάθον.

ἔστι δὲ φύλον ἐν ἀνθρώποισι ματαιότατον,

ὅστις αἰσχύνων ἐπιχώρια παπταίνει τὰ πόρσω

μεταμώνια θηρέων ἀκράντοις ἐλπίσιν.

The *Scholia* to the last but one verse comments: ἐπιχώρια νῦν λέγει τὰ παρόντα (an unnecessary restriction, biased and inapposite; after all the lover was a foreigner, from for off); ἔστι δὲ ὅμοιον τῷ

νήπιος, ὃς τὰ ἐτοῖμα λιπῶν ἀνέτοιμα διώκει,

an epic verse, which the *Scholia* ad Theocritus, I, 75 and Orion *Antholognomicum* I, 25 (ed. Meineke in Stobaeus *Florilegium* vol. IV p. 252.9) ascribe to Hesiod (Fr. 61 Merkelbach et West). (Plutarchus, *de Garrulitate* 505D uses it proverbially without mentioning its author). But it is indeed futile and a typical exercise in sterile possibilism to suppose that the Hesiodic verse comes from the narration of the story of Coronis – which, besides, I have argued, belongs to the unhesiodic *Μεγάλαι Οἶαι*. But essentially: it is one and apposite thing to chastise Coronis' infatuation for the mysterious hero from afar to the extent of both profaning the divine sperm in her and contemning and orderly marriage in the joyous customary celebrations of her country; it is another and inapplicable thing to comment on her fatal error by gnomologizing on the foolishness of those who, leaving what is ready embark on a pursuit of what is remote, untested and uncertain: there was nothing really ready for Coronis – pace the

naivety of the German upholders (in the beginning of the previous disgustingly and deplorably degenerate century) of a cloudy Königsbergian version of Greek idealism, who would even, apparently, expect, and advice Coronis to wait for, a formal nuptial with Apollo. To call the semi-divine embryo ready, and to label the acceptance of additional humane, though heroic, sperm as pursuit of the unready, is simply perverse in the circumstances. – The Hesiodic verse sounds exactly as the precepts in *Opera et Dies*, and may belong to a similar gnomic work. (Hopfness adjudicated it to *Χείρωνος Υποθήκαι*; which only if he would ascertain me that he learnt from clear and unambiguous divination I would accept).

[7] The Aeginetans took back their island at the destruction of the Athenian Empire, *ibid*.

[8] To differentiate them from the inhabitants of the well-known Kynouria at the east coast of Peloponessos, between Argolis and Laconia.

[9] That happened even in modern times, before the drying up of the lake for agricultural purposes. When at full volume in the winter, the lake was mostly an expanse of morasses, although in summer time it almost entirely disappeared. One must bear in mind Col. Mure's description, *Tour in Greece*, vol. I, p. 227 (apud e.g. Smith).

[10] For it is one thing to initiate a new order in consonance with nature and nature's order and god; it is completely different to

reembark on a route which nature in its historical evolution had condemned by destroying it.

[11] If, as Eustathius has in his Commentary on *Dionysius Periegetes*, 267, the river flew to, and not from, the lake, the geographical analogy to the Boeotian combination is perfect.

[12] V. Pausanias IX, 5, 1: ...καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου τοῖς πολλοῖς τῶν ποιητῶν ἐπίκλησις ἐς τὰς Θήβας ἐστὶν Ὠγύγιοι. Cf. e.g. Sophocles, *Oedipus Coloneus*, 1770: Θήβας... Ὠγυγίους. (Aeschylus though he applies the adjective to the Boeotian Thebes, *Sept. contra Theb.*, 320, and to Attic Athens, *Persae*, 974, he seems to mean it primarily in the derivative sense of *primeval*, as he also calls the *Egyptian* Thebes Ὠγυγίας (*Persae*, 37); However there was a mythological connection between the two Thebes; v. Tzetzes, *Scholia* in *Lycophron*, 1206). Corinna (Fig. 31B) apud *Scholia* in *Apollonius*, III, 1177; *Apollonius loc. cit.*; *Lycophron, Alexandra*, 1206 (cf. Tzetzes *ad loc.*); *Stephanus Byzantius* s.v. (where it is added: ἐλέγετο καὶ ἡ Ἀττικὴ πᾶσα Ὠγυγία, ὡς Χάραξ φησὶν ἐν τοῖς Χρονικοῖς. The Ὠγύγιοι Πύλαι in Boeotian Thebes are well known. I omit many other references and in primo those from Latin sources. All confirm the supremacy of Boeotia over Attica in those times; for so we must interpret the reported kingship of Ogygus in Attica (Eusebius in *Chronica; Et.M.* s.v.); the very gap between him and Cecrops, and his precedence over the Attic king, assumed in the chronographical accounts (of which I have treated elsewhere) testify to it. And Amphictyon's kingship in Athens

points in the same direction. However, when we meet with an independent Attica, the Ogygian hegemony of southern Boeotia has been eclipsed, while the Orchomenian preeminence to the north of the country is more and more affirmed. However significant connection between the countries continued in later times, too: in Haliartus there existed a Heroon of Cecrops, the son of Pandion (Pausanias IX, 33, 1). The strictly Boeotian (and Aeolian) War-Goddess Athena (*) coexisted with the Ionian (and Pelasgian) Poseidon in Boeotia, where the tribal equilibrium was reflected in the undisturbed relationship of the gods, as is manifested also in the remarkable mediation of *Triton* between the Τριτογένεια and the Sea-Water god. But in Athens, the Goddess had to give a battle for the possession of the Acropolis, as there was not enough phyletic basis for her authority.

(*) The Lesbian poet-aristocrat-warrior, invoking her, refers to her Coronian residence in preference to any supposed archetypal Thessalian abode (Alcaeus Fr. 3 Diehl = 9 Bergk = 325 Voigt = 325 Lobel - Page, apud Strabo IX, 411):

Ὡ' νασσ' Ἀθανάα πολεμάδοκος
 ἄ ποι Κορωνήας μεδέοισ' ἐπὶ λαΐω
 νάυω πάροιθεν ἀμφιβαίνεις
 Κωραλίω ποτάμω παρ' ὄχθαις.

[I have tentatively restituted the second verse from its corrupt state in the mss. tradition ἐπιδεων αυω or ἐπιδεύων ἄνω or ἐπιδέων

αὐτῶ with μεδ[in the cod. rescr., cf. Voigt. In the rest I follow in the main Welcker's felicitous emendations].

The name of the riverlet by the sanctuary is Κουράλιον in Callimachus *Lavacra Pallados*, 64 and in Strabo himself IX p. 438 treating of what he considers as the Thessalian prototype. But he gives Κουάριον in the present place as well as in p. 435, and explicitly observes the Alcaic modification in the mane as he says (p. 412). Yet Κουάριον is hardly Greek. And Κουράλιος comes nicely and euphoniously from Κούρη, the *Maiden*, very appropriately.

[13] There can be no doubt that the statues in IX, 39, 3 represent the second alternative, Trophonios and Hercyna.

[14] Τῶ δὲ Ἀσκληπιῶ ναὸς ὠκοδόμηται καὶ ἄγαλμα γένεια ἔχον ἔστι. But as the Aesculapius was normally represented bearded, I would suggest we must read: καὶ ἄγαλμα γένεια <οὐκ> ἔχον ἔστι. However the expression reoccurs in the other passage: ἐν μέσῳ δὲ ὅ τε ναὸς καὶ ἄγαλμα λίθου πεποιημένον, γένεια ἔχον, μέγεθος καὶ ὑπὲρ δύο πόδας. I hesitate. But the reason I adduced still seems to me overwhelming.

[15] In Panopeus, the Phlegyan habitation in Phocis, within a curious small building of unburnt bricks there was a stone statue which others ascribed to Asclepius, others to Prometheus. Good reason is adduced by Pausanias (X, 4, 4) that it represented the latter.

[16] To mention some locations: Sicyon (II, 10, 2); Patrae (VII, 21, 14); Titane (II, 11, 5 sqq.); Thelpusa (VIII, 25, 3); Messene (IV, 31, 10);

Phlius (II, 13, 5); Argos (II, 23, 4); Aegium (VII, 23, 6); Pellene (VII, 27, 10); Asopos in Laconia (III, 22, 9); and another nearby (§10); and further (§13); also in Epidaurus Limera (III, 23, 7); all these places on the Malea promontory.

[17] The other significant singularity of worship in the Titanic (Titanean) Asclepieion is immersed in textual corruption. I read (II, 11, 6) ὄν (pro ᾧ) δ' ἂν ἐνταῦθα τούτων ἰλάσασθαι θελήσῃ τις etc., i.e. whomever of the before mentioned two divinities (Asclepius or Hygieia) one wishes to propitiate, he is instructed to offer his worship to the statue of the latter. And in VII, 23, 8 I assume and ἀψφορδινγλυ fill a lacuna thus: ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐν Τιτάνῃ τῆς Σικυωνίων τὸ αὐτὸ ἄγαλμα Ὑγίειάν τε ὀνομάζεσθαι <καὶ μόνον σέβεσθαι>, καὶ παιδὶ εἶναι δῆλα ὡς τὸν ἡλιακὸν δρόμον ἐπὶ γῆς ὑγίειαν ποιοῦντα ἀνθρώποις. Alternatively, one may supply <καὶ Ἀσκληπιοῦ θυγατέρα> or <καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδα>, congruously to the details of Pausanias' encounter and exchange with the Sidonian.

[18] This stood immediately to the east of the Propylaea where its basis has been found, bearing the inscription: Ἀθηναῖοι τεῖ Ἀθηναίαι τεῖ ὑγίειαι. Πύρρος ἐποίησεν Ἀθηναῖος. Plutarch, *Pericles*, XIII, relates the concrete occasion on which the statue was erected; but he adds: ἐπὶ τούτῳ δὲ καὶ χαλκοῦν ἄγαλμα τῆς Ὑγίειας Ἀθηνᾶς ἀνέστησεν (sc. Pericles) ἐν ἀκροπόλει παρὰ τὸν βωμόν, ὃς καὶ πρότερον ἦν, ὡς λέγουσιν. Plinius XXII, 44 gives a variant of the same particular story.

[19] What Cyrill says in VI p. 200E has been construed as implying an Aesculapian tomb in Epidaurus, but erroneously: προσβαλῶν (sc. Asclepius) δὲ τοῖς Ἐπιδαυροῖσι, καὶ δόξαν ἀρπάσας οὐκ ἀγεννῆ παρ' αὐτοῖς τοῦ καὶ θεοῦ εἶναί τις, βάλλεται κεραυνῶ, ποιήν αὐτῶ τὴν πρεπωδεστάτην ἐπαφέντος θεοῦ etc.

[20] The article telling for the latter, rather, supposition. Helos was in Pausanias' time (and at that of the inscription) deserted, III, 22, 3, cf. 20, 6; though it still played some religious role, v. *loc. cit.* In the time of Strabo, it was but a village (κώμη), VIII, 363.

[21] To evade the problem by assuming the work of an interpolator who confounded Λύρκειον with Λύκαιον, is the way of folly. And after all the glorious Lycaion did *not* actually belong to Kynouria, which extended up to its north and easterly feet.

[22] That in a 3rd century B.C. decree an Argive from Lyrceion is mentioned (Bull. d. corr. hell. 1968 p. 7) can easily be interpreted in a number of ways without involving the existence of a separate κώμη up there on the pre-homeric spot. This would in any case be inconsistent with the supercilious and rough way the Argives handled their renowned neighbours in the plain. Pausanias speaks only of a χωρίον (a place in the country) and of ἐρείπια, ruins, in which he noticed a memorial to Lyncus (εἰκὼν ἐπὶ στήλῃ τοῦ Λύρκου), and it is the Argives who celebrate the festivity in commemoration of the exchange of beacon-signs between Lynceus and Hypermnestra (*loc. cit.*). That Strabo (VIII, 376) speaks of Λύρκειον and Ὀρνεαί in the

present (κῶμαι δ' εἰσὶ τῆς Ἀργείας etc.) is certainly noncommittal; he being not an eye-witness, normally utilizes the temporally indefinite present to report information supplied by his sources, unless he explicitly wants to register time accidents.

[Spring, 1986]