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 awkwardnessiness 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 δηλοὶ μάλιστα οὐκ ὄντα Ασκληπιῶν Ἀρσινόης, ἀλλὰ Ἡσίοδον ἢ τῶν τινά
ἐμπεποιηκόταν 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 Ἀσκληπιόν οἱ μὲν Ἀρσινόης, οἱ δὲ Κορωνίδος φασίν εἶναι. Ἀσκληπιάδης (= Fr. 32 Fr.Gr.H.; from Tragilos, the author of the famous Τραγῳδούμενα) δὲ φησὶ τὴν Ἀρσινόην Λευκίππου εἶναι τοῦ Περνήρους, ἢς καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος Ἀσκληπιός καὶ θυγάτηρ Ἕρωπος. <Ἡσίοδος> [2]:

حلة ἔτεκεν ἐν μεγάροις Ἀσκληπιίον ὀρχαμον ἀνδρῶν
Φοίβῳ ὑποδημθείσα, εὐπλόκαμον τ’ Ἕρωπιν.

Καὶ Ἀσίως [3] ὁμοίως:

Ἀρσινόῃ δὲ μγείσα Διὸς καὶ Λητοῦς νῦν
τίκτ’ Ἀσκληπιίον νῦον ἀμύμονα τε κρατερόν τε.

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

τῷ μὲν ἄρ’ ἠλθεν κόραξ, φράσσεσαν δ’ ἀρα ἔργ’ ἀδῆδηλα [4]
Φοίβῳ ἀκερσεκόμην, ὅτ’ ἄρ’ Ἰσχυς ἐγήμε Κορωνίν
Εἰλατίδης Φλεγύαιο διογνήτω θύγατρα.

ἐν δὲ τοῖς Ὀμηρικοῖς Ὄμους (ΧVI, 1):

ἰητήρα νόσων Ἀσκληπιίον ἀρχομ’ ἀείδειν,
νῦον Ἀπόλλωνος, τῶν ἐγείνατο δία Κορωνίς
Δωτίω ἐν πεδίω, κούρη Φλεγύου βασιλής.
Αριστείδης δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ Κνίδου συγγράμματι φησιν οὖτως: Ασκληπιίως Ἀπόλλωνος παῖς καὶ Αρσινόης. αὕτη δὲ παρθένος οὐσα ὄνομαζετο Κορωνίς, Λευκίππου δὲ θυγάτηρ ἡν τοῦ Αμύκλα τοῦ Λακεδαιμόνος (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 Ἔγαλαι Ἡοῖαι; it follows that the εἰς Ἡσίοδον ἀναφερόμενα ἔπη must be the Ἔγαλαι 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 Hesiodean (Strabo, IX, 442 and XIV 647). The appearance of Ἑρμῆς 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 ὅρη ἐν Θετταλίᾳ, but I doubt whether he correctly interprets them to be the Hesiodean δίδυμοι κολώνοι). 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 miserōs 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):

ὁ μέγα χάρμα βροτοῖς βλαστῶν Ασκληπιέ πᾶσιν,

ὅν Φλεγυηῆς ἔτικτεν ἐμοὶ φιλότητι μιγείσα
ίμερόσεσα Κορωνίς ἐνὶ κραναὶ Ἐπιδαύρῳ.

It is important that this squares with the local Epidaurian account as detailed by Pausanias (loc. cit. §§3 sqq.): Φλεγύαν Ἐπιδαύριοι φασίν ἐλθεῖν ἐς Πελοπόννησον πρόφασιν μὲν ἐπὶ θέα τῆς χώρας, ἔργῳ δὲ κατάσκοπον πλήθους τῶν ἐνοικούντων καὶ εἰ τὸ πολὺ μάχημον εἰη τῶν ἀνθρώπων· ἥν γὰρ δὴ Φλεγύας πολεμικῶτατος τῶν τότε, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶν ἐκάστοτε ἐφ’ οὗσ τῶν τούς καρποὺς ἔφερε καί ἠλαυνε τὴν λείαν. ὅτε δὲ παρεγένετο εἰς Πελοπόννησον, εἴπετο ἡ θυγάτηρ αὐτῶ, λεληθεῖα ἐτὶ τὸν πατέρα ὅτι ἐξ Ἀπόλλωνος εἶχεν ἐν γαστρὶ. ὡς δὲ ἐν τῇ γῇ τῇ Ἐπιδαυρίων ἐτεκεν, ἑκτίθησι τὸν παῖδα ἐς τὸ ὀρὸς τούτο ὁ δὴ Τίτθιον ὄνομαξουσι ἐφ’ ἣμὼν 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 Ἑοῖαι); 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 Megálai Ηoíai and,
probably, other non extant epics. Pherecydes from Syros upheld the
account (Sch. Pindarus, Pythia, III, 59 = Fr. 3a Fr.Gr.H): ὁτι ἐν
Λακεδεία ὦκει Κορωνίς Φερεκύδης ἐν ἀ ιστοφει πρός ταῖς πηγαις
tοῦ Αμύρου. καὶ περὶ τοῦ κόρακος διηγεῖται (the older account, not
the improved theistically Pindaric version of divine omniscience, as
Artemon had observed): καὶ ὁ Ἀρτεμιν ἐπέμψεν ὁ Ἀπόλλων, ἡ
πολλὰς ἀμα γυναίκας ἀπέκτεινε. Ἰσχυν δὲ Ἀπόλλων ἀποκτεῖνει
(very orthodox: sudden death in women caused by Artemis, in men by
Apollo), τὸν δὲ Ἀσκληπίον δίδωσι Χείρωνι. – Acusilaos shared the

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: ἐτέρος δὲ ἐστι Ληθαῖος (sc.
potamós) ὁ ἐν Γορτύνῃ καὶ ὁ περὶ Τρίκκην, ἐφ’ ὥ ὁ Ἀσκληπιός
γεννηθήναι 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 Ὄγκειων (from Ὄγκιος
son of Apollo, prince of the place) south of the sacred sanctuary of
Demeter Eriny, 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
Ὅγκαιάτης was located. In the Aesculapian sanctuary there was the
tomb of Trygon: τροφὸν δὲ Ἀσκληπιοῦ τὴν Τρυγόνα εἰναι λέγουσιν·
ἐν γὰρ τῇ Θαλποῦσῃ τῷ Ἀσκληπιῷ παιδί ἐκκειμένῳ φασίν
ἐπιτυχοντα Αὐτόλαον Ἀρκάδος ύιὸν νόθου ἀνελέσθαι (I correct
from ἀναθέσθαι) τὸ παιδίον, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ Παῖδα Ἀσκληπιόν
<τιμᾶν· ἡ δ’> εἰκότα εἶναι μάλλον ήγούμην [ὁ καὶ] ἐδήλωσα ἐν τοῖς
Ἔπιδαυρίων (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 obligavesse; 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: Ἀσκληπιοί τρεῖς λέγονται γενέσθαι πρῶτος Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ Ἡφαίστου, ὃς ἐξεύρε μήλην δεύτερος Ἰσχύος τοῦ Ἐλάτου καὶ Κορωνίδος, <ὁς ἐν τοῖς Κυνοσουρίδος> [5] ὁρίως ἐτάφη τρίτος Αρσίππου καὶ Αρσίνος τῆς Λευκίππου οὗτος εὑρε τομήν καὶ ὀδοντάγχαν, καὶ τάφος αὐτῷ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ οἱ δὲ ἀστρονόμοι αὐτὸν φασίν εἶναι τὸν ὀφιοῦχον τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ σκορπίου ἔστωτα. 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 *Aristippe* 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 “onomatothesia” 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 πῶ γένεια) and of Health, the works of Scopa; everything, including the reputed dedication of a θωραζε 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 ὥκισεν ἐπὶ ποταμῶν 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 ξώανον – 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 = Ἰσχὺς; hence we must emend to Coronidis, with Davies, from Phoronidis. Κυνοσουρίς, tells us the scholion to the Clementine passage above quoted, is κῶμη 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: τούτο δὲ οἱ Λιμνάται Σπαρτιατῶν καὶ Κυνοσουρεῖς καὶ ἕκ Μεσόας τε καὶ Πιτάνης θύοντες τῇ Αρτέμιδι ἐς διαφοράν, ἀπὸ δὲ αὐτῆς καὶ ἐς φόνους, προήχθησαν, ἀποθανόντων
δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ βωμῷ πολλῶν νόσσος ἔφθειρε τοὺς λοιποὺς. Hesychius s.v. Κυνόσουρα· φυλή Λακωνική... καὶ πᾶς χερσοειδής 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 κώμαι 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 εἶ ἡ πόλις ἐρημωθεῖ, λειψθεὶ δὲ τὰ τε ιερὰ καὶ τῆς κατασκευῆς τὰ ἐδάφη, πολλὴν ἄν οἶμαι ἁπίστιαν τῆς δυνάμεως προελθόντος πολλοῦ χρόνου τῆς ἐπείτα πρὸς τὸ κλέος αὐτῶν εἶναι· καίτοι Πελοποννήσου τῶν πέντε τὰς δύο μοίρας νέμονται, τῆς τε ἐυμπάσης ἤγονται καὶ τῶν ἔξω εὐμμάχων πολλῶν ὄμως δὲ σύμε ἐννοικισθείσης πόλεως σύμε ἵεροῖς καὶ κατασκευαῖς πολυτελεῖς χρησμαμένης, κατὰ κώμας δὲ τῶ παλαιῶ τῆς Ἐλλάδος τρόπῳ οἰκισθείσης, φαίνοιτ' ἂν ύποδειοτέρα Ἀθηναίων δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο παθόντων διπλασίαν ἄν τὴν δύναμιν εἰκάζεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς φανερῶς ὁψεως τῆς πόλεως ἢ 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, Meso to the south, south-east.

Callimachus has this passage, *Hymnus in Dianam*, 93-5:
On which word the *Scholia* observe: τὰς ὑπὸ κυνῶν καὶ ἀλωπεκῶν τικτομένας κύνας. Ἡ τὰς Λακωνικάς. Κυνοσουρίς γάρ, τόπος Λακωνικής. 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, 607α1: γίνεται δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἑκ μίξεως μη ὀμοφύλων, ἀσπερ καὶ ἐν Κυρήνη οἱ λύκοι μίσγονται ταῖς κυσί καὶ γεννώσι, καὶ ἐξ ἀλώπεκος καὶ κυνὸς οἱ Λακωνικοί 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: αἱ δὲ Καστορίδες Κάστωρος θρέμματα, Ἀπόλλωνος τὸ δώρον ταῦτας δ’ ὁ αὐτὸς οὕτως ποιητής εἶναι τὰς ἀλωπεκίδας λέγει, μιξαμένου τὸ γένος ἀλώπεκι Κάστωρος.

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:

\[\text{\epsilonυ \deltaι \sigmaν \epsilonκφερει} \]

κυνός Λακαίνης ὡς τις εὐρίνος βάσις.

- Aglaosthenes, the author of *Naξιακά* (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 *Ἰστοῖ* (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 κυνός εἶναι εἰκῶν (the Arctos minor) ἦτε τὴν Καλλιστοῦς, ἦτε συγκυνηγός ἥν τῇ Αρτέμιδι ἄποθανούσης δὲ αὐτῆς διὰ τὸ φθορῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Διός, καὶ φωραθείσης τῇ Αρτέμιδι ἔγγυον εἶναι καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀποθηρωθείσης, συναπέθανε. Τὸ δὲ ὅνομα ἔχει διὰ τὸ κυνός οὐράν 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 (ἡτὶς 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: ἀκρα Αρκαδίας ἀπὸ Κυνοσούρου τοῦ Ἐρμοῦ. τὸ ἑθνικὸν Κυνοσουρεύς καὶ Κυνοσουρίς θηλυκὸν. Mercury, we have seen, is the brother of the Aesculapius in question; and their father is a thorough Arcadian, Ἄσχυς 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 (ἀκρα supra) with the Arcadic Κυνουρία; 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 Κυνουρία (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 Κυνοσουρία.

Pausanias recensing the regions and cities which combined in the foundation and population of Megalopolis, mentions (VIII, 27, 4): ἐκ δὲ Κυνοσουρίων τῶν ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ [8] Γόρτυς καὶ Θεισόα ἡ πρὸς Λυκαίῳ καὶ Λυκαϊται καὶ Αλίφειοα. This is the area to the north and north-east of mount Λύκαιον; 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 ἅκρα 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 Στῦμφαλος) (ibid.) as well as the location of the tomb of another son, Aipytos, unmistakably point to the same area. Aepytus 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 Aepytus 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 (ἐστὶ μὲν οὖν γῆς χώμα οὐ μέγα, λίθου κρηπίδι ἐν κύκλῳ περιεχόμενον). Pausanias VIII, 16, 2-3. Σηπία 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 Ἕρμης Αἰπύτος (VIII, 47, 4) – and after all Αἰπύτος 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 heighest mountain in Arcadia, Pausanias VIII, 17, 1. Hermes Aipytos is an aspectual identification which renders this personification of Hermes a divine actual brother of Ἰσχὺς, 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 Cylleenian parental origin for our Asclepius (cf. supra p. 9).

Elatos reigned for some time in the Cylleenian 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: Αμφισβητούσι δὲ οὕτως ξενικῶν γένους, καὶ Ἀρκάδες φασίν εἶναι τὸ ἄρχαῖον Ἐλατον γὰρ τὸν Ἀρκάδος, ἤνικα ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν Φλεγύαι τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἐστρατεύσαντο, ἀμύναι 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 Delus and of Delphes):

```
ίξες δ’ ἐς Φλεγύων ἀνδρῶν πόλιν ὑβριστάων,
oi Διός οὖκ ἀλέγοντες ἐπὶ χθονὶ ναετάσκον
ἐν καλῇ βῆσσῃ Κήφισίδος ἔγγυθι 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 Ὄγχήστιος 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: ἔπει μηδὲ ἄχρι τῶν Τρωϊκῶν χρήμασιν ἀδυνάτως εἶχον. μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι καὶ Ὄμηρος ἐν Ἀχιλλέως ἀποκρίσει πρὸς τοὺς παρὰ Αγαμέμνονος πρέσβεις:

```
οὔδ’ ὥσ’ ἐς Ὀρχομενὸν ποτινιόσσαται, (Ilias I, 381)
δῆλα δῆποις ἐν 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 Lanyrna, 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 Υλίκη 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 Κηφισόν χάσματος καὶ τῶν ἑλῶν). 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 τούναντίον (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 τῶν Μινύειων Ὀρχομενῶν ρεῖθρον, ἐποίησε λιμνάζειν τὴν χώραν, καὶ φθαρῆναι τὰ κατ’ αὐτὴν ἀπαντα. ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν κατὰ τὴν Θεσπαλίαν ἑπραζείεν εὐεργετῶν τοὺς Ἑλλήνας, τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν Βοιωτίαν, τιμωρίαν λαμβάνων παρὰ τῶν τὴν Μινυάδα κατοικοῦντων 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 ἰππομαχεῖν ἐν πεδίῳ Μινύαι δεινοῖ; and it was an epic standing epitheton of Phlegyas ἐὐπιπος. 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 Κωτπαι (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 Ὑλίςι under 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, Ἀθῆνας καὶ Ἑλευσίνα, οἰκεῖσθαι, καὶ ὡς ἔρρα χειμώνος ἐπικλύσασα 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’ ἐγχομένων τῶν πόρων (this is Strabo’s rationalization, of the same sort as the previous one), ὁ μεταλλευτὴς Κράτης, ἀνήρ Χαλκιδεὺς, ἀνακαθαίρειν τὰ ἐμφράγματα ἑπαύσατο, στασιασάντων τῶν Βοιωτῶν, καίπερ, ώς αὐτὸς ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον ἐπιστολῇ φήσιν, ἀνεψυγμένων ἡδή πολλῶν, ἐν οἷς οἱ μὲν τὸν Ὀρχομενὸν οἰκείσθαι τὸν ἀρχαίον ύπελάμβανον, οἱ δ’ Ἑλευσίνα καὶ Ἀθῆνας παρὰ τὸν Τρίτωνα ποταμόν. Λέγεσθαι <δ’ οἰκίσαι> Κέκροσα, ἡνίκα τῆς Βοιωτίας ύπηρέζε, καλουμένης τότε Ὀγυγίας, ἀφανισθῆναι δὲ ταύτας ἐπικλυσθείσας ὑστερον. Triton was a riverlet, or rather torrent, by Alalcomenae, (Pausanias IX, 33, 7), with glorious religious significance: Pei δὲ καὶ ποταμός ἑνταύθα, οὐ μέγας, χειμαρρός· ὄνομάζουσι δὲ Τρίτωνα αὐτὸν ὅτι τὴν Ἀθηναί τραφήναι παρὰ ποταμῷ Τρίτωνι ἔχει λόγος, ώς δὴ τοῦτο τὸν Τρίτωνα ὄντα καὶ οὔχι τὸν Λιβύην, ὥς 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 ποταμός Λιβύης, ἔστι δὲ καὶ Βοιωτίας. Δοκεῖ δὲ ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ παρ’ ἑτέρῳ αὐτῶν γεγενήσθαι, ἀφ’ οὐ καὶ Τριτογένεια λέγεται. οὕτω τινές: οἳ δὲ, ἢ τὸ τρεῖν, ὃ ἐστι φοβεῖσθαι, τοῖς δὲ ἑναντίας ἐμποιοῦσα. (Scholia A in Ilias, Θ, 39 ascribe the latter meaning to Homer (πολεμικὴ γὰρ ἡ θεός), and the former to οἱ νεώτεροι). Ὅτι γεγενήσεσαν ἔτρεσαν αὐτὴν οἱ θεοὶ add the scholia A, B in Ilias, Δ, 515. The derivation from τρεῖν is impugned by τῇ γραμματία καθαρόν Herodianus according to Choeroboskos apud Et. Magnum s.v. Τριτογένεια (767.52 sqq.): ἐπειδὴ (ὡς φησίν ὁ τεχνικός) τὰ τοιαῦτα εἰς πάθη ἀναλύονται, καὶ οὐκ εἰς ἐνέργειαν οίον λυκηγενής, ὁ ἐν Λυκίᾳ γεγενημένος, ἤριγενής, ὁ ἐν τῷ ἔαρι γεγενθεῖς. οὕτως οὖν καὶ τριτογένεια, ἡ ἐκ τοῦ τρεῖν γεγεννωμένη, οὐ μὴν ἢ τὸ τρεῖν γεγεννώσα. 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 Ὅιοι. 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 ἄρφητουργεῖν θέλουσι τὴν Μήτιν γεννήσας κατέπιεν· ἦν δὲ ἢ Μήτις 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 unmistakeably to the primeval unity of the two regions and the phyletic community or affinity of the inhabiting peoples [12]: Ἀονές, Ἰάονες and Ἰωνές, the same tribal group, were common aboriginal inhabitants of the two districts).

Nearby, before we reach Coroneia, there was the famous sanctuary of Ίτωνία Αθηνᾶ, ἀπὸ Ίτώνου τοῦ Ἀμφικτυόνος, καὶ εἰς τὸν κοινὸν συνισισιν ἑνταῦθα 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 Κωπαῖ, in the
NE, where Δήμητρος καὶ Διονύσου καὶ Σαράπιδος ἐστὶν ἱερὰ (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:

οὐ πάππον (sc. Pelops) ἐν γαμφαίσιν Ἑνναία ποτὲ
‘Ἐρκυνν Ἐρινὺς Θουρία Ζηφηφόρος
ἀσαρκα μιστύλασα τύμβευσεν φάρω
τὸν ὁλενίτην χόνδρον ἐνδατουμένη.

Scholia and Tzetzes ad loc.: Ἐρκυνα ἢ Τροφωνίου θυγάτηρ ἐν Λεβάδι τῆς Βοιωτίας ἵδρυσατο τὴν θεόν καὶ ἄφ’ ἐαυτῆς ὠνόμασεν Ἐρκυναν. (It is significant of the Boeotian character that: ἐν τῇ Βοιωτίᾳ ἱδρυται ἡ Δημήτηρ ξίφος ἤχουσα ὅθεν ξιφηφόρον αὐτὴν εἰπεν). There was also a feast called Ἐρκύνια, Hesychius s.v. Ἐρκύνια (pro Ἐρκήνια): ἐορτή Δήμητρος.

There was a place nearby on the sides of a height called Κόρης θῆρα 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 Δίως made by Pheidias’
favourite and beloved (παιδικὰ) Agoracritus, while Strabo (IX, 411)
relates that συγκαθίσθωται δὲ τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ ὁ Ἀδης κατὰ τινα, ὡς φασὶ,
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
hypotheses 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-
face, 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 ἄρχαιος 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
οἰκεῖοθαι τὸν Ὀρχομενόν φασὶν ἐπὶ πεδίῳ, ἐπιπολαζόντων δὲ τῶν
ὕδατων, ἀνοικοσθῆναι πρὸς τὸ Ἀκόντιον ὄρος, παρατείνουν ἐπὶ
ἐξῆκοντα 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 ἡ λίμνη κατέχει νῦν ἡ Κωπαΐς, ἀνεψύχθαι πρότερον καὶ γεωργείσθαι παντοδαπῶς ὑπὸ τῶν Ὀρχομενίων πλησίων οἰκούντων (οὐ ὑπὸ <τῶν> τοῖς Ὀρχομενίοις πλησίον οἰκούντων; for the transmitted ὑπὸ τοῖς Ὀρχομενίοις ὦν πλησίον οἰκούσι is corrupt; and ὄν I take to be an initial superscripted ὄν 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 Orchemenos; 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 Μινύᾳ τηλικαύται μέγεθος ὡς ὑπερβαλέσθαι τοὺς πρὸ αὐτοῦ πλούτων θησαυρόν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὑώ ἴσμεν Μινύας πρῶτος ἐς ὑποδοχὴν χρημάτων ὕκοδομήσατο. Ἐλληνες δὲ ἀρα εἰσὶ δεινοὶ τὰ ὑπερόρια ἐν θαύμασι τίθεσθαι μεῖζον ή τὰ σικεία, ὅποτε γε ἀνδράσιν ἐπιφανέσιν ἐς συγγραφήν πυραμίδας μὲν τὰς παρὰ Αἰγυπτίων ἐπήλθεν ἑξηγήσασθαι πρὸς τὸ ἀκριβέστατον, θησαυρὸν δὲ τὸν Μινύου καὶ τὰ τείχη τὰ ἐν Τιρννθι οὐδὲ ἐπὶ βραχὺ ἦγαγον μνήμης, οὐδὲν ὅντα 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 Orchemenians is also manifested by the capacities and works of the brothers Trophonius and Agamedes. Τούτους φασίν, ὡς ἴμβιζήσαν, γενέσθαι δεινοὺς θεοῖς τε ἱερὰ κατασκευάσασθαι καὶ βασίλεια ἀνθρώποις· καὶ γὰρ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι τὸν ναὸν ὕκοδομήσαν τὸν ἐν Δελφοῖς καὶ ὄρει τὸν θησαυρὸν. 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 ιερὸν συλήσοντες στρατεύοντος τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς, ὅτε καὶ Φιλάμμων λογάσιν Ἀργείων ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ (sc. τούς Φλεγύας) βοηθήσας αὐτὸς 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, Χ, 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 Ὄηττός, another foundation by an Argive leader (Paus. IX, 36, 6-7), indubitably paeceful this one and under the aegis of Orchomenos, as the Ἑγάλαι Ἡοῖαι testify (apud Pausanias). Ὄηττός lied on the high mountainous road to the coast, v. Pausanias, IX, 24, 3-5. The highway (λεωφόρος) from Ὀρχομενός to Opus passed through ὸάμπολις (the aboriginal ὸαντες of Southern Boeotia founded it, after having been expelled by the Cadmeians); by this road, remarkably as part of the same shield, lied Aabe: οἱ δὲ ἐν παῖς Ἀβαῖς ἐς γῆν τὴν Φωκίδα λέγουσιν ἀφικέσθαι ἐξ Ἄργους, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα ἀπὸ Ἀβαντος τοῦ οἰκιστοῦ λαβεῖν τὴν πόλιν, τὸν δὲ Λυγκέως τε καὶ Ὀπερμνήστρας τῆς Δαναοῦ παῖδα εἶναι (Pausanias, Χ, 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 synonymsies 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 Halicarnassseus, *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 Ἄγεττός 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 κατά τό 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 teams 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 Cylenian, 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 Trophoönus and (truly from Agamedes) of Cercyon – this Agamedes being a chief and lord in Stymphalus 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 Stymphalus (VIII, 4, 8), who was son of Elatos and brother of *Ischys* (4, 4). If we correct Charax by making Trophoönus’ coadjutor Agamedes his *brother* according to the ordinary account, we can easily accommodate the Ciceronian testimony as to the *Ischyan* fathership (whether nominal or real) of Trophoönus-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 Trophoönus’ statue in his Lebadeian Temple, the work of Praxiteles, was made in the likeness of Asclepius, Ἀσκληπιὼ καὶ τοῦτο εἰκασμένον, just as the images in the sacred cave are ἀγάλματα ὀρθά, περιειληγμένοι δὲ εἰσιν αὐτῶν τῆς σκῆπτρως δράκοντες. Ταῦτα εἰκάσαι μὲν ἂν τις Ἀσκληπιωῦ τε εἶναι καὶ Ἰγγίειας, εἰέν δὲ ἂν Τροϕώνιος καὶ Ἐρυκνα, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ τοὺς δράκοντες Ἀσκληπιωῦ μᾶλλον ἢ καὶ Τροϕώνιον 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 *suovotaurilia* 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 Aesclapius; 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: ἡεὼν δὲ Ἀσκληπιόν νομισθέντα ἐξ ἀρχῆς, καὶ οὐκ ἄνα χρόνον λαβόντα τὴν φήμην, τεκμηρίως καὶ ἄλλοις εὐφήμως, καὶ Ὀμήρου μαρτυρεῖ μοι τὰ περὶ Μαχάονος ὑπὸ Λαγαμέμνονος εἰσημένα (*Ilias* Δ, 193-4):

> Ταλθύβι ὅτι τάχιστα Μαχάονα δεύρη κάλεσσον
> φῶς Ἀσκληπιοῦ νιόν,

ός ἄν εἰ λέγοι θεοῦ παῖδα ἀνθρωπον. 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): ὁπόσα δὲ τῶν θυομένων καθαγίζουσιν, οὐδὲ ἀποχρα σφίσιν ἕκτεμνειν τοὺς μηροὺς <ἀλλ’ ὁλοκαυτοῦσι>, χαμάι δὲ καίοντι πλὴν τοὺς ὀφριθας, τοῦτοις 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 Αθηνᾶ 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 Amphiaraurus in Oropus the fourth part and potency was devoted jointly to Αφροδίτη and Πανάκεια and Ιασώ and Υγίεια and Αθηνᾶ 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 phyletic-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 Elatus (Pausanias VIII, 4, 8). And in the Στοά in the Asclepieion of Titane there was a statue of Ἀσκληπιώς 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 ἀξιώκουστον; (it takes quite some nerve to ask this even rhetorically!) μάλλον δὲ τίς οὕτω διώλωλεν οἰκτρῶς; κατεπρήσθη γὰρ κεφανά, καὶ μήν καὶ εἰς δεύροι κεῖται νεκρός, οὐδὲ ὅποι ποτε γῆς ἔστιν εἰδότων τῶν προσκυνοῦνταν αὐτῷ (or αὐτῶν) [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 Aesclepians 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 Λιμναίον κατὰ τὸν <Θόρνο>κα (according to Meineke’s suppletion, vastly preferable to the alternative <Θρόνο>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 πεποίηται σφισὶ πρὸς τοῖς Βοωνήτοις. 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 Kynosoura 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 Αφεταῖς (12, 1) and, to judge from the context, near the beginning of the street, at the Agora; Αφεταῖς 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 Λιμναίων, 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 Αγιαδῶν 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 Πλατανηστάξ, circumflown by the river (Ποτάμι τῆς Μαγουλας), 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 Ἀσκληπιός Αγνίτας, so called according to Pausanias because the xoanon of the God was made from
the wood of the plant of chastity, ἀγνος. 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: Ποντ[ωνίαν Καλλ[ίστονείκην Αρίστου ιέρεια[ν] διὰ [β[ίου [καὶ διὰ γένους τῆς ἐπιφ[ανε]στάτης θεοῦ Αρτέμιδος Ὄ[γθειας κ[αι] τῶν συνικ[α]θείσθησι[ν] αὐτῆς θεω[ν Μοιρῶν Λαχέσεων κ[αι] Αφροδείτης Ἑνοπλίον καὶ Ἀσκλειπιὸν Σχοινάτα ἐ[ν τῷ Ἑλει καὶ Αρτέμιδος Πατριώτιδος ἐν Πλείαν καὶ Δ[ω]σκούρων etc. Whether by Ἑλος 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 Αγνίτας was worshipped. It may well be that the Σχοινάτας was co-honoured with the Αγνίτας, or even that the two were aspectually identified, ἀγνος and σχοῖνος being both characteristic watery plants. Now a valuable but corrupt Hesychian gloss runs thus s.v. σχινάτας: σχινατίων ἀγών τις ἐπιτάφιος ἐν Λακεδαίμονι. The unmeaning beginning should I believe be restored to health as follows:

Σχινάτας <Ἀσκληπιὸς ἐν Ἑλει vel. Λακεδαίμονι>

Σχινατίων ἀγών 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. Σχινάτια 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 έι for the simple ί (Καλλιστονείκης, ὄρθείας, συνκαθειδρυμένων, Αφροδείτης), the ominous Ἀσκλειπιόν. Σχοίνος was furthermore more common than σχίνος, 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. σχίνος; Scholia ad Aristophanes, Plutus 720, although Theophrastus differentiated between the two appellations. The purificatory σχίνος and the sanctifying ἀγών 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 ἄγών in inscription CIG 1417 (= Griechische Dialekts-Inschriften 4472 = IG, V 1, 660): Α τόλις Κλέωνα Σωσικράτους ἄγωνισάμενον τόν ἐπιτάψι[ον Λεωνίδα] καὶ Παυσαν[ία καὶ τῶν λοι[πών ἥρω[ν ἀγώνα καὶ (?) στεφα]νωθέντα etc. That the two old hero-kings are honoured here is made certain by Pausanias III, 14, 1: τοῦ θεάτρου δὲ ἀπαντικρὸς Παυσανίου τοῦ Πλαταϊσιν ἣγησαμένου μνήμα ἔστι, τὸ δὲ ἔτερον Λεωνίδον καὶ λόγους κατὰ ἐτος 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 ἄγώνα, ἐν ὧ πλήν Σπαρτιατῶν ἄλλῳ γε οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγωνίζεσθαι. Should the
victors, e.g. be wreathed by crowns of σχίνος, 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: χεῖ δ’ αὐτῆς (sc. the city of Argos and its acropolis, Larisa) πλησίον ὦ Ἴναχος, χαραδρώδης ποσαμός, 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, Argonautica 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 Ἀργοὺς. Καλλίμαχος Ἐκάλη. Τὸ τοπικὸν «Λυρκηίιον ὕδωρ», καὶ Λυρκηίιος τὸ ἀρσενικόν, καὶ Λύρκειος ως Ροίτειος. As Meineke saw, Λυρκηίιον 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 Acheloous (Fr 271 Radt = Fr. 265 Di,
apud Strabo VI, 271) making the one the miraculous continuation of
the other: εἰ δὲ τούτο δυνατόν, τά γε προειρημένα ἀδύνατα, καὶ τῷ
περὶ τοῦ Ἰνάχου μύθῳ παραπλήσια·

φεῖ γὰρ ἀπ’ ἄκρας

Πίνδου (φησιν ὁ Σοφοκλῆς), Λάκμου τ’ ἀπὸ Περραίβων
εἰς Αμφιλόχους καὶ Αχαρνάνας,
μίσγει δ’ ὦδασιν τοῖς Αχελώου·
καὶ ὑποβάς,

ἐνθένθ’ εἰς Ἀργος διὰ κύμα τεμών

ἡκει δήμον τὸν Λυρκείου.

Hesychius explains the very expression s.v. Λυρκείου (Schmidt pro
Λυρκίου cod.) δήμον· τὸ Ἀργος, ἀπὸ Λύρκου (Scmidt 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: έν τούτω (sc. τῷ Ἀρτεμισίῳ) δὲ εἰσὶ τῷ
ὅρει καὶ οἱ πηγαὶ τοῦ Ἰνάχου πηγαὶ γαρ δὴ τῷ ὄντι εἰσὶν αὐτῷ, τὸ δὲ
ὕδωρ οὖκ ἐπὶ πόλυ ἐξικενεῖται 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 Ἀργος
πολυθύψιον). 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 υπολειπομένη τῶν ὀδῶν (sc. from Argolis to Arcadia, the middle one is meant) στενωτέρα ἐστὶ τῆς πρωτέρας (the most northerly) καὶ ἀγεὶ διὰ τοῦ Ἀρτεμισίου. Τούτου δὲ ἐπεμνήσθην καὶ ἐτί πρῶτον τοῦ ὄρους, ἢς ἔχοι μὲν ναὸν καὶ ἄγαλμα Ἀρτέμιδος, ἔχοι δὲ καὶ τοῦ Ἰνάχου τὰς πηγὰς. Ο δὲ Ἰναχὸς ἐφ’ ὁσον μὲν πρόεισι κατὰ τὴν ὀδὸν τὴν διὰ τοῦ ὄρους, τούτο ἐστὶν Ἀργείως καὶ Μαντινεύσιν ὄρος τῆς χώρας· ἀποστρέψας δὲ ἐκ τῆς ὀδοῦ τὸ ὕδωρ διὰ τῆς Ἀργείας ἤδη τὸ ἀπὸ τούτου κάτεισι, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ τὸν Ἰναχὸν ἄλλοι τε καὶ Αἰσχύλος ποταμὸν καλοῦσιν Ἀργείον. 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 Κυνουρίοι αὐτόχθονες ἐόντες δοκέουσιν
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 Lyrceas 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 Δειφάς (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 Lyrceas (II, 25, 4) and eventually crossed the Lyreion mountain through the passage called Κλίμαξ with the same ultimate destination (VIII, 6, 4-6). Now the first difficulty is the site of Lyrceas on this road. Remains by the villages Σχινοχώρι, Σκάλα, Στέφανα 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 unrecensned 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’ ἀφα ἀπὸ Λευκίππου τοῦ Περιήγουσ, ὡς οἱ Μεσσήνιοι φασὶν, τοῦτον μοι δοκούσιν ἕνεκα οἱ ταύτη (in the Laconic Leuctra, Messenian of old according to the Messenians and near Φαραι) θεῶν μάλιστα Ασκληπιόν τιμᾶν, ὁτε Ἀρσινόης παῖδα εἶναι τῆς Λευκίππου νομίζοντες. In the pictures at the back side of the Temple of Messene in Messenia γέγραπται δὲ καὶ Ασκληπιός, Ἀρσινόης ἃν λόγῳ τῶν Μεσσηνίων καὶ Μαχάων καὶ Ποθάλειός, ὅτι ἐργὸν τοῦ πρὸς Ἰλίω 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 τῶ δὲ ποταμῷ κατεστήσατο τῷ Παμίω κατὰ ἔτος ἔκαστον θύειν τὸν βασιλεύοντα, καὶ Εὐρυτῶ τῷ Μελανέως ἐναγίζειν ἐν Οἰχαλία 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 περιήλθε Μεσσηνίων ἡ ἀρχὴ τῶν τε ἄλλων καὶ ὅσων πρὸ τοὺς ἐβασίλευσεν Ἰδας, πλὴν ὅσιοι τοῖς Ἀσκληπιοῦ παισίν αὐτῶν ὑπήκοουν. καὶ γὰρ τοὺς Ἀσκληπιοῦ παῖδας στρατεύσαι φασιν ἐς Ἰλιὸν Μεσσηνίους ὄντας· Ἀρασίνης γὰρ Ἀσκληπιοῦ τῆς Λευκίππου καὶ οὐ Κορανίδος παῖδα εἶναι. καὶ Τρικκαν τε καλοῦσιν ἐφήμην ἐν τῇ Μεσσηνίᾳ χωρίον καὶ ἔπι τῶν Ὄμήρου καταλέγουσαν ἐν σίς τὸν Μαχάονα ὁ Νέστωρ τῷ οἷς οἶς ἐβεβλημένον περιέπτων ἐστὶν εὐνοϊκῷς. οὐκ ἄν οὖν αὐτὸν μή ἐς γείτονα καὶ ἀνθρώπων βασιλέα ὁμοφύλων προθυμίαν τοσὴν δὲ γε ἐπιδείξασθαι. τοῖς δὲ καὶ μάλιστα ἣδη βεβαιωόνται τὸν ἐς τοὺς Ἀσκληπιάδας λόγον, ἀποφαίνοντες ἐν Γερηνία Μαχάονος μνήμα καὶ τὸ ἐν Φαραῖς τῶν τοῦ Μαχάονος παῖδαν ἱερὸν. – Whether or not Τρικκη 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 Οεχαλία (V. on Οεχαλία).

[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):

τήμος ἄρ’ ἄγγελος ἠλθὲ κόραξ ἱερῆς ἀπὸ δητὸς
Πυθῶ ἐς ἡγαθέην και ρ ἐφθασεν ἠγγ γ衰δηλα
Φοῖβω ἄκεφσεκόμιη, ὄτ’ ἄρ’ Ἰσχυς γῆμε Κορωνίν
Εἰλατίδης Φλεγύαο Διογνήτοιο θύγατρα.

[5] This has been correctly supplied by Hase, with reference to Clemens, Protrepticus I p. 26 §30: Ασκληπιιός κεῖται κεφανωθεὶς 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.)
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); ἐστι δὲ ὀμοιον τῷ νήπιος, ὡς τὰ ἐτοίμα 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 Hesiodean verse comes from the narration of the story of Coronis — which, besides, I have argued, belongs to the unhesiodic Μεγάλαι Οἰαί. But essentially: it is one and opposite 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
naivity 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 Χείρανος
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 Boetian combination is perfect.

[12] V. Pausanias IX, 5, 1: ...καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦτο τοῖς πολλοῖς τῶν
ποιητῶν ἐπίκλησις ἐς τὰς Θῆβας ἐστίν Ωγύιαι. Cf. e.g. Sophocles,
Oedipus Coloneus, 1770: Θῆβας... Ωγυίους. (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
Ωγυίαις (Persae, 37); However there was a mythological connection
between the two Thebes; v. Tzetzes, Scholia in Lycophron, 1206).
Corinna (Fg. 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 Αττικὴ πᾶσα
Ωγυία, ὡς Χάραξ φησίν ἐν τοῖς Χρονικοῖς. The Ωγύιαι Πύλαι in
Boeotean 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):

Ω' νασσ' Αθανάα πολεμάδοκος
ἀ ποι Κορωνήας μεδέοισ' ἐπί λαϊω
νάνω πάροδην ἀμφιβαίνεις
Κωραλίω ποτάμω πάρ' ὄχθαις.

[I have tentatively restituted the second verse from its corrupt state in the mss. tradition ἐπίδεων αὖω or ἐπιδεύων ἅνω or ἐπιδέων]
αὐτῶ· with μὲν [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 Κουφάλιον in Callimachus Lavacra Pallados, 64 and in Strabo himself IX p. 438 treating of what he considers as the Thessalian prototype. But he gives Κουφάριον 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 Κουφάριον is hardly Greek. And Κουφάλιος comes nicely and euphoniously from Κοῦρη, 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] Τῷ δὲ Ἀσκληπιῷ ναὸς ψιθυρίζεται καὶ ἄγαλμα γένεια ἔχον ἐστὶ. But as the Aesculapius was normally represented bearded, I would suggest we must read: καὶ ἄγαλμα γένεια <οὐκ> ἔχον ἐστὶ. However the expression reoccurs in the other passage: ἐν μέσῳ δὲ ὁ τε ναὸς καὶ ἄγαλμα λίθου πεποιημένον, γένεια ἔχον, μέγεθος καὶ ὑπέρ 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) ὁν (pro ὁ) δὲ ἄν 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 ἀψυφορδίνγλυ fill a lacuna thus: ἔπει καὶ ἐν Τιτάνῃ τῆς Σικυωνίων τὸ αὐτὸ ἄγαλμα ᾿Υγίειαν τε ὀνομάζεσθαι καὶ μόνον σέβεσθαι, καὶ παιδὶ εἶναι δήλα 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: Αθέναιοι τε Αθεναίαι τε ύγιείαι. Πύρρος ἐποίεσεν Αθέναιος. Plutarch, Pericles, XIII, relates the concrete occasion on which the statue was erected; but he adds: ἐπὶ τούτῳ δὲ καὶ χαλκοῦν ἄγαλμα τῆς ᾿Υγίειας ᾿Αθηνᾶς ἀνέστησεν (sc. Pericles) ἐν ἀκροπόλει παρὰ τὸν βασιλέα, δὲ 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: προσβαλὼν (sc. Asclepius) δὲ τοῖς Ἐπιδαυρίοις, καὶ δόξαν ἀφτάσας οὐκ ἄγεννη παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς τοῦ καὶ θεός εἶναι τις, βάλλεται κεφανῷ, ποινήν αὐτῷ 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 χώριον (a place in the country) and of ἔρειπια, ruins, in which he noticed a memorial to Lyrcus (εἰκῶν ἐπὶ στήλη 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᾽ εἰσί τῆς Αργείας 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.
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