

CHAPTER THREE

Telling the Mythology: From Hesiod to the Fifth Century

Ken Dowden

Introduction: Mythology and Mythography

‘Greek mythology’ can be seen as a collection of stories (‘myths’) that can be presented alphabetically in a dictionary, or – remarkably – that can be told from the beginning (the origin of the gods) to the end (the Trojan War and its aftermath) as though it was a history. To write a body of mythology, especially in this continuous story mode, is to be a ‘mythographer’, and what a mythographer engages in, not unnaturally, is ‘mythography’. This chapter is about the origins of mythography and its development first in verse and then in prose up to the classical period of Greece. This activity served to record tradition every bit as much as history finally did; indeed, history was something that emerged from mythography. Tellings of myth, too, could be regarded as true or false, as authorized or not, as making sense or not. The Muses that appeared to Hesiod (so he tells us in the proem to his *Theogony*) told him:

We know how to pile up falsehoods that look genuine;
But we know when we wish how to utter truths.

(Hesiod, *Theogony* 27–8)

Myths have their own sense of authority.

Hesiod and ‘Hesiod’ (seventh–sixth centuries BC)

Where each god was born from – whether they always existed, all of them, and what they were like in appearance, was not known until, one might put it, yesterday or the day before. Hesiod and Homer were I think 400 years older than me, no more than that. They are the ones who created the theogony for the Greeks, gave the gods their titles, distinguished their roles and skills, and indicated their appearance. (Herodotos, Histories 2.53)

This is a statement of a fifth-century BC man. For him, there is a fairly definite view of the gods, which is a significant part of mythology, and it was Homer and Hesiod – who in our chronology were composing their works not much earlier than 700 BC, if at all – who created this authoritative view. The truth was not quite like this and Hesiod, like Homer, was part of a longstanding and continuously evolving tradition of poetic creativity, one which had vanished by Herodotos’ times.

The epic tradition that was embodied in the works of Homer and the cyclic poets, as we saw in CH. 2, was only part of the story, if a very influential one. Its purpose was to recount heroic mythology, centring on wars (the Trojan War and the wars against Thebes) or on other heroic exploits (the voyage of Argo, possibly cattle-raiding stories, and difficult returns like that of Odysseus) and, in a different register, the exploits of superheroes such as Herakles and presently Theseus.

Hesiod (c. 700 BC) is known for two works which are believed to be genuine (for the most part) and have survived complete; but there is also a plethora of works which are not genuine but go under his name (so they are by ‘Pseudo-Hesiod’, or are noncommittally ‘Hesiodic’). Of these mostly only fragments survive, though rather a lot of them, given the importance of this body of literature (mainly of the seventh–sixth centuries BC) to later tradition. ‘Hesiod’, in this wide sense, is the foundation of Greek mythology as we know it, much more so than Homer. Hesiod often seems to *tell* the mythology, where Homer assumes you already know it and composes a descant on it.

The two complete poems are the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*. Both are highly individual compositions, and both go well beyond plain statements of authentic mythology. They are also fashionable for their day, and behind the façade of a righteous, sometimes grumpy, narrator lies an author drawing on the resources of Near Eastern mythology and poetic forms, as we can see in more detail in CH. 19.

A theogony is an account of the *gods* (*theoi* in Greek) and how they were *begotten* or *came into existence* (the Greek root is *gon-*). Hesiod presents his *Theogony* as the sort of performed tribute to the gods (*hymnos*) that the Muses

themselves sing (*Theogony* 11–21); and it is they who accredit him to sing it too. The gods may be described as ‘the holy race of immortals who always exist’ (21, 105, and cf. 33) but all the same, Hesiod will tell (106) how they were sprung ultimately from Earth (Ge) and Heaven (Ouranos), and how they divided up their roles (112), the act which Herodotos (above) transferred to Hesiod himself. There is thus, from the beginnings of theogonies in Greece, a contradiction between the eternity of the gods and the myths of their coming into existence, one which will eventually even encompass Plato’s own myth of the creation in the *Timaios* (see CH. 9) and would raise the issue for later interpreters (such as Plutarch) of whether Plato had meant the creation to be in time or whether it was a way of expressing views about the world and its dependency on the divine.

As Hesiod reaches for the beginnings of the divine, and for the beginnings of our own universe, this pre-world is populated very much by personifications (116–46) – by the Gap (*Chaos*) from which the Darkness (*Erebos*) and Night (*Nyx*) first sprang, and by Night’s children Ether (*Aither*, the bright upper air) and Day (*Hemera*). We meet Earth, Heaven, and the primal force of Love too. Some of this relates to Near Eastern conceptions which make their appearance also in Genesis 1 (cf. CH. 19). As proliferation becomes possible, now collective groups arise – mountains, and nymphs to go with them; Titans, and *Kyklopes* (to forge Zeus’s thunderbolt; no mention of Polyphemos and Odysseus at this cosmic level – that may be a distinctive, and wilful, creation of Homer’s). The plot is now sufficiently developed for tensions to set in. The monstrous Hundred-Handers, loathed by their father Heaven, are buried in the Earth, in effect being *un*-born. Earth in revenge makes the great adamant sickle which the youngest Titan, Kronos, agrees to wield, and Earth and Heaven are separated by the castration of his father Heaven, the final separation of Heaven and Earth, but also a terrible act which would send shock-waves through later interpreters of Greek mythology.

The *Theogony* is a work very rich in proper names of divine beings and constantly tempts those so disposed to draw family trees connecting all these figures. But the key point of the work is to celebrate the victory of Zeus and the gods who live on Olympos. Zeus overthrows Kronos and the Titans; Zeus becomes distant from men because Prometheus’ attempt to help man backfires; the institution of sacrifice is explained (535–69); and Zeus has Hephaistos create woman to be a bane to men. Together with his fellow Olympians he fights the Titans (the ‘Titanomachy’, 617–735), wielding awesome lightning and thunder. The Titans are cast into the depths of Tartaros and locked up there. And finally (820–80), he defeats one last monster, Typhon, an emblematic compound of horror and confusions.

From this point, the *Theogony* goes downhill. The new regime is established and the wives and offspring of the gods are briefly recounted (886–929),

though the style of the poem seems by now to be wandering from that of the real Hesiod. Suddenly, there is a transition (963–8) to present goddesses and their liaisons with mortal men (969–1018). But the *Theogony* ends with another transition (1019–22) – to a highly significant work of which Hesiod, however, is agreed not to be the author, whose function it is to tell of liaisons of gods with mortal women. This large-scale work bears the title *Catalogue of Women*, though ancient writers often referred to it as the *Ehoiai*, the ‘Or-likes’, from the formula that introduced each named women:

Or like her in Phthia with the beauty of the Graces,
she who dwelt by the waters of the Peneios, Kyrene.
(Pseudo-Hesiod, *Catalogue of Women*
F 215 MW (F 158 Most))

It is difficult at first to envisage the scale of this lost work, or indeed its significance. But, looking at the fragments, it becomes clear that a very large portion of Greek mythology was to be found here and that its organizational principles may have been defining for Greek mythology as we know it. It might seem that a work where every incident arose from a mortal woman who was impregnated by a particular god would be miscellaneous and episodic. And it does give the impression (F 1 MW/Most) of being organized god by god, much like *Theogony* 886–929, though on a huge scale. But in fact the *Catalogue* seems to have proceeded region by region, descent group by descent group. And its whole principle of organization, and indeed its contents, are generally thought to be mirrored in a text that does survive and is much used by modern students of mythology, the *Library* of Apollodoros (of which more at the end of this chapter). In turn, then, Apollodoros underpins most modern continuous (as opposed to alphabetical) accounts, such as that of Robert Graves.

We cannot know on what earlier work the perhaps mid-seventh century BC *Catalogue of Women* was based, though it is suggestive that Homer includes a listing of women in Hades for Odysseus to witness (*Odyssey* 11.225–329), perhaps in tribute to a predecessor of this work. Mythology must originally have been told on an area, or family, basis, not least because the systems of mythology emerge from the heritage of particular areas of Greece and can only have been combined by poets travelling from area to area and producing compromises and syntheses. The end of the geometric period and beginning of the archaic age was one in which travel and trade were vibrant, and systematic multiregional mythologies must by this point have been long in existence. But the *Catalogue of Women*, with its ‘Or-like’ approach, became the definitive collection of the national mythology. It is a tragedy that it does not survive intact. Glenn Most speaks with justice of ‘an idiosyncratic, original work of art’ and of a ‘human counterpart to Hesiod’s *Theogony*’.¹

Table 3.1 Ps.-Hesiod, *Catalogue of Women* (following Most (2006: lii–liiii)).

<i>Bk</i>	<i>Contents</i>	<i>Region</i>	= <i>Section</i> (<i>Table 3.6</i>) of <i>Apollodoros</i>
1	Descendants of Deukalion, Hellen, Aiolos	north Greece	B
2	Aiolids (end)	north Greece	B
	Descendants of Inachos	Argolid	C
3–4	Descendants of Agenor	Crete; Thebes	D
	Descendants of Pelasgos	Arkadia	E
	Atlas' daughters: the Pleiades	Arkadia; Troy; Thebes	E, F, D
	Pelops and his descendants; Herakles	Argolid	I, C
	Asopos and offspring; Peleus	uncertain; Aigina;	G
	Kekropids and Erechtheids	Phthia Athens	H
5	Suitors of Helen; Zeus's plans for the Trojan War		I

The *Catalogue* extended over five books – a long follow-up to the *Theogony* in just one book, but nowhere near an *Iliad* with twenty-four. Its contents can be reconstructed given that they seem to have determined the design of Apollodoros' *Library of Greek Mythology* (see Conclusion in this chapter). So, as reconstructed by Most,² its material was distributed as in Table 3.1. Key figures originate the mythology for particular sections: so, for instance, Aiolos (eponym of the Aiolian Greeks) drives much of Book 2, and 'Aiolids' are his descendants.

Though the first four books trace genealogies, the fifth book is the most remarkable in the structure, serving as it does not only to close the *Catalogue* but also to close Greek mythology. I have spoken elsewhere of 'the Trojan War, with which myth ends'.³ This is a matter of design in the *Catalogue*, and indeed is integral to the plot: Zeus has specifically planned the end of the heroic race through the medium of the Trojan War (F 204 MW, F 155 Most, 96–123). And mythology, which began with a theogony depicting the prehistory, the time of the gods and their beginnings, continues as a sort of history through the main part of the *Catalogue* until the end comes. There was a logic in presenting Hesiod's *Theogony* as the prelude to this work.

This panorama of gods and men is brought down to the present day by Hesiod's *Works and Days*. This remarkable composition has as its principal

subject the nature of the world in which we humans live and how we are to respond to it, particularly through unremitting toil. But it also sets this in the context of the *Theogony* (by the real Hesiod too) and in the context of at least the subject matter of the *Catalogue*, a poem which on most scholars' assumptions was composed significantly later than Hesiod. It links into the *Theogony* by recapitulating the story of Prometheus – how he stole fire and how, in revenge, the first woman, Pandora, was created. But now she has 'Pandora's box' to open, unleashing plagues and grief upon men (90–105, on which see CH. 23). But it also links into the *Catalogue*, through the 'Myth of the Races' (109–201). Zeus creates mankind five times over, and each new creation is worse than its predecessor – Gold to Silver to Bronze to the Heroes and finally to us, an age of Iron. The sequence is *interrupted* by the race of Heroes, both because they are not labelled after a metal, and because that race is 'more just and better', indeed 'divine' (158–9). Some even live on by the Ocean on the Isles of the Blest. But their function is to fight and die at Thebes, and at Troy for the sake of Helen, as part of Zeus' plans for the world. This is a return to the closure of the heroic, mythical world that we see in the *Catalogue*. Once that world too is over, we are left only with the age of modern men, the real subject of the poem – the harsh justice of Zeus, the work that must be done in all its detail, and the few clues one can learn from heavenly signs or from observance of dates that will make one's lot a little better than it would otherwise have been. But the two ages of mythology, the age of the gods and the age of the heroes, are the context in which we understand the harsh realities of modern life.

Beyond these systematic works, the body of traditional poetry that goes under the name of 'Hesiod' exploits all sorts of mythological subjects. The *Catalogue* appears to have inspired elaborations: a surviving poem, the *Shield of Herakles*, starts with a fifty-six-line 'Or-like' from the *Catalogue*:

Or like her, leaving her home and fatherland,
who came to Thebes to join warlike Amphitryon,
Alkmene.

(Pseudo-Hesiod, *Catalogue* F 195 MW
(F 138 Most) 8–10 (= *Shield* 1–3))

Fifty lines later, she has given birth to Herakles. Together with this, the poem packages a description of Herakles' defeat of Kyknos ('Swan'), son of Ares, most notable for its description of Herakles' shield (a virtuoso turn also practised by Homer in the case of Achilles' shield, *Iliad* 18.478–608). It depicts ferocious personifications – Fear, Strife, Slaughter, and suchlike – and ferocious animals to match; then there are Lapiths and Centaurs, Perseus and Gorgons, and scenes, rather like Homer's, of war and peace, with the ocean (just as in Homer's) bounding the micro-universe that this shield displays.

There was also another poem, the ‘Great Or-likes’ (*Megalai Ehoiai*), some sort of large-scale variant containing yet more detail.⁴ And then there were such works as *The Wedding of Keyx*, an apparently obscure subject: Keyx is presumably the King of Trachis, father-in-law of Kyknos (*Shield* 356); it is doubtful whether he is the same as Ovid’s Ceyx, on whose death he and his beloved wife Alcyone are turned into birds (Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 11.710–48). Poems about weddings are found elsewhere too: Catullus 64 ‘celebrates’ the wedding of Peleus and Thetis; and in the Bosnian tradition, one of the poems studied by researchers was Avdo Medjedović’s *Wedding of Smailagić Meho*. Perhaps poems about mythic weddings are good for singing at actual weddings. Perhaps ‘Or-likes’ about mythical mothers also suit that environment.

And beyond this lies a further miscellany of poems: one about the mythic prophet Melampous (‘Blackfoot’), the *Melampodia*, another about the *Descent of Peirithoös* into the Underworld, another about the *Idaian Daktyls* (whose magic invented metalworking and mystery religions), and another about the origin of constellations, the *Astronomy*. If you needed more advice than you could find in the *Works and Days*, you could always turn to the *Precepts of Cheiron*, where the noble, educational Centaur who tutored Achilles and Jason would helpfully tell you:

Now give all this full consideration in your thought-packed minds:
first, whenever you enter a house
always do fine sacrifice to the immortal gods ...

(Pseudo-Hesiod F 283 MW (F 218 Most))

Mythology was integral with the stages of life, its special moments, and its values. In a real sense, Greeks of the Archaic Age lived the mythology. That is why the plots of tragedy could in the end be largely restricted to the mythology.

Other Poets of the Seventh–Sixth Centuries BC

Poets were busy with the mythology in their societies in the seventh century and much of the sixth century, mythologies that existed in all sorts of different cities and regions, amongst them, Corinth. Some significant poems in the Corinthian tradition that were still known in Roman times, went under the name of Eumelos. The *Titanomachy* ascribed to him told in more detail than Hesiod, and not always the same detail, of the times long ago when the Olympian gods, and in particular Zeus, were still establishing their power and had to confront gods of an earlier generation, the Titans, and defeat them. Seventh-century art tended to pick up a similar conflict, the Gigantomachy, the battle with the Giants, which perhaps had more pictorial

possibilities. Whatever the particulars, it is clear that the age of the beginnings were of special interest at this time, and this may reflect the fact that mythology of beginnings was relatively new to the Greek tradition and rather more fluid, more exposed to authors who wished to make an original account. Where Homer's heroic epic in effect represents the culmination of a long-standing tradition, however original and personal his take on it, Hesiod was actually bringing something new to Greece, perhaps in large part from the Near East, which only gradually became something standard and central to Greek tradition. Indeed, he never wholly drove out the capacity for thinking of theogony in different ways.

'Eumelos', rather like the Epic Cycle (see CH. 2) gives the appearance of presenting some of the back story to Hesiod and Homer, though in fact they must draw on him or his predecessors. Mēkōnē, an obscure place (supposed to be the same as Sikyon near Corinth), is named by Hesiod as the place where Prometheus tricked the gods into taking the inedible parts of animals as their portion in meals then shared with men, and later in sacrifices; this is what leads to the final division of men from gods. But why at 'Mēkōnē'? It looks as though this may have been where Eumelos situated an episode after the Gigantomachy where the gods cast lots for which part of the world they would rule – heaven, sea, and Tartaros.⁵ This casting of lots is referred to by Homer (*Iliad* 15.187–93), but without any context. It is only really in the account of 'Eumelos' that this major event gets its logical context and a place to happen – in the vicinity of a village interestingly called Titane,⁶ and near the Corinth that Eumelos came from. And similarly, the helpful deeds of which Achilles thinks Thetis should remind Zeus (*Iliad* 1.394–407, rather an offbeat account it must be said) include a reference to Thetis' summoning of the hundred-handed creature Aigaion or Briareos to the side of Zeus. She must have summoned him from the sea, which is her special domain; it was there, according to Eumelos (F 3 West), that Aigaion, a son of the Sea (Pontos), had his home. Thetis' story (or Achilles') is evidently not based on Hesiod's version (*Theogony* 617–28), where Briareos is instead son of Heaven and summoned by Gaia (Earth).⁷

Another mythographic poem of this era was the *Phoronis*, a poem from Argos in which the first man was called Phoroneus and he (not Prometheus) was responsible for the introduction of fire.⁸ This also told of a mythical first priestess of Hera at Argos, 'Kallithoē ... she who first decorated the Lady's (i.e., Hera's) tall pillar round about with wreaths and tassels' (F 4, tr. M. L. West). Regionalism was doubtless not the whole story: this author could tell you details about the Idaian Daktyls (the first metalworkers) and the Kouretes, who according to him played the double-flute and came from Phrygia. This is doubtless the tip of an iceberg of local traditions now lost to us, but poems like those of 'Eumelos' and the *Phoronis* were those that went into the melting-pot of the sixth century BC from which a more standard mythology emerged.

Towards the end of the sixth century, less standard mythologies also came into existence, including mystical ones supposedly written by the legendary Orpheus – or the no less legendary poet Mousaios, or the primal hierophant of the Eleusinian Mysteries, Eumolpos. Some of these are dealt with in CH 4.

Obviously, many poets in this period (600–400 BC) are significant for the history of myth but are not in themselves mythographers. Possibly the most important of these outside epic and tragedy are Stesichoros, Bakchylides, and Pindar (CH. 5).

The Prose Tradition, Fifth Century BC

By the mid-sixth century the age of prose was beginning. What had once only been a medium for records, correspondence, and the emerging notion of law codes (and the plethora of public documents – inscriptions – that would follow), now became a way of setting down a view of the world. Before Herodotos set down what we regard as the first *History* (c. 430 BC), others set down philosophy and mythology. Mythology is very like history and the compulsion to write down the mythology (the act of ‘mythography’) has some of the same sense of recording a definitive narrative account of the past in which your readers may place their trust.

Akousilaos (Acusilaos) of Argos

The first prose mythographer of whom we know was Akousilaos of Argos, who wrote his *Genealogies* in three books around 500 BC. Though his work is lost except for fragments, we know he began with a theogony and ended with the Trojan War and its aftermath, thus conforming to the design of ‘Hesiod’ and helping make this the definitive shape of Greek mythology. The lovely story that he based his work on bronze tablets that his father uncovered while digging in the garden (T 1), if it is not a later invention, will have appeared in his introductory section to bolster the authority of the traditions he now set down.

In passing on ‘traditions’, writers sometimes opted for the conservative, sometimes for the innovative. Conservatism was denounced centuries later (in the second century AD) as plagiarism by the Christian Clement of Alexandria: ‘Hesiod’s material was converted into prose and issued as their own by the historical [!] writers Eumelos and Akousilaos’ (Clement, *Stromata* 6.26.7 (Eumelos, T 2 West)). Josephus on the other hand (first century AD) regards it as a chore to list ‘all the points on which Akousilaos corrects Hesiod’ (Akousilaos F 6). Degrees of innovation are recorded too by the philosopher

Table 3.2 Akousilaos' *Genealogies* (FGrH 2 F esp. 1–4).

<i>Book</i>	<i>Known, or plausible, contents</i>	= Section (Table 3.6) of Apollodoros
1	Okeanos and the origin of rivers; theogony (and Phoroneus?)	A
2	?	
3	A contemporary of Agamemnon (Echepolos of Kleonai)	I
<i>uncertain</i>	Phaiakes (and return of Odysseus?) Phoroneus, Niobe; Io and 'All-seeing' Argos; Proitids; Herakles: deeds and death Deukalion and Pyrrha; Aktaion; Apollo kills Kyklopes; Asopos; Kaineus; Trojan War	C B, D, E, G, H, I

Philodemos (first century BC): 'In certain authors the universe is said to have begun with Night and Tartaros, in some with Hades and Ether [*Aither*, the divine upper atmosphere]. The author of the *Titanomachy* ['Eumelos', then] says it began with Ether. But Akousilaos says everything started with Chaos ['the gaping emptiness']. In the work ascribed to Mousaios it says 'Tartaros first ... Night' (Akousilaos F 2). So, varying conceptions existed of what it was like before the universe was created, as these early pre-philosophers struggled to depict the nature of emptiness through mythological personifications. There was just air, no light, just emptiness.

The material of theogony and genealogy was particularly receptive to thoughtful variation, as we can see from this scholion (note by an ancient Greek commentator):

Akousilaos in Book 3 says that it so happened that *rhanides*, i.e. droplets, fell to earth from the castration of Ouranos, from which the Phaiakes were born, but others [namely Hesiod, *Theogony* 185!] say it was the Giants. Alkaios [the poet from Lesbos, c. 600 BC] says that the Phaiakes have their descent from the droplets of Ouranos. And Homer [*Odyssey*, e.g., 5.35] says the Phaiakes are related to the gods because of their descent from Poseidon. (Scholion on Apollonios, *Argonautika* 4.992 (Akousilaos F 4))

The Phaiakes (Phaeacians) are the people Homer has Odysseus meet in the *Odyssey*: they receive him hospitably and convey him home with gifts. They seem to our eyes to be an epic transposition of a people like the Phoenicians, who would have been familiar seafarers in Homer's times. But this is not how Greeks later viewed it, and it is revealing for the nature of Greek belief in their mythology to adopt their priorities: it was an object of genuine interest where

the Phaiakes came from and how divine they were, and whether they were sprung from the blood of castrated Ouranos, and if not them, then who was? Correction of genealogies and new explanations of events were the preoccupation of successive mythographers. So doubtless Akousilaos' *Genealogies* were packed with such detail and did indeed seek to improve, particularly in the opening book, on Hesiod. We do not, however, hear of more than three books, and the coverage, which looks quite similar to Hesiod's *Theogony* plus *Catalogue*, may have been organized in the same way but been more compressed or selective.

But why did Akousilaos write this work? It may seem an obvious thing to write books outlining Greek mythology, but in our times that is because Greek mythology is something we need to learn. The overwhelming quest amongst Greeks seems to have been to record mythology correctly and fully, much as authors would presently be concerned to set down a correct and complete history. Akousilaos is by no means as idiosyncratic as his contemporary Hekataios was (as we shall see later in this chapter), but his motivation was similar: this is why he 'corrects' Hesiod. And in following ages, it was this sort of limited 'correction' that was valued: what commentators, scholars, and poets wanted was a reliable, traditional mythology containing the most correct account possible. 'Correctness' here combines two different approaches: (i) the *historicizing* approach: the story told is what actually happened (as though myth were history); (ii) the *authoritative* approach: the story told is based on the best, and probably oldest, authors.

One area that authors persistently corrected and filled out was the story of the Trojan War, where the back story to Homer was attested by figures of weaker authority than Homer (the cyclic epics, see CH. 2) who were therefore ripe for correction. Sometimes, too, one might report (or make up) the events that Homer passed over in his own account. Take, for instance, the cause of the Trojan War. The prevalent account is, and was, the story centring on the Judgement of Paris, but Akousilaos developed an ingenious variant *explaining* the reference Poseidon makes in *Iliad* 20.306–7 to the fact that Zeus now detests the clan of Priam and that soon Aeneas (and his descendants) will rule over the Trojans. We find this reported in the scholia on Homer:

In the light of an oracle to the effect that Priam's reign would end and the descendants of Anchises would be kings over Troy, Aphrodite made love to Anchises, though he was past his prime. She gave birth to Aeneas and, in order to construct a reason for the downfall of the Priamids, created in Paris a longing for Helen and after the abduction gave the appearance of supporting the Trojans (whilst in truth she counselled their defeat) so that they would not completely despair and return Helen. The story is in Akousilaos. (Scholion on Homer, *Iliad* 20.307 (Akousilaos F 39))

Thus Akousilaos produces a picture of elaborate long-term diplomacy on the part of the goddess. This is not quite reducing myth to history (it still has a goddess in it), but it does assign more historically plausible motives. It is therefore *historicizing*, even if it is a new account and therefore technically lacks authority.

A simpler case of filling out the story (it may even be what Homer was thinking of) results from Akousilaos' reading of a problematic line of Homer's *Odyssey* (11.520–1) where Homer refers to Achilles' son Neoptolemos having killed one Eurypylos, son of Telephos, and lots of his comrades 'because of a woman's presents'. Here the scholion tells us,

Eurypylos – the son of Astyoche and Telephos, son of Herakles – took over his father's domain of Mysia and became its leader. Priam learnt about his acquisition of power and sent to him to come and join the Trojan side. Since he replied that he could not because of his mother, Priam sent his mother as a gift a golden vine. And she accepted the golden vine and sent her son to war, and he was killed by Neoptolemos son of Achilles. The story is in Akousilaos. (Scholion on Homer, *Odyssey* 11.520 (Akousilaos F 40))

Akousilaos probably said more than this. Telephos is wounded by Achilles at the beginning of the war when, in a false start, the Greeks invade Teuthrania (Mysia), thinking it is Troy (a story not from Homer but from the Epic Cycle). He is at the centre of an elaborate mythology which we do not have time to go into here, though his healing by Achilles and a melodramatic scene in a lost play of Euripides (the *Telephos*, mercilessly parodied by Aristophanes) are part of this story. Here we enter a mirror scene where Telephos' son is killed by Achilles' son, perhaps because Telephos had sworn that his family would not enter the war. His mother Astyoche is, in fact, Priam's sister. And the golden vine, it transpires, is actually the one given by Zeus to Ganymede (as we can see in the cyclic epic, the *Little Iliad*, F 6 West). These mythographies, as recorded by Akousilaos and others like him, serve to show that Homer's mythology is the tip of an iceberg, part of a complex and rich tapestry of stories, often conflicting with each other, but all creating a body of knowledge too large for us to master if we do not have our Akousilaos to hand. It is revealing too that this story of the death of Eurypylos furnished the subject for a play by Sophocles where a surviving fragment seems to provide a report of Priam lamenting over his dead body (Sophocles, *Eurypylos* F 210.70–85). From the perspective of mythography it may seem that one of the conditions for the possibility of the tragedy we know was in fact the development, and recording, of a sufficiently rich and complex mythographic tradition. It is no coincidence that Akousilaos stands at the head of the fifth century, drawing together, organizing, and completing the ancient traditions of epic poetry.

We should not, however, leave Akousilaos without noting the role he assigns to his local *polis*. Like the *Phoronis* (above), he claims that Phoroneus was the first man, a son of the river Inachos and the first king of Akousilaos' native Argos (F 23). Autochthony, the quality of always having been there, not having arrived from some other place, having even sprung from the ground itself – like the Athenian Erichthonios – was always valued by Greek societies that had been there before the tribal movements ('Dorian invasion') at the end of the Bronze Age. Argos, then, made that claim, and the poet of the *Phoronis* and Akousilaos were at different times its mouthpiece.

Hekataios (Hecataeus) of Miletos

At much the same time, Hekataios, whose work was the key predecessor to Herodotos' *Histories* was laying down the foundations for geography and ethnology, themselves vital components of history, but he also wrote a work usually referred to as *Genealogies*. Its beginning famously ran, 'This is the account of Hekataios of Miletos. I write the following in the way that seems true to me – the stories of the Greeks are many and laughable, as it appears to me' (Hekataios F 1). So, where he felt they were too foolish, Hekataios proceeded to rewrite myths in order to bring them within the bounds of historical possibility. Logically, this is the *historicizing* approach, which is taken at the cost of authority. In a sense, though, this has mutated into a third approach, (iii) the *virtuoso* approach, in which the intellect of the author is admired for the ingenuity displayed in reconstructing history from myth (without regard to its plausibility or authority). This reduction of myth to history is generally known as *rationalization* of myth (that is, making it rational so that it could actually have happened), but that maybe gives too little credit to the applause invited by these stunts of interpretation. And they would become commoner later.

One instance concerns Cape Tainaron (south of Sparta), where there was a cave ...

... and in certain Greek poets this is where Herakles brought up Hades' dog – even though there is no road leading through the cave beneath the earth and even though it is hard to believe that there is some underground settlement of the gods where souls gather. Hekataios the Milesian has found a likely explanation, when he says that a terrible snake lived at Tainaron and that it was called the Dog of Hades because anyone it bit automatically died immediately from the poison. Herakles, he continues, brought this snake to Eurystheus. (Pausanias 8.25.5 (Hekataios, *FGrH* 1 F 27))

Pausanias (or Hekataios?) proceeds to argue that Homer referred to the 'dog of Hades' but did not *name* it or describe its appearance – the idea that it was

Table 3.3 Hekataios' *Genealogies* (FGrH 1 F 13–32).

Book	Contents	= Section (Table 3.6) of Apollodoros
1	Deukalionids, Argonauts	B
2	Danaids ? Herakles and the Heraklids	C
3	? Theban mythology	D

a three-headed dog called Kerberos came later. So we can see again that Homer (*Iliad* 8.368, *Odyssey* 11.623) lies at the root of this discussion, and Homer's economy and allusiveness leaves room for ingenious filling out of detail. And once again we see the continuing fascination of those committed to the heritage of mythology, in this case Pausanias in the second century AD, for the pioneers of prose mythography like Hekataios around 500 BC. It is interesting that the text of Hesiod was adjusted at some stage to contain the offspring of the viperous Echidna, including a named 'Kerberos' with no less than fifty heads (*Theogony* 311–12).

We should not, however, develop an exaggerated idea about rationalization in Hekataios. It was a tool he sometimes turned to, but on other occasions it would be left for later authors to intervene. This is what happens when Phrixos, son of King Athamas of Orchomenos, is rescued from sacrifice by the ram with the golden fleece and he flies off on it with his sister Helle, who, alas, falls into the sea (*pontos*, thus naming the *Helles*-pont). Should he stop? At this key moment, the ram speaks to assure him to go on: 'The story that the ram spoke is in Hekataios. But others say he sailed in a ram-prowed boat. And Dionysios [Skytobrachion, possibly early third century BC] in Book 2 says Ram was the tutor of Phrixos and sailed together with him to Kolchis' (Scholion on Apollonios, *Argonautika* 1.256 (Hekataios F 17)).

Turning from the manner to the scope of Hekataios' *Genealogies* we can see that its contents were arranged rather as in Table 3.3. At first sight, this is the standard mythology in the standard order, a replica almost of Akousilaos (or vice versa). But there is a key difference: there is no evidence that Hekataios included theogonic material. This was maybe beyond the scope of a sensible account and that attitude, together with some rationalization and his geographical interests and activity as a politician, in a way make him the first historian. Herodotos (writing c. 440–420 BC), otherwise the first, follows in his footsteps but may be viewed in comparison as setting aside the mythic period altogether (cf. Herodotos 1.1–5 and 1.6 *init.*).

Table 3.4 Pherekydes' *Histories* (BNJ 3 esp. F 1–41).

<i>Book</i>	<i>Contents</i>	= Section (Table 3.6) of <i>Apollodoros</i>
1	Peleus; Koronis and Ischys	G, E
2	Argolid: Perseus and Danae; Herakles	C
3	Herakles (contd.), Heraklids	C
4	Agenor, Kadmos	D
5	Kadmos founds Thebes, the <i>Spartoi</i> ('Sown Men') Protogeneia, daughter of Deukalion	D B
6	Argonauts	B
7	Argonauts (contd) Aiolids; Melampous and Iphikles Kephalos and Prokris	B B H
8	Asklepios; Apollo serves Admetos Ankaios (Kalydonian Boar) Pelops and Oinomaos Niobe's tears	E B I D
9	Elatos, son of Ikarios, father of Tainaros	E (3.9 or 3.10)
10	Pelops, descent Thebes: Amphion and Zethos; the Phlegyes	I D

Pherekydes of Athens

One final key mythographer was writing perhaps in the 470s BC – between Hekataios and Herodotos. This was Pherekydes of Athens, whose *Historiai* ('Researches', the same title as Herodotos) reached later authorities in ten books. It is perhaps worth emphasizing at this point that it is generally believed that, rather than forming part of the original design of earlier authors, book divisions arose in the Hellenistic age, in the third century BC, as a convenience for scholars. Regardless of this, they are useful for describing the sequence of events in our mythographers.

From Table 3.4 it can be seen that Pherekydes ventures rather further from the traditional organization of mythology than his predecessors seem to have done. That is not to say that he ignores it: Book 2 to the first half of Book 5 follows the traditional sequence; and from there to mid-way through Book 7 appears to mop up the earlier material. Our impression, however, of the remainder is that Book 1 is more concerned to promote the mythology of the Aiakids, who as they originate on the island of Aigina, create an interest – and an agenda – for his Athenian audience. But the last books are more miscellaneous, unless his principle of organization (which is much contested) eludes us. It does however seem that he, like Hekataios, allowed no place for a theogony.

Be that as it may, his name appears constantly in later literature and in particular in the scholia on Homer – seven times, in something of a catchphrase, ‘the story is in Pherekydes’ (*he historia para Pherekydei*). There are 180 arguable quotations from, or allusions to, his work, contrasted to the 46 for Akousilaos and 23 for the *Genealogies* of Hekataios.

There are some signs that Pherekydes promoted particular Athenian agendas. For instance, we read,

Philaios son of Ajax made his home in Athens. He had a son Aiklos, who in turn had Epilykos, who had Akestor, who had Agenor, who had Oulios, who had Lykes, who had ?Tophon, who had Philaios, who had Agamestor, who had Tisandros – in whose archonship in Athens <something or other happened>, who had Miltiades, who had Hippokleides – in whose archonship [566/5 BC] the Panathenaia was established – who had Miltiades who colonised the Chersonese [c. 520 BC]. (Pherekydes F 2)

Ajax belonged in Salamis, whose ownership Athens had once disputed with Megara. He was the son of Aiakos, who belonged on the island of Aigina, with which Athens had fraught relations. This genealogy clearly prepares the ground for propagandist use. Furthermore, the Philaids were an important clan in the politics of Athens and it is hard not to discern in the background the figure of Kimon, the son of the Miltiades ‘who colonised the Chersonese’ and who was the leading politician of the 470s and 460s. This is why we date Pherekydes in the 470s or so (the only evidence we have otherwise is a later chronologist who says he ‘flourished’ in 455/4).⁹

Pherekydes, like earlier mythographers, fills out missing details in the genealogy and mythology. Who was the eagle that was sent to gnaw at Prometheus’ liver? Why, none other than the offspring of Typhon and Echidna (F 7b) – like the Kerberos we earlier saw added to Hesiod and which was known to Akousilaos. His style appears to have been very simple, and something of this ‘story-telling supplement to the mythology you already know’ can be seen in the following report of his account of the Perseus story in Book 2, where our source, a Scholion on Apollonios *Argonautika* 4.1091, appears to quote him word for word:

In what follows he also talks about the death of Akrisios, to the effect that ‘After the *apolithosis* [‘turning into stone’] of Polydektes and those with him using the head of the Gorgon, Perseus leaves Diktys behind on Seriphos to rule over the remaining Seriphians, but himself went off by ship to Argos together with the Kyklopes, Danae, and Andromeda. And when he gets there he does not find Akrisios in Argos: he had gone away in fear of him to the Pelasgians in Larissa. So, not finding him, he leaves Danae behind with her mother Eurydike, and Andromeda and the Kyklopes too, and himself went to Larissa. And on

arriving he recognizes Akrisios and persuades him to come with him to Argos. But when they were about to go, he comes across a competition of young men at Larissa. He strips for the contest, and takes a discus and throws it. It was not the pentathlon but they were contesting each of the events individually. The discus, however, lands on Akrisios' foot and wounds him. Suffering from this, Akrisios dies there in Larissa, and Perseus and the Larissans bury him in front of the city, and the locals make him a *heroion* [shrine where he may be worshipped as a hero]. And Perseus leaves Argos.' (Pherekydes F 12)

So this is what happened to Danae's father Akrisios (a question we perhaps never thought to ask). Perseus kills him, which is good. But not deliberately, which would have been bad, as Akrisios is Perseus' maternal grandfather. We have no idea what the Kyklopes are doing in this story, but doubtless there was a fascinating reason. And Diktys the fisherman becomes king of Seriphos. If there were more of Pherekydes, we might even find out what happened in the end to Andromeda.

Countless questions are answered by Pherekydes, which is why he is required reading for ancient commentators (scholiasts). If Ares and Harmonia are the parents of the Amazons, where did they have sex? – in the Akmonian Grove, which is near the distant River Thermodon (F 15a). What was the origin of the Golden Apples of the Hesperides that Herakles had to fetch? – they were produced by Ge (Earth) on the marriage of Hera (F 16a). And the Hesperides, in case you are wondering, are the daughters of Zeus and Themis (F 16d). Where did Herakles get the advice on how to win the apples? – from the nymphs by the River Eridanos (F 16a). Pherekydes may have introduced this distant north-western river Eridanos, later identified with the Italian river Po, into Greek mythology altogether (F 74). But he did not persuade Herodotos, a generation later, who denied it even existed (3.115).

Rationalization does not seem to be an interest of Pherekydes. His Niobe prays to Zeus to be turned into stone. And she is (F 38). There is no attempt to eliminate the miraculous nature of this story which is, in the end, about a natural feature of a rocky landscape. He has no problem with the Kerkopes, opponents of Herakles, being turned to stone, either (F 77). Indeed, *apolithosis* (turning to stone) plays a remarkable role in Pherekydes.

Pherekydes tells versions of some of the obscurer stories which appear in the tragedians (Aeschylus was his contemporary, after all). Neoptolemos' death in Delphi and Orestes' marriage to Menelaos' daughter Hermione, scarcely a central part of the tradition, may have driven Sophocles' lost play, *Hermione*, and are referred to at the end of Euripides' *Orestes*, apparently based on Pherekydes (F 64a–b, 135A). The earliest reference to Neoptolemos' death has been held to be in Pindar, but the particular poems in question (*Paeon* 6, *Nemean* 7) may well date from the period 478–460 and therefore be contemporary with,

or derived from, Pherekydes.¹⁰ The way *Nemean* 7 is addressed to Sogenes of Aigina and takes the Aiakids into consideration, it looks as though Pherekydes' first book is in Pindar's mind.

Patroklos' killing of a youth led to his arrival at Peleus' court (*Iliad* 23.87). His name was 'Kleisonymos', Pherekydes helpfully informs us (F 65). The same story later, amongst the Alexandrian poets, became the subject of the *Astragalistai* ('knucklebone players'), a play by the then celebrated tragedian Alexander of Pleuron. Given our fragmentary remains both of the prose mythographers and of the extensive output of tragedians, it is probably best to take the view that tragedians were men of their times and, as part of their culture, read all the mythographical literature available to them, just as Herodotos doubtless did. Aeschylus may have claimed that his plots were 'slices' of Homer, but in fact few tragedies owe their origin to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The broader tradition of the cyclic epics and of the works discussed in this chapter provided an enormously wealthier range of possible plots to dip into.

Hellanikos of Lesbos

With the *Historiai* of Pherekydes the work of mythographers, in the sense of those who tried to write a complete mythology, was apparently done. But this really only marked the beginning of the Greek tradition. What followed was more detailed work, something which in our sense was rather more 'scholarly'.

Hellanikos is usually viewed as a historian (his scope is in fact not unlike that of Hekataios). He was a younger contemporary of Herodotos and an older contemporary of Thucydides, and lived to the ripe old age of eighty-five. He was responsible also, however, for some key mythographic studies and what immediately catches the eye is the two-book *Phoronis*. The title of this work makes clear that Hellanikos must have accepted the somewhat deviant account of Akousilaos (and the earlier poetic *Phoronis*) according to which the beginnings of human genealogy lay in Argos itself, with the first king, Phoroneus, whose son was Pelasgos (the eponym of the people who in myth precede the Greeks in Greece). Phoroneus is mentioned by Hesiod (F 10b) and Apollodoros (2.1), but he is given only second position in the series of accounts of the origins of humanity (Section C, not B in Table 3.6) and has little impact. For Hellanikos, on the other hand, Phoroneus was evidently the key to the tight genealogical organization of his monograph on the mythology of the Argolid and Thebes. This exercise is repeated for a new and apparently separate monograph on the Ionian peoples and their perceived relations in the time of myth, which starts from Deukalion in a more conventional way, as we can see from the

Table 3.5 Hellanikos' various mythographic works (following Jacoby, *FGrH* 4).

<i>Book</i>	<i>Contents</i>	= <i>Section (Table 3.6) of Apollodoros</i>
<i>Phoronis</i> 1	Theogony?	A?
	Phoroneus, and the Pelasgians	C, E
	Agenor and Kadmos. The 'Sown Men' (<i>Spartoi</i>)	D
	Polyneikes and Eteokles.	D
<i>Phoronis</i> 2	Herakles and his labours	C
<i>Deukalionis</i> , 2 bks	Agenor, Kadmos	D
	Deukalion and Pyrrha; beginnings of Aitolia	B
	Neleus (Pylos); Kodros (Athens), Boiotia	B; I, D
	Jason and the Argo	B
<i>Atlantis</i> (2 bks)	Atlas – the Pleiades and, for example, Hermes; sons of Atlas	E
<i>Asopis</i> , 1 bk	The R. Asopos	G
<i>Troika</i> , 2 bks	Genealogy of Miltiades?	
	Genealogy and geography of Troy	F, I
	Myths of Troy	
	Achilles and the swollen Skamandros	
	The Wooden Horse and fall of Troy	

coverage of Apollodoros (Book 1) and from the very starting point of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*.

However much Hellanikos refines the organization of the mythographic works, their real significance lies in the 'improvement' in detail, not just in the assertion of new or variant genealogical information but also in the references to actual places in the Greek world: it is as though he improves the reality of the mythology, this time not by historicizing it, but by 'geographizing' it. All the same, his books dedicated to the *Troika* do seem to have helped the illusion that the Trojan myth was history, something which would reach completion towards the end of the first century AD when someone wrote the war memoirs of Diktys of Crete, supposedly an eyewitness of the war itself. So it is that Hellanikos addresses the problem of the battle conducted by Achilles with the river Skamandros (*Iliad* Book 21):

About this time god rained on Mount Ida. As a result the Skamandros overflowed its banks due to the storm water and overran the area that had hollow places. Achilles met with this torrent first because he was at the head of the army and, concerned that the torrent might do him some harm, took hold of some

elms that were growing on the plain and hoisted himself up. The others, seeing the torrent in time, turned wherever each individual one of them could and climbed the hills that overlooked the plain. (Hellanikos F 28)

So far we have seen the fabulous matter of theogonies excluded from more hard-headed accounts of mythology. But a determined segregation of myth as a whole from history, though a long time growing, would only arrive in the following generation when Ephoros created ‘universal history’ but excluded from it the entire mythical period: he began at the sack of Troy (T 1) and the return of the Heraklids (T 8). For the time being, mythography would be a matter for specialists and for those who in succeeding centuries would seek to explain great works of literature, the epics and the dramas.

Conclusion: Apollodoros, *The Library*

It is, however, worth showing where this picture culminates for us. Our principal account of mythology from antiquity is, of course, none of the lost texts we have discussed above, though maybe they would be if we had them. Instead we resort to a text about which we know very little, the *Library* (*Bibliothēkē*) of Apollodoros. This text aims to give a systematic, continuous account of the mythology in as accurate a version as is possible, quite often stopping to cite its sources (often the lost authors discussed in this chapter). It is later than around 60 BC because he mentions the author Kastor of Rhodes (at 2.1.3) whose work goes that late. It is generally thought that ‘Apollodoros’ is a pseudonym or an incorrect attribution, referring to the relatively famous second-century BC annalist and scholar Apollodoros of Athens, who also wrote an *On the Gods*. This is an unnecessary supposition and he does seem as entitled to the name ‘Apollodoros’ as the other 1,314 that are known currently in the Oxford *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*.¹¹

My own view is that this is a mid-/late first-century AD authority who is trying to stabilize Greek mythology at a time when ever more preposterous alterations are being suggested for it – often to prove Homer wrong, rather as a sport or a party game.¹² But, whether this is true or not, it is the nearest we are going to come to a reliable and complete mythology from antiquity. Fortunately, though part of it is lost, we do have versions of an abridgement (*Epitome*) of the work. Its contents, as we have now seen, follow quite closely the order of the combination of Hesiod, *Theogony* and the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*. The organization, as can be seen from Table 3.6, is by genealogy and region till we reach the Trojan War, where the illusion of history and chronology is practically complete.

Table 3.6 The *Library* of Apollodoros.

	<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Contents</i>
A	1	Theogony; the Titans; the birth of Zeus
Book One 1–6: the gods (scene: divine geography)	2	Zeus defeats the Titans. The offspring of Titans, and various monsters and sea-creatures
	3	Zeus and the birth of the Olympian gods
	4	Deeds of Apollo and Artemis
	5	Pluto, Persephone, and Demeter
	6	The gods’ battles with giants and with Typhon
	B	7
Book One 7–9: the descendants of Deukalion (scene: Thessaly and neighbouring areas)		Deukalion and the Flood
		Deukalion’s son Hellen (‘Greek’) and his sons Doros (‘Dorian’), Xouthos, and Aiolos (‘Aiolian’)
		Aiolos’ descendants (THESSALY, AITOLIA, and ELIS)
	8	The boar hunt of Meleager at Kalydon (AITOLIA); the hero Tydeus
	9	Athamas (BOIOTIA), Phrixos, and the Golden Fleece
		Sisyphos, Prokris, and Eos, Salmoneus’ impiety (THESSALY, ELIS), Melampous
		Admetos and Alkestis (THESSALY)
		the Argonauts (Iolkos in THESSALY)
C	1	Inachos (ARGOLID), his son Phoroneus, and Niobe, mother of Argos and Pelasgos
Book Two: the descendants of Inachos (scene: mainly the Argolid; some remote lands)		Agenor (see Bk 3) and his son ‘All-seeing’ Argos
		Io – seduced by Zeus, wanders the world. EGYPT and LIBYA
		The Danaids murder their husbands.
		Anymone and Nauplios
	2	Akrisios and Proitos, warring twins
		TIRYNS; madness of the Proitids, cured by Melampous
	3	Bellerophon and Stheneboia; Pegasos, and the Chimaira (LYKIA)
		Bellerophon and the Solymoi, and the Amazons
	4	Danaē and Perseus; the Gorgon Medusa; Andromeda (AITHIOPIA).
		Amphitryon and the Teleboai (on Taphos); Alkmene; Herakles and Eurystheus; deeds, and madness of Herakles

Continued

Table 3.6 Cont'd

	<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Contents</i>
	5	The Labours of Herakles
	6	Herakles and Iole; his murder of Iphitos; recovery of Alkestis; servitude to Omphale
	7	Military deeds of Herakles; Auge (TEGEEA); his wife Deianeira (KALYDON) Aigimios; Kyknos Capture of Oichalia (and Iole); the poison cloak; death on Mt Oita; immortality
	8	Flight of the Heraklids (e.g., Hyllos) from Eurystheus; return of the Heraklids to the Peloponnese Various oracles and soothsayers; division of the Peloponnese
D	1	Agenor's children, e.g., Europa and Kadmos (PHOENICIA) Europa and the bull (Zeus); Kadmos goes in search of her Her son Minos. Pasiphaē and the bull; the Minotaur (CRETE)
Book Three 1–7: the descendants of Agenor (scene: mainly Thebes, with orientalizing start)	2	Katreus, son of Minos; Katreus killed by his son Althaimenes
	3	Glaukos raised from dead by seer Polyidos
	4	Kadmos follows cow, founds THEBES, defeats the Sown Men (<i>Spartoi</i>) Kadmos and Harmonia Zeus, Semele, and Dionysos; Ino and Melikertes. Aktaion
	5	Dionysos, and Lykourgos in Thrace; India; Thebes (Euripides' <i>Bacchae</i>) Etruscan pirates (Homeric <i>Hymn to Dionysos</i>); brings Semele from Hades Theban stories: Antiope, her twin sons Amphion and Zethos; the death of Dirke Niobe enrages Apollo and Artemis Laios, Jocasta, Oedipus (Sophocles' <i>Oedipus Tyrannos</i>)
	6	Eteokles and Polyneikes; the Seven Against Thebes
	7	Kreon and Antigone; Sons of the Seven, the <i>Epigono</i> i

Table 3.6 Cont'd

	<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Contents</i>
E	8	Children of Pelasgos; Lykaon offers cannibal meal to Zeus (SW ARKADIA)
Book Three 8–11: the descendants of Pelasgos; and of Atlas (scene:	9	Kallisto, and her son Arkas (ARKADIA) Auge and Telephos (TEGEA, S ARKADIA; MYSIA) Atalanta and the golden apples
Arkadia and its neighbour	10	Atlas' daughters, the Pleiades (ARKADIA) Birth of Hermes (N ARKADIA). Steals cattle of Apollo
Lakedaimonia [Sparta])	11	LAKEDAIMONIA; Apollo kills Hyakinthos; Dioskouroi and the Leukippides Deeds of Apollo: kills Koronis; kills the Kyklopes over death of Asklepios Tyndareus, Helen, Klytaimestra, Penelope; suitors of Helen End of the mortal life of the Dioskouroi
F	12	Elektra (one of Pleiades, cf. 3.10): sons Iasion and Dardanos; Demeter and Iasion; the founders of Troy (Teukros, Dardanos, Ilos, Tros); the Palladion; Eos and Tithonos; Priam, Hekabe, Helen, Paris, Andromache.
Book Three 12: the descendants of Elektra (scene: Troy)	12	Elektra (one of Pleiades, cf. 3.10): sons Iasion and Dardanos; Demeter and Iasion; the founders of Troy (Teukros, Dardanos, Ilos, Tros); the Palladion; Eos and Tithonos; Priam, Hekabe, Helen, Paris, Andromache.
G	12	R. Asopos seeks Aigina (abducted by Zeus). Aiakos; men from ants; keys of Hades; son Telamon goes to SALAMIS
Book Three 12–13: The descendants of Aiakos (scene: Aigina and alleged daughterlands)	13	Son Peleus goes to PHTHIA; early adventures; marriage to Thetis Thetis nearly immortalizes Achilles. Achilles on Skyros. Patroklos.
H	14	Kekrops (ATHENS); Athene and the olive-tree; daughters of Kekrops; Kephalos and Prokris Adonis; Athene and Hephaistos. Erichthonios; Tereus and Prokne
Book Three 14–16/ <i>Epitome</i> 1: (scene: Athens)	15	Boreas abducts Oreithyia Kings of Athens: Erechtheus, Pandion, Aigeus Nisos and Skylla (MEGARA) The Minotaur and the Labyrinth (KNOSSOS)
	16	Deeds of Theseus <i>rest of text is lost: we now turn to the Epitome (abridgement), which does survive</i>
	1.1–4	... deeds of Theseus

Continued

Table 3.6 Cont'd

	<i>Chapter</i>	<i>Contents</i>
	1.5–15	Theseus and the Minotaur; Ariadne; suicide of Aigeus; flight (both senses) of Daïdalos and Ikaros; death of Minos
	1.16–24	Theseus and the Amazons; Phaidra and Hippolytos; Ixion and Hera (whence the Centaurs) Theseus and Peirithoos; Lapiths and Centaurs; Kaineus; Helen.
I	2.1–2	Tantalos; Broteas and Artemis
<i>Epitome 2–7: The descendants of Tantalos; the Trojan War and aftermath</i>	2.3–9	Pelops (son of Tantalos), and Poseidon, and Hippodameia
	2.10–16	Sons of Pelops; Thyestes and Atreus and the kingship of MYCENAE Agamemnon and Menelaos; Klytaïmestra, Helen
	3	The Trojan War: preliminaries, and up to where the <i>Iliad</i> begins
	4	The plot of the <i>Iliad</i>
	5	Events after the <i>Iliad</i> , the capture of Troy
	6	Returns, and subsequent fates of, the Greeks who went to Troy
	7	The <i>Odyssey</i> and the end of Odysseus' story

In Table 3.6, which obviously cannot itself tell the mythology,¹³ I have attempted to show the articulation of the mythology. (A) deals with beginnings and gods. (B) deals with mythology about (and which therefore originated in) Thessaly. It will be seen that this mythology is not quarantined to Thessaly on the map, but spreads, as culturally it will have done, to Boiotia to the south and Aitolia to the south-west of Thessaly. This beginning also serves to deal with the Greeks as mythology systematized them in their entirety, as the sons of Hellen.

With (C) we move to the Peloponnese, and specifically to the Argolid. Lykia, Libya, and Egypt mark how gradually mythology came to map the rest of the world relative to the home-base for that mythology. Aithiopia is a practically ideological place, rather than a real one (see Rutherford, CH. 24); the myth of Andromeda when located more 'realistically' usually found itself at Joppa (Jaffa). The first half of Herakles' labours are in or near the Argolid, and his map does seem to draw a picture of the influence of the Argolid over the Peloponnese, probably in Mycenaean times (the formative age for the mythology). The location of Oichalia is quite uncertain – it may be in the south-west Peloponnese, in Messenia, or else as imaginary as the damsel Iole.

(C) not only enshrines Argive stories. It *competes* with other parts of the mythology. Phoroneus is the first man – he is autochthonous, and Niobe is the first woman with whom Zeus coupled. If authors such as Apollodoros and Hesiod actually accepted this, then the story would have to be told at the beginning of the account of humanity – as section (B) instead of Thessaly. Hellanikos' *Phoronis* did adopt this perspective, as doubtless the archaic *Phoronis* had. And it is hard to believe that Akousilaos would not have done. The same thing happens in other areas, too. In (D) Kadmos must defeat the Sown Men, an emblem of autochthony (birth from the earth). In (E) Pelasgos is autochthonous on Hesiod's account, but made a son of Zeus and Niobe by Akousilaos to re-skew the genealogy to Argive primacy.¹⁴ In (G) Aiakos is on his own at the beginning and needs men to be made out of ants; that done, a dispersion can follow and places like neighbouring Salamis and (outrageously) Phthia, effectively in Thessaly, can be derived from Aigina. In (H) Athens has its own autochthonous characters, bearing the name 'from the very earth' – Erichthonios/Erechtheus – the latter born of the semen of Hephaistos, falling to Athene's disgust on her leg and wiped thence to the ground (Apollodoros 3.14.6). Somehow related is the theme of cannibalism and dismemberment: Pelops (I) needs to be reassembled, but others are merely eaten or merely offered: Lykaon's impious feast in Arkadia (E) and the banquet where Atreus serves Thyestes' children (I). These are not so much matters of recurrence as realizations of very similar mythologies in different landscapes. The trick of the mythographer is to piece them together as though they were independent stories which somehow can be mapped together.

The structure creaks somewhat at (F), where the need to establish Troy so that it may play its full mythical part in the story later leads to the creation of a tradition as though Troy, too, had contributed its local mythology to the system. That is, of course, an illusion. There is no Trojan mythology – in the sense of a mythology told by Trojans to each other that becomes incorporated in 'Greek mythology'. It is perhaps desperate to deploy 'Elektra', one of the Pleiades, to make (F) possible. It is redolent of how, later, Romans had to be accommodated in the mythic system (see FOX, CH. 13).

The Athenian mythology (H) seems unusually separable from the main body of Greek mythology and makes its best connections with outside through the Herakles-like modelling of Theseus and his close association with a Lapith. But it may be, to speculate, that Athens was rather outside the main cultural circles of late Mycenaean mythology.¹⁵

Finally (I). This section starts with sinners against the gods, and is not without them as the story progresses (particularly Lokrian Ajax and his terrible offence against Athene). But in the end it is about establishing the place of the treasured epics of Homer in the mythographic tradition. Homer, indeed, did not intend to tell mythology (cf. Létoublon in CH. 2). But as the centuries passed he seemed to have done so, and it becomes the duty of the mythographer

to enshrine his ‘histories’, as they can seem, in a genealogical and regional mythology that has dominated this chapter.

FURTHER READING

Hesiod the mythographer is not specially well served in the English language. A good sense of his character and some modern debates can be obtained from Lamberton 1988; J. S. Clay 2003 gives us Hesiod the thinker. More severely traditional (lots of Greek in the text) are West’s commentaries on the *Theogony* (1966) and *Works and Days* (1978) but they are where the serious information is. Beyond that, one may turn to Most’s excellent and extensive introductory material (2006–7: vol. 1).

Books on mythology have difficulty finding space for archaic and classical mythography. Graf deals primarily with theogony and cosmogony (1993a: ch. 4) and deals a little with the *Catalogue of Women* as genealogy (126–8). Dowden 1992 is rather lacking on Hesiod but better on Akousilaos and such mythographers (1992: 42–5). Pearson 1939 must still be pressed into service until such time as Robert Fowler produces Vol. 2 of his *Early Greek Mythography* (cf. Fowler 2000), with its mythological half of the commentary, and until the *BNJ* commentaries are complete (see below).

It is best to read the texts for oneself. The only anthology, though of rather wide scope, is Trzaskoma *et al.* 2004. *BNJ*, currently only online in significant university libraries, will finally provide translation of, and commentary on, all fragments of such authors as Akousilaos (see ‘Less Easily Found Texts’ in the bibliography).

The story beyond the fifth century BC is taken up by Carolyn Higbie in Woodard 2007 (ch. 7).

NOTES

1. Most (2006–7: liii).
2. Most (2006–7: lii–liiii).
3. Dowden (1992: 46).
4. Clearly, it was a separate poem: see D’Alessio (2005a).
5. Kallimachos, *Aitia* F 119 with M. L. West (2002: 115–16).
6. M. L. West (1966, online 536).
7. M. L. West (2002: 111).
8. Pausanias 2.19.5.
9. Pherekydes, *BNJ* 3 T 6, and W. S. Morison’s commentary; Huxley (1973).
10. Gantz (1993: 690) (earliest references in Pindar); Finley (1951).
11. <http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk> (accessed 1 August 2010).
12. Dowden (forthcoming a).
13. It builds, of course, on Frazer (1921 1.xlv–lviii).
14. Apollodoros 3.8.1 (Hesiod F 160 MW, F 110 Most; Akousilaos *FGrH* 2 F 25).
15. This might make sense in the light of the interesting theories of Margalit Finkelberg about the development of Greek dialect groupings in this period (Finkelberg 2005: 138).