

# FRAGMENTS, HOLES, AND WHOLES

## RECONSTRUCTING THE ANCIENT WORLD IN THEORY AND PRACTICE

EDITED BY

TOMASZ DERDA  
JENNIFER HILDER  
JAN KWAPISZ

WARSAW 2017



UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW  
FACULTY OF LAW AND ADMINISTRATION  
CHAIR OF ROMAN AND ANTIQUE LAW



UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW  
INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY  
DEPARTMENT OF PAPYROLOGY



THE RAPHAEL TAUBENSCHLAG  
FOUNDATION

# THE JOURNAL OF JURISTIC PAPYROLOGY

Supplements

SERIES EDITORS  
**TOMASZ DERDA**  
**ADAM ŁAJTAR**  
**JAKUB URBANIK**

VOLUME XXX

**T H E J O U R N A L O F J U R I S T I C P A P Y R O L O G Y**  
Supplement XXX

# **FRAGMENTS, HOLES, AND WHOLES**

## **RECONSTRUCTING THE ANCIENT WORLD IN THEORY AND PRACTICE**

EDITED BY  
TOMASZ DERDA  
JENNIFER HILDER  
JAN KWAPISZ

WARSAW 2017

*Supplements to The Journal of Juristic Papyrology* are jointly published by the Faculty of Law and Administration of the University of Warsaw, the Institute of Archaeology of the University of Warsaw, and Fundacja im. Rafała Taubenschlaga, Krakowskie Przedmieście 26/28  
00-927 Warszawa 64  
tel. (+4822)55.22.815 and (+4822)55.20.384, fax: (+4822)55.24.319  
e-mails: t.derda@uw.edu.pl, kuba@adm.uw.edu.pl  
a.lajtar@uw.edu.pl, g.ochala@uw.edu.pl  
web-page: <http://www.taubenschlagfoundation.org>

Cover design by Maryna Wiśniewska

This book has been reviewed for publication  
by Mikołaj Szymański and Ewa Wipszycka

Computer design and DTP by Tomasz Derda  
Editing and proofreading by Tomasz Derda, Jennifer Hilder,  
and Jan Kwapisz

© for the book by Fundacja im. Rafała Taubenschlaga

© for the constituting papers by the authors

Warszawa 2017

The publication of this volume was made possible  
thanks to the financial support from the Faculty of Polish Studies  
of the University of Warsaw

ISBN 978-83-946848-0-8

Wydanie I

Druk i oprawa: Sowa Sp. z o.o.  
ul. Raszyńska 13, 05-500 Piaseczno

*Fragments, Holes, and Wholes*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

PREFACE .....	VII
NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS AND EDITORS .....	XI
INTRODUCTION	
Jan KWAPISZ, <i>Fun from fragments</i> .....	3
PART ONE: PROLEGOMENA TO FRAGMENTOLOGY	
Joshua T. KATZ, <i>Reconstructing the pre-ancient world in theory and practice</i> .....	23
Hans-Joachim GEHRKE, <i>Fragmentary evidence and the whole of history</i> .....	41
Annette HARDER, <i>From pieces to pictures</i> .....	53
PART TWO: FROM FRAGMENTS TO CONTEXTS	
Han BALTUSSEN, <i>Slim pickings and Russian dolls? Presocratic fragments in Peripatetic sources after Aristotle</i> .....	73
Ilaria ANDOLFI, <i>Hecataeus Milesius: A textual approach to selected fragments of the Genealogies</i> .....	91
Gertjan VERHASSELT, <i>Reconstructing lost prose literature: The fragments of Dicaearchus</i> .....	109
S. Douglas OLSON, <i>Some unattributed fragments of Eupolis: Problems and possibilities</i> .....	127
PART THREE: FROM CONTEXTS TO FRAGMENTS	
Renate SCHLESIER, <i>How to make fragments: Maximus Tyrius' Sappho</i> .....	141

Eran ALMAGOR, <i>Facts, fragments and fiction: Plutarch's Solon</i> .....	163
Henriette VAN DER BLOM, <i>Sulla in the contio: An oratorical episode in pieces</i> ...	181
PART FOUR: FRAGMENTS THEMSELVES	
Christophe CUSSET & Antje KOLDE, <i>Fragments of a female lover's discourse: Inconsistent discourse or consistent text? The Fragmentum Grenfellianum (P. Dryton 50)</i> .....	199
Martin STÖCKINGER, <i>Fragments, wholes, and missing ends? The Carmina Einsidlensia and the question of bucolic closure</i> .....	217
Victor M. MARTÍNEZ, <i>Rethinking the fragmentary (w)hole in archaeology: A microscopic paradigm for understanding macroscopic problems</i> .....	233
PART FIVE: FRAGMENTS OF GRAND DISCOURSES	
Lech TRZCIONKOWSKI, <i>Collecting the dismembered poet: The interplay between the whole and fragments in the reconstruction of Orphism</i> .....	251
Marquis BERREY, <i>Technology, performance, loss: Reconstructing Andreas of Carystus' surgical machine</i> .....	273
Jennifer M. HILDER, <i>Making wholes: Using exemplary fragments in the Rhetorica ad Herennium</i> .....	291
PART SIX: FRAGMENTOLOGISTS AT WORK	
Ettore CINGANO, <i>Epic fragments on Theseus: Hesiod, Cercops, and the Theseis</i> ...	309
Giuseppe UCCIARDELLO, <i>Reconstructing Greek lyric poetry from papyrus fragments: The case of P. Oxy. 32.2624 (choral lyric)</i> .....	333
Karol MYŚLIWIEC, <i>Hole or whole? A cemetery from the Ptolemaic period in Saqqara</i> .....	363
EPILOGUE	
Han BALTUSSEN & S. Douglas OLSON, <i>A conversation on fragments</i> .....	393
GENERAL INDEX .....	407

*Fragments, Holes, and Wholes*

pp. VII–IX

Krystyna Bartol  
Jerzy Danielewicz

**PREFACE**

*However, as every parent of a small child knows, converting a large object into small fragments is considerably easier than the reverse process.*

Andrew S. Tanenbaum, *Computer Networks*, 4th ed., Upper Saddle River, NJ 2002, p. 428

**I**N THE FIELD OF STUDIES OF ANCIENT CULTURE the enormous and lasting authority of fragments is, not surprisingly, a stable feature. This important and difficult subject has attracted scholars' attention over the past decades; as a result, more and more emphasis is placed on the phenomenon in question. Examining fragments requires not only understanding what the fragment is (which is by no means easy), but also what the fragment can and should be for scholars working on various 'objects' and aspects related to ancient culture. It also requires realizing the strengths and, at the same time, limitations of a *fragmentum*, which – being a piece detached from the whole – may bear little resemblance to the 'object' it originally belonged to.

In the case of Greek and Roman monuments of culture, material as well as spiritual, the process of corruption began quite early, and the quest for the 'original' lasts to this day. Scholars nowadays persist in their efforts to reconstruct the realities of the ancient world and – in a way – to re-cre-

ate the past. The vast body of extant fragments cannot be dismissed if a broad picture of past times is to be obtained.

The present volume offers a variety of case studies rather than a theoretically oriented survey of trends and overall approaches towards the fragmentarily preserved ancient material. Nevertheless, the discussions of specific cases are not confined to merely illustrating with examples the patterns already detected and followed by scholars, but also formulate some new theoretical proposals applicable to different kinds of material.

This book stems from the international conference *Fragments, Holes, and Wholes: Reconstructing the Ancient World in Theory and Practice* (Warsaw, 12–14 June 2014), which was organized by the Committee on Ancient Culture of the Polish Academy of Sciences, the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of Warsaw, the Institute of Archaeology of the University of Warsaw, and the Institute of Classical Studies of Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. The papers assembled in it were all delivered during the conference, and roughly reflect the range of different subjects represented there. We are grateful to the Faculty of Polish Studies of the University of Warsaw for providing the funds for publication of this volume.

Many individuals contributed to the success of the event. The members of the Conference Committee: Tomasz Giaro, Włodzimierz Lengauer, Adam Łajtar, Karol Myśliwiec, Jakub Pigoń, Mikołaj Szymański (accompanied by the two undersigned) are to be thanked for their unfailing support, and particularly for their valuable contribution to the selection of papers for the conference. Additionally, they all – together with Renate Schlesier, Johannes Engels, Hans-Joachim Gehrke and Han Baltussen – presided over sessions. Very special thanks go to the scholars who kindly accepted our invitation and agreed to deliver the opening and keynote lectures: Hans-Joachim Gehrke, Annette Harder, Wolfgang Kaiser, Joshua Katz, Karol Myśliwiec, and Dirk Obbink.

We are convinced that the fruitful dialogue between speakers, formal respondents (Maria Jennifer Falcone, Chiara Meccariello, Elisabetta Miccolis, Marco Perale, Mateusz Stróżyński, Alexandra Trachsel, Matteo Zaccarini) and other participants contributed to the improvement of the papers before their submission to this volume. The lively intellectual atmosphere of the discussions is best exemplified by the exchange



between S. Douglas Olson and Han Baltussen, which is included at the end of this volume as the Epilogue.

Finally, we should like to express our heartfelt gratitude to the Conference Secretary, Jan Kwapisz, without whose tremendous input and organizational skills the conference would never have been so successful. Separate thanks are due to him, Jennifer Hilder and Tomasz Derda for taking on the time-consuming task of editing this volume.

Poznań, June 2016

*Krystyna Bartol*  
krbartol@amu.edu.pl

*Jerzy Danielewicz*  
danielew@amu.edu.pl



*Fragments, Holes, and Wholes*

pp. XI–XV

## NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS AND EDITORS

**Eran Almagor** is co-editor of *Ancient Ethnography: New Approaches* (Bloomsbury, 2013) and author of papers on the history of the Achaemenid Empire, its image in Greek literature, the *Lives* of Plutarch and Greek imperial writers (in particular Strabo, Josephus, and Lucian). Among his interests is the reception of Antiquity in modern popular culture.

**Ilaria Andolfi** is currently a postdoctoral researcher at the Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Storici in Naples. Her research interests include the early Greek prose of the mythographers and the Presocratics, Plato and fifth-century BC philosophical poetry (especially Empedocles).

**Han Baltussen** is the Hughes Professor of Classics at the University of Adelaide and a Fellow of the Australian Academy of the Humanities. He has published on a wide range of topics in intellectual history; his book publications include *Philosophy and Exegesis in Simplicius: The Methodology of a Commentator* (2008).

**Krystyna Bartol** is Full Professor of Classics at Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, and President of the Committee on Ancient Culture of the Polish Academy of Sciences. Her research interests include various

aspects of Greek poetry and Greek prose of the Imperial period. She recently co-authored with Jerzy Danielewicz the first Polish translation of Athenaeus (2010) and a translation, with extensive commentary, of Greek comic fragments (2011).

**Marquis Berrey** is an assistant professor of Classics at the University of Iowa. His research explores how the cultural practices of gift-exchange, reading, and performance shaped scientific communities and scientific ideas in Greco-Roman Antiquity. His book *Hellenistic Science at Court* will be published by de Gruyter.

**Henriette van der Blom** is Lecturer in Ancient History at the University of Birmingham. She is an expert on Roman oratory and political life, on which she has published a string of articles and a co-edited volume. Her latest monograph, *Oratory and Political Career in the Late Roman Republic* (2016), is published by Cambridge University Press.

**Ettore Cingano** is *Professore Ordinario* at Ca' Foscari University of Venice. He has extensively published on early Greek myth and its reception, Greek epic and archaic lyric poetry from Stesichorus to Bacchylides, and a number of other aspects of Greek culture.

**Christophe Cusset**, Professor of Greek Literature at the University of Lyon (ENS de Lyon), is author of several books on Hellenistic poetry. His recent publications include French editions of Lycophron (with Cédric Chauvin, 2008) and Euphorion (with Benjamin Acosta-Hughes, 2012), and the volume *Lycophron: éclats d'obscurité*, co-edited with Évelyne Prioux (2009).

**Jerzy Danielewicz** is Professor Emeritus at Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, and Honorary President of the Committee on Ancient Culture of the Polish Academy of Sciences. His main research interest is Greek lyric poetry. He has recently published the Polish translations, with introductions and commentaries, of Posidippus, Athenaeus and the fragmentary comic poets (the last two co-authored with Krystyna Bartol).

**Tomasz Derda** is Professor at the Department of Papyrology at the University of Warsaw and co-editor of the *Journal of Juristic Papyrology*. In his many years of work on excavations at Naqlun in the Fayum Oasis he has focused on investigating and publishing newly found papyrus texts.

**Hans-Joachim Gehrke** is a former President of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut and Professor of Ancient History at the Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg. His numerous publications reflect his interests in the history, social and intellectual history of the central and eastern Mediterranean in Antiquity, geography and ethnography of Greece.

**Annette Harder** is Professor of Ancient Greek Language and Literature at the University of Groningen. She has published commented editions of Euripides' fragmentary *Cresphontes* and *Archelaus* (1985) and Callimachus' *Aetia* (2012). She is the force behind the Groningen Workshops on Hellenistic Poetry.

**Jennifer Hilder** is a Lecturer in the Department of Classics and Ancient History at Durham University. Her research interests are focused on the mid to late Roman Republic and Roman rhetoric. She is currently working on a monograph on the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*.

**Joshua T. Katz** is Cotsen Professor in the Humanities, Professor of Classics, and sometime Director of the Program in Linguistics at Princeton University. Subjects that have recently occupied his attention include the morphology of the Greek pluperfect, Aristotle's knowledge of the badger, and the reception of Saussure's *cabiers d'anagrammes*.

**Antje Kolde**, Professor at the Haute École Pédagogique of Lausanne and Associated Researcher at the University of Lausanne, is author of a number of publications on Hellenistic poetry, including Isyllos, Euphorion and Lycophron. She co-authored, with André Hurst, a commented edition of Lycophron (2008).

**Jan Kwapisz** is an assistant professor in the Institute of Classical Studies

at the University of Warsaw. He is the author of a commented edition of the Greek *technopaegnia* (2013), and has co-edited *The Muse at Play: Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry* (with David Petrain and Mikołaj Szymański, 2013).

**Victor M. Martínez**, Instructor of Art History at the Arkansas State University, also serves as associate director of the Palatine East Pottery Project and is co-director of the Najerilla River Valley Research Project in La Rioja, Spain. He is currently at work on a monograph tentatively entitled, *Networks of Intoxication: The Case of Late Roman Wines from Italy, ca. 250–700 CE*.

**Karol Myśliwiec** is a former Director of the Institute of Mediterranean and Oriental Cultures at the Polish Academy of Sciences. Since 1985 he has directed excavations in Egypt, currently at Saqqara. He has published twelve books and some 300 articles on the archaeology, history and culture of Egypt.

**S. Douglas Olson** is Distinguished McKnight University Professor in the Department of Classical and Near Eastern Studies at the University of Minnesota. He has recently completed the work on a three-volume commentary on the fragments of Eupolis for the Heidelberg Academy *Kommentierung der Fragmenten der griechischen Komödie* project.

**Renate Schlesier** is Professor of the Study of Religion at the Freie Universität of Berlin. In her scholarly work she has explored ancient Greek religion from a variety of perspectives, focusing on its history, aesthetics, cultural significance and the methodology of the study of religion and culture.

**Martin Stöckinger**, Academic Coordinator of the August Boeckh Centre at the Humboldt University of Berlin, works on Augustan and early imperial literature. His book entitled, *Vergils Gaben. Materialität, Reziprozität und Poetik in den Eklogen und der Aeneis*, has recently been published by Winter.

**Lech Trzcionkowski** is currently Head of the Institute for the Study of Religion at the Jagiellonian University in Cracow. His primary interest is in Greek religion, especially Orphism. His book *Bios – Thanatos – Bios: Orphic Semiophores from Olbia and the Polis Culture* was published (in Polish) in 2013.

**Giuseppe Ucciardello** is Associate Professor in Greek Language and Literature at the University of Messina. He has published a number of articles on Greek lyric, Attic orators, Greek literary papyri and Byzantine lexicography. He is currently working towards a commented edition of a selection of lyric adespota.

**Gertjan Verhasselt** is a postdoctoral collaborator in the Department of Ancient History at the University of Leuven. In his work he focuses on Greek prose and Greek literary papyri. His edition of the fragments of Dicaearchus will soon appear as part of the continuation of Jacoby's *FGrHist*.

**T H E J O U R N A L O F J U R I S T I C P A P Y R O L O G Y**  
Supplement XXX

# **FRAGMENTS, HOLES, AND WHOLES**

**RECONSTRUCTING  
THE ANCIENT WORLD  
IN THEORY AND PRACTICE**



Ettore Cingano

**EPIC FRAGMENTS ON THESEUS:  
HESIOD, CERCOPS, AND THE *THESEIS***

TO ILLUSTRATE THE KALEIDOSCOPE of problems and challenges presented by the elusiveness of fragmentary poetry, I shall deal in depth with a few epic fragments centred on the Athenian hero Theseus, which are quoted mainly by Plutarch in his *Life of Theseus*. Interestingly, these texts are also closely connected with some fragments of the local historian Hereas of Megara (fourth century BC) and of the writers of *Megarica*; therefore, fragments from different literary genres can here be seen to interact in relating various details regarding the heroic deeds of Theseus.<sup>1</sup>

I

The prominence of Theseus in Greek mythology, iconography and literature, particularly in the *imaginaire* of sixth-fifth century Athens, needs not to be stressed here: it is well documented by a vast array of sources, starting with the Homeric and the cyclic poems, which recall his companionship with the Lapith Pirithous, the abduction of Helen, and his Cretan adventures, including the story of Ariadne.<sup>2</sup> The killing of the Mino-

<sup>1</sup> The fragments of the writers of *Megarica* have been edited by F. JACOBY (*FGrHist* 485-487) and by L. PICCIRILLI, *MEΓΑΡΙΚΑ. Testimonianze e frammenti*, Pisa 1975.

<sup>2</sup> Hom. *Il.* 1.265 (see also 3.144, which features Theseus' mother Aethra), both considered

taur is attested at an early stage by the friezes on the body of the François vase painted by Clitias (ca. 570 BC), representing Theseus with youths and maidens and supposedly celebrating his recent killing of the Minotaur; Clitias also represented the *geranos* dance of the Athenian youths on two other vases: the theme may have been popular in Athens because the aristocratic *γέννη* claimed descent from those youths.<sup>3</sup> In lyric poetry, the earliest evidence for Theseus – still centred on the Cretan episode – is provided by Sappho, fr. 206 Voigt = *schol. Verg. Aen.* 6.21:

quidem septem pueros et septem puellas accipi volunt, et Plato dicit in Phaedone et Sappho in lyricis et Bacchylides in dithyrambis et Euripides in Hercule, quos liberavit secum Theseus.

Some think seven boys and seven girls are meant, as Plato has it in the *Phaedo* [58a], Sappho in her lyric poems, Bacchylides in his dithyrambs [*Dith.* 17] and Euripides in the *Hercules* [1326–1327]. Theseus freed them along with himself.<sup>4</sup>

A few decades later, in the last part of the sixth century Theseus emerges as a civilizing hero designed to be the Attic response to Heracles in lyric and tragic poetry, and in Greek art.<sup>5</sup> Besides the poems just men-

interpolated by many scholars (see, most recently, M. L. WEST, *The Epic Cycle: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics*, Oxford 2013, p. 172); *Od.* 11.321–325, 631; *argum. Cypr.* p. 40.29 Bernabé; *schol. D Hom. Il.* 3.242 van Thiel = *Cypr.* fr. 13 Bernabé = 12 Davies/West. On these texts see my ‘Teseo e i Teseidi tra Troia e Atene’, [in:] P. ANGELI BERNARDINI (ed.), *L’epos minore, le tradizioni locali e la poesia arcaica*, Rome 2007, pp. 91–102.

<sup>3</sup> See M. TORELLI, ‘Un dono per gli dei: *kantharoi* e gigantomachie. A proposito di un *kantharos* a figure nere da Gravisca’, [in:] K. LOMAS (ed.), *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean: Papers in Honour of Brian Shefton*, Leiden 2004, pp. 211–227, at 220; the same scene is represented on an Attic amphora roughly contemporary to the François vase (*ABV* 104.126, Leiden). On the early iconography of the episodes of the Minotaur and the *geranos* dance see H. MAEHLER, ‘Theseus Kretafahrt und Bakchylides 17’, *Museum Helveticum* 48 (1991), pp. 114–126, at 118–120; T. GANTZ, *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*, Baltimore 1993, pp. 262–269; S. WOODFORD & J. NEILS, ‘Theseus’, [in:] *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, 7.1 (1994), pp. 940–941, 943, nos. 228–235, 264–265.

<sup>4</sup> Trans. D. A. CAMPBELL, *Greek Lyric, I: Sappho and Alcaeus*, Cambridge, MA 1982.

<sup>5</sup> According to K. W. ARAFAT, ‘Theseus: Theseus in art’, [in:] *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th ed., p. 1465, ‘from the late 6th cent. a cycle of Theseus’s adventures on the road from

tioned, Theseus also occurs in other epic poems connecting him to further adventures or exploits; among these there is one Hesiodic fragment (fr. 298 Merkelbach-West = 235a, b Most), quoted by Plutarch, who draws on Hereas of Megara (Plut. *Thes.* 20 = *FGrHist* 486 F 1), to which I shall return later. Furthermore, in a detailed passage listing the poems attributed to Hesiod, Pausanias mentions a poem on Theseus' descent to Hades together with Pirithous, who had previously helped him with the abduction of Helen:

ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἑτέρα ... ὡς πολὺν τινα ἐπῶν ὁ Ἡσίοδος ἀριθμὸν ποιήσειεν, ἐς γυναικῆς τε ἀδόμητα καὶ ἄς μεγάλας ἐπονομάζουσι Ἥοϊας, καὶ Θεογονίαν τε καὶ ἐς τὸν μάντιν Μελάμποδα, καὶ ὡς Θησεὺς ἐς τὸν Αἴδην ὁμοῦ Πειρίθῳ καταβαίη παραινέσεις τε Χείρωνος ἐπὶ διδασκαλίᾳ δὴ τῇ Ἀχιλλέως ...  
(Paus. 9.31.5)

But there is another opinion ... according to which Hesiod composed a very great number of epic poems: the poem about women; and what they call the *Great Ehoiai*; *The Theogony*; the poem about the seer Melampus; the one about Theseus' descent to Hades together with Peirithous; and *The Precepts of Chiron* (the ones for teaching Achilles) ...<sup>6</sup>

The myth related their ill-fated journey to Hades with the bold aim of abducting Persephone, whom Pirithous intended to marry; the two heroes were tricked by Hades into the chairs of forgetfulness, and Theseus alone was finally rescued by Heracles from the underworld.<sup>7</sup> Elsewhere, Pausanias relates that the *katabasis* of Theseus and Pirithous was also narrated in the

Troezen appears, perhaps derived from poetry'. In the late sixth century the Attic tragedian Thespis composed a tragedy named *Ἡῖθεοι*, *The Young Men*. See M. L. WEST, 'The view from Lesbos', [in:] M. REICHEL & A. RENGAKOS (eds), *Epea pteroenta. Beiträge zur Homer-forschung. Festschrift für W. Kullmann zum 75. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart 2002, pp. 207–219, at 215 (= *Hellenica: Selected Papers on Greek Literature and Thought*, I: *Epic*, Oxford 2011, p. 402 = *Greek Epic Fragments*, Cambridge, MA 2003, pp. 24–25), who claims that Theseus' 'emergence as a sort of Attic Heracles ... appears on artistic evidence to have occurred only around 525 BC':

<sup>6</sup> Trans. G. W. MOST, *Hesiod: Theogony. Works and Days. Testimonia*, Cambridge, MA 2007.

<sup>7</sup> On the descent of Theseus and Pirithous into Hades see also Diod. Sic. 4.63.1–4 (cf. 4.26.1); Verg. *Aen.* 6.392–397; GANTZ, *Early Greek Myth* (cit. n. 3), pp. 291–295.

epic poem *Minyas* (Paus. 10.28.2 = *Miny.* fr. 1 Bernabé/Davies/West), which must have dealt extensively with the underworld, since all the characters mentioned in the extant fragments are set in Hades. To add to the picture, a substantial papyrus fragment (28–29 lines) in hexameters, published in 1950 by Reinhold Merkelbach (*P. Ibscher*, col. i, first century BC), presents a dialogue between Theseus and Meleager in the underworld, in the presence of Pirithous.<sup>8</sup> The two distinct accounts by Pausanias indicate that the *katabasis* was narrated both by ‘Hesiod’ and in the *Minyas*, and it remains therefore unclear whether this papyrus fragment should be assigned to the *Minyas* or to the Hesiodic *katabasis* of Theseus and Pirithous.<sup>9</sup>

In theory, the best evidence on the life and deeds of Theseus must have been provided by the epic poem *Theseis*, whose title indicates that it was centred on the exploits of the Athenian hero. Among others, Emily Kearns has recently expressed the view that ‘his prominence in Athenian tradition seems not to pre-date the 6th cent. BC, deriving at least in part from an epic or epics’.<sup>10</sup> Unfortunately, the evidence for such a poem rests on very thin ground: Aristotle in the *Poetics* only speaks in generic terms of the *many* poets who composed an *Heracleis* and a *Theseis*:

διὸ πάντες εἰκόασιν ἀμαρτάνειν ὅσοι τῶν ποιητῶν Ἡρακλεΐδα Θησηΐδα καὶ  
τὰ τοιαῦτα ποιήματα πεποιήκασιν ...

(Arist. *Poet.* 1451a 19–21)

So all those poets appear to go wrong who have composed a *Heracleis*, a *Theseis*, and poems of that kind ...<sup>11</sup>

<sup>8</sup> On the text of the papyrus see R. MERKELBACH, ‘ΠΕΙΠΙΘΟΥ ΚΑΤΑΒΑΣΙΣ’, *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 24 (1950), pp. 255–263; IDEM, ‘Nachtrag zur ΠΕΙΠΙΘΟΥ ΚΑΤΑΒΑΣΙΣ’, *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 26 (1952), pp. 221–222.

<sup>9</sup> Scholars have accordingly attributed it to either poem, with a marked preference for the *Minyas* (Hes. fr. 280 Merkelbach-West = 216 Most = *Miny.* fr. 7–8 dub. Bernabé = 7\* West). On this fragment see my forthcoming paper ‘Placing epic and lyric fragments: Stesichorus, Simonides, Corinna, the Hesiodic corpus and other rags’. On the attribution to a *Minyad* see most recently A. DEBIASI, *Eumelo. Un poeta per Corinto. Con ulteriori divagazioni epiche*, Rome 2015, esp. pp. 255–258. By contrast, in her recent unpublished Masters dissertation (Messina 2015), Silvia CUTULI has argued that this fragment was part of the *Theseis*.

<sup>10</sup> E. KEARNS, ‘Theseus’, [in:] *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th ed., p. 1464.

<sup>11</sup> Trans. WEST, *Greek Epic Fragments* (cit. n. 5).

It remains surprising, given the fame of Theseus and the ability of Athens to appropriate most poetic genres and promote the prestige of its local heroes, that apart from Aristotle the existence of an epic *Theseis* is explicitly attested only by two other sources, both associating Theseus with Heracles. This can be seen as a clear sign that '[t]his poem, from a time in which early epic poetry had perished, makes a second Herakles of the only Attic hero who was known outside Athens, and to achieve this end it borrowed extensively from the Herakles story'.<sup>12</sup> In the *Life of Theseus*, Plutarch relates about 'the Amazon uprising that the poet of the *Theseis* has written of, in which, when Theseus was celebrating his wedding to Phaedra, Antiope [his former wife: cf. Ps.-Apollod. *Epit.* 1.16-17] attacked him and the Amazons with her gave support, and Heracles killed them'.<sup>13</sup> The second fragment is preserved in a scholion to Pindar and refers to a mythological detail: according to the poet of the *Theseis* (ὁ τὴν *Θησηίδα γράψας*) and to Pisander of Camirus and Pherecydes, the Cerynean hind, which was successfully captured by Heracles, had golden horns (*schol. Pind. Ol.* 3.50b = *Thes.* fr. 2 Bernabé/Davies/West).<sup>14</sup> The pairing of the author of

<sup>12</sup> So F. JACOBY, *Atthis: the Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*, Oxford 1949, p. 220; see already C. ROBERT, *Die griechische Heldensage*, II 2, 4th ed., Berlin 1921, p. 676: 'In diesem Sagen [describing his early days in Troezen, the journey towards Athens and the Amazons episode] tritt deutlich die Tendenz hervor, den Theseus dem Herakles möglichst ähnlich zu machen'.

<sup>13</sup> Plut. *Thes.* 28.1 = *Theseis* fr. 1 Bernabé/Davies/West: 'Ἦν γὰρ ὁ τῆς *Θησηίδος* ποιητῆς Ἀμαζόνων ἐπανάστασιν γέγραφε, *Θησεὶ* γαμοῦντι Φαίδραν τῆς Ἀντιόπης ἐπιτιθεμένης καὶ τῶν μετ' αὐτῆς Ἀμαζόνων ἀμνησμένων καὶ κτείνοντος αὐτὰς Ἡρακλέους ...; trans. WEST, *Greek Epic Fragments* (cit. n. 5). See H. HERTER, 'Theseus der Athener', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 88 (1939), pp. 244-286, 289-326, at 283. Two slightly different versions of the episode are found in Paus. 1.2.1, who quotes Pindar (fr. 175 Maehler, associating Theseus with Pirithous), and Aegias of Troezen (= *Nostoi*, fr. 15 fals. Bernabé; see ROBERT, *Die griechische Heldensage* [cit. n. 12], p. 731 n. 2), associating Theseus and Heracles, and locating the clash in Asia Minor. See U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Homerische Untersuchungen*, Berlin 1884, p. 342; A. KALKMANN, *Pausanias der Perieget. Untersuchungen über seine Schriftstellerei und seine Quellen*, Berlin 1886, pp. 141-142; HERTER, 'Theseus der Athener', p. 247 n. 9; JACOBY *ad FGrHist* 606; A. CAMERON, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*, Oxford 2004, pp. 236-237.

<sup>14</sup> *Θήλειαν δὲ εἶπε* [sc. ἔλαφον] καὶ χρυσοκέρων ἀπὸ ἱστορίας. ὁ γὰρ <τὴν> *Θησηίδα γράψας* τοιαύτην αὐτὴν <λέγει> καὶ Πείσανδρος ὁ Καμυρεὺς καὶ Φερεκύδης. The myth probably narrated that Theseus helped Heracles in securing the hind.

the *Theseis* with the epic poet Pisander (seventh/sixth century BC) in this source may hint at an early date of the poem in the opinion of the scholiast: a reference here to the *Theseis* composed (according to Diogenes Laertius) by one Nicostratus in the fourth century BC seems unlikely.<sup>15</sup>

What is quite puzzling is the almost total lack of evidence for a poem (the *Theseis*) aimed at endorsing and celebrating the exploits of the hero who indisputably embodied the glory of Athens in the sixth and fifth centuries. One would expect, (a) that particular care would have been dedicated to preserving such a poem, which may have originated in an Attic milieu; (b) that this poem would have left a lasting trace in later literature, and would have been quoted as an authoritative source on Theseus in the writings of Pherecydes and the prose writers who dealt with early Athenian history and mythology. Contrary to these expectations, not a single line of the poem survives and no mention of the *Theseis* is found in the fragments of Pherecydes, who dealt at length (mainly) with the older stories of Theseus (such as the Cretan adventure, the battle with the Amazons and various abductions: *FGrHist* 3 F 145–155 = Pherec. frs. 145–155 Fowler), or in the Attidographers, such as Hellanicus (*FGrHist* 323a; on Theseus see F 14–20) and Philochorus (*FGrHist* 328; see F 108–112).<sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Diog. Laert. 2.59 = *Thes.* test. 2 Davies: γεγόνασι δὲ Ξενοφῶντες ἑπτὰ ... δεύτερος Ἀθηναῖος, ἀδελφὸς Νικοστράτου τοῦ τὴν Θησιῖδα πεποιηκότος ... A Pindaric scholion (*In Ol.* 10.83b = Diphil. Iamb. fr. 1 West) relates that one Diphilus composed a *Theseis* in iambic meter, which surely had a less celebrative purpose; U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLEN-DORFF, *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*, I, Berlin 1924, p. 104 n. 3 seems to date him to the Hellenistic age. L. RADERMACHER, *Mythos und Sagen bei den Griechen*, Baden bei Wien – Leipzig 1938, p. 335 n. 626, attributed *Thes.* fr. 2 Bernabé/Davies/West to the *Theseis* of Diphilus; see H. HERTER, 'Theseus', [in:] *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplementband 13 (1973), coll. 1046–1047.

<sup>16</sup> Regarding Pherecydes, this is rightly pointed out by J. NEILS, *The Youthful Deeds of Theseus*, Rome 1987, p. 12, who rejects the existence of a *Theseis* in the sixth century BC; on this point see also S. P. MORRIS, *Daidalos and the Origins of Greek Art*, Princeton 1992, pp. 341–342. On Theseus in the early Greek mythographers see R. FOWLER, *Early Greek Mythography*, II: *Commentary*, Oxford 2013, pp. 468–489. On the *Theseis* see the judicious remarks of JACOBY, *Atthis* (cit. n. 12), pp. 219–220 and 394–395 n. 23; according to Jacoby, Pherecydes' *Atthis* 'has largely furnished the basis for the *Life* of Theseus' (JACOBY, *FGrHist*, III B (Supplem.), *Notes*, p. 217, n. 155).

Moreover, the generic reference by Aristotle (quoted above) to the *many* poets who composed an *Heracleis* and a *Theseis*, without singling out one specific poem and/or author, can only signify that by his time no poem centred on Theseus had gained the status and prominence of the poems of the epic cycle. If the existence of (at least) one epic *Theseis* cannot be doubted, its dating and influence remain obscure.<sup>17</sup> The last quarter of the sixth century is the most accepted date, and it is supported by a spate of Attic vases centred on Theseus dating from ca. 515/510 BC, which could have been inspired by a poem performed in Athens around 520 BC. They represent the episode of the confrontation between Minos and Theseus, and the latter's leap into the sea to visit Amphitrite and retrieve the ring. According to the scholarly opinion from the turn of the twentieth century, Bacchylides' *Dithyramb* 17 (dated between 490 and 470 BC) which featured the episode of the ring may well have been inspired by the epic *Theseis*.<sup>18</sup>

To conclude on this point, it remains unclear why the epic *Theseis* fell into oblivion in Athens at a relatively early stage. There may be some truth in Jacoby's remark that '[t]his epos may have had a strong momentary effect, but tragedy superseded it'.<sup>19</sup> Yet, tragedy surely lacked the narrative pace which was appropriate for listing the exploits of a hero; a source that better meets this requirement and could have provided the Athenian audience of the late sixth and fifth centuries with a skilful narrative on Theseus may have been a poem by Simonides of Ceos, who was active in Athens for many decades, from the time of the Pisistratids to his multiple victories in dithyrambic contests (cf. Pl. [?] *Hipparch.* 228c; Arist. *Ath. pol.* 18.1; Simon.

<sup>17</sup> On the existence and dating of the *Theseis* see RADERMACHER, *Mythos und Sagen* (cit. n. 15), pp. 227–228, 266; W. S. BARRETT, *Euripides: Hippolytos*, Oxford 1964, pp. 3–4; G. HUXLEY, *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis*, London 1969, pp. 117–22; C. SOURVINOU-INWOOD, *Theseus as Son and Stepson: A Tentative Illustration of the Greek Mythological Mentality*, London 1979, pp. 25, 53, 55; C. AMPOLO, [in:] IDEM & M. MANFREDINI (eds), *Plutarco. Le vite di Teseo e di Romolo*, Milan 1988, pp. xxviii–xxix; C. CALAME, *Thésée et l'imaginaire athénien*, Lausanne 1990, pp. 397–406, esp. 405–406, placing the poem in the last quarter of the sixth century BC.

<sup>18</sup> See the scholarship quoted by MAEHLER, 'Theseus Kretafahrt' (cit. n. 3), p. 114 and n. 5. The same episode was painted on a wall of the Theseion in Athens, dating from the second quarter of the fifth century BC; see Paus. 1.17.3.

<sup>19</sup> JACOBY, *FGrHist*, III B (*Supplem.*), 2, *Notes*, n. 20 *ad* Philoch. F 110, p. 344.

*Epigr.* 27 Page). It is very likely that Simonides composed a poem on the subject; from what we can gather, he dealt with at least two episodes, the Cretan adventure and the journey home (Plut. *Thes.* 17.5; Simon. fr. 550–551 *PMG* = 242–243 Poltera) to which the above-mentioned spate of Attic vases could be referred, and the abduction of the Amazon Hippolyte (Ps.-Apollod. *Epit.* 1.16 = Simon. fr. 551A Campbell = 287 Poltera; cf. Ath. 13.557a), called Antiope or Melanippe by most sources.<sup>20</sup>

## II

I shall now deal with an anonymous fragment, whose authorship is much debated; it is quoted by Plutarch, who in the *Life of Theseus* (32.7) draws on the local historian Hereas of Megara (see also above and below). The mythical context is the abduction of the young Helen by Theseus with the help of his companion, the Lapith Pirithous. Theseus took Helen to Attica and handed her over to his mother Aethra with the task of guarding her (cf. Diod. Sic. 4.63). In Plutarch's version, when the Dioscuri Castor and Polydeuces set off to rescue their sister and arrived in the town of Aphidna in North Attica flanked by other heroes and allies (cf. Hdt. 9.73; Ps.-Apollod. *Epit.* 1.23), they were confronted by Theseus.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> The Amazon is called Hippolyte also by Isoc. *Panath.* 193; Clidem. *FGrHist* 323 F 18; Zopyr. *FGrHist* 336 F 1; Istr. Callim. *FGrHist* 334 F 10 = Ath. 13.557a; *hyp. Eur. Hipp.* p. 1 Schwartz; *schol. Ar. Ran.* 849; Diod. Sic. 4.28.1–2; conversely, Antiope is the only name to appear in the inscriptions on vases representing the episode – see JACOBY, *FGrHist*, III B (*Supplem.*), *Text*, pp. 439–440. For the name Antiope cf. Pind. fr. 175 Maehler; Philoch. *FGrHist* 328 F 110; Plut. *Thes.* 26.1; 28.1–2; Paus. 1.2.1; Diod. Sic. 4.28.1–2; on Antiope see GANTZ, *Early Greek Myth* (cit. n. 3), pp. 282–285. The possibility that a work ('whether literary or artistic') other than the epic *Theseis* may account for the many vases representing the exploits of Theseus was raised by BARRETT, *Euripides: Hippolytos* (cit. n. 17), p. 3 n. 1.

<sup>21</sup> M. L. WEST, 'Stesichorea: Stesichorus at Sparta: Supplementary note', [in:] *IDEM, Helenica: Selected Papers on Greek Literature and Thought*, II: *Lyric and Drama*, Oxford 2012, p. 106 has recently suggested that the journey of the Dioscuri to retrieve Helen should be identified in the narrative of *P. Oxy.* 2735 fr. 1 (attributed by him to Stesichorus, otherwise generally classified as Ibycean; see Ibyc. fr. 166 Davies): 'I now see that the impending war cannot be the Trojan war, in which the Tyndaridai did not take part. I think it must be



Plutarch, drawing on Hereas and on the lines of an anonymous epic poem, reports that in the fierce fight that followed Theseus killed the Megarian hero Halycus, a son of Sciron and an ally of the Dioscuri:

ἐνταῦθά φασι καὶ Ἄλυκὸν πεσεῖν τὸν Σκείρωνος υἱόν, συστρατευόμενον  
τότε τοῖς Διοσκούροις, ἀφ' οὗ καὶ τόπον τῆς Μεγαρικῆς Ἄλυκὸν καλεῖσθαι  
τοῦ σώματος ἐνταφέντος. Ἡρέας δ' ὑπὸ Θησέως αὐτοῦ περὶ Ἀφίδνας  
ἀποθανεῖν τὸν Ἄλυκὸν ἰστόρηκε, καὶ μαρτύρια ταυτὶ τὰ ἔπη παρέχεται περὶ  
τοῦ Ἄλυκοῦ·

... τὸν ἐν εὐρυχόρῳ ποτ' Ἀφίδνῃ  
μαρνάμενον Θησεὺς Ἑλένης ἔνεκ' ἠυκόμοιο  
κτεῖνεν ...

(Plut. *Thes.* 32.6–7 = Hereas, *FGrHist* 486 F 2  
= fr. 2 Piccirilli = *epic. adesp.* fr. 8 West)

Here they say that Halycus, the son of Sciron, was killed among others, who at the time was joining in an expedition with the Dioscuri, and that from him the place in Megara where he was buried is called Halycus. Hereas reports that Halycus died at the hands of Theseus in Aphidna, and he provides as evidence these epic lines about Halycus: 'Halycus, whom once upon a time Theseus slew while he was fighting in spacious Aphidna for the sake of Helen of the lovely tresses ...'<sup>22</sup>

Interestingly, in mentioning the first abduction of Helen by Theseus, an episode prior to the war at Troy, the poet of these verses appropriates the formula Ἑλένης ἔνεκ' ἠυκόμοιο, which in Homer and Hesiod refers to the second abduction of Helen at the hands of Paris. It is mainly used to stress Helen's role and responsibility in the Trojan war which ensued (cf. Hom. *Il.* 9.338–339 τί δὲ λαὸν ἀνήγαγεν ἐνθάδ' ἀγείρας | Ἀτρεΐδης; ἢ οὐχ Ἑλένης ἔνεκ' ἠυκόμοιο;). Hesiod couples the war at Thebes for the sake of Oedipus' property and throne with the war at Troy 'for the sake of Helen of the lovely tresses' (*Op.* 165). The Hesiodic flavour of our fragment is

their expedition to Attica ... to recover Helen when she had been abducted by Theseus. We know that this story was told by Stesichorus'.

<sup>22</sup> Trans. mine.

strengthened by the participle *μαρνάμενος*, which also occurs in the Hesiodic passage just quoted.<sup>23</sup> The formula *Ἑλένης ἔνεκ' ἠϋκόμοιο* is also employed in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (Hes. fr. 200.11 Merkelbach-West = 154e Most = 109 Hirschberger), in a lacunose context referring to the Trojan war fought by Helen's suitors.<sup>24</sup>

The combination pronoun + adverb (*τὸν ... ποτέ* in our fragment) is often found in a narrative frame in the Hesiodic corpus and in epic catalogue poetry, where it serves to introduce a short narrative going backwards in time; in particular, in Hes. fr. 171.6–8 Merkelbach-West (= 120 Most = 75 Hirschberger) it apparently introduces the mention of the death of Hyacinth at the hands of Apollo (... *τὸν ῥά ποτ' αὐτὸς* | [*Φοῖβος ἀκερσεκόμης ἀέκων κτάνε νηλέ*] *ἰ δίσκωι*; cf. also Hes. fr. 17a.4; 26.7; 161.2; 177.9; 234.2 Merkelbach-West; Hom. *Il.* 2.547, 629; 6.21; *Od.* 11.281, 284, 322 [about Theseus]; *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 307).<sup>25</sup> On these grounds, it would be tempting to consider this fragment quoted by Plutarch as 'Hesiodic', as recently suggested by Martina Hirschberger without further clarification (= Hes. fr. \*7 Hirschberger).<sup>26</sup> Otherwise, it has variously been classified as a frag-

<sup>23</sup> Hes. *Op.* 161–165: *καὶ τοὺς μὲν πόλεμός τε κακὸς καὶ φύλοπις αἰνή | τοὺς μὲν ὕφ' ἑπταπύλῳ Θήβῃ, Καδμηίδι γαίῃ, | ὄλεσε μαρναμένους μῆλων ἔνεκ' Οἰδιπόδαο, | τοὺς δὲ καὶ ἐν νήεσσιν ὑπὲρ μέγα λαῖτμα θαλάσσης | ἐς Τροίην ἀγαγὼν Ἑλένης ἔνεκ' ἠϋκόμοιο.*

<sup>24</sup> The simpler variant *εἵνεκα κούρης* is used to refer to Helen several times at the end of a line in the catalogue of suitors, with a different nuance ('presents ... for (the sake of) Helen': Hes. fr. 196.4; 198.4; 204.76 Merkelbach-West). Similar expressions occur many times in other poetic genres, such as lyric poetry and tragedy, stressing the bond between Helen and the war at Troy: cf. Alc. fr. 283.13–14 Voigt *Τρώων πεδίω<ι> δά[μεντας] | εἵνεκα κήρας*; Ibyc. S151.5–6 Davies *ξ[α]νθᾶς Ἑλένας περὶ εἶδει | δῆ]ριν πολύνυμνον ἔχ[ο]ντες*; Eur. *Andr.* 103–106 *Ἰλίῳ αἰπεινᾶ Πάρις ... | ἀγάγετ' ... Ἑλέναν. | ᾄς ἔνεκ', ὧ Τροία, δορὶ καὶ πυρὶ δηϊάλωτον | εἰλέ σε ... Ἄρης*. It should however be noted that the formula *εἵνεκα κούρης*, combined with an epithet, is also applied to women other than Helen: cf. Hes. fr. 43(a).37 (Mestra, supplemented); 73.6 Merkelbach-West (Atalanta). On Helen as the cause of the Trojan war see most recently C. CALAME, 'The abduction of Helen and the Greek poetic tradition: Politics, reinterpretations and controversies', [in:] U. DILL & C. WALDE (eds), *Antike Mythen: Medien, Transformationen und Konstruktionen*, Berlin 2009, pp. 646–647.

<sup>25</sup> It is however also found elsewhere in epic and in lyric poetry; see e.g. Hom. *Il.* 7.90; Pind. *Pyth.* 4.10, 46; 9.5; 10.31.

<sup>26</sup> See M. HIRSCHBERGER, *Gynaikon Katalogos und Megalai Ehoiai: Ein Kommentar zu den Fragmenten zweier hesiodischer Epen*, München – Leipzig 2004, pp. 469–470, slightly

ment from a *Theseis*<sup>27</sup> or from the *Cypria*,<sup>28</sup> or from another lost epic poem (*epic. adesp.* fr. 8 Davies/West<sup>29</sup>), or as a fragment of Hellenistic poetry (*SH* 1155) providing evidence of a poem issued from a Megarian *milieu*.<sup>30</sup>

Yet, in spite of its brevity and anonymity, this fragment also raises other questions – besides its attribution – regarding the mythological background it presupposes. A striking difference surfaces if one considers that according to the standard version of the episode attested in epic and lyric poetry, Theseus was *not* involved in the clash which took place at Aphidna. According to the *Cypria* (fr. 13 Bernabé = 12 Davies/West),<sup>31</sup> to Alcman (fr. 21 *PMGF* = Paus. 1.41.4 and *schol. D Hom. Il.* 3.242 van Thiel), and Pindar (fr. 243 Maehler = Paus. 1.41.3–5), Theseus was actually unable to fight at Aphidna and keep Helen with him because (as recalled above) at the time he had descended to Hades with Pirithous with the aim of abducting Persephone;<sup>32</sup> or else, according to a less daring tradition, he had set off to Thesprotia to abduct the daughter of the local king.<sup>33</sup> It is worth noting that most sources stress that Theseus was far away when

modifying the attribution to the *Catalogue of Women* suggested by A. I. ZAJCEV, ‘Gesiodovskij fragment o Tesei i Galike? (Plut., *Thes.*, 32,7)’, *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 72.2 (1960), pp. 93–96 who suggested that the fragment might have had a place at the beginning of Book 2 of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*.

<sup>27</sup> See e.g. H. DÜNTZER, *Die fragmente der epischen Poesie der Griechen*, Köln 1842, p. 119: ‘Aus einer *Theseis*’; F. PFISTER, *Der Reliquienkult im Altertum*, I, Gießen 1909, p. 30.

<sup>28</sup> T. W. ALLEN, ‘Homeric II: Additions to the Epic Cycle’, *Classical Review* 27 (1913), pp. 189–191, at 190, noting that ‘the absence of an author’s name makes Hesiod somewhat less likely’.

<sup>29</sup> A. BERNABÉ, *Poetae Epici Graeci*, I, 2nd ed., Leipzig 1996, p. 52 refers to it as ‘fragmentum epicum anon.’; see also p. 136 *ad Thes.* test. 2.

<sup>30</sup> See P. J. PARSONS & H. LLOYD-JONES *ad SH* 1155: ‘e *Megaricis* potius quam *Theseide* ... ? vid. Jacoby *ad FGrHist* 486 F 2’.

<sup>31</sup> It is irrelevant for the sake of my argument whether this episode was narrated in the *Cypria* or another cyclic poem. On this point, see most recently WEST, *The Epic Cycle* (cit. n. 2), pp. 87–88.

<sup>32</sup> See also Hdt. 9.73.2; Hellan. fr. 168c Fowler; Ps.-Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.10.7; *Epit.* 1.23; Diod. Sic. 4.63; Paus. 1.17.5–6; Plut. *Thes.* 31.3; Hyg. *Fab.* 79; *schol. Ap. Rhod.* 1.101a.

<sup>33</sup> The departure of Theseus and Pirithous to Thesprotia is attested by Pausanias (1.17.4–5, 18.4; 2.22.6–7 - Stes. fr. 86 Finglass quoted below); see also Ael. *VH* 4.5 and Philoch. *FGrHist* 328 F 18a.

the Dioscuri stormed Attica, sacked Aphidna, rescued Helen and eventually took her back to Sparta, together with Aethra to serve as her slave. Besides Alcman and Pindar (= Paus. 1.41.3–5, quoted below, n. 39), cf. Stes. fr. 86 Finglass (from Paus. 2.22.6–7):

πλησίον δὲ τῶν Ἀνάκτων Εἰληθυίας ἐστὶν ἱερὸν ἀνάθημα Ἑλένης, ὅτε σὺν Πειρίθῳ Θησέως ἀπελθόντος ἐς Θεσπρωτοὺς Ἀφιδνά τε ὑπὸ Διοσκούρων ἑάλω καὶ ἤγετο ἐς Λακεδαίμονα Ἑλένη ... καὶ ἐπὶ τῷδε Εὐφορίων Χαλκιδεὺς καὶ Πλευρώνιος Ἀλέξανδρος ἔπη ποιήσαντες, πρότερον δὲ ἔτι Στησίχορος ὁ Ἱμεραῖος, κατὰ ταῦτά φασιν Ἀργείοις Θησέως εἶναι θυγατέρα Ἰφιγένειαν.

Near the Lords [statues of the Dioscuri] is a sanctuary of Eileithyia, dedicated by Helen at the time **when Theseus had gone with Pirithous to Thesprotia** and Aphidna was captured by the Dioscuri and Helen was being taken to Sparta ... Euphorion of Chalcis [fr. 86 Lightfoot] and Alexander of Pleuron [fr. 11 Magnelli], who wrote poetry on this subject, and even earlier Stesichorus of Himera all agree with the Argives that Iphigeneia was Theseus' daughter.<sup>34</sup>

Cf. further Ps.-Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.10.7 ἐν Αἰδου Θησέως ὄντος; *schol. D Hom. Il.* 3.242 van Thiel = *Cypr.* fr. 13 Bernabé = 12 Davies/West = Alcman fr. 21 *PMGF* οἱ δὲ Διόσκουροι Θησέως μὴ τυχόντες λαφυραγωγούσι τὰς Ἀφιδνας (Page: *Ἀθήνας* codd., cf. Ps.-Apollod. *Epit.* 1.23; see, however, Diod. Sic. 4.63.4; Ps.-Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.10.7; Plut. *Thes.* 32.7). The Homeric scholion adds that in the ensuing fight Castor was wounded by the king of the city, the eponymous hero Aphidnus.

According to the mainstream Panhellenic tradition then, a clash between the Dioscuri and Theseus never occurred, and one can easily understand why this was the standard version of the myth. It has eluded most modern scholars that what lies behind the absence of Theseus is a subtle way to dispose of a mythological *impasse*: as Plutarch acutely remarked, 'it is not likely that Theseus himself was present when both his mother and Aphidna was captured'<sup>35</sup>. Had the Athenian hero been present

<sup>34</sup> Trans. D. A. CAMPBELL, *Greek Lyric, III: Stesichorus, Ibycus, Simonides, and Others*, Cambridge, MA 1991.

<sup>35</sup> Plut. *Thes.* 32.7 οὐ μὴν εἰκὸς αὐτοῦ Θησέως παρόντος ἀλῶναι τὴν τε μητέρα καὶ τὰς

at Aphidna when the fight took place, how could it possibly be that in spite of his heroic status and vigour the city was conquered and his mother Aethra carried away by the Dioscuri and made a slave of Helen (not to mention a further humiliation for him in the loss of Helen)? In other words, Theseus' failure in defending his own territory would have (a) utterly undermined his aura and prestige, and (b) brought about an *adynaton*, by assuming an unprecedented confrontation between heroes of outstanding status, neither of whom could prevail: on one side the Lacedemonian heroes Castor and Polydeuces of divine descent, on the other the most prominent Athenian hero Theseus, a *protégé* of Athena and a descendant of Erichthonius. The stress laid by the other sources on the absence of Theseus when the Dioscuri rescued Helen pinpoints their awareness of the mythological pitfall. As George Huxley has observed, 'the loss of Helen and Aithra could only be excused by the preoccupation of Theseus elsewhere';<sup>36</sup> his timely departure to Hades was therefore the solution to avoid a confrontation which would have been mythologically disruptive.<sup>37</sup> For another timely departure in a critical moment in epic narrative, generating a radical change in the course of events, one can compare the unwise departure of Menelaus from Sparta in the *Cypria*, leaving Helen alone with Paris (argum. *Cypria* 2 West = p. 39 Bernabé, 31 Davies).

Remarkably, the doubts raised by Plutarch regarding the presence of Theseus at Aphidna were also voiced by Pausanias (1.41.3–5), who in his section on the Megarid reports another local version confirming the presence of Theseus in the fight at Aphidna, with a variant that credits him

*Ἀφιδνας*. Trans. B. PERRIN, *Plutarch: Lives, I: Theseus and Romulus. Lycurgus and Numa. Solon and Publicola*, Cambridge, MA 1914, slightly changed.

<sup>36</sup> HUXLEY, *Greek Epic Poetry* (cit. n. 17), p. 120.

<sup>37</sup> The point is also raised by F. GUÉRIN, 'Le cycle de Thésée dans le théâtre perdu de Sophocle', *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé* 1 (2015), pp. 89–127, at 104: '...pour les Athéniens qui "fabriquaient" leurs héros il était impensable que Thésée ait pu subir une telle défaite'; however, she seems to ignore the implications of the contrasting versions of the epic fragment and of Hereas (n. 51: 'Le témoignage d'Héréas montre que ... Thésée pouvait bien être présent lors de cette guerre'). For another mythological taboo concerning the Dioscuri and the abduction of Helen by Paris see my 'Aporie, parallelismi, riprese e convergenze: la costruzione del ciclo epico', [in:] A. ALONI & M. ORNAGHI (eds), *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali. Nuovi contributi*, Messina 2011, pp. 3–26, at 14–18.

with the killing of yet another Megarian hero, Timalcus, the son of the eponymous king Megareus ('They say that ... the elder son of Megareus Timalcus had before this [i.e. the killing of another son, Euippus, by a lion] been killed by Theseus while on campaign with the Dioscuri against Aphidna<sup>38</sup>). Pausanias then continues:

Such is the account of the Megarians; but although I wish my account to agree with theirs, yet I cannot accept everything they say. I am ready to believe that a lion was killed by Alcathous on Citheron, but **what historian has recorded that Timalcus the son of Megareus came with the Dioscuri to Aphidna? And supposing they had gone there, how could one hold that he had been killed by Theseus**, when Alcman wrote a poem on the Dioscuri [= fr. 21 *PMGF*], in which he says that they captured Athens and carried into captivity the mother of Theseus, Aethra, but **Theseus himself was absent?** Pindar in his poems [= fr. 243 Maehler] agrees with this account, saying that Theseus wishing to be related to the Dioscuri, <carried off Helen and kept her> **until he departed to carry out with Pirithous the marriage that they tell of.**<sup>39</sup>

In spite of the different name of the hero killed by Theseus, we can detect in the two versions by Plutarch and Pausanias a sharp contrast with the earlier Athenian/Panhellenic report denying the presence of Theseus on the scene. In the anonymous epic fragment and in these later

<sup>38</sup> Paus. 1.41.3 φασὶ ... τὸν ... πρεσβύτερον τῶν παίδων αὐτῶ [sc. Μεγαρεῖ] Τίμαλκον ἔτι πρότερον ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὸ Θησέως, στρατεύοντα ἐς Ἀφιδναν σὺν τοῖς Διοσκούροις. Here and below, trans. W. H. S. JONES, *Pausanias: Description of Greece*, I: *Books 1-2 (Attica and Corinth)*, Cambridge, MA 1918, slightly adapted.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibidem*, 4-5 ταῦτα μὲν οὕτω γενέσθαι λέγουσιν· ἐγὼ δὲ γράφειν μὲν ἐθέλω Μεγαρεῦσιν ὁμολογοῦντα, οὐκ ἔχω δὲ ὅπως εὔρωμαι πάντα σφίσι, ἀλλὰ ἀποθανεῖν μὲν λέοντα ἐν τῷ Κιθαιρῶνι ὑπὸ Ἀλκάθου πείθομαι, Μεγαρέως δὲ Τίμαλκον παῖδα τίς μὲν ἐς Ἀφιδναν ἐλθεῖν μετὰ τῶν Διοσκούρων ἔγραψε; πῶς δ' ἂν ἀφικόμενος ἀναιρεθῆναι νομίζοιτο ὑπὸ Θησέως, ὅπου καὶ Ἀλκμᾶν ποιήσας ἄσμα ἐς τοὺς Διοσκούρους, ὡς Ἀθήνας ἔλοιεν καὶ τὴν Θησέως ἀγάγοιεν μητέρα αἰχμάλωτον, ὁμῶς Θησέα φησὶν αὐτὸν ἀπεῖναι; Πίνδαρος δὲ τούτοις τε κατὰ ταῦτα ἐποίησε καὶ γαμβρὸν τοῖς Διοσκούροις Θησέα εἶναι βουλόμενον <ἀρπασθεῖσαν τὴν Ἑλένην διαφυλάξαι> [add. SCHROEDER], ἐς ὃ ἀπελθεῖν αὐτὸν Πειρίθῳ τὸν λεγόμενον γάμον συμπράξοντα. On this passage see PICCIRILLI, *ΜΕΓΑΡΙΚΑ* (cit. n. 1), pp. 64-66, 107-108; Pausanias (1.42.4 = *Megarica* fr. 8b Piccirilli) also mentions the tomb of Timalcus in Megara.

versions (one of them depending on Hereas) two Megarian heroes, Halycus and Timalcus, are killed by Theseus; nevertheless, as the story clearly implies, in the end Theseus was defeated in spite of his bravery and had to surrender not only Helen, but even his own mother. It would have been interesting to see how the defeat of Theseus and the recovery of Helen by the Dioscuri were accounted for in this non-Athenian narrative.

Although at first sight the episode might fit into an epic *aristeia* of Theseus, adding to his deeds when he liberated the Attic coast from all sorts of monsters, villains and evildoers, a closer look reveals that this fragment is very unlikely to have come from a *Theseis*.<sup>40</sup> The defeat suffered by Theseus at the hands of the Dioscuri would have been unflattering in a poem centred on his many deeds, such as an Attic *Theseis* must have been.<sup>41</sup> Moreover, the already discussed combination τὸν ... ποτέ (relative pronoun + temporal adverb; line 1: ... τὸν ἐν εὐρυχόρῳ ποτ' Ἀφίδνῃ ...) refers to the death of Halycus in what seems to be an incidental mention of the episode focused on him, rather than a full narrative centred on Theseus or his *aristeia*. Luigi Piccirilli is right in stressing that Halycus died in a war in which he is represented as the 'nemico invasore', and it may well be that these lines belong to a local epic poem centred on the deeds and wars of Megarian heroes.<sup>42</sup>

It should also be considered that the fragment was quoted by Hereas the Megarian, 'a dedicated hypercritic of Attic mythological pretensions';<sup>43</sup> moreover, to my knowledge it has gone unnoticed that it can be convincingly connected to a further piece of evidence which points towards a Megarian tradition. An earlier passage of Plutarch's *Theseus*, also relying on οἱ Μεγαρόθεν συγγραφεῖς, the writers of Megarian history, reports another

<sup>40</sup> This view was rejected by ROBERT, *Die griechische Heldensage* (cit. n. 12), p. 701 n. 6; cf. H. HERTER, 'Theseus der Athener' (cit. n. 13), p. 283 n. 189: 'Die von Hereas zitierten verse bei Plut. These. 32,7 enthalten eine der herrschenden Tradition widersprechende Version und sind daher nicht der alten Theseis zuzuschreiben'; IDEM, 'Theseus' (cit. n. 15), coll. 1169–1170; A. BERNABÉ, *Poetae Epici Graeci* (cit. n. 29), p. 136 *ad These. test. 2*.

<sup>41</sup> On the *Theseis* see the bibliography quoted at nn. 16–17.

<sup>42</sup> See K. HANELL, *Megarische Studien*, Lund 1934, p. 11 n. 2; PICCIRILLI, *METAPIKA* (cit. n. 1), p. 66; AMPOLO, *Plutarco. Le vite* (cit. n. 17), pp. 254–255.

<sup>43</sup> HUXLEY, *Greek Epic Poetry* (cit. n. 17), p. 120.

clash between Athens and Megara centred on the interpretation of myths (Plut. *Thes.* 10.1–4 = *FGrHist* 487 F 1 = *Megarica* fr. 6a Piccirilli).<sup>44</sup> It was related to Sciron, the father of Halycus (cf. Plut. *Thes.* 32.6), a Corinthian based in the Megarid:<sup>45</sup> according to the Athenian version, attested first in Bacchylides (18.25; cf. Isoc. *Hel.* 29) and reported by Plutarch (*Thes.* 10.1), Sciron was a bandit, a savage, and for this reason he was killed by the civilizing hero Theseus on his journey towards Athens, along with other equally negative figures.<sup>46</sup> On the other hand, Plutarch continues (*Thes.* 10.2–4), quoting Simonides, the historians from Megara, ‘at war with antiquity’ (τῶ πολλῶ χρόνῳ πολεμοῦντες: Simon. fr. 643 *PMG* = 316 Poltera), told quite a different story, according to which Sciron was neither arrogant nor a bandit; they insisted that he was a punisher of robbers and a friend of just and good men. He was grafted by the Megarians on an impressive stemma connecting him to the righteous Aeacus (who married his daughter Endeis – Ps.-Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.12.6), to Cychreus of Salamis, who received divine honours in Athens, and also to Peleus and Telamon, the fathers of the Panhellenic heroes Achilles and Ajax.<sup>47</sup> Traces of a positive assessment of Sciron

<sup>44</sup> On the historians from Megara (fifth–fourth centuries BC) see L. A. OKIN, ‘Theognis and the sources for the history of archaic Megara’, [in:] T. J. FIGUEIRA & G. NAGY (eds), *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and Polis*, Baltimore 1985, pp. 9–21, at 19–21; T. J. FIGUEIRA, ‘The Theognidea and Megarian society’, *ibidem*, pp. 112–158, at 115–124.

<sup>45</sup> For a detailed analysis of this myth and of the Attic genealogy of Sciron concocted by the Megarians see J. M. WICKERSHAM, ‘Myth and identity in the archaic polis’, [in:] IDEM & D. C. POZZI (eds), *Myth and the Polis*, Ithaca 1991, pp. 16–31, at 18–22; although he omits to connect the narratives on Sciron to the one on his son Halycus in Plutarch (*Thes.* 10.1–4; 32.7), WICKERSHAM convincingly demonstrates how, even after Athenian possession of Salamis was irreversible, Megara deployed genealogy, ritual, myth and cult to make its case and create a tradition to counter Athenian claims of the past. I should add, however, that WICKERSHAM misinterprets (pp. 28–31) the Homeric and Hesiodic passages listing the domains of Ajax (Hom. *Il.* 2.557–558; Hes. fr. 204.44–51 Merkelbach–West): see my ‘A catalogue within a catalogue: Helen’s suitors in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 196–204)’, [in:] R. HUNTER (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge 2005, pp. 143–151.

<sup>46</sup> The same tradition on Sciron’s wickedness and punishment is found in *schol. Eur. Hipp.* 979; Diod. Sic. 4.59.4; Hyg. *Fab.* 38.4; Ps.-Apollod. *Epit.* 1.2–3; Paus. 1.44.8.

<sup>47</sup> Plut. *Thes.* 10.3: Αἰακὸν τε γὰρ Ἑλλήνων ὀσιώτατον νομίζεσθαι, καὶ Κυχρέα τιμὰς θεῶν ἔχειν Ἀθήνησι τὸν Σαλαμῖνιον, τὴν δὲ Πηλέως καὶ Τελαμῶνος ἀρετὴν ὑπ’ οὐδενὸς ἀγνοεῖσθαι.



can also be found in Pausanias, who reports the work he managed as the polemarch of the Megarians to enlarge what was later called the Scironian road (Paus. 1.44.6 = *Megarica* fr. 6b Piccirilli).

If we combine the two passages regarding father (Sciron) and son (Halycus) in Plutarch's *Theseus*, who relies on Hereas and other historians (*syngrapheis*) from Megara, we can assume that in the fifth–fourth centuries BC an alternative myth had been created in Megara, with the aim to counter the domineering Attic propaganda and rehabilitate the character of Sciron.<sup>48</sup> At the same time, Theseus was portrayed as a negative figure who killed two prominent Megarian heroes: the righteous Sciron, unjustly labelled as a brigand by Athenian propaganda in earlier times (perhaps during the dispute between Athens and Megara over the control of Eleusis),<sup>49</sup> and at a later stage his son Halycus, who was helping the Dioscuri to retrieve their sister 'unjustly' abducted by the Athenian hero.

The Megarian version told by Pausanias (1.41.3–5), replacing Halycus with Timalcus son of the king Megareus as a victim of Theseus, seems to have served the same purpose – it can be viewed as a belated attempt to reshape the mythological background concocted by the Athenians, which had proved successful in earlier times in securing Athenian control of Salamis, as was reported in Plutarch's *Life of Solon* (10.1–6).<sup>50</sup> Only the

Σκείρωννα τοίνυν Κυχρέως μὲν γενέσθαι γαμβρόν, Αἰακοῦ δὲ πενθερόν, Πηλέως δὲ καὶ Τελαμώνιος πάππον, ἐξ Ἐνδηίδος γεγονότων τῆς Σκείρωνος καὶ Χαρικλοῦς θυγατρὸς ... As a further divergence from the Athenian version, the Megarians also claimed that Sciron had been killed by Theseus at a later stage of his adventures (*ibidem*, 4).

<sup>48</sup> See HERTER, 'Theseus' (cit. n. 15), coll. 1073–1074; A. BRELICH, 'Theseus e i suoi avversari', *Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni* 27 (1956), pp. 136–141; PICCIRILLI, *ΜΕΓΑΡΙΚΑ* (cit. n. 1), pp. 101–102; AMPOLO, *Plutarco. Le vite* (cit. n. 17), pp. 207–210; WICKERSHAM, 'Myth and identity' (cit. n. 45), pp. 19–21. JACOBY, *FGrHist*, III B (*Supplem.*), *Notes*, p. 210, n. 102, has rejected the view of HANELL, *Megarische Studien* (cit. n. 42), pp. 40–48 (see also PICCIRILLI, *ΜΕΓΑΡΙΚΑ* [cit. n. 1], p. 101), that the Attic version of the episode was conveyed by the *Theseis*.

<sup>49</sup> According to the view of PICCIRILLI, *ΜΕΓΑΡΙΚΑ* (cit. n. 1), p. 102; see also JACOBY, *FGrHist*, III B (*Supplem.*), pp. 292–293; *Notes*, pp. 210–211.

<sup>50</sup> On the propaganda war between Athens and Megara for the possession of Salamis see R. LEGON, *Megara: The Political History of a Greek City-State to 336 B.C.*, Ithaca 1981, pp. 122–131; WICKERSHAM, 'Myth and identity' (cit. n. 45).

determination to reshape what in the past had been the dominating mythical (Panhellenic) version could bring the Megarians to neglect or underplay the difficulty of creating a direct confrontation between Theseus and the Dioscuri, and also of producing chronological discrepancies in the genealogy of Timalcus and Theseus, who was made a near contemporary to Pelops, his maternal ancestor/great grandfather.<sup>51</sup> Moreover, we can see that Hereas was working in the same anti-Athenian direction in another fragment transmitted by Plutarch (*Solon* 10.3–5 = Hereas, *FGrHist* 486 F 4 = *Megarica* fr. 3 Piccirilli), where he is quoted as having pointed out that – contrary to what Solon had claimed in the dispute over the possession of Salamis – the Salaminian burial habits resembled those in Megara more closely than the Athenian practice, thus proving a strong link between the two places.

To conclude, this epic fragment should safely be assigned to an otherwise unattested Megarian epic poem of later times (fifth–fourth century BC), as was suggested by Peter Parsons and Hugh Lloyd-Jones, who included it in the *Supplementum Hellenisticum* with a brief comment in the apparatus.<sup>52</sup> As they note, a similar opinion had already been expressed by Felix Jacoby in his comments on this fragment of Hereas. What is attested here is a *Lokalgeschichte* asserting its rights by way of an epic poem against the more powerful weapon of propaganda represented by the well attested Athenian version; moreover, it can be inferred that the epic medium was still considered an effective way to confer heroic status on local rulers and lend credibility to the lore of traditions which shaped the identity and history of Megara.

### III

It is now time to take into account another fragment recalled at the

<sup>51</sup> See Paus. 1.41.5 ἀλλὰ γὰρ τὸν ὄντα λόγον οἱ Μεγαρεῖς εἰδότες ἐπικρύπτουσι and the commentary *ad* Paus. 1.41.4–5 in D. MUSTI & L. BESCHI, *Pausania. Guida della Grecia*, I: *L'Attica*, Milan 1982, p. 426.

<sup>52</sup> See n. 30 above.

beginning, which again is embedded in Plutarch's *Life of Theseus*. Earlier on in the text, he draws another epic fragment about Theseus from the historian Hereas, adding that Hereas attributed it to 'Hesiod' (ἐκ τῶν Ἡσιόδου, Plut. *Thes.* 20.1-2 = Hereas, *FGrHist* 486 F 1 = fr. 1 Piccirilli = Hes. fr. 298 Merkelbach-West = 235a Most). The setting is similar to the previous fragment, although the subject matter is love, not war. In recounting the misadventures of Ariadne, the discussion shifts to the representation of Theseus as a *tombreur de femmes*; Plutarch relates that 'some say that she hanged herself when she was abandoned by Theseus, others that she was brought to Naxos by sailors and married Onarus, the priest of Dionysus, and that she was abandoned by Theseus who was seized by desire for another woman, "for a terrible desire for Panopeus' daughter Aegle was wearing him down" [Hes. fr. 298 Merkelbach-West]'. Plutarch adds that 'according to Hereas of Megara [*FGrHist* 486 F1] Pisistratus removed this line from the works of Hesiod to do a favour to the Athenians; for the same reason, he inserted in Homer's *nekylia* a line mentioning "Theseus and Pirithous, the splendid children of the gods" [*Od.* 11.631]:<sup>53</sup>

Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀπάγξασθαί φασιν αὐτὴν [sc. Ἀριάδνην] ἀπολειφθεῖσαν ὑπὸ τοῦ  
Θησέως, οἱ δ' εἰς Νάξον ὑπὸ ναυτῶν κομισθεῖσαν Ὠνάρω τῷ ἱερεὶ τοῦ  
Διονύσου συνοικεῖν· ἀπολειφθῆναι δὲ τοῦ Θησέως ἐρῶντος ἑτέρας·

Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ μιν ἔπειρεν ἔρωσ Πανοπηίδος Αἴγλης'.

τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ ἔπος ἐκ τῶν Ἡσιόδου Πεισίστρατον ἐξελεῖν φησιν Ἡρέας ὁ  
Μεγαρεύς, ὥσπερ αὖ πάλιν ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν Ὀμήρου νέκυιαν τὸ Ἐθυσία  
Πειριθόον τε θεῶν ἀριδείκετα τέκνα', χαριζόμενον Ἀθηναίοις.

The Hesiodic poem mentioned by Plutarch is now generally identified as the *Aegimius*, although no explicit connection between the poet and the poem occurs in the text.<sup>54</sup> As can be seen, we are faced here with one

<sup>53</sup> Trans. G. W. Most, *Hesiod: The Shield. Catalogue of Women. Other Fragments*, Cambridge, MA 2007, adapted.

<sup>54</sup> The attribution to the *Aegimius* was fostered by J. SCHWEIGHAEUSER, *Animadversiones in Athenaei Deipnosophistas*, VII, Strasbourg 1805, p. 9, and accepted by K. O. MÜLLER, *Die Doriaer*, II, 2nd ed., Breslau 1844, p. 464; see, however, G. MARCKSCHEFFEL, *Hesiodi, Eumeli,*

more confutation/denigration of Athenian propaganda by Hereas, exposing the wrongdoing of the early Athenian tyrant Pisistratus, who in the mid-sixth century BC tampered with the Homeric and Hesiodic poems on more than one occasion. The allegation by Hereas is interesting since it implies the circulation of some poems of the Hesiodic corpus in Athens in the mid-sixth century BC; however, its reliability remains dubious, also considering that it is the only piece of evidence at such an early age.<sup>55</sup>

The Plutarchean passage is however just the first part of the Hesiodic fragment recalling Theseus' love for Aegle; it can be complemented by another source, Athenaeus (13.557a = Hes. fr. 147 and 298 Merkelbach-West = fr. 235b Most), who also deals in detail with the sexual exuberance of the Athenian hero. After drawing on Ister the Callimachean (*FGrHist* 334 F 10) for the three different types of relationships with women that Theseus experienced (love, abduction, legal wedding), Athenaeus reports the following:

Νομίμως δ' αὐτὸν [sc. Θησέα] γῆμαι Μελίβοιαν τὴν Αἴαντος μητέρα. Ἡσίοδος δέ φησιν καὶ Ἴππην καὶ Αἴγλην, δι' ἣν καὶ τοὺς πρὸς Ἀριάδην ὄρκους παρέβη, ὡς φησι Κέρκωψ.

[Theseus] lawfully married Meliboea, the mother of Ajax. Hesiod adds Hippe, and Aegle too, for whose sake he violated his oaths to Ariadne, as Cercops says.<sup>56</sup>

By way of complicated (and in my opinion, not particularly convincing; see below) reasoning, the editors have attributed these two complementary fragments to the *Aegimius* (see fr. 294–301 Merkelbach-West), the only poem of the Hesiodic corpus to have been assigned in antiquity to specific poets other than Hesiod. The Hesiodic authorship of the

*Cinaethonis, Asii et Carminis Naupactii fragmenta*, Leipzig 1840, pp. 160–162. On Theseus' adventures with women see GANTZ, *Early Greek Myth* (cit. n. 3), pp. 276–291.

<sup>55</sup> On the allegation by Hereas see M. L. WEST, *Hesiod: Theogony*, Oxford 1966, p. 50 n. 1. On the circulation of Hesiodic poems in early Greece see my 'The Hesiodic corpus', [in:] F. MONTANARI, A. RENGAKOS & C. TSAGALIS (eds), *Brill's Companion to Hesiod*, Leiden 2009, pp. 98–101.

<sup>56</sup> Trans. MOST, *Hesiod: The Shield* (cit. n. 53), slightly modified.

*Aegimius* is firmly maintained only by Stephen of Byzantium, who quotes from the second book of the poem (fr. 296 Merkelbach-West). The main competitor for the authorship of the *Aegimius* was the little known Cercops of Miletus, quoted mainly by a limited number of mythographical sources.<sup>57</sup> Elsewhere, dealing with Peleus and Thetis, Athenaeus raises doubts as to whether Hesiod or Cercops was the author of the *Αἰγίμιος* (Ath. 11.503d = Hes. fr. 301 Merkelbach-West = 238 Most: καὶ ὁ τὸν Αἰγίμιον δὲ ποιήσας εἴθ' Ἡσίοδος ἐστὶν ἢ Κέρκωψ ὁ Μιλήσιος· ἔνθα ποτ' ἔσται ἕμὸν ψυκτῆριον, ὄρχαμε λαῶν'); on the other hand, the small number of other sources who quote fragments from the poem waver between Cercops and anonymity, limiting themselves to the formula ὁ τὸν Αἰγίμιον ποιήσας, whereas Ps.-Apollodorus quotes Cercops twice, without connecting him to any specific poem (*Bibl.* 2.1.3; 2.1.5).

As a matter of fact, the controversy over the author may have been even more muddled in antiquity, if a passage of Tzetzes' commentary on the *Iliad*, recently reedited by Manolis Papathomopoulos, is to be trusted, where Tzetzes assigns the poem to a Clinias Carystius, a name otherwise unattested in the whole extant corpus of Greek literature (Tzet. *in Hom. Il.* 1.109, p. 200 Papathomopoulos: ὃν Ἄργον καὶ τετράφθαλμον λέγει Κλειῖας ὁ Καρύστιος ὁ τὸν Αἰγίμιον ποιήσας). Tzetzes then proceeds to quote four lines of the poem which are also found in a Euripidean scholion, which assigns it to 'the poet of the *Aegimius*' (Hes. fr. 294 Merkelbach-West = 230 Most).<sup>58</sup>

<sup>57</sup> A Pythagorean Cercops of uncertain dating, who composed a *katabasis* and a *hieros logos*, was also known in antiquity (cf. Cic. *Nat. D.* 1.107 [where, however, the name Cercops has been introduced by conjecture]; Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.131.5); he has often been identified with the poet of the *Aegimius*, although evidence for this is missing. On Cercops see in particular MARCKSCHEFFEL, *Hesiodi, Eumeli* (cit. n. 54), pp. 163–66; K. O. MÜLLER, *Die Dorer*, I, 2nd ed., Breslau 1844, p. 29 n. 2. Most recently, U. KENENS, 'The sources of Ps.-Apollodorus's *Library*: A case-study', *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 97 (2011), pp. 129–146, at 140–144, has identified Cercops, following some earlier attempts, with the Orphic poet mentioned by Cicero and Clement of Alexandria. She is however wrong in assuming that Ps.-Apollodorus testifies that the *Aegimius* was attributed to both Hesiod and Cercops, since the poem is never explicitly mentioned in the *Bibliotheca* (see p. 140 nn. 4–5, which follows M. VAN DER VALK, 'On Apollodori *Bibliotheca*', *Revue des Études Grecques* 71 (1958), pp. 100–168, at 162–163).

<sup>58</sup> For a tentative identification of Clinias see M. PAPATHOMOPOULOS, *Nouveaux fragments d'auteurs anciens*, Athens 1980, pp. 27–28 and n. 1. However, Tzetzes' reliability on this

On the grounds of the occurrence of the names of Hesiod and Cercops in the Athenaeus passage, Reinhold Merkelbach and Martin West in their *editio maior* of the Hesiodic corpus have assigned the information it conveys on Theseus and Aegle to the 'Hesiodic' *Aegimius*, and as a consequence the attribution has also been extended to the more generic mention of 'Hesiod' in the Plutarch passage. Moreover, Merkelbach and West have classified the Athenaeus passage on Hippe and Aegle for a second time, as fr. 147 in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (whereas Glenn Most arranges it as fr. 235b), thereby implicitly indicating how speculative the attribution to the *Aegimius* is.

Yet, the point I intend to make here is that the oscillation between Hesiod and Cercops in the ancient testimonies may not necessarily imply that only one poem named *Aegimius* was circulating in early Greece, or else that only one of the two poets, if any, should be credited with such a poem.<sup>59</sup> As a matter of fact, it should be pointed out that in this passage Athenaeus (11.57a), far from contrasting Cercops and Hesiod on the authorship of the *Aegimius* (as he does elsewhere, i.e. 11.503d = Hes. fr. 301 Merkelbach-West), mentions them alongside each another regarding one matter narrated in the poem, namely the women loved by Theseus. After mentioning Hesiod, Athenaeus brings Cercops into the context in order to provide an additional detail on the story of Theseus and Aegle; unless one rejects Athenaeus' evidence as unreliable, it follows that the additional information in the account of Cercops (the breaking of Theseus' oath to Ariadne) was not narrated in the Hesiodic poem and for this reason Cercops is brought in. The omission of the oath in Hesiod can be accounted for by the catalogic nature of Hesiodic poetry, which in general tended to avoid expanded narratives (with few notable exceptions).

If we accept this view, it thus follows that, as was already argued by Wilhelm Marckscheffel in 1840, there were two independent poems cir-

matter (as well as on other matters) is a moot point; it should be noted that the name of Clinias is dropped in a scholion by Tzetzes to his own commentary, where the same fragment occurs again (p. 457 Papathomopoulos).

<sup>59</sup> See U. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, *Die Ilias und Homer*, Berlin 1916, p. 412-413, followed by A. RZACH, 'Kerkops', [in:] *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplementband 4 (1924) coll. 901-902, at 901 with further considerations.

culating in antiquity, relating Theseus' love for Aegle and the sorrow of Ariadne.<sup>60</sup> Further evidence in support of the view here expressed can be found in a fragment from Aristotle's *Poetics* quoted by Diogenes Laertius (2.46 = Arist. fr. 75 Rose), where it is reported that 'also Cercops *ephiloneikei* with Hesiod when he was alive' (καὶ Κέρκωψ ἐφιλονείκει Ἡσιόδῳ ζῶντι), just as Xenophanes did, whereas Cylon of Croton *ephiloneikei* with Pythagoras, Amphimenes of Cos with Pindar etc. The widespread assumption among scholars (especially from the past) that Cercops and Hesiod competed in rhapsodic contests<sup>61</sup> rests on the misinterpretation of the verb *φιλονεικεῖν* in the passage of Diogenes Laertius. In this passage Xenophanes is explicitly said to *philoneikein* with Homer and Hesiod when they were already dead, which clearly shows that the meaning of the verb in this context is not 'to compete', but 'to take issue, to argue with, criticize', which is precisely what Xenophanes did when he blamed Homer and Hesiod for misrepresenting the behaviour of the gods.<sup>62</sup> The testimony of Diogenes Laertius can therefore be taken to allude to the existence of two poems, and to mean that Cercops diverged from Hesiod regarding the version of a myth in one of his poems. It can be gathered from Ps.-Apollodorus (*Bibl.* 2.1.3; 2.1.5) that Cercops dealt

<sup>60</sup> On the *Aegimius* see MARCKSCHEFFEL, *Hesiodi, Eumeli* (cit. n. 54), pp. 160–163, esp. 162: 'Cum enim perspexerimus, Athenaeum duo diversa carmina habuisse ante oculos, quorum alterum Hesiodo alterum Cercopi ... tribuebat, hoc iam pro certo possumus et explorato ponere, neque Plutarchum neque Athenaeum Aegimium respexisse. Plutarchus autem omnino nullum carmen Hesiodi manibus tractabat, quum illud scriberet, sed ex Hereae libro notitiam suam hauriebat. Sed illud vix dubitari poterit, quin versus, quem Hereae servaverat, ex eodem carmine [n.: 'Erat autem Catalogus aut Thesei ad inferos descensus'] eiectus fuerit, quo Hippa et Aegla (Athenaeo teste) legitimae Thesei uxores dicebantur'; see already SCHWEIGHÄUSER, *Animadversiones in Athenaei* (cit. n. 54), p. 9: 'Verum ita discrete hoc loco *Hesiodi* testimonium a *Cercopis* testimonio distinguitur, ut fere dubitari non possit, e diversis operis ducta esse'. On the possibility that Cercops may have composed other poems than the *Aegimius* see MARCKSCHEFFEL, *Hesiodi, Eumeli* (cit. n. 54), p. 165; RZACH, 'Kerkops' (cit. n. 59), col. 901.

<sup>61</sup> See already F. WÜLLNER, *De cyclo epico poetisque cyclicis commentatio philologica*, diss. Münster, 1825, p. 50; RZACH, 'Kerkops' (cit. n. 59), col. 901.

<sup>62</sup> See MARCKSCHEFFEL, *Hesiodi, Eumeli* (cit. n. 54), p. 165; F. G. WELCKER, *Der Epische Cyclus oder die homerischen Dichter*, I, 1st ed., Bonn 1835, p. 270 n. 435 = I, 2nd ed., 1865, p. 248 n. 435; C. G. HEYNE, *Ad Apollodori Bibliothecam observationes*, II, Göttingen 1803, p. 354.

with various mythical themes in his poetry, including for instance Nauplius' marriage to Hesione, a detail unattested in the extant sources.<sup>63</sup>

As a final note in favour of my interpretation, it may be added that – somewhat similarly to Athenaeus – in the first century BC the learned Philodemus (who often drew on the erudition and competence of Apollodorus of Athens) quotes the *Aegimius* without mentioning the name of the poet, next to Hesiod in a context related to the one-eyed daughters of Phorcys (Hes. fr. 295 Merkelbach-West = 233 Most: ὁ τὸν Αἰγίμιον ποι[ήσας· παρὰ] δ' ὄνν' Ἡσιό[δωι]...; cf. *Theog.* 270–283). This detail could count as further evidence for the existence of two distinct poets, both dealing with the same mythical material.

Admittedly, we are on thin ice in dealing with these fragments and the scanty information provided by the ancient sources; but if my interpretation is correct, it means that, contrary to what the editors of Hesiod have always thought, we have in Athenaeus' passage (13.557a) two distinct fragments on Theseus and Aegle (and Ariadne), one to be attributed to Hesiod, the other to Cercops (= Cercops fr. 1). Moreover, once one fragment is attributed to Cercops, we no longer have any reason to place the other in the *Aegimius*, because it is just as likely to have belonged in the *Catalogue of Women*, listing the women loved by Theseus and their offspring (Hes. fr. 147 Merkelbach-West).

*Ettore Cingano*  
willyboy@unive.it

<sup>63</sup> See KENENS, 'The sources of Ps.-Apollodorus's *Library* (cit. n. 57).



**T H E J O U R N A L O F J U R I S T I C P A P Y R O L O G Y**  
**Supplement XXX**



ISBN 978-83-946848-0-8



9 788394 684808