

Boiotia, Athens, the Peisistratids, and the *Odyssey's* Catalogue of Heroines

Stephanie Larson

IN *Odyssey* 11, Odysseus entertains his Scherian hosts with a vivid description of his journey to the Underworld. As he recounts his meeting with the dead, Odysseus lists fourteen female mythological figures whom he saw there. This section is commonly known as the “catalogue of heroines.”¹

As is well known, ancient Greeks were fond of catalogues, especially those recounting heroic genealogies, such as the Hesiodic *Ehoiai*, another early example of a specifically female-oriented catalogue.² Such lists were not concerned solely with portraying women *per se*, although the female figures of catalogues were significant mythological characters. Consider Odysseus’ own words as he begins his catalogue in the *Odyssey*: ἀριστήων ἄλοχοι ἔσαν ἠδὲ θύγατρεις, “they were the wives and daughters of the best men” (11.227).³ Brief mention of heroines in catalogues thus served to recall myths of related heroes; it was the womens’ male relations who mattered most, their

¹ The following are cited by authors’ names alone: T. GANTZ, *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore 1993); J. LARSON, *Greek Heroine Cults* (Madison 1995); A. SCHACHTER, *Cults of Boiotia* (*BICS* 38.1–4 [1981–1994]); A. SHAPIRO, *Art and Cult under the Tyrants* (Mainz 1989); M. WEST, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford 1985).

² Dated *ca* 580 by West (130–137, 164; see 137–164 for the different chronological layers of the poem); see also R. Fowler, “Genealogical Thinking, Hesiod’s *Catalogue*, and the Creation of the Hellenes,” *PCPS* 44 (1998) 1 and n.4. On the date for the textualization of the *Odyssey*, see n.113 *infra*.

³ Recall also the proem to the *Ehoiai*, where the Muses are urged to sing: γυναικῶν φύλον ... αἶ τὸτ’ ἄρισται ἔσαν ... μίτρας τ’ ἀλλύσαντο ... μισγόμεναι θεοῖσιν] (fr.1.1–4 M./W.).

husbands, or their famous male children.⁴ A similar privileging of male over female is also evident spatially in Greek cult which commonly celebrated females as secondary figures to their male partners or sons.⁵

Traditionally the Hesiodic *Ehoiai* has been seen as a model for the *Odyssey's* catalogue. Scholars have rightly begun challenging this assumption.⁶ While many heroines of the catalogue seem to form a unified group and must be based on an existing and well-known mythic tradition, it does not follow that the catalogue relied on the first book of the *Ehoiai* (which treats many of the Homeric catalogue's characters at length, particularly the Aiolidai).⁷ As Heubeck remarks: "not only is there no proof for such dependence; it is also highly improbable." Heubeck attributes the similarity between the catalogues to a common mythic source, a view which seems most likely.⁸ Far from being derived from the *Ehoiai*, then, the catalogue of heroines is a juxtaposition of traditional tales of particular relevance to a certain time and place. Indeed, Sherrat has argued that catalogues comprise a structural element of epic extremely susceptible to alteration and amalgamation.⁹ In terms of function and reception, such alterations surely conformed to the needs and expectations of the audience at the time of perfor-

⁴ L. Doherty, *Siren Songs: Gender, Audiences, and Narrators in the Odyssey* (Ann Arbor 1995) 94, 108; West 2 (on the *Ehoiai*).

⁵ Larson 79–80 (the most notable exception being the cult of Helen at Therapne).

⁶ West 6, 32; for a list of others, see A. Heubeck *et al.*, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey* (Oxford 1988–) II 91; Doherty (*supra* n.4) 66 n.4.

⁷ As first noticed by Zutt in 1894 (G. Zutt, *Über den Katalog der Heroinnen in der Nekyia* [Baden-Baden 1894]; see West 32). For the western Greek, southern and eastern Thessalian offspring of Aiolos, see West 60–72. Many of these figures, *e.g.* Athamas and Minyas, also pertain to Boiotian tradition.

⁸ Heubeck (*supra* n.6) II 90–91.

⁹ E. Sherrat, "Reading the Texts," *Antiquity* 64 (1990) 813; see also K. Raaf-laub, "A Historian's Headache: How to Read 'Homeric Society'?" in *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*, edd. N. Fisher and H. van Wees (London 1998) 169–194.

mance and were used by these audiences “to provide proof or explanation for the present.”¹⁰

In attempting to locate this context for the *Odyssey*'s catalogue, it is instructive to review Odysseus' own strategy in incorporating the catalogue of heroines into his narrative for the Phaiakians. His method can be understood to mirror that used for the catalogue itself at the time of the poem's final textualization. As we will see, one of Odysseus' main concerns in telling his genealogical tales is to compliment his audience and to acquire their continued good will.

On Scherie, Athena leads the shipwrecked Odysseus to the palace of king Alkinoos. On the way she informs him about the Phaiakians, his future audience (7.75). They are, as he learns, descendants of Poseidon; Poseidon was the father of great-hearted Nausithoos (7.62), the original king of the Phaiakian community and *oikistes* of Scherie (7.56–57, 6.4–8). Alkinoos, the present king and Odysseus' host, is Nausithoos' son and Poseidon's grandson.

Recall that Odysseus has landed on Scherie bereft of everything, even his name. In order to accomplish his *nostos*, Odysseus desperately needs the Phaiakians. The genealogical information provided by Athena is thus vital. He must in no way insult these descendants of Poseidon, even though it is this very deity who would destroy him. Πολύτροπος Odysseus thus devotes over half his catalogue to tales of women linked to the god; eight of fourteen are related to Poseidon, as mothers of his sons, as his descendants, through cult relationships, or by marriage.¹¹ The content of Odysseus' tale demonstrates his

¹⁰ R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge 1989) 173; see also West 11.

¹¹ Tyro, Epikaste, Chloris, Iphimedeia, Phaidra, Ariadne, Eriphyle, and Clymene: Poseidon is lover to Tyro and Iphimedeia and the father of their sons; he is also the ancestor of the husbands of Epikaste, Chloris, Phaidra, and Ariadne (Laios, Neleus son of Tyro, and Theseus, respectively). Chloris is related to Poseidon by blood through her maternal grandfather Minyas, son of Poseidon (Chloris' mother being Persephone, daughter of Minyas, and her

familiarity with Phaiakian traditions and thereby creates a bond of good will between himself and his audience based on shared knowledge of an inherited tradition of stories.

Immediately upon the catalogue's completion, queen Arete praises Odysseus' heart (φρένες, 11.337), and she urges his Phaiakian audience not to begrudge him any gifts (339–340). Alkinoos also applauds Odysseus for his heart and for his minstrel-like skill in truth and story-telling (363–367). The king even requests a second catalogue of the heroes Odysseus encountered in the *katabasis*. The positive reception of Odysseus' catalogue of heroines indicates his internal audience's acceptance of his tales and character; his return seems more assured. This causal relationship between the genealogies in the catalogue of heroines and Odysseus' successful journey has often gone unnoticed by commentators; some have even called the catalogue irrelevant.¹² One exception is Stanford, although he does not explicitly link the families of the heroines in Odysseus' catalogue to Arete's positive response.¹³ Doherty's reading concentrates primarily on the pleasant effect the list of women had on Arete as a female member of Odysseus' audience.¹⁴

So much for Odysseus' internal audience. I return now to the poem's external, historical audience at the time of textualization. It is likely that these same genealogies served an analogous

father being Amphion, son of Iasos of Orchomenos, city of Minyas). Eriphyle is related to Poseidon through the cult of her husband, Amphiaraos, who was worshipped as a cult-hero at Argos where he was said to be a blood-relative of the Minyan Melampous, relation of Poseidon. One of the Clymenes of myth is also connected to the god through her associations with Thessalian Phylake, a Minyan community.

¹² E.g. Heubeck (*supra* n.6) II 91: "the lack of any direct connection between the stories related in this episode and the fate of Odysseus is a flaw in composition." Heubeck explains the function of the catalogue as a demonstration of Odysseus' experience in the heroic world and briefly reviews earlier scholarship on the issue.

¹³ W. Stanford, *The Odyssey of Homer* I (London 1959) 394.

¹⁴ Doherty (*supra* n.4) 22, 65–69, 82–83, 92–121; see 76–86 for similarities between Arete and Penelope as ideal female members of Odysseus' internal audience.

purpose at that specific historical moment: to engage and perhaps even to compliment implied members of the external audience of the poem. We may come closer to identifying the time of textualization by examining the regions and mythic families with which the catalogue's genealogies are primarily associated. As we will see, the catalogue focuses on Thessaly, Boiotia, and Attica. Within these regions, Thebes, Athens, and south-central Thessaly are particularly well represented, the last insofar as the Thessalian heroines of the catalogue are all related, usually by blood, to the Aiolidai of south-central Thessaly.

The catalogue as a whole consists of fourteen heroines. In the following analysis I have tried to follow Odysseus' own classification of these figures as wives and daughters of the ἄριστοι by categorizing them according to marriage, their famous children, other immediate blood relationships, and the locations of their primary cults. I limit my sources to the archaic and early classical periods, so as to remain as close as possible to the moment of the *Odyssey's* final textualization.

Odysseus begins with Tyro, daughter to king Salmoneus, son of Aiolos,¹⁵ and wife to Thessalian Cretheus, her father's brother.¹⁶ Tyro is thus an Aiolid by both blood and marriage. In archaic myth the Aiolidai and many of their offspring were linked to central Greece, especially south-central Thessaly and the Iolkos region.¹⁷ This geography is particularly evident in the cities to which Tyro's sons are connected. Pelias, one of Tyro's sons by Poseidon, became king of Thessalian Iolkos (11.256).¹⁸ To her mortal husband she bears Aison, eponymous founder of Thessalian Aison and father of the famed Thessalian hero

¹⁵ Hes. *Eho.* fr.30; West 64. For Tyro's story see West 142; for the association of this Elean family with Thessaly see also Gantz 171 and n.7.

¹⁶ *Eho.* fr.30.26–34.

¹⁷ West 142. See West's map of Aiolos' offspring in the *Ehoiai*, where three of Aiolos' five daughters are linked geographically to southern Thessaly (61).

¹⁸ For Pelias as Poseidon's son see Hes. fr.38.

Jason;¹⁹ Tyro also bears Pheres, eponym of Thessalian Pherai and father of Admetos.²⁰ Thus, through blood, marriage, and children, Tyro is firmly connected to south-central Thessaly.

Antiope, the second woman in the catalogue, figures prominently in Boiotian tradition. According to Asios, a late sixth-century poet who often treated Boiotian legends, Antiope is daughter to Asopos, the main river in south-central Boiotia.²¹ In the *Ehoiai* Antiope was born in Hyria, a southern Boiotian community.²² She bore the famous twin *oikistai* of Thebes, Amphion and Zethos.²³ Early Ionian historians center the mythology of Amphion and Zethos in southern Boiotia, especially Thebes,²⁴ where the two heroes were likely worshipped at a tumulus north of the Acropolis.²⁵ Antiope is thus strongly linked to south-central Boiotian topography and cult.

¹⁹ *Eho.* fr.38–42; West 65.

²⁰ West 65.

²¹ Asios fr.1 Davies. That the south-central Boiotian river is meant in the *Odyssey* must be inferred from its existence at *Iliad* 4.382–384 and 10.285–288 (Gantz 219, as opposed to other rivers of the same name, e.g. at Sikyon). Antiope's importance in nearby Thebes may also suggest that the Boiotian river is the Asopos named in the catalogue. For Asios' sixth-century date see G. Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry* (London 1969) 95. The alternative late-fifth-century date seems less probable, since it is based on the style and tone of one of the less securely ascribed fragments (see G. Forrest, "The First Sacred War," *BCH* 80 [1956] 43 n.3; C. Bowra, "Asios and the Old-Fashioned Samians," *Hermes* 85 [1957] 391–401, esp. 400; Schachter I 59).

²² *Eho.* fr.181.

²³ *Eho.* fr.182; Pindar characterizes Thebes as the city of Zeathos (fr.52k.44 S./M.).

²⁴ For differences between the Pherekydean, Hekataian, and Hellanikan traditions, see R. Buck, "The Historical Traditions of Early Boiotia," in *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Boiotian Antiquities*, edd. J. Fossey and A. Schachter (Montreal 1979) 21, 23.

²⁵ See Aesch. *Sept.* 526–528; Paus. 9.16.4–7, 9.17.3, 10.32.10–11. T. Spyropoulos excavated prehistoric tombs in the mound north of the Kadmeia (Ἄμφειον: Ἐρευνα καὶ μελέτη τοῦ μνημείου τοῦ Ἄμφειοῦ Θηβῶν [Sparta 1981]; Schachter I 28 and n.2). Through ritual the tumulus later seems to have been linked to a grave of Antiope in Phokis, where she was thought to have been buried because of her marriage to Phokos (Paus. 9.17.3; Larson 75). Antiope later had ties elsewhere in southern Boiotia (e.g. Eleutherai: Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.5.5; Plataia: Paus. 1.38.9).

The following three heroines also have important associations with Thebes. First is Alkmene, wife of Amphitryon and mother of Herakles. The *Iliad*, the *Ehoiai*, and the pseudo-Hesiodic *Aspis* all associate her with Thebes,²⁶ and the *Odyssey* and Pindar with Herakles.²⁷ She was even worshipped in Thebes at her own sacred *alsos*.²⁸ The catalogue next includes Megara, daughter of Theban Kreon, wife of Herakles, and mother to his eight sons, the Alkaidai.²⁹ Following Megara comes Epikaste, a variant of the more familiar name Jocasta. She was the daughter of Menoikeus, a Theban descended from Echion, one of the original and autochthonous Spartoi.³⁰ Little need be said about Epikaste's sorry fate. She is thought to have been worshipped alongside Oedipus at his primary burial site in Thebes (*Il.* 23.679).³¹ Thus, through autochthonous ancestry, by marriage, and through cult, Epikaste, Megara, and Alkmene are strongly Theban.

Chloris, the sixth heroine of the catalogue, is tied to Boiotia through her father, Amphion. This Amphion was king of Boiotian Orchomenos, the main city of the Minyai. Hesiod and Pherekydes place Chloris in the genealogy of the Minyans of

²⁶ *Il.* 14.323–324; *Eho.* fr.193; *Aspis* 50–53. For Herakles' connections to Thebes see Schachter II 14–30; for Alkmene, Schachter I 15–16.

²⁷ *Od.* 11.266–268; Pind. *Nem.* 10.13–18.

²⁸ Pherekydes *FGrHist* 3 F 84; also Paus. 9.11.1 (for a discussion of this passage and problems with Schachter's interpretation of it see Larson 91–92; Schachter I 15–16). For Alkmene's later connections to Athens through Herakles at Kynosarges, Paus. 1.19.3; E. Kearns, *The Heroes of Attica* (London 1989) 145; Larson 93. While a panhellenic figure, Herakles was at the same time considered a local Theban and Boiotian hero (e.g. *Il.* 14.323–324; *Aspis* 50–53; Pind. *Isthm.* 1.55–56 and *Isthm.* 3/4; Paus. 9.11.4, 9.27.6–7, 9.37.1–3; Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.4.9–11).

²⁹ On the Alkaidai, worshipped at Thebes, see Pind. *Isthm.* 4.61–64, Stesichor. 230 *PMG*, Panyassis fr.1 Davies, Paus. 9.11.1–2.

³⁰ For the genealogy see Soph. *OT* 69–70 and schol. Eur. *Phoin.* 942.

³¹ On Oedipus' Theban burial site see also Kearns (*supra* n.28) 50–52. His cult, of course, spread throughout the Greek world, most famously at Athens (Larson 185 and n.68, 187 and n.98; but cf. Kearns 50–52). By the fifth century Sparta too had a cult of Oedipus (*Hdt.* 4.149.2).

Orchomenos.³² Chloris establishes ties with Thessaly through marriage to Neleus, one of Tyro's sons and a descendant of the Thessalian Aiolids. Although Neleus and Chloris were king and queen of Pylos, by blood they are both thus firmly tied to central Greece; their marriage was considered of great regional importance, as Pausanias later indicates.³³ Thus, Chloris offers a mixture of Boiotian and southwest-Thessalian ties.³⁴

After this patently Thessalian and Boiotian section, the catalogue briefly includes Leda, a figure with primary ties to Sparta, but also to central Greece and Athens. Leda is celebrated in terms of her husband, Tyndareos, king of Sparta, and of course her two famed sons, Kastor and Polydeukes.³⁵ Despite these obvious Spartan connections, Thestios, Leda's father, descended from Kalyke, another daughter of Aiolos,³⁶

³² *Eho.* fr.33a; in Pherekydes the mother of Chloris was Persephone, daughter of Minyas (F 117).

³³ Paus. 9.36.4–9.37.1. Although in many early accounts Neleus and the Neleids are pursued by the Theban Herakles, this antagonism may reflect intra-Boiotian rivalry (Thebes versus Orchomenos) rather than casting into doubt Chloris' and Neleus' central-Greek pedigree and origins. Herakles kills the Neleids except for Nestor at *Il.* 11.692–693; the *Ehoioi* tells of Herakles' capture of Pylos and the death of Periklymenos (fr.33a, 35, elaborated in Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.9.9, 2.6.2, 2.7.3); see Gantz 184–185. That Neleus' family was thought to have remained linked to Thessaly is clear from the story of Neleus' trial for the wooing of his daughter Pero, partially told in the catalogue. The trial consisted in driving the stolen cattle of Neleus' mother Tyro back from Iphiklos in Thessalian Phylake (*Od.* 11.281–297; *cf.* 15.225–256 and Pherekydes' account, F 33).

³⁴ Cult evidence is of little worth in this case, as references to cults involving Chloris and her family are late, although some concern her cult in Thebes (Paus. 9.1.6.4; Hyg. *Fab.* 69); see Larson 86–87 for discussion of Chloris' Argive and Elean cults.

³⁵ Here, as in the *Ehoioi*, Leda is Tyndareos' wife: Hes. fr.23a; *cf.* Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.10.5.

³⁶ Thestios is father to Leda in Asios, as quoted by Pausanias (3.13.8: fr.6). The genealogy, which seems of central-Greek importance, runs: Kalyke > Endymion > Aitolos > Pleuron > Agenor > Thestios; see Huxley (*supra* n.21) 94. Kalyke is not listed as one of the daughters of Aiolos in the damaged fragment of the *Ehoiai* concerning the family (*Eho.* fr.10a.100, 96, 34), but on the basis of Apollodoros' testimony Gantz (168) has convincingly suggested that Kalyke, as well as her sister Kanake, be restored to fill the gaps. Gantz's argument (317) for rejecting Eumelos' differing account of Leda's paternity (fr.7 Davies) is convincing.

patriarch of the famous Thessalian family already involved in the catalogue through the family of Tyro. If Shapiro is right in accepting the existence of a mid-sixth-century Athenian cult and sanctuary of the Dioskouroi, Leda's relations also may be linked to Athens. Although the Anakeion cannot be securely connected to Peisistratos or his sons, it is striking that the Dioskouroi are not depicted in Attic art for at least fifty years after the end of Peisistratid rule.³⁷ Leda's presence in the catalogue of heroines may thus serve to link Sparta, central Greece, and Athens, much as that of Chloris linked Peloponnesian Pylos to central Greece.

Iphimedeia brings the audience back directly to southern Thessaly and central-Greek tradition. She is the daughter of Triops, another descendant of Thessalian Aiolos;³⁸ in Hesiod she is also the wife of Aloeus, a second relation of Aiolos.³⁹ Thus, Iphimedeia too is related to the Aiolidai through descent and marriage.⁴⁰ Like many of the other heroines, Iphimedeia is celebrated for her sons, Otos and Ephialtes (the Aloadai), whose legends were set in central Greece and celebrated by Pindar.⁴¹ It is important to note that all the figures of the catalogue who have Thessalian connections up to this point are somehow related to or descended from the Thessalian Aiolidai. I will return to this issue below.

With Phaidra begins the catalogue's brief list of Athenian

³⁷ Shapiro 151–154, after A. Hermay, "L'image de l'apothéose des Dioscures," *BCH* 102 (1978) 71–76, who argues for a direct connection between the tyrants and the cult of the Dioskouroi.

³⁸ Triops is son of Kanake, another daughter of Aiolos (Gantz 168). For Triops as Iphimedeia's father (restored in the *Ehoiai* from Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.7.4) see Gantz 169.

³⁹ Aloeus is a son of Kanake: *Eho.* fr.19.

⁴⁰ West (61) has also connected Iphimedeia's husband Aloeus to the Thessalian town Alos, mentioned at *Il.* 2.682.

⁴¹ In some versions Otos and Ephialtes are the children of Aloeus (*Il.* 5.385–391); in others, like this one, Iphimedeia bears them to Poseidon (*Eho.* fr.19, Pind. fr.162). Pausanias tells us that their graves were visible in Boiotia (9.22.6) and that Otos and Ephialtes founded Askra and established a cult of the Muses on Helikon (9.29.1–2).

families and places. The *Odyssey* is our only attestation of Phaidra before Sophokles;⁴² the most prominent feature of her story at that time seems to have been her marriage to Theseus.⁴³ Prokris, the next heroine, also has significant ties to Attic tradition. She was the daughter of Erechtheus, autochthonous king of Athens, and wife of Kephalos, a hero found in Attic cult and myth.⁴⁴ Kephalos seems to have been one of the figures chosen by Kleisthenes as a possible eponymous hero in the reorganization of Attic tribes.⁴⁵ The deme Kephale was of course named for him.⁴⁶ Prokris and Kephalos are paired in cult in the famous sacrificial calendar from Thorikos.⁴⁷ Kephalos' pedigree, however, further ties Prokris to central Greece, for he was son to the Phokian king Deion, himself a son of Aiolos.⁴⁸ Kephalos was thus uncle to Tyro, the first heroine of the catalogue, and was also related by blood to the other Thessalian Aiolidai in the list. After Prokris, the catalogue includes Ariadne who also has primary associations with Athens through her relationship to Theseus, as noted in the catalogue itself. In this predominantly Attic section, the poem lists Phaidra and Prokris only by name, giving no details about their traditions. Ariadne is more fully described, although her story is relatively short in comparison

⁴² Sophokles' lost tragedy *Phaidra* (frs. 677–693 Radt), perhaps reflected in Seneca's *Phaedra*: see Gantz 285–286.

⁴³ Phaidra herself was celebrated in cult primarily at Troezen where her tomb lay within the sanctuary of Hippolytos (Paus. 2.32.1–3; Larson 59, 181 n.12 with bibliography). Phaidra's cult on the south slope of the Acropolis, reportedly near Hippolytos' tomb, is uncertain (Eur. *Hipp.* 31–32; Kearns [*supra* n.28] 173).

⁴⁴ Pherek. F 34; Hellan. *FGrHist* 323a F 22; Istros *FGrHist* 334 F 14.

⁴⁵ Kearns (*supra* n.28) 177.

⁴⁶ In Apollodoros Kephalos was the son of the Athenian princess Herse (*Bibl.* 3.14.3); for Kephalos as son of Kreousa see Kearns (*supra* n.28) 177.

⁴⁷ Kearns (*supra* n.28) 177; Larson 29–34.

⁴⁸ Gantz 173, 181–182; J. Camp, "Before Democracy: Alkmaionidai and Peisistratidai," in *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy*, edd. W. Coulson *et al.* (Bloomington 1994) 7–12, at 7.

with some of the other heroines. In fact, when taken together, the Athenian stories are noticeably brief.⁴⁹ This economy may suggest that the audience was fully familiar with these myths and even that large numbers of Athenians comprised the intended audience. The inclusion of these figures highlights their relevance at the time of textualization; the length of the stories is less important in understanding their significance.

Maira, the twelfth woman of the catalogue, is otherwise unknown. The thirteenth heroine, Klymene, again brings the audience back to central Greece and Athens. Although there are many mythical characters named Klymene, this Klymene is almost certainly the Minyan heroine who married Kephalos.⁵⁰ According to Pausanias, Polygnotos depicted this Klymene in his painting of Odysseus' *katabasis* in the Delphian Lesche.⁵¹ There she was pictured with seven other heroines from the catalogue, thus nearly securing her precise identification here. In some versions, Klymene bore Kephalos a son named Iphiklos,⁵² a figure associated in the catalogue with the Thessalian town Phylake.⁵³ Thus, through her own Minyan associations, marriage to Kephalos, and her son, Klymene's presence further emphasizes the regions which the catalogue concerns. The final heroine, Eriphyle, brings the audience back to Boiotia and Thebes through her husband, Amphiaraus, who, while also an

⁴⁹ As noted also by Doherty, although not in geographic terms (*supra* n.4: 94, 112). Doherty attributes the brevity in the accounts of Phaidra and the following heroines to the narrator's desire to suppress unsavory stories about these figures. This view is attractive and well-argued, although in catalogue poetry even brief mention of a mythological character would have been sufficient to call to mind vast networks of tradition associated with that figure. Nonetheless, Doherty's view does not necessarily exclude the geographic and regional interpretation offered here.

⁵⁰ *Nostoi* fr.4 Davies (Paus. 10.29.6).

⁵¹ Paus. 10.29.4–7.

⁵² *Nostoi* fr.6; cf. Gantz 182, who argues that this fragment may have been an inaccurate quotation of the *Nostoi* by Pausanias.

⁵³ See also Gantz 185.

Argive hero, was primarily worshipped in Thebes and at his nearby and important oracular sanctuary at Oropos.⁵⁴

In sum, the catalogue includes thirteen heroines with particular links to south-central Thessaly and the Aiolidai (Tyro, Iphimedeia); Sparta, the Aiolidai, and Athens (Leda); southern Thessaly, Boiotia, and the Aiolidai (Chloris); Thebes and Boiotia (Antiope, Alkmene, Megara, Epikaste, Eriphyle); Boiotia, Thessaly, and Athens (Klymene); and Athens (Phaidra, Prokris, Ariadne).⁵⁵

A brief analysis of Boiotian group traditions will help narrow this geographic focus and show that the descendants of the Thessalian Aiolidai were significant in archaic Boiotia. Of primary importance is the tradition of Boiotian migration, most fully related by Thucydides (1.12.2–3):

ἐπεὶ καὶ μετὰ τὰ Τρωικὰ ἡ Ἑλλὰς ἔτι μετανίστατό τε καὶ κατωκίετο, ὥστε μὴ ἡσυχάσασαν ἀνέζηθῆναι. ἢ τε γὰρ ἀναχώρησις τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐξ Ἰλίου χρονία γενομένη πολλὰ ἐνεόχμωσε, καὶ στάσεις ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν ὡς ἐπὶ πολὺ ἐγίνοντο, ἀφ' ὧν ἐκπίπτοντες τὰς πόλεις ἔκτιζον. Βοιωτοὶ τε γὰρ οἱ νῦν ἐξηκοστῷ ἔτει μετὰ Ἰλίου ἄλωσιν ἐξ Ἄρνης ἀναστάντες ὑπὸ Θεσσαλῶν τὴν νῦν μὲν Βοιωτίαν, πρότερον δὲ Καδμηίδα γῆν καλουμένην ὄκισαν (ἦν δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ ἀποδασμὸς πρότερον ἐν τῇ γῆ ταύτῃ, ἀφ' ὧν καὶ ἐς Ἴλιον ἐστράτευσαν) ...

Then even after Troy Greece was still continuously in the process of forced migration and settlement, so that she had no peace in which to grow. For the return of the Greeks from Troy over many years caused great problems, and for the most part civil strife occurred in the cities, from which exiles were constantly founding cities. For example, in the sixtieth year after the capture of Troy those who are now called Boiotoi were pushed out of Arne by the Thessalians and they settled the land now

⁵⁴ The exact site of the Theban Amphiraion is unknown, although Pausanias locates it between Thebes and Potniai on the spot where the earth swallowed the hero (9.8.3); cf. Pind. *Nem.* 9.24–27, 10.8–9, *Ol.* 6.12–17; for discussion of the possibilities see Schachter I 21–23; T. Hubbard, “Remaking Myth and Rewriting History: Cult Tradition in Pindar’s *Ninth Nemean*,” *HSCP* 94 (1992) 102–107.

⁵⁵ I omit Maira from this list as her status is unclear.

called Boiotia, formerly called Kadmeian (earlier on in this same land there was also a division of these people, from whom there was an expedition to Troy) ...

While there is much to discuss in Thucydides' version of the migration, I will note only that his account describes one way in which Thessaly and the Aiolidai were significant to the archaic Boiotians. He acknowledges the importance of the Thessalian community Arne for the tradition of Boiotian migration, as do earlier sources which mention the related town of Boiotian Arne (Hes. fr.218; *Il.* 2.507). Thessalian Arne, the probable *metropolis*, is thought to have been located in south-central Thessaly, the area in which the Aiolidai were prominent in myth.⁵⁶

The tradition of migration is not our only evidence that the Boiotians were interested in claiming connections to Thessaly in the late archaic period. This tendency is particularly manifest in myth and cult, for example, in collective Boiotian worship of the Thessalian Athena Itonia whose sanctuary lay near the *polis* Koroneia, on the western border of lake Kopais.⁵⁷ Boiotian

⁵⁶ As the site of Thessalian Arne some scholars accept Kierion, a site whose remains date to the end of the seventh century; see B. Helly, "Les cités antiques de la Thessalie," *Les Dossiers d'archéologie* 159 (1991) 36. Others prefer Thessalian Philia: C. Morgan, "The Archaeology of Sanctuaries in the Early Iron Age and Archaic Ethne," in *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*, edd. L. Mitchell and P. Rhodes (London 1997) 171, 173, 194 n.31. Both candidates are situated in southern Thessaly.

⁵⁷ Although secure evidence does not appear until the late fourth century, certain factors support seeing the Itonion as pan-Boiotian already in the archaic period (see Schachter I 119–127, esp. 199 and 122–123, and his "La fête des Pamboiotia," *CEA* 8 [1978] 81–107). The evidence consists primarily in non-Boiotian familiarity with the local site in the archaic period, a series of mid-sixth-century black-figure Boiotian vases thought to have been produced by a single workshop and connected to the Pamboiotia, the status of the Itonion later as a federal cult center, and the accessible location of the Itonion in central Boiotia at the edge of lake Kopais. For non-Boiotian familiarity with the site: Alc. fr.147 with D. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford 1955) 268–269; Bacchyl. fr.15; for the vases, A. Ure, "Boeotian Geometricising Vases," *JHS* 49 (1929) 160–171, esp. 167–170, and "More Boeotian Geometricising Vases," *JHS* 55 (1935) 227–228; Schachter I 119–120; for the Itonion as a federal cult center, P. Roesch, *Etudes béotiennes* (Paris 1982) 218, 270; Schachter I 113, 123, 126–127; for its accessible location, W. Pritchett, *Studies in Greek Topography III Roads* (Berkeley 1969) 85–88; *contra* Roesch 221; Schachter I 119. See also S. Larson, *Boiotian Group Identity in the Late Archaic and Early Classical Periods* (diss. Univ. Texas at Austin 2001) 99–105.

concern with Thessaly is perhaps most apparent, however, in the traditional story and genealogy of the eponymous hero Boiotos. First, Boiotos seems to have been linked to the story of Boiotian migration from Thessaly.⁵⁸ Second and more important, in sources for his genealogy Boiotos is consistently descended from a daughter of Thessalian Aiolos, the patriarch of the family so prominent in myths of southern Thessaly.⁵⁹ In light of these Boiotian connections to Thessaly and the Aiolidai through traditions of migration, collective cult, and the genealogy of Boiotos, the emphasis on Thessaly and the Aiolidai in the *Odyssey's* catalogue takes on new meaning and can be understood to relate directly to sixth-century Boiotian collective identity.

Given the intersection of the archaic traditions concerning the Thessalian Aiolidai and those of the Βοιωτοί, I suggest that the specific areas targeted by the *Odyssey's* catalogue can be narrowed to Boiotia and Athens, although this reading certainly does not exclude the continued importance of these figures for Thessaly. In itself this conclusion is important for our understanding of the catalogue, for while commentators have noted its general central-Greek tone, the importance of the characters for specific central-Greek populations, especially the Thessalian figures, has not been pursued.

Why does the *Odyssey's* catalogue seem to focus on these particular traditions? If one had wanted to impart a panhellenic tone to the catalogue, surely many other well-known regional traditions could have been included. What does the catalogue's concentration on Boiotia, Thessaly, and Athens suggest about its historical and performative context?

Patterns and trends evident in the composition of the *Ehoiai*

⁵⁸ Hes. fr.218; cf. Larson (*supra* n.57) 210–212.

⁵⁹ Asios fr.2; Hellan. F 51; Eur. *Sophe*, cf. T. Webster, *The Tragedies of Euripides* (London 1967) 147–157.

prove useful in answering these questions. The *Ehoiai*, like other catalogue poetry, would have been particularly attractive to certain members of an audience who claimed descent from one of the figures mentioned or who lived in an area which was associated with that figure as the recipient of cult. Eponymous figures or figures related to famous founders of *poleis* or *ethne* might have been most attractive, as West (9) has remarked, "because their genealogical connexions defined the city's, region's, or tribe's position in the world in relation to others ... To this extent assertions about the mythical past expressed the political perceptions or aspirations of the present." West has also argued that as Greek poetry crystallized, certain myths from concurrent traditions were set side by side in catalogues,⁶⁰ thus often highlighting political and ethnic situations of the period of composition.⁶¹ West in fact bases dates for different layers of the *Ehoiai* on various genealogies and their combinations constructed from the eighth to the sixth century; he places the Athenian genealogies no earlier than the late seventh century.⁶² In the end, he understands the entire Hesiodic *Catalogue* as a mid- to late-sixth-century cobbling together of earlier and contemporaneous material by an Athenian.⁶³ The *Odyssey's* catalogue of heroines can be seen in a similar light, as earlier Boiotian and Thessalian material juxtaposed with bits of traditional Athenian genealogies to comprise a combined list relevant for a certain point in time.

If one pursues this reasoning, the geographical associations of the catalogue of heroines suggest that a positive political re-

⁶⁰ Thus the post-eleventh-century juxtaposition of an Argive genealogy with one concerning the kings of Mykenai in the *Ehoiai* (West 152–166).

⁶¹ West (150–153) connected the Inachid genealogy in the Hesiodic *Ehoiai* and the historical emergence of Argos as the dominant power in the late eleventh century.

⁶² For the Geometric layers of the poem, West 143–144, 150–153, 155–161, 164–166; for the sixth century, 130–137, 143, 154, 156, 164 (the Attic genealogies); for synopsis of all the layers see 165.

⁶³ West 136–137, 164, 169–171, and his "The Invention of Homer," *CQ* 49 (1999) 380.

lationship between Boiotia, especially Thebes, Thessaly, and Athens marked the period of the catalogue's final composition. Scattered evidence points toward the second half of the sixth century, when the Peisistratids seem to have been active in Boiotia and Thessaly. In what follows, I shall review these sources, especially those which shed light on Athenian activity in Boiotia. Although each detail on its own fails to confirm Athenian operations in Boiotia, the sum of these items is impressive and may reasonably constitute the cultural context into which we can place the *Odyssey's* catalogue of heroines.

Material evidence for Athenian and Peisistratid activity at the Boiotian oracular sanctuary of Apollo Ptoos during the second half of the sixth century attests to a relationship between Boiotia, Thebes, and Athens. The sanctuary, perched atop a steep slope in the eastern *chora* of the *polis* Akraiphia, was active from the eighth century and was especially popular as a regional sanctuary in the middle and last half of the sixth century. The Ptoon is perhaps best known for the series of fine *kouroi* and *korai* which begin in the late seventh century, many of which are of local manufacture, but some of which are significant Naxian, Parian, and Athenian works.⁶⁴

The Ptoon is commonly assumed to be Theban. Evidence for this attribution comes from Herodotos (8.135.1) but is not entirely convincing. Akraiphia, the closest *polis* to Apollo's sanctuary and the community which controlled the nearby sanctuary of the hero Ptoos, may just as well have controlled the Apolline site. A solution to the issue is not crucial in the present discussion.⁶⁵ Rather it is most important to recognize

⁶⁴ J. Ducat, *Les Kouroi du Ptoion* (Paris 1971); Schachter I 52–73.

⁶⁵ Herodotos describes the famous journeys of Mardonios' Carian envoy Mys to various oracular sanctuaries before the battle of Plataia. Mys is sent to the Ptoon in the company of three men from an unnamed town (*asty*). When the oracle is delivered in Carian, some Theban men with the group express surprise. It is on this basis that the *asty* is identified as Thebes. That the *polis* Akraiphia and the sanctuary of its hero were located extremely close to the Apolline Ptoon is not taken into account in interpretations of this passage,

the site's significance in the area as an attraction to visitors from various archaic Boiotian *poleis*.⁶⁶ Supporting the interpretation of the Ptoon as a regional sanctuary is the fact that it is one of only two Boiotian sanctuaries at which the Boiotians as a collective are known to have set up dedications to Athena in the sixth century.⁶⁷ Perhaps significantly, the other Boiotian sanctuary where the Boiotians dedicated collectively is the nearby and related sanctuary of the Akraiphian civic hero Ptoos.⁶⁸ The area of the Ptoon thus seems to have been one of the focal points for expression of Boiotian regional identity in this period and thus stands out as a center for regional cult activity.⁶⁹

even though Herodotos himself comments on the proximity between the two sanctuaries and the city. Most important, it is only after acknowledging a Theban source for his story that Herodotos remarks on Theban control of the Apolline site. In my view, this aside at the beginning of the tale may indicate Herodotos' own personal doubt and at least absolves him of responsibility for the details of the Theban story. Further, as Schachter has noted (I 67–68), the prophet at the Apolline sanctuary seems always to have been an Akraiphian. For arguments for possible Akraiphian control of the site, see Schachter I 69. Guillon's argument for the sanctuary's dependence on Thebes is unconvincing, since he based his conclusions in part on Pindar's juxtaposition of the Ptoon with the Theban sanctuary of Apollo Ismenios. This may show a connection between the two Apolline sanctuaries but does not indicate archaic Theban control over the sanctuary in Akraiphian territory. Guillon also interpreted Herodotos' phrase οἱ τῶν ἀσπίων αἰρετοὺς ἄνδρας τρεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ as "trois délégués officiels de Thèbes" (P. Guillon, *Les trépieds du Ptoion* [Paris 1943] II 117–125, at 118). For a rebuttal to Guillon see Ducat (*supra* n.64) 448–450 (who nonetheless identifies the three men from the *asty* as Thebans).

⁶⁶ The sanctuary has produced a number of personal dedications: by Thebans: e.g. Ducat (*supra* n.64) 201 no. 124, 379 nos. 232–233; by Akraiphians: 355 no. 202, 411 no. 260; by Alkmaion, son of Alkmaionides: 242 no. 141; by Hipparchos, son of Peisistratos: 251 no. 142. On the Attic inscriptions see below. As Ducat notes (202), many inscriptions that do not mark the city ethnic were likely dedications by Akraiphians. In my view this further suggests Akraiphian control of the site.

⁶⁷ Dedications by the Βοιωτοί: Ducat (*supra* n.64) 409 no. 257 and plate CXLII (Athens NM 7394, dimensions 4.95 x 5.5 cm; found by Holleaux in 1885); Ducat 419 no. 269a (no photograph).

⁶⁸ Ducat (*supra* n.64) 448 n.5 (analogous to Ducat 409 no. 257). There is no reference to this piece in Guillon's study of the hero Ptoos' sanctuary (*supra* n.65).

⁶⁹ I do not mean to suggest that the two Ptoon sanctuaries were the only sites at which the Βοιωτοί were interested in representing themselves in a cultic context. Surely insufficient excavation and happenstance have prevented sixth-

But what of Peisistratid activity at the site or in other central-Greek cult? As is well known, their involvement in the establishment, promotion, and maintenance of certain cults indicates that the Peisistratids were alert to the political potential of religion.⁷⁰ They expressed particular interest in Apolline cult; they even maintained a collection of oracles on the Acropolis, as Herodotos reports.⁷¹ Their involvement in Apolline cult on Delos is well documented (Hdt. 1.64.2, Thuc. 3.104.1). Following the French School's excavation reports from Delos, Shapiro and Parker have even attributed to the Peisistratids a small temple of purely "Attic materials and construction."⁷² The Peisistratids were of course also active in Apolline cult in Athens, founding the sanctuary of Apollo Pythios, started by Peisistratos himself and continued by his grandson.⁷³

We have no record of any Peisistratid activity from Delphi, the main Apolline sanctuary in central Greece.⁷⁴ This somewhat surprising fact, given Peisistratid involvement in other Apolline cults, might be attributed to Alkmaionid interests in Delphi and to the famous antipathy of these two families in archaic Athens. It is well known that during the Peisistratid tyranny the

century pan-Boiotian inscriptions from coming to light in other areas of the region, e.g. the area of Koroneia near the sanctuary of Athena Itonia.

⁷⁰ Shapiro 12–166.

⁷¹ Hdt. 5.96.2, 5.93.2; cf. R. Parker, *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford 1996) 87; A. Aloni, "Anacreonte a Atene: Datazione e significato di alcune iscrizioni tiranniche," *ZPE* 130 (2000) 81–94, at 86–87.

⁷² Shapiro 48 (who also mentions Peisistratos' institution of the Delia); Parker (*supra* n.71) 87; see also P. Bruneau and J. Ducat, *Guide de Délos* (Paris 1983) 128–129 no. 11.

⁷³ The Peisistratids may also have been involved in building a temple of Apollo Patroos on the west side of the Agora, although its scanty remains make a precise determination of its date difficult (Shapiro 51). For a sixth-century date for the building, see H. Thompson, "Buildings from the West Side of the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 6 (1937) 79–84. Hedrick has challenged the identification of the archaic remains as a temple to Apollo Patroos and argues instead that Peisistratid interest in Apollo in Athens centered on the Python near the Ilissos (C. Hedrick, "The Temple and Cult of Apollo Patroos in Athens," *AJA* 92 [1988] 185–210). For the Python as possibly reflected in two Attic black-figure vases see Shapiro 59–60. For the Peisistratids' general interest in Apollo in Athens, Hedrick 207, 209.

⁷⁴ Shapiro 49–50; Parker (*supra* n.71) 87.

Alkmaionids were not always welcome in the city; when absent, they likely settled in Phokis. As Camp has shown, Alkmaionid ties to Delphi and Phokis were strong in the sixth century, and likely included Megakles' involvement in the First Sacred War against Krisa, and Alkmaion's service to Kroisos as an envoy to Delphi. As is also well known, after fire destroyed Apollo's temple in 548 the Alkmaionids accepted the contract for its rebuilding and faced the temple in marble, even though such lavish expenditure was not required.⁷⁵ Viewed in this context, Peisistratid involvement at other Apolline sanctuaries in central Greece takes on added significance, as does their inactivity at Delphi. Scholars have even suggested that the Peisistratids not only avoided (or were excluded from) Delphi, but that certain of their actions, notably the founding of the sanctuary of Apollo Pythios in Athens, indicate a defiant attitude toward Delphi.⁷⁶ Although Shapiro is skeptical of this scenario, he does concede that Peisistratid involvement at non-Delphic sanctuaries might be understood in part as an attempt "to mitigate the influence of the Alkmaionids in Delphi."⁷⁷

It is beyond question that the Peisistratids were active at the Boiotian Ptoon. First, we have a dedication by Hipparchos, Peisistratos' son, from the site, probably erected before 519.⁷⁸

⁷⁵ Hdt. 5.62; Camp (*supra* n.48) 7. For Megakles and Delphi see Plut. *Sol.* 2.2; for Alkmaion, Delphi, and Kroisos, Hdt. 6.125.

⁷⁶ See Forrest (*supra* n.21) 37; J. Boardman, "Herakles, Delphi and Kleisthenes of Sikyon," *RA* (1978) 234; V. Watrous, "The Sculptural Program of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi," *AJA* 86 (1982) 167; D. Williams, "Herakles, Peisistratos, and the Alcmeonids," in *Image et céramique grecque*, edd. F. Lisarague and F. Thelamon (Rouen 1983) 136–137; D. M. Lewis, "The Tyranny of the Pisistratidae," *CAH*² IV (1988) 294.

⁷⁷ Shapiro 52, and his "Herakles, Kyknos and Delphi," in *Ancient Greek and Related Pottery: Proceedings of the International Vase Symposium* (Amsterdam 1984) 271–274, at 274.

⁷⁸ Thebes museum no. 634: IG I³ 1470; Ducat (*supra* n.64) 251–258 no. 142; R. Buck, *A History of Boiotia* (Edmonton 1979) 118; Jeffery, *LSAG* 78 no. 38; A. Schachter, "The Politics of Dedication: Two Athenian Dedications at the Sanctuary of Apollo Ptoieus in Boeotia," in *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*, edd. R. Osborne and S. Hornblower (Oxford 1994) 304.

The inscription marks a simple base in local Boiotian stone, possibly for a tripod: ἵππαρχος ἀνέθε[κεν ὁ Πεισις]τράτο.⁷⁹ What moved Hipparchos to make this offering? An earlier dedication from the sanctuary, a column capital given to Apollo by Alkmaionides, son of Alkmaion, brother to Megakles and one of the most famous Alkmaionids from this period, may provide a clue. Lewis has convincingly placed both these inscriptions in the context of Peisistratid interest in Apolline oracles and antipathy toward Alkmaionid-controlled Delphi.⁸⁰ Shapiro (50) even calls Hipparchos' dedication "a kind of substitute" for involvement at Delphi.

There is more to be said about Hipparchos' dedication and Peisistratid activity at the Ptoon. The hand of the Hipparchan inscription from the Ptoon has been connected to that of the Peisistratid altar of Apollo Pythios in Athens, now on display in the Epigraphical Museum.⁸¹ Bizard, the first editor of the Hipparchan text, noticed the similarity;⁸² Meritt, Raubitschek, and other scholars have followed suit.⁸³ In 1990 Immerwahr dissented, yet the small differences in letter spacing between the two inscriptions to which he calls attention are easily explained. Discrepancies may be credited first to the differences in stone—Hipparchos' dedication is local Boiotian stone⁸⁴—but particularly to the ultimate location for each dedication and the different requirements in spacing for each text.⁸⁵ Immerwahr did

⁷⁹ See B. Meritt, "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 8 (1939) 65; Ducat (*supra* n.64) 257–258; Jeffery, *LSAG* 75 and no. 38; Aloni (*supra* n.71) 85.

⁸⁰ Lewis (*supra* n.76) 292–294; after some disagreement, Schachter too seems to arrive at this view (*supra* n.78: 304).

⁸¹ EM 6787: Meiggs/Lewis 11, *IG* I³ 948. Cf. Aloni (*supra* n.71) 84–86 on the disputed date for the piece; on the Pythion see Thuc. 6.54.6.

⁸² L. Bizard, "Fouilles du Ptoion: Inscriptions," *BCH* 44 (1920) 239.

⁸³ Meritt (*supra* n.79) 65; Jeffery, *LSAG* 75. See also Lewis (*supra* n.76) 292; D. Viviers, *Recherches sur les ateliers de sculpteurs et la cité d'Athènes* (Brussels 1992) 108–109.

⁸⁴ Schachter (*supra* n.78) 292.

⁸⁵ See M. Arnush, "The Career of Peisistratos Son of Hippias," *Hesperia* 64 (1995) 149; Aloni (*supra* n.71) 86.

not examine the stone firsthand, and even the photographs seem to contradict his comments on letter forms and spacing.⁸⁶ Most recently, Viviers tentatively suggested that the two stones, along with two funerary bases from the last quarter of the sixth century, may have come from Endoios' Athenian workshop, favored by the tyrants.⁸⁷ If we accept that the same hand or at least the same workshop was responsible for both inscriptions, then we have evidence for Peisistratid use of preferred stone-cutters who were sufficiently important and recognized to be commissioned to travel from Athens to Boiotia to inscribe Hipparchus' dedication in local Boiotian stone.

Around the date proposed for his dedication at the Ptoon, Hipparchos was busy marking Attic roads with herms, apotropaic road markers which served to measure distances between the altar of the Twelve Gods in the Agora and various outlying demes.⁸⁸ Each herm was inscribed with a phrase noting its location and a moral maxim attributed by name to Hipparchus.⁸⁹ Herms were even depicted in black-figure vase painting, as one example shows, inscribed *Hipparchos kalos*.⁹⁰ One sixth-century herm has been found near modern Koropi, halfway between Athens and the ancient deme Kephale:⁹¹ [ἐ]ν μ' ἔσοι Κεφαλῆς τε καὶ ἄστεος ἀγλαὸς ἕρμῆς, "a glorious herm in the middle of Kephale and the city ..."⁹² Scholars generally

⁸⁶ H. Immerwahr, *Attic Script: A Survey* (Oxford 1990) no. 455, pp.17–18, 76 and n.2.

⁸⁷ EM 10643 (base for the funerary stele of Lampito, constructed ca 525: Viviers [*supra* n.83] 84–89 and 222 where he also suggests that the lettering shows Ionian influence); M 662 (base for the funerary stele of Leanax, dated 525–500: Viviers 103–110, 222–223).

⁸⁸ For the altar as center of Attica see Hdt. 2.7.1 and *IG* II² 2640.

⁸⁹ As we learn from an imitator of Plato (*Hipparch.* 228C–229B).

⁹⁰ R. Osborne, "The Erection and Mutilation of the Hermai," *PCPS* 31 (1985) 48; Shapiro 126.

⁹¹ Pritchett (*supra* n.57) 162; J. Crome, "ΗΙΠΠΑΡΧΕΙΟΙ ΕΡΜΑΙ," *AM* 60–61 (1935–1936) 305.

⁹² *IG* I³ 1023 (Jeffery, *LSAG* 78 no. 35; M. Lazzarini, *Le Formule delle dediche votive nella Grecia arcaica* [*MemLinc* VIII 19.2 (1976)] 302 no. 872), called

agree that a now lost additional line would have identified the stele as Hipparchos' and would have added a moral maxim. What is most significant about this herm is the similarity between its lettering and that of the Peisistratid altar and the Hipparchan inscription from the Ptoon. Jeffery has linked the herm to the mason/workshop responsible for these dedications.⁹³ Such herms served a variety of functions: as cult objects, as moral lessons, as symbols of the geopolitical unity of outlying areas with Athens as the geographical and political center, and finally, in light of Hipparchus' name, as *mnemata* of Peisistratid presence.⁹⁴ It seems significant that at the time when Hipparchos was concerned to demarcate Athenian territory and publicize the Peisistratid name in Attica, he may have also set up a dedication inscribed by the same one of his family's preferred workshops at the Boiotian sanctuary.

Thus far we have explored the significance of the dedication of Peisistratos' son at the Ptoon. It is also possible that Peisistratos himself was active at the sanctuary, for evidence suggests that he may have had a building constructed there. While identifying and distinguishing buildings at the Ptoon has been a perennial problem since the earliest excavations at the site—especially on the middle terrace of the sanctuary area—we may have a clue about one of them.

In the 1903 excavations Gustave Mendel found a terracotta gorgoneion antefix "sur le flanc de la colline."⁹⁵ This antefix,

"Fourmont's herm" after its discoverer; cf. B. Lavelle, "Hipparchos' Herms," *EMC* 29 (1985) 412; Osborne (*supra* n.90) 51; Parker (*supra* n.71) 73 n.23; Aloni (*supra* n.71) 83.

⁹³ See also Aloni (*supra* n.71) 85–86.

⁹⁴ See e.g. Crome (*supra* n.91) 300–313; E. Harrison, *The Athenian Agora XI Archaic and Archaistic Sculpture* (Princeton 1965) 113–114; Pritchett (*supra* n.57) 162; C. Clairmont, *Patrios Nomos: Public Burial in Athens during the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* (BAR 161 [1983]) 151; Lavelle (*supra* n.92) 417; Parker (*supra* n.71) 81; Aloni (*supra* n.71) 82–83, 91.

⁹⁵ NM16341: G. Mendel, "Fouilles du Ptoïon (1903)," *BCH* 31 (1907) 203 n.3.

dated before the late sixth century by Ducat,⁹⁶ comes from an identical mold as two gorgoneion antefixes from the Athenian Agora dated 550–540.⁹⁷ The two Athenian pieces were found in the same context, a well associated with Building F (well H 12:15),⁹⁸ constructed in the decade following 550.⁹⁹ This building is specifically connected to changes in the area of the Agora including the closing of nearby wells; it seems domestic in character and is large in scale, containing a kitchen, drainage system, two of its own wells, and even space for large-scale bronze casting.¹⁰⁰ Following its excavator, both Shear and Camp have identified Building F as either the residence of the Peisistratids, or recently, not as a residence *per se*, but more broadly as Peisistratid “headquarters.”¹⁰¹ This must remain speculative, of course, since certain aspects of the building, such as the space for metalworking, may prohibit identifying the

⁹⁶ Ducat (*supra* n.64) 425.

⁹⁷ N. Winter, *Greek Architectural Terracottas* (Oxford 1993) 223–224, where she describes the pieces (Agora A 2296 [missing since 1956], A 2345). For additional description see R. Nicholls, “Architectural Terracotta Sculpture from the Athenian Agora,” *Hesperia* 39 (1970) 138.

⁹⁸ The well fill dates *ca* 480: Nicholls (*supra* n.97) 131.

⁹⁹ S. Miller, *The Prytaneion: Its Function and Architectural Form* (Berkeley 1978) 63.

¹⁰⁰ T. L. Shear, Jr., “Tyrants and Building in Archaic Athens,” in *Athens Comes of Age: from Solon to Salamis* (Princeton 1978) 1–15, at 6–7; for the domestic nature of the building, see H. Thompson, *The Tholos of Athens and Its Predecessors* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 4 [1940]) 15–33.

¹⁰¹ Shear (*supra* n.100) 7, and his “Ἴσονόμους τ’ Ἀθήνας ἐποιήσατον: The Agora and the Democracy,” in Coulson (*supra* n.48) 225–248, at 231; Camp (*supra* n.48) 10. Shear bases his conclusion on the domestic nature of the building, its construction around the time of Peisistratos’ final takeover of Athens, the date for building F, and the number of wells closed in the Agora at the same time. For the building as Peisistratid headquarters see Camp 10. At one time this building was considered a possible candidate for the archaic prytaneion on the basis of its position in the strata below the later tholos (Nicholls [*supra* n.97] 131; Thompson [*supra* n.100] 40–44). As Miller remarks, however, it is dangerous to assume continuity of purpose in buildings built on the same site but in different periods (*supra* n.99: 62). Moreover, if the building was built during the Peisistratid tyranny, as seems likely, it is difficult to accept it as a prytaneion. It may have been taken over by the late sixth-century democracy and used as a prytaneion annex, as Miller suggests, but there is no evidence that its original purpose concerned civic government (Miller 64–65 and n.77).

structure as a residence. It would also be highly unusual to adorn a domestic building with a decorated roof system, as antefixes did not normally decorate private or even civic buildings.¹⁰²

Whether one accepts building F as a tyrant's residence or not, it is important that the date for the building, 550–540, coincides with the generally accepted date for the final return of Peisistratos: 546.¹⁰³ It is most significant that the Agora as we know it, in size and architectural construction, seems to have been largely a work of Peisistratos and his sons, including the southwest corner where Building F stands.¹⁰⁴

As Winter argues, the antefix from the Ptoon is probably Athenian in origin. Given its identification with the antefixes from the Athenian Agora associated with building F, the Ptoon piece was in all likelihood also produced during Peisistratos' tyranny. The identical antefixes from the two sites suggest that the Peisistratids did more than dedicate at the Ptoon; they may have built a temple or treasury there,¹⁰⁵ these being the only types of buildings associated with decorated terracotta roofs in archaic Greece, with the possible exception of building F in the Athenian Agora, as noted above.¹⁰⁶ In fact, the original French excavators tentatively associated the Ptoon antefix with a sixth-century predecessor to the main fifth-century temple of Apollo. Association with a "small or medium" sized temple on the middle terrace is also possible.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰² Winter (*supra* n.97) 223–224.

¹⁰³ Shapiro 2, who relies on A. Andrewes, "The Tyranny of Pisistratus," in *CAH*² III.3 (1982) 400.

¹⁰⁴ Camp (*supra* n.48) 9–11.

¹⁰⁵ Winter (*supra* n.97) 223.

¹⁰⁶ See Winter (*supra* n.97). Economic considerations, of course, could also explain the origin of the object, although this interpretation seems less likely, since the development of the Athenian Agora during the tyranny would not likely have been spared expense.

¹⁰⁷ Ducat (*supra* n.64) 425, who notes that the only surviving evidence for an archaic temple at the nearby sanctuary of the hero Ptoos also consists of bits of surviving architectural terracottas.

Similarity in ancient Greek roof decoration has long been considered a means of expressing various kinds of affinity, including the evocation of one place in another. Similarity in roofing systems may also indicate other past relationships between two locations, such as gift-exchange. A good example of the former are the consciously western-style roof systems on some of the western Greek treasuries at Olympia.¹⁰⁸ As an example of the latter we might adduce the sixth-century roof from Didyma which Winter has connected to a specific roof at Delphi, both of which may have been dedicated or paid for by Kroisos. Relevant too are the similar disc acroteria at Sardis and Sparta, also linked to diplomatic efforts on the part of Kroisos during this period.¹⁰⁹ Such shared roofs reflect diplomatic gift-exchange and thank offerings, but also political display contemporaneous with the Peisistratid tyranny.

When seen in this light, the gorgon antefix from the Ptoon may have evoked a structure in the southwest corner of the Athenian Agora built during the Peisistratid years. The antefix may even have decorated the main sixth-century building at the Ptoon. In the context of sixth-century activity of aristocratic Athenian families in central Greece, Peisistratid construction at the Ptoon would have signified more than just personal elite display: an element of Peisistratid rivalry with Alkmaionid Delphi through

¹⁰⁸ E.g. the treasury of Gela (Winter [*supra* n.97] 313). Another example comes from Larisa on the Hermus and Sardis, parts of whose roof systems came from the same workshops. Other shared aspects of roof systems and roof painting are unique to only these two cities. These similarities indicate the existence of some sort of relationship between the two communities, perhaps only the use of the same workshop for production, but perhaps also something more meaningful, such as a conscious evocation of Sardian styles on the part of Larisa (Winter 240, raking sima type 1, variant 3b; 245, revetment plaques from Larisa and lateral sima/geison plaque from Sardis; see 241–244 for more examples of this roof system; for still other similarities in roof painting from Larisa and Sardis see 251, soffit from the Old Palace roof from Larisa/eaves tiles from Sardis).

¹⁰⁹ N. Winter, "Kroisos' Role in the Diffusion of Greek Mainland Architectural Terracottas to Ionia," in *Les grandes ateliers d'architecture dans le monde égéen du VI^e siècle av. J.-C.*, edd. J. Courtills and J.-C. Moretti (Paris 1993) 29–33.

construction and dedication at the Boiotian Ptoon seems a real possibility.

To summarize: from the sanctuary of Apollo Ptoos we have evidence suggestive of Peisistratid construction, possibly of the main temple, perhaps rather of a smaller temple or treasury. We suspect that the Peisistratids were involved in small building projects at other Apolline sites like Delos. From the Ptoon we also have a dedication by Peisistratos' son Hipparchos, from the same general period in which he undertook a personal program in Attica to mark the distances connecting each deme with the center of Athens. The dedication may have been in the same hand as the famous Peisistratid altar to Pythian Apollo and the Hipparchan herm from Koropi. It thus seems possible to suggest that the Peisistratids showed a high level of interest in the Ptoon sanctuary, a site important to individual Boiotian *poleis* and also to the larger regional group of Βοιωτοί. In addition, as a prominent international Apolline site in central Greece from which one can see Mount Parnassos, the Ptoon provided a useful place for the Peisistratids to compete with the Alkmaionids. While not decisive, the evidence presented here *in toto* is suggestive of a relationship between Peisistratid Athens and Boiotia.

What, then, does this contribute to our understanding of the *Odyssey's* catalogue of heroines? Simply put, quite a suitable historical setting for the performance of our Boiotian-Thessalian-Athenian catalogue of heroines in mid-sixth-century Peisistratean Athens, a time when our sources—both literary and material—suggest that Boiotia, Thebes, Thessaly, and Athens enjoyed close relations. As for Peisistratid connections to Thessaly, we know Peisistratos named one of his sons Thessalos. Further, when the Spartans attacked the Peisistratids in order to liberate Athens, the Peisistratids appealed to Thessaly and were duly sent a troop of 1000 cavalry under Thessalian leadership. After Hippias' exile, the Thessalians

volunteered Iolkos to him.¹¹⁰ Although Hippias refused the offer, this evidence for Peisistratid interaction and alliance with Thessaly is clear. On the Boiotian side of things, Thebes' great financial support of Peisistratos' final takeover of Athens is well known.¹¹¹ Aristotle in fact was later to identify the Thebans as primary players in Peisistratos' rise to power.¹¹² In light of the material evidence for Peisistratid activity in Boiotia adduced above, the Boiotian, Theban, Thessalian, and Athenian focus of the catalogue seems quite apposite in this political milieu.

For the sake of argument, then, let us assume a mid-sixth-century date for the final and definitive textualization of the *Odyssey*, a culmination of the oral poem after a formative period in the late eighth and seventh centuries. While down-dating the poem remains contested, the position has been steadily gaining acceptance among philologists, cultural historians, and archaeologists.¹¹³ Studies of oral transmission

¹¹⁰ For Thessalos, Thuc. 6.55.1, Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 17.3, 18.2; for Thessalian aid to the Peisistratids, Hdt. 5.63–64; for Hippias and Iolkos, Hdt. 5.94; cf. Camp (*supra* n.48) 8.

¹¹¹ Hdt. 1.61: πολλῶν δὲ μεγάλα παρασχόντων χρήματα, Θηβαῖοι ὑπερέβαλλοντο τῇ δόσι τῶν χρημάτων.

¹¹² Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 15.2: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ὡς ἐξέπεσε τὸ δεύτερον, ἔπει μάλιστα ἐβδόμῳ μετὰ τὴν κάθοδον, (οὐ γὰρ πολὺν χρόνον κατέσχεν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ μὴ βούλεσθαι τῇ τοῦ Μεγακλέους θυγατρὶ συγγίνεσθαι, φοβηθεὶς ἀμφοτέρας τὰς στάσεις ὑπεξῆλθεν), καὶ πρῶτον μὲν συνόκισε περὶ τὸν Θερμαῖον κόλπον χωρίον ὃ καλεῖται Ῥαίκηλος, ἐκεῖθεν δὲ παρήλθεν εἰς τοὺς περὶ Πάγγαιον τόπους, ὅθεν χρηματισάμενος καὶ στρατιώτας μισθωσάμενος, ἐλθὼν εἰς Ἐρέτριαν ἐνδεκάτῳ πάλιν ἔπει τότε πρῶτον ἀνασώσασθαι βίαν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπεχείρει, συμπροθυμουμένων αὐτῷ πολλῶν μὲν καὶ ἄλλων, μάλιστα δὲ Θηβαίων καὶ Λυγδάμιος τοῦ Ναξίου, ἔπει δὲ τῶν ἰπέων τῶν ἐχόντων ἐν Ἐρετρίᾳ τὴν πολιτείαν.

¹¹³ For this dating I use Nagy's crystallization model. On the seventh century for the formulation of the *Iliad* and the following stage of crystallization/textualization in the mid-sixth century, see A. Ballabriga, "La question homérique pour une réouverture de débat," *REG* 103 (1990) 16–29; W. Burkert, "Das hunderttorige Theben und die Datierung der Ilias," *WS* 89 (1976) 5–21; E. Cook, *The Odyssey in Athens: Myths of Cultural Origins* (Ithaca 1995) esp. 3–5; J. Crielaard, "Homer, History and Archaeology: Some Remarks on the Date of the Homeric World," in *Homeric Questions* (Amsterdam 1995) 201–288; S. Lowenstam, "The Uses of Vase-Depictions in Homeric Studies," *TAPA* 122

support this view, particularly in demonstrating the near impossibility of transmission of extended oral poems over centuries without change.¹¹⁴ Artistic representations of epic scenes before the sixth century also do not presuppose the existence of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as we have them.¹¹⁵ In fact, as Friis Johansen and West have demonstrated, it is not until as late as 520 that vase painters begin to depict scenes from the entire *Iliad*, as opposed to a few scenes from the last third of the epic.¹¹⁶ In considering a sixth-century date for the catalogue of heroines, it is interesting that even Wilamowitz, an early Analyst, considered the catalogue the work of the final reviser of the *Odyssey*.¹¹⁷ I am ultimately not so much interested in arguing whether or not we ought to accept this date, but in exploring the consequences of doing so for our understanding of the *Odyssey's* catalogue.

Given the evidence gathered here, it seems reasonable to suggest that the historical and political context of Peisistratid Athens had a formative effect on the *Odyssey's* catalogue of heroines. It was during the Peisistratid recension that traditional Boiotian and Thessalian figures were juxtaposed with shorter Athenian stories, all of which were familiar from oral tra-

(1992) 165–198; G. Nagy, "Homeric Questions," *TAPA* 122 (1992) 17–60, esp. 51–52; R. Osborne, *Greece in the Making, 1200–479 B.C.* (London 1996) 156–160; R. Seaford, *Reciprocity and Ritual* (Cambridge 1994) 144–154; K. Stanley, *The Shield of Homer* (Princeton 1993) 279–293; H. van Wees, "Greeks Bearing Arms: the State, the Leisure Class, and the Display of Weapons in Archaic Greece," in *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*, edd. J. Fisher and H. van Wees (London 1999) 333–378; M. West, "The Date of the *Iliad*," *MusHelv* 52 (1995) 203–219.

¹¹⁴ See R. Finnegan, *Oral Poetry: Its Nature, Significance and Social Context* (Cambridge 1977) 140–141; S. West, "The Transmission of the Text," in Heubeck (*supra* n.6) I 33–48, at 36; Seaford (*supra* n.113) 145.

¹¹⁵ Seaford (*supra* n.113) 146; A. Snodgrass, *Homer and the Artists: Text and Picture in Early Greek Art* (Cambridge 1998).

¹¹⁶ K. Friis Johansen, *The Iliad in Early Greek Art* (Copenhagen 1967) 223–240; West (*supra* n.63) 382.

¹¹⁷ Heubeck (*supra* n.6) II 90.

dition.¹¹⁸ Stephanie West has convincingly argued for a final standardization of the *Odyssey* in Peisistratean Athens. Her interpretation takes into account the lack of regional variants for the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as well as the attribution of their standardization to “the relatively unromantic figure” of Hipparchos, not Peisistratos, the most famous member of the family. During this final stage of the text’s revision, West argues that certain passages, some Athenocentric, were added or altered.¹¹⁹ The catalogue of heroines could very well be one of these sections.

Similar arguments have in fact been adduced for other portions of catalogue poetry embedded in epic. Wickersham argues that Athenian and Megarian disputes over Salamis in the sixth century influenced the *Iliad*’s brief mention of Ajax in the Catalogue of Ships. When Megara lost Salamis to Athens, the passage adopted an Athenian perspective which it retained during the final crystallization of the poem.¹²⁰ This Athenocentric entry in the Catalogue of Ships even caught Zenodotos’ attention in Alexandria.¹²¹ Stephanie West and other commentators have similarly discerned an Attic and likely a Peisistratid influence on the entire *Odyssey*, most notably in the present context in the poem’s concern with the Neleid family of Nestor of Pylos, for we know from Herodotos that Peisistratos’ family claimed descent from the Pylian Neleids.¹²² She also men-

¹¹⁸ Interestingly, Wilamowitz considered the Attic stories interpolations (Heubeck [*supra* n.6] II 97).

¹¹⁹ West (*supra* n.114) 36–38; also M. Jensen, *The Homeric Question and the Oral-Formulaic Theory* (Copenhagen 1980) 133–134. Attribution of the recension to Hipparchos: Pl. *Hipparch.* 228B. For a discussion of the sources for the recension and their modern interpretations see Jensen 128, 207–226.

¹²⁰ J. Wickersham, “Myth and Identity in the Archaic *Polis*,” in *Myth and the Polis*, edd. D. Pozzi and J. Wickersham (Cornell 1991) 16–31; on this possibility see also West 10 and n.34.

¹²¹ West (*supra* n.114) 38.

¹²² Hdt.5.65;cf. Strab.14.1.3. As Davies notes, however, the Alkmaionids too claimed descent from the Neleids of Pylos. The evidence for this comes only from Pausanias and thus may reflect the genesis of the tradition after the family’s rise in power, as Fornara and Samons suggest (J. Davies, *Athenian Propertied*

tions the episode of Athen's visit to Athens as a candidate for possible Athenian influence.¹²³

In this paper I have explored further evidence for a mid sixth-century Peisistratid *Odyssey*, a poem which reached final fixity in this last stage of living epic and whose codification was likely influenced by this historical period. Like Odysseus' use of genealogy to compliment his Phaiakian audience, the *Odyssey*, performed in Athens in the sixth century, perhaps at the Panathenaic festival expanded by the Peisistratids, incorporated traditions of well-known heroines of particular relevance to Thessaly, Boiotia, and Thebes, communities with whom the Peisistratids were involved at the time in politics and cult.¹²⁴

December, 2001

Dept. of History and Literature
Univ. of California, Santa Cruz
Santa Cruz, CA 93940
slarson68@hotmail.com

Families [Oxford 1971] 369 and table 1; C. Fornara and L. Samons, *Athens from Cleisthenes to Pericles* [Berkeley 1991] 4).

¹²³ *Od.* 8.80–81; West (*supra* n.114) 38 and n.15.

¹²⁴ I would like to thank J. Camp, E. Cook, K. Daly, J. Kroll, P. Perlman, N. Winter, and the anonymous readers for *GRBS* for their helpful feedback on this paper.