

# Pelops at Olympia

W. J. Slater

So brauchen wir uns gar nicht zu wundern, wenn auch sonst bei Heroenopfern nach olympischen Ritus geschlachtet und vom Opfertier gegessen wird....

K. Meuli, *Ges. Schriften* II 920

THE PROBLEM [*sc.* of epiphanic gods] is related," remarked W. K. Pritchett, "to the 'divine banquets' common in Greek (theoxenion) and Roman (lectisternium) rituals, where the god reclines on a κλίνη."<sup>1</sup> Ritual table-laying and bed-spreading are practically synonymous with theoxenies, and the custom is old.<sup>2</sup> Presumably the god's or the hero's invisible presence is assumed,<sup>3</sup> sometimes symbolized by means of *e.g.* armour (Σ Pind. *Nem.* 2.19 Drachmann), sometimes replaced by a masked worshipper,<sup>4</sup> a statue or image,<sup>5</sup> or other represen-

<sup>1</sup> W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War* III (Berkeley 1979) 17f; *cf.* K. MEULI, "Griechische Opferbräuche," in *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. T. Gelzer (Basel 1975: hereafter 'Meuli') II 907–1021, esp. 917. Also cited by author's name: W. BURKERT, *Greek Religion*, tr. J. Raffan (Oxford 1985); A. D. NOCK, "The Cult of Heroes," *HThR* 37 (1944) 141–74 (= *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, ed. Z. Stewart [Cambridge, Mass., 1972] II 575–602).

<sup>2</sup> H.-J. Klauck, *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult* (= *Neutestamentl. Abh.* N.F. 15 [Münster 1982]) 120, *cf.* 158 n.433; Hdt. 6.139; Pind. *Ol.* 3.40; and above all the material collected by K. Schauenburg, "Theoxenien auf einer schwarzfigurigen Olpe," in *Mélanges Mansel* I (Ankara 1974) 101–17 with pls. 57–60. Wilamowitz (*Glaube der Hellenen*<sup>3</sup> [Darmstadt 1959] 346f), noticed the absence of *lectisternia* in the earliest inscriptions.

<sup>3</sup> "Its concern is with effective presence [Es geht um die wirksame Präsenz]" of hero cult: Burkert 204; *cf.* Plut. *Mor.* 1102A, somewhat idealistically.

<sup>4</sup> *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 736.24; Plut. *Mor.* 417; Paus. 8.15.1; and obviously in Attic drama: see R. Hirschmann, *Symposienszene auf unteritalischen Vasen* (Würzburg 1985) 146; H. Usener, *Kleine Schriften* IV (Leipzig 1913) 453. *Cf.* P. Stengel, *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer*<sup>3</sup> (Munich 1920) 28 n.2.

<sup>5</sup> L. Radermacher, *SBWien* (1927) 182ff; K. Latte, *ArchRW* 26 (1928) 48 (= *Kleine Schriften* [Munich 1968] 118) on "die Toten ... vertretenden Puppen"

tation.<sup>6</sup> Several evocative names are given to such rituals, e.g. ξένια, θεοξένια, ἠρωξένια, θεοδαισία, in which the divinity is invited to participate in the feast (ἐς δεῖπνον, ἐς ξένια καλεῖν); but D. Gill demonstrated in a well-known article that there were other circumstances in which table-offerings were shared between gods and heroes and their worshippers.<sup>7</sup> The greatest such feast was probably the Delphic Theoxenia, in which Apollo invited the other gods to dine; but here also a large public banquet followed.<sup>8</sup> Yet innumerable lesser feasts were observed around hero cults in smaller groups (e.g. θίασοι, ὀργεῶνες, ἔρανοι, and many more), like the worshippers of the hero Egretes.<sup>9</sup> In the festival and games held in the gymnasium of Aegiale for the dead youth Aleximachus, whose father Critolaus had dedicated the hero foundation to him, there is to be no pancratium, and the heroized youth is to be declared winner.<sup>10</sup>

It is impossible to prove that in classical times the worshippers of the dead, including the heroic dead, felt themselves to

---

of Sokolowski, *LSCGS* 115.39, i.e., *colossi*, on which see R. Parker, *Miasma* (Oxford 1983) 347. If so, Pritchett (*supra* n.1: 18) is in error; cf. the *xoana* of *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 589.42 or the σημεῖον of Aesch. *Supp.* 205. The type of popular religious feast, where the divine *xoanon* is surrounded by banqueting worshippers, is epitomized by the Tonaia of Samos, reconstructed by G. Kipp, "Zum Hera Kult auf Samos" *Innsbr. Beitr.* 18 (1974) 157–209, with criticisms by Uta Kron, "Kultmahle im Heraion von Samos archaischer Zeit," in R. Hägg *et al.* edd., *Early Greek Cult Practice: Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium at the Swedish Institute in Athens* (Stockholm 1988) 135ff, esp. 139.

<sup>6</sup> Aen. Tact. 31.15; Ar. *Vesp.* 821; in the many discussions of the meaning of *Totenmahlreliefs* it is perhaps not sufficiently stressed that they might have been the place for the gathering of banqueting worshippers or relatives.

<sup>7</sup> Important is Sophron's description of a magical action, discussed by Latte (*supra* n.5) 496; Parker (*supra* n.5) 222ff; D. Gill, "Trapezomata," *HTbR* 67 (1974) 117–37.

<sup>8</sup> S. L. Radt, *Pindars Zweiter und Sechster Paian* (Amsterdam 1958) 83ff; L. Bruit, "Sacrifice à Delphes; sur deux figures d'Apollon," *RHR* 101 (1984) 339–67.

<sup>9</sup> *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1097 [Sokolowski, *LSCG* 47]: a representation of the hero with two *triclinia*.

<sup>10</sup> *LSCGS* 61, a shortened form of *IG* XII.7 515, recording this hero-cult typical of the islands, but also influenced by the presence of Italian traders. Whether he was to be offered as victor a share in the sacrifice as we should expect (F. Puttkammer, *Quo modo Graeci victimarum carnes distribuerint* [diss. Königsberg 1912] 44ff and n.57 *infra*) is not certain; in any case all the meat that was afterwards used for prizes was first presented to him on a table (lines 74–78).

be participating in table-fellowship with them;<sup>11</sup> it is equally impossible to prove that there was any sense of table-fellowship in sacrifice to the gods. With gods it is commonly assumed, and there is some circumstantial evidence.<sup>12</sup> It is assumed, however, with more certainty that there was table-fellowship in the case of some heroes. The obvious objection to this was that it used to be affirmed on the basis of a passage of Herodotus that heroes were given *enagismata* which were totally burned,<sup>13</sup> while gods by contrast were offered a *θυσία*, parts of which could be eaten normally by the worshippers; it would therefore be impossible for worshippers of heroes to share—even symbolically—in a meal that was totally burned.<sup>14</sup> But this distinction was dismissed by Ada Thomsen in 1911 in a brilliant article as overschematic, and Meuli and Nock in particular collected further exceptions, of which the Olympic ritual for Pelops is one

<sup>11</sup> So Nilsson (*GGR* I<sup>2</sup>, 179) asserted, probably correctly, of the *perideipnon* only, though his remark has been taken to apply to the *Totenmahl* generally, and has therefore provoked skepticism: e.g. U. Hausmann, *Kunst und Heilium* (Potsdam 1958) 156 n.445, 159 n.482; N. M. Kontoleon, in *Charisterion A. K. Orlandos* I (Athens 1965) 359 n.34. Klauck (*supra* n.2: 83) quotes Artemidorus 5.82, although Nilsson (179 n.7) had already cited it as invalid evidence for classical times; even Meuli (922 n.3) agreed.

<sup>12</sup> In the most important discussion Nock (582) argued that strictly (a) “participation in the flesh of a sacrificed animal did not involve conscious table-fellowship with the supernatural recipient of the other parts of the animal...,” and (b) “the semblance of table-fellowship with heroes and the dead was not avoided.” The first thesis refers to gods, and is I suppose incapable of strict demonstration; Meuli (936) was more positive: “Denn die Götter geniessen die Mahlzeit mit.” The second thesis, with its extremely cautious formulation, is the one that interests us.

<sup>13</sup> The principal exponents of this scheme, which was based (*cf.* Stengel, *Hermes* 27 [1892] 165ff) on Herodotus, were E. Rohde, *Psyche*<sup>5</sup> (Leipzig 1910) 149ff, and Stengel (*supra* n.4) 124. This is even today repeated by the unwary, e.g. C. Brown (*GRBS* 23 [1982] 311). *Cf.* the note at Aristophanes fr.504 K.-A.: *discrimen illud—saepe neglegitur*. Herodotus does not follow his own definition at 2.44 (θύουσι ... ὡς ἥρωι), 7.117, 5.14. For a similar example of Herodotean dogmatism in religious matters *cf.* L. Robert, *Opera minora selecta* V (Amsterdam 1969) 493f. Another typical example of pointless sophistic *distinctio* at Antiphon fr.72; *cf.* K. J. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality* (Oxford 1974) 59.

<sup>14</sup> Fr. Pfister, *Der Reliquienkult im Altertum* (Giessen 1909) 466–509, still provides one of the best surveys, though he maintains the validity of the Herodotean definition. Noel Robertson suggests that table-fellowship and sacrifice may have had nothing to do with one another in the beginning since they have different origins.

of the best known.<sup>15</sup> Nock's results, reached independently of Meuli, and based to a great extent on recent epigraphy, are summarized by Brelich:<sup>16</sup>

la differenza tra i due tipi di rituale con le sue regole nette e fisse, sarebbe frutto di quel processo di *legalizzazione*, di sistemazione, che anche in altri campi della religione greca si sovrappone, con l'andar del tempo, alle più antiche formazioni spontanee.

Likewise Pouilloux, discussing recent epigraphical discoveries in Thasos, came to the same conclusion as Nock and Thomsen had done.<sup>17</sup>

Indeed Herodotus is retailing what looks like a sophistic distinction, preserved by grammarians and occasionally remembered by the well educated, but just as often forgotten, and with no general validity. There was, as Thomsen had pointed out long before, a great deal more variety in the actual procedures than the antiquarians and philologists wished to recognize.

For the question immediately arises how *enagismata* are compatible with the feasting worshippers, who are also a feature of hero cult, as one can see from the examples collected by Nock. Pfister, for example, had already drawn attention to the problem not only by citing the well-known examples of heroes (Heracles, Achilles) to whom sacrifice was made both as a hero and as a god, but by using the traditional distinction to explain a double sacrifice to Heracles at Cos on the same day.<sup>18</sup> But even though authorized by Herodotus, this was clearly a questionable academic procedure, in which the form of sacrifice defines the object of the sacrifice as god or chthonic hero, so that the worshippers may be enabled, when necessary, to have

<sup>15</sup> Ada Thomsen [later Adler], *ArchRW* 12 (1909) 481, to whom are indebted Meuli (907–1021="Griechische Opferbräuche," in *Phyllobolia: Festschrift Peter Von der Mühl* [Basel 1946] 185ff), and Nock, after Thomsen's article had been largely ignored.

<sup>16</sup> A. Brelich, *Gli eroi greci* (Rome 1958) 18, cf. 17f, 81. The criticisms of Nock by K. Kerényi (*Saeculum* 7 [1956] 387) have not to my knowledge won any followers. "The distinction between holocaust and sacrificial banquet does not coincide with the distinction between chthonic and Olympian sacrifice": Burkert 428, citing esp. *LSCG* 18.Γ.23 (a holocaust for Zeus Epoptes); Lucian *Merc. Cond.* 28.

<sup>17</sup> J. Pouilloux, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos* I (Paris 1954) 371–81, cited by J. Casabona, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en grec* (Aix-en-Provence 1966) 227 n.15.

<sup>18</sup> *LSCG* 151.9, although the inscription says clearly that both are *thusiai*; Burkert 430 n.30 (the importance of these banquets already recognized by Nock), 467 (following Rohde).

their cake and burn it too; Stengel was thereby obliged by his insistence on this criterion to classify Helios and Selene as chthonic.<sup>19</sup> The division might of course seem to work for the obvious demigods, but not for the innumerable and constantly multiplying heroes of Greece. Once we accept Thomsen's thesis, we must contemplate various kinds of hero worship, where feasting and *enagismata* could be combined. Either a portion was set aside for the hero as an *enagisma* to be burned, or a separate victim could be sacrificed for the banqueters to eat, or in some other way it was possible for the feasters to celebrate a hero. For example, Thucydides speaks of the honours accorded to Brasidas: οἱ Ἀμφιπολίται, περιέρξαντες αὐτοῦ τὸ μνημεῖον, ὡς ἥρωί τε ἐντέμνουσι καὶ τιμὰς δεδώκασι ἀγῶνας καὶ ἐτήσιους θυσίας.<sup>20</sup>

Here the *enagismata* with the *entemnein*,<sup>21</sup> the bloodletting, are separated from but associated with the cultic θυσίαι and feasting; it is not important to tell us the objects of the θυσίαι or that they imply, as would be obvious, feasting. As Scheid says in another context: "Pourquoi les documents omettent-ils souvent de souligner cette liaison entre banquet et sacrifice? Sans doute en raison de sa banalité."<sup>22</sup> The feasting is in honour of Brasidas the hero, however it was justified. Conversely the mention of θυσία does not oblige us to reclassify a hero as a god, nor does it preclude the existence of *enagismata*. At the annual *Totenopfer* for the dead at Plataea the dead were called ἐπὶ τὸ δεῖπνον καὶ τὴν αἱμακουρία, i.e., to both *thusia* and *enagismata*, among which were fruit (Meuli 915, 4). In any event, *enagizein* does not preclude a common meal. Lucian refers with disdain to the feasting ceremonies after *enagismata*, while the Hellenistic historian Harmodius of Lepreum describes a traditional feast in Arcadia: "when they sacrifice to the heroes, there is a great butchering of cattle, and they all feast with their slaves...."<sup>23</sup> But—to cite only one of the epigraphic examples that have come to light in the last hundred years—the contract

<sup>19</sup> P. Stengel, *ArchRW* 8 (1905) 204 (Helios), as Thomsen (*supra* n.15) pointed out; Stengel, *Opferbräuche der Griechen* (Leipzig 1910) 132 (Selene).

<sup>20</sup> Thuc. 5.11, cited by Casabona (*supra* n.17) 226.

<sup>21</sup> "ἐντέμνειν lui-même concerne l'offrande de sang sur le μνημεῖον, c'est à dire les rites bien connus de l' αἱμακουρία" is the definition of Casabona (*supra* n.17) 228.

<sup>22</sup> J. Scheid, "Sacrifice et banquets à Rome," *MEFRA* 97 (1985) 196.

<sup>23</sup> Lucian *Merc. Cond.* 28; Harmod. *FGrHist* 319 F1=Ath. 149c, already noted by Pfister (*supra* n.14) 486 as anomalous.

of the worshippers of the hero Egretes<sup>24</sup> leaves no doubt that the main business of the worshippers was a *thusia* (line 25) with attendant preparation of tables, couches for two *trikina*, and the *optanion*. If there was an *enagisma*, it is not mentioned. Nor for that matter is table-fellowship, but we can reasonably assume nonetheless that it was for that purpose that the feasters collected in the hero's shrine.

Certainly cakes or fruit would suffice for *enagismata*, and being both cheap and traditional would be likely to be omitted in an official recording. But the blood of the slaughtered animal certainly went into the ground for the hero, as did *choai*. Could in some cases the blood be considered sufficient as an *enagisma*? And just how did the various kinds of soups and stews we know from Spartan theoxenies get prepared and consumed and offered? Ferguson showed that banqueting and feasting was a central preoccupation of the early Attic herocults known as *orgeones*, in which a chief officer is called the "restaurateur" (ἔστιάτωρ).<sup>25</sup> The conclusion must be that collective banqueting in hero worship was a common practice, and indeed sometimes regarded to such an extent as the main feature that any *enagismata* are subsumed into the general *thusia*.

"The main event [sc. of a festival for a hero] is the cultic feast of the living in the company of, and in honour of, the hero: accordingly the hero is often shown recumbent at the feast," writes Burkert.<sup>26</sup> Aristophanes' *Banqueters*, for example, met in a temple of Heracles to eat and drink, in the 'presence' of Heracles to whom they sacrificed; it follows, one supposes, that they imagined the hero lying like themselves in a sympotic position, cup in hand, as he is so often depicted on vases, as indeed the heroized Archilochus was depicted in his *heroon*.<sup>27</sup> H. Hoffmann concludes: "What Bronze Age heroes have in common is their great antiquity and the fact that in classical

<sup>24</sup> *LSCG* 47, cited by Thomsen (*supra* n.15) 483; Nock 578.

<sup>25</sup> W. S. Ferguson, "The Attic Orgeones," *HTbR* 37 (1944) 60–140, discussing especially the implications of *LSCG* 20; Nock 578.

<sup>26</sup> Burkert 205; cf. M. Wörrle, *Stadt und Fest in kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien* (= *Vestigia* 39 [Munich 1988]) 254f.

<sup>27</sup> Aristophanes *PGC* IV 122–48 K.-A., with the useful comments of H. Lind, *MusHelv* 42 (1985) 249ff; W. Lambrinudakis and M. Wörrle, *Chiron* 13 (1983) 293, with further references.

times they were most commonly visualised as banqueters at an eternal symposium."<sup>28</sup>

This is, I believe, exactly how Pindar wanted to portray the hero Pelops at Olympia in his festival (*Ol.* 1.90–93):

νῦν δ' ἐν αἵμακουρίαῖς  
ἀγλααῖσι μεμίκται,  
Ἄλφειοῦ πόρῳ κλιθείς,  
τύμβον ἀμφίπολον ἔχων πολυξενωτάτῳ  
παρὰ βωμῷ.

The suggestion that κλιθείς could mean “reclining” as at a feast was first made tentatively by van der Valk. That must be the primary association of the word, and can be supported by other considerations.<sup>29</sup> First, the poem is full of references to festivity, and especially symposia; κλιθείς would only be the last of these.<sup>30</sup> Secondly, the antithesis stressed throughout between Tantalus who in eternal misery εὐφροσύνας ἀλάτται (“is an outcast from festivity”) and Pelops the successful hero requires that Pelops be firmly located;<sup>31</sup> accordingly Pindar tells us not only that in contradistinction to his father he has a tomb next to an altar much frequented by tourists, presumably the Zeus altar, but also that, unlike his father, he is a party to cultic festivity (αἵμακουρίαῖς and κλιθείς). Thirdly—the point of this article—a consideration of hero cult and the cult of Pelops must lead to the conclusion that Pelops would have been invited to dine

<sup>28</sup> H. Hoffmann, “Rhyta and Kantharoi in Greek Ritual,” *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum* 4 (1989) 159, cf. 163 nn.197f on the eternal banquet of the heroes. My thanks to Dr M. Miller for drawing this useful article to my attention. See also N. W. Slater, *GRBS* 26 (1985) 333–44, esp. 336ff.

<sup>29</sup> M. van der Valk, in *KOMODOTRAGEMATA: Studia Aristophanea ... W. J. W. Koster in honorem* (Amsterdam 1967) 131; P. Janni, *QUCC* 3 (1967) 7–25; G. Tedeschi, *RivStCl* 26 (1978) 205. Van der Valk noted the odd parallel with the perfect participle—the aorist is not in Homer—at *Il.* 5.709, which looks like a misused formula. The translation of μέμικται as “drenched” (Burkert [n.35 *infra*] 96, 98), however, is incorrect; if anything it would more properly represent συνεῖναι, a word describing festive communion, as pointed out several times by L. Robert, e.g. *Études anatoliennes* (Paris 1937) 184; *Bull. épigr.* 1977, 405.

<sup>30</sup> D. Gerber, *Pindar: Olympian One* (Toronto 1982) index s.v. “symposium, theme of.” For Aglaia cf. L. Robert, *Hellenica* II (Paris 1946) 115: “L'éclat de fête.”

<sup>31</sup> There is a strong connection between the word *euphrosyne* and the festivity arising from sacrifice: P. Roussel, *BCH* 51 (1927) 134; Dentzer, *RA* (1971) 253; J. and L. Robert, *Bull.épigr.* 1977, 342; Burkert (206) comments that “a hero is always confined to a specific locality.”

together with some of the annual officers of the Zeus/Pelops cult and anyone else who was invited,<sup>32</sup> and that Pindar means us to think of Pelops as he would have been portrayed by the Greek artist, reclining in a *Totenmahl*, cup in hand.<sup>33</sup>

When Pausanias visited Olympia, over six hundred years after Pindar, the shoulder-bone of Pelops, he was informed, had been lost again, though his bones were in the temple of Artemis Kordax close by.<sup>34</sup> Wherever they were, they were not in his tomb, a fact which was known apparently then and can be verified now.<sup>35</sup> But hero-cults require bones and myths to accompany them,<sup>36</sup> and Pindar's allusions to the ivory shoulder suggests that his shrine had already been adequately furnished with explanation of the first and elaborations of the second. This was made even more necessary by the fact that the Eleans considered Pelops as superior to other heroes as Zeus was superior to other gods (Paus. 5.13.1). Pelops may or may not have preceded Zeus at Olympia; but Pindar thought that he was

<sup>32</sup> Burkert (*GRBS* 7 [1966] 104) says that the ram sacrificed to Pelops at Olympia "was ... not eaten by participants in the festival"; this is not at all what Paus. 5.13.2 says. The magistrates are to sacrifice; the *mantis* does not get a share, and the "woodman" gets "only the neck"; the other magistrates, one concludes, will therefore get something better. No one at all who has eaten of the ram may enter the temple of Zeus, implies Pausanias, without a bath. Comparable is the notorious prohibition against entering the precinct of Zeus Lycaon.

<sup>33</sup> The best example is the fine archaic relief from Thasos now in Istanbul: J.-M. Dentzer, *Le motif du banquet couché* (Paris 1982) fig. 565 (R316). On "die verehrten Toten im Bild anwesend" see Meuli 921 with reference to Pfuhl, *JdI* 20 (1903) 130, approved by Eitrem, *RE* 8 (1912) 1145 s.v. "Heros." More in Hoffmann (*supra* n.28) 163 n.198.

<sup>34</sup> Paus. 6.22.1; Plin. *HN* 28.34.

<sup>35</sup> W. Burkert, *Homo Necans*, tr. P. Bing (Berkeley 1983) 94ff, with further references; H. Abramson, "Greek Hero Shrines" (diss. Berkeley 1978) 105ff. There had been no agreement about the state of the Pelopeion at the time of Pindar, as one can learn from the very differing interpretations of the experts: H.-V. Herrmann, "Pelops in Olympia," ΣΤΗΛΗ ... ΚΟΝΤΟΛΕΟΝΤΟΣ (Athens 1980) 59ff (cf. *Forschungen zur aegaeischen Vorgeschichte: Das Ende der mykenischen Welt* [Cologne 1987] 151-72); A. Mallwitz, "Cult and Competition Locations at Olympia," in W. J. Raschke, ed., *The Archaeology of the Olympics* (Madison 1988) 79-109. Even the present mound, one learns, is a modern creation. The problem, however, has now been clarified by archaeological proof that under the Pelopeion lies a Mycenaean tumulus marked by a simple stone circle: *BCH* 112 (1988) 633.

<sup>36</sup> Nilsson, *GGR* I<sup>2</sup> 189, on "Reliquienkult"; Philostratus (*Gymn.* 7) does not seem to me to have relevance to the rites discussed here.



certainly Kronian and that the Olympic races were his.<sup>37</sup> Whether the races have an origin in initiation rites is uncertain, but this does not affect the paper.<sup>38</sup>

In the midst of such possibilities, it is good to know that there is one certain fact, which we owe to Pindar. Pelops was worshipped in archaic times with the version of heroic cult sacrifice known as αἰμακουρία, a Boeotian word according to the scholiast, who to everyone's surprise appears to be confirmed by Plutarch (*Arist.* 21), the only other author apart from lexicographers to use the word.<sup>39</sup> Apparently the rites of Pelops reminded Pindar of the rituals for the heroic dead of his own Boeotia. From personal experience, as Plutarch says, he describes the rites (ἐναγίζειν with χοαί of milk and wine) for the Greek dead at Plataea, which involve the following actions at their τάφοι, though we know that the account is incomplete:<sup>40</sup> (1) washing of the tombstones and anointing with myrrh by the

<sup>37</sup> Pind. *Ol.* 10.24; 3.23; Bacch. 8.31; Burkert (*supra* n.35) 93ff, although very different views of Pelops' position and connection with the races have been held, e.g. Stengel (*supra* n.4) 192 n.2 with addenda.

<sup>38</sup> In particular the Cretan *apodromoi* and their related institutions provide a good analogy; cf. L. Gernet, *The Anthropology of Ancient Greece*, tr. J. Hamilton and B. Nagy (Baltimore 1981) 315f with n.28. But Noel Robertson points out to me that Meuli did not approve the idea.

<sup>39</sup> I have doubts about the standard derivation from κόπος (Frisk, *GEW* III 136; Chantraine, *Dictionnaire s.v.*) and cannot believe that the aberrant vowel is Boeotian; but nothing better comes to mind. Gerber tentatively followed Frisk's original suggestion of a derivation from κείρω, but this is not possible. This meaning of κείρω was already proposed by E. Maas, *ArchRW* 23 (1925) 221–28, and refuted by B. Laum, *ArchRW* 25 (1927) 213–16.

<sup>40</sup> The basic study is by Meuli (915); cf. Stengel, *Opferbräuche* (*supra* n.19) 24; Burkert (*supra*, n.35) 56ff; Nilsson, *GGR* I<sup>2</sup> 455; Plut. *Arist.* 21; Thuc. 3.58; Philostr. *VA* 4.6. Obviously *Od.* 10.517ff and 11.23ff are relevant. Odysseus is told to sacrifice the animals into Erebus, and then his companions are to burn the animals completely. In Bk 11, however, he says he butchered (δειροτομέω) the animals into a *bothros*, the blood ran, and then after the ghosts came, his companions flayed and burned the slaughtered beasts. No explanation for the skinning is given. The sacrificial calendar for Mykonos (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 1024.25 [LSCG 96]), however, specifies black animals to be flayed for Zeus Chthonios and Ge but adds that they may be eaten. According to Nock (579) in another context, "skins ... excludes the idea of holocaust," while in Ziehen's view (*RE* 3A [1929] 1675), "Das Fell des Opfertieres wurde mitverbrannt." But Meuli, under the influence of the analytic theories of his colleague Von der Mühl, saw no difficulty in the Teiresias passage: 916 n.3, 924. The *Vernichtungsoffer* of *Il.* 23.166ff for the dead Patroclus is very different, but we still would like to know why the sheep, cattle, and dogs are flayed before being burnt completely.

archon; (2) the slaughter (σφάζειν) of a black ox εἰς τὴν πυράν;<sup>41</sup> (3) prayer to Zeus and Hermes Chthonios and invitation of the brave dead εἰς τὸ δεῖπνον and to the αἱμακουρίαν;<sup>42</sup> (4) mixing of a crater of wine, pouring of χοαί; (5) pronouncing a toast to the men who died for Greece;<sup>43</sup> (6) races and competitions. The festive banquet came presumably after the races, when the ox had cooked. To be compared is also the law relating to honours for the patriotic dead at Thasos, where ἐντέμνειν is again probably combined with a banquet.<sup>44</sup>

From Pausanias' brief indication we can deduce that something similar was to be found in the cult of Pelops. It was a black ram not a black ox that was sacrificed.<sup>45</sup> But fortunately Pausanias, by indicating that portions of the animal were apportioned to the cult personnel, makes it indirectly certain that the animal was eaten afterwards, and that a festive banquet took place.

If there was a sacrifice and blood was poured to the dead Pelops so that he could participate, then we have to consider the strong probability that he was invited to join in the common meal as were the Plataean heroes. This is how he is thought to keep company (μέμικται) with men in death as he did in life. When Pelops is given blood, it is to allow him to join with his worshippers, just as Teiresias is given blood so that he may communicate with men.<sup>46</sup> Pindar would be further circumstan-

<sup>41</sup> Not specified, but presumably the remains of the funeral pyre. That would require that a *bothros* was dug into the pyre, into which the blood would flow in the ritual of ἐντέμνειν.

<sup>42</sup> It would seem that the δεῖπνον is the consequence, as we should expect, of the αἱμακουρία. Epiphanius *Ancor.* 86.5 (=CGS 106.25 Holl) ridicules the pagan custom of calling up the dead by the invocation ἄναστα, ὁ δεῖνα, φαγῆ καὶ πιῆ καὶ εὐφράνθητι. So Eur. *Hec.* 536, ἐλθὲ δ', ὡς πίης. Ar. fr.504.5 K.-A. asks only for blessings. See Rohde (*supra* n.13) 235ff. But it is to be assumed that the recalled dead are asked to eat, drink, and be merry, and grant blessings from below *sc.* in return.

<sup>43</sup> A sympotic action. My colleague Dr M. Miller will discuss sympotic toasts in a forthcoming *Hesperia*.

<sup>44</sup> *LSCGS* 64 with Sokolowski's notes on line 10, which do not, however, amount to proof of his assertion.

<sup>45</sup> In Homer black animals are specifically sacrificed only to Poseidon, Earth, and the ghost of Teiresias. Hoffmann (*supra* n.28: 142) provides evidence for the ram as equivalent to the hero.

<sup>46</sup> M. Andronikos, *ArchHom* IIIw: *Totenkult* (Göttingen 1968), collects much relevant archaeological material, but his results have been overtaken by the Lefkandi excavations. E. T. Vermeule (*ArchHom* IIIv: *Götterkult* [Göttingen 1963 (published 1974)] 98) deals briefly with the Teiresias scene, but translates κατακαίειν as "braten" when it must mean in fact "burn up," *i.e.* an *enagisma*.

tial evidence for table-fellowship in archaic times. The primary motive was to allow the worshippers to celebrate the effective presence of the hero at the banquet.

Beyond this we are at the mercy of speculation on the basis of flimsy evidence, even if one tries to avoid “des interprétations à la mode, globales et simplificatrices.”<sup>47</sup> The great importance of the cauldron at Olympia has been emphasized by Burkert;<sup>48</sup> and on the basis of the Lycaon festival, which shows close analogies with neighbouring Olympia,<sup>49</sup> he has suggested that it played a rôle in the rituals of Pelops, as the vessel in which the sacrificial meat was boiled. Quite apart from the general reconstruction, the important evidence comes primarily from Herodotus’ story (1.59) which strongly suggests that an important sacrifice in Olympia involved—whether primarily or secondarily we cannot tell—a boiling cauldron; the further connection of the cauldron with Pelops’ is not self-evident since there is particular likelihood that it was the same cauldron. But the basic probability remains that Pelops’ cauldron is one involved in a sacrifice to him. There is very little surviving evidence for cauldron sacrifice as opposed to the doubtless common use of the cauldron for secondary preparation of sacrificial meat,<sup>50</sup> but a valuable parallel is cited by Burkert from the Hellenistic founda-

<sup>47</sup> J. and L. Robert, *Bull. épigr.* 1987, 618; cf. G. Kirk, “Pitfalls in the Study of Greek Sacrifice,” in *Le sacrifice dans l’antiquité* (=Entretiens Hardt 27 [Vandoeuvres-Geneva 1981]) 41–80.

<sup>48</sup> Burkert (*supra* n.35) 100. C. Uhsadel-Gülke, *Knochen und Kessel* (=Beitr. z.kl.Phil. 43 [Meisenheim am Glan 1972]), gives many parallels, following Meuli. To be compared is the famous bronze cauldron at Dodona (H. W. Parke, *The Oracles of Zeus* [Oxford 1967] 46–79), which I take to be the same as the boiling cauldron into which the prophetess Myrtila (cf. Myrtilus!) was thrown: Zenob. 2.84=Heracl. Pont. fr.14a Wehrli<sup>2</sup>, cf. Ephorus *FGrHist* 70 F 119; Eur. fr.368 Nauck<sup>2</sup> (=Nov.Fr.Eur. 59 Austin).

<sup>49</sup> Treated most recently by M. Jost, *Sanctuaires et cultes d’Arcadie* (Paris 1985) 179ff, 249ff, with serious criticism of Burkert’s reconstruction, esp. 256, 260. Equally strong reservations by Herrmann (*supra* n.35) 62 n.32: “eingehend aber mit zu weit getriebenen religionswissenschaftlichen Spekulationen.”

<sup>50</sup> Now well illustrated on an Ionian hydria in the Villa Giulia: C. Bérard, J. P. Vernant, et al., *Die Bilderwelt der Griechen* (Mainz 1984) 76, 79. J.-L. Durand gives a grisly commentary in *The Cuisine of Sacrifice among the Greeks* (Chicago 1989) 87–128, as does also G. Berthiaume, *Les rôles du Mâgeiros* (Leiden 1982) 45ff, with valuable comments on the rôle played by the σπλάγχνα in sacrifice.

tion by Critolaus of a hero-cult and games at Aegiale.<sup>51</sup> One should note at this point that the early depictions of the wine crater were scarcely distinguishable from the *lebes* on a tripod, and Herodotus (3.11.3) has a human sacrifice into a *crater*.<sup>52</sup> We can add the archaic and difficult law of the Ephesian Molpoi, where the clan of the Onitadae are allocated ὄπτησις σπλάγχνων, κρεῶν ἔψησις ... ἔψησις καὶ διαίρεσις κρεῶν, where the tenderloin is to be divided up after stewing, a strange process.<sup>53</sup> From the parallels collected by Uhsader-Gülke, it would be hyperskeptical to deny that boiling cauldrons played an important part in most sacrifice. Athenaeus even tells us that the size of the *lebes* was an indication of the magnitude of the hospitality offered. There is no representation of the sacrifice of Pelops; we do have as a substitute the boiling of a ram and the rejuvenation by Medea of a child, documented by H. Meyer. There the ram is shown being cooked whole but possibly for artistic reasons only, while the child is removed.<sup>54</sup> At Aegiale a ram on the morning of the first day is sacrificed and boiled ὀλομέλη<sup>55</sup> beside the hero's statue, and given to the ephebic

<sup>51</sup> Burkert (*supra* n.35) 89 n.29; the evidence first collected by Puttkammer (*supra* n.10) 64; *LSCGS* 61.77, καὶ τοῦ κριοῦ τὰ κρέα [όλο]μέλη ἀποζέσαντες παρατιθέτωσαν τῷ ἀγάλματι. On this inscription see also P. Gauthier, *BCH* 104 (1980) 210–20. Cauldron sacrifice would have been common enough in less elevated religious gatherings (Ar. fr.419 K.-A. with notes), where soup and stew would be served. For soup, probably vegetarian, at Spartan theoxenies see the commentary of C. Calame, *Alcman* (Rome 1983) 362–69.

<sup>52</sup> Kontoleon (*supra* n.11) 354 n.19; Ath. 37F. More on tripods, *lebetes*, and cauldrons in G. Bruns, *ArchHom IIQ: Küchenwesen und Mahlzeiten* (1970) 37ff.

<sup>53</sup> *LSAM* 50.34ff, also cited by Burkert. The Scythian rites described by Herodotus 4.61 are similar, where the meat is boiled in *lebetes* very like craters, according to Herodotus.

<sup>54</sup> Ath. 131B, quoting Anaxandrides 2.151 K.; H. Meyer, *Medea und die Peliaden* (Rome 1982); representations of a white ram in the Oenomaus story are irrelevant: so Burkert (*supra* n.35) 98.

<sup>55</sup> This is a technical Hellenistic term (Jos. *AJ* 3.221.4 of a holocausted ram; Ath. 540B-C, 210C-D *bis* [=Posidonius, *FGrHist* F 9]; Strab. 15.3.19), apparently meaning "in one piece," which is obvious enough of hens or fish; but "with whole limb" seems the meaning in the Diphilus fr.34.2 K. (wrongly cited by LSJ). It occurs twice in the Aegiale inscription, both times describing κρέα and not the animal. I am inclined to think it means in the second instance at least whole parts of the animal; *contra* Stengel (*BPhW* 28 [1908] 927), who considers it the whole animal and indicates the opposite of κόπτειν. E. Ziebarth, *Aus dem griechischen Schulwesen* (Leipzig 1914) 147, is I think therefore right to translate "noch unverteilte Fleischstücke," *i.e.* μέλη. Berthiaume (*supra* n.50) 71ff makes it clear that the dissection was often in two parts, roughly κόπτειν and κατακόπτειν. A further dissection followed any division κατὰ μέλη.

victors as a prize the next day.<sup>56</sup> The victors in the girls' race at Olympia were given part of the cow sacrificed to Hera so that we could at least suspect that the victors in the main races were also given a portion of the Pelops sacrifice, as well as being entertained in the prytaneion afterwards.<sup>57</sup> Just exactly how the feast is to be connected to the sacrifice we are not told; boiling obviously takes some time, and must be left to those like the professional officials (μάγειροι) who are mentioned in the inscriptions of Olympia.<sup>58</sup> The inference would be that a boiling cauldron full of mutton stew was part of the sacrificial feast, in which Pelops and those honouring him participated.

Finally Burkert again has put forward the suggestion that the rumour of cannibalism at the rites of Zeus Lycaon was a misunderstanding of the sacrificial meat in the cauldron during the initiation rituals. It would be reasonable to seek the same explanation for the cannibalism that Pindar claims to be offensive in the myth of Pelops. The cauldron, here as in other myths, is the place of both dismembering and reintegration, of death and rebirth.<sup>59</sup> It is also the place at which myth and ritual meet. Pindar knows of a myth in which Pelops is chopped limb from limb into the boiling water of a cauldron; he knows of a myth whereby Pelops is taken from a cauldron with an ivory shoulder; here too the cauldron is attested as a symbol of death and rebirth. We know of the importance of the cauldron at Olympia from the many archaeological finds; its importance in the rituals of Pelops is symbolized in the myth of Pelops.<sup>60</sup> Into

<sup>56</sup> See Gill (*supra* n.7) 128–33. Noel Robertson suggests that the reason for this odd procedure both at Aegiale and at Olympia—and perhaps at other gymnasia in similar circumstances—was that the meat offered to the hero needed to be kept cooked in order to provide as usual the prizes to the victors in the competitions on the following day; this would be impossible for grilled meat but appropriate for boiled or stewed.

<sup>57</sup> Paus. 5.16.3. But this is common practice, *cf. supra* n.10; e.g. *I. Priene* 112.110; *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 958.33f (Koressos); *I. Magnesia* 98.36; at Notion, Ziebarth (*supra* n.55) 154. L. Robert shows that victorious kings as well as other eminent benefactors were accorded this honour in Hellenistic times: *Documents d'Asie Mineure* (Paris 1987) 470 n.64, *cf.* 534.

<sup>58</sup> *I. Olympia* 58–141. These inscriptions are all disappointingly late, and do show some changes in the development of cult personnel in Imperial times.

<sup>59</sup> Burkert (*supra* n.35) 98–119; Uhsadel-Gülke (*supra* n.48) *passim*, following Meuli.

<sup>60</sup> Lastly, H.-V. Herrmann, *AM* 99 (1984) 17–33. See also Bruns (*supra* n.52) for the archaic use of these objects. The well-known Trajanic inscription, *OGIS* 611, would be precisely true for Pelops: Νετείρου τοῦ ἀποθεωθέντος ἐν τῷ λέβητι δι' οὗ αἱ ἐορταὶ ἄγονται.

it the black ram was dismembered and eaten by the worshippers in his presence. The cauldron would be the primary permanent cult object.

If one approaches the text of the first Olympian Ode with all this in mind, some aspects of the narrative assume a significance that is at the same time more real and more profound. The detailed description at lines 48f of the sacrifice of Pelops:

ὔδατος ὅτι τε πυρὶ ζέουσιν εἰς ἀκμὴν  
μαχαίρα τάμον κατὰ μέλη

would be a description of cauldron sacrifice, modelled after the cannibal meal of the Cyclops at *Od.* 9.291, τοὺς δὲ διὰ μελειστί ταμὼν ὀπλίσσατο δόρπον.<sup>61</sup> The Cyclops in Euripides prepares his human meat by both boiling the μέλη in a *lebes* and roasting the flesh.<sup>62</sup> Even if Pindar alleges that the dismemberment of Pelops was just envious gossip, he also asserts that this was the tale of πρότεροι, and his assumed repugnance at his (unnecessary!) mention of it, besides being a useful poetic *recusatio*, is somewhat at variance with his obvious fascination with details which occupy four whole lines. The action is κρεανομία; τάμον perhaps represents the technical ἐντέμνειν,<sup>63</sup> the bloodletting of the hero-sacrifice, but the subsequent “cutting up limb by limb” would most accurately be κατακόπτειν<sup>64</sup> or διαιρεῖν κατὰ μέλη<sup>65</sup> or prosaically (δια)τέμνειν κατ’ ἄρθρα; μάχαιρα is the sacrificial knife.<sup>66</sup> In this description would not some of the audience recognize the public sacrifice of the black ram?

The detailed description of the heroic honours accorded to Pelops—the *haimakouria*, the recurring honours, the perma-

<sup>61</sup> *Od.* 18.338 and *Il.* 24.409 are threats to cut up enemies.

<sup>62</sup> Eur. *Cycl.* 390ff with Seaford’s commentary on this very disturbed text.

<sup>63</sup> Stengel (*supra* n.4) index *s.v.*; Burkert (200) translates “to cut into the fire,” but the evidence does not justify that. Casabona (*supra* n.17) 226, cited by Burkert, specifically connects it with αἱμακουρία, *i.e.*, the animal is cut so as to let the blood flow into the ground for the dead.

<sup>64</sup> Berthiaume (*supra* n.50) 114 n.102, to which add Meuli 932 n.2; Burkert (*supra* n.35) 115 shows that κόπτειν and the association of the shoulder have parallels (*LSCG* 96.7) that explain the prominence attached to Pelops’ shoulder.

<sup>65</sup> Pl. *Pol.* 287c; G. J. de Vries, *A Commentary on Plato’s Phaedrus* (Amsterdam 1969) on 265E1, *cf.* Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.13.7, Ἄστυδάμειαν ... φονεύει καὶ διελὼν μεληδόν, cited by Ziehen (*supra* n.40) 1673; J. Svenbro, “Il taglio della poesia,” in C. Grottanelli and N. F. Parise, edd., *Sacrificio e società nel mondo antico* (Rome 1988) 238ff.

<sup>66</sup> Berthiaume (*supra* n.50) 111 n.34, 109f.

nent hero-cult—were of much more than passing interest to Hieron. We learn that in founding the city of Etna, a project he had already started, his motives were in part to ensure that he continued to be awarded heroic honours by its loyal inhabitants. To this end he constructed his tomb as a *ktistes* there, presumably in the agora, and it is further likely that he established the short-lived Aetnaean games in honour of his patron Zeus of Etna and of himself.<sup>67</sup> Since nearly all scholars accept that Pelops is throughout intended as an analogy for Hieron, Pindar would be making a direct comparison between the rites of Pelops and those intended to ensure the future immortality of the aptly named Hieron. He too must hope to participate in banquets held by the populace, in a shrine visited by many foreigners and celebrated by famous games.

This consideration leads inevitably to the representation of heroization in art, the so called *Totenmahl*.<sup>68</sup> The hero is buried as a symposiast,<sup>69</sup> according to popular thinking lived on as a symposiast in the afterlife,<sup>70</sup> and the first Olympian suggests that Pelops is heroized as a symposiast at Olympia. This would be one reason why banqueting is a central theme in the poem.<sup>71</sup> The connection between horse-racing and symposia that we find in the first Olympian is well attested in ancient art; horses

<sup>67</sup>  $\Sigma$  *Ol.* 6.162a Drachmann, but a reasonable inference from *Ol.* 1 and *Pyth.* 1 in any case; Pfister (*supra* n. 14) 445ff; W. Leschorn, *Gründer der Stadt* (= *Palingenesia* 20 [Stuttgart 1984]) 124–27: a useful collection of the material on Etna, though the whole book gives insight into heroic *ktisis*.

<sup>68</sup> The complex problems associated with its iconology are discussed by Dentzer (*supra* n.33) 562ff.

<sup>69</sup> First evidence: *Alcmaeonis* fr.2 Bernabé (2 Davies) with commentary by M. Blech, *Studien zum Kranz* (= *Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten* 38 [Berlin 1982]) 101.

<sup>70</sup> Earliest evidence: Pind. fr.129; *Ol.* 2.74 with Pl. *Resp.* 363c; bibliography in Blech (*supra* n.69) 101, 407.

<sup>71</sup> Among these symptomatic references should be included the opening words. The unexplained statement, “Water is best,” corresponds to the symptomatic game: “What is best?”: Fraenkel *ad* Aesch. *Ag.* 899. Burkert (*Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism* [Cambridge 1972] 169) has come to the same conclusion, though the passage is missing in his index. A festive poem demands the standard answer: “Wine (or Euphrosyne, etc.) is best,” as in *Kypria* fr.17.1 Bernabé (15 Davies); Panyassis fr.19.1 Bernabé (14.1 Davies); and esp. Pind. *Nem.* 4.1, imitating *Od.* 9.5ff; on the later influence on this precept see the remarks of H.-G. Nesselrath, *Lukians Parasitendialog* (Berlin 1986) 301ff. To start a poem by affirming that water is best is to invert a topos. The actual solution—whether water is poetry or something else—is perhaps less important.

even appear in the *Totenmahl* where they are scarcely apposite.<sup>72</sup> It was therefore predictable that Pindar should praise the cultivated symposia of the victorious Hieron (16f). This theme is maintained through the banquets of Tantalus and Pelops to culminate in the heroic *haimakouria* festival of Pelops, who was considered to return not as a horseman but as symposiast. It has been a difficulty for many readers that Pindar mentions a καθαρὸς λέβης as almost the first item in his narrative, though he goes on to deny the old myth of dismemberment and especially its consequence in cannibalism, which would be difficult to equate with a "pure" or "purifying" cauldron.<sup>73</sup> Not everyone has accepted that there is any difficulty here. Uhsadel-Gülke (*supra* n.48: 32), for example, commented: "The cauldron has this epithet because in it Pelops achieves new life, because Pelops is redeemed as pure, because the cauldron's effect is purifying."

This seems to me to be on the right lines. The difficulty is seen to be illusory, if we accept that the cauldron is central to the rituals of Pelops and Olympia, and that, although by its very mystery it could give rise to wild myths, its sacral existence and primary purpose were not in doubt. This purpose was in the minds of listeners that of 'Jungkochen'; it was the cauldron of rebirth, not dismemberment,<sup>74</sup> just as—to use a modern analogy—the cross which is an instrument of torture can be viewed by the faithful as a sign of hope and redemption. Beyond that, as Mme Schmitt-Pantel affirms,<sup>75</sup> "le chaudron est le signe du repas commune à base de viandes du banquet sacrificiel privilégié de l'aristocratie guerrière."

<sup>72</sup> Examples from art in P. Schmitt and A. Schnapps, "Image et société en Grèce ancienne: les représentations de la chasse et du banquet," *RA* (1982) 57ff; cf. I. Kyme, ed. H. Engelman (Bonn 1976) T19, 152; Dentzer (*supra* n.33) 490.

<sup>73</sup> E.g. R. Scodel, *CP* 80 (1985) 267, considers the mention of the "pure" cauldron to be the strongest but insufficient argument against the traditional interpretation of the myth, which is that of Gerber in his commentary, and which seems to me also correct, but a discussion at this point of what is still a controversial matter would not be helpful.

<sup>74</sup> The motif of 'Jungkochen' is a popular one in many myths, cf. S. Trenkner, *The Greek Novella in the Classical Period* (Cambridge 1958) 47 n.2; P. Rau, *Paratragodia* (Munich 1967) 189. The first mention of it is in the *Nostoi*.

<sup>75</sup> P. Schmitt-Pantel, "Banquet et cité grecque," *MEFRA* 97 (1985) 140, dealing with the importance of the cauldron in burial rites and citing M. Gras, "Vin et société à Rome," in *Modes de contact et processus de transformation dans les sociétés antiques* (=ColLEFR 67 [Rome 1983]) 1067–75.



Just as εὐνομώτατον (line 37) indicates in advance that Pindar intends to contradict the myth of cannibalism at the banquet of Tantalus, so καθαρός here declares in advance the purity of the rituals of Pelops. Rebirth, not dismemberment; of the gods, not of men; a cult object, not a kitchen utensil. As such it deserves its ritual epithet; Clotho took Pelops not from a clean basin, but the Cauldron of Purification.

Even though we know so little of the complex rituals of Pelops, it still seems appropriate to stress their existence and try to sketch a possible outline, if only because the reality of his worship can be forgotten in a purely literary interpretation of Pindar's text. If Themistocles could take part in cauldron sacrifice at Olympia in Pindar's time, it seems likely that some of Pindar's Syracusan aristocrats—some with close family ties to Arcadia and the Peloponnese—knew Olympia at first hand. For them Pelops really did take part, as Pindar says, in his festival.<sup>76</sup>

MCMASTER UNIVERSITY  
*October, 1989*

<sup>76</sup> I am grateful for a detailed critique of an earlier draft by Noel Robertson, who touches on Pelops at *GRBS* 29 (1988) 250.