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AN AETOLIAN LOCAL MYTH IN PAUSANIAS?

In the mid-third century BCE, the Aetolians admitted a city called Heraclea into their League and agreed to speak to Ptolemy II on its behalf on an unknown matter. An inscription found at Delphi, *IG IX 1*² 173,¹) commemorates the diplomatic venture and indicates that the Heracleans had made a claim of kinship in their initial overtures to the Aetolians (line 4). The Aetolians found Heraclea’s justification convincing, agreeing to its requests because they considered the Heracleans to be their colonists (lines 11-3): ὁ φυλακαὶ δεῖν ὃς Ἡρακλεῖ / ὀντοι [τὸν βασιλέα] ἐκτὸς θαυματορείν ἀν ³ντων ἀποίκων / [τῷ]ν Αἰτωλῶν.

There is an enormous bibliography for this inscription, most recently in the context of kinship diplomacy.²) Throughout the twentieth century most discussion focused on the question of which Heraclea is mentioned. A number of suggestions was made,³) but the majority opinion rests with Heraclea-at-Latmus in Caria.⁴) The argument made by Louis Robert relies on evidence found at Pausanias 5.1.5, that Heraclea-at-Latmus and the Aetolians shared a myth involving Endymion. This myth, he argued, explains the kinship.⁵) Pausanias (5.1.5) and Strabo (14.1.8) indicate that there was a shrine to Endymion at Heraclea. Strabo places it in a cave, which brings to mind the cave in which Endymion was said to be sleeping eternally. On the south side of Heraclea is a sanctuary worked into a rocky niche with large outcroppings and which may have been dedicated to Endymion.⁶) As for the Aetolian version, Pausanias 5.1.5 relates Endymion’s role in the ‘early history’ of the Aetolians’ neighbors in Elis.⁷)

However, while Robert made excellent use of Pausanias to solve the puzzle of the mysterious Heraclea in *IG IX 1*² 173, he and all of the commentators who have followed suit have begged one fundamental question. Most of Pausanias’ evidence is in his first book on Elis (Book 5), and so what he gives us is Elean myth. But is citing Elean local myth the same as citing Aetolian? I will argue here that it is, by offering evidence that, where myths of Endymion and other ‘early history’ of Elis were concerned, the Aetolian and Elean perspectives were much the same in the time that *IG IX 1*² 173 was made. The evidence follows two tracks, and in both cases I am presenting ancient perspectives on the relationship between the Aetolians and the Eleans. This relationship was real and originated in the post-Mycenaean migrations of Aetolians into Elis. As with other phenomena from those obscure times, including the Ionian and Dorian migrations, the details of the who, what, where, and when are provided less by history and archaeology than by Greek myth. Nonetheless, that a real kinship existed between the Aetolians and the Eleans is certain, in part because
of dialectal similarities, and this reality underlies the stories that the Greeks developed to account for those origins. I am concerned here with (1) a mythological reconstruction of a real kinship between Aetolians and Eleans and especially its origins in these migrations and (2) monuments mentioned by Greek writers that give support to the putative kinship.

Endymion himself is the proper starting point. He was, of course, an important Greek hero known especially for his love affair with Selene, the Moon, and the eternal sleep by which he avoided old age. At 5.1.5, Pausanias specifically mentions the Eleans as his source when relating the local version of Endymion’s story. Before that, he says, ‘We know the Eleians crossed over from Kalydon and from all over Aitolia, and I discovered something about their history even before that. They say the first king in this territory was Aethlius, who was a son of Zeus by Deukalion’s daughter Protageneia, and Endymion was his son. . . . Endymion’s children were Paion and Epeios and Aitolos and a daughter Eurykyda’ (τοὺς Ἡλείους ἱσμεν ἐκ Καλυδῶνος διαβεβηκότας καὶ Αἰτωλίας τῆς ἄλλης· τὰ δὲ ἐτε παλαιότερα εῖς ἄυτὸς τοιάδε εὐρίσκον, βασιλεύσαν πρῶτον ἐν τῇ γῇ ταύτῃ λέγουσιν Ἀθῆλον, παιὸν δὲ αὐτὸν οἶος τε εἶναι καὶ Προτογενείας τῆς Δυκαλίας, Ἀθῆλιον δὲ ἔνδυμιαν γενέσθαι . . . γενέσθαι δ’ ὅν πασιν αὐτὸν Πατίνα καὶ Ἑπείου τε καὶ Αἰτωλῶν καὶ θυγατέρα ἐκ αὐτῶν Εὐρυκόδαν, 5.1.3-4). There is a bit of a chronological mess here, for the migration Pausanias mentions is that of Oxylus and is dated to the time of the Return of the Heraclidae, several generations after the Trojan War and more still after the time of Endymion. The word παλαιότερα refers to the period of Aethlius, Endymion, and Aetolus. The Eleans apparently had this group begin in Elis itself since Aethlius was supposed to be their first king. Endymion succeeded Aethlius to the throne and was eventually followed by his son Aetolus. Then, having been convicted of murder, Aetolus was exiled to the region later to be called Aitolia.

Some generations later, in the time of the Return of the Heraclidae, Aetolus’ descendant Oxylus returned to Elis. This figure is well documented, as if he had been promoted as eponymous ancestor by a prominent family in Elis in historical times. In any case, he was said to have been a guide for the Heraclidae under Temenus; in return they allowed him to reclaim his ancestral land in the northwest Peloponnesos. Oxylus led an Aetolian army against the Eleans (or Epeans) but only became king of Elis after the matter was decided in single combat between the two parties’ champions.

Despite Pausanias’ version, it is curious that Apollodoros mentions Endymion as leading Aeolian Greeks from Thessaly into Elis (Lib. 1.7.5), which calls to mind Strabo’s more general discussion of the distribution of the ‘four’ Greek dialects, Attic, Ionic, Doric, and Aeolic and his note that the Eleans were an Aeolic-speaking group (8.1.2), thereby giving them a tie to Thessaly. If we bring this alternative tradition into the picture, then we have the Eleans/Aeolians (or at least one strain of them) moving
into Elis from the north, then leaving Elis for Aetolia, and finally returning to Elis again. The two migrations into Elis are separated by several generations, related in essentially two separate accounts, despite clear signs as far back as Ephorus that they were linked. The suspicion arises that the two have separate origins, different accounts of real population movements in the Dark Ages. Perhaps one was strictly Aetolian to begin with, featuring an eponymous ancestor. This version was known to Hesiod in Boeotia (F. 10a.58-64 MW). Aethlius complicates that scenario, however, since his name (= ὀθλιός) means ‘winning the race,’ suggesting a connection with the Olympic Games. But he may have been added to the genealogy by the Aetolians’ Elean descendants at a later date, certainly by Hesiod’s time. Meanwhile, we can argue that the other account was a concoction of the Eleans, perhaps an aristocratic family there, with an eye toward legitimacy through myth. Oxylus was an important personage in local myth in Elis as a statue of him had been erected in the agora of the city (see below). In addition, Aristotle mentions an Elean property law that was attributed to Oxylus (Pol. 1319a).

This dual origin is of course only conjecture. Just as we know better than to posit a single ‘invasion’ of Dorians in sub-Mycenaean times, the actual movements of Aeolic-speaking peoples are no doubt also complicated, perhaps involving a series of migrations of smaller groups over centuries. That state of affairs may account for two narratives of Elis’ occupation rather than one, but there is no way to be sure. In any case, by the fourth century BCE at the latest, the figures of Aetolus and Oxylus were important in local myths on both sides of the Corinthian Gulf.

The evidence for this shared perspective is in Ephorus (FGrH 70 F. 122), whose observations are reiterated by Strabo (10.3.2). Ephorus recounted much of the foregoing narrative, noting a war against the Curetes by Aetolus after his departure from Elis. Ten generations later, Aetolus’ descendant Oxylus led Aetolians back into Elis. Strabo goes on:

παρατίθει δὲ τούτων μαρτύρια τὰ ἐπιγράμματα, τὸ μὲν ἐν Θέρμως τῆς Αἰταλίας, ὕπου τὰς ἀρχαιοποιίς ποιεῖσθαι πάτριον αὐτοῖς ἑστίν, ἐγκεχαραγμένον τῇ βάσει τῆς Αἰταλοῦ εἰκόνος·

χάρις σικειστῆρα, παρ’ Ἀλφειοῦ ποτὲ δίνας θρεφθέντα, σταδίων γείτων. 'Ολυμπιάδος,

'Ενδυμίανος παιδ’ Αἰταλοὶ τόνδ’ ἀνέθηκαν Αἰταλόν, σφέτερας μνήμ’ ἄρετῆς ἐσοφᾶν.

tὸ δὲ ἐν τῇ ἄγορᾷ τῶν 'Ηλείων ἐπὶ τῷ 'Οξυλοῦ ἀνδριάντι·

Αἰταλός ποτὲ τόνδε λιπὼν αὐτόχθονα δήμων κτήσατο Κουρήτην γῆν, δορὶ πολλὰ καμάων· τῆς δ’ αὐτῆς γενεᾶς δεκατάκπορος Λίμωνος υἱός 'Οξυλος ἀρχιάιτι έκτισε τὴνδέ κόλιν.

'And [Ephorus] cites as evidence of all this two inscriptions, the one at Therma in Aetolia (where it is their ancestral custom to hold their elections of mag-
This evidence, coming from a fourth-century writer, assures us that the Aetolian League of the third century shared the same basic epichoric myth as the Eleans, who related this myth to Pausanias five hundred years later.

Endymion then is indeed the most likely link between the Aetolians and the Heracleans in IG IX 12 173, as Robert had argued. He is the figure—whether he started out in Elis (Pausanias) or in northern Aeolian lands, apparently Thessaly (Apollodorus)—who founded Heraclea-at-Latmus as a colony of the Aetolians, hence their term for the Heracleans: ἄσωκων (line 12). This putative kinship was real enough to merit the Heracleans’ membership in the League in the mid-third century and an Aeolian embassy to Ptolemy II on Heraclea’s behalf. Even contradictions between the local variants of Endymion’s story did not prevent the two communities from agreeing that Endymion was their common ancestor. I have been in full agreement with Robert about this conclusion but have sought here to justify it more fully by showing how the evidence in Pausanias, local Elean myth, can be used to represent the point of view of the Aetolians that lies behind their claim of kinship with the people of Heraclea-at-Latmus. The traditions explored here are most likely memories of real events, though in terms of the details they are false memories. Though we may doubt the historicity of Oxyulus, Aetolus, and Endymion (something the Greeks themselves did not do, it should be remembered), we recognize that a real kinship existed between the Aetolians and the Eleans. From the evidence of monuments in the two communities, we also know that they shared a common perspective on their ancestry. In ‘renewing’ their kinship with the Aetolians, the Heracleans were also invoking ancient epichoric myths from Elis.
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APPENDIX

Aethlius is a remarkably complicated figure. First, as West explains, "Aethlius was properly the fictive patron of the Eleans who came together at Olympia. Aitolos' affiliation to Aethlius' son Endymion signifies acknowledgement by the Eleans of their kinship with the Aetolians of Pleuron and Kalydon across the straits."21) (This interpretation does not preclude Aetolus being an Aetolian personage whom the Eleans then adopted for the purpose
West suggests.) An incidental remark by Pausanias at 5.8.2 betrays a local idiosyncrasy in the Eleans' conception of Aēthlius: 'Kretheus' son Amythaon, who through Kretheus was Endymion's cousin—as they say Aethlius was a son of Aiōlos, which is a title of Zeus' (Ἀμυθάων ὁ Κρηθεὺς Ἐνδυμίων Ἀἰολός πάτρου—ἐναι γὰρ φασι καὶ Ἀθήλιον Αἰόλου, Διὸς ἐστί ἑπικλήςιν, my emphasis). Elsewhere Aēthlius is quite firmly established as a son of Zeus (Paus. 5.1.3. Apollod. Ἁ. 1.7.2, Hesiod F. 260 MW, Schol. A.R. 4.58). Cretheus, meanwhile, is a son of Aeolus son of Hellen (Apollod. Ἁ. 1.7.3, Hesiod F. 10 MW). Something does not add up, and it would seem that the local Eleans are confusing the two Aeoli. What is more, whatever we may say about his father, Endymion's mother Calyce certainly was a daughter of Aeolus son of Hellen (Apollod. Ἁ. 1.7.2).2)

1) For the text, see also SEG II.257; ISE II.77 (ed. Moretti); FidD III.3.144 (ed. Daux and Salač); Curty (1995: no. 15); Robert (1978); Pomtow (1923: no. 200a); Wescher & Foucart (1863: no. 471).


4) The argument usually put forward to support this identification was that the Heraclea in question was clearly a dependency of the Ptolemaic regime in Egypt and on that criterion Heraclea-at-Latmus was least problematic. See, for example, Beloch (1927: 609); Gunther Klaffenbach on IG IX 1 2 173; Daux (1932: 112); Flacelière (1937: 243 n. 4); Larsen (1968: 204 n. 2).

5) Robert (1978: 481-90). Following him in this interpretation are Habicht (1998: 66-7); Curty (1995: 31-2); and Jones (1999: 53-4). As an example of kinship diplomacy, IG IX 1 2 173 joins many other inscriptions that refer to suggencia or oikieotés or other such links. These inscriptions, most of which date to the Hellenistic period, are essentially documents of such diplomatic activity as grants of asylia and exchanges of polity. The communities interacting in this manner often asserted a putative kinship as a justification for the diplomatic venture. It was most common for the shared ancestor to be a mythological personage, a hero such as Heracles or an abstract personage like Aeolus. This state of affairs allowed Robert to make a strong case for Heraclea-at-Latmus, given the cultic importance of Endymion there. Other examples of kinship diplomacy are recorded in Io Magnesia 35 (kinship between Magnesia-on-the-Maeander and Kephallenian Same based on sons of Aeolus), IG IX 1 97 (Phokis and Tenos based on sons of Hellen), and Io Pergamon 156 (Pergamum and Tegea based on Telephus). Aside from the works mentioned in note 2, see also Musti (1963) and Lucke (2000).

6) Bean (1967: 257). Endymion is also mentioned in an inscription found at Heraclea in 1873 and published sixty years later by Alphonse Daët. Inscribed on white marble and originally attached to a monument, it is a hymn celebrating a
festival, possibly to Athena. See Dain (1933: 66-73); Robert (1978: 488-9). Endymion is mentioned as the founder and in connection with his unending sleep and the cave (lines 6-9).

7) Recent studies have shown how Pausanias is an important source for local myth. In his travels throughout the Greek world in the second century CE, Pausanias made direct contact with local myths, getting his information from a variety of sources, especially works of art, local literary works, and local informants whom he met, any of whom might provide the foundation narrative that we then look for in our reading of Pausanias’ text. See further Patterson (2003: 165-242); Jost (1998); Alcock (1996).

8) On Aetolian migrations into Elis, see Lafond (1997). On the West Greek dialects spoken in Aetolia and Elis and elsewhere, see Osborne (1996: 35-6) and Hall (1997: 155). Where filling in gaps in history was concerned, the Greeks often turned to myth, as Dowden (1992) discusses.

9) Hesiod. F. 10a.60-2 MW, Plato Phaedo 72c, Apollod. Lib. 1.7.6, Paus. 5.1.3-4, Hyginus Fab. 271.

10) All translations of Pausanias are by Peter Levi from the Penguin edition.

11) Paus. 5.1.4-10, Apollod. Lib. 1.7.6, Strabo 8.3.33, Ephorus FGrH 70 F. 115.

12) In the Cambridge Ancient History (p. 704), Hammond (1975) made the case for a family called the Oxylidæ. However, I have found no evidence of this family. In fact, we even hear from Pausanias that the descendants of Oxylos' son Læas were not kings in Elis (5.4.5), which seems an odd statement if an aristocratic family in Elis had promoted its origins with stories about Oxylos. Nonetheless, much of the local aetiological myth recorded by Pausanias and others did arise from attempts by prominent families in the Dark Ages to promote their nobility and account for their origins, heroic of course.

13) Ephorus FGrH 70 FF. 115, 122, Strabo 8.1.2, 8.3.33, 10.3.2, Paus. 5.3.5-4.4, Apollod. Lib. 2.8.3.

14) And distribution implies migrations, on which he has much to say elsewhere, as at 7.7.8 and 14.2.6.

15) Though Strabo has his facts wrong. The Eleans spoke a dialect of West Greek, not Aecolic.


17) For an excursion on the Elean Aethlius, see the Appendix.

18) Ephorus FGrH 70 F. 122, Strabo 10.3.2. In addition to the statue of Oxylos in the agora of Elis, there may have been a small monument to him there as well. Pausanias saw it and postulated, if the old man I asked gave me the right answer, this would be the monument of Oxylos’ (οἱ δὲ δὲ γέρων ὄντινα ἡρῴην εἶχεν ἀληθή λόγον, Ὡξύλου τότε ἄν μνήμα εἶπ, 6.24.9).


20) Pausanias 5.1.5: 'The Eleians and the Herakleians near Miletos tell different stories about Endymion's death; the Eleians show you Endymion's tomb, but the Herakleians say he went away to Mount Latmos, where they honor him and have a holy place of Endymion’ (τὰ δὲ ἐς τὴν Ἑνδυμίωνος τελευτὴν ὦν κατὰ τὰ σύντα Ἡρακλείδωται τε οἱ πρὸς Μύλητα καὶ Ἡλείου λέγοσιν, ἄλλα Ἡλείου μὲν ἀποφαίνουσιν Ἑνδυμίωνος μνήμα, Ἡρακλείδωται δὲ ἐς Λάτμον τὸ δρός ἀποιχορήσας φασίν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ Λάτμῳ, καὶ ἄνευν Ἑνδυμίωνος ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ Λάτμῳ, 5.1.5).


22) I wish to express my thanks to Eugene N. Lane and Ian Worthington for taking the time to reread this paper and offer further suggestions. They and the rest of my dissertation committee read an earlier version of it, and I am grateful to them all for their advice and encouragement.
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