

## AUTOCHTHONY AND THE ATHENIANS

Athenians of the fifth and fourth centuries claimed with pride that their ancestors had always lived in Attica, a claim which they expressed by describing themselves as *αὐτόχθονες*. Related to this Athenian belief that they had always lived in Attica was a second, that, as a people, they were literally ‘sprung from the earth’. It is generally assumed that both beliefs developed at a very early date, but this is merely an assumption, and in the course of this paper we will see evidence suggesting, to the contrary, that both ideas were relatively late developments. This paper focuses on the development of the concept of autochthony, as far as our sources allow, in an effort to understand better what autochthony meant to the Athenians. In particular it considers how the Athenians came to think of themselves as ‘born from the earth’. It then suggests how, through the medium of the word *αὐτόχθων*, the idea of being ‘born from the earth’ came to symbolize ‘living in a place from time immemorial’. Finally it examines how the concept of autochthony was used in contexts which relate it to the ideology of Athenian democracy.

### I

The conventional view, as noted above, is that at some uncertain, but nonetheless very early date the Athenians came to believe that, as a nation, they had always lived in Attica; and it is further assumed that these early Athenians expressed this belief in mythological terms, as relatively primitive people would do, by saying that their nation was, literally, sprung from the soil of its native land. From these assumptions it is an easy step to the further claim that these early Athenians invented the earthborn Erechtheus as their mythological ancestor, or at least that they gave him chthonic origins, as an expression of their belief in their own indigenous origins.<sup>1</sup> Since Homer already describes Erechtheus as earthborn in the *Iliad* (... *Ἐρεχθῆος μεγαλήτορος ὃν ποτ' Ἀθήνη | θρέψε Διὸς θυγάτηρ, τέκε δὲ ζείδωρος ἄρουρα*, *Il.* 2.547–8), on this interpretation the *Iliad* would thus provide a *terminus ante quem* for the Athenians' belief that they had always lived in Attica.<sup>2</sup> Now in the course of time, it is true, the Athenians did come to associate Erechtheus' chthonic origins with their own indigenous origins,<sup>3</sup> but there is no evidence that they made this association at an early date,<sup>4</sup> and later practice is not always a certain guide to such early belief. Indeed, such

<sup>1</sup> The most influential proponent of this orthodox view was E. Ermatinger, *Die attische Autochthonensage bis auf Euripides* (Berlin, 1897), followed most recently by N. Loraux, ‘L'autochthonie: une topique athénienne. Le mythe dans l'espace civique’, *Annales E.S.C.* 34 (1979), 1–26, and C. Berard, *Anodoi: Essai sur l'imagerie des passages chthoniens* (Neufchatel, 1974), 31–8. In the latest work on the subject, M. J. Miller (*The Athenian Autochthonous Heroes from the Classical to the Hellenistic Period* [diss. Harvard, 1983]), also follows Ermatinger, though the origin of the concept of autochthony is not a central part of Miller's work which is more concerned with the use which later authors made of the concept. On E. Montanari, *Il mito dell'autoctonia: Linee di una dinamica mitico-politica ateniese*, second edition (Rome, 1981) see below, note 31.

<sup>2</sup> It is unimportant for our purpose here whether *Il.* 2.547ff. is a late Athenian interpolation.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. e.g. X. *Mem.* 3.5.10 where τὴν Ἐρεχθέως γε τροφὴν καὶ γένεσιν takes the place of autochthony in the standard list of patriotic legends discussed below.

<sup>4</sup> Ermatinger (above, n. 1) calls attention to the appearance of the *χθών* element both in *αὐτόχθονες* and in *Erichthonius*, another earthborn early king of Attica whom Ermatinger sees

evidence as we have would suggest rather that early Athenians did not think of Erechtheus as anything but a serpentine or quasi-serpentine deity – he is offered sacrifices at *Il.* 2.550–1 for example –, and that his transformation into a human ancestor-king occurred perhaps as late as the fifth century.<sup>5</sup> In this regard it is interesting to note that Cecrops, who was also said to be earthborn, was never used to symbolize Athenian autochthony.<sup>6</sup> Now if Cecrops' chthonic origins had nothing to do with Athenian autochthony, it is *a priori* likely that Erechtheus' chthonic origins, at least originally, had nothing to do with autochthony either. Rather Cecrops and Erechtheus were both gods before they came to be viewed as human kings – indeed, even while he was viewed as a king Erechtheus continued to be offered cult as a god at the Erechtheum –, and both Erechtheus and Cecrops will owe their chthonic origins to the same early religious ideas which also attributed chthonic origins and serpentine or quasi-serpentine characteristics to similar beings found elsewhere in Greek mythology.

If we consider that Erechtheus' chthonic origins came first, and his associations with Athenian autochthony later, it will be possible to trace the process whereby the Athenians, over time, came to see the earthborn Erechtheus as a symbol of their continuous habitation of Attica. As noted earlier, according to Homer (*Il.* 2.547–8) Erechtheus was, quite literally, born from the earth. Now having one or more of their early kings born from the earth does not of itself make the Athenians, as a race, earthborn, since not all Athenians were descended from the old royal line. More importantly, as we have just seen, Erechtheus is likely to have been a god originally, and there is no evidence that he was thought of as a human king, and hence as a possible ancestor of the Athenians, before the fifth century. All the same, the Athenians were already called δῆμος Ἐρεχθίδης by Homer (*Il.* 2.547), and *Erechtheidai* as early as Pindar (*I.* 2.19) and frequently thereafter.<sup>7</sup> The patronymic may be used loosely to describe 'the people of Erechtheus', but literally it means 'the sons of Erechtheus'. It was precisely the frequent use of this patronymic, I would suggest, which fostered a habit of thinking that the Athenians as a people were, at least metaphorically, descended from Erechtheus. And if Erechtheus was earthborn, then by this way of thinking so too was the Attic race. Thus, for example, at *S. Aj.* 202 Tecmessa addresses the Salaminian sailors as γενεᾶς χθονίων ἀπ' Ἐρεχθειδᾶν. In this, the earliest extant text which implies a chthonic origin for the Athenian people as a whole, it is noteworthy that Sophocles uses the patronymic Ἐρεχθειδᾶν to describe the Athenians. χθονίων is in effect a transferred epithet: the people of earthborn Erechtheus become Erechtheus' earthborn people.

Several notes of caution are in order here. First, saying that the Athenians were the descendants of an earthborn Erechtheus, or even that they were earthborn themselves, would not normally indicate that the Athenians had been in Attica since time immemorial. Indeed, being born from the earth usually has quite different

as merely a doublet of Erechtheus, but it is (a) far from certain that Erichthonius is just a doublet of Erechtheus; (b) far more likely that the χθών element in his name relates to his chthonic origins rather than to the autochthony of the Athenians.

<sup>5</sup> More generally, F. Brommer ('Attische Könige', *Charites: Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. K. Schauenburg 153–64), after examining the literary and archaeological evidence, finds that while Theseus was promoted by Pisistratus in the sixth century, there is no certain trace of the other Athenian kings before the fifth; Brommer concludes (163–4) that all these kings *qua* kings are likely to have been inventions of the classical period, and that their invention was due ultimately to political motives. <sup>6</sup> On earthborn Erichthonius see above, n. 4.

<sup>7</sup> By contrast the Athenians are rarely called *Kekropidai* in texts of the classical period.

implications. *χθόνιος*, the adjective used by Sophocles, is properly associated with the underworld or with giants and other monsters born from the earth (e.g. *Τιτῆνας χθονίους*, Hes. *Th.* 697). *γηγενής*, the word which literally means 'born from the earth', describes anyone or anything with chthonic origins (e.g. *Ἐρεχθέος τοῦ γηγενέος λεγόμενου*, Hdt. 8.55), but this again will also include chthonic monsters (e.g. *δράκων ὁ γηγενής*, E. *Ph.* 931). Both adjectives are used to describe the Theban Spartoi (*χθόνιος*, e.g. E. *Ba.* 538–41; *γηγενής*, e.g. *ibid.* 264), but no one claimed that the historical Thebans had lived in Thebes since time immemorial,<sup>8</sup> and if the adjectives evoke anything in these Theban contexts it is the monstrous character of the immediate descendants of the Spartoi. Stated simply, neither the adjectives *χθόνιος* and *γηγενής*, nor even the myth of a descent from someone born from the earth implies of itself prolonged habitation in a particular place. That the Athenian myth came to be understood in this way is a special case for which we will offer an explanation in the course of this paper.

Second, it is far from clear that the Athenians as a whole habitually thought of themselves as *Erechtheidai*, descendants of Erechtheus. Indeed at Ar. *Eq.* 1015–22 Demus' failure to understand Paphlagon who addresses him as *Ἐρεχθείδῃ*<sup>9</sup> suggests that the use of *Ἐρεχθείδαι* as a synonym for *Ἀθηναῖοι* was a cliché, but also that it was the sort of highflown 'poetic' cliché that a lowbrow like Demus might not understand. If the patronymic is only a poetic usage, then the claim of a chthonic origin for the Athenians, a claim which we have argued evolved from the patronymic, is likely to have begun as another poetic conceit, and not as a reflection of a broad popular belief.

Finally, it is possible to argue positively that the chthonic births of Erechtheus and other early Athenian kings are not simply a mythological formulation of the Athenians' belief that they had always lived in Attica. On the one hand, the primitive serpentine/chthonic character of Erechtheus and the other earthborn kings indicates that they originated at a very early, if undatable, stage of Athenian religion. On the other hand, while Athenian tradition contains no memories of an Athenian migration into Attica,<sup>10</sup> there is no reason to believe that the Athenians were particularly aware of what was *not* in their tradition until they came in contact with peoples like the Dorians who did have traditions of folk migrations. Only at this point would the Athenians have reason to reflect that, unlike the Dorians, they had not migrated, and in this way the absence of a memory of their own migration was transformed into a positive assertion that the Athenians had always been in Attica. With so few really early sources it is impossible to say when this assertion was first made, but it is almost

<sup>8</sup> Harp. (s.v. *αὐτόχθονες*) does say that the Thebans were *αὐτόχθονες*, but by his day *αὐτόχθονες* was synonymous with *γηγενεῖς*, and Harpocration's reference is to the chthonic origin of the Spartoi. On this item of Harpocration see further below, n. 46.

<sup>9</sup> Demus apparently thinks that the word somehow refers to Erechtheus himself, since he asks 'What do jackdaws and a dog [referring to the Paphlagonian's oracle] have to do with Erechtheus?' (1022).

<sup>10</sup> That is a folk movement of the people as a whole. Athenian tradition did include migrations of refugees who came to Attica to join the Athenians, notably at the time of the 'Dorian invasions' (cf. e.g. Hellanic. *FGrHist* 4 F 125, Hdt. 5.65.3), and more recently Cleisthenes' reforms were supposed to have added numerous foreigners to the citizen roles (so e.g. Arist. *Pol.* 1275b36–7). Interestingly enough, however, the Athenians did not seem bothered by the contradiction between traditions which spoke of immigrants incorporated into the citizen body on the one hand, and the claim of autochthony, on the other, that the ancestors of the Athenian citizen body as a whole had always been in Attica.

certainly later than the 'Dorian invasions', and possibly much later.<sup>11</sup> Indeed, since autochthony is not simply a matter of difference but one of superiority, the concept may well have become prominent as late as the 470s and beyond when the Athenians became rivals with the Dorian Spartans.<sup>11</sup> Whatever its actual date, however, the Athenians' idea that they had always lived in Attica certainly appears to be much younger than their belief in Erechtheus' chthonic origins, and hence not the source of that belief.

In sum then, it seems on the whole more likely that the Athenian tradition of continuous habitation of Attica had, in the beginning, nothing to do with Erechtheus or with birth from the earth. Over time, however, the Athenians became identified as *Erechtheidai*, and as a result Erechtheus' chthonic origins could be transferred to the Athenians as a whole. Finally this chthonic origin of the Athenian race was joined with and became the conventional metaphor for the Athenians' belief that they had lived in Attica since time immemorial.<sup>12</sup> Given the political associations of the concept of autochthony, which we shall examine later in this paper, I would argue that at least the final stages of this process are to be dated to the first half of the fifth century. Before examining these political associations, however, we will first consider in greater detail the word *αὐτόχθων* itself.

## II

Turning to the word *αὐτόχθων*, we may begin by noting that it is always used to describe a people which has lived in its homeland since time immemorial, but it does this in two ways. Sometimes it describes the people as literally born from the earth, and in this sense *αὐτόχθων* can be used as a synonym of *γηγενής* (cf. e.g. Pl. *Soph.* 247c with 248c). At other times, however, *αὐτόχθων* is used to describe a people as indigenous without any suggestion that the people or its ancestors were born from the earth. Herodotus provides us with some good examples of this second use of *αὐτόχθων*. At 1.171–2 he says that the Carians consider themselves *αὐτόχθονας ἡπειρώτας* while the Cretans say they came from the islands; and the Caunians seem to him to be *αὐτόχθονες* even though they claim to come from Crete. At 4.197.2, describing the people of Libya he calls the Greeks and Phoenicians *ἐπήλυδες* and the Libyans and Ethiopians *αὐτόχθονες*. Finally at 8.73, describing the seven *ἔθνη* of the Peloponnese he says:

τούτων δὲ τὰ μὲν δύο αὐτόχθονα ἔοντα κατὰ χώραν ἱδρυταὶ νῦν τῇ καὶ τὸ πάλοι οἴκεον, Ἀρκάδες τε καὶ Κυνούριοι,

while the other five *ἔθνη* are *ἐπήλυδα*. There was a rather weak tradition that the mythical royal line of the Arcadians began with a Pelasgus born from the earth,<sup>13</sup> but

<sup>11</sup> The earliest example of this way of thinking in our extant texts is Hdt. 7.161.3 where the Athenians are said to have asserted their claim of superiority over the Spartans as *ἀρχαιότατον μὲν ἔθνος παρεχόμενοι, μούνοι δὲ ἔόντες οὐ μετανάσται Ἑλλήνων*; cf. in a similar vein Hdt. 1.56.3 where the Pelasgic race, which Herodotus says *οὐδαμῇ κω ἐξεχώρησε*, is contrasted with the Hellenic race which was *πολυπλάνητον κάρτα*; the whole of this latter passage is a projection back into an earlier set of races of the contrast between Athenians and Doric Spartans, as Ph.-E. Legrand notes (*Hérodote* [Paris, 1967] *ad loc.*; *contra* F. Jacoby, *FGH Hist* IIIB, vol. 2, p. 316 n. 41). Isocrates uses the same contrast to argue Athenian superiority to Sparta at 4.63 (cf. 4.25).

<sup>12</sup> I have described here the logical development of the process, but particularly the two movements of transferring Erechtheus' chthonic origins to the Athenians as a whole and making these chthonic origins the metaphor for permanent habitation may have been combined in a single step, in e.g. an influential drama or a precedent-setting speech.

<sup>13</sup> See the Appendix below.

apart from this weak tradition, none of the peoples whom Herodotus mentions in these three passages, as far as we know, claimed that their race had been born from the earth or ruled by earthborn kings. Indeed at least as far as the Caunians are concerned, their traditions, as described by Herodotus here, rule out such a possibility.

Both uses of *αὐτόχθων* (*sc.* with and without chthonic associations) appear about the same time in our extant sources. The earliest examples without a suggestion of chthonic origins are in the Herodotus passages discussed above. Chthonic associations seem implied, on the other hand, in *A. Supp.* 250–1 when the Argive king Pelasgus says of himself *τοῦ γηγενεοῦς γάρ εἰμ' ἐγὼ Παλαίχθονος* | *ἱνις* – it seems likely that Palaechthon's name, Aeschylus' invention,<sup>14</sup> is meant to call the word *αὐτόχθων* to mind.<sup>15</sup> The *Supplices*, written in or about 463,<sup>16</sup> is somewhat earlier than the Herodotean passages, but both texts are really only *termini ante quos* for the development of the two uses of *αὐτόχθων*, and with so few texts surviving from the period it is impossible to say how long either use was about before it appeared in an extant source. Under these conditions the priority of the *Supplices* text certainly does not prove that the chthonic use of *αὐτόχθων* preceded the indigenous, and it may well be that both uses were already current when the word starts to appear in our texts.

Etymology is one tool which can perhaps take us back beyond the extant texts, particularly in the case of compound words like *αὐτόχθων* whose etymologies are transparent. We would assume that when people coin a word like *αὐτόχθων* the structure of that word, i.e. its constituent elements and the way those elements are put together, would correspond as closely as possible to the idea to be represented by the coinage. If the structure of the word does not correspond to the way the word is used in some (or even all) of our extant texts, we would conclude that the concept represented by the word evolved over time, and that the meaning apparent in the structure of the word is likely to correspond to the *original* form of the concept which the word represents. *αὐτόχθων* is, of course, a compound of *αὐτός* and *χθών*. It is generally assumed that this compound represents something like *ἐκ τῆς χθονὸς αὐτῆς γενόμενος*,<sup>17</sup> but this is not the natural sense of the compound, as we shall shortly see, and it is hence unlikely to have been its original meaning either.

To begin with the second element of the compound, the word *χθών* by itself originally described the earth, particularly its surface (e.g. *ἐτέθαστο ὑπὸ χθονός*, *Od.* 11.52; cf. *οὐρανῶ* contrasted with *ἐπὶ χθονί* at *Il.* 4.443). Homer uses *χθών* once in the sense of 'land, place' (*Od.* 13.352), and in this use he is followed by Pindar (e.g. *P.* 9.7) and frequently by later authors. Finally Pindar is the earliest extant source to use *χθών* in the sense of 'land, country' to refer to the territory of a specific people (*O.* 7.30). The word *χθών* is essentially a 'poetic' one, and to the best of my knowledge

<sup>14</sup> The name Palaechthon is found only here. Elsewhere when Pelasgus is given a chthonic origin he is born directly from the earth (*ἀντίθεον δὲ Πελασγὸν ἐν ὑψικόοισιν ὄρεσσι | γαῖα μέλαινα' ἀνέδωκεν, ἵνα θνητῶν γένος εἴη* = Asiatic, frag. 8 K. appears to be the earliest text; on Hes. fr. 160–1 M.–W. see the Appendix below).

<sup>15</sup> Pelasgus is an Argive, but the historical Argives never claimed to be autochthonous in any sense, and Aeschylus must have had Athens in mind in some way when he wrote these verses, whether they are meant as an oblique reference to the Athenians' own Pelasgic (= indigenous) origins, or more simply to present Pelasgus in a favourable light by emphasizing his autochthony to an Athenian audience which was proud of its own autochthony. In the epigram quoted in Aeschin. 3.190 *παλαίχθων* refers to the *δῆμος Ἀθηναίων*.

<sup>16</sup> For the date of the *Supp.* see A. F. Garvie, *Aeschylus' Supplices: Play and Trilogy* (Cambridge, 1969), 11.

<sup>17</sup> 'Sprung from the land itself', *LSJ* 9; cf. 'ex ipsa terra ortus, ex ipsa tellure oriundus', Stephanus, *TGL* s.v.; 'aus dem Lande selbst', Pape, *Handwörterbuch* s.v.; 'né du sol même de la patrie', Loraux (above, n. 1), 1.

it does not appear in any extant prose work of the classical period. Similarly, from among the compounds of -χθων listed by Buck and Petersen,<sup>18</sup> Aristotle mentions the Pythagoreans' use of ἀντίχθων as the name of the twin earth they placed on the opposite side of the central fire (e.g. *Cael.* 293a24); otherwise only αὐτόχθων is found in literary prose before Dionysius of Halicarnassus.<sup>19</sup> As we shall see, in αὐτόχθων the -χθων suffix probably has the sense of 'land, country'. The relatively late appearance of this sense of χθών in our sources, the unusual compound with αὐτο- (on which see below), and the almost exclusively poetic use of χθών and its compounds taken together would indicate that the word αὐτόχθων did not arise spontaneously but was a conscious coinage. In view of the particular association of αὐτόχθων with the Athenians it seems probable that the source of the word was Attic, and one might hazard a guess that it was Attic drama which was responsible for its popularization.

αὐτόχθων is in fact a very unusual αὐτο- compound since its second element is a noun. In the large majority of cases αὐτο- is prefixed to a verbal root to denote an action one does oneself, either actively (e.g. αὐτόπτης), reflexively (e.g. αὐτοδιδάκτος) or passively (e.g. αὐτόγραφος). αὐτο- is compounded with noun roots far more rarely, but also with a greater variety of meanings:<sup>20</sup>

(A) to indicate that one does something oneself (e.g. αὐτουργός, and by extension αὐτόχειρ, αὐτόπους); this would correspond to αὐτο- compounds with verbal roots used actively;

(B) in adjectives, to describe people who have something of their own which has not been imposed from without (e.g. αὐτόνομος [*S. Ant.* 821], αὐτόδικος [*Th.* 5.18.2]; this would correspond to αὐτο- compounds with verbal roots used reflexively;

(C) somewhat similarly in adjectives describing things, to indicate that the thing referred to by the noun element in the compound is a natural extension of the larger object (e.g. <ἄροτρον> αὐτόγυον, 'with a natural γύης branching from the stock';<sup>21</sup> βέλη αὐτόκωπα, 'weapons with their own handles'<sup>22</sup>);

(D) prefixed to nouns denoting family relations, to emphasize the closeness of the relationship (e.g. αὐτάδελφος, 'one's very own brother/sister'; αὐτοκασίγνητος);

(E) in adjectives where the noun root identifies crudely worked raw material from which something is made (e.g. αὐτόξυλον ἔκπωμα,<sup>23</sup> αὐτόποκον ἰμάτιον<sup>24</sup>); the αὐτο- prefix is probably used in these compounds since the objects described still retain characteristics of the raw material itself;

(F) especially in philosophical language, in nouns to denote an ideal form (e.g. αὐτοάνθρωπος, αὐτόπιπος [*Arist. Metaph.* 1040b35]; in a non-philosophical context, e.g. αὐτόνεκρος, 'a very corpse', [*Alcph.* 3.7.27]);<sup>25</sup>

(G) in adjectives, in the sense of '\_\_\_\_\_ and all' (e.g. αὐτότοκος [*A. Ag.* 137],

<sup>18</sup> C. D. Buck and W. Petersen, *A Reverse Index of Greek Nouns and Adjectives* (Chicago [1945]), 253.

<sup>19</sup> The adjective χθόνιος appears in prose only in reference to the underworld (e.g. τῶν χθονίων θεῶν, *Hdt.* 6.134.1).

<sup>20</sup> I apologize for this lengthy list, but I know of no other way of fairly presenting the case for what I think αὐτόχθων originally meant.

<sup>21</sup> *Hes. Op.* 433; the translation is that of M. L. West, *Hesiod: Works and Days...* (Oxford, 1978) *ad loc.*; cf. also *A. R.* 3.232 and *schol. ad loc.*

<sup>22</sup> *A. Ch.* 163; cf. τὰ ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν ἔχοντα τὴν λάβην [*ξίφη*], *schol. vet. ad loc.* Despite the ξίφη – a gloss on a gloss – in the scholion, βέλη αὐτόκωπα sound like they should be spears or perhaps clubs rather than swords.

<sup>23</sup> *S. Ph.* 35; cf. ὅμοιον... τὸ παρὰ Σοφοκλεῖ αὐτόξυλον ἔκπωμα, καὶ ὅλως ὅσα ἔργα οὐκ εἰς κάλλος ἐσκεύασται, *Eustath.* 1457.26–7 [ed. Bas.], explaining αὐτοχόωνον at *Il.* 23.826.

<sup>24</sup> *Com. adesp.* 854 K. *ap. Poll.* 7.61; αὐτόποκον ἰμάτιον τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πόκου εἰς κρόκην [= *subtēmen*] βληθέν, *Bekk. Anec.* 467.18. <sup>25</sup> Cf. αὐτόδεκα, 'exactly ten', *Th.* 5.20.1.

αὐτόχθονος [A. Ag. 536], αὐτόπρεμνος [S. Ant. 714]); this use developed from the idiom of αὐτός modifying a noun in the dative which is used in the same sense.<sup>26</sup>

In all of the uses considered thus far the αὐτο- prefix reflects the intensive use of αὐτός (= *ipse*). Clearly (A), (F) and (G) cannot provide satisfactory meanings for αὐτόχθων. (B)'s sense of 'having their own land', to be meaningful must imply a contrast with others who had their land imposed on them by someone else,<sup>27</sup> but forced resettlement was so rare in the Greek world that its absence was not something significant enough to be proud of; nor does it seem likely that the αὐτο- prefix is used more loosely in the sense of 'by themselves, independently',<sup>28</sup> since the simple fact of national independence, though an important part of the Athenian self-image, is not a part of the range of ideas described by αὐτόχθων. (C) is also unsatisfactory since it would make the land of Attica a natural extension of the Athenians, and similarly the αὐτο- prefix in the sense of (D) could only be used to describe Attica belonging (being αὐτόχθων) to the Athenians rather than vice versa. Finally, αὐτόχθων in the sense of (E) is also impossible since it would suggest that the Athenians were crudely wrought earth, as it were, and in some way still 'unfinished',<sup>29</sup> but αὐτόχθων is never used in this way to imply that the Athenians were primitive or uncivilized. We may note in passing that none of the uses of the αὐτο- prefix considered thus far provides any parallel for the definition of αὐτόχθων as 'sprung from the earth'.

In addition to the uses of αὐτο- reflecting αὐτός = *ipse* the prefix is also used in the following ways which reflect ὁ αὐτός in the sense of 'the same' (= *idem*):

(H) in the sense of 'being the same as' (apparently only at Sem. 7.12: αὐτομήτωρα, 'just like her mother', but the interpretation is far from certain);

(I) in expressions of time (e.g. αὐθήμερον, αὐτόετες);

(J) in the sense of 'having the same \_\_\_\_ as another' (apparently only ἀθανάτοις ὁμέσσιοι, αὐτοτράπεζοι [Emp. 147.1]; αὐτογενής [the generally accepted emendation at A. Supp. 8]; αὐθαίμων [S. Tr. 1041, Lyc. 1446], αὐθαίμος [S. OC 1078; cf. αὐθόμαιμος, *ibid.* 335, Lyc. 168, 222], αὐτεπώνυμος [E. Ph. 769] and αὐτόφρων καὶ ὁμοσπόνδων [Ion 19F53f]).

Even if (H) is a legitimate use of the αὐτο- prefix – and it is far from certain that it is –, 'being the same as the land' hardly seems to be a compliment when we think of the traditionally poor quality of Attic soil. Since (I) deals with expressions of time it cannot provide a parallel for αὐτόχθων. Finally (J) does provide an excellent explanation of αὐτόχθων if we understand 'having the same land' as 'always having the same land'.<sup>30</sup> In this interpretation the structure of the word neatly reflects the

<sup>26</sup> For the dative usage see H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, rev. by G. M. Messing (Cambridge, MA, 1956), no. 1525.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. the definitions of αὐτόνομος and αὐτόδικος given in the scholion to Th. 5.18.2, and by Harp. s.v. αὐτοδικεῖν.

<sup>28</sup> There is really no parallel for the use of the αὐτο- prefix in this looser sense of 'independent' except perhaps the *hapax legomenon* αὐτόνομοι καὶ αὐτοπόλεις (Th. 5.79.1, quoting the Doric text of a treaty between Sparta and Argos). αὐτοπολίται (X. HG 5.2.14), which is often cited to illustrate αὐτοπόλεις, is in fact an unnecessary emendation (for αὐτοὶ πολίται) which appears to be inspired by αὐτοπόλεις at Th. 5.79.1.

<sup>29</sup> This, however, would appear to be exactly the sense of Cheiron's αὐτόχθων ἑστία, glossed differently by Hesychius (ἡ τοῦ Χείρωνος, παρόσον ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι διήγεν) and Eustathius (1457.22–4: τὴν αὐτοφυῆ καὶ σπηλαιώδη, ἣν ἕτερός τις λέγει αὐτόροφον [= self-roofed', i.e. naturally roofed over]). The words αὐτόχθων ἑστία are probably quoted from a now lost drama (trag. adesp. F 201).

<sup>30</sup> For ὁ αὐτός in the sense of 'the same as before, unchanged' cf. e.g. Th. 2.61.2, 3.38.1. (Strictly speaking the other examples of (J) occur in contexts which imply 'the same as X', but

idea of being indigenous which is central to the concept of autochthony. Indeed, the fit between the structure of the word and the idea it represents is most persuasive in this interpretation, especially since no other attested use of the *αὐτο-* prefix comes close to yielding a meaning that fits any of the uses of *αὐτόχθων*, or even one that makes any other acceptable sense.

In support of the interpretation given here we may note that the usual opposite of *αὐτόχθων* is *ἐπηλύς* (cf. Hdt. 4.197.2, 8.73.1; Isoc. 4.63, 12.124; Pl. *Mx.* 237b; [D.] 60.4; contrasted with *ἐπακτός*: E. *Ion* 589–90, frag. 362.7). *ἐπηλύς* is a relatively rare adjectival formation, from *ἐπέρχομαι*, but it is found in prose, e.g. Th. 1.29.5 where it is used to describe the fresh colonists whom the Corinthians had settled in Epidamnus to support one of the sides in the civil strife there. If we define *αὐτόχθων* by its opposite, it would describe someone *οὐκ ἐπηλύς*, someone who has not come to a place, a native rather than an immigrant. This corresponds closely to *αὐτόχθων* = ‘always having the same land’ which we have argued was the original meaning of *αὐτόχθων*.

Whether or not we accept the explanation of *αὐτός* + *χθών* given above, we can at least be certain that *structurally* the word does not mean ‘born from the earth’. Further, since it is quite unlikely, as we have said, that one would coin a word whose structure did not correspond to its meaning, we would conclude that *αὐτόχθων* originally represented an idea which corresponded to its structure, probably ‘always living in the same land’. We saw earlier, on the other hand, how the belief that some of Athens’ early kings were born from the earth had, originally, nothing to do with the belief that the Athenian race was indigenous to Attica; and we saw further that since being born from the earth normally had nothing to do with always living in a particular place, the association of chthonic origins with autochthony was a special Athenian development which required an explanation. In the course of time the chthonic origins of Erechtheus came to symbolize the Athenian autochthony while, conversely, the word *αὐτόχθων* came to be understood as ‘born from the earth’. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that these two ideas worked upon each other, the chthonic origins of Erechtheus as ‘ancestor’ of the Athenians influencing how the word *αὐτόχθων* was understood, and the word *αὐτόχθων* as now understood providing the link between chthonic origins and the idea of always living in Attica.

The significance of our argument lies in this then, that contrary to the conventional view, the chthonic origins of Erechtheus had in the beginning nothing to do with the indigenous origins of the Athenians; that these two ideas came to be blended into a single idea only at a relatively late date, perhaps as late as the fifth century; and that it was only as a result of this blending that Erechtheus could become a symbol of Athenian autochthony. Further, this symbol was not an expression of socio-religious beliefs, as the conventional view would have it, but rather, as the uses of the symbol to be examined below will show, it was a vehicle for the expression of political, or more exactly ideological beliefs linked to Athenian democracy.<sup>31</sup>

this seems to be simply a matter of context.) Note also Thucydides’ indirect reference to autochthony in the Funeral Oration which describes the Athenians as *τῇν...χώραν οἱ αὐτοὶ αἰεὶ οἰκοῦντες* (2.36.1).

<sup>31</sup> Montanari (above, n. 1) recognizes Erechtheus’ ideological role, which he attempts to date to the Cleisthenic reforms, as a symbol of ‘una tendenzialità politico-democratica’ opposed to the ‘< tendenzialità > etnico-genetica’ characteristic of the pre-democratic political order (p. 59). Montanari’s study, which focuses on Herodotus’ account of Cleisthenes and on Euripides’ *Erechtheus* and *Ion*, is suggestive, but the evidence available cannot support the case he seems to be making, of a single orthodox view evolving over time, particularly through the agency of tragedy as a propaganda mechanism for the democratic state.



## III

Thus far we have been concerned with the original meaning and development of the concept of autochthony. We must now consider why the Athenians were proud to be autochthonous.<sup>32</sup> More often than not our sources simply assert or imply that being autochthonous makes the Athenians better without explaining why or how it does so. Most of these instances, it is true, occur in patriotic contexts such as public funeral orations where explanations should not be necessary for an audience familiar with the claims of Athenian history as popularly understood. All the same, one cannot help suspecting that at least some of the time there is a 'patriotic logic' at work to the effect that Athenians are better than others; Athenians are autochthonous and others are not; therefore autochthony is one of the things that makes Athenians better than others. This suspicion is strengthened when we read the sources which do provide some indication of why autochthony confers superiority, for in fact we find not one but a variety of reasons.

On the simplest level autochthony, 'always having the same land', can mean that a *polis* is so old that no one knows how or when it was founded. Being the oldest, or at least very old, automatically makes one better in a society which respects age (cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 1360b31–2), and the assertion that the Athenians are *ἀρχαιότατον ἔθνος* (Hdt. 7.161.3) is in itself a claim for preferential treatment which needs no further elaboration. Beyond simple antiquity there is also the 'fact' that while other peoples were still wandering from place to place the Athenians started off, as it were, by being settled down, and they could therefore begin the process of becoming civilized before others could. Thus in contexts which also speak of autochthony Isocrates (12.124) says that the Athenians were *πρώτους . . . καὶ πόλιν οἰκήσαντας καὶ νόμοις χρησαμένους* (cf. Isoc. 4.39, 8.49); Plato (*Mx.* 237e–238a) and Isocrates (4.28–9) say the Athenians were the first to cultivate grain, a discovery which they generously shared with others (cf. also [D.] 60.5); and Plato (*Mx.* 238b) says the Athenians first learned *technai*. As Isocrates says of Athens: *εὐρήσομεν . . . αὐτὴν . . . τῆς . . . κατασκευῆς ἐν ἧ κατοικοῦμεν καὶ μεθ' ἧς πολιτευόμεθα καὶ δι' ἣν ζῆν δυνάμεθα σχεδὸν ἀπάσης αἰτίας οὖσαν* (4.26–7; cf. Pl. *Mx.* 238b, Hyp. 6.4–5, Cic. *Flac.* 62). Thucydides seems to touch on this same idea, albeit in far less grandiose terms, when he attributes Athens' early development to the poor soil of Attica which made her unattractive to invaders (and less prone to civil strife); other lands underwent continual changes of population, and therefore did not develop (*μη' αὐξηθῆναι*) as Athens did because of her stable population (Th. 1.2.1–6).

Less obviously, and therefore perhaps more interestingly, autochthonous Athenians can be contrasted with peoples who are ethnically mixed (*μίγαδες*, Isoc. 4.24, 12.124). In these contrasts the ethnically mixed groups are seen as nothing more than random assemblies of strangers who fit together poorly, are prone to tyranny and oligarchy because of their heterogeneous composition, and in general lack loyalty to the city (e.g. E. frag. 362.7–10, Pl. *Mx.* 238c, Lycurg. *Leocr.* 47; cf. Alcibiades' comments on the weaknesses of the mixed peoples of Sicily, Th. 6.17.2–4). This contrast with ethnically mixed communities is a logical development of the idea, implicit in the

<sup>32</sup> Particularly in his discussion of the *logos epitaphios* Miller (above, n. 1), 11–34, touches on some of the points considered here, but his focus is on the use individual authors make of the myth of autochthony, and not on the common ramifications of the myth found in a variety of authors. Miller also emphasizes what he sees as a sophistic critique of the traditional myth, and does not give sufficient credit to the political ideas which shaped the developed concept of autochthony.

concept of autochthony, that all Athenians were descendants of a common set of ancestors.<sup>33</sup>

The same way of thinking which contrasts Athens with other states can also be carried over into Athens itself. The *αὐτόχθων* has a superior claim to *εὐγένεια*, nobility of birth, than the *ἑλληυς* (Pl. *Mx.* 237b, Hyp. 6.7; cf. D.H. *Rh.* 261); by contrast the *ἑλληυς* is a stepchild ([D.] 60.4), a misfitted peg, *λόγω πολίτης ἐστί, τοῖς δ' ἔργοισιν οὐ* (E. frag. 362.11–13). The concept of autochthony thus claims that even the lowliest citizen is superior, of nobler birth, than any non-citizen. This claim is especially significant in a society like that at Athens where a large number of the inhabitants were not citizens, and where at least some of the non-citizens had considerably greater wealth and social prestige than the large majority of the citizens. The concept of autochthony flatters the citizens and helps to justify their unwillingness to extend citizenship to the strangers in their midst.<sup>34</sup>

Autochthony is, however, more than a matter of age and ethnic purity. Autochthony is the first in a standard list of Athenian patriotic legends which also includes Erechtheus' defeat of Eumolpus, Theseus' defeat of the Amazons, the defence of the Heracleidae and the burial of the Seven Against Thebes, and usually concludes with the defeat of the Persians at Marathon and Salamis. These legends seem to have been thought of as a group, and they are frequently cited together in patriotic contexts as examples of Athenian excellence. The other legends are all military and illustrate either the Athenians' defence of their native land or their protection of the oppressed. In this context autochthony, particularly in the version that the Athenians were actually sprung from the earth, was used to claim that the Athenians had a unique relation to their land since it was their mother and nurse. This relation could be used to exhort the Athenians to greater patriotism (e.g. Isoc. 6.124, Lycurg. *Leoc.* 100) or to explain why the Athenians were capable of patriotic acts on behalf of their country.<sup>35</sup> In his *Republic* Plato proposed a myth of chthonic origin for the first citizens of his ideal state precisely so that their descendants in later generations would think of their country *ὡς περὶ μητρὸς καὶ τροφῶν* and defend it against foreign attack (*R.* 414e). And autochthony by itself, without reference to chthonic origins, is associated with the spirit of resistance to foreign domination at Ar. *Vesp.* 1076, X. *HG* 7.1.23, Lys. 2.4.3, D. 19.261 (cf. Th. 2.36.1).

Plato gives as a second use of the myth of autochthony that later generations of citizens will think of each other as brothers (*R.* 414c). In this sense autochthony can be egalitarian, but as always in Athenian democracy equality levels up, not down. When all citizens are born from a common parent all are equally noble, and all are equally entitled to the claims of *εὐγένεια vis-à-vis* non-citizens which we discussed above. Conversely, within the citizen population itself when all citizens are equally noble no one can claim preferential treatment because of superior birth. Thus in the

<sup>33</sup> See also above, n. 10.

<sup>34</sup> The legend of Athenian autochthony is thus an expression, in mythological terms, of the same attitudes reflected in Athens' restrictive citizenship laws, beginning with Pericles' law of 451/0. For the argument cf. also [D.] 59.74 where, it is claimed, Neaera should not be allowed to conduct the sacrifices required of the wife of the *archōn basileus* since the *archōn basileus* is the successor of the line of Athenian kings *ὑπερεχόντων διὰ τὸ αὐτόχθονας εἶναι* and, according to the orator, Neaera was not an Athenian citizen. By contrast, Lycurgus (*Leoc.* 41) says that it is enough to cause tears when one sees the Athenian *dēmos*, which had once been proud of its autochthony, now vote to make strangers citizens. On this use of the concept of autochthony see also Loraux (above, n. 1), 10.

<sup>35</sup> E.g. E. frag. 362.7ff. Isoc. 4.25 even uses the relation to argue, somewhat illogically, that Athens deserves to hold the hegemony of Greece.

*Menexenus* descent from a common mother disposes the Athenians against oligarchy and tyranny, or as Plato elegantly puts it, ἡ ἰσογονία ἡμᾶς ἡ κατὰ φύσιν ἰσονομίαν ἀναγκάζει ζητεῖν κατὰ νόμον. Because of this heritage of ἰσονομία, which is equated with ἐλευθερία, the Athenians fought other Greeks in defence of freedom and fought the barbarian in defence of all the Greeks (Pl. *Mx.* 239a–b, which continues with the standard list of patriotic legends [defeat of Eumolpus, etc.]; for autochthony and ἐλευθερία see also D. 19.261, Lycurg. *Leoc.* 41). The same ideas occur again in a slightly different arrangement at Lys. 2.17–20, where the great deeds in the standard list are traced to the Athenians' unanimous willingness to fight on behalf of the right, a willingness which is explained by their autochthony<sup>36</sup> and their democracy with its emphasis on ἐλευθερία and νόμος. And at X. *Mem.* 3.5.8–12 the great deeds in the standard list are explained by Athens' settled condition which caused others to turn to her as arbitrator in disputes of justice and as protector of the oppressed. This settled condition, in contrast to the migrations of the other Greeks, was another aspect of autochthony, as we have seen.<sup>37</sup>

In cases such as these autochthony and the other legends in the standard list are ideological in the sense that they are used to say something about Athens as a political entity, in a way that saying, e.g. that Athens is a very old city is not an ideological statement. The rest of the standard list is used to illustrate how Athens typically acts as a *polis*, while autochthony in particular seems to be used to explain why in these typical instances Athens acts as she does. It is worth noting, however, that the standard list could be interpreted in a variety of ways (championship of liberty, pursuit of justice, defence of the oppressed in the examples considered above). In particular democracy itself is linked to autochthony in different ways in the *Menexenus* and in Lysias 2, while it is not even mentioned in the passage from the *Memorabilia*. All this suggests that the legends, but not their interpretation, were part of the patriotic consciousness of the Athenians. Everyone knew, as it were, that autochthony and the other legends demonstrated the virtues of the Athenians, but there was less consensus on exactly what virtues the legends demonstrated and on how they demonstrated that the Athenians possessed them.

Since the legends in the standard list were thought of as a group, one legend would suggest the others by association,<sup>38</sup> and oblique references to one legend are easily recognized in contexts which mention the other legends.<sup>39</sup> We have no real evidence of when or how the standard list developed, but the appearance of the list as a standard element in public funeral orations suggests that it may have developed within the tradition of these orations, a tradition which had its beginning, it should be noted, only at the time of the Persian Wars (D.H. *AR* 5.17.4). On the other hand, Aeschylus' two plays, the *Heracleidae* and the *Eleusinioi* (the latter on Theseus' burial of the Seven Against Thebes), probably used these legends for patriotic purposes, as Euripides did later in his own *Heracleidae* and *Supplices*. It may be that Aeschylus chose these stories

<sup>36</sup> There is also a claim to superior justice in Lysias' statement (2.17) that by being autochthonous the Athenians did not seize someone else's land and oust the original inhabitants (note esp. ἀρχὴ τοῦ βίου δικαία, *ibid.*).

<sup>37</sup> Cf. also Hyperides' summary of the list (6.5, ed. Kenyon OCT): ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν διατελεῖ τοὺς μὲν κακοὺς κολάζουσα, τοῖς δὲ β[ο]ήθουσα, τὸ δὲ ἴσον ἀν[τ]ι τῆς πλεονε[ξ]ίας ἅπασιν [φυλάττουσα, τ]οῖς δὲ ἰδί[ο]ις κινδύνοις καὶ δαπάναι[ς] κοινὴν ἀδείαν τοῖς Ἑλλη[σιν] παρασκεύ[α]ζουσα.

<sup>38</sup> So e.g. the indirect reference to the defeat of Eumolpus at E. *Ion* 277–8 in a play whose principal patriotic motif is autochthony.

<sup>39</sup> So e.g. Isoc. 7.74 is not an obvious reference to autochthony, but that such a reference is intended is made clear by the mention of Amazons *et al.* in 7.75.

because they were part of the patriotic group, but it is also possible that his plays popularized a particular version of the legends which led to their inclusion in the group. In all events, whether the legends in the group took on their ideological coloration within the funerary tradition or, as seems more likely to me at least, they were included in that tradition because of an ideological coloration they had taken on elsewhere, the process of formulating the standard list must have been completed by the time Herodotus listed the legends in his *History* (9.27).<sup>40</sup>

Earlier we saw evidence that the word *αὐτόχθων* itself was a relatively late coinage, as was the association of chthonic origins with the idea of autochthony. The most likely time for both these developments, I would suggest, was the same time that the standard list was being formulated, viz. in the period between the Persian Wars and the middle of the fifth century. Legends do not evolve by themselves: individuals devise and disseminate new versions, specifically individuals who are in a position to communicate these new versions to the populace at large. In the period of which we are speaking such individuals could only be public speakers or dramatists. There are many reasons why public speakers or dramatists might devise new versions of old legends, but in Athens in the early to mid-fifth century ideology, specifically democratic ideology, is likely to have been at least an important factor. We have already seen how the legend of autochthony was used as part of democratic ideology, asserting the political equality of all citizens and the superiority of even the humblest citizen to any non-citizen. I would argue that the legend of autochthony became prominent, and did so at this time, precisely because it could be used for this ideological purpose, and that its re-elaboration, particularly the addition of the notion of chthonic origins, served to increase its effectiveness as an ideological tool.

Fairfield University, Connecticut

VINCENT J. ROSIVACH

#### APPENDIX: 'EARTHBORN' ARCADIANs

The evidence for a chthonic origin for the Arcadians is as follows:

(1) According to Strabo (5.2.4) Ephorus had used Hesiod as his authority that the Pelasgians had originated in Arcadia, quoting Hes. frag. 161 M.-W.: *υἱεῖς ἐξεγένοντο Λυκάονος ἀντιθέοιο | ὃν ποτε τίκτε Πελασγός* – Lycaon followed Pelasgus as king of Arcadia.

(2) Pausanias (2.1.4–2.2.1) quotes Asius frag. 8 K. (quoted above, n. 14) to show that Pelasgus was born from the earth; after describing Pelasgus' reign Pausanias continues with Lycaon's.

(3) [Apoll.] *Bibl.* 3.8.1 says that, according to Hesiod, Pelasgus was *αὐτόχθων* (cf. *ibid.* 2.1.1.); he then continues by cataloguing Lycaon's wife and children (*αὐτόχθων* here would appear to be a paraphrase rather than Hesiod's own language, in which case it would mean 'born from the earth', the meaning it usually has in these later texts).<sup>41</sup>

(4) Serv. *Aen.* 2.84 glosses 'Pelasgi': *a Pelasgo Terrae filio, qui in Arcadia genitus dicitur, ut Hesiodus tradit*.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Herodotus does not include autochthony in the list, but at 9.27 the list is used to show that Athenians are better than Arcadians, and autochthony would not have been an effective argument since the Arcadians were autochthonous too (cf. Hdt. 8.73.1).

<sup>41</sup> Cf. above, n. 8.

<sup>42</sup> [Apollod.] 2.1.1. and 3.8.1. are grouped together with Serv. *Aen.* 2.84 as Hes. frag. 160 M.-W.

None of these sources says quite the same thing as the others, and their differences in detail are not easy to reconcile. Very briefly, my own reading of the evidence is that Ephorus combined the testimony of Hesiod and Asius<sup>43</sup> to argue that the Pelasgians were originally Arcadians who had spread out from Arcadia, and that the Arcadians themselves were 'autochthonous',<sup>44</sup> since they were descendants of Lycaon (as the Hesiod quotation would show) whose father Pelasgus was born from the earth (as the Asius quotation would show). Pausanias most closely follows Ephorus. The author of the *Bibliotheca* (or more probably his source), while also depending on Ephorus, passed over the less well known Asius and attributed both pieces of information to Hesiod.<sup>45</sup> Like the author of the *Bibliotheca* Servius (or his source) also depends ultimately on Ephorus, but Ephorus has now been further misconstrued to make Hesiod say apparently that Pelasgus himself was born in Arcadia.

Without a complete text of Hesiod it is impossible to prove that Hesiod did not say in some way that the Arcadians were descendants of an earthborn Pelasgus, but if he did no one in our extant sources seems to have taken notice of it before Ephorus. If on the other hand the reconstruction given above is correct, then the tradition of an earthborn ancestry for the Arcadians cannot be older than Ephorus himself. Herodotus (8.73.1), perhaps Hellanicus,<sup>46</sup> Xenophon (*HG* 7.1.23) and Demosthenes (19.261) all use the word *αὐτόχθων* to describe the Arcadians, but there is no evidence in these contexts that for these authors the word meant anything more than 'indigenous'.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>43</sup> Asius' work seems to have been a standard source for genealogical information, similar to but perhaps not quite as authoritative as Hesiod's *Eoiae* (cf. Paus. 4.2.1).

<sup>44</sup> In fact he probably used the word *αὐτόχθονες* (cf. [Scym.] 526).

<sup>45</sup> This is not difficult to do when one is dealing with excerpts and paraphrases. Note for example that in the Servius item quoted above it is impossible to say how much of this information is specifically attributed to Hesiod and how much is not.

<sup>46</sup> Harp. s.v. *autochthones* says... *αὐτόχθονες δὲ καὶ οἱ Ἀρκάδες ἦσαν, ὡς Ἑλλάνικός φησι, καὶ Αἰγινῆται καὶ Θηβαῖοι*. The flow of the Greek shows that only the part of this statement dealing with the Arcadians is to be attributed to Hellanicus (see also Jacoby's note on *FGrHist* 4 F 161). As we saw earlier (above, n. 8) when speaking of the Thebans Harpocration almost certainly means by *αὐτόχθονες* 'sprung from the earth'. In speaking of the Arcadians Harpocration may be using *αὐτόχθονες* in a similar fashion to paraphrase what Hellanicus actually said, in which case Hellanicus could have indicated in some way that the Arcadians were born from the earth. It seems more likely, however, that Hellanicus himself used the word *αὐτόχθονες*, and that Harpocration is quoting him directly; if this is the case, there is no reason to believe Hellanicus meant by it anything more than 'indigenous', no matter what Harpocration thought the word meant.

<sup>47</sup> Research for this study was supported by a Summer Stipend from the Fairfield University Faculty Research Committee. Special thanks are owed to the editors and an anonymous referee for their valuable criticism of an earlier draft of this paper.