

derives from that employed by Winnington-Ingram in his transcription of *POslo* 1413.<sup>13</sup>

In this transcription one can see that the melody follows the contour of the pitch-accent by rising to its highest pitch for the accented syllable.<sup>14</sup> If the word before *ἀείσωμεν* is in fact *θεὸν* then the pitch over its grave-accented syllable correctly lies lower than the accented syllable of the following word. In following the pitch-accent contour, the melody of this inscription resembles that of such other hymns as the Delphic (2nd cent. BC), those by Mesomedes (2nd cent. AD), the Seikilos inscription (1st cent. AD), the Oslo papyrus (1st–2nd cent. AD), *POxy* 2436 (1st–2nd cent. AD), the Michigan papyrus (2nd cent. AD), the Berlin paian (2nd–3rd cent. AD), and *POxy* 1786 (3rd–4th cent. AD).<sup>15</sup>

That the line of music might end on the ‘borrowed’ note has a striking parallel in the very dramatically and melodically rendered *Αἴαν* at the phrase end of the second line of the (roughly contemporary) Berlin tragic fragment (17). And to the melisma *ZΘ* jumping the entire length of a tetrachord from ‘standing’ *mesē* (*Z*) to ‘standing’ *nētē synēmmenōn* (*Θ*), one might compare the unaccented ultima of  $\epsilon[\nu]<\delta>\acute{\omicron}[\mu]\nu\chi\omicron\nu$  in line 2a of *POslo* 1413 (*mesē* to *nētē synēmmenōn*), the accented antepenult of  $\chi\omicron\rho\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$  in line 2 of *POxy* 2436 (*nētē synēmmenōn* [= *paranētē diezeugmenōn*] to *mesē*), and several other loci. To this inscription’s intraverbal tetrachordal movement (systemic modulation) from *E* (*tritē synēmmenōn*) to *N* (*lichanos mesōn*) above *-ov*, one might compare those in line 17 of the first Delphic hymn ( $\tau\omega\text{-}\acute{\omega}\nu$ : *tritē hyperbolaiōn* to *nētē synēmmenōn*) and in line 1 of the Zenon papyrus ( $\sigma\omicron\iota\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\prime\ \acute{\epsilon}\text{-}$ : *tritē synēmmenōn* to *lichanos mesōn* to *tritē synēmmenōn*).

The reason for the presence of just one line of musical notation is not clear and the phenomenon is unparalleled. One cannot assume that all subsequent lines were to be sung to the same sequence of notes, and the notes above the first line do not seem to be establishing a *tropos* from which a musician could improvise the rest of the hymn; they are not in scalar order, some notes seem to be repeated, and there is no parallel for such a theoretical scale at the introduction of a piece of ancient Greek sung poetry.<sup>16</sup> It is puzzling as well that this exhortation for the worshippers to ‘sing’ might be the only musically notated word in the hymn, since very few of the worshippers would be able to read the music and those present frequently would certainly have memorized the phrase.

Despite all the perplexities and uncertainties found in reading, analyzing, and transcribing this brief piece of third-century votive poetry, what does become clear is that from the third-century renaissance of interest in hygienic cults at Epidaurus there may now have been

found at least one example of an inscribed, musically notated hymn to Apollo and other deities. We may now have three votive musical inscriptions ranging in date from the second century BC to the third century AD and a musical epitaph from the first or second century AD. The range of date for these four stone inscriptions suggests to us that the practice of cutting musical notation into stone can no longer be assigned only to several flukes recovered one century ago. While all the discoveries of new musical fragments since the 1890s had been in the area of papyrology,<sup>17</sup> there is now at least hope that further excavation in religious sanctuaries might turn up more musically notated offerings more complete and more reliably copied than this extremely fragmentary hexameter, Hyperionian chromatic curiosity.<sup>18</sup>

JON SOLOMON

University of Arizona

<sup>17</sup> *PBerlin* in 1918, *POxy* 1786 in 1922, *PZenon* 59533 in 1931, *POslo* in 1955, *POxy* 2436 in 1959, *PMich* 2858 in 1965, *PLeiden* inv. 510 in 1973, and *POxy* 3161 and 3162 in 1976.

<sup>18</sup> I would like to thank Profs Thomas J. Mathiesen of Brigham Young University and Michael W. Haslam of UCLA for their careful reading of this paper and subsequent criticisms and suggestions. I am grateful as well to M. Mitsos and Alcibiades N. Oikonomides for calling the inscription to my attention.

### Alexander’s brothers?

Our knowledge of the early life of Alexander the Great is based upon very slender literary evidence. Arrian devotes only a few sentences to the years prior to Alexander’s campaigns. Plutarch’s coverage of Alexander’s youth is also very condensed, and both he and Arrian rely almost exclusively upon pro-Alexander sources such as Ptolemy and Aristoboulos. The books of Curtius which deal with the early years of Alexander have been lost, and Diodorus’ coverage is as usual very scanty. Justin’s epitome of Trogus is among our longest and most comprehensive accounts, but it is often rhetorically unreliable and careless with details. Yet apart from occasional flashbacks and allusions in these sources and a few fragments of other historians, this evidence—heavily biased, meager, and unreliable as it is—comprises all we know concerning the first twenty years of Alexander’s life.

Naturally facts are difficult to establish when all our extant sources are so unsatisfactory, and grotesque distortions are relatively easy to produce. Earlier this century, W. W. Tarn managed to create a pristine-pure Alexander the Just by explaining away all contrary evidence as hostile propaganda fabricated by Alexander’s enemies to blacken his name.<sup>1</sup>

I wish to thank E. Badian and A. B. Bosworth for many valuable discussions and helpful suggestions made during the preparation of this paper; I also wish to thank several anonymous referees for their useful comments. Obviously, none of these persons should be held responsible for those errors which still remain, nor for the arguments presented. I am grateful to Harvard University, the Westinghouse Corporation, and the Winston Churchill Foundation for their financial support during the preparation of this paper.

<sup>1</sup> The extreme nature of Tarn’s views is well-demonstrated by a passage relating to the topic of this paper. In his *Alexander the Great: sources and studies* ii (Cambridge 1948) 260–2, he acquits Alexander of the murder of his brother Karanos by ‘debunking’ Karanos’ existence,

<sup>13</sup> Eitrem–Amundsen–Winnington-Ingram (n. 12) 62, line 7 over  $\text{-}\acute{\delta}\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\iota\alpha$ .

<sup>14</sup> For the contour over an uncircumflexed diphthong, cf. *POxy* 1786.3 ( $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\nu\omicron\acute{\upsilon}\nu\tau\omega\nu$ ).

<sup>15</sup> For the most part the pitch sung to the accented syllable stands higher than the pitches used on the previous, unaccented syllables of the same word. The rules for accentual corresponsion as outlined in Pöhlmann 140 need re-examination. Cf. *POxy* 1786.5 ( $\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\nu$ ) and *POxy* 3161. 8–9.

<sup>16</sup> Several pieces from the *Anonymus Bellermanni* (Pöhlmann nos 8, 9, 11) are in ascending scalar order, but these ‘exercises’ with instrumental notation are not attached to any text.

Arguments from silence are also particularly questionable in view of the sources' character. Amyntas Perdikkou was a leading figure at the court of Alexander's father Philip, being the son of Philip's brother and predecessor; Amyntas may even have reigned for a few years of his infancy before Philip his guardian usurped the throne.<sup>2</sup> Several casual allusions in our sources make it clear that upon his accession, Alexander murdered Amyntas, accusing him of conspiracy;<sup>3</sup> yet only Justin explicitly mentions the killing,<sup>4</sup> and Plutarch's *Alexander* (for example) never even hints at Amyntas' existence.

We must bear these facts in mind as we consider the evidence concerning Alexander's brothers. Although a fragment of Satyros lists among Philip's various children only two sons, Alexander and his feeble-minded half-brother Arridaios,<sup>5</sup> Justin mentions one or more other sons. In describing the circumstances of Philip's assassination, Justin states that Alexander 'feared his brother begot of a step-mother as his rival for the kingdom; and had been thereby moved to quarrel with his father' ('Alexandrum quoque regni aemulum fratrem ex noverca susceptum timuisse; eoque factum ut in convivio antea primum cum Attalo mox cum ipso patre iurgaret').<sup>6</sup> The purpose of the first half of the sentence is to set the scene for Alexander's dispute with Attalos at the wedding of Philip and Attalos' niece Kleopatra. Hence it has been generally supposed that the 'brother' is a hypothetical unborn son of Kleopatra and that Alexander feared the loss of his position as heir to such a future son.<sup>7</sup> However, a closer examination of Justin renders this view implausible. Justin later tells how Alexander, during the aftermath of Philip's assassination, 'took care likewise to have Karanos, his brother begot of a step-mother, his rival for the kingdom, slain' ('aemulum quoque imperii Caranum fratrem ex noverca susceptum interfici curavit').<sup>8</sup> There can be little doubt that the two sentences are parallel and refer to the same brother: *aemulum imperii* matches *aemulum regni*, *fratrem ex noverca susceptum* is exactly duplicated,

and closes his account with the words: 'Alexander did commit two [sic] murders in his day; there is no need to invent a third which he could not have committed.' A naive reader is liable to exhaust Tarn's quota of killings in a single sentence of our Alexander sources; and E. Badian forcefully depicts the bloody character of Alexander's later reign of terror in *JHS* lxxxii (1961) 16–43 and *Studies in Greek and Roman history* (Oxford 1964) 192–205.

<sup>2</sup> See J. R. Ellis, *Philip II and Macedonian imperialism* (London 1976) 15–22 for the sources and a good discussion of the evidence.

<sup>3</sup> References to Amyntas' alleged conspiracy are in Plut. *de fort. Alex.* 1.3, Curt. vi 9.17, 10.24; while in Arr. *An.* i 5.4, Alexander offers a foreign king the hand of Kynna, his half-sister and the erstwhile wife (and current widow?) of Amyntas.

<sup>4</sup> Justin xii 6.14–15.

<sup>5</sup> Satyros in Ath. xiii 557, on which see A. D. Tronson, *JHS* cv (1984) 116–26.

<sup>6</sup> Justin ix 7.3.

<sup>7</sup> Tarn (n. 1) 260 argues this interpretation of the passage, and the same view is held either explicitly or implicitly by N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith, *A history of Macedonia* ii (Oxford 1979) 681 n. 1; Ellis (n. 3) 214; and R. Lane Fox, *Alexander the Great* (London 1973) 503. W. Heckel, *RFIC* cvii (1979) 386–7 considers the alternative possibility simply to dismiss it. H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (Munich 1926) s.v. 'Karanos' argued that Karanos was Phila's son, but his reasoning was very weak (see n. 27 below).

<sup>8</sup> Justin xi 2.3.

and the structure of the two sentences is quite similar.<sup>9</sup> On the other hand, it is very unlikely that Justin is describing Karanos as an infant son of Kleopatra; he specifically states that Kleopatra's child was a daughter, and describes her death at the hands of Olympias (without Alexander's apparent complicity).<sup>10</sup>

Satyros' fragment lists Kleopatra's child as a daughter named Europe.<sup>11</sup> According to Diodorus, Kleopatra had borne a child (*παιδίον*) to Philip a few days before his death.<sup>12</sup> Only Pausanias claims that the infant was a son: 'And when Philip died, Olympias took his baby son (*παῖδα νήπιον*), the child of Attalos' niece Kleopatra, and murdered the child and the mother together by dragging them onto a bronze oven filled with fire.'<sup>13</sup> It has been suggested<sup>14</sup> that these accounts may be reconciled by the hypothesis that Kleopatra bore two children to Philip, first a daughter named Europe, then a son named Karanos, but this is unlikely. Justin never claims that Karanos was Kleopatra's son. More significantly, none of our sources imply that Kleopatra had two children; in each account, only a single child is mentioned. Then too, Kleopatra's marriage to Philip seems far too short to have permitted the births of two children.<sup>15</sup> Finally, the statement of Pausanias—the only tangible evidence that Kleopatra bore a son—is very weak, and probably represents an embellishment of the indeterminately-sexed 'child' (*παιδίον*) of an earlier source.<sup>16</sup> Taken together, the testimony of our sources makes it likely that Kleopatra had only one child, a daughter.

Alexander's quarrel with Attalos at the marriage feast is not difficult to understand within this framework. With his mother Olympias having been displaced by Kleopatra, Alexander probably viewed Attalos' taunts as a sign that his own position as heir was in jeopardy.

<sup>9</sup> On this point I am in complete agreement with Tarn (n. 1) 260 and Heckel (n. 7) 387.

<sup>10</sup> Justin xi 7.12.

<sup>11</sup> Satyros (n. 5).

<sup>12</sup> Diod. xvii 2.

<sup>13</sup> Paus. viii 7.7.

<sup>14</sup> Lane Fox (n. 7) 503–5.

<sup>15</sup> With the political aftermath of Chaironeia occupying his attention, it is unlikely that Philip returned to Macedonia to marry Kleopatra until after the meeting at Korinth; this would place the marriage in spring or summer 337. Diod. xvii 2.3 says that Kleopatra's child was born a few days before Philip's death in summer 336. This would fit well, and two births are impossible. Lane Fox (n. 14) is driven to the wildly implausible conclusion that Kleopatra was already many months pregnant at the time of her marriage to Philip. The general case against two births is well-argued by Heckel (n. 7) 389–93 and the issue of the date of the marriage is discussed by Ellis (n. 2) 301 n. 1, 302 n. 4.

<sup>16</sup> Pausanias' full account is: ἐπὶ δὲ Φιλίππῳ τελευτήσαντι Φιλίππου παῖδα νήπιον, γεγονότα δὲ ἐκ Κλεοπάτρας ἀδελφιδῆς Ἀττάλου, τοῦτον τὸν παῖδα ὁμοῦ τῇ μητρὶ Ὀλυμπίας ἐπὶ σκευῶς χαλκοῦ πυρὸς ὑποβελημένον διέφθειρεν ἔλκουσα. Nowhere does the actual word 'son' (*υἱός*) appear. Only two phrases specify the sex of the child: *παῖδα νήπιον γεγονότα* and *τοῦτον τὸν παῖδα*. Both of these imply a masculine child, but the impression they give is that Pausanias' own confidence in the certainty of his information (or his memory) was not firm. The absence of the word 'son' makes it easy to imagine that Pausanias embellished the indeterminately-sexed *παιδίον* of Diodorus or some other source into a masculine *παῖδα νήπιον* or *τὸν παῖδα*. An anonymous referee was kind enough to point out that a parallel embellishment may have occurred in the case of Julia's baby born in 54 BC, apparently a daughter (Plut. *Pomp.* 53.5; Dio xxxix 64) but sometimes called a son (Vell. ii 47.2; *nepos* at Suet. *Caes.* 26.1 and Lucan ix 1049).

He did not fear a hypothetical unborn (and unconceived!) son of Kleopatra, but his younger brother Karanos, who was obviously much more of a threat. Similarly, he was later to fear (momentarily) even feeble-minded Arridaios as a rival (an absurd possibility, which demonstrates the irrational nature of Alexander's suspicion).<sup>17</sup>

Justin gives further evidence concerning the existence of Alexander's brothers. Following his account of the assassination of Philip, he states:<sup>18</sup> 'Philippus genuit ex Larissaea saltatrice filium Aridaeum qui post Alexandrum regnavit. habuit et alios multos ex variis matrimoniis regio more susceptos qui partim fato partim ferro periere.' The phrase *alios multos* almost certainly refers to sons (cf. *filium* in the previous sentence) rather than to children in general, since otherwise Justin presumably would have added a word such as *liberos*; and *partim ferro periere* can hardly refer to brothers of Alexander who died naturally in infancy or childhood.

What became of these brothers? The answer is plain: Alexander killed them. The practice of eliminating rival half-brothers was virtually universal among polygamous monarchies. Philip had killed his own three half-brothers;<sup>19</sup> Persian rulers often slaughtered dozens.<sup>20</sup> As seen above, Justin explicitly states that Alexander killed his rival half-brother Karanos. A later passage in Justin mentions that Alexander, before embarking on the Persian War, slew all his stepmother's relatives (*omnes novercae suae cognatos*),<sup>21</sup> as well as all of his own 'who seemed fit for kingship' (*suus qui apti regno videbantur*) in order to prevent any chance of sedition while he was far away.<sup>22</sup> Clearly *suos cognatos* includes Amyntas, who was killed around this time,<sup>23</sup> but aside from half-brothers, it is difficult to imagine what other names would explain the plural (and the sole survivor, Arridaios, who was emphatically not 'fit for the kingship', is the exception which supports the rule). An additional passage in Justin raises this implication of general fratricide to an explicit statement of fact. Following his murder of Kleitos, Alexander laments and recounts his various murders:<sup>24</sup> 'tunc Parmenion et Philotas, tunc Amyntas consobrinus, tunc noverca fratresque interfecti; tunc Attalos, Eurylochus, Pausanias aliique Macedoniae extincti principes occurrebant.' *Fratres* is explicitly plural.

Our evidence for the existence of Alexander's brothers has come from Justin, and as mentioned, Justin is not always reliable as an epitomizer of Trogus' history. However, while it is plausible that Justin occasionally garbled or rhetorically distorted sections of Trogus (e.g. apparently having Alexander blame himself in the passage above for the murder of his stepmother Kleopatra, who was actually Olympias' victim), it seems highly unlikely that Justin simply invented all these widely separated references to Karanos and to Alexander's other brothers. It seems

undeniable that Trogus repeatedly mentioned these brothers.

Therefore the issue comes down to weighing the statements of Justin—Trogus against the silence of our other sources. The fragment of Satyros is concerned with Philip's marriages rather than with his children and mentions only those children who played a significant role in history; the sole exception, Kleopatra's daughter Europe, is listed apart from the others, almost as an afterthought. The very brief nature of our other sources has already been discussed, and it must be remembered that pro-Alexander sources such as Ptolemy and Aristoboulos would have balked at portraying their hero as a fratricide. In any event, if we are willing to accept the existence of Karanos (as some scholars do),<sup>25</sup> then the argument from silence immediately becomes invalid: if one brother of Alexander slipped through the cracks of Satyros and our other sources, other brothers may have done the same, especially since they were much less important than Karanos, whom Alexander feared as his chief rival. The explicit evidence of Justin—Trogus—who is perhaps our earliest main Alexander source—should outweigh the silence of our other sources. Alexander had brothers, whom he murdered when he came to the throne.<sup>26</sup>

If we accept this idea, our picture of Macedon under Philip II must be redrawn. There was Alexander, Philip's (probably) eldest son and likely successor; there was Arridaios, roughly of Alexander's age (or perhaps even a little older), whose mental inability left him a cipher in succession intrigues; there were Alexander's various sisters, possibly more than just those significant ones mentioned by Satyros; and there were Alexander's younger brothers and their mothers, each (undoubtedly) continually intriguing on behalf of her sons. Since Karanos is singled out by Justin as being Alexander's rival, it is likely that he was the eldest of these brothers, perhaps in his late teens at the time of Philip's death (unfortunately we have no clue as to the identity of his mother).<sup>27</sup>

It might be argued that strong-willed Olympias

<sup>25</sup> E.g. Lane Fox (n. 7) 503, Ellis (n. 2) 306 n. 54, and S. Hornblower, *The Greek world, 479–323 BC* (London 1983) 262, to name a few recent authors. Various other references to the supporters of the existence of Karanos (whether as a son of Kleopatra or some other wife) are collected by Heckel (n. 7).

of Philip's other seven wives; this is so thin as to be non-existent. Strangely enough, Berve also claims that Phila (a sister of Dardas and

<sup>26</sup> The existence of other brothers (and sisters) besides those mentioned in the fragment of Satyros may help to resolve another puzzle: Philip's fecundity. As it stands, for Philip to have had only six surviving children after twenty-five years of marriage to a total of seven wives seems implausible. Philip's fertility must have been high, for at the age of forty-seven he obtained a child from his last wife Kleopatra after only about one year of marriage.

<sup>27</sup> The suggestion that Karanos was the son of Phila, Philip's second wife, was accepted by Berve (n. 7) and followed by half-a-dozen other (mostly German) scholars in the last hundred years; see Heckel (n. 7) 386 n. 1 for the list. The main argument is that Satyros lists no children for Phila, though he does list children for five Machatas of Illyria) was the only 'social peer' of Olympias, and hence only a son of hers could be a rival to Alexander. This is completely untrue (as far as we can judge such things): Audata came from the royal Illyrian house, Meda was a daughter of the Thracian king, Kleopatra was the niece of a leading Macedonian noble, and even Philinna and Nikesipolis (about whose social background we know nothing) are usually assumed to have come from aristocratic Thessalian families.

<sup>17</sup> Plut. *Alex.* 10.

<sup>18</sup> Justin ix 8.2–4.

<sup>19</sup> Justin viii 3.10–12.

<sup>20</sup> E.g. Justin x 1–2.

<sup>21</sup> The murder of Attalos, Kleopatra's uncle is well-known (Diod. xvii 2.5). Probably Kleopatra's brother Hipprostratos and various other relatives also fell in the purge.

<sup>22</sup> Justin xi 5.1–3.

<sup>23</sup> See n. 3 above.

<sup>24</sup> Justin xii 6.14–15.

would never have permitted Philip to keep his other wives at court or even to continue to consort with them, but this is clearly false. Satyros explicitly tells us that Philip 'brought home' Thracian Meda as another wife besides Olympias (around 342),<sup>28</sup> just as he later did with Kleopatra.<sup>29</sup> Once Alexander was the well-established crown prince, say by about 339, Olympias' influence may have risen considerably; perhaps Philip sent his other wives to live away from court around this time (also partly to enhance his image as a Hellene by removing the stigma of an 'oriental harem'). But during the first decade of Philip's reign, Olympias cannot have had overwhelming influence over her husband: she was not Philip's first wife, nor his only high-born one, nor (as yet) the mother of the certain successor. And it was probably during these years that Karanos and most of Alexander's other rival half-brothers were born.

RON K. UNZ

*Churchill College, Cambridge*

<sup>28</sup> See Ellis (n. 2) 166–7.

<sup>29</sup> Satyros (n. 5). The same verb *ἐπεισάγω* is used in each case.

### Hesiod's Titans

In the opening lines of the *Eumenides* Aeschylus' Pythia says that the first prophetic deity at Delphi was Gaia. She was followed by two of her daughters in succession, Themis and Phoibe. Phoibe gave the oracle to Phoibos as a birthday present, and it is from her that he had his name.

Gaia and Themis are mentioned elsewhere as early proprietors of the oracle,<sup>1</sup> and they have other associations with prophecy. Phoibe, however, is not otherwise mentioned in this connexion. Indeed, she is not much spoken of at all. Hesiod lists her among his Titans, and makes her the mother of Leto and Asteria by her brother Koios (*Th.* 136, 404 ff.); she is thus the grandmother of Apollo, Artemis, and Hecate. A few authors repeat this genealogy, but for the rest, there is no more to say of her. Antimachus referred to her as *Γαιής* (fr. 116 Wyss), but we do not know what for.

It is understandable that Wilamowitz should have dismissed her as 'eine leere Füllfigur' among the Titans, 'die ihren Namen von dem Sohne der Leto hat'. In the *Eumenides* too, he considers, she is merely a stopgap: Aeschylus took the name from Hesiod to make the transition from Themis to Phoibos.<sup>2</sup> There is, however, no apparent reason why any intermediary between Themis and Phoibos should be necessary. Pindar, Euripides, and Aristonoos are all quite content for Apollo to take over directly from Gaia and/or Themis, whether by force or peaceably; in Ephorus' account he and Themis established the oracle together.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Pind. fr. 55, Eur. *IT* 1245–69 (cf. *Or.* 164), Ephorus *FGrH* 70 F 31, Aristonoos i 21 f. (Powell, *Coll. Alex.* 163), Diod. xvi 26.3 (cf. 5.67.4), Ov. *M.* i 321, 4.643, Lucan v 81, Apollod. i 22, Plut. *Pyth. Orac.* 402d, *Def. Orac.* 421c, 433e, Paus. x 5.5–6 (citing Musaeus, DK 2 B 11), Orph. *H.* 79, sch. Pind. *Pyth.* hypoth. p. 2.6 Dr., Harpocr. (Phot. *Suda EM*) s.v. *θεμισοτεύειν* (citing Aeschylus); Themis sitting on the tripod, RF vase Berlin 2538.

<sup>2</sup> *Sitz. Ber. Preuss. Ak.* 1929, 44 = *Kl. Schr.* v(2) 170 = *Kronos und die Titanen. Zeus* (Darmstadt 1964) 16. In my note on Hes. *Th.* 136 I took a similar view.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Plut. *De Herod. malign.* 860d.

I think we should regard Phoibe not as Aeschylus' arbitrary interpolation into the succession but as a figure given to him by Delphic tradition. It would not seem to have been a tradition of much vigour or substance. What it said, in essence, was that before Phoibos became the god of the oracle it belonged to a goddess who had the same title, Phoibe. With this much given, it was natural to postulate a genetic relationship between the two. Phoibos could not be the son of Phoibe, because he was Apollo, was he not, and Apollo's mother was undeniably Leto. Leto was not an oracular goddess,<sup>4</sup> and could hardly be identified with Phoibe. But Phoibe could be made her mother and Phoibos' grandmother. It was from his grandmother, then, that Phoibos acquired the oracle. And since he came into possession of it on his birthday, the seventh of Bysios (for this was, in cult, the day when his return to Delphi was celebrated, and in early times the one day in the year when oracles were given<sup>5</sup>), it was natural to say that she gave it to him as a birthday present.

The evidence of archaeology tends to confirm that at Delphi, as at certain other Greek sites, the dominant male deity of archaic and classical cult was preceded by a goddess. J. N. Coldstream has summarized the picture that emerges from the material record as follows:<sup>6</sup>

In late Mycenaean times, worship of a female deity is suggested by an accumulation of over two hundred female terracotta figurines, mainly of the twelfth century B.C. . . . Her cult lapsed during the Dark Age, but it is unlikely that the sanctity of the place was ever forgotten. Then, after three centuries without votive offerings, the worship of Apollo became firmly established when relations with Corinth were opened around 800 B.C.

Coldstream assumes, as others have,<sup>7</sup> that the Mycenaean goddess was remembered in the Greek tradition as Ge. The problem of continuity, however, is acute, and others again have adopted a sceptical stance. Perhaps the thread of tradition reaches back only to the ninth or eighth century. Even so, it is plausible that it should have preserved genuine memories of a goddess with whom divination was associated before Apollo assumed responsibility for it. At Aigeira, directly across the Corinthian Gulf from Crisa, there was an oracle of Ge, at which the procedure resembled that at Delphi inasmuch as the prophecies were delivered by a priestess who had to be chaste and who descended into a cavern to get her information.<sup>8</sup>

Aeschylus is the only author (except for Sch. Eur. *Or.* 164) who gives a succession of oracular goddesses, and this is evidently a construction to accommodate concur-

<sup>4</sup> See Wehrli, *RE*supp. v (1931) 564.14 ff., for honours she received at Delphi as Apollo's mother; she had no independent significance there.

<sup>5</sup> Callisthenes (*FGrH* 124 F 49) and Anaxandrides *ap.* Plut. *Q. Gr.* 292ef.

<sup>6</sup> *Geometric Greece* (London 1977) 178 f.

<sup>7</sup> E.g. Demangel, *BCH* 46 (1922) 507; M. P. Nilsson, *The Minoan–Mycenaean Religion*<sup>2</sup> (Lund 1950) 467–8; H. W. Parke and D. E. W. Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*<sup>2</sup> i 7.

<sup>8</sup> Plin. *NH* xxviii 147, cf. Paus. vii 25.13. She had to drink bull's blood (generally considered a deadly poison: Hdt. iii 15.4, Soph. fr. 178 Radt, *Ar. Eq.* 83, etc.). Drinking blood is not attested for Delphi, but at the oracle of Apollo Deiradiotes at Argos, said to have been founded from Delphi, the prophetess drank the blood of a lamb sacrificed in the night before the monthly séance, and this was what brought her into the state of divine possession (Paus. ii 24.1; cf. *Od.* xi 95 ff. (Teiresias), and J. G. Frazer, *The Magic Art (Golden Bough*<sup>3</sup> i [1911]) i 381–3).