

Rhoecus and Theodorus pioneers of bronze casting. As for the statement that the oldest bronze statue was said to be by a pupil either of Dipoenus and Scyllis or of Daedalus,<sup>86</sup> Pausanias evidently was uncertain and generally one may wonder how much accurate information was likely to have been available in the Chalkioikos at Sparta. The perusal of Overbeck's *Schriftquellen* is disillusioning.

Digressing briefly from art to dendrochronology, one can only sympathise with V.<sup>87</sup> The 26 years deducted from Central European dates before 310 BC were soon afterwards more than reinstated by the insertion of an extra 71 years in the series.<sup>88</sup> Still it would be surprising if this is the last revision of the tree-ring calendar.

V. has also proposed a bold lowering of dates for some early issues of coins.<sup>89</sup> On this I offer no comments, since I know too little about numismatics and it is not related intimately with the general revision of absolute chronology. Here, it seems to me, F. and V. have not proved their case. For the fifth century the positive evidence of the Marathon mound, Megara Hyblaea and the Delphi Charioteer confirm the conventional system. For earlier times, admittedly, we are dealing not with certainties, but probabilities: even so, on this basis F. and V. have the advantage only with the external evidence for the foundation of Naucratis, while in most other instances theirs is, taken by itself, the less likely solution and it must be remembered that by the middle of the sixth century the fixed points belong to an interlocking system. All considered the cumulative improbabilities of F. and V.'s revised chronology make it much less credible than the conventional one.

This is not to condemn their work as worthless. The conventional absolute chronology is much less sure than is often supposed and anyhow in the seventh and eighth centuries, since there are no historical correlations to disturb, it is not yet of importance except for the convenience of expressing relative dates numerically. There is too a continuing need for minor modifications of the relative chronology, for example that of much East Greek pottery; and stylistically determined sequences are always liable to be too rigid. It is a pity that because of F. and V.'s impetuous and not always impartial exposition<sup>90</sup> some useful criticisms they make may be overlooked.<sup>91</sup>

R. M. COOK

*Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge*

#### Postscript

Since this paper was submitted to *JHS*, three relevant studies have appeared. J. Boardman, *AA* 1988, 423–5 shows the difficulty for

<sup>86</sup> iii 17.6; on which V. in XII, 286.

<sup>87</sup> VII.

<sup>88</sup> J. R. Pilcher et al., *Nature* cccxii (1984) 150–2.

<sup>89</sup> XI *passim*.

<sup>90</sup> Note for example, XII and XIII, professedly reviews but in fact propaganda, and such statements as 'Mon collègue E. D. Francis et moi-même avons pu montrer . . .' (V. in edd. F. Lissarague and F. Thelamon, *Images et céramiques grecques* [Rouen 1983] 29) and 'If, as is in fact the case, stronger arguments exist . . .' (V. in ed. H. A. G. Brijder, *Ancient Greek and related pottery* [Amsterdam 1984] 97).

<sup>91</sup> J. N. Coldstream kindly read the early part of this paper and J. Boardman and A. W. Johnston the whole of it. I am very grateful to them for improvements they have made.

genealogy of F. and V.'s compression of the periods of Attic Black-figure and early Red-figure pottery. P. Amandry, *BCH* cxii (1988) 591–610 defends the authenticity of the Siphnian Treasury. F. and V., *BSA* lxxxiii (1988) 143–67 publish their heralded 'The Agora revisited'; but in effect this is concerned with relative and not absolute chronology, except for the notion that square water-shafts were the work of Persian invaders.

#### Hesiod's Father

In this note it is assumed that the bibliographical remarks in the *Works and Days* are true or anyhow true enough.

Hesiod's father started at Cyme in Aeolis. For a time he tried the sea—for trade, to judge by 631–4, where trade is regarded as the only object of seafaring. After that, to flee from poverty, he migrated to Ascra in Boeotia, where he came into possession of a farm, prosperous enough when divided between his sons to allow each of them a reasonable livelihood (37 for division; 298–307 for implication that Perse's share too was in land).

Hesiod does not say how his father obtained his farm at Ascra. The most popular explanation is that he reclaimed waste land, but there are objections. First, Hesiod does not mention reclamation as a way in which a landless man could become landed or a landed man enlarge his property, though he approved enlargement, but by purchase (341). Secondly, the property which Hesiod and Perse inherited must have been a good one, since it could support at least ten persons,<sup>1</sup> and to bring waste land to so productive a condition would have been a remarkable achievement for a man who started poor and so could not buy or hire help; if Hesiod's father did this, it would have made an excellent example of the benefits of hard work to hold up to his idle son. Of other methods of acquiring land taking it by force is very improbable and a poor man could hardly have purchased it, nor is so valuable a gift very likely. Perhaps then Hesiod's father married an heiress, the only child of a fairly prosperous farmer. This is, of source, speculation, but certainly no more so than citing the *Works and Days* as evidence for unclaimed land of fair quality in the neighbourhood of Ascra.

One may speculate further, though this does not affect the previous argument. If Hesiod's father married an heiress, how did he manage to do so? Poor men do at times make good marriages; but though sexual attraction can be enough, it helps if they have some social qualification. A qualification of sorts, according to the *Odyssey* (xvii 302–6), was recognised for *aidoi*, and perhaps Hesiod's father had some skill in their art. Not much is known about *aidoi*. According again to the *Odyssey* there seems to have been an *aidos* among the retainers of Odysseus (i 153–4 etc.), Agamemnon (iii 267), Menelaus (iv 17) and Alcinoos (viii 43–4 etc.), but those were great kings, while the *basileis* round Ascra were much lesser magnates, who might not have had the means or even the desire to keep a permanent *aidos*; Hesiod himself, it may be noted, successful enough to win a competition at Chalcis, presumably practised

<sup>1</sup> Hesiod's share, to judge by his recommendations, could support the owner, presumably a wife and perhaps children, two or more male slaves (469–71, 502, 607–8) and a female one (602–3). Perse's share presumably had a similar potential.

*aoide* only as a sideline to farming, though that might have been because farming provided a better living. Nor do we know the comparative standards or supply of *aidoi* in different parts of the Greek world and whether a performer reckoned indifferent in Aeolis would have had a more appreciative reception in Boeotia. But argument of this sort is bound to be nebulous. The one merit of the suggestion is that it explains how Hesiod learnt the technique of *aoide* without the need to postulate sufficient rhapsodic activity in Thespiæ or a regular celebration of Mouseia near Ascra.<sup>2</sup> It may be objected that, if Hesiod had learnt *aoide* from his father, he would have said so; but it would hardly have been relevant information or even perhaps proper, since it is the Muses he credits with his teaching (*Th.* 22).

R. M. COOK

*Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge*

<sup>2</sup> So M. L. West, though tentatively (*Hesiod, Works and Days* [Oxford, 1978] 31). On the puzzling Doric elements in Hesiod's dialect, to which also he refers, I offer no opinion.

### Pelops and Sicily: The Myth of Pindar *Ol.* 1

In the myth of Pelops in *Ol.* 1.25–93, Pindar makes various selections, elaborations and innovations<sup>1</sup> of the mythic material available to him. Kakridis has shown that the mention of Zeus' house (line 42), of the anxiety of one of Pelops' parents (46) and of wondrous horses (87) makes the story conform to that of Ganymede, which Pindar cites as a parallel in lines 43–5, while other choices, which cannot be so explained, Kakridis attributes to Pindar's striving for variation.<sup>2</sup>

Krischer has further shown that in lines 65–94, the explicit parallel with Ganymede is replaced by an implicit parallel with Achilles. Achilles has an ally in battle (Thetis), a divinity to whom he prays alone by the sea-shore (*Il.* i 349–50), who suddenly appears to him (*Il.* i 359), and to whom he claims to prefer a short life with honour to a long inglorious one (*Il.* xviii 155–21). So too, Pelops has a divine patron (Poseidon) as a result of his earlier erotic liaison. He prays to him alone by the shore (*Ol.* 1.71–2), claiming not to want to 'sit in darkness and digest a no-name old age in vain apart from all glory' (82–4). According to Krischer, Pindar's reasoning in choosing Achilles as a model is this: Pelops defeats Oenomaus not through the treachery of Myrtilus but by receiving a magic chariot from a patron god as Achilles received magic armour from a patron goddess. The best god to give horses is Poseidon Hippios, but Pelops is not his son as Achilles was Thetis', therefore the relationship of Pelops to Poseidon could have been erotic (on the model of Ganymede), a

motivation that allows the poet to deny that gods are cannibals.<sup>3</sup>

As Pindar has shaped his myth, it can be seen to have five 'acts'. (1) Poseidon sees the young Pelops and, falling in love with him on account of his ivory shoulder, which is a birth-mark,<sup>4</sup> abducts him 'on golden horses'<sup>5</sup> (line 41) to Zeus' house on Olympus (lines 36–45). (2) A search-party fails to bring him to his mother (46). (This lets a jealous neighbour spread the rumour that the gods have eaten Pelops, 47–51.) (3) Tantalus cannot control his delight at his new connection with the Olympians, tries to feed nectar and ambrosia to mortals, and is punished (54–64). (4) As a corollary to his punishment, the gods send Pelops back to earth (65–6). (5) Although returned to earth, Pelops retains a connection with Poseidon. When he seeks to defeat Oenomaus and win the hand of Hippodameia, he appeals to Poseidon, who provides the chariot he needs to win (67–89).

This myth is integrated with the local mythology of Sicily. One myth dominates all others in Sicily: that of Demeter and Kore, who in another facet of her personality is Persephone, the queen of Aidoneus in the underworld.<sup>6</sup> Sicily's fruitfulness (πολυμάλω/ Σικελία *Ol.* 1.12–13) is attributed to Demeter Μαλοφόρος<sup>7</sup>. *Insulam Siciliam totam esse Cereri et Liberae consecratam*, writes Cicero (*Verr.* ii 4.48 [106]; cf. *Diod.* v 2.3). Zeus gave Sicily to Persephone (*Nem.* 1.13–18) as a wedding gift (τοῖς ἀνακαλυπτηρίοις Schol. ad *Nem.* 1.16) after Aidoneus had raped her on the slopes of Aetna (Schol. ad *Nem.* 1.20). The Sicilian setting for the rape is maintained (against the vaguer account of the *Hymn.*

<sup>3</sup> T. Krischer, *Grazer Beiträge* x (1981) 69–75.

<sup>4</sup> I interpret the narrative of *Ol.* 1.25–51 as follows. Lines 25–6 (kephalaion): the third event of the true story; Poseidon abducts Pelops. Lines 26–7 (archa): this may be interpreted either as the first event of the true story, in which case it would be translated as, 'since from an untainted bath, the goddess of birth had drawn him . . . with an ivory birthmark,' or as the fourth and last event of the false story, in which case it would be translated as, 'when from a purifying stew-pot, the goddess of rebirth (?) drew him . . . with an ivory prosthesis'. On a second reading, we must choose the first interpretation, but on a first it remains ambiguous. Lines 28–36 (gnome): Pindar will tell the true story for the first time. Lines 37–9: the second event of the true story, which is the same as the first event of the false story; Tantalus invites the gods to dinner. Lines 40–5 (kephalaion-ring): the third event of the true story; Poseidon abducts Pelops. Lines 46–7 (beginning of the terminal exploits): the fourth event of the true story; a jealous neighbour circulates the false tale. Lines 48–50: the second event of the false tale; the gods cook Pelops. Line 51: the third event of the false tale; the gods eat Pelops.

This interpretation (above all as regards the ivory shoulder) is not universally accepted. See G. Kirkwood, *Selections from Pindar = American Philological Association Textbook Series* vii (Chico, Ca. 1982) ad 26–7 and D. E. Gerber, *Pindar's Olympian One: a commentary* (Toronto 1982) note ad 27 (page 58). This is an important point for the interpretation of the ode, but it does not effect the present argument.

<sup>5</sup> The importance of horses in various parts of the poem has been well discussed by A. Köhnken, *CQ* xxiv (1974) 199–206.

<sup>6</sup> See E. A. Freeman, *History of Sicily from the earliest times* (Oxford 1891) appendix xi 1.530–542; T. J. Dunbabin, *The western Greeks: the history of Sicily and South Italy from the foundation of the Greek colonies to 480 BC* (Oxford 1948) 176–81; and G. Zuntz, *Persephone: three essays on religion and thought in Magna Graecia* (Oxford 1971) 70–5.

<sup>7</sup> See W. M. Calder III, *The inscription from Temple G at Selinus, Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Monographs* iv (1963) 31–32, and A. Landi, *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia della Università di Napoli* xxv (1972–3) 19–22.

<sup>1</sup> The exact nature and degree of Pindar's innovation in the myth of *Ol.* 1 is uncertain. It is clear, however, that some degree of innovation has taken place (cf. σὲ δ' ἀντία προτέρων φθέγγομαι 36). For a review of the evidence, see J. G. Howie, in F. Cairns, ed., *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* iv (1984) 277–313.

<sup>2</sup> J. T. Kakridis, *Philologus* lxxxv (1930) 463–77 = W. M. Calder III and J. Stern edd., *Pindaros und Bakchylides, Wege der Forschung* cxxxiv (Darmstadt 1970) 175–90, esp. 183 (this and subsequent references are to the pages in the *Wege der Forschung* volume).