

‘EUMELOS’: A CORINTHIAN EPIC CYCLE?*

Abstract: The author surveys the evidence for the three antiquarian epics commonly ascribed to Eumelos: the *Titanomachy*, *Korinthiaka* and *Europia*. He elucidates and restores details, and endeavours to grasp their poets’ objectives. He argues that they were products of the Corinthian-Sikyonian sphere, and to a degree mutually complementary; that they were composed between the late seventh and the late sixth century, considerably after the supposed lifetime of Eumelos; and that they were perhaps attributed to him for lack of other claimants, he being famous as the Corinthian poet of the Messenians’ treasured Prosodion.

AMONG the reputed authors of early epic poems, few of whom can be pinned down as creatures of flesh and blood, Eumelos of Corinth stands out as one of the solid figures. We are offered more definite biographical information about him than about most of that crepuscular fraternity. According to Pausanias (2.1.1) he was the son of Amphilytos and a member of the famous Bacchiad family that ruled Corinth up to the time of Kypselos. He was credited with the authorship of a Prosodion, a processional song, that the Messenians performed for Apollo on Delos, and in Pausanias’ opinion this was his only genuine work. It is supposed to have been composed in the time of the Messenian king Phintas, in the generation before the first Messenian War.¹ That should mean some time in the mid eighth century. It is in harmony with this that Eumelos is said to have overlapped with Archias, his fellow-Bacchiad who founded Syracuse around 734. Eusebius’ *Chronicle* offers similar datings.²

Besides the Prosodion, a number of more substantial poems – epics – were at least sometimes attributed to Eumelos: the *Titanomachy*, *Korinthiaka*, a *Europia*, a Νόστος τῶν Ἑλλήνων, a *Bougonia*. The last two are mentioned in only one source each. The title *Bougonia*³ suggests a didactic poem about cattle-breeding (cf. Varro, *De re rustica* 2.5.5), but there is no other trace of such a work. The Νόστος τῶν Ἑλλήνων is presumably identical with the *Cyclic Nostoi*, an epic otherwise ascribed to Agias of Troizen: its attribution to Eumelos may be an isolated error.⁴

The three remaining titles (*Titanomachy*, *Korinthiaka* and *Europia*) are more regularly associated with Eumelos, though many authors prefer to cite them without an author’s name. It will be argued in what follows that they are bound together not only by this community of attribution, but also by certain links of subject matter. I am inclined to regard them as forming a sort of Corinthian epic cycle that was transmitted under the name ‘Eumelos’. It will be shown that none of them can be as early as the eighth century. The *Titanomachy* and *Europia* were composed in the late seventh century at the earliest, and the *Korinthiaka* not before the mid sixth.

The Prosodion, with its rather emphatic assertion of Messenian liberty, perhaps dates from the years before or during the second rather than the first Messenian War.⁵ If Eumelos was really its author, one has to ask firstly what a Corinthian noble was doing composing choral songs in Messene, and secondly how the circumstance could have been remembered. To the first ques-

* I wish to thank Jan Bremmer and two anonymous referees for constructive comments on the original draft of this article; Jan Bremmer also for letting me see an unpublished paper of his on the Titans; and Dirk Obbink for a preview of the second volume of his great edition of Philodemus, *De pietate*.

¹ Paus. 4.4.1, 4.33.2, with the quotation τῶι γὰρ Ἰθωμάται καταθύμιος ἔπλετο Μοῖσα | ἅ καθαρὰ καὶ ἐλεύθερα σάμβαλ’ ἔχοισα (PMG 696).

² Clem. *Strom.* 1.131.8; Euseb. *Chron.*, Ol. 5.1 (760/759) and 9.1 (744/743); cf. Cyril *Contra Iulian.* 1.12 (*Patrol. Gr.* lxxvi. 520D). See C.M. Bowra, *CQ* 12

(1963) 146-7 = *On Greek Margins* (Oxford 1970) 47-9; A.A. Mosshammer, *The Chronicle of Eusebius and the Greek Chronographic Tradition* (Lewisburg 1979) 198-203.

³ Euseb. (Hieron.) *Chron.*, Ol. 5.1: *Eumelus poeta, qui Bugoniam et Europiam... composuit... agnoscitur*. Salmasius’ conjecture *Theogoniam* has its attractions, though the assumed corruption is unlikely.

⁴ Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 13.31a. Since a Corinthian poet is in question, Gyraldus’ Εὐμηλον is a certain correction of the manuscripts’ εὐμολπον.

⁵ Admitted as a possibility by Dunbabin 67 n.71.

tion, the exiling of the Bacchiads when Kypselos came to power around 657 BC would be a pretty answer; to be sure, some historians of early Greece, where facts are few and far between, have been too prone to this sort of facile combination. As to the second question, it is imaginable that the song was preserved orally as an anthem of independence down to the fourth century, and that the most basic facts about its author were remembered with it until some historian wrote them down.

Pausanias' statement that the Prosodion alone was considered to be Eumelos' genuine work has little evidential value. It is of a piece with his other idiosyncratic pronouncements on literary history, such as that the Boiotians living round Helikon had a tradition that Hesiod composed nothing except the *Works and Days* (9.31.4). Nevertheless, if we accept that Eumelos was remembered by the Messenians as the author of their Prosodion, it will be a considerable possibility that his name was attached to a body of Corinthian epic verse just because it was the only name available. The citharode Arion (who anyway came from Lesbos, not Corinth) was obviously unsuitable.

The evidence relating to the three epics must now be reviewed in detail.

THE TITANOMACHY

The *Titanomachy*⁶ is mostly cited by its title alone, or with the formula ὁ τὴν Τιτανομαχίαν γράψας or ποιήσας, 'the author of the *Titanomachy*'. The scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius (1.1165c) says 'Eumelos in the *Titanomachy*', and Athenaeus (277d) writes 'the author of the *Titanomachy*, whether he is Eumelos the Corinthian or Arktinos or whatever he likes to be called'. In three places fragments that must come from this poem are cited simply as 'Eumelos' or 'Eumelos the Corinthian'.⁷

It was divided into at least two books (*fr.* 4 B. = 8 D.). To judge from its title, the war in which the younger gods defeated the Titans must have bulked large in it. But the fragments show that it had a wider scope. It appears to have begun with some account of the earlier generations of gods, for we are told that Aither was identified in it as the father of Ouranos and in some sense as the beginning of everything (*fr.* 1-2 B. = 1 D.). The poem therefore belonged to the genre theogony.

Both the details of the divine genealogies and the account of the gods' war diverged somewhat from Hesiod's *Theogony*. Zeus's birth was located in Lydia instead of Crete:

Εὐμηλος δὲ ὁ Κορίνθιος τὸν Δία ἐν τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς Λυδίαι τεχθῆναι βούλεται.

Eumelos the Corinthian would have it that Zeus was born in the land we know as Lydia.⁸

⁶ Fragments collected by G. Kinkel, *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Leipzig 1877) 5-8; T.W. Allen, *Homeri Opera* 5 (Oxford 1912) 110-11; W. Aly, *Hesiods Theogonie* (Heidelberg 1913) 65-7; H.G. Evelyn-White, *Hesiod, The Homeric Hymns and Homeric* (London 1914) 480-3; K. Ziegler in Roscher 5.1524; A. Bernabé, *Poetae Epici Graeci* 1 (Leipzig 1987, 2nd edn 1995) 11-16; M. Davies, *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen 1988) 16-20. Principal discussions: Welcker (1849) 2.409-20; J. Dietze, 'Zur kyklischen Theogonie', *Rh. Mus.* 69 (1914) 522-37; K. Ziegler in Roscher 5.1523-31; Severyns (1928) 165-77; Vian (1952) 171-2; Kranz (1967); O. Gigon in Dörig-Gigon (1961) vi-xxiv

(esp. xiv-xxi); Huxley (1969) 22-8; Davies (1989) 13-18.

⁷ *Hyg. Fab.* 183; *Ath. epit.* 22c (ἡ Ἀρκτίνος has been added in the margin of C from 277d); *Lydus Mens.* 4.71.

⁸ *Lydus, loc. cit.* = Eumelos *fr.* 18 B., *dub.* 4 D. The fragment seems not hitherto to have been assigned to the *Titanomachy* (though Wilisch 7 mentioned the possibility), but this is the obvious place for it. Earlier in the same section of *Lydus*, where we find ὁ δὲ ἰμηλίας ὑπὸ Ἀμαλθείας αὐτὸν τραφῆναι, Lobeck, *Aglaophamus* 1047 not. i, conjectured Εὐμηλος, which Wünsch should have reported. But in the acknowledged fragment *Lydus* writes Εὐμηλος ὁ Κορίνθιος, as if introducing a new name.

We should understand this to mean on Mount Sipylos; *cf.* Aristides, *Or.* 17.3, ‘the oldest foundation of our city [Smyrna] is on Sipylos, where they locate both the “goddesses’ couchings” [*Il.* 24.615] and the dances of the Kouretes round the mother of Zeus’; *ibid.* 18.2, 21.3.

Another peculiarity of the *Titanomachy*, at least as against Hesiod, is that Aigaion, who cannot be distinguished from Hesiod’s Briareos,⁹ was the son of Pontos, not of Ouranos, and fought on the Titans’ side instead of against them: schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.1165c,

Eumelos in the *Titanomachy* says that Aigaion was the son of Earth and Sea, lived in the sea, and fought on the side of the Titans.

In Hesiod Gaia advises the younger gods that in order to defeat the Titans they should bring up the Hundred-handers, Kottos, Gyges and Briareos, from the lower darkness where Ouranos has imprisoned them (*Th.* 617-28). They do so, and the Hundred-handers help the Olympians to victory by discharging a massive fusillade of rocks from all their hands. The Titans are overwhelmed and committed to Tartarus. Hesiod then describes the underworld regions at length. In the course of this we are surprised to find that the three Hundred-handers have returned there (*Th.* 734-5). A little later this is modified: Kottos and Gyges are there, ‘at the foundations of Okeanos’, but Briareos, ‘being good’, has been specially favoured by Poseidon, who has given him one of his daughters to marry. It is implied that he lives somewhere else, presumably in the sea (*Th.* 815-19). It must have been from the sea that Thetis brought him up to support Zeus against his enemies on the occasion recalled at *Il.* 1.397-406.

There is later evidence for his marine connections,¹⁰ and it seems likely that this many-armed figure was a marine monster in origin, a demonized giant polyp, an embodiment of the sea itself in its unruly strength.¹¹ The myth in which he rises up against the storm-god and is quelled and confined to his element looks older than the one in which he is brought up to perform as Zeus’s ally and then sent back to the deep. It recalls the Ugaritic myth of the battle between Baal and Yammu (Sea), conceived as a seven-headed dragon, and its Biblical and Mesopotamian parallels. Its Hesiodic reflex seems to be Zeus’s conflict with the hundred-headed Typhoeus.¹² Hesiod’s treatment of Briareos, then, would involve a secondary reassignment of function, and the Eumelian account, whether or not written before the Hesiodic, would preserve the older version.

Echoes of this version appear in Antimachos¹³ and Virgil, *Aen.* 10.565-8:

Aegaeon qualis, centum cui bracchia dicunt
centenasque manus, quinquaginta oribus ignem
pectoribusque arsisse, Iouis cum fulmina contra
tot paribus streperet clipeis, tot stringeret ensis.¹⁴

Like Aigaion, who they say had a hundred arms and a hundred hands and blazed fire from fifty mouths and in fifty breasts, when he raged against Jupiter’s thunderbolt with the same number of matching shields and bared the same number of swords.

⁹ The two are explicitly identified in *Iliad* 1.402-4, though presumably separate in origin.

¹⁰ Schol. *Il.* 1.404a (Aristarchus) ἐνάλιος δαίμων; schol. D *Il.* 1.399 (Didymus) θαλάσσιος δαίμων; schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.1165c θαλάσσιον θηρίον; Ov. *Met.* 2.8-10, caeruleos habet unda deos, Tritona canorum | Proteaque ambiguum ballenarumque prementem | Aegaeona suis immania terga lacertis; Preller-Robert (1894) 623-4; my commentary on Hes. *Th.* 149.

¹¹ Cf. Preller-Robert (1894) 49; Roscher 1.142.

¹² See West (1997) 86, 97, 302.

¹³ Schol. Veron. Virg. *Aen.* 10.565, *Homerus amicum Aegaeona dicit Iouis, sed Antimachus in tertio Thebaidos* (fr. 14 Wyss) *d<icit> aduersum eum armatum*.

¹⁴ Statius, *Theb.* 2.596, is probably dependent on Virgil.

Cf. Servius auctus on *Aen.* 6.287, *centumgeminus Briareus*:

Who, as some record, waged war on the gods' behalf against the Giants; but as others affirm, he fought against the gods, above all on the occasion when Jupiter and Saturn were contesting for the kingship of heaven. Hence they record that he was driven down by Jupiter to the underworld with a thunderbolt.

And on 10.565:

Others say he was born from Earth and Sea, and had Koios¹⁵ and Gyges as his brothers. He is said to have assisted Jupiter against the Titans; or as some would have it, to have assisted Saturn.

The details that Virgil gives of Aigaion's armature and emission of flames may perhaps come from 'Eumelos'. I am more doubtful about the commentator's statement that Zeus despatched his adversary with a thunderbolt to the underworld (where Virgil locates him), as the characterization of Aigaion as a son of Pontos who lived in the sea has little point if that is not where he is imagined to be living now. It seems more likely that Zeus repulsed him and he returned to his own element.

There seem to have been other differences between 'Eumelos' and Hesiod in the roll-call of those who fought on the Titans' side. In Hesiod they are simply 'the Titans' without qualification (*Th.* 392, 630, 648, 650, 663, 668, 674, 676, 697, 717, 882), which should mean the six sons and six daughters of Ouranos and Gaia listed at 133-7: Okeanos, Koios, Kreios, Hyperion, Iapetos, Kronos; Theia, Rheia, Themis, Mnemosyne, Phoibe, Tethys. In consigning his Titans collectively to the underworld (717, 729, 814), Hesiod did not stop to reflect that that was no place for such figures as Okeanos and Tethys, Themis or Mnemosyne. Now, Servius, in a muddled comment on Virgil's reference to the Titans in Tartarus (*Aen.* 6.580, *hic genus antiquum Terrae, Titania pubes*), writes:

Antiquum, i.e. primum. Titanas enim contra Saturnum genuit, Gigantas postea contra Iouem. Et ferunt fabulae Titanas ab irata contra deos Terra in eius ultionem creatos, unde et Titanes dicti sunt ἀπὸ τῆς τίσεως, i.e. ab ultione. De his autem solus Sol abstinuisse narratur ab iniuria numinum, unde et caelum meruit.

'Ancient', i.e. first. For she bore the Titans to oppose Saturn, and the Giants later to oppose Jupiter. And the legends have it that the Titans were created by Earth when she was angry with the gods, to avenge her; that is why they are named Titans, from the Greek *tisis*, 'vengeance'. Of them, the Sun-god alone is related to have abstained from assaulting the gods; hence he earned a place in heaven.

This last sentence appears to refer to a version of the Titanomachy in which the Sun-god refrained from assisting the Titans and was rewarded by being stationed in heaven instead of Tartarus. The deity in question was doubtless not Helios but Hyperion.¹⁶ The account in which he defected from the Titan cause must have been an old poetic narrative of the Titanomachy, as there were no Hellenistic ones. The Eumelian poem is practically the only source that comes into question; we have seen that details from it reached the Virgilian commentators.

¹⁵ Probably a mistake for 'Kottos' (Thilo).

¹⁶ E. Wüst, *RE* 6A.1502. Hyperion was a poetic name and epithet of the sun; theologians accommodated him as the father of Helios, but his name continued to be

used for the sun itself (*Il.* 19.398, *Od.* 1.24, *Hymn. Ap.* 369). Cf. K.F. Ameis and C. Hentze, *Anhang zu Homers Odyssee* (4th edn, Leipzig 1890) 8-9 (on *Od.* 1.8); H. Usener, *Götternamen* (Bonn 1896) 19-25.

There are signs that the sons of Iapetos (Atlas, Menoitios, Prometheus) were more directly involved in the war than in Hesiod. Apollodoros, whose account of the conflict probably derives from ‘Eumelos’ (see below), mentions that Menoitios fought in it (*Bibl.* 1.2.3):

Iapetos’ sons by Asia were Atlas, who holds the heaven on his shoulders, Prometheus and Epimetheus, and Menoitios, whom Zeus thunderbolted in the battle with the Titans and consigned to Tartarus.

Hesiod (*Th.* 514-16) mentions that Menoitios was a ruffian (ὕβριστής) whom Zeus despatched to the lower world because of his bad qualities, but he gives no further explanation and does not place the incident in the context of the Titanomachy. With Atlas, similarly, Hesiod describes the fate that Zeus imposed on him, the support of the sky, but he gives no motivation, whereas a later mythographer, Hyginus, says that it was because he led the Titans in their assault on Jupiter (*Fab.* 150). Hyginus’ account is an eccentric one, in that he makes Juno provoke the Titans to their revolt after seeing Epaphos born to her husband’s mistress Io. Jupiter is assisted by other children not born from Juno: Minerva, Apollo and Diana. But the detail about Atlas is not organically related to this construction, and may perhaps come from ‘Eumelos’, whom Hyginus cites by name elsewhere.

In describing Atlas’ fate Hesiod writes (*Th.* 517-19):

Ἄτλας δ’ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχει κρατερῆς ὑπ’ ἀνάγκης
 πείρασιν ἐν γαίης, πρόπαρ’ Ἑσπερίδων λιγυφώνων
 ἐστηώς, κεφαλῆι τε καὶ ἀκαμάτησι χέρεσσιν.

Atlas, under strong constraint, holds up the broad sky with his head and tireless hands, standing at the ends of the earth, away by the clear-voiced Hesperides.

It may have been in the same context of Atlas’ punishment that ‘Eumelos’ told of the golden apples of the Hesperides: Philodemos *De pietate* 1088 vii (lines 5731-8 Obbink),

καὶ τὰς Ἄρπυϊας τὰ μῆ[λα φ]υλάττειν Ἀκο[υσί]λλας (*FGrHist* 2 F10 = *fr.* 10 Fowler),
 Ἐπιμεν[ί]δης δὲ (DK 3 B 9) καὶ τοῦτο καὶ τὰς αὐτὰς εἶναι ταῖς Ἑσπερίσιν· ὁ δὲ τὴν
 Τι(τα)νομαχίαν (γράψας φησὶν τὰ) μὲν μῆλα φυλάτ[τειν]...

And Akousilaos says the Harpies guarded the (golden) apples; Epimenides agrees, while identifying them with the Hesperides. The author of the *Titanomachy* says the apples were guarded by [...

Kranz argued that the reference to the apples made sense only in the context of Herakles’ journey to obtain them.¹⁷ But the Hesiod passage and similar ones elsewhere in the *Theogony* (215-16, 334-5) show that this need not be the case.

As for Prometheus, an entry in Hesychios’ lexicon (ι 387) may be relevant:

Ἴθαξ· ὁ τῶν Τιτῶνων κήρυξ, Προμηθεύς. τινὲς Ἴθαξ.

Ithas: the herald of the Titans, Prometheus. Some write ‘Ithax’.

Welcker and others have conjectured that this Ithas or Ithax came from the *Titanomachy*.¹⁸ The Ionic form Τιτῶνων is perhaps the relic of a verse quotation. In any case it is hard to see where

¹⁷ Kranz (1967) 95.

¹⁸ Welcker (1849) 2.415; M. Pohlenz, *Neue Jahrb.* 37 (1916) 588 n.2.

a ‘herald of the Titans’ could come from if not a poetic narrative, or in what circumstances he might have had a function if not in interchanges with another group of gods, namely the Olympians in the context of the struggle for power. Prometheus, it seems, acted as the Titans’ envoy to his cousins.

As for an explanation of his name Ithas, I would suggest that this was the mythical eponym of a phyle in some region or other known as the Ithageneis, literally the Indigenous Ones. The element *itha-* (an ancient adverb, ‘here’) being no longer perspicuous, the word was interpreted as ‘born from Ithas’. If the Ithageneis also claimed to be descended from Prometheus (through Deukalion), the identification of Prometheus with Ithas is easily understood.

Diplomatic activity by Prometheus in the context of the Titanomachy is recalled in the *Prometheus Vincit* (199-221, cf. 305). He offered the Titans wise advice, which they spurned. Knowing that they could not win on their own, he went over to Zeus and gave him the counsel that led to his victory. Did he change sides already in the *Titanomachy*?¹⁹ The logic of events almost requires it, for it was a fixed datum that he was punished for giving mankind fire, not for being on the wrong side in the Titan war. If he played a part in the Titanomachy at all, it was only as an ally of Zeus that he could have come through unscathed. His portrayal as a herald going between the two sides would have provided the ideal framework within which his defection could be narrated.²⁰

More about the course of the battle may probably be gleaned from the account in Apollodoros, *Bibl.* 1.2.1:

With them [his brothers and sisters] Zeus unleashed the war against Kronos and the Titans. When they had been fighting for ten years, Ge prophesied to Zeus that he would be victorious if he had as his allies those who had been consigned to Tartarus; so he killed their prison-warder Kampe and freed them. Then the Cyclopes gave thunder, lightning, and the thunderbolt to Zeus, the cap of invisibility to Pluto, and the trident to Poseidon. Armed with this equipment they overcame the Titans, imprisoned them in Tartarus, and set the Hundred-handers to be their warders. They themselves cast lots for government, and Zeus got power in heaven, Poseidon in the sea, and Pluto in the underworld.

Apollodoros’ preceding account of the gods’ history, from the reign of Ouranos to Zeus’s nurture in Crete, is mainly based on an Orphic theogony. But his Titanomachy seems to come from a different source. It is quite unlike Hesiod, and the obvious candidate is the Eumelian poem.²¹ It is true that Apollodoros does not mention that Aigaion fought on the Titans’ side, and indeed he speaks of the Hundred-handers collectively as being set to guard them in Tartarus. But he had to maintain consistency with his previous (Orphic) narrative, which on these points agreed with Hesiod.

Who are ‘those who had been consigned to Tartarus’, οἱ καταταρταρωθέντες, whom Zeus must release to win the war? If ‘Eumelos’ is the source, they cannot be the Hundred-handers, as Aigaion was on the enemy side, and there is no sign that Zeus got any help from Kottos and Gyges. They must be the Cyclopes, who furnish the three sons of Kronos with the decisive weapons. In Hesiod there is an awkward duplication. Zeus releases the Cyclopes at *Th.* 501-6 and receives the thunderbolt from them, before there is any mention of the Titanomachy. In 617-28, on Gaia’s advice, he releases the Hundred-handers, and the battle goes forward. In 687-711

¹⁹ Welcker 2.415-16.

²⁰ Stephanie West, *Mus. Helv.* 51 (1994) 129-49, has argued, partly following Welcker (2.414-20), that other elements of pseudo-Aeschylus’ mythology derive from the *Titanomachy*: Zeus’s wish to destroy mankind (*sc.* by

means of the Flood, which Prometheus enabled his son Deukalion to survive), and Prometheus’ release from torment through the self-sacrifice of Cheiron.

²¹ On the sources of Apollodoros’ account, see West (1983) 121-6.

his discharge of thunderbolts appears to be decisive: ἐκλίνθη δὲ μάχη, ‘the battle tipped’. But then, in a clumsy breach of Zieliński’s Law that epic narrative moves only forwards (or sideways), not backwards, we are suddenly pulled back to an earlier moment: ‘But until then, they attacked each other, fighting furiously in fierce combat.’ Now it is the bombardment by the Hundred-handers with their rocks that defeats the Titans. Hesiod has conflated two competing motifs.

The Cyclopes were guarded in Tartarus by Kampe, ‘Worm’, who must have been a formidable dragon.²² The same name is borne by a murderous, earthborn creature (γηγενὲς θηρίον) that Dionysos destroyed in the Libyan desert, and Nonnos has a long description of another Kampe, a multiform monster with a winding body, a consort of Tartarus (νύμφη Ταρταρίη), that Zeus killed in his struggle against Kronos.²³

In Hesiod the Cyclopes bear the names Brontes, Steropes and Arges, corresponding to the thunder, lightning and bright bolt (ἀργήτα κεραυνόν) that they make for Zeus. No other artefact of theirs is mentioned, and no contribution of Poseidon and Hades to the defeat of the Titans. In Apollodoros’ account each of the three brothers receives his own special, characteristic weapon from the Cyclopes. Zeus gets the thunderbolt, Poseidon the trident, and Hades (whose name, in its epic form Ἄϊδης, suggested ‘no-see’) the cap of invisibility. In this presumptively Eumelian version the Cyclopes are general manufacturers; they are not uniquely connected with thunder and lightning as in Hesiod, and they will not have had the Hesiodic names, Brontes, Steropes and Arges. In fact in ‘Eumelos’, Bronte and Sterope were the names of two of Helios’ horses.²⁴

The Eumelian version of the battle, with its motif of the three brothers using three special weapons, looks old. The trident is already an attribute of Poseidon in the *Iliad* (12.27), and Hades’ cap is mentioned there too (5.845: Athene puts it on to avoid being seen by Ares). What is more striking is that the *Iliad* poet also knows a history of the gods in which, as in Apollodoros, the three brothers draw lots after their victory to determine which parts of the universe each is to govern.²⁵ The Hellenistic poet of a hymn to Demeter, in recalling the myth, rather pointedly has Poseidon holding his trident: *Supp. Hell.* 990.5-6,

πρώτῳ δ’ ἦλθε λαχεῖν πόντον βαθὺν ἀλμυροδίνην
χερσὶ τρίαιναν ἔχοντα Ποσειδᾶν.

And first it fell to Poseidon, his trident in his hands, to get as his portion the deep, briny-swirling sea.

Callimachus’ version of the lot-casting in his *Aitia* may also be relevant to ‘Eumelos’: *fr.* 119 Pf.,

Μηκώνην μακάρων ἔδρανον αὐτίς ἰδεῖν,
ἦχι πάλους ἐβάλλοντο, διεκρίναντο δὲ τιμάς
πρώτα Γιγαντείου δαίμονες ἐκ πολέμου.

To see again Mekone, seat of the immortals, where the gods cast their lots and made their original settlement of privileges after the war with the Giants.

²² ‘Eine doch wohl um das Gefängnis sich windende Schlange’ (Gigon xvi).

²³ Diod. 3.72.3; Nonn. *Dion.* 18.236-64. Cf. J. Fontenrose, *Python* (Berkeley 1959) 243-5.

²⁴ Hyg. *Fab.* 183; see below.

²⁵ 15.187-92; cf. *Hymn. Dem.* 86. This was an old Babylonian motif; see West (1997) 109-10.

We cannot draw any conclusions from the fact that he refers to the war with the Giants instead of the one with the Titans.²⁶ What is more noteworthy is that he locates the event at Mekone. This was the mythical place where, according to Hesiod (*Th.* 535-7), gods and mortals separated and determined their respective portions, and Prometheus tricked Zeus in the division of the sacrificial meat. It was identified as Sikyon, or as a village in Sikyon's territory.²⁷ Whether or not Hesiod knew this identification, there is some likelihood that it was maintained in Corinthian tradition; we shall see that the histories of Corinth and Sikyon were closely linked in the Eumelian *Korinthiaka*. We have already found reason to believe that Prometheus played a part in the *Titanomachy*. Even if the poet did not relate the Hesiodic story about the division of the meat, he may have named Mekone as the place where the sons of Kronos cast lots.

Apollodoros naturally omits as an inessential embellishment the festivity with which the Olympians celebrated their victory. But this was no doubt the context of the line quoted by Athenaeus 22c (= *fr.* 6 B., 5 D.),

μέσσοισιν δ' ὄρχεῖτο πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε.

And in their midst danced the father of gods and men.

Later authors record that Zeus was garlanded by the other gods after the Titans were defeated, that Apollo, his unshorn locks nicely combed, sang Zeus's praises, and that Athena danced the *purrrhiche*.²⁸

In Hesiod the defeat of the Titans is followed by the acclamation of Zeus as king of the gods and by his allocation of functions and privileges to the rest (*Th.* 881-5). In the Eumelian poem, as we have seen, the major division of cosmic provinces was done by lot. But this may also have been the occasion for assigning their places to other gods. If the story of Hyperion's abstention from the battle is rightly attributed to the *Titanomachy*, it would be at this juncture that he got his reward and his station as celestial sun. Here the poet might have described his team of four steeds, the yoked mares Bronte and Sterope and the male trace-horses Eoios and Aithops;²⁹ here too the vessel that carries him over the waters at night.³⁰ If Hyperion had not previously been the sun, he had now to be provided with these essential pieces of equipment.

The two pairs of horse-names do not sort well together, and we may suspect that an earlier two-horse team with established names has been expanded into a four-horse team by the addition of the trace-horses. These have the intelligible, secondary names: Eoios, who steers the sun

²⁶ See Pfeiffer *ad loc.*; G. Massimilla, *Callimaco, Aitia. Libri primo e secondo* (Pisa 1996) 397-8.

²⁷ See Pfeiffer or Massimilla (n.26).

²⁸ Diod. 6.4 *ap.* Tertull. *De corona militis* 7, *Saturnum Pherecydes* (DK 7 B 4) *ante omnes refert coronatum, Iouem Diodorus post deuictos Titanas hoc munere a ceteris honoratum*; Tib. 2.5.9-10, *qualem te memorant Saturno rege fugato | uictori laudes concinuisse Ioui*; Sen. *Ag.* 332-4, *licet et chorda grauiore sonos, quale canebas cum Titanas fulmine uictos uidere dei*; Dion. Hal. *Ant.* 7.72.7, 'Ἑλληνικὸν δ' ἄρα καὶ τοῦτ' ἦν ἐν τοῖς πάνυ παλαιὸν ἐπιτήδευμα, ἐνόπλιος ὄρχησις ἢ καλουμένη πυρρήχη, εἶτ' Ἀθηναῖς πρώτης ἐπὶ Τιτάνων ἀφανισμῶι χορεύειν καὶ ὀρχεῖσθαι σὺν τοῖς ὅπλοις τὰπνίκια ὑπὸ χαρᾶς ἀρξαμένης, εἶτε παλαίτερον ἔτι Κουρήτων αὐτὴν καταστησαμένων, κτλ. Others speak of Zeus revelling or dancing after the Gigantomachy:

Eur. *H.F.* 178-80; Pamprepios, *Carm.* 4.13 Livrea: Ζῆνα γ]υγαντοφόνοιο κυβερνητήρα χορείη[ς. See further Lebedev (1998) 3-5.

²⁹ Hyg. *Fab.* 183 (*fr.* 7 B. = 4 D.). M. Schmidt's correction of *Aethiops* to *Aethops* is supported by Eur. *fr.* 896 (from *Phaethon*?); cf. Ov. *Met.* 2.153 *Eous et Aethon*.

³⁰ Ath. 470b (*fr.* 8 B. = 7 D.). For mention of the Sun's horses in the same context as his floating vessel cf. Mimn. *fr.* 12 W. In Pisander's *Herakleia* (*fr.* 5 B. = 6 D.) and in Stesichoros' *Geryoneis* (*PMGF* p.160, S 17) Herakles used the vessel to get to the Hesperides, and there has naturally been a temptation to link it with the Hesperides in the *Titanomachy*, as both are known to have been mentioned in the poem (Severyns (1928) 166; Kranz (1967) 95). But it is hard to imagine how it could have encompassed the labours of Herakles.

from the east, and Aithops, who steers him through the south.³¹ The mares’ names, Bronte and Sterope, will be the older ones. They no doubt made up the first half of a hexameter, Βροντή τε Στεροπή τε.³² But why should the Sun’s chariot be drawn by Thunder and Lightning? The usual explanation is that it is the horses’ thundering hooves that make the thunder.³³ But what about the lightning? And why are they the horses of the Sun-god, whose progress across the clear sky is not accompanied by continuous thundering? If it were the Storm-god’s chariot that they were drawing, there would be less of a problem.³⁴ Perhaps they had been Zeus’s horses in some older tradition, and when he came to be thought of as too dignified to gallop about in a chariot, they were transferred to the Sun-god. Conceivably they kept the residual function of conveying the thunder and lightning to Zeus, as Pegasus does in Hesiod and Euripides.³⁵

Two further fragments of the poem are concerned with the centaur Cheiron. One of them, to be sure, is ascribed to ‘the author of the *Gigantomachy*’, but it is generally accepted that this is an error of the scholiast on Apollonius for ‘the author of the *Titanomachy*’.³⁶ This fragment (10 B. = 9 D.) concerns Cheiron’s birth from the Oceanid Philyra, whom Kronos impregnated in the form of a horse, thus accounting for the centaur’s hybrid physique.³⁷ The escapade must have preceded the Titanomachy, since Kronos can have been in no condition for it afterwards. If Cheiron took any part in the war, it must have been on Zeus’s side. But perhaps he was not born in time. He was clearly no enemy of Zeus, but a wise creature, celebrated as a culture-hero. According to *fr.* 11 B. = 6 D., he first

εἷς τε δικαιοσύνην θνητῶν γένος ἤγαγε δείξας
ὄρκους καὶ θυσίας ἰλαρὰς καὶ σχήματ’ Ὀλύμπου.

led the human race to righteousness by instructing them in oath-taking and cheerful sacrifices and the patterns(?) of Olympus.

This reflects his role in myth as the educator of heroes such as Achilles, ‘whom Cheiron had taught, most righteous of centaurs’ (*Iliad* 11.832), or perhaps an actual didactic poem such as the *Precepts of Cheiron* ascribed to Hesiod. The importance of sacrifices is stressed in an extant fragment of that work (283 M.-W.). The ‘patterns of Olympus’ are presumably astronomical or meteorological lore, ‘Olympus’ standing for ‘heaven’.³⁸ Possibly the *Titanomachy* contained other stories about Cheiron, such as his voluntary surrender of his immortality to Prometheus.³⁹

The last fragment of the poem, cited as being from its second book, is beautiful but enigmatic:

ἐν δ’ αὐτῇι πλωτοὶ χρυσώπιδες ἰχθύες ἔλλοί
νήχοντες παίζουσι δι’ ὕδατος ἀμβροσίοιο.

And in it there float fish with golden scales, that swim and sport through the ambrosial water.

³¹ Kranz (1967) 92.

³² Kranz (1967) 93, comparing Hes. *Th.* 140, 286, al.

³³ Gigon xviii; Barigazzi (1966a) 137; Davies (1989) 15.

³⁴ For oriental parallels, see West (1997) 115. There is an Assyrian text that lists nine storm demons as the yoke-animals of Shamash, the sun: West 507.

³⁵ Hes. *Th.* 285-6; cf. Eur. *fr.* 312 N.².

³⁶ There must have been an early *Gigantomachy*, to account for the wealth of allusions to the subject in literature and art (see e.g. M. Mayer, *Die Giganten und Titanen in der antiken Sage und Kunst* (Berlin 1887);

Vian (1952); Dörig-Gigon (1961)), but it was apparently not transmitted to later times. There is no evidence that the Giants’ Revolt had a place in the narrative of the *Titanomachy*, as some have supposed.

³⁷ Schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.554; cf. Hes. *Th.* [1001-2]; Pherecydes, *FGrHist* 3 F50 = *fr.* 50 Fowler; Ap. Rhod. 2.1231-41; Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.2.4.

³⁸ See Kranz (1967) 94-5. On the problems of the phrase see also Lebedev (1998) 5-10.

³⁹ [Aesch.] *Prom.* 1026-9; Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.5.4; Welcker 2.414-20. Cf. above, n.20.

Welcker supposed that it belonged in an ecphrasis of a shield, perhaps one wielded by Zeus or Athena. Others objected that the present tense was incompatible with this.⁴⁰ In fact it would be possible if the shield (or whatever it was) was represented as a god's possession that still exists now.⁴¹ In any case, unless the lines are from a speech, they must refer to something still existing. I would guess that the feminine noun represented by ἀντῆι was λίμνη, and that the description was of some marvellous pool or lake associated with one of the gods, such as the Circular Lake (τροχοειδῆς λίμνη) on Delos, or the Libyan Tritonis (Τριτωνίς λίμνη) from which, according to some, Athene (Tritogeneia) was born.⁴²

THE KORINTHIAKA⁴³

This composition was valued more for its content than for its poetry, and the poetic text was largely displaced from circulation by a prose version, still under Eumelos' name, that told the same story in what was perhaps felt to be a more accredited format. Hence Clement can associate Eumelos with Akousilaos as a prose historian who used material of the Hesiodic type: *Strom.* 6.26.7,

τὰ δὲ Ἡσιόδου μετήλλαξαν εἰς πεζὸν λόγον καὶ ὡς ἴδια ἐξήνεγκαν Εὐμηλὸς τε καὶ Ἀκουσίλαος οἱ ἱστοριογράφοι.

And Hesiod's poetry was turned into prose and brought out as their own work by the historians Eumelos and Akousilaos.⁴⁴

Pausanias (2.1.1) clearly distinguishes the prose history from Eumelos' verses:

ἐπεὶ Εὐμηλὸς γε ὁ Ἀμφιλύτου τῶν Βακχιαδῶν καλουμένων, ὃς καὶ τὰ ἔπη λέγεται ποιῆσαι, φησὶν ἐν τῇ Κορινθίαι συγγραφῆι - εἰ δὴ Εὐμήλου γε ἡ συγγραφὴ - κτλ.

For Eumelos the son of Amphilytos, one of the so-called Bacchiadai, and the reputed author of the poetry, says in the *Corinthian History* – if it is by Eumelos – (etc.).

It may have been from a preface prefixed to the prose version that Pausanias obtained his biographical details about Eumelos.⁴⁵ On the other hand, references in the Pindar and Apollonius scholia show that some people still had access to the poetic version, at least in late Hellenistic times.⁴⁶

⁴⁰ Welcker 2.409; Kranz (1967) 94; Davies (1989) 17; J.N. Bremmer in F. García Martínez and G.P. Luttikhuisen (eds), *Interpretations of the Flood* (Leiden 1998) 44.

⁴¹ Cf. *Il.* 2.448 (v.1.), 5.724-8, 13.21-2.

⁴² Hdt. 4.180.5, cf. 'Hes.' *fr.* 343.12, Aesch. *Eum.* 292-3, Call. *fr.* 37 with Pfeiffer. Gigon (xix) thought of the Delian lake. Kranz (96) suggested that someone was advising Herakles about his journey to the Hesperides and 'das göttliche Weltmeer'.

⁴³ Besides the editions of Kinkel, Bernabé and Davies (as in n.6), the fragments are collected by G. Marckscheffel, *Hesiodi, Eumeli, Cinaethonis, Asii et Carminis Naupactii Fragmenta* (Leipzig 1840) 397-407; F. Jacoby, *FGrHist* IIIB no. 451. R.L. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography* 1 (Oxford 2000) 105-9, edits those

fragments which he regards as coming from the prose version. For discussion see especially Marckscheffel 216-35; Wilisch (1875); P. Friedländer, 'Kritische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Heldensage, I: Argonautensage', *Rh. Mus.* 69 (1914) 299-317; Radermacher (1938) 226-30; Jacoby (1955); Will (1955) 85-129, 237-42; Barigazzi (1966a) 129-48, (1966b) 321-5; Huxley (1969) 61-8, 74-5; Brillante (1981) 187-99; P. de Fidio (1991); Harrauer (1999).

⁴⁴ Does the reference to Hesiod indicate that the prose version included the *Titanomachy* as well as the *Corinthian history*?

⁴⁵ Jacoby 297.

⁴⁶ Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 13.74f (*fr.* 3 B. = 2A D.); schol. Ap. Rhod. 3.1354-6a (*fr.* 19 B. = 4 D.).

The work was primarily concerned with the origins of Corinth and the history of its kingship, but it also took account of its western neighbour Sikyon. Corinth had been a notable settlement in Neolithic and Early Helladic times, but it then lapsed into insignificance, becoming a major town again only after about 925 BC.⁴⁷ It had no standing in traditional epic myth, and it is hardly mentioned in Homer.⁴⁸ A mythical history had to be constructed for it in the Archaic period. Much the same applies to Sikyon. It too is mentioned only twice in Homer, and both passages may be interpolated.⁴⁹

For Corinth the first step was to identify itself with a place celebrated in tradition: Ephyra, the city of Sisyphos, which lay ‘in a secluded part of Argos’, *μυχῶι Ἄργεος ἰπποβότοιο* (*Il.* 6.152). Its true location was perhaps in Thessaly, in the ‘Pelagic Argos’.⁵⁰ Corinth must have been called Corinth continuously from pre-Hellenic times, as its *-nth-* suffix shows.⁵¹

‘Eumelos’ accounted for the name Ephyra as that of an Oceanid nymph who was the first settler in the area (*fr.* 1 B. and D.). He made her the wife of Epimetheus. For an explanation of this odd alliance we turn to Hesiod, the primary source for Epimetheus. There he is the man who marries the first woman, Pandora, from whom all women descend.⁵² Prometheus is involved in the story, as the wise brother who advises Epimetheus not to accept the gift. Prometheus, as we have seen, also played an important role in the separation of gods from humankind at Mekone, which was identified with Sikyon. Pandora was brought out by Hephaestus ‘where the other gods and men were’ (*Th.* 586). Was this also at the Mekone gathering? In any case there was clearly interest in Prometheus and Epimetheus in the Sikyon area. In the Eumelian mythology where Ephyra, as the first settler in the land, was the ancestress of the city, she takes the place of Pandora as *Urmutter* and thus as the consort of Epimetheus.

The first king was Helios, a deity who enjoyed a certain honour in the land.⁵³ According to a myth told by ‘the Corinthians’, he contested for possession of the region with Poseidon. They called upon Briareos to arbitrate, and he awarded the Isthmus to Poseidon, but the higher ground on which the city stood to Helios: Paus. 2.1.6 (*cf.* 2.4.6),

The Corinthians too say that Poseidon got into dispute with Helios over the land, and that Briareos acted as their arbitrator, who decreed that the Isthmus and that whole area should belong to Poseidon, but gave Helios the heights above the city.

It is very probable that this came in ‘Eumelos’, especially as Favorinus in his *Corinthian Oration* (= Dio Prus. *Or.* [37]) 11, in referring to the story, quotes a hexameter describing Briareos:

(The city) over which they say two gods contested, Poseidon and Helios... and after referring their dispute for arbitration to a third, more senior god, who had

πλείσται μὲν κεφαλαί, πλείσται δέ τε χεῖρες,
very many heads, and very many arms,

they both occupy this city and territory.

⁴⁷ Brillante (1981) 211-17; Salmon (1984) 39.

⁴⁸ Only at *Il.* 2.570 and 13.664.

⁴⁹ *Il.* 2.572, 23.299. *Cf.* my *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad* (Leipzig and Munich 2001) 12, 181.

⁵⁰ M.B. Sakellariou in *Atti e memorie del I Congresso internazionale di Micenologia* (Rome 1968) 903-5. On the problem of the location *cf.* also Dunbabin (1948) 60 n.18; R. Drews, *CPh* 74 (1979) 122 n.53; Brillante (1981)

209-10. There were various other Ephyras: see Strabo 8.3.5; Sakellariou 901-2; Brillante (1981) 196 n.35.

⁵¹ *Cf.* P. Kretschmer, *Glotta* 31 (1948-51) 99. It occurs as a place-name in the Pylos tablets.

⁵² Hes. *Th.* 511-14, 570-612; *Op.* 57-89. In the *Catalogue of Women* (*frs.* 2-4) the primal pair Deukalion and Pyrrha were respectively the son of Prometheus and the daughter of Epimetheus by Pandora.

⁵³ O. Jessen, *RE* 8.64; Will 233-5.

Wilamowitz saw that the source of the verse was likely to be 'Eumelos' (= *fr.* 2 B., 12 D.).⁵⁴

Helios' wife was called Antiope (*fr.* 3.2 B. = 2.2 D.). Whose daughter was she? It would be economical to suppose that she was the daughter of Epimetheus and Ephyra. Ephyra had no need of a husband if she was to be childless. She had to be linked to the royal dynasty of Corinth, and the straightforward way to do it was to have her daughter marry the first king.⁵⁵

But why is this daughter called Antiope? It is hardly a coincidence that the famous Antiope of mythology, the mother of Amphion and Zethos, was a daughter of Asopos (*Od.* 11.260, etc.). There was always ambiguity with the various mythical Asopides as to whether the Boiotian or the Sikyonian Asopos was the river in question.⁵⁶ The tug between the two is manifest in Antiope's case.⁵⁷ She was usually, and properly, regarded as a Boiotian heroine, from Hyria. But there was an early legend that she was abducted by the Sikyonian Epopeus and that he was the real father of her sons.⁵⁸ Pausanias quotes some lines of Asios of Samos (*fr.* 1 B. = D.):

Ἀντιόπη δ' ἔτεκε Ζῆθον κάμφιονα δῖον
Ἄσωποῦ κούρη ποταμοῦ βαθυδινηέντος,
Ζηνί τε κυσαμένη καὶ Ἐπωπέϊ ποιμένι λαῶν.

Antiope, daughter of Asopos the deep-swirling river, bore Zethos and noble Amphion, after conceiving to Zeus and Epopeus, shepherd of peoples.

In naming Helios' consort as Antiope, 'Eumelos' may have been operating with an existing Antiope who was the daughter of the Sikyonian Asopos.⁵⁹

This paternity is not necessarily incompatible with our hypothesis that he represented her as the daughter of Epimetheus and Ephyra. The nymph Ephyra, having Epimetheus as her official husband, might have been impregnated by the river. The pairing of Asopos and Ephyra would make the perfect start to the dual Sikyonian-Corinthian genealogy.

Helios and Antiope have two sons, Aloeus and Aietes, who by the rules of mythical history account for the dichotomy of the two neighbour states. Helios divides his realm between them, allocating the Asopos land to Aloeus and the Ephyraea to Aietes (*fr.* 3.1-5 B. = 2.1-5 D.):

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ⁶⁰ Αἰήτης καὶ Ἄλωεὺς ἐξεγένοντο
Ἡελίου τε καὶ Ἀντιόπης, τότε δ' ἄνδιχα χώραν
δάσσατο παισὶν εἰς Ὑπερίωνος ἀγλαὸς υἱός·
ἦν μὲν ἔχ' Ἄσωπός, ταύτην πόρε δίωι Ἄλωεϊ·
ἦν δ' Ἐφύρη κτεάτισσ', Αἰήτηι δῶκεν ἅπασαν.

But when Aietes and Aloeus were born from Helios and Antiope, then Hyperion's glorious son divided the country in two between his sons. The Asopos riverland he awarded to noble Aloeus, while all that Ephyra had settled he gave to Aietes.

⁵⁴ Wilamowitz (1924) 2.241 n.2; so too (without reference to Wilamowitz) Barigazzi (1966a) 131-4, (1966b) 321; disputed by Jacoby (Noten) 186 n.32. The verse probably began with τοῦ δ' ἦν, cf. Hes. *Th.* 321, *Op.* 150.

⁵⁵ In 'Epimenides', *FGrHist* 457 F11 = *fr.* 14 Fowler, she herself was evidently the wife of Helios, since she was the mother of Aietes. This telescopes the Eumelian genealogy.

⁵⁶ See West (1985) 100-1. There was more than one river Asopos, but there could not be more than one god.

⁵⁷ Cf. F. Vian, *Les origines de Thèbes* (Paris 1963) 194-8.

⁵⁸ Paus. 2.6.1-4; Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.5.5.

⁵⁹ Cf. Jacoby (Noten) 185 n.15.

⁶⁰ I have written δὴ for the impossible δ' given by the manuscripts. The corruption occurs regularly in Homer where δὴ is in synaliphe, as in *Il.* 1.340, 540, 2.225, 7.24, etc.

Aietes the son of Helios belongs, of course, in the story of the Argonauts. He is here given a Corinthian origin only in preparation for the later appearance of his daughter Medea. As the next lines of the fragment relate, he does not stay in Corinth:

Αιήτης δ' ἄρ' ἐκὼν Βούνωι παρέδωκε φυλάσσειν,
εἰς ὃ κεν αὐτὸς ἵκοιτ' ἢ ἔξ αὐτοῖό τις ἄλλος,
ἢ παῖς ἢ υἱωνός· ὃ δ' ἵκετο Κολχίδα γαίαν.

Aietes chose to entrust it to Bounos, until such time as he himself should return, or someone of his blood, a child or grandchild, and he went off to the Kolchian land.

The narrative in these verses is very summary, and some of the events they relate must have been told more fully in another context. The reason for Aietes' departure is not explained. The scholiast on Pindar who quotes the fragment, paraphrasing it in advance, says that he left from discontent, μὴ ἀρεσθεῖς τῆι ἀρχῆι.⁶¹ Another scholion on the same passage gives him a more definite motivation: it says he received an oracle telling him to found a city in Kolchis that should be named after himself, *sc.* Aia. Jacoby rightly proposes attributing this to 'Eumelos'.⁶²

The scholiast also adds another detail that is not given in the verse fragment, namely that Bounos was the son of Hermes and a nymph. This is confirmed for 'Eumelos' by Pausanias (2.3.10), who names the mother as Alkidameia. Bounos is a stopgap figure who gets his name from Hera's local cult title Bounaia, 'Hera on the Hill', whose shrine he was supposed to have founded.⁶³

On his death the Ephyraea falls under the sway of the king of the Asopos land, Epopeus, son of Aloeus (Paus. 2.3.10). Epopeus was an important figure in Sikyonian tradition independently of 'Eumelos'. In one Sikyonian account reported by Pausanias (2.6.1-3) he was an interloper from Thessaly whose reign briefly interrupted the rule of the autochthonous dynasty. The linkage of his name with that of Aloeus also has suspiciously Thessalian associations, as Aloeus and Epopeus are listed among the sons whom the Aeolid Kanake bore to Poseidon (Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.7.4); that Aloeus was the father of the notorious pair, Otos and Ephialtes, who tried to scale heaven. But Aloeus may originally have been a general protective hero of ἄλωαί, and so liable to appear in more than one place.

Epopeus' annexation of the Ephyraea violated the fair allocation that Helios made between his two sons, and from the Corinthian point of view it was an injustice. In keeping with this, 'Eumelos' represented Epopeus as a harsh and tyrannical ruler.⁶⁴ His son Marathon fled from his iniquities and made his home in coastal Attica. When Epopeus died, Marathon returned, but only to re-divide the Asopian-Ephyraean kingdom between his two sons, whose names were Sikyon and Korinthos. Thus the historical cities acquired their names. Marathon then returned to Attica.⁶⁵

We see now why the kingdoms that Helios had separated had to be united under Epopeus. The eponyms Sikyon and Korinthos were naturally treated as brothers. That implied a new division of a father's realm. But why was the father identified with the eponym of Marathon in Attica? 'Eine schwierige erscheinung, die nur da ist um wieder zu verschwinden... Ich kann...

⁶¹ Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 13.74f, copied by schol. Eur. *Med.* 9 and Tzetzes on Lykophron 174 and 1024; cf. Paus. 2.3.10.

⁶² Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 13.74d; Jacoby 301. Cf. *Mimn.* 11.2 W. ἐξ Αἴης... 11a.1 Αἴηταιο πόλις.

⁶³ Paus. 2.4.7; Wilisch (1875) 11.

⁶⁴ Cf. de Fidio (1991) 247.

⁶⁵ All this is related on Eumelos' authority by Paus. 2.1.1 (= *fr.* 4 B., 5 D.).

in ihr nicht mehr sehen als... eine freche annexion.⁶⁶ It stands beside other genealogies that connected Sikyon with Attica. 'Hesiod' made Sikyon a son of Erechtheus, and Asios made him a son of the Erechtheid Metion.⁶⁷ These affiliations have the effect of subordinating Sikyon to Athens, and they suit the early sixth century.⁶⁸ But why Marathon? The story seems to contain both a claim and a counter-claim: Sikyon and Korinthos were the sons of Marathon, giving Marathon the primacy; but then, Marathon was himself a Sikyonian, the grandson of Aloeus. Possibly the Corinthians felt themselves to have a connection with Marathon in the cult of the old goddess Hellotis, who became identified with Athene. According to a scholiast on Pindar (*Ol.* 13.56a), Athene had the name Hellotis from the marsh (*helos*) at Marathon, where she had a statue.⁶⁹

Having served his purpose as eponym, Korinthos dies childless, leaving the stage clear for the entry of the next character: Medea. As the daughter of Aietes and granddaughter of Helios, she is the true heir to the throne. She no longer lives in Kolchis, as the Argonauts' expedition has by now taken place and Jason has brought her to Iolkos. She is sent for from there.

She comes with Jason, travelling, it seems, in the Argo with its whole crew of heroes. Several authors mention that its last voyage was to the Isthmus, where Jason dedicated it to Poseidon.⁷⁰ This makes sense only in the context of Medea's move to Corinth.

We can go further. Favorinus makes the dedication of the ship follow on the celebration of the first Isthmian Games, which he says were organized by Poseidon and Helios. It is the same passage where he has adverted to the earlier dispute between the two gods and quoted what appears to be a line of 'Eumelos' describing Aigaion. He lists the victors in the games: Kastor in the stadion, Kalais in the diaulos, Orpheus in the citharodic contest, Herakles in the pankration, Polydeukes in the boxing, Peleus in the wrestling, Telamon with the discus, Theseus in the race in armour, Phaethon as jockey, Neleus in the chariot-race, and the Argo in a boat race. All these persons are known as Argonauts except for Phaethon, who is of course Helios' son. 'Eumelos' is the obvious source for the whole event.⁷¹ The start of the list of victors, Κάστορα μὲν στάδιον, Κάλαϊν δὲ διαύλον, appears to preserve nearly a whole hexameter.⁷² Favorinus also quotes a Sibylline oracle that combines the foundation of the games by Poseidon and Helios with a reference to the Eumelian Oceanid Ephyra:

(Ἴσθμοῦ δ') εὐδαίμων πιτυώδεος ὄλβιος ἀρχήν,
Ἔκεανοῦ κούρης Ἐφύρης (ἔδος), ἔνθα Ποσειδῶν,
μητρὸς ἐμῆς Λαμίας γενέτωρ, προύθηκεν ἀγῶνα
πρῶτος ἄμ' Ἡελίωι, τιμὰς δ' ἠνέγκατο μόνος.⁷³

⁶⁶ Jacoby 299-300. We may leave aside the explanation of Will (1955) 250: 'Ne serait-il pas un souvenir d'une communauté ionienne s'étendant de part et d'autre de l'Isthme? Et un Isthme *ionien* ne rétablirait-il pas la continuité entre les deux domaines *ioniens* de Thésée, l'Attique et Trézène?'

⁶⁷ 'Hes.' *fr.* 224; Asios *fr.* 11 B. and D. On Metion *cf.* West (1985) 107.

⁶⁸ See West (1985) 133.

⁶⁹ On Hellotis *cf.* Wilamowitz (1931-2) 1.382-4; Will (1955) 131-5; M.H. Jameson, D.R. Jordan, R.D. Kotansky, *A lex sacra from Selinous (Greek Roman and Byzantine Monographs* 11, Durham, NC 1993) 23; below at the end of my discussion of the *Europia*. This link between Corinth and Marathon is noted by de Fidio (1991) 251.

⁷⁰ Diod. 4.53.2; Aristid. *Or.* 46.29; Favor. *Cor.* (= Dio Prus. *Or.* [37]) 14; Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.9.27. Aristides' idea that

the Argo was built at Corinth in the first place, attributed to 'Eumelos' by Barigazzi (1966a) 142, is manifestly the orator's own invention.

⁷¹ Barigazzi (1966a) 140-3, (1966b) 323. In Diodoros' narrative the story has been adapted to make it the origin of the Olympic Games instead of the Isthmian. The heroes sail to the Isthmus and dedicate the Argo there; Jason stays in Corinth; the rest are about to disperse to their homes, but Herakles proposes that they bind themselves in a treaty of alliance, and also seek out the best site in Greece for a panegyris and games, to be consecrated to Olympian Zeus, after whom he names the chosen site Olympia.

⁷² In the original the names would have been in the nominative.

⁷³ Favor. *Cor.* 13. I adopt supplements by Ebert in lines 1 and 2. Barigazzi, followed by Bernabé (*fr.* 8), wrongly treats the oracle as a fragment of 'Eumelos'.

And the fortunate, god-favoured neck of the pine-clad <Isthmus, seat> of Okeanos’ daughter Ephyra, where Poseidon, the father of my mother Lamia, first established a contest together with Helios, and he alone carried off the honours.

This tends to confirm the Eumelian provenance of the story about the games.

The poem also included some reference to the Kolchian expedition. When Apollonius Rhodius describes how the warriors grew from the earth after Jason had sown the dragon’s teeth, and Ares’ whole temenos ‘bristled’ (φριξεν) with armour and weapons (3.1354-7), the scholiast reports:

This and the following lines are taken from Eumelos, in whom Medea says to Idmon: < >. And Sophocles in his *Colchian Women* makes the Messenger, in reply to Aietes’ enquiry about the matter, ‘Then did the autochthonous growth not grow?’, say ‘Indeed it did: bristling with helmet-plumes and bronze-worked weapons it rose up out of its mother.’ These lines Apollonius has adapted.

This should not be understood to mean that the verses were taken verbatim from Eumelos, but that some lines in Eumelos, spoken by Medea to the seer Idmon, appeared to be their model.⁷⁴ The actual quotation has fallen out, but it no doubt contained the ‘bristling’ image, for which the Sophocles parallel is also adduced.

How was the Argonauts’ expedition to Kolchis brought into the *Korinthiaka*? One possibility is that when he had dealt with the eventless reign and demise of Korinthos, the poet proceeded: ‘Now the Corinthians decided that they should invite Medea, the daughter of their former king Aietes, to come and occupy the throne. She was no longer at Kolchis, for Jason had brought her to Iolkos, in the following way.’ But the story might also have been told in retrospect after the Argo’s arrival at Corinth, for example in a first-person narrative by Medea, in the manner of Odysseus’ Apologoi. The above scholion indicates that at least one of Jason’s exploits was indeed related in a speech by Medea. It remains hard to explain why the addressee should be Idmon, the seer who had sailed with the Argonauts. In Apollonius (2.815-34) he is killed by a boar in Mariandynia on the way to Kolchis. In the *Carmen Naupactium* (fr. 5 B. = D.) he at least reached Kolchis, and encouraged Jason to undertake the fearsome task of yoking Aietes’ bulls. But what part he played in the Eumelian narrative is obscure.

Medea was now queen of Corinth, with Jason as her consort.⁷⁵ The story of her children’s death and her separation from Jason took a different form from that familiar from Euripides. Each time she gave birth, she would take the baby into the temple of Hera and bury it there,⁷⁶ believing that by this procedure they would become immortal. Eventually she realized that it was not working, and she was detected by Jason, who had no sympathy with her explanations but sailed off back to Iolkos. So Medea departed too, transferring the sovereignty to Sisyphos. Where she went is not recorded, and is perhaps of no significance: she just went.

The underlying fact is a Corinthian cult of the dead children, whose tomb was situated in the precinct of Hera.⁷⁷ It is probable that the dead children of the cult were originally sons of a local

The Sibyl who uttered it, the daughter of Lamia, was the Libyan Sibyl (Paus. 10.12.1), not Herophila as Bernabé says. She was mentioned in a Euripidean prologue spoken by Lamia (fr. 922 N.² = 312a Snell; Varro ap. Lact. Inst. 1.6.8; schol. Pl. *Phaedr.* 244b); see H.M. Cockle in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* lii p.21.

⁷⁴ Cf. Barigazzi (1966a) 145 n.3.

⁷⁵ Paus. 2.3.10-11; schol. Eur. *Med.* 9 = 19; fr. 5 B. = 3 D.; cf. Simon. *PMG* 545.

⁷⁶ For this interpretation of Pausanias’ κατακρύπτειν, see Radermacher (1938) 229.

⁷⁷ Eur. *Med.* 1378-83; Parmeniskos ap. schol. Eur. *Med.* 264; Paus. 2.3.7; M.P. Nilsson, *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung* (Leipzig 1906) 57-60; A. Brelich, ‘I figli di Medea’, *SMSR* 30 (1959) 213-54; id., *Paides e Parthenoi* (Rome 1969) 355-65; F. Graf in J.J. Clauss and S.I. Johnston (eds), *Medea* (Princeton 1997) 39-40; S.I. Johnston in the same volume, 44-70.

goddess Medea who had no connection with the Medea of the Argonautic legend.⁷⁸ The coincidence of name led to Aietes' and Jason's introduction into the Corinthian story.

Once the cult is provided for, there is no further role for Medea. She takes her leave, and hands over the throne to the Aeolid Sisyphos. He was famous in myth as a king of Ephyra (*Il.* 6.152, 210), and therefore needed to be worked into the narrative, but we do not know how Medea's choice of him as her successor was explained.⁷⁹ Nor can we say how many of his wily exploits the poem celebrated. The only event of his reign attested for 'Eumelos' is that Neleus died of some illness at Corinth and was buried on the Isthmus. Nestor came to pay his respects at his father's tomb, but Sisyphos refused to reveal its whereabouts, saying it was a secret that must be withheld from everyone without exception. When Sisyphos himself died, he too was buried on the Isthmus, and the poet recorded that the site of this tomb likewise was known to only a few of his fellow-Corinthians.⁸⁰ This seems to exclude the story of Sisyphos' attempt to cheat Hades and his punishment in the underworld.⁸¹ The secret hero-tombs whose location is known only to the king or to a privileged priesthood have their best parallel in the tomb of Oedipus at Colonus (*Soph. O.C.* 1520-38). Oedipus tells Theseus that he would not divulge the secret even to his own children, much as he loves them, just as in 'Eumelos' the site of Neleus' tomb cannot be revealed even to his son. There was also a secret tomb of Dirce at Thebes, known only to the hipparch.⁸²

Sisyphos bequeathed the kingship to his son Glaukos. Glaukos went to Lacedaemon in search of some lost horses, and there encountered a girl called Panteidyia, with whom he had intercourse. Soon afterwards she married Thestios and gave birth to Leda, who was generally held to be Thestios' daughter but was really Glaukos'.⁸³ The purpose of this fiction was no doubt to claim the Dioskouroi (rather than Helen or Klytaimestra) as being of Corinthian blood.⁸⁴

We do not know how much further the poet of the *Korinthiaka* took his tale. He can hardly have omitted Glaukos' son Bellerophon, who went to Lycia and started a new royal line there (*Il.* 6.168-211). He may perhaps have been the source for Pindar's myth of the golden bridle that Bellerophon obtained from Athena, which enabled him to capture Pegasus.⁸⁵ Bellerophon's story is, moreover, a possible point of attachment for the Arcadian genealogy attested for Eumelos in two passages of Apollodoros.⁸⁶ It covered at least four generations: Lykaon, his daughter Kallisto, her son Arkas, and Arkas' sons Elatos and Apheidas. According to the *Catalogue of Women* (*fr.* 129.18, 131) Apheidas was the father of Stheneboia, Proitos' wife, whose passion for Bellerophon led to his leaving the Argolid for Lycia.

Pausanias (2.4.3) relates that the Corinthian kingship was carried on by the descendants of another son of Sisyphos, Ornytion, until in the fourth generation the Dorians arrived under the

⁷⁸ Robert (1920-3) 185-6; Wilamowitz (1924) 2.234; A. Lesky, *RE* 15.50-1; Will (1955) 103-14; disputed by Harrauer (1999) 22. For Medea as a goddess, *cf.* Hes. *Th.* [992], Alc. *PMGF* 163(?), Pind. *Pyth.* 4.11, Musaeus *π.* Ἴσθμίων, *FGrHist* 455 F2.

⁷⁹ As a son of Aiolos he was in fact Jason's great-uncle according to the standard genealogies (noted by de Fidio (1991) 236). Theopompos' tale that Medea was in love with him (*FGrHist* 115 F356) is not to be projected back into 'Eumelos'; as Jacoby says, it is a 'romanhafte Fortbildung'. Robert (1920-3) 186 suggested that Sisyphos was originally Medea's consort in the pre-Argonautic Corinthian myth. Nicolaus of Damascus (*FGrHist* 90 F36) eliminated Medea and made Sisyphos the immediate successor of Korinthos, whose assassination by local conspirators he avenged.

⁸⁰ Paus. 2.2.2 = *fr.* 6 B. and D. Neleus had taken part in the Isthmian Games; probably he was represented as having stayed at Corinth since then.

⁸¹ *Od.* 11.593-600, Alc. *fr.* 38, Theognidea 702-5, Pherec. *FGrHist* 3 F119 = *fr.* 119 Fowler, etc.; Jacoby 301.

⁸² Plut. *De genio Socratis* 578b. *Cf.* E. Kearns, *The Heroes of Attica* (*BICS* Suppl. 57, 1989) 51-2; J.N. Bremmer in H.G. Kippenberg and G. Stroumsa (eds), *Secrecy and Concealment* (Leiden 1995) 61-3.

⁸³ Schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.146-9a = *fr.* 7 B., 8 D.

⁸⁴ *Cf.* Barigazzi (1966a) 144, who emphasizes the presence of the Dioskouroi among the Argonauts.

⁸⁵ Pind. *Ol.* 13.63-92, *cf.* Paus. 2.4.1; Jacoby (Noten) 186 n.18; Barigazzi (1966a) 139.

⁸⁶ Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.8.2, 3.9.1 = *fr.* 14-15 B., 10-11 D.

leadership of the Heraklid Aletes. Aletes and his descendants then reigned for five generations more to the time of Bacchis, the ancestor of the Bacchiads. Some part of this account may possibly derive from Eumelos,⁸⁷ though it is to be observed that the last of the Sisyphids, Doridas and Hyanthidas, have names that are awkward to accommodate in hexameter verse – awkward, but not impossible, as forms such as Δωρίδεω, Ὑανθίδηι, could have been used with correction before a vowel. It has been suggested that Βακχιάδαι, which alternates in the tradition with Βακχίδαι as the name of the family descended from Bacchis, is a form created by 'Eumelos' for the hexameter.⁸⁸

Such is the evidence for the contents of the *Korinthiaka*. It is obvious what an artificial construct the whole story was. It is easy to discern the author's agenda. He had to explain that Corinth was originally Ephyra, and account for the change of name. He had to define its relationship with Sikyon. Because of the cult of Medea's children, he had to explain her presence in the city and the legitimacy of her queenship. He had to provide also for the Sisyphid dynasty that came with the name Ephyra. He managed to stitch these things together, but he left some rough seams. It is not clear, at least in the evidence available to us, what motivated Aietes to bestow the kingdom on Bounos, or Medea to give it to Sisyphos. There is blatant disregard for chronology: Korinthos, the great-grandson of Aloeus, is succeeded by Medea, the daughter of Aloeus' brother Aietes, and yet she can still bear children. She in turn is succeeded by her husband's great-uncle, Sisyphos. He, grandfather to Leda and therefore living a good three generations before the Trojan War, receives a visit from Nestor, his great-great-nephew. Leda's sons Kastor and Polydeukes visit Corinth as Argonauts even before Sisyphos' reign.

Connections are made with non-Corinthian, especially Thessalian mythology, with the tendency to appropriate some of it for Corinth. Neleus dies there and has a tomb – or so it is claimed; no one can actually visit it. Glaukos is represented as the real father of Leda.

Before we pass on to the *Europa*, let us consider whether there are detectable connections between the *Titanomachy* and the *Korinthiaka* beyond the fact that both were ascribed to Eumelos. I suggest that there are several elements in the former poem that point forward to the latter.

First, there is the interest shown in the Sun-god: his explicit exclusion from the Titans' battle line, his reward of a place in heaven, and the details of his four-horse team and his floating vessel. Admittedly, this god is Hyperion in the first instance, and while we have postulated the identity of Hyperion and Helios in the *Titanomachy*, the Helios of the *Korinthiaka* is called Hyperion's glorious son (*fr.* 3.3 B. = 2.3 D.). But this use of a formula found also in the Homeric Hymns hardly nullifies the argument. It may be added that the young Phaethon's participation in the Isthmian Games may be a sign that the poet somewhere told the story of his drive in the solar chariot, with the horses that were introduced in the *Titanomachy*.

Secondly, there is the prominence of the ancient, many-handed sea-deity Aigaion or Briareos, who in the *Titanomachy* measured himself against Zeus and in the *Korinthiaka* was called in to arbitrate between Poseidon and Helios over the division of the land.

Thirdly, there is the prominence of the sons of Iapetos. Atlas, Menoitios and Prometheus all had distinctive roles in the first poem, and the unwarlike brother who is missing there, Epimetheus, turns up in the second poem as the husband of Ephyra and father-in-law of Helios. A factor in the use of Epimetheus may have been an association with Mekone-Sikyon, if that is where Hesiod thought of him as receiving Pandora; and that may also have been the place where the gods cast lots in the *Titanomachy*.

⁸⁷ So Dunbabin (1948) 67; Will (1955) 238; Brillante (1981) 192; Salmon (1984) 38, 46-7, 49-50, 52; denied by Jacoby (1955) 299.

⁸⁸ T. Lenschau, *RE Suppl.* 4.1013.

These links may suggest that, whether or not the two poems were actually the work of one poet, they were intended to complement one another. The *Titanomachy* supplied the divine pre-history to the Corinthian dynastic history. They constituted a unity of the same sort as that formed by the Hesiodic *Theogony* and *Catalogue of Women*, that is, a sequence of genealogies that began with the gods and continued with mortal kings. In the Hesiodic case the continuation is certainly by a second hand. In the case of the Eumelian complex we have not got the evidence on which to make a judgement, or to override the general ancient hesitation about Eumelos' authorship.

THE EUROPIA

How does it stand with the *Europa*? Examining the scanty fragments for signs of connection with the *Korinthiaka* or with Corinth or Sikyon, we make three relevant observations.

The first concerns the story of Dionysos and Lykourgos which is related summarily in *Iliad* 6.130-40 and which, according to the D scholia, many authors had referred to, 'and principally (προηγούμενος) Eumelos the author of the *Europa*' (= fr. 11 B., *Eur.* 1 D.). We should not spring to the conclusion that the *Iliad* poet got it from the *Europa*, but it is noteworthy that he drags it in oddly just in the episode where Glaukos rehearses to Diomedes the history of Sisyphos of Ephyra and his descendants (6.152-211). Nowhere else in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* does Dionysos have such prominence. But he was the patron deity of the Bacchiadai, as their name implies; the Bacchis from whom they claimed descent was a son of the god.⁸⁹ Dionysos may therefore have been somewhat more at home in Archaic Corinthian epic than he is in Homer, whether or not the *Europa* was actually composed by a Bacchiad.

The second observation concerns Amphion, whom the *Europa* celebrated as the first man to play the lyre: Hermes taught him the art, to such effect that his music attracted the animals and moved the stones with which the walls of Thebes were built.⁹⁰ As mentioned earlier, Amphion and his brother Zethos have a direct connection with Sikyon in the legend that their mother Antiope had been abducted from Hyria in Boiotia by the Sikyonian Epopeus, and that he was actually their father. Epopeus, as we have seen, played a part in the narrative of the *Korinthiaka*.

The third observation concerns another daughter of Asopos who appeared in 'Eumelos': Sinope, eponym of the Milesian colony on the Black Sea (fr. 10 B. = 7 D.). Because this Pontic allusion seemed to tie up with the Argonauts and the Kolchian location of Aietes' kingdom (fr. 3.8 B. = 2.8 D.), it has generally been assumed that the testimony is to be referred to the *Korinthiaka*. However, the scholiast on Apollonius who cites Eumelos mentions that Sinope was abducted by Apollo from Hyria in Boiotia. This makes her parallel to the Antiope who was abducted from Hyria by Epopeus, the mother of Amphion and Zethos. Amphion at least was dealt with in the *Europa*. So perhaps Sinope should be assigned to the same poem. If so, the Black Sea interest makes another link with the *Korinthiaka*. If on the other hand Sinope had her place in the *Korinthiaka*, then the link between the two poems would be their shared interest in Asopides abducted from Hyria.⁹¹

The title *Europa* implies that the story of Europa had a prominent place in the work, which Pausanias indeed cites as 'the Europa epic', τὰ ἔπη τὰ ἐς Εὐρώπην (9.5.8).⁹² A text that has

⁸⁹ Schol. Ap. Rhod. 4.1212/14a. Cf. H. Jeanmaire, *Dionysos* (Paris 1951) 72-3; Untersteiner (1971) 171.

⁹⁰ Paus. 9.5.8 = fr. 13 B., *Eur.* 3 D. As Hermes was his teacher, Amphion's instrument was the simple tortoise-shell lyre, not the Apolline cithara.

⁹¹ It has been plausibly suggested that some other mythical Asopides such as Korkyra, Thebe and Aigina

appeared in 'Eumelos': Bowra (1938) 216-19; G. Capovilla, *Rend. Ist. Lomb.* 91 (1957) 746-50.

⁹² This is against Scaliger's idea that the poem was named after Europs, the son of the autochthonous Aigialeus in a Sikyonian genealogy known to Kastor, *FGrHist* 250 F2 and Paus. 2.5.6.

hitherto eluded editors attests that it described her abduction by Zeus: Philodemos, *De pietate* 1692 iii (lines 7262-70 Obbink),

ὁ δὲ [τὴν Εὐ]ρώπειαν γράψα[ς] καὶ αὐτῆς τὸν α[ὐ]τὸν ἐρασθῆνα[ί] φησιν, καὶ διὰ τ[ὸ] μὴ ὑπομείνα[ι μι]χθῆναι Διὶ αὐτ[ὸν] αὐτῆν [τὸν] Δία [πα]ρηιρήσ[θαι].

The author of the *Europa* says that the same god fell in love with her [Europa] too, and that because she would not submit to intercourse with Zeus, Zeus himself abducted her.

The poem must then have recorded the birth of her sons Minos, Rhadamanthys and Sarpedon, and perhaps some of their descendants. There is one fragment, attributed to ‘Eumelos’ without the poem being specified, that can perhaps be attached here. It is a notice that Menelaos had a son Xenodamos by a Knossian nymph.⁹³ It is a reasonable guess that the amorous encounter occurred on the fatal occasion when Menelaos went to Crete for the funeral of his maternal grandfather Katreus, leaving Helen to look after the house-guest Paris.⁹⁴ Katreus was a son of Minos. The poet may therefore have followed the line Minos – Katreus – Aerope – the Atreidai.

The story of Europa led also towards Boiotia. We know that the *Europa* of Stesichoros included the story of Kadmos’ foundation of Thebes (*PMGF* 195), no doubt after he had searched in vain for his vanished sister Europa and received advice from Delphi. If the Europa story was developed similarly in the Eumelian poem, this suggests possible contexts for the Delphic reference of *fr.* 12 B. = *Eur.* 2 D.,

ὄφρα θεῶι δεκάτην ἀκροθίνιά τε κρεμάσαιμεν
σταθμῶν ἐκ ζαθέων καὶ κίονος ὑψηλοῖο,

So that we might hang up for the god a tithe and first-fruits from his holy steading and tall pillar,

and for Amphion and his lyre.

Europa herself had links with Boiotia, as did one of her sons. There was a myth that Zeus hid her in a cave at Teumessos, and a Demeter Europa was worshipped at Lebadeia. Rhadamanthys is associated with Okalea and Haliartos, where he had a tomb.⁹⁵ Dionysos, the subject of *fr.* 11 B. = *Eur.* 1 D., has connections with Thebes, though his encounter with Lykourgos is located in a region far to the north.

A further doubtful Boiotian connection might be sought in the strange trinity of Muses ascribed to Eumelos by Tzetzes in his commentary on the *Works and Days*, p.23 Gaisford (*fr.* 17 B. = *dub.* 3 D.):

But Eumelos of Corinth says there are three Muses, daughters of Apollo: Kephiso, Apollonis and Borysthenis.

Kephiso necessarily evokes a river Kephisos, and we think in the first instance of the Phokian/Boiotian Kephisos. However, there were several others, including a Sikyonian one.⁹⁶ Borysthenis too is called after a river: Borysthenes (the Dniepr). The third name, Apollonis, is

⁹³ Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.11.1 = *fr.* 9 B. and D. Xenodamos was presumably a figure of Cretan legend. The only guess we can make at his significance is that he might possibly have been a mythical ancestor of Xenodamos of Kythera, an early poet of choral lyric (Pratinas *PMG* 713 (ii); ps.-Plut. *De musica* 1134bc).

⁹⁴ Proclus, summary of the *Cypria*; Apollod. epit. 3.3; Huxley (1969) 74.

⁹⁵ See West (1985) 146. The possibility that the Teumessos myth might come from ‘Eumelos’ has been noted by Wyss on Antim. *fr.* 3; Untersteiner (1971) 172; Lecomte (1998) 75.

⁹⁶ Strabo (9.3.16) enumerates six besides the Phocian one: in Attica, Salamis, Sikyon, Skyros, Argos and Apollonia (Epirus).

suspect, not only because it is not based on a river, but because it fails to individuate; as daughters of Apollo, all three are Apollonides. Gottfried Hermann made these observations and conjectured that ‘Apollonis’ was corrupt for ‘Achelois’.⁹⁷ One might also think of ‘Asopis’, linking Boiotia with Sikyon. In any case the conjunction of central Greece (Kephiso?) and the Black Sea (Borysthenis) recalls the case of the Asopid Sinope. But in what context might ‘Eumelos’ have named such Muses? In an invocation at the beginning of a poem?⁹⁸ If so, the bizarre choice of names might have been governed by the scope of the intended work. A poet who planned to deal with Boiotian myths and also to pursue Pontic connections might perhaps have invented these particular Muses to deliver the material. But it remains very peculiar.

Finally an indirect association may be noted between Europa and Corinth.⁹⁹ The Corinthian cult of Hellotis has been mentioned in connection with Marathon. This goddess was known in one or two other places, including Crete – Gortyn is mentioned in particular – and there she was identified with Europa.¹⁰⁰ Seleukos in his *Glossai* (fr. 52 Müller ap. Ath. 678a) recorded the word ἔλλωτις, denoting an enormous myrtle garland, twenty cubits in circumference, which was carried in procession at the Hellotia:

φασὶ δὲ ἐν αὐτῶι τὰ τῆς Εὐρώπης ὅστᾳ κομίζεσθαι, ἦν ἐκάλουν Ἑλλωτίδα. ἄγεται (-εσθαι Ath.)
δὲ καὶ ἐν Κορίνθωι τὰ Ἑλλώτια.

And they say that in it are conveyed the bones of Europa, whom they called Hellotis. The Hellotia are also held at Corinth.

As the additional clause at the end indicates, the festival that featured the garland said to contain Europa’s bones was not the Corinthian Hellotia; it was presumably the Cretan one.¹⁰¹ Europa, we know, was strongly attached to Crete in myth. There is no evidence that Hellotis was identified with her at Corinth.

CONCLUSIONS

The discussion of the *Europa* is necessarily unsatisfactory and leaves loose ends. The testimonia are too few for us to assess where its centre(s) of gravity lay. One of its foci may have been Boiotian mythology, seen from a Sikyonian-Corinthian perspective. It may or may not be relevant that in the Pythian *Hymn to Apollo* (251 and 291) Εὐρώπη is a geographical term designating central and northern Greece.

If the Sikyonian-Corinthian perspective is real, and the poem was a product of that region and initially current in it, it might be seen as complementing the more narrowly local *Korinthiaka*, however imperfectly it did so.¹⁰² A couple of pages back I pointed to links between the *Korinthiaka* and the *Titanomachy*, and argued that they too effectively complemented one another, the *Titanomachy* supplying the divine prehistory to the Corinthian dynastic history. When we take the *Europa* into account as well, it does not seem far-fetched to speak of a sort of Corinthian epic cycle.

⁹⁷ *Opuscula* 2 (Leipzig 1827) 301. His discussion of the fragment is otherwise unprofitable.

⁹⁸ Such is clearly the source of fr. 16 B. = *dub.* 2 D., Μνημοσύνης καὶ Ζηνὸς Ὀλυμπίου ἐννέα κοῦραι. This may have been the first line of the *Titanomachy* or *Korinthiaka*.

⁹⁹ Cf. Barigazzi (1966a) 148 n.1; Lecomte (1998) 75.

¹⁰⁰ Hesych. ε 2181, ‘Hellotia: a festival of Europa in Crete’; Steph. Byz. p.212.2 Meineke, ‘Gortyn... formerly called Hellotis, for so Europa was called among the

Cretans’; cf. *Et. Gen.* ε 423 = *Magn.* 332.40, ‘Europa was anciently called Hellotia’.

¹⁰¹ Wilamowitz (1931-2) 1.383.

¹⁰² Untersteiner (1971) 172 suggested that the poem was ‘una specie di sintesi religiosa, alla maniera delle *Eoiai*, in modo da ottenere il collegamento di alcune significative storie sacre, che illustrassero non solo l’unità spirituale-religiosa di Corinto e della Beozia, ma anche i rapporti fra il mondo egeo e quello della grecità sicula, dall’Asia e dalla Tracia fino a Siracusa.’

If Eumelos was remembered in connection with the Messenian Prosodion as a significant poet from Corinth, it is not surprising if the epics too, in the absence of other claimants, came to be ascribed to him, whether or not he actually had anything to do with any of them. This was already the view of Welcker.¹⁰³ As É. Will put it:

Le nom d'Eumèlos pourrait avoir été passablement... collectif.

On est ainsi amené à se demander si le nom d'Eumèlos serait attaché non tant à l'œuvre d'un poète qu'à une tradition corinthienne, dont l'élaboration première remonterait bien au VIII^e s. mais qui aurait pu être remaniée par la suite, et fixée dans le langage épique. La nature même de la geste d'une cité laisse entrevoir la possibilité de remaniements, d'additions, de retranchements...¹⁰⁴

Will's suggestion that the beginnings of this tradition may go back to the eighth century is no doubt based on the supposed date of Eumelos. But if the situation is as sketched above, and it is a matter of anonymous poems being ascribed to Eumelos, the date(s) of their composition is (are) independent of his lifetime. Any attempt at dating them must be founded on internal evidence.

We saw that the *Titanomachy* appeared to exhibit certain motifs in a more original state than Hesiod: Aigaion-Briareos as a strongly individual marine deity, not just one of three less clearly defined Hundred-handers; the more definite roles played by Iapetos' sons Atlas, Menoitios and Prometheus in the war between the Titans and the younger gods; the Cyclopes as general artificers, not specialist thunderbolt-makers, and the treatment of their release from captivity and their material assistance as an organic part of the *Titanomachy*. There are other things that look old: the oriental motif of the battle between the Storm-god and a monster representing the sea; the three divine brothers each armed with a special weapon; their division of the universe among themselves by lot. This last (again an ancient oriental myth) is known to the poet of the *Iliad*, as are Poseidon's trident and Hades' cap of invisibility.

All this would be compatible with an eighth-century dating of the *Titanomachy*, but other considerations must be set against it. The Sun's chariot and his floating vessel are unknown to Hesiod and the Homeric epics (though Dawn has a chariot in *Od.* 23.244-6). Outside the *Titanomachy* they first appear in Mimnermos; the chariot also in some of the Homeric Hymns, and the vessel in Pisander's *Herakleia*.¹⁰⁵ These items, then, are not securely attested before about 630 BC. The fact that the Eumelian Sun-god has four horses to his chariot rather than two (as Dawn has to hers in the *Odyssey* passage) is also against a very early date. Four-horse teams are abnormal in Homer, and in art they are not represented before the later eighth century. According to Pausanias they were admitted to the Olympic Games in 680.¹⁰⁶

Another thing not likely to be very ancient is the idea of Cheiron as the teacher of mankind, which would seem to presuppose the currency of the 'Hesiodic' *Precepts of Cheiron* or some similar composition. Admittedly we do not know how old this poem was. The evidence shows only that it was well known by the first half of the fifth century.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰³ Welcker (1865) 1.257-8: 'Spätere Verse unbekannter Verfasser, die in Korinth einheimisch waren, giengen, wie es scheint, wegen dieser Unbekanntheit unter demselben Namen, der wenigstens die Korinthische Herkunft unterschied.'

¹⁰⁴ Will (1955) 125, 128-9 (author's triple dots).

¹⁰⁵ *Mimn. fr.* 12 W.; *Hymn. Dem.* 63, 88, *Herm.* 69, *Hymn. Hom.* 28.14, 31.9, 15; *Pisander fr.* 5 B. = 6 D. The chariot is another oriental motif: West (1997) 507-8.

¹⁰⁶ *Il.* 8.185 (interpolation), 11. 699; *Od.* 13.81-3;

Paus. 5.8.7; H.L. Lorimer, *Homer and the Monuments* (London 1950) 328; J. Wiesner, *Fahren und Reiten (Archaeologia Homerica 1 F, Göttingen 1968)*, 22-3, 66: 'in geometrischer Zeit noch nicht häufig. Daß dieser Fahrweise die Zukunft gehörte, zeigt das Konkurrieren mit der Zweigespanntradition seit dem achten Jahrhundert.'

¹⁰⁷ See testimonia in R. Merkelbach and M.L. West, *Fragmenta Hesiodica* (Oxford 1967) 143-4.

All in all, the likelihood is that the *Titanomachy* was composed in the later seventh or the sixth century, though it contained mythical material of older origin. If Stephanie West¹⁰⁸ should be right in suggesting that it introduced the story of the Flood, it would probably have to be brought down to the late sixth century, as this myth is first attested by Pindar and Epicharmos and was apparently absent from the *Catalogue of Women*.

We turn to the *Korinthiaka*. The first point to be made with regard to its dating is that the assertion of Corinthian and Sikyonian status in the heroic age is essentially post-Iliadic. That is not to say that the assertion had not yet been made when the *Iliad* was composed, only that it had not achieved any wide recognition. There is no sign that the Ephyra of Sisyphos, Glaukos and Bellerophon in *Iliad* 6 is meant to be Corinth; ἔστι πόλις Ἐφύρη implies a distant place, not too well known, and the expression μυχῶι Ἄργεος ἱποβότοιο also indicates somewhere out of the way. It would be a very odd way to refer to the location of Corinth.¹⁰⁹ The Sikyonian claim on Adrastos, unsubtly interpolated at *Il.* 2.572, is best attested for the time of Kleisthenes, when it received the authorization of the Delphic Oracle (Hdt. 5.67). To be sure, the interpolator who called Adrastos Sikyon's first king was no student of 'Eumelos'. Conversely, we have no evidence for Adrastos in 'Eumelos'. But we do have evidence for Corinthian adoption of mythical heroes for cult purposes in the reference to tombs of Neleus and Sisyphos.

The nomination of Marathon as the father of Sikyon and Korinthos is puzzling, but as I have said, it has analogies in sixth-century genealogies ('Hesiod', Asios) that linked Sikyon with Attica.

Aietes' eastern kingdom is located in Kolchis: *fr.* 3.8 B. = 2.8 D., ὃ δ' ἔκετο Κολχίδα γαῖαν. This is the only evidence before Simonides¹¹⁰ for the identification of the mythical Aia with the land of the Kolchians, who were a real people.¹¹¹ There is no good reason to believe that the identification preceded Greek settlement in Kolchis, which appears to date only from the middle of the sixth century, though the region was no doubt visited sporadically before that.¹¹²

If Favorinus' mythical account of the first Isthmian Games comes from 'Eumelos', and if the details can be trusted, there are further implications for chronology. The Games are supposed to have been suspended by Kypselos and restored in their original form in 582, i.e. after the fall of the Kypselids. Solinus 7.14:

hoc spectaculum per Cypselum tyrannum intermissum Corinthii olympiade quadragesima nona sollempnitati pristinae reddiderunt.

This spectacle, which had been intermitted under the tyrant Kypselos, the Corinthians restored to its old ceremonial in the forty-ninth Olympiad.

The abolition of a prestigious, potentially supra-regional festival is an unlikely act for a popular tyrant. The truth is more likely that the Games were first established in 582; a mythical origin was invented for them,¹¹³ and it was claimed that the new Games were a restoration of old ones

¹⁰⁸ See n.20 above.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. E. Bethe, *Thebanische Heldenlieder* (Leipzig 1891) 181-4; W. Leaf, *Homer and History* (London 1915) 216-19 and on *Il.* 6.152.

¹¹⁰ *PMG* 545, and probably *SLG* 372.3 from *POxy* 2623, now known to be also Simonides.

¹¹¹ Urartian *Qulhā*: I.M. Diakonoff and S.M. Kashkai, *Répertoire géographique des textes cunéiformes* 9: *Geographical Names According to Urartian Texts* (Wiesbaden 1981) 68-9.

¹¹² D. Braund, *Georgia in Antiquity* (Oxford 1994) 89-118; Tssetskhladze (1998) 35; id., *Die Griechen in der Kolchis* (Amsterdam 1998). These writers misguidedly cite 'Eumelos' as evidence that Aia was localized at Kolchis as early as 700 or before.

¹¹³ Not necessarily from the Argonauts' visit. The more usual account is that Poseidon or Sisyphos or Glaukos founded the Games in honour of Melikertes-Palaïmon, the drowned son of Athamas. In another version they were founded by Theseus. See K. Schneider, *RE* 9.2248; Barigazzi (1966a) 141 n.1.

that had been celebrated in the same form. The now unpopular tyranny was blamed for the interruption. That at least is Solinus’ story, but in Jerome’s version of Eusebius’ *Chronicle* under Ol. 49 we read: *Isthmia post Melicerten et Pythia primum acta*, in other words, these were the first Isthmia since Melikertes.

This will give us – again, if Favorinus is following the *Korinthiaka* – a definite *terminus post quem* of 582. Of the events that Favorinus enumerates, two are of particular interest. There is a contest for κιθάρα, i.e. for citharody, which Orpheus wins. Orpheus is never heard of before the mid sixth century. He is first named on the sculptured metope of the Sikyonian Treasury at Delphi, and in literature by Ibykos; Pythagoras had much to do with the dissemination of his fame.¹¹⁴ In what may have been the earlier version of the Argonauts’ adventures their musician was Philammon (Pherecydes, *FGrHist* 3 F26 = *fr.* 26 Fowler). It is actually questionable whether a musical contest existed at the Isthmia before the Hellenistic period, as Nikokles of Tarentum (early third century BC) in the inscription recording his many citharodic triumphs claims to be the first Isthmian victor.¹¹⁵ Still, the concept was certainly familiar in the sixth century, and ‘Eumelos’ might have put in a citharodic event for Orpheus’ sake, as he was a notable presence among the Argonauts. The boat race is similarly an *ad hoc* invention for the Argo; there is no other evidence for such an event at the Isthmia at any period.

The other contest worthy of remark is the *enhoplion* won by Theseus, that is, a race in armour, Hoplitodromia. According to Pausanias (5.8.10) this event was first introduced at the Olympic Games in 520. So we may have here another pointer to a late date.

The claim that Glaukos was the real father of Leda, and thus the grandfather of the Dioskouroi, was endorsed by a lyric poet quoted in the same scholion to Apollonius that records the Eumelian story, 1.146-9a:

Φερεκύδης δὲ ἐν τῇ β̄ ἐκ Λαοφόνης τῆς Πλευρῶνος Λήδαν καὶ Ἀλθαίαν γενέσθαι φησίν. ὅτι δὲ Γλαύκου ἐστὶ θυγάτηρ, καὶ †Ἀλθαίας αἰνίττεται λέγων· “τοὺς τέκε θυγάτηρ Γλαύκω μάκαιρα”.

Pherecydes in Book 2 [*FGrHist* 3 F9 = *fr.* 9 Fowler] says that Leda and Althaia were born from Laophone the daughter of Pleuron. But that [Leda] is Glaukos’ daughter, †Althaias too implies when he says, ‘[the Dioskouroi,] whom Glaukos’ blessed daughter bore’ [= *PMG* adesp. 1012].

The poet’s name has been corrupted under the influence of the preceding Ἀλθαίαν, but the Doric or Aeolic genitive Γλαύκω makes it virtually certain that he was either Alkman or Alkaios. Bergk assigned the fragment to Alkman, writing τὼς τέκε <οῖ> to restore a plausibly Alcmanic elegiambus (his *fr.* 8). He was followed in this ascription by Diehl (*fr.* 6) and Calame (*fr.* °230). Wendel noted that Ἀλκαῖος would be closer to what is transmitted, and Page said he would prefer it, emending to τοὺς τέκε Γλαύκω θυγάτηρ, an Alcaic hendecasyllable that might in fact be accommodated in the lost portion of Alkaios’ hymn to the Dioskouroi (*fr.* 34). I think the balance of probability is on Page’s side. But whether it was Alkaios or Alkman, the fragment indicates that the Corinthian version of Leda’s ancestry was already abroad by the late seventh century. We have seen reason to suspect that the *Korinthiaka* was composed, or at any rate brought into its definitive form, distinctly later than that. If so, it incorporated an older claim about Leda.

Finally the *Europia*. There is very little to go on. The poem is named as the principal text in which to find the story of Dionysos and Lykourgos as related by Diomedes in *Iliad* 6. It has already been noted that the tale is dragged in oddly here, and in the very scene where the Sisyphid genealogy is presented. This raises a suspicion that the poet of the *Iliad* had become acquainted with some poetry in which those two things were both contained. But as has also

¹¹⁴ West (1983) 7-20.

¹¹⁵ *IG* ii² 3779. Cf. my *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford 1992) 373.

been noted, he does not appear to associate Sisyphos' Ephyra with Corinth. So perhaps it was poetry that was only later, or independently, adapted and exploited by Corinthians.

The reference to Sinope as a daughter of Asopos, which I have attributed to the *Europia* on account of the indirect parallel between her abduction from Hyria and that of Antiope, presupposes an interest in the Black Sea. So does the Muse Borysthenis, whom I assigned to this poem on the frail ground that she and Sinope were better not separated. Supposing these assumptions to be right, what are the chronological implications? Pontic exploration probably goes back to the eighth century, but Sinope was not likely to be celebrated as an Asopid before the establishment of the pioneering Milesian colony, a cardinal event in Greek penetration of the Black Sea. Although Eusebius dates this to before 756, the archaeological evidence, which alone has any value, points to the late seventh century.¹¹⁶ The settlement on Berezan, the island opposite the Dniepr-Bug estuary, dates from much the same time.¹¹⁷ If Sinope and Borysthenis had a place in the *Europa*, therefore, we can say that the poem was composed not much before 600. For all we know, it may have been a good deal later.

M.L. WEST
All Souls College, Oxford

¹¹⁶ A.I. Ivantchik in Tsetschladze (1998) 329-30; Boardman (1999) 242, 254-5, 282. R. Drews, *JHS* 96 (1976) 24, appeals to 'Eumelos' as evidence for an eighth-century Corinthian foundation: another example of historians and archaeologists being misled by unreliable literary history.

¹¹⁷ Boardman (1999) 282; S.L. Solovyov, *Ancient Berezan (Colloquia Pontica* 4, Leiden, Boston and Cologne 1999) 3-4; *id.* in G.R. Tsetschladze (ed.), *North Pontic Archaeology. Recent Discoveries and Studies (Colloquia Pontica* 6, Leiden, Boston and Cologne 2001) 120.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barigazzi, A. (1966a) 'Nuovi frammenti dei *Corinthiaca* di Eumelo', *RFIC* 94, 129-48
 – (1966b) *Favorino di Arelate, Opere* (Florence)
- Boardman, J. (1999) *The Greeks Overseas* (4th edn, London)
- Bowra, C.M. (1938) 'The daughters of Asopos', *Hermes* 73, 213-21 = his *Problems in Greek Poetry* (Oxford 1953) 54-65
- Brillante, C. (1981) *La leggenda eroica e la civiltà micenea* (Rome)
- Davies, M. (1989) *The Epic Cycle* (Bristol)
- de Fidio, P. (1991) 'Un modello di "Mythistorie": Asopia ed Efirea nei "Korinthiaka" di Eumelo', in F. Prontera (ed.), *Geografia storica della Grecia antica* (Rome) 233-63
- Dörig, J. and O. Gigon (1961) *Der Kampf der Götter und Titanen* (Olten and Lausanne)
- Dunbabin, T.J. (1948) 'The early history of Corinth', *JHS* 68, 59-68
- Harrauer, C. (1999) 'Der korinthische Kindermord. Eumelos und die Folgen', *Wien. St.* 112, 5-28
- Huxley, G.L. (1969) *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis* (London)
- Jacoby, F. (1955) *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* IIIb, Kommentar zu Nr. 297-607 (Leiden); the notes volume cited as 'Noten'
- Kranz, W. (1967) 'Titanomachia', in his *Studien zur antiken Literatur und ihrem Fortwirken* (Heidelberg) 89-96; originally in *Studi in onore di Luigi Castiglioni* (Florence 1960) 1.475-86
- Lebedev, A. (1998) 'The justice of Chiron (*Titanomachy*, Fr. 6 and 11 B.)', *Philologus* 142, 3-10
- Lecomte, C. (1998) 'L'Εὐρωπία d'Eumélos de Corinthe', in R. Poignault and O. Wattel-de Croizant (eds), *D'Europe à l'Europe 1: Le mythe d'Europe* (Tours) 71-9
- Preller, L. and C. Robert (1894) *Theogonie und Götter (Griechische Mythologie 1*, 4th edn, Berlin)
- Radermacher, L. (1938) *Mythos und Sage bei den Griechen* (Vienna)
- Robert, C. (1920-3) *Die griechische Heldensage (Griechische Mythologie 2*, 4th edn, Berlin)
- Roscher, W.H. (ed.) (1884-1937) *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* (Leipzig and Berlin)
- Salmon, J.B. (1984) *Wealthy Corinth. A History of the City to 338 BC* (Oxford)
- Severyns, A. (1928) *Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque* (Liège and Paris)
- Tsetschladze, G.R. (1998) (ed.) *The Greek Colonization of the Black Sea Area (Historia Einzelschriften 121*, Stuttgart)
- Untersteiner, M. (1971) 'Eumelo di Corinto', in his *Scritti minori* (Brescia) 165-79; originally in *Antiquitas* 6/7 (1951-2) 3-13
- Vian, F. (1952) *La guerre des Géants* (Paris)
- Welcker, F.G. (1865/1849) *Der epische Cyclus* 1 (2nd edn), 2 (Bonn)
- West, M.L. (1983) *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford)
 – (1985) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Its Nature, Structure, and Origins* (Oxford)
 – (1997) *The East Face of Helicon. West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford)
- Wilamowitz(-Moellendorff), U. von (1924) *Hellenistische Dichtung* 1-2 (Berlin)
 – (1931-2) *Der Glaube der Hellenen* 1-2 (Berlin)
- Wilisch, E.G. (1875) *Über die Fragmente des Epikers Eumelus* (Progr. Zittau)
- Will, É. (1955) *Korinthiaka. Recherches sur l'histoire et la civilisation de Corinthe des origines aux guerres médiques* (Paris)