

ßend den Besten der Achaier zum Zweikampf fordert, wird das Fehlen Achills bereits peinlich fühlbar: keiner will kämpfen (H 92 ff). In der *κόλος μάχη* endlich wird die Situation geschaffen, deren Konsequenz die Bittgesandtschaft ist. Diese Linie führt deutlich von der Masse zu den Wenigen und von den Wenigen zu dem Einen. Die Motive aus dem Kriegsanfang sind von dieser Konzeption kaum zu trennen. Im Vertrauen auf die Weisagung von Aulis stürmt die Masse los – unabsehbare Scharen – wie am ersten Tag; jetzt ist der Augenblick gekommen, die neun Jahre Krieg werden zu einem Vorfeld des eigentlichen Beginns. Dieser zweite Beginn absorbiert alle Motive des ersten und verdeckt auf diese Weise Achill. Da der Zorn Achills mit der Patroklie und dem Tod Hektors ein Kriegsende-Motiv ist, kann man sagen, daß der Dichter (oder Kompilator) Anfang und Ende ineinanderschiebt, eine Prozedur, bei der der eigentliche Anfang und das eigentliche Ende wegfallen; oder anders ausgedrückt: bei der das aufs neue vergegenwärtigte Orakel von Aulis und die Lösung Hektors zum eigentlichen Anfang und Ende werden. Es ist klar, daß in dieser Konzeption das Umdisponieren der Anfangs-Motive eine entscheidende Rolle spielt und der Schiffskatalog jedenfalls sinnvoll ist und neben der Aufzählung der Mannschaften noch eine weitere, wichtige Funktion hat. Um ihretwillen hat der Dichter des Prooimions seine „Entschuldigung“ erfunden.

Berlin

Tilman Krischer

---

## CALLISTO AND THE VIRGINITY OF ARTEMIS

---

The story of Callisto achieves its most familiar and most elegant form in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, 2.401–530. She was an Arcadian princess and close companion of Artemis; Zeus saw her, wanted her, and took the form of Artemis to seduce her; she was driven from Artemis' company after her pregnancy was discovered, gave birth to a son named Arcas, and was changed by Hera into a bear; when Arcas was grown he came across his mother in the woods and was about to kill her when Zeus put

her amongst the stars as the Great Bear; Hera then persuaded Tethys to keep Callisto from bathing in the ocean. The tale is suffused with the imagination of poets, of both Ovid and his predecessors: lust, not for the last time, takes the guise of chastity in order to seduce innocence; the maid who has been raped feels the same guilt as if she had been seduced; the black and ugly bear that the "most beautiful" girl becomes seems to symbolize the black, ugly envy that drives Hera, so that in wreaking the change upon Callisto she is giving visible form to her own emotions; and this envy is such as to pursue its victim even beyond the grave, or its equivalent, and to assault the starry memorial to the hated rival. Apart from such touches of poetic imagination, the story includes details which have grown up in the course of time around a simple nucleus; there are other complex versions like Ovid's, containing considerable differences in detail, but these can, I think, be reduced ultimately to the same basic elements. The task of the present paper is to uncover this fundamental story and to discuss its relationship to the cult of Artemis *Kalliste*, who had a sanctuary in central Arcadia in which Callisto was said to lie buried.

Such a task is interesting in itself, but it has a further and perhaps more important justification. Scholars since the time of K. O. Müller have felt that the maiden Callisto and the goddess Artemis *Kalliste* were once identical – that what was later said about Callisto was once said about Artemis – and that therefore in early times Artemis was considered a mother. As Müller put it, she was "introduced under the name of Callisto into the national genealogies, and called the daughter of Lycaon (i. e. of the Lycaean Zeus) and mother of Arcas (i. e. of the Arcadian people)"<sup>1</sup>). Later scholars have combined the idea that Artemis was not always a virgin with other data in order to promulgate the view that the goddess is derived from a Cretan "Mother of the Mountains", held by many to be the chief divinity of the Minoan pantheon<sup>2</sup>). I have no wish to discuss the correctness of

1) Karl Otfried Müller, *Die Dorier* (Breslau 1824) I, 372.

2) See, for example, H. J. Rose, *A Handbook of Greek Mythology* (London 1928) 112–22, Karl Hoenn, *Artemis* (Zurich 1946) 17 and *passim*, and W. K. C. Guthrie, *The Greeks and their Gods* (Boston 1950) 99–106, who derive Artemis from a Cretan (or Aegean) mother-goddess who is also the Mistress of Animals. Also asserting her original motherhood are E. Curtius, "Studien zur Geschichte der Artemis", *Sitz. Berlin*, 1887, 1173–75; L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, II (Oxford 1896) 442–6; Wernicke in Pauly-Wissowa

this conception of Minoan religion, though I must confess to finding plausible Nilsson's arguments that we should not attribute maternal qualities to the Mistress of Animals, from whom Artemis may indeed have derived some features<sup>3</sup>). I want rather to examine the validity of the argument which, historically, was the basis for challenging Artemis' virginity. Does an analysis of the myth of Callisto support the view that there was an early and fundamental connection between Callisto and Lycaon and between the divinities with whom they were associated? Is the earliest form of the myth of Callisto one in which her identity with Artemis is evident? And does whatever identity can be claimed justify the attribution of any of Callisto's mythology to Artemis?

The principal study of the development of Callisto's myth is Reinhold Franz's *De Callistis Fabula*<sup>4</sup>), a work which can be criticized, but not, for the later period at any rate, genuinely improved upon. Hence I will make no effort here to trace the full development of the myth, but will confine myself to the two chief pre-Alexandrian forms of it which Franz felt he had uncovered, the Arcadian and the Hesiodic versions. The Hesiodic, which he considered earlier, went as follows: Callisto, daughter of Lycaon, devoted herself to hunting and became a companion of Artemis. Zeus saw her and forced her to submit to him; her pregnancy was eventually discovered by Artemis, who changed her to a bear. Callisto returned to Mt. Lycaeus, and gave birth to Arcas; Zeus sent Hermes to turn the infant over to Maia and to nurture the mother. This story, down to the birth of Arcas, is attributed to Hesiod by Eratosthenes, as we infer from the various witnesses to this work, of which Hyginus' *Poetic Astronomy* is the most faithful<sup>5</sup>). The rest of it has mostly been extracted by Franz from the scholia to Theocritus 1.123 and attached to this Hesiodic version for no good reason; I have elsewhere argued that we simply do not know how this story ended<sup>6</sup>).

*RE*, I, 1340 (s. v. "Artemis"); Schreiber in Roscher's *Lexikon* I, 576, 580-1 (s. v. "Artemis").

3) Martin P. Nilsson, *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion*, 2 ed. (Lund 1950). Pages 389-96 contain his criticism of the theory that the Mistress of Animals was a mother-goddess; in 503-10 he discusses the connection between the Mistress of Animals and Artemis.

4) In *Leipziger Studien*, XII, part 2 (Leipzig 1890) 235-365.

5) The most recent discussion of this work is in Jean Martin's *Histoire du Texte des Phénomènes d'Aratos* (Paris 1956) 38-126.

6) In "The Story of Callisto in Hesiod", *Rheinisches Museum* 102 (1962) 133-141. I have used the term "181 A" to refer to the fragment from Eratosthenes containing the story of Callisto down to the birth of Arcas.

I have also tried to show that there must have been another Hesiodic version, in which Callisto was not the daughter of Lycaon but one of the nymphs<sup>7</sup>).

The version which Franz gives to the Arcadians is referred to by the *Certamen Hesiodi et Homeri*:

Hesiod: But after she succumbed to sexual intercourse,  
arrow-pouring Artemis

Homer: Slew Callisto with her silver bow (111-2).

This version is also mentioned by Apollodorus (3.8.2) and is illustrated by some Arcadian coins and perhaps a statue of the fifth century B. C.<sup>8</sup>). From these witnesses Franz constructed the following tale: Callisto, daughter of Lycaon, became a companion of Artemis and swore to be chaste. Zeus seduced her, Artemis became angry when she discovered Callisto's pregnancy and shot her, and Hermes snatched the child and carried him to Cyllene for his mother Maia to nourish, while Callisto was buried where she fell. The notion that in this version Lycaon was Callisto's father is quite baseless and apparently a slip on Franz' part; this Arcadian version could in fact be identical with the Hesiodic story (fragment 181 D) in which Callisto was one of the nymphs. It is worth noticing too that Hermes' role in the story looks like a later addition, an attempt on the part of those who dwelt around Cyllene to lay some kind of claim to Arcas. The way they make this claim recognizes implicitly that the myth that Callisto was Arcas' mother was too well known to be tampered with.

Franz seems to be justified in maintaining that most of the elements not found in these two versions are late<sup>9</sup>). Zeus' dis-

7) Apollodorus 3.8.2 (Fragment 181 D by my nomenclature). Franz attempts to eliminate this fragment by emending the text of Apollodorus; for a criticism of this procedure see *Rb. Mus.* 102 (1962) 135-6. Though there are thus two Hesiodic versions, I will continue to use Franz' term "Hesiodic version" for fragment 181 A where no confusion is likely to arise; we have no good idea how the version of 181 D went.

8) Jean Svoronos in „La 'Suppliante' Barberini", *Journal International d'Archéologie et Numismatique* 16 (1914) 255-77 argues that the so-called Barberini Suppliant is actually the Callisto of Deinomenes' Callisto-Io group (Paus. 1.25.1), that it was dedicated in 418 B. C., and that it was the model for the Arcadian coins of the following century.

9) In one early version, Callisto is made the mother of Pan, one of the national Arcadian deities, as well as Arcas (Epimenides, Fragment 16 D.-Kr. *Vorsokratiker*). Since this place is virtually unique (Aeschylus may know the genealogy, Franz 239-41), while the relation between Callisto and Arcas is found in many sources, it seems safe to say that Pan has been grafted on to a previous Callisto-Arcas genealogy. Just what version was known to

guising himself as Artemis in order to lull Callisto is expressly attributed by Eratosthenes to the comic poet Amphis (Hyginus P. A. 2.1); it apparently exists for the sake of the irony of Callisto's telling Artemis, when brought to task for her pregnancy, that the angry goddess was herself responsible. Such astronomical fancies as Tethys' refusal to allow Callisto to bathe in her waters (for in fact the Great Bear never sets) are certainly more appropriate to Alexandrian poetry than to any other. And the notion that it was Hera who changed Callisto into a bear seems a complication and refinement, perhaps borrowed from the story of Io, of the earlier version in which Artemis is herself responsible. I cannot however agree with Franz that the catasterism of Callisto is necessarily Alexandrian; the version represented by Hesiod's fragment 181 A can perfectly well have ended this way.

Franz does not hesitate for a moment to say that the Hesiodic version is earlier than the Arcadian: "potest enim haec ex illa, numquam illa ex hac deduci" (282). This unfortunate argument appears to assume that if one version is later than another, the later version must necessarily be implied by and extracted from the earlier, that the author of the later version could not even have added modifications of his own. The use of an entirely different sort of argument leads to quite the opposite conclusion, that the Arcadian is earlier. It is complicated, but based upon a reasonably uncomplicated principle: when there are two or more versions of a given tale concerning a figure principally associated with a certain locale, the story told by the local inhabitants will be the earlier, unless their story has replaced an earlier local version now lost. Suppose that we have two myths, A and B, about a certain local figure, of which we can demonstrate that A is a local myth and B a myth by outsiders. Then the principle asserts that either A has replaced another and different local myth, A', now lost (or else we would not be concerned with A but only with A'), or else A is earlier than B. If the principle were not true, it would mean that B, the outside myth, would precede any version told by local inhabitants, that outsiders would be making myths about a strictly local figure before the native population had made any myth about him at all, and this seems to me unlikely in the extreme.

An illustration will make this principle clearer. On Mt. Lycaeus, in southwestern Arcadia, human beings were sacrificed Euripides (*Helen* 375 ff) is hard to say; he appears to have regarded her as a lion, but the passage seems corrupt.

to Zeus Lycaeus, the weather-god, presumably in order to induce rain<sup>10</sup>). This cult practice finds reflection in the story of Lycaon's, or his sons', offering a child as sacrifice or meal to Zeus. The development of this myth is very complex, and we have almost as many various ways of telling the story as we have sources, but they can probably be reduced to three distinct versions<sup>11</sup>). In one of them, Lycaon is a thoroughly vicious king whom Zeus visits in disguise and who offers the god a meal of human flesh (e.g. Ovid *Metamorphoses* 1. 209-239); in another, Lycaon is an upright king, but his sons offer the visiting Zeus the unholy meal (cf. Nicolaus of Damascus); in the third, Lycaon is apparently an honorable figure, but he kills a child on the altar of Zeus (Pausanias 8.2.1-3). Pausanias tells us that the last version is told locally, and he is convinced of its great antiquity. Both of these opinions can be confirmed.

That it is a local version is indicated by the fact that it is close enough to the cult of Zeus Lycaeus to speak, not of offering a meal to Zeus in disguise, but a sacrifice on his altar<sup>12</sup>). It is hardly a myth at all, but a foundation legend. The same conclusion is indicated too by the fact that the legends of which it forms part honor Lycaon but permit him to perform the awful sacrifice<sup>13</sup>); of the other versions, one preserves his character as a righteous king, and therefore introduces his sons as the sacrificers, while

10) The cult is discussed by Martin P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion* I<sup>2</sup> (Munich 1955) 397-400, where references to earlier work may be found.

11) A list of sources may be found in W. R. Halliday, *Plutarch's Greek Questions* (Oxford 1928), 169-71; my discussion will make it clear why I consider his grouping and analysis unsatisfactory. The following sources should be added to his list: Hesiod Fragment 44 Rz (where the tale is not told, but the version where the sons are guilty implied), Lactantius Placidus *Thebaid* 7.414, Lycophron 481, Hesiod Fragment 181 Rz (my 181 C), Anonymous in A. Westermann *Mythographi* (Brunswick 1843) 357, the so-called "Argument of Lactantius Placidus" to Ovid *Metamorphoses* 1, and the scholia to Germanicus in Carl Robert, *Eratosthenis Catasterismorum Reliquiae* (Berlin 1878) 74-6.

12) Since a sacrifice is a kind of meal, it is natural that in the derived versions of the myth it becomes a meal; the presence of the god in the vicinity of the altar becomes the visit of the disguised Zeus to the palace. Nicolaus of Damascus preserves remnants of the earlier myth when he says, strangely, that Lycaon offered a sacrifice, and his sons mingled human flesh with it, although the god came in human form.

13) Earlier in chapter 2 Pausanias gives us other legends which make Lycaon a local culture hero: he founded the city of Lycosura, he named Zeus *Lykaios* (that is, he founded the cult of Zeus *Lykaios*) and he instituted the Lycaean games (8.2.1).

the other preserves Lycaon's role as the perpetrator of the deed and in keeping with this makes him into an archetypal villain. Both clearly regard the sacrifice as a monstrous act, and this can hardly have been the attitude of the local worshipers, who were of course involved themselves in performing just such sacrifices. In both, the act is *punished*: Lycaon is turned into a wolf, or his sons are struck with lightning. Nicolaus of Damascus even says that Zeus sent *storms* to afflict the guilty sons – clearly an echo of some story in which the storms came not as a punishment but as the desired result of the sacrifice. But in Nicolaus the storms are a retribution, not a blessing; and in all representatives of the versions in which Lycaon is an unrighteous king or his sons are guilty, the denouement is a punishment. Even Pausanias feels that Lycaon became a wolf in expiation of his act; what this detail meant to the local worshipers – if indeed it was not grafted on to the myth by relative outsiders, Arcadians not directly involved in Zeus Lycaeus' worship – I am at a loss to say. They no doubt felt that the sacrifice was awesome and terrible, but I do not see how they can have considered it criminal<sup>14</sup>); still, the wolf metamorphosis can stand for some kind of period of quarantine for pollution<sup>15</sup>). Be that as it may, Pausanias, in preserving Lycaon's reputation as a culture hero and yet making him the sacrificer, is telling a story which must be closer to the cult version than any other we have.

To justify his assertion of the story's antiquity we ask what we must believe if we suppose that these outside versions, which condemn killing a human being and offering him to a god to eat,

---

14) The situation is not comparable to the literary handling of the sacrifice of Iphigenia at Aulis, for example, where Agamemnon's guilt arises in the first instance not from the sacrifice but from some earlier or logically prior crime – the slaying of a deer, a boast, or the future destruction of Troy. Iphigenia's life is demanded by the goddess, not because she wants it, but because she wants Agamemnon to suffer. Moreover, she usually offers the alternative, which Agamemnon weakly refuses, of disbanding the expedition.

15) Nilsson (GGRel I<sup>2</sup>, 400) feels that the werewolf motif was a later addition to the legend; others have other views. It is possible that the sacrificer was isolated temporarily from society and that men explained his disappearance by the folk legend that he became a wolf. The legend says that whoever *tasted* the human flesh of the sacrifice became a wolf (Plato, *Republic* 8 p. 565 D); though some say if he ate no human flesh for eight or nine years thereafter he was changed back. But it does not seem too harsh to explain this legend by saying that Lycaon became a wolf not for eating but for merely killing the child.

were actually earlier than the local version. These versions reflect the human sacrifice on Mt. Lycaeus; their ultimate authors, on this hypothesis, must therefore have known about the sacrifice. But these versions do not say that Lycaon instituted this sacrifice; they speak in symbols, and say that he or his sons offered a meal to Zeus in disguise. The belief that he instituted the sacrifice must then be supposed to have originated only later – the symbolic form of the story, told by outsiders, was heard by the local worshipers, and from it they first learned that their own culture hero was responsible for originating one of their own institutions. This seems to me altogether unlikely. The other hypothesis is simple and convincing: it was believed locally that Lycaon instituted human sacrifice, that he killed a child for Zeus to partake of, in order to induce the god to send rain; outsiders heard this story, and took the rain, or rather the accompanying lightning, to be a punishment for offering, not a sacrifice, but an unholy meal to a god in disguise<sup>16</sup>). What the authors of the outside versions must have heard is very nearly the same as what Pausanias tells us; this seems to eliminate the possibility that Pausanias' is a new local myth, that there was once a different myth, now lost, which was told locally and heard by the outsiders.

How does this principle apply to the tale of Callisto? Unfortunately we have less data from the cult here than we do in the case of Lycaon; Pausanias says virtually everything we know:

As you go down about 30 stades from Cruni you find the tomb of Callisto, a high mound of earth with many trees on it both cultivated and uncultivated. On the peak of the mound there is a temple of Artemis surnamed *Kalliste* (8.35.8).

We know nothing of the ritual here, nothing of the symbolism. All that we can infer from this evidence is that at one time people thought that a nymph or maiden Callisto, subordinate to Artemis, died and was buried here<sup>17</sup>).

---

16) It is curious that Nicolaus reveals his closeness to the cult not only by preserving Lycaon's righteous character and by having Zeus send rain, but also by having the sons offer the disguised Zeus, most illogically, not a meal but a sacrifice.

17) Similar are: the cult of Artemis on Delos, where the maidens Hecaege and Opis lie buried in her precinct (see my article, "The Hyperborean Maidens on Delos", *Harvard Theological Review*, LIV, 2 [April 1961] 75 ff); of Apollo Hyacinthus at Amyclae, where Hyacinth rests under the altar (Paus. 3.19.3); of Aphrodite Ariadne at Amathus, where Ariadne's tomb is in the goddess' grove (Plutarch *Theseus* 20).



However meagre this may be, it is obvious that Franz' Arcadian myth, in which Artemis shoots Callisto, accounts excellently for the tomb and explains therefore everything we know about the cult. When we add to this the fact that this is the story which appears on Arcadian coins, we are surely entitled *prima facie* to call it the local cult myth, and therefore, on the principle enunciated above, the earliest myth<sup>18</sup>). For here again, suppose that the outside myth was the earlier. Then either it gave rise to the local myth, as Franz urges, or the two developed independently. There are too many similarities for the latter notion to be plausible: Callisto is in both a companion of Artemis, is seduced by Zeus and gives birth to Arcas, and is punished by Artemis. But can we suppose that the local worshippers of Artemis *Kalliste* and Callisto had to learn from outsiders that Callisto was a companion of Artemis<sup>19</sup>)? Are we to imagine that they had no way of accounting for the tomb in Artemis' sanctuary, that they waited for outsiders to tell them that she was converted into a bear, in order to deny this and claim alternatively that she was shot? There is another possibility: we may agree that the irreducible minima of the local myth, the details that Callisto was a companion of Artemis and was shot, were earlier, but insist that her liaison with Zeus and motherhood of Arcas were later intrusions from the Hesiodic myth. I must postpone for a moment a full discussion of this possibility, but it should be pointed out that its acceptance would have several important consequences: first, that in the sanctuary of Artemis *Kalliste*, Callisto was initially *not* the mother of Arcas, though this idea was eventually adopted from outside; second, that she was *not* a bear, and this idea was, when learned from outside, rejected, for it is in the Hesiodic but not in the Arcadian myth<sup>20</sup>). We ought, therefore, whether we regard Franz' Arcadian myth

---

18) Besides possessing a tomb in his god's sanctuary, Hyacinth resembles Callisto mythologically, in that he too was killed by the deity to whom he was subordinate. "In the myth of Hyakinthos", says Nilsson, "the most striking feature is his death; *this originated in his cult*, for he had a tomb both at Sparta and at Tarentum" (MMRel<sup>2</sup> 557, italics supplied).

19) The possibility that the myth actually preceded the foundation of the cult is a very unlikely one; we would have to suppose not only that men named the occupant of the tomb from a story they had heard, but gave Artemis the epithet *Kalliste* from it.

20) It is worth noticing that Pausanias' version, in which Callisto becomes a bear before being shot, is specifically identified as non-local: *λέγω δὲ τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων*.

as the original or as a modification of the original, to be able to say that the bear-metamorphosis and probably Lycaon's parentage of Callisto are relatively late developments (since there is no reason to hold that the Arcadian myth regarded Lycaon as her father), developments imposed upon her by outsiders; and if we do this, most of Müller's case for identifying Artemis and Callisto in any important respects would, as we shall see, collapse. It, and most modern views, would be especially threatened if we were to regard Callisto's motherhood of Arcas as a relatively late addition to the local myth; we could certainly not use the myth to assert that Artemis *Kalliste* was ever considered Arcas' mother.

But it is clearly not satisfying to let the case rest here. In the first place, the principle that cult myths are earlier, however reasonable it may be, has not been proved yet, nor can it be done within the scope of this paper. In the second place, we have not eliminated the *possibility* that the cult of Artemis *Kalliste* had something to do with Lycaon and bears, even if we have no evidence. The genealogical link between Callisto and Lycaon, the story of her conversion to a bear, are such prominent features in most tellings of the tale, and are so thoroughly identified in the minds of all students of myth with the very essence of Callisto, that we must investigate carefully the age of each of these details.

Müller, of course, thought that the Lycaon-Callisto link was basic; he claimed that the Arcadian Artemis "als Kallisto selbst den Stammgenealogien eingetragen und Tochter des Lykaon, d.h. des Lykäischen Jupiters, und Mutter des Arkas, d.h. des Völkes, genannt wurde. Denn daß Kallisto nur der wenig umgewandelte Name der Artemis Kalliste ist, geht daraus hervor, daß der Heroine Grab im Tempel der Göttin gezeigt wurde, und daraus, daß Kallisto in eine Bäerin verwandelt sein sollte, die Symbol der Arkadischen Artemis war"<sup>21</sup>).

What gives this line of thought its plausibility is that it makes Artemis *qua* Callisto the daughter, not of the mortal king Lycaon, but of Zeus Lycaeus. For no one would accept the theory that Artemis was once considered the daughter either of a mortal or of some god other than Zeus. If Lycaon had been subordinate to a Hermes or a Pan, we could hardly be persuaded that Callisto was thought of as his daughter and was at the same time identified with Artemis. The identification of Callisto with

---

21) *Dorier*, loc. cit. note 1.

Artemis and Lycaon's daughter at the same time succeeds only if behind the Lycaon-Callisto link we can see the genealogy Zeus-Artemis<sup>22</sup>); conversely, this link, if it goes back to a time when Artemis and Callisto were hardly distinguished, must be quite fundamental.

Now the most immediate objection to this theory is that it makes of the virgin goddess not only a mother, but also an incestuous daughter, for she must be Zeus' consort and daughter all at once. Müller of course goes part of the way toward meeting these difficulties by claiming that Artemis was not always a maiden, but the second problem he does not face: if Artemis was the daughter of Zeus and mother of Arcas, who was the father of Arcas? Tradition overwhelmingly favors Zeus<sup>23</sup>). And certainly to attribute this incestuous relationship to Artemis without additional evidence is most unsatisfactory. Callisto, of course, cannot have always been identical with Artemis, she must have eventually become a person in her own right, whom Artemis shot or changed into a bear. We might therefore venture the suggestion that it was not until Callisto and Artemis were distinguished that Zeus became Callisto's lover, but then we cannot say that Artemis was ever Arcas' mother, and the most striking feature of Müller's argument collapses<sup>24</sup>).

This criticism, though effective, is still *ad hominem*, for it does not refute the assertion that Lycaon became the father of Callisto when he was still Zeus (if he ever was) and she still Artemis; it merely says that she cannot have been the mother of Arcas at the same time. It still allows the Lycaon-Callisto genealogy to be firmly rooted in a primary mythological relationship, and therefore be very early. If now we look at early tradition, we see that in fact several persons are put forward as fathers of Callisto: Asius, according to Apollodorus 3.8.2, said that she was the daughter of Nycteus; Pherecydes, that her father was Ceteus; while Hesiod made her one of the nymphs. But though Callisto has several fathers or no specific father, she has but one

22) In challenging this identification, as I shall, I do not intend to challenge the possibility that "Callisto" was once the name of Artemis *Kal-liste*, merely that *at that time* Callisto was called the daughter of Lycaon.

23) Apollodorus says that some maintain that Zeus took the likeness of Apollo, which suggests that a tradition existed that Apollo was the father (3.8.2).

24) The suggestion that after Lycaon was no longer Zeus, but before Callisto and Artemis were distinguished, Zeus begot Arcas upon Callisto, runs afoul of the objection that it makes Artemis the daughter of a mortal.

son, Arcas<sup>25</sup>). The natural inference is that the tie between mother and son is much stronger than that between father and daughter. And from this it seems reasonable to conclude that the form of the myth in which Callisto was simply one of the nymphs is the earliest form, and that her various fathers are a later accretion. If the Lycaon-Callisto link were the earliest and were fundamental, how did it happen that amongst early writers there was anything but unanimity on the point? How much intrinsic significance ought we to attach to a relationship which can be so easily challenged?

It is not as though Callisto and Lycaon played an important role in each others's myths. In all the various forms which the story of Lycaon takes, there are only two sources, one probably ultimately deriving from the other, in which the myths of Callisto and Lycaon are intertwined. Lactantius Placidus on Thebaid 7.414 says: *Lycaon pater Helicae ursae fuisse dicitur, qui dolore stupratae a Ioue filiae deos humanarum carnum cibis uiolauit*<sup>26</sup>). And [Hesiod] in Fragment 181 C says that Lycaon, feigning ignorance of the fact that Zeus had raped Callisto, entertained the god, and cut up a child and put him on the table<sup>27</sup>). It is reasonably clear that this version uses one *story* to explain another. Its author knew that Zeus had raped Callisto; he was not told what prompted Lycaon to such a deed, and decided that it can only have been the desire for vengeance. For obviously this author attached no religious significance to Lycaon's act; his motivation was not sacrifice but revenge. Hence this isolated interweaving of the two stories was a literary inspiration, and tells us nothing which we can apply to the cults of Lycaon and Callisto. In most of our sources the stories are not interwoven; those who mention both usually tell of Lycaon's ultimate fate before even introducing Callisto. Ovid tells Lycaon's story in Book 1 of the *Metamorphoses*, that of his daughter – barely identified as such – in Book 2; Pausanias tells of the accession of Nyctimus, Lycaon's eldest son, and of the founding of many Arcadian cities by the other sons, before even mentioning Callisto; even in Apollodorus, where the stories run on, Lycaon is dead and his proper

25) To be more accurate, she never fails to have Arcas for a son, though occasionally she is also the mother of Pan (Franz 238–41).

26) *Helice* is apparently used interchangeably for *Callisto* by this time; the plural *deos* seems to be a slip.

27) For a defense of the attribution of this fragment, as I have given it, to Hesiod, cf. *Rh. Mus.* 102 (1962) 131–2.

story finished before we hear that "Eumelus and certain others say that Lycaon *also* had a daughter named Callisto (*Εὐμηλος δὲ καὶ τινες ἕτεροι λέγουσι Λυκάονι καὶ θυγατέρα Καλλιστώ γενέσθαι*, 3.8.2)". Nor is there any known *cult* connection between Callisto or her son Arcas and Lycaon (or between Artemis Calliste and Zeus Lycaeus). It is true that the cult of Artemis *Kalliste* was located near Tricoloni, a town founded by one of Lycaon's sons (Pausanias 8.3.4), but this relationship is very remote, and in any case most of Arcadia lay near a town founded by one or another of Lycaon's sons. There are other legends concerning the cult of Mt. Lycaeus<sup>28</sup>); in none of them do we find any trace of Artemis *Kalliste* or Callisto or Arcas<sup>29</sup>).

Why then was the link between Lycaon and Callisto ever forged, if we assert that it was not essential to the myths or natures of either? And why should early writers have disagreed over whether Ceteus, Nycteus or Lycaon was Callisto's father? It is of course within the realm of possibility that there is some special connection between Callisto and Ceteus or Nycteus which eludes us because we know so little about them, but it is much more likely that the relation between these figures and Callisto was no more secure than that between Lycaon and her. The truth, I think, emerges when we recall that, in all likelihood, Eumelus, Asius and Pherecydes or their sources had before them the myth in which Callisto was the mother of Arcas, doubtless as a result of a liaison with Zeus. To which of the two did they wish their protege attached, the nymph or the eponymous ancestor of the Arcadian people? Surely they were attaching various heroes from various locales to the house of Arcas: they wanted to connect Lycaon of Mt. Lycaeus, or Nycteus the Boe-

---

28) They are collected in A.B.Cook, *Zeus* 1 (Cambridge 1914) 70ff.

29) In [Hesiod] Fragment 181 B Callisto in bear form enters the *abaton* of Zeus Lycaeus pursued by her son; both are about to be put to death when Zeus translates them to the stars. In *Rb. Mus.* 102 (1962) 128-9 I have attempted to show that this fragment is not Hesiodic; its original source is unknown. The entrance of the two into the *abaton*, son pursuing mother, is a picture derived from and intended to explain the position of Bootes and Ursa Major in the sky; what religious significance can the tale then have? The scholia to Theocritus 1.123 say that Callisto in bear form came to Mt. Lycaeus to be brought up by Hermes; where this story comes from is not known, but since it says nothing of Zeus Lycaeus or his cult, or of Lycaon, it can hardly be used to assert a cult connection between Lycaon and Callisto.

otian, or Ceteus, who seems to belong to the region around Tegea, to Arcas<sup>30</sup>).

The matter may be put another way. The Arcadian archives which are reproduced by Pausanias (8.1-5) begin the national genealogies with Pelasgus, born of the soil, and continue through Lycaon and his son Nyctimus; suddenly the line passes to Arcas and Arcas' sons. Why did not the descent continue in the male line? Two easy possibilities lay open to the archivists: they could have let one of the other sons of Lycaon inherit the throne (for in Pausanias at least they seem to survive), or they could have made Arcas Lycaon's son. That the first was not done suggests that Arcas was already well established as ancestor of the Arcadians when he and Lycaon were joined; that the second was not done implies that he was not only well established but his mother and father were well known. It was felt that Lycaon could neither replace nor be a double of Zeus<sup>31</sup>), and the connection was made another way. Lycaon became Arcas' grandfather, his own sons were either disposed of when they were made guilty of serving the unholy meal or simply and crudely forgotten. Only Nyctimus survives (perhaps as a reflex of Nycteus, in honor of Nycteus' lost claim to be Arcas' grandfather), and he disappears without issue.

Finally, we may look at a piece of late evidence which seems at first sight to weaken the link between Callisto and Arcas. Araethus of Tegea said that Arcas' grandfather was Ceteus and

---

30) The name Nycteus is apparently not found elsewhere in Arcadian myth and genealogy (Franz 344) and is of course familiar in Boeotian legend. It is therefore a reasonable guess that Boeotians in Arcadia put forward his claim. For a discussion of Boeotian influence in Arcadia, see Walter Immerwahr, *Die Kulte und Mythen Arkadiens I* (Leipzig 1891) 68-70 and 219-21. Ceteus seems originally to have been Mysian (cf. Wilamowitz, *Homerische Untersuchungen* [Berlin 1884] 152 n. 12). The reasons for associating him with Tegea are: 1) He appears in the genealogy of a Tegean historian Araethus (see below). It is true that he appears as the father of Callisto in the genealogies of Pherecydes and the scholia to *Orestes* 1646, whose sources may be older than Araethus' and who have no obvious motive for preferring Tegean tradition to any other; but Araethus, in inserting Ceteus into the genealogy, may very well be displaying local prejudice or asserting a local claim - why else should he refuse to follow the - by his time - general tradition? 2) The reason for connecting Ceteus with the *Κήτειοι* of Mysia is that we know of another link between Arcadia and Mysia in the person of King Telephus. But by the same token, since Telephus is a Tegean (son of Auge, Paus. 8.4.9), Ceteus can well have been one too.

31) In the way, for example, that Amphitryon is a double of Zeus, or Aegeus of Poseidon, where the hero has both a mortal and a divine father.

his mother was Megisto; to Megisto he assigned Callisto's story (Hyginus *Poetic Astronomy* 2.1; it must be noted carefully that this does not contradict my statement that wherever Callisto is mentioned she is called the mother of Arcas). It is clear that Araethus honors the old claim of Ceteus *to be Arcas' grandfather*; if Callisto is no longer his mother, Ceteus no longer shows any interest in her, but attaches himself to Megisto. Furthermore, in this account Lycaon appears as *Ceteus' father*; he too is more concerned with his claim to Arcas than with Callisto, and if he has to abandon his daughter he will do so<sup>32</sup>). It seems reasonably certain, then, that the link between Lycaon and Callisto is a result of the claim on the part of those who dwelt about Mt. Lycaeus that their local hero was the grandfather of the eponymous ancestor of the Arcadian people; that this made him the father of Callisto is almost irrelevant.

It follows from this that the relationship between Lycaon and Callisto in no sense rested on the genealogical link between Zeus and Artemis. This is important, because if, when the link between Lycaon and Callisto was forged, Callisto were still thought of as identical with Artemis, it would be very hard to deny that in the more frequent and therefore at least as fundamental relationship between Callisto and Arcas, Callisto was thought of as identical with Artemis. And this would make Artemis the mother of Arcas. But as it is, the relationship between Lycaon and Callisto is late and secondary, and if when it was made Callisto and Artemis were not identified, we have stripped away one reason for saying that Artemis was ever a mother.

We must now turn to the second of the ideas which Müller thought was basic to the myth of Callisto and to the Arcadian Artemis, her connection to the sacred bear; "So müssen wir schließen", he says in the *Prolegomena*, "daß *Kαλλιτώ* der zu einem Eigennamen umgebildete Ehrenname der Göttin ist; und wir gelangen zu dem unausweichlichen Schlusse, daß Kallisto eben nichts anders ist als die Göttin und ihr heiliges Thier in einen Begriff zusammengefaßt" (p. 75). The steps by which we are driven to this inescapable conclusion are these:

1. Maidens who serve the Brauronian Artemis are called "she-bears", so that the bear was held sacred to the goddess. The belief that in Arcadia her companion Callisto is changed into a

32) The myth that Arcas was the son of Themisto seems to have arisen from the desire to connect him with the Argives and to have little to do with Arcadian belief (see Franz 346-7).

bear therefore is due to the fact that bears were sacred to her. "Nur hieraus lassen sich Mythos und Cultusgebrauch zugleich erklären, und der Zusammenhang derselben begreifen; denn wollte man etwa auch den Gebrauch von der Sage herleiten, so könnte man es doch nur dann, wenn es nicht zufällig war, daß die Göttin ihre Nymphe grade in eine Bärin verwandelte, und man kommt immer wieder auf die Heiligkeit des Thiers zurück". I reproduce this sentence in full because the argument at the end is unsound: the notion that Callisto becomes a bear, of all animals, might well be due not to its sanctity but because it may well have been considered appropriate for Arcas to have an *ἄρκτος* for a mother. I do not, however, imply that the Brauronian ritual stemmed from Arcadian myth; as I shall indicate below, I think the two can have acquired their bears quite independently.

2. In the original myth, Callisto became a bear solely because the bear was sacred to Artemis, not because (as Hesiod has it) Artemis was angry because of Callisto's loss of virginity; to convert her to a sacred animal could not be the result of divine anger, and Artemis' virginity was imposed on her by the poets and has no place here. Müller admits that he cannot here prove that the virginity of Artemis "auf den Dienst der Göttin an solchen Orten übertragen wurde, wo man sich dieselbe ursprünglich ganz anders gedacht hatte" (p. 74). I cannot here prove what I take to be the truth, that the virginity of Artemis, a prevailing feature of the goddess in most of our sources, is in fact quite essential to her original concept of goddess of the wilderness, and expressed an attitude toward the wilderness, that it was not to be tamed<sup>33</sup>). I am quite prepared to concede that if, in the original myth, the bear was considered sacred to Artemis and Callisto became a bear, it is not altogether likely that she suffered this transformation as a punishment. But why must we regard the original myth as containing the metamorphosis at all? Why could it not quite easily have been introduced later by someone who was ignorant of, or prepared to disregard, the sanctity of the bear? We have already, therefore, made three very risky assumptions: that the bear was peculiarly sacred to the Arcadian Artemis, so much so that conversion to a bear cannot

---

33) Nilsson defends her essential virginity – at least her lack of a consort – on different grounds (GGRel I<sup>2</sup> 498), while Wilamowitz says "jungfräulich ist diese Herrin, unantastbar" (*Der Glaube der Hellenen*, 3rd ed. [Basel 1959], 176). But almost everyone else thinks otherwise.



have been considered a punishment<sup>34</sup>); that Artemis was not originally a virgin goddess; and that the bear-metamorphosis was necessarily part of the original myth.

3. Artemis *Kalliste* cannot derive her appellative from the name of the nymph, "da dieser offenbar das Abgeleitete, jener das Ursprüngliche ist; auch war der Beiname in Griechenland noch sonst viel verbreitet, wo man sich um die Arkadische Kallisto wenig kümmerte" (p. 75). The "wide diffusion" consists of its use by Sappho and Pamphus, the name of an image in the temple of Artemis near the Academy, and the use of ἄκαλά in tragedy to refer to Artemis. Apparently Wilamowitz, as well as Jane Harrison, was prepared to see in the epithet *Kalliste* the result of Artemis' absorbing a lesser deity, which would make "Callisto" the original name<sup>35</sup>). But this is not a point which I am anxious to dispute.

4. "So müssen wir schließen, daß *Καλλιτώ* der zu einem Eigennamen umgebildete Ehrenname der Göttin ist; und wir gelangen zu dem unausweichlichen Schlusse, daß Kallisto eben nichts anders ist als die Göttin und ihr heiliges Thier in einen Begriff zusammengefaßt" (p. 75). This, on the contrary, I am anxious to dispute, because a very important assumption is here involved: the mythology of a subordinate figure, Müller assumes can be freely attributed to the dominant figure if it can be shown that the former derives his name from the latter. I claim that he makes this assumption because I can attach no other meaning to the very imprecise phrase, "die Göttin und ihr heiliges Thier in einen Begriff zusammengefaßt" than that Artemis and her bear were sometimes not distinguished (were comprehended in one idea) and you called attention to her being a bear when you called her Callisto<sup>36</sup>). (I pass over the apparent additional assumption

34) I do not deny that the bear was regarded as important by the Arcadians, but there can have been a variety of reasons for this, the most obvious being the similarity between the words ἄρκτος and Ἀρκάδες.

35) Wilamowitz in *Hellenistische Dichtung* (Berlin 1924) II 49 speaks as if Callisto were younger than Artemis *Kalliste*: "Kallisto ist von ihr erst differenziert, als die Jungfräulichkeit, die ihrem Wesen entsprach, eine solche Stammesage nicht mehr vertrug". But the following year in "Die Griechische Heldensage", *Sitzungsberichte Berlin* (1925) he says that Atalanta was in east Arcadia what Callisto was in west Arcadia, "eine der Göttinnen, deren Wesen später von Artemis übernommen wird" (219).

36) To avoid being accused of distortion, let me point out that Müller's discussion of Callisto is intended to illustrate the view that the gods appear under names which they do not usually bear, but which are formed from their ancient epithets (*Prolegomena* 74).

that the Arcadians, unlike most people, thought of the bear as *καλός*). What conceivable warrant do we have for saying that because "Callisto" later referred to a nymph who became a bear, and because this word once was used of Artemis, that when so used it referred to Artemis *as a bear*? Granting for argument's sake all of Müller's premises, a perfectly reasonable pattern of development would be for Artemis to have lent her surname to one of her nymphs, and for it then to have been said that this nymph became the sacred bear. A parallel for this can be found in the mythology of Hecaege, a maiden who, from the meaning of her name, can have begun life only as an epithet of Artemis. Hecaege was said to be, with Upis and Loxo, one of the daughters of Boreas and to have come with her sisters to Delos from the Arimaspians; she was worshiped on Delos with offerings of locks of hair (Callimachus Hymn 4.291-9). Now it was never, so far as I know, said that Artemis came to Delos from the Arimaspians, or from the Hyperboreans either<sup>37</sup>); it was said of Apollo, Leto, Eileithyia, as well as the maidens subordinate to Eileithyia (Hyperoche and Laodice) and Artemis (Opis-Upis, Arge, Hecaege and Loxo), but not Artemis herself<sup>38</sup>). It would be very rash to infer from the mythology of her subordinate figures that Artemis herself was ever thought of as making this journey, especially as we know whence Hecaege derives her mythology; what was said about her and Upis was originally said about Hyperoche and Laodice, the recipients of the hair offerings in the fifth century. As Hecaege and Upis acquired the ritual from the earlier pair, they acquired the myth from the same source. Now since this earlier pair was subordinate to Eileithyia and not to Artemis, it is obvious that Artemis had no rôle to play in Hecaege's acquisition of the myth. And just as Hecaege was born from an epithet of Artemis and acquired an important cult myth without borrowing it from the goddess, so can Callisto have been born from the epithet *Kalliste* and have

---

37) Callimachus' source probably spoke of Hyperboreans rather than Arimaspians; the poet playfully indicates his disbelief in the Hyperboreans by saying that the present senders of the familiar Hyperborean tribute (cf. Herodotus 4.33-5), who must be the same as the original senders, the Arimaspians, dwell "beyond Boreas".

38) Apollo is said to make the journey by Alcaeus, Hymn to Apollo (cf. the discussion of Denys Page in Sappho and Alcaeus [Oxford 1955] 244-52); Leto by Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.* 6, 35; Eileithyia, by Pausanias (1.18.5); Opis, Arge, Hyperoche and Laodice by Herodotus, 4.33; Upis, Hecaege and Loxo by Callimachus, Hymn 4.278-299.

been identified with a sacred bear without Artemis' having been thought of as a bear herself.

Nothing I have said so far proves that Müller's theory must be wrong, though it makes it far from compelling. Whether or not we accept it will probably depend on whether or not we are convinced that the Brauronian Artemis and Artemis *Kalliste* are related, and the testimony favoring such a relationship appears to me to be insufficient.

The evidence from Arcadia that Artemis was a bear-goddess anywhere in that region, or had such a predecessor, is surprisingly scanty. We have the myth of Callisto itself, the story that Atalanta was nurtured by a bear, and the use of the bear as a symbol on coins, especially those of Mantinea<sup>39</sup>). We can, as I have suggested, explain the presence of the bear in the myth of Callisto very easily on the supposition that it was desirable for Arcas to have a bear for a mother. The Atalanta story is an old folk legend, that of the child nurtured by a wild animal, adapted to Arcadia, in whose wilderness bears were common; it says nothing about the goddess Artemis, with whom Atalanta is associated. As for the Mantinean coins, Franz argues plausibly that the bear symbol on them is the *result* of the popularity of the myths of Callisto and Atalanta, so that by explaining the myths we have explained the coins.

But let us grant, for argument's sake, the alternative hypothesis, that Artemis was associated with bears in parts of Arcadia even before the development of the bear form of Callisto's myth and that the Mantinean coins express this fact. My theory holds that in the local myth of the cult of Artemis *Kalliste* near Tricoloni, Callisto was shot while in the form of a nymph, and that later, outside of the cult, the bear myth developed. Unless *Kalliste* was herself a bear-goddess, the hypothesis that Artemis was associated with bears elsewhere in Arcadia does no harm to my theory; it offers another possible reason for the formation of the bear myth. Men who did not worship *Kalliste* specifically, but thought of Artemis rather as a bear-goddess, may well have altered the myth of Callisto, and said that she was not shot but became a bear, as befits the companion of a bear-goddess. (It is generally agreed that the form in which she was both changed *and* shot was late, whether or not Franz [pp. 283-94] is right in arguing that

39) Atalanta's being nurtured by a bear is recorded by Apollodorus, 3.9.2, and Aelian V. H. 13.1; a discussion of the Mantinean coins is given by Franz, 241-52.

it was fathered by Callimachus). Unlike the worshipers of *Kalliste*, these outsiders had no need to say that Callisto was shot, because they were not obliged to account for a tomb.

If, however, it could be shown that Artemis *Kalliste* was herself a bear-goddess, my theory would be untenable. *Prima facie* the testimony of the cult says that she was not: the tomb of Callisto in her sanctuary is by every analogy the tomb of a nymph or a woman, not a bear, and it seems most obvious to attach to it a form of the myth in which Artemis shot Callisto without changing her to a bear. We have already seen that this form is found on coins of central Arcadia, the region around Tricoloni; we have already observed that this form not only accounts for but seems intended to account for the tomb, while the bear form, which so far as we know says nothing about how Callisto died, does not. But if there were a strong resemblance between *Kalliste* and the Brauronian Artemis, we might be tempted to discount this *prima facie* argument and hold that the former was a bear-goddess, since there is every reason to think that the latter was.

What is known of the cult of Artemis does not point to any very great similarity: we hear of no ἀρκτοί at Tricoloni, no girls in saffron gowns who sacrifice a goat, no procession with basket carriers, no portico for girls to dwell in<sup>40</sup>). But there are points of resemblance: both cults honor Artemis; both associate the goddess with tombs of heroines who are mythologically subordinate to her; both heroines have fathers who are Peloponnesian kings, who are found subordinate to Zeus in cult, and who perform human sacrifice<sup>41</sup>). I am sure that the last comparison is a chimera, that the resemblances between Lycaon and Agamemnon are quite accidental; but even if they are not, their usefulness for the present argument is vitiated by the very great differences between the two heroines themselves. Iphigenia is thought by most scholars to have been an originally independent goddess who had something to do with childbirth, who was, at least later, honored with the clothes of women who died while giving birth; I do not rule out of court the possibility that Callisto was once an independent deity (though Müller of course

40) The archaeological data from Brauron are to be found in BCH 1949-51 and 1956 to date; the literary testimony in Ludwig Deubner, *Attische Feste* (Berlin 1932) 207-8 (cf. 204-7).

41) Sources for the cult of Zeus Agamemnon may be found conveniently grouped in L.R. Farnell, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality* (Oxford 1921) 408 (n. 55).

does), but there is certainly nothing to connect her with the supervision of childbirth. In myth Iphigenia is a victim, potential or actual, of human sacrifice, or a priestess who performs it, or a goddess for whom it is performed. She does not have sexual relations with a god and give birth to a hero; though she eventually acquires a mortal consort and a child, this happens only in late poetry<sup>42</sup>). She has almost nothing to do directly with bears: one version of her sacrifice story (Phanodemos *apud* Schol. Lyc. 183) says that a bear instead of a deer was substituted for her during the sacrifice, but this need only reflect the fact that bears were recognizably a part of the Artemis cult at Brauron. Iphigenia is never shot by Artemis; in most versions, in fact, Artemis saves her life. She and Callisto are in no way like each other.

Nevertheless, there still seems to be one reason for claiming that the two heroines were originally related: both are connected, in one fashion or another, with bears, because bears were part of the Artemis-Iphigenia cult at Brauron. But this consideration is discountenanced when we examine the origins of that cult. Iphigenia was present at Brauron very early, if Wilamowitz' theory of the origin of the myth of Iphigenia is correct (*Hermes* 18, 1883, pp. 262-3). If, as is generally assumed, Iphigenia was an independent goddess (and the assumption seems necessary to explain the fact that some myths make her immortal, and that she was identified with the Tauric Maiden, undoubtedly an independent deity), we ought probably to conclude that she was at Brauron first, and that Artemis came and absorbed her, as she did so many others. If now we ask, who was the original bear-goddess, Iphigenia, a divinity we have no right to connect with anything except birth, or Artemis, the Mistress of Animals, surely our choice will fall upon the latter. Iphigenia acquired her connection with bears late and probably accidentally, so that this connection provides no ground for claiming an original relationship between Callisto and Iphigenia; and in fact the points of resemblance are so slight, the differences so great, that we are no doubt safe in concluding that originally they had nothing to do with each other.

Nor is there anything to connect Callisto or *Kalliste* with Brauron. It is true that (in one version of the tale) Iphigenia had to be sacrificed because Agamemnon had pledged to Artemis

---

42) Iphigenia is first made the consort of Achilles in Lycophron, 183-201 (or its source), clearly a development of the idea of the false marriage.

“the most beautiful thing the year brought forth” (Euripides I. T. 20). But Agamemnon’s vow (reminiscent of folklore and fairy tale) was ironic, he doubtless had in mind fruit or animal, certainly not his daughter; to achieve this irony Euripides must make him offer τὸ κάλλιστον or something very like it. The connection suggested is therefore quite illusory. With no trace of *Kalliste* or Callisto at Brauron it would be hazardous to guess that Iphigenia had replaced Callisto, that Callisto had once lain in her tomb (as, for example, different maidens at different times lay in the *sema* of the Hyperborean Maidens in Delos).

If there is anything, therefore, to the comparison between *Kalliste* and the Brauronian Artemis, it must rest on resemblances between *Kalliste* and the bear-goddess who came to Brauron. And between these two there *are* no provable resemblances except the name Artemis. Perhaps the bear-goddess came originally from Arcadia; perhaps she and the hypothetical Arcadian bear-goddess came initially from yet a third place. As long as there is no connection between Iphigenia and Callisto, there can be no reason to connect this bear-goddess with Artemis *Kalliste*.

None of this, of course, *proves* that *Kalliste* was not a bear-goddess, and the fact that she was eventually, at least, connected with bears may still tempt us to make her one. If Artemis can be a bear-goddess in Attica, why should she not be one near Tricoloni, where her nymph Callisto, who became a bear, was originally at home? Again, the stumbling block is the fact that the form of the myth in which Callisto is shot is so well adapted to what we know of the cult. Suppose *Kalliste* was a bear-goddess and that the bear form of the myth was the earliest. Then the other form will have developed later, outside of the cult. These outsiders said, for no discernible reason, that Callisto did not become a bear, but was shot; while at Tricoloni, where Callisto lay in her tomb, they said that she was not shot, but became a bear instead. This seems to be the very reverse of probable; everything suggests that the form in which Callisto is shot belongs to the cult and is earlier. And nothing whatever stands in the way of this suggestion, provided that the eventual presence of the bear can be accounted for.

It is quite possible that chance alone dictated that this nymph companion of the Mistress of Animals should become a bear rather than some other animal. It is perhaps more likely that the bear was sacred to the Arcadian Artemis, even if it was not an integral part of the worship of Artemis *Kalliste*, and that this

dictated the choice of form that Callisto should change to, among those who thought such a change desirable. But this runs up against the objection which Müller saw (*Prolegomena* 74), that as a form of punishment for pregnancy it is a bizarre choice, especially if the bear is sacred. And it is much more probable that the choice of the bear was indicated by the relation between the words ἀρκτος and "Arcas" or "Arcades"; it is most appropriate for someone named Arcas to have a bear for a mother<sup>43</sup>).

I therefore suggest the following line of development of the myth, apologizing in advance for the fact that at many points it is necessarily speculative:

The very first story of Callisto was of the sort which so often grew up about the virgin goddess: Callisto, nymph and companion of Artemis, was pursued by Zeus and succumbed or was raped; when Artemis discovered her pregnancy, she shot her, and Callisto was buried in the tomb near Tricoloni. Quite independently the Arcadians developed the notion that their ancestor was the son of a bear. At some point it was considered desirable to join Arcas with the leading goddess of Arcadia, and because this could not be done by making Artemis his mother, the honor was given Callisto, her favorite nymph. From this stage two versions developed: in one, the idea that Arcas was born of a bear was suppressed, because in the vicinity of her cult Callisto (as we know from the coins) remained an anthropomorphic figure; in the other, popular in regions remote from her cult, Artemis did not slay her but changed her into the bear-mother of Arcas.

The local myth persisted in central Arcadia, where it appeared on coins of the fourth century; it seems to have become popular in the region of Mt. Cyllene, in the northeast corner of Arcadia, because on some coins of Pheneus (cf. Franz pp. 275, 279) we see depicted the myth, told in Apollodorus (3.8.2), that Hermes brought Arcas to Maia to be nourished (doubtless on Mt. Cyllene, where Maia was at home)<sup>44</sup>). Men will have said that Arcas was born in central Arcadia (since Callisto was buried

43) Either Callisto became a bear because she was the mother of Arcas, or she became the mother of Arcas because she was a bear, or the relationship is sheerly coincidental. It is surely unsatisfying to maintain that pure chance made an ἀρκτος give birth to Arcas; in the form of the myth which has the best claim to being called earliest we see Callisto as the mother of Arcas but not as a bear; the first alternative therefore seems inescapable.

44) Reasons for attaching this detail to the local version are given by Franz p. 281.

there and the birth of the child and death of the mother were roughly simultaneous) and that he was brought up on Cyllene. This version seems to have remained essentially local, however, and to have had, in its pure form, little influence on literature. It was apparently known to the writer of the *Certamen*; Apollodorus had heard of it; it may have been the version of the *Catalogue* of Hesiod; and no one can deny it to Eumelus, Asius or Pherecydes.

The inhabitants of the region around Mt. Lycaeus were of course responsible for making Lycaon Callisto's father; they seem to have favored the version in which Callisto becomes a bear<sup>45</sup>). This form, with Lycaon and the bear-metamorphosis, was taken up into the Hesiodic corpus and thence became the ordinary popular tale. Eventually the local version was brought into it, and men said that it was Hera who made Callisto into a bear and that afterwards Artemis was tricked into shooting her. Pausanias (8.3.6) tells this story, the version "told by the Greeks"; he presumably did not know the local version. Other complications were added in the course of time, among them that Callisto became Ursa Major and that she was denied the waters of the ocean. But with the way in which the myth developed in later antiquity I cannot here concern myself.

Whether or not the process of development of the myth in early times followed the lines I have suggested, there is no need to hesitate in refusing to accept three key points of Müller's analysis: there is no provable fundamental relation between Artemis *Kalliste* and Zeus Lycaeus; there is no basis for attributing Callisto's mythology to Artemis; and the myth of Callisto cannot be used to challenge the virginity of Artemis. Lycaon was just one candidate for the father of Callisto, put forward by those who dwelt about Mt. Lycaeus, while other men from other regions were saying that it was rather Ceteus or Nycteus, and her worshipers near Tricoloni presumably continued to say that she was one of the nymphs. Probably "Callisto" was once a name for Artemis *Kalliste*. But we have seen that there is no general ground for attributing the mythology of a subordinate figure to

---

45) We infer this not only from the fact that in all versions where Lycaon is mentioned and the story is told it contains the bear-metamorphosis, and not only from the fact that the original local version says nothing about Lycaon, but from the scraps of evidence mentioning Callisto's return in bear form to Lycaeus ([Hesiod] fragment 181 B, Scholia to Theocritus 1. 123).



the predominant figure, and insufficient specific reason in the case of Callisto to attribute any of her mythology to Artemis. And even if we should venture the unwarranted assumption that because Callisto became a bear, Artemis was once in some sense regarded as a bear, we would still have no reason to attach Callisto's motherhood to Artemis; we would be just as justified in attaching her catasterism to Artemis. It follows from this that there is no way in which the myth of Callisto can be used to deprive Artemis of her chastity and make her a mother.

Washington University  
Saint Louis

William Sale

---

## ÜBER DAS VERHÄLTNIS DES ARISTOTELES ZUR DYNAMISLEHRE DER GRIECHISCHEN MATHEMATIKER

---

An anderer Stelle<sup>1)</sup> wurde in einer kleinen Untersuchung zur aristotelischen Modaltheorie auf deren Uneinheitlichkeit hingewiesen. Es erwies sich dort als in sich stimmig die Darstellung in Met. V 12, sowie IX 1–2 und 5, während in IX 6–9 eine andere Dynamis-Energeia-Lehre gefunden wurde. Die den zuerst genannten Partien zugrunde liegende Konzeption versteht unter „Dynamis“ das (aktive und das passive) Veränderungsprinzip und kennt bereits den Begriff der Totalmöglichkeit, sofern sie für die Möglichkeit des Naheseins eines aktiven und eines hinreichend disponierten passiven Prinzips und des Ausgeschlossen-seins aller Hindernisse, also das Erfülltsein aller Bedingungen, fordert. In diesen Partien (bes. in IX 5) wird also der Begriff echter Realmöglichkeit greifbar. Dagegen wird von IX 6 ab, wo eine Neufassung des Energeiabegriffs angekündigt wird, „Möglichkeit“ meistens als isoliertes passives oder isoliertes aktives Vermögen, d. h. aber: als Partialmöglichkeit, genommen.

---

1) Archiv f. Geschichte d. Philosophie, 45 (1963), S. 43–67.