

MICHAEL W. HASLAM

AIOLOS' COUSIN

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 88 (1991) 297–299

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## AIOLOS' COUSIN

Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones' conjecture that "the cousin of Aiolos Hippotades" in P.Oxy. LVII 3876 fr.62 is Odysseus (*ZPE* 87 (1991) 297-300) is most ingenious and neatly ties things together. If it is right, we have confirmation that the poem is what I suggested it might be, "a version of the western wanderings of Odysseus" (P.Oxy. LVII p.42). But I have doubts.

The relationship can be said to exist if (i) Odusseus is son of Sisuphos, who on all accounts is son of Aiolos son of Hellen (Roscher's Aiolos I), and (ii) Aiolos Hippotades (Roscher's Aiolos III) is son of Hippotes and Melanhippe daughter of Aiolos son of Hellen. Lloyd-Jones traces the kinship not through Hippotes but through Aiolos' nonhomeric mother, and Melanhippe and Sisuphos are only half-siblings (no source gives them a common mother); the two Aeolid lines are discrete from top to bottom, even if Euripides did juxtapose them in his *Melanhippe Sophe* (fr. 479N<sup>2</sup>, Greg.Cor.)

As to Odusseus' being son of Sisuphos, it is certainly legitimate to entertain the possibility that the story may be older than Aischulos, but that does not get us very far. W.Kullmann argued that it is presupposed by the *Odyssey* (*Das Wirken der Götter in der Ilias*, 41), but even that gives little comfort to the notion that Stesichoros rejected the Ithacan paternity in favour of the Corinthian one. Was Odusseus ever fathered upon Sisuphos except in denigration?

As for Aiolos Hippotades, the genealogy is attested only in the two places I cited in my commentary, scholl.QV *Od.*10.2 and Diod. 4.67.3; and they give only his father's pedigree, not his mother's (Hippotes<Mimas scholl.QV, Hippotes<Mimas<Aiolos<Hellen Diod.).<sup>1</sup> The matter is complicated by the fact that we have to reckon with identification of Aiolos Hippotades—Homer's ταμίης ἀνέμων—with Aiolos the brother of Boiotos (Roscher's Aiolos II). Schol.Q *Od.*10.2 distinguishes Aiolos son of Hippotes and Melanhippe from Aiolos son of Poseidon and Arne, but in Euripides Aiolos and Boiotos are the sons of Poseidon and Melanhippe (fr.479, 488N<sup>2</sup>; this is where Melanhippe's father is Aiolos son of Hellen), and Diodoros' account manages to incorporate all four parents.<sup>2</sup> We cannot look to Euripides for identification of Melanhippe's son Aiolos with the ruler of the winds (as Lloyd-Jones seems to suggest is possible), since the ruler of the winds is Aiolos

<sup>1</sup> So if it is entry into the Aiolidai that we are after, Hippotes might provide it more suitably than Melanhippe. The *Catalogue of Women* listed seven sons of Aiolos (Apollod. 1.7.3 + Hes. fr. 10a [P.Turner 1] 25ff.); it seems we have the names of all but one of them, that one being lost in lacuna at fr. 10a 28 (P.Oxy. 2822 fr.2.12 + P.Turner 1.28), Δήϊων τε μέγ[α]ρ .....] τ' ἀριδείκετος ἀνδρῶν (so M.L.West, *ZPE* 53,1983,28-29); if that is right Mimas is excluded unless the iota was lengthened (μειμας).

<sup>2</sup> One of Aiolos' five daughters in the *Catalogue* mated with Poseidon and gave birth twice (fr. 10a 102 [P.Turner 1.102 + Hes. fr.16.12] ἦ δὲ Ποσειδάω[v-, 104 δις τέκε); but that must be Kanake, not Melanhippe, unless the correspondence with Apollodorus breaks down at just this point.

Hippotades, and a son of Poseidon cannot at the same time be Hippotades.<sup>3</sup> But it could still be Stesichorean.<sup>4</sup>

Incidentally, if we see Melanhippe (Black Horse) and Poseidon as Earth Goddess and Earth-Shaker, as is very tempting to do, we shall recognize the antiquity of their union, and shall be inclined to view the genealogy which has Aiolos as son of Poseidon and Melanhippe (daughter of Hippe daughter of Cheiron) as traditional. But for both Homer and Stesichoros Aiolos' father is not Poseidon but Hippotes. I wonder whether it was the Poseidon-Melanhippe genealogy that generated Homer's Aiolos Hippotades. It would be a characteristically Homeric response. Posidonian filiation was preempted by Poluphemos (and utilized in the immediately preceding scene, at the end of *Od.9*) and was in any case hardly compatible with Aiolos' assigned role vis-à-vis Odusseus; while "Hippotades" deftly sanitizes all that nasty horsy stuff, without kicking over the traces altogether.

However that may be, it is clear that we are in no position to say that either of the required pedigrees, Odusseus' or Aiolos', is Stesichorean. The given genealogy of Aiolos seems to me to stand a fairly good chance (Stesichoros seems a likely enough source for it), but we cannot know that Aiolos' mother had any more existence in Stesichoros' poem than she has in Homer's; and a notion that the poem made Odusseus Sisuphos' son must rest more on faith than on evidence. And before Odusseus can be thought of as Aiolos' cousin, on Lloyd-Jones' reconstruction, not only does Odusseus have to be thought of as Sisuphos' son, and Aiolos as Melanhippe's, but Sisuphos and Melanhippe have to be thought of as brother and sister, and that is not easily done.<sup>5</sup>

But my more positive doubts about Lloyd-Jones' identification are centered elsewhere. Why should Odusseus be referred to in this curiously oblique fashion? The question is Lloyd-Jones' own, and his answer lies in the postulated family relationship between Odusseus and the dead man, on the further supposition that the corpse is Misenos', whom Vergil calls Aeolides (just as he refers to Odusseus as Aeolides, 6.529, only in Misenus' case the Aeolus in question is taken to be the ruler of the winds, not the son of Hellen). The

---

<sup>3</sup> There is no evidence that the standard mythological mechanism for resolving paternity conflict (true vs. supposed father) was ever brought into play for Aiolos; Euripides' Aiolos son of Poseidon is simply not Aiolos Hippotades, the wind-ruler. If Hippotes is a hypostasis of Poseidon (I offer a variant hypothesis in the next paragraph), he is not mythographically so.

<sup>4</sup> Once we introduce Melanhippe, we have a possible link with the Meleagros story, represented among these fragments in fr.4 and 2+6. Antoninus Liberalis names Melanhippe as one of four daughters of Oineus and Althaia (2.1; differently scholl. *Il.9.584*; not Hesiodic [fr.25.17]); but I imagine this is not so much a dark horse as a red herring. Thucydides records that the area of Kalydon and Pleuron was called Aiolis (3.102.5), but that should have no connection with Aiolos Hippotades (cf. Apollod. 1.7.7 + Hes.fr. 10a [P.Turner 1] 63f.), even though the Diodoran Aiolos-Mimas-Hippotes-Aiolos genealogy allows Aiolis (= Thessaly) to be assigned to both Aioloι (I and III).

<sup>5</sup> Contrast Pind. *Nem.* 3.63 ἀνεπιὸς ζαμενῆς Ἑλένοιο Μέμνων, where the kinship is through Helenos' and (named!) Memnon's respective fathers, whose identities were well-known and uncontested and whose status as siblings was straightforward and Homeric (*Il.* 20.237, Λαομέδων δ' ἄρα Τιθωνὸν τέκετο Πρίαμόν τε). Even without the *Aithiopsis*, Priam as Memnon's uncle makes for no head-scratching; but Sisuphos as Aiolos Hippotades' uncle, or Melanhippe as Odusseus' aunt?

phrase then signals that Odusseus is conducting the funeral rites not just of a member of his crew but of a relative. I am not sorry to have mooted the notion that the dead man might be Misenos, but it is a precarious thing to build on, and I do not see that on present evidence it can be regarded as anything more than an intriguing possibility. (The same could be said of a notion that he is Aiolos himself.) But more importantly: supposing the pair to be whom Lloyd-Jones would like them to be, Odusseus son of Sisuphos and Misenos son of Aiolos, I cannot think that Stesichoros would refer to Odusseus in such a fashion. To read the phrase in such a loaded way, as an allusion to Odusseus' kinship with the dead man, jars intolerably on my sense of style, as something that would be at home perhaps in hellenistic epigram, but not in Stesichoros, any more than in Homer. ἀνεψιὸς Αἰόλου Ἴπποτάδα is a phrase I would have expected to designate someone given a name earlier in the sentence (I have struggled in vain with line 3) or even someone whose identity is left *tel quel*. It may be that our urge to effect "identification," approaching the periphrasis as a puzzle to be solved, is something we would do better to resist.<sup>6</sup>

University of California, Los Angeles

Michael W. Haslam

---

<sup>6</sup> I am most grateful to Sir Hugh for sharing his ideas with me, and to my colleague Andrew Dyck for helpful discussion. — I should perhaps add a word on my suggestion of ἐριδα[νούς in line 9, on which Lloyd-Jones comments "miro accentu." It may not be right (though it is just perfect for context, cf. ξύλα δανά *Od.* 15.322), but I do not think the given accentuation tells against it. If -δᾶνος was understood as being from δαίω it was more probably classed as having active than passive meaning (kindling, to δαίειν the flame), which according to the rules would make it oxytone (cf. H.W.Chandler, *A Practical Guide to Greek Accentuation*<sup>2</sup> §426); in any case the rules were not only arbitrary but were irregularly and inconsistently applied, as Chandler makes clear (§§426f., cf. §540). *mira forma* might be more to the point.