ROBERT L. FOWLER

THE MYTH OF KEPHALOS AS AN AITION OF RAIN-MAGIC (PHEREKYDES FGRHIST 3 F 34)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 97 (1993) 29–42

THE MYTH OF KEPHALOS AS AN AITION OF RAIN-MAGIC (PHEREKYDES FGRHIST 3 F 34)[1]

Kephalos,[2] son of Deion or Deioneus, was such a fetching youth that Eos, the goddess of the dawn, fell in love with him and carried him off from his favourite hunting-spot. But Kephalos was too much in love with his wife Prokris, daughter of Erechtheus, to heed her attentions. Angrily she let him go, but not without making insinuations about his wife's fidelity. Plagued by doubt, Kephalos decided to test Prokris, and giving out that he was leaving (either abroad or on a hunt), returned in disguise and succeeded in seducing her. In shame Prokris fled to the woods, there to hunt with Artemis. Eventually the two were reconciled, and Prokris brought gifts from Artemis (or in a variant from King Minos of Crete): a magical javelin that always hit its mark, and a hound that never failed to catch its prey.

All would have been well had not Prokris then conceived doubts about her husband. From a servant she heard that he was in the habit of going to a mountain peak and calling for "Nephele", whose name of course means "Cloud," but whom Prokris takes to be a rival. She concealed herself on this peak to spy on him, and when he once again called on Nephele came forward to confront him. Startled, he hurled the invincible javelin, and killed her.[3]

Pherekydes of Athens is one of the principal sources of the story. Fragment 34 is preserved by the Mythographus Homericus;[4] as it happens, a papyrus of the original book

---

[1] A much revised version of a lecture delivered at the University of Waterloo, Mc. Master University, the Classical Association of Canada's annual meeting in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island (May 1992}, and the Humboldt-Universität, Berlin. I thank the audiences on those occasions, as well as my colleagues C.Brown and R.Drew Griffith, for their suggestions and criticism.

[2] I.Toeppfer, Attische Genealogie (1889) 255ff.; C.Robert, Die Griechische Heldensage (1921) 162ff.; M.Broadbent, Studies in Greek Genealogy (1968) ch. 5; E.Kearns, The Heroes of Attica (BICS Suppl. 57, 1989) 177. At this point we may treat the myth synchronically; disagreements in the various sources relate only to inessential details or the order of events.

[3] An incident involving Amphitryon, father of Herakles, appears to be an add-on to the original myth (Antoninus Liberalis 41; Apollod. Bibl. 2.4.7). Amphitryon, trying to raise an army for his campaign against the Teleboans, was refused help by the Thebans so long as they were preoccupied by the ravages of the Teurnessian fox. Amphitryon approached Kephalos for help, or more specifically for his javelin and dog. The fox, which was fated never to be caught, posed a nice metaphysical dilemma for the hound which could never fail of its prey. At the last moment Zeus turned them both to stone. Kephalos then went on the expedition against the Teleboans, and was awarded one of their islands as booty, which henceforward became known as Kephallenia. The motive for the intrusion will have been the chauvinistic one of claiming Kephallenia for Attika. In a similar spirit Hyginus claims that Kephalos was the great-grandfather of Odysseus.

[4] On this author and his relation with the Homeric scholia see M. Van der Valk, Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad I (Leiden 1963) 303ff.; F.Montanari, "Gli homerica su papiro: Per una distinzione di generi," Filologia e critica letteraria della grecità (Ricerche di filologia classica II, Pisa 1984) 125-38, with

(or one based on it) has turned up, providing a parallel text to the version preserved in the Homeric scholia.[5]

a. Schol. (MV^{mou}Z+) *Od.* 11.321 ("Πρόκριν τε ἴδον"): Κέφαλος ὁ Δηϊονέως γήμας Πρόκριν τὴν Ἐρεχθέως ἐν τῇ Θορικίων κατῴκει. θέλων δὲ τῆς γυναικὸς ἀποπειρᾶσθαι λέγεται εἰς ἀλλοδαπὴν ἀποδημῆσαι ἐπὶ ἔτη ὀκτὼ καταλιπὼν αὐτὴν ἐπὶ νυμφῶνος οὖσαν. ἔπειτα κατακοσμήσας καὶ ἀλλοειδῆ ἑαυτὸν ποιήσας ἔρχεται εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ἔχων κόσμον, καὶ πείθει τὴν Πρόκριν δέξασθαι τοῦτον καὶ συμμιγῆναι αὐτῷ. ἡ δὲ Πρόκρις ἐποφθαλμίσασα τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ τὸν Κέφαλον ὁρῶσα κάρτα καλὸν συγκοιμᾶται αὐτῷ. ἐκφήνας δὲ ἑαυτὸν ὁ Κέφαλος αἰτιᾶται τὴν Πρόκριν. οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καταλλαγεὶς ἐξέρχεται ἐπὶ θήραν. πυκνῶς δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῦτο δρῶντος ὑπώπτευσεν ἡ Πρόκρις ὅτι μίσγεται γυναικὶ ἑτέρᾳ. προσκαλεσαμένη οὖν τὸν οἰκέτην ἐρωτᾷ εἰ σύνοιδεν. ὁ δὲ θεράπων ἔφη τὸν Κέφαλον ἰέναι ἐπί τινος ὄρους κορυφὴν καὶ λέγειν συχνῶς, ὦ νεφέλα παραγενοῦ, καὶ τοῦτο μόνον συνειδέναι. ἡ δὲ Πρόκρις ἀκούσασα ἔρχεται εἰς ταύτην τὴν κορυφὴν καὶ κατακρύπτεται. καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ λέγοντος αὐτοῦ πυθομένη προστρέχει πρὸς αὐτόν. ὁ δὲ Κέφαλος ἰδὼν αὐτὴν αἰφνιδίως ἔξω ἑαυτοῦ γίνεται, καὶ ὥσπερ εἶχε βάλλει <τῷ> μετὰ χεῖρας ἀκοντίῳ τὴν Πρόκριν καὶ κτείνει. μεταπεμψάμενος δὲ τὸν Ἐρεχθέα θάπτει πολυτελῶς αὐτήν. ἡ δὲ ἱστορία παρὰ Φερεκύδῃ ἐν τῇ ἑβδόμῃ.

b. *PSI* X 1173 fr. 2.

(recto)

Πρ]ο̣κριν. Κέ[λα]φαλ[ο]c ὁ Δηϊ[ονέως
γή]μας Πρόκριν τὴν Ἐρεχ[θέως
κα]τ̣ώικει ἐν Θορικῶι. θέλων [δὲ
τῆς γ]υναικὸς ἀποπειρᾶσθαι ἀ-
πο]δημεῖ ἐπ᾽ ἔτη ὀκτὼ καταλ[ι-
πὼ]ν αὐτὴν ἔτ{ε}ι νύμφην. [ἔπει-
τα κατ]α̣κοσμήσας ἑαυτὸν κ[αὶ
ἀλλ]ο̣ιώ[cα]c ἔρχεται {ἐρχ[}
εἰς τὴν οἰκία]ν ἔχων κ[όσμον
] . . [
. . . . .

(verso; intercesserunt ll. fere 14)

. . . . .
] . . . . [. .] π̣roca[
]αυρα γένοιτο καὶ τ[οῦ-
το μόνον c]υνειδέναι αὐτῶι· ἡ [δὲ
Πρόκρις] ἀκούσα̣σα ἔρχεται ε[ἰc
τ]ὴν
ταύτ]ην κορυφὴν καὶ κατα[κρύπτε-
τ]αι καὶ κατακούουσα αὐτο[ῦ
τοῦτο λέγοντος προστρέχ[ει
ὡς αὐτόν. ὁ δὲ Κέφαλος ἐξ[αίφ-
νης ἰδὼν ταύτην ἔξ[ω αὐτοῦ
γί]νεται καὶ ὡς εἶδε βάλλ[ει ἀκον-
τί]ωι τὴν Πρόκριν κ[αὶ κτεί-
νε]ι. μεταπεμψάμεν[ος δὲ τὸν
Ἐρεχ]θέα ταφ[
. . . . .

a. Quisquilias mitto. **3.** Θορικίων Labarbe, Thorikos: Les Testimonia (1977) 20, cf. **b.** (ἐν τῇ [voluit τῷ] Θορικῷ iam Buttmann); Θοριέων codd.; Θορ⟨α⟩ιέων Wilamowitz Hermes 18 (1883) 425 n. 0 = Kl. Schr. I 139 || **6** ἐπὶ νυμφῶ(ος) Z, cf. Eust. Od. 1688.22 ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ νυμφῶνος; ἐπὶ νυμφῶνα M (α s.l.); ἐπὶ νυμφῶν V; ἔτι νύμφην edd., cf. **b.** || **12-26** aliter Z: τῆς δὲ πειcθείcης ἐμφαίνει ὁ Κέφαλος ἑαυτὸν καὶ αἰτιᾶται μὲν αὐτὴν ὡς μὴ ἑαυτῆς ἐγκρατῆ ὅμως δὲ καταλλάττεται. τὸ δ᾽ ἐντεῦθεν ἐξιόντα τὸν ἄνδρα cυχνάκις ἐπὶ θήραν ὑποπτεύει ἐκείνη ὡς ἑτέρᾳ γυναικὶ cυνόντα, καὶ

---

bibliography at 131 n. 12; id., "Revisione di PBerol 13282. Le historiae fabulares omeriche su papiro," Atti del xvii congresso internazionale di papirologia (Naples 1984) 22g-42; id., "Filologia omerica antica nei papiri," Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology (Athens 1988) 1.341-44; M.W.Haslam, "A New Papyrus of the Mythographus Homericus," BASP 27 (1990) 31-36.

[5] The readings are the result of collations which I have had to do in the course of preparing an edition of the early mythographers. The + after "MV^{mou}Z" indicates that other, parallel sources are witnesses to the fragment, but are not fully cited; in the case of Homeric scholia this usually means Eustathios (see the apparatus). The sigla are those of Ludwich (except for "Z", on which see below); V° is Dindorf´s O, the oldest MS of the D-scholia to the Odyssey, Bodleian Auct. V 1 51, late tenth century.

προσκαλέσαςα τὸν συνεπακτῆρα ἐρωτᾷ τί ποιεῖ ὁ Κέφαλος συχνάκις ἀποδημῶν. ὁ δὲ ἔφη ὡς ἐπί τινος κορυφῆς ὄρους (ὄρους s.l.) ἐκεῖνος ἱστάμενος βοᾷ "ὦ νεφέλη." ἡ δὲ Πρόκρις ὑπονοήσαςα τὴν Νεφέλην εἶναι γυναῖκα ἀπελθοῦσα ἐκεῖ κρύπτεται. τοῦ δὲ Κεφάλου ἀναβοωμένου τὸ σύνθες, αὐτὴ ἐξιοῦσα προστρέχει πρὸς αὐτόν. ὁ δὲ τῷ ἀδοκήτῳ διαταραχθεὶς βάλλει αὐτὴν τῷ μετὰ χεῖρας ἀκοντίῳ καὶ κτείνει. Simillima Eust. Od. 1688.26 sqq. ‖ **17** ἐρωτᾷ **Z**, Eust. (vide supra); ἔλεγεν cett.; ἐλέγχει Wilamowitz, SPAW (1926) 139 = K1. Schr. V 2.147 ‖ **18** ἰέναι] ἰδεῖν codd., em. Jacoby; κορυφῇ ⟨ἰέναι⟩ Wilamowitz SPAW loc. cit., sed mira constructio ἰδεῖν cum infinitivis ‖ **19** νεφέλη Z (vide supra) ‖ **25** ᾧπερ εἶχε μετὰ χεῖρας ἀκοντίῳ βάλλει Wilamowitz, Hermes loc.cit., sed Graecismus ὥσπερ εἶχε non sollicitandus (Soph. Ant. 1235, Xenoph. Anab. 4.1.19, Hdt. 2.121 δ et saepius) ⏐ ⟨τῷ⟩ Buttmann ex Eust., cf. Z supra ‖ χεῖρας Z, Eust.: χεῖρα cett.

b. numeratio linearum eadem est quam instituit editio Florentina continuam (l. 29 = fr. 2 l. 4). Omnia supplevit editor primus (G.Coppola). ‖ **48** ὡς εἶδε cum ἰδὼν in 47 male congruit; error nimirum pro ὡς εἶχε, cf. **a.**

There is a textual problem in line 6 of fr. a. The three V (for "Vulgate") MSS, which all have the scholia minora in their original form as an independent commentary, read ἐπὶ νυμφῶν. M, a Marcianus (613, saec. xiii) which Dindorf made the basis of his edition, has ἐπὶ νυμφῶνα, the last letter being written above the line. A manuscript I found in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (CCC 81),[6] which I have labelled "Z", has ἐπὶ νυμφῶνος, at the bridal chamber. This is also what Eustathios says in his paraphrase (see the apparatus). This Cambridge MS, although quite late (15th century), is I believe a good witness to the version of the scholia upon which Eustathios drew; at first I thought the MS was dependent upon Eustathios, but closer examination proved this impossible. In this passage, editors have all read ἔτι νύμφην, which at first sight appears to be triumphantly vindicated by the papyrus. Yet I believe ἐπὶ νυμφῶνος to be right. The termination in my MS Z is abbreviated in the usual way as a single slash descending to the right. Although this is a minuscule symbol, similar ones were in use in antiquity. Loss through abbreviation accounts for the reading of all three V-MSS, which as it stands is nonsense (compare also the arrangement in M). The reading ἔτι νύμφην is a variant, either by someone who wrote what comes to the same thing instead of copying what was in front of him, or by someone confronted with the nonsensical ἐπὶ νυμφῶν. The papyrus merely shows that the variant was ancient. There is also the

6 R.L.Fowler, "Testis novus ad scholia in Homeri Odysseam," Minerva 3 (1989) 71-77. Allen dubbed it "Ca" in his list of Odyssean MSS (PBSR 5 [1910] 4); his report that the scribe is Emmanuel of Constantinople is based on some mistake, for M.R.James, whose article in The Journal of Theological Studies 5 (1903-04) 445ff. Allen cites, is there discussing the Leicester codex of the gospels. The scribe of CCC 81 is Demetrios Xanthopoulos. Joshua Barnes already used the text in his edition of Homer, but did not read the scholia, even though he thought the MS was written in the seventh century!

principle of *utrum in alterum;* ἔτι νύμφην is more likely to be corrupted into the choicer reading ἐπὶ νυμφῶνος than the other way around.[7]

Textual criticism thus points independently to the reading ἐπὶ νυμφῶνος. Now the idea that Kephalos left his bride *at the bridal chamber* itself is a suspiciously particular detail. The possibility presents itself that the myth is aetiological. The detail is there not because the narrative suggests or requires it, but because it was part of a ritual. Like the Rharian plain and other landmarks mentioned in the frankly aetiological *Hymn to Demeter*, this chamber may well have existed.[8] Of course, the detail may have been invented by a dramatically vivid imagination: not just "left her as a new bride" but "left her right at the bridal chamber." Yet still one wonders. This is not the only curious detail in the myth: there is the coming in disguise, the presentation of a precious object, and above all the summoning of a cloud. Moreover, there is the evidence of the sacred calendar of Thorikos, first published from the stone as recently as 1983, and dating perhaps to the 430s B.C.[9] Sumptuous sacrifices are prescribed for Kephalos and Prokris at lines 16 and 54. Cult honours for the protagonists are thus explicitly attested at the place mentioned in the myth.[10]

These facts encourage a reappraisal of the familiar story. As it turns out, the myth yields a plausible ritual connection with surprising ease. Admittedly, every detail cannot be explained without recourse to speculation; but it is a rare luxury for the student of Greek religion to have complete evidence for both myth and ritual, thus obviating the need for extrapolation from the known to the unknown and reconstruction by means of analogy.

The aspect that most catches the imagination is the tragic misunderstanding of Prokris. Sophokles wrote a play about her, and Ovid does not fail to milk the story for its full pathetic

---

[7] For the preposition see LSJ s.v. I.1; parallels include Hdt. 2.121 ε 2 κατίσαι ἐπ' οἰκήματος, Pl. Charm. 163b ἐπ' οἰκήματος καθημένῳ, Pl. Ap. 17c ἐπὶ τῶν τραπεζῶν ("at the moneychangers"'). For the noun see next note.

[8] The noun is not attested earlier than the first century A.D., and may have replaced a Pherekydean original. Although many details can be preserved, one must assume revision as the normal state of fragments in this tradition. On the other hand the formation of the noun is perfectly ordinary (cf. παρθενών, ἀνδρών, γυναικών) and it could easily be classical. For νυμφών as the name of a sacred building cf. Pausanias 2.11.3. A bridal chamber, designated by another unusual word, also figures in the story of Amphitryon (below, p.36).

[9] G.Daux, L'Antiquité Classique 52 (1983) 150-74 and The J.Paul Getty Museum Journal 12 (1984) 145-52. An excellent discussion with full bibliography in Robert Parker, "Festivals of the Attic Demes," Gifts to the Gods. Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1985 edd. T.Linders, G.Nordquist (Boreas 15, Uppsala 1987) 137-47. See also D.Whitehead, The Demes of Attica (Princeton 1986) 194-99; S.Dow, "Six Athenian Sacrificial Calendars," BCH 92 (1968) 170-86.

[10] Kephalos has been understood as the eponym of nearby Kephale (so Toeppfer, above n. 2); in this case his appropriation by Thorikos must have taken place early. Alternatively, he is the eponym of the Kephalidai, to whom (on one reconstruction) the orator Andokides belonged (Broadbent, above n. 2, 243f.). Andokides was of the deme Thorai, which lends some colour to the conjecture of Wilarnowitz in Pher. fr. 34a (see apparatus); but it is thin support indeed, and although his conjecture is palaeographically easier I have preferred the better attested Θορικίων. For the use of the feminine article see E.Schwyzer, Griechische Grammatik II (1950) 175; cf. Wilamowitz on Eur. HF 681.

potential. Yet this is not the heart of the story. The heart of it is that Kephalos goes to a mountain-top and summons a cloud. This is neither a necessary nor an obvious device for someone wishing to tell a story about misplaced doubt. The climb up the mountain demands explanation, but the most obvious suggestion has apparently never been made: that Kephalos is trying to make it rain. Such a trip and such an incantation can have no other purpose.[11]

Weather magic in Greece has been fully documented by scholars of an earlier generation.[12] It was no isolated phenomenon. In engaging in such activities the Greeks were no different from other pre- industrial societies all over the world. When the growth of crops and the flourishing of life are completely at the mercy of nature, magical devices are one's only hope. The gods are cruel. In our insulated age (or more correctly, in our insulated Western civilization) we have forgotten what it is like to lose half our children to death, to starve in the winter, or to suffer the devastation of plague. Consequently we think there are no gods (though looming environmental catastrophes may make us think again). The surviving indications of weather-magic - and of other kinds of magic, especially fertility magic - from Greece surely represent only the smallest fraction of the ancient reality. General probabilities overwhelmingly suggest that *every* Greek farmer used such devices constantly, and *every* Greek community carried out such rites on behalf of all its members. The Thesmophoria for Demeter is first and foremost fertility magic.[13]

We should expect that in many cases these rituals were backed up by an aetiological myth; but, once again, given the spottiness of our sources, it would be sheer luck to have both ritual and myth preserved. At Thorikos, in addition to the mountain-top ritual I am hypothetically reconstructing from the myth, there is the suggestive evidence of the calendar. The most appropriate times of year for weather-magic are July, when the Dog-Star rises, and

---

[11] The later story (not attested earlier than Parth. Amat. Narr. 10, cf. [Plut.] Parall. parv. 21 and Stob. IV 20. 70 [4.471 Wachsmuth-Hense]) of Leukonoe and Kyanippos appears to be modelled on this one and omits the business of the cloud altogether, as does the story of Aemilius and his wife ([Plut.] loc.cit.), perhaps confirming the awkwardness of the detail. Roscher felt compelled to add a special note about it to A.Rapp's article (Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie II.1 [1890-1894] 1091): mist often gathers around Hymettos of a morning, he explains, and the peasants in the plain call upon such clouds to come, because after a long dry spell they herald the coming of rain. In a quaint way Roscher has nearly arrived at our conclusion. Schwenn, RE XI.1 (1921) 218 s.v. Kephalos, finds the cloud "ziemlich unverständlich", and advances a wholly unconvincing explanation. A.B.Cook, Zeus III (1940) 72ff. compares the myths of Kephalos, Phrixos, and Ixion as I do below, but fails to draw the inference, in spite of his reference to rain magic at the start of his discussion.

[12] J.G.Frazer, The Golden Bough I^3 (1911) 309f.; J.E.Harrison, Themis^2 (1927) 76ff.; W.Fiedler, Antiker Wetterzauber (1931); L.Radermacher, Mythos und Sage bei den Griechen^2 (1938) 321f., 369f.; A.B.Cook, Zeus III (1940) 296ff.; M.P.Nilsson, Geschichte der griechischen Religion I^3 (1967) 110ff., 116f., 396ff. (with further references).

[13] On the Thesmophoria see H.S.Versnel's article (below, n. 47). The well-known ritual cry ὗε κύε from Eleusis reminds us that there too rain magic had its part to play. John McK. Camp, Jr., "A Drought in the Late Eighth Century B.C.," Hesp. 48 (1979) 397-411 at 398, following M.K.Langdon, A Sanctuary of Zeus on Mount Hymettos (Hesp. Suppl. XVI, Princeton 1976), rightly infers a drought in the late eighth century trom the marked increase in offerings at the sanctuary ot Zeus Ombrios atop Mount Hymettos.

October, at the sowing of the seed. These are precisely the times when Kephalos and Prokris are honoured. It looks as if the deme made offerings to these important spirits at the times of year when the magic was to be done. Secondly, as we shall see below, two other myths in which a cloud figures in a similarly unnecessary way have long been recognized as aitia of rain magic: the myth of the Golden Fleece, and the myth of Ixion. A final hint is that on the top of Hymettos, where Ovid places these events, there was a sanctuary of Zeus Ombrios, god of rain.[14]

Rain-making may be considered to be the kernel of the story, at least in origin. Myths can, however, evolve, be adapted to different purposes, acquire additions and suffer abbreviation. The tragic colouring of the tale in particular has suggested to some that Sophokles, who wrote a play *Prokris*, was a source for Pherekydes.[15] How Sophokles might have altered a Thorikian myth can hardly be gauged. Nonetheless, it takes no great effort of imagination to find ways in which the remaining details can be read aetiologically; insofar as the reading is cogent, the assumption is strengthened that the myth as it stands is coherent and not much altered from its source.

---

[14] Paus. 1.32.2; see the excavation report of M.K.Langdon (last note). E.K.Borthwick (AJP 84 [1963] 227; reference from Hugh Lloyd-Jones) and others assume that Ovid (Ars Am. 3.687ff.} sets the story at the sanctuary of Aphrodite known as the Κύλλου Πήρα, but Ovid's locus amoenus motif is hardly probative of any particular locality. The beggar's wallet is also on the wrong side of Hymettos for Thorikos, whereas the sanctuary of Zeus Ombrios is just past the sumrnit and accessible via the road from Paiania. On the other hand, Ovid has Kephalos living in Athens (Met. 7.723). The details of so late and inventive an author can hardly be pressed. As Langdon points out, inhabitants of southern Attica would more likely have used nearer peaks; he conveniently catalogues evidence of worship on hilltops around the peninsula. The story may well have been transferred at some stage from a lesser known Attic height to one of its principal peaks.

[15] E.g. Robert (above, n. 2) 164 n. 3. See fr. 533 Radt. The date of Pherekydes is not secure, but G.Huxley, GRBS 14 (1973) 137-43, with much plausibility, places his activity in the time of Kimon son of Miltiades; if this is correct it makes the borrowing, though not impossible, somewhat unlikely. (Some confirmation of this dating is offered below, n. 41). In this connection the words spoken by Kephalos according to Pherekydes are relevant: "ὦ νεφέλα παραγενοῦ". The non-Attic form of the noun is striking. It is found in all manuscripts but one, including M, in spite of what Dindorf says. If this corruption is not merely a weird accident, the words might come from a choral portion of Sophokles' play. Another explanation that occurs to me is that the words are a ritual formula preserved from the days before the Attic dialect changed alphas to etas (such formulas are fiercely resistant to change). That would take us back to before the Ionian migration of ca. 1,000 B.C., that is the high Dark Ages and within spitting distance of the Bronze Age. The deforestation of Attika was not yet complete, and the aition does imply wooded environs; by the Classical Age Hymettos supported only bees. Wilamowitz noticed this (SPAW [1926] 139 = Kl. Schr. V 2.147) and commented: "Ist etwa νεφέλᾰ gemeint, wie wir νύμφα aus Homer, κούρα aus Anakreon kennen?" In other words he thinks of archaic survival. His second example is not pertinent because of the digamma, but the first is explained by P.Chantraine, Grammaire Homérique I (1958) 200, as the survival of the original Indo-European vocative of the ᾱ/η declension.

The union of Kephalos and his wife in the bridal chamber is a sacred marriage.[16] The union of king and queen under ritual circumstances imitates the primal union of heaven and earth, whose rain and soil are semen and womb. This is sympathetic magic at its most basic; the famous myth of Demeter and Iasion in Crete, whereby the coupling occurred in a thrice-ploughed field, merely takes the act to its logical conclusion. The union occurs under ritually marked circumstances, in a special place (in this case, the , "bridal chamber") with special preparations. The king may be in disguise, or be represented by a mysterious other person, for example the priest of the god. The best-known example is the marriage of the wife of the King Archon in Athens, originally therefore the queen of Athens, and Dionysos, presumably represented by his priest or by the King, at the Boukoleion.[17] The return of Kephalos in disguise to the bridal chamber is to be understood in this manner.[18] The king, in the earliest days, derives his power directly from Zeus, and was regarded as his earthly representative. Putting him in a mask and hiding his ordinary identity on occasions like this encourages one to think of him less as a human king than as some other mysterious presence, obviously that of the god.

A suggestive parallel springs to mind at once: the famous story of Amphitryon, subject of comedies since ancient times. Alkmene is visited twice in the same night, once by her husband, once by the king of heaven disguised as her husband. Moreover, in both cases the disguised stranger gains access to the bride by the gift of a precious object. In the case of Alkmene, it is an unusual cup, said by Zeus to be the prize of valour in the fight against the Teleboans. Pherekydes, once again (FGrHist 3 F 13), preserves the vital detail: the cup was the type known as a καρχήσιον. To Greek ears the root would have suggested something

---

16 Some scholars (e.g. H.Sauer, Der Kleine Pauly s.v.) would restrict this term only to reenactments of the wedding of Zeus and Hera such as were celebrated at the Samian Heraia, but its extension to include all instances of real or simulated union in the furtherance of fertility is not difficult. See W.Mannhardt, Der Baumkultus der Germanen und ihrer Nachbarstämme (1875) 480-88 ("Brautlager auf dem Ackerfelde"); Frazer, op. cit. (above, n. 12) II^3 120ff.; A.Klinz, RE Suppl. VI (1935) 107ff. s.v. Hieros Gamos (a discussion marred by racist ideology; based on his dissertation, Hieros Gamos [Halle 1933]); S.M.Kramer, The Sacred Marriage Rite (Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1969); K.Kerenyi, Zeus und Hera. Urbild des Vaters, des Gatten und der Frau (Leiden 1972) 83-90; W.Burkert, Greek Religion, tr. J.Raffan (Cambridge, Mass., 1985) 108f. I have not seen Aphrodite Avagianou, Sacred Marriage in the Rituals of Greek Religion, advertised by Peter Lang (Bern, Frankfurt/M., New York, Paris, 1991); it is not listed in German, English, or American Books in Print. R.Janko, The Iliad: A Commentary IV (Cambridge 1992) on 14.153-353 quotes (p. 171) F.Robert's opinion (CRAI 1941, 293-7) that "the whole episode [of Zeus and Hera] is inspired by the clouds with fertilizing dew that often sit on mountain-tops, the cloud-gatherer's epiphany." Prokris' name is probably significant: "the chosen one" (cf. Robert, above n. 2, 163 n. 3, and Roscher, above n. 11, who render "exirnia"); she is most suited for the sacred task.

17 For doubts about whether this occurred at the Anthesteria see R.Hamilton, Choes and Anthesteria: Athenian Iconography and Ritual (Ann Arbor 1992) 53-56.

18 W.Burkert, Homo Necans, tr. P.Bing (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1983) 234 n. 14, draws the parallel, thus implying that he regards our myth as aetiological, but says no more about it.

Phoenician, and one thinks immediately of the Punic connections of Thebes in myth.[19] Presumably this item was an ancient artifact; so, indeed, Anaximander and Athenaios tell us.[20] We may suspect that Pherekydes, who also reports the aetiological myth for Alkmene's cult at Thebes (FGrHist 3 F 84), got his information from a local source. Alkmene - whose own bearing of Herakles suffered such notable difficulties - received chthonic rites in Boiotia at Haliartos as well as at Thebes.[21] She was also honoured at Thorikos, as we learn from line 37 of the calendar. All chthonic deities are fertility deities to a greater or lesser extent, and it is highly suggestive for our argument that in Euripides' play *Alkmene,* the heroine, about to be roasted on a pyre by her outraged husband, calls upon Zeus in the manner of Bacchylides' Kroisos to extinguish the burning pyre with an impromptu rainstorm. He complies.[22] The myth appears to be an aition for a sacred marriage followed by rain-magic, just like the myth of Kephalos.[23] If so, the occurrence of the word παστός "bridal chamber" in Pherekydes' report (fr. 13b) becomes most interesting. It is an uncommon word, which on the evidence was especially used of holy chambers;[24] although corruption is present at this point in the fragment, this is not the kind of word to be emended away. As the text stands (δοκοῦσα τὸν ἑαυτῆς παστὸν εἶναι), it is applied to Zeus disguised as Amphitryon; assuming a lacuna and an easy corruption of ἰέναι to εἶναι,[25] I would guess the original sense was something like "thinking that her own <husband was entering her> bridal chamber" (δοκοῦσα τὸν ἑαυτῆς ⟨ἄνδρα εἰς τὸν⟩ παστὸν ἰέναι). The union is placed in a particular place with a special name, a name with the same import as the νυμφών at Thorikos - and also in the mysteries of Meter, where initiates into the

---

[19] Pausanias also saw a cup on the Kypselos chest (5.18.3), which takes us even further back. See E.Stark, "Die Geschichte des Amphitryonstoffes vor Plautus," RhM 125 (1982) 275-303 at 280f.; J.Boardman, "The Karchesion of Herakles," JHS 99 (1979) 149-51.

[20] Ath. 11.474f (3.43.13 Kaibel) = Pherekydes FGrHist 3 F 13a; Anaximander FGrHist 9 F 1; cf. Herodoros FGrHist 31 F 16 (quoted by Athenaios in the same place); Charon of Lampsakos FGrHist 262 F 2, who reports seeing the cup in Sparta in his day.

[21] A.Schachter, Cults of Boiotia I (BICS Suppl. 38.1, 1981) 13-16.

[22] A.Nauck, TGF2 p. 386.

[23] Frazer, op.cit. (above, n. 12) II^3 97ff., collects many examples from around the world of the use of sexual union to stimulate the growth of crops; the production of rain is sometimes said to be the purpose as well. Conversely, sexual impropriety can cause bad weather or blight the crops (so Oidipous). The equivalence of human and god is also illustrated by the aetiological myth of the Anthesteria (both Theseus and Dionysus as spouse of Ariadne). The Egyptian sacred marriage myth which is often taken as the origin of the Amphitryon story explicitly identifies king and god; see Stark (above, n. 19) 285ff. citing P.Walcot, Hesiod and the Near East (1966) 65-72 and "The Divinity of the Mycenaean King," SMEA 2 (1967) 53-62; P.Walcot, "Cattle Raiding, Heroic Tradition, and Ritual: The Greek Evidence," HR 18 (1979) 326-51 at 338.

[24] It appears to apply to the curtain hung across the entry to the chamber, and by metonymy to the chamber. See Jebb on Soph. Antig. 1207 (Appendix to his edition [^{2}1891], p. 264); W.Headlam, Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments, ed. A.D.Knox (1922) on Herodas 4.56. Theocr. 24.46 uses παστός of this same bed-chamber; the anonymous author of SH 961 uses παστός of the wedding of Hera (line 8).

[25] MS X of the Odyssean scholia (Vind. phil. gr. 133) has μεριστὴν, which is not easily explained as a misreading.

mysteries had to say ὑπὸ τὸν παστὸν εἰσέδυν. Jane Harrison did not hesitate to assume a sacred marriage in the rite.[26]

Thus far we have a sacred marriage followed by a trip to a mountain-top by Kephalos to summon a cloud. The rest of the story tells how Prokris foolishly interrupted the proceedings and met her sad death. This may be interpreted as a warning against the interruption of the actual ritual. Directly after the union, the of ficiating priest departed for the mountain-top, and his bride must not follow him. Dire consequences attend those who break the tabu. As a general rule magical ceremonies must be conducted strictly according to prescription or their effectiveness will be frustrated. In Greek mythology the idea is easily illustrated. In the myth of the Arrhephoria at Athens, the two naughty daughters of Kekrops, overcome by curiosity, look into the chest in defiance of Athena's orders, and are driven mad by what they see there. The corresponding injunction in the cult is well known: the Arrhephoroi must not know the nature of their burden (Paus. 1.27.3).[27] In the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, the goddess' nocturnal efforts to immortalize the boy Demophon by magic are interrupted and therefore ruined. The counterpart in ritual is not known, but that one exists is agreed by many scholars.[28] In the Thesmophoria at Kyrene, King Battos once interrupted the magical proceedings and was castrated for his trouble.[29] It is doubtful, given his example, that other Kyrenean males would have dared intrude upon the ceremony.

Similar tabus are also known in rain magic. At the sanctuary of Zeus Lykaios in Arkadia, on Mount Lykaion, anyone who trod upon the sacred ground variously lost his shadow, was killed, or was bound to die within a year.[30] Rain magic is specifically attested for this site by Pausanias (8.38.3). Concerning the cult of Zeus Laphystios at Halos in Thessaly, Herodotos (7.197) reports that if the eldest member of the Athamantid family should enter the Council Chamber, he must be sacrificed. The tabu is tied explicitly to the original Athamas and his attempt to kill his son Phrixos and daughter Helle. He was misled by their wicked stepmother Ino, who arranged for a false oracle ordering their sacrifice. The crisis facing the community was famine, caused by none other than Nephele, Cloud, Athamas' first wife, angry at being deserted by him.[31] Anger at rejection is also what led Eos to plant doubt about Prokris in Kephalos' mind. The Thessalian story, too, is the aition of a rain ritual. It tells how at the last minute Phrixos and Helle were rescued by the ram with the golden fleece, a ram sent by their mother the cloud. The fleece of a sacrificed ram is the usual instrument for

---

[26] J.E.Harrison, Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion (l903) 536f; W.Burkert, Ancient Mystery Cults (Cambridge, Mass. 1987) 98. At Phlya the room was designated παστάς.

[27] On the Arrhephoria, R.L.Fowler, "AIΓ- in Early Greek Language and Myth," Phoenix 42 (1988) 95-113 at 105-110.

[28] See N.Richardson, ed., The Homeric Hymn to Demeter (Oxford 1974) 231ff.

[29] Aelian fr. 44; W.Burkert, CQ 20 (1970) 12 gives instances of similar punishments.

[30] References in W.Burkert (above, n. 18) 85.

[31] So ran the story in Sophokles, at any rate (Athamas, TrGF IV p. 99), as opposed to Euripides in his Phrixos who seems to be the origin of the better-known version about Ino roasting the seed-corn.

rain-magic in other instances; the officiants put one on and imitate clouds. Already in 1893 Eduard Meyer had drawn the appropriate conclusion about this myth.[32]

The tabu, admittedly, is not referred to the attempted sacrifice of Phrixos, but to the Achaeans' attempt to execute Athamas (whether as a substitute for Phrixos or because of his treatment of Phrixos is not clear from Herodotos' narrative); his grandson Kytissoros rescued him. Nor is the tabu related to the cult site, if one assumes the site to be on a mountain near Halos. Mount Laphystion, however, is in Boiotia; Nilsson argued that that is the original home of the cult.[33] Some shifting of motifs and application may have resulted from the transfer. At any rate the presence of the motif "death of loved ones" in a myth whose connection with rain magic has long been recognized is suggestive. A similar instance is presented by the myth of Ixion, who enticed his father-in-law to his death in a fiery pit. Zeus purified him, but during his stay on Olympos he took a fancy to Hera. Zeus made a likeness of the goddess - out of a cloud; with this Ixion mated. The result of this union was the race of Centaurs. Ixion was punished by being tied to a wheel of fire. The details are very odd, the narrative motivation creaks at every juncture; the myth smacks of aetiology. Nilsson posited a connection with rain magic.[34] The fiery, smoky pit was perhaps the instrument.[35] It was here that the relation met his death, though this time by design rather than accident. In Ixion's case, the necessary warning about the conduct of magic has taken the form of blasphemous and dangerous conduct on the part of the first officiant.[36] But a relation dies just the same. The Centaurs, in their turn, were first identified as wind spirits by Mannhardt; Kretschmer, with greater philological probability, thought they were water spirits.[37] In weather magic it comes to the same thing. These creatures are at home on Mount Pelion; the cult there of Zeus Akraios, which required young men to toil up to the top of the mountain on the hottest day of the summer, clad in sheepskins in imitation of clouds, is attested in both literary and epigraphical sources.[38]

---

[32] E.Meyer, Geschichte des Altertums II (1893) 94.

[33] M.P.Nilsson, The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology (1931) 135f.; op.cit. (above, n. 12) 397 n. 1.

[34] M.P.Nilsson, op.cit. (above, n. 33) p.135 n. 19.

[35] As N.Robertson suggests to me.

[36] Salmoneus' case is similar; these affairs are dangerous. I withdraw the skepticism expressed at Phoenix 42 (1988) 112 about Salmoneus'connection with weather magic.

[37] W.Mannhardt, Antike Wald- und Feldkulte (1877) 39ff.; P.Kretschmer, Glotta 10 (1920) 50ff. (both cited by Nilsson, above n. 12, 231). G.S.Kirk, Myth Its Meaning and Functions in Ancient and Other Cultures (University of California Press 1970) 155, writes: "It is hard ... entirely to reject the possibility of an original connexion with water; but the connexion certainly does not show in their actions in surviving myths... Mythical ancestors give little help in this case," adding that the descent from Ixion and a cloud looks "late and rationalistic." Nilsson's suggestion provides the clue. What Kirk says about surviving myths of Centaurs is true; but these are the free inventions of poets and need have nothing to do with cult.

[38] Nilsson, op.cit. (above, n.12) 396.

These observations account for the principal elements of the myth. Some details remain. First, the role of the dawn goddess. This could be an independent accretion. The story works well enough as an aition without it, beginning just where Pherekydes begins it. Someone wanting to provide a *narrative* motive for Kephalos' visit in disguise (a need not always felt by aetiological myth) might have found this an easy way to do it. Myths of the dawn goddess snatching desirable young hunters are common, perhaps because hunters are abroad at such odd hours. Kephalos, the Attic Orion, got on the list.[39] Perhaps, on the other hand, dawn was the time of the ritual. Leaving Thorikos at daybreak after the previous night's conjugal union, a few hours' vigorous walking would put a man on Hymettos, suitably perspiring like the climbers of Pelton. Ovid and Hyginus both make Kephalos set out at dawn, and Ovid is quite emphatic that the death of Prokris occurred at precisely noon.[40] Or again, the role of dawn may relate more directly to moisture and fertility, by way of dew; Herse, the dew, is Kephalos' mother in Apollodoros (3.14.3) - the father is

---

[39] Indo-European motifs may also be mixed up here in indeterminate ways; by Eos Kephalos was father of the morning star according to some late sources, and according to Hesiod (Theog. 986) Kephalos was father of Phaethon, although the identity of this Phaethon with the child of the sun is sharply denied by J.Diggle, Euripides: Phaethon (Cambridge 1970) 4, 12ff. Frazer would certainly fit Kephalos in with Mullerian sun-mythology. On the slightest of grounds he hypothesizes (op.cit. above, n. 12, IV 58ff.) an eight-year reign for early kings of Sparta, Delphi, and Thebes, like that of Minos at Knossos (Od. 19.178f.); the great year, being the length of time between coniunctions of sun and moon at the same point in the sky, sets the interval for renewal of the king's reign, and is appropriately marked by a sacred marriage. Minos is the sun, and Pasiphae (who "shines on all") the moon. The eight-year absence of Kephalos would surely have been interpreted in this manner had he chanced to think of it in this connection. He is able, certainly, to cite evidence (73 n. 23 that the ancients regarded the juncture of sun and moon as a good time for marriages, and mythology might easily develop the idea, but his theory hardly carries convinction. For Kephalos as the sun see also Rapp in Roscher's Lexicon (above, n. 11) 1096ff.; for Prokris as the moon, see Roscher in the same work, II.2 (1894-97) 3199. - It might occur to some readers (to move from an older fad to a current one) to find signs of initiation rituals in our myth: Kephalos goes away for eight years (mythical exaggeration of the actual period of segregation as in the myth of Lykaon); and in the version of Antoninus Liberalis (41) and Hyginus (Fab. 189), Prokris returns after her sojourn with Artemis and tests her husband disguised as a handsome youth (transvestism as in the myth of Achilles on Skyros). But this looks like someone's clever elaboration of the story; in this version, Prokris demands her husband's favours as a παιδικά (the elaboration, satisfying the sense that Kephalos deserves a come-uppance) in return for the spear and dog (the traditional features). P.M.C.Forbes Irving, Metamorphosis in Greek Myth (Oxford 1990) 50ff., expresses great skepticism regarding the tendency to detect initiation rituals behind any occurrence of the motif of separation in a myth, and points out that independent evidence for such rituals is usually not available.

[40] Hyg. Fab. 189; Ov. Met. 7.702, 723-24, 804; AA 3.687ff. An interesting interpretation of K.Latte, "Die Sirenen," Kleine Schriften (Munich 1968) 106-11 (after O.Curtius and Felix Solmsen), may be mentioned here, according to which the Siren (etymologically related to Sirius) is the personification of the midday heat, much like the meridianus daemon (on which see W.Drexler in Roscher, Lexikon II.2 [1894-97] 2832). On a fifth-century column-crater by the Hephaistos Painter in London depicting the death of Prokris (Beazley, ARV2 390, 11) a winged figure hovers overhead, which Latte wanted to interpret as a Siren (rather than a psyche), with reference to the time of death at noon. For objections see A.Heubeck in A.Heubeck, A.Hoekstra, edd., A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey II (Oxford 1989) on Od. 12.167-9. - One would very much like to know the exact provenience of an inscription marking the sanctuary boundary of "Zeus the parcher" found at Thorikos: A.Lolling, Ἀρχ. Δελτ. (1890) 140 no. 20; IG H^2 2606.

Hermes. One way suspect that this is the original Attic genealogy, since Deioneus, the father of Kephalos in Pherekydes, is a son of Aiolos and a Phokian. Whatever the motive for this genealogical link, it is at any rate non-Attic.

The final detail of Prokris' burial is perhaps not related to the ritual, since it may serve merely to wrap up the narrative.[41] The dramatic prominence of the spear, however, is probably significant. Perhaps it was an ancient object associated with the cult; perhaps a find from a Mycenaean grave; perhaps it did the duty of a kingly sceptre. The myth implies that the officiant had to take this spear with him to perform his duties. The use of spears or sticks to stir up a pool of water is a documented method of sympathetic rain magic; the idea is that one creates a mist which imitates rain. Or the spear may simply be Kephalos' hunting spear; he is persistently characterized in the sources as a great hunter, and in Pherekydes the suspicious trips to the mountain-top are hunting trips. Hunters, too, need fertility in a general way, for the nurture of animals.

Finally, a strange variant in Ovid's version of the story calls for comment. His Kephalos calls not for rain, but for a breeze to cool him after the exertions of his chase, both in the Metamorphoses and the Ars Amatoria; the detail is striking and unlikely to be invented out of nothing (why change it from Nephele?). If Ovid found this in his source, we must account for it. Wind-magic as well as rain-magic is an amply attested phenomenon in ancient Greece, whether to quell damaging winds or to encourage the cool etesians in the height of midsummer.[42] The methods used are often similar. Moreover, winds are prominent in the myth of Prokris' sister Oreithyia, the mountain-rusher, carried off by the North Wind just as Kephalos was raptured by the Dawn.[43] Perhaps the ritual at Thorikos was wind- and rain-magic together: depending on who one spoke to, one might hear slightly different accounts of the aition.[44]

* * *

---

[41] Jacoby ad loc. observed that the funeral at the end of the story is quite inconsistent with the Athenian tradition known from Hellanikos (FGrHist 323a F 22a) that this murder was one of the early trials heard by the Areopagos in Athens. This was one of the reasons for his conclusion that not much of Pherekydes has survived into this report of the Mythographus Homericus. But just as Herodotos can say "this is the story told by the Persians; the Phoenicians, however..." (1.5, and sirnilarly elsewhere), Pherekydes might have signalled explicitly that this version of the Thorikians was at odds with that told by the Athenians. Or perhaps he preferred the Thorikian version. M.Broadbent (above, n. 2) 267 also suggested that "Probably stories of homicide trials before the heroic Areopagus would never have been constructed but for the reforms of 462/1: and if so, Pherekydes may well have been writing before the trial of Kephalos was invented." This accords with the date of Pherekydes' activity argued by Huxley (above, n. 15).

[42] Authorities cited above n. 12.

[43] Sources in C.Robert (above, n. 2) 167ff.

[44] Robert Parker, "The Hymn to Demeter and the Homeric Hymns," Greece and Rome 38 (1991) 1-17, has drawn attention to the activity of the author of the Hymn in choosing among competing versions of the myth in shaping his poem, which we are mistaken in regarding as the one, authoritative account, at least when it was first composed.

The plausibility of this admittedly speculative reconstruction will be judged by every reader. To repeat what was said at the outset, it is frustratingly rare for the student of Greek religion to be well informed on any myth-ritual complex. Normally we have one or the other. Moreover, the myths are preserved in literary sources, the great majority of which are ultimately dependent on poets. Poets have their own special ways of treating myths, and even if they first got the story from a cult instead of another poet or their own imagination, their purpose in relating the tale, perhaps at a festival or a competition, will often have little to do with the cult. Especially in the case of epic the audience is pan-Hellenic and will be intolerant of meanings comprehensible only to people of a particular locality. The world of poetry is universal, its space imaginary. Ritual, on the other hand, is invariably tied to a locality, because it has to be performed somewhere; if it moves, it will take root somewhere else, and derive new nuances from its new location. The myth behind the cult cannot be preserved unchanged if it is divorced from the cult and put to new uses. This is the great value of Pausanias; he went to these locations, and wrote down what he heard. It now appears that Pherekydes was similar; apart from Thorikos, we have mentioned other instances where he appears to follow Theban sources.[45]

Many questions are raised in the attempt to interpret even a single myth, much less develop a coherent view of the whole of Greek mythology - to say nothing of world mythology. George Eliot's Mr. Casaubon, who set out to find the key to all mythologies, and died before finding the key to one, has his counterparts still. In working out the interpretation of the Kephalos myth proposed here, I found myself turning, to my own surprise, to the insights of an earlier generation of scholars, particularly Frazer and Harrison, who gave more prominence to the role of magic than is customary nowadays, and understood ritual as the plot of the *dromenon*.[46] Problematic and simplistic though these notions clearly are, a re-evaluation may be in order, particularly of the concept of magic, brought up to date with the more sophisticated tools of analysis now available.[47] It is obviously beyond the scope of a brief article to undertake such a task. But this unexpected

---

[45] It follows that the Mythographus Homericus in this case has reproduced his source fairly faithfully. His asciptions have been gaining respect in recent years; cf. R.Janko, CQ 36 (1986) 52f. Jacoby thought the report a late patchwork, fixing particularly on the poor motivations in the narrative; so too Labarbe, op.cit. (above, p. 30, 21 n. 4). But aetiological myth worries less about such things than about getting the appropriate details in; cf. on the Homeric Hymn to Demeter Parker (above n. 44) 10- 12.

[46] On the Carnbridge Ritualists see W.M.Calder, III, ed., The Cambridge Ritualists Reconsidered (Illinois Classical Studies Suppl. 2, Atlanta l99l); on Frazer, see R.Ackerman' "Frazer on Myth and Ritual," JHI 36 (1975) 115-34, and J.G.Frazer: His Life and Work (Cambridge 1987).

[47] An instructive article with some relevant considerations is offered by H.S.Versnel, "The Festival for the Bona Dea and the Thesmophoria," Greece and Rome 39 (1992) 31-55. See also his "What's Sauce for the Goose is Sauce for the Gander: Myth and Ritual, Old and New," Approaches to Greek Myth, ed. L.Edmunds (Johns Hopkins University Press 1990) 23-90. Christopher A.Faraone's recent Talismans and Trojan Horses: Guardian Statues in Ancient Myth and Ritual (Oxford 1992) is another sign of renewal of interest in this subject.

twist to an old tale may at least give pause for thought in the interim, and encourage one to cast about in the mythographers for other neglected aitia.

That there are such is likely enough.[48] The famous myths, worked over by poets, are apt to loom too large in one's mind when pondering the question of how much Greek myth is related to ritual. Ritual connections in such re-worked myths tend to be obscured. But it cannot be an accident that in that part of Greece where our knowledge of local myths is richest, Attika, again and again the key to their understanding lies in some detail of local cult. If we had such sources for Thebes, Argos, and the other centres of the great epic cycles, I cannot doubt these would be eclipsed in mass by the welter of local myths, much less grand, to be sure, but no less interesting in many ways and probably the ultimate originals of their inspiring, pan-Hellenic counterparts. The golden fleece of Mount Laphystion, after all, was the fleece Jason and his Argonauts set out to recover.

University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada Robert L.Fowler

[48] See for instance Aristokles FGrHist 33 F 3 = 436 F 1 (cf. Paus. 2.36).