

AIG- IN EARLY GREEK LANGUAGE AND MYTH

R. L. FOWLER

THE SEEMINGLY INNOCENT ROOT αἰγ- soon leads the interested student into a treacherous path of inquiry crossing the boundaries between linguistics, myth, cult, and pre-Greek history. Several primal meanings for the root, from at least two different languages, had long co-existed with each other by historical times, so that the resulting semantic picture may never be completely clarified. Nonetheless, a survey of the evidence may lead to a partial clarification.

I A HOMERIC PUZZLE

We begin with an old chestnut in Homer: the celebrated reference to "him whom the gods call Briareos, but all men Aigaion." Here is the context:

- πολλάκι γάρ σεο πατρός ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἄκουσα
 εὐχομένης, ὅτ' ἔφησθα κελαυφεῖ Κρονίωνι
 οἷη ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν αἰεκέα λοιγὸν ἀμῦναι
 ὁππότε μιν ξυνδῆσαι Ὀλύμπιοι ἤθελον ἄλλοι,
 400 Ἥρη τ' ἡδὲ Ποσειδάων καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη·
 ἀλλὰ σὺ τὸν γ' ἔλθοῦσα, θεά, ὑπελύσαο δεσμῶν,
 ὥχ' ἑκατόγχειρον καλέσασ' ἐς μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον,
 ὃν Βριάρεων καλέουσι θεοί, ἄνδρες δέ τε πάντες
 Αἰγαίων' - ὁ γὰρ αὐτὲ βίην οὐ πατρός ἀμείνων -
 405 ὅς ῥα παρὰ Κρονίῳνι καθέζετο κύδει γαίων·
 τὸν καὶ ὑπέδεισαν μάκαρες θεοὶ οὐδ' ἔτ' ἔδησαν. (Il. 1.396-406)

There seem to be two ways of articulating the train of thought in 403 ff: either "summoning the hundred-hander to Olympus (whom the gods called Briareos, but all men Aigaion) because he was stronger than his father," or "summoning the hundred-hander to Olympus (whom the gods called Briareos, but all men Aigaion, because he was stronger than his father)." In the first, the end of 404 with its γάρ gives the reason why Thetis summoned Briareos; in the second, the words are intended to explain the god's double name. As far as the syntax goes there is nothing to force either interpretation; as in the two English versions, it is a matter of pause and emphasis during delivery. The overall context might suggest that the first interpretation is correct; we want to know why this fellow is the right ally to summon in the emergency. Further reflection lessens the plausibility of this view. If *the* measure of his strength is his being stronger than his father, then everything depends on who this father is; yet about him we are told nothing. Some have assumed that he is Poseidon. There is, however, no evidence

elsewhere for this view, and indeed it is intolerable to think that a creature exists, other than Zeus, who is stronger than Poseidon.¹ One might claim that Homer relies on knowledge of the story in his audience. If so, it was a mightily learned audience. The story is anything but well-known; it occurs in surviving literature nowhere else but here, and other sources' inability to say who Aigaion's father was suggests they knew no other versions. In fact,

¹Aigaion is not called a son of Poseidon in earlier sources, who call him rather a son of Pontos (Eumelos, quoted below, n. 5) or simply of the sea (Ion of Chios *apud* Σ Ap. Rhod. 1.1165c = Page, *PMG* 741). It is easy to infer that Poseidon is Aigaion's father because he is the only male god among the opponents of Zeus here mentioned, unless Zenodotos' reading Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων for Παλλάς Ἀθήνη is correct (Σ A *Il.* 1.400a; see below). But the inference is not certain. The ease of the inference is I believe responsible for the information about Poseidon in the Homeric scholia, particularly the A-scholion on *Il.* 1.404 (whose implication is that this view of Aigaion's parentage was held by Aristarchos), and the D-scholion to *Il.* 1.399 (repeated in A): Ζεὺς παραλαβὼν τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ διοίκησιν περισσῶς τῇ παρρησίᾳ ἔχρητο, πολλὰ αὐθάδῃ διαπρασσόμενος. Ποσειδῶν δὲ καὶ Ἥρα καὶ Ἀπόλλων καὶ Ἀθηνᾶ ἐβούλοντο αὐτὸν δῆσαι ὑποτάξαι. Θέτις δὲ ἀκούσασα παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς Νηρέως (ἦν γὰρ μάντις) τὴν Δίος ἐπιβουλὴν ἔσπευσε πρὸς αὐτόν, ἐπαγομένη Αἰγαίῳ φόβητρον τῶν ἐπιβουλευόντων θεῶν· ἦν δὲ θαλάσσιος δαίμων οὗτος, καὶ τὸν πατέρα Ποσειδῶνα κατεβράβευεν. ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ζεὺς Θέτιδος τὴν μὲν Ἥραν ἐν τοῖς καθ' αὐτοῦ δεσμοῖς ἐκρέμασε, Ποσειδῶνι δὲ καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι τὴν παρὰ Λαομέδοντι θητεῖαν ἐψηφίσατο, τῇ δὲ Θέτιδι τὴν Ἀχιλλέως τιμὴν εἰς τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐταμειύσατο. The subscription reads ἱστορεῖ Δίδυμος; M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad* 1 (Leiden 1963) 244, gives reasons for thinking the subscription reliable in this case. Didymos reports no independent information (nor was the bT commentator on *Il.* 1.399–404 in any better position, for he makes the absurd guess that Zeus was the father). The story of Apollo and Poseidon serving Laomedon as a punishment for this rebellion was probably not told anywhere else in connection with Aigaion, and is connected with him here precisely in order to explain the peculiarity of the passage and justify the emendation Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων for Παλλάς Ἀθήνη (note *POxy* 3.419.24 f.: γράφουσι τινὲς καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων· φ[ασί γὰρ / ὅτι . . . , followed by the story. This material is omitted by Erbse in his edition of the scholia, as are the D-scholia generally; the papyrus is cited in Erbse's apparatus and by Jacoby on *FGrHist* 26 F 2. For mythographical papyri and the D-scholia see R. Janko, "The *Shield of Heracles* and the Legend of Cycnus," *CQ* ns 36 [1986] at 53, n. 80). The emendation was made by Zenodotos; Didymos is supporting him by showing that the passage as emended was consistent with Homeric legend (*Il.* 21.446 ff.) In the text of the scholion, Athena's name is still to be read, which confuses the picture slightly. Schmidt in his edition of the fragments of Didymos simply omitted the words, rightly, but without explanation. Van der Valk (244, cf. 314) pointed out that Athena is not punished in the sequel, and is missing in the papyrus (above); he also noted how often the D-scholia or their sources (here the so-called Mythographus Homericus) changed details in their authorities (here Didymos) to make a narrative harmonize with Homer (i.e., they added Athena's name because of the vulgate text, failing to grasp the point of the argument); and V. de Marco, in his unpublished collations of the principal D manuscripts which Nigel Wilson has kindly allowed me to see, remarks "Didymus igitur Zenodoti lectionem probaverat." In an edition of Didymos the words should be deleted; in an edition of the D-scholia they should not. Zenodotos also athetized the whole passage; how this action is related to his reading in 400 is not clear. The grounds were presumably that he found the whole idea of the passage inappropriate to the otherwise all-powerful Homeric Zeus (so K. Nickau, *Untersuchungen zur textkritischen Methode des Zenodotos von Ephesos* [Berlin 1977] 204 f.).

it is very likely Homer's invention, based on the better-known story of the Hundred-handers who helped the Olympians in Hesiod's *Theogony* and the single fact of a double-named, reputedly fearful, but largely retired sea-god.² The strength of the god consists in his one hundred limbs; that, and his previous good service to Zeus, is the justification for his being summoned, not that he was stronger than his father.

If these considerations are not sufficient to support the second interpretation, here is another: the form of the verses is paralleled exactly in other passages where names are being explained. As Ernst Risch observed, the expression "we call him X, because . . .," while very common in Hesiod, is not so common in Homer—*except* in a few passages where he is explaining the existence of two names.³ Risch cites three passages:

τόν ῥ' Ἐκτωρ καλέεσκε Σκαμάνδριον, αὐτὰρ οἱ ἄλλοι
Ἀστυάνακτ'· οἷος γὰρ ἔρνετο Ἴλιον Ἐκτωρ. (Il. 6.402–403)

. . . καλῇ Κλεοπάτρῃ

. . .
τὴν δὲ τότε ἐν μεγάροισι πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ
Ἀλκυόνην καλέεσκον ἐπώνυμον, οὔνεκ' ἄρ' αὐτῆς
μήτηρ Ἀλκυόνης πολυπευθέος οἶτον ἔχουσα
κλαίεν ὃ μιν ἐκάεργος ἀνῆρπασε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων. (Il. 9.556 ff.)

Ἀρναῖος δ' ὄνομ' ἔσκε . . .
. . . Ἴρον δὲ νέοι κίκλησκον ἅπαντες,
οὔνεκ' ἀπαγγέλλεσκε κίων, ὅτε πού τις ἀνώγει. (Od. 18.5 ff.)

The parallel of form allows us to believe that the words ὁ γὰρ αὐτε κτλ. are meant to explain Aigaion's name.

This interpretation is assumed to be correct in a recent discussion by J. T. Hooker.⁴ His view is that the name Αἰγαίων was not originally a name, but developed from an adjective *αἰγίων, whose existence is deduced from a meaning "swift" for the root αἰγ-. *αἰγίων was "a comparative adjective with a meaning similar to that of ἀμείνων or ἀρείων, which has been altered under the powerful influence of Αἰγαί and Αἰγαῖος" (188). This hypothesis seems unlikely. It argues that an ordinary word, which then had the misfortune to become both misunderstood and extinct, lies behind the story. The name Aigaion, in other words, is a phantom. It is difficult to believe, however, that Briareos, who is summoned from (one presumes) the sea by a sea-goddess, acquired his connection with all things Αἰγαί-, the Aegean sea

²Cf. M. M. Willcock, "Mythological Paradeigma in the *Iliad*," CQ ns 14 (1964) 141–154, at 143. The invention does not include the name of Aigaion: see below, n. 5.

³E. Risch, "Namensdeutungen und Worterklärungen bei den ältesten griechischen Dichtern," in *Eumusia: Festgabe für Ernst Howald* (Erlenbach/Zürich 1947) 72–91 = *Kleine Schriften* (Berlin/New York 1981) 294–313 (see 79 = 301).

⁴J. T. Hooker, "ΑΙΓΑΙΩΝ in Achilles' Plea to Thetis," JHS 100 (1980) 188–189.

foremost among them, by a linguistic accident. Moreover, there is good evidence, both early and independent of Homer, for the god's double name.⁵ This is the primary datum of the legend, as our oldest evidence stands; we ought to start with it unless there is good reason not to. Hooker's inclination to look for the explanation of Homer's words in the formation of the name itself may, however, be right. If Homer says Αἰγαίων means "strong-er," then he should be taken at face value: he thought the word was a comparative, either like ἀρείων or (scanning -αῖων) like καλλίων or γλυκίων.⁶ For him, however, and (we may presume) for his predecessors, Aigaion was never anything but a proper name.

The problem facing a poet was how to explain the existence of another name beside it. Homer reaches for several well-worn handles for assistance. First, his "translation" of the name Aigaion is an exercise in popular etymology, a pursuit which is easily documented in Greek poetry; it is the ancestor of scientific linguistics, as perusal of Plato's *Cratylus* demonstrates.⁷ The second handle, the "language of the gods" motif, is also in keeping with the spirit of learning evinced here; for, although no one explanation of this interesting phenomenon will fit all the cases (e.g., that the divine words are pre- or non-Greek, or that they are obsolete instead of current words, or poetic instead of ordinary),⁸ they all display a common emphasis on

⁵Σ Ap. Rhod. 1.1165c cites a fragment of Kinaithon (p. 212 Kinkel, *Epicorum graecorum fragmenta*: Κιναιθων δὲ ἐν τῇ Ἡρακλείᾳ φησὶν ὅτι Αἰγαίων καταγωνισθεὶς ὑπὸ Ποσειδῶνος κατεποντίσθη εἰς τὸ νῦν λεγόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου "ἡρίον Αἰγαίῳνος," τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ Βριάρεων καλῶν) and another of Eumelos (Titanomachia fr. 2, p. 6 Kinkel: Εὐμηλος δὲ ἐν τῇ Τιτανομαχίᾳ τὸν Αἰγαίωνα Γῆς καὶ Πόντου φησὶ παῖδα, κατοικούντα δὲ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ τοῖς Τιτάσι συμμαχεῖν). In the first passage Kinkel preserves the manuscripts' Κόνων; Κιναιθων, which Wendel prints, is fairly certain: cf. the scholion on Ap. Rhod. 1.1357c. Antimachos fr. 14 Wyss and Vergil (*Aen.* 10.585) echo this tradition. A Corinthian story in Pausanias (2.1.6, 2.4.6) holds that Briareos settled a dispute between Poseidon and Helios, giving the Isthmos to the former, and Acrocorinth to the latter; this story suggests importance in local cult, and may ultimately derive from Eumelos' *Corinthiaca*, the prose version of which Pausanias cites at 2.1.1 (= *FGrHist* 451 T2, F1). The story is cited by K. O. Müller, *Prolegomena zu einer wissenschaftlichen Mythologie* (Göttingen 1825, repr. Darmstadt 1970) 360, a work whose power to astonish remains undiminished (its author was twenty-eight).

⁶On the scansion -ῖων see W. Schulze, *Quaestiones epicae* (Gütersloh 1892) 299 ff. A reader suggests that the former has the merit of retaining the sound-play with γαίων in the next line.

⁷For popular etymologies in early poetry see Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* 1,1 and 1,2 (Munich 1929–1934) indexes s.v. "Etymologien;" E. Fraenkel, ed., *Aeschylus: Agamemnon* (Oxford 1950) index s.v. "Etymologies in Aeschylus;" Risch (above, n. 3); D. Fehling, *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias* (Berlin 1969) 260 ff.

⁸See Hooker (above, n. 4); G. S. Kirk, *The Iliad: A Commentary* 1 (Cambridge 1985) 94; A. Heubeck, "Die homerische Göttersprache," *WJb* 4 (1949–50) 197–218 = *Kleine Schriften zur griechischen Sprache und Literatur* (Erlangen 1984) 94–115.

the poet's access to privileged information.⁹ Homer uses the motif to explain why there are two names; having decided that one of them meant "stronger," he then had to say stronger than what.¹⁰ To answer this question he reached for the third handle, the motif "stronger than his father." If Homer actually thought that Poseidon was Aigaion's father, he either conveniently forgot it or did not notice the embarrassing consequences of using the motif; but he does not in fact say that Poseidon was his father, and we do not know what he thought.¹¹

II AIG- AND THE SEA

Aigaion in Homer is, it seems, a sea-god. Other evidence exists for connecting our root with the sea. There is, first, the name of the Aegean sea itself. The Greeks, who were not native to the region, were at a loss to explain the origin of the name; one suspects it was bestowed by their predecessors. Most familiar to moderns is probably the story of Aegeus leaping into the sea.¹² In various sources, however, the suicide of Aegeus is not followed by the *aition*, so that one wonders how old the connection is.¹³ On the face of it, Pausanias' version, which is demonstrably related to local cult, has a greater claim to authority; according to him, Aegeus leapt not into the Aegean but off the Acropolis, whence he could see the sea, onto a spot later venerated by the Athenians. Alternative versions of the sea's naming refer either to various places named Aigai (or the like), or to a thalassocrat or hero named Aigaion. With respect to the former, Strabo (13.615) seems to say that the Aiga near Lesbos gave the Aegean sea its name (so too one alterna-

⁹See K. J. Dover, "Il linguaggio del canto," *QdSt* 9 (1979) 225–245, esp. 235 f. The Townleian scholiast on line 403 comments on Homer's knowledge, *ὡς μουστροφῆς καὶ τὰς παρὰ θεοῖς ἐπίσταται λέξεις*. Cf. Eust. p. 124.27.

¹⁰That Homer's translation of the word as a comparative is a secondary accretion to the original story is further supported by the consideration that no one would gloss a name meaning "strong" (Briareos) with a word or name meaning "stronger."

¹¹See above, n. 1. The "stronger than his father" motif might also have been suggested to Homer by Thetis' own legend; cf. Willcock (above, n. 2) 144; L. M. Slatkin, "The Wrath of Thetis," *TAPA* 116 (1986) 1–24, at 11–13. The name Aigaion, as has sometimes been pointed out, could be a patronymic by formation (Lattimore, for example, translates "Aigaïos' son"); but to assume that this is the starting-point of the poet's thought is essentially to adopt the first interpretation of the passage, to which the stated objections apply whether Aigaïos is thought to be a non-entity or identical with Poseidon. On the other hand, a vague sense of this linguistic fact might have subconsciously prompted the second part of the poet's autoschediasm, "stronger than—his father."

¹²See, e.g., Hyginus *fab.* 242, Serv. *Aen.* 3.74, Suidas s.v. αἰγαῖον πέλαγος.

¹³Plut. *Thes.* 22, Diod. 4.61.7, Paus. 1.22.5. If the name Nikokrates (*FGrHist* 376) could confidently be read in Σ Ap. Rhod. 1.831, we could add him to the list of those who mention the *aition* and reach "gute hellenistische Zeit" (Jacoby). See further H. Herter, "Theseus der Ionier," *RhM* 85 (1936) 177–191, and 193–239, at 206 f.

tive in the *Nesias* quoted by the scholiast on Ap. Rhod. 1.1165c, although its author calls the place "Aix"); however, Strabo's Greek may mean the opposite, that the sea gave Aiga its name. If the former is correct (it would, incidentally, contradict Strabo himself, who at 8.386 inclines to give the palm to Aigai in Euboeia), the site would be a rival to Karystos in Euboeia, which was also known as Aigaie, according to the *Nesias* just mentioned, Stephanos of Byzantion s.v. Κάρυστος, and Eustathios p. 281.3. With respect to Aigaion, we are told by Arrian (*Bithyn.* fr. 35 Roos, in Eust. p. 123.35 ff. = *FGrHist* 156 F 92) and the local historian Archemachos (*FGrHist* 424 F 5, early third century B.C.) that he was a thalassocrat from Euboeia. The euhemeristic nature of this story does not inspire confidence in its antiquity, but the connection with Euboeia, having no motivation within the story itself, may be inherited and significant (see below, note 20). Another tradition makes Aigaion a Mysian hero whose tomb was located at the mouth of the Rhyndakos river.¹⁴ Lykillos, whom Gudeman dates to the mid-first century B.C. (*RE* 13.2 [1927] 1785 ff.), was probably trying to reconcile conflicting traditions when he said that Aigaion fled from Euboeia to Mysia; significantly, he calls him a Giant (functionally the same thing as a Titan). He may be thinking, therefore, of the Aigaion of epic, and the occasion for his flight was perhaps the Titan's defeat by Poseidon.¹⁵

Other information connecting the root αἰγ- with the sea is not lacking. Hesychius preserves the words αἶγες and αἰγάδες meaning "waves" (α 1679, 1700 Latte).¹⁶ αἰγιαλός means "shore;" Mt Aigaleos in Attica affords a splendid view of the waters around Salamis, as Xerxes knew. The most violent storm in Greek mythology befell the Greek fleet on the way home from Troy—at Aigai, according to Alkaios fr. 298.6 Voigt. Normally the event is placed at Cape Kaphereus, near Karystos, which was also called Aigaie according to the sources quoted above; so possibly Alkaios was thinking of that location.¹⁷ Aigai is moreover the legendary home of Poseidon himself (*Il.* 13.21, *Od.* 5.381).

¹⁴Kallim. fr. 459 Pf., Ap. Rhod. 1.1165, Lykillos of Tarrha in Σ Ap. Rhod. 1.1165d, Demetrios of Skepsis fr. 71 Gaede. ("Skepsis" depends on a fairly secure emendation in Σ Ap. Rhod. 1.1165c; Wilamowitz suggested Καλλατιανού on the basis of a wholly illusory connection with Σ Theokr. 1.65/66a.)

¹⁵Above, n. 5. Eust. on Dion. Per. 135 = Müller, *GGM* 2.240.23, tells us that the sea was named for the Homeric Aigaion, but he is the only source to do so. For further discussion of the naming of the Aegean see V. Burr, *Nostrum Mare* (Stuttgart 1932) 8 ff.

¹⁶A. Heubeck, "Myk. a₃-ki-pa-ta Ziegenhirt: Vermutungen griechischer Wortbildungen mit αἰγ(υ) und ᾠασθαυ," *IF* 68 (1963) 13–21, at 19, raises the possibility that this meaning was invented by etymologists to explain αἰγιαλός. He does not, however, cite the same interpretation at Artemid. 2.12, where there is no obvious sign of an etymological source. See further V. Pisani, "*Notulae graeco-latinae*," *IF* 53 (1935) 22–39, at 33 f., who cites parallels in other languages to show that αἶγες used of waves may mean simply "goats," metaphorically.

¹⁷H. Lloyd-Jones, "The Cologne Fragment of Alcaeus," *GRBS* 9 (1968) 130, after R. Merkelbach. G. Huxley, "Aigai in Alkaios," *GRBS* 10 (1969) 1–11, may be right in identi-

The relations of Poseidon and Aigaion bear further discussion. We have already seen that they are not father and son; the version of Kinaithon and Eumelos is to be preferred that Aigaion was a Titan/Giant whom Poseidon defeated in battle. Wilamowitz observed that the name Aigaion can mean "the man from Aiga(i)," ¹⁸ being formed like Ἀττικίων or Καρίων or Δαρδανίων. ¹⁹ Aigai survives as the legendary home of Poseidon, and is the site of his actual worship in Achaia, Euboia, and Lakonia (Aigiai). ²⁰ We observe further that Kallimachos (fr. 59.6 Pfeiffer = Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *SH* 265.6) and Lykophron (135) used Αἰγαίων as an epithet of Poseidon. This sequence of events puts us in mind of similar stories about Pallas and Athena, and Kronos and Zeus. ²¹ It is suggestive too that Aegeus is in legend a

lying Alkaios' Aigai with the Aiga(i) near Mt Kane in Aiolia. He is supported by the alternative Nostos in Sappho fr. 17, according to which the storm befell the heroes just as they were setting out from Troy and drove them to Lesbos. For our purposes it comes to the same thing; the connection of the name and the storm is suggestive. Because of the stronger connection of things Aig- with Euboia, however, I should judge Alkaios' version to be a secondary transferal. (For this connection see below, n. 20.)

¹⁸U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Der Glaube der Hellenen* 1 (Berlin 1931, reprinted Basel 1955) 218.

¹⁹Cf. H. von Kamptz, *Homerische Personennamen* (Göttingen 1982) 134.

²⁰For the last see Paus. 3.21.5; for ancient sources on Euboia and Achaia see *LfgRE* s.v. Αἰγαί. Homer *Il.* 8.203 implies an Achaian Aigai next to Helike; so the line was interpreted by Strabo (8.386) and Paus. (7.25.12) when they visited the site in later times. It has been identified as the modern Akrata (E. Mastrokostas, Ἀρχ. Δελτ. 17 B [1961–62] 130; Pausanias, tr. N. D. Papachatzé, 4 [Athens 1980] 158, n. 3); chance finds have turned up part of a monumental building, an archaic Doric capital, and a περισσπαντήριον, all of which may well belong to the sanctuary of Poseidon. For old Αἰγ- names in the district (which as a whole was also called Αἰγυαλός) cf. Hdt. 1.145. For the temple of Poseidon at the Euboian Aigai see Strabo 9.405, who, however, has not seen it. The location of his Aigai is controversial. M. B. Wallace, *The History of Karystos from the Sixth to the Fourth Centuries B.C.* (diss., University of Toronto 1972) 106 ff., makes a good case that Strabo (as often in this part of his work) is quite confused, and that there was but one famous Euboian Aigai, situated on the windswept promontory of Philagra (between Karystos and Kaphereus). The same scholar ingeniously suggests that the story in Paus. 2.23.1 of wild goats helping the shipwrecked Achaeans may be an *aition* for the name Aigai; if so, we have further evidence for the association of Aigai and the storm of the Nostoi. Further evidence for the association of a Titanic Aigaion with Euboia is provided by Solinus 11.16: *Titanas in ea* [sc. Euboea] *antiquissime regnasse ostendunt ritus religionum: Briareo enim rem divinam Carystii faciunt, sicut Aegaeoni Chalcidenses; nam omnis fere Euboea Titanum fuit regnum*, and by Hesych. s.v. Τιτανίδα: τὴν Εὐβοίαν, παρόσον Βριάρεω θυγάτηρ ἦν. Εὐβοίαν and what appears to be a form of Briareos' name occur within six lines of each other in a commentary on Alkman, *POxy* 2390 fr. 49 col. 1 (= *PMG* 5 fr. 49). See also above, 100.

²¹Although Κρονίων is strictly speaking a patronym, it functions as an epithet in epic. (According to these analogies, there would be nothing difficult in Aigaion being a son of Poseidon; what is difficult in Homer is Aigaion's being stronger than Poseidon.) For Pallas and Athena, see W. Burkert, *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche* (Stuttgart 1977) 222 = *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, tr. J. Raffan (Oxford 1985) 139, with references, to which add *PKöln* 3.126, first published by L. Koenen and R. Merkelbach,

surrogate human father for Theseus, son of Poseidon. That Aigaion was a deity of the pre-Hellenic religion is a hypothesis easily suggested by the evidence.²²

Perhaps more than anything else, the connections of Aigaion with the name of the sea and with the great storm at Aigai lead one to think that he was *the* pre-Greek sea-god. The widespread use of the root in place-names throughout the Aegean world may also suggest a link with the pre-Greek inhabitants; these names often resist Greek etymologies (as do numerous common nouns like αἴγειρος, αἰγίθαλος and αἰγυθος).²³ Like other gods, Aigaion was absorbed by the incoming Indo-European pantheon.²⁴ The pre-Greek religion is commonly regarded as non-Indo-European. But if we have tentatively identified a non-Indo-European origin for Aigaion, we must now confront other evidence that the root αἰγ- is indisputably Indo-European.

III AIG- AND INDO-EUROPEAN

There are at least three separate meanings for the root αἰγ- in Indo-European. The first, however, has but a tenuous existence, being found only in a nasalized form *ing-, which means "sick;" the pure form *may* appear in Latin *aeger* and *aegrotus*, but apparently nowhere else. No trace of this meaning survives in Greek.²⁵ A second meaning, "oak," is more securely

"Apollodoros περὶ θεῶν Epicharm und die Meropis," *Collectanea Papyrologica: Texts Published in Honor of H. C. Youtie* 1 (Bonn 1976) 3–26, esp. 16 f.; add also A. Henrichs, "Philodems 'de Pietate' als mythographische Quelle," *CronErc* 5 (1975) 5–38, at 32 ff. For Αἰγαῖος as an epithet of Poseidon see Pherekydes *FGrHist* 3 F 43, Strabo 9.405, Vergil *Aen.* 3.74. Similar relations between eventually pan-Hellenic gods and pre-Greek figures are evident in the pairings Artemis and Britomartis, Apollo and Paian, Apollo and Hyakinthos, Ares and Enyalios, etc. For the last named, we learn from Eust. p. 673.46 ff. on *Il.* 7.166 that Enyalios was an inhospitable Thracian killed by Ares. The source is once again Arrian, *Bithyn.* fr. 14 Roos (see above, 100).

²²L. Radermacher, *Mythos und Sage bei den Griechen* (Munich etc. 1938) 266 ff.

²³It must be noted, however, that not all of these places were on the sea. The Mediterranean affiliations of the root αἰγ- were stressed by P. Chantraine, *La formation des noms en grec ancien* (Paris 1933) 248, and by F. Sommer, "Abhijava und kein Ende?," *IF* 55 (1937) 169–297, at 259 ff.

²⁴It is not certain, however, that Poseidon was Indo-European. It seems a god of horses and fresh water did arrive with them (the connection, incidentally, is that a nomadic people must water its horses to survive), but a serious objection to thinking his name at that time was Poseidon is the difficulty of analysing Ποσειδάων as Greek. Perhaps two similar gods merged. At all events Poseidon was pan-Hellenic from an early date. See in addition to the standard works M. P. Nilsson's review of F. Schachermeyr, *Poseidon und die Entstehung des griechischen Götterglaubens* (Bern 1950) in *AJP* 44 (1953) 161–168, with references; L. R. Palmer in *Res Mycenaee*, ed. A. Heubeck, G. Neumann (Göttingen 1983) 352 ff., with discussion.

²⁵A. Walde, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der indogermanischen Sprachen*, hrsg. u. bearb. v. J. Pokorný, 1 (Berlin/Leipzig 1930) 9 f.

attested: Greek has αἰγίλωψ, German has *Eiche*, English has “oak,” Latin has *aesculus* (although its place here is disputed). αἰγανέη, “spear,” may also be derived from this root; μηλέα and πελέα provide parallels for the termination, while μελία shows how the same word can be used both of a tree and of the spear made from its wood. The infix -αν-, however, creates difficulties for the etymology.²⁶ The main characteristic of the oak’s wood is its strength as a building material, as the Latin word *robur* indicates; one may suspect too that “strength” is the connotation of many venerable names of legend and history—the Aigeidae (see Hdt. 4.149, Σ Pind. *Isthm.* 7.18), the Aigikoreis (one of the four old Ionic tribes), and Aigimios (ancestor of the Dorians), to mention only a few. The peculiar meaning of αἰγίς as the (hard) core of certain trees seems to be part of this complex, although for some reason the etymologists have not tumbled to the fact.²⁷

The third meaning denotes rapid motion. Uncontroversial Greek examples are the verb αἰσσω and the noun αἰκή. τριχάικες of the long-haired Dorians (see Frisk s.v.) and κορυθαῖξ (*Il.* 22.132) may also be mentioned. αἶξ in the sense “goat” has been put under this head because of its quick, jerky movements, but the link seems tenuous; if it does not hold, “goat” will be yet a fourth meaning for the root (the word is certainly Indo-European). αἶγλη too has been claimed for this meaning because of its connotation of shimmering; again, the semantic link is weak, and the extra consonant is difficult to explain.²⁸ Another candidate is αἶγες, “waves,” but (we suggested above) the word may better be related to the sea than to motion.

A series of words related to αἰγίς, “storm,” are normally placed here as well: ἐπαυγίζω, καταυγίζω,²⁹ καταυγίς, κατάϊξ, καταΐγδην, ἐπαΐγδην. The aegis

²⁶See Walde-Pokorny (above, n. 25) 10; P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* 1 (1968) s.v. αἰγανέη; H. Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1 (Heidelberg 1960) s.v. αἰγανέη; P. Friedrich, *Proto-Indo-European Trees* (Chicago 1970) 132 f.; S. Laser, “AIGANEH,” *Gymnasium* 60 (1953) 315–321; K. Vretska, “Zu S. Laser, AIGANEH,” *Gymnasium* 61 (1954) 419.

²⁷Walde-Pokorny (above, n. 25), Friedrich, and Frisk (above, n. 26) are silent; Chantraine (above, n. 26) mentions the meaning but offers no explanation. The usage is attested at Theophr. *HP* 3.9.3, 3.9.8, 5.1.9, Pliny *HN* 16.187 and *IG* I³ 386.99. It is unclear whether αἰγειρος is derived from this meaning; it may be related rather to the third meaning (by virtue of the tree’s characteristic swaying motion), to which some have also related αἰγανέη; or it may not be Indo-European.

²⁸Walde-Pokorny 11 f.; Frisk and Chantraine s.v. αἰγίς; P. Kretschmer, “Literaturberichte: Griechische (für das Jahr 1935),” *Glotta* 27 (1939) 1–40, at 28; P. Thieme, “Die Heimat der indogermanischen Gemeinsprache,” *AbhMainz*, Geistes- und SozialwissKl, 1953.11, 42 f.; A. Thumb, “Alt- und neugriechische Miscellen,” *IF* 14 (1903) 343–362, at 343–346. For the peculiar meaning of αἰγίς as a white blotch in the eye, see J. Jouanna and C. Marelli, “À propos du vocabulaire hippocratique de la pathologie de l’œil: αἰγίς ou *αἰγλίς?,” *RevPhil* 58 (1984) 207–215.

²⁹The simple verb αἰγίζω in Soph. fr. 984 Radt surely means the same as these two compounds; it is glossed in both Photios α 507 Theodoridis and Hesychios α 1708 Latte first by

is the cloak and weapon of Zeus αἰγίοχος; when he raises it, the clouds gather, lightning flashes, and men panic (*Il.* 17.591 ff.). Zeus as storm-god is one of the most basic Indo-European facts; the lightning bolt is usually his weapon, but the aegis here subsumes it. It has both defensive and offensive purposes; in the *Iliad* it is conceived of as an impenetrable shield, with terrifying emblems on it (including the Gorgon's head).³⁰ On the analogy of νεβρίς and ἀρνάκις, the word would seem to mean "goatskin;" so Herodotos (4.189) understood it. Animal skins were the earliest form of armour;³¹ Pausanias (4.11.3) gives an example of their use in his account of the First Messenian War. In some way, these two roots—or two meanings of the same root ("goat" and "storm")—were conveniently united in the aegis of Zeus, which, we may be sure, was part of the proto-Greek heritage (see Endnote A). How does this fact sit with the indications that αἰγ- is a root with pre-Greek affinities, relating to the sea? Is not the Aegean sea noted for its storms? Perhaps we should revise our conclusions in section II, and say rather that the incoming Greeks, having a word for "storm" in their language, very aptly applied it to this new and very stormy thing, the sea. Yet not all of the facts cited above square with this alternative hypothesis, particularly the many place-names of uncertain and presumably non-Greek etymology. Moreover, it is a strange fact that no early poet ever makes Zeus or Athena raise a storm at sea with the aegis;³² nor does Poseidon ever wield the weapon.

It seems, then, that we shall have to suppose two roots, one Indo-European and the other pre-Greek, which happened to sound alike.³³ Now it is quite possible that another Indo-European race lived in the Aegean before the Greeks;³⁴ perhaps it would be simpler to adopt this hypothesis. It is also possible, however, that both Indo-European and non-Indo-European peoples lived in the area before Greek times. With respect to our problem, two facts seem relevant: the obscure place-names and nouns mentioned above resist not only Greek, but Indo-European etymologies; and the domi-

καταγίγει and secondly, in Hesychios only, by διασπᾶ. The second equivalent is presumably a gloss from some particular context in which tearing apart was the actual consequence of the violent assault; but that is not the word's primary meaning. Correct LSJ s.v. αἰγίζω.

³⁰*Il.* 2.447 ff., 4.167, 5.738 ff., 15.230, 309, 320 ff., 17.591 ff., 18.202 ff., 21.400 f., 24.20; cf. *Od.* 22.297.

³¹M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* 1³ (Munich 1967) 437.

³²At the beginning of Euripides' *Trojan Women* Athena must enlist Poseidon's help in stirring up the storm of Greek mythology.

³³This hypothesis was advanced by Kretschmer (above, n. 28), but abandoned in favour of the view that the pre-Greek stratum was also Indo-European.

³⁴J. T. Hooker, *Mycenaean Greece* (London 1977) 29 f., writes: "... the positive identification of the Early Helladic people with a pre-Indo-European stock, on the one hand, and that of the Middle Helladic people as Indo-Europeans, on the other, cannot be sustained."

nant religion of the pre-Greek Aegean was not in the view of most judges Indo-European.³⁵

If we return now to Aigaion with our new understanding of the facts, we may surmise that Aigaion's other name Briareos states with a commoner word for "strong" what Greek ears heard in the pre-Greek name. This is not to say that the pre-Greek word meant "strong" too; that is an Indo-European meaning of the root. It would strain credulity to say that the putative non-Indo-European root happened to sound like a Greek root *and* mean the same thing. Yet the sea *is* a mighty force; Poseidon too was a strong god. So the pre-Greek word, while referring primarily to the sea, can have overtones of strength without becoming an Indo-European word. The Greek equivalent is to that extent accurate.

To summarize progress: we have identified one Indo-European root with several meanings, and a homophonous pre-Greek root referring to the sea. The two semantic fields overlap in the notion of "strength," and the stormy nature of the sea causes some confusion in the picture. We have satisfied ourselves that mighty Aigaion is pre-Greek, but the aegis, for all that the word can mean "storm," is the weapon of Zeus.

The aegis now demands our further attention. It is also the weapon of Athena, transferred to her at an early date, and, indeed, wielded more often by her than by Zeus. Athena is pre-Greek. Moreover, the rite of giving the statue of Athena on one's acropolis a peplos—attested in the *Iliad* (6.297 ff.), and well-known from historical Athens—is a rite of evidently high antiquity, and may well be pre-Greek too. Examination of the myths and cults connected with the peplos point to a very close association, perhaps even an identification, of it with the aegis. But if *that* aegis is pre-Greek, then the confusion between the two spheres is so thoroughgoing that there is no hope of disentangling them. It is necessary then to examine this business of the peplos more closely.

IV THE AEGIS OF ATHENA

As we have seen, the aegis in Homer is a shield, but is often used for the offensive purpose of terrifying the enemy. Its blazon is the Gorgon's head, as in Classical iconography. The blind, headlong panic of stricken Homeric warriors faced by the aegis is suggestively similar to the experience of the Kekropids in the charter myth of the Arrhephoria, in which their disobedience to Athena resulted in a horrifying vision and a fatal leap from the Acropolis.

The curious rite of the Arrhephoria has long been the object of study, with inconclusive results until quite recently. An exemplary study by Noel Robertson has cleared away many mistakes in older reconstructions. Since

³⁵W. Burkert (above, n. 21) 34–48 (= Engl. tr. 10–19).

direct evidence is often lacking for many aspects of the Arrhephoria, Robertson's own reconstruction is necessarily dependent on speculative analogy with other myth-ritual complexes; but it is recommended by its simplicity, by the ease with which it accommodates the evidence we do have, and by the familiarity of the resulting picture in the context of pagan rituals generally.³⁶ According to Robertson, the Arrhephoroi, whose name means "basket-bearers," carried baskets laden with sacred loaves in the form of snakes and male genitalia. They descended from the Acropolis along the normal route, and did not descend through any Mycenaean staircase. They were under strict orders not to look into the baskets, which they carried to a sanctuary not far from that of Aphrodite in the Gardens. There they descended into a crypt, where the loaves were fed to sacred snakes. They then received a second burden to carry back up to the Acropolis: a stone wrapped in a blanket, representing a newborn child. If the girls carried out their task precisely according to instructions, and if the snakes ate as they should, then it boded well for a prosperous year. At its heart the ceremony was one of omen-taking.

The Arrhephoroi also had duties every four years when a new peplos was woven for Athena. When the loom was first erected, they assisted at the ceremonial start of the weaving. More precisely, additional Arrhephoroi assisted: it seems that in the year when this was happening there were four Arrhephoroi instead of two.³⁷ Pointing to this circumstance, and finding no room for a peplos in the essential rite of the Arrhephoria as just described, Robertson argues well that the girls' involvement with the peplos was a secondary development dating to the reorganization of the Panathenaia in the mid-sixth century, commonly credited to Peisistratus. What rituals were associated with the peplos before that time we are not now in a position to discover; but Robertson's arguments suffice to show that the gift was not originally associated with the Arrhephoroi. He also advances a reason for thinking that the gift was not originally an annual one: that notion does not sit well with the rite of the Plynteria, in which the robe was washed, since this took place shortly before the Panathenaia. It makes poor sense to wash a robe just before discarding it in favour of a new one. The Plynteria was an ancient and annual festival, as parallels and month-names show.³⁸ One might add another reason for thinking that the gift was not originally an annual

³⁶Noel Robertson, "The Riddle of the Arrhephoria at Athens," *HSCP* 87 (1983) 241–288; see also W. Burkert, "Kekropidensage und Arrhephoria," *Hermes* 94 (1966) 1–25.

³⁷It seems settled that after the reorganization of the Panathenaia the new robe was given every four years, not every year, and that in this year there were two more Arrhephoroi: see Robertson (above, n. 36) 276 f.

³⁸Robertson (above, n. 36) 277; *id.*, "The Origin of the Panathenaia," *RhM* NS 128 [1985] 231–295, esp. 256 ff., 289 f.

one: it seems no improvement in one's piety to substitute the gift of a new robe every four years for one previously given annually.

Thus far Robertson's arguments are cogent. Yet we may presume that new robes were occasionally made for Athena before the Peisistratid reorganization—perhaps not regularly (i.e., in times of stress only, like the Trojan women), but made nonetheless. Even a regular donation is possible if one does not find the conflict with the Plynteria embarrassing. A full two months did elapse before the Panathenaia; and might one not feel reluctant to consign so sacred an object without ceremony to the rubbish heap? A laundering might be thought in order. But these things are unknowable. More to the point is the observation that, whatever connection with the peplos the Arrhephoroi might have had originally, assigning extra Arrhephoroi to the making of the peplos must have seemed ritually appropriate when it was first done.

There are several reasons that this was so. One was provided by Erichthonios, the boy with whose care the Kekropids were entrusted; he grew up to found the Panathenaia and invent the *apobates*-contest, in which ephebes leaped from coursing chariots and ran alongside as long as possible before flinging themselves aboard again. Athena was always depicted in her chariot on the peplos, possibly so as to suggest this contest. A clearer connection existed between the general theme depicted on the peplos and the myths of the origin of the aegis. The scene was always the Gigantomachy. The myths of the aegis' origin, at least those involving Athena,³⁹ speak of a Titan Pallas or a Giant Aster(os).⁴⁰ Having defeated her enemy and donned his skin, Athena became invulnerable. In the *Meropis* fr. 6 this skin is actually called a peplos. In the rite the gift of the cloak is meant to guarantee the protection of the city; this is the intention of the Trojan Women in the *Iliad*. These statues

³⁹The story that the aegis came from the skin of the goat that nursed Zeus (ΣD II. 15.318 = ΣA II 15.229 = Eratosth. *Catalog.* fr. 2 p. 42 Robert; [Eratosth.] *Catast.* 13 p. 102 Robert = p. 17 Olivieri) looks authoritative. The details are plainly aetiological, and the business of Amaltheia, caves, and the nursing of the infant Zeus lands us squarely in Minoan times: see M. P. Nilsson, *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion*² (Lund 1950) 537 ff. Eratosthenes will have culled this information from a local history or epic with direct knowledge of the cults (perhaps Epimenides' *Cretica*, cited at *Catast.* 5 and 27 [*FGrHist* 457 F 18,19]; Jacoby [introduction to Epimenides, *FGrHist* III b Text 308 ff.] argues that this composition dates to the fourth, perhaps the fifth, century). However, the aegis in the story is an accretion to a narrative otherwise concerned with the infancy of Zeus. The relevant portion begins $\alpha\upsilon\gamma\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \delta\acute{o}\ \text{Zeus}$ in the fragment of the *Catalogue* (similarly in the epitome), followed directly by the Titanomachy, in which Zeus discovered his need for the aegis. M. L. West, *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford 1966) 290 ff., shows that Kronos and the Succession Myth had no connection with Minoan Crete. (He omits mention of this catasterism at the bottom of p. 292.)

⁴⁰For Pallas, see Koenen and Merkelbach (above, n. 21) 16; for Aster(os), see *ibid.* 17 (citing Hes. *Th.* 376–378, Arist. fr. 585 Rose, Σ Aristides 3.323 Dindorf). Aristotle reports that the Panathenaia was instituted in honour of Athena's victory over Aster; the author of the *Meropis*, calling the giant Asteros, is emphatic about the identity of his skin and the peplos. The *Meropis*

are of Athena Polias after all—Athena protector of the city. The protection afforded by the aegis in the myth is a simple reflection of the point of giving the peplos.⁴¹

The associations of peplos and Arrhephoria are not yet exhausted. In the myth the Kekropids are frightened out of their wits either by two snakes who guard Erichthonios, or by a snake who is Erichthonios. The δράκων is so named because of its piercing gaze (δέρκεσθαι);⁴² the Gorgon's head on the aegis had a similar effect.⁴³ Epicharmos (fr. 85a Austin = *PKöln* 3.126 i 8 ff.) remarks that Athena donned the skin πὸτ τὸ φοβεράν εὐθὺς εἴμεν. Now violation of a tabu is the theme of the Kekropid myth; it results in an unendurable, piercing gaze, like some beam of intense light, and the destruction of the sacrilegious. The corresponding cult activity presumes that disaster for the city will follow if the tabu is broken. Structurally, the blasphemous rape of Cassandra by Ajax during the sack of Troy is very similar. The oldest literary and artistic traditions are insistent that the crime occurred in the very presence of Athena; Cassandra clung to the statue in vain. Alkaios' description is worth quoting (fr. 298 Voigt, with some plausible supplements):

Αἴας δὲ λ]ύσσαν ἦλθ' ὀλόαν ἔχων
 ἐς ναῦο]ν ἄγνας Πάλλαδος ἃ θέων
 θνάτο]σι θεοσύλαισι πάντων
 αἶνο]τάτα μακάρων πέφυκε.
 χέρρεσ]σι δ' ἄμφοιν παρθενίκαν ἔλων
 σέμνω]ι παρεστάκοισαν ἀγάλατι
 ὕβρισσ'] ὁ Λόκρος, οὐδ' ἔδεισε
 παῖδα Δ]ίος πολέμω δοτέρραν
 γόργωπι]ν· ἃ δὲ δεινὸν ὑπ' ὄφρυσι
 σμ[]π[ε]λ[ι]δνώθεισα κατ' οἶνοπα
 αἰ[ξ]ε [πόν]το[ν] ἐκ δ' ἀφάντοις
 ἐξαπ[ίν]ας ἐκύκα θυέλλαις.

"Then came Aias, a destructive madness upon him, to the holy temple of Pallas, who of all the blessed gods is most terrible in punishment of the

is a local epic of Kos; in this section it discusses the victory of Herakles over the Meropes (i.e., the victory of the invading Dorians). The myth may be the *aition* for the presentation of a peplos in Kos, with the same purpose as its presentation in Athens. Athena Polias is attested in inscriptions of the second century B.C. (Dittenberger, *SIG*³ 1025.56, 1028). For the story of the fire-breathing Aegis, see Endnote A.

⁴¹Aristophanes well evokes the patriotic associations of the peplos when he calls the older generation ἄνδρες . . . τῇσδε τῆς γῆς ἄξιοι καὶ τοῦ πέπλου (*Eg.* 566).

⁴²See B. Snell, *Die Entdeckung des Geistes*⁵ (Göttingen 1980) 13 f.

⁴³Euripides (*Ion* 989) had good reason for calling Athena's giant foe "Gorgon" (although he also seems to retain the traditional association with Pallas at 991, 996, and 1001).

sacrilegious. Seizing the maiden with both hands as she stood by the august image, the Lokrian assaulted her, and showed no fear before the Gorgon gaze of the child of Zeus, though warfare is her province. But she, with dire and livid countenance, leapt upon the wine-dark sea and stirred up unforeseen, night-long storms."⁴⁴ Note the great stress placed by the poet on the gaze of the goddess. The perpetrator of the crime then meets with destruction; so does the city whose Palladion this is.

The oldest version of the Laokoon story is similar too. According to the original tale, Laokoon defiled the sanctuary of Thymbraian Apollo by having intercourse there with his wife. Apollo (not Poseidon) later sent the serpents to kill Laokoon's family as a portent of the coming fall of Troy. The only difference here is that the sanctuary is not one of Athena on the Acropolis; it is, however, a local sanctuary of the Troad. Otherwise it is the same story: violation of a tabu forebodes destruction for the criminal and the city. One supposes that the Thymbraian tale originally spoke of disaster for Thymbra. Robertson makes a good case that the story is the *aition* for a cult in which sacred snakes were tended by Thymbraian boys, just as the Arrhephoroi fed snakes during their omen-taking.⁴⁵

With these myths in mind, we see that the Peisistratid arrangements for weaving the peplos and for presenting it to Athena made good ritual sense. It is the aegis-bearing statue of Athena Polias whose grim presence the Arrhephoroi must bear in mind as they take the omens for the city's safety.⁴⁶

⁴⁴Athena's visage seems to darken while she is still in the temple—appropriately, if our analogy with the Kekropid myth holds. The destruction of the Greek fleet took place some time later, of course, but in the narrative the span seems to be collapsed; perhaps one should suppose a lacuna. See R. L. Fowler, *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric: Three Preliminary Studies* (Toronto 1987, *Phoenix* Supp. 21) 60 f.; A. M. van Erp Taalman Kip in *Some Recently Found Greek Poems* (Leiden 1987, *Mnemosyne* Supp. 99) 117 ff. In Hellenistic invention, the motif of the goddess' gaze is transformed; the image of the maiden Athena is said to have turned its eyes upward in shock and horror (Kallim. fr. 35 Pf., if indeed this detail of the *historia* is his; Lyk. 361 f.; cf. [Apollod.] *Bibl. epit.* 5.22.)

⁴⁵See Robertson (above, n. 36) 260 ff.; J. S. Rusten, *Dionysius Scytobrachion* (Opladen 1982, *Papyrologica Coloniensis* 10) 30–53. It may be relevant that Troilos, whose death was necessary to ensure the fall of Troy, was killed in this sanctuary ([Apollod.] *Bibl. epit.* 3.32 with Frazer).

⁴⁶A lekythos in Basel (BS 404; ca 440 B.C.) by the Phiale painter strikingly illustrates the point: a stern, aegis-bearing Athena grasps a fleeing Kekropid by the forearm; between them a snake emerges from a *kiste*. See M. Schmidt, "Die Entdeckung des Erichthonios. Zu einer neuen Lekythos des Phialemalers und einem ungedeuteten Vasenbild," *Ath Mitt* 83 (1968) 200–212 (plates 73–74). Note that upon return their new burden (the symbolic child) was delivered, according to the myth, to Athena, to be nursed by lamplight in the "maidens' chamber," ὁ παρθενών (unless these details are Hellenistic invention; they are found in Nonnos *Dion.* 13.171–179, 27.112–117, 321–323, 29.334–339, 48.956, who H. Lloyd-Jones and J. Rea, "Callimachus, Fragments 260–261," *HSCP* 72 [1967] 126–145, at 136 f., argue was drawing on Kallimachos). One does not nurse standing up, as a rule, nor while wearing armour; the child was not therefore delivered back to the statue of Athena Polias. Was there another statue of Athena available for the purpose, a seated one? Pausanias (1.26.4) saw a seated

The mythical scene on the peplos, hoisted aloft in the parade of the Greater Panathenaia, evokes the occasion on which the aegis was acquired and Athena's own power was secured. The peplos is then given to the statue of Athena Polias, for the security of the city.

These arguments are sufficient to show that the involvement of the Arrhephoroi with the peplos during the Peisistratid reforms made good ritual sense. They do not suffice, however, to show that the Arrhephoroi were *necessarily* involved with the peplos before that time; and, as we have seen, other reasons exist for supposing that they were not. In the mid-sixth century certain patterns of myth and cult easily permitted an association between peplos and aegis. But—and this is the critical point—this is not the same as saying that the peplos was identical with the aegis, then or at any time before. After all, the peplos is a dress, not a shield or piece of armour; in the *Iliad* (5.738 ff.) Athena must first doff her peplos before donning a chiton and hoisting the aegis—as common sense would suggest. Moreover, the cult statue of Athena did have an aegis, and it was a separate item from the peplos. The aegis and other accoutrements catalogued in Classical inscriptions seem to have been the work of Endoios, done for the Peisistratids.⁴⁷ It is possible, of course, that the aegis was a completely new addition at that time; it is true that the aegis was not a regular part of statues of Athena Polias before then as it was after. One might argue (rather desperately) that the peplos, being the sole adornment before the mid-sixth century, originally did double duty as an aegis. The same iconographical tradition which provides this argument provides the argument against it. The material catalogued in *LIMC* s.v. Athena establishes two types of cult statues of Athena before the mid-sixth century, one seated, the other standing (see Endnote B). The standing statues were always armed; conversely, it seems that the early seated statues were not, although for want of evidence we cannot be sure. The standing statues did not regularly have an *aegis* before the mid-sixth century, but they could have one, and that is all that is necessary here: it is certain that the pre-Peisistratid statue had armour, and if it had an aegis, it would have had a real aegis, not a substitute.⁴⁸

statue, which he attributes to Endoios. This artist's activity is dated to the latter part of the sixth century; a statue surviving on the Acropolis (*LIMC* Athena 18) has been tentatively identified as his. Whether or not the identification is correct, this is unlikely to be the statue we are looking for here; Pausanias saw it *outside*. Robertson (above, n. 36, 273 f.) suggests that the west chamber of the Parthenon was the final destination of the Arrhephoroi in Classical times. If there *was* a second statue for the return journey, its point is clear: the hazardous outward trip is conducted under the grim eye of Athena Polias, but once the task is successfully completed, a relaxed, nurturing Athena presides.

⁴⁷Athenagoras *Legatio* 17.3 (a problematic text); J. H. Kroll, "The Ancient Image of Athena Polias," in *Studies in Athenian Architecture, Sculpture and Topography Presented to Homer A. Thompson* (Princeton 1982, *Hesperia* Supp. 20) 65–76 (see 72–73).

⁴⁸R. C. T. Parker refers me to F. Graf, "Nordionische Kulte: Religionsgeschichtliche und

The peplos, then, was not originally the same as the aegis. Giving the peplos to Athena had the same purpose as her wearing the aegis; for this and other reasons given above the peplos and aegis could easily be associated. But they are not the same. Returning now to the question that begins this section, we may be satisfied that the quite possibly pre-Greek rite of the peplos does not imply a pre-Greek aegis used as a weapon like the aegis of Zeus. The aegis of Zeus was unknown to the pre-Greek Aegean. Because Athena's most basic and oldest function was to protect the citadel, the aegis was given also to her. This transfer was accomplished in myth by Homer's time, and may have been established in cult long before, for all we know.

This completes our survey of things αἰγ- in early Greek language and myth. The reader will agree that the journey offers many obstacles of uncertain circumnavigation. Later topographers may discover that instead of forging on through the passage with assured sense of direction we have been bound for pack-ice. But McClures must ever be preceded by Franklins.⁴⁹

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO
WATERLOO, ONTARIO N2L 3G1

ENDNOTE A

Professor Robertson draws my attention to a suggestion which has been made from time to time that rain-magic is the original connection between goatskins and the aegis of Zeus (recently endorsed by H. Schwabl, *RE Supp.* 15 [1978] 1047 f.). Certainly the image of Zeus shaking the aegis and produc-

epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulturen von Chios, Klazomenai und Phokaia," *Schweizerisches Institut in Rom, Bibliotheca Helvetica-Romana* 21 (1985) 211 f., who argues that the two functions of Athena as the armed protector of the city and the weaving woman's goddess formed a polarity in her character from the start. The peplos belonged to the latter function. It is clear from our discussion, however, that these two poles were not kept strictly separate in either myth or cult, but developed rather intricate connections with one another.

⁴⁹W. Burkert, *Homo Necans* (Berlin 1972) 78 f. = *Homo Necans*, tr. P. Bing (Berkeley 1983) 66, seems to open up a wholly different line of enquiry by connecting the armour-festooned τρόπαιον with the "prehistoric" hunter's practice of hanging skins on trees. The practice of dedicating objects by hanging them up in temples is quite old too; but the τρόπαιον, even if its function as the memorial of the enemy's rout is reminiscent of the aegis, itself seems to be an invention of the late archaic or early classical age: see F. Lammert, *RE* 7A.1 (1939) 664 f., and W. K. Pritchett, *The Greek State at War* 2 (Berkeley 1974) 246 ff. (who thinks he has found some earlier examples). Moreover, the skin of the goat sacrificed before battle was burnt, and the sacrifice was not for Athena. The use of the aegis in fertility magic does not seem relevant to our problems either (see Leutsch-Schneidewin on *CPG* 1.339.18, who write out the references); as the object waved at new brides was made of branches, calling it an aegis was secondary (though I cannot explain the development).

The referees of the journal have been extraordinarily helpful with their criticism, as too have Dr R. C. T. Parker and Professor Noel Robertson, all of whom I wish to thank.

ing storms in *Il.* 17.591 ff. looks suspiciously like a reflection of magical practice. Other evidence for rain-magic in ancient Greece is gathered by J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* 1³ (1911) 309 f.; L. Radermacher, *Mythos und Sage bei den Griechen*² (Munich/Vienna 1938) 321 f., 369 f.; A. B. Cook, *Zeus* 3 (Cambridge 1940) 296 ff.; M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* 1³ (Munich 1967) 110 ff., 116 f., 396 ff. (with further references). Although rain-magic is well attested, the difficulty of using it as a solution to the present problem is that goatskins are nowhere used in the incidences cited by these authorities. Even at Vergil *Aen.* 8.351 ff., where we learn that Evander's Arcadians have often seen Zeus shaking his aegis and producing rain, we find that the corresponding cult (Paus. 8.38.4) has nothing to do with goatskins. If an animal skin is used, it is a sheepskin (the best-known example is the myth and ritual of Zeus Laphystios in Halos); often enough, as in the cult of Zeus Lykaios, other instruments are employed. Salmoneus used skins to cover the tops of his thunder-imitating bronze urns (Hes. fr. 30 M-W; ps.-Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.89), but in no way wielded them like an aegis; and as O. Weinreich pointed out (*Menekrates, Zeus und Salmoneus* [Stuttgart 1933, Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 18] 87), no source says anything about rain in connection with Salmoneus—only lightning and thunder. If the myth is primarily the charter for rain-making ritual, this silence is inexplicable. The fire-breathing monster Aegis in Diod. Sic. 3.70, who parches half a world before he is finally killed and skinned by Athena, might seem relevant; but, again, the story makes no reference to rain, and the whole thing is likely to be a late invention: the source is Dionysios Skytobrachion (*FGrHist* 32 F 8 = fr. 9 Rusten), who is through and through euhemeristic. In the absence of clearer evidence for the use of goatskins in Greek rain-magic, I should prefer to think that the image of Zeus shaking his aegis is the product of simple anthropomorphic imagination: in primitive days, his armour was a goatskin shield; he was the storm god; the onslaught of the storm was Zeus shaking his shield. So Stengel, *RE* 1.1 (1893) 971; R. B. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought* (Cambridge 1954) 421. Strepsiades' notion of Zeus urinating through a sieve is a comic version of the mentality involved.

ENDNOTE B

It should be acknowledged that P. Demargne, the author of this part of the entry, analyses the material otherwise: he distinguishes Palladia from statues of Athena Polias, and argues that the latter were seated and received the peplos. L. Ziehen, *RE* 18.3 (1949) 176 ff., supports him, pointing out that no one ever calls the Athenian statue of Athena Polias a Palladion, and that the main characteristic of a Palladion is its smallness (which cannot be said of the statue of Athena Polias if it could accommodate the Panathenaic

peplos). However, in origin and purpose the Palladion is indistinguishable from Athena Polias: it is the ancient, often aniconic, image of the protector of the citadel, sharing there the house of the Mycenaean king. See M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* 1³ (Munich 1967) 348, 433 ff. (who, incidentally, regards the Palladion as an object of myth only). Our discussion of the myth-ritual complex of peplos and aegis will stand, even if the Athenians would not have called their statue of Athena Polias a Palladion.

Ziehen and others think that there *was* another statue in Attica known as the Palladion; indeed, they think there were two others. The first is the statue at the court of Zeus ἐνὶ Παλλαδίῳ or ἐμ Παλλαδίῳ, where cases of unintentional homicide were tried; see also W. Burkert, "Byzyge und Palladion: Gewalt und Gericht in altgriechischem Ritual," *ZRGG* 22 (1970) 356–368. This court certainly existed, but the form of its name (on the analogy of the courts "at the Delphinion" and "at the prytaneion") rather suggest that "Palladion" is a temple of Pallas Athena; it is apparently used in this sense by Plutarch, *Thes.* 27.5. Cf. IG II² 3177, 1096 (*SEG* 3.108), 5055; I³ 369.73, 90. The aetiological myths of the court's foundation (Kleidemos 323 F 20 with Jacoby; Phanodemos 325 F 16; Suda ε 2505 Adler, with further references provided there; Σ Aristides 3.320 Dindorf, citing Lysias fr. 113 Thalheim) connect it with the re-location of the Trojan Palladion to Attica. The invention of this myth will hardly antedate the sixth century (cf. Jacoby on 323a F 1, n. 19). By this time the reputation of the Trojan Palladion was established (the myth of its transfer indicates as much); the Athenians knew that their Athena Polias had been there during the Trojan War, and so could not be the same Palladion. Of course on general grounds one expects these old fetishes to be numerous; but a city cannot have more than one true, protective Palladion. The function is clear, whatever the nomenclature. The evidence for the other Palladion (Serv. Vergil *Aen.* 2.166; Σ Aristides 3.320 Dindorf; Joann. Lyd. *De mens.* 4.15) is quite problematic; see Jacoby on *FGrHist* 333 F 4.

Demargne's dictum about seated statues receiving the peplos is based on the statue in *Iliad* 6 and the belief that the Athenian statue was seated. The latter orthodoxy has recently been reversed: Kroll (above, n. 47); cf. H. Jung, *Thronende und Sitzende Götter* (Bonn 1982) 53–64. Homer thus seems anomalous; the passage has long been notorious for this reason (for a recent discussion see Jung 47–49). But in truth, since we do not know the cult status of many of the images listed in *LIMC*, it is impossible to state categorically that statues of Athena Polias were always seated or standing; and it seems impossible *a priori* that the standing, armed images were never so designated if the function of the goddess was to protect the city. The only tenable distinction seems to be that pertaining to the presence of armour, on which I have relied here.