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Famously dubbed, according to Plutarch, the “Dancing Floor of Ares” by the 4th century Theban general Epaminondas (Plut. Life of Marcellus 21.2), the region of Boiotia hosted throughout Antiquity a series of battles that shaped the history of the ancient world, such as the battle of Plataia – which ended the Persian Wars in 479 – and the battle of Chaironeia, won in 338 by the Macedonian king Philip II and his son Alexander the Great over a coalition of Greek states. The present volume is devoted to different dances of Ares. Rather than discussing seminal battles through the lens of military history, it investigates regional conflicts and local violence in Central Greece, with a particular focus on the region Boiotia, through the complementary approaches, conceptual approaches and synergies offered by the two research projects. This double perspective allows us to explore the crucial role played by conflict in the shaping of the Boiotian experience. At the same time, the region’s relations with various foreign powers (the Achaian koinon, the Macedonian kings, the Romans among others) as well as with its neighbours, such as Athens, Lokris, and Euboea, become visible. Organised as a series of thematic studies involving mythology, genealogy, federalism, political institutions, and geopolitical strategies, our inquiry starts with the Mycenaean period, and runs down through the Classical and Hellenistic periods to conclude with the involvement of the Romans in Central Greece.

The Montreal workshop received funding from the Anneliese Maier Research Prize that was awarded to Hans Beck by the German Humboldt Foundation, as well as from the John MacNaughton Chair of Classics, which he held at McGill University at the time. The Fribourg workshop was supported by the Université de Fribourg Fonds du Centenaire and the Faculté des lettres et sciences humaines. The respective teams of research assistants in Montreal and Fribourg did a magnificent job to turn both workshops into a wonderful experience: Corey Straub, Cyrena Gerardi, Emilie Lucas, Daniel Whittle, and Roy van Wijk. As the papers were prepared for publication, we received insightful comments from the anonymous peer-reviewers. Tim Howe offered helpful advice to improve the manuscript of this first volume in the new AHB Supplement Series. To all we offer our heartfelt thanks.

Fabienne Marchand and Hans Beck
May 2019
Genealogies and Violence. Central Greece in the Making

Elena Franchi

Abstract. Evidence about the eponymous hero of the Lokrians is scanty and contradictory, and as consistent a genealogy as possible (that, very probably, mirrors a late stage of homogenization) has already been reconstructed. This paper aims to analyse Lokros’ puzzling genealogies from the perspective of politics and interstate relations. The changes in his kinship are interpreted as an ongoing response to the continual reconfiguring of interstate relations in Central Greece. Lokros’ pedigree is constantly adapted to promote new alliances and express enmities. In fact, despite their contradictions, the stories about Lokros help to shed light on peoples’ interactions in Central Greece over time: migrations, ethnogenetic processes, enmities, alliances, local conflicts, regional violence, Delphi’s centripetal force and the challenge of the Aitolian federal state: in this light, Lokros’ genealogies reveal central Greece in the making.
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Lokros, Physkos, Opous: des éponymes assez pâles

In his seminal book on Western Lokrians (1952), Lucien Lerat defined the hero Lokros and his father Physkos “des éponymes assez pâles”. More than fifty years later, Lerat’s statement still holds true, not only for the Western Lokrians, but also the Eastern (and, thus, for the hero Opous). In fact, evidence about Lokros is scanty and contradictory, and this could be enough to discourage further analyses of his puzzling genealogies: these

1 Lerat 1952 II: 3-4. See also Korenjak 2017: “farblose Gestalten” and Domínguez Monedero 2013: 413.
2 The Lokrian territories comprised two regions, usually known as Ozolian Lokris and Opuntian Lokris: the two regions are separated by mountain ranges and by the ethnos of the Phokians. Ozolian Lokris lies to the West, and its inhabitants are usually called Western Lokrians; the Opuntian Lokrian region lies to the East of Phokis, and its inhabitants are known as Eastern Lokrians. These Eastern Lokrians were divided into Hypoknemidians, living in the area to the east of mount Knemis, and Epiknemidians, living in the area to the west of Mount Knemis; through the middle ran the so-called Phokian Corridor (where a continuous Phokian presence is, however, questioned). The best known city in the area to the east was Opous, which meant that Hypoknemidian Lokris, and even the whole of Eastern Lokris, was sometimes called Opuntian Lokris (Nielsen 2000). More generally, on the topography of the Lokrides, see Lerat 1952; Fossey 1990; Domínguez Monedero 2010: 75-76; Papakonstantinou-Zachos 2013; Pascual 2013: 171-3, 383-5.
efforts are unlikely to improve our knowledge of Lokrian eponymous heroes. Moreover, as consistent a genealogy as possible (that, very probably, mirrors a late stage of homogenization) has already been reconstructed.³

However, from the perspective of politics and interstate relations, Lokros’ genealogies may still be able to provide intriguing nuggets of information: genealogies were one of the ways through which populations groups conceived and defined themselves,⁴ and the “ethnic identity of a group is only likely to become salient when confronted with at least one other group”.⁵ In fact, despite their contradictions, the stories about Lokros help to shed light on peoples’ interactions in Central Greece over time: migrations, ethnogenetic processes, enmities, alliances, local conflicts, regional violence, Delphi’s centripetal force and the challenge of the Aitolian federal state. Lokros’ genealogies thus reveal central Greece in the making.

Genealogies can also reveal so much about interstate (interethnic) relations because of their well-known malleability: they constantly need to adapt to new situations.⁶ Several, sometimes contradictory genealogical variants are “testimony not to the confused debility of human memory but to the varying functions which they served through time and across different regions”.⁷ Seminal studies have shown that when a relationship between contemporary groups changes, relationships within genealogies are modified through mechanisms such as the addition, omission and substitution of names, or by reconceptualising relations between existing names.⁸ Of course, this does not imply that every genealogical tradition necessarily serves an ethnic function, since genealogies performed multiple purposes,⁹ and ethnicity gains varying degrees of salience at different times.¹⁰ Yet “fictive kinship is a sine qua non condition for ethnic consciousness and is often expressed in genealogical form”¹¹ and changes to the boundaries of the ethnic group are conceptualized genealogically through changes in the stemma.¹²

³ Seminal studies are D’Alessio 2005: 222-6; Cingano 2009: 115-7; Domínguez Monedero 2013: 413-4; Fowler 2013: 127ff. This article builds on their results.
⁴ On these mechanisms, see below 138f.
⁶ And it is exactly because they can adapt that the ethnic groups who adopt them tend to survive for long periods of time despite the permeability of their boundaries. See esp. Cassola 1953; Hall 1997: esp. 2, 29; Thomas 2001; Hall 2002; Gehrke 2003; and Fowler’s analysis of historical genealogies: “They [scil. genealogies] are far more important in their social function to early societies than they are as records that would satisfy a modern scholar. Indeed, if they are incapable of change, it would pose a serious problem. They constantly need to adapt to new realities. It is not that there is no history at all in them, but the history is only one ingredient in the recipe, and not often the most important one” (1998: 3; see also 2013: esp. 125; 569).
⁷ Hall 1997: 2.
⁹ Elevating the claims to status and authority of one particular family, or expressing inter-relationships between features of local landscape: see Hall 2002: 26.
¹¹ Hall 2002: 25 (cfr. also Sammons 2018). Smith observes how in Ancient Greece genealogies were not synecdochical (i.e. professing direct lineal descent) but “ideological” (or “metaphorical”): members of an ethnic group profess shared descent from heroes without literally believing in it (Hall 2002 citing Smith 1999: 57-58; 70-71: the terminology is Hall’s, since Smith distinguishes between ideological and genealogical myths).
Even more interesting is the fact that not only do genealogies adapt in response to changing historical frameworks: it is also possible that they are shaped in order to change this framework – thus serving as a way of renegotiating a sense of belonging.\(^{13}\) Genealogy, which acts as a cognitive artefact for a group, is particularly suited to this use.\(^{14}\) Myths of shared descent are paramount among the features that – together with an association with a specific territory – distinguish ethnic groups from social and associative groups, and proof of descent is a defining criterion of ethnicity.\(^{15}\)

In light of the above, in this paper I try to challenge the traditional approach which has identified three different Lokros, an Opuntian active in Eastern and Western Lokris, a son of Maira active in Thebes and a son of Phaiax active in Epizephyrian Lokri. Instead, I propose to analyse this changing kinship as a series of responses to the constant shifts in Central Greek interstate relations. Lokros’ pedigree is continually adapted to promote new alliances and express enmities. In the second section, I analyse the sources and some relevant philological cruces in chronological order. The third paragraph builds on the results of the second and investigates the same sources from an historical, specifically geopolitical, point of view: an analysis focused on interactions between peoples through which at least some of the philological problems are also solved.

### The evidence. Decoding the genealogical grammar in stories of origins, violence, and migrations

In normal social and historical circumstances, genealogies “are only rarely expressed as a whole”,\(^{16}\) but rather as several genealogical stories. Unfortunately, as is often the case, the evidence on Lokros’ genealogies is fragmentary. Nevertheless, it is possible to recognize some typical genealogemes.

Genealogemes are the elements of the genealogical syntax – the basic, irreducible “building blocks” of a genealogy.\(^{17}\) They can be linked together vertically through descent or grafted on horizontally through marriage. Since most of the different types of genealogeme feature in Lokros’ genealogies, I will explain the concept briefly here.

The most common are:\(^{18}\) cultural heroes; toponymic heroes; theogeniture; transition from agnatic to uterine descent; uxorilocality and conjunctive names. 1) Cultural heroes are mythological figures who are represented as patrons of a town or a region: they can be a) primeval cultural heroes, such as eponymous heroes, belonging to the upper, cosmogonic part of a genealogy; they were usually shallow personalities to whom few stories were attached and who could therefore be universally employed “to explain origins and kin-ties which gradually came to be recognized between geographically distant

---

16 Vansina 1985: 182.
17 Hall 1997: 86.
18 I am following Hall’s analysis: 1997: 86ff.
populations in Greece”;}^{19} or b) dynastic cultural heroes, who typically arrive, or return, from outside the locality to which they come to be attached.^{20} In this last case, the emphasis is much more heavily on the place of arrival than that of departure. 2) Toponymic heroes, too, generally appear in the earlier, cosmogonic part of a genealogy, “pegging the genealogies in their consumer cities”.^{21} 3) Theogeniture means that a hero has one divine (and one human) parent.^{22} 4) Transition from agnatic to uterine descent in a patrilineal society undermines the legitimacy the genealogies are intended to validate,^{23} as does 5) uxorilocality (the groom moves to the bride’s household upon marriage in a society where the general rule is vice versa – virilocality).^{24} 6) Conjunctive names often symbolize a warrior virtue and are fillers: shallow figures to whom very few tales are attached.

Lokros’ genealogies use most of these genealogemes, as an analysis of the evidence shows. According to Strabo (7.7.2 Baladié), Hesiod wrote that Lokros was chief of the people of the Leleges (Λελέγων ἠγέτας τῆς λαῶν). As D’Alessio suggests, the phrasing may indicate an emigration.^{25} Strabo also traces back to Hesiod the belief that these Leleges – who were given to Deukalion by Zeus, son of Chronos, and thus belonged to an early generation – had sprung from stones (fr. 234 M.-W.). Hesiod’s fragment belongs to the Catalogue of Women, which is commonly considered pseudohesiodic (at least in its final form), and was written at some point in the 6th century BC.^{26} Since the Catalogue “partakes in a pervasive song-tradition weaving its own nexus of associations”, which immerses its listeners “in an intertext of mythical cross-references”^{27}, we may assume that Lokros played a key-role in the traditions of the Archaic song-culture. Some lines before citing the Catalogue, Strabo cites Aristotle to explain that the Leleges are the Lokrians. Indeed, in his Polity of the Aitolians (and also in his Polity of the Opuntians and Polity of the Megarians) Aristotle allegedly called Leleges living in Akarnania, in Western Lokris and in other cities, as well as those controlling Boiotia, the “Lokroi of today”.^{28} Lokros’ parents are not mentioned in the

---

^{19} Hall 1997: 77.
^{20} See also Eriksen 1993: 110 (with some case studies).
^{21} Hall 1997: 88.
^{22} Hall 1997: 88.
^{24} Hall 1997: 89.
^{25} 2005: 225 (cfr. also Farnell 1932: ad l., Fowler 2013: 96): possibly the migration from Eastern to Western Lokris and the quarrel between Lokros and his son Opous (as is later represented by Pindar): see below, 141-3.
^{26} After a stage of oral circulation. Authorship and chronology of the Catalogue are debated (scholars including Janko 1982 [70-94] have argued for Hesiodic authorship). Recent discussions of the literature are Cingano 2009: 115-7 and Fowler 2013: 127 (both also analyse previous positions and take into account intertextualities suggested by previous scholarship); they cannot be summarised here. Cingano’s most recent suggestion that a much shorter original version by Hesiod grew like a snowball through a series of later accretions (a suggestion which further develops an idea already expressed by Wilamowitz: 1905: 123-24) has influenced later studies (see Ormand 2014). Cfr. also Cingano 2005: 120-121 on the arrangements of the fragments in Merkelbach-West’s edition and the legacies of West’s seminal work (1985). A general comment on the Catalogue’s words about Lokros is to be found in Lerat 1952 II: 5; D’Alessio 2005: 223; Cingano 2009: 115-7; Domínguez Monedero 2013: 413-14; Fowler 2013: 127ff. More generally, on the whole passage by Strabo: Sakellariou 1958: 115 n. 5; Baladié 1989: 222; Fowler 2013: 96-100.
^{27} Tsagalis 2008, xii. See also Fowler 2001: 110.
^{28} See Lerat II: 5, commenting on Aristot. fr. 560 Rose. On Aristotle’s passage on Lokros see below, 146.
surviving fragments of the Catalogue. Martin L. West, followed by Robert Fowler, suggested that Lokros’ name might have been cited among the sons of Aiolos in another fragment, fr. 10a.28, and that he is therefore considered a descendant of Protogeneia.29 This deserves attention: Deukalion is the grandfather of Hellen (Hekat. Fr. 13) who is father of Doros, Aiolos and Xouthos, and Xouthos is father of Achaios and Ion; while Protogeneia is mother of Aethlios, ancestor of the Aitolians through his grandson Aitolos (Apollod.1.49; Paus.5.1.3).30 All these connections are relevant with regard to intercommunity relations in central Greece and will be discussed later on.

†”Iων δὲ πρεσβύτερος Λοκρός ἦν Φύσκου παῖς (FGrHist 1 F 16): with these words, Hekataios (second half of the 6th century?27) – according to Herodianos (Π.μον.λέξ. 2.947.8 Lentz) – described Lokros’ pedigree to the learned fifth-century Greeks, his intended audience,32 among whom he was a well-known “prose-writer”.33 The passage is corrupt: the first word runs ”Ιωνος according to Ludwig Weniger34, ἕων according to Karl Lehrs, August Lentz, and Fowler,35 των according to Ulrich von Wilamowitz,36 in his edition of Hekataios, Rudolf Heinrich Klausen, followed by Felix Jacoby, proposed Λοκροῦ instead of Λοκρός.37 As it stands, i.e. ”Ιων, it would have to be translated “There was an older Ion, a Lokrian, the son of Physkos”, but modern scholarship points to the fact that “it is hard to think what use he [Hekataios] could have made of two Iones”.38 If we follow Lehrs and Fowler, we have to construe “there was an older Lokros, son of Physkos”, and the natural completion would be “than Lokros, son of Y”39; the remains of an expression containing the name of Y may be lurking in the corrupt first word, and “the two Lokroi will be the Ozolian and the Opuntian, and Hekataios is explaining the split.”40 This (extremely complicated) hypothesis is fascinating because it explains the split between Opuntian Lokris and Ozolian Lokris through the genealogy of the very eponymous hero.41

29 West 1983: 29; Fowler 2013: 122 and 145. Later sources seem to confirm this: see Apollod.1.7.2; Konon BNJ 26 F 1.14; Paus.5.1.3, and commentary thereon in Wilamowitz 1922: 359. However, one wonders if we should, in fact, retroject.

30 Fowler 2013: 122.

31 Or first half of the 5th, at the latest: see Jacoby 1912: 2667-69 (=ad FGrHist 1). Jacoby’s view is still considered valid: more recent literature is discussed by Fowler 2013: 658; Morison 2014; Pownall 2014.


33 Hdt.5.36.2; cf. West 1991: 145.

34 Weniger 1897: 2139: ”Ιωνος δὲ πρεσβύτερος Λοκρός ἦν Φύσκου παῖς.


36 Wilamowitz 1922: 358 n. 3: των δὲ πρεσβύτερος Λοκρός ἦν Φύσκου παῖς.

37 1831: 145: †”Ιων δὲ πρεσβύτερος Λοκροῦ ἦν, Φύσκου παῖς.


39 I.e. “There was an older Lokros, son of Physkos (than Lokros, son of Y)”.

40 Fowler 2013: 141.

41 However, this involves changing “Ιων to ἕων, and assuming that the name of Y must have been indicated previously.
Another possibility is to change Λοκρός to Λοκροῦ, and thus to follow Klausen and Jacoby: the translation would be “Ion (?), son of Physkos, was older than Lokros”.

If, on the other hand, we accept Wilamowitz, and emendate Ἰων to τῶν, the text will run: “Lokros, son of Physkos, was the oldest of the two (Lokros).” This would be an easy correction, involving, like the previously cited corrections, the emendation of only one letter. Finally, Weniger’s emendation in Ἰωνος also warrants attention. In this case, Hekataios’ sentence would be: “Lokros, son of Physkos, was older than Ion.” Here, the text seems to hint at a story of half-brothers and of a quarrel between them, which might have led to emigration. This puzzling kinship between Lokros and Ion – which is also implied by Klausen and Jacoby’s emendation – is not consistent with Ion’s genealogies, as will be clarified later on.

Pindar’s ninth Olympian ode offers an early-classical perspective on Lokros’ genealogies. In order to celebrate the wrestling of Epharmostos from the renowned city of Opous (c. 468 or 466 B. C.), Pindar sings that Zeus abducted the daughter of (an otherwise unknown) Opous, from the land of the Epeians (the Homeric name for the inhabitants of Elis); he lay with her and then brought her to Lokros, so that he would not die without

---

42 See Jacoby ad l.: “wenn keine schwerere verderbnis vorliegt, ist Λοκροῦ die glaublichsste änderung; neben Ἰωνος wäre die nochmalige angabe von Lokros' abstammung – Φόσκου παῖς – nicht begreiflich”. See also Hall 2002: 27 (and fig. 1.2 on page 28).

43 One wonders to what τῶν may refer. Wilamowitz devoted the last sentence of a footnote to his correction and refrained from trying to figure it out, since it is a marginal issue in his chapter on the ninth Olympian Ode (where Lokros is cited too: see below). According to Fowler, the τῶν-correction implies that the names of the two fathers were given in the preceding sentence.

44 This is also the interpretation of Jonathan Hall (2002: 27-28) and Fritz Graf (2011: 220). Jacoby dismissed the possibility, since it would make no sense to add Φόσκου παῖς to Λοκρός if Ion were his brother (see above, n. 38). However, Φόσκου παῖς would work, if Ion and Physkos were half-brothers, as Fowler suggests. More generally on Physkos: Lerat 1952 II: 4.

45 See Jacoby (above, nn. 38 and 42); Pearson 1939: 100; Fowler 2003: 8, and, more recently, Francis Pownall (2014): “The text of this citation from Herodotus is corrupt, and so it is very unlikely that Ion is a descendant of Lokros and Physkos, who in other traditions are part of the Aiitolian branch of the Deukalian family tree (...). In the Hekataian stemma of Deukalion, it is possible that Ion was the grandson of Marathonios (see F 13 above), whereas Physkos was the son of Amphiktyon, Hellen’s brother, and Lokros was the son of Physkos”. However, a particular koine in the eastern part of central Greece comes to mind. Although he did not agree with this emendation (preferring Λοκροῦ), Jacoby (ad l.) had previously pointed to a similar connection: “H verband die völker um den korinthischen golf – Aitoler (F 15), Lokrer (die ozolischen, wie Φόσκος zeigt; die trennung muß er anders erzählt haben als Plut. Quaest. gr; 15; Eus. Il 277, 20) Ionier (oï εν Πελοποννήσω, wie Schol. AT* Il. N 685 Βυσωτοί και Ἰδώνες ἐλκε- χίτωνες, Λοκροί και Φθιοί και ...) ἐπειδοι an sich falsch auffassen, während Androton Schol. BT in ihnen die von den Ἰωνες verschiedenen Athener sieht; für H s. Herod. V 58) – zu einem auf den Deukalionssohn Orestheus zurückgehenden stammbau”: see below, 144-6. This might also apply to another (although less likely) possibility: that the text remains as it stands, but the translation is “Ion, who is Lokrian, and son of Physkos, is older (than…?)”.

46 Epharmostos won in Olympia in 468 and in the Pythian games in 466 (this last victory is alluded to in lines 11-12). It is not clear whether Pindar composed the ode after the Olympic, or the Pythian, Games: scholarship is divided. The debate cannot be summarised here (and is not relevant to our point). Literature and discussion in Hornblower 2004: 167 n. 146; see also Wilamowitz 1922: 348 n. 1 (with a discussion of the different chronological data in the scholia) and Gerber’s commentary of 2002.

47 Ὄποες (in Pindar as e.g. in Il.2.531; Strab.9.4.2) and Ὅποῦς are equivalent (Ὅποες was most probably the ancient, not-contracted name of classical Ὅποες, whose location perhaps shifted from Mitrou to Atalanti: Visser 1997: 401; Kramer-Hajós 2012: 90 and n. 12).

48 Gehrke 2003: 7, and Bourke 2018: 16-18 with references (see esp. Od.13.275). This connection between Opous senior and Elis is interesting and resonates with Strab.9.4.2 (there are still people in Elis who claim Opuntian ancestors); Diod.14.17.8-9 and Steph.Byz. (s.v. Ὅποες), who both mention a town called Opous
descendants. Lokros’ new bride, the daughter of Opous, was thus carrying the seed of Zeus in her womb, and “the hero rejoiced to see his adopted son, and gave him the same name (ἰὼνυμον) as his mother’s father, Opous, a man beyond words in beauty and fine deeds.”

Lokros gave him a city and a people to rule (πόλιν δ’ ὁμασον λαόν τε διαλαβαν). Given Pindar’s tendency to make himself part of the tradition, it is interesting to note that here he is reporting a new story: he refers to “new songs” (47–8).

Furthermore, Pindar’s emphasis on Lokros’ enthusiastic response to the birth of Opous junior may be a reaction to a previous version in which the relationship between the two is far from idyllic. This argument needs to be investigated further in connection with Aristotle’s Polity of the Opuntians (see below).

According to Pindar, therefore, Lokros married the daughter of Opous; together they had a child, who was called after his grandfather. The latter, and thus Opous the younger’s mother, were from Elis; Lokros gave his son a city and a people to govern; and strangers from the western Peloponnese, and from Thebes, came to join him. The scholia vetera (possibly drawing on Didymos) make it clear that from this Opous – the descendant of Zeus (see, for example, schol. 82d, l. 2; 96c, l. 2) – descended the Opuntians (schol. 82f, l. 2; 87b, ll. 3–5; 89), and all the Lokrians, whose metropolis was Opous (schol. 89).

In Elis, and schol. Pind.9.64c Drachmann, which mentions a river called Opous. This Elis-Opous connection must be seen in the light of Lokros’ kinship with Protogeneia (see above, and Gerber 2002: 50; D’Alessio 2005: 224 n. 33, both with further sources) and fits perfectly within an ode that celebrates a victory won in Eleian Olympia (Wilamowitz 1922: 360).

Scholars have suggested different names for her (maybe a Protogeneia II? See, however, Huxley’s remarks: 1975: 31): cf. Wilamowitz 1922: 359; Huxley 1975: 31; Gerber 2002: 49; D’Alessio 2005; Suárez de la Torre 2006: 15. In Aristotle’s Polity of the Opuntians (see below, 145), where a different version of the foreign marriage of Lokros is given, this girl is called Kambys (561 = schol. Pind. 9.66e Drachmann); in Plutarch’s Qu.Gr.15 Kabye. Kambys and Kabye are probably two different names for the same girl: Giesen 1901: 466. On the whole question, see Halliday 1928: 85–9, and, more recently, Boulogne 2002: 403; D’Alessio 2005: 224. See also below.

Vv. 62–65, in Diane Arnson Svarlien’s translation (The Odes of Pindar, in Perseus Project 1.0, Yale University Press, 1991). Pindar is here clearly referring to the well-known eunomia of Opous (cf. Strab.9.4.2: eunynomoi); see Giangiulio 1989: 35–36 and n. 96

Pavlou 2008: 564; Spelman 2018: 213. See also Kurke 1991: 259. Pavlou rightly refers to the concept of “traditionalization”, i.e. the contextualization of a discourse in a socially constituted field of verbal production: cfr. Bauman 1992: 135–42. Lokros’ reaction is described using the same vocabulary as in the Iliad’s depiction of Phoenix’s happy adoption by Peleus (II. 9.483, and commentary thereon in Mann 1994: 324). Pindar, in fact, draws on Homer more than once in this ode: the very fact that Opous is described as “famous” (I. 14) indicates that the city’s prominence cannot be new, and dates back to the Iliad, where Patroklos son of Menoitois is said to be from Opous (18.326), as Hornblower observes (2004: 168).


D’Alessio 2005: 224. See also Pavlou 2008: 559, and Huxley 1975: 32, who argues that Pindar is delivering an important political message by denying the quarrel.

Schol.82d l. 2 Drachmann (=82f l. 2): Διὸς γὰρ Λοκρός ὁ πρόγονος αὐτῶν; 96c l. 2. ἢ δὲ ὁ Λοκρός Ἀμφικτύονος τοῦ Δίως; 87b ll. 3–5: ὃ δὲ Λοκρός τὸν ἅπαν Δίως καὶ Πρωτογενείας παῖδα ὡς ὅδιον σχῶν ἀνόμασαν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ συντελεῖν δύμνωμον τῷ κατὰ μήτερα πάπτω: 89: Λοκρός ἔχει τὸ γένος ἐκ Δίως ἴκαρ’ οὗ ἢ τῶν Λοκρῶν χῶρα, ἢς Λοκρόδου μητρόπολις ἢ Ὀπους. Gigon maintains that 82f and 87b depend upon Aristotle and classifies them together with 81, 82a, 82c, 82g, 85b, 86b-c and 87a as fr. 571, 1. On the role of Amphiktyon in these genealogies, see below, 148; on the sources and the chronology of the scholia vetera, see Gurdemann 1921: 647–8.
Any consideration of the above has to take into account the nature of Pindar’s audience. A “patronage-based circulation of short texts among selective pan-Hellenic networks”\textsuperscript{55} with common interests can reasonably be assumed for the late-archaic Period. It should also be remembered that the written text of any epinician was always circulated throughout Greece very soon after its first performance. Finally, the author knew that frequent reperformances would ensure the dissemination of the poem.\textsuperscript{56}

A further question concerns the genre. As D’Alessio pointed out, epinician poetry is composed for a particular audience and does not need to be adjusted to fit within a Panhellenic frame as genealogical poetry. This allows Pindar to stress the Eastern side of Lokros’ pedigree and, conversely, to neglect the Western Lokrians, in order to most effectively celebrate Epharmostos. This tradition contains a specific genealogeme for Eastern Lokris: since – in this patrilineal society – uterine descent is accorded more significance (Opous-Protogeneia II [?]-Opous), the role of Opous, though important, is sidelined in favor of that of Lokros – and Lokris. And finally, note the apokia model which represents the relationship between two subethnic: Eastern Lokris as the motherland of Western Lokris.

So far, it seems clear that, while the Ehoiai and Hekataios refer to Western Lokris, where the city Physkeis lies, Pindar refers to the Eastern Lokrians, where Opous is located. Both Physkos and Opous are clearly toponymic heroes (see above), who are subsumed into the identities of Physkeis and Opous. The two figures thus represent a function of what might be described as an “ancestralising” strategy for understanding the cities’ antiquity. Originally, they must have been two different genealogemes (of the same type) embedded in two different, competing, genealogical stemmata, and generated in two different social, or possibly subethnic, contexts.\textsuperscript{57} At a certain point, they may have come to express political hierarchies or territorial claims. Later on, these competing genealogemes must have been accommodated in one and the same stemma by consigning them to different parts of the territory.\textsuperscript{58}

Pherekydes, writing in the first half of the 5th century BC,\textsuperscript{59} refers to a completely different tradition, in which Lokros is the son of Maira and Zeus; Maira is the daughter of Proitos, the ruler of Argos, and Anteia, the daughter of Amphianax.\textsuperscript{60} Intending to preserve her virginity, Maira joined Artemis in her hunt, but Zeus desired Maira: she became pregnant and gave birth to a child, named Lokros, who went to live in (or even colonized) Thebes with Amphion and Zethos: ὃς Θήβας μετ᾽ Ἀμφίονος καὶ Ζῆθου οἰκίζει.\textsuperscript{61} Another testimonium, the Mythographus Homericus, also reports that Lokros assisted Amphion and

\textsuperscript{55} Hubbard 2004: 84. See also Pavlou 2008: 540ff.

\textsuperscript{56} Hubbard 2004: 71-93; Pavlou 2008: 540ff. On the reperformance of Pindar’s odes, see Currie 2004: 49-69.


\textsuperscript{59} His treatment of Theseus which shows specific connections with Kimon provides evidence for his floruit: 465 (see Huxley 1973; Dolcetti 2004: 30; Morison 2014; Fowler 2013: 708-9).

\textsuperscript{60} This is F 170a: the testimonium is a scholium (codd. HX) on Od. 11.326 (= F 175 Dolcetti), to be compared with Eust. vol. 1, 421, 36 ad Od.11.325, slightly different.

\textsuperscript{61} This is F 170b: the testimonium is a scholium (codd. MV\textsuperscript{amos}) on Od. 11.326 (= F 173 Dolcetti).
Zethos in the foundation of the city of Thebes. In other words, Pherekydes’ Panhellenic audience was comfortable with stories in which an individual, whose name is Lokros – thus most probably an eponymous hero – is thought to have founded Thebes together with two key figures of Boiotian mythology, Amphion and Zethos. He is a cultural hero; we cannot assume that he is not also an eponymous one, since we do not know if his connection to the Lokrians was mentioned in a no longer extant passage. His mother comes from Argos: this “external” element is filtered through theogeniture (Zeus is his father). It is even possible that Pherekydes rationalized a story that was already circulating orally in order to preserve it with an encyclopedic purpose (which would have been typical of mythography), and then told it using the typical narrative rhythm of mythography – the summary: “the time taken to perform the text is much shorter than the time of the fabula”, which is told as economically as possible, without the ornamental adjectives, speeches and descriptions typical of the enunciative dimension of early poetry. Commenting on these fragments, Morison states that Lokros “should not be confused with the homonymous ancestor of the Ozolian Lokrians (Plutarch, Quaestiones Graecae 15)”; this view is shared by modern scholarship, which distinguishes two Lokros. While the two supposedly different Lokros are usually dealt with separately, in this paper I cite and discuss sources about both figures in the same section. It will be remembered that the focus of this paper is the investigation of inter-community relations in Central Greece as they are reflected in Lokros’ genealogies. Therefore, of interest here is the fact that at a specific stage and/or in a specific environment (a) Lokros was considered to be connected to Opous or Physkos; but at a different stage and maybe in a different environment (b) Lokros is (also?) considered to be connected to Thebes. Why? This will be investigated in the next section. Lokros’ connection with Thebes would – one might reasonably expect – have been likely to spread more and more widely: mythography was occasion-free and used in schools, symposia, as well as by dramatists, sophists and rhetores. Surprisingly, this seems not to have occurred: Lokros’ connection with Maira, Amphion and Zethos is only rarely mentioned in later sources, as we will see later on.

Let us now turn to another source, a piece of information that, according to Valentin Rose and Olof Gigon, can be traced back to Aristotle’s Polity of the Opuntians (an assumption that will be questioned below). Here the two Lokrides, east and west, are merged in a single discourse; Lokros’ genealogies were homogenized and became uniform, which indicates that 1) they were both recited frequently; and 2) from then on transformation did not readily occur: Φύσκου τοῦ Ἀμφικτύονος υἱὸς ἦν Λοκρός, ἐκ δὲ τοῦτον καὶ Καβύης Ὀποῦς.
(fr. 561 Rose, ll. 5-6= fr. 572 Gigon): Opous is son of Kabye and Lokros who is son of Physkos, who is son of Amphiktyon. The testimonium is Plutarch (Plut.Qu.Gr.15). Some lines later (the testimonium here is Eustathios=561 ll. 14-20 Rose, cited more extensively by Gigon as fr. 574), Aristotle is claimed to have written:

The ancients say also these things: that Physkos is a descendant of Amphiktyon and Chtonopatra, that Lokros is son of Physkos, that from Physkos come the inhabitants of Physkeis and that they were called Lokroi after Lokros; Opous was son of Lokros; having had a quarrel with Opous, Lokros let him in command, while he himself went to colonize the western side of the Parnassos, ruling there the people who are called both Hesperioi and Ozolai. (translation by author)

Soon afterwards (the testimonium is Athenaios, citing Didymos: 561, ll. 21-27), Aristotle goes on to say that “when Lokros received an oracle commanding him to build a city wheresoever he should be bitten by a wooden dog, he founded the city in the region where he had scratched his leg on a dog-thorn”. In the passage by Plutarch cited above, the same episode is reported in more detail (Plut.Qu.gr.15: see above): Lokros, greatly troubled by the wound, spent several days in that region, during which time he explored the country and founded the cities Physkos and Oiantheia and the other cities which the so-called Ozolian Lokrians inhabited.70 It is well-known that Aristotle’s Polities included Novellen, “this one

70 Here is the whole fr. 561, as reconstructed by Rose:

Schol.Pind.Ol.9.86 ἀπὸ γὰς Ἑπείων: Ἑπείων
tῶν Ἡλείων ... ὁ πολιτεύσαν ήν θυγάτηρ (ἢ Πρωτογένεια)
Ἡλείων βασιλέως, ήν Ἀριστοτέλης Καμβύσην καλεῖ.

Plut.Qu.Gr.15: Τίς ἡ ξυλίνη κύών παρὰ Λοκροίς;
Φόοκος τοῦ Ἀμφικτύονος υἱὸς ἦν Λοκρός, ἐκ δὲ τοῦτο
καὶ Καβύσης Ὀπούς, πρὸς ὃν ὁ πατὴρ διενεχθεῖς καὶ συγγούς
τῶν πολιτῶν ἀναλαβὼν περὶ ἀποκοίμησεν ἐμαντεύτητο: τοῦ δὲ
θεοῦ φίλου κτίζειν πόλιν διατέρα τὰς δηθεῖς ὡς ἄν
κυνός ξυλίνης, ὑπερβαίνων εἰς τὴν ἐπάτημα κυνόβατον,
ἐνοχληθεῖς δὲ τῇ πληγῇ διέτριψεν ἡμέρας
ἀυὴλθεὶ πλεῖονα, ἐν αἷς καταμαθεῖν τὸ χωρίον ἔκτισε πόλεις
Φοκείς καὶ Ὄλντειναν καὶ τὰς ἄλλας δοῖς οἱ κληθέντες
῾Οξόλαι Λοκροί κατώκησαν.

Eustathios in ll.p. 277: οἱ δὲ πολιαί φασι καὶ ταῦτα:
Ἀμφικτύονος καὶ Χθονοπάτρας ἀπόγονος Φόοκος, οὗ Λο-
κρός, ὃν ἀπὸ μὲν Φόοκοις Φόοκοι πρώην, ἀπὸ δὲ Λοκροῦ
Λοκροὶ οἱ αὐτοὶ ὄνομαζότηςαν. Λοκροῦ δὲ Ὀπούς, πρὸς δὲ
διενεχθεῖς ὁ πατὴρ Λοκρός ἐγένοις ἄρχειν ἐκεῖνον, αὐτός δὲ
οἰκεῖ τὰ πρὸς ἐσπέραν τοῦ παρνασσοῦ ἔχουν ψυ' ἐαυτὸν τοὺς
ἐκεῖ οἱ Ἑσπεριῶτα τε καὶ Ὀξόλαι ἐκαλοῦντο.
being of notable political significance (...) we might imagine the whole project going slightly ‘off piste’ at times.”71 Once written, a Polity (despite its constitutional emphasis) fossilized an ethnographic vision of a place or a region.72 In this case, the genealogy is ranked: Physkos, as Lokros’ father, is accorded more importance whereas Opous is Lokros’ son. Furthermore, we find here – like in Pindar – the apokia-model to represent the kinship between Eastern and Western Lokris, the latter being the apokia of the former. It is probable that, from then on, this vision became very influential.

According to Rose and Gigon, Stephanos of Byzantium’s lemma Φύσκος is also drawn from Aristotle (it is catalogued under fr. 560 by Rose, under fr. 571 by Gigon). Here, an attempt is made to substantiate the kinship of Lokros with Amphiktyon by calling upon Aitolos:

Physkos: polis in Lokris, from the name of Physkos, son of Aitolos, son of Amphiktyon...they also use the masculine Physkos: “Physkos from whom came the Leleges who are now called Lokroi.” (translation by author)73

However, the question is much more complicated. Stephanos of Byzantium’s Αἰτωλοῦ – accepted by Meineke in his edition of Stephanos (and by Rose and Gigon in their edition of Aristotle’s fragments) – is, however, questioned by Didier Marcotte.74 Marcotte discusses this passage in his edition of Pseudo-Skymnos (or rather, in his edition of the anonymous

Αθήν. Π. 70c: Δίδυμος δ’ ο γραμματικός ἐξηγοῦ· μένος παρὰ τῷ Λοκρικεῖ τὸ κοῦναρο ἄκανθα, μήποτε, ἡφι, τὴν κυνόσβατον λέγει διὰ τὸ ἀκανθώδες καὶ τραχύ εἶναι τὸ φυτὸν καὶ γὰρ ἡ Ποιής ξυλίνην κόνα αὐτὸ ἐπε καὶ ὁ Λοκρός χρησίμων λαβὼν ἐκεί πόλιν οἰκίζειν ὅπου ἄν ὑπὸ ξυλίνης κυνός δηχηθή, καταμυχθείς τὴν κνήμην ὅπο κυνοσβάτου, ἔκτισε τὴν πόλιν. Ησυχ. s.v. κοῦναρος: φυτὸν τι καὶ μήποτε ή κυνόσβατος, διὰ τὸ τραχό καὶ ἀκανθώδες κόνα γὰρ ξυλίνην τὴν κυνοσβάτον θεὸς λέγει.

See above (n. 48) for the discussion of the relation between Eleians and Opuntians addressed in the first part of the fragment.

72 Thomas 2019: 385.
73 Here is the whole fr. 560 (including the passage cited by Strabo and discussed above): Strabo VII p. 321 fin. [=568 Gigon]: ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἀἰτωλῶν (πολιτεία Αριστοτέλης) τοῖς νῦν Λοκρὸς Λέλεγας καλεῖ, κατασχεῖν δὲ καὶ τὴν Βοιωτίαν αὐτοῦς φησιν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ὀπουντίων καὶ Μεγαρέων. Στρ. Βυζ. σ. Φύσκος· πόλις Λοκρίδος, ἀπὸ Φύσκον τοῦ Ἀἰτωλοῦ Ἀμφικτύονος τοῦ Δευκαλίωνος ... λέγεται καὶ ἄρσενικῶς ὁ Φύσκος “Φύσκος δὲ ἀρ’ οὖ ὁι Λέλεγες οί νῦν Λοκροί.”
author of the *Periodos ges*, erroneously believed to be Skymnos).\(^{75}\) Stephanos, indeed, quite often draws on the *Periodos ges*.\(^{76}\) In fact, in the only available codex where this part of the *Periodos ges* is reported (i.e. D = Parisinus suppl. gr. 443),\(^{77}\) it reads that father (or “foregoer”, depending on the meaning of ἔτοιμος) of Physkos (and thus of Amphiktyon) is a Ἰτωλός (v. 590) a vox nihili which was always corrected as Αἴτωλός on the basis of Stephanos’ lemma.\(^{78}\) Didier Marcotte, followed by Martin Korenjak,\(^{79}\) corrects instead in Ἰτωνος, who according to Pausanias (9.1.1; 9.34.1) is the father of Boiots (or the son, according to Diod.4.67), and also the son of Amphiktyon (Paus.5.1.4).\(^{80}\) Given that he is the son of Amphiktyon also according to Stephanos (s.v. Boiotia), Marcotte argues that Stephanos, too, must have written Ἰτωλός instead of Αἴτωλός, possibly because he directly consulted the archetype of D, i.e. μ, where this error was already present. Itonos is an attractive correction: he is cited by Simonides the genealogist (5 BC)\(^{81}\), as the father of Athena and Io, with connections to the Thessalian town of Iton (cfr. BNJ 8 F 1); and by Armenidas, one of the authors of *Thebaika*, also dating back to the 5th century BC,\(^{82}\) as son of Amphiktyon and eponymous hero of the Thessalian city Itonos;\(^{83}\) later on, he is cited by Alexander Polyhistor (BNJ 273 F 97, 1st BC)\(^{84}\), again as the son of Amphiktyon; and, finally, by Pausanias, who links him to Boiotia.\(^{85}\) Since Armenidas’ work seems to have dealt exclusively with Theban matters, we may assume that his reference to Itonos is also connected to Boiotia, maybe with an event in Theban legend.\(^{86}\)

\(^{75}\) The *Periodos ges* in iambic trimeters was erroneously attributed to Skymnos; it is clear, however, that we have two different authors here; the author of the *Periodos ges*, called “Pseudoskymnos” by modern scholars, dates back to the 2nd century BC: see Gisinger 1927: 672, 50 - 674, 19; Marcotte 2000: 36f.; Bravo 2009; Orth 2017; Korenjak 2017 with discussion and literature.

\(^{76}\) Marcotte 2000: cxxvii-cxxxix.

\(^{77}\) A corpus of writings dating back to the 13th century collected by the author of one of them, Marcian of Heraclea, writing in the 2nd BC (see Marcotte 2000: XIX-XLV). Further fragments are preserved by other codices: see Marcotte 2000: 1-2.

\(^{78}\) Müller GGM I (1861, 1990)\(^{a}\), ad l.; and, as far as Stephanos is concerned, Meineke 1849 (in his edition of the *Ethnika*); Wilamowitz 1922: 359; Daux 1957: 98; Uhl 1963: 42. David Höschel, in his *editio princeps* of Stephanos, proposed Αἴτωλός even before D was discovered (he read ν, an apocryph reading Ἰτωλός).

\(^{79}\) Korenjak 2017: ad l.

\(^{80}\) This allows us to reconstruct a consistent genealogy where Itonos is son of Amphiktyon, son of Deukalion, and Aitolos son of Endymion, son of Aithlios, son of Protogeneia, daugther of Deukalion: see Marcotte 2000: 271, app. B (Stemmata).

\(^{81}\) See Paradiso 2008 and Fowler 2013: 729-30 (discussing *Suda*, s.v.).

\(^{82}\) See Jacoby *FGrHist* 378 (Introduction).

\(^{83}\) Armenidas *FGrHist* 378 F 1 and commentary thereon in Grainger 1999: 47 and Schachter 2011. The testimo-nium is one of the scholia commentaries (1.551a) written in the margins of manuscripts to the *Argonautika* of Apollonios Rhodios. The source of Armenidas might be Hekataios (cf. F 2). See also Korinna fr. 7 (Page) and commentary thereon in Larson 2007: 24-25 and Tufano 2019: 134.

\(^{84}\) See *Suda* s.v. and commentary thereon in Jacoby *FGrHist* 3A Kommentar: 248-50 and Blakely 2011: 273 with further literature. Cfr. also Diod.4.67.7

\(^{85}\) Paus.5.1.4; 9.1.1; 34.1, in this last passage, however, the name is corrupt in the Mss. See Kühr 2006: 263 and 266.

\(^{86}\) Or even to the description of the Boiotian sanctuary of Athena Itona at Koroneia. See Preller-Robert 1887: 214; 220f.; Nilsson 1906: 86; Jacoby ad l.; Schachter ad l. See also Kühr 2006: 266; Tufano 2019: 134 (who points to the fact that the connection with Boiotia is not mandatory). Even if all the three major manuscripts of Stephanos (Rehdigeranus, Vossianus, and Parisiensis) do actually read Αἴτωλός, a strong argument supports Marcotte’s emendation of Stephanos’ passage: the internal consistency in the *Ethnika*. 
However, two more – related and, themselves, interconnected – issues need to be clarified: first, who is the source of Stephanos? And second, who is the source of the “Lokrian archaeology” of the *Periodos ges* (vv. 587-591)? As we have seen, Rose and Gigon trace Stephanos’ lemma Physkos back to Aristotle; Marcotte does not deal with the problem of the source of “Lokrian archaeology” of the *Periodos ges* (and assumes that Stephanos had drawn on it). Commenting on F 13 by Hekataios, and on the Deukalionidai stemmata in general, Jacoby argues that both Stephanos and the Lokrian verses of the *Periodos ges* go back to Ephoros. However, a piece of information (that the Lokrians were formerly called Leleges) which according to Strabo can be traced back to Aristotle is cited – with very similar wording – in the *Periodos ges*. This is, I believe, another argument in support of Αἴτωλος in Stephanos, since Aristotle’s “news item” about the Leleges-Lokrians is also given in the *Polity of the Aitolians* (as according to Strabo).

In any case, a safe conclusion seems to be that the “Lokrian archaeology” of the *Periodos ges* goes back to a fourth-century source (Ephoros, or Aristotle, or both) and that Stephanos drew from this source, either directly or through a *Mittelquelle* (the *Periodos ges*).

Caution is also required with regard to the other pieces of information about the parentage of Lokros assembled by Rose and Gigon. Most scholars maintain that at least some of this information (contained in Plutarch and Eustathios) can be traced back to Aristotle, on the basis of *schol.Pind. Ol. 9.86e*, who explicitly cites the philosopher as his source.87 Although this connection cannot be assumed, it does seem highly probable.88 Looking more closely, two different traditions appear to exist: the first, which provides a more “Opuntian” perspective, involves Lokros and Opous and narrates Lokros’ migration (this is the line Pind.-Didym.-schol.Pind. Ol.9.86-Plut.-Eust); a second tradition, which provides a more Ozolian perspective, narrates Lokros’ kinship with Physkos and Amphiktyon (*Periodos ges-schol.Pind. Ol.9.96c-Plut.-Steph.-Eust.*). The addition of Amphiktyon to the framework of the Ozolian perspective will be further investigated in the next section; these two traditions merged before the time of Plutarch, and probably even before Aristotle.

So far, then, we can infer that in the 4th century the following beliefs spread:

– membership of the Amphiktyony was capital for the Lokrians, and it was essential to think that this membership had to be dated back to a remote past, since Amphiktyon was considered Lokros’ ancestor. In the 2nd – or possibly even the 4th – century, this membership was mediated either through the Aitolians (Itolos=Itolos) or through the Boiotians (Itolos=Itonos): they are both thought to have played an important role in the relation between the Lokrians and Delphi.

---

Stephanos would have written that Aitolos is the son of Amphiktyon s.v. Boiotia, and that he is the father of Physkos s.v. Physkos; yet this last lemma most probably depends on vv. 587-90 of the *Periodos ges*, where Aitolos is the son of Endymion (473-7), and not of Amphiktyon. Why would Stephanos not have noticed this contradiction?

87 See Giesen 1901: 466-8; Oldfather 1908: 426 n. 47; Fowler 2013: 142 n. 70.

88 Wilamowitz and Martin Hose are more cautious. Hose (2002: 216) maintains that Lokros’ kinship with Opous cannot be reconciled with his alleged kinship with Physkos: this would have meant that Aristotle was contradicting himself. However, we must remember that Pindar (vv. 62-65, see above) clearly states that Lokros named his son after the father of his wife, Opous, i.e. we have an Opous I and an Opous II.
– the Western Lokrians predated the Eastern Lokrians, since Physkos was considered to be the father of Lokros and grandfather of Opous.

If Plutarch and Eustathios were drawing on Aristotle, then we may argue that, in the 4th century, ethnogenesis was believed to have occurred earlier in Eastern Lokris than in Western Lokris. According to these authors, in fact, the Ancients maintain that Lokros went to colonize the western side of Mount Parnassos (where he commanded the Ozolai), and that the inhabitants of Physkeis are called after Physkos, and were only later called Lokroi after Lokros.\(^8^9\)

Centuries later, in the Roman era, Lokros’ genealogies extend further, serving the interests of Lokrian geopolitics in Italy. Two other sources, moreover, report the further involvement of Lokros in the foundation of colonies: Lokros is claimed to have founded E. Lokri. The sources are Konon (FGrHist F 1, 3) and Herodianos (1.203.26-27 Lentz). Herodianos (whose source may have been Konon?) states merely that Lokros has a close connection with the ethnos and the city of E. Lokroi. Konon, writing during the reign of Augustus\(^9^0\), however, tells a longer story: Alkinous and Lokros, sons of Phaiakos the king of Kerkysra (former Scheria), quarrelled after their father’s death, but then agreed that Alkinous would be king of Phaiakos, and Lokros would locate the island, with a section of the ethnos and some treasure, and found a colony. He sailed to Italy where he was hosted by Latinos,\(^9^1\) the king of the Italians, who gave him his daughter Laurine in marriage. It was here that Lokros hosted Herakles, who at about that time was driving Geryon’s beautiful cows from Erytheia. Latinos, who was visiting his daughter and son-in-law, drove Herakles’ cows away, upon which Herakles killed him, and – accidentally – Lokros, too. When he realised what he had done, Herakles mourned loudly and performed burial rites for Lokros. Later, after his death, Herakles appeared to the people as a ghost and ordered them to establish a city beside the tomb of Lokros, and to name it E. Lokri, in honor of Lokros. The reliability of this story has (rightfully) been questioned, since its similarity to the story of the foundation of Kroton by the hero Kroton is unmistakable.\(^9^2\) Its dubious veracity notwithstanding, this narrative is significant in that it reveals the need to trace the foundation of E. Lokri back to the eponymous hero of both Eastern and Western Lokris, thereby supporting the narrative that

\(^8^9\) That Western Lokrians were once called Physkeis is the most common interpretation of Stephanos’ and Eustathios’ words: see Lerat 1952 II: 5. However, the μὲν-δὲ construct in Eustathios (ὦν ἀπὸ μὲν Φύσκου Φώκοι πρώτης, ἀπὸ δὲ Λοκροῦ Λοκρὶ τοίς αὐτοῖς οὖν ὁμόϕωνας) possibly suggests two different categories: 1) the name of the inhabitants of a city (Physkos [Steph.Byz. s.v.] or Physkeis [Plut.Qugr. 15; FD III 1,565; 3,49; SGDI II 1851; 1854; 2137; IG IX 1\(^2\) 3: 672; 3: 675; 3: 678], after the name of its inhabitants: see Lerat 1952 I: 49); and 2) the name of the inhabitants of a region (Western Lokris) – not the chronological order in which the region’s inhabitants were variously named at various stages. If this were the case, Stephanos’ more puzzling words could be interpreted differently, and we could also infer that Plutarch and Eustathios’ words were simply connected to the prominence of the city Physkeis, and bore no relation to the fact that the inhabitants of all the other cities of Lokris were called Physkeis. Besides, the alleged priority of the Physkeis over the Leleges/Western Lokrians might also have been a narrative device often used in myths (the myth of precedence), here conveying the prominence of the city; see Giangiulio 2010: 106-7 (= 1983: 799-800).

\(^9^0\) Brown 2002: 4.

\(^9^1\) The MMs read Δακίων, Duker corrected in Λακίων, claiming that it was a doublette of Kroton’s foundation story: see below, n. 92.

\(^9^2\) Bayet 1926: 156-64; Bérrard 1941: 352; Egan 1971: 54; Brown 2002: 69; Blakely 2011; the main sources on Kroton’s foundation are: Theokr.Id.A.33b; Diod.4.24.7; Iambl.DevitaPyth.9.50: see Blakely 2011 with further sources and the remarks of Giangiulio 1989: 71-2 and 185-186.
E. Lokri was founded by the ethnos of the Lokrians as a whole. So, Lokros was placed at the origin of all the Lokrian worlds. The story may also, of course, have played an important role in legitimizing the colony and regulating relations with the indigenous people. These aspects will be further investigated in the next section.

**What's history got to do with it? Genealogical inconsistencies as a resource of history**

As alluded to above, it is extremely difficult to make sense of the different genealogies of Lokros, to position them within the broader context of the key genealogies that make up the very core of the Greeks’ origins (e.g. his kinship with Deukalion), and to reconstruct a consistent framework (e.g. the problem of his kinship with Protogeneia). The greatest challenge is the endeavour to make sense of the inevitable inconsistencies. Scholars specializing in genealogies have already attempted this, and the present paper does not aspire to add anything to their results. My aim, in fact, is actually to exploit these genealogical inconsistencies and fracture points as a resource. Using them, we can reconstruct intercommunity relations in Central Greece, and explore the ways in which the Greeks responded to the challenges posed by the changing geopolitical framework in central Greece over time, and how, progressively, the origin of the Lokrians was imagined.

According to the pseudohesiodic Catalogue of Women, Lokros was the chief of the Leleges peoples, whose ancestors had sprung from stones. These Leleges were given to Deukalion by Zeus; this information is also given in the Catalogue. At an equally ancient stage of the tradition (Hekataiōs), Deukalion is the grandfather of Hellen (Fr. 13), who, in the Hesiodic tradition, is the father of Doros, Aiolos and Xouthos (father of Achaios and Ion). In the first half of the 6th century BC, therefore, an image of the Lokrians was circulating which dated them prior to the Hellenes and thus much earlier than the Dorian, Aiolian, Achaian and Ionian. This image depicted (and constructed) a primitive stage in which a very ancient and primitive people, the Leleges, lived in Central Greece before the Hellenes split into different peoples; the image retrojected the name of the later inhabitants of a country in Central Greece, the Lokrians, onto the Leleges, thus anchoring them in the deeper mythical past of Mainland Greece. From this perspective, Lokros is provided with a genealogy which stresses and explains the socio-political existence of a region’s population, the Lokrians.

Interestingly, this textual evidence seems to correspond in some ways with the framework now emerging from the archaeological evidence which testifies to strong cultural interactions in Central Greece prior to the 6th century; it is as if the Greeks were

---

95 See Fowler 2013: 98.
96 Hall 1997: 53.
97 This is not to assume that material cultural patterning can serve as an objective or passive indication of ethnic groups; Jonathan Hall showed how ethnic groups actively and consciously select certain artefacts from the material cultural repertoire, artefacts which become indicia of ethnicity (Hall 1997: 135; cfr. also Morgan 1991: 134: “Ethnic behaviour affects only those categories of artefact selected to carry social or
seeking, and highlighting an explanation for previous cultural interactions, of which they were aware. In the Mycenaean Era, Opuntian Lokris had links with both Thessaly\textsuperscript{98} and Euboia\textsuperscript{99} and the material evidence dating back to the Iron Age found in Eastern Phokis and Eastern Lokris show very similar patterns.\textsuperscript{100} Furthermore, the so-called “dorianisation funéraire” (the shift from cremation to the inhumation in cists or enchytrismos that occurred during the Dark Age in Central Greece and progressively extended to the Peloponnese), spread throughout Central Greece and seems to have been common to the regions later referred to as Thessaly, Opuntian Lokris, Ozolian Lokris and Phokis.\textsuperscript{101} The Lokrians’ identity as Leleges, who had spread throughout Central Greece, might be a clue to understanding a large koine (testified to by the material evidence) which points to dynamic interactions: a period in which the Lokrians are not yet Lokrians, the Phokians not yet Phokians, and so on. What we have here is Central Greece in the making. And Strabo seems to have had a similar perception when he wrote μιγάδας. Moreover, this priority of the Lokrians still represents a belief in the 4th century, as we have seen before: in his \textit{Politics} Aristotle called “Leleges” the Lokroi of today and stated that these Leleges lived in Acarnania, in Western Lokris – and in other cities and countries.\textsuperscript{102}

According to Hekataios, who was writing at about the same time as the author of the \textit{Catalogue}, Lokros was the son of Physkos. Recent studies have pointed out that Hekataios’ \textit{Genealogies} reveal an historical attitude to the mythical past (partly as a “rationalistic” reaction to the poetic genealogical tradition),\textsuperscript{103} and that he may have employed a geographical superstructure\textsuperscript{104} expressed through ethne; Hekataios also conceptualises political meaning under particular circumstances, rather than the totality of a society’s material culture\textsuperscript{97}). I wonder if what is at stake here is a particular kind of indicium of ethnicity: an indicium that expresses ethnic boundaries by representing the cultural interaction between different, competing ethne. Both shared myth and the active employment of certain artefacts or cultural forms may become an ancestralising strategy aiming to the subscription to the division of an ancestral territory between ethne which share specific artefacts and genealogemes but, through this sharing, attempt to legitimize the occupation of a part of a territory which was originally occupied by another ethnos.

\textsuperscript{98} Two Thessalian-style bronze fibulae were found in tombs in Anavra: Dakoronia 1977: 104-5; Domínguez Monedero 2013: 406.


\textsuperscript{100} Sánchez-Moreno 2013: 332-5: sites which were later Phokian, like Kalapodi and Zeli, both belong-ed to the same koine, along with other Epiknemidian settlements.

\textsuperscript{101} See Morgan 1997: 175-9; Eder 2004; Luce 2007; 2011: 355f. The reference to the Dorians in the name of the burial custom is due to the assumption that the custom was connected to the Dorians and their alleged invasion, an assumption which does not have to be shared in order to concur with my hypothesis.

\textsuperscript{102} Furthermore, if West is right in suggesting that Lokros’ name might have been cited among the sons of Aiolos in another pseudephesiodic fragment, fr. 10a.28, we can infer that Lokros was considered to be a descendant of Protogeneia, who is the mother of Aethlios, ancestor of the Aitolians through his grandson Aitolos. Nothing definitive can be said about this alleged kinship between Lokros and Aitolos; the Aitolians may, over time, have put pressure on the Western Lokrians: in the \textit{Catalogue of the Ships} Cape Antirrhion on the northern coastal strip of the Korinthian Gulf is considered Aitolian: see \textit{il.638-44} and \textit{commentary} thereon in Funke 2015: 86. The fact that the Spartan Eurylochos’ campaign against Lokrian Naupaktos was initiated by the Aitolians may be relevant: see Thuk.3.100.1 and \textit{commentary} thereon in Funke 2015: 88. Anyway, something more can be said about the topicality of these issues (esp. of the “Aitolian issue”) in later sources.

\textsuperscript{103} Cfr. Suda, s.v. Ἑκαταίος Ἡγανάρθου Μιλήμος (and \textit{FGrHist} 1 T 2; T 3; T 21; F 2; F 4; F 5); but criticized by Herodotus (2.143). See Bertelli 2001: 94; Fowler 2001: 103; Gorman 2004: 82-5; Lloyd in Asheri-Lloyd-Cercella 2007: 231.

\textsuperscript{104} Bertelli 1998.
eponymic heroes genealogically as fathers and sons in cases of ethnic annihilation or incorporation.\(^\text{105}\)

Was this particular genealogy of Lokros developed in order to affirm the priority of the Western Lokrians, since the city Physkeis lays in their region? Or is it, in fact, a reaction to the genuine priority of the Eastern Lokrians? The cities of Western Lokris, unlike those of Eastern Lokris, are not mentioned in the Homeric *Catalogue of the Ships*.\(^\text{106}\) That said, the expression **Λοκρῶν, οἱ ναίουσι πέρην ερής Εύβοις** at ν. 535 (part of a description of the military forces of Ajax Oileus) most probably refers to the Western cities, as Strabo noted (9.4.7 426).\(^\text{107}\) Nevertheless, the very fact that they are only alluded to, and are not among the main protagonists, suggests their comparative irrelevance at the time when the Lokrian part of the Catalogue was composed, as Lerat has observed. It is, however, difficult to pinpoint this time, since the *Catalogue* is “a vestige of the past interwoven with the present” and mirrors different periods,\(^\text{108}\) mixing old elements with new ones. Material evidence thus becomes even more necessary and particularly telling.

We know that the settling of both regions occurred relatively early.\(^\text{109}\) The excavations carried out so far have revealed other, older remains in Eastern Lokris.\(^\text{110}\) We might therefore conclude that the literary evidence together with the archaeological evidence testifies to the Eastern Lokrians’ intention to stress their ethnogenetic priority and thus to attribute the vagueness of the allusion to Western Lokrians to the fact that Western Lokris was occupied later then Eastern Lokris, and that it was still insignificant at the time of the Catalogue’s composition. However, this conclusion must remain provisional, since few excavations have yet been carried out in Western Lokris.

It is, in fact, the evidence about Physkos/Physkeis that raises questions about Physkos’ role in Hekataios.\(^\text{111}\) We had assumed this city to represent all Western Lokrians in Hekataios’ genealogy, but it is not even mentioned in the famous list of cities of Western Lokris given by Thukydides (3.101); the first literary reference is in Plutarch (Qu.gr. 15), who mentions it (with Oiantheia) as a colony founded by Lokros. What is more, the first inscriptions mentioning Physkeis/Physkos date back to the first half of the 2\(^{\text{nd}}\) BC,\(^\text{112}\) and the oldest datable remains of Malandrino, the modern settlement on the site of the ancient Physkeis/Physkos,\(^\text{113}\) date back to the Classical Period. While it is true that some

---


107 See Oldfather 1926: 1185; Lerat 1952 II: 13.

108 The expression is that of Domínguez Monedero 2013: 411, referring to these very Lokrian lines. On the Lokrian lines of the *Catalogue* see Visser 1997: 397-412; Kramer-Hajós 2012. On the chronology of the *Catalogue*, see Visser 1997 (passim and 744).


110 See, e.g., Lerat 1952 II: 12ff; and, more recently, Baziotopoulou-Valavanis 1993; Van de Moortel-Zahou 2005; Kramer-Hajós 2008; Kramer-Hajós-O’Neill 2008. In Eastern Lokris investigations focused esp. on Halai and Mitrou (see e.g. [http://halai.arts.cornell.edu/wwwroot/chelp/reports/online.htm](http://halai.arts.cornell.edu/wwwroot/chelp/reports/online.htm) with literature and reports).

111 On the name of the city, see above n. 89.

112 See e.g. *Inscr. Magn.* 31; *IG* IX 1\(^2\) 3: 671; 678; *SGDI* 1842; 1851; 1854. See also Lerat 1952 II: 49 and Rousset 2006 for further inscriptions.

113 In 1885, Habbo G. Lolling discovered some fragments of several manumission decrees mentioning both the ethnic Physkos and the names of people who had come from Physkeis/Physkos (see e.g. *IG* IX 1\(^1\) 349-
fortifications are still undated, the evidence as a whole seems to point to the fact that Physkos/Physkeis becomes relevant at the end of the Classical Period. Indeed, the sanctioning formula for a decree found at Malandrino dated 360 to 357 BC (IG IX 1² 3: 665), reads [.XML]
εἴδοξε τῶι κοινῷ τῶν Λοκρῶν τῶν Ἐρ[περι]-[ων] (“It has been deliberated by the koinon of the Hesperian Lokrians”), which has led scholars to argue that Physkos/Physkeis was the capital of a West Lokrian koinon of unknown size in the 4th BC (there is no evidence for the previous period). We know from another inscription that the city also became the capital of the Lokrian federation after 167 (IG IX 1² 3: 667). Against this background, how should we interpret the role of Physkos/Physkeis in Hekataios’ stemma? The neatest solution would seem to me to be that, when the author was writing, Physkos/Physkeis was an insignificant but emerging settlement, possibly already with aspirations to power and influence.

Another relevant philological issue is then raised by ἰὼν (?). Both of Weniger’s solution as well as Klausen’s and Jacoby’s involve some form of kinship (or at least relationship) between Lokros and a puzzling figure called Ion: according to Weniger, this puzzling Ion and Lokros were half-brothers; according to Klausen and Jacoby, Ion was Lokros’ son. Given the significance and reach of the genealogy of the “proper” Ion, it is extremely difficult to imagine a second Ion: one can only speculate. With Pindar, we are

50=IG IX 1² 672): this led Dittenberger to infer that modern Malandrino lies on the site of ancient Physkeis/Physkos, and further inscriptions discovered by Cahen, Wilhelm, Oldfather and Klaffenbach confirmed this (see Lerat 1952 I: 77 and above, n. 89).


112 If one follows the hypothesis that Lokros and Ion are half-brothers, or father and son, it becomes necessary to explain Ion’s presence in Lokros’ genealogy. One option would be to value a connection with the Ionian world of Euboia, traces of which are found in the Catalogue of the Ships (where the Eastern Lokrians are referred to as those “who dwell over against sacred Euboia”). Evidence of the Submycenaean and Protogeometric period in Opuntian Lokris does not contradict such a connection (Kramer-Hajós 2008: 145; Domínguez Monedero 2013: 405); more specifically, objects found in the tombs of Anavra, close to the modern town of Kainourgio, and Tragana, demonstrate, once again, important links to Euboia (Lemos 2002: 112ff; Domínguez Monedero 2013: 408; see more generally Dakoronia 2006: 483-504). More indirectly, we can imagine that Lokros’ kinship with Ion could still be perceived as consistent in the second part of the 5th BC, at least with reference to the Western Lokrians, when Naupaktos became a strategic zone for the Athenians (see Thuk.1.103.1-3; 2.69.1; 3.7; 69; Diod.11.84.7-8; 14.34.2-6 and commentary thereon in Lerat 1952 II: 37-9; Domínguez Monedero 2006; on Ion and Athenian ethnicity, see Fowler 2013: 465 with sources and discussion); in the 4th century, when two different, unluckily obscure agreements between Athenians and Lokrians were signed (IG II² 15 and 148 =Syll. 198, and commentary thereon in Lerat 1952 II: 43 and 49 and Pascual 2013: 496); around 323-322, when the Lokrians participated alongside the Athenians in the Lamiac war (Diod.18.9.5; 11.2; Paus.1.25.4, and commentary thereon in Lerat 1952 II: 63 and Moreno Hernández-Pascual Valderrama 2013: 508); and in the 2nd AD, as a story told by Pausanias also seems to prove: coming back from Troy, the “Lokrians from Thronion” and the “Abantes from Euboia” were driven onto the Keraunian mountains, where they founded a city, which they called Thronion, in a land they called Abantis (Paus. 5.22.4; see Domínguez Monedero 2016: 197-201). Setting aside the problem of the identification of this Thronion (which is not relevant here), the story told by Pausanias is surprisingly consistent with Lokrian and Euboian voyages around the Northern Epirote coast (Milán 2013: 98-99) and with other sources referring to common enterprises between Lokrians and Euboians (e.g. the traditions of the foundation of Aiolic Kyme and Phokaia: sources and comment in Domínguez Monedero 2014). Significantly, according to Aristotle the Thracians re-colonized Euboia having set out from Abai, which is Phokian but lies in an area which has several aspects in common with the Lokrians (Arist. fr. 601 Rose, ap. Strabo 10.13 and commentary thereon on Domínguez Monedero 2014: 192). If Lokros and Ion were half-brothers, they would be of equal standing; two ethnic groups could thus stress an affinity without undermining their independent identity; at the same time, their being half, rather than full, brothers might imply a tense relationship; if Lokros were Ion’s father, we
finally faced with Opous and the Opuntians. As we saw in section 2, in the 9th Olympian ode the story is: Lokros married the daughter of Opous; together they had a child, whom they called Opous, after his grandfather. Grandson and grandfather – Opous and Opuntian Lokris, where Opous is the most important city? – are considered the past and the future of Lokros and of Lokris. The Opuntians were recognized (and recognize themselves) as an ethnos prior to the Lokrians as a whole and are represented as their present and, in a forward-looking perspective, their future.

Opous, interestingly, was thought to be from Elis. Opous is a toponymic hero coming from outside (as dynastic cultural heroes usually were). He acted as an ancestor, whereas Opous the younger acted more as a leader, as typically occurred when a group was a product of aggregation or ethnic assimilation. Here we witness an “act of mythical integration which seeks to attach the identity of one ethnic group to that of another already in possession of a more established ethnic pedigree”. Moreover, Opous the elder’s foreign blood needed to be filtered out through theogeniture: here Zeus came into play, lying with his daughter, who then gave birth to Opous the younger. His role, although important, was secondary to that of Lokros (genealogeme of the uterine descent: see above, 139).

Pindar does not stop there: Lokros gave Opous the younger, “ein undankbarer Sohn” in Wilamowitz’s words, an (unnamed) city, and a people (also unnamed), to govern. Most scholars believe that Pindar is referring to Lokros’ colonization of Western Lokris: indeed, if we trust later sources (which may go back to a fourth-century source – Plutarch and Eustathios), Lokros colonized the western side of Mount Parnassos, and there ruled the people who are called both Hesperioi and Ozolai (the apoikia-model). So, if Pindar was actually referring to the Ozolians, we can conclude that, in his time, the Opuntians were probably closer to the centre of Lokrian history than the Ozolians, who are not even mentioned, or at least not explicitly. Furthermore, this mythical emigration from east to west seems to have been intended to legitimize a real migration which is testified to by the famous Law of the Eastern [Hypoknemidian] Lokrians which regulated land distribution in their Colony at Naupaktos of c. 500-475 BC (Naupaktos had been resettled by the Eastern Lokrians). This common enterprise also provided two t.a.q for an ethnic structure (maybe even a koinon?) – one for the Eastern Lokrians and one for the Western. The fact that our first reference to the choronym “Lokris” dates back to the 5th century (see e.g. Hellanikos...
That Pindar gives priority to the Eastern Lokrians seems odd given the prominence of Physkos in Hekataios: a prominence I suggested to interpret in the light of the aspirations of a still irrelevant but emerging settlement. The apoikia-model is used not only to promote a sense of kinship but also to express priority. As mentioned above, Pindar’s lines on Lokros and Opous were probably written in reaction to a previous tradition referring to a quarrel between the two: the countermemories of the Ozolians and the Opuntians may be involved here. Examined more closely, they seem, in fact, to be conflicting origin stories, and these conflicts might have been connected with membership of the Amphiktyony and the distribution of votes within that body.122 This “amphiktyonic” factor affected Lokros’ changing genealogies more than once.

In the 4th century priority over both Lokrides was given to Amphiktyon. Amphiktyon’s kinship with Lokros is narrated, as we have seen, from an Ozolian perspective: he is the father (or ancestor) of Physkos, grandfather of Lokros and (just) the great-grandfather of Opous. The fact that the temple of Apollo in Delphi was destroyed in the first half of the 4th century, and that the Ozolians – along with the other members of the Amphiktyony – contributed to the financing of its reconstruction, may be no coincidence. They are explicitly mentioned in a list of contributors (FD III 5, 4, III ll. 46–7). One wonders if the Lokrians of Amphissa, who were defeated by Philip and turned over to Delphi, were involved: Amphiktyon’s position at the beginning of the genealogy suggests a (perceived) need to reaffirm the priority of the Amphiktyony over its members. This need may well have become more acute in the 4th century – the first mention of the Ozolian koinon dates back to this period. The addition of Amphiktyon to Lokros’ stemmata also seems to demonstrate the centripetal force of the Amphiktyony (and of Delphi), which caused local stories, that had not initially included Delphi, to incorporate these later stages.

Can Pherekydes’ stemma be reconciled with all of the above? No, of course, it cannot, and it is for precisely this reason that it is so revealing. According to Pherekydes, a mythical figure called Lokros lived in Thebes with Amphion and Zethos; maybe he even assisted
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122 On the other hand, these countermemories also point to a common sense of belonging (they are all relatives, Physkos, Lokros, Opous) found in other traditions in Lokris as well. The Lokrians’ sense of belonging to a single ethnos is also testified by the abovementioned inscription (n. 120) from ca. 500 BC: Naupaktos was resettled by the Eastern Lokrians, but the inscription clearly refers to all Lokrians, including the Ozolians; Lerat 1952 II: 19, 29 and Beck 1997. The cults of both Athena Ilias and Ajax are also connected with the construction and ongoing fostering of a pan-Lokrian sense of belonging: Dominguez Monedero 2008: 323; Daverio Rocchi 2013: 146. Indeed, the cult of Athena Ilias was centred on the shrine at Physkeis (which was the centre of the koinon: see above, n. 89). The epiklesis of Athena (i.e., Ilias) naturally refers to the shrine of Athena at Illion, to which the Lokrians were obliged to send two maidens, once a year for a thousand years, in order to atone for their ancestor Aiax the Lesser’s rape of Cassandra. Curiously, this tribute was paid by the Lokrians of Eastern Lokris, apparently mainly by the Opuntians, and, more specifically, by the family of the Hundred houses (cf. Polyb.12.5.6; 8; 11), but explicitly in the name of all the Lokrians. At the same time a tradition developed in which Aiax the Lesser was transformed from a brutal rapist into a brave warrior, the national hero of the Lokrians, particularly the Eastern Lokrians (cf. the so-called Mädchensinschrift: IG IX 1: 3.706, and commentary thereon in Wilhelm 1911 and Ragone 1996): see Daverio Rocchi 2013: 147ff. An altar was dedicated to Ajax at Opous and he is mentioned by Pindar (Ol.9.112-113, to compare with IG IX 1: 3, 706A ll. 23-24); he appears on many 4th century Lokrian coins; a festival (Aianteia), was celebrated at both Opous and Naryx (the seat of the royal house of Ajax) – all bearing witness to his status.
Amphion and Zethos, two key figures in Boiotian mythology, in their foundation of Thebes. Surprisingly, no later sources attempt to homogenize this genealogeme with the other genealogies of Lokros. This claim to Theban kinship can probably be explained in the light of geopolitical issues. The exact borders of Eastern Lokris varied over time and parts of Boiotia (and even of Phokis) were Lokrian during certain periods. Surrounded by other states – Thessaly and Phokis (for example) – who were constantly struggling for control over the passes connecting Northern and Central Greece, the Eastern Lokrians established an alliance with the Boiotian Confederacy – or, when the Confederacy did not exist, with Thebes. This alliance was strengthened through the shaping of Lokros’ genealogy.

Pherekydes’ work was highly influential, but this is not the only reason why these passages preserved by the scholia may still have made sense centuries later: the friendship between the Eastern Lokrians and the Boiotians continued to be important for centuries. In Thukydides’ description of the so-called First Peloponnesian war, he says that, after the battle of Oinophyta, the Athenians (who had won) invaded Boeotia, and took a hundred hostages from amongst the richest of the Opuntians (1.108.2–3), who were allies of the Boiotians. Some chapters later (113) Thukydides writes that, in 446, the Boiotians – together with the Euboians and the Lokrians – instigated a revolt against the Athenians. In 424, the Lokrians again fought alongside the Boiotians to defeat the Athenians in the battle of Delion (Thuk.4.96.8). In the Corinthian War, the Lokrians were again allied with the Boiotians (Xen.Hell.3.5.4; 4.3.15), and with Jason of Pherae (Plut.Pel.16.1-17.10; Mor. 412B). In the 4th century, the Lokros-Thebes connection was still alive, which explains why the source of the Lokrian lines of the Periodos ges (Aristotle? Ephoros?) would have been familiar with the sequence Amphiktyon-Itonos-Physkos-Lokros (if the emendation Itonos in v. 590 of the Periodos ges is correct). After Leuktra, the Thebans formed an alliance with the Lokrians (and the Phokians and the Aitolians: Diod.15.57) and both the Ozolians and the Eastern Lokrians cooperated with the Thebans in invading the Peloponnes (Xen.Hell.6.5.23), with the result that, in 367, Epaminondas handed Naupaktos back to the Lokrians (Diod.15.75). The Lokrians also fought alongside the Thebans at Mantinea (Diod.15.75). Therefore, it is not surprising that, when the Phokians invaded Lokris, the Lokrians asked the Boiotians for help “on the grounds of their traditional friendship” (ἀξίας ἡν ἀδύνατον ἔχει Μακρ. Ἡλ.Οξυ.21.4), which, most probably, lasted until the end of the (Third) Sacred War (Dem.19.62), at which point Daphnous might well have been returned to the
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125 Fowler 2006a.
126 See Pascual 2013: 475. One wonders if this Spartan connection could be traced back to the Spartan connections of E. Lokri: see Giangiulio 1989: 183, 211, 257.
127 See Pascual 2013: 476.
128 See Pascual 2013: 487.
129 See Buckler-Beck 2008: 99-110 and Pascual 2013: 489 both with further sources.
130 See also Ages.2.24 and Diod.15.62 with comment of Lerat 1952: II 46.
131 Cf. also Diod.16.24.4; 25.2-3; 28.3; 29.1 and commentary thereon in Pascual 2013: 492.
132 Cf. also FD III 5, 19, l. 79 and commentary thereon in Lerat 1952 II: 51.
Opuntians, and Eastern Lokris reunified under a reconstituted Confederacy.\footnote{133 Pascual 2013: 495.} The Lokrians’ friendship with Thebes continued to be important in the following decades, but from then on their alliance with the Aitolians became increasingly valued.

The Aitolians’ conquest of part of Central Greece was gradual, especially in Western Lokris.\footnote{134 Lerat 1952 II: chap. VI.} It probably began in the second half of the 4th century, when they came to dominate some Western Lokrian cities\footnote{135 Oldfather 1926: 128-9. T.a.q. for the Aitolian koinon is 367, when an Athenian inscription cites it (R&O 35, ll. 8 and 16-7): see Funke 2015: 89; previous common politics of the Aitolians should not be dismissed: Rzepka 1999.} after many decades of pressure.\footnote{136 See above, n. 134.} Is it coincidental that the source of the Lokrian archaeology in the \textit{Periodos ges} dates from the 4th century? Wilamowitz was already fascinated by the emendation Aitolos and thus by the link between the Aitolos-Lokros kinship and the Aitolians’ historical role in Central Greece. The prominence of the Aitolians in Delphi – which is entirely coherent with the stemma Amphiktyon-(A)itolos-Physkos-Lokros – is, however, undoubtedly later (after the Galatian invasion: see below). Nevertheless, if Pseudo-Skymnos’ source read Aitolos (and not Itonos), this would not have surprised him at all, given the significance of the Aitolian factor in Hellenistic Lokrides, both East and West:

From the end of the Lamian war (322) until its invasion by the Galatians (279), Eastern Lokris was of course subject to Makedonia; however, the fact that Kassander had to drive some Aitolians out of Thermopylai on the route to the Peloponnese clearly demonstrates that the Aitolians were already trying to control the pass (Diod.19.53.1).\footnote{137 See Moreno Hernández-Pascual Valderrama 2013: 509.} After the Galatian invasion, the Aitolians took control of the Amphiktyony (which implies that they also controlled Western Lokris)\footnote{138 See Lerat 1952 II: 64.} and one of the Lokrians’ two votes would have gone to the Aitolians: the former probably formed a sort of telos of the broader Aitolian confederacy.\footnote{139 See Flacelière 1937: 120; Lerat 1952 II: 66, 117; Scholten 2000: 63ff; Moreno Hernández-Pascual Valderrama 2013: 531-2; Funke 2015: 96, 115.} This would resonate strongly with the stemma Amphiktyon-(A)itolos-Physkos-Lokros in the \textit{Periodos ges}: indeed, it is plausible that the stemma was shaped to promote this incorporation. The sequence Amphiktyon-Itonos-Physkos-Lokros would also be entirely coherent with the fact that, soon after the Aitolians gained control of Delphi, Epiknemidian Lokris also fell under their control,\footnote{140 The Lokrian delegates were from the Epiknemidion poleis: cf. 	extit{CID} IV no. 27; 	extit{SGDI} 2517; 	extit{Syll.3} 419; see Scholten 2000: 242-7 and Moreno Hernández-Pascual Valderrama 2013: 518-9 citing further inscriptions.} whereas Opuntian Lokris remained in the Boiotian sphere of influence at least until 245,\footnote{141 IG IX 1\textsuperscript{3} 5: 2032 and commentary thereon in Moreno Hernández-Pascual Valderrama 2013: 516-7.} when the Aitolians defeated the Boiotians (Polyb.20.4.4-5; Plu.\textit{Arat.16});\footnote{142 Grainger 1999: 217; Scholten 2000: 259.} and, in fact, probably soon fell back under the latter’s influence.\footnote{143 Le Bohec 1993: 162ff; Moreno Hernández-Pascual Valderrama 2013: 521.} When Demetrius II came to the throne, the Aitolians were also in control of Ozolian Lokris, dominating them to such an extent that the names Lokris and
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\footnotesize

133 Pascual 2013: 495.

134 Lerat 1952 II: chap. VI.

135 Oldfather 1926: 128-9. T.a.q. for the Aitolian koinon is 367, when an Athenian inscription cites it (R&O 35, ll. 8 and 16-7): see Funke 2015: 89; previous common politics of the Aitolians should not be dismissed: Rzepka 1999.

136 See above, n. 134.

137 See Moreno Hernández-Pascual Valderrama 2013: 509.

138 See Lerat 1952 II: 64.

139 See Flacelière 1937: 120; Lerat 1952 II: 66, 117; Scholten 2000: 63ff; Moreno Hernández-Pascual Valderrama 2013: 531-2; Funke 2015: 96, 115.

140 The Lokrian delegates were from the Epiknemidion poleis: cf. 	extit{CID} IV no. 27; 	extit{SGDI} 2517; 	extit{Syll.3} 419; see Scholten 2000: 242-7 and Moreno Hernández-Pascual Valderrama 2013: 518-9 citing further inscriptions.

141 IG IX 1\textsuperscript{3} 5: 2032 and commentary thereon in Moreno Hernández-Pascual Valderrama 2013: 516-7.


143 Le Bohec 1993: 162ff; Moreno Hernández-Pascual Valderrama 2013: 521.
Lokrians actually disappeared in the sources.\(^{144}\) The Opuntians, however, were Boiotian allies for a long (comparatively unbroken) period: Polybios was almost undoubtedly referring to them when he described the anti-Roman (and thus anti-Aitolian) coalition in which the Lokrians and the Boiotians participated, together with other allies (11.5.4). Whether or not the Epiknemidians were returned to the Aitolians after the Peace of Phoenice (205) remains unclear;\(^{145}\) the Opuntians, however, probably remained in Boiotian hands (Livy 32.36.9).\(^{146}\) Flamininus’ famous Declaration of 196 awarded control of Eastern Lokris (and of Phokis) to the Aitolians.\(^{147}\) On the other hand, we know that in 189 at least a part of Western Lokris was a telos within a broader context,\(^{148}\) and that in 168 a confederacy of the Lokrians awarded gold crowns to Kassander and Alexander (son of Menestheus of Alexandria Troas), which suggests that a joint eastern Lokrian federal state existed.\(^{149}\) In Western Lokris, however, from 166/5 onwards the manumission decrees were no longer dated using the name of the Aitolian strategos.\(^{150}\) Until the end of the 2nd century BC, some cities of Western Lokris were still Aitolian.\(^{151}\) Although federal leagues were dismantled after the Achaian war of 147-6, they were then allowed to reorganize in the following decades,\(^{152}\) and the Lokrians continued to feel that they were a unique ethnos, even during the time of Augustus: when the latter organised the Amphiktyony, both “the Ozolian Lokrians, and the Lokrians opposite the time of Augustus: when they were still Aitolian,\(^{151}\) although federal leagues were dismantled after the Achaian war of 147-6, they were then allowed to reorganize in the following decades,\(^{152}\) and the Lokrians continued to feel that they were a unique ethnos, even during the time of Augustus: when the latter organised the Amphiktyony, both “the Ozolian Lokrians, and the Lokrians opposite the time of Augustus: when they were still Aitolian,\(^{151}\) although federal leagues were dismantled after the Achaian war of 147-6, they were then allowed to reorganize in the following decades,\(^{152}\) and the Lokrians continued to feel that they were a unique ethnos, even during the time of Augustus: when the latter organised the Amphiktyony, both “the Ozolian Lokrians, and the Lokrians opposite the Aitolians (11.5.4).\(^{146}\) The Opuntians’ reference to Itonos (if Marcotte is right) would express the topicality of the Lokrian-Boiotian connection during the first centuries of the empire (that connection became especially relevant again at the time of Hadrian, when the Eastern Lokrians were de facto absorbed by the Boiotians: Zachos 2013: 541 with sources).

\(^{144}\) Lerat 1952 II: 75-7.

\(^{145}\) Flacelière 1937: 308; Grainger 1999: 235.

\(^{146}\) Cf. Walbank 1967 II: 96 n. 1 and 103 n. 6.

\(^{147}\) Polyb.18.46.5; Liv.33.32.5, see Lerat 1952 II: 72; Moreno Hernández-Pascual Valderrama 2013: 526.

\(^{148}\) Cf. GDI 2139 and 1070 and commentary thereon in Lerat 1952 II: 80 (citing further evidence).

\(^{149}\) Syll. I 653 A and commentary thereon in Moreno Hernández-Pascual Valderrama 2013: 534.

\(^{150}\) See e.g. FD III 3, 54, and commentary thereon in Lerat 1952 II: 95.

\(^{151}\) Lerat 1952 II: 95-96.

\(^{152}\) Lerat 1952 II: 100 and 125 with an analysis of the inscriptions.

\(^{153}\) Furthermore, Stephanos’ reference to Itonos (if Marcotte is right) would express the topicality of the Lokrian-Boiotian connection during the first centuries of the empire (that connection became especially relevant again at the time of Hadrian, when the Eastern Lokrians were de facto absorbed by the Boiotians: Zachos 2013: 541 with sources).

play in peoples’ memories about the foundation of colonies might also have been part of stories like those possibly told by Scipio’s men, when they were faced with the violence of Quintus Pleminius (Scipio Africanus’ lieutenant in Lokri). Indeed, Quintus Pleminius plundered Lokri’s Temple of Persephone (Diod.27.4; Liv.29.8), an episode referred to during Scipio’s trial in 187 (Liv.38.51.19).

Some Concluding Remarks

At a very ancient stage, Lokros’ genealogies can be linked to (and are possibly intended to explain) the early ethnogenetic processes that occurred in central Greece during the Dark Age; they also are connected with the role of these ethnogenetic processes in the Lokrians’ exchanges with Euboea, Phokis and Thessaly (the kinship with Ion and the Leleges/Lokroi–Deukalion connection). The Lokrians, led by Lokros, are represented as a very ancient, primitive people, who interacted dynamically with other peoples, thus paving the way for those ethne considered to be Greek.

Later, (but before Pindar, if his story was a reaction to a more ancient, violent, tale) Lokros’ genealogies addressed the problem of the partition of Lokris into Eastern and Western; and that of the priority of ethnogenesis – the latter’s significance probably linked to the distribution of votes in the Amphiktyony. At this stage, Lokros’ genealogies stress the E. Lokrians’ perception of their – and their koînôn’s – priority. They also reflect the Western Lokrian intention to affirm their own priority over the Eastern, an intention which might have been a reaction to an historical event, if we assume that ethnogenesis concluded earlier in Eastern Lokris, or an expression of Physkeis’ aspiration to emerge as a power (as remarked above, the archaeological evidence in W. Lokris does not yet allow comparison with E. Lokris because Ozolian Lokris is still under-investigated).

East-West colonial enterprises, such as the refoundation of Naupaktos, are legitimized in the 5th-century discourses on Lokros (testified to by Pindar). Furthermore, from the 5th century onwards, the alliance with the Boiotians also became a recurrent theme in Lokros’ genealogies. The dancing floor of Ares became more and more significant from the Lokrians’ perspective; to the extent that Lokros was eventually even imagined to have played a part in the foundation of Thebes. If the Itonos-emendation in the Periodos ges is correct, we can assume that in the 4th century (source of the Periodos ges) the Lokrian–Theban connection was very alive and familiar and that its topicality lasted until at least the 2nd century BC.

---

155 In colonies’ memories about the foundation, Herakles’ adventures represent the contacts made between the Greeks and indigenous people, and legitimize the Greek colonies, partly through the myth of heroic relics. See also Giangiulio 2010: esp. 99-124=1983: 788-811; Malkin 1994: 184ff; Blakely 2011 with further sources and the comment of Giangiulio 1989: 71-2 and 185-6, discussing other cities which claim Herakles’ role in their foundation.

156 Representing Pleminius as a new Herakles, a civilizing hero who brought Graeco-Roman values to the peoples he conquered, might have made it easier to rationalize his violence. Scipio (who was held responsible for his legate’s crimes) and Herakles are often associated in Roman literature, see e.g. Cic.Sest. I 43; Hor. C. 4.8.15ff.; Lact. Inst. I.9 (cf. Galinsky 1966 with further sources).
The Lokrian-Theban connection may also be linked to the power of the Thebans in the Amphiktyonic council in the 4th century (in this reading, Itonos would be the son of Amphiaktyon and father of Physkos). The centripetal force exercised by Delphi influenced local origin stories and Lokros’ descent from Amphiaktyon became relevant: first, because it reflected the Thebans’ real interests (as evidenced by their contributions to the reconstruction of Apollo’s temple in Delphi); second because – from a Makedonian perspective – it legitimized Philip’s interventions in the Council during (and after) both Sacred Wars.

Against this (4th century) background, however, Aitolian pressure was steadily increasing, especially in the Ozolian region, where their presence is well documented. The Aitolos-emendation in the Lokrian archaeology of the Periodos ges (which can be traced back to a fourth-century source) could plausibly be explained by the pressure being exerted by the Aitolians – and have been shaped in an Aitolian environment. As mentioned above, Lokros’ descent from Aitolos might well have sounded very familiar to Pseudo-Skymnos, who was writing after the Aitolian’s had risen to prominence in the Amphiktyony after the Galatian invasion (in which case, Aitolos would have been the son of Amphiaktyon and father of Physkos). In the centuries that followed, the political focus shifted further west. Konon’s story about Lokros founding E. Lokri, in which there is no mention of either the Opuntians or the Ozolians, became a legitimizing story, told from a Roman perspective but drawing upon Greek themes.
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