The “Double Orpheus”: between Myth and Cult

Il “doppio Orfeo”: tra mito e culto

Tomasz Mojsik

Electronic version

URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/mythos/1674>

DOI: 10.4000/mythos.1674

ISSN: 2037-7746

Publisher

Salvatore Sciascia Editore

Electronic reference

Tomasz Mojsik, “The “Double Orpheus”: between Myth and Cult”, *Mythos* [Online], 14 | 2020, Online since 31 December 2020, connection on 05 October 2021. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/mythos/1674> ; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/mythos.1674>

This text was automatically generated on 5 October 2021.

Mythos

The “Double Orpheus”: between Myth and Cult

Il “doppio Orfeo”: tra mito e culto

Tomasz Mojsik

- 1 Orpheus, as we are told, was “the son of Oeagrus” and “a Thracian musician”. This is what we read in textbooks and encyclopedias. But what does it mean in the case of Greek myths? Was the figure of the hero borrowed from Thracian religious tradition, as some claim? Or, alternatively, was his Thracian origin a comment on the role of the Thracians in the history of Greek music, as others believe? Thus, were the Muses, one of whom was his mother, also of Thracian origin?¹ And maybe Orpheus, being Thracian, should be treated as a construct expressing the idea of the alien nature of poetry and music, a personification of “otherness not quite congruent with the daily life of the polis”?²
- 2 In his influential 1987 article F. Graf asserted that: “Orpheus is always a Thracian” (p. 86). However, a few pages later he put forward another proposal (90): “[...] if the place where a hero has his grave is really his place of origin, Orpheus is not a Thracian, but a Pierian”. The same double ethnicity of the hero was noted by J. Bremmer (1991, 16): “Now in the mythological tradition Orpheus is a Thracian, but in the historical period his real place of origin, Leibethra on the foothill of Mt Olympus, was part of Macedonia”.
- 3 Both researchers draw attention to the role of Pieria and Macedonia, even though this aspect of Orpheus’ image was earlier either ignored or treated superficially.³ Both interpretations, however, generate some reservations. For example, Graf is both right and simultaneously wrong, because the location of the mythical musician’s grave does not necessarily entail that his place of origin was identical, as the examples of Homer and Hesiod prove. Besides, the ethnic connotations of a mythic figure are a more complicated issue and does not allow an easy answer.⁴ On the other hand, Bremmer’s distinction between mythological tradition and the hero’s image in the historical period is somewhat paradoxical. The scholar goes on to explain that what he means is the distinction between naming Orpheus “a Thracian” and placing him in Pieria.

However, is locating the tomb in Pieria in historical times not connected with the image of the hero known from the mythical story?

- 4 Regardless of these doubts, the passages from Graf's and Bremmer's papers quoted above have one thing in common: they indicate Orpheus' ethnic and geographical duality. An attempt to explain this phenomenon is our point of departure for a more general consideration on cultural context that explains some aspects of Orpheus' image. Furthermore, conclusions arising from an investigation of the source material will allow us to sketch the background against which the heroic cult of Orpheus appeared in Macedonia, as well as to connect his Pierian grave with introduction or development of the cult of the Muses during the reign of King Archelaus. The politics of the "Hellenization" of Macedonia and artistic patronage supported by this ruler seem to explain well both the information about the tomb and statues of Orpheus as the first musician, and as the great-ancestor of Homer and Hesiod. Finally, in connection with Orpheus' importance for poetic tradition, we may pose a question about the role of his cult and tomb within the phenomenon of the cult of the poets, which arose in the 5th-4th century. It seems that the heroic cult of Orpheus in Macedonia could be viewed as a missing link in the explanation how this phenomenon began.

Orpheus' double ethnicity

- 5 Let us begin with the issue of the hero's "ethnicity" and an analysis of early sources. The peculiar duality which has been expressed in contemporary papers is also encountered in the ancient sources, of which the most representative examples may be found in Apollonius of Rhodes and Conon.
- 6 Firstly, Apollonius' *Argonautica* (1,24-25; 30-32 Vian = OF 951T; 1010T):
 Καλλιόπη Θρήικι φατίζεται εὐνηθεῖσα
 Οἰάγρῳ σκοπιῆς Πιμπληίδος ἄγχι τεκέσθαι. [...]
 Ὀρφέα μὲν δὴ τοῖον ἔων ἐπαρωγὸν ἀέθλων
 Αἰσονίδης Χείρωνος ἐφημοσύνησι πιθήσας
 δέξατο, Πιερίῃ Βιστωνίδι κοιρανέοντα.
 Calliope herself once bore near the peak of Pimpleia, after making love to Thracian Oeagrus. [...] Such then was Orpheus, whom Jason, in obedience to Cheiron's behests, welcomed as a helper in his trials, Orpheus, ruler of Bistonian Pieria. (transl. W. H. Race).
- 7 The passage describes the birth of Orpheus in the Pierian village Pimpleia, his setting out and his later ruling over "Bistonian Pieria". Here one must ask what precisely was a "Bistonian Pieria"? Did it signify a real place or was it a poetic fantasy? Similarly, Conon, a mythographer and paradoxographer of the Augustan era, merges Thrace and Macedonia in his description of Orpheus (Phot. *Bibl.* 186.140a-b Henry [OF 931T]):⁵
 Ἦ με' ὡς Ὀρφεὺς ὁ Οἰάγρου καὶ Καλλιόπης μιᾶς τῶν Μουσῶν, ἐβασίλευε Μακεδόνων καὶ τῆς Ὀδρυσίδος, ἐπετήδευε δὲ μουσικὴν, καὶ μάλιστα κιθαρῳδίαν. Καί (φιλόμουσον γὰρ τὸ Θρακῶν καὶ Μακεδόνων γένος) ἤρεσκεν ἐν τούτοις διαφερόντως τῷ πλήθει.
 The forty-fifth, how Orpheus the son of Oeagrus and Kalliope, one of the Muses, ruled the Macedonians and the land of the Odrysians; he practised music, especially singing to the accompaniment of the kithara. And he was in these matters especially pleasing to the multitude (for the race of the Thracians and Macedonians is fond of music). [transl. M. K. Brown]

- 8 As can be seen, both authors clearly confirm the existence of a duality in regional and ethnic references to Orpheus. The version of Apollonius seems to be a clever reference to an imagined place (Bistonian "Pieria"), whereas in Conon we find some kind of imagined mythical *koinonia* or a kingdom of Thracians/Odrysiens and Macedonians.⁶ It would be highly desirable to give an explanation for this duality and where it arose, and I shall endeavor to answer these questions in the following terms.

Thracian Pieres

- 9 One of these two regional and spatial references (Thrace – Pieria) has always been considered *primaeval* and obvious, since "Orpheus is always a Thracian". On the other hand, his connection with Pieria is still treated as problematic. The commonly accepted explanation of the presence of references to Pieria assumes that all these connotations should be considered as Thracian, since Pieria was once inhabited by the tribe of Thracian *Pieres*. As the key passage provided by the testimony of Thucydides runs (2.99 Stuart-Jones):

τὴν δὲ παρὰ θάλασσαν νῦν Μακεδονίαν Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Περδίκκου πατὴρ καὶ οἱ πρόγονοι αὐτοῦ, Τημενίδαι τὸ ἀρχαῖον ὄντες ἐξ Ἀργούς, πρῶτοι ἐκτῆσαντο καὶ ἐβασίλευσαν ἀναστήσαντες μάχῃ ἐκ μὲν Πιερίας Πίερας, οἱ ὕστερον ὑπὸ τὸ Πάγγαιον πέραν Στρυμόνος ὤκησαν Φάγρητα καὶ ἄλλα χωρία (καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν Πιερικὸς κόλπος καλεῖται ἡ ὑπὸ τῷ Παγγαίῳ πρὸς θάλασσαν γῆ), ἐκ δὲ τῆς Βοττίας καλουμένης Βοττιαίους, οἱ νῦν ὄμοροι Χαλκιδέων οἰκοῦσιν·

The country on the sea coast, now called Macedonia, was first acquired by Alexander, the father of Perdikkas, and his ancestors, originally Temenids from Argos. This was effected by the expulsion from Pieria of the Pierians, who afterwards inhabited Phagres and other places under Mount Pangaeus, beyond the Strymon indeed the country between Pangaeus and the sea is still called the Pierian gulf) of the Bottiaeans, at present neighbors of the Chalcidians, from Bottia. [transl. J. M. Dent]

- 10 This passage narrating an early phase of how the development of Macedonia took place, how the Pierians were driven out, confirms the claims about the primary Thracian origin of Orpheus. However, with such an explanation the problem was avoided rather than resolved. First, because modern researchers have uncritically trusted Thucydides' information and Hammond's influential reconstructions based on it.⁷ Second, because scholars have consigned all references connecting Orpheus with Pieria, especially those referring to his grave and cult, to the over-arching designation of being "Thracian". Therefore even those researchers who saw problems in the interpretation of the sources felt reluctant to criticize Thucydides' authority, as well as the general conception that Orpheus was "a Thracian". Thus, even when Graf demonstrates that Orpheus' "being Thracian" is rather an intellectual construct of the 5th century, he does not abandon the view that Orpheus' roots are Thracian set in Pieria, and of Orpheus' general "Thracianness".⁸
- 11 As there is no room here for a full discussion of the passage in Thucydides, I will just briefly enumerate the weak points and limitations in his testimony.⁹ First, Thucydides' information did not result from his knowledge of the area's past, but rather from a resemblance between proper names: the historian knew of the Pieres, since they lived near his estate in Thrace. Secondly, Pieria is a Greek name suggesting soil fertility (πῖαρ), and the way Pieria was perceived in the Archaic and most of the Classical period

does not indicate any connections with the Thracians.¹⁰ This was already observed by Hammond (1972, 416-418), who, trying to solve the problem, astonishingly proposed that it was the tribe of the Pieres that took their name from Pieria, not reversely. Thirdly, the Pieres never appear in the stories of Orpheus, but there are other Thracian tribes who do instead: Edonians, Bisaltians, Kikones, Bistones.¹¹ We can add, however, that it seems obvious, that the Thracians in Greek narratives, especially including those of a mythical nature, are not identical with the historical Thracians, but are an expression of "otherness", that is perceived as something different from "us".¹² Fourthly, the Macedonians proposed their own explanations of the origins of their ruling dynasty and development of their territory, including Pieria. They maintained that, for example, the mythological character Pieros was Makedonos' son, who in the genealogy of Orpheus was also Oeagrus' father.¹³ Finally, Macedonian identity (most probably, a case of "hybrid ethnicity") developed gradually and rather not before the 5th century. Therefore, an assumption that in the very beginning some clearly ethnically defined separate Macedonian nation chased away some clearly ethnically defined Thracians is an artificial construction from the end of the 5th century.¹⁴ In general, we may conclude that the *Pieres* were not the Pierians.

- 12 It seems therefore of utmost importance that one must evaluate the literary sources referring to Orpheus' regionality and ethnicity in a neutral way, and without bias. This must be followed by search for explanations that lie not in an alleged prehistory of the Macedonian lands, but both in the cultural climate of the period which created it, as in the principles of mythographic practice.¹⁵ Special attention should therefore be given to Orpheus' connections with Macedonia. To put it briefly – we must look for the context in which such a connection could arise.

Orpheus and Thrace

- 13 Before we pass on to Orpheus' connections with Pieria and Macedonia, it is worth considering the Thracian aspect of the hero's image and its potential sources. Recent studies on the history of Macedonia and Thrace repeat the idea that the cult and the figure of Orpheus are either a result of a Thracian cultural influence, or arose because originally Orpheus was a common, Graeco-Thracian god.¹⁶ Such an approach is derived mostly from erroneous assumptions about the Thracian roots of music, Muses and Orpheus. They arise from erroneous interpretation of the source evidence, including two important, yet relatively late, passages of Strabo (9.2.5; 10.3.17 [OF 1024T]).¹⁷
- 14 I would not venture to deconstruct the thesis itself, because Graf (1987) has already explained that the Thracian identity of Orpheus says more about the Greeks' perception of music than about the Thracians themselves. It is also important to note that when we hear about Thracian feasts in the 5th-4th centuries, they are a barbarian phenomenon (e.g. dances with weapons or drinking of unmixed wine), and music is performed there by hired Greek musicians and Asian instruments.¹⁸ Nothing in the early, classical literature proves any proof of the role of the Thracians in the development of music. Nothing indicates any connection with *mousikē*, i.e. culture and education.¹⁹
- 15 Thus, this image is undoubtedly a construct that results from transferring onto others certain qualities of Greek culture. It includes either fantasies referring to their origins, or alternative versions of development, etc.²⁰ The question is why the Thracians at all?

When happened and in what context? Why was Orpheus not, for example, a Pelasgian, or why did he not come simply from Asia, as the Greeks were aware of their (in this case real) musical borrowings from Asian territory?

- 16 When we survey the earliest sources, we can observe that basically all the evidence from the 5th c. (including iconographic) come from Athens, the city which, at that time, enjoyed an exceptionally rich history of contact with the Thracian region.²¹ The best evidence for Athenian influence on the mythic image of Orpheus is the earliest and most influential location of the moment of his death on Mt. Pangaion. The choice of the place for hero's death does not result from any real knowledge of the location where these (fictitious, anyway) events took place. Instead, it says a lot about the people responsible for creating the regional references and locating the grave. Pangaion, which first appears in Aeschylus' *Bassarai*, lies near Amphipolis, a very important Athenian colony upon Strymon. Otherwise, we know that silver and gold mines of Mt Pangaion were exploited already since the times of Peisistratus.
- 17 In order to prove the thesis that there was a connection between the mythic image of the hero and the political context, it is worth remembering that in Apollonius' *Argonautica* (v. 32), an epic poem written in Alexandria, Orpheus lived in Bistonia, so in the eastern part of Thrace which was then under strong influence of the Ptolemies. Why not on Mt. Pangaion or by the River Strymon? Everything indicates that was because that is where the power of the Antigonid dynasty, rivals of the Ptolemies, reached to.
- 18 Similarly, in the 5th century, as is mentioned by Thucydides (2.29), Tereus was, for example, associated with Thrace for purely political reasons. Here, the point of departure was the identification of the hero's name with the name of the Thracian king Teres, the father of Sitalkes, who was the ruler of the Odrysians, and with whom the Athenians tried at that period to maintain friendly relations.²² Another hero, who at this time also suddenly became a "Thracian" was Eumolpos.²³ Therefore, many researchers posit the process of "barbarization" of mythical heroes, a phenomenon perceivable in the iconography, especially on Attic ceramics of the 5th century. This is also true in the case of the Athenian theatre.²⁴
- 19 Summing up, the Thracian ethnicity of Orpheus has nothing to do with Thrace itself, nor with an alleged Thracian predilection to music. The roots of such a Thracian ethnic-geographic hue in the myth should be found both in the Athenian fascination with this country, as well as in the Athenian political and economic engagement in the Strymon valley.²⁵ The phenomenon is also connected with defining Orpheus' extraordinary skills through locating them at the peripheries of the civilized world, where unique and magical things could happen.²⁶ Thus, it is probable that behind the popularity of, and perhaps even behind the very appearance of the Thracian component in the image of Orpheus, lie the Athenians of the 5th century. The myth and the hero are then by no means "Thracian" in their primary form, since in the image of Orpheus these elements are of secondary importance and could be changed in a local, performative context.²⁷

Orpheus and Pieria

- 20 Even so, given that the provenance of Orpheus' connections with Thrace was Athenian, and connected with the political position of Athens in the 5th century, it is hardly

probable that the hero's connections with Pieria were part of this tradition. Athens' friendly relations with the Thracians usually implied tense relations with Macedonia, which is best to be seen in the times of Sitalkes, on the eve of the invasion of Macedonia that was of Athenian inspiration.²⁸ The Strymon valley was also an area of dramatic rivalry for influence between Athens and Macedonia. Therefore, placing the birth of Orpheus in Pieria would make no sense and contradicts known mythographic practice. This means that we should search for other explanations of Orpheus' connections with this area.

- 21 Thus, let us scrutinize the group of references, which bind Orpheus with Pieria and Macedonia. We begin with the two earliest references, of Euripides and Timotheos.

Eur. *Bacch.* 560-65 Dodds [OF 947 T]:

τάχα δ' ἐν ταῖς πολυδένδροισιν Ὀλύμπου
θαλάμαις, ἔνθα ποτ' Ὀρφεὺς κιθαρίζων
σύναγεν δένδρεα μούσαις,
σύναγεν θήρας ἀγρώστας.
μάκαρ ὦ Πιερίᾳ, ...
Perhaps in the leafy coverts
of Olympus where Orpheus, playing his lyre,
once assembled the trees by his song,
assembled the beasts of the wild.
Happy Pieria,
Euhios honors you. [transl. D. Kovacs]

Timotheos fr. 791, 221-224 Budelmann [OF 883+902T]:²⁹

πρῶτος ποικιλόμουσον Ὀρ-
φεὺς <χέλ>υν ἐτέκνωσεν
υἱὸς Καλλιόπας <β>-
<β> Πιερίᾳθεν.³⁰
Orpheus, son of Calliope, native of Pieria, was the first to beget the tortoise shell
lyre of dappled music.

- 22 As can be seen, in both cases the poets clearly point at Pieria as a place with which Orpheus is connected, and Timotheos even seems to suggest his Pierian origin. In other works of Euripides' the hero was associated with Thrace (*Hypsipyle*, fr. 759 Kannicht [OF 1007T]; *Alc.* 967 [OF 919T]), but there is no contradiction in this, since which version of myth was chosen usually depended on the performative context. And here we approach the key issue, because in the case of both poets we are dealing with the consummate artists who at the end of the 5th century found themselves at the court of the Macedonian king, Archelaos, and under his royal patronage. In addition, Euripides' *Bacchae* were even to be written in Macedonia.³¹
- 23 Thus, a simple question arises: if the emphasis on the role of Pieria in the plays of both poets, is not a result of the existence of a local, Macedonian version of the myth of Orpheus? Especially so, when we find more traces of the "Pierian tradition". It is possible, for example, to connect the traditional name of Orpheus' wife with Macedonia. Jan Bremmer (1991) already indicated this, when in his article considering why the name of Eurydice appears in the sources so late (for the first time in *Bion's Lament* [OF 986T]). The earlier tradition either misses her name or, as in *Hermesianax's* poem (fr. 3 [OF 985T]), a completely different name, Agriope, appears in its place.³² According to this researcher, the most probable explanation is that the name Eurydice indicates the Macedonian roots of this mythical version. The name only occurs in Macedonia frequently, including, or perhaps especially, the royal family.³³ However,

Bremmer drew no extensive conclusions from this fact, perhaps because he did not associate the mythographic information with cult gestures.

- 24 Even more interesting is a group of references concerning one version of the genealogy of Orpheus. Ancient and modern textbooks usually inform us that Orpheus was the son of a Muse and either Oeagrus or Apollo. His birth from a Muse, usually Calliope, and Apollo indicates his key feature – musical skills. On the other hand, his birth from Oeagrus, testified for the first time in Pindar (fr. 128c [OF 912T]), may suggest a partial connection with a savage (ἄγριος) world, of the Thracians maybe.³⁴ This is possible, but is not necessary, as the figure of Oeagrus is not connected with any mythical story; he is only Orpheus' father.
- 25 This is not, however, the complete information about the genealogy of Orpheus in the ancient sources, for we also know another, a little more extended, version, preserved in late sources but originating, without doubt, in the classical era. In the *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi* [OF 873T] it goes as follows: Apollo, Linos, Pieros and Methone, Oeagrus, Orpheus, (10 generations), Homer/Hesiod.³⁵ The version from Orpheus downwards is undoubtedly invented (or developed) by Hellanikos of Lesbos, which was confirmed, for example, by Proklos.³⁶ It is difficult to say if the earlier part of the genealogy is the invention of Hellanikos too, but there are a great number of premises suggesting its origins in the 5th-4th century.³⁷
- 26 In this form, genealogy is an effect, typical of mythographic practice, of reconciling divergent traditions. Firstly, it combines two divergent versions that refer to Orpheus' father, either Apollo or Oeagrus, changing the divergence into a chronological dependency. Secondly, it includes the genealogy of Linos, whose connections with Orpheus are obvious, as another mythical musician, but the dependency between them is presented in different ways.³⁸ Thirdly, the genealogy adds Pieros (with Methone), the eponymous hero of Pieria, between Apollo and Oeagrus, which connects Orpheus with Macedonia. Fourthly, it derives Homer and Hesiod, the classical figures who were epitomes for Greek culture and education, from Orpheus in the 11th generation (counting inclusively).
- 27 In former analyses of this genealogy, modern researchers have emphasized the connection between Orpheus and Homer and Hesiod. From our point of view, however, the most interesting information is that which makes Pieros Oeagrus' father and Orpheus' grandfather, for it makes Orpheus a true son of Pierian soil. Besides, the spatial connection of Orpheus with the area of Pieria is reinforced by adding as Pieros' wife (or sister) the figure of Metho/Methone, the eponym of the polis Methone located on the coast of Pieria.³⁹ And we can add that this mythographic detail would come from a 4th c. source because the city was captured and totally destroyed by Philip in 354 and was never rebuilt.⁴⁰
- 28 The presence of Pieros became so important in Orpheus' genealogy, that an alternative version emerged, according to which Orpheus' mother was not a Muse at all, but Pieros' daughter, or the false *Pieris* (Paus. 9.30.4), best known from the contents of Ovid (*Met.* 5.294 sqq.). This version, as well as the story of the fight of the *Thespiades* as true Muses with the false *Perides*, has its roots in a rivalry between the Heliconian and the Pierian cult places of the Muses.⁴¹
- 29 To capitulate on the argument so far, the existence of such a genealogical lineage indicates the intention of deriving Orpheus' origin from Apollo, of subordinating Oeagrus to Pieros, and firmly linking Orpheus with the territory of Macedonia and,

subsequently, demonstrating Homer and Hesiod's descent from him. The conclusion to be drawn from such a genealogy, and thus also its objective, could be only one: the true roots of Greek culture lie in the Macedonian Pieria. That is where Orpheus, a direct ancestor of Homer and Hesiod, was born. This meant, by the way, that the Macedonians did not have to prove their Hellenic origins and civilization, which became an important political issue in the 5th-4th centuries. The roots of this genealogy, or at least the part confirming the central role of Pieros, can be seen in Macedonia only and nowhere else, and its inspiration came primarily from the policy of the ruler of the country, Archelaos.⁴² The same Macedonian ruler is also responsible for the introduction, at the end of the 5th century, of the worship of the Muses in Pieria, whereas the goddesses (*Pierides*) were added to the cult of Zeus within the framework of the festival *Olympia*.⁴³ As Pingiatoglou put it (2010, 190): "We would therefore assume that with regard to the Muses the promotion of their worship was part of the propaganda launched by King Archelaos". The cult is connected in the sources with the town of Dion, but other testimonies demonstrate that of certain importance was also a village in the territory of this polis, Pimpleia.⁴⁴ Callimachus' testimony (*h.* 4.7) indicates that Pimpleia was even recognized as the birthplace of the Muses.⁴⁵ In Hellenistic literature, the goddesses are also evoked as *Leibethrides*, which is an additional link with another Pierian place name, Leibethra.⁴⁶

- 30 This information is extremely important from the point of view of studies on the figure of Orpheus, and the roots of different aspects of his mythical image. Firstly, because one of the Muses was to be his mother, and it is the most stable element of his genealogy. Secondly, all aforementioned place names are also important for the myth of Orpheus, or at least in the version which links him with Pieria. It is worth remembering that in Apollonios' *Argonautica* Orpheus was born in Pimpleia, and most of the literary sources associate his death and/or grave with Leibethra. Thirdly, the introduction of the worship of the Muses in the times of Archelaos, and the importance of this gesture as a part of the king's cultural policy, makes the hypothesis of the deliberate promotion of the Pierian, and so Macedonian, roots of Orpheus, highly probable. For it seems that it was the best moment for the emergence of both the Pierian genealogy of the hero, as well as the location of his grave in Leibethra. In particular, since Orpheus' connections with Pieria appeared suddenly in the works of two poets, Euripides and Timotheos, who were under the Macedonian king's patronage.
- 31 Finally, let us take a closer look at the sources that point most strongly to Orpheus' Macedonian links: the testimonies referring to his death, grave and heroic worship. First, we have early attestations to the existence of a real, or fictitious, gravestone epigram of Orpheus. The earliest source may be Alcidamas' *Ulixes* (24 Avezzu [OF 1073T]), as far as the work is genuine. However, similar versions may be also found in Pseudo-Aristotle's *Peplos*, in Diogenes Laertios' *Lives*, and in two epigrams.⁴⁷
- 32 Second, at least two testimonies from the 4th century connect Orpheus' death with Pieria and Leibethra. Menaechmus of Sicyon (FGrHist 131 F2), an author writing in the 2nd half of the 4th century, quotes an oracle: "Pierians who suffer dire ills, you will pay back your hateful crime, since you have killed Orpheus, Apollo's own son". And the second one, a proverb, which presents the Leibethrians as uniquely coarse and unmusical (ἀμουσότεροι Λειβηθρίων), for it is among them where Orpheus allegedly died (παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐγένετο ὁ τοῦ Ὀρφέως θάνατος).⁴⁸

- 33 Third, the best known testimony linking Orpheus' death with Pieria and Leibethra is the description of the placing Orpheus' lyre in the sky, which can be found in Eratosthenes' *Catasterismoi*.⁴⁹ In the final part, describing Orpheus' death at the hands of maenads, the author refers to Aeschylus (TGrF 3 fr. 23-25). Then he explains that the body of the musician torn to pieces on Mt Pangaion was collected by the Muses, who brought it to Leibethra and buried it there. The problem with this testimony is that, for many reasons, the mention of Leibethra does not seem to come from the plot of the Aeschylus' tragedy.⁵⁰ This, however, does not change the fact that in the version dating to the 3rd century (Eratosthenes), as in many other sources, Orpheus' death was connected with Leibethra located in the south of Pieria. All those testimonies show the existence of a separate and elaborate Macedonian mythical tradition locating Orpheus' birth in Pimpleia and death in Leibethra, both toponyms from the territory of Pieria.
- 34 The whole picture is completed with information indicating the presence of Orpheus' grave, statues and cult in Pieria. The sources discussed earlier allow us to place them in their proper perspective. We hear about his grave in Leibethra from Pausanias and Conon, the statues are discussed by Arrian, Plutarch and Ps.-Callisthenes.⁵¹ The presence of not only the grave but also the worship, heroon, and then a temple of Orpheus, is clearly suggested by Conon (45 = Phot. *Bibl.* 186.140a-b Henry [OF 1080T]):
- Λαβόντες οὖν ὑπὸ σήματι μεγάλῳ θάπτουσι, τέμενος αὐτῷ περιείρξαντες, ὃ τέως μὲν ἡρώον ἦν, ὕστερον δ' ἐξενίκησεν ἱερὸν εἶναι· θυσίαις τε γὰρ καὶ ὅσοις ἄλλοις θεοὶ τιμῶνται γεραίρεται·
So they took it and buried it under a large mound, and enclosed it with a sacred precinct that for a time was a hero-shrine but later came into vogue as a temple.
For it is honoured with sacrifices and all other things with which gods are honoured; [transl. L. Trzcionkowski]
- 35 Orpheus' worship is also suggested in the testimony of Ps.-Callisthenes, who writes about a temple (ναός) and a statue surrounded by representations of wild animals and statues of the Muses (*Hist. Alex. Magn.* 1.42 Kroll [OF 1084T]):
- ναὸς καὶ ἄγαλμα τοῦ Ὀρφέως καὶ αἱ Πιερίδες Μοῦσαι καὶ τὰ θηρία αὐτῷ παρεστῶτα.
there was a temple and a statue of Orpheus and standing near him the Pierian Muses and the wild beasts.
- 36 Furthermore, taking into consideration the fact that the testimonies of Plutarch, Arrian and Ps.-Callisthenes refer to the times of Alexander the Great, it is more than probable, that the phenomena being discussed are earlier and come from the 5th century. Thus, it does not seem that we are dealing with a hybrid "Thracian Pieria", as some researchers want,⁵² an effect of the Thracian alleged presence in distant Pieria, at some time in the distant past (see Th. 2.99), but rather with a phenomenon, which had its beginning in Macedonia in historical times, and responded to certain social and political needs of the Macedonians. In a sense, this phenomenon is parallel to the "Thracian Orpheus" of the Athenians.
- 37 Thus, the sources allow us to assume that there were two separate, regional mythical traditions. One of them was strictly connected with the grave and the worship of Orpheus; it came into existence as part of an extensive programme connected with the Hellenization of Macedonia and the simultaneous demonstration of its immanent and original "Greekness". The other, Athenian tradition put more emphasis on Orpheus' Thracian roots and connections. Obviously both traditions existed alongside one another in the later sources, especially the literary ones, and are frequently combined

and intermesh with each other. An effect of one such combination, but also most probably an expression of the awareness of the existence of two separate traditions, is Apollonios' imaginary "Bistonian Pieria".⁵³

Conclusions

- 38 To sum up, the information about the statues, the grave and the worship of Orpheus clearly prove the compatibility of the topography of his cult with mythical geography (Leibethra). It is worth adding that the mythical topography allows for broader connections with Pieria (Pimpleia, Bephyra, the River Helicon).⁵⁴ Besides, most of the aspects of the image of Orpheus examined here are known from the end of the 5th century onwards, which allows us to link this phenomenon with the policies and propaganda of Archelaos. A good example of this aspect of political activity is Euripides' lost tragedy *Archelaos*, written on behalf of the Macedonian ruler. The drama showed the connection of the Argeads with Argos, and their descent from Heracles.⁵⁵ As a propaganda instrument, it could have more than one aim: it served to reaffirm the Hellenic aspirations of Archelaos and the house of the Argeads; it was addressed to the local Macedonian audience in order to legitimize the power of the king, as well as to establish bonds between the king and the Macedonian elite; in sum create Macedonian cultural identity.
- 39 Likewise, the *Olympia*, a festival celebrated in Dion at the foot of Mt Olympus, the seat of gods and Zeus himself, and reorganized by Archelaos in the late 5th c., served to demonstrate the original Hellenic nature of the Macedonians. As Frances Pownall (2017, n. 54) observes "[...] Archelaus' real goal was not simply to be accepted as Greek, but to be viewed as their cultural superior, and a "better" Olympics would therefore serve his purposes exceptionally well".
- 40 It seems, then, that both the worship of the Muses (the true "Pierides", in other words those coming from Pieria), introduced at the *Olympia*-festival and linked with the Pierian city of Dion, as well as the Pierian myth and cult of Orpheus, a Muse's son, served precisely the same cultural and political ends. For the ruler wanted to demonstrate that Macedonia needs not to be "hellenized" since, as the birthplace of the Muses and Orpheus, it is actually is the cradle of Greek culture (that is *mousikē* in the meaning that appears in the second half of the 5th century).⁵⁶ In this way, Archelaos not so much rejected the charge of the Macedonians' barbarity, which recurred in political disputes in the 5th and 4th centuries, as made it ridiculous and groundless.⁵⁷
- 41 Returning to the question posed in the beginning, we may state that Orpheus' connection with Leibethra and Pieria does not result from any primary Thracian roots of Pieria, but from the myth-creating and worshipping activity of the Macedonians themselves. Finally, it is worth observing that the information about Orpheus' worship in Macedonia in the late 5th century is in line with our knowledge of the development of the phenomenon of heroization of "outstanding individuals" in the 5th-4th centuries, in particular of poets, musicians, philosophers. Therefore, we can pose the question if the worship of Orpheus (with the cult of the Muses behind it) in Pieria may be a missing link in the explanation of the origins of the cult of poets? Or should we rather perceive it as a side effect? After all, Orpheus is a mythical hero, and not a real poet or philosopher; as marginal from a cultural point of view, as Macedonia was itself in the 5th-4th centuries.⁵⁸

- 42 On the other hand, if we assume that the phenomenon originated in the times of Archelaos, thus before Euripides' death, one may ask did it affect later gestures towards poets (statues and other forms of commemoration), including the Athenian playwright? Thus, to put it differently: could Orpheus and his cult be the first case that reveals the importance and appreciation of intellectual qualities in the social life of the ancient Greeks? This question also seems justified and important because of the popularity of the genealogy constructed in the 5th century, according to which Orpheus was the ancestor of the ancient "cultural saints": Homer and Hesiod.⁵⁹

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BARALIS 2015: A. Baralis, «Le banquet en Thrace», in A. Esposito (ed.), *Autour du « banquet ». Modèles de consommation et usages sociaux*, Dijon 2015, 253-273.
- BASSINO 2019: P. Bassino, *The Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*, Leiden 2019.
- BORGEAUD 1991: Ph. Borgeaud (ed.), *Orphisme et Orphée : en l'honneur de Jean Rudhardt*, Genève 1991.
- BERNABÉ 2002: A. Bernabé, «Orfeo. De personaje del mito a autor literario», *Itaca* 18 (2002), 61-78.
- BERNABÉ 2017: A. Bernabé, «Orpheus in Apollodorus», in J. Pamiás (ed.), *Apollodoriana*, Berlin 2017, 113-125.
- BREMMER 1987: J. Bremmer (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, London 1987.
- BREMMER 1991: J. Bremmer, «Orpheus. From Guru to Gay», in BORGEAUD 1991, 13-30.
- BUDELMANN 2018: F. Budelmann, *Greek Lyric: A Selection*, Cambridge 2018.
- BURGES WATSON 2013: S. Burges Watson, «Muses of Lesbos or (Aeschylean) Muses of Pieria? Orpheus' Head on a Fifth-century Hydria», *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 53 (2013), 441-460.
- BURGES WATSON 2015: S. Burges Watson, «Mousikê and Mysteries: A Nietzschean Reading of Aeschylus' Bassarides», *Classical Quarterly* 65, 2 (2015), 455-475.
- DI MARCO 1993: M. di Marco, «Dioniso ed Orfeo nelle Bassaridi di Eschilo», in MASARACCHIA 1993, 101-153.
- DOVIĆ, HELGASON 2016: M. Dović, J. K. Helgason, *National Poets, Cultural Saints: Canonization and Commemorative Cults of Writers in Europe*, Leiden 2016.
- DOWDEN 1992: K. Dowden, *The Uses of Greek Mythology*, London-New York 1992.
- ENGELS 2010: J. Engels, «Macedonians and Greeks», in ROISMAN, WORTHINGTON 2010, 81-98.
- FOWLER 1999: R.L. Fowler, «Genealogical thinking, Hesiod's Catalogue, and the creation of the Hellenes», *PCPS* 44 (1999), 1-19.
- FOWLER 2013: R. L. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythographers*, vol. II: *Commentary*, Oxford 2013.
- GARTZIOU-TATTI 1999: A. Gartziou-Tatti, «Death of Orpheus», *Ancient Macedonia* 6 (1999), 439-451.

- GOLDSCHMIDT, GRAZIOSI 2018: S. Goldschmidt, B. Graziosi (eds), *Tombs of the Ancient Poets*, Oxford 2018.
- GOSTOLI 1990: A. Gostoli, *Terpander*, Roma 1990.
- GRAF 1987: F. Graf, «Orpheus. A Poet among Men», in BREMMER 1987, 80-106.
- GRANINGER 2010: D. Graninger, «Macedonia and Thessaly», in ROISMAN, WORTHINGTON 2010, 306-325.
- GRAZIOSI 2018: B. Graziosi 2018, «Still Singing: The Case of Orpheus», in GOLDSCHMIDT, GRAZIOSI 2018, 171-196.
- GUTHRIE 1952: W. K. C. Guthrie, *Orpheus and Greek Religion*, Princeton 1952.
- HALL 1989: E. Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian*, Oxford 1989.
- HALL 2002: J. M. Hall, *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*, Chicago 2002.
- HAMMOND 1972: N. G. L. Hammond, *A History of Macedonia*, vol. 1: *Historical Geography and Prehistory*, Oxford 1972.
- HAMMOND, GRIFFITH 1979: N. G. L. Hammond, G. T. Griffith, *A History of Macedonia*, vol. 2, Oxford 1979.
- HAMMOND 1995: N. G. L. Hammond, «Connotations of 'Macedonia' and of 'Macedones' Until 323 B. C.», *Classical Quarterly* 45, 1 (1995), 120-128.
- HANNINK 2018: J. Hannink, «Pausanias' Dead Poets Society», in GOLDSCHMIDT, GRAZIOSI 2018, 235-252.
- HARDER 1985: A. Harder, *Euripides' Kresphontes and Archelaos. Introduction, Text and Commentary*, Leiden 1985.
- HATZOPOULOS, PASCHIDIS 2004: M. B. Hatzopoulos, P. Paschidis, «Makedonia», in H. Hansen (ed.), *Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford 2004, 794-809.
- HECHT 2017: C. Hecht, *Zwischen Athen und Alexandria. Dichter und Künstler beim makedonischen König Archelaos*, Wiesbaden 2017.
- HENRICHS 1987: A. Henrichs, «Three Approaches to Greek Mythography», in BREMMER 1987, 242-277.
- HORDERN 2002: J. H. Hordern, *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus*, Oxford 2002.
- KLOOSTER 2011: J. Klooster, *Poetry as Window and Mirror*, Leiden 2011.
- LARSON 2001: J. Larson, *Greek Nymphs*, Cambridge 2001.
- LEVEN 2014: P. LeVen, *The Many-Headed Muse. Tradition and Innovation in Late Classical Greek Lyric Poetry*, Cambridge 2014.
- LINFORTH 1941: I. M. Linforth, *The Arts of Orpheus*, Berkeley, LA 1941.
- LISSARRAGUE 1994: F. Lissarrague, «Orphée mis à mort», *Musica e storia* 2 (1994), 269-307.
- LISSARRAGUE 2002: F. Lissarrague, «The Athenian Image of the Foreigners», in Th. Harrison (ed.), *Greeks and Barbarians*, New York 2002, 101-124.
- MARI 1998: M. Mari, «Le Olimpie macedoni di Dion tra Archelao e l'età romana», *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 126, 2 (1998), 137-159.
- MARI 2002: M. Mari, *Al di là dell'Olimpo*, Paris 2002.
- MARI 2012: M. Mari, «Amphipolis between Athens and Sparta. A Philological and Historical Commentary on Thuc. V 11, 1», *Mediterraneo Antico* 15, 1-2 (2012), 327-353.

- MASARACCHIA 1993: A. Masaracchia (ed.), *Orfeo e l'Orfismo*, Roma 1993.
- MOJSIK 2011: T. Mojsik, *Antropologia metapoetyki: Muzy w kulturze greckiej od Homera do końca V w. p.n.e.* [*Anthropology of Metapoetics: The Muses in Greek Culture from Homer to the End of the Fifth Century BC*], Warszawa 2011.
- MOJSIK 2018: T. Mojsik, «Alexandria as Pi(m)pleian Thebes? A Commentary on Posidippus 118 A.–B. (P. Berol. 14283)», *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 205 (2018), 68–76.
- MOJSIK 2019: T. Mojsik, *Orfeusz między Tracją a Pierią: mit, kult i tożsamość macedońska* Białystok 2019.
- MOJSIK 2019a: T. Mojsik 2019a, «From Hesiod's Tripod to Thespian Mouseia: Archaeological Evidence and Cultural Contexts», *Klio* 101, 2 (2019), 405–426.
- MOLONEY 2014: E. Moloney, «Philippus in acie tutior quam in theatro fuit... (Curtius 9, 6, 25): The Macedonian Kings and Greek Theatre», in E. Csapo et al. (eds), *Greek theatre in the fourth century B.C.*, Berlin 2014, 231–248.
- MUNDT-ESPIN 2003: Ch. Mundt-Espin (ed.), *Blick auf Orpheus*, Tübingen 2003.
- MURRAY, WILSON 2004: P. Murray, P. Wilson (eds), *Music and the Muses. The Culture of Mousike in the Classical Athenian City*, Oxford 2004.
- MÜLLER 2016: S. Müller, *Die Argeaden: Geschichte Makedoniens bis zum Zeitalter Alexanders des Großen*, Paderborn 2016.
- OF: *Orphicorum Fragmenta: Poetae epici Graeci. Testimonia et fragmenta*, vol. 2, 1–3, red. A. Bernabé, Leiden 2004–2007.
- PINGIATOGLU 2010: S. Pingiatoglou, «Cults of Female Deities at Dion», *Kernos* 23 (2010), 179–192.
- REVERMANN 1999/2000: M. Revermann, «Euripides, tragedy and Macedon: some conditions of reception», *Illinois Classical Studies* 24/25 (1999/2000), 451–467.
- RICHARDSON 1981: N. J. Richardson, «The Contest of Homer and Hesiod and Alcidamas' Mouseion», *Classical Quarterly* 31, 1 (1981), 1–10.
- ROBINSON 2012: B. Robinson, «Mount Helikon and the Valley of the Muses: the production of a sacred space», *American Journal of Archaeology* 25 (2012), 227–259.
- ROISMAN, WORTHINGTON 2010: J. Roisman, I. Worthington (eds), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia*, London 2010.
- SANTAMARÍA ÁLVAREZ 2008: M. A. Santamaria Álvarez, «La muerte de Orfeo y la cabeza profética», in A. Bernabé, F. Casadeus (eds) *Orfeo y la tradición órfica*, Madrid 2008, 105–136.
- SCHACHTER 1986: A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia*, vol. II, London 1986.
- SEARS 2013: M. A. Sears, *Athens, Thrace, and the Shaping of Athenian Leadership*, Cambridge 2013.
- SEGAL 1989: Ch. Segal, *Orpheus: The Myth of the Poet*, Baltimore 1989.
- SPRAWSKI 2010: S. Sprawski, «Early Temenid Kings to Alexander I», in ROISMAN, WORTHINGTON 2010, 127–144.
- TRZCIONKOWSKI 2015: L. Trzcionkowski, «Prophetic Voice of Orpheus», in K. Bielawski (ed.), *Mantic Perspectives*, Kraków 2015, 143–168.

- TSIAFAKI 2002: D. Tsiafaki, «Thracian Influence in Athenian Imagery of 5th Century: The case of Orpheus», in *Thrace and the Aegean: Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Thracology*, Sofia 2002, 727-738.
- TSIAFAKI 2000: D. Tsiafaki, «The Allure and Repulsion of Thracians in the Art of Classical Athens», in B. Cohen (ed.), *Not the Classical Ideal: Athens and the Construction of the Other in Greek Art*, Leiden 2000, 364-389.
- TSIAFAKI 2016: D. Tsiafaki, «Ancient Thrace and the Thracians through Athenian Eyes», *Thracia* 21 (2016), 261-282.
- VIEILLEFON 2003: L. Vieillefon, *La figure d'Orphée dans l'Antiquité tardive*, Paris 2003.
- VLASSOPOULOS 2013: K. Vlassopoulos, *Greeks and Barbarians*, Cambridge 2013.
- WARDEN 1982: J. Warden (ed.), *Orpheus. Metamorphosis of a Myth*, Toronto 1982.
- WEST 1983: M. L. West, *The Orphic Poems*, Oxford 1983.
- WEST 1990: M. L. West, *Studies in Aeschylus*, Stuttgart 1990.
- ZENCK 2004: C. M. Zenk (ed.), *Der Orpheus-Mythos von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, Frankfurt am Main, Oxford 2004.

NOTES

1. See GRAF 1987, 99: "even the Muses come from Thracian Pieria"; LARSON 2001, 139.
2. GRAF 1987, 100.
3. The secondary literature on Orpheus is vast. Among the most important studies are: LINFORTH 1941; GUTHRIE 1952; WARDEN 1982; WEST 1986; SEGAL 1989; BORGEAUD 1991; MASARACCHIA 1993; BERNABÉ 2002; MUNDT-ESPIN 2003; VIEILLEFON 2003; ZENCK 2004; GRAZIOSI 2018; about Orpheus' death see GARTZIOU-TATTI 1999; SANTAMARÍA ÁLVAREZ 2008. Below I call attention to selected problems (spatial references, ethnicity, genealogy, statues, tomb), where the papers by Graf and Bremmer are fundamental. A more detailed investigation of these testimonies, together with the *status quaestionis*, is to be found in a monograph on Orpheus (MOJSIK 2019); the English version of which is planned to be published in 2021.
4. See e.g. HALL 1989; HALL 2002; VLASSOPOULOS 2013, 161-178.
5. See also Hyg. Astr. 2.7 (OF 1034T), where the author locates Olympus on the border between Macedon and Thrace and Bremmer's note on this passage (1991, 16): "attempt at harmonizing myth and history".
6. GRAF 1987, n. 28 (about Conon's "warriors of Macedonia and Thrace"): "Obviously a compromise between the mythical tradition and Conon's historical and geographical knowledge".
7. See HAMMOND 1972, 416-18.
8. As GRAF observes (1987, 101): "his fame as a poet made him – or kept him, if he really was a hero or god of the Pierian Thracians – a Thracian".
9. See MOJSIK 2019, 77-86.
10. See *h. hom.* 4. 71.
11. See MOJSIK 2019, 49-61.
12. On perception of the Thracians and sentiments extending from nostalgia for heroic days of Homer to savagery and barbarity – see HALL 1989; SEARS 2013.
13. See Marsyas 135-136 F13 FGrH.

14. As HAMMOND (1972, 417) claims, the Thracians were for the Greeks rather a geographical construct.
15. In the same paper GRAF (1987, 100) writes: "When a figure in Greek mythology is given a foreign origin, this does not necessarily mean that he was, at a certain point of Greek history or rather pre-history, introduced from outside into the system of Greek mythology". About "applied mythography" and proper analysis of the mythographical material, see HENRICHS 1989.
16. See e.g. ENGELS 2010, 97: "Macedonians shared popular cults with the neighbouring Thracians, especially those of Bendis, Orpheus, and the Thracian Rider"; MÜLLER 2016, 20: "So werden starke thrakische kulturelle Einflüsse, gerade hinsichtlich des Kults für Dionysos und den Heroen Orpheus angenommen".
17. Strab. 9.2.5: "Now Helicon, not far distant from Parnassus, rivals it both in height and in circuit; for both are rocky and covered with snow, and their circuit comprises no large extent of territory. Here are the temple of the Muses and Hippocrene and the cave of the nymphs called the Leibethrides; and from this fact one might infer that those who consecrated Helicon to the Muses were Thracians, the same who dedicated Pieris and Leibethrum and Pimpleia to the same goddesses. The Thracians used to be called Pieres, but, now that they have disappeared, the Macedonians hold these places. It has been said that Thracians once settled in this part of Boeotia, having overpowered the Boeotians, as did also Pelasgians and other barbarians." Strab. 10.3.17: "From its melody and rhythm and instruments, all Thracian music has been considered to be Asiatic. And this is clear, first, from the places where the Muses have been worshipped, for Pieria and Olympus and Pimpla and Leibethrum were in ancient times Thracian places and mountains, though they are now held by the Macedonians; and again, Helicon was consecrated to the Muses by the Thracians who settled in Boeotia, the same who consecrated the cave of the nymphs called Leibethrides. And again, those who devoted their attention to the music of early times are called Thracians, I mean Orpheus, Musaeus, and Thamyras; and Eumolpus, too, got his name from there". [transl. H. L. Jones]. Evaluation of the passages: SCHACHTER 1986, 188: "We see that what was a guess in Book 9 became a certainty in Book 10. Both are valueless"; MOJSIK 2011, 125-133; 2019, 63-89.
18. See Xen. *Anab.* 7.3; Athen. 4.130b-c; 4.151; Eur. *Hyps.* fr. 27 [OF 1007T] – Asian kithara of Thracian Orpheus? See BARALIS 2015. About the so called "Thracian kithara" in iconography see TSIAFAKI 2016.
19. In 4th c. the Attidographer Androtion (FGrHist 324 F54 [OF 1028T]) pointed at the barbarity of the Thracians and the inadequacy of Orpheus' image as a sage.
20. See HALL 2002, 146: "ethnicity can be used to express real truths in terms of the Greeks' conceptualization of different abstractions, without being literally true".
21. On the iconography see LISSARRAGUE 1994; 2002; TSIAFAKI 2002. On the Athenian fascination with Thrace see Ar. F 156 K-A (Athenians as *Thraikophoitai*); DOWDEN 1992, 60-61; SEARS 2013, 3.
22. GRANINGER 2010, 29.
23. See HALL 1989, 105-106; DOWDEN 1992, 60-61; FOWLER 2013, 464-465.
24. See HALL 1989.
25. About Thracian aspects of the image of mythical musicians as (Athenian) cultural construction see HALL 1998, 101-159; TSIAFAKIS 2016, 272.
26. Other arguments about "Thracian" as a construct see GRAF 1987, 99-101; VLASSOPOULOS 2013, 161-225.
27. See the information about Orpheus' death in Aornon in Thesprotia (Paus. 9.30.6); on "appropriating mythical poets" see KLOOSTER 2011, 75 sqq.; MOJSIK 2019, 162-172.
28. See Th. 2,99-101.
29. HORDERN (2002) accepts Hutchinson's supplement <τέχνη> (sc. ποικιλόμουσον) in v. 222 and such a version is proposed also by Bernabé in OF 883T. I leave Wilamowitz' emendation that was

accepted by LEVEN (2014, 97) and BUDELMANN 2018. Let us note, however, that the choice of either version has no consequences for our interpretation. For general editorial problems with the reconstruction of Timotheus’ text see HORDERN (2002, 241-242); BUDELMANN 2018 (ad loc.).

30. Πιερίαθεν is Page’s emendation, papyrus contains the version: περιάσενι (in *Pieria*).

31. See REVERMANN 1999/2000; HECHT 2017.

32. See M. Cuypers (<http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2000/2000-04-22.html>): “transmitted Ἀγριόπην produces a not unhermesianactic jingle after Οἰάγροιο and seems to combine the names of Orpheus’ father (Oi-**agr**-os) and mother (Call-**iope**)”.

33. BREMMER 1991, 13-17; see BERNABÉ 2017, 118.

34. About Oeagrus see Pi. fr. 128c [OF 912T] and Asclepiades ap. schol. Eur. *Rhes.* 895 [OF 896; 912T]; Diod. 3.65.6 [OF 893T]: “Oeagrus as a son of the Thracian king Charops”; Serv. in *Georg.* 4, 523 (III 358, 14 Thilo-Hagen) [OF 894T]: *Oeagrius Hebrus: Oeagrus fluvius est, pater Orphei, de quo Hebrus nascitur, unde eum appellavit Oeagrium*. However, it is worth emphasizing that most of the testimonies are late, and what exceeds the hero’s name may be described as the ‘bricolage’ effect. Some of the themes are borrowings and assimilations. Oeagrus, like Strymon, gives conception to the hero in the relationship with the Muse (Orpheus – Rhesus). Some elements in these stories, however, arose from Orphic concepts, as in the case of the tale about Charops’s son, to whom rule over Thrace was given by Dionysus, the deity associated with this region in Greek culture (see OF 893-894 T). The image of Oeagrus is neither particularly Thracian nor original from the point of view of mythical tradition.

35. About the *Certamen* and its classical roots see RICHARDSON 1981; BASSINO 2019. Similar genealogy: Charax BNJ 103 F62 [OF 872T].

36. Procl. *Vita Homeri* 5.4 [OF 871T]: „Hellanicus, Damastes, and Pherecydes trace his lineage back to Orpheus. They say that Homer’s father Maion and Hesiod’s father Dios were the sons of Apellis, son of Melanopus, son of Epiphraides, son of Chariphemus, son of Philoterpes, son of Idmonides, son of Eucles, son of Dorion, son of Orpheus. And Gorgias of Leontini takes him back to Musaeus”. See FOWLER 2013, 609.

37. It is indicated, inter alia, by the role of Pieros and Methone in this genealogy.

38. See Pind. fr. 128c; Asclepiades BNJ 12 F6; Apd. 1,14 [OF 901T] (brothers); *Certamen* 4; Suda, s.v. Ὀμηρος (grand grandfather); teacher or pupil see Suda s.v. Ὀρφεύς.

39. See Plut. *QG* 11; *EM* 671, 37; Melisseus BNJ 402 F1: “And Pieria originally founded by Pieros, the brother of Methone and the father of Linos, had been called Pieria and later was called Lynkos.”; Tzetz. *Chil.* 6, 931ff.; proverb about Leibethrians: Zenobius Athous prov. (coll. Miller 3,1: *Mel.* p. 369).

40. See Diod. 16.31.6.

41. This may be suggested by the information about three Muses on Mt Helicon (Paus. 9.29.2; story about 3x3 statues of the goddesses see Aug. *De doct. christ.* 2.68-70) as competition for nine Pierides, as well as the differences in their names (Heliconian names: Mneme, Melete, Aoide); aetiological myths (Paus. 9.29.1: Aloadai vs Pieros: Paus. 9,29,3 – see HARDIE 2006); confusion of toponyms (Libethra/Leibethra [Strab. 9.2.25] and Helicon as a river in Pieria [Paus. 9,30,8]); stories about rivalry between Helikoniades/Thespiades and Pierides or between the true and false Muses (Ov. *Met.* 5.310 sqq.); investment in “Beotian” mythical musician Linos in opposition to Pierian Orpheus (Paus. 9.29.6) – see ROBINSON 2012. The rivalry is probably connected with the foundation of sanctuaries dedicated to the goddesses in both regions in the same period (see MOJSIK 2019a) and with the meaning of the epithets *Helikoniades* and *Pierides* in Greek culture.

42. We find a great number of arguments for early dating the genealogy, also indicating Pieros’ growing importance as an eponym of Pieria: see Marsyas FGrHist 135-136 F13.

43. See Dion Chr. 2.2; Diod. 16.55; 17.16.3-4; Arr. *Anab.* 1.11.1; Dem. 19.192 and scholia ad locum. See MARI 1998; 2002.

44. About Pimpleia see Strabo 7 fr. 17-18 and PAPAIOGLOU 1988, 112; HATZOPOULOS, PASCHIDIS 2004, 797; MOJSIK 2018; 2019, *passim*.
45. Call. h. 4,7: ὡς Μοῦσαι τὸν αἰοῖδον ὃ μὴ Πίμπλειαν ἀείσῃ / ἔχθουσιν, τῶς Φοῖβος ὅτις Δῆλοιό λάθῃται; see Epich. fr. 39 PCG; Lyc. *Alex.* 274-275.
46. See Euphorion 416.2 SH; fr. 988; 993 SH; Varro *LL* 7.20: *ita enim ab terrestribus locis aliis cognominatae Libethrides, Pipleides, <T>hespiades, <H>eliconides*. See also *Argonautic Orphica* 1373 sqq.; Verg. *Ecl.* 7.21 and schol. Bern. ad Verg. *eclog.* 7.21; Tzetz. *Chil.* 6.945.
47. See DL 1.5 [OF 1073T]; Damagetos *AP* 7.9 [OF 1071T]; Lobon SH 508 = *AP* 7.617 [OF 1046, 1073T]; Aristot. fr. 640.48 Rose [OF 1073T].
48. Zenobius *Athous* 3.1 [OF 1069T]: ἄμουσότερος Λειβηθρίων: Λειβήθριοι ἔθνος ἐστὶ Πιερίκον, οὗ καὶ Ἀριστοτέλης μέμνηται ἐν τῇ Μεθωναίων πολιτείᾳ (fr. 552 Rose). λέγονται δὲ ἄμουσότατοι εἶναι οἱ Λειβήθριοι, ἐπειδὴ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐγένετο ὁ τοῦ Ὀρφέως θάνατος. Judging from Aristotle's reference to the constitution of Methone (fr. 552 Rose) located in text, proverb should come from the 4th century.
49. Ps.-Eratosth, *Catast.* 24 Pàmias [OF 1074T]: ὅθεν ὁ Διόνυσος ὀργισθεὶς αὐτῷ ἔπεμψε τὰς Βασσαρίδας, ὡς φησιν Αἰσχύλος ὁ τῶν τραγωδιῶν ποιητῆς αἱ διέσπασαν αὐτὸν καὶ τὰ μέλη ἔρριψαν χωρὶς ἕκαστον· αἱ δὲ Μοῦσαι συναγαγοῦσαι ἔθαψαν ἐπὶ τοῖς καλουμένοις Λειβήθροις – “Dionysus was angry at this and sent against him the Bassirids, as the tragic poet Aeschylus says, who tore him in pieces and scattered them together and buried him at the place called Leibethra” [transl. L. Trzcionkowski].
50. See TRZCIONKOWSKI 2015, 164-167. About Aeschylus' *Bassarai* see WEST 1990; DI MARCO 1993; BURGES WATSON 2015.
51. See Paus. 9.30 [OF 1082T]; Conon 45 (= Phot. *Bibl.* 186,140b 11 [OF 1080T]); Plut. *Alex.* 14 [OF 1084T]; Ps.-Callisth. *Hist. Alex. Magn.* 1.42 [OF 1084T]; Arrian, *Anab.* 1.11.2 [OF 1084T].
52. See most recently BURGES WATSON 2015, 455.
53. In the case of Conon it this looks somewhat differently since the author (writing in the days of Octavianus Augustus) clearly failed to understand the political realities of the Greek world of a few hundred years before.
54. Lyc. *Alex.* 274-275; Paus. 9.30.8.
55. See HARDER 1985; MOLONEY 2014.
56. See MURRAY, WILSON 2004 (*Introduction*).
57. Charges of the barbarity see e.g. Thrasymachus 85 B2 DK; Pl. *Gorg.* 471a-d.
58. See however HANINK 2018.
59. About “cultural saints” see DOVIĆ, HELGASON 2016.

ABSTRACTS

Starting with pointing at the presence of a specific ethnic and geographical duality of Orpheus in the mythical image, the article aims to explain the context of the appearance and function of his tomb and statues in Pieria. Re-analysis of the testimonies reveals the discrepancies between the early sources and their subsequent transformations, as well as some kind of tensions between Thracian and Pierian context in the mythical stories about Orpheus. The analysis of the circumstances in which certain features of the mythical image appear will allow us to pose a question about the role of his cult and tomb within the phenomenon of the cult of the poets, on

the one side, and King Archelaos' cultural politics, on the other. In my conclusions I try to show that the cult of the Muses, as well as the tomb and the heroic cult of Orpheus in Pieria was part of the "Hellenizing" policy of Macedon, as well as an important element of the newly constructed cultural identity of the Macedonians as true "Hellenes".

Prendendo le mosse da una specifica dualità etnica e geografica nell'immagine mitica di Orfeo, l'articolo si propone di illustrare il contesto e della funzione della comparsa, nell'antica regione della Pieria, della sua tomba e delle sue statue. Un'ulteriore analisi delle testimonianze rivela delle discrepanze tra le fonti arcaiche e la loro successiva ricezione. Si evidenzia inoltre nelle storie mitiche relative a Orfeo una sorta di tensione tra il contesto tracio e quello della Pieria. L'esame delle circostanze in cui appaiono alcuni tratti dell'immagine mitica del cantore ci permetterà, da un lato, di interrogare il suo ruolo all'interno del fenomeno più ampio del culto destinato poeti e, dall'altro, quello della politica culturale del re macedone Archelao. Infine, il contributo si propone di dimostrare che il culto delle Muse, così come la tomba e l'eroico culto di Orfeo in Pieria faceva parte della politica "filoellenica" del sovrano macedone, e rappresentava un tassello importante nella recente costruzione identitaria del ritratto dei Macedoni come "veri Greci".

INDEX

Keywords: Orpheus, heroic cult, tomb, myth, Pieria

Parole chiave: Orfeo, culto eroico, tomba, mito, Pieria

AUTHOR

TOMASZ MOJSIK

Faculty of History and International Relations

University of Białystok

Plac Niezależnego Zrzeszenia Studentów 1

15-420 Białystok

Polonia

tmojsik(at)uwb.edu.pl