Another story with the same motif is that of Peleus and Hippolyte Cretheis (or Astydameia). The tale in its fullest and clearest version is given by Apollodoros, *Bibl.* III. 12, 6 ff:

1. In Euripides' play Peleus, and not Telamon, is the murderer of his half-brother Phocos; see Excursus, pp. 147 ff.
According to him Peleus and Telamon were brothers. As their half-brother Phocos excelled in sports, they became jealous of him, plotted against him and, the lot falling to Telamon, he killed him by throwing a quoit at his head as he and Phocos were practising together. Then, with the help of Peleus, he carried Phocos’ body into a wood and hid it there. But the murder was discovered, and they were driven into exile by their father Aeacos. Telamon went to Salamis, to the court of Cychreus, son of Poseidon and Salamis, daughter of Asopos... (13) while Peleus fled to Phthia to the court of Eurytion, son of Actor. He was purified by Eurytion and received as his wife Eurytion’s daughter, Antigone, as well as a third of the country as his domain. A daughter Polydora was born to them, who was later married by Boros, son of Perieres. One day Peleus went with his father-in-law Eurytion to hunt the Calydonian boar, but, as he threw his spear at the animal, he accidentally hit and killed Eurytion. Therefore, he fled once more and from Phthia came to Acastos at Iolcos and was purified by him. He took part in the games celebrated in honour of Pelias and competed with Atalante. Astydameia, Acastos’ wife, fell in love with Peleus and sent him a proposal for a meeting. When she saw that she could not persuade him, she sent a letter to his wife saying that Peleus was going to marry Sterope, Acastos’ daughter. When Peleus’ wife was informed of that, she hanged herself. Then Acastos’ wife accused Peleus to her husband, telling him falsely Peleus had attempted to rape her. After Acastos heard of this, he did not want to kill the man he had purified; he took him to hunt on Mount Pelion, where in a contest they had in connection with hunting, Peleus cut out the tongues of the animals he got and put them into his bag, while the party of Acastos bagged his (Peleus’) game and derided him, saying he had not taken any. But he showed the tongues, telling them he had slain just as many animals. When Peleus had gone to sleep on Mount Pelion, Acastos deserted him, hid Peleus’ sword in the cows’

1. *Apollodorus The Library*, ed. by Sir James George Frazer (LCL), London 1921.
2. *Pindar, Nem.* V 13 ff. (... βία Φώκου κρέοντος,)
   δ τάς θεού, ὑν Ψαμάθεια
   τικτ’ ἐπὶ βημαίν πόντον
dung, and returned home. When Peleus arose and was looking for his sword, he was caught by the Centaurs and would have met his doom if he had not been saved by Cheiron, who searched also for his (Peleus') sword and brought it back to him.

Of equal or even greater importance is the reference which Pindar makes in *Nemea* V, in his hymn to Pytheas, the Aeginetan man who practised the παγκράτιον. In his digression in praise of the Aeacidae and particularly Peleus, Pindar gives us in brief the essential points of the myth. After Pindar has mentioned the incident of Phocos' murder by his brothers Telamon and Peleus (verses 12 ff.), he goes into a relatively more detailed narration of the seduction (25 ff.):

... αἱ δὲ (sc. Μοῦσαι) πρώτιστοιν μὲν ὑμη-

- σαιν Δίως ἄρχωμεναι σεμνὰν Θέτιν

Πηλέα θ', ὡς τε νῦν ἅβρα

Κρηθείς Ἰππολύτα δάλω πεδᾶσαι

 thiện ξυνάμα Μαγνήτων σκοπῶν

πείπασιν' ἄκοιταν ποικίλους βουλεύμασιν,

ψεύσταν δὲ ποιητῶν συνέπαξε λόγον,

ὡς ἤρα νυμφεῖς ἐπείρα

κείνος ἐν λέκτροις Ἀχάστου

εὐνάξις τὸ δ' ἐναντίον ἔσκεν:

tολλὰ γάρ νῦν παντὶ θυμῷ

παραμένειν λυτάνεσεν.

τοῦ δ' ὄργαν χυτὶζον αἰτεινοὶ λόγοι:

εὐθὺς δ' ἀπανάνατο νῦμφαν,

ζεινίον πατρὸς χόλον

deίσιςις: δ' ὡς ἄρραφη κατένευ-

- σεν τε οἱ ὄρανεν νυμφή εὔμανου

Zeὺς ἄθανάτων βασιλεὺς, ὡς' ἐν τάχει

ποντίαν χρυσαλακάτων τινά Νη-

- ρείδων πράξειν ἵκοιτιν.

The story continues in *Nemea* IV 54 ff.:

Παλίου δὲ πάρ ποδὶ λατρίαν Ἰαολόκ

- πολεμίχ χερὶ προστραχῶν

Πηλεὺς παρέδωκεν Αἰμόνεσσιν

---

1. 14: αἰθέομαι μέγα εἰπεῖν / ἐν δίκης τε μὴ κεκινδυνευμένοιν, πῶς δ' ἔτοι οὐκελέα

- νάσον, / καὶ τὶς ἀνδρὸς ἀλκίμους / δαίμων ἀπ' Ὀλύμνας ἔλασεν.
It comes to its end in *Isthmia* VIII 42 ff.; Themis determines that the very pious Peleus shall marry Thetis:

> τὸ μὲν ἐμὸν, Πηλέϊ γέρας θεόμορον ὁπάσσαι γάμου Αἴακίδα,
> δὲν τ’ εὔσεβέστατον φάτις Ίαολκοῦ τράφειν πεδίον

...ἐν διχομηνίδεσσι δὲ ἐσπέραις ἐρατόν λύοι κεν χαλινόν ὑπ’ ἠρωϊ παρθενίας.

The points dealt with by Pindar generally agree with the account of Apollodoros and with an important fragment from Hesiod (*Fragmenta Hesiodea*, ed. R. - M.L. Merklebach -West, Oxford 1967 — Γυναικών Κατάλογος sive 'Ηοίαι—, pp. 106 f. 209 Schol. Pind. Nem. IV. 95 (III. 80.23-81. 5 Drachmann; post fabulam de Peleuo et Acasti uxore scholiis ad Nem. IV. 92 et 95 narratam) de Acasto

ταῦτα δὲ ἱστοροῦσι πολλοὶ μὲν, ἀτάρ δὴ καὶ 'Ἡσίοδος λέγων οὕτως1·
> ἦδε δὲ οἱ κατὰ θυμὸν ἁρίστη φαίνετο βουλή·
> αὐτὸν μὲν σχέσθαι, κρύψαι δὲ ἄδοξητα μάχαιραν καλὴν, ἢν οἱ ἐτευξὲ περικυκλώτας 'Ἀμφιγυῆις,
> ὡς τὴν μακατέων οἴος κατὰ Πήλιον αἰτῶν αἰσθανόμην ὑπὸ Κενταύρωισιν ὀρεσκώισι δαμαίη.

The myth in its main outlines, apart from some minor discrepancies mainly in the names2 of some of the persons involved, seems to be well established in most of the sources. This may well support the supposition that both Sophocles and Euripides, who wrote a tragedy


2. See below, pp. 147 ff.
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entitled Peleus, did not make any great changes in the plot significantly affecting the basic scenes and characters. If they had done so, one would accordingly expect essential variations in the later sources, very likely influenced by the great tragedians. Of course, apart from a very few fragments of a very general nature about the Sophoclean and the Euripidean tragedies and a few hints in their other works, we have nothing that can help us in the reconstruction of the play.

In the Troades, verses 1126 ff., Euripides mentions the Peleus theme:

αύτός δ' ἀνήκται Νεοπτόλεμος, καινάς τινας
Πηλέως ἀκούσας συμφοράς, δός νῦν χθονός
'Ακαστος ἐκβέβληκεν, ὁ Πελίου γόνος.

The Scholia (A Eur. Tro. 1128) state much the same thing regarding Troades 1128 'Ακαστος ἐκβέβληκεν and also seem to differentiate between the two plays:

ο μὲν Εὐριπίδης ὑπὸ 'Ακάστου φησίν ἐκβεβλήθαι τὸν Πηλέα, εἰσὶ δὲ οἱ
φασιν ὑπὸ τῶν δύο αὐτοῦ παιδῶν, 'Αργάνδρου καὶ 'Αρχιτέλους, κατὰ τὸν καὶ-
ρόν (σκανδὸν A, corr. L. Dindorf) ὅν (ὅτε Schw.) ἐμελλόν “Εἷληνες ἢ Ἐλίου
ἐπινειάν, ἐξοειλάσθαι καὶ ἐλθόντα εἰς ἀπάντησιν τῷ Νεοπτόλεμῳ προσελθεῖν
dιὰ χειμῶνα τῇ, Κώ. τῇ νήσῳ καὶ ἐξεισθέντα ὑπὸ Μόλωνὸς τινος "Αβαντος
ἐκει καταλύσασθαι (καταλύσαπι E. Schwartz)1 τὸν βίον.

The emphasis placed by Euripides himself on—καινάς τινας συμφοράς—Peleus’ expulsion from the land by Acastos, together with what Horatius says in Epist. 2, 3, 95:

et tragicus plerumque dolet sermone pedestri Telephus et Peleus, cum pauper et exul uterque proicit ampullas et sesquipedalia verba2, seems to be something that greatly occupied the poet, who also tried to exploit its dramatic effect on the audience. Aristophanes certainly parodies Peleus, the Euripidean hero, when, in the Clouds 1154 f., he writes,

βοάσομι τάρα τάν ύπέρτονον
βοάν. ἵδι, κλάετ' ὀ βολοστάται,

to which the Scholiasts on Aristophanes add:

1154 b. βοάσομαι ΡΕΡs <...> τάν ὑπέρτονον RE: παρὰ τά ἐν Πηλέως
Εὐριπίδου3. RVERs επιφέρει γάρ

2. The reference made is doubtless to the Euripidean play; cf. Aristophanes Clouds 1154.
3. Εὐριπίδου ΡΕΡs, σοφοκλέους V; it is much less likely that Aristophanes parodies Sophocles.
From these Nauck obtained fr. 623:

_ibôsmai târa tân úptêronton
ibân. ERS

The other theme that Euripides stresses in his *Peleus* is the virtuous character of the hero. This is found particularly in plays with a Potiphar motif. We see it in *Hippolytos*, in *Phoenix*¹ and *Bellerophon*², and it appears even more prominently in *Peleus* where, as we have seen, it finds its full expression.

Aristophanes in the *Clouds* 1063 ff. parodies the hero Peleus, making the Δίκαιος (or Κρείττων) and the "Αδίκος (or "Ηττων) Λόγος argue about what brings good to man. The "Αδίκος Λόγος, based on the common people’s view that virtue and σωφροσύνη (taken mostly as moral qualities here, something like goodness and decency with honesty) do not often help one in one’s practical life, particularly when they are carried to excess—a point of discussion that prominently arises in Plat. *Gorg.* 483-487 between Socrates and Callicles and in the ἀγών λόγων between Amphion and Zethos in the *Antiope* of Euripides—comically distorts this point by maintaining that these qualities ought not to be aspired to by young men and asks the Δίκαιος Λόγος to give concrete examples of persons who did well in life by having those qualities:

An interesting piece of evidence about the Euripidean play comes from Tzetzes, *Scholia on Lycophron*³, 175:

---

1. See «Phoen. a. Cl.», and «Beller. a. Sthen.».
2. The hero in *Steneboea*.
3. *Lycophronis Alexandra*, ed. Ed. Scheer (II, scholia continens), Berlin (Weid-
This piece of evidence is corroborated by the scholion on Euripides Andromache 1265 ἐλθὼν παλαιὰς χοιράδος: χοιράς πᾶσα πέτρα ἔξέχουσα καὶ περικυλοζομένη θαλάσση. πέτραν οὖν φασί τινα σπήλαιον ἔχουσαν ἐν ὃ εἰώθει διατρίβειν ἐκ θαλάσσης ἀνιούσα ή Θέτις. Σηπιάς δε τότος περὶ τὸ σπήλαιον ὅπου τὴν Θέτιν ἦρπασεν ὁ Πηλεὺς εἰς σηπίαν μεταβληθείσαν: - ΜΝΟΑ1.

Where, how and by whom this was related in the play we cannot say. We are completely in the dark regarding the scenes and the arrangement. It seems more like an αἴτιον that comes to explain the name of the place. One can think of it only as being reported towards the end of the play.

How the particular situations of the plot were handled in dramatic scenes and acts we have no idea. The rough sketch drawn here is not intended to be taken as more than a conjecture.

All the details regarding Peleus' ancestry and previous life must have been given in the exposition, that is, mainly in the prologue and the early scenes. Thus Phocos' murder, the exile from Aegina, the reception and purification of Peleus by Eurytion, his marriage to Antigone and the birth of Polydora apparently formed merely the introduction of the drama proper. So possibly did the story of the Calydonian boar and the misfortune Peleus had in striking and unintentionally killing his father-in-law Eurytion.

The plot would have exploited situations and incidents after Peleus' arrival at Acastos' court, particularly the seduction attempted by Hippolyte Cretheis (or Astydameia). It is likely that Euripides here used a Trophos (Nurse) as an intermediary, as he did in Sthenoeboea. The accusation and the treacherous plan of Acastos to do away with him, must...
have been dealt with in actual scenes, as seems to be the case in Stheneboea. But things such as the hunt on Mount Pelion and the abandoning of Peleus in the forest, while he was sleeping, the hiding of his sword in the cows’ dung and his exposure to the danger of being killed by the Centaurs may have constituted part of his speech of defence made to Acastos and to the Chorus1. By this he likely tried to justify himself for the punishment he had inflicted (or was seeking to bring about). This is what Bellerophon does and we may assume that Peleus did something similar2. He is the one who had personally experienced all these things, and nobody else was in a position to relate these details, except of course a deus ex machina, who, supposing there was one, might also have brought the theme up very succinctly at the end of the play3.

On the other hand Peleus’ marrying Thetis because of his σωφροσύνη4, the way he could achieve this, and the means by which he would exact satisfaction from Acastos for what he (Acastos) had done to him may be among the terms dictated by the deus ex machina, assuming that there was one in the play to help the noble hero out of the difficult situation into which he was put5.

2. See above, p. 141.: Παλίου δὲ πάρ ποδὶ λατρίαν Ἰαολκόν / πολέμια χερὶ προστραχόν / Πηλεύς παρέδωκεν Αἰμόνεσσιν; the view that Peleus on his return to Iolcos slew Acastos and Hippolyte looks more like a natural happening than the end of a tragedy of Euripides.
3. One expects here, as in the other tragedies of the same motif, that Peleus’ revenge was primarily taken upon Acastos’ wife, while Acastos himself had to suffer indirectly and in the long run the consequences of his evil-doing. The Centaur Cheiron, who had helped him in finding his sword, is a possible candidate for the role of the deus ex machina, assuming that there was one in the play to help the noble hero out of the difficult situation into which he was put.
5. See above, p. 3.
EXCURSUS

Here one can see some of the problems that arise from our sources, which are ambiguous mainly with regard to the person who killed Pho­cos; the man who purified Peleus after his flight from Aegina; the name of his daughter by his first marriage and the name of Acastos’ wife, who tried to seduce Peleus and who, after being rebuffed, accused Peleus of rape or attempted rape.

As to the first Apollod. Bibl. III. 12, 6 states: διαφέροντος δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἀγώσι Φώκου, τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς Πηλέα καὶ Τελαμώνα ἐπιβουλεύσαν· καὶ λαχῶν κλήροι Τελαμώνιν συγγεμνάζομεν αὐτῶν βαλὼν δίσκω κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς κτείνει, καὶ κομίς μετὰ Πηλέως κρύπτει κατὰ τινὸς ὥλῃς. Scholia on Euripides Andromache 687 (quoting verses from the Alemae­onis). In the Andromache 685 ff. Menelaos tells Peleus,

εἰ δ’ εἰς πρόσωπον τῆς ἐμῆς ἐλθὼν ἐγὼ γυναικὸς ἔσχον μη κτανείν, ἐσωφρόνουν.

οὐδ’ ἂν σὲ Φώκον ἤθελον κατακτανείν·

and the Scholiast writes, ὀσπερ ἐγὼ οὐκ ἐφόνευσα τὴν Ἐλένην, οὕτως οὐδὲ σὺ ὀφελεῖς τὸν Φώκον ἄνελείν. καὶ ὁ τὴν Αλκμαιωνίδα πεποιηκώς φησι περὶ τοῦ Φώκου [frg. 1].


Τελαμών μὲν ἐν 'Αττιδί διά νάσσα τὸν Ψαμάθη τῇ Νηρέως εἰς φώκην ἠλλα­γμένη καὶ τὸν Φώκον ἄνειλεν ἐπιβουλεύσας· οὕτως καὶ 'Αστικὴν τοῦν ἐν τῷ καταλόγῳ φησι (I 93):

...οὐδὲν οὖν ὁ Πήνθαρος τὸν Φώκον θάνατον, ἀλλ' ἐκτρέπεται εἰπείν. | μήπο­τε δὲ καὶ τὸ παρά Καλλιμάχῳ (fr. 136):
Εκλυε, τόν μηδέν ἐμοὺς δι’ ὀδόντας ὀλίσθοι,
Πηλεὺς,
οὔτως ἀποδοτέον, ὅτι αἱ γυναῖκες ὕμνεις ὃδι τοῦ Φώκου θάνατον.
Pausanias II. 29. 9. καὶ ἡνίκα Φώκον Τελαμών καὶ Πηλεὺς προηγάγοντο
εἰς ἀγῶνα πεντάθλου καὶ περιήλθεν ὡς Πηλέα ἀφεῖναι τὸν λίθον—οὔτος γὰρ ἀντὶ
dίσκου σφίσιν ἦν—, ἐκὼν τυγχάνει τοῦ Φώκου. ταῦτα δὲ ἐγέρχοντο τῇ μητρὶ:
αὐτῷ μὲν γὰρ ἐγεγόνεσσαν ἐκ τῆς Σκίρωνος θυγατρός, Φώκος δὲ οὐκ ἐκ τῆς
ἀκτῆς, ἀλλ’ ἐξ ἀδελφῆς Θέτιδος ἦν, εἰ δὴ τὰ ὄντα λέγουσιν 'Ελληνες.

Scheer, Berlin -Weidmann - 1958): Ὅλυνη ἐκκαλεῖτο ἡ Αἴγινα, ἀφʼ ἡς ἐφυγε
ὁ Πηλεὺς φονεύσας τὸν ἡνίον ἀδελφὸν Φώκον | ἐπὶ δὲ... ἄλλοι... φασίν ὅτι
Πηλεὺς ἀνελὼν τὸν ἡνίον ἀδελφὸν ἔφυγε... φυγὴς ὁ Πηλεὺς· || Άλακοῦ γὰρ καὶ
Ἐνδήδος παῖδες Τελαμών καὶ Πηλεὺς καὶ Φώκος ἀδελφὸς αὐτῶν ἐκ Ψαμά-
θης μιᾶς τῶν Νηρηίδων | ὃν Φώκον ἐν γυμνασίῳ Πηλεὺς δίσκῳ πλήττει, Τε-
λαμών δὲ τὸ μετάφρενον ἔξεις καὶ ἀνέειλον αὐτὸν | δὲν παρ’ Αἴακοῦ διώκονται
τῆς Ἀλιγνῆς.

Antoninus Liberalis, Les métamorphoses 38 (Ἀλύκως): [ἰστορεῖ Νίκαιδρος
'Ετεροιομένων α']... τοῦτον (sc. τὸν Φώκον) ἐφίλησε περισσῶς Αἰακὸς, ὅτι
καλὸς κἀγαθός ἦν ἄνηρ. 2 Πηλεὺς δὲ καὶ Τελαμὼν φθονήσαντες αὐτῷ κτείνου-
σι θανάτῳ κρύφα, καὶ διὰ τοῦτ’ ἐξελαθέντες ὑπ’ Αἴακοῦ τήν Αἴγιναν ἐξελι-
τον.

Diodorus of Sicily IV. 72. 6 (ed. C. H. Oldfather, LCL, London 1939,
repr. 1961): τοῦτον δ’ ἐγένοντο ὥσι τοῦ Πηλεὺς καὶ Τελαμών. τούτων δὲ Πη-
λεὺς δίσκῳ βαλὼν ἀπέκτεινεν ἀκουσίως Φώκον ὁμοπάτριον ἀδελφόν, ἐξ ἀλλῆς
dὲ μητρὸς γεγεννημένον. διὰ δὲ τὸν φόνον Πηλεὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς φυγαδευθεὶς
ἔφυγε τῆς νῦν Θετταλίας καλομενῆς εἰς Φθίαν, καὶ καθαρθεὶς ὑπὸ "Ἀκτορος
tοῦ βασιλέως διδέξατο τὴν βασιλείαν, ἐπαιδος ὄντος τοῦ ὧν Ἀκτορος.
Ovidius Metamorphoses, ed. W. S. Anderson (Teubner) 1977, XI 266 ff.:

Felix et nato, felix et coniuge Peleus,
et cui, si demas iugulati crimina Phoci,
onmia contigerant. fraterno sanguine somem
expulsumque domo patria Trachinia tellus
accipit.

Hyginus Fabula 14: Peleus et Telamon Aeaci et Endeidos Chironis filiae
filii ab Aegina insula. qui ob caedem Phoci fratris relictis sedibus suis
diuersas petierunt domos, Peleus Phthiam, Telamon Salaminam quam
Apollonius Rhodius Atthida uocat. 9.

Lactantii Placidi qui dicitur commentarios in Statii Thebaidae et com-

mentarium in Achilleida (rec. Ricardus Jahnke, Leipzig - Teubner - 1898) II. 113:
Pollutus placuit id est: Tydeus aduersum te pactus est foedus. pollutus autem sanguine Melanippi fratris sui, quam in uenatu incautus occiderat ut Peleus Phocum, unde reiecta post terga pingitur.

VII. 344 Phocida a Phoco, Aeaci filio, quem Peleus et Telamon occidisse feruntur.
XI. 281 Phocidos sonorae a Phoco, Aeaci filio, quem Peleus et Telamon occidisse dicuntur, ciuitas nomen acceptit.

Plutarch, Parallela minora 25 Φώκου ὄντος ἐκ Ἑαμάθης Αἰακῷ καὶ στεργομένου, Τελαμών ἤγεν ἐπὶ θήραν καὶ συὸς ἑπίφαντος κατά τοῦ μισουμένου ἐπαφήκε τὸ δόρυ καὶ ἐφόνευσεν. ὡ δὲ πατὴρ ἐφυγάδευσεν ὡς Δωρόθεος ἐν πρῶτῳ Μεταμορφώσεων (Plutar. Chaer. mor., G. Bernardakis); W.-J.B. Nachstädt - Titchener, Leipzig. (Teubn.) 1934.

From a comparison of our source-data we obtain the following picture:

According to Apollodoros and the author of Alcmaeonis, Telamon first hits Phocos on the head with a quoit and then Peleus comes to help Telamon kill Phocos. According to the Scholiast on Pindar and Tzetzes on Lycophron, it happens the other way round: Peleus hits Phocos first with the quoit, and then Telamon kills him.

Antoninus Liberalis, Hyginus, and Lactantius Placidus at two places in his scholia on Statius, Thebais, make both Peleus and Telamon equally responsible. But the great majority of the sources, Euripides in Andromache, the Scholiast on Andromache, Pausanias, Tzetzes on Lycophron, Ovid, and in one place Lactantius Placidus make Peleus the intentional murderer of his half-brother, while Diodoros speaks of an accidental killing. Only one piece of evidence, Dorotheos quoted by Plutarch, makes Telamon alone the murderer of his brother Phocos, whom he kills with his spear during a boar hunt. Perhaps this version resulted from a confusion of the incident of the murder of Phocos with the accidental killing of Eurytion.

Apollodoros himself (Bibl. III. 12, 6) gives an account of the genealogy of the Aeacidae. He mentions immediately after that, however, the authority of Phercydes:

γαμεῖ δὲ Αἰακὸς 'Ενθηίδα τὴν Σκελρωνος, ἐξ ἓς αὐτῷ παῖδες ἐγένοντο Πηλεύς τε καὶ Τελαμών. Φερεκύδης δὲ φησὶ Τελαμώνα φιλὸν, οὐκ ἄδελφον Πηλέως εἶναι, ἀλλ' Ἀκαταίου παῖδα καὶ Γλαύκης τῆς Κυρρέως.

1. One should also take into account that Apollodoros often mentions Phercydes (e. g. I. 5, 2, III. 8, 2 etc.) and in a number of cases probably relies on him.
It is probable that the account of the parentage of Telamon, which the old writer Pherecydes (first half of the 5th century B.C.) gives us, is earlier than the one Apollodoros adopts. According to his authority then, Telamon was a Salaminian and not an Aeginetan, for Cychreus (Apollod. III. 12, 7) was a king of Salamis, and the later life of Telamon was certainly associated with Salamis. If then one accepts Pherecydes’ evidence that denies any blood relationship between Peleus and Telamon, it becomes easy to explain why in the original tradition Peleus, and not Telamon, must have been the murderer of Phocos. This view seems to agree with the majority of the sources. And what I think important is that Euripides in the Andromache and his Scholiast on 687 speak of Peleus as the one who killed Phocos.

Regarding the accidental killing that Peleus seems to have committed during the boar hunt after his purification, we find in Apollodoros’ account (III. 13, 1) Eurytion [and also (I. 8, 2) Eurytion] son of Actor from Phthia. The Scholiast on Aristophanes Clouds 1063 calls him Eurytos son of Actor; Tzetzes, Scholia on Lycophron 175 (according to Pherecydes), Peleus was purified by Eurytos1, son of Actor, whose daughter Antigone he received as his wife, Antoninus Liberalis 38 calls the killed man Euryton son of Iros, and Diodoros IV. 72, 6 calls him Actor, king of the country, who died childless and bequeathed his kingdom to him (Peleus). Many of these sources do not explicitly mention the hunt of the Calydonian boar, but some of them do mention a boar hunt or a general hunt. The more prevalent view seems to be that of Pherecydes and the Scholiast on Aristophanes2, who call the man Eurytion (or Eurytos).
rytos) son of Actor. Apollodoros tells us that Peleus had by his wife Antigone a daughter called Polydora. This account agrees completely with Homer II. Π (XVI) 173-8:

τῆς μὲν ἕτη στιχος ἦρχε Μενέσθιος αἰολοθώρης, υίὸς Σπερχειοῦ, διπετεὸς ποταμοῦ. ὄν τέκε Πηλής θυγάτηρ, καλῆ Πολυδώρῃ, Σπερχειῷ ἀκάμαντι, γυνὴ θεῶ εὐνυθεῖσα, αὐτῷ ἐπικαλῆσαι Βόρῳ, Περιήρεις υἱῷ.


From a comparison of the evidence of Pherecydes as it is presented in Tzetzes, Scholia on Lycophron and in the Scholia on Homer II. Π (XVI) 175 and from the account of Apollodoros, one can see that Apollodoros' testimony coincides with that of Pherecydes and, since the former often mentions the latter as an authority, it is likely that he followed him at this point.

With reference to the Acastos’ wife, Pindar calls her Cretheis Hippolyta, that is Hippolyte daughter of Cretheus, or simply Hippolyta. His Scholiast calls her Cretheis, daughter of Hippolytos (Νεμ. V 46 a) and Cretheis, daughter of Hippolyte (Νεμ. IV 92). The Scholiast on Apollonios Rhodios (Argon. 224-226a) and to some extent the Scholiast on Aristophanes (Clouds 1063 a, 1063 b) point out the existence of at least two versions of the account regarding the name of Acastos’ wife and the person who gave Peleus the ἱφαιστότευκτον μάχαιρα, the sword wrought by Hephaestos:

A 224 - 26 a. οὖδὲ μὲν οὖδ’ αὐτοῖο πάκις: "Ἀκαστός Πελίου υἱὸς ἔγημεν Κρηθηίδα ἡ, ὡς τινες, Ἰππολύτην. ἡ δὲ Πηλέως ἐρασθεῖσα ἀπῆτει συνελθεῖν. ὡς δὲ ἀπετύγχανεν, προβαλούσα τὸν Πηλέα τῷ ἀνδρὶ κατηγορεί, ὅτι ἦθελεν

After the line οὖδὲ μὲν οὖδ’ αὐτοῖο πάκις, Apollodoros seems to have become confused and calls Polydora the wife of Peleus: γαμεὶ δὲ οἱ Πηλεός Πολυδώραν τὴν Περιήρους, ἐξ ὡς αὐτῷ γίνεται Μενέσθιος...

1. In III. 13, 4 of his Library Apollodoros seems to have become confused and calls Polydora the wife of Peleus: γαμεὶ δὲ οἱ Πηλεός Πολυδώραν τὴν Περιήρους, ἐξ ὡς αὐτῷ γίνεται Μενέσθιος...
αὐτῇ συνελθεῖν. ὃ δὲ δεξαμενὸς τὸν Πηλέα ὡς ἐπὶ θήραν εἰς τὸ Πήλιον κατέλειψεν ἄσπλον, ἵνα ὑπὸ θηρίων διαφθαρῇ. ἔπιστάκες δὲ Ἔρμης ἢ, ὡς τινες, Χείρων ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ἁφασιστότευκτον μάχαιραν. καὶ τὸ ἐπιτυγχάνοντα θηρία ἀναρών ἤλθεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ ἄνειλεν "Ἀκαστὸν αὐτὸν <τε> καὶ τὴν τοῦ Ἀκάστου γυναίκα"; while the Scholiast on Aristophanes calls her (1063 a) Astydameia and (1063 b) Hippolyte. As in the case of Anteia—Sthenoebea and possibly Phthia—Clytia, there is probably also here a change of the name from Astydameia into Hippolyte Cretheis. If we assume that Euripides used in Peleus, as we hinted above, the contrivance of the deus ex machina, then what the Scholiasts on Apollonios Rhodios and on Aristophanes say with regard to Hermes may come from Euripides. It is possible that the newer version that used the name Hippolyte Cretheis instead of Astydameia also used the role of the god Hermes instead (or possibly in addition to that) of Cheiron.


* Ruhnkenius enotavit ἤθελεν.
2. Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera), Η. Erbse, Berlin 1971, Z 160 a. (τῶι δὲ γυνὴ προῖτον ἐπεμείνατο) δι' Ἀντεια: ἡ διπλῆ, διὶ ὁμηρος Ἀντειαν, οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι Σθενέβουλαι, καὶ διὶ ἄκαίρου τὸ δία μάχεται γάρ ἡ μάχος. Α
3. It looks likely that the second account of the Scholiast on Aristophanes Clouds (1063b) stands closer to Euripides' plot than the first (1063a); in any case it agrees in many respects with the account of the Scholiast on Apollonios Rhodios.