Constructing and Deconstructing Carian Identity: Xanthus of Lydia, Felix Jacoby and Herodotus

This paper will discuss a fragment from the Lydian author named Xanthus (FGrH 765) and its value in connection with Carian mytho-genealogical identity.¹ Mytho-genealogical identity refers to identity constructed in antiquity using genealogies which trace an ethnic group’s origins to an eponymous, usually heroic, figure. Both Greeks and non-Greeks alike did this, producing discourses that could be used to establish lineages and ethnicity through purported descent from mythological figures.² Yet, as Nino Luraghi has shown, such statements of identity should be evaluated differently, depending upon whether they represent a description of ‘others’ or a self-identifying discourse.³ The Xanthian genealogical information is from Nicolaus of Damascus’ Histories, as described in the Suda. Nicolaus’ source is considered to have been Xanthus.⁴ The importance of Xanthus’ genealogy — which in one reading makes Carius a son of Zeus and Torrhebia, and also the father of Manes and the grandfather of Aty — is that it provides a record of Graeco-Anatolian traditions concerning eponymous mythological figures connected with Hellenised

¹ I wish to acknowledge Prof. John Melville-Jones and Dr Neil O’Sullivan for suggestions made after the presentation of this paper in draft form at a seminar held at The University of Western Australia, 2009; remaining errors are those of the author. I also wish to thank the AMPHORA Conference organisers for the opportunity to participate. All translations in this paper are my own. All dates are BCE unless otherwise stated.


non-Greeks.\textsuperscript{5} However, the Xanthian genealogy produces tension with the more widely known text of Herodotus, which states that the Carians themselves saw their eponymous figure as a brother of Lydus and Mysus.\textsuperscript{6} So, according to the reading of Xanthus, Carius (Κάρης) is the grandfather of Atys, but according to the report in Herodotus, Atys could be the father or uncle of Car (Κάρος).\textsuperscript{7} As will be suggested, Carius and Car can be understood as one figure, despite the differences in nominal form.

The text of the Xanthus fragment was reconstructed by Felix Jacoby in order to fill what he perceived as a lacuna, which extended Car’s genealogy downwards through Manes and Atys.\textsuperscript{8} Jacoby, however, constructed a theoretical genealogical line of identity which might not have been expressed in this way by Xanthus, and hence needs to be deconstructed. Lionel Pearson, in fact, rightly rejected Jacoby’s additions, but in suggesting that his addition of parentheses could improve the text he may himself have subverted its original sense.\textsuperscript{9} The following Greek text represents Jacoby’s text, including his suggested additions. Also included is Pearson’s addition of parentheses:

\begin{quote}
Τὸρρήβος πόλεις Λυδίας ἀπὸ Τορρήβου τοῦ Ἄτυος, τὸ ἔθνικὸν Τορρήβιοι, καὶ ἦλθον Τορρηβίες: (ἐν δὲ τῇ Τορρηβίδι ἐστὶν ὄρος Κάρος καλεόμενον, καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Καρίου ἐκεῖ. Κάρος δὲ Διὸς παῖς καὶ Τορρηβίας, ὡς Νικόλαος δ’),\textsuperscript{10} <οὐ Μάνης, οὐ Ἄτυς, οὐ Τόρρήβος>,\textsuperscript{11} ὃς πλαζόμενος περί τινα λίμην, ἢτις ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ Τορρηβία ἐκλήθη, φθογγῆς Νυμφῶν ἀκουόσας, ὡς καὶ Μοῦσας Λυδίς καλοῦσα, καὶ <αὐτός> μουσικὴν ἐδιδάχθη καὶ <αὐτὸς> τοὺς Λυδίους ἐδίδαξε· καὶ τὰ μέλη διὰ τοῦτο Τορρηβια ἐκαλεῖτο.\textsuperscript{12}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{5} Peter Carrington, ‘The Heroic Age of Phrygia in Ancient Literature and Art,’ \textit{Anatolian Studies} 27 (1977): 120 ff.
\textsuperscript{6} Hdt. 1.171.6.
\textsuperscript{7} This is likely to be Herodotus’ own view rather than a report. See Hdt. 1.7.3, 4.45.5 and 7.74.1. On 4.45.5 cf. David Asheri, Alan Lloyd and Aldo Corcella, \textit{A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV} (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 615 (‘these things which are common knowledge’).
\textsuperscript{8} \textit{Suda}, s.v. Τόρρηβος; \textit{FGH} 90 (Nicolaus Damascenus), fr. 15.
\textsuperscript{9} Pearson, \textit{Early Ionian Historians}, 121 n3.
\textsuperscript{10} ibid., with added parentheses, omits Jacoby’s, \textit{Die Fragmente}, suggestion.
\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Suda}, s.v. Τόρρηβος; \textit{FGH} 90 (Nicolaus Damascenus), fr. 15.
Torhebus, a polis of Lydia, from Torhebus son of Atys. The ethnic is Torrhbeioi and the feminine form is Torrhbeis. (In Torrhbeian territory there is a mountain named Carius and the shrine of the hero Carius is there. Carius is the child of Zeus and Torrhbeia, according to Nicolaus Book Four), <then Manes, then Atys, then Torrhbeus,> who, wandering around a lake which was called Torrhbeia by him, hearing the sound of Nymphs which the Lydians also call Muses, was both instructed in mousike and taught it to the Lydians, and the songs, on account of this, were called Torrhbeian.

Others had previously intimated a solution supported by numismatic evidence, without addressing the perceived problem of the lacuna, but neither Jacoby nor Pearson properly dealt with this evidence. Louis Robert addressed both the numismatic evidence and the question of the lacuna, but his suggestions create several further problems. However, Jacoby’s constructed genealogy has been generally accepted post-Pearson, which suggests that, collectively, these views should be retested. It will be argued that Jacoby’s additional text is unnecessary but that Pearson’s suggested alterations are equally unconvincing. The numismatic evidence, on the other hand, offers a clue to the missing information and properly contextualises the surviving text. Thus, the passage


can be read in a way which elucidates a question of Carian identity in a Lydian context earlier than that of the Labraundean genealogy reported to Herodotus.

Xanthus’ *floruit* is dated to the mid fifth century.\(^\text{16}\) Born at about the turn of the sixth and fifth centuries, his father Candaules was probably Lydian, although his mother may have been Greek.\(^\text{17}\) Xanthus’ Lydian history (*Lydiaca*) was probably written in Ionian Greek and influenced by Greek intellectualism, particularly Ionian rationalism. In general terms it would have served to explain Lydian history, customs and traditions not only to a potential Greek audience but also to a Lydian or other Hellenised non-Greek audience.\(^\text{18}\) The *Lydiaca* was produced contemporaneously with Herodotus’ *Histories*, although a fragment of Ephorus suggests that Xanthus may have favoured older material.\(^\text{19}\)

Why might the Carian eponymous figure have been included in a genealogy by a Lydian author writing on Lydian history? According to Wacholder, Nicolaus included the information in Book Four of his *Histories*,\(^\text{20}\) making Torrhebus a hero from the legendary period in which native figures such as Mopsus and

---


\(^\text{17}\) *FGrH* 765 (Xanthus), T 2 = Strabo 13.4.9 and see John Pedley, *Ancient Literary Sources on Sardis* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972), 2.

\(^\text{18}\) Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians*, 122-23. Probably Nicolaus (*FGrH* 90) did not draw upon the original version of Xanthus, but rather an abridged Greek version: cf. *OCD*, s.v. Xanthus (2). Hanfmann, ‘*Lydiaca*’, 70, felt that Semitic words might have been used by Xanthus. *FGrH* 765 (Xanthus), fr. 15 = Strabo 12.8.3 shows that Xanthus had familiarity with the Lydian language (he explained that the origin of the name of the Mysians was drawn from a Lydian word; shown by translating a Greek word back into Lydian, and transliterated to Greek). Xanthus used other non-Ionic words such as the Sardian name, Xuaris (Ξυάρις), for Sardis: *FGrH* 765 (Xanthus), F 23 = Lydus *De mens.* 3.20. See also A. Sayce, ‘The Decipherment of the Lydian Language’, *American Journal of Philology* 46 (1925): 48.


Tylus were located, and within Greek mythology Heracles. Elements within these strains of mythology have been traced to Sumerian and Hittite traditions but became interwoven in the complex tapestry of Lydian mythology. Whether or not the tradition of Torrhebus was alive orally or in written form prior to the Mermnad period is uncertain. Balcer, however, has suggested that following the Mermnad usurpation of power the Greek structure of Lydian stories was influenced by Lydian nobility. Thus, with regard to Carius, a historical context for the Xanthian tradition can be defined. This is based on the prominence of Carians in Sardinian politics and is further supported by Sardinian archaeological, Carian inscriptional and Greek literary evidence.

Following the downfall of the last Tylonid king, Candaules (?–c. 680), a new dynasty (the Mermnadae) assumed power in Sards, the first of its kings being Gyges (c. 680–644). According to Plutarch, Carian supporters of Gyges, particularly Mysans, intervened on his behalf when he usurped power from Candaules. At this time, Arselis, the leader of the Mysan faction of Carian support, is said to have transferred the religious paraphernalia (the labrys)

---


22 See, for example: Hdt. 1.7.4 which describes the Heraclidæ—that is, the Tylonids—as descended from Heracles and an unnamed slave, possibly not Omphale; Soph. Trach. 69-70, 252-3 at which Heracles is Omphale’s slave; Diod. 4.31.8 and cf. Ovid Epist. 9.54 at which Lamus is described as the son of Heracles and Omphale, queen of the Maenians, and Cleodaeus as the son of Heracles and a slave, begat whilst Heracles was Omphale’s slave; Strabo 5.2.2 at which Aths and his sons, Tyrrhenus and Lydus, are descendants of Heracles and Omphale; Apollod. 2.7.8 at which Agelaus, from whom the family of Croesus was descended, is the son of Heracles and Omphale; Paus. 2.21.3 at which Tyrenus, discoverer of the trumpet, is the son of Heracles and a ‘Lydian woman’.


24 Balcer, Sparda by the Bitter Sea, 42 f., 43 f.

25 Hdt. 1.13.1. On Candaules (also known as Myrsilus), the last Tylonid king of Lydia, see Brill's New Pauly, s.v. Candaules. On Candaules, the divinity ('the dog throttler'), and the complexities by which this figure is associated with Hermes and Heracles, see Pedley, 'Carians in Sards', 98 and C.H. Greenewalt (Jnr), Ritual Dinners in Early Historic Sards (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), 44-52.
of the Lydian kings to the sanctuary of Zeus Labraundeus in Caria. Whilst Gyges was in power he campaigned against Miletus and Smyrna and took Colophon. Gyges’ son, Ar dys (c. 645–c. 625), subsequently continued the campaign against Miletus and also took Priene. There is an absence of textual evidence for Carian involvement in Lydian politics during the reign of Sadyattes (c. 625–600), son of Ar dys, although the anti-Milesian policy was continued by his son, Alyattes (c. 600–c. 561), as were the campaigns against Ionian poleis.

During the reigns of Alyattes and his son, Croesus (c. 560–547), Carian and Lydian history is clearly intertwined, and it seems certain that the Mermnadae sought Carian support. Alyattes married a Carian wife who was to become the mother of Croesus and undertook a military campaign in Caria. He also supported the ascendency of his half-Carian son, Croesus, at the expense of the child of his Greek wife, Croesus’ half-Ionian brother, Pantaleon. The political ramifications of this move strongly suggest that Alyattes’ attention was focused upon relationships with Carians, possibly at the expense of Ionian interests. The military activities of the Mermnadae need not, however, be considered to have been anti-Ionian in terms of ethnic identity, and it is almost certain that trade or other economic considerations played a part. These activities were also not necessarily anti-Carian, although many Carians in the Ionian poleis may have sided with their local communities in order to protect local interests.

26 Plut. Mor. 301f-302a.
27 Hdt. 1.15.1.
28 Hdt. 1.16.1-2; on Sadyattes see also FGrH 90 (Nicolaus Damascenus), fr. 63 and FGrH 767 (Xenophi lus), fr. 1.
29 Hdt. 1.16.1-18.3; FGrH 90 (Nicolaus Damascenus), fr. 63 and FGrH 767 (Xen ophilus ), fr. 1.
30 For Alyattes’ marriage see Hdt. 1.92.3. FGrH 90 (Nicolaus Damascenus), fr. 65. The information may have had a Xanthian origin (exactly where in Caria is not specified): Pedley, ‘Carians in Sardis’, 97.
31 Plut. Mor. 401e (on the alleged involvement of Croesus’ Ionian stepmother in promoting Pantaleon) and 858e (on Croesus’ treatment of a sympathiser with Pantaleon).
32 For other (Mermnad) examples of politically convenient marriages note Gyges’ marriage to Candaules’ widow, Tudo (a Mysian princess), and Alyattes offering his daughter to the Median crown prince, Astyages (see Balcer, Sparda by the Bitter Sea, 48-51, where he discusses ‘harem factionalism’).
33 Cf. Balcer, Sparda by the Bitter Sea, 44-45; overall, 33-93.
Pedley suggested that Mermmad political and military strategies may have been fuelled by a ‘Carian alliance or pro-Carian thinking’ within Sardis.\(^\text{34}\) The actions of Alyattes imply this, and archaeological evidence from Sardis and the nearby territory of Torrhebia supports the suggestion further. A Carian presence in Sardis is indicated by numerous Carian graffiti and an undated inscription identified as a form of the Carian language.\(^\text{35}\) Discovered in an ‘industrial-commercial’ area, near assemblages of pots containing the skeletons of puppies (usually accompanied by an iron knife), the graffiti are dated to c. 575–25 and have a suggested chronological range of seventy-five to one hundred years.\(^\text{36}\) The assemblages were deposited as ritual meals offered to a deity, possibly Enyalius, Hecate or the Maenonian Candaules,\(^\text{37}\) each of whom had a function connected with war.\(^\text{38}\) Dogs are considered to have been ‘the

\(^{34}\) Pedley, ‘Carians in Sardis’, 97.


\(^{38}\) The question of the meals’ recipient(s) is complex and was left unresolved by Greenwalt (Jnr). Therefore, only the following should be suggested here: for Enyalius, generally, see F. Graf, ‘Women, War, and Warlike Divinities’, Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 55 (1984): 247-54 and Brill’s New Pauly, s.v. Enyalios, which offers that Enyalius was associated with the moment ‘immediately preceding the start of battle’ and that the deity was appealed to ‘as the frontlines [sic] aligned their spears for the first charge’. Thus, Enyalius cannot be analogously connected with the ritual meals. In Sparta dog sacrifices to Enyalius were ‘made with the purpose of purifying a wound inflicted by weapons’. Hecate was a multi-functional deity who Hesiod described as a provider of help to ‘warriors in battle’: Hes. Theog. 431-3 with D. Boekeker, ‘Hecate: A Transfunctional Goddess in the Theogony?’, Transactions of the American Philological Association 113 (1983): 82-5. For a suggestion that Candaules was known also as Heracles but ‘related to an Indo-European war god’ see Pedley, ‘Carians in Sardis’, 98. Overall, see Greenwalt (Jnr), Ritual Dinners in Early Historic Sardis, 31-54. The whole issue is fraught with uncertainty, given the likely, but difficult to measure, degree of syncretic assimilation of one deity to another which could oc-
sacrificial animal *par excellence*...among the Carians'. These may also have
been Carian sacrifices offered in a culturally syncrctic (post-Hittite > Anatolian
> Greek) Lydian environment. On the basis of comparative evidence, it can be
inferred that these ritual deposits could have been connected directly in some
way with strength in war, or indirectly with other military matters. This is ap-
propriate for Carians, who were held in high regard as heavy infantry soldiers
in the seventh and sixth centuries, and who are known to have been both
used and sold as mercenaries by Gyges.

In combination, the literary testimonies and the inscriptions, with the evidence
of the repeated ritual, offer confirmation of the regular presence of Carians—possibly
connected with military campaigns—who freely used the Sardian ‘industrial-
commercial’ area for ritual purposes. Two periods of Carian prominence in
Sardian affairs are delineated by the literary evidence: that of the rule of Gyges,
who certainly had Carian supporters, and of Alyattes when Carian support was
fostered, after which he was succeeded by his Sardian but half-Carian son,
Croesus, who also probably had Carian support. The archaeological evi-
dence for a Carian presence in Sardis is dated to one of the only two periods
during which Carians are prominently recorded in Greek sources describing
Mermaid affairs: that is, to the periods when Alyattes and Croesus ruled. Based
on the evidence, Carians appear to have been less prominent during the rule
of Sadyattes. This suggests that there was a diminished Carian presence after

cur due to the legacy of Hittite influence in Sardian rituals, the cultural interaction
between Lydia and Greeks (Ionia, for example) and the far more complex ques-
tion of syncrctic inter-Anatolian ideational developments applied to conceptions
of local deities, many of which were also simultaneously being subjected to ‘pres-
sures’ of Ionian rationalism (easily described as ‘Hellenisation’).

420, 669.


and epikoureoi in Early Greek Literature and History’, *Greek, Roman and Byzant-

Assurbanipal Prism A, II, 111 ff.; Diod. Sic. 1.66.1 ff.; cf. Hdt. 2.152.1-5. See also
Lavelle (ibid.), 229-62 and B.M. Lavelle, ‘The Apollodoran Date for Archilochus’,


Crawford H. Greenewalt (Jnr) and Ann M. Heywood, ‘A Helmet of the Sixth Cen-
tury BC from Sardis’, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 285

46
the rule of Gyges, followed by a resurgence of Carian activity in Sardis during the reigns of Alyattes and Croesus.\textsuperscript{45}

Further evidence of Carian influence near Sardis is found in Xanthus’ description of a sanctuary of Carius situated in Torrhebian territory on Mount Carius (\textit{Kel Dağ}), close to Mount Tmolus (\textit{Boz Dağ}) on which Lake Torrhebia (Gölcük) was located.\textsuperscript{46} The Torrhebians were not Lydians, based upon the mytho-genealogical distinction provided by Xanthus the eponymous Torrhebian hero was Torrhebus, as Lydus was for Lydians. Also, Xanthus distinguishes the Torrhebians and Lydians linguistically in a similar way that the Ionians and Dorians could be differentiated.\textsuperscript{47} Since before the fifth century, the sanctuary of Carius was probably an open-air sanctuary and ‘a focal point for the regional cults of Mount Tmolus’.\textsuperscript{48} The local water sources may have had importance for local cults, and the site of the sanctuary of Carius was most likely dignified by Zeus’ presence in his function as a rain-bringing god. The sanctuary was on the route of the procession from the Ephesian Artemisium to that at Sardis, a ritual in which Carians are likely to have participated.\textsuperscript{49} There is archaic evidence of settlement in the general vicinity, and the significance of the area is further suggested by roads that would have been in use during the sixth and fifth centuries. Specifically, the sanctuary was located near the roads lying east and west of the Pactolus River and running north from Hypaeapa to Sardis over Mount Tmolus. Possession of the sanctuary of Carius was strategically important, as it commanded a view of the southern valleys of Mount Tmolus,

\textsuperscript{45} The withdrawal of Arselis to Mylasa suggests this (Plut. \textit{Mor.} 301f-302a).


\textsuperscript{47} \textit{FGrH} 765 (Xanthus), fr. 16 = Dion. Hal. A. \textit{R.} 1.28.2; Pearson, \textit{Early Ionian Historians}, 121.


\textsuperscript{49} ibid., 6-12.
and the sanctuary’s locale may have been part of a chain of communication points running from Hypaepa to Sardis.\textsuperscript{50}

The archaeological evidence indicates a significant Carian presence in the area of the sanctuary, and the lines of communication with Sardis suggest a degree of Sardian influence over the region of Torrhebia in the sixth century. When Xanthus’ \textit{Lydiaca} was written the sanctuary of Carius had already been established, which must be considered in relation to the Carian presence in Sardis from the seventh to sixth centuries and onwards. Such conditions virtually guarantee a Carian involvement at the sanctuary of Carius. The fact that a Carian presence is difficult to identify archaeologically may be due to the influences of Lydian and Torrhebian material culture.

Xanthus provided an upward genealogy for Carius, making him a son of Zeus and Torrhebia, and there are possible reasons that could explain this. Jacoby, however, in filling a lacuna, added genealogical information which he imagined was appropriate, but his solution presumes too much.\textsuperscript{51} Adding Manes and Atys as descendants of Carius creates a situation where, if eponymous figures are considered, Maenians could be seen as descendants of Carians. An alternative reading might suggest a period of Carian control of Lydia before Maenian. Neither suggestion, however, is supportable by Jacoby’s reconstruction. There are partial grounds for Jacoby’s suggestion if one takes Herodotus’ reports of what the Lydians themselves said, which was that Atys was a son of Manes.\textsuperscript{52} Also, Xanthus described Torrhebus as the son of Atys,\textsuperscript{53} but a common Lydian tradition reported by Herodotus makes no reference to Torrhebus, and the son of Atys in this tradition is Tyrrenhus.\textsuperscript{54} In referring to Manes, Herodotus also provided a Lydian genealogy that made Cotys his son.\textsuperscript{55} Jacoby’s information about Manes and Atys might yet be acceptable, but Dionysius of Halicarnassus reported another tradition that made Manes a son of Zeus and Ge, putting Manes

\begin{itemize}
\item Foss, ‘Explorations in Mount Tmolus’, 27-30; Bengisu, ‘Lydian Mount Karios’, 13; Strabo 13.4.5.
\item Pearson, \textit{Early Ionian Historians}, 121 n3. Possibly Jacoby, \textit{Die Fragmente}, thought that there had been a copyist’s error.
\item Hdt. 1.94.3, 5 and 4.45.3. Asheri et al., \textit{A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV}, vouches that ‘[i]t looks like a local Lydian tradition that Herodotus reports without commenting’: Asheri et al., \textit{A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV}, 146 and cf. 17 f.
\item \textit{FGH} 765 (Xanthus), fr. 16 = Dion. Hal. \textit{A. R.} 1.28.2.
\item Hdt. 1.94.1-5.
\item Hdt. 4.45.3.
\end{itemize}
on the same horizontal stemmatic level as Carius.\textsuperscript{56} None of these traditions suggest that Carius should be considered as the father of Manes. Therefore, as the father/son relationship of Carius and Manes lacks attestation, except in Jacoby’s restoration, the genealogical step from Carius to Manes is difficult to accept. Consequently, without Manes or Atys in the genealogy, the importance of the remaining information concerning Carius must be interpreted through his matrilineal descent line. Thus, without dependence upon any questionable textual additions, and by acknowledging only the genuine ancient information, Carius and the Carians, along with Torrhebia and the Torrhebians, are not forced into a non-existent genealogical relationship with Manes and Atys as descendants. The remaining upward genealogy of Carius indicates a mytho-genealogical relationship linking Carians with Torrhebians.

After removing Jacoby’s questionable addition, a residual problem is that this leaves the text lacking grammatical sense. This is based upon a translation of \( \alpha \tau \pi \omega \) as ‘from him’, which produces an odd result that Carius, from (or after) himself, had named a lake Torrhebia. Justifiably, Pearson questioned this, but his addition of parentheses is an awkward and complicated solution. Other possible alternatives avoid these difficulties. For example, without the parentheses \( \alpha \pi \delta \) could be taken in the same way as \( \upsilon \pi \delta \), making Carius the agent by whom—not the person from (after) whom—the lake was named.\textsuperscript{57} Examples from the Suda could be used to defend such a reading, supported by similar usages from Herodotus and Thucydides.\textsuperscript{58} A variable reading of the two uses of \( \alpha \pi \delta \) would still not resolve Jacoby’s identification of twenty seven or twenty eight missing letters. To avoid the complications, \( \alpha \pi \delta \) in the first line can be understood as from (after) Torrhebus, and it is then preferable to accept consistent usage in the succeeding text.

There is wide agreement that the information following the lacuna indicates that Torrhebus’ name is missing from the text. Suggesting further confirmation of why Carius is not the figure described wandering by the lake is that the Suda entry is about the polis of Torrhebus, its founding and other Torrhebian matters. It is not actually about Carius. Further, it is strange that Carius would

\textsuperscript{56} Dion. Hal. A. R. 1.27.1-2.

\textsuperscript{57} See, for examples, Friedrich Wilhelm and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 118, sect. 210; LSJ, s.v. \( \alpha \pi \delta \) (4).

\textsuperscript{58} Suda, s.v. "\( \alpha \kappa \eta \) has \( \alpha \pi \delta \) \( \mathrm{H} \rho \alpha \kappa \lambda \epsilon \omega \varsigma \), which makes little sense if translated as other than ‘by Heracles’. Hdt. 1.15.1; Thuc. 1.17.
have taught music known as Torrhebian to the Lydians. It is also difficult to ascertain a reason why the Lydians would consider their own music to be Torrhebian, but taught to them by Carius, particularly given the indications of ancient arguments attempting to linguistically distinguish Lydian and Torrhebian identities. On the other hand, Torrhebus' name is well connected with music, particularly in the addition of a fifth string to the lyre. There is no ambiguity in the numismatic evidence, confirming that it is Torrhebus with whom a musical association should be made. Carius, however, is difficult to connect with music.

Still, Carius' place in the story requires an explanation. As it is clear that the nymph Torrheba taught music to the namer of the lake and that this was Torrhebus, Carius could simply be a genealogical addition connected to the nymph's name for some other purpose. For example, it might explain the existence of the shrine and the name of the mountain. Therefore, the passage makes more sense if Torrhebus was wandering, and after meeting the nymph who taught him Torrhebian music he then passed it on to the Lydians. He was also the eponym of the Torrhebians and their polis, and thus from his name that of their music was also derived. This logically implies (with near certainty) that the lacuna contained Torrhebus' name, but a restoration could not be based upon this alone. As it is prudent to accept a consistent use of ἀπό, Jacoby's and Pearson's suggested repairs are unnecessary, the text is grammatically sound as it stands, and Carius' upward genealogy remains clear. Importantly, removing the uncertain textual content minimises the danger of a misinterpretation with regard to questions of mytho-genealogical identity. The text can thus be utilised with Jacoby's perceived lacuna acknowledged:

59 The juxtaposition of Lydian and Torrhebian, in musical terms (Plut. De Mus. 1136c), perhaps echoes the same debate.
60 Boethius, De Institutione Musica, 1.20.
61 Suda, s.v. Τόρρηβος; FGrH 90 (Nicolaus Damascenus), fr. 15.
Torrhebus, a polis of Lydia, from Torrhebus son of Atys. The ethnic
is Torrhebioi and the feminine form is Torrhebis. In Torrhebian terri-

tory there is a mountain named Carius and the shrine of the hero Carius
is there. Carius is the child of Zeus and Torrhebia, according to Nico-
laus Book Four, <...>19-207. . . . . . . . . . . . . . Torrhebus> who, wandering around a lake which was called Torrhebia by him,

hearing the sound of Nymphs which the Lydians also call Muses, was both
instructed in mousike and taught it to the Lydians, and the songs, on account
of this, were called Torrhebian.

Two points are significant where the Carians are concerned. First, it is note-
worthy that Carius is a figure whose name was used to explain the reasons
for the description of a mountain, as Torrhebia’s did for the lake, in what may
be considered Torrhebian or Lydian territory. Carius appears as a stranger in a
strange land, but the report of a mountain named Carius and a shrine dedicated
to a hero of the same name is consonant with the suggestion that Carians held
a place in Torrhebian territory, or that Torrhebians should be connected with
Carians in some other way. It seems, therefore, that Xanthus has rationalised
the Carians into a Torrhebian landscape or reported a local epicloric tradition.
In all likelihood an element of both suggestions is contained in the text. Second,
the genealogical descent of Carius from Torrhebia suggests that the Carians’
place in Torrhebian territory was also being explained through this mythological
relationship, which is also consonant with the existence of a mountain named
Carius and a shrine for a similarly named hero. Suitably, this is consistent with
what would be expected of the presentation of information by a logographer
influenced by Ionian rationalism, such as Xanthus.

Torrhebus is shown as a civiliser of the Lydians by the act of teaching them
music, casting him in an Apolline role. This aspect of the story might be better
considered as a Lydian or Torrhebian tradition recorded by Xanthus.62 If this
is correct, then the myth may have been generated during a period of Carian
prominence in Sardis and Torrhebia, which created a need to explain the pres-
ence of the Mount Carius sanctuary. An appropriate period for the development
of the tradition is well placed in post-Tylonid Lydia, during the Mermnad period of
Carian prominence between the rules of Gyges and Croesus; that is, at the time
when the Torrhebian sanctuary of Carius was being architecturally developed.

Ephorus suggested that Xanthus used more ancient (παλαῖοτέρος) source
material than Herodotus. Perhaps this was the type of approach he referred

to, suggesting an indication of the way that Xanthus prepared his material.

The Xanthian genealogy for Carius, after removing the textual difficulties, is truncated. Also, for other reasons it lacks mytho-genealogical value in terms of Carian identity. This can be understood by comparison with the following statement of Carian identity reported to Herodotus at Labraunda:

\[
\text{ἀποδείκνυσι δὲ ἐν Μυλάσσαι Δίως Καρίων ἄρχαιον, τοῦ Μυσάαι μὲν καὶ Λυδίας μέτεστι ὡς κασιγνήτοισι ἐσύν τοῖς Καραῖ τῶν γὰρ Λυδίων καὶ Μυσῶν λέγουσι εἶναί Καράς ἀδελφοὺς. τούτοις μὲν δὴ μέτεστι, ὃσοι δὲ ἐστὶς ἄλλοι ἑθικοὶ ὁμάγλωσσοι τοῖς Καραῖ ἐγένοντο, τούτοις δὲ οὐ μέτα.}^{63}
\]

they point to an ancient shrine of Carian Zeus at Mylasa, to which Mysians and Lydians, as brethren of the Carians (for Lydus and Myus, they say, were brothers of Car), are admitted, but not those who spoke the same language as the Carians but were of another people.

The Labraundean tradition is specific in the way that it is presented and can be attributed to a particular source, unlike the Xanthian example. Herodotus’ information was probably obtained from Mylasa or Labraunda, both of which he could easily have visited.\(^{64}\) Available evidence suggests, however, that it was not drawn from a written source, as there are no fifth-century indications that such records existed at Labraunda. Also, Herodotus should not have been allowed to enter the temple in order to access written records, if they did exist, because he was not Carian, Mysian or Lydian (he could only gain admittance if he claimed kinship with the non-Greeks, and speaking Carian would not necessarily have guaranteed access).\(^{65}\) The tradition was presented as something ‘they say’ (λέγουσι), which might imply a written source, but it is more likely that Herodotus received this information orally.\(^{66}\) ‘They’, in this case, can refer only to those permitted to worship at Labraunda, which means that the tradition was probably reported to Herodotus in Carian, Lydian, Mysian or Greek.
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63 Hdt. 1.171.6.
64 The approximate distance between Halicarnassus and Mylasa was forty kilometres, with Labraunda some ten kilometres further away (cf. Talbert, Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World, 61).
65 Hdt. 1.171.6.
Carians permitted at Labraunda spoke Carian and left ‘para-Carian’ graffiti, but they are likely to have had bilingual Greek speakers in their midst. Herodotus is considered to have known only Greek, but his family connections and his experience of the Carian population of Halicarnassus suggest a possible familiarity with the Carian language. Overall, the evidence strongly indicates that this was an orally reported tradition delivered to Herodotus in Greek and possibly that a scant knowledge of Carian assisted his understanding.

Espousal of the mytho-genealogical tradition of the fraternity of Car, Lydus and Mysus defined participation in religious affairs at Labraunda. Further, as the tradition was expressed in a mytho-genealogical form, defining groups through their eponymous ancestry, it can be said that it also defines the ethnic identities of the religious participants at Labraunda in the mid-fifth century. Supporting this is the fact that the tradition is presented as something ‘they’ said, making this an example of Luraghi’s model of an ἄκοινη discourse (what Herodotus heard). Accounts of this kind provide ‘the social and or ethnic dimension’ of the knowledge Herodotus drew upon, particularly when made by a community which claimed knowledge of its own past. Thus, an ἄκοινη discourse was a collective statement originating in a ‘group that believes it knows, in the sense of

---


68 Based upon SIG, 45 and 46, which indicate the Carian community at Halicarnassus. Cf. also Asheri et al., A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV, 2-3 and FGrH 741 (Philippus Theangeleus), fr. 1 = Strab.14.2.28. For Herodotus’ knowledge of languages see How and Wells, 27 f.; Asheri et al., A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV, 17-8.

holding as true, a certain tale or piece of information’ describing its collective past. In this way ethnicity and identity amount to the same thing, as they are presented as a self-identifying discourse. Unfortunately, the same conditions are inapplicable to the Xanthian fragment. By analogy with the Labraundean tradition, one may expect that Carians and Torrhebians frequented the sanctuary of Carius, but it does not offer a definition of the ethnic identity of those who were so allowed.

How, therefore, should we understand Xanthus’ treatment of Carius in comparison with the Labraundean tradition presented by Herodotus? Perhaps this is best done by answering the question, can the figures of Carius (Kápios) at Torrhebia and Car (Káp) at Labraunda be reconciled as being the same mythological hero? This question is complicated by the existence of Lydian and Torrhebian dialects, as well as possible differences in the Sardian/Lydian conventions which influenced Xanthus’ Greek as compared with Herodotus’ use of Greek. Religious symbiosis, the rationalising tendencies of Ionian logographers and later syncretic accruals of ideas attached to the name of Carius further complicate the question.

Robert linguistically equated the epithet of Apollo Careius (Kápios) with the name of Carius. He argues that the former was a later variant form of Carius required for verse. This is, however, mid-second-century evidence, by which time a great deal had changed since Xanthus and Herodotus. Carius may well have linguistic equivalence with the second century example of Careius, suggesting the latter to be a syncretic development of an earlier Carius, as Robert thought; this, however, does not necessitate that Xanthus’ Carius should be seen as Apollo (Careius) well before this association began. Malay and Bengisu also describe Xanthus’ Carius as Apollo, but this dependence upon Robert’s linguistic argument presumes more than the evidence permits.

The suggestion that Carius was Apollo has problematic consequences for which it is difficult to provide concise explanations. First, it is difficult to es-

70 ibid., 147.
71 Cf. Hall, 40 ff.
73 Note that Talbert, Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World, marked the sanctuary as being that of Apollo Carius, although this also seems wrongly applied to sixth century conditions in Torrhebia (that is, a sanctuary of Carius but not of Apollo Carius or Careius): Talbert, Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World, s.v. Apollo Karios T. TKY, 56 F5.
cape the genealogical circumstance that a Carian Apollo was seen as a son of Zeus and Torrhebia, for which there is no comparable evidence. Apollo is the son of Leto.\textsuperscript{74} Moreover, the place of his twin Artemis in such a scheme is just as problematic. A solution along these lines also requires an explanation for the alteration of Leto, the daughter of a Titan, for Torrhebia, a nymph. A further difficulty is that Carius is the son of a god and a nymph, and can only be considered as a semi-divine figure, but Apollo Careius must be a divine son of Leto. In fact, there is no Xanthian evidence that Carius is Apollo, and any such suggestion requires detailed further explanation.\textsuperscript{75} Since Robert wrote it has also been shown elsewhere that Apollo can be connected with the Bronze Age Anatolian figure, Appaliuna,\textsuperscript{76} which now casts earlier findings in a different light. It seems also, that if Carius is a name, then it is a flaw to compare this with a geographic epithet applied to Apollo. Carius is normally treated as an adjective\textsuperscript{77} but Xanthus seems not to offer an adjectival description or a geographic epithet for Apollo. When used to describe the mountain that was named after Carius, the word seems to be used as a name in either instance. Other evidence shows that Carius could be treated as a name in antiquity, and not just as a geographic epithet or an adjective. Aelius Herodianus, for example, repeated the description that Carius was a son of Torrhebia, apparently accepting that Carius was the name of a semi-divine figure.\textsuperscript{78}

The following scheme offers a simple approach to a complex set of evidence. Prior to Arselis transferring the \textit{labrys} to Labraunda, the Labraundean Zeus Carius had an earlier cult in Lydia. Xanthus’ Carius was understood to be a son of Zeus and was mythologically coupled with Torrhebia (by Xanthus); but when Arselis transferred the \textit{labrys}, the domicile of Carius’ father (Zeus) was also transferred to Labraunda. This properly distinguishes Xanthus’ Carius from Zeus, and explains how Carius could later have been rationalised into a Carian setting. Car, as described by Herodotus, is also distinguishable from Zeus Carius, which makes it possible that Carius and Car could be the same figure. If Car, Lydus and Mysus are mytho-genealogical brothers, then Zeus Carius must be on a stemma one or more steps higher than Atys, the father of Lydus according to Herodotus. Xanthus’ Torrhebus, however, was a son of Atys,

\textsuperscript{74} For example, Hes. \textit{Theog.} 918-20; Op. 771; Hom. \textit{Il.} 1.9; Apollod. 1.4.1.

\textsuperscript{75} Contra Malay and Bengisu, ‘Torrhebia Limne’, 35.


\textsuperscript{77} \textit{LSJ}, s.v. \textit{káρος}.

\textsuperscript{78} Aelius Herodianus, \textit{De prosodia catholica}, 3.1, 290, 7.
and Car appears on the same horizontal line as Torrhebus in the Labraundean version. Possibly then, Herodotus (or his source) altered the genealogical positions of the eponymous figures, Car and Torrhebus, for a Labraundean environment where promotion of Torrhebians was not required, but that of Lydians and Mysians was. Lydus or Mysus might have absorbed the role of Torrhebus. Later, Torrhebus was represented on mid-second-century coins of Hierapolis in connection with Apollo, who had by this time become more widely popular than the earlier Carian figure known in Torrhebia. By this scheme, it is better to assimilate the more closely contemporaneous Xanthian Carius to the Labraundean Car, the eponymous figure of the fifth-century Carians, rather than equating Carius with Zeus or Apollo, and therefore he need not be connected with Artemis or Leto. Carius and Car, however, can both be understood as an eponymous figure whose name could be written in different ways. In doing so, Carius appropriately remains a lesser figure, rather than being given the wider prominence of Apollo. Thus, these traditions identify two genealogical representations of the name of a Carian eponymous figure, conceptually ‘equivalent’ but differently presented. Varying audience expectations and authorial practices probably contributed to the differences.

Of course, a hero named Carius or Car may never have actually existed. In that sense, these different mythological conceptions of Car could have been understood as representations of the same hero. More important is the fact that ideations of Car were manufactured and expressed in stories at different times and for different reasons. The historical context of the discourse in Herodotus differs from the earlier Lydo-Torrhebian context. The Lydian empire had fallen following the rule of Croesus, and Achaemenid rule had been established; however, when Herodotus was gathering traditions, the imperial power of Athens was opposed to Achaemenid domination of Lydia, Caria and Ionia. The source differences, therefore, were probably influenced by the changing historical conditions and reflect shifting views concerning expressions and perceptions of the mythographic landscape of Carian ethnic identity between the seventh and fifth centuries.

The description of Carius in Xanthus can be tied to the Mermaid policies involving Carians during the seventh and sixth centuries. The evidence, archaeological and literary, suggests that the cult of Carius would have been an important focus of Carians who were connected in some way with Torrhebian territory. The Carian presence in Sardis can firstly be traced to the period of Gyges’ rule, during which time they were involved in Lydian affairs. Later, there is the
evidence for Carian support sought by Alyattes through a marriage alliance. Carians featured prominently in Sardian politics between the seventh to mid-sixth centuries, at which time Carius became an important mythological figure. Xanthus, working in a post-Croesid environment, appears to have recorded a tradition which was a legacy of seventh-and sixth-century Lydian politics. This tradition developed during the reigns of successive Mermaid kings whose actions altered the balance of Sardian power in with Lydia, Caria and Ionia.

Each source of information discussed here has its own value and one should not be favoured over the other. The examples must be considered in terms of their individual historical contexts, rather than generic universals used to state facts about a particular identity at any given time. In this way, the comparison of the examples from Xanthus and Herodotus illustrate a definitional criterion for a perception of ethnicity held (of themselves) by members of the fifth-century Carian ethnē. The mythological variants discussed here are evidence of an active restructuring of Carian myth-genealogical identity, and highlight a ‘fracture point’ between two variant strands of mythology. The value of this ‘fracture point’ is as a form of cognitive artifact which both circumscribes and restructures an aspect of identity. The fracture point thus plays a role in the discursive construction of Carian ethnicity. It may be said that the fifth-century Carians were stepping beyond the constraints of Xanthus’ Lydo-Torrhebian representations in order to define their place in a cultural environment which was increasingly influenced by new political factors. Herodotus’ Labraundean statement thus defines fifth-century Carian ethnic identity, and was expressed in a way that maintained connections with Lydia. This statement also operated to define Carians as distinct from Greek and other non-Greek ethnē. This was done by describing the self-perception of their ancestry in terms of a genealogical stemma, which produced a mytho-genealogical statement of ethnic identity.

This paper has demonstrated that the Xanthus fragment can be used to explain the invention of Torrhebian music and rationalise the presence of identities located in the environs of Torrhebia. The fragment indicates that Carians are likely to have frequented the environs of Torrhebia and were seen by some Lydians as having an identity that was in some way related to the identity of the Torrhebians. This information has some historical value, but its drawback is that it can only be described as something that Xanthus reported. Whilst this is probably a Lydian or Torrhebian tradition, we do not know enough about Xanthus’ method of enquiry to establish exactly where the information might
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79 Hall, 41-2 and 87 ff.
have originated. Interpretation beyond this point is speculative and there is also uncertainty as to whether individuals associable with the nominally described identities (Carian and Torrhебian) actually promulgated or accepted the information presented by Xanthus. Thus, it is a very different type of representation to that from Labraunda, which defines ethnic identities. Hence, rather than using the Xanthus fragment from Nicolaus to better understand Carian identity, it is best to take it as a mythological story used to explain the invention of Torrhебian music and to rationalise the presence of identities located in the environs of Torrhебia.
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80 On this subject see the suggestions of Kingsley, 'Meetings with Magi', 173.