

# FAMOUS HYPERBOREANS

Pär Sandin

## Introduction

I share with the northernmost Classics Professor in the world an affiliation with and sentimental attachment to the regions of the utmost North, real and imaginary. Synnøve has explored this theme in her research (e.g., des Bouvrie 1996), and I would like to honour her with a technical contribution in this same area. My article takes the form of a catalogue enumerating the individual Hyperboreans mentioned in the literature of Greco-Roman Antiquity. The Hyperboreans were a people of Greek myth imagined to reside in the northernmost part of the world (“beyond the North Wind”, as the name was understood to mean), nevertheless having had important dealings with the Greeks until historical times. This paper reviews the sources that mention Hyperborean *individuals*, commenting on noteworthy features of and some more or less bone-dry philological problems in the texts. On particular points that invite novel observation or treatment or are simply deemed to be especially worthy of interest, the text goes into larger detail than ordinary, while usually keeping to the level of synthesis and epitome of the source material. I shall not discuss the myth or indeed the reality of the Hyperboreans in general,<sup>1</sup> but touch upon some of its various aspects while treating individual sources. The famous Hyperboreans will be presented according to the chronological order of the sources that mention them first, that is approximately in the order of fame.<sup>2</sup>

## 1. Abaris

I. Pi. fr. 270 Maehler (ap. XVI). II. Hdt. 4.36. III. Pl. *Chrm.* 158b. IV. Lycurg. 14.5 (fr. 85) Conomis (ap. XVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII, XXXIX, XLIV, XLV). V. Heraclid.Pont. (1) fr. 51c Wehrli (ap. VIII), (2) fr. 73 Wehrli (ap. XV), (3) fr. 74 Wehrli (ap. XLI 2), (4) fr. 75 Wehrli (ap. XLI 1), (5) fr. \*90 Wehrli (ap. XX). VI. Arist. fr. \*191 Rose (ap. XXIV 2). VII. Hecat.Abd. *FGrH* 264 fr. 7 (ap. XIII). VIII. Eratosth. \**Cat.* 29. IX. Hippostrat. *FGrH* 568 fr. 4 (ap. XVI). X. Bolus ap. Apollon. *Mir.* 4.1–2. XI. Phld. *Piet.* 4699–703 Obbink (= [Abaris] *FGrH* 34 fr. 1<sup>add.</sup>)? XII. Str. 7.3.8. XIII. D.S. 2.47. XIV. Anon. *POxy.* 13.1611 fr. 11 (= [Abaris] *FGrH* 34 fr. 2<sup>add.</sup>)? XV. Plut. *Quomodo adul.* 14e. XVI. Harp. s.v. Ἀβαρις. XVII. Paus. 3.13.2. XVIII. Cels. 3.31 Bader (ap. XXII). XIX. [Phalar.] *Ep.* 56–57. XX. Clem.Al. *Strom.* 1.21.133.2. XXI. Philostr. *VA* 7.10. XXII. Or. *Cels.* 3.31. XXIII. (Nicom. ap.?) Porph. *VP* 28–29. XXIV. (Nicom. ap.?) Iambl. *VP* (1) 19.90–93, (2) 28.135, 138, 140–41, 147, (3) 32.215–17, 221, (4) 36.267. XXV. Euseb. *Chron.* Ol. 53.1, 82.4 (= 568, 449 B.C.). XXVI. Firm.Mat. *Err.prof.rel.* 16. XXVII. Jul. *ad Ath.* 1. XXVIII. Gr.Naz. (1) *Ep.* 2.1, (2) *Or.* 43.21.4, (3) *Carm.* 1.2.10.50–51, 37.684 M. XXIX. Him. *Or.* 23. XXX. Lib. *Ep.* 143.3. XXXI. Nonn. *D.* 11.132–33. XXXII. Procl. *in Ti.* II 8

<sup>1</sup> See especially the articles in the major German encyclopedias of Antiquity for introductions and bibliography: Daebritz in *RE* IX 1 258–79, Werhahn in *RAC* XVI 967–86, Ambühl in *NP* v 802–3. A series of articles with Swedish translations of all ancient Greek and Latin sources for the myth of the Hyperboreans is currently in progress (Sandin 2011, Sandin forthcoming).

<sup>2</sup> The source collections include complete references up to and including the seventh century AD and a selection of later instances. To each source is attached a Roman numeral, with Arabic numerals indicating multiple quotations from the same author or work. These numerals index the source in question in the discussions. An asterisk by the abbreviated title of an author, work or number of fragment indicates that the attribution is uncertain; a question mark after a source indicates that the mention of the Hyperborean(s) in question is in some way conjectural, for instance restored in the text by emendation. Abbreviations not explained in the list of references at the end of the article follow the standard of LSJ, Lampe, or *OCD* (for works of Plutarch, Eusebius and Latin authors).

Diehl. XXXIII. Procop.Gaz. Ep. 58. XXXIV. Σ Ar. Eq. 729. XXXV. Σ Arat. 311. XXXVI. Σ Pl. R. 600b. XXXVII. Σ Gr.Naz. Carm. 2.2.7.274 (37.1572.10 M.), pp. 50–51 Gaisford. XXXVIII. [Nonn.Abb.] Hist.Bas. 7. XXXIX. Cosm.Mel. schol. Gr.Naz.Carm. 2.2.7.274, 38.509 M. XL. Phot. (1) s.v. Ἄβαρις (α 29 = XVI), (2) Bibl. 374a (= XXIX). XLI. Lexica Segueriana, περί συντάξεως, (1) p. 145 Bekker (AB I 145), (2) p. 178 Bekker (AB I 178). XLII. Suda (1) s.v. Ἄβαρις (α 18), (2) s.v. Πυθαγόρας (π 3120). XLIII. Eust. (1) in D.P. 31, (2) Oratio 12 pp. 198–99 Wirth. XLIV. Nicetas Heracleensis in Gr.Naz. fr. 36 Constantinescu. XLV. [Eudocia Macrembolitissa] *Violarium* 19, p. 34 Flach.

To the ancient Greeks, Abaris was the most famous Hyperborean. He visited Greece carrying (in later versions riding on) a mystical arrow, associated with Apollo. His legend developed throughout the centuries, but he seems always to have been regarded as a spiritual or magical authority (III, V) and an ascetic (II); soon we hear of him as a seer and prophet (e.g., IV, V 5, X, XXIV 2–3).

Pindar (I) said, according to Harpocration (XVI), that Abaris was a contemporary of king Croesus of Lydia. If the lexicographer cites accurately, Abaris is then the Hyperborean individual mentioned first in known Greek sources, while at the same time being one of the youngest of the known Hyperboreans, belonging in the historical rather than mythical age.<sup>3</sup> Herodotus (II) is the first to reveal concrete details of the legend, dismissing it as unworthy of his attention:

Thus much then, and no more, concerning the Hyperboreans. As for the tale of Abaris, who is said to have been a Hyperborean, and to have gone with his arrow all round the world without once eating, I shall pass it by in silence.<sup>4</sup> (Rawlinson 1910)

Heraclides of Pontus (V 1) enhanced the narrative and let Abaris fly upon the arrow, which incidentally turned aerobatics and the magical arrow into his defining attributes in late antiquity.<sup>5</sup> Abaris is mentioned offhandedly in a slightly ironical tone as a Hyperborean with magical or pharmaceutical competence by Socrates in Plato's *Charmides* (III), but the earliest source that *prima facie* has more than a few lines of substance to offer is the speech *Against Menesaechmus* of Lycurgus (IV), preserved in fragments. Abaris is here said to have come to Greece in order to seek help, as the Hyperboreans and the rest of the world were subject to plague or famine, and Apollo ordained that Athens must pray for all nations in order to abjure the disaster. As for this fragment, it is uncertain how much of the information attributed to Lycurgus really derives from the orator, though. For reasons which the allotted space will not allow me to develop here, I find it unlikely that the versions given by the scholiast tradition to Gregory of Nazianzus (XXXVIII, etc.), which have Abaris entering the service of Apollo and uttering divinations, really originate in the speech of Lycurgus.<sup>6</sup> I think they belong rather to

<sup>3</sup> Firmicus Maternus (XXVI) uniquely dates Abaris to before the fall of Troy (see n. 7). Almost all who supply a chronological context agree with Pindar (I), but Hippostratus (IX) allegedly dated him to the third Olympiad (768–764 f.Kr.), although this according to Jacoby *ad loc.* is due to a misunderstanding or error in the text tradition. Harpocration (XVI) says that “others” place him in the twenty-first Olympiad (696–693 f.Kr.).

<sup>4</sup> καὶ ταῦτα μὲν Ὑπερβορέων περί εἰρήσθω. τὸν γὰρ περί Ἀβάριος λόγον τοῦ λεγομένου εἶναι Ὑπερβορέου οὐ λέγω, λέγοντα ὡς τὸν ὀϊστὸν περιέφερε κατὰ πᾶσαν γῆν οὐδὲν σιτεόμενος.

<sup>5</sup> XVIII, XXII, XXIII, XXIV 2, XXVIII, XXX 1–3, XXXI, XXXIII, XLII 1, XLIII 2; cf. no. 11 below. Iamblichus (XXIV 2, 28.140–42) and perhaps Procopius of Gaza (XXXIII) also preserve morsels of what may have been a realistic version of the myth, taking the arrow as an instrument of navigation, like a compass.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Conomis 1961, 146, hinting at a similar assessment. The fragment is inadequately presented in the editions of Conomis 1970 and Blass 1899, partly due to their lack of (good) editions of the sources. We still lack a comprehensive critical edition of the anonymous scholia to the sermons of Gregory of Nazianzus, which might well reveal another, perhaps even archetypal version of this particular scholium. The editors should have referred to Cosmas of Maiuma (XXXIX), though, who may be the source (Moroni 1995) of the anonymous “scholium Clarkianum” (XXXVII) that they choose to print. Cosmas himself here cites pseudo-Nonnus (XXXVIII) verbatim, who is taken to be of only secondary interest by Blass and Conomis. The editors will be

theological and Pythagorean traditions concerning Abaris, deriving perhaps on the one hand from Heraclides of Pontus (see below), on the other from Bolus of Mendes and his contemporaries and/or Pythagorean predecessors (see n. 8).

Several of the sources for the life of Abaris are preserved only in fragments. He was generally represented as a paragon of virtue, to judge from Strabon (XII), who reflects on the superior virtue of ancient barbarians, seeing (in the manner of Tacitus *Germania*) Abaris and other illustrious foreigners of old as in possession of high moral integrity by virtue of not having been corrupted by modern ways of life introduced by trade and innovation (cf. below, no. 9). Of the earlier sources, Heraclides of Pontus (V) in particular may have portrayed Abaris as a saintly figure, as suggested by Plutarch's disparaging remarks (XV = V 2) and by the titles of works of Heraclides that are said to have featured him: *On righteousness* (V 1), *On the Soul* (V 5). The preserved fragments yield little of interest, apart from an assertion of the existence and benign disposition of the gods, given by someone who may be Abaris, having been revealed to him by a spirit (V 4). A few examples of a moral stand or ethical characterization are found in later sources (cf. XIX, XXIX, XXIV 1–3). The Christians, mentioning Abaris briefly in various contexts (XX, XXII, XXV, XXVIII, XXXIII, XLII, XLIII), are generally neutral and do not condemn him as a pagan sorcerer, except for Firmicus Maternus (XXVI), who asserts that he is a despicable Scythian savage and hints that he is a con artist and/or necromancer.<sup>7</sup>

The most comprehensive extant accounts of Abaris are found in Iamblichus' *Life of Pythagoras* (XXIV). The legend has here been incorporated into that of Pythagoras in the latter's cultic identity as "the Hyperborean Apollo" (cf. no. 3). The neopythagoreans invoke the testimony of the Hyperborean Abaris as a verification of this pretension (XXIV 1, 2; a brief account also in Porphyry, XXIII),<sup>8</sup> Abaris in effect playing the part of *prodromos* (as John the Baptist to Christ) to the divine protagonist. The central narrative is found in chapter 19 (XXIV 1). Abaris meets Pythagoras in Italy on his way home to Hyperborea,<sup>9</sup> having collected gold for the Hyperborean temple. He recognizes the philosopher as Apollo and gives him his arrow. He is persuaded to remain and share his gold with the Pythagorean community, and receives instruction by Pythagoras. Much of this is repeated in chapter 28 (XXIV 2). Iamblichus later (XXIV 3) describes a philosophical conversation taking place between Abaris, Pythagoras, and the evil tyrant Phalaris, who is said to have imprisoned the divine philosopher (the details are garbled and apparently abbreviated from the source). Most of the content of the conversation is attributed to Pythagoras, but a theological tenet concerning divine providence (possibly drawing on Heraclides; see on V 4 above) is put in the mouth of Abaris:

---

excused for not taking Nicetas of Heraclea (XLIV) into account, fragments of whose commentary on Gregory of Nazianzus were first edited in 1977 (Constantinescu) from manuscripts in Bucharest and Moscow.

<sup>7</sup> Maternus cites an eccentric legend, perhaps of Euhemerist origin (cf. no. 3), according to which the famous Palladium, the Trojan idol of Athena brought by Aeneas to Rome, was originally created by Abaris out of the bones of Pelops (cf. Clem.Al. *Protr.* 4.47.6) and sold to the Trojans.

<sup>8</sup> It must be regarded as uncertain whether this fusion of the two legends appeared in the Aristotelian *De Pythagoreis* (VI). In contrast to Rose (1886), Gigon (1987) does not include the neopythagorean material about Abaris in his edition of the fragments of Aristotle (Iambl. *VP* 28.142–43 constitutes Gigon's Arist. fr. 172). A likelier original source for the information that Abaris and Pythagoras met may have been Bolus of Mendes (X), a third-century B.C. Pythagorean mysticist from Egypt. The first six chapters of Apollonius' *Mirabilia*, describing the quasi-Pythagorean holy men Epimenides, Aristetas, Hermetimus, Abaris, Pherecydes, and finally Pythagoras himself, are likely to have been adapted from Bolus (the probably lacunose ms. has Βόλου at the beginning: see Giannini 1964, 123–24 for discussion with further references). Another lost source that perhaps dealt with Abaris is Nicomachus, a Neopythagorean mathematician born around 60 AD, possibly one of the main sources for Porphyry's and Iamblichus' *Lives of Pythagoras* (cf. Porph. *VP* 20, 59; Iambl. *VP* 35.251).

<sup>9</sup> Perhaps then located in or beyond the Alps; cf. below text for n. 37.

Abaris turned the conversation away from those things, towards those that appeared manifest to all; and arguing from spiritual entities and divine benefaction being present in helpless circumstances, that is insufferable wars, incurable disease, the destruction of crops, the ravage of plague, and other such entirely griveous and desperate things, he tried to persuade of the existence of a divine providence, exceeding every human expectancy and strength.<sup>10</sup>

Pythagoras gets the last word, humiliating the tyrant, and the prophet and the divine philosopher are both condemned to death, but Phalaris is assassinated before the sentence is carried out. The narrative appears to be related to a fictive *Letter to Phalaris* in which Abaris declines an invitation from the tyrant (XIX); cf. also [Phalar.] *Ep.* 23 and 74.<sup>11</sup>

## 2. The maidens and young men visiting Delos

The Hyperboreans were famous for sending offerings to the Delian temple of Apollo.<sup>12</sup> This was done via intermediates, but the practice was said to have been instigated by Hyperborean young women and men coming to Delos in person. Long before that, other Hyperborean maidens are said to have been the nurses of the gods, Apollo and Artemis, who were born on Delos.<sup>13</sup>

The oldest and most comprehensive source mentioning these ancient visitors is Herodotus:

Two damsels, they say, named Hyperoche and Laodice, were first sent by the Hyperboreans bringing offerings; and with them the Hyperboreans sent five men to keep them from all harm by the way; these are the persons whom the Delians call “Perpherees,” and to whom great honours are paid at Delos. [...] The damsels sent by the Hyperboreans died in Delos; and in their honour all the Delian girls and youths are wont to cut off their hair. [...] They add that, once before, there came to Delos by the same road as Hyperoche and Laodice, two other virgins from the Hyperboreans, whose names were Arge and Opis. Hyperoche and Laodice came to bring to Eileithyia the offering which they had laid upon themselves, in acknowledgment of their quick labours; but Arge and Opis came at the same time as the gods themselves, and are honoured by the Delians in a different way. For the Delian women make collections in these maidens’ names, and invoke them in the hymn which Olen, a Lycian, composed for them; and the rest of the islanders, and even the Ionians, have been taught by the Delians to do the like. (Rawlinson 1910, slightly revised.)<sup>14</sup>

<sup>10</sup> ὁ δ’ Ἀβαρις μετήγε τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τούτων ἐπὶ τὰ πᾶσι φαινόμενα ἐναργῶς, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν ἀμηχάνοις, ἤτοι πολέμοις ἀτλήτοις ἢ νόσοις ἀνιάτοις ἢ καρπῶν φθοραῖς ἢ λοιμῶν φοραῖς ἢ ἄλλοις τισὶ τοιοῦτοις παγγαλέποις καὶ ἀνηκέστοις παραγινομένων δαιμονίων τινῶν καὶ θεῶν εὐεργετημάτων ἐπειρᾶτο συμπεῖθειν, ὡς ἔστι θεῖα πρόνοια, πᾶσαν ἐλπίδα ἀνθρωπίνην καὶ δύναμιν ὑπεραίρουσα.

<sup>11</sup> See also Thesleff 1968, 169, with further references.

<sup>12</sup> The process cannot have been an entirely legendary one, since later inscriptions preserve official records from the temple administration which show that they indeed kept what they called “the sacred offerings from the Hyperboreans” in the precinct ([τὰ ἐξ] Ὑπερβορέων ἱερά, *Inscr.Delos* 100.49, 104-3A.8), whoever these Hyperboreans may have been. This problem is not addressed in this article. See especially Tréheux 1953 for a discussion and review of the sources.

<sup>13</sup> For a discussion of the Hyperborean maidens and their role in Delian and Greek cult, see Sale 1961.

<sup>14</sup> πρῶτον δὲ [sc. Δήλιοι λέγουσι] τοὺς Ὑπερβορέους πέμψαι φερούσας τὰ ἱερά δύο κόρας, τὰς ὀνομάζουσι Δήλιοι εἶναι Ὑπερόχην τε καὶ Λαοδίκην· ἅμα δὲ αὐτῆσι ἀσφαλείης εἵνεκεν πέμψαι τοὺς Ὑπερβορέους τῶν

## 2.1. Hyperoche and Laodice

I. Hdt. 4.33–35. II. Clem.Al. *Protr.* 3.45.2. III. Eus. *PE* 2.6.4. (= II).

These two are forgotten in later elaborations of the embassies of the Hyperborean maidens, or merged with Arge and Opis (see 2.3). They are, however, mentioned briefly by Clement of Alexandria (II, cited by III). Mss. of Herodotus give a variant reading Λαοδόκη: cf. no. 10 Laodocus.

## 2.2 The Perpherees

I. Hdt. 4.33–34. II. Call. *Del.* 293–99. III. Hsch. s.v. Πέρφερεις (π 2010)?

The five men who accompanied Hyperoche and Laodice are rarely mentioned after Herodotus. Possibly some of the Hyperboreans named by Pausanias and others, Laodocus and Hyperochus in particular (no. 10), are meant to be individual Perpherees, drawing on some Hellenistic expansion of the myth, for instance “Boeo” (no. 8). Hesychius (III) glosses Πέρφερεις (sic) with θεωροί, i.e., properly pagan pilgrim-ambassadors who were sent out by the Greek states to the sacred festivals, but used also in an extended sense, for instance of Abaris (1 XXXIV). The only one who unmistakably refers to the myth of the Perpherees after Herodotus is Callimachus (II). He speaks of them as:

*The men who at that time were best  
Of the young. Nor did these men come back returning to their home;  
But well-endowed by fate and never without repute were they.*<sup>15</sup>

The passage deserves comment since Callimachus with his talk of “best” is clearly suggesting an etymology for Περφερείες, relating the word to ὑπερφέρω, “excel”, and perhaps to the adjective ὑπερφερέης.<sup>16</sup>

## 2.3 Arge/Hecaëрге, Opis/Upis, and Loxo

I. Hdt. 4.35. II. Call. (1) *Del.* 291–98, (2) *Dian.* 204–5?, (3) *Aet.* fr. 186.26–30 Pfeiffer (*POxy.* 19.2214)? III. Euph. fr. 103 Powell (ap. XVI). IV. Phanodic. *FGrH* 397 fr. 5 (ap. XV; cf. VIII, XII 1–2, XVII, XIX). V. Verg. *Aen.* 11.532–37, 587–96, 836–67. VI. [Pl.] *Ax.* 371a. VII. [Apollod.] 1.27. VIII. Heraclit. *All.* 7.8. IX. Paus. (1) 1.43.4, (2) 5.7.8. X. Solin. 17. XI. Porph. *Abst.* 2.19. XII. *Serv.Dan. Aen.* (1) 11.532, (2) 11.858.

ἀστῶν ἄνδρας πέντε πομπούς, τούτους οἱ νῦν Περφερείες καλέονται, τιμὰς μεγάλας ἐν Δήλῳ ἔχοντες. [...] τῆσι δὲ παρθένοισι ταύτησι τῆσι ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων τελευτησάσῃσι ἐν Δήλῳ κείρονται καὶ αἱ κόραι καὶ οἱ παῖδες οἱ Δηλίων. [...] Φασὶ δὲ οἱ αὐτοὶ οὗτοι καὶ τὴν Ἀργὴν τε καὶ τὴν Ὠπίν, ἐούσας παρθένους ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων, κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς τούτους ἀνθρώπους πορευομένας ἀπικέσθαι ἐς Δήλον ἐπιπρότερον Ὑπερόχῃς τε καὶ Λαοδίκῃς· ταύτας μὲν νῦν τῇ Εἰλειθυίῃ ἀποφερούσας ἀντι τοῦ ὀκυτόκου τὸν ἐτάξαντο φόρον ἀπικέσθαι, τὴν δὲ Ἀργὴν τε καὶ τὴν Ὠπίν ἅμα αὐτοῖσι τοῖσι θεοῖσι ἀπικέσθαι. Λέγουσι καὶ σφι τιμὰς ἄλλας δεδόσθαι πρὸς σφέων· καὶ γὰρ ἀγείρειν σφι τὰς γυναῖκας, ἐπονομαζούσας τὰ οὐνόματα ἐν τῷ ὕμνῳ τὸν σφι Ὠλὴν ἀνὴρ Λύκιος ἐποίησε, παρὰ δὲ σφέων μαθόντας νησιώτας τε καὶ Ἴωνας ὑμένειν Ὠπίν τε καὶ Ἀργὴν ὀνομάζοντάς τε καὶ ἀγείροντας. (Hdt. 4.32–35)

<sup>15</sup> ἄρσενες οἱ τότε ἄριστοι | ἠιθέων. οὐδ’ οἶγε παλιμπετὲς οἴκαδ’ ἴκοντο· | εὐμοῖροι δ’ ἐγένοντο καὶ ἀκλεῆς οὐποτ’ ἐκεῖνοι. ἐκεῖνοι has been condemned on stylistic grounds: “utterly flat, not to say completely otiose” (Mineur 1984 *ad loc.*). But it may be an unproblematic epic expansion. Editors should not put a comma before καὶ, which indeed makes the expression awkward (“they were well-endowed by fate, and never without repute were these”). Instead ἐκεῖνοι is the subject of ἐγένοντο, καὶ coordinating the two predicative adjectives, whereas οὐποτ’ negates ἀκλεῆς only. The postplaced negative is often combined with a particle (Schwyzer–Debrunner 1950, 596), and ἀκλεῆς serves as an approximate antonym to εὐμοῖροι, providing the expression with several parallels in poetry (Cooper–Krüger 2002, 2713, §2.66.1.3B). For the quasi-formulaic use of the subject ἐκεῖνοι at the end of clause and verse, cf. Il. 18.188, Od. 24.437.

<sup>16</sup> He thus anticipates the influential etymology, if not the semantic interpretation, of Ahrens 1862, 340–42.

XIII. Claud. *Cons.Stil.* 3.24.253–56, 277, 292, 308. XIV. Nonn. *D.* (1) 5.489–91, (2) 48.331–34. XV. Σ II. 21.472. XVI. Σ Od. 5.121. XVII (= XIX). Σ Call. *Dian.* 204. XVIII. Σ Call. *Del.* 292a. XIX (= XVII). *EM* s.v. Οὔπις (641–42). XX. Eust. *Il.* 1 213 van der Valk.

It is uncertain what Herodotus (I, cited above) means exactly by Arge and Opis coming “at the same time as the gods themselves”. Legrand (1938, 231) ingeniously emended to αὐτῆσι τῆσι θεοῖσι, “the goddesses themselves”, i.e., Leto, who came to Delos to give birth to Apollo and Artemis, and Eileithyia, who came to assist.<sup>17</sup> Both goddesses are said to have come from the Hyperboreans. Approximately the same sense may perhaps be intended by the reading of the mss., if sound. The masculine gender then implies that Herodotus includes Apollo (and Artemis) in the number of gods who “came” to Delos, in this case brought *in utero*, in order to be born. This is in accordance with a version of the myth preserved in a few sources, which has the elder Hyperborean maidens nursing the infants Apollo and Artemis, hence giving their own names as epithets to the gods.<sup>18</sup> This may have been the version offered by Phanodicus (IV), an author of uncertain date who wrote a *Δηλιακά*, “Delian matters”. A comprehensive account is given in Servius Danielis (XII):

(1) Some say that Opis and Hecaërge were the first who came from the Hyperboreans to the island Delos, bringing sacred offerings hidden in bundles of sheaf. Others believe that Opis and Hecaërge [corrected from Hecaërgos<sup>19</sup>] were the nurses of Apollo and Diana: Diana herself is accordingly called Opis, as stated above, and Apollo Hecaërgos.<sup>20</sup>

(2) And Virgil did not make her [the character Opis: see below no. 2.3.1] up like Tarpeia and others, but seems to have invested her with her own proper name: for the Greeks tell that ἀμαλλοφόροι [“sheaf-bringers”] came to Latona from the Hyperboreans, who are themselves also Thracians [cf. below, text for nn. 29–30]: and this woman [i.e., Opis] and Hecaërge [corrected from Hecaërgos] nursed Apollo and Diana, as may also be seen from the epithets of the gods, she being called Opis and he Hecaërgos, of which more has been said above.<sup>21</sup>

Callimachus (II 1) is the oldest extant source for the former version, letting these maidens take over the role that Herodotus assigned to Laodice and Hyperoche, that is of bringing the first Hyperborean offerings to Delos. As we saw, he or a source he has used other than Herodotus alters the name Arge to Hecaerëge, thenceforth canonical (“Arge” never appears

<sup>17</sup> Arist. *HA* 580a, Ael. *NA* 4.4.3, Paus. 1.18.5.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Sale 1961, 82–83 for a discussion, albeit I think too rigid in its interpretation of the turn of phrase in question. ἅμα αὐτοῖσι τοῖσι θεοῖσι is surely a valid expression to use even if the maidens and both goddesses did not arrive together and deliver the twins on the very same day, but only in the same general timeframe (as opposed to the much later Hyperoche and Laodice). Herodotus may have been intentionally vague: if he knew of a legend depicting the physical delivery of gods in the presence of mortals, he may have considered explicit mention of it as improper, just as he consistently avoids mentioning the death of gods when treating foreign myths and ritual (Sandin 2008).

<sup>19</sup> In both cases we read *Hecaergen* where we would have expected *Hecaergen*, which may be a misunderstanding due to limited erudition, either of Servius himself or a later scribe.

<sup>20</sup> *Quidam dicunt Opim et Hecaergen primas ex Hyperboreis sacra in insulam Delum occultata in fascibus mergitum pertulisse. alii putant Opim et Hecaergen [Hecaergen mss.] nutritores Apollinis et Dianae fuisse: hinc itaque Opim ipsam Dianam cognominatam, quod supra dictum est, Apollinem vero Hecaergen.*

<sup>21</sup> *Et hanc Vergilius non ita finxit, ut Tarpeiam et ceteras, sed proprio nomine videtur induxisse: Graeci enim tradunt ἀμαλλοφόρους ex Hyperboreis, qui et ipsi sunt Thracēs, ad Latonam venisse: hanc et Hecaergen [Hecaergen mss.] Apollinem et Dianam educasse, ut etiam ex cognominibus deorum, cum illa Opis et hic Hecaergos appellatur, agnoscitur: quod supra plenius dictum est.*

again). He uses the form Οὐπίς (Upis) for Herodotus' Ὠπίς, and makes two further changes to the narrative; claiming that the maidens are the daughters of Boreas (see below, no. 5), and adding a third companion, Λοξώ. Just as Hecaërge, Loxo is connected with Apollo by the latter's epithet Loxias (cf. XIX), but most later sources ignore her. In the pseudo-Platonic *Axiochus* (VI, perhaps first century B.C. or AD), Opis and Hecaërge are said to have brought sacred bronze tablets from the Hyperboreans to Delos, containing elaborate descriptions of the underworld (similar to the so-called Orphic gold tablets, but on a larger scale). Compare the role of Abaris (no. 1) in Pythagorean sacred legends.

In Latin sources and Nonnus (V, XIII, XIV), the Hyperborean maidens feature as semi-divine servants of Artemis, but we have no information as to how this change from their status as Hyperborean mortals occurred. Claudian (XIII) touches upon the matter, though, mentioning Opis and Hecaërge as two of the seven chiefs of Diana's virgin band:

*There join them the twin sisters Hecaërge, terror of beasts, and Opis, deity beloved of hunters, Scythian maids; their preference for Delos over the Hyperborean frosts made them goddesses and queens of the woods.*<sup>22</sup>

(Platnauer 1922, slightly revised.)

### 2.3.1 Opis/Upis

Later in the same poem of Claudian (277, 292), Opis accompanies Diana as charioteer on a particular mission. She is in fact singled out for individual treatment in several sources dealing with the myth of Artemis as the mistress of formidable virgins, functioning as a hypostasis of the epithet Οὐπίς of the goddess. We will take a closer look at the passages in question here, the interrelations of which may have been neglected to a degree.

In the *Hymn to Artemis*, Callimachus addresses the goddess as Οὐπι ἄνασσα on two occasions (204, 240), both occurring in the context of her associating with virgin females. The first address (II 2), which I believe should be seen as a proper allusion to the Hyperborean Opis, occurs in a catalogue of maidens who have been befriended by the goddess (Britomartis/Dictynna, Cyrene, Proclis and Anticleia). The epithet is used in a verse where Callimachus describes how the goddess is named after Dictynna, hence serving as an implied justification for the case of a goddess being named after a lesser being.

If the maidens first came to Delos bringing offerings to the temple, as suggested elsewhere by Callimachus (II 1), they cannot have nursed the gods there, who were obviously born before their cult was instigated. Callimachus may have preferred a different *aition* for the epithet Οὐπίς of Artemis, equivalent to her adoption of the name Dictynna, which occurred after the latter nymph escaped ravishing by Minos (II 2). Callimachus seems to have treated an extension of the narrative of Opis in his *Aetia*, in a passage preserved in fragments of a papyrus (II 3). The narrative concerns the offerings of the Hyperboreans and their itinerary to Delos (vv. 1–14), after which appears a fragmented passage featuring “beetling Ilion”, “drinking of water”, “Antiope” (usually an Amazon), and a little later:

*favour/pleasure/grace they could not  
... most lewd ... sheaf  
... about ...  
defence against a shameless eye  
the goddess put an end [to the outrage, Hybris?]*

<sup>22</sup> *Iungunt se geminae metuenda feris Hecaërge | et soror, optatum numen venantibus, Opis | progenitae Scythia: divas nemorumque potentes | fecit Hyperboreis Delos praelata pruinis* (3.253–56).

... you deer-hunting daughter of Zeus  
 ... race.<sup>23</sup>

As Pfeiffer *ad loc.* notes, the word “sheaf” (ἀμάλλης) in combination with sexual innuendo and intervention of Artemis suggests that Callimachus has narrated a special version of the myth of the death of Orion, described in a Homeric scholium (XVI), citing Euphorion (III) as its authority:

*As when Orion*] [...] The meaning is, “as when Day took Orion”. For the Day fell in love with him and took him away from Tanagra to Delos, where he saw the sheaf-bearing Opis and wanted to force himself upon her. For this, the goddess [i.e., Artemis] was wroth and killed him, as Euphorion shows.<sup>24</sup>

In the passage of Homer to which the scholium refers (Od. 5.121), Orion is slain by Artemis for having an amorous liaison with the goddess Eos, Dawn, even (according to the nymph Calypso, who is the narrator) with the full consent of the latter. But the version involving Opis is found also in the *Library* of pseudo-Apollodorus (VII).

I believe that the myth in the version of Euphorion may shed light on a verse of Virgil, the meaning of which has been debated.<sup>25</sup> Opis features in the *Aeneid* (V) as a servant of Diana. Neither Macrobius, nor any of the modern commentaries on Virgil that I have seen,<sup>26</sup> except perhaps Williams 1973, who is unclear on the subject, takes this Opis to be the Hyperborean maiden, although the identical names are duly noted. Servius, however (XII 2, contradicting XII 1), and Ambühl in *NP* VIII 1256, correctly identify them.<sup>27</sup> In the *Aeneid*, Diana assigns to Opis the mission of avenging Camilla, another favourite of the goddess, slain in battle by the Etruscan Arruns. Right before killing Arruns, Opis utters (11.857):

*Shall even you die by the shafts of Diana?*<sup>28</sup>

The arrows of Artemis have slain many a proud male, and Arruns is not one of the more illustrious or honourable victims. But I believe that this in the mouth of Opis should be an allusion to Orion in particular, in her experience the first and most glorious target, and intimately connected with her own fate. As the age of Heroes is coming to an end, Opis reflects on the distance in time and stature between Orion, the Great Hunter, and Arruns, the Etruscan; just conceivably with a nuance of regret. If Artemis had not slain Orion, but he had had his way, as Heracles had with Palantho (see no. 7), the destiny of Opis must have been another than the eternal maidenhood that Artemis seems to have conferred on her (cf. Claudian, XIII, cited above). We may ask ourselves if the advances of Orion were entirely unwelcome in all versions of the myth. Servius identifies a note of “immense bitterness” in the utterance of Opis, claiming that she grudges (*invidet*) Arruns the honourable manner of death. But perhaps she is jealous of his very mortality.

<sup>23</sup> ]ν χάριν οὐκ ἐδύναν[τ]ο | ]ατι λιχνο[τά]τω· | ] παραπλω[.]σ[.] ἀμάλλης | ]μα πέρι | ] ἀναιδέος ὄθμ[α]τος ἄλκα[ρ] | ὕβρι]ν ἔπαυσε θεή | ]σα Διὸς κεμαδοσσόε [κο]ύρη | ] [ ]εμ[.] | ] γενέθλη.

<sup>24</sup> ὡς μὲν ὄτ' Ὀρίωνα] [...] ὁ δὲ νοῦς, ὥσπερ δὴ ὅτε Ὀρίωνα ἔλαβεν ἡ Ἡμέρα. τοῦτου γὰρ ἐρασθεῖσα ἡ Ἡμέρα ἤρπασεν ἀπὸ Τανάγρας εἰς Δῆλον, ἔνθα τὴν ἀμαλλοφόρον Οὐπιν ἰδὼν ἠθέλησε βιάσασθαι. ἐφ' ᾧ ὀργισθεῖσα ἡ θεὸς ἀναρεῖ αὐτὸν, ὡς Εὐφορίων δηλοῖ.

<sup>25</sup> On Virgil's use of Euphorion, detectable in at least *Ecl.* 6.72 and 10.50, see Barigazzi in *Enc. Virg.* II 421–22, Ross in *Virg. Enc.* I 459. As the fragment of Callimachus shows, Euphorion is not the only source for this version of the myth.

<sup>26</sup> Macrobius, *Sat.* 3.22; most recently Horsfall 2003, 532n.

<sup>27</sup> As opposed to Radke in *RE* IX<sup>2</sup> 2 927–28.

<sup>28</sup> *tune etiam telis moriere Dianae?*



Virgil calls his Opis a Thracian (11.858), which may be a poetical epithet meaning little more than “somewhere north of Greece and Anatolia”,<sup>29</sup> but it may also imply that he follows Callimachus, making Opis a Thracian by birth as a daughter of Boreas. The latter is Thracian by authoritative poetic tradition;<sup>30</sup> and his sons Zetes and Calaïs were born in Thracia according to Apollonius Rhodius (1.213; cf. no. 5.1); cf. also *Aen.* 10.350 *tris quoque Threicios Boreae de gente suprema*, “and three Thracians, of the most noble [or ‘furthest away’?] family of Boreas”.

## 2.4 Achaeïa

I. Paus. 5.7.8

According to Pausanias, the mythological epic poet Olen (cf. no. 8) composed a poem in honour of Ἀχαιΐα, who came from the Hyperboreans to Delos. Pausanias says nothing about her except that she came later than Opis and Hecaërgē, whose praises the equally mythological Melanopus in turn sang (see above no. 2.3). It is unclear whether Pausanias means that Melanopus mentioned Achaeïa as well. In Herodotus (I), Olen’s hymn is devoted to Opis and Arge.

## 3. Pythagoras and the mortal Apollo (son of Zeus and Leto)

I. Arist. fr. 173 Gigon (ap. IV; cf. fr. \*191 Rose, ap. IV–VI). II. Cic. *Nat.D.* 3.57. III. D.S. 3.59.6–7? IV. Ael. *VH* 2.26. V. Porph. *VP* 28. VI. Iambl. *VP* (1) 6.30, (2) 19.91, (3) 28.140. VII. D.L. 8.11.

As a rule, only mortals are included in this collection, but several sources, for instance Aristotle (I) as cited by Aelian (IV), claim that the followers of Pythagoras considered their master to be “the Hyperborean Apollo” (see above, no. 1). This has been deemed mortal enough to meet our criteria for inclusion. To this post is added two instances of the Hyperborean Apollo featuring in Euhemeristic sources (II–III), that is portrayed as a mortal man, although there are no implications of this Euhemeristic Apollo being identical to Pythagoras. Cicero (II), who relates the opinions of the Euhemerists, says that the Apollo that came from the Hyperboreans was the “third Apollo”, i.e., the third mortal man contributing to the myth of the god, and that he was the son of the “third Zeus” and of Latona, i.e., Leto. Perhaps the Apollo who is said by Diodorus Siculus (III) to have fallen in love with Cybele and walked with her to the Hyperboreans is then only the “second” Apollo according to the Euhemeristic system (and not, strictly, himself a Hyperborean).

## 4. Hyperboreos

I. Phanod. *FGrH* 325 fr. 29 (ap. III). II. Philosteph.Hist. fr. 33 *FHG* (III 33) (ap. III). III. Σ Pi. *O.* 3.28a Drachmann.

Phanodemus (I) is said to have claimed that the Hyperboreans took their name after Ὑπερβόρεος (or Ὑπερβοραῖος), an Athenian. Philostephanus of Cyrene (II) on the other hand said that this Hyperboreos was from Thessaly. Whether they imagined that the Hyperboreans originated as a Greek colony or were at a crucial period in their history led by a Greek in exile is not known.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. *Serv.Dan.* (XII 2), cited above. Thracian = “northern” is attested in (late) Greek, apparently interpolated from a gloss in a ms. to Zos.Alch., Περὶ τοῦ θείου ὕδατος (p. 31.18 Mertens).

<sup>30</sup> Hes. *Op.* 553, Tyrt. fr. 12.4 West, Ibyc. fr. 5.9 Page, Simonid. fr. 6.2 West; cf. II. 9.5.

## 5. The Boread family

Some of the individual Hyperboreans mentioned in literature are said to have been sons and daughters, or descendants, of Boreas, the North Wind (himself a Thracian: see n. 30). Neither of the explicitly named mothers, Oreithyia and Chione (also found as a daughter of Boreas; see 5.1), is ever said to be a Hyperborean. The sources are also in conflict as to whether the sons and daughters resided in Hyperborea or somewhere else. Here are gathered those sources that explicitly state that the offspring or descendants of Boreas at some time resided in the land of the Hyperboreans.

### 5.1. Zetes and Calais (sons of Oreithyia)

I. Duris *FGrH* 76 fr. 86 (ap. III). II. Phanodic. *FGrH* 397 fr. 1 (ap. III). III. Σ A.R. 1.211.

The brothers Zetes and Calais were two of the Argonauts, mortal and eventually slain by Heracles on the island of Tenos. Two sources, cited in a scholium to Apollonius Rhodius (III), claim that they came to the expedition from the Hyperboreans. Their sisters, Cleopatra and Chione (cf. 5.2), are never said to be Hyperborean.<sup>31</sup>

### 5.2. Hyperborean priests and rulers (sons and descendants of Chione)

I. Hecat.Abd. *FGrH* 264 (1) fr. 7 (ap. II), (2) fr. 12 (ap. III). II. D.S. 2.47. III. Ael. *NA* 11.1.

Hecataeus of Abdera, whose lost work on the Hyperboreans is cited by later authors (*FGrH* 264 frs. 7–14), mention high priests and/or theocratic rulers. The two sources, Diodorus Siculus (II) and Aelian (III), which preserve these fragments, are in disagreement as to the exact pedigree of the priests, if indeed the same Boreads are intended in both cases. In one case (I 2), the three *sons* of Boreas and Chione (who is elsewhere said to be the daughter rather than consort of Boreas; see 5.1) are high priests, six cubits tall, in the Hyperborean temple of Apollo. In the other case (I 1), the priesthood and theocratic leadership of the city of the Hyperboreans are inherited among the *descendants* of Boreas, the leaders being called the Boreads. Either of the secondary sources may have misunderstood Hecataeus; or possibly he referred to different time frames, a golden age in the past when the sons of Boreas ruled, and the present state under their descendants. Hecataeus elsewhere (fr. 10 ap. Σ A.R. 2.675) explicitly claimed that the Hyperboreans still existed in his own time.

### 5.3. Opis, Loxo and Hecaërge (mother unknown)

See 2.3. Only Callimachus (*Del.* 293) explicitly claims these to be the daughters of Boreas.

## 6. Arimaspus

I. Pherenic. *Suppl.Hell.* 671 (ap. II). II. Σ Pi. *O.* 3.28c Drachmann.

A fragment by Pherenicus, an obscure Hellenistic poet from Heraclea Pontica, states that the Hyperboreans “grew from the blood of the Titans” (from the earth fertilized by their spilled blood?), and that they were led into the north by their leader Ἀριμασπός.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>31</sup> [Apollod.] 3.199, A.R. 2.234, Paus. 3.15.2.

<sup>32</sup> Herodotus (4.13) mentions the Arimaspi as a separate people, neighbours of the Hyperboreans (cf. no. 9), but Antimachus (fr. 141 Matthews ap. St.Byz. s.v. Ὑπερβόρειοι) and perhaps Callimachus (*Del.* 291; cf. fr. 186.12 Pfeiffer) consider the Hyperboreans and the Arimaspi to be identical. Stephanus of Byzantium s.v. also claims that the latter are an ἔθνος Ὑπερβορέων, “people among the Hyperboreans”.

## 7. Palantho and her father

I. Silen.Chius *FGrH* 27 fr. \*3 = Silen.Caleactensis *FGrH* 175 fr. \*8 (ap. III, IV). II. D.H. 1.43.1–2. III. Festus s.v. *Palatium*. IV. Solin. 1.14–15.

According to Dionysius from Halicarnassus (II), Latinus, the eponymous king of the Italic tribe of the Latins, was not the biological son of Faunus, king of the Aborigines, but of Heracles and “some Hyperborean woman that Heracles brought with him after her father had submitted her as a hostage”.<sup>33</sup> King Faunus took this woman, pregnant by Heracles, as his wife. Latin sources, allegedly deriving from a Greek author Silenus (uncertain which<sup>34</sup>), give her name as Palantho (IV) or Palanto (III), claiming this to be the eponym of the Palatine hill in Rome, where she was observed having sexual intercourse with Heracles.<sup>35</sup>

The context in which Heracles receives as hostage the daughter of a Hyperborean is not explained by Dionysius, but Pindar mentions that he visited the Hyperboreans, introducing the olive plant from there to Greece.<sup>36</sup> The narrative of Dionysius should perhaps be seen in light of the learned tradition that locates the Hyperboreans in or beyond the Alps,<sup>37</sup> which may fall back on the Olympian Ode in question, in which they reside by the source of the Istros (Danube). Dionysius claims that Heracles sailed to Italy with the girl, though.

## 8. Pagasus, Agyieus, and Olen

I. Boeo fr. 1–2 Powell (ap. II). II. Paus. 10.5.7–8. III. (\*Agath.) Σ Paus. 10.5.8. IV. *Suda* s.v. Ὠλήν (ω 71).

Pausanias (II) cites a female poet Boeo (I)<sup>38</sup> for the information that the Delphic oracle was instituted by Hyperboreans. In the quotations offered by Pausanias, Boeo mentions the Hyperboreans Παγασός, Ἀγυιεύς and Ὠλήν, claiming that the last-named, in all other sources (including Pausanias elsewhere) a Lycian,<sup>39</sup> was the very first epic poet. Pausanias reports that Boeo lists yet more names of Hyperboreans in a catalogue section of her poem (cf. no. 10).

## 9. A Hyperborean native in the *Arimaspea*

I. [Aristeas Epic.] fr. 11 Bernabé (ap. II). II. [Longin.] 10.4.

The epic *Arimaspea* of Aristeas is said to have depicted a journey of the author to various peoples of the North, including the Arimaspi and Hyperboreans. Possibly Aristeas, allegedly a very ancient poet, is a construct of the imagination of Herodotus (4.13, 4.16). The epic poem circulating in the Roman period was at any rate pseudepigraphic, as suspected already by its contemporaries (D.H. *Th.* 2). One of the fragments is found in pseudo-Longinus (II):

*Here is another thing also that fills us with feelings of wonder,  
Men that dwell on the water, away from the earth, on the ocean.  
Sorrowful wretches they are, and theirs is a grievous employment:  
Fixing their eyes on the stars, their lives they entrust to the waters.*

<sup>33</sup> ἐκ τινος Ὑπερβορίδος κόρης, ἣν πατὴρ εἰς ὀμηρείαν δόντος ἐπήγετο. The female ethnonym appears only here.

<sup>34</sup> A Silenus from Chius and one from Caleacte are known, but see Tell 2014 on the possibility of the former being an entirely spurious entity.

<sup>35</sup> The word used by Solinus, *compressisse*, does not necessarily suggest rape, as many translators seem to think (see OLD, L&S s.vv. *compressio*, *compressus*, *comprimo*).

<sup>36</sup> Pi. *O.* 3.10–35, cf. Paus. 5.7.7.

<sup>37</sup> Protarch. fr. 1 *FHG* (IV 485) ap. St.Byz. s.v. Ὑπερβόρειοι, Posidon. *FGrH* 87 fr. 103 ap. Σ A.R. 2.675.

<sup>38</sup> On whom see Jacoby on Philoch. *FGrH* 328 fr. 214.

<sup>39</sup> Hdt. 4.35, Call. *Del.* 305, Paus. 5.7.8.

*Often, I think, to the gods they lift up their hands and they pray;  
Ever their innermost parts are terribly tossed to and fro.*<sup>40</sup> (Fyfe 1995)

The speaker marvels over foreigners who willingly traverse the waves, obviously representing a people (“us”) unfamiliar with seafaring and boats.<sup>41</sup> He is likely to be a Hyperborean native, as it is probable that the topic originates in an interpretation of the name Abaris (see no. 1). As Hesychius records, this may be understood as “without boat”.<sup>42</sup>

## 10. Hyperochus and Amadocus/Laodocus

I. Paus. (1) 1.4.4, (2) 10.23.2.

Pausanias relates a supernatural event taking place during the invasion of Gauls into Greece in 279 B.C. At Delphi, warriors are said to have materialised out of thin air to the aid of the Hellenes (I 1):

...of these two are said to have come from the Hyperboreans, Hyperochus and Amadocus, and the third was Pyrrhus, the son of Achilles.<sup>43</sup>

The story is repeated later (I 2), but the mss. then offer the name Λαόδοκος. The warriors have been conjectured to originate in the poem of Boeo (no. 8), but the names may also connect them with the maidens Hyperoche and Laodice/Laodoce mentioned by Herodotus (no. 2.1).

## 11. A Hyperborean sorcerer

I. Luc. *Philops.* 13–15.

One of the tall tales in Lucian’s *Philopseudes* concerns a nameless Hyperborean sorcerer who is able to fly (cf. no. 1, text for n. 5), walk on water, and cast spells of different kinds.

## 12. Zabius, Themisto, and Galeotes/Galeos

I. Clem.Al. *Strom.* 1.21.134.4. II. (\*Hdn.Gr. III 1 74 *GrGr* ap.) St.Byz. s.v. Γαλεῶται (γ 23).

The main source for these very obscure Hyperboreans, king Zabius, princess Themisto, and Galeotes, the son of the latter by Apollo, is the geographical dictionary by Stephanus of Byzantium (II):

*Galeots*: a people in Sicily or in Attica, from Galeotes, the son of Apollo and Themisto, daughter of Zabius, king of the Hyperboreans, as will be told in the article on Telmissus. Some say that the Galeots are a kind of Sicilian seers. [...] They say that Galeotes (came) from the Hyperboreans,

<sup>40</sup> θαῦμ’ ἡμῖν καὶ τοῦτο μέγα φρεσὶν ἡμετέρησιν. | ἄνδρες ὕδωρ ναίουσιν ἀπὸ χθονὸς ἐν πελάγεσσι | δύστηνοὶ τινές εἰσιν, ἔχουσι γὰρ ἔργα πονηρά· | ὄμματ’ ἐν ἄστροισι, ψυχὴν δ’ ἐνὶ πόντῳ ἔχουσιν. | ἧ που πολλὰ θεοῖσι φίλας ἀνὰ χεῖρας ἔχοντες | εὐχονται σπλάγχθοισι κακῶς ἀναβαλλομένοισι.

<sup>41</sup> “Longinus” cites disingenuously, infavourably comparing this to a storm in Homer. The purpose of “Aristeas” is not the depiction of the awe-inspiring (δεινά) and sublime forces of nature applied on man, but of the good-natured naivité of an inexperienced barbarian (cf. Strabon on Abaris, no. 1 above).

<sup>42</sup> ὁ ἡπειρώτης καὶ μὴ ἔχων βάρην, “one who dwells on the mainland and does not have a boat” (Hsch. α 74). The word βάρης was used in particular of foreign ships, properly of a kind of Egyptian flat-bottomed vessel (being an Egyptian loan-word).

<sup>43</sup> τούτων τοὺς μὲν ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων λέγουσιν ἐλθεῖν, Ὑπέροχον καὶ Ἀμάδοκον, τὸν δὲ τρίτον Πύρρον εἶναι τὸν Ἀχιλλέως.

Telmissus <from ...>, and that Apollo told them in an oracle in Dodona that the one should sail east, the other west, and that they should set up an altar at the place where an eagle would snatch the meat away as they were sacrificing. Galeotes accordingly came to Sicily and Telmissus to Caria, where there is a sanctuary of the Telmissian Apollo.<sup>44</sup>

“Galeos”<sup>45</sup> is a variant reading in the first instance of the name, also found in Clement of Alexandria (I), who mentions “Telmessus in Caria and Galeos in Sicily” in a catalogue of ancient seers. The lacuna after Τελμισσὸν is necessary: Telmissus (or Telmessus) was not a Hyperborean,<sup>46</sup> but identical with the son of Apollo by “one of the daughters of Antenor”, mentioned by Dionysius of Chalcis.<sup>47</sup> The further narrative promised “in the article on Telmissus” is not extant in the abbreviated version of Stephanus that has survived.

Observe that the notion of a Hyperborean king contradicts the theocratic polity described by Hecataeus (no. 5.2).

### 13. Passerus

I. (\*Hdn.Gr. III 2 564 *GrGr* ap.) Hsch. s.v. Πάσσηρος (π 1074).

The Lexicon of Hesychius states that Πάσσηρος<sup>48</sup> the Hyperborean founded Ειρήνη (“Peace”), adding that “it was called Eirene and Pelagussa”. While “Pelagussa” is unattested elsewhere, the island Kalaureia is said to have been once called Eirene.<sup>49</sup> It is also said to have been originally sacred to Apollo,<sup>50</sup> which would be in accordance with a Hyperborean foundation myth (cf. above, no. 8).

### 14. Seuthes

I. *Suda* s.v. Ἄβαρις (α 18). II. [Zonar.] s.v. Ἄβαρις.

*Suda* (I) claims that Abaris was Σεύθου υἱός, the son of Seuthes, which is repeated by pseudo-Zonaras (II). This Seuthes is not mentioned elsewhere, but the name belongs to several famous Thracian kings (illustrating the blurred distinctions in literature between “Thracian”, “Scythian”, and “Hyperborean”; cf. text for n. 7; no. 2.3; no. 2.3.1 *fin.*).

### Coda

Apart from the utility of source collections as tools for future study, in this case of the myth of the Hyperboreans, and the small advances that have been claimed here on certain individual passages, one might ask if any immediate general conclusions may be drawn from the

<sup>44</sup> Γαλεῶται· ἔθνος ἐν Σικελίᾳ ἢ ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ, ἀπὸ Γαλεώτου υἱοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ Θεμιστοῦς, τῆς θυγατρὸς Ζαβίου, τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Ὑπερβορέων, ὡς εἰρήσεται ἐν τῷ περὶ Τελμισσοῦ. τινὲς δὲ ὅτι Γαλεῶται μάντεων εἶδος Σικελῶν. [...] φασὶ δὲ τὸν Γαλεώτην ἐξ Ὑπερβορέων, Τελμισσὸν <δὲ ἐκ \*\*\* ἐλθεῖν>, οἷς ἔχρησεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν Δωδώνῃ τὸν μὲν ἐπὶ ἀνατολὰς τὸν δ' ἐπὶ δυσμὰς πλεῖν, ὅπου τε ἂν αὐτῶν θυομένων ἀετὸς ἀρπάσῃ τὰ μηρία βωμὸν ἐνταῦθα ἰδρῦσαι. Γαλεώτης οὖν ἐν Σικελίᾳ καὶ Τελμισσοῦ ἐν Καρίᾳ ἦλθεν, ἔνθα Ἀπόλλωνος Τελμισσοῦ ἱερόν.

<sup>45</sup> γαλεοῦ N, γαλ\*\* QP.

<sup>46</sup> Pace A. Lesky in *RE* v<sup>2</sup> 2 1683 (s.v. Themisto 4).

<sup>47</sup> Fr. 4 *FHG* (IV 394) ap. Phot. s.v. Τελμισσοῖς.

<sup>48</sup> Musurus emends to Πάσσηρος.

<sup>49</sup> Anticl. *FGrH* 140 fr. 9 ap. Harp. s.v. Καλαύρεια, Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 295e.

<sup>50</sup> Strab. 8.6.14 cum Ephor. *FGrH* 70 fr. 150; Philosteph. Hist. fr. 18 *FHG* (III 31) ap. Σ A.R. 3.1243; Paus. 2.33.2; *App. Anth.* 6.58; Call. fr. 593 Pfeiffer ap. Σ A. *Eu.* 27, Σ Lyc. 617, etc.

material collected. For instance, one might pose the question whether any traces of a hypothetical lost, comprehensive narrative may be discernible; that is if any of these individuals may be connected in any way to others, indicating a shared origin in some lost epic or pseudo-historical treatment of the myth. While it cannot be ruled out that some of the more obscure names (cf. nos. 2.4, 8, 10, 12–13) were originally to be found in Hecataeus from Abdera (cf. no. 5.2) or a seminal epic poem now lost, for instance the *Arimaspea* (cf. no. 9) or Boeo (cf. no. 8), the material offers no evidence that either affirms or refutes this. We may also be fairly sure that most of the individual names can have no earlier origin than Hecataeus. Apart from Abaris (no. 1) and the visitors to Delos (no. 2), who, occurring in Herodotus and Pindar, probably emerge from oral narrative traditions, all other Hyperborean individuals listed here bear the mark of literary innovation and mythic embellishment in the Hellenistic fashion, and/or invention for the purpose of religious and political propaganda. Indeed most individuals seem to have been invented for purposes that are, to a degree, story-external, not fictional: foundation myths (8, 12, 13), eponymy (4, 6, 7), improved royal lineage (7). Taken together, then, the various obscure characters and narratives may also serve as a concise illustration of the manner in which ancient Greek mythological themes developed in Hellenistic literature.

### Works Cited

- Ahrens, F. H. L. "Zur griechischen Monatskunde." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 17 (1862): 329–67.
- Bader, R. (ed.). *Der Ἀληθῆς λόγος des Kelsos*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1940.
- Bekker, I. (ed.). *Anecdota Graeca*, vol. I, *Lexica Segueriana*. Berlin: Nauck, 1814.
- Bernabé, A. (ed.). *Poetarum epicorum Graecorum testimonia et fragmenta*. Vol. I, ed. corr., Leipzig: Teubner, 1996.
- Blass, F. (ed.). *Lycurgi Oratio in Leocratem: post Carolum Scheibe adiectis ceterarum Lycurgi orationum fragmentis edidit Fredericus Blass*. Ed. maior, Leipzig: Teubner, 1899.
- Conomis, N. C. "Notes on the fragments of Lycurgus." *Klio* 39 (1961): 72–152.
- (ed.). *Lycurgi Oratio in Leocratem: cum ceterarum Lycurgi orationum fragmentis post C. Scheibe et F. Blass cur. Nicos C. Conomis*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1970.
- Constantinescu, R. (ed.). *Texte românești în arhive străine = Nicetae Heracleensis commentariorum XVI orationum Gregorii Nazianzeni fragmenta rem litterariam, historiam atque doctrinam antiquitatis spectantia*. Bucharest: Direcția generală a arhivelor statului din Republica Socialistă România, 1977.
- Cooper, G. L. III & Krüger, K. W. *Greek Syntax: Early Greek Poetic and Herodotean syntax*. Vol. IV, Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 2002.
- des Bouvrie, Synnøve. "Hyperboreerne og Ultima Thule i antikkens forestillingsverden." *Ultima Thule: Et skrift i anledning Universitetsbibliotekets utstilling om det ytterste nord 10.10.–22.11.1996*. Eds. S. Nettet & H. Salvesen. Tromsø: Universitetsbiblioteket, 1996 (Ravnetrykk, 7). 3–26.
- Diehl, E. (ed.). *Procli Diadochi In Platonis Timaeum commentaria*. Vol. I–III, Leipzig: Teubner, 1903–1906.
- (ed.). *Anthologia lyrica Graeca*. Vol. II, 2. ed., Leipzig: Teubner, 1942.
- Drachmann, A. B. (ed.). *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*. Vol. I–III, Leipzig: Teubner, 1903–1927.
- [*Enc. Virg.*] F. Della Corte a.o., *Enciclopedia virgiliana*. Vol. I–VI, Rome: Istituto della enciclopedia italiana, 1984–1991.

- [FGrH] F. Jacoby a.o. (ed.), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Berlin: Weidmann; Leiden: Brill, 1923–. (Useful index in: P. Bonnechere, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker: (F Gr Hist): Indexes of Parts I, II, and III: Indexes of Ancient Authors, 3, Alphabetical List of Fragmentary Historians with Alphabetical List of Source-Authors for Each*, Berlin: Brill, 1999.)
- [FHG] K. Müller (ed.), *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*. Vol. I–V, Paris: Didot, 1841–1883.
- Flach, H. (ed.). *Eudociae Augustae Violarium*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1880.
- Fyfe, W. H., a.o. (ed., transl.). *Aristotle: Poetics*, edited and translated by Stephen Halliwell; *Longinus: On the Sublime*, translation by W. H. Fyfe, revised by Donald Russell; *Demetrius: On Style*, edited and translated by Doreen C. Innes based on W. Rhys Roberts. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995 (Loeb Classical library).
- [Gaisford, T.] *Catalogus sive notitia manuscriptorum qui a Cel. E. D. Clarke comparati in bibliotheca Bodleiana adservantur, Pars prior, inseruntur scholia quaedam inedita in Platonem et in carmina Gregorii Nazianzeni*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1812.
- Giannini, A. “Studi sulla paradossografia greca, II, Da Callimaco all’età imperiale: la letteratura paradossografica.” *Acme* 17 (1964): 99–139.
- Gigon, O. (ed.). *Aristotelis opera*, vol. III, *Librorum deperditorum fragmenta*. Berlin (etc.): de Gruyter, 1987.
- [GrGr] G. Uhlig a.o. (ed.), *Grammatici Graeci*. Vol. I–IV (in 10), Leipzig: Teubner, 1867–1910 (rep. Hildesheim: Olms, 1965).
- Horsfall, N. *Virgil, Aeneid 11: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill, 2003 (Mnemosyne: Supplementum, 244).
- [Jacoby] See *FGrH*.
- Lampe, G. W. H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961.
- Legrand, P.-E. “Herodotea.” *Revue des études anciennes* 40 (1938): 225–34.
- [LSJ] H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. Stuart-Jones, a.o., *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed., with a revised supplement, Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- [L&S] C. T. Lewis & C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1879 (etc.).
- [M.] J.-P. Migne a.o. (ed.), *Patrologiae cursus completus: Series Graeca*. Vol. 1–161, Paris: Migne, 1857–1866.
- Maehler, H. (ed.). *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis, Pars 2, Fragmenta; indices*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1989.
- Matthews, V. J. (ed.). *Antimachus of Colophon*. New York: Brill, 1995 (Mnemosyne: Supplementum, 155).
- Mertens, Michèle (ed.). *Les alchimistes grecs*, T. 4, P. 1, *Zosime de Panopolis: Mémoires authentiques*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1995.
- Moroni, Maria Grazia. “Il Commentario di Cosma di Gerusalemme ai Carmi di Gregorio Nazianzeno agli Scholia Clarkiana. Una riflessione.” *Sileno* 21 (1995): 195–99.
- [NP] H. Cancik & H. Schneider (eds.), *Der neue Pauly*, vol. I–XII, *Altertum*. Stuttgart (etc.): Metzler, 1996–2002.
- Obbink, D. (ed.). *Philodemus On Piety: Critical Text with Commentary*. Part 2, Oxford: Clarendon, forthcoming.
- [OCD] S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 3rd ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- [OLD] P. G. W. Glare (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968–1982.
- Page, D. L. (ed.). *Poetae melici Graeci*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.
- Pfeiffer, R. (ed.). *Callimachus*. Vol. I–II, Oxford: Clarendon, 1949–1953.
- Platnauer, M. (ed., transl.). *Claudian*. Vol. II, London: Heinemann, 1922.
- Powell, J. U. (ed.). *Collectanea Alexandrina*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1925.

- [RAC] T. Klauser, E. Dassman, a.o. (eds.), *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1950–.
- Rawlinson, G. (transl.). *The History of Herodotus*. Vol. I, London: Dent, 1910.
- [RE] G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, K. Witte, a.o. (eds.), *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Neue Bearbeitung, vol. I–XXIV, I<sup>2</sup>–XV<sup>2</sup>, Suppl. I–. Stuttgart: Metzlersher, 1894–.
- Rose, V. (ed.). *Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1886.
- Sale, W. “The Hyperborean Maidens on Delos.” *Harvard Theological Review* 54 (1961): 75–89.
- Sandin, P. “Herodotus, Dionysus, and the Greek death taboo. The Homeric Hymn to Demeter and the construction of the ‘chthonic’ in Greek literary tradition.” *Symbolae Osloenses* 83 (2008): 2–17.
- . “Hyperboreerna: En källsamling. I. 750–323 f.Kr.” *KultOrg: Samskandinavisk tidsskrift* 11/nr. 28 (2011): 83–136.
- . “Hyperboreerna: En källsamling. II. 323–1 f.Kr.” *KultOrg: Samskandinavisk tidsskrift* 13/nr. 30 (forthcoming).
- Schwyzler, E., & Debrunner, A. *Griechische Grammatik*, Bd 2, *Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*. Munich: Beck, 1950 (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, 2.1.2).
- [Suppl.Hell.] H. Lloyd-Jones & P. Parsons (eds.), *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1983.
- Tell, H. “Silenos of Chios (27).” *Brill’s New Jacoby*. Ed. Ian Worthington, Brill Online, 2014. Accessed 13 Feb. 2014 at <http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-jacoby/silenos-of-chios-27-a27>.
- Thesleff, H. (ed.). *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*. Åbo: Abo Akademi, 1965 (Acta Academiae Aboensis. Ser. A, 30:1).
- Tréheux, J. “La réalité des offrandes hyperboréennes.” *Studies Presented to David Moore Robinson*. Ed. G. E. Mylonas & D. Raymond. Vol. II, Saint Louis: Washington University, 1953. 758–74.
- van der Valk, M. (ed.). *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes*. Vol. I–IV, Leiden: Brill, 1971–1987.
- [Virg.Enc.] R. F. Thomas, J. M. Ziolkowski, a.o., *The Virgil Encyclopedia*. Vol. I–III, Chichester: Blackwell, 2014.
- Wehrli, F. (ed.). *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, Hft. 7, *Herakleides Pontikos*. 2. Aufl., Basel: Schwabe, 1969.
- West, M. L. (ed.). *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantata*. Vol. I–II, 2. ed., Oxford: Clarendon, 1989–1992.
- Williams, R. D. (ed.). *The Aeneid of Virgil*, vol. II, *Books 7–12*. London: Macmillan, 1973.
- Wirth, P. (ed.). *Eustathii Thessalonicensis opera minora (magnam partem inedita)*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999 (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, Series Berolinensis, 32).

### About the Author

*Pär Sandin* is Professor of Greek at the Department of Linguistic, Literary and Aesthetic Studies, University of Bergen. Sandin has produced a PhD dissertation in the form of a commentary on half of Aeschylus’ *Supplices*, but been kept by necessity and distractions from finishing this work. He has sundry research interests among which poetry, myth and religion feature prominent. In this decade he has *inter alia* published on Sappho, erotic literature, Hyperboreans, and Classical reception in Scandinavian poetry. [par.sandin@lle.uib.no](mailto:par.sandin@lle.uib.no)



**Latin summary**

*De Hyperboreis illustribus.* Singuli Hyperborei, qui in litteraturā antiquā apparent, exhibentur in respectū fontium Latinorum Graecorumque atque collectionum locorum allatorum. Pleraque indoles mythologicae breviter disputabantur, sed traditio litteraria, quae spectat ad fabulam Abaridis atque “puellarum Hyperborearum” speciatim tractabantur. Quidam fontes litterariae in symbolā tractantur analysi inclusis adnotationibus philologicis locorum, qui sunt [Aristeas Epic.] fr. 11 Bernabé (hic locus interpretatione nominis Abaridis instigatur); Call. *Dian.* 204–5 (includitur allusio ad puellam Hyperboream, quae est Upis/Opis); Call. *Del.* 293–95 (hoc loco deliberatur de etymologia verbi Περφερέες; et ἐκεῖνοι in 295 bene se habet); Call. *Aet.* fr. 186.26–30 Pfeiffer (disputatio mythi Orionis atque Opidis); D.H. 1.43.1–2 (disputatio mythi ad Palanthonem et Heraclem spectantis); Hecat.Abd. *FGrH* 264 fr. 7, 12 (disputatur differens nuntius de gubernatione Hyperboreica, qui in his duobus fragmentis praebetur); Hdt. 4.35 (interpretatio locutionis, quae est ἅμα αὐτοῖσι τοῖσι θεοῖσι); Iambl. *VH* 32.217 (opinionem exhibitam ab Abaride videntur similes esse eis prolatis in Heraclid. Pont. fr. 75 Wehrli); Verg. *Aen.* 11.857–58 (sententia, quam Opis profert, alludit ad mortem Orionis, quemadmodum invenitur apud Euphorionem, Callimachum atque pseudo-Apollodorum).

**English summary**

The individual Hyperboreans appearing in ancient literature are presented with a review of the Greek and Latin sources and collections of references. Most of the mythological characters are briefly discussed, but the literary evolution of the legends of Abaris and of the “Hyperborean maidens” are treated in some detail. Some of the literary sources receive scholarly treatment, the paper including philological notes on [Aristeas Epic.] fr. 11 Bernabé (the passage is inspired by an interpretation of the name Abaris); Call. *Dian.* 204–5 (includes an allusion to the Hyperborean maiden Upis/Opis); Call. *Del.* 293–95 (the passage hints at an etymology of the word Περφερέες; and ἐκεῖνοι in 295 is sound); Call. *Aet.* fr. 186.26–30 Pfeiffer (discussion of the myth of Orion and Opis); D.H. 1.43.1–2 (discussion of the myth of Palantho and Heracles); Hecat.Abd. *FGrH* 264 fr. 7, 12 (discussion of the different information about the Hyperborean leadership that is given in the two fragments); Hdt. 4.35 (interpretation of the phrase ἅμα αὐτοῖσι τοῖσι θεοῖσι); Iambl. *VH* 32.217 (the stated opinions of Abaris seem similar to those professed in Heraclid.Pont. fr. 75 Wehrli); Verg. *Aen.* 11.857–58 (the utterance of Opis alludes to the death of Orion as presented in Euphorion, Callimachus and pseudo-Apollodorus).

**Keywords**

Abaris, Apollo, pseudo-Aristeas, Artemis, Callimachus, Herodotus, Hyperboreans, Iamblichus, Pythagoras, Virgil.