In the mid-third century BCE, the Aetolians admitted a city called Heraclea into their League and agreed to speak to Ptolemy II on its behalf on an unknown matter. An inscription found at Delphi, \textit{IG IX 12 173},\textsuperscript{1}) commemorates the diplomatic venture and indicates that the Heracleans had made a claim of kinship in their initial overtures to the Aetolians (line 4). The Aetolians found Heraclea’s justification convincing, agreeing to its requests because they considered the Heracleans to be their colonists (lines 11-3): οὖν τοίς δῇν οἱ Ἡρακλεῖς - / ὑπὲρ [τῶν βασιλέων] ἐκαστῶν πολιωρίην ὡς ὑποται ἀποίκιαν / [τὰ]ν Αἰτωλοῦ.

There is an enormous bibliography for this inscription, most recently in the context of kinship diplomacy.\textsuperscript{2}) Throughout the twentieth century most discussion focused on the question of which Heraclea is mentioned. A number of suggestions was made,\textsuperscript{3}) but the majority opinion rests with Heraclea-at-Latmus in Caria.\textsuperscript{4}) The argument made by Louis Robert relies on evidence found at Pausanias 5.1.5, that Heraclea-at-Latmus and the Aetolians shared a myth involving Endymion. This myth, he argued, explains the kinship.\textsuperscript{5}) Pausanias (5.1.5) and Strabo (14.1.8) indicate that there was a shrine to Endymion at Heraclea. Strabo places it in a cave, which brings to mind the cave in which Endymion was said to be sleeping eternally. On the south side of Heraclea is a sanctuary worked into a rocky niche with large outcroppings and which may have been dedicated to Endymion.\textsuperscript{6}) As for the Aetolian version, Pausanias 5.1.5 relates Endymion’s role in the ‘early history’ of the Aetolians’ neighbors in Elis.\textsuperscript{7})

However, while Robert made excellent use of Pausanias to solve the puzzle of the mysterious Heraclea in \textit{IG IX 12 173}, he and all of the commentators who have followed suit have begged one fundamental question. Most of Pausanias’ evidence is in his first book on Elis (Book 5), and so what he gives us is Elean myth. But is citing Elean local myth the same as citing Aetolian? I will argue here that it is, by offering evidence that, where myths of Endymion and other ‘early history’ of Elis were concerned, the Aetolian and Elean perspectives were much the same in the time that \textit{IG IX 12 173} was made. The evidence follows two tracks, and in both cases I am presenting ancient perspectives on the relationship between the Aetolians and the Eleans. This relationship was real and originated in the post-Mycenaean migrations of Aetolians into Elis. As with other phenom-
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of dialectal similarities, and this reality underlies the stories that the Greeks developed to account for those origins.\(^5\) I am concerned here with (1) a mythological reconstruction of a real kinship between Aetolians and Eleans and especially its origins in these migrations and (2) monuments mentioned by Greek writers that give support to the putative kinship.

Endymion himself is the proper starting point. He was, of course, an important Greek hero known especially for his love affair with Selene, the Moon, and the eternal sleep by which he avoided old age.\(^6\) At 5.1.5, Pausanias specifically mentions the Eleans as his source when relating the local version of Endymion’s story. Before that, he says, “We know the Eleans crossed over from Kalydon and from all over Aitolia, and I discovered something about their history even before that. They say the first king in this territory was Aethlius, who was a son of Zeus by Deukalion’s daughter Protogeneia, and Endymion was his son... Endymion’s children were Paion and Epeios and Aitolos and a daughter Eurykyda” (toÁw ‘Hle¤ouw ‡smen §k Kalud«now diabebhkÒtaw ka‹ Afitvl¤aw t∞w êllhw: tå d¢ ¶ti palaiÒtera §w aÈtoÁw toiãde eÏriskon. basileËsai pr«ton §n tª taÊt˙ l°gousin ‘A°ylion, pa›da d¢ aÈtÚn DiÒw te e‰n ka‹ Prvtogene¤aw t∞w Deukal¤vnow, ‘Aeyl¤ou d¢ ‘Endum¤vna gen°syai. gen°syai d’ oÔn fasin aÈt” Pa¤ona ka‹ ‘EpeiÒn te ka‹ AfitvlÚn ka‹ yugat°ra §p’ aÈto›w EÈrukÊdan, 5.1.3-4).\(^10\)

There is a bit of a chronological mess here, for the migration Pausanias mentions is that of Oxylus and is dated to the time of the Return of the Heraclidae, several generations after the Trojan War and more still after the time of Endymion. The word palaiÒtera refers to the period of Aëthlius, Endymion, and Aetolus. The Eleans apparently had this group begin in Elis itself since Aëthlius was supposed to be their first king. Endymion succeeded Aëthlius to the throne and was eventually followed by his son Aetolus. Then, having been convicted of murder, Aetolus was exiled to the region later to be called Aetolia.\(^11\)

Some generations later, in the time of the Return of the Heraclidae, Aetolus’ descendant Oxylus returned to Elis. This figure is well-documented, as if he had been promoted as eponymous ancestor by a prominent family in Elis in historical times.\(^12\) In any case, he was said to have been a guide for the Heraclidae under Temenus; in return they allowed him to reclaim his ancestral land in the northwest Peloponnese. Oxylus led an Aetolian army against the Eleans (or Epeans) but only became king of Elis after the matter was decided in single combat between the two parties’ champions.\(^13\)

Despite Pausanias’ version, it is curious that Apollodorus mentions Endymion as leading Aeolian Greeks from Thessaly into Elis (Lib. 1.7.5), which calls to mind Strabo’s more general discussion of the distribution of the ‘four’ Greek dialects, Attic, Ionic, Doric, and Aeolic\(^14\) and his note that the Eleans were an Aeolic-speaking group (8.1.2), thereby giving them a tie to Thessaly.\(^15\) If we bring this alternative tradition into the picture, then we have the Eleans/Aetolians (or at least one strain of them) moving