

Brill's New Jacoby

Sostratos

Paola Ceccarelli, University College London

English

Ancient Greek

This entry was prepared by Paola Ceccarelli and published on

About this Historian

Historian:	Sostratos
Jacoby number:	23
Historian's work:	<i>Collection of Mythical History; On Thracian affairs; Tyrrhenian histories; On the Art of Hunting; On Rivers; Teiresias</i>
Historian's date:	1st century BC
Historical focus:	I. Mythological History (Genealogy and Mythography) B. Hellenistic Reference Works and Collections
Place of origin:	unknown

BNJ 23 F 1

Source:	Pseudo-Plutarch, <i>On Rivers</i> , 24, 4
Historian's work:	<i>Collection of Mythical History</i>
Source date:	2nd century AD
Source language:	Greek
Fragment subject:	science - Library of Congress medicine, ancient - Library of Congress natural history - Library of Congress
Edition:	E. Calderón Dorda, A. De Lazzer, and E. Pellizer (eds.), <i>Plutarco. Fiumi e monti</i> (Naples 2003), 208-9; see also Jacoby.

γεννᾶται δ' ἐν αὐτῶι¹ βοτάνη, ἣ κριθῆι ἐστι παρόμοιος ἀγρία· ταύτην οἱ ἐγχώριοι θερμαίνοντες ἐν ἐλαίω καὶ ἀλειφόμενοι² οὐδέποτε νοσοῦσι μέχρι ἀνάγκης³ τοῦ θανάτου· καθὼς ἱστορεῖ Σώστρατος ἐν ᾧ Μυθικῆς Ἱστορίας <Συν>αγωγῆς⁴.

Apparatus criticus

1. Jacoby, *FGrH* 23 F 1, adds '(sc. ἐν Τίγριδι)'
2. Jacoby, based on Stobaios 4.36.21 (θερμαίνοντες ἐν ἐλαίω καὶ ἀλειφόμενοι); θερμαίνοντες ἐλέω καταλειφόμενοι P, Calderón Dorda; θερμαίνοντες ἐλαίω καταλειφόμενοι Delattre, possibly rightly so.
3. ἀνάγκης P; τῆς ἀνάγκης Stobaios
4. ἱστορίας ἀγωγῆς P; corr. Maussac (1518); Ἱστορίων Συναγωγῆς Bernhardt, *Analecta in geographos* p. 29.

Translation

A plant grows on it [on Mt. Gauranos, close to the river Tigris], that resembles very much wild barley. The locals boil it in olive oil and then anoint themselves; thus they never fall ill until the term of death; this is reported by Sostratos in the first book of his *Collection of Mythical History*. [cf. Stobaios, *Anthologium* 4.36.21]

Commentary on the text

The name of the plant is not given, and the story remains on a very general level; as noticed by A. De Lazzer in E. Calderón Dorda, A. De Lazzer, and E. Pellizer (eds.), *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003), 261, the virtues of this plant actually illustrate what is told about the satrap Gauranos in the previous paragraph ([Plutarch], *On Rivers* 24.3): he received as a gift from the gods to live for 300 years without ever being ill, and was buried on top of the mountain, which was then named after him.

Ioannes Stobaios 4.36.21, who also refers to Sostratos as source, narrates this story in the chapter on illnesses and their remedies of his own *Anthologium*, where he excerpts, in the same order and often in almost exactly the same words, a number of paragraphs from *On Rivers*. However, as a result of his conflating the overall heading of the chapter (on the river Tigris) and the specific passage on the plant, he gives the impression that the plant grows in the river:

Σωστράτου ἐν α' Μυθικῆς <συν>αγωγῆς. Τίγρις ποταμός ἐστι τῆς Ἀρμενίας. γεννᾶται δ' ἐν αὐτῶ βοτάνη κριθῆ παρόμοιος ἀγρία. ταύτην οἱ ἐγχώριοι θερμαίνοντες ἐν ἐλαίῳ καὶ ἀλειφόμενοι οὐδέποτε νοσοῦσι μέχρι τῆς ἀνάγκης τοῦ θανάτου.

Sostratos in the first book of his *Mythical Collection*. The Tigris is a river of Armenia. A plant grows in it, similar to wild barley. This plant the locals boil in olive oil, and when they have anointed themselves with this they never fall ill until the term of death.

This is why Jacoby suggested that part of the text in [Plutarch], and specifically a reference to the Tigris, may have been lost. Indeed, the entire Chapter 24 of the *De fluviis* concerns the Tigris; but it seems clear that the plant grows on Mount Gauranos, which is located along the river. Comparison with other chapters of the *On Rivers* confirms this (so also C. Delattre, *Pseudo-Plutarque, Nommer le monde*, Villeneuve D'Ascq 2011, 221).

A title such as *Collection of Mythical History* is slightly surprising (as pointed out by Delattre, *Nommer le monde*, 221, one might have expected the plural, μυθικῶν ιστοριῶν συναγωγή; Bernhardt did indeed propose to restore a plural, see apparatus). It is even more surprising to see such a work cited as reference for a passage which deals rather with ethnography. Moreover, the title is (suspiciously?) close to that of the work of an Aristodemos, cited once in the *Parallela minora*, another work attributed to Plutarch which presents characteristics similar to the *On rivers*. This Aristodemos has been identified with a (real) Aristodemos of Nysa, who had a brother, Sostratos. No other sources apart from Pseudo-Plutarch however attests to a work by the title of *Collection of Mythical History* by the two brothers from Nysa (see discussion in *BNJ* 22).

Commentary on F 1

This is the last paragraph of Chapter 24 of [Plutarch], *On Rivers*; for a discussion of the reliability of the *On Rivers*, see the Biographical Essay. The work can be consulted in two recent commented editions: E. Calderón Dorda, A. De Lazzar, and E. Pellizer (eds.), *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003); and C. Delattre, *Pseudo-Plutarque, Nommer le monde* (Villeneuve D'Ascq 2011). The text has been transmitted by a rather special manuscript, the *Palatinus graecus Heidelbergensis* 398, which also preserves other paradoxographical works, as well as the *Erotika pathemata* of Parthenius (a history of the text and description of the manuscript in Calderón Dorda, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti*, 91-7; Delattre, *Pseudo-Plutarque. Nommer le monde*, 12–20; further details in C. Poidomani, 'Il De fluviis pseudoplutarcheo nella redazione del codice Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Supplément grec 443A', *Commentaria Classica* 3 (2016), 57-82; digital reproduction of the entire codex at <http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/cpgraec398/0037>).

Following the typical structure of the *On Rivers*, the chapter as a whole deals with the origin of the name of the river (sources: Theophilos of Antioch, Hermesianax of Kypros, and Aristonymos); with the peculiar stone that is found in it (source: Leon of Byzantion); with a mountain nearby (in this instance, Mt. Gauranos — no source-reference); and with a plant growing on it, for which the source-reference offered by [Plutarch] is Sostratos.

BNJ 23 F 1b

Source:	Natalis Comes (Natale Conti), <i>Mythologies</i> , 9.5 (p. 632 Venice 1581)
Historian's work:	<i>Collection of Mythical History</i>
Source date:	16th century AD
Source language:	Latin
Fragment subject:	religion etymology - Library of Congress etiology - Library of Congress

genealogy - Library of Congress
medicine, ancient - Library of Congress

Edition: Natalis Comes, *Mythologiae sive explicationis fabularum libri decem*, Venetiis 1581; see also Jacoby

alii dicunt Atym fuisse eius deae (scil. Rhae) sacerdotem ab illa dea sacrificiis praefectum illa lege ut perpetuam castitatem servaret. sed postea promissi parum memor Sangaritidem nympham compressit, e qua Lydum, qui Lydiae nomen dedit, et Tyrrhenum, a quo vocata est Thyrrhenia, suscepit, ut ait Dorotheus Corinthius in Historiis. At dea irata furorem immisit Atyi, qui sibi testes execut, violentas etiam manus iugulo illaturus, nisi dea miserta in pinum arborem sibi consecratam convertisset.

Alii tamen ex Hercule et Iole Tyrrhenum et Atym praedictum esse natos maluerunt, ut scripsit Sostratus in secundo Introductionis Historiae Fabulosae, quare non mirum est si propter antiquitatem suscepti argumenti vel ego quoque ipse a me dissentio, cum variorum scriptorum opiniones in variis locis sim secutus.

Translation

Some say that Atys was a priest of that goddess (Rhea), charged by that goddess to supervise sacrifices, with the condition of maintaining his chastity forever. But later, little remembering his promise, he made pregnant the nymph Sangaritis, from whom he had Lydos, who gave the name to Lydia, and Tyrrhenos, after whom Tyrrhenia is named, as Dorotheos the Korinthian says in his *Histories*. But the goddess, angry, sent a madness into Atys, who cut off his testicles, and was going to bring violent hands on his neck, if the goddess had not, having taken pity, changed him into a pine tree, sacred to herself.

Others, however, have insisted that Tyrrhenos and the above-mentioned Atys were the children of Herakles and Iole, as Sostratos has written in the second book of his *Collection of Mythical History*; and for this reason it is not surprising if, because of the remoteness of the topic discussed, I contradict myself at times, having followed in different places the opinions of different writers.

Commentary on the text

Jacoby added this fragment to those of Sostratos in the second edition (1957) of the first volume of the *FGrH* (*FGrH* 1 A *11). This passage, focusing on the identity and genealogical connections of Atys, is part of a discussion of the cult of Rhea and of her priests.

A first version combines the traditional, well-known story of Attis with that of the origins of the Lydian dynasty from Atys and his sons Lydos and Tyrrhenos (a story already attested in Herodotos 1.7 and 1.94, who does not mention the mother; as for Attis, see G. Baudy, 'Attis', in *BNP*, 2, (Leiden 2003), 327-9, who points out the links between the story of Attis and the Lydian story, told in Herodotos 1.34-5, of a young newly married man, Atys, killed accidentally on a boar-hunt; see also the extremely detailed discussion of the various myths linked to Attis by M.G. Lancellotti, *Attis. Between Myth and History: King, Priest, and God* (Leiden 2002),

passim). The union between Attis and the Hamadryad Sagaritis is narrated in Ovid, *Fasti* 4.229; a male Sagaris, son of Mygdon and Alexirrhoe and offender against the cult of Kybele appears also in [Plutarch], *On Rivers*, 12.1, where no source-reference is given, and the offence is not specified; in both Ovid and [Plutarch], *On Rivers* 12.1 Sagaritis/Sagaris gives her/his name to the river Sagaris, while here nothing is said of her story after giving birth. This version is attributed to Dorotheos the Korinthian, probably to be identified not with the Dorotheos of Korinth mentioned once by Athenaios 7.277A, but rather with Dorotheos the Chaldaean, *BNJ* 289; he in turn may be the same as Dositheos, as suggested by K. Dowden (*BNJ* 54 F 8 and Biographical Essay).

The second version, attributed by Natale Conti to Sostratos, appears to conflate the traditions on the stay of Herakles in Lydia, his union with Omphale, the origins of the Lydian dynasty, and Herakles' union with Iole (already a remarkable feat in itself), with the story of Atys/Attis, by making the latter a brother of Herakles' son Tyrrhenos. This last association may have been helped by the fact that there was a thematic connection between the story of the Lydian Atys, as narrated in Herodotos 1.34-5 and in Hermesianax F 8 Powell, and the Phoenician myth of Adonis (see Baudy, 'Attis', 327). The modifications of the tradition in respect to the Herodotean picture of the Lydian kings can be followed in various authors. In Herodotos, Atys, Lydos and Tyrrhenos are distinct, and earlier, than the Herakleidai: at Herodotos 1.7, it is stated that the very first kings of Lydia were descendants of Lydos son of Atys, and that only with Agron son of Ninos, son of Belos, son of Alkaios, son of Herakles and 'a slave-girl of Iardanos', did the Herakleidai receive the kingship, which they held for twenty-two generations, until Kandaules son of Myrsilos; while in Herodotos 1.94, Herodotos narrates the story of the migration to Etruria of Lydian colonists led by Tyrrhenos, son of Atys son of Manes, and thus implicitly brother of Lydos (see Asheri, in D. Asheri, A.B. Lloyd, A. Corcella (eds.), *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I-IV* (Oxford 2007), 79-80). However, Dionysios of Halikarnassos 1.28.1 states that Tyrrhenos, the son of Herakles and Omphale, drove off the Pelasgians from the coast of Italy and settled there. According to Pausanias 2.21.3, Herakles had a son called Tyrsenos 'from a Lydian woman'; Strabo's version (Strabo, *Geography* 5.2.2) comes probably closest to the story attributed here to Sostratos: he makes Atys a descendant of Herakles and Omphale, and the father of Lydos and Tyrrhenos. No traditions concerning children of Herakles and Iole are known.

Commentary on F 1b

Natalis Comes (Natale Conti), who is the only source for this passage, is known for his *Mythologiae sive explicationis fabularum libri decem*, the most popular and influential of Renaissance mythographies, whose first edition was published in 1567: see A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2004), 249, who refers for this to P. Ford, 'The *Mythologiae* of Natale Conti and the Pléiade', in J.F. Alcina et al. (eds.), *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Bariensis: Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies, Bari, 29 August to 3 September, 1994* (Tempe, AZ 1998), 243-50; and already M. Corbett and R.W. Lightbown, *The Comely Frontispiece: The Emblematic Title-Page in England, 1550-1660* (London 1979), 29 n. 1. The *Mythologiae* were reprinted a number of times; for the complex story of the various editions of the work, see J. Mulryan and S. Brown, *Natale Conti's Mythologiae* (Tempe, AZ 2006), 937-58, as well as R.M. Iglesias Montiel and M.C. Álvarez

Morán, *Natale Conti. «Mitología»* (Murcia 1988), 11-13 (available online at [http://interclassica.um.es/investigacion/monografias/natale_conti_mitologia/\(ver\)/1](http://interclassica.um.es/investigacion/monografias/natale_conti_mitologia/(ver)/1)), who, however, maintain their belief in a first edition of 1551. Importantly, a second, enlarged edition was published in Venice in 1581 (and in Frankfurt, also 1581), probably one year before Conti's death; later editions all rely on the enlarged editions of 1581, which are used here as basis for the text.

In this work, Natale Conti collected into an overarching structure all sorts of mythical narratives, contrasting the various versions (for which he systematically gave the source) and offering a symbolic, allegorical interpretation of them. However, notwithstanding the popularity of the work, from the very beginning Natale Conti's reliability has been suspected: following a recommendation of Casaubon, Scaliger, in a letter to the humanist Calvisius, defined Conti 'homo futilissimus', and recommended to his friend not to include in his work any citations from the *Mythologiae* (letters 1606 05 30, Casaubon to Scaliger, and 1606 06 19, Scaliger to Calvisius, in P. Botley and D. van Miert (eds.), *The Correspondence of Joseph Justus Scaliger* (Geneva, 2012), vol. VI, 424 and 441; Scaliger's letter was then printed as an appendix to Calvisius' *Examen hypothesium chronologicarum a Davide Pareo... propositarum*, Leipzig 1606, <https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=dZBmAAAACAAJ&dq>). Mistrust remained alive through the centuries: S. Whately's dismissal of the attack on Bentley made by Bennet in his book on Callimachus, mentioning in particular the use by Bennet of Natalis Comes, is worth reading: *An answer to a late book written against the learned and reverend Dr. Bentley, relating to some manuscript notes on Callimachus together with an examination of Mr. Bennet's appendix to the said book*, London 1699, 371–2.

The source-references to Sostratos and Dorotheos are part of a number of instances in which Natale Conti is the only witness for an otherwise unattested text. He, for instance, preserves (or claims to preserve) two other fragments of Sostratos (not in Jacoby; see below, 23 F 1c and 23 F 1d). Of course, it is possible that he may have found his information in manuscripts now lost; this is why Jacoby included this and some other fragments found only in the *Mythologiae* in the *addenda* to his *FGrH* (while adding words of caution: see e.g., his comments on *FGrH* 572 FF 17-21). For a thorough discussion of the sources used by Conti, see Iglesias Montiel and Álvarez Morán, *Natale Conti*, 18-32; specifically for the extent to which he used ancient Byzantine commentaries, see R.M. Iglesias Montiel and M.C. Álvarez Morán, 'Escolios griegos en la *Mythologia* de Natale Conti', in F. Dominguez Dominguez (ed.), *Humanae Litterae. Estudios de humanismo y tradicion clasica en homenaje al profesor Gaspar Morocho Gayo* (Leon 2004), 241-50, esp. 243 for their belief in the authenticity of Conti's source-references. However, a case has been made that quite a few of the source-references he gives are either erroneous or plainly invented (see the list in Mulryan and Brown, *Natale Conti's Mythologiae*, xv-xvi; the most important recent items are A.G. Roos, 'De fide Natalis Comititis', *Mnemosyne* 49 (1947), 69-77; Cameron, *Greek Mythography*, 250-1; R. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythographers* 1 (Oxford 2000), xxxiii); V. Costa, 'Natale Conti e la divulgazione della mitologia classica in Europa tra Cinquecento e Seicento', in E. Lanzillotta (ed.), *Ricerche di antichità e tradizione classica* (Tivoli 2004), 257–307; V. Costa, '«Quum mendaciis fallere soleat.» Ancora sui frammenti della storiografia greca traditi da Natale Conti', in C. Braidotti, E. Dettori, E. Lanzillotta, οὐ πᾶν ἐφήμερον. *Scritti in memoria di Roberto Pretagostini* (Roma 2009), 915–925.

Interestingly, Natale Conti is also the author of a Latin translation of [Plutarch], *On Rivers*, published in Basel in 1560 as *Natalis de Comitibus Venetus, De terminis rhetoricis libri quinque... Plutarchi item opusculum de montibus et fluminibus, et de iis quae admirabilia in illis inveniuntur, eodem Natale interprete* (see A. De Lazzer, in E. Calderón Dorda, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer (eds.), *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003), 36, as well as Calderón Dorda, in Calderón Dorda, De Lazzer, Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti*, 97-8; and Mulryan and Brown, *Natale Conti's Mythologiae*, xvii-xviii; Conti's translation is available online at <http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/~db/0003/bsb00035038/images/index.html?seite=00001&l=de>). According to De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti*, 36, Conti conducted his translation directly on the one manuscript that preserves the text, the *Palatinus graecus Heidelb.* 398, then in Basel, where the translation was also published; but a Greek print edition of the *On Rivers* already existed, conducted on that same manuscript by S. Gelenius, and published by Froben in Basel in 1533, and Conti may rather have used this. At any rate, Natale Conti had access, shortly before publishing his *Mythologiae*, to the text on which our editions of the *On Rivers* are based. M.C. Álvarez Morán, 'Ecos del *De fluviis* del Pseudo Plutarco en la *Mitología* de Natale Conti', in J. García López and E. Calderón Dorda (eds.), *Estudios sobre Plutarco: Paisaje y Naturaleza* (Murcia 1990), 143-54 gives a list of the passages of the *Mythologiae* relying on [Plutarch]'s *On Rivers*, and shows that Conti made use of his own translation of the work.

F 1b may be taken to offer some support to those who consider that Natale Conti may have invented some of his source-references and stories: Dorotheos and Sostratos, two names relatively often mentioned by [Plutarch], are given as source-references, in the same context, for two stories otherwise unattested in this version. It is unlikely that Conti could have had access to two independent sources, now both lost, both concerning the story of Atys/Attis, one with Dorotheos' and one with Sostratos' version; the only possibility to save the *fides* of these references is to suppose that Conti found the two versions together either in an ampler (or at least amply annotated) and now lost version of the *On Rivers* or of the *Parallela minora* (for the history of the manuscript tradition and of the text of the latter, see, e.g., A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 82-159); or in a now lost ampler version of the works of one of the authors who rely on these texts, such as Tzetzes or Ioannes Stobaios. But if other information had been available when Conti in 1560 published his translation of the *On Rivers*, one would have expected him to have made use of it, or at least to have mentioned it, then; and this is not the case.

One important further element is that the paragraphs on Atys with their references to Dorotheos and Sostratos were not present in the 1567 edition of the *Mythologiae*; they were added in the enlarged Venice edition of 1581 (which is why Iglesias Montiel and Álvarez Morán, *Natale Conti*, 672 put the passage between brackets). In fact, all references to Sostratos in the *Mythologiae* were absent from the first edition — it would be worthwhile to catalogue all the additions, to see whether they follow a pattern, and to track the readings and activities of Conti in between 1567 and 1581. This is something that cannot be done here; but the very words with which Conti closes this addition (an acknowledgment of internal contradictions, probably aimed at preventing criticisms) seem significant.

BNJ 23 F 1c

Source:	Natalis Comes (Natale Conti), <i>Mythologies</i> , 3, 3 (p.130 ed. Venice 1581, p. 195 ed. Geneva 1651)
Historian's work:	<i>Collection of Mythical History</i>
Source date:	16th century AD
Source language:	Latin
Fragment subject:	religion - Library of Congress mythology, greek - Library of Congress geography, ancient - Library of Congress etiology - Library of Congress natural history - Library of Congress
Edition:	Natalis Comes, <i>Mythologiae sive explicationis fabularum libri decem</i> , Venetiis 1581

Fabulati sunt antiqui Minthen nympham non indecoram fuisse Cocyti filiam, quam ubi Proserpina cum Plutone deprehendisset, tam diu indignationem dissimulavit, donec Pluto recederet. Deinde post gravem reprehensionem in mentham herbam convertit, et de prisco nomine appellavit. Istud cum in monte Pylo propinquo accidisset, mons etiam nomen inde accepit ut ait Sostratus in secundo introductionis fabulosae historiae. Fratrem etiam spurium, qui furto conscius assensisset vel propter metum, vel propter reverentiam Plutonis, in sylvestrem herbam prope similem odore et aspectu convertit.

Translation

The ancients narrated that Minthe, a rather attractive nymph, was the daughter of Cocytus; Proserpina, having surprised her with Pluto, hid her indignation up till when Pluto left. Then, after a severe reprimand, she changed her into the herb mint, and called her with her ancient name. And as this happened on a mountain close to Pylos, the mountain too took its name from this, as Sostratos narrates in the second book of his *Collection of Mythical History*. And similarly she changed her half-brother, who, apprised of the affair had assented to it, either through fear or out of respect for Pluto, in a forest herb similar in smell and shape.

Commentary on the text

The main sources for the story of Minthe are listed in H.W. Stoll, 'Minthe', in W.H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* 2.2 (Leipzig 1894-97), 2801. Strabo 8.3.14 mentions the eponymy of the mountain from Minthe and the vicinity to Pylos. Ovid briefly alludes to the story (Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 10.728-9: 'Persephone of old was given grace to change a woman's [Mintha's] form to fragrant mint', with F. Bömer, *P. Ovidius Naso, Metamorphosen* 10-11 (Heidelberg 1980), 231). A scholion to Nikander's *Alexipharmaka* 374B has a similar version (again only a short allusion). Fairly different is the version narrated in Oppian, *Haliutika* 3.486-96 (and in the related scholia): Minthe is here a beloved of Hades who, jealous of Kore, affirms that she is more beautiful than her rival and that Hades will come back to her; as a result, Demeter (not Persephone/Proserpina) tramples her underfoot. An entry of

Photios, *Lexicon*, s.v. μ 456 (Mintha) Theodoridis, confirms that there was some discussion on who exactly the nymph was: some unnamed authorities linked Minthe to the herb mint and to the mountain in Triphylyia, against the opinion of Zenodotos (*BNJ* 19 F 4), for whom Mintha was another name of Iynx, a Naiad daughter of Peitho, while Aristokles in his *On Giants* discussed the reasons behind the invention of the story (see R. Fowler, *BNJ* 33 F 2, Commentary on the text, for a full discussion). Other references to Minthe's metamorphosis include Pollux, *Onomasticon* 6.68, and the *Etymologicum Gudianum*, μ 395. For the meaning of the myth see the fascinating discussion by M. Détienné, *Les jardins d'Adonis. La mythologie des aromates en Grèce* (Paris 1989²), 117-84 (= *The Gardens of Adonis: Spices in Greek Mythology*, trans. J. Lloyd (Princeton 1994²), 72-98; for information on the various types of mint, A.A. Andrews, 'The Mints of the Greeks and Romans and Their Condimentary Uses', *Osiris* 13 (1958), 127-149.

I am, however, not aware of any source mentioning a half-brother also changed into a herb; this may have been a misunderstanding (or an addition) of Conti.

Commentary on F 1c

This fragment is not in Jacoby. This is probably why J. Mulryan and S. Brown, *Natale Conti's Mythologiae* (Tempe, AZ 2006), 167 n. 13 comment, 'This citation is not from Sostratos', without giving any grounds for such a statement. This passage, too, as F 1b, was not present in the 1567 edition of Natale Conti's *Mythologiae*, and was added in the enlarged edition of 1581. It seems reasonable to assume that all the Sostratos references added in the enlarged version of the *Mythologiae* (see below on 23 F 1d, also not in Jacoby) will stand or fall together.

BNJ 23 F 1d

Source:	Natalis Comes (Natale Conti), <i>Mythologies</i> , 5.20 (p.361 ed. Venice 1581, p. 541 ed. Geneva 1651)
Historian's work:	<i>Collection of Mythical History</i>
Source date:	16th century AD
Source language:	Latin
Fragment subject:	religion - Library of Congress mythology, greek - Library of Congress genealogy - Library of Congress etiology - Library of Congress geography, ancient - Library of Congress
Edition:	Natalis Comes, <i>Mythologiae sive explicationis fabularum libri decem</i> , Venetiis 1581

Fabulantur huius [Telluris] fuisse filium Diorphum qui, ut ait Sostratus in introductione historiae fabulosae, filium Mithrae optavit, genus foemineum aversatus. atque petram quandam calefaciens ex ea gravida facta post terminatum tempus iuvenem suscepit Diophorum nomine. Ille vir factus Martem¹ in certamen de virtute provocavit, atque interfectus in montem sui nominis consilio Deorum est conversus.

Apparatus criticus

1. Martem: So the editions Venice 1581, Frankfurt 1581, Geneva 1620, Geneva 1651; the edition Padua 1616 has Matrem (p.361), accepted in the translation of R.M. Iglesias Montiel and M.C. Álvarez Morán, *Natale Conti. «Mitología»* (Murcia 1988), 393 and n.464).

Translation

They also narrated that she [Earth] had a son, Diorphos, who, as Sostratos says in his *Collection of Mythical History*, desired a son of Mithras, hating the race of women. And having heated up a stone, from it, rendered thus pregnant, he obtained after the requisite amount of time a son called Diophoros. The latter after becoming a man challenged Mars in a competition on valour; having been killed, he was changed by a decision of the gods into a mountain bearing his name.

Commentary on the text

This is an elliptic passage, difficult to translate. R.M. Iglesias Montiel and M.C. Álvarez Morán, *Natale Conti. «Mitología»* (Murcia 1988), 393 consider, in light of the emphasis on getting children, that Diorphos desired a son from Mithras. J. Mulryan and S. Brown, *Natale Conti's Mythologiae* (Tempe, AZ 2006), 453-4 correct the first name into Diophorus, and then assume that the Earth is the subject of 'calefaciens'; as a result, they offer the following translation: 'They also fabled that Earth had a son named Diophorus. And Sostratus tells us (in the introduction to his *Mythological History*) that Earth lusted after Mithras' son, for he had no taste for women. So she took a stone and warmed it up so much that it became "pregnant", and when the requisite amount of time had elapsed the stone presented him with his son, a boy called Diophorus. After Diophorus became a man he challenged Mars to compete with him in a test of strength...' This does not make much sense; furthermore, the Frankfurt 1581 edition has Diorphos as the first name, just as the Venice edition. Part of the problem may be explained with the fact that again, this is an addition to Conti's original work (the paragraph is absent from the 1567 edition of Natale Conti's *Mythologiae*).

As noted by R.M. Iglesias Montiel and M.C. Álvarez Morán, *Natale Conti. «Mitología»*, 393 and J. Mulryan and S. Brown, *Natale Conti's Mythologiae*, 937-58, Conti took the story from Pseudo-Plutarch, *On Rivers* 23.4, where, however, no source-reference is given, and where the story is slightly different:

Παράκειται δὲ αὐτῷ ὄρος Δίορφον καλούμενον ἀπὸ Διόρφου τοῦ γηγενοῦς, περὶ οὗ φέρεται ἱστορία τοιαύτη. Μίθρας υἱὸν ἔχειν βουλόμενος καὶ τὸ τῶν γυναικῶν γένος μισῶν πέτρα τινὶ προσεξέθορεν. Ἐγκυος δὲ ὁ λίθος γενόμενος μετὰ τοὺς ὠρισμένους χρόνους ἀνέδωκε νέον

τοῦνομα Δίορφον· ὃς ἀκμάσας καὶ εἰς ἄμιλλαν ἀρετῆς τὸν Ἄρη προκαλεσάμενος ἀνηρέθη· οὗτος κατὰ πρόνοιαν θεῶν εἰς ὁμώνυμον ὄρος μετεμορφώθη.

Nearby there is a mountain called Diorphos from Diorphos the earthborn, about whom the following story is told. Mithras, desiring to have a son but hating the race of women, ejaculated on the stone. The stone became pregnant and gave birth, after the fixed time, to a young boy named Diorphos; having grown, he provoked Ares to a competition in valour, and was killed; he was then metamorphosed, by the will of the gods, in the mountain of the same name.

The story is not otherwise known: it is a variation on the theme of a miraculous birth. A. De Lazzer, in E. Calderón Dorda, A. De Lazzer, and E. Pellizer (eds.), *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003), 258 suggests a connection with the myth of Ullikummi, a version of which is narrated by Arnobios, *The case against the pagans* V, 5–7, who gives as his source an unknown Timotheus (see R. Laqueur, 'Timotheus no. 15, *RE* 2.6, 1937, 1338) 'and many others'. In Arnobius Zeus, being unable to mingle with the great Mother, ejaculates on on a primordial rock called Agdus, on which she is resting; a child is born, Acdestis, bisexual and possessed of extraordinary strength. Ample discussion of this story and its Near Eastern connections in W. Burkert, 'Von Ullikummi zum Kaukasus. Die Felsengeburt des Unholds', *Wurzbürger Jahrbücher* 5 (1979) 252–61; see now A. Mastrocinque, *The Mysteries of Mithras. A Different Account* (Tübingen 2017), 107–8.

The myth of a birth from the ground is the reason why Hercher (in Dübner, *Plutarchi fragmenta et spuria*, XI) suggested, on grounds of meaning, to correct the name Δίορφος given by P into Δίμορφος (for the manuscript tradition of the *On Rivers* see above, on F 1); numerous γηγενεῖς are indeed δίμορφοι. His proposal has however never been accepted into the text of the *On Rivers*. Alternatively, C. Delattre, *Pseudo-Plutarque. Nommer le monde* (Villeneuve D'Ascq, 2011), 213–15, suggests that the name Diorphos (otherwise unattested) might be formed from the name of Zeus and ὄρφανός, and be modelled (ironically) on διογενής. M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and the Scholia of the Iliad* (Leiden 1963), 411 observes that the notion of a young god being killed is widespread in the East (actually not only there), that Adonis was, for instance, killed by Ares, and that there may be a genuine tradition behind this story. But, of course, if [Plutarch] was creating stories, he would have built upon existing traditions (notice that in this instance [Plutarch] does not give any source-reference).

Commentary on F 1d

The differences between the passage of the *On Rivers* and the text of Conti (mainly the fact that in [Plutarch] Mithras has sex with a stone, while in the *Mythologiae* a Diorphos son of the Earth desires the son of Mithras) are explained by Iglesias Montiel and Álvarez Morán, *Natale Conti*, 393 n. 464 with the hypothesis that Conti read the *On Rivers* in a translation that did not reproduce the text exactly. But Conti himself produced a translation of the *On Rivers*, which was published in 1560 (it may be consulted online, as part of the digitization project of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (<http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/~db/0003/bsb00035038/images/>); here is the passage:

Finitimus est mons Diorphus, nominatus a Diorpho terrae filio, de quo haec ita traduntur: cum filium Mithrae cooptaret, genusque foemineum aversaretur, petram quandam calefecit. At petra gravida facta, post determinata tempora iuvenem edidit Diophorum nomine, qui cum in viro evasisset, Martemque in virtutis certamen provocasset, interemptus fuit: mox deorum voluntate in montem sui nominis est conversus.

Conti's translation misunderstands [Plutarch] in exactly the same way as his *Mythologiae* do, in taking Mithras as a genitive (noticed by M.C. Alvarez Morán, 'Ecos del *De fluviis* del Pseudo Plutarco en la *Mitología* de Natale Conti', in J. García López and E. Calderón Dorda (eds.), *Estudios sobre Plutarco: Paisaje y Naturaleza* (Murcia 1990), 143-54). This conclusively proves that Conti was here, indeed, relying on his own (mis)translation; and that the source-reference, missing from the original *and* from Conti's own translation, but present in the *Mythologiae*, is an addition by Conti unsupported by any ancient source. While it is difficult to prove that all of Conti's references to Sostratos that find no backing in an ancient source are invented, it is worth noticing that [Plutarch]'s source for the story narrated in the preceding paragraph of the *On Rivers*, 23.3 (the Araxes River generates a black stone called *sikyonos* that, when touched with a sacrificial knife, sends forth blood) is the book *περι λίθων* (*On Stones*) of Dorotheos the Chaldaean (*BNJ* 289 F3). Dorotheos and Sostratos had been mentioned by Natale Conti as the sources for two versions, unattested elsewhere, of the story of Atys, see above, F 1b.

A further reference to Sostratos in *Mythologiae* 8.3 ('Sostratos describes them [the Tritons] in the third book of his work *On Animals*') is best attributed to some other Sostratos. A Sostratos author of *περι φύσεως ζώων*, *On the Nature of Animals*, or of *On Animals That Strike and Bite*, is cited four times in the scholia to Nikander's *Theriaka* 565D, 747A, 760B, 764A: the titles of the books have nothing to do with any of those attributed to Sostratos. For the necessity of distinguishing between Sostratos the mythographer and a Sostratos author of works on medicine and animals, see M. Wellmann, 'Sostratos, ein Beitrag zur Quellenanalyse des Aelian', *Hermes* 26 (1891), 321-50 (with list of fragments, not including this one), and 'Nochmals Sostratos', *Hermes* 27 (1892), 649-52; see however below, Biographical Essay, for the different opinion of Jacoby, *FGrH* 1a, Kommentar 498-9, who left the issue open. More importantly, this source-reference was already present in the first edition of 1567: clearly, in terms of the composition of the *Mythologiae*, it belongs to a different group/layer.

BNJ 23 F 2

Source: Stobaios, Ioannes, Anthologium (ed. Wachsmuth – Hense) [Vide: Areius Didymus & Joannes Damascenus apud Stobaeum (Joannem) (cf. Aetius. De placitis [excerpta Stobaei]), 3, 7, 67]

Historian's work: *On Thracian Affairs*

Source date: 6th century AD

Source language: Greek

Fragment subject: religion - Library of Congress
mythology, greek - Library of Congress

history, ancient - Library of Congress
military history, ancient - Library of Congress
oracles - Library of Congress

Edition: Jacoby

Σωστράτου ἐν δευτέρῳ Θραικικῶν. Ἀθηναῖοι πρὸς Θραϊκὰς πόλεμον ἔχοντες στρατηγὸν ἐχειροτόνησαν Κόδρον. οὗτος ἀκούσας ὅτι χρησμὸν εἰλήφασιν οἱ πολέμιοι ἐγκρατεῖς γενήσεσθαι τῆς νίκης αὐτοῦς, ἐὰν τοῦ στρατηγοῦ φείσωνται τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ἐν δρυτόμου σχήματι συνέβαλε μάχην μετὰ τινων Θραικῶν ξυλιζομένων καὶ τῷ δρεπάνῳ καιρίως ἐξ αὐτῶν ἓνα πλήξας ἀνεῖλεν· οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ τὴν περίστασιν τοῦ στρατηγήματος μὴ γινώσκοντες ἀπέκτειναν τὸν Κόδρον θέλοντα. συμβαλόντες δὲ τὸν πόλεμον Ἀθηναῖοι τῆς νίκης ἐγκρατεῖς ἐγένοντο.

Translation

Sostratos in the second book *On Thracian Affairs*. The Athenians, being at war with the Thracians, elected Kodros as *strategos*. Having learnt that the enemies had received an oracle stating that they would obtain the victory if they spared the *strategos* of the Athenians, Kodros disguised himself as a woodcutter and engaged battle with some Thracians who were gathering wood; and having caught one of them in a vital part with a scythe, he killed him. The others, not knowing the circumstances of the stratagem, killed the willing Kodros. The Athenians then having engaged battle gained the victory. [cf. Ps.-Plutarch, *Parallela minora* 18, 310A]

Commentary on the text

The same story appears, in a much shorter version, different in the wording, and also, remarkably, in the source cited as authority, in [Plutarch]'s *Parallela minora* 18.310A:

Θραϊκες Ἀθηναίοις πολεμοῦντες χρησμὸν ἔλαβον, ἐὰν Κόδρου φείσωνται, νικῆσαι· ὁ δὲ δρέπανον λαβὼν ἤκεν εἰς τοὺς ἐναντίους ἐν εὐτελοῦς σχήματι καὶ ἓνα φονεύσας ὑπὸ θατέρου ἀνηρέθη, οὕτω τ' ἐνίκησαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι· ὡς Σωκράτης ἐν δευτέρῳ Θραικικῶν.

When the Thracians were at war with the Athenians, they received an oracle that they would win if they spared Kodros; but he took a scythe and went against the enemies in a shabby dress, and having killed one was killed by the second. Thus, the Athenians gained the victory; as Sokrates states in his second book *On Thracian Affairs*.

The relation between the two versions is discussed below (Commentary on F 2).

Kodros is a mythical Athenian king, son of Melanthos (Paus. 7.25.2); to speak of his election to the *strategia* is definitely anachronistic. The story of his voluntary death while disguised as a commoner to deceive the enemies had been narrated already by Pherekydes (*BNJ* 3 F 154) and Hellanikos (*BNJ* 4 F 125 = *FGrH* 323a F 23). However, in the detailed account of Hellanikos (transmitted by the scholiast to Plato, *Symposion* 208D), it is in the course of a war against the Dorians (Peloponnesians), who are attacking Athens, that the oracle is given and Kodros dies; this is the version told at length by Lykourgos, *Against Leokrates* 84-7; Polyainos, *Stratagems* 1.18; Cicero, *On the Nature of the Gods* 3.49 and Cicero, *On Ends* 5.62; Konon, *Diegesis* 26

(*BNJ* 26 F 1, 26); Pausanias 1.19.5, mentioning the place where Kodros son of Melanthos was killed by the Peloponnesians (see also Paus. 7.25.2); Ailios Aristeides, *Panathenaicus* 119; Pausanias the Atticist, ε 79; Iustinus 2.6.16ff; Zenobios, *Proverbs* 4.3; Lexica Segueriana, Δικῶν ὀνόματα π; Photios, *Lexicon* ε 2127; and the *Suda*, ε 3391. Eustathios of Thessalonica mentions the voluntary sacrifice of Kodros in both his *Commentary to the Iliad* 2.439.23-25 and in his *Commentary to the Odyssey* 1.20.15-16, but does not discuss the origin of the aggressors.

An invasion of Attica by Dorian groups at the time of Kodros is remembered by Herodotos 5.76, who does not give further details. Similarly Strabo, in mentioning the Dorian invasion at the time of Kodros, simply states that the Peloponnesians were defeated in battle (Strabo 9.1.7, C393) and that Megara was founded after the death of Kodros (Strabo 14.2.6, C653), without specifying the context of the king's death. Behind this may lie a tradition according to which Kodros was killed in battle, as suggested by H. von Geisau, 'Kodros', *Der kleine Pauly* 3 (München 1975), 264-5; but the sources remain extremely vague. The ancient scholiast to Ailios Aristeides' *Panathenaic Oration* 119.2-3 has a slightly different version, in which the oracle says that those who will begin battle will lose, with the result that Kodros provokes the Lakedaimonians to the point where they attack, kill him, and are defeated (same narrative also in the scholiast to Ailios Aristeides, *Panathenaic Oration* 237.18); importantly, the scholiast states that Kodros freely chose to die (the oracle did not require him to, as in the case of the daughters of Erechtheus and Leo).

Whatever the details, the significant point is that the war is always one that opposes Athenians to Dorians or Peloponnesians, and never to Thracians. This was noticed by Nachstädt (*Plutarchi Moralia* 2.2 (Leipzig 1935), 21; see also F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *Parallela minora* und die Schwindelauthoren', *Mnemosyne* ³ 8 (1940), 77). Both Jacoby and Nachstädt warned however against changing the text to Δωριεῖς, and explained the error as resulting from the fact that the example of Kodros is often mentioned in the speeches of the orators alongside that of Erechtheus. For instance, Ailios Aristeides, *Panathenaic Oration* 87 (Behr) presents one after the other the three Athenian outstanding mythical examples of individual sacrifice, that of Erechtheus sacrificing his daughter in the war against the Thracians of Eumolpos, that of Leo sacrificing his daughters to end a plague, and that of Kodros sacrificing himself in the war against the Dorians and Peloponnesians; Erechtheus and Kodros are paired in Libanios, *Declamations* 14.12; Lykourgos refers to the examples of Kodros (Lykourgos, *Against Leokrates* 84-7) and Erechtheus (Lykourgos, *Against Leokrates* 98-100).

The story of Erechtheus sacrificing his daughter is also narrated in [Plutarch], *Parallela minora* 20 (only two chapters after the story of Kodros); it too is not without problems (again two different sources are given for the same story, and again there are small differences from the traditional version — but this cannot be addressed here). It is however worth noting that the story of Kodros is presented as a parallel to the *devotio* of Publius Decius, itself narrated with some divergences in respect to Livy's version, and attributed to Aristeides of Miletos; while the story of Erechtheus parallels the sacrifice by Marius of his daughter Calpurnia at the time of the war against the Cimbrians, a story otherwise unattested, that does not fit with the fact that no defeat of Marius in the war against the Cimbrians is known, and whose source is Dorotheos.

Rather intriguingly, Tzetzes, in his *Commentary to Lykophron's Alexandra* 1378, narrates the traditional story of the attack of the Lakedaimonians, of the oracle, and of Kodros' voluntary death, without giving any source reference; he follows this with two lines relating the story of the *devotio* of Decius, for which he refers to the authority of Douris (*BNJ* 76 F 56b), Diodoros of Sicily 21.6, and Cassius Dio (7.35), after which he goes back to Kodros. Tzetzes has no reason at all to be talking of the *devotio* of Decius here; if he does so, the reason must be that he has found the pairing of Kodros and Decius in a source. But neither Douris, nor Diodorus, nor Dio put the two stories together; [Plutarch], *Parallela minora* 18 A and B remains, if I am not mistaken, the earliest (and only) source surviving that closely pairs the two stories (however, Valerius Maximus 5.6.5 has Decius in a list of Roman *exempla*, and then Kodros as the first of the Greek examples, Valerius Maximus 5.6 (ext).1). Tzetzes might have taken his cue from the pairing in *Parallela minora*, correcting however the information relative to Kodros' story, and adding references for the part concerning Decius. As a pair, Kodros and Decius will live on, offering a model for the story of the death of Arnold von Winkelried at the battle of Sempach (1386), as narrated by Rudolf Gwalther in his *De Helvetiae origine* (1538), and providing food for innumerable discussions of freedom and necessity (Schopenhauer's list, in *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung* [*The World as Will and Representation*] (1818, but here from the edition Zürich 1997, 4.465, § 67) comprises Kodros, Leonidas, Regulus, Decius Mus, and Arnold von Winkelried).

However, even if the error of having Thracians instead of Peloponnesians as the enemies involved in the story of Kodros' death could be explained as a slip, the further connection, already pointed out by Jacoby, between this specific 'error' and the source-reference given by Stobaios/[Plutarch], a Sostratos/Sokrates author of at least two books *On Thracian Affairs*, can hardly be accidental. A well-informed authority was needed, to support such an unorthodox version: at play here is the principle of citing the obvious source — an Athenian one was out of question, so a Thracian one, an author of *Thrakika*, was created. In this context, it is worth mentioning that there are very few authors of *Thrakika* – even less, I would argue, than the six discussed by D. and M. Dana, 'Les auteurs grecs de *Thrakika*', in P. Schirripa (ed.), *I Traci fra geografia e storia* (Trento 2015), 161–185: one, Dionysophanes (*FGrHist* 856 F 20, is just a name, and we do not know the title of his work; the others are all authors cited in the *parallela minora* or the *On rivers*, and only two (Calisthenes and our Sostratos) for a title *Thrakika*.

Commentary on F 2

For the text of the *Parallela minora* see, after W. Nachstädt, *Plutarchus. Moralia* II, 2 (Leipzig, 1935), 1-42, the recent editions of A. de Lazzer, *Plutarco: Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), on which the text above is based, and J. Boulogne, *Plutarque, Oeuvres morales* 4 (Paris 2002). The *Parallela minora* is a short work of uncertain authorship and uncertain date (between the end of the first century AD and the end of the second century AD). Its 41 chapters contain each a Greek and a Roman story; its avowed intent is to give credibility to the ancient myths, by comparing them with more recent historical events. For the relationship between the *Parallela minora* and Stobaios, see De Lazzer, *Plutarco: Paralleli minori*, 82–89, with further bibliography.

The differences between the two versions of the story ([Plutarch]'s version leaves unsaid how Kodros got to know of the oracle, and nothing is said of Kodros' status, while in Stobaios he is

elected general) and their import are discussed in detail by J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallela minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 36-8 and 121, and F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *Parallela minora* und die Schwindelauthoren', *Mnemosyne* 3 8 (1940), 110-11 n. 2, 127 n. 2. Although their overall evaluation of [Plutarch] differs, both Schlereth and Jacoby (as well as Müller, *FHG* 4.505) assume that the source-reference 'Sokrates' in the *Parallela minora* is a scribal error for 'Sostratos'.

A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori*, 74-5 and J. Boulogne, *Plutarque. Oeuvres morales*, 257 n. 138 prefer to accept the transmitted text and suggest the identification of this author with a Sokrates of Argos or Kos, active in the first century BC, author of a work *On Mountains and Places and Fire and Stones* (a subject close to that of the *On Rivers* attributed to Plutarch): on him, see A. Gudeman, 'Sokrates (3)', *RE* 3.A (Stuttgart 1927), cols. 804-10. Neither Boulogne nor De Lazzer, however, advance an explanation for the problem of the double reference and of the relationship between Stobaios and *Parallela minora*: Boulogne in his edition does not take into account Stobaios, so that for him the problem does not exist. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori*, 40-2 and nn. 139 and 145 discusses the two cases where Stobaios and [Plutarch], *Parallela minora* cite for the same story different authors with works of the same title (this passage, and [Plutarch], *Parallela minora* 29A, where Aristotle's *Paradoxa* 2 are mentioned as source, while Stobaios 4.473.11 refers to Aristokles' *Paradoxa* 2). De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori*, 74-5, seems to imply that these may be genuine variants; he thus attributes the fragment preserved by Stobaios to Sokrates, and the one preserved by Plutarch to Sostratos. The fact that the title of the work and the book number are the same in both [Plutarch] and Stobaios, together with the closeness of the authors' names, rules out in my opinion the notion of genuine variants; and Sostratos, an author also mentioned elsewhere in the *Parallela minora*, seems the better option (D. and M. Dana, 'Les auteurs grecs de *Thrakika*', 166, also conclude that Sokrates is 'manifestement corrompu').

BNJ 23 F 3

Source:	Stobaios, Ioannes, <i>Anthologium</i> (ed. Wachsmuth – Hense) [Vide: Areius Didymus & Joannes Damascenus apud Stobaeum (Joannem) (cf. Aetius, <i>De placitis</i> [excerpta Stobaei]), 4, 20 b 72]
Historian's work:	<i>Tyrrhenian Histories</i>
Source date:	6th century AD
Source language:	Greek
Fragment subject:	religion - Library of Congress mythology, greek - Library of Congress history, ancient - Library of Congress women - Library of Congress marriage - Library of Congress
Edition:	Jacoby

Σωστράτου ἐν δευτέρῳ Τυρρηνικῶν. Αἴολος τῶν κατὰ Τυρρηνίαν βασιλεὺς τόπων ἔσχεν ἐξ Ἀμφιθέας θυγατέρας ἕξ καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀριθμὸν ἀρρένων παίδων, ὧν ὁ πρεσβύτατος Μακαρεὺς Κανάκης τῆς ἀδελφῆς ἐρασθεὶς ἐβίασατο τὴν προειρημένην. Αἴολος δὲ περὶ τούτων μαθὼν τῆι θυγατρὶ ξίφος ἔπεμψεν· ἡ δὲ ὡς νόμον δεξαμένη τὸν σίδηρον αὐτὴν ἀνεῖλε. Μακαρεὺς δὲ τὸν γεννήσαντα προεξιλωσάμενος ἔδραμεν εἰς τὸν θάλαμον· εὐρών δὲ τὴν ἀγαπωμένην αἰμορραγοῦσαν τῷ αὐτῷ ξίφει τὸν βίον περιέγραψε.

Translation

Sostratos in the second book of his *Tyrrhenian Histories*. Aiolos, king over the Tyrrhenian region, had from Amphithea six daughters and the same number of male sons. The eldest of them, Makareus, fell in love with his sister Kanake, and exerted violence on her. Aiolos having learnt this sent a sword to the daughter; and she, receiving the instrument as if it were a ruling, killed herself. Makareus having propitiated his parent ran to her bedroom; but having found his beloved covered in blood, he drew a line over his life with the same sword. [cf. Pseudo-Plutarch, *Parallela minora* 28, 312C-D]

Commentary on the text

This story is also narrated, as one of a pair concerning incestuous stories of love between brother and sister, by Pseudo-Plutarch, *Parallela minora* 28, 312C-D, who offers a slightly different version, for which he also gives as source-reference Sostratos:

Αἴολος τῶν κατὰ Τυρρηνίαν βασιλεὺς ἔσχεν ἐξ Ἀμφιθέας θυγατέρας ἕξ καὶ ἴσους ἄρρενας· Μακαρεὺς δ' ὁ νεώτατος ἔρωτι ἔφθειρε μίαν, ἡ δὲ παιδίον ἐκύησεν. † ἐμπεσοῦσα δὲ καὶ ξίφους πεμφθέντος ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός, ἄνομον κρίνασα ἑαυτὴν διεχρήσατο· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ Μακαρεὺς· ὡς Σώστρατος ἐν δευτέρῳ Τυρρηνικῶν.

Aiolos, king of the Tyrrhenian region, had from Amphithea six daughters and six male sons; Makareus, the youngest one, violated one out of love, and the girl became pregnant. And when the father sent a sword, considering herself outlawed she committed suicide; and similarly also Makareus, as Sostratos narrates in his second book of *Tyrrhenian Stories*.

This is the text of W. Nachstädt (ed.), *Plutarchi Moralia* 2 (Leipzig 1935), p. 29, followed by A. De Lazzar, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 270. It is worth noting that the Φ family offers θυγατέρας τρεῖς, and that there is a fairly marked divergence between the families ΦΠ and Σ (the latter omits ἐμπεσοῦσα δὲ, has παρὰ νόμον, and omits the source reference). A number of conjectures have been advanced for the clearly impossible ἐμπεσοῦσα (see the apparatus of Nachstädt, *Plutarchi Moralia*; De Lazzar, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori*, 270, and J. Boulogne, *Plutarque. Oeuvres morales* (Paris 2002)); the most convincing is τεκοῦσα (or some similar word with this meaning; Boulogne, *Plutarque*, prints ἐκτεκοῦσα), which brings the plot in line with that of the Euripidean *Aiolos*.

In [Plutarch]'s account, the name of the violated sister is not given; more importantly, unlike in Stobaios, the girl becomes pregnant and has a child, as in Ovid and already in Euripides; finally, while in Stobaios Makareus is the eldest son, he is the youngest one in [Plutarch]. The source is

in both versions Sostratos; as for the work cited, it would seem that at play is once again the principle of the obvious source: for a story concerning a myth located in the Tyrrhenian regions, a work on *Tyrrhenian Histories* is the best reference possible. Detailed comparison and discussion in J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallela minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 44-6; F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *Parallela minora* und die Schwindelauthoren', *Mnemosyne* ³ 8 (1940), 110-12. Abridgement from a fuller version seems a sufficient explanation for the discrepancies — the issue becomes whether from a fuller version of the *Parallela minora*, or from a fuller version of the work of Sostratos.

The Aiolos of Stobaios/*Parallela minora* 28A is the result of a fusion of the traditions concerning Aiolos the son of Hellen, ancestor of the Aioliens and father by Enarete of twelve children (seven male and five female), among which Makareus and Kanake (Hesiod FF 9-10 Merkelbach-West, [Apollodoros], *Library* 1.7.3 [51]; for the Euripidean variant, as narrated in the *Melanippe Wise*, see C. Collard and M. Cropp (eds.), *Euripides VII. Fragments* (Cambridge, MA 2008), 569-71 and F 481), and Aiolos the son of Poseidon and Melanippe or Arne, grandchild of the former Aiolos, born in Metapontium and founder of Lipara (Diodoros of Sicily 14.67.2-6). Both are often confused with the master of winds of the *Odyssey*, Aiolos Hippotades, who also has from his wife Telepatra six male children and six daughters (so the ancient scholiast to Homer, *Odyssey* 10.6, who lists the names of the children as well — neither Kanake nor Makareus are among them — and adds 'Euripides tells the story differently'). Lists of Aiolos' children are also in Diodorus Siculus 5.8.1 and Apostolios 1.83, in E.L. Leutsch and F.G. Schneidewin (eds.), *Corpus paroemiographorum graecorum* (Hildesheim 1958), 2.262.3.

The amalgam begins as early as Euripides, with the plays *Aiolos*, *Melanippe*, and *Melanippe desmotis*: P. Oxy. 2457 (= *TrGF* 5 *Aiolos* T ii: R. Kannicht (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* 5.1 (Göttingen 2004), 5), containing the remains of the hypothesis of Euripides' *Aiolos*, shows that the story of the incestuous love between Makareus and Kanake was central to it, and that the story was narrated by Euripides along lines — it would seem — similar to Sostratos' summary: in Euripides Aiolos was the son of Hippotes, king of the winds. General discussion in T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth* 1-2 (Baltimore, MD 1993), 167-9 and 734-5; O. Scherling, 'Kanake', *RE* 10 (Stuttgart 1919), cols. 1854-5; T. Scheer, 'Aeolus [1]' in *BNP*, 1, (Leiden 2002), 233-4; J.N. Bremmer, 'Aeolus [2]' in *BNP*, 1, (Leiden 2002), 234; F. Graf, 'Aeolus [3]' in *BNP*, 1, (Leiden 2002), 234. The *testimonia* have been collected by Kannicht, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* 5.1, 158-62 (see also the presentation with recent bibliography by Collard and Cropp, *Euripides VII. Fragments*, 3-5).

Among the *testimonia*, particularly important is Ovid, *Heroides* 11, a letter of Kanake to Makareus. In composing it, Ovid seems to have followed a version of the story similar to the one narrated in Sostratos, in which Makareus managed, but too late, to appease their father (see G. Williams, 'Ovid's Canace: Dramatic Irony in *Heroides* 11', *CQ* 42 (1992), 201-9). Ovid's Kanake begins her letter in a striking way, stating that her blood will have stained the letter, and that her right hand holds a pen, her left hand holds a sword (Ovid, *Heroides* 11.1-4). This opening, with its stress on the parallelism between pen and sword, may offer a clue (or provide a link) with a striking feature of Sostratos' account, as transmitted in Stobaios: Makareus 'writes himself out of life', a non banal use of the verb περιγράφω. Even though there is no hint of a letter by Kanake in Sostratos, the use of this term points to knowledge of a tradition where a

letter played an important role, and to the desire of building a parallelism between the way Kanake described her final moments, and the description of Makareus' last action. Ovid may have made use of Sostratos' account, as suggested for instance by Williams, 'Ovid's Canace', or both may rely on an earlier source (a further possibility is [Plutarch]'s building on an earlier account); at any rate, the elaborate linguistic choice (shared by other of [Plutarch]'s stories) is interesting. Also interesting, in view of the existence of some points of contact between the work of Parthenios and fragments attributed to Sostratos and to his brother Aristodemos (*BNJ 22* Biographical Essay), is the fact that the love between two children of Aiolos, Polymela and Dioces, was narrated by Parthenios in his *Love Sufferings 2*; the affair was, however, narrated there in a very different way, since it involved Odysseus, and had a happy ending, inasmuch as Aiolos was persuaded by Dioces and gave his blessing to the couple (the manchette, i.e., a marginal note apposed at the beginning of most of the stories narrated in Parthenios' *Love Sufferings* and Antoninos Liberalis's *Metamorphoses*, and pointing to an earlier treatment of the same story — not necessarily the source — indicates a precedent for this version in Philetas's *Hermes*). See on this J.L. Lightfoot (ed.), *Parthenios of Nicaea: The Poetical Fragments and the Erotika pathemata* (Oxford 1999), 381-3, and 247-8 on the contacts between Parthenios, Aristodemos, and Sostratos.

Commentary on F 3

For the text of the *Parallela minora* and its relationship with Stobaios see above, Commentary on F 2. The Greek story of the love between the children of Aiolos is paired in [Plutarch] with a Roman story, attributed to 'Chrysippos' in the first book of his *Italika*, narrating the unhappy love of Papirius Romanus and Canuleia, two of the twelve children of Papirius Tolucer and Iulia Apolchra. On it, see M. Horster, *BNJ 832 F 1*, who with some optimism states 'It is unknown whether this story is authentic or if it was invented either by Pseudo-Plutarch or Chrysippos'; A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 60, who does not take position; and G. Knaack, 'Chrysippos (14b)', *RE Suppl.* 1 (Stuttgart 1903), col. 299 who states his disbelief in the story and in the source-reference.

BNJ 23 F 4

Source:	Stobaios, Ioannes, Anthologium (ed. Wachsmuth – Hense) [Vide: Areius Didymus & Joannes Damascenus apud Stobaeum (Joannem) (cf. Aetius.De placitis [excerpta Stobaei]), 4, 20 b 70
Historian's work:	<i>On the Art of Hunting</i>
Source date:	6th century AD
Source language:	Greek
Fragment subject:	religion - Library of Congress mythology, greek - Library of Congress history, ancient - Library of Congress

sports - Library of Congress
marriage - Library of Congress

Edition: Jacoby

Σωστράτου ἐν β΄ Κυνηγετικῶν. Κυάνιππος τῷ γένει Θεσσαλὸς γήμας Λευκῶνην τὰ πολλὰ διὰ φιλοκύνηγον ἐνέργειαν ἐν ὕλαις διέτριβεν. ἡ δὲ νεόνυμφος ὑπολαμβάνουσα συνήθειαν αὐτὸν ἔχειν μεθ' ἑτέρας γυναικός, κατ' ἴχνος ἠκολούθησε τῷ προειρημένῳ καὶ ἐν τινι κατακρυβεῖσα συνδένδρῳ τὸ μέλλον ἀπεκαρᾶδοκει. τῶν δὲ πέριξ κλάδων αἰφνιδίως σεισθέντων, οἱ στιβευταὶ κύνες <ᾠρμησαν θηρίον εἶναι> δόξαντες καὶ αὐτὴν ἀλόγου ζώου δίκην διεσπάραξαν. τῆς δὲ πράξεως αὐτόπτης γενόμενος Κυάνιππος ἑαυτὸν ἐπικατέσφαξεν.

Translation

Sostratos in the second (book) of his *On the Art of Hunting*. Kyanippos, a Thessalian by birth, having married Leukone spent most of the time in the woods, because of his passion for the hunt. His newly-wedded wife suspecting that he might have an intimacy with another woman followed the above-mentioned in his footsteps, and having hidden herself in a thicket she awaited events. But the branches around suddenly shook; the hunting dogs thinking that it was a wild animal went at her and tore her to pieces as if she had been a brute animal. Kyanippos, who had been witness to the accident, slew himself. [cf. Ps.-Plutarch, *Parallela minora*, 21, 310E]

Commentary on the text

The story is a variation on the theme of love and hunting, modelled on the better known story of Kephalos and Prokris: as J.J. O'Hara, 'History and Elegy in Hellenistic Greece. Sostratus *Suppl. Hell.* 733: A Lost, Possibly Catullan-Era Elegy on the Six Sex Changes of Tiresias', *TAPA* 16 (1996), 203 remarks, it 'puts an Actaeon-like ending to the pattern of the Cephalus and Procris story found in *Ov., Met.* 7.661-865'. The names of the two main characters illustrate nicely the contrast between hunting and outdoor activity on the one hand, and women's life on the other (the name Kyanippos implies darkness, recalling stories such as that of Melanion, while Leukone, of course, points to whiteness).

The story is printed as *SH* 735, from the *Kynegetika* of Sostratos, by Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, who further remark that the story of Leukone suggests a poem rather than a prose narrative (H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons (eds.), *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin 1983), 354); as a result, they canvass the possibility that this text may be attributed to a Sostratos of Phanagoreia (more on him below, under F 6, F 7, and the Biographical Essay), who according to Athenaios 13.590a wrote *Ehoioi* (presumably a poem listing illustrious youths/men), but then conclude for the grammarian, cited three times by Stobaios.

The story is also narrated (with these same names) by Parthenios (see below); it appears in Apostolios, *Proverbs* 10.52b (= *CPG* 2.500.15 [E.L. Leutsch and F.G. Schneidewin (eds.), *Corpus paroemiographorum graecorum* (Hildesheim 1958)]), who derives from Stobaios, and in Arsenios 33.65, 10.44, who has it from Apostolios. It also appears, but without the detail of the name of the wife and with some slight differences in the wording, in [Plutarch], *Parallela minora* 21, 310E, where it is attributed to Parthenios 'the poet':

Κυάνιππος τῷ γένει Θετταλὸς ἐπὶ θήραν συνεχῶς ἐξήει· ἡ δὲ νεόνυμφος αὐτοῦ ὑπολαβοῦσα διὰ τὸ πολλάκις ἐν ὕλαις μένειν συνήθειαν ἔχειν μεθ' ἑτέρας κατ' ἴχνος ἠκολούθησε τῷ Κυανίππῳ· καὶ ἐν τινι κατακρυβεῖσα συνδένδρῳ τὸ μέλλον ἀπεκαραδόκει. τῶν δὲ κλάδων σεισθέντων οἱ κύνες θηρίον εἶναι δόξαντες ὥρμησαν καὶ τὴν φίλανδρον ἀλόγου δίκην ζώου διεσπάραξαν. ὁ δὲ Κυάνιππος ἀνελπίστου πράξεως αὐτόπτης γενόμενος ἑαυτὸν ἀπέσφαξεν· ὡς Παρθένιος ὁ ποιητής.

Kyanippos, a Thessalian by birth, used to hunt continuously; because of his frequent stays in the woods, his newly wedded wife conceived the suspicion that he had a relationship with another woman and followed Kyanippos in his steps; and having hidden herself in some bushes she waited for the events. But the branches shook, and the dogs thinking that it was a wild animal went at her and tore the loving wife to pieces as if she had been a brute animal. Kyanippos, who had himself been witness to the accident, slew himself; as Parthenios the poet narrates.

The divergence in source reference between Stobaios and [Plutarch] cannot be explained by a scribal confusion: the title of the work attributed to Sostratos is too apposite (*Kynegetika, On Hunting*) for this to be an error (again, the principle of the obvious source seems to be at work: see Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* s. 3,8 (1940), 77-8). At the same time, the reference to Parthenios in [Plutarch], *Parallela minora* is obviously correct, since Parthenios did narrate the story (*Love Sufferings* 10, 'Leukone'), although with slightly different touches: in Parthenios, the wife follows Kyanippos out of curiosity, but no suspicion of an affair with another woman is mentioned; the dogs (in Parthenios actually bitches) attack her because they are wild after the chase, and the wife does not hide among bushes; Kyanippos is not a witness to the accident; and before committing suicide, he kills the bitches (Parthenios' version is discussed by J.L. Lightfoot (ed.), *Parthenius of Nicaea: The Poetical Fragments and the Erotica Pathemata* (Oxford 1999), 428-33).

Commentary on F 4

For the text of the *Parallela minora* see above, Commentary on F 2. The reference to Parthenios in *Parallela minora* and to Sostratos in Stobaios, and the relationship of the three texts ([Plutarch]'s *Parallela minora*, Stobaios, and Parthenios' *Love Sufferings* 10) pose a problem.

To begin with, [Plutarch] refers to Parthenios as 'the poet'. Parthenios may have narrated the story of Leukone and Kyanippos also in a poem; or the reference may be to the prose narrative of the *Love Sufferings*, and the qualification may be due to the fact that Parthenios was also known as a poet. I think that the qualification 'the poet' fits too well with the fact that the accounts of [Plutarch] (and Stobaios), allegedly based on Parthenios, are slightly different from the prose narrative of Parthenios himself, to be dismissed as unimportant, especially considering that these qualifications are extremely rare in the *Parallela*. (On the specific issue of the small differences between the accounts of [Plutarch] and Stobaios on the one hand, and Parthenios on the other, see A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 41-42). The possibility should be entertained that [Plutarch] is here referring to a poem by Parthenios, or also — more likely — that the reference to 'the poet' offered him the leeway for the small differences introduced (see also Lightfoot, *Parthenius*, 297-8 and 428-9). The thesis advanced by O. Musso, 'Sulla struttura del Cod. Pal. Gr. 398 e deduzioni storico-letterarie', *Prometheus* (1976), 1-10 — on Parthenios esp.

9-10 —, is also worth mentioning, that what is preserved in the *Palatinus graecus Heidelbergensis* 398 are *excerpta*, and that neither Parthenios nor Antoninus Liberalis ever wrote the two works attributed to them in the codex. But for one exception, namely T. Dorandi, *Antigone de Caryste. Fragments* (Paris 1999), this hypothesis has been ignored or not accepted by scholars (neither Lightfoot, *Parthenius*, nor A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2004), mention it; it would completely change the current outlook on all the texts transmitted in that codex).

A second element of the puzzle concerns Parthenios himself: for this story the *Palatinus graecus Heidelb.* 398 presents no manchette, but only a mysterious sign of uncertain interpretation. It is commonly accepted that the manchettes, because of their position in the margins among other things, are later additions (mid-third century?) to the text of Parthenios (detailed argument in J.L. Lightfoot (ed.), *Parthenius of Nicaea: The Poetical Fragments and the Erotica Pathemata* (Oxford 1999), 246-56 and esp. 248, although note the different opinion of A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2004), 106-14, for whom they are the work of Parthenios himself; so also C. Francese, ‘L’erotisme dans les *Erotika Pathemata* de Parthénios’, in A. Zucker (ed.), *Littérature et érotisme dans les Passions d’amour de Parthénios de Nicée* (Grenoble 2008), 163, while Musso, ‘Sulla struttura’, 10, considers them the work of the Byzantine *excerptor*). As for the sign, it is formed of a small circle (similar to an *omicron*), and above it what resembles the two divergent bars of a Y. The interpretative possibilities are canvassed by Lightfoot, *Parthenius*, 253-6: the sign might be an abbreviation for οὐ or for οὐτως; at any rate, ‘it indicates the lack of a source, either the inability to find one, or the absence of one in the exemplar before the scribe’, and it was apposed in a second moment, by someone who was not the author of the manchettes (Lightfoot, *Parthenius*, 254). Lightfoot’s further point (Lightfoot, *Parthenius*, 254), that all the stories that have this sign in Parthenios begin with λέγεται δὲ καί, an opening that, she supposes, might have deterred the writer of the manchettes from looking for a source, actually does not apply to this story. At any rate: the writer of the manchette did not know Sostratos’ *Kynegetika* (a work known to Stobaios), or chose not to mention it (note however that the manchettes refer elsewhere to Aristodemos, Sostratos’ brother, as the author of a narrative paralleling one of Parthenios’ own), while [Plutarch] referred for this story to Parthenios ‘the poet’ — i.e., adding to the name a qualification, something that happens only very rarely in the *Parallela minora*.

The explanation usually put forward when Stobaios and [Plutarch] disagree, in the story or/and in the source-reference, is the existence of an earlier, ampler version of the *Parallela minora*, presenting at times double source-references and variants: so Jacoby, ‘Die Überlieferung’, 130-1, 140-3; see also the ample discussion of J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Paralleliis minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 38-41; and now A. De Lazzar, *Plutarco. Parallelii minori*, 82–89. Such may be the case here.

The story is paired by [Plutarch], *Parallela minora* 21, 310E-F with a similar one (the similarity includes, here as in other instances, the use of exactly the same words for the Greek and the Roman story), involving a young man from Sybaris, Aemilius, and his wife, and attributed to a Kleitonimos (*BNJ* 292 F 2) author of at least two books on Sybaris; whatever one may think of the existence of Sostratos’ *Kynegetika*, Kleitonimos’ books *On Sybaris* are certainly the fruit of

[Plutarch]'s fertile phantasy (see Jacoby's remarks, *FGrH Kommentar* IIIa, 395-6, as well as the similarly skeptical ones by Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis minoribus*, 110).

BNJ 23 F 5

Source:	Pseudo-Plutarch, <i>On Rivers</i> , 2, 1
Historian's work:	<i>On Rivers</i>
Source date:	2nd century AD
Source language:	Greek
Fragment subject:	religion - Library of Congress mythology, greek - Library of Congress etiology - Library of Congress geography, ancient - Library of Congress etymology - Library of Congress sacrifice - Library of Congress
Edition:	E. Calderón Dorda, A. De Lazzer, and E. Pellizer (eds.), <i>Plutarco. Fiumi e monti</i> (Naples 2003), 126; same text as Jacoby

Ἴσμηνός ποταμός ἐστὶ τῆς Βοιωτίας κατὰ πόλιν Θήβας, ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ τὸ πρότερον Κάδμου ποῦς ἀπ' αἰτίας τοιαύτης. Κάδμος τὸν κρηνοφύλακα δράκοντα τοξεύσας καὶ εὐρὼν ὥσπερ¹ πεφαρμακευμένον φόνου² τὸ ὕδωρ περιήρχετο τὴν χώραν ζητῶν πηγὴν· γενόμενος δὲ κατὰ τὸ Κωρύκιον ἄντρον κατὰ πρόνοιαν Ἀθηναῖς τὸν δεξιὸν πόδα βαθύτερον εἰς πηλὸν ἤρεισεν· ποταμοῦ δ' ἀναδοθέντος ἐκ τοῦ τύπου³ ὁ ἥρως βουθυτήσας Κάδμου πόδα προσηγόρευσεν αὐτόν. μετὰ δὲ τινα χρόνον Ἴσμηνός, Ἀμφίονος καὶ Νιόβης παῖς, ὑπ' Ἀπόλλωνος τοξευθεὶς καὶ ἀλγηδὸν συνεχόμενος ἑαυτὸν ἔβαλεν εἰς τὸν προειρημένον ποταμόν, ὃς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Ἴσμηνός ὠνομάσθη· καθὼς ἱστορεῖ Σώστρατος ἐν β' Περὶ ποταμῶν.

Apparatus criticus

1. ὥσπερ P : delevit Wytttenbach
2. φόβου P : correction of Reinesius, accepted by Calderón Dorda, who in apparatus suggests also μετὰ φόβου
3. τόπου P: correction of Bernhardt, approved by Wytttenbach, and accepted by Calderón Dorda. Possibly unnecessary?

Translation

The Ismenos is a river of Boeotia, close to the city of Thebes. It was previously called 'Foot of Kadmos', for the following reason. Kadmos having hit with his bow the serpent that guarded the fountain found that the water had been as if poisoned by the blood, and went around in the region looking for a spring. But having arrived at the Corycian cave, following the instructions of

Athena he pushed his right foot deeply in the mud; out of that imprint arose a river, and the hero, after having sacrificed oxen, named it ‘Foot of Kadmos’. After some time Ismenos, son of Amphion and of Niobe, having been hit by Apollo’s bow and afflicted with pain threw himself in the above-mentioned river, which from him took the name of Ismenos; as recorded by Sostratos in the second book of *On Rivers*.

Commentary on the text

Two metonomasies are narrated here, one after the other, as happens relatively often in the *On Rivers*; they follow mythical schemes that are fairly common in Greek literature, and that reappear elsewhere in the *On Rivers* (the miraculous emergence of a source thanks to a hero/ine, or even a horse, as Pegasus for the Hippokrene on Helikon, and its being named from someone who finds his death in it; see further F. Atenstädt, ‘Zwei Quellen des sogenannten Plutarch *De Fluviis*’, *Hermes* 57 (1922), 226 for this passage, 219-46 for an important discussion of the sources and working method of Pseudo-Plutarch, *On Rivers*, and A. De Lazzer, in E. Calderón Dorda, A. De Lazzer, and E. Pellizer (eds.), *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003), 217-18 n.17, with further instances of miraculous springs and references).

However, if they are true to type, the stories told here are definitely uncommon in the panorama of Greek mythology. There is no parallel for the first part of the story: while the killing by Kadmos of a serpent who guarded a spring is well-known -- and in most retellings, that spring, the spring of Ares, would become Dirke -- the Corycian cave (or at least: the famous Corycian cave) does not fit local geography: it is located in Phokis, on Mount Parnassos, close to Delphi -- definitely far from Thebes (see Strabo 9.3.1, Paus. 10.6.3, 10.32.2 and 7, and A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti*, 217 n. 16), and it is linked to another serpent (for the parallelism between the two serpents and the two stories, see J.E. Fontenrose, *Python: A Study of Delphic Myth and its Origins* (Berkeley, CA 1959), 306-12 and 366-74). Notice that Hyginus, C. Iulius identifies the spring of Ares with Kastalia, while in Pausanias 9.10.5 the spring of Ares is identified with that of the Ismenos. A second Corycian cave is known, but it is even more distant from Thebes: it is located in Cilicia, right after the mouth of the Kalykadnos (Strabo 14.5.5). In this cave too there is a spring, which sends forth a river, named ‘Bitter water’ (πικρὸν ὕδωρ). J. Delattre, *Pseudo-Plutarque. Nommer le monde* (Villeneuve D’Ascq 2011), 81 points out that this second Corycian cave is somehow connected to the first: it had nurtured the giant Typhon (Pind. *Pyth.* 1.16–17: Κιλίκιον θρέψεν πολυώνυμον ἄντρον, cf. Strabo 13.4.6, [Apollodoros], *Bibliothèque* 1, 6.3 [39]); furthermore, according to [Apollodoros] *Bibliothèque* 1, 6.3 [42], Typhon, after cutting away the tendons of Zeus’ hands and feet, left them (and Zeus) there, under the guard of a half-snake, Delphine. It may thus be, as Delattre suggests, that the unique name ‘Foot of Kadmos’ of the river was inspired by the story of the tendons (νεῦρα: they represent the vital force) of Zeus’ feet, in connection with the other Corycian cave.

Not only is the story of the imprint of Kadmos’ foot in the mud unique (though feet will figure prominently in later Theban history, with Oidipous); ‘Foot of Kadmos’ as the first name of the river that was later known as Ismenos is unparalleled (Pausanias 9.10.5 states that the first name of the river was Ladon). The foot (ποῦς) is in Greek a metaphorical term for the phallus: see e.g. J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse. Obscene language in Attic Comedy*, 2nd ed. (Oxford 1991) 249: ‘The foot as a displacement for the phallus is very common as a structural symbol in myths

and folktales, most notoriously in the story of Oidipous (swollen/knowledgeable foot/phallus)', and *passim*. Might there be a sexual allusion in the notion of a river surging from the foot's imprint? At any rate, [Plutarch] gives no source for this part (the first part) of the story.

The second part of the story also shows traces of a combination of traditions. There were various traditions concerning the Boeotian river Ismenos: in Hyginus, *Fabulae, praef.* 28, Ismenos the river is the son of Okeanos and Tethys; Apollodoros, *Library* 3, 12.6 [156] and Diodorus 4, 72 make of him the son of Asopos and Metope, and brother of Pelagon or Pelagos, while in Pausanias 9.10.5 he is the son of Apollo and of the nymph Melia, a source located at the Ismenion in Thebes (on this version of the story and on the first name of the river, Kaanthos, killed by Apollo when he tried to avenge the rape of his sister Melia, see Fontenrose, *Python*, 317-18, as well as J. Larson, *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore* (Oxford 2001), 142-3; note also the version, preserved in *POxy* 10.1241, 85-90 (col. 4, 5-10) = M. van Rossum - Steenbeek, *Greek Readers' Digests?: studies on a selection of subliterate papyri* (Leiden 1998), 138-40 and 322-7 no. 68, according to which the fight in Thebes between Ismenos and Klaaitos (= Kaanthos?), sons of Okeanos, for their sister Melia, would have been the first instance of murder of brothers; and A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia*, 1, *BICS Supplement* 38.1 (1981), 79 and nn. 1-4). However, a version concerning an Ismenos son of Amphion and Niobe is known to Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 6.224 and [Apollodoros], *Library* 3.5.6 [45] (the earliest appearances; later also in Hyginus, *Fabulae* 11 and Tzetzes, *Chiliades* 4.141); but in neither Ovid nor [Apollodoros] is this Ismenos linked in any way to the river. See on all this D. Fimmen, 'Ismenos (1)', *RE* 9.2 (Stuttgart 1916), cols. 2143-4; H.W. Stoll, 'Ismenos', in W. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* 2.1 (Leipzig 1890-94), 551.

BNJ 23 F 6

Source:	Eustathios of Thessalonica, <i>Commentary on Homer's Odyssey</i> , 11, 538, p. 1696, 49-50
Historian's work:	unknown
Source date:	12th century AD
Source language:	Greek
Fragment subject:	mythology, greek - Library of Congress religion - Library of Congress sports - Library of Congress
Edition:	H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons (eds.), <i>Supplementum Hellenisticum</i> (Berlin 1983), 734; same text as Jacoby

Ἀχιλλέα δὲ ὅτι Πάρις ἀνεῖλε τοξεύσας καθωμίληται. Σώστρατος δὲ ἱστορεῖ Ἀλέξανδρον¹ Ἀπόλλωνος ἐρώμενον καὶ μαθητὴν τοξείας, ὑφ' οὗ τόξον ἐλεφάντινον σχόντα τοξεῦσαι Ἀχιλλέα κατὰ γαστρός.

Apparatus criticus

Lloyd-Jones and Parsons note: ‘voluit “Ἐλενον’, with reference to the text of Chennos (see below)

Translation

It is said that Paris killed Achilles with his bow. Sostratos says that Apollo fell in love with Alexandros and taught him archery, and Alexandros having received from the god a bow made of ivory hit Achilles in the belly.

Commentary on the text

On the traditions concerning the death of Achilles (in all of which Apollo and Paris play a role), see T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth* 1-2 (Baltimore, MD 1993), 695-8, as well as the still useful account by C. Fleischer, ‘Achilleus’, in W.H. Roscher, *Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* 1.1 (Leipzig 1884), 47-8.

While the story of the vulnerable ankle is relatively late, and while Apollo is presented as in various ways helping Paris/Alexandros, Sostratos’ version is unique in making of Alexandros the beloved of Apollo, in mentioning the gift of an ivory bow, and in the precision that Achilles was hit in the belly. Photios’ *Bibliothēke*, however, shows that in the sixth book of his *Novel History* Ptolemaios Chennos narrated how Helenos, son of Priam, became the beloved of Apollo, received from him an ivory bow and with it wounded Achilles in the hand (Photios, *Bibl. Cod.* 190, 151B.34-7: Ὡς Ἐλενος ὁ Πριάμου Ἀπόλλωνος ἐρώμενος γένοιτο, καὶ ἔλαβε παρ’ αὐτοῦ δῶρον τόξον ἐλεφάντινον ᾧ Ἀχιλλέα τοξεύσειε κατὰ τῆς χειρός; note that in Dictys Latinus 3.6 too Helenos wounds Achilles in the hand with an arrow). However, neither in Ptolemaios (in Photius) nor in Diktys is the wound cause of death.

The problem is the relationship (if any) between the ‘novel’ account of Ptolemaios, and the similarly novel one of Sostratos. The presence in both stories of an ivory bow, gift of Apollo to a beloved one, seems too much for a coincidence: possibly Ptolemaios Chennos was inspired by Sostratos’ story (if we accept that Sostratos’ account is independent, and has come to Eustathios, for instance, through the mediation of the scholia). Alternatively, we must assume that Ptolemaios did mention Sostratos’ version in his *Novel History*, as an alternative to the version preserved in Photios’ summary — in which case we have no means to ascertain whether Sostratos is real, or whether he and his story are a creation of Ptolemaios’ imagination. A third possibility is hinted at by H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons (eds.), *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin 1983), 353: Eustathios may simply have misremembered and written Alexandros while he meant Helenos. I am not so convinced: there is also the discrepancy belly/hand, and Chennos does tend to accumulate variant stories.

Commentary on F 6

This and the following fragment are both attributed by Eustathios to a Sostratos; they may ultimately derive from a scholion to the *Odyssey* (and on this basis, as well as because of their difference in character in respect to the fragments attested in Pseudo-Plutarch, F. Jacoby, ‘Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren’, *Mnemosyne* ³ 8

(1940), 82-3, was prepared to consider them as genuine references to Sostratos' activity); or Eustathios may have found the information in Ptolemaios Chennos, as suggested by A. Chatzis, *Der Philosoph und Grammatiker Ptolemaios Chennos* (Paderborn 1914), 10-15 and 39 for this passage. The second possibility is the most likely, and is accepted (for instance) by L. Brisson, *Le mythe de Tirésias: essai d'analyse structurale* (Leiden 1976), 78-80, and J.J. O'Hara, 'History and Elegy in Hellenistic Greece. Sostratus *Suppl. Hell.* 733: A Lost, Possibly Catullan-Era Elegy on the Six Sex Changes of Tiresias', *TAPhA* 16 (1996), 173 and 200.

The fact that these stories ultimately come from the *Novel History* of Chennos does not necessarily imply their being bogus, but certainly casts a shadow on them (general discussion of the main issues concerning Ptolemaios in K. Dowden, Antipater, commentary to F 1b *BNJ* 56 F 1b; see also K. ní Mheallaig, *Reading Fiction with Lucian. Fakes, Freaks and Hyperreality* (Cambridge 2014), 116–126; and T. Braccini, in L Canfora, N. Bianchi and C. Schiano, *Fozio. Biblioteca*, Pisa 2016, 1084). In the case of this specific passage, K.-H. Tomberg, *Die Kaine Historia des Ptolemaios Chennos* (Bonn 1968), 172, has tried to make a case for Ptolemaios' credibility. He has been followed by H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons (eds.), *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin 1983), 353, who print this passage as *SH* 734, attribute it to a Sostratos of Phanagoreia, and add that the topic is perfect for a work such as the *Ehoioi* (literally: *Or Such Men As*, a catalogue of illustrious youths or men, modelled on the Hesiodic catalogue of women, and attributed by Athenaios, *Deipnosophists* 13.590a, to Sostratos of Phanagoreia); by A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton, NJ 1995), 382; and by O'Hara, 'History and Elegy in Hellenistic Greece', 173-4, 198-200. But it seems likely that many of Ptolemaios' source-references (and stories) are invented: see the persuasive argument of A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2004), 134-59, and 142 for this passage, who proposes to see in Ptolemaios' work a parody of a mythological handbook — while of course accepting that a parody has to rely on elements of reality to work.

BNJ 23 F 7

Source:	Eustathios of Thessalonica, <i>Commentary on Homer's Odyssey</i> , 10, 492, p. 1665, 47
Historian's work:	<i>Teiresias</i>
Source date:	12th century AD
Source language:	Greek
Fragment subject:	mythology, greek - Library of Congress religion - Library of Congress religion - Library of Congress elegy art, ancient - Library of Congress music, greek and roman - Library of Congress
Edition:	H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons (eds.), <i>Supplementum Hellenisticum</i> (Berlin 1983), 733; see also Jacoby

Καλλίμαχος δὲ λέγει τὸν Τειρεσίαν ἰδόντα γυμνὴν λουομένην τὴν Ἄρτεμιν περὶ πῦρ τὴν Βοιωτίαν πηρωθῆναι. Σώστρατος δὲ ἐν Τειρεσίαι – ποίημα δὲ ἐστὶν ἐλεγειακόν – φησὶ τὸν Τειρεσίαν θήλειαν τὴν ἀρχὴν γεννηθῆναι καὶ ἐκτραφῆναι ὑπὸ Χαρικλοῦς. καὶ ἑπτὰ ἐτῶν γενομένην ὀρειφοιτεῖν· ἐρασθῆναι δὲ αὐτῆς τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα καὶ ἐπὶ μισθῶι συνουσίας διδάξαι τὴν μουσικὴν· τὴν δὲ μετὰ τὸ μαθεῖν μηκέτι αὐτὴν ἐπιδιδόναι τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι, κάκεινον ἀνδρῶσαι αὐτὴν, ἵνα πειρῶιτο ἔρωτος. καὶ αὐτὴν ἀνδρωθεῖσαν κρῖναι Δία καὶ Ἥραν, ὡς ἀνωτέρω ἐρρήθη. καὶ οὕτω πάλιν γυναικωθεῖσαν ἐρασθῆναι Κάλλωνος Ἀργείου, ἀφ' οὗ σχεῖν παῖδα κατὰ χόλον Ἥρας τὰς ὄψεις διεστραμμένον· διὸ καὶ κληθῆναι Στράβωνα. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τοῦ ἐν Ἄργει ἀγάλματος τῆς Ἥρας καταγελῶσαν εἰς ἄνδρα μεταβληθῆναι ἀειδῆ, ὡς καὶ Πίθωνα λέγεσθαι. ἐλεηθεῖσαν δὲ ὑπὸ Διὸς εἰς γυναῖκα μορφοθῆναι αὐτῆς ὡραίαν καὶ ἀπελθεῖν εἰς Τροιζῆνα, ὅπου ἐρασθῆναι αὐτῆς Γλύφιον ἐγγῶριον ἄνδρα καὶ ἐπιθέσθαι αὐτῇ λουομένην· τὴν δὲ ἰσχύι περιγενομένην τοῦ μείρακος πνίξαι αὐτόν· Ποσειδῶνα δέ, οὗ παιδικὰ ἦν ὁ Γλύφιος, ἐπιτρέψαι ταῖς Μοίραις δικάσαι περὶ τούτου· καὶ αὐτὰς εἰς Τειρεσίαν αὐτὴν μεταβαλεῖν καὶ ἀφελέσθαι τὴν μαντικὴν. ἦν αὐτῆς μαθεῖν ὑπὸ Χείρωνος, καὶ δειπνήσαι ἐν τοῖς Θέτιδος καὶ Πηλέως γάμοις. ἔνθα ἐρίσαι περὶ κάλλους τὴν τε Ἀφροδίτην καὶ τὰς Χάριτας, αἷς ὀνόματα Πασιθέη Καλὴ καὶ Εὐφροσύνη. τὸν δὲ δικάσαντα κρῖναι καλὴν τὴν Καλὴν, ἣν καὶ γῆμαι τὸν Ἥφαιστον, ὅθεν τὴν μὲν Ἀφροδίτην χολωθεῖσαν μεταβαλεῖν αὐτόν εἰς γυναῖκα χερνήτην γραῖαν· τὴν δὲ Καλὴν χαίτας¹ αὐτῇ ἀγαθὰς νεῖμαι καὶ εἰς Κρήτην ἀπαγαγεῖν, ἔνθα ἐρασθῆναι αὐτῆς Ἄραχνον, καὶ μιγέντα αὐχεῖν τῆι Ἀφροδίτῃ μιγῆναι· ἐφ' ᾧ τὴν δαίμονα ὀργισθεῖσαν τὸν μὲν Ἄραχνον μεταβαλεῖν εἰς γαλῆν, Τειρεσίαν δὲ εἰς μῦν, ὅθεν καὶ ὀλίγα φησὶν ἐσθίει ὡς ἐκ γραός, καὶ μαντικός ἐστὶ διὰ τὸν Τειρεσίαν.

Apparatus criticus

1. The mss. have χαίτας, 'hair', i.e., beautiful hair, accepted by Jacoby, which does not seem sufficient to support Arachnon's boast; *SH* proposes χά<ρ>ιτας, but χά<ρ>ιτας ἀγαθὰς sounds slightly odd. O'Hara (J.J. O'Hara, 'History and Elegy in Hellenistic Greece. Sostratus *Suppl. Hell.* 733: A Lost, Possibly Catullan-Era Elegy on the Six Sex Changes of Tiresias', *TAPA* 16 (1996), 174-6 discusses the pro and cons of both readings.

Translation

Kallimachos says that Teiresias was struck blind after seeing Artemis bathing in the nude somewhere in Boiotia. But Sostratos in the *Teiresias* — this is an elegiac poem — says that Teiresias was originally born female, and was raised by Khariklo. At the age of seven she was wandering in the mountains, and Apollo fell in love with her, and taught her music as payment for sexual intercourse. But after being taught the girl no longer gave herself to Apollo, and he changed her into a man, so that she would have experience of *eros*. Having been changed to a man, he acted as a judge for Zeus and Hera, as has been mentioned above. Having been changed back into a woman, she fell in love with Kallon the Argive, by whom she had a son, who was called Strabo or 'Squinter', because he was born with squinting eyes, due to the anger of Hera. After this Teiresias laughed at the statue of Hera at Argos, and was changed into an unsightly man, and so called Pithon or 'Monkey'. Zeus pitied her and changed her back to a woman in the bloom of youth and sent her to Troezen. There a local man named Glyphios fell in love with her and assaulted her as she was bathing. But she was stronger than the young lad, and strangled him. Glyphios was the beloved of Poseidon, who turned the matter over to the Moirai for

judgment. The Moirai turned her into Teiresias, and took away the skill at prophecy. But he learned this again from Cheiron, and dined at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. There a beauty contest was held between Aphrodite and the Charites, whose names were Pasithea, Kale, and Euphrosyne. He acted as a judge, and judged Kale most beautiful, and Hephaistos married her. This made Aphrodite angry, and she changed him into a poor old gray-haired woman, but Kale gave her beautiful hair, and led her away to Krete. There Arachnos fell in love with her, and after lying with her he boasted that he had lain with Aphrodite. At this the goddess became angry and changed Arachnos into a weasel, and Teiresias into a mouse. This is why a mouse eats little, from having been an old woman, and has the power of prophecy, because of Teiresias.

Commentary on the text

This is one of three different versions of the myth of Teiresias: Eustathios, in commenting on Kirke's suggestion (Homer, *Odyssey* 10.494) that Odysseus interrogate Teiresias in the underworld, reviews the various versions of the myth (detailed discussion and references in J.J. O'Hara, 'History and Elegy in Hellenistic Greece. Sostratus *Suppl. Hell.* 733: A Lost, Possibly Catullan-Era Elegy on the Six Sex Changes of Tiresias', *TAPA* 16 (1996), 174-6; see also G. Ugolini, 'Le sette metamorfosi di Tiresia secondo il poeta ellenistico Sostrato', in *Paignion. Piccola Festschrift per Francesco Donadi* (Trieste 2016), 129-47).

The first version Eustathios mentions, attested for the first time in the *Melampody* attributed to Hesiod, has Teiresias seeing snakes coupling on the Mount Helikon, killing the female, and being as a result turned into a female. Later, Teiresias, having happened onto the male at the right moment, gets back his male nature, and is chosen to adjudicate on a dispute between Zeus and Hera concerning the amount of pleasure males and females derive from sexual intercourse. As a result of his answer (nine parts of pleasure to the woman, one to the man), he is blinded by Hera, but granted prophetic power by Zeus.

In the second version, found in Pherekydes of Athens (*BNJ* 3 F 92) and in Kallimachos, *Hymn to Athena*, Teiresias is blinded after seeing Athena bathing (Eustathios, however, says Artemis, probably an error induced by the story of Aktaion, also narrated elsewhere by Kallimachos; whether this is an error or a variant, and whether due to Eustathios, Chennos, or an intermediary is not important); no sex changes are mentioned in Kallimachos or Eustathios, but in Pherekydes' version (*BNJ* 3 F 92b, transmitted in the corrupted scholion T to Homer, *Odyssey* 10.493 (p. 782.2 Dindorf), there must have been a metamorphosis (more likely two).

The third version Eustathios attributes to an elegiac poem by Sostratos. The story is much abbreviated — for instance, prophecy is mentioned only as it is taken away from Teiresias, who then has to learn the skill again from Cheiron. Yet it is clear that Sostratos' version incorporates, and at the same time plays against, earlier accounts: interestingly, the seven changes of Teiresias correspond to the statement that Teiresias had seven lives, present from early on in the story, at any rate already in the Hesiodic corpus (Hesiod, F 276 Merkelbach-West; scholia to Lykophron, *Alexandra* 682); whether this should be linked to the notion, mentioned by Servius Honoratus Maurus on Virgil, *Aeneid* 6.448, that those who are reborn alternate sex, is uncertain (see on all this O'Hara, 'History and Elegy in Hellenistic Greece', 182; Servius is uncertain whether to consider this an Aristotelian or a Platonic notion). It can also hardly be accidental that the first

metamorphosis (of seven) should happen exactly when Teiresias (who lived seven lives) was seven; and that as a result of Hera's anger Tiresias, having been turned back into a woman (probably by Zeus as a reward, since females are supposed to have more pleasure, and since that was Teiresias' original status), has a son who squints, as against the traditional version in which Hera provoked his blindness (on the squinting son, named Strabo for this reason, see O'Hara, 'History and Elegy in Hellenistic Greece', 185-6, 209-12, and below, Biographical essay). Again, it is telling that Teiresias, as a young woman, is assaulted while bathing by a man, whom she kills (as goddesses do — but as mortals should not). Conversely, as noticed by G. Ugolini, *Untersuchungen zur Figur des Sehers Teiresias* (Tübingen 1995), 107-8, the gift of prophecy and the punishment of blindness play a relatively limited role in the story, although in the conclusion the statement that the mouse is a prophetic animal relies on the traditional image of Teiresias as *mantis*; and while in the other accounts Teiresias is mainly a male, here his 'default nature', the one with which he begins and ends his life, is female. See L. Brisson, *Le mythe de Tirésias: essai d'analyse structurale* (Leiden 1976), 84-111 for an analysis of Sostratos' version in terms of the two earlier versions of the story, which it would reflect through mechanisms of development or inversion — in particular, for Brisson the mouse, an animal known for his prophetic virtues, but also for its strong sexual drive, would correspond to the snake, in the first and most ancient version; while in this version, the mouse at the end would correspond to Apollo — the god of prophecy, also known as Smintheus.

The narrative of Teiresias' sex-changes may be inserted into a larger group of similar stories: Hellenistic stories of sex change include that of Leukippos, narrated by Nikander (according to the manchette to Antoninus Liberalis, *Metamorphoses* 17; the same story is told by Ovid, *Metamorphosis* 9.665-796, but the protagonist is called Iphis), of Mestra (but here the change is into an animal), of Kaenis, and of Siproites (all listed, but for the story of Iphis, in Antoninus Liberalis' account of the metamorphosis of Leukippos); list in O'Hara, 'History and Elegy in Hellenistic Greece', 181-2; see also T. Gärtner, 'Die Geschlechtsmetamorphose der ovidischen Caenis und ihr hellenistischer Hintergrund', *Latomus* 66 (2007), 891-9. Particularly interesting is the way in which myths that had been associated with other mythological figures are here transferred onto Teiresias: O'Hara, 'History and Elegy in Hellenistic Greece', 180-1 lists as subtexts of the poem the story of Cassandra and Apollo for the acceptance of a gift but the refusal of sexual favour, that of the daughters of Proitos laughing at the statue of Hera, the story of the judgment of Paris, that of Anchises boasting of having slept with Aphrodite, and the myth of Arachne.

As for the language of the fragment, J.L. Lightfoot (ed.), *Parthenius of Nicaea: The Poetical Fragments and the Erotica Pathemata* (Oxford 1999), 521-2 points out, in discussing Parthenios 17 (Alkinoe), that γωνή χερνῆτις, attested in Homer, *Iliad* 12.433, is very rare in prose, Parthenios' being the first post-Homeric occurrence. She further remarks that the presence of the term in Sostratos might be due to Eustathios; but in light of other instances of closeness between Parthenios and 'Sostratos' the word might have been present in the latter (especially since this text is supposed to be the summary of an elegiac poem).

Commentary on F 7

This passage comes from Eustathios' commentary to the *Odyssey*; who Eustathios' source was for the story is uncertain. Jacoby's idea that Eustathios might have found this story in a scholion to the *Odyssey* (F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *Parallela minora* und die Schwindelauthoren', *Mnemosyne* ³ 8 (1940), 82, restated more forcefully in *FGrH* 3a, *Kommentar*, 399), has found no followers; on the whole, Ptolemaios Chennos is the most likely source, because Eustathios elsewhere uses him, and because Photios' summary shows that Ptolemaios narrated the story of the seven metamorphoses of Teiresias (Photios, *Library*, codex 190, 146b: καὶ ὡς Τειρεσίας ἐπτάκις μετεμορφώθη, διὰ τί τε ὑπὸ Κρητῶν οὗτος Φόρβαντος κόρη ἐκαλεῖτο, 'and how Teiresias was metamorphosed seven times, for which reason he was called by the Cretans daughter of Phorbas'). This is the position of A. Chatzis, *Der Philosoph und Grammatiker Ptolemaios Chennos* (Paderborn 1914), 11-13, who has been followed by M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and the Scholia of the Iliad* (Leiden 1963), 404, by K.-H. Tomberg, *Die Kaine Historia des Ptolemaios Chennos* (Bonn 1968), 172-3, by H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons (eds.), *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin 1983), 353 (the passage is printed as *SH* 733), and most recently by J.J. O'Hara, 'History and Elegy in Hellenistic Greece', 199-200 and A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2003), 150-2. It is worth noting however that once again, just as in the case of F 6, there is a slight discrepancy between the information we glean from Chennos and what we learn from Eustathios: a father called Phorbas is not named anywhere in the long extract of Sostratos' poem by Eustathios.

The choice of Ptolemaios as the most likely source has implications, because Ptolemaios' reliability is disputed (see above, F 6). Thus, Cameron, *Greek Mythography*, 150-2 considers the poem a parodic invention of Ptolemaios. Most other interpreters, however, tend to think, for various reasons, that there was indeed a poem *Tiresias*, and that the summary reflects it, however inadequately. Lloyd-Jones and Parsons, *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, no. 733 attribute the poem to a poet Sostratos (or Sosikrates) of Phanagoreia (so also initially A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton, NJ 1995), 382); O'Hara, 'History and Elegy in Hellenistic Greece', 202-6, while admitting that Sostratos of Phanagoreia remains a possibility, prefers to think of Sostratos of Nysa as the author of the poem; D. Braund, *Greek Religion and Cults in the Black Sea Region: Goddesses in the Bosphoran Kingdom from the Archaic Period to the Byzantine Era* (Cambridge 2018), 209-12, offers a detailed discussion, but concludes that while many of the themes touched in the poem relate well to the religious and cultural sphere of Phanagoreia (see discussion below, Biographical essay), certainty is impossible.

Biographical Essay

As pointed out by F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *Parallela minora* und die Schwindelauthoren', *Mnemosyne* ³ 8 (1940), 82-3, the fragments attributed to Sostratos have a rather disparate character, in terms of transmission and in terms of content. FF 1 to 5 are transmitted by [Plutarch] (FF 1 and 5 in the *On Rivers*, FF 2, 3, and 4 in *Parallela minora*), and come from works bearing titles as varied as *Collection of Mythical History* (F 1), *On Thracian Affairs* in at least two books (F 2), *Tyrrhenian Histories* in at least two books (F 3), *On the Art of Hunting* in at least two books (F 4), and *On Rivers* in at least two books (F 5). F 6 and F 7 are preserved by Eustathios, who might have found them in Homeric scholia, or also, as is more likely, in the *Novel History* of Ptolemaios Chennos; finally, three more fragments (FF 1b, 1c, and 1d) are transmitted only in Natale Conti's *Mythologiae*, but at least in the case of F 1d the

source-reference is certainly an invention of Conti (the same most likely applies to the other two passages).

As for content: F 7 attests to an elegiac poem; F 6 is the kind of story that might have been treated by an elegiac poet, or also mentioned by a Homeric scholar; in terms of content, both are outside mainstream Greek mythology. The fragments cited by [Plutarch] and anthologized by Stobaios have a rather different character: the one coming from the *Collection of Mythical History* (F 1) concerns a herb with extraordinary properties; F 2 concerns events of the remote past, and does not imply any miraculous events; F 3 and F 4 could form the basis for elegiac poems (they are unhappy love-stories); F 5 touches on the metamorphic theme, i.e. on the same theme so extensively treated in F 7. Metamorphoses are also the topic of 23 F 1c and 23 F 1d; but as they concern the metamorphosis of humans (or semi-divine entities) into herbs or mountains, they are better compared with others narrated in the *On Rivers* by [Plutarch]. As, moreover, the reference to Sostratos as source in F 1d is clearly an invention of Conti, these fragments on metamorphic themes are to be seen as the result of Natale Conti's adding to themes and stories typical of the *On Rivers* (and at least in one case lifted from the *On Rivers*) a source-reference, Sostratos, in which we have no good reason to believe.

While a *Collection of Mythical History* might fit the profile of the elegiac poet Sostratos implied by F 7, F 1, the only piece attributed to Sostratos under that title, does not -- and we have no titles for the fragments transmitted by Eustathios. For the sake of completeness the possibility should be mentioned that the Pseudo-Plutarchan titles *On Thracian Affairs*, *Tyrrhenian Histories*, *On the Art of Hunting*, and *On Rivers* may be subdivisions of the larger *Collection of Mythical History*. There is, however, something odd about the regularity with which all these works (but for the *Collection*) are attributed two volumes. This has been remarked upon more than once: R. Hercher, *Plutarchi Libellus De Fluviiis* (Lipsiae 1851), Jacoby, and now A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2004), 128 see in this one of many pointers to the fact that the source-references in Pseudo-Plutarch are bogus.

Bringing all these fragments under one author seems impossible; but there were a number of Sostrati active, to whom some of the fragments might be attributed. J.J. O'Hara, 'History and Elegy in Hellenistic Greece. Sostratus *Suppl. Hell.* 733: A Lost, Possibly Catullan-Era Elegy on the Six Sex Changes of Tiresias', *TAPA* 16 (1996), 200-9, lists four main candidates:

- Sostratos the learned doctor, drug expert, and zoologist, active in the second half of the first century BC; it is disputed whether the books *περὶ ζώων* (*On Animals*) mentioned by Athenaios, *Deipnosophists* 7.303B and 312E and the scholia to Apollonios Rhodios 1.1265, as well as those *περὶ φύσεως ζώων* (*On Nature*) and *περὶ βλητῶν καὶ δακέτων* (*On Animals Striking and Biting*) mentioned in the scholia to Nikander, *Theriaka* 565, 760 and 764 belong to him, or to the grammarian (see Jacoby, *FGrH* Ia, *Kommentar* 498-99, with older bibliography, and A. De Lazzar, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 74-76).

- the poet Sostratus, mentioned in Juvenal 10.176-78 as singing with wet wings (an allusion to perspiration due to excessive gesticulation? Or because inspired by one too many drinks?) of the effect of the Persian invasion on rivers ('*credimus altos / defecisse amnes epotaque flumina Medo / prandente et madidis quae cantat Sostratus alis*'). This poet may have been one of the

competitors in the Capitoline *agon* instituted by Domitian in AD 86; or the Sostratos of the *On Rivers*, himself author of an *On Rivers*; or he may be the same as the next item, Sostratos of Phanagoreia (see discussion and further references in O'Hara, 'History and Elegy in Hellenistic Greece', 201).

- the poet Sostratos of Phanagoreia, *SH* 731, mentioned by Stephanos of Byzantium, *Ethnika*, s.v. Mykale for the use of the adjective Μυκαλησίς. This may be the same as the Sosikrates of Phanagoreia, *SH* 732, mentioned by Athenaios, *Deipnosophists* 13.590A (= *SH* 743) as the author of a poetic catalogue of men, of which F 7 (the *Tiresias*) might have been part (see above, on F 7). D. Braund, *Greek Religion and Cults in the Black Sea Region: Goddesses in the Bosporan Kingdom from the Archaic Period to the Byzantine Era* (Cambridge 2018), 209-12 offers a nuanced discussion of these authors.

- the grammarian Sostratos of Nysa, son of Menekrates and brother of Aristodemos (Strabo 14.1.48, C650, see *BNJ* 22) active in the second half of the first century BC. This Sostratos may have composed works in both prose and poetry (see again, O'Hara, 'History and Elegy in Hellenistic Greece', 208-9 for the kind of writings one could attribute to him, and for the historical background).

While certainty on all fragments is impossible, consideration of the way in which [Plutarch] worked makes the following likely, in my opinion:

F 1 may be an invention, on which the name of a real author has been imposed (Sostratos of Nysa, by analogy with his brother Aristodemos, *BNJ* 22; one of the two would indeed have composed a *Mythical Collection*). There is definitely something odd about F 2: I do not believe in the antiquity of the story, nor in the source reference. Note however that D. and M. Dana, 'Les auteurs grecs de *Thrakika*', in P. Schirripa (ed.), *I Traci fra geografia e storia* (Trento 2015), 165–6, think that both Plutarch (who speaks of Sostratos) and Stobaios (who refers to Sokrates) go back to one author only; they identify him with Sostratos of Nysa. F 3 and F 4 are perfectly acceptable stories, that may have been part of any *Mythical Collection* (and maybe even of one written by Sostratos of Nysa); the only 'tweaking' here concerns the titles of the works, which are definitely unlikely, unless they be taken as subtitles of a larger work. I feel again less confident about F 5: the 'coupling' of the two stories concerning Ismenos (son of Niobe and Amphion, or of Asopos/Apollo) is otherwise unattested, as is the notion of a 'Foot of Kadmos'; the title *On Rivers* is unparalleled for Sostratos (and, again, in two books) — this too might be a manipulation of [Plutarch]. Anyone of the Sostrati mentioned above might have sparked [Plutarch]'s imagination.

F 6 and 7 are more difficult. The argument advanced by M. Van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and the Scholia of the Iliad* (Leiden 1963), 405, that it is unlikely that both Ptolemaios and [Plutarch] would have independently invented a fictive author bearing the name of Sostratos, and that thus although both Ptolemaios and [Plutarch] are unreliable, in this case they both must be referring to an author (and presumably to works) that really existed, is interesting but not ultimately compelling. No one disputes that a Sostratos (of Nysa) existed, and that he did write something; the problem is whether he, or indeed an author named Sostratos, actually wrote all the texts attributed to a Sostratos by [Plutarch] and Ptolemaios Chennos, giving them the titles

and the content we find in these works. Van der Valk is, however, right in (re)stating what had been stated by Jacoby (and what is accepted also by Cameron): not everything (author, title, and content) need be false; some information will actually be correct, sometimes on all scores. My view on the fragments preserved by [Plutarch] I have outlined above. As for the fragments transmitted by Ptolemaios: I cannot but subscribe to Cameron's assessment of Ptolemaios as a 'fraud' (see M. Hose, 'Ptolemaios Chennos und das Problem der Schwindelliteratur', in S. Heilen, R. Kirstein, et al. (eds.), *In Pursuit of Wissenschaft. Festschrift für William M. Calder III* (Hildesheim 2008), 194-6 for a characterization of Ptolemaios' work as explicitly fictional; the closing remarks of Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*, 162-3 go in the same direction, of an inventiveness that does not aim at deception but rather at amusement; this is also the position taken by K. ní Mheallaig, *Reading Fiction with Lucian. Fakes, Freaks and Hyperreality* (Cambridge 2014), 116-126). Nonetheless, not everything in Ptolemaios Chennos need to have been invention: the difficulty of distinguishing between invention and real reference was probably central to the game of literary connoisseurship set up by Chennos (see, again, ní Mheallaig, *Reading Fiction with Lucian*, 125).

Thus, an elegiac poem on Teiresias' transformations may have indeed existed. O'Hara, 'History and Elegy in Hellenistic Greece', 209-12, makes an important point about the *aition* of the name Strabo in the second transformation: he argues that it might speak for the occasionality of the poem, whoever may have been meant by the *aition*. More precisely, O'Hara reads the *aition* as an allusion to a patron, and canvasses possibilities such as C. Julius Caesar Strabo Vopiscus (born ca. 130 BC, known as writer of tragedies); Pompeius Strabo (Strabo the geographer attests to the connection between Sostratos' family and that of Pompeius Magnus and Pompeius Strabo); Servilius Strabo, active in the vicinity of Nysa around 50 BC; Seius Strabo, the natural father of Tiberius's prefect of the Praetorian Guard, Aelius Gallus Seianus, or his son, also named Strabo (a rare case of the name being passed on). However, the *aition* of the name Strabo need not in my opinion be read exclusively in terms of patron-client relationship (would it have pleased a patron? would it not have sounded like a mocking allusion?); and there are a score of other names in the poem. Nonetheless, on the whole this speaks for the topicality of the poem. This elegiac poem may have been the work of a Sostratos, and possibly of Sostratos of Nysa — but again, with the exception of the doctor, any of the Sostrati above could be a credible candidate. Indeed, Braund, *Greek Religion and Cults in the Black Sea Region*, 209-12 has recently pointed out that some of the themes of the elegiac poem *Teiresias* might fit a poet from Phanagoreia — either Sosicrates/Sostratos, if they are the same individual, or a Sostratos separate from Sosicrates, but still originating from this region. In particular, a story concerning changes of sex might be relevant to the cult of Aphrodite Ourania, developed in the area (Aphrodite Ourania had inflicted the 'female disease' on the Scythians, Herodotus 1.105.4); prophecy is something that Teiresias and the androgynous Scythians Enarees have in common (Herodotus 4.67 narrates how Aphrodite Ourania gave prophecy to these Scythians). As Braund says, the poem appears to be well suited to the thought-world of Phanagoria, with its focus on concerns central to the cult of Aphrodite Ourania (marriage, motherhood, reproduction and sex-change). F 6 too could suit a poet from Phanagoreia: the cult of Achilles was important in the Taman peninsula (Braund, *Greek Religion and Cults in the Black Sea Region*, 256-72). And it is possible to find affinities between the themes of F 6 and 7 and the other works attested for Sostratos/Sosikrates of Phanagoreia (the female ethnic at Mycalessos and the catalogue of men). F 4, on the unhappy love story of Kyanippos and Leukone, would also fit the profile of an elegiac poet (indeed, the

passage is listed as *SH* 735 by Lloyd -Jones and Parsons). And yet, Braund too concludes that there are too many elements of uncertainty to allow a definite attribution of FF 4, 6 and 7 to a poet from Phanagoreia.

Bibliography

J. Boulogne, *Plutarque, Oeuvre morales*, 4, (Paris 2002)

E. Bux, 'Sostratus (7)' in *RE* (Stuttgart 1927), cols. 1200-1

E. Calderón Dorda and A. De Lazzer and E. Pellizer (eds.), *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003)

A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2004)

A. De Lazzer (ed.), *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000)

J.J. O'Hara, 'History and Elegy in Hellenistic Greece. Sostratus *Suppl. Hell.* 733: A Lost, Possibly Catullan-Era Elegy on the Six Sex Changes of Tiresias' in *TAPA*, 16, (1996), 173-219

F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *Parallela minora* und die Schwindelauthoren' in *Mnemosyne*, S. 3, 8, (1940), 73-144, reprinted in F. Jacoby, *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtschreibung* (Leiden 1956), 359-422

M. Wellmann, 'Nochmals Sostratos' in *Hermes*, 27, (1892), 649-52