

Brill's New Jacoby

Dionysios of Samos

Paola Ceccarelli, University College London

English

Ancient Greek

About this Historian

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Historian: | Dionysios of Samos |
| Jacoby number: | 15 |
| Historian's work: | Cycle: F1, Cycle: F2, Cycle: F3, On the Cycle: F4a, On the Cycle: F4b, Cycle: F5, Cycle: F6, Cycle: F7, Cycle: F8, Cycle: F9, Cycle: F12, |
| Historian's date: | 3rd century BC, 3rd-2nd century BC 2nd century BC |
| Historical focus: | I. Mythological History (Genealogy and Mythography) B. Hellenistic Reference Works and Collections |
| Place of origin: | unknown |

BNJ 15 T 1

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Source: | Suda, Lexicon, - Διονύσιος Μουσωνίου |
| Historian's work: | Local Histories; Description of the inhabited world; Instructive history |
| Source date: | 10th century AD |
| Source language: | greek |
| Source genre: | classical antiquities - biography--to 500 - |
| Fragment subject: | classical antiquities - biography--to 500 - |
| Edition: | Jacoby |

Ῥόδιος ἢ Σάμιος ἱστορικός. ἦν δὲ καὶ ἱερεὺς τοῦ ἐκεῖσε ἱεροῦ τοῦ Ἥλιου. Ἱστορίας Τοπικάς ἐν βιβλίοις ἕξ Οἰκουμένης Περιήγησιν· Ἱστορίας Παιδευτικῆς βιβλία ἰ.

Translation

Dionysios son of Mousonios: Rhodian or Samian; historian. He was also priest of the local shrine of Helios. He wrote *Local Histories* in 6 books; a *Description of the Inhabited World*; an *Instructive History* in ten books. See Dionysios of Rhodos T 1.

Commentary

See commentary to T 2

BNJ 15 T 2

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Source: | Suda, Lexicon, - Διονύσιος Μιλήσιος |
| Historian's work: | Events after Dareios; Description of the inhabited world; Persian history; Trojan war; Mythic stories; Historical cycle |
| Source date: | 10th century AD |
| Source language: | greek |
| Source genre: | classical antiquities - biography--to 500 - |
| Fragment subject: | classical antiquities - biography--to 500 - |
| Edition: | Jacoby |

ιστορικός, τὰ μετὰ Δαρεῖον ἐν βιβλίοις ἑ· Περιήγησιν Οἰκουμένης· Περσικά, Ἰάδι διαλέκτῳ. Τρωικῶν βιβλία γ· Μυθικά· Κύκλον ἱστορικὸν ἐν βιβλίοις ζ.

Translation

Dionysios of Miletos: historian. He wrote *Events after Dareios* in 5 books; a *Description of the Inhabited World*; a *Persian History* in Ionic dialect; *Trojan war* in 3 books; *Mythic stories*; a *Historical Cycle* in 7 books. See Dionysios Skytobrachion T 5; Dionysios of Miletos T 1.

Commentary on the text

The two entries of the *Suda* must be discussed together, for they may refer, in part at least, to the same author: the high number of writers bearing the name 'Dionysios' makes it (and made it) difficult to distinguish among them. Fragments of a Dionysios author of a *Historical Cycle* are quoted by various ancient authorities: Athenaios, who gives Samos as his origin; Clement of Alexandria (T. Flavius Clemens); an ancient commentator on Pindar; an ancient commentator on three of the 'canonical' plays of Euripides; and Tzetzes. This must be one personality (the so-called 'Cyclographer'); but whether he is to be identified with the author recorded by the *Suda* as Dionysios son of Mousonios, based in Samos or Rhodes (T 1), or with the Dionysios of Miletos (T 2, see *FGrH* 687 T 1) author of a *Historical cycle*, or whether these two are one and the same author, is unclear. What is certain is that there is a massive confusion in the *Suda* (pace A. Adler, *Suidae Lexicon*, 2, (Lipsiae, 1931), 110, who prints the notices without accepting transpositions). This is most obvious in the case of the *Description of the Inhabited World*, which is cited among the works of Dionysios son of Mousonios (see T 1), among the works of Dionysios of Miletos (see T 2), but also as the work of a Dionysios of Korinthos (an *epopoios*) in the entry *Suda* δ 1177 – the *Description* is in fact probably to be identified with the extant *Description of the*

Inhabited World by Dionysios Periegetes.

A *Historical cycle* is explicitly attributed by the *Suda* to Dionysios of Miletos (T 2). But the *Suda* often presents confusions in the attribution of works by homonymous authors, and this specific life shows marked traces of such a confusion: as pointed out by Jacoby, *FGrH* 1a 491, following a distinction sketched in its main lines by F.G. Welcker, *Der epische Cyclus oder die homerischen Dichter*, 1.2, (Bonn, 1865), 70-82 (see now the ample discussion by J.S. Rusten, *Dionysius Scytobrachion* (Opladen, 1982), 10-11 and 80-81), the *Historical cycle* is preceded by the titles of two works, *Trojan war* and *Mythic stories*, which belong to Dionysios Skytobrachion (*FGrH* 32 T 4 and T 5). At this point, the easiest solution is to leave to Dionysios of Miletos only the *Events after Dareios* and the *Persian History*, which have a similar character (see K. Meister, 'Dionysios (5) of Miletus' in *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford, 1996) 3, 478, and *FGrH* 687 T 1), and to attribute the *Historical cycle* to a Samian Dionysios (as in Athenaios, F 4).

Nothing is known of the *Local Histories* mentioned in T 1; and no fragments remain of an *Instructive history* by a Dionysios. Because of the educational character attributed by the ancients to the recounting of mythological tales (in the epigram which preceded the Apollodorean Library the reader is exhorted to 'learn the ancient myths pertaining to education' from the *Library* rather than looking at the pages of Homer, the lyrics, the tragic or the cyclic poets: Proclus in Photios *Library* 142b10 = Bernabé, *PEG Cyclus epicus* T 5, Davies, *EGF* 9), E. Schwartz, 'Dionysios 110' in *RE*, 5.1, (Stuttgart, 1905), 933 has suggested that the *Instructive history* of T 1 might be identical to the *Historical cycle* attributed in the *Suda* to Dionysios of Miletos (T 2). The discrepancy in book numbers might be accounted for by the hypothesis of two editions. This may be so; but as the numbering of the fragments does not show any traces of a double edition, this must remain a guess (Jacoby, *FGrH* 1a 492; *FGrH* 3b [Text] 430).

The double origin of the son of Mousonios (Rhodes or Samos) in the *Suda* (T 1) has also given rise to suspicion. Welcker, *Der epische Cyclus oder die Homerischen Dichter* 1.2 (Bonn, 1865), 70 assumed that a Samian Dionysios had been honoured with the position of priest of Helios in Rhodes, receiving thus also the honorary Rhodian citizenship. This would allow to harmonize the information of F 4 and T 1, but it clearly is a fairly complex scenario. Jacoby (*FGrH* 3b [Text] 430 and 452, with 3b [Noten] 255 nn. 3 and 5, 266 n. 13) does not believe in a Rhodian origin of the Cyclographer; accordingly, he attributes a further number (*FGrH* 511) to a Dionysios of Rhodes, son of Mousonios, for whom the only evidence is the *Suda*. This Dionysios would have been the author of the *Local histories* and of the *Instructive history* in 10 books, if this work is not to be identified with the *Historical cycle*. P.M. Fraser and E. Matthews, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, I, (Oxford, 1987), register Dionysios (n° 428) and his father Mousonios as Rhodians, allowing alternatively for the possibility of a Samian origin for both, and date them in the early imperial period. This date is too late for the Dionysios author of the *Kyklos*, but on the other hand it is appropriate to a name such as Mousonios – a further argument to distinguish between the Dionysios son of Mousonios and the Dionysios author of the *Historical cycle*. Moreover, while the names Mousa, Mousaios, and Mouson are securely attested in Rhodes, to date no such names have been found in Samos. And if Dionysios son of Mousonios was really a priest of Helios, then a Rhodian origin is more likely. All of this speaks in favour of Jacoby's solution of distinguishing between a Dionysios of Samos (the Cyclographer), active in the third, or possibly second, century BC, and a Dionysios son of Mousonios of Rhodes, active in the early imperial period. A Dionysios at any rate appears in the list of Rhodian eponyms reconstituted on the basis of the known amphoric stamps at what might be the right moment, the first half

of the first century BC (see G. Finkielsztein, *Chronologie détaillée et révisée des éponymes amphoriques rhodiens de 270 à 108 av. J.-C. environ* (Oxford, 2001), 162), but the name of his father is unknown.

Yet another problem is raised by the fact that a Dionysios from Samos is mentioned as the author of a poem *Bassarika* in two Byzantine sources: Eustathius, *Commentary to the description of the world of Dionysios Periegetes* 215,10 Müller; and *Dionysii Periegetae Vita Chigiana* A. Colonna (ed.), *Bollettino Del Comitato per l'Edizione Nazionale dei Classici*, 5, (1957), p. 10, 13-17 (τὰ δὲ Βασσαρικὰ διὰ τραχύτητα πολλὴν αὐτοῦ χωρίζοντες ἀναφέρουσιν εἰς τὸν Σάμιον, 'But the *Bassarika*, because of their excessive roughness, they declare not to be his (the work of Dionysios the periegetes), and attribute them to the Samian (Dionysios)'). As noted by E. Livrea, *Dionysii Bassaricon et Gigantiadis fragmenta* (Roma, 1973), 9-11, we do not know on what grounds the Byzantine scholars thought of a Dionysios of Samos, whom Livrea assumes to be the Cyclographer, as the author of *Bassarika*. But the possibility of a(nother) Dionysios from Samos, a poet, cannot be excluded, and part at least of the indications of the *Suda* entry might be pertinent to this latter Dionysios (so Jacoby, *FGrH* 1a, 492).

Commentary on T1 / T2

The main source for the biographical entries of the *Suda* (a Byzantine encyclopedia compiled in the 10th century AD) is generally seen in the *Onomatologos* or *Table of Eminent Writers* by Hesychios Illoustrios of Miletus (active in the sixth century AD), a series of literary biographies organized by literary genres (so E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Oxford 2007), 90-91); but the *Suda* may well have relied on other sources of information for its biographies (see in particular on this point V. Costa, 'Esichio di Mileto, Johannes Flach e le fonti biografiche della *Suda*', in G. Vanotti (ed.), *Il lessico Suda e gli storici greci in frammenti* (Tivoli 2010), 43-55). The order in which homonymous authors are listed in the *Suda* shows at any rate that the compilers of the lexicon, or their source, converted into alphabetical order a series of biographies that had previously been arranged by literary genre (A. Kaldellis, 'The Works and Days of Hesychios the Illoustrios of Miletos', *GRBS* 45 (2005) 381-403, and on the *Onomatologos* 385-388). This explains the relatively frequent confusions.

BNJ 15 F 1

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------------|
| Source: | Scholia, Phoenissae, 1116 |
| Historian's work: | Cycle |
| Source date: | various |
| Source language: | greek |
| Source genre: | Commentaries, ancient |
| Fragment subject: | Mythology, Greek |
| Edition: | Jacoby |

ιδίως ὁ Εὐριπίδης ἔνια μὲν τῶν τοῦ Ἄργου ὀμμάτων συνανατέλλειν τοῖς ἄστροις φησὶ δεδορκότα, τὰ δὲ πρὸς ταῖς δύσεσι καταμύειν. ... Διονύσιος δὲ ἐν τῷ ᾧ τοῦ Κύκλου βύρσαν αὐτὸν ἡμφιέσθαι φησὶ καὶ κύκλωι τὸ σῶμα ὅλον ὠμματῶσθαι. see Pherekydes F 66.

Translation

Euripides uniquely says that some of Argos' eyes would be watching together with the rising stars, while others would be closing in unison with the setting stars. ... Dionysios in the first book of the *Kyklos* says that he was clothed in a hide and that he had eyes all round the whole of his body.

Commentary on the text

The tradition is not unanimous as to the number and the location of Argos' eyes (sources in K. Wernicke, 'Argos 19' in *RE*, 2, (Stuttgart, 1896), 791-5). A third eye behind the head was given Argos by Hera according to Pherekydes (*FGrH* 3 F 66, quoted by the scholiast just before our fragment), while in the *Aigimios* (Hes. Fr. 294 M.-W., quoted just after our fragment) Argos had four eyes. For many other authors however, beginning with Aischylos, *Prometheus bound* 569 and Aischylos, *Prometheus bound* 678-9, he has myriads of eyes, either distributed around the head, or all over his body; the latter is the version accepted by Dionysios and [Apollodoros] *Library* 2.1.2 (2.4 W). While in Euripides it seems that some of the eyes would sleep in turn (this is clearly how the scholiast understood Euripides, *Phoenician women* 1116: an explanation and defence of this difficult passage in D.J. Mastronarde, *Euripides. Phoenissae* (Cambridge, 1994), 462-464), in both Pherekydes and the *Aigimios* Argos was described as never sleeping. We do not know Dionysios' position on this.

As for the hide, it is not often mentioned by ancient authors. The only other explicit reference to it is in [Apollodoros] *Library* 2.1.2 (2.4 W), who adds some details on the origin of the hide: Argos, being exceptionally strong, killed a bull which ravaged Arcadia and clad himself in its skin. A detail in Apollonios Rhodios 1.324-5 (Argos son of Arestor comes to join the Argonauts, covered down to his feet with the black hide of a bull) may convey an echo of this story: for in Pherekydes (*FGrH* 3 F 66-67), Arestor is the father of Argos *panoptes* (a summary of the various genealogies of Argos is in [Apollodoros] *Library* 2.1.3 (2.6 W)). It is probably because of this connection that in Apollonios Rhodios the hero Argos is clothed in a hide (so F. Vian, *Apollonios de Rhodes. Argonautiques*, 1, (Paris, 1976), 244-5). On Attic and Italiote vases Argos is often represented clad in an animal skin: this seems to have been an ancient element (on the eyes and the hide of Argos in imagery, see N. Yalouris, 'Io 1' in *LIMC*, 5.1, (1996), 661-76, in particular 674, as well as the more general discussion in T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth* (Baltimore - London, 1993), 201-2). Welcker's assumption (*Der epische Cyclus oder die homerischen Dichter*, 1.2, (Bonn, 1865), 74) that the many eyes of Argos were imagined by Dionysios as being painted over the skin is not borne out by the text. As pointed out by Jacoby, *FGrH* 1a, 491, rationalistic explanations are not something commonly found in, or pertinent to, the genre of work to which Dionysios' *Kyklos* presumably belonged.

Commentary on F 1

For the way the ancient scholiasts on Euripides emphasise the uniqueness of his version (e.g. using the term ἰδίως, as here), contrasting it with a list of other variants, see T. Papadopoulou, 'Tradition and invention in the Greek tragic scholia', *Studi italiani filologia classica* 91 (1998), 231-232 (with reference to this specific passage). Indeed, the scholiast contrasts the version of Euripides to those of Pherekydes, Dionysios, and the author of the *Aigimios*; he may have found these authors already grouped together in an earlier source (Dionysios himself, or an intermediary author). On the quality of the scholia to Euripides' play see E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Oxford 2007), 31-34.

BNJ 15 F 2

| | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Source: | Scholia, Isthmia, 4, 104 |
| Historian's work: | Cycle |
| Source date: | various |
| Source language: | greek |
| Source genre: | Commentaries |
| Fragment subject: | Mythology, Greek |
| Edition: | Jacoby |

Διονύσιος μὲν ἐν πρώτῳ Κύκλων Θηρίμαχον καὶ Δηικόωντα (sc. λέγει τοὺς Ἡρακλέους ἐκ Μεγάρας παῖδας). See Pherekydes F 14.

Translation

Dionysios in the first book of the *Kyklos* says that Therimachos and Deikoon (were sons of Herakles by Megara).

Commentary on the text

There were various lists of children of Herakles: Therimachos (a very appropriate name for a son of Herakles) appears as one of Herakles' children by Megara, together with Deikoon and another brother Kreontiades, also in [Apollodoros] *Library* 2.4.11 (2.70 W) and 2.7.8 (2.165 W.), and in *Scholia* on Homer, *Odyssey* 11.269 (where the source quoted is Asklepiades, *FGrH* 12 F 27); Therimachos, Kreontiades, Demokoon (an equivalent of Deikoon) and Onites are mentioned in *Scholia vetera* on Lykophron, *Alexandra* 38, as well as in *Scholia* on Lucian. 58 Jacobitz; two children only, Therimachos and Ophites, appear in Hyginus, *Fabulae* 31, 32 and 72.

The reference to Dionysios is embedded in a scholion covering two topics: the identity of the murderer of the sons of Herakles by Megara (Herakles himself, in his madness; a foreigner; Lykos; Augeas), and the number of the sons of the hero. On the latter point, the scholiast adduces the conflicting authorities of Dionysios, Euripides, Deinias (?) of Argos (*FGrH* 306 F 8), Pherekydes (*FGrH* 3 F 14), and Baton of Athens (*FGrH* 268 F 1), ordered according to the number of children they admit: two for Dionysios, three in Euripides (see R. Kannicht, *TrGF* 5.2 F [1016]), four in Deinias, five in Pherekydes, and seven in Baton; Pindar, in the passage the scholiast is explaining (*Isthmian* 4.63-4), had spoken of eight sons, without giving names.

Jacoby (*FGrH* 1a, 492) suggested that the fact that Dionysios has the lowest number of children may be explained with the hypothesis that he took into account only those names which were present in all traditions – this would help to assess the moment in which Dionysios was active. However, Deikoon is not present in Pherekydes *FGrH* 3 F 14, and Baton has a totally idiosyncratic list (none of his names correspond with those given by the previous authors).

Commentary on F 2

The collection of authors assembled in the scholion might allow further inferences. It is clear that we are in front of a group of citations: the scholion draws on sources which had already been organised. In 1923, Jacoby (*FGrH* 1a, 492; see also 394) assumed that the source of the

scholiast for the entire passage (both on the identity of the murderer of the sons of Herakles, and on their number) was Lysimachos of Alexandria (*FGrH* 382, active ca. 200 BC: on him, see O. Dreyer, 'Lysimachos 4' in K. Ziegler (ed.), *Der kleine Pauly*, 3, (Stuttgart, 1969), 841-2, as well as G. Damschen, 'Lysimachos 6' in *DNP*, 7, (Stuttgart, 1999), 608, with further bibliography): all references to other authors would have been mediated by him. This would give a fairly early terminus *ante quem* for the activity of Dionysios. Later, however, in his commentary on Lysimachos (*FGrH* 3b [Text] 168-70 and 3b [Noten]), Jacoby took a more prudent stance, recognizing on the one hand the difficulty of reconstructing Lysimachos' work, and on the other the possibility of independent additions by the scholiasts. What is at any rate clear is that this is a very learned scholion; on the 'impressive pedigree' of the exegetical scholia to Pindar, which preserve in an epitomized form the remains of commentaries by Aristarchos and his successors, see E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Oxford 2007), 39-40.

BNJ 15 F 3

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Source: | Clement of Alexandria (T. Flavius Clemens), <i>Protrepticus</i> (Stählin O.), 4, 47, 6 |
| Historian's work: | Cycle |
| Source date: | 2nd century AD, c. 190 AD |
| Source language: | greek |
| Source genre: | |
| Fragment subject: | Mythology, Greek |
| Edition: | Jacoby |

πολλοὶ δ' ἂν τάχα που θαυμάσειαν, εἰ μάθοιεν τὸ Παλλάδιον τὸ διοπετὲς καλούμενον, ὃ Διομήδης καὶ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἱστοροῦνται μὲν ὑφελέσθαι ἀπὸ Ἰλίου, παρακαταθέσθαι δὲ Δημοφῶντι, ἐκ τῶν Πέλοπος ὀστέων κατεσκευάσθαι, καθάπερ τὸν Ὀλύμπιον ἐξ ἄλλων ὀστέων Ἰνδικοῦ θηρίου. καὶ δὴ τὸν ἱστοροῦντα Διονύσιον ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ μέρει τοῦ Κύκλου παρίστημι.

Translation

Many would certainly be surprised to hear that the Palladion, the one famously descended from heaven, which it is said Diomedes and Odysseus took away from Ilion and gave to Demophon, was made of the bones of Pelops, just as the Olympian (the statue of Zeus) from other bones of an Indian animal. And I refer for this to Dionysios in the fifth part of the *Kyklos*.

Commentary on the text

Clemens is here speaking of the most famous of guardian statues, the Palladion of Troy, which, according to the most commonly accepted tradition, was a small wooden image of Pallas Athena that had fallen from the sky ([Apollodoros] *Library* 3. 12.3 (3. 143 W.)). There were various stories concerning both its origin and the place where it ended after having been taken from Ilion (see E. Wörner, 'Palladion' in W.H. Röscher (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, 3.1, (Leipzig, 1897-1902), 1301-24; T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth* (Baltimore and London 1993), 643-6; S. Schorn, *Satyros aus Kallatis. Sammlung der Fragmente mit Kommentar*

(Basel, 2004), 481-2; and, for a larger contextualisation, C. Faraone, *Talismans and Trojan Horses: Guardian Statues in Ancient Myth and Ritual* (New York and Oxford, 1992), *passim*). Common to all of these stories is the assumption that the safety of Troy depended on its possession of the Palladion.

According to Dionysios, Diomedes and Odysseus gave the statue to the son of Theseus Demophon. The handing over of the Palladion to the Theseidai is mentioned also by Pausanias 1.28.9, and by Polyainos 1.5; it may be alluded to in the decoration of an Attic red-figured cup attributed to Makron (St. Petersburg 649, ARV² 460), on which Odysseus and Diomedes, both holding a Palladion, are engaged in a dispute, while between them stand Demophon, Agamemnon, Phoinix and Akamas (all named).

As for Pelops: a tradition first attested in Lykophron's *Alexandra*, 52-54 linked the arrival of his bones in the Greek army besieging Troy with the fall of the city; see also [Apollodoros] *Epitome* 5.10-11, Scholia on Lykophron, *Alexandra* 54, and Tzetzes, *Posthomerica* 576-77, all speaking of bones, as well as Pausanias 5.13.4, where Pelops' ivory shoulder is brought to Troy (on bones as talismans, and on those of Pelops in particular, see Faraone, *Talismans*, 13 n. 6). A few more sources, all later than Clemens (F 3), affirm that the Palladion was made from the bones of Pelops: they consist of schol. LV to Homer *Iliad* 6.92, naming Hephaistos as the maker of the Palladion; Arnobios, *Against the Pagans* 4.25; and Firmicus Maternus, *The Error of the Pagan Religions* 15.1-2 (for whom the statue was made out of the bones of Pelops by the Scythian Abaris). Thus, Dionysios is the earliest source for this strange story. For this reason, M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*, I, (Leiden, 1963), 388, has suspected Dionysios of having invented it. This seems excessive. The notion that the Palladion was made out of the bones of Pelops might have been due to a confusion between two of the conditions necessary for Troy to fall: that the Greek capture the Palladion, and that they obtain the bones of Pelops, as a symbolic sign of ancient possession of the land. Or, as M.L. West, *The Epic Cycle. A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics* (Oxford 2013) 201 and n. 48 puts it, 'one may surmise that there was some account according to which the Achaeans were told that they needed to get the bones of Pelops, and they were in understandable perplexity until it was somehow revealed that this meant, not a journey to Elis, but stealing the Palladion from Troy.' Alternatively, Dionysios might here be following an epic version unknown to us: so L. Lulli, 'Un'altra strada per l'epos: l'opera di Dionisio il ciclografo e alcune sintesi mitografiche di età ellenistica e imperial su papiro', *Aegyptus* 93 (2013), 73-74). At any rate, the connection between the Palladion and the bones of Pelops need not necessarily imply that in Dionysios' *Kyklos* the Palladion had come to Troy with Helen as a stolen Argive heirloom (as suggested by Wörner, 'Palladion', 1304), and certainly not that already in the *Kypria* the Palladion was formed by the bones of Pelops: see Jacoby, *FGrH* 1a, 492.

As for the bones of the Indian animal (an elephant), it is unlikely that this information derives from Dionysios, as it is not directly pertinent to his story; it is best explained as an insertion due to Clemens, playing on the fact that the statue of Zeus in Olympia (mentioned a few lines earlier in the text) was (in part) in ivory. Clemens states that this reference to the Trojan Palladion came from the fifth 'part' of Dionysios work: for this reason, M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis, 'Introduction: *Kyklos*, the Epic Cycle, and Cyclic poetry', in M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception* (Cambridge 2015), 5 n. 20, state that his work was divided in μέρη, 'parts' (rather than books); but all other precise references are either explicitly to 'books' (so the *Suda*, T 2) or imply a masculine noun (F 1: ἐν τῶι ᾧ τοῦ Κύκλου; F 2: ἐν πρώτῳ; F 4b: ἐν ἔκτῳ Περὶ τοῦ Κύκλου). Either way, it is clear that Clemens' 'parts' map

onto the 'books': the stealing of the Palladion ('part 5') comes before the encounter of Odysseus with the Cyclops (F 4b, 'book 6'). It is difficult to attribute weight to such variations.

Commentary on F 3

For Clemens' way of introducing source quotations, see A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford- New York, 2004), 47-9; Marrou, H.I. Marrou and M. Harl (eds.), *Clément d'Alexandrie: Le Pédagogue*, I, (Paris, 1960), 71-81.

BNJ 15 F 4a

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Source: | Athenaios, Deipnosophistae, 11, 53, 477de |
| Historian's work: | On the Cycle |
| Source date: | 2nd century AD, late 2nd-early 3rd century AD 3rd century AD |
| Source language: | greek |
| Source genre: | Literature, food |
| Fragment subject: | Mythology, Greek |
| Edition: | Jacoby |

Διονύσιος δ' ὁ Σάμιος ἐν τοῖς Περὶ τοῦ Κύκλου τὸ Ὅμηρικὸν κισσύβιον κυμβίον ἔφη γράφων οὕτως "καὶ αὐτὸν Ὀδυσσεὺς ὀρών ταῦτα ποιοῦντα πληρώσας τοῦ οἴνου κυμβίον δίδωσι πιεῖν."

Translation

Dionysios of Samos however in his *On the Cycle* called the Homeric *kissybion* a *kymbion*, writing thus: 'And Odysseus, when he saw him (Polyphemos) doing that, filled a *kymbion* with wine and gave it to him to drink'.

Commentary

See the commentary to 15 F 4b.

BNJ 15 F 4b

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Source: | Athenaios, Deipnosophistae, 11, 63, 481e |
| Historian's work: | On the Cycle |
| Source date: | 2nd century AD, 2nd-3rd century AD 3rd century AD |
| Source language: | greek |
| Source genre: | Literature, food |
| Fragment subject: | Mythology, Greek |

| | |
|----------|--------|
| Edition: | Jacoby |
|----------|--------|

Διονύσιος δ' ὁ Σάμιος ἐν ἕκτῳ Περὶ τοῦ Κύκλου τὸ αὐτὸ οἶεται εἶναι κισσύβιον καὶ κυμβίον. φησὶ γὰρ ὡς Ὀδυσσεὺς πληρώσας κυμβίον ἀκράτου ὤρεξε τῷ Κύκλωπι. οὐκ ἔστι δὲ μικρὸν τὸ διδόμενον αὐτῷ κισσύβιον παρ' Ὀμήρῳ· οὐ γὰρ ἂν τρεῖς πίων μέγιστος ὦν τὸ σῶμα ταχέως ἂν ὑπὸ τῆς μέθης κατηνέχθη.

Translation

Dionysios of Samos in the sixth book of his *On the Cycle* considers that *kissybion* and *kymbion* are the same thing. For he says that Odysseus having filled a *kymbion* with unmixed wine handed it to the Cyclops. The *kissybion* given to the Cyclops in Homer is definitely not a small cup; or he would not have been overcome by drunkenness, with his huge body, after drinking three times.

Commentary on the text

This fragment paraphrases the offering of a cup of wine by Odysseus to the Cyclops, in Homer, *Odyssey* 9.346. Both κισσύβιον and κυμβίον were obscure terms, whose interpretations are discussed in Athenaios, *Deipnosophists* 11.476f-477e and 481d-482d, as well as in Macrobius 5.21.7-13. Dionysios seems to have replaced without explanation the Homeric κισσύβιον with κυμβίον, and this, as noted by Jacoby (*FGrH* 1a, 492), seems to imply that he was one of those who considered the second term as a syncopated form of the first (see Macrobius 5.21.11: *fuerunt qui cymbium a cissybio per syncopam dictum existimarent*, 'there were some who thought that cymbium was a contracted form of cissybium'). Needless to say, such a derivation is impossible.

The comment on F 4b about the size of the cup may go back to Dionysios; but the same sentence appears also, unattributed, in Athenaios 11.461 D, where it contains a criticism of Chamaileon: 'In all this it is plain that Chamaileon ignores the fact that the bowl (κισσύβιον) given to the Cyclops by Odysseus, in Homer, cannot be small. Otherwise the Cyclops, who was huge, would not have been completely overcome with intoxication after only three drinks (οὐ γὰρ ἂν τρεῖς πίων οὕτως κατηνέχθη ὑπὸ μέθης τηλικούτος ὦν).' Thus, either Dionysios criticized in his work Chamaileon's interpretation, or the comment that follows the reference to Dionysios in F 4b is not from Dionysios.

The choice of κυμβίον for the cup handed by Odysseus to the Cyclops means at any rate that Dionysios took part in an erudite dispute on the nature (and size) of the Homeric κισσύβιον, testified by a Callimachean passage (fr. 178.11-12 Pfeiffer: the guest from Ikos affirms that he hates drinking cups of neat wine like the Thracians, but takes pleasure in a small cup, ὀλίγω ... κισσυβίῳ); see on the Callimachean fragment and on its poetological implications M. Fantuzzi and R.L. Hunter, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge 2004), 76-83.

Dionysios might have used κυμβίον to make it clear that the vessel was a big one; he would have then accepted, against Chamaileon (fr. 9 Wehrli = Athenaios 11.461 AD), the Callimachean interpretation of κισσύβιον (so already E. Schwartz, 'Dionysios (110)' in *RE*, 5.1, (Stuttgart, 1905), col. 933).

In both F4a and F4b Athenaios cites the title of Dionysios' work as if it were a commentary on the epic cycle (περὶ τοῦ κύκλου), while all other sources concur on the fact that Dionysios wrote a *Kyklos*. However, the content of the quotation does not speak for a commentary; hence, since F.G. Welcker, *Der epische Cyclus oder die homerischen Dichter*, 1.2, (Bonn, 1865), 75, the

passage quoted in Athenaios has been generally considered a fragment from the *Kyklos* or *Historical cycle*.

Commentary on F 4

These are the only references to the work of Dionysios in Athenaios; they come from his (alphabetically ordered) discussion of drinking cups in book 11. Tracing the source of his information is impossible. But the fact that Dionysios discussed the size of the *kissybion*, taking part in a dispute that involved Callimachus and Chamaileon, is interesting: if L. Lehnus, 'I due Dionisii (PSI 1219 fr. 1,3-4)' in *ZPE*, 97 (1993), 25-28, is right in his hypothesis that Dionisios the Cyclographer may have been one of the two Dionysii mentioned at the beginning of the list of Telchines preserved in the Florentine commentary to Kallimachos fr. 1, 1, 3-8 Pf., the ancient commentators saw some connection between Kallimachos and Dionysios the Cyclographer. The identification of the Dionysii of the list with Dionysios Skythobrachion and with the Cyclographer has been disputed by G. Massimilla, *Aitia. Libri primo e secondo* (Pisa 1996), 200-201, who is followed by L. Lulli, 'Un'altra strada per l'epos: l'opera di Dionisio il ciclografo e alcune sintesi mitografiche di età ellenistica e imperial su papiro', *Aegyptus* 93 (2013), 68 n. 7. But the identification of one of the Dionysii with Dionysios Skythobrachion is now certain; things are less clear for the other one, but the Cyclographer remains a possibility (see G. Bastianini, 'Considerazioni sulle Diegeseis fiorentine (PSI XI 12.19)', in G. Bastianini and A. Casanova (ed.), *Callimaco. Cent'anni di papyri, Atti del convegno internazionale di studi* (Firenze 2006), 165-166; A. Harder, *Callimachus. Aetia, volume I* (Oxford 2012), 89-90).

BNJ 15 F 5

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Source: | Scholia, Hecuba, 123 |
| Historian's work: | Cycle |
| Source date: | various |
| Source language: | greek |
| Source genre: | Commentaries, ancient |
| Fragment subject: | Mythology, Greek |
| Edition: | Jacoby |

τοὺς Θησέως παῖδας ἔνιοί φασι μὴ ἡγεμόνας στρατεύεσθαι ἐπὶ Ἴλιον μηδὲ τῆς συμμαχίας χάριν, ἀλλὰ ἀποληψομένους τὴν Αἴθραν· διὸ καὶ τὸν Ὅμηρον (Il. 2.552) λέγειν τὸν Μενεσθέα ἡγεῖσθαι τῶν Ἀθηναίων. Διονύσιος γοῦν ὁ τὸν Κύκλον ποιήσας φησί: "Δημοφῶν δὲ ὁ Θησέως ἔδεῖτο αὐτοῖς δοῦναι Αἴθραν τὴν Πιτθέως τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς μητέρα, ὅπως αὐτὴν κομίσωσιν οἴκαδε. Μενέλαος δὲ πρὸς Ἑλένην πέμπει Ταλθύβιον κελεύσας ἄγειν Αἴθραν. καὶ Ἑλένη δωρησαμένη Αἴθραν παντοδαπῶ κόσμῳ ἀποστέλλει πρὸς Δημοφῶντα καὶ Ἀκάμαντα". (Followed by Hellenikos 4 F 143).

Translation

Some say that the children of Theseus took part in the expedition against Troy not as leaders nor because of the alliance, but in order to recover Aithra; this is why Homer (Il. 2.552) says that Menestheus led the Athenians. And Dionysios the author of the *Kyklos* says: "Demophon

the son of Theseus asked them to give back Aithra the daughter of Pittheus and mother of their father, so that they could bring her home. Menelaos then sends Talthybios to Helen, ordering her to bring out Aithra. And Helen having given all sorts of presents to Aithra sends her back to Demophon and Akamas”.

Commentary on the text

The story was narrated in a slightly different form in the *Little Iliad* of Lesches or Lescheos, as we know from Pausanias’ description of Polygnotos’ pictural rendering of Lesches’ poem (Pausanias 10.25.8 = A. Bernabé, *Poetae Epici Graeci*, I, (Leipzig, 1987), *Iliades parvae* F 20): ‘Lescheos said of Aethra that, when Troy was taken, having stealthily left she arrived to the Greek camp and was recognised by the sons of Theseus, and that Demophon asked her from Agamemnon. And he said that he wanted to oblige him, but could not do it before Helen had given her consent. He thus sent a herald, and Helen granted the favour. So in the painting Eurybates seemed to have just come to Helen to ask about Aithra, and to be repeating what he had been ordered by Agamemnon.’ The fact that in Dionysios Menelaos consents directly, while in Pausanias Helen’s agreement is required, need not be taken as a correction: there were numerous variants (so Jacoby, *FGrH* 1a, 492, against E. Schwartz, ‘Dionysios 110’ in *RE*, 5.1, (Stuttgart, 1905), 933). Thus, the herald is named Eurybates in Lesches but Talthybios in Dionysios; in Arctinos’ *Sack of Iliion*, according to Proclus’ summary (*Chrest.* 239 Seve. = Bernabé, *PEG Ilii excidium, argumentum*; cf. [Apollodoros] *Epitome* 5.22), Demophon and Akamas simply found Aithra, while in *PEG Ilii excidium* fr. 6 (quoted by Lysimachos of Alexandria, *FGrH* 382 F 14, a passage preserved in schol. Eur., *Trojan Women* 31) Agamemnon is represented as giving presents to both the sons of Theseus and to Menestheus, presumably as their part of the booty.

Commentary on F 5

The scholion to the Hecuba continues with a version attributed to Hellanikos (BNJ 4 F 143) , which sketches a picture more complex than that of Dionysios: the sons of Theseus came with the army to Troy in order to get Aithra as their part of the booty, if the Achaeans could take Troy, and if not, in order to redeem her through gifts. The various versions might have already been collected together in the sources of the scholiast, as part of a commentary to Homer. On the scholia to Euripides see also above, commentary to F 1.

BNJ 15 F 6

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Source: | Scholia, Orestes, 872 |
| Historian's work: | Cycle |
| Source date: | various |
| Source language: | greek |
| Source genre: | Commentaries, ancient |
| Fragment subject: | Mythology, Greek |
| Edition: | Jacoby |

ἡ πολλὴ δόξα κατέχει μὴ ἀφίχθαι τὸν Αἴγυπτον εἰς Ἄργος, καθάπερ ἄλλοι τέ φασι καὶ Ἐκαταῖος ... καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ κυκλογράφος ἐν † τούτῳ τὰ παραπλήσιά φησι.

Translation

but the opinion prevails that Aigyptos did not go to Argos, as many others, among which Hekataios (*BNJ* 1 F 19), say... and Dionysios the cyclographer in † this matter says more or less the same. (Under F 1).

Commentary on the text

Besides the passage of the *Orestes* commented upon by the scholiast, in which Aigyptos goes to Argos after the death of his sons to obtain justice from Danaos, and besides a play by Phrynichos the tragedian, the *Egyptians* (B. Snell, *TrGF* 1, 3 F1), referred to in the last part of this very scholion, a fragment of Euripides (R. Kannicht, *TrGF* 5 F846) quoted in Aristophanes, *Frogs* 1206-208, affirms that Aigyptos, ὡς ὁ πλεῖστος ἔσπαρται λόγος, went to Argos, with his fifty sons. Rather surprisingly, the scholiast however adds that the prevailing opinion among ancient authors was that Aigyptos did not go to Argos: this was apparently the case in the *Ehoiai*, fr. 127 M.-W. and in Hekataios F 19. Moreover, Aeschylus, *Suppliant women* 928, Euripides, *Hecuba* 886, Pausanias 2.24.2 and [Apollodoros] *Library* 2.1.5 (2.15 W.), might possibly be taken as implying the absence of Aigyptos, inasmuch as he is not explicitly mentioned. On the other hand, Pausanias, 7.21.13, affirming that Aigyptos for fear of Danaos flew to Aroe and was finally buried in Patrae, in Achaia, implies the arrival of Aigyptos in Greece. The confusion derives most likely from the fact that the scholiast does not take into account that in some versions Aigyptos did not travel with his sons, but arrived nonetheless at Argos, although later, to avenge them.

As pointed out by Jacoby (*FGrH* v. 1°, 492), if instead of ἐν τούτῳ, which is difficult to accept, there was a numeral, then Cobet's proposal ἐν πρώτῳ ('in the first book') is the only reasonable one: after all, Argive mythology formed the subject of book 1.

Commentary on F 6

Again this is a learned scholion, which gathers together a number of versions and authors. In such a context, it is unlikely that Dionysios the cyclographer was consulted separately, all the more since he is mentioned simply in support of what precedes, that is, in support of Hekataios' position. On the value of the scholia to Euripides see above, to F 1.

BNJ 15 F 7

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Source: | Scholia, Orestes, 995 |
| Historian's work: | Cycle |
| Source date: | various |
| Source language: | greek |
| Source genre: | Commentaries, ancient |
| Fragment subject: | Mythology, Greek |
| Edition: | Jacoby |

ὅθεν δόμοισι τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἦλθ' ἀρὰ πολύστονος, λόχευμα ποιμνίοισι Μαιάδος τόκου, τὸ χρυσόμαλλον ἄρνος ὅπότ' ἐγένετο τέρας ὁλοὸν ὁλοὸν Ἀτρέος ἵπποβώτα] ἀκολουθεῖν ἂν δόξειε

τῶι τὴν Ἀλκμαιωνίδα πεποηκότι εἰς τὰ περὶ τὴν ἄρνα, ὡς καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ κυκλογράφος φησί. Φερεκύδης δὲ οὐ καθ' Ἑρμοῦ μῆνιν φησι τὴν ἄρνα ὑποβληθῆναι, ἀλλὰ Ἀρτέμιδος (FGrH 3 F 133). ὁ δὲ τὴν Ἀλκμαιωνίδα γράψας τὸν ποιμένα τὸν προσαγαγόντα τὸ ποιμνιον τῶι Ἀτρεΐ Ἀντίοχον καλεῖ.

Translation

Whence came a curse bringing much lamentation to my house, the birth among the flock of the son of Maia, when that lamb with the golden fleece was born, a terrible, terrible portent for Atreus breeder of horses] In regard to the story of the lamb, Euripides appears to be following the author of the *Alcmaeonis* (F 6 Ki = F 6 PEG), as Dionysios the Cyclographer also says. Pherekydes says that the lamb was put into the flock not because of Hermes' anger, but because of Artemis'. And the author of the *Alcmaeonis* calls the shepherd who brought the lamb to Atreus Antiochos.

Commentary on the text

This comment of the scholiast might be taken to imply that Dionysios remarked on the fact that Euripides had followed the version of the *Alcmaeonis* (Bernabé, *PEG Alcmaeonis* F 6); in his *Kyklos*, then, Dionysios would not have limited himself to retelling the events, choosing between the various versions, but would also have commented on his choices. The reference to Dionysios is followed in the scholion by a citation from Pherekydes (*BNJ* 3 F 133 = Fowler *EGM* 133), which offers as the reason for the birth of the lamb the anger of Artemis and not of Hermes. I have extended the fragment to include the entire scholion, because the scholiast might in theory have found the last comment, concerning the name of the shepherd who brought the lamb, in Dionysios, whom he has just cited, rather than in the *Alcmaeonis*. (For a thorough discussion of the *Alcmaeonis*, with the text of all fragments surviving, see A. Debiasi, 'Alcmeonis', in M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception* (Cambridge 2015), 261-280, and for this passage 267, 274-276).

However, because the *Alcmaeonis* is also cited in *schol.* Euripides, *Andromache* 687, while Dionysios is not mentioned there, M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*, I, (Leiden, 1963), 388 n. 304, prefers to suppose that the scholiast consulted the *Alcmaeonis* directly, and that the comment on Dionysios is the result of a reflection of the scholiast. This obviously implies a different perception of the character of Dionysios' cycle; but such an interpretation puts a remarkable strain on the Greek and is thus rather unlikely. Moreover, the scholia are subject to abbreviations: the scholiast might still have used Dionysios without mentioning him explicitly in *schol.* Euripides, *Andromache* 687; or a reference to Dionysios might later have been omitted.

Commentary on F 7

The scholiast to Euripides contrasts here the opinion of Dionysios with that of Pherekydes, a fifth-century mythographer, just as earlier he had contrasted the viewpoints of Dionysios and Hekataios (F 6) and Hellanikos (F5). On the ancient commentaries to Euripides's plays see above, commentary to F 1.

BNJ 15 F 8

| | |
|---------|---|
| Source: | Tzetzes, Ioannes, <i>Vita Hesiodi</i> (Wilamowitz U., <i>Vitae</i>), p. 49, 19 |
|---------|---|

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| Historian's work: | Cycle |
| Source date: | 12th century AD |
| Source language: | greek |
| Source genre: | biography |
| Fragment subject: | biography |
| Edition: | Jacoby |

ἀλλ' ἴσως ὁ ἕτερος Ὅμηρος ἦν ὁ τῶι Ἡσιόδῳ ἰσόχρονος, ὁ τοῦ Εὐφρονοῦ παῖς ὁ Φωκεύς, ὁ καὶ τούτῳ τὴν ἔριν στησάμενος ... Ὅμηροι γὰρ πολλοὶ γεγόνασιν ἕτεροι ζήλωι τοῦ παλαιοῦ τὴν κλῆσιν λαμβάνοντες ... τὸν παλαιὸν δ' Ὅμηρον Διονύσιος ὁ κυκλογράφος φησὶν ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρων ὑπάρχειν τῶν Θηβαϊκῶν στρατειῶν καὶ τῆς Ἰλίου ἀλώσεως.

Translation

(Chil. XII 177-180 Leone, Alleg. Hom. 106ff.): But it is possibly the other Homer who was a contemporary of Hesiod (Hesiodos), the son of Euphron from Phokaia, who also entered in competition with him... for there have been many Homers, taking their name from the desire to imitate the ancient one... Dionysios the cyclographer however says that the ancient Homer lived through both the two expeditions against Thebes and the conquest of Ilion.

Commentary on the text

That Homer lived at the times of the Trojan war, and that he might have been a witness of it, is a relatively ancient and diffuse opinion: already Herodotos (2.53) attacked it, by assigning to Hesiod and Homer a date c. 400 years earlier than his time (i.e., in the middle of the ninth century BC). More surprising is that Dionysios considered Homeric the Theban cycle; but as Pausanias 9.9.5 shows, many other important authors shared this opinion. Even more astonishing is the notion here put forward, that he might have lived through all three epic expeditions. This is unique: it is repeated, with almost identical words, only in two texts closely related to the Tzetzean *Vitae Hesiodi particula*: the *Scholia in Hesiodum (scholia vetera partim Procli et recentiora partim Moschopouli, Tzetzae et Joanni Galeni)*, ed. T. Gaisford, *Poetae minores graeci*, 2, (Leipzig, 1823), respectively *Prolegomena schol. Procli* 7.30 and *Prolegomena schol. Tzet.* 17.23, and it might be a slip of Tzetzes; for in his own commentary to his *Exegesis* of the *Iliad*, Tzetzes mentions two expeditions: σημείωσαι. Διονύσιος ὁ κυκλογράφος τὸν Ὅμηρον ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρων φησὶν εἶναι τῶν στρατειῶν, Θηβαϊκῆς καὶ Τρωικῆς (25.10, in G. Hermann, *Draco Stratonicensis de metris poeticis, Ioannis Tzetzae Exegesis in Homeri Iliadem* (Leipzig, 1812), p. 150 – but a better text, the one printed here, is in L. Bachmann, *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem*, I, (Lipsiae, 1832), p. 841 l. 15-17, and in F.J. Boissonade, *Tzetzae Allegoriae Iliadis, accedunt Pselli Allegoriae* (Lutetiae, 1851), note to the Tzetzean *Prolegomena to the allegories*, v. 108).

Similarly in the *Prolegomena* to his *Allegories of the Iliad*, ed. Boissonade, v. 106-108, in the context of a discussion of the various figures called Homer, Tzetzes mentions only two expeditions, adding, again, that Dionysios the cyclographer confirms this information: ἐπὶ τῶν δύο στρατειῶν ὁ Ὅμηρος ὑπῆρχε, | Θηβαϊκῆς καὶ Τρωικῆς οἴδας ἐκ Προναπίδου, | καὶ Διονύσιος φησὶν ὁ κυκλογράφος τοῦτο. Pronapides seems to function as a chronological anchor: having lived in the third generation from Kadmos, he would have been Homer's teacher. Homer was

thus assigned to the fourth generation, that of Laios and Oidipous, but would have lived until the Trojan war. This is what Tzetzes affirms in the commentary to his *Allegories of the Iliad* (in J.A. Cramer, *Anecdota Graeca e codicibus manuscriptis Bibliothecarum Oxoniensium*, v. 3, (Oxonii, 1836), 376): this time however Diodoros of Sicily is mentioned as the source of the information. The last passage to be mentioned in this context is Tzetzes, *Chiliades*, 12. 178-180, where again Dionysios the cyclographer is referred to for the information that Homer would have been active at the time of two expeditions, the one against Thebes and the one for Helen; in the same context, at ll. 181-2, Tzetzes adds that Diodoros (Diodoros of Sicily, 7 fr. 1 Oldfather) agrees with Dionysios, as do ἕτεροι μῦθοι.

The mention of Diodoros in the *Chiliades*, in conjunction with the reference to Pronapides as the teacher of Homer in the *Allegories of the Iliad*, itself linked again to Diodoros of Sicily in the *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, poses however a problem. It is true that Tzetzes speaks explicitly of Dionysios the cyclographer; on the other hand, the passage of Diodoros (3.67.5 = *FGrH* 32 F 8 = J.S. Rusten, *Dionysius Scytobrachion* (Opladen, 1982), 81 n. 23 and F 8) discussing the connection between Homer and Pronapides is usually thought to derive from Dionysios Skytobrachion (and Jacoby, *FGrH* v. 1 a 493, insists that '32 F 8 c. 67.2 has nothing to do with D(ionysios von Samos)'). Thus, it is possible (and in fact, rather likely) that, as assumed for instance by C.H. Oldfather, *Diodorus Siculus*, v. III, (London – Cambridge, Mass. 1939) 347 n. 6, the Dionysios referred to by Tzetzes in all of these passages is Dionysios Skytobrachion. We would have to assume a slip of Tzetzes, in a context which is anyway rather full of slips (F. Jacoby, *Apollodoros Chronik* (Berlin, 1902), 98-105, in part. 104, has shown that here Tzetzes wrongly attributes to Pseudo-Apollodoros a date for Homer, which is in fact the one proposed by Krates). The only alternative scenario is fairly unlikely, as it presupposes that Tzetzes found somewhere an explicit attribution to the Cyclographer for the information he gives on Pronapides and Homer; that he then made the connection with the narration in Diodorus Siculus; and that either Skytobrachion addressed the question of the date of Homer in exactly the same terms as the Cyclographer, or Diodoros inserted at this point of his epitome of Skytobrachion's *Libyan stories* material from Dionysios the cyclographer, as excerpted probably in a mythological handbook (see for the question of the insertions Rusten, *Dionysius Scytobrachion*, 15-16 and 117).

For a detailed discussion of these texts see H. Felber, *Quellen der Ilias-Exegese des Ioannes Tzetzes* (Zurich, 1925), 26-30; O. Höfer, 'Pronapides', in W.H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* (Leipzig, 1897-1909), 3116-7; E. Rohde, *Kleine Schriften*, I, (1901) 5 39-40, and especially the 'Anhang 1', 101-103 (= 'Studien zur Chronologie der griechischen Litteraturgeschichte', *Rhein. Mus.* 36 (1881), 384, 417, and 564-5), where Rohde suggests that Dionysios the cyclographer should be identified with the Skytobrachion. But see now also E. Cingano, 'Epigonoï', in M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception* (Cambridge 2015), 245, who considers this passage to be from the Cyclographer. More generally on the notions of the ancients on the date of Homer see B. Graziosi, *Inventing Homer. The Early Reception of Epic* (Cambridge, 2002), 91-124 (these texts, and the question of Homer's contemporaneity to both the Theban and the Trojan wars, are however not touched upon).

Commentary on F 8

In this part of his *Life of Hesiod* Tzetzes first reports the opinion of those (anonymous) who considered Hesiod a contemporary of, or even older than, Homer; he then recounts the story of the contest at the funerals of the hero Amphidamas, and concludes by stating his opinion, that Homer was much earlier than Hesiod. At this point come references to other, younger

'Homers': the son of Euphron from Phokaia; another even younger Homer, from Byzantion, son of Andromachos and composer of the *Eurypilia*. Tzetzes then quotes Dionysios on the contemporaneity of Homer with the Theban and Trojan expeditions, and concludes that on this basis, Homer must have been 400 years older than Hesiod. For the text of Tzetzes *Life of Hesiod*, see S. Burges Watson, *Living Poets*, (Durham, 2015), https://livingpoets.dur.ac.uk/w/Tzetzes,_Life_of_Hesiod?oldid=3898

BNJ 15 F 9

| | |
|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Source: | Scholia, Phoenissae, 670 |
| Historian's work: | Cycle |
| Source date: | various |
| Source language: | greek |
| Source genre: | Commentaries, ancient |
| Fragment subject: | Mythology, Greek |
| Edition: | Jacoby |

ὁ μὲν Στησίχορος ἐν Εὐρωπείᾳ τὴν Ἀθηναίων ἐσπαρκέναι τοὺς ὀδόντας φησὶν. ὁ δὲ Ἀνδροτίων Σπαρτοὺς αὐτοὺς φησὶ διὰ τὸ ἀκολουθήσαντας αὐτοὺς ἐκ Φοινίκης Κάδμωι σποράδην οἰκῆσαι. Ἀμφίλοχος δὲ διὰ τὸ ἐπεσπάρθαι τοῖς οἰκοῦσιν ἐν Θήβαις. Διονύσιος δὲ ἔθνος Βοιωτίας φησὶν αὐτοὺς, ἔνιοι δὲ παῖδας Κάδμου αὐτοὺς φασὶν ἐκ διαφορῶν γυναικῶν πεντήκοντα τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὄντας.

Translation

Stesichoros in the *Europeia* (F 195 PMG = 195 PGMF) says that Athena sowed the teeth. Androtion (BNJ 324 F 60) says that they were called Spartoi because they lived in a scattered way, having followed Kadmos from Phoenicia. Amphilochos because they had been sowed among the habitants of Thebes. Dionysios says that they are a people of Boiotia. And some say that they are the sons of Kadmos born from different women, fifty in number.

Commentary on the text

This fragment and the following ones have been classified by Jacoby among the uncertain and doubtful- reasonably so, as the name Dionysios is not in itself a sufficient indication. The scholiast to Euripides presents here, after the mythical explanation (on which see T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth. A guide to literary and artistic sources* (Baltimore 1993), 468-471, as well as F. Vian, *Les origines de Thèbes. Cadmos et les Spartes* (Paris, 1963), 160-62), a group of rationalistic interpretations of the name Spartoi. The rationalistic interpretation here speaks against an attribution of this sentence to the Cyclographer (Jacoby, *FGrH* v. 1 a 493 proposes instead the *Ktiseis* of Dionysios of Chalkis).

Commentary on F 9

On the learned character of the scholia to Euripides see E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship*

(Oxford 2007), 31-34. An interpretation very similar to that attributed here to a Dionysios was advanced also by Hippias (*BNJ* 6 F 1), quoted in a long note of the scholiast to Apollonios Rhodios 3.1179, who is here relying for all his material on Lysimachos of Alexandria (*BNJ* 382 F 1); while it is extremely probable that originally Lysimachos quoted Dionysios too in this context (whether the Cyclographer or Dionysios of Chalkis, who is also at times quoted by Lysimachos, is difficult to decide), this fact does not necessarily imply that Dionysios was passed on to the scholiast to Euripides by Lysimachos (as suggested by Jacoby, *FGrH* v. 1 a 493; for Jacoby's views on Lysimachos as collector and intermediary source see the commentary to F 2, and *FGrH* v. 3 b [Kommentar] 168-9, with [Noten] 123 n. 32, referring specifically to Dionysios).

BNJ 15 F 10

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Source: | Scholia, Ilias (Dindorf W.), 16, 159 (BT) = Erbse 16, 159b |
| Historian's work: | |
| Source date: | various |
| Source language: | Greek |
| Source genre: | Commentaries, ancient |
| Fragment subject: | Mythology, Greek |
| Edition: | Jacoby |

αἵματι φοινόν] πεφοινιγμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος. [...] καὶ Φοίνικες ὅτι παρὰ τὴν Ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν ὠίκουν, ἣν φοινικὴν Διονύσιος καλεῖ.

Translation

deeply red with blood] made deeply red by the blood. [...] And Phoenicians because they lived close by the Red Sea, which Dionysios calls Phoinikian (i.e. red).

Commentary on the text

F 9 and 10 might have come from the same context; it is worth keeping in mind however that Dionysios in F 9 dissociates the Spartoi from the Phoenicians. One wonders whether the two fragments, and this one in particular, should not be attributed to Dionysios Skytobrachion, who did discuss the Phoenicians in the context of the transmission of the alphabet (*FGrH* 32 F 8 = Diod. Sic. 3.67.1; see A. Corcella, 'Dionisio Skytobrachion, i "Phoinikeia" e l'alfabeto pelasgico' in *Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino*, 120, (1986), 41-82). But the most likely candidate, at any rate for this fragment, is Dionysios of Miletos, who, as shown by *FGrH* 687 F 1 (certainly by the Milesian), had also discussed the origins of the alphabet. The possibility of attributing F 10 to Dionysios of Miletos had been already mentioned by Jacoby, *FGrH* v. 1 a 493, who later printed our fragment as *FGrH* 687 F 4; see also M. Moggi, 'Autori greci di Persika. I: Dionisio di Mileto' in *ASNP*, 3, 2, (1972), 433-468, in part. 462-7, and J. S. Rusten, *Dionysius Scytobrachion* (Opladen, 1982), 68-70, who both attribute F 10 to the Milesian.

Commentary on F 10

The passage of the *Iliad* commented here is a simile: Achilles has yielded to the request of Patroclos, and musters his Myrmidons to send them into battle (they will go with Patroclos): they are like wolves who having captured a stag devour it, their jowls red with blood. This is what leads the scholiast into a discussion of connected terms meaning red, and eventually to a mention of the Phoenicians. Dionysios is the only source mentioned by the commentator, and for what is definitely a side issue, the name given to the Red sea.

BNJ 15 F 11

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Source: | Scholia, Ilias (Dindorf W.), 16, 170 (T)= Erbse 16, 170a1 |
| Historian's work: | |
| Source date: | various |
| Source language: | greek |
| Source genre: | Commentaries, ancient |
| Fragment subject: | Mythology, Greek |
| Edition: | Jacoby |

πεντήκοντ' ἦσαν νῆες θοαί, ἦισιν Ἀχιλλεὺς ἐς Τροίην ἠγεῖτο δίφιλος· ἐν δὲ ἐκάστη πενήκοντ' ἔσαν ἄνδρες ἐπὶ κληῖσιν ἐταῖροι] πῶς, φασίν, ἐν ἅπασιν αὐξῶν Ἀχιλλέα τούτῳ μειοῖ; τινὲς μὲν οὖν, ὅτι οὐκ ἐν πλήθει ἡ ἀρετὴ ... Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ φησὶν ἂν ἐρέτας εἶναι διὰ τὸ 'ἐπὶ κληῖσιν' ἢ ναύτας πρὸς ὑπηρεσίαν. Διονύσιος δὲ τὸν μέγιστον¹ ἀριθμὸν ῥῆκ τιμαῖ², τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ τούτων ἄγεσθαι, ὡς φθάνειν πάσας ἀπὸ πῆ³ ἀνδρῶν.

Translation

Fifty were the swift ships, which Achilles dear to Zeus led to Troy; and in each were fifty men on the rowing benches, his comrades] how come, they say, that when he elsewhere tries to aggrandize Achilles, in this passages he diminishes him? Some say, because virtue is not to be found in numbers... Aristarchos however says that the rowers are fifty because of the 'on the benches', or sailors as crew. But Dionysios estimates the greatest number of rowers at 120, and that the rest was in between these, so that they would all on average reach eighty-five men.

Apparatus criticus

¹ T (and Van der Valk, Erbse, Linke): <μὲν ἐρετῶν> Maass, Jacoby

² Maass, Jacoby: τίμιον T (Linke); ποιεῖν Erbse

³ Holwerda, *Mnemos*. 1966, 288-9: ἀποτε T (and Jacoby): ἀπὸ τε Linke; ἀπὸ πῆ Schrader, ἐπὶ πῆ Erbse, ἀπὸ πεντέκοντα Van der Valk

Commentary on the text

The scholion opposes the interpretation of Aristarchos to that of a Dionysios, possibly the

Cyclographer. If the identification with the Cyclographer is correct, this is interesting, as it implies that Dionysios' work was considered significant enough to be contrasted with Aristarchos' (so L. Lulli, 'Un'altra strada per l'epos: l'opera di Dionisio il ciclografo e alcune sintesi mitografiche di età ellenistica e imperial su papiro', *Aegyptus* 93 (2013), 74). On the passage, see M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*, 1, (Leiden, 1963), 519, with a short discussion of the style and terminology of Dionysios; K. Linke, *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Dionysios Thrax* (Berlin- New York, 1977), 32 and 73 (F 59), who considers the attribution to Dionysios the Cyclographer most likely, although Dionysios Thrax cannot be excluded; and D. Holwerda, in his review of Van der Valk in *Mnemosyne*, 4, 19, (1966), 288-9, whose text I accept.

The type of question discussed here could have been addressed in the *Apora*, if Dionysios did indeed write a work of that title (see F 15). The ancients were surprised at the discrepancies between the crews of the different contingents: while Achilles had a crew of fifty men on each ship, the Boiotians for instance had 120 (cf. Homer *Iliad* 2.510; 120 and 50 are already for Thucydides 1.10.4 the two extremes). The latter figure must however have been a hyperbolic compliment to the Boiotians, since the number of 50 (itself a typical number for enumerations) fits with what else we know for ships of the Homeric period: so R. Janko, *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 4, books 13-16 (Cambridge, 1992), 340.

Commentary on F 11

This fragment and the preceding one (10) come both from the scholia vetera to the *Iliad*, and from a related passage (the preparation of the Myrmidons for battle).

BNJ 15 F 12

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Source: | Scholia, <i>Odyssea</i> (Dindorf W.), 12, 85 (V) |
| Historian's work: | Cycle |
| Source date: | various |
| Source language: | greek |
| Source genre: | Commentaries, ancient |
| Fragment subject: | Mythology, Greek |
| Edition: | Jacoby |

Σκύλλα θυγάτηρ μὲν ἦν Φόρκυος καὶ Ἐκάτης, τὸ μὲν μέγεθος θαυμαστή. εἶχε δὲ πόδας μὲν δώδεκα, κεφαλὰς δὲ ἕξ, ἐν ἑκάστωι δὲ τῶν στομάτων τρεῖς στίχους ὀδόντων, ὀφθαλμοὺς δὲ πυροειδεῖς, καὶ τὸ μὲν ἄλλο σῶμα ἐκρύπτετο αὐτῆς ἐν τινι σπηλαίωι κατὰ βυθοῦ βεβλημένον, συμφυῆς οὕσα τῇ πέτραι· τὰς δὲ κεφαλὰς αὐτῆς εἶχεν ἕξω, περιμήκεις ὥστε δύνασθαι ἀπὸ τῆς πέτρας εἰς τὴν ναῦν φθάνειν. ταύτην λέγεται τὸν Ἡρακλέα, ὁπότε τὰς Γηρυόνοιο βοῦς ἦγεν, ὡς εἶδεν ἀπληστευομένην, ἀνελεῖν. τὸν δὲ πατέρα διὰ πυρὸς ἀναγκάσαι πάλιν αὐτὴν ἀναζηῖσαι. ἡ δὲ ἱστορία παρὰ Διονυσίωι.

Translation

Skylla was the daughter of Phorkys and Hekate, of extraordinary dimensions. She had twelve feet, six heads, in each of the mouths three rows of teeth, and eyes of the colour of fire. And the rest of her body was hidden, placed in a cavern under the depth of the sea, for she was of a piece with the rock; but her heads extended outside, and were extremely long, so that she could reach from the rock to the ship. It is said that Herakles, when he fetched the oxen of Geryon, as he saw this insatiable being, killed her. But her father forced her back to life through fire. The history is in Dionysios.

Commentary on the text

On Skylla, see T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth* (Baltimore – London, 1993), 731-3. The description of Skylla offered by Dionysios is quite close to that of the *Odyssey*, 12.85-95; in Homer, *Odyssey* 12.124 however the mother of Skylla is Krataiis, as also in a papyrus fragment preserving stories of the Mythographus Homericus (Pack² 1209 = PSI 10, 1173, 6v), a text which is otherwise quite close to our fragment. In the *Megalai Ehoiai* Skylla was the daughter of Phorbas and Hekate (Hesiod fr. 262 M.-W.); the genealogy given by Dionysios is that of Akousilaos (FGrH 2 F 42), with Skylla as the daughter of Phorkys and Hekate. This has led some to doubt the attribution to the Cyclographer, evidently in the belief that he would have kept closer to the Homeric text; E. Schwartz, 'De scholiis homericis ad historiam fabularem' in *Jahrbücher für Klassische Philologie*, Suppl. 12, (1881), 462 for instance attributed the fragment to Dionysios Skytobrachion. This suggestion has been ruled out by M. Van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*, 1, (Leiden, 1963), 388 n. 301, mainly on the basis of the rationalistic character of the work of Dionysios Skytobrachion (see also on this J. S. Rusten, *Dionysios Scytobrachion* (Opladen, 1982), 14), in particular of his *Argonauts*, which would be the work here required; such a tendency is manifestly absent from our fragment. Moreover, already in Apollonios Rhodios, *Argonautics* 4.825-831, Krataiis is mentioned as a second name of the mother of Skylla, Hekate: the divergence between the two texts can thus be easily accounted for.

The second part, linking the story of Skylla to the adventures of Herakles, with the extraordinary detail about the monster being revived by her father through being burned, is first attested in Lykophron, *Alexandra* 44-49 (see *Scholia* on Lykophron 46). The connection with the adventures of Herakles might have been made already by Stesichoros (O. Waser, 'Skylla 1', in W.H. Röscher, *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, 4, (Leipzig, 1909-15), 1032-3; see also E. Ciaceri, *La Alessandra di Licofrone* (Napoli, 1901), 144), but as we have practically nothing of Stesichoros' *Scylla*, this must remain a hypothesis. Just as unclear is the relationship – if any – between Lykophron and Dionysios, the only two extant sources for the story of Skylla's death by Herakles: Lykophron might be dependent on Dionysios (see van der Valk, *Researches*, 388-9, in part. n. 395), or both might be dependent on an earlier account. Skylla's return to life through burning is easily explained, as obviously she had to be somehow revived, in order to be there for the men of Odysseus; fire is a hallmark of the passage of the *Argonautics* (A. R. 4.924-929) in which this earlier passing of the straits is described.

Commentary on F 12

The scholia to the *Odyssey* labelled V in Dindorf's edition are part of the so-called D scholia, the largest group of Homeric scholia (E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Oxford 2007), 22). These D scholia "have diverse origins and form a heterogeneous group, but there is no doubt that much of the material in them is very old, for there are remarkable similarities between the D scholia and Homeric scholarship found on papyri" (Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship*, 20). The D scholia

often offer short lexical explanations; but they may also, as here, report mythological explanations, plot summaries, and prose paraphrases.

BNJ 15 F 13

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Source: | Scholia, Pythia, 1, 109 |
| Historian's work: | |
| Source date: | various |
| Source language: | greek |
| Source genre: | Commentaries, ancient |
| Fragment subject: | Mythology, Greek |
| Edition: | Jacoby |

φρσι γάρ Διονύσιος χρησιμοῖς Ἀπόλλωνος ἀπολουσάμενον τὸν Φιλοκτῆτην ἀφυπνῶσαι, τὸν δὲ Μαχάονα ἀφελόντα τοῦ ἔλκουσ τὰς διασαπείσας σάρκας καὶ ἐπικλύσαντα οἴνῳ τὸ τραῦμα ἐπιπάσαι βοτάνην, ἣν Ἀσκληπιὸς εἶληφε παρὰ Χείρωνος, καὶ οὕτως ὑγιασθῆναι τὸν ἥρωα.

Translation

Dionysios says that following Apollo's oracles Philoktetes took a bath and fell asleep, and that Machaon, after taking away from the wound the putrefied flesh poured wine over it and then applied to it a herb, which Asklepios had received from Cheiron, and thus the hero was healed.

Commentary on the text

It is fairly likely that the Dionysios referred to is the Cyclographer: the healing of Philoktetes was part of the *Little Iliad* (Proclus *Chrest.* 206 Seve. = A. Bernabé, *Poetae Epici Graeci*, I, (Leipzig, 1987), *Iliades parvae argumentum* 1), and we know from F 5 that Dionysios had narrated these events, in both cases going into minute details (so Jacoby, *FGrH* v. 1 a 493). The fact that the healer is Machaon, as also in Proclus' summary, shows that in this case Dionysios kept close to the epic poem: for other names of healers were known, such as Podaleirios ([Apollodoros] *Epitome* 5.8). F 3, F 5 and F 13 were probably all part of the fifth book of the *Kyklos*. Tzetzes in his commentary to the *Alexandra* of Lykophron, 911 offers a text fairly close to that of the Pindaric scholion (his information probably derives directly from the scholion rather than from another source quoting Dionysios), but mentions also an alternative version, which he attributes to Orpheus (*Lithica* 346-8), and in which Machaon heals the hero through a stone called Ophietis.

Commentary on F 13

This is a typically learned scholion; on the high quality of the scholia to Pindar see above, commentary on F 2.

BNJ 15 F 14

| | |
|---------|-------------------------|
| Source: | Scholia, Isthmia, 1, 79 |
|---------|-------------------------|

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Historian's work: | |
| Source date: | various |
| Source language: | greek |
| Source genre: | Commentaries, ancient |
| Fragment subject: | Mythology, Greek |
| Edition: | Jacoby |

Διονύσιος δὲ τὸν Μινύαν Ἄρεος ἀναγράφει.

Translation

Dionysios records Minyas as son of Ares. Cf. *BNJ* 3 F 171.

Commentary on the text

This fragment was assigned to the Cyclographer by Jacoby (*FGrH* v. 1 a 493), on the basis of the fact that his *Historical* cycle is cited elsewhere in the *scholia* to Pindar (see F 2 and the less certain F 13).

The scholiast is here explaining the connection between Minyas and Orchomenos. He first discusses the genealogy offered by Pherekydes (*FGrH* 3 F 171: Minyas descended from Orchomenos), then moves to the opinion of others, who affirm that on the contrary Minyas was son of Orchomenos, or who make both Minyas and Orchomenos descend from Eteokles; he contrasts these positions with that of Dionysios, for whom Minyas is a son of Ares, and closes with the genealogy offered by Aristodemos of Thebes (*FGrH* 383 F 16), according to which Minyas was son of Aleos.

Normally the father of Minyas is however Poseidon (see Jacoby, *FGrH* v. 1 a 429), while Ares is attested in this role only here, in Dionysios. Ares is however the father of the Orchomenians Askalaphos and Ialmenos in Homer, *Iliad* 2.511-12. Both Ares and Poseidon are mentioned in the long genealogy offered by Pausanias, 9.34.6-36.6: Ares is the father, with Chryse daughter of Almus, of Phlegyas, who inherits the throne, but dies childless; Phlegyas is succeeded by Chryses, born of Poseidon and Chrysogeneia sister of Chryse and daughter of Almus, and father of Minyas; the latter gives his name to the people, and has a son called Orchomenos. Discussion of these traditions in Jacoby, *FGrH* v. 1 a 429.

Commentary on F 14

This is a very learned scholion (on the 'impressive pedigree' of the exegetical scholia to Pindar see above, Commentary to F 2). Here as in F 2, Dionysios is mentioned with Pherekydes (and Aristodemos of Thebes); the association with Pherekydes recurs also twice in the scholia to Euripides (F 1 and 7).

BNJ 15 F 15

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Source: | Scholia, Ilias (Dindorf W.), 2, 308 (A) |
| Historian's work: | On Problems |

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------------|
| Source date: | various |
| Source language: | greek |
| Source genre: | Commentaries, ancient |
| Fragment subject: | Mythology, Greek |
| Edition: | Jacoby |

δράκων ἐπὶ νῶτα δαφρινός] τούτῳ τὸ ὄνομα ὁ Πορφύριος ἐν τοῖς Ζητήμασί φησι Σθέσιος· οὕτως γὰρ ἱστοροῦται Διονυσίῳ ἐν τῷ εἰ τῶν Ἀπόρων.

(cf. D schol. 308 Heyne: ἔνθ' ἐφάνη· ὅπου ἡμῖν ὤφθη ὁ δράκων· οὗτινος δράκοντος τὸ ὄνομα ὁ Πορφύριος ἐν τοῖς ζητήμασί φησι, λέγων αὐτὸν Σθένιον· οὕτως γὰρ ἱστοροῦται Διονυσίῳ ἐν τῇ εἰ τῶν ἀπόρων)

Translation

a serpent, his back the colour of blood] Porphyrios in his *Researches* says that his name was Sthenios; for so it is recorded by Dionysios in the fifth book of his *Problems*.

Commentary on the text

This is the only reference to a Dionysios author of a work *On Problems*; L. Cohn, 'Dionysios 140' in *RE*, 5.1, (Stuttgart, 1905), 895 distinguishes this Dionysios from other homonymous writers, and attributes to him a work *περὶ ἀπόρων*. Jacoby attributes the fragment to the Cyclographer, remarking moreover (*FGrH* v. 1 a 493) that as Dionysios treated of the Trojan theme in the fifth book of his *Kyklos*, it might be tempting to conjecture *περὶ Κύκλου* instead of *τῶν Ἀπόρων* here. The latter was however a much practised genre, and both schol. A and D concur in mentioning a fifth book of *Apora*; there is after all no reason why Dionysios might not have written also *On Problems*. In favour of attributing the fragment to the Cyclographer, while maintaining the title *On Problems*, is also K. Linke, *Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Dionysios Thrax* (Berlin-New York, 1977), 73 (F 58).

The serpent has no name in Homer; the name *Sthenios* may be an invention of the Cyclographer (if the fragment belongs to him), for also elsewhere he shows the tendency to adorn Homeric stories with further details.

Commentary on F 15

Here the commentator is quoting the neoplatonic philosopher Porphyrios (ca. 234-310 AD), who in turn refers to Dionysios for his information. Porphyrios' discussion is not from the first book of his *Homeric Researches*, and thus is not in Sodano's edition; but see H. Schrader, *Porphyrii quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem pertinentium reliquias* (Leipzig, 1880), 36-37, with the cautionary remarks of E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Oxford 2007), 27. Porphyrios is here discussing the passage of *Iliad* 2.301-332 where Odysseus recalls events at Aulis: a serpent sent by Zeus, his back the colour of blood, ate eight small sparrows and their mother as well, and was then turned into a stone by Zeus, an event interpreted by Calchas as relating to the length of the war.

Biographical Essay

According to E. Schwartz, 'Dionysios (110)' in *RE*, 5.1, (Stuttgart, 1905), 933, the *Historical cycle*

belongs to the third or second century BC. This is accepted by Jacoby (*FGrH* v. 1 a 491) and is, on the whole, probably right: the authors who quote Dionysios, the contexts in which fragments of his work appear, and the character of the work seem to justify this hypothesis. For the possibility that one of the two Dionysii mentioned at the beginning of the list of (probably) Telchines preserved in the Florentine commentary to Kallimachos fr. 1, 1, 3-8 Pf. may be the Cyclographer (in which case he would have been a contemporary of Kallimachos) see above, commentary on F 4.

But a date to the second, or even worse to the third century BC, as implied by the identification suggested above, does not square with the information (admittedly contradictory) we have from the *Suda*. The problem is thus how much of the information offered by the *Suda* is pertinent to Dionysios the Cyclographer, and how much we want to trust it. T 1, which does not mention a *Kyklos*, affirms that Dionysios son of Mousonios was priest of Helios in Rhodes. The name Mousonios points to contacts with Rome and to an early imperial date, as suggested by P.M. Fraser and E. Matthews, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, I, (Oxford, 1987), 'Dionysios 428'; this however does not agree with the date which would fit best the remains of the *Historical cycle*. Moreover, the double nationality (Samian and Rhodian) implies a complicated scenario. Thus, the best solution is to follow Jacoby, and to distinguish between a Dionysios son of Mousonios, priest in Rhodes, and a Dionysios of Samos, author, as affirmed by Athenaios, of a *Cycle*, which can be considered the same as the *Historical cycle* mentioned in the *Suda* entry concerning Dionysios of Miletos (T 2).

It is worth mentioning here a fourth or third century BC fragmentary Samian decree (IG XII 6.1, 100) honouring a historian Dionysios for his continued goodwill towards the Samians (ll. 8-9: ἐπ]/-ηινῆσθαι μὲν Διο]νύσιον ἱστορ[ι - -, to be restored as ἱστορ[ικὸν, as suggested by C. Habicht, 'Samische Volksbeschlüsse der hellenistischen Zeit' in *Athenische Mitteilungen*, 72, (1957), 198-199, or with Hallof, in IG XII 6.1, 100 as ἱστορ[ικῶν συγγραφέα). The man cannot have been originally a Samian, as the decree orders (ll. 14-15) that he be inscribed among the citizens; Habicht canvasses the possibility of identifying him with the historian Dionysios of Chalcis, active in the fourth century BC and writer of *Ktiseis* (*FHG* IV 393-6; E. Schwartz, 'Dionysios (103)', *RE* 5.1 (Stuttgart 1905), 929), and notes that the Rhodian Dionysios son of Mousonios is out of question, because a name such as Mousonios can be expected only later. But the Cyclographer might also be a candidate. At any rate, the document is important, inasmuch as it links a historian named Dionysios to Samos: even if the historian in question had nothing to do with the Cyclographer, his presence and the honours he received in Samos might have contributed to the confusion surrounding the latter.

As for the *Historical cycle* itself, it seems to have comprised events from the origin of the world to the end of the age of heroes, possibly following, for the early period, a Peloponnesian version. The *Cycle* was probably organised along genealogical lines: F 1 and F 2, from the first book, recount Argive mythology (as pointed out by Jacoby, *FGrH* v. 1 a 492, it seems likely that the story of Herakles continued into the second book); F 3 shows that the fall of Troy was narrated in the fifth book; F 4 shows that the travels of Odysseus were told in book six, and possibly in book seven, together with other *nostoi*. C. Meliaddò, 'Dionysius [9] Cyclographus', *LGGA* (2005), suggests to order the fragments in the following chronological sequence: 1, 6, 7, 2, 3, 5, 4. The events narrated in F 6 and 7 may indeed find their chronological place between F 1 and F 2; and certainly the events narrated in F 5 (which, like F 6 and 7, does not have any indication of book number) must have been placed between F 3 and F 4: F 3 and F 5 narrate events from the *Little Iliad*, while F 4 retells an episode of the *Odyssey*. Thus Dionysios' *Historical*

cycle covered the ancient – mythical – history narrated also in the epic poems, from the Theogony and Titanomachy to the death of Odysseus, including on the way the Theban epics, the *Aigimios*, *Alcmaeonis*, and possibly the *Danaiids*. Dionysios took an independent line: as pointed out by Meliadò (2005, as well as C. Meliadò, ‘Mythography’, in F. Montanari, S. Matthaïos and A. Rengakos (eds), *Brill’s Companion to Ancient Scholarship* ii (Leiden – Boston 2015), 1072-1073, whenever we can compare Dionysios’ work with the surviving fragments of the epic cycle or with Proclus’ summary, the differences are evident: Dionysios ‘collected in his *Kyklos* learned versions of the myth which were different from the tales, universally known, of the *Epic Cycle*.’ (1073). The title *Historical cycle* however should not be taken only as an allusion to the so-called epic cycle; it also plays on the notion of completeness, as is shown by the case of Menekles of Teos, honoured by the Cretan city of Priansos around 170 BC because he composed a cycle on Crete and the gods and goddesses born in the island, collecting material from many poets and historians (FGrH 461 T 1 = *Inscriptiones Creticae* I 24.1 ll. 9-13: εἰσήνευκε κύκλον ἱστορημέναν ὑπὲρ Κρέτας καὶ τῶν ἐν Κρέτᾳ γενομένων θεῶν τε καὶ ἥρώων, ποιησάμενος τὰν συναγωγὰν ἐκ πολλῶν ποιητᾶν καὶ ἱστοριογράφων). The comparison with Menekles is also discussed in M.L. West, *The Epic Cycle. A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics* (Oxford 2013), 1; L. Lulli, ‘Un’altra strada per l’epos: l’opera di Dionisio il ciclografo e alcune sintesi mitografiche di età ellenistica e imperial su papiro’, *Aegyptus* 93 (2013), 75-78. Lulli in particular notes that just as Menekles focused on local, epichoric material for his cycle of Cretan affairs divine and heroic, so also Dionysios recounted minor myths and variant details, besides the Panhellenic narratives.

More generally on the changing meanings of the terms *kyklos* and *kyklikos* see E. Schwartz, ‘Apollodoros’ in RE, 1.2, (Stuttgart, 1894), 2877-86; A. Rzach, ‘Kyklos’ in RE, 11.2, (Stuttgart, 1922), 2347-435, in part. 2347-9; A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton, 1995), 394-9; M. Steinrück, *Kranz und Wirbel. Ringkompositionen in den Büchern 6-8 der Odyssee* (Hildesheim – Zürich – New York, 1997), in part. 1-80; M. Cantilena, ‘Il Ciclo, Callimaco e Lisania’, in R. Nicolai (ed.), *ΠΥΣΜΟΣ. Studi di poesia, metrica e musica greca offerti dagli allievi a Luigi Enrico Rossi per i suoi settant’anni* (Roma 2003), 365-377; and M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis, ‘Introduction: *Kyklos*, the Epic Cycle, and Cyclic poetry’, in M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception* (Cambridge 2015) 1-40, who indeed think that the ‘idea of completeness perhaps also underlies the prose work of Dionysios the *kyklographos* ... His compilation was a sort of encyclopedia of the mythical material found in epic, a formal corpus of heroic saga (‘Corpus der Heldensage’)’ (*ibid.*, 5).

It is difficult to judge the impact and diffusion of Dionysios’ *Historical cycle*. Clemens (F 3) must have found him mentioned in a mythographical compendium, while the quotation in Athenaios (F 4) gives the impression of deriving from a lexicon. Some dubious references of very different character are preserved in the Homeric scholia and in Tzetzes; and obviously Dionysios may be lurking behind generic references to the authority of *tines*, ‘some’, in a number of texts (thus Jacoby suspects Dionysios to be the source of Strabo 14.2.5 on the archaic history of Rhodes, FGrH v. 3 b [Text] 452 with v. 3 b [Noten] 266 n. 13). But the highest number of securely attributable fragments has been preserved in the ancient commentaries to the plays of Euripides, and in the commentaries to Pindar. In both cases, recurrent associations in the context of groups of quotations show that the scholiast is unlikely to have accessed the *Historical cycle* directly; the intermediary may have been Lysimachos of Alexandria, as hypothesised by Jacoby (see commentary to F 2, as well as to F 6 and F 9). At any rate, Dionysios’ *Kyklos* is cited four, possibly five times in the ancient commentaries on Euripides (F 1, 5, 6, 7 and 9), once in association with Hekataios (F 6) and twice in association with

Pherekydes (F 1 and F 7); the association with Pherekydes recurs also in F 2 and F 14, two fragments transmitted in the ancient commentaries to Pindar. This says something about the character of his work, which must have been relatively close to the ancient genealogical tradition. This closeness concerns not only the general format of the work, organised along genealogical lines, but also the language used, a very plain and simple prose, as shown by the two literal quotations we have (F 4 and F 5).

Scholars have given fairly divergent evaluations of Dionysios' work. E. Schwarz, 'Dionysios 110', 933, remarking on the attention to strange details and on the relative lack of attention for philological data shown by F 8 ('whoever in the Hellenistic period dates Homer to the time of the Theban and Trojan war does not want to be taken seriously, if only because the *Thebais* thereby acquires the same status as the *Iliad*, in deliberate disregard of the critical work of Alexandrian philology'), thought of a mythographical novel. But, as pointed out by Jacoby (*FGrH* v. 1 a 491), this is putting too much weight on F 8 (besides, F 8 might derive from Dionysios Skytobrachion's oeuvre, a mythographical novel); moreover, other fragments seem to imply a philological treatment, which would point to a mythographical work of a learned character. For instance, F 7 may certainly be taken to imply a critical discussion of the tradition (as affirmed by Jacoby, *FGrH* v. 1 a 491), although this need not necessarily be the case. Similarly F 1 and F 4 may, but need not to, have implied a philological discussion. The one fragment which clearly presupposes a learned philological discussion is F 11 – so much so that it looks almost out of place in the general context of Dionysios' *Cycle*, and that an attribution to the *Apora* makes much more sense.

On the whole, the character of the fragments seems to speak for a mythographical handbook (so J.S. Rusten, 'Dionysius (11)' in *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford, 1996)³, 479), but one showing a certain interest in strange events and details: thus M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad*, I (Leiden 1963), 388, who attributes quite a lot of inventiveness to Dionysios. This is true even if we leave out of discussion the uncertain fragments, such as F 12: F 1 on Argos and F 3 on the Palladion, both explicitly attributed to the Cyclographer, definitely do not give 'mainstream' versions of the events.

Bibliography

L. Lulli, 'Un'altra strada per l'*epos*: l'opera di Dionisio il ciclografo e alcune sintesi mitografiche di età ellenistica e imperial su papiro', *Aegyptus* 93 (2013), 65-104.

K. Meister, 'Dionysius (5) of Miletus' in *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford, 1996) 3 , 478.

C. Meliadò, 'Dionysius [9] Cyclographus', *LGGA* (2005); now 'Dionysios [10] Cyclographos in *Brill's Lexicon of Greek Grammarians of Antiquity* (2005)

C. Meliadò, 'Mythography', in F. Montanari, S. Matthaios and A. Rengakos (eds), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Scholarship* ii (Leiden – Boston 2015), 1057-1089.

J.S. Rusten, 'Dionysius (11)' in *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford, 1996) 3 , 479.

E. Schwartz, 'Dionysios (110)' in *RE*, 5.1, (Stuttgart, 1905), cols. 932-3.

E. Schwartz, 'Dionysios (112)' in *RE*, 5.1, (Stuttgart, 1905), cols. 933-4.

F.G. Welcker, *Der epische Cyclus oder die homerischen Dichter*, 1.2, (Bonn, 1865), 70-82.