

288 Derkyllus

Paola Ceccarelli (Durham)

BJN	Dercyllus	Derkyllus
Historian Number:	288	

288 F 1 - (IV, 387, 5) [Plutarch] De fluviis 22, 4 = Moralia 1164c	meta[[id="288" type="F" n="1"]]
Subject: Myth: Mythical figure; Genre: aetiology Historical Work: Aitolika book 3 Source date: 2nd century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: Mythical past	Translation
παράκειται δ' αὐτῶι ὄρος Καλυδῶν καλούμενον, τὴν προσηγορίαν εἰληφὸς ἀπὸ Καλυδῶνος τοῦ Ἄρεως καὶ Ἀστυνόμης παιδός. οὗτος γὰρ κατ' ἄγνοιαν λουομένην ἰδὼν Ἄρτεμιν τὴν μορφὴν τοῦ σώματος μετέβαλεν εἰς πέτραν· κατὰ δὲ πρόνοιαν θεῶν τὸ ὄρος καλούμενον Γυρόν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Καλυδῶν μετωνομάσθη. (5) γεννᾶται δ' ἐν αὐτῶι βοτάνη [ή] μύωψ προσαγορευομένη, ἣν ἕάν τις εἰς ὕδωρ βαλὼν νίψηται τὸ πρόσωπον, ἀποβάλλει τὴν ὄρασιν· Ἄρτεμιν δ' ἔξιλασάμενος ἀνακτᾶται τὸ φῶς, καθὼς ἱστορεῖ Δέρκυλλος ἐν ᾗ Αἰτωλικῶν.	Along it (the Acheloos river) is the mountain called Kalydon, which took its appellation from Kalydon the son of Ares and Astynome. For he unwittingly saw Artemis as she was bathing, and changed the form of his body into a stone; and through the foresight of the gods the mountain called Gyron changed its name into Kalydon, after him. (5) On it grows a herb called <i>myops</i> ('shortsighted'), and if after having thrown it into the water one washes one's face, he loses his sight; but after appeasing Artemis he reacquires the light, as Derkyllus narrates in the third book of his <i>Aitolian histories</i> .

288 F 1 Commentary

A Kalydon son of Ares and Astynome is known only from this passage (Kalydon is usually the son or nephew of Aitolos, son or brother of Pleuron, son of Endymion: T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore - London 1993), 168). Before entering into a discussion of this fragment, it is worth bearing in mind that in *On rivers* 22.1 (i.e. within the same chapter 22) [Plutarch] had told the story of another Aitolian Kalydon, the son of Thestios son of Ares and Peisidike, killed by his father who did not recognize him and thought he was an adulterer sleeping with his own wife. This story is also unattested elsewhere, and it is juxtaposed to the following one (Derkyllus F 1) without any explanations (see H.W. Stoll, 'Kalydon 1', in W.H. Roscher, *Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* 2.1 (Leipzig 1890-94), 939); [Plutarch] does not mention any source-references for it (note however that *Aitolika* of Diokles of Rhodes are mentioned at the end of *On rivers* 22.3, and it may well be that Diokles is meant to be taken as source for all that

precedes, as Jacoby, FGrH 3a, 387 seems to suggest; however, both FGrH 302 F 1 and BNJ 302 F 1 print only *On rivers* 22.3 as belonging to Diokles).

The story of Kalydon's metamorphosis (*On rivers* 22.4) clearly belongs with the description that follows it, of the virtues of the plant growing on the mountain (*On rivers* 22.5): once the two stories are read together, it becomes clear that this narrative is a blend of the stories of Tiresias, who having seen Athena bathing became blind, and of Aktaion, who οὐκ ἐθέλων saw Artemis bathing, was transformed in a stag and cut to pieces by his own dogs, as narrated for instance by Callimachos, *Hymn* 5.70-84 and 108-15 respectively (see F. Jacoby, FGrH 288 3a, 387; A. De Lazzer, in E. Calderon Dorda, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Napoli 2003), 254; for the evolution of the story of Aktaion see e.g. R.L. Lacy, 'Aktaion and a lost bath of Artemis', *JHS* 110 (1990), 26-42).

The point of departure for Derkyllos's / [Plutarch]'s transformative process is probably the Homeric formula 'and rocky Kalydon' (Καλυδῶνά τε πετρήεσσιν, Homer, *Iliad* 2.640: so P. Grossardt, *Die Erzählung von Meleagros. Zur literarischer Entwicklung der kalydonischen Kultlegende* (Leiden - Boston Köln 2001), 209-10); the story narrated by the Orchomenians, that a ghost carrying a stone ravaged their land, until the god of Delphi suggested that they find the remains of Aktaion and bury them, and that having made a bronze image of the ghost they fasten it to a rock (Pausanias 9.38.5), may also have played a role in stimulating [Plutarch]'s imagination and steering it towards metamorphosis into a rock, as may the fact that Aktaion (at least in Euripides's version) dies on Mt. Kithairon (Euripides, *Bacchant women* 1290-92): on the level of sound-association, Κιθαίρων resonates with Καλυδών.

In giving an Aitolian location to a story partly modeled on that of Aktaion Derkyllos / [Plutarch] may have followed precedents: already Nikandros had mentioned the story of Aktaion (originally located in Boiotia) in his *Aitolika* (see Jacoby, FGrH 3a, 387, and De Lazzer, in Calderon Dorda, De Lazzer, Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti*, 254); Grossardt's view (*Die Erzählung von Meleagros*, 132) that the *Aitolika* of Nikander are being parodied here is very attractive.

Grossardt points out that the genealogy offered for Thestios in *On rivers* 22.1 (son of Ares and Peisidike) is a light modification of the traditional genealogy (son of Ares and Demonike: [Apollodoros] *Library* 1.7.7), and that the outcome in [Plutarch] *On rivers* 22.5 parodies the symbolism of the earlier stories, since the sight of the goddess brings disaster, indeed, but the loss of sight caused by the herb linked to the event is easily repaired. The genealogy of Kalydon in *On rivers* 22.4 (F 1) may also be seen as a further variation on the variation.

[Plutarch]'s variation on the well-known stories of Teiresias and Aktaion seems to have been part of the Zeitgeist: many of the other examples of individuals accidentally seeing a goddess belong to a type of literature that has points of contact with the *On rivers*. (For a recent, ample catalogue of the story-type, see M. Leutzsch, *Die Wahrnehmung sozialer Wirklichkeit im "Hirten des Hermas"* (Göttingen 1990), 31-39, and 32 on Derkyllos). Ptolemy Chennos, *Novel history* 183.10-14, mentions Erymanthos (a name reminiscent of another famous boar and chase) who saw Aphrodite and was blinded; Antoninus Liberalis, *Metamorphoses* 17.5, mentions, in the context of the story of Leukippos and within a list of persons who changed sex, the Cretan Siproites, who saw Artemis and underwent a sex-change (interestingly, the manchette to Antoninus mentions as source for the story of Leukippos the lost *Metamorphoses* of Nikandros). The connections are impossible to pinpoint in detail, but one can see that they exist. On this network of interrelated tales, it is worth quoting J.L. Lightfoot, *Parthenius of Nicaea* (Oxford 1999), 234: 'Most of Ps.-Plutarch's stories

in the *Parallela minora* are generated in this very way, some none too competently, and the author's jigsaw-piece approach to the construction of a narrative shows itself in the way he throws story-motifs injudiciously together, resulting in sequences that are badly determined, or over-determined, or both. The adaptation of myth to a new context, the lifting of motifs from one story and recasting them elsewhere, are clearly not confined to the Hellenistic period: but this is a particular type of borrowing and rewriting which is characteristic of that time, and reflect the copying of motifs between specifically literary source: 'mass production of pleasantly familiar goods by literary assembly-line', as Horsfall [in J.N. Bremmer and N. Horsfall (eds.), *Roman mythography* (London 1987), 5-6] well puts it'.

As for the plant: in Nikandros, *Theriaka* 626, μύωψ ('myopical') is used figuratively for the plant called *korkoros* (κόρκορος ἢ μύωψ, the anagallis or blue pimpernel), because pimpernel flowers remain open only under direct sunlight. Nothing is otherwise known of a plant named *myops*. It is thus very tempting to assume that in this passage [Plutarch] may have taken his cue from Nikandros (a suggestion advanced by De Lazzer, in Calderon Dorda, De Lazzer, Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti*, 255), creating, out of a translated use, a real plant whose name is appropriate to the story he wanted to tell; this is all the more likely in view of the fact that for this Aitolian chapter [Plutarch] may have parodied, or at any rate made use of, Nikandros's *Aitolika*.

Derkyllus's F 3 also deals with a blindness caused by the sight of a divine object that should not have been seen by men, and with its healing by means of a prayer to the offended goddess (Athena in that case); for discussion of potential implications, such as a connection with the author-name Derkyllus, see below, Biographical essay.

288 F 2 - (6) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 38B = Moralia 315c	meta[[id="288" type="F" n="2"]]
Subject: Myth: mythical figure Historical Work: Italika book 3 Source date: 2nd Century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: Mythical past	Translation
Ἡρακλῆς τὰς Γηρυόνου βοῦς ἐλαύνων δι' Ἰταλίας ἐπεξενώθη Φαύνωι βασιλεῖ, ὃς ἦν Ἑρμοῦ παῖς καὶ τοὺς ξένους τῶι γεννήσαντι ἔθυσεν. ἐπιχειρήσας δὲ τῶι Ἡρακλεῖ ἀνηιρέθη, ὡς Δέρκυλλος ἐν τρίτῳ Ἰταλικῶν.	When driving the cattle of Geryon through Italy, Herakles was offered hospitality by king Phaunos, who was son of Hermes and used to sacrifice his guests to his parent. But as he attacked Herakles he was killed, as Derkyllus says in the third book of his <i>Italika</i> .

288 F 2 Commentary

[Plutarch] presents this story as the Roman parallel to that of Herakles and Busiris, recorded in a version attributed to Agathon of Samos (BNJ 843 F 3). Clearly in this case the purpose is not to validate a more ancient account through a similar but recent and better-attested one, since the hero of both narratives is the same. The story of Herakles and the cattle of Geryon is well-known, and attested already in Hesiod's *Theogony*, 287; the traditions concerning Herakles's encounter with Faunus are more recent and confused, and our fragment in particular presents quite a few oddities. The main issues are the descent of

Faunus from Hermes; the connection between Herakles and Faunus; and the notion that Faunus used to commit human sacrifice.

In our fragment, Phaunos is said to be a king, and – uniquely – son of Hermes. In the Roman tradition, Faunus appears as one of the early kings of Laurentum, in a line that goes from Saturnus to Picus to Faunus to Latinus (Virgil, *Aeneid* 7.45-9 and elsewhere), although at times Mars/Ares takes the place of Picus as Faunus's father (so in Dionysios of Halicarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* 1.31.2); but he is also a god of the wild: if the first references are to *Fauni* in the plural, in the singular, as Faunus, he received a cult on the Tiberine island from at least 194 BC (see F. Graf, 'Faunus', *BNP* 5 (2004), 368-70; and W. Stroh, 'Vom Faunus zum Faun: theologische Beiträge von Horaz und Ovid', in W. Schubert (ed.), *Ovid: Werk und Wirkung* (Frankfurt/M 1998), 569-71 and 605-7, with an evaluation of Derkyllos's fragment at n. 167).

The descent from Hermes in our fragment may be a consequence of the equation of Faunus with Pan (Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 368). Stroh, 'Vom Faunus zum Faun', 559-612, considers that the equation of Faunus and Pan begins probably with Horace, and that it is thus relatively late; he sees in the genealogy offered by [Plutarch] a reflection of that identification. (On the relationship between Pan, Silvanus and Faunus see also P.F. Dorsey, *The cult of Silvanus: a study in Roman folk religion* (Leiden 1992), 33-42). Much later, in the so-called 'Picus-Zeus narrative', the work of a fourth-century Christian author partly preserved in the *Chronicle* of John Malalas, 1.13-15, and in the *Excerpta Latina Barbari* (text in B. Garstad, 'The *Excerpta Latina Barbari* and the 'Picus-Zeus Narrative'', *Jahrbuch für Internationale Germanistik* 34 (2002) 270-74), Faunus will be identified with Hermes, and described as wicked and cunning (*impius*, *πανοῦργος*). It is worth noting in this context that the Arcadian Evander, who is received in Italy by Faunus, who is deemed responsible for the introduction of the cult of the latter (Ovid, *Fasti* 5, 99-100), and whose name has been connected, from the point of view of its meaning, with that of Faunus (so J. E. Fontenrose, *Python. A Study of Delphic Myth and its Origin* (Berkeley Los Angeles London 1959), 340-1, relying on J. Bayet, *Les origines de l'Hercule romain* (Paris 1926), 173-82), was considered to be son of Hermes (so Dionysios of Halicarnassos 1.31.1 and Pausanias 8.43.2; and Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.138-8, even if more vaguely). Hermes thus hovers in the background. (If there is something – as there clearly is – in the notion that Faunus here replaces Cacus, and if Cacus, in the narrative that Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.194-224, puts in the mouth of Evander, 'does nothing but copy a trick performed by Hermes' (S. Casali, 'The development of the Aeneas legend', in J. Farrell and M.C.J. Putnam, *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and its tradition* (Malden 2010), 39, pointing to v. 224, in which fear gives wings to Cacus's feet – Hermes notoriously has winged feet), then we might possibly see a reason why Hermes has been chosen as the father of a villain Faunus here. Such a genealogy may have been further facilitated, as suggested by B. D'Agostino, 'Eracle e Gerione: la struttura del mito e la storia', *AION* 2 (1995), 11 (= B. D'Agostino, L. Cerchiai, *Il mare, la morte, l'amore. Gli Etruschi, I Greci e l'immagine* (Roma 1999), 159-60), through the association with another famous story concerning stolen cattle, the narrative of the theft by Hermes of Apollo's cattle.)

As for Herakles's connection with Faunus: the hero is present within the line of the early kings of Laurentum, because in one part of the tradition Latinus is the son not of Faunus and of a local nymph (as in Vergil), but of Herakles and Faunus's wife (so Dionysios of Halicarnassos 1.43, Tzetzes, *Scholia to Lycophron's Alexandra* 1232), or of Herakles and Faunus's daughter (so Justinus 43.1.9). (Besides the bibliography in Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 388, see F. Graf, 'Faunus', *BNP* (2004), 369-372). A surprising twist on the connection between Faunus

and Herakles is in Ovid's *Fasti*, 2.303-356: in what he himself defines 'an old tale full of laughter', Ovid narrates the story of how Faunus fell in love with Omphale and tried to rape her while she and Herakles were sleeping in a cave; but as the two had exchanged their clothes, it was besides Herakles that Faunus reclined. The story cannot be traced to any sources (see on it E. Fantham, 'Sexual Comedy in Ovid's *Fasti*: Sources and Motivation', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 87 (1983), 185-201; on the way in which Vergil and Ovid created myths such as those discussed above, see the important essays of N. Horsfall, 'Mythological invention and *poetica licentia*', in F. Graf (ed.), *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaften: das Paradigma Roms* (Leipzig 1993), 131-141, and D. Porte, 'Les trois mythologies des "Fastes"', in F. Graf (ed.), *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaften: das Paradigma Roms* (Leipzig 1993), 142-57.

Whatever the connection between Faunus and Herakles, the habit of sacrificing his guests here attributed to Faunus is entirely new: Faunus is usually depicted as benevolent in character, mild and hospitable. Fontenrose, *Python*, 340 believes in the authenticity of the story and of the source-reference, and considers Derkyllus 'a comparatively early authority on Roman subjects'; it seems to me that just as Ovid could build on traditional narratives to develop his tale in the *Fasti*, so [Plutarch] may have used the confused traditions around Faunus and Herakles for his own purposes. In particular, the idea for the story may have lain in a tradition related by Dionysios of Halicarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* 1.38.2, that originally the ancient inhabitants of the Latium sacrificed human victims to Saturn, and that Hercules, desiring to abolish the custom of this sacrifice, erected an altar upon the Saturnian hill and performed the sacrifice with unblemished animal victims burning on a pure fire, while at the same time, to lessen their scruples at having abandoned their traditional sacrifices, he taught them to make images resembling men, bound at the hands and feet, as they had used to before, and to throw in the Tiber them instead of human beings.

In his commentary to Agathon of Samos *BNJ* 843 F 3, Dowden airs the possibility that Derkyllus here may be a slip for Dositheos *BNJ* 54, to whom [Plutarch] attributes a work *Italika*, mentioned a number of times in the *Parallela minora*, while this is the only instance of attribution of *Italika* to Derkyllus. However, the manuscript tradition is unanimous; moreover, there are other instances in [Plutarch] of authors of *Italika* mentioned one time only.

288 F 3 - (7) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 17A = Moralia 309 ef	meta[[id="288" type="F" n="3"]]
Subject: Myth: mythical figure Historical Work: Foundations book 1 Source date: 2nd century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: Mythical past	Translation
ἐν Ἰλίῳ τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐμπρησθέντος, προσδραμῶν Ἴλος τὸ διοπετὲς ἤρπασε Παλλάδιον, καὶ ἐτυφλώθη, οὐ γὰρ ἐξὸν ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς βλέπεσθαι. ὕστερον δ' ἐξίλασάμενος ἀνέβλεψεν, ὡς Δέρκυλλος ἐν πρώτῳ Κτίσεων.	When the temple of Athena was destroyed by fire in Ilios, Ilos rushing forward took away the Palladion that had fallen from the heavens, and lost his sight; for it was not allowed that it be seen by a man. But later having placated the goddess he recovered his sight, as Derkyllus says in

288 F 3 Commentary

The Palladion of Troy is one of the magical guardian statues commonly associated with ancient cities. According to the most widespread tradition, it was a small wooden image of Pallas Athena that had fallen from the sky; Ilos, son of Tros and founder of Troy, found it and put it in the temple of Athena in Troy ([Apollodoros] *Library* 3. 12.3 (3. 143 W.)). But there were other stories concerning both its origin and the place where it ended after having been taken from Troy (see E. Wörner, 'Palladion', W.H. Röscher (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* 3.1 (Leipzig 1897-1902), 1301-24; L. Ziehen and G. Lippold, 'Palladion', *RE* 18.3 (Stuttgart 1949), cols. 171-201; T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth* (Baltimore and London 1993), 643-6; and, for a larger contextualisation, C. Faraone, *Talismans and Trojan Horses: Guardian Statues in Ancient Myth and Ritual* (New York and Oxford 1992), *passim*). In the most widespread version, Odysseus and Diomedes carry away the Palladion before the fall of Troy (so already in the *Little Iliad* of Lesches or Lescheos, for which we possess summaries by Proklos, *Chrestomathia* 206 Seve. = A. Bernabé, *Poetae Epici Graeci* 1 (Leipzig 1987) *Iliades Parvae Argumenta* 1, and [Apollodoros], *Epitome* 5.6-16; see further *BNJ* 18 F 1; *BNJ* 20 F 1; and *BNJ* 15 F 3). Common to all of these stories is the assumption that the safety of Troy depended on its possession of the Palladion. But the story here attributed to Derkyllus, of a fire in the temple of Athena endangering the Palladion, is unique.

F 3 forms a parallel to a Roman story, in which **someone called Antillos** saves the Palladion from the fire that is destroying the temple of Vesta, and loses his sight, but reacquires it later (source: Aristeides of Mileto, *BNJ* 286 F 15; **note that the Roman tradition knows of such a story, but the hero is Caecilius Metellus**). Faraone, *Talismans and Trojan Horses*, 137, acknowledges that the Greek and Roman stories are obvious duplicates, but considers it impossible to tell which gave rise to which. But while the Trojan Palladion certainly had magical powers, the only source for its causing blindness at Troy is our passage (and this, it should be stressed, within a rich tradition). It is much more likely that this was invented to fit the Roman parallel, because the Roman story makes it possible to understand how the story of the Palladion causing blindness came to establish itself: see commentary to *BNJ* 286 F 15; J. N. Bremmer and N.E. Horsfall, 'Caeculus and the Foundation of Praeneste', in *Roman Myth and Mythography* (1987) 53; and E. Champlin, *Nero* (Cambridge Mass. 2003), 321-2, who states: 'That the Palladium caused blindness at Troy is, alas, not to be accepted. The sole source for this is Pseudo-Plutarch..., an absurd farrago of patently invented stories purporting to substantiate other, sometimes well-attested, stories'.

Among much that is confused, F. Létoublon, 'Athéna et son double', in *Kaina pragmata: mélanges offerts à Jean-Claude Carrière, Pallas* 81 (Toulouse 2009), 184 offers an interesting remark on the possibility that there may be a word-play between the name of Ilos, the founder of Ilion, and the participle ἐξίλασάμενος expressing the action with which Ilos placates the goddess.

Another story attributed by [Plutarch] to Derkyllus concerns the loss of vision, and the possibility of recovering it through prayer (above, F 1); on the connection between these two stories, and the possibility that the very name 'Derkyllus' may have to do with them, see below, Biographical essay.

288 F 4 - (10) [Plutarch] De fluviis 19, 3 = Moralia 1162cd	meta[[id="288" type="F" n="4"]]
Subject: Myth: mythical figure; genre: aetiology Historical Work: On stones book 1 Source date: 2nd century BC Historian's date: unknown Historical period: mythical past	Translation
<p>παράκειται δ' ὄρος Κρόνιον καλούμενον ἀπὸ αἰτίας τοιαύτης. μετὰ τὴν γιγαντομαχίαν Κρόνος τὰς Διὸς ἀπειλὰς ἐκκλίνων εἰς ὄρος παρεγένετο Κτοῦρον, ὃ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Κρόνιον μετωνόμασεν· λαθὼν δὲ πρὸς ὀλίγον καιρὸν καὶ ἀφορμῆς δραξάμενος διῆρεν εἰς Καύκασον τῆς Σκυθίας. (4) γεννᾶται δ' ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ κύλινδρος καλούμενος λίθος ἀπὸ τοῦ συγκυρήματος· ὁσάκις γὰρ ἂν ἀστράψῃ Ζεὺς ἢ βροντήσῃ, τοσαυτάκις ἀπὸ τῆς ἀκρωρείας διὰ φόβον κυλίεται, καθὼς ἱστορεῖ Δέρκυλλος ἐν ᾧ Περὶ λίθων.</p>	<p>Nearby (close to the river Alpheios) is the mountain called Kronion for the following reason. After the Gigantomachy Kronos, fleeing the menaces of Zeus, reached Mt. Ktouros, which after him changed its name to Kronion; after having remained hidden for some time he grasped an opportunity and left for the Caucasos in Skythia. (4) And in this mountain a stone is formed, called kylindros from this occurrence: every time that Zeus sends a lightning or thunders, the stone for fear rolls down from the peak, as Derkyllus records in his first book <i>On stones</i>.</p>

288 F 4 Commentary

The *On rivers* twice mentions Kronos's attempts at fleeing Zeus after the Gigantomachy: here, and in the chapter dedicated to the Phasis, where the end of Kronos's story is narrated, in connection with the metonymy of the mountain first called 'Bed of Boreas' into 'Caucasos', from the name of a shepherd killed by Kronos (*On rivers* 5.3 = *Moralia* 1152ef-1153a, attributed to the *Theomachy* of Cleanthes). Interestingly, the wording of the two passages is very similar; in particular, the passage from μετὰ τὴν to Σκυθίας in F 4 corresponds almost *verbatim*, exception made of course for proper names, to the passage from μετὰ τὴν to Κοίτης in *On rivers* 5.3: see A. De Lazzer, in E. Calderon Dorda, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Napoli 2003), 247.

Jacoby (*FGrH* 3a, 388) refused to see any links with the 'hill of Kronos' mentioned in Pindar, *Olympian* 10.49-5 (καὶ πάγον Κρόνου προσεφθέγγατο: πρόσθε γὰρ νώνυμος, ᾧ Οἰνόμαος ἄρχε, βρέχετο πολλὰ νιφάδι "And he called it the Hill of Kronos; it had been nameless before, while Oinomaos was king, and it was covered with wet snow"), on the grounds that in Pindar Herakles simply gives a name to the hill, while [Plutarch] assumes a deeper connection with Kronos; but the existence of a hill of Kronos may have sparked [Plutarch]'s imagination, and the snow may have also played a role in it (see below). On the hill, see E. Pieske, 'Kronion (1)', *RE* 9.2 (Stuttgart 1922), 1976-7). Nothing is known of a Mt. Ktouros.

R. Hercher, *Plutarchi Libellus De Fluviis* (Lipsiae 1851), 28 n. 35 and 78, suggested to write Ἄρκτοῦρον instead of Ktouros, because of the closeness (textual and thematic) with *On rivers* 5.3, where the second part of Kronos's adventure is narrated: in *On rivers* 5.1 Arktouros is given as the earlier name of the Phasis (reason for it: the extreme coldness of the region); more importantly, in 5.3 Arktouros is the father of Chione ('snowy': see above on Pindar),

the girl whom Boreas carries off to Mt. Niphas in the East; from this event the Niphas took the name of 'Bed of Boreas', before becoming, after the arrival of Kronos, the Caucasos. Hercher's proposal has not been accepted by any of the successive editors (Jacoby and Calderon Dorda print Κτοῦρον; Mueller proposed, without much conviction, other names: Κύτωρον, Τομοῦρον, Τμᾶρον); yet I find it extremely attractive. Hercher may well be right in thinking that Arktouros is meant here; but I wonder whether the missing "Αρ" in Κτοῦρος is not a deliberate ploy on the part of [Plutarch], a hidden pointer, rather than an explicit one as would have been the case with Arktouros, to the earlier narrative concerning the later segment of the story. Moreover, in this way the mountain's original name is made to begin with K, as Kronos and Kaukasos, and as the kylindros stone mentioned in the following paragraph and clearly connected to the story. That [Plutarch] liked playing with names and sounds is clear from other instances of naming in the work (authors are for instance often named from the names of heroes or geographical features appearing in the stories attributed to them: Hercher, *Plutarchi Libellus De Fluviis*, 22).

As Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 388 and De Lazzer, in Calderon Dorda, De Lazzer, Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti*, 247 point out, a *kylindros* stone is known from other sources, Greek and Roman ones: in Apollonios Rhodios, *Argonautics* 2.594, the Argo runs over the waves ὥστε κύλινδρος, explained by the scholiast as 'a small rounded column'; Chrysippos, in A. von Arnim, *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta* 2, 283.974 = Cicero, *On providence* 43, cf. Gellius, *Attic nights* 7.2, mentions the cylinder as an instance of object that initially moves because of external pulsion, but then keeps rolling because of its nature; De Lazzer refers the reader also to Pliny, *Natural history* 37.20.78 and 34.113, but these passages concern stones artificially cut into cylinders, not natural cylinders; similarly in Juvenal, *Satyres* 2.61 the term is used for precious stones. Nothing however is known of a connection between cylinder stones and Olympia, and Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 388 suggests that the idea may derive from the stone swallowed by Kronos. This is certainly the element linking the myth of Kronos with the natural feature that follows. But that does not explain why a cylinder - any odd stone would have done. [Plutarch] may have chosen to playfully put to contribution here an element of what must have been a famous stoic demonstration, if Chrysippos's theory is exposed by both Cicero and Gellius; it seems to me even more likely that the Homeric use of κυλίνδω (to roll) may constitute the background of this passage. Particularly interesting is the Homeric verse concerning the stone of Sisyphos αὐτίς ἔπειτα πέδονδε κυλίνδετο λάαξ ἀναιδής ('then again the shameless stone would roll towards the plain', Homer, *Odyssey* 11.598), a verse well-known to grammarians (a dactylic line, it mimetically expresses rapid motion; more importantly, Aristotle singles it out, *Rhetoric* 3.11, as an example of a metaphor creating actuality, as against complete metaphors, exemplified by the Simonidean dictum that the good men is *tetragonos*): attributing sentiments to stones would have resonated well with the mentality that pervades the pages of [Plutarch]. Note also *Odyssey* 5. 296, καὶ Βορέης αἰθρηγενέτης, μέγα κῦμα κυλίνδων: what is rolled here are waves, but Boreas is interesting, since he is part of the story narrated in *On rivers* 5.3 (Mt. 'Bed of Boreas', Βορέου κοίτη changes its name into Caucasos because of Cronos having killed the young shepherd).

Note that another cylinder stone is mentioned at *On Rivers* 9.5: found on Mt. Sipylos, it has the peculiarity that when found by pious children who dedicated it in the sanctuary of the Mother of the Gods, it makes them remain respectful towards their parents (sources for this story are Agatharchides of Samos in the fourth book *On stones*, *BNJ* 284 F 4 and Demaratos *FGrH* 42 F 6 = *BNJ* 42 F 3). At least in [Plutarch], cylindrical stones appear uncannily linked to the parent - children relationship.

288 F 5 - (8) [Plutarch] De fluviis 1, 4 = Moralia 1150bc	meta[[id="288" type="F" n="5"]]
Subject: Genre: aetiology; geography Historical Work: On mountains book 3 Source date: 2nd Century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period:	Translation
<p>ὑπέρκειται¹ δ' αὐτῷ ὄρος Ἐλέφας καλούμενον δι' αἰτίαν τοιαύτην. Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνοσ μετὰ στρατεύματος εἰς Ἰνδίαν ἔλθόντος, καὶ τῶν ἐγχωρίων κρίσιν ἐχόντων ἀντιπολεμεῖν αὐτῷ, Πῶρου τοῦ βασιλέωσ τῶν τόπων ἑλέφασ αἰφνιδίωσ οἰστροπλήξ γενόμενοσ ἐπὶ τὸν Ἥλιου λόφον ἀνέβη, καὶ ἀνθρωπίνη φωνῇ χρησάμενοσ εἶπεν ἄδεσποτα βασιλεῦ τὸ γένοσ ἀπὸ Γηγασίου κατάγων, μηδὲν ἐξ ἐναντίας Ἀλεξάνδρου ποιήσῃσ: Διὸσ γάρ ἐστιν Γηγάσιοσ'. καὶ τελέσασ τὸν λόγον ἔθανεν. ἀκούσασ δὲ τούτων ὁ Πῶροσ ψοφοδεήσ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου γόνασι προσέπεσεν εἰρήνην αἰτούμενοσ, τυχῶν δὲ ὧν ἤθελεν τὸ ὄροσ Ἐλέφαντα μετωνόμασεν, καθῶσ ἱστορεῖ Δέρκυλλοσ ἐν ᾗ Περι ὀρῶν.</p>	<p>And above it (the Indian river Hydaspes) is the mountain called Elephas for the following reason. As Alexander the Macedonian was attacking India with an army, and as the locals had resolved to fight him, an elephant of Poros, the king of the place, being suddenly driven wild, climbed on the hill of Helios, and said in a human voice: 'Master King, descending in your lineage from Gegasios, do not do anything in opposition to Alexander; for of Zeus is Gegasios'. And having finished his speech he died. When he heard this, Poros, terrified, fell at Alexander's knees, asking for peace; and when he received what he wanted he renamed the mount Elephas, as Derkyllos records in his third book <i>On mountains</i>.</p>

288 F 5 Commentary

Jacoby (*FGrH* 3a, 389) has highlighted the essential features of this narrative; I limit myself here to summarizing his main points. The story goes against all we know of the encounter between Alexander and Poros. It is thus entirely fictional, but based on elements that recur in the tradition. These are: the important role played by elephants in the battle of the Hydaspes, in which Alexander defeated Poros (see for instance Curtius Rufus, *History of Alexander* 8.14.9-40); the fact that according to Kleitarchos (Diodoros of Sicily 17.89.3) Alexander after the battle offered a sacrifice to Helios, who had allowed him to bring under his control the lands of the Levant; and the story that Alexander dedicated to Helios an elephant, who had behaved courageously in battle (Philostratos, *Life of Apollonios* 2.13). The tradition recorded in Juba (*BNJ* 275 F 53a and b), concerning the worship of the sun by elephants, may also have played a role. Finally, elephants figure importantly on a number of Alexander coins connected with Poros (see e.g. R.J. lane Fox, 'Text and Image: Alexander the Great, Coins and Elephants', *BICS* 41 (1996), 87-108): this too may be part of the background of the story.

¹ This is a correction of Dodwell (see Jacoby's apparatus for other proposals); P has ὑπόκειται (below it, which for a mountain located beside a river sounds inappropriate, hence the changes suggested, although it might be possible to interpret this in relation to the cardinal points) maintained by Calderon Dorda. The term most frequently used to indicate the relationship between a river and the mountain besides it in the *On rivers* is παράκειται (Hercher proposed restoring it here).

The name Gegasios is odd and hardly invented (see Jacoby's apparatus for the textual situation); the term appears here only in all of Greek literature (TLG search); the name may correspond to that of Yayati, a hero of the Mahabharata, progenitor of Paurava/Poros (see on this C. Lassen, *Indische Alterthumskunde III* (Leipzig 1858), 299; as Lassen points out, this implies that Indian legends had reached the west and were known to [Plutarch], something that is confirmed by other passages of the work). P. Bernard, 'Les rhytons de Nisa. I. Poétesses Grecques', *Journal des savants* (1985), 105 and n. 25, agrees on the non traditional character of the story, but refers to the work of the Chinese pilgrim Hiuan-Tsang (seventh century AD) for 'mountains of the elephant' in both Kapiça (actual Begram, Afghanistan) and the Swat (Pakistan).

The phrase pronounced by the elephant has been felt to be problematic. S. Bochart proposed to emend the second Γηγάσιος in τὸ γένος, to mean 'Iovis enim est genus', 'for he is of the race of Zeus' (*Hierozoicon sive bipartitum opus de animalibus sacrae scripturae* (London 1663), vol. 1, 2.14, p. 170 of the ed. Lipsiae 1793). R. Hercher, *Plutarchi Libellus De Fluviis* (Lipsiae 1851), 40, thinking along the same lines, expunged the second [Gegasios] from the text, and suggested that a contrast is intended, between the mortal origin of Poros, descending from a mortal, Gegasios, and the divine origin of Alexander ('O king, descending in your lineage from Gegasios, do not do oppose Alexander; for he is the son of Zeus'). S. C. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum graecorum 4* (Parisii 1851), 388 accepted the transmitted text, but in his edition of the *On rivers* (in *Geographi graeci Minores 2*, Parisii 1861) he suggested that something might have been missing, e.g. to <ἵττων> or <χείρων> ἐστὶ after γὰρ, or also Διὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν, οὐ Γηγασίου). Jacoby simply daggers the sentence. E. Calderon Dorda, in E. Calderon Dorda, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Napoli 2003), accepts the transmitted text as correct. Bochart's and Hercher's solutions are very tempting; but against the background of stories about Alexander's divine descent from Zeus, the sentence as it is can be understood as stressing the fact that Poros's lineage (and thus Poros himself) are under the ultimate control of the Greek god Zeus.

<p>288 F 6 - (9) [Plutarch] De fluviis 8, 3-4 = Moralia 1155AB</p>	<p>meta[[id="288" type="F" n="6"]]</p>
<p>Subject: Myth: mythical figure; Historical Work: On mountains book 3 Source date: 2nd century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period:n/a</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>παράκειται δ' αὐτῷ ὄρος Μύηνον καλούμενον ἀπὸ Μυήνου τοῦ Τελέστορος καὶ Ἀλφειβοίας [τῆς] παιδός. οὗτος γὰρ ὑπὸ τῆς μητρικῆς φιλούμενος καὶ μὴ θέλων μιαίνειν τὴν κοίτην τοῦ γεννήσαντος εἰς Ἄλφιον ὄρος ἀνεχώρησε. Τελέστωρ δὲ † ὁ ζηλωτῆς τῆς γυναικὸς † συσχηματισθεὶς τὴν ἐρημίαν μετὰ τῶν δορυφόρων κατὰ τοῦ τέκνου ληψόμενος † ἐδίωκε. Μύηνος δὲ φθάσας τοῦ πατρὸς τὰς ἀπειλὰς κατεκρήμνισεν ἑαυτόν· τὸ δὲ ὄρος κατὰ πρόνοιαν θεῶν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Μύηνον μετωνομάσθη. (4) γεννᾶται δ' ἐν αὐτῷ</p>	<p>And along it (the Aetolian river Lykormas-Euenos) is a mountain called Myenos from Myenos the son of Telestor and Alpheiboia. For he, as he was loved by his step-mother and did not want to pollute his parent's bed, retired to Mt. Alphios. But Telestor †, having revealed himself as jealous of his wife †, was pursuing him through the wilderness with his guards, in order to capture his son. Myenos, forestalling the menaces of his father, threw himself down a precipice; and the mountain, through divine providence,</p>

λευκόιον ἄνθος, ὃ μητριᾶς ὀνομασθείσης
μαραίνεται, καθὼς ἰστορεῖ Δέρκυλλος ἐν γ
Περὶ ὄρων.

took from him the name Myenos.
(4) And in it grows a white-violet flower
(the gilliflower), that withers when a step-
mother is mentioned, as Derkyllus narrates
in his third book *On mountains*.

288 F 6 Commentary

On rivers 8 concerns the river Lykormas/Euenos. The reference to Derkyllus in *On rivers* 8.4 is the first source-reference in the chapter: thus, we might want to attribute to him more than just *On rivers* 8.4. The particular characteristics of the plant described in 8.4 nicely correspond to the story narrated in *On rivers* 8.3: Myenos is ruined by his step-mother, and the gilliflower withers when a stepmother is mentioned. Thus, 8.3 and 8.4 should both be attributed to Derkyllus. As for the first two paragraphs of chapter 8: the same story (the abduction of Marpessa by Idas, the useless chase of her father Euenos and his jump in the river Lykormas, is narrated, with minimal differences, in *Parallela minora* 40a (*Moralia* 315e), where the story is attributed to Dositheos (see *BNJ* 54 F 3); Stobaios 4.36.17 also preserves the story, and attributes it to the first book *On rivers* of Archelaos (an author also elsewhere mentioned in the *On rivers*); the story is moreover found, anonymous, in [Aristoteles], *On marvellous things heard* 171 (see on the relationship between these texts P. Ceccarelli, *BNJ* 284, commentary to F 3; as well as below, on F 8).

This is a puzzling passage. The story itself is one of the numerous variants of the Proitos-Alpheia-Bellerophon (Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 389); the triangle Theseus-Phaidra-Hippolytos offers an even more precise parallel. However, the mountain names Myenos and Alphios are unattested; Telestor is known only as a descendant of Ikarios, and none of the many Alpheisiboiia present in Greek literature fit the story. The *On rivers* itself (3.1) offers yet one example of the genre, with the story, also otherwise unknown, of the love of Damasippe daughter of Atrax for her stepson Hebros, of his refusal, of her calumnies, of the jealousy of the father Kassandros and of the final jump of the boy into the river that now bears his name, a story fittingly derived (so [Plutarch]) from the 11th book *On rivers* of a certain Timotheos (*BNJ* 313 F 2).

The *leukoion* is mentioned in Theophrastos, *History of Plants* 6.8.1 as the first of flowers to appear; its name appears also in a few medical texts, but nothing is ever said about stepmothers. Apollonios the paradoxographer, *Marvelous facts* 45, states that ‘among the remarkable traditions transmitted is the fact that lights are lighted around gilliflower plants and crowns, so that they may last until the light of day and not wither’ (Τῶν παρατηρημένων ἐστὶν καὶ τὸ τοῖς λευκοῖσι ἄνθεσιν ἢ στεφάνοις διὰ νυκτὸς λύχνους παρακαίεσθαι, ἵνα εἰς τὴν πρωΐαν ταῦτα παραμένει ἀμάραντα); the use of the same root (μαραίνεται in [Plutarch], and here ἀμάραντα) is intriguing, as is the fact that the *leukoion* had already made its way into paradoxography.

The text itself is damaged in one or two points; see Jacoby’s apparatus for the various proposals advanced. E. Calderon Dorda (in E. Calderon Dorda, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Napoli 2003), 150) follows the paradosis (with one exception: he too accepts Gelenius’s proposal to strike out τῆς at l. 2) and does not see the necessity of daggers; A. De Lazzer (in Calderon Dorda, De Lazzer, Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti*, 227, briefly discusses the story but does not tackle the textual issues (he is however forced to put a question mark in his translation of the central passage on Telestor).

288 F 7 - (12) [Plutarch] De fluviis 10, 3 = Moralia 1156c	meta[[id="288" type="F" n="7"]]
Subject: natural sciences Historical Work: Satyrica book 1 Source date: 2nd century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: n/a	Translation
γεννᾶται δ' ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ τούτῳ βοτάνη αὐλὸς ὀνομαζομένη, ἣν ἐὰν πρὸς ἄνεμον σείσῃ τις, μουσικὴν ἔχει μελωδίαν, καθὼς ἱστορεῖ Δέρκυλλος ἐν ᾧ Σατυρικῶν.	And in this river (the Phrygian Marsyas) grows a plant called <i>aulos</i> (flute), which if someone moves it towards the wind, produces a musical melody, as Derkyllos narrates in the first book of his <i>Satyrika</i> .

288 F 7 Commentary

In the preceding paragraph, [Plutarch] has narrated various versions of the story of Marsyas, attributing them to Alexander Polyhistor (273 F 76) and to Euhemeridas of Cnidos (this last certainly an invented author: Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 389). It is not excessively surprising to find a plant named *aulos* and producing musical sounds growing besides a river supposedly born out of the blood of Marsyas (*On rivers* 10.1 = *Moralia* 1156B); Strabo 12. 8. 15 states that around the lake from which the rivers Marsyas and Maeander originate a reed grows, especially suitable for the mouth-pieces of *auloi*. It is however interesting and typical of the allusive (or haphazard?) way in which *On rivers* is constructed that the preceding paragraphs on Marsyas simply state that he was defeated by Apollo and then flayed alive, but do not specify in what kind of competition (*i.e.*, it is the herb that is mentioned in 10.3 that points to the type of competition). The title *Satyrica* attributed to the work of Derkyllos from which [Plutarch] claims to derive his information is very unusual, but also very appropriate, since, again according to [Plutarch] *On rivers* 10.1, the satyrs were born out of the blood of Marsyas. M. van der Valk, *Researches on the text and the scholia of the Iliad* 1 (Leiden 1963), 410 ‘cannot imagine that [Plutarch] should have invented a title Σατυρικά’ rather than the expected *On rivers*, and so considers Derkyllos and his work authentic; he then proceeds to assert that ‘On the other hand, if the title of the work is genuine, we can understand that in a work called Σατυρικά a plant αὐλός is mentioned’ (410-11): this strikes me as a perfect instance of circular reasoning (the story of Marsyas will have called up both the title of the work and the name of the plant).

In light of the fact that *On rivers* 10.1 (that is, just before our text) narrates a version of the story of Midas and the gold, it is worth noting that the *Kaine Historia* of Ptolemaios Chennos contained the story of the speaking reed that gave away the secret of Midas’s donkey’s ears (Photios, *Library*, cod. 190, 148a30-31); it was narrated just after an account of how Diomedes and Odysseus stole the Palladion. As K.-H. Tomberg, *Die Kaine Historia des Ptolemaios Chennos* (Bonn 1968), 178-9 acknowledges, we shall never know what kind of twist exactly Ptolemaios had given to the story; he suggests that it might have lain in the ambiguity of κάλαμος, both ‘reed’ and ‘aulos’, and goes on to mention the similar ambiguity posited by Derkyllos for the plant *aulos*. LSJ s.v. αὐλός state that one of the meanings of the term is *cicuta virosa* or cow-bane, giving as reference our passage (Montanari does the same, in *GL Vocabolario della lingua greca*, s.v.); but this seems to be the only instance where ‘aulos’ is

used literally of a plant, and I do not see on what their identification rely: we might be facing an innovation of Derkyllus/[Plutarch].

288 F 8a - (11) IOANN. LYD. De mens. 3, 11 p. 51, 16 - 52, 1 Wü	meta [[id="288" type="F" n="8"]]
Subject: natural sciences Historical Work: unknown Source date: first half of 6th C AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: n/a	Translation
φασὶ δέ τινες, ὧν ἔστι καὶ Δέρκυλλος, ὅτι γεννᾶται ἐν τῷ Ὑδάσπῃ ποταμῷ λίθος λυχνὶς καλούμενος. οὗτος σελήνης ἀξομένης ἤχον μελωδίας ἀποδίδωσιν.	Some, among which is Derkyllus too, say that a stone called <i>lychnis</i> grows in the river Hydaspes. This stone, when the moon is waxing, sends out the echo of a song.

288 F 8a Commentary

See below, commentary to 8b.

288 F 8b - [Plutarch] De fluviis 1, 2 = Moralia 1149b	meta [[id="288" type="F" n="8"]]
Subject: natural sciences Historical Work: unknown Source date: 2nd century BC Historian's date: n/a Historical period: n/a	Translation
Γεννᾶται δὲ ἐν αὐτῷ λίθος λυχνὶς καλούμενος· ἐλαιώδης δὲ ἔστιν τῇ χροῇ καὶ ζεστὸς πάνυ· σελήνης δὲ ἀξομένης εὐρίσκεται πρὸς μελωδίαν αὐλῶν· χρῶνται δὲ οἱ ἐν ἐξοχῇ τυγχάνοντες αὐτῷ.	And in it (the river Hydaspes) grows a stone called <i>lychnis</i> ; it is olive in colour and fairly hot; it is found when the moon is waxing, at the sound of the auloi. Those who are in an elevated position use it.

288 F 8b Commentary

This is one of those passages that are of central importance to understand the tradition of the *On rivers*.

On rivers is transmitted by one manuscript only, the *Palatinus graecus Heidelbergensis* 398; but some passages also appear in the indirect tradition: in Stobaios, in a scholion to Dionysios the perieget, in the *On marvellous things heard* attributed to Aristoteles, and in the *On months* of Johannes Lydos (more on this in A. De Lazzer, in E. Calderon Dorda, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Napoli 2003), 10-14). None of these texts mentions explicitly the *On rivers* or its author ([Plutarch]); and yet it is clear that in the majority of cases these authors rely on the *On rivers* for their information.

There are however some problematic instances. One, concerning the relationship with Stobaios and with the *Parallela minora*, is discussed above, commentary to F 6; another, concerning the relationship with the *On marvellous things heard*, is discussed in BNJ 284 F 3. Here, at issue is the relationship between [Plutarch]'s *On rivers* and the *On Months* of Johannes Lydos. F 8b is one of two passages from two different parts of the *On rivers*, that

appear, one after the other, in Johannes Lydos: *On rivers* 6.2 (on the Arar; see BNJ 291 F 5) ≈ Johannes Lydos *On months* 3.11, p. 52, 1-3 Wunsch; and our passage (F 8 b), which in Lydos (F 8 a) immediately precedes the text on the Arar. These passages are problematic because the information contained in Lydos is both slightly different and more detailed than that contained in the *On rivers*.

Both passages reappear, in a version close to that of Lydos but without source-references, in Anastasios of Sinai (F. Cumont, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 1930, 33 ff), and thence in Michael Glykas, *Annals* 1.46B, p. 107 (*Michelis Glycas Opera* ed. J.-P. Migne, Paris 1866); more interestingly, both passages appear also in J.F. Boissonnade, *Anecdota graeca e codicibus regiis* 1 (Parisii 1829) p. 417; while the text of the *Anecdota* is (but for minor differences that could be due to the initiative of the writer) very close to that of Lydos (and slightly different from that of [Plutarch]: among other things, it names Derkyllus as source), the *Anecdota* adds one detail not present in Lydos, the source for the information on the Arar, Kallisthenes of Sybaris, as in [Plutarch] *On rivers* 6.2-3. This shall be discussed in full in connection with Kallisthenes of Sybaris (BNJ 291); but clearly there is something going on here, for the writer of the notice published in the *Anecdota* cannot have relied solely on Lydos, nor solely on [Plutarch].

J. Bidez, 'Plantes et pierres magiques d'après le Ps. Plutarque *de Fluviis*', *Mélanges offerts à O. Navarre* (Toulouse 1935), 26-29 stressed the differences between F 8 a and F 8 b, and argued that the situation could only be explained with the assumption that Johannes Lydos and the author of the *On rivers* had independently consulted original sources (a lost treaty on the cosmic influence of the moon); he took this to prove the existence of an author Derkyllus. However, Johannes Lydos also preserves six stories (and their source-references) present in the *Parallela minora*, and it is fairly certain that he took them from an earlier, ampler version of the *Parallela minora* and not through independent consultation of the various sources mentioned (see A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. paralleli minori* (Napoli 2003), 82-88). Because it is clear that Lydos took stories and source-references from the *Parallela minora*, A. Cameron, *Greek mythology in the Roman world* (Oxford - New York 2004), 133-4, assumes that he did the same with the *On rivers*. This may indeed have been the case (although Cameron is misleading when he states that John of Lydos cites Agatharchides of Samos from the *On rivers* and the *Parallela*: Agatharchides does not appear in Lydos). But it does not explain how the source-reference Derkyllus, absent in *On rivers*, can be present in Lydos. Actually, the two passages of Lydos that closely echo the *On rivers* present at the same time differences that cannot be explained simply as 'rewriting': as De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti*, 13 points out, it is here necessary to advance other explanations, such as:

- textual losses at a later stage of the tradition in the relevant parts of the *On rivers*;
- the use by Lydos and [Plutarch] of the same sources (here Derkyllus, or a common source citing Derkyllus: this is the thesis defended by Bidez);
- or the existence of an original ampler version of the *On rivers*, of which we would have only an epitomized text.

De Lazzer, in Calderon Dorda, De Lazzer, Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti*, 13 is unhappy with the notion of an ampler original version of the *On rivers*, and considers that the treatise as we have it is not an epitome but the original, an original that however has suffered heavy mechanical damages and loss of portions of text in the transmission; he does not take up a position on the exact nature of the relationship between the text of Lydos and that of [Plutarch]. That we must assume the loss of sections of the text of the *On rivers* had been already stated, with reference to our fragment, by F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps.

Plutarch's *Parallela minora* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* S. 3, 8 (1940), 93-4 and 132-4 (Jacoby actually oscillates between the first and the third hypothesis: his discussion is mainly focused on *Parallela*, for which indeed we must admit that what we have is the epitome of an initial ampler version). In fact, as the remarks of De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti*, 11-12 and nn. 10, 13, show, the relationship between the text of *On rivers* as we have it and the indirect tradition is more problematic than is usually admitted (see also above, on the *Anecdota*).

As for the hypothesis of a common source: it is worth noting that the two passages in Lydos that reflect information also present in the *On rivers* follow one another, although they are attributed to different authors (Derkyllus, and Kallisthenes of Sybaris, the latter also in [Plutarch]): this speaks against the independent use of original sources (in the best of cases, we have to postulate a common intermediary).

Lydos has more and less information than the *On rivers*: he lacks a description of the stone and he lacks the final sentence on its use (a sentence that anyway, as it is, does look incomplete also in [Plutarch]); but he has a source-reference: Derkyllus. He does not mention a book-title, and as pointed out by Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch's *Parallela minora* und die Schwindelautoren', 93, the book-title cannot have been absent in [Plutarch] (this is one of the rare instances where even the indirect tradition leaves it out); but there are other instances in Lydos where a pseudo-Plutarchan author is mentioned without book-title. More importantly, Lydos contains slightly different information: while [Plutarch] speaks of a stone found at the sound of the *auloi*, for Lydos the stone emits a sound. The difference is usually explained through a misunderstanding by Lydos rather than as an alternative version, because the two texts are indeed very close; but while in terms of tradition it may make sense to assume that Lydos misunderstood whatever was in the original text of [Plutarch], I am not certain that this is indeed what happened (Lydos's text makes as much sense as [Plutarch]'s; and see below on Pliny and the *carchedonia*).

The stone *lychnis* is mentioned by a number of other authors, but with properties that do not entirely match those highlighted here. It is a stone of contrasts, since if thrown in cold water it will bring it to boiling temperature, but if thrown in boiling water it will cool it down; more importantly, it sends forth luminosity in the night, while it is dim during the day (see S. Macrì, *Pietre viventi I minerali nell'immaginario del mondo antico* (Torino 2009), 86, 90, and 143; Loukianos, *On the Syrian goddess* 31-32, states that at night the stone located on the head of the goddess would light the temple as if with oil-lanterns, *lychnides*, hence the name). One understands why the stone is found during the night. In other texts, the *lychnis* is connected with storks: Philostratos, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, 2.14, states that the *lychnis* is put by storks in their nests to keep away serpents; Aelian too, *History of animals* 8, attests to a connection between storks and *lichnites*. An olive color is nowhere attested for the *lychnis* (but olive colour is mentioned for the beryl).

The *lychnis* is also mentioned in Pliny, *Natural history* 37, 29.103: Pliny states that it belongs to a group of fiery red stones (*ex eodem genere ardentium*), and that it derives its name from the lighting of lamps, which makes it especially beautiful; he adds that there are four varieties of it, gives their provenance (around Orthosia and all of Caria, but the best variety comes from India), and states that one quality these stones have is that when heated or rubbed, they attract chaff and papyrus fibres. At this point, Pliny adds that the *carchedonia* (the Carthaginian stone) has this same property (*Natural history* 37.30.104); and then goes on to add that

nascitur apud Nasamonas in montibus, ut incolae putant, imbre divino. inveniuntur ad repercussum lunae maxime plenae. Carthaginem quondam deportabantur. Archelaus et in Aegypto circa Thebas nasci tradit fragiles, venosas, morienti carboni similes, pоторia ex had et ex lychnides factitata inuenio,

Tr.: 'It is formed in the mountains, among the Nasamones, out of divine rains, as the locals like to think. They are found when they reflect the light of the moon, especially when it is full, and in former times they were exported to Carthage. Archelaus records that brittle stones, full of veins, similar to a dying ember, are found in Egypt near Thebes. I find that drinking vessels used commonly to be made from this stone and from *lychnis*.'

The presence of a full moon, as in F 8 a and b, is striking, in a paragraph that follows right after the discussion of the *lychnis* (and the *lychnis* is mentioned again at the end of the passage); moreover, anything that is *repercussum* corresponds to an echo, here a visual one (indeed, Bidez, 'Plantes et pierres magiques', 28, paraphrases *ad repercussum* with 'comme par une sorte d'écho'). This connection has been pointed out by F. Atenstädt, 'Zwei Quellen des sogenannten Plutarch de fluviis', *Hermes* 57 (1922) 237, and after him, independently, by Bidez, 'Plantes et pierres magiques', 28. Rather oddly, Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 389 accepts that the sentence *lychnis... probatissima in Indis* allows us to catch again the connection between a source common to [Plutarch] and Pliny (as Atenstädt), but considers the further connection suggested by Atenstädt between our fragments and the comment on the *carchedonia* dubious ('zweifelhaft' – probably because Atenstädt mentions only [Plutarch], where the echo does not figure at all); Jacoby does not refer to Bidez's article.

Atenstädt and Bidez are surely right that there is a connection between the three passages; the issue is whether Pliny, [Plutarch] and Lydos each independently (mis)understood a common source, in which Derkyllus was mentioned; or whether Pliny and the *On rivers* depend on a common source that did not mention Derkyllus, the latter's name having been first willfully added by [Plutarch] in the still undamaged version of the *On rivers*, from which Lydos would, with a further (mis)understanding, depend. This requires us to assume a textual loss in the *On rivers* (to explain the missing reference to Derkyllus), as well as a modification/misunderstanding of the original text, resulting – possibly – from the disturbance that caused the lacuna. Possible, but slightly complex.

One further piece should be added to the puzzle. An Archelaos is cited in Pliny for the *carchedonia*, in a context that involves the *lychnis* as well (cited above; it corresponds to *FGrH* 123 F 3 and 4); an Archelaos is also present in Lydos, immediately after the two passages that might or might not depend on the *On rivers*, as the authority for another story which again involves a full moon. To put it differently: in Pliny, *Natural history* 37.30.104, in a passage where the *lychnis* is mentioned, we find a formulation close to that attributed by Lydos to Derkyllus in F 8a, and then the name of Archelaos (the Egyptian probably, since the passage mentions Egyptian Thebes; yet Pliny in his list of sources for book 37 mentions the Archelaos the king); in Lydos we find what is printed above as F 8 a, followed by what corresponds to Kallisthenes *FGrH* 201 F 5, followed by a story attributed to an Archelaos, concerning the lobes of the liver of mice, that one by one open as the moon waxes, and one by one close as it wanes (a testimonium also present in Pliny, *Natural History* 11.76, without source reference); similarly, in Boissonnade, *Anecdota graeca* 1.417, this story, with explicit reference to Archelaos, also follows our two stories (the text can be consulted in Giannini, *Paradoxographorum graecorum reliquiae* (Milano 1966), 25, Archelaos F 3; Giannini points out that the story was already in Antigonos F 124 a b, and indeed it has a long tradition within paradoxography; Giannini's apparatus is however insufficient).

The difficulty is that we know of more than one writer named Archelaos. Among those that may concern us the first is a paradoxographer, author of a work Ἰδιοφύη (fragments in Giannini); the second is the king of Cappadocia, author of a *chorographia* which was used by Juba, and possibly also of a book *On stones*, from which would come *FGrH* 123 F 2 to 5 (which correspond to the four references to Archelaos as a source in Pliny, *Natural History* book 37). The confusion between the two is ancient: see Jacoby, *FGrH* 2B, 410 specifically on Pliny (Pliny mentions both in his index: the king for books 8, 9, and 37, and the writer of *Idiophye* for book 27; but as Jacoby shows, this does not correspond to what we can piece from Varro's references to Archelaos's work). At any rate, Jacoby considers that the passages from Pliny's *Natural history* book 37 come from the king of Cappadocia; and he must have assumed that the text attributed to an Archelaos and preserved in Lydos and the *Anecdota* belonged to the paradoxographer, since he did not include it in *FGrH* 123. But the Archelaos of Lydos most likely comes from the same environment as the other two stories that precede him (moreover, Lydos qualifies him as ἱστορικός, for all it is worth, *On months* 3.11, p. 53.4 Wü); in which case, the confusion goes deeper than Jacoby acknowledged, and some of the fragments at the moment attributed to the paradoxographer should be attributed to the king - or viceversa, to reconstitute a homogeneous ensemble. As for the three mentions of Archelaos in the *On rivers*, Jacoby prints them as *FGrH* 123 F 7, F 8 and F9, but considers them spurious.

The most detailed discussion of the relationship between the Archelaos of [Plutarch] and that of Pliny is in Atenstädt, 'Zwei Quellen des sogenannten Plutarch de fluviis', 238-9 and 243-6; for him, the Archelaos of Pliny is the king of Cappadocia. Atenstädt concludes that Xenokrates (of Aphrodisias?) is the source common to Pliny and [Plutarch]; and that Archelaos was cited in Xenokrates. This part of his argumentation is very convincing; as for the identity of Archelaos, one may add that an Archelaos is mentioned by Artemidoros, *The Interpretation of Dreams* 4.22, in one breath with Aristoteles's books on animals and the works of Xenokrates of Aphrodisias. (Giannini, *Paradoxographorum graecorum fragmenta*, 24 assumes this to be the paradoxographer and prints the text as 'Archelaus' T 4; and this text is not to be found in Jacoby's testimonia for Archelaos the king, so both agree on the issue). (On Xenokrates as one of the sources which are behind [Plutarch]'s erudition see P. Ceccarelli, 'Chrysermos', *BNJ* 287, Biographical essay).

An interesting detail is that the authority of Archelaos in the *On rivers* is only once mentioned on its own; in the other two instances it appears as a second reference, to buttress the first one (see *FGrH* 123 F 7 = 287 F 3, Chrysermos, and *FGrH* 123 F 9 = *FGrH* 42 F 7, *BNJ* 42 F 4). So Archelaos may indeed have been (modeled upon) a better known author.

The last sentence of F 8b (the text of the *On rivers*; the sentence is not found in Lydos) poses one last difficulty: it is difficult to make sense of it. Why would people in an elevated position make use of the lychnis - what specific use would it have been to them (and not to others)? I have found no explanations for this in either ancient or modern literature. Such a statement might derive, in the context of a problematic textual tradition, as is clearly the case here, from the presence of the name of 'Archelaos' (interpreted as 'he who commands the people') among the sources - but this is carrying hypothetical reconstructions very far.

Whether the name of Derkyllos goes back to a reliable source, common to Pliny and [Plutarch], such as Xenokrates, or whether it was inserted by [Plutarch] within a story taken from this common source, must at this point remain open. Any serious discussion of the reliability of the sources cited by [Plutarch] has to be based on the overall picture, and on a

comprehensive reconstruction of the story of the transmission of the text of the *On rivers*; none of the two can be done here, beyond what has been attempted above.

288 F 9 - NATALE CONTI <i>Mythologiae</i> 4, 11, p. 193 (Padua 1616)	meta [[id="288" type="F" n="9"]]
Subject: Myth: mythical character Historical Work: unknown Source date: 1567 Historian's date: unknown Historical period: n/a	Translation
Et eius gestamen putatus fuit baculus serpente involutus, ut ait Dercylus.	And his (Aesculapius's) emblem was deemed to be a walking stick with a serpent entwined around it, as Dercylus says.

288 F 9 Commentary

This fragment is not in Jacoby; it appears in the first edition of Natale Conti, *Mythologiae sive explicationis fabularum libri decem*, Venice 1567, and then in all subsequent editions. As J. Mulryan and S. Brown, *Natale Conti's Mythologiae* (Tempe 2006), 305 remark, 'Dercylus is not the source' – or, to put it better: this information is not associated with an author named Derkylos/Derkyllus in any extant ancient source. It is a fairly banal piece of information: the staff with a serpent around it is part of the familiar image of Asklepios.

288 F 10 - NATALE CONTI <i>Mythologiae</i> 5.14, p. 282 (Padua 1616)	meta [[id="288" type="F" n="10"]]
Subject: Myth; natural sciences Historical Work: unknown Source date: 1567 Historian's date: unknown Historical period: n/a	Translation
Erant etiam papavera Cereri sacra, ut quidam crediderunt, ob feracitatem seminum; ut malunt alii, quia inter fata plerunque nascerentur, et eundem cultum ament; alii inter quos fuit Dercylus, quia somnum non posset percipere ob filiae molestiam: in quem fuit papaverum beneficio adiuta quam plantam Lucinae etiam quidam attribuerunt.	Poppies were also sacred to Ceres, as some thought, because of the productivity of seeds; as others prefer, because they so often shoot up in the midst of grain and thrive on the same kind of care; other commentators, among which Dercylus, because she could not fall into sleep, because of her worry about her daughter; and in this situation the poppies (which are sometime associated with Lucina) helped her.

288 F 11 Commentary

This fragment is not in Jacoby; it appears in the first edition of Natale Conti, *Mythologiae sive explicationis fabularum libri decem*, Venice 1567, and then in all subsequent editions. As J. Mulryan and S. Brown, *Natale Conti's Mythologiae* (Tempe 2006), 431 point out, the story is not in any of the fragments attributed to an author named Dercylus (or Dercyllus), but the

connection between Demeter and the poppy was familiar in antiquity (e.g. Ovid, *Fasti* 4.547 ff). It is worth remembering that Conti knew [Plutarch]'s *On rivers*, and quotes (not always appropriately) quite a few authors from it: he published a latin translation of the *On rivers* 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* (Napoli 2003), 36 and Calderón Dorda, in E. Calderón Dorda, A. De Lazzer, Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti*, 97-8; Mulryan and Brown, *Natale Conti's Mythologiae*, xvii-xviii; and R.G. Ortega, 'Natale Conti, traductor del De fluviis de Plutarco', in M. García Valdés (ed), *Estudios sobre Plutarco : ideas religiosas actas del III Simposio Internacional sobre Plutarco* (Madrid 1994), 407-418).

<p>288 F 11 - NATALE CONTI Mythologiae 6, 8, p. 319-20 (Padua 1616)</p>	<p>meta[[id="288" type="F" n="11"]]</p>
<p>Subject: Myth; natural sciences Historical Work: unknown Source date: 1567 Historian's date: unknown Historical period: n/a</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>Neque tamen me illud praeterit alios fuisse, inter quos Dercylus, qui Argonautas ad vellum aureum, sive ad Scytharum opulentiam diripiendam navigasse putarint: (semper enim opes tamquam umbra sequitur invidia, omniaque bella prope praedae gratia reipsa, verbo iniuriae ulciscendae suscipiuntur). Quippe cum non procul a Caucaso monte torrentes quidam aurum deferre dicerentur, quod tabulis perforates ac lanosis pellibus Scythis excipere mos fuit, ut ait Strabo lib. 2.</p>	<p>I am also aware that other writers, among whom Dercylus, claimed that the Argonauts set sail to capture the Golden Fleece, or rather to appropriate Scythian wealth – for envy always follows wealth just like a shadow, and all wars are in truth taken up for desire of booty, although in words to avenge an injury). For there were supposed to be some torrents near Mount Caucasus that carried gold along with them, and the Scythians used to sift through them with meshed tablets and woolly fleece, as Strabo says in his second book.</p>

288 F 11 Commentary

This fragment is not in Jacoby. It is part of a chapter on Jason, within a book, the sixth of Natale Conti's *Mythologia sive explicationis fabularum libri decem*, Venice 1567, dedicated to the relationship between the gods and humankind (this book in particular discusses 'that we should accept God's decisions calmly, if he doesn't give us something that we want'). Conti aims in this chapter to show that the voyage of Jason was remembered mainly because it showed that human lives are besieged by many troubles, 'and that a good man has to cure his spirit with the medicine of good counsel so that he can fearlessly confront the many shifts and changes of fortune' (a good example of Conti's interpretation of ancient mythology). Towards the end of the chapter, Conti acknowledges the alternative view, that the Argonauts set out for desire of wealth (the passage above), giving Dercylus as source. J. Mulryan and S. Brown, *Natale Conti's Mythologiae* (Tempe 2006), 848 simply state: 'Dercylus is not the source'. And indeed, this information is not found linked to the name of a

Dercylus/Derkyl(l)os anywhere. The second part of the text has a correct reference to Strabo (11.2.19).

<p>288 F 12 - NATALE CONTI <i>Mythologiae</i> 9, 8, p. 510b (Padua 1616)</p>	<p>meta[[id="288" type="F" n="12"]]</p>
<p>Subject: Myth: mythical figure; genre: aetiology Historical Work: On the names of cities and places Source date: Historian's date: unknown Historical period: Myth: mythical past</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>Cum quidam Celtum etiam Polyphemi filium fuisse inquit, a quo dicti sunt Celtae; et Illyrium, a quo Illyris, et Henetum, ut quidam voluerunt, a quo regio postea Venetia; & Paphlagonem, ut ait Dercyllus in lib. de nominibus urbium et locorum.</p>	<p>But other writers suggest that Celtus too was a son of Polyphemos, from whom the Celts are named; and Illyrius, whence the Illyrians, and Henetus, as some state, who gave his name to the Venetian territory; and Paphlagon, as Dercyllus says in his book <i>On the Names of Cities and Places</i>.</p>

288 F 12 Commentary

In what precedes, Conti has narrated the love of Polyphemus for Galatea, citing as sources Theokritos (*Idyll* 11), Philoxenos, Alkimos (*FGrH* 560 F 10), and the scholia to Theokritos; Conti goes on to add that not only was the Kyklops in love with Galatea, he also had from her a son Galatus, quoting as evidence for this Bacchylides (fr. 59 Campbell). F 12 follows immediately; but here, the source reference is impossible to verify. It is worth pointing out that while what precedes F 12, until the reference to Bacchylides, was already in the first edition (1567) of the *Mythologiae*, our fragment was inserted in the second edition, published in Venice in 1581 (and remained in all subsequent editions).

J. Mulryan and S. Brown, *Natale Conti's Mythologiae* (Tempe 2006), 848 comment: 'Dercyllus (*FGrH* 288) is not the source', and go on to remark that Illyrius is usually the son of Kadmos and Harmonia, while Keltos is a son of Herakles. Information closer to what appears in Natale Conti may be found in a passage of Appian, *Illyrian wars* 3: (φασὶ δὲ τὴν μὲν χώραν ἐπώνυμον Ἰλλυριοῦ τοῦ Πολυφήμου γενέσθαι· Πολυφήμῳ γὰρ τῷ Κύκλωπι καὶ Γαλατεία Κελτὸν καὶ Ἰλλυριὸν καὶ Γάλαν παῖδας ὄντας ἐξορμήσαι Σικελίας, καὶ ἄρξαι τῶν δι' αὐτοὺς Κελτῶν καὶ Ἰλλυριῶν καὶ Γαλατῶν λεγομένων. καὶ τόδε μοι μάλιστα, πολλὰ μυθεύοντων ἕτερα πολλῶν, ἀρέσκει). Appian emphasizes that others tell many other divergent stories; see for other versions J. Lightfoot, *Parthenius of Nicaea* (Oxford 1999) 531; Jacoby on Timagenes 88 F 2, *FGrH* 2C, 225-6; and Timaios, *FGrH* 566 F 69 stating that the country Galatia took the name from Galatos son of Polyphemos and Galateia with Jacoby, *FGrH* 3b [Kommentar] 569-71, where the passage of Natale Conti is quoted, and [Noten] 334-5). Thus, even though Appian's version is the closest to F 12 I have been able to find (searches for combined terms, in the TLG, and in the TLL through Diogenes), and even though it is not an exact parallel, there may have been other versions circulating; the problem is how Conti would have been able to know them.

There are doubts even on what precedes: concerning Bacchylides, for instance, D.A. Campbell, *Greek lyric IV* (Cambridge Mass. and London 1992), 305 remarks that a son Galates is mentioned by Timaios, in a passage preserved in the *Etymologicum magnum* (Timaios *FGrH* 566 F 69 = *Et. Mag.* 220.5), while Appian mentions a son Galas, and reports Pfeiffer's opinion (R. Pfeiffer, *Callimachus I* (Oxford 1949), 305) that Conti, 'a notoriously unreliable writer' (Campbell), took this information from the *Etymologicum magnum*, simply substituting Bacchylides for Timaeus.

In a discussion of this passage, A. Coppola, 'La leggenda troiana in area venetica', in L. Braccesi (ed.), *Hesperia 12. Studi sulla grecità di Occidente* (Roma 2000), 12-14 also wonders where Natale Conti could get his information from, but seems inclined on the whole to accept the reliability of the entire passage: 'possiamo disporre di un frammento in più per Dercillo... effettivamente esso è credibile in ottica siracusana'. She adds however that the tradition making of the Kyklops the father of Henetus and Paphlagon, but omitting Antenor and the Trojans, might be part of a learned attempt to deprive Padua of its mythical connection with Troy and Antenor, or also to keep at a distance the traditions linking the city with a traitor (Antenor).

In what follows Conti refers to the story that Polyphemos and not Herakles would have been Hylas's lover, a story preserved in the *scholia* to Apollonios Rhodios and there (as well as in Conti) attributed to the *To Idotheus* of Socrates (this part was present already in the first edition of the *Mythologiae*). Conti knew the *scholia* to Apollonios well, and in his second version he may have decided to further embroider, on the basis of reminiscences from the passage of Appian, attributing everything to an author, Dercyllus, whose name he knew from his translation of the *On rivers*. Alternatively, we must accept either that Conti committed an error (something which is entirely possible), or that he could rely on manuscripts now lost.

288 Biographical Essay

Derkyllus is one of those authors whose name appears in both *Parallela minora* (F2 and 3) and *On rivers* (F 1 and F 4 to 8), and whose origin is never stated. The fact that both *Parallela minora* and *On rivers* refer to Derkyllus as a source cannot be taken, *pace* J. Boulogne, *Plutarque. Oeuvres morales, IV* (Paris 2002), *Parallèles mineurs*, 'Notice', 231, as an argument for his real existence, since both *Parallela* and *On rivers* stem from the same writer (for more discussion of the *On rivers*, see F8b Commentary). The works attributed to Derkyllus cover mythical themes (*Foundations* in at least 2 books, since book one is mentioned in F 3; *Satyrica* in at least 2 books, since one is mentioned in F 7), works of a geological/geographical/paradoxographical nature (*On stones* in at least two books, since book one is mentioned in F 4; *On mountains* in at least 3 books, F 5 and 6), and Greek and Roman history (*Aitolika* in at least 3 books, in F 1; *Italika* in at least 3 books, in F 2). He is thus one of the relatively few pseudo-Plutarchan authors that span both Greece and Rome, the others being Aristokles, Dorotheos, Dositheos, Kleitonimos, Menyllos, Theophilos.

Natale Conti refers four times to Dercylus for information concerning mainly Greek myth, but also natural sciences (FF 9-12); in one case only does he mention the work title, a *Liber de nominibus urbium et locorum*, which might correspond to the title *Ktiseis* (*Foundations*) in F 3. The content of the passages attributed by Conti to 'Dercylus' does not match that of any ancient texts attributed to either Derkyllus or Derkylos (*FGrH* 305, discussed below). Where, then, do Conti's references to Derkylos as the source come from? Conti may have had access to some lost manuscript where he found information concerning this and other authors he mentions in his *Mythologiae*, for which we do not find any parallel references now; he may

have misremembered (in the case of F 11, in particular, Derkyllus F 4 (on the Caucasos) may be behind the association); or he may have misleadingly added a reference, using an author name with which he was familiar from his work on the *On rivers*. Since the likelihood that Conti was relying on manuscripts now lost for his information is relatively small, I prefer to consider the attribution to Dercylus of the information preserved in FF 9-12 as resulting from an error, or from misleading intent. See further, on Natale Conti and the *On rivers*, the discussion in Sostratos, *BNJ* 23 F 1b-1d.

Interestingly, in both *Parallela minora* and the *On rivers* Derkyllus's name appears without any indication of origin; this is something that Derkyllus shares, within the group of pseudo-Plutarchan authors, with Demaratos, Kleitonymos, Ktesiphon, Sostratos, and Theophilos only: see F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *Parallela minora* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* S. 3, 8 (1940), 93). Because the indication of the origin is a constituent part in the invention of the author-names, Jacoby suggested that, but for famous authors, it would probably always have been present, and that its absence could have special implications, pointing for instance to the reality of an author ('Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch', 93). In this specific instance however it is difficult to see what meaning exactly the absence of place of origin might have. It may be that the absence of origin would have led the reader to the assumption that [Plutarch]'s Derkyllus is the same as a Derkylos (*FGrH* 305) author of *Argolika* of which some 10 fragments remain, and who is mostly mentioned together with another author, Agias; but Derkylos, although slightly better known than Derkyllus, does not fit the notion of a 'famous author'.

This opens up the question of whether indeed the Derkylos author of *Argolika*, usually mentioned together with Agias (or Hagias), and the Derkyllus quoted in [Plutarch]'s work might be the same. C. Müller *Fragmenta Historicorum graecorum* IV (Parisii 1851) 386-8 put together their fragments; and E. Schwartz, 'Derkylos 2', *RE* 5 (1905) 243, discussed them together. J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 113 also identified the two, basing his argument on the thematic closeness of some fragments (in particular, Derkyllus F 3 concerns the Palladion of Troy; Derkylos *FGrH* 305 F 2 discusses the exact date of the fall of Troy). More shall be said below on the closeness between topics that must have been part of the work of (H)agias and Derkylos, and topics for whom Derkyllus is mentioned as an authority in [Plutarch]; and yet, closeness in the topics discussed cannot automatically mean identity.

Against the identification of the two are:

- the difference in name (for Jacoby, *FGrH* 3b [Kommentar], 17-8 and [Noten], 10, the main reason for keeping the two apart, together with his overall view of [Plutarch]'s ingenuity): in [Plutarch], we find Derkyllus (always with two λ in the best manuscripts of the *Parallela minora*, and always with two λ in the *On rivers*); elsewhere, Derkylos (so in Athenaios, *FGrH* 305 F 3; in the scholia to Antimachos, *FGrH* 305 F 4; in the *Etymologicum magnum*, *FGrH* 305 F 5; in the scholia to Euripides *Trojan women*, *FGrH* 305 F 7; and in the scholia to Callimachos's *Aitia*, *FGrH* 305 F 8). In two cases the tradition hesitates: in *FGrH* 305 F 2, Clemens of Alexandria, *Stromateis* 1, 104 has Derkylos, while Eusebios, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 10, 12, 14-15, who preserves the same fragment, has Derkyllus; and for *FGrH* 305 F 6, the tradition of the scholia to Euripides, *Phoenician women* 7, hesitates between Δέρκυλος (M), δερκύλλος (T), δερκυλλος (B), while A omit the name entirely;

- the fact that Derkylos is associated with Agias (or Hagias) in 7 of the 10 fragments we have (in *FGrH* 305 F 1 Hagias is mentioned alone; and Derkylos is named alone in *FGrH* 305 F 4 and F 5), while Derkyllus is always mentioned alone in [Plutarch];
- the fact that Hagias and Derkylos are attributed *Argolika* (F 1, 3, and 4), and no other work, while Derkyllus is the author of a number of very disparate works, none of them bearing the title *Argolika*;
- and the fact that the longest fragment we have of (H)agias and Derkylos, F 4, shows that their *Argolika* was written in a local dialect, something that does certainly not transpire from the references to Derkyllus in [Plutarch].

For all these reasons, it is best to keep Derkylos and Derkyllus separate. And yet, intriguing connections come up, that render the hypothesis that [Plutarch] modeled aspects of his own Derkyllus on the writer of *Argolika* difficult to resist.

Our point of departure will be the accent put on vision (losing eyesight, and reacquiring it) in two of Derkyllus's fragments. In F 3, Ilos, having seen the Palladion, loses his sight; he recovers it after appeasing the goddess. This story is relatively close to that narrated in Derkyllus F 1, where the sight of Artemis brings about the metamorphosis into stone of the imprudent, just as the herb *myops* may bring loss of sight, a loss that can however be made good by addressing prayers to Artemis. As stressed by O. Weinreich, *Antike Heilungswunder. Untersuchungen zum Wunderglauben der Griechen und Römer* (Gießen 1909), 148 n. 2, to deduce from this coincidence that such information may indeed derive from an original work of Derkyllus is excessive; however, stories having to do with eyesight and vision may have attracted the name Derkyllus, because of its connection with δέρκομαι. We have seen above (commentary to F 1 and F 3) that the stories narrated in F 1 and 3 rework themes that go back to the stories of Teiresias and Aktaion; moreover, the *Palladion* plays an important role in F 3. Interestingly, all of this comes together in Callimachos *Hymn* 5 ('The bath of Pallas'), a 'mimetic' hymn that takes place in Argos, and that concerns the ritual washing of the statue of the goddess, explicitly identified by the Argives (so Pausanias 2.23.5 – he disagrees) as the *Palladion* that came from Troy (in this direction also goes Callimachos, *Hymn* 5, 35-42).

Sight, its loss, and recovery (a second sight in the case of Teiresias, divination) after prayer to the goddess are important elements in this hymn. While this should not be pushed too far (see e.g. W. Bühler's withering review, *Gnomon* 35 (1963), 566-8, of J.K. McKay, *The poet at play. Kallimachos, The Bath of Pallas* (Leiden 1962)), sight is an important element: cf. R. Hunter, 'Writing the God: Form and Meaning in Callimachus, Hymn to Athena', *MD* 29 (1992), 22-7, and 20 on the juxtaposition of δόρκας (roe, but the term is linked to δέρκομαι) and φάεξ (Teiresias's eyes) in Callimachos *Hymn* 5, 92-3. More specifically, and closer to our preoccupations, vv. 51-54 contain an exhortation addressed to the men of Argos not to look upon the statue, the punishment for it being probably loss of sight: 'But o Pelasgian be mindful not to see the goddess even unwittingly. Who sees Pallas Poliouchos naked, he will have seen Argos [τῶργος; or, following a conjecture of West, τῶργον 'this work of art'] for the last time!' (ἀλλά, Πελασγέ,/ φράζεο μὴ οὐκ ἐθέλων τὰν βασιλείαν ἴδης. / ὅς κεν ἴδῃ γυμνὰν τὰν Παλλάδα τὰν πολιοῦχον, / τῶργος ἐσοψεῖται τοῦτο πανυστάτιον, with the commentary of A.W. Bulloch, *Callimachus. The Fifth Hymn* (Cambridge 1985), 159-62 - note however that contrary to what is stated at p. 159, neither Ilos nor Metellus were trying to steal the Palladion!)

There has been ample and rather inconclusive discussion as to whether the *Palladion* was, in Argos, kept in the temple of Athena *Oxyderkes* or in that of Athena Polias (for a *status quaestionis*, see Bulloch, *Callimachus. The Fifth Hymn*, 15). Independently of where the *Palladion* was kept in Argos, independently of whether an Athena *Oxyderkes* should be seen in Callimachos's *Hymn 5*, we would be committing an injustice towards [Plutarch] if we thought that he did not know of the Argive *Palladion* and of the temple of Athena *Oxyderkes* (the statement by Pausanias, 2.24.2, that Diomedes dedicated the temple of Athena *Oxyderkes* because once, when fighting at Ilion, the goddess took away the mist from his eyes, based on Homer, *Iliad* 5.127-8, may also be pertinent: but it is impossible to know whether the aition is an ancient, local one, or a recent construct). Similarly, if Athenaios and other scholiasts could cite (H)agias and Derkylos, if the scholia name them as sources for the *Aitia* of Callimachos, then independently of whether Callimachos used them for his *Hymn 5*, which pending a papyrus discovery we shall never know, [Plutarch] might have chosen the name as representative of that nexus of ideas.

Actually, within the meagre fragments of (H)agias and Derkylos we have, there are some that concern eyesight, and that might have further influenced [Plutarch]'s choices. Thus, Derkylos 305 F 7, preserved by a scholiast to Euripides's *Trojan Women* 16, is quoted in a context where the fall of Troy and the death of Priamos at the altar of Zeus Herkeios are at issue; (H)agias and Derkylos are specifically mentioned as authorities for the fact that the statue of Zeus Herkeios, an archaic statue which had been taken from Troy and brought to the temple of Zeus Larissaios in Argos (Pausanias 2.24.3) had three eyes (see on all this Jacoby, *FGrH* 3b [Kommentar], 22-23 and 11-12).

At the same time, if there is a thread connecting Derkylos and Derkyllos, which goes through stories linked to eyesight and to Troy, this does not mean that we should identify them, as the stories told by the two authors present very clear differences. It is true that, as pointed out by Schlereth, Derkylos 305 F 2 (preserved by Clemens of Alexandria) discusses the date of the fall of Troy, while Derkyllos 288 F 3 discusses the *Palladion*, the statue whose presence in Troy guaranteed the safety of the city. But while the date for the fall of Troy offered by Derkylos finds its place within a series of statements on the fall of Troy (see Jacoby, *FGrH* 3b [Text] 20-1), what Derkyllos says about the *Palladion* is unique (see commentary above). More importantly, the thread followed thus far accounts for only two of the fragments attributed to Derkylos and preserved in [Plutarch]; it seems to me that even if a real 'Derkyllos' existed, from whose works [Plutarch] would be quoting (this cannot be excluded: see above, discussion of F 8), it must have been an author different from the author of *Argolika* Derkylos. But an author 'Derkyllos' may very well never have existed outside of [Plutarch]'s mind (a search through the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, vols. 1 to 5a, shows a total of 12 Derkyllidas/Derkyllides, and 14 Derkylos, but no Derkyllos). In that case, a name invented for the purpose of one of the fragments having to do with eyesight, or/and as an 'improvement' on Derkylos, took on a life of its own, until Derkyllos became, to put it in Cameron's words, 'one of Ps-Plutarch's most trustworthy workhorses' (A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2004), 134), credited with multivolume works covering a number of different areas.

288 Bibliography

J. Bidez, 'Plantes et pierres magiques d'après le Ps. Plutarque *De Fluviis*', *Mélanges offerts à O. Navarre* (Toulouse 1935), 28-31.

W. Kroll, 'Derkyllos 2', *RE suppl.* 7 (Stuttgart 1940), 123-4.

A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Napoli 2000), 63

A. De Lazzer, in E. Calderon Dorda, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Napoli 2003), 80-81.

J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Paralleli minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 113.

E. Schwartz, 'Derkylos', *RE* 5 (Stuttgart 1905), 244.