

Peisandros

Ceccarelli, Paola (University College London)

This entry was prepared by Paola Ceccarelli and published on

Name	Pisander
Jacoby number	16
Edition	bnj2
Historian's date	3rd century BCE
Historical focus	I. Mythological History (Genealogy and Mythography); B. Hellenistic Reference Works and Collections
Place of origin	unknown

Fragment 16 T 1

ID	16 T 1
Source	Macrobius, <i>Saturnalia</i> 5.2.4
Work mentioned	
Source date	5th century CE
Source language	Latin
Source genre	criticism; epic
Fragment subject	criticism; epic
Textual base	R. A. Kaster, <i>Ambrosii Theodosii Macrobiani Saturnalia. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit</i> , Oxford 2011.

Text

dicturumne me putatis ea quae vulgo nota sunt, quod Theocritum sibi fecerit (scil. Vergilius) pastoralis operis auctorem, ruralis Hesiodum, et quod in ipsis Georgicis tempestatis serenitatisque signa de Arati Phaenomenis traxerit, vel quod eversionem Troiae cum Sinone suo et equo ligneo ceterisque omnibus quae librum secundum faciunt a Pisandro ad verbum paene transcripserit, (5) qui inter Graecos poetas¹ eminent opere quod a nuptiis Iovis et Iunonis incipiens universas historias, quae mediis omnibus saeculis usque ad aetatem ipsius Pisandri contigerunt, in unam seriem coactas redegerit et unum ex

diversis hiatibus temporum corpus effecerit, in quo opere inter historias ceteras interitus quoque Troiae in hunc modum relatus est, quae Maro fideliter interpretando fabricatus sibi est Iliacae urbis ruinam? (6) sed et haec et talia pueris decantata praetereo. iam vero Aeneis ipsa, nonne ab Homero sibi mutuata est ...?

Translation

Or do you perhaps imagine that I shall speak of things that are common knowledge, such as that Virgil made Theokritos his model for his pastoral poetry, and Hesiod for the rural, and that in the *Georgics* themselves he drew for the signs of bad and good weather on the *Appearances* of Aratos, or that he transcribed almost word by word his account of the destruction of Troy, inclusive of his Sinon and the wooden horse and all the rest that forms the content of the second book (of the *Aeneid*), from Peisandros, (5) who is eminent among Greek poets for a work that, beginning with the wedding of Jupiter and Juno, has brought together in a single sequence all the stories that concerned the intervening ages until Peisandros's own time and that presents a single whole out of the various gaps of time; and in this work, among the other stories, the fall of Troy, too, is retold in this way, an account that Maro faithfully translated, thus composing his own destruction of the city of Ilion? But this and similar stories I will omit, as being commonplace themes of schoolboys. (6) As for the *Aeneid* itself, has it not been borrowed from Homer ...?

Critical Apparatus

1. {poetas}? Jacoby in apparatus

Commentary on the text

In what precedes, Eustathius, one of the participants at the *Saturnalia* banquet, has been asked to share what he knows about Virgil's deep knowledge of, and borrowings from, Greek culture. This is the beginning of an exposition which will occupy all of *Saturnalia* book 5, and whose opening here takes the form of a *recusatio* ('I am not going to talk of...'). Eustathius claims that he is not going to mention what everyone knows; among the examples of common knowledge he gives is that Virgil transcribed the content of the second book of the *Aeneid* 'almost word by word' from the work of a poet Peisandros. To this Peisandros Eustathius/Macrobios attributes the composition of a narrative history of the world, covering the entire timespan from the wedding of Jupiter and Juno down to Peisandros' own day, including, among other things, the story of the fall of Troy, all woven into a unified chronology. Who is this Peisandros?

Two men of letters named Peisandros are known, both important epic poets. The first one is Peisandros from Kameiros in Rhodos, active, according to the tradition, in the period between Homer/Hesiod and Panyassis/Antimachos, thus at some point in the seventh century BCE, and author of a *Herakleia* in hexameter verse; to him were also attributed other, spurious poems, composed by others authors among which Aristeus (*Suda*, s.v. Πείσανδρος, π 1465 Adler: Ποιήματα δὲ αὐτοῦ Ἡράκλεια ἐν βιβλίοις β'· ἔστι δὲ τὰ Ἡρακλέους ἔργα· ἐνθα πρῶτος Ἡρακλεῖ ῥόπαλον περιτέθεικε. τὰ δὲ ἄλλα τῶν ποιημάτων νόθα αὐτοῦ δοξάζεται, γενόμενα ὑπὸ τε ἄλλων καὶ Ἀριστέως τοῦ ποιητοῦ.) The *testimonia* and fragments concerning this Peisandros are collected in A. Bernabé (ed.), *Poetae Epici*

Graeci 1 (Leipzig 1987), 164-71; M. Davies (ed.), *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen 1988), 129-35; and M.L. West (ed.), *Greek Epic Fragments* (Cambridge, MA 2003), 177-87.

The second epic poet is Peisandros from Laranda in Lykaonia, active at the time of Alexander Severus (222-235 CE) and author of a *poikile historia* in epic verse, called *Heroic Theogamies* (*testimonia* and fragments in E. Heitsch (ed.), *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit II* (Göttingen 1964), 44-7). Here too, the *Suda*, s.v. Πείσανδρος, π 1466 Adler, mentions, besides the *Theogamiai*, undefined other works in prose (καὶ ἄλλα καταλογάδην).

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, 'Lesefrüchte', *Hermes* 60 (1925), 280-4 (= *Kleine Schriften* 4 (Berlin 1962), 368-71) forcefully defended the view that most references to a Peisandros (including the ones in Macrobius, Ambrosius, Theodosius, and Johannes Philoponos) concerned the archaic epic poet of Kameiros, while the others could be understood to refer to the poet from Laranda.

But some of the ancient references to a writer named Peisandros do not fit easily with either of these two epic poets, a fact already remarked upon in the nineteenth century. Hence, the idea of a further author presenting himself under the name of the famous poet from Kameiros (a pseudo-Peisandros), writing either in verse or in prose.

The hypothesis of a pseudepigraphic epic poem was proposed by F.G. Welcker, *Der epische Cyclus oder die homerischen Dichter*² (Bonn 1865), 91-6 (as we saw, the *Suda*, in the notice π 1465 concerning the archaic epic poet Peisandros, mentions the existence of numerous spurious poems, beside the authentic *Herakleia*); L. Legras, *Les légendes thébaines dans l'épopée et la tragédie grecques* (Paris, 1905), 35-36 n. 2, went further and suggested that this Pseudo-Peisandros composed, at some point between the third and the first century BCE, a work titled *Heroic Theogamies* (just like the later work of Peisandros of Laranda), and that it is to these *Heroic Theogamies* that Macrobius alludes. Recently, L.C. Colella, 'Un Pisandro mitografo? Per una riconsiderazione di Pisander, *FGrHist* 16', *Incidenza dell'antico* 16 (2018), 11-50 has revived a variant of the idea of the pseudonymous poet: after a very rich *status quaestionis*, Colella suggests that Macrobius (or rather his source) is here thinking of the spurious epic poems that according to the *Suda* circulated under the name of Peisandros of Kameiros (see also L.C. Colella, 'Ancora su P. Schubart 4: sul problema dell'identificazione di Pisandro', *Quaderni del Museo del Papiro* 15 (2018), 201-211).

The alternative is that there must have been also a prose writer named Peisandros, or writing under the pseudonym of Peisandros. This 'Peisandros' could have been an early logographer (so C. Robert, *Oidipus, Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffs im griechischen Altertum* (Berlin 1915), 64), or a mythographer active in the early Hellenistic period; at any rate, the mentions of a Peisandros in the *scholia* to Apollonios Rhodios and some other texts should refer to this prose author (the mention of works in prose, καὶ ἄλλα καταλογάδην, that concludes the entry dedicated by the *Suda* π 1466 to Peisandros of Laranda, has also been linked to the work of the mythographer). The hypothesis of a Hellenistic mythographer, first advanced by E. Bethe, *Thebanische Heldenlieder* (Leipzig 1891), 4, was accepted by Jacoby in *FGrH* 1A, 493-4 (1923); a fuller argument was provided

by R. Keydell, 'Die Dichter mit Namen Peisandros', *Hermes* 70 (1935), 310-11 and R. Keydell, 'Peisandros (11), (12), (13)', *RE* 19 (Stuttgart 1937), cols. 144-7. Jacoby returned to the issue in *FGrH* 1A, 544-7 (1957: his remarks are still the best treatment of the issue). See also the cautious assent of D. Mastronarde (ed.), *Euripides. Phoenissae*, (Cambridge 1994), 31-2; S. Fornaro, 'Peisander 10', *Brill's New Pauly* vol. 10 (2007), check; H. Lloyd Jones, 'Curses and Divine Anger in Early Greek Epic', *CQ²* 42 (2002), 3-10 (reprinted with modifications in H. Lloyd-Jones, *The Further Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford 2005), 18-35; in what follows I shall refer to this version); and C. Meliaddò, 'Mythography', in F. Montanari, S. Matthaios, A. Rengakos (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Leiden 2015), 1079-81.

The source of Macrobius must have been thinking of one of these Peisandroi. The archaic epic poet is an unlikely option; he had composed an *Herakleia*, and other works were attributed to him, but it is difficult to reconcile what we know of his oeuvre with Macrobius's summary. As for the poet from Laranda, the difficulty is that his work cannot, for obvious chronological reasons, have been the source of Virgil's *Aeneid*. Yet Macrobius's description of the work of Peisandros closely fits what we know of the poem of Peisandros of Laranda.

A solution is to assume that Peisandros of Laranda imitated the *Aeneid*, and that Macrobius noticed the correspondences between the two works but wrongly assumed that Peisandros was the earlier author, since his work covered all world history down to Alexander the Great. Such an error would not be unthinkable: it can be compared with similar ones in the *Saturnalia*. This solution was advanced as early as 1739 by James Merrick in his *Triphiodorus* (Oxford 1739), LXVI, and then restated by C.G. Heyne (ed.), *Vergilii Maronis opera*² 2 (Leipzig 1787), 288 (see Keydell, 'Die Dichter', 302); the strongest arguments for it have been put forward by G. Funaioli, 'D'una pretesa fonte della *Iliuperside* Virgiliana', *Atti II Congresso Nazionale di Studi Romani* (Rome 1931), 311-17 (revised and updated in *Studi di letteratura antica. Spiriti e forme, figure e problemi delle letterature classiche* 2.1 (Bologna 1947), 167-74) and by Keydell, 'Die Dichter', 301-9, in a paper whose main conclusions are accepted by most scholars (so for instance G. D'Ippolito, 'Pisandro', *Enciclopedia Vigiliana* 4 (Rome 1988), 125-6; S. Fornaro, 'Peisander (9)', *Brill's New Pauly* vol. 10 (2007), check; see also N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 11: A Commentary* (Leiden 2003), 471, with further bibliography, as well as B. Garstad, 'The Assyrian Hero's Romantic Interlude in Libya: A *topos* from Virgil in Pisander of Laranda, the Picus-Zeus Narrative, and Nonnus of Panopolis', *Eranos. Acta philologica Suecana* 101 (2003), 6-16), and U. Gärtner, *Quintus Smyrnaeus und die Aeneis* (Munich 2005), 27-34).

Yet while this remains a possibility, the solution adopted by Jacoby (*FGrH* 1A, 547) and developed by A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2004), 257-60, in a detailed discussion of this passage, is worth considering: Macrobius may have found in the pamphlets that accused Virgil of plagiarism (pamphlets on which he is relying here) a reference to an early Hellenistic mythographer writing under the name of Peisandros; Jacoby (*FGrH* 1a, 494 (1925) and again 545 (1957)) suggested that the name is a pseudonym, intentionally built on the name of the archaic epic poet: a mythographer could have published, under the name of the famous poet, a prose work in which he paraphrased the epic poem, expanding it further. Macrobius, however, mistook him for Peisandros of

Laranda (whom he erroneously thought to have been active in the Hellenistic period, as above), and added a few remarks concerning the work of the latter. If this is so, then we have indeed here a testimonium concerning, at least in part, Peisandros the mythographer. In his recent edition, R.A. Kaster (ed.), *Macrobius. Saturnalia*, books 3-5 (Cambridge, MA and London 2011), 228-9 n. 12, agrees that Peisandros of Laranda is the poet described here, and that Macrobius must have confused him with another Peisandros, but leaves open the identity of the latter: either the archaic poet from Rhodos or the Hellenistic mythographer.

Commentary on T 1

This testimonium was added by Jacoby in the second edition of *FGrH* 1 (1957, A*10), but he had already mentioned it in the first edition, *FGrH* 1A, 493-4; it may refer, in a mediated way, to the mythographer named Peisandros.

Macrobius's *Saturnalia* is a work in seven books, written after c. 431 CE, purporting to be the account of a conversation held, over three days, at a gathering of Roman aristocrats during the festival of the *Saturnalia* of probably 383 CE; among the guests are famous political and literary figures. For the date, see A. Cameron, 'The date and identity of Macrobius', *Journal of Roman Studies* 56 (1966), 25-38; for a discussion of the *Saturnalia*, Macrobius, and his circle, see A. Cameron, *The Last Pagans of Rome* (Oxford 2011), 231-72; a list of editions and further bibliography is in J. Zetzel, *Critics, Compilers and Commentators. An Introduction to Roman Philology, 200 BCE-800 CE* (Oxford 2018), 263-4.

Fragment 16 T 2

ID	16 T 2
Source	Ioannes Philoponos, <i>In Aristotelis Analytica posteriora commentaria</i> 77 b 31-32 (M. Wallies (ed.), <i>Commentaria in Aristotelis graeca</i> 13.3 (Berlin 1909), 156-7)
Work mentioned	
Source date	6th century CE
Source language	Greek
Source genre	criticism; epic
Fragment subject	criticism; epic
Textual base	M. Wallies (ed.) , <i>Commentaria in Aristotelis graeca</i> 13.3 (Berlin 1909), 156-7)

Text

ἄρα πᾶς κύκλος σχῆμα; ἂν γράψῃ, δῆλον. [τί δέ; τὰ ἔπη κύκλος; φανερόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν.]¹
... γεγράφασι² γοῦν τινες περὶ τοῦ κύκλου, ἀναγράφοντες πόσοι τε ποιηταὶ γεγόνασι, καὶ
τί ἕκαστος ἔγραψε, καὶ πόσοι στίχοι ἐκάστου ποιήματος, καὶ τὴν τούτου τάξιν, τίνα τε
πρῶτα³ δεῖ μανθάνειν καὶ δεύτερα καὶ ἐφεξῆς. Πεισάνδρου δὲ τὴν αὐτὴν πραγματείαν
ποιησαμένου, λέγω δὲ πλείστην ἱστορίαν κατὰ τάξιν συναγ<αγ>όντος⁴, ἀντιποιησαμένου
δὲ καὶ εὐεπείας, καταφρονηθῆναι φασὶ τὰ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ ποιητῶν συγγράμματα· διὸ μηδὲ
εὐρίσκεσθαι τὰ ποιήματα τὰ ἐν τοῖς Κύκλοις ἀναγεγραμμένα.

Translation

Is every circle a shape? If it is drawn, yes, plainly. [What then? are the epic poems a circle? Clearly they are not.] ... Some have written about the cycle, enumerating the number of poets, what each one of them wrote, the number of verses of each poem and their arrangement, and which should be learnt first, which second, and so on. And because Peisandros composed a similar work, I mean he brought together in good order the entire historical matter, with pretensions to a beautiful style, they say that the writings of the poets before his time fell out of favour; and this is why it is not possible anymore to find the poems listed in the Cycles.

Critical Apparatus

1. the part within brackets is in Aristotle, but it is not quoted in Philoponos' commentary.
2. γεγράφασι.... ἀναγεγραμμένα om. a (the Aldine); γράφουσι R (Laurentianus LXXXV 1); γεγράφασι τινες Wilamowitz *Hermes* 1925, Jacoby
3. πρῶτον R
4. συναγ<αγ>όντος Wallis (Wilamowitz, Jacoby); συνάγοντος R U (Marcianus 225)

Commentary on the text

Philoponos here moves from Aristotle's argument on paralogisms to an excursus on the meaning of cycle in the context of literature and education, and specifically in what sense epigrams (such as the famous one which marked the tomb of Midas) or the epic poems can be said to form a 'circle'.

The first discussion of this passage was offered by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, 'Lesefrüchte', *Hermes* 60 (1925), 280-4; his conclusions, that Philoponos has here in mind the archaic epic poet from Kameiros, and that the latter had composed, besides the *Herakleia*, an all-encompassing poem called Κύκλος, *Cycle*, which would have caused the loss of the earlier cyclic poems, cannot be accepted. As pointed out by Jacoby, *FGrH* 1A, 545-7, Wilamowitz himself acknowledged, in concluding his essay, that some fragments remained intractable and that it remained mysterious how a poem totally ignored by the grammarians of the Hellenistic period suddenly could become in Roman times so extraordinarily important and well known.

For his part, E. Schwartz, 'Der Name Homeros', *Hermes* 75 (1940), 5-7, advanced the hypothesis that Philoponos was referring here to a pseudepigraphic epic poem with the same scope as the mythographical and novelistic *kykloi* of the first century BCE.

There are, however, difficulties with this view as well (highlighted by Jacoby, *FGrH* 1A, 544-6). R. Keydell, 'Die Dichter mit Namen Peisandros', *Hermes* 70 (1935), 309, must be right, that here the epic poet from Laranda is meant. This is the current view in scholarship, even when there is disagreement on almost everything else: e.g., E.C. Kopff, 'Virgil and the Cyclic Epics', in *ANRW* 31.2 (Berlin 1981), 921-2; H. Lloyd Jones, 'Curses and Divine Anger in Early Greek Epic', *The Further Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford 2005), 31; N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 11: A Commentary* (Leiden 2003), 470-1; and R. McKirahan, *Philoponus: on Aristotle Posterior Analytics 1.9-18* (London 2012), 128, who notwithstanding his translation 'after Pisander composed a treatise of the same kind' (for Πεισάνδρου δὲ τὴν αὐτὴν πραγματείαν ποιησαμένου), which seems to imply prose, settles nonetheless for Peisandros of Laranda. See also most recently L.C. Colella, 'Ancora su P. Schubart 4: sul problema dell'identificazione di Pisandro', *Quaderni del Museo del Papiro* 15 (2018), 207-8, who compares the passage of Philoponos with the wording of a statement of Zosimos, *Historia nova* 5.29.2 (deriving probably from Olympiodoros), concerning the foundation of Emona by the Argonauts, in which Peisandros of Laranda is explicitly cited: ὡς ὁ ποιητὴς ἱστορεῖ Πείσανδρος, ὁ τῆ τῶν ἡρωικῶν θεογαμιῶν ἐπιγραφῆ πᾶσαν ὡς εἶπεῖν ἱστορίαν περιλαβών, 'as the poet Peisandros relates, encompassing with his work *Heroic Theogamies* the entire historical matter so to say'. Colella point out that here there cannot be any doubt that Zosimos/Olympiodoros refers to Peisandros of Laranda (this passage is listed by Heitsch as Pisander F 2), because of the explicit reference to the *Heroic Theogamies*; the expression used in Zosimos / Olympiodoros (πᾶσαν ὡς εἶπεῖν ἱστορίαν περιλαβών) is very close to the ones used by Philoponos (πλείστην ἱστορίαν κατὰ τάξιν συναγ<αγ>όντος) and Macrobius (*universas historias... in una seriem coactas*) to describe the work of their Peisandros.

Note, however, the contrary opinion of Jacoby, *FGrH* 1A, 546, who prefers to think that the mythographer is here meant; so also R. Fowler (*per litteras*), pointing out that Philoponos's language is consonant with an encyclopaedic prose work that aimed to dethrone the poets both in content and style, and that Philoponos's point works rather better if one thinks of prose, because the actual course of events shows that prose summaries did replace earlier poems (e.g., the *Tales from Euripides*). For the idea of a prose *Cycle*, one may compare Dionysios the Cyclographer, *BNJ* 15, also writing in prose; the epigram that preceded Pseudo-Apollodoros, *Library* (references and brief discussion in *BNJ* 15 T 1) stated that the new work (in prose) would supersede everything. The detail concerning Peisandros's *euepeia* does not necessarily imply a poetic work; *euepeia* is a standard term used by ancient literary critics (such as Dionysios of Halikarnassos) of elegant style in prose (Fowler *per litteras*, who suggests the comparison with *orthoepieia*: both words appear in Plato, *Phaedrus* 267C).

Commentary on T 2

This testimonium was added by Jacoby in the second edition of *FGrH* 1 (1957, A*10), but he had already discussed it in the first edition, *FGrH* 1A, 493-4; it has also been edited as

Pisander F 4 in E. Heitsch, *Die griechische Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit II* (Göttingen 1964), 2.45), and in M Davies (ed.), *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen 1988), Epicus Cyclus T 2.

Ioannes Philoponos, active in Alexandria in the first half of the sixth century CE, is the author of a series of commentaries on Aristotle. Here, Philoponos begins with a quote from the relevant passage of Aristotle, followed by a long digression on when and how epics can be a 'circle'; Philoponos considers that this is the case when they are composed in such a way that it is possible to begin from any one of the verses of the poem. The reference to Peisandros comes towards the end of this digression and closes it. See R. McKirahan, *Philoponus: on Aristotle Posterior Analytics 1.9-18* (London 2012), 56-7 and 128.

On the passage of Aristotle which underlies the commentary of Philoponos see M. Davies, 'Prolegomena and Paralegomena to a New Edition (with Commentary) of the Fragments of Early Greek Epic', *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, Philol.-histor. Kl. 2 (1986), 93-8, as well as J. Barnes, *Aristotle. Posterior Analytics²* (Oxford 1993), 152-3: Aristotle is here interested not in the epic cycle, but in paralogsms. Where Philoponos may have found his information is uncertain; the similarity with the wording of Macrobios (T 1) and especially of Zosimos check is at any rate striking.

Fragment 16 F 1

ID	16 F 1
Source	Pseudo-Apollodoros, <i>Library</i> 1.8.4-5, 74-5
Work mentioned	
Source date	uncertain
Source language	Greek
Source genre	genealogy; mythology, Greek; religion
Fragment subject	genealogy; mythology, Greek; religion
Textual base	Jacoby

Text

Ἄλθαίας δὲ ἀποθανούσης ἔγημεν Οἰνεὺς Περίβοιαν τὴν Ἴππονόου ... (1.8.5, 75) ...
ἐγεννήθη δὲ ἐκ ταύτης Οἰνεῖ Τυδεύς. Πείσανδρος δὲ αὐτὸν¹ ἐκ Γόργης γενέσθαι λέγει· τῆς
γὰρ θυγατρὸς Οἰνέα κατὰ τὴν βούλησιν Διὸς ἐρασθῆναι.

Translation

After Althaia's death Oineus married Periboia the daughter of Hipponoos ... (1.8.5, 75)
From her, Tydeus was born to Oineus. But Peisandros says that he was born from Gorge;
for Zeus willed it that Oineus should fall in love with his own daughter.

Critical Apparatus

1. αὐτὸν Heyne (1872): αὐτὴν codd.

Commentary on the text

Althaia was the wife of Oineus, king of Calydon; she is best known in connection with the hunt for the Calydonian boar and the death of her son Meleagros. In what immediately precedes, Pseudo-Apollodoros has narrated the events that led to Althaia's burning of the brand, the death of Meleagros, and the death of Althaia herself. He then proceeds to report variant traditions on whom Oineus married next. In this context he refers to the author of the *Thebaid* for a version in which Periboia was given to Oineus as a gift of honor after the sack of Olenos, and to Hesiod for a version in which Periboia, having been seduced by Hippostratos, son of Amarynkeus, was sent away from Olenos by her father Hipponous, with a request to Oineus to put her to death (this was a widespread story: Sophokles wrote a drama on this, and Diodoros of Sicily 4.35.1 ff. reports a version in which Periboia alleged that she was with child by Ares; Pseudo-Apollodoros also adds that according to some it was Oineus who seduced Periboia). Finally, Pseudo-Apollodoros refers to Peisandros for the story that Oineus committed incest with his daughter Gorge, out of which Tydeus was born.

There were further variants: slightly earlier in his work, Pseudo-Apollodoros, *Library* 1.8.1, 64 had stated that Gorge was indeed the daughter of Oineus by Althaia (so already in the *Ehoiai*, Hesiod F 25.17 M.-W.), but that she was given in marriage to Andraimon (so also Pausanias 10.38.5, who says that he saw the tomb of Andraimon in Amphissa and that Gorge was buried with him). An imaginary epitaph, part of a series on heroes of the Trojan war, names Thoas as the son of Gorge and Andraimon (pseudo-Aristotle F 640.23 Rose = *Anthologia graeca appendix, epigrammata sepulcralia* 75); and Homer, *Iliad* 2.638-42 names Thoas son of Andraimon as the leader of the Aetolian contingent, because Oineus has no sons left. Gorge and Deianira are mentioned in Antoninus Liberalis, *Metamorphoses* 2.7 as the only two daughters of Althaia who, thanks to the intercession of Dionysos, were not metamorphosed in birds (guinea hens) for their sorrow over Meleagros (T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore, MD 1993), 333-4).

That Tydeus was the son of either Gorge or Periboia is also stated by the scholiast (T) to Homer, *Iliad* 14.120 (γέγονε δὲ ὁ Τυδεὺς ἐκ Γόργης ἢ Περιβοΐας), in a lemma that interestingly is linked to 'the will of Zeus' (Ζεὺς ὁ τοὺς ἐμφυλίουσ ἐκδιώκων φόνους), just as in Pseudo-Apollodoros/Peisandros (the connection has been highlighted by C. Robert, *Oidipus, Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffes im griechischen Altertum* (Berlin 1915), 138-41, in a fascinating discussion in which he points at the connections of Gorge with Athena, as well as at the story in which Thyestes through the union with his daughter Pelopia gives birth to an avenger, Aigisthos, a story attested in Dion of Prusa, 60.6, in Hyginus, *Fabulae* 88, in Pseudo-Apollodoros, *Epitome* 2.14, in the scholia to Euripides *Orestes* 14, and in those to Plato, *Laws* 8, 839C). Slightly earlier, the scholiast (T) to Homer, *Iliad* 14.114 had recounted how Tydeus (here said to be the child of Oineus and Periboia daughter of Hippotes) killed his brothers Lykopes and Alkathoos who were conspiring against Oineus, and with them also, unwillingly, his paternal uncle Melas, and then had to leave for Argos.

The point of the variant concerning Tydeus's mother is unclear; Jacoby (*FGrH* 1A, 494) is certainly right in thinking that the incest must be somehow linked to the traditions on Tydeus's cannibalism. But he also rightly stresses that because of the shortness of the

notice it is impossible to decide whether this is a piece of very ancient lost epic lore, whether this information derives from tragedy, or whether we are faced with a piece of novelistic *kaine historia*. The Peisandros cited here as an authority is usually assumed to have been the Hellenistic mythographer; see Gantz, *Early Greek Myth*, 334. There are, however, no strong reasons for this: as L.C. Colella, 'Un Pisandro mitografo? Per una riconsiderazione di Pisander, *FGrHist* 16', *Incidenza dell'antico* 16(2018) 27 points out, interest in genealogies is expected in an archaic poem, and the fact that Deianeira was a daughter of Oineus (and thus sister of Gorge) provides a link of sorts with Herakles. Pseudo-Apollodoros might thus here preserve a fragment from the archaic poet. The larger context of the passage does not help in reaching a decision.

Commentary on F 1

The *Library* is a mythological handbook, credited to an Apollodoros (not the Alexandrian scholar Apollodoros of Athens), whose date is uncertain (proposals range from the first century BCE to the second or even the beginning of the third century CE). One of its peculiarities lies in the vast number of sources cited in support of the various versions: epic and lyric poets, tragedians, and prose authors, in particular fifth century mythographers such as Pherekydes and Akousilaos. See C. Meliadò, 'Mythography', in F. Montanari, S. Matthaios, A. Rengakos (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Leiden 2015), 1077-9; C. Higbie, 'Hellenistic mythographers', in R. Woodard (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Mythology* (Cambridge 2007), 243-5). A survey of scholarship on Pseudo-Apollodoros' *Library* is in M. Huys, '125 Years of Scholarship on Apollodoros the Mythographer: A Bibliographical Survey', *L'Antiquite Classique* 66 (1997), 319-51; see also the edition with commentary by P. Scarpi, *Apollodoro. I miti greci* (Milan 1996).

Fragment 16 F 2

ID	16 F 2
Source	Scholia (L+) on Apollonios of Rhodes <i>Argonautica</i> 1.152 (ed. Wendel)
Work mentioned	
Source date	various
Source language	Greek
Source genre	mythology, Greek; genealogy; etiology; etymology; geography, ancient; epic
Fragment subject	mythology, Greek; genealogy; etiology; etymology; geography, ancient; epic
Textual base	Jacoby

Text

Ἀρήνηθεν] Φερεκύδης τὴν μητέρα τῶν περὶ Ἴδαν¹ Ἀρήνην φησὶν, ἀφ' ἧς ἡ πόλις·
Πείσανδρος Πολυδώραν· Θεόκριτος Λαοκόωσαν. οὗτοι δὲ συνήκμασαν τοῖς Διοσκούροις.

Ἀρήνη δὲ πόλις Πελοποννήσου πλησίον Πύλου· καὶ Ὅμηρος· οἱ δὲ Πύλον τ' ἐνέμοντο καὶ Ἀρήνην ἐρατεινήν'.

Translation

From Arene] Pherekydes [BNJ 3 F 127] says that the mother of Idas and his brother was Arene, whence the name of the city. Peisandros says that it was Polydora; Theokritos [Idyll. 22.206] Laokoosa. These (the Apharetidai) flourished at the same time as the Dioskouroi. Arene is a city of the Peloponnesos close to Pylos; Homer [Iliad 2.591] mentions it too: 'Those who inhabited Pylos and the lovely Arene'.

Critical Apparatus

1 τῶν περὶ Ἴδαν] Λυγκέως καὶ Ἴδου P.

Commentary on the text

The scholia here comment on Apollonios' statement (at *Argonautika* 1.151-2) that the Apharetidai Idas and Lynkeus came from Arene (clearly a geographical name in Apollonios, but also obviously deriving from a woman). Peisandros is unique in giving the name of Polydora to the wife of Aphareus, mother of Idas and Lynkeus (just as Theokritos 22.206 is unique in calling her Laokoosa). He thus distances himself from the widely accepted tradition, reflecting the political relations between Sparta and Messenia, in which Aphareus, son of the Thessalian Perieres and of the Argive Gorgophone daughter of Perseus, married his half-sister Arene, daughter of the Spartan king Oibalos and of the above-mentioned Gorgophone (the first woman to have been married twice). Pseudo-Apollodoros, *Library* 3.10.3, 117, refers for the story to Stesichoros, F 227 PMG (D.L. Page (ed.) *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford 1962); see also Pausanias 4.2.4. For a discussion of the impact of these genealogies and their variants see C. Calame, 'Spartan Genealogies: The Mythological Representation of a Spatial Organisation', in J. Bremmer (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* (London 1987), 166-70 and 172-4; R. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography* II, *Commentary* (Oxford 2013), 422-3; and M. Davies, J.P. Finglass, *Stesichorus. The Poems* (Cambridge 2014), 574-5 (on F 287).

Peisandros need not have significantly modified the overall genealogical scheme: Polydora is a name frequent in Thessalian genealogies. In Pherekydes (BNJ 3 F 61a, BNJ 3 F 61b, with Jacoby *FGrH* 1A, 410), Polydora is a daughter of Peleus and sister of Achilles; the *Iliad* (16.173-8) and Hesiod (F 218 M-W) mention a Polydore daughter of Peleus, married to Boros, the son of Perieres (and thus brother of Aphareus), and mother of the Myrmidon Menestheus: see T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore, MD 1993), 227, as well as the ample discussion of P. Scarpi, *Apollodoro. I miti greci* (Milan 1996), 591. For Polydora's marriage with the son of Perieres, Boros, see also Pseudo-Apollodoros, *Library* 3.13.1, 163: this at any rate brings her close to the family of Aphareus.

The choice of Polydora over Arene as the mother of the Apharetidai is however not a purely mythographic variant. It may have a political point, since it avoids the rupture of social norms otherwise inherent in the marriage of Aphareus to his half-sister Arene (see again

for the larger context Calame, ‘Spartan Genealogies’, 166-74); moreover, making of the Thessalian Polydora the mother of the Apharetidai effectively severs any links of the twins with Arene, and thus by implication with Sparta, since Arene was the daughter of Oibalus king of Sparta.

The Peisandros mentioned here might equally well be the archaic epic poet or an Hellenistic mythographer (so also G. Lachenaud, *Scholies à Apollonios de Rhodes* (Paris 2010) 37 n.74), and it is unclear who the source is for the group of references (Peisandros the mythographer or some other later writer). The order in which the various authors are mentioned in the scholion (Pherekydes, Peisandros, Theokritos) cannot be taken as an argument for assuming that Peisandros here is the hellenistic mythographer: L.C. Colella, ‘Un Pisandro mitografo? Per una riconsiderazione di Pisander, *FGrHist 16*’, *Incidenza dell’antico* 16 (2018) 31-32 rightly points out that Pherekydes is mentioned first, because his version of the genealogy of the Apharetidai was closest to that followed by Apollonios. At the same time, she must acknowledge that there is no evident connection to Herakles; not only, it would be slightly surprising to see a poet from the Rhodian Kameiros emphasize a genealogy that favours the Thessalian and Messsenian element over the Spartan and Dorian one. It is worth noting in conclusion that the issue of the localization of Arene reappears elsewhere in the scholia to Apollonios (scholia on Apollonios Rhodios, *Argonautika* 1.471), with a further isolated remark on its change of name, attributed to Peisandros: see [F 3](#).

Commentary on F 2

The scholia to Apollonios Rhodios’ *Argonautika* go back to at least the first century BCE; on their transmission, direct and indirect, see E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Oxford 2007), 62-3. As Dickey points out, the edition C. Wendel, *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera* (Berlin, 1935), on which Jacoby’s text is based (and on which the text given above relies), foregrounds two of the three branches of the ‘direct’ transmission, L and A (from the main representatives, the Laurentianus XXXII 9, and the Ambrosianus B 98; hence the abbreviation L+, which covers these two branches, and the indirect tradition). The P tradition, whose main representative is the Parisinus 2727, preserves slightly different material; it can be consulted in G.H. Schaefer, *Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica*, ii (Leipzig 1813). For what concerns Peisander F 2, the P tradition offers, as commentary to *Argonautika* 1.152, the same information as A, in a slightly different order.

Fragment 16 F 3

ID	16 F 3
Source	Scholia (L+) on Apollonios of Rhodes <i>Argonautica</i> 1.471
Work mentioned	
Source date	various
Source language	Greek
Source genre	geography, ancient
Fragment subject	geography, ancient

Text

τοῖον μ' Ἀρήνη<θεν>] Ἀρήνη πόλις Πελοποννήσου· νῦν δὲ Ἔρανα¹ λέγεται, ὡς φησι Πείσανδρος.

Translation

Such me from Arene] Arene is a city of the Peloponnesos; now it is called Erana, as Peisandros says.

Critical Apparatus

1. Ἔρανα Heyne; Ἰέρανα codd.

Commentary on the text

Arene is mentioned in the *Iliad* (2.591; 11.723; also *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 422) as a city close to Pylos and part of the reign of Nestor. Its precise localisation was discussed: Stephanos of Byzantion, s.v. Ἀρήνη, states that there were two cities of this name, one to the north, in Triphylia, the other one more southerly, in Messenia; so also Eustathios of Thessalonica, *Commentary to the Iliad* 297.1 and 880.54-5. As E. Visser, *Homers Katalog der Schiffe* (Stuttgart and Leipzig 1997) 509–11 points out, this is probably a result of the uncertainties as to the localisation of Pylos itself.

Strabo 8.3.19, 346C knows of an Arene in Triphylia, which he proposes to identify with Samikon (see also Pausanias 5.6.2); this might correspond best to Homeric Arene (Il. 11.722–3). But he then also mentions an Erana close to Kyparissia, which one encounters when going southwards, towards the Messenian Pylos; this Erana ‘some (τινες) wrongly (οὐκ εὖ) think was in earlier times called Arenê, by the same name as the Pylian Arenê’ (Strab. 8.3, 23, 348C), a statement repeated at Strab. 8.4.6, 361C. A Messenian city Arene, founded by Aphareus and taking the name from his wife and sister of the same name, is also mentioned by Pausanias 4.2.4.

To this same context belongs the remark in Stephanos of Byzantion, s.v. Κυπαρισσία· πόλις τῆς Τριφυλίας, ἣ τις Ἔρανα ἐκαλεῖτο ‘Kyparissia. A city of Triphylia, which was called Eranna’ (see M. H. Hansen and T. H. Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford, 2004), n. 317; the further comment in Stephanos s.v. Κυπάρισσος, ‘Kyparissos’, is non-pertinent: cf. Hansen and Nielsen, *Inventory*, 405-6, and M. Billerbeck (ed.), *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica*, vol. III: K-O (Berlin – Boston 2014) 152-155).

This fragment is the cornerstone of the argument for the existence of a mythographer Peisandros: E. Bethe, *Thebanische Heldenlieder* (Leipzig 1891), 4 n. 10, was the first to argue that such a text could only derive from a scholar and not from a poetic work, an argument picked up by R. Keydell, ‘Die Dichter mit Namen Peisandros’, *Hermes* 70 (1935), 310. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, ‘Lesefrüchte’, *Hermes* 60 (1925), 283-4 (= *Kleine Schriften* 4 (Berlin 1962), 370-1) recognized that the reference to Erana spoke against a

very ancient work, since Erana was considered, at least by some, as the place of the ancient, but now disappeared, city of Arene; as a result, because this ruled out the archaic epic poet, Wilamowitz, with some discomfort, attributed the passage to Peisandros of Laranda. But attention to a change of name fits very well a Hellenistic mythographer (Jacoby, *FGrH* 1A, 545, calls attention to the $\nu\upsilon\nu$ typical of this kind of accounts; on *metonomasiai* in the Hellenistic period and after, see J.J. O'Hara, *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay* (Ann Arbor, MA 1996), 88-91; N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid VII: A Commentary* (Leiden 2000), 282-3, 504); it might also fit an early logographer, since attention to changes of name is documented for them (see, e.g., *BNJ* 4 F 77; detailed argument in C. Robert, *Oidipus, Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffs im griechischen Altertum* 3 (Berlin 1915), 64). Peisandros might be one of the $\tau\iota\nu\epsilon\varsigma$, 'some', to which Strabo alludes in the passage quoted above. This fragment must have been closely connected to the preceding one (F 2). It remains the case that it is difficult to decide between a prose work and a poetic work: as stressed by F. Vian, *Recherches sur les Posthomerica de Quintus de Smyrne* (Paris 1959), 99-100, and again by L.C. Colella, 'Un Pisandro mitografo? Per una riconsiderazione di Pisander, *FGrHist* 16', *Incidenza dell'antico* 16 (2018), 33, poets, and Hellenistic poets in particular, were also interested in *metonomasiai*.

Commentary on F 3

On the scholia to Apollonios of Rhodos' *Argonautika* see above, Commentary on F 2; in this case too, P conveys the same information in a slightly different way.

Fragment 16 F 4a

ID	16 F 4a
Source	Scholia (L+) on Apollonios of Rhodes <i>Argonautica</i> 1.1195-6
Work mentioned	
Source date	various
Source language	Greek
Source genre	mythology, Greek
Fragment subject	mythology, Greek
Textual base	Jacoby

Text

χαλκοβαρεῖ ῥοπάλωι] ... τῶι ἰσχυρῶι, ἢ τῶι πρὸς τῶι τέλει χαλκῶι βεβαρημένωι.
Πείσανδρος δέ φησι χαλκοῦν εἶναι τὸ ῥόπαλον Ἑρακλέους.

Translation

With the bronze-heavy club]... because of its strength, or made heavy at the extremity with bronze. But Peisandros says that the club of Herakles was made of bronze.

Critical Apparatus

Πείσανδρος δὲ ὀλόχαλκον εἶναί φησι τὸ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους ῥόπαλον ('But Peisandros says that Herakles' club was entirely of bronze'), P

Commentary on the text

The scholiast addresses here the meaning of the attribute *chalkobares*, given to Herakles' club by Apollonios: is the club so characterized because it was very solid? Because it had a bronze tip (in Apollonios, Herakles' club is made of olive wood, *Argonautica* 4.1438–40)? Or was it made entirely of bronze, as Peisandros says? The scholion taps here into existing discussions on the type of weapon typical of Herakles. Specifically while in the earliest images of Herakles we have he wields a sword, in the seventh century BCE he appears more and more as an archer

Because Peisandros of Kameiros wrote a *Herakleia*, we might have here a reference to the archaic epic poet (so already U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, 'Lesefrüchte', *Hermes* 60 (1925), 280-4 = *Kleine Schriften* 4 (Berlin 1962), 368-71). Not only: the *Suda*, π 1465, s.v. Πείσανδρος, talking of the archaic epic poet, affirms that 'he was the first to give Herakles a club' (πρῶτος Ἡρακλεῖ ῥόπαλον περιτέθεικε), using the same term, *rhopalon*, as the fragment here quoted. Furthermore, Strabo 15.1.9 states that 'the attire of Herakles is much later than the records of the Trojan War, being a fabrication of the authors of the *Herakleia*, whether the author was Peisandros or someone else', a passage usually taken to refer to the archaic epic poet from Kameiros (so A. Bernabé (ed.), *Poetae Epici Graeci* 1 (Leipzig 1987), Pisander F 1; M. Davies (ed.), *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen 1988), Pisander F 1/2; M.L. West (ed.), *Greek Epic Fragments* (Cambridge, MA 2003), Pisander F 1). Clearly, the *Herakleia* of Peisandros was remembered as distinctive in respect to Herakles's equipment, in particular concerning the club. For this reason, Davies, *EGF* 131, prints the text of the scholiast to Apollonios Rhodios together with his fragment Pisander F 1; Bernabé, *PEG* 1, gives it as Pisander *Fragmentum dubium* 13 (note, however, that West, *Greek Epic Fragments*, omits it).

The portrayal of Herakles did indeed undergo remarkable changes during the archaic period: more precisely, to the early image of a sword-carrying archer hero were added the lionskin and the club of the hunter. See P. Brize, 'Samos und Stesichoros. Zu einem früharchaischen Bronzeblech', *MDAIA* 100 (1985), 86-9 and B. Cohen, 'From Bowman to Clubman: Herakles and Olympia', *The Art Bulletin* 76.4 (1994) 695-715 for the iconography; recent focused discussion, including the names used for the club, in G. Ucciardello, 'P.Berol. 17071: frammenti esametrici su Eracle?', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 55.2 (2009) 482-3, for whom this fragment belongs to the archaic epic poet and who offers at 485-6 important remarks on Hellenistic epic poems on Herakles; and G. Ucciardello, 'Su alcuni frammenti papiracei in esametri relativi a Eracle e Perseo', in E. Cingano (ed.), *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali: generi poetici e storiografia in Grecia* (Alessandria 2010), 329-384, and in particular 338, 348-52.

For his part, Jacoby, *FGrH* 1A, 494 sees in the bronze club described here a compromise, typical of a Hellenistic mythographer, between a Herakles equipped as a hoplite

(described, e.g., in Sophokles *Philoktetes* 726: χάλκασπις ἀνήρ), and the hero armed with a wooden club described by Strabo/Peisandros of Kameiros in the passage mentioned above, or by Stesichoros in a passage that is part of a long excursus by Athenaios (Athenaios 12.512E-513A = *PMG* 52). This excursus, which goes back to Megakleides, the author of a work on Homer active around circa 300 BCE, shows at any rate that there was at the time a lively discussion as to what kind of weaponry was appropriate for Herakles (and according to R. Janko, *Philodemus: On Poems, Book 1* (Oxford 2000), 142, one of the butts of Megakleides's criticisms might have been indeed the epic poet Peisandros from Kameiros: Megakleides discusses warm baths, and a fragment of Peisandros states that Athena made warm baths for Herakles at the Thermopylae, Bernabé, *PEG*, Pisander F 7= Davies *EGF*, F 9). Note also that in the catalogue of gifts that the gods gave to Herakles because of his achievements (Diodoros of Sicily 4.14.3, an account based on the work of the rhetorician Matris, *BNJ* 39, active possibly already in the fourth, but more probably in the third century BC), Hephaistos gives the hero at the same time a club and a coat of mail.

A final decision is difficult (moreover, both the passage of Strabo and that of Athenaios present internal difficulties). Peisandros of Kamiros certainly discussed the club of Herakles, and he may have stated that the club was entirely in bronze (so Ucciardello, 'P.Berol. 17071: frammenti esametrici su Eracle?', 482-3, who points out that a ῥόπαλον παγγάλκεον, a club entirely in bronze, is mentioned already for Orion in *Odyssey* 11.575; see also L.C. Colella, 'Un Pisandro mitografo? Per una riconsiderazione di Pisander, *FGrHist* 16', *Incidenza dell'antico* 16 (2018), 28). While it is possible that a mythographer named Peisandros (or naming himself Peisandros), contemporary or slightly later than Megakleides, discussed the topic, a final decision will depend on the evaluation of the group of references to Peisandros in the scholia to Apollonios Rhodios. Indeed, the main reason for attributing this fragment to the prose mythographer is the fact that its source is a scholiast to Apollonios Rhodios and that an argument may be advanced that all references to a Peisandros in the scholia to Apollonios Rhodios belong to the same Peisandros, the mythographer.

Commentary on F 4a

On the scholia to Apollonios of Rhodos' *Argonautika* see above, Commentary on F 2. The term ὀλόχαλκον, used in the P branch of the scholia to Apollonios' *Argonautika* 1.1196, to indicate that the club of Herakles was entirely in bronze, is very rare: according to the *TLG*, it is only found in the *scholia vetera* (and in the *scholia recentiora*) to Euripides' *Phoenician Women*, at v. 114 for a door covered with leaves of bronze in such a way as to appear as if entirely of bronze (in comment on the expression χαλκόδετ' ἄρ' ἔμβολα, 'bronze bolts'), and at v. 121 as an explanation for πάγγαλκον ἀσπίδ', a shield 'entirely in bronze'; then twice in Digenis Acritas, 1.113 and 1.115, and once in the *Historia Monachorum in Aegypto* 23.12 (the life of Makarios).

Fragment 16 F 4b

ID	16 F 4b
----	---------

Source	Natalis Comes, <i>Mythologiae</i> 7.1
Work mentioned	
Source date	16th century CE
Source language	Latin
Source genre	mythology, Greek
Fragment subject	mythology, Greek
Textual base	<i>Natalis Comitum Mythologiae libri decem</i> , Venetiis 1581

Text

In hunc Hercules multas sagittas frustra coniecit, neque laesit omnino: mox cum ad clavam ventum esset[, quae multo ferro erat gravis: ut Sokrates scripsit ad Idotheum, ut vero sensit Pisander, tota erat ferrea]¹: et illa crebris verberibus comminuitur.

Translation

Herakles threw many arrows against the animal without results, nor did he wound him at all; then he switched to the club [which was heavy with iron, as Sokrates wrote to Idotheus; in fact Pisander claimed that the whole club was made of iron]; but it, too, was going to pieces under the frequent blows.

Critical Apparatus

1. Quae multo.... ferrea: the sentence was absent from the first edition of the *Mythologiae* (Venice 1568) it was added in the following editions.

Commentary on the text

Natale Conti is here narrating the fight of Herakles with the Lion of Kithairon. This is not one of the canonical labours, but a deed accomplished when the hero was still only eighteen (so Pseudo-Apollodoros, *Library* 2.4.9-10, who keeps this story separate from that of the lion of Nemea; according to Pausanias 1.41.3, it was Alcathous son of Pelops who killed the lion of Kithairon; discussion of the story and sources in T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore, MD 1993), 379). Conti assimilates the story of the lion of Kithairon to that of the lion of Nemea: the skin of the lion is invulnerable, and once Herakles realizes that his weapons are useless and that his club is being worn out by the blows, he strangles the animal.

Commentary on F 4b

This fragment is absent from Jacoby *FGrH*; it comes from Natalis Comes's work on mythology. In Book 7 of his *Mythologiae sive explicationis fabularum libri decem* (Venice 1567), Natale Conti narrated the story of Herakles's labours; in the second, expanded edition (Venice 1581, Frankfurt 1581), he added the detail that the club was made of iron, and gave as references Sokrates and Peisandros (R.M. Iglesias Montiel and M.C. Álvarez Morán, *Natale Conti. «Mitología»* (Murcia 1988) 483, put this part within brackets, to signal

that it is an addition that appears only from 1581 onwards; they however mistranslate the sentence, suggesting that ‘gracias a ella lo debilitó’, ‘thanks to the club he wearied the lion’). Clearly Conti must have come across F 4 (he had a very good knowledge of the scholia to Apollonios Rhodios: see R.M. Iglesias Montiel and M.C. Álvarez Morán, ‘Escolios griegos en la *Mythologia* de Natale Conti’, in F. Dominguez Dominguez (ed.), *Humanae Litterae. Estudios de humanismo y tradicion clasica en homenaje al profesor Gaspar Morocho Gayo* (León 2004), 241-50) and he decided to insert the reference to an iron club in the part of his work dealing with the first of Herakles’s labours, the combat with the lion of Kithairon (J. Mulryan and S. Brown, *Natale Conti’s Mythologiae* (Tempe, AZ 2006), 570 n. 12, correctly refer for Peisandros to *FGrH* 16 F 4). Conti then added as sources for the information Peisandros and the *Against Eidotheos* of Sokrates of Argos (*BNJ* 310 F 15), also mentioned in the scholia to Apollonios Rhodios, just a few paragraphs later, at v. 1.1207b, but on a different issue: not the club, but the fact that Hylas was the lover of Polyphemos and not Herakles. It is worth noting that there are quite a few references to Herakles in the surviving fragments of Sokrates of Argos, but none to his club.

Conti’s mention of Peisandros offers a window on Conti’s way of working. His reference to Peisandros for the bronze club is indeed correct, but for the detail of iron instead of bronze, which may be a slip; but the further reference, in the same context, to Sokrates Scholastikos’s *To Eidotheos*, is problematic. The script *To Eidotheos* is mentioned twice in all of Greek literature: in a comment of the scholiast to Apollonios Rhodios 1.1207b, which states that Hylas was the beloved not of Herakles but of Polyphemos (Sokrates of Argos, [BNJ310 F 15](#); the reference in Mulryan and Brown, *Natale Conti’s Mythologiae*, 570 n. 11 is misleading); and in the *Suda*, χ 296 $\chi\acute{\iota}\lambda\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\nu$ (= *FGrH* 310 F 16), which refers to Sokrates’s *To Eidotheos* in the context of a discussion of music. Neither of these two passages may be understood as concerning a club with bronze, although one of them does mention Herakles. That Natale Conti got the name of the author and the title of the work out of the *scholia* to Apollonios Rhodios seems, however, almost inevitable, in view of the fact that both Peisandros and Sokrates are not very often mentioned in ancient literature, and that the *To Eidotheos* in particular is mentioned only here (only a few sentences after the scholiast has mentioned Peisandros) and in the *Suda*. This means that in the second version of the *Mythologiae*, Natale Conti added to his text an incorrect reference to Sokrates’s work *To Eidotheos* and a correct reference to Peisandros. This is part of a larger pattern of dubious sources citations added to the second edition of the *Mythologiae*; for more on Natale Conti and source citations, see [BNJ 23 F 1b](#), [BNJ 23 F 1c](#), and [BNJ 23 F 1d](#).

Fragment 16 F 5

ID	16 F 5
Source	Scholia (L+) on Apollonios of Rhodes <i>Argonautica</i> 2.98
Work mentioned	
Source date	various
Source language	Greek
Source genre	mythology, Greek; sports
Fragment subject	mythology, Greek; sports

Text

οὐδ' ἄρα Βέβρυκες] Ἀπολλώνιος μὲν ἐμφαίνει ὡς ἀνηριημένον τὸν Ἄμυκον. Ἐπίχαρμος δὲ καὶ Πείσανδρος φασιν ὅτι ἔδησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Πολυδεύκης. Δηίλοχος¹ δὲ ἐν πρώτῳ Περὶ Κυζίκου καταπυκτευθῆναι φησιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ Πολυδεύκου.

Translation

And nor the Bebrykes] Apollonios shows that Amykos was killed. But Epicharmos [F 7 K.-A.] and Peisandros affirm that Polydeukes bound him. And Deilochos in his first book *On Kyzikos* [BNJ 471 F 1] says that he was conquered in boxing by Polydeukes.

Critical Apparatus

1. Δηίλοχος L, V, Jacoby; Δηίλοχος Wendel.

Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι Ἀπολλώνιος μὲν ἀναιρεθῆναι φησὶ τὸν Ἄμυκον ὑπὸ τοῦ Πολυδεύκου Ἐπίχαρμος δὲ καὶ Πείσανδρος δεθῆναι. Δείλοχος δὲ ἐν α τῶν περὶ Κυζίκου καταπυκτευθῆναι μόνον φησὶ. P (on Apoll. Rh. 2.106)

Commentary on the text

Apollonios Rhodios narrates the fight between Amykos (a son of Poseidon and king of the Bebrykes) and Polydeukes in his *Argonautika* 2.88-97; in that narrative, Amykos dies as a result of a blow. And death is also the conclusion of most of the late accounts of the story (Valerius Flaccus 4.99-343; Pseudo-Apollodoros, *Library* 1.9.20, 119; Hyginus, C. Iulius, *Fabulae* 17). But other endings were known: in Epicharmos (F 7 K.-A.) Amykos was bound by Polydeukes; this was probably also the case in Sophokles, who wrote a homonymous satyr-play (cf. F 111 and 112 R. (S. Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* 4 (Göttingen 1977))); in Theokritos 22.109-30, too, the defeated Amykos surrenders. A similar dénouement is also attested by a number of images on vases, from ca. 420 BCE to 320 BCE (see T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore, MD 1993), 439; G. Beckel, s.v. Amykos, LIMC nos. 4-10). As R. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography* II, *Commentary* (Oxford 2013), 220 points out, the comic possibilities of such a situation are obvious. It is unclear what ending the wording of Deilochos exactly implies; as the three authors cited in the scholion are contrasted to the version of Apollonios, death is unlikely (Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography* II, 220, 647). Thus, death seems to have entered the story at a later moment.

If this is correct, then Peisandros here is aligning himself with the most ancient accounts. This may have been a choice of the mythographer (just as in Theokritos, too, Amykos does not die). If this passage goes back to Peisandros the mythographer, then he may have mentioned in his narrative Epicharmos, whose version of the events is also known from Photios, the *Etymologicum genuinum*, and the *Suda* (see Epicharmos F 7 K.-A.). Jacoby's theory of a pseudepigraphical work in prose summarizing and expanding on the epic

poems of Peisandros (see discussion above, under [T 1](#), and in the Biographical Essay), would account for the situation perfectly.

But it is also possible that the scholiast refers here to the epic poet. The episode concerning Amykos might have been mentioned in the *Herakleia*, for it is closely juxtaposed to a story concerning Herakles in the *Argonautika*: one of the heroes mentions Herakles and what he might have done had he been present (Apollonios Rhodios, *Argonautika* 2.145-53); Herakles is again explicitly recalled by Lykos, lord of the Mariandynians and enemy of the Bebrykes (Apollonios Rhodios, *Argonautika* 2.752ff.)

As for Dei(l)ochos, he was active at the latest in the first half of the fourth century BCE (so Jacoby, *FGrH* 3B, Text, 370), but possibly already before the Peloponnesian War (so Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *On Thucydides* 5.1; see R. Fowler, 'Herodotos and his Contemporaries', *JHS* 116 (1996), 63-4, and Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography* II, 647). He is mentioned some nine times in the scholia to Apollonios, and never, but for this passage, in connection with Peisandros.

Commentary on F 5

On the scholia to Apollonios of Rhodes' *Argonautika* see above, Commentary on F 2. As often, P presents a slightly differently worded version, as a commentary to v. 106 (rather than 98); but the main points are the same.

Fragment 16 F 6

ID	16 F 6
Source	Scholia (L+) on Apollonios of Rhodes <i>Argonautika</i> 2.1088-89
Work mentioned	
Source date	various
Source language	Greek
Source genre	mythology, Greek; animals
Fragment subject	mythology, Greek; animals
Textual base	C. Wendel , <i>Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera</i> , Berlin, 1935.

Text

ὡς πυκινὰ πτερά] χαλάζης πυκνότερα ἐφίεσαν αὐτοῖς πτερά, φεύγοντες διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης. πιθανῶς δὲ ὁ Πείσανδρος τοὺς ὄρνιθας φησιν εἰς Σκυθίαν ἀποπτῆναι, ὅθεν καὶ ἐληλύθεσαν.

Translation

Thus dense feathers] They shot at them feathers denser than hail, fleeing across the sea. But Peisandros plausibly states that the birds flew towards Skythia, whence they had come.

Critical Apparatus

Commentary on the text

The context is the arrival of the Argonauts to the island of Ares, inhabited by terrible birds whose feathers serve as arrows: the scholiast is here commenting on a simile meant to illustrate, through a comparison with a hailstorm, the thickness of the feather-arrows sent over the Argonauts by the birds, as they fly off from the island 'towards the mountains of the land on the opposite side' (Apollonios of Rhodes, *Argonautika* 2.1089). It is the birds' flight away from the Argonauts towards the sea that the scholiast is commenting upon; he then adds that according to Peisandros, the arrow-feathered birds went back to Skythia, whence they had come.

The question is, which one of the authors called Peisandros said this, and in what context. The driving away of the birds by the Argonauts in Apollonios Rhodios is explicitly modelled by one of the Argonauts, Amphidamas, on Herakles' fight against similar birds living on the Stymphalian Lake in Arcadia (Apollonios Rhodios, *Argonautika* 1052-7). This has implications for the authorship of our fragment, because Pausanias 8.22.4 cites Peisandros of Kameiros (i.e., the old epic poet) as authority for the fact that Herakles did not kill the Stymphalian birds, as stated in most accounts:

ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ ὕδατι τῷ ἐν Στυμφάλῳ κατέχει λόγος ὄρνιθᾶς ποτε ἀνδροφάγους ἐπ' αὐτῷ τραφῆναι· ταύτας κατατοξεῦσαι τὰς ὄρνιθας Ἡρακλῆς λέγεται. Πείσανδρος δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Καμειρεὺς ἀποκτεῖναι τὰς ὄρνιθας οὐ φησιν, ἀλλὰ ὡς ψόφῳ κροτάλων ἐκδιώξειεν αὐτάς.

There is a story current about the water of the Stymphalos, that at one time man-eating birds bred on it, which Herakles is said to have shot down. Peisander of Kameiros, however, says that Herakles did not kill the birds but drove them away with the noise of rattles. (Pisander F 4 *PEG* = F 5 *EGF* = 4 West).

Peisandros of Kameiros had then narrated in his *Herakleia* the labour of the Stymphalian birds. For this reason, M. Davies (ed.), *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen 1988), 132, prints the text of the scholiast to Apollonios Rhodios together with his Pisander F 5; A. Bernabé (ed.), *Poetae Epici Graeci* 1 (Leipzig 1987), prints it as Pisander F 14 *dubium*. If this fragment is indeed to be attributed to Peisandros the epic poet, it becomes necessary to rethink the argument that all the references to Peisandros in the scholia to Apollonios go back to the mythographer (see also, above, on F 4). But the story of the Stymphalian birds occurs also in Pherekydes *BNJ* 3 F 72 and in Hellanikos *BNJ* 4 F 104 (in these authors, [Herakles killed the birds, using the rattle to startle them](#)); this means that it was widely known (for other attestations see T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore, MD 1993), 393-4). Furthermore, arrow-feathered birds, not explicitly linked to Herakles and Stymphalos, had been located somewhere on the way to Colchis already in Euripides's *Phrixos*, F 838 K. (R. Kannicht (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* 5 (Göttingen 2004)).

Thus, even though Peisandros the archaic epic poet certainly narrated the story, the scholiast might here have been thinking of a mythographer, all the more since it is not evident that the passage of Peisandros, cited by the scholiast in contrast to the text of

Apollonios, refers to the Stymphalian birds: the equation between the Stymphalian birds and those of the island of Ares, taken for granted in the scholion to Apollonios Rhodios, *Argonautika*, 382-85a ('the island is called Aretias; in that island were the birds of Stymphalos, chased away from the Arcadian city by Herakles'), is in fact extremely uncertain (see Gantz, *Early Greek Myth*, 393-4, as well as 358). The mention of Skythia as the place of origin of the birds, to which they return, is also more appropriate to the arrow-shooting birds of the island of Ares than to those of Stymphalos. So this may indeed be a fragment from the Hellenistic mythographer Peisandros, and it may concern the birds of the island of Ares rather than those of Stymphalos.

Commentary on F 6

On the scholia to Apollonios of Rhodos' *Argonautika* see above, Commentary on F 2.

Fragment 16 F 7

ID	16 F 7
Source	Scholia (L+) on Apollonios of Rhodes <i>Argonautica</i> 4.57
Work mentioned	
Source date	various
Source language	Greek
Source genre	mythology, Greek; genealogy; epicreligion
Fragment subject	mythology, Greek; genealogy; epicreligion
Textual base	Jacoby

Text

τὸν δὲ Ἐνδυμίωνα Ἡσίοδος μὲν¹ Ἀεθλίου τοῦ Διὸς καὶ Καλύκης παῖδα λέγει², παρὰ Διὸς εἰληφότα τὸ δῶρον ἴν αὐτῶι³ ταμίαν εἶναι θανάτου, ὅτε θέλοι ὀλέσθαι⁴· καὶ Πείσανδρος⁵ καὶ Ἀκουσίλαος καὶ Φερεκύδης καὶ Νίκανδρος ἐν δευτέρωι Αἰτωλικῶν καὶ Θεόπομπος ὁ ἔποποιός.

Translation

Hesiod [F 245 M-W] says that Endymion is the son of Aethlios the son of Zeus and Kalyke, and that he received from Zeus the gift of being able to choose the moment of his own death; so also Peisandros and Akousilaos [*BNJ* 2 F 36] and Pherekydes [*BNJ* 3 F 121] and Nikandros in the second book of his *Aitolika* [*BNJ* 271-272 F 6], as well as Theopompos the epic poet [*SH* 765].

Critical Apparatus

1. τὸν δὲ Ἐνδυμίωνα υἱὸν φασιν εἶναι Ἀεθλίου A
2. παῖδα λέγει F (editio princeps Florentiae impressa, Schaefer, Jacoby); εἶναι παῖδα P (Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography* I) ; om. L (Wendel)

3. ἴν αὐτῶι Rzach, ex Apoll. Dysc. De pron. 82, 21 Schn.; ἴν αὐτῶι Bast *Greg. Cor. rec. Schaefer 1811, 84*; ἐν αὐτῶι LP; ἑαυτῶι A; εἰληφότα δῶρον, αὐτὸν F

4. θέλοι: μέλλοι Ps. Eudok. 256, 17 Fl

5. ὀλέσθαι: ἐλέσθαι A.

6. Jacoby; ὀλέσθαι <...> καὶ lacunam postulavit Wendel; καὶ Πείσανδρος δὲ τὰ αὐτά φησι P.

Commentary

Out of the numerous divergent accounts of the story of Endymion, two main strands can be singled out: one revolving around Mount Latmos in Karia (cf. the epigraphic hymn in lyric verse found at Herakleia on the Latmos, discussed by L. Robert, *BCH* 102 (1978), 483-9, or *I. Magnesia* 17, 46-51), and one mainly based in Elis (see M. Hirschberger, *Gynaikōn Katalogos und Megalai Ēhoiai: Ein Kommentar zu den Fragmenten zweier hesiodeischer Epen* (Leipzig 2004), 189; G. Maddoli and V. Saladino, *Pausania. Guida della Grecia V: l'Elide e Olimpia* (Milan 1995), 184; R. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography II, Commentary* (Oxford 2013), 133-4).

The fragment of Peisandros is part of a long, learned scholion. In what precedes, the scholiast has narrated the story of the love of Selene, the Moon, for Endymion, and her visits to the cave on Mount Latmos in Karia where Endymion lived, citing for this Sappho (F 199 L-P = 199 V) and Nikandros in the second book of his *Europeia* (F 24 Gow-Scholfield, *BNJ* 271-272 F 18). (The connection with Karia is also present in Apollonios Rhodios *Argonautica* 4.57-58; pseudo-Theokritos, *Idyll* 20.37-9; Kallimachos, mediated through Catullus 66.5-6; Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 1.38.92; Ovid, *Heroides* 18.61-5; Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 3.83; Ovid, *Tristia* 2.299; and Lucian, *Dialogues of the Gods* 19). In this version, the gift of Zeus to Endymion, to sleep, ageless, forever, is probably to be understood in some sort of connection with the love of Selene.

The scholiast then moves to a different strand of tradition, stressing the connections of Endymion with both Elis and Aitolia. It is in this context that he refers to Peisandros. Endymion is here the son of Aethlios and of Kalyke, daughter of Aiolos, and the father of Aitolos. This is the commonly accepted genealogy, although there are variants, relatively unimportant, since they remain within the Aitolian context: thus Pseudo-Apollodoros, *Library* 1.7.5, 56 gives the genealogy just discussed, but adds that some thought that Endymion was the son of Zeus; Conon, *Narrations* 14 makes of him the son of Aethlios son of Zeus and Protogeneia daughter of Deukalion rather than of Kalyke. For Pausanias 5.1.3, it is Aethlios who is the son of Protogeneia and Zeus, but at 5.8.2 the same Pausanias mentions another tradition, according to which Aethlios was the son of Aiolos. The main point of dispute, in this genealogical construction, lies in whether the Aitolians should be considered as descendants of the Eleans (so for instance Ephoros, *BNJ* 70 F 122 = Strabo 10.3.2) or not, as in Nikander; see Jacoby, *Kommentar FGGrH* 3A, 241. Interestingly, there is no mention of eternal sleep here, but of a gift, to choose the moment of his death. It may be that the eternal sleep was the consequence of Endymion's refusal to set a moment for his death.

This opens the question of whether Endymion's eternal sleep was a gift or rather a punishment for his impiety. The same scholiast to Apollonios Rhodios 4.57-58 refers to Hesiod's *Megalai Ehoiai* F 260 M-W and to Epimenides, *BNJ 457 F 10*, for the variant according to which Endymion was accepted among the gods but then fell in love with Hera and was punished with eternal sleep (discussion of the various versions in T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore, MD 1993), 35-6).

The mention of Peisandros here is not sufficient to establish his position in the matter; nor is it possible to be certain of the identity of this Peisandros. He is mentioned immediately after Hesiod, so we could have here a reference to the archaic epic poet (the statement 'omittit Kinkel' against the name of Peisandros in Akousilaos *FGrH 2 F 36* shows that Jacoby was then thinking of the epic poet; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, 'Lesefrüchte', *Hermes* 60 (1925), 283, also thought that the order in which the authors here are cited pointed to the archaic poet). L.C. Colella, 'Un Pisandro mitografo? Per una riconsiderazione di Pisander, *FGrHist 16*', *Incidenza dell'antico* 16 (2018), 30-31 further notes that the cave of Endymion at mount Latmos was located very close to the city of Herakleia (Λάτμος ὄρος Καρίας, ἔνθα ἔστιν ἄντρον, ἐν ᾧ διέτριβεν Ἐνδυμίων. ἔστι δὲ καὶ πόλις ἢ λεχθεῖσα Ἡράκλεια.) Thus, mention of the city of Herakleia and Herakles might have prompted a digression on Endymion, if we want to think of the *Herakleia* of Peisandros of Kameiros; or the topic might have been touched in one of the spurious poems attributed to Peisandros (the fact that Herakles and Endymion were both accepted among the gods is a further point of contact between the two: Endymion might have been mentioned in a comparison).

Peisandros's name appears, possibly after a lacuna, immediately after Hesiod and before two early prose-writers, followed by two authors of the Hellenistic period, the last one an epic poet. We would thus have here an ordered succession of two epic poets, Hesiod and Peisandros of Kameiros, then two prose-writers of the classical period, and finally two authors of the Hellenistic period. The alternative requires separating the reference to Hesiod from the rest, assuming that this is a Zitatennest rather than a series of independent references, and considering Peisandros the mythographer as the ultimate source from which this information was culled.

Commentary on the text

The text given above follows that of Jacoby; there are a number of small differences in the various strands of the tradition (besides Wendel's and Schaefer's editions of the scholia to Apollonios, C. Wendel, *Die Überlieferung der Scholien zu Apollonios von Rhodos* (Berlin 1932), 32 should be consulted; more generally on the tradition of the scholia to Apollonios Rhodios see above, Commentary to F 2). It is in particular worth noting that Wendel, in his edition of the scholia to Apollonios Rhodios, postulated the existence of a lacuna towards the end of the passage, between the reference to Hesiod and all the others. But even if we posit a lacuna, we need not suppose that Peisandros, Akousilaos, Pherekydes, Nikandros, and Theopompos narrated a different version (a simple verb of saying might fit the bill, as in the Parisinus 2727).

Fragment 16 F 8

ID	16 F 8
Source	Scholia (L+) on Apollonios of Rhodes <i>Argonautica</i> 4.1396
Work mentioned	
Source date	various
Source language	Greek
Source genre	mythology, Greek; genealogy
Fragment subject	mythology, Greek; genealogy
Textual base	C. Wendel, <i>Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera</i> , Berlin, 1935.

Text

Ἴξον δ' ἱερὸν πέδον, ὧν ἔνι Λάδων εἰσέτι που χθιζὸν παγχρύσεια ῥύετο μῆλα] Πείσανδρος τὸν δράκοντα ὑπέλιφεν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς γεγενῆσθαι, Ἡσίοδος δὲ <...>¹ ἐκ Τυφῶνός φησιν.

Translation

They reached the sacred plain, in which Ladon until yesterday kept watch over the golden apples] Peisandros accepted that the serpent was born of the earth, but Hesiod <[F spurium 391 M-W]> says he was born of Typhon.

Critical Apparatus

1. Wendel; Ἡσίοδος <δὲ ἐκ Κητοῦς καὶ Φόρκυος, Φερεκύδης> δὲ ἐκ Τυφῶνός Wendel, in apparatus (so also Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography* I, Pherecydes F 16b, in apparatus: *'fortasse recte'*); Ἡσίοδος δὲ ἐκ Τυφῶνός Jacoby.

Commentary on the text

The genealogy of the serpent who guarded the golden apples was disputed. In Hesiod, *Theogony* 333, the serpent, unnamed, is the son of Keto and Phorkys. Our fragment appears to contradict this, naming Hesiodos as authority for the birth of Ladon from Typhon; on this basis Rzach supposed that a different genealogy appeared in another, now lost, work of Hesiod, and printed the passage as *fragmentum dubium* 249 (A. Rzach, *Hesiodi carmina* (Lipsiae 1908). Jacoby followed Rzach in his decision to accept the text of the scholiast without intervention. However, Wendel's hypothesis of a lacuna here, in which the birth from Keto and Phorkys would have appeared, followed by the name of another, different authority for the birth from Typhon, is convincing; indeed, all recent editions of Hesiod's fragments either omit this passage, or label it as spurium.

Who was the authority cited in the scholium for the birth of Ladon/the serpent from Typhon? Pseudo-Apollodoros, *Library*, 2.5.11, 113 and Hyginus, C. Iulius, *Fabulae* 151 give as his parents Typhoeus and Echidna, a genealogy which is mentioned, with specific attribution to Pherekydes (Jacoby, *FGrH* 3 F 16a, b and 17 = *BNJ* 3F 16a, b and 17), a few lines later in the P scholia to Apollonios Rhodios, *Argonautica* 4.1396, as well as in the L+

scholia – hence Wendel’s proposal to restore the name of Pherekydes in the lacuna. For his part, Ptolemy Chennos (Photios, *Bibliothēke* 190) made of the serpent guarding the golden apples (whom he does not name) the brother of the lion of Nemea. Finally, in Apollonios Rhodios the serpent is born of the soil (Ap. Rhod. 4.1398: χθόνιος ὄφις), as in Peisandros, and his name Ladon, attested here for the first time, is possibly to be associated with the similar-sounding name of the river of Euesperides, Lathon or Lethon, in turn possibly linked to Lethe (Strabo 17.3.20, C836; cf. P. Green, *The Argonautika*² (Berkeley, CA 2007), 345-6, with further references; R. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography II, Commentary* (Oxford 2013), 28 and n. 97).

There are two possible contexts for a mention of the serpent guardian of the golden apples: the wedding of Zeus and Hera, when the golden apples were first created (cf. Pherekydes, [BNJ 3 F 16](#)), or the labours of Herakles (the eleventh being to bring the apples back from the garden of the Hesperides). The first is an appropriate theme for the Hellenistic mythographer; moreover, if we accept that [T 1](#) may refer to Peisandros the mythographer, then according to Macrobius Ambrosius Theodosius his work began exactly with the wedding of Zeus and Hera (note, however, that most likely Macrobius here is introducing in the discussion information that is pertinent to Peisandros of Laranda). The labours of Herakles would also fit a mythographic universal work. And yet, as in [F 4](#) and [F 6](#), above, the possibility exists that the scholiast may be thinking of Peisander of Kameiros, the ancient epic poet, and his *Herakleia*; as L.C. Colella, ‘Un Pisandro mitografo? Per una riconsiderazione di Pisander, *FGrHist* 16’, *Incidenza dell’antico* 16 (2018), 28-9 points out, Athenaios 11.469c (Pisander fr. 5 B. = 6 D. = 5 West) and *schol. in Pind. Pyth.* 9.185a (Pisander fr. 6 B. = 7 D. = 6 West) show that the archaic poet had probably mentioned the story. And yet, it is difficult to be certain: A. Bernabé (ed.), *Poetae Epici Graeci* 1 (Leipzig 1987), lists our fragment as Pisander, *Fragmentum dubium* 15; M. Davies (ed.), *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta* (Göttingen 1988), 134 gives it as Pisander *fragmentum dubium* 3; M.L. West, *Greek Epic Fragments from the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC* (Cambridge, MA 2003), omits it. The agreement of Apollonios and Peisandros on the birth from the earth of the serpent cannot be an argument either way: of course, the Hellenistic mythographer might have followed Apollonios’s version, but Apollonios might have chosen an erudite variant.

Commentary on F 8

On the scholia to Apollonios of Rhodos’ *Argonautika* see above, Commentary on F 2.

Fragment 16 F 8b

ID	16 F 8b
Source	Natalis Comes Mythologiae 7.7
Work mentioned	
Source date	various

Source language	Latin
Source genre	genealogy; mythology, Greek
Fragment subject	genealogy; mythology, Greek
Textual base	Natalis Comitum Mythologiae, sive explicationum fabularum libri decem, Venetiis 1568

Text

Hunc serpentem e terra natum fuisse testatur Pisander¹, at non e Typhone et Echidna, ut ait Apollonii enarrator.

Translation

Peisandros attests that this serpent was born of the earth, and not from Typhon and Echidna, as the commentator to Apollonios says.

Critical Apparatus

1. Pisander: ed. Venetiis 1568; Paus(anias): ed. Venetiis 1581; Francofurti 1581.

Commentary on the text

In terms of content, this is extremely close to the information transmitted by F 8a. Clearly Conti's information derives from the scholia to Apollonios.

Commentary on F 8b

The text above comes from the first edition of Natale Conti's *Mythologiae*. What is surprising is that in the second edition of the *Mythologiae* (second enlarged editions appeared almost at the same time in Venice and in Frankfurt in 1581), Conti decided to alter his text, and substituted 'Pausanias' for the correct Peisandros (Pausanias nowhere mentions the birth of the serpent guarding the golden apples). J. Mulryan and S. Brown, *Natale Conti's Mythologiae* (Tempe, AZ 2006), 622 print 'Pausanias', because they follow the Frankfurt edition; R.M. Iglesias Montiel and M.C. Álvarez Morán, *Natale Conti. «Mitología»* (Murcia 1988), 521, who base their translation on a collation of the first and the following editions (Venice 1568 and Padua 1616), rightly stick with Peisandros.

Fragment 16 F 9

ID	16 F 9
Source	Scholia on Euripides <i>Phoenissae</i> 834
Work mentioned	

Source date	various
Source language	Greek
Source genre	genealogy; mythology, Greek
Fragment subject	genealogy; mythology, Greek
Textual base	Jacoby

Text

Πείσανδρος ἱστορεῖ ὅτι Ξάνθη¹ γαμηθεῖσα² Τειρεσίαι³ ἐποίησε παῖδας τέσσαρας· Φαμενόν⁴, Φερσεκέρδη⁵, Χλώριν, Μαντώ.

Translation

Peisandros records that Xanthe having married Teiresias gave birth to four children: Phamenos, Phersekerdes, Chloris, and Manto.

Critical Apparatus

1. Schwartz; ξάνξη MT
2. om. T
3. Τειρεσίας T
4. Schwartz, Jacoby, Radt (cf. Soph. fr. 392 Radt); φαινή M, φαινέν T
5. codd., Jacoby, Radt (Soph. fr. 392); Φρασικέρδη Nauck²; Φερεκύδη Schwartz; Φερκεέρδη Wilamowitz.

Commentary on the text

As stressed by Jacoby, *FGrH* 1A, 494, this is not an invention of Peisandros. A wife Ξάνθη, 'Xanthe', and a son Φαμενός, 'Phamenos', are attested for Teiresias in Sophokles's play *Manteis or Polyidos* F 392 Radt (S. Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* 4 (Göttingen 1977)) (preserved in Herodian, *On Peculiar Style* 8.27; this is the only reference to a Xanthe wife of Teiresias); the scholiast to Pindar, *Nemean* 9.57, mentions, in the context of the genealogy of Periklymenos, that he was the son of Poseidon and of Chloris, the daughter of Teiresias. The other daughter, Manto, is mentioned in Pseudo-Apollodoros, *Library* 3.7.4, 85 and in Pausanias 9.10.3 (in Diodoros of Sicily 4.66.5 this same daughter, captured after the fall of Thebes and sent to Delphi as part of the booty, is called Daphne, while a daughter Historis, who deceived Hera at the moment of the birth of Herakles, is mentioned in Pausanias 9.11.3). The only child from this list not attested elsewhere is Φερσεκέρδης, 'Phersekerdes'. Phamenos, Manto, and Historis are all speaking names, extremely appropriate for children of a seer; less so Chloris and Phersekerdes. For the latter the correction Phrasikerdes has been suggested; but as argued by C. Robert, *Oidipus, Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffs im griechischen Altertum* (Berlin 1915), 63, the two components of the name Phersekerdes are well attested and unproblematic (although the name as a whole

does not fit a hexameter). H. Lloyd-Jones, 'Curses and Divine Anger in Early Greek Epic', *CQ*² 42 (2002), 6 n. 39 (not in his later version), suggests that this kind of information is more likely to derive from an epic poem than from tragedy. While *prima facie* one might be tempted to agree, the mention of a wife and son of Teiresias in Sophokles's *Manteis* shows that tragedy could fit the bill as well. This means that the Peisandros mentioned here might be the archaic epic poet: Teiresias's prophecies to Alcmena and Amphitryon connect him to the story of Herakles (Pindar, *Nemean* 1.60-9). But he might also be the mythographer, drawing either on archaic epic poetry (the *Oidipodeia*) or on more recent tragic material.

Commentary on F 9

On the tradition of Euripides' scholia, and specifically on the limits of Schwartz's edition, see the short overview by E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Oxford 2007), 31-4, and the detailed discussion by D. Mastronarde, *Preliminary Studies on the Scholia to Euripides* (Berkeley 2017) and most recently at <https://euripidesscholia.org/>

Fragment 16 F 10

ID	16 F 10
Source	Scholia on Euripides <i>Phoenissae</i> 1760
Work mentioned	
Source date	various
Source language	Greek
Source genre	genealogy; mythology, Greek; religionlaw, ancient
Fragment subject	genealogy; mythology, Greek; religionlaw, ancient
Textual base	Jacoby

Text

ἱστορεῖ Πείσανδρος ὅτι κατὰ χόλον τῆς Ἥρας ἐπέμφθη ἡ Σφιγξ τοῖς Θηβαίοις ἀπὸ τῶν ἐσχάτων μερῶν τῆς Αἰθιοπίας, ὅτι τὸν Λάϊον ἀσεβήσαντα εἰς τὸν παράνομον ἔρωτα τοῦ Χρυσίππου, ὃν ἤρπασεν ἀπὸ τῆς Πίσσης, οὐκ ἐτιμωρήσαντο. (2) ἦν δὲ ἡ Σφιγξ, ὡς περ γράφεται, τὴν οὐρὰν ἔχουσα δρακαίνης. ἀναρπάζουσα δὲ μικροὺς καὶ μεγάλους κατήσθειεν, ἐν οἷς καὶ Αἴμονα τὸν Κρέοντος παῖδα καὶ Ἴππιον τὸν Εὐρυνόμου τοῦ τοῖς Κενταύροις μαχεσαμένου. ἦσαν δὲ Εὐρύνομος καὶ Ἴχιονες υἱοὶ Μάγνητος τοῦ Αἰολίδου καὶ Φυλοδίκης. ὁ μὲν οὖν Ἴππιος καὶ ξένος ὢν ὑπὸ τῆς Σφιγγὸς ἀνηρέθη, ὁ δὲ Ἴχιονες ὑπὸ τοῦ Οἰνομάου, ὃν τρόπον καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι μνηστῆρες. (3) πρῶτος δὲ ὁ Λάϊος τὸν ἀθέμιτον ἔρωτα τοῦτον ἔσχεν. ὁ δὲ Χρυσίππος ὑπὸ αἰσχύνης ἑαυτὸν διεχρήσατο τῷ ξίφει. (4) τότε μὲν οὖν ὁ Τειρεσίας ὡς μάντις εἰδὼς ὅτι θεοστυγῆς ἦν ὁ Λάϊος, ἀπέτρεπεν αὐτὸν τῆς ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα ὁδοῦ, τῇ δὲ Ἥρῃ μᾶλλον τῇ γαμοστόλῳ θεᾷ θύειν ἱερά. ὁ δὲ αὐτὸν ἐξεφαύλιζεν. ἀπελθὼν τοίνυν ἐφρονεῦθη ἐν τῇ σχιστῇ ὁδῷ αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ ἡνίοχος αὐτοῦ, ἐπειδὴ ἔτυψε τῇ μᾶστιγι τὸν Οἰδίποδα. (5) κτείννας δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔθαψε παραυτίκα σὺν τοῖς ἱματίοις ἀποσπάσας τὸν ζωστήρα καὶ τὸ ξίφος τοῦ Λαίου καὶ φορῶν· τὸ δὲ ἄρμα

ὑποστρέψας ἔδωκε τῷ Πολύβῳ. εἶτα ἔγημε τὴν μητέρα λύσας τὸ αἴνιγμα. (6) μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ θυσίας τινὰς ἐπιτελέσας ἐν τῷ Κιθαιρῶνι κατήρχετο ἔχων καὶ τὴν Ἰοκάστην ἐν τοῖς ὀχήμασι. καὶ γινομένων αὐτῶν περὶ τὸν τόπον ἐκείνον τῆς σχιστῆς ὁδοῦ ὑπομνησθεὶς ἐδείκνυε τῇ Ἰοκάστηι τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα διηγήσατο καὶ τὸν ζωστῆρα ἔδειξεν. (7) ἡ δὲ δεινῶς φέρουσα ὄμως ἐσιώπα· ἠγνόει γὰρ υἱὸν ὄντα. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἦλθέ τις γέρων ἵπποβουκόλος ἀπὸ Σικυῶνος, ὃς εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ πᾶν ὅπως τε αὐτὸν εὔρε καὶ ἀνείλετο καὶ τῇ Μερόπῃ δέδωκε, καὶ ἅμα τὰ σπάργανα αὐτῷ ἐδείκνυε καὶ τὰ κέντρα ἀπήιτει τε αὐτὸν τὰ ζῶαργια, καὶ οὕτως ἐγνώσθη τὸ ὄλον. (8) φασὶ δὲ ὅτι μετὰ τὸν θάνατον τῆς Ἰοκάστης καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ τύφλωσιν ἔγημεν Εὐρυγάνην παρθένον, ἐξ ἧς αὐτῷ γεγόνασιν οἱ τέσσαρες παῖδες, ταῦτά φησιν Πείσανδρος.

Translation

Peisandros narrates that on account of the anger of Hera the Sphinx was sent upon the Thebans from the remotest regions of Aithiopia because they did not punish Laios for the impiety he committed through his unlawful love of Chrysippos, whom he carried away from Pisa. (2) The Sphinx, just as she is depicted, had the tail of a serpent. And snatching both small and big creatures she devoured them, among which also Haimon the son of Kreon and Hippios the son of the Eurynomos who fought against the Centaurs. As for Eurynomos and Eioneus, they were sons of Magnes the son of Aiolos and of Phylodike. And Hippios, even if a foreigner, was killed by the Sphinx, and Eioneus was killed by Oinomaos, in the same way as the other suitors. (3) Laios was the first to conceive this unlawful passion. And Chrysippos because of the shame killed himself with his sword. (4) Then Teiresias, who being a seer knew that Laios was hated by the gods, tried to turn him away from the road to Apollo and suggested instead to sacrifice to Hera, the goddess of marriage. But he took little account of him. And after his departure he was murdered, himself and his charioteer, where the road divided itself, because he struck Oidipous with his whip. (5) After he killed them, he immediately buried them with their cloaks, having torn away the belt and the sword of Laios and put them on; as for the chariot, once he returned he gave it to Polybos. He then married his mother, after solving the riddle. (6) After this and after he had made some sacrifices on Kithairon, he was returning with Iokaste as well in the chariot; and when they reached that place at the crossroads, he was reminded and showed to Iokaste the place and recounted the affair and showed her the belt. (7) And she, although suffering terribly, kept silent; she did not realize that he was her son. But after this an old horse-keeper came from Sikyon, who told him everything, how he had found him and had taken him and given him to Merope, and at the same time showed him his swaddling-clothes and the pins and asked a reward for saving his life, and thus everything came to light. (8) They say that after the death of Iokaste and his own blinding he married the maiden Eurygane, from whom were born to him his four children. So Peisandros says.

Critical Apparatus

Commentary on the text

This passage has provoked extended controversy: it contains fascinating variants on the Theban myth, but its source or sources are difficult to pinpoint (for the main ancient narrative accounts of the Oedipus legend see L. Edmunds, *Oedipus: The Ancient Legend and*

Its Later Analogues (Baltimore 1984), 47-57; the Peisandros scholion appears at 53-4). Recent discussions include D. Mastronarde (ed.), *Euripides. Phoenissae* (Cambridge 1994), 31-5; H. Lloyd Jones, 'Curses and Divine Anger in Early Greek Epic', *CQ*² 42 (2002), 3-10 (reprinted in H. Lloyd-Jones, *The Further Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford 2005), 18-35); N. Sewell-Rutter, *Guilt by Descent. Moral Inheritance and Decision Making in Greek Tragedy* (Oxford 2007), 61-6; R. Gagné, *Ancestral Fault in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge 2013), 348-9; M. Davies, *The Theban Epics* (Washington, DC 2015); E. Cingano, 'Oedipodea', in M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (eds), *The Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion* (Cambridge 2015), 213-225; L.C. Colella, 'Un Pisandro mitografo? Per una riconsiderazione di Pisander', *FGrHist* 16', *Incidenza dell'antico* 16 (2018), 34-7; see also the very detailed apparatus (with further references) of A. Bernabé (ed.), *Poetae Epici graeci* 1 (Leipzig 1987), *Oidipodea* 17-19. Jacoby's very dense discussion (*FGrH* 1A, 494-6) is still one of the best.

The first extensive commentary on the passage was offered in 1842 by Welcker, who affirmed that the scholion did not summarize an epic *Oidipodeia*, and that it could not reflect the work of the epic poet Peisandros of Kameiros, known as the author of an epic *Herakleia*, nor the work of the later epic poet Peisandros of Laranda, but that it went back to a pseudoepigraphic epic poem (F.G. Welcker, *Der epische Cyclus oder die Homerischen Dichter*² (Bonn 1865), 94-5). Welcker's main argument was the fact that if this version had been the work of the archaic epic poet, it would have been followed by later writers, while the story remains, under this shape, unique. Most other treatments since assume that the Peisandros mentioned in the opening is a mythographer; the debate concerns his sources, and whether Peisandros for his account relies on an early epic, or on drama, or on both. Of the other early discussions, still useful accounts are those by E. Bethe, *Thebanische Heldenlieder: Untersuchungen über die Epen des thebanisch-argivischen Sagenkreis* (Leipzig 1891), 1-28 (for whom the *scholion* reflects, in its main lines, an archaic epic *Oidipodeia*); C. Robert, *Oidipus: Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffs im griechischen Altertum* (Berlin 1915), 150-67 (who took the scholion to be in the main the composite work of a grammarian); Jacoby, *FGrH* 1A, 493-4 and again in *FGrH* 1A, 544-5 (who also thought that this was the work of an author of the Hellenistic period, putting together different sources); U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, 'Lesefrüchte', *Hermes* 60 (1925), 282-4 (who claimed that the scholion, notwithstanding obvious difficulties, reflected the 'Cycle' attributed to the archaic epic poet Peisandros); R. Keydell, 'Die Dichter mit Namen Peisandros', *Hermes* 70 (1935), 301-2 (for whom the scholion reflected the work of a Hellenistic mythographer); E. Schwartz, 'Der Name Homeros', *Hermes* 75 (1940), 6-7 (suggesting that the scholion summarized a Hellenistic epic); L. Deubner, *Oedipusprobleme. Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse*, 4 (Berlin, 1942), for whom the scholion depended almost exclusively on two lost tragedies of Euripides, the *Chrysippos* (for the first part of the scholion, until 4) and the *Oidipous* (from 5 onwards); and E.L. de Kock, 'The Peisandros scholium—its Sources, Unity and Relationship to Euripides' *Chrysippus*', *Acta Classica* 5 (1962), 15-37, whose detailed argument in support of considering the scholion as the product of the ingenious and idiosyncratic combination of older and newer motifs by a learned Hellenistic mythographer closed the first phase of analysis.

ἱστορεῖ Πείσανδρος ὅτι ... ταῦτά φησιν Πείσανδρος: Lloyd-Jones, 'Curses', 5, took the initial ἱστορεῖ, 'records', to suggest prose rather than poetry; but there are countless examples in the mythographical scholia of ἱστορεῖ used of poets, with the sense of 'tells the story', and Lloyd-Jones, *Further Academic Papers*, dropped the argument in the revised version. In analyzing the scholion, we should keep in mind that although the text opens and closes with a reference to Peisandros, not all in it comes necessarily from him (independently of whether we see in him the mythographer). There are actually two explicit pointers to other sources: ὥσπερ γράφεται (at 2, introducing the description of the Sphinx); and φασὶ (at 8). If we assume Peisandros to be a mythographer, he will have learnedly chosen among various sources; more importantly, the scholiastic tradition will in turn have modified Peisandros's text (Jacoby, *FGrH* 1a, 495; Mastronarde, *Euripides. Phoenissae*, 32). The text clearly presents problems--it either is indeed a patchwork from different sources, or something has been lost in its transmission.

1-2: Origins and description of the Sphinx. The narrative begins with information concerning the origins of the Sphinx, here sent from the remotest end of Aethiopia by Hera (so also in Pseudo-Apollodoros, *Library* 3.5.8, 52 and in Dio Chrystostom 11.8). This is interesting, as most sources do not dwell on who sent the Sphinx or why; Hades, Ares and Dionysos are mentioned as senders of the Sphinx, respectively in Euripides, *Phoenician women* 810 (Hades); the scholia to Euripides, *Phoenician women* 1064 (Ares); and Euripides, *Antigone* fr. 178 Kannicht = scholia to Euripides, *Phoenician women* 1031, with Lykos *BNJ* 380 F 1 (Dionysos): see Mastronarde, *Euripides: Phoenissae*, 19-20. The ample role played by Hera in this account points to an archaic narrative: possibly the *Oidipoeia*. The exact meaning of the expression ὥσπερ γράφεται is uncertain ('as is written', or 'as she is depicted'): Robert, *Oidipous*, 152-3, thought that this could only mean a painting; Lloyd-Jones, 'Curses', 23 with further references, leaves the question open. On the whole, this expression seems to me to speak for tragedy rather than *epos*: references to a γραφή of unclear status are frequent in drama (note, however, Bethe's suggestion of a hexametric description of the Sphinx, ending with οὐράν δὲ δράκοντος, mentioned with approval by Lloyd-Jones, 'Curses', 23). The 'serpent-tail' is remarkable: usually, the Sphinx is portrayed as having the tail of a lion (so in Pseudo-Apollodoros, *Library* 3.5.7, 52), or also of a bird (but Jacoby, *FGrH* 1A, 495 points to an archaic bronze sphinx with tail ending in the head of a serpent, Berlin inv. 8266: see U. Gehrig, A. Greifenhagen, and N. Kunisch, *Führer durch die Antikenabteilung* (Berlin 1968), 153). One might have expected more of a description--it may be that the mythographer or scholiast highlighted only what appeared remarkable, leaving out the rest.

ἀναρπάζουσα δὲ ... καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι μνηστῆρες: the description of the Sphinx is followed by a list of some of the deaths caused by the monster, which has been felt to be an insertion into the main thread (so in particular Robert, *Oidipus*, 151-2; Davies, *The Theban Epics*, ch. 1 check). This does not really apply to the deaths of Haimon and Hippios, which have directly to do with the Sphinx: the death of Haimon is also mentioned in one of the only two fragments we have of the *Oedipodea*, Bernabé *PEG* F 1 = M. Davies, *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen 1988) 1 = F 3 West, preserved as an added note at the end of the long scholion to Euripides *Phoenissae* 1670 by the Monacensis 570 only (see Cingano, 'Oedipodea', 218-9, who, as numerous other scholars before him, sees in this a link between

the tradition preserved in the Peisandros scholion and the epic *Oidipodeia*; and Gagné, *Ancestral Fault in Ancient Greece*, 348, who stresses that while the fragment concerning Haimon is quoted next to the 'Peisandros' scholion, it is not part of it). But the genealogy of Hippios and the detailed account of the deaths of his father and uncle have nothing to do with the Sphinx, and have thus been deemed 'strictly irrelevant' by Davies. It could be argued, however, that the reference to the death of Hippios's uncle Eioneus, one of the suitors of Hippodamia (also attested in Pausanias 6.21.11), is not entirely out of place since it strengthens the connection between events at Thebes and at Pisa through its reference to Oinomaos, whose grandson Chrysippos (the son of Pelops, who defeated Oinomaos) was carried away from Pisa by Laios.

3: Then, the narrative goes back to the initial cause, the love of Laios for Chrysippos, his abduction of the boy, and the suicide of Chrysippos out of shame; all this links back to Hera's anger, which resulted in her sending the Sphinx. There are quite a few thorny issues here. The notion of a suicide out of shame because of a homosexual rape is problematic no matter whether we assume it to derive from an early epos, from tragedy, or from the account of a mythographer (see on this issue T.K. Hubbard, 'History's First Child Molester: Euripides' *Chrysippus* and the Marginalization of Pederasty in Athenian Democratic Discourse', in J. Davidson, F. Muecke, and P. Wilson (eds.), *Greek Drama III. Essays in Honour of Kevin Lee* (London 2006), 223-44, and 228-9 for the Peisandros scholion). Notwithstanding Lloyd-Jones's contrary opinion, it seems to me that tragedy, rather than the *epos*, still offers the best context for this (so also M.L. West, *Greek Epic Fragments from the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC* (Cambridge, MA 2003), who does not include the Peisandros scholion among the *testimonia* for the *Oedipodea*, and Mastronarde, *Euripides. Phoenician Women*, 35-6). The representation of Laios carrying off Chrysippos on several Apulian vases also speaks for a tragic theme (for the images, see K. Schefold, *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* 3 (Zurich 1986), s.v. 'Chrysippos 1', with A. Cohen, 'Gendering the Age Gap: Boys, Girls, and Abduction in Ancient Greek Art', in A. Cohen and J.B. Rutter, *Constructions of Childhood in Ancient Greece and Italy* (Princeton, NJ 2007), 267-72). See further, for an excellent overall discussion of the story of Chrysippos and of its variants, T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore, MD 1993), 488-91 and 832-3. Similarly problematic is the fact that this affair seems to be presented as the reason for the arrival of the Sphinx: but while it is a feature of some ancient traditions that the Sphinx was sent by Hera, only here is Laios's crime – and the lack of action on the part of the Thebans – the reason for the goddess's anger and the arrival of the monster. It is on the whole unclear from the scholion at what moment exactly the Sphinx appeared (see again Gantz, *Early Greek Myth*, 492-8 for an excellent discussion of all variants). Mastronarde, *Euripides: Phoenissae*, 32-33 offers the most convincing interpretation of the chronology of the events: the suicide of Chrysippus is part of a digression, meant to explain the first sentence of the scholion; it actually preceded the inaction of the Thebans towards Laios, Hera's anger, and the arrival of the Sphinx as punishment.

4-5: at this point, the Sphinx tacitly disappears, and Teiresias suggests that Laios, since he is hated by the gods, sacrifice to Hera in order to appease her, rather than going to Delphi. The king, however, does not listen (just as Oidipous will not heed the seer's warning, at

least in Sophokles's *Oedipus the King*), and Oidipous enters the scene. Oidipous kills Laios, buries the king and his charioteer, but keeps the king's belt and sword; he brings back the chariot to Polybos, presumably in Sikyon (Oidipous gives the chariot to Polybos also in Euripides, *Phoenician Women* 44, Antimachos of Colophon fr. 70 Wyss, and Nicolaos of Damascus *FGrHist* 90 F 8); he solves the riddle of the Sphinx; and he marries the queen.

Clearly, the narrative here is very much compressed; clearly, here, too, a number of details are intriguing.

- a. Why does Teiresias suggest sacrifice to Hera? This is obviously linked to the crime committed by Laios – Hera here is explicitly the goddess of marriage (τῆι γαμοστόλῳ θεᾷ). But the reference to Hera as goddess of marriage possibly also points forward to the first action accomplished by Oidipous after he has married Iokaste: he sacrifices, with her, on the Kithairon (see below, 6). And 'the crag of Kithairon and the meadows of Hera' are mentioned by Iokaste, in her opening speech in Euripides' *Phoenician women* 24, as the place where her son Oidipous was exposed. Hera may thus have played an important role in an early version of the story (see Mastronarde, *Euripides: Phoenissae*, 34 and *ad v.* 24).
 - b. The reason for Laios's trip to Delphi is not made clear (to ask about children? This, the usual reason, may have explained an earlier trip unmentioned in the scholion, but cannot be the right explanation here, since Oidipous is already a young man. To ask for help against the Sphinx? As Lloyd-Jones, 'Curses', 25-6 suggests, the two reasons may have been conflated here); nor is any reason given for Oidipous' presence on the road.
 - c. The location of the crossroads is unclear (in Sophokles, *Oedipus the King* 732-34, it is located in Phokis, where the path from Daulis and the road to Delphi merge into one, but Aischylos in an earlier play (*TGrF* F 387a Radt) had put it close to Thebes, at Potniai; the narrative of the scholion makes it likely that it is this crossroad that is meant, but Jacoby's notion, *FGrH* 1A, 495, that the crossroads here and below are left unnamed on purpose, to avoid conflict between versions, is worth mentioning).
 - d. The burial of Laios and his charioteer 'in their cloaks' by Oidipous is an interesting and slightly surprising detail (in Pseudo-Apollodoros, *Library* 3.5.8, 52, Laios was buried by a certain Damasistratos, king of Plataiai; in Nikolaos of Damaskos, *BNJ* 90 F 8, Epikaste is present when Oidipous kills Laios and the herald, and buries both); striking is the fact that in Peisandros' version, Oidipous takes for himself the belt and sword of Laios, which he will later show to Iokaste, who will recognize them. Part of the reason for this attention to sword and belt may be due to the desire to separate Iokaste's recognition of Oidipous as the killer of Laios from the realization that he is her son; but this may also have been the sword with which Chrysippos had committed suicide (ἐαυτὸν διεχρήσατο τῷ ξίφει, 3), in which case Oidipous' gesture of picking up sword and belt of Laios and carrying them emphasized visually the continuity of the curse across generations – again possibly a tragic motif.
 - e. The riddle appears here as a surprise (riddles had not been mentioned previously).
6. The sacrifices accomplished by Oidipous and Iokaste on the Kithairon are otherwise unattested. Bethe, *Thebanische Heldenlieder*, 9, suggested that these sacrifices reflected a

very ancient version: they would have been for Hera, and linked to Laios's refusal to sacrifice to the goddess (or possibly to an earlier version in which Laios did not go to Delphi: after all, in coming back from the Kithairon Oidipous passes the fatal crossroads). This part might indeed derive from the *Oidipodeia* (see Lloyd-Jones, 'Curses', 28).

7. The recognition through objects brought by a horse-keeper (ἵπποβουκόλος; the same rare term is also used for the horsemen who saved Oidipous in Euripides, *Phoenician women* 28) is certainly different from the way in which Sophokles brings about realization in his *Oedipus the King*, but the fact that it is based on objects need not imply that this is an early, 'very primitive' element, as argued by de Kock, 'The Peisandros scholium' 19-20, 24 and 37.

8. One interesting point concerns the wives and children of Oidipous. 'Peisandros' (= the scholion to Euripides, *Phoenician Women* 1760), the scholion to Euripides, *Phoenician Women* 13, Pseudo-Apollodoros, *Library* 3.5.8, and Pausanias 9.5.11 concur in giving the name of Iokaste to the first wife and Euryganeia to the second (Eurygane in the Peisandros scholion); there were two wives also in the epic *Oedipodea*, Epikaste (probably the earliest form, very close to Iokaste) and Euryganeia (Bernabé, *PEG* 1, *Oedipodea* F 2 = M. Davies (ed.), *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttigen 1988), *Oedipodea* F 2). The scholion D to Homer, *Iliad* 4.376 Dindorf and Eustathios of Thessalonica, *Commentary to the Iliad* 4.376-81 mention instead Iokaste and Astymedousa; Pherekydes (*BNJ* 3 F 95 = scholia on Euripides, *Phoenician Women* 53) apparently distributed the three names over three wives (see further Jacoby, *FGrH* 1A, 416-17). The two wives probably reflects the tradition of the epic *Oedipodia*, to which the version of *Odyssey* 11.272-7 may have been close: there, Oidipous continues to live in Thebes, and even if he is guilty of having killed his father and having slept with his mother, he does not have children from the incest (cf. Pausanias 9.5.7). Clearly in this version the shame of the incest falls exclusively on Iokaste (see the excellent discussion by Cingano, 'Oedipodea', 220-23); we do not know how the epic *Thebais* and Stesichoros dealt with this; but tragedy foregrounds the birth of children from the incest. For his part, the 'Peisandros' scholion makes it clear that the four children of Oidipous were born from Euryganeia and not Iokaste (so already in Pherekydes, who mentions two sons from Iokaste, Phrastor and Laonytos, who are killed by the Minyans and Erginos; and four by Euryganeia, Antigone, Ismene, Eteokles, and Polyneikes: detailed discussion in R. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography* II, *Commentary* (Oxford 2013), 403-8). This limited the horror; it also meant that aristocratic families, such as the Aigeidai in Sparta (Pausanias 9.5.14), Theron of Akragas (Pindar *Olympian* 2.40-7), or the Kleonymidai in Thebes (Pindar, *Isthmian* 3.15-17), could trace back their origins to the Labdacids without having to worry about the taint of incest. See on this Jacoby, *FGrH* 1A, 416-17; Mastronarde, *Euripides: Phoenissae*, 20-22; Lloyd-Jones, 'Curses', 28; E. Cingano, 'The Death of Oedipus in the Epic Tradition', *Phoenix* 46 (1992), 1-11, and 'Oedipodea', 220-3; A. Moreau, 'Manipulations généalogiques: les épouses d'Oedipe, Médée, Prométhée', in D. Auger and S. Saïd (eds.), *Généalogies mythiques* (Paris 1998), 30-34; and Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography* II, 403-8. Thus, Peisandros accepted the non-tragic version of the children of Oidipous, the one present in the epic *Oidipodeia*.

What about the identity of Peisandros and the character of his work? It is difficult to see in the scholion the direct seamless summary of an archaic epic poem by Peisandros of

Kameiros, and positing a pseudepigraphic epic poem won't help much. The alternative is to admit that an author of the Hellenistic period ('Peisandros' the mythographer; a Peisandros is cited twice as source in the scholia to Euripides's *Phoenician Women*, here and in F 9, which also probably concerns Thebes, since it discusses Teiresias) produced a narrative based on archaic materials (e.g., the epic *Oedipodeia*), on an Euripidean drama (the lost *Chrysippos*), or on both (G. Ucciardello, *per litteras*, points out that words such as θεοστυγής, attested in Euripides, Nonnos, and Christian authors, γαμοστόλωι, attested in Nonnos, in the *Palatine anthology*, in the *Orphic hymns*, and in technical and astrological prose, and possibly also the form θεᾶι, besides the serpent's tail, οὐράν δὲ δράκοντος, discussed above, might derive from a poetical text, whether epic or tragic); and that the scholiast (or tradition) is responsible for further compression and loss of coherence.

Commentary on F 10

On Euripides' *scholia* see above, Commentary on F 9.

Fragment 16 F 11

ID	16 F 11
Source	Philodemos, <i>On Piety</i> (περὶ εὐσεβείαν), <i>P.Herc.</i> 1088 col. 2 a (<i>dextra pars</i>), ll. 17-21 (= Th. Gomperz (ed.), <i>Philodem. Über Frömmigkeit</i> (Leipzig 1866) 87A, p. 37)
Work mentioned	
Source date	1st century BCE
Source language	Greek
Source genre	mythology, Greek
Fragment subject	mythology, Greek
Textual base	Jacoby

Text

[Π]ε<(>σα[ν|δρος δέ φη]σιν [σ]κώ|[πτοντ' άύ]τόν (sc. τὸν Προμηθέα) [έκβλη-|20 θῆναι εἰς] άνό[δει|αν].

Translation

Peisandros says that he (Zeus) threw him (Prometheus) in a place outside of reach because of his mockery.

Critical Apparatus

Jacoby (based on Philippson); ...]AI.EΣA...|....]ΣIN..KΩ..|...TON.....|....\NO....| engraving (*Coll. Altera* II, *P.Herc.* 1088 2a), Gomperz 87A, p. 37; [...]AIEΣA[...|.....]ΣINKAI |

Ο[.....]ΤΟΝ[..... |.....]ΝΟ[...|..] *disegno*; συνά-| πτεσθ]αι. ΕΣΑ[.....|..... φη]σιν. καὶ | ὁ [Ατλας] τὸν [γίγαν- |20 τεῖον οὐρα]νὸ[ν φέ-| ρει Schober, cf. <http://litpap.info/dclp/62400>

Commentary on the text

This is probably not a fragment of Peisandros the mythographer, nor should Jacoby's text, given above, be accepted. For his text, Jacoby relied on Gomperz's edition (Th. Gomperz (ed.), *Philodem. Über Frömmigkeit* (Leipzig 1866) – but Gomperz had been unable to make sense of these lines); he supplemented it with the restorations suggested by R. Philippson, 'Zu Philodem's Schrift über die Frömmigkeit', *Hermes* 55 (1920), 245, while adding that the restoration of the source name itself ([Π]ε<ι>σα[νδρος], suggested by Philippson) was very uncertain (*FGrH* 1A, 496). According to Philippson, Philodemos here had in mind the *Herakleia* of Peisandros of Kameiros; and the otherwise unattested term *anodeia* 'impassable region', 'place outside of reach' (restored by Philippson and on which Philippson's interpretation rested) would have been another way of expressing what is formulated by Aischylos, *Prometheus vincetus* 2, with ἄβροτον εἰς ἐρημίαν, all the more since earlier in the column (ll. 10 to 17) the hardships suffered by Prometheus are indeed mentioned. Peisandros (the epic poet) could plausibly have touched on Prometheus in his *Herakleia*, Philippson argued. (It should be noted that Philippson never saw the papyrus and that he relied fully, for his interpretations, on the few letters transcribed by Gomperz, who was himself relying on transcriptions). Philippson's (and Jacoby's) text is still printed by M. Davies (ed.), *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttigen 1988), as Pisander F *dubium* 5.

That text has, however, been superseded with the publication of A. Schober's 1923 dissertation, 'Philodemi *De Pietate* pars prior', *CronErc* 18 (1988), 67-125; a close discussion of this part of the *On Piety*, making use of Schober's text, as well as of new readings of *disegni* and papyri, has been given by A. Henrichs, 'Die Kritik der stoischen Theologie im *P.Herc.* 1428', *CronErc* 4 (1974), 5-32, and A. Henrichs, 'Philodems «De Pietate» als mythographische Quelle', *CronErc* 5 (1975), 5-38. As it turns out, this was probably the second part of Philodemos's book *On Piety* and not the first, as supposed initially: see D. Obbink, *Philodemus. On Piety, Part 1* (Oxford 1996), 94-8 for a discussion of both the authorship (either Philodemos or Phaidros) and the structure of the book, and below, Commentary on F 11.

Schober did not accept Philippson's restorations, and offered an entirely different text for this part (1088 IIa ll. 17ss p. 92-93 Schober):

συνά-| πτεσθ]αι. ΕΣΑ... | φη]σιν. καὶ | ὁ [Ατλας] τὸν [γίγαν- | τεῖον οὐρα]νὸ[ν φέ-| ρει.
[were linked]. ESA says. And Atlas carries the gigantic sky.

This is not very satisfactory, as it is difficult to imagine a short sentence starting with ΕΣΑ, continuing with some 8/9 letters, and closing with φη]σιν; moreover, the restoration of γίγαντεῖον at ll. 19-20 is extremely uncertain. In the following lines (ll. 21-30) Philodemos is clearly concerned with Atlas, rather than Prometheus; Euripides's *Ion*, Simonides, and Hesiod are referred to in this connection. Our passage sits thus at the junction between the

exposition of the suffering which Prometheus underwent, and those endured by Atlas (who was possibly already mentioned in the extremely damaged ll. 1-9). While restoring an otherwise not attested ἀνόδεια, thus positing a *hapax* for the sake of recognizing Prometheus as the topic of the fragment is not acceptable, Atlas' name and the mention of the 'gigantic sky' are also entirely restored. In these conditions, any discussion of the content of these lines remains extremely hypothetical.

In particular, there seems to be no compelling reason to restore Peisandros' name at l. 17-18: the traces of the letters seen by Schober actually speak against this (and already Philippson, 'Zu Philodem's Schrift', 245 and Jacoby, *FGrH* 16 F 11 were clear on the fact that the name 'Peisandros' could be read only at the cost of admitting a scribal error). Even if we were to accept the reading Peisandros, his identity (archaic poet? Hellenistic mythographer?) would still be uncertain. Jacoby, *FGrH* 1A, Text, 182, had classified this fragment among the 'uncertain and dubious'; A. Bernabé (ed.), *Poetae Epici Graeci* 1 (Leipzig 1987), does not include *FGrHist* 16 F 11 (*dubium*) among the fragments of the archaic poet Peisandros of Kameiros; similarly, in the most recent discussion of the passage, O. Salati, 'Mitografi e storici in Filodemo (*De Pietate, pars altera*)', *CronErc* 42 (2012), 251 agrees that the lacunae in the column and, in particular, the sequence of letters of l. 17 (ΑΙΕΞΑ) render it highly unlikely that the authority cited was Peisandros.

This seems the appropriate place to mention four more possible references to an author Peisandros in Philodemos' *On Piety*: in all cases, the name is heavily restored.

1. Philodemos, *On Piety, P.Herc.* 433 IX ll. 12-16, p. 87 Schober: [καὶ | τὴν Ἄτην δ[ὲ τοῦ Δι- |] ὃς θ]εράπα[ιναν εἰσή-] |15 χα]σιν Πε[ίσανδρος καὶ | Ὅμ]ηρος. Ἐ[νιοι] | . . θεω αὐτὴν [ὡς] | [καὶ τ]ὴν μεταμέλει-|20 αν. 'and both Peisandros and Homer have presented Ate as the servant of Zeus. Some ... θεω her as well as the repentance.'

It is very unlikely that this is a fragment of Peisandros the mythographer. The name Pe[isandros] has been restored by Schober, *Philodemi De Pietate Parts Prior*, 87, whose restoration Salati, 'Mitografi e storici in Filodemo', 49-50 accepts; she thus prints this text as 'Pisandro di Camiro II.'

But Philippson, 'Zu Philodem's Schrift über die Frömmigkeit', 257, thought that Philodemos had here in mind a passage of Homer, *Iliad* 19.90-129, where Agamemnon recounts how Ate, persuaded by Hera, blinded even Zeus. The god, thinking of Herakles, swore a mighty oath that the man who would be born on that day would be king of all men. Hera however halted his birth, and brought forward that of Eurystheus. Thus, Agamemnon concludes, Zeus would think of Ate and groan when seeing his son Herakles laboring under Eurystheus. Philippson linked this to the following lines, which mention a *metameleia*, repentance. He thus proposed the following text:

| φησι]ν Ἄτην δ[ὲ τὸν |15 πα]τέρ' ἀπα[τᾶν Ἡρας | ἔπε]σιν πε[ιθομένην | Ὅμ]ηρος [λ]έ[γει, ἀλλ'] | εὐθ]έως αὐτὴν ἔ[πελ] | [θεῖν] τὴν μεταμέλει-|20 αν

Salati chooses Schober's reading over Philippson's, on the following grounds: (a) in this part of his work, Philodemos is interested in emphasizing the servile duties of the goddess (θεράπεινα) rather than her ability to deceive; (b) θεράπεινα is part of Philodemos' usual lexicon, and it appears elsewhere in the *On piety* in relation to the duties and tasks of the gods; (c) many of Philippson's restorations are rather adventurous; in particular for ll. 18-19, Salati states that the *disegno* (N) shows only the letters ΘΕΩ, so that in order to accept εὐθέως 'occorre ipotizzare l'omissione di *sigma*'; (d) μεταμέλεια is usually governed by λαμβάνω rather than ἐπέρχομαι; (e) it is on the whole likely that Peisandros was cited with Homer, since having composed an *Herakleia* he would have mentioned the role played by Ate at the moment of the birth of the hero.

This is not entirely convincing. It is true that Philippson's readings tend to be adventurous; but as long as the order of the columns of the *On Piety* is not securely established, it is difficult to know with certainty what the larger context of the passage was. More importantly the point about εὐθέως is mistaken: both the papyrus and the *disegno* show clearly a *sigma* after the letters ΘΕΩ at l. 18, so Philippson is here right (a photo of the papyrus can be consulted on the Chartes website, at <http://www.chartes.it/index.php?r=document/view&id=453>; the engraving made by Luigi Corazza on the basis of the drawing of G.B. Casanova can be consulted at http://www.epikur-wuerzburg.de/vh2/VH2_02_064.jpg). Based on both the papyrus and the engraving, Philippson's restorations fit the space better. But also, while Peisandros is indeed often cited with Homer and/or Hesiod, the order (Peisandros first) would be very surprising.

The context is of no help: the 13 lines that precede our passage are very fragmentary and have defied restorations so far; the 3 lines that complete the column mention a sanctuary of Phobos at Argos (ἐν Ἄργει), and 'some' (τινές). My own conclusion is that it is unlikely that this passage preserves a reference to a Peisandros (whether the epic poet of Kameiros, a later poet writing under the name of Peisandros, or a prose writer).

2. Philodemos, *On Piety*, *P.Herc.* 433 II b (*sinistra pars*) ll. 28-29, p. 94 Schober.; Ὅμη[ρος καὶ Πείσαν]-| δρος [ἐν Ἡρακλείαι] |30 καὶ M

Very little remains of the left part of *P.Herc.* 433 II b: lines 1-18 are entirely missing; only between one and three letters per line are left of ll. 19-23; and four letters per line of ll. 24-30. At l. 26 Ἥρας is legible; in the next line, the letters ΔΕΤΑ; then, the text above. In this part of his work, Philodemos discussed the suffering of gods and demi-gods; we cannot reconstruct this specific topic, but it presumably had to do with Hera. That Peisandros (the epic poet from Kameiros?) was cited right after Homer is entirely possible; the reference to the *Herakleia* is entirely restored. See further Salati, 'Mitografi e storici in Filodemo', 150, who points at the connection between Hera and Herakles; the fragment is absent from Bernabé *Poetae epici graeci* I.

3 and 4: W. Luppe, 'Verstümmelungen sowie körperliche und charakterliche Mängel bei Göttern in Philodemos *Περὶ εὐσεβείας* (Zu Kronos, Hephaist und Ares)', *CErc* 25 (1995), 203-10 has flagged the possibility of restoring the name of Peisandros in two passages of

Philodemos' *On piety* relatively close to each other, *P.Herc.* 1088 XI l. 9, p. 83 Schober, and *P.Herc.* 1088 X l. 1, p. 84 Schober. The first passage might concern the birth of Aphrodite, the intervention of Metis, and the cutting of Kronos' genitals at ll.8-10 the disegni (and Schober) offer: - ca.11 - [M]ήτι-| [δος ...]PI ... ΝΔΡΟΣ |10 -ca. 7- ΤΗΝΤΗΣ |. It is just possible to restore the name Peisandros here, as the source of the story; definitely not the author of the *Herakleia*, considering the context. But this is not a particularly compelling restoration, just a possibility. The same applies to the second passage, where only between two and five letters remain for each of the ll. 1-4. At l. 1 the letters ΔΡΟΣ were restored by Schober with ἀνδρὸς; what follows clearly concerns Hephaistos (Schober sensibly suggests for ll. 2-5: [διότι εἶχεν κυ]λλοὺς | [ἄμφω πόδας,] ὑπὸ | [δὲ τῆς Θετιδός]ς φη-| 5[σιν] ἐ]κτραφῆναι. If we were to accept that the source was Peisandros (and the presence of the letters -ΔΡΟΣ is not per se a sufficiently compelling argument) this again would unlikely be the author of the *Herakleia*; but both of these stories might fit a *Cycle*.

Commentary on F 11

P.Herc. 1088 preserves fragments of the *De pietate* (*On piety*), a work probably by Philodemos, an Epicurean philosopher (c. 110-ca. 40 B.C), whose work forms the bulk of the papyri found at the Villa dei Papiri in Herculaneum (but an attribution to Phaidros has also been defended: first discussion, settled in favour of Philodemos, also because the treatise's slovenly ('salopp') style would not have suited an elegant writer like Phaidros, in A. Nauck, 'Über Philodemos περὶ εὐσεβείας', *Bulletin de l'Academie Imperiale des Sciences de St.-Petersbourg* VII (1864) 219-23=*Melanges Greco-Romains* II (St.-Petersbourg 1866) 585-9; see then A. Henrichs, 'Toward a New Edition of Philodemos' Treatise *On Piety*', *GRBS* 13 (1972) 81 n. 37; D. Obbink, *Philodemos. On Piety, Part 1* (Oxford 1996), 94-8).

The *On piety* constituted a response to Stoic criticisms of Epicureanism, divided in two parts: a defence of Epicurean religious ideas and practice, and a long catalogue of the false views of poets and other writers, going from Homer to Apollodoros of Athens, remarkable for the very high number of citations Philodemos makes.

It is unlikely that Philodemos had direct access to all of these works, and scholars have tried to pinpoint intermediary sources. Thus, after the pioneering work of J. Dietze, 'Die mythologischen Quellen für Philodemos' Schrift περὶ εὐσεβείας', *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 42 (1896), 218-226, Albert Henrichs managed, in two fundamental contributions, 'Towards a new edition of Philodemos' treatise *On piety*', , and 'Philodemos *De pietate* als mythographische Quelle', *CronErc* 5 (1975), 5-38, in part. 6-8, to confirm Eudemos as the source of the theogonic summary in Philodemos, and to pinpoint parallelisms between the *On Gods* of Apollodoros of Athens and passages of Philodemos *On piety*. Henrichs concluded that for the mythographic part of his work Philodemos relied on the Apollodoros of Athens and on a further intermediary source, an *anonymus Epicureus*, who integrated the work of Apollodoros with further mythical material. More recently, D. Obbink, 'How to read poetry about gods', in D. Obbink (ed.), *Philodemos and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemos and Horace* (Oxford 1995), 200-206, has suggested that both Apollodoros of Athens and Philodemos' teacher Zeno of Sidon relied

for their mythographic material on the treatise *On Athena* by Diogenes of Babylon. and O. Salati, 'Mitografi e storici in Filodemo (*De Pietate, pars altera*)', *CronErc* 42 (2012), 210-17.

P.Herc. 1088 belongs to the second part of the *On Piety*; but it is important to note here that the carbonized papyrus rolls had to be cut in half, in order to open them, yielding at a minimum two sets of 'scorze' (layers); the drawings of the scorze were then numbered as each layer was taken away (destroying it in the process), moving from the inside towards the outside of the roll. This means that the ancient numbering (and the editions based on it) has the fragments in inverted order; to reconstruct the ancient roll, it is necessary to start from the highest numbers (the beginning of the text) and proceed backwards, integrating together the different sets of scorze (see R. Janko, 'How to read and reconstruct a Herculaneum papyrus', in B. Crostini, G. Iversen, and B. M. Jensen, *Ars Edendi Lecture series*, vol. IV (Stockholm 2016), 137-42). Thus, for Gomperz and Schober (and still in Henrichs, 'Toward a New Edition', 67-98, and Henrichs, 'Philodems *De pietate* als mythographische Quelle', 5-38, as well as in T. Dorandi, 'Una "ri-edizione" antica del Περὶ εὐσεβείας di Filodemo', *ZPE* 73 (1988), 25-9), the first part of the *On Piety* comprised the false views of poets and mythographers, and the second presented the Epicurean doctrines. Only in 1989 D. Delattre, 'Philodème, De la musique: livre IV, colonnes 40* à 109*', *CronErc* 19 (1989), 49–143 presented the evidence for the reordering of the drawings; this principle also underlies the edition by D. Obbink, *Philodemus: On Piety Part I: Critical Text with Commentary* (Oxford, 1996) – see in particular . The second part of the *On Piety* is still awaiting a scholarly edition.

P.Herc. 1088 was unrolled c. 1823, by Carlo Malesci, who also, in 1824, executed drawings (disegni) of the text, as he opened it up; the papyrus itself was partly destroyed in the process of opening up the roll, layer (scorza) by layer, from the outer part towards the centre. The engravings made by Vincenzo Corazza in 1861-1862, based on Malesci's drawings, revised and approved by Minervini, Malesci himself, and Genovesi (cf. the catalogue of the Biblioteca nazionale 'Vittorio Emanuele' in Naples, https://manus.iccu.sbn.it//opac_SchedaScheda.php?ID=205786), were meant to be published in the seventh volume of the *Collectio Prior* by Bernardo Quaranta, to whom publication of the *On piety* had been assigned. Quaranta never finished his work, and the *On Piety* was published in the second volume of the *Collectio Altera* (1863), 86-97, with the engravings (all engravings from the *Collectio altera* are available here: <http://epikur-wuerzburg.de/digitale-ressourcen/downloads/vh2/>; engraving as well as online edition (Schober's text) here: <http://papyri.info/dclp/62400>; the same facsimile is also given in J.A.D. Irvine, 'Euripides' *Ion* l. 1 and *Pap. Herc.* 1088 2 a Reconsidered', *ZPE* 117 (1997) 8).

Fragment 16 F 12

ID	16 F 12a
Source	Philodemos, <i>On Piety</i> (περὶ εὐσεβείαν) (<i>P. Herc.</i> 1602 V 6-19)
Work mentioned	
Source date	1st century BCE
Source language	Greek

Source genre	mythology, Greek; epic mythology, Greek; criticism
Fragment subject	mythology, Greek; epic mythology, Greek; criticism
Textual base	Jacoby

Text

δὲ κα[ὶ] συνοι-| κίσ]αι (*scil.* Thetis) τῶι Π[η]λεῖ.¹ | ἐν Π[ρ]ομηθ[εῖ] δὲ | τῶι Λυομέ[ν]ω[ι] τῆς |5
 Θέτ]ιδος² ἐ[πι]θυμεῖν. | καὶ] φασιν[- - - καὶ³ | [ὁ δὲ τ]ᾶ Κύπ[ρ]ια γράψας | τῆι⁴ (*Kypria* F 2
PEG) Ἡ]ραὶ χαρ[ι]ζομέ-| νη]ν φεύγειν ἀύ[τ]ην |10 τὸ]ν γάμον Δ[ί]ος. τὸν⁵ | δ' ὀ]μόσαι
 χολω⁶[θέν-| τ]α διότι θνη[τῶι | συ]νοικίσει.⁷ κα[ὶ] πα-| ρ' Ἡ]σιόδωι δὲ κε[ῖ]ται |15 τ]ὸ
 παραπλήσ[ιον.] ὁ] Πείσανδρος [δὲ | περὶ Κλυμένης [|]ον ἔρασθέν[τ⁸ |]έστιν[|20]καὶ
]τον[

Translation

and that she (Thetis) went to live with Peleus. In the *Prometheus Liberated* [F 202b Radt] (Aeschylus says that Zeus) was taken by desire of Thetis. And (someone) and the author of the *Kypria* say that she refused the union with Zeus in order to please Hera; but Zeus in anger swore that she would marry a mortal. And in Hesiod [F 210 M-W] one finds a similar story. As for Peisandros, concerning Klymene he says that having fallen in love...

Critical Apparatus

1. Reitzenstein, *Hermes* 35 (1900), 73-4 (in what follows, all restorations not otherwise attributed are by Reitzenstein); Jacoby, Schober, Mette, and Radt; Luppe is unconvinced and prefers to leave the lacuna unrestored.
2. Luppe, who tends to go for a slightly longer line, and also proposes as alternative καὶ; [περὶ Θέτ]ιδος Reitzenstein, *Ind. lect.* (Rostock 1891) 15; φησὶ Θέτιδος Schober; Θέμιδος Wilamowitz.
3. Luppe; ρασιν *disegno*.
4. Luppe;]Κύπ[ρ]ια ποιήσας Ἡ]ραὶ Jacoby, Schober.
5. ll. 9-10 Luppe; φεύγειν ἀύ[τοῦ] |10 τὸ]ν γάμον, Δ[ί]α
6. Luppe; χολω *disegno*.
7. Luppe;]οικίσει Reitzenstein 1900 and all editors apart from Mette;]οικήσει *disegno*, and Reitzenstein 1891/2, Mette.
8. Luppe, who suggests as possibilities (rather convincingly, to my mind) περὶ Κλυμένης [λέ]-| [γ]ων or περὶ Κλυμένης [καὶ] | [τ]ῶν ἔρασθέν[των (?) ἀύ]-| τ]ῆς; Κλυμένης, [ῆς Ἡλι]ον ἔρασθέν[τα Reitzenstein; Κλυμένης [ᾧτι | σ]υνερασθέν[των Lippold and Jacoby, but as pointed out by Luppe, a Υ is out of question here; Περικλυμένης [αύ]-| τὸν ἔρασθέν[τα Schober.

Commentary on the text

The above text follows in the main the text as restored by W. Luppe, 'Zeus und Thetis in Philodem 1602V', *Mus. Helv.* 43 (1986), 61-7. The apparatus provides some information on textual issues (these lines have been edited more than once: besides the editions of the papyrus as such, and besides Jacoby's text, where the line-division is often wrong, editions include H.J. Mette (ed.), *Die Fragmente der Tragödien des Aischylos* (Berlin 1959), F 321a ll. 1-13; R. Merkelbach-M.L. West (eds.), *Fragmenta Hesiodica* (Oxford 1967), F 210 ll. 7-15; S. Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* 3 (Göttingen 1985), F **202b, ll. 1-15; A. Bernabé (ed.), *Poetae Epici Graeci* 1 (Leipzig 1987), 45 F 2, ll. 6-15; see Luppe, 'Zeus und Thetis', for further details).

The first part, on Thetis, forms a unit in a sequence of stories concerning love-affairs of Zeus; Luppe, 'Zeus und Thetis', 66, and before him R. Reitzenstein, 'Die Hochzeit des Peleus und der Thetis', *Hermes* 35 (1900) 73-4, have pointed out that the wording is here very close to that of Pseudo-Apollodoros, *Library* 3.13.5, 169 and that most likely here Philodemos and Pseudo-Apollodoros rely on a common source. The unit on Thetis closes with the statement that a similar account is found also in Hesiod (F 210 M.-W.).

With l. 16, a new unit starts, for which the quoted authority is Peisandros; unluckily, much of the text here is lost. Attempts at understanding this passage base themselves on the female name in l. 17, Klymene, or Periklymene. The second name has been defended by A. Schober, *Philodemi De Pietate Parts Prior* (Königsberg 1923) (a dissertation printed only much later, in *CronErc* 18 (1988), 65-125), who restores ll. 16-18 as follows:

Πείσανδρος [δὲ | Π]ερικλυμένης [αὐ-| τὸ]ν ἔρασθέν[τα | . ΕΣΤΙΝ

Peisandros (says) that having fallen in love with Periklymene he ...

The restored [αὐ-| τὸ]ν ('he' – a restoration by no means certain, and not accepted by the majority of editors) would mean that the lover is still Zeus; as for Periklymene, she is a very minor character in Greek mythology, possibly simply a doublet of the better attested Klymene or Eteoklymene: daughter of Minyas and Klytodora (so the scholion to Apollonios Rhodios 1.230b, who gives as her sister Eteoklymene – but slightly earlier, the same scholion mention a Klymene daughter of Minyas), she is the wife of Pheres and mother of Admetos according to Tzetzes, *Chiliades* 2.53.789 Leone. Nothing else is known of a Periklymene, and it is difficult to see what she would be doing here, after a story as famous as that of Zeus's love for Thetis.

As for Klymene, proposed by Reitzenstein, 'Die Hochzeit des Peleus und der Thetis' 74, and accepted by most editors, she is a figure difficult to pinpoint, as there are quite a few heroines bearing this name, all of them relatively obscure, and whose stories intersect (see Stoll, 'Klymene', in W.H. Roscher, *Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* 2.1 (Leipzig 1890-94), 1227-8). A further issue is that once Schober's [αὐ-| τὸ]ν ἔρασθέν[τα is not accepted, anyone among the gods (and not necessarily Zeus) could be the lover (see Luppe's proposals in apparatus).

A first Klymene is an Okeanid; in Hesiod, *Theogony* 351 and 507-9 she is the wife of Iapetos and mother of Atlas, Menoitios, Epimetheus and Prometheus; but the *scholia* to Pindar, *Olympian* 9.68, 72, and 79, the *scholia* to the *Odyssey*, 10.2, and Dionysios of Halikarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* 1.17, have a version in which she is the wife of Prometheus and mother of Hellen and Deukalion. This is unlikely to be Philodemos's Klymene: her love life seems too straightforward (see on her also R. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography II, Commentary* (Oxford 2013), 114). L.C. Colella, 'Un Pisandro mitografo? Per una riconsiderazione di Pisander, *FGrHist* 16', *Incidenza dell'antico* 16 (2018), 38-9 and n. 99, points out however that the punishment of Prometheus is linked to the prophecy according to which the son of Thetis would be stronger than his father; the mention of Klymene might imply Prometheus here (as husband or son), and so rather than a new story of love, this might be simply an elaboration of the problems caused by the earlier love story. This is possible, but the presence of ἐρασθέν[τ, that is, of a verb meaning 'having fallen in love', rather than simply 'having married', or 'having given birth to', goes against it.

Another Klymene appears at the end of the catalogue of women of the Nekyia (Homer, *Odyssey* 11.326). This is an interesting mention, for the catalogue comprises women who have had affairs with gods (Tyro, Antiope, Alkmene, Leda, and Iphimedeia are mentioned in the preceding verses). Maira, who is here paired with Klymene (Μαῖράν τε Κλυμένην τε ἴδον, *Odyssey* 11.326), was loved by Zeus: the scholiast, citing Pherekydes (*BNJ* 3 F 170ab), explains that Zeus fell in love with her and made her pregnant. Ancient commentators (the scholiast to *Odyssey* 11.326) identify this Klymene with the daughter of Minyas and Klytodora (see above, on Periklymene), wife of Phylakos or Kephalos, and mother of Iphiklos and Alkimede (they are followed by the moderns: see for instance A. Heubeck and A. Hoekstra, *A Commentary to Homer's Odyssey* 2 (Oxford 1988-1992), 97); this is certainly correct, as it rounds off the catalogue linking back to vv. 286ff., where Iphiklos is mentioned. The scholiast to Homer, *Odyssey* 11.326, gives as authority Hesiod (F 62 M.-W.; see also *PSI* 1173.78-81), whence Eustathios of Thessalonica, *Commentary in Homer's Odyssey* 1689.2 (very close version in Eustathios, *Commentary in Homer's Odyssey* 1688.65 = Hesiod F 387 M.-W), so this is an early story. But he goes on to add that according to some, Klymene had first united herself to Helios, from whom she had had Phaethon:

Κλυμένη Μινύου τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος καὶ Εὐρυανάσσης τῆς Ὑπέρφαντος γαμηθεῖσα Φυλάκῳ τῷ Δηΐονος Ἴφικλον τίκτει ποδώκη παῖδα. ἔνιοι δὲ αὐτὴν τὴν Κλυμένην προγαμηθῆναι φασιν Ἡλίῳ, ἐξ ἧς Φαέθων ἐγένετο παῖς. ἡ δὲ ἱστορία παρὰ Ἡσιόδῳ.

Klymene, daughter of Minyas son of Poseidon and Euryanassa daughter of Hyperphas, having married Phylakos son of Deion gave birth to Iphiklos, her child fleet of foot ... some, however, say that this same Klymene united herself first with Helios, giving birth to Phaethon. The story is in Hesiod. (scholiast to Homer, *Odyssey* 11.326)

Here we have a more complicated love-life. The scholiast to Homer, *Odyssey* 11.326 attributes this version to 'some others'; a variant of this story is first attested in Euripides's *Phaethon*, in which Klymene first gives to Helios Phaethon and the Heliades and then marries the king of the Ethiopians, Merops (see *TGrF* 5 (72) *Phaethon*). However in this narrative the main characters are, besides Klymene herself, Helios, and a mortal, Phylakos or Merops: thus either we move here into another type of love affair, where Helios and a

mortal play a major role, or we have to imagine an unattested dispute for Klymene between two gods, one of them Helios, following the model of the dispute that took place for Thetis. This is the position of Reitzenstein, Lippold, and Jacoby (*FGrH* 1A *11 n. 4).

A third possibility is offered by a unique story, preserved in a scholion to Euripides's *Orestes*, according to which Myrtilos the charioteer of Oinomaus, usually said to have been the son of Hermes, is instead the result of the union of Klymene and Zeus (scholion to Euripides, *Orestes* 998: οἱ δὲ ἐκ Κλυμένης φασὶν αὐτὸν καὶ Διὸς γεγενῆσθαι). One wonders whether this Klymene should be somehow linked to the one mentioned in *Odyssey* 11.326 and paired with Maira: after all, both are loved by Zeus. If we assume that *P.Herc.* 1602 V 19 refers to this latter Klymene, then the narrative continued with further love affairs of Zeus.

Who is the Peisandros mentioned as authority here? The overall context is clearly archaic (other authorities mentioned in the papyrus fragment include the author of the *Kypria* and Hesiod). Thus, for R. Keydell, 'Die Dichter mit Namen Peisandros', *Hermes* 70 (1935), 10, it was clear that Peisandros the archaic epic poet from Kameiros was meant here; so also O. Salati, 'Mitografi e storici in Filodemo (*De Pietate, pars altera*)', *CronErc* 42 (2012), 250-1. It is reasonably easy to imagine a context in the *Herakleia* in which Peisandros might have mentioned Klymene in connection with Helios and his descendants; slightly more difficult to imagine a connection with any of the other characters named Klymene. The possibility of a spurious poem attributed to Peisandros should also be borne in mind: in that case, we need not look for a link with the *Herakleia*.

Commentary on F 12

Jacoby's doubts on the Philodemian authorship of the text (*FGrH* 1A *11, where he contrasted this passage with *P.Herc.* 1609 col. 2 l. 10, which indeed is about Periklymenos, περικλυμένωι, and Mestra) are superseded: *Vol. Herc. Coll. Alt.* VIII 105 (consultable here: <http://epikur-wuerzburg.de/digitale-ressourcen/downloads/vh2/>) is not an error, but the publication of an engraving, made twenty years later, of the same text from which the *apographum oxoniense* (on which Gomperz based his edition) derives, which is *P.Herc.* 1602 col. 5: see A. Schober, 'Philodemi *De Pietate Parts Prior*, Königsberg 1923', in *CronErc* 18 (1988), 67.

On Philodemos and on his *On piety* see above, commentary on F 11. *P.Herc.* 1602 was unrolled in 1826 by F. Casanova, who also prepared, in the same year, the Neapolitan *disegni* of the papyrus. See <http://www.chartes.it/index.php?r=document/view&id=1626> for the data and a bibliography of publications concerning the papyrus; Schober's text is available at <http://litpap.info/dclp/62485>; the engraving by D. Casanova at http://www.epikur-wuerzburg.de/vh2/VH2_08_105.jpg.

Fragment 16 F 12bis

ID	16 F 12bis
Source	Philodemos, <i>On Piety</i> (περὶ εὐσεβείαν) (P. Herc. 247 IV b <i>dextra pars</i> ll. 5-21, p. 80 Schober)

Work mentioned	
Source date	1st century BCE
Source language	Greek
Source genre	mythology, Greek; criticism; epic
Fragment subject	mythology, Greek; criticism; epic
Textual base	A. Schober, <i>Philodemi De Pietate Parts Prior</i> , <i>CronErc</i> 18 (1988), 65-125 [Königsberg 1923]

Text

5 τὸν Ἀσκληπιὸν δ' ὕ- | πὸ Διὸς κα[τακταν-] | θῆναι¹ γέγρ[αφεν² Ἡ-] | σίοδος καὶ [Πείσαν-
] | δρος³ καὶ Φε[ρεκύδης] | 10 ὁ Ἀθηναῖος [καὶ Πανύ-] | ασις⁴ καὶ Ἄν[δρων] | καὶ
Ἀκουσίλαος καὶ | Εὐριπίδ[ης ἐν οἷς] | λέγει 'Ζ[εὺς γὰρ κα-] | 15 [τ]ακτὰς πα[ῖδα τὸν] |
ἐμόν' καὶ ὁ τ[ᾶ] Ναυ- | πάκτια ποι[ήσας] | καὶ Τελέστ[ης ἐν Ἄσ-] | κληπιῶι. λ[έγεται] | 20 δὲ
καὶ ἐν τ[οῖς Νόσ-] τοις.

Translation

That Asklepios was killed by Zeus Hesiod [F 51 M.-W.] wrote, and Peisandros and Pherekydes the Athenian [BNJ 3 F 35] and Panyassis [F 26 PEG] and Andron [BNJ 10 F 17] and Akousilaos [BNJ 2 F 18] and Euripides where he says 'for Zeus, having killed my son' [Eur. *Alkestis* 3] and the poet who composed the *Naupaktia* [F 11 PEG] and Telestes in the *Asklepios* [F 3 Page].

Critical Apparatus

1. κα[τακταν-] | θῆναι Körte, Henrichs 1975, Fowler *EGM* 13; κα[τακτα-] | θῆναι Schober, Jacoby, (*addenda FGGrH* 9 F 3bis, Part 1A p.*9), Salati, Luppe (; κε[ραυνω-] | θῆναι Gomperz, Nauck; κα[θαίρε-] | θῆναι Dietze *Neue Jahrbücher* 153 (1896) 222.
2. γέγρ[άφασιν] Luppe, Fowler *EGM* 13, longius spatio?
3. Schober, Jacoby (*addenda FGGrH* 9 F 3bis, Part 1A p.*9), Henrichs 1975, Salati; Πίνδ-] | αρος Nauck, contra divisionis leges (Jacoby); Ἄναξιμαν-] | δρος Wilamowitz, spatio longius
4. [- - -] | δοσις N (Neapolitan *disegno*)

Commentary on the text

This reference to Peisandros in Philodemos's *On Piety* (*P.Herc.* 247 IV b 8-9, p. 80 Schober; 8; and Bernabé, *PEG* 1, Pisander F *dubium* 17) is absent from Jacoby, who only mentioned this passage in his *Addenda* to Anaximandros, *FGGrH* 9 F 3bis; but it should be added to the others.

The story is a well-known one: Asklepios' mother, the nymph Koronis, preferred a mortal husband to Apollo, and for this was punished with death; Apollo snatched their son Asklepios from the pyre, and entrusted him to the centaur Cheiron. From him Asklepios learnt the art of healing, but went beyond the allotted boundaries when he restored the dead to life, and was for this reason killed by Zeus with a thunderbolt. There are numerous variants to the story, regarding Asklepios' mother, the individuals he called back from death, and Asklepios' reasons for this: see Pseudo-Apollodoros, *Library* 3.10.3, 118-121; E. and L. Edelstein, *Asclepius: A Collection and interpretation of the Testimonies* (Baltimore 1945), test. 94-116 (Philodemos's passage is test. 106); full discussion in R. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography II, Commentary* (Oxford 2013), 74-9.

The restoration of Peisandros' name is not entirely certain: much depends on the assumed line length, which oscillates between c. 14 and c. 16 characters per line (see ll. 5 and 9 respectively). In most cases this does not really matter (e.g. at l. 7 we could have γέγραφεν Ἥ- | σίοδος (14 letters) or γεγρ[άφασιν Ἥ-] | σίοδος and all other authors (16 letters). L. 8, where [Πείσαν-] is entirely restored, fits this pattern perfectly, with its 15 letters, so technically there are no obstacle to the restoration proposed by Schober, and generally accepted. Wilamowitz' Anaximandros is slightly too long, and does not really fit the context, while Nauck's Πινδ-αρος has an unlikely word division (besides assuming a small imprecision in the Neapolitan drawing). R. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography I* (Oxford 2000), p. 13 (Anaximander F 18) prefers to leave the lacuna in the text; but as Peisandros' name fits the space, as Peisandros is mentioned elsewhere in Philodemos' *On piety*, and as he appears elsewhere in this kind of company (with Pherekydes in the scholia to Apollonios Rhodios, see F 7, and the discussion below), I accept the restoration.

The text is again a Zitatennest, and as shown in the very rich discussion by A. Henrichs, 'Philodemos «De Pietate» als mythographische Quelle', *CronErc* 5 (1975), 8-10, the entire passage, with all its source citations, goes back to Apollodoros's *On the Gods*. As in the fragment previously discussed, Peisandros is mentioned just after Hesiod, with Pherekydes, Panyassis, Andron, and Akousilaos. The archaic poet from Kameiros might be meant here: Bernabé, *Poetae Epici Graeci I* (Leipzig 1987), 171 puts this among Peisandros's *fragmenta dubia*, with the number 17, an approach shared by M. Davies (ed.), *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta* (Gottingen 1988), 134 F *dubium* 4 and O. Salati, 'Mitografi e storici in Filodemo (*De Pietate, pars altera*)', *CronErc* 42 (2012), 249; this was also the opinion of Jacoby, in his *addenda* to Anaximandros, *FGrH* 9 F 3bis, Part I A p.*9). And yet, the overall configuration is similar to that appearing in F 7, where the scholiast to Apollonios cited Hesiod, Peisandros, Pherekydes, and Akousilaos. Should we then see in the Peisandros of *P.Herc.* 247 IV b 8-9 the early logographer/Hellenistic mythographer--or should we see in the Peisandros quoted by the scholia to Apollonios Rhodios the archaic epic poet?

Commentary on F 12bis

On Philodemos and on his *On piety*, see above, Commentary on F 11. Stories of deaths of gods and demi-gods form the larger context of this fragment.

Together with *P.Herc.* 1098, 1077, 229, 437, 452, 242, 1610, and 1114 (=N 1788 fr. 9), *P.Herc.* 247 forms one roll of *De pietate* (see D. Obbink, *Philodemus. On Piety, Part 1* (Oxford 1996) 643-5). Documentary records of the roll can be traced back to 1790, when it was first issued for drawing; Carlo Malesci took over the unrolling in 1830 (for the complex story of *P.Herc.* 247, its drawings, and various renumberings, see R. Janko, 'New fragments of Epicurus, Metrodorus, Demetrius Laco, Philodemus, the Carmen de bello Actiaco and other texts in Oxonian disegni of 1788-1792', *CronErc* 38 (2008), 51); C. Malesci's own disegni of *P.Herc.* 247 can be consulted here: <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12113/731>, F 4 (note the statement at the bottom: 'non esiste l'originale'). The Neapolitan disegni formed then the basis for the engraving in the *Herculanensium Voluminum Quae Supersunt Collectio Altera* vol. 2 p. 45, accessible in a digitized online version here: <http://epikurwuerzburg.de/digitale-ressourcen/downloads/vh2/>). An online text, based on Schober's edition, is available here: <http://litpap.info/dclp/62400>.

Fragment 16 F 13

ID	16 F 13
Source	Servius Danielis on Virgil's, <i>Aeneid</i> 2.211
Work mentioned	
Source date	various
Source language	Latin
Source genre	mythology, Greek
Fragment subject	mythology, Greek
Textual base	Jacoby

Text

hos dracones Lysimachus † curifin et Periboeam¹ dicit, filios vero Laocoontis Ethronem et Melanthum Thessandrus² dicit.

Translation

Lysimachos [[BNJ 382 F 16](#)] gives the names of these serpents as †curifin and Periboea, while Thessandros (?) names the sons of Laokoon Ethro (?) and Melanthos.

Critical Apparatus

1. Jacoby, Rand; *Porcen et Chariboeam* Masvicius 1717; *Porcen ofin et Chariboeam* Thilo in *app.*; *Coryphen et Periboeam* F. Schoell
2. fort. Peisandros, Rand et. al in *app.*, cf. *Macr. Sat.* 5.2.4.

Commentary on the text

Thessandros, offered by the manuscripts, is unknown; Heyne (*Publius Virgilius Maro Varietate Lectionis Et Perpetua Adnotatione Illustratus a Christ. Gottl. Heyne, 4. Ed. Curavit G. P. E. Wagner* (Leipzig 1832) 399) suggested to emend the name in Pisandros (he was thinking of the archaic epic poet). His emendation is generally accepted (it is mentioned,

without attribution, in the apparatus of Rand et al., *Servianorum in Vergilii carmina commentariorum editio Harvardiana*, vol 2 (Lancaster, Penn. 1946), 381), but is considered to refer to the mythographer (so Jacoby; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, 'Lesefrüchte', *Hermes* 60 (1925), 280-4; and A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2004), 260). In light of Macrobius Ambrosius Theodosius's remark on Virgil having made use of Peisandros's work for his narrative of the capture of Troy, a reference to Peisandros in a note to the second book of the *Aeneid* makes sense (see Jacoby, *FGrH* 1A, *11 n. 7). See also N. Horsfall, *Virgil Aeneid II. A commentary* (Leiden 2008), 194-5, who finds the hypothesis of a mythographer attractive. Yet, as noted by R. Keydell, 'Die Dichter mit Namen Peisandros', *Hermes* 70 (1935), 311, Peisandros of Laranda is also a plausible candidate: he might have given names to the sons of Laokoon, unnamed in Virgil. Finally, it is worth remembering that, as stressed by Cameron, *Greek Mythography*, 203, Thessandros is not in itself an implausible or unknown name and other emendations are possible. (C. Robert, *Die griechische Heldensage* 3.1 (Berlin 1921), 1250 n. 4, suggested, for instance, that Alexandros (Polyhistor) should be restored—I agree with Jacoby, *FGrH* 1A *11 n. 7, that this is extremely unlikely).

There existed a rich mythographic tradition concerning the names of the serpents. Slightly earlier in his commentary, Servius Danielis states that Sophokles had named the serpents in his *Laocoon* (Sophokles F 343 R. (S. Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* 4 (Göttingen 1977))= on Virgil's *Aeneid* 2.204), and that the scene had also been described by Bacchylides (Servius Honoratus, Maurus on Virgil's *Aeneid* 2.201); Cameron, *Greek Mythography*, 203, is certainly right in thinking that all these details derive from a comprehensive account, that of Lysimachos. But there were other accounts of the serpents' names: Porkis and Chariboia in Nikander, as quoted by Apollodoros, *On Gods* (*Supplementum Hellenisticum* 562.11); and Porkis in Lykophron, *Alexandra* 347, while the *scholia vetera* to Lykophron add Chariboia († curifin and Periboia in Servius Auctus are clearly misreadings or variants for Porkis and Chariboia). As for the children of Laokoon, much less is known about them: Nikander seems to have known of one son only, whom he does not name, while in Hyginus, C. Iulius Fabulae 135, they are named Antiphanes and Thymbraios (see on this, Cameron, *Greek Mythography*, 203 and n. 87, who suggests that a name such as Anthron or Aethion hides behind the rather odd Ethro).

Commentary to F 13

On Servius' commentary on Virgil, and on the distinction between the vulgate version of Servius, containing a relatively simple commentary, and the larger version, known as Servius Danielis (after its first editor Pierre Daniel), Servius Auctus, or DS, and containing more specific and obscure information, see J. Zetzel, *Critics, Compilers, and Commentators: An Introduction to Roman Philology, 200 BCE-800 CE* (Oxford 2018), 131-5. Servius may have been composed his commentary in the early fifth century; particularly important for our purpose is the fact that Servius, Macrobius, and Servius Danielis all appear to rely, at least in part and in different degrees, on the lost, larger commentary on Virgil by Aelius Donatus (active in the middle of the fourth century BC), which in turn excerpted his materials from earlier sources. This is what pushed Heyne (and many after him) to link Macrobius' information concerning a Peisandros source of Virgil with Servius Danielis'

comment on Thessandrus (on the closeness of the information preserved by Servius Danielis and Macrobius Cameron, *Greek Mythography*, 198-200).

Fragment 16 F 14

ID	16 F 14
Source	P. Berol. Inv. 13872 (W. Schubart, <i>Griechische Literarische Papyri</i> 1950, n° 4; Pack ² 1229)
Work mentioned	
Source date	first half of 1 st century BCE
Source language	Greek
Source genre	criticism; religion
Fragment subject	criticism; religion
Textual base	Jacoby

Text

καὶ Πείσανδρος |15 [έν τοῖς ... συγγεγρα]μμένοις τὴν ἐ-| [ξ Αὐλίδος ὀρμὴν] καὶ τὴν εἰς
[Ἴ]λιον ἄ-| [φιξιν ἐξηγεῖται...] ὥσθ' ὅταν ἴδω-| [μεν..... νοο]υμεν ὡς π[.].οκ[.] | [- . .] ὑπὲρ
τῶν πρότε-|20 [ρον.....].ν[.]εὐμενων [.]επ[.]ις

Translation

And Peisandros [in ...] written narrates the departure from Aulis and the arrival to Ilium in such a way that when we see ... we understand that... concerning those who before ...

Critical Apparatus

16.: [έν ταῖς Θεογαμίαις καλου]μέναις? Jacoby, *longius spatium*; [τοῖς Κύπρια ἐπιγεγρα]μμένοις Maas, *Gnomon* 23, 5 (1951), 243

Commentary on the text

The name 'Peisandros' appears at l. 14 of a very fragmentary passage of the first column of the papyrus, in which also references to Achilles' anger and Odysseus' nostos (ll. 12-13) can be recognized. Because of specific interpunction (*dicolon*), *paragraphos*, and spacing, W. Schubart, *Griechische Literarische Papyri* (Berlin 1950), 9-10 assumed that this was part of a dialogue; and on the basis of the content, he suggested that the dialogue had to do with issues of internal and external chronology of the Homeric poems. For his part, R. Merkelbach, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 16 (1968) 119 thought that the central part of the column (ll. 11-) reden von den υποπέσεις der Epen, dem Zorn des Achill und dein Nost s des Odysseus im Gegensatz zu Autoren, welche den ganzen Mythenzyklus in historischer Folge darstellen,

While there are in the Homeric poems four minor characters named 'Peisandros' (two Trojans and a Greek warrior in the *Iliad*, respectively 11.122 and 143, 13.601, 606, and 611, and 16.193, and a suitor of Penelope in *Odyssey* 18.299, 22.243, and 22.268), none of these seems to fit the context. Peisandros, then, must be an author quoted or mentioned in this context; Schubart, *Griechische Literarische Papyri*, 11 indeed suggested that Peisandros appeared here in relation to the voyage of the army from Aulis to Troy, without taking position on the identity of this Peisandros.

In his review of Schubart's edition, Paul Maas (*Gnomon* 23, 5 (1951), 243) suggested that the archaic poet was meant, to whom authorship of *Kypria* might have been attributed. That a reference to the arrival of the Achaians at Troy appeared in the *Herakleia* of Peisandros of Kameiros is unlikely (and indeed, P. Schubart 4 does not appear in any of the editions of the testimonia and fragments of Peisandros the archaic poet of Kameiros); but this could have been one of the spurious works attributed to Peisandros.

For his part François Lasserre, in his review of Schubart's edition (*L'Antiquité Classique* 20 (1951), 187), took this Peisandros to be the mythographer (and for this reason considered P. Schubart 4 as one of the most interesting pieces of the collection).

Jacoby quoted Schubart's text of this fragment in his *addenda* to the 1957 reedition (*FGrH* 1 A *11), but he was clearly not convinced of the attribution to the mythographer, since in his apparatus he proposed to restore at l. 15 [έν ταῖς Θεογαμίαις καλου]μέναις?, 'in the work called *Theogamiai*', the title of the poem of Peisandros of Laranda. Jacoby was working on the assumption that the papyrus dated to the third century CE (the date proposed by Schubart, *Griechische Literarische Papyri*, 9); reading a reference to Peisandros of Laranda in a literary papyrus of the third century BCE implies that a writer active in the third century was discussing the work of a contemporary poet; one feature of the papyrus, the fact that it is only written on the recto, i.e., that it was meant as a literary production from the start, may speak for this. However, Jacoby's proposal is slightly longer than the space allows (31 letters, while the line-length is ca. 26-28 letters); more importantly, the recent re-dating of the papyrus to the 1st century BCE by L.C. Colella, 'P.Schubart 4: ricontestualizzazione e nuova proposta di datazione', *Aegyptus* 93, 2013, 51–63, makes any reference to Peisandros of Laranda impossible (incidentally, P. Schubart 4 does not appear among the fragments of Peisandros of Laranda in E. Heitsch, *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit II* (Göttingen 1964)).

We are thus faced with a choice between the mythographer (and a date of the papyrus to the first century BCE makes this an attractive proposition) or a poem attributed to the archaic poet of Kameiros (L.C. Colella, 'Ancora su P. Schubart 4: sul problema dell'identificazione di Pisandro', *Quaderni del Museo del Papiro* 15 (2018) 201-211, leaves the issue open).

Commentary on F 14

The papyrus, now in Berlin, contains two columns of text (but for much of the first column only the right side is preserve; and of the second column only a few words remain) with the remains of a learned discussion (possibly a dialogue) on Homeric matters. It was first

published by W. Schubart, *Griechische literarische Papyri* (Berlin 1950), no. 4, on the basis of earlier transcriptions. Schubart was not able to see the papyrus, which had gone missing during the war; he proposed a date to the third century AD, while acknowledging that the writing appeared to be 'archaizing' (on the difficult conditions in which Schubart produced his edition see L. C. Colella, 'P. Schubart 4: ricontestualizzazione e nuova proposta di datazione', *Aegyptus* 93, 2013, 51–63).

The papyrus has now been found, and its origin established: it was part of a mummy cartonnage from Bousiris (modern Abusir el-Melek) in the Herakleopolite nome in Egypt. On this basis, Colella has proposed, with very solid arguments, a date in the first half of the first century BCE – a re-dating that carries implications also for the interpretation of the reference to Peisandros. A photograph of the papyrus (P. Berol. Inv. 13872 = Pack² 1229), with short description and links to bibliographical references, is accessible in the Berliner Papyrusdatenbank (<https://berlpap.smb.museum/03912/>); basic bibliography and links here: www.trismegistos.org/text/60754

Biographical Essay

Everything about Peisandros the mythographer is the result of conjectures and inferences. There is no explicit statement about his existence, nor do we have any title for a work of his; and at least some of the fragments or testimonia attributed to him by Jacoby could equally plausibly be attributed to one of the other Peisandroi, the archaic epic poet from Kameiros or the late imperial epic poet from Laranda. The only reason for postulating the existence of a mythographer of this name is the fact that some fragments attributed to a Peisandros do not seem to fit the notion we have of the work of the two epic poets. In particular, a group of fragments (seven from the scholia to Apollonios Rhodios; two from the scholia to Euripides's *Phoenician Women*; one in Pseudo-Apollodoros; and one in Servius's *Commentary to Virgil's Aeneid*), have been considered by Jacoby, and then by R. Keydell, 'Die Dichter mit Namen Peisandros', *Hermes* 70 (1935), 309-11, R. Keydell, 'Peisandros (13)', *RE* 19 (Stuttgart 1937), cols. 146-7, and A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2004), 29 and 255-60, as belonging to the mythographer rather than to one or the other epic poet. A further alternative, advanced by C. Robert, *Oidipus, Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffs im griechischen Altertum* (Berlin 1915), 64, was to separate the seven references in the *scholia* to Apollonios Rhodios from the rest and to consider that they belonged to an early logographer (Keydell, 'Peisandros', 146-7, acknowledged that it was difficult to decide between early logographer or Hellenistic mythographer). A further possibility is to accept, with L.C. Colella, 'Un Pisandro mitografo? Per una riconsiderazione di Pisander', *FGrHist* 16', *Incidenza dell'antico* 16 (2018), 11-50, that most fragments go back to the *Herakleia* of the archaic poet from Kameiros, and that those that do not fit (mostly based on subject matter: they do not concern Herakles) derive from the νόθα, spurious works (in poetry) which according to the *Suda* circulated under the name of Peisandros of Kameiros. Again, this is possible; but the fact that the *Suda* mentions also 'other works in prose' (καὶ ἄλλα καταλογάδην) circulating under the name of Peisandros of Laranda ultimately shows that there was material, both in prose and in verse, circulating under the name of a Peisandros. Macrobius and Philoponus (T 1 and T 2) do not help: they seem to speak of the same Peisandros, who is not the archaic poet; they

might both have in mind Peisandros of Laranda (so N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 11. A commentary* (Leiden 2003) 470-1), but their sources might equally well have been thinking of someone else writing – in prose? In epic verse? – as Peisandros (note that Horsfall changed his mind, and that in his *Virgil, Aeneid 2. A commentary* (Leiden 2008), 194-5, he found Cameron’s defense of a mythographer attractive).

The fragment that it is most difficult to attribute to the archaic epic poet, and that most likely belongs to a later writer (whether of prose or poetry), is F 3, on the change of name of Arene/Erana, preserved in the scholia to Apollonios Rhodios. This could come from the work of an early logographer or from that of an Hellenistic mythographer; but attention to *metonomasiai* is well attested also in Hellenistic poetry. Unfortunately, Peisandros is here mentioned as an isolated source, so the context does not help.

Also isolated are the references to Peisandros in F 4 (on Herakles’s club) and F 6 (the Stymphalian birds/birds of the island of Ares) from the same scholia to Apollonios, and those in the scholia to Euripides’s *Phoenician Women* (F 9 and F 10).

As for the other fragments, F 1, from Pseudo-Apollodoros’s *Library*, presents the constellation *Thebaid*, Hesiod, ‘some’, and Peisandros. F 2, from the scholia to Apollonios Rhodios, contrasts variants from Pherekydes, Peisandros, and Theokritos. F 5, from these same scholia, mentions together Epicharmos and Peisandros, and adds Deilochos. F 7, again from the scholia to Apollonios, mentions as giving the same version Hesiod, Peisandros, Akousilaos, Pherekydes, Nikandros, and Theopompos the epic poet. The last reference to Peisandros in the scholia to Apollonios, F 8, contrasts him with Hesiod.

References to Peisandros in Philodemos’s *On Piety* group him with Euripides, Simonides, and Hesiod (F 11, if indeed Peisandros is mentioned here); with Aischylos, the *Kypria*, and Hesiod (F 12); and with Hesiod, Pherekydes, Panyassis, Andron, Akousilaos, Euripides, the author of the *Naupaktia*, and Telestes (16 F 12a). This is a very homogeneous group, filtered through Apollodoros’s *On the Gods*; the topics (Atlas, Klymene, and Asklepios) do not seem to fit a *Herakleia*, but the citation contexts speaks for an early writer (prose or poetry).

Traditionally, the references in Philodemos have been thought to go back to the archaic epic poet (Jacoby listed fragments 11 to 14, that is, the Philodemian ones, the one preserved by Servius, where the name is restored, and the one in the anonymous dialogue on the Trojan cycle, under the heading ‘Uncertain and Dubious’), while those in Pseudo-Apollodoros’s *Library*, in the scholia to Apollonios Rhodios, and in Euripides’s *Phoenician Women* have been considered to go back to the Hellenistic mythographer/early logographer. Yet, the constellation of sources within which Peisandros appears is in both groups very similar, and in both groups only some passages may depend on a poem on Herakles, while for others we have to think of a work with a different scope.

Finally, F 13, where the name Peisandros is the result of an emendation, contrasts him with the Hellenistic prose writer Lysimachos. F 14 discusses matters linked with the Trojan cycle; the *Herakleia* of Peisandros of Kameiros is unlikely, and the new dating of the papyrus excludes Peisandros of Laranda; here, a Hellenistic mythographer seems a good option.

How to interpret this? A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2004), 29, points out that in most cases Peisandros is the most recent writer of the group, which suggests that he may have tended to cite his sources. But Cameron's argument rests on the unproven assumption that Peisandros is a Hellenistic mythographer; in practice, Peisandros is mostly positioned right after Homer or Hesiod, and before early prose-writer such as Akousilaos and Pherekydes, which is exactly where we would expect to find the archaic poet of Kameiros. As Keydell, 'Peisandros', 147, concluded, 'Sicherheit ist nicht zu erreichen'.

The Suda mentions both pseudepigraphic epic poems (in the entry concerning Peisandros of Kameiros) and other prose works (in the entry on Peisandros of Laranda). Clearly the contours of these authors were uncertain, and there were both prose works and epic poems attributed to a 'Peisandros'. Notwithstanding the arguments advanced by Colella, 'Un Pisandro mitografo? Per una riconsiderazione di Pisander, *FGrHist* 16', in favour of a Hellenistic poet, a mythographer seems to fit the historical development better (see again Cameron, *Roman mythography*, 27-32 and 255-60). If a Hellenistic mythographer named Peisandros did indeed exist, the homonymy with the much more famous archaic epic poet from Kameiros will have facilitated confusions. The hypothesis advanced by Jacoby, *FGrH* 1A, 494 (1925) and again 545 (1957), that the name is a pseudonym, intentionally built on the name of the archaic epic poet, is also attractive: a mythographer would have published, under the name of the famous poet, a prose work in which he paraphrased the epic poem, expanding it further (so also G. Ucciardello, *per litteras*, who compares with what happened with Eumelos of Corinth; one could compare also Epimenides and perhaps Agias/Derkyllus: R. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography I* (Oxford 2000), xxxiii-iv, 79, 105). Such a scenario would explain the fact that many of the fragments of the 'mythographer' could equally well be attributed to the epic poet, and conversely, that the mythographer is mentioned together with very early poets and prose-writers.

The scenarios we are left with (besides the potential but unlikely survival of an ancient epic poem) are thus the following:

1. a mythographer named Peisandros, who did not have a particular commitment to the works of the archaic poet Peisandros, who quoted his sources, as mythographers do, and for that reason appears to us within constellations of early poets and prose-writers;
2. a Peisandros, or someone writing under that name, who paraphrased in prose the work of the archaic poet Peisandros, taking in later authors, who would cite him together with other early poets and prose-writers. On the whole, the second hypothesis accounts best for the situation. (I should like to thank here Nicholas Horsfall, Giuseppe Ucciardello, and Robert Fowler for their help in coming to grips with the evidence--and in the case of Nicholas, much more).

Bibliography

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

Colella, L.C. 2018. 'Ancora su P. Schubart 4: sul problema dell'identificazione di Pisandro', *Quaderni del Museo del Papiro* 15,

Colella, L. C. 2018. "Un Pisandro mitografo? Per una riconsiderazione di Pisander, *FGrHist* 16", *Incidenza dell'antico* no. 16: 11-50.

Fornaro, S. 2007. *Peisander* [9]. *Brill's New Pauly*. Vol. 10.: 000

Jones, H. Lloyd. 2005. *The Further Academic Papers of Sir High Lloyd-Jones*. Oxford.

Keydell, R. 1935. "Die Dichter Mit Namen Peisandros." *Hermes*, no. 70: 301–11.

———. 1937. "Peisandros (11), (12), (13)." *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie Der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 19, 000

Lloyd Jones, H. 2002. "Curses and Divine Anger in Early Greek Epic." *CQ*, no. 42: 3–10.

Meliadò, C. 2015. "Mythography." *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship*, F Montanari, S. Matthaios, A. Rengakos (eds.), 1057–1089.

von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. 1925. "Lesefrüchte." *Hermes*, no. 60: 280–4.