

287 Chrysermos of Corinth

Paola Ceccarelli (Durham)

Chrysermus Corinthius	Chrysermos of Corinth
Historian Number:	287

287 F 1 - (IV 361, 1) [Plutarch] De fluviis 18, 7 = Moralia 1161D meta[[id="287" type="F" n="1"]] Subject: Genre: Aetiology, Foundation Myth Historical Work: Peloponnesian Histories book 1 Source date: 2nd century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: myth: mythical past	Translation
Χρύσερμος δ' ὁ Κορίνθιος ἐν ᾧ Πελοποννησιακῶν ἱστορίας μέμνηται τοιαύτης. Περσέως φερομένου μετεώρου καὶ κατὰ τὸν λόφον γενομένου τοῦτον, ἐξέπεσεν αὐτοῦ τῆς λαβῆς τοῦ ξίφους ὁ μύκης. Γοργοφόνος δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἐπιδαυρίων ἐκπεσῶν τῆς ἀρχῆς ἔλαβεν χρησμόν ἐκπεριελθεῖν τὰς Ἀργολικὰς πόλεις, καὶ ὅπου ἂν εὕρηι ξίφους μύκητα, ἐκεῖ κτίσαι πόλιν. γενόμενος δὲ κατὰ τὸ Ἄργιον ὄρος καὶ εὐρῶν τὴν ἔλεφαντίνην λαβὴν πόλιν ἔκτισεν, ἣν ἀπὸ τοῦ συγκυρήματος προσηγόρευσε Μυκήνας.	But Chrysermos of Corinth in the first book of the <i>Peloponnesian Histories</i> remembers a story of this kind. When Perseus was being transported in the air and had arrived around this hill (Argion / Mykenai), the cap (<i>mykes</i>) of the handle of his sword fell. Gorgophonos however, the king of the Epidaurians, who had fallen from power, received an oracle that he should go round the cities of the Argolid, and that he should found a city there, where he found the cap of a sword. Having arrived at Mt. Argion and having found the ivory handle he founded a city, which, because of the accident, he named Mykenai.

287 F 1 Commentary

Jacoby's commentary, in *FGrH* 3a, 384, covers all that is essential; what follows here only complements it with recent references.

Chapter 18 of the *On rivers* concerns the river Inachos and more generally the Argolid; it is a rather unusual chapter, peculiar within the treatise, because it is much longer than usual (13 paragraphs, while most chapters of the *On rivers* count 4 or 5 paragraphs, dedicated in turn to an account of the character who in dying gives his name to the river, the plant and/or stone that grows in the river, the mountain close to the river, and the plant and/or stone to be found on the mountain). It is unusual also because it presents discordant stories (see on the general structure of *On Rivers* A. De Lazzer, in E. Calderon Dorda, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Monti e fiumi* (Naples 2003), 7-15).

On rivers 18.6 and 7 are closely related, although two different authors are mentioned as source of the information.

In the paragraph preceding our fragment the author of the *On rivers* has given an aetiology

of the name 'Mykenai', deriving it from the pained and sonorous bellowing (μυκηθμός) of the two surviving Gorgons, when they realized that they would not capture Perseus; an aetiology that he claims to have found in the (otherwise unknown) *Perseis* of Ctesias of Ephesos. The connection with the bellowing of the Gorgons seems to be unique to [Plutarch] (Stephanos of Byzantion s.v. *Mykenai* gives three aetiologies for the name of the city: from Mykeneos son of Sparton brother of Phoroneos; from the cap of Perseus's sword; or from the bellowing of Io when she arrived there; the same appears in Aelius Herodianus, *De prosodia catholica* 3.1.331 and in Eustathios, *Commentary on Homer's Iliad* 1.447. The bellowing in connection with the name of Mykenai is thus normally associated to Io, and such a connection would have been perfectly appropriate in a chapter on the Inachos).

In that same paragraph, *On rivers* 18.6, [Plutarch] had also given an aetiology, presumably from the same source, for the name of Mount Argion, which he derived from Argos *panoptes*, the many-eyed giant sent by Hera to guard Io. As Jacoby noted (*FGrH* 3a, 384), an *Argion oros* appears only here in all of Greek literature, and is most likely invented (the fact that Nikandros, *Alexipharmaka* 100-5, in retelling a version of the story, mentions a hill Μελανθίς, i.e. black, on which the cap of Perseus's sickle would have fallen, is highly suggestive: one of the meanings of the adjective ἀργός is white); it is however worth noting that according to [Apollodoros], *Library*, 2.1.5, 18 one of the sons of Aigyptos bore the name Argion: the name is attested in local lore.

As pointed out by Jacoby, a mention of the finding of the fallen cap of a scabbard (μύκηνη) was already in Hecataeus (see F. Jacoby, *FGrH* 1a, 324-5 for further parallels); but who it was who found the cap, or whether the story was similar to the one narrated by Chrysermos, is unclear. The oscillation in the text of [Plutarch] between cap of the sword, cap of the handle of the sword, and handle is in general paralleled in the tradition; but within one text, this may be taken as further indication of the lack of attention to details of the author of the *On rivers* – or of problems within the tradition (see De Lazzer, in Calderon Dorda, De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Monti e fiumi*, 7-15).

A Gorgophonos king of the Epidaurians is otherwise unattested; the name is clearly invented on the basis of the myth of the killing of the Gorgons by Perseus (whose own daughter by Andromeda was called Gorgophone, [Apollodoros] *Library* 2.4.5, 49; other references in Jacoby). Gorgophonos is thus a double of Perseus. De Lazzer (in Calderon Dorda, De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Monti e fiumi*, 244) points out that the story makes of Mykenai a sort of colony of Epidaurus, while in reality Mykenai is much more ancient than Epidaurus. Whether this could be used to support the idea of a rewriting of Peloponnesian history (from a Corinthian viewpoint?) by Chrysermos depends on how much trust one is willing to put in Chrysermos's existence; even if Chrysermos is one of [Plutarch]'s invented authors, as I would tend to believe (with F. Atenstädt, 'Zwei Quellen des sogenannten Plutarch de fluviis', *Hermes* 57 (1922), 245 and Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 383: see below, biographical essay), the *Parallela minora* might here preserve a trace of an anti-Spartan tradition.

287 F 2a - (2) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 3A =
Moralia 306ab
meta[[id="287" type="F" n="2" n-mod="a" tgroup="2, 1"]]

Subject: Military History
Historical Work: Peloponnesian History book 3
Source date: 2nd century AD
Historian's date: unknown
Historical period: mid 6th century BC?

Translation

Ἄργείων καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων ὑπὲρ Θυρεάτιδος χώρας πολεμούντων, οἱ Ἄμφικτύονες ἔκριναν πολεμήσαι ἑκατέρων τριακοσίους,¹ καὶ τῶν νικησάντων εἶναι τὴν χώραν. Λακεδαιμόνιοι μὲν οὖν Ὀθρυάδην ἐποίησαν στρατηγόν, Ἄργεῖοι δὲ Θέρσανδρον. πολεμούντων δέ, δύο ἐκ τῶν Ἄργείων περιλείφθησαν Ἀγήνωρ καὶ Χρόμιος, οἵτινες εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἤγγειλαν τὴν νίκην. ἡρεμίας δ' ὑπαρχούσης, Ὀθρυάδης ἐπιζήσας καὶ ἡμικλάστοις δόρασιν ἐπεριδόμενος τὰς τῶν νεκρῶν ἀρπάζων ἀσπίδας περιείλετο, καὶ τρόπαιον στήσας ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος ἐπέγραψε «Διὶ τροπαιούχῳ». καὶ τῶν δήμων στάσιν ἐχόντων, οἱ Ἄμφικτύονες αὐτόπται γενόμενοι Λακεδαιμονίοις προ<σ>κρίνουσι, καθάπερ Χρύσερμος ἐν ᾧ Πελοποννησιακῶν.

When the Argives and the Lakedaimonians were fighting for the Thyreatis, the Amphiktyons decided that three hundred of each side should fight, and that the region should be of those who would win. The Lakedaimonians then made Othryades their general, and the Argives Thersandros. And after they had fought, two of the Argives, Agenor and Chromios, survived, who announced to the city the victory. Once the battlefield was deserted, Othryades revived and, leaning on half-broken spears, despoiled and stripped the dead of their shields; and having erected a trophy, he inscribed it with his own blood: 'To Zeus Guardian of Trophies.' And because the two peoples were in dispute, the Amphiktyons, after having seen for themselves, decided for the Lakedaimonians, as Chrysermos narrates in the third book of his *Peloponnesian History*.

287 F 2a Commentary

See below under 2b

287 F 2b - Stobaios Anthologus 3, 7, 68
meta[[id="287" type="F" n="2" n-mod="b" tgroup="2, 2"]]

Subject: Military History
Historical Work: unknown
Source date: 5th century AD
Historian's date: 1st century AD
Historical period: mid 6th century BC ?

Translation

ἐκ τῶν Θησέως. Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ Ἄργεῖοι περὶ χωρίου Θυρέας ἐν μεθορίῳ κειμένης μέχρι μὲν τινος ὄλοις τοῖς στρατεύμασι παρετάσσοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους. τέλος ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς ἐπιλέξαι παρ' ἑκατέρων τριακοσίους, κάκεινων μαχεσαμένων τοῖς κρατήσασιν διαφέρειν τὸ χωρίον. οὐπερ γενομένου, Ὀθρυάδης Λακεδαιμόνιος στρατιώτης πολλοὺς ἀποκτείνας καὶ πολλὰ τετρωμένος ἔκειτο μεταξὺ τῶν ἀνηρημένων Λακεδαιμονίων μόνος περιλείφθεις, Ἄργείων δὲ δύο, Ἀλκίνωρ καὶ Χρόμιος. ὧν ἀπελθόντων εἰς Ἄργος ἀπαγγεῖλαι

From the work of Theseus. The Lakedaimonians and the Argives were drawn up in battle order with nearly all their entire armies for the land of Thyrea, which lay along the border. Eventually it seemed better to them to choose three hundred from each side, and once they had fought, to assign the territory to the victors. Once this happened, Othryades, a Lakedaimonian soldier, having killed many and having been repeatedly wounded, lay among the Lakedaimonian dead, being the only survivor, while there were two Argives, Alkenor

¹ ἑκατέρους codd., and De Lazzer (2000), who argues that the paragraph presents evident signs of compression and brevity; the correction ἑκατέρων τριακοσίους, proposed by Kurtz 1891, has been accepted by Nachstädt, Jacoby, and Boulogne, and seems in this context necessary.

τὴν νίκην, Ὀθρυάδης πολλοὺς σκυλεύσας τῶν πολεμίων τρόπαιον ἔστησε, καὶ χρησάμενος τῶι τῶν τραυμάτων αἵματι ἐπέγραψε «Λακεδαιμόνιοι κατ' Ἀργείων». καὶ τοῦτο πράξας ἀπέθανεν. (= BNJ 453 F2)

and Chromios. When these left for Argos to announce the victory, Othryades stripped many of the enemies and erected a trophy, and with the blood of his wounds inscribed it 'The Lakedaimonians, against the Argives'. And having done this he died.

287 F 2b Commentary

If F2a and 2b are discussed together, it is because a number of stories from the *Parallela minora* are also found in Stobaios (see on the relationship between Stobaios and *Parallela F*. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *Parallela minora* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* S. 3, 8 (1940), 98-124; and A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 39-49). Because Stobaios preserves a story (here F 2b) that, in its main lines, is very close to that narrated in *Parallela minora* (here F 2a), while at the same time giving as source a different author (Theseus instead of Chrysermos), the usual assumption is that Stobaios and the *Parallela minora* both depend on an ampler, now lost original version of [Plutarch]'s work (see Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *Parallela minora*', 98-115 for the general argument, 97 n. 1 for qualifications concerning Theseus, and full discussion of the relationship between Stobaios and *Parallela minora* in respect to Theseus/Chrysermos at 121-123; *FGrH* 3a, 385).

Looking at this specific case only may not be sufficient to make such an assumption fully convincing: Jacoby (*FGrH* 3a, 385) for instance acknowledges that the fact that the story in Stobaios is followed by another excerpt headed τοῦ αὐτοῦ (i.e. from the same author: Theseus), an excerpt also concerning Spartan history, but absent from *Parallela minora* (although the story is present in Plutarch, *Moralia* 235F, *Sayings of the Spartans* 63), might give rise to some doubts ('einen ganz leisen zweifel erweckt') as to whether the relationship between *Parallela minora* and Stobaios is here the usual one. Yet consideration of the whole relationship between the two texts, consideration of issues such as the double source references which arise elsewhere in the *Parallela minora*, and finally some details such as the uncanny dovetailing of the text of the dedications (see below), led Jacoby (*FGrH* 3a, 385) to accept that both Theseus's text and the story attributed to Chrysermos in *Parallela minora* were part of the original, ampler, and now lost version of the *Parallela minora*.

Jacoby's position has been attacked by M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and the Scholia of the Iliad* 1 (Leiden 1963), 401-3, who developing Jacoby's doubt on the relationship in this instance between Stobaios and *Parallela minora* argues that the two texts are indeed related, but that the relationship is the opposite: Theseus (in Stobaios) is looking at Chrysermos's text. From this, Van der Valk deduces the real existence (beyond the *Parallela minora*) of Chrysermos's *Peloponnesiaka*. In particular, Van der Valk focuses on the slightly redundant formulation Ὀθρυάδης Λακεδαιμόνιος στρατιώτης, where στρατιώτης is not really necessary, to argue that the word is here to demarcate this version against that of Chrysermos, who made of Othryades a στρατηγός. The observation concerning the redundancy of the term στρατιώτης is excellent, and the argument on the whole points, I believe, in the right direction, but it presents some flaws: 1. the idea that Theseus is looking at Chrysermos's work, and not at Chrysermos as mediated by [Plutarch], is an unwarranted assumption (Theseus does not mention any sources, and could be looking at either text); 2. Van der Valk's reconstruction of Theseus's methods in writing history is far too complex: he would have been attracted by the romantic aspects of Chrysermos's version, but wanted to produce a scientific history and thus corrected it in light of Herodotos, eliminating the Amphictyons, but retaining, in one final concession to romanticism, the motif of the

inscription with blood; 3. more importantly, and in my view decisively, it does not deal adequately with the uncanny dovetailing of the texts of the inscriptions on the trophies in Theseus, in Chrysermos, and in the Roman parallel to Chrysermos's story in [Plutarch] (see below for this). This last point implies that [Plutarch], when writing *Parallela minora* 3AB, was building his account around the version we know as 'of Theseus'. In his commentary of *BNJ* 453 (Theseus) F 2, B.W. Millis does not take position on this (he does not mention [Plutarch] at all), but, on the basis of onomastic evidence, accepts for Theseus a date after Plutarch, in the 2nd century AD at the earliest; A. Corcella, 'A New Fragment of the Historian Theseus', *CQ* n.s. 46 (1996), 261-66 tends to follow Jacoby's line of reasoning, but he does not address this specific issue, and his suggested date for Theseus at the 2nd or 3rd century AD implies that Stobaios can hardly have taken his excerpt from an ampler version of the *Parallela minora*. The existence of a further fragment of Theseus preserved in the *Palatine Anthology* 14.77 (Corcella, 'A New Fragment', 266) shows that his work may have been more widely spread than otherwise assumed, but does not prove anything decisively. In what follows, I shall discuss the text of the *Parallela minora* (attributed to Chrysermos) and also its possible relationship with the text of Stobaios (from Theseus), considering them (with Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung', 123) not as two versions of the same text, but as two different narratives of the same story, two narratives that, for Jacoby, would have been both comprised within the earlier and ampler version of [Plutarch]'s *Parallela*; in Jacoby's scenario, Theseus would be one of the few authentic authors cited by [Plutarch], and his version would have been contrasted to the version of an invented Chrysermos. That the two versions stood together, with the two attributions to Chrysermos and Theseus, is in my opinion difficult to prove, and a doubt must remain; but that within the *Parallela minora* the version of Chrysermos was shaped so as to contrast it, implicitly or explicitly, to the rhetorical vulgata that we perceive now under the name of Theseus seems to me indubitable.

The conflict between Sparta and Argos for the possession of the Thyreatis can be dated to shortly before 547 BC, following Herodotos 1.82 (the earliest preserved account of the battle), who links it with the request of help from Kroisos and with his fall (see T. Kelly, *A History of Argos to 500 BC* (Minneapolis 1976), 137-9). The later tradition proposed however a very different date and context: probably already Ephoros put the battle soon after the end of the First Messenian war, in the seventh century (Plutarch, *Sayings of the Lakedaimonians* 231e and Pausanias 3.7.5 state that it happened under the kings Theopompos and Polydoros, whence the dates to 720/19 BC in Eusebios and to 735/34 in Solinus, *Collection of curiosities* 7.9: discussion in N. Robertson, *Festivals and Legends: The Formation of Greek Cities in the Light of Public Ritual* (Toronto 1992), 181-84). In Herodotos, the two armies decide that 300 champions from each side shall fight; the champions fight the entire day, and at night, only two Argives, Alkenor and Chromios, and a Spartan, Othryades, are still alive; the Argives go back to their city claiming victory, while the Spartan remains, strips the Argive dead of their armour and brings it to the Spartan camp. On the following day, the armies return, and there is discussion, the Argives claiming that they have won because two of their men survived, the Spartans claiming that victory is theirs because their man has remained in control of the battlefield. Eventually the two armies start fighting, and the Lakedaimonians win; Othryades, the Spartan survivor, ashamed of returning to Sparta, commits suicide on the battlefield. (On this narrative see Robertson, *Festivals and Legends*, 199-206; J. Dillery, 'Reconfiguring the past: Thyrea, Thermopylae and narrative patterns in Herodotus', *AJPh* 117 (1996), 217-54; and D. Asheri, in D. Asheri, A.B. Lloyd, A. Corcella, *A Commentary on Herodotus I-IV* (Oxford 2007), 139-40).

As Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 384 and Asheri, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, 140 have pointed out, the story was soon distorted for rhetorical purposes, e.g. by Isocrates 6.99, who in his *Archidamos* presents the battle as if the 300 Spartans had fought victoriously against the entire Argive army; similarly, in Strabo's account (*Geography* 8.6.17) Othryadas is the Spartan general, and he leads the three hundred Lakedaimonians to the victory. In these versions the suicide does not figure at all (the only text that retains the notion of a suicide is an epigram attributed to Nikandros of Colophon, *Palatine Anthology* 7.526); notably, Pausanias 2.20.7 states that close to the theatre of Argos one can see a representation of the Argive Perilaos, son of Alkenor, killing the Spartan Othryadas. (See also B.W. Millis, *BNJ Theseus* (453) F 3). Nor does the inscription of the trophy with blood have a place in these narratives. (As P. Liddell points out to me, the idea of inscribing a trophy in blood might have something to do with the fact that trophies are sometimes dedicated in the name of those who have died in the battle: compare the Marathon dedication IG I³ 784 = Fornara 49, and perhaps also the Theban monument after Leuctra, P. J. Rhodes, R. Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions* 404-323 BC (Oxford 2003), n° 30).

As the story became a topic in rhetorical exercises, numerous variants developed, and in this context the motif of the inscription in blood began to figure prominently: it is attested in Dioskourides, *Palatine Anthology* 7.430, while in *Palatine Anthology* 431 the trophy simply sends a message; it is present in Valerius Maximus 3.2 ext. 4; the writing is given ample development in Seneca the Elder, *Suasoriae* 2.2 and 16; an inscribed trophy is also present in Lucian, *Charon or the inspectors* 24, in which Hermes, pointing out to Charon a battle between Argives and Lakedaimonians, adds that "The general who lies there half-dead, writing an inscription on the trophy with his own blood, is Othryades", and *Professor of rhetoric* 18 (suggesting that τὰ Ὀθρυάδου γράμματα, the writing of Othryades, should always be kept handy). The popularity of the topic may also be inferred by the existence of engraved gems, representing Othryades writing the word 'Nike' on his shield; according to H. B. Walters, 'Three Engraved Gems', *The British Museum Quarterly* 6, 2 (1931), 34-35, this kind of decoration is found on gems dating to the second / first century BC. The theme preserved its rhetorical power, as is shown by the neoclassical studies of 'Othryades dying' by Johan Tobias Sergel (Paris, Louvre; the terracotta served as model for a plaster presented as admission piece to the Royal Academy of Painting and Sculpture in Paris in 1779) and by Pierre-Jean David d'Angers (Musée des beaux-Arts, Angers; awarded the second prize in the Prix de Rome of 1810), in both of which the gesture of writing in blood over a shield figures prominently. The most detailed collection of sources for the story is P. Kohlmann, 'Othryades', *Rheinisches Museum* 29 (1874), 463-80.

The versions of the *Parallela minora* and of Theseus/Stobaios share certain distinctive aspects, that set them apart from the Herodotean tradition. In both narratives the chronological collocation is left vague; and the erection of a trophy, further inscribed with the blood of the Spartan warrior, is common to both. Clearly, the trophy inscribed with blood is here a central element of the story; in the *Parallela minora* the story is presented as a parallel to that of Misunius Amblirenus (? Postumius Albinus? the name is corrupted: see *BNJ* 286 F 3), who having lost three legions while fighting the Samnites and having fallen wounded, woke up during the night and erected a trophy, dedicating it to Zeus with his blood; when on the following day a Roman general, Maximus, arrived, he took this as a good sign, and went on to defeat the Samnites. The Roman story does not revolve about a battle of the champions, but rather on the dedication of a trophy with the blood of the general, which leads on the following day to victory. (A. Cameron, *Greek mythography in the Roman world* (Oxford - New York 2004), 130-31, does not discuss Theseus, but argues on the basis of the extraordinary 'fit' between Greek and Roman story that although attributed to

different sources, these must have been written by the same person). More importantly, in a further step, the accounts of Theseus and of Chrysermos give what purports to be the actual text of Othryades's dedication, just as the account attributed to Aristides gives the text of Amblirenus' dedication.

But if the accounts of Chrysermos/[Plutarch] and of Theseus/Stobaios present some striking points in common, if they are thus part of the same rhetorical vulgate (Corcella, 'A New Fragment', 264 stresses the 'element of rhetorical elaboration' recognizable in Theseus's fragments *FGrH* 453 F2 and F3), there are also some significant differences between the two (minute discussion in J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 18-22).

The most important difference is the presence of Amphiktyons in [Plutarch]'s account. Amphiktyons are never mentioned in the rest of the *vulgata* on Thyrea (see A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Napoli 2000), 318, and Kohlmann, 'Othryades', 472); Pausanias, 4.5.1, mentions an Argive amphiktyony in the context of the dispute leading to the first Messenian war, which would have been in a position to settle the dispute between Spartans and Messenians, but does not mention the fight over the Thyreatis; and Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 384 points out that for [Plutarch] the Amphiktyony here must be the Delphic one. One aspect that has been discussed is the formula οἱ Ἀμφικτύονες αὐτόπται γινόμενοι: L. Piccirilli, *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci, I: dalle origini al 338 a.C.* (Pisa 1973), n° 8, 38-39 has argued that the expression corresponds to περιηγησάμενοι which appears in epigraphical documents whenever judges are called to decide on a territorial question. On this basis, Piccirilli suggests that Chrysermos was consulting a well-informed source, and that indeed an amphiktyony took part in the decision. But the equivalence of the two expressions is questionable; more importantly, all this would only prove that [Plutarch] could use the language typical of arbitrations (so P. Sánchez, *L'Amphictionie des Pyles et des Delphes* (Stuttgart 2001), 82-84). It seems clear that a statement such as the following: "Chrysermus of Corinth... adds a tantalizing scrap of information to our knowledge of this battle between champions, that it was organized by an amphictyony or religious league" (P. Walcot, 'Cattle Raiding, heroic Tradition, and Ritual: the Greek Evidence', *History of Religions* 18 (1979) 332 n. 16) gives excessive weight to [Plutarch]'s testimony; the role of the Amphiktyony is much more likely to be a variant introduced by [Plutarch].

A further difference between the two narratives concerns the rank and the names of the fighters: Theseus (in Stobaios) presents Othryades as a simple soldier (στρατιώτης) and names the two Argive survivors Alkenor and Chromios; in [Plutarch], Othryades is a general (as in other texts, e.g. in Strabo 8.6.17, discussed above, and Lucian), while the otherwise unknown Thersandros appears in the role of the Argive one; moreover, one of the two Argive survivors is named Agenor (but the name is close enough to Alkenor for it to be an error rather than a variant).

More interesting is one further difference, which concerns the text of the inscriptions: while the fact of inscribing the trophy with blood is one of the elements linking together the text of Chrysermos in [Plutarch] and that of Theseus in Stobaios, the two epigrams are different, the first being a short dedication to 'Zeus of the trophies', while the second focuses on the two fighting groups, 'Lakedaimonians, against the Argives'. Strikingly however, in the Roman parallel that follows this story, *Parallela minora* 3B, supposedly from the *Italian stories* of Aristides of Miletos, Misunius Amblirenus writes with his blood 'The Romans against the Samnites, to Zeus of the trophies': the inscription of the Roman story appears thus to combine the two Greek inscriptions (a point highlighted by Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis minoribus*, 21). Schlereth concluded from this that the original, ampler text of the *Parallela minora* contained both versions, and that Stobaios

preserves one of them, *Parallela minora* in its actual state the other. The same conclusion, although supported by a more stringent analysis of the tradition, was reached by Jacoby, who further considered Theseus a real, authentic author, while Chrysermos would have been an invented one, whose origin (Corinth) might actually derive from the title of one of Theseus's works, *Korinthiaka* (*Corinthian stories*). This implies a dating of Theseus in the first century AD.

As stated above, it seems to me that while it is not entirely necessary to accept a scenario in which the text of the *Parallela minora* contained the versions of both Theseus and 'Chrysermos' (attractive though the connection ethnic origin/title of work may be! But cf. also Jacoby's residual doubt above), the narrative of *Parallela minora* 3AB presupposes knowledge of Theseus's version (or of what became Theseus's version).

An intriguing note by a scholiast to Statius, *Thebaid* 4.48, helps measure the remarkable flexibility of the story: here, Othryades is the general of the Lakedaimonian army; but the affair involves the two armies in their entirety, and as the Lakedaimonians are winning, Othryades is mortally wounded. At this point, he orders his men to erect a trophy, and dipping his finger in his blood, inscribes the story – the passage is corrupt, so that the text of the inscription remains uncertain, but it is likely that something like κατὰ Ἀργείων was meant: see P. Kohlmann, 'Die Inschrift des Othryades beim Statius-scholiasten', *Rheinisches Museum* 31 (1876), 302-304.

On the epithet *tropaiouchos* for Zeus (rather than the more frequent Ζηνὶ τροπαίῳ) see K. Preisendanz, 'Tropaiouchos', in W.H.Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* 5 (Leipzig 1916), 1265; A.B. Cook, *Zeus. A study in ancient religion* 2.1, 110-11 n. 9; on the inscriptions Kohlmann, 'Othryades'; in general De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori*, 318-9.

<p>287 F 3 - (4) [Plutarch] De fluviis 1, 3 = Moralia 1150ab meta[[id="287" type="F" n="3"]]</p>	
<p>Subject: Genre: Ethnography; Religion: Ritual Historical Work: Indian stories book 80 Source date: 2nd century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: n.a</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>Εὐρίσκεται δὲ αὐτοῦ παρὰ τὰς καλουμένας Πύλας βοτάνη παρόμοιος ἡλιοτροπίῳ· ταύτην λειοτριβοῦντες τῷ χυλῷ τοῖς καύμασιν ἀλείφονται, καὶ φέρουσιν ἀκινδύνως τῆς περισσοτέρας θερμασίας τὴν ἀναθυμίασιν. οἱ δὲ ἐγχώριοι τὰς ἀσεβῶς ἀναστρεφομένας παρθένους σταυροῖς προσηλώσαντες εἰς αὐτὸν βάλλουσιν, τῇ σφῶν διαλέκτῳ τὸν Ἀφροδιτησὺν ἕμνον αἰδόντες. κατορύσσουσι δὲ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν γραῦν κατάκριτον παρὰ τὸν ὀνομαζόμενον λόφον Θηρογόνον· ἅμα γὰρ «τῶι» τὴν πρεσβῦτιν «κατορυχθῆναι» ἐρπετῶν πλῆθος ἐκ τῆς ἀκρωρείας ἐξέρχεται, καὶ τὰ περιπτάμενα τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων κατεσθίει, καθὼς ἱστορεῖ Χρύσερμος ἐν π' Ἰνδικῶν. μέμνηται δὲ τούτῳ</p>	<p>There, by the so-called Gates, is found a plant similar to heliotrope; crushing it they anoint themselves with the juice against the burning heat, and bear without danger the exhalation of the excessive heat. The local inhabitants nail the maidens who behave impiously to a cross and throw them in it (the river Hydaspes), singing in their dialect the hymn of Aphrodite. Every year they bury a condemned old woman beside the hill called Beast-bearer. For, at the same time as the old woman is buried, a multitude of reptiles emerges from the mountain ridge and devours the brute animals flying around. So records Chrysermos in Book</p>

ἀκριβέστερον Ἀρχέλαος (IV) ἐν ἰγ Περὶ ποταμῶν.

80 of the *Indika*. And Archelaos has recounted these matters more fully in book 13 of *On rivers*.

287 F 3 Commentary

It is unclear how much of this is supposed to come from Chrysermos. Jacoby, *FGrH* 287 F 3, prints the text from the second paragraph; but in the absence of any references the whole might be thought to be from Chrysermos – the second paragraph certainly does, as, together with the third, it reflects the narrative of the previous passage (ultimately the issue does not arise, since all of this stems from the pen of [Plutarch]). The fact that this passage claims to be from the 80th book of the *Indian stories*, a work otherwise unknown, makes it all the more likely that this is an invention (so, after others, M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and the Scholia of the Iliad* 1 (Leiden 1963), 400 n. 356). As for the further reference to Archelaos, who here and in the other passage of the *On rivers* in which he is mentioned (9.3) serves the purpose of providing an alternative source-reference, see, besides F. Atenstädt, ‘Zwei Quellen des sogenannten Plutarch de fluviis’, *Hermes* 57 (1922), 238-9, *FGrH* 123 F 7-9. Jacoby follows Atenstädt in considering that the homonymous king of Cappadocia is meant here, and that the references are only in part fictional, while some elements may indeed go back to Archelaos’s work (see also A. De Lazzer, in E. Calderon Dorda, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003), 70-71, with further references).

The opening chapter of the *On rivers* concerns the Indian river Hydaspes (the last chapter will discuss the river Indus, so that two Indian rivers open and close the treatise). Nothing is known of ‘gates’ located along the course of the river, and A. De Lazzer supposes that these may be imagined as the mouth of the river, i.e. the point in which the Hydaspes flows into the Indus (in E. Calderon Dorda, A. de Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e Monti* (Naples 2003), 216-17). The heliotrope is a stone (also known as ‘bloodstone’, because the stone is formed by green chalcedony with red inclusions of iron oxide or red jasper), but also a plant (Pliny, *Natural History* 37.60.165 highlights the reflective capacities of the stone; see *Natural history* 22.29 for the plant and its virtues). **Here, the name of the plant is not given (one of the two varieties of heliotrope might be meant, the one mentioned by ancient writers as ἡλιοτρόπιον τὸ μέγα or σκορπίουρον: interestingly, the potential to help cure heat-strokes in children is attested for the latter, in Pliny, 22.29: ‘folia infantium destillationibus, quod siriasim vocant, inlita medentur’, ‘the leaves, applied topically, are good against the affections of small children, known as ‘siriasis’ (heat-stroke, but also inflammation of the brains)) as well as in Dioscourides, *Regarding Medical Materials* 4.190.2; *On simple drugs* 1.9.1. The connection between the effects of the plant’s juice and the name of the heliotrope is evident: while usually the name of the plant is derived from the fact that the flower turns with the sun, it is here taken to mean ‘turning the sun away’; the main difference between the information given by the medical writers and Pliny on one side, [Plutarch]/Chrysermos on the other, is that medical writers are quite clear that the great heliotrope helps seiriasis in children only.**

The two following stories reflect the narrative of *On rivers* 1.1 (two paragraphs earlier) about the illicit love of Chrysippe for her father Hydaspes, caused by the anger of Aphrodite. Chrysippe, thanks to the help of her old nurse, united herself with her father; when Hydaspes found out, in his anger he punished his daughter by nailing her to a cross, and the old nurse by burying her alive; finally, Hydaspes threw himself into the river (then named Indos), giving it his name. The actions of nailing of impious maidens to a cross and throwing them in the river while singing a hymn to Aphrodite, and of burying every year a

condemned old woman, are transformations into ritual actions of the *aition* narrated above (that is: the story is imagined through and through, and it would be wilful to consider that the ritual actions gave origin to a story meant to explain them). No sources are given for the story of Chrysippe, her nurse and Hydaspes, which opens the *On rivers*; nor are source-reference given for the stone *lychnis*, mentioned in 1.2. The references to Chrysermos's *Indian stories* (and to Archelaos's *On rivers*) are thus the two first source-references of the small treatise. In terms of textual tradition, it should be noted here that the entire first three paragraphs of *On rivers* (1.1 until 1.3, i.e. the story of Chrysippe's love for her father, her punishment, and the behaviour of the locals) is also present, with minimal variations and without the source-reference, in the scholia to Dionysios the perieget, schol. *H* 1139 (vol. 2 p. 456 Müller); according to Müller, *Geographi graeci minores* II (Parisiis 1861), 456, the text of the *scholion*, which clearly derives from [Plutarch] *On rivers* 1.1-3, is in a different hand from the rest. Thus, at least one ancient reader thought that the three paragraphs went together (this is for instance not the case of the scholion to Dionysios the Perieget 1165, Müller *Geographi graeci minores* 2, 457, which also derives probably from the *On rivers*, but which preserves only the last part of paragraph 2.1). **Another element for taking the three paragraphs together resides in the possibility that the name of the source-reference Chrysermos was invented on the basis of (or so as to resonate with, as I would tend to think) that of Chrysippe, the heroine of *On rivers* 1.1, for whose story no source-reference is given (the reference to Chrysermos is the first of the *On rivers*): see R. Hercher, *Plutarchi libellus de Fluviis* (Lipsiae 1851), 22, and A. Cameron, *Greek mythography in the Roman world* (Oxford - New York 2004), 129-30.**

<p>287 F 4a - (3) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 10A = Moralia 308b meta[[id="287" type="F" n="4"]]</p>	
<p>Subject: Major wars: Persian war; Law: Capital punishment Historical Work: Historica Source date: 2nd century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: 480-470 BC</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>Περσῶν τὴν Ἑλλάδα λεηλατούντων Πausanίας ὁ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων στρατηγὸς πεντακόσια χρυσοῦ τάλαντα παρὰ Ξέρξου λαβὼν ἔμελλε προδιδόναι τὴν Σπάρτην. φωραθέντος δὲ τούτου, Ἀγησίλαος² ὁ πατὴρ μέχρι τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς Χαλκιοίκου συνεδίωξεν Ἀθηνᾶς, καὶ τὰς θύρας τοῦ τεμένους πλίνθω φράξας λιμῶι ἀπέκτεινεν, ἢ δὲ μήτηρ καὶ ἄταφον ἔρριψεν, ὡς Χρύσερμος ἐν δευτέρῳ Ἱστορικῶν.</p>	<p>When the Persians were plundering Greece, Pausanias the general of the Lakedaimonians, having received five hundred talents of gold from Xerxes, intended to betray Sparta. But he was discovered, and his father Agesilaos joined in pursuing him until the temple of Athena Chalkioikos, and having blocked the doors of the sanctuary with bricks killed him through hunger, while the mother threw him out to remain unburied, as Chrysermos narrates in the second book of his <i>Histories</i>.</p>

287 F 4a Commentary

See below under F 4b.

² Nachstädt, Ducat, De Lazzer, Boulogne; Ἡγησίλαος Jacoby.

287 F 4a - (3) Stobaios Anthologus, 3.39.31 meta[[id="287" type="F" n="4"]]	
Subject: Major wars: Persian war; Law: Capital punishment Historical Work: Persika Source date: 5th century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: 480-470 BC	Translation
Χρύσερμος ἐν δευτέρῳ <u>Περσικῶν</u> . Περσῶν τὴν Ἑλλάδα λεηλατούντων <u>καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐγχωρίων συγκεχυμένων</u> , Πausανίας ὁ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων στρατηγὸς πεντακόσια χρυσοῦ τάλαντα παρὰ Ξέρξου λαβὼν ἔμελλε προδιδόναι τὴν Σπάρτην. <u>τῶν δὲ ἐπιστολῶν μεσολαβηθεισῶν</u> , Ἡγησίλαος ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ προειρημένου <u>περὶ τῶν συμβεβηκότων ἀκούσας τὸν υἱὸν</u> μέχρι τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς Χαλκιοίκου συνεδίωξεν Ἀθηνᾶς, καὶ τὰς θύρας τοῦ τεμένους πλίνθοις ἐμφράξας μετὰ τῆς γυναικὸς τὴν εἴσοδον ἐφρούρησε καὶ λιμῶι τὸν προδότην ἀνείλεν, ὃν ἡ μήτηρ ἀείρασα ὑπὲρ τοὺς ὄρους ἔρριψεν.	Chrysermos in the second book of his <i>Persian Histories</i> . When the Persians were plundering Greece and all the neighbours were in confusion, Pausanias, the general of the Lakedaimonians, having accepted five hundred talents of gold from Xerxes, intended to betray Sparta. But the letters having been intercepted, Hegesilaos, father of the above-mentioned, having heard what had happened, helped to pursue his son until the temple of Athena of the Brazen House, and having walled up the doors of the sanctuary with bricks, and killed his son by starvation, while his mother having taken his body threw it outside the borders.

287 F 4b Commentary

The fragment is transmitted in the *Parallela minora* (F 4a) and in a slightly longer version in Stobaios, 3.39.31 (F 4b; the differences are underlined)

Clearly a common narrative is at the base of *Parallela minora* (F 4a) and Stobaios (F 4b; the differences are underlined). The *Parallela minora* simply offer a more compressed version (minute comparison of the two texts in J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Paralleliis minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 27-9).

The difference in the title of the work from which the story is taken need not be significant, especially since the book number is the same: *Historika* may be understood as a general title, covering the *Persika* and possibly also the *Indika*, rather than as the title of yet another work (so Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 385; De Lazzar, *Plutarco. Parallelii minori*, 44 and 330). Similarly, the fact that in the *Parallela minora* Pausanias is simply ‘caught out’, while Stobaios has the usual (Thucydidean) version in which letters are intercepted, need not imply the existence of ‘diversas recensiones’ (so Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Paralleliis minoribus*, 29): it is sufficient to think that the original ampler version of the *Parallela* was richer in details, and that Stobaios and *Parallela minora* both summarized, although in different ways and to a different extent (indications as to how the epitomator proceeded in F. Jacoby, ‘Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *Parallela minora* und die Schwindelautoren’, *Mnemosyne* S. 3, 8 (1940), 113, who comments concerning *Parallela minora* 10A that the people (the ἐγχώριοι) can be left out as unimportant, here and elsewhere, when the story concerns a king; and that the Roman parallel, with the simple φωραθείς, may have influenced the choice in *Parallela minora* of φωραθέντος δὲ τούτου instead of the more elaborate τῶν δὲ ἐπιστολῶν μεσολαβηθεισῶν of Stobaios). At any rate: that a common narrative is behind these two versions is proven by the fact that both present common mistakes or oddities, too surprising to be independent. In particular,

1. the general setting is wrong: the events narrated should be located well after the end of the Persian wars (even if one were to accept Diodoros's chronology of the events).
2. Pausanias's father was Cleombrotos (Thucydides 1.94.1), and not Hegesilaos or Agesilaos; and it was after his death in 480/79 that Pausanias became the regent (Herodotos 9.10.2-3); thus, Pausanias's father cannot have played a role in his son's death. Incidentally, the very form Ἡγησίλαος, shared by both strands of the tradition (although not by all manuscripts) is striking, with its Ionian beginning and Dorian conclusion. J. Ducat, 'Crypties', *Cahiers du Centre Glotz* 8 (1997), 27-28 has argued that this is not just a mistake of copyists, because it has thoroughly permeated both traditions, and because this form reappears in the P. Lond. Lit. 114 (LDAB 826, a constitution of the Cretans by Ephoros? Latest discussion in F. Valerio, 'PLond inv. 187 recto = PLondLit 114. Testo, traduzione e commento', *Papyrologica Lupiensia* 17 (2008), 61-83), and because Agesipolis as the name of Pausanias' father appears also in Vitruvius, *On architecture* 1.1.6. Jacoby (*FGrH* 3a, 385) advances the hypothesis that the name Hegesilaos for the father may have followed from the definition of Pausanias as *strategos* (for once, surprisingly, correct: he was regent, not king). This seems slightly difficult to accept, and possibly a confusion (innocent, or wilful) with Agesilaos, the Euripontid who accessed kingship in 401 BC and whose Agiad colleague was for a while a king Pausanias, who having been condemned to death in absence went into exile in 395 (Xenophon, *Hellenica* 3.5.25) and who, however one wants to interpret Ephoros's statement, preserved in Strabo 8.8.8, was involved in suggestions of political reforms that went against the ephors (see e.g. J.T. Hooker, 'Spartan Propaganda', in A. Powell, *Classical Sparta: techniques behind her success*, London 1989, 127-8).
3. The corruption by means of 500 talents (an amount that recurs elsewhere in *Parallela minora*) is an oversimplification of Pausanias's complex dealings with Persia, as narrated in Thucydides 1.128-30; such a sum is never mentioned in the rest of the tradition concerning Pausanias, but it is typical, in its round number, of the *Parallela minora*.

As in the case of the battle of Thyrea (see above, F 1), so also for the story of the death of Pausanias a rhetorical tradition set in early on. Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 385 (who quotes Diodoros) has rightly highlighted the change from the terse Thucydidean narrative, in which the ephors handle everything alone, to the introduction into the action of Pausanias's mother, as in Diodoros 11.45.6 and probably already on Ephoros (note that the brick, πλίνθος, is present from the start); from then onwards the mother is present, in Cornelius Nepos, *Life of Pausanias* 5 (text quoted in Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 385), in Polyainos, *Stratagemata* 8.51, where she receives the name Theano (a choice possibly influenced by the stories on the philosopher Theano?), and in Tzetzes, *Chiliades*, 1.134. In the *Parallela minora*, [Plutarch] simply transposes to Pausanias's father what the other sources had related of his mother. As for leaving the body unburied or throwing it outside the borders, this was a theme already present in Thucydides 1.134.4, who presents us with a discussion, and with an ultimate outcome totally different from the narrative of [Plutarch], since the oracle at Delphi ordered that Pausanias be buried where he had met his death, on sacred ground (see also Diodoros 11.45.7, and the rhetorical tradition, closer to that of [Plutarch], in Aelian, *Various history* 4.7, with Jacoby's discussion, *FGrH* 3a, 385).

287 F 5 - (5) [Plutarch] De fluviis 7, 4 = Moralia 1154bc meta[[id="287" type="F" n="5"]]	
Subject: Natural Sciences; Genre: Geography Historical Work: On rivers	Translation

Source date: 2nd century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: n/a	
γεννᾶται δὲ βοτάνη πορφυράνθεμος, καλουμένη χρυσόπολις· πρὸς αὐτὴν γὰρ αἱ ἀστυγείτονες πόλεις τὸν ἀκέρατον χρυσὸν δοκιμάζουσιν. ἅμα γὰρ αὐτὸν χωνευθῆναι <β>ἀπτουσι ³ τὴν βοτάνην· καὶ ἐὰν μὲν ἀνόθευτον τὸ χρυσίον ᾗ, τὰ φύλλα χρυσοῦται [καὶ διατηρεῖ τῆς ὕλης τὴν οὐσίαν] ⁴ , ἐὰν δ' ἐφθαρμένον ὑπάρχη, τὴν ἠλλαγμένην ὑγρασίαν ἀποπτύει <καὶ διατηρεῖ τῆς ὕλης τὴν οὐσίαν>, καθὼς ἱστορεῖ Χρύσερμος ἐν ᾧ Περὶ ποταμῶν.	A plant with purple flowers grows there (in the river Paktolos), called Chrysopolis: for against it the neighboring cities test the unmixed gold. For at the same time it is cast, they dip the plant; and if the gold is pure, the leaves become gold, but if it happens to be corrupted, they refuse the adulterated liquid, < and preserve the essence of their nature >, as Chrysermus records in the third book <i>On Rivers</i> .

287 F 5 Commentary

A plant of this name is mentioned also by Tzetzes, *Chiliades* 4.140.415-19 (text in Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 386: it is appended to a story concerning the magnet stone) and 4.713 (the epistle summarizing what precedes); and by Aristainetos, *Letters*, 1.10 (also quoted in *FGrH* 3a, 386). Tzetzes, here as in other instances, got his information from [Plutarch]. The same may have been the case for Aristainetos, whose activity is probably to be located in the early 6th century AD. But even if Aristainetos's source was [Plutarch], there is some truth in the observation of J. Bidez, 'Plantes et pierres magiques d'après le Ps. Plutarque *De Fluviis Mélanges offerts à O. Navarre* (Toulouse 1935), 30, that the mention of the chrysopolis in a passing comparison seems to imply that the plant was well-known. The Paktolos was famous in Greek tradition for carrying gold in its waters, and thus the presence in it of a plant named *chrysopolis* is not particularly surprising; however, the existence of such a plant is mentioned by these authors only. The second part of the name seems less easy to explain, and Bidez, 'Plantes et pierres magiques', did indeed suggest to correct the name in χρυσόπωλις, 'gold-seller'. It seems however preferable to follow R. Hercher, *Plutarchi Libellus de Fluviis* (Lipsiae 1851), 24-25, in accepting that a number of plant names have been invented on the basis of the names of cities (Hercher mentions Cinyra, Charisia, Chrysopolis and Alinda). This theory has been further developed by F. Atenstädt, 'Zwei Quellen des sogenannten Plutarch de fluviis', *Hermes* 57 (1922), 221 and 224. Atenstädt accepted that the plant *chrysopolis* and two other obscure plants, the *alinda* and the *araxa*, mentioned in *On rivers* 14.2 and 23.2, correspond to (are transpositions into plants of) three cities of the same name; and having noticed that in the entries dedicated to these cities Stephanos of

³ For previous editors' choices and for the reasoning behind Kaltwasser's correction of ἄπτουσι in <β>ἀπτουσι, see Jacoby's apparatus; Calderon Dorda's decision to keep the ἄπτουσι transmitted in P (in E. Calderon Dorda, A. De Lazzer and E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003), 146) is in this instance the wrong one (Aristaenetus, *Letters* 1.10, where Kydippe attaches herself (συνήπτετο) to the boy just as the chrysopolis plant to the gold is not sufficient to support the transmitted text, since the choice of verb is dictated here by the situation).

⁴ Jacoby accepts Hercher's proposal, to transpose the sentence καὶ διατηρεῖ τῆς ὕλης τὴν οὐσίαν two lines below, right after ἀποπτύει. The move does indeed yield a better meaning (although it is possible to make a case for the text as it stands: Calderon Dorda for instance accepts the paradosis).

Byzantion refers to the writing of Alexander Polyhistor (resp. *FGrH* 273 F 56 (Araxa), F 113 (Alinda), F 140 (Chrysopolis)), he further suggested that Alexander Polyhistor is the remote source for these passages, a source that would of course have been suitably adapted by [Plutarch].

There is no way to know whether the extraordinary passage on the stone *arouraphylax*, also found in the Paktolos and discussed just before our passage, in *On rivers* 7.3, without any source references, should be thought of as also from Chrysermos's work (an ultimately unimportant issue, if Chrysermos is a fiction): see Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 386.

<p>287 F 6 - (6) [Plutarch] De fluviis 20, 2-3 = Moralia 1162e (Stobaios Anthologus 4, 36, 13) meta[[id="287" type="F" n="6" sourcework(level1="Stobaeus (Joannes)" level2="" level3="Anthologium (Wachsmuth C.-Hense O.) [Vide: Areius Didymus & Joannes Damascenus apud Stobaeum (Joannem) (cf. Aetius, De placitis [excerpta Stobaei]])" level4="" level5="" level6="4, 36, 13")]]</p>	
<p>Subject: natural sciences; medicine Historical Work: On rivers Source date: 2nd century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: n/a</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>γεννᾶται δ' ἐν αὐτῷ λίθος ἀετίτης καλούμενος, ὃν αἱ μαῖαι ταῖς δυστοκούσαις ἐπὶ τὰς γαστέρας ἐπιτιθέασι, καὶ παραχρῆμα τίκτουσιν ἄτερ ἀλγηδόνας. (3) γεννᾶται δ' ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ βοτάνη ἄξαλλα (?) καλουμένη, μεθερμηνευομένη θερμόν. ταύτην οἱ τεταρταίζοντες ὅταν ἐπὶ τοῦ στήθους θῶσιν, ἀπαλλάττονται παραχρῆμα τῆς ἐπισημασίας, καθὼς ἱστορεῖ Χρῦσερμος Κορίνθιος ἐν < τῶι > ιγ Περὶ ποταμῶν.</p>	<p>And in it a stone called aetites is produced, which the midwives put on the stomachs of women having difficult labors, and immediately they give birth without pain. 3. And in it, too, grows a plant called axalla, which translated means 'warm'. Those who have quartan fever, when they set this on their chest, are immediately freed from the symptoms, as Chrysermos of Corinth records in the thirteenth book <i>On Rivers</i>.</p>

287 F 6 Commentary

On rivers 20 discusses the river Euphrates. Paragraph 2 and 3 are both probably supposed to rely on Chrysermos's authority - at least, that is Stobaios's understanding, since the entire passage is presented under the heading: Χρυσέρμου Κορινθίου ἐν τῷ ιγ' Περὶ ποταμῶν (Stobaios, *Anthologium* 4.36.14, with minimal differences in the text).

The *aetites* stone and the *axalla* plant are part of a fairly large number of stones and plants in the *On rivers* whose peculiarity lies in their medical and curative virtues (list of passages in F. Atenstädt, 'Zwei Quellen des sogenannten Plutarch de fluviis', *Hermes* 57 (1922), 234). The unifying element of these curative plants and stones lies in their magical, rather than natural, action, enhanced in [Plutarch]'s *On rivers* by the fact that the virtues of plants/stones are often related to the mythological stories narrated.

The *aetites* is fairly well known (to the attestations collected by F. Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 386, should be added the Arab quote of Xenokrates by al-Gāfiqī, text edited and translated in M. Ullmann, 'Das Steinbuch des Xenokrates von Ephesos', *Medizinhistorisches Journal* (1972) 53-55 and 64, with further references; see also M. Ullmann, 'Neues zum Steinbuch des Xenokrates', *Medizinhistorisches Journal* (1973), 65-66); see also S. Macrì, *Pietre viventi. I*

minerali nell'immaginario del mondo antico (Torino 2009), 85-8 and 139-40. What is striking is that in ~~all of~~ the authors mentioned the effect of the *aetites* is opposite to that stated by [Plutarch], inasmuch as the stone is supposed to stop parturition and avoid abortion (this applies to all of the four varieties of *aetites* known to Pliny, *Natural History*, 36.39.149-151: two are found in the nests of eagles, and a fourth, called 'taphiusan *aetites*', in rivers, but all of them "Attached to pregnant women or to cattle in skins of sacrificed animals, they prevent abortion, and should not be removed until the moment of parturition; for otherwise procidence of the uterus results. But if they are not removed at the moment of parturition, there is no parturition at all." (*Natural History* 36.39.151; see also 30.130: "The stone *aetites*, found in the eagle's nest, preserves the foetus against all attempts of abortions").

The presence of the verb μεθερμηνεύειν and the gloss *thermon* for the local name *axalla* of the plant make it likely that the source for this passage is Alexander Polyhistor, who in his writings appears to have given ample space to glosses, often introduced by a form of (μεθ-) ἐρμηνεύειν (so Atenstädt, 'Zwei Quellen des sogenannten Plutarch de fluviis', 219-20; see on this also the commentary to Theophilus, *BNJ* 296 F 3).

287 F 7 - (7) <i>Natalis Comes</i> , <i>Mythologiae</i> book 5. 5, p. 294 (Venetiis 1581)	
Subject: Myth: Mythical figure; Genre: Aetiology Historical Work: On Peloponnesian Affairs Source date: 1581 AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: myth, mythical time	Translation
Suscepit (sc. Mercurius) Erycem ex Aglauro Cecropis filia; e Daura Oceani Eleusinem, Bunum ex Alcidamea, e Philodamea Danai filia Pharim, <u>Caicum ex Ocyrhoe, qui se in fluvium Zaurum deiecit, & dedit nomen Caico Mysiae flumini, ut scripsit Chrysermus Corinthius in Peloponnesiacis.</u> Polybum ex Rihonophila ⁵ , Myrtilum e Cleobula filia Aeoli, e nympha Ladonis filia Euandrum...	And he generated Eryx from Aglauros the daughter of Cecops; from Daura daughter of Oceanus Eleusine; Bunus from Alcidamea, Pharis from Philodamea daughter of Danaus, <u>and Caicus from Ocyrhoe, Caicus who threw himself into the Zauraeus river and gave his name to the Caicus river of Mysia, as Chrysermus the Corinthian wrote in his <i>eloponnesian ffairs</i>.</u> From Chthonophile, Polybus, Myrtilus from Cleobula daughter of Aeolus, from a nymph daughter of Ladon Euander...

287 F 7 Commentary

The part underlined in the text above was added by Conti to the second edition of his *Mythologiae, sive explicationis fabularum libri decem*, published in Venice in 1581; on Natale Conti's work see J. Mulryan and S. Brown, *Natale Conti's Mythologiae* (Tempe 2006), xi-xlvi, as well as P. Ceccarelli, *BNJ* Sostratos 23 F 1b, c and d. The title of the work of Chrysermos from which the story is supposed to come, *On Peloponnesian Affairs*, corresponds to one of the titles ascribed to Chrysermos by [Plutarch]; however, the story as such is unattested. Mulryan and Brown, *Natale Conti's Mythologiae*, 368, point to a passage of [Plutarch], *On rivers* 21.1; the story narrated there, without any source reference, concerns Caicus and the naming of the river as a result of his plunge in it, and moreover gives for him the same

⁵ *sic*: Chthonophyle (Mulryan and Brown 2006, 368): cf. Pausanias 2.6.6.

genealogy; but the earlier name of the river is different (in [Plutarch], the *Astraios*), and the story is more elaborated.

287 F 8 - (8) <i>Natalis Comes, Mythologiae</i> book 7.1, p. 445 (Venetiis 1581)	
Subject: Myth, Mythical figures Historical Work: <i>On Peloponnesian Affairs</i> Source date: 1581 AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: myth, mythical past	Translation
Memoriae prodidit Chrysermus libro secundo rerum Peloponnesiacarum, Iunonem supplicium de Hercule sumere volentem Lunam in auxilio acciuisse carminibus magicis usam, quae cistam spuma implevit, e qua natus est hic leo. Hunc Iris in gremio stringens in montem Opheltam deportavit, a quo eodem die Apaesantus pastor fuit dilaniatus, ut ait Demodocus in rebus Heracleae.	Chrysermus consigns to memory, in the second book of his work <i>On Peloponnesian Affairs</i> , that Juno, desiring to take revenge on Hercules, called on the Moon to help through the use of magical incantations; the latter filled a chest with foam, out of which this lion was born. This Iris holding in her bosom brought to Mt. Opheltas, and on that same day the shepherd Apesantos was cut to pieces by it, as Demodocus narrates in his <i>Stories on Heracles</i> .

287 F 8 Commentary

This is one of the passages added by Conti to the second edition of his *Mythologiae*, Venice 1581. The title corresponds to one of the titles ascribed to Chrysermos by [Plutarch], and the story of how Hera asked the help of Selene to take revenge upon Heracles, is indeed narrated in the *On rivers*, 18.4; however, the source reference there offered for that narrative is the first book of Demodokos's *Heracleid*. Natale Conti is thus here attributing to Chrysermos a passage that does (probably) not go back to him (see also J. Mulryan and S. Brown, *Natale Conti's Mythologiae* (Tempe 2006), 570 n. 9 and 10, although with some confusion). An error is certainly possible; it is slightly surprising however that Natale Conti goes on to narrate exactly the same succession of events as [Plutarch] *On rivers* 18.4 (how Selene, to help Hera, created a lion out of foam, which was brought by Iris to Mount Opheltes, and how the lion devoured on that very day a shepherd named Apesantos, who then gave his name to the mountain), giving as source-reference exactly the same author mentioned in that context by [Plutarch], Demodokos (behind whom most likely lurks Herodorus of Herakleia: cf. A. De Lazzer, in E. Calderon Dorda, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003), 79). Thus, the reference to Chrysermos is inserted, rather unnecessarily, within a context which is entirely correct, including the other source-reference. (In this context, it is important to note that both the part attributed to Chrysermos and that attributed to Demodokos were absent from the first edition, and were inserted together in the second, enlarged edition of 1581).

287 Biographical Essay

Four works are attributed to Chrysermos: *Peloponnesiaka* in at least 3 books, mentioned in both *Parallela minora* and *On rivers* (F1 and 2; the further two fragments from this work mentioned by Natale Conti, F 7 and 8 above, are bogus); *Indika* (in 80 books!), mentioned in the *On rivers* (F 3); *Persika* (or *Historika*) in at least 2 books, referred to in *Parallela minora* (F 4); and *On rivers*, in 3 or possibly 13 books, mentioned in [Plutarch]'s own *On rivers* (F 5 and 6). As Jacoby pointed out (FGrH 3a 383), the titles are invented in a way that shows

understanding of the connections drawn in ancient ethnography: in particular, the link between *Persika* and *Indika* is to be seen in the work of Ctesias, who was still widely read in this period. From these two, the connection to a work on the Peloponnese is easy, since the story recounted in F 4 from the *Persika* concerns the dealings between the Spartan general Pausanias and Xerxes, while F 1 from the *Peloponnesiaka* concerns Perseus (where the name leads, over *Perseis*, to *Persika*); moreover, as again Jacoby stressed, it is a connection that finds a collocation in the larger frame of Herodotos's work (systematically not mentioned in [Plutarch]'s two works, even though for some of the episodes he is the obvious, most important source: clearly, a deliberate exclusion). For other Peloponnesian histories, see BNJ 503, 504.

As for the identity of Chrysermos: J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 110 simply stated: 'Quis sit hic Chrysermus, ignoratur'. The identification with Chryseros (*FGrH* 96) is mentioned only to be dismissed by Jacoby, for chronological reasons among others (Chryseros's Roman chronicle went until 180 AD, which makes him too late to have served as inspiration for [Plutarch]). Most likely Chrysermos is one of [Plutarch]'s fictional authors (but see Dowden in BNJ 56 for the argument that some of his authors were real); in this case, the source of his inspiration may be sought, as Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 384 and before him F. Atenstädt, 'Zwei Quellen des sogenannten Plutarch de fluviis', *Hermes* 57 (1922), 244-6 suggested, in the Herophilean doctor Chrysermos, active around 50 BC and mentioned in one of the sources of [Plutarch], the doctor Xenokrates, a contemporary of Pliny who wrote *On stones* (*Λιθογνώμων*). But another possibility is worth mentioning, first advanced by R. Hercher, *Plutarchi Libellus de Fluviis* (Lipsiae 1851), 22 and recently taken up by A. Cameron, *Greek mythology in the Roman world* (Oxford - New York 2004), 129-30, that the name may have been invented on the basis of the names of characters or natural elements playing in the story: F 5, from the chapter on the Paktolos, concerns a plant Chrysopolis; in what precedes (*On rivers* 7. 1-2) [Plutarch] narrates, without giving any source-reference, how the river first took the name Chrysorrhoeas, and how from Chrysorrhoeas it changed in Paktolos; similarly F 3 comes from the chapter on the Hydaspes (*On rivers* 1); the chapter opens with the story of Chrysippe, a story that finds a reflection in what is narrated of the habits of the locals in *On rivers* 1.3, explicitly attributed to Chrysermos (and see commentary to F 3 for the possibility that the entire chapter may have been conceived as depending on Chrysermos).

Της Χορινθηιαν οριγιν, μεντιονεδ ιν Φ 1 ανδ Φ 6, ισ μορε δελιχατε: θαχοβψ αργυεδ τ ηατ ονε οφ Τησευσ□σ ωορκσ, της Χορινθηιαν στοριεσ, γαπε [Πλυταρχη] της ινσπιρατιον (*ΦΓρΗ* 3α, 385), ιν α χοντεξτ ιν ωηιχη Τησευσ□σ (αυτηεντιχ) περσιον (νοτ νε χεσσαριλψ φρομ της Χορινθηιαν στοριεσ. Τησευσ ωροτε αλσο *Ιλλυστριουσ λιπεσ*) ωασ βεινγ χοντραστεδ ωιτη της φιχτιοναλ *Πελοποννεσιαν στοριεσ* by the fictional Χηρψερμοσ,. Τηισ ραισεσ της ισσυε (δεαλτ ωιτη αβοπε, χομμενταρψ το Φ 2) οφ της δατε οφ Τησευσ, ανδ οφ της χοννεχτιον ωιτη της τωο τεξτσ. Ιφ Τησευσ ισ λατερ τη αν της *Ον ριπερσ* ανδ *Παραλλελα μινορα*, την ωε μυστ λοοκ ελσεωηερε φορ ινσπιρατιον.

As for the content and the provenance of the stories attributed to Chrysermos, it is difficult to say much: [Plutarch]'s method seems to have been to take a transmitted story, and to twist it slightly. Atenstädt, 'Zwei Quellen des sogenannten Plutarch de fluviis', has suggested that a certain Xenokrates, a doctor whose work seems to have included a number of extraordinary and magical remedies (hence no doubt its attractiveness for [Plutarch]), is one of [Plutarch]'s main sources for the part on stones and plants. On the whole Atenstädt's argument is convincing (and has been fully endorsed by Jacoby), but some details need to be

worked out. Atenstädt (and with him Jacoby) assumed that this Xenokrates was Xenokrates of Aphrodisias, a doctor active in the first century AD who wrote on pharmacology (thus, he would have written on stones, but also *On Useful Things from Living Beings* (Περὶ τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν Ζώων Ὀφελείας)), and who is mentioned by Galen, *On the mixture and properties of simple medicines* vol.11 p. 793 Kühn, and Artemidoros, *Interpretation of dreams* 4.22 (on him, see F. Kudlien, Xenokrates 8, in *RE* 9A (Stuttgart 1967), 1529-31, and C.J. Classen, Xenokrates 4, in *Der kleine Pauly* (München 1975), 1416). Some however prefer to see the source of Pliny on stones in the works of another doctor active at the time of Pliny, Xenokrates son of Zenon, of Ephesos, who wrote a book on stones (see K. Ziegler, Xenokrates 7, in *RE* 9A (Stuttgart 1967), 1529; J. Kollesch, Xenokrates 5, in *Der kleine Pauly* (München 1975), 1416; and M. Ullmann, 'Das Steinbuch des Xenokrates von Ephesos', *Medizinhistorisches Journal* (1972), 49-64; M. Ullmann, 'Neues zum Steinbuch des Xenokrates', *medizinhistorisches Journal* (1973), 59-76; and M. Ullmann, Xenokrates 7, in *RE* Suppl. 14 (Stuttgart 1974), 974-7). Even after Ullmann's detailed discussion, it is not clear to me whether a decision is possible: the Arab sources who cite the work of Xenokrates on stones do not state his origin, so that on this matter arguments still rely on the interpretation of Pliny. What seems certain is that a Xenokrates author of a work on stones and active in the first century AD was the source of Pliny, and was also probably used by [Plutarch].

Moreover, Atenstädt himself had argued that the fragments containing the information on the two herbs *chrysopolis* (F 5) and *axalla* (F 6) had come to [Plutarch] through Alexander Polyhistor. But in F 6, the *axalla* (from Polyhistor?) follows closely the *aetites*, which is amply discussed in Pliny (from Xenokrates? as we saw in the commentary to F 6 [Plutarch] seems to offer an inverted mirror of the picture offered by Pliny): thus here [Plutarch] would be attributing to Chrysermos, a name he found in one of his sources (Xenokrates), materials coming from both Alexander Polyhistor and Xenokrates.

287 Bibliography

- F. Atenstädt, 'Zwei Quellen des sogenannten Plutarch de fluviis', *Hermes* 57 (1922), 219-246.
A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 59-60.
A. De Lazzer, in E. Calderon Dorda, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003), 77-78.
M. van der Valk, *Researches on the text and scholia of the Iliad I* (Leiden Boston 1963), 400-403.