

16 Peisandros

Paola Ceccarelli (Durham University)

BJN	Pisander	Peisandros
Historian Number:	016	

16 T 1 - MACROB. Sat. 5.2.4	
Subject: literary criticism Historical Work: unknown Source date: 1st half of the 5th C AD Historian's date: 3rd century BC? Historical period: mythical past	Translation
<i>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 poetas 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 hiatus 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? sed et haec et talia pueris decantata praetereo. (6) iam vero Aeneis ipsa nonne ab Homero sibi mutuata est.....</i>	<p>Or are you perhaps thinking that I shall speak of things that are common knowledge, that Vergil took Theocritus as a model for pastoral poetry, and Hesiod for the rural, and that in the <i>Georgics</i> themselves he drew for the signs of bad and good weather on the <i>Appearances</i> 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 <i>Aeneid</i>), 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' 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 recounted 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) However, the <i>Aeneid</i> itself, has it not been borrowed from Homer?...</p>

16 T 1 Commentary

This testimonium and the following were added by Jacoby, in the second edition of *FGrH* 1 (1957, A *10; he had already discussed this one in the first edition, *FGrH* 1a, 493-4); they may refer, in a mediated way, to a mythographer named Peisandros. Among the various men of letters named Peisandros are two important epic poets: one from Kameiros in Rhodos, active, according to the tradition, in the period between Homer/Hesiod and Panyassis/Antimachos (*testimonia* and fragments in A. Bernabé, *Poetae Epici Graeci* I (Leipzig 1987), 164-71, M. Davies, *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen 1988), 129-35, and M.L. West, *Greek Epic Fragments* (Cambridge, Mass. and London 2003), 177-87); and one from Laranda, active at the time of Alexander Severus (222-235 AD), who composed a *poikile historia* in epic verse, called *Heroic Theogamies* (*testimonia* and fragments in E. Heitsch, *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der Römischen Kaiserzeit*, *Abh. d. Göttinger Akademie, Ph.-hist. Kl.* 33, II (1964), suppl. 6, 44-7).

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, 'Lese Früchte', *Hermes* 60 (1925), 280-84 (= *Kleine Schriften* 4, 1962, 368-71) forcefully defended the view that most mentions of a Peisandros (including the ones in Macrobius and Johannes Philoponos) refer back to the archaic epic poet of Kameiros, while the others can be attributed to the poet from Laranda. But some of the ancient references to a writer named Peisandros do not fit easily with either of these authors, a fact already remarked upon in the eighteenth century; the question had been already fully discussed by F.G. Welcker, *Der epische Cyclus oder die homerischen Dichter* (Bonn 1865²), 91-6, who explained these references with the hypothesis of a pseudepigraphic epic poem (the *Suda*, in the notice π 1465 concerning the archaic epic poet Peisandros, mentions the existence of numerous spurious poems, beside the authentic *Herakleia*). This view has been abandoned: it is now commonly accepted that there must have been also a prose writer named Peisandros, 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, to whose work the references in the *scholia* to Apollonios Rhodios and some other texts must refer (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 (1925); a fuller argument was provided by R. Keydell, 'Die Dichter mit Namen Peisandros', *Hermes* 70 (1935), 310-11, and 'Peisandros' 11, 12, 13, *RE* 19 (1937), 144-7; Jacoby returned to the issue in *FGrH* 1a, 544-7 (1957: his remarks are still the best treatment of the issue); see now the cautious assent of D. Mastronarde, *Euripides. Phoenissae*, (Cambridge 1994), 31-2; S. Fornaro, 'Peisandros' 9, *Der Neue Pauly* 9 (2000), 480, and H. Lloyd Jones, 'Curses and divine anger in early Greek epic', *CQ* NS 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).

Macrobius must refer to 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' summary. As for the poet from Laranda, the difficulty is that his work cannot, for obvious chronological reasons, have been the source of Vergil's *Aeneid*. Yet Macrobius' 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 had been advanced as early as 1739 by Merrick in his *Triphiodorus* (Oxford, LXVI), and then restated by C.G. Heyne, *Vergilii Maronis opera* (Leipzig² 1787), 2, 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* (Roma 1931), 311-17 (revised and undated in *Studi di letteratura antica. Spiriti e forme, figure e problemi delle letterature classiche* II 1, Bologna 1947, 167-74) and by Keydell, ‘Die Dichter’, 301-309, in a paper whose main conclusions are accepted by most scholars (so for instance G. D’Ippolito, ‘Pisandro’, *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 4 (Roma 1988), 125-6; Fornaro, ‘Peisandros 9’, 480; 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 suggested by Jacoby (*FgrHist* 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 Vergil 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 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). Macrobius however mistook him for Peisandros of Laranda (whom he erroneously thought to be 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.

<p>16 T 2 - IOANNES PHILOPONOS on <i>Aristoteles, Analytica posteriora</i> 77 b 31-32 (<i>Commentaria in Aristotelis graeca</i> 13.3.156-7 Wallies) = Pisander fr. 4 E. Heitsch, <i>Die griechische Dichterfragmente der römischen kaiserzeit</i> 2.45) = Epicus Cyclus T2 Davies</p>	
<p>Subject: literary criticism Historical Work: unknown Source date: 6th C AD Historian’s date: 3rd C BC? Historical period: mythical past</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>ἄρα πᾶς κύκλος σχῆμα; ἂν γράψῃ, δῆλον. τί δέ; τὰ ἔπη κύκλος; φανερόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν. γεγράφασί τινες περὶ τοῦ κύκλου, ἀναγράφοντες πόσοι τε ποιηταὶ γεγόνασι, καὶ τί ἕκαστος ἔγραψε, καὶ πόσοι στίχοι ἑκάστου ποιήματος, καὶ τὴν τούτου τάξιν, τίνα τε πρῶτα δεῖ μανθάνειν καὶ δεύτερα καὶ ἑφεξῆς. Πεισάνδρου δὲ τὴν αὐτὴν</p>	<p>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, and what each one of them wrote, and the number of verses for each poem and their arrangement, and which should be learnt first and second and so on. And because</p>

<p>πραγματείαν ποιησαμένου, λέγω δὲ πλείστην ἰστορίαν κατὰ τάξιν συναγαγόντος, ἀντιποιησαμένου δὲ καὶ εὐεπείας, καταφρονηθῆναί φασι τὰ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ ποιητῶν συγγράμματα. διὸ μηδὲ εὐρίσκεισθαι τὰ ποιήματα <τὰ> ἐν τοῖς Κύκλοις ἀναγεγραμμένα.</p>	<p>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 earlier poets were despised. For this reason it is not possible anymore to find the poems written in the Cycles.</p>
---	---

16 T 2 Commentary

On the passage of Aristotle, 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 Analytics* (Oxford 1993²), 152-3. The first discussion of Philoponos’ commentary was offered by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, ‘Lesefrüchte’, *Hermes* 60 (1925), 280-84, whose conclusions however (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, 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, tried to suggest that Philoponos was referring here to a pseudepigraphic epic poem, having 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, 544-46). 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 (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* (Leyden 2003), 470-71. Note however the contrary opinion of Jacoby, *FgrHist* 1a, 546, who prefers to think that the mythographer is here meant; so also R. Fowler (*per litteras*), pointing out that Philoponos’ language is consonant with an encyclopaedic prose work that aimed to dethrone the poets both in content and style, and that Philoponus’ 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 Cycle, one may compare Dionysios the Cyclographer, *BNJ* 15, also writing in prose; the epigram that preceded [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’ *euepeia* does not necessarily imply a poetic work; *euepeia* is a standard term used by ancient literary critics (such as Dionysios of Halicarnassos) of elegant style in prose (Fowler *per litteras*, who suggests the comparison with *orthoepia*: both words appear in Plato, *Phaedrus* 267c).

<p>16 F 1 - [APOLLODOROS] Bibliothêkê I 74-75</p>	<p>meta[[id="16" type="F" n="1"]]</p>
<p>Subject: Myth Historical Work: unknown</p>	<p>Translation</p>

Source date: Historian's date: 3rd C BC? Historical period: mythical past	
Ἄλθαίας δὲ ἀποθανούσης ἔγημεν Οἰνεὺς Περίβοιαν τὴν Ἴππονόου ... (75) ... ἐγεννήθη δὲ ἐκ ταύτης Οἰνεῖ Τυδεύς. Πείσανδρος δὲ αὐτὸν ἐκ Γόργης γενέσθαι λέγει· τῆς γὰρ θυγατρὸς Οἰνέα κατὰ τὴν βούλησιν Διὸς ἔρασθῆναι.	After Althaia's death Oineus married Periboia the daughter of Hipponoos... (1.8.5) Tydeus was born to Oineus from her. But Peisandros says that he was born from Gorge; for Zeus willed it that Oineus should fall in love with his own daughter.

16 F 1 Commentary

The Peisandros cited here as an authority is usually assumed to have been the Hellenistic mythographer; see T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth: a guide to literary and artistic sources* (Baltimore 1993), 334. There are however no strong reasons for this; and the larger context of the passage does not help in reaching a decision. In what immediately precedes, [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 gift of honor after the sack of Olenos, and to Hesiod for a version in which Periboia, having been seduced by Hippostratus, son of Amarynceus, was sent away from Olenos by her father Hipponous, with a request to Oeneus to put her to death (this was a widespread story: Sophokles wrote a drama on this, and Diodoros of Sicily 4.35.1ff. reports a version in which Periboia alleged that she was with child by Ares). [Apollodoros] then adds that according to some it was Oineus who seduced Periboia; and he finally refers to Peisandros for the story that Oineus committed incest with his daughter Gorge, out of which Tydeus was born.

There were further variants: earlier, [Apollodoros], *Library* 1.8.1, 64, had stated that Gorge was indeed the daughter of Oineus by Althaia (so already in the *Ehoiai*, Hesiod fr. 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 ([Aristotle] fr. 640.23 Rose = *Anthologia graeca appendix, epigrammata sepulcralia*, 75); Thoas son of Andraimon is mentioned as leading the Aetolian contingent, because Oineus has no sons left, in Homer, *Iliad* 2.638. 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 (Gantz, *Early Greek Myth*, 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 Περιβοίας), in a lemma that interestingly is linked to 'the will of Zeus' (Ζεὺς ὁ τοὺς ἐμφυλίους ἐκδιώκων φόνους), just as in [Apollodoros]/Peisandros (the connection has been highlighted by C. Robert, *Oidipus, Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffs im griechischen Altertum* (Berlin 1915), 138-141, 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, attested in Dion of Prusa, 60, 6, in Hyginus *fabulae* 88, in 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' mother is unclear; Jacoby (*FGrH* 1a, 494) is certainly right in thinking that the incest must be somehow linked to the traditions on Tydeus' 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*.

16 F 2 - SCHOLIA AD APOLLONIUM RHODIUM I 152	meta[[id="16" type="F" n="2"]]
Subject: myth Historical Work: unknown Source date: various Historian's date: 3rd C BC? Historical period: mythical past	Translation
Φερεκύδης (#@3 F 127@#3 F 127@#) τὴν μητέρα τῶν περὶ Ἴδαν Ἀρήνην φησὶν, ἀφ' ἧς ἡ πόλις Πείσανδρος Πολυδώραν Θεόκριτος (<i>Dioskouroi</i> 206) Λαοκόωσαν. οὗτοι δὲ συνήκμασαν τοῖς Διοσκούροις. Ἀρήνη δὲ πόλις Πελοποννήσου πλησίον Πύλου· καὶ Ὅμηρος (B 591): 'οἱ δὲ Πύλον τ' ἐνέμοντο καὶ Ἀρήνην ἔρατεινήν'.	Pherekydes says that the mother of Idas and his brother was Arene, whence the name of the city; Peisandros says that it was Polydora; Theokritos (<i>Idyll.</i> 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 mentions it too: 'Those who inhabited Pylos and the lovely Arene'.

16 F 2 Commentary

Peisandros is unique in giving the name of Polydora to the mother of the Apharetidai, Idas and Lynkeus (just as Theokritos 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 Oibalos and of the above-mentioned Gorgophone, the first woman to have been married twice. The story was already in Stesichoros fr. 50 *PMG* (see [Apollodoros] *Library* 3.10.3, 117); see also Pausanias 4.2.4, and C. Calame, 'Spartan genealogies: The Mythological Representation of a Spatial organisation', in J. Bremmer (ed.), *Interpretations of Greek Mythology* (London - Sydney 1987), 168-70.

Peisandros need not have modified importantly the overall genealogical scheme: Polydora is a name frequent in Thessalian genealogies. In Pherekydes (*FGrH* 3 F 61a and b, with Jacoby *FGrH* 1a, 410) Polydora is a daughter of Peleus and sister of Achilles; *Iliad* 16.173-78 (and Hesiod fr. 218 M-W), mention a Polydore daughter of Peleus, married to Boros son of Perieres, and mother of the Myrmidon Menestheus: see T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth: a guide to literary and artistic sources* (Baltimore 1993), 227, as well as the ample discussion of P. Scarpi, *Apollodoro. I miti greci* (Milano 1996), 591. For Polydora's marriage with the son of Perieres Boros, see also [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 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).

The Peisandros mentioned here might equally well be the archaic epic poet, or an Hellenistic mythographer, and it is unclear who the source is for the group of references (Peisandros the mythographer, or some other later writer). However, the remark on the localization of Arene reappears elsewhere in the scholia to Apollonios (1.471), with a further isolated note on its change of name attributed to Peisandros: see F 3.

16 F 3 - SCHOLIA AD APOLLONIUM RHODIUM I 471	meta[[id="16" type="F" n="3"]]
Subject: myth; mythical past Historical Work: unknown Source date: various Historian's date: 3rd C BC? Historical period: mythical past; 3rd C BC?	Translation
Ἄρῆνη πόλις Πελοποννήσου· νῦν δὲ Ἔρανα λέγεται, ὡς φησι Πείσανδρος.	Arene is a city of the Peloponnesos; now it is called Erana, as Peisandros says.

16 F 3 Commentary

Arene is mentioned in the *Iliad* (2.591; 11, 723; also *Homeric hymn to Apollo*, 422) as a city close to Pylos and the reign of Nestor. Its identification was discussed (Stephanos of Byzantium s.v. Ἄρῆνη states that there were two cities of this name, one in Triphylia, the other one in Messenia; so also Eustathios, *Commentary to the Iliad* 297.1 and 880.54-5). Strabo 8.3.19, 346C knows of an Arene in Triphylia, which he proposes to identify with Samikon (see also Pausanias 5.6.2), while being aware that there is also an Erana in Triphylia, which some (τινες) wrongly (οὐκ εὔ) suggest is the same as epic Arena (8.3, 23, 348C); to the same context belongs the remark in Stephanos of Byzantium, s.v. Κυπαρισσία· πόλις τῆς Τριφυλίας, ἣ τις Ἔρανα ἐκαλεῖτο, and s.v. Κυπάρισσος. Slightly later, in 8.361C, Strabo mentions a Messenian city Erana close to Pylos, ‘of which some (τινες) wrongly affirm that it is the earlier Arene’. A Messenian Arene, founded by Aphareus and taking the name from his wife and sister of the same name, is indeed mentioned by Pausanias 4.2.4.

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, ‘Lese Früchte’, *Hermes* 60 (1925), 283-4 (= *Kleine Schriften* 4, 1962, 370-71) 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 a name fits very well a Hellenistic mythographer (Jacoby, *FGrH* 1a, 545, calls attention to the νῦν 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 1996), 88-91; N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid VII: A commentary* (Leiden-Boston-Köln 2000), 282-3, 504); it might also fit an early logographer, since attention to changes of name is documented for them (see e.g. *FGrH* 4 F 77; detailed argument in C. Robert, *Oidipus, Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffs im griechischen Altertum* (Berlin 1915), II 64). Peisandros might be one of

the τινες, 'some', to which Strabo alludes in the passage quoted above. This fragment must have been closely connected to the preceding one (F 2).

16 F 4 - SCHOLIA AD APOLLONIUM RHODIUM I 1195	Meta [[id="16" type="F" n="4"]]
Subject: myth: mythical figure Historical Work: unknown Source date: various Historian's date: 3rd C BC? Historical period: mythical past	Translation
χαλκοβαρεῖ ῥοπάλωι] ... τῶι ἰσχυρῶι, ἢ τῶι πρὸς τῶι τέλει χαλκῶι βεβαρημένωι. Πείσανδρος δέ φησι χαλκοῦν εἶναι τὸ ῥόπαλον Ἡρακλέους.	With heavy brazen club]... because of its strength, or made heavy at the extremity with bronze. Peisandros said that the club of Herakles was made of bronze.

16 F 4 Commentary

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.

And yet, because Peisandros of Kameiros wrote a *Herakleia*, this might be a reference to the archaic epic poet (so already U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, 'Lesefrüchte', *Hermes* 60 (1925), 280-84 = *Kleine Schriften* 4, 1962, 368-71). Not only: the *Suda*, s.v. π 1465 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; 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, *Poetae Epici Graeci* I (Leipzig 1987), Pisander F1; M. Davies, *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen 1988), Pisander F 1/2; M.L. West, *Greek Epic Fragments* (Cambridge, Mass. - London 2003), Pisander F 1). Clearly, the *Herakleia* of Peisandros was remembered as distinctive in respect to Herakles' 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* I, gives it as Pisander *Fragmentum dubium* 13 (note however that West, *Greek Epic Fragments*, omits it). On the changes in the portrayal of Herakles during the archaic period see P. Brize, 'Samos und Stesichoros. Zu einem früharchaischen Bronzeblech', *MDAIA* 100 (1985), 86-89; full recent discussion in G. Ucciardello, 'P. Berol. 17071: frammenti esametrici su Eracle?', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete*, 55.2 (2009), 482-3, for whom this fragments 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), 471-526.

For his part, Jacoby, *FGrH* 1a, 494 sees in the bronze club of the Hellenistic mythographer a compromise between a Herakles equipped as a hoplite (described e.g. in Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 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 (12.512e-513a = PMG 52). This excursus, which goes back to Megakleides, the author of a work on Homer active around circa 300 BC, 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* (Oxford 2000), 142, one of the butts of Megakleides' 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). Note also that in the catalogue of gifts that the gods gave to Herakles because of his achievements (Diodoros 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); thus, while it remains true that there is no reason why a mythographer should not have talked of Herakles (it is actually difficult to see how he could have avoided doing so), and while it is possible that a mythographer named Peisandros (or naming himself Peisandros), contemporary or slightly later than Megakleides, may have discussed the topic, a final decision will depend on the evaluation of the group of references to Peisandros in the scholia to Apollonios Rhodios.

16 F 4b - NATALIS COMES, MYTHOLOGIAE VII 1,	Meta[[id="16" type="F" n="4"]]
Subject: myth: mythical figure Historical Work: unknown Source date: 2nd half of 16th C AD Historian's date: 3rd C BC? Historical period: mythical past	Translation
In hunc Hercules multas sagittas frustra coniecit, neque laesit omnino: mox cum ad clavam ventum esset, [quae multo ferro erat gravis, ut Socrates scripsit ad Idotheum: ut vero sensit Pisander, tota erat ferrea:] et illa crebris verberibus comminuitur.	Against the animal Hercules threw without results many arrows, nor did he wound him at all; then he switched to the club [which was heavy with iron, as Socrates 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.

16 F 4b Commentary

This fragment is absent from Jacoby *FGH*; it comes from Natale Conti's work on mythology. In book V of his *Mythologiae sive explicationis fabularum libri decem* (Venice 1567), Natale Conti narrated the story of Herakles' labours; in the second, expanded edition (Venice 1581), he added the part here printed between brackets. 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* (Leon 2004), 241-50), and he inserted the reference to an iron club in the part of his work dealing with the first of Heracles' labours, the combat with the

lion of Kithairon (J. Mulryan and S. Brown, *Natale Conti's Mythologiae* (Tempe, AZ 2006), 570 n. 4 correctly refer for Pisander to *FGrH* 16 F 4).

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'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, *FGrH* 310 F 15; the comments in Mulryan and Brown, *Natale Conti's Mythologiae*, 560 n. 4 are misleading); and by the *Suda*, χ 296 χιάζειν (= *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 and in the *Suda*. This means that, in the second version of the *Mythologiae*, Natale Conti added to his text a incorrect reference to Sokrates' work *To Eidotheos*, and a correct reference to Peisandros (further on Natale Conti and source citations see *BNJ* 23 F 1b, 1c and 1d).

16 F 5 - SCHOLIA AD APOLLONIUM RHODIUM II 98	meta[[id="16" type="F" n="5"]]
Subject: myth: mythical figure Historical Work: unknown Source date: various Historian's date: 3rd C BC? Historical period: mythical past	Translation
<p>οὐδ' ἄρα Βέβρυκες] Ἀπολλώνιος μὲν ἐμφαίνει ὡς ἀνηρημένον τὸν Ἄμυκον. Ἐπίχαρμος (F 7 K.-A.) δὲ καὶ Πείσανδρος φασιν ὅτι ἔδησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Πολυδεύκης. Δηίλοχος δὲ ἐν πρώτῳ Περὶ Κυζίκου (<i>FGrH</i> 471 F 1) καταπυκτευθῆναί φησιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ Πολυδεύκου.</p>	<p>And nor the Bebrykes] Apollonios shows that Amykos was killed. But Epicharmos and Peisandros affirm that Polydeukes tied him. And Deilochos in his first book <i>On Kyzikos</i> says that he was conquered in boxing by Polydeukes.</p>

16 F 5 Commentary

Apollonios Rhodios narrates the fight between Amykos (a son of Poseidon) 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; [Apollodoros], *Library* 1.9.20, 119; Hyginus, *Fables*, 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.); a similar dénouement is also attested by a number of images on vases, going from ca. 420 BC to 320 BC (see T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth: a guide to literary and artistic sources* (Baltimore 1993), 439). In Theokritos 22.09-130 too the defeated Amykos surrenders, while it is unclear what ending the wording of Deilochos exactly implies. On whole, 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); the other possibility is that the scholiast refers here to the epic poet – the episode concerning Amykos is after all closely juxtaposed to a story concerning Herakles in the *Argonautica*. 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 Photius, the *Etymologicum genuinum*, and the *Suda* (see Epicharmus 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 T1, and in the biographical essay), would account for the situation perfectly. As for Dei(l)ochos, he was active at the latest in the first half of the fourth century (so Jacoby, *FGrH* 3B, Text, 370), but possibly already before the Peloponnesian war (so Dionysios of Halicarnassos, *On Thucydides* 5.1; see R. Fowler, ‘Herodotos and his contemporaries’, *JHS* 116 (1996), 63-4); he is mentioned some nine times in the *scholia* to Apollonios, and never, but for this passage, in connection with Peisandros.

16 F 6 - SCHOLIA AD APOLLONIUM RHODIUM II 1088	meta[[id="16" type="F" n="6"]]
Subject: myth: mythical figure Historical Work: unknown Source date: various Historian’s date: 3rd C BC? Historical period: mythical past	Translation
πιθανῶς δὲ ὁ Πείσανδρος τοὺς ὄρνιθὰς φησὶν εἰς Σκυθίαν ἀποπτῆναι, ὅθεν καὶ ἐηλύθεσαν.	Peisandros plausibly states that the birds flew towards Skythia, whence they had come.

16 F 6 Commentary

This is problematic, because in Pausanias 8.22.4 Peisandros of Kameiros (i.e. the old epic poet) is cited 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 ὄρνιθὰς ποτε ἀνδροφάγους ἐπ’ αὐτῷ τραφῆναι· ταύτας κατατοξεῦσαι τὰς ὄρνιθας Ἡρακλῆς λέγεται. Πείσανδρος δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Καμειρεὺς ἀποκτεῖναι τὰς ὄρνιθας οὐ φησὶν, ἀλλὰ ὡς ψόφῳ κροτάλων ἐκδιώξειεν αὐτάς, ‘There is a story current about the water of the Stymphalus, 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).

For this reason, M. Davies, *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttingen 1988), 132 prints the text of the scholiast to Apollonios Rhodios together with his Pisander F 5; A. Bernabé, *Poetae Epici Graeci I* (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). However, the story occurs also in Pherekydes *FgrH* 3 F 72, and in Hellanikos *FgrH* 4 F 104; this means that it was widely known (for other attestations see T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth: a guide to literary and artistic sources* (Baltimore 1993), 393-4). Thus

even though the story was certainly narrated by Peisandros the archaic epic poet, the scholiast might here have been thinking of Peisandros the mythographer. A further problem is that the context here is the arrival of the Argonauts to the island of Ares, inhabited by terrible birds, whose feathers can be used as arrows: it is the birds' flight away from the Argonauts, towards the sea, that the scholiast is commenting upon. Of course the driving away of the birds by the Argonauts is explicitly modelled on what Herakles had done at the Stymphalian lake; still, 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 (already mentioned in Euripides' *Phrixos*, fr. 838 K.) is uncertain (see Gantz, *Early Greek Myth*, 393-4, as well as 358).

16 F 7 - SCHOLIA AD APOLLONIUM RHODIUM IV 57	meta[[id="16" type="F" n="7"]]
Subject: myth: mythical figure Historical Work: unknown Source date: various Historian's date: 3 rd C BC? Historical period: mythical past	Translation
<p>τὸν δὲ Ἐνδυμίωνα Ἡσίοδος μὲν Ἀεθλίου τοῦ Διὸς καὶ Καλύκης παῖδα λέγει, παρὰ Διὸς εἰληφότα τὸ δῶρον ἴν αὐτῶι¹ ταμίαν εἶναι θανάτου, ὅτε θέλοι ὀλέσθαι· καὶ Πείσανδρος² καὶ Ἀκουσίλαος (#@2 F 36@#2 F 36@#) καὶ Φερεκῦδης (#@3 F 121@#3 F 121@#) καὶ Νίκανδρος ἐν δευτέρῳ Αἰτωλικῶν καὶ Θεόπομπος ὁ ἔποποιός.</p>	<p>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 <i>Aitolika</i> (FGrH 271-272 F 6), as well as Theopompos the epic poet (SH 765).</p>

16 F 7 Commentary

The text given above follows that of Jacoby; it is however worth noting that Wendel, in his edition of the scholia to Apollonios Rhodios, postulated the existence of a lacuna between the reference to Hesiod, and all the others. 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)— although a number of divergent accounts of the story of Endymion exist.

Two main strands can be singled out: one revolving around the mount Latmos in Caria (cf. the epigraphic hymn in lyric verse found at Herakleia on the Latmos, discussed by L. Robert, *BCH* 102 (1978), 483-489, or *I.Magnesia* 17), 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).

The fragment of Peisandros is part of a long, learned scholion. In what precedes, the scholiast has recounted the story of the love of Selene, the Moon, for Endymion, and her

¹ ὄν (ἴν Greg. Cor.) αὐτῶι Apoll. Dysc. De pron. 82, 21 Schn ἐν αὐτῶι L ἑαυτῶι A θέλοι: μέλλοι Eudok. 256, 17 Fl ὀλέσθαι: ἔλέσθαι A.

² Jacoby; lacunam postulavit Wendel; καὶ Πείσανδρος δὲ τὰ αὐτὰ φησι Parisinus 2727.

visits to the cave on Mount Latmos in Caria, where Endymion lived, citing for this Sappho (fr. 199 L-P = 199 V) and Nikandros in the second book of his *Europeia* (F 24 Gow-Scholfield, *FGrH* 271-272 F 18). (The connection with Caria is also present in Apollonios Rhodios 4.57-58; [Theokritos] *Idyll* 20.37-39; in Callimachos, mediated through Catullus 66.5-6; in Cicero, *Tusculan Disputations* 1.38.92; in Ovid, *Heroides*, 18.61-65; *Ars Amatoria*, 3.83; *Tristia* 2.299; in 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 [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, *FGrH* 70 F 122 = Strabo 10.3.2) or not, as in Nikander; see Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a (Kommentar) 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 not rather a punishment for his impiety. The same scholiast to Apollonios, 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 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); but there is no evident connection with Herakles (unless in a comparison, both having been accepted among the gods), and Peisandros's name appears, possibly after a lacuna, as the first of a series formed by two early prose-writers, followed by two authors of the Hellenistic period, the last one an epic poet. This looks very much like a 'Zitatennest', and Peisandros the mythographer might have been the ultimate source from which the information was culled.

16 F 8 - SCHOLIA AD APOLLONIUM RHODIUM IV 1396	meta[[id="16" type="F" n="8"]]
Subject: myth: mythical figure Historical Work: unknown Source date: various Historian's date: 3 rd C BC? Historical period: mythical past	Translation
ἴζον δ' ἱερὸν πέδον, ᾧ ἔνι Λάδων εἰσέτι	They reached the sacred plain, in which

<p>που χθιζὸν παγχρύσεια ῥύετο μῆλα] Πείσανδρος τὸν δράκοντα ὑπέιληφεν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς γεγενῆσθαι, Ἡσίοδος δὲ ἐκ Τυφῶνός φησιν.</p>	<p>Ladon until yesterday kept watch over the golden apples] Peisandros accepted that the serpent was born of the earth, but Hesiod (fr. 391 M-W) says he was born of Typhon.</p>
--	--

16 F 8 Commentary

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; [Apollodoros] *Library* 2.5.11, 113 and Hyginus *Fabulae* 151 give as his parents Typhoeus and Echidna, a genealogy that goes back to Pherekydes (so Jacoby, *FGrH* 3 F 16b), while Ptolemy Chennos (Photius *Bibliotheca* 190) made of him the brother of the Nemean lion. In Apollonios Rhodios the serpent is born of the soil (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 to be associated with Lethe (Strabo 17.3.20, C836; cf. P. Green, *The Argonautika* (Berkeley - Los Angeles 2007²), 345-6, with further references).

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, *FGrH* 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 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; A. Bernabé, *Poetae Epici Graeci* I (Leipzig 1987), lists this as Pisander *Fragmentum dubium* 15; M. Davies, *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta* (Gottingen 1988), 134 gives it as Pisander *fragmentum dubium* 3. 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' version; but Apollonios might have chosen an erudite variant.

16 F 9 - SCHOLIA AD EURIPIDEM Phoenissae 834	Meta [[id="16" type="F" n="9"]]
Subject: myth: mythical figure Historical Work: unknown Source date: various Historian's date: 3rd C BC? Historical period: mythical past	Translation
Πείσανδρος ἱστορεῖ ὅτι Ξάνθη γαμηθεῖσα Τειρεσίαι ἐποίησε παῖδας τέσσαρας· Φαμενόν, Φερσεκέρδην ³ , Χλωρίν, Μαντώ.	Peisandros records that Xanthe having married Teiresias gave birth to four children: Phamenos, Phersekerdes, Chloris and Manto.

³ codd; Φρασικέρδην Nauck²; Φερεκύδην Schwartz; Φερεκέρδην Wilamowitz

16 F 9 Commentary

As stressed by Jacoby, *FGrH* 1a, 494, this is not an invention of Peisandros. A wife Ξάνθη and a son Φαμενός are attested for Teiresias in Sophokles' play *Manteis or Polyidos* F 392 R (preserved in Herodianus, *On peculiar style* 8.27); the scholiast to Pindar, *Nemean* 9.57, mentions, in the context of the genealogy of Periklymenos, that he was the son of Chloris daughter of Teiresias and of Poseidon; the other daughter Manto is mentioned in [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 unattested child is thus Φερσεκέρδης. 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* NS 42 (2002), 6 n. 39 (not in the 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' *Manteis* shows that tragedy could fit the bill as well. As a result, the Peisandros mentioned here might be the archaic epic poet: Teiresias' prophecies to Alcmene and Amphitryon connect him to the story of Herakles (Pindar, *Nemean* 1.60-69). But it might also be the mythographer, drawing either on archaic epic poetry (the *Oidipodeia*) or on more recent tragic material.

16 F 10 - SCHOLIA AD EURIPIDEM Phoenissae 1760	Meta [[id="16" type="F" n="10"]]
Subject: myth: mythical figure Historical Work: unknown Source date: various Historian's date: 3rd C BC? Historical period: mythical past	Translation
ιστορεῖ Πείσανδρος ὅτι κατὰ χόλον τῆς Ἥρας ἐπέμφθη ἡ Σφίγξ τοῖς Θηβαίοις ἀπὸ τῶν ἐσχάτων μερῶν τῆς Αἰθιοπίας, ὅτι τὸν Λαίον ἀσεβήσαντα εἰς τὸν παράνομον ἔρωτα τοῦ Χρυσίππου, ὃν ἤρπασεν ἀπὸ τῆς Πίσσης, οὐκ ἐτιμωρήσαντο. (2) ἦν δὲ ἡ Σφίγξ, ὡσπερ γράφεται, τὴν οὐρὰν ἔχουσα δρακαίνης. ἀναρπάζουσα δὲ μικροὺς καὶ μεγάλους κατήσθιεν, ἐν οἷς καὶ Αἴμονα τὸν Κρέοντος παῖδα καὶ Ἴππιον τὸν Εὐρυνόμου τοῦ τοῖς Κενταύροις μαχεσαμένου. ἦσαν δὲ Εὐρύνομος καὶ Ἥιονεὺς υἱοὶ Μάγνητος τοῦ Αἰολίδου καὶ Φυλοδίκης. ὁ μὲν οὖν Ἴππιος καὶ ξένος ὢν ὑπὸ τῆς Σφιγγὸς ἀνηρέθη, ὁ δὲ Ἥιονεὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ Οἰνομάου, ὃν τρόπον καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι μνηστήρες. (3) πρῶτος δὲ ὁ Λαῖος τὸν ἀθέμιτον ἔρωτα τοῦτον ἔσχεν. ὁ	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 Chrysisippos, whom he carried away from Pisa. 2. The Sphinx, as is written/as she is painted, 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

δὲ Χρύσιππος ὑπὸ αἰσχύνης ἑαυτὸν διεχρήσατο τῷ ξίφει. (4) τότε μὲν οὖν ὁ Τειρεσίας ὡς μάντις εἰδὼς ὅτι θεοστυγῆς ἦν ὁ Λάιος, ἀπέτρεπεν αὐτὸν τῆς ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα ὁδοῦ, τῇ δὲ Ἥρῃ μᾶλλον τῇ γαμοστόλῳ θεᾷ θύειν ἱερά. ὁ δὲ αὐτὸν ἐξεφαύλιζεν. ἀπελθὼν τοίνυν ἐφονεύθη ἐν τῇ σχιστῇ ὁδῷ αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ ἠνίοχος αὐτοῦ, ἐπειδὴ ἔτυψε τῇ μᾶστιγι τὸν Οἰδίποδα. (5) κτείνας δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔθαψε παραυτίκα σὺν τοῖς ἱματίοις ἀποσπᾶσας τὸν ζωστήρα καὶ τὸ ξίφος τοῦ Λαίου καὶ φορῶν· τὸ δὲ ἄρμα ὑποστρέψας ἔδωκε τῷ Πολύβῳ. εἶτα ἔγημε τὴν μητέρα λύσας τὸ αἶνιγμα. (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 Ἰοκάστη τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα διηγῆσατο καὶ τὸν ζωστήρα ἔδειξεν. (7) ἡ δὲ δεινῶς φέρουσα ὅμως ἐσιώπα· ἠγγόει γὰρ υἱὸν ὄντα. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἠλθέ 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 ζωάγρια, 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.

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 having gone he was murdered, himself and his charioteer, where the road divided itself, because he struck Oidipous with his whip. 5. Having killed them, he immediately buried them with their cloaks, having torn away the belt and the sword of Laios and wearing them; as for the chariot, once 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 the Kithairon, he was coming back, having Iocaste as well in the chariot; and when they reached that place at the crossroads, he was reminded and showed to Iocaste the place and recounted the affair and showed 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 which were born to him his four children. So Peisandros says.

16 F 10 Commentary

This passage has provoked extended controversy: it contains fascinating variants on the Theban myth, but it is difficult to pinpoint its source. Recent discussions include H. Lloyd Jones, 'Curses and divine anger in early Greek epic', *CQ* NS 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; D. Mastronarde, *Euripides. Phoenissae* (Cambridge 1994), 31-5; see also the very

detailed apparatus (with further references) of A. Bernabé, *Poetae Epici graeci* I (Leipzig 1987), *Oidipodea* 17-19. Jacoby's very dense discussion (*FGrH* 1a 494-6) is still one of the best. The first extensive discussion of 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 Cameiros, 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* (Bonn 1865², 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 assumed 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, those by E. Bethe, *Thebanische Heldenlieder: Untersuchungen über die Epen des thebanisch-argivischen Sagenkreis* (Leipzig 1891), 1-28 (assuming the scholion to reflect, in its main lines, an archaic epic *Oidipodeia*), by C. Robert, *Oidipous: Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffs im griechischen Altertum* (Berlin 1913), 150-167 (who took the scholion to be in the main the composite work of a grammarian), by 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), by U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, 'Lesefrüchte', *Hermes* 60 (1925), 280-1 (claiming that the scholion, notwithstanding obvious difficulties, went back to a hypothetical work called 'Kyklos' by the archaic epic poet Peisandros), R. Keydell, 'Die Dichter mit Namen Peisandros', *Hermes* 70 (1935), 301-302 (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), and E.L. de Kock, 'The Peisandros scholium – its Sources, Unity and Relationship to Euripides' *Chrysippus*', *Acta Classica* 5 (1962), 15-37, are still useful.

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); 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' text (Jacoby, *FGrH* 1a, 495; Mastronarde, *Euripides. Phoenician women*, 32). The text clearly presents problems – it either is indeed a patchwork from different sources, or something has been lost in its transmission. The narrative begins with information concerning the origins of the Sphinx, here sent from the remotest end of Aethiopia by Hera (so also in [Apollodoros] *Library* 3.5.8, 52, and in Dio Chrystostomos 11.8; most sources do not dwell on who sent the Sphinx or why). The ample role played by Hera in this account points to an archaic narrative: possibly the *Oidipodeia*. The exact meaning of the expression ὡς περ γράφεται is uncertain ('as is written', or 'as she is painted'): Robert, *Oidipus*, 152-3 thought that this could only mean a painting; Lloyd-Jones, 'Curses', 23 with earlier 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 οὐρανὸν 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 [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, 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.

This is followed by a list of some of the deaths caused by the monster, that has been felt to be an insertion into the main thread: not so much the deaths of Haimon and Hippios, which have to do with the Sphinx, as the genealogy of Hippios, and the detailed account of the deaths of his father and uncle. It could be argued however that the reference to the death of Hippios' uncle Eioneus, one of the suitors of Hippodamia (also attested in Pausanias 6.21.11), is not really out of place, since it strengthens the connection between events at Thebes and at Pisa, through Oinomaos, whose grandson Chrysippos (the son of Pelops, who defeated Oinomaos) was carried away from Pisa.

Then, the narrative goes back to the initial cause, the love of Laios for Chrysippos, his abduction of the boy, the suicide of Chrysippos out of shame, and Hera's anger, resulting 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' 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, Mass. and London 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 III*, 1986, s.v. 'Chrysippos I', 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, Hesperia supplement 41*, 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 1993), 488-91 and 832-3. Similarly problematic is the reason for the arrival of the Sphinx: while it is a widespread feature of ancient traditions that the Sphinx was sent by Hera, only here is Laios' crime the reason for the goddess' anger. But at this point, the Sphinx tacitly disappears, and Teiresias suggests that Laios, being 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 Sophocles' *Oedipus king*), and Oidipous enters the scene. He kills Laios, solves the riddle of the Sphinx, and marries the queen.

A number of details are here too intriguing. It is 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); the reason for Laios' trip to Delphi is not made clear (to ask about children? This, the usual reason, cannot be the case 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; the location of the crossroads is unclear (in Sophocles, *Oedipus Tyrant* 732-34, it is located in Phocis, where the path from Daulis and the road to Delphi merge into one, but Aeschylus in an earlier play had put it close to Thebes, at Potniai, fr. 387a R.; the narrative of the scholion makes it likely that it is this crossroad that is meant, but Jacoby's notion, *FGrH* 1 a, 495, that the crossroads here and below are left unnamed on purpose, to avoid conflict between versions, is worth mentioning); the riddle appears here as a surprise (riddles had not been mentioned previously) – moreover why, if the Sphinx had been sent because of Laios' crime, was the death of Laios not enough to free the city from her; finally, 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' 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).

One interesting point concerns the wives of Oidipous, and their children. 'Peisandros' (=the scholion to Euripides, *Phoenician women* 1760), the scholion to Euripides, *Phoenician women* 13, [Apollodoros], *Library* 3.5.8, and Pausanias 9.5.11 concur in giving their names as Iokaste and Euryganeia, while in the epic *Oedipodea* their names were Epikaste (very close to Iokaste) and Euryganeia (Bernabé, *PEG I, Oedipodea* F 2 = M. Davies, *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Göttigen 1988), *Oedipodea* F 2). The scholion D to Homer, *Iliad* 4.376 Dindorf and Eustathios, *Commentary to the Iliad* 4.376-381 mention instead Iokaste and Astymedousa. Pherekydes (*FGrH* 3 F 95 = schol. Euripides, *Phoenician women* 53) apparently distributed the three names over three wives (see further Jacoby, *FgrH* 1a, 416-17). This goes against the tradition of the epic *Thebais*, but probably reflects that of the epic *Oidipodia*, to which the version of *Odyssey* 11.272-77 may have been close: there, Oidipous continues to live in Thebes, and if he is guilty of having killed his father and having slept with his mother, however he does not have incestuous children (cf. Pausanias 9.5.7). 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). See on this Jacoby, *FgrH* 1a, 416-17; Lloyd-Jones, 'Curses', 28; E. Cingano, 'The Death of Oedipus in the Epic Tradition', *Phoenix* 46 (1992), 1-11. 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? Lloyd-Jones ('Curses' (2002) 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 dropped the argument in the revised version ('Curses' 2005). But it is very 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' *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 *Oidipodeia*), on an Euripidean drama (the lost *Chrysis*), or on both; and that the scholiast (or tradition) is responsible for further compression and loss of coherence.

16 F 11 - PHILODEMOS π. εὐσεβ. 87a 17 p. 37 G	meta[[id="16" type="F" n="11"]]
Subject: myth: mythical figure Historical Work: unknown Source date: 1 st C BC Historian's date: 3 rd C BC? Historical period: mythical past	Translation
[Π]ε<ί>σα[νδρος δέ φη]σιν [σ]κώ[πτουτ']	Peisandros says that he (Zeus) threw him

αὐ]τὸν (sc. τὸν Προμηθεά) [ἐκβληθῆναι εἰς] ἀνό[δειαν].	(Prometheus) in a place outside of reach because of his mockery.
--	--

16 F 11 Commentary

The above is Jacoby's text; for it, Jacoby relied on Th. Gomperz' edition (*Philodem. Über Frömmigkeit*, Leipzig 1866), to which he added the restorations suggested by R. Philippson, 'Zu Philodem's Schrift über die Frömmigkeit', *Hermes* 55 (1920), 245 (adding that the restoration was very uncertain, *FGrH* 1a, 496). According to Philippson, Philodemos here had in mind the *Herakleia* of Peisandros von Kamiros; and the otherwise unattested term *anodeia* (restored by Philippson, and on which Philippson's interpretation rested) would have been another way of expressing what is formulated by Aischylos, *Prometheus* 2 with ἄβροτον εἰς ἐρημίαν. (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, *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 *PHerc.* 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' book *On Piety* and not the first, as supposed initially: see D. Obbink, *Philodemus. On Piety, Part 1* (Oxford 1996), 94-98 for a discussion of both the authorship (either Philodemos or Phaidros) and the structure of the book.

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.
[to connect?]. 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 γίγαν- | τεῖον at ll. 19-20 is very uncertain. At any rate, what follows seems to make clear that here the text is concerned with Atlas rather than Prometheus; Euripides's *Ion*, Simonides and Hesiod are referred to in this connection (ll. 21-30). As for Peisandros, there seems to be no compelling reason to restore his 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 the name Peisandros could be read, his identity (archaic poet? Hellenistic mythographer?) would still be uncertain (Jacoby, *FGrH* 1A, Text, 182, had classified this fragment among the 'uncertain and dubious').

16 F 12 - PHILODEMOS π. εὐσεβ. (P. Hercul. 1602 V 6-19):	
Subject: myth: mythical figure Historical Work: unknown Source date: 1 st C BC Historian's date: 3 rd C BC?	Translation

Historical period: mythical past	
<p>δὲ κα[ἰ] συνοι κίσα[ι] (<i>scil.</i> Thetis) τῶι Π[η]λαί.⁴ ἐν Π[ρο]μηθε[ῖ] δὲ τῶι Λυομέ[ν]ω[ι] τῆς⁵ 5 Θέ[τ]ιδος ἐπιθυμῆιν.⁶ κα[ἰ] φασιν[- - καὶ⁷ [ὁ δὲ τ]ὰ Κύπ[ρ]ια γράψας τῆ⁸ (Kypria F 2 PEG) Ἡ[ρ]αι χαρ[ι]ζομέ- νη]ν φεύγειν αὐ[τὴν 10 τὸ]ν γάμον Δ[ι]ός. τὸν⁹ δ' ὀμόσαι χολῶ¹⁰[θέν- τ]α διότι θνη[τῶι συ]νοικίσει.¹¹ κα[ἰ] πα- ρ' Ἡ[σι]όδωι δὲ κε[ῖ]ται 15 τ]ὸ παραπλήσ[ιον.] ὁ Πείσανδρος [δὲ π]ερὶ Κλυμένης []ον ἔρασθέν[τ¹²]έστιν[20]κα[ἰ]]τον[</p>	<p>and that she (Thetis) went to live with Peleus. In the <i>Prometheus liberated</i> (F 202b Radt) (Aischylos says that Zeus) was taken by desire of Thetis. And (someone) and the author of the <i>Kypria</i> 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 (fr. 210 M-W) one finds a similar story. As for Peisandros, concerning Klymene he says that having fallen in love...</p>

16 F 12 Commentary

Jacoby's doubts on the Philodemian authorship of the text (*FGrH* 1a *11) are superseded: Vol. Herc. Coll. Alt. VIII 101-107 is simply the publication of a copy, made twenty years later, of the same text from which the *apographum oxoniense* (on which Gomperz based his edition) derives: see A. Schober, 'Philodemi De Pietate Parts Prior, Königsberg 1923', in *Cronache Ercolanesi* 18 (1988), 67.

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, *Die Fragmente der Tragödien des Aischylos* (Berlin 1959), fr 321a ll. 1-13; R. Merkelbach-M.L. West, *Fragmenta Hesiodica* (Oxford 1967), fr. 210 ll. 7-15; S. Radt, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* 3 (1985), fr. **202b, ll. 1-15; A. Bernabé, *Poetae Epici Graeci* I (Leipzig 1987), 45 F2, 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 already Reitzenstein, have pointed out that the wording is here very close to that of [Apollodoros], *Library* 3.13.5, 169, and that most likely here Philodemos and [Apollodoros] rely on a common source. The unit on Thetis closes with the statement that a similar account is found also in Hesiod (fr. 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

⁴ Reitzenstein, *Hermes* 35 (1900), 73-74 (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.

⁵ Luppe, who tends to go for a slightly longer line, and also proposes as alternative κα[ἰ].

⁶ Luppe; [περὶ Θέτ]ιδος Reitzenstein, *Ind. lect.* (Rostock 1891/91) 15; φησὶ Θέτιδος Schober; Θέμιδος Wilamowitz

⁷ Luppe; ρασιν disegno.

⁸ Luppe;]Κύπ[ρ]ια ποιήσας Ἡ[ρ]αι Jacoby, Schober.

⁹ ll. 9-10 Luppe; φεύγειν αὐ[τὸ]ν | 10 τὸ]ν γάμον, Δ[ι]α

¹⁰ χολῶ disegno (Luppe)

¹¹]οικίσει Reitzenstein 1900 and all editors apart from Mette;]οικήσει disegno, and Reitzenstein 1891/2, Mette (Luppe)

¹² Luppe; Κλυμένης, [ἦς Ἡ[λ]ι]ον ἔρασθέν[τα Reitzenstein; Κλυμένης [ὅτι | σ]υνερασθέν[των Lippold and Jacoby, but as pointed out by Luppe, a Y is out of question here; Περικλυμένης [αὐ- | τὸν ἔρασθέν[τα Schober.

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 *Cronache Ercolanesi* 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...

Periklymene is however a fairly minor character in Greek mythology: daughter of Minyas and Klytadora (so the scholion to Apollonios Rhodios 1.230b, who gives as her sister Eteoklymene), she is the wife of Pheres and mother of Admetos according to Tzetzes, *Chiliades* 2.53.789 (Leone). Nothing else is known of her, and it is difficult to see what she would be doing here, after a story as famous as that of Zeus' love for Thetis.

As for Klymene, proposed by R. Reitzenstein, 'Die Hochzeit des Peleus und der Thetis', *Hermes* 35 (1900), 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, s.v. 'Klymene', in W.H. Roscher, *Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* ii.1 (Leipzig 1890-94), 1227-8).

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 can hardly be Philodemos' Klymene: her love life seems too straightforward.

Homer, *Odyssey* 11.326, mentions a Klymene at the end of the catalogue of women of the *Nekyia*, without adding anything. This is an interesting mention, for the catalogue comprises women who have affairs with gods (Tyro, Antiope, Alkmene, Leda and Iphimedeia are mentioned in the preceding verses); as for Maira, who is here paired with Klymene (Μαῖράν τε Κλυμένην τε ἴδον, *Odyssey* 11.326), she too was loved by Zeus: the scholiast, citing Pherekydes (*FGRH* 3 F 170ab), explains that Zeus fell in love with her and made her pregnant. Ancient commentators (the scholiast to *Odyssey* 326) identify this Klymene with the daughter of Minyas, wife of Phylakos or Kephalos, and mother of Iphiklos and Alkimede (they are followed by the moderns: see for instance A. Heubeck, A. Hoekstra, *A Commentary to Homer's Odyssey* vol. II, 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 (fr. 62 M.-W.; see also *PSI* 1173.78-81), whence Eustathios, *Commentary in Homer's Odyssey*, 1689.2 (very close version in Eustathios, *Commentary in Homer's Odyssey* 1688.65 = Hesiod fr. 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 Δηϊόνος Ἰφικλον τίκτει ποδώκη παῖδα. ἔνιοι δὲ αὐτὴν τὴν Κλυμένην προγαμηθῆναί 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 gives birth to Iphiklos, her child fleet of foot... some however say that this same Klymene united herself first with Helios, giving birth to Phaeton. The story is in Hesiod.

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 Aethiopians, 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; at any rate, if we assume that *P. Hercul.* 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. It is reasonably easy to imagine a context in the *Herakleia* in which Peisandros might have mentioned Helios and his descendance; slightly more difficult to imagine a connection with the Klymene loved by Zeus.

16 F 12b - PHILODEMOS π. εὐσεβ. <i>P. Hercul.</i> 247 IV b 8-9, p. 80 Schober	meta [[id="16" type="F" n="12b"]]
Subject: myth: mythical figure Historical Work: unknown Source date: 1 st C BC Historian’s date: 3 rd C BC? Historical period: mythical past	Translation
τὸν Ἀσκληπιὸν δ’ ὑπὸ Διὸς κα[τακταν]θῆναι γέγρα[φεν] Ἡ[σίοδος] καὶ [Πείσαν]δρος καὶ Φε[ρεκύδης] ὁ Ἀθηναῖος καὶ Πανύ[ασσις] καὶ Ἄν[δρων] καὶ Ἄκουσ[ίλαος] καὶ Εὐριπίδης ἐν οἷς λέγει καὶ ὁ τὰ Ναυπάκτια ποιήσας καὶ Τελέστης ἐν Ἀσκληπιῶι.	That Asklepios was killed by Zeus have written Hesiod (fr. 51 M.-W.) and Peisandros and Pherekydes the Athenian (<i>FgrH</i> 3 F 35) and Panyassis (fr. 26 <i>PEG</i>) and Andron (<i>FgrH</i> 10 F 17) and Akousilaos (<i>FgrH</i> 2 F 18) and Euripides where he says [<i>Alc.</i> 3] and the poet who composed the Naupaktia (fr. 11 <i>PEG</i>) and Telestes in the <i>Asklepios</i> (fr. 3 Page).

This reference to Peisandros in Philodemos’ *On Piety* (*P. Hercul.* 247 IV b 8-9, p. 80 Schober; A. Henrichs, ‘Philodemos «De Pietate» als mythographische Quelle’, *Cronache Ercolanesi* 5 (1975) 8; and Bernabé, *PEG* I, Pisander F *dubium* 17), is absent from Jacoby, but should be discussed with the others.

The text is again a Zitatennest, and as shown in the very rich discussion by Henrichs, ‘Philodems «De Pietate»’, 8-10, the entire passage, with all its source citations, goes back to Apollodoros’ *On the gods*. As in the fragment previously discussed, Peisandros is mentioned just after Hesiod, with Pherekydes, Panysassis, Andron and Akousilaos: the archaic poet might be meant here (Bernabé, *PEG I*, 171 puts this among Peisandros’ *fragmenta dubia*, with the number 17; similarly M. Davies, *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta* (Göttingen 1988), 134 F dubium 4). 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. Hercul. 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?

16 F 13 - Servius Danielinus on Vergil’s <i>Aeneid</i> 2.211	
Subject: myth, mythical figure Historical Work: unknown Source date: various Historian’s date: 3rd C BC? Historical period: mythical past	Translation
<i>hos dracones Lysimachus (382 F 16) † curifin et Periboeam dicit, filios vero Laocoontis Ethronem et Melanthum Thessandrus dicit.</i>	Lysimachos gives the names of these serpents as †curifin and Periboea, while Thessandros (?) names the sons of Laokoon Ethro and Melanthos.

16 F 13 Commentary

Thessandrus, offered by the manuscripts, is unknown; already Heyne suggested to emend the name in Pisandrus (he was thinking of the archaic epic poet). His emendation is generally accepted, but considered to refer to the mythographer (so Jacoby; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, ‘Lesefrüchte’, *Hermes* 60 (1925), 280-84; and A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2004), 260): in light of Macrobius’ remark on Virgil having made use of Peisandros’ 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 already Jacoby, *FGrH* 1A, *11 n. 7) 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 Vergil. Finally, it is worth remembering that, as stressed by Cameron, *Greek Mythography*, 203, Thessandrus is not in itself an implausible or unknown name; and that 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 Danielinus states that Sophocles had named the serpents in his *Laocoon* (F343 R.= on Vergil’s *Aeneid* 2.204), and that the scene had also been described by Bacchylides (Servius, on Vergil’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 Chariboea in Nikander, as quoted by Apollodoros *On Gods* (*Supplementum Hellenisticum* 562.11); and Porkis in Lykophron, *Alexandra* 347, while the *scholia vetera* to Lycophron add Peroiboea. As

for the children of Laokoon, much less is known about them: Nikander seems actually to have known of one son only, which he does not name, while in Hyginus, *Fables* 135, they are named Antiphanes and Thymbraios (see on this again Cameron, *Greek Mythography*, 203 and n. 87).

<p>16 F 14 - P. Berol. Inv. 13872 (W. Schubart, <i>Griechische Literarische Papyri</i> 1950, n° 4; Pack 1229)</p>	
<p>Subject: myth; literary criticism Historical Work: unknown Source date: 3rd C AD Historian's date: 3rd C BC? Historical period: mythical past</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>καὶ Πείσανδρος 15 [ἐν τοῖς ... συγγεγραμμένοις¹³ τὴν ἐ- [ξ Αὐλίδος ὄρμη] καὶ τὴν εἰς [Ἰ]λίον ἄ- [φιξιν ἐξηγεῖται...] ὥσθ' ὅταν ἴδω- [μεν..... νοο]υμεν ὡς π[.]οκ[.] [- . .] ὑπὲρ τῶν πρότε- 20 [ρον.....].ν[.]εὐμενων [.]επ[.]ις</p>	<p>Peisandros [in] written narrates the departure from Aulis and the arrival to Ilion in such a way that when we see... we understand that... concerning those who before....</p>

16 F 14 Commentary

The papyrus, dated to the third century AD, originally coming from Egypt, and now lost, contains the rest of a learned discussion (possibly a dialogue) on Homeric matters. The text of the papyrus (Pack² 1229), based on Schubart's edition, is accessible in the Catalogue of Paraliterary Papyri, n. 199 (<http://cpp.arts.kuleuven.be/index.php?page=closeup&id=0199>). Peisandros is the only author explicitly quoted in the very fragmentary text, which seems to concern time in the Homeric poems. That this Peisandros is the prose mythographer is very unlikely: the comments made in the papyrus seem to refer rather to a poetic narrative. This may have been also the impression of Jacoby, who quoted Schubart's text of this fragment in his *addenda* (FGrH 1 A *11), but in apparatus proposed to restore at l. 15 [ἐν ταῖς Θεογαμίαις καλου]μέναις?, 'in the work called *Theogamiai*', the title of the poem of Peisandros of Laranda (fragment not present in E. Heitsch, *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit*, II, Göttingen 1964). This would imply that a writer active in the third century was discussing the work of a poet active in the third century; 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. It should however be noted that Jacoby's proposal is slightly longer than the space allows (31 letters, while the line-length is ca. 26-28 letters).

016 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

¹³ The restoration is slightly too long: the line-length is ca. 26-28 letters. [ἐν ταῖς Θεογαμίαις καλου]μέναις? Jacoby

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' *Phoenician women*; one in [Apollodoros], and one in Servius' *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, and 'Peisandros' 13, in *RE* 19 (1937), 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).

The fragment that it is most difficult to attribute to the archaic epic poet, and that most likely belongs to a later prose writer, 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; 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' 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 10).

As for the other fragments, F 1, from [Apollodoros]' *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 (F 12a). This is a very homogeneous group, filtered through Apollodoros' *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).

Finally, F 13, where the name Peisandros is the result of an emendation, contrasts him with the Hellenistic writer Lysimachos; F 14 discuss matters linked with the Trojan cycle, but the context does not allow any inferences.

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 [Apollodoros]' *Library*, in the *scholia* to Apollonios Rhodios, and in Euripides' *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. 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 as Keydell, 'Peisandros', 147 concluded, 'Sicherheit ist nicht zu erreichen'. 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. More likely is 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: 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* 1 (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 two scenarios we are left with (besides the potential but unlikely survival of an ancient epic poem) are thus:

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 that for 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).

016 Bibliography

- A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2004), 29 and 255-60.
 S. Fornaro, 'Peisandros' 9, *DNP* (Stuttgart and Weimar 2000), 480.
 R. Keydell, 'Die Dichter mit Namen Peisandros', *Hermes* 70 (1935), 301-11.
 R. Keydell, 'Peisandros' 11, 12, 13, in *RE* 19 (1937), 144-147.
 H. Lloyd Jones, 'Curses and divine anger in early Greek epic', *CQ* NS 42 (2002), 3-10, reprinted with modifications in *The further academic papers of Sir High Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford 2005), 18-35.
 U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Lesefrüchte", *Hermes* 60 (1925), 280-84.