

285 Aretades of Cnidus

Paola Ceccarelli (Durham)

BJN	Aretades Cnidius	Aretades of Cnidus
Historian Number:	285	

285 F 1 - (IV 316, 1) [Plutarch] <i>Parall. min.</i> 11 A = <i>Moralia</i> 308C meta[[id="285" type="F" n="1"]]	
Subject: Major battles: Battle of Granikos; Major war: Wars of Alexander against Persia Historical Work: <i>Macedonian History</i> book 3 Source date: 2nd Century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: 334 BC	Translation
Δαρείος ὁ Πέρσης ἐπὶ Γρανικῶι πολεμήσας Ἀλεξάνδρῳ καὶ ἑπτὰ σατράπας ἀποβαλῶν καὶ ἄρματα δρεπανηφόρα δύο καὶ πεντακόσια συμβαλεῖν ἔμελλε τῆι ἑξῆς. Ἀριοβαρζάνης δ' ὁ υἱὸς συμπαθῶς διακείμενος πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον ὑπισχνεῖτο τὸν πατέρα προδώσειν. ἀγανακτῆσας δ' ὁ πατὴρ ἐτραχηλοκόπησεν, ὡς Ἀρητάδης Κνίδιος ἐν τρίτῳ Μακεδονικῶν.	Dareios the Persian, after having fought Alexander at the Granikos and having lost seven satraps and five hundred and two scythed chariots, intended to attack again on the following day. But his son Ariobarzanes, who was kindly disposed toward Alexander, was promising that he would betray his father. The father, enraged, cut his throat; so Aretades of Knidos in the third book of his <i>Macedonian History</i> .

285 F 1 Commentary

This story is paired with that of Brutus, who, having put an end to the monarchy in Rome, decapitated his sons, when they were found to be conspiring against him (a story attributed by [Plutarch] to Aristides of Miletos, *BNJ* 286). The Greek parallel is thus much later than the Roman one which should validate it (something that happens also elsewhere in the *Parallela minora*: list of instances and discussion in J. Boulogne, *Plutarque. Oeuvres morales*, 4 (Paris 2002), 226; see also [A. Cameron, *Greek mythography in the Roman world* \(Oxford - New York 2004\), 128](#)). The story also presents a feature typical

of many of the stories that form the *Parallela minora*: it is extremely compressed, to the point of being illogical, since it does not explain how Dareios found out about Ariobarzanes's treacherous notions. More importantly, there are some erroneous statements: in particular, Dareios was not present at the Granikos in 334 BC, nor were scythed chariots used (they were first used against Alexander at Gaugamela in 331, as shown by the narratives of Diodoros of Sicily, 17.18-21 and 33-34 and Arrian, *Anabasis* 1.13-16 and 2.8-11 for Granikos and Issos respectively, and Diodoros 17.53.1-2, with Curtius, 4.9.3-5 and Arrian, 3.8.6-13, for the chariots at Arbela; on them see A.K. Nefiodkin, 'On the Origin of the Scythed Chariots', *Historia* 53 (2004) 369-378).

It is also disputed whether Dareios ever had a son named Ariobarzanes. Arrian (*Anabasis* 3.8.5, 3.18.2 and elsewhere) and Curtius Rufus (4.12.7, 5.3.17) mention among the generals of Dareios an Ariobarzanes, who almost managed to stop Alexander at the Persian Gate (see on him W. Heckel, *The Marshals of Alexander's Empire* (London - New York 1992), 100-101, and W. Heckel, *Who's who in the age of Alexander* (Oxford 2006), 45 n. 2; H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (München 1926), v. 2, 60-61 n. 115 identifies this Ariobarzanes with the homonymous satrap son of Artabazos); but no source, apart from the passage from the *Parallela minora*, mentions a son of Dareios named Ariobarzanes (see Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 371 and A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 331 n. 109). Diodoros of Sicily 17.21.3 and Arrian 1.16.3 however state that a Pharnakes, 'brother of Dareios's queen', died in this battle, and as Berve points out, this queen cannot be Stateira, who was herself Dareios's sister, but must be a former wife of Dareios (see now Heckel, *Who's who in the age of Alexander*, 274, F5); because the names Ariobarzanes and Pharnakes are frequent in the family of Artabazos, Berve, *Das Alexanderreich*, II 61 n. 116, and before him W. Judeich, *RE* 2 s.v. Ariobarzanes (3) (Stuttgart 1896), 833 accept, on the basis of our passage, that Dareios had from an earlier wife a son named Ariobarzanes, probably a nephew of Pharnakes; so also Heckel, *Who's who in the age of Alexander*, 44-45, and M. Brosius, *Women in Ancient Persia, 559-331 BC* (Oxford 1998), 68.

And yet, even Berve, *Das Alexanderreich*, II 61 n. 116, while claiming that 'there is no reason not to accept the testimony of an ancient author such as Aretades of Knidos', admits that many precisions in the passage have novelistic character ('Romanhafte Zutaten', speaking in particular of the loss of 502 scythed chariots) or are simply wrong (the presence of Dareios at Granikos). How should we then evaluate the story of the attempted betrayal by, and punishment of, one of Dareios's sons? In favour of the hypothesis of an invention is the fact that [Plutarch] or his source might here be transposing motifs from another affair: an Ariobarzanes son of Pharnabazos and satrap of Hellenistic Phrygia is attested, who had good connections with Athens and Sparta, and who in 367 revolted against Artaxerxes II; the rebels were defeated in 363/2 BC; Ariobarzanes was betrayed by his own son Mithridates and crucified (Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 8, 8. 4; see on this Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 371; De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori*, 331 n. 110). Moreover, the betrayal of Dareios by Ariobarzanes and Bessos, as narrated in Pseudo-Callisthenes, *Historia Alexandri Magni*, 2.20.1 and 21.9, may also hover behind the story preserved by [Plutarch]: in view of the passage of Xenophon mentioned above, it is interesting to notice that Alexander has both Ariobarzanes and Bessos crucified, as a

'reward' for their betrayal of Dareios. Jacoby (FGrH 3a 371) refers the reader to Droysen's remarks (in the Appendix I of the second edition of his *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, 1: *Geschichte Alexanders des Grossen*, 2 (second edition, Hamburg 1877) 395) on the likelihood that the Romance of Alexander may have been one of the sources of [Plutarch] for precisely this story. Finally, Periander and an Ariobarzanes appear as examples of the bad behaviour of tyrants and satraps towards their children in Themistius's oration 32, 362ab (*On Moderation of One's Emotions, or, On Love of One's Children*): that is, in Themistius the name reappears in the context of an unnatural relationship between father and son, but in an almost opposite situation. In sum: this passage of the *Parallela minora* may preserve an otherwise lost piece of information (as Plutarch remarks in the opening of his *Life of Demetrius*, 3.4-5, assassinations and complots were part of the everyday life of Hellenistic courts); but it seems more likely that it represents a construct, made up to correspond to the Roman story it purports to parallel, and incorporating themes from other stories concerning a satrap Ariobarzanes (the information about the existence of a son of Dareios named Ariobarzanes might just conceivably be correct, but the story of the betrayal is most likely invented). In the latter case, the author of the story is most likely not Aretades, but rather [Plutarch], and the mention of Aretades is to be interpreted as one of the many bogus references of the *Parallela minora* (so for instance also Cameron, *Greek mythography in the Roman world*, 126 for this passage, and 127-34 for a general discussion of source-references in [Plutarch]'s *Parallela minora* and *On rivers*).

285 F 2 - (3) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 27 A =
Moralia 312B meta[[id="285" type="F" n="2"]]

Subject: Myth: mythical figure
Historical Work: Island stories
Source date: 2nd Century AD
Historian's date: unknown
Historical period: mythical past

Translation

Τελαμών ὁ Αἰακοῦ καὶ Ἐνδηίδος ἐλθὼν εἰς
† Εὐβοίαν καὶ νυκτὸς ἔφυγεν. ὁ δὲ πατὴρ
αἰσθόμενος καὶ τῶν πολιτῶν τινα
ὑποπεύσας ἔδωκε τὴν κόρην
καταποντωθῆναί τινα τῶν δορυφόρων· ὁ δὲ
ἐλείσας ἀπηπόλησε. προσσχούσης δὲ τῆς
νεῶς Σαλαμῖνι, Τελαμών ὠνήσατο· ἡ δ'
ἔτεκεν Αἴαντα, ὡς Ἀρητάδης Κνίδιος ἐν
δευτέρῳ Νησιωτικῶν.

Telamon, the son of Aiakos and Endeis, came to *** Euboa¹ and left in the night. But the father noticed, and suspecting one of the citizens, he gave order to one of his guards to throw the girl into the sea. But he, taken by pity, sold her. And as the ship reached Salamis, Telamon bought her; and she gave birth to Ajax, as Aretades of Knidos narrates in the second book of his *Island stories*.

285 F 2 Commentary

¹ E (the *Parisinus Graecus* 1672) indicates a lacuna of ca. 75 letters after καί;--

This is a well-known story, attested already in Bacchylides 13.102, Pindar *Isthmian* 6.45, and Sophocles *Ajax* 569, who give Eriboia as the name of the mother of Ajax; the names of Meliboia and Periboia are however also attested (see K. Tümpel, 'Eriboia' (2), *RE* 6 (Stuttgart 1909), 438; T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth. A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore 1993), 225; A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 384). Stories of maidens cast away by their fathers because of real or suspected misconduct are numerous; a fairly close parallel is in Herodotus, with the story of Phronime, who should have been thrown in the sea (καταποντῶσαι, Hdt. 4.154.3), following her father's orders, and who met with compassion on the part of the person to whom she had been entrusted. What makes [Plutarch]'s narrative peculiar is the fact that the maiden is acquired by the person who violated her, something reminiscent of new comedy (Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a 371-2; De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori*, 348). In [Plutarch], this story forms a parallel to a similar Roman one, not attested elsewhere, and lacking the usual source reference.

[Plutarch] gives as authority for this story a work *Nesiotika* ('Island stories') in at least two books, by Aretades of Knidos. The genre of *Nesiotika* is relatively well-attested (see P. Ceccarelli, 'I Nesiotika', *ASNP* s. 3, 19 (1989), 903-935, and 929 on Aretades); and the story narrated could have been at its place in such a work, since the works *On islands* tend to give space to mythical narratives with paradoxical elements, metonomasies, and extraordinary events, often taking place in the mythical past. This is however the only reference to such a work by Aretades.

The opening of the story is problematic; solutions include accepting the existence of a lacuna of variable length, that might be located after εἰς; in this case the place where the events happened was in the lacuna, and Euboia is the name of the girl, or a corrupt reflection of it (so Jacoby). But the lacuna might also be located after καί: in this case, Telamon violates his future bride in Euboia (so J. Boulogne, *Plutarque, Oeuvres morales, 4* (Paris 2002), 263 and n. 186); the problem with this solution is that a presence of Telamon in Euboia is unattested, and that his future bride is usually the daughter of Alkathoos king of Megara ([Apollodoros], *Library* 3.12.7), or also an Athenian (Diodoros of Sicily 4.72.7). A third possibility, which does not require the hypothesis of a lacuna, is advanced without much conviction by De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori*, 348: to consider Euboia as yet another variant of the girl's name, to change ἐλθῶν to ἔλθε, and to consider that ἔλθε εἰς Εὐβοίαν might here have the pregnant meaning of 'united himself to Euboia'; but as De Lazzer acknowledges, if ἔρχομαι παρά is attested with this meaning, there are no parallels for this use of ἔρχομαι εἰς.

285 F 3 - (2) [Plutarch] De fluviis 12, 2 =
Moralia 1157C meta[[id="285" type="F" n="3"]]

Subject: Religion: Ritual
Historical Work: On Phrygia
Source date: 2nd century AD
Historian's date: unknown
Historical period:

Translation

<p>γεννᾶται δ' ἐν αὐτῷ λίθος αὐτόγλυφος² καλούμενος· εὐρίσκεται γὰρ τετυπωμένην ἔχων τὴν Μητέρα τῶν θεῶν. τοῦτον τὸν λίθον [ἐὰν εὕρη τις] σπανίως εὐρισκόμενον <ἐὰν εὕρη τις τῶν> ἀποτέμν<εσθαι βουλ>ομένων, οὐ ξενίζεται ἀλλ' εὐψύχως φέρει τῆς παρὰ φύσιν πράξεως τὴν ὄψιν, καθὼς ἱστορεῖ Ἀρητάδης ἐν τοῖς Φρυγιοκοῖς.</p>	<p>And in it (the river Sangaris) a stone is produced, called autoglyphos (self-engraved): for it is found carrying engraved the image of the Mother of the gods. And this stone, rarely found, if one of those who plan to be mutilated finds it, he does not find odd, but rather accepts with good will the sight of the unnatural action, as Aretades records in his <i>Phrygian stories</i>.</p>
---	---

285 F 3 Commentary

A number of issues beset this text. First, the central passage as transmitted does not make much sense; numerous proposals have been made to improve it. It is at the very least necessary to accept that a τῶν has dropped out (so E. Calderón Dorca, in E. Calderón Dorca, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003), 162; this is enough to make sense of the passage, although the *ordo verborum* remains odd and the meaning strained); interventionist proposals include changing the *ordo verborum*, and assuming that something else is missing (so for instance Jacoby in the text printed above).

The second problem concerns the name of the author: the one manuscript of the *On rivers* we have gives the name as Ἀρητάζης, a name attested only here. Ἀρητάδης is a correction of Müller; it is also a fairly rare name, but there are other instances of it. Müller's correction has been almost universally accepted, and the Aretazes writer of *On Phrygia* is usually identified to the Aretades writer of *On Macedonia* and *Island stories* (interestingly, P.J. Maussac, *Plutarchi libellus de fluviorum et montium nominibus* (Tolosae 1615), thought that they were one and the same person, but proposed to consider Aretazes the original form of the name). In his recent edition, Calderón Dorca maintains Aretazes (Calderón Dorca, De Lazzer, Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti*, 162); De Lazzer, in the introduction to this edition, 71, leaves things open. Once it is agreed that the author of *On Phrygia* is a creation of [Plutarch], the variation between Aretades and Aretazes might be accepted as intentional; however, typically [Plutarch]'s bogus references closely mirror (or closely distort) the names of real authors, and a never-attested name such as Aretazes seems out of place in such a context. At any rate, the choice of a work *On Phrygia* is certainly appropriate to the geographical location of this particular story.

Third, the story itself presents some problematic features. *On rivers* 12 opens with a discussion of the river Sagaris, to be identified with the Sangarios near Pessinous, already mentioned in Homer (*Il.* 3.187; 16.719) and Hesiod (*Theog.* 344); for a Sangarios at Pessinous and a discussion of the name see L. Robert, *Noms indigènes dans l'Asie*

² The Palatinus graecus Heidelb. 398 has here αὐτόγλυκος; αὐτόγλυφος is a correction of Gelenius, accepted by all editors, and finding some support in the marginal title of this story in the msscr, λίθος αὐτόγλυφος (see also Hercher).

Mineure gréco-romaine (Paris 1963), 536-7, to which can be added the local names Sagarios and Sagaria, preserved in SEG 41.1152 and 45.1706. The connection of the river with Attis and the cults of the Great Mother was well established (Ovid, *Fasti* 4.229 for instance knows of an union between Attis and the Hamadryad Sagaritis; see on Attis and the Mother now J.N. Bremmer, 'Attis: a Greek god in Anatolian Pessinous and Catullan Rome', *Mnemosyne* S 4, 56 (2004), 534-73; republished in J.N. Bremmer, *Greek religion and culture, the Bible, and the ancient Near East* (Leiden 2008), 267-302). Thus until here, we are on local and relatively solid ground. However, in [Plutarch] the river is initially named Xerobates ('that can be crossed on dry ground', or 'that crosses dry ground?'), a name otherwise unattested; it takes its new name from a Sagaris son of Mygdon and Alexirrhoe. The father's name is local and well-attested; the mother's name is also local, but extremely infrequent. It is only found three times in Greek, and twice in Latin, literature (searches on the TLG and the Latin PHI disk): 1) here; 2) in another passage of [Plutarch], *On rivers* 7.5, where through her union with Dionysos Alexirrhoe gives birth to Karmanor (the setting is Lydia, and fittingly Karmanor dies young while hunting a boar); 3) in the *scholia vetera* to Homer, *Iliad* 24, 497, where Alexirrhoe daughter of Antandros is one of Priam's wives; 4) in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 11, 763, where she is the daughter of the horned river Granikos, wife of Priam and mother of Aesacus, who will throw himself into the sea, in his despair for the death of the nymph Hesperia, bitten by a snake while trying to escape his amorous advances (*Metamorphoses* 11.749-795); and 5) in Servius, *Commentary to Virgil's Aeneid* 4, 254, who retells Ovid's story. Somehow, Alexirrhoe's name hovers in this area, but apart from [Plutarch], no one seems to have connected it with the Sagaris; however, it is easy to feel in the end of Sagaris an echo of Aesacus's story. Sagaris shows disrespect for the mysteries of the Mother, commits hybris against her priests and Galloi, is punished by the goddess with madness, and throws himself in the river. For this part of the story, [Plutarch] gives no sources.

The following paragraph concerns a stone growing in the river (as typical of the structure of the *On rivers*: see De Lazzer, in Calderon Dorda, De Lazzer, Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti*, 19-20). The stone mentioned here does not have a specific name, but is described by its most striking characteristics: it is *autoglyphos*, it is found carrying engraved the image of the Mother of the Gods, and it can give peace to those who are embarking in the ritual mutilation.

The term αὐτόγλυφος is attested only 6 times in Greek literature (TLG search): here; twice in Olympiodoros (*Commentaries in Job*, ed. U. and D. Hagedorn (Berlin 1984) p. 251 l. 21, and *Commentaries in Jeremiah*, Migne vol. 93 p. 637 l. 3), where it concerns a σπήλαιον αὐτόγλυφος, i.e. a cave created by the men for themselves, symbolizing the freedom of the soul to act badly; and three times in Tzetzes. This author is particularly interesting, because he identifies the stone *autoglyphos* with the stone called 'drakontia' or 'drakonitis', the snakestone, supposedly to be found in the head of serpents:

Περὶ δρακόντων Λιβυκῶν Ἀδέσποτος γὰρ λέγει,
καταλογάδην συγγραφῆ, μηδὲ μετρικωτάτη,
ἐν μέτρῳ δ' ὁ Ποσειδίππος, ὡς κεφαλαῖς ταῖς τούτων
λίθοι τινὲς εὐρίσκονται, τὴν κλήσιν δρακοντίαι,

αὐτόγλυφοι τυγχάνοντες, ὧν ἐν ἐνὶ καὶ ἄρμα
ἐγγεγλυμμένον κατιδεῖν αὐτοφυῶς πως λέγει,
μὴ φαίνεσθαι τὸ γλύμμα δε πρὶν τυπωθῆ κηρίοις.
Καὶ τῶν ἐπῶν κατάκουε νῦν τῶν τοῦ Ποσειδίππου.
“Οὐ ποταμὸς κελάδων ἐπὶ χεῖλεσιν, ἀλλὰ δράκοντος,
εἶχέ ποτ’ εὐπῶγων τόνδε λίθον κεφαλῇ
λευκὰ φαληριόωντα. Τὸ δὲ γλυφέν ἄρμα κατ’ αὐτοῦ,
τοῦθ’ ὑπὸ Λυγκείου βλέμματος ἐγλύφετο,
ψεύδει χειρὸς ὅμοιον· ἀποπλασθὲν γὰρ ὄραται
γλύμμα. Κατὰ πλατέος δ’ οὐκ ἂν ἴδοις προβόλου.
Ἦ καὶ θαῦμα πέλει μόχθου μέγα, πῶς ὁ λιθουργὸς
τὰς ἀτενιζούσας οὐκ ἐμόγησε κόρας.” (660)
Ταῦτα μὲν ὁ Ποσειδίππος καὶ ἕτερα μυρία.

For an Adespotos speaks of Libyan snakes, in his work composed in prose, and not in metre; but in metre Poseidippos, of how in the heads of such snakes stones are found, called *drakontiai*, which are self-carved, and on one of which he says one can see a chariot depicted of its own nature, and that the incision does not appear unless it is imposed on wax. Listen now to the verses of Poseidippos.

‘Not a river sounding on its banks, but the bearded head of a serpent once held this stone, white and thickly streaked. The chariot depicted on it, it was made by a Lyncean eye, similar to a mark on a nail; for after an imprint is taken, the chariot is seen, but on the flat face you would not see any projections. In which resides a great marvel of labor, how the craftsman did not damage his straining eyes’. Such poems Poseidippos, and thousand more. (Tzetzēs, *Chilias* 7, 144, 645-661 = Poseidippos AB 15)

Tzetzēs restates his point about the snakestone being a self-carved stone in the part of his *Histories* in which he discusses Indian islands (in particular, Taprobane: *Chiliades* 8, 213, 636-40: Ὦνερ δρακόντων κεφαλαῖς εὐρίσκονται καὶ λίθοι, / λίθοι πολυτιμότατοι, πολλοὶ τῶν αὐτογλύφων, / φέροντες καὶ σφραγίσματα. Ὡς παρ’ ἐνὶ καὶ ἄρμα / τούτων αὐτόγλυφον ἰδεῖν, ἄνδρες φασὶ μυριοί, / καὶ ὁ Ποσειδίππος αὐτὸς ἐν ἔπεσί που γράφει. “And stones are found in the heads of these serpents, very precious stones, many of the autoglyphos type, carrying incisions. And thousands of men say how in one of these it is possible to see a self-carved chariot, and Poseidippos himself writes this in his verses”). The question of what source Tzetzēs is relying here is an open question (see D. Obbink, ‘New Old Posidippus, Old New Posidippus’, in K. Gutzwiller (ed.), *The New Posidippus. A Hellenistic Poetry Book* (Oxford 2005), 110); as for the anonymous writer mentioned in l. 645, A. Westermann, *Paradoxographoi Scriptores Rerum Mirabilium Graeci* (Braunschweig and London 1839), *Praefatio* xviii suggests that this may be the same as the anonymous writer of a collection of wonders (θαυμάτων συναγωγή), which according to Photios, *Library* cod. 161, 103b was excerpted by Sopater in the fourth book of his *Eclogae*. It is also unclear how reliable Tzetzēs’s interpretation of the *drakontia* as an *autoglyphos* may be. For A.F.S. Gow and D.L. Page, *Hellenistic Epigrams 2, Commentary* (Cambridge 1965), 500-501, Tzetzēs ‘absurdly misunderstood’ the fifth line of Poseidippos’s epigram, and was mistaken in seeing in the chariot a natural formation of

the stone; in this case, the identification of *autoglyphos* and snakestone would be an error of Tzetzes. But M. Smith, 'Elusive Stones: Reading Posidippus' *Lithika* through Technical Writing on Stones', in B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou, M. Baumbach, *Labored in Papyrus Leaves* (Cambridge, Mass. and London 2004), 113-17 accepts Tzetzes's interpretation of the poem and thinks that this is what Poseidippos meant. In this case, the identification would be ancient.

The idea that the snakestone is self-carved finds support in a passage of Pliny (*Natural History* 37.158), in which Pliny refers to the ancient writer of *Lithika* Sotakos (third century BC) for the fact that the stone is 'glossily white and translucent, and cannot be polished or submitted to any other skilful process' (*candore tralucido, nec postea poliri aut artem admittere*). No one has ever linked Poseidippus's epigram and Tzetzes's interpretation of it with this passage of the *On rivers*, because the engraved image is very different (a chariot in Poseidippus, the Mother of the Gods in [Plutarch]); yet, the scarcity of *autoglyphoi* stones renders it necessary at least to raise the possibility that [Plutarch]'s *autoglyphos* may be a snakestone.

It should be said here that this is one of a series of stones that the *On rivers* links to the goddess Cybele: the 'frantic' stone, antiphrastically called *sophron*, at *On rivers* 9.3; the cylindrical stone at *On rivers* 9.5; the *machaira* at *On rivers* 10.5; and the *autoglyphos* at *On rivers* 11.2. For J. Bidez, 'Plantes et pierres magiques d'après le Ps. Plutarque, *De fluviis*', *Mélanges Navarre* (Toulouse 1935), 33, all these texts, and their references, are reliable. And yet: for the first stone the sources are Demaratos, *On rivers* book 3, and Archelaos *On stones* book 1 (resp. BNJ 42 F 4 and FGrH 123 F 9); for the second, Agatharchides of Samos, *On stones* book 4 and Demaratos, *On Phrygia* book 4 (resp. BNJ 284 F 4 and BNJ 42 F 3); for the third, Agatharchides, *Phrygian stories* (BNJ 284 F 3); and for the fourth, Aretazes, *On Phrygia* (our F 3). The least one can say is that this is a remarkable 'mix and match'.

Further on stones see R. Halleux and J. Schamp, *Les lapidaires grecs* (Paris 1985), xiii-xxxiv, and in particular xxv-xxvi for the position of [Plutarch] and the authors cited in the *On rivers* within the ancient tradition of *Lithika*; Halleux and Schamp follow Bidez, 'Plantes et pierres magiques d'après le Ps. Plutarque, *De fluviis*', 25-38, in thinking that [Plutarch] faithfully preserves the remains of a whole literature now lost (hints of its richness can still be seen in Pliny, *Natural history* book 37. The publication of *P. Mil. Vogl.* viii 309, containing a third century BC epigram collection now known as 'the new Poseidippus', has revived interest in *Lithika*: see e.g. Smith, 'Elusive Stones: Reading Posidippus' *Lithika* through Technical Writing on Stones', 105-117, and on the snakestone K. Gutzwiller, 'Cleopatra's Ring', *GRBS* 36 (1995), 387-88; see also S. Macrì, *Pietre viventi. I minerali nell'immaginario del mondo antico* (Milano 2009), 80-82 and 98-104.

285 F 4 - Natalis Comes, *Mythologiae libri X*, Venice 1581, p.125 (book III, 1).
meta[[id="285" type="F" n="4"]]

Subject: Myth: Mythical past; Genre: Geography

Translation

<p>Historical Work: Macedonian history Source date: 1568 Historian's date: unknown Historical period:</p>	
<p>Iuxta hanc Acherusiam fuit descensus ad inferos, ut scripsit his verbis Aretades Gnidius in lib. 2 rerum macedonicarum et repetivit perdoctus Apollonii enarrator: ἡ περὶ Ἡράκλειαν Ἀχερουσιάς καλουμένη πανταχόθεν ἐκ θαλάσσης ἐστὶν ὑψηλή τε καὶ ³ἀπονένευκεν εἰς δυσμὰς εἰς τὸ πρὸ τῆς Βιθυνίας πέλαγος, καὶ ⁴προσπίπτον αὐτῇ τὸ κῦμα σφοδρὸς ἀποτελεῖ ἤχους, καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐπ' ἄκρας αὐτῆς πεφυκκιῶν πλατάνων καὶ τοῦ ἐπ' αὐτῇ πεδίου, καὶ ⁵δοκεῖ κατὰ βασίς εἰς Ἄϊδου ὑπάρχειν,⁶ Acherusia vocata, quae est iuxta Heracleam, ubique alta est et praecipua supra mare: atque in occidentem respicit in mare Bithyniae, cui unda incidens ingentes sonos efficit. Huius in summa parte natae sunt platani, et in eius planitie; ibique videtur esse ad inferos descensus”, quod scripsit etiam Nymphis Samius in primo Heracleae.</p>	<p>Near this Acherusia (a lake in Epiros) was the route to the underworld, as Aretades of Knidos states with these very words in the second book of his <i>On Macedonia</i>, and as a very learned scholiast of Apollonios repeats: “the place called Acherusia near Herakleia is almost from all sides encircled by the sea and high; it looks westwards to the sea of Bithynia, and the waves that fall on it there make a crashing sound; and concerning the plane-trees on its top, as well as the plain on it, and the entrance to the underworld seems to be there”(schol. A.R. 2.729-35) ‘the place called Acherusia, which is close to Heraclea, is everywhere high and vertical over the sea; and towards west it looks towards the Bithynian sea, where the wave falling raises a loud sound. On top of it, and on its plain, there are plane trees; and it appears that there is located a descent to the underworld’. This same description is echoed by Nymphis the Samian in his first book <i>On Herakleia</i>.</p>

285 F 4 Commentary

This fragment is not in Jacoby; it comes from Natale Conti's *Mythologiae, sive Explicationum fabularum libri decem*, 3.1 (second enlarged edition Venice 1581; but the reference to Aretades appeared already in the first edition, Venice 1568). This part of Conti's work is dedicated to the ideas of the ancients concerning the underworld. Conti begins by mentioning the existence of two different Acheron rivers, one in Southern Italy, one in Epirus. He then mentions a lake Acherusia in the territory of the Mariandyni (in Asia Minor, close to Heraclea); Conti seems to misplace this, because he goes on to say that it was not far from a town called Cichyrus (= Ephyra, in Thesprotia),

³ Here the edition of 1581 omits two words from the scholion, ἀπόκρημνος καὶ; moreover, the scholion has the simple νένευκεν, while Conti has ἀπονένευκεν.

⁴ Conti, in inserting the text of the scholion into his narrative, omits ὅτι, present in the scholion.

⁵ Conti omits ὅτι, present in the scholion.

⁶ The scholiast gave here his reference: Νύμφις ἐν τῷ Περὶ Ἡρακλείας ἀΐφησί. Conti omits the reference, and prefers to say that Nymphis 'the Samian' also writes this.

and that it bordered onto cape Misenum (in Southern Italy). It is at this point that the reference to Aretades's *On Macedonia* is introduced, a reference that Conti supports with a long quote from the *scholia* to Apollonios Rhodios (2.729-35). And yet, clearly the scholiast, and Apollonios, and Nymphis (whom the scholiast quotes), mean here Herakleia in Asia Minor (cf. the mention of the Bithynian sea; an Acherusia in this area is also mentioned by Pliny, *Natural History* 6.1.4), so that a reference to an author who has written *On Macedonia* is scarcely appropriate. Moreover, the scholiast to Apollonios gives indeed as his source the first book of Nymphis's work *On Heraclea*, but it nowhere mentions Aretades of Knidos. Thus either Natale found his information in some other text that he chose not to mention, or he threw in the name of Aretades, whom he might have remembered from his translation of the *On rivers*, simply to add one further reference. Natale Conti's relationship with the *scholia* to Apollonios Rhodios, and this passage in particular, are discussed by R.M. Iglesias Montiel and M.C. Álvarez Morán, 'Escolios griegos en la *Mythologia* de Natale Conti (Venecia 1567)', in F. Dominguez Dominguez (ed.), *Humanae Litterae. Estudios de humanismo y tradicion clasica en homenaje al profesor Gaspar Morocho Gayo* (Leon 2004), 243-4: notwithstanding the evidence they collect, they leave open the possibility that Natale Conti may have found his references in some now lost text.

If the reference to Aretades is due to Natale Conti's creative impulses, a possible explanation for his choice of Aretades might be seen in the fact that the *scholia* to Apollonios Rhodios, a text that Natale Conti certainly knew very well, mention, a few lines before this passage, in discussing Apollonios Rhodios 2.722, a river Sangarios. And the reference to Aretades in the *On rivers* (F 3 above) comes from the chapter dedicated to the river Sagaris, a river of Phrygia. These connections (in discussing the Sangarios, the scholiast actually mentions a work *On Phrygia* by Hermogenes; [Plutarch] refers back to Aretades's book *Phrygian stories*) might have informed Conti's decision. If moreover he was not too clear on the geography of the various place named Acherousia, he might have considered a reference to a work *On Macedonia* appropriate for a lake located in Epiros. One further problem is the fact that Natale goes on to summarize information from Nymphis, which actually comes from that same scholion to Apollonios (see again Iglesias Montiel and Álvarez Morán, 'Escolios griegos', 244); but while the scholiast had not given the origin of Nymphis, Natale gives him a Samian origin (erroneously: other testimonia show that the Nymphis author of a work *On Heraclea* was from Herakleia; there is no attestation in all of Greek literature of a Nymphis from Samos. Iglesias Montiel and Álvarez Morán, 'Escolios griegos', 244, do not seem to notice).

285 Biographical Essay

Only two fragments of Aretades of Knidos have been preserved, both from the *Parallela minora*; a third one may be added, attributed to an Aretazes, from the *On Rivers*; each refers to a different work (*Makedonika* in at least three books; *Nesiotika* in at least two books; and *Phrygiaka*, without book number). Beyond the choice of geographical denominations, there is no further thematic connection among them. A fourth reference to Aretades of Knidos, preserved in Natale Conti's *Mythologiae*, can be traced

back, in terms of content, to an ancient text, a commentary to Apollonios Rhodios, that however does not make any mention of Aretades: it may thus be considered as bogus (see further on Natale Conti the comments on *BNJ* 23 F 1b).

Any evaluation of the status of fragments 1-3, and of Aretades as an author, must address the larger issue of the credibility of the source-references in the *Parallela minora* and the *On rivers*. Since the fundamental study by R. Hercher, *Plutarchi Libellus de fluviis* (Leipzig 1851), 17-24, the majority of the source- and work-references contained in the *Parallel Stories* and in the *On rivers* have been considered bogus. As stressed by F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *Parallel Stories* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* 3, 8 (1940), 78, there may be a few exceptions where the source reference is real, but in general this is not a matter where one can decide case by case: there is no way of proving the non-existence of an author, as long as he has a plausible name. As a result, two general stances are possible: one may think, with J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Paralleliis minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), J. Boulogne, *Plutarque, Oeuvre morales 4* (Paris 2002), 241, and K. Dowden, *BNJ* 56 F 1b, that given the lacunae in our knowledge of the ancient world, and given the fact that some of the source-references are real, it is necessary to start from the assumption that each individual author is real; or, with Hercher, *Plutarchi Libellus de fluviis*, 17-24, Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung', *passim*, K. Ziegler, *Plutarchos von Chaironeia* (Stuttgart 1949), 230-4 (= 'Plutarchos von Chaironeia', *RE* 21 (Stuttgart 1951), 867-70), and most recently A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2004), 127-34, one may prefer to first look at [Plutarch]'s work as a whole: the stories recounted are so inane, present such odd 'errors', and are at the same time so similar to each other, that it is difficult not to agree on the extreme unlikelihood that a number of real, different authors would have written so many multivolume works made of so evidently implausible, yet similar, and at the same time unique stories. This second approach seems to me methodologically sounder, as it takes into account the overall context and not each reference by itself; as a result, I would tend to assume that the source-references in [Plutarch] are fictive, unless there is good evidence to the contrary (see further discussion in *BNJ* 22 and 23).

Aretades is a relatively infrequent name. An Aretades active in Alexandria, commentator of Homer and author of a work *Concerning coincidence* (Περὶ συνεμπτώσεως) is attested in Eusebios, *Praeparatio Evangelica* (*Preparation for the Gospel*) 10.3.23; the context there implies that the treatise of Aretades was part of the genre called ὁμοιοτήτων ('Parallelisms'). Some scholars have proposed to identify this grammarian with Aretades of Knidos: so Carl Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* IV (Paris 1868), 316, who further proposed to identify the Aretades of the *On rivers* with the grammarian Aretades of Knidos; K. Tümpel, 'Eriboia' (2), *RE* 6 (Stuttgart 1909), 438, in his discussion of F 2, which he took to be an example of coincidence (but as pointed out by Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a 371, Tümpel's understanding of the text is fairly distant from the text as we have it); H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* (München 1926), v. 2, 61, who after silently identifying Aretades of Knidos with the Hellenistic grammarian, made use of Schwartz's comments, focused exclusively on the Alexandrine grammarian (E. Schwartz, 'Aretades', *RE* 2 (Stuttgart 1896), 669), to defend the historicity of the narrative of F 1; and J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Paralleliis*

minoribus (Freiburg 1931), 102-3. In her discussion of Aretades the grammarian, A. Ippolito, 'Aretades', in *LGGA* (<http://www.aristarchus.unige.it/lgga/schede.php>), 2006, includes, with a question mark, the passages preserved in the *Parallela minora* and the *On rivers* (note however that she misinterprets Jacoby's position).

Others have considered Aretades an invention of [Plutarch]: G. Knaack, 'Aretades', *RE* suppl. 1 (Stuttgart 1903) 125 stated bluntly that Aretades of Knidos, and with him his *Makedonika* and *Nesiotika*, were an invention of the author of the *Parallela minora* (11 and 27); in the entry 'Aretazes', *RE* suppl. 1, (Stuttgart 1903), 126, Knaack opposed, without giving any grounds, the correction of Aretazes in Aretades, and considered Aretazes an invention of the author of the *De Fluviis*.

The best discussion is still that of F. Jacoby (*FGrH* 3a 371-72), who is followed by A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 52-3. As Jacoby points out (*FGrH* 3a 372), the fact that the narrative of F 2 concerns a coincidence (the girl is sold to the very person who had first raped her) cannot be taken as supporting the theory of the identity of the grammarian and Aretades of Knidos (all the more since the work seems to have been on stylistic coincidences, and possibly on plagiarism); and the other fragments, do not correspond with what one would expect of a grammarian. The possibilities, as Jacoby outlines them, are as follows: [Plutarch] might have been inspired, for his bogus reference, by the grammarian's name; or he might have playfully modified the name of an Aristeides, who wrote a work *On the foundation of Knidos* (*FGrH* 444). Two details may be added.

First, Aristeides the author of a *Foundation of Knidos* is also cited twice by Pliny (*Natural History* 4, 64 and 4, 70) for island metonomasies, in particular for the name of Eubolia (Macra according to Aristeides) and of Melos (Mimblida in Aristeides); Pliny does not give a title for Aristeides's work, but metonomasies are one of the stock topics of *Nesiotika*. Moreover, the manuscript tradition of the first passage of Pliny is uncertain: the name Aristeides appears as Aristhides (F); Aristades (a); Aristodes (E1); and Aristotides (AE2; see *FGrH* 444 F 5 and 6). Thus, besides the Knidian origin and the onomastic closeness, there would be also a thematic connection: it seems to me that this increases the likelihood that [Plutarch] modeled his Aretades on Aristeides of Knidos.

Second, it is possible that for the Aretazes/Aretades of the *On rivers*, for whom no ethnic is given, the source of inspiration may have been a different one. As we have seen, in F 3 the author of the *On rivers* is doing something complex; but the fragment mainly concerns the Mother of the Gods and the mutilation of her followers. Aretaios of Cappadocia, who may have been active in the first century AD (but discussion on his date is still open), and who was an extremely important medical writer at the time, discussed the madness that led to castration in his work *On the causes and symptoms of chronic diseases*, 1.6 ('madness ... of divine origin, and if they recover from the madness, they are cheerful and free of care, as if initiated to the god; but yet they are pale and attenuated, and long remain weak from the pains of the wounds'). If Aretazes is modelled on the name of Aretaios, then it might be better to maintain the Aretazes of the manuscript of the *On rivers*, for two different authors would have been behind two different creations of [Plutarch]'s. But these are speculations, and it may be better to heed Jacoby's warning against pushing imagination too far (*FGrH* 3a, 371).

285 Bibliography

- A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 52-3.
A. De Lazzer, in E. Calderon Dorda, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003), 71.
G. Knaack, 'Aretades 2', *RE Suppl.* 1 (Stuttgart 1903), 125.
G. Knaack, 'Aretazes', *RE Suppl.* 1 (Stuttgart 1903), 126.