

284 Agatharchides of Samos

Paola Ceccarelli (Durham University)

BJN	Agatharchides Samius	Agatharchides of Samos	
Historian Number:	284		

284 F 1a - (III 197, 1) [Plutarch.] Parall. min. 2 A = Moralia 305de (Stobaios Anthologus 3, 7, 64)

meta[[id="284" type="F" n="1" sourcework(level1="Stobaeus (Joannes)" level2="" level3="Anthologium (Wachsmuth C.-Hense O.) [Vide: Areius Didymus & Joannes Damascenus apud Stobaeum (Joannem) (cf. Aetius, De placitis [excerpta Stobaei]])" level4="" level5="" level6="3, 7, 64")]]

Subject: Major wars: Persian wars Historical Work: Persian stories book 2 Source date: 2nd century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: 480 BC	Translation
Ξέρξης μετὰ πεντακοσίων μυριάδων Ἄρτεμισίῳ προσορμίσας πόλεμον τοῖς ἐγχωρίοις κατήγγειλεν· Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ συγκεχυμένοι κατάσκοπον ἔπεμψαν Ἀγησίλαον τὸν Θεμιστοκλέους ἀδελφόν, καίπερ Νεοκλέους τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ κατ' ὄναρ ἑωρακότος ἀμφοτέρως ἀποβεβληκότα τὰς χεῖρας. παραγενόμενος δ' εἰς τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐν σχήματι Περσικῶν Μαρδόνιον ἓνα τῶν σωματοφυλάκων ἀνεῖλεν ὑπολαμβάνων Ξέρξην εἶναι· συλληφθεὶς δὲ πρὸς τῶν πέριξ δέσμιος ἤχθη πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα. βουθυτεῖν δὲ τοῦ προειρημένου μέλλοντος ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ Ἥλιου βωμῷ, τὴν δεξιὰν ἐπέθηκε χεῖρα, καὶ ἀστένακτος ὑπομείνας τὴν ἀνάγκην τῶν βασάνων ἠλευθέρωθη τῶν δεσμῶν εἰπὼν Ἅπαντες ἔσμεν ¹ τοιοῦτοι Ἀθηναῖοι· εἰ δ' ἀπιστεῖς, καὶ τὴν ἀριστερὰν ἐπιθήσω'. φοβηθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ξέρξης φρουρεῖσθαι αὐτὸν προσέταξε, καθάπερ ἴστορεῖ Ἀγαθαρχίδης Σάμιος ἐν δευτέραι τῶν Περσικῶν.	Xerxes, having put anchor with five million men near Artemision, declared war on the local inhabitants. The Athenians, being agitated, sent Agesilaos, the brother of Themistocles, as a spy, although his father Neocles had seen in a dream his son deprived of both his hands. Having arrived in Persian dress among the barbarians, he slew Mardonios, one of the king's bodyguards, supposing him to be Xerxes. Arrested by the bystanders, he was brought in bonds to the king. As the latter was about to sacrifice on the altar of Helios, he placed his right hand upon it; and having endured the suffering of this torture without a groan, he was freed from his bonds, having declared, 'All we Athenians are such; if you do not believe me, I will place also my left hand on the altar.' Xerxes, frightened, ordered that he be kept under guard. This Agatharchides the

¹ The *codices* of *Parallela* have here μὲν; Bernardakis, followed by Nachstädt, Babbitt, Jacoby, and Boulogne, inserts in *Parallela* the ἔσμεν of Stobaios. As pointed out by A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Napoli 2000), 316, this is an unnecessary correction, once it is clear that there are differences between the two texts. Yet the succession πάντες ἔσμεν would have made the loss of an ἔσ very easy - I prefer to modify the text, with most editors.

Samian relates in the second book of his *Persian Stories*.

284 F 1a Commentary

See below F 1b

284 F 1b - Stobaios Anthologus 3, 7, 64)

meta[[id="284" type="F" n="1" sourcework(level1="Stobaeus (Joannes)" level2="" level3="Anthologium (Wachsmuth C.-Hense O.) [Vide: Areius Didymus & Joannes Damascenus apud Stobaeum (Joannem) (cf. Aetius, De placitis [excerpta Stobaei]])" level4="" level5="" level6="3, 7, 64")]]

Subject: Major wars: Persian wars

Historical Work: Persian stories book 4

Source date: 5th century AD

Historian's date: unknown

Historical period: 480 BC

Translation

Ἀγαθαρχίδου Σαμίου ἐν δὲ Περσικῶν.
Ξέρξης μετὰ πεντακοσίων μυριάδων
Ἀρτεμισίῳ προσορμίσας πόλεμον τοῖς
ἐγχωρίοις κατήγγειλεν. Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ
συγκεχυμένοι κατάσκοπον ἔπεμψαν
Ἀγησίλαον τὸν Θεμιστοκλέους ἀδελφόν,
καίπερ Νεοκλέους τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ κατ'
ὄναρ ἑωρακότος ἀμφοτέρας
ἀποβεβληκέναι τὰς χεῖρας. παραγενόμενος
δὲ ὁ ἀνὴρ εἰς πλῆθος τῶν βαρβάρων ἐν
σχήματι Περσικῶι Μαρδόνιον ἓνα τῶν
σωματοφυλάκων ἀνεῖλεν ὑπολαβῶν
Ξέρξην ὑπάρχειν. συλληφθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν
δορυφόρων πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα δέσμιος
ἤχθη. βουθυτεῖν δὲ τοῦ προειρημένου
μέλλοντος ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν τοῦ Ἥλιου τὴν
δεξιὰν ἐπέθηκε χεῖρα καὶ ἀστένακτος
ὑπομείνας τὴν ἀνάγκην τῶν βασάνων
ἤλευθερώθη καὶ τῶν δεσμῶν εἰπὼν
ἴτιοι πάντες ἐσμέν Ἀθηναῖοι· εἰ δ'
ἀπιστεῖς, καὶ τὴν ἀριστερὰν ἐπιθήσω·
φοβηθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ξέρξης φρουρεῖσθαι τὸν
Ἀγησίλαον προσέταξεν.

Of Agatharchides of Samos, in the fourth book of *Persian stories*. Xerxes, having put anchor with five million men near Artemision, declared war on the local inhabitants. The Athenians, being agitated, sent Agesilaos, the brother of Themistocles, as a spy, although his father Neocles had seen in a dream that he would be deprived of both his hands. The man, having arrived among the multitude of the barbarians in Persian dress, slew Mardonios, one of the king's bodyguards, supposing him to be Xerxes. Arrested by the spearmen, he was brought in bonds to the king. As the latter was about to sacrifice on the altar of Helios, he placed his right hand upon it, and having endured the suffering of this torture without a groan, he was also freed from his bonds, having declared, 'All we Athenians are such; if you do not believe me, I will place also my left hand on the altar.' Xerxes, frightened, ordered that Agesilaos be kept under guard.

284 F 1b Commentary

[Plutarch]'s account is closely paralleled by that of Stobaios (3.7.64). A comparison of the two versions is offered by J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 17-18, who sees the few differences (underlined above) as insignificant ('et paucae et levidenses'). Among the few differences that have some weight (not discussed by Schlereth) are the fact that Stobaios quotes the story as from the fourth book of Agatharchides's *Persian history* (and not the second), and the way in which Neokles's prophetic dream is presented.

The first difference may be the error of a copyist, or it may go back to an ampler version of the *Parallela*, which contained variants (there are quite a few instances of divergence between the *Parallela minora* and the text of Stobaios, concerning source references and book numbers, that have been explained on the hypothesis of original double source-references; on the manuscript tradition of the *Parallela minora* see the very clear outline by A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 82-89; **specifically on the relationship between *Parallela* and Stobaios see also A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman world* (Oxford - New York 2004), 133).**

The second divergence is more interesting: in [Plutarch], Neokles dreams that his son has lost both hands (ἀποβεβληκότα, a perfect participle), and this, as pointed out by E. Kurz, 'Zu Plutarch's *Moralia*', *Neue Jahrbücher für Klassische Philologie* 37 (1891), 440 creates a contradiction with the rest of the story, in which Agesilaos loses only one hand. Stobaios however uses the infinitive ἀποβεβληκέναι, expressing a potentiality ('even though Neokles his father had seen in a dream that he would lose both hands'), which fits the story better. For this reason, Kurz suggested to restore the infinitive in Plutarch's text too. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori*, 316 objects that if there is some truth in the idea that [Plutarch] was here trying to create a story that could form a parallel with the Roman story, then the incongruence should be considered simply a distraction. This does not really address the issue: why an incongruence in one branch (the *Parallela minora*) and not in the other (Stobaios)? Besides, there is no dream at all in the Roman story that follows (Mucius Scaevola), and Mucius loses only one hand. Jacoby's explanation (*FGrH* 3a, 370), that the original, ampler text of the *Parallela minora* included multiple versions, makes more sense, as does the observation that also in the case of Kynegiros the early tradition (Herodotus) mentions the loss of one hand only, while later tradition has him deprived of both hands (Justin, 2.9.16-9, and most likely [Plutarch], *Parallela minora* 1AB, 305bd, at least if we have to go by the Roman parallel).

Stobaios's text presents a further ambiguity, which may have been present in the original version of the *Parallela minora*: the lack of pronouns renders it unclear whether Neokles had dreamed that his son would lose both hands, or that he (Neokles himself) would lose them. In the second case, the allusion would have been to the loss of both of his sons (so Kurtz, 'Zu Plutarch's *Moralia*', 440 – in the case of Themistokles, the exile would correspond to the loss of a son).

In [Plutarch], this story is coupled with the Roman story of Porsenna and Mucius Scaevola, narrated in *Parallela minora* 2B on the authority of Aristeides of Miletos (*BNJ* 286); on the relationship between the story of Mucius Scaevola and the Greek parallel in [Plutarch], with a detailed discussion of the formation of the story itself, see Münzer, s.v. 'Mucius 10', *RE* 16 (Stuttgart 1935), 416-23, and especially 422. (Münzer points out that another Roman story was invented on the model of that of Mucius Scaevola, narrated in Valerius Maximus 3.3.2 right after the one on Mucius: Pompey, sent as an ambassador to the Illyrian king Genthios, would have put his finger on a lamp, letting it burn, thus convincing the king of the advisability of having the Romans as allies. The story, Münzer argues, was invented in the circle of Pompey the Great, whose wife was of the family of the Mucii Scaevola. [Plutarch]'s mythopoetic activity has to be seen in this kind of context). As usual in the small treatise, the Greek story precedes the Roman one: the stated aim of the treatise, as expressed in the preface, *Parallela minora* 305B, is to confirm the truthfulness of ancient (Greek) stories through the testimony of more recent, 'historical' Roman stories, while the mention of the source serves to underline the truthfulness of the accounts. Here however, as in quite a few other cases, the Greek story is more recent than the Roman one by some twenty years at least (list of instances and discussion in J. Boulogne, *Plutarque. Oeuvres morales*, 4 (Paris 2002),

226).

A number of features in this account illustrate well the way in which [Plutarch] combines narrative strands to remodel the history of the Persian wars according to his necessities. The round number (five million men), which is repeated in F 2, derives probably from the number given in a famous Herodotean passage (7.186.2: five million, two hundred and eighty-three thousands, two hundred and twenty). Themistocles however is given an otherwise unattested brother, bearing a famous name, Agesilaos, which is not exactly the kind of name one would expect for an Athenian at this time (the name is not attested in Athens until the second century BC: see M.J. Osborne and S.G. Byrne (ed.), *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names II: Attica* (Oxford 1994) s.v. Agesilaos). The story concerning the loss of the hand(s) is clearly influenced by that of Mucius Scaevola; it is also linked to another story concerning the loss of a hand (with ensuing death this time), i.e. the amputation of which Aischylos's brother Kynegiros was victim, narrated in Herodotos 6.114, but also mentioned in *Parallela minora* 1A, just before this passage. Finally, the name of the barbarian victim, Mardonios, killed instead of the king, cannot but recall the general left by Xerxes in Greece, who met his death at Plataia (on all this see Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 370). It may be worth pointing out that the names of Themistocles and Agesilaos are associated as models of good behaviour in a treatise of Plutarch, the *περὶ δυσωπίας* (*On compliancy*) 534D; this may have inspired [Plutarch]'s choice.

An Agatharchides of Samos, author of *Persika* in at least two books, is known only from the narratives of [Plutarch] and Stobaios, who rely on a common source (an ampler version of the *Parallela minora*). However, a more famous Agatharchides of Knidos is known, author among other things of a *History of Asia* (Ἀσιατικὰ) in ten books, which will have comprised also the events of the Persian wars; hence the theory of J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Paralleli minoribus*, 97-99, that the ethnic 'Samios' is here an error for 'Knidios', and that this passage goes back to Agatharchides of Knidos. Schlereth is followed by Boulogne, *Plutarque. Oeuvres morales*, 4, 429 n. 17; E. Amato, 'Agatharchides of Samos', in P.T. Keyser and G.L. Irby-Massie, *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Natural Scientist. The Greek tradition and its many heirs* (London - New York 2008), 41, is willing to leave open the possibility of the existence of a writer Agatharchides of Samos.

Yet, before Schlereth, a number of interpreters had recognized in the story and the source an invention of the author of the *Parallela*: so for instance G. Knaack, 'Agatharchides', *RE* suppl. 1 (1903), 22, and F. Jacoby (*FGrH* 2C, Kommentar, 150-2). Jacoby restated his position in 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* S 3, 8 (1940) 76-77, and in *FGrH* 3a, 369; doubts as to the existence of an Agatharchides of Samos are also expressed by De Lazzar, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori*, 49-50.

284 F 2 - (III 197,1) [Plutarch.] Parall. min. 4 A = Moralia 306d
meta[[id="284" type="F" n="2"]]

Subject: Major wars: Persian wars; Major battles: Thermopylae
Historical Work: Persian stories book 1
Source date: 2nd Century AD
Historian's date: unknown
Historical period: 480 BC

Translation

see #@286 F 20@#Aristeides@#.

284 F 2 Commentary

See commentary at BNJ Aristeides 286 F 20.

284 F 3 - (2) [Plutarch] De fluviis 10, 4-5 = Moralia 1156c-d meta[[id="284" type="F" n="3"]]	
Subject: genre: aetiology Historical Work: Phrygian stories Source date: 2nd Century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: n/a	Translation
παράκειται δ' αὐτῶι ὄρος Βερεκύνθιον καλούμενον, τὴν προσηγορίαν ἔχον ἀπὸ Βερεκύνθου τοῦ πρώτου ἱερέως γενομένου τῆς Μητρὸς τῶν θεῶν. (5) γεννᾶται δ' ἐν αὐτῶι λίθος καλούμενος μάχαιρα – ἔστι γὰρ σιδήρωι παραπλήσιος –, ὃν ἐὰν εὕρηι τις τῶν μυστηρίων ἐπιτελουμένων τῆς θεᾶς, ἔμμανῆς γίνεται, καθὼς ἱστορεῖ Ἀγαθαρχίδης ἐν τοῖς Φρυγιοκοῖς.	Close to it (to the river Marsyas) is the mountain called Berekynthios, deriving its name from Berekyntos, who was the first priest of the Mother of the Gods. (5) In it is formed a stone called <i>machaira</i> (knife) – for it is very similar to iron – which if found by one of those who are celebrating the mysteries of the goddess, renders him mad, as Agatharchides narrates in his <i>Phrygian stories</i> .

284 F 3 Commentary

This passage, as some others in the *On rivers* (stone *sophron*, at *On rivers* 9.3; cylindrical stone at *On rivers* 9.5; *autoglyphos* at *On rivers* 11.2) discusses a stone connected to the cult of Cybele. J. Bidez, 'Plantes et pierres magiques d'après le Ps. Plutarque, *De fluviis*', *Mélanges Navarre* (Toulouse 1935), 33, considers all these texts, and their references, reliable; but see the discussion in BNJ Aretades 285 F 3.

Berekyntios is a toponym attested in Phrygia, for a city, Berekyntos, and for its territory, Berekyntia, to be located in the area between Nysa and the river Maiandros (Plinius, *Natural History* 5.108), but also on the river Sangarios (Servius, *Commentary on Vergil's Aeneid* 6.784: *Berekyntos... castellum... iuxta Sangarium*); according to Stephanos of Byzantion, s.v. Βερέκυντος, the name would derive from that of a certain Berekyntes (so also Herodianus, *On general prosody*, in *Grammatici Graeci* vol. 3.1 Lenz, p. 77-78); Stephanos and Herodianos are the only authors to make reference to an eponym Berekyntes, whose status (priest?) is never stated apart from in [Plutarch]. Ovid however (*Metamorphoses* 11.107: *Laetus abit gaudetque malo Berekyntius heros*) refers to Midas as 'Berekyntius heros' exactly at the moment in which the king start experiencing the results of Dionysos's gift; this narrative may possibly lay behind [Plutarch]'s version in the preceding paragraphs (*On Rivers* 10.1-2), where he reports a variant version of Midas's story. But Berekyntia was indeed also an epicleris of Cybele (cf. the *Berekyntia mater* going through Phrygian cities, in Vergil, *Aeneid* 6.784), because of her cult by the Phrygian tribe of the Berekyntians (Strab. 10.3.12, 469 C; 12.8.21, 578 C); and a Mt. Berekyntos is mentioned also in Vibius Sequester, *de montibus* 155 R., and in [Aristoteles] *On marvellous things heard* 173 (see below – this is however probably from the same source as [Plutarch]). Further references in H. Treidler, s.v. 'Berekyntes', in *Der kleine Pauly* 1 (München 1975), 863, and W. Ruge, s.v. 'Berekyntes', *RE* 3, 1899, 270-1. Berekyntes the mountain may have been an invention of grammarians, as Ruge, s.v. 'Berekyntes', 270 suspects, or it may have indeed existed (so Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 370, who finds Ruge too skeptical). De Lazzer, in E. Calderon Dorda, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003), 230, points out that a mount Berekyntos is attested in Crete (Diodoros

of Sicily 5.64.5); this is unproblematic, and can be explained with the connection between Crete and the mainland, and with the widespread cult of Cybele on the island.

The stone itself may have been a piece of silex; interestingly, a very similar story is attested, in a slightly different form, in [Aristoteles], *On Marvellous things heard*, 173, 847a5-8, where it is attributed to an Eudoxos, in which Jacoby (*FGrH* 79 F 5) and after him C.G. Champion (*BNJ* 79 F 5) recognize Eudoxos the Rhodian, a historian active in the third century BC, rather than the more famous Eudoxos of Knidos:

ἐν ὄρει Βερεκυνθίῳ γεννᾶσθαι λίθον καλούμενον μάχαιραν, ὃν ἂν εὔρη τις τῶν μυστηρίων τῆς Ἑκάτης ἐπιτελουμένων ἐμμανῆς γίνεται, ὡς Εὐδοξός φησίν.

On Mt. Berekynthios a stone grows, called *machaira*, which if it is found by one of those who are celebrating the mysteries of Hekate, renders him mad, as Eudoxos states.

It is commonly accepted that this part of the *On marvellous things heard* (the third and final part, comprising chapters 152-178) relies on [Plutarch]'s *On rivers*: see G. Vanotti, [Aristotele], *De mirabilibus auscultationibus* (Pordenone-Padova 1997), xiv-xv; H. Flashar, 'Zu den pseudo-Aristotelischen *Mirabilia*', in *Eidola: ausgewählte kleine Schriften* (Amsterdam 1989), 371-95 = 'Einleitung' in *Aristoteles, Mirabilia*, übersetzt von H.F., in *Aristoteles. Werke in deutschen Übersetzung*, bd. 18, *Opuscula Teil II und III* (Berlin 1972), 39-64, in particular 372-3 = 40-41; and A. Diller, 'A Source of the *Mirabiles Auscultationes*', *Classical Philology* 46 (1951), 239-40. (T. Banchich, Demaratos *BNJ* 42 F4, appears to suggest the opposite relationship between the two texts – but the *On marvellous things heard*, in the state in which we have it, is to be dated to the sixth century AD). In general, the *On marvellous things heard* gives the same story as the *On rivers*, or a very similar account, but omits the source-reference. Thus for instance the story that follows this one in the *On marvellous things heard* concerns a stone from the Tmolos (no source reference); the same story appears in [Plutarch] *On rivers* 7.6, 1154e, where it is attributed to Kleitophon, *FGrH* 293 F 4. The list of common passages is rather long:

On marvellous things heard 158 ≈ *On rivers* 5.2

On marvellous things heard 159 ≈ *On rivers* 24.2

On marvellous things heard 160 ≈ *On rivers* 13.2

On marvellous things heard 162 ≈ *On rivers* 9.5

On marvellous things heard 163 ≈ *On rivers* 17.4

On marvellous things heard 166 ≈ *On rivers* 16.2

On marvellous things heard 167 ≈ *On rivers* 9.3

On marvellous things heard 171 ≈ *On rivers* 8.2

On marvellous things heard 173 ≈ *On rivers* 10.5

On marvellous things heard 174 ≈ *On rivers* 7.6

On marvellous things heard 175 ≈ *On rivers* 21.4

However, in the case of Agatharchides F 3, the *On marvellous things heard* not only gives a source reference (something which is rather infrequent in the treatise, although references are otherwise a typical hallmark of paradoxographers), it indicates as source for the information Eudoxos, and not Agatharchides as [Plutarch]. This means that at least in this case, [Aristoteles]' source cannot have been the *On rivers*.

F. Gisinger, *Die Erdbeschreibung des Eudoxos von Knidos* (Berlin 1921), 7 pointed out that some paradoxographical writings cite for their information Eudoxos of Knidos (so for instance Apollonios, *Historiae Mirabiles* 38 = F323 Lasserre, Antigonos, *Historiae mirabiles* 123=F337,

129=F347, 138=F355, 147=F331, 153=F368, 161=F363, 162=F333), and, more importantly, that [Aristoteles], *On marvellous things heard* 54 and 74 (=F334 and 330 Lasserre) rely on Eudoxos, even though he is not mentioned by name; hence, he suggested to see in Eudoxos of Knidos the source of [Aristoteles] *On marvellous things heard* 167, and printed the passage as Eudoxos F 53. The argument has been restated by F. Lasserre, *Die Fragmente des Eudoxos von Knidos* (Berlin 1966), 244, who prints both [Aristoteles] *On marvellous things heard* 167 and [Plutarch] *On rivers* 10.4 as Eudoxos of Knidos F 338. Gisinger, *Die Erdbeschreibung* 7 n. 1, proceeded further and assumed the fragment preserved in [Plutarch] to be an authentic fragment of Agatharchides (of Knidos), borrowed by the latter from the work of his more famous compatriot. Thus Eudoxos would have been the source of the *On marvellous things heard*, and a passage of Agatharchides reproducing material of Eudoxos would have been the source of [Plutarch]'s *On rivers*. However, the argument from the references to Eudoxos of Knidos in paradoxographers is not entirely foolproof, since Eudoxos of Rhodes is also quoted by paradoxographers (Apollonios, *Historiae mirabiles* 24 = FGrH 79 F 2, with the remarks of Jacoby, FGrH 2C, 132-3), and since many of the other references are simply to an 'Eudoxos'. More importantly, it seems much simpler to assume a common source for the final part of *On marvellous things heard* and the *On rivers*, in the shape of a book of wonders, in which the story was attributed to an Eudoxos, whose name [Plutarch] will have altered in Agatharchides, possibly thinking in terms of a mental chain Eudoxos of Knidos / Agatharchides of Knidos / Agatharchides *tout court* (so Jacoby, FGrH 3a, 369-70; see also Jacoby, FGrH 2C, 133). (See further for the possibility that Alexander Polyhistor might be this common source Ceccarelli, in *BNJ Theophilus* 296 F 3).

Whether the ultimate source for this piece of information is Eudoxos of Knidos or rather Eudoxos of Rhodes is not relevant here; what is relevant is that if [Plutarch] tampered with the source-reference, as is most likely, he does not seem to have done so with the story. It is good to remember that even the most skeptical scholars have always admitted that some of the stories told, as well as some of the source-references, are reliable, and that not all in [Plutarch] is invention.

A story connected to Marsyas is also mentioned on the authority of Agatharchides of Knidos by Natale Conti, in the second, enlarged edition of his *Mythologiae sive explicationis fabularum libri decem* (Venice 1581), 6.15. Conti has just narrated the story of Marsyas's contest with Apollo and his punishment, quoting Nicander (*Alex.* 361-362) for the flaying of the satyr; he continues:

Illud cum apud fluvium Midam prius vocatum contigisset, effecit ut fluvius postea Marsya diceretur, e cuius sanguine nati sunt Satyri, ut scripsit Agatharchides in rebus Phrygiis.

And since that happened close to the river before called Midas, it resulted in the river being subsequently renamed Marsyas, from whose blood the Satyrs were born, as Agatharchides wrote in his work *On Phrygia*.

J. Mulryan and S. Brown, *Natale Conti's Mythologiae* (Tempe 2006), 522 refer to F 3 as the source of the story; but F 3, quoted above, narrates something else. The story of the renaming of the river Midas and of the birth of the satyrs from Marsyas's blood is indeed narrated in the *On rivers*, but it appears three paragraphs earlier, at 10.1 (1156b), and the source given there is the third book of *Phrygiaka* of Alexandros Cornelios, better known as Polyhistor (so correctly R.M. Iglesias Montiel and M.C. Álvarez Morán, *Natale Conti, Mitología* (Murcia 1988), 445 n. 532; for the passage of Alexandros Polyhistor see FGrH 273 F 76, with Jacoby's remark in FGrH 3a 285-7, who does not however discuss in this connection Natale

Conti). Natale Conti may have here have made a rather free use of source-references; or, as is more likely, he may have been led into error by the fact that both Agatharchides and Alexandros Cornelios would have written, according to [Plutarch], *Phrygiaka*, moreover quoted at a very short distance from each other. At any rate, this is certainly not a new fragment of Agatharchides.

284 F 4 - (4) [Plutarch] De fluviis 9, 4-5 = Moralia 1155f meta[[id="284" type="F" n="4"]]	
Subject: myth: mythical figure; genre: aetiology Historical Work: On stones, book 4 Source date: 2nd century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: n/a	Translation
<p>παράκειται δ' αὐτῶι ὄρος Σίπυλον, τὴν προσηγορίαν ἔχον ἀπὸ Σιπύλου τοῦ Ἄγηνορος καὶ Διωξίππης παιδός. οὗτος γὰρ μητροκτονήσας κατ' ἄγνοιαν καὶ ὑπ' Ἐρινύων οἰστροηλατηθεὶς εἰς τὸ Κεραύνιον ὄρος ἦλθε καὶ διὰ λύπης ὑπερβολὴν βρόχῳ τὸν βίον περιέγραψεν. τὸ δ' ὄρος κατὰ πρόνοιαν θεῶν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Σίπυλον ὠνομάσθη. (5) γεννᾶται δ' ἐν αὐτῶι λίθος παρόμοιος κυλίνδρῳ, ὃν οἱ εὐσεβεῖς υἱοὶ ὅταν εὕρωσιν ἐν τῶι τεμένει τῆς Μητρὸς τῶν θεῶν τιθέασι, καὶ οὐδέποτε χάριν ἀσεβείας ἀμαρτάνουσιν, ἀλλὰ φιλοπάτορες ὑπάρχουσι καὶ πρὸς τοὺς προσήκοντας συμπαθοῦσιν· ὡς ἱστορεῖ Ἄγαθαρχίδης ὁ Σάμιος ἐν δ' Περὶ Λίθων. μέμνηται δὲ τούτων ἀκριβέστερον Δημάρατος ἐν δ' <Περὶ> Φρυγίας. see FGrH42 F 6=BNJ42 F 3.</p>	<p>Situated beside it [the Maeander] is Mt. Sipylos, which takes its name from Sipylos, the son of Agenor and Dioxippe. For he, when he had unintentionally killed his mother and was being pursued by the Erinyes, arrived at Mt. Keraunion and, through a surfeit of grief, put an end to his life with a noose. And the mountain, according to the providence of the gods, was named from him Sipylos. (5) And a stone similar to a cylinder is produced in it, which pious sons, when they find it, place in the sanctuary of the Mother of the Gods, and never do they offend in respect of impiety, but remain devoted to their fathers and affectionate towards their relatives. So records Agatharchides the Samian in Book 4 of <i>On Stones</i>. And Demaratos has recounted these things more fully in Book 4 of <On> <i>Phrygia</i>.</p>

284 F 4 Commentary

This is one of a series of four chapters dealing with stones connected with the cult of Cybele (see Ceccarelli on Aretades, *BNJ* 284 F3). It is worth pointing out right away that although this is the second fragment of Agatharchides's dealing with a stone, which might seem to imply a consistency and coherence of topic within the same author, actually the two fragments come from different works: *On Stones* book four for this passage; *Phrygian Stories* for F 3. This in itself is of course not sufficient to prove invention on the part of [Plutarch]; but this passage presents also many of the formulaic features that, together with the rather standardized introductions to each section and references to the various sources, form a hallmark of the *On rivers* (and of the *Parallela minora*). Thus, κατ' ἄγνοιαν is used for an unintentional action with heavy consequences in *On rivers* 3.2, 4.1, 7.1, 9.4, 17.1, 18.1, 13, 21.1, 22.4; κατὰ πρόνοιαν θεῶν for the providence of the gods appears in 2.2, 3.2, 3.4, 8.3, 9.4, 22.4, 23.4, 24.3; the rather recherché expression βρόχῳ τὸν βίον περιέγραψεν to indicate

suicide through hanging is used at *On rivers* 7.5, here, and at 17.3, and besides in *Parallela minora* 307c, 311c, 314c. Further on this feature of [Plutarch]'s work, see A. De Lazzer, in E. Calderon Dorda, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003), 24-30; also B. Weissenberger, *Die Sprache Plutarchs von Chaeronea und die pseudoplutarchischen Schriften* (Straubing 1895), 30 and 54-55.

As for the story: the first part gives a rare aetiology of the name of mount Sipylos. The name is in most sources linked to that of a son of Amphion and Niobe, killed by Apollo (so e.g. [Apollodoros], *Library* 3.5.6, 45, and Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 6.230-38); [Plutarch]'s version is not attested elsewhere. The names Agenor and Dioxippe might be related to Argive saga (in [Apollodoros], *Library* 2.1.5, 17 and 20 respectively, Agenor figures among the children of Aigyptos, while Dioxippe is one of the daughters of Danaos), and a passage of the *Etymologicum magnum*, s.v. Σίπυλον: Τὸ ὄρος, οὕτω κέκληται ἀπὸ Σιπύλου τοῦ Ἄργου παιδός, may be taken to strengthen this Argive connection. Even more intriguing in this respect is the fact that the earlier name Keraunion for the Sipylos is unattested, but that [Plutarch], *On rivers* 18.12, 1161e mentions a Keraunion hill in the Argolid, which would have subsequently taken the name of Athenaion (see on this T. Banchich, Demaratos, *BNJ* 42 F 3, with further references).

Yet the narrative structure points in another direction. Sipylos was famous as the retreat of Niobe, a mother who, out of grief for the death of her children at the hands of Apollo and Artemis, prayed that she could be transformed into a stone; a natural rock in the shape of a mourning woman was visible on the Sipylos. In [Plutarch], we have the story of a boy, whose name brings to mind the story of Niobe, who inadvertently kills his mother, is pursued by the Erinyes (in the best tragic tradition, and yet wrongly, since the killing was accidental), and who out of excess of grief commits suicide by hanging himself. The basic inverted elements are visible, and show how [Plutarch] or his source went about for their story. It is further worth noting that hanging is a mode of death usually reserved to women, rather than men (see N. Loraux, *Tragic Ways of Killing a Woman* (tr. A Forster, Cambridge, MA 1987), 7-30).

The second part concerns a naturally-occurring cylindrical stone which, when pious sons find it and dedicate it to the Mother of the Gods, makes them remain pious: clearly, analogy with the previous story, where a son in despair for having accidentally killed his mother commits suicide, is at work here. (On aetiology and analogy as structuring principles of the *On rivers* see De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti*, 20-22). This story finds a parallel in a paragraph of [Aristoteles], *On marvellous things heard* 162, 846b:

Περὶ τὸ Σίπυλον ὄρος γίνεσθαί φασι λίθον παρόμοιον κυλίνδρῳ, ὃν οἱ εὐσεβεῖς υἱοὶ ὅταν εὔρωσιν, ἐν τῷ τεμένει τῆς μητρὸς τῶν θεῶν τιθέασιν, καὶ οὐδέποτε χάριν ἀσεβείας ἀμαρτάνουσιν, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ εἰσι φιλοπάτορες.

They say that on Mt. Sipylos a stone is found similar to a cylinder, which, whenever they find it, the pious children deposit in the sanctuary of the Mother of the Gods, and they never err because of impiety, but remain forever respectful of their parents.

The passages of the *On rivers* and [Aristoteles] on the cylinder stone are clearly connected; but [Aristoteles] does not give a source reference here, while [Plutarch] gives two, Agatharchides in the fourth book of his *On stones*, and Demaratos in the fourth book of his *Phrygian stories*. It is usually assumed that this part of the *On marvellous things heard* relies on the *On rivers*; but F 3 shows that things might be more complex.

A cylinder stone (with different, more banal properties: it simply rolls down when Zeus sends lightning and thunder) is also mentioned in *On rivers* 19.4 as growing on mount Cronios, close to Olympia, on the authority of Derkyllus in the first book *On stones* (FGrH 288 F 4). Otherwise, cylindrical stones (not linked to the Sipylos, nor to Olympia) are mentioned in Apollonios Rhodios, 2.594 (a simile) or in Chrysisippos (cf. Gellius, *Attic nights* 7.2): see Jacoby, FGrH 3a, 388. (De Lazzer's reference to Plinius, *Natural history* 37.20.78 and 34.113, in Calderon Dorda, De Lazzer and Pellizer, *Plutarco. Monti e fiumi*, 52 and 245, is non-pertinent, as Pliny is talking of stones cut into cylinders, not of *kylindros*-stones; similarly, Iuvenal, *Satyres* 2.61 shows only that the term 'cylinder' could be used for a precious stone). The fact that a natural cylinder stone with this peculiar properties is unattested elsewhere, joint with the remarkable fit of such properties with the story detailed above, and with its hidden blueprint, the story of Niobe transforming herself into a stone for grief over her children, point in my opinion to a rather skilful fabrication.

284 Biographical Essay

The *On rivers* and *Parallela minora* attributed to Plutarch are the only sources mentioning an Agatharchides of Samos. To him the *Parallela minora* attribute *Persian stories* ('*Persika*') in at least two books, and possibly four books, if Stobaios's tradition is to be preferred, as is often the case (F 1). F 2, also from a work on *Persian stories*, should also be attributed to Agatharchides: Jacoby is surely right that the source-reference naming Aristeides, present in the manuscripts of the *Parallela*, is an error for Agatharchides. As for the *On rivers*, it attributes to an Agatharchides without ethnic a book of *Phrygian stories* (*Phrygiaka*), and to Agatharchides of Samos a treatise *On stones* in at least four books. It may be worth noting that the passage quoted from the work on *Phrygian stories* concerns a stone too – that is, the two fragments by an Agatharchides in the *On rivers* share a very similar topic. Thus, notwithstanding the absence of ethnic, it seems sensible to assume that the two fragments of Agatharchides preserved in the *On rivers* belong to the same 'persona'. It is also clear however that there is a remarkable difference in topic between the work *On stones* (and *On Phrygian stories*, but apparently giving ample space to stones) and the 'historical' narratives of F 1 and F2.

For J. Boulogne, *Plutarque. Oeuvres morales*, 4 (Paris 2002), 231, the presence of an author named Agatharchides of Samos in both the *Parallela minora* and the *On rivers* is an argument for his existence; this need not be the case, and the majority of scholars have thought otherwise. J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 97-9 argued that the ethnic 'Samian' was an error for 'Cnidian', basing himself mainly on the fact that writings of paradoxographic character are attested also for Agatharchides of Knidos (something like a *Συναγωγή θαυμάτων*, *Collection of marvels*, may be meant in the garbled passage FGrH 86 T 2: see Jacoby's apparatus ad T 2, l.19-20, as well as A. Giannini, *Paradoxographorum graecorum reliquiae* (Milan 1966), 144-5), and that the Cnidian had written *Stories of Asia* (the title is variously transmitted as *Asiatika*, κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν, περὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν). If this were true, we would have four more fragments of Agatharchides the Cnidian (FGrH 86), the historian and geographer active in the second century BC, author of a *History of Asia* in 10 books, of a *History of Europe* in 49 books, and of five books *About the Red Sea* (all of this almost entirely lost), as well as of smaller works, whose titles have been preserved in Photius. The very broad span of Agatharchides of Knidos's interests, on which see W. Ameling, 'Ethnography and Universal History in Agatharchides', in T. Corey Brennan and H. I. Flower (eds.), *East and West: Papers in Ancient History Presented to Glen W. Bowersock* (Cambridge, MA 2008), 14-59, makes such an hypothesis attractive.

And yet, such a systematic error is difficult to accept; F. Jacoby is surely right in his assumption that Agatharchides of Samos is an invention of [Plutarch], modeled on Agatharchides of Knidos (Jacoby stated his position in *FGrH* 2C, Kommentar, 150-2; in 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* S 3, 8 (1940) 76-77; and in *FGrH* 3a, 369). This line had already been taken by G. Knaack, s.v. 'Agatharchides n. 3', *RE Suppl.* 1 (Stuttgart 1903), 22; see also the comments of M. van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and the Scholia of the Iliad*, 1 (Leiden 1963), 400 n. 356, on the suspicion raised by a list of names such as Agathon of Samos, Agatharchides of Samos, Agathokles of Samos, Agathokles of Miletos, Agathonymos and Aristonymos; and now A. Cameron, *Greek mythology in the Roman world* (Oxford - New York 2004), 129. On the way in which the imagination of [Plutarch] worked when creating sources, the pages of R. Hercher, *Plutarchi Libellus De Fluviis* (Lipsiae 1851), 22-23 are still unrivalled; an excellent overview of the nature of, and of the problems posed by, the *Parallela minora* and the *On rivers* is in K. Ziegler, 'Plutarchos', *RE* 21.1 (Stuttgart 1951), 867-871.

As for the content of the fragments: it is difficult not to consider the story told in F 1 an invention (for F 2 see *BNJ* 286 F 20). The situation is different for the two stories attributed to Agatharchides in the *On rivers*. These stories are both also attested in the *On marvellous things heard* attributed to Aristoteles, one as from Eudoxos, the other one anonymously. The first one (F 3) probably depends on some earlier book of *mirabilia*. The overall structure of the second one (F 4), and the formulaic language of which it is permeated, would make me incline towards considering it an invention; but in such a situation it is difficult to reach certainty.

284 Bibliography

- A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 49-50.
A. De Lazzer, in E. Calderon Dorda, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003), 66-67.
G. Knaack, s.v. 'Agatharchides n. 3', *RE Suppl.* 1 (Stuttgart 1903), 22.
K. Meister, s.v. 'Agatharchides of Cnidus', *Brill's New Pauly* 1 (Leiden 2002), 311.
J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Paralleli minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 97-9.