

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/249588343>

Pherecydes of Syros: Ancient Theologian and Genealogist

Article in *Mnemosyne* · October 1997
DOI: 10.1163/1568525972662213

CITATIONS
20

READS
39

1 author:



David L. Toye
Northeast State Community College

4 PUBLICATIONS 48 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



BRILL

Pherecydes of Syros: Ancient Theologian and Genealogist

Author(s): D. L. Toye

Source: *Mnemosyne*, Oct., 1997, Fourth Series, Vol. 50, Fasc. 5 (Oct., 1997), pp. 530-560

Published by: Brill

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4432771>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Brill is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Mnemosyne*

PHERECYDES OF SYROS: ANCIENT THEOLOGIAN AND GENEALOGIST

BY

D.L. TOYE

1. Introduction¹).

Both ancient and modern scholars have recognized a 'Pherecydes' as one of the earliest Greek prose writers. Since the publication of Felix Jacoby's article, *The First Athenian Prose Writer*, in 1947, scholars have generally accepted his view that there were

1) The following works are cited by author's name only or in abbreviated form: A. Boeckh (ed.), *Pindari Interpretatio Latina* (Hildesheim 1963); W. Burkert, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism* (Cambridge, MA. 1972); L. Cohn, *Didymos*, RE 5.1 (1905), 445 ff.; H. Diels (ed.), *Doxographi Graeci* (Berlin 1958); H. Diels, W. Kranz (ed.), *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (Berlin 1934-35); W. Dindorf (ed.), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam* (Amsterdam 1962); M. J. Edwards, *Numenius, Pherecydes, and the Cave of the Nymphs*, CQ 40 (1990), 258-262; H. Erbse (ed.), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem* (Berlin 1983); D. Fehling, *Die sieben Weisen und die frühgriechische Chronologie* (New York 1985); C. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley 1983); P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford 1972); K. von Fritz, *Die griechische Geschichtsschreibung* (Berlin 1967); J. Geffcken, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte* (Heidelberg 1926); O. Gigon (ed.), *Aristotelis Opera* (Berlin 1987); A. Gudeman, *Scholien*, RE 2A.1 (1923), 623 ff.; F. Jacoby, *The First Athenian Prose Writer*, in: H. Bloch (ed.), *Abhandlung zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung* (Leiden 1956), 100-143; F. Jacoby (ed.), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Leiden 1923-58) (*FGH Hist*); G. S. Kirk, J. E. Raven, M. Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers* (Cambridge 1983); R. Lamberton, *Homer the Theologian* (Berkeley 1986); S. Lilja, *On the Style of the Earliest Greek Prose* (Helsinki 1968); L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians* (Oxford 1939); R. Pfeiffer, *The History of Classical Scholarship From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford 1968); R. Pfeiffer (ed.), *Callimachus* (Oxford 1949-53); E. Rohde, *Kleine Schriften* (Hildesheim 1969); W. J. Slater, *Aristophanes of Byzantium on the Pnakes of Callimachus*, Phoenix 30 (1976), 234-241; R. Thomas, *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens* (Cambridge 1989); F. Wehrli, *Die Schule des Aristoteles* (Basel 1967-78); C. Wendel (ed.), *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium Vetera* (Berlin 1958); M. L. West, *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient* (Oxford 1971); M. L. West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women* (Oxford 1985); M. L. West, *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford 1983); M. L. West, R. Merkelbach (ed.), *Hesiod* (Oxford 1990); M. L. West (ed.), *Iambi et Elegi* (Oxford 1971); Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Pherekydes*, *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Kl.* (1926), 125 ff.

© Koninklijke Brill, Leiden, 1997

Mnemosyne, Vol. L, Fasc.5

two early Greek prose writers named Pherecydes: a theologian from Syros, who composed a theogony in the sixth century B.C., and an historian from Athens, who recorded heroic myths and genealogies in the fifth century B.C.²). Jacoby's opinion has supplanted the opposing views of Wilamowitz and J. Geffcken, both of whom rejected the existence of the Athenian Pherecydes and identified the Syrian as the only early prose writer with that name³). The review of the ancient testimony for a 'Pherecydes' and the fragments of 'Pherecydes' attributed to the Athenian and the Syrian suggests that Jacoby's position is the incorrect one. Jacoby was misled by a controversy among Hellenistic scholars concerning the identity of a single 'Pherecydes' who composed both a theogony and heroic genealogies. It can be shown through the examination of the surviving fragments of this work that its author was Pherecydes of Syros who lived at the end of the sixth century B.C.

Before we begin this examination, we must first summarize Jacoby's views. He inferred the existence of the Athenian Pherecydes from the testimony of three Hellenistic authors, Eratosthenes, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Strabo. Eratosthenes (*FGr Hist* 241 F10) distinguished between the theologian Pherecydes of Syros and the genealogist Pherecydes of Athens. Dionysius (1.13) declared that among the genealogists Pherecydes of Athens was second to none. Strabo (10.487) noted that Pherecydes of Athens had lived more recently than Pherecydes of Syros. Jacoby identified this Athenian with an historian named Pherecydes who was listed in Eusebius' chronicle and whose *acme* was assigned to the 81st Olym-

2) Jacoby, 100-143. Jacoby assembled the fragments which he assigned to the Athenian in *FGr Hist* 3. Jacoby was not the first to posit the existence of an Athenian and Syrian Pherecydes. This conclusion was first reached by G. J. Vossius (1577-1649), *De historicis Graecis Libri IV* (Westmead, England 1970), 445. Many scholars before Jacoby's article accepted this view. See F. G. Sturz, *Pherekydis Fragmenta* (Leipzig 1824); K. Müller, *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum* v. 2 (Paris 1853), 70-99; H. Diels, *Zur Pentemychos des Pherekydes*, in: W. Burkert (ed.), *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte der antiken Philosophie* (Hildesheim 1969), 23-35; Diels-Kranz, 7; J. B. Bury, *The Ancient Greek Historians* (London 1909), 8-21; Richard Laqueur, *Pherekydes (genealoge)*, *RE* 19 (1938) 1991-2024. Since Jacoby's work, scholars have studied the fragments as assigned to the Athenian or the Syrian in the collections of Diels and Jacoby. See West, *Early Greek Philosophy*, 1-75; Kirk, 50-71; Schibli, 132-134; Von Fritz, 84-86; A. Uhl, *Pherekydes von Athen. Grundriss und Einheit des Werkes* (Munich 1963); Fornara, 4-12.

3) Wilamowitz, 125-136; Geffcken, 98-99, note 106.

piad (456/53 B.C.) (Eus. *Chron.* s.Ol. 81,1). He also ascribed to this Pherecydes the date of a Pherecydes of Leros, an historian mentioned by the *Suda*, who reportedly flourished around the 75th Olympiad (480/77 B.C.). Jacoby argued that this Lorian Pherecydes was a little known Hellenistic writer whom the *Suda* conflated with the earlier Athenian Pherecydes⁴).

The testimony of Eratosthenes, Jacoby maintained, provided irrefutable evidence for the existence of the Athenian Pherecydes. The dates supplied by both Eusebius and the *Suda* were derived ultimately from his chronological research. Since Eratosthenes presided over the Alexandrian Library, Jacoby supposed that he was aware of a work by the Athenian Pherecydes, which would have been among the books in the Library which had been catalogued by Callimachus in the *Pinakes*. Jacoby further argued that Eratosthenes labeled this Pherecydes an Athenian since this Pherecydes would have identified his native city in the opening of his work just as did Herodotus, Thucydides, and other fifth century prose writers.

Jacoby insisted that Eratosthenes was stating a fact concerning the Athenian Pherecydes and not simply making an assertion, despite the fact that ancient scholars usually cited 'Pherecydes', while only rarely citing a Pherecydes of Athens or Syros specifically⁵). The absence of the ethnic in the majority of the citations appears to indicate that many ancient authors were not compelled to distinguish one Pherecydes from another, thereby suggesting that they knew only of a single author with that name. Jacoby, however, explained the absence of a qualifying ethnic in the citations of 'Pherecydes' by arguing that the scholiasts and lexicographers who preserved many fragments eliminated the distinguishing ethnic *Athenaios* when epitomizing the commentaries of earlier

4) *Suda* s.v. *Pherekydes Leros* ; Jacoby, 110-136. It is unclear whether the date for the Lorian Pherecydes in the *Suda*, a Byzantine lexicon, refers to his birthdate or to his *acmē* (40 years). The verb *gegonōs* can signify both, but in most cases in the *Suda* the verb is used to mean *acmē*. See Rohde, 177-178.

5) In ancient literature there are nine citations of the Athenian Pherecydes, and five of these are by a single author. *FGH Hist* 3 F35c, 90d, 91, 130, 156, 162, 165, 166, 169. There are eleven citations of Pherecydes of Syros. *FGH Hist* 3 136c, 174; Diels-Kranz 7 A8, 10, 11, B1, 1a, 2, 6, 9, 12. There are 224 citations of simply "Pherecydes" in the collections of Jacoby and Diels.

Hellenistic scholars who had in fact cited Pherecydes of Athens. He further reasoned that ancient scholars did not need to add an ethnic when citing either author due to the context of the citation; one was an authority in theology, and the other in genealogy (Jacoby, 102-105, 117-121).

2. *Criticism of Jacoby's Arguments.*

Jacoby's argument is impressive, but is not without a number of flaws. First, Jacoby does not adequately account for the absence of any biographical information concerning the Athenian Pherecydes. He simply stated that there was none (Jacoby, 121). A second flaw in his argument is his complete faith in the testimony of Eratosthenes. Hellenistic scholarship was much more speculative and less empirical than Jacoby supposed. A third problem is his insufficient explanation for the lack of a qualifying ethnic in the citations of 'Pherecydes'. Ancient writers whose works survive unabridged also consistently cited 'Pherecydes' as did scholiasts and lexicographers. Furthermore, ancient theology and genealogy were not so distinct as fields of study in antiquity as Jacoby assumed. Taken together, all three of the above mentioned weaknesses are sufficient to bring into question the validity of Jacoby's argument for the existence of the Athenian Pherecydes. Therefore, let us now examine each of these three problems separately to clarify them.

(1) The absence of a biographical tradition surrounding the Athenian Pherecydes is one reason to question his existence. If the 'Pherecydes' cited so often by Hellenistic commentators was the Athenian, as Jacoby maintained, it is unlikely that Alexandrian scholars would have been content to know nothing about an author whose opinion they regarded highly⁶). The many citations

6) Wilamowitz, 125-136. Hellenistic scholars derived biographies of poets by interpreting remarks in their works as personal experiences and studying references to them by contemporary authors. See M. R. Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (Baltimore 1981), 25-39. They conducted such studies to learn something about prose writers as well. Hellanicus, for example, recorded heroic myths and genealogies. Citations of his work in the scholia are fewer than those of 'Pherecydes', yet ancient scholars recorded information regarding his family (*FGH Hist* 4T1), travels (T1), teaching (T9), and even the place of his death and his age at that time (T1, 7-8,28). Scholars probably obtained these "facts" from Hellani-

of 'Pherecydes' in the scholia to the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, Pindar, Euripides, and Apollonius Rhodius testify to his importance as a source of information concerning heroic myths and genealogies for Hellenistic commentators from whose works the scholia derive⁷). The citations of 'Pherecydes' in the scholia of these works is comparable in number to those of the most respected authorities in antiquity for Greek myths—Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, Callimachus, and the Athenian tragic poets⁸).

It is more likely that this 'Pherecydes' was Pherecydes of Syros rather than the little known Athenian Pherecydes. Pherecydes of Syros appears often in ancient literature. In the middle of the fifth century B.C. Ion of Chios in an epigram praised him for his virtue and modesty (Ion, F30 West). The historian Theopompus and Aristotle in the fourth century B.C. discussed certain strange and wondrous incidents from his life such as his various prophetic utterances⁹). Early Peripatetic philosophers in their works on the

cus' works or from those of his contemporaries. Hellanicus' reported relationship with his student Damastes, for example, was a "fact" derived from similarities between their works. See Damastes, *FGH Hist* 5 T4, 5.

7) Byzantine scholars compiled the various codices of the scholia to these works from epitomes of the commentaries of Didymus of Alexandria and other Hellenistic grammarians. See Gudeman, 625-651; Cohn, 448-453; Fraser, 452-465; Dindorf, XV-XVII; Erbse, XLV-LVIII; Wendel, XVIII.

8) Excluding the citations of Homer and the Homeric commentators, the number of citations of 'Pherecydes' in the scholia to the *Iliad* (19) is outnumbered only by seven other authors: Hesiod (125), Pindar (68), Callimachus (60), Euripides (51), Sophocles (45), Aeschylus (39), and Aristophanes, the comic poet (28). The citations of these authors are listed in the index to Erbse, 6:535-634. In the scholia to the *Odyssey*, again excluding the citations of Homeric commentators and Homer, the number of citations of 'Pherecydes' (17) is only exceeded by those of Hesiod. See index to Dindorf, 795-805. 'Pherecydes' is cited 21 times in the scholia to Pindar. Not counting the citations of Pindar and his Hellenistic commentators, only five authors are cited more frequently: Homer (281), Hesiod (51), Callimachus (36), Euripides (27), and Sophocles (22). See index to Boeckh, 851-855. In the scholia to the *Argonautica*, the citations of 'Pherecydes' (55) outnumber all these poets except for Homer. See index to Wendel, 330-341. In the scholia to Euripides, only the citations of Homer, Hesiod, Sophocles, and Euripides among the poets exceed in number those of "Pherecydes". Gudeman, 669-670.

9) Theopompus, *FGH Hist* 115 F64-76. Later writers followed Theopompus in attributing prophetic powers to this Pherecydes. See Cic. *Div.* 1.50.112; Pliny *HN* 2.192; Max. Tyr. 19.5; Tert. *De an.* 28; Apollonius *Mir.* 5. Aristotle discussed Pherecydes' life in his lost work *On the Pythagoreans* since Pherecydes was reportedly the teacher of Pythagoras. Aristotle F71 Gigon. Aristotle mentioned the strange disease which afflicted Pherecydes in *HA* 556b-557a.

Pythagoreans mentioned the relationship between Pherecydes of Syros and Pythagoras, his pupil. In the Hellenistic period the life of Pherecydes of Syros was treated in the works of various writers: Duris of Samos, Hermippus, Satyrus, Neanthes of Cyzicus, Alexander Polyhistor, and Diodorus Siculus¹⁰). Later biographies of Pherecydes of Syros by Diogenes Laertius and Porphyry (third century A.D.), drew material from the works of these earlier writers¹¹). The information provided by these authors concerning Pherecydes of Syros is abundant. Ancient writers described his education¹²), travels¹³), views concerning the immortality of the soul¹⁴), and relations with other ancient sages and *theologoi* including Pythagoras¹⁵). Conflicting reports also circulated concerning the manner of his death and the location of his tomb¹⁶). Whether or not these reports are fact or fiction, the existence of such biographical lore surrounding the Syrian Pherecydes strongly suggests that any citation of a 'Pherecydes' without any qualification can only be a reference to this famous wise man and not to Pherecydes of Athens, about whose life no ancient scholar even bothered to investigate.

(2) Jacoby's attribution of the fragments of 'Pherecydes' which concern heroic myths and genealogies to an Athenian Pherecydes

10) Dicaearchus F34 Wehrli; Aristoxenus F14 Wehrli; Duris, *FGr Hist* 76 F22; Hermippus F6, 17 Wehrli; Satyrus in D.L. 8.40; Neanthes, *FGr Hist* 84 F30; Alexander, *FGr Hist* 273 F85; D.S. 10.3-110.

11) D.L. 1.116-122. Porphyry's *History of Philosophy* was the source for Hesychius' account of the sage's life preserved in the *Suda*. Rohde, 114-126.

12) Alexander Polyhistor, *FGr Hist* 273 F85; J. *Ap.* 1.14; Clem. Al. *Strom.* 6.7; Philo, *FGr Hist* 790 F1, 4; *Suda* s.v. *Pherekydes*.

13) Aristoxenus F14 Wehrli; Dicaearchus F34 Wehrli; Theopompus, *FGr Hist* 115 F70-71; Hermippus F17 Wehrli; D.L. 1.116-118, 8.2; Ael. *VH* 4.28.

14) Cic. *Tusc.* 1.16.18; Tatianus *Ad Gr.* 3; Lactant. *Div. Inst.* 7.8; August. *C. Acad.* 3.37.

15) Hermippus F6 Wehrli; D.L. 1.13; Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.14; Origen *Cels.* 1.16-18; Tert. *De an.* 2; Aristotle F21 Gigon; *Suda* s.v. *Pherekydes*. Pythagoras' relationship with Pherecydes was mentioned by many authors. See Aristotle F71 Gigon; Cic. *Tusc.* 1.16.38; Ael. *VH* 4.29; Tatianus *Ad Gr.* 3; Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.14; Tert. *De an.* 2.3; Lactant. *Div. Inst.* 7.8; Apul. *Flor.* 15; Eus. *Chron.* s.Ol.59.

16) Cf. Aristoxenus F14 Wehrli; Neanthes of Cyzicus, *FGr Hist* 84 F30; Satyrus in D.L. 8.40; D.S. 10.3.4; Iambl. *VP* 30.252; Porph. *VP* 55; Dicaearchus F34 Wehrli. Duris, *FGr Hist* 76 F22; Arist. *HA* 556b-557a; Pliny *HN* 7.172; Antig. *Mir.* 88; Plu. *Sull.* 36.5; Max. Tyr. 7.4.9-13; Ael. *VH* 4.28; Apul. *Flor.* 15; Paus. 1.20.7; Phot. *Bibl.* 279.533a; Hermippus F17 Wehrli; Plu. *Pel.* 21.1; D.L. 1.118.

is based almost entirely on the testimony of Eratosthenes, as even Jacoby admitted, since Eratosthenes was the first ancient writer to mention the Athenian *genealogos*. Jacoby was convinced that Eratosthenes could not have invented this author, as Wilamowitz maintained¹⁷). However, it can be shown that Eratosthenes logically posited the existence of an Athenian Pherecydes based on the methodological principles that prevailed in his day¹⁸). Those ancient writers who cited Pherecydes of Athens were following Eratosthenes' opinion and did not reflect the views of most scholars who simply cited 'Pherecydes' and saw no need to distinguish between one Pherecydes and another.

Eratosthenes was prompted to create an Athenian Pherecydes due to uncertainty about the identity of the author of a work by a 'Pherecydes'. A great deal of interpretation and speculation was involved in the process by which Alexandrian scholars attributed books to specific authors. Disagreements among these scholars were not unusual. Hellenistic scholars, for example, questioned Callimachus' attribution of works to various authors in the *Pinakes*¹⁹). Moreover, for some books only the name of the author

17) "Against the theory of Wilamowitz that before Eratosthenes the *Pentamychos* and the *Historiae* were regarded as having been written by the well-known theologian from Syros, and that it was Eratosthenes who first attributed the latter work, though it was written in the Ionic dialect, to an Athenian author invented by him for this purpose, it may be sufficient to say that such an unqualified assertion on the part of Eratosthenes is quite inconceivable; for that it was unqualified we learn from him and from the witnesses dependent on him. Wilamowitz's assumption contradicts all we know about Eratosthenes' method e.g. from his history of Geography, not to mention the method of Kallimachos in the *Pinakes*, and the opinions as well as prejudices of ancient scholars generally." Jacoby, 117.

18) This approach differs from that of Wilamowitz who maintained that the work of 'Pherecydes' was a compilation of prose works concerning heroic genealogies written by anonymous Ionian authors and attributed to Pherecydes of Syros just as Ionian epics and medical treatises were ascribed to Homer and Hippocrates. According to Wilamowitz, these authors completed and continued the theogony composed by Pherecydes of Syros. Eratosthenes, Wilamowitz maintained, recognized that these books were not written by the Syrian and assigned them to an Athenian Pherecydes since some of them dealt extensively with Attic myths. Wilamowitz, 126-136. Jacoby successfully refuted Wilamowitz's theory of a *corpus Pherecydeum* by demonstrating that the fragments of 'Pherecydes' belonged to a single work which was similar to other prose genealogical works of the late sixth and early fifth centuries B.C. See *FGr Hist* 3 with commentary.

19) Concerning Callimachus' *Pinakes*, see Pfeiffer, *History*, 123-133. Dionysius of

was known, while his homeland remained unknown²⁰). Such a situation existed in the case of the work of 'Pherecydes' since it did not contain a *sphragis* at the beginning in which the author stated his name and homeland. Diogenes Laertius (1.121) in his biography of Pherecydes of Syros quoted the *incipit* of this work as it appeared in Callimachus' *Pinakes*, and there is no mention of either the author's name or homeland²¹). Callimachus attributed this work to the famous wise man from Syros by that name; Eratosthenes disagreed with Callimachus and identified this 'Pherecydes' as Pherecydes of Athens²²).

Eratosthenes rejected the Syrian as the author on stylistic grounds since his own chronology for this Pherecydes conflicted with the dating of the style and dialect employed by 'Pherecydes'. Eratosthenes constructed his chronology for both Pherecydes of Syros and Pythagoras around the 48th Olympiad (588/5 B.C.) since in his *Chronographiai* he identified the philosopher Pythagoras of Samos with an Olympic victor in that year with the same name and homeland. Eratosthenes would have assigned Pherecydes of Syros, as Pythagoras' teacher, to the early sixth century as well (*FGH Hist* 211 F10-11). Although no ancient writer cited Eratosthenes for the date of Pherecydes of Syros, it is clear that some subsequent scholars accepted his chronology²³). Eratosthenes' ap-

Halicarnassus disagreed with Callimachus' attribution of certain speeches to Demosthenes. Callimachus F444, 447 Pfeiffer. Scholars also questioned Callimachus' attribution of the treatise, the *Triagmoi*, to an Epigenes instead of Ion of Chios. Callimachus F449.

20) Varro in his *Res Rustica* (1.1) was consulting some *Pinakes* when, listing all Greek authors on agriculture, he distinguished between those writers with an ethnic and those without one. Concerning the editing and classification of books by Alexandrian scholars, see Fraser, 305-335, 465-473.

21) Diels-Kranz 7 A1; Schibli, 5, note 10. Callimachus in the *Pinakes* listed the titles of each author's books and quoted the opening phrase of each composition in order to avoid confusing different works with the same or similar titles as was often the case with prose works. See Pfeiffer, *History*, 129-133.

22) It would not have been unusual for Eratosthenes to disagree with Callimachus' attribution of works to specific authors. Eratosthenes rejected Callimachus' assignment of early prose works to specific authors. Str. 1.7. Pearson, 31-32. Eratosthenes also disagreed with Callimachus' attribution of plays to the comic poets. See Slater, 234-241.

23) Alexander Polyhistor (first century B.C.) in recognizing Pherecydes of Syros as a student of Pittacus, dated the former to the early sixth century B.C. since

proach to determining the date for this Pherecydes and Pythagoras was the same as Peripatetic scholars who used lists of magistrates and contest winners to construct their chronologies²⁴). Since Eratosthenes assigned Pherecydes of Syros to the early sixth century, he could not accept this Pherecydes as the author of the work of 'Pherecydes' which he dated to a later period based on its literary style. The stylistic analysis of this work placed its author among the ranks of the 'ancient historians' (*archaioi sungrapheis*). According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, these 'ancient historians' recorded myths in simple, unadorned prose and lived either shortly before the Peloponnesian War or were contemporaries of it (*Th.* 5; 23)²⁵). Dionysius labeled Pherecydes of Athens as one of these 'ancient historians' (1.13.1). Modern analysis of the fragments of those 'ancient historians' listed by Dionysius supports this classification since the fragments generally possess the stylistic characteristics which Dionysius attributed to these authors (Lilja, 14-49, 73-116). One can conclude that Eratosthenes accepted this classification of early prose writers and made use of it to attribute works to certain authors. First, Eratosthenes did examine literary style and the language employed in works for the purpose of classifying writers into

Pittacus reportedly flourished around that time. Alexander Polyhistor, *FGr Hist* 273 F85. Apollodorus of Athens (second century B.C.) in his *Chronicle* identified Pittacus' *acme* as the 42nd Olympiad (612/9 B.C.). *FGr Hist* 244 F27. Porphyry reported that this Pherecydes' *acme* occurred during the 45th Olympiad (600/597 B.C.). Porphyry was ultimately the source for the article on Pherecydes of Syros in the *Suda*. Rohde, 159-160.

24) Aristotle compiled lists of victors in the Olympic and Pythian games as well as the winners of the Athenian dramatic festivals. Aristotle F415-462 Gigon. Demetrius of Phaleron listed the Athenian archons and the important events that had occurred during their terms of office. *FGr Hist* 228 F1-3. Phainias' *Pylaneis of the Eresians* was similarly arranged. Phainias F17-19 Wehrli with commentary. Eratosthenes published his own list of Olympic victors, and he consulted Aristotle's earlier list. *FGr Hist* 241 F4-8. The Peripatetics possessed a scholarly interest in such lists and in archives. Peripatetic thought influenced the Alexandrian Museum and Library. Eratosthenes was a student of the Peripatetic Ariston of Ceos. See Ath. 7.281c; Pfeiffer, *History*, 79-81; Fraser, 305-335.

25) For a translation and commentary to this passage in this work, see W. K. Pritchett, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus: On Thucydides* (Berkeley 1975), 3, 50-54. For a discussion of this passage, see D. L. Toye, *Dionysius of Halicarnassus on the First Greek Historians*, *AJP* 116 (1995), 279-302. Theophrastus may have been the first to conceive of this classification of writers which Dionysius used. Fornara 19, note 38.

categories and ascribing works to authors who fell into these categories²⁶). Second, Eratosthenes studied the writings of the 'ancient historians' listed by Dionysius²⁷). Third, we can assume that Dionysius in labeling Pherecydes of Athens as an 'ancient historian' was following the opinion of Eratosthenes since the latter was the first to posit the existence of this Pherecydes. It is therefore probable that Eratosthenes dated this Pherecydes to the middle of the fifth century B.C. in his *Chronographiai* in order to make him a contemporary of other 'ancient historians'²⁸).

The invention of the Athenian Pherecydes by Eratosthenes would not have been a violation of the methods of respectable Hellenistic scholars. He was not the only reputable historian to posit the double of a famous person in order to resolve a chronological problem. Timaeus concluded that there were two Spartan statesmen named Lycurgus to account for the different dates assigned to this legendary lawgiver²⁹). Other historians resorted to

26) Eratosthenes established rules for proper Attic usage among Athenian comic poets and assigned works to those writers whose language followed these rules. Slater, 234-241.

27) Eratosthenes in his geographical work cited Damastes and Xanthus. Str. 1.47,49. He also maintained that Hecataeus was the author of the two books of the *Periegesis* because of the similarities between these books and his others. Str. 1.7. Dionysius (*Th.* 5) identified Damastes, Xanthus, and Hecataeus as 'ancient historians'.

28) Jacoby correctly maintained that the *acmē* of the Pherecydes mentioned in Eusebius' *Chronicle* was derived ultimately from Eratosthenes' *Chronographiai*. It is not a coincidence that the *acmē* for both this Pherecydes and Hellanicus is identical (456/5 B.C.). See Apollodorus of Athens, *FGr Hist* 244 F7 with commentary. Hellanicus was one of the 'ancient historians' listed by Dionysius. The *Suda*'s date for Hellanicus in its article on this author (*FGr Hist* 4 T1) is listed as shortly before *ta Persika* (480/79). The *Suda* assigns the same date to Pherecydes of Leros (*FGr Hist* 3 T3). Jacoby correctly maintained that the *Suda* confused the date of this historian with Eratosthenes' Athenian Pherecydes. In both the articles on Pherecydes of Leros and Hellanicus *gegonōs* refers to the birthdate rather than the *acmē*.

29) Timaeus, *FGr Hist* 566 F127. Lycurgus reportedly established the first truce for the celebration of the Olympic games in 776 B.C. (Aristotle F541 Gigon). He also supposedly lived six generations after Procles, one of the first kings of Sparta. The scholars who determined Lycurgus' date using this information arrived at a date far earlier than 776 B.C. Eratosthenes (*FGr Hist* 241 F1-2) and Apollodorus (*FGr Hist* 244 F61) agreed that Lycurgus flourished in 885 B.C., 299 years after the Trojan War. Timaeus therefore concluded that the elder Lycurgus lived a little later than Homer while the younger Lycurgus flourished at the time of the

the same device to resolve the conflicting chronologies for the philosopher Pythagoras³⁰). In determining the homeland of his own doublet, Eratosthenes' method was not unique. Hellenistic authors did not need a *sphragis* to identify an author's homeland. Aristotle and the Hellenistic critic Crates both maintained that the Spartan poet Alcman was originally a native of Lydia because of the many allusions to this land in his poetry³¹). Eratosthenes identified Athens as the native city of his Pherecydes using the same criteria; the fragments of 'Pherecydes' indicate that this author treated Athenian myths and genealogies extensively³²).

Eratosthenes' distinction between the Syrian and Athenian Pherecydes supported his chronology for the past. In positing the existence of the Athenian, his method was not unlike that of other Hellenistic scholars. This reconstruction of Eratosthenes' line of reasoning and research is speculative, but it is less speculative and better supported by the evidence than Jacoby's position that Eratosthenes derived the native city of the Athenian from a *sphragis*, for whose existence there is no evidence whatsoever. But whatever motivated Eratosthenes to identify an Athenian Pherecydes, we must be cautious in accepting his statement as fact since Eratosthenes was a controversial scholar who was often attacked by ancient critics for his errors³³). Moreover, only a handful of subsequent scholars accepted Eratosthenes' assertion and cited or mentioned the Athenian Pherecydes specifically³⁴).

first Olympiad. Apollodorus (*FGr Hist* 244 F63) reported that Homer's *acmē* was 944 B.C. See Plu. *Lyc.* 1-3.

30) According to one report (Plu. *Num.* 1), the Roman king Numa was a disciple of Pythagoras. Other scholars rejected this account and dated the philosopher to the second half of the sixth century B.C. Eus. *Chron.* s.Ol.63; Clem. Al. *Strom.* 1.65; D.L. 8.45; D.S. 10.3.1; Tatianus *Ad Gr.* 41. Some historians therefore maintained that Numa was an associate of another Pythagoras from Sparta who was an Olympic champion in the 16th Olympiad (712/709 B.C.) when Numa was king. Plu. *Num.* 1.

31) G. Huxley, *Aristotle's Interest in Biography*, GRBS 15 (1974), 203-213.

32) Pherecydes' account of the exploits of Theseus was one of Plutarch's important sources in his biography of the hero. Plu. *Thes.* 19;26. The fragments also mention king Codrus (F154), the Ionian migration (F155), and the heroic ancestry of the elder Miltiades (F2).

33) Str. 1.15; Slater, 240-241.

34) Philodemus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Hyginus, Strabo, and the grammarians Herodian and George Choeroboscus all cite the Athenian Pherecydes.

(3) The citation of the Athenian Pherecydes by these authors does not necessarily demonstrate that all ancient scholars universally recognized two early prose writers named Pherecydes; the frequency of citations of just 'Pherecydes' suggests otherwise. The absence of a distinguishing epithet in these citations did not result, as Jacoby maintained, from its omission by epitomizing scholiasts. The extant works of ancient authors often simply cite 'Pherecydes'. Plutarch in all his works either cited or mentioned 'Pherecydes' eight times without making a distinction between a Syrian and an Athenian³⁵). Apollodorus in the *Bibliothēke* made reference to 'Pherecydes' thirteen times; Strabo cited 'Pherecydes' five times, even though he was aware of Eratosthenes' Athenian Pherecydes³⁶). In citing 'Pherecydes' without a distinguishing ethnic, Athenaeus in his *Deipnosophists* was following the practice of other Alexandrian scholars³⁷).

Jacoby argued, however, that ancient writers who were citing either the Athenian or Syrian Pherecydes could simply cite 'Pherecydes' without confusing readers since "the scholars who used one of the two works belong to widely different circles, and therefore naturally did not always add a distinguishing epithet to the name

FGr Hist 3 T5, F130, 90d, 156, 162, 169. Herodian is the source for the scholia A to *Il.* 2.592 (F169). Erbse, 1:310. It is evident that at least three of these authors were directly acquainted with the works of Eratosthenes and repeated his opinion. Dionysius in his own chronological research (1.74) cited Eratosthenes' *Chronographiai*. Strabo (1.15) indicated his familiarity with Eratosthenes' works and expressed his admiration for this scholar. Hyginus in *De astronomia* simply reproduced in Latin prose Eratosthenes' *Katasterismoi*. A. le Boeuffe, *Hygin, L'astronomie* (Paris 1983), XXXIII-XXXV.

35) Plu. *Agis* 10.3; *Pel.* 21.2; *Sull.* 36.4; *De comm. not. adv. Stoic.* 1064a; *Non posse suav.* 1089f; *De fac.* 938d; *Thes.* 19.1, 26.1.

36) Apollodorus: *FGr Hist* 3 F22c, 42, 52, 53, 60, 67, 69a, 87, 89, 92a, 111a, 122a, 157. Strabo: *FGr Hist* 3 F18b, 48, 139, 142, 155. In citing 'Pherecydes' Strabo may have been following the usage of his sources. One of Strabo's citations (F139) occurs in a section of his work which was drawn from Apollodorus' *Catalogue of Ships*. See Apollodorus of Athens, *FGr Hist* 244 F201-203 with commentary. Apollodorus in his *On the Gods* simply cited "Pherecydes". *FGr Hist* 244 F95.

37) See *FGr Hist* 3 F13a, 18a, 153. Athenaeus' work is representative of a literary genre that was popular among Alexandrian scholars. See Cohn, 469-471; H. Schulz, *Herodianos*, RE 8 (1912), 971. One of Athenaeus' citations was an excerpt from the work of the earlier Alexandrian scholar Istrus (third century B.C.), a student of Callimachus. Istrus, *FGr Hist* 334 F10 with commentary.

of the author whom they quoted, because there was no danger of misapprehension". Jacoby's premise for this argument was that ancient philosophers studied the work of the *theologos* Pherecydes of Syros, while historians consulted the heroic genealogies recorded by Pherecydes of Athens (Jacoby, 102-104). This premise can be shown to be false since some 'ancient historians' were *theologoi* whose works were examined by philosophers. In fact, philosophers discussing *theologia* cited Pherecydes of Syros, Pherecydes of Athens, and 'Pherecydes' as an authority for certain myths.

In the Hellenistic period the works of the 'ancient historians' entered into discussions by philosophers concerning the value of ancient myths for understanding the nature of the gods. Some Stoics maintained that these myths were an important source of such knowledge, if interpreted allegorically³⁸. The Stoic Strabo (1.19-20) stated that *theologia* consisted of the wondrous myths about gods and heroes. In a section of his work dealing with the mythical Curetes (10.466-474), Strabo declared that the study of such myths was theological in nature and was a suitable subject of inquiry for the philosopher who had to uncover the hidden meaning of enigmatic myths. Throughout this discussion Strabo cited poets as authorities such as Homer and Hesiod, but he also cited the prose writers 'Pherecydes' and Acusilaus. Dionysius of Halicarnassus labeled both Acusilaus (*Th.* 5) and Pherecydes of Athens (1.13) as 'ancient historians'.

Cicero's dialogue *On the Nature of the Gods* provides further evidence for the examination of the works of 'ancient historians' by Hellenistic philosophers. In one section of this work (3.39-60), Cicero had the Sceptic Cotta discuss the absurdities of the *theologi* who listed the various genealogies of the gods. Cicero understood the term *theologus* to signify both the ancient mythographers and the Hellenistic interpreters of myth (Lamberton, 24). According to Cicero, these *theologi* compiled divine genealogies from the 'ancient writings of the Greeks' (*priscis Graecorum litteris*). Among these 'ancient writings', Cicero cited the *antiqui historici* for the genealogy of certain gods. These *antiqui historici* are equivalent to Dionysius' *archaioi sungraphais* as Cicero was aware of this classification of early

38) Paul Veyne, *Did the Greeks Believe Their Myths?* (Chicago 1988), 59-70.

historians. In another treatise (*De or.* 2.53) he attributed to the first Greek historians the same simple prose style as did Dionysius, and he listed 'Pherecydes', Hellanicus, and Acusilaus as early historians, all of whom were identified as *archaioi sungrapheis* by Dionysius³⁹).

Philodemus' *On Piety* also demonstrates that the works of 'ancient historians' were examined in the study of ancient *theologia*. *On Piety* was a Epicurean treatise on *theologia* which criticized various philosophers' opinions concerning the gods and the myths related about the gods. Philodemus cited ancient poets as authorities for these myths, and he also frequently cited Acusilaus and Pherecydes of Athens⁴⁰). Philodemus' list of authorities resembles Strabo's sources in the Stoic's theological discussion of the Curetes.

Later Platonists interpreted myths allegorically including those of 'Pherecydes'. Numenius in his *On the Incorruptibility of the Soul* discussed the nature of the soul and supported his views by analyzing allegorically myths related by the ancient *theologoi*, Homer, Hesiod, and 'Pherecydes'. Porphyry treated the same subject in *On the Cave of the Nymphs* and discussed the hidden meaning in the myths of these poets and Pherecydes of Syros⁴¹).

Since the views of an 'ancient historian' and *genealogos* such as Pherecydes of Athens entered into the theological discussions of philosophers just as did the opinions of a *theologos* such as Pherecydes of Syros, it would have been necessary to add always a distinguishing ethnic when citing either of the two writers in order to avoid confusing readers, if indeed two different authors existed. The absence of such an ethnic in the majority of the fragments of 'Pherecydes' thus leads to the conclusion that there was no fear of confusion and that a single author named 'Pherecydes' in antiquity was an authority on myths.

39) The "ancient historians" did discuss divine genealogies. Dionysius reported (*Th.* 6) that these writers related the mating of gods and mortals and the offspring of such unions. It follows then that they would have recounted to a certain extent the genealogy of the gods.

40) R. Philippson, *Zu Philodems Schrift Über die Frommigkeit*, *Hermes* 55 (1920), 225-278.

41) Porph. *Antr.* 6 ff.; Diels -Kranz 7 B6-7; Edwards, 258-262.

3. *Why Syros?*

There are a number of reasons to identify this writer as Pherecydes of Syros. First, there is no hard evidence from the fragments that two separate works existed, which were composed by the Syrian and Athenian respectively. Second, the style of the fragments attributed to the Syrian and Athenian does not appear to differ. Third, the information in the fragments of both confirm the ancient testimony concerning the literary activity of Pherecydes of Syros. Finally, most ancient scholars recognized Pherecydes of Syros as one of the first prose writers and historians, and as the author of both a theogony and heroic genealogies. We must now examine each of these points separately.

(1) Only one fragment supports the view that Pherecydes of Athens and Pherecydes of Syros each wrote separate works, and the authenticity of this fragment is questionable. H. Diels accepted the restoration of the name Pherecydes of Syros to one fragmentary line of Philodemus' *On Piety* in the context of Philodemus' citation of authorities. Diels included this citation in his collection of the fragments of the Syrian⁴²). If this restoration is valid, Philodemus would have been aware of two different authors since he also cited the Athenian. However, the content of this restored citation is missing, since the text of the papyrus breaks off at the point where the restoration occurs, making it therefore very speculative. Moreover, elsewhere, Philodemus cited simply 'Pherecydes' without an ethnic epithet, which suggests that he did not feel compelled to distinguish his Athenian Pherecydes from another author of the same name⁴³).

(2) Analysis of the style of the fragments assigned to the Athenian and the Syrian supports the view that these fragments stem from a single author. Modern scholars who have examined the fragments of either writer separately have come to the same conclusions about their style. K. Luetke studied only those fragments

42) Diels-Kranz 7 B13. The restored text is reproduced by Schibli, 164.

43) *FGH Hist* 3 F83. Cf. Jacoby, 102, note 10. T. Gomperz in his publication of *On Piety* did not restore Pherecydes' name to the passage. T. Gomperz, ed., *Über Frömmigkeit* (Leipzig, 1865) 19. Neither did C. W. Bowra accept this reading of the text in his edition of the fragments of Pindar, who is cited in the passage. C. W. Bowra, *Pindari Carmina* (Oxford 1935), 77.

dealing with heroic genealogies which he attributed to the Athenian. According to Luetke, this Pherecydes wrote simple and clear Ionic prose, often using the present tense⁴⁴). M. L. West described the style of the fragments assigned to the Syrian as simple, unaffected Ionic prose⁴⁵). Because of the stylistic homogeneity in the fragments of the Athenian and Syrian, J. Geffcken proposed that all these fragments originated from the composition of a single author. Geffcken observed that the style of the fragments was characterized by its simple paratactic sentence structure, use of the present tense, and primitive repetition of words and phrases, just as in folk tales⁴⁶).

S. Lilja disagreed with Geffcken's position and maintained that there were subtle differences in the style of the Athenian's and Syrian's fragments. According to Lilja, the Athenian employed more complex sentences than the Syrian, but varied his tenses less. Lilja also maintained that the Athenian used more determinative rather than qualificative adjectives while the opposite was true for the Syrian. These perceived differences, however, disappear once one eliminates modern editors' distinction between two sets of fragments. The Athenian's more varied use of subordinate clauses in complex sentences, for example, simply reflects the fact that editors have assigned 115 lines of text to the Athenian and only 16 lines to the Syrian. Lilja also argued that the Syrian alternated the past and present tenses in a narrative, while the Athenian simply strung together sentences in the present. Yet she also observed that among the early prose writers whose fragments are numerous, only Acusilaus, Pherecydes of Syros, and Pherecydes of Athens interwove the past and present tenses into the same narrative. In one of the Syrian's fragments the subordinate clause in the aorist is followed by the main clause in the present; Lilja stressed this order

44) K. Luetke, *Pherekydes* (Göttingen 1903), 26-27. Luetke examined those fragments attributed to the Athenian by Müller.

45) West, *Early Greek Philosophy*, 9.

46) Geffcken, 98, note 106. K. Von Fritz also saw stylistic similarities in the fragments of the Athenian and the Syrian, but he did not equate the two. K. Von Fritz, 83, note 32. D. A. Russel observed that the fragments assigned to both the Athenian and the Syrian "illustrate a simple style of storytelling", and he noted that the fragments of both consisted of the repetition of certain words. D. A. Russel (ed.), *An Anthology of Greek Prose* (Oxford 1991), 1-2.

of tenses as an example of the Syrian's variety in his use of tenses. Yet this exact same sequence of tenses in the subordinate and main clauses occurs three times in the Athenian's fragments⁴⁷).

Lilja also proposed that "philosophers" like Heracleitus and Pherecydes of Syros preferred qualificative to determinative adjectives, while "historians" such as Pherecydes of Athens generally used more determinative adjectives. Lilja maintained that those writers whom she designated "historians" used more determinative adjectives than "philosophers". The stumbling block to this theory, as Lilja admitted, was Acusilaus the "historian", who employed an equal number of determinative and qualificative adjectives. Lilja argued that one could not generalize concerning Acusilaus since there were only 15 lines of text preserved of his work. Yet Lilja also considered the 16 lines assigned to the Syrian as sufficient to reach conclusions concerning the stylistic differences between these fragments and the 115 lines ascribed to the Athenian (Lilja, 73-116).

It would appear that such labels as "historian" and "philosopher" inclined Lilja to assume differences in the style of the Athenian and the Syrian. Lilja noted that both often repeated words and phrases; but, according to Lilja, repetition served the "philosopher" to emphasize key ideas, while the "historian" only desired to clarify his stories. Similarly, both borrowed language taken from epic; but, the "philosopher" adopted epic words and phrases for emphasis, while the "historian" simply repeated the epic language which was ingrained in myths which he was retelling in prose (Lilja, 50-51, 128-129). Such assumptions do not constitute evidence for different styles. Instead, the stylistic similarities in the fragments of both the Syrian and the Athenian point to a common source.

(3) That source was the work of Pherecydes of Syros, as is evident from the correlation between the content of the fragments of 'Pherecydes' and the ancient testimony about the literary activity of Pherecydes of Syros. The *Suda* credited Pherecydes of Syros with the composition of a single work in ten books entitled the *Theologia* whose alternative titles were the *Heptamychos*, *Theokrasia*, and the *Theogonia*⁴⁸). Clement of Alexandria and the Alexandrian

47) Lilja, 114-125; See *FGr Hist* 3 F22, 95.

48) *Suda* s. v. *Pherekydes Babyos*. *Theokrasia* is a rare word, only appearing in

grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus also attributed to Pherecydes of Syros and 'Pherecydes' respectively the *Theologia*, which, Apollonius informs us, was written in the Ionian dialect⁴⁹). The fragments of 'Pherecydes' whether assigned to the Athenian or the Syrian confirm this information. All those fragments which are excerpts are written in Ionic prose, and the citations of 'Pherecydes' attest to the existence of ten books. The scholia to the *Argonautica* provide many citations of 'Pherecydes' with specific book numbers⁵⁰). None of these citations mention a title, but one scholion does cite the *Theogonia* of 'Pherecydes' without stating the book number (Schol. A.R. 2.1210). It can therefore be concluded that the *Theogonia* was the title of the work whose ten books are cited in the scholia. Since the *Theogonia* was an alternative title for the Syrian's *Theologia*, the 'Pherecydes' cited in the scholia must refer to Pherecydes of Syros.

Jacoby, however, maintained that all the fragments dealing with heroic genealogies belonged to the Athenian and stemmed from a work entitled *Historiai* since some fragments cite the histories (*historiai*) of 'Pherecydes'⁵¹). But the title *Historiai* is instead only an alternative name for the *Theologia* by Pherecydes of Syros. Alexandrian scholars bestowed such titles as *Genealogiai*, *Heroologia*, *Historia*,

literature in Late Antiquity. Neoplatonists used the term to mean "merging with god". Some Neoplatonist commentator may have applied the term to interpret some aspect of Pherecydes' work, and the word became identified with the title. The other titles arose similarly. The title *Heptamychos* refers to the *mychoi* mentioned in Pherecydes' cosmology. The title *Theogonia* concerns the birth of gods which was also described in Pherecydes' work. See West, *Early Greek Philosophy*, 8-9. Cf. Schibli, 38-49.

49) Clem. Al. *Strom.* 5.8; Diels-Kranz 7 B10-11.

50) Book One: Schol. A.R. 4.1091. Book Two: 2.1248. Book Three: 1.1212. Book Four: 3.1186. Book Five: 3.1179. Book Six: 2.1149. Book Seven: 4.156. Book Eight: 1.188. Book Nine: 1.102. Book Ten: 1.740.

51) *FGH Hist* 3 F35a, 2, 18a; Jacoby, 102, note 8. Jacoby argued that the *Suda* incorrectly attributed to the Syrian a work in ten books. This information, according to Jacoby, crept into the article on the Syrian from the article which followed concerning an Athenian Pherecydes who reportedly lived earlier than the Syrian and wrote about Attic *archaiologia* in ten books. Jacoby demonstrated that this Pherecydes was not the same as Eratosthenes' Pherecydes; the former's work was either a forgery or a false citation from the later Hellenistic period. Jacoby, 101, note 6; 136-143. There is another possible explanation for the same number of books attributed to both authors. A clever forger would have bestowed upon his work the same number of books as the genuine work of the Syrian. Hellenistic authors likened their own invented authorities to famous writers so as to increase their credibility. See Fehling, 31-36.

and *Historiai* on works by early prose writers who related divine and heroic genealogies and myths. These names were interchangeable, and one work often had several titles⁵²). These titles were applicable to a work which contained a theogony as well as heroic genealogies. The fragments of Acusilaus indicate that he composed a theogony in a work which the Alexandrian scholar Didymus entitled the *Historia*⁵³). Alternative titles for this work were the *Genealogiai* and the *Theogonia* (*FGr Hist* 2 T1, 4, F37). Similarly, the Syrian's *Theologia*, which also included both a theogony and heroic genealogies, was entitled the *Genealogia* and the *Theogonia*⁵⁴). The *Historiai*, therefore, was simply another title for this work.

The *Theologia* was an appropriate title for this work since its fragments suggest that Pherecydes prepared a compendium of Greek myths about the gods and heroes. He recounted the deeds of such heroes as Perseus, described such mythical adventures as the voyage of the Argonauts, and related the divine exploits of Zeus⁵⁵). Such subject matter constituted what Strabo (1.19-20) defined as ancient *theologia*. It was the task of the philosopher, according to Strabo, to uncover the underlying meaning of these myths. The Neoplatonists shared this outlook and considered all mythology as a type of *theologia*⁵⁶).

The Syrian's composition of the *Theologia* in ten books, as reported by the *Suda*, does not conflict with other ancient testimony that this Pherecydes wrote little. According to Diogenes Laertius (1.119, 122), Pherecydes composed a single work which Diogenes

52) The fragments of Hecataeus of Miletus refer to his work as the *Historia*, *Historiai*, *Genealogiai*, and the *Heroologia*. *FGr Hist* 1 T3, F2-5, 7a, 8, 9-12. The *Historiai* was also a generic title for the works of Hellanicus. Pearson, 166-167.

53) *FGr Hist* 2 F1, 5-14. K. Von Fritz, 80.

54) Helladius *apud* Phot. *Bibl.* 279.533a; *Suda* s.v. *Pherekydes Babyos*.

55) Perseus: *FGr Hist* 3 F10-12; Argonauts: F111; Zeus: F54.

56) See Herm. in *Phdr.* 73.18-21. Lamberton, 31. Porphyry was indebted to Numenius for his allegorical interpretation of Pherecydes' work. Edwards, 258-262. Plotinus (5.1.7-9) maintained that myths spoke in riddles (*ainittontai*). Proclus (in *Ti.* 32c) described the work of the *theologos* 'Pherecydes' as "full of riddles" (*ainigmatodes*). In the second and third centuries A.D, a number of writers described the work of Pherecydes of Syros as enigmatic. Max. Tyr. 10.3-4; Clem. Al. *Strom.* 5.8; D. L. 1.122. The Neoplatonists' allegorical interpretation of myth included both cosmological and heroic myths. Proclus understood the Trojan Epic Cycle as an allegory for the descent of the soul into matter and its return. Procl. in *R.* 1.175.15-21. Lamberton 199-201.

referred to as a *graphê* and *biblion*. Diogenes' use of the word *biblion* to describe this composition does not necessarily contradict the testimony of the *Suda* concerning the *Theologia*. The word *biblion* was applicable to a multi-volume work⁵⁷). Josephus also related (*Ap.* 1.14) that this Pherecydes produced little literature, and placed him in the company of Thales and Pythagoras as authors whose works were not only not numerous, but of questionable authenticity. Yet the works which some scholars attributed to Pythagoras and Thales were not any less substantial than the ten books of the *Theologia*. The handful of works attributed to these authors would have certainly appeared negligible by the Hellenistic period when compared to the multitude of books written by more contemporary authors. Just as some Hellenistic scholars denied that Pythagoras and Thales left behind any writings or ascribed their works to others, Eratosthenes and others denied that Pherecydes of Syros wrote the *Theologia* and attributed this work to an Athenian Pherecydes, which explains why Josephus listed Pherecydes of Syros along with these two other authors whose works were also not considered authentic by all⁵⁸).

(4) Most scholars in antiquity, however, recognized Pherecydes of Syros as the author of the *Theologia* and hailed him as one of the first prose writers and historians. He was an "historian" in the sense that even educated Greeks throughout antiquity considered the heroic myths recounted by Pherecydes and other early prose writers to represent actual historical events of the distant past⁵⁹). It

57) M. L. West, *Three Presocratic Cosmologies*, CQ 13 (1963), 157, note 5.

58) Diogenes Laertius (1.23) reported that Thales wrote two treatises on the solstice and the equinox and a work on nautical astronomy which some scholars credited to a Phocus of Samos. The Hellenistic scholar Sotion maintained that Pythagoras' poems were written by an Aston of Croton. Other authorities ascribed a prose work by Pythagoras to Lysis of Tarentum. See D.L. 8.6-8. The number of works attributed to Thales and Pythagoras pales in comparison to the literary output of the Stoics Chrysippus and Cleanthes. See D.L. 7.174-202. Didymus reportedly wrote 3500 books. Ath. 4.139c.

59. Veyne, 67-78. E. J. Bickermann, *Origines Gentium*, CP 47 (1952), 65-81. According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Th.* 5-7), the "ancient historians" told many silly myths, but faithfully recorded historical traditions (*mnemai*) about the ancient past which were passed down from generation to generation. Ancient literary critics who analyzed literary works about the Heroic Age recognized the stories of heroes as accounts of historical events, only designating those stories as myths which seemed fabulous or impossible, such as the transformation of men

was Pherecydes' reputation as an "historian" which earned him consideration by ancient scholars as one of the first prose writers. A number of ancient sources recognized Pherecydes of Syros as the author of the first prose work (*sungraphē*)⁶⁰. Although the term *sungraphē* can apply to any prose composition, in this case the word refers specifically to an historical work. Hellenistic scholars identified all the other first prose writers as historians and apparently equated the first historians with the first prose writers⁶¹. No ancient scholar mentioned the philosopher Anaximander as the first prose writer although he reportedly left behind a prose work and flourished prior to those authors who received this recognition⁶². A number of ancient sources do in fact refer to Pherecydes of Syros specifically as either an historian or as the author of a work on heroic myths and genealogies⁶³.

into animals. See Sextus Empiricus *Ad. Gram.* 1.248-268; D. B. Dietz, *Historia in the Commentary of Servius*, TAPA 125 (1995), 61-97.

60) Str. 1.18; Pliny *HN* 7.205; Apul. *Flor.* 15; Suda s.v. *Pherekydes*; s.v. *Hekataios*.

61) Besides Pherecydes of Syros, Hecataeus, Cadmus, and Acusilaus were listed as the first prose writers and historians as well. The *Suda* identified Hecataeus as the first to write a history in prose, while Strabo (1.19) recognized him as one of the first prose writers. Cadmus was named as the first historian (Suda s.v. *Kadmos Pandionis*; s.v. *Pherekydes*; Pliny *HN* 7.205; Jos. *Ap.* 1.13) and as the first prose writer (Pliny *HN* 5.112; Str. 1.19). Acusilaus was listed as one of the first historians (Suda s.v. *Akousilaos*; J. *Ap.* 1.13; Cic. *De or.* 2.53). Porphyry recognized Pherecydes of Syros as the first prose writer and apparently did not recognize any other writer with the same name. Edwards, 260, note 11.

62) Diogenes Laertius reported (2.2) that there was a prose summary of Anaximander's doctrines. This work existed since Theophrastus quoted from it. See Diels-Kranz 12 A9; Kirk, 100. Apollodorus of Athens (*FGr Hist* 244 F29) recognized 571/0 B.C. as Anaximander's *acme*. Pherecydes of Syros and Hecataeus received credit as the first prose writers even though they lived later. According to Apollodorus of Athens (*FGr Hist* 244 F338 with commentary), Pherecydes' *acme* was the 59th Olympiad (544/1 B.C.). The *Suda* (s.v. *Hekataios*) placed Hecataeus' *acme* in the 65th Olympiad (520/17 B.C.).

63) Eusebius labeled Pherecydes of Syros as an historian. Eus. *Chron.* s.Ol.59. Ps-Lucian (*Macr.* 23) listed Pherecydes of Syros among those historians who lived a long life. Helladius (in Phot. *Bibl.* 279.533a) referred to the work of Pherecydes of Syros as the *Genealogia*. Jacoby either ignored or dismissed such references, concluding that these later writers had confused the Syrian with the Athenian. Jacoby, 111, note 35. Such a scenario would have been highly unlikely if indeed Hellenistic scholars had universally recognized two distinct authors with the same name. Eusebius' source for his chronicle was the chronicle of Porphyry who was well acquainted with Alexandrian scholarship. See Porphyry, *FGr Hist* 261 F1-3; Gudeman, 630-635; Erbse, 1:xlvi-lviii. Helladius (fourth century A.D.) was also

There is no difficulty in viewing Pherecydes of Syros as an historian who composed both a theogony and heroic genealogies. He was not the only ancient author with such a reputation. In antiquity Hesiod was recognized as the author of both the *Theogony* and the *Ehoiai*. The author of the Hesiodic *Ehoiai* in the middle of the sixth century B.C. intended this poem to be a continuation of the *Theogony*. Taken together, these two poems related the genealogy of both gods and heroes. The fragments of the *Ehoiai* indicate that the author of this work organized his work around the great families of myth, dividing it into sections which recounted the myths and genealogy of the members of each clan beginning with its patriarch such as Inachus or Atlas (West, *Catalogue*, 31-125). Aristotle (*Metaph.* 1000a) and subsequent ancient writers identified Hesiod as a *theologos*, but he was also an historian in the sense that he related the deeds of heroes. Josephus (*Ap.* 1.15-18), for example, placed Hesiod in the company of the historians Acusilaus, Hellanicus, Ephorus, and Timaeus in a discussion of the Greek historians' conflicting accounts of their own past.

The fragments of 'Pherecydes', whether assigned to the Athenian or the Syrian, suggest that this author organized his work just as did the composer of the *Ehoiai*, beginning his work with a theogony just as the *Ehoiai* was preceded by the *Theogony*. He was not alone since the fragments of another 'ancient historian' listed by Dionysius of Halicarnassus indicate that his work was structured similarly. Acusilaus' *Genealogiai* in its Alexandrian edition consisted of three books. Book one contained a theogony. Acusilaus also related the myths and genealogies of the houses of Deucalion and Inachus⁶⁴). The *Theologia* of Pherecydes of Syros began with a theogony, as did the work of Acusilaus. Book one also treated the heroic descendants of the river gods Asopus and Peneius⁶⁵). In

familiar with Hellenistic literature and scholarship. The summary of his *Chrestomatheia* in Photius (279.530-536) includes citations of Hellenistic scholars and poets.

64) *FGr Hist* 2 F1, 23-38 with commentary; West, *Catalogue*, 6.

65) Citations of 'Pherecydes' from book one discuss the heroes Achilles, Ajax, and Asclepius. *FGr Hist* 3 F1-3. Both Achilles and Ajax were descended from Asopus. *FGr Hist* 3 F60 with commentary; Hes. F208-214 West; West, *Catalogue*, 101-103; Apollod. 3.12.6-3.13.6. "Pherecydes'" account of the birth of Asclepius may have occurred in the context of his discussion of the house of Peneius. Apol-

books two through five the *Theologia* discussed the house of Inachus which was divided into two branches, the Belids and the Agenorids⁶⁶). Books five through eight concerned the Deucalionids⁶⁷), while the eighth, ninth, tenth books discussed the descendants of Atlas⁶⁸). The *Theologia* also recounted the genealogies of the Arcadian and Athenian families of Pelasgus and Erechtheus, but there are no book numbers associated with these fragments⁶⁹). In prefacing their account of the Heroic Age with a theogony, the “historians” Pherecydes of Syros and Acusilaus established a precedent which later historians followed⁷⁰).

Both Pherecydes of Syros and Acusilaus were indebted to the Hesiodic mythopoetic tradition in their works. Ancient commentators observed the similarities in their literary activities and often compared their opinions side by side⁷¹). Philosophers focused on

lo murdered Ischys for being the lover of Coronis, the mother of Asclepius; Ischys was the son of the Lapith king. All Lapith kings were reportedly descended from Peneius. Acusilaus, *FGr Hist* 2 F22; *Pi. P.* 9.10; D.S. 4.69.1-2; West, *Catalogue*, 71, 85-86, 103. ‘Pherecydes’ placed the birth of Asclepius in Thessaly which was the home of the Lapiths. He also discussed the descendants of Peneius in a fragment which, unfortunately, does not include a book number. See *FGr Hist* 3 F57.

66) *FGr Hist* 3 F10-22 with commentary. Cf. Apollod. 2.1.1-3.7.7; West, *Catalogue* 76-85.

67) *FGr Hist* 3 F23-36 with commentary. Cf. Apollod. 1.7.2-1.9.28; West, *Catalogue*, 50-69.

68) Fragments from book eight mention the myths of Pelops and his sister Niobe. *FGr Hist* 3 F37-38 with commentary. “Pherecydes”, like the author of the *Ehoiai*, may have discussed the Pelopids in his account of the Atlantids since Hippodameia, the wife of Pelops, was descended from Atlas. See West, *Catalogue*, 109. Hellanicus told the story of Niobe in his *Atlantis*. *FGr Hist* 4 F21. In book nine ‘Pherecydes’ recounted the descendants of Lacedaemon, the son of Zeus and Taygete, the daughter of Atlas. *FGr Hist* 3 F39 with commentary. Cf. West, *Catalogue*, 95-96. Book ten related the deeds of the twins Amphion and Zethus. *FGr Hist* 3 F124, 41. These two heroes were also descended from Atlas. See West, *Catalogue*, 97-98. Cf. Jacoby, *FGr Hist* 3 F41 with commentary.

69) *FGr Hist* 3 F145-153, 156-161 with commentary.

70) Zoilos of Amphipolis and Anaximenes of Lampsacus (fourth century B.C.) both composed histories which began with a theogony. *FGr Hist* 71 T1; *FGr Hist* 72 T1, 14, F2-3. Diodorus Siculus began his universal history (1.6) by discussing the nature of the gods and the origins of the cosmos and humanity.

71) The Neoplatonist Damascius (*Pr.* 124) compared the views of Pherecydes of Syros and Acusilaus concerning cosmology. Philodemus in *On Piety* noted that Acusilaus and Pherecydes of Athens identified a different deity as the messenger of the gods. Gomperz, 43. Strabo observed (10.472) that ‘Pherecydes’ and Acusilaus offered different genealogies for the Cabeiri. The scholia also put their

their theogonies because of their interest in cosmology, while historians and grammarians studied their accounts of the Heroic Age⁷²). In antiquity Acusilaus was accused of borrowing too heavily from Hesiod by some critics, while others observed that Acusilaus disagreed with Hesiod and corrected his errors⁷³). Similarly, ancient critics declared that Pherecydes too took his ideas from Hesiod⁷⁴).

Some modern scholars may hesitate accepting Pherecydes of Syros as the author of a work concerning heroic genealogies and myths since most studies have regarded him as a Presocratic philosopher, citing Aristotle (*Metaph.* 1091a) who made a distinction among the *theologoi* between the early poets such as Hesiod and 'Pherecydes' since the latter did not express himself entirely through myth⁷⁵). But Aristotle's statement does not negate the possibility that this Pherecydes composed a work about heroic myths. Strabo (1.20) informs us that the first historians (*historikoi*) and philosophers (*phusikoi*) were mythographers (*mythographoi*). In the

opinions side by side. See Schol. A.R. 4.57; Schol. T Hom. *Il.* 23.296. According to Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 1.14), some labeled Pherecydes of Syros as one of the seven wise men, while others replaced Pherecydes on the list with Acusilaus.

72) Aristotle (*Metaph.* 1091a), Celsus (Origen *Cels.* 6.42), and Proclus (*in Ti.* 32) discussed the theogony of Pherecydes of Syros. The fragments dealing with heroic myths occur in the scholia. See *FGr Hist* 3 F1-41. Plato (*Smp.* 178ab) and Damascius (*Pr.* 124) examined the theogony of Acusilaus, while the fragments relating heroic myths are often contained in the same scholia which preserve the fragments of "Pherecydes". See *FGr Hist* 2 F23-45.

73) Clem. Al. *Strom.* 6.2; J. *Ap.* 1.16. The fragments substantiate these different assessments. Plato (*Smp.* 178ab) noticed the similarities between Acusilaus' and Hesiod's theogonies. However, Acusilaus placed the birth of Metis at an earlier stage in his theogony than did Hesiod. Cf. *FGr Hist* 2 F6; Hes. *Th.* 358. Acusilaus' genealogies were often in agreement with those of the Hesiodic *Ehoiai*. Cf. *FGr Hist* 2 F36; Hes. F10a.58-65. Yet Acusilaus disagreed with the author of the *Ehoiai* concerning the origins of the Arcadian house of Pelasgus. Cf. *FGr Hist* 2 F25; Hes. F160.

74) Achilles Tatius (*Intr. Arat.* 3) maintained that Pherecydes of Syros agreed with Hesiod and called Chaos the first principle (*arche*). According to one doxographical tradition, Pherecydes of Syros made the earth the *arche*. S.E. *P.* 3.30; Epiph. *Adv. Haer.* 37.505; Ps-Galen in Diels, 610. Aristotle (*Metaph.* 989a) attributed this belief to Hesiod. Ancient commentators undoubtedly made note of this shared view of Hesiod and Pherecydes since the doxographical tradition began with Theophrastus and the Peripatetics. On the development of this tradition, see Diels, 102-118.

75) For a discussion of this passage in Aristotle, see Schibli, 89-93.

fragments assigned to the Athenian and the Syrian the approach to myth appears similar. Modern commentators who have examined the fragments assigned to the Syrian Pherecydes have agreed that he was an innovative and creative mythographer whose work nonetheless reflects the influence of Hesiod⁷⁶). The fragments of 'Pherecydes' dealing with heroic myths and genealogies belong to an author who fits this same description. Although 'Pherecydes' followed the basic outline of the Hesiodic genealogies, he disagreed with the *Ehoiai* on certain points and recorded a new stemma for heroes⁷⁷).

By recognizing Pherecydes of Syros as the author of both a theogony and heroic genealogies, it is possible to date him accurately since some of the fragments of 'Pherecydes' refer to historical events. Modern scholars who have only studied the fragments of the Syrian's theogony have depended on the testimony of ancient historians for their chronology of the Syrian since these fragments contain no historical material. These historians' conflicting dates for Pherecydes of Syros do not provide any firm ground to establish an accurate chronology. By examining the fragments of 'Pherecydes' which do contain historical data, one can determine which ancient account is the most trustworthy.

The estimates of ancient historians for the life of Pherecydes range from the middle of the seventh century B.C. to the late sixth century B.C. The historian Theopompus reported that this Pherecydes served as an advisor to the Spartan kings and foretold the fall of Messene to the Spartans, an event which occurred in the seventh century B.C.⁷⁸). The Hellenistic biographer Hermippus also dated Pherecydes to the seventh century B.C. According to Hermippus, Pherecydes' sacrificial death enabled the Ephesians to

76) Schibli, 132-134; West, *Early Greek Philosophy*, 74-75; G. S. Kirk, *Greek Mythology: Some New Perspectives*, JHS 92 (1972), 84-85.

77) 'Pherecydes' slightly altered the genealogies found in the *Ehoiai* in the case of the heroes Jason and Heracles. Cf. *FGr Hist* 3 F104, 13c; Hes. F38 190. He was in total agreement with the *Ehoiai* in regard to the genealogy of the heroes Perseus and Proetus. Cf. *FGr Hist* 3 F10, 114; Hes. F129. 'Pherecydes' also invented a new stemma for Dictys and Polydectes which did not appear in the *Ehoiai*. Cf. *FGr Hist* 3 F4 with commentary; Hes. F8 West; West, *Catalogue*, 54.

78) Theopompus, *FGr Hist* 115 F71. Cf. Olymp. in *Alc.* 164, 167e; Plu. *Pel.* 21. For a general discussion of the chronology of the Messenian Wars, see R. Sealey, *A History of the Greek City-States* (Berkeley 1976), 66-69.

defeat the neighboring Magnesians in battle. This war between the two cities can be dated to the seventh century B.C. since Callinus and Archilochus made allusions to this conflict in their poetry⁷⁹). Hermippus' most likely source for this information was Theopompus⁸⁰).

Theopompus' contemporaries in the latter half of the fourth century B.C. proposed a later date for Pherecydes of Syros. Some Peripatetic scholars posited a date for the sage in the first half of the sixth century B.C., just as Eratosthenes would do later. According to Aristotle, the death and burial of Pherecydes on Samos coincided with the *floruit* of Aesop, who, according to ancient reports, lived in the first half of the sixth century B.C.⁸¹). Dicaearchus would have agreed with this chronology since he stated that Pherecydes fell ill and died on Samos before his student Pythagoras departed Samos for Italy. Hellenistic historians connected Pythagoras' emigration to Italy with the establishment of Polycrates' tyranny on Samos, which they dated to the 62nd Olympiad (532/29 B.C.)⁸²). By placing Pherecydes' death prior to Pythagoras' departure, Dicaearchus would have dated Pherecydes' life to the early and middle part of the sixth century.

Dicaearchus intended with his date for Pherecydes' death to refute those who claimed that Pythagoras was absent from Croton nursing his dying teacher Pherecydes on Delos when the Pythagorean regime in Croton was overthrown. In his biography of Pythagoras Dicaearchus argued that Pythagoras was an ineffective statesman who was responsible for his own political downfall⁸³).

79) Hermippus F17 Wehrli; Callinus F3 West; Archilochus F20 West. See L. Burchner, *Ephesos*, RE 5 (1905), 2778-2789; Schibli, 7-9. For the date of the two poets, see Str. 14.647; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1.31; Apollodorus, *FGr Hist* 244 F336.

80) Callimachus and his pupils Istrus, Philostephanus, and Hermippus in their prose works drew material from the Peripatetics and the historians Ephorus and Theopompus. See Fraser, 454-455, 700-701. Since Theopompus and Hermippus are the only known authors to tie Pherecydes with events of the seventh century B.C., one can conclude that Hermippus was following Theopompus.

81) *Constitution of Samos apud* (Heracleides) *Pol.* 32-33 (Gigon, 567). Diogenes Laertius (1.72) placed Aesop's *acme* in the 52nd Olympiad (572/69 B.C.). The *Chronicon Romanum* (*FGr Hist* 252 = *IG* 14.1297) dated the death of Aesop at Delphi to 563/2 B.C.

82) Dicaearchus F34 Wehrli. For the date of Pythagoras' departure, see Apollodorus, *FGr Hist* 244 F339 with commentary.

83) Burkert, 115-117, note 46. For Pythagoras' absence during the uprising at

Dicaearchus' opponents disagreed with his date for Pherecydes' death since they coincided the death of Pherecydes with the demise of the Pythagorean regime in Croton which reportedly occurred after the destruction of Sybaris by Croton in 510/9 B.C.⁸⁴). The Athenian chronographer Apollodorus rejected Dicaearchus' account and accepted the latter tradition, assigning Pherecydes a lifespan of eighty-five years between 584/1 and 499/6 B.C., thereby dating the sage's death after the sack of Sybaris⁸⁵).

The chronological accuracy of these different accounts of the Syrian's life is very questionable. The earliest writers to discuss his life (i.e. Aristotle, Theopompus) lived by their own calculation centuries after their subject. Beginning in the fourth century B.C., scholars drew biographical information concerning earlier Greek writers from the works which they left behind. If one can therefore determine what information in Pherecydes' work prompted later writers to make conclusions about his life, it will be possible to assess which ancient account is the most reliable.

There are certain fragments of 'Pherecydes' pertaining to known people and events, which could have encouraged ancient scholars to posit a date for Pherecydes of Syros. Modern scholars as well have scrutinized certain fragments in search of a *terminus post quem* for the literary activity of the Athenian Pherecydes. Three fragments have been considered. According to Jacoby, a reference to the Attic deme of Daidalidai (F146) was evidence that this Athenian Pherecydes wrote after 508/7 B.C., the year which saw the reforms of Cleisthenes in Athens (Jacoby, 114-116). Another proposed date for the Athenian Pherecydes is ca. 450 B.C., which is based on a citation of 'Pherecydes' (F59) for the genealogy of the

Croton, see Iamb. *VP* 252-256; Neanthes of Cyzicus, *FGr Hist* 84 F30; Satyrus in D. L. 8.40. Cf. D.S. 10.3.4; Aristoxenus F14 Wehrli.

84) Iamblichus (*VP* 254-262) stated that the people of Croton under the leadership of the demagogues Cylon and Ninon overthrew the Pythagorean oligarchy while Pythagoras was absent, because this regime had not equally divided the conquered land of Sybaris among them. This account can be traced back to the early Peripatetic biographers of Pythagoras. Aristoxenus (F18 Wehrli) described Cylon as a violent enemy of Pythagoras. Diodorus Siculus (12.9-10) dated the destruction of Sybaris by Croton to 510/9 B.C., 63 years before the archonship of Callimachus in Athens (447/6 B.C.). See Burkert, 105.

85) *FGr Hist* 244 F338 with commentary.

physician Hippocrates (ca. 476-400 B.C.)⁸⁶). Arnaldo Momigliano maintained that a suitable *terminus post quem* for the work of the Athenian Pherecydes was Darius' Persian expedition against the Scythians in 514 B.C. since Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 5.8.44 = F174) cited Pherecydes of Syros for an incident which occurred during this campaign. Momigliano accused Clement of confusing the Syrian with the Athenian⁸⁷).

Of these three fragments, F174 is not only the key to determining the chronology of Pherecydes of Syros, but also is the basis for the hypothesis that Pherecydes of Syros composed both a theogony and heroic genealogies. The historical implications of the other two fragments are not as clear. The Attic deme mentioned in F146 could have existed prior to the reforms of Cleisthenes⁸⁸), while the citation of 'Pherecydes' in F59—a fragment from the biography of Hippocrates by Soranus (second century A.D.)—may only pertain to the genealogies of Heracles and Asclepius, from whom others traced the descent of the physician⁸⁹). In contrast, F174 contains a specific citation of Pherecydes of Syros and concerns an historical event which can be dated. It therefore establishes the *terminus post quem* as 514 for Pherecydes of Syros, not the Athenian Pherecydes.

Momigliano and others have questioned the authenticity of this fragment and have attributed the citation of the Syrian to confusion on the part of Clement⁹⁰). Yet if one accepts the position that

86) K. Von Fritz, 83, note 18. Thomas, 159, note 6.

87) Momigliano, 346-351. For a discussion of this expedition's date, see H. T. Wade-Gery, *Milhiades*, JHS 71 (1951), 217.

88) G. Huxley, *The Date of Pherecydes of Athens*, GRBS 14 (1973), 137-143; D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica* (Princeton 1986), 364-368.

89) Jacoby, 113-114, note 40. Soranus cited Eratosthenes, Apollodorus, and Areius of Tarsus in addition to "Pherecydes". Any one of these authors could have constructed a genealogy for Hippocrates and cited 'Pherecydes' for the genealogies of Heracles and Asclepius, which 'Pherecydes' did discuss. On Soranus, see F. E. Kind, *Soranos*, RE 3A (1927), 1114-1130. Areius was a physician who wrote a biography of Hippocrates and lived in the first century A.D. See M. Wellman, *Areios*, RE 2 (1895), 626.

90) Momigliano, 346-351; Jacoby, 129-136. Jacoby argued that Clement had confused the Syrian with the Pherecydes of Leros mentioned in the *Suda*. Jacoby determined that this Pherecydes was a Hellenistic writer based on the titles attributed to this author by the *Suda*. However, the *Suda* alone mentions this Pherecydes. It is possible that this Pherecydes is the invention of some late

Pherecydes of Syros composed both a theogony and heroic genealogies, there is no reason to question this citation. This fragment recounts an incident during Darius' campaign against the Scythians in which the Scythian king threatened Darius with war after the latter's crossing of the Danube with his army by sending him the message through certain symbolic objects which Darius was expected to interpret. Herodotus (4.131-132) told the same story with some minor alterations. In Herodotus' narrative this incident is followed by the efforts of the Scythians to persuade the Ionians guarding the bridge across the Danube to desert their Persian overlords (4.133-138). Among the Ionians, only Miltiades, the tyrant of the Chersonese, urged the Ionians to follow the advice of the Scythians and liberate themselves from Persian domination. The prominent role of Miltiades in Herodotus' account allows one to draw a bridge between Clement's citation of Pherecydes of Syros and a fragment of 'Pherecydes' which relates the descendents of the hero Ajax for fourteen generations down to the elder Miltiades who founded the colony at Chersonese⁹¹). Since 'Pherecydes' mentioned the foundation of Chersonese, it is certainly possible that this same author, like Herodotus, recounted the Persian invasion of Scythia and the younger Miltiades' plea for the freedom of Ionia. In 'Pherecydes'' narrative Miltiades may have advocated the Scythian proposal because of the friendship between Telamon, the ancestor of Chersonese's *oikistes*, and Peleus, the father of Achilles who, according to popular tradition, had lived again among the Scythians following his death at Troy⁹²).

The discussion of these events in the work of 'Pherecydes' prompted Apollodorus to date the death of Pherecydes of Syros to 499/6 B.C. and probably served as the chronological basis for the story of Pythagoras tending Pherecydes on Delos after the destruc-

grammarian to account for a host of ancient forgeries attributed to the Syrian or to 'Pherecydes'. In the Hellenistic period writers passed off their own works as the works of ancient wise men and cited non-existent books written by ancient sages. See West, *Orphic Poems*, 39-61; Fehling, 31-36. The ethnic of this fictional writer could have been derived from the work *On Leros* which the *Suda* assigned to this author.

91) *FGH Hist* 3 F2. For a discussion of this genealogy, see J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford 1971), 294-302; Thomas, 161-173.

92) See *FGH Hist* 3 F60; G. Hedreen, *The Cult of Achilles in the Euxine*, *Hesperia* 60 (1991), 313-330.

tion of Sybaris in 510/9 B.C. Yet, if indeed Pherecydes of Syros mentioned the Scythian expedition in his work, how does one explain the conflicting chronologies for his life? To answer this question, it is necessary to understand that even respected literary critics in antiquity sometimes ignored such chronological references in their efforts to extract biographical information from their subjects' works⁹³). Apollodorus, for example, determined the *acme* of Pherecydes of Syros in the 59th Olympiad (544/1 B.C.) based on the Syrian's fictional relationship with his famous pupil Pythagoras, whose own *acme* was the 62nd Olympiad (532/29 B.C.)⁹⁴). Consequently, it is best to estimate the date of the Syrian's period of literary activity based on the *terminus post quem* of 514 B.C. provided by F174. His account of the Persian invasion of Scythia must have been written shortly after this event. Pherecydes' version of the sending of the symbols, as preserved by Clement, is more historically accurate than Herodotus' report, and undoubtedly older⁹⁵).

We can therefore date Pherecydes of Syros and the composition of his theogony and heroic genealogies to ca. 500 B.C. This estimate for the Syrian's date is consistent with the intellectual currents in his work. Modern commentators have observed certain Pythagorean and Orphic concepts in the theogony of Pherecydes. By the end of the sixth century B.C. both Pythagorean doctrines and Orphic beliefs were in circulation in Ionia⁹⁶). This period also witnessed the literary activity of the early prose writers Hecataeus and Acusilaus whose works resembled Pherecydes' *Theologia* in both their style and content.

The testimony of Eratosthenes led Jacoby and others to distinguish between two prose writers who shared the same name. But if

93) The Peripatetic Chamaeleon (third century B.C.) maintained that Sappho and Anacreon addressed each other in their poetry even though they lived more than a half-century apart. Ath. 13.599d. On Chamaeleon's work as a literary critic and historian, see Chamaeleon F24-42 Wehrli with commentary. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Amm.* 1-2) had to prove on chronological grounds that Demosthenes could not have consulted Aristotle's *Rhetoric* when composing his speeches, as some Peripatetics claimed.

94) Apollodorus, *FGr Hist* 244 F338-339 with commentary. Concerning the fictional relationship between these two, see Schibli, 11-13.

95) S. West, *The Scythian Ultimatum* (*Herodotus* 4.131-132), *JHS* 108 (1988), 207-211.

96) Schibli, 124-127; West, *Orphic Poems*, 18-20; Burkert, 120-165.

we accept this hypothesis, certain unanswered questions arise: Why is there no biographical data on the Athenian Pherecydes, if indeed he is the author who was cited so frequently by Hellenistic grammarians? Why did ancient scholars refer to the Syrian as an historian and place him in the company of historians as one of the first prose writers? Why did ancient writers consistently cite 'Pherecydes' and not include a distinguishing epithet when there was the potential for confusion, given the fact that both authors wrote in Ionic prose on ancient *theologia*? All these problems disappear if one dismisses the statement of Eratosthenes as a mistaken conjecture and recognizes the Syrian sage as the composer of a theogony and heroic genealogies.

JOHNSON CITY, 4102 Bradford Ln., Tennessee 37601