Heraclitus the Paradoxographer:
Περὶ Ἀπίστων, *On Unbelievable Tales**

JACOB STERN

The Graduate School, City University of New York

In Memory of Professor Seth Benardete

SUMMARY: The text of Heraclitus the Paradoxographer (so *LSJ*, although "Mythographer" would be better), which is here translated with Introduction and Commentary, survives to the present in a single 13th-century manuscript. Of the author nothing is known, although he appears to belong to the late 1st or 2nd century A.D. The text includes 39 items in which familiar myths are briefly told and then interpreted through rationalism, euhemerism, allegory, or etymology. Among extant mythographical collections this text is of particular interest precisely because it exemplifies in brief compass such a range of ancient strategies for the interpretation of myth.

A. THE AUTHOR AND THE TEXT

A SINGLE 13TH-CENTURY MANUSCRIPT, Vatican 305, preserves for us the text which is here translated and annotated.[1] It is not until the end of the work

---

[1] The scribe was Theophylactus Saponopoulus and the date of the manuscript apparently either 1254 or 1269 (*Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten 800–1600: 3* [Rom mit dem Vatikan] #233). For a description of the contents of the manuscript see Mercati 443–50: *inter alia* it contains Nicander *Theriaca*; Porphyrius *Quaestionum Homericarum ad Iliadem pertinentium reliquiae* and *de Antro nympharum*; Anonymous *de Incredibilibus*; Ps.-Herodotus *de Vita Homeri*; and Heraclitus *Allegoriae (=Quaestiones Homericae)*. About the author of the last of these I shall be arguing that he is not the same as Heraclitus Paradoxographus.

that this manuscript identifies the title and author: τέλος ἡρακλείτου περὶ ἀπίστων. As to the title ("On Unbelievable Tales"), it is the same as and is likely to have been borrowed from the better known work of Palaephatus, though whether by a copyist, an epitomizer, or the author can hardly be determined. The author himself is identified simply as "Heraclitus." By this name he was known to Eustathius, the 12th-century Byzantine scholar and commentator on Homer, who twice refers to him by name, on one occasion (1504.55 Stallbaum) specifying "the Heraclitus who proposes to render unbelievable tales believable."[2] But apparently he is named by no one else prior to the Vatican manuscript mentioned above. He is distinguished from others of the same name by *LSJ* as "Heraclitus Paradoxographus," although he might better have been called "Mythographus," since he is hardly a paradoxographer in the usual sense of that term. (I shall, nonetheless, follow convention and continue to use *LSJ*'s epithet.) The standard modern edition is the 1902 Teubner of Nicolaus Festa (*Mythographi graeci III.II*, 73–87); prior to Festa there were notable editions by Anton Westermann in 1843 (*Mythographoi*, 313–20) and T. Gale in 1671 (*Opuscula mythologica ethica et physica*, 75–96).

But who is he? Hardly the famous pre-Socratic philosopher by that name, nor is he likely to be any of the other Heraclituses of whom antiquity tells us—with one possible exception. A certain Heraclitus is identified as the author of an extensive work called the *Homeric Allegories* (Προβλήματα; *Quaestiones*). Could our Heraclitus be the same?

The majority opinion, with which I concur, is that this is not likely to be the case.[3] The *Homeric Allegories*, as its title suggests, offers fairly detailed allegorical interpretations, apparently influenced by Stoicism or by what Dawson (51) calls "eclectic Hellenistic philosophy," of various episodes in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in terms of both τὰ φυσικά and τὰ ἠθικά.[4] These are

---

[2] See also 1859.45 and a clear reference to Heraclitus 14 at 1709.31–32. Cf. Buffière 1962: viii.

[3] Buffière 1956: 232 fudges slightly but is more decisive at 1962: ix: "En résumé, nous n'avons pas de raisons positives de suspecter le nom d'Héraclite, attaché à l'auteur des *Allégories*. Que l'auteur des *Apista* se nommât aussi Héraclite, ce ne serait pas impossible, car le nom était fort courant. Que les deux Héraclite n'en fassent qu'un, c'est improbable, en raison de l'extrême diversité de ton entre les deux ouvrages;" Festa (1902: liii): "*Allegoriarum* enim libellum satis bona Alexandrinorum doctrina refertum cum his pragmaticorum, palaephateorum etiam, rhetorum lusibus componere nequeo;" Nestle 151; cf. Decharme 409, who accepts the identity of the two and on that basis dates our Heraclitus "vers l'époque d'Auguste probablement."

[4] See also Dawson 263 n. 43: "Although he makes use of Stoic concepts, Heraclitus is not an orthodox Stoic like Cornutus."

presented in a complex and elaborate style and are accompanied by polemi-
cal attacks on Plato and Epicurus for their failure to understand the true mean-
ing of the Homeric epics.[5] Although Heraclitus' περὶ Ἀπίστων also offers
occasional allegorical interpretations of episodes in the *Odyssey*, the tone and
language—not to mention the details of the interpretations themselves—are
substantially different from what is found in the *Homeric Allegories*: there is
no assault on Plato, no philosophical allegorizing in terms of τὰ φυσικά, and
an utter simplicity in language, style, and thought.[6] It is, of course, impos-
sible to say that a single individual could not write two works whose language,
style, and subject matter vary as greatly as these two do. But I should rather
think in this case that the opposite possibility is the correct one: that some-
one—a copyist or epitomizer—in late antiquity attached the name
"Heraclitus" to an anonymous περὶ Ἀπίστων in the erroneous belief that the
work was by the author of the *Homeric Allegories*. Either way, not much is
gained or lost, for nothing particular is known about the author of the *Homeric
Allegories* either. I shall follow the majority opinion and consider the two
authors to be separate individuals, though the occasional connections between
the two works will be a regular topic in the Comments below. The author who
is the subject of this article I shall call simply "Heraclitus" unless a confusion might
arise, in which case I shall add "the Paradoxographer." When referring to the other
Heraclitus, I shall take care to specify him as author of the *Homeric Allegories*.

 Where the author came from it is impossible to say, but some speculation
about his date is possible. He refers in item 39 to the Hellenistic poet Aratus,
author of the astronomical poem *Phaenomena*. The citation leads Nestle (151)
to the conclusion that Heraclitus "gehört also frühestens ins 3. Jahrh. v. Chr."
and the *TLG Canon of Greek Authors* to state simply "*post* 4 B.C.?" Gantz (560)
appears equally unsure, referring at one point to "the (Hellenistic?) *Peri
Apiston* of one Herakleitos." My own view is that the citation of Aratus indi-
cates that Heraclitus was probably alive during the 1st or 2nd century A.D.,
when Aratus' popularity was established through the Latin translations of
Cicero and Germanicus[7]—in truth a time rich in rationalistic and allegori-
cal readings of myth. Such a dating is suggested, if not actually confirmed, by
the vocabulary of the περὶ Ἀπίστων, for included in the text are a number of

---

 [5] See Russell 191 for Heraclitus' attitude toward Plato, the "false accuser of Homer,"
and Epicurus; in fact, according to Heraclitus both Plato and Epicurus "owe the origin of
their own doctrines to Homer." There are, however, a few passages in *Homeric Allegories*
which for their brevity seem like Heraclitus Paradoxographus: e.g., 33 (Heracles), 70–73
(Odysseus).

 [6] Buffière 1956: 232 calls the style "sans aucun apprêt."

 [7] Hopkinson 138; Sale 160–64.

words, and forms of words, which appear to belong especially to the 1st century B.C. or thereafter. I note in particular the following: ἡττάω in the active voice (item 16); ὅρασις "eye" (13, cf. 11); προβλέπω (11); προσπάθεια (16); χωρίζεσθαι "depart" (8, 14); and possibly also ἀλληγορεῖν (39). In addition, we may note one other minor piece of evidence, for what it may be worth, the fact that in item 35 Heraclitus follows the later Roman version of the myth of Philomela and Procne (see the Comment on this item). Altogether, then, there is not much by way of evidence. We may speculate that our author came from one of the urban centers of the late 1st or 2nd century A.D.; that his work, whatever its original length may have been, was probably epitomized like the works of Palaephatus and Conon during the Byzantine period.[8] Neither the title nor the name of the author can be guaranteed, but there is no good reason not to refer to the work as the περὶ Ἀπίστων of Heraclitus the Paradoxographer.

The text, a mere fifteen pages in the Teubner edition of Nicolaus Festa, is comprised of 39 separate items. In each of these a myth is briefly told—or alluded to in a way which implies that it is so well known as not to require telling—and then interpreted. For the most part the myths which are treated by Heraclitus are quite familiar; the few exceptions, for example Glaucus of the Sea (10) or Lamia (34), will be dealt with specifically in the Comments which follow. As for the interpretations, these fall into four main categories, which at times overlap: (1) rationalism; (2) euhemerism (an important subset of rationalism); (3) allegory; and (4) etymology. Each of these will be discussed below. For the moment it is sufficient to note that this range of interpretation is perhaps the most notable feature of this brief collection. Other such collections, from the Hellenistic period to the Roman Empire, exist, but for the most part they collect tales around some common theme but do not offer interpretations of them: e.g., the *Metamorphoses* of Antoninus Liberalis, a collection of metamorphosis-tales borrowed for the most part from Boios and Nicander; the Ἐρωτικὰ παθήματα of Parthenius, a collection of love-stories; and the *Catasterisms* of Pseudo-Eratosthenes, a collection of myths in which characters are transformed into constellations. Still other collections seem to have no consistent common theme—for example, the Διηγήσεις of Conon or the omnium-gatherum Βιβλιοθήκη of Apollodorus. The closest analogy to the περὶ Ἀπίστων of Heraclitus is the similarly named περὶ Ἀπίστων of Palaephatus; here in fact we do find a collection of myths each of which is subject to an interpretation, but these interpretations are only of

---

[8] The extreme conciseness of some items in the collection implies that they have been individually abbreviated. We also note the obvious incompleteness of a few items (e.g., 22 and 38), though whether this is due to an epitomizer is unclear.

the rationalistic type. In truth, the brief text of Heraclitus the Paradoxographer is unique in the range of interpretations that it offers for the myths that it cites; and correspondingly its primary interest for students of mythology is that it exemplifies in brief compass such a range of ancient strategies for the interpretation of myth.[9] A brief description of these four main modes of interpretation will be in order.

B. RATIONALISM

The fundamental principle of this mode of interpretation is that myth is a mistake of history. Some event in the past—a casual or oddly metaphoric remark, a surprising invention or innovation, or some other unexpected happening—is misunderstood by contemporaries and from the misunderstanding a myth is believed to arise. The interpreter's job is nothing more complicated than to discover the historical event which is behind the fantastical narrative. The prime exemplar of this approach in antiquity is the περὶ Ἀπίστων of Palaephatus, whom the *Suda* identifies as the παιδικά of no less than the philosopher Aristotle. Geryon, we learn from Palaephatus, was not a monster with three heads; he was an ordinary man from the city of Threetops, "Tricarenia," who was therefore called tricranite Geryon. Confusion about the word, nothing more than a false etymology or bad pun, produced the myth. So too Pandora was hardly molded from clay; she was instead the first woman to use the cosmetic known as ψιμύθιον—we might say she was the inventor of the mud-pack who perplexed a later age of fools. This story offers a typical example of the rationalistic motif of the πρῶτος εὑρετής, the "first discoverer/inventor." A further example is the case of Medea: it is hardly likely that Medea had the ability to rejuvenate old men by dismembering them and boiling them in a magical cauldron, as the myth relates; rather, we learn from Palaephatus that she was the inventor of hair dye and the steam bath, from which old men emerged, as we might say, revitalized and rejuvenated. The marvelous is thus repudiated, the myth subjected to an apparent scientific scrutiny. As Detienne has noted (14), the illusion that myth must reflect reality is "irrepressible."

This rationalistic method is an approach to myth found principally in the ancient historians and geographers, whose prime interest in this mode of analysis is to construct a historical bridge to the mythic past.[10] Most of the

---

[9] Festa 1897: 246 n. 1 comments on the double use of rationalism and allegorical interpretation in Heraclitus. See also Veyne 62 quoted by Dietz 81 n. 38: "Two schools exist, then: the criticism of legends by historians and the allegorical interpretation of legends by the majority of philosophers, including the Stoics." Dietz adds euhemerism to the mix.

[10] Lightfoot 230 speaks of "the seamlessness with which the mythical and historical periods blend and the indifference with which folkloric motifs attach to them." See also Bietenholz 40–41.

myth of a Theseus or a Heracles—or a Moses, for that matter—does not vio-
late our sense of reason, and that part which does the rationalizer can explain
away as merely a confused report of simple historical events. Belief in the
historicity of the heroes thus becomes easy and uncomplicated. Examples of
the approach can be found in the earliest Greek historians—Hecataeus,
Pherecydes, Hellanicus—and throughout the historical tradition, for example
in such authors as Dionysius Scytobrachion, Diodorus Siculus, Pausanias, and
Plutarch.[11] As we shall soon see, it is possible to discern the last stage of this
mode of analysis in antiquity in the handbooks of the rhetoricians. Through
these rhetorical works, we may suppose, the rationalistic method became a
fundamental part of the educational system from the 1st century onward. It
is, furthermore, a mode of analysis which we recognize in our own day, for
despite Plato's emphatic rejection of it as absurd (*Phaedrus* 229c–d), it dies hard.

C. EUHEMERISM

The type of rationalism which we have discussed up to this point avoids the
rationalizing of myths of the gods. It is the heroes, and the monstrous crea-
tures they encounter, with which it is primarily concerned, since its funda-
mental intention is to establish the historicity of those heroes by the elimina-
tion of the "unlikely," the non-εἰκός, from their myths. But there is a form of
rationalism which deals with myths of the gods—the form which we call
"euhemerism." The outline of Euhemerus' views is known to us primarily from
the summary statement in the 5th book of Diodorus Siculus (5.41–46) and
the Latin fragments of Ennius' *Euhemerus' Sacra historia*. The thesis is quite
simple: that what we call the gods were nothing more than humans, great men
and women of the past whose deeds, inventions, and benefactions on our
behalf caused them to be highly regarded during their lives and to receive
respectful worship after death.[12] Perhaps the most familiar instance of this
approach comes from the end of Plutarch's pseudo-historical *Theseus* (31),
where the gods Hades, Persephone, and Kore appear as a human royal family

[11] See Wipprecht 20–27, 38–43; Nestle 133–48; Rusten 93–94; Dowden 42–45; Stern
1996: 10–16; Brown 27–31 for surveys of mythological rationalization in the historians.
Fowler 1996: 71–72 notes that rationalization in the early historians is not a universal
method; that it sits alongside an occasional naive acceptance of myth.

[12] Buffière 1956: 245–47; Grant 49–50; Lightfoot 230: Euhemerus "exhibits a special
kind of rationalism, asserting that gods were humans deified for their benefactions
towards mankind ... to show Hellenistic kings how they too could attain to divine honours."
Bietenholz 39–40, while agreeing that Euhemerus wrote "perhaps with the intent to popu-
larize the cult of contemporary rulers," correctly doubts whether Euhemerus himself was
a euhemerist in the full later sense of the term. See also Geffcken s.v. "Euhemerism."

with a surprisingly fierce pet dog named Cerberus. From an earlier period we also find the method employed notably by Dionysius Scytobrachion[13] and Conon,[14] among many others. Such euhemerism has at least this much in common with the more straight-forward form of rationalism, that ultimately it is not so much an attempt to explain the ways of gods as it is an effort to deny the very existence of such unlikely beings by asserting, once again, that myth is nothing but human history misunderstood.

D. ALLEGORY

The third form of analysis which will be found in the text of Heraclitus' περὶ Ἀπίστων is that which seeks to find what Plato (*Republic* 378d) called the ὑπόνοια of the myth—what the later tradition refers to as its ἀλληγορία: that is to say, its "under-meaning" or its "other-speaking."[15] The topic, of course, is immense and there are only a few aspects which I intend to consider here.

The term ἀλληγορία in antiquity covered a much larger area than its modern equivalent; it was used to refer to any form of interpretation of myth or narrative in which a meaning other than that which was obvious on the surface was claimed. Ancient allegorical interpretations centered for the most part on the Homeric or the Hesiodic texts. Two motives behind such allegorical interpretations seem to have been paramount.[16] The first, and according to Tate the original and most important, was the desire of certain philosophical schools, especially the Stoic school, to discover in the great epics of the past the first principles of their own physics and their own ethics.[17] Homer, it was

---

[13] *FGrHist* 32F7, F8: Rusten 102–12; Henrichs 1975: 110; Lightfoot 224, who says of Dionysius Scytobrachion that he "took a swingeingly Euhemerist approach;" see also Häussler 7.

[14] Lightfoot 228–30; so also Servius (see Dietz 73–75).

[15] See Plutarch *Moralia* 19E (where Plutarch disapproves of this form of analysis).

[16] See Dawson 12–13: "Some classicists insist that ancient allegory was a defensive, apologetic effort to save venerated cultural classics from the rationalist, philosophical critique begun by Xenophanes and given impetus by Plato. Allegorical readers thus translated seemingly immoral myths of gods and goddesses into ethical and cosmological accounts. Other classicists argue that ancient allegory, from its very origins, was a philosophically sophisticated hermeneutic designed to treat writers of myth and poetry as philosophers and scientists" (12). See also Zeller 355 n. 1 and Lamberton 15–22.

[17] See the two articles cited in the Bibliography. The following fairly represents Tate's position (1934: 107): "... allegorical interpretation was in its very first germs positive, not defensive in its aims: that is to say, it was practised in order to make more explicit the doctrines which the students of the poets believed to be actually contained in the poets' words, and not simply to defend the poets against censure."

asserted, by an intention based on his own wisdom, or by a divine inspiration of which he might have been unaware, or simply because, as Dio Chrysostom suggests (53.3), it was the customary practice of his day, expressed in allusive narrative form and in "symbols and riddles" the fundamental principles of various philosophical schools.[18] Such a reconciliation of Homer and Hesiod with his own philosophy was the goal of the Stoic Chrysippus, according to the Epicurean Velleius in Cicero's *de Natura deorum* (1.41): *ut etiam veterrimi poetae, qui haec ne suspicati quidem sint, Stoici fuisse videantur.*[19] If Cicero's interlocutors are to be believed, the claim was most frequently made by the Stoics. But those who assert the secret philosophical under-meaning of Homer or Hesiod are surprisingly eclectic, willing to find in the ancient epics evidence of various aspects of pre-Socratic or Platonic philosophy as well.[20] So, for instance, the appearance of Athene to Achilles at *Iliad* 1.194–200 is interpreted as alluding to the Platonic tripartition of the soul; the salacious story of Aphrodite and Ares is said to exhibit an Empedoclean principle, the union of φιλία and νεῖκος to produce ἁρμονία. So also the myth of Circe is allegorized as an allusion to the Pythagorean cycle of transmigration from human to animal which the prudent Odysseus is able to escape.[21] The arbitrariness of these interpretations was recognized even in antiquity (Seneca *Epistulae* 88.5):

> Nam modo Stoicum illum faciunt, virtutem solam probantem et voluptates refugientem et ab honesto ne immortalitatis quidem pretio recedentem, modo Epicureum, laudantem statum quietae civitatis et inter convivia cantusque vitam exigentis, modo Peripateticum, tria bonorum genera inducentem, modo Academicum, omnia incerta dicentem. Adparet nihil horum esse in illo, quia omnia sunt.

> For sometimes they make him (*sc.* Homer) a Stoic esteeming only virtue, fleeing pleasures, and not departing from the honorable even with an offer of immortality; but sometimes they make him an Epicurean praising the condition of an undisturbed citizenry passing its life in party and song; sometimes a Peripatetic putting forward three kinds of goodness; and sometimes an Academic

---

[18] Cornutus 76.3–5; Tate 1934: 107–8; Dawson 30.

[19] See Dawson 13 on this "ancient sarcastic remark" and cf. Pease 276. Long, on the other hand, rejects (49–53, 62) the consensus that the Stoics interpreted Homer and Hesiod allegorically (i.e., as being crypto-Stoics). He argues that Velleius' remark is an anti-Stoic Epicurean polemic. In so arguing he disputes among others Pfeiffer 237.

[20] Whitman 40.

[21] For the Platonic interpretation of *Iliad* 1.194–200 see Heraclitus *Homeric Allegories* 17–20 (cf. Buffière 1962: xxiii–xxv). For Aphrodite and Ares see *Homeric Allegories* 69; Cornutus 34.12–13; and Pseudo-Plutarch 101–2. For Circe and transmigration see Pseudo-Plutarch 126 (and Lamberton 40–42).

saying that everything is uncertain. It is apparent that none of these things is in him, since all are.

Yet a second motive for such allegory is not so much the positive intention of discovering basic philosophical principles in Homer, as the defensive intention of acquitting Homer of the familiar charges leveled against him by Xenophanes, Plato, and the Epicureans.[22] It is not that Homer is immoral or impious (ἀσεβής) in his myths of the gods; it is rather that there are allegorical meanings to the myths which need to be discovered. Of this approach to the epics the best example from antiquity is the already mentioned *Homeric Allegories* of Heraclitus. A sentence in its opening paragraph is famous: "If Homer is not engaging in ἀλληγορία, he is guilty of ἀσέβεια ('impiety')."[23] By an analysis not only of individual names but also of narrative episodes in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* this Heraclitus demonstrates his belief that Homer was an "intentional composer of allegory" and he "offers his own allegorical readings as the recovery and reproduction of that authorial intention."[24] So, for example, that Aphrodite should act like a pimp in bringing Helen to Paris is not an example of τὸ ἀπρεπές ("the unseemly") in Homer;[25] it is rather Homer's illustration of the ἀφροσύνη ("the folly")—note the pun on Aphrodite—which accompanies erotic affliction (*HA* 28.4–5). Examples could be multiplied: the binding of Zeus by Hera, Poseidon, and Athene (*HA* 21, 25);[26] the lameness of Hephaestus (*HA* 26); the Διὸς Ἀπάτη (*HA* 39); the

[22] Lamberton 15–16; Wilson 10: "In some difficult cases the device of allegorical interpretation could be brought into use ... in order to avoid a literal interpretation of passages in Homer which gave an unflattering picture of the gods." So also Dawson 24, 38–41, 51: "Philosophically minded defenders of Homer like Heraclitus countered charges of immorality and impropriety by insisting that Homer was actually presenting a scientific and philosophical world view by means of the seemingly offensive portions of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*" (51).

[23] For a translation of the opening pages of Heraclitus see Russell 190–93. See also Pépin 159–67 and especially Dawson 24, 39–40: "If read literally, the Homeric epics do indeed deserve censure as 'impious' and 'unfitting' myth; when read 'allegorically,' however, they are seen to be not myths at all but indirect expressions of profound philosophical wisdom" (39); "Heraclitus reads the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as though they were intentionally written by Homer as allegories of moral and scientific truths" (39–40). See in addition Long 45–48 who supports Buffière 1962: xxxi–xxxix, arguing that Heraclitus was not a Stoic.

[24] Dawson 47. For the "intentionalist" nature of ancient allegorical interpretation see also Russell 96–97: "'Heraclitus' assumes that what he is uncovering is actually the intention of the author. This seems to be the general assumption throughout antiquity. Homer was thought to have been fully conscious of all the moral and scientific facts that were read into him."

[25] ἀπρεπές is a favorite word of Heraclitus, author of *Homeric Allegories*: e.g., 26.5, 28.4, 60.3.

[26] See Dawson 48–50.

Θεομαχία (*HA* 58.4), and so forth. We may acknowledge Tate's strongly argued assertion that the positive intention of discovering philosophical principles in Homer or Hesiod was the earlier and more fundamental incentive behind the allegorical movement. Yet it can hardly be denied that the ethically troublesome nature of myth, whether in familiar Homeric or Hesiodic form or free-floating in no particular well-known text, was also a substantial motivating force behind the impulse to allegorize. It is also the most obvious reason why, although rationalism generally treats the myths of heroes, allegory for the most part treats myths, especially ethically questionable myths, of the gods. Such divine myths, for example, are the exclusive concern of Cornutus' allegorical treatment of myth in his *Theologiae Graecae compendium*: e.g., 27.5–6 (the binding of Zeus) or 34.20 (Ares and Aphrodite).[27]

Allegory, of course, was not without its critics in antiquity: these ranged from the editors and philologists of the Alexandrian Library to Seneca and Plutarch.[28] The complex position of the last of these has been well summarized by Dawson (65):

> As a moralist faced with too many unacceptable myths, Plutarch takes a position that largely rejects the extreme solutions of Stoic etymologists like Cornutus and allegorists like Heraclitus. He is unconcerned to demonstrate that a particular philosophy lies hidden on every page of Homer, behind every morally shocking myth. Instead, he wants to show that something of moral value can be found on the "surface" of the poetry.[29]

But this particular extension of the topic of allegory is beyond the limited scope of this Introduction.

E. ETYMOLOGY

I have chosen to identify "etymology" as a separate form of mythological interpretation though in truth it is a method employed both by rationalists and allegorists and is one of the oldest forms of mythological interpretation, being especially employed by Hesiod in *Theogony* and most notably in Plato's *Cratylus*.[30] It is not my intention here to pursue a full analysis of this method, any more than it was in the discussion of the allegorical method. Within the

---

[27] See Dietz 75 n. 31; Dawson 36; and compare Pseudo-Plutarch 96 and 102.

[28] On the Library see Pfeiffer 167, 239–42.

[29] See also Dawson 64 for Plutarch's belief that "allegorical readings distort the author's own intention to lay things out in ways that reveal his own implicit moral judgment." Cf. Long 61.

[30] In the *Theogony* see, e.g., 144–45 (Cyclopes); 197–99 (Aphrodite); 207–10 (Titans). For etymology in the 5th-century mythographer/historians (esp. Hellanicus) see Fowler 1996: 72–73 with additional bibliography in n. 73.

text of Heraclitus the Paradoxographer, as we shall see, etymology is employed for two main purposes. It is first, in the rationalistic mode of Palaephatus, a playing with words to discover in language the historical error in understanding which can be used to explain the origin of the myth: so, for example, both Palaephatus (3) and Heraclitus (19) rationalize the myth of the Spartoi by taking the name in the sense of "scattered people," as opposed to the (to them) erroneous meaning of "Sown Men."[31] And secondly, in the allegorical mode, it is a search for the deep mythological meaning of a god or hero in the etymology of the name of the character: this latter approach is that which is fundamental to the etymologizing in Hesiod and is perhaps most fully illustrated from classical antiquity in the *Theologiae Graecae compendium* of Cornutus.[32] Here we find numerous instances of the etymologizing of the names of gods in an effort to discover the fundamental significance of those gods—i.e., the "true meaning" of the name: so, for example, Prometheus is etymologized from the "foresight" (προμήθεια) of the universal soul which the moderns (i.e., the Stoics) call Πρόνοια (32.1–3); Cronos and Rhea from "time" (χρόνος) and "flow" (ῥύσις), i.e., rain (5.10–11; 7.4).[33] So the name reveals the essence of the god, an essence more often than not in Cornutus which contains "at least embryonically, important insights of Stoic physics and ethics."[34]

The habit of etymologizing was particularly criticized by Cotta the Platonist and Velleius the Epicurean in their dialogue with the Stoic Balbus in Cicero's *de Natura deorum* (1.36–37; 3.39–40). To the former "Balbus's interpretation of the gods … is an illicit transformation of mere metaphors into realities;" to the latter "Balbus's Stoic etymological analysis is actually atheistic because

[31] For further examples in Palaephatus see Stern 1996: 18–20. Dietz 74 n. 28 quotes Veyne 67: "In order to make the transition from myth to history, it will thus be sufficient to correct mistakes that often are simple confusions over words." Dietz 74 also discusses rationalistic etymologizing in Servius.

[32] See Pépin 156–59 and Dawson 24–38. The former especially notes (159) that Cornutus "tire les anciens poètes dans le sens de la cosmologie et de la physique."

[33] For Cronos and Rhea see Pépin 157. See also Dawson 29–33 for the additional examples of Ares and Hades.

[34] Dawson 30; see also 32–33: "Cornutus's interpretations do presuppose a background set of Stoic cosmological beliefs that describe a progression from the generation of the *kosmos* by the action of the *logos* to its periodic dissolution in a grand conflagration or *ekpyrôsis.* This sequence is already well known; Cornutus's goal is to investigate in what ways ancient myths reflect this true story of the cosmos. However, the principal point of contact between the Stoic philosophical account and the myths is provided not by the overt mythical plots but by the hidden meanings of names." See also Grube 136 and Long 53–57, who demonstrates that the Stoic Cornutus is "an etymologist, not an allegorist" (54).

it reduces the gods to mere forces of nature."[35] Yet as Rollinson has observed (26–27), it was through such etymologizing that the allegorist could avoid the charge of arbitrariness in his method. The allegorical meaning of the mythic narrative lies in the fundamental reality residing in its words—especially in the names of its characters.[36] It is, therefore, only through such etymologizing that the allegorist discovers the correct direction, from among many possible directions, for his analysis of "under-meaning" to go.[37]

F. THE EPIGRAPH OF HERACLITUS᾽ Περὶ ᾽Απίστων

The text of Heraclitus᾽ περὶ ᾽Απίστων is not, like that of Palaephatus, preceded by extended general remarks which identify and explain the interpretative methods which are to be followed, but it does have a very brief epigraph: ἀνασκευὴ ἢ θεραπεία μύθων τῶν παρὰ φύσιν παραδεδομένων "The Deconstruction or Curing of Traditional Myths in Which Nature Is Violated."[38] The key words—ἀνασκευή and θεραπεία—refer to two of the fundamental modes of interpretation which have just been discussed and which are exemplified in the text.

The first term, ἀνασκευή, comes from the preliminary rhetorical exercises known as προγυμνάσματα or *praeexercitamina*. The ancient rhetorical handbooks, themselves known as Προγυμνάσματα, by Hermogenes and Theon in the 2nd century A.D. and by Aphthonius in the 4th or 5th, list and exemplify as a specific rhetorical exercise for students the ἀνασκευή (or *refutatio*) of myth.[39] Such ἀνασκευαί are in terms of a set list of topics (τόποι) which

[35] Dawson 54–55. See in general Dawson 52–72 for criticism of the technique of etymology by Seneca and Plutarch.

[36] Dawson 58: "Old Stoic etymology drew upon an ever-present correspondence between word (*logos*), meaning (*lekton*) and nature (*physis*)—a correspondence implied by Cornutus's etymologizing." See also Grube 135: "Their [*sc.* the Stoics'] interest in etymology was great. They believed that there was a natural relation between things and their original or true (ἔτυμα) names, a relationship which was usually believed to be onomatopoeic."

[37] See Dawson 6: "It [*sc.* etymology] has often been presented by ancient interpreters as a 'rational' or 'scientific' way of justifying the attribution of another, less-than-obvious meaning to a word or of giving some sort of acceptable meaning to an otherwise incomprehensible expression. In this way, the etymologist could counter charges of hermeneutical willfulness with the claim to have uncovered the original foundations of meaning."

[38] The epigraph is not printed in Gale or Westermann; see Festa 1897: 244–45 and Buffière 1962: viii.

[39] For handbook texts see Rabe and Spengel; a translation of Aphthonius will be found in Nadeau; of Theon in Butts. See also Kennedy 62, and note Quintilian 2.4.18–19. For a full discussion of ἀνασκευή see Lausberg 493: "it takes up the partisan position of rationalistic enemies of tradition." Cf. Festa 1897: 243–45; Grant 59.

can be found in essentially the same form in all three rhetorical handbooks. The myth is to be analyzed and "deconstructed" by the student according to specific categories: it might be ἀδύνατον (impossible); ἀπίθανον (unbelievable); ψευδές (false); ἀσαφές (unclear); ἀπρεπές (improper), and so forth.[40] An amusing example is Hermogenes' deconstruction of the tale of Arion from Herodotus 1.23–24: it is, says Hermogenes, ἀδύνατον that Arion was rescued by a dolphin; but it is ἀπίθανον that in such dire circumstances he should wish to sing a song. It is precisely these categories—the impossible, the unbelievable, the improper, the false, and so forth—which are employed in the περὶ Ἀπίστων of Palaephatus and, as we shall see, more generally throughout the rationalistic tradition. And it seems to be clear that the use of this rhetorical term in the epigraph to Heraclitus' περὶ Ἀπίστων is meant to allude to those interpretations within his text which fall into the deconstructive or rationalistic mode: that is, the term ἀνασκευή refers to the identification of the "impossible" or "unbelievable" in the myth; thereafter, the rationalistic method discovers the "mistake" which created the "unbelievable" tale. And it appears equally clear that it is from the Προγυμνάσματα that this tedious form of rationalistic analysis of myth enters the educational system from which it has never departed, nor been successfully expelled.[41] The historians and geographers who employed the rationalistic method had at least a purpose, the asserting of the historicity of the mythological heroes by the removal of the unlikely from their biographies. But in the hands of the rhetoricians this method of deconstruction becomes mere idle play.

The second term in the epigraph, θεραπεία, appears to make reference to the allegorical interpretations which will also be found in the text of Heraclitus the Paradoxographer. Here we encounter a technical term which was borrowed from the Stoic tradition in which the ethically problematic nature of myth was frequently described in a medical metaphor: the myth was said to be afflicted with disease (τὸ νοσοῦν, τὸ καχεκτοῦν, τὸ σαθρόν) and to require a "cure." So, for instance, Plutarch (*Moralia* 20F) refers to "true" opinions about the gods in literary texts as "healthy" (ὑγιαίνουσαι). In Heraclitus, the author of the *Homeric Allegories*, one of the terms employed is ἀντιφάρμακον. The narrative of the Homeric epics, the author informs us, is in need of an "antidote," which is the allegorizing of its apparent impiety (22.1): "For this

---

[40] See Hermogenes *Prog.* 5; Aphthonius ch. 5; and for a full list of such "commonplace arguments" in Theon see Butts 243.

[41] See Lausberg 493: "The *refutatio* is a weapon of historical criticism and a weapon of enlightenment in the struggle between world views. From an erudite exercise it sank to the level of school teaching."

ἀσέβεια there is but one ἀντιφάρμακον, to demonstrate that the myth has been allegorized." In the same author we also find the term θεραπεύω employed in the same sense (6.1): "Since the trope of allegory is found in Homer, shall we not cure (θεραπεύσομεν) what seem to be unhealthy statements (φαύλως ἔχειν) about the gods in him by the use of this defense (ἀπολογία)?" It is this latter term, θεραπεύω, and its cognate θεραπεία which typically are used in this sense by the later Byzantine critics who clearly inherit the familiar terminology from the earlier Stoic tradition. So, for example, in Eustathius the two words are used in the special sense of "curing a myth by allegorical interpretation." On one occasion Eustathius notes (123.16 Stallbaum) that those who understand Hera as ἀήρ, Poseidon as water, and Zeus as divine νοῦς are "curing the myth" (τὸν τοιοῦτον μῦθον θεραπεύουσιν). Elsewhere, in a number of similar allegorical contexts, we find in Eustathius such expressions as θεραπεία τοῦ μύθου (1382.49), τὸ μυθικὸν θεραπεύεται (1550.61), and even ἡ φιλόσοφος θεραπεία (1597.51), "the philosophical curing of the myth." Festa, in addition to these cases, cites the 14th-century *de Ulixis erroribus*,[42] an allegorical treatment of the wanderings of Odysseus, which has an epigraph that promises to "cure the unsoundness of the myth" (τὸ μύθου σαθρὸν ... θεραπεύουσα).[43] The terms θεραπεία and θεραπεύω are therefore found in this special sense from the time of Heraclitus, author of the *Homeric Allegories*, to the Byzantine period and are clearly part of the Stoic interpretative tradition. Whether the appearance of the word θεραπεία in the epigraph to the text of Heraclitus' περὶ Ἀπίστων indicates that the epigraph was added in the Byzantine period or that it was placed there by Heraclitus himself in the 1st or 2nd century it is now impossible to tell.[44]

We may, however, safely conclude that whether the brief introductory epigraph was added by the author himself or by his Byzantine copyist or epitomizer, the technical terms ἀνασκευή and θεραπεία are explicitly meant to refer to the rationalistic and the allegorical modes of interpretation which are found in the text of Heraclitus' περὶ Ἀπίστων. And to that extent they offer a very brief summary of the approaches which will be illustrated in the text of Heraclitus the Paradoxographer.

[42] Festa 1897: 244–45; the text will be found in Westermann 329–44.

[43] The author was Matthew, Bishop of Ephesus (1329–51); see Cameron: the text "took in even Pfeiffer." Compare Σ Pi. *Ol.* 2.162b.

[44] Cf. the so-called manchettes in the MS of Parthenius and Antoninus Liberalis, and see Lightfoot 246–56: "It can no longer seriously be upheld that the manchettes derive from the authors themselves" (248).

G. HERACLITUS, Περὶ Ἀπίστων

1. Content and Method.

We turn now specifically to the text of Heraclitus the Paradoxographer, a text which consists, as was noted at the beginning of this Introduction, of 39 briefly told and interpreted myths. In terms of subject these 39 items are randomly arranged within the corpus. So, for instance, five items deal with the myth of Heracles (18, 20, 21, 31, 33); three with the myth of the Argonauts (8, 17, 24); four with the myth of Perseus (1, 9, 13, 27); and seven with the myth of Odysseus (2, 11, 14, 16, 29, 32, 39). No sequencing is apparent in any of these, and in fact roughly a third of the corpus deals with what might be called free-floating myths from no obvious or well-known literary source: e.g., Glaucus (10); the Pans (25); or Lamia (34).

Next to be observed is that the four modes of interpretation which have been discussed above are all represented within Heraclitus' text. In some instances, more than one mode is found within a particular item. So, for instance, in both 1 and 24 we find a treatment of myth which is fundamentally rationalistic, but in each item the final sentence is allegorical. Similarly, item 3 appears to exhibit not only a rationalistic and allegorical approach, but also to engage in euhemerism. Yet despite these few instances, for the most part the methodological approaches are kept distinct.

a. Rationalism. First, the rationalistic mode. Many of the mythological examples in this category will be found also in the collection of Palaephatus, as the Comments on the individual items will demonstrate. In most instances the details or even general basis of Heraclitus' rationalizations will differ from those of Palaephatus; in a few cases Heraclitus' rationalizations will be fundamentally the same as what can be found in Palaephatus. It is also noteworthy that, as frequently in Palaephatus, so too in Heraclitus' rationalizations it will at times be the case that significant details of the myths are left totally unrationalized: in item 19, for example, the "dragon's teeth" are unexplained; in item 34 Lamia's eyes in a cup are without any apparent explanation. On the other hand, sometimes Heraclitus will rationalize a detail which he has not bothered to specify in his opening sentence, assuming the traditional myth is well known: so, for example, the "cur-like" dogs in item 2 or the Sirens' music in item 14.

Typical examples of rationalizations in Heraclitus which are essentially the same as what can be found in Palaephatus are items 5 and 12: the Centaurs (=Palaephatus 1) and Atalanta (=Palaephatus 13). In these two cases the specific form of the rationalization is identical to the Palaephatean, although the

versions in Palaephatus are much more extensive. But in a number of other cases it seems clear that Heraclitus and Palaephatus are drawing on different sources: in item 2, for example, "Scylla," Heraclitus offers a rationalization— that Scylla was a famous prostitute—which is fundamentally different from Palaephatus' rationalization of Scylla as a ship with a dog-figure on its prow (Palaephatus 20).[45] In each of these examples, and in others in the text which are fundamentally rationalizations of the myth, we note also the common features of the rationalized or "deconstructed" myth: the narrative is said, or clearly implied, to be "false" (5, 18, 36), "impossible" (4, 5), "laughable" (7), or otherwise "unbelievable" (19, 26). The explanation is simple: history has been misunderstood. In the case of the centaurs it is a πρῶτος εὑρετής, an inventor whose discovery confused his contemporaries.[46] So too in the case of Asclepius (26) and Atlas (4; cf. Glaucus 10) we find instances of πρῶτοι εὑρεταί. On the other hand, in the case of Pasiphae (7), or for example the Spartoi of item 19, the rationalization depends on a simple confusion of words: Taurus was not an animal, but a human being; the Spartoi were not "sown people," but people who had been "scattered far and wide."[47] The interpreter's job has thus become nothing more than to correct the "false" and "impossible" by explaining what is "true" (ἀληθές: 15, 21, 23) or "likely" (εἰκός: 13, 18).

   b. Euhemerism. Rationalism of the sort just discussed in the text of Palaephatus is limited in its application to myths of heroes and the monsters they occasionally encounter. Palaephatus never rationalizes myths of the Olympian gods, for atheism is not his intention, but rather by employing the rationalistic method to defend the historicity of the heroes through the elimination of anything in their myths which is "unlikely." But in the text of Heraclitus the Paradoxographer we do find the rationalistic method applied to myths of the gods: the particular form of rationalism discussed above which is called euhemerism. So, for instance, in item 3 (and presumably also in the identical item 6), where Caeneus' sex-change from female to male is interpreted as a transition from youthful ἐρώμενος (i.e., "female") to adult man (ἀνδρωθείς), it is Festa's opinion, based in particular on the absence of the

---

[45] See especially Decharme 410 for a discussion of the different sources of Heraclitus and Palaephatus. We may, in addition, note with Decharme and Buffière 1956: 236 that Heraclitus seems particularly obsessed with ἑταῖραι: see 2, 8, 14, 16.

   [46] Henrichs 1975: 111. For πρῶτοι εὑρεταί in the early mythographers see Fowler 1996: 73–74 with additional bibliography in n. 87.

   [47] For additional examples of rationalization in Heraclitus see items 8, 13, 15, 20, 35 (and cf. Festa 1897: 245–47). It is to be noted that the stem ψευδ- does not occur in Heraclitus (although it occurs many times in Palaephatus); Heraclitus indicates the falseness of the myths he rationalizes with, among others, the words οὐκ ἀληθές.

so-called anaphoric article, that the second appearance of the name Poseidon refers to a human being—"*cuiusdam nomine Poseidon*"—not to the god mentioned in the previous line.[48] So too in item 9 (cited as a parallel in Festa's *apparatus*) the same grammatical subtlety leads to the conclusion that the first appearance of the name "Hermes" refers to the god, whereas the second appearance refers to a human being of the same name who is playing the familiar role of the πρῶτος εὑρετής.

In 28 and 34 the euhemerizing of Zeus (and in 28 also of other gods) seems beyond question. The recording of the traditional myth in each case assumes the god; the interpretation relies on the assumption that the narrative is not about a divinity, but rather a human king. In both instances the key word is βασιλεύς/βασιλεύω, the precise word that Euhemerus himself had used to "euhemerize" the myths of Ouranus, Cronus, and Zeus;[49] and the precise word also that in an earlier period Hecataeus (fr. 26 Fowler) had used to euhemerize Geryones, and Herodorus (fr. 30 Fowler) to euhemerize Prometheus. Finally, we may mention a possible additional example of euhemerism in the treatment of Selene in item 38, though here the text is apparently flawed and the meaning not completely clear. On the other hand, in item 30 it is noteworthy that Zeus appears as a god without being euhemerized.

c. Allegory. In addition to euhemerism, there are notable instances of allegorical interpretation in Heraclitus' περὶ Ἀπίστων—here again a mode of mythological analysis entirely absent from the περὶ Ἀπίστων of Palaephatus. In these allegorical examples from the text of the Paradoxographer we find no search for the origin of the myth nor any explicit presumption that the origin is to be located in an error or mistake in the past—these were the concerns and presumptions of the rationalizing mode of analysis. Nor in these allegorical cases does the Paradoxographer "deconstruct" the myths. Instead, he accepts the myths as the tradition presents them and offers *interpretations* of them, based on his understanding of the "under-meaning" or "other-speaking" of the narratives. Such allegorical interpretations in the Paradoxographer are entirely in terms of τὰ ἠθικά, as opposed to τὰ φυσικά, i.e., in contrast to the interpretations in Heraclitus' *Homeric Allegories* which frequently treat divine myth in terms of the natural world,[50] in the Paradoxographer the only allegorical interpretations we find are in ethical or moralistic terms.

---

[48] Festa 1902: ad loc. explicitly rejects inserting the article at this point, as Westermann had done.

[49] For βασιλεύς/βασιλεύω in Euhemerus see *FGrHist* 63F2, F3 *passim.*

[50] So, for example, Heraclitus *Homeric Allegories* 65–66 treats the episode of Proteus "as an account of creation" (Lamberton 226 n. 256).

We may take as a first example the elegant allegorization of the single eye of the Cyclops in item 11: "that the Cyclops had only one mode of perception—his eyesight—and that he never used reason to foresee anything."[51] This instance exemplifies the special role of Odysseus in the allegorical tradition. As early as the *Homeric Allegories* and the pseudo-Plutarchean *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer*, Odysseus, the ἔμφρων or φρόνιμος man, had become the Stoic model of prudence (φρόνησις)—a significance he maintains throughout the allegorical tradition.[52] So, for instance, in Heraclitus *Homeric Allegories* 70–72 and 78 we find Odysseus as the symbol of the victory of φρόνησις over various vices: pleasure (the Lotoseaters); savagery (the Cyclops); impudence (Scylla); wastefulness (Charybdis); and gluttony (Circe).[53] In the text of Heraclitus the Paradoxographer this special role of Odysseus in the allegorical tradition is represented not only by item 11 (the Cyclops) but also by item 16 (Circe)—here, as also in item 2 (Scylla) and by implication in item 14 (the Sirens), the prudent Odysseus resists the temptations of an ἑταίρα. Additional examples of the allegorization of myths of Odysseus, or more generally of myths from the *Odyssey*, in Heraclitus the Paradoxographer will be found in items 29 (Proteus), 32 (Calypso), and 39 (the Cattle of the Sun). We might note that of the seven *Odyssey*-myths in Heraclitus the Paradoxographer only one is also treated by Palaephatus.[54] Apparently the allegorical interpretation of Odysseus as the man of prudence and endurance influenced the 1st- or 2nd-century Heraclitus much more than the earlier rationalist Palaephatus.

Further examples of allegorical interpretation in the Paradoxographer are of myths known from a variety of classical sources. From *Iliad* 8.367–69 and *Odyssey* 11.623–26 we know the myth of Heracles' escape from Hades, and from Euripides' *Alcestis* 357–62 and Plato's *Symposium* 179d the similar myth of Orpheus' ascent; both are allegorized in Heraclitus 21: "whenever a person endured a long and dangerous journey ... people said that he had been delivered from Hell." Orpheus' ability to move inanimate rocks and trees through his song is a myth known from Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 1629–30, Euripides' *Bacchae* 560–64, and *Iphigeneia in Aulis* 1211–14; and this myth will be found allegorized in Heraclitus 23. So also the myth of the Helmet of

---

[51] See Westermann 376.XLIII.

[52] See Buffière 1962: xxiv–xxv; Lamberton 41–42; Keaney and Lamberton 24–26 (and sections 126 and 136).

[53] Dowden 24–25.

[54] As mentioned above, Heraclitus 2 (Scylla)=Palaephatus 20. Both authors rationalize the myth, although the last sentence of Heraclitus 2 is apparently allegorical: *ergo* a "mixed case."

Hades is known from Hesiod's *Aspis* 226–27 (cf. Pherecydes *FGrHist* 3F11) and it is allegorized in Heraclitus 27: the helmet is "the bourn to which the dead man goes, where he can be no longer seen." And finally the myth of the fire-breathing bulls, allegorized in Heraclitus 17, is known from Pindar *Pythian* 4.220–42 and Apollonius Rhodius *Argonautica* 3.1278–353.

We might at this point revisit a topic which was raised in section D of this Introduction and inquire whether the text of Heraclitus the Paradoxographer lends support to either of the two supposed motives for allegorizing which were discussed there. The immediate impression is that support is given by this text to neither of the two competing motives. On the one hand, none of the allegorical interpretations in Heraclitus presents a recognizable philosophical position which is intended to be authorized or bolstered by its apparent presence in an authoritative classical source. In fact, Heraclitus never allegorizes in terms of τὰ φυσικά and his "ethic," such as it is, is hardly recognizable as belonging to any specific philosophical school. Nor does he at any time—with the possible exception of the untypical item 39—specifically mention any classical author as a source of such philosophizing. On the other hand, it hardly appears that Heraclitus is particularly interested in rescuing by allegorical interpretation any specific classical author such as Homer or Hesiod from a charge of ἀσέβεια. Yet it might be argued—and here is the fundamental point—that Heraclitus is sufficiently interested in rescuing the whole mythological tradition from the "Platonic" attack that he moralizes by his allegorical interpretations whatever myth from whatever source comes to hand: this is seen in almost all the examples of allegorical interpretation which have just been discussed. Though many of these are familiar Homeric myths, others come more generally from Hesiod or from early lyric or classical tragedy. So it is the mythological tradition in general, rather than any specific author, that Heraclitus the Paradoxographer is effectively defending against a charge of impiety and irrationality: so, for example, Odysseus shows his moral superiority to the ἑταίρα Circe (16) and Orpheus far from being a magician is a civilizer and culture-hero (23). Heraclitus, it appears, belongs to an age of skeptical disbelief: fundamentally he plays with a mythological tradition which is no longer a source of serious belief, but in which he can discover by allegory and occasionally by rationalization a simple ethic which he thinks the tradition requires if it is to be saved from a general charge of implausibility and impiety.

d. Etymology. Next, we move to the topic of etymology in the text of Heraclitus the Paradoxographer: here we find a number of distinct uses. First, as was illustrated above, etymological word play appears in what we may call "Palaephatean" rationalizations as nothing more than simple punning; the presumption is always of an error in the past—some quasi-metaphoric ex-

pression was misunderstood, apparently by literal-minded simpletons of a bygone age, and from the misunderstanding myths arose. This word-play may be onomastic: Κριός (24), Λέων and Δράκων (15; 20), and Ταῦρος (7) were not animals but rather humans with the names Ram, Lion, Dragon, and Bull. Or it may appear as rationalistic punning of the type which is quite common in the περὶ Ἀπίστων of Palaephatus: Medusa (1) did not turn men to stone; rather she was a prostitute whose beauty "petrified" them; Perseus (9) did not have winged sandals for his feet, but as a swift runner "he flew;" or, in the example cited above, the Spartoi (19) were not "sown people," but rather people "scattered far and wide."

In some cases the ἔτι καὶ νῦν ("still now") motif will be employed—a motif found frequently in the texts of Antoninus Liberalis and Conon, where it is regularly used to introduce the aetiology of some on-going cult or religious celebration.[55] But in Heraclitus, as also in Palaephatus, the "still now" motif is used exclusively of verbal expressions. Typically, these will be citations of contemporary speech to confirm that a metaphor used to explain a myth is still in use. The paradigm is seen clearly in item 9: we begin with a simple, prosaic fact, a swift runner named Perseus; people said metaphorically that he had wings on his feet and this is misunderstood as literal fact, whence the myth of Perseus' winged sandals arises; the whole is confirmed by the observation that we still even today say of swift runners that they fly. The identical paradigm is found in a number of other instances: so in item 1 we begin with a beautiful ἑταίρα who was said to "turn men to stone"; from a misunderstanding of this metaphor the myth arises which is confirmed by the fact that "we ourselves also say: he saw her and was turned to stone"; similarly in 21 "still now" we say of those who have escaped great dangers that they have been rescued from Hades; or in 32 of those who feast in wealth that they are "among the gods." In two instances the logic seems to be reversed: it is not that a misunderstood metaphoric expression from the past explains the origin of the myth, but rather that the myth explains a word in present use. So in 37 the myth of Argos, represented with eyes all over his body, explains the word "panoptic"; and in 25 the "Pans" explain the origin of the word πανεύω, "gang-bang."

In the rationalizing instances which have just been discussed the word-play appears to be little more than an idle search for *double-entendre* as a means of discovering the mistake which will reveal the origin of the myth. But in the allegorized examples within the text the word-play seems to be more fundamental, an effort to discover in etymology the deep meaning of the myth which is the basis of the allegory which is claimed. In the text of Heraclitus

[55] Lightfoot 226–27; see also Fowler 1996: 73.

the allegorized myth of Orpheus, item 23, provides an example in the words θηριώδεις, πετρώδεις, and δενδρώδεις, as they are applied to the bestial, stony, and tree-like nature of humanity before it is led to civilized life by Orpheus. The words are not misunderstood puns; rather they reveal the essence of the allegory. Further instances will be found in the elegantly brief item 27 (the Cap of "Hades" allegorized as the τέλος where "the dead can be no longer seen") or in the play on words of "seeing" (αἴσθησιν, ὁράσεως, and προβλέποντα) as an allegorical explanation of the single eye of the Cyclops in item 11.

2. Language

Next we turn to the language of Heraclitus: this, as was noted in the opening section of this Introduction, is for the most part unremarkable and simple. The syntax is correspondingly uncomplicated, although at times the sense can be quite puzzling because of the extreme conciseness of the items; it is unclear whether this was a feature of the original or is the result of later epitomizing. Heraclitus' vocabulary is standard, aside from a few uncommon words, which in fact he is usually in the act of defining; see, for example, items 25 and 37. As was mentioned earlier, occasional items of vocabulary indicate a date for the text and therefore its author after the 1st century B.C. One finds in Heraclitus a larger number of abstract nouns and moral or ethical terms than one sees in Palaephatus. This is clearly the result of the items of allegory and euhemerism in Heraclitus which have no counterpart in Palaephatus. We may note the following typical examples: φρόνιμος of Odysseus in 2; αἴσθησις and λογισμός in 11; δεισιδαιμονία (in a positive sense) and εὐσεβεῖν in 23; and—perhaps the most remarkable instance—the whole of item 16 in which a philosophically-tinged vocabulary allegorizes the myth of Circe: ἀρέσκεια, εὔνοια, προσπάθεια, ἐπιθυμία, ἀλογίστως, ἡδονή. In this regard also we may observe Heraclitus' use of the abstract noun ὑπόληψις and its verb ὑπολαμβάνω by which he elucidates not so much the "truth" of a myth as the "notion"—i.e., the interpretative or allegorical "notion"—behind it: clear examples will be found in 6 (Teiresias); 8 (the Harpies); 11 (the Cyclops); 12 (Atalanta and Hippomenes); 17 (the Fire-breathing Bulls); and 28 (Boreas and Oreithyia). That the noun ὑπόληψις appears nowhere in Palaephatus is an indication of how much broader the range of explanation is in Heraclitus.

3. The Nature of the Book

Finally, we may ask *what* is the text before us? It is unlikely, I think, that it is a random collection, although the text which survives to the present has most

probably suffered abbreviation, and in at least a few of its 39 items it is clearly incomplete. It seems more probable that the work is guided by an intention to illustrate in short compass a variety of approaches for understanding some of the more problematic ancient myths. In this regard it is important to observe that 19 of the 39 myths treated by Heraclitus the Paradoxographer are also treated in Palaephatus' περὶ Ἀπίστων but that in only 5 of those 19 cases are the interpretations by the two authors the same. In the remaining 14 cases the treatments of identical myths are fundamentally dissimilar. Sometimes both authors rationalize the same myth but do so quite differently: e.g., the myth of Scylla (Heraclitus 2; Palaephatus 20). In other cases Palaephatus rationalizes a myth which Heraclitus treats allegorically: e.g., the myth of Orpheus (Heraclitus 23; Palaephatus 33). So in spite of the initial impression, it is the case that in only 5 of the 39 items does Heraclitus actually follow his predecessor. We may speculate that by Heraclitus' day a list of "problematic myths" had become commonplace. This, no doubt, was based in part on the unepitomized text of Palaephatus' περὶ Ἀπίστων, but there must also have been other sources, since Palaephatus did not use allegory or euhemerism as interpretative tools and even his specific rationalizations were not consistently followed by Heraclitus. These problematic myths then became the standard examples, used over and over again, to illustrate and expound competing systems of interpretation through which the mythological tradition could be made reasonable or meaningful to a doubting, skeptical audience. My own suspicion is that Heraclitus' περὶ Ἀπίστων is a handbook, perhaps the remnant of a schoolbook for the education of the young, designed to accomplish this purpose. If so, it would be analogous to the rhetorical Προγυμνάσματα, the *Theologiae Graecae compendium* of Cornutus,[56] and possibly also the *Fabulae* of Hyginus.[57]

[56] See the address to παῖς; παιδίον 1.1; 28.11; 41.19; 52.5; 76.2. See also Long 53 and Dawson 36: "Cornutus composed his work for late adolescents who came to him for instruction in philosophy after having been trained by a *grammatikos* in classical Greek literature." The work was "a primer in philosophy."

[57] Lightfoot 225: "Epitomes of epic are known from the fourth century B.C. ... and continue on papyri at least as late as the third century A.D., where they are clearly school exercises (Augustine [*Conf.* 1.17.27] describes how such techniques formed a large part of his own education)." Additional sources are cited in n. 48, esp. Quintilian 1.2.27. Cameron *passim* stresses the connection of mythological collections to "the schoolroom," citing Quintilian and Juvenal.

ΉΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΥ, Περὶ Ἀπίστων[58]
Heraclitus, On Unbelievable Tales

ἀνασκευὴ ἢ θεραπεία μύθων τῶν παρὰ φύσιν παραδεδομένων[59]
The Deconstruction or Curing of Traditional Myths in Which Nature Is Violated

1. Περὶ Μεδούσης

Φασὶ ταύτην ἀπολιθοῦν τοὺς θεασαμένους αὐτήν, καὶ Περσέως ἀποτεμόντος αὐτῆς τὴν κεφαλήν, ἐξελθεῖν ἵππον πτερωτόν. ἔχει δὲ οὕτω. αὕτη ἑταίρα καλὴ ἐγένετο ὡς τὸν ἰδόντα αὐτὴν ἔκπληκτον γενόμενον οἷον ἀπολιθοῦσθαι. λέγομεν δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς "ἰδὼν αὐτὴν ἀπελιθώθη." παραγενομένου δὲ Περσέως ἐν ἔρωτι γενομένη τά τε ὑπάρχοντα κατέφαγε καὶ τὴν ἑαυτῆς ἡλικίαν κατέφθειρεν· ἀπολέσασα δὲ τὴν ἡλικίαν καὶ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἵππου γήρᾳ ἐγήρασεν. ἡ γὰρ κεφαλὴ τὸ τῆς ἡλικίας ἄνθος ἐστίν, ὃ ἀφεῖλεν αὐτῆς ὁ Περσεύς.

1. Medusa

They say that Medusa turned anyone who looked at her to stone and that when Perseus cut off her head a winged horse emerged.

But here is how it was. Medusa was a beautiful prostitute. Any man who saw her was amazed—turned to stone, so to speak.[60] We ourselves say, "He saw her and was turned to stone."

But when Perseus arrived, Medusa fell in love with him: she squandered[61] her possessions on him and ruined the prime of her life. And when she had lost these—her youth and her possessions—she suffered a "whorse"[62] old age. For the head is the flowering crown[63] of youth—which is what Perseus took from her.

Comment: Compare Palaephatus 31, where the Gorgon's head is rationalized as the head of a golden statue of Athene which Perseus put on his ship and where the petrification is oddly rationalized as a group of man-sized stones set in the market-place of Seriphos by its citizens before they flee from Perseus and abandon the island (as Festa 1897: 247 notes, the rationalized version of Palaephatus is more confused than that of Heraclitus). For a different rationalization see Pausanias 2.21.5.

2. Περὶ Σκύλλης

Λέγεται περὶ ταύτης ὅτι κατήσθιε τοὺς παραπλέοντας. ἦν δὲ αὕτη νησιῶτις καλὴ ἑταίρα καὶ εἶχε παρασίτους λαιμούς τε καὶ κυνώδεις, μεθ᾽ ὧν τοὺς ξένους κατήσθιεν, ἐν οἷς καὶ τοὺς Ὀδυσσέως ἑταίρους. αὐτὸν δὲ ὡς φρόνιμον οὐκ ἠδυνήθη.

2. Scylla

They say that Scylla devoured passing sailors.

But Scylla was a beautiful prostitute who lived on an island with her gluttonous and cur-like[64] hangers-on. Together with these she would devour[65] her clients[66]—and among them Odysseus' companions. But with Odysseus himself she failed: he was too sensible.

Comment: Compare Palaephatus 20, where Scylla is rationalized as a trireme with a dog-figure on the prow. More often Scylla was rationalized as a dangerous promontory at the strait of Messina: Sallust *Histories* 4.27; Ovid *Metamorphoses* 14.73–74; Servius on *Aeneid* 3.420; Tzetzes on Lycophron 46. See also Polybius 34.2.12–34.3.10 (=Strabo 1.2.15–16).

Heraclitus *Homeric Allegories* 70.11 allegorizes Scylla as "polymorphous shamelessness."

3. Περὶ Καινέως

Λέγεται τοῦτον πρότερον γυναῖκα γεγονέναι, εἶτα ὑπὸ Ποσειδῶνος γενέσθαι ἄνδρα ἄτρωτον χαλκῷ καὶ σιδήρῳ. οὗτος δὲ ὢν νέος ἐρώμενος ἐγένετο Ποσειδῶνος, ἀνδρωθεὶς δὲ μέγας κατὰ ψυχὴν ἐγένετο ὑπ' οὐδενὸς καταπονηθῆναι δυνάμενος οὐδὲ δώροις ἐξαλλαγῆναι χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου· οὔπω γὰρ χρυσὸς καὶ ἄργυρος εὕρητο.

3. Caeneus

It is said that Caeneus was at first a woman, whom Poseidon later turned into a man—one who could not be wounded by bronze or iron.

But Caeneus as a boy had been Poseidon's beloved.[67] Thereafter, when he became a man, his greatness of spirit emerged. No one could overpower him, nor get him to change with bribes of bronze or iron. For gold and silver had not yet been discovered.

Comment: Cf. Palaephatus 10, where the myth is rationalized, rather than, as here, given an allegorical interpretation. See the discussion of Sergent 247–49: the transition from ἐρώμενος to adult man is mythically (and possibly also ritually) represented as a transformation or passage from female to male. For such a passage from girlishness to manhood compare, most famously, Achilles among the maidens.

The rationalization of iron and bronze as items of bribery necessitates the somewhat laughable final comment that gold and silver had not yet been discovered: an example of the theme of *illud tempus*, which is common in such rationalizations (Stern 1996: 21–22).

See also Cameron's discussion of mythographus Homericus' version of the Caeneus myth at *Il.* 1.264; and for the myth in general see Acusilaus *FGrHist* 2F22.

4. Περὶ Ἄτλαντος

Οὗτος παραδέδοται φέρων οὐρανὸν ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων, ὃ ἀδύνατον ὑπὸ οὐρανὸν καὶ αὐτὸν ὄντα. ἀνὴρ δὲ σοφὸς ὢν τὰ κατὰ ἀστρολογίαν πρῶτος κατώπτευσε, προλέγων δὲ χειμῶνας καὶ μεταβολὰς*** ἄστρων καὶ δύσεις ἐμυθεύθη φέρειν ἐν αὑτῷ τὸν κόσμον.

4. Atlas

The tradition is that Atlas carries heaven on his shoulders, which is impossible, even though[68] Atlas himself is under heaven.

Atlas was a wise man who was the first to observe the principles of astronomy. He foretold storms and

changes [in the winds and the risings[69]] and settings of stars, and so the myth arose that he carried the cosmos within himself.

Comment: For Atlas rationalized as an astronomer see Dionysius Scytobrachion *FGrHist* 32F7 (=Diodorus Siculus 3.60.2): "… and therefore it was believed that the whole cosmos was borne on Atlas' shoulders" (see Buffière 1956: 238 and Rusten 109). By extension Herodorus *FGrHist* 31F13 suggests allegorically that when Heracles took the pillars of the cosmos from Atlas he was gaining "knowledge of heavenly things." It is an instance of the theme of the πρῶτος εὑρετής, for which see Stern 1996: 20. Compare Aeolus in Palaephatus 17, who is also rationalized as an astronomer (cf. Polybius 34.2.4–10 [=Strabo 1.2.15]; Pliny *Nat.* 3.94, 7.203; and Servius on *Aeneid* 1.52); as Dietz comments (73): "this explanation [*sc.* of the myth of Aeolus] does not reject the entire *fabula* outright, but seeks to purge it of its poetic or improbable fictions." Compare Euhemerus' treatment of Ouranos (Diodorus Siculus 6.1.8): "a king ... knowledgeable about the motion of the stars." See Bolle 27.

For a Stoic allegorizing of Atlas cf. Cornutus 48.10–12: "Atlas, who supports the heavens by tirelessly [ἀταλαιπώρως] producing the things which come into being in accordance with the λόγοι ... , is also the whole cosmos" (Hays 97).

5. Περὶ Κενταύρων
Λέγεται περὶ τὸ Πήλιον καὶ τὴν Φολόην γεγονέναι διφυεῖς, τὰ μὲν ἐπάνω τῶν λαγόνων ἀνδρῶν ἔχοντας, τὸ δ᾽ ἀπὸ ⟨τούτου⟩ τοῦ μέρους πᾶν ἵππου. οὐκ ἀληθὲς δὲ τοῦτο. δύο γὰρ διηλλαγμένας φύσεις εἰς ἓν συνελθούσας ἀδύνατον ζῳογονηθῆναι καὶ τραφῆναι. ἀλλ᾽ ἔτι τῆς τῶν ἵππων χρήσεως οὔσης ἀγνώστου, πρῶτοι καθίσαντες ἐφ᾽ ἵππων κατέτρεχον τὰ πεδία λῃστεύοντες, φαντασίαν τε ἀπετέλεσαν τοῖς πρώτως θεασαμένοις μακρόθεν, ὡς ἐκ δυοῖν εἰσι γεγονότες φύσεων.

5. The Centaurs
It is said that around Mt. Pelion and Mt. Pholoe there were creatures of double form: above the flanks they had the bodies of men; but all the rest was horse.

But this is not true. For it is impossible for two different creatures joined together in this way to be born alive or to grow. Rather, at a time when horseback riding was still unknown, these were the first to sit upon their horses. They overran and plundered the plains. And to those who first saw them from a distance they gave the appearance of being made of two creatures.

Comment: Again the theme of the πρῶτος εὑρετής. Cf. Palaephatus 1, where the same rationalization—at much greater length—is given. The same rationalization for the double form of the Centaurs is found in Diodorus Siculus 4.70.1. Cf. also Xenophon *Cyropaedia* 4.3.19–20; Pliny *Nat.* 7.202; and Tzetzes *Chiliades* 7.10–48.

Oddly enough, the rationalistic explanation of the Centaurs by Heraclitus and Palaephatus seems "plausible" to Nash (289).

6. Περὶ Τειρεσίου
Οὗτος μετασχεῖν λέγεται τῆς γυναικείας καὶ ἀνδρείας φύσεως, κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν ὑπόληψιν ἣν ἐπὶ Καινέως ἐγράψαμεν.

6. Teiresias
Teiresias is said to have partaken of both woman's and man's nature.[70]

It is the same notion I wrote down in the case of Caeneus.

Comment: Initially it seems that the first sentence means that Teiresias had both sexual organs at the same time, but the familiar myth and the analogy to Caeneus (3) imply a sex change instead. The stories of Caeneus and Teiresias are also linked together at Antoninus Liberalis 17.4–5.

For a structural analysis of the myth see Brisson.

7. Περὶ Πασιφάης
Ταύτην φασὶν ἐρασθῆναι Ταύρου, οὐχ, ὡς πολλοὶ νομίζουσι, τοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἀγέλην ζῴου (γελοῖον γὰρ ἀκοινωνήτου συνουσίας ὠρέχθαι τὴν βασίλισσαν), ἑνὸς δέ τινος τῶν ἐντοπίων, ᾧ Ταῦρος ἦν ὄνομα. συνεργῷ δὲ χρησαμένη πρὸς τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν Δαιδάλῳ καὶ γεγονυῖα ἔγγυος, ἐγέννησε καθ᾽ ὁμοιότητα τοῦ Ταύρου ⟨υἱόν⟩, ὃν οἱ πολλοὶ Μίνῳ μὲν ἐκάλουν, Ταύρῳ δὲ εἴκαζον· κατὰ δὲ σύνθεσιν Μινώταυρος ἐκλήθη.

7. Pasiphae
They say that Pasiphae fell in love with a bull.

But it was not the bull in the herd, as many people believe: that the queen yearned for a sexual union impossible to consummate[71] is ridiculous. It was rather a local man, whose name was Taurus. To fulfill her passion Pasiphae found an accomplice in Daedalus, and, becoming pregnant, she bore [a son] with a resemblance to Taurus. The people called him Minos' son, but they said he looked like Taurus. And by a joining together of the names he came to be called Minotaurus.

Comment: Cf. Palaephatus 2, where, with much else, the same rationalization of Taurus as a man appears (similarly in Palaephatus 15); so also Demon *FGrHist* 327F5; Philochorus *FGrHist* 328F17a (=Plutarch *Theseus* 16.1, 19.3–7). See, in addition, Servius on *Aeneid* 6.14 and Dietz 67: "The account of Pasiphae is *fabula* presumably because it tells of something unnatural (*con-*

tra naturam).” In this it is contrasted by Servius with the myth of Phaedra, which he calls *historia.*

<table>
<tr>
<td>

8. Περὶ Ἀρπυιῶν
Ταύτας ὁ μῦθος παραδέδωκε γυναῖκας ὑποπτέρους τὸ τοῦ Φινέως δεῖπνον ἁρπαζούσας. ὑπολάβοι δ’ ἄν τις ταύτας ἑταίρας καταφαγούσας τὴν τοῦ Φινέως οἰκίαν εἶναι, καὶ καταλιπούσας αὐτὸν καὶ τῆς ἀναγκαίας τροφῆς ἐνδεῆ κεχωρίσθαι ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ, αἰεὶ δὲ ὅσα ἀνακτήσαιτο παραγινομένας ἐσθίειν καὶ αὖθις χωρίζεσθαι, ὃ σύνηθες ποιεῖν ταῖς ἑταίραις.

</td>
<td>

8. The Harpies
The myth has been handed down that the Harpies were winged women who used to snatch[72] away Phineus’ dinner.

One may suppose that they were prostitutes who devoured Phineus’ estate and then went off and left him without even the bare minimum of food. But if he ever got anything else, they always returned and devoured[73] it, and then they departed again—which is typical of prostitutes.

</td>
</tr>
</table>

Comment: Cf. Palaephatus 22, where the grasping Harpies are not prostitutes, but Phineus’ evil daughters (cf. Tzetzes *Chiliades* 1.219–23).

Although it is not emphasized here, it is likely that the speedy departure and return of the prostitutes is intended to rationalize the fact that the mythological Harpies are winged: cf. Heraclitus 9, 14, 35; and contrast item 17 where speed is likened to fire.

<table>
<tr>
<td>

9. Περὶ Περσέως
Τούτῳ ἱστορεῖται τὸν Ἑρμῆν πέδιλα πτερωτὰ δεδωκέναι. Ἑρμῆς γὰρ τὴν πρὸς δρόμον γυμνασίαν ἐπενόησεν, ἐν ᾗ εὐδόκιμος ἦν ὁ Περσεύς. οἱ γοῦν θεώμενοι, τὸ τάχος θαυμάζοντες, πτερὰ εἶπον προστεθεῖσθαι τοῖς ποσὶν αὐτοῦ, καθὼς εἰώθαμεν λέγειν ἐπὶ τῶν τάχεως τρεχόντων, ὅτι “ἔπτη.”

</td>
<td>

9. Perseus
It is recorded that Hermes gave winged sandals to Perseus.

Now Hermes was the inventor of training for foot-racing, and it was there that Perseus gained renown. The people who saw him, at any rate, marveled at his speed; they said he had wings[74] attached to his feet, just as we are accustomed to say about swift runners: “he flew.”

</td>
</tr>
</table>

Comment: Again the theme of the πρῶτος εὑρετής, common in such rationalizations (see the Comment on 4). Hermes is (apparently) euhemerized by Dionysius Scytobrachion *FGrHist* 32F7 (=Diodorus Siculus 3.60.4) as the “inventor of many things for mankind,” and Festa would discover euhemerism here in Heraclitus 9, as he does in Heraclitus 3: see the discussion in section G of the Introduction.

In Cornutus (20.18–20, 22.3–5) Hermes is the λόγος sent from heaven, and his winged sandals are the winged words (ἔπη). Cf. Pseudo-Plutarch 126.

10. Περὶ Γλαύκου τοῦ θαλασσίου
Οὗτος θαλάσσιος ἀναφέρεται μάντις.
νῆσον γὰρ οὗτος οἰκῶν, αἰεὶ τοῖς
παραπλέουσιν ἐσήμαινεν ὡς δεῖ
ποιεῖσθαι τὸν πλοῦν, προλέγων τὰ
συμβησόμενα.

10. Glaucus of the Sea
Glaucus is reported to have been a prophet of the sea.

But Glaucus lived on an island and invariably signaled to those who sailed by how they should make their journey—predicting for them what was going to happen.

Comment: For an extensive and essentially different rationalization of the myth of Glaucus see Palaephatus 27 (sources for the narrative in Stern 1996: 57). For Heraclitus' version of the wise man—a variation on the πρῶτος εὑρετής—compare Heraclitus 4 and Palaephatus 17.

11. Περὶ Κύκλωπος
Τοῦτον ἄν τις ὑπολάβοι διαιτώμενον
ἐπ᾽ ἐρημίᾳ νόμων ἄπειρον εἶναι,
πεποιθέναι δὲ τῇ βίᾳ, μίαν αἴσθησιν
ἔχοντα τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ὁράσεως, λογισμῷ
δὲ μηδὲν προβλέποντα· ὃν ὁ σοφὸς
Ὀδυσσεὺς κατεπόνησε.

11. The Cyclops
One may suppose that because the Cyclops lived in solitude he was ignorant of laws and relied on his strength; that he had only one mode of perception—his eyesight—and he never used reason to foresee[75] anything. The clever Odysseus got the better of him.

Comment: Heraclitus *Homeric Allegories* 70.4–5 allegorizes the Cyclops as the savage spirit in each of us—called "Cyclops" because it "steals" (ὑποκλωπῶν) our judgment. Odysseus was able to incapacitate it by the counsel of his words—"as if by a branding iron." In Plato *Laws* 680b the Cyclopes illustrate the most primitive form of government, called δυναστεία (see also Strabo 13.1.25, 1.2.9). See also Westermann 376.XLIII, where "as Palaephatus says" the Cyclopes were so called because they "inhabited a circular (κυκλοτερῆ) island."

12. Περὶ Ἀταλάντης τῆς Σχοινέως
καὶ Ἱππομένους
Τούτους φασὶν ἀπολεοντωθῆναι ἐν
τῷ ὄρει, τῆς περὶ αὐτῶν ὑπολήψεως
τοιαύτης οὔσης. μεσημβρίας οὔσης
εἰσῆλθον εἴς τι σπήλαιον γενέσθαι
θέλοντες μετ᾽ ἀλλήλων· κατὰ τύχη
δὲ λέοντες ὄντες ἐν τῷ σπηλαίῳ
κατέφαγον αὐτούς· ὕστερον δὲ τῶν
θηρίων ἐξελθόντων, ἐκείνων δὲ μὴ

12. Atalanta, the daughter of Schoeneus, and Hippomenes
They say that on the mountain Atalanta and Hippomenes were turned into lions.

Here is the notion behind that. At midday the two of them went into a cave, wishing to be together. By chance there were lions in the cave who devoured them. Later when the beasts came out, but Atalanta and Hippomenes

φαινομένων, μεταμορφωθῆναι ὑπ-
έλαβον αὐτοὺς οἱ προσεδρεύοντες.

did not appear, those who were waiting for them assumed that they had been transformed.

Comment: Palaephatus 13 offers the identical rationalization for the myth, but there Atalanta's partner is named Melanion, not Hippomenes.

13. Περὶ Φορκίδων
Ταύτας ὑφίστανται μιᾷ ὁράσει χρῆσθαι ἀεὶ πρὸς τὴν χρείαν μεταλαμβανούσας παρὰ τῆς ἐχού-σης. εἰκὸς δέ ἐστι τρεῖς γυναῖκας τυφλωθείσας ὁδηγῷ ἑνὶ χρῆσθαι πρὸς τὴν πορείαν. [ὀνόματα δὲ αὐτῶν Πεφρηδώ, Ἐνυώ, Περσώ. ἐφύλαττον δὲ τὰ χρυσᾶ μῆλα.]

13. The Daughters of Phorcys
People imagine that the Daughters of Phorcys used a single eye, each one getting it in turn for her own use from the one who had it before.
   It is likely that they were three blind women who made use of a single guide for traveling around. [Their names[76] were Pephredo, Enyo, and Perso, and they guarded the golden apples.]

Comment: Cf. Palaephatus 31, an extensive rationalization of the myth of the Graeae, where The Eye appears as a character more explicitly than here in Heraclitus.

14. Περὶ Σειρήνων
Ταύτας διφυεῖς μυθολογοῦσι τὰ μὲν σκέλη ὀρνίθων, τὸ δὲ ⟨λοιπὸν⟩ σῶμα γυναικῶν ἐχούσας, ἀπολλύειν δὲ τοὺς παραπλέοντας. ἦσαν δὲ ἑταῖραι ἐκπρεπεῖς τῇ τε δι' ὀργάνων μούσῃ καὶ γλυκυφωνίᾳ, κάλλισται, αἷς οἱ προσερχόμενοι κατησθίοντο τὰς οὐσίας. ὀρνίθων δὲ σκέλη ἐλέγοντο ἔχειν, ὅτι ταχέως ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπο-βαλόντων τὰς οὐσίας ἐχωρίζοντο.

14. The Sirens
The myth is that the Sirens were of double form—with the legs of birds, but [for the rest] the bodies of women—and that they destroyed those who sailed past them.[77]
   But the Sirens were prostitutes, remarkable for their playing of musical instruments and for their sweet voices. They were also most beautiful, and any man who visited them soon found his wealth eaten away.[78] They were said to have the legs of birds[79] because they departed speedily from those who thus cast away their own property.

Comment: Heraclitus rationalizes the beauty of the Sirens' music, even though he has not mentioned it in his initial summary of the traditional myth: compare Pseudo-Plutarch 147 using the Sirens-episode as a general praise of music (Keaney and Lamberton 27). See also Heubeck and Hoekstra 119–20 for further allegorical interpretations of the Sirens.

15. Περὶ Χιμαίρας
Ταύτην Ὅμηρος εἰκονογραφῶν φησι "πρόσθε λέων, ὄπιθεν δὲ δράκων, μέσση δὲ χίμαιρα." γένοιτο δ' ἂν τὸ ἀληθὲς τοιοῦτον. γυνὴ τῶν τόπων κρατοῦσα δύο πρὸς ὑπηρεσίαν ἀδελφοὺς εἶχεν ὀνόματι Λέοντα καὶ Δράκοντα. παράσπονδος δὲ οὖσα καὶ ξενοκτόνος ἀνῃρέθη ὑπὸ Βελλεροφόντου.

15. Chimaera
Homer describes Chimaera in these words: "A lion in front, a dragon behind, in the middle a she-goat."[80]

The truth would be as follows: a woman who ruled over her territories had two brothers in her service, named Leo and Drago. She was a breaker of treaties and a slayer of guests, and so Bellerophon put her to death.

Comment: Cf. Palaephatus 28, which quotes the same line of Homer, but rationalizes Chimaera as a mountain guarded in front by a lion and in back by a snake (see also Plutarch *Moralia* 248C; Strabo 14.3.5; Servius on *Aeneid* 6.288; and Anonymous περὶ Ἀπίστων [Westermann 322.VIII]). Heraclitus is followed by Tzetzes on Lycophron 17. See also Buffière 1956: 235.

16. Περὶ Κίρκης
Ταύτην ὁ μῦθος παρ⟨αδ⟩έδωκε ποτῷ μεταμορφοῦσαν ἀνθρώπους. ἦν δὲ ἑταίρα, καὶ κατακηλοῦσα τοὺς ξένους τὸ πρῶτον ἀρεσκείᾳ παντοδαπῇ ἐπεσπᾶτο πρὸς εὔνοιαν, γενομένους δὲ ἐν προσπαθείᾳ κατεῖχε ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις ἀλογίστως φερομένους πρὸς τὰς ἡδονάς. ἥττησε δὲ καὶ ταύτην Ὀδυσσεύς.

16. Circe
The myth has been handed down[81] that Circe transformed men with a potion.

Circe, however, was a prostitute who bewitched her clients[82] at first with every sort of willingness to please and led them on to be well-disposed toward her. But when their passion for her grew, she controlled them through their lust, as they were mindlessly carried along in their pleasures.

Odysseus got the better of her also.[83]

Comment: For allegorical interpretations of Circe see Heraclitus *Homeric Allegories* 72.2; Phidalius of Corinth *FGrHist* 30F2 [Jacoby 501]; Pseudo-Plutarch 126. To the first of these "Circe's potion is a vessel of pleasure. The licentious drink from it and, for a momentary surfeit, they live a life more wretched than that of pigs. So the companions of Odysseus, a foolish lot, were bested by their own gluttony, whereas the wisdom (φρόνησις) of Odysseus prevailed over Circe's sensuality" (cf. Heraclitus *Homeric Allegories* 73.13). Pseudo-Plutarch, on the other hand, uses Circe, whose name he traces to the word "cyclic," as a symbol of Pythagorean metempsychosis (Keaney and Lamberton 24): while Circe transforms Odysseus' companions into beasts, the wise Odysseus is able to avoid such a transformation. See also Buffière 1956: 237.

Note that the Paradoxographer's allegory does not explain ποτῷ ("with a potion").

17. Περὶ πυριπνόων ταύρων
Τίς ἂν ὑπολάβοι θνητὴν φύσιν πῦρ
πνεῖν ἐξ αὐτῆς, ὃ πάντων ἐστὶν
ἀναιρετικόν; ἄγριοι δὲ καὶ τραχεῖς
ὄντες πρὸς τὴν ἀναίρεσιν τῶν
ὁραθέντων ὀξεῖς ἦσαν. τὸ οὖν ἐν
τάχει περὶ αὐτοὺς ἀναιρετικὸν
εἰκάσθη πυρί.

17. The Fire-breathing Bulls
Who would accept the notion that a
mortal creature breathed fire from itself,
since fire is destructive of all things?

The bulls were wild and savage—
swift for the destruction of whatever
they saw. And so in their case their quick
destructiveness was likened to fire.[84]

Comment: For the first sentence compare Palaephatus 28 on the folly of imagining that a beast of mortal nature could breathe fire.

For an etymological euhemerizing of the fire-breathing bulls see Diodorus 4.47.3 (and see Dietz 74 n. 28)

18. Περὶ ὕδρας
Πολυκέφαλον ἱστορεῖται θηρίον, οὐχ
οὕτως ἔχοντος τἀληθοῦς. εἰκὸς δὲ
νεοσσοὺς αὐτὴν ἐσχηκέναι πολλούς,
οἳ συνόντες αὐτῇ καὶ τεκούσῃ
βοηθοῦντες τοὺς προσιόντας ἀπ-
ώλλυον μετ’ αὐτῆς.

18. The Hydra[85]
It is recorded that the Hydra was a
many-headed beast,[86] but this is not the
truth.

It is likely that she had many off-
spring who stayed by their mother’s
side, aided her, and along with her killed
any who came near.

Comment: Cf. Palaephatus 38, where the Hydra, amid much complex detail, is rationalized as a military fort under attack by Heracles; whenever one of the defenders of this fort was killed two bowmen would ascend the tower in his place. For a humorous account of the Hydra as a female sophist—if you cut off one head of her argument, she would send up two to replace it—see Plato *Euthydemus* 297c.

19. Περὶ τῶν Σπαρτῶν
Τίς πιστεῦσαι δύναται ὅτι, τοῦ
Κάδμου σπείραντος τοὺς δράκοντος
ὀδόντας, ἔφυσαν ἔνοπλοι ἄνθρωποι;
κρατήσας δὲ τῶν τόπων ὁ Κάδμος καὶ
τὸ θηρίον ἀνελὼν δι’ ὃ συνέβαινεν
ἔρημον εἶναι τὸν τόπον, τοὺς σπο-
ράδην οἰκοῦντας εἰς ἓν συνήγαγεν, οἳ
ὄντες ἔνοπλοι καὶ θηριώδεις
διηνέχθησαν εὐθὺς πρὸς ἀλλήλους
καὶ πλὴν ὀλίγων πάντες ἀπώλοντο.

19. The Spartoi
Who can believe that armed men
sprang forth when Cadmus scattered[87]
the dragon’s teeth?

Cadmus became lord of the region
and slew the beast who had caused the
place to be desolate. He gathered to-
gether there people who had been liv-
ing scattered far and wide. These, being
armed and beast-like, soon fell out with
one another, until all but a few were
killed.

Comment: Note that, in contrast to Palaephatus 3, Heraclitus has failed to rationalize the dragon or its teeth.

20. Περὶ τῶν χρυσῶν μήλων
Δράκοντά φασι τὰ τῶν Ἑσπερίδων χρυσᾶ μῆλα φυλάττειν. ἀνὴρ δὲ ἐγένετο Δράκων, ὃς ἐκ τῆς ἐπιμελείας τῶν δένδρων πολὺν ἐσώρευσε χρυσόν. τοῦτον διαπρεπεῖς ἐθήρευσαν γυναῖκες, καὶ ταῖς ἐρωτικαῖς ἐπιθυμίαις ἐνδήσασαι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸ λοιπὸν ὑπηρέτην ἔσχον καὶ φύλακα τοῦ κήπου.

20. The Golden Apples
They say that a dragon guarded the golden apples of the Hesperides.

But Drago was a man who amassed much gold from his tending of fruit-trees. He was chased after by some elegant women; they entangled his soul in their lustful passions and for the future acquired him as a servant and guard of their garden.

Comment: Cf. Palaephatus 18 and Diodorus Siculus 4.26.2–4.27.2, where the apples are rationalized as sheep—μῆλον being a homonym capable of either meaning. Both Heraclitus and Palaephatus agree in rationalizing the dragon as a human guard named Drago (cf. Agroetas *FGrHist* 762F3a; Servius on *Aeneid* 4.484 [Dietz 74 n. 28]; Tzetzes *Chiliades* 2.376–78), though in Palaephatus the sheep are called "golden"—not literally as here in Heraclitus— but as a metaphor for their excellence. As for the apples in Heraclitus' version they are presumably rationalized by δένδρα ("fruit trees") and possibly also by σωρεύω ("heap").

In Herodorus *FGrHist* 31F14 the apples of the Hesperides are three, and they allegorically represent "three virtues: the avoidance of anger, of love of money, and of love of pleasure."

21. Περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἅιδου
Λέγεται ὡς Ἡρακλῆς κατελθὼν ⟨εἰς Ἅιδου⟩ ἀνῆλθεν ἀνάγων τὸν Κέρβερον, καὶ Ὀρφεὺς ὡσαύτως Εὐρυδίκην τὴν γυναῖκα. τὸ δ' ἀληθές, ὅτι ὁπηνίκα τις ἐκ μακρᾶς ἀποδημίας καὶ ἐπικινδύνου δια⟨ν⟩τλήσας ἐσώθη, ἔφασκον ἐξ Ἅιδου αὐτὸν διασεσῶσθαι. ὅθεν ἔτι καὶ νῦν τοὺς μακροὺς πόνους καὶ παραβόλους ὁδοὺς καὶ ἐπισφαλεῖς νόσους ⟨δια⟩-φεύγοντας φάσκομεν ἐξ Ἅιδου σεσῶσθαι.

21. People in Hades
It is said that Heracles descended [into Hades] and that he came back up bringing Cerberus with him, and that Orpheus did the same with his wife Eurydice.

But the truth is that whenever a person endured a long and dangerous journey and came through it unharmed, people said that he had been delivered from Hell. Even today we say that people who survive great hardships or hazardous voyages or dangerous illnesses have been rescued from Hell.

Comment: Cf. Palaephatus 39, where Cerberus is rationalized as an ordinary dog, penned up in Taenarum, whom Heracles went down and brought out; see further the Comment to item 33. Heraclitus' explanation of the metaphoric meaning of the descent into Hades is one of his nicer allegories, although it fails to explain explicitly Eurydice or Cerberus.

22. Περὶ Φαέθοντος

Οὗτος Ἡλίου ὢν υἱὸς ἐπεθύμησεν εἰς τὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἅρμα ἀναβὰς διφρεῦσαι· ἀπείρως δὲ τοῦτο ποιοῦντος καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπολλυμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ καύματος, ὁ Ζεὺς αὐτὸν ἐκεραύνωσεν ***

22. Phaethon

Phaethon, the son of Helios, was eager to mount his father's chariot and drive it. But when he did it inexpertly and people were killed by the heat of the sun, Zeus struck him with a thunderbolt ...

Comment: The item is obviously incomplete, there being neither explanation nor rationalization of the myth. Cf. Pseudo-Palaephatus 52. A direction that a rationalization of this myth might have taken is suggested by Anonymous περὶ Ἀπίστων (Westermann 324.XIII): Phaethon was a man who tracked the course of the sun by signs; however, he did not do so accurately but rather imperfectly, as a result of which he perished.

23. Περὶ Ὀρφέως

Οὗτος κινεῖν λέγεται καὶ πέτρας καὶ δένδρα καὶ θῆρας οἰωνούς τε. εἴποι δ᾽ ἄν τις ἀληθῶς ὅτι θηριώδεις ὄντας τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ οὔτε ἔθη οὔτε νόμους εἰδότας εἰς δεισιδαιμονίαν ἀγαγών, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ εὐσεβεῖν παρακαλέσας πετρώδεις ὄντας καὶ δενδρώδεις[88] καὶ διὰ τῶν λόγων κηλήσας ταύτης τῆς φήμης ἔτυχε.

23. Orpheus

It is said that Orpheus moved rocks and trees, beasts and birds.

Truly, one might say that he brought men, who were bestial and knew nothing of manners and laws, to a proper fear of the gods; that he summoned these stony, stolid, tree-like men to piety; that he bewitched them with his words; and that thus he gained his reputation.

Comment: Cf. Palaephatus 33, where, in contrast to Heraclitus' allegorical interpretation, we find the myth rationalized: Orpheus leads the Bacchants down from the hills by playing his lyre, but as they descend they hold θύρσοι in their hands, and so it appears that the wood is moving. Horace *Ars poetica* 391–93 offers an interpretation closer to Heraclitus 23: Orpheus caused the rude peasants of his day to stop their brutal behavior, and so the story arose that he had tamed wild beasts. For a straightforward version of the myth see Conon 45.3.

24. Περὶ Ἕλλης καὶ Φρίξου
Ἡνίκα τὴν Ἰνοῦς ἐπιβουλὴν
μητρυιᾶς οὔσης ἔφευγον Ἕλλη καὶ
Φρίξος, ὁ παιδαγωγός, ᾧ ἦν Κριὸς
ὄνομα, ἐπὶ πλοιαρίου μικροῦ
χειμῶνος ὄντος ἔφυγεν ἔχων αὐτούς.
καὶ συμβαίνει τὴν μὲν Ἕλλην
ἐκπεσεῖν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν (ὅθεν
ἐκλήθη Ἑλλήσποντος), τοῦ δὲ
Φρίξου σωθέντος ἐπιθυμητικῶς ἔχειν
τὸν Αἰήτην, τὸν δὲ Κριὸν διακω-
λύοντα καὶ πειρώμενον ἄφθορον
διατηρῆσαι τὸν Φρίξον, ἀποδαρῆναι
καὶ τὸ δέρμα αὐτοῦ προσπασσα-
λευθῆναι, χρυσοῦν δὲ προσαγορευ
θῆναι διὰ τὸ πιστότατον ⟨αὐτὸν⟩
γεγενῆσθαι.

24. Helle and Phrixus
When Helle and Phrixus were escaping the evil scheme of their step-mother Ino, their slave-attendant, whose name was Ram, fled with them on a small boat during a storm. As it happened Helle fell into the sea (which for that reason was called Hellespont); but Phrixus escaped destruction and became the object of Aeetes' lust. Ram interfered and tried to keep Phrixus from being defiled, but he was flayed and his skin was hung on a nail: they called it golden because Ram had kept to his trust.

Comment: There is here, as in Heraclitus 11, no explicit rendition of the traditional myth, which is assumed to be known: see Pherecydes 99 Fowler and Hecataeus 17 Fowler; in the latter, as in Apollonius Rhodius 1.257–58, the ram speaks to Phrixus. Cf. Palaephatus 30, where, as here, Ram is found as the name of a human being, but where *inter alia* the golden fleece is rationalized as a golden statue of a woman named Fleece (Κῶς). Palaephatus rejects the notion that Ram was flayed, but it will be found in Dionysius Scytobrachion *FGrHist* 32F14 (=Diodorus Siculus 4.47.5–6; see Jacoby 516; Rusten 21).

There is a nice shift from rationalization to allegory in the last sentence.

25. Περὶ Πανῶν καὶ Σατύρων
*** ἐν ὄρεσι καταγινόμενοι καὶ
γυναικῶν ἀπωτέρω ὄντες, ὅταν τις
παρεφάνη γυνή, κοινῶς αὐτῇ
ἐχρῶντο. [τράγων δὲ τρίχας καὶ
σκέλη ἐδόκουν ἔχειν διὰ τὴν περὶ τὰ
λουτρὰ ἀμέλειαν καὶ τὴν περὶ ταῦτα
δυσοσμίαν. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο Διονύσου
φίλοι· τὴν γὰρ ἐργασίαν τῶν ἀμπέλων
ἐποίουν.] καὶ νῦν δὲ ἔτι τὰς εἰς
πλῆθος γυναῖκας λέγομεν ὅτι
ἐπανεύομεν αὐτάς.

25. Pans and Satyrs
... living in the mountains far away from women; whenever a woman appeared, they would use her in common. [They seemed to have the hair and legs of goats because of their indifference to bathing and their consequent foul smell. And they were friends of Dionysus because they used to cultivate grape vines.[89]] Still today in the case of women who are available for a crowd we say: "we all did them—the way the Pans do."

Comment: The final quoted words translate the Greek ἐπανεύομεν; a double pun (we acted like the Pans; we All did them). The women are panned; here is the ancient Greek for "gang-bang" (πανεύω): see Borgeaud 75–76. See also Cameron for Pan, the son of Penelope and *all* the suitors: Thilo and Hagen 223 (to *Aeneid* 2.44) and Wendel 27–28 (Σ Theoc. 1.3/4c).

In Orphic theology Zeus was called "Pan" as διατάκτωρ of *all* things: Hellanicus *FGrHist* 4F87 (=202A Fowler).

For an extensive Stoic allegory of Pan see Cornutus 49.8–16, where *inter alia* Pan's lewdness is allegorized in terms of σπερματικοὶ λόγοι ("generative principles") and what arises from them by σύμμιξις ("commixture" or "intercourse"); similarly, Pan's pursuit of the (water)-nymphs is because of his pleasure in the "moist exhalations" from the earth, without which the cosmos could not arise (Hays, 98 and 165, citing the different etymology at *Homeric Hymn* 19.47).

---

26. Περὶ Ἀσκληπιοῦ
Λέγουσιν αὐτὸν κεκεραυνῶσθαι. εἴη δ' ἂν πιθανώτερον οὕτω. ἰατρικὴν κινήσας[90] καὶ ὑψώσας αὐτὸς ὑπὸ πυρετοῦ φλεχθεὶς ὤλετο. ὅθεν διὰ τὴν φλεγμονὴν αὐτὸν κεραυνωθῆναι λέγουσιν.

26. Asclepius
They say that Asclepius was struck by a thunderbolt.

The following would be more plausible: Asclepius was an innovator[91] in the art of medicine who brought it to new heights, but then himself died of a burning fever. It was on account of the fiery heat of the fever that people say he was struck by lightning.

Comment: To be struck by lightning is hardly impossible, nor does it seem to require rationalization or allegorical interpretation. I suspect that Heraclitus has omitted the critical detail: that Asclepius was thunderbolted *by Zeus* as a punishment for his defiance of natural law, i.e., raising the dead: see Pherecydes *FGrHist* 3F35a and Apollodorus 3.10.3.

See Cornutus 70.7: Asclepius' name is etymologized from ἀπόσκλησις, the "withering of death."

---

27. Περὶ τῆς τοῦ Ἅιδου κυνῆς
Ὅτι ὁ τὴν Ἅιδος κυνῆν, ὡς καὶ ὁ Περσεύς, περιθέμενος ἀόρατος ἐγίνετο. ἔστι δὲ κυνῆ Ἅιδος τὸ τέλος εἰς ὃ ἀπελθὼν ὁ τετελευτηκὼς ἀόρατος γίνεται.

27. The Helmet of Hades
[It is said] that whoever put on the helmet of Ades,[92] as Perseus did, became invisible.

But the helmet of Ades is the bourn to which the dead man[93] goes, where he can no longer be seen.

Comment: For the helmet of Hades, worn by Athene, Hermes, and Perseus, see *Iliad* 5.845; *Aspis* 226–27; Pherecydes *FGrHist* 3F11; Apollodorus 1.6.2, 2.4.2; additional sources will be found in *LSJ* s.v. κυνέη.

28. Περὶ Βορέου καὶ Ὠρειθυίας
Λέγεται ὅτι Βορέας Ὠρείθυιαν ἥρπασεν. ἦν δὲ βασιλεὺς τῶν τόπων ἐκείνων.

Ἡ δὲ αὐτὴ ὑπόληψις καὶ μέθοδος καὶ περὶ Διὸς καὶ Γανυμήδους. βασιλεύων γὰρ ⟨ὁ Ζεὺς⟩ ἁρπάζει τὸν Γανυμήδην, ἀετὸς γεν⟨έσθαι λεγ⟩όμενος, ὅτι καὶ τὸ ζῷον ἄλκιμον. ὁ δ᾿ αὐτὸς τρόπος καὶ περὶ Ἠοῦς καὶ Τιθωνοῦ, καὶ Ἀγχίσου καὶ Ἀφροδίτης.

28. Boreas and Oreithyia
It is said that Boreas abducted Oreithyia: Boreas, however, was merely the king of those regions.

The same assumption and method also apply for Zeus and Ganymedes: Zeus was a king who abducted Ganymedes—it was said that he turned into an eagle because the eagle is also a mighty animal.

Similarly, for Eos and Tithonus; and for Anchises and Aphrodite.

Comment: As it stands the only explanation for the text is outright euhemerism: Boreas and Zeus were not abductor gods, but powerful mortal kings (for Boreas euhemerized see Palaephatus 22); and so presumably Eos and Aphrodite were only powerful queens. There is nothing fantastical, therefore, in their stories, merely humans acting as humans will. In this regard compare Zeus in Heraclitus 34, where the same word, βασιλεύων, indicates the euhemerizing. Zeus, of course, had been euhemerized most notably by Euhemerus himself and also by Dionysius Scytobrachion *FGrHist* 32F7 (=Diodorus Siculus 3.61.1–6): for the latter there are in fact two mortal Zeuses, one the son of Cronos and one the brother of Ouranos.

For the myth of Boreas and Oreithyia see Acusilaus *FGrHist* 2F30, 31 and Apollonius Rhodius 1.211–18; and for an early rationalization of the myth, rejected by Socrates, see Plato *Phaedrus* 229b–e.

29. Περὶ Πρωτέως
Λέγεται ὅτι ἐγένετο ποτὲ μὲν ὕδωρ, ποτὲ δὲ πῦρ, δηλονότι τοῖς μὲν χρηστοῖς ὡς ὕδωρ, τοῖς δὲ πονηροῖς κατ᾿ ἀξίαν τιμωρητικός· ὅθεν ταύτην τὴν φήμην περὶ αὐτοῦ διέσπειραν.

29. Proteus
It is said that at one moment Proteus became water, at another fire.

Clearly, he was like water to the good, but vengeful to the wicked according to their deserts. And so people spread this story about him.

Comment: A simple allegorical explanation here, but for an extensive Stoic allegory of Proteus in terms of τὰ φυσικά see Heraclitus *Homeric Allegories* 66: the episode is said to signify the "passage du chaos au cosmos" (Buffière 1962: xvii; cf. 1956: 239) through a process of separation or metamorphosis. Proteus himself represents formless matter (ὕλη) which divides into multiple shapes, formed by Providence (Πρόνοια, who is allegorically Proteus' daughter Eidothea): the lion=αἰθήρ; the dragon=earth; the tree=ἀήρ, etc. (cf. *Odyssey* 4.456–58).

30. Περὶ τοῦ κυνὸς καὶ τῆς ἀλώπεκος
Τῷ μὲν κυνὶ τοῦ Κεφάλου δεδομένον εἶναί φασιν γέρας ὃ ἂν ἴδῃ θηρίον καταλαμβάνειν, τῇ δὲ ⟨Τευμησίᾳ⟩ ἀλώπεκι ὑπὸ μηδενὸς καταλαμβάνεσθαι. διώκοντος οὖν τοῦ κυνὸς τὴν ἀλώπεκα, ἵνα μὴ λυθῇ τὸ πεπρωμένον, τοὺς δύο λίθους ὁ Ζεὺς ἐποίησεν. εἴη δ' ἂν τὸ τοιοῦτον πλάσμα παρὰ τὴν αὐτῶν ἀμφοτέρων κατὰ τὸν διωγμὸν πλάνην.

30. The Dog and the Fox
They say that the gift was given to Cephalus' dog of catching any animal it saw; but to the [Teumesian] fox of never being caught by anything. And so when the dog was chasing the fox, Zeus turned them both to stone, so that what was fated would not be annulled.

Such a solution would be in keeping with[94] the motion of both in the chase.

Comment: Cf. Palaephatus 5, which does not mention the riddle of the dog fated to catch and the fox fated never to be caught but which does rationalize Fox as a clever rogue who plundered the outskirts of Thebes until he was slain by Cephalus (for both Dog and Fox rationalized as human beings see also Tzetzes *Chiliades* 1.553–72). For a straight-forward version of the myth see Antoninus Liberalis 41.10.

31. Περὶ τῶν Διομήδους ἵππων
Φασὶ ταύτας ἀνθρωποφάγους εἶναι. ἄγριαι δὲ ἦσαν νομάδες. οὐ δυναμένου δέ τινος αὐτὰς ὑφ' ἅρμα ζεῦξαι, ὁ Ἡρακλῆς ἔζευξεν.

31. The Mares of Diomedes
They say that Diomedes' mares were man-eaters.

They roamed wild—devouring pastures. No one was able to yoke them to a chariot, until Heracles did it.

Comment: Cf. Palaephatus 7, where Diomedes is a horse-breeder who squanders his whole estate on horses; these, therefore, were said by his friends to be "man-eaters" (see also Palaephatus 25).

But what is the point of Heraclitus' short-hand version? Presumably the story that the mares were "man-eaters" arose from a misunderstanding of the fact that they were "wild" or "savage" (ἄγριαι) and "devoured pastures" (νομάδες). For the former adjective compare its use in Heraclitus 17 (the Fire-

breathing Bulls). As for the second adjective, νομάδες, it appears capable of bearing a meaning of "feeding" (of animals the root νομ-/νεμ- has a usual sense of "graze" or "feed," e.g., *Odyssey* 9.449, *Homeric Hymn* 4.492; Herodotus 1.78.1). It is presumably from these meanings that the misunderstanding arose that the horses were "savage-feeders," i.e., man-eaters. For the last sentence, cf. Euripides *Heracles* 380–86: presumably the horses are tamed of their flesh-eating ways by being yoked to the chariot (see Gantz 396).

32. Περὶ Καλυψοῦς καὶ Ὀδυσσέως
Ἄλογον θνητὸν ὄντα Ὀδυσσέα αὐτὴν ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι ποιήσειν ἀθάνατον, ἀλλὰ τὸ τὰ πρὸς τροφὴν καὶ πρὸς βίου ἀπόλαυσιν ἄφθονα καὶ λαμπρὰ ἕξειν. ὅθεν καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὅταν που κλιθῶμεν καὶ λαμπρῶς εὐωχώμεθα, "ἐν θεοῖς" φαμεν γεγονέναι.

32. Calypso and Odysseus
That Calypso offered to make the mortal Odysseus immortal is contrary to reason.

It was rather that he would have a splendid abundance for sustenance and the enjoyment of life. That is why we too, when we lie on our couches for a splendid feast, say that we are "among the gods."

Comment: Compare Pseudo-Plutarch 136, where Odysseus' rejection of Calypso is said to epitomize the Stoic scorn of pleasure (ἡδονή).

33. Περὶ Κερβέρου
Τοῦτ' ἂν εἴη ὃ καὶ περὶ τῆς Ὕδρας. οὗτος γὰρ εἶχε δύο σκύμνους, ὧν ἀεὶ συμβαδιζόντων τῷ πατρὶ ἐφαίνετο εἶναι τρικέφαλος.

33. Cerberus
This would be the same as the case of the Hydra.[95] Cerberus had two whelps who always accompanied their father: thus he appeared to be three-headed.

Comment: Cf. Palaephatus 39, where three-headed Cerberus is rationalized as a dog from the city of Tricranium: i.e., a tricranite dog (similarly Geryon in Palaephatus 24). In Hecataeus *FGrHist* 1F27 Cerberus is rationalized as a terrible snake that dwelt at Taenarum and was called "the dog of Hades" because of its deadly bite (cf. Pausanias 3.25.4–5); Plutarch *Theseus* 31.4 (=Hellanicus 168a Fowler) identifies Cerberus as the family dog of a Molossian king named Aidoneus whose wife was named Persephone and daughter Kore (cf. Tzetzes *Chiliades* 2.406–10, 747–54). For a further rationalization see Servius on *Aeneid* 6.395.

See Heraclitus 21 for the remainder of the myth of Cerberus.

34. Περὶ Λαμίας
Ἱστοροῦσιν ὅτι, Διὸς αὐτῇ συμμιγέντος, Ἥρα ἀπεθηρίωσεν αὐτήν,

34. Lamia
It is recorded that after Zeus slept with Lamia Hera turned her into a beast; that

καὶ ὅτι ἡνίκα ἂν μανῇ, τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐξαιρεῖ καὶ εἰς κοτύλην βάλλει, καὶ ὅτι σαρκοφαγεῖ καὶ ἀνθρώπους ἐσθίει. εἴη δ' ἂν τάδε. καλῇ αὐτῇ οὔσῃ ὁ Ζεὺς ἐπλησίασε βασιλεύων, Ἥρα δὲ συναρπάζουσα αὐτήν, τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐξώρυξε καὶ εἰς τὰ ὄρη ἔρριψεν· ὅθεν ἐπιπόνως ἔζη ἐπικουρουμένη δὲ οὐδέν· ⟨διὰ δὲ τὸ⟩ ὑπὸ ταῖς ἐρημίαις καταγινομένην αὐτὴν ἄλουτον καὶ ἀθεράπευτον εἶναι, ἐδόκει θηρίον ὑπάρχειν.

whenever the madness comes over her, Lamia takes out her eyes and puts them in a cup;[96] and that she eats flesh and devours people.

But here is how it was: Zeus was a king[97] who slept with the beautiful Lamia. Hera seized her, gouged out her eyes, and cast her into the mountains. There she lived a life of suffering with no one to help her. [And because] she dwelt in the wilderness and was unwashed and uncared for, she seemed to be a wild animal.

Comment: For the story of Lamia see Duris *FGrHist* 76F17; Diodorus Siculus 20.41.3–6; Plutarch *Moralia* 515F; Σ Ar. *Pax* 758; and Σ Theoc. 15.40c: Lamia has children by Zeus who are destroyed by the jealous Hera; in envy of other women Lamia turns bestial and orders that their children be taken from them and slain. She was said to be able to remove her eyes and place them in a jar while she slept; but then she replaces the eyes and goes abroad again. The story is rationalized by Diodorus: it is not that Lamia removed her eyes but that she would on occasion become drunk, so people started the story that she could not see—that she had thrown her eyes into a [wine]-jar. See further Fontenrose 100–104 with additional sources in n. 17. (For the parallel to Lilith see Trachtenberg 36–37; compare also Saint Lucy, who plucked out her eyes and sent them to her fiancé on a plate.)

For "unwashed" compare the rationalization in 25 (the Pans).

35. Περὶ Πρόκνης καὶ Φιλομήλας ⟨καὶ Τηρέως⟩
Ἱστοροῦνται ὄρνιθες γενέσθαι, ἡ μὲν χελιδών, ἡ δὲ ἀηδών, ὁ δὲ ἔποψ. τοῦτο δ' ἂν ἔχοι οὕτως. ἀποκτείνασαι τὸν Ἴτυν καὶ πορθήσασαι τὸν οἶκον, εἴς τι πλοιάριον ἐμβᾶσαι ταχεῖαν τὴν φυγὴν ἐποιήσαντο. ὁ δὲ Τηρεύς, ἐπεὶ διώξας οὐ κατέλαβεν αὐτάς, αὐτὸν ἀναιρεῖ. ὅθεν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὐ φαινομένων αὐτῶν, διὰ τὸ ἐξαίφνης ἀφανεῖς γενέσθαι εἶπον ὅτι ἀπωρνιθώθησαν.

35. Procne, Philomela, [and Tereus]
It is recorded that these three turned into birds: Procne, a swallow; Philomela, a nightingale; and Tereus, a hoopoe.

But here is how it was. Procne and Philomela killed Itys and laid waste their home. They then embarked on a small boat and made a speedy escape. Tereus pursued them but failed to catch them, and so he killed himself. All three had vanished, and because of their sudden disappearance people said that they had been turned into birds.[98]

Comment: Heraclitus follows the later Roman version in which Procne becomes the swallow and Philomela the nightingale (see Gantz 241 and compare, for example, Conon 31; for additional references see Brown 223); this is perhaps an indication of Heraclitus' later date.

Lightfoot 230–31 comments on the "rationalized ending of the Tereus story in Ps.-Heraclitus περὶ Ἀπίστων 35, where the cannibal Tereus kills himself but does not undergo a metamorphosis."

36. Περὶ τῶν Ἡλιάδων

Ταύτας φασὶν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων αἰγείρους γενέσθαι. οὐ τοῦτο δέ, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ πάθος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ εἰς τὸν Ἠριδανὸν αὐτὰς ἔβαλον. διὸ οἱ ζητοῦντες, ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμὸν παραγενόμενοι καὶ τὰς μὲν οὐχ εὑρόντες, τρία δὲ στελέχη αἰγείρων, ὑπέλαβον αὐτὰς ἀποδενδρωθῆναι. [ὄνομα δὲ αὐταῖς Φοίβη, Λαμπετώ, Αἴγλη.]

36. The Daughters of the Sun

They say that the daughters of Helios were turned from women into poplars.

Not so; it was rather that they threw themselves into the river Eridanus because of their brother's misfortune.[99] The people who were looking for them arrived at the river but did not find them. Instead, they found three poplar trunks, and so they assumed that the sisters had been turned into trees. [Their names were Phoebe, Lampeto, and Aegle.[100]]

Comment: See Forbes Irving 269–71 for sources and a discussion of this familiar myth.

37. Περὶ Πανόπτου

Τοῦτον πάντα βουλόμενον ἀκούειν καὶ ὁρᾶν ἐν παντὶ τῷ σώματι ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχειν ἐπλάσαντο. ὅθεν ἔτι καὶ νῦν τοὺς τοιούτους πανόπτας καλοῦμεν.

37. Panoptes

Because he wished to hear[101] and to see everything, people imagined Panoptes with eyes all over his body. That is why still today we call such people[102] "panoptic."

Comment: Panoptes is Argos, the multi-eyed guard of Io slain by Hermes (Aeschylus *Suppliants* 304; Euripides *Phoenissae* 1115; Apollodorus 2.1.2). Charax *FGrHist* 103F13=Westermann 324–25 rationalizes Argos as a human guard slain by a euhemerized Hermes. At Argos' death the peacock arose: Moschus 2.58–59; Ovid *Metamorphoses* 1.722–23 (see further Forbes Irving 255–56).

38. Περὶ Ἐνδυμίωνος καὶ Σελήνης
Λέγεται ὅτι καθεύδοντος αὐτοῦ
Σελήνη ἐρασθεῖσα καταβᾶσα ἐμίγη
αὐτῷ. εἴη δ᾽ ἂν ὁ μὲν Ἐνδυμίων
ποιμὴν ἄπειρος γυναικός, ἐπιθυ-
μητικῶς δὲ σχοῦσα γυνὴ αὐτοῦ
***ἐρωτηθεὶς[103] δὲ παρά τινος τίς εἴη,
ἔφη "Σελήνη."

38. Endymion and Selene
It is said that while Endymion slept
Selene fell in love with him and that she
descended and lay with him.

Endymion, however, would likely be
a shepherd who had no experience of a
woman. So when a woman conceived a
passion for him (*sc.* ... as he slept), and
thereafter he was asked by someone
who she was, he said "(*sc.* It must have
been) the Moon!"[104]

Comment: The myth of Endymion is variously rationalized and allegorized
(see especially Σ Ap. Rhod. 4.57 quoted in full at Wendel 132): (1) Endymion
was a meteorologist, a πρῶτος εὑρετής, who studied the phases and motions
of the moon; as a result he spent his nights awake and rested during the day,
so that people thought he was constantly asleep; (2) Endymion was a hunter
who hunted during the night when the animals came out to their pastures—
with the same result as above; (3) Endymion was simply lazy—hence the
proverbial "sleep of Endymion" for those who act so carelessly that they seem
to be asleep. In addition, and most outlandishly: "Die Liebe der Mondgöttin
zum Hirten bedeute die Förderung des Wachstums der Kräuter durch den
von den Monddünsten erzeugten Nachttau" (Roscher 1.1.1248). See also Σ
Theoc. 3.49 (citing Nicander); Acusilaus 36 Fowler; Pliny *Nat.* 2.43; Fulgentius
Myth. 2.16; Anonymous περὶ Ἀπίστων (Westermann 324.XII, XIII [citing
Plato]); and Lucian *DDeor* 19 (cited in Gantz 35).

39. Περὶ τῶν Ἡλίου βοῶν
Περὶ τούτων οὕτως εὗρον ἠλληγο-
ρημένον ἐν Ἰλιάδι. οὐκ ἐξῆν τοῖς
ἀρχαίοις ἱεροθυτεῖν βοῦς ἐργάτας.
καὶ τοῦτο φησὶ μὲν καὶ Ἄρατος,
δῆλον δὲ καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς ποιήσεως.
φησὶ γὰρ Ἑκάβη πρὸς Ἀθηνᾶν·
  σοὶ δ᾽ αὖ ἐγὼ ῥέξω βοῦν ἦνιν
    εὐρυμέτωπον
  ἀδμήτην ἣν οὔπω ὑπὸ ζυγὸν
    ἤγαγεν ἀνήρ.
οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἡλίου βόας
τούτους ἐκάλουν ὡς τὴν γῆν
ἐργαζομένους καὶ ἡμᾶς τρέφοντας. οἱ
δὲ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως ἑταῖροι οὐχ Ἡλίου

39. The Cattle of the Sun
I discovered in the *Iliad*[105] the follow-
ing allegorical interpretation of the
Cattle of the Sun. Among people of old
it was not allowed to sacrifice cattle that
had worked in the fields. The poet
Aratus[106] confirms this, and it is also
clear from the *Iliad*, where Hecabe says
to Athene:
  I will sacrifice to you a wide-browed
    yearling cow
  Unbroken, which no man has led be-
    neath the yoke.
Furthermore, people used to call
them "cattle of the sun"[107] because they

βοῦς, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐργάτας θοινηθέντες σφῆισιν ἀτασθαλίηισιν ὑπὲρ μόρον ἄλγε᾽ ἐπέσπον.

worked the earth and sustained us. So in the case of the comrades of Odysseus, it was not because they feasted on the Cattle of the Sun-god, but because they sacrificed and feasted on cattle that had worked that "by their own reckless deeds they encountered grief beyond their lot."[108]

Comments: Heraclitus 39 has a number of special attributes: (1) the first person singular verb in the first sentence (though this has a parallel in the first person plural verb in 6); (2) the citing of a work of literature, the *Iliad*, by its name; (3) the citing of Aratus without a quotation; (4) the unique use of the verb ἀλληγορέω. These are perhaps enough to suggest that Heraclitus 39 might have been interpolated into the text from some other source.

Aristotle famously allegorizes the 350 Cattle of the Sun as the days of the year (fr. 157R; see Buffière 1956: 243–45; Benardete 36). To Pseudo-Plutarch 120 the eating of the Cattle of the Sun by the companions of Odysseus demonstrates that "the responsibility not to commit the crime was theirs, but their being destroyed if they did was a consequence of fate" (Keaney and Lamberton 191). To Heraclitus *Homeric Allegories* 70.12 the Cattle of the Sun allegorically represent "mastery over the belly."

---

[58] Both author and title are given at the end of the manuscript; see Festa's *apparatus* to item 39.

[59] "La guérison des mythes qui présentent des phénomènes contre nature" (Buffière 1956: 232 and 1962: viii); "Behandlung der naturwidrigen Mythen" (Nestle 151).

[60] For the familiar myth see Pherecydes *FGrHist* 3F11 and compare Conon 40, where Perseus "petrifies" (i.e., "frightens") the crew of the ship, which is named Κῆτος ("sea-monster")—an alternate rationalization of the power of Medusa's head.

[61] Lit. "devoured." The pun is an active part of the rationalization in items 2 and 8 (since Scylla and the Harpies actually "devour"), but here and in item 14 it is a dead metaphor: there is no "eating" in the myths of Medusa and the Sirens.

[62] Thus Pegasus is rationalized; ἵππος is used of a lewd woman (Aelian *NA* 4.11); cf. examples cited by Henderson 165: e.g., ἱππόπορνος. ἱππο- as a prefix can mean "coarse," as it does in English: horse-radish, horse-chestnut, etc.

[63] Heraclitus has, after his fashion, rationalized the petrification, the beheading, and the horse. I suspect that ἄνθος is meant in some way to explain the remaining notable item: that the horse is "winged."

[64] Rationalizes the dogs which encircle Scylla, even though these have not been specifically mentioned by Heraclitus.

[65] See note 61. Here, as in item 8, the pun rationalizes the detail of the myth.

[66] ξένος is apparently the term for the hetaira's "john" either in ritual or ordinary life: cf. Heraclitus 16. I have collected examples in *Eranos* 87 (1989) 18, nn. 19 and 20.

[67] "Poseidon" is taken by Festa as referring in this second instance to a human not the god because of the absence of the anaphoric article (Festa rejects Westermann's text, in which the article τοῦ was inserted to link the two occurrences of the name). See the discussion of euhemerism in section G of the Introduction and compare Hermes in Heraclitus 9.

[68] "Because" might seem a more likely translation, but the sense, I believe, is not as good.

[69] Festa identifies the lacuna and fills it thus.

[70] Or "genitals" (cf. Antoninus Liberalis 41.5).

[71] "Impossible to consummate" translates ἀκοινωνήτου, a verbal adjective in -τος: "not able to be united."

[72] "Snatch" (ἁρπαζούσας) employs the familiar pun on the Harpies' name; see, e.g., Apollonius Rhodius 2.189.

[73] See notes 61 and 65.

[74] Wings emphasize speed; see the Comment on item 8. For the myth of the winged sandals see Pherecydes *FGrHist* 3F11.

[75] Word-play ("eyesight … foresee") is the basis of this elegant bit of allegory which explains the detail it hardly needs to specify: the Cyclops' single eye is the reason he has "only one mode of perception."

[76] In Hesiod *Theogony* 273 the names of the Graeae are given as Pemphredo and Enyo; Pherecydes *FGrHist* 3F11 adds Deino, for which Perso ("Destroyer") is presumably an alternative. But the last sentence, if it belongs, confuses the Graeae with the Hesperides (cf. Heraclitus 20; Gantz 19). For the full story of the Graeae see Pherecydes (cited above).

[77] The Sirens, it is said, died when they failed to bewitch Odysseus (Epimenides 8 Fowler).

[78] See notes 61 and 65; here also the metaphor is dead since the Sirens do not, like the Harpies (8) and Scylla (2), "devour."

[79] As in 8, 9, and 35 swift motion rationalizes a bird or wing in the myth.

[80] *Iliad* 6.181 (also interpolated in Hesiod *Theogony* 323).

[81] Compare Heraclitus 8 for the formulaic opening words.

[82] See note 66.

[83] A unique internal reference, which emphasizes for us the number of items in Heraclitus from the myth of Odysseus: see 2, 11, 14, 16, 29, 32, 39.

[84] Note that here speed is likened to fire; cf. note 79.

[85] Compare item 33.

[86] The same expression (πολυκέφαλον θηρίον "a many-headed beast") occurs at Plato, *Republic* 588c, in a context which refers to Chimaera, Scylla, and Cerberus.

[87] The Spartoi are commonly explained as the "sown" people, from Cadmus' "sowing" of the dragon's teeth. Heraclitus rationalizes via the other sense of the verb σπείρειν, "to scatter." In this he is not alone: cf. Palaephatus 3; Androtion *FGrHist* 324F60a–b; Diodorus Siculus 19.53.4. In Conon 37 the Spartoi are rationalized as Phoenician warriors whose unfamiliar armor and style of fighting from ambush terrified the local Boeotians; these said that the Phoenicians appeared to have sprouted from the earth.

[88] Festa's excellent emendation for θηριώδεις.

[89] The rationalizing words inside the brackets, in Festa's opinion, are from a marginal note which worked its way into the text. Note the similar explanation for the "unwashed" Lamia in item 34. Borgeaud (222 n. 18) suggests "a certain amount of dirt was perhaps thought to have a good effect on the quality of the wine when the grapes were trodden out with bare feet."

[90] Festa's elegant emendation for νικήσας; Westermann's ἀσκήσας would mean "practitioner."

[91] See Epimenides 4.74 Fowler=Diodorus Siculus 5.74.6, according to whom Asclepius advanced the art of medicine to the point where he is honored as its "originator and founder."

[92] The rough breathing of the title ("Hades") disappears in the two appearances of the word in the text, no doubt so that the pun on "unseen" (ἀόρατος=ἀ-ἴδές) will be more obvious: this exact explanation will be found in Cornutus 5.2–4 (see Dawson 33) and Heraclitus *Homeric Allegories* 23.11.

[93] "The bourn … the dead man" (τὸ τέλος … ὁ τετελευτηκώς) is a second obvious pun: see Plato *Phaedo* 80d, cited by Festa.

[94] For "in keeping with" (παρά) Prof. Donald J. Mastronarde suggests "along the lines of." "In violation of" would also be possible, but the sense does not seem as good.

[95] See item 18.

[96] As Plutarch and Diodorus (cited below) show, the cup (or jar or flask) was part of the myth, but it is not impossible that Heraclitus here is rationalizing the cup as the hollow valley of the mountains in which Lamia wandered. There is perhaps even a further pun in ὄρη ("mountains") and ὁράω ("see").

[97] An outright case of euhemerizing (see the Comment on 28). It is not the god, but a mortal king of that name who is in question here. The same word, βασιλεύων, as in Heraclitus 28 indicates that the euhemerizing has occurred.

[98] For mythological birds (or wings) allegorically interpreted as speed or quickness compare Heraclitus 8, 9, and 14.

[99] Their brother was Phaethon (see 22 and cf. Pseudo-Palaephatus 52).

[100] Festa brackets the sentence, though the names of the Heliades in Hyginus 154 include Aegle, Lampetie, and Phoebe.

[101] But of course Argos did not have *ears* all over his body!

[102] Presumably overly-inquisitive busy-bodies, who well might be said to wish to see *and* hear everything. But note that πανόπτης is also an epithet of Zeus and Helios (*LSJ* s.v.).

[103] I accept Festa's suggestion of the masculine participle, ἐρωτηθείς, which seems to me to make better sense than the manuscript's feminine. Festa, I believe, is also correct to place a lacuna before the word. I take it that the sense was as follows (and I have in my translation added the words in parentheses to indicate as much): the shepherd Endymion had no experience with women; but a woman makes love to him while he sleeps; he then awakens and, when asked who she was, naively responds "It must have been the Moon."

[104] The moon, of course, is a regular symbol of passionate love (see, e.g., Theocritus *Idyll* 2): but if there was here some more precise play on words or rationalization of

Endymion's sleeping or his statement, it seems to have been lost in the lacuna. At least one possibility is that the Moon was more explicitly euhemerized than appears in the available text (for Selene euhemerized see Diodorus Siculus 3.57).

[105] Westermann, following Gale and followed by Festa, remarks "immo *Odysseia*," but Heraclitus is not claiming that the episode of the Cattle of the Sun is from the *Iliad*; he is asserting that he found the key to understanding the episode in lines from the *Iliad*, which he then proceeds to quote. It is true that in quoting these lines he incorrectly identifies them as coming from the famous scene in *Iliad* 6.274–75=308–9, whereas in fact the lines are not delivered by Hecabe, but by Diomedes at 10.292– 93=*Odyssey* 3.382–83. But this is a minor error in comparison to the whopper Heraclitus is accused of by his editors.

[106] Festa, following Westermann, cites *Phaenomena* 132, although the line does not seem exactly to the point. Aratus was a particularly popular author in the first centuries A.D., being translated into Latin by Cicero, Germanicus, and Avienius: see Sale 160–64. Perhaps there is a hint here at the date of Heraclitus.

[107] Or we might say "cattle who worked each day during the sun-light." I have tried by changing from upper to lower case letters to indicate the basis of the allegory here: that it was not the cattle of the Sun-god, *Helios*, but the cattle who had worked during the daylight that the companions of Odysseus inappropriately sacrificed and ate. The ordinary noun is confused with the god of the same name. (We might compare the double-spelling of ταῦρος in 7.) For a counter-case, an instance where the sacrifice of βοῦς ἐργάτας is allowable, see Pausanias 9.12.1.

[108] *Odyssey* 1.34, where the final verb in modern texts is ἔχουσιν.

WORKS CITED

Benardete, S. 1997. *The Bow and the Lyre.* Lanham, Md.

Bietenholz, P. 1994. *Historia and Fabula.* Leiden.

Bolle, K.W. 1970. "In Defense of Euhemerus." In J. Puhvel, ed., *Myth and Law among the Indo-Europeans.* Berkeley. 19–38.

Borgeaud, P. 1988. *The Cult of Pan in Ancient Greece.* Trans. K. Atlass and J. Redfield. Chicago.

Bremmer, J., ed. 1987. *Interpretations of Greek Mythology.* London.

Brisson, L. 1976. *Le mythe de Tirésias.* Leiden.

Brown, M. 2002. *The Narratives of Konon: Text, Translation and Commentary of the Diegeseis.* Leipzig.

Buffière, F. 1956. *Les mythes d'Homère et la pensée grecque.* Paris.

———, ed. 1962. *Héraclite, Allégories d'Homère.* Paris.

Butts, J. 1987. *The 'Progymnasmata' of Theon: A New Text with Translation and Commentary.* Ph.D. dissertation. Claremont Graduate School.

Cameron, A. (forthcoming). *Greek Mythography in the Roman World.*

Celoria, F. 1992. *The Metamorphoses of Antoninus Liberalis: A Translation with a Commentary.* London.

Dawson, D. 1992. *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria.* Berkeley.

Decharme, P. 1904. *La critique des traditions religieuses chez les grecs.* Paris.

Detienne, M. 1979. *Dionysos Slain*. Trans. M. Muellner and L. Muellner. Baltimore.

Dietz, D. 1995. "*Historia* in the Commentary of Servius." *TAPA* 125: 61–97.

Dowden, K. 1992. *The Uses of Greek Mythology*. London.

Festa, N. 1897. "Nuove osservazioni sopra l'opuscolo di Palefato περὶ Ἀπίστων." *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica* 4: 225–56.

———, ed. 1902. *Mythographi Graeci III.II: Palaephati* περὶ Ἀπίστων, *Heracliti qui fertur libellus* περὶ Ἀπίστων, *Excerpta vaticana (vulgo anonymus De incredibilibus)*. Leipzig.

Fontenrose, J. E. 1980 (original publication 1959). *Python: A Study of Delphic Myth and Its Origins*. Berkeley.

Forbes Irving, P. 1990. *Metamorphosis in Greek Myths*. Oxford.

Fowler, R. 1996. "Herodotos and his Contemporaries." *JHS* 116: 62–87.

———, ed. 2000. *Early Greek Mythography, Volume 1: Text and Introduction*. Oxford.

Gale, T., ed. 1671–70. *Opuscula mythologica ethica et physica*. Cambridge (reissued Amsterdam, 1688).

Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth*. Baltimore.

Geffcken, J. 1912. "Euhemerism." In *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*. Edinburgh.

Grant, R. 1952. *Miracle and Natural Law*. Amsterdam.

Grube, G. M. A. 1965. *The Greek and Roman Critics*. London.

Häussler, R. 1984. "Grundzüge antiker Mythographie." In W. Killy, ed., *Mythographie der frühen Neuzeit*. Wiesbaden. 1–23.

Hays, R. 1983. *Lucius Annaeus Cornutus'* Epidrome *(Introduction to the Traditions of Greek Theology): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Texas.

Henderson, J. 1975. *The Maculate Muse*. New Haven.

Henrichs, A. 1975. "Democritus and Prodicus on Religion." *HSCP* 79: 93–123.

———. 1987. "Three Approaches to Greek Mythography." In Bremmer (listed above). 242–77.

Hercher, R. 1867. "Miscellen: De Incredibilibus." *Hermes* 2: 150–51.

———. 1877. "Zu griechischen Prosaikern." *Hermes* 12: 148–50.

Heubeck, A., and A. Hoekstra, eds. 1989. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey, Volume II, Books IX–XVI*. Oxford.

Hopkinson, N., ed. 1988. *A Hellenistic Anthology*. Cambridge.

Jacoby, F., ed. 1923–. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Berlin.

Keaney, J. J., and R. Lamberton, eds. 1996. [*Plutarch*], *Essay on the Life and Poetry of Homer*. Atlanta.

Kennedy, G. 1983. *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors*. Princeton.

Kiessling, Th., ed. 1963 (original publication 1826). *Ioannis Tzetzae Historiarum Variarum Chiliades*. Hildesheim.

Lamberton, R. 1986. *Homer the Theologian*. Berkeley.

Lang, C., ed. 1881. *Cornutus*. Theologiae Graecae compendium. Leipzig.

Lausberg, H. 1998. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Trans. M. T. Bliss, A. Jansen, and D. E. Orton. Leiden.

Lightfoot, J., ed. 1999. *Parthenius of Nicaea*. Oxford.

Long, A. 1992. "Stoic Readings of Homer." In R. Lamberton and J. J. Keaney, eds., *Homer's Ancient Readers*. Princeton. 41–66.

Mercati, J., and P. Franchi De' Cavalieri, eds. 1923. *Codices Vaticani Graeci, Tomus 1*. Rome.

Nadeau, R. 1952. "The *Progymnasmata* of Aphthonius in Translation." *Speech Monographs* 19: 264–85.

Nash, H. 1984. "The Centaur's Origin: A Psychological Perspective." *CW* 77: 273–91.

Nestle, W. 1940. *Vom Mythos zum Logos.* Stuttgart.

Papathomopoulos, M., ed. 1968. *Antoninus Liberalis: Les Métamorphoses.* Paris.

Pease, A. S., ed. 1955. *M. Tulli Ciceronis de natura deorum liber primus. Libri secundus et tertius.* 1958. Cambridge, Mass.

Pépin, J. 1976. *Mythe et allégorie.* Paris.

Pfeiffer, R. 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship.* Oxford.

Rabe, H., ed. 1969 (original publication 1913). *Hermogenis opera.* Leipzig.

Rollinson, P. 1981. *Classical Theories of Allegory and Christian Culture.* Pittsburgh.

Roscher, W. H. 1884–1937. *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie.* 6 vols. in 9. Leipzig.

Russell, D. A. 1981. *Criticism in Antiquity.* Berkeley.

Rusten, J. 1982. *Dionysius Scytobrachion.* Opladen.

Sale, W. 1965–66. "The Popularity of Aratus." *CJ* 61: 160–64.

Sergent, B. 1986. *Homosexuality in Greek Myth.* Trans. A. Goldhammer. Boston.

Spengel, L., ed. 1854. *Rhetores Graeci, Vol. 2.* Leipzig.

Stallbaum, G., ed. 1960 (original publication 1825–26). *Eustathii ... commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam.* 2 vols. in 1. Hildesheim.

Stern, J. 1989. "Demythologization in Herodotus 5.92.η." *Eranos* 87: 13–20.

———. 1996. *Palaephatus, Peri Apiston: On Unbelievable Tales.* Wauconda, Ill.

Tate, J. 1929–30. "Plato and Allegorical Interpretation." *CQ* 23: 142–54 and 24: 1–10.

———. 1934. "On the History of Allegorism." *CQ* 28: 105–14.

Thilo, G., and H. Hagen, eds. 1961 (original publication 1881). *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii, Vol. 1.* Hildesheim.

Trachtenberg, J. 1939. *Jewish Magic and Superstition.* New York.

Veyne, P. 1988. *Did the Greeks Believe in Their Myths?* Trans. P. Wissing. Chicago.

Wendel, C., ed. 1914. *Scholia in Theocritum vetera.* Leipzig.

Westermann, A., ed. 1843. *Mythographoi: Scriptores poeticae historiae Graeci.* Braunschweig.

Whitman, J. 1987. *Allegory: The Dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval Technique.* Cambridge, Mass.

Wilson, N. G. 1983. *Scholars of Byzantium.* Baltimore.

Wipprecht, F. 1902. *Zur Entwicklung der rationalistischen Mythendeutung.* Tübingen.

Zeller, E. 1879. *The Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics.* Trans. O. J. Reichel. New York.