

Host or Parasite?

Trends in Classics – Supplementary Volumes



Edited by

Franco Montanari and Antonios Rengakos

Associate Editors

Stavros Frangoulidis · Fausto Montana · Lara Pagani

Serena Perrone · Evina Sistakou · Christos Tsagalis

Scientific Committee

Alberto Bernabé · Margarethe Billerbeck

Claude Calame · Jonas Grethlein · Philip R. Hardie

Stephen J. Harrison · Richard Hunter · Christina Kraus

Giuseppe Mastromarco · Gregory Nagy

Theodore D. Papanghelis · Giusto Picone

Tim Whitmarsh · Bernhard Zimmermann

Volume 92

Host or Parasite?

Mythographers and their Contemporaries in the
Classical and Hellenistic Periods

Edited by
Allen J. Romano and John Marincola

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-067279-4
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-067282-4
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-067285-5
ISSN 1868-4785

Library of Congress Control Number: 2019948523

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2019 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston
Editorial Office: Alessia Ferreccio and Katerina Zianna
Logo: Christopher Schneider, Laufen
Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

www.degruyter.com

Preface

This volume collects written versions of five of the papers delivered at the conference ‘Host or Parasite?’ held in February 2015 at Florida State University in Tallahassee. Since two of the speakers were unable to contribute to the printed volume, we solicited two additional papers to round out the offerings.

We are grateful to the Langford Endowment of the Classics Department at Florida State for the ability to hold the conference, and to the members and staff of the Department for their assistance in making the meeting a success. We thank Alex Lee, currently a graduate student in the Department, who served as our editorial assistant and supervised the compilation of the Bibliography, the Index Locorum, and the Index of Names and Subjects.

We are grateful to the editors of the *Trends in Classics Supplements* series, Franco Montanari and Antonios Rengakos, for their encouragement and for their acceptance of the volume into the series.

Allen J. Romano
John Marincola
Tallahassee, May 2019

Contents

Preface — V

Abbreviations — IX

John Marincola and Allen J. Romano

Introduction — 1

Andrew Ford

Mythographic Discourse among Non-Mythographers:

Pindar, Plato and Callimachus — 5

Robert Fowler

Myth(ography), History and the Peripatos — 29

René Nünlist

Questions of Mythology as seen through the Eyes of a Hellenistic Critic — 53

John Marincola

Diodorus the Mythographer? — 75

Jessica Wissmann

Does Mythography Care about Good or Bad? — 95

Ken Dowden

Vergil the Mythographer — 113

Greta Hawes

The Mythographical Topography of Pausanias' *Periegesis* — 135

Bibliography — 153

About the Contributors — 165

Index Locorum — 167

Index of Names and Subjects — 181

Abbreviations

<i>BNJ</i>	I. Worthington (ed.), <i>Brill's New Jacoby</i> , online publication.
<i>BNJ</i> ²	I. Worthington (ed.), <i>Brill's New Jacoby</i> , second edition, online publication.
<i>CA</i>	J.E. Powell (ed.), <i>Collectanea Alexandrina: reliquiae minores poetarum Graecorum aetatis Ptolemaicae 323–146 A.C.</i> (Oxford, 1925).
<i>CAF</i>	T. Kock (ed.), <i>Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta</i> , 3 vols (Leipzig, 1880–1888).
<i>EGM</i>	R.L. Fowler (ed.), <i>Early Greek Mythography</i> , 2 vols (Oxford 2000, 2013); fragments are cited by Fowler's number in volume 1; prefatory or commentary material is cited by volume ('I', 'II') and page number.
<i>FGrHist</i>	F. Jacoby <i>et al.</i> (eds.), <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , 3 vols in 15 parts (Berlin/Leiden, 1923–1958; Leiden, 1994–).
<i>FRHist</i>	T.J. Cornell (ed.), <i>The Fragments of the Roman Historians</i> , 3 vols (Oxford, 2013).
<i>FHG</i>	C. Müller (ed.), <i>Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum</i> , 4 vols (Paris, 1878–1885).
<i>HRR</i>	H. Peter (ed.), <i>Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae</i> , 2 vols (Stuttgart, 1914 ² , 1906).
<i>IEG</i> ²	M.L. West (ed.), <i>Iambi et Elegi Graeci</i> , 2nd edition, 2 vols (Oxford, 1989–1992).
<i>LCL</i>	Loeb Classical Library.
<i>PCG</i>	R. Kassel and C. Austin (eds.), <i>Poetae Comici Graeci</i> , 8 vols to date (Berlin and New York, 1983–).
<i>PMG</i>	D.L. Page (ed.), <i>Poetae Melici Graeci</i> (Oxford, 1962).
<i>PMGF</i>	M. Davies (ed.), <i>Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> (Oxford, 1991).
<i>TrGF</i>	B. Snell, S. Radt, and R. Kannicht (eds.), <i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> , 5 vols in 6 (Göttingen, 1981–2004).

John Marincola and Allen J. Romano

Introduction

The last several decades have seen a remarkable flourishing in the study of mythography in the Greco-Roman world. New editions of or new commentaries on mythographic authors began to appear already in the 1980s, with more following in successive decades, and culminating in Robert Fowler's magisterial collection of the early Greek mythographers, completed in 2013.¹ During this same period, there have been new English translations,² overviews of the genre and its practitioners,³ surveys of the ever-increasing bibliography,⁴ and a series of studies that have sought to give more attention to the contextualisation of individual mythographers as well as to the various methodologies which they employed.⁵ All these studies have helped to show that mythography, far from being an arid or superficial genre, was alive with scholarship and intellectual debate.

The protean status of myth in antiquity perhaps determined that mythography also would have a protean form. Indeed, although most of the mythographical works from antiquity are lost, we can nonetheless see a remarkable variety of approaches and interests even in the works that do survive or are summarised for us. The 'survey' approach of pseudo-Apollodorus' *Library*,⁶ though perhaps the best known, is only one manifestation of mythographical study in antiquity. Other approaches, such as thematic collections—those of 'Eratosthenes', for example, on catasterisms, or Parthenius on love stories, or Antoninus Liberalis on metamorphoses—also feature prominently in the genre. Dionysius Scytobrachion, Palaephatus, and Euhemerus offered rationalising guides to myth, sometimes violently altering the stories so as to make them congruent with the human world of today.⁷ There were, of course, mythographic commentaries on particular authors (perhaps the best known being the *Mythographus Homericus* on the most

1 E.g., Dionysius Scytobrachion: Rusten 1982a; Palaephatus: Stern 1996; Parthenius: Lightfoot 1999; Conon: Brown 2002; 'Eratosthenes': Pàmias i Massana/Zucker 2013; Antoninus Liberalis: Papathomopoulos 2002; Heraclitus: Stern 2003.

2 E.g., Condos 1997; Smith/Trzaskoma 2007.

3 Pellizer 1993; Higbie 2007; Meliadò 2015; Trzaskoma 2017.

4 Particularly valuable is Smith/Trzaskoma 2013, in the Oxford Bibliographies Online series; for Apollodorus see the on-line bibliography maintained by Marc Huys.

5 Henrichs 1987 is rightly praised as seminal; see also Henrichs 1999; Cameron 2004; Fowler 2006, 2011, and *EGM II*, *passim*.

6 And to a lesser extent from Hyginus and the Vatican mythographer.

7 On rationalisation see Buxton 1999; Winiarczyk 2002; Hawes 2014a.

important poet of all) or genres (e.g., Asclepiades of Tragilos' *Stories from Tragedy*).⁸

The present volume, building on these previous studies, seeks to continue and deepen the aspects of engagement with myth that was characteristic of the Greco-Roman intellectual world by looking at the ways in which mythography interacted with other genres, or, from the opposite point of view, how writers who were not mythographers engaged with and used the elements and methods of myth and mythography in their own work. The dichotomy 'host or parasite' refers to the different ways in which mythography could appear or be implemented in classical texts. Looked at from one point of view, mythography quarries from existing texts to create its own approach, i.e., its own genre; it analyses, comments upon, or seeks to 'resolve' mythical stories: in this sense it is parasitical on more 'established' works of literature such as epic or tragedy. On the other hand, the existence of mythographical works offered would-be writers a rich locus for a large body of knowledge on the mythical tradition, sometimes (often?) with a good deal of scholarly excavation to back it up: here mythography was much more the host.

In this volume we try, therefore, to bring out both roles for mythography in antiquity, in authors from Pindar to Pausanias, and over a range of genres including epic, epinician, hymn, philosophy, history, and periegetic literature. Some chapters discuss the ways in which ancient writers engaged in the study of myth employed particular techniques or approaches: Robert Fowler, for example, looks at the ways in which the Peripatetics evinced 'a very lively interest in mythology...and its penumbra', and in particular how Dicaearchus in his *Life of Greece* worked with but adapted received myths in his attempt to delineate what early Greek life was like. René Nünlist similarly examines how Aristarchus engaged with the vast mythical tradition of the gods and heroes when writing his commentary on Homer, using fixed but not rigid principles to try to explicate what was distinctive about Homer's approach to and treatment of traditional stories. Jessica Wissmann, on the other hand, asks to what extent mythography, usually thought of as a genre more devoted to narration than explanation, concerned itself with issues of morality, with questions of good and bad, and she shows how mythography, by employing small narrative gestures or indirect characterisation or even by structural means, could give guidance to the reader about moral choices.

⁸ See, on the former, Montanari 1995 and van Rossum-Steenbeek 1998, 85–118; on the latter, *FGrHist* 12; Villagra Hidalgo 2012; and *BNJ* 12 (S. Asirvatham).

The remaining chapters examine how non-mythographers employed the manners and techniques of mythographic discourse, and the purposes to which such employment was directed. Andrew Ford sees mythographic discourse as evident already in Pindar and Plato (when mythography itself as a genre was still in its infancy) as well (rather less surprisingly) in Callimachus. Ford sees a variety of uses for these authors' allusion to mythographic discourse, believing that it served not the purposes of piety or religion but 'the pleasurable sharing of learning lightly worn for the connoisseurship of the "wise"'. In a different context, Diodorus of Sicily, according to John Marincola, found in mythographic discourse an ideal way to treat the labours of Heracles within a historical work, presenting Heracles' deeds in a straightforward and unproblematic manner, but overlaying it with certain 'historical' gestures that sought to integrate Heracles both into the various lands through which he travelled and into the long series of mythical and historical figures whom Diodorus marked out as benefactors of mankind. Ken Dowden argues for a deep knowledge of mythographic traditions and discussions in Virgil, and shows how the poet alludes both to the controversies and to the variant versions which he knows but does not utilise in his own epic. Dowden also argues that apparent contradictions in Virgil's use of different traditions do not reflect carelessness on the author's part but a deliberate manipulation of the tradition, 'designer inconsistency'. Greta Hawes examines Pausanias *Periegesis* by carrying further her and Charles Delattre's idea of 'mythographic topography', an analysis of the rhetorical strategies and organisational structures used by writers to bring order to myth. She exploits the three meanings of *topos*—place, literary passage, and rhetorical commonplace. Pausanias emerges as a *de facto* mythographer, although he does not seek a unified Hellenic mythography but portrays instead a patchwork of local traditions and local contestation.

It should go without saying that the contributions in this volume are in no way to be seen as comprehensive. Rather, as noted above, the work here builds on recent research to extend our appreciation of the variety of mythographic discourse and of how mythographic approaches and concerns can be found in a number of works of classical literature. Whether host or parasite (or something in between), mythography was an important, indeed nearly omnipresent component of how both Greeks and Romans looked at literature and at the world itself.

Andrew Ford

Mythographic Discourse among non-Mythographers: Pindar's *Ol. 1*, Plato's *Phaedrus* and Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*

It may seem ungrateful to observe that, although Robert Fowler's *Early Greek Mythography* (*EGM*) has cast a flood of light on the Greek mythographic tradition from the later sixth century BCE up to the Hellenistic age, mythography remains a shadowy affair in its formative stages. Fowler himself, however, introduces both volumes of *EGM* with remarks on the difficulties in getting a grasp on the field in the late-archaic and early classical periods: on the one hand, such works as the *Genealogies* of Hecataeus of Miletus and Acusilaus of Argos allow us to trace mythography back to the time before the Persian wars; on the other, it is only at the end of the classical period that Fowler is willing to say that mythography had become a 'flourishing business' (I.xxvii),¹ one that presented 'a recognizable generic face to the reader' (II.xiii–xiv). Indeed, Fowler observes that it is only in Hellenistic times that *muthographia* gets named as a discipline in its own right and its specialist is titled a *muthographos* (I.xxvii).² Before that time, writers like Hecataeus and Acusilaus would likely have called themselves *logopoiioi* and presented their works as *logoi* or *historiai* (I.xxviii). For these reasons, Fowler calls what he has collected in *EGM* only 'the predecessors of Hellenistic mythography' (I.xxxi). This modest description does nothing to detract from the value of *EGM* as a collection. After all, none of Diels' *Vorsokratiker* would have called himself a 'pre-Socratic', and few of Jacoby's *Griechische Historiker* called themselves historians, and when they did so the word had a different meaning than it does now.³ Fowler was warning us that, in interpreting early mythography, we should be wary of imposing a teleological view on the material. Yet the situation remains puzzling: how is it that this innovative approach to a fundamental and ubiquitous aspect of Greek cultural life—and one that enlisted the talents and industry of figures from all parts of Greece—should have failed to leave more traces in the record than the late reports Fowler has collected about the early mythographers' views and the very rare *ipsissima verba* that have come down to us?

1 Cf. Fowler 2006.

2 In Palaephatus *On Incredible Tales* §26 (dated ca. 340 by Hawes 2014a, 227–238) *muthographos* means 'writer of legends'.

3 Branscome 2013, 11–16 is a recent discussion.

One way we might try to shed more light on Fowler's picture is to look for reflexes of mythographic practice among writers who are not classified as mythographers and yet who share an interest in mythography as Fowler defines it, the practice of collecting, synthesising and critiquing Greek myths with a view to arriving at a 'reasoned account of the remote past' (II.xvi, 665). Such reflexes among non-mythographers are bound to be there, for the very gradualness of mythography's emergence as a distinct and independent branch of inquiry implies that its interests and methods were not at first confined to a discrete set of intellectuals we can isolate as proto-mythographers. One obvious place to look is early historical texts that reflect critically on myth, and Fowler points to Herodotus' analysis of Helen's role in the Trojan War (2.112–117) and Thucydides on the legends of early Sicily (6.1–5) as 'belong[ing] in important ways' to the same genre as the mythographers.⁴ But one can also look further afield: Greta Hawes' *Rationalizing Myth in Antiquity* discerns contemporary mythographic analysis underlying Teiresias' disquisition on the birth of Dionysus in Euripides' *Bacchae* and Socrates' analysis of Boreas' rape of Oreithyia in Plato's *Phaedrus*. On this basis Hawes suggests that 'by the Classical period at least, rationalistic interpretation was so recognisable that its use could be subjected to critical analysis, or indeed satirized'.⁵ The present paper furthers this approach by proposing that reflexes of early mythography can be discerned not only in the content of non-mythographic texts but in their rhetoric as well. I offer three case studies that span the era of early mythography to suggest that already in the late archaic period mythography had developed a distinctive discursive style, an authoritative rhetoric favouring a set of terms and *topoi*, that was imitated or parodied by non-mythographers. I hope thereby both to make the influence of this important intellectual project more palpable in the record and to bring out new dimensions in the texts that borrow from it. Such an approach can also reveal continuities between earlier forms of presenting myth with authority and the new styles of self-presentation that were forged by early mythographers for their new *sophia*.⁶ I accept, then, Fowler's contention that mythography was an emergent form of intellectual investigation in pre-Hellenistic Greece, though I will also support and extend

⁴ *EGM* II.xvii n. 7, and on later historians in this volume. Cf. Marincola 1999, and Andolfi 2017b, 183 on 'how unprofitable it is to rely upon a rigid distinction among the production of early prose writers who clearly share a common goal and, to some extent, a similar communicative strategy'.

⁵ Hawes 2014a, 13–17, quotation from 13.

⁶ For discussion of the contexts of myth-telling and the oral/literate divide see Buxton 1994, chs. 2–3; Ford 2002, 152–157; 2003.

Hawes' view and argue that it was already in the early fifth century a conspicuous, identifiable enterprise, presenting 'a recognizable generic face to the reader'.

In taking a rhetorical approach to mythographic discourse I must push back to an extent against Fowler's stress on early mythography as an 'eminently literate activity', noting that Pherecydes' *Historia* filled 10 books.⁷ Fowler allows, of course, that a fifth-century writer seeking to spread new ideas did well to supplement writing with oral *apodeixeis*, as did Herodotus and the many wise men documented in Rosalind Thomas' *Herodotus in Context*.⁸ An instance of such a mythological 'display' speech is referred to in Plato's description of Hippias of Elis. In the *Greater Hippias*, Hippias is a polymath (*Hp. mai.* 285c), and among the topics on which he was prepared to lecture was 'the races of the heroes and of men' and *archaeologia* in general (285d6–e2 = *FGrHist* 6 T 3)⁹:

Περὶ τῶν γενῶν, ὃ Σώκρατες, τῶν τε ἡρώων καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν κατοικήσεων, ὡς τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἐκτίσθησαν αἱ πόλεις, καὶ συλλήβδην πάσης τῆς ἀρχαιολογίας ἥδιστα ἀκροῶνται, ὥστ' ἔγρωγε δι' αὐτοῦς ἡνάγκασμαι ἐκμεμαθηκέναι τε καὶ ἐκμεμελετηκέναι πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα.

The [Lacedaimonians], Socrates, are very fond of hearing about the *genealogies of heroes and men and the foundations of cities in ancient times* and, in short, about *ancient history* in general, so that for their sake I have been obliged *to learn by heart* all that sort of thing and *to have it at my fingertips*.

Fowler remarks that Hippias' specialty is 'a rather good description of mythography as a classical genre' (I.xxxii),¹⁰ and I would note that the verbs ἐκμεμαθηκέναι, 'to learn by heart', and ἐκμεμελετηκέναι, 'to rehearse again and again', indicate that Hippias worked his material up for oral presentation. In speculative areas in which authority had to be asserted and contested for, presenting a new way of thinking about myth, which amounted to a new claim on the right to pronounce upon its truth, called for a new way of talking; mythographic discourse may thus be defined as the stance that such performers developed in order to present themselves, on the podium and on the page, as experts in this new way of inquiry. As a discursive practice/knowledge, mythographic discourse had of course sociological and political aspects, but for the present study its rhetorical forms are of

⁷ Fowler 2001, 95–115, esp. 115; cf. *EGM* II.xii. Cole 1991, 74 describes these as texts for 'reference and consultation'.

⁸ Thomas 2000.

⁹ See the excellent discussion by M. Węcowski at *BNJ* 6.

¹⁰ Isoc. *Antid.* (15) 45 refers to mythography as a specialty of prose writers: οἱ μὲν γὰρ τὰ γένη τὰ τῶν ἡμιθέων ἀναζητοῦντες τὸν βίον τὸν αὐτῶν κατέτριψαν. So too *Panath.* 1: τοὺς μυθώδεις, sc. λόγους.

most importance,¹¹ and I will sketch how early mythographers projected an ethos of trustworthiness and expertise as they asserted that traditional tales needed re-assessing and that the present speaker was the one qualified to do it.¹²

Hecataeus' brief first fragment exhibits several salient elements of mythographic discourse so defined (*EGM* F 1 = *FGrHist* 1 F 1a):

Ἐκαταΐος Μιλήσιος ὧδε μυθεῖται· τάδε γράφω ὡς μοι δοκεῖ ἀληθέα εἶναι· οἱ γὰρ Ἑλλήνων λόγοι πολλοὶ τε καὶ γελοῖοι, ὡς ἐμοὶ φαίνονται, εἰσίν·

'Hecataeus of Miletus speaks (μυθεῖται) thus: I write these things as they seem to me to be true; for the tales of the Greeks are to my mind many and ridiculous.'

Hecataeus presents himself as both a speaker (μυθεῖται) and a writer (γράφω), for he, like Hippias, aims at audiences beyond his polis. In introducing himself to this wider audience, his self-presentation exhibits four noteworthy features. First, there is the authorial 'I' taking responsibility for the discourse and implicitly offering to defend it against other views. In an excellent analysis of this fragment, Lucio Bertelli interprets the shift from the third- to the first-person verb as both an assertion of authority—being modelled on Near Eastern introductions to royal messages—and as agonistic, comparing Hector's ὧδε δὲ μῦθέομαι in challenging the Greeks (*Il.* 7.76).¹³ A second noteworthy element is Hecataeus' critical attitude toward tradition: 'the tales of the Greeks' are regarded as data not as dogma, and the fact that these are 'many' suggests an awareness of variant versions, which implies that some stories at least cannot be true.¹⁴ Thirdly, the sentence as a whole projects a non-partisan, analytical approach to the stories: Hecataeus speaks neither as rhapsode nor as poet, nor indeed as *logios anêr*, a local expert whose authority derives from his integration in a particular community:¹⁵ the inquirer is indifferent to the source of the story, and will critique tales handed down by poets no differently than by tale-tellers in prose. In this light we should take Hecataeus' μοι δοκεῖ not as a modest tempering of his claims but as signaling that he will reason from probability, not authority. Finally, this new science

¹¹ Foucault 1972; Bourdieu 1988.

¹² Mythographic discourse is thus a sub-genre of the rhetoric of fifth-century science and medicine as described by Lloyd 1987, 70, stressing 'the habit of scrutiny and...the expectation of justification—of giving an account—and the premium set on rational methods of doing so'. Cf. Fowler 1996, 70–71 on 'the historian's voice'.

¹³ Bertelli 2001, esp. 80–84. For a recent discussion with bibliography, see Andolfi 2017a, esp. 188–192.

¹⁴ Bertelli 2001, 83.

¹⁵ Luraghi 2009.

distinguishes itself by exclusions: those naïve enough to credit the old stories are dismissed as γελοῖοι.¹⁶

I do not insist that all the items on this checklist will be found in each and every reflex of mythographic discourse among non-mythographers; but the examples below exhibit enough family resemblances to indicate that mythographic discourse was already an established, imitable performative stance in the early fifth century and to show that it continued to provide a recognisable role for a speaker or writer to adopt through the end of the classical period. In what follows I will begin with the parody of mythographic discourse in Plato's *Phaedrus*: while the passage has been much-studied to determine Plato's ambivalent attitude toward myth,¹⁷ my analysis will be from a rhetorical point of view and consider it as a social practice: in this way the jargon and posturing of myth-experts at the time become more apparent and so make it easier to see that Pindar also speaks as a modern myth-expert for a long stretch in the beginning of *Olympian* 1 of 476. Finally, a reflection on Callimachus's *Hymn to Zeus* will suggest that the exchange between mythographers and poets did not stop when mythography assumed its place as a fully recognisable and named discipline. Taken together, these samples will not only confirm how early and long-lived was the influence exerted by mythography; they will also reveal how polymorphic the pose of the myth-expert could be as it was inflected in different genres with different relations to discourses about the past. Indeed, in the longest perspective mythographic discourse can be seen as a characteristically 'enlightened' variation on an earlier and ongoing critical tradition that was always reflecting on the powers and limitations of narrative.

1 Boreas and Oreithyia in Plato's *Phaedrus*

'Tell me by Zeus, Socrates, do you believe this bit of mythology is true?' (*Phdr.* 229c4–5: ἀλλ' εἰπὲ πρὸς Διός, ὦ Σώκρατες, σὺ τοῦτο τὸ μυθολόγημα πειθῆ ἀληθὲς εἶναι). With the keyword μυθολόγημα the *littérateur* Phaedrus invites Socrates to reflect on the myth of Boreas and Oreithyia in line with the latest modern thought. *LSJ* defines μυθολόγημα as a 'mythical narrative or description' but this is merely glossing a very rare word, first attested here, that is found once or perhaps twice

¹⁶ Cf. Foucault 1972 on discourse seeking power by rules of exclusion.

¹⁷ Hawes 2014a, 15 is an exception, with bibliography at n. 24. Cf. Ferrari 1987, 11–12; Clay 2007, esp. 212–213; Hunter 2012, 84–85; Trabattoni 2012, esp. 309–311; Werner 2012, 27–43.

again in classical Greek.¹⁸ As an out-of-the-ordinary term, μυθολόγημα is an expression on a par with Levi-Strauss' 'mytheme': its quasi technical formation suggests a scientific and analytical attitude toward traditional tales, but equally important is its rarity: Plato is not coining language but reporting jargon in which the novel word signals the speaker's distance from (and superiority to) common understandings of myth.

Thus cued, Socrates embarks on an ostentatiously learned discourse (229c6–d2):

Ἄλλ' εἰ ἀπιστοίην, ὥσπερ οἱ σοφοί, οὐκ ἂν ἄτοπος εἶην, εἴτα σοφίζόμενος φαίην αὐτὴν πνεῦμα βορέου κατὰ τῶν πλησίον πετρῶν σὺν Φαρμακείᾳ παίζουσαν ὦσαι, καὶ οὕτω δὴ τελευτήσασαν λεχθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Βορέου ἀνάρπαστον [229d] γεγονέναι— ἢ ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου· λέγεται γὰρ αὐτὸ καὶ οὗτο ὁ λόγος, ὡς ἐκέϊθεν ἄλλ' οὐκ ἐνθῆνδε ἡρπάσθη.

If I disbelieved, as *wise men* do, I should not be extraordinary; I then might say, *taking a scientific approach*, that a blast of the north wind [*boreas*] pushed her off the neighbouring rocks as she was playing with Pharmaceia, and that when she had died in this manner she *ended up being said* to have been [229d] carried off by Boreas—or from the Areopagus, for this story is also told with her being taken from there and not from this place.

Here the σοφοί are wise in the sense of sophisticated:¹⁹ when they come across myths their response is to σοφίζεσθαι, 'to be scientific, to speculate rationalistically'; at *Politicus* 299b this verb expresses the acquisition by experts of special knowledge about things of which everyone has some experience (e.g., seafaring, medicine, climate). Plato often invests the word with a touch of 'crafty dealing' and associates it with the likes of Gorgias and Hippias (and never Socrates). To σοφίζεσθαι about myth, then, is to take a critical attitude toward it in the best modern way, but at the same time the word connects modern thinkers with earlier experts in the tradition.²⁰ Ibycus attributes 'being expert' about myth to the Muses themselves in a *recusatio* preceding a catalogue of Greek ships bound for Troy (S151.23–29 *PMGF* = 282a *PMG*):

καὶ τὰ μὲ[ν ἄν] Μοῖσαι σεσοφ[ισμ]έναι
εὖ Ἑλικωνίδ[εις] ἐμβαίεν † λόγ[ω]

¹⁸ It is found one other time in Plato, *Laws* 663e, and in what is perhaps a comic line: παίδων γὰρ ἔστι ταῦτα μυθολογήματα (*CAF* 503 = *Lib. Orat.* 31.43; not in *PCG*).

¹⁹ Good remarks on *sophoi* here in Ferrari 1987, 234–235, n. 12 and Yunis 2011, 92–93.

²⁰ Theognis used it of himself in his *sphrēgis* (18), apparently investing it with a double sense to include both the moral wisdom conveyed by his verse and his technical cleverness in devising the trick of the seal. On Hesiod's οὔτε τι ναυτιλῆς σεσοφισμένος (*Op.* 649), see Scodel 2001, 122–123.