

063 Euhemerus of Messene

Paul Christesen (Dartmouth)

BJN	Euhemerus Messenius	Euhemerus of Messene
Historian Number:	063	

<p>63 T 1 - DIODOR. (VI 1) bei EUSEB. PE II 2 p. 59 D</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="T" n="1" sourcework(level1="Diodorus Siculus" level2="" level3="Bibliotheca historica" level4="" level5="" level6="6, 1") sourcework(level1="Diodorus Siculus" level2="apud Eusebium Caesariensem" level3="Praeparatio evangelica" level4="" level5="" level6="2, 2, 55, 59d")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Biography Historical Work: <i>Historical Library</i> Source Date: 1st century BC Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 4th century BC</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>Εὐήμερος μὲν οὖν φίλος γεγονὼς Κασάνδρου τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ διὰ τοῦτον ἠναγκασμένος τελεῖν βασιλικὰς τινὰς χρείας καὶ μεγάλας ἀποδημίας...</p>	<p>Euhemerus, after having become a friend of King Cassander, was compelled by the king to perform for him some important services and great journeys...(the text continues in F2)</p>

63 T 1 Commentary

Euhemerus of Messene, active c. 300 BC (see Biographical Essay, below) was the author of the *Sacred Register*, a fictional account, told in the first person, of a voyage to a group of three islands in the Arabian Sea: Hiera, Panchaia, and an unnamed island used as a cemetery. The last of these was described as the site of a huge temple to Triphylian Zeus, inside of which was an inscribed pillar that revealed that many if not all of the gods were in fact mortals who had long ago been accorded divine honors in recompense for their benefactions to humankind. This view of the origins of the gods was subsequently closely

associated with Euhemerus and is now typically described as Euhemerism. The *Sacred Register* has attracted a great deal of scholarly attention, both as an important philosophical-religious treatise (see the commentary on F2) and as a utopian novel (see the commentary on F3).

The extant testimonia and fragments of the *Sacred Register* come from a variety of sources, two of which are of particular importance: the *Historical Library* (Βιβλιοθήκης Ιστορικής) of Diodorus Siculus (first century BC) and the *Divine Institutes* (*Divinae Institutiones*) of Lactantius (first half of the fourth century AD). Diodorus gives a detailed resumé of Euhemerus' description of Hierá and Panchaia (F3 5.41-6) and summarizes Euhemerus' views on the divine (F2 6.1). The *Divine Institutes* is an apologetic work that also offers the first extant attempt at a summary of Christian thought. Lactantius, in striving to show that there was widespread consensus that god is and can only be one, makes use of Euhemerus' ideas to dismiss the pagan gods as unworthy of attention.

Cassander ruled Macedonia from 316 to 297 BC (he proclaimed himself 'King of the Macedonians' in 305). The statement that Euhemerus was a friend of Cassander's is one of the few scraps of biographical information found in the relevant ancient sources. However, M. Winiarczyk, in his authoritative treatment of Euhemerus' life and work, casts doubt on the reliability of this statement (*Euhemerus von Messene: Leben, Werk und Nachwirkung* (Munich 2002), 1-2). The ostensible connection with Cassander may have been a truth claim internal to the narrative of the *Sacred Register* rather than accurate information about the author of the work. Indeed, N. Holzberg has pointed out that it is possible that 'Euhemerus' was nothing more than an authorial persona and associated name ('Utopias and Fantastic Travel: Euhemerus, Iambulus', in G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden 2003), 621-8 at 621).

63 T 1 Bibliography

For a good summary of what is known about the contents of the *Sacred Register*, see T. Brown, 'Euhemerus and the Historians', *HThR* 39 (1946), 259-74 at 259-61. On first-person narrative in the *Sacred Register*, see K. Peterson, *Living on the Edge: The Travel Narratives of Euhemerus, Iamboulos, and Lucian* (Ph.D. Diss. Duke University 2001), 21-3 and Winiarczyk, *Euhemerus von Messene*, 25, 83.

On Diodorus' *Historical Library*, the best starting places are D. Ambaglio, F. Landucci, et al., (eds.), *Diodoro Siculo, Biblioteca Storica, commento storico, introduzione generale* (Milan 2008) and K. Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* (Princeton 1990). On Lactantius' *Divinae Institutiones*, see A. Bowen and P. Garnsey, (eds.), *Lactantius: Divine Institutes*

(Liverpool 2003), 1-54. Lactantius also produced an epitome of the *Divinae Institutiones*, which shows some minor variations from the original. On that work, see M. Perrin, (ed.), *Lactantius Épitomé des Institutions Divines* (Paris 1987).

Here and throughout, Greek and Latin texts as given by Jacoby in the original publication of *FGrH* have been updated based on readings suggested in Winiarczyk's Teubner edition of all of the known fragments of Euhemerus' work (M. Winiarczyk, (ed.), *Euhemerus Messeniensis Reliquiae* (Stuttgart 1991)).

<p>63 T 2a - SCHOL. CLEM. ALEX. Protr. II 24, 2 p. 304,18 Stäh</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="T" n="2" n-mod="a" sourcework(level1="Scholia" level2="ad Clementem Alexandrinum" level3="Protrepticus (Stählin O.)" level4="" level5="" level6="2, 24, 2; p. 304")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Biography Historical Work: Scholion to Clement of Alexandria <i>Protrepticus</i> Source Date: Varied Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 4th-3rd century BC</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>Εὐήμερον τὸν Ἀκραγαντῖνον] οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Εὐήμερος, ὃν τινες Μεσσήνιον, οὗ μέμνηται ὁ Καλλίμαχος (vgl. T 4a)...</p>	<p>Euhemerus of Akragas: this is the Euhemerus, some say he was from Messene, whom Callimachus mentions (see T4a)...</p>

63 T 2a Commentary

In most cases where his origins are specified, the ancient sources give Euhemerus' home town as Messene (Aelian *Varia Historia* 2.31, *Etymologicum Magnum* (F8), Eusebius (F2), Eustathius *Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam* 3.381, Lactantius (T3), Plutarch (T4e), Polybius (T5b), Strabo (T5a)). The doxographic tradition descending from Aetios identifies Euhemerus as Tegean (see T4a and the commentary thereon, as well as Theodoretus *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio* 2.112, 3.4 and Ps.-Galen *Historia Philosophia* 35 pp. 617-18 Diels). Jacoby was of the opinion that this was probably an error arising from textual corruption ('Euemeros', in *RE* 6: 952-72 at 952). Athenaeus (T2b) describes Euhemerus as a Coan; it is possible, as Jacoby suggested (*ibid.*), that Euhemerus spent a considerable period of his life living within the boundaries of the Ptolemaic kingdom, on Cos (see commentary on T4a).

If, as seems likely, Euhemerus was in fact originally from Messene, the question arises whether he was from Messene in the Peloponnese or the homonymous city on Sicily. (The divergent spellings for the two places in current use are a modern development; in the ancient world the two cities had identical names.) There is some reason to think that Euhemerus was Sicilian. For instance, Ennius, who was from southern Italy and who produced a Latin version of the *Sacred Register*, translated the work of two other Greek authors, both of whom were from Sicily (Archestratos of Gela and (Pseudo) Epicharmus). Euhemerus' likely Sicilian origins may help explain why Clement of Alexandria refers to him in passing as an Akragantine (*Protrepticus* 2.24.2), a Sicilian city in which Euhemerus may have had occasion to spend time.

63 T 2a Bibliography

For detailed argumentation supporting the idea that Euhemerus was from Sicilian Messene, see F. de Angelis and B. Garstad, 'Euhemerus in Context', *CA* 25 (2006), 211-42 at 213-18.

63 T 2b - ATHEN. XIV 658 E	<pre>meta[[id="63" type="T" n="2" n-mod="b" sourcework(level1="Athenaeus" level2="" level3="Deipnosophistae" level4="" level5="" level6="14, 77, 658e")]]</pre>
Subject: Genre: Biography Historical Work: <i>Philosophers at Dinner</i> Source Date: 2nd-3rd century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 4th-3rd century BC	Translation
Εὐήμερος...ὁ Κῶος (F 1)...	Euhemerus...of Cos....

63 T 2b Commentary

See the commentary on T2a.

63 T 2b Bibliography

Writer, title etc.

<p>63 T 3 - LACTANT. Div. inst. I 11, 33</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="T" n="3" sourcework(level1="Lactantius (Caelius [Caecilius?])" level2="" level3="Divinae institutiones" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 11, 33-34")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Biography Historical Work: <i>Divine Institutes</i> Source Date: 4th century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 4th-3rd century BC</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>antiquus auctor Euhemerus, qui fuit ex civitate Messene, res gestas Jovis et ceterorum qui dii putantur collegit historiamque contexit ex titulis et inscriptionibus sacris, quae in antiquissimis templis habebantur maximeque in fano Jovis Triphylii, ubi auream columnam positam esse ab ipso Jove titulus indicabat, in qua columna sua gesta perscripsit, ut monumentum posteris esset rerum suarum. hanc historiam et interpretatus est Ennius et secutus. folgt F 19</p>	<p>The ancient author Euhemerus, who came from the city of Messene, gathered together the deeds of Jupiter and of others thought to be gods and wove together a historical narrative from commemorative tablets and sacred inscriptions that were kept in the oldest temples and especially in the temple of Jupiter Triphylios. The commemorative tablet there claimed that a gold column had been set in place by Jupiter himself, on which column he recorded his deeds so that it would be a memorial of his deeds for posterity. Ennius translated and followed this historical account. (The text continues in F19.)</p>

63 T 3 Commentary

See the commentary on FF2 and 19.

63 T 3 Bibliography

Writer, title etc.

<p>63 T 4a - AETIOS Plac. I 7, 1 p. 297, 13 Diels</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="T" n="4" n-mod="a" sourcework(level1="Aëtius" level2="" level3="De placitis (excerpta Stobaei) (Diels H., Doxographi Graeci)" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 7, 1; p. 297, 13")]]</p>
--	--

	II
Subject: Philosophy, Religion Historical Work: <i>Opinions of the Philosophers</i> Source Date: 1st century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 5th-3rd century BC	Translation
ἔνιοι τῶν φιλοσόφων καθάπερ Διαγόρας ὁ Μήλιος καὶ Θεόδωρος ὁ Κυρηναῖος καὶ Εὐήμερος ὁ Τεγεάτης καθόλου φασὶ μὴ εἶναι θεούς. τὸν δὲ Εὐήμερον καὶ Καλλίμαχος ὁ Κυρηναῖος αἰνίττεται ἐν τοῖς Ἰάμβοις γράφων· ἐς τὸ πρὸ τείχευς ἱρὸν ἀλέες δεῦτε οὗ τὸν πάλαι Πάγχαιον ὁ πλάσας Ζᾶνα γέρων λαλάζων ἄδικα βιβλία ψήχει.	Some philosophers such as Diagoras of Melos and Theodoros of Cyrene and Euhemerus of Tegea speaking generally say that there are no gods. And with respect to Euhemerus, Callimachus of Cyrene poses a riddle in the <i>Iambi</i> , writing: ‘come in throngs to the shrine outside the walls, where the old man who invented the ancient Panchaean Zeus babbles and scribbles his impious books’.

63 T 4a Commentary

This passage comes from the doxographer and philosopher Aetios, who lived in the first century AD. Aetios produced a comprehensive survey, in five books, of the various opinions of Greek philosophers on issues of natural philosophy. This work survives in two abridgements, made by the Pseudo-Plutarch and by Stobaeus. The passage given here exists only in the *Peri ton Areskonton Philosophois Physikon Dogmaton* of the Pseudo-Plutarch (*Moralia* 880d-e).

The quotation from Callimachus supplied by Aetios comes from *Iambus* 1.9-11. Papyrus finds of Callimachus' poetry have made it possible to emend the text of the Callimachus quotation, which was slightly corrupted in the version given by the Pseudo-Plutarch. In *Iambus* 1, the long-dead poet Hipponax returns to the land of the living, at a shrine near Alexandria, and calls together the scholars of the Museum to deliver an acerbic diatribe intended to persuade them to stop arguing with each other. A scholion to Callimachus says that the shrine referred to here is the Serapeum of Parmenio. There has been ongoing scholarly debate as to the precise identity and location of this Serapeum (see A. Kerkhecker, *Callimachus' Book of Iambi* (Oxford 1999), 22-3). It seems likely that Callimachus has Hipponax allude to Euhemerus as a jibe at Euhemerus' attitudes toward the gods (on which see the commentary on F2).

Callimachus' allusion to Euhemerus is the best single indicator of the date for the latter's activity. The date of the composition of *Iambi* 1 remains uncertain, but must have been somewhere between 280 and 260. Given that Euhemerus' work was at that point sufficiently well known to merit mention by Callimachus, it is reasonable to suppose that Euhemerus was active sometime around 300. The association of Euhemerus with a specific shrine in Alexandria and Callimachus' engagement with his work (and perhaps some details of the *Sacred Register*, which appear to reflect a close knowledge of Egyptian society) suggest that Euhemerus spent a considerable amount of time in Alexandria.

63 T 4a Bibliography

On Aetios, see H. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci* (Berlin 1929) and J. Mansfeld and D. T. Runia, *Aëtiana: The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer* (Leiden 1997). On papyrus finds giving the text of Callimachus' *Iambi*, see D. Clayman, *Callimachus' Iambi* (Leiden 1980), 1-4. For details of the text of *Iambus* 1.9-11 and the text of the relevant scholion, see R. Pfeiffer, (ed.), *Callimachus* (Oxford 1949), 1: 162-3. For a thorough analysis of *Iambus* 1, see Kerkhecker, *Callimachus' Book of Iambi*, 11-48. On the chronology and geography of Euhemerus' life, see M. Winiarczyk, *Euhemerus von Messene: Leben, Werk und Nachwirkung* (Munich 2002), 1-10. On the archaeological evidence for Serapis shrines in Alexandria, see D. Kessler, 'Das hellenistische Serapeum in Alexandria und Ägypten in ägyptologischser Sicht', in M. Görg and G. Hölbl (eds.), *Ägypten und der östliche Mittelmeerraum im 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (Wiesbaden 2000), 163-230 and M. Sabottka, *Das Serapeum in Alexandria: Untersuchungen zur Architektur und Baugeschichte des Heiligtums von der frühen ptolemäischen Zeit bis zur Zerstörung 391 n. Chr* (Cairo 2008).

<p>63 T 4b - SEXT. EMPIR. adv. math. IX 51</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="T" n="4" n-mod="b" sourcework(level1="Sextus Empiricus" level2="" level3="Adversus mathematicos" level4="" level5="" level6="9, 51")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Philosophy, Religion Historical Work: <i>Against the Professors</i> Source Date: 2nd century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 5th-3rd century BC</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>μη εἶναι (sc. θεούς) δὲ οἱ ἐπικληθέντες ἄθεοι καθάπερ Εὐήμερος, ἄδικα βιβλία ψήχων, καὶ Διαγόρας ὁ Μήλιος καὶ Πρόδικος ὁ Κεῖος καὶ Θεόδωρος</p>	<p>That the gods do not exist is the assertion of those called atheists, such as Euhemerus, 'an old charlatan, scribbling impious books', and Diagoras of Melos and</p>

καὶ ἄλλοι παμπληθεῖς ὧν Εὐήμερος μὲν ἔλεγε τοὺς νομιζομένους θεοὺς δυνατοὺς τινὰς γεγονέναι ἀνθρώπους, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων θεοποιηθέντας δόξαι θεοῦς...	Prodicus of Ceos and Theodoros and a multitude of others. Of these Euhemerus said that those considered to be gods had been certain powerful men, and, having been deified by the rest on account of this, were reputed to be gods...
---	---

63 T 4b Commentary

This passage comes from a work known as *Pros Mathematikous* (*Against the Professors*), written by the Pyrrhonist Sceptic Sextus Empiricus (who seems to have been active towards the end of the second century AD). In its current form *Pros Mathematikous* consists of eleven books, but there is general agreement that it was originally two different works. Books 7-11 have a separate title, *Pros Dogmatikous* (*Against the Dogmatists*), and offer critiques of a series of different dogmatic schools of philosophy. (From the perspective of Pyrrhonist Sceptics, any claim to achieve certainty about anything was grounds for labeling a school of philosophy as dogmatic.) Book 9 is directed against physicists, which is to say philosophers with a deep interest in the corporeal world. Sextus' comments on Euhemerus' work occur as part of a lengthy review (9.13-194) of a host of different opinions about the existence or non-existence of gods, which leads Sextus to conclude that the wise man, i.e., the Sceptic, will suspend judgment (9.191). Sextus, like Aetios in T4a above, quotes Callimachus *Iambus* 1.11, but gives a slightly different text (γέρων ἀλαζών, ἄδικα βιβλία ψήχων instead of γέρων λαλάζων ἄδικα βιβλία ψήχει). On Euhemerus' views on the divine, see the commentary on F2.

63 T 4b Bibliography

On Sextus Empiricus, see A. Bailey, *Sextus Empiricus and Pyrrhonian Scepticism* (Oxford 2002).

63 T 4c - ebd. IX 17	meta [[id="63" type="T" n="4" n-mod="c" sourcework(level1="Sextus Empiricus" level2="" level3="Adversus mathematicos" level4="" level5="" level6="9, 17")]]
Subject: Philosophy, Religion Historical Work: <i>Against the Professors</i> Source Date: 2nd century AD	Translation

Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 5th-3rd century BC	
Εὐήμερος δὲ ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς ἄθεός φησιν, ὅτ' ἦν ἄτακτος ἀνθρώπων βίος, οἱ περιγενόμενοι τῶν ἄλλων ἰσχύι τε καὶ συνέσει, ὥστε πρὸς τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῶν κελεύόμενα πάντας βιοῦν, σπουδάζοντες μείζονος θαυμασμοῦ καὶ σεμνότητος τυχεῖν ἀνέπλασαν περὶ αὐτοῦς ὑπερβάλλουσάν τινα καὶ θεῖαν δύναμιν, ἔνθεν καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἐνομίσθησαν θεοί. Πρόδικος δὲ...	And Euhemerus, the one nicknamed 'the atheist', says: 'When the life of humankind was disorderly, those who excelled the rest in strength and intelligence with the result that everyone lived in accordance with their commands, being eager to meet with more wonderment and veneration, invented for themselves a certain superhuman and divine authority, whereupon they were also reckoned gods by the populace'. And Prodicus...

63 T 4c Commentary

See the commentary on T4b.

63 T 4c Bibliography

Writer, title etc.

63 T 4d - CICERO De n. d. I 119	meta [[id="63" type="T" n="4" n-mod="d"]]
Subject: Philosophy, Religion Historical Work: <i>On the Nature of the Gods</i> Source Date: 1st century BC Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 4th-3rd century BC	Translation
Quid, qui aut fortis aut claros aut potentis viros tradunt post mortem ad deos pervenisse, eosque esse ipsos, quos nos colere precari venerarique soleamus, nonne expertes sunt religionum omnium? quae ratio maxime tractata ab Euhemero est, quem noster et interpretatus est et secutus praeter ceteros Ennius. ab Euhemero autem et mortes et sepulturae	Again, those who teach that brave or famous or powerful men have been deified after death, and that it is these very people whom we are accustomed to worship, pray to, and venerate, are they not devoid of all religious feeling? This theory was developed principally by Euhemerus, whom our Ennius among others both translated and followed. Now both the

demonstrantur deorum...	deaths and burials of gods are described by Euhemerus...
-------------------------	--

63 T 4d Commentary

The *De Natura Deorum* (*On The Nature of the Gods*) is a dialogue in which the speakers alternately explain, defend, and critique the positions of Epicureans, Stoics, and Academics on the divine. This passage occurs towards the end of a lengthy attack on Epicurean views on the gods (1.57-124). The speaker, an Academic named Cotta, is arguing that the Epicurean claim to free humans from superstition is a meaningless result of the Epicureans portraying the gods as being powerless and that the same result was achieved by atheists such as Diagoras, Theodoros, and Euhemerus. On Euhemerus' views on the divine, see the commentary on F2.

63 T 4d Bibliography

On *De Natura Deorum*, see P. G. Walsh, (ed.), *Cicero's The Nature of the Gods* (New York 1997), xi-lv.

63 T 4e - PLUTARCH. De Js. 23 p. 360 A	meta [[id="63" type="T" n="4" n-mod="e"]]
<p>Subject: Philosophy, Religion, Biography Historical Work: <i>On Isis and Osiris</i> Source Date: 1st-2nd century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 4th-3rd century BC</p>	Translation
<p>...μεγάλας μὲν τῶι ἀθέωι Λέοντι κλισιάδας ἀνοίγοντας καὶ ἐξανθρωπίζοντας τὰ θεῖα, λαμπρὰν δὲ τοῖς Εὐημέρου τοῦ Μεσσηνίου φενακισμοῖς παρρησίαν δίδοντας, ὃς αὐτὸς ἀντίγραφα συνθεῖς ἀπίστου καὶ ἀνυπάρκτου μυθολογίας πᾶσαν ἀθεότητα κατασκεδάννυσι τῆς οἰκουμένης, τοὺς νομιζομένους θεοὺς πάντας ὁμαλῶς διαγράφων εἰς ὄνομα<τα> στρατηγῶν καὶ ναυάρχων καὶ βασιλέων ὡς δὴ πάλαι γεγονότων, ἐν δὲ Πάγχοντι γράμμασι χρυσοῖς ἀναγεγραμμένων, οἷς οὔτε</p>	<p>...opening the great gates for the goddess Leon and degrading things divine to the human level, giving magnificent licence to the quackeries of Euhemerus of Messene. He, having himself constructed copies of an unbelievable and non-existent mythology, sowed atheism over the whole of the inhabited earth. He put those reckoned to be gods, one and all, among the names of generals and admirals and kings who lived long ago, they being recorded in inscriptions with golden</p>

<p>βάρβαρος οὐδείς οὐθ' Ἕλληνα, ἀλλὰ μόνος Εὐήμερος, ὡς ἔοικε, πλεύσας εἰς τοὺς μηδαμόθι γῆς γεγονότας μηδ' ὄντας Παγχώους καὶ Τριφύλλους ἐντετυχέει.</p>	<p>letters in Panchon. No one, either non-Greek or Greek, only Euhemerus, it seems, has come upon these inscriptions, he having sailed to those who were born nowhere on earth and do not exist at all, the Panchoans and Triphyllians.</p>
--	---

63 T 4e Commentary

In his *On Isis and Osiris* Plutarch discusses the cult of these two deities. One matter that concerns him is how to interpret the story of the travails, dismemberment, and burial of Osiris. He briefly considers, and vehemently rejects, a Euhemerist reading of the story. Leon of Pella, who was probably active in the Hellenistic period (almost certainly after Euhemerus), was the author of a book on Egyptian gods. It took the form of an apocryphal letter from Alexander the Great to Olympias and portrayed the gods as having originally been mortal rulers and culture-heroes (on the latter see the commentary on F2). Plutarch's mention here of Euhemerus may in part have been motivated by the fact that the latter had used Isis as a key example of his theory about the origins of the divine (see T4f). On Euhemerus' views on the divine, see the commentary on F2.

63 T 4e Bibliography

On the *Isis and Osiris*, see J. G. Griffiths, (ed.), *Plutarch's de Iside et Osiride* (Cardiff 1970) and D. Richter, 'Plutarch on Isis and Osiris: Text, Cult, and Cultural Appropriation', *TAPA* 131 (2001), 191-216. On Leon of Pella, see *FGrH* 659 and J. S. Rusten, 'Pellaeus Leo', *AJP* 101 (1980), 197-201.

63 T 4f - MINUC. FELIX Oct. 21,1	meta [[id="63" type="T" n="4" n-mod="f"]]
<p>Subject: Philosophy, Religion, Biography Historical Work: <i>Octavius</i> Source Date: 3rd century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 4th-3rd century BC</p>	Translation
<p>lege historicorum scripta vel scripta sapientium...ob merita virtutis aut muneris deos habitos Euhemerus exsequitur et eorum natales patrias sepulcra dinumerat</p>	<p>Read the writings of historians or, if you will, those of philosophers...Euhemerus prosecutes those who have been reckoned gods on account of services in the form of</p>

<p>et per provincias monstrat, Dictaei Jovis et Apollinis Delphici et Phariae Isidis et Cereris Eleusinae. Prodicus... (vgl. DIOD. VI 1, 3 (= F 2 p. 302, 28ff.). AELIAN. V H II 31. CLEM. ALEX. Protr. II 24, 2 p. 18, 7ff. Stäh (ARNOB. adv. nat. IV 29). THEOPHIL. ad. Autol. III 7. LACTANT. De ira 11, 7-8. AUGUSTIN. De civ. dei VI 7. VII 27. De cons. evang. I 23)</p>	<p>bravery or doing their duty, and enumerates their birthplaces; homelands; tombs, and makes his case through the provinces, of Jupiter of Dikte, of Apollo of Delphi, of Isis of Pharos, and of Ceres of Eleusis. Prodicus... (Cf. Diodorus Siculus 6.1.3 (=F2); Aelian <i>Varia Historia</i> 2.31; Clement of Alexandria <i>Protrepticus</i> 2.24.2 (Arnobius <i>Adversus Nationes</i> 4.29); Theophilus <i>Ad Autolyicum</i> 3.7; Lactantius <i>De Ira Dei</i> 11.7-8; Augustine <i>De Civitate Dei</i> 6.7, 7.27; Augustine <i>De Consensu Evangelistarum</i> 1.23.)</p>
--	---

63 T 4f Commentary

Minucius Felix was a Christian apologist who was active in the first half of the 3rd century AD. The *Octavius* is a fictional dialogue between a pagan, Caecilius, and a Christian, Octavius, in which they debate the relative merits of their respective religions. After a brief introduction (1-4), Caecilius speaks (5-15), then Octavius (16-38). A brief conclusion describes Caecilius' conversion to Christianity (39-40). The passage given here forms part of the presentation of one of Octavius' key points, namely that the pagan gods are nothing more than mortals who had been deified for services rendered. Euhemerus followed established tradition in linking Zeus to the Diktaian cave in Crete (see also F27, cf. F3 5.46.3, F16 1.14.10, F24 1.11.46). The Pharos in Alexandria was one of the more important cult sites of Isis (see, for example, Ovid *Amores* 2.13.8 and [Plutarch] *De Fluviis* 16.2). On Euhemerus' views on the divine, see the commentary on F2.

63 T 4f Bibliography

On Minucius Felix and the *Octavius*, see G. W. Clarke, (ed.), *The Octavius of Marcus Minucius Felix* (New York 1974). On the cult of Zeus at the Diktaian cave, see K. Dowden, *Zeus* (London 2006), 28-35 and H. Verbruggen, *Le Zeus crétois* (Paris 1981), 134-8. On Isis cults in Egypt in the Hellenistic period, see F. Dunand, *Isis: Mère des dieux* (Paris 2000), 41-62.

<p>63 T 5a - STRABON I 3, 1</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="T" n="5" n-mod="a" sourcework(level1="Strabo" level2="" level3="Geographica [Vide: Apollodorus et</p>
---------------------------------	--

	Eratosthenes apud Strabonem]" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 3, 1") II
Subject: Genre: Geography Historical Work: <i>Geography</i> Source Date: 1st century BC-1st century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 5th-3rd century BC	Translation
ὁ δὲ Δαμάστηι χρώμενος μάρτυρι οὐδὲν διαφέρει τοῦ καλοῦντος μάρτυρα τὸν Βεργαῖον ἢ τὸν Μεσσηνίον Εὐήμερον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους, οὓς αὐτὸς (sc. Ἐρατοσθένης) εἶρηκε διαβάλλων τὴν φλυαρίαν.	But citing Damastes as proof is no different than citing as authorities the Bergaian or the Messenian Euhemerus and the rest, whom Eratosthenes himself mentions, slandering their nonsense.

63 T 5a Commentary

(This passage is also given by Jacoby as *FGrH* 5 (Damastes) T7.) As part of his lengthy critiques of earlier geographic writers, Strabo criticizes Eratosthenes for spending too much time discussing untrustworthy sources, and sometimes being overly credulous about the ‘information’ they contained. Damastes of Sigeum, a younger contemporary of Herodotus, was a geographer and historian. Antiphanes of Berga in Thrace was a writer known for his penchant for telling tall tales, and the adjective Bergaian became a shorthand for unreliable authors. On the perceived veracity of the *Sacred Register*, see the commentary on F3.

63 T 5a Bibliography

On Strabo, see D. Dueck, *Strabo of Amasia: A Greek Man of Letters in Augustan Rome* (London 2000). On his *Geography*, see G. Aujac, (ed.), *Strabon Géographie* (Paris 1969), vii-57.

On Damastes, see *FGrH* 5. On Antiphanes, see W. Schmid, 'Antiphanes', in *RE* 1: 2521-2.

63 T 5b - STRABON II 4, 2	meta [[id="63" type="T" n="5" n-mod="b" sourcework(level1="Strabo" level2="" level3="Geographica [Vide: Apollodorus et Eratosthenes apud Strabonem]" level4="" level5="" level6="2, 4, 2") II
---------------------------	---

Subject: Genre: Geography Historical Work: <i>Geography</i> Source Date: 1st century BC-1st century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 4th-2nd century BC	Translation
πολὺν δὲ φησι (sc. Πολύβιος) βέλτιον τῶι Μεσσηνίῳ πιστεύειν ἢ τούτῳ (sc. Πυθέαι). ὁ μὲντοι γε εἰς μίαν χώραν τὴν Παγχαίαν λέγει πλεῦσαι· ὁ δὲ καὶ μέχρι τῶν τοῦ κόσμου περάτων....Ἐρατοσθένη δὲ τὸν μὲν Εὐήμερον Βεργαῖον καλεῖν, Πυθέαι δὲ πιστεύειν...	He (Polybius) says that it is far better to believe the Messenian than Pytheas. (He says that) the former at all events claims that he sailed to a single country, Panchaia, whereas Pytheas asserts that he explored even as far as the ends of the world....He (Poseidonius) says that Eratosthenes calls Euhemerus a Bergaian, but believes Pytheas...

63 T 5b Commentary

(This passage forms part of Polybius 34.5.) In this section of his work Strabo is discussing Polybius' skepticism about the ostensible explorations of Pytheas as well as Polybius' and Poseidonius' criticisms of Eratosthenes' willingness to believe at least some parts of Pytheas' account. (The subject of the clause introducing the indirect discourse beginning with Ἐρατοσθένη is elided, but it would appear to be Poseidonius rather than Polybius, given that both before and after the quote given here Strabo discusses Poseidonius' work and given that Strabo shortly after this quote launches into an attack on Polybius and Poseidonius.)

Pytheas of Massalia was a seafarer, astronomer, and geographer who was active in the fourth century BC. He wrote a now lost work, *On the Ocean*, which described a voyage through the straits of Gibraltar to the British Isles and Scandinavia. The reliability of Pytheas' account was a subject of considerable debate in antiquity. On the perceived veracity of the *Sacred Register*, see the commentary on F3.

63 T 5b Bibliography

On Pytheas, see C. H. Roseman, (ed.), *Pytheas of Massalia: On the Ocean* (Chicago 1994). On 'Bergaian', see T5a.

63 T 5c - STRABON VII 3, 6	meta [[id="63" type="T" n="5" n-mod="c" sourcework(level1="Strabo" level2="" level3="Geographica [Vide: Apollodorus et Eratosthenes apud Strabonem]" level4="" level5="" level6="7, 3, 6")]]
Subject: Genre: Geography Historical Work: <i>Geography</i> Source Date: 1st century BC-1st century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 6th-2nd century BC	Translation
ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων ἐπὶ τοὺς συγγραφέας βαδίζει (scil. Ἀπολλόδωρος) Ῥιπαῖα ὄρη λέγοντας καὶ τὸ Ὠγύιον ὄρος καὶ τὴν τῶν Γοργόνων καὶ Ἑσπερίδων κατοικίαν καὶ τὴν παρὰ Θεοπόμπῳ Μεροπίδα γῆν, παρ' Ἑκαταίῳ δὲ Κιμμερίδα πόλιν, παρ' Εὐημέρῳ δὲ τὴν Παγχ<α>ίαν γῆν... – ebd. II 3, 5.	From these men he (Apollodorus) proceeds against the historians who speak of the Rhipaian Mountains, and of Mt. Ogyion, and of the settlement of the Gorgons and Hesperides, and of the Land of Meropis in Theopompus, as well as the City of Cimmeris in Hecataeus, and the Land of Panchaia in Euhemerus... (Cf. Strabo 2.3.5.)

63 T 5c Commentary

This entire passage is also given by Jacoby as *FGrH* 244 (Apollodorus) F157a. Jacoby printed ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων ἐπὶ τοὺς συγγραφέας βαδίζει Ῥιπαῖα ὄρη λέγοντας καὶ τὸ Ὠγύιον ὄρος καὶ τὴν τῶν Γοργόνων καὶ Ἑσπερίδων κατοικίαν as *FGrH* 1 (Hecataeus of Miletus) F194. The same text, with the addition of καὶ τὴν παρὰ Θεοπόμπῳ Μεροπίδα γῆν, is printed by Jacoby as *FGrH* 115 (Theopompus) F75d. 'παρ' Ἑκαταίῳ δὲ Κιμμερίδα πόλιν is supplied by Jacoby as *FGrH* 264 (Hecataeus of Abdera) F8.

In this section of his work Strabo is discussing Apollodorus' critiques of inaccuracies and fabrications in earlier geographic treatises. See the discussion and bibliography in the relevant entries in *FGrH*. On the perceived veracity of the *Sacred Register*, see the commentary on F3.

63 T 5c Bibliography

Writer, title etc.

63 T 6a - CICERO De n. d. I 119 (T 4 d)	meta [[id="63" type="T" n="6" n-mod="a" sourcework(level1="Cicero (Tullius)" level2="" level3="De natura deorum" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 119")]]
Subject: Philosophy, Religion Historical Work: <i>On the Nature of the Gods</i> Source Date: 1st century BC Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 4th-3rd century BC	Translation
	See T4d

63 T 6a Commentary

This is an example of a Normal paragraph with text. Italics can be added.

63 T 6a Bibliography

Writer, title etc.

63 T 6b - LACTANT. Div. inst. I 11, 33 (T 3)	meta [[id="63" type="T" n="6" n-mod="b" sourcework(level1="Lactantius (Caelius [Caecilius?])" level2="" level3="Divinae institutiones" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 11, 33")]]
Subject: Genre: Biography Historical Work: <i>Divine Institutes</i> Source Date: 4th century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 4th-3rd century BC	Translation
Übersetzung des Ennius.	See T3.

63 T 6b Commentary

This is an example of a Normal paragraph with text. Italics can be added.

63 T 6b Bibliography

Writer, title etc.

63 F 1 - ATHEN. XIV 658 E F	meta [[id="63" type="F" n="1" sourcework(level1="Athenaeus" level2="" level3="Deipnosophistae" level4="" level5="" level6="14, 77, 658ef")]]
Subject: Genre: Biography Historical Work: <i>Philosophers at Dinner</i> Source Date: 2nd-3rd century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?	Translation
Εὐήμερος...ὁ Κῶιος ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ τῆς Ἱερᾶς Ἀναγραφῆς τοῦθ' ἱστορεῖ, ὡς Σιδωνίων λεγόντων τοῦτο, ὅτι Κάδμος μάγειρος ὦν τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ παραλαβὼν τὴν Ἀρμονίαν ἀύλητρίδα καὶ αὐτὴν οὔσαν τοῦ βασιλέως ἔφυγεν σὺν αὐτῇ.	Euhemerus....of Cos in the third book of the <i>Sacred Register</i> relates that the Sidonians say this, that Cadmus was the king's cook and that taking Harmonia, a flute-player who also belonged to the king, he fled with her.

63 F 1 Commentary

This fragment is something of an outlier in that it does not relate to the two elements of Euhemerus' work that seem to have been of particular interest to later authors: his views on the divine and his description of Hiera and Panchaia. It forms part of a lengthy excursus on cooks (658e-62d), and Athenaeus provides no information that would make it possible to place it within the larger economy of the *Sacred Register*. This passage, along with F11, make it clear that Euhemerus discussed topics having to do with the early 'history' of the Near East, but little definite beyond that can be said due to paucity of evidence. This passage has been much discussed by those scholars who see the *Sacred Register* as a satirical work (see G. Vallauri, (ed.), *Euemero di Messene* (Torino 1956), 54 and the commentary on F3).

63 F 1 Bibliography

On Athenaeus, see D. Braund and J. Wilkins, (eds.), *Athenaeus and his World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire* (Exeter 2000) and A. M. Desrousseau and C. Astruc, (eds.), *Athénée de Naucratis Les Deipnosophistes Livres I et II* (Paris 1956), vii-lxvii.

63 F 2 - DIODOR. (VI 1) bei EUSEB. P E II 2 p. 59	meta [[id="63" type="F" n="2" sourcework(
--	---

<p>B-61 A</p>	<p>level1="Diodorus Siculus" level2="" level3="Bibliotheca historica" level4="" level5="" level6="6, 1") sourcework(level1="Diodorus Siculus" level2="apud Eusebium Caesariensem" level3="Praeparatio evangelica" level4="" level5="" level6="2, 2, 52-62,59b-61a")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Geography, Religion Historical Work: <i>Historical Library</i> Source Date: 1st century BC Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 4th-3rd century BC</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>ταῦτα ὁ Διόδωρος ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ τῶν Ἱστοριῶν (c. 56ff. = 32 F 7). ὁ δ' αὐτὸς καὶ ἐν τῇ ἕκτῃ ἀπὸ τῆς Εὐημέρου τοῦ Μεσσηνίου γραφῆς ἐπικυροῖ τὴν αὐτὴν θεολογίαν, κατὰ λέξιν ὧδε φάσκων. (2) περὶ θεῶν τοίνυν διττὰς οἱ παλαιοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοῖς μεταγενεστέροις παραδεδώκασιν ἐννοίας. τοὺς μὲν γὰρ αἰδίους καὶ ἀφθάρτους εἶναί φασιν, οἷον ἥλιόν τε καὶ σελήνην καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἄστρα τὰ κατ' οὐρανόν, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἀνέμους καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς τῆς ὁμοίας φύσεως τούτοις τετευχότας· τούτων γὰρ ἕκαστον αἰδίον ἔχει τὴν γένεσιν καὶ τὴν διαμονήν. ἑτέρους δὲ λέγουσιν ἐπιγείους γενέσθαι θεούς, διὰ δὲ τὰς εἰς ἀνθρώπους εὐεργεσίας ἀθανάτου τετευχότας τιμῆς τε καὶ δόξης, οἷον Ἡρακλέα Διόνυσον Ἀρισταῖον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς τούτοις ὁμοίους. (3) περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐπιγείων θεῶν πολλοὶ καὶ ποικίλοι παραδέδονται λόγοι παρὰ τοῖς ἱστορικοῖς καὶ μυθογράφοις· καὶ τῶν μὲν ἱστορικῶν Εὐήμερος ὁ τὴν Ἱερὰν Ἀναγραφὴν ποιησάμενος ἰδίως ἀναέγραφεν, τῶν δὲ μυθολόγων Ὅμηρος καὶ Ἡσίοδος καὶ Ὀρφεὺς καὶ ἕτεροι τοιοῦτοι τερατωδεστέρους μύθους περὶ</p>	<p>(The passage begins with Eusebius discussing the work of Diodorus Siculus.) Diodorus relates these (preceding) things in the third book of his <i>Histories</i> (3.56-61, excerpts from the work of Dionysius Skytobrachion, see <i>FGrH</i> 32 F7). And the same writer, in the sixth book, confirms the same view of the divine, drawing on the work of Euhemerus of Messene, writing verbatim as follows. (2) 'Concerning the gods, then, men of old have handed down to their descendants them two conceptions. For they say that some of the gods are eternal and imperishable, such as both the sun and the moon and the rest of the stars in the heavens, and in addition to them the winds and whatever else happens to have a nature similar to theirs. For they say that each of these has eternal genesis and duration. They say the other gods were terrestrial beings who, on account of their services to humankind, met with both immortal honor and fame, such as Herakles, Dionysos, Aristaios, and the rest of those like them. (3) Concerning the terrestrial gods many variant accounts</p>

θεῶν πεπλάκασιν. ἡμεῖς δὲ τὰ παρ' ἀμφοτέροις ἀναγεγραμμένα πειρασόμεθα συντόμως ἐπιδραμεῖν... (4) Εὐήμερος μὲν οὖν...(T 1) φησὶν ἐκτοπισθῆναι κατὰ τὴν μεσημβρίαν εἰς τὸν ὠκεανόν (vgl. T 5 b)· ἐκπλεύσαντα γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐκ τῆς Εὐδαίμονος Ἀραβίας ποιήσασθαι τὸν πλοῦν δι' ὠκεανοῦ πλείους ἡμέρας καὶ προσενεχθῆναι νήσοις πελαγίαις, ὧν μίαν ὑπάρχειν τὴν ὀνομαζομένην Παγχαίαν, ἐν ἣι τεθεῶσθαι τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας Παγχαίους εὐσεβείαι διαφέροντας καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς τιμῶντας μεγαλοπρεπεστάταις θυσίαις καὶ ἀναθήμασιν ἀξιολόγοις ἀργυροῖς τε καὶ χρυσοῖς. (5) εἶναι δὲ καὶ τὴν νῆσον ἱερὰν θεῶν· καὶ ἕτερα πλείω θαυμαζόμενα κατὰ τε τὴν ἀρχαιότητα καὶ τὴν τῆς κατασκευῆς πολυτεχνίαν, περὶ ὧν τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἐν ταῖς πρὸ ταύτης βίβλοις ἀναγεγράφαμεν (F3)· (6) εἶναι δ' ἐν αὐτῇ κατὰ τινὰ λόφον ὑψηλὸν καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἱερὸν Διὸς Τριφυλίου, καθιδρυμένον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, καθ' ὃν καιρὸν ἐβασίλευσε τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπάσης ἔτι κατὰ ἀνθρώπους ὧν· (7) ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ἱερῷ στήλῃν εἶναι χρυσοῦν, ἐν ἣι τοῖς Παγχαίοις γράμμασιν ὑπάρχειν γεγραμμένας τὰς τε Οὐρανοῦ καὶ Κρόνου καὶ Διὸς πράξεις κεφαλαιωδῶς. (8) μετὰ ταῦτά φησι πρῶτον Οὐρανὸν γεγονέναι βασιλέα, ἐπεικῆ τινὰ ἄνδρα καὶ εὐεργετικὸν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἄστρον κινήσεως ἐπιστήμονα· ὃν καὶ πρῶτον θυσίαις τιμῆσαι τοὺς οὐρανίους θεοὺς διὸ καὶ Οὐρανὸν προσαγορευθῆναι. (9) υἱὸς δὲ αὐτῷ γενέσθαι ἀπὸ γυναικὸς Ἑστίας Τιτᾶνα καὶ Κρόνον, θυγατέρας δὲ Ἑρέαν καὶ Δήμητρα. Κρόνον δὲ βασιλεῦσαι μετὰ Οὐρανὸν καὶ γήμαντα Ἑρέαν γεννῆσαι Δία καὶ Ἥραν καὶ Ποσειδῶνα. τὸν δὲ Δία διαδεξάμενον τὴν

have been handed down by historians and mythographers. Of the historians Euhemerus, who composed the *Sacred Register*, wrote specifically on this subject. Of the mythographers, Homer and Hesiod and Orpheus and others of that sort have fabricated rather monstrous stories about the gods. We will attempt to run through briefly the accounts given by both groups of writers....(Diodorus now launches into a lengthy summary of part of Euhemerus' work, a summary that runs all the way to the end of section 10.) (4) Euhemerus therefore...(see T1 for text in ellipsis) says that he was borne south to the ocean (cf. T5b). For (he says that,) having set sail from Blessed Arabia, he made the journey through the ocean for many days and was borne to islands in the sea, one of which was called Panchaia. (He says that) on this island he saw the Panchaians who live there, who are distinguished by their piety and who honor the gods with magnificent sacrifices and with remarkable dedications in both silver and gold. (5) (He says that) there is also an island sacred to the gods, and (that) there are a number of other things which are objects of wonder on account of both their antiquity and on account of the consummate skill with which they were made. We have written about these objects in turn in the earlier books (see F3). (6) (He says that) there is on the island, situated on a certain exceedingly lofty hill, a sanctuary of Zeus Triphylios, which was established by Zeus himself during the time he ruled over the entire inhabited world, still being among men. (7) (He says that) in this shrine there

βασιλείαν γῆμαι Ἴηραν καὶ Δῆμητρον καὶ
Θέμιν· ἐξ ὧν παῖδας ποιήσασθαι Κουρήτας
μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης, Περσεφόνην δὲ ἐκ τῆς
δευτέρας, Ἀθηναῖν δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς τρίτης. (10)
ἐλθόντα δὲ εἰς Βαβυλῶνα ἐπιξενωθῆναι
Βήλωι· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰς τὴν Παγχαίαν
νῆσον πρὸς τῷ ὠκεανῷ κειμένην
παραγενόμενον Οὐρανοῦ τοῦ ἰδίου
προπάτορος βωμὸν ἰδρύσασθαι· κάκεῖθεν
διὰ Συρίας ἐλθεῖν πρὸς τὸν τότε δυνάστην
Κάσιον, ἐξ οὗ τὸ Κάσιον ὄρος· ἐλθόντα τε
εἰς Κιλικίαν πολέμῳ νικῆσαι Κίλικα
τοπάρχην· καὶ ἄλλα δὲ πλεῖστα ἔθνη
ἐπελθόντα παρὰ πᾶσιν τιμηθῆναι καὶ θεὸν
ἀναγορευθῆναι. (11) ταῦτα καὶ τὰ τούτοις
παραπλήσια ὡς περὶ θνητῶν ἀνδρῶν περὶ
τῶν θεῶν διελθὼν ἐπιφέρει λέγων· καὶ
περὶ μὲν Εὐημέρου τοῦ συνταξαμένου τὴν
Ἰερὰν Ἀναγραφὴν ἀρκεσθησόμεθα τοῖς
ῤηθεῖσιν...

is a golden *stèle*, on which is inscribed, in Panchaean lettering, a summary of the deeds of Ouranos and Kronos and Zeus. (8) After these things he says that Ouranos was the first to become king, that he was a moderate and beneficent man and versed in the movement of the stars, and that he was the first to honor the heavenly (*ouranious*) gods with sacrifices, on account of which he was called by the name of Ouranos. (9) (He says that) sons, Titan and Kronos, and daughters, Rhea and Demeter, were born to Ouranos from his wife, Hestia. (He says that) Kronos became king after Ouranos and, marrying Rhea, had children, Zeus and Hera and Poseidon. (He says that) Zeus, on succeeding to the kingship, married Hera and Demeter and Themis and from them had children, the Kouretes from the first, Persephone from the second, Athena from the third. (10) (He says that) Zeus, going to Babylon, was hospitably received by Belos and (that), after that, going to the island of Panchaia, which lies in the ocean, he erected an altar to his forefather Ouranos. And (he says that) from there Zeus went through Syria and arrived at the court of Cassios, who was at that point in time ruler and from whom Mt. Casius takes its name. And (he says that) coming to Cilicia Zeus conquered in war Cilix, who was governor of the region, and (that) visiting many other peoples, he was honored and proclaimed a god by all of them'. (11) After recounting these things and others like them about the gods as if about mortal men, he (Diodorus) goes on to say, 'And concerning Euhemerus who composed the

<i>Sacred Register</i> we will be content with what has been said...'

63 F 2 Commentary

Note: The translation provided here is more literal than literary, so that the reader can better follow the complexities of the passage, as Diodorus moves in and out of indirect discourse (reported speech). The repeated use of conjunctions at the beginning of sentences is likely the result of Diodorus abridging and summarizing what he found in the *Sacred Register*.

The first six books of Diodorus' *Historical Library* offer a systematic treatment of the *mythoi*, customs, and lands of both non-Greeks (Books 1-3) and Greeks (Books 4-6). Diodorus drew on Euhemerus in two separate places in the extant text of the *Library*. In Book 5, much of which is devoted to islands, Diodorus gives a detailed resumé of Euhemerus' description of Hiera and Panchaia (F3 5.41-6). In Book 6, which is devoted to Greek myths set in the period going down to the Trojan War, Diodorus summarizes Euhemerus' views on the divine (F2 6.1).

F2 is the most detailed extant summary of Euhemerus' religious views. At first glance it appears to ascribe three basic religious ideas to Euhemerus: (1) a belief that many gods are in fact humans from earlier ages who have received divine honors; (2) a belief that the granting of divine honors to humans was the result of the benefactions they bestowed on humankind (euergetism); and (3) a belief in two different kinds of gods, imperishable 'heavenly' deities such as the sun and moon and 'terrestrial' deities in the form of humans who have received divine honors. The collection of extant fragments taken as a whole leaves no doubt that Euhemerus was a proponent of (1), suggests that he also endorsed (2), and leaves the situation with regard to (3) very much up in the air. In order to understand why, it is necessary to begin with a brief review of the textual history of this and many of the other fragments of the *Sacred Register*. (See below for detailed commentary on specific sections of F2.)

The text of this fragment comes to us third-hand—it is Eusebius' quotation of Diodorus' summary of Euhemerus' work. Of the original 40 books of Diodorus' *Library*, Books 1-5 and 11-20 survive intact through the normal chain of manuscript transmission. This passage comes from a different route; it forms part of Eusebius' *Evangelike Proparaskeue* (*Preparation for the Gospel*, more typically cited by its Latin equivalent, *Praeparatio Evangelica*), an apologetic work of the early fourth century AD. Eusebius constructed this *apologia* in large

part around lengthy verbatim quotations from pagan sources, in order to defuse any charge that he was mischaracterizing pagan religious thought. In Book 2 of the *Praeparatio Evangelica* Eusebius considers the religions of Egypt and Greece and to that end brings in long passages from the early parts of Diodorus' *Library*, including this fragment. Eusebius, like other Christian apologists, found Euhemerus' ideas to be a useful avenue of attack on pagan religion.

In various places (in both the *Praeparatio Evangelica* and in other works) Eusebius claims to have transcribed verbatim a section of Diodorus' *Library*, and the many overlaps between passages quoted by Eusebius and those preserved in the entirely separate manuscript tradition for the *Library* shows that that is in fact what Eusebius generally did. However, despite the fact that Eusebius claims to have transcribed verbatim the text that makes up F2, there are inconsistencies between the description of the island of Panchaia found in F2 and the description of Panchaia in F3, which comes to us through the manuscript tradition of the *Library* (G. Bounoure, 'Eusèbe citateur de Diodore', *REG* 95 (1982), 433-9). For instance, at F3 5.42.6 the temple of Triphylian Zeus is described as located in a plain, whereas at F2 6.1.6 it is described as located on a lofty hill. At F3 5.46.7 the inscription in the temple is described as written in 'letters that are called sacred among the Egyptians', whereas at F2 6.1.7 it is described as written in 'Panchaiaian lettering'. (On the discrepancies between F2 and F3, see G. Némethy, *Euhemeri Reliquiae* (Budapest 1889), 9, 77-8, though cf. G. Vallauri, (ed.), *Euemero di Messene* (Torino 1956), 54.) It seems likely, therefore, that Eusebius, although he made an effort to quote from Diodorus verbatim, introduced at least some changes to the original text of F2. (The alternative possibility, that the contradictions were already present in text of the *Library*, is less probable but not impossible. For an attempt to reconcile the contradiction between F3 5.42.6 and F2 6.1.6, see Némethy, *Euhemeri Reliquiae*, 77).

Further difficulties arise when we take up the question of whether Diodorus faithfully summarized Euhemerus' views on the divine or presented his own interpretation of those views. (Eusebius' statement that in this section of the *Library* Diodorus was 'drawing on the writings of Euhemerus of Messene' is not helpful in this regard.) Until relatively recently Diodorus was typically characterized in the modern scholarship as an unimaginative compiler who simply transcribed what he found in extant sources. This was grounds for assuming that Diodorus faithfully summarized Euhemerus' views. More recently, however, it has become clear that Diodorus structured the *Library* around a clearly articulated set of beliefs and priorities and accordingly modified what he found in his sources in ways both large and small.

The single most important alternative source of information about Euhemerus' religious views is Lactantius' *Divine Institutes* (especially FF 13, 21, 23-4), and here again there are textual complications that merit consideration. Lactantius did not access Euhemerus' work directly, but rather through an unknown intermediary who summarized or abridged a Latin translation of the *Sacred Register* produced by Ennius early in the second century BC. There has been much debate as to whether Ennius' translation was rendered in verse or prose and about the nature and extent of the changes to the original introduced by Ennius. There is now something of a consensus that Ennius produced a relatively free prose translation. Some details of the passages from the *Divine Institutes* show that the Latin version of the *Sacred Register* differed in at least some ways from the Greek original. For example, in F14 1.14.5 the Latin equivalent of Pluto is specified, and F23 1.22.25 includes a reference to Aeneas; neither can have appeared in the Greek text written by Euhemerus. However, comparison of Lactantius' paraphrases of Ennius' translation and the Greek fragments reveal only one significant contradiction. According to Diodorus, Ouranos received his name from having been the first to honor the heavenly gods with sacrifices (F2 6.1.8), whereas Lactantius states that Jupiter renamed the sky after his grandfather Ouranos (F21). In the first version, Ouranos is named after the sky, in the second the sky is named after Ouranos (G. Vallauri, (ed.), *Euemero di Messene* (Torino 1956), 10-11). However, the relatively close correspondences between the contents of the fragments based on the original Greek text and the fragments based on Ennius' translation indicate that Ennius did not introduce substantive changes to the original.

All of this must be borne in mind when reading F2. In regard to the belief that humans have received divine honors on account of their euergetism, one of the more prominent themes in the *Library* is that of progress achieved as the result of necessity and by means of the inventions and benefactions of individuals, who are rewarded with divine honors. K. Sacks has pointed out that 'Almost seventy times in the first five books and the very few fragments of book vi, Diodorus records a benefactor's gift to humanity and the consequent divine election' (*Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* (Princeton 1990), 71). The assignment of a causal role to benefaction in the process of deification in F2 may, therefore, have come from Euhemerus himself, or it may have been added by Diodorus.

There are multiple pieces of evidence that might suggest that assigning a causal role to benefaction was a Diodoran innovation. First, Diodorus repeatedly employs a formulaic phrase of his own creation, τυχεῖν ἀθανάτων τιμῶν, in discussing the deification of mortals (*ibid.*). Precisely that phrase occurs in F2 6.1.2 (διὰ δὲ τὰς εἰς ἀνθρώπους εὐεργεσίας ἀθανάτου τετευχότας τιμῆς). Second, the only place in F2 where deification is the direct result of benefaction is 6.1.2, a section which purports to describe the opinions of οἱ παλαιοὶ. The first mention of Euhemerus is at 6.1.3, and there is no certainty that 6.1.2 is

intended as a summary of Euhemerus' views on religion. Third, in F22 Lactantius gives a lengthy account of Jupiter's deification, according to which he is elevated not on account of his benefactions but due to his own, clever manipulation of the kings and princes who served as his hosts. Finally, Sextus Empiricus (T4c) specifically paraphrases Euhemerus as saying that powerful and wise rulers 'invented for themselves a certain superhuman and divine authority, whereupon they were reckoned gods by the populace'; this seems to preclude a causal role for benefaction.

On the other hand, Minucius Felix (T4f) characterizes Euhemerus as writing about 'those who have been reckoned gods on account of services in the form of bravery or doing their duty', which certainly suggests the existence of a causal connection. Furthermore, in F3 5.46.2 Euhemerus describes priests on Panchaia as singing about the deeds of the gods and their benefactions to humankind, which implies that euergetism was an important element of the relationship between gods and humans. In addition, Euhemerus offers portrayals of both Kronos and Zeus (and presumably Ouranos as well) that are much more sympathetic than those found in Hesiod and [Apollodorus] (see FF12-16 and the commentary thereon). In F20 Zeus, living on Mt. Olympos, receives visits from anyone having invented something useful for humankind, in F22 he puts an end to the eating of human flesh, and in F24 he creates laws, customs, and grain. All this indicates that Euhemerus went out of his way to construct Zeus as an admirable culture-hero, and he presumably did the same for Ouranos and Kronos. A culture-hero by definition is a figure who does good for humankind—the prototypical culture-hero in Greek myth is Prometheus—and Euhemerus' evident interest in painting Zeus and others in those colors strongly suggests that Euhemerus drew a causal connection between euergetism and deification. Here again some degree of caution is called for, as Diodorus also showed a considerable interest in culture-heroes in Books 1-6 of the *Library*. However, the fragments of the *Sacred Register* from Lactantius show that the regular appearance of culture-heroes in the fragments of the *Sacred Register* from the *Library* reflects the original contents of Euhemerus' work. It is probable in fact that a shared interest in culture-heroes is one of the reasons why Diodorus drew on Euhemerus as a source. One might, therefore, tentatively conclude that Euhemerus did indeed draw a causal connection between euergetism and deification.

Significantly less certainty is possible with respect to the question of whether Euhemerus believed that there were two types of deities (eternal and imperishable entities, such as the sun and the moon, and deified humans), or only one type (deified humans). Diodorus ascribes a belief in precisely these two types of deities to the Egyptians (1.12.10-13.1) and Ethiopians (3.9.1) and in doing so uses wording similar to that found in F2. In addition, the differentiation between heavenly and terrestrial deities does not appear in any of the other fragments of Euhemerus' work. In F2 6.1.2 Diodorus makes a clear distinction between

heavenly and terrestrial deities, but here again it is necessary to bear in mind that 6.1.2 is a description of the views of οἱ παλαιοὶ, not explicitly of Euhemerus. It is also potentially relevant that Aetios (T4a) and Sextus Empiricus (T4b-c) characterize Euhemerus as an atheist, and Callimachus, in writing that Euhemerus ‘scribbles impious books’, is probably suggesting the same thing (T4a). This would not fit well with a belief in imperishable heavenly deities. On the other hand, F2 6.1.8, where Diodorus is definitely summarizing the *Sacred Register*, he describes Ouranos as ‘the first to honor the heavenly gods with sacrifices’. Winiarczyk, who invested a great deal of time and effort in the study of both Euhemerus’ work and of atheism in the ancient world, is of the opinion that Euhemerus made ‘keine klare Einteilung in himmlische und irdische Götter’ (*Euhemerus von Messene: Leben, Werk und Nachwirkung* (Munich 2002), 29). The one conclusion that stands out is that Euhemerus’ religious views, beyond the relatively straightforward conception that some gods were humans who had been granted divine honors, are less evident than they might appear.

It is not entirely clear that Euhemerus’ ideas on religion were particularly original, in spite of the fact that his name became synonymous with a belief that the gods were originally humans who had been deified. Well before Euhemerus’ time Greeks had turned numerous prominent individuals such as the founders of colonies into objects of worship, had put a great deal of emphasis on euergetism, and had shown an ongoing interest in the rationalistic interpretation of myth. In the fifth century sophists began to inquire into the origins of religion, and over the course of the fourth century ruler cult became an increasingly important part of the Greek religious and political landscape. It may have been the case that Euhemerus’ work became a standard referent more because it presented ideas in an interesting fashion than because of the novelty of the ideas involved.

The rest of the commentary on this fragment focuses on details in specific sections of text.

6.1.2: Aristaios in Greek myth was the son of Apollo and the nymph Cyrene and the guardian of Dionysos. He was a culture-hero who, among other things, was associated with the beginning of bee-keeping (cf. F27) and who was ultimately accorded divine honors. Diodorus discusses Aristaios at some length at 3.81-2.

6.1.6, 6.1.10: On Zeus Triphylaios, Belos, and Cassios, see the commentary on F23.

63 F 2 Bibliography

On the transmission of the text of the *Sacred Register*, see Winiarczyk, *Euhemerus von Messene*, 15-17. Winiarczyk argues that all the preserved text should be considered testimonia (i.e., that there are no extant fragments), which is perhaps something of an

extreme position. On the *Historical Library* and *Divine Institutes*, see the work cited in the bibliography to T1. On the degree of correspondence between the Greek text of the *Sacred Register* and Ennius' translation, see Winiarczyk, *Euhemerus von Messene*, 126-131 and E. Romano, 'Oracoli divini e responsi di giuristi: Nota sulla *interpretatio ennian* nell'*Euhemerus*', in L. Castagna and C. Riboldi (eds.), *Amicitiae templa serena: Studi in onore di Giuseppe Aricò* (Milan 2008), 2: 1433-48 at 1443-7. On the *Praeparatio Evangelica*, see A. Kofsky, *Eusebius of Caesarea against Paganism* (Leiden 2000). For a detailed discussion of the manifold issues related to Euhemerus' religious views, see G. Vallauri, (ed.), *Euemero di Messene* (Torino 1956), 19-23 and Winiarczyk, *Euhemerus von Messene*, 28-74, 119-35. On culture-heroes in the *Library*, see I. Sulimani, *Diodorus' Mythistory and the Pagan Mission: Historiography and Culture-Heroes in the First Pentad of the Bibliotheca* (Leiden 2011). Winiarczyk argues that there was little original in Euhemerus' ideas on religion. For more positive assessments, see A. I. Baumgarten, 'Euhemerus' Eternal Gods: or, How Not to Be Embarrassed by Greek Mythology', in R. Katzoff (ed.), *Classical Studies in Honor of David Sohlberg* (Ramat Gan, Israel 1996), 91-103 and R. J. Müller, 'Überlegungen zur *Hiera Anagraphe* des Euhemerus von Messene', *Hermes* 121 (1993), 276-300.

<p>63 F 3 - DIODOR. V 41-46</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="3" sourcework(level1="Diodorus Siculus" level2="" level3="Bibliotheca historica" level4="" level5="" level6="5, 41, 1-46, 8")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Geography, Mythology Historical Work: <i>Historical Library</i> Source Date: 1st century BC Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 4th-3rd century BC</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>(41) ἐπεὶ δὲ περὶ τῆς πρὸς ἑσπέραν κεκλιμένης χώρας καὶ τῆς πρὸς τὰς ἄρκτους νενευκίας, ἔτι δὲ τῶν κατὰ τὸν ὠκεανὸν νήσων διεξήλθομεν, ἐν μέρει διεξιμεν περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν μεσημβρίαν νήσων τῶν ἐν ὠκεανῶι τῆς Ἀραβίας τῆς πρὸς ἀνατολὴν κεκλιμένης καὶ προσοριζούσης τῆι καλουμένῃ Κεδρωσίαι. (2) ἡ μὲν γὰρ χώρα πολλαῖς κώμαις καὶ πόλεσιν ἀξιολόγοις κατοικεῖται, καὶ τούτων αἱ μὲν ἐπὶ χωμάτων ἀξιολόγων κεῖνται, αἱ δ' ἐπὶ γεωλόφων ἢ πεδίων</p>	<p>(41) Since we have described the area which lies to the west and that which extends northward, and also the islands in the ocean, we will in turn discuss the islands to the south, the ones in the ocean off Arabia, which is situated to the east and which borders on the area known as Cedrosia. (2) For this area is settled with many villages and notable cities, of which some are situated on remarkable mounds, others of which are built on hillocks or in plains. The largest cities have lavishly</p>

καθίδρυνται· ἔχουσι δ' αὐτῶν αἰ μέγιστα βασιλεία κατεσκευασμένα πολυτελῶς, πλῆθος οἰκητόρων ἔχοντα καὶ κτήσεις ἱκανάς. (3) πᾶσα δ' αὐτῶν ἡ χώρα γέμει θρεμμάτων παντοδαπῶν, καρποφοροῦσα καὶ νομάς ἀφθόλους παρεχομένη τοῖς βοσκήμασι· ποταμοὶ τε πολλοὶ διαρρέοντες ἐν αὐτῇ πολλὴν ἀρδεύουσι χώραν, συνεργοῦντες πρὸς τελείαν ἀύξησιν τῶν καρπῶν. διὸ καὶ τῆς Ἀραβίας ἡ πρωτεύουσα τῇ ἀρετῇ προσηγορίαν ἔλαβεν οἰκειάν, Εὐδαίμων ὀνομασθεῖσα. (4) ταύτης δὲ κατὰ τὰς ἐσχατίας τῆς παρωκεανίτιδος χώρας κατ' ἀντικρὺ νῆσοι κεῖνται πλείους, ὧν τρεῖς εἰσιν ἄξια τῆς ἱστορικῆς ἀναγραφῆς· μία μὲν ἡ προσαγορευομένη Ἱερά, καθ' ἣν οὐκ ἔξεστι τοὺς τετελευτηκότας θάπτειν· ἑτέρα δὲ πλησίον ταύτης, ἀπέχουσα σταδίους ἑπτὰ, εἰς ἣν κοιμίζουσι τὰ σώματα τῶν ἀποθανόντων ταφῆς ἀξιοῦντες. ἡ δ' οὖν Ἱερά τῶν μὲν ἄλλων καρπῶν ἄμοιρός ἐστιν, φέρει δὲ λιβανωτοῦ τοσοῦτο πλῆθος, ὥστε διαρκεῖν καθ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην πρὸς τὰς τῶν θεῶν τιμάς. ἔχει δὲ καὶ σμύρνης πλῆθος διάφορον καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θυμιαμάτων παντοδαπὰς φύσεις, παρεχομένης πολλὴν εὐωδίαν. (5) ἡ δὲ φύσις ἐστὶ τοῦ λιβανωτοῦ καὶ ἡ κατασκευὴ τοιάδε· δένδρον ἐστὶ τῷ μὲν μεγέθει μικρόν, τῇ δὲ προσόψει τῇ ἀκάνθῃ τῇ Αἰγυπτίαι τῇ λευκῇ παρεμφερές, τὰ δὲ φύλλα τοῦ δένδρου ὅμοια τῇ ὀνομαζομένῃ ἰτέαι, καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ἐπ' αὐτῷ φύεται χρυσοειδές, ὃ δὲ λιβανωτὸς γινόμενος ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὀπίζεται ὡς ἂν δάκρυον. (6) τὸ δὲ τῆς σμύρνης δένδρον ὅμοιον ἐστὶ τῇ σχίνῳ, τὸ δὲ φύλλον ἔχει λεπτότερον καὶ πυκνότερον. ὀπίζεται δὲ

equipped royal residences, which have many inhabitants and ample lands. (3) The entire land of the Arabians is full of domestic animals of every kind, bears fruit, and furnishes ungrudging pastures for the fatted animals. Many rivers flowing through it irrigate much of the land, aiding in the full growth of the crops. And, as a result, that part of Arabia that holds first place for its excellence has a suitable name, being called Blessed. (4) On the farthest boundaries of Blessed Arabia, where it borders the ocean, there lie opposite more islands, of which there are three worthy of mention in a historical record. One of them is called Hiera (Sacred), on which it is not permitted to bury the dead. Another island is nearby, being seven stades distant, to which they bring the bodies of the dead whom they reckon worthy of a tomb. Hiera does not produce any other crops, but it produces such a quantity of frankincense that it would suffice for the honors rendered to the gods throughout the entire inhabited world. It also has an exceptional quantity of myrrh and, of the other kinds of incense, every variety that provides a powerful fragrance. (5) The nature of frankincense and its preparation are as follows. The tree is small in size, in appearance it resembles white Egyptian acacia, but its leaves are like those of the tree called the willow. The blooms it bears are gold in color. The frankincense coming from it oozes out like tears. (6) The myrrh tree is like the mastic tree, although its leaves are more slender and grow closer together. It oozes myrrh when the soil is

περισκαφείσης τῆς γῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ῥιζῶν· καὶ ὅσα μὲν αὐτῶν ἐν ἀγαθῇ γῆι πέφυκεν, ἐκ τούτων γίνεται δις τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ, ἔαρος καὶ θέρους· καὶ ὁ μὲν πυρρὸς ἔαρινος ὑπάρχει διὰ τὰς δρόσους, ὁ δὲ λευκὸς θερινός ἐστι. τοῦ δὲ παλιούρου συλλέγουσι τὸν καρπὸν, καὶ χρῶνται βρωτοῖς καὶ ποτοῖς καὶ πρὸς τὰς κοιλίας τὰς ῥεούσας φαρμάκωι. (42) διήρηται δὲ τοῖς ἐγχωρίοις ἡ χώρα· καὶ ταύτης ὁ βασιλεὺς λαμβάνει τὴν κρατίστην, καὶ τῶν καρπῶν τῶν γινομένων ἐν τῇ νήσῳ δεκάτην λαμβάνει. τὸ δὲ πλάτος τῆς νήσου φασὶν εἶναι σταδίων ὡς διακοσίων. (2) κατοικοῦσι δὲ τὴν νῆσον οἱ καλούμενοι Παγχαῖοι· καὶ τότε λιβανωτὸν καὶ τὴν σμύρναν κομίζουσιν εἰς τὸ πέραν καὶ πωλοῦσι τοῖς τῶν Ἀράβων ἐμπόροις, παρ' ὧν ἄλλοι τὰ τοιαῦτα φορτία ὠνούμενοι διακομίζουσιν εἰς τὴν Φοινίκην καὶ Κοίλην Συρίαν, ἔτι δ' Αἴγυπτον· τὸ δὲ τελευταῖον ἐκ τούτων τῶν τόπων ἔμποροι διακομίζουσιν εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην. (3) ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλη νῆσος μεγάλη, τῆς προειρημένης ἀπέχουσα σταδίους τριάκοντα, εἰς τὸ πρὸς ἕω μέρος τοῦ ὠκεανοῦ κειμένη, τῷ μήκει πολλῶν τινων σταδίων· ἀπὸ γὰρ τοῦ πρὸς ἀνατολὰς ἀνήκοντος ἀκρωτηρίου φασὶ θεωρεῖσθαι τὴν Ἰνδικὴν ἀέριον διὰ τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ διαστήματος. (4) ἔχει δ' ἡ Παγχαία κατ' αὐτὴν πολλὰ τῆς ἱστορικῆς ἀναγραφῆς ἄξια. κατοικοῦσι δ' αὐτὴν αὐτόχθονες μὲν οἱ Παγχαῖοι λεγόμενοι, ἐπήλυδες δ' Ὠκεανῖται καὶ Ἰνδοὶ καὶ Σκύθαι καὶ Κρήτες. (5) πόλις δ' ἐστὶν ἀξιόλογος ἐν αὐτῇ, προσαγορευομένη μὲν Πανάρα, εὐδαιμονία δὲ διαφέρουσα. οἱ δὲ ταύτην οἰκοῦντες καλοῦνται μὲν Ἰκέται τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ Τριφυλίου, μόνοι δ' εἰσὶ τῶν τὴν

dug away from its roots, and in the case of myrrh trees planted in good soil, this takes place twice a year, in spring and summer. The spring myrrh is red, on account of the dew, the myrrh of the summer is white. They gather the fruit of the Garland Thorn, which they use for food and drink and as a remedy for dysentery. (42) The territory of Hiera is apportioned among its inhabitants, and the king takes the best of it, and he takes a tithe of the island's produce. They say that the width of the island is about 200 stades. (2) The people inhabiting the island are called Panchaioi. They take both the frankincense and myrrh to the mainland and sell them to Arab merchants, from whom others purchase this sort of wares and convey them to Phoenicia and Koile Syria, and Egypt too. Finally, merchants convey the frankincense and myrrh from these places to the rest of the inhabited world. (3) And there is another large island, 30 stades distant from the aforementioned one, situated in the part of the ocean to the east and many stades in length. For they say that from its promontory that extends to the east India can be seen, misty on account of the great distance. (4) Panchaia has on it many things worthy of historical record. The people who inhabit it are autochthons, called Panchaioi, and non-autochthons, Oceanites and Indians and Scythians and Cretans. (5) There is a noteworthy city on it, called Panara, distinguished for its felicity. The inhabitants of the city are called Suppliants of Zeus Triphylios, and they alone of the inhabitants of the land of

Παγχαίαν χώραν οἰκούντων αὐτόνομοι καὶ ἀβασιλευτοί. ἄρχοντας δὲ καθιστᾶσι κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν τρεῖς· οὗτοι δὲ θανάτου μὲν οὐκ εἰσι κύριοι, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα διακρίνουσι· καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ οὗτοι τὰ μέγιστα ἐπὶ τοὺς ἱερεῖς ἀναφέρουσι. (6) ἀπὸ δὲ ταύτης τῆς πόλεως ἀπέχει σταδίου ὡς ἑξήκοντα ἱερὸν Διὸς Τριφυλίου, κείμενον μὲν ἐν χώρῃ πεδίαδι, θαυμαζόμενον δὲ μάλιστα διὰ τὴν ἀρχαιότητα καὶ τὴν πολυτέλειαν τῆς κατασκευῆς καὶ τὴν τῶν τόπων εὐφυίαν. **(43)** τὸ μὲν οὖν περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν πεδίον συνηρεφές ἐστι παντοίοις δένδρεσιν, οὐ μόνον καρποφόροις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς δυναμένοις τέρπειν τὴν ὄρασιν· κυπαρίττων τε γὰρ ἑξαισίων τοῖς μεγέθεσι καὶ πλατάνων καὶ δάφνης καὶ μυρσίνης καταγέμει, πλήθοντος τοῦ τόπου ναματιαίων ὑδάτων. (2) πλησίον γὰρ τοῦ τεμένους ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐκπίπτει τηλικαύτη τὸ μέγεθος πηγὴ γλυκεὸς ὕδατος, ὥστε ποταμὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς γίνεσθαι πλωτόν· ἐκ τούτου δ' εἰς πολλὰ μέρη τοῦ ὕδατος διαιρουμένου, καὶ τούτων ἀρδευομένων, κατὰ πάντα τὸν τοῦ πεδίου τόπον συνάγκειαι δένδρων ὑψηλῶν πεφύκασι συνεχεῖς, ἐν αἷς πλῆθος ἀνδρῶν ἐν τοῖς τοῦ θέρους καιροῖς ἐνδιατρίβει, ὀρνέων τε πλῆθος παντοδαπῶν ἐννεοττεύεται, ταῖς χλόαις διάφορα καὶ ταῖς μελωδίαις μεγάλην παρεχόμενα τέρψιν, κηπεῖαί τε παντοδαπαὶ καὶ λειμῶνες πολλοὶ καὶ διάφοροι ταῖς χλόαις καὶ τοῖς ἄνθεσιν, ὥστε τῇ θεοπρεπείᾳ τῆς προσόψεως ἄξιον τῶν ἐγχωρίων θεῶν φαίνεσθαι. (3) ἦν δὲ καὶ τῶν φοινίκων στελέχη μεγάλα καὶ καρποφόρα διαφερόντως, καὶ καρύαι πολλαὶ ἀκροδρύων δαψιλεστάτην τοῖς ἐγχωρίοις ἀπόλαυσιν παρεχόμεναι. χωρὶς

Panchaia are autonomous and do not have a king. Each year they elect three chief magistrates. These men do not have authority in capital cases, but they render judgment in all other matters. The most important matters they of their own accord refer to the priests. (6) The sanctuary of Zeus Triphylios is about sixty stades distant from this city, situated in plainland. It is especially admired on account of its antiquity and the lavishness of its construction and the natural beauty of the place where it is built. **(43)** The plain around the sanctuary is, therefore, thickly covered with trees of every kind, not only with those that bear fruit, but also with those that have the power to delight the eye. For the plain overflows with cypresses extraordinary for their size and plane trees and sweet bay and myrtle, since the area is full of flowing water. (2) For close to the sacred precinct, a spring of sweet water bursts forth from the ground, a spring of such size that it gives rise to a navigable river. The water of this river is dispensed to many places that are irrigated with it, and everywhere throughout the plain there grow continuous glens of lofty trees, in which a multitude of men pass their time in the summer season. And a multitude of birds of all kinds make their nests there, remarkable for their colors and providing great delight with their singing. And there are gardens of every kind and many meadows remarkable for the plants and flowers growing in them, so that in the divine majesty of its aspect it appears worthy of the land's gods. (3) And there were mighty trunks of palm trees,

δέ τούτων ὑπῆρχον ἄμπελοί τε πολλαὶ καὶ παντοδαπαί, αἱ πρὸς ὕψος ἀνηγμέναι καὶ διαπεπλεγμέναι ποικίλως τὴν πρόσοψιν ἠδεῖαν ἐποίουν καὶ τὴν ἀπόλαυσιν τῆς ὥρας ἐτοιμοτάτην παρείχοντο. (44) ὁ δὲ ναὸς ὑπῆρχεν ἀξιόλογος ἐκ λίθου λευκοῦ, τὸ μῆκος ἔχων δυεῖν πλέθρων, τὸ δὲ πλάτος ἀνάλογον τῷ μήκει· κίοσι δὲ μεγάλοις καὶ παχέσιν ὑπήρειστο καὶ γλυφαῖς φιλοτέχνους διειλημμένος· ἀγάλματά τε τῶν θεῶν ἀξιολογώτατα, τῆι τέχνῃ διάφορα καὶ τοῖς βάρεσι θαυμαζόμενα. (2) κύκλωι δὲ τοῦ ναοῦ τὰς οἰκίας εἶχον οἱ θεραπεύοντες τοὺς θεοὺς ἱερεῖς, δι' ὧν ἅπαντα τὰ περὶ τὸ τέμενος διωικεῖτο· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ναοῦ δρόμος κατεσκεύαστο, τὸ μὲν μῆκος σταδίων τεττάρων, τὸ δὲ πλάτος πλέθρου. (3) παρὰ δὲ τὴν πλευρὰν ἐκατέραν τοῦ δρόμου χαλκεῖα μεγάλα κεῖται, τὰς βάσεις ἔχοντα τετραγώνους· ἐπ' ἐσχάτῳ δὲ τοῦ δρόμου τὰς πηγὰς ἔχει λάβρως ἐκχεομένης ὁ προειρημένος ποταμὸς. ἔστι δὲ τὸ φερόμενον ρεῦμα τῆι λευκότητι καὶ γλυκύτητι διαφέρον, πρὸς τε τὴν τοῦ σώματος ὑγίειαν πολλὰ συμβαλλόμενον τοῖς χρωμένοις ὀνομάζεται δ' ὁ ποταμὸς οὗτος Ἡλίου ὕδωρ. (4) περιέχει δὲ τὴν πηγὴν ὄλην κρηπὶς λιθίνη πολυτελής, διατείνουσα παρ' ἐκατέραν πλευρὰν σταδίους τέτταρας· ἄχρι δὲ τῆς ἐσχάτης κρηπίδος ὁ τόπος οὐκ ἔστι βásiμος ἀνθρώπῳ πλὴν τῶν ἱερέων. (5) τὸ δ' ὑποκείμενον πεδῖον ἐπὶ σταδίου διακοσίους καθιερωμένον ἔστι τοῖς θεοῖς, καὶ τὰς ἐξ αὐτοῦ προσόδους εἰς τὰς θυσίας ἀναλίσκουσι. μετὰ δὲ τὸ προειρημένον πεδῖον ὄρος ἔστιν ὑψηλόν, καθιερωμένον μὲν θεοῖς, ὀνομαζόμενον δὲ Οὐρανοῦ

distinguished in the fruit they bore, and many nut-bearing trees providing to the inhabitants the most abundant enjoyment of hard-shelled fruits. Apart from these things, grape vines grow, in great number and of every kind; being directed up high and variously intertwined, they made a pleasurable sight and provided the readiest enjoyment of the season. (44) The temple was a remarkable edifice of white stone, the length being two plethra and the width proportionate to the length. It was supported by large, thick columns and was decorated at intervals with ingenious carving. There were also very noteworthy statues of the gods, distinguished by the skill with which they were executed and wondrously massive. (2) The priests who served the gods had their dwellings around the temple, everything pertaining to the sacred precinct was administered by them. An avenue had been built from the temple, four stades in length and a plethron in width. (3) Large bronze vessels on square bases stand on either side of the avenue. At the end of the avenue the aforementioned river has its sources, which boisterously pour forth. There is a flowing current remarkable for its limpidity and sweetness, and it brings many benefits with respect to bodily health for those who use it. This river is called the Water of the Sun. (4) A costly stone quay surrounds the entire spring; it extends along both of its sides for four stades. It is forbidden to anyone except the priests to enter the space up to the edge of the quay. (5) The plain lying below the temple, for a distance of 200 stades, has been dedicated to the gods, and

δίφρος καὶ Τριφύλιος Ὀλυμπος. (6) μυθολογοῦσι γὰρ τὸ παλαιὸν Οὐρανὸν βασιλεύοντα τῆς οἰκουμένης προσηνῶς ἐνδιατρίβειν ἐν τῷδε τῷ τόπῳ, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕψους ἐφορᾶν τὸν τε οὐρανὸν καὶ τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν ἄστρα· ὕστερον δὲ Τριφύλιον Ὀλυμπον κληθῆναι διὰ τὸ τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ὑπάρχειν ἐκ τριῶν ἐθνῶν· ὀνομάζεσθαι δὲ τοὺς μὲν Παγχαίους, τοὺς δ' Ὠκεανίτας, τοὺς δὲ Δώιους, οὓς ὕστερον ὑπ' Ἀμμωνος ἐκβλήθησαν. (7) τὸν γὰρ Ἀμμωνά φασι μὴ μόνον φυγαδεῦσαι τοῦτο τὸ ἔθνος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶν ἄρδην ἀνελεῖν καὶ κατασκάψαι τὴν τε Δώϊαν καὶ Ἀστερουσίαν. θυσίαν τε κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ὄρει ποιεῖν τοὺς ἱερεῖς μετὰ πολλῆς ἀγνεΐας. (45) μετὰ δὲ τὸ ὄρος τοῦτο καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἄλλην Παγχαΐτιν χώραν ὑπάρχειν φασι ζώων παντοδαπῶν πλῆθος· ἔχειν γὰρ αὐτὴν ἐλέφαντάς τε πολλοὺς καὶ λέοντας καὶ παρδάλεις καὶ δορκάδας καὶ ἄλλα θηρία πλείω διάφορα ταῖς τε προσόψεσι καὶ ταῖς ἀλκαῖς θαυμαστά. (2) ἔχει δὲ ἡ νῆσος αὕτη καὶ πόλεις τρεῖς ἀξιολόγους, Ὑρακίαν καὶ Δαλίδα καὶ Ὠκεανίδα. τὴν δὲ χώραν ὅλην εἶναι καρποφόρον καὶ μάλιστα οἴνων παντοδαπῶν ἔχειν πλῆθος. (3) εἶναι δὲ τοὺς ἄνδρας πολεμικοὺς· καὶ ἄρμασι χρῆσθαι κατὰ τὰς μάχας ἀρχαϊκῶς. τὴν δ' ὅλην πολιτείαν ἔχουσι τριμερῆ· καὶ πρῶτον ὑπάρχει μέρος παρ' αὐτοῖς τὸ τῶν ἱερέων, προσκειμένων αὐτοῖς τῶν τεχνιτῶν· δευτέρα δὲ μερὶς ὑπάρχει τῶν γεωργῶν· τρίτη δὲ τῶν ρατιωτῶν, προστιθεμένων τῶν νομέων. (4) οἱ μὲν οὖν ἱερεῖς τῶν ἀπάντων ἦσαν ἡγεμόνες, τὰς τε τῶν ἀμφισβητήσεων κρίσεις ποιοῦμενοι καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν δημοσίων πραττομένων

the revenues from it defray the cost of sacrifices. Beyond the aforementioned plain is a lofty mountain, which has been dedicated to the gods, named the Throne of Ouranos and the Triphylian Olympos. (6) For the myth relates that long ago, when Ouranos was king of the inhabited world, he happily lingered in this place, and from its height surveyed both the heavens and the stars therein, and that it was later called Triphylian Olympos because the people living around consisted of three groups. (They say that) they are called the Panchaiioi, the Oceanites, and Doians, the last of whom were later expelled by Ammon. (7) For they say that Ammon not only drove this group into exile, but also utterly destroyed their cities and razed to the ground both Doia and Asterousia. (They say that) each year the priests make a sacrifice on this mountain with great solemnity. (45) They say that beyond this mountain and throughout the rest of the land of Panchaia there exist a multitude of animals of every kind. For (they say that) the land has many elephants and lions and leopards and gazelles and other beasts remarkable for their number and wondrous in both appearance and strength. (2) This island also has three notable cities, Hyrakia and Dalis and Oceanis. (They say that) the entire land is fruitful, especially in regard to the number of vines of every kind. (3) (They say that) the men are warlike and use chariots in battle in the ancient fashion. The entire body politic is divided into three castes. And first among them is the caste consisting of the priests, the artisans are

κύριοι, οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ τὴν γῆν ἐργαζόμενοι τοὺς καρποὺς ἀναφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ κοινόν, καὶ ὅστις ἂν αὐτῶν δοκῆι μάλιστα γεωργηκέναι λαμβάνει γέρας ἑξαίρετον ἐν τῇ διαιρέσει τῶν καρπῶν, κριθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερέων ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ δεύτερος καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ μέχρι δέκα, προτροπῆς ἕνεκα τῶν ἄλλων. (5) παραπλησίως δὲ τούτοις καὶ οἱ νομεῖς τὰ τε ἱερεῖα καὶ ἄλλα παραδιδόασιν εἰς τὸ δημόσιον, τὰ μὲν ἀριθμῶι, τὰ δὲ σταθμῶι, μετὰ πάσης ἀκριβείας. καθόλου γὰρ οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἰδία κτήσασθαι πλὴν οἰκίας καὶ κήπου, πάντα δὲ τὰ γεννήματα καὶ τὰς προσόδους οἱ ἱερεῖς παραλαμβάνοντες τὸ ἐπιβάλλον ἑκάστωι δικαίως ἀπονέμουσι τοῖς δ' ἱερεῦσι μόνοις δίδονται διπλάσιον. (6) χρῶνται δ' ἔσθῃσι μὲν μαλακαῖς διὰ τὸ παρ' αὐτοῖς πρόβατα ὑπάρχειν διαφέροντα τῶν ἄλλων διὰ τὴν μαλακότητα. φοροῦσι δὲ καὶ κόσμον χρυσοῦν οὐ μόνον αἱ γυναῖκες, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες, περὶ μὲν τοὺς τραχήλους ἔχοντες στρεπτοὺς κύκλους, περὶ δὲ τὰς χεῖρας ψέλια, ἐκ δὲ τῶν ὠτων παραπλησίως τοῖς Πέρσαις ἐξηρητημένους κρίκους. ὑποδέσσει δὲ κοιλαῖς χρῶνται καὶ τοῖς χρώμασι πεποικιλμέναις περιττότερον. (46) οἱ δὲ στρατιῶται λαμβάνοντες τὰς μεμερισμένας συντάξεις φυλάττουσι τὴν χώραν διειληφότες ὀχυρώμασι καὶ παρεμβολαῖς· ἔστι γάρ τι μέρος τῆς χώρας ἔχον ληιστήρια θρασέων καὶ παρανόμων ἀνθρώπων, οἱ τοὺς γεωργοὺς ἐνεδρεύοντες πολεμοῦσι τούτους. (2) αὐτοὶ δ' οἱ ἱερεῖς πολὺ τῶν ἄλλων ὑπερέχουσι τρυφῇ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις ταῖς ἐν τῷ βίῳ καθαριότησι καὶ πολυτελείαις· στολὰς μὲν γὰρ ἔχουσι λινᾶς, τῇ λεπτότητι καὶ μαλακότητι διαφόρους, ποτὲ δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐκ τῶν μαλακωτάτων

attached to them. The second caste consists of the farmers. The third is that of the soldiers, the shepherds are attached to them. (4) The priests were leaders of the rest, both rendering judgment in matters of controversy and being sovereign in all other public matters. The farmers who work the land bring the produce into the communal storehouse, and whoever among them is thought to have farmed best receives a special prize in the division of the produce, who is first and who is second and so in order to the tenth having been judged by the priests, as an incentive for the rest. (5) In a similar fashion the shepherds also hand over to the state both the sacrificial animals and the rest, some by number, some by weight, with all precision. For, speaking generally, it is not permitted to have private possessions except a house and garden; the priests, taking over all the products and revenues, justly apportion a share to each person. To the priests alone is given a double share. (6) They wear soft wool clothing because of the existence among them of sheep distinguished above all others for their softness. They also wear gold jewelry, not only the women, but also the men, having braided necklaces around their necks, bracelets on their wrists, and rings hanging from their ears in the manner of the Persians. They wear hollowed out shoes decorated with more varied colors than is usual. (46) The soldiers, receiving the allotted pay, guard the land, distributed in forts and posts. For there is a certain part of the land infested with bands of brigands, bold and lawless men,

ἐρίων κατεσκευασμένας ἐσθήτας φοροῦσι· πρὸς δὲ τούτοις μίτρας ἔχουσι χρυσοφεῖς· τὴν δ' ὑπόδεσιν ἔχουσι σανδάλια ποικίλα φιλοτέχνως εἰργασμένα· χρυσοφοροῦσι δ' ὁμοίως ταῖς γυναιξὶ πλήν τῶν ἐνωτίων· προσεδρεύουσι δὲ μάλιστα ταῖς τῶν θεῶν θεραπαίαις καὶ τοῖς περὶ τούτων ὕμνοις τε καὶ ἐγκωμίοις, μετ' ᾧδῆς τὰς πράξεις αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς εἰς ἀνθρώπους εὐεργεσίας διαπορευόμενοι. (3) μυθολογοῦσι δ' οἱ ἱερεῖς τὸ γένος αὐτοῖς ἐκ Κρήτης ὑπάρχειν, ὑπὸ Διὸς ἡγμένους εἰς τὴν Παγχαίαν, ὅτε κατ' ἀνθρώπους ὦν ἐβασίλευε τῆς οἰκουμένης· καὶ τούτων σημεῖα φέρουσι τῆς διαλέκτου, δεικνύντες τὰ πολλὰ διαμένειν παρ' αὐτοῖς Κρητικῶς ὀνομαζόμενα· τὴν τε πρὸς αὐτοὺς οἰκειότητα καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν ἐκ προγόνων παρεληφέναι, τῆς φήμης ταύτης τοῖς ἐκγόνοις παραδιδομένης ἀεί· ἐδείκνυον δὲ καὶ ἀναγραφὰς τούτων, ἃς ἔφασαν τὸν Δία πεποιῆσθαι καθ' ὃν καιρὸν ἔτι κατ' ἀνθρώπους ὦν ἰδρύσατο τὸ ἱερόν. (4) ἔχει δ' ἡ χώρα μέταλλα δαψιλῆ χρυσοῦ τε καὶ ἀργύρου καὶ χαλκοῦ καὶ καττιτέρου καὶ σιδήρου· καὶ τούτων οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἐξενεγκεῖν ἐκ τῆς νήσου· τοῖς δ' ἱερεῦσιν οὐδ' ἐξελθεῖν τὸ παράπαν ἐκ τῆς καθιερωμένης χώρας· τὸν δ' ἐξελθόντα ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ περιτυχὼν ἀποκτεῖναι. (5) ἀναθήματα δὲ χρυσᾶ καὶ ἀργυρᾶ πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα τοῖς θεοῖς ἀνάκειται, σεσωρευκότος τοῦ χρόνου τὸ πλῆθος τῶν καθιερωμένων ἀναθημάτων. (6) τὰ τε θυρώματα τοῦ ναοῦ θαυμαστάς ἔχει τὰς κατασκευὰς ἐξ ἀργύρου καὶ χρυσοῦ καὶ ἐλέφαντος, ἔτι δὲ θύας δεδημιουργημένας· ἡ δὲ κλίνη τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ μὲν μῆκος ὑπάρχει πηχῶν ἕξ, τὸ δὲ πλάτος τεττάρων· χρυσῇ δ' ὅλη καὶ τῇ κατὰ μέρος

who, lying in wait for farmers, attack them. (2) The priests themselves greatly exceed the rest in luxury and in every other refinement of lifestyle and extravagance. For they wear linen robes, exceptionally sheer and soft. And sometimes they wear clothes made from the softest wool. In addition, they wear gold headbands. Their footwear is multi-colored and ingeniously worked sandals. They wear golden ornaments as do women, except for earrings. Their primary duties are services to the gods and both hymns and encomia about them, going through in detail in song the deeds of the gods and their benefactions to humankind. (3) The priests tell a story that their origin was in Crete, they having been led to Panchaia by Zeus, when he was among men and ruled the inhabited world. They cite as proof of these things their language, pointing out that most of the things among them retain their Cretan names. (They say that) they received their kinship with the Cretans and their regard for them from their ancestors, this tradition always being handed down to their descendants. They also pointed out inscriptions about these things, which they say were made by Zeus during the time when, still being among men, he founded the shrine. (4) The land has rich mines of gold and silver and copper and tin and iron. And none of these metals is permitted to be taken off the island. It is not permissible for priests for any reason whatsoever to set foot outside sacred ground. Anyone encountering a priest outside sacred ground has license to kill him. (5) Many great gold and silver

<p>ἔργασίαι φιλοτέχνως κατεσκευασμένη. (7) παραπλήσιος δὲ καὶ ἡ τράπεζα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῶι μεγέθει καὶ τῆι λοιπῇ πολυτελείαι παράκειται πλησίον τῆς κλίνης. κατὰ μέσην δὲ τὴν κλίνην ἔστηκε στήλη χρυσοῦ μεγάλη, γράμματα ἔχουσα τὰ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις ἱερὰ καλούμενα, δι' ὧν ἦσαν αἱ πράξεις Οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ Διὸς ἀναγεγραμμένοι, καὶ μετὰ ταύτας αἱ Ἄρτεμιδος καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος ὑφ' Ἑρμοῦ προσαναγεγραμμένοι. περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν κατ' ἀντικρὺ τῆς Ἀραβίας ἐν ὠκεανῶι νήσων ἀρκεσθησόμεθα τοῖς ῥηθεῖσιν.</p>	<p>votives are dedicated to the gods, the passage of time heaping up a multitude of dedicated votives. (6) The doorways of the temple are objects of wonder, being made from silver and gold and ivory, as well as crafted cedar wood. The couch of the god is six cubits long and four cubits wide. It is entirely of gold and each part of it is skillfully constructed. (7) And the table of the god, similar in both size and more or less in cost, stands alongside the couch. On the center of the couch stood a large gold <i>stèle</i>, which has letters that are called sacred among the Egyptians, by means of which the deeds of both Ouranos and Zeus had been recorded, and after these the deeds of Artemis and of Apollo were inscribed in addition by Hermes. Therefore concerning the islands in the ocean opposite Arabia, we will be content with the things having been said.</p>

63 F 3 Commentary

Note: The translation provided here is more literal than literary, so that the reader can better follow the complexities of the passage, as Diodorus switches tenses and moves in and out of indirect discourse (reported speech).

(See below for commentary on specific sections of the text.) This passage forms part of Diodorus' discussion of *mythoi*, customs, and lands in the Greek world in the period before the Trojan War. Much of Book 5 focuses on islands, and the text given here comes after a discussion of Gaul, Celtiberia, Liguria, and Etruria (5.24-40) and before a discussion of Samothrace and the mystery cult found there (5.47-9). Diodorus does not explicitly cite Euhemerus as the source for this passage, but given that it contains a detailed description of Hieria and Panchaia and that Euhemerus is cited as a source for information on these places by Diodorus in F2, it seems safe to take it as a fragment of the *Sacred History*. The presence of

a detailed description of a fictional land in this part of Diodorus' work speaks to the nature of both the *Sacred Register* and of the *Library*.

Euhemerus' work defies easy categorization. It is sometimes described as a travel novel. T1, T5b, and F2 6.1.4 all show that the *Sacred Register* was cast as a story of a voyage, but it is impossible to tell from the extant fragments whether the travel element was crucial to the work as a whole (as, for example, in the *Odyssey*) or was nothing more than a convenient framework for an account of Hiera and Panchaia and of the contents of the inscription at the temple of Triphylian Zeus. It is, therefore, not at all obvious that the *Sacred Register* can be accurately characterized as a travel novel (N. Holzberg, 'Utopias and Fantastic Travel: Euhemerus, Iambulus', in G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden 2003), 621-8).

The *Sacred Register* is more commonly identified as a Utopian novel. The widely variant meanings applied to the word 'utopia' make a specific definition desirable. B. Kytzler suggests that a utopia is 'an experimental figure of thought...that counteracts and transcends acutely felt impairments—whether due to natural causes (such as sickness, death, hunger, thirst, heat, cold, distance, etc.) or of social origin (exploitation, oppression, social exclusion, injustice toward individuals, social classes, races and the like)—by imagining happy counter-scenarios' ('Utopia', in H. Cancik, H. Schneider, A. F. von Pauly, and G. Wissowa (eds.), *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike* (Stuttgart 1996), 15: 145). Utopias are normally portrayed as being either temporally or spatially separated from contemporary reality.

Utopias can be fruitfully categorized as high or low; a high utopia is so idealized as to belong entirely in the realm of fiction, while a low utopia is sufficiently close to practical realities as to be at least notionally realizable (D. Dawson, *Cities of the Gods: Communist Utopias in Greek Thought* (New York 1992), 3-12). All utopias include some element of fantasy, but high utopias frequently take this element further. It is also helpful to keep in mind that Greek utopias tend to manifest collectivist impulses.

The degree to which the play of fantasy brings about divergences from reality and the degree to which collective impulses are realized represent two helpful criteria in establishing whether any given utopia is high or low. For instance, in Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae* the women of Athens create a system in which property of all forms, as well as spouses, will be held in common. Agricultural labor is to be performed by slaves, leaving the citizens to dine at their leisure in common messes (ll. 597-715). This is an unrealizable, high utopia in which fantasy runs riot and collectivist impulses are taken to their logical extreme. In the *Laws* Plato outlines a low utopia, in which each citizen is given a plot of land

with the provisions that the land be reckoned the 'common property of the whole city' (740a) and that the owners 'shall keep in mind that...no household...belongs so much to the owner or his whole family as to the city' (877d). Marriage will be obligatory (721b), and although males are free to choose their spouses (772d), each citizen will be admonished to 'seek a marriage that is beneficial to the city, not one which is pleasing to himself' (773b). Plato limits the franchise to those serving in the cavalry or infantry (753b), all of whom will be at liberty to serve the state because their lands will be worked by slaves (806e), and all of whom will dine together in common messes (806e-7d, 842c). Elements of fantasy and collectivism are present but much more muted.

Another means of categorizing utopias is descriptive vs. constructive (Frank Manuel and Fritzie Manuel, *Utopian Thought in the Western World* (Cambridge 1979), 1-29; B. Kytzler, 'Utopia: Antik—Modern—Postmodern', in R. Faber and B. Kytzler (eds.), *Antike Heute* (Würzburg 1992), 238-48). A descriptive utopia is one that is sketched largely for escapist pleasure, while a constructive utopia is offered as a practical model for society. For obvious reasons these two systems of categorization frequently align; high utopias tend to be descriptive and low utopias tend to be constructive (though there are numerous examples of descriptive low utopias). The high utopia in the *Ecclesiastusae* is descriptive, the low utopia in the *Laws* constructive.

There is a utopian element in Greek literature from its earliest preserved manifestations, and many of the basic elements that will continue to be characteristic of Greek utopias are already evident in the Homeric poems. This is most evident in the description given in *Odyssey* Book 7 of the Phaiakians, who reside on the island of Scheria. The Phaiakians' ships are capable of sailing to the edge of the earth and back in a single day. Their ruler, Alkinoos, lives in a spectacularly luxurious bronze-walled palace guarded by immortal silver and gold dogs and surrounded by a huge orchard of trees that live in perpetuity and bear fruit all year round. The placement of a utopia on an island, a place that was by its very nature spatially separate, and in a fabulously fertile and beautiful setting (a *locus amoenus*) are both motifs that had a long life in the Greek world (G. L. Campbell, *Strange Creatures: Anthropology in Antiquity* (London 2006), 61-91 and M. Winiarczyk, *Euhemerus von Messene: Leben, Werk und Nachwirkung* (Munich 2002), 19-23).

The society sketched by Euhemerus is in many ways a standard low utopia. It is sited on two islands located on the edge of the known world (India is visible from Panchaia, F3 5.42.3). Hieria by itself produces enough frankincense and myrrh to supply the entire world (F3 5.41.4), Panchaia is the site of the Temple of Zeus Triphyllos, which is remarkable for its antiquity, lavish construction, and the beauty of its site (F2 6.1.4-5, F3 5.42.6). The improbably fertile plain around the temple, a classic *locus amoenus*, is described in loving

detail (F3 5.43). There is an element of fantasy and collectivism, but it is restrained. Animals, for example, exist in unusual abundance, but they are all real-world, if somewhat exotic, creatures—elephants, lions, leopards, and gazelles. The residents of Panchaia are permitted no private property except a house and garden (F3 5.45.5), and all agricultural produce is brought into a common storehouse and then redistributed (F3 5.45.4). However, on Hieria all the land is apportioned among the inhabitants, and there is no mention of the sharing of spouses or children.

A useful comparandum can be found elsewhere in the *Library* (2.55-60), in the form of Diodorus' summary of a utopian travel narrative originally composed by Iamboulos at some point in the Hellenistic period. Iamboulos sets off on a voyage from the Ethiopian coast and after four months at sea arrives at the Islands of the Sun (2.55.5). These islands are so temperate and fertile that food spontaneously grows in greater quantity than can be easily consumed (2.57.1-2). The inhabitants have a number of highly unusual physical traits, including the facts that they live as long as 150 years (2.57.4) and that their tongues are split so that they can carry on two conversations at once (2.56.5-6). The local fauna include an animal whose blood can be used to re-attach severed human limbs (2.58.2-4). There is no marriage, and all spouses and children are shared (2.58.1).

Not only does Euhemerus offer a low utopia rather than the sort of fantastic high utopia created by Iamboulos, but Hieria and Panchaia are also in many ways decidedly less than utopian. To begin with, they are placed within the known world. Whereas Iamboulos sails for months to an isolated archipelago, Euhemerus sails for days (F2 6.1.4) to a place that has regular commercial exchanges with Arabian merchants (F3 5.42.2). Moreover, Hieria and Panchaia are portrayed as less than ideal places to live. The king and priests who wield power have privileged access to resources (F3 5.42.1, 5.45.5), and the priests live in great luxury (F3 5.46.2). Violent discord is a standard part of life on Panchaia. At some point in the past, one of the groups of people that inhabited the island, the Doians, was expelled and their cities razed to the ground (F3 5.44.6-7). A standing army garrisons forts in order to suppress bands of brigands that attack farmers (F3 5.46.1). The inhabitants of Hieria at least occasionally suffer from dysentery (F3 5.41.6).

The *Sacred Register* can thus be described as a utopian novel only with considerable reserve. Hieria and Panchaia are in some ways very much a standard Greek low utopia and in some ways not utopian at all. The socio-political systems and conditions on the islands are sufficiently foreign and flawed as to make it difficult to believe that the *Sacred Register* can be read as a constructive utopia. If one chooses to see it as a purely descriptive utopia, one must account for the presence of rather jarring, almost dystopian elements.

A third approach to reading the *Sacred Register* is to see it not as a travel or utopian novel, but as a philosophical-religious treatise that is placed within the framework of a realistic first-person travelogue in order to bolster the credibility of the author's ideas. Proponents of this approach point out that the title of the work indicates that the centerpiece of the *Sacred Register* was the contents of the *stele* at the Temple of Triphylian Zeus, with its revelations about the nature of the gods (T3, T4e, F2 6.1.7). From this perspective, all of the information that Euhemerus provided about Hieria and Panchaia served to legitimize the information enshrined on the *stele*.

There can be no doubt that Euhemerus employed a number of strategies to heighten the believability of his account. Hieria and Panchaia are placed just at the edge of the known world. They are several days sail from Arabia, as opposed to Iamboulos' Islands of the Sun, which are four months sail from Ethiopia. The description of Panchaia draws heavily on received information about distant but real-world places such as the city of Saba in Arabia (see the note below on 5.41.1-3). They are exotic, but in ways that corresponded closely with long-established Greek ideas about realizably ideal societies (e.g., the presence of a limited degree of collectivism), as opposed to the unabashedly high utopian character of the Islands of the Sun. Hieria and Panchaia are thus carefully constructed to be a good home for a revelatory inscription—far enough away that the existence of Euhemerus' fictional *stele* could not be disproved but not so far away as to be in the realm of fantasy, and mildly but not unbelievably strange.

Furthermore, Euhemerus built into the *Sacred Register* what would have appeared as strong evidence for the veracity of his account. By Euhemerus' time, Greek historians writing about the distant past had evolved a series of techniques to help them sort fact from fiction when dealing with traditions about events in much earlier periods. They showed a particular interest in locating survivals from the past that could validate or invalidate such traditions. Two of the more favored kinds of survivals were inscriptions (C. Higbie, 'Craterus and the Use of Inscriptions in Ancient Scholarship', *TAPA* 129 (1999), 43-83) and religious cults or rituals (see the commentary on F23). Historians such as Ephorus believed that details of cult practice were frequently shaped by historical events and then remain unchanged for long periods; contemporary cults or rituals could thus offer insight into events from the distant past. Euhemerus turned both of these strategies on their head by crafting a fictional narrative built around an ancient inscription and by having the contents of that inscription describe Zeus as traveling the inhabited world and founding cults in places that in Euhemerus' time actually had ancient shrines to Zeus. As a result, the *Sacred Register* offered what would have seemed like good *bona fides* of its reliability.

There was, moreover, an existing model for creating a realistic but fictional site as part of the presentation of philosophical ideals—Plato’s tales of Atlantis. Plato’s description of the Temple of Poseidon finds many echoes in Euhemerus’ description of the Temple of Zeus Triphylios. Plato’s Athenians and Euhemerus’ Panchaians are both autochthonous and are divided into three castes. Most importantly, there is on Atlantis an orichalcum *stele*, placed in the temple of Poseidon in the center of the island, on which are inscribed laws given by Atlantis’ first kings in accordance with the precepts of Poseidon (*Critias* 119c-d).

This approach to reading the *Sacred Register* has the advantage of offering insight into the reasons for the vaguely utopian description of Panchaia. S. Montanari has argued that Panchaia is constructed to fit Greek ideas about the sort of place where memory of the distant past, particularly of matters pertaining to the divine, was likely to be preserved ('Utopie et religion chez Evhémère', *Kentron* 24 (2008), 79-104). The *locus amoenus* had since Homer been associated with the presence of the divine, Panchaian society is centered on the cult of Zeus and the perpetuation of the memory of the gods (something which is particularly evident in the prominence of priests whose duties include singing songs of the deeds and benefactions of the gods), and in Panchaia the distant past lingers on into the present (e.g., in the use of chariots in war (F3 5.45.3)). Panchaia thus ends up bearing a fairly close resemblance both to a low utopia and to earlier Greek portrayals of Egypt (the golden *stele* is in fact inscribed with 'letters that are called sacred among the Egyptians (F3 5.46.7, though cf. F2 6.1.7)), and it is striking that Plato claims that the story of Atlantis was preserved by Egyptian priests (*Timaeus* 21e-3e). It is also probably significant that Panchaia is within sight distance of India, a place that had a special connection to unusual forms of sanctity in Greek thought (G. L. Campbell, *Strange Creatures: Anthropology in Antiquity* (London 2006), 112-23). In other words, Euhemerus’ Panchaia is precisely the sort of place where, in the Greek imaginary, insight into the ancient origins of the gods might well be conserved for generations, and that in turn further legitimates Euhemerus’ religious ideas.

There is thus good reason for seeing the *Sacred Register* as a particular kind of work, one that presented philosophical-religious ideas within a pseudo-historical framework that heightened their credibility.

This perspective offers considerable assistance in dealing with the question of why Diodorus chose to include two detailed summaries of different sections of the *Sacred Register* in Books 5 and 6 of his *Library*. This is at first sight rather surprising—an account of a fictional voyage may well seem out of place in a work that overtly advertised itself as historical in nature. To begin with, there was considerable overlap in regard to subject matter. The detailed description of Hiera and Panchaia offered in F3 fits nicely with the other accounts of islands that occupy much of Book 5. The summary of Euhemerism offered

in F2 makes a good deal of sense in the context of Book 6, which was evidently in large part dedicated to the stories of Greek heroes in the period leading up to the Trojan War. As we have seen (commentary on F2), the contents of Books 1-6 leave no doubt that Diodorus believed that deification for euergetism took place throughout the inhabited world from an early period, an approach to the history of religion that was in part or whole outlined in the *Sacred Register*.

It also needs to be borne in mind that the uncompromising standards of inquiry advocated by Thucydides, Polybius, etc. were observed more in the breach than in practice by a considerable fraction of Greek historians. E. Gabba has persuasively argued that the primary concern of many historians was 'to provide lively and highly-coloured pictures of milieus and situations, whose historicity was already accepted'. This tendency was strongly reinforced by the huge influx of facts and fantasy that followed upon Alexander's conquests. Gabba concludes that 'the novel, paradoxography, history as fable—all are different ways of dealing with reality, of describing it and explaining it, regarding it as essentially miraculous, but allowing it a scholarly aspect; in other words, they deliberately reject the intellectual methods which had been created to investigate it critically' ('True History and False History in Classical Antiquity', *JRS* 71 (1981), 50-62 at 54, 55, respectively). The entertainment of the reader, a goal Thucydides rejected with some asperity (1.22), is the reason Diodorus gives for writing at length about Arabia (2.54.7). Moreover, the summaries of Euhemerus' work are found in Books 5 and 6, parts of the *Library* devoted to the period before the Trojan War, a period which was for most Greek historians too distant to be the subject of proper historical narrative.

Finally and perhaps most importantly, Diodorus may well have seen the *Sacred Register* as a largely if not perfectly reliable source. It has been argued that Euhemerus himself understood the *Sacred Register* as a work not of fiction but of fact. This argument revolves around the idea that many Greek thinkers recognized two kinds of truth—the truth of the particular and of the universal. This position is most famously articulated by Aristotle in the *Poetics* (1451a36-b31). It is possible—but impossible to prove—that Euhemerus was of the opinion that the *Sacred Register*, if not entirely factual, was precisely correct about some profound philosophical-religious truths. T5a-c show that Eratosthenes, Polybius, Apollodorus, Poseidonius, and Strabo had a range of opinions about the veracity of the geographical information offered by the *Sacred Register*. At least some of them saw it as to some extent reliable, and there was no reason for Diodorus to think differently. It may be relevant that Diodorus introduces Iamboulos' work by characterizing it as paradoxography (2.55.1), a clear recognition that it was not a standard historical narrative.

Note: A detailed commentary on F3 can be found in K. Peterson, *Living on the Edge: The Travel*

Narratives of Euhemerus, Iamboulos, and Lucian (Ph.D. Diss. Duke University 2001), 28-53. The comments that follow draw heavily on Peterson's work, to which the reader should refer for further discussion of and bibliography on the points discussed below. See also Winiarczyk, *Euhemerus von Messene*, 75-106.

5.41.1-3: The description of Hiera and Panchaia is preceded by an account of Blessed Arabia, an area Diodorus treats in some detail at 2.48-54 and 3.46-8. See also Strabo 16.4.2-4. Euhemerus' description of Hiera and Panchaia has many similarities with and presumably draws upon earlier descriptions of Arabia in general and the city of Saba in particular.

5.41.4: Hiera seems to take its name from the fact that it produces a significant fraction of the frankincense used in divine worship throughout the known world, though the prohibition of the burial of the dead would also appear to be relevant. There were numerous islands, both real and imagined, in the Greek world, that were called Hiera and prohibition of burials was enforced on Delos (Diodorus 12.58.3-7; Strabo 10.5.5; Thucydides 1.13.6, 3.104.1-2).

5.41.5: On frankincense trees, see also Theophrastus *Historia Plantarum* 9.4.2-3 and Pliny *Naturalis Historia* 12.55-7, 67.

5.42.2: The name Panchaia seems to be a combination of *pan* and *chaios* and thus to mean something like 'completely wonderful'.

5.42.3: The specific information given about the location of Panchaia has led to numerous attempts to connect it to real-world sites, including Sokotra and Taprobane. Winiarczyk is no doubt correct in dismissing all such attempts as fundamentally misguided (*Euhemerus von Messene*, 21-2).

5.24.6-43.3: Here, as in other places, Euhemerus seems to be drawing in part on Plato's description of Atlantis, in this case on the description of the Temple of Poseidon on Atlantis (*Critias* 116c-17a).

5.45.3: The account of the Panchaian caste system here may in part reflect the realities of Ptolemaic Egypt and the social structure of Plato's Atlantis (*Timaeus* 24a).

5.46.7 (cf. F2 6.1.7): An inscription set up by a ruler to record *res gestae* has numerous parallels. Such inscriptions were regularly erected from an early date by Near Eastern rulers (cf. *Critias* 119c-d). See Winiarczyk, *Euhemerus von Messene*, 97-103.

63 F 3 Bibliography

For detailed discussion of the genre of the *Sacred Register*, with extensive bibliography of earlier scholarship, see Winiarczyk, *Euhemerus von Messene*, 19-27. Winiarczyk reviews seven distinct interpretations, not all of which are discussed above. Winiarczyk endorses the idea that the *Sacred Register* was, loosely speaking, a utopian novel that served to present Euhemerus' ideas on the origins of the gods. The idea that the *Sacred Register* should be read as an exercise in political theory, presented in H. Braunert, 'Die heilige Insel des Euhemerus in der Diodor-Überlieferung', *RM* 108 (1965), 255-68, is no longer widely accepted (and hence is not discussed above). The reasons for rejecting the identification of the *Sacred Register* as an exercise in social theory or as a utopian novel are outlined in R. Bichler, 'Zur historischen Beurteilung der griechischen Staatsutopie', *Grazer Beiträge* 11 (1984), 179-206. The argument that the *Sacred Register* was constructed so as to present philosophical-religious ideas in a particularly believable fashion is discussed in R. J. Müller, 'Überlegungen zur *Hiera Anagraphe* des Euhemerus von Messene', *Hermes* 121 (1993), 276-300. On the idea that Euhemerus saw the *Sacred Register* as factual rather than fictional, see J. Dochhorn, 'Ein "Inschriftenfund" aus Panchaia: Zur *Iera Anagraphe* des Euhemerus von Messene', in J. U. Kalms (ed.), *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Aarhus 1999* (Münster 2000), 265-97 and S. Honigman, 'Euhemerus of Messene and Plato's Atlantis', *Historia* 58 (2009), 1-35. The latter outlines in some detail the similarities between Plato's Atlantis and Euhemerus' Panchaia.

On ancient utopian thought, see H. C. Baldry, *Ancient Utopias* (Southampton 1955); R. Bichler, *Von der Insel der Seligen zu Platons Staat: Geschichte der antiken Utopie* (Vienna 1995), 9-53; and Dawson, *Cities of the Gods*. On collectivism in ancient utopias, see P. Christesen, 'Utopia on the Eurotas: Economic Aspects of the Spartan Mirage', in T. Figueira (ed.), *Spartan Society* (Swansea 2004), 309-37. On Iamboulos' work, see Peterson, *Living on the Edge*, 54-100 and M. Winiarczyk, 'Das Werk des Jambulos', *RM* 140 (1997), 128-53. On paradoxography, see G. Schepens and K. Delcroix, 'Ancient Paradoxography: Origin, Evolution, Production and Reception', in O. Pecere (ed.), *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino* (Cassino 1996), 373-460.

<p>63 F 4 - HYGIN. Poet. astr. II 13 4</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="4" sourcework(level1="Hyginus" level2="" level3="Astronomica" level4="" level5="" level6="2, 13")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Mythology Historical Work: <i>On Astronomy</i> Source Date: 1st century BC-3rd century AD</p>	<p>Translation</p>

Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?	
Euhemerus ait Aega quendam fuisse Panos uxorem: eam ab Jove compressam peperisse quem viri sui Panos diceret filium. ita puerum Aegipana, Iovem autem Aegiochum appellatum. qui, quod eam diligebat plurimum, inter astra caprae figuram memoriae causa collocavit. s. F 21.	Euhemerus says that a certain Aex (goat) was the wife of Pan. Having been embraced by Jupiter, she bore a son whom she said was the child of her husband Pan. Thus the boy was called Aegipan and Jupiter was called Aegiochus. Since Jupiter was very fond of Aex, he placed in her memory the form of a goat among the stars. (See F21.)

63 F 4 Commentary

This passage comes from a manual of astronomy and mythology known as the *Poetic Astronomy* (*Poeticon Astronomicum* or *De Astronomia*). This work has typically been attributed to C. Iulius Hyginus, a polymath and freedman of Augustus, though that attribution has been frequently questioned and a somewhat later date (second or third century AD) of composition has been suggested. The *Poetic Astronomy* consists of four books. Book 1 contains a concise cosmography, Book 2 a collection of myths pertaining to the constellations. In Book 3 the same constellations are treated from an astronomical perspective, and for each constellation details are given of makeup, alignment, and position in the sky. Book 4 is devoted to discussions of astronomical topics such as celestial circles, the orbits of the planets, and the theory of the harmony of the spheres. A brief section of text from the end of Book 4 is missing, but the majority of the work appears to be preserved.

Hyginus discusses Aex, Pan, and Aegipan as part of his treatment of the constellation called the Charioteer, which had the shape of a chariot driver (Erichthonios, Myrtilos, or Orsilochos) accompanied by one or more goats. Immediately preceding the text given here Hyginus identifies Aex as the daughter of Sol and a nurse of Jupiter. Aegipan is also mentioned in Hyginus' treatment of the constellation Capricorn (2.28). He appears in Greek myth and art in various guises, sometimes as Pan under a different name, sometimes as the son of Pan, sometimes as his father. The *Sacred Register* provided a detailed recounting of Jupiter's offspring (see F14), and it is a reasonable supposition that the birth of Aegipan was discussed in that context. It may also be relevant that Euhemerus portrayed Ouranos as having a continuing interest in the heavens (F2 6.1.8, F3 5.44.6, F21) and stated that constellations were first established by Venus (see F7).

63 F 4 Bibliography

For a thorough introduction to the *Poetic Astronomy*, see A. L. Boeuffle, (ed.), *Hygin L'Astronomie* (Paris 1983), vii-lxxviii. On this passage, see *ibid.*, 163 nn. 26-7 and T. Condos, (ed.), *Star Myths of the Greeks and Romans: A Sourcebook Containing the Constellations of Pseudo-Eratosthenes and the Poetic Astronomy of Hyginus* (Grand Rapids, MI 1997), 49-54, 71-3, 229-31.

<p>63 F 5 - HYGIN. Poet. astr. II 12 2</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="5" sourcework(level1="Hyginus" level2="" level3="Astronomica" level4="" level5="" level6="2, 12")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Mythology Historical Work: <i>On Astronomy</i> Source Date: 1st century BC-3rd century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>Euhemerus quidem Gorgonam a Minerva dicit interfectam.</p>	<p>Euhemerus indeed says the Gorgon was killed by Minerva.</p>

63 F 5 Commentary

This passage forms part of Hyginus' discussion of the constellation Perseus. The information about Minerva killing the Gorgon has no direct relevance to the constellation itself. For more information on Hyginus and his *Poetic Astronomy*, see the commentary on F4.

63 F 5 Bibliography

On this passage, see A. L. Boeuffle, (ed.), *Hygin L'Astronomie* (Paris 1983), 161 nn. 11-13 and T. Condos, (ed.), *Star Myths of the Greeks and Romans: A Sourcebook Containing the Constellations of Pseudo-Eratosthenes and the Poetic Astronomy of Hyginus* (Grand Rapids, MI 1997), 157-60, 250-1.

<p>63 F 6 - FESTUS p. 310 M</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="6" sourcework(level1="Festus (Pompeius)" level2="" level3="De verborum significatione (L.: Lindsay W.; M.: Müller O.)" level4="" level5="" level6="p. 310 M.")]]</p>
--	--

Subject: Genre: Biography Historical Work: Epitome of <i>On the Meaning of Words</i> Source Date: 2nd century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 4th-1st century BC	Translation
'Sus Minervam' in proverbio est, ubi quis id docet alterum, cuius ipse inscius est. quam rem in medio, quod aiunt, positam Varro et Euhemerus ineptis mythis involvere maluerunt, quam simpliciter referre.	'Sus Minerva' is proverbial for a person teaching to someone else what they themselves do not know. Varro and Euhemerus preferred to wrap up this proverb, which was, as they say in circulation, in absurd myths rather than simply to refer to it.

63 F 6 Commentary

Sextus Pompeius Festus produced in the second century AD an abridged version of *De verborum significatu*, a lexicon originally composed by Verrius Flaccus during the Augustan period (Flaccus must have worked with Ennius' translation of the *Sacred Register*). This passage is an entry from Book 17, where it occurs among the other entries for words beginning with the letter 's'. 'Sus Minervam' is short for 'Sus Minervam docet,' 'a pig teaches Minerva'. The same proverb, nearly identically worded, was common in Greek (see, e.g., Theocritus *Idylls* 5.23) and was presumably used by Euhemerus. Cf. F8.

63 F 6 Bibliography

On Festus, see F. Glinister and C. Woods, (eds.), *Verrius, Festus, and Paul: Lexicography, Scholarship, and Society* (London 2007), 1-5.

63 F 7 - HYGIN. Poet. astr. II 42 5	meta [[id="63" type="F" n="7" sourcework(level1="Hyginus" level2="" level3="Astronomica" level4="" level5="" level6="2, 42")]]
Subject: Genre: Mythology Historical Work: <i>On Astronomy</i> Source Date: 1st century BC-3rd century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC	Translation

Historical Period: ?	
Euhemerus autem Venerem primam ait sidera constituisse et Mercurio demonstrasse. s. F 25.	Euhemerus however says that Venus first established the constellations and made them known to Mercury. (See F25.)

63 F 7 Commentary

This passage forms part of Hyginus' discussion of the planets. For more information on Hyginus and his *Poetic Astronomy*, see the commentary on F4. Euhemerus portrayed Ouranos as having a continuing interest in the heavens (F2 6.1.8, F3 5.44.6, F21), and it would appear that he also provided at least some information about the establishment of the constellations. On Venus, see also F25.

63 F 7 Bibliography

Writer, title etc.

63 F 8 - Et. M. 215, 37	meta [[id="63" type="F" n="8" sourcework(level1="Etymologicum Magnum (Gaisford T.) [Vide: Lexicon rhetoricum & Photius apud Etymologicum Magnum]" level2="" level3="" level4="" level5="" level6="215, 37, Βροτός")]]
Subject: Genre: Mythology Historical Work: <i>Great Dictionary</i> Source Date: 12th century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?	Translation
Βροτός· ὡς μὲν Εὐήμερος ὁ Μεσσήνιος, ἀπὸ Βρότου τινὸς αὐτόχθονος· ὡς δὲ Ἡσίοδος (F 400 M-W) ἀπὸ Βροτοῦ τοῦ Αἰθέρος καὶ Ἡμέρας· ἄλλοι δὲ ἀπὸ βρότου τοῦ αἵματος.	Brotos: according to Euhemerus of Messene, (this word derives) from a certain Brotos who was autochthonous. According to Hesiod (F400 Merkelbach-West), from Brotos the son of Aether and Day. According to others, from the gore of blood.

63 F 8 Commentary

The *Etymologicum Magnum* is a lexicon that was compiled in the middle of the twelfth century AD in Constantinople. Nothing is known about the author(s). This passage is part (but not all) of the entry for *Brotos*. Euhemerus' *Brotos* is otherwise unknown (G. Vallauri, (ed.), *Euemero di Messene: Testimonianze e frammenti con introduzione e commento* (Torino 1956), 55). Merkelbach and West reject this fragment of Hesiod as spurious (*Fragmenta Hesiodica* (Oxford 1967), 188.)

63 F 8 Bibliography

On the *Etymologicum Magnum*, see K. Alpers, 'Griechische Lexicographie in Antike und Mittelalter', in H. A. Koch (ed.), *Welt der Information: Wissen und Wissenvermittlung in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Stuttgart 1990), 14-38 and P. Rance, 'The *Etymologicum Magnum* and the "Fragment of Ubricius"', *GRBS* 47 (2007), 193-224.

<p>63 F 9 - DIOGENIAN. Proverb. II 67 (Add. cod. Bodl.)</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="9" sourcework(level1="Diogenianus?)" level2="" level3="Paroemiae (Leutsch E.-Schneidewin F., 1)" level4="" level5="" level6="2, 67 (B); p. 207, 13")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Mythology Historical Work: <i>Popular Sayings Collected from the Work of Diogenianos</i> Source Date: 2nd-12 century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>Ἄτλας τὸν οὐρανὸν Εὐήμερος ἐν Ἱερῶι Λόγωι προσέθηκε τὸ 'ὑπεδέξω'. λέγεται δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν τινι κακῶι περιπεσόντων, ἐπιβαλλομένων μεγάλωι πράγματι.</p>	<p>Atlas the sky: Euhemerus in the <i>Sacred Record</i> added 'you lifted up'. It is said about those falling in with evil, when devoting themselves to a great undertaking.</p>

63 F 9 Commentary

The phrasing here is highly compressed; the passage can be understood as saying that Euhemerus added the phrase "you lifted up" to make a saying, "Oh Atlas, you lifted up the sky."

Diogenianos of Heracleia Pontus was a grammarian who was active in the Hadrianic period. Under his name has been transmitted an alphabetically organized collection of 776 sayings

with the title *Popular Sayings from the Collection of Diogenianos* (*Paroimia Demodeis ek tes Diogenianou Synagoges*). It is now generally agreed that this collection was not authored by Diogenianus, though the precise date of its compilation remains unclear. It was definitely in existence by the late Byzantine period, when it was used as a source for other collections of sayings. It is possible that one or more of Diogenianos' grammatical works was a source for some of the sayings in the collection, hence its name. The title of Euhemerus' work is given in this passage as *Hieros Logos*.

This proverb is found in at least three other sources, one of which provides the further explanation that 'Atlas, having plotted against Ouranos and having been caught, was cast forth in exile into the Atlantic Ocean' (Macarius Chrysocephalus *Paroemiae* Centuria 2 Section 57). A myth along those lines would explain why Euhemerus had occasion to include this proverb in the *Sacred Register*. F6 and F8 taken together suggest that Euhemerus had a fondness for including aphorisms in his work.

63 F 9 Bibliography

See L. Cohn, 'Diogeneianos', in *RE* 5: 778-83.

<p>63 F 10 - PLIN. NH. XXXVI 79</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="10" sourcework(level1="Plinius (Secundus)" level2="" level3="Historia naturalis" level4="" level5="" level6="36, 79")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Natural History Historical Work: <i>Natural History</i> Source Date: 1st century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: Varied</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>qui de iis (sc. de pyramidibus) scripserint – sunt Herodotus, Euhemerus, Duris Samius (II), Aristagoras (III), Dionysius (III), Artemidorus (V), Alexander Polyhistor (III), Butoridas (IV) Antisthenes (III), Demetrius (III), Demoteles (VI), Apion (III) – inter omnes eos non constat a quibus factae sint...</p>	<p>The authors who have written about them (pyramids)—Herodotus, Euhemerus, Duris of Samos (<i>FGrH</i> 76), Aristagoras (<i>FGrH</i> 608), Dionysius (<i>FGrH</i> 653), Artemidorus (<i>FGrH</i> 438), Alexander Polyhistor (<i>FGrH</i> 273), Butoridas (<i>FGrH</i> 654), Antisthenes (<i>FGrH</i> 655), Demetrius (<i>FGrH</i> 643), Demoteles (<i>FGrH</i> 656), Apion (<i>FGrH</i> 616)—do not agree amongst themselves as to who constructed them...</p>

63 F 10 Commentary

This passage is part of an excursus on Egyptian pyramids (36.76-83). It would appear that Euhemerus had something to say about who was responsible for the building of one or more pyramids, an otherwise unattested facet of his work.

63 F 10 Bibliography

On Pliny, see M. Beagon, *Roman Nature: The Thought of Pliny the Elder* (Oxford 1992). On this passage, see J. André, R. Bloch, et al., (eds.), *Pline l'Ancien: Histoire Naturelle Livre XXXVI* (Paris 1981), 186.

<p>63 F 11 - JOSEPH. c. Ap. I 216 (EUSEB. PE IX 42 p. 458 C)</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="11" sourcework(level1="Josephus (Flavius)" level2="" level3="Contra Apionem" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 216") sourcework(level1="Eusebius Caesariensis" level2="" level3="Praeparatio evangelica [Vide: Africanus (Julius), Diodorus Siculus, Plutarchus & Porphyrius apud Eusebium Caesariensem]" level4="" level5="" level6="9, 42, 2, 458bc")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Jewish Literature Historical Work: <i>Against Apion</i> Source Date: 1st century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 4th-3rd century BC</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>ἔτι δὲ πρὸς τοῖς εἰρημένοις...Εὐήμερός τε καὶ Κόνων (26 F 4)...οὐ παρέργως ἡμῶν ἐμνημονεύκασιν.</p>	<p>In addition to those already mentioned...Euhemerus and Conon (FGrH 26 F4)...have made more than passing allusion to us.</p>

63 F 11 Commentary

Josephus (37-c. 100 AD) was a priest, general, and historian who spent time in both Palestine and Rome. *Against Apion*, written c. 95-100 AD, is directed against his younger contemporary Apion of Alexandria, who had launched what Josephus believed to be slanderous

accusations against Jews both orally, in front of the emperor Caligula, and in writing. In the passage given here Euhemerus appears in a list of eight separate authors who had something substantial to say about Jews.

63 F 11 Bibliography

On Josephus' *Against Apion*, see J. Barclay, (ed.), *Flavius Josephus Translation and Commentary: Against Apion* (Leiden 2007). On this passage in particular, see *ibid.*, 122-3. On Apion, see *FGrH* 616. On Conon, see *FGrH* 26.

<p>63 F 12 - LACTANT. Div. inst. I 13, 14 (Epit. ad Pentad. 14, 4)</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="12" sourcework(level1="Lactantius (Caelius [Caecilius?])" level2="" level3="Divinae institutiones [Vide: Varro (Terentius) apud Lactantium]" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 13, 14") sourcework(level1="Lactantius (Caelius [Caecilius?])" level2="" level3="Epitoma institutionum divinarum (ad Pentadium)" level4="" level5="" level6="14, 4")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Mythology, Religion Historical Work: <i>Divine Institutes</i> Source Date: 4th century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>Ennius quidem in Euhemero non primum dicit regnasse Saturnum, sed Uranum patrem. #quote#«initio»# inquit #quote#«primus in terris imperium summum Caelus habuit. is id regnum una cum fratribus suis sibi instituit atque paravit.»#</p>	<p>Ennius in fact in his <i>Euhemerus</i> says that Saturn did not reign first, but his father Uranus. 'In the beginning', he says, 'first Caelus held supreme power on earth. He established and organized that kingship for himself together with his brothers'.</p>

63 F 12 Commentary

Lactantius' *Divine Institutes* is, along with Diodorus' *Library*, one of the two key sources of testimonia about and fragments of the *Sacred Register*. It can, for reasons that will become apparent, be somewhat difficult to form a clear picture of the Euhemeran material

preserved in the *Divine Institutes*, and so it is worth beginning with an exploration of this work and the arrangement of Euhemeran material within it.

The *Divine Institutes* is a Christian *apologia* and an attempt to summarize Christian thought for the benefit of a learned audience. The text of the *Divine Institutes* is divided into seven books; all of the testimonia and fragments of the *Sacred Register* are found in Book 1. In that book, which bears the title *On False Religion (De Falsa Religione)*, Lactantius strives to show that there is widespread consensus that god is and can only be one. He makes use of Euhemerus' work to argue that the pagan gods are nothing more than humans who had in the not-so-distant past been accorded divine status.

Lactantius cites Euhemerus in only five of the 23 sections into which Book 1 is divided. This is apparent from a structural summary:

Book and Section #	Contents	Material from <i>Sacred Register</i>
1.1	Aims and Methods	
1.2	Providence Controls All	
1.3	Unity of the Divine	
1.4	Unity of the Divine: Testimony of the Prophets	
1.5	Unity of the Divine: Testimony of Pagan Poets and Philosophers	
1.6	Unity of the Divine: Testimony from Trismegistus and the Sibyls	
1.7	Some Objections Answered	
1.8	Pagan 'Gods' were Born and are thus Human	
1.9	Misdeeds Associated with Pagan 'Gods' Show They Cannot Be Divine, Case of Hercules	
1.10	Misdeeds of Other Pagan 'Gods', including Jupiter	
1.11	Misdeeds of Jupiter (continued) and of Saturn • poetic accounts of the pagan 'gods' are really embellished versions of real-world doings of men; this is proved by work of Euhemerus; Jupiter was a human ruler—he died and had a father and grandfather	1 testimonium, 6 fragments
1.12	Stoic Physical Explanation of Stories of Pagan 'Gods' Not Viable	
1.13	Saturn was a Human Too • Saturn did not eat his sons, but did have them killed; Saturn had a father	2 fragments
1.14	History of Saturn's Reign According to Euhemerus	3 fragments
1.15	Deification of Historical Figures	
1.16	Existence of Female 'Gods' in Pagan Pantheon Presumes Procreation and thus Shows Pagan 'Gods' are not Divine	
1.17	Stories of Misfortunes and Scandalous Behavior of Pagan 'Gods' Show They are not Divine	1 fragment
1.18	According Divine Honors to Benefactors does not Make Them Divine	
1.19	According Divine Honors to Benefactors does not Make Them Divine (continued)	
1.20	The 'Gods' of Rome are Ludicrous	
1.21	Pagan Cults are Bloody and Comic	

1.22	Pagan Cults are Human Creations • creation of cults in Rome; Jupiter cleverly created his own cult	1 fragment
1.23	Pagan 'Gods' are Recent Creations	

As is evident from this summary, most of the Euhemeran material in the *Divine Institutes* concerns the reigns of Saturn and Jupiter, whom Lactantius, following Euhemerus, portrayed as human rulers who were accorded divine honors. Lactantius, unlike Diodorus, made no attempt to provide coherent summaries of specific parts of the *Sacred Register*; instead, he brought in relatively short pieces of that work in places he felt it to be useful in buttressing his arguments. In addition, Lactantius discussed Jupiter and then Saturn, whereas it is likely that Euhemerus' narrative of the reigns of Ouranos and his offspring was chronologically ordered. As a result, the parts of the *Sacred Register* embedded in the *Divine Institutes* appear in no particular order.

Jacoby addressed this problem by dividing the Euhemeran material in the *Divine Institutes* into 14 separate testimonia and fragments, sometimes separating a single passage into more than one fragment on the basis of subject matter. He then numbered the fragments so that they occurred in something like their original order. However, much of the resulting clarity was lost due to the presentation of material in *FGrH*, along with the presence of one intervening fragment from another author.

Insofar as the *Divine Institutes* is valuable to the study of the *Sacred Register* in large part due to what it can tell us about Euhemerus' narrative of the reigns of Saturn and Jupiter, it is worth summarizing the relevant testimonia and fragments in the form of a chart, which helps make clear the benefits of Jacoby's division of material:

<i>FGrH</i> <i>T or</i> <i>F#</i>	Placement in the <i>Divine</i> <i>Institutes</i>	Summary of Contents
T3	1.11.33	Euhemerus wrote a historical narrative using tablets and inscriptions from ancient temples, making special use of a golden column at the Temple of Zeus Triphylis on which Jupiter himself recorded his deeds for posterity
F12	1.13.14	Ennius says Uranus, not Saturn, reigned first
F13	1.11.65	Jupiter sacrifices to his grandfather Caelus, who died in Oceania and was buried in Aulacia
F14	1.14.1-6	The brothers Titan and Saturn agree that Saturn, the younger of the two, will hold the throne but that it will devolve upon Titan's sons after Saturn's death and that Saturn's male offspring will be killed; Jupiter, Neptune, and Pluto are raised in secret, without Saturn's knowledge
F15	1.14.7	When Titan finds out about the existence of Saturn's male offspring, he seizes Saturn and Saturn's wife/sister and imprisons them
F16	1.14.10-12	When Jupiter becomes an adult, he hears about his parents' predicament, gathers an army of Cretans, conquers Titan and his sons, frees his parents, restores his father to the kingship, and returns to Crete; afterward an oracle warns Saturn to be careful

		lest Jupiter expel him from the throne; Saturn plots to have Jupiter killed; Jupiter learns about the plot, claims the throne, and drives Saturn into exile, sending armed men after him; Saturn eventually finds refuge in Italy
F18	1.11.65	An eagle settles on Jupiter's head and foretells his kingship
F19	1.11.34	Jupiter gives rule of the sea to Neptune
F20	1.11.35	Jupiter lived on Mt. Olympos, giving judgment on matters of controversy; inventors of anything new and useful went to Olympos to show it to Jupiter
F21	1.11.63	Jupiter goes to the Panchaian mountain, also known as the Throne of Heaven, builds an altar to Caelus and is the first to sacrifice on that altar; he renames the sky above, from aether to Caelus
F22	1.13.2	Saturn and his contemporaries were accustomed to eating human flesh; Jupiter puts an end to this
F23	1.22.1-7	Jupiter arranges for his own deification by traveling widely and ordering each of his hosts to build a temple to Jupiter, with the title of each cult consisting of the names of Jupiter and his host (e.g., Jupiter Atabyrius); his hosts were happy to oblige him because it perpetuated their names; Aeneas did something similar when founding a city in Italy
F24	1.11.45-7	After having circled the earth five times, Jupiter divided his powers among his friends and relatives, created laws and customs and grain and performed other benefactions, left memorials for posterity, went to Crete, and died; his tomb is in Cnossus; on his tomb there is an inscription, 'Zan Kronou', meaning 'Jupiter, son of Saturn'
F25	1.17.10	Venus started prostitution and promoted it among women in Cyprus so that they could make money and so that she would not seem unusually lacking in chastity or overly fond of men

The preceding chart shows that Jacoby's arrangement of material makes it possible to get a good sense of Euhemerus' narrative of the reigns of Saturn and Jupiter. It has the additional benefit of reducing the need for detailed and repetitive comment on individual fragments.

In regard to the fragment under consideration here, one issue that merits discussion is that Lactantius assigns the title *Euhemerus* to Ennius' translation of the *Sacred Register*. Elsewhere he calls it *Sacra Historia* (FF14, 18, 24) or *Historia Sacra* (FF22-3, 25). It seems likely, therefore, that the original title was *Euhemerus sive Sacra Historia* (M. Winiarczyk, *Euhemerus von Messene: Leben, Werk und Nachwirkung* (Munich 2002), 126).

There has been considerable scholarly discussion as to the reason why Ennius, probably in the years 200-194 BC, decided to produce a Latin translation of the *Sacred Register*.

Winiarczyk has argued against earlier views that Ennius sought to undermine traditional religion in Rome and instead has made the case that he wished to ready the ground for the deification of Scipio Africanus (*Euhemerus von Messene*, 119-25). That conclusion is speculative, though it seems clear that Euhemerus' ideas did affect Roman thinking about the deification of emperors (B. Bosworth, 'Augustus, the *Res Gestae* and Hellenistic Theories

of Apotheosis', *JRS* 89 (1999), 1-18 at 10-12). It is also possible to read Ennius' *Sacred History* as a reflection of and on the role of law and jurists in Roman society (E. Romano, 'Oracoli divini e responsi di giuristi: Nota sulla *interpretatio ennian* nell'*Euhemerus*', in L. Castagna and C. Riboldi (eds.), *Amicitiae templa serena: Studi in onore di Giuseppe Aricò* (Milan 2008), 2: 1433-48).

63 F 12 Bibliography

On Lactantius' *Divinae Institutiones*, see A. Bowen and P. Garnsey, (eds.), *Lactantius: Divine Institutes* (Liverpool 2003), 1-54. On the specific subject of Lactantius' use of Ennius' *Sacred Register*, see also J. Bryce, *The Library of Lactantius* (New York 1990), 187, 328-47.

<p>63 F 13 - LACTANT. Div. inst. I 11, 65</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="13" sourcework(level1="Lactantius (Caelius [Caecilius?])" level2="" level3="Divinae Institutiones [Vide: Varro (Terentius) apud Lactantium]" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 11, 65")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Mythology, Religion Historical Work: <i>Divine Institutes</i> Source Date: 4th century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>cui ergo sacrificare [sc. Juppiter] potuit nisi Caelo avo, quem dicit Euhemerus in Oceania mortuum et in oppido Aulacia(?) sepultum. F 21.</p>	<p>To whom therefore could Jupiter sacrifice except to his grandfather Caelus, whom Euhemerus says died in Oceania and was buried in the town of Aulacia? (Cf. F21.)</p>

63 F 13 Commentary

Oceania would appear to be Euhemerus' name for the region of Panchaia inhabited by the group called Oceanites (F3 5.42.4, 5.44.6, 5.45.2). The manuscript tradition shows a considerable amount of variation with respect to the word rendered here as Aulacia, a place which is otherwise completely unknown. It is typically taken as a corruption of another place name (G. Némethy, *Euhemeri Reliquiae* (Budapest 1889), 79-80).

63 F 13 Bibliography

Writer, title etc.

<p>63 F 14 - LACTANT. Div. inst. I 14, 1–6 (Epit. 13)</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="14" sourcework(level1="Lactantius (Caelius [Caecilius?])" level2="" level3=" <i>Divinae Institutiones</i> [Vide: Varro (Terentius) apud Lactantium]" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 14, 1-6") sourcework(level1="Lactantius (Caelius [Caecilius?])" level2="" level3="Epitoma institutionum divinarum (ad Pentadium)" level4="" level5="" level6="13")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Mythology, Religion Historical Work: <i>Divine Institutes</i> Source Date: 4th century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>nunc quoniam ab iis quae rettuli aliquantum Sacra Historia dissentit, aperiamus ea quae veris litteris continentur, ne poetarum ineptias in accusandis religionibus sequi ac probare videamur. (2) haec Ennii verba sunt: <i>#quote#«exim Saturnus uxorem duxit Opem. Titan, qui maior natus erat, postulat ut ipse regnaret. ibi Vesta mater eorum et sorores Ceres atque Ops suadent Saturno, uti de regno ne concedat fratri. (3) ibi Titan, qui facie deterior esset quam Saturnus, idcirco et quod videbat matrem atque sorores suas operam dare uti Saturnus regnaret, concessit ei ut is regnaret. itaque pactus est cum Saturno, uti si quid liberum virile secus ei natum esset, ne quid educaret. id eius rei causa fecit, uti ad suos gnatos regnum rediret. (4) tum Saturno filius qui primus natus est, eum necaverunt. deinde posterius nati sunt gemini</i></p>	<p>Now since the <i>Sacred History</i> differs somewhat from those things that I have quoted, let us lay out those things that are contained in truthful literature, so that we do not seem to follow or approve the follies of poets in attacking religions. (2) These are the words of Ennius: ‘Saturn then took Ops as his wife. Titan, who was older by birth, demands that he himself rule. Thereupon Vesta, their mother, and their sisters, Ceres and Ops, persuade Saturn to not concede the throne to his brother. (3) Thereupon Titan, who was less good-looking than Saturn, for that reason and because he saw that his mother and sisters were working to have Saturn reign, gave way to Saturn so that Saturn would reign. Accordingly he made an agreement with Saturn, that if a male child was born to him, it would not be reared. This was done so that the throne would revert to Titan’s children. (4) They then killed the son who was first born to Saturn. Next afterward twins were born, Jupiter and Juno. They gave Juno to Saturn to see, and</p>

Juppiter atque Juno. tum Junonem Saturno in conspectum dedere atque Jovem clam abscondunt dantque eum Vestae educandum celantes Saturnum. (5) item Neptunum clam Saturno Ops parit eumque clanculum abscondit. ad eundem modum tertio partu Ops parit geminos Plutonem et Glaucam. Pluto Latine est Dis pater; alii Orcum vocant. ibi filiam Glaucam Saturno ostendunt, at filium Plutonem celant atque abscondunt. deinde Glauca parva emoritur. (6) haec ut scripta sunt Jovis fratrumque eius stirps atque cognatio. in hunc modum nobis ex Sacra Scriptione traditum est.»#

they secretly hide Jupiter and give him to Vesta to be reared, concealing him from Saturn. (5) In the same way Ops gives birth to Neptune, keeping it secret from Saturn, and secretly hides him. In the same fashion in her third labor Ops gives birth to twins, Pluto and Glauce. Pluto in Latin is Diespieter; some call him Orcus. Then they show the daughter, Glauce, to Saturn, but they conceal the son, Pluto, and hide him. Glauce then dies young. (6) These are the origins and blood-relationships of Jupiter and his brothers, as written. In this fashion it has been passed down to us in holy scripture’.

63 F 14 Commentary

Ennius equated Ouranos with Caelus (who also appears as Uranus, FF12-13), Kronos with Saturn, Rhea with Ops (the Roman goddess of Plenty and companion of Saturn). For an alternative, somewhat divergent version of Kronos’ problematic relationship with his children, see [Apollodorus] *Library* 1.1.4-7 and Hesiod *Theogony*, 453-506. The version found in Apollodorus and Hesiod portrays Kronos as actively seeking to destroy his children in order to preserve his kingship. Euhemerus makes him into a more benign figure, presumably because he cast Kronos as a culture-hero worthy of deification. See the commentary on F2 for further discussion.

63 F 14 Bibliography

Writer, title etc.

63 F 15 - LACTANT. Div. inst. I 14, 7

meta[[id="63" type="F" n="15" sourcework(level1="Lactantius (Caelius [Caecilius?])" level2="" level3="Divinae Institutiones [Vide: Varro (Terentius) apud Lactantium]" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 14, 7")

	¶
Subject: Genre: Mythology, Religion Historical Work: <i>Divine Institutes</i> Source Date: 4th century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?	Translation
item paulo post haec infert: #quote#«deinde Titan postquam rescivit Saturno filios procreatos atque educatos esse clam se, seducit secum filios suos qui Titani vocantur, fratremque suum Saturnum atque Opem comprehendit eosque muro circumegit et custodiam iis apponit.»#	In the same way a little later he adds these words: 'Next, after Titan realized that sons had been born to Saturn and raised without his knowledge, he leads away with him his sons, who are called Titans, and seized his brother Saturn and Ops and encircled them with a wall and set a guard over them'.

63 F 15 Commentary

For an alternative, somewhat divergent version of the conflicts involving the offspring of Ouranos, see [Apollodorus] *Library* 1.1.1-4 and Hesiod *Theogony*, 126-210. In the version given by Apollodorus and Hesiod, Titans is a nickname given by Ouranos to his six sons who overthrew him with the help of their mother Earth (Kronos being the youngest and leader). In Euhemerus' version, Titan is Kronos' older brother and rival claimant for the throne. This implies that Euhemerus wished to remove from Kronos the opprobrium of having castrated and overthrown his father. See also the commentary on FF12 and 14. In more general terms, Euhemerus transformed traditional stories about succession in the Greek pantheon into the story of a family, with Ouranos, Kronos, and Zeus all portrayed in a generally favorable light, and disreputable behavior for the most part displaced to Titan.

63 F 15 Bibliography

Writer, title etc.

63 F 16 - LACTANT. Div. inst. I 14, 10–12	meta [[id="63" type="F" n="16" sourcework(level1="Lactantius (Caelius [Caecilius?])" level2="" level3=" <i>Divinae Institutiones</i> [Vide: Varro (Terentius) apud Lactantium]" level4="" level5=""
--	--

	level6="1, 14, 10-12")]]
<p>Subject: Genre: Mythology, Religion Historical Work: <i>Divine Institutes</i> Source Date: 4th century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?</p>	Translation
<p>reliqua historia sic contextitur: Jovem adultum cum audisset patrem atque matrem custodiis circumsaeptos atque in vincula coniectos venisse cum magna Cretensium multitudine Titanumque ac filios eius pugna vicisse, parentes vinculis exemisse, patri regnum reddidisse atque ita in Cretam remeasse. (11) post haec deinde Saturno sortem datam, ut caveret ne filius eum regno expelleret; illum elevandae sortis atque effugiendi periculi gratia insidiatum Jovi, ut eum necaret; Jovem cognitis insidiis regnum sibi denuo vindicasse ac fugasse Saturnum. (12) qui cum iactatus esset per omnes terras persequentibus armatis, quos ad eum comprehendendum vel necandum Juppiter miserat, vix in Italia locum in quo lateret invenit. – Lyd. <i>De mens.</i> IV p. 170, 13 W.</p>	<p>The remainder of the <i>History</i> goes as follows: ‘When Jupiter became an adult and had heard that his father and mother had been ringed with guards and had been thrown into chains, he came with a great host of Cretans and conquered Titan and his sons in battle, released his parents from their chains, restored his father to the kingship, and then went back to Crete. (11) Afterward, an oracle was given to Saturn that he should take care lest his son expel him from the throne. In order to remove the threat of this oracle and to avoid the danger, he plotted against Jupiter, in order to have him killed. Jupiter, having learned about the plot, reclaimed the throne for himself, and drove Saturn into exile. (12) Saturn, when he had been chased through every land, pursued by armed men whom Jupiter had sent to seize or kill him, with difficulty found in Italy a place in which he could hide’. (Cf. Ioannes Laurentius Lydus <i>De Mensibus</i> 4.154 pg. 170.13 Wünsch.)</p>

63 F 16 Commentary

For an alternative, somewhat divergent version of the conflict between Kronos and Zeus, see [Apollodorus] *Library* 1.1.5-2.1 and Hesiod *Theogony*, 453-506 and 617-735. In the version given by Apollodorus and Hesiod, Zeus wages war against his father Kronos and Kronos' brothers in order to seize power. In Euhemerus' version, Zeus wages war against his uncle

Titan in order to rescue his parents. Here again Euhemerus makes one of his culture heroes into a relatively sympathetic figure. See also the commentary on FF12, 14-15. The association between Zeus and Crete is already present in the *Theogony*.

63 F 16 Bibliography

Writer, title etc.

<p>63 F 17 - AUGUSTIN. epp. 17 1 (C S E L XXXIII 40)</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="17" sourcework(level1="Augustinus (Aurelius)" level2="" level3="Epistulae (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, 33)" level4="" level5="" level6="17; p. 40")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Mythology, Religion Historical Work: <i>Epistle 17</i> Source Date: 4th century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 390-1 AD</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>... in illo monte (sc. Olympto) Jovem castra posuisse, cum adversus patrem bella gereret, ut ea docet historia, quam vestri etiam sacram vocant...</p>	<p>...on that mountain (Olympos) Jupiter pitched his camp, when he was at war with his father, as history, which your kind even call sacred, tells us...</p>

63 F 17 Commentary

This fragment comes from a letter written by Augustine in 390/1 AD to the grammarian Maximus of Madauros, who may have been one of Augustine's teachers. In an earlier, now lost, letter Maximus had evidently argued that all the pagan gods were diffuse manifestations of a single deity. Near the beginning of his reply Augustine acerbically notes that Maximus had made a jocular comparison between Mt. Olympos and the local forum, which Augustine rejects as pointless unless it were intended as a reminder that Jupiter set up camp on Mt. Olympos when he was at war with his father. Augustine's point is that it is foolish to talk about the unity of the pagan 'gods'. There is no overt reference to Euhemerus, but the 'historia quam vestri etiam sacram vocant' is presumably an allusion to Ennius' *Sacred History*.

63 F 17 Bibliography

On Augustine's letters, of which c. 300 are extant, see A. Fitzgerald and J. C. Cavadini, (eds.), *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids, MI 1999), 298-310. On Maximus of Madauros, see *ibid.*, 550.

<p>63 F 18 - LACTANT. Div. inst. I 11, 65</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="18" sourcework(level1="Lactantius (Caelius [Caecilius?])" level2="" level3=" <i>Divinae Institutiones</i> [Vide: Varro (Terentius) apud Lactantium]" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 11, 65")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Mythology, Religion Historical Work: <i>Divine Institutes</i> Source Date: 4th century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>Sacra vero Historia etiam ante (sc. quam adversus Titanas profectus est) consedisse illi aquilam in capite atque ei regnum portendisse testatur. (Fulgent. Myth. I 20).</p>	<p>Earlier in truth the <i>Sacred History</i> claims that 'an eagle (sc. which set out against the Titans) settled on his head and foretold his kingship'. (Cf. Fulgentius <i>Mythologiae</i> I 20.)</p>

63 F 18 Commentary

See the commentary on FF12, 14-16.

63 F 18 Bibliography

Writer, title etc.

<p>63 F 19 - LACTANT. Div. inst. I 11, 34</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="19" sourcework(level1="Lactantius (Caelius [Caecilius?])" level2="" level3=" <i>Divinae Institutiones</i> [Vide: Varro (Terentius) apud Lactantium]" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 11, 34")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Mythology, Religion Historical Work: <i>Divine Institutes</i> Source Date: 4th century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC</p>	<p>Translation</p>

Historical Period: ?	
cuius haec verba sunt: #quote#«ibi Juppiter Neptuno imperium dat maris, ut insulis omnibus et quae secundum mare loca essent omnibus regnaret»# s. T 3.	These are his (Ennius') words: 'There Jupiter gives rule of the sea to Neptune, so that he would rule over all islands and over all places bordering the sea'. (See T3.)

63 F 19 Commentary

See the commentary on FF12, 14-16.

63 F 19 Bibliography

Writer, title etc.

63 F 20 - LACTANT. Div. inst. I 11, 35	meta [[id="63" type="F" n="20" sourcework(level1="Lactantius (Caelius [Caecilius?])" level2="" level3=" <i>Divinae Institutiones</i> [Vide: Varro (Terentius) apud Lactantium]" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 11, 35")]]
Subject: Genre: Mythology, Religion Historical Work: <i>Divine Institutes</i> Source Date: 4th century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?	Translation
in Olympo autem Jovem habitasse docet eadem historia, quae dicit: #quote#«ea tempestate Juppiter in monte Olympo maximam partem vitae colebat et eo ad eum in ius veniebant, si quae res in controversia erant. item si quis quid novi invenerat quod ad vitam humanam utile esset, eo veniebant atque Jovi ostendebant.»#	But the same <i>Historia</i> informs us that Jupiter dwelt on Mt. Olympos, when it says: 'At that time Jupiter was living most of the time on Mt. Olympos, and people came to him there for justice, if there were controversial matters. In the same way, if anyone had discovered something new which might be useful for human life, they would come there and show it to Jupiter'.

63 F 20 Commentary

Jupiter is cast here as a culture-hero who dispenses justice and who receives anyone with an invention that would benefit humankind. See also the commentary on FF2, 12, 14-16.

63 F 20 Bibliography

Writer, title etc.

<p>63 F 21 - LACTANT. Div. inst. I 11, 63</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="21" sourcework(level1="Lactantius (Caelius [Caecilius?])" level2="" level3=" <i>Divinae Institutiones</i> [Vide: Varro (Terentius) apud Lactantium]" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 11, 63")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Mythology, Religion Historical Work: <i>Divine Institutes</i> Source Date: 4th century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>in Sacra Historia sic Ennius tradit: #quote#«deinde Panchaeum deducit in montem, qui vocatur Caeli sella. postquam eo ascendit, contemplatus est late terras ibique in eo monte aram creat Caelo, primusque in ea ara Juppiter sacrificavit. in eo loco suspexit in caelum quod nunc nos nominamus, idque quod supra mundum erat, quod aether vocabatur, de sui avi nomine caelum nomen indidit; idque Juppiter quod aether vocatur placans primus caelum nominavit eamque hostiam quam ibi sacrificavit totam adolevit.»# s. F 13.</p>	<p>Ennius thus relates in his <i>Sacred History</i>: 'Then he led the way to the Panchaian mountain, which is called the Throne of Heaven. After he ascended it, he surveyed the lands far and wide, and there on that mountain he builds an altar to Caelus, and Jupiter was the first to sacrifice on that altar. In that place he looked up into what we now call heaven, and he gave the name heaven to that which is above the world, which used to be called aether, naming it after his grandfather. And Jupiter was the first to call what is called aether heaven, doing so in a placatory spirit, and the sacrificial victim that he offered there he burnt entire'. (Cf. F13.)</p>

63 F 21 Commentary

Euhemerus portrayed Ouranos as having a continuing interest in the heavens (F2 6.1.8, F3 5.44.6, F21) and stated that constellations were first established by Venus (see F7). There may, therefore, have been some element of astronomy in the *Sacred Register*. That may in turn be part of the reason why Hyginus made some use of the Latin translation of Euhemerus' work in crafting his astronomy manual (see FF4-5, 7). See also the commentary on FF2 and 12.

63 F 21 Bibliography

Writer, title etc.

<p>63 F 22 - LACTANT. Div. inst. I 13, 2</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="22" sourcework(level1="Lactantius (Caelius [Caecilius?])" level2="" level3=" <i>Divinae Institutiones</i> [Vide: Varro (Terentius) apud Lactantium]" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 13, 2")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Mythology, Religion Historical Work: <i>Divine Institutes</i> Source Date: 4th century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>quamquam scriptum sit in Historia Sacra Saturnum et Opem ceterosque tunc homines humanam carnem solitos esitare; verum primum Jovem leges hominibus moresque condentem edicto prohibuisse, ne liceret eo cibo vesci.</p>	<p>Although it is written in the <i>Sacred History</i> that Saturn and Ops and the rest of their contemporaries were accustomed to eating human flesh, Jupiter first, in crafting laws and customs for humankind, imposed by edict a ban, making it unlawful to feed on such food.</p>

63 F 22 Commentary

Cannibalism was for the Greeks a standard index of the absence of restraint and culture, and the role Euhemerus gave to Zeus in putting an end to it once again establishes him as a culture-hero. See also the commentary on FF2, 12, 14-16, 20. Zeus' termination of

cannibalism may reflect the traditional story of Ouranos eating his children, a story which seems to have not appeared in the *Sacred Register* (see the commentary on F14, as well as G. Vallauri, (ed.), *Euemero di Messene: Testimonianze e frammenti con introduzione e commento* (Torino 1956), 22.)

63 F 22 Bibliography

On the meaning of cannibalism in the Greek world, see M. J. Edwards, 'Some Early Christian Immoralities', *Ancient Society* 23 (1992), 71-82.

<p>63 F 23 - LACTANT. Div. inst. I 22, 21-27 (Epit. 24)</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="23" sourcework(level1="Lactantius (Caelius [Caecilius?])" level2="" level3=" <i>Divinae Institutiones</i> [Vide: Varro (Terentius) apud Lactantium]" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 22, 21-27") sourcework(level1="Lactantius (Caelius [Caecilius?])" level2="" level3="Epitoma institutionum divinarum (ad Pentadium)" level4="" level5="" level6="24")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Mythology, Religion Historical Work: <i>Divine Institutes</i> Source Date: 4th century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>Historia vero Sacra testatur ipsum Jovem postquam rerum potitus sit in tantam venisse insolentiam, ut ipse sibi fana in multis locis constituerit. (22) nam cum terras circumiret, ut in quamque regionem venerat, reges principesve populorum hospitio sibi et amicitia copulabat, et cum a quoque digrederetur, iubebat sibi fanum creari hospitis sui nomine, quasi ut posset amicitiae ac foederis memoria conservari. (23) sic constituta sunt templa Jovi Ataburio, Jovi Labryandio: Ataburus enim et Labryandus hospites eius atque adiutores in bello fuerunt. item Jovi Laprio,</p>	<p>But the <i>Sacred History</i> claims that Jupiter himself, after he gained possession of power, developed such arrogance that he in many places built temples to himself. (22) For when he went round his lands, when he arrived at each region, he bound to him the kings or princes of the people by means of hospitality and friendship, and when he was departing from each place, he ordered that a temple should be built to him in the name of his host, as if a memory of the friendship and agreement could be preserved in this way. (23) In this way temples were founded to Jupiter</p>

Jovi Molioni, Jovi Casio et quae sunt in eundem modum. quod ille astutissime excogitavit, ut et sibi honorem divinum et hospitibus suis perpetuum nomen acquireret cum religione coniunctum. (24) gaudebant ergo illi et huic imperio libenter obsequebantur et nominis sui gratia ritus annuos et festa celebrabant. (25) simile quiddam in Sicilia fecit Aeneas, cum conditae urbi Acestae hospitis nomen inposuit, ut eam postmodum laetus ac libens Acestes diligeret augeret ornaret. (26) hoc modo religionem cultus sui per orbem terrae Juppiter seminavit et exemplum ceteris ad imitandum dedit. (27) sive igitur a Melisseo, sicut Didymus tradidit (ebd. § 19–20), colendorum deorum ritus effluxit sive ab ipso Jove, ut Euhemerus, de tempore tamen constat quando dii coli coeperint.

Atabyrius, Jupiter Labryandius: for Atyburus and Labryandus were his hosts and his allies in war. In a similar fashion temples were also built to Jupiter Laprius, Jupiter Molio, Jupiter Casius, and others which are named in the same way. He was very clever in devising this plan, as he acquired for himself divine honor and for his hosts a perpetual name linked with a religious cult. (24) The kings and princes were therefore glad, and readily yielded to his rule, and in gratitude for the perpetuation of their names they observed annual rites and festivals. (25) Aeneas did something similar in Sicily, when he founded a city and gave it the name of his host Acestes, so that afterward Acestes would gladly and readily love it, expand it, beautify it. (26) In this fashion Jupiter disseminated throughout the world the celebration of his cult and gave an example for others to imitate. (27) Whether, then, the practice of worshipping gods came from Melisseus, as Didymus related (see *Divine Institutes* 1.22.19–20), or from Jupiter himself, as Euhemerus says, nevertheless there is agreement about the time at which gods began to be worshipped.

63 F 23 Commentary

This fragment offers insight into one of the reasons why the *Sacred Register* was taken by some ancient readers as at least partially factual. In his account of Zeus' travels (see also F2 6.1.10 and F23) and deification, Euhemerus offered aetiologies for real-world cults of Zeus in various places. There were well-established cults of Zeus Atabyrius on Mt. Atabyris, the highest mountain on Rhodes; of Zeus Labryandius, at Labranda in Caria; and of Zeus Casius on three different versions of Mt. Casius (near Antioch, in Egypt, and on Corcyra). (The cults of Zeus Laprius and Zeus Molio mentioned by Euhemerus cannot be definitively connected

to specific cult sites (though see R. F. Willetts, *Cretan Cults and Festivals* (London 1962), 236.) There is no evidence for a significant Zeus cult at Triphylia in the Peloponnese.)

As B. Garstad has pointed out, 'Euhemerus has taken an epithet derived from the geographical location of the cult and created from it a personal name for the host of Zeus in his narrative' ('Belus in the Sacred History of Euhemerus', *CP* 99 (2004), 246-57 at 255). This was quite a clever strategy in that it was a standard methodology among Greek historians of the fourth century to use contemporary ritual practice to test the reliability of inherited traditions about events in the distant past. This practice was driven by a belief that past events had at least in some cases shaped religious practices, which then endured largely unchanged. Accounts of events in the distant past could thus be verified by current cultic rituals. Euhemerus, on the other hand, invented traditions that corresponded closely with contemporary ritual practice; that correspondence made his invented traditions seem very much like reliable history.

Zeus' hosts include Belos (F2 6.1.10), a Hellenized version of Bel, a title closely associated with Marduk, the chief Babylonian god. Bel was from an early date identified with Zeus (see, for example, Herodotus 1.181). In the *Sacred Register* Euhemerus extended his reading of the origins of deities to foreign gods and made Belos into a human ruler of Babylon; he was evidently the first Greek writer to do so. This had the effect of making the cult of Bel-Marduk in Babylon another example of a cult founded by one of Zeus' hosts and hence of aligning it with the other Zeus cults touched on by Euhemerus. Garstad has argued that this was a reflection of a desire on the part of Euhemerus to promote 'a benign internationalism that knit the peoples of the world together in the worship of a single Zeus' (*ibid.* 257). The idea that the *Sacred Register* was intended to foster a sense of the unity of all humankind goes back at least as far as Tarn, but it is not easily sustained because of the existence of violent conflict among the peoples who inhabit Panchaia (see the commentary on F3 and M. Winiarczyk, *Euhemeros von Messene: Leben, Werk und Nachwirkung* (Munich 2002), 115-16).

The idea that this passage reflects and perhaps satirizes the autodeification of Hellenistic rulers runs into difficulties with chronology. Hellenistic rulers do not seem to have begun indulging in autodeification until the third quarter of the third century, and it seems likely, though not certain, that the *Sacred Register* was composed before that point (Winiarczyk, *Euhemeros von Messene*, 63-8, 108-11).

On Aeneas naming a newly-founded city after Acestes, see *Aeneid* 5.718.

63 F 23 Bibliography

On the use of contemporary ritual practice to test the reliability of inherited traditions, see G. Parmeggiani, 'Eforo F31b: L'indagine locale e l'autopsia archeologica', in Università di Bologna Dipartimento di storia antica (ed.), *Atti del congresso storiografia locale e storiografia universale* (Como 2001), 165-97. The evidence for the real-world equivalents of Zeus cults mentioned by Euhemerus is assembled in Garstad, 'Belus in the Sacred History of Euhemerus', 250-6. On the Zeus cult at Mt. Casius, see also W. Fauth, 'Das Kasion-Gebirge und Zeus Kasios', *Ugarit Forschungen* 22 (1990), 105-18.

<p>63 F 24 - LACTANT. Div. inst. I 11, 45-47 (Epit. 13)</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="24" sourcework(level1="Lactantius (Caelius [Caecilius?])" level2="" level3=" <i>Divinae Institutiones</i> [Vide: Varro (Terentius) apud Lactantium]" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 11, 45-47") sourcework(level1="Lactantius (Caelius [Caecilius?])" level2="" level3="Epitoma institutionum divinarum (ad Pentadium)" level4="" level5="" level6="13")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Mythology, Religion Historical Work: <i>Divine Institutes</i> Source Date: 4th century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>Ennius in Sacra Historia descriptis omnibus quae in vita sua gessit ad ultimum sic ait: <i>#quote#«deinde Juppiter postquam quinq̄ue terras circuiuit omnibusque amicis atque cognatis suis imperia diuisit reliquitque hominibus leges mores frumentaue parauit multaue alia bona fecit, inmortalī gloria memoriaue adfectus sempiterna monumenta sui reliquit. (46) aetate pessum acta in Creta vitam commutauit et ad deos abiit, eumque Curetes filii sui curauerunt decoraueruntque eum. et sepulcrum eius est in Creta in oppido Gnosso, et dicitur Vesta</i></p>	<p>Ennius, in his <i>Sacred History</i>, having described everything which he (Jupiter) did in his life, at the end says: 'Then after Jupiter circled the earth five times and divided and willed his powers to all his friends and relatives, prepared for humans laws, customs, and grain and did many other good things. Bestirred by immortal glory and memory, he left memorials for his people that would last forever. (46) As his time wound down, he moved to Crete and departed to the gods, and his sons the Curetes looked after him and honored him. And his tomb is in Crete in the town of Cnossus, and Vesta is said to have founded this city. And on this tomb is an inscription in ancient Greek letters, "Zan Kronou",</p>

<p>hanc urbem creavisse, inque sepulcro eius est inscriptum antiquis litteris Graecis ΖΑΝ ΚΡΟΝΟΥ id est Latine Juppiter Saturni.»# (47) hoc certe non poetae tradunt, sed antiquarum rerum scriptores.</p>	<p>which in Latin is Jupiter the son of Saturn'. This is certainly not what the poets say; but it is what writers upon antiquities say.</p>
--	---

63 F 24 Commentary

See the commentary on FF12, 14-16, 20-3.

63 F 24 Bibliography

Writer, title etc.

<p>63 F 25 - LACTANT. Div. inst. I 17, 10</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="25" sourcework(level1="Lactantius (Caelius [Caecilius?])" level2="" level3=" <i>Divinae Institutiones</i> [Vide: Varro (Terentius) apud Lactantium]" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 17, 10")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Mythology, Religion Historical Work: <i>Divine Institutes</i> Source Date: 4th century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>quae (sc. Venus) prima, ut in Historia Sacra continetur, artem meretriciam instituit auctorque mulieribus in Cypro fuit, uti vulgato corpore quaestum facerent: quod idcirco imperavit, ne sola praeter alias mulieres in pudica et virorum adpetens videretur. F 7.</p>	<p>As it says in the <i>Sacred History</i>, she (Venus) first started prostitution and promoted it among women in Cyprus, so that they could make money from letting others have a share in their body. She ordered this thing so she would not seem beyond other women in lack of chastity and appetite for men. (Cf. F7.)</p>

63 F 25 Commentary

This fragment is somewhat surprising given Euhemerus' highly positive portrayal of Ouranos, Kronos, and Zeus. It occurs in a section of the *Divine Institutes* intended to highlight the scandalous behavior of the pagan gods, and in its original context it may have read somewhat differently. F7 shows that Euhemerus characterized Venus as having established the constellations and taught them to Mercury, an intellectual exercise that puts her in a much different light.

63 F 25 Bibliography

Writer, title etc.

<p>63 F 26 - VARRO De r. r. I 48, 2</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="26" sourcework(level1="Varro (Terentius)" level2="" level3="Res rusticae" level4="" level5="" level6="1, 48, 2")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Lexicography Historical Work: <i>On Matters Rural</i> Source Date: 2nd-1st century BC Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: 2nd-1st century BC</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>arista et granum omnibus fere notum, gluma paucis. itaque id apud Ennium solum scriptum scio esse in Euhemeri libris versis.</p>	<p>'Beard' and 'grain' are words known to almost everyone, 'husk' to few. Thus, as far as I know, it occurs only in the work of Ennius, in his translation of Euhemerus.</p>

63 F 26 Commentary

This fragment forms part of Varro's discussion of the parts of grain plants. He identifies four such parts: grain (*granum*), husk (*gluma*), beard (*arista*), and sheath (*vagina*). The *De Re Rustica* (*On Farming*), completed sometime around 37 BC, was a treatise on agriculture in three books, cast in the form of a dialog. Varro here shows his deep interest in philology (most clearly embodied in his *De Lingua Latina* (*On the Latin Language*)) and his predilection for analyzing wholes in terms of their parts.

63 F 26 Bibliography

On the *De Re Rustica*, see J. Heurgon, (ed.), *Varron Économie Rurale, Livre Premier* (Paris 1978), vii-lxxv. On this passage, see *ibid.*, 175-6.

<p>63 F 27 - COLUMELLA De r. r. IX 2.3-4</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="27" sourcework(level1="Columella (Junius)" level2="" level3="De re rustica" level4="" level5="" level6="9, 2")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Mythology Historical Work: <i>On Matters Rural</i> Source Date: 1st century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>nec sane rustico dignum est sciscitari, fueritne mulier pulcherrima specie Melissa, quam Juppiter in apem convertit, an, ut Euhemerus poeta dicit, crabronibus et sole genitas apes, quas nymphae Phryxonides educaverint, mox Dictaeo specu Jovis extitisse nutrices easque pabula munere dei sortitas, quibus ipsae parvum educaverant alumnum. ista enim quamvis non dedeçant poetam...attigit Vergilius (ge. IV 152)...sed ne illud quidem pertinet ad agricolas, quando et in qua regione primum natae sunt: utrum in Thessalia sub Aristaeo an in insula Cea, ut scribit Euhemerus, an Erechthei temporibus in monte Hymetto, ut Euphronius, an Cretae Saturni temporibus, ut Nicander.</p>	<p>Nor indeed is it fit for a rustic to ask whether there ever existed a woman of exceeding beauty in appearance, Melissa, whom Jupiter changed into a bee, or whether, as Euhemerus the poet says, bees, having been bred from hornets and the sun and having been reared by nymphs, the daughters of Phryxon, soon afterward became the nurses of Jupiter in the Diktaian cave and had allotted to them by the gift of the god the food by means of which they themselves had reared their small ward. These matters, however, are unworthy of a poet...Vergil briefly touched on (<i>Georgics</i> 4.152)...but it does not indeed concern farmers, when and in what region bees first came into being: whether in Thessaly during the rule of Aristaios, or on the island of Kea, as Euhemerus writes, or in the time of Erechtheus on Mt. Hymettos, as Euphronios says, or on Crete in the time of Saturn, as Nicander says.</p>

63 F 27 Commentary

Columella's detailed, systematic manual on agriculture in 12 books, *De Re Rustica* (*On Farming*), appeared c. 60 AD. This passage occurs near the beginning of Columella's lengthy, almost entirely practical discussion of the care of bees (9.2-16). It gives Columella an

opportunity to display the depth and breadth of his knowledge of Greek and Roman literature before launching into much more mundane subject matter. F14 makes it clear that the *Sacred Register* had much to say about Jupiter’s birth and his actions as an adult; this passage shows that Euhemerus also wrote in some detail about his secret upbringing.

Columella is the only author to characterize Euhemerus as a poet, and Euhemerus appears here alongside Vergil. The *Sacred Register* certainly had a poetic feel when compared to the practical concerns that dominate Columella’s *De Re Rustica*. The Nicander mentioned here is one of two Hellenistic authors who have proven difficult to disentangle.

63 F 27 Bibliography

On this passage, J.-C. Dumont, (ed.), *Columelle De l'Agriculture Livre IX* (Paris 2001), 27-8. On Nicander, see A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton 1995), 194-207.

<p>63 F 28 - PLIN. NH. VII 197</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="28" sourcework(level1="Plinius (Secundus)" level2="" level3="Historia naturalis" level4="" level5="" level6="7, 197")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Natural History Historical Work: <i>Natural History</i> Source Date: 1st century AD Historian’s Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>auri metalla et flaturam Cadmus Phoenix ad Pangaem montem; ut alii Thoas aut Aeacus in Panchaia... s. F 3 c. 46, 4.</p>	<p>Cadmus the Phoenician (invented) the mining and smelting of gold on the Pangaion mountain, or, as others say, Thoas or Aeacus in Panchaia. (See F3 5.46.4.)</p>

63 F 28 Commentary

This passage occurs in a lengthy list of inventions and the individuals responsible for them (7.191-215). F3 5.46.4 shows that Euhemerus wrote about mines and mining on Panchaia, and he evidently identified the individual responsible for the relevant innovations. Here again we encounter Euhemerus’ interest in culture-heroes (see the commentary on F3).

63 F 28 Bibliography

On Pliny, see M. Beagon, *Roman Nature: The Thought of Pliny the Elder* (Oxford 1992). On this passage, see R. Schilling, (ed.), *Pline l'Ancien Histoire Naturelle Livre VII* (Paris 1977), 241.

<p>63 F 29 - PLIN. NH. X 4</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="29" sourcework(level1="Plinius (Secundus)" level2="" level3="Historia naturalis" level4="" level5="" level6="10, 4")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Natural History Historical Work: <i>Natural History</i> Source Date: 1st century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>primus atque diligentissime togatorum de eo (sc. de phoenice) prodidit Manilius senator...neminem exstitisse qui viderit vescentem; sacrum in Arabia Soli esse; vivere annis DXL; senescentem cassiae turisque surculis construere nidum, replere odoribus et superemori. ex ossibus deinde et medullis eius nasci primo ceu vermiculum, inde fieri pullum, principioque iusta funera priori reddere et totum deferre nidum prope Panchaiam in Solis urbem et in ara ibi deponere.</p>	<p>The senator Manilius first and most carefully of the Romans reported on it (the phoenix)...(He said that) nobody has ever existed that has seen one feeding; that in Arabia it is sacred to the sun; that it lives 540 years; that when it is growing old it constructs a nest with twigs of wild cinnamon and frankincense, fills it with scents, and lies on it until it dies; that subsequently from its bones and marrow is born first a sort of maggot, which becomes a chicken, and that this first pays due funeral rites to the former bird and carries the whole nest down to the City of the Sun near Panchaia, and deposits it on an altar there.</p>

63 F 29 Commentary

This passage is part of Pliny's discussion of the phoenix, which is in turn part of a much larger discussion of birds (10.1-168). Euhemerus is not referenced by name, but, given the mention of Panchaia, it is a reasonable supposition that Euhemerus' *Sacred Register* was the source of much of Manilius' information about the phoenix.

63 F 29 Bibliography

On Pliny, see M. Beagon, *Roman Nature: The Thought of Pliny the Elder* (Oxford 1992). On this passage, see E. de Saint Denis, (ed.), *Pline l'Ancien Histoire Naturelle Livre X* (Paris 1961), 106-7. On the phoenix, see R. van den Broek, *The Myth of the Phoenix, According to Classical and Early Christian Traditions* (Leiden 1972). On Manilius, see W. Suerbaum, *Die archaische Literatur: Von den Anfängen bis Sullas Tod: Die vorliterarische Periode und die Zeit von 240 bis 78 v. Chr* (Munich 2002), 323-5.

<p>63 F 30 - SERV. VERG. ge. II 139</p>	<p>meta[[id="63" type="F" n="30" sourcework(level1="Servius" level2="ad Vergilium [Vide: Anecdota Helvetica, Junius Philargyrius, Probus, schol. & Servius Danielis ad Vergilium]" level3="Georgica" level4="" level5="" level6="2, 139")]]</p>
<p>Subject: Genre: Geography Historical Work: <i>Commentary on Vergil's Georgics</i> Source Date: 4th century AD Historian's Date: 4th-3rd century BC Historical Period: ?</p>	<p>Translation</p>
<p>Panchaia regio Arabiae, ubi et templum Triphylia Jovis.</p>	<p>Panchaia in the kingdom of Arabia, where there is also a temple of Jupiter Triphylia.</p>

63 F 30 Commentary

Servius was a grammarian who was active in the fourth century AD and who was the author of a famous commentary on the work of Vergil. This passage is his gloss on Vergil's use of the word Panchaia at *Georgics* 2.139. In that part of the poem Vergil has just finished discussing the effects of climate and location and has begun an encomium of Italy. As part of a list of other celebrated places in the world, Vergil mentions 'Panchaia, rich with incense-bearing sands'. The connection that Servius makes to the Temple of Zeus Triphylia (see T3, F2 6.1.6, F3 5.42.6) shows that he understood this as an allusion to Euhemerus' Panchaia. Cf. *Georgics* 4.378.

63 F 30 Bibliography

On the relevant passage from the *Georgics*, see M. Erren, (ed.), *P. Vergilius Maro Georgica* (Heidelberg 1985), 2: 361. On the life and work of Servius, see C. M. McDonough, R. E. Prior, et al., (eds.), *Servius' Commentary on Book Four of Virgil's Aeneid: An Annotated Translation* (Wauconda, IL 2004), xi-xix.

063 Commentary

This is an example of a Normal paragraph with text. Italics can be added.

063 Biographical Essay

Euhemerus was probably from Messene in Sicily (T2a); it is likely that he spent at least some time in Alexandria (T4a). Callimachus alludes to Euhemerus as a living writer in *Iambus* 1, which was composed sometime between 280-260 BC (*ibid.*). Diodorus reports that Euhemerus undertook voyages on behalf of Cassander (ruled 316-297 BC), a claim that Diodorus seems to have found in Euhemerus' work (T1); the veracity of this claim is open to question. No other biographical information is available, and precise dates for Euhemerus' life are, as a result, impossible to establish, though it seems beyond doubt that he was active in the early years of the third century BC.

Euhemerus authored only one known work, which bore the title Ἱερὰ Ἀναγραφή (*Sacred Register*) (F1; F2 6.1.3, 6.1.11) and *Euhemerus sive Sacra Historia* (*Euhemerus or Sacred History*) in the Latin translation of Ennius (F12). The Greek title can mean either 'sacred inscription' or 'sacred historical record', and probably was intended to allude to both the inscription at the Temple of Triphylian Zeus (T1, T3, T4e, F2 6.1.7) and the work as a whole. Athenaeus cites the third book of the *Sacred Register* (F1); nothing else is definitively known about the size or internal arrangement of the work (though see G. Némethy, *Euhemeri Reliquiae* (Budapest 1889), 30-6 for a speculative reconstruction of its structure).

The explanation of the origin of the gods offered in the *Sacred Register*—that they were humans accorded divine honors in return for euergetism—gained Euhemerus a (possibly undeserved) reputation as an atheist (T4a-f, commentary on F2). The pseudo-historical framework in which he presented his ideas also gained Euhemerus a reputation as a historian (T4f, F2 6.1.3), though the veracity of the *Sacred Register* was a debated subject in the ancient world (T5a-c and commentary on F3).

063 Bibliography

All the known fragments of Euhemerus' work—including fragments not printed by Jacoby and hence not considered here—are collected in M. Winiarczyk, (ed.), *Euhemerus Messenius Reliquiae* (Stuttgart 1991). The elaborate apparatus supplied in Winiarczyk's edition is an invaluable tool for the serious study of Euhemerus' work.

Jacoby included testimonia about and fragments of Euhemerus' work in *FGrH* but did not supply any commentary. He did, however, write about Euhemerus at some length elsewhere (*RE* 6, 952-72). There are three commentaries on the *Sacred Register*, though none are exhaustive:

- G. Némethy, *Euhemeri Reliquiae* (Budapest 1889).
- K. Peterson, *Living on the Edge: The Travel Narratives of Euhemerus, Iamboulos, and Lucian* (Ph.D. Diss. Duke University 2001), 28-53.
- G. Vallauri, (ed.), *Euemero di Messene: Testimonianze e frammenti con introduzione e commento* (Torino 1956).

Winiarczyk published a definitive study of Euhemerus' life and work, *Euhemerus von Messene: Leben, Werk und Nachwirkung* (Munich 2002), which should be consulted for pertinent bibliography up through c. 2000. Scholarship on the *Sacred Register* continues to appear with some regularity. Some of the more important recent pieces are:

- F. de Angelis and B. Garstad, 'Euhemerus in Context', *CA* 25 (2006), 211-42.
- J. Dochhorn, 'Ein "Inchriftenfund" aus Panchaia: Zur Iera Anagraphe des Euhemerus von Messene', in J. U. Kalms (ed.), *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Aarhus 1999* (Münster 2000), 265-97.
- J. Dochhorn, 'Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Religion bei Euhemerus: Mit einem Ausblick auf Philo von Byblos', *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 53 (2001), 289-301.
- B. Garstad, 'Belus in the Sacred History of Euhemerus', *CP* 99 (2004), 246-57.
- S. Honigman, 'Euhemerus of Messene and Plato's Atlantis', *Historia* 58 (2009), 1-35.
- S. Montanari, 'Utopie et religion chez Evhémère', *Kentron* 24 (2008), 79-104.