Links between Antonius Diogenes and Petronius

EWEN BOWIE
University of Oxford

In this paper I make a proposal of whose speculative nature I am well aware. I have long been struck by some features shared between the τὰ ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἄπιστα of Antonius Diogenes and the *Satyrica* of Petronius, and want belatedly to see how far a hypothesis of some knowledge of one author by the other can be taken, and in what direction such a hypothesis would carry us.

Shared features

What are these shared features?

   First, the size and articulation of the work: we do not know for certain the size and articulation of the *Satyrica*, but many suppose that the narrative from whose books 14, 15 and 16 our fragments come was a work in 24 books. Photius is explicit that τὰ ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἄπιστα, *Incredible things beyond Thule*, of Antonius Diogenes was a 24-book work;[1] and although he is unhelpful on how the narrative of the first 23 books was divided, he does say explicitly what fell in Book 24. That contained the narrative of a character perhaps not previously named, Azulis, the release of Dercyllis and Mantineas from their spell, and their return to Tyre where they resuscitated their bewitched parents, the paradoxical further travels of Deinias, his miraculous falling asleep on or near the moon, and his waking up in the temple of Heracles at Tyre.[2] Finally there was a coda of *Beglaubigungs-apparat*. None of our other ancient prose narrative texts is known to have had 24 books, and several are known not to – the Greek famous five (ranging between 4 and 10 books), Apuleius (with 11 or, on van Mal Maeder's sugges-

---

tion, 12), Iamblichus (16 according to Photius, 39 according to manuscripts of the Suda).

Second, both texts have an element of comedy. The comic aspects of the *Satyrica* are too well-known to need discussion. In the τὰ ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἄπιστα of Antonius Diogenes there is much weird and wonderful teratology, and the tone of its presentation is not easy to evaluate on the basis of Photius' summary: for example, what was the register of the scene in which the wizard Paapis cast a spell on Dercyllis and Mantineas by spitting openly in their faces?

> And he inflicted upon them by his magic art the following condition, that they were dead during the day, but that they revived at the arrival of night. And he implanted this condition by spitting in full view of all onto the faces of the two of them.[3]

The consequences are dire, but the actual casting of the spell could have a *Monty Python* or *Blackadder* flavour, or could be wannabe-serious Grand Guignol in a *Dracula* or *Raiders of the Lost Ark* mode.[4]

I don't think we can decide on the basis of the texts we have, but any decision must take into account Antonius Diogenes' claim (111a35) 'that he is a poet of old comedy', ὅτι ποιητής ἐστι κωμῳδίας παλαιᾶς.[5] Since Photius goes on immediately to report Antonius Diogenes as having written that 'even if he is fabricating things incredible and fictitious, nevertheless he has the testimonies of older writers for the majority of the stories he has told' (εἰ καὶ ἄπιστα καὶ ψευδῆ πλάττοι, ἀλλ' οὖν ἔχει περὶ τῶν πλείστων αὐτῷ μυθολογηθέντων ἀρχαιοτέρων μαρτυρίας, 111a35–7), I am inclined to take Old Comedy (κωμῳδίας παλαιᾶς) to mean fifth-century Comedy, technically κωμῳδία ἀρχαία, and so to see this as generic self-affiliation with plays which had uproarious humour and, like *Peace* and *Frogs*, both aerial journeys and potentially frightening καταβάσεις.[6]

---

[3] καὶ τὸ πάθος ἐκεῖνο τέχνῃ μαγικῇ ἐπέθηκε θνήσκειν μὲν ἡμέρας, ἀναβιώσκειν δὲ νυκτὸς ἐπιγινομένης. καὶ τὸ πάθος ἐνέθηκεν ἐμπτύσας αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸ ἐμφανὲς τοῖν προσωποῖν, 110b1–5.

[4] For the issue of humour in the 'ideal' novels see Anderson 1982. Another case hard to judge is that of the fabulous bean plant that after 90 days turns into a child's head or a woman's genitals in Antonius Diogenes fr. 1(b) Stephens and Winkler = John Lydus *de mensibus* 4,42.

[5] Misleading rendered as 'that he is the author of an ancient story' by Gerald Sandy in Reardon (ed.) 1989, 781.

[6] For further discussion of this issue see Bowie 2007.

.

Third, location. Again we are hampered by deficient material, in this case our ignorance about the territory traversed by Petronius' principal characters in the many missing books. The narrative that we have starts in the bay of Naples, involves a sea-voyage (99–115) that ends in shipwreck between Italy and Sicily (114.3) and in the drowning of the evil Lichas of Tarentum (115); it goes on to take Encolpius, Eumolpus and Giton to Croton (124–125). An earlier episode, Encolpius' seduction of Lichas' wife Tryphaena, seems to have been set in a portico of Heracles (106.2), perhaps at Lichas' *origo* Tarentum. There is no hint of any place further north than Capua (62.1) or further east than the Ionian sea, though the origin of Trimalchio himself (75.10) and of one of his guests, Ganymedes (44.4), is '*Asia*' which I take to be *provincia Asia*, whither Eumolpus also claims to have gone in the *cohors amicorum* of a *quaestor* (85.1). Knowledge of the other books could change our perception radically, but in what we have the axis of action is the bay of Naples, the gulf of Taranto and the cities of the Roman province Asia.

The extent of the travels of Antonius Diogenes' characters is vastly greater: the peregrinations of its main narrator, an Arcadian Deinias (109b3–4), include the Black Sea, the Caspian Sea and sources of the river Don (Tanais), (109a15), Thule itself and places even further north. Its main characters are the Arcadian Deinias and a brother and sister from Tyre, Mantinias and Dercyllis, but no action (at least involving any of them) seems to be set in Arcadia, and as in Achilles Tatius only small sections of the adventures of Mantinias and Dercyllis, and the denouement of all three characters' travels, are set in Phoenicia.

Dercyllis' route seems to have been as follows: Rhodes, Crete, Etruria, the bay of Naples, Spain, Gaul, Aquitania, again Spain, Sicilian Eryx and Leontini, Rhegion, Metapontum, Massagetic or Getic territory, and penultimately Thule: here Dercyllis narrates all these travels to Deinias, who has fallen in love with her (109a26), and here her brother Mantinias also has one or more amorous encounters (τοὺς ἔρωτας Μαντινίου, καὶ ὅσα διὰ τοῦτο συνέβη, 110b13–14). It is striking that a writer whose writing medium and presumably whose chief imagined audience is Greek should have given such prominence to travels in Gaul, Spain, Italy and Sicily. Within these it is also noteworthy how significant the action in the bay of Naples seems to have been: after Crete, Dercyllis and her brother Mantinias went to Etruscan territory, εἰς Τυρρηνούς (109a38): at the dramatic date of these adventures – ca. 490 BC to judge from the identification of Aenesidemus as tyrant of Leontini (110a6–7) – that could even mean territory south of Rome, though it is

more likely, perhaps, that Antonius Diogenes imagined Etruria. From there she came 'to the so-called Cimmerians', εἰς Κιμμερίους οὕτω καλουμένους (109a39): there she saw what was in Hades and learned much about goings-on in Hades from her long dead servant Myrto: καὶ ὡς τὰ ἐν Ἅιδου παρ' αὐτοῖς ἴδοι καὶ πολλὰ τῶν ἐκεῖσε μάθοι (109a39–40).[7] The next stop after these so-called Cimmerians turns out to be the tomb of the Siren: 'how after her return from Hades she arrived with Ceryllus and Astraeus at the tomb of the Siren' (ὅπως μετὰ τὴν ἐξ Ἅιδου αὐτῆς ἀναχώρησιν σὺν Κηρύλλῳ καὶ Ἀστραίῳ…ἐπὶ τὸν Σειρήνης ἀφίκοντο τάφον, 109b11–12). The tomb of the Siren fixes the location in the bay of Naples, so the entrance to Hades is most probably that at Avernus. The description of the local population as Κιμμέριοι is mysterious, but the name presumably alludes, perhaps *inter alia*, to the location of Odysseus' κατάβασις at *Odyssey* 11.13–15:[8]

> ἡ δ' ἐς πείραθ' ἵκανε βαθυρρόου Ὠκεανοῖο
> ἔνθα δὲ Κιμμερίων ἀνδρῶν δῆμός τε πόλις τε
> ἠέρι καὶ νεφέλῃ κεκαλυμμένοι.

Fourth, types of incident. The just-mentioned journey to the bay of Naples offers a transition to my next feature, types of incident.

(a) The infernal communication by the servant Myrto concerning Hades has an analogy in our surviving parts of the *Satyrica*, i.e. the prophecy delivered by Hades himself, at *lacus Avernus*, in Eumolpus' 120-lines poem of which it occupies one-sixth (lines 79–99). The location suggests that the *Aeneid* should be seen as one intertext for Eumolpus' account; in that case we should ask if, as well as the *Odyssey*, suggested by the location among the Κιμμέριοι, the *Aeneid* was also known to and drawn upon by Antonius Diogenes. The use of a prophecy delivered by a dead person recurs in our novelistic corpus only in Heliodorus 6.14.15, on any chronology much later than Antonius Diogenes and certainly very differently handled.[9]

---

[7] That the going-on in Hades should be of interest either to Dercyllis or to readers is perfectly understandable, cf. what we are offered by the poet of *Odyssey* 11. But it is worth asking whether ἐκεῖσε is a mistake (by the scribe or by Photius in his apparently hasty activity of summarising) for ὄπισθε 'thereafter': in this case (again with *Odyssey* 11 as a precedent) Dercyllis would be discovering something about her later travels.

[8] See Heubeck's long and useful note *ad loc*. in Heubeck-Russo-West 1988–1992.

[9] Somewhat different is the information about his own and an unidentified girl's place of burial imparted to Glaucetes by (it seems) a phantom (which disappears once the message has been conveyed) in the Oxyrhynchus fragment (*P.Oxy.* 1368 col. ii 1–15) of Lol-

(b) The death of the arch-villain is another feature common to the *Satyrica* and τὰ ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἄπιστα. In the *Satyrica* it is the death of Lichas by drowning (115); in τὰ ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἄπιστα we have first the murder of Astraios, which is presented by the narrator as just retribution for his early crimes (110a1–3) and which offers a foretaste of the ultimate death of the arch-villain, the priest Paapis (110b7–9). The death of a villain or arch-villain is not a common *topos* in the surviving Greek novels. At the end of *Leucippe and Clitophon* Achilles Tatius' nasty character Thersander simply fades away (8.19). In Xenophon a walk-on character, the brigand Anchialus, who tries to satisfy his lust for Anthia, is stabbed and killed by her during his attempt (4.5), but the initially darker figure of Hippothous becomes a goody. In Chariton the pirate Theron is eventually caught, tried and condemned to death by crucifixion (3.4, cf. 8.7), but he never has the major role apparently played by Lichas and Paapis, any more than have the two Phaedra-figures in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*, Demaenete (cf. 6.2) and Arsace, both of whom meet a death presented as richly deserved.

(c) The central linking feature of at least one of the story-lines in both works is the wrath of a powerful being: more than that, the name given by Antonius Diogenes to his persecuting Egyptian priest, Paapis, is remarkably similar to the name borne by the divinity whose wrath some act of Encolpius has excited, Priapus.

(d) One might wonder whether the spell laid by Paapis upon Dercyllis and Mantinias, that they sleep by day but wake up at night (110b1–2, quoted above) has some analogy with Encolpius' repeated situations of arousal which then reach their climax only in humiliating sexual 'death'.

(e) The text encapsulates a multitude of inserted stories told by characters both major and minor. Inserted stories are of course, in varying degrees, a feature of all the Greek prose fiction of the period, but the Satyrica and Antonius Diogenes are extreme cases, closer to Heliodorus and to Apuleius' version of the ass-story than to our other earlier writers Chariton, Xenophon or even Achilles Tatius.

---

lianus' *Phoenicica*, best read in Stephens and Winkler 1995, 326. Also different is the exotic Zatchlas in Apuleius *Met.* 2,28–9.

Fifth, two small details.

(a) The outlandishness of Gauls. Petronius *Satyrica* 102.14 presents Gauls as having painted faces. For Antonius Diogenes (109b23) they are 'cruel and feeble-minded' (ὠμοὶ καὶ ἠλίθιοι).[10]

(b) At the banquet of Trimalchio one guest is C. Pompeius Diogenes (38.10), now very rich (but he has not always been so). It is worth at least toying with the idea that this Diogenes is a version of the successful Diogenes from Aphrodisias: a version, no more, since clearly his *gentilicium*, Antonius, which as argued above points to early acquisition of the *civitas Romana*, has been replaced by another *gentilicium* also frequently found as a marker of an eastern family's early capture of Roman patronage, Pompeius. Petronius was in a position to observe the senatorial progress in Rome, generation after generation, of the descendants of Theophanes of Mytilene, proud bearers of the *gentilicium* Pompeius.

If the guess that the character C. Pompeius Diogenes is meant to bring Antonius Diogenes (*inter alios*) to the reader's mind, then of the hypotheses set out below (2) will be decidedly preferable to (1).

Where does this take us?

The features to which I have drawn attention certainly do not prove knowledge by one author of the other's work. But to me, as I said, they do raise the question. If the similarities are thought to be significant, what are the possible ways of explaining them? There seem to be three:

(1) Antonius Diogenes knows the *Satyrica*.
(2) The *Satyrica* knows Antonius Diogenes.
(3) The *Satyrica* and Antonius Diogenes draw on a common source.

(1) *Antonius Diogenes knows the Satyrica.*

Setting aside for the moment chronological issues, the hypothesis that Antonius Diogenes knows the *Satyrica* would entail two *prima facie* improbabilities: first, that a Greek writer knew and choose to be influenced by a work written in Latin; second, that a work that seems overall to aim at a middlebrow rather than a low register should draw on a work which aggressively presented itself as 'low'.

---

[10] Such a perception of Gauls is easier to imagine in a text of the mid-first century A.D. than one written significantly later.

.

The first of these apparent improbabilities is hard to assess. The *communis opinio*, which I have certainly tended to share and reinforce, has been that the works of high literature written by Greeks of the later 1ˢᵗ to early 3ʳᵈ centuries AD were written by authors who had little or no knowledge of Latin literature for readers who had even less. But there are clearly exceptions. Plutarch the philosopher, as he would have preferred to be classified, read much Varro for his *Roman Questions* and even more Cicero and Livy for his *Lives*; and he cites the poet Horace. My colleague Stephen Heyworth is sure that Chariton knew some Latin elegy; Tom Hubbard is about to publish an article that argues for Longus' knowledge of Vergil.[11] Argentarius' epigrams in the first century AD and Ammianus' satirical epigrams directed at Polemo of Laodicea around AD 140 have bilingual puns, and the *conversazioni* reworked in the *Attic Nights* of Aulus Gellius suggest an Athenian society that was in some respects bilingual. Knowledge of Latin must have varied greatly from place to place and person to person. Of the Greek cities of *provincia Asia* Ephesus must have heard most Latin spoken, above all in official communications or exchanges, but Aphrodisias, as is becoming clearer with the last few decades' excavation, maintained close contacts with Rome and could deploy a number of prominent citizens to whom Rome and Italy were familiar. Unlike Ephesus, Aphrodisias has not yet yielded Latin inscriptions from the first two centuries AD.[12] If, as Bowersock argued,[13] the combination of the *nomen* Antonius and the *cognomen* Diogenes point to an Aphrodisian origin for our writer, then a man whose family got citizenship at an early stage – already perhaps in the 30s BC as the *nomen* Antonius might suggest – could well have made visits, even prolonged visits, to Rome, and if there in the 60s and 70s AD might have been aware of Petronius' adaptation of a genre of prose fiction that was not simply a very recent development in the Greek world but might even have been developed precisely by a fellow-citizen of Antonius Diogenes, that is, by Chariton.

Chronology can no longer be evaded. The model just suggested would work best if τὰ ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἄπιστα of Antonius Diogenes were responding both to Chariton and to Petronius. Chariton will have given him some ideas for the erotic plots which seem not to have dominated τὰ ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἄπιστα (though Photius, *pace* Rohde, is hardly a reliable guide on this, and it certainly seems as if the love affair between Deinias and Dercyllis provided one overarching framework for the work's complex nexus of plots); Petro-

---

[11] Hubbard forthcoming; on the whole question see Rochette, 1997.
[12] Joyce Reynolds in a private communication.
[13] Bowersock 1994, 38.

nius will have given him some ideas for a massive and complex serio-comic
work. One might also wonder if Pliny's *Natural History* encouraged him in
the idea of prefacing each book with a list of authors whose testimony he
claimed for far-fetched phenomena. All this would cohere with an Antonius
Diogenes writing shortly after Agricola's circumnavigation of Britain ca.
AD 80 had brought Thule into the Roman public eye and, as Stramaglia
suggested following Bowersock (himself reviving an idea of Hallström), an
Antonius Diogenes dedicating his work to a Faustinus who is also the dedi-
catee of poems by Martial.[14]

(2) *The author of the Satyrica knows Antonius Diogenes.*

Prima facie this hypothesis might seem more probable than (1): any Latin
writer knows Greek texts, and Petronius' range of allusion to both Greek and
Latin texts is impressively wide-ranging. Encounters with both an example
of the ideal Greek romance such as Chariton – or perhaps *precisely* Chariton
– and the curious and arguably overblown cousin of the ideal Greek romance
that was written by Antonius Diogenes – might have contributed to suggest-
ing to Petronius his schema of a sexually intertwined trio, one of whose
members is a victim of the wrath of the god Priapus.

  This sequence has one slight argument in its favour over that which pos-
tulates that Antonius Diogenes knows the *Satyrica* (as well as the hypothesis
about C. Pompeius Diogenes suggested above). Petronius notoriously makes
recurrent and effective use of verse – as, of course, very differently, does
Chariton. There is, however, no hint at all in Photius or in our few scraps of
papyri that Antonius Diogenes did so.[15] Of course Photius may have been
too keen to sketch out the baffling plot to spare any attention for poetic pas-
sages, and our papyri may just happen to have missed them. It is true that in
one of our quoted fragments, fr. 2a, 16–17 Stephens and Winkler (= Por-
phyry, *Life of Pythagoras* 16–17), Pythagoras is said by Antonius Diogenes
to have composed epigrams for 'Apollo's tomb' at Delphi (an elegiac cou-
plet, not quoted by Porphyry) and a hexameter for a 'tomb of Zeus' on
Mount Ida in Crete.[16] But such citation of epigrams (with a pedigree going
back to Herodotus 7,228) is found in a number of novelists (Xenophon and
Heliodorus) and is quite different from the exploitation of verse by Petro-

[14] For arguments for this chronology see Bowie 2002.
[15] For the various categories of evidence see Stephens and Winkler 1995, 101–72.
[16] Quoted by Porphyry *Life of Pythagoras* 17 as ὧδε θανὼν κεῖται Ζεὺς ὃν Δία κικλήσκου-
σιν.

nius. On present evidence, at least, τὰ ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἄπιστα was not markedly prosimetric. Yet could a reader inspired by Petronius have abstained from recurrent play with poetic passages?

The main problem with the sequence τὰ ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἄπιστα – Petronius might be that it requires a very tight chronology. If we retain the identification of Petronius with the Neronian consul, as I believe we should, then Antonius Diogenes has to write and publish before, say, AD 60. That requires him to be detached from Martial's Faustinus; it requires his attention to Thule to be a response not to Agricola's circumnavigation of Britain but perhaps merely to geographical intelligence-gathering associated with Claudius' invasion in AD 43 and its aftermath; and Pliny's first book listing sources for the *Natural History* can no longer be invoked as a possible springboard for Antonius Diogenes' list prefaced to each book. But as our knowledge stands, nothing actually prevents us supposing a publication date of ca. AD 55 for τὰ ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἄπιστα: if published at this date it would follow Chariton's *Callirhoe* by a just a few years, and would point both to close links between literary circles in Rome and Aphrodisias, and to a greater interest being shown by Greek Aphrodisian novelists – and by their hanger-on Xenophon of Ephesus[17] – in the Latin-speaking West than is later shown by the mid- to late- second century Greek novelists Achilles Tatius, Iamblichus and Longus.[18]

(3) *The* Satyrica *and Antonius Diogenes draw on a common source.*

The recent work of Jensson has offered powerful arguments in favour of the view that the *Satyrica* is based on a lost Greek predecessor.[19] If these are accepted (as for example they are by Dowden in this volume) then the problems and opportunities raised by either (1) or (2) above may be thought to dissolve. The elements of similarity between the *Satyrica* and the work of Antonius Diogenes can be argued to be derived by both these texts from the postulated lost Greek original of the former, and if that is the case nothing can then be inferred about the one's direct knowledge of or chronological relation to the other. Two points, however, suggest to me that my explorations above have not been pointless. First, the hypothesis of a lost Greek

---

[17] It remains an unsolved puzzle why Xenophon brought his hero Habrocomes precisely to Nuceria, not far from the bay of Naples.

[18] In the Appendix I have tabulated the occurrence of place-names in the western Mediterranean in Petronius, Antonius Diogenes, *Metiochus and Parthenope*, Chariton and Xenophon and of eastern Mediterranean Greek place-names found in the first three of those.

[19] Jensson 2002 and 2004.

original for the *Satyrica* remains just that, a hypothesis. Persuasive as many of Jensson's points are, I am still inclined to suspend judgement; and it will be an unusual hypothesis in which sceptical scholars over the years do not manage to pick holes. Second, even if the hypothesis of a Greek original for the *Satyrica* is accepted, it need not explain all or even any of the elements common to Petronius and Antonius Diogenes: that it does so is a further, supplementary hypothesis.

How likely is it, then, that in an extended Milesian-tale narrative there were to be found any of the common features for which I have set out the case above? On the one hand some general features might derive from a Milesian creation – complexity of structure, abundance of narration by characters in the narrative, humour. On the other hand the pursuit of the hero and his companion by a powerful and vengeful force, the death of the arch-villain, and the location in the bay of Naples and south Italy have no parallel in any extant Greek 'low' narratives – e.g. the title of Lollianus' Φοινικικά suggests very strongly that the action is anchored in the eastern Mediterranean, though not necessarily all in Phoenicia (cf. Achilles Tatius).[20]

Proof, were it to emerge, that Petronius drew on a lost Greek original would therefore indeed add complexity to the calculation: but we would still be left to make a judgement whether either (1) or (2) above was a scenario supported by the phenomena, and whether in either case the issue of literary influence should be supposed to be further complicated by allowing that both Petronius and Antonius Diogenes might have drawn some (though hardly all) common features from the former's lost original.

Bibliography

Anderson, G. 1982. *Eros sophistes. Ancient novelists at play.* Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press.

Bowersock, G.W. 1994. *Fiction as history.* Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: California University Press.

Bowie, E.L. 2002. 'The chronology of the earlier Greek novels since B.E. Perry: revisions and precisions', *Ancient Narrative* 2, 47–63.

— 2007. 'The Ups and Downs of Aristophanic Travel' in Hall, E.M. and Wrigley A. (eds.) *Aristophanes in Performance*, Oxford: Legenda.

Hallström, A. 1910. 'De aetate Antonii Diogenis', *Eranos* 10, 200–1.

Heubeck, A., Russo, J., and West S.R. 1988–92. *A commentary on the* Odyssey. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---

[20] It must be admitted that the part of the world in which the *Iolaus*-story was set is wholly obscure

Hubbard, T.K. forthcoming. 'Vergil, Longus and the Pipe of Pan' in M. Fantuzzi and T. Papanghelis (eds.) *A companion to pastoral.* Leiden – Boston – Köln : Brill.

Jensson, G. 2002. 'The *Satyrica* of Petronius as Roman palimpsest', *Ancient Narrative* 2, 86–122.

— 2004. *The Recollections of Petronius: The Satyrica of Petronius as Milesian fiction. Ancient Narrative* Supplement 2. Groningen: Barkhuis.

Reardon, B.P. (ed.) 1989, *Collected Ancient Greek Novels in translation.* Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: California University Press.

Rochette, B. 1997. *Le latin dans le monde grec.* Brussels : Latomus.

Stephens, S.A. and Winkler, J.J. 1995. *Ancient Greek novels. The fragments.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Appendix

Places	Petronius	Antonius Diogenes	*Metiochus & Parthenope*	Chariton	Xenophon
Acragas				1,2,4 +	
Aphrodisias				1,1,1	
Apulia	77,3				
Aquitani		109b25			
Arcadia		109b4			
Athens	2,7. 5,9. 38,3	fr. 2a, 34? (Hymettus)		1,1,2, 1,11,5	
Baiae	53,10, 104,2				
Capua	62,1				
Caspian sea		109a15			
Celtoi		109b23			
Cimmerioi(?)		109a39			
Crete		109a38			5,10
Croton	116,2.124,2. 125,1	fr. 2a,54–5			
Cumae	48,8. 53,2				
Delos		fr. 2a,15			
Delphi		fr. 2a,16.41			
Ephesus	111,1 +	fr. 2a			1,1,1+
Eryx		110a5			
Getae		110a24 +			
Hyrcania	134,12	109a16			
Iberia	66,3.121,112	109b19			
Imbros		fr. 2a,10			
Ionia / *provincia Asia*	2,7. 44,4. 75,10. 85,1			1,11,8 +	

Places	Petronius	Antonius Diogenes	*Metiochus & Parthenope*	Chariton	Xenophon
Italy	114,3,116,2	110a4			5,6
Lemnos		fr. 2a,10			
Leontini		110a6			
Lesbos	133.3				5,15
Lycia				1,13,6	5,6. 10
Messene				1,7,4	
Metapontion		110a20			
Miletus		fr.2a, 11		1,7,5 +	
Naples	Sirenum domus *5,11* Parthenope 120,68 fr.xvi *crypta Nepoli-tana*	Σειρήνης τάφος 109b13	?*via* Parthenope cf. Σ Dionysius Periegetes 358		
Nuceria					5,8
Numantia	141,11				
Petelia	141,10				
Persia				1,13,1	
Pontos	123,241	109a15			
Puteoli	120,68				
RhipaeanMt		109a16			
Rhegion		110a20		1,2,2	
Rhodes		109a36			5,6 +
Samos		fr.2a, 10.15.16	(cols 1&2)		
Scyros		fr. 2a,10			
Scythian sea		109a18			
Sicily		110a4 +		1,1,3 +	5,6+
Sybaris				1,13,8. 2,1,9	
Syracuse				1,1,1+	5,1. 6
Tanais		109a17			
Tarentum	5,10 & *passim*				5,5
Tauromenion					5,6
Thracians	55,4	110a22.fr 2a,14			
Thourioi				1,7,4	
Thule		109a24			
Tyre	30,11	109a27 +			
Tyrrhenoi		109a38.fr.2a,10			

.