286 Aristeides of Miletos

Paola Ceccarelli (Durham)

BJN	Aristides Milesius	Aristides of Miletus
Historian Number:	286	

286 F 1 - (IV 320, 1) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 30B = Moralia 313A meta[[id="286" type="F" n="1"]]	
Subject: Religion: ritual; festival. Genre: aetiology. Military history: tactics. Everyday culture: women. Historical Work: Italika book 1 Source date: 2nd C AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: c. 390 BC	Translation
Ἀτεπόμαρος Γάλλων βασιλεὺς Ῥωμαίοις πολεμῶν ἔφη μὴ πρότερον ἀναχωρῆσαι, ἐὰν μὴ τὰς γυναῖκας εἰς συνουσίαν ἐκδῶσι. τῶν δὲ διὰ συμβουλὴν θεραπαινίδων πεμψάντων τὰς δούλας, κοπωθέντες οἱ βάρβαροι τῆι ἀλήκτωι συνουσίαι ὑπνώθησαν. ἡ δὲ Ῥητᾶνα – αὕτη γὰρ ἦν ἡ τοῦτο συμβουλεύσασα – ἀγρίας ἐπιλαβομένη συκῆς ἀναβαίνει εἰς τὸ τεῖχος καὶ μηνύει τοῖς ὑπάτοις· οἱ δ᾽ ἐπελθόντες ἐνίκησαν. ἀφ᾽ οὗ καὶ ἑορτὴ θεραπαινῶν καλεῖται, ὡς Ἀριστείδης Μιλήσιος ἐν πρώτηι Ἰταλικῶν.	Atepomaros, king of the Gauls, who was at war with the Romans, said that he would not retire, unless they should surrender their wives for intercourse. But the Romans, on the advice of their maid-servants, sent slave-women; and the barbarians, exhausted by unremitting intercourse, fell asleep. Rhetana however (for she had been the author of this advice), taking hold of a wild fig-tree climbs upon the wall and informs the consuls; and the Romans attacked and conquered. From this the Servants' Festival takes its name. So Aristeides the Milesian in the first book of his *Italian History.*

286 F 1 Commentary

This story, supposedly taking place at the time of a war between Gauls and Romans, is also preserved in the epitomized text of the *Parallela minora*:

Καὶ Ἀτεπόμαρος δὲ Γάλλων βασιλεὺς Ῥωμαίοις πολεμῶν τὸ αὐτὸ ᾔτησε. Καὶ θεραπαινίδες αὐτοῖς ἀντὶ τῶν ἐλευθέρων κοσμηθεῖσαι ἀπεστάλησαν· καὶ κοπωθέντες οἱ βάρβαροι τῇ συνουσίᾳ ὕπνῳ κατεσχέθησαν. ἡ δὲ Ἀριτάνα, αὕτη γὰρ ἦν ἡ ἀντὶ τῶν ἐλευθέρων θεραπαινίδας ἀποστεῖλαι συμβουλεύσασα, ἀγρίας ἐπιλαβομένη συκῆς ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ τεῖχος καὶ μηνύει τοῖς ὑπάτοις τὸ συμβάν· οἱ δὲ ἐπελθόντες ἐνίκησαν. ἀφ᾽οὗ καὶ ἑορτὴ θεραπαινῶν καλεῖται.

Atepomaros too, the king of the Gauls, asked the same when fighting the Romans. And they sent them maid-servants instead of free women, having adorned them; and the barbarians tired from the intercourse fell into deep sleep. But Aritana, for she was the one who had suggested to send maid-servants rather than free women, taking hold of a wild fig-tree climbed on the wall and informs the consuls of what had happened; and they attacking won. From this there is a festival called of the servants.

Besides small changes in the wording (in some details the epitome is actually fuller: thus, the servants are adorned, and the consuls are informed 'of what had happened'), the main differences are the name of the heroine of the story, Rhetana in *Parallela minora* but Aritana in the epitome, and the fact that the epitome, as usual, does not preserve the source-reference.

The story parallels a Greek one attributed to Dositheos (*BNJ* 54 F 7), concerning the Sardians, in the role of the offending besiegers, and the Smyrnaeans as the besieged and ultimately victorious; the maid-servants play a similar role, and a festival *Eleutheria* is instituted. As K. Dowden states in his commentary to *BNJ* 54 F 7, the Greek story 'has no historical veracity unless there is some in the setting'. While recognizing that the Greek story does not warrant much confidence, F. Graf, *Nordionische Kulte: Religionsgeschichtliche und Epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulten von Chios, Erythrai, Klazomenai und Phokaia* (Rome 1985), 310 has argued that the Roman parallel might be more reliable, because it is attested in other authors; the Roman story might thus have offered the model for the Greek one. The other accounts include Varro, *On Latin language* 6.18; Ovid, *Art of love* 2.257; Plutarch, *Life of Camillus* 33, 145D-146E; *Life of Romulus*, 29, 4-10, 36B-37A; Polyainos, *Stratagems* 8.30; Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1.11.35-40; the calendar of Polemius Silvius, *CIL* I² 1, p. 269, and Ausonius, *Eclogae* 23.9-10.

These parallel texts are usually read as *aitia* for the ritual of the *Nonae Capratinae* (or *Caprotinae*, from the name of the wild fig-tree, *caprificus*, or of Juno *Caprotina*). This was a festival (also called *ancillarum feriae*, 'festival of the servants') celebrated on July 7 (for a different dating see N. Robertson, 'The Nones of July and Roman Weather Magic', *Museum Helveticum* 44 (1987), 18-20, who argues that the *Nonae Caprotinae* took place on the same day as the *Poplifugia*, on July 5; but see *e.g.* D. Sabbatucci, *La religione di Roma antica* (Milano 1988), 228-31 for an argument in favour of the traditional dating to July 5 of the *Poplifugia*, and to July 7 of the *Nonae Caprotinae*). There is no explicit reference to the festival in the *Parallela minora*; but one may, with Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 372 wonder whether a reference to the *Nonae Caprotinae* might have been present in the (lost) original full version of the *Parallela minora*.

The interpretation, and even the exact name, of this ritual, which is often linked in our sources to the *Poplifugia*, is very much discussed. Earlier scholars (Latte, Wissowa) saw in it a fertility ritual; there is a survey of such interpretations in G. Dury-Moyaers, M. Renard, 'Travaux relatifs au culte de Juno', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* 2.17 (Berlin - New York 1981), 157-61. Along these lines Sabbatucci, *La religione di Roma antica*, 231-5, correlates *Poplifugia* and *Nonae Caprotinae*: the *Poplifugia* signals a male deficiency, which is repaired by female intervention; the festival thus marks the necessary integration of civilisation and nature in order to achieve fertility (see also the important discussion of F. Coarelli, *Il Campo Marzio. Dalle origini alla fine della Repubblica* (Roma 1997), 21-60). G. Dumézil, *Camillus. A study of Indo-European religion as Roman history* (Berkeley - Los Angeles 1980) appendix 4: *The Nonae Caprotinae,* 241-56 (English translation of 'Les Nones Caprotines', in *Fêtes Romaines d'été et d'automne* (Paris1975), 271-83), while accepting the fertility elements, considers this mainly a moon festival. J.N. Bremmer, 'Myth and Ritual in Ancient Rome: the *Nonae Capratinae*', in J.N. Bremmer and N. Horsfall, *Roman Myth and Mythography* (London 1987), 76-86, has proposed to read it as an inversion ritual. For T.P. Wiseman, *Roman Drama and Roman History* (Exeter 1998), 10 and 68, this is an erotic story, explaining an erotic festival (more on the meaning of the erotic story in T.P. Wiseman, *The Myths of Rome* (Exeter 2004), 169-74: 'sexy fun with a patriotic purpose', an erotic cult, ultimately aiming at maximising slave pregnancies). J. von Ungern-Sternberg, 'Eine katastrophe wird verarbeitet: Die Gallier in Rom', in C. Bruun (ed.), *The Roman Middle Republic* (Rome 2000), 219-221 (reprinted in J. von Ungern-Sternberg, *Römische Studien: Geschichtsbewusstsein - Zeitalter der Gracchen - Krise der Republik* (Munich and Leipzig 2006)*,* 128-30), stresses the repetition / duplication that is part of the overall setting of this story (foundation of the republic at the time of Romulus and rape of the Sabines, versus re-foundation with Camillus, and the request by the Latins of Roman women). Others have thought of rain magic (so Robertson, 'The Nones of July and Roman Weather Magic', 8-41). R. Pfeilschifter, 'Die Römer auf der Flucht. Republikanische Feste und Sinnstiftung durch aitiologischen Mythos', in H. Beck and H.-U. Wiemer (eds.), *Feiern und Erinnern: Geschichtsbilder im Spiegel antiker Feste*, (Berlin 2009), 110 offers a synopsis of the various interpretations.

Let us look at these narratives. Some are very short, not to say elliptic. Varro, *On the Latin language* 6.18 mentions the *Poplifugia*, then states that the *Nonae Caprotinae* derive their name from the fact that on that day the women in Latium sacrifice to Juno *Caprotina*, and do this under a wild fig-tree, using a branch of it; he closes mentioning a *togata praetexta* (*togata* might be understood, with Robertson, 'The Nones of July and Roman Weather Magic', 14 as the title, "The Woman in a toga", of the praetexta, a dramatic spectacle on a Roman topic) given on the *Ludi Apollinares* and explaining the story (*cur hoc, togata praetexta data†eis† Apollinaribus ludis docuit populum*). This part of Varro's text is problematic, and the bibliography on it ample: see at least Wiseman, *Roman Drama and Roman History*, 8-11; the extensive discussion, with full bibliography, by G. Manuwald, *Fabulae praetextae: Spuren einer literarischen Gattung der Römer* (München 2001), 66-71, as well as R. Pfeilschifter, 'Die Römer auf der Flucht', 128-32; for the other interpretation, according to which a *toga praetexta* was presented to the servants at the games, see e.g. Coarelli, *Il Campo Marzio. Dalle origini alla fine della Repubblica*, 38-9 and 44-

5, and K. Olson, *Dress and the Roman woman: self-presentation and society* (London 2008), 44; the fact that Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1.11.40 explicitly states that the Senate in gratitude gave the maid-servants the right to wear the dress they had used on that occasion (*ornatum quo tunc erant usae gestare concessit*) gives pause. Similarly, the verses of Ovid ("Offer some of them [gifts] to the maid-servant, on this day when the Gallic horde was punished, duped by the nuptial gown", *Porrige et ancillae, qua poenas luce pependit / Lusa maritali Gallica veste manus*, *Art of Love* 257-8) may allude to the story linked to the ritual of the *Nonae caprotinae* (see M. Janka, *Ovid. Ars Amatoria* 2 (Heidelberg 1997), 216); if this interpretation is correct, it speaks for the offer of a toga; this is however also the only other instance (besides [Plutarch]) in which the Gauls, rather than the Latins, are the enemy.

The other texts offer a more detailed narrative. Plutarch, *Life of Camillus*, 33 opens stating that there are two accounts of the war between Latins and Romans. Most writers follow the one which has Camillus in the role of the hero, and which is a piece of intelligent warfare, in which the Latins are surprised from two sides (Plutarch, *Life of Camillus,* 34). In the 'fabulous' version, which Plutarch chooses to narrate first (*Life of Camillus,* 33), the Latins demand from the Romans free-born virgins in marriage. The Romans do not want war, yet they fear that the request may hide the desire of keeping their daughters as hostages; a maid-servant, Tutula or Philotis, suggests that they send the most beautiful maid-servants, having dressed them elegantly as free women. In the night, the servants steal the enemy's swords; Tutula climbs on a wild fig-tree and sends a signal with a torch. The Romans attack, and defeat the enemy. Plutarch concludes stating that a festival in memory of these deeds is celebrated to his days.
This is very close to the versions given in Plutarch's *Life of Romulus* 29 (for a comparison of the two Plutarchan versions, see W. Bühler, 'Die doppelte Erzählung des Aitions der *Nonae Caprotinae* bei Plutarch', *Maia* 14 (1962), 271-82; note that both times Plutarch affirms that he prefers the version that relates the festival to the disappearance of Romulus), in Polyainos, and in Macrobius. In particular, in Plutarch, Polyainos and Macrobius the leader of the enemies is a Latin, Livius Postumius; the name of the protagonist is said to be Tutula or Philotis in Plutarch and Macrobius, while Polyainos and Silvius give only Philotis; and the reason for the request of young girls (or of young girls and widows or unmarried matrons) is in all these authors marriage (it has often been pointed out that there is an echo, sometimes explicit, of the story concerning the Sabine weddings). There are some further small differences even within this group: for instance, the maid-servants offer wine to the enemies (Macrobius) or disarm them (Plutarch). But in all versions a wild fig-tree is present, as are the maidens and the enemy. (The notion of an Etruscan origin of the enemies, sometimes mentioned as a further variant, is not taken into account here, as it depends on another passage of Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 3.2.14, which may not be pertinent, as it concerns the *Poplifugia* – the same applies to the passage of L. Calpurnius Piso linking the *Poplifugia* with a retreat after an attack of Etruscans, *Tusci*, followed by a victory, F 43 HRR= 45 Chassignet).

This survey shows that although most of the passages listed above do indeed narrate a story in which maid-servants play an important role during a siege, saving the Romans, there are nonetheless some differences between this group of stories and the narrative

of Aristeides/[Plutarch], differences that have been highlighted by Jacoby (*FGrH* IIIa, 373).

The version of Aristeides / [Plutarch] presents the following distinctive characteristics:

1) the events take place at the time of the siege of Rome by the Gauls, whose leader is given a real, *bone fide* Celtic name, Atepomaros ('He who has a great horse', attested as an epithet of Apollo / Belenus (*CIL* 3 1318) as well as of Mercury (*AE* 1969-70, 405), but also as a personal name, in particular for two potters, both active in the early first century BC, one in the area of Lezoux, the other at La Graufesenque: see D.E. Evans, *Gaulish Personal names* (Oxford 1967), 52-3, and B.R. Hartley, B. M. Dickinson, *Names on terra sigillata: an index of makers' stamps & signatures on Gallo-Roman terra sigillata (Samian ware)* 1 (London 2008), 281-7). [Plutarch] will hardly have invented such a name; it is worth noting that the name reappears in [Plutarch] *On rivers* 6. 4, a narrative concerning the river Arar attributed to Cleitophon (*BNJ* 293 F 3).

2) the name of the maid-servant that offers a solution is – uniquely – Rhetana (or Aritana in the Epitome). In the other versions her name is disputed, being either Philotis (Plutarch, *Life of Camillus* 33; Polyainos 8.38; Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1.38; the fifth-century AD calendar of Polemius Silvius, *CIL* I^2 1, p. 269), a name that is clearly related to φιλότης, although not necessarily in a sexual sense; or Tutula (Plutarch, *Life of Camillus* 33 and *Life of Romulus* 29); or also Tutela (Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1.38). As pointed out by Bremmer, 'Myth and Ritual in Ancient Rome', 84, who follows on this point N. Zorzetti, 'La sintassi della crescita', *Classense* 15 (1984) 40-58, Tutela is clearly a normalization of Tutula, a term that can be explained in connection with the *tutulus*, the conical hairstyle of the Roman matrons. This would fit the story, as the maid-servants will have put on the finery of the matrons, and will have imitated their hairstyle. Two other interpretations of the name Tutula are possible. The name can be linked to that of Tutilina / Tutulina, the goddess of the collected corn (so Th. Köves-Zulaf, *Reden und Schweigen* (Münich 1972), 80-86) or a goddess protecting boundaries (so C. Green, 'The Gods in the Circus', in S. Bell, H. Nagy, *New Perspectives on Etruria and Early Rome* (Madison 2009), 65-78, an interpretation that fits well the pattern of recurrence highlighted by Ungern-Sternberg, 'Eine katastrophe wird verarbeitet'). Or the name may allude to the penis (Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 373 refers to Buecheler for this meaning; see also the detailed study by W. Goldberger, 'Kraftausdrücke in Vulgärlatein', *Glotta* 18 (1929), 46-51; the discussion in Dumézil, *Camillus,* appendix 4: *The Nonae Caprotinae*, 248, with reference to Mutunus Tutunus; R.E.A. Palmer, *Roman Religion and Roman Empire* (Philadelphia 1974), 187-206; and Coarelli, *Il Campo Marzio. Dalle origini alla fine della Repubblica*, 29-30, who proposes that Tutula corresponds to the goddess presiding over the festival, Iuno, and that we should recognize in her a Iuno Sospita, a warrior goddess, a protrectress, presiding also over sacred practices of *porneia*).
While it is unlikely that the sexual interpretation explains the name Tutula, the double-entendre potentially alive in her name might have helped the re-shaping the story towards a sex orgy.

3) there is no torch signal, but Rhetana, with the help of a wild fig-tree, climbs on a wall to confer with the Romans (Robertson, 'The Nones of July and Roman Weather Magic', 16, in stressing the uniqueness of this version in which the fig-tree is located close to the city wall, says that [Plutarch] "uses his imagination to produce a burlesque variant, a maid-servant clambering over the wall").

4) Aristeides / [Plutarch] offer an eroticised version of the story, with the enemy being exhausted by the excessive intercourse with the maid-servants (something not mentioned in the other versions; interestingly, the wine here has disappeared). This is of course particularly appropriate to a tale narrated by an author, Aristeides of Miletos, whose name and origin are modelled on the Aristeides who was author of the salacious Milesian tales.

These differences make it reasonable to assume that Aristeides (or [Plutarch]) constructed his own version of the story on the basis of existing narratives, linked indeed to the ritual of the *Nonae caprotinae.* Still unexplained is the name of the maid *Rhetana*: it is not traditional to the story, but one would expect from an invented name some punning meaning.

286 F 2 - * (2) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 2B = Moralia 305 F-306 A meta[[id="286" type="F" n="2"]]	
Subject: military history: warfare, tactics Historical Work: *Histories* book 3 Source date: 2nd C AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: c. 500 BC	Translation
Πορσίνας Τούσκων βασιλεὺς πέραν ποταμοῦ Θύμβρεως στρατεύσας[1] ἐπολέμησε Ῥωμαίοις, καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ σιτίων φερομένην εὐθηνίαν Ῥωμαίοις μέσην λαβὼν λιμῷ τοὺς προειρημένους ἔτρυχε. τῆς δὲ συγκλήτου συγκεχυμένης, Μούκιος τῶν ἐπισήμων ἀνὴρ λαβὼν τετρακοσίους ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπάτων ὁμήλικας ἐν ἰδιωτικῷ σχήματι τὸν ποταμὸν διῆλθεν. ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν	Porsenna, king of the Etruscans, having advanced with his army as far as the other side of the river Tiber made war against the Romans; and intercepting the abundant corn supply of the Romans, he oppressed the above-mentioned with famine. As the senate was in confusion, Mucius, a man of the nobility, having taken from the consuls four hundred men of his own age in civilian

---

[1] Jacoby accepts in his text the proposal of Stegmann (and of Bases before him), to read στρατ<οπεδ>εύσας ('having put his camp') instead of στρατεύσας; De Lazzer (2000) and Boulogne (2002) maintain the transmitted text, on which all manuscripts agree. This is also the text printed here.

σωματοφύλακα τοῦ τυράννου τὰ ἐπιτήδεια διαδιδόντα τοῖς στρατηγοῖς[2], ὑπολαβὼν αὐτὸν τὸν Πορσίναν εἶναι ἀνεῖλεν. ἀχθεὶς δ' ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα τοῖς ἐμπύροις ἐπέθηκε τὴν δεξιὰν χεῖρα, καὶ στέξας τὰς ἀλγηδόνας εὐψύχως ἐμειδίασεν εἰπών 'βάρβαρε, λέλυμαι, κἂν μὴ θέλῃς· καὶ ἴσθι ἡμᾶς κατὰ σοῦ τετρακοσίους ὄντας ἐν τῶι στρατοπέδωι, οἵ σε ἀνελεῖν ζητοῦμεν'. ὁ δὲ φοβηθεὶς σπονδὰς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐποιήσατο, καθάπερ ἱστορεῖ Ἀριστείδης ὁ Μιλήσιος ἐν τρίτηι Ἱστοριῶν.	dress crossed the river. And seeing one of the tyrant's bodyguards distributing provisions to the officers he assumed him to be Porsenna and killed him. Brought to the king, he put his right hand over the sacrificial fire; and courageously dissembling his sufferings, he said with a smile, "Barbarian, I am free, even if you do not agree. Know moreover that there are against you four hundred of us in your camp, that seek to kill you." Porsenna, frightened, made a truce with the Romans, as Aristeides the Milesian relates in the third book of his *Histories.*

286 F 2 Commentary

The story is a famous one, attested by numerous sources: Plutarch, *Life of Publicola* 17.2 opens with: 'the story concerning Mucius is narrated by many, and variously' (ὑπὸ πολλῶν καὶ διαφόρως)'. As stressed by Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 373, the hint on differences here should not be excessively emphasized: Aristeides / [Plutarch] clearly reflects the vulgate tradition, possibly because he is here for once building a Greek parallel on the basis of a Roman one (the Greek parallel, *Parallela minora* 2A, attributed to Agatharchides of Samos, *BNJ* 284 F1, narrates how Themistokles' brother Agesilaos entered the camp of Xerxes, attempted to kill the Persian king but slew instead a guard, and then, brought to the presence of the king, put his hand on the fire without letting out a groan; note that, as in quite a few other cases, the Roman 'modern' parallel is earlier than the 'ancient', Greek one). F. Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 373-4 offers an ample and detailed commentary, on which much of what follows relies; see also A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 316-7.

The events play themselves out in the third year of the Roman Republic (504/3 BC, or 507 BC in the Varronian chronology). Mucius Scaevola (and Horatius Cocles) are of course hardly historical figures (see on the formation of the story R.M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1-5* (Oxford 1965), 262-4, with a good discussion of specific aspects of Livy's narrative); they belong to the category of folk-tales, in which salvation comes from a hero lacking an eye, a leg, or a hand. Among the many studies of G. Dumézil on the topic, it is enough to refer here to the discussion in *Mythe et epopée* III (Paris 1973), 267-81, and to G. Dumézil, '"Le Borgne" and "Le Manchot": the State of the Problem', in G.J. Larson, C. Scott Littleton and J. Puhvel (eds.), *Myth in Indo-European*

---

[2] This (στρατηγοῖς) is the text of all manuscripts. Jacoby considers that the text does not make sense, and prints στρατιώταις. Of course ultimately the provisions would have gone to the troops; but in a context in which everything is happening around the king/tyrant, distribution to the commanders is more appropriate than distribution to the troops; I thus maintain the transmitted text (with De Lazzer 2000, Boulogne 2002, and all editors excepted Jacoby).

antiquity (Berkeley - Los Angeles - London 1974), 17-28, with B. Lincoln, *Death, war, and sacrifice: studies in ideology and practice* (Chicago 1991), 244-58; see also M. Sehlmeyer, *Städtrömische Ehrenstatuen der republikanischen Zeit* (Stuttgart 1999), 91-2 and 96-7; G. Forsythe, *A critical history of early Rome: from prehistory to the first Punic war* (Berkeley - Los Angeles - London 2005), 149.

The most detailed accounts are those of Livy, 2.12.1-13.5, and Dionysios of Halicarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* 5.25.4-31 (comparison in D. Musti, 'Tendenze nella storiografia romana e greca su Roma arcaica: studî su Livio e Dionigi d'Alicarnasso', *QUCC* 10 (1970), 109-14); but the story was already present in Cassius Hemina (fr. 16 *HRR*= 19 Chassignet); it appears also (listed in rough chronological order) in Valerius Maximus 3.3.1, who gives as motivation for the self-inflicted mutilation the fact that Mucius' hand failed him (as do Seneca, *Dialogue*s 1 (*On Providence*) 3.4-5, Martial, *Epigrams* 1.21, where the allusive *decepta dextra* may be thus interpreted, and [Aurelius Victor], *On illustrious men* 12); Plutarch, *Life of Publicola* 17; Florus, *Epitome* 1.4.10.5-6; Polyainos, *Stratagems* 8.8; Cassius Dio 4, p. 439-40 Boissevain = Tzetzes, *Chiliades* 6.201-23; and Zonaras 7.12. (Full list of sources in F. Münzer, 'Mucius' n. 10, *RE* 16.1 (1933), 416-23).

As pointed out by Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 373-4, the four hundred youths in civilian dress accompanying Mucius result from a misunderstanding of the story narrated in Livy 2.12, Plutarch, *Life of Publicola* 6, and Dionysios of Halicarnassos 5.29.3. In these accounts, the youth refers to the existence of three hundred (not four hundred) other persons ready to kill the king; but of course they are not (yet) in the encampment. For Dionysios, this is actually a ruse of Mucius'; Plutarch's text would also lend itself to such an understanding; Florus, Cassius Dio and Polyainos speak explicitly of a trick: Mucius' action is typically the deed of one individual.

I am less convinced by Jacoby's suspicion, that the banalisation concerning the 'civilian dress', as opposed to Mucius' use of Etruscan dress and Etruscan language in most other accounts (for details see Münzer, 'Mucius', 418) is due not to the author of the original *Parallela minora*, but rather to the epitomator responsible for the version we have. Jacoby bases his argument on the fact that for another story, that of Codros, transmitted in both *Parallela minora,* 18A = *Moralia* 310A and Stobaios 3.7.67, Stobaios preserves a precise indication concerning dress, while *Parallela minora* has the generic 'in a simple costume'. However, *Parallela minora* and Stobaios diverge in that case not just concerning dress, but also concerning the source for the story, Socrates for *Parallela*, Sostratos for Stobaios (see *BNJ* 23 F 2), and this complicates the issue. At any rate, certainly the lack of precision as to the dress and language used by Mucius is one of the aspects that distinguishes the version of *Parallela* from most other accounts.

A further problem is presented by the σωματοφύλαξ: most other accounts speak of a secretary, *scriba* or γραμματεύς (so Livy, Dionysios of Halicarnassos, Cassius Dio, who even knows the name of the secretary, Κλουσῖνος in the language of the Tyrrhenians, and Zonaras), who is sitting close to the king (so Plutarch and Polyainos). Yet, as Jacoby once more points out, the presence in the Greek parallel version of a σωματοφύλαξ that gets killed instead of Xerxes, as well as the use of *satellite* in Martial 1.21 to indicate the

victim of Mucius' attack, render the presence of σωματοφύλαξ in Aristeides' text certain. But again, a bodyguard would not be in charge of distributing rations to soldiers or commanders. One may thus wonder, with Jacoby, whether this is the result of the abbreviation of a text, the original text of [Plutarch], which included variants.

The omission of the *aition* concerning Mucius' name also points in this direction: Scaevola, because he was left with only one hand, the left (so Livy, 2.13.1; Plutarch, *Life of Publicola* 17.5). Ogilvie, *A commentary on Livy*, 266, points out that although *cognomina* derived from physical peculiarities are frequent, this aetiology works only in Greek, and is thus probably false (but as Nicholas Horsfall points out to me, *scaevus* on Latin means 'left handed'); Ogilvie thus suggests to associate the name with the *scaevolae*, small phallic ornaments with magical properties. Be that as it may, the aetiology of the name is also omitted by Dionysios of Halicarnassos, in an otherwise detailed narrative; there is no *aition* in the Greek parallel either; and not all stories will have had one. The lack of aetiology is possibly one aspect of the typical simplicity (not to say barrenness) of [Plutarch]'s narratives (at any rate after the epitomization process). More important is the fact that the hero here is called simply Μούκιος; not only is the name Scaevola not even alluded to, the praenomen Γαίος is also absent, as are the eponym Κόρδος (which we find in Dionysios of Halicarnassos 5.25.4) or the variant Ὀψίγονος (mentioned in Athenodoros son of Sandon, according to Plutarch, *Life of Publicola* 17.8).

The title of the work from which [Plutarch] affirms he is citing is in all manuscript Ἱστοριῶν, *Histories*; again, one cannot but agree with Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 372 and 374, that the reference to a 'third' book implies that the *Italika* are meant here, and that Ἱστοριῶν is not a corruption of Ἰταλικῶν, but rather a variant title.

Porsenna is the negative hero of another of [Plutarch]'s parallel stories: at *Parallela minora* 8B (*Moralia* 307DE) the deeds of Horatius Cocles, including the loss of an eye, are compared with what happened to Philip II of Macedon during the siege of Methone and Olynthos. Typically for the author of the *Parallela minora*, the first lines of the Roman parallel story 8B (from Πορσίνας to ἔτρυχε) are identical to the beginning of the Roman parallel story 2B, even though the latter is attributed to Aristeides of Miletos, while the former supposedly derives from the second book of the *Italika* of Theotimos (*FGrH* 834 F 1 = *BNJ* 470 F 6).

286 F 3 - (3) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 3 B = Moralia 306 BC meta[[id="286" type="F" n="3"]]	
Subject: Military history: warfare. Historical Work: Italika book 3 Source date: 2nd century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: last quarter of 3rd C BC - first quarter of 2nd C BC	Translation
Ῥωμαῖοι πρὸς Σαμνίτας πόλεμον ἔχοντες	The Romans being at war with the

9

στρατηγὸν ἐχειροτόνησαν † μισούνιον ἀμβλιρηνόν[3]. οὗτος κατὰ τὰς καλουμένας Φορκούλας Καυδίνας – ἔστι δὲ τόπος στενώτατος – ἐνεδρευθεὶς τρεῖς ἀπέβαλε λεγεῶνας, καὶ αὐτὸς καιρίως τρωθεὶς ἔπεσε. βαθείας δὲ νυκτὸς ὀλίγον ἐπιζήσας περιείλετο τῶν ἀνηιρημένων πολεμίων τὰς ἀσπίδας, καὶ εἰς τὸ αἷμα τὴν χεῖρα βαπτίσας ἔστησε τρόπαιον ἐπιγράψας "Ῥωμαῖοι κατὰ Σαμνιτῶν Διὶ τροπαιούχωι". Μάξιμος δὲ ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Λαίμαργος στρατηγὸς πεμφθεὶς καὶ παραγενόμενος ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον, ἰδὼν τὸ τρόπαιον τὸν οἰωνὸν ἀσμένως ἐδέξατο· καὶ συμβαλὼν ἐνίκησε, καὶ αἰχμάλωτον λαβὼν τὸν βασιλέα εἰς Ῥώμην ἔπεμψεν, ὡς Ἀριστείδης ὁ Μιλήσιος ἐν τρίτηι Ἰταλικῶν.	Samnites elected as general Misunius Amblirenus (? Spurius Postumius? Postumius Albinus? Minucius Augurinus?). Ambushed at the so-called Caudine Forks (this is a very narrow pass) he lost three legions, and fell mortally wounded. But in the deep of night, reviving a little, he removed the shields from the enemies' bodies; and having dipped his hand in his blood, he set up a trophy and inscribed it: "The Romans from the Samnites to Zeus tropaiouchos." When Maximus, surnamed the Glutton, was dispatched as general and arrived to the place, seeing the trophy he gladly accepted the omen; and having attacked the enemy he conquered, and taking their king prisoner he sent him to Rome, as Aristeides the Milesian in the third book of his *Italian Histories.*

286 F 3 Commentary

This should be the defeat of the Caudine Forks, as the text explicitly states, which took place in 321 BC, in which case the first elected general should be Spurius Postumius (restored here by Guarinus, and accepted by numerous editors, from Amyot and Xylander to J. Boulogne, *Plutarque. Oeuvres morales IV* (Paris 2002), 245); the colleague in the consulship should then have been T. Veturius Calvinus (see C.J. Smith, 'The *Origo gentis romanae*: facts and fictions', *BICS* 48 (2005) 121). However, if the Caudine Forks marked a humiliating defeat, in Livy's narrative (9.1-11) no legions were lost – the Romans surrendered and the Samnites let them go. In this context, Quintus Fabius Ambustus was nominated dictator, although only to be immediately dismissed, while Quintus Fabius Maximus was nominated interrex (Livy 9.7.13 and 15 respectively); none of these Fabii seems to have borne the surname of 'Glutton'.

Livy's version of the events cannot be followed in all points, and much of it is certainly fiction, modelled so as to provide a precedent for the events of the campaign at Numantia in 137 BC: see N. Horsfall, 'The Caudine Forks: Topography and Illusion', *Papers of the British School at Rome* 50 (1982), 45-52; the detailed discussion and ample bibliography of S.P. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy, book IX* (Oxford 2005), 24-34, as well as his *Appendix 2*, 648-51, where he discusses the radical thesis advanced by M.H. Crawford,

---

[3] This is the text of the majority of the manuscripts, and it is printed by Jacoby, De Lazzer and Boulogne. Nachstädt prefers to correct the text, and prints the name of Μινούκιον Αὐγουρῖνον, adding: "consulto ex more scriptoris nostri confunduntur et res et nomina et memoria Livii" (9.2-12 et 44.3). Guarinus, Amyot, Xylander and Meziriac prefer ποστούμιον ἀλβινον. See further discussion in the text.

'*Foedus* and *sponsio*', *Papers of the British School at Rome* 41 (1973), 1-7, that the story of the surrender was unknown in 137 BC, and was invented in the aftermath of the defeat of Mancinus at Numantia. Thus, notwithstanding Livy's clear statement, a battle may have been fought at the Caudine Forks (cf. Cicero, *On duties* 3.109: 'male pugnatum', as well as Cicero, *Cato the elder, on Old age* 41), after which a number of Romans surrendered (Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy*, 26).

But whatever of the reliability of Livy's account, and whatever the historicity of the defeat of the Caudine Forks, the other accounts too all imply that the Romans were trapped, and that hostages were taken: this was certainly the case in the treatment by Quadrigarius, the earliest we can trace, whom Livy used; this is the case in Dionysios of Halicarnassos (*Roman antiquities* 16.1.1-2.4) and in Appian (*Samnite wars* fr. 4.1-21 Viereck-Roos). It thus seems to me that the narrative offered by Aristeides / [Plutarch] has still to be assessed against the versions of Livy and of the other sources: because the likelihood that Aristeides / Plutarch may have had access to a better source that has not survived, either by itself or as a trace in other narratives, is minimal; and because the narratives that reached us (Livy and the rest) will have formed part of the cultural background of [Plutarch] himself, and of his intended audience.

The text of *Parallela minora* is corrupt (see Jacoby's apparatus), and the names in particular have suffered: the majority of manuscripts give μισούνιον ἀμβλιρηνόν, or some variant. Two manuscripts, Vaticanus graecus 264 and Harleianus 5592 (= Sc, both presenting an epitomized text of *Parallela minora* (description in A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 123-6), have μινοῦσιον αμβρῖνον. 'minousion' might be explained as a corruption of Minucius, and might hide the name of Ti. Minucius Augurinus, consul in 305 BC; 'ambrinon' might be a corruption of the *cognomen* Albinus, which was used by the main branch of the *gens* Postumia: the colleague in consulship of Minucius Augurinus was a Postumius (however, L. Postumius Megellus, not Albinus).

If indeed one of the corrupted words hides the name of Minucius Augurinus, then there may be here a confusion between the wars against the Samnites of 321 BC (narrated in Livy 9.1-11) and those of 305 BC (Livy 9.44.5-15) (so Nachstädt). Indeed, in Livy's account of the events, Minucius and Postumius are both forced to retreat; Minucius fights first, with his own troops, and Postumius' troops intervene at a second moment, while Minucius is still fighting; according to Livy, the Romans reported a resounding victory - taking 21 standards, and, after a further encounter, taking prisoner also the commander of the Samnites, Statius Gellius. It is worth pointing out moreover that Livy 9.44.15 is aware of a variant account by unnamed authors, following which Minucius died of the wounds received, and Marcus Fulvius, elected *consul suffectus*, captured Bovianum (*Minucium consulem, cum volnere gravi relatum in castra, mortuum quidam auctores sunt, et M. Fulvium in locum eius consulem suffectum, et ab eo, cum ad exercitum Minuci missus esset, Bovianum captum*).

Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 374-5 further points out that Zonaras 7.26.12 (cf. Cassius Dio 8, p. 100 Boissevain) gives the name of the consul of 321BC as Τιβέριος Καλουῖνος (rather than Titus Veturius Calvinus): thus, there was indeed confusion concerning the *praenomen* of

at least one of the consuls of 321 BC. But there is a further possibility: while Livy 9.8.13 names as *tribuni plebis* for the year of the Caudine Forks the otherwise unknown L. Livius and Q. Maelius, Cicero, *On duties* 3.109, states that the *tribuni plebis* for that year were Maelius and Ti. Minucius. The disagreement between Livy and Cicero does not concern only the names of the tribunes: Cicero adds that the tribunes were delivered to the Samnites, because it was with their agreement that the peace had been concluded (in Livy, the tribunes simply speak against breaking the agreement made by the consuls). While this still does not explain the state of [Plutarch]'s text, it shows how ramified the traditions concerning the Caudine Forks were.

And yet the confusion in the *Parallela minora* goes beyond this, as it seems to embrace further, later clashes against the Samnites: for a Maximus nicknamed 'Glutton' (or 'throat', 'spendthrift') is known from other sources, but he belongs to the following generation. A Fabius Maximus Gurges, the son of Fabius Rullianus (who also fought against the Samnites) was *tribunus militum* in 297 BC; he built as *aedile* in 295 the Temple of Venus Obsequens *ad circum maximum* using money from fines for adultery (Livy 10.31.9, a story adumbrated also in [Plutarch] *Parallela minora* 37b, 315a-b, cf. Dositheos *BNJ* 54 F 6); he became consul in 292, proconsul in 291, and celebrated a triumph over the Samnites in 290; he was consul a second time in 276 BC, when he again defeated the Samnites and celebrated a triumph over them. A son of his, also surnamed Gurges, was consul in 265 (see on both K.-L. Elvers, 'Fabius' I 26 and 27, *BNP* 5 (2004), 293; F. Münzer, 'Fabius' 112, *RE* 6 (1909), 1798). These are the only Romans known to have born such a *cognomen* (cf. I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* (Helsinki 1965), 269)– if indeed we may assume that Λαίμαργος here translates *Gurges.*

A further element that may be hiding under this story, once we assume that there was indeed a confusion, is the – much later – defeat of Lucius Postumius Albinus, consul in 216 BC, who fell with his troops in an ambush arranged by the Boii: all his troops (two Roman legions besides a further levy, to a total, as Livy say, of c. 2000 men) were slaughtered; he was killed, decapitated, and his skull, covered in gold, was made into a drinking vessel (Livy 23.24.6-13; and Polybios 3.118.6, who gives his *praenomen* as Aulus). The context is of course very different, but the total loss of the troops similar; and a Maximus plays a role here too, Quintus Fabius Maximus the dictator.
It is worth noting that another Postumius Albinus, legate in 110 BC, who had been left in command of the troops by his brother Spurius Postumius Albinus, consul for the year, was lured into a trap by Jugurtha and forced to accept a surrender, which implied making a treaty with the king and passing under the yoke (Sallustius, *The war with Jugurtha* 38; Livy, *Periocha* 64; Florus 1.36.9; Orosius 5.15.6); although the story is very different, the coincidence of family name and yoke may have given fresh impetus to the reelaboration of the narrative concerning the earlier event.

In such a situation, it seems best to follow Jacoby and De Lazzer, and to leave the crux in place: as stressed by Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 374-5, the story is constructed so as to correspond to the Greek parallel (for which see *BNJ* 287 F 2), and this is its main point (so also A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2004), 130-31, who makes the general point that although the Greek and Roman story parallel each other

in details that are clearly fictitious, they are however attributed to two different authors – an indication that the two authors too are fictitious, and that both stories stem from one writer). Jacoby's further remark, 'so... dass man in den drei bis auf den letzten mann vernichteten legionen am liebsten die der Varusschlacht sehen und auch für den verwundeten konsul nicht auf Liv. 9, 44, 15 verweisen möchte' ("to the point that one feels very tempted to recognize in the three legions annihilated until the last man those of the battle of Varus, while for the wounded consul one would prefer not to look back at Livy 9.44.15") is extremely suggestive, in light of some other of the stories attributed to Aristeides in the *Parallela minora* (see below, F 4). It is at any rate worth bearing in mind that no Roman could ever have believed that three legions had been lost in the defeat of the Caudine Forks: the story, no matter how much 'massaged' (or possibly because of how much 'massaged' it had been), was too well known. Thus, even if the problems with the names of the consuls may be explained by damage incurred in the transmission of the text, the main issue remains the fact that we are presented with a version of the battle of the Caudine forks that clashes with all the Romans knew of it. (For a similar situation, see N. Horsfall, 'From history to legend: M. Manlius and the geese', *CJ* 74 (19981) 298-311 (reprinted with modifications in J. Bremmer, N. Horsfall, *Roman Myth and Mythography* (London 1987), 63-75). This may give us an insight into the working method, cultural background, intended public, and objectives of [Plutarch] (or of his source Aristeides).

Ζεὺς Τροπαιοῦχος is not attested in Rome: the divinity's epithet is clearly chosen so as to work with the Greek story (attributed to Chrysermos; on the construction of the dedication see the commentary to *BNJ* 287 F2). Yet, as pointed out by Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 375, he may correspond to Juppiter *Feretrius*, who had a temple on the Capitol, in which the *spolia opima* from enemies were dedicated by Romulus, by A. Cornelius Cossus in 428 BC, and by C. Claudius Marcellus in 221 BC. Such an equation has the support of Dionysios of Halicarnassos, *Roman Antiquities* 2.34.4: 'As for Jupiter Feretrius, to whom Romulus dedicated these arms, one will not err from the truth whether one wishes to call him Tropaiouchos, or Skylophoros, as some will have it'.

286 F 4 - (4) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 19 B = Moralia 310 C meta[[id="286" type="F" n="4"]]	
Subject: religion: festival, sacrifice. Everyday culture: sexuality Historical Work: Italika book 3 Source date: 2nd Century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: unknown	Translation
τῶν Διονυσίων ἐν τῆι Ῥώμηι ἀγομένων Ἀρνούτιος ἐκ γενετῆς ὑδροπότης ἐξουδένιζε τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμιν· ὁ δὲ μέθην ἐνέβαλε, καὶ ἐβιάσατο τὴν θυγατέρα	As the Dionysia were being celebrated at Rome, Arnutius, who had been from birth a water-drinker, made nothing of the power of the god. But the latter sent drunkenness

Μεδουλλίναν νυκτὶ λαθραίαι. ἡ δὲ ἐκ δακτυλίου γνοῦσα τὸ γεγονὸς[4] καὶ πρεσβύτερα τῆς ἡλικίας φρονήσασα, μεθύσασα τὸν πατέρα καὶ στεφανώσασα ἤγαγεν ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν τῆς Ἀστραπῆς, καὶ δακρύσασα ἀνεῖλε τὸν ἐπίβουλον τῆς παρθενίας, ὡς Ἀριστείδης ἐν τρίτηι Ἰταλικῶν.	upon him, and in the night, he violated his daughter Medullina. She however, understanding from the ring what had happened, planned deeds greater than her years; having made her father drunk and having crowned him with garlands, she led him to the altar of Lightning, and there crying she slew the man who had plotted against her virginity. So Aristeides in the third book of his *Italian History*.

286 F 4 Commentary

The story is otherwise unattested, and is clearly an adaptation of a Greek motif to the Roman world. In a Roman setting, the Dionysia might correspond to the Bacchanalia (on which see J.-M. Pailler, *Bacchanalia* (Rome 1988) as well as *Bacchus. Figures et pouvoir* (Paris 1995)); so at least the term is translated by F.C. Babbitt, in his Loeb translation of the *Moralia*, and by J. Boulogne, *Plutarque. Ouvres morales IV: Parallèles mineurs* (Paris 2002). Such an equation would appear to be confirmed by the role played by drinking wine in the story; moreover, human sacrifice is in Greece connected with Dionysos, as is possibly the case here, and certainly in the parallel Greek story (see list of gods associated with human sacrifice in S. Georgoudi, 'À propos du sacrifice humain en Grèce ancienne: remarques critiques', *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 1 (1999), 65-6).
But the *Liberalia*, celebrated in honour of Liber (Dionysos) on March 17 (the 15 of October was also marked as a festive day for Liber: a sacrifice was made to Liber, including an offering of must (grape-juice): Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 302), or alternatively, the *Vinalia*, celebrated for Juppiter, may turn out to be the more appropriate festival (see already J. Gagé, *Huit recherches sur les origines italiques et romaines* (Paris 1950), 191). What is central in all this is the wine, and it is worth quoting here a passage of Porphyry, *On abstinence* 2.54, on human sacrifice at Rhodes: 'For one of those men who, by the public decision, had been sentenced to death, was kept in prison till the Saturnalia commenced; but as soon as this festival began, they brought the man out of the gates of the city, opposite to the temple of Aristobulus, and giving him wine to drink, they cut his throat.' (see on this, and more general on human sacrifice, J.N. Bremmer, 'Myth and Ritual in Greek Human sacrifice: Lykaon, Polyxena, and the Case of the Rhodian Criminal', in J.N. Bremmer (ed.), *The strange world of human sacrifice* (Leuven 2007), 55-60, with further bibliography; P. Bonnechère, 'Le sacrifice humain grec entre norme et anormalité', in P. Brulé (ed.), *La norme en matière religieuse en Grèce ancienne* (Liège 2009), 189-212).

Whatever the festival, it is unclear how sacrifice on the altar to lightning comes into this. Liber pater had an altar on the Capitol (Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 299)

---

[4] This is the text of the Epitome Σ, accepted by Jacoby and Nachstädt; the main manuscript families of the *Parallela* (ΠΦ) have however γένος, printed by most of the other editors, including De Lazzer (2000) and Boulogne (2002).

– but this had no connection with the lightning. Gagé, *Huit recherches sur les origines italiques et romaines*, 191 see in the altar to Lightning the traces of a primitive rivalry between 'la religion d'ivresse dionysiaque et les cultes de l'éclair': this seems to me unlikely in the extreme. Boulogne, *Plutarque. Ouvres IV: Parallèles mineurs*, 258 suggests that the altar of Fulgora may be meant here: Fulgora is mentioned once by Seneca (as quoted by Augustine, *On the City of God* 6.10) with Diva Rumina and Populonia, among the *deae viduae* (the meaning of this epiclesis is disputed, but it may mean simply 'unmarried', in which case one understands Medullina's choice). Nothing is known of an altar of Fulgora in Rome, however, and Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 375 suggests that the altar of Juppiter Fulmen may be meant here (references to the latter in Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 121-2): in particular, Juppiter Fulgur was venerated in Rome on October 7, and there was on the Aventine an altar of Juppiter Elicius.

If we are to think of the altar of Jupiter, then the festival of the *Vinalia* (divided in *Vinalia rustica*, which took place on August 19, *Meditrinalia*, on October 11, and *Vinalia priora*, on April 23) may provide an appropriate context for the story. Varro, *On the Latin language* 6.16 states that the *Vinalia* were dedicated to Jupiter, and that it was an important festival, in which the Flamen Dialis marked the official beginning of the vintage, and sacrificed a lamb to Jupiter (he is here thinking of the *Vinalia rustica*). Consumption of wine was a conspicuous feature of the *Vinalia*, both in the late summer and in the spring (especially the latter). Not only that; a third celebration, which took place in October, fits within the pattern, the *Meditrinalia*, a celebration of the healing virtues of wine (according to Varro, *On the Latin Language* 6.21, the name was supposed to derive from *mederi*, to be healed: *die dictus a medendo*; further references for the *Vinalia* and *Meditrinalia* in Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 115-6). The existence of a Juppiter Liber, to be understood as a god of abundance, might have played a bridging role between the *Vinalia* (for Jupiter) and the *Dionysia* (for Dionysos) mentioned in our story.

All this is however speculative in the extreme. Once we abandon the attempt to find a plausible specific socio-cultural context, the plot itself is standard, similar to many of those recounted in the *Parallela minora*: the father is here crowned with garlands and then sacrificed on the altar, as a sacrificial victim. And yet, even within a standard plot, there are obvious problems: for instance, it is unclear how Medullina could make an inveterate water-drinker drunk.

Let us now turn to another fascinating issue, the names of the characters involved. 'Medullina' is an unobjectionable name, worn by a number of Roman ladies. In this specific story, however, its choice may appear ironical: Juvenal, *Satires* 6.322, in a description of excesses taking place during the festival of Bona Dea, names 'Medullina' a woman of insatiable sexual appetites (for the erotic connotations of the marrow in Greek and Latin literature see P. Rosenmeyer, 'Tracing Medulla as a Locus Eroticus', *Arethusa* 32 (1999), 19-47). The father's name is transmitted in two families of manuscripts as Ἀρνούτιος (maintained by Jacoby, De Lazzer and Boulogne), while the epitome Σ has Ἀρνούσιος. Xylander, Guarinus, and many recent editors (including Nachstädt) have proposed to restore the Roman name Ἀρούντιος. Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 375

points out that this does not help, since the Aruntii are attested only towards the end of the Republic, while the mention of the *Bacchanalia* points to a time preceding the *senatus consultum* of 186 BC. And yet, the name Ar(r)untius, when read besides that of Medullina, tells a fascinating story.

'Medullina' is a name that 'seems to have been present in the family of Camillus' (Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 375). There are indeed some eight Furii Medullini between 488 and 363 BC, their *cognomen* deriving from the placename Medullia: see K.-L. Elvers, 'Furius' (I n. 3, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26), *BNP* 5 (2004) 614-7; interestingly they do not appear later than 363 BC). This is the oldest branch of the *gens* Furia. And a Livia Medullina is known, the daughter of M. Furius Camillus, consul in 8 AD (see W. Eck, 'Furius' II n. 2, in *BNP* 5 (2004), 618-9); she had been promised to the young Claudius, but died on the day of the wedding, in 9 or 10 AD (Suetonius, *Life of Claudius* 26; see also *CIL* X6561 = *ILS* 199, from Velitrae, with M. Kajava, 'Livia Medullina and CIL X 6561', *Arctos* 20 (1986) 59-71).

This Medullina had a brother, M. Furius Camillus, who was adopted by Lucius Arruntius (consul AD 6), and took the name of L. Arruntius Camillus Scribonianus; he became consul in 32 AD, was governor of Dalmatia under Caligula and Claudius, and led a failed attempt at revolt against Claudius (see W. Eck, 'Arruntius' II n. 8, *BNP* 2 (2003) 30). As for Lucius Arruntius, he took his own life when accused (together with Gnaeus Domitius Ahenobarbus and Vibius Marsus) by the praetorian praefect Macro of having been an accomplice and the paramour of Albucilla (the wife of Satrius Secundus, a henchman of Sejanus and the accuser of Cremutius Cordus), herself accused of 'impietas in principem' (Tacitus, *Annals* 6.47-48; Cassius Dio 58, 27.2-4; W. Eck, 'Arruntius' II n. 3, *BNP* 2 (2003) 30); for a discussion of L. Arruntius' career, see R.S. Rogers, 'Lucius Arruntius', *Classical Philology* 26 (1931) 31-45.

It is impossible – and ultimately unimportant – to know whether the 'Arnoutios' of the majority of the manuscripts of *Parallela* is the reading intended by Aristeides / [Plutarch], or whether 'Arruntios' was originally meant (it may be worth noting here that the gentile name, probably deriving from the Etruscan name Arruns, and corresponding to Etruscan *arntni,* is found in inscriptions also as Arentius); the important point is that if – and it is a big if – the names of Medullina and Arnoutios/Aruntios echo those of two connected characters that had a part in the political life of the early principate, and if what we sketched above on the various strands that combine to create the religious background of the story is correct, then again we gain an insight into the world of [Plutarch].

286 F 5 - (5) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 22B = Moralia 311 AB meta[[id="286" type="F" n="5"]]	
Subject: Myth: mythical figure. Genre: aetiology Historical Work: Italika book 3 Source date: 2nd Century AD	Translation

Historian's date: unknown Historical period: n/a	
Οὐαλερία Τουσκλαναρία κατὰ μῆνιν Ἀφροδίτης ἐρασθεῖσα Οὐαλερίου[5] τοῦ πατρὸς τῆι τροφῶι ἀνεκοίνωσεν· ἡ δὲ τὸν δεσπότην δόλωι ὑπῆλθεν, εἰποῦσα ὡς αἰδεῖται[6] κατ᾽ ὄψιν μίσγεσθαι τῶν τε γειτόνων εἶναι παρθένον. καὶ οἰνωθεὶς[7] ὁ πατὴρ ἤιτει φῶς, ἡ δὲ τροφὸς φθάσασα διήγειρεν. † ἥτις ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀγροικίαις ἦν ἐγκύμων τυγχάνουσα, ποτὲ δὲ κατὰ κρημνῶν ἐνεχθείσης, τὸ βρέφος ἔζη· κατιοῦσα δ᾽ ἐγκύμων κατέστη†, καὶ εἰς τὸν ὡρισμένον χρόνον ἐγέννησεν Αἰγίπανα, κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων φωνὴν Σιλουᾶνον. ὁ δὲ Οὐαλέριος ἀθυμήσας κατὰ τῶν αὐτῶν <ἑαυτὸν> ἔρριψε κρημνῶν, ὡς Ἀριστείδης Μιλήσιος ἐν τρίτωι Ἰταλικῶν.	Valeria Tusculanaria, having through the wrath of Aphrodite fallen in love with her father Valerius, informed of this her nurse. The latter deceived her master by a trick, saying that she was too modest to consort with him openly, but that she was a maiden of the neighbourhood. And the father, drunk, kept calling for a light; but the nurse was quick enough to wake (her?) up. And she, finding herself pregnant, was in the countryside, and once she threw herself down from a cliff, but the child still lived. Returning home, she found her pregnancy inescapable, and in due time gave birth to Aigipan, called in the Roman tongue Silvanus. But Valerius, in a fit of despair, hurled himself down the same cliff. So Aristeides the Milesian in the third book of his *Italian History.*

286 F 5 Commentary

The text has suffered. In particular, the sequence in the central part does not make much sense: the drunkenness of the father comes as a surprise; the οἱ μιχθείς, 'having united himself to her', of some manuscripts appears more appropriate indeed, all the more since something similar appears in the parallel narrative, *Parallela minora* 22A; the

---

[5] Οὐαλερίου edd.; γαλερίου ΦαΑΠγ (i.e., the most ancient and reliable manuscripts: see De Lazzer's apparatus for further details); βαλερίου α[2] (a correction, possibly by the hand of Planudes); γαλλερίου the remaining manuscripts; and note the γεραιρίου of the epitome Σ. Interestingly, the name Οὐαλερία has not caused similar difficulties (but note the οὐ ἀλλερία of J, the Ambrosianus C 195 inf, of the 13th century, the earliest representative of the epitome Σ) while the Τουσκλαναρία of Π, accepted by all editors, but obviously problematic, is – if that is the term that stood in the original text – misunderstood in most codices, yielding τοῦ Σκλαναρία Φκλ; τους κλουναρία J; τους κλοβαρία S; τουσκλοβαρίας c.

[6] Van Herwerden suggested to insert <γυνὴ> or <παῖς τις αὐτῷ> after αἰδεῖται; but one could assume a construction *ad sensum*, the result of compression (as Boulogne 2002 does).

[7] This is the text of the majority of the manuscripts, and it is accepted by all editors, included Jacoby, De Lazzer and Boulogne; some however have οἱ μιχθείς, which in this context makes probably more sense. If οἰνωθείς is kept in the text, then something is missing after it: so Wyttenbach, Bernardakis, Schlereth, Jacoby. De Lazzer daggers the entire part of text from καὶ οἰνωθείς to ἐγκύμων κατέστη.

sentence with ἥτις should *prima facie* refer to the nurse, who is the subject of what precedes (an object for διήγειρεν is missing), but a pregnancy of the nurse does not make any sense; also problematic is the survival of the child: his birth is narrated only in the sentence that follows the jump from the cliff, so the first mention must refer to the foetus; even so the two sentences are not well-adjusted. Similarly at the end of the story, unless one assumes, as in the text printed above, that an <ἑαυτόν> is missing, it is unclear whom or what the father throws down from the cliff.

Various proposals have been advanced to restore sense to the story, all implying a different dislocation of the sentences. E. Kurtz, 'Zu Plutarch's *Moralia*', *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pedagogik* (1891), 442-3, suggested to consider κατιοῦσα δ' ἐγκύμων κατέστη an interpolation, and to move the sentence ποτὲ δὲ κατὰ κρημνῶν ἐνεχθείσης, τὸ βρέφος ἔζη after Σιλουᾶνον: Valeria threw herself down a cliff after giving birth, but the baby survived. In the following sentence, Kurtz proposed to restore a missing τὸ βρέφος: the father out of shame threw the baby down the cliff. This is unacceptable, as Silvanus must be alive at the end of the story (and comparison with the narrative of the epitome confirms this).
W. Nachstädt (*Plutarchi Moralia*, v. 2 (Leipzig 1935), *ad l.*) suggested that two *recensiones* had here been conflated, one reading ἐπὶ — ἔζη and the other one κατιοῦσα — κατέστη. Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 375 agrees on the fact that the removal of the words ἐπὶ... to ἔζη would restore the narrative logic; however, life in the countryside (ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀγροικίαις) is necessary for the aetiology of the name 'Silvanus'. Consequently, he suggests that two variants (not two recensions) may have been conflated here, one in which the baby was born prematurely, at the moment of the jump from the cliff, the other in which the baby was born at the right moment; alternatively, he proposes in his apparatus as the original text διήγειρεν (διέσωσεν?) <αὐτὴν· ἡ δὲ κατιοῦσα ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀγροῖς ἐγκύμων κατέστη, ποτὲ δὲ...('the nurse woke/saved her; and she going into the countryside underwent there her pregnancy, and once threw herself from a cliff, but the baby survived...').
A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 256 and 342-3, follows the practice of most editors in apposing two *cruces* to his text, and limits himself to reporting previous attempts at finding a solution. J. Boulogne, *Plutarque. Oeuvres morales IV. Parallèles mineurs* (Paris 2002), 260 seems not to notice any problems: he prints the trasmitted text without *cruces*, and offers a remarkably free (and notwithstanding the freedom, still nonsensical) translation: "la nourrice reveilla celle qui se trouvait être dès lors enceinte de ses moeurs sauvages [the countryside disappears, Valeria's customs, or her father's, are here said to be savage]. Comme elle s'était fait porter un jour dans un précipice, son enfant vécut [the jump from the cliff becomes a comfortable descent, as a result of which (? *sic*) the son lives]; y descendant enceinte elle s'y établit et, le moment venu, mit au monde Aegipan... [Valeria installs herself in the precipice and gives birth at the right moment]". The story is swiftly discussed by H. Volkmann, 'Valerius' 1, *RE* 7A2 (1948), 2296, and 'Valeria' 384, RE 8A1 (1955) 241; but the fact that Aristeides is for him an invented author leads him to dismiss it altogether.

The *Epitome* (Σ) presents some significant differences:

Ὡσαύτως καὶ Οὐαλλερία Τουσκλουναρία τοῦ ἰδίου πατρὸς ἠράσθη Γεραιρίου. Καὶ τὴν τροφὸν ἔσχε τοῦ ἔρωτος ὑπηρέτιν καὶ ἐγκύμων γέγονεν· εἶτα κατὰ κρημνῶν ἔρριψε ἑαυτήν. Καὶ ὁ πατὴρ τοῦτο γνοὺς καὶ ἀθυμήσας ἐποίησεν ὁμοίως.

Similarly also Valleria Tusclunaria fell in love with her own father Gerairios. And she used of the nurse as intermediary of her love, and became pregnant; then, she threw herself from a cliff. When the father learned this, he did the same thing, in a fit of despair.

It has often been pointed out that as the text of the *Parallela minora* advances, the process of epitomization becomes more careless (on the relationship between *Parallela minora* and the epitome Σ see De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli Minori*, 87-8, 120-131, as well as F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* S.3, 8 (1940), 97-8). But here we have a remarkable instance of normalization by elimination. The text as it is makes sense; but firstly, the birth of Silvanus / Aigipan, which must surely have been the point of the story, disappears entirely in the epitome's version; secondly, and connected to the first point, everyone dies (or rather: in the epitome, the survival of the daughter is not pointed out, so one is led to assume that she dies); thirdly, the name of the father is markedly different – while Valerius as father of Valeria is unproblematic, Gerairios is difficult to explain (a corruption of the Galerios – itsef a corruption of Valerios – found in some manuscripts?). Finally, the Ὡσαύτως that typically opens the epitome's narrative is here slightly misleading: the preceding Greek story also features a daughter, Myrrha, falling in love with her father, Cinyras; but, in the version of the *Parallela minora* and of the *Epitome*, Cinyras, when he finds out the truth, pursues Myrrha with a sword, intending to kill her; the daughter is however metamorphosed, through the intervention of Aphrodite, into the homonymous tree (a story attributed by the author of *Parallela minora* to Theodoros' *Metamorphoses*).

The differences between the text of the *Parallela* and that of the epitome may be explained, with Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 375 on the assumption that two versions (or variants) were reported side by side in the original, ampler version of the *Parallela minora*; the writers of the *Parallela minora* and of the Epitome Σ, who were both using an earlier epitome of the original extended version, would have combined these variants in different ways (see on the passages from the original version to the *Parallela minora* as we have them and to the epitome Σ Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch *Parallela Minora...*', 143, and the diagram printed by De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori,* 87); as we have seen, such an assumption also helps to make sense of the state of the text of the *Parallela minora* itself.

The story is unique. The names of the heroine and her father are those of an important gens (but not particularly connected to Tusculum); Tusculanaria (or Tusclanaria) is a monstrosity (a search on TLL and TLG found no parallels; origin from Tusculum is usually indicated with *Tusculanum*: see A. Bormann, *Altlateinische Chorographie und Städtgeschichte* (Halle 1852), 164. I. Kajanto, *The Latin cognomina* (Helskinki 1965), 183 lists 'Tusculanus/na' for three men, a slave and two women, from the area of Tusculum; 'Tusculus', for Manilius Tusculus; and 'Tusculina', *CIL* 2 5437). A number of stories in [Plutarch] concern the Valerii (within the stories attributed to Aristides, besides this

one, the one concerning Valerius Gestius or Vestinus, F 6, and the one concerning Valeria Luperca, F 10); whether they (and this story in particular) are part of the inventions created around that gens (see T.P. Wiseman, 'Valerius Antias and the Palimpsest of History', in *Roman Drama and Roman History* (Exeter 1998) 75-89, and T. Köves -Zulauf, *Reden und Schweigen. Römische Religion bei Plinius Maior* (Munich 1972) 211, with the necessary cautionary note that not all that concerns the Valerii need derive from Valerius Antias), or whether the palimpsest of Antias served to [Plutarch] or some other author as the model for further inventions, is impossible to say. J. Aronen, 'Il culto arcaico nel *Tarentum* a Roma e la *gens Valeria', Arctos* 23 (1989), 33 has argued that the story attests an archaic connection between Faunus and the Valerii. Aronen suggests that such a connection is apparent also in the story of Valeria Luperca (narrated in *Parallela minora*, and also attributed to Aristeides, see below F 10; Luperca means wolfish, and Faunus is sometimes presented as wolf, besides being involved in the *Lupercalia*), and in the aetiology of the cult of the *Tarentum* recorded by Valerius Maximus 2.4.5 and Zosimos 2.1-2 (cult instituted by Valesius, the progenitor of the *gens Valeria*, when, following the suggestion of a voice – Faunus?, his children were healed after drinking the warmed up water of the Tiber). The connection between the foundation of the *ludi* in the *Tarentum* (located in the Campus Martius) and the Valerii is probably ancient (see also H.S. Versnel, 'Die neue Inschrift von Satricum in historischer Sicht', *Gymnasium* 89 (1982), 217-28, and R. Turcan, *The gods of ancient Rome. Religion in everyday life from Archaic to Imperial times* (Edinburgh 2000), 45-46, who mentions together the stories of Valesius and Valeria Luperca); the connection between Faunus and the Valerii, and the antiquity of all of these stories, seems to me less certain.

Silvanus is mentioned in connection with birth in a passage of Augustinus of uncertain interpretation (*On the City of God* 6.9: three gods protect women after childbirth, to avoid Silvanus entering in the night and causing trouble to mother or child, *tamen mulieri fetae post partum tres deos custodes commemorat adhiberi, ne siluanus deus per noctem ingrediatur et uexet*, an information that Augustinus affirms derives from Varro); he is moreover often assimilated to Pan (P.F. Dorcey, *The Cult of Silvanus: A Study in Roman Folk Religion* (Leiden 1992), 36-8 for the god's connection with birth and aggressiveness towards women, and 40-42 for the association with Pan). However, while there were many differing traditions concerning the birth of Pan (see the learned scholion to Euripides, *Rhesus 36* = Apollodoros of Athens *FGrH* 244 F 135, the scholion to Vergil, *Georgics* 1.17 = scholion to Lucan 3.402 = *FGrH* 244 F 136a, Cornutus, *Compendium of Greek Theology* 27 p. 49, 5 L = *FGrH* 244 F 136b, and Porphyrios in Eusebios, *Preparation for the Gospel* 3.11 p. 115 A = *FGrH* 244 F 136c, as well as Hesychius s.v. Ἀγρεύς = *FGrH* 244 F 137 for some genealogies), the only story mentioning Silvanus' own birth (besides our passage) is modelled on the story of the birth of Pan recounted by Aelian, *History of animals* 6.42, and comes from Probus' commentary to Virgil, *Georgics*, 1.20: a shepherd named Crathis used to have sex with a nanny-goat; one day he fell asleep close to the river; the billy-goat who also used to cover the same nanny attacked him and threw him with a broken head into the river, which took its name from the shepherd; but the goat gave birth to a child with the lower body of a goat; because he was exposed in a forest (*silva*), people named him Silvanus. The story could have figured among those

collected by [Plutarch]; at any rate, here only the aetiology of the name is specific to Silvanus, the rest concerns Pan.

Hesychius' entry α 773 Ἀγρεύς· ὁ Πὰν παρὰ Ἀθηναίοις, ὡς Ἀπολλόδωρος, corroborated by the *Etymologicum Magnum* 54.27: ... ἀγρευτὴς γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐν Ἀθήναις τιμώμενος, is interesting in view of the stay in the countryside (ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀγροικίαις) in our passage. As Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 375 wistfully says, it would be nice to know what Mnaseas' 'even more astonishing' (according to the scholion to Euripides, *Rhesus* 36) story concerning Pan was, since Mnaseas' name appears also in the context of Aristeides F 6 (below): if we had more specific information, we might be able to trace something of the sources used by Aristeides / [Plutarch]. But after a thorough discussion of Mnaseas' text, P. Cappelletto, *I frammenti di Mnasea* (Milan 2003), F 22 and pp. 214-8, suggests that the scholiast, when he says that Μνάσεας δὲ ξενικώτερον ἀφηγεῖται τὰ περὶ Πᾶνα, may have been thinking not of the parents of Pan, but of his descendants: for Mnaseas uniquely attributed to Pan the paternity of a son named Boukolion (see Cappelletto, *I frammenti di Mnasea*, F 11 and pp. 175-7); in which case, whatever Mnaseas said is not relevant to the story of Aigipan's birth from Valeria Tusculanaria.

Aigipan himself appears only relatively late in our sources. Hyginus, *On astronomy* 2.13 states that according to Euhemeros, Pan had as wife a certain Aiga ('Goat'), with whom Zeus slept; the child who was born out of the union received the name of Aigipan. A rather different story is told later, in 2.28: Aigipan is found among the stars, as the Capricorn, because he was raised together with Zeus by a goat, and joined in the fight against the Titans (note however that in his *Fable* 155, Hyginus states that Aigipan was son of Zeus by the she-goat Boetis). Helping Zeus in the Titanomachy is the exploit most often mentioned: see the scholia to Aratos, 283, which affirm that Aigokeros is the same as Aigipan, and add that Pan transformed himself in Aigipan/Aigokeros by taking on half the nature of a fish, when pursued by the Titans; as a result, he is χέρσυδρος, may live on the earth and in the water. But the most extended narrative (even so, very short) comes from [Apollodoros], *Library* 1.6.3 (42); in the course of his fight with Zeus, Typhon cut away Zeus' tendons, thus rendering the god impotent, and hid them under a bear's skin in the Corycian cave, in Cilicia. Hermes and Aigipan however stole the tendons and gave them back to Zeus. Thus, the very little that is known of Aigipan does not present him as particularly close to Silvanus.

The birth of Aigipan / Silvanus replaces here the metamorphosis of the parallel Greek story, in which Myrrha becomes the homonymous tree. Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 375 expresses a negative opinion on this ('es ist aber recht unüberlegt'), because even if Pan and Silvanus are often assimilated (besides R. Peter, 'Silvanus', in W.H. Roscher, *Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* iv (Leipzig 1909-15), 824-77, and esp. 874-6, and G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer* (Munich 1912[2]) 213-6, see Dorcey, *The cult of Silvanus*, 33-48), Silvanus never has animal parts (Peter, 'Silvanus', 874), and thus does not even remotely qualify as the object of a metamorphosis. And indeed, the two parallel stories 22A and B, even though in a few instances they use exactly the same words (e.g. διὰ μῆνιν Ἀφροδίτης ἠράσθη 22A ~ κατὰ μῆνιν Ἀφροδίτης ἐρασθεῖσα 22B; τῇ τροφῷ τὴν ἀνάγκην τοῦ ἔρωτος ἐδήλωσεν· ἡ δὲ δόλῳ ὑπῆγε τὸν δεσπότην· ἔφη γὰρ γείτονα παρθένον ἐρᾶν αὐτοῦ καὶ αἰσχύνεσθαι ἐν φανερῷ προσιέναι 22A ~ τῆι τροφῶι

ἀνεκοίνωσεν· ἡ δὲ τὸν δεσπότην δόλωι ὑπῆλθεν, εἰποῦσα ὡς αἰδεῖται[8] κατ᾿ ὄψιν μίσγεσθαι τῶν τε γειτόνων εἶναι παρθένον 22B), are not really parallel: Myrrha is pursued by her father, who having asked for light, recognizes her and tries to kill her, while Valeria takes her destiny in her own hands; nothing is known of what happens to Cinyras, Myrrha's father, while Valeria's father – it would seem – dies; in one story we have a metamorphosis, in the other death. The lack of exact correspondence between the two stories may have been the reason of the narrative variants that are probably at the root of the confusion in our text. And yet, even if (or possibly, because) an explicit metamorphosis is absent from the second story, the choice of Silvanus may not have been such a bad one. To begin with, his name ('Silvanus', the god of the *silvae*, of the trees) recalls the metamorphosis of Myrrha into the homonymous tree, narrated in the Greek parallel: thus, this story becomes explicitly a variation on that one. Secondly, Silvanus is first named with a Greek name, even if this is a Roman story; the choice of the Greek name, Aigipan rather than simply Pan, carries openly within itself elements of the animal (goat) and the human/divine. Interestingly, all other composed names in -Pan, such as Ἑρμόπαν, Ἀντίπαν, Εὐήπαν, Τιτανόπαν, do not carry the animal element; yet their very existence and variety points to the somewhat transformative nature of Pan; and the one story told of Aigipan in reasonable detail concerns his metamorphosis. Of all references to Aigipan in Latin literature (only 13: search on the Latin database Brepolis) the only ones to present him as an individual are those in Hyginus: otherwise, the name is in the plural, and most often joined with the Satyrs (four times in Pliny, *Natural history* - where the Aegipanes are said to be *semiferos*).

286 F 6 - (6) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 24B = Moralia 311 DE meta[[id="286" type="F" n="6"]]	
Subject: law: impiety Historical Work: Italika book 3 Source date: 2nd Century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: 217-203 BC	Translation
Ἀννίβα Καμπανοὺς ληλατοῦντος Λούκιος[9] Θύμβρις[10] τὸν υἱὸν Ῥούστι\<κ\>ον[11] μετὰ	When Hannibal was plundering the Campanians, Lucius Thymbris placed his

[8] Van Herwerden suggested to insert \<γυνή\> or \<παῖς τις αὐτῷ\> after αἰδεῖται; but one could assume a construction *ad sensum*, the result of compression (as Boulogne 2002 does).

[9] Λούκιος codd., Nachstädt, De Lazzer (2000), Boulogne (2002); Λεύκιος Anon. Westermann, Hercher (1851 p. 19), Jacoby.

[10] Θύμβρις ΕΠδη, Xylander (1570), Reiske (1777), Kaltwasser (1787), Dübner (1841), Bernardakis (1889), Babbitt (1936), and Boulogne (2002). Θίμβρης d; Θίμβρις vz; θρύμβρις αΑΠν and many ancient editors; Θοῦβις J (the epitome, see in the text); Οὔμβριος Westermann's Anonymus *On impious persons* (see discussion in text); Hercher (1851 p. 19); Nachstädt; Jacoby; De Lazzer (2000).

χρημάτων ἐξέθετο πρὸς Οὐαλέριον Γέστιον[12] ὄντα γαμβρόν. ὁ δὲ νενίκηκεν. ἀκούσας δ' ὁ Καμπανὸς φιλαργυρίαι παρέβη τὰ δίκαια τῆς φύσεως τὸν παῖδα φονεύσας. ὁ δὲ Θύμβρις[13] διὰ τῆς ἀγροικίας πορευόμενος καὶ τῶι σώματι τοῦ παιδὸς ἐντυχὼν ἔπεμψεν ἐπὶ τὸν γαμβρὸν ὡς δείξων θησαυρούς· ἐλθόντα δ' ἐτύφλωσε καὶ ἐσταύρωσεν, ὡς Ἀριστείδης ἐν τρίτωι Ἰταλικῶν.	son Rusticus together with his property in the hands of Valerius Gestius, who was his son-in-law; but Hannibal was victorious. When the Campanian heard this, through love of money he transgressed the rights of nature and slew the child. But when Thymbris journeying through the countryside came upon the body of his son, he sent to his son-in-law, pretending that he would show him treasures; but when he came, he put out his eyes and crucified him, as Aristeides narrates in the third book of his *Italian History*.

286 F 6 Commentary

This forms a parallel to the story of the punishment inflicted by Hecuba on the Thracian king Polymestor. The king, out of greed, after the destruction of Troy, killed the young Polydoros who had been entrusted to him with a treasure. Hecuba blinded Polymestor. Lucius Thymbris goes one better - he blinds and crucifies Valerius Gestius. But while the Greek story was well-known, having been brought onto the tragic stage by Euripides (*Hecuba* 1035 ff.), as well as having been narrated by Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 13.429-575 (and a number of other authors), the Roman parallel is unique – or almost so.

The story is also transmitted in the *Epitome* (Σ):

καὶ Λούκιος Θούβις τὸν υἱὸν Ῥουστίκιον μετὰ χρημάτων παρέθετο πρὸς Οὐαλλέριον Γέστιον ὄντα γαμβρόν, Καμπανοὺς Ἀννίβα λεηλατοῦντος. ὁ δὲ φιλαργυρίας ἔρωτι τὸν παῖδα φονεύει. καὶ ὁ Λούκιος τῷ σώματι τοῦ παιδὸς ἐντυχὼν ἔπεμψεν ἐπὶ τὸν γαμβρὸν ὡς δείξων θησαυρούς· ἐλθόντα δὲ ἐτύφλωσε καὶ ἐσταύρωσεν.

Also Lucius Thoubis left his son Rusticius with a treasure with Valerius Gestius, who was his son-in-law, when Hannibal was ravaging the Campanians. But he, for love of money, kills the child. And Lucius, having accidentally found the body of the child, called the son-in-law as if to show him treasures; but when he arrived he blinded and crucified him.

---

[11] Ῥούστικον Westermann's Anonymus *On impious persons*, Hercher (1851 p. 19), Nachstädt, Jacoby, De Lazzer (2000), Boulogne (2002); ῥυότιον Φ; ῥούστιον Π and some editors; ῥουστίκιον Σ (the epitome, see in text).

[12] Γέστιον all manuscripts, all early editors, and Nachstädt; Οὐεστῖνον Westermann's Anonymus *On impious persons*, Hercher (1851 p. 19), Jacoby, De Lazzer (2000), and Boulogne (2002), who writes in his apparatus: Οὐέστινον ego: γέστιον codd.

[13] As above, n. 8; Nachstädt notes in his apparatus to this line some further variants: ἰμβρίκιος να, ἰαμβρίκιος zΠ².

The names, although corrupt, are the same; the epitome is simply slightly shorter and, as usual, omits the source-reference.

Finally, the story is also transmitted in an anonymous mythographic compilation, first published in 1789, and then again by A. Westermann, ΠΑΡΑΔΟΞΟΓΡΑΦΟΙ: *scriptores rerum mirabilium graeci* (1839), 222. These mythographic excerpts have now been reedited, with a thorough discussion of the manuscript tradition, by A. Cameron, *Greek mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2004), 337-9; I give here his text (based on collation of the main manuscript, the Laurentianus graecus 56.1) and translation:

Οὐαλέριος Οὐεστῖνος ἐτυφλώθη ὑπὸ Λευκίου Οὐμβρίου διὰ τὸν τοῦ υἱοῦ Ῥουστίκου θάνατον, ὃν παρακαταθήκην παρὰ Οὐμβρίου λαβὼν ἀνεῖλε διὰ τὰ μετ'αὐτοῦ χρήματα.

Valerius Vestinus was blinded by Lucius Umbrius because of the death of his son Rusticus, who had been left for safekeeping [with Vestinus], who had killed him because of the money left with him.

The story is the same, although it has been further shortened here (the historical context has entirely disappeared, and there is no mention of crucifixion). But the names – or rather, some of the names – are slightly different. In particular, the mythographic excerpts have Umbrius instead of Tiberis/Thymbris/Thoubis; and Vestinus instead of Gestius. Most editors, including Jacoby and De Lazzer, have restored in the text of the *Parallela minora* the names of the mythographic excerpts, which are attested, 'sensible' names (F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* S.3, 8 (1940), 92 uses this parallel as an example of how strongly names have been corrupted during their textual transmission).

Vestinus is a *cognomen* attested in the Republican period for C. Catius Vestinus, *tribunus militum* in 43 BC, and in the imperial period for three men and a woman of senatorial rank, besides 13 more men and 9 women; it derives either from the homonymous tribe located in the Sabine area or from Vesta (see I. Kajanto, *The Latin cognomina* (Helsinki 1965), 186 and 214). No Valerii Vestini are known; of the four Iulii known to have had the *cognomen* Vestinus, two occupied important positions in the early principate: L. Iulius Vestinus, a native of Vienna in Gallia Narbonensis, close friend of Claudius, *Praefectus Aegypti* in AD 60-62, and entrusted by Vespasian with the reconstruction of the Capitol in 70 AD; and M. Iulius Vestinus Atticus, son of the previous, closely linked to Nero and consul in AD 65, who was forced by Nero to commit suicide during his consulship (see on both W. Eck, 'Iulius' II 146 and 147, *BNP* 6 (2005),1078; and R. Hanslik, 'Vestinus' 1 and 3, *RE* 8A2 (Stuttgart 1958)1788-9; two more Vestini were active respectively as writer 'on flowers and herbs' and as grammarian (R. Hanslik, 'Vestinus' 2, and K. Ziegler, 'Vestinus' 4, *RE* 8A2 (Stuttgart 1958) 1789). As for Umbrius, the name is attested only in the late imperial period, and derives from that of the region Umbria (see Kajanto, *Latin cognomina* 188 for Umbrius, Umber, Umbrianus and Umbrinus). A striking aspect of the group of names of this story is actually the fact that they all share some kind of geographical connotation (Umbria and Sabinum, while part of the events take place in Campania).

But while Valerius Vestinus and Lucius Umbrius may have been the names that were present in the original, ampler version of the *Parallela*, all the more since the change is not so significant and can be explained palaeographically (see K. Dowden, Dositheos *BNJ* 54, bibliographical essay), restoring them against the agreement of all codices seems excessive; it certainly obfuscates issues at the level of the transmission of the text.

That the story is an invention, and not a particularly brilliant one, is evident. It does not function as well as the Greek parallel: for Troy had indeed been destroyed, when Polymestor killed Polydoros, while Hannibal may have appeared victorious for a moment, in the course of the second Punic war, but in the end Rome won; the ὁ δὲ νενίκηκεν, 'and he won', is clearly overstated. Even more disturbing is the fact that Lucius Thymbris/Umbrius, at a moment when Hannibal is ravaging Campania, entrusts his son and a treasure to a Campanian. A longer version might have smoothed over these details, but the text as we have it is not really satisfactory. It is however interesting for two interconnected reasons: the names are intriguing, because they are unusual; and the fact that the *Parallela minora* and the anonymous mythographic excerpts offer different names for the main characters gives an edge to the question of the transmission: where did the anonymous author read the story?

Names first. Most recent editors assume that the original text of the *Parallela minora* had Umbrius as the name of the father, and Vestinus as that of the son-in-law. This may be so; however, as the 'corrupted' names Thymbris and Gestius have thoroughly permeated all branches of the tradition of the *Parallela minora*, including the *epitome*, it is worth seeing whether they may make some sense. Θύβρις and Θύμβρις are used by Greek authors of the river Tiberis, and correspond to the Etruscan form of the name of the river Tiber, attested in Varro, *On Latin language* 5.30: Thebris (see also Latin Thubreis, *CIL* 6.4659; cf. Plutarch, *Life of Romulus* 1; Herodianos 1.99.19; Stephanos of Byzantion s.v. Θύμβρις, *Anthologia Palatina* 9.219, and others). Homer mentions a river in the Troad, called Θύμβριος, close to which was the city of Θύμβρα, founded by Dardanos; Apollo bore the appellative of Thymbraeus; Thymbris moreover appears as the name of one of the companions of Aeneas in Virgil, *Aeneid* 10.124, while another one is named Thymbraeus in *Aeneid* 12.458; a Rutulian is also called Thymber (Virgil, *Aeneid* 10.391, but in the vocative Thymbre at *Aeneid* 10.394). There was a discussion on the origins of the name of the Tiber, as shown by Servius Danielis, commentary to the *Aeneid*, 8.330; see also Pliny, *Natural History* 3.53: *Tiberis, antea Thybris appellatus et prius Albula*, with the excellent discussion of F.Cairns, 'The nomenclature of the Tiber in Virgil's *Aeneid*', in J.Booth, R.Maltby (ed.), *What's in a name? The significance of proper names in classical Latin literature* (Swansea 2006), 65-82. Cairns concludes that Virgil uses Thybris to exploit the archaic Trojan and Etruscan associations of the name (71); he sees in Virgil's usage of Thybris 'a manifestation of that key theme of the *Aeneid*, the continuity between the physical Troy and the physical Rome and between the destinies of Troy and Rome' (77; this is something that up to a point corresponds to the avowed purpose of [Plutarch]'s *Parallela minora*). This is thus, for the Romans, a Trojan, as well as a local, name; and [Plutarch] might have found it particularly appropriate to a character who was acting as the double of Hecuba.

The question of how the story entered the anonymous mythographic excerpts is also difficult to answer. The mythographic excerpts are transmitted through four manuscripts only (Cameron, *Greek mythography in the Roman world*, 335-7): the earliest is the Laurentianus graecus 56.1, which is the source of the three others. The Laurentianus graecus 56.1 contains the following texts: Menander rhetor; the paradoxographus Florentinus; the mythographic excerpts; the *Competition of Homer and Hesiod*; four orations of Theophylact of Bulgaria; the declamations of Polemo; excerpts from Gregory of Corinth; Pollux, *Onomasticon*; and Polyainos' *Stratagemata* (the other three manuscripts contain only Polyainos, followed by the paradoxographus Florentinus and the mythographic excerpts). The Laurentianus was put together at different moments and by different hands; the mythographic excerpts themselves are divided into sections.

Most of these sections are not much more than bare lists, but sometimes, in the case of less known characters or events, a story is narrated. Sections 1 to 4 concern 'Which houses were ruined by women?', 'Those who loved their siblings', 'Those who loved their friends', and 'Those who loved their mothers'. Section 5 discussed of 'Impious men' (one story only, that of Lityerses is recounted at length). The five names and stories that follow have traditionally been considered as part of the section 'On impious men'; but Cameron, *Greek mythography in the Roman world*, 241-2 and 338 puts them now (following a suggestion of Wilamowitz) under the heading 'those struck by a thunderbolt' – one of the missing chapters in Hyginus (254) had such a heading. The stories comprise the examples of Philanthropos the tyrant, who "burned the temple at Olympia because his prayers were not fulfilled as he wished; he was not only struck by a thunderbolt when driving to Elis, but the three hundred men with him as well"; of Alphaios the son of the river Sangarios, who taught Athena to play the flute, tried to rape her, and was struck by a thunderbolt; of Ardys the son of Hippocoon who tried to rape Hera as she was travelling to Argos, and was struck by a thunderbolt; of Phorbas the Thesprotian who tried to rape Demeter and was struck by a thunderbolt; and of Valerius Vestinus. A unifying characteristic of this section is that while the other stories are mostly well-known (or reasonably known) ones, these five stories are unattested elsewhere (although they might have figured in Hyginus), with the exception of that of Valerius Vestinus, narrated, with slightly different names, in the *Parallela minora*. In any case, the main point must be that most people in this section are rapists and die struck by a thunderbolt, while the story of Valerius Vestinus does not fit either category; nor does it fit the next section in the mythographic excerpta, which concerns 'Those who were metamorphosed' (unless one wants to stress the fact that the story of Hecuba, which forms the pendant offered in *Parallela minora* to the story of Lucius Umbrius, ended in Euripides – but not in the *Parallela minora* – with a metamorphosis). Cameron, *Greek mythography in the Roman world*, 242 suggests that the most likely explanation for the presence of the story of Lucius Umbrius in the excerpta is that it was added to an all-mythological list by some later compiler. Cameron's further point, that this is the only nonmythological story, holds only so far: it is interesting to note that the historical context present in the *Parallela minora* is here left out, so that the story might in theory pass for mythological; conversely, the story of the tyrant Philanthropos could also qualify as nonmythological. And the divergence in the

names remains unexplained: the story would have had to have been added to the mythographic excerpta very early – before corruption entered the archetype of all the tradition of the *Parallela minora.* It really is a pity that we do not have Hyginus' chapter 'on those struck by a thunderbolt'!

286 F 7 - (7) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 31B = Moralia 313 B meta[[id="286" type="F" n="7"]]	
Subject: military history: warfare. politics: revolt Historical Work: Italika book 3 Source date: 2nd C AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: ? c. 390 BC?	Translation
Ῥωμαίων πρὸς Γάλλους πολεμούντων καὶ τῆς εὐθηνίας μὴ ἀρκούσης Κίννας τοῦ δήμου τὸ σιτόμετρον ὑπέσπασε· Ῥωμαῖοι δ' ὡς ἀντιποιούμενον αὐτὸν τῆς βασιλείας λιθόλευστον ἐποίησαν, ὡς Ἀριστείδης Μιλήσιος ἐν τρίτωι Ἰταλικῶν.	When the Romans were waging war against the Gauls, and their supply of food was insufficient, Cinna secretly reduced the distribution of grain to the people. But the Romans stoned him to death on the suspicion that he had designs on the kingship. So Aristeides in the third book of his *Italian History.*

286 F 7 Commentary

The Roman story attributed to Aristeides forms a parallel to an equally unknown story, concerning the lapidation by the Athenians of a certain Pyrandros, who during the war against Eumolpos, also tried to impose measures of austerity, and was stoned to death by the people; the story is attributed to Kallisthenes (*BNJ* 291 F 1). This is one of those relatively rare instances in which both Greek and Roman parallels are unattested elsewhere.

Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 376, suggests that what is meant here is the war against the Gauls of Brennus, in which a famine plays an important part (Livy 5.47.8-48); A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 353 mentions Jacoby's interpretation, and adds that the episode is however not attested, nor is it possible to find 'spunti per la sua invenzione'. Another episode in early Roman history might lurk in the background, the attempt by Spurius Maelius to win the people over with corn distributions in a period of famine, with a view to attaining royalty, and his execution by Servilius Ahala (an event conventionally dated to 439 BC: Livy 4.13-16; Dionysios of Halicarnassos 12 fr 4). But none of the names or contexts will fit exactly; it seems to me that this is again an instance where contemporary history is creatively reused, to provide exempla in remote times. Two Cinnae come into play here.

The first one is Lucius Cornelius Cinna, who opposed Sulla's politics; elected consul for 87 BC on the basis of his promise not to touch Sulla's legislation, he immediately tried to circumvent it. Expelled from Rome, he came back at the head of a military force, and

remained in power for three further years (the so-called *dominatio Cinnae* or *Cinnanum tempus*, as Cicero named it, respectively in *Letters to Atticus* 8.36 and in the speech *On his house* 83). According to Cicero, *Brutus* 227, this was for the republic a time of lawlessness and lack of dignity, *sine iure fuit et sine ulla dignitate res publica*): numerous political opponents were murdered. In 85 BC Cinna began to prepare for the return of Sulla from the East, but was murdered by rebellious troops in Ancona at the beginning of 84 BC; Appian, *The civil wars*, 1.78 mentions explicitly the throwing of stones; so also [Aurelius Victor], *On illustrious men of the city of Rome*, 69.4: *Quarto consulatu cum bellum contra Syllam pararet, Anconae ob nimiam crudelitatem ab exercitu lapidibus occisus est*; the other sources on his death (Livy, *Periocha* 83; Velleius Paterculus, *Roman history* 2.24.5; Plutarch, *Life of Sertorius* 6.1, and *Life of Pompey* 5.1-3; Cassius Dio 45.47.2 and 52.13.2; Iulius Exsuperantius 29; Orosius 5.19.24; see further F. Münzer, 'Cornelius' 106, *RE* 4 (1901) 1282-7) are not as specific.

The second one is Helvius Cinna, tribune of the plebs, friend of Caesar, and a famous poet (see T.P. Wiseman, 'Helvius' I 3, *BNP* 6 (2005) 124-5), who died because of having been confused with Lucius Cornelius Cinna (son of the consul of 87-84 BC, brother of Julius Caesar's wife Cornelia and praetor in 44 BC). Lucius Cornelius Cinna, although not one of the conspirators, made, on the day before Caesar's funeral, a violent speech against the dictator; at the funeral, the enraged mob confused him with Helvius Cinna, and lynched the latter (Suetonius, *The deified Julius* 85; Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Deeds and Sayings* 9.9.1; Appian, *The Civil Wars* 2.20.147; Dio Cassius, *Roman History* 44.50; Plutarch, *Brutus* 20.6; and F. Münzer, 'Cornelius 107', *RE* 4 (1901) 1287-8). [J. Boulogne, *Plutarque. Oeuvres morales, IV. Parallèles mineurs* (Paris 2002), 266 blithely footnotes: 'Lucius Cornelius Cinna, préteur en 44 av. J.-C. et frère de Cornelia, la femme de Jules Caesar. Parce-qu'il avait approuvé le meurtre de ce dernier en raison de son attachement à la république, il fut lynché lors des proscriptions qui suivirent sa mort' - *sic.* Apart from the factual error, Boulogne seems to me to be on the right track - but he does not explain at all how this could fit with a war with the Gauls].

The reason given in *Parallela minora* for the stoning (the suspicion of designs on kingship, which in itself does not have so much to do with famine and the Gauls) seems to me to confirm the blend of remote and recent history in this story.

286 F 8 - (8) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 40B = Moralia 315 EF meta[[id="286" type="F" n="8"]]	
Subject: myth: mythical past. Genre: aetiology. Historical Work: Italika book 3 (?) Source date: 2nd century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: Myth: mythical past.	Translation

Ἄννιος[14] δὲ Τρούσκων[15] βασιλεὺς ἔχων θυγατέρα εὔμορφον τοὔνομα Σαλίαν[16] παρθένον ἐτήρει. Κάθητος δ᾽ ἐκ τῶν ἐπισήμων ἰδὼν τὴν παρθένον παίζουσαν ἡράσθη, καὶ μὴ στέγων τὸν ἔρωτα ἥρπασε καὶ ἦγεν εἰς Ῥώμην. ὁ δὲ πατὴρ ἐπιδιώξας καὶ μὴ συλλαβὼν ἥλατο εἰς τὸν Περεούσιον(?) ποταμόν, ὃς Ἀννίων[17] μετωνομάσθη. τῆι δὲ Σαλίαι συγγενόμενος Κάθητος ἐποιήσατο Λατῖνον καὶ Σάλιον, ἀφ᾽ ὧν οἱ εὐγενέστατοι κατῆγον τὸ γένος, ὡς Ἀριστείδης Μιλήσιος καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Πολύιστωρ ἐν τρίτωι Ἰταλικῶν.	Annios king of the Etruscans, having a beautiful daughter named Salia, preserved her virginity. But Cathetos, one of the nobles, having seen the girl playing, fell in love with her; and being unable to control his love, he seized her and brought her to Rome. The father pursued them, but could not capture them, and leaped into the river Pereüsion, which changed its name to Annio. And Kathetos consorted with Salia and begat Latinus and Salius, from whom the most noble patricians traced their descent. So Aristeides the Milesian, and also Alexander Polyhistor (*FGrH* 273 F 20) in the third book of his *Italian History.*

286 F 8 Commentary

The story is unknown; it forms a parallel to that of Evenos, his daughter Marpessa, and the son of Aphareus Idas (*Parallela minora* 40A; this story is also narrated in [Plutarch] *On rivers* 8.1). A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco, Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 364, lists ancient references to the priest of Apollo Anios and his three daughters, the Oinotropoi Elais, Spermô and Oinô; Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 376 is certainly right in stating that the Delian Anios and his family have nothing to do with our story.

An Etruscan king Annios is unknown. Jacoby denies any connection with the Annii; it is indeed unlikely that the Annii may have traced themselves back to king Annius. However, the existence of the plebeian gentilicium Annius (Annii are active in Roman political life from the third century BC: see K.-L. Elvers, 'Annius', *BNP* 1 (2002), 705, who calls the Etruscan Annius 'a scholarly invention' – yes, but by [Plutarch], or preexisting?), combined with its occurrence in Etruscan and Oscan inscriptions, together with the existence of the river Anio (today's Aniene, a tributary of the Tiber

---

[14] Ἄννιος all manuscripts, with the exception of Σ (the epitome); so also numerous editors, as well as De Lazzer (2000) and Boulogne (2002). Ἄνιος Σ (the epitome), and Xylander, Amyot, Kaltwasser, Nachstädt and Jacoby (who notes in his apparatus: Ἄννιος or Ἀνιηνός?).

[15] Τρούσκων all manuscripts; Τούσκων Stephanus, and most editors after him (including Jacoby, De Lazzer 2000 and Boulogne 2002). While the Tusci are certainly meant, the reading with 'r' is too widespread to be an accident: it must reflect a choice.

[16] So α²ΕΠ²n (fairly authoritative manuscripts) and most editors; but the variants σιλίαν (ΦΣ), στιλίαν and σταλίαν are also well and authoritatively attested (see the apparatus of De Lazzer and Boulogne for more precisions); Nachstädt suggested to read ἰλίαν.

[17] Ἀννίων is the reading of most manuscripts, and is printed by the majority of ancient editors, as well as Bernardakis, Boulogne (2002) and De Lazzer (2000); Ἀνίων ΕΠ²n, and Guarinus, Xylander, Nachstädt, Jacoby.

and a well-known river, if Pausanias mentions it in a passage listing the colours of different types of waters, 4.35.10), may have provided material for the story. Among the Annii, L. Annius Setinus, one of the two *praetores* of Latium, played a prominent role in 340 BC as supporter of the Latins (Livy, 8.3.9-6.5); Livy states that there were various stories about this affair, and one of them may be in the background of [Plutarch]'s narrative.

The personal name Kathetos/Cathetus appears only here (searches on TLG and Brepolis database, as well as LGPN); Nachstädt's hypothesis, advanced in his apparatus, that this is the Greek translation of Latin Considius, is worth consideration. Alternatively, one could try to recognize in it the name of one of the Alban kings, corrupted through textual transmission, or altered, whether playfully or through ignorance. The names of Capetus (Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 14.613; Livy 1.3.8; Diodoros of Sicily 1.71.1, where Capetus is duplicated) and Calpetus (Ovid, *Fasti* 4.46) are attested (as R.M. Ogilvie, *A commentary on Livy, books I-V* (Oxford 1965), 44 points out, Calpetus is added to provide a pedigree for the Calpurnii; on the Alban king list, see G. Forsythe, *The Historian L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi and the Roman Annalistic Tradition* (Lanham - New York - London 1994), 113-23); the variation within the same author shows how easily these names could be modified. It is however difficult to posit a straight connection between Kathetos and the Capetus of the Alban king list, because Ovid, *Fasti* 4.37–56 lists Postumus / Silvius as the son of Iulus and father of Latinus (2), while Calpetus appears three kings down the line, as the father of Tiberinus: the succession order is very different. (Further on these lists and names, see J. Poucet, *Les rois de Rome* (2000), *passim*).

As for Salia, it is epigraphically attested as a personal name (I. Kajanto, *The Latin cognomina* (Helsinki 1965), 154, refers to *CIL* 6 25769, *Salia Saliana*). Further, according to Festus p. 439.18 Lindsay, there were *Saliae virgines*, who (so Cincius) were hired and brought to (or added to) the male *Salii*, in a ritual whose meaning remains difficult to understand, or also (so Aelius Stilo) 'accomplished sacrifices in the *regia* with the *pontifex* while dressed in military garb with *apices* in the manner of the *Salii*'. It is however worth noting that the manuscript tradition hesitates, with a number of texts giving Silia; Nachstädt's proposal to restore Ilia is attractive.

The two sons are problematic in different ways: while Salius as personal name is attested in literary texts (not in inscriptions), but is not found in any of the lists of Alban kings, Latinus figures in the early history of Rome (twice); Latinus is moreover an epigraphically attested cognomen (a senator of Republican times, another in the imperial period, more than 53 men, plus 6 slaves or freedmen, 10 women and two more either slaves of freedwomen, concentrated, as one would expect, in Rome and Latium: see Kajanto, *The Latin cognomina,* 180).

The narrative may reflect an attempt to connect the Salii with Etruria (so Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 376). There were competing traditions on the origins of the Salii. One, represented e.g. by Dionysios of Halicarnassos, *Roman antiquities* 2.63.2-73, made them epichoric, and derived their name from the dance, *salire.* But according to Plutarch, *Life of Numa* 13.7 (who is here referring a story he does not agree with), they took their name from a

certain Salius, native of Samothrace or Mantinea in Arcadia; the notion of an Arcadian origin of Salius was already present in Polemo (in Festus, s.v. Salios, p. 438-39 L.) and Varro (in Isidorus, *Origins* 18. 50; see also, for an Arcadian Salius, Servius Danielis, commentary on Virgil, *Aeneid* 8.285). In Virgil, *Aeneid* 5.298-9, a Salius from Tegea in Arcadia, one of Aeneas' companions, takes part in the funeral games for Anchises. Our text inserts itself in this complex landscape: in [Plutarch], Latinus and Salius are said to descend from an Etruscan king; the chronological horizon would appear to predate the foundation of Rome (just as in Virgil, where the Salius mentioned in *Aeneid* 5.298-9 is a companion of Aeneas, while in *Aeneid* 8.285 the Salii dance in Evander's Pallanteum – again, before the foundation of Rome) – however, Kathetos brings the girl to Rome!

The river's name too is problematic: Nachstädt suggested we restore Περουσῖνος as the original name; but one cannot but agree with Jacoby (*FGrH* 3a, 376) that this is the typical example of a pseudo-palaeographic conjecture. There are thus no strong reasons for accepting it, all the more since a river named 'Perousinos' is not known; note however that J. Boulogne, *Plutarque. Oeuvres morales, IV: Parallèles mineurs* (Paris 2002), 433, is happy to think that the story concerns not the Anio/modern Aniene, but a river flowing through the Etruscan area of Perugia – but he then refers to Livy, 1.27.4 and Pliny, *Natural History* 3.109, who are only concerned with the Tiber and the Anio.

Here as in a few other cases, [Plutarch] buttresses the authority of his narrative with not just one, but two source references: besides Aristeides of Miletos, also Alexander Polyhistor, in the third book of *Italika*. *Italika* are not known for Alexander Polyhistor, nor can the title be understood as part of the περὶ Ῥώμης or of the Θαυμάσια (as suggested by I. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 99); Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 270 must be right that the reference to the book here pertains to Aristeides, whose third book of *Italika* is frequently cited in the *Parallela minora* (see also the fuller discussion of double source-reference in F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* S.3, 8 (1940), 124-35, and 128, 132 in particular).

As for the content of the fragment and the correctness of the citation, things are complex. Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 376, states that this is a real reference to Polyhistor ('echtes Polyhistorzitat'), who is mentioned as source also elsewhere by [Plutarch] (in *On rivers* 10.1, from the *Phrygiaka* = *FGrH* 273 F 76: see De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori*, 51-2, with further bibliography), and refers the reader to Alexander Polyhistor, *FGrH* 273 F 20. Yet in his commentary there (*FGrH* 3a, 270), Jacoby states that the content of F20, 'which is lost to us' ('der uns verloren ist'), could have belonged to Polyhistor's Περὶ Ῥώμης, although the anti-Roman tendency implicit in making the mother of Latinus and Salius an Etruscan, and the difficulties occasioned by the chronological collocation of Latinus, cannot be attributed to Polyhistor. If I understand this correctly, Jacoby's position here is that Alexander Polyhistor may indeed have talked of similar issues in the Περὶ Ῥώμης, and so that this is not entirely a bogus reference, but that the text as we have it does not reflect what he might have written (A. Cameron, *Greek mythography in the Roman world* (Oxford 2004), 132, simply states that there is no other evidence that Polyhistor wrote an *Italika*). That Polyhistor did discuss these topics is at any rate

certain from a passage of Servius Danielis, Commentary on Virgil, *Aeneid* 8. 430 (= Alexander Polyhistor, *FGrH* 273 F 110), on the names and order of the Alban kings.

Subject: Politics: tyranny. Law: torture Historical Work: Italika book 4 Source date: 2nd C AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: unknown	Translation
† ενεπεστη πόλει τῆς Ἰταλίας ἐγένετό τις ὠμὸς τύραννος Αἰμίλιος Κενσωρῖνος. οὗτος τοὺς καινότερα βασανιστήρια κατασκευάσαντας ἐδωροδόκει. εἰς δέ τις Ἀρούντιος Πατέρκουλος δημιουργήσας ἵππον χαλκοῦν τῶι προειρημένωι δῶρον ἔδωκεν, ἵνα † βάλλῃ αὐτούς. ὁ δὲ τότε πρῶτον νομίμως ἀναστραφεὶς τὸν χαρισάμενον πρότερον ἐνέβαλεν, ὡς ἂν ἣν ἐπενόησε βάσανον ἄλλοις αὐτὸς πάθηι πρῶτος [τοῦτον συλλαβὼν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ταρπίου ὄρους ἔρριψε]· καὶ δοκοῦσιν οἱ ἀποτόμως βασιλεύσαντες ἀπ᾽ ἐκείνου Αἰμίλιοι προσαγορεύεσθαι, ὡς Ἀριστείδης ἐν τετάρτωι Ἰταλικῶν.	In †teste†, a city of Italy, there was once a cruel tyrant, Aemilius Censorinus. This person used to reward with gifts those who invented more novel forms of torture. A certain Arruntius Paterculus having built a horse of bronze gave it as a gift to the aforesaid, that he might cast them (the citizens?) therein. But behaving in a just manner on this occasion for the first time, he first thrust inside the giver of the gift, so that he himself should experience as the first the torment that he had devised for others. [Then he seized it and hurled it from the Tarpeian Rock.] It is believed that those who rule with great cruelty are called Aemilii from this Aemilius. So Aristeides in the fourth book of his *Italian History.*

286 F 9 Commentary

The textual situation renders the interpretation – problematic in itself - even more difficult.

This narrative forms the Roman parallel to the famous story of the tyrant Phalaris, for which [Plutarch] refers to Callimachos. But while there is a rich tradition on Phalaris of Agrigentum and his bronze bull (or a heifer, as in [Plutarch], *Parallela minora* 39A), and while in Callimachos and in much of the later tradition the misdeeds of the tyrant are paralleled with those of the Egyptian king Busiris (see Callimachos frr. 44-47 Pfeiffer = 51-54 Massimilla; Ovid, *The art of love*, 1.647-56, *Tristia* 11.39-52, *Letters from Pontus* 3.6.41 ff.; Claudianus, *Against Rufinus* 1.251-5, and the discussion in G. Massimilla, *Callimaco. Aitia. Libri primo e secondo* (Pisa 1996), 360-66), nothing is known of a similar torture imposed by an Aemilius in Segesta, and through a bronze horse. On the latter point, the story of the bronze horse of Gyges, narrated in Plato, *Republic* 2.359a–2.360d (Gyges enters a cave and finds a bronze horse which contains a corpse, larger than that of a normal man and wearing a ring, which he pockets; cf. Cicero, *On duties* 3.38), or that of the Trojan horse (although this was wooden), may be lurking behind

Aristeides/[Plutarch]'s choice of a horse (see cf. V. Hinz, *Nunc Phalaris doctum protulit ecce caput* (Berlin 2001), 39 and n. 100). But so far as the story as a whole is concerned, it seems clear to me that here [Plutarch] is up to something. The story of Busiris is also narrated in the *Parallela minora*, 38A, where it is attributed to Agathon of Samos, and it forms a parallel to the human sacrifices attributed to Faunus (a story not attested elsewhere); is it too much to suspect that [Plutarch] had two parallel stories, both Greek, and that, having decided to keep them both, he managed to 'find' two Roman parallels for them?

Let us focus on our story. The difficulties begin with the location. The manuscripts have ενεπέστη πόλει τῆς Ἰταλίας (so F, the Parisinus Graecus 1957, of the end of the 10th century AD) or ἐν ἐνγέστη πόλει Σικελίας (Φ, marking the agreement of a group of fifteen-century manuscripts). ἐν Αἰγέστῃ, the only reading to make sense, is offered by a second hand on F (the same hand also proposes Σικελίας): it is thus a late correction (see A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 362 who nonetheless accepts this reading in his text, as do most editors, including Nachstädt).
In support of the Egestan and Sicilian reading, Nachstädt invoked a passage of Diodoros of Sicily, 20.71, where Diodoros narrates the treatment meted out by Agathokles to Segesta, and in particular compares Agathokles' invention of a bronze bed in human shape, on which the victims were fixed and then roasted, to the bull of Phalaris (possibly linked to this is the comment by the scholion to Lycophron, *Alexandra* 968, p. 307 Scheer: Αἰγέστα πόλις Σικελίας ἡ κατά τινας Ἀκράγας καλουμένη). But as Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 376 points out, events happening in Segesta, and more generally in Sicily, would not count as a Roman parallel for [Plutarch]; Agathokles is Greek history.
For the same reason also the reading Σικελίας, 'of Sicily', proposed by some manuscripts and accepted by most editors (*e.g.* Nachstädt, Boulogne), should be rejected, in favour of the better attested Ἰταλίας, 'of Italy', offered by the already mentioned, authoritative F, as well as by the epitome, and accepted by Jacoby and De Lazzer.

Next, the names. Jacoby dismisses Nachstädt's reference to Orosius, *Histories against the pagans* 1.20, in which the reign of Phalaris (including the story of the invention of the torture by means of the bronze bull) is explicitly compared to the slightly earlier reign of the Latin Aremulus, to whose continuing injustices and impiety a lightning put an end (passage quoted in Jacoby); Orosius concludes by explicitly asking Sicilians and Latins whether they would prefer to live at the time of Aremulus and Phalaris, or rather in Christian times. For Jacoby, this passage has nothing to do with the *Parallela minora*, because the information concerning Aremulus derives to Orosius from Jerome (*Chronicle*, year of Abraham 1142; Eusebios, Armenian version p. 138, 30ff. Karst = Diodoros of Sicily 7.5.10-11). But the point here is not really who Orosius took his information from ([Plutarch] is indeed unlikely), but rather that there were various versions of the Alban king-list, and that the first century BC is a moment of remarkable development in this area (cf. the various lists of Dionysios of Halicarnassos, *Roman antiquities* 1.64.1, 65.1, 70.1, 71; Livy 1.3; Appian *Concerning the kings* 1.1 Viereck-Roos; Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 14.609–622, 772–774; Ovid, *Fasti* 4.37–56; Jerome, *Chronicle* (year of Abraham 838 ff.); Eusebius, Armenian Chronicle = Diodoros of Sicily 7.5; Georgios

Synkellos, *Extracts of chronography* pp. 201, 207, 216–7, 226 ed. Mosshammer (1984), esp. 217 for Aremulus, with B. Garstad, 'Barbarian interest in the *Excerpta Latina Barbari*', *Early Medieval Europe* 19 (2011) 16).

Similarly, Jacoby dismisses the proposal of D. Wyttenbach, *Animadversiones*, in *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia* 7 (Oxford 1821), 89 (see De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori*, 36) to connect this story with that of the last of the Alban kings, Amulius, who after having expelled his brother Numitor, added crime to crime, as Livy 1.3.11 puts it, by killing his nephew and trying to prevent his niece to have children.

Of course the crimes of the Alban kings are different from those attributed to Aemilius Censorinus; but an explicit connection between the *gens* Aemilia and the last Alban king Amulius is made in Silius Italicus, *Punic wars* 8.293-6 (Aemilius Paulus could trace descent, through the founder of his line, Amulius, to Assaracus, and from him to Zeus), as well as in Festus (Paulus) 22 Lindsay: cf. T.P. Wiseman, 'Legendary genealogies in late-Republican Rome', *Greece & Rome* 21 (1974), 153 and 155, and on Livy 1.3 R.M. Ogilvie, *A commentary on Livy, books I-V* (Oxford 1965), 42-6.

Thus, while Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 376 is certainly right that it is impossible to iron out as corruptions all the problems posed by the story, since even if one were to think of Aremulus or Amulius, it would still be impossible to make sense of the *cognomen* Censorinus (attested for the Marcii but certainly not for the Aemilii: see I. Kajanto, *The Latin cognomina* (Helsinki 1965), 317) or of an Aruntius Paterculus of whom nothing is known, nonetheless one could see in our story a reaction to traditions concerning the origins of Rome or the early years of the Republic, possibly circulated by the 'resplendent Aemilii' themselves (could one see in Censorinus an error for Mamercinus, attested for many of the early Aemilii?) Plutarch, *Life of Numa* 8.18-19 and *Life of Aemilius Paulus* 2.2, shows that the connection of the *gens* with the cognomen Mamercus, Mamercinus, was still felt and very much alive in the first century AD (Numa called one of his sons Mamercus; and from him the *gens* Aemilia took its name, because with the other name, Aimilios, Numa stressed his son's seductive grace in speaking, with a pun on αἰμυλία / Αἰμίλιος)); more importantly, Plutarch's positive interpretation of the pun on the αἰμυλία, the astute gracefulness in speaking of the Aemilii offers a neat contrast to the statement of [Plutarch], that those who rule with cruelty are called Aemilii from this Aemilius; at the same time, it shows that such tendentious interpretations were current.

On the 'resplendent' Aemilii, see R. Syme, *The Augustan aristocracy* (Oxford 1986), 104-140, as well as T.P. Wiseman, 'Rome and the Resplendent Aemilii', in H.D. Jocelyn and H. Hurt, *Tria lustra: Essays and Notes Presented to John Pinsent* (Liverpool 1993), 181-92, reprinted in T.P. Wiseman, *Roman Drama and Roman History* (Exeter 1998), 106-20. The attempt of M. Aemilius Lepidus, consul 78 BC, to seize power, may have sparked this kind of reaction, or the involvement in conspiracies of the later Aemilii. The assessment by Plutarch, *Life of Aemilius Paullus* 3.4-7, of the strictness of Aemilius Paullus is instructive; it shows that there may have been different views (see also A.E. Astin, *Scipio Aemilianus* (Oxford 1967) 17 on Paullus and Aemilianus, and 23-5 on Scipio Aemilianus).

As for the other name, Aruntius Paterculus, again it cannot be brought back to any family. One explanation for the invention lies in allusive construction: L. Arruntius, consul 6 AD, may have been married to an Aemilia (Syme, *Augustan aristocracy*, 143). And the one Paterculus who is relatively well-known (to the moderns), the author of the *Roman history*, also lived under Augustus and Tiberius, being a contemporary of Arruntius; a friend of Sejanus, he may have shared in his final destiny (see R. Syme, 'Seianus on the Aventine', *Hermes* 84 (1956) 257-266). Otherwise, Paterculus is attested as cognomen of a L. Albinius, tribunus plebis in 493, for two Sulpicii, active at the time of the first Punic war; for three Velleii of senatorial rank, active in the imperial period, besides 17 free men and a woman (see I. Kajanto, *Latin cognomina* (Helsinki 1965) 304).

Besides problems with location and names, the passage poses a structural difficulty in the sentence 'τοῦτον συλλαβὼν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ταρπίου ὄρους ἔρριψε'. The object cannot be the inventor: not much would have been left of him after the torture. The sentence has thus been considered as a gloss; usually however glosses have some sense. We might have here a corrupted echo of the story told by Timaios, *FGrH* 566 F 28c, that Phalaris' bull was thrown into the sea (a version possibly also present in Callimachos *SH* 252 vv. 7-9 = fr. 53 Massimilla; see Massimilla, *Callimaco. Aitia. Libri primo e secondo*, 363, as well as Hinz, *Nunc Phalaris doctum ecce protulit caput*, 69-70). Alternatively, we may have here a corrupted and adapted version of the story according to which the Agrigentines lost their patience and submitted the tyrant himself to the torture (or threw him down a cliff); *contra*, however, see W. Nachstädt (ed.), *Plutarchi Moralia* v. 2 (Lepzig 1935), *ad l.,* for whom it cannot be the tyrant who is thrown down the rock. Nachstädt chooses the surgical way out, and expunges the sentence; so also Jacoby, and so in the text printed above. J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 93 is certainly right that something is wrong here with our text, and that there must be a lacuna; it is impossible to go any further.

Finally, one element is interesting for the issue of the reality of the source references: the καινότερα referring here to the novel forms of torture may be an allusion to Callimachos F 53 = 46 pf.: πρῶτος ἐπεὶ τὸν ταῦρον ἐκαίνισεν. However, Callimachos is explicitly cited as source for the story of Phalaris, narrated in *Parallela minora* 39A (with an alternative source for the same story, Dorotheos, mentioned in Stobaios: see *BNJ* 2829 F 2a and 2b); but there, forms of καινός to emphasize the extraordinary character of the torture are avoided (in the slightly more detailed text of Stobaios one find ξέναις καὶ παρευρημέναις βασάνοις). Thus, the term used in the source explicitly followed for one story appears in the parallel story– and not in the one directly derived.

286 F 10a - (10; 25) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 35B = Moralia 314 DE meta[[id="286" type="F" n="10"]]	
Subject: Religion: sacrifice, ritual Historical Work: Italika book 19 Source date: 2nd C AD Historian's date: unknown	Translation

λοιμοῦ κατασχόντος Φαληρίους καὶ φθορᾶς γενομένης, χρησμὸς ἐδόθη λωφῆσαι τὸ δεινόν, ἐὰν παρθένον τῆι Ἥραι θύωσιν κατ᾽ ἐνιαυτόν. ἀεὶ δὲ τῆς δεισιδαιμονίας μενούσης, κατὰ κλῆρον καλουμένη Οὐαλερία Λουπέρκα *** †[18] σπασαμένη δὲ τὸ ξίφος, ἀετὸς καταπτὰς ἥρπασε καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐμπύρων ἔθηκε ῥάβδον μικρὰν ἔχουσαν σφῦραν, τὸ δὲ ξίφος ἐπέβαλε δαμάλει τινὶ παρὰ τὸν ναὸν βοσκομένηι. νοήσασα δ᾽ ἡ παρθένος ‘τῆς δαίμονος τὸ φιλάνθρωπον’ καὶ τὴν βοῦν θύσασα καὶ τὴν σφῦραν ἄρασα ‘πᾶσαν’ κατ᾽ οἰκίαν περιῆλθε, καὶ τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας ἠρέμα πλήττουσα διήγειρεν, ἐρρῶσθαι ἑνὶ ἑκάστωι λέγουσα· ὅθεν καὶ νῦν τὸ μυστήριον τελεῖται, ὡς Ἀριστείδης ἐν ἐννεακαιδεκάτωι Ἰταλικῶν.	When a plague was oppressing the city of Falerii and many had perished, an oracle was given that the terror would abate if they sacrificed a virgin to Hera each year. As this superstitious practice remained in place, once, as a maiden chosen by lot, Valeria Luperca, ... had drawn the sword, an eagle swooping down snatched it up, and placed a wand tipped with a small hammer upon the sacrificial offerings; but it threw the sword on a heifer which was grazing near the shrine. The maiden, realizing the benevolence of the divinity, sacrificed the heifer, and having taken up the hammer, went about from house to house, and tapping the sick lightly with her hammer she roused them, telling each of them to be well again; whence even to this day this mystic rite is performed, as Aristeides says in the nineteenth book of his *Italian History.*

286 F 10a Commentary

See commentary to F 10 c.

Subject: Religion: sacrifice, ritual Historical Work: unknown Source date: 6 C AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: mythical past	Translation
παρθένος τῆς δαίμονος τὸ φιλάνθρωπον ..... τὴν ὀφ.... πᾶσαν κατοικίαν παρῆλθε καὶ	The virgin... the kind sign of the divinity... went through all the settlement and...

[18] So Jacoby and Nachstädt; De Lazzer 2000 and Boulogne 2002 follow E, the Parisinus Graecus 1672, dated to 1350-1380 AD, and print ἤγετο εἰς θυσίαν followed by a lacuna, as already Dübner and Bernardakis (see De Lazzer 112-3 for instance in which E may have introduced conjectures on its own). Λουπέρκα is a correction of Guarinus, based on Tzetzes (F 10c); the manuscripts have του πέρκα or τουπέρκα. What follows is certainly corrupt; there is here a lacuna follows, for which Pohlenz proposed <ἔμελλεν αὐτὴν τῇ θεῷ θύειν>; Duebner proposed to add ἤγετο εἰς θυσίαν (see Nachstädt's aparatus). In all this, it is unlcear who holds the sword.

τοῖς .... διήγειρεν, ὡς ὁ Ῥωμαῖος Βάρ<ρων. ὅμοια καὶ> Λακε<δαιμ>ονίοις γεν<έσθ>αι λόγος .... Ἀριστείδης, ὃς ἐν τῇ πε<.......... φη>σίν· ἡνίκα .... οὗτος <ὁ λοιμὸς κατεῖχε Λακεδαίμονα, ...[19]	roused, as the Roman Varro says. It is said that similar events also befell the Lakedaimonians... Aristeides, who in his ... says: such a famine held Lakedaimon. ...

286 F 10b Commentary

See commentary to F 10 c.

286 F 10c - (10) Tzetzes in Lycophronis *Alexandram* 183	
Subject: Religion: sacrifice, ritual Historical Work: unknown Source date: 12 C AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: mythical past	Translation
οὐκ ἀπεικὸς δὲ τὸ θυομένης τῆς Ἰφιγενείας διαδραμεῖν ἔλαφον καὶ ταύτην τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἀνελεῖν, τὴν δὲ κόρην ἐᾶσαι· καὶ γὰρ Ἰουλίαν Λουπέρκαν Ῥωμαίαν ἀετὸς οὕτως ἔσωσε· σφαγιαζομένης γὰρ αὐτῆς καταπτὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱερέως τοῦ δήμου τὸ ξίφος ἁρπάζει καὶ πρὸς δάμαλιν ἐπιρρίπτει πλησίον τοῦ νεὼ νεμομένην, ἣν καὶ ἐσφαγίασαν ἀντ' αὐτῆς. οὐκ ἀγνοεῖς δὲ καὶ τὸν ἀντ' Ἰσαὰκ *ἐν φυτῷ* Σαβὲκ κριὸν δεδεμένον.	And it is not unlikely that when Iphigeneia was being sacrificed a deer ran by and that the Greeks sacrificed it, and let the girl be; for an eagle saved the Roman Ioulia Luperca in the same way; for as she was being sacrificed the eagle flying down grabs the sword from the public priest and lets it fall besides a heifer who was grazing close to the temple, and which they sacrificed instead of her. And you don't ignore also the goat given instead of Isaac † in Sabek.

286 F 10c Commentary

This is a problematic story. Besides the *Parallela minora* (F10a), the story is probably also present in Johannes Lydos *On months* 4.147 (F10b), and certainly in Tzetzes (a comparison of the three versions is in J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 63-71; F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* S.3, 8 (1940), 120, 126-7; see also R. Hercher, *Plutarchi Libellus de Fluviis* (Lipsiae 1851), 15-6).

In *On months* 4.147 Lydos first relates a couple of stories present in the *Parallela minora*, 20 B and 20A: the story of Marius' battles against the Cimbri and of his sacrifice of his daughter, paired with that of Erectheus' sacrifice of his daughter (see respectively Dorotheos *BNJ* 289 F1 and Demaratos *BNJ* 12A F 1); this is followed by a very damaged part, which seems to be about a young woman, the benevolence of a daimon, going

---

[19] The text as printed shows how much we are missing. Here are, *exempli gratia*, Nachstädt's restorations: <νοήσασα δὲ ἡ> παρθένος τῆς δαίμονος τὸ φιλάνθρωπον <ἄρασά τε> τὴν <σ>φ<ῦραν>, πᾶσαν κατ' οἰκίαν <περι>ῆλθε, καὶ τοὺς < ἀσθενοῦντας ἠρέμα πλήττουσα > διήγειρεν, ὡς ὁ Ῥωμαῖος Βάρρων.

through a settlement, and the Roman Var<ro> (our F 10b above), coupled with a better preserved story concerning human sacrifice at Sparta, which ceased when, as Helen had been chosen, an eagle swooped down, took the sword and brought it close to a heifer (text under Aristodemos BNJ 22 F1b, since Aristodemos is the author referred to as source in *Parallela minora* 35A, which forms the pendant of F1a above). In both the instances in Lydos the Greek story follows the Roman one, contrary to the normal practice of *Parallela minora*; more importantly, while for the first couple of stories Lydos does not give any sources, for the second couple he refers to Varro (restored, but with a high degree of probability) for the Roman story, and to Aristeides for the Greek one. This is rather disconcerting, as in the *Parallela minora* the Greek story is attributed to Aristodemos (*BNJ* 22 F 1) and not to Aristeides; the Roman story to Aristeides (above, F 10 a) and not to Varro.

The explanation typically accepted for such a situation is that the original, ampler version of the *Parallela minora* contained variant versions (thus, both Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren', 120, 126-7 and W. Schmid, *Philologische Wochenschrift* (1932) 630-31 assumed that in the original text a double reference would have been present, to Aristeides and to Varro). In general, this works; but in this particular case, there may have been some further confusion within Lydos' text, since it does strain credibility to accept that Aristeides, who in *Parallela minora* is mentioned as the source for the Roman story, should be cited as source of the Greek story in Lydos; the relative similarity of the source names 'Aristodemos' and 'Aristeides' may have caused the confusion in Lydos.

A radical alternative has been recently suggested by J. Poucet, 'Valéria Luperca et le «maillet guérisseur falisque» (pseudo-Plutarque, *Parall. minor*., 35)', *Folia electronica Classica* 9 (2005) (also published in *Ollodagos. Actes de la Société belge d'études celtiques* 19 (2005), 159-199). For Poucet, the passage in Lydos might derive not from the tradition of the *Parallela minora* but directly from Varro; the *scholia Bobiensia* to Cicero, *Pro Sestio* 21.48 (p. 91 Hildebrand = P. Mirsch, 'De M. Terenti Varronis Antiquitatum Rerum Humanarum libris XXV*', Leipziger Studien zur classischen Philologie* 5 (1882), 85) indeed contain a list of Attic kings, from Cecrops to Erechtheus, followed by the story of how Erechtheus' daughters, to save their city in war, offered themselves for sacrifice. But while it is possible that in his *Antiquities* Varro expanded upon a group of stories all concerning virgin sacrifice, we do not have any proof of that; moreover, the fragmentary words in Lydos appear closer to the text of the *Parallela minora* than to that of the scholion to Cicero; most importantly, we know for certain that Lydos relies on the *Parallela minora* for five other stories, and specifically for the stories that precede and follow this one (this is conceded by Poucet himself). And yet, there is a complication (ignored by Poucet): the *Parallela minora* never cite as authority a Roman author; Varro here would be a unique instance (see A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 41, 44 n. 157, and 80-81). A solution may be to attribute to Lydos the reference to Varro, while maintaining that the story as a whole derives (as the two preceding and the following ones) from a version of [Plutarch] (so already Hercher, *De Plutarchi libellus De Fluviis*, 16; see also M. Van der Valk, *Researches on the text and the*

scholia of the Iliad 1 (Leiden 1963), 409 n. 384). In other instances Lydos can be seen not to have followed slavishly one source.

As for Tzetzes' version, it too presents some puzzling characteristics: it is added as a remark following the sacrifice of Iphigeneia; there are no source references; and the name of the heroine is slightly different (Ioulia instead of Valeria). The simplest explanation here is that just as Tzetzes added on his own a reference to the biblical story of Isaac, so also he added from memory the story of Valeria Luperca, giving erroneously her name as Ioulia (he might have been induced in error by the existence of a group of *luperci Iulii*, added to the existing *luperci Fabiani* and the *luperci Quinctiales* by Caesar, Suetonius, *Life of Julius Caesar* 76.1, *CIL* VI 3488-3489); it is remarkable that when he added the comparison with Valeria Luperca, if his source for it was the *Parallela minora*, he did not mention the Greek parallel for it, i.e. the attempted sacrifice of Helen, and limited himself to the more famous story of Iphigeneia. This is all the more surprising as in this part of his commentary Tzetzes spends quite some time discussing Helen and her relationship to Iphigenia (see further on this, and for more on the sacrifice of young maidens, the commentary to Aristodemos, *BNJ* 22 F 1).

The story itself has for long been considered to reflect a Faliscan ritual, linked to a cult of Juno; the depictions on a coin minted by Valerius Acisculus in c.45 BC, showing Apollo Soranus and a small hammer (the acisculus) on the obverse, and a young woman sitting on a heifer on one side on the reverse, were taken to attest the wide currency of this story. H. Volkmann, 'Valeria' 400, *RE* 8A1 (1955), 245, does not grant the story any credence, because it is transmitted in the *Parallela minora*. Since then, the whole dossier has been restudied by Th. Köves-Zulauf, 'Valeria Luperca', *Hermes* 90 (1962) 214-38 = Th. Köves-Zulauf, *Kleine Schriften*, A. Heinrichs ed. (Heidelberg 1988); id., *Reden und Schweigen. Römische Religion bei Plinius Maior* (Munich 1972), 227; J. Aronen, 'Il culto arcaico nel Tarentum e la gens Valeria', *Arctos* 23 (1989), 19-39; Cl. Sterckx, 'Sucellos et Valéria Luperca', in J. Carey, J. T. Koch, P.-Y. Lambert, *Ildánach Ildírech. A Festschrift for Proinsias Mac Cana* (Andover and Aberystwyth 1999), 255-261; and Poucet, 'Valéria Luperca et le «maillet guérisseur falisque» (pseudo-Plutarque, *Parall. minor.*, 35)'. Poucet's remarks describe well the difficulties facing the interpreter: "il n'est pas toujours facile de faire le départ entre ce qui est authentique et ce qui est fantaisiste. Beaucoup de notices ne représentent en effet que des altérations, des adaptations ou des répliques de motifs connus, l'auteur jouant avec la matière historique, mythologique ou folklorique. Certains récits sont même de pures inventions. Par ailleurs, les garants sont souvent fictifs. Bref, chaque cas doit être soumis à un examen particulier, qui autorise rarement d'ailleurs des conclusions solides". Bearing this in mind, let us see what can be said of the story.

The story of Valeria Luperca fits in with stories concerning interrupted sacrifices, wolves and healing. On the first point (interrupted sacrifices) see N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 2: a commentary* (Leiden - Boston 2008), 188-9 and 200-202, with further references. As for wolves: the *cognomen* 'Luperca' is the same as the name of a goddess, so named from the she-wolf who spared the twins, according to Varro (as quoted by Arnobius, *Against the heathens* 4.3). In Rome, the wolves defend from impurity: thus,

during the Lupercalia, the Luperci purify the city (Varro, *On the Latin language* 6.34: *Lupercis nudis lustratur antiquum oppidum Palatinum*); similarly, according to Servius, Commentary on Virgil, *Aeneid* 11.475, the Hirpi Sorani take their name from an oracular response, indicating that if they wanted to be relieved from an epidemic, they should live like wolves (*Responsum est posse eam (pestilentiam) sedari si lupos imitarentur, id est rapto viverent*); note that the Soracte, where a local festival for the god Soranus involving *hirpi* (wolves) took place, is in the vicinity of Falerii. Valeria Luperca relieves Falerii from an epidemic. Her *gentilicium* also fits with stories concerning healing: the name of the *gens* was commonly etymologized from *valere*, to be well. Moreover, the Valerii seem to have been connected to two feminine cults, the cult of Juno (if the raven in the story of Valerius Corvus may be interpreted thus, Livy 7.26.1–10) and that addressed to Fortuna Muliebris, of which Valeria was chosen to be the first priestess (Dionysios of Halicarnassos 8.39-43, 55; Plutarch, *Life of Coriolanus* 33; Appian, *Italika,* fr 5.7-8 Viereck-Roos).

Lupercus/a is a well-attested cognomen in imperial period: see I. Kajanto, *The Latin cognomina* (Helsinki 1965), 318 (5 attestations of senatorial rank; moreover, 85 men and 7 slaves or freedmen; 21 women, and a freedwoman). As for the location of the story, Ovid, *Amores* 3.13.4 attests the existence of a cult of Juno at Falerii; Dionysios of Halicarnassos 1.21.2 adds that a virgin (a *canephoros*) was part of the ceremony. All this does not necessarily mean that the story reflects a ritual taking place in the early years of the Roman republic, or that Valeria Luperca is an ancient figure ('eine echte Sagengestalt'); it means however that this certainly is a plausible story.

As for the coins, it is still disputed whether they should be interpreted in relation to the story of Valeria Luperca or not. However, M. H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage* 1 (Cambridge 1974), 483-485 has taken a stand against this interpretation, suggesting that the female image on the coins of Acisculus should be interpreted as Europa on her bull (in a few instances the 'heifer' is visibly given masculine attributes; see also Poucet, 'Valéria Luperca et le «maillet guérisseur falisque»'). And yet elsewhere Europa is on the reverse of coins having a head of Jupiter on the obverse; the coins of Acisculus have the head of Apollo (possibly Apollo Soranus) on the obverse. At any rate, we should not forget that these coins were minted c. 45 BC: even if they were to reflect the story of Valeria Luperca, once again this would not necessarily imply that the story is an ancient one; it might have started circulating in the first century BC.

This is not the place for a discussion of the antiquity of the story; for our purposes, it is enough to ascertain whether Aristeides/[Plutarch] might have found this story in a source, or whether he invented it wholesale. While a definite answer is impossible, in this case [Plutarch] might have found the story somewhere (this is also the conclusion of Van der Valk, *Researches on the text and the scholia of the Iliad* 1, 409-10, although it has to be stated, *pace* Van der Valk, that this has no implications on the existence of a historian called Aristeides and writer of *Italika*). The hint to a ritual performed 'even to our days', although a widespread *topos*, is something that one would not expect in an invention (and indeed there was a cult of Juno in Falerii, although its details do not find an exact parallel in our narrative); the Greek story is unattested, and the couple of

stories *Parallela minora* 35A and B seem to be part of the relatively small group in which the Roman parallel is the core around which an invented Greek parallel is constructed. Moreover, comparison with the story of Valeria Dentata, narrated only by Pliny, *Natural history* 7.68-69, provides an excellent parallel for a plausible story concerning a Valeria, reported by an author who has never been suspected of inventing his stories (see on this story Köves-Zulauf, *Reden und Schweigen*, 207-227). Finally, there are a few other stories concerning the Valerii in [Plutarch], and they might all derive from a work on the *gens*.

286 F 11 - (11) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 5B = Moralia 306 F-307 A meta[[id="286" type="F" n="11"]]	
Subject: Religion: purification; oracle. Genre: foundation myth Historical Work: Italika book 40 Source date: 2nd C AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: ? 362 BC	Translation
Διὰ μέσης τῆς ἀγορᾶς ῥέων ὁ Τίβερις διὰ μῆνιν Ταρσίου[20] Διὸς μέγιστον ἀπέρρηξε χῶμα[21] καὶ πολλὰς οἰκίας ἐβύθισε. χρησμὸς δ' ἐδόθη λήξεσθαι, ἐὰν τὸ τιμι<ώτατ>ον[22] ἐμβάλωσι. τῶν δὲ χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον ἐμβαλόντων, Κούρτιος τῶν ἐπισήμων νέος τὸν χρησμὸν νοήσας καὶ λογισάμενος τὴν ψυχὴν τιμιωτέραν ἔφιππον ἑαυτὸν ἔρριψεν εἰς τὸ χάσμα καὶ τοὺς οἰκείους ἐξέσωσε τῶν κακῶν, ὡς Ἀριστείδης ἐν τεσσαρακοστῶι Ἰταλικῶν.	Because of the anger of Jupiter Tarsios (?) the Tiber, running through the middle of the Forum, broke open a dam and engulfed many houses. An oracle was given that this would end if they would throw in their most precious possession. As they were throwing in gold and silver, Curtius, one of the distinguished young men, understanding the oracle and reasoning that human life is more precious, hurled himself on horseback into the abyss, and saved his people from their miseries. So Aristeides in the fortieth book of his *Italian*

---

[20] Ταρσίου Διὸς ΦΑ² Π² (Διὸς is omitted by S) and the majority of editors, including De Lazzer (Jacoby prints it too, with a question mark ?); other manuscripts offer the readings ταρσιόυ δίου (FaA¹) and ταρσιδίου (JcgP). Naber, Nachstädt and Babbitt correct in Ταρ<πε>ίου; so also Boulogne 2002.

[21] χῶμα is the reading of all manuscripts, and is accepted by Bernardakis and Jacoby. Most editors prefer to read χάσμα (as below in the story): so already a second hand correction in Π, the Aldina, Xylander, Naber, Nachständt, De Lazzer (2000) and Boulogne (2002).

[22] The reading of all manuscripts is τίμιον, which is printed by De Lazzer 2000 and Boulogne 2002; τιμι<ώτατ>ον was proposed by Bernardakis, and has been accepted by Nachständt, Babbit and Jacoby. It offers a better sense, and it is the term present in the Greek parallel.

286 F 11 Commentary

There were three aetiological legends to explain the existence of the so-called *Lacus Curtius* (a small trapezoidal area in the forum, revered as a *mundus* and considered as a point of communication with the underworld) in the Roman forum.

Varro, *On the Latin language* 5.148-50, attributes the first version to Procilius; this is also the version accepted by Livy 7.6.1-6, and is closest to the version of [Plutarch], even though in Varro and Livy there is no mention of water (one must agree with Jacoby that the brevity of Varro makes it difficult to be certain of the identity of the two accounts. Certainly Varro does not highlight here the theme of 'the most precious thing', which is present, even though in a slightly different formulation, in Livy 7.6).

The second version, which Varro attributes to the *Annals* of Piso, locates the events at the time of the war against the Sabines that opposed Romulus and Tatius: the lake took its name from that of a strong Sabine warrior, Mettius Curtius, who advanced beyond the others, but managed to make his way back through the swamps. This story is also attested in Livy 1.12.2-13.5, and Plutarch, *Life of Romulus* 18, who adds that by unwittingly exposing the difficult ground, Mettius Curtius saved the Sabines from mortal danger. Note also the further mention of this story in Livy 7.6.5-6, who comparing it with the version he is relating, involving the *devotio* of Marcus Curtius, states that the more recent story is more credible; Ovid, *Fasti* 6.401-16 does not retell the story, but mentions the previous existence of a marshy lake. This version is probably a rationalization.

The third version Varro attributes to Cornelius and Lutatius (Catulus): the place was hit by lightning, and fenced in by decree of the senate. This happened, in 445 BC, during the consulship of Curtius, whose colleague was M. Genucius. This third version, which is not attested elsewhere, definitely sounds like a rationalization. The existence of a consul C. Curtius Chilo, whose colleague in 445 BC would have been a M. Genucius Augurinus, is uncertain; Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 378, points out the intriguing fact that Livy places his preferred version of the story of the lake Curtius (corresponding to the first one in Varro) in 362 BC, when Q. Servilius Ahala and L. Genucius were consuls; traces of the way in which the tradition was modified? Besides Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 377-8, see on all this R.M. Ogilvie, *A commentary on Livy*, books 1-5 (Oxford 1965), 75-8, G. Forsythe, *The Historian L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi and the Roman annalistic tradition* (Lanham - New York - London 1994), 157-70, and S.P. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy* vol. 2, books 6-7 (Oxford 1998), 96-102.

F 11 corresponds to the first version, recorded by Livy 7.6.1-6 (who dates the event to the year 362 BC), Dionysios of Halicarnassos, *Roman antiquities* 14.11, Valerius Maximus 6.5.2, and Zonaras 7.25.1-6 (Cassius Dio fr. 30.1-4), the latter, as Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 377 points out, almost with the same words as [Plutarch] (complete list of sources for the episode in F. Münzer, 'Curtius' n. 7, *RE* 4 (1901) 1864-5). It parallels a Greek story attributed to the *Metamorphoses* of Callisthenes (*BNJ* 291 F4 = 124 F 56), located in

Phrygia and concerning the jump into a chasm of a young man named Anchouros, son of Midas. The well-attested Roman story might have offered the model for the (not otherwise attested) Greek one. For the contrary view (that the Greek story is ancient, and that the Roman one has been influenced by it and is thus a relatively late one), see J. Poucet, *Recherches sur la légende sabine des origines de Rome* (Louvain 1967), 250-55, as well as Forsythe, *The Historian L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi and the Roman annalistic tradition*, 157-70, who stresses that the Livian (hence also [Plutarchan]) version of the story must be recent.

Stories of riding on horse-back into a chasm are actually relatively widespread (collection in H.S. Versnel, 'Self-sacrifice, compensation and the anonymous gods', in *Le sacrifice dans l'antiquité* (Fondation Hardt Entretiens 27, Genève-Vandoeuvres 1981), 152-6). Thus the Roman story may indeed well be a relatively recent one, but this need not imply that the Greek story of Anchouros offered the original model for the Roman story; both stories in the *Parallela minora* might be relatively recent, with the Roman one still being the more ancient of the two. Decision of course depends on one's identification of the Callisthenes mentioned as source of the Greek story, and more generally on one's view of the reliability of [Plutarch]'s source-references (on which issue see R. Hercher, *Plutarchi Libellus De Fluviis* (Lipsiae 1851), 17-24; F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* S.3, 8 (1940), 73-144; A. Cameron, *Greek mythography in the Roman world* (Oxford 2004), 127-34).
Forsythe, *The Historian L. Calpurnius Frugi*, 165-6, suggests for the Roman story a date in the 80's or 70's, and compares it with an event narrated by Plutarch, *Life of Sulla* 6.6-7, for which Plutarch gives as source the *Memoirs* of Sulla himself: 'he records that when he was sent out to the Social war with an army, a great chasm appeared in the earth near the precinct of Laverna, and much fire burst forth from it, and a bright flame soared skywards. The soothsayer then said that a brave man of striking appearance and well versed in statecraft would end the present turmoil of the state, and Sulla said that he was this person'. Such an event might have given the spur for the new twist on an ancient story.
 In a careful assessment of the relationship between the Greek and the Roman parallel in [Plutarch], Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy* vol. 2, 97-8 seems to incline (with Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 367-9 and 377-8) towards the priority of the Roman story; and this is the view I would take.

In *Parallela minora*, the aetiology of the place-name is lacking. Jacoby is probably right that here as in all other versions, the story formed the *aition* for the existence of the *lacus Curtius*, and that the aetiology was left out in the process of epitomization; yet the lack of aetiology is frequent in the *Parallela minora*, and giving them may not have been part of the prime purpose of [Plutarch].

The Τάρσιος Ζεύς is problematic. J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 25 points out the parallelism with the god of the Greek parallel story, as reported in Stobaios (διὰ μῆνιν Ἰδαίου Διὸς ~ διὰ μῆνιν Ταρσίου Διὸς). While the parallelism is interesting, Τάρσιος remains problematic (and to think of Zeus

Ἰδαῖος at Rome is not a solution). Jacoby refuses to correct Τάρσιος Ζεύς into Ταρπήιος, as most editors do: it is difficult to see how such a change would have occurred, and, as Jacoby says, the fact that the story of the *lacus Curtius* in Plutarch, *Life of Romulus* 18.1 follows immediately after that of Tarpeia cannot be used to support a correction here. A Juppiter Tarpeius is absent from cult (Jacoby calls him a 'zweifelhafte Erscheinung'), and is mentioned in literary texts only, possibly first by Propertius 4.1.7, and by Ovid, *Fasti* 6.34, *Metamorphoses* 15.866 and many others authors afterwards, while Livy 1.55.1 knows of a temple of Jupiter on the mons Tarpeius; list of passages in F. Mielentz, 'Tarpeius 1' RE 4 (1932) 2330. As Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 378 says, it would be good to know where the Zeus Tarsios in this text comes from, to understand something more of [Plutarch]'s sources. Tarsios is attested as an epiclesis of Apollo; but it is used also for Zeus (see Höfer, 'Tarsios', in W.H. Roscher, *Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* V (Leipzig 1915-24), 117-9); it has been suggested that we should connect the epiclesis with Ταρσ-ηνοί, the name of the Tyrrhenians, and with Ταρσ-ιμένη λίμνη, Lake Trasimenus, but also with the Anatolian Μήτηρ Ταρσηνή, with the Mysian river Τάρσιος (Strabo 13.587), with the Bithynian city of Tarsos and the Ταρσηνά χωρία also located in Bithynia, close to the river Sangarios. As Höfer says, if one assumes an Etruscan origin of the word in [Plutarch], then one might assume that the oriental and occidental attestations are related, through the Lydian origin of the Etruscans.

And yet all this seems extraordinarily complicated. It seems to me not impossible that [Plutarch] (or one of his sources) may have found in his source a mention of Zeus Tarpeios (whose existence seems to me less doubtful than Jacoby implies); and that he may have modified it into Tarsios, building on his knowledge of local Bithynian lore (there is much about the region in the *On rivers*), and playing on the sense of 'drying up' of the verb τέρσομαι (see *LSJ* s.v.: , 'to be or become dry, dry up', with *Etymologicum magnum* s.v. Τρασιά· Παρὰ τὸ τέρσω, τὸ ξηραίνω, τερσιὰ καὶ ταρσιά, ὡς παρὰ Σιμωνίδῃ· καὶ καθ᾽ ὑπέρθεσιν, τρασιά, and the *scholia recentiora* to Aristophanes, *Nubes* 50a, of similar import). Stephanos of Byzantion, s.v. Ταρσός, actually mentions a cult of Ζεὺς Τέρσιος, and connect the epithet with a story according to which the Tarsians were the first people to learn how to dry fruits for the winter. Greek etymologies are a phenomenon not infrequent in the late Republic; choice is at any rate more plausible than accidental corruption; and the epithet Τάρσιος for Zeus would function as a (learned?) comment on the god's activity within the context of the story.

The above applies all the more, since the version of [Plutarch] is one of the few in which water plays an important role. In Livy 7.1.6 the earth sinks and forms a chasm, for no particular reason ('whether owing to an earthquake or to some other violent force'); the same applies to Dionysios of Halicarnassos, *Roman antiquities* 14.11.1 and to Zonaras - Cassius Dio; in none of these authors does water play any role.
In general, and independently of the water issue, the three main versions of the story could not have functioned in the same way: as stressed by Jacoby (*FGrH* 3a, 378, the second version (that of Piso) could not assume a sudden catastrophe, and the locality is simply *palustris*, wet, because there is as yet no drainage. Plutarch, *Life of Romulus* 18, follows this version in its main lines, but strikes a compromise, allowing for a natural cause: the river had flooded out of his bed a few days earlier. The third version, which

focuses on the lightning, is a 'dry' one, and it requires no sacrifice. Similarly, [Plutarch]'s version and that of Cassius Dio mention an oracle, while the second and third versions have no use for it. However, as again pointed out by Jacoby, interestingly, the other representatives of the first version of the story diverge on this, with Procilius mentioning the *haruspices*, Livy a *vates*, and Dionysios of Halicarnassos interpreters of the *Libri sibyllini.*

286 F 12 - (13) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 11B = Moralia 308 D meta[[id="286" type="F" n="12"]]	
Subject: politics: tyranny, revolt. Historical Work: Italika Source date: 2nd C AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: 509 BC	Translation
Βροῦτος ὑπὸ πάντων ὕπατος χειροτονηθεὶς ἐφυγάδευσε τὸν Ὑπερήφανον Ταρκύνιον τυραννικῶς ἀναστρεφόμενον. ὁ δὲ ἐλθὼν εἰς Τούσκους ἐπολέμει Ῥωμαίοις. οἱ δὲ <Βρού> του υἱοὶ[23] τὸν πατέρα προδοῦναι ἠβουλήθησαν. ἐμπεσόντων δὲ *** τραχηλοκοπῆσαι[24], ὡς Ἀριστείδης Μιλήσιος ἐν Ἰταλικοῖς.	Brutus, having been unanimously elected consul, sent into exile Tarquinius the Proud, who was behaving despotically. The latter, having gone to the Etruscans, began to wage war against the Romans. But the sons of Brutus conspired to betray their father. Having however been detected, their heads were cut off. So Aristeides the Milesian in his *Italian History.*

286 F 12 Commentary

This is again a well-known story, which, in the *Parallela minora*, forms a pendant to the (otherwise unattested) story of Dareios and his son Ariobarzanes, attributed to Aretades of Cnidos (*BNJ* 285 F 1); this may be thus again a case in which the Roman story has provided the model for the Greek one (it certainly is also one of those instances in which the modern, Roman parallel is earlier than the ancient, Greek one).
The text has suffered in the transmission (see the apparatus), but the story is well-known, and there are no significant divergences within the tradition (see Livy 2.4-5, with R.M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy*, Books 1-5 (Oxford 1965), 241-7; Plutarch, *Life of Publicola* 1-6; Dionysios of Halicarnassos, *Roman antiquities* 5.8-13; Valerius Maximus 5.8.1), so that [Plutarch] will have kept probably to the accepted lines, although, as

[23] Integrated by Amyot and Xylander, followed by most editors, including Nachstädt, Jacoby, De Lazzer (2000), Boulogne (2002); Guarini, Dübner, Bernardakis and Babbitt print υἱοί, omitting <Βρού> του; the manuscripts have either τοῦσκοι or τούσκιοι.
[24] Lacuna pointed out by Xylander, followed by most editors, including Nachstädt. On the basis of the preceding Greek parallel, with has ἀγανακτήσας δ'ὁ πατὴρ ἐτραχηλοκόπησεν, Schlereth suggested a similar restoration here; along these lines, Babbitt prints ἐμφανέντας ἐτραχηλοκόπησεν, and Boulogne (2002) ἐμπεσόντων ἐτραχηλοκόπησεν.

Jacoby points out in his discussion of Poseidonios *FGrH* 87 F 40 (= Posidonius fr. 256 Kidd, Plutarch, *Brutus* 1), there will have been renewed discussions of family traditions concerning tyrannicide after Brutus' deed in 44 BC.

In terms of style, it is worth pointing out that the verb τραχηλοκοπέω, a fairly rare word, appears, in the form ἐτραχηλοκόπησεν or as here with an uncertain τραχηλοκοπῆσαι, in the conclusion of four parallels in a row: *Parallela minora* 11A (Aretades of Cnidos), 11B (here, Aristeides), 12A (Ctesiphon), and 12B (Aristeides again).

286 F 13 - (15) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 15B = Moralia 309 C meta[[id="286" type="F" n="13"]]	
Subject: military history: tactics; women Historical Work: Italika (book 5?) Source date: 2nd century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: last quarter of 8th C BC	Translation
Ταρπηία τῶν εὐσχημόνων παρθένων τοῦ Καπιτωλίου[25] φύλαξ, Ῥωμαίων πρὸς Σαβίνους[26] πολεμούντων, ὑπέσχετο τῶι Τατίωι δώσειν εἴσοδον εἰς τὸ Ταρπηίον ὄρος, ἐὰν μισθὸν λάβηι τοὺς ὅρμους, οὓς ἐφόρουν κόσμου χάριν. Σαβῖνοι δὲ ποιήσαντες[27] ζῶσαν κατέχωσαν, ὡς Ἀριστείδης Μιλήσιος ἐν Ἰταλικοῖς.	Tarpeia, one among the virgins of the nobility, guardian of the Capitol when the Romans were at war against the Sabines, promised Tatius that she would give him entry to the Tarpeian Rock if she received as pay the necklaces that they wore for adornment. The Sabines did that and buried her alive. So Aristeides the Milesian in his *Italian History*.

286 F 13 Commentary

The well-known Roman story of Tarpeia (list of main sources in S. Zimmermann, 'Tarpeia', *BNJ* 14 (2009), 147; the texts, with some further oriental parallels, are conveniently printed in A.H. Krappe, 'Die Sage von der Tarpeia', *Rheinisches Museum* 78 (1947), 249-67; see also N. Horsfall, 'From history to legend: M. Manlius and the geese', in J.N. Bremmer, N. Horsfall, *Roman Myth and Mythography* (London 1987), 68-70) is here offered as parallel to a much more obscure story of betrayal, in which the Ephesian noble virgin Demonike betrays her city to Brennos general of the Galatians, with the same results; this latter story is attributed by [Plutarch] to Cleitophon (*BNJ* 293 F1ab).

---

[25] The manuscripts unanimously give Καπετωλίου, which is accepted and printed by De Lazzer 2000; all other editors since Wyttenbach print the more frequently attested Καπιτολίου.

[26] Σαβίνους is a correction; ΦΠ have ἀλβανούς (and the Epitome ἀλβανῶν); but at the end of the story, the same manuscripts have Σαβῖνοι.

[27] ποιήσαντες is a proposal by Kurtz (and A.J. Kronenberg, *Mnemosyne* 52 (1924) 64), based on the use of the same participle (ποιησάντων) in the parallel Greek story, and accepted by Nachstädt, Jacoby, and Boulogne 2002; all codices have νοήσαντες, printed by the ancient editors, by Bernardakis, and now defended by De Lazzer 2000, 236-7 and 336 n. 144 (the Sabines 'understood'). Babbitt alone prints νήσαντες.

Plutarch, *Life of Romulus* 28, explicitly criticizes the version according to which Tarpeia was in charge of the Capitol, asserting that her father Tarpeius was in charge, and that the girl acted during an absence of the father (so also Appian, *Concerning the kings*, frr. 3 and 4 Viereck-Roos; Ovid, *Fasti* 1.261; Propertius 4.4.94). This implies at any rate that the story as told by [Plutarch] must have had some currency, and that it is not here the result of unthinking abbreviation (so already Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 379).

The story of the heroine who for love or greed betrays her city to the enemies is a topos: examples range from Leukophrye and Leukippos (Parthenios, *Love-sufferings* 5, who refer as source to Hermesianax), to Polycrite and Diognetos (Plutarch, *Moralia* 254B-F = *FGrH* 501 F 2; Parthenios, *Love-sufferings* 9, who refers to Theophrastos, F 626 Fortenbaugh, and Andriskos, *FGrH* 500 F 1; Polyainos, *Stratagems* 8.36), Nanis and Kyros (Parthenios, *Love-sufferings* 22, who refers for the story to Likymnios of Chios and Hermesianax), Peisidike and Achilles (Parthenios, *Love-sufferings* 21, who quotes a poem), Skylla and Minos (Aischylos, *Libation-bearers* 612-23, Apollodoros, *Library* 3.15.8, Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 8.1-151, Pausanias 2.34.7), Arne and Minos (Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 7.464-7), Komaitho and Amphitryon (Apollodoros, *Library* 2.4.7), and even Medea and Jason. See A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 335; J.L. Lightfoot, *Parthenius of Nicaea. The poetical fragments and the Erotika pathemata* (Oxford 1999), 397-8 for Leukophrye, 418-22 for Polycrite (with a specific comparison with Tarpeia), 496-507 for Peisidike and Nanis; general treatment of these stories, with focus on Tarpeia and the construction of its legend in Rome, in G. Forsythe, *The Historian L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi and the Roman annalistic tradition* (Lanham - New York - London 1994), 150-57). A fundamental discussion of how this topos works (and of its modifications / inversions) is offered by W. Burkert, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Berkeley - Los Angeles - London 1979), 72-77; Burkert in particular points out that a sexual tension is inherent in the tale's structure, whatever the explicit motivation.

Here, the explicit reason for betrayal is greed rather than love. It has been argued that love was first explicitly introduced in the Tarpeia story by Propertius (*Elegies* 4.4); the Greek elegist Simylos (quoted in Plutarch, *Life of Romulus* 17) had also treated the story, making love the reason for betrayal, but his activity is not securely dated (Plutarch offers only a *terminus ante*: see *Supplementum Hellenisticum* 724, and De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori*, 335-6; Jacoby *FGrH* 3a, 379; F. E. Brenk, 'Tarpeia among the Celts: Watery Romance, from Simylos to Propertius', *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 1 (1979) 166-74; G. Hutchinson, *Propertius. Elegies IV* (Cambridge 2006), 116-119, with ample bibliography). Whatever Simylos' date (note moreover that in Simylos Gauls, not Sabines, are the enemy: one wonders whether the parallel story of Brennos and Demonike in [Plutarch]'s *Parallela minora* 15 is not the result of a transposition and adaptation of Simylos' poem), the high frequency of love-stories in the *Parallela minora*, and even more importantly the fact that in the Greek parallel the girl, Demonike, is driven to betrayal by love, show that the choice of greed as a motive here is a deliberate choice – or else, that Aristeides' activity (or that of the source followed here by [Plutarch]) must be placed earlier than Propertius (and potentially Simylos).

The original version of the *Parallela minora* certainly gave (at least in most cases) a book-number; in this case, it is possible that the indication ε (book 5) has dropped out. So Jacoby, *FGrH* 3A, 166 (in the apparatus), who deduces this from the fact that Stobaios quotes a Greek story, corresponding to *Parallela minora* 15 A (i.e. a story placed just before ours), as from the fifth book of Cleitophon's *Italika*; the *Parallela minora* however give as source for that same story the first book of Cleitophon's *Galatika*, which is a much more likely work, since the story concerns the arrival of Gauls in Asia Minor. Hence, the inference that the fifth book of the *Italika* is a misplaced quote from the following story (this of course would imply that Stobaios, who actually cites exclusively Greek stories, knew all of the *Parallela*, both Greek and Roman stories, and chose to excerpt only the Greek ones); see also De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori*, 44-5.

The name of the heroine is, as so often in the *Parallela minora*, corrupt: ταρπεία is a marginal correction in the Basel edition of 1542, also proposed by Turnebus, and accepted by most ancient editors and all of the moderns; but the manuscripts have ταρσία (Φ), ταρπτησία (Π), and ταρμισία (the epitome; for details, see Jacoby's apparatus). The other significant variant concerns the name of the enemies: Σαβίνους was first suggested by Xylander in 1570, who is followed by all modern editors; but the manuscript tradition is unanimous in giving Ἀλβανούς (or Ἀλβανῶν in the slightly different formulation of the epitome Σ). We must here admit intentional variation (or original blunder), or else take this is an indication of how early corruptions entered the textual tradition of the *Parallela minora.*

286 F 14 - (16) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 16B = Moralia 309 E meta[[id="286" type="F" n="14"]]	
Subject: Military history: tactics. Women Historical Work: Italika Source date: 2nd Century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: ?673 BC	Translation
Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ Ἀλβανοὶ πολεμοῦντες τριδύμους προμάχους εἵλοντο, καὶ Ἀλβανοὶ μὲν Κουριατίους, Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ Ὡρατίους. συμβληθείσης δὲ τῆς μάχης οἱ Κουριάτιοι δύο τῶν ἐναντίων ἀνεῖλον, ὁ δὲ περίλοιπος φυγῆι προσποιητῆι συμμάχωι χρώμενος ἐφόνευσε καθ᾽ ἕνα τῶν ἐπιδιωκόντων. χαρέντων δὲ πάντων μόνη ἡ ἀδελφὴ οὐ συνεχάρη Ὡρατία <τῶι> τὸν κατηγγυημένον ἄνδρα Κουριάτιον ἀνηιρηκότι. ὁ δὲ ἐφόνευσε τὴν ἀδελφήν, ὥς φησιν Ἀριστείδης ὁ Μιλήσιος ἐν Ἰταλικοῖς.	The Romans and the Albans, while at war, chose triplets as their champions, the Albans the Curiatii, the Romans the Horatii. When the battle was joined, the Curiatii killed two of their opponents; but the survivor taking simulated flight as ally killed one after another his pursuers. Amid the universal rejoicing his sister Horatia alone did not rejoice with him; for he had slain her betrothed, Curiatius. So Horatius killed his sister. This Aristeides the Milesian narrates in his *Italian History.*

286 F 14 Commentary

The famous story of the fight of the triplet brothers Curiatii and Horatii, which supposedly took place at the time of Tullus Hostilius, during the conflicts between Rome and Alba Longa, forms here the parallel for an otherwise unknown Greek story, about a war between Phenea and Tegea which likewise involved a duel between triplet brothers on both sides and a sister in love with one of the enemy, and attributed to the *History of Arcadia* of Demaratos (*FGrH* 42 F 5 = *BNJ* 42 F2a and F2b). Jacoby (*FGrH* 3a, 379) is certainly right that in this case the Greek parallel has been invented on the basis of the Roman one (on the unobjectionable character of this Roman story see also C.J. Smith, 'The *Origo gentis Romanae*: facts and fiction', *BICS* 48 (2005), 97-1).

The narrative here attributed to the *Italian history* of Aristeides corresponds closely to that of Livy, 1.24-26 (the beginning is cited in Jacoby; in particular, Livy states that it is unclear to which people exactly the Horatii and the Curiatii belonged, but that he will follow the majority and consider the Horatii Romans, as is the case also in *Parallela minora*); a more rhetorical tratment of the story is given in Dionysios of Halicarnassos, *Roman antiquities* 3.12-22. On the tradition concerning this duel see F. Münzer, 'Horatius' 2, RE 8 (1913) 2322-7, as well as R.M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1-5* (Oxford 1965), 109-16. For an in-depth analysis of the meaning of the fight between two twin groups of triplets see F. Mencacci, 'Orazi e Curiazi: uno scontro tra trigemini gemelli', *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi di testi classici* 18 (1987), 131-48 (focusing mainly on Dionysios of Halicarnassos).

Jacoby (*FGrH* 3a, 380) points out that in [Plutarch] the *aition* of the *sororium tigillum* and of the monuments resulting from the killing by Horatius of his sister Horatia, to which ample space is given in the other narratives, is absent. But the provision of *aitia* of actual local features, monuments or names, although relevant in the *On rivers*, may not have been part of the main purpose of [Plutarch] in his *Parallela minora*.

286 F 15 - (17) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 17B = Moralia 309 F-310 A meta[[id="286" type="F" n="15"]]	
Subject: Religion Historical Work: Italika Source date: 2nd C AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: ? 241 BC	Translation
Ἄντιλος[28] ἀνὴρ τῶν ἐπισήμων πορευόμενος εἰς τὸ προάστειον ὑπὸ	Antylus, one of the noblemen, while on his way to the outskirts of the city, was held up

---

[28] The manuscript tradition has ἄντιλλος (Φ), ἄντυλος or ἀντύλος (Π, or the Planudean recensio) (with ἀντύλλος δ); the epitome has ἄρτυλος. ἄντυλος is printed by most editors (including Jacoby). Guarinus proposed to correct in μέτελλος, because the story told is very close to that narrated of Caecilius Metellus; he has been followed by Xylander, Amyot, and now De Lazzer (2000). Boulogne (2002) maintains Ἄντυλος, but

κοράκων ἐπεσχέθη παιόντων ταῖς πτέρυξι. φοβηθεὶς δὲ τὸν οἰωνὸν εἰς Ῥώμην ὑπέστρεψεν. ἰδὼν δὲ τὸ τέμενος τῆς Ἑστίας καιόμενον καὶ τὸ παλλάδιον ἁρπάσας ἐτυφλώθη, ὕστερον δ᾽ ἀνέβλεψεν ἐξιλασάμενος, ὡς Ἀριστείδης Μιλήσιος ἐν Ἰταλικοῖς.	by crows that struck at him with their wings. Frightened by the omen, he returned to Rome. And seeing that the shrine of Vesta was burning, he seized the Palladium, and was blinded. But later he regained his sight, having placated the goddess. So Aristeides the Milesian in his *Italian History*.

286 F 15 Commentary

This is a fascinating, but extremely problematic story; it forms the pendant of a Greek story attributed to Derkyllos (*BNJ* 288 F 3), and concerning the Trojan Palladion. According to the most widespread account, the Palladion was a small wooden statue of Athena fallen from the sky, and found by Ilos the son of Tros and founder of Troy; deposited in the temple of Athena, it became the guardian of the city, and had to be stolen by Odysseus and Diomedes for Troy to fall (more details and references in the commentary to Derkyllos, *BNJ* 288 F 3; see also N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 2: A Commentary* (Leiden - Boston 2008), 162-8). But according to other traditions, Diomedes or Aineias brought it to Italy (Diomedes: Cassius Hemina fr. 7 *HRR* = 8 Chassignet; Servius, *Commentary to the Aeneid* 2.166; Silius Italicus, *Punica* 13.51-78; Aineias: Pausanias, *Description of Greece* 2.23.5), first to Lavinium and thence to Rome (Dionysios of Halicarnassos, *Roman antiquities* 1.68-69). In Rome, the Palladion was kept, together with other talismans (the *pignora imperii*) in the temple of Vesta, where only the chief Vestal could enter (Servius, *Commentary to the Aeneid,* 7.188); see on all this F. Prayon, 'Palladion', *BNP* 10 (2007), 391-2, and the brilliant discussion in E. Champlin, *Nero* (Cambridge, Mass. - London 2003), 188-191, 321-2. Note that Dionysios of Halicarnassos, *Roman antiquities* 2.66.2-6, is not certain as to what was in the temple: only the fire, or also *sacra* brought by Aineias, or indeed the Palladion, and concludes that there are certainly holy things, besides the fire, but unknown to the general public. It is only from a relatively late date (at least from Cicero, see below) that the notion that the Palladion was kept in the temple of Vesta imposes itself: see O. Leuze, 'Metellus caecatus', *Philologus* 18 (1905), 99-100.

Difficulties begin with the name of the story's protagonist: a praenomen Antul(l)us/la is on record for a woman, in Republican time, and for some 14 men and a slave, as well as 15 women, in the imperial period (I. Kajanto, *The Latin cognomina* (Helsinki 1965), 175); there are no traces of either Antylus or Antul(l)us in the literary texts, although a Q. Antyllius, attendant of the consul Opimius, is attested for 121 BC (he is killed by supporters of the Gracchi).

---

on a wrong premise (at 436 n. 134 he states that 'aucune des autres versions ne faisant allusion au prodige des corbeaux, il n'y a pas lieu de changer le nom que donnent les manuscrits. Il s'agit d'un récit différent, bien que composé de matériaux communs'; but Valerius Maximus 1.4.5 mentions ravens for Metellus.) I propose Ἄντιλος of Φ, and suggest that the name is the counterpart of the name of the hero of the Greek parallel story (Ἶλος) – see below.

However, a very similar story is on record for Caecilius Metellus, consul in 251 BC, when he obtained a resounding victory over Hasdrubal at Panormos (see F 21); consul again in 247; Pontifex Maximus from 243 until his death in 221 BC; and dictator for conducting the elections in 224 (see J. van Ooteghem, *Les Caecilii Metelli de la République* (Namur 1967), 7-22). Of him Pliny, *Natural History* 7.43 (141) says that Lucius Metellus 'lived out his old age in blindness, having lost his sight in a fire when he snatched the Palladium to safety from the temple of Vesta': this fire happened in 241 BC. The story of the fire and of Metellus' action is certainly relatively ancient and trustworthy; it is mentioned by Varro in Augustinus, *On the city of God* 6.2; Cicero, *On behalf of Scaurus* 2.48; Livy, *Periocha* 19 (and Augustinus, *On the city of God* 3.18 and Orosius, *Histories against the pagans* 4.11); Dionysios of Halicarnassos, *Roman antiquities* 2.66; Ovid, *Fasti* 6.444-54; Valerius Maximus 1.4.5; Seneca the elder, *Controversies* 4.2; Pliny (as above); Juvenal, *Satires* 3.138 and 6.265; [Plutarch]; Ampelius, *Memorial book* 20.11; and the scholion to Juvenal 3.138.

However, not all the sources speak of blindness in connection with Metellus' deed; in fact, the only sources that speak of Metellus' blinding are Seneca the elder (as above); Seneca the younger, *On Providence* 1.5.2, and Pliny, Juvenal, [Plutarch] and Ampelius (as above). Similarly, not all sources state that Metellus saved the *Palladium*: Varro (in Augustinus, *On the city of God* 6.2), Dionysios of Halicarnassos 2.66 and Livy *periocha* 19 speak simply of *sacra* / τὰ ἱερά. Following a detailed analysis of the sources, O. Leuze, 'Metellus caecatus', 95-115, came to the conclusion that the story of the loss of sight was a relatively late invention, at any rate later than Cicero. This is a point on which almost everyone agrees: if Metellus had become blind, he could not have gone on being a priest, nor would he have been elected dictator *comitiorum habendorum causa* in 224 BC.

The earliest source to mention loss of sight is Seneca Rhetor, *Controversiae* 4.2: the story, which has the heading 'Metellus caecatus', is the theme for a rhetorical exercise. The passages of Cicero, Livy, Dionysius and Ovid (as above) show that they did not yet know of a blinding that resulted from Metellus' action. Leuze, 'Metellus caecatus', 104-107 concluded that the story had been invented for rhetorical purposes, possibly by Asinius Pollio or Junius Gallio, who, according to Seneca, had themselves discussed the rhetorical exercise 'Metellus caecatus' (see also Champlin, *Nero*, 188-191, 321-2). This part of the story would be an invention, to be dated to the mid-first century BC (Cicero could hardly have pronounced what we read in the peroration of the *On behalf of Scaurus*, 2.48, if there had been a story that Metellus had lost his sight – or even if the rhetorical exercise 'Metellus caecatus' had been already circulating).

Could a story invented as a rhetorical exercise have imposed itself? Here, it is worth pointing out that the Caecilii Metelli derived their ancestry from an ancestor Caeculus, 'so called because of his small eyes': the analogy with *caecus*, blind, must have been felt, in the name of Caeculus but also in that of the Caecilii (see N. Horsfall, 'Caeculus and the Foundation of Praeneste', in J.N. Bremmer and N. Horsfall, *Roman Myth and Mythography* (1987) 53, as well as A. Brelich, 'Il mito nella storia di Cecilio Metello', *SMSR* 15 (1939), 30-41). Brelich accepted that Metellus could not have lost his sight; however, he felt

that 'una tradizione così diffusa non possa risalire ad una invenzione arbitraria'. And thus, he suggested that the story was an earlier legend, resulting from the fact that the three main themes of the story (Vesta, fire, and blindness) are present in the mythology of the Caecilii.

It seems to me that the dichotomy between 'ancient legend arising out of the mythology of the *gens Caecilia*' and 'rhetorical invention' is overstated: surely the answer to the question, how could a story invented as a rhetorical exercise have imposed itself so widely, is to be found in the fact that the invention found strong roots in the mythology surrounding the Caecilii Metelli (again, see Horsfall, 'Caeculus and the Foundation of Praeneste'), while the arguments for a late date (in the first century BC) are too strong to be ignored. Moreover, the sudden onset of blindness was traditionally connected (ever since the story of Tiresias) with seeing what ought not to be seen (further references in M. Beagon, 'M. Sergius, Fortunae Victor', in G. Clark and T. Rajak (eds.), *Philosophy and power in the Graeco-Roman world* (Oxford 2002), 117). Finally, Cassius Dio 54.24.2 records a fire for the year 14 BC, that starting from the Basilica Paullii destroyed the temple of Vesta; in this context, he adds that the *sacra* were transported to the Palatine 'by the other vestals, for the chief vestal had been blinded' (καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ ἔς τε τὸ παλάτιον ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀειπαρθένων (ἡ γὰρ πρεσβεύουσα αὐτῶν ἐτετύφλωτο) ἀνακομισθῆναι). In this context, the allusion to the blindness of the chief Vestal will have been a reenactment of the story of Metellus' loss of sight, and at the same time will have worked towards reinforcing its credibility (see the excellent discussion of Champlin, *Nero*, 190-1 and 321 n. 30).

The version of the *Parallela minora* distinguishes itself from the other sources on the blindness of Metellus in two aspects: it states that ravens recalled him (this statement is also present in the scholion to Juvenal, 3.138); and it affirms that Metellus later recovered his sight.
Concerning the first point, Leuze, 'Metellus Caecatus', 106 n. 35 is certainly right in thinking that the loss of sight and the recall by birds are alternative versions (ravens are also present in Valerius Maximus 1.4.5 – but there Metellus does not lose his sight): because if indeed Metellus had been called back by divine will, then he should not have lost his sight. Leuze interpreted the presence of the two variants in [Plutarch] and in the scholion to Juvenal as indicative of the lack of critical sense of [Plutarch] and the scholiast. This may be so; but at least in the case of the *Parallela minora*, we must leave open the possibility that in the original version of the work, the two motives were mentioned as alternatives. At any rate, the presence of ravens in Valerius Maximus and in the scholion excludes the possibility that they may be an invention of [Plutarch]. (On the ravens as late intruders in the story see also Brelich, 'Il mito nella storia di Cecilio Metello', 32).

As for Metellus' recovery of his sight, uniquely attested in our story (if we assume that it concerns Metellus, although it names Antilos): Brelich, 'Il mito nella storia di Cecilio Metello', 32 ascribed the notion to [Plutarch]'s (or Aristeides') realisation that Metellus could not have gone on being a Pontifex had he been blind, and to his desire to solve the contradiction. (With an ingenuity that would have pleased Seneca the Elder,

Beagon, 'M. Sergius, Fortunae Victor', 117 suggests that the story concerning Metellus' blindness need not have been entirely fictitious, and that Metellus may have been only temporarily blind; see also M. Beagon, *The Elder Pliny on the human animal: Natural History Book 7* (Oxford 2005), 340).

At any rate, the twist is unique to the *Parallela minora*, and it must be due to the fertile imagination of either Aristeides or [Plutarch]. Brelich, 'Il mito nella storia di Cecilio Metello', 35 n. 5, adds that if the Aristeides referred to as source by [Plutarch] is indeed the author of the c. second century BC *Milesiaka*, and if the name Antilos is the one originally present in the story, then a Roman story concerning blindness after seeing the Palladion would have been already circulating, and would have been adapted to fit Metellus. This is however wildly implausible.

It seems to me that the twist by which the hero reacquires his vision, which is clearly a late element, as it must come after the story concerning Metellus' loss of sight was invented, might go together with the change in name, from Metellus (about whom the story, in its simpler form, must have been already circulating) to Antilos – unless Antilos is an error that entered the *Parallela minora* very early on in their transmission. In fact, the name Antilos might be explained in terms of a connexion with the parallel Greek story: the hero there is Ilos, who saves the Palladion of Ilion when a fire destroys the temple of Athena (the Greek parallel begins: ἐν Ἰλίῳ τοῦ ναοῦ κτλ; the Roman one Ἄντιλος ἀνὴρ κτλ). Is it too much to suggest that our hero is 'Ant-ilos'? Jacoby's comment (*FGrH* 3a, 380: 'ich bezweifle, ob wir in diesem buche das recht haben, Ἄντυλος in Μέτελλος (s. F 21) zu ändern; die billige änderung liegt palaeographisch nicht nahe': 'I doubt whether in this book we have the right to change *Antylos* in *Metellos*: this cheap solution is not palaeographically easy' implies that he considered the name Antylos a choice of [Plutarch]'s, although he refrained from proposing an interpretation of such a choice). Further, Nero's temporary loss of sight of in the temple of Vesta (Suetonius, *Nero* 19.1: 'For as he was making the round of the temples and had sat down in the shrine of Vesta, first the fringe of his garment caught when he attempted to get up, and then such darkness overspread his eyes that he could see nothing') may have provided a model for the story of Antilos' / Metellus' temporary (rather than final) loss of sight. If this last suggestion were true, then we would have a terminus post for the unique version of Metellus' loss and recovery of vision; we would also know something more of the *modus operandi* of [Plutarch] or his source here.

Beagon, 'M. Sergius, Fortunae Victor', 117 gives a number of useful references to stories where looking at something that ought not to be seen causes blindness; they may lie behind this story. See also Champlin, *Nero*, 321-2, who considers the whole 'an absurd farrago of patently invented stories purporting to substantiate other, sometimes well-attested, stories'; and, concerning the relationship between this story and its parallel, C. Faraone, *Talismans and Trojan Horses: Guardian Statues in Ancient Myth and Ritual* (New York and Oxford 1992), 137, who acknowledges that the Greek and Roman stories are obvious duplicates, but considers it impossible to tell which gave rise to which. Yet while the Trojan Palladion certainly had magical powers, the only source stating that it caused blindness at Troy is [Plutarch], *Parallela minora 17A = BNJ* Derkyllos 288 F 3 (and this, it should be stressed, within a rich tradition). It is much more likely that the Roman story formed the basis from which the Greek parallel was developed.

Subject: myth: mythical past Historical Work: Italika Source date: 2nd Century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: mythical past	Translation
Ἀμούλιος πρὸς Νομίτορα τὸν ἀδελφὸν τυραννικῶς διακείμενος τὸν μὲν υἱὸν Αἴνιτον[29] ἐπὶ κυνηγίαι ἀνεῖλε, τὴν δὲ θυγατέρα Σιλουίαν ἢ Ἰλίαν τῆς Ἥρας(?) ἱέρειαν ἐποιήσατο. ταύτην Ἄρης ἐγκύμονα ποιεῖ· ἡ δ' ἔτεκε διδύμους ὡμολόγησέ τε τῶι τυράννωι τὴν ἀλήθειαν. ὁ δὲ φοβηθεὶς ἀμφοτέρους κατεπόντισε, βαλὼν παρὰ τὰς ὄχθας τοῦ Θύμβρεως. οἱ δὲ προσηνέχθησαν ἐν τόπωι, ἔνθα λύκαινα ἦν φωλεύουσα νεοτόκος· καὶ τοὺς μὲν σκύμνους ἔρριψε, τὰ δὲ βρέφη ἔτρεφε. Φαῦστος(?) δὲ ποιμὴν αὐτόπτης γενόμενος τοὺς παῖδας ἀνέτρεψε, καὶ τὸν μὲν Ῥῶμον, τὸν δὲ Ῥωμύλον προσηγόρευσε, τοὺς κτίστας Ῥώμης, ὡς Ἀριστείδης Μιλήσιος ἐν τοῖς Ἰταλικοῖς.	Amoulios, behaving tyrannically towards Numitor his brother, killed Ainitos, the latter's son, in a hunt, and made his daughter Silvia or Ilia a priestess of Hera. But Ares makes her pregnant. She gave birth to twins and acknowledged the truth to the tyrant; he, frightened, attempted to drown both children, throwing them from the banks of the Tiber. But they were carried to a place where a she-wolf that had recently whelped had her den. She abandoned her cubs and suckled the children. A shepherd, Faustus, having witnessed this event reared the children, and named them Rhomos and Rhomulos, the founders of Rome, as Aristeides the Milesian in his *Italian History*.

286 F 16a Commentary

See commentary to F 16b.

Subject: Myth; mythical past. Historical Work: unknown (Italika?) Source date: 6 C AD Historian's date: unknown	Translation

---

[29] Αἴνιτον all manuscripts; Jacoby puts a question mark besides the name, comparing in apparatus the Αἰγέστην of Tzetzes, schol. Lycophr. *Alex.* 1232, the Αἴγεστον of Dionysios of Halicarnassos 1.76.2 and the Ἔγεστον of Appian, *Concerning the kings* fr. 1.5 Viereck-Roos. De Lazzer 2000 and Boulogne 2002 stick to the manuscript tradition.

<Τ>ῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ μνήμη Ῥέμου <καὶ Ῥωμύ>λου· ὅτε Ἀμού<λιος πρὸς Νομίτο>ρα τυραννικῶς διακείμε<νος> τὸν μὲν υἱὸν <αὐτοῦ ἀνεῖλε, τ>ὴν δὲ θυγατέρα ἱερα<τεύειν προσ>έταξε· τῆς δ<ὲ τεκούσης, ὡς λέγου>σιν, ἐξ Ἄρεος, δεί<σας αὐ>τὸς καταποντωθῆναι προσ<έταξε τὰ βρ>έφη· τῶν δὲ δο<ρυφό>ρων παρὰ τὰς ὄχθας τοῦ Θύβριδος <ἐκθεμ>ένων αὐτά, λ<ύκαι>να προσελθ<οῦ>σα τὰς θηλὰς αὐτ<οῖς> προσένειμε· π<οιμ>ὴν δὲ τοῦτο θεασάμενος ἀν<έλ>αβε τοὺς παῖδας καὶ ὡς ἰδίο<υς> ἀν>έθρεψεν, οἳ καὶ κτίζουσ<ι τὴ>ν Ῥώμην. ταὐτὸν καὶ παρὰ Ζωπύρῳ τῷ <Βυζαντίῳ>.	On the following [day], remembrance of Rhemos and Rhomulos; when Amoulios behaving tyrannically towards Numitor killed his son, and ordered that the daughter be a priestess; but she, having given birth, as they say, from Ares, fearing him ordered to throw the babies into the water; but the guards exposed them on the banks of the Tiber, and a she-wolf approaching them offered them her teats. A shepherd having seen this took the children and brought them up as his own, and they found Rome. This same story is also in Zopyros of Byzantion.

286 F 16b Commentary

A comparison of the versions of *Parallela minora* and Lydos is in J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 71-4. The narrative of *Parallela minora* is fairly detailed: it gives the names of all characters, it mentions Silvia's acknowledgment of the birth to the king, and it offers the detail of the abandonment of her own cubs by the she-wolf; it is however strangely compressed when narrating the decision to throw the children in the waters of the Tiber (a passage difficult to translate: comparison with Lydos shows what the original version might have been like). Lydos' version is more concise, but it preserves a trace of a discussion about the paternity of the twins, present also in Livy 1.4.2 (among others), but absent in the *Parallela minora*. It is impossible to say if this is an insertion by Lydos, or if it was present in the original, ampler version of the *Parallela minora* (see Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 381). That Lydos acted rather freely is shown by the fleeting reference, without further details, to 'the same story' being also narrated by Zopyros: Zopyros is indeed named as the source of the Greek parallel (36A, *Moralia* 314 EF, a story unattested elsewhere, and again, *pace* M. Van der Valk, *Researches on the text and the scholia of the Iliad* 1 (Leiden 1963), 410, whose only argument is that wolves are at home in Arcadia, clearly invented to fit the Roman story - incidentally, the parallel 36A should be added as F 2 in *FGrH* / *BNJ* Zopyros 336, after F 1 = Stobaios *Florilegium* 4.20.75 ≈ [Plutarch], *Parallela minora* 34A, *Moralia* 314 AB where, it should be pointed out, the name of Zopyros does not appear). For our story Lydos does not give his source.

Jacoby in his apparatus mentions the possibility that Tzetzes, *Commentary to Lycophron's Alexandra* 1032, may also derive from [Plutarch]; but the story was so well-known that, in the absence of specific connections, certainty is impossible.

The narrative of *Parallela minora* is for this story very close to the vulgate (references to the passages in Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 381; ample discussion of the evolution of the story and of its many variations in T.P. Wiseman, *Remus. A Roman Myth* (Cambridge 1995), and 136

for a passing reference to F 16b). For this reason, Jacoby considers that we are authorized to correct the names in *Parallela minora* on the basis of the vulgate, even where Lydos does not offer any support. Thus, he considers Ainitos certainly corrupt, and Faustus and Hera most likely corrupt as well. Indeed, in all of the tradition the shepherd is called Faustulus and not Faustus, and one can see how such a corruption might have entered the tradition. The case of Hera is less clear-cut. In the traditional account, Silvia was forced to become a vestal, so that she should remain a virgin; but the error of a copyist writing Hera instead of Hestia is not so easy to accept, and we may be facing a variant. As for Ainitos, it could indeed be a corruption of an original Αἴγεστος; but with a text such as this one, a variant is not something unexpected. (See De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori,* 358, who also stresses the unity in this of the manuscript tradition.)

Jacoby's very full commentary (*FGrH* 3a, 381-2) discusses the most important points; his main contention, that considering the amount of variants within the vulgate, the original version of the *Parallela minora* must have been much more detailed, is a reasonable one, all the more since some variants (for instance as regards the name of Silvia) are still present in the text of the *Parallela minora*.

286 F 17a - * (12) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 4B = Moralia 306 DE meta[[id="286" type="F" n="17"]]	
Subject: Military history; battle Historical Work: unknown (Italika?) Source date: 2nd Century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: last quarter of 3nd C BC?	Translation
Ῥωμαῖοι πρὸς Ποινοὺς πόλεμον ἔχοντες ἔπεμψαν τριακοσίους καὶ στρατηγὸν Φάβιον Μάξιμον. συμβαλὼν δ' ἀπέβαλε παντάς, αὐτὸς δὲ καιρίως τρωθεὶς μεθ' ὁρμῆς ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀννίβαν ἠνέχθη, καὶ καθελὼν τὸ διάδημα συναπέθανεν αὐτῶι, καθάπερ ἱστορεῖ Ἀριστείδης ὁ Μιλήσιος.	The Romans, being at war with the Carthaginians, sent three hundred men and Fabius Maximus as their general. He attacked the enemy and lost all his men, but he himself, although mortally wounded, with a mad rush reached Hannibal and knocking down his crown died together with him, as Aristeides the Milesian narrates.

286 F 17a Commentary

See commentary to F 17b.

286 F 17b Ioann. Lyd. De mens. fr. 5 p. 179, 17 Wü	
Subject: Military history: battle Historical Work: unknown (Italika?) Source date: 2nd Century AD Historian's date: unknown	Translation

ὅτι Ῥωμαῖος ὁ Φάβιος καιρίως τρωθεὶς ἐπὶ τοῦ πρώτου Φοινικικοῦ πολέμου μετ᾽ ὀργῆς ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀννίβαν ἐνεχθεὶς καὶ ἁρπάσας αὐτοῦ τὸ διάδημα ἐναπέθανεν αὐτῷ.	That Fabius the Roman, mortally wounded during the first Punic war, went against Hannibal in his fury and grabbing his crown died with him.

286 F 17b Commentary

This is a very odd story. Lydos offers a shorter version, but gives one detail absent in *Parallela minora*, the statement that the events took place during the first Punic war. Apart from this, his wording is very close to that of the *Parallela minora*: it is clear that here the *Parallela minora* and Lydos derive from an earlier and ampler version of the story (see discussion in F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* S.3, 8 (1940), 119-20).

To this same story must also refer also the passage of Aelian quoted in the Suda, τ 207 Adler, s.v. ταινίαι (= Aelian fr. 117 Hercher ed. Teubner 1866 = fr. 188 Hercher ed. Didot 1858 = 120 Domingo-Forasté):
Αἰλιανός· ὁ δὲ ἐκρυέντος τοῦ αἵματος περιτραπεὶς ἐντάφιον ἑαυτῷ τρόπον τινὰ τὸ δυστυχὲς ταινίδιον ἐπήγετο. περὶ Μαξίμου λέγει τοῦ Ῥωμαίων στρατηγοῦ, τοῦ ἀποσπάσαντος ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς Ἀννίβου τὸ στέμμα.
Aelian: and he, while his blood was flowing out, procured for himself the unlucky diadem, turning it into a shroud. He speaks of Maximos the general of the Romans, who tore the crown from Hannibal's head.

Interestingly, while Lydos, notwithstanding the differences indicated above, is very close to the *Parallela minora*, the passage in Aelian is significantly different, both in the wording (ταινίδιον Aelian, στέμμα the gloss of whoever was discussing this passage, but nowhere διάδημα as in [Plutarch] and Lydos) and in the rhetorical elaboration (Aelian is much more dramatic: cf. the use of ἐκρυέντος τοῦ αἵματος to indicate that death was close, and even more the metaphorical turning of the tainia into a shroud). Important is also the fact that in Aelian the names are not given (the fragment ends with ἐπήγετο); the names are part of a summary, by an author who may have read them in Aelian, but who may also have known the versions of *Parallela minora* and Lydos). Aelian might thus here be narrating a slightly different story from that recounted in *Parallela minora* and Lydos. (In a note to the text of the Didot edition, R. Hercher, p. 452 ad fr. 188, states: 'Respexit Aelianus parallelorum minorum c. 4'; the connection had already been noticed by D. Wyttenbach, *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia* VII (Oxonii 1821) 81, who however seems to me to have taken it to show that the story existed independently: 'huiusmodi tamen quid de Poenorum duce Hannibale et Romanorum Fabio Maximo traditum fuisse colligitur ex fragmento Aeliani apud *Suida* [the fragment follows] quibus versis hand notulam addit lexicographus [follow the comment from περὶ to στέμμα]'. Wyttenbach further recognized that the Roman 'mendaciolum' recalls the story of the 300 Fabii to the Cremera; but he advanced an interesting explanation for the confusion, the fact that, according to Polybios, 36.5.8-9, in 149 BC Q. Fabius

Maximus (Aemilianus) as *praetor* received 300 Carthaginian hostages, and brought them from Lylibaion to Rome.

In at least one other case, the *Parallela minora* and Aelian (once again through the *Suda*) are the only sources to attest a specific story, interestingly a story also concerning the Punic wars (the main heroes are Metellus and Hasdrubal), and also attributed by *Parallela minora* to Aristeides (see below, F 21). There too, there are small differences (mainly concerning the names). The coincidence is striking. It might be worth looking further into the relationship between *Parallela minora* and Aelian, to see whether *Parallela minora* (possibly in the earlier and ampler version) might be the source of Aelian, or whether we must admit an independent common source (this would be important for understanding [Plutarch]); but this is something that is not possible in this context (L. Prandi, *Memorie storiche dei Greci in Claudio Eliano* (Rome 2005) offers a useful table listing all fragments of Aelian preserved in the *Suda*, but is of no help for assessing the relationship between Aelian and the *Parallela minora*; see also the discussion below, F 21).

The mention of Hannibal, without further specifications, makes one think of the second Punic war; the Roman general would then be Quintus Fabius Maximus Cunctator. However, neither Hannibal nor Fabius died in the war, and certainly not as described. Moreover, Lydos explicitly mentions the first Punic war. The Hannibal in question should in this case be an earlier one: possibly the Hannibal senior mentioned by Orosios, *Histories against the Pagans* 4.7.5-8.4. He however died stoned by his soldiers, in a mutiny following a naval defeat.
Moreover, the detail in *Parallela minora* concerning the collective death of the three hundred men sent with Maximus brings to mind the traditions about the death of the three hundred Fabii at the Cremera river: but this is an event dated by the tradition to 477 BC (Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 382; A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 321). Again, it is hard not to conclude that something strange is going on here. The Greek parallel, concering Leonidas and the 300 at Thermopylae, does not help, since it too is rather unusual, in its content, but also in the source reference, since it belongs to Aristeides too, see F 20.

F. Cassola, 'Il diadema di Annibale', *AAEC* XII (1961-63), 191-94 offers a most sensible analysis of the narrative of the three sources. For him, the intended context must have been the second Punic war (the reference to the first by Lydos he considers simply a blunder), with as the two main characters Hannibal Barca and Fabius Maximus Cunctator; the story does not go back to a historiographical tradition, but is part of the genre of the pseudo-historical novel. [Plutarch] (and Aelian) would have found the story in one, or more, repertories of similar anecdotes. That there were pseudo-historical narratives concerning the Punic war already at an early date is shown by the so-called 'Hannibal papyrus', a forged letter by Hannibal to Athens, possibly composed in the mid-second century BC (P. Hamb. 129, first edited by R. Merkelbach, 'nr. 129: Anthologie fingierter Briefe', in *Griechische Papyri der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek*, Hamburg 1954, 51-74; for the traditional date of c. 185 BC, i.e. almost contemporary to the events, and the evaluation as historical propaganda, see

e.g. S. Lancel, *Hannibal* (Malden 1999; French edition Paris 1995), 208; D. Campanile, 'Del bere sangue di toro e della morte di Annibale', *Chiron* 30 (2000), 117-129 (128-9 on the papyrus letter); L. Pasqualetto, 'Il papiro di Annibale', *Anemos* 1 (2000), 185-204, reads the papyrus as an example of anti-Roman Mithridatic propaganda and suggests a date around 70 BC; note also J.-D. Gauger, 'Orakel und Brief: zu zwei hellenistischen Formen geistiger Auseinandersetzung mit Rom', in C. Schubert, K. Brodersen (eds.), *Rom und der griechische Osten* (Stuttgart 1995), 64-67, who sees in the letter a school exercise, and Ch.G. Leidl, 'Historie und Fiktion. Zum Hannibalbrief (P. Hamb. 129)', in Schubert and Brodersen (eds.), *Rom und der griechische Osten*, 151-69, who speaks of 'entertainment-literature'. However one may interpret the papyrus, Càssola is clearly right when he stresses that the Barcids tried to present themselves as kings, for instance on coins.

286 F 18 - * (14) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 12B = Moralia 308 E meta[[id="286" type="F" n="18"]]	
Subject: military history: discipline Historical Work: unknown (Italika?) Source date: 2nd Century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: 340 BC?	Translation
Ῥωμαῖοι πρὸς Σαμνίτας πόλεμον ἔχοντες ἐχειροτόνησαν Μάλιον τὸν Ἐπιτάκτην ἐπικληθέντα. οὗτος διὰ χειροτονίαν ὑπατικὴν εἰς Ῥώμην πορευόμενος τῶι υἱῶι προσέταξε μὴ συμβαλεῖν. οἱ δὲ Σαμνῖται μαθόντες βλασφημίαις ἐξουδένιζον τὸν νεανίαν· ὁ δὲ ταραχθεὶς ἐνίκησεν· Μάλιος δὲ στεφανώσας τῆς νίκης, ἐτραχηλοκόπησεν τῆς παραβάσεως, καθάπερ ἱστορεῖ Ἀριστείδης Μιλήσιος.	When the Romans were engaged in war against the Samnites, they appointed general Manlius, called Imperiosus. As he was journeying to Rome for the consular elections, he ordered his son not to engage the enemy. But the Samnites having learned of this insultingly called the youth a nobody. He was provoked and defeated them, but Manlius having crowned him for the victory cut off his head because of his transgression, as Aristeides the Milesian relates.

286 F 18 Commentary

The story of the punishment inflicted by Titus Manlius Torquatus Imperiosus on his victorious son is a famous one; in [Plutarch], it forms the parallel to the otherwise unattested story of the punishment of his son by Epameinondas for a similar action (a story attributed to Ctesiphon, *BNJ* 294 F 1). Behind the Roman story, which finds numerous parallels in Roman tradition, from the punishment by Brutus of his sons, accused of treason, cf. above F 12, to the deed of A. Postumius Tubertus, who killed his son who had broken the ranks (Livy 4.29.5-6, a story very similar to that of Manlius), lies the institution of *patria potestas*: see S.P. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy* vol. 2, books 7-8 (Oxford 1998), 439, with further bibliography. U. Walter, '«Ein Ebenbild des Vaters». Familiale Wiederholungen in der historiographischen Traditionsbildung der römischen

Republik', *Hermes* 132 (2004), 406-25, discusses the theme of the severity of the Manlii, as it repeats itself through following generations.

Even for a story as famous as this one, the tradition diverged (see Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 382, as well as A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 332). The version of the *Parallela minora* is close to that of Dionysios of Halicarnassos (15.3,10-4) in making the Samnites the enemy; in Livy 8.7, Valerius Maximus 2.7.6, and Cassius Dio fr. 35 p. 90 Boissevain (Zonaras 7.26.3-5), the episode takes place at the time of the war against the Latins, in 340 BC (for Livy's treatment see Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy* vol. 2, books 7-8, 436-51, with list of the main sources at 436 – *Parallela minora* is however not discussed). Sallustius, *The war with Catiline*, 52.30 locates the deed at the time of a war against the Gauls; he may have been misled by the famous story of the duel between Manlius and a Gaul, which resulted in Manlius being given the *cognomen* Torquatus (Livy 7.10; Sallustius' passage presents also another slip, since it gives Manlius the *praenomen* Aulus, rather than Titus). Note however that Dionysios of Halicarnassos commits the same slip, if a slip it is, when in 8.79.2, in a list of Romans who punished their own sons with death for their offenses, he mentions the incident as happening during the Gallic war.

Parallela minora is also close to Dionysios of Halicarnassos (8.79.2) and Cassius Dio in mentioning a crowning before the decapitation, a most sensational presentation of the story; this Livy omits (excellent discussion of the points on which sources agree or disagree in Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy* vol. 2, books 7-8, 438). But *Parallela minora* is unique in positing an absence of the father, and in making the son substitute in supreme command during the father's absence: elsewhere, the son is simply the commander of a small unit of cavalry (a *turma*), who disattends the command not to fight *extra ordinem*.

286 F 19 - * (18) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 18B = Moralia 310 B meta[[id="286" type="F" n="19"]]	
Subject: military history: war; religion: ritual Historical Work: unknown Source date: 2nd Century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: 340 BC and 295 BC	Translation
Πούπλιος Δέκιος Ῥωμαῖος πρὸς Ἀλβανοὺς πολεμῶν ὄναρ εἶδεν, ἐὰν ἀποθάνηι, ῥώμην προσποιήσειν Ῥωμαίοις. ἐλθὼν οὖν εἰς μέσους καὶ πολλοὺς φονεύσας ἀνηιρέθη. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Δέκιος ἐν τῶι πρὸς Γάλλους πολέμωι τοὺς Ῥωμαίους διέσωισεν, ὡς Ἀριστείδης Μιλήσιος.	Publius Decius the Roman as he was fighting against the Albans had a dream, that if he died, he would give strength to the Romans. He thus went in the middle and after having killed many was himself killed. Similarly his son Decius saved the Romans in the war against the Gauls, as Aristeides of Miletos narrates.

286 F 19 Commentary

The famous story of the *devotio* of the Decii is presented as a parallel to the story of the self-sacrifice of Kodros (*Parallela minora* 18 A, attributed to Sostratos (*BNJ* 23 F2). On *devotio*, a measure in which a magistrate with *imperium* consacrates himself and the enemy to death, and then charges against the enemy meeting death, see H.K. Versnel, 'Self-sacrifice, compensation and the anonymous gods', in *Le sacrifice dans l'Antiquité*, Entretiens Hardt 27 (Vandoeuvres 1981), 135-85; S.P. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy* vol. 2, books 7-8 (Oxford 1998), 477-86 and 501; and A. Feldherr, *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History* (Berkeley - Los Angeles - London 1998), 85-92.

Livy 8.8.19-11.1 offers a detailed narrative of the first devotio, that of Publius Decius at the battle of the Veseris in 340 BC (in Livy, the account follows almost directly on the story of the punishment of young Manlius, see above, F 18); as for the second devotio, it took place in 295 BC, at the battle of Sentinum (Livy, 10.24.1-31.15, with S.P. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy* vol. 4, book 10 (Oxford 2005), 290-1). The evidence for the devotio of another Decius, the grandson of P. Decius Mus, at Ausculum in 270 BC is slim (see Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy* vol. 2, books 7-8, 477-80); its absence in the list given by [Plutarch] is thus not surprising.

Parallela minora offers only a summary narrative, which on the whole seems to correspond with the way in which the *devotio* was performed. Jacoby (*FGrH* 3a, 382) contrasts the description of Decius' *devotio* given in Plutarch, *Whether vice be sufficient to cause unhappiness* (*Moralia* 499 C): 'The Roman general Decius... built a funeral pyre between the camps and, to fulfil a vow, sacrificed himself to Kronos on behalf of Rome's supremacy'; indeed the contrast is striking. Jacoby further stresses the presence of a dream in the Roman story, against that of an oracle (χρησμός) in the Greek parallel, a distinction that is at work also in the stories of Erechtheus' sacrifice of his daughter, prompted by an oracle (*Parallela Minora* 20 A≅ Stobaios 3.39.33 ≅ Lydos, *De mens.* 4, 147, who pointedly states οὐκ ὀνείρῳ ἀλλὰ χρησμὸς πεισθείς, = Demaratos *FGrH* 42 F 4, *BNJ* 42 F 1), and of Marius' sacrifice of his daughter Calpurnia, prompted by a dream (*Parallela Minora* 20 B). But against Jacoby's notion that the dream corresponds to the Roman way of presenting such situation ('der traum entspricht der römischen darstellung'), it must be pointed out that these four instances are slightly different (the sacrifice of a daughter is not the same as *devotio*); and that technically the *devotio* is not a vow, nor a sacrifice. On the contractual nature of the Roman *devotio,* and on its difference from Greek similar practices, see E. Flaig, 'Amnesie und Amnestie in der griechischen Kultur. Das vergessene Selbstopfer für den Sieg im Athenischen Bürgerkrieg 403 v. Chr.', *Saeculum* 42 (1991), 129-49, as well as G. Weber, *Kaiser, Träume und Visionen in Prinzipat und Spätantike* (Stuttgart 2000), 255-7; the presence of a dream makes the devotio of P. Decius Mus a unique example of the Greek model of *devotio*, in which the god first gives a sign, and the human assents. It seems thus difficult to valorize in this instance the distinction dream/oracle as reflecting a Roman / Greek outlook; it is however true that the distinction is markedly present in [Plutarch]'s work, and this is historiographically, if not historically, significant. Further on the pairing of Kodros and Decius see Ceccarelli, commentary to Sostratos *BNJ* 23F 2.

The version of [Plutarch] distinguishes itself from the others in giving as context for the *devotio* of P. Decius Mus a war against the Albans (Livy and all other sources have the Latins; Tzetzes, Commentary to Lycophron's *Alexandra* 1378, mentions 'Samnites, Tyrrhenians and other populations': as Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 383 suggests, most probably Tzetzes here puts together the *devotiones* of Decius father and son); as for his son, Gauls were only a part of the coalition, comprising Samnites, Etruscans, Umbrians, and their Gallic allies, that fought against the Romans at Sentinum in 295 BC. But in Livy's narrative of the moments immediately preceding the *devotio* (10. 28), although the Samnites are initially mentioned with the Gauls, it is mainly the Gauls that cause the Roman left wing, under the command of Decius, to panic, and thus they are responsible for Decius' decision. Decius Mus is also mentioned in *Parallela minora* 10B (source: Kleitonymos), interestingly in the right historical context, as general in a war with the Latins – the story that follows is unattested, and does not concern Decius.

On the repetition of the model offered by the father, see U. Walter, '«Ein Ebenbild des Vaters». Familiale Wiederholungen in der historiographischen Traditionsbildung der römischen Republik', *Hermes* 132 (2004), 406-25.

286 F 20a - (21) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 4A meta[[id="286" type="F" n="20" n-mod="a" tgroup="3, 1"]]	
Subject: Persian wars, battle Historical Work: Persika book 1 Source date: 2nd Century AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: 480 BC	Translation
Περσῶν μετὰ πεντακοσίων μυριάδων ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐρχομένων, Λεωνίδας ἅμα τριακοσίοις ἐπέμφθη εἰς Θερμοπύλας ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων. εὐωχουμένων δ' ἐκεῖ ἐπέκειτο τὸ τῶν βαρβάρων πλῆθος· καὶ ὁ Λεωνίδας εἶπεν ἰδὼν τοὺς βαρβάρους 'οὕτως ἀριστᾶτε ὡς ἐς Ἅιδου δειπνήσοντες'. καὶ ὁρμήσας κατὰ τῶν βαρβάρων καὶ πολλοῖς περιπαρεὶς δόρασιν ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὸν Ξέρξην καὶ τὸ διάδημα ἀφείλετο. οὗ ἀποθανόντος ὁ βάρβαρος τέμνει τὴν καρδίαν καὶ εὗρε δασεῖαν ὡς Ἀριστείδης ἐν πρώτηι(?) Περσικῶν.	When the Persians were marching with five million men against Greece, Leonidas was sent by the Spartans to Thermopylae with three hundred men. While they were eating and drinking there, the barbarian host attacked them; and when Leonidas saw the barbarians, he said, 'Eat your lunch now as if you were to dine in the other world.' And having rushed against the barbarians and having been pierced by many spears, he made his way up to Xerxes and snatched off his diadem. When he was dead the barbarian cut out his heart and found it covered with hair. So Aristeides in the first book of his *Persian History*.

286 F 20a Commentary

See commentary to F 20c.

286 F 20b - Stobaeos Anthologus 3, 7, 65 meta[[id="286" type="F" n="20" n-mod="b" tgroup="3, 2"]]	
Subject: Major wars: Persian wars; Major battles: Thermopylae. Historical Work: Persika book 3 Source date: 5 C AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: 5 C BC	Translation
Ἀριστείδου ἐν τῶι γ̄ Περσικῶν. Περσῶν μετὰ πεντακοσίων μυριάδων ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα φερομένων, Λακεδαιμόνιοι τριακοσίους εἰς Θερμοπύλας ἔπεμψαν, στρατηγὸν αὐτοῖς δόντες Λεωνίδαν. οὗτος τὸ ἐπερχόμενον θεασάμενος τὸ πολεμίων πλῆθος εὐωχουμένοις εἶπε τοῖς συμμάχοις 'οὕτως ἀριστᾶτε, ὦ τριακόσιοι, ὡς ἐν Ἅιδου δειπνήσοντες'. ἐπιφανέντων οὖν τῶν βαρβάρων, Λεωνίδας πολλοῖς περιπεπαρμένος δόρασι μεθ' ὁρμῆς ἐπὶ Ξέρξην ἠνέχθη, καὶ περιελόμενος αὐτοῦ τὸ διάδημα πρὸ τῶν τραυμάτων κατέσχε, καὶ αἱμορραγήσας ἐξέπνευσεν. ἀνατεμὼν δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ προειρημένου τὸ στῆθος εὗρεν αὐτοῦ τὴν καρδίαν τριχῶν γέμουσαν.	Aristeides in the third book of his Persika. The Persians having come against Greece with five million men, the Lacedaemonians sent three hundred at Thermopylae, giving them as general Leonidas. And he, observing the advancing mass of enemies, said to his allies who were eating: 'take your lunch now, o three hundred, as people who will dine in Hades.' When the barbarians appeared, Leonidas transfixed by numerous spears arrived up to Xerxes, and taking his diadem held it over his wounds, and having lost all his blood died.[30] The king, having cut open his thorax, found that his heart was covered with hair.

286 F 20b Commentary

See commentary to F 20c.

286 F 20c - Ioann. Lyd. De mens. fr. 5 p. 179, 20 Wü meta[[id="286" type="F" n="20" n-mod="c" tgroup="3, 3"]]	
Subject: Persian wars Historical Work: Persika Source date: C 6th AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period:	Translation
ἐν τῶι Περσικῶι δέ φησιν ὁ Ἀριστείδης, ὅτι	Aristeides says in his Persian book that

[30] Here, De Lazzer (2000) offers the following translation: 'si portò d'impeto verso Serse e gli sottrasse la corona; poi si fermò, a causa delle ferite, quindi spirò per le forti emorragie'. It seems to me that πρὸ with genitive has to mean 'before', 'in front', with a (normal acception of) κατέσχε as transitive.

Λεωνίδης ὁ στρατηγὸς θεασάμενος τὸ τῶν Περσῶν πλῆθος ἐν Θερμοπύλαις ἐπῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου τοῖς πολεμίοις, καὶ ἀπείροις περιπαρεὶς δόρασιν ἐπὶ Ξέρξην ἐπῆλθε, καὶ περιελόμενος αὐτοῦ τὸ διάδημα ἐξέπνευσεν. ἀνατεμὼν δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Πέρσης εὗρε τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς ἐμφύτου θέρμης τετριχωμένην.	Leonidas the general, having seen the number of the Persians at Thermopylae, advanced right against the enemies, although transfixed by innumerable spears went straight to Xerxes, and taking his diadem gave his last breath. The Persian cutting him open found that his heart was hairy, because of his innate warmth.

286 F 20c Commentary

This is the only Greek story attributed to Aristeides; for this reason, Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, thinks that the source reference, Aristeides in all of the three testimonia (from the first book of *Persika* in *Parallela*, from the third in Stobaios, and without book indication in Lydos) should be modified. Because our fragment 20, *Parallela minora* 4a, is sandwiched between *Parallela minora* 3b and *Parallela minora* 4b, which both mention Aristeides (they correspond to F 3 and 17 above), the name of Aristeides might easily have entered this fragment too, replacing (*e.g.*) Agatharchides, cited in *Parallela minora* for a close story (see *BNJ* 284 F 1). This may indeed have been the case; but if so, it must have happened at an earlier stage of the tradition, in the version that was used by the epitomator of *Parallela minora* as we have them, by Stobaios and by Lydos. Note however the dissent expressed by A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 320-1, who states that in light of the unanimity of the manuscript tradition, confirmed by the indirect tradition, Aristeides should be maintained. I suppose at issue here is the moment in which this displacement happened: after all, Jacoby too prints in his text 'Aristeides', because we cannot hope to reach beyond the text that was common to *Parallela minora,* Lydos and Stobaios, and such a text had already Aristeides as source-reference.

The story is preserved in *Parallela minora*, Stobaios and Lydos; comparison of the three versions in J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 56-62. Lydos' version is much abbreviated: it entirely omits the part about the lunch/dinner in Hades, and preserves only the part concerning the diadem and the death. This is on the whole appropriate, since this is the part that corresponds more closely to the Roman story *Parallela minora* 4b, which Lydos has just excerpted (inverting the order, Lydos has first the Roman and then the Greek story). Lydos has however one detail that is absent from all other versions: he gives the reason of Leonidas' shaggy heart, his natural inner warmth. Moreover, as Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur parallelis minoribus*, 58 notes, the *Parallela minora* do not mention the moment of the death of Leonidas (we have instead a participle, οὗ ἀποθανόντος); this is rather curious, because the death with the diadem in hand, and close to – or even together with – the enemy, is exactly what connects the Greek and the Roman parallels (Stobaios and Lydos use the same verb, ἐξέπνευσεν, which must have been present in the text they were excerpting).

Leonidas' apophthegm on taking the next dinner in Hades is a famous one – but also a relatively recent one. It is found in Cicero, *Tusculan disputations* 1.42.101; Diodoros of

Sicily 11.9.4; Seneca the Elder, who in mentioning the saying (*Suasoriae* 2.12), refers to an orator Dorion as his source for it, and adds that he believes it was also in Herodotus (this is a mistake: the story is not part of the Herodotean narrative of the Thermopylae); in Valerius Maximus 2 ext. 3; Seneca, *Ad Lucilium* 10.82.21; Plutarch, *Moralia* 225D. See further E.N. Tigerstedt, *The legend of Sparta in classical antiquity* 1 (1965), 216-8, and 2 (1974) 254-5, and N.G.L. Hammond, 'Sparta at Thermopylae', *Historia* 45 (1996), 1-20, who elaborates on the idea that Diodoros, Justinus / Trogus and Plutarch all go back to a common source, possibly Ephoros, that presented a version of Thermopylae rather different from the Herodotean one (neither Tigerstedt nor Hammond discuss the version of *Parallela minora*); see also J. Dillery, 'Reconfiguring the Past: Thyrea, Thermopylae and Narrative Patterns in Herodotus', *AJPh* 117 (1996), 217-254, and M.A. Flower, 'Simonides, Ephorus, and Herodotus on the Battle of Thermopylae', *CQ* NS 48, (1998), 365-379, who do not discuss the dining in Hades story, but deal with variant versions of Thermopylae.

The second part of the narrative of F 20, concerning the attack on Xerxes himself and Leonidas' death, is common to *Parallela minora*, Stobaios, and Lydos. Interestingly, Diodoros includes details of a night attack against the headquarters of Xerxes (see also Plutarch, *On the malice of Herodotus*, 32, and for other references Hammond, 'Sparta at Thermopylae', and Flower, 'Simonides, Ephorus, and Herodotus on the Battle of Thermopylae'); this is again absent from Herodotos, but helps understanding what is behind the statement of F 20 (a, b and c) that Leonidas arrived right up to Xerxes, to the point of being able to take away the Persian king's diadem.
Stobaios is however the only one to preserve the detail of Leonidas holding the diadem against his own wounds. This offers a remarkable parallel to a passage of Aelian, quoted in the Suda, Adler τ 207, s.v. ταινίαι (= Aelianos fr. 117 Hercher), and apparently concerning Fabius Maximus (i.e. the hero of the Roman story adduced as parallel to this one) in which someone is said to metaphorically turn a *tainidion* (a tissue band) into his shroud (see above, commentary to F 17, with the text of the passage). The original text of [Plutarch] may indeed have implied this kind of metaphor (extremely famous, as it goes back to the poem of Simonides for the fallen at the Thermopylae).

Neither this story, in the version in which it is couched, nor the Roman parallel are attested independently (unless one considers that Aelian reflects an independent tradition); both are very problematic in historical terms. It may be that both were invented on the basis, and as modifications of, the narrative of Herodotos 7.238: 'Xerxes passed in review the bodies of the dead; and as for Leonidas, hearing that he had been the king and commander of the Lakedaimonians, he ordered that having cut his head they impale it' (so Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 383). But the story of Aristomenes may also have played a role: it is said that the Spartans cut him to pieces, and found that his heart was covered in hair, *BNJ* Rhianos of Bene 265 F 46 (=Stephanos of Byzantium, s.v. Ἀνδανία); Pliny, *Natural History* 11.185; Valerius Maximus 1.8. ext. 15 (who has the Athenians rather than the Spartans open Aristomenes up!), and Dio Chrysostomos, *Orations* 35.3), with the remarks of Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 194-5. In his commentary to *BNJ* 265 F 46, Bertelli states that 'The feature of the *cor hirsutum*, as noticed by D. Ogden, *Aristomenes of Messene* (Swansea 2004), 114-7, is a quite common topos to show exceptional courage

from the Spartan Leonidas onwards (Pseudo-Plutarch, *Parallela minora* 306D; Stobaios, *Florilegium* 3.7.65; Johannes Lydus, *De mensibus* fr. 5; Aristides of Miletos, BNJ 286 F 20a, 20b, 20c)'. But all the sources on Leonidas boil down to one, our [Plutarch] (or in the best of cases, Aristeides and [Plutarch]); while, as Jacoby says, the story of Aristomenes' hairy heart is older than the 'Schwindelliteratur' of [Plutarch] and Chennos, and it certainly does not derives from the *Parallela minora*. (For other characters – including dogs – with shaggy hearts, see Ogden, *Aristomenes of Messene* 114-7; interestingly, much of the information on such instances seems to go back to Ptolemy Chennos).

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">286 F 21 - (20) [Plutarch] Parall. min. 1B = Moralia 305 CD meta[[id="286" type="F" n="21"]]</td></tr>
<tr><td>Subject: military history: war
Historical Work: Sikelika book 1
Source date: 2nd C AD
Historian's date: unknown
Historical period:</td><td>Translation</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ἀσδρούβας βασιλεὺς Σικελίαν καταλαβόμενος πόλεμον Ῥωμαίοις κατήγγειλε. Μέτελλος δ᾽ ὑπὸ τῆς συγκλήτου στρατηγὸς χειροτονηθεὶς ἐγκρατὴς ἐγένετο τῆς νίκης ταύτης, ἐν ἧι Λεύκιος Γλαύκων εὐγενὴς ἀνὴρ τὴν Ἀσδρούβα κατέχων ναῦν ἀμφοτέρας ἐπέβαλε τὰς χεῖρας, καθάπερ ἱστορεῖ Ἀριστείδης Μιλήσιος ἐν πρώτηι Σικελικῶν, παρ᾽ οὗ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἔμαθε Διονύσιος ὁ Σικελιώτης.</td><td>King Asdrubas having occupied Sicily declared war upon the Romans. Metellus having been elected general by the senate reported that famous victory, in which Lucius Glaukon, a man of the nobility, taking hold of the ship of Asdrubas lost both hands, as Aristeides of Miletos narrates in the first of his *Sikelika*, whence Dionysios of Sicily (*FGrH* 567 F 1) learnt the story.</td></tr>
</table>

286 F 21 Commentary

The context of the story must be the first Punic war (not the second, as A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 315, writes; see also the brief remarks of C.J. Smith, 'The *Origo gentis romanae*: facts and fictions', *BICS* 48 (2005), 121). Polybios (1.38-40) and Diodoros (23.18-21) offer slightly divergent versions of the events; F 21 seems to be a very free rewriting of the battle of Panormos, a land-based battle fought c. 250 BC, in which the consul L. Caecilius Metellus (on whom see K.-L. Elvers, 'Caecilius' 1.11', *BNP* 1 (2003), 874) won a resounding victory against Hasdrubal, killing or capturing all his elephants (Polybios 1.40; Diodoros of Sicily 23.21). If so, the ship-element must have been imported from one of the numerous naval engagement between Romans and Carthaginians that took place in the course of the first Punic war (note that Zonaras 8.14.9-10 (=Cassius Dio 11, p. 164-6 Boissevain) mentions Carthaginians running towards the fleet and trying to save themselves on the ships – as pointed out by T. Banchich, *BNJ* Dionysios the Sicilian 567 F 1, this episode may have provided [Plutarch] with inspiration for his own account. For further bibliographical references see Banchich, *BNJ* 567 F 1; for an analysis of the source-material for the first Punic war see B.

Bleckmann, *Die römische Nobilität im Ersten Punischen Krieg* (Berlin 2002), 19-56; particularly important his remark p. 48 on 'prosopographische Unstimmigkeiten', prosopographical imprecisions, going back to variants within the annalistic tradition.

[Plutarch]'s version presents some peculiarities. Asdrubas/Hasdrubal was never a king. More importantly, nothing is known of a Leukios (Lucius) Glaukon. Glaukon appears here as the Roman counterpart of Kynegeiros, the brother of Aischylos: the story of the loss of one or two hands in an attempt at retaining a ship, famously narrated of him in Herodotos 6.114, figures also in [Plutarch], *Parallela minora* 1A (the source which [Plutarch] claimed to have used for the Greek story is not known, because the text of *Parallela minora* has suffered a lacuna just after the name of Kynegeiros; Stobaios, who also preserves the story, and who depends upon an earlier version of the *Parallela minora*, mentions as source Plutarch's *diegeseis*).

Given the confusion in the historical background, Gaius Duilius and his ravens may hover behind the name and hand of Lucius Glaukon. Alternatively, one may want to consider the fact that the *praenomen* of the victorious consul (Lucius Caecilius Metellus) is the same as that of the noble Lucius Glaukon, while the *gentilicium* Caecilius may adumbrate Glaukon – all the more since this Caecilius Metellus became famous for losing his sight (see above, commentary on F 15; note also that Metellus figures also in *Parallela minora* 14a, *Moralia* 309a-b, where he sacrifices his daughter to Hestia in order to get favourable winds for his expedition to Sicily, a story culled from the third book of Pythocles' *Italika*: see *BNJ* 833 F 1). The proposal tentatively advanced by Nachstädt in his apparatus, to read Γλαβρίων instead of Γλαύκων, provides us with a Roman name, but does not solve the difficulties.

De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori*, 315, expresses his disagreement with Jacoby's position that the story is an invented one, modelled on the story of Kynegeiros (Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 383), and refers the readers to Aelian, fr. 118 Hercher ed. Teubner 1866 = fr. 64 Hercher ed. Didot 1858 = fr. 121 Domingo-Forasté:

αὐτόχρημα πηδῶν ὑπὲρ τὰ ἐσκαμμένα, τὴν ναῦν Ἀσδρούβα φεύγειν ἐπειγομένην τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιβαλὼν εἴχετο ἐρρωμένως τῆς πρύμνης ὁ Κλάτιος ὄνομα,
'immediately leaping further than seemed possible, and throwing his hand on the ship of Hasdrubal which was trying to escape, a man named Klatios vigorously held the stern'.

The fragment (preserved in *Suda* α 4537 Αὐτόχρημα ὅμοιον, as well as in *Suda* κ 1706 Κλάτιος: ὄνομα κύριον) stops here, but one can sense what is coming next.

W. Nachstädt (ed.), *Plutarchi Moralia* v. 2 (Leipzig 1935), *ad l.* argued that the Klatios of Aelian should be corrected into Kalatinos, on the basis of the fact that Cicero, *Cato the Elder on old age* 17.61, refers in one breath to the greatness of Lucius Caecilius Metellus and Aulus Atilius Calatinus. Atilius Calatinus did indeed fight during the first Punic war (K.-L. Elvers, 'Atilius' 1.14, *BNP* 1 (2003), 288). As consul for the second time in 254 BC, Calatinus went with his colleague Cn. Cornelius Scipio Asina to Sicily with a newly-built fleet, and took, among other places, Panormos. There is thus a connection of sorts

between the story narrated in the *Parallela minora* and the activities of Atilius Calatinus; and indeed, Hasdrubal was in command of Carthaginian forces both at this moment and later, when Metellus arrived.

De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori*, 315 draws from this the conclusion that a historical event may form the basis of the story narrated in the *Parallela minora*; he finds support for such a conclusion in another similar story, involving this time one of Caesar's legionnaires, Acilius, who lost his right hand in a sea-battle against the Massaliotai, but even so managed to take over the enemy ship (Valerius Maximus 3.2.22; Plutarch, *Life of Caesar* 16.2, 715A; Suetonius, *Life of Julius Caesar* 68.4). Such a conclusion is over-hasty.

First, in all violent fights there will have been persons who lost a hand; the parallel with the soldier in Caesar's army is simply non-pertinent - or rather, and more damagingly: it attests the existence of a topos. The point is not whether someone could have lost a hand in a sea-battle against Hasdrubal, but whether someone called Lucius Glaukon (or Klatios, or Calatinus) may have done so, within the context offered by our fragment. Further (and even more damaging): if the story of Acilius was so well-known (and this seems to have been the case: it is enough to look at the source-references) then why did not [Plutarch] take it as a recent example of something attested also for ancient times in the Greek world? The answer we give to this question has further, important, consequences for how we read the *Parallela minora*, and for the question of the sources of [Plutarch].

The assumption that Atilius Calatinus is the name that hides behind Klatios, and thus behind Lucius Glaukon (because the accounts of Aelian and [Plutarch] certainly concern the same episode) is a defensible one. However, as Caecilius Metellus does not seem to have been active against Hasdrubal at the same time as Calatinus (Polybios 1.38, who narrates the arrival of Calatinus and Scipio with the newly-built fleet and their conquest of Panormos, states at the end of the chapter that having left a garrison in Panormos the two consuls sailed back to Rome), and as Metellus is consul in 451 BC, while Calatinus is consul in 254 BC, we still have to admit a mild confusion. Moreover, but for the passages of [Plutarch] and Aelian, Calatinus is nowhere on record as having lost his hand – this part still has to be accounted for.

Could Aelian and [Plutarch] go back to a common source (Aristeides), preserving otherwise lost – if slightly confused – information? Or does Aelian depend on [Plutarch]? Besides the passage under discussion, in at least one other instance Aelian narrates a story attested also (and only) in the *Parallela minora*: Aelian fr. 117 Hercher corresponds fairly closely to F 17 above. Moreover, Aelian fr. 120 Hercher, a very confused text, concerns the famous story of the punishment of T. Manlius by his father T. Manlius Torquatus, also narrated in *Parallela minora* (above, F 18). This is not sufficient to decide: Aelian might depend from *Parallela minora*, but as all three fragments are, in *Parallela minora*, attributed to Aristeides, it is also possible that Aelian and [Plutarch] used a common source (the differences in wording would speak for this second solution). There are moreover cases of divergence between Aelian and the *Parallela minora*: thus, in Aelian, *Historical miscellany* 5.19 the brother of Aeschylos

Amynias loses a hand at Salamis, while in [Plutarch], *Parallela minora* 1A, *Moralia* 305AB, a strategos named Kynegeiros loses both hands at Marathon, while trying to get hold of a ship, a story that must ultimately derive from the narrative of Herodotos 6.114 about the loss of one hand by Kynegeiros the son of Euphorion (and thus brother of Aischylos). Hercher, in his note to his fr. 64 (see above, F 17), stated that 'Aeliano materiam huius narrationis praebuit qui eam fabricatus est auctor Parallelorum minorum, cuius de Fabio Maximo nugas a nostro ornatas infra habes v. ταινία.' Pending a more detailed analysis of the potential relationship between Aelian and the *Parallela minora*, it is impossible to say more.

The reference to *Sikelika* is problematic: *Sikelika* are usually Greek history; moreover, this is the one instance of *Sikelika* attributed to Aristeides. The event however concerns Roman history: see Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 383. It may thus be that *Sikelika* is here a slip for the more usual *Italika*.
As for the double reference, particularly important in a situation in which the story is clearly invented, see F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* S.3, 8 (1940), 132: the reference to Aristeides of Miletos is here buttressed, in the context of a Roman story concerning Sicily, by the authority of a Sicilian author: Dionysios of Sicily, clearly a conflation of Dionysios of Halicarnassos and of Diodoros of Sicily (compare with another double reference above, at F 8).

286 Biographical Essay

Aristeides of Miletos is the author most frequently cited in the *Parallela minora* (21 times); he does not appear in *On rivers*, the other work attributed to [Plutarch], which share much the same characteristics of *Parallela minora* in terms of references to stories and authors otherwise unknown. Aristeides is cited mainly for his *Italika* (as pointed out by Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 372, the *Historiai* of F 2 must belong to the *Italika*), in – apparently – 40 books (F 11). The fact that he is often cited should not be taken to imply that here [Plutarch] was relying on a real work, full of more or less invented stories concerning Roman Italy (*pace* M. Van der Valk, *Researches on the text and the scholia of the Iliad* 1 (Leiden 1963), 408-9); the numbers attributed to the volumes cannot be constructed into any structure (Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 372, who further notes how in this case too the love of [Plutarch] for the number three shines forth: seven references to *Italika* book three, one each to book 1, 4, 19 and 40, possibly also one reference to *Italika* book 5 (F 13), and the rest without indication of the book). This has to be considered together with the fact that *Italika* is the most frequent title – understandably so, since half of the stories deal with early Roman history (see A. Cameron, *Greek mythography in the Roman world* (Oxford 2004), 128). Two other works of Aristeides' are mentioned once each: *Persika* (F 20) and *Sikelika* (F 21). While the latter work fits, also in terms of topic, the picture obtainable from the fragments of the *Italika* (F 21 concerns an episode supposedly having taken place during the first Punic war – at any rate, it involves Romans), the *Persika* appear out of character for Aristeides, and the source reference of F 20 may be erroneous (either an error, or the consequence of a textual damage).

Are there any common, identifying motifs in the stories attributed to Aristeides by [Plutarch] – can we recognize authorial traits? A motif that runs through many of the stories attributed to Aristeides is that of extraordinary courage or extraordinary severity (as pointed out by Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 382, apropos of F 19, many of these fragments look as if they came from a collection of *exempla*). Some of these stories are extremely well-known: thus F 2 (Mucius Scaevola); F 11 (Curtius); F 12 (Brutus); F 14 (the Horatii); F 18 (Manlius); F 19 (Decius); others are otherwise unknown: F 3 (Misounios Amblirenos?); F 17 (Fabius); F 21 (Glaukon, from the *Sikelika*?), and F20, which however involves a Greek hero (Leonidas).

There are also some stories highlighting female courage or virtue, or – on the contrary – female greed: F 1 (Rhetana), F 4 (Medullina), F 13 (Tarpeia); here too, besides some well-known stories, otherwise unattested ones appear.

Finally, there are stories of violence, often involving women (Valeria Tusculanaria (F 5), Salia (F 8, although the violence is here kept to a bare minimum), Valeria Luperca (F10), Silvia and the twins (F 16)), sometimes concerning men only (the tyrant Aemilios (F9), Lucius Umbrius (F6)); with the exception of F 16, which is a well-known story, this last group is not attested elsewhere.

However, these are motifs that run throughout [Plutarch]'s *Parallela minora*; they thus cannot be claimed as distinctive of Aristeides' work (on the motif of violence on women in [Plutarch], see the recent overview by A. Ibáñez Chacón, 'La violación como tópico en los *Parallela Minora*', *Ploutarchos* n.s. 6 (2008/9), 3-14). Moreover, some of these stories seem to have been made up in order to match a better known Greek parallel, attributed however to a different author (this is the case of F 5, F 6, F 8, F 9, F 21 – this does not mean that the Greek parallel is necessarily entirely trustworthy, or that the source-reference there is any more reliable); in other cases, the Roman story may have been the point of departure (so for F 1, F 2, F 11, F 12, F 13, F 14, F 16, and F 18 – which does not mean that some additions may have been made to the basic story-line). Most interesting are those instances of 'constructive encounter', where Greek and Roman world seem to have interacted in order to fabricate an entirely new 'pair': F 3 is an example of this (discussed by Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*, 130-31: 'no one who reads these pairs of stories together could have a moment's doubt that both halves were written together to balance each other, presumably by the same person'). Here, two historical contexts (the Caudine Forks and the battle for the Thyreatis) are embellished or at any rate modified so as to make of them parallel stories; however, the historical tradition was in this particular case too strong, and the 'parallelization' is not entirely successful. Other instances are F 4 (both the Greek and Roman stories are unattested elsewhere; the Greek one is attributed to Dositheos; the overall motif is clearly a Greek one); F 7 (a story of corruption; the source of the Greek example, also unattested elsewhere, is the *Thracian history* of Callisthenes); F 10 (the story of Valeria Luperca, although unattested elsewhere, may reflect some local traditions; the same applies to the Greek story of Helen, which seems an elaboration on that of Iphigeneia); F 15 (the blindings of Ilos and Ant-ilos, on account of the Palladion: here the Roman story of Metellos may have provided the initial idea); F 17 and 20 (Fabius / Leonidas: a very interesting construction, in which the Roman arch-enemy Hannibal corresponds to the Greek arch-enemy Xerxes; Leonidas and his 300 Spartans

correspond to Fabius and the 300 Fabii; both heroes are given the special characteristic of the *cor hirsutum*). And then, there are some 'true' parallels, such as the one posited between the self-sacrifice of the Athenian king Kodros and the *devotio* of the Decii (F 19), where both stories are independently attested.

It is worth stressing that even for the well-known stories often Aristeides/[Plutarch] presents some details that set his version apart from the others. Remarks like the one made by Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 380, on the fact that in a work like the *Parallela minora* it is probably wrong to correct the name Antylos in Metellos (see discussion above, commentary to F 15) might be applied to other instances of 'odd names' (e.g. Rhetana F 1, Tarpeia / Tarmisia at F 13, and the Albans instead of Sabines at F 19), usually left unexplained, or attributed to textual corruption; we would then have to ask the question of the meaning of these alterations. If Aristeides is a bogus author, then fabricating details that made his version of events slightly different from the *vulgata* would have been a sensible move on the part of [Plutarch], besides adding interest to his work (see Cameron, *Greek mythography in the Roman world*, 129, for how this could function to cover up issues with forged source-references).

So is Aristeides an invention of [Plutarch]? it is worth noting at the outset that only F 10, 16, 17 and 20 are attested by authors other than [Plutarch], and these are all later authors who could be 9and in some cases demonstrably are) drawing upon him. And yet, not all references of the *Parallela minora* need be to bogus authors, even when unique; a short overview of the question, with a sound conclusion, is offered in S. Burstein, 'Trasyllos of Mendes', *BNJ* 622 Biographical essay; see also the ample discussion by K. Dowden, *BNJ* 54, Biographical essay, and *BNJ* 56 F 1b. Indeed, in theory many of the source-references might be correct; but it seems to me that we should first look at the treatises as a whole, and then move to the discussion of individual source-references (see also the discussion in *BNJ* Aristodemos 22, Biographical essay). If we do so, then the case against the authenticity of the source-references, as put by R. Hercher, *Plutarchi Libellus de fluviis* (Leipzig 1851), 17-24, F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *Parallel Stories* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* 3, 8 (1940), 73-144 (= *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung* (Leiden 1956) 359-422), K. Ziegler, *Plutarchos von Chaironeia* (Stuttgart 1949), 230-4 (= 'Plutarchos von Chaironeia', *RE* 21 (Stuttgart 1951), 867-70), and most recently Cameron, *Greek mythography in the Roman world*, 127-34, is overwhelming: the stories narrated are so unique, they present such odd 'errors', and are at the same time so similar to each other, that it is difficult to accept that a number of real authors not attested elsewhere would have written so many multivolume works on stories presenting the similar characteristics, all entirely lost but for [Plutarch]. To repeat: this need not imply that everything in the two treatises is fabricated. A story may represent a reliable tradition, attributed to a bogus author; a bogus story may be attributed to a real author; real stories may be attributed to real authors, and the opposite. Even in the case of fabrication, there is always an element from which the invention moves: thus, Hercher, *Plutarchi Libellus de Fluviis*, 22-3 argued that often the author's name begins with the same syllable as the name of the story's main character; Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *Parallel Stories* und die Schwindelautoren', 85-6, added that many of the names of the source-references

were fabricated by taking the name of an author, and the origin of another one, something that may have happened also with Aristeides (on these mechanisms, see also Cameron, *Greek mythography in the Roman world*, 129-32).

Those who want to identify [Plutarch]'s Aristeides of Miletos with an author attested elsewhere have the following options:

• a local historian of Knidos, possibly the same as a geographer quoted by Pliny as authority for variant names of Aegean islands, and listed by Vitruvius 8.3.27 among the sources he has relied upon for his treatment of the *paradoxa aquarum.* Jacoby puts all this material under *FGrH* Aristeides 494 F 1-7; see also W. Kroll, 'Aristeides 23a', *RE* suppl. 5 (Stuttgart 1931), 46, who states that it is difficult to identify this Aristeides, since the personalities of the local historian of Knidos (known from a local work on Knidos) and of the geographer mentioned by Pliny (4.64.70) are both obscure);

• an Aristeides active in the second century BC, who wrote at least six books of erotic stories taking place in Miletos, and thus called *Milesiaka* (*Milesian tales*); this work was translated in Latin by a Sisenna in the first century BC (Ovid, *Tristia* 2.443-4) and gave rise to a veritable genre, the *Fabula milesia.* (The very few testimonia and the unique fragment we have of the *Milesian tales* are in *FGrH* Aristeides 495, T 1-ab, T2 ab, and F1. The translator mentioned by Ovid (FGrH 495 T 2b) is most likely not the historian Cornelius Sisenna, but a more recent Sisenna active in the period of the triumvirate: see E. Rawson, 'L. Cornelius Sisenna and the Early First Century BC', *CQ* 29 (1979), 331-3).

• any one of the other Milesian historians (such as *BNJ* 489-94), and not least those referred to anonymously, as *BNJ* 496 F 1, which has been linked with the Aisteides author of *Milesian tales.*

W. Schmid, 'Aristeides 23', *RE* 2 (Stuttgart 1896) 886, in discussing the author of the *Milesiaka,* mooted the possibility of identifying him with [Plutarch]'s Aristeides; he pointed out that some fragments of the latter present novelistic and erotic themes (*e.g.* F 1; F 4; see discussion above), such as were characteristic of the *Milesian tales*; he added that [Plutarch] had however erred in making Aristeides a Milesian, since authorship of *Milesian tales* does not imply Milesian origin (and actually speaks against it). Finally, Schmid also noted that the tradition, scarce as it is, is however unanimous in linking Aristeides to his *Milesiaka*, and never even hints at *Italika* (not to mention *Sikelika*, and potentially *Persika* too).

The most sustained attempt at defending the thesis that the *Italika* quoted by [Plutarch] are the work of an Aristeides, to be identified with the author of *Milesian tales*, has been made by J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis Minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 103-5. (A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 53-4, offers a digest of scholarship on the argument, but leaves the issue open). For Schlereth, the common link between [Plutarch]'s Aristeides and the author of the *Milesian tales* is the interest in aetiology: present in quite a few of the fragments of the former (Schlereth points as examples to F 1 and F 9), it would be evident also in the one fragment we have of the latter

(Harpokration Δ 23 Keaney = *FGrH* 495 F 1: μήποτε δὲ μᾶλλον ἂν εἴη ὅστις τὰ δέρματα ἐσθίει δερμηστής, ὡς ὑποσημαίνεται καὶ ἐν ϛ̄ Μιλησιακῶν Ἀριστείδου, "perhaps whoever eats skins should rather be named 'dermestes', as is intimated also in the sixth book of the *Milesian tales*"). It seems to me that the kind of aetiology displayed in the parallel stories of [Plutarch] and in this fragment is rather different – at any rate, on the basis of such slight material it is difficult to conclude much. As for the point that such a huge work (40 volumes) would have left a trace in our tradition, in itself (i.e., not combined with all the other authors and works that are cited by [Plutarch] only) it has never been a central one in discussions of authenticity, and Schlereth's objection that the numeral might be erroneous is well-taken; but one should also note that F 10a speaks of *Italika* book 19 – thus still a huge, multivolume work, even admitting an error for the numeral 40. Finally, Schlereth stresses the fact that the fragments attributed to Aristeides show an interest in erotic stories that fits with what we know of the character of the *Milesian tales.*

None of these arguments seem to me solid enough to prove that the *Italika* should be attributed to Aristeides of Miletos; the way in which couples are constructed in the *Parallela minora* (see discussion above) points in the opposite direction. Moreover, most of the arguments for the identification the author of the *Milesian tales* (or with the local historian of Knidos / geographer / paradoxographer, for that matter) can be stood on their head. Thus, the Milesian origin of [Plutarch]'s Aristeides may be understood not as a mistake of [Plutarch], but rather as one more example of his playful way of providing invented authors with places of origin (see here Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 372, who comments that the very reference to a Milesian origin of Aristeides in [Plutarch] is almost certain proof that the author of the *Milesian tales* was not from Miletos). Similarly, it may well be that Aristeides of Miletos was chosen as the putative author of a number of erotic stories because of the existence of an Aristeides author of *Milesian tales.* Finally, the argument from aetiology does not make sense, not just because of the different type of aetiologies involved, but mainly because a number of the stories narrate in [Plutarch]'s *Parallela minora* have an aetiological character, even though attributed to other authors: interest in aetiology is a characteristic of [Plutarch].

In fact, already D. Wyttenbach, *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia* VII (Oxonii 1821) 80 had stated that [Plutarch]'s Aristeides of Miletos had been invented on the model of the author of *Milesiaka*; this is also the position taken by G. Knaack, 'Aristeides n. 23', *RE* suppl. 1 (Stuttgart 1903), 132; by F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren', 86 n.1, and *FGrH* 3a, 372; and by A. Cameron, *Greek mythography in the Roman world*, 127-34. This seems to me the most sensible position.

[My thanks to Nicholas Horsfall, for reading this text and discussing it with me].

286 Bibliography

A. Cameron, *Greek mythography in the Roman world* (Oxford 2004), 127-34.
F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* S.3, 8 (1940), 73-144 = H. Bloch (ed.), *Abhandlungen zur*

griechischen Geschichtschreibung von Felix Jacoby zu seinem achtzigsten Geburtstag (Leiden 1956), 359-422.

G. Knaack, 'Aristeides n. 23', *RE* suppl. 1 (Stuttgart 1903), 132.

W. Kroll, 'Aristeides 23a', *RE* suppl. 5 (Stuttgart 1931), 46.

W. Schmid, 'Aristeides 23', *RE* 2 (Stuttgart 1896) 886.

J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis Minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 103-5.