

289 Dorotheos

Paola Ceccarelli (Durham)

BJN	Dorotheus Chaldaeus	Dorotheos
Historian Number:	289	

289 F 1a -[Plutarch] Parall. min. 20B = Moralia 310 D (Script. Al. M. 155, 3)	meta [[id="289" type="F" n="1" n-mod="a" tgroup="2, 1"]]
Subject: Religion: sacrifice; military history: warfare; genre: aetiology Historical Work: Italika book four Source date: 2nd c AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: end of 1st C BC	Translation
Μάριος πρὸς Κίμβρους πόλεμον ἔχων καὶ ἡττώμενος ὄναρ εἶδεν, ὅτι νικήσει, ἐὰν τὴν θυγατέρα προθύσει· ἦν δ' αὐτῷ Καλπουρνία. προκρίνας δὲ τῆς φύσεως τοὺς πολίτας ἔδρασε καὶ ἐνίκησε. καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν βωμοὶ εἰσι δύο ἐν Γερμανίαι, οἳ κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν ἦχον σαλπίγγων ἀποπέμπουσιν, ὡς Δωρόθεος ἐν τετάρτῳ Ἰταλικῶν.	When he was fighting against the Cimbri and was being worsted, Marius saw in a dream that he would win, if he first sacrificed his daughter; for he had a daughter Calpurnia. Having put the citizens before nature he acted and won. And even now there are two altars in Germany, who send forth at that moment a sound of trumpets, as Dorotheos reports in the fourth of his <i>Italika</i> .

289 F 1a Commentary

See below commentary to F1c.

289 F 1b - LYDUS De mens. 4, 147	meta [[id="289" type="F" n="1" n-mod="b" tgroup="2, 2"]]
Subject: Historical Work: unknown Source date: Historian's date: unknown Historical period:	Translation
ὅτι Μάριος ὁ μέγας πολεμῶν Κίμβροις καὶ Τεύτοσι κατ' ὄναρ εἶδε κρατῆσαι τῶν	That Marius the Great when fighting against the Cimbri and Teutones saw in a

¹ Φ has νικήσεις and προθύσης (see Jacoby's apparatus). This may be an error; but it might also be an echo of a version, in which words were addressed to Marius 'You shall obtain victory, if you'll first sacrifice': an address to the father (by a character in the dream? through an oracle?) would have been much more dramatic. Traces of attempts to make the stories more lively can be found elsewhere in *Parallela minora*, even in the sad state in which we have them. Thus while the stories are typically narrated with past tenses, we find at times a move to the use of the present, to make the action more vivid (e.g. in *BNJ* Aristeides 286 F 1: ἔφη – ὑπνώθησαν – ἀναβαίνει καὶ μηνύει; examples are numerous).

πολεμίωv, εἰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα θύσει Ἄποτροπαίοις· καὶ προκρίνας τῆς φύσεωv τοὺς πολίτας τοῦτο ἐποίησε καὶ τῶv πολεμίωv ἐκράτησεν.	dream that he would gain victory over his enemies, if he would sacrifice his own daughter to the Averting gods; and having put the citizens before nature he did this and conquered the enemy.
--	--

289 F 1b Commentary

See below, commentary to F1c.

289 F 1c - CLEM. AL. Protr. 3, 42, 7	meta [[id="289" type="F" n="1" n-mod="c"]]
Subject: religion: sacrifice Historical Work: Italika book 4 Source date: 189-200 AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: n/a	Translation
Ἐρεχθεὺς δὲ ὁ Ἀττικὸς καὶ Μάριος ὁ Ῥωμαῖος τὰς αὐτῶv ἐθυσάτην θυγατέρας· ὧv ὁ μὲν τῆι Φερεφάττηι, ὡς Δημάρατος ἐv πρώτῃι Τραγωιδουμένων (#@42 F 4#@42 F 4@#), ὁ δὲ τοῖς Ἄποτροπαίοις ὁ Μάριος, ὡς Δωρόθεοv ἐv τῆι τετάρτῃι Ἰταλικῶv ἱστορεῖ.	Erechtheus of Attica and Marius the Roman sacrificed their own daughters; one of them to Pherephatta, as Demaratos says in the first book of his <i>Tragoidoumena</i> , the other one, Marius, to the Averting gods, as Dorotheos narrates in the fourth book of his <i>Italika</i> .

289 F 1c Commentary

The story of Marius' sacrifice of his daughter in order to conquer the enemy forms the pendant of the story of the sacrifice by Erechtheus of his daughter. The Greek story is well-known, and Pseudo-Plutarch mentions as one of the sources Euripides, who had written a play on it. The Roman story is known only through Pseudo-Plutarch (F 1a); Lydos (F 1b) and Clement (F 1c) must depend on an earlier, ampler version of the *Parallela Minora*, since they agree on specific details absent from the text of the *Parallela*, and in particular, on the mention of the Averting gods (Eusebios, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 4.16.12, cites the story again, from Clement, in the context of a long chapter on human sacrifice). As A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2004), 130 stresses, the story is clearly a fabrication (listed and dismissed as such in K. Ziegler, 'Plutarchos', *RE* 21.1 (1951), 868); such an 'utterly un-Roman story' (Cameron) can have been fabricated only by someone who needed to provide a parallel for the story of Erechtheus. It is worth noting that there is another instance of a Roman father sacrificing his daughter in *Parallela minora* 14a (*Moralia* 309a-b, quoting as authority the third book of Pythokles' *Italika*, *BNJ* 833 F 1): the seer Gaius Julius tells Metellus that he must sacrifice his daughter to Hestia, in order to get favourable winds for his naval expedition to Sicily; the goddess intervenes and substitutes a heifer – the story is paired with that of Iphigenia, and clearly presupposes it. On human sacrifice, see D.D. Hughes, *Human sacrifice in ancient Greece* (London 1991) 118–22; P. Bonnechère, *Le sacrifice humain en Grèce ancienne* (Athens - Liège 1994); S. Georgoudi, 'A propos du sacrifice humain en Grèce ancienne: remarques critiques', *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 1 (1999), 61–82; C. Leduc, 'La figure du père sacrificateur de sa fille dans les rituels athéniens' and J.-B. Bonnard, 'Les pères meurtriers de leur fils', both in J.-M. Bertrand (ed.), *La violence dans les mondes grec et romain* (Paris 2005), 271–86 and 287–305 respectively (the 'Greek slant' of the bibliography shows the important place occupied by such stories in the Greek 'imaginaire',

but note that neither Leduc nor Bonnard mention Pseudo-Plutarch's stories); see also the overview by J. Scheid, 'Human sacrifice III, Classical Antiquity', *BNP* 6 (2005), 568-71.

While Lydos and Clement agree on the Averting gods, absent in *Parallela minora*, and also agree in omitting any mention of the two altars emitting a sound of trumpets, Lydos does not give a source reference for the information (whereas Clement does: Dorotheos, as in *Parallela minora*); Clement does not identify the enemy; *Parallela minora* mentions the Cimbri; Lydos adds to the Cimbri the Teutones, which may, as Jacoby suggests, be an addition by Lydos, or not (the Teutones might have been present in the original ampler version, and have been left out in the process of epitomization of the *Parallela minora*, just as happened with the *theoi apotropaioi*. If indeed the two altars correspond to the two trophies in Rome mentioned by Valerius Maximus 6.9.14 – see below – then it is worth remembering that the same Valerius Maximus, in the same passage, mentions in the same breath Marius' victory over Cimbri and Teutones: the two tribes correspond to the two altars. Yet the argument cuts both ways: Lydos might have added the Teutones because he was used to this kind of association).

For discussion of the textual relationship between the *Parallela minora*, Lydos, and Clement, see C. Müller, *Geographi graeci minores* 1 (Paris 1851), lii-liii; E. Hiller, 'Zur Quellenkritik des Clemens Alexandrinus', *Hermes* 21 (1886) 126-33; F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* S.3, 8 (1940), 95-6, and 104 with 117-8; A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 83-87, and in part. 85 n. 348; on *Parallela minora* and Clement, see also A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman world* (Oxford 2004), 49 (but while I certainly agree on the fact that Demaratos' *tragoidoumena* and Dorotheos' *Italika* are Ps-Plutarchan fictions, the case of Pythokles's *On concord* is more complex, and would need further investigation – Horster's commentary, in *BNJ* Pythokles 833, is not sufficient).

As stressed by Jacoby (*FGrH* 3a, 390), in terms of tradition, it is important that both Lydos and Clement, who otherwise summarize, have preserved a reference to the Ἀποτρόπαιοι θεοί: their accord on this point shows that these gods must have been present in the original, ampler version of the *Parallela minora*. K. Dowden, 'Dositheos', *BNJ* 54 F 8, forgets about Lydos (F 1b above), when he stresses that the Averting gods appear in Clement but not in the *Parallela minora* 20 B, and as a result claims that Clement 'appears to have data from Dorotheos independently of the *Parallela minora*' (see also A. De Lazzer, in E. Calderon Dorda, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003), 33 and nn. 98-99, who seems to leave open the possibility that Clement and *Parallela minora* may be independently using a common source; Lydos is again ignored). Lydos certainly depends on *Parallela minora*: he gives one after the other the Roman and the Greek story here discussed, but also preserves seven other parallel stories attributed to other authors (list in Ziegler, *Plutarchos*, 867; Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren', 98, 110; and De Lazzer, 84-5 n. 348). Thus, unless we want to assume that Lydos, who quotes no authorities for this story, on one occasion looked up Dorotheos, or invented the relatively recherché Avenging gods (even though evidence for actual cult is scarce, literary texts refer to sacrifices to the Averting gods as a group; see R. Parker, 'Apotropaic gods', *BNP* 1 (2002), 891-2), we must accept that the earlier and ampler version of *Parallela minora* included a mention of these gods. And this in turn means that while in theory Clement might have found the story, with the *theoi apotropaioi*, in Dorotheos, that need not be the case.

Besides our passage, the *Theoi apotropaioi* are mentioned in Pseudo-Plutarch also:

- at Pseudo-Plutarch, *On rivers* 23, attributed to Dorotheos the Chaldaean, *On stones* book 2 (see below, F3);
- at *Parallela minora* 19A (after emendation: the text has τρόπαιοι), in a passage attributed to Dositheos, *Sikelika* book 3 (= BNJ Dositheos 54 F 8, the story of a daughter raped by her father, whom Dionysos has made drunk as punishment for his refusal to drink wine; the daughter recognizes him from his ring, sacrifices him to the Averting gods, and then sacrifices herself over him);
- at Pseudo-Plutarch, *On rivers* 16.1 (after emendation: the text has ἀποτρόπαιον referred to the victim, and not to the gods), attributed to Thrasyllus, *Aigyptiaka* (FGrH 622 F1). Thrasyllus is important in this context, because an author of this name is also cited by Clement, *Miscellanies* 1.136, 3 (FGrH 253 = BNJ 253 F 1), for information that is different from that of the fragments present in Pseudo-Plutarch.

K. Dowden, 'Dositheos', BNJ 54 F 8, offers a discussion of this group of references; the one point on which I fully agree is that these references to the Averting gods are not independent of each other. (See further below, 'Biographical essay').

No defeat of Marius by the Cimbri is on record; on the contrary, Marius won in 101 BC at the Campi Raudii, near Vercellae, a definitive victory over the Cimbri. It is however true that Marius intervened after Roman forces, led by the consul Gnaeus Manlius Maximus and the proconsul Quintus Servilius Caepio, were wiped out in a terrible defeat at Arausio in 105 BC; and that even after the – irregular – election of Marius as consul to fight the Cimbri, the latter managed to descend into Italy when the Marius' fellow-consul, Lutatius Catulus, failed to fortify the Alpine passes. Even so, the fact remains that Marius never had anything to do with Germany (the location of the altars according to F 1a), and that the decisive battles were fought in Gaul, at Aquae Sextiae, and in Italy, at Vercellae (see K. Elvers, 'Marius I 1', *BNP* 8 (2006) 363-6, with further bibliography).

Even more surprising is the attribution to Marius of a daughter Calpurnia. F. Münzer, 'Calpurnia 124', *RE* 3 (1896) 1406 nr. 124 states his disbelief in the story, but does not explain the choice of such a name; Jacoby advances the hypothesis of a connection between Pseudo-Plutarch and the Calpurnii. An alternative, but rather far-fetched, possibility is to think that the choice of Calpurnia as the name of the daughter sacrificed by Marius here is a reflection of the suicide of the daughter of L. Calpurnius Bestia: wife of L. Antistius and mother of Antistia, the first wife of Pompey, she committed suicide, following the murder of her husband in 82 BC on the orders of the younger Marius.

The invention concerning the extraordinary altars may be based on the stories of menacing signs during the wars against the Cimbri; these signs, among which figure the ringing of weapons and the sound of trumpets as from the sky, were noticed in Italy (Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 391 refers to Pliny, *Natural History* 2.148; Lydos, *On celestial signs* 6 p. 13.15 Wachsmuth; Julius Obsequens, *Book of prodigies* 43; Plutarch, *Marius* 17.8). The two altars of the story perhaps owe their existence, as Jacoby suggests, to the two trophies visible in Rome (Valerius Maximus 6.9.14) and to the commissioning, following an answer of the aruspices, of two armed statues in olive wood (Julius Obsequens, *Book of prodigies* 43), in the year 104 BC, when Marius was consul with Flaccus. We do not know exactly at what moment the altars in Germany 'even now' send forth a sound of trumpets: the detail must have been lost during

the process of epitomization of the *Parallela minora*: either at the anniversary of the sacrifice, or when a similar sacrifice is accomplished.

Jacoby further points out that Marius' reliance on signs and prodigies made him the right hero for the story, but that interestingly Pseudo-Plutarch chose a trivialised version, the dream, while he could have made use of some of the more extraordinary practices attributed to Marius, such as those mentioned by Plutarch, *Life of Marius* 17 (who has them from Poseidonios: the prophetess Martha, 2-5 or the great mother of Pessinus, 9-11.)

This story presents an *aition* at the end; Jacoby considers it as one of the features that must have been typical of Pseudo-Plutarch, and compares it with *Parallela minora* 5 A (= Ps. Kallisthenes *FGrH* 124 F 56), and with *Parallela minora* 6 B (=Kritolaos *FGrH* 823 F 2); in these stories, someone offers their life for the common weal, and an altar is established; the place then is named from the deed. While the parallelisms are certainly there (*pace* M. Horster, *BNJ* 823, commentary to F 2: there is here a fascinating cluster, that has been explored e.g. by 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), the aetiological element is not always treated in the same way. It seems to me that while in the *On rivers* Pseudo-Plutarch certainly laid much stress on aetiologies, this is less evident in the case of the *Parallela minora*.

289 F 2a - (2) <i>STOB Flor.</i> 4, 8, 33	meta [[id="289" type="F" n="2" n-mod="a" tgroup="2, 1"]]
Subject: Politics: tyranny. Law: torture Historical Work: Sikelika book 1 Source date: 5th C AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: c. 570-550 BC	Translation
<p>Δωροθέου ἐν ᾧ Σικελικῶν. Φάλαρις Ἀκραγαντίνων τύραννος, ἀπότομος καὶ ἀπαθῆς ὑπάρχων, ξέναις καὶ παρευρημέναις βασάνοις ἔτρυχε καὶ ἐστρέβλου τοὺς ὁμοφύλους. Πέριλλος δὲ τῆι τέχνῃ χαλκουργὸς κατασκευάσας δάμαλιν ἔδωκε τῷ βασιλεῖ δῶρον, ἵνα τοὺς ξένους εἰς αὐτὴν βάλλων κατακαίῃ ζῶντας· μυκηθμὸν δ' ἡ δάμαλις ἀνεδίδου τῷ φυσικῶι παρόμοιον. Φάλαρις δὲ τότε μόνον γενόμενος δίκαιος αὐτὸν τὸν τεχνίτην πρῶτον ἐνέβαλεν.</p>	<p>Dorotheos in the first book of his <i>Sikelika</i>. Phalaris the tyrant of Agrigentum, being cruel and pitiless, used to torment and torture with extraordinary and special tortures his citizens. Perillos, by trade a bronze worker, built a heifer and gave it to the king as a gift, so that he, throwing the foreigners in it, could burn them alive; the heifer gave out a bellowing similar to the natural one. But Phalaris, showing himself just in this one instance only, first threw into it the artisan.</p>

289 F 2a Commentary

See commentary to F 2b.

289 F 2b - [Plutarch] <i>Parall. min.</i> 39A = <i>Moralia</i> 315 CD = Callimachos fr. 47 Pfeiffer, 54 Massimilla	meta [[id="289" type="F" n="2" n-mod="b" tgroup="2, 2"]]
Subject: Politics: tyranny. Law: torture Historical Work: Aitia book 2 Source date: 2nd C AD	Translation

Historian's date: third century BC Historical period: c 570/50 BC	
<p>Φάλαρις Ἀκραγαντίνων τύραννος ἀποτόμως τοὺς παριόντας ξένους ἐστρέβλου καὶ ἐκόλαζε. Πέριλλος² δὲ τῆι τέχνῃ χαλκουργὸς δάμαλιν κατασκευάσας χαλκῆν³ ἔδωκε τῷ βασιλεῖ, ὡς ἂν τοὺς ξένους κατακαίῃ ζῶντας⁴ ἐν αὐτῇ. ὁ δὲ τότε μόνον γενόμενος δίκαιος αὐτὸν ἐνέβαλεν. ἔδοκει δὲ μυκηθμὸν ἀναδιδόναι ἢ δάμαλις, ὡς <Καλλίμαχος> ἐν δευτέρῳ Αἰτίων.⁵</p>	<p>Phalaris the tyrant of Agrigentum tortured and punished cruelly the foreigners that passed by. Perillos, by trade a bronze worker, having built a bronze heifer gave it to the king, so that he could burn alive in it the foreigners. But the king, behaving justly only then, threw him into it. The heifer seemed to emit a bellowing, as <Callimachos> says in the second book of the <i>Aitia</i>.</p>

289 F 2b Commentary

The story of Phalaris' bull was a famous one; for details on the bull, and on its potential connection with Ζεὺς Ἀταβύριος and beyond it with a Hittite bull-god, see A.B. Cook, *Zeus. A Study in Ancient Religion*, 910; on Phalaris, see D. Musti, 'Le tradizioni ecistiche di Agrigento' and O. Murray, 'Falaride fra mito e storia', both in L. Braccisi, E. De Miro (eds.), *Agrigento e la Sicilia greca* (Roma 1992), 27-45 and 47-60 respectively; N. Luraghi, *Tirannidi arcaiche in Sicilia e Magna Grecia* (Firenze 1994), 21-49; as well as F.W. Walbank, *A historical commentary on Polybius II* (Oxford 1967), 380-3, and J. Thornton, in *Polibio. Storie* (Milano 2003), 482-4. The Roman parallel narrative (Aemilius Censorinus tortures people by means of a bronze horse, a story attributed to Aristeides of Miletos, *BNJ* 286 F 9) is unattested elsewhere, and is clearly modelled on the Greek story.

The accounts of Stobaios (F 2a, attributed by Stobaios to Dorotheos) and *Parallela minora* (F 2b, from the second book of Callimachos' *Aitia*, if the restoration is correct) are clearly connected (the discussion by G. Knaack, *Callimachea* (Stettin 1887), 6-13 is still relevant): they present some variants unique within the tradition on Phalaris and his tortures. In particular,

- both texts speak of a bronze heifer, while usually the animal is a bull: so in Pindar, *Pythian* 1.95, the first source to mention Phalaris's novel instrument of torture; in Aristotle, fr. 611.69 Rose; in Timaios, *FGrH* 566 F 28c, who thought that the Agrigentines had thrown the bull in the sea; in Polybios 12.25.1-5, for whom the bull had been brought to Carthage; in Diodoros of Sicily, 13.90.4-6. On the bull / heifer issue see V. Hinz, *Nunc Phalaris doctum protulit ecce caput. Antike Phalarislegende und Nachleben der Phalarisbriefe* (Berlin 2001) 37-39 and n. 99, and on the traditions concerning the end of Phalaris' bull F. W. Walbank, 'Phalaris' Bull in Timaeus (Diod. Sic. xiii. 90. 4-7)' *CQ* 59 (1945), 39-42 and G. Schepens, 'Polybius on Timaeus' Account of Phalaris' Bull: a case of ΔΕΙΣΙΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΑ', *Ancient Society* 9 (1978) 249-78;

² All the codices have Τέρυζος; Πέριλλος is only attested as the correction of a second hand in α. De Lazzer 2000 thus retains Τέρυζος. Most editors however (including Nachstädt, Jacoby, and Boulogne) put back here the Πέριλλος transmitted by Stobaios, which corresponds to the name as known by the tradition (see commentary); palaeographically the two words are close, and corruption in names is very frequent.

³ The Epitome omits χαλκῆν

⁴ The Epitome omits ζῶντας.

⁵ Καλλίμαχος Bentley; Αἰτίων Bentley (αἰτιῶν codd.)

• both give as the name of the inventor Perillos – or rather: Stobaios has Perillos (i.e. the diminutive form of the name, which is typically used by Latin authors: Pliny, *Natural history* 34.89, Propertius 2.25.12, Ovid *Ibis* 437 and *Art of Love* 65); in contrast, Diodoros of Sicily 9.18 and 32.25, the first source to name the inventor, gives as his name Περίλαος, followed by most Greek authors. Thus, Dorotheos / Pseudo-Plutarch seems to have made a clear choice of the Latinized form of the name (assonance with the name of the tyrant of Himera Terillos may have helped). *Parallela minora* has Τέρυζος, a name unattested elsewhere, which is most likely to be explained as an error for Πέριλλος (see Hinz, *Nunc Phalaris doctum protulit ecce caput. Antike Phalarislegende und Nachleben der Phalarisbriefe*, 70-71 and n. 203).

There are however also some small differences between the two passages (discussed in J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Paralleli minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 53-6, as well as in Knaack, *Callimachea*, 6-8, in Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 391, and in A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 360-2), as well as between the two passages on the one hand, and the epitome on the other (the text of the Epitome is given below):

1. the source references differ (no source references, as usual, in the Epitome);
2. in F2a (Dorotheos) the victims of Phalaris' cruelty are ὁμόφυλοι (literally: 'people of the same tribe'), while in F2b (Callimachos) and in the Epitome they are foreigners;
3. the sentence concerning the sound emitted by the heifer is located differently, and has a different effect;
4. the Epitome stresses the tyrant's pleasure in the torture.

1. The name of Callimachos is absent from the manuscripts of the *Parallela minora*; but Bentley (*Callimachi fragmenta a Richardo Bentleio collecta*, in *Callimachi hymni, epigrammata, et fragmenta ex recensione Theodori J.G.F. Graevii* (Ultrajecti 1697), 310) already proposed to restore his name, on the basis of the reference to the second book of the *Aitia*, present in *Parallela minora*, and because we know from independent evidence (Tzetzes's commentary to Lycophron, *Alexandra*, 717; a scholion to Pindar, *Pythian* 1.185; and a papyrus fragment) that Callimachos had, in the second book of his *Aitia*, narrated the story of Phalaris (frr. 45-46+SH252-47 Pfeiffer = 52-53-54 Massimilla). R. Hercher, *Plutarchi Libellus De Fluviis* (Leipzig 1851), 21 however suggested that we should trust Stobaios, whose version is more complete and detailed, expunge the reference to a book of *Aitia* from the *Parallela minora*, and restore instead the name of Dorotheos and the title *Sikelika*; Hercher actually argued that in all instances in which the indirect tradition had a source reference different from that given in *Parallela minora*, we should agree with the indirect tradition, because *Parallela minora*, as we have them, are an epitome, and Hercher assumed that the epitomator, while shortening the stories, also substituted here and there known authors for unknown ones (see 19-21 for the full argument; this explanation has been accepted by Knaack, *Callimachea*, 6, for whom however the reference to the *Aitia* was the fact of a 'probus atque doctus grammaticus' (different from the epitomator?), who recognized where Pseudo-Plutarch had taken his information from). F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* S.3, 8 (1940), 106-108 and 124-35, advanced an alternative explanation: taking as his point of departure the existence of double references **within** the *Parallela minora*, and taking into account also those cases where the indirect tradition (i.e. Stobaios, Lydos and Clement) differs from *Parallela minora* in the content of the stories narrated, Jacoby argued that the original, ampler version of Pseudo-Plutarch's work

included instances of double source-references and variant versions, in which a real author and an invented one were cited side to side (besides Jacoby's list of instances, 124-7, see also the list of divergences concerning the authority for the story narrated in De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori*, 40-2). This indeed may explain the situation – although only in part, because one still wonders why Stobaios should have chosen Dorotheos rather than Callimachos, and more generally why the indirect tradition should so often have gone for the 'worse' authority. At any rate: to leave in the text of *Parallela minora* the reference to the *Aitia* without adding the name of Callimachos, as Nachstädt did, and as both De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori*, and J. Boulogne, *Plutarque. Oeuvres morales* 4 (Paris 2002), 272, do, shows respect for the textual tradition, but is certainly not a solution, in light of the fact that Stobaios has *Sikelika* as the title of Dorotheos' work: it seems to me that here one should either expunge the reference to the *Aitia* as well, and follow Hercher in thinking that Callimachos was never mentioned in the original version of the *Parallela minora*, and that the *Sikelika* of Dorotheos should be reinstated; or, if one prefers to keep the reference to the *Aitia*, then one should add the author's name as well (with Jacoby), since this is the one piece of information that is never missing in *Parallela minora*, and since, whenever there are double citations, one of them is from a famous author. This second course has been followed here.

2. The *homophyloi* have been interpreted as citizens of Akragas; in this case, F2a would present the traditional model of the tyrant cruel towards his own citizens, as opposed (F2b) to a more general cruelty towards foreigners. It is possible, as De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 361 suggests, that in the original, ampler version of *Parallela minora* there were two variants, concerning cruelty towards citizens and towards foreigners; but as Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 391 stresses, the *homophyloi* could very well be Greek foreigners (all the more since later in F2a the prospective victims of the heifer, earlier denoted as *homophyloi*, are now said to be foreigners, *xenoi*). If this is true, then the story of Phalaris, as presented in F 2a and 2b, reflects a specific moment of the tradition, in which Phalaris has moved from the tyrant harsh towards his own citizens to a general example of extraordinary cruelty, exercised towards foreigners (as Bursis), but including (unlike Bursis) foreigners who are *homophyloi*, Greek foreigners. (See on this change E.A. Freeman, *The History of Sicily* ii (Oxford 1891), 458-77).

The Roman parallel narrative (39B, *Moralia* 315 DE = *FGrH* 286 F 9) does not help us decide, since it does not specify who the intended victims might have been. But modifications as to the origin and status of the victims (citizens/foreigners) do indeed correspond to a division within the ancient tradition: Callimachos, who was proposing a comparison between the behaviour of Bursis and that of Phalaris, had to have foreigners, because Bursis famously sacrificed foreigners to Zeus (see on this the scholia to Pindar, *Pythian* 1, 185). However a variant preserved in Diodoros 9 frr. 18-19 Vogel, and possibly going back to Timaios (cf. *FGrH* 566 F 28), states, as in F2b above, that *ὁμόφυλοι* were sacrificed in Phalaris' bull. See on all this G. Massimilla, *Callimaco. Aitia. Libri primo e secondo* (Pisa 1996), 360-66.

3. in F2a, the sentence concerning the sound emitted by the heifer simply refers to how the torture functioned, while in F2b, the bellowing comes after the remark concerning the punishment of the inventor, so that the impression is that the sound is emitted by the inventor while being tortured. This is most likely the result of a mechanical error, as a result of which the sentence was misplaced (so Knaack, *Callimachea*, 6; Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 391, on the grounds that the bellowing is part of the invention: numerous Latin authors, who all seem to depend on Callimachos, describe the sound produced by the victims of Phalaris (e.g. Propertius 2.25.11-12. Ovid *Ibis* 437-40 with the scholia, *Tristia* 3.11.53-54, 5.1.53, Valerius

Maximus 9.2.ext. 9, Persius 3.39, Silius Italicus 14.213-17, Claudian, *Gildonic war* 1.186-7, *Against Eutropius* 1.167; and Pliny, *Natural history* 34.89): this shows that the sound was an important part of the story).

4. In terms of textual tradition it is worth stressing that the version of the *Epitome*, even if it misses some minor details, is on the whole slightly ampler, slightly different and more detailed than either Stobaios or *Parallela minora*:

Φάλαρις Ἀκραγαντίνων τύραννος τοὺς παριόντας ξένους ἐστρέβλου καὶ ἐκόλαζε. Τέρυζος δὲ τῆι τέχνῃ χαλκουργὸς δάμαλιν κατασκευάσας ἔδωκε τῷ βασιλεῖ, ὡς ἂν τοὺς ξένους κατακαίῃ ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἡδέως ἔχῃ μυκηθμὸν ἐν τῷ κατακαίεσθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον τῆς δαμάλεως ἀναδιδούσης. ὁ δὲ Φάλαρις ἐν τούτῳ μόνῳ δίκαιος φανεῖς αὐτὸν ἐκείνον ἐνέβαλε τῆς οἰκείας τέχνης ἀπολαῦσαι.

Phalaris the tyrant of the Agrigentines tortured and punished cruelly the foreigners that passed by. Teryzos, a bronze worker, having built a heifer gave it to the king, so that he might burn in it the foreigners, and himself take pleasure out of it, as the heifer emitted a bellowing in burning the man. But Phalaris appearing just in this one instance only threw him into it, so that he could taste his own craft.

This is the only text to stress the element of pleasure, ‘straightforwardly’ in talking of the tyrant, and ironically (ἀπολαῦσαι) when mentioning the inventor. Pleasure is not at all stressed in either Stobaios or *Parallela minora*, but it must have been present in the original version.

The paradoxical justice of the tyrant and the punishment of the inventor reappear in much of the tradition, beginning with Callimachos F 53 Massimilla =F 46 Pf. (see e.g. Diodoros of Sicily 32.25; Ovid, *Art of love* 1.653-6; *Tristia* 3.11.42-52; 5.1.53; 12.47; *Letters from the Pontus* 2.9.44; Silius Italicus 14.216-7; Pliny, *Natural history* 24.89; Claudian, *In Eutropius* 1.164-67). Phalaris himself is made to justify this decision in one of the letters attributed to him (*Epist.* 122, 3, in R. Hercher, *Epistolographi graeci* 446). The same paradoxical notion of justice is present in the story of Burisis, at least in the version narrated by [Apollodoros], *Library* 2.11: the first foreigner sacrificed by Busiris was the seer Phrasius, who had suggested this solution to end the persisting draught. Ovid, *Ibis* 439 has a further twist, not attested elsewhere: the tyrant himself was burnt inside the bull, after his tongue had been cut (that the mother and the friends of the tyrant were thrown into the bull and burnt by the Agrigentines is stated by Heracleides Lembos 69 Dilts).

289 F 3 - (6) [Plutarch] De fluviis 23, 3 = Moralia 1165A	meta[[id="289" type="F" n="3"]]
Subject: Religion: cult, sacrifice, ritual Historical Work: On stones book 2 Source date: 2nd C AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: n/a	Translation
καὶ λίθος δὲ γεννᾶται σικύωνος καλούμενος, μελάγχρους. οὗτος ὅταν τις χρησμὸς ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἐκπέσῃ, τοῖς βωμοῖς τῶν Ἀποτροπαίων θεῶν ὑπὸ δυνεῖν ἐπιτίθεται παρθένων· τοῦ δὲ ἱερέως αὐτοῦ τῆι μαχαίραι θιγόντος, αἵματος ἔκρυσις	And in it (the Armenian Araxes) a stone called ‘sikyonos’ grows, black in colour. And whenever an oracle requesting human sacrifice is given, this stone is put on the altar of the Averting gods by two virgins. And when the priest touches it with the

γίνεται δαφιλής, καὶ τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ τὴν δεισιδαιμονίαν τελέσαντες μετ' ὄλολυγμῶν ἀναχωροῦσι, τὸν λίθον πρὸς τὸν ναὸν προσενέγκαντες, καθὼς ἰστορεῖ Δωρόθεος ὁ Χαλδαῖος ἐν β' Περὶ λίθων.	sacrificial knife, there is an abundant flow of blood. And when they have accomplished the rite in this way they retire with lamentations, having brought the stone to the temple, as Dorotheos the Chaldaian records in the second book <i>On stones</i> .
--	--

289 F 3 Commentary

As usual in the *On rivers*, the stone has virtues that are connected to those of the river in which it is found. According to one version, the river Araxes takes its name from a tyrant who sacrificed the two virgin daughters of a subordinate, Mnesalkes, in order to spare the life of his own daughters (interestingly, a father who refuses to sacrifice his daughters: see by contrast above, F 1); the subordinate however took revenge and killed the daughters of the tyrant, who threw himself in the river (narrated in *On rivers* 23.1; no source is mentioned for this story, which is preceded by an alternative version that does not involve virgins and is attributed to Ktesiphon, *BNJ* 294 F 2). A plant growing in the river is called *araxa*, which in the local language means 'virgin-hater' (*misoparthenos*); when found by virgins, it first loses blood, and then withers (*On rivers* 23.2; for this too no source-reference is given). F 3 follows, attributed to Dorotheos (and we may wonder whether all that precedes is also meant to come from Dorotheos). The stone mentioned here is also linked to virginal blood, as the river and the plant; it is a substitute for human blood, and stops the chain of revenge initiated by the act of the king. Jacoby remarks (*FGrH* 3a, 392) that it is not by chance that the name of the stone reminds one of the σικύη (gourd, but also a cupping-instrument to draw blood, as *e.g.* in Hippocrates, *On ancient medicine* 22), and of the juicy cucumber (σίκυος). But there is also an intra-textual connection here, since the name of the stone recalls that of the Greek city Sicyon, mentioned in the previous paragraph (*On Rivers* 22.1), in the context of a story in which a father kills by mistake his own son (see C. Delattre, *Pseudo-Plutarque. Nommer le monde* (Villeneuve d'Ascq 2011), 213).

The indication concerning the origin (Chaldaeia) is important, because none of the other fragments give an origin for Dorotheos. This is actually rather odd, as in most cases the origin of an author is indicated (see F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* S.3, 8 (1940), 92-3). Because *Parallela minora* and *On rivers* stem from the same author, references to a source of the same name in the two works are considered to refer to the same 'source'. As pointed out by Delattre, *Nommer le monde*, 213, the name 'Dorotheos' ('gift of the gods' or 'gift to the gods') is appropriate for the author of a story in which a stone is offered to the gods, in replacement of human sacrifice.

289 F 4 - (4) [Plutarch] <i>Parall. min.</i> 25A = <i>Moralia</i> 311 E	meta[[id="289" type="F" n="4"]]
Subject: Historical Work: <i>Metamorphoseis</i> book 1 Source date: 2nd C AD Historian's date: unknown Historical period: Myth: mythical past	Translation
Φώκου ὄντος ἐκ Ψαμάθης Αἰακῶδι καὶ	Telamon led out to a hunt Phokos, who

στεργομένου Τελαμών ἦγεν ἐπὶ θήραν· καὶ
σὺς ἐπιφανέντος κατὰ τοῦ μισομένου
ἐπαφῆκε τὸ δόρυ καὶ ἐφόνευσεν. ὁ δὲ
πατήρ ἐφυγάδευσεν, ὡς Δωρόθεος ἐν
πρώτῳ Μεταμορφώσεων.

was the son of Aiakos by Psamathe and
much beloved. When a boar appeared,
Telamon threw his spear against the hated
one and killed him. But his father drove
him into exile, as Dorotheos says in the
first book of his *Metamorphoses*.

289 F 4 Commentary

This is a well-known story, of which there were numerous versions, different in respect to who exactly had murdered Phokos (both brothers; Peleus only – this is the most widespread version – or Telamon only, a version present only here), in the way in which Phokos was killed, and in the reason for the murder (see S. Eitrem, ‘Phokos 3’, *RE* 20.1 (1941), 498-500; the long, detailed footnote of J.G. Frazer, *Apollodoros. Library* (Cambridge, Mass. - London 1921), II 56-7, ad 3.13.6; and T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth: a Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore 1993), 222-3). Its Roman pendant, the story of the murder by Rhesos of his half-brother Similis during a hunt, and of the exile imposed on him by his father Gaius Maximus, supposedly culled from the third book of Aristokles’ *Italika*, is unknown, and clearly modelled on the basis of the Greek story (see *BNJ* 831 F 1 - but I cannot agree with M. Horster’s commentary to F 1, nor with her overall evaluation of Aristokles). Because the title *Metamorphoses* does not fit with the other works attributed to Dorotheos, Dübner in a note to Müller’s edition (C. Müller, *Scriptores rerum Alexandri magni* (Paris 1846) 156) proposed the correction of the author’s name to Theodoros, whose *Metamorphoses* are cited in *Parallela minora* 22A, *Moralia* 310 F-311 A; the same correction is proposed by M. van der Valk, *Researches on the text and the scholia of the Iliad* 1 (Leiden 1963), 406 n. 377. There is no reason to correct the text, which is perfectly sound as it is.

The sixth-century epic poem *Alcmeonis* is our earliest source for the death of Phokos. In it, Phokos is killed by his half-brothers Telamon and Peleus: the first hits him with a discus, the second finishes him off with an axe (*Alcmeonis* F 1 Bernabé, *Poetae Epici Graeci* I (Leipzig 1987) = *Alcmeonis* F 1 West, *Greek epic fragments* = scholia to Euripides, *Andromache* 687). A similar version, in which, however, Peleus hits Phokos with the discus and Telamon finishes him off with a sword, is recorded in the scholia on Pindar, *Nemean* 5.14 and in Tzetzes’ commentary to Lycophron’s *Alexandra*, 175.

Pausanias 2.29.9 and 10.30.4, Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 11.267, and the A scholia to Homer, *Iliad* 16.14 all present Peleus as the murderer, and his action as intended. In [Apollodoros], *Library* 3.12.6.11 Telamon is the main actor, as in F 4 above: the two brothers plot against Phokos, but the lot falls on Telamon, who kills him. (In discussing Dorotheos’ version, F 4 above, in which Telamon acts alone, Gantz, *Early Greek Myth*, 223 suggests that this version may have been intended to exonerate Peleus. While such an intent may have applied to the source followed on that point by [Apollodoros], it seems to me very unlikely that the *Parallela minora* – or even Dorotheos’ *Metamorphoses*, if they ever existed – might have had such an intent). Finally, some sources present the death as accidental: in Pindar, *Nemean* 5.14-16, no specific details are given, but the brothers are unjustly exiled together, one supposes as a consequence of the accidental death of Phokos; the death is accidental also in Diodoros of Sicily 4.72.6 (with Peleus having thrown the discus and being sent into exile).

Antoninus Liberalis, *Metamorphoses* 38, offers a complex narrative (related, if one trusts the manchette, to Nikander’s *Heteroiumena* (cf. *BNJ* 271-2)), which involves a metamorphosis. In Antoninus’ version, the two brothers kill Phokos ‘in secret’ – how the murder was

perpetrated is not specified; they are then exiled; while in exile, Peleus unintentionally kills, during a hunt, his benefactor Eurytion, who has purified him; he has thus to leave again, and after other incidents brings together cattle and sheep as blood-price for Eurytion; but as the father of Eurytion, Iros, does not accept the price, the animals are left free. At this point, a wolf eats them all, and is by divine will changed into a stone. In Antoninus, the murder of Phokos is presented in the traditional way; but the second story, in which Peleus kills Eurytion during a boar-hunt, is interesting. Telamon is the hero of a similar adventure: according to Philostephanos, quoted as authority in the scholia D to Homer, *Iliad* 16.14 (Van Thiel), Peleus killed Phokos, and was sent into exile; as for Telamon, he killed involuntarily one of the participants in the hunt of the Calydonian boar, and thus was also sent into exile. In [Apollodoros] *Library* 3.13.2, Peleus kills Eurytion, son of Actor, during the Calydonian boar-hunt. The unique version of *Parallela minora* might thus be the result of a confusion between these versions (so Frazer, *Apollodorus* II, 56-57), or also, as I prefer to think (with Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 392), of intentional readaptation. Note however that Lactantius Placidus, *Commentary to Statius, Thebaid* 2. 113, seems to hint at a version in which Peleus unwittingly killed Phokos during a hunt (he is comparing Tydeus, ‘pollutus ... sanguine Melanippi fratris sui, quem in venatu incautus occiderat ut Peleus Phocum, ...’; but in the commentary to the *Thebaid* 7.344 and 11.281, Lactantius Placidus names Peleus and Telamon together as murderers, without giving details as to how this was achieved): more variants than we can now track may have been circulating. As Peter Liddel points out to me, beyond issues of content, we may find a trace of the literary ambitions of the Pseudo-Plutarch in the parallelism preserved in the text of *Parallela minora*, where Phokos moves from being presented as the beloved one (στεργουμένου) to being the hated one (μισουμένου).

Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 392 stresses the oddity of the absence of a metamorphosis in a story culled from a book titled *Metamorphoses*. As he points out, the notion that in an ampler version of the *Parallela minora* / in Dorotheos Phokos transformed himself in a seal, is a solution of despair; nor can a metamorphosis such as the one that occurs at the end of the version of Antoninus Liberalis 38 (the wolf who eats the cattle, and is then changed into stone) solve the problem. However, according to a tradition preserved by [Apollodoros], *Library* 3.12.6, and by the scholiast to Euripides, *Andromache* 687, Phokos’ mother, the Nereid Psamathe, had transformed herself into a seal in attempting to escape the advances of Aiakos. While this cannot have figured in the story as narrated in *Parallela minora*, it is clear that transformations are part of the story’s overall landscape; in this sense, to give as source-reference a book on metamorphosis may have been an intended, allusive joke of Pseudo-Plutarch.

289 Biographical Essay

Dorotheos is a very common name; this makes any attempt at identification particularly difficult. He is one of a restricted group of authors mentioned in both *Parallela minora* (F 1, 2 and 4) and *On rivers* (F 3, where an origin from Chaldaeia is indicated); to him are attributed *Italika* in at least four books; *Sikelika*, in at least one book; *Metamorphoses*, in at least one book; and at least two books *On stones*. The character of these fragments is rather disparate: an extremely improbable piece of Roman history; another historical piece on an early Sicilian tyrant (as pointed out by F. Jacoby, ‘Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren’, *Mnemosyne* S.3, 8 (1940), 78, this passage shows well how the titles were invented: a Sicilian book for a story on a Sicilian tyrant); a mythological narrative; and a discussion of stones. An element that connects some of these fragments is human sacrifice: F 1 and 3 discuss sacrifices of virgins; to speak of sacrifice for Phalaris’ bull

would be to stretch the implications of the text, since the torture imposed by Phalaris does not seem to have had a religious context; but after all, the story was traditionally paired with that of Busiris, and the Egyptian king did 'sacrifice' men; F 4 is a story of murder, and it is impossible to read sacrifice in it; but it is murder between kin, as in F 1.

Can Dorotheos be identified with an existing author, or failing that, can we identify an author as the probable source of inspiration of Pseudo-Plutarch? Among the many authors bearing the name Dorotheos, A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 64-5 singles out the following four as potential candidates for an identification:

1. an Athenian, historian of Alexander (*FGrH* 145), possibly active in the first century BC (E. Schwartz, 'Dorotheos' n. 15, *RE* 5.2 (1905), 1571);
2. a physician, possibly from Egypt, active in the first century BC (M. Wellmann, 'Dorotheos' n. 19, *RE* 5.2 (1905), 1571);
3. a grammarian from Ascalon, active at the time of Augustus and Tiberius (L. Cohn, 'Dorotheos' n. 20, *RE* 5.2 (1905), 1571-2)
4. an astronomer, astrologer and poet from Sidon, active in the first - second century AD (F. Kuhnert, 'Dorotheos' n. 21, *RE* 5.2 (1905), 1572; see also W. Kroll, 'Dorotheos' n. 21, *RE* suppl. 3 (1918), 412-4.

The physician is unlikely to have played a role. As for the others, the two most prominent candidates are the historian of Alexander, and the astronomer from Sidon. In his appendix to Arrian, C. Müller, *Scriptores Rerum Alexandri Magni* (Paris 1846) 155-6 printed the four fragments listed above, with two further fragments: a fragment preserved by Athenaios, 7.276 F (= *FGrH* 145 F 1: 'Philip of Macedon and his son Alexander loved apples, as Dorotheos states in the sixth book of his *Histories concerning Alexander*'), and another one preserved by Clement of Alexandria, *Miscellanies* 1.24, 133.1 ('They say that the Cyrenaean Battos instituted the divination called of Mopsos, and Dorotheos says in the first book of the *Pandects* that Mopsos listened to the halcyon and the crow'). In his commentary, Müller stated that he thought it preferable to distinguish between the historian of Alexander, of whom Athenaios had preserved one fragment, and the author of *Italika* and *Sikelika* preserved by Pseudo-Plutarch; further, he considered that the author of *Metamorphosis* (also preserved in Pseudo-Plutarch) and of *Pandectae* (preserved by Clement) was the same as the author of *Italika*; and finally, since some of the authors cited in *Parallela minora* reappear in the *On rivers*, he hesitantly suggested that all these fragments might be attributed to Dorotheos the Chaldaean (with a disarming, telling remark: 'Certe Italica si ab Asiatico homine scripta putes, fabulam fr. 3 narratam (= F 1) minus miraberis'). For his part, U. Kahrstedt, 'Dorotheos' 15a, *RE* suppl. 3 (1918), 412, decided that two fragments should be specifically referred to an invented Dorotheos the Chaldaean: *De Fluviis* 23.3 (the *On stones*, F 3), and *Parallela minora* 25B (the *Metamorphoses*, F 4).

J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Paralleli minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 114-5 accepted Müller's apportionment of the fragments; in particular, he argued that the fragment preserved in Clement as from Dorotheos' *Pandects* 'smelled of metamorphosis', because it mentions the halcyon and the crow, and because stories exist narrating the metamorphosis of girls (Halkyone and Cornix, narrated e.g. in Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 11, 384-746 and 2, 547-95 respectively) into these two birds. This allowed him to posit a strong connection between

the Dorotheos author of *Metamorphoses* and the Dorotheos author of *Pandects*; the next step was to argue for the existence of the second, with the consequence that all fragments could be attributed to a real source, Dorotheos, consulted by Pseudo-Plutarch.

In his *FGrH* 2B [published 1926-30], Jacoby too had followed Müller both in listing all six fragments under Dorotheos 145, and in interpreting them: he thought that the fragment preserved by Athenaios (*FGrH* 145 F 1), together with the testimonium of Pliny (*Natural history* 1.12, listing Dorotheos the Athenian among the sources for the book on trees: *FGrH* 145 T1 and F1) belonged indeed to the work of a historian of Alexander, probably of Hellenistic period; and he attributed all other fragments (2-6) to the work of a 'Fälscher' (*FGrH* 2C [published 1926-30], 532). Later, however, Jacoby changed his mind. In *FGrH* 3a [published 1940-43] he restated that the fragment preserved by Athenaios belonged to the historian of Alexander; but he considered now that he had been unduly influenced by E. Hiller, 'Zur Quellenkritik des Clemens Alexandrinus', *Hermes* 21 (1886) 126-33, in his assessment of the value of Clement's reference to Dorotheos, and that on second thoughts he preferred to see in the writer of *Pandects* mentioned by Clement (*FGrH* 145 F 4) the grammarian Dorotheos of Ascalon (see *FGrH* 3a, 389-90, as well as Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* S.3, 8 (1940), 96 and n. 89). As for the Dorotheos mentioned in the other four fragments, Jacoby maintained that he was a creation of Pseudo-Plutarch: he thus republished the fragments with a new numeration (*FGrH* 145 F 2, 3, 5 and 6 = *FGrH* 289 F 1, 2, 3 and 4); as for the indication of a Chaldaean origin in the *On rivers*, Jacoby interpreted it as a sign that the inspiration for the invention was Dorotheos of Sidon.

The arguments of Jacoby are accepted by De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 64-6; the same, in E. Calderon Dorda, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003), 81-2, seems less certain, and refers to R. Halleux, J. Schamp, *Les lapidaires grecs* (Paris 1985) xxvi n. 8, for the proposal of identifying Dorotheos to the homonymous astrologer of Sidon. For his part, J. Boulogne, *Plutarque. Oeuvres morales* 4 (Paris 2002), 438 limits himself to suggesting that the mythographer author of F 4 'n'est probablement pas le même écrivain que l'auteur de l'*Histoire de l'Italie*' (F 1), unhelpfully forgetting about F 2 and 3.

In his discussion of the historian Dositheos (*BNJ* 54, another of Jacoby's 'Schwindelautoren'), K. Dowden proposes to see in Dositheos and Dorotheos one author only, a Hellenizing Jewish historian, active in the early imperial period, because of some undeniable similarities in the topics treated, in the titles of works, and in the meaning of their name (Dositheos is uncommon in Greek, although frequent among Jews: it is the transcription into Greek of a Jewish name, Nathaniel, for which the normal Greek form would be Theodotos/Theodoros): see *BNJ* 54 F 4: "perhaps it is simpler to admit that the author of these stories was Dositheos, sometimes known as Dorotheos, sometimes calling himself a 'Chaldaean' or being wrongly so called by others, and that his real name was in fact non-Greek and could be rendered either 'Dositheos' or 'Dorotheos'"; cf. also *BNJ* F 8, and 'Biographical essay': "Dositheos... perhaps sometimes also known as 'Dorotheos'. The similarities between Dositheos and Dorotheos are indeed undeniable; but it is very difficult to see in them one real author named in two different ways (and by whom? we would have to posit a double transmission, and to accept that Plutarch would have consulted both these intermediate sources). It seems to me far more likely that Dositheos and Dorotheos are the two 'invented' faces of a same coin – minted in Pseudo-Plutarch's own, personal mint.

[I should like to thank Nicholas Horsfall for reading and discussing with me this text].

289 Bibliography

E. Calderon Dorda, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003).

A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000).

A. Cameron, *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford 2004).

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.

J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis Minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 114-5.