Theophilos (BNJ2 296)

Ceccarelli, Paola (University College London)

This entry was prepared by Paola Ceccarelli and published on.

Name	Theophilos
Jacoby number	296
Edition	bnj2
Historian's date	uncertain
Historical focus	III. History of Cities and Peoples (Horography and Ethnography); A. Authors on Different Cities and Regions
Place of origin	unknown

Fragment 296 F 1

ID	296 F 1
Source	Pseudo-Plutarch, *Parallela minora* 13B (= Plutarch, *Moralia* 308f-309A)
Work mentioned	*Italika* book 3
Source date	2nd century AD
Source language	English
Source genre	military history, ancient
Fragment subject	military history, ancient
Textual base	Jacoby

Text

Ῥωμαῖοι πολεμοῦντες πρὸς Τροῦσκον[1] ἐχειροτόνησαν Γαλέριον[2] Τορκουᾶτον. οὗτος θεασάμενος τοῦ βασιλέως τὴν θυγατέρα τοὔνομα Κλουσίαν ἠιτεῖτο παρὰ τοῦ Τρούσκου[3] τὴν θυγατέρα, μὴ τυχὼν δ᾽ ἐπόρθει τὴν πόλιν· ἡ δὲ Κλουσία ἀπὸ τῶν πύργων ἔρριψεν ἐαυτήν, προνοίαι δ᾽ Ἀφροδίτης κολπωθείσης τῆς ἐσθῆτος διεσώθη ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. ἣν ὁ στρατηγὸς ἔφθειρε[4], καὶ [διὰ] τούτων πάντων ἕνεκα[5] ἐξωρίσθη κοινῶι δόγματι ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων εἰς Κόρσικαν νῆσον πρὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, ὡς Θεόφιλος ἐν τρίτωι Ἰταλικῶν.

Translation

The Romans, fighting against Trouskos, elected as their general Galerius Torquatus. He, having seen the daughter of the king named Klousia, sought from Trouskos this daughter,

and on not obtaining her laid siege to the city. Klousia threw herself down from the towers, but because her dress, through the agency of Aphrodite, swelled to form a balloon, she landed safely on the ground. The general abused her, and for all these reasons he was exiled by the Romans with a public decree to the island of Corsica, in front of Italy. So Theophilos in the third book of his *Italian stories.*

Critical Apparatus

1. Τροῦσκον ΦΠ (Σ) Aldina, Stephanus, Jacoby; Τοῦσκον most editors (incl. De Lazzer); Τούσκου Guarinus; Τούσκους Babbitt, Boulogne, Ibáñez Chacón 2014

2. γαλέριον Π, Jacoby; ἀγαλέριον (ἐγ-) Φ; γαρέλλιον Σg; Βαλέριον a² (v); Οὐαλέριον v² Guarinus Xylander 70, Amyot, Kaltwasser, Budaeus, Nachstädt, De Lazzer, Boulogne, Ibáñez Chacón 2014

3. Codices omnes, Guarinus, Aldina, Stephanus, Jacoby; τούσκου most other editors (incl. De Lazzer, Boulogne, Ibáñez Chacón 2014)

4. Mss, Nachstädt, De Lazzer, Ibáñez Chacón 2014; διέφθειρε Babbitt, Jacoby, Boulogne. The compound διαφθείρω is in general more frequent than the simple φθείρω (*LSJ*); but here all manuscripts but one (k, the 14th century Laur. Plut. 80.5, part of the *corpus Planudeum*) have ἔφθειρε, which yields a good meaning, so there is no reason for changing it. Note that here the epitome Σ is relatively distant from the narrative's text, with ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἀβλαβῶς κατενεχθεῖσα συνεφθάρη τῶι στρατηγῶι. See the full text in De Lazzer 2000.

5. Here Boulogne and De Lazzer (in the apparatus) give contradictory indications: Boulogne claims that most codices (and the most authoritative ones) have τούτων, while according to De Lazzer (and Jacoby, and Nachstädt) the opposite situation obtains, with most codices (and the most authoritative) offering διὰ τούτων. This reading, although redundant, is accepted by De Lazzer (and by most older editors, as well as Schlereth 1931), because one should not expect too much of Pseudo-Plutarch – (redundancy is particularly evident in this story: De Lazzer 2000, 333; Schlereth, 90). Jacoby (and before him Hutten and Dübner) preferred to delete the διά (but added a question mark); Boulogne 2002 prints simply καὶ τούτων πάντων ἕνεκα, and if indeed his description of the manuscript tradition is correct, this is the best reading.

Commentary on the text

This story (also preserved in an epitomated version in Σ, the main differences being the omission of the name of the girl's father, of Aphrodite's intervention, and of the source reference) is offered as the parallel for the Greek story of Iole, who according to Nikias of Mallos threw herself from the walls of Oichalia, which was besieged by Heracles, but landed unscathed, the wind having inflated her clothes (pseudo-Plutarch, *Parallela minora* 13a; see *BNJ* 60 F 1). Such a story is unattested (just as unattested is the Roman parallel of a young woman throwing herslef from the city wall and being saved by her billowing clothing); as A. Ibáñez Chacón, *Los Parallela minora atribuidos a Plutarco (Mor. 305A-316B): introducción,*

edición, traducción y comentario (Malaga 2014), 254-256 points out, the complexity of the cycle of Herakles' adventures made it easy for further stories to develop, and so we cannot be certain that these are inventions of pseudo-Plutarch. The story of Herakles throwing Iphitos from the walls of Tiryns (Sophocles, *Women of Trachis* 269-280; Pherekydes *BNJ* F82b) might have provided inspiration.

In the Roman story, the names of general and king have caused difficulties. The manuscripts give Galerius as the general's name (or forms that can be linked to an original Galerius); and there can be no doubt that, from the point of view of the transmission of the text, we have to go (with Jacoby) for Galerius. Historically, the story is not attested, nor is there any trace of a general named Galerius Torquatus – the *nomen* Galerius is anyway attested only for a period later than the one in which the story is imagined. Most editors have thus corrected the text to 'Valerius'. This may well be an instance of inaccurate rendition in the mss of the *Parallela minora* of Roman names beginning with 'V': K. Dowden, Dositheos, *BNJ* 54 Biographical Essay, has pointed out that while most Roman names beginning with V – are rendered accurately, this is not the case for the passages where the sources are Dositheos (three instances) and Theophilos (this passage). Dowden suggests that this confusion could be explained with the hypothesis of a text of Claudian times, written in a Roman environment: the introduction by Claudius of a modified digamma in Latin, to distinguish the semi-vowel u from v, might lie behind this type of error (see E. Huzar, 'Claudius – the erudite emperor', in *ANRW* 2.32.1 (1984), 625-6, with ample bibliography). If that were so, we would have a date and context for Dositheos and Theophilos – interestingly, two very close names, uniquely joined, within the group of authors assembled by Pseudo-Plutarch, by this characteristic.

Yet even assuming an original Valerius in the source, the story is unattested: in the early history of Rome (when fighting against the Etruscans) there are no Valerii Torquati. The association of *nomen* and *cognomen* here proposed (were we to accept Valerius) is however rather striking: because among the early Roman stories of great deeds are those, often jointly narrated, of T. Manlius Torquatus (Livy 7.9.6-10.4, an exploit dated to 367 or 361) and of M. Valerius Corvus (Livy 7.26.1-10, in 349), who both defeated in single combat a Gaul.

As for the king: the mss are unanimous in giving Trouskos as his name; yet most editors, including Nachstädt, De Lazzer (2000) and Boulogne (2002), prefer to print Guarinus's correction Touskos, because (so A. de Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 332-3) this is the form found elsewhere in the *Parallela minora* (at 2b, 305e, = Aristeides, *BNJ* 286 F 2, and 11b, 308d = Aristeides, *BNJ* 286 F 12). However, also in these other passages the mss show disagreement; it seems thus better to retain, with Jacoby, the transmitted text, all the more since the other passages refer to the 'people', the Tusci, while here the king only is meant (the name is of course unattested outside Pseudo-Plutarch). As for the daughter, Klousia, her name closely recalls the Etruscan city of Clusium; her story (not known from any other sources) is meant to parallel that of Iole, narrated in what precedes this passage; but the part on the punishment of the Roman general (exile to Corsica, something difficult to imagine at the period in which one has to imagine the events) has no parallel in the Greek story (although of course eventually Iole would cause Herakles' death, through Deianeira's jealousy).

Already D. Wyttenbach, *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia* 7 (Oxonii 1821), *Animadversiones* 83 had considered both this story and the Greek parallel preceding it complete inventions: 'Iole cognita in fabulis, non item innocuus de muro saltus: Latinum, cum auctoribus Nicia et Theophilo, unde venerunt, eo abeant'. De Lazzer, *Plutarco. Paralleli minori* 333 n. 126 seems to agree; Boulogne, *Plutarque*, remains silent; Dowden, BNJ 60, is willing to accept the existence of a Nikias of Mallos who wrote on mythical stories with a rather peculiar bent, but does not discuss the Roman parallel. A Theophilos 'Zenodotean' is cited as source for a unique version of the myth of Arachne in a scholion to Nikandros (schol. Nicandri *Theriaka* 11); but he is unlikely to be the same as the Pseudo-Plutarchan Theophilos, author of very different works. See on this the Biographical essay, and for further discussion Ibáñez Chacón, *Los Parallela minora atribuidos a Plutarco* (Malaga 2014), 259-259.

A work on *Italian stories* seems a reasonable place for a narrative such as this one: yet works bearing the title *Italika* are very rare outside Pseudo-Plutarch (see table and discussion in Dowden, Dositheos, BNJ 54 Biographical Essay).

Contextual notes on F 1

The passage is part of the *Parallela minora,* a short work of uncertain authorship and uncertain date (between the end of the first century AD and the end of the second century AD). Its 41 chapters contain each a Greek and a Roman story; its avowed intent is to give credibility to the ancient (Greek) myths by comparing them with more recent (Roman) historical events (while this is the purpose stated, there are numerous instances in which the Roman story is definitely earlier than the Greek one). A work of this title is included in Lamprias' catalogue of Plutarch's writings; but because of its style, scholars almost unanimously agree that the *Parallela minora* cannot have been written by Plutarch (note however the position of J. Boulogne, *Plutarque, Oeuvre morales* 4 (Paris 2002), 240, for whom the *Parallela* might be the work of the 'team of secretaries that Plutarch must have employed to exploit a considerable historiographical library').

The text and tradition of the *Parallela minora* present a number of problems; furthermore, in terms of content, the *Parallela minora* appears to specialise in unattested stories, or surprising tweaks on well-known ones; finally, the credibility of its source-citations is disputed (discussion in A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco: Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 1-38; K. Dowden, *BNJ* 54, 'Biographical essay'; see further below, 'Biographical essay').

Besides the fundamental edition of W. Nachstädt, *Plutarchi Moralia* 2.2 (Leipzig 1935), 1-42, there are three modern editions of Pseudo-Plutarch's *Parallela minora*: A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco: Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000); J. Boulogne, *Plutarque, Oeuvres morales* 4 (Paris 2002); P.D. Bernardakis and H.G. Ingenkamp, *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia editionem maiorem* vol. 2 (Athens 2009), 354-382 (but see on this edition the negative remarks by A. Ibáñez Chacón, '¿De *minora* a *maiora*? Los *Parallela minora* en la nueva *editio maior* de los *Moralia*', *Ploutarchos* n.s., 9 (2011/2012) 37-48); see also the PhD dissertation by A. Ibáñez Chacón, *Los Parallela minora atribuidos a Plutarco (Mor. 305A-316B): introducción, edición, traducción y comentario* (Malaga 2014)

The text with introduction, translation and notes by F. Carlà-Uhink, in E. Lelli and G. Pisani, *Plutarco. Tutti i Moralia* (Milano 2017), 570-591 and 2610-2616 is also worth consulting.

Fragment 296 F 2

ID	296 F 2
Source	Pseudo-Plutarch, *Parallela minora* 32A (= Plutarch, *Moralia* 313C)
Work mentioned	*Peloponnesiaka* book 2
Source date	2nd century AD
Source language	English
Source genre	major wars politics and government
Fragment subject	major wars politics and government
Textual base	Jacoby

Text

ἐν τῶι Πελοποννησιακῶι πολέμωι Πεισίστρατος Ὀρχομένιος τοὺς μὲν εὐγενεῖς ἐμίσει, τοὺς δ᾽ εὐτελεῖς ἐφίλει. ἐβουλεύσαντο δ᾽ οἱ ἐν τῆι βουλῆι φονεῦσαι, καὶ διακόψαντες αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς κόλπους ἔβαλον, καὶ τὴν γῆν ἔξυσαν. ὁ δὲ δημότης ὄχλος ὑπόνοιαν λαβὼν ἔδραμεν εἰς τὴν βουλήν· ὁ δὲ νεώτερος υἱὸς τοῦ βασιλέως Τλησίμαχος εἰδὼς τὴν συνωμοσίαν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀπέσπασε τὸν ὄχλον, εἰπὼν ἑωρακέναι τὸν πατέρα μεθ᾽ ὁρμῆς εἰς τὸ Πισαῖον ὄρος φέρεσθαι, μείζονα μορφὴν ἀνθρώπου κεκτημένον. καὶ οὕτως ἠπατήθη ὁ ὄχλος, ὡς Θεόφιλος ἐν δευτέρωι Πελοποννησιακῶν.

Translation

During the Peloponnesian War Peisistratos of Orchomenos showed himself averse to the well-born and favourable to the simple citizens. The members of the Council decided to kill him, and having cut him in pieces threw these into the folds of their garments, and scraped the earth clean. But the demotic rabble, feeling suspicious, ran to the Council. Tlesimachos, however, the younger son of the king, aware of the conspiracy, drew the crowd away from the assembly by declaring that he had seen his father being swiftly carried toward the mount of Pisa, having acquired a stature greater than the human one. And in this way the crowd was deceived. So Theophilos in the second book of his *Peloponnesian History.*

Critical Apparatus

Commentary on the text

The story is otherwise unknown (it is also preserved, in an epitomized version, in the group of manuscripts Σ; the main differences are that Σ omits to mention the Peloponnesian war, thus not giving a chronological frame for the events, and that, as usual with Σ, the source-reference is lacking).

While often in the *Parallela minora* a Roman story is made up to fit a Greek one, here the contrary seems to have happened, and this story is modelled on that of Romulus, that follows it (attributed to Aristoboulos's *Italika*, *BNJ* 830 F 1). As a few other times in the *Parallela minora*, the Greek story, whose reality the more recent Roman parallel should prove, is later than the Roman story by more than two hundred years (see A. Boulogne, *Plutarque. Oeuvres morales* 4 (Paris 2002), 225-6).

The title of the work, with its reference to the Peloponnese, makes it likely that the Orchomenos mentioned here is the Arcadian one; on it, see M.H. Hansen and H.T. Nielsen, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Copenhagen 2004), 523-5. In the same direction goes the mention of Mt. Pisaios as the place where the king would have been transported: although a Mt. Pisaios is known from this passage only, most likely here the Pisatis is meant (and so probably by implication Olympia, Jacoby, *FGrH* 3a, 399). Orchomenos played a role in the Peloponnesian war: the Spartans had deposited there Arcadian hostages, but because of the weakness of their fortifications, the Orchomenians, besieged by Athenians, Mantineans, Eleans, and Argives, capitulated, giving up the Arcadian hostages and giving some of their own to the Mantineans (Thucydides 5.61.3-5, and 5.77.1 for the return of the Orchomenian hostages). Thucydides states that Argos and Mantineia were democratic at this time (5.29.1, 5.47.9, with S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides* 3 (Oxford 2009), 117-8), but says nothing of Orchomenos (see further Hansen and Nielsen, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, 523-5, for references to the social organization of the city). It is interesting that even in the context of a story of tyranny, Orchomenos is said to have a *boule* and *ekklesia*; but no other texts or documents mention their existence.

An Orchomenian king Peisistratos is not known (P. Carlier, *La royauté en Grèce avant Alexandre* (Strasbourg 1984), 404-7, does not mention Peisistratos of Orchomenos at all, and in his discussion of Arcadia states categorically that 'aucune βασιλεία n'est attesté en Arcadie à l'époque classique'). As pointed out by Jacoby, *FGrH* 3A, 399, the Arcadian Peisistratos exhibits one of the traits typically attributed to the famous Athenian tyrant of that name: attention towards the people. The betrayal by a son of (a) Peisistratos, joining forces with the assassins of his father, is equally unknown; A. Ibáñez Chacón, *Los Parallela minora atribuidos a Plutarco (Mor. 305A-316B): introducción, edición, traducción y comentario* (Malaga 2014) 405 suggests that this may be a memory of the truly tyrannical character of the tyranny of the sons of Peisistratos; this seems rather feeble. Finally, the name Tlesimachos is exceedingly rare: besides our passage (mentioned without further precisions in *LGPN* 3b as concerning Boiotian Orchomenos), the only occurrence (search in the *TLG* and *LGPN*) is an Ambraciot, Tlasimachos, who in the Hellenistic period won the Olympic games with the *synoris* (*BNJ* 257a F 4). Here, son and father both have warlike names.

For other Peloponnesian histories, see *BNJ*503, 504; for Arkadian histories, *BNJ* 315-322.

Contextual notes on F 2

See above, Contextual notes on F 1

Fragment 296 F 3

ID	296 F 3
Source	Pseudo-Plutarch, *On Rivers* 24.1 (= Plutarch, *Moralia* 1165CD)
Work mentioned	*On Stones* book 1
Source date	2nd century AD
Source language	English
Source genre	mythology, Greek; etiology
Fragment subject	mythology, Greek; etiology
Textual base	Jacoby

Text

Τίγρις ποταμός ἐστι τῆς Ἀρμενίας, τὸν ῥοῦν καταφέρων εἴς τε τὸν Ἀράξην καὶ τὴν Ἀρσακίδα λίμνην· ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ τὸ πρότερον Σόλλαξ, ὅπερ μεθερμηνευόμενόν ἐστι κατωφερής, ὠνομάσθη δὲ Τίγρις δι᾽ αἰτίαν τοιαύτην. Διόνυσος κατὰ πρόνοιαν Ἥρας ἐμμανὴς γενόμενος περιήρχετο γῆν τε καὶ θάλατταν, ἀπαλλαγῆναι τοῦ πάθους θέλων. γενόμενος δὲ ἐν τοῖς κατ᾽ Ἀρμενίαν τόποις καὶ τὸν προειρημένον ποταμὸν διελθεῖν μὴ δυνάμενος ἐπεκαλέσατο τὸν Δία· γενόμενος δὲ ἐπήκοος ὁ θεὸς ἔπεμψεν αὐτῶι τίγριν, ἐφ᾽ ἧς ἀκινδύνως προενεχθεὶς εἰς τιμὴν τῶν συμβεβηκότων τὸν ποταμὸν Τίγριν μετωνόμασεν, καθὼς ἱστορεῖ Θεόφιλος ἐν ᾱ Περὶ λίθων.

Translation

The Tigris is a river of Armenia, whose waters flow into the Araxes and the Arsacid marsh; before, it was called Sollax, which translated means 'Descending precipitously'. It was called Tigris for the following reason. When Dionysos, by Hera's design, went mad, he was roaming over land and sea, hoping to get rid of the suffering. Having reached the region of Armenia and being unable to cross the above-mentioned river he prayed to Zeus; the god listened and sent him a tiger, on which he was safely carried across; and in honour of what had happened he renamed the river Tigris, as Theophilos narrates in the first book of his treatise *On stones*.

Critical Apparatus

Commentary on the text

This passage comes from the opening of the chapter of the *On rivers* dedicated to the Tigris; as is typical of the book, Pseudo-Plutarch begins with a discussion of the river, its name and metonomasies. Sollax as the original name of the river is not attested elsewhere; but the variant name Sulax is used in Eustathios of Thessalonica, *Commentary on the Description of the World by Dionysius the Periegetes* 976.30-41 for what is certainly the same river: Κατὰ δέ τινας παρὰ τὸν τίγριν τὸ ζῶον ἡ κλῆσίς ἐστι τούτω τῷ ποταμῷ, οὗ ἡ γενικὴ τίγριος παρὰ τῷ Ἀριστοτέλει. Μυθεύεται γὰρ ὅτι Σύλαξ ποτὲ καλούμενος ὁ ποταμὸς οὗτος, ὃ ἔστι κατωφερής, ὕστερον ἐκλήθη Τίγρις δι᾽ αἰτίαν τοιαύτην· μαίνεται Διόνυσος Ἥρας προνοίᾳ,

καὶ φοιτῶν ὅπῃ τύχοι γίνεται καὶ πρὸς τῷδε τῷ ποταμῷ, καὶ θέλων εἰς τὸ πέραν διαβῆναι ἀπόρως ἔχει. Οἰκτίζεται δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ πατὴρ Ζεὺς, καὶ πέμπει ζῶον τίγριν, ὃς τοῦ πόρου τῷ Διονύσῳ καθηγησάμενος αὐτῷ μὲν ποιεῖ τὸ θυμῆρες, τῷ δὲ ποταμῷ ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ καλεῖσθαι ἀφίησι.

According to some this river takes its name from the animal 'tiger', whose genitive case is '*tigrios*' in Aristotle. For it is said that this river was once called Sylax, meaning 'descending precipitously', and was later named Tigris for the following reason: Dionysos is mad because of Hera's counsel, and wandering wherever it happened he reaches also this river, and wanting to cross to the other side he does not know how to. But his father Zeus has pity on him, and sends the animal tiger, which having guided Dionysos across the passage gives him sanity back, and lets the river be called from himself.

Clearly the Sollax and the Sulax are one and the same river (the name is interpreted in exactly the same, unique, way). The story reappears, without any references to either the *On rivers* or to Theophilos, in Natalis Comes, *Mythologiae, sive explicationum fabularum, libri decem* (Padua 1616), 5.13.263-4: *Fabulati sunt antiqui Sollacem Armeniae fluvium in Araxem stagnum influentem dictum fuisse Tigrim ab ea tigre, quam conscendens Dionysus Iunonis consilio furiosus traiecit, cum maria ac terras circumiens remedium affectus quaereret. Nam cum Iupiter exoratus tigrim pro lintre misisset traiecturo, mox ad eventus memoriam fluvium ita vocavit; quod tamen alii a Medo eius filio et Alphesiboeae factum fuisse maluerunt.*

The ancients used to tell that the Armenian river Sollax, which flows into the lake Araxes, was renamed Tigris from that tiger which Dionysus, rendered mad by the decision of Iuno, rode on to get across the river, when wandering all over sea and land he was seeking a cure for his affliction. For when Jupiter, on his request, sent him a tiger instead of a boat to facilitate the crossing, immediately to commemorate the event he named the river so. Others however prefer to think that this happened through Medus, his son from Alphesiboea.

While Natale Conti certainly depends from the *On rivers* (the passage is one of those that were added in the second edition of the Mythologiae, published in Venice in 1581; see further on this Ceccarelli, *BNJ* 23 F 1b; the part on Medus and Alphesiboea comes from the second part of On rivers 24.1, which offers a different explanation for the name change, based on two different sources), it is less certain that Eustathios relies on Pseudo-Plutarch. One intriguing element is the reference to Aristotle in Eustathios: for in all of Aristotle the term appears only twice, once when talking of the union of different species, in the *History of animals* 607a: Φασὶ δὲ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τίγριος καὶ κυνὸς γίνεσθαι τοὺς Ἰνδικούς ('They say that the Indian dogs are born of the union of a tiger and a dog'), where indeed one finds the genitive τίγριος (and it is worth noting that Eustathios will take up again the topic of the Tigris's name and of its declension, after recounting the story of the mythical origins of the name); and in Pseudo-Aristotle, *On marvellous things heard* 846a31-33: ἐν δὲ τῷ Τίγριδι γίνεσθαί φασι λίθον μωδῶν κεκλημένον βαρβαρικῶς, τῇ χρόᾳ πάνυ λευκόν, ὃν ἐὰν κατέχῃ τις, ὑπὸ θηρίων οὐδὲν ἀδικεῖται, 'they say that a stone called in barbarian language *modon* grows in the Tigris, entirely white in its appearance, which if someone possesses it, he is never attacked by wild animals'.

In this second text, we find the form τίγριδι (thus not the genitive mentioned by Eustathios); but fascinatingly, a stone having a very similar name (μυνδάν), exactly the same characteristics, and also found in the river Tigris, forms the topic of *On rivers* 24.2, i.e. of the paragraph that follows this one; for that information the *On rivers* gives a source, Leon of Byzantion(BNJ 132 F 3, for Jacoby an invented reference to a real author). Thus the question arises of the relationships existing between the *On rivers*, the commentary of Eustathios, and the *On marvellous things heard.* None of them has exactly the same text or gives exactly the same information, and yet clearly these texts belong together. Possibly the author of the *On rivers* and Pseudo-Aristotle, *On marvellous things heard* both depend here upon a common source, a book of wonders, as is probably the case for Agatharchides, BNJ 284 F 3 (see there for an ampler discussion of the relationship between the *On rivers* and the *On marvellous things heard*). This common source might be some book of wonders; but the best candidate is probably to be sought in the work of Alexander Polyhistor. F. Atenstädt, 'Zwei Quellen des sogenannten Plutarch de fluviis', *Hermes* 57 (1922), 219-33, has plausibly suggested to see in Alexander Polyhistor, whose information would have been further tweaked by Pseudo-Plutarch, the source for some passages common to Pausanias and Pseudo-Plutarch; he has moreover singled out Theophilos as one of the authors cited by Polyhistor, whose name might have been 'reused' by Pseudo-Plutarch (Atenstädt, 'Zwei Quellen', 230; and F. Atenstädt, *Quellenstudien zu Stephanos von Byzanz* 1 (Schneeberg 1910), 7). Atenstädt does not discuss in his paper Pseudo-Aristotle, *On marvellous things heard*, but some of the stories narrated by Alexander Polyhistor might have found their way in collections of *paradoxa*. This hypothesis finds support in the way the story is narrated.

This is one of many passages of the *On rivers* that betray an interest in foreign languages and glosses (see also 6.4; 10.2; 12.3 and 4; 14.2.4 and 5; 20.3; 23.2); an interest for glosses, and the habit of presenting them through the use of the verb (μεθ)-ἑρμενεύειν, is one of the hallmarks of Alexander Polyhistor's work (see again Atenstädt, 'Zwei Quellen', 219-21). Pseudo-Plutarch, *On rivers* 23.2 (no source reference) is also an Armenian 'gloss', pretending that the plant *araxa* that grows in the river Araxes means '*misoparthenos*'; interestingly, the passage of the *On marvellous things heard* cited above, on the stone *modon* in the river Tigris, also implies a kind of gloss ('called *modon* in barbarian language'): the approach is the same. It is worth noting that no trace of the names Sollax/Sulax can be found in H. Hübschmann, 'Die altarmenischen Ortsnamen', *Indogermanische Forschungen* 16 (1904), 197-490, in part. 369-70 for rivers's names; the Sumerian name of the Tigris is *Idigna*, probably derived from **Id(i)gina*, 'running river'; which in Akkadian becomes *Idiklat*, and in Hebrew *Hiddeqel;* the Greek Τίγρις derives from Old Persian*Tigrā* < **Diglā*. In Pliny, *Natural History* 6.31.127, these have become two synchronically aligned names, *Diglitus* for the first, slow-flowing part of the river, and *Tigris* for the second, fast-flowing part (*ipsi qua tardior fluit Diglito; unde concitatur, a celeritate Tigris incipit vocari: ita appellant Medi sagittam* 'where it flows slowly it is called Diglitus, but as it flows faster, it begins to be called Tigris from its speed; for the Medes call the arrow thus'). Thus, if Pseudo-Plutarch' name Sollax is not attested elsewhere for the river, the interpretation he offers of it corresponds to current interpretations of the name Tigris.

On the heterogeneous mix of anthroponyms and toponyms in this part of the *On rivers* see the remarks of A. De Lazzer, in E. Calderón Dorda, A. De Lazzer and E. Pellizer, *Plutarco, Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003), 256-7 and 259, who furthermore points out that the interpretation of the Sollax as κατωφερής here inversely corresponds to the interpretation offered of the former name of the river Maiandros in *On rivers* 9.1: Ἀναβαίνων, 'flowing upwards').

The information concerning the precipitousness of the Tigris's waters is correct; but the geographical setting is very unreliable (the Arsacid marsh is near the lake Van, but the Tigris does not flow into it): this is a problem common to most ancient description of the area (see R. Syme, *Anatolica: studies in Strabo*, ed. by A. Birley (Oxford 1995), 32-8, who at 33 n. 38 characterizes the passage of the *On rivers* as 'fantastically confused'). C. Delattre, *Pseudo-Plutarque, Nommer le monde. Origine des noms de fleuves, de montagnes, et de ce qui s'y trouve* (Villeneuve D'Ascq 2011), 217-219 offers a detailed discussion of the geography: the lake Arsacis is called Arsene by Strabo (11.14.8), who confuses it with the lake Thopitis, and Aretissa by Pliny, *Natural History* 2.225-226 and 6.127; the lake is usually identified with the Erçek, near Lake Van. Delattre suggests that the modification of the name (from Arsene or Aretissa to Arsacis) in Pseudo-Plutarch is due to a desire to link the name to the Arsacid dynasty, who had links with Armenia. As for the Tigris, it cannot be the actual Tigris, which does not flow into the Araxes; it might be one of the affluents of the Tigris, the Kentrites (modern Bohtan Su), mentioned in Xenophon, *Anabasis* 4.3.1 and Diodorus of Sicily 14.27.7.

In the rest of the chapter, the story for which Theophilos is the source is contrasted with another version, for which the sources are Hermesianax of Cypros, and Aristonymos in the third book of a work whose title is lost (*On rivers? On stones*?): according to these authors, Dionysos metamorphosed himself into a tiger to convince a nymph, Alphesiboea, to yield to his love. This is one of eleven passages in which two versions, with two source references, are mentioned side by side (list and discussion in F. Jacoby, 'Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarchs *Parallela Minora* und die Schwindelautoren', *Mnemosyne* S. 3.8 (1940) 133-4, and in De Lazzer, in E. Calderón Dorda, A. De Lazzer, E. Pellizer, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti*, 64-5); further discussion of the second version by A. Paradiso, Hermesianax, *BNJ* 797 F 3.

Contextual notes on F 3

This passage comes from chapter 24 of the *On rivers*. As usual, Pseudo-Plutarch begins by recording the name-changes of the river (here, rather exceptionally, he gives two stories justifying the name, and three sources for them: Theophilos for our story, and Hermesianax of Cyprus and Aristonymos for the story in which Dionysos transforms himself in a panther and rapes Alphesiboea who gives birth to Medos, *BNJ* 797 F 3); he then mentions a stone called myndan which grows in the river and offers protection from wild beasts (source: Leon of Byzantion, *BNJ* 132 F 3), a mountain nearby, and a plant growing on it whose oil makes men healthy (source: Sostratos, *BNj* F 1).

The *On rivers* (whose full title is περὶ ποταμῶν καὶ ὀρῶν ἐπωνυμίας καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς εὑρισκομένων, *On the names of rivers and mountains and on what is found in them*) can be consulted in G. N. Bernardakis, *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia vol. 7* (Leipzig 1896), 282-

328; but there are also three recent commented editions: E. Calderón Dorda, A. De Lazzer, and E. Pellizer (eds.), *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003); C. Delattre, *Pseudo-Plutarque, Nommer le monde. Origine des noms de fleuves, de montagnes, et de ce qui s'y trouve* (Villeneuve D'Ascq 2011); V. Zanusso, 'Sulla denominazione di fiumi e monti, e su quanto si trova in essi', in E. Lelli and G. Pisani (eds.), *Plutarco. Tutti i Moralia*, (Milano 2017), 2232-2259 (text and translation) and 3004-3019 (introduction and notes). S. Lund Sørensen, 'Introduction to Works *On rivers* (Περὶ ποταμῶν) (1683-1691), in *FGrHCont* IV E: *Paradoxography and Antiquarian Literature*, fasc 2, 873-876, offers an excellent and synthetic introduction to the genre of writings 'On rivers', with list of authors having composed such works, as well as an introduction to the *On rivers* of pseudo-Plutarch specifically at 918-925 (in the context of a discussion of the bogus author Agathokles of Miletos, *FGrHCont* 1687).

The text has been transmitted by a rather special manuscript, the *Palatinus graecus Heidelbergensis* 398, produced in Constantinople in the third quarter of the ninth century; this manuscript also preserves other geographical, paradoxographical and mythographical works, including the *Erotika pathemata* of Parthenius and the *Metamorphoses* of Antoninos Liberalis (a history of the text and description of the manuscript in Calderón Dorda, *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti*, 91-7; Delattre, *Pseudo-Plutarque. Nommer le monde*, 12–20, as well as C. Delattre, 'L'alphabet au secours de la géographie. (Dés)organiser le *De fluviis* du pseudo-Plutarque', *Polymnia* 3, 2017, 55-61; Zanusso, 'Sulla denominazione di fiumi e monti', 3004-5; Lund Sørensen, *FGrHCont* E IV fasc. 2, 1676 (Agatokles of Miletos), 'Introduction'. Digital reproduction of the entire codex at https://doi.org/10.11588/diglit.303). The *On rivers* is also preserved in another manuscript, the *Parisinus suppl. gr.* 443 A (B), which has been shown to depend from the above-mentioned *Palatinus graecus Heidelbergensis* 398 (further details in C. Poidomani, 'Il *De fluviis* pseudoplutarcheo nella redazione del codice Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Supplément grec 443A', *Commentaria Classica* 3 (2016), 57-82).

In both manuscripts the work is attributed to Plutarch; but it is commonly accepted that the *On rivers* is not by Plutarch. It does not appear in Lamprias' catalogue of Plutarch's works (a reference to a work *On rivers* by Plutarch first appears in the excerpts by a certain Sopatros, cited by Photius in his *Bibliotheca*, 161); the style is learned but rather poor. The work must have been composed between the second and the third century CE. Two of its distinguishing features, which it shares with the *Parallela minora,* are the frequence of source citations, most of them of authors not known otherwise (for a discussion of their reliability, see the Biographical Essay), and a very marked tendency to relate unattested (and rather unlikely) stories. F. Racine, 'Pseudo-Plutarch *On rivers* and the school tradition', in E. Gielen and J. Papy (eds.), *Falsifications and Authority in Antiquity, the Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (Turnhout 2020) 215-239, rightly emphasizes the parodic, playful aspect of the work.

Biographical Essay

For a first-century AD date and context for Theophilos, see F 1 Commentary. However, writers named Theophilos are numerous; the writings of historical character attributed to a Theophilos were collected by C. Müller in his *Fragmenta historicorum graecorum* 4.515-7.

The scholia to Nicander's *Theriaka*, 11, record a unique Attic local story concerning two siblings, Arachne and Phalanx, brought up by Athena who teaches them the art of weaving and hoplomachy respectively; but as they then commit incest, Athena incensed transforms them in a spider and a tarentula; this story, which is not so different from some of the Pseudo-Plutarchan ones, the scholiast attributes to a 'Zenodotean Theophilos. For Müller, this Theophilos was also the author of the *Italian stories* and *Peloponnesian stories*, mentioned in the *Parallela minora*, and the author of a book *On stones* mentioned in the *On rivers*. J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 123-124 defended this view, adding furthermore that the appellation 'Zenodotean' did not necessarily mean that Theophilos was a student of Zenodotos. R. Laqueur, 'Theophilos (11)', *RE* 10a (Stuttgart 1934), cols. 2137-8 proposed to divide this material differently: there would have been a Zenodotean Theophilos, quoted by the scholia to Nicander's *Theriaka*; a philosopher, whose saying μίμος ὁ βίος is cited by Fulgentius, *Mythologies* 2.17, and to whom another fragment might be attributed; and a geographer, author of a *Periegesis of Sicily*, who might have been the same as a Theophilos mentioned in Eusebios, *Praeparatio evangelica (Preparation for the Gospel)* 9.34.19 for a testimonium of the gold sent by Solomon to the king of Tyre (a Theophilos is also mentioned in Josephos, *Contra Apionem* 1.215-18, as having written on the Jews). As for the Theophilos referred to in the *Parallela minora* and in the *On rivers*, Laqueur stated that he belonged to the realm of fiction.

In turn, Jacoby proposed to distinguish between the Zenodotean scholar, and two homonymous historians: one cited by Eusebios and Josephos (*BNJ* 733); the other one known only from one passage of Stephanos of Byzantion, who in his entry Παλική mentions a *Periegesis of Sicily* by Theophilos (*BNJ* 573 F 1). In his commentary to this passage, Jacoby (*FGrH* 3B (Kommentar) 605) suggests that Pseudo-Plutarch may have taken the idea for his own Theophilos, to whom he ascribes *Italika*, from the author of the *Periegesis of Sicily.* This may be so, and some tweaking on Pseudo-Plutarch' part is easy to admit; it is however interesting to notice that the reference to Theophilos in Stephanos is followed by a few remarks on the Palikoi (their lake is one of the standard items in paradoxography), and by a passage from Pseudo-Aristotle, *On marvellous things heard* 57. Thus, the connection between Theophilos 296 and Theophilos 573 may be closer than the one sketched by Jacoby, and the two Theophili may have been one and the same author, possibly mentioned in a book of wonders which would have been the source of Pseudo-Plutarch as well as of Pseudo-Aristotle and Stephanos. Similarly, F 4 points to a relationship between the *On rivers* and the *On marvellous things heard* which is not just the straightforward one of source and new version (more on the relationship between Pseudo-Plutarch, *On rivers* and Pseudo-Aristotle, *On marvellous things heard* in Ceccarelli, 'Agatharchides', *BNJ* 284 F 3 and F 4).

A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco: Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 78, presents the status quaestionis, but does not take position (so also in E. Calderón Dorda, A. De Lazzer and E. Pellizer, *Plutarco, Fiumi e monti* (Naples 2003), 89); so also C. Delattre, *Pseudo-Plutarque, Nommer le monde. Origine des noms de fleuves, de montagnes, et de ce qui s'y trouve* (Villeneuve D'Ascq 2011), 219 ('la fréquence de son nom dans les sources antiques rend toute identification difficile'). A. Ibáñez Chacón, *Los Parallela minora atribuidos a Plutarco (Mor. 305A-316B):*

introducción, edición, traducción y comentario (Malaga 2014), 259 follows Jacoby and considers, rightly in my opinion, that the attribution to a same author of at least three books of *Italika*, at least two books of *Peloponnesiaka*, and of at least two books *On stones* raises suspicions (he also does not find that there are similarities between the story of Arachne and Phalanx, told by the 'Zenodotean Theophilos', and the Pseudo-Plutarchan narratives; of this I am less convinced).

S. Iles Johnston, 'A New Web for Arachne', in U. Dill and C. Walde (eds.), *Antike Mythen: Medien, Transformationen, Konstruktionen* (Berlin 2009), 1-3, has re-examined the issue in the context of her discussion of the story of the two Attic siblings Phalanx and Arachne, quoted from Theophilos the Zenodotean in the scholia to Nicander's *Theriaka* (see above)*.* Iles-Johnston does not take a firm position, leaving open the possibility that Müller might have been right in lumping together the Zenodotean Theophilos and that of the *Parallela minora* and *On rivers*; but concedes that the Theophilos of Pseudo-Plutarch might be a fiction, created either on the basis of the Theophilos scholar of Zenodotos, or of the author of the *Periegesis of Sicily*. The first hypothesis seems to her more plausible, because of a 'certain fabulous quality' that the stories narrated by the Pseudo-Plutarchan Theophilos share with the story of Arachne and Phalanx, while the geographical description of Sicily would be lacking in this. Actually, the only fragment we have of the *Periegesis of Sicily* concerns the Palikoi: thus, a 'certain fabulous quality' may have been part of the *Periegesis* as well, with the title serving only as a 'scientific' cover.

Bibliography

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

Delattre, C. 2011. *Pseudo-Plutarque, Nommer le monde. Origine des noms de fleuves, de montagnes, et de ce qui s'y trouve.* Villeneuve D'Ascq.

De Lazzer, A. 2000. *Plutarco: Paralleli minori*. Naples.

Laqueur, R. 1934. *Theophilos (11)*. *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie Der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Stuttgart.

Schlereth, J. 1931. *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis minoribus*. Freiburg.