

Dorotheos

Ceccarelli, Paola (University College London)

This entry was prepared by Paola Ceccarelli and published on (2025).

Name	Dorotheos
Jacoby number	289
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 289 F 1a

ID	289 F 1a
Source	Pseudo-Plutarch, Parallela minora 20B = Plutarch, Moralia 310D (<i>Scriptores rerum Alexandri Magni</i> 155.3)
Work mentioned	Italika book 4
Source date	2nd century AD
Source language	Greek
Source genre	sacrifice; military history, ancient
Fragment subject	sacrifice; military history, ancient
Textual base	Jacoby

Text

Μάριος¹ πρὸς Κίμβρους πόλεμον ἔχων καὶ ἡττώμενος ὄναρ εἶδεν, ὅτι νικήσει, ἐὰν τὴν θυγατέρα προθύσῃ². ἦν δ' αὐτῷ Καλπουρνία³. προκρίνας δὲ τῆς φύσεως τοὺς πολίτας ἔδρασε καὶ ἐνίκησε. καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν βωμοὶ εἰσὶ δύο ἐν Γερμανίαι, οἱ κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν ἦχον σαλίγγων ἀποπέμπουσιν, ὡς Δωρόθεος ἐν τετάρτῳ Ἰταλικῶν.

Translation

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 (book) of his *Italika*.

Critical Apparatus

1. Μάριος ΦΣ Guarinus and most editors since; μάνιος all other codices, Wytttenbach and Dubner
2. νικήσης dv, νικήσεις z (d, v and z are all part of the Φ family, see De Lazzer 2000, 131-136; see also Jacoby's apparatus). προθύσης Φ
3. Καλπουρνία (α^{pc} ΑΠ² and all editors (Calpurniam Guarinus, Xylander); Καλπορνία Φ^{ac}., Καρπορνία Σ, Καλλιπουρνία δ Petau

Commentary on the text

See Commentary on the text of F 1c.

Commentary to F 1a

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 – the treatise cannot be later since Clement of Alexandria knows it; see F 1c). 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* presents a number of problems (see, for a careful description of the textual situation A. De Lazzer, *Plutarco: Paralleli minori* (Naples 2000), 82-139, with the stemma proposed by Jacoby, which De Lazzer by and large accepts, at p. 87).

In terms of content, the *Parallela minora* appears to specialise in unattested stories, or surprising tweaks on well-known ones; the same applies to his source-citations, authors otherwise unknown, whose names often replicate those of known authors, but with a different geographical origin. For this and other reasons, 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, '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) (<https://riuma.uma.es/xmlui/handle/10630/8488>). 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 289 F 1b

ID	289 F 1b
Source	John the Lydian, On Months 4.147
Work mentioned	
Source date	6th century AD
Source language	Greek
Source genre	military history, ancient; sacrifice
Fragment subject	military history, ancient; sacrifice
Textual base	Jacoby

Text

ὅτι Μάριος ὁ μέγας πολεμῶν Κίμβροις καὶ Τεύτοσι κατ' ὄναρ εἶδε κρατῆσαι τῶν πολεμίων, εἰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα θύσει Ἀποτροπαίοις· καὶ προκρίνας τῆς φύσεως τοὺς πολίτας τοῦτο ἐποίησε καὶ τῶν πολεμίων ἐκράτησεν.

Translation

That Marius the Great when fighting against the Cimbri and Teutones saw in a 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.

Critical Apparatus

Commentary on the text

See the Commentary on the text of F 1c.

Commentary on F 1b

Three works by Johannes Lydos, active in Constantinople at the time of Justinian (ca. 490 – ca. 565 CE), are still extant: *De ostentis* (*On omens*); *De magistratibus* (*On powers, or the magistracies of the Roman state*, of which there is a recent edition by M. Dubuisson and J. Schamp, *Jean le Lydien: Des magistratures de l'État romain*, Paris 2006); and *On months*, a treatise in four books on the Roman calendar from the time of the monarchy until his own time that survives in extensive excerpts. The last two works have been mined for the information they offer on ancient calendars and ritual practices, and more generally for the fragment of lost ancient authors they contain. Johannes Lydos' striking fascination with antiquarianism has been taken as a sign of his pagan beliefs; that need not necessarily be the case. See the very brief discussion in F. Tinnefeld, 'Lydos 3: Iohannes L. Official and antiquarian writer, c. AD 490-560', in *Brill's New Pauly*, 2006; the much more detailed introduction in M. Hooker, *John Lydos: On the Months (De mensibus)*, *Translated with Introduction and Annotations* (2nd edition 2017), <https://archive.org/details/JohnLydosOnTheMonthsTr.Hooker2ndEd.2017> (retrieved 4/12/2022); and M. Maas, *John Lydos and the Roman Past: Antiquarianism and Politics in the Age of Justinian* (London–New York 1992), esp. 45-56).

For a long time, Lydos' work *On months* could be consulted only in the edition by R. Wünsch, *Ioannis Laurentii Lydi Liber de mensibus* (Leipzig 1898). The new edition by A. C. Bandy, with A. Bandy, D. J. Constantelos, and C. J. N. de Paulo, *Ioannes Lydos. On the Months (De mensibus). The Three Works of Ioannes Lydos, 1* (Lewiston 2013), presents major problems (notably, Bandy changed the order of the excerpts without providing a concordance with Wünsch; Hooker's translation provides a tabulation of the correspondences); a new edition is under preparation by E. Zingg (relevant are here his preliminary studies: E. Zingg, 'The Fragments of John Lydos, On the Months, Preserved in Anastasius Sinaites and John Sardianus (Lyd. mens. 2.2, 2.6, 2.9, 3.4, 3.11, and 3.12)', *Byzantinoslavica, Revue internationale des études byzantines* 77 (2019), 26-60 and E. Zingg, 'Les fragments de Jean le Lydien, *Sur les mois* IV, 147-150; 154-156 dans le Par. suppl. gr. 257', *L'Antiquité Classique* 90 (2021), 47-106). For the time being, and until the new edition is published, the easiest way to gain a sense of the transmission and textual state of the text of Lydos is through Wünsch's edition, through Hooker, *John Lydos: On the Months*, 31-46, and through Zingg's studies; but one must be aware that this is not sufficient.

Fragment 289 F 1c

ID	289 F 1c
Source	Clement of Alexandria, Exhortation 3.42.7
Work mentioned	Italika book 4
Source date	2nd century AD
Source language	Greek
Source genre	sacrifice
Fragment subject	sacrifice

Text

Ἐρεχθεὺς δὲ ὁ Ἀττικὸς καὶ Μάριος ὁ Ῥωμαῖος τὰς αὐτῶν ἐθυσάτην θυγατέρας· ὧν ὁ μὲν τῇ Φερεφάττῃ¹, ὡς Δημάρατος ἐν πρώτῃ² Τραγωιδουμένων, ὁ δὲ τοῖς Ἀποτροπαίοις ὁ Μάριος, ὡς Δωρόθεος ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ Ἰταλικῶν ἱστορεῖ.³

Translation

Erechtheus of Attika and Marius the Roman sacrificed their own daughters, one of them to Pherephatta, as Demaratos says in the first book of his *Tragoidoumena* (42 F 4), the other, Marius, to the Averting gods, as Dorotheos narrates in the fourth book of his *Italika*.

Critical Apparatus

1. Φερεφάττῃ Clemens; Περσεφόνη Stobaios 3, 39, 33

2. πρώτη Clemens; τρίτῃ Stobaios 3, 39, 33

3. Cyril of Alexandria, *Contra Julianum imperatorem* 4, 19 (697AB) preserves a garbled version, different from all others, inasmuch as it retells the story of Erechtheus sacrifice, attributing it to Dorotheos: Ἐρεχθέα τὸν Ἀθήνησι τοῖς ὑποχθονίοις δαίμοσι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα ὡμῶς ἀποσφάζαι φησὶ Δωρόθεος ὁ ἱστορικός ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν Ἰταλικῶν. The wording is quite different; but the context makes it clear that Cyril must be summarising Clement here (he refers to the same group of stories about human sacrifices as Clement, although in a different order).

Commentary on the text

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, narrated in *Parallela minora* 20A. The Greek story is well-known, and Pseudo-Plutarch mentions as one of his 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 of Caesarea, *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), col. 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 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 Scheid (2005), 568-71.

While Lydos and Clement agree on the Averting gods, absent in the *Parallela minora*, and also agree in omitting any mention of the two altars emitting a sound of trumpets (while they thus have in common both more and less than the *Parallela minora*), 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 (claiming that other 'odd looking' citations of human sacrifices in Clement might also have come from an original, ampler collection of stories, from which also the *Parallela minora* derives); 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), 83-7, 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 Pythokles, *BNJ* 833, is not sufficient).

One difficulty so far has been the fact that there is no good edition of Lydos' *On months*. It is worth pointing out here that while Lydos has the same two stories (Greek and Roman) as in the *Parallela minora* (the story of Erechtheus' daughter, and the story of Marius sacrificing his daughter, which concerns us here) he inverts their order, giving the Roman story priority. Throughout the *On Months*, whenever Lydos gives a pair of examples that coincide with material from the *Parallela minora* (this happens eight times: see E. Zingg, 'Les fragments de Jean le Lydien, *Sur les mois* IV, 147-150; 154-156 dans le Par. suppl. gr. 257', *L'Antiquité Classique* 90 (2021), 65-69, with a synoptic table, and discussion of our passage), the Roman story comes first, in line with Lydos' own interest. The implication is

that there is at the very least a degree of manipulation on the part of Lydos in the reordering of the examples.

One feature of the pseudo-Plutarchan version of the story is worth highlighting. The manuscripts of the *Parallela minora* record the content of Marius' dream with a second person address (νικήσεις or νικήσεις, and προθύσεις), rather than a narrative third person. This may be an error in the manuscript tradition (and indeed, the text printed by all editors has the third person, as above, F 1a); 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. F 1b and F 1c do not help decide, as they are very much abbreviated. But 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 Aristeides, *BNJ* 286 F 1: ἔφη – ὑπνώθησαν – ἀναβαίνει καὶ μνηύει; examples are numerous).

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 an 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* 20B, 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. 98-9, 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* Averting gods (even though evidence for actual cult is scarce, literary texts refer to sacrifices to the Averting gods as a group; see Parker (2002), 891-2), we must accept that there was an earlier and ampler version of *Parallela minora* which 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, F 3);
- at *Parallela minora* 19A (after emendation: the text has τρόπαιοι), in a passage attributed to Dositheos, *Sikelika* book 3 (= Dositheos, *BNJ* 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* (BNJ 622 F 1). Thrasyllus is important in this context because an author of this name is also cited by Clement, *Miscellanies* 1.136, 3 (FGrH / 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, [Biographical essay](#)).

The issue of the relationship between the text of the *Parallela minora*, Lydos and Clement of Alexandria has been recently discussed also by A. Ibáñez Chacón, 'Los *Parallela Minora* como pseudepigrafía: criterios externos (Clemente de Alejandría y Lido)', in J. Martínez (ed.), *Mundus vult decipi. Estudios interdisciplinarios sobre falsificación textual y literaria* (Madrid 2012), 159-170; he notes that both Lydos and Clement know and frequently cite the work of Plutarch, but they never attribute these narrations to him: the implication is that the compendium was transmitted anonymously, and that at some point, possibly because of the homonymy with a work mentioned in the Lamprias Catalogue, or because of thematic affinity, it was incorporated into the Corpus Plutarcheum. And he concludes that Lydos and Clement cite from an earlier and ampler version of the *Parallela minora* (following in this Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis minoribus* (Freiburg 1931), 56-86, and Jacoby); this is also, beyond slight differences in the formulation, the conclusion of Zingg, 'Les fragments de Jean le Lydien, *Sur les mois* IV, 147-150; 154-156 dans le Par. suppl. gr. 257', *L'Antiquité Classique* 90 (2021), 69: 'Nous considérons donc toutes les recensions [Clement, Lydos, *Parallela minora* and Stobaios] comme des témoins indépendants de la collection originale des histoires parallèles gréco-romaines' (the original collection being lost).

Indeed, there are divergences in the source references given by *Parallela minora*, Clement, Stobaios and Lydos for the story parallel to ours, that of Erechtheus (*Parallela minora* 20A, see apparatus to F 1c): in pseudo-Plutarch, the authority is Euripides in the *Erechtheus*; in Stobaios, Demaratos (BNJ 42 F 1) in the third book of the *Tragodoumena*; in Clement, Demaratus in the first book of the *Tragodoumena* (BNJ 42 F 1); Johannes Lydos does not mention any source, neither for the Roman nor for the Greek story (Banchich, in BNJ 42 F 1, is misleading, inasmuch as he indicates Varro as the source of Lydos, which is not the case: if the name of Varro indeed appears in the text of Lydos, it was given as source for the following, extremely fragmentary story of Valeria Luperca, see M. Hooker, *John Lydus: On the Months (De mensibus), Translated with Introduction and Annotations* (2nd edition 2017), p. 164 and n. 8, and now Zingg, 'Les fragments de Jean le Lydien, *Sur les mois* IV, 147-150; 154-156 dans le Par. suppl. gr. 257', *L'Antiquité Classique* 90 (2021), 69-70, who has serious doubts on the text of Hase and Wünsch). And there is a minor divergence also in the divinity to whom Erechtheus sacrifices his daughter: not mentioned in *Parallela minora* nor in the very short text of Lydos; Φερεφάττηι in Clement; Περσεφόνηι in Stobaios (see apparatus to F 1c).

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 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 Elvers (2006), 363-6, with further bibliography).

Even more surprising is the attribution to Marius of a daughter Calpurnia. F. Münzer, 'Calpurnia (124)', *RE* 3 (1897), col. 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 (Velleius 2. 26.3).

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* 6.13.15 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). See on this also A. Ibáñez Chacón, *Los Parallela minora atribuidos a Plutarco (Mor.305A-316B): introducción, edición, traducción y comentario* (Malaga 2014), 314-316, who concludes that although the religious element fits up to a point Marius' profile, the overall conception is much closer to Greek paradoxography than to Roman *portenta*.

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* 5A (= Pseudo-Kallisthenes, [BNJ 124 F 56](#)) and with *Parallela minora* 6B (= Kritolaos, [BNJ 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, [commentary to BNJ 823 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* (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*.

Commentary on F 1c

Clement of Alexandria was a Christian theologian, a poet and a philosopher; probably born in Athens from a pagan family, he was active between c. 150 and c. 215 CE. Our passage comes from one of the three major and extant works of Clement of Alexandria, the *Exhortation to the Greeks* (Προτρεπτικός πρὸς Ἕλληνας). Clement here puts to use his extensive knowledge of pagan mythology in order to exhort his readers to convert to Christianity. The *Exhortation* can be consulted in M Marcovich (ed.), *Clementis Alexandrini Protrepticus* (Vigiliae Christianae, Supplements 34), Leiden - New York 1995 (with a very rich apparatus, or in the edition (with introduction and facing French translation) by C. Mondésert, *Clement d'Alexandrie. Protreptique*, Paris² 1949. Clement's list of instances of human sacrifice in *Protrepticus* 3.42 is discussed by D. H. Hughes, *Human sacrifice in ancient Greece* (London 1991), 118-122, who concludes that some of the citations appear to be false, and that the list as a whole should not be considered reliable without additional confirmation.

Fragment 289 F 2a

ID	289 F 2a
Source	Ioannes Stobaios, Anthology 4.8.33
Work mentioned	Sikelika book 1
Source date	5th century AD
Source language	Greek
Source genre	despotism; law, ancient
Fragment subject	despotism; law, ancient
Textual base	Jacoby

Text

Δωροθέου ἐν ᾧ Σικελικῶν. Φάλαρις Ἀκραγαντίνων τύραννος, ἀπότομος καὶ ἀπαθὴς 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.

Translation

Dorotheos in the first book of his *Sikelika*. 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.

Critical Apparatus

Commentary on the text

See [commentary on the text of F 2b](#).

Commentary on F 2a

Ioannes Stobaios, native of Stobi in Macedonia and active in the fifth century CE, is the author of an anthology in four books, the Ἀνθολόγιον, comprising excerpts of Greek literature from Homer to the fourth century CE, grouped by theme. Rather than consulting the texts themselves, Stobaios seems to have made use of earlier collections. For a good introduction to the whole, see R.M. Piccione and D. T. Runia, 'Stobaios', *BNP* (2006, Consulted online on 30 December 2022

<http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.ucl.ac.uk/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e1123320>); see also E. Dickey, *Ancient Greek Scholarship. A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period* (Oxford 2007), 105-106. Our passage comes from book 4, chapter 8, which discusses the evils and errors of tyranny.

Fragment 289 F 2b

ID	289 F 2b
Source	Pseudo-Plutarch, Parallela minora 39A = Plutarch, Moralia 315C-D = Kallimachos fr. 47 Pfeiffer (54 Massimilla)
Work mentioned	Aitia book 2
Source date	2nd century AD
Source language	Greek
Source genre	despotism; law, ancient
Fragment subject	despotism; law, ancient
Textual base	Jacoby

Text

Φάλαρις Ἀκραγαντίνων τύραννος ἀποτόμως¹ τοὺς παριόντας ξένους ἐστρέβλου καὶ ἐκόλαζε. Πέριλλος² δὲ τῇ τέχνῃ χαλκουργὸς δάμαλιν κατασκευάσας χαλκῆν³ ἔδωκε τῷ βασιλεῖ, ὥς ἂν τοὺς ξένους κατακαίῃ ζῶντας⁴ ἐν αὐτῇ. ὁ δὲ τότε μόνον⁵ γενόμενος δίκαιος αὐτὸν ἐνέβαλεν. ἐδόκει δὲ μυκηθμὸν ἀναδιδόναι ἢ δάμαλιν, ὥς <Καλλίμαχος> ἐν δευτέρῳ Αἰτίων⁶.

Translation

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 the foreigners alive in it. But the king, behaving justly only then, threw him into it. The heifer seemed to emit a bellowing, as <Kallimachos> says in the second book of the *Aitia*.

Critical Apparatus

2. Τέρυζος codices; 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, Boulogne, Ibáñez Chacón 2014) 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; there is no need to suppose a variant.
3. χαλκῆν is omitted in Σ (the Epitome); see full text of the Epitome in the commentary
4. ζῶντας is omitted in Σ (the Epitome): see full text of the Epitome in the commentary
5. τότε μόνον Φ, Stobaios, Xylander, Nachstädt, Jacoby. μόνον τότε all other codices, De Lazzer, Boulogne, Ibáñez Chacón 2014. ἐν τούτῳ μόνῳ δίκαιος φανεῖς αὐτὸν ἐνέβαλε τῆς οἰκείας τέχνης ἀπολαῦσαι the Epitome Σ.
6. ὥς is omitted in Φ. After ὥς Nachstadt and De Lazzer indicate a lacuna (according to Nachstadt, after ὥς E (the Parisinus Graecus 1672) presents a lacuna of c. 8 letters).. <Καλλίμαχος> Bentley, Schlereth, Jacoby, Ibáñez Chacón 2014; Boulogne prints the transmitted text, without author's name: ὥς ἐν δευτέρῳ Αἰτίων; Hercher 51 proposes, based on Stobaios, <ἱστορεῖ Δωρόθεος ἐν πρώτῳ σικελικῶν> . Αἰτίων Bentley (αἰτιῶν codd.).

Commentary on the text

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* (Cambridge 1914), 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* (Rome 1992), 27-45 and 47-60 respectively; N. Luraghi, *Tirannidi antiche in Sicilia e Magna Grecia* (Florence 1994), 21-49; as well as

F.W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* 2 (Oxford 1967), 380-3, and J. Thornton, in *Polibio. Storie* (Milan 2003), 482-4. The Roman parallel narrative (Aimilios Censorinos tortures people by means of a bronze heifer, a story attributed to Aristides of Miletos, [BNJ 286 F 9](#)) is unattested elsewhere, and is clearly modelled on the Greek story (see on this, and more generally for a detailed discussion of our story, A. Ibáñez Chacón, *Los Paralela minora atribuidos a Plutarco (Mor.305A-316B): introducción, edición, traducción y comentario* (Malaga 2014), 464-471).

The accounts of Stobaios ([F 2a](#), attributed by Stobaios to Dorotheos) and *Paralela minora* (F 2b, from the second book of Kallimachos' *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, [BNJ 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) 37-9 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), 117-148;
- 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). *Paralela minora* has Τέρυζος, a name unattested elsewhere, which is most likely to be explained as an error for Πέρυλλος (see Hinz, *Nunc Phalaris doctum protulit ecce caput. Antike Phalarislegende und Nachleben der Phalarisbriefe*, 70-1 and n. 203).

There are however also some small differences between the two passages (discussed in J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Paralleliis 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 [F 2a](#) (Dorotheos) the victims of Phalaris' cruelty are ὁμόφυλοι (literally: 'people of the same tribe'), while in F 2b (Kallimachos) 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 Kallimachos 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 Lykophron, *Alexandra* 717; a scholion to Pindar, *Pythian* 1.185; and a papyrus fragment) that Kallimachos had, in the second book of his *Aitia*, narrated the story of Phalaris (fr. 45-46+SH252-47 Pfeiffer = 52-53-54 Massimilla). Nonetheless, R. Hercher, *Plutarchi Libellus De Fluviis* (Leipzig 1851), 21 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), 106-8 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 authorities for the stories narrated in De Lazzer, *Plutarcho. 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 Kallimachos, 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 Kallimachos, as Nachstädt did, and as both De Lazzer, *Plutarcho. Paralleli minori*, and J. Boulogne, *Plutarche. 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 Kallimachos 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 and Ibáñez Chacón 2014), 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, F 2a would present the traditional model of the tyrant cruel towards his own citizens, as opposed (F 2b) 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 F 2a the prospective victims of the heifer, earlier denoted as *homophyloi*, are now said to be foreigners or guests, *xenoi*). If this is true, then the story of Phalaris, as presented in F 2a and F 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 Burisis), but including (unlike Busiris) foreigners who are *homophyloi*, Greek foreigners. (See on this change E.A. Freeman, *The History of Sicily* 2 (Oxford 1891), 458-77). The Roman parallel narrative (39B, *Moralia* 315 DE = *BNJ* 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: Kallimachos, who was proposing a comparison between the behaviour of Burisis and that of Phalaris, had to have foreigners, because Busiris famously sacrificed foreigners to Zeus (see on this the scholia to Pindar, *Pythian* 1.185). However a variant preserved in Diodoros of Sicily 9 fr. 18-19 Vogel, and possibly going back to Timaios (cf. *BNJ* 566 F 28), states, as in F 2b above, that *ὁμόφυλοι* were sacrificed in Phalaris' bull. See on all this G. Massimilla, *Callimaco. Aitia. Libri primo e secondo* (Pisa 1996), 360-6; A. Harder, *Callimachus Aitia. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford 2012), vol. 1, fr. 44-47 for the text of the fragments and translation, and vol. 2, 369-378 for discussion.

3. in F 2a, the sentence concerning the sound emitted by the heifer simply refers to how the torture functioned, while in F 2b, 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 Kallimachos, 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, ὥς 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 ἐκεῖνον
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 Kallimachos F 53 Massimilla = F 46 Pf./Harder (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* 1.164-7). 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 Pseudo-Apollodoros, *Library* 2.11: the first foreigner sacrificed by Busiris was the seer Phrasius (or Thrasius: see Harder, *Callimachus Aetia. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford 2012), vol. 2, 373 and 377), 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 Herakleides Lembos 69 Dilts).

Commentary on F 2b

See commentary to F 1a. It is worth highlighting here, as a pointer to the composition of the *Parallela minora* and to how they function, that our passage (*Parallela minora* 39A) is paired with an otherwise unknown Roman story (*Parallela minora* 39B), in which a Roman, Aemilius Censorinus, who is living in Egesta (thus in Sicily, like Phalaris – although the text is corrupt, and the location not certain: there is a reference to a mount Tarpeios, which makes one think rather of Rome), delights in new instruments of torture, and notably a bronze horse, into which he throws the inventor (see Aristides, *BNJ* 286 F 9). This pair is preceded by another pair, which also has to do with human sacrifices: *Parallela minora* 38A is dedicated to Busiris, and *Parallela minora* 38B to Faunus, thus to two evildoers who both meet, in the story recounted by Pseudo-Plutarch, their final retribution through Herakles. We thus have an expansion of the Callimachean coupling of Busiris and Phalaris; a parallel is set up for Busiris through the connection with Herakles; and a parallel for Phalaris through a 'Roman' based in Sicily. The sources for all this are the most varied: Agathon of Samos for the story of Burisis (*Parallela minora* 38A), Derkyllus in the third book of his *Italika* for Herakles and Faunus, Kallimachos in the second book of the *Aitia*/Dorotheos in

the first book of his *Sikelika* for Phalaris, and Aristeides in the fourth book of his *Italika* for Censorinus.

Fragment 289 F 3

ID	289 F 3
Source	Pseudo-Plutarch, On Rivers 23.3 = Plutarch, Moralia 1165A
Work mentioned	On Stones book 2
Source date	2nd century AD
Source language	Greek
Source genre	religion sacrifice; ritual
Fragment subject	religion sacrifice; ritual
Textual base	Jacoby

Text

καὶ λίθος δὲ γεννᾶται σικύωνος καλούμενος, μελάγχρους. οὗτος ὅταν τις χρησμὸς ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἐκπέσῃ, τοῖς βωμοῖς τῶν Ἀποτροπαίων θεῶν ὑπὸ δυεῖν ἐπιτίθεται παρθένων· τοῦ δὲ ἱερέως αὐτοῦ τῇ μαχαίρᾳ θιγόντος, αἵματος ἔκρυσις γίνεται δαψιλῆς. καὶ τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ τὴν δεισιδαιμονίαν τελέσαντες μετ' ὀλολυγμῶν ἀναχωροῦσι, τὸν λίθον πρὸς τὸν ναὸν προσενέγκαντες, καθὼς ἱστορεῖ Δωρόθεος ὁ Χαλδαῖος ἐν β' Περὶ λίθων.

Translation

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 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 *On stones*.

Critical Apparatus

Commentary on the text

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 Hippokrates, *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 chapter (*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).

On the Averting gods see above, Commentary on F 1c.

The indication concerning the origin (Chaldaea) 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.

Commentary on F 3

This passage comes from chapter 23 of the *On rivers*, which tells the story of the Armenian river Araxes, then mentions a special plant called *araxa*, whose qualities are linked to the story of the metamorphosis of the river; this is also the case of the stone growing in the river, the *sikyonos* (sources: only one source for the two stories of the river's metamorphosis: Ktesiphon, *BNJ* 294 F 2; no source reference for the plant; and Dorotheos for the stone). The chapter then continues with the mountain near the river (the Diorphos – no source for the story concerning it), and the plant growing on it (with a story whose source is again Ktesiphon, *BNJ* 294 F 3).

The *On rivers* (whose full title is *περὶ ποταμῶν καὶ ὀρῶν ἐπωνυμίας καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς εὕρισκομένων*, *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* pseudoplutarqueo 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. One of its distinguishing features, which it shares with the *Parallela minora*, is the frequency 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.

Fragment 289 F 4

ID	289 F 4
Source	Pseudo-Plutarch, <i>Parallela minora</i> 25A = Plutarch, <i>Moralia</i> 311E
Work mentioned	<i>Metamorphoses</i> book 1
Source date	2nd century AD
Source language	Greek
Source genre	mythology, Greek
Fragment subject	mythology, Greek

Text

Φώκου ὄντος ἐκ Ψαμάθης Αἰάκῳ καὶ στεργομένου Τελαμῶν ἦγεν ἐπὶ θήραν· καὶ συὸς ἐπιφανέντος κατὰ τοῦ μισομένου ἐπαφῆκε τὸ δόρυ καὶ ἐφόνευσεν. ὁ δὲ πατήρ ἐφυγάδευσεν, ὥς Δωρόθεος ἐν πρώτῳ Μεταμορφώσεων.

Translation

Telamon led out to a hunt Phokos, who 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*.

Critical Apparatus

Commentary on the text

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), cols. 498-500; the long, detailed footnote of J.G. Frazer, *Apollodorus. Library 2* (Cambridge, Mass. 1921), 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* 310F-311A; 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 although extremely abbreviated, is perfectly sound as it is.

What is surprising is not so much that a work *Metamorphoses* should be attributed to Dorotheos, but rather that a work on *Metamorphoses* should be the source for a story in which there are no metamorphoses – something emphasized by Jacoby, *FGrH* 3A, 392. 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 Pseudo-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.

The 6th-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* 1 (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 Lykophron'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 Pseudo-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 Pseudo-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).

Antoninos Liberalis, *Metamorphoses* 38, offers a complex narrative (related, if one trusts the manchette, to Nikander's *Heteroioumena* (cf. [BNJ 271-272](#))), 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 Pseudo-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* 2.56-7), or also, as I prefer to think (with Jacoby, *FGrH* 3A, 392), of intentional readaptation. Note however that Lactantius, *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. In this respect, A. Ibáñez Chacón, *Los Parallela minora atribuidos a Plutarco (Mor.305A-316B): introducción, edición, traducción y comentario* (Malaga 2014), 359-360 rightly emphasizes the fact that stories of brothers that kill each other are a folkloric motif, present also elsewhere in the *Parallela minora* (e.g. at 33A, Atreus, Thyestes and Chrysippus; there was in Hyginus a – now lost – catalogue *qui fratres suos occiderunt*, Index n. 236).

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 the *Parallela minora*, where Phokos moves from being presented as the beloved one (στεργούμενου) to being the hated one (μισούμενου).

Commentary on F 4

See above, commentary to F 1a.

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, F 2 and F 4) and *On rivers* (F 3, where an origin from Chaldaea is indicated); to him are attributed *Italika* in at least four books; *Sikelika*, in at least two books (otherwise, the reference to a first book would not make sense); *Metamorphoses*, in at least two books, for the same reason; 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 F 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 (BNJ 145), possibly active in the first century BC (E. Schwartz, 'Dorotheos (15)', *RE* 5.2 (1905), col. 1571);

2. a physician, possibly from Egypt, active in the 1st century BC (M. Wellmann, 'Dorotheos (19)', *RE* 5.2 (1905), col. 1571);

3. a grammarian from Ascalon, active at the time of Augustus and Tiberius (L. Cohn, 'Dorotheos (20)', *RE* 5.2 (1905), cols. 1571-2)

4. an astronomer, astrologer and poet from Sidon, active in the 1st-2nd century AD (F. Kuhnert, 'Dorotheos (21)', *RE* 5.2 (1905), col. 1572; see also W. Kroll, 'Dorotheos (21)', *RE* suppl. 3 (1918), cols. 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, *Deipnosophistai* 7.276 F (= [BNJ 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), col. 412, proposed that two fragments should be specifically referred to an invented Dorotheos the Chaldaean: *On rivers* 23.3 (the *On stones*, [F 3](#)), and *Parallela minora* 25B (the *Metamorphoses*, [F 4](#)).

J. Schlereth, *De Plutarchi quae feruntur Parallelis 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* 'smells of metamorphosis', because it mentions the halcyon and the crow, and because stories exist narrating the metamorphosis of girls (Halkyone and Cornix, married 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 ([BNJ 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: [BNJ](#)

145 T 1 and F 1) 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, 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 (BNJ 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 (BNJ 145 F 2, F 3, F 5 and F 6 = Dorotheos BNJ 289 F 1, F 2, F 3 and F 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 lapidaries 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 F 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 54 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 would like to thank Nicholas Horsfall for reading this entry and discussing it with me; all mistakes remain of course mine.

Bibliography

Bloch, H., ed. 1956. *Abhandlungen Zur Griechischen Geschichtschreibung von Felix Jacoby Zu Seinem Achtzigsten Geburtstag*. Leiden.

Calderon Dorda, E., A. De Lazzer, and E. Pellizer. 2003. *Plutarco. Fiumi E Monti*. Naples.

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

De Lazzer, A. 2000. *Plutarco. Paralleli Minori*. Naples.

Elvers, K. 2006. *Marius [I 1]. Brill's New Pauly*. Vol. 8. Leiden.

Jacoby, F. 1940. "Die Überlieferung von Ps. Plutarch Parallela Minora Und Die Schwindelautoren." *Mnemosyne*, nos. S.3, 8: 73–144.

Parker, R. 2002. *Apotropaic Gods. Brill's New Pauly*. Vol. 1. Leiden.

Scheid, J. 2005. *Human Sacrifices [III], Classical Antiquity. Brill's New Pauly*. Vol. 6. Leiden.

Schlereth, J. 1931. *De Plutarchi Quae Feruntur Parallelis Minoribus*. Freiburg.