

## ***Parallela Graeca et Romana* 20A: Sources and Narrative Structure**

[*Parallela Graeca et Romana* 20A: fonti e struttura narrativa]

by

**Giovanna Pace**

**Università degli Studi di Salerno**

gpace@unisa.it

### **Abstract**

This paper focuses on the Greek tale of *Parallela Graeca et Romana*'s chapter 20. The differences in the Greek story between the direct and the indirect tradition perhaps depend on the intent of *Parallela*'s author to emphasize its parallelism with the Roman tale. As for the source, the direct tradition indicates Euripides' *Erechtheus*, while the indirect tradition (Stobaeus and Clement of Alexandria) indicates Demaratus' *Tragodoumena*. The Greek tale is probably founded on the account of *Erechtheus*' plot in Lycurgus' *Adversus Leocratem* 98-100, perhaps integrated with information from other sources. The divergence between the direct and the indirect tradition regarding the source can be explained (according to Jacoby's theory) by the presence in the originary text of both the names of Demaratus and Euripides (the latter introduced by μέμνηται, as in the pairs of sources in *De fluviis*). It is possible that in the originary text Demaratus was introduced to justify the presence in the story of information missing in Euripides.

**Key-Words:** Plutarch, *Parallela Graeca et Romana*, Euripides, *Erechtheus*, Demaratus, Indirect tradition.

### **Riassunto**

Il contributo si occupa della narrazione greca del capitolo 20 dei *Parallela Graeca et Romana*. Le differenze nella narrazione greca tra la tradizione diretta e la tradizione indiretta dipendono forse dall'intento dell'autore dei *Parallela* di enfatizzare il parallelismo con la narrazione romana. Per quanto riguarda la fonte, la tradizione diretta indica l'*Eretteo* di Euripide, la tradizione indiretta (Stobaeo e Clemente Alessandrino), invece, i *Tragodoumena* di Demarato. La narrazione greca si basa probabilmente sull'esposizione della trama dell'*Eretteo* in Licurgo, *Contro Leocrate* 98-100, forse integrata con informazioni provenienti da altre fonti. Le divergenze tra tradizione diretta e tradizione indiretta nell'indicazione della fonte possono essere spiegate (concordemente con la teoria di Jacoby) con la presenza nel testo originario sia del nome di Demarato che di quello di Euripide (quest'ultimo introdotto da μέμνηται, come nelle coppie di fonti citate nel *De fluviis*). È possibile che nel testo originario il nome di Demarato fosse stato introdotto per giustificare la presenza nel racconto di informazioni assenti in Euripide.

**Parole-chiave:** Plutarco, *Parallela Graeca et Romana*, Euripides, *Eretteo*, Demarato, Tradizione indiretta.

The pseudo-Plutarchan work *Parallela Graeca et Romana*<sup>1</sup> consists, as is known, of a brief introduction and 41 pairs of tales, one regarding the Greek world and the other the Roman world<sup>2</sup>. It came down to us both through the direct tradition<sup>3</sup>, a part of which (family Σ) is in the form of an epitome, and through the indirect tradition, primarily through Stobaeus, John Lydus and (in some cases) Clement of Alexandria. With respect to the indirect tradition, the

*Parallela* offer a generally more concise presentation, although there are cases in which they contain information not present in the indirect tradition or where there are qualitative differences<sup>4</sup>. These relationships between the direct tradition and the indirect tradition have been explained by Jacoby under the hypothesis that there exists a single recension, on which depend both Stobaeus and John Lydus as well as (through an epitome) the text of the *Parallela* in its more complete form and in the further epitomated form of the Σ family<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The work is generally considered not authentic on the basis of external (cf. above all Á. IBAÑEZ CHACÓN, 2012) and internal criteria (cf. D. WYTTEBACH, 1821, pp. 78-79; K. ZIEGLER, 1965, pp. 276-277; E. VALGIGLIO, 1992, p. 4024; M. CANNATÀ FERA, 2000, p. 388; B. SCARDIGLI, 2004; *contra* cf. G. D'IPPOLITO, 1999, p. 340, who thinks that the work can be considered authentic because it belongs to the genre of paradoxography).

<sup>2</sup> On the nature and the subject of the work, cf. A. DE LAZZER, 2000, pp. 21-27.

<sup>3</sup> The text of the work is included in the *corpus Plutarcheum* already in Par. gr. 197 (F), X-XI sec., used thereafter by Planudes for his Plutarch's edition in Ambr. 126 C inf. (α), 1294-1295; cf. Á. IBAÑEZ CHACÓN, 2016, p. 27; Á. IBAÑEZ CHACÓN, 2017, pp. 341-343 (both with previous bibliography). The inclusion of the *Parallela minora* in the *corpus Plutarcheum* has been explained on the basis of its topics, which probably seemed analogous to that of *Vitae parallelae*, but perhaps also to those of *Aetia Graeca* and *Aetia Romana* (cf. C. MÜLLER, 1861, p. LII; F. JACOBY, 1940, pp. 79-81; F. CARLÀ-UHNIK, 2017, p. 2610). The work is generally identified with διηγήσεις παράλληλοι, Ἑλληνικαὶ καὶ Ῥωμαϊκαί, n. 28 in Lamprias' catalogue, but, if the identification is correct, it can prove only that in the III-IV sec. d.C. the work was attributed to Plutarch (cf. A. DE LAZZER, 2000, pp. 18-19; and, for the problematic nature of the catalogue, Á. IBAÑEZ CHACÓN, 2012, p. 160).

<sup>4</sup> For a *status quaestionis* on the relationship between the direct and indirect tradition and a description of the manuscripts cf. A. DE LAZZER, 2000, pp. 82-139.

<sup>5</sup> F. JACOBY, 1940, p. 143. The reconstruction of the relationship between the direct and indirect tradition proposed by Jacoby has recently been accepted by A. DE LAZZER, 2000, pp. 86-89; however, he refutes the hypothesis (made by Jacoby) that underlying the tradition there is a συναγωγή, "quale testo dotto, infarcito di informazioni e citazioni accumulate senza un criterio compositivo" and also expresses doubts on the hypothesis of a single recension. Also R.M. PICCIONE, 1998, pp. 170, 174-177, 180 thinks that the text of the *Parallela* and of Stobaeus depend autonomously on a common source.

Of the numerous sources cited in the text of the *Parallela* and in the indirect tradition, many are probably invented authors (*Schwindelautoren* in Jacoby's definition<sup>6</sup>) and only a few can definitely be held to be authentic<sup>7</sup>; among these is Euripides, who is cited in 20Aa<sup>8</sup>, 310D and in 26A, 312A (with an indication of the title of the works, the *Erechtheus* and the *Meleager*, respectively) and in 24A, 311D (with no indication of the title, but with a clear reference to the plot of the *Hecuba*)<sup>9</sup>. As for what concerns the sources, the text poses two main problems: 1) to establish which of the otherwise unknown authors are fictitious and which are actually existed; 2) for the already known authors, to establish if the tales are really taken from their works (eventually in combination with other sources) or are (partially or totally) invented (this problem concerns also the unknown authors recognized as real ones)<sup>10</sup>.

The aim of this paper is to examine the case of 20A, 310D, which is of particular interest as we possess the indirect tradition both for the Greek tale (Stob., III 730 =

20Ab and Lyd., *Mens.* 4.147 = 20Ac) and for the Roman tale (Lyd., *Mens.* 4.147 = 20Bb; Clem.Al., *Protr.* 3.42,7 = 20Bc). The Greek tale summarises the central episode of Euripides' *Erechtheus*, where the character of the same name sacrifices a daughter in obedience to an oracle that prophesied his victory in the war against the Thracians led by Eumolpus<sup>11</sup> if he did so, while the parallel Roman tale reports that Marius at the time of the war with the Cimbri acted in the same way following a warning received in a dream.

Below, we report the text of the direct and the indirect tradition of the Greek and Roman tales:

20Aa Ἐρεχθεὺς πρὸς Εὐμόλπον πολέμων ἔμαθε νικῆσαι, ἐὰν τὴν θυγατέρα προθύσῃ, καὶ συγκοινωνήσας τῇ γυναικὶ Πραξιθέα προέθυσεν τὴν παῖδα. μέμνηται Εὐριπίδης ἐν Ἐρεχθεῖ<sup>12</sup>.

When Erechtheus was at war with Eumolpus, he learned that he would conquer if he sacrificed his daughter before the battle, and, communicating this to his wife Praxithea, he sacrificed his

<sup>6</sup> Cf. F. JACOBY, 1940.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. K. ZIEGLER, 1965, pp. 274-277; A. DE LAZZER, 2000, pp. 39-49.

<sup>8</sup> For the numbering of the chapters, we will follow A. DE LAZZER, 2000.

<sup>9</sup> A. DE LAZZER, 2000, p. 69.

<sup>10</sup> Á. IBÁÑEZ CHACÓN, 2004-2005, pp. 30-31; Á. IBÁÑEZ CHACÓN, 2010, p. 56.

<sup>11</sup> On this version of the myth of Eumolpus cf. R.M. SIMMS, 1983, pp. 201-203.

<sup>12</sup> For the text of the *Parallela*, both in the direct and the indirect tradition, we follow A. DE LAZZER, 2000.

daughter. Euripides records this in the *Erechtheus*<sup>13</sup>.

20Ab Stob., III 730 Δημαράτου ἐν τρίτῳ Τραγωδομένων. Ἀθηναίων πρὸς Εὐμόλπον τὸν Θρακῶν βασιλέα πόλεμον ἔχόντων, Ἐρεχθεὺς ὁ τῆς Ἀττικῆς προΐσταμενος χρησμὸν ἔλαβεν, ὅτι νικήσει τοὺς ἐχθροὺς, ἐὰν τὴν πρεσβυτάτην τῶν θυγατέρων Περσεφόνη θύσῃ. παραγενόμενος [ὁ] δ' εἰς Ἀθήνας Πραξιθέα τῇ γυναικὶ τὴν πυθόχρηστον μαντεῖαν ἀπήγγειλεν· εἰθ' οὕτω τὴν κόρην προσαγαγὼν τοῖς βωμοῖς ἀνεῖλεν, καὶ συμβαλὼν τὸν πόλεμον ἐγκρατὴς ἐγένετο τῆς νίκης.

Demaratus in book III of *Tragodoumena*; when Eumolpus, king of Thracia, was at war with Erechtheus, lord of Attica, he learned from an oracle that he would defeat his enemies if he sacrificed his eldest daughter to Persephone. On reaching Athens, he told his wife Praxithea of the prophecy of the Pythia and led his daughter to the altars where he sacrificed her; he was then victorious in battle.

20Ac Lyd., *mens.* 4.147 Ἐρεχθεὺς δὲ ὁ τῆς Ἀττικῆς προΐστά-

μενος οὐκ ὀνειρώ ἀλλὰ χρησμῷ πεισθεὶς τοῦτο ἔπραξε καὶ νενίκηκε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς.

Erechtheus, lord of Attica, performed this deed, out of trust not in a dream but an oracle, and defeated his enemies<sup>14</sup>.

20Ba Μάριος<sup>15</sup> πρὸς Κίμβρους πόλεμον ἔχων καὶ ἡττώμενος ὄναρ εἶδεν, ὅτι νικήσει, ἐὰν τὴν θυγατέρα προθύσῃ· ἦν δ' αὐτῷ Καλπουρνία· προκρίνας δὲ τῆς φύσεως τοὺς πολίτας ἔδρασε καὶ ἐνίκησε. καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν βωμοὶ εἰσὶ δύο ἐν Γερμανίᾳ, οἱ κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν ἦχον σαλπύγων ἀποπέμπουσιν· ὥς Δωρόθεος ἐν τετάρτῳ Ἰταλικῶν.

When Marius was fighting the Cimbri and was being worsted, he saw in a dream that he would conquer if he sacrificed his daughter before the battle; for he had a daughter Calpurnia. Since he placed his fellow-citizens before the ties of nature, he did the deed and won the victory. And even to this day there are two altars in Germany which at that time of year send forth the sound of trumpets. So Dorotheus in the fourth book of his *Italian History*<sup>16</sup>.

<sup>13</sup> Translation of this and other passages from the *Parallela* in F.C. BABBITT, *Plutarch. Moralia*, IV, Cambridge (Mass.) – London, 1936.

<sup>14</sup> The translations of the passages from Stobaeus and John Lydus are mine.

<sup>15</sup> Μάριος is transmitted only by families Φ and Σ, whereas the other manuscripts have Μάνιος. Μάριος is also the reading of the indirect tradition.

<sup>16</sup> The text of the epitome is here omitted as it is outside the scope of the present paper.

20Bb Lyd., *mens.* 4.147 Ὅτι Μάριος ὁ μέγας πολέμων Κίμβροις καὶ Τεύτοσι κατ' ὄναρ εἶδε κρατῆσαι τῶν πολέμων, εἰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα θύσει ἀποτροπαίοις· καὶ προκρίνας τῆς φύσεως τοὺς πολίτας τοῦτο ἐποίησε καὶ τῶν πολέμων ἐκράτησεν.

When Marius the great was fighting the Cimbri and the Teutons, he saw in a dream that he would defeat his enemies, if he sacrificed his daughter to the Averters of evil. By placing the interests of his fellow-citizens before those of his family, he did the deed and defeated his enemies.

20Bc Clem. Al., *Protr.* 3.42,7 Ἐρχθεὺς δὲ ὁ Ἀττικὸς καὶ Μάριος ὁ Ῥωμαῖος τὰς αὐτῶν ἐθυσάτην θυγατέρας· ὣν ὁ μὲν τῇ Φερεράτῃ, ὡς Δημάρατος ἐν πρώτῃ Τραγωδομένων, ὁ δὲ τοῖς ἀποτροπαίοις, ὁ Μάριος, ὡς Δωρόθεος ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ Ἰταλικῶν ἱστορεῖ.

Erechtheus the Athenian and Marius the Roman sacrificed their own daughters: the former to Persephone, as Demaratus relates in the first book of his *Subjects of Tragedy*, the latter, Marius, to the “Averters of evil”, as Dorotheus relates in the fourth book of his *Italian History*<sup>17</sup>.

As far as the Greek tale is concerned, the text of the *Parallela* is (as usual) more concise than that of Stobaeus. However, the many differences or omissions do not seem to be random but, rather, tend to emphasize the parallelism of the Roman and the Greek tales, which is consistent with the aim of the work to select similar events (ὁμοία 305B):

1. the use of the generic ἔμαθε instead of the reference to the oracle (χρησμὸν ἔλαβεν) eliminates the difference with respect to the Roman tale, where Marius receives the information in a dream (ὄναρ εἶδεν; cf. also John Lydus κατ' ὄναρ ... οὐκ ὀνειρώ ἀλλὰ χρησμῷ)<sup>18</sup>;

2. the indication τὴν θυγατέρα, with the omission of Stobaeus' specification that it was the eldest daughter who is sacrificed (τὴν πρεσβυτάτην τῶν θυγατέρων), corresponds to the identical expression present in the Roman tale of the *Parallela* (similarly in the indirect tradition of the Roman tale τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα in John Lydus, τὰς αὐτῶν ... θυγατέρας in Clement of Alexandria, with reference to the daughters of both characters);

3. the use of προθύω<sup>19</sup> in both the Greek and the Roman tales (compared to the simple θύω in the indirect tradition and, only in the Greek tale, in the epitome):

<sup>17</sup> Translation by G.W. BUTTERWORTH, *Clement of Alexandria. The Exhortation to the Greeks. The Rich man's salvation and the fragment of an address entitles to the newly baptized*, London - Cambridge (Mass.), 1919.

<sup>18</sup> Á. IBAÑEZ CHACÓN, 2014, p. 145 n. 44 observes that in the Roman tale the substitution of the oracle with the dream is part of the ‘Romanisation’ of the event.

<sup>19</sup> A. MARTÍNEZ DíEZ, 1975, p. 219 rightly attributes a temporal meaning to προ-.

in this case, it seems uncertain whether this is a conscious choice on the part of the author of the *Parallela* or whether the compound verb was already present in the originary text and the preverb was omitted in the indirect tradition (and, for the Greek tale, in the epitome);

4. finally, we cannot exclude the possibility that in the direct tradition the omission of the different deities to whom the two girls had been sacrificed (Persephone for the daughter of Erechtheus in Stobaeus and Clement of Alexandria and the Averters of evil [ἄποτροπαίους] for the daughter of Marius in John Lydus and Clement of Alexandria) is also attributable to the desire to make both tales as similar as possible.

Just how complex the situation is and why we cannot talk about coherent epitomation<sup>20</sup> for the text of the *Parallela* is indicated by two cases (in the Roman tale) in which, compared to the indirect tradition, we find further information<sup>21</sup> that cannot be explained as interventions or 'inventions' of the author of the *Parallela*:

1. the indication of the name of Marius' daughter, Calpurnia (while the daughter of Erechtheus remains anonymous);

2. the reference (totally extrinsic to the core of the parallel tales) to the altars which emit the sounds of the σάλπιγξ.

It is likely, then, that the Roman tale of the *Parallela* provides us with information present in the originary text but omitted in the indirect tradition, which usually offers a fuller and more detailed account.

A particularly major problem regards the source of the Greek tale, which the *Parallela* identify as the *Erechtheus* of Euripides. An initial hypothesis might indicate an indirect knowledge of the tragedy through the oration *Against Leocrates* of Lycurgus (98-101, p. 67 f. Conomis)<sup>22</sup>, which also contains the citation of an ample *rhesis* made by Erechtheus' wife Praxithea in favour of the sacrifice of their daughter (fr. 12 Sonnino = 14 Jouan = 360 Kannicht)<sup>23</sup>. The following arguments support this hypothesis:

1. a substantial coincidence between the account of the plot in Lycurg., 98-99 (which mentions the war against Eumolpus, Erechtheus' wife - Praxithea -, the oracle, the sacrifice of their daughter, the fact that the enemies were subsequently driven from the region χρήσαντος δ' αὐτῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, τὴν θυγατέρα εἰ θύσειε πρὸ τοῦ συμβαλεῖν τὸ

<sup>20</sup> A. DE LAZZER, 2000, p. 85.

<sup>21</sup> F. JACOBY, 1940, p. 115.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. F. JOUAN - H. VAN LOOY, 2002, p. 96 (the *Erechtheus* is edited by F. Jouan).

<sup>23</sup> According to L. DI GREGORIO, 1980, p. 55 the *rhesis* became famous after its citation by Lycurgus.



στρατοπέδω, κρατήσιν τῶν πολεμίων, ὁ δὲ τῷ θεῷ πιθόμενος τοῦτ' ἔπραξε, καὶ τοὺς ἐπιστρατευομένους ἐκ τῆς χώρας ἐξέβαλε “The god’s answer to him was that if he sacrificed his daughter before the two sides engaged he would defeat the enemy and, submitting to the god, he did this and drove the invaders from the country”<sup>24</sup>) and the tale of the *Parallela* and of the indirect tradition;

2. in the Roman tale (which is not otherwise recounted and which, as in other cases<sup>25</sup>, seems to have been invented along the lines of the Greek story<sup>26</sup>) the observation that Marius placed the interests of his fellow-citizens before those of his family (προκρίνας ... τῆς φύσεως τοὺς πολίτας) presents a clear analogy with the text of Lycurgus, in which Euripides is praised for choosing to represent a myth that provides the citizens with an incentive to love their country (τὸ τὴν πατρίδα φιλεῖν 100, τοὺς γ' ἄνδρας ἀνυπέρβλητόν τινα δεῖ εὖ νοῖαν ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος ἔχειν 101 “men should show towards their country a devotion which cannot be surpassed”) in the same way as Praxithea, who loved her country more than her daughters (τὴν πατρίδα μᾶλλον τῶν παίδων φιλοῦσαν

101)<sup>27</sup>. The expression προκρίνας τῆς φύσεως τοὺς πολίτας seems to echo the vocabulary of the *rhesis* of Praxithea cited by Lycurgus, which contains several references to the πόλις (ll. 5, 8, 11, 16, 21, 23, 27, 40, 42, 47, 52) and to the πολῖται (ll. 13, 50) and where in l. 38 the woman states that her daughter is not her πλὴν <εἰ> φύσει “except in nature’s way”<sup>28</sup> (cf. also φύσει γὰρ οὐσῶν φιλοτέκνων πασῶν τῶν γυναικῶν 101 “All women are by nature fond of children”).

If the hypothesis that the Greek tale is derived from the text of Lycurgus is correct, the expression εἰ θύσειε πρὸ τοῦ συμβαλεῖν τὸ στρατοπέδω (Lycurg., 99) might have led to the use of the compound προθύω in the *Parallela* and (perhaps) in the originary text as well.

On the contrary, other elements seem to cast doubt on the use of Lycurgus’ text:

1. the fact that Erechtheus refers the content of the oracle to his wife (present both in the *Parallela* and in Stobaeus), although implicit in the *rhesis* of Praxithea (from which it may theoretically have been deduced), is absent in Lycurgus’ account of the plot;

<sup>24</sup> Translation by J.O. BURTT, *Minor Attic orators*, II, Cambridge (Mass.) – London, 1954.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Á. IBAÑEZ CHACÓN, 2010, p. 57 and n. 8; Á. IBAÑEZ CHACÓN, 2014, p. 145.

<sup>26</sup> On the Roman tale and, in particular, on the elements that may have formed the basis of its elaboration, cf. *FGrH* IIIa, 390-391 and now A. DE LAZZER, 2000, pp. 340-341, *ad loc.*

<sup>27</sup> On the meaning of Euripides’ choice of this myth cf. J.B. CONNELLY, 1996, pp. 79-80.

<sup>28</sup> On the value of the expression, the text of which is corrupted, cf. M. SONNINO, 2010, pp. 280-281, *ad loc.*, which considers as being noteworthy the integration εἰ of F. FERRARI, 1978, p. 234.

2. the title of the Euripides' tragedy, present in the *Parallela*, is not mentioned by Lycurgus: it is unlikely that the compiler of the text on which the *Parallela* depend or the author of the *Parallela* himself may have deduced it from the mere mention of Erechtheus, unless it is conceivable that they were aware of the existence of a tragedy of this name in some other way.

We thus cannot exclude the possibility that underlying the Greek tale (instead of or as well as the text of Lycurgus) is a knowledge of the story of the *Erechtheus*<sup>29</sup>, either first-hand or (more probably) through the mediation of another source that has since been lost. That the tragedy (or at least its plot) was known in the first few centuries AD (probable time in which the *Parallela* were written)<sup>30</sup> is shown first of all by the citation (partially integrated, but virtually certain) of the work in a commentary on Thucydides, found in a papyrus scroll (*POxy* VI, 853, col. X 2 ad 2.15.1 [... ἐν Ἐρε]χθεῖ Εὐριπί[δης ...]) dating from the 2nd century AD and written probably in the 1st century AD, and secondly by a concise allusion to the plot in Aristid., *Panathen.* 87:

λέγεται γὰρ Ἐρεχθεὺς μὲν ἐν τῷ πρὸς Εὐμόλπον τούτῳ πολέμῳ τὴν θυγατέρα ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως ἐπιδόῦναι, τοῦ θεοῦ χρήσαντος, προσαγαγεῖν δ' αὐτὴν κοσμήσασα ἢ μήτηρ ὥσπερ εἰς θεωρίαν πέμπουσα·

Erechtheus is said in this war against Eumolpus to have given his daughter on behalf of the city because of the god's oracle; and her mother is said to have led her forth after adorning her as if for a festival<sup>31</sup>.

That Aelius Aristides may have been the source of the Greek tale can probably be excluded, firstly because the passage makes no mention of Euripides or the tragedy and, secondly, because they lack such elements as the name of Erechtheus' wife and his victory over his enemies, while the active role played by the girl's mother does not seem to find correspondence in the *Parallela* or in Stobaeus<sup>32</sup>. The mention of the myth in Aelius Aristides as an example of the ability to set aside personal interest in favour of Athens (*Panathen.* 86)<sup>33</sup> and the citation of fr. 13 Sonnino = 15 Jouan = 360a Kannicht (φιλῶ τέκν', ἀλλὰ πατρίδ' ἐμὴν μᾶλλον φιλῶ "I love my children,

<sup>29</sup> Thus M. SONNINO, 2010, pp. 101-102.

<sup>30</sup> F. JACOBY, 1940, p. 91 dates the *Parallela* between 125 and 190 AD.

<sup>31</sup> Translation by CH.A. BEHR, 1986.

<sup>32</sup> *Contra* A. MARTÍNEZ DíEZ, 1975, p. 231 thinks that in Stobaeus προσαγαγὼν has a causative meaning.

<sup>33</sup> Aristides inaccurately includes Erechtheus among Athens' meritorious foreigners; cf. CH. A. BEHR, 1986, p. 433 n. 120 *ad loc.*



but I love my country more”)<sup>34</sup> in Plu., *Praec. ger. reip.* 809D (with no indication of the source)<sup>35</sup>, regarding the opportunity of overcoming hatred towards political adversaries out of love for one’s country, show however that the exemplary value and exceptional nature of the event (already highlighted by Lycurgus) must have been recognised between the late 1<sup>st</sup> and the 2<sup>nd</sup> centuries AD<sup>36</sup>; this would explain the presence of the tale in the *Parallela*, which aimed to include ancient stories containing paradoxical actions (305A τὰ παράδοξα τῆς πράξεως).

The most problematic aspect of the source of the Greek tale is that Stobaeus and Clement of Alexandria attribute

it to Demaratus’ *Tragodoumena*. It is important to establish first if this author can be considered authentic or invented, like many others unknown authors cited as sources in the *Parallela* and in the indirect tradition (cf. *supra*, p. 45). Other works by Demaratus are cited as sources in the *Parallela* (16A, 309D-E = 42 F5 Jacoby) and in the *De fluviis* (9.5; 9.3 = 42 F6-7 Jacoby), a pseudo-Plutarchan work characterised by considerable similarities to the *Parallela* (collection of isolated mythological tales, citation of otherwise unknown sources – some of which common to the *Parallela* –, presence of rare expressions and of particular syntactic turns)<sup>37</sup> and which,

<sup>34</sup> Translation by H.N. FOWLER, *Plutarch. Moralia*, X, Cambridge (Mass.) - London, 1936). The line (doubtfully attributed to the *Erechtheus* already by R. PORSON, 1812, p. 226) is paraphrased in Lycurg., 101 (... ταύτην ἐποίησε τὴν πατρίδα μᾶλλον τῶν παίδων φιλοῦσαν ...) after the citation of the *rhesis* of Praxithea (fr. 12 Sonnino = 14 Jouan = 360 Kannicht) and thus probably belongs to the same dramatic context; cf. CH. COLLARD - M.J.CROPP - K.H. LEE, 1995, in the apparatus (the *Erechtheus* is edited by M.J. Cropp); L. DI GREGORIO, 1980, p. 55 n. 76; M. SONNINO, 2010, p. 288.

<sup>35</sup> The verse has been transcribed several times in the margins of the text of the *Praecepta gerendae rei publicae* in the Par. gr. 1957; cf. J.-C. CARRIÈRE, 1984, p. 104.

<sup>36</sup> The citations of this and other passages from the *Erechtheus* in Plutarch (*Nic.* 9 = fr. 10,1 Sonnino = 369 Kannicht; *De ad. et am.* 63A; *De Al. Magn. fort.* 337F = fr. 16 Sonnino, 18-20. 29-31 = 362 Kannicht; *De exilio* 604D = fr. 12, 7-10 Sonnino = 360 Kannicht: this is a section of the *rhesis* recorded also by Lycurgus, for which, see *supra*) and in Clem.Al. (*Strom.* 6.2.7, 1 = fr. 3 Sonnino = 367 Kannicht; 6.2, 9, 5 = fr. 11 Sonnino = 365 Kannicht) are not necessarily proof that the two authors had direct knowledge of this tragedy, as they could have found them in anthological collections; see P. CARRARA, 1977, p. 12; L. DI GREGORIO, 1980, p. 55 (who notes that the citation of fr. 13 Sonnino = 15 Jouan = 360a Kannicht in Plutarch shows that it must have been well known in the early 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD); M. SONNINO, 2010, p. 249. Whereas A. TUILIER, 1968, pp. 82-88 envisaged a first-hand knowledge of many of Euripides’ tragedies (including the *Erechtheus*) on the part of Plutarch and Clement of Alexandria; *contra* cf. H. VAN LOOY, 1970, p. 531.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. CH. DELATTRE, 2011, p. 8

some claim, is attributable to the same author<sup>38</sup>. Demaratus is also attributed, in the scholia on Apollonius Rhodius and in the *Bibliotheca* of Pseudo-Apollodorus, with some fragments regarding the saga of the Argonauts (42 F1-3 Jacoby)<sup>39</sup>. Initially, Jacoby had hypothesised that these fragments might belong to the *Tragodoumena*, thus implicitly admitting the authenticity of Demaratus and this work<sup>40</sup>; but he later accepted Wendel's proposal<sup>41</sup> to attribute them to the mythographer Demaretes<sup>42</sup>, based on the fact that the manuscript tradition of F 1-2 Jacoby presents the form Δημαρέτης (-ετος), while Δημάρτος is conjectured<sup>43</sup>. If the fragments 42 F1-3 Jacoby of Demaratus are attributed to Demaretes, falls the main argument for the authenticity of Demaratus himself, cited only in the *Parallela* and in

the *De fluviis*<sup>44</sup>; he is therefore likely to be an invented author<sup>45</sup>.

This passage is hence one of the five cases in the *Parallela* in which the direct and the indirect tradition cite completely different sources<sup>46</sup>, which in this case are authentic (Euripides) and probably invented (Demaratus). These cases were explained by Jacoby<sup>47</sup> under the hypothesis that the originary text contained an indication of both sources, an indication maintained in the Roman tale of the first and of the penultimate chapter of the work (1B, 305D ... καθάπερ ἱστορεῖ Ἀριστείδης ἐν πρώτῃ Σικελικῶν, παρ' οὗ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἔμαθε Διονύσιος ὁ Σικελιώτης. "This Aristeides the Milesian relates in the first book of his *Sicilian History*; from him Dionysius Siculus learned the facts";

<sup>38</sup> Cf. R. HERCHER, 1851, pp. 5-6, 30-32; F. JACOBY, 1940, p. 80 (implicitly); A. DE LAZZER, 2000, pp. 31-33 (who does not take up a clear position); A. DE LAZZER, 2003, pp. 30-44 (with *status quaestionis*).

<sup>39</sup> Sch. A.R., I 45 = 42 F1 Jacoby; Apollod., I 118 = 42 F2a Jacoby; Sch. A.R., I 1289 = 42 F2a Jacoby; in the Sch. A.R., I 224 = 42 F3 Jacoby the manuscript tradition offers the form Δημάγητος, for which Jacoby doubtfully conjectures Δημάρτος in the apparatus.

<sup>40</sup> *FGrH* Ia, 520.

<sup>41</sup> C. WENDEL, 1931, pp. 465-467.

<sup>42</sup> *FGrH* IIIa, 386-387; see also *FGrH* Ia, 555.

<sup>43</sup> The conjecture is that of Janus Lascaris for the scholia on Apollonius, and Benedetto Egio for Apollodorus.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. A. DE LAZZER, 2000, p. 63.

<sup>45</sup> Whereas M. SONNINO, 2010, p. 101 and n. 181 claims that Demaratus was a truly existing source and the testimony was significant for the reconstruction of the plot of the *Erechtheus*.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. F. JACOBY, 1940, p. 128; A. DE LAZZER, 2000, p. 41.

<sup>47</sup> F. JACOBY, 1940, pp. 132-133.

40B, 315F ... ὥς Ἀριστείδης Μιλήσιος καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Πολυῆστορ ἐν τρίτῳ Ἰταλικῶν. “So Aristeides the Milesian, and also Alexander Polyhistor in the third book of his *Italian History*”), where the epitomation activity may have been less significant. In the passage in question, Jacoby’s hypothesis seems to be supported by the introduction of the reference to Euripides through the verb form μέμνηται, which is an *unicum* in the *Parallela*, where the reference to the source is generally introduced by ὥς, καθά ο καθάπερ, at times accompanied by ἱστορεῖ or φησιν<sup>48</sup>. In the grammatical and erudite tradition, μέμνηται is often used to introduce the reference to a source after giving some information and, in particular, in those cases where an author mentions facts that are also (or primarily) known through another, previously cited author; particularly significant in relation to this passage is the sch. E., Tr. 228, which reports the information acquired by Parmeniscus (ὥς Παρμενίσκος φησιν) regarding the existence of two rivers named Crathis and then points out that Euripides (in the passage to which the comment refers) mentions the second of

the two (οὗ νῦν μέμνηται ὁ Εὐριπίδης). As Jacoby observed<sup>49</sup>, in the *De fluviis* it is a highly common practice to juxtapose two authors as sources, introducing the second through the indication μέμνηται δὲ τούτων<sup>50</sup>. Similarly, in this case we can hypothesise that the mention in the originary text of Demaratus as the source was followed by the indication μέμνηται Εὐριπίδης ἐν Ἐρεχθεῖ: the indirect tradition conserved only the first reference and the *Parallela* only the second<sup>51</sup>.

The attribution of the tale to a fictitious source (Demaratus) and only secondarily to the authentic one (Euripides) in the text on which both the *Parallela* and the indirect tradition depend could explain the presence in the latter of some elements that (inasmuch as can be deduced from the fragments and the testimony in our possession) seem to be absent in the *Erechtheus* and of which there is in any case no trace in the text of Lycurgus. Specifically:

1. the indication of Persephone as the goddess to whom the daughter of Erechtheus is sacrificed<sup>52</sup>. According to Diggle and Collard, this information might

<sup>48</sup> Á. IBAÑEZ CHACÓN, 2012, p. 163 and n. 20 seems to underestimate the difference.

<sup>49</sup> F. JACOBY, 1940, pp. 133-134.

<sup>50</sup> *De fluv.* 1.3; 9.3; 9.4; 9.5; 11.4; 14.3; 17.4; 18.3; cf. also A. DE LAZZER, 2003, pp. 64-66.

<sup>51</sup> Á. IBAÑEZ CHACÓN, 2012, pp. 162-163 hypothesises that the indication of the *Erechtheus* of Euripides as the source in the *Parallela* might have been inserted by the epitomator who, in summarising a well-known story, may have preferred to make reference to an important and famous author instead of an almost unknown writer like Demaratus.

<sup>52</sup> On the presence of this element in the indirect tradition cf. Á. IBAÑEZ CHACÓN, 2012, p.

lie in the words Δηοῦς κάρα in fr. 17, 34 Sonnino = 22 Jouan = 370 Kannicht (see also Δηοῦς fr. 17, 109 Sonnino = 22 Jouan = 370 Kannicht), as Δηώ is a name sometimes used to indicate Demeter and κόρα could be conjectured for κάρα<sup>53</sup>; the text, handed down in *PSorb* 2328, is however fragmentary and certainty cannot be guaranteed. The sacrifice of a virgin to Persephone is also recorded in E., *Heracl.* 408-409<sup>54</sup>.

2. the specification that the eldest daughter was sacrificed: fr. 12 Sonnino = 14 Jouan = 360 Kannicht cited by Lycurgus mentions two other daughters (δύο ... ὁμοσπόρω) in l. 36 but does not specify which was destined for the sacrifice. Moreover, the information contrasts with the testimony of Apollod., III 15.4, who

indicates that the youngest of the daughters (τὴν νεωτάτην) was sacrificed<sup>55</sup>.

It is therefore possible that the compiler of the originary text started from the version of the myth present in Euripides (which he probably knew through the mediation of Lycurgus and/or other authors) and expanded it with the inclusion of these elements (invented or gleaned from other sources unknown to us). The divergence between the direct and the indirect tradition regarding the source can be explained (according to Jacoby's theory) by the presence in the originary text of both Demaratus *Tragodoumena* (probably invented to justify the presence in the story of information missing in Euripides<sup>56</sup>) and Euripides *Erechtheus* (introduced, as in the pairs of sources in *De fluviis*, by

162. According to A. MARTÍNEZ DÍEZ, 1975, p. 237, ἐὰν τὴν πρεσβυτάτην τῶν θυγατέρων Περσεφόνη θύσῃ (Stobaeus) can be interpreted in the sense that «la hija al morir pasaría a ser considerada potencia ctónica, o equivalente del simple hecho del morir».

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Ch. Collard and J. Diggle *apud* CH. COLLARD - M.J. CROPP - K.H. LEE, 1995, p. 188 *ad loc.* (Cropp does not put the conjecture in the text); J. DIGGLE, 1997, p. 106. The proposal was taken into consideration by M. SONNINO, 2010, p. 361 *ad loc.*, who highlights the relationship that could be established with the testimony of 'Demaratus' (cf. *supra*, n. 45).

<sup>54</sup> On the reasons for the sacrifice to Kore in the *Heraclidae* and on the possible analogies with the *Erechtheus* cf. J. WILKINS, 1995, pp. 104-105 *ad loc.*

<sup>55</sup> On the various versions of the myth with regard to the overall number of Erechtheus' daughters and to the ones involved in the sacrifice cf. A. MARTÍNEZ DÍEZ, 1975, pp. 232-234; J.B. CONNELLY, 1996, pp. 60-61 and n. 52; F. JOUAN - H. VAN LOOY, 2002, p. 97; M. SONNINO, 2010, pp. 100-102.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. A. DE LAZZER, 2000, pp. 46-47, in the exposition of F. JACOBY, 1940, p. 135. A similar case is that of 21A, 310E, where the *Parallela* present major differences compared to the text of Parthenius (indicated as the source), while in Stobaeus the tale is attributed to a

μύνηται, which does not imply an exact match between the tale presented and the Euripides tragedy).

At this point we can envisage two different hypotheses for the text on which the *Parallela* and the indirect tradition depend:

1. a single and more extensive tale, similarly to what we read in Stobaeus (containing therefore also the indications on Erechtheus' eldest daughter and Persephone). This would have been followed by the indication of the *Tragodoumena* of Demaratus as the source and the reference to Euripides introduced by μύνηται. The author of the *Parallela* (or the epitome from which the text of the work is derived) may then have summarised the tale, omitted some details (including those not present - as far as we know - in Euripides' text) and indicated Euripides alone as the source. This reconstruction has the advantage of a direct juxtaposition of the names of the two sources in the originary text (as in *Parallela* 1B and 40B and in various passages from the *De fluviis*<sup>57</sup>); moreover, the presumed epitomation would

find ample confirmation throughout the *Parallela*.

2. A larger tale, attributed to Demaratus, may have been followed by a more concise tale, attributed to Euripides, following the *Erechtheus* more closely. Stobaeus would then have reported the first tale (summarised in Clement of Alexandria and John Lydus), while the *Parallela* would have followed the second. The fact that the *Parallela* lack that information which (as far as we know) did not even appear in Euripides' text would then not be the result of epitomation, but would depend on using Euripides as (direct or indirect) source. This reconstruction is in line with the hypothesis of Jacoby<sup>58</sup>, according to which the cases of double citations might be explained as the result of the desire to juxtapose an invented story alongside the known tale of a known author or (as in our case) to tell it with the addition of variations.

Although the first reconstruction undoubtedly appears more plausible, the problem (which is likely to remain as such) nevertheless shows the com-

certain Sostratus, a probably fictitious author (or invented starting from the name of a real author): see the analysis of A. IBÁÑEZ CHACÓN, 2010, which on p. 63 hypothesises the existence of an intermediate source between Parthenius and the *Parallela* (cf. also F. JACOBY, 1940, pp. 130, 140-143).

<sup>57</sup> Cf. *supra* p. 53 and n. 50.

<sup>58</sup> F. JACOBY, 1940, p. 135. Jacoby's theory is questioned by A. DE LAZZER, 2000, pp. 46-49, above all with reference to the possibility of accurately identifying the origin and meaning of the double citations.

plexity of the relationship between the *Parallela*, the indirect tradition and the sources (true or fictitious) of the tales and suggests a more thorough assessment of the cases in which the *Parallela* and the indirect tradition cite different authors or works, also in light of the possible analogies with the *De fluviis*.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BEHR, CH.A.,  
- *P. Aelius Aristides. The Complete Works*, I, Leiden, 1986.
- CANNATÀ FERA, M.,  
- "Il corpus plutarceo: formazione e problemi", *AION* 22 (2000), pp. 381-398.
- CARLÀ-UHNIK, F.,  
- *Paralleli minori*, in *Plutarco. Tutti i Moralia* Prima traduzione italiana completa, coord. di E. Lelli – G. Pisani, Milano, 2017 (traduzione: pp. 570-591; introduzione e note: pp. 2610-2621).
- CARRARA, P.,  
- *Euripide. Eretteo*, Firenze, 1977.
- CARRIÈRE, J.-C. – CUVIGNY, M.,  
- *Plutarque. Œuvres morales* XI, 2 (Traité 52-53) *Préceptes politiques; Sur la monarchie, la démocratie et l'oligarchie*, Paris, 1984 (the *Praecepta gerendae reipublicae* are edited by J.C. Carrière ).
- COLLARD, CH. - CROPP, M.J. - LEE, K.H.,  
- *Euripides. Selected fragmentary plays*, I, Warminster, 1995.
- CONNELLY, J.B.,  
- "Parthenon and Parthenoi: A Mythological Interpretation of the Parthenon Frieze", *AJA*, 100 (1996) 53-80.
- DELATTRE, CH.,  
- *Pseudo-Plutarque. Nommer le monde*, Villeneuve d'Ascq, 2011.
- DE LAZZER, A.,  
- *Plutarco. Parallela minora*, Napoli, 2000.  
- *Introduzione a Plutarco. Fiumi e monti*, Napoli, 2003, 7-99.
- DIGGLE, J.,  
- "Notes on Fragments of Euripides", *CQ*, 47 (1997) 98-108.
- DI GREGORIO, L.,  
- "Lettura diretta e utilizzazione di fonti intermedie nelle citazioni plutarchee dei tre grandi tragici. II", *Aevum*, 54 (1980) 46-79.
- D'IPPOLITO, G.,  
- "Generi letterari e problemi pseudepigrafici nel Corpus plutarceo", in I. GALLO – C. MORESCHINI, *I generi letterari in Plutarco*, Napoli, 1999, 335-344.
- FERRARI, F.,  
- "Su alcuni frammenti di Euripide", *SIFC*, 50 (1978) 232-235.
- HERCHER, R.,  
- *Plutarchi libellus de fluviis*, Lipsiae, 1851.
- IBAÑEZ CHACÓN, Á.,  
- "Historia legendaria romana y sus «paralelos». (Pseudo-Plutarco, *Par. min.* 2 y 8)", *Cudas*, 5-6 (2004-5) 29-43.  
- "Sobre las fuentes verídicas de los *Parallela minora* (I): Partenio de Nicea", *REA*, 112 (2010) 55-63.  
- "Los *Parallela minora* como pseudo-epigrafía: 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.  
- "Ex monstrorum officina: la historia de Roma en los *Parallela minora*", *Antesteria*, 3 (2014) 139-156.  
- "Estudios sobre el texto del los *Parallela minora*: Toletanus 51.5", *Codices manuscripti et impressi*, 103/104 (2016) 27-44.  
- "Estudios sobre el texto del los *Parallela minora*: los marginalia de Amyot en la



- editio Basileensis*", *Eikasmós*, 28 (2017) 339-351.
- JACOBY, F.,
- "Die Überlieferung von Ps.-Plutarchs *Parallela minora* und die Schwindelautoren", *Mnemosyne*, 8 (1940) 73-144.
- JOUAN, F. & VAN LOOY, H.,
- *Euripide 8.2 Fragments. De Bellérophon à Protésilas*, Paris, 2002.
- MARTÍNEZ DíEZ, A.,
- "Reconstrucción del *Erecteo* de Eurípides", *Emerita*, 43 (1975) 207-239.
- MÜLLER, C.,
- *Geographi Graeci minores*, II, Parisiis, 1861.
- PICCIONE, R.M.,
- "Plutarco nell'*Anthologion* di Giovanni Stobeo", in I. GALLO (ed.), *L'eredità culturale di Plutarco dall'Antichità al Rinascimento. Atti del VII Convegno plutarcheo, Milano-Gargnano, 28-30 maggio 1997*, Napoli, 1998, 161-201.
- PORSON, R.,
- *Adversaria*, Cantabrigiae, 1812.
- SCARDIGLI, B.,
- "Il concetto di tempo nei *Parallela minora* di Plutarco", in *Ad fontes! Festschrift für Gehrard Dobesch zum fünfundsechzigsten Geburtstag am 15. September 2004* dargestellt von Kollegen, Schülern und Freunden, hrsg. von H. Heftner und K. Tomaschitz, Wien 2004, 193-200.
- SIMMS, R.,
- "Eumolpus and the Wars of Athens", *GRBS* 24 (1983) 197-208.
- SONNINO, M.,
- *Euripidis Erechtei quae exstant*, Firenze, 2010.
- TUILIER, A.,
- *Recherches critiques sur la tradition du texte d'Euripide*, Paris, 1968.
- VALGIGLIO, E.,
- "Dagli *Ethica* ai *Bioi* in Plutarco", in *ANRW* II.33.6, pp. 3963-4051.
- VAN LOOY, H.,
- "Tragica II: Ouvrages récents sur Euripide (1967-1970)", *AC*, 39 (1970) 528-562.
- WENDEL, C.,
- "Δημαρέτης", *Hermes*, 66 (1931) 465-467.
- WILKINS, J.,
- *Euripides. Heraclidae*, Oxford, 1995<sup>2</sup>.
- WYTTENBACH, D.,
- *Animadversiones in Plutarchi Moralia*, VII.1, Oxonii, 1821.
- ZIEGLER, K.,
- *Plutarco*, Brescia 1965 (orig. ed. *Plutarchos von Chaironeia*, Stuttgart, 1949).

(Página deixada propositadamente em branco)