

Banne der Verhältnisse, in denen sie selbst lebten, auch dies nicht mehr vorstellen: Für sie waren alle Landstriche Italiens ohne kriegserfahrene, d. h. über das Rekrutenstadium hinausgewachsene Legionen gegen Hannibal ebenso schutzlos wie im Jahre 49 gegen Caesar; eben darum verteilen sie großzügig Legionen über alle Teile des Landes.

Das bringt uns auf das zweite Ergebnis dieser, wie schon eingangs bemerkt, von Anfang an auf zwei verschiedene Ziele gerichteten Untersuchung. Wir haben uns wieder einmal auf Polybios zurückziehen, das Zeugnis der späten Annalisten verwerfen müssen, gerade auch in den Abschnitten, die den Eindruck sachlicher, ja geradezu in unserem Sinn 'wissenschaftlicher' Berichterstattung machen. Wir haben gesehen, daß die Versuche dieser Annalisten, ἀξιόπιστος zu lügen, d. h. ein scheinbar besonders wirklichkeitsnahes Bild in einer reichlich mit Fakten gesättigten Darstellung zu geben, nur dazu geführt haben, daß sie die Verhältnisse ihrer eigenen Zeit auf die Zeit übertrugen, von der sie berichteten. Nicht nur ihre Berichte über die Frühzeit Roms, sondern auch die aus der Geschichte der klassischen Republik sind, wie wir jetzt sehen, voll von Anachronismen spätrepublikanischer Provenienz.

Wir haben, wie ich hoffe, in der Sache, wir haben auch in der Beurteilung der Quellen hinzugelernt; ich darf zum Abschluß vielleicht bemerken, daß wir auch zur Beurteilung der neueren Forschung und einiger ihrer namhaften Vertreter Erfahrungen gesammelt haben. Es waren nicht immer erfreuliche Erfahrungen; ich habe über viele gelehrte Bemühungen den Stab brechen müssen; um so mehr freut es mich, einige Große unseres Faches wieder einmal bewährt gefunden zu haben. Zwar nicht in der heeresgeschichtlichen Frage – davon sprechen sie in diesem Zusammenhang kaum, und wo sie es tun, stehen sie zum Teil noch zu sehr unter dem Einfluß der gängigen Anschauungen, um die Fakten richtig zu erfassen<sup>56</sup> –, wohl aber in der Beurteilung der Quellen (von der auf diesem Gebiet alles abhängt) haben zwei nach allgemeinem Urteil ganz große Vertreter unseres Faches recht behalten, EDUARD MEYER und MATTHIAS GELZER, mit ihnen ULRICH KAHRSTEDT, dem die allgemeine Anerkennung nicht im selben Maß zuteil geworden ist. Hier sei mir eine persönliche Bemerkung gestattet. KAHRSTEDTs Schwächen sind mir bekannt, aber ich habe – auch auf anderen Gebieten – von ihm so viel gelernt wie von nur ganz wenigen unseres Faches. Seine Darstellung des Zweiten Punischen Krieges ist, wenn ich recht sehe, die einzige brauchbare seit Polybios; sie gilt im allgemeinen wohl eher als unergiebig, aber das rührt in der Hauptsache daher, daß KAHRSTEDT als einziger den Mut gehabt hat, auf die Aussagen der von ihm als unbrauchbar erkannten Quellen zu verzichten. KAHRSTEDTs Schüler ERNST MEYER hat in einer seiner letzten Arbeiten<sup>57</sup> eindringlich gezeigt, daß

<sup>56</sup> Vgl. oben Anm. 33 und 46.

<sup>57</sup> Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt I 2 (Berlin u. New York 1972), 970 ff.

sich die spätannalistischen Berichte bei Livius überall dort als falsch erweisen, wo sie an urkundlichem Material überprüft werden können; auch seine Überzeugungen haben sich wieder einmal bewährt. Es berührt mich schmerzlich, daß ich meine in langen Jahren in Seminar und Vorlesung erarbeiteten Ergebnisse nicht mehr zu seinen und MATTHIAS GELZERS Lebzeiten an die Öffentlichkeit bringen konnte.

*Nachtrag (Mai 1980):* Im September 1978, als das Manuskript dieses Aufsatzes der Redaktion des »Hermes« zugeing, lagen mir J. F. LAZENBY, Hannibal's War: A military history of the Second Punic War (Warminster 1978) und P. MARCHETTI, Histoire économique et monétaire de la deuxième guerre punique (Brüssel 1978 = Académie royale de Belgique, Mémoires de la Classe des Beaux-Arts 14, 4) noch nicht vor. Beide Autoren stützen sich weitgehend auf die von mir verworfenen annalistischen Angaben und insbesondere auf die livianischen Jahresübersichten; eine Auseinandersetzung im einzelnen ist an dieser Stelle nicht möglich und wohl auch nicht nötig.

Heidelberg

FRITZ GSCHNITZER

## PLUTARCH'S PARALLEL LIVES: THE CHOICE OF HEROES<sup>1</sup>

»Wenn es uns scheinen will, als wären doch die größten Männer von Hellas und Rom so ziemlich alle in Plutarchs Heldenschau vertreten, so ist das vielmehr gerade die Wirkung seiner schriftstellerischen Leistung: die von ihm behandelten Männer sind eben durch ihn in den Vordergrund des Interesses der Nachwelt gerückt, viele, die es nicht minder verdient hätten, im Dunkel geblieben; es wäre nicht schwer, eine Liste von Männern aufzustellen, die mindere Popularität genießen und von deren Persönlichkeit wir weniger wissen, weil Plutarch an ihnen vorübergegangen ist – carent quia vate sacro«. (K. ZIEGLER RE 21. 898 = Plutarchos [Stuttgart 1949] 261).

Few, if any, will disagree with the verdict of the highest twentieth century authority on Plutarch by questioning the significance of his choice of heroes for our understanding and evaluating the history of Greece and Rome. Yet while Plutarch's aims and methods of composition, including the choice of certain types of men had been given adequate attention<sup>2</sup> little of it has been paid to his preference for certain individuals and omission of others. No doubt the main reason for this neglect is the inherent difficulties of the prob-

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank Prof. D. ASHERI, Mr. E. L. BOWIE and Prof. C. P. JONES for their advice and criticism; I alone am responsible for the remaining faults.

<sup>2</sup> E. g. J. R. HAMILTON, Plutarch, Alexander, A Commentary (Oxford 1969) XXXVIIff; D. A. RUSSELL, Plutarch (London 1972) 100ff; A. WARDMAN, Plutarch's Lives (London 1974) 21 ff; S. S. AVERINCEV, The Choice of Heroes in Plutarch's Parallel Lives and the Ancient Biographical Tradition VDI 92 (1965) 51 ff. (in Russian).

lem. The following attempt does not propose to ignore, or belittle, these difficulties, but to cover the ground with a view to hitherto unnoticed openings.

ZIEGLER himself, in what follows the above quotation, contents himself with a cursory view of the problem, touching on only two of the aspects pertaining to it: he notes that Plutarch, in accordance with the classicistic tendencies of his time, shows a marked preference for Greeks from classical times and places. Secondly, discussing the composition of the pairs, ZIEGLER praises the choice of some pairs while he condemns Plutarch for others, where he, according to ZIEGLER, forced together unlike yokefellows by means of rhetorical arts, the implication probably being that some of these pairings were forced on Plutarch by his choice of heroes. The first of ZIEGLER's points is, as shall be shown in detail below, far from being as simple as it may seem at first glance; the second does not provide a profitable avenue (though, let it be said, ZIEGLER's own views of what do and what do not constitute matching pairs do sometimes betray a lack of understanding of Plutarch's literary methods)<sup>3</sup>.

Nevertheless these two approaches are significant for the two main aspects of our problem. On the one hand proper historical understanding must place Plutarch against his background in order to appreciate the influences of his age and of the literary genre which he was using, while on the other hand we should be careful not to ignore the vital part played by the author's own interests and preferences. Chance is an important, but not an exclusive factor: the arrangement of the gallery of heroes of which ZIEGLER speaks in such convincing terms is not purely the random selection of an individual, but also the choice forced on this individual by his circumstances. Understanding the composition of the mosaic of the Parallel Lives involves not only the mind of the artist, but also the materials available as well as the rules and conventions of his art.

Unfortunately Plutarch himself is far from outspoken on the subject. Nor does his earlier practice reveal his motives: The Lives of the Emperors from Augustus to Vitellius which he composed earlier than the Parallel Lives – probably under the brief reign of Nerva<sup>4</sup> – followed one of the most conventional themes in Greek biographical writing<sup>5</sup>. There are no clues for the

<sup>3</sup> See e. g. Part. III of this paper.

<sup>4</sup> J. GEIGER, *Zum Bild Julius Caesars in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, *Historia*, 24 (1975) 444 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Histories of countries by means of series of biographies of their rulers were written by e. g. Pha(e)nius of Eresus (WEHRLI, *Die Schule des Aristoteles IX*), Baton of Sinope (FGrHist 268), Charon of Carthage (FHG IV. 360), Euagoras of Lindos (FGrHist 619), Nicandros of Chalcedon (FGrHist 700), Menander of Ephesus (FGrHist 783), Timagenes of Alexandria (FGrHist 88), Athenaeus of Naucratis (FGrHist 166), and the authors of Jewish histories Justus of Tiberias (FGrHist 734), Demetrius (FGrHist 722), and Eumolpus (FGrHist 723).

time of the composition of other biographies that did not form part of the Parallel Lives and which are mostly lost, though that of Scipio Africanus must have been written before the commencement of the work on the series<sup>6</sup>: yet it would stand to reason that most of these were out of the way when Plutarch embarked on the great undertaking of the Parallel Lives. For the choice of the subjects of some of these single Lives purely personal motives seem to have been decisive: the extant »Aratus« was expressly composed for the instruction of the descendants of the hero (Arat. 1)<sup>7</sup> »Daiphantus« (Lamprias-catalogue no. 38; cf. *mul. virt.* 244B = frg. 11)<sup>8</sup> and the »Pindar« (Lamprias-catalogue no. 36; cf. frg. 9) must have been outcomes of his local interests.

Turning to the Parallel Lives, similar considerations can be noticed. The suggestion that the only lost pair, the »Epaminondas-Scipio«, formed the opening book and as it were the flagship of the series, has as a main reason Plutarch's glowing admiration for his Boeotian compatriot<sup>9</sup>, evident in the Life of Pelopidas, in the »de genio Socratis« as well as in the number of references to him in other works of the »Moralia«, which is second only to that of Alexander the Great. Local-patriotism is explicitly the cause of the inclusion of Lucullus, of whom Plutarch pledges to leave a more beautiful portrait than the one at Chaeronea, erected to him by a grateful city (Cim. 2). Personal considerations might have played sometimes a more subordinate role the value of which would be difficult to assess: certainly Themistocles was a natural choice even if his descendant and namesake were not a fellow student of the young Plutarch (Them. ad fin.) and the memories of his grandfather were at most but a complementary reason for writing a Life of Antony (Ant. 28). Nevertheless these facts provide us with some rare glimpses at the influences bearing on the decisions of the author.

The necessity of adhering to the strict framework of the Parallel Lives must have forced Plutarch more than once to include a biography so that he could provide a pair to another Life. Presumably at the outset of the series

<sup>6</sup> The Lamprias-catalogue lists both a Life of Scipio Africanus (no. 28) and a pair Epaminondas-Scipio (no. 7). The problem of the proper assignment of these Lives to the Elder and the Younger Africanus has been a matter of considerable dispute (see résumé in SANDBACH, *Loeb Moralia XV* p. 74). To the points already discussed should be added that the »Scipio Africanus« must have been written before the series was planned, since it is inconceivable that no room would have been found in the Parallel Lives for both Scipios. Thus the question should be not which of the two Romans would have been more aptly compared with Epaminondas, but rather which of the two would have excited Plutarch's imagination even before he conceived the plan of the Parallel Lives. The application 'Scipio Africanus' presupposes a certain uniqueness fitting for a single biography but hardly acceptable after a series of which a 'Scipio' was one.

<sup>7</sup> F. W. WALBANK, *Aratus of Sicyon* (Cambridge 1933) 16, maintains, apparently on no evidence, that the »Aratus« was composed later than the Lives of Agis and Cleomenes.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. P. A. STADTER, *Plutarch's Historical Methods* (Cambr. Mass. 1965) 137 f.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. WILAMOWITZ, *Reden und Vorträge*<sup>4</sup> II (1926) 260.

there existed a rudimentary plan for part of it, some of which like the »Demosthenes-Cicero«, the fifth pair, (Demosth. 3. 1) would have been traditional or self-evident<sup>10</sup>. Yet Plutarch states that he expanded the series out of the delight and moral profit he derived from it (Aem. Paul. 1) and probably at this stage he would have had to look around for likely companions for the biographies he wanted to write. In a number of cases indeed Plutarch states his starting-point and the fact that he is looking around for an accompanying pair (Thes. 1, 3; Agis 2, 6; Cim. 3, 1; Sert. 1, 11; Publ. 1, 1; Nic. 1, 1; Phil. ad fin. & Flam. init.) yet this does not necessarily mean that the need to provide a pair for a hero on whose inclusion he already decided was the sole reason for the choice of his counterpart. In the following we shall have an opportunity to assess the value of some of these passages.

It seems that the above is the entire explicit evidence concerning Plutarch's choice of his heroes. To this main difficulty and the concomitant inability to reconstruct the author's mental processes two further points should be added: one, already mentioned in passing, is the fact that Plutarch did not work according to a fixed and complete plan. We have seen that he admitted to expanding the series because of the satisfaction he derived from it (Aem. Paul. 1, 1); also his statement (Thes. 1) that the Lives of Theseus and Romulus, and by implication Lysurgus and Numa, lie respectively beyond the pale, and on the borderline of, the verifiable facts of history, and that he came to write them only after he had traversed these, imply that this was a possible expansion of the original plan he may have had; the explanation of the inclusion of the book »Demetrius-Antony« (Demetr. 1) with the need to add one or two negative to the many positive examples seems also to have been an afterthought.

The other difficulty is the notorious problem of the relative chronology of the Parallel Lives without which there can be no clear picture of our problem. JONES' tentative results (JRS 56. 1966, 66 ff) must be regarded with due caution, resting as they do on the conclusions of STOLTZ<sup>11</sup>. Yet evidently the progress of the series cannot be divorced from the chronological framework, however tentative it may be.

It will seem that our problem lies well guarded behind a high wall of stony silence: in what follows one or two avenues will be shown to give some access to the exploration of those dark areas.

<sup>10</sup> The comparison of Demosthenes and Cicero goes back of course to Cicero himself: e. g. his calling his orations against Antony 'Philippics': ad Brut. 2, 4, 2; cf. Plu. Cic. 24, 6. For the comparison of the two orators by Caecilius of Caleacte see Plu. Demosth. 3, 2. For a comparison contemporary with Plutarch see Juvenal 10, 114 ff.

<sup>11</sup> C. STOLTZ, Zur relativen Chronologie der Parallelbiographien Plutarchs (Lund 1929); I have criticized STOLTZ's method in my paper Munatius Rufus and Thræsea Paetus on Cato the Younger (Athenaeum, forthcoming).

### 1. Plutarch on Hellenistic History

An interesting facet of the choice of Plutarch's heroes is his inclusion of subjects from the Hellenistic Age. It has been noticed<sup>12</sup> that Philostratus' sophists of the Second Sophistic did not treat historical subjects later than the time of Alexander the Great, and though this restriction is not as perfect as it seems to be assumed<sup>13</sup> it is fairly typical of the times. An important feature of these times – whatever the reason for it<sup>14</sup> – was the nostalgia for the glorious past of Hellas, which meant, in the first place, Athens and Sparta of the Classical Age and the life and times of Alexander. There is little sign of interest in the Diadochi and subsequent times, no glorification of deeds and heroes later than Alexander: the historical *exempla* as well as the rhetorical themes and hypotheses treated the well-known episodes and incidents of history down to the death of Alexander, the main features of which formed an important component of the common literary culture of the time. The classics of Ancient History, Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon, but also Theopompus and Ephorus were widely read: one may remember the anecdote told by Plutarch himself (garr. 514 C) how in tiny Chaeronea a man, who had read only a few books of Ephorus was nicknamed 'Epaminondas'. A public whose chief cultural entertainment seems to have been listening to speeches recounting the glories of the battles of Marathon, Plataea and Eurymedon<sup>15</sup> must have been reasonably well acquainted with the main historical facts relating to these events.

Plutarch's choice of his Greek heroes reflects well his peculiar stance of being both a child of his own age and of standing on the edge of the main cultural movements of Atticism and Sophistic. There is no need to reproduce here Plutarch's views of rhetoric<sup>16</sup> nor to emphasize those features of his language and style which set him apart from the reigning Atticism of his time<sup>17</sup>. Yet it is significant and characteristic of Plutarch that in the choice of his Greek heroes he displays an attitude of detachment without opposition or spite, of maintaining an individual outlook without necessarily dismissing the

<sup>12</sup> HAMILTON, op. cit., XXII.

<sup>13</sup> Sophists discussing themes later than Alexander: Gell. 17, 21, 3; Plu. Philop. 2 fin. (where PERRIN [Loeb] translates erroneously *ἐν ταῖς σχολαῖς* = in the schools of philosophy).

<sup>14</sup> On this important and controversial topic see E. L. BOWIE, The Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic, Past and Present 46 (1970) 3 ff. and F. MILLAR, Herennius Dexippus: The Greek World and the Third Century Invasions, JRS 59 (1969) 12 ff.

<sup>15</sup> See e. g. Plu. praec. reip. 814 C; Lucian. reth. praec. 18.

<sup>16</sup> R. JEUCKENS, Plutarch von Chaeronea und die Rhetorik (Diss. Strassburg 1907); ZIEGLER, Plutarchos (Stuttgart 1949) 291 ff.

<sup>17</sup> ZIEGLER, op. cit., (supra n. 16) 294 ff; RUSSELL, op. cit., (supra n. 2) 18 ff; W. SCHMID, Der Atticismus (Stuttgart 1887) I, 3, 26.

mainstream of contemporary opinion. It has been noticed<sup>18</sup> that Plutarch chose, in conformity with the taste of his times, most of his Greek heroes from the well-known areas of classical history; yet here as often, the exceptions are more significant than the rule.

The bulk of the Greeks is from Classical Athens, — with small contributions from Sparta and Thebes: Solon, Themistocles, Aristides, Cimon, Pericles, Nicias, Alcibiades, Demosthenes, Phocion, Lysander and Agesilaus, Epaminondas (whose Life is lost) and Pelopidas; to these should be added the two liberators of Sicily, Dion and Timoleon; the Athenian and Spartan of mythical and semi-mythical times, Theseus and Lycurgus have been accounted for as probable expansions of Plutarch original intent to concentrate on biographies of historical personages (vide supra); it is to the remaining heroes from the Hellenistic era that we now must turn our attention. These include, besides Aratus, who is not part of the series, but may be as well taken into account as relevant for our purposes, Eumenes of Cardia, Demetrius Poliorcetes, Pyrrhus of Epirus, the Spartan kings Agis IV and Cleomenes III who are paired off with the Gracchi, and 'the last of the Greeks' Philopoemen. To begin with it is interesting to note that Plutarch, normally so sparing with comments on his choice, gives one in almost every one of these cases: we have seen that the »Aratus« was written for the benefit of the hero's descendants (Arat. 1), Eumenes to provide a pair for Sertorius (Sert. 1, 11), Demetrius with Antony as deterrent examples (Demetr. 1), Agis and Cleomenes to be coupled with the Gracchi (Agis 2, 6); in the case of Philopoemen it is ostensibly Flamininus who is sought out as accompaniment for Philopoemen (Flam. 1, 1), but there might be good reasons to believe that despite Plutarch's turn of phrase it was from Flamininus that the author started in his composition<sup>19</sup>. It is remarkable, that these comments are so much more rare in the biographies of the Greeks from the classical period.

Of course a major factor in Plutarch's choice of his subjects must have been the material available to him. Thus it is not possible to discuss our problem without recourse to the problem of Plutarch's sources. It will not be necessary to revise here the endless discussions of Plutarchean *Quellenforschung*, but some of its generally accepted results will serve to throw some light on our problem.

The historical picture of the hundred and fifty years that passed between the death of Alexander the Great and the battle of Pydna was dominated by

<sup>18</sup> BOWIE, op. cit., (supra n. 14) 14.

<sup>19</sup> Polybius was the main source of both biographies: see R. M. ERRINGTON, *Philopoemen* (Oxford 1969) 228 ff.; H. PETER, *Die Quellen Plutarchs in den Biographien der Römer* (Halle 1865) 80 ff.; A. KLOTZ, *Die Quellen Plutarchs in der Lebensbeschreibung des T. Quintius Flamininus*, *RhM* 84 (1935) 46 ff.; the belief of R. E. SMITH, *The Sources of Plutarch's Life of Titus Flamininus*, *CQ* 38 (1944) 89 ff. in a biographical source is totally unfounded. Plutarch

the accounts of three historians: Hieronymus of Cardia<sup>20</sup>, describing the fifty years from the death of Alexander to that of Pyrrhus; for the next fifty years from Pyrrhus' last campaign to the beginning of Polybius Phylarchus is the 'maßgebende autor'<sup>21</sup>, and finally Polybius dominates the scene for the period of Rome's great expansion. Hieronymus is generally acknowledged as a historian of the highest order, an equal of Polybius<sup>22</sup>. Though Phylarchus seems not to have attained the high standards either of his predecessor or of his continuator the partisan criticism directed against him by Polybius seems to be greatly exaggerated<sup>23</sup>. The seven Hellenistic Lives of Plutarch deal with the careers of the chief characters of these historians; Eumenes, Demetrius Poliorcetes (together with his father Antigonos Monophthalmos, who also plays a considerable part in the Plutarchean biography) and Pyrrhus are the protagonists of Hieronymus; Phylarchus eulogizes Agis, Cleomenes and the Spartan Revolution, while the Achaeans Aratus and Philopoemen — the latter the subject of a special encomiastic work<sup>24</sup> — are the principal heroes among the Greek characters of their compatriot.

This is not to maintain that these historians were the only sources of Plutarch in his Hellenistic biographies: what we are concerned with is the choice of his protagonists. The most likely reconstruction of his course of action is to assume that he would embark upon the writing of a biography with all that such a work involved in reading, research, etc. after he had decided on the subject from preliminary reading and knowledge: indeed it is such a course of action that suggests itself to us from Plutarch's own description of his reading of Latin sources (Demosth. 2). Thus e. g., though in the »Aratus«, Aratus' Memoirs have been used in addition to Phylarchus and Polybius<sup>25</sup> probably this book came to Plutarch's attention only through reading Polybius<sup>26</sup>, as there is no sign that any other writer in antiquity was acquainted with it<sup>27</sup>; similarly, whatever the share of Aristocrates of Sparta

must have read Polybius mainly for the sake of his Roman Lives, so that »Philopoemen« might easily have been a byproduct.

<sup>20</sup> FGrHist 154; on Hieronymus and Plutarch: *ibid.* IID p. 544.

<sup>21</sup> FGrHist 81; *ibid.*, IIC p. 133; cf. T. W. AFRICA, *Phylarchus and the Spartan Revolution* (Univ. Calif. Publ. Hist. 68, 1961); cf. JACOBY FGrHist IIC p. 134.

<sup>22</sup> T. S. BROWN, *Hieronymus of Cardia*, *Am. Hist. Rev.* 52 (1946–1947) 684 ff.

<sup>23</sup> See E. GABBA, *Studi su Filarco*, *Athenaeum* 35 (1957) 3 ff.; 193 ff.

<sup>24</sup> *Plb.* 10, 21, 5.

<sup>25</sup> On the sources of the »Aratus« see WALBANK, op. cit., (supra n. 7) 15 ff. and the editions and commentaries of W. H. PORTER (Cork 1937) and A. J. KOSTER (Leiden 1937).

<sup>26</sup> Professor JONES has kindly suggested to me that it may have been Plutarch's friends descended from Aratus who have brought the »Memoirs« to his attention.

<sup>27</sup> For the rediscovery of not unimportant authors in this period cf. Arrian's rediscovery of Ptolemy: *Arr. Anabasis* 1 praef.; JACOBY FGrHist IIB p. 499.

and other, unidentified sources in the Life of Philopoemen it is clear that Plutarch took his departure from Polybius<sup>28</sup>. Most instructive is the case of Eumenes of Cardia: the paradox that his career is the best known among those of his contemporary Diadochi is due to his compatriot, and probably relative, Hieronymus<sup>29</sup>: thus he is included not only in the Parallel Lives but also in the only other extant series of biographies of Greek generals by Cornelius Nepos<sup>30</sup>.

Indeed the degree of Plutarch's originality in the choice of heroes from the Hellenistic age is best demonstrated by a comparison with Nepos. Among Plutarch's heroes of the Classical Age only Solon, Pericles, Nicias, Demosthenes and Alexander are not included in Nepos' selection. Among these Alexander's exclusion, like that of other kings, is explicitly accounted for by Nepos (reg. 2, 1); most probably Demosthenes, but perhaps also Solon, Pericles and Nicias might have been included in categories other than generals<sup>31</sup>. Thus the difference between the Hellenistic biographies of the two writers is the more striking: from among the seven Hellenistic subjects of Plutarch's Lives only one, Eumenes, appears in Nepos as well – and is, in fact, the only figure from post-classical Greece to do so. Nepos' classical canon is remarkable for a man who was both a Roman and lived before the age of Atticism: Plutarch's originality, whether in relation to the traditions of the literary genre or to his age is a feature of his writing that should not be overlooked.

Another possible criterion to test Plutarch's attitude towards his heroes is to collect and compare his numerous references to them outside his biographical writing. The results here could hardly be more significant.

Of the Hellenistic heroes Agis is never mentioned in the »Moralia«, Aratus and Eumenes score one reference each, Cleomenes two, Pyrrhus and Philopoemen four each, and Demetrius is nine times mentioned. The seven together are thus mentioned twenty-one times, or an average of three times. It will not be surprising that this is significantly less than the references to the rest of the Greek heroes, though the size of the gap should not go without drawing attention to it. Allowance has been made for the fact that some of

<sup>28</sup> cf. ERRINGTON, *op. cit.*, (supra n. 19) 236 ff.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. H. D. WESTLAKE, Eumenes of Cardia, *Bull. John Rylands Libr.* 37, 1 (1954) 309. Eumenes was the son of a Hieronymus; *Arr. Ind.* 18. The relationship was first suggested by U. KÖHLER, *Sitz. Berlin* 1890, 558, 1.

<sup>30</sup> For Nepos' dependence on Hieronymus cf. WESTLAKE *op. cit.*, (supra n. 29) 313. The dissertation of J. R. BRADLEY, *The Sources of Cornelius Nepos: Selected Lives* (Harvard 1968) I know only from his report in *HSCP* 73 (1969) 308 f.

<sup>31</sup> The work might have included books on Greek orators (comprising Lives of Demosthenes, possibly Pericles and Nicias) and Solon could have been included on a book on Poets, Philosophers or Lawgivers. But one cannot be too cautious on this subject: see my caveat in: *Cornelius Nepos, de regibus exterarum gentium*, (Latomus, forthcoming).

these characters occupy special positions in certain works of the »Moralia«: the fifty-seven quotations from and references to Demosthenes' speeches have been ignored together with the nine quotations from Solon; also disregarded are the references to Alexander the Great in the two Declamations about his Fortune, the references to Solon in the Banquet of the Seven Sages and to Epaminondas and Pelopidas in the »de genio Socratis«. Even so the eighteen subjects rate 409 mentions, or nearly twenty-three on average. Only Timoleon (five mentions) and Theseus (eight) rate less than Demetrius, the most often referred to of the Hellenistic heroes, while Nicias (nine) equals his score: but even Timoleon surpasses the other six Hellenistic subjects. It becomes plain that though Plutarch chose his heroes from all periods of Greek history, those of Hellenistic times were stepchildren only.

These facts can be supported by another set of statistics, relating to the references to the subjects of the Roman Lives in the »Moralia«. Plutarch's Greek culture, late start in reading Latin (*Demosth.* 2) as well as the subject-matter of many of his essays make it self-evident that there will be far fewer references in the »Moralia« to Roman than to Greek matters. His historical exempla, literary reminiscences, allusions and quotations most naturally derive from the Greek culture whose typical representative he is: it is not an unfair assumption that a very great proportion of the references to Romans in the »Moralia« are but a by-product of his work on the Parallel Lives. This assumption may be supported by the observation that the bulk of these references is, as a matter of fact, paralleled in the biographies, while in the references to the Greeks in the »Moralia« there is much more that is not included in the Lives<sup>32</sup>. Thus the twenty-five Romans (including the two Scipios whose Lives have been lost) are referred to 175 times, or seven times on average, in the »Moralia«. But we do arrive at surprising results if we divide the Romans into two groups, the first comprising Antony, Flamininus, the two Gracchi, Marius and Sertorius, the second all the others. There are no common denominators for either group, except that the first group are paired off with Hellenistic Greeks in the Parallel Lives, and the second with the rest. Yet the first group rate an average of 2, 66 mentions only in the »Moralia«, the second 8, 3, or more than three times as many. The picture is much the same if we disregard the specialist essays »de fortuna Romanorum« and »Quaestiones Romanae«, the respective figures being 1, 66 and 5, 8, the ratio between the two

<sup>32</sup> One example will suffice: in the prologue to the »Alexander-Caesar« (*Alex.* 1) Plutarch discusses the abundance of material and the choice the biographer is bound to make. Indeed he refers to Alexander in the »Moralia« (except the two Declamations) sixty-five times: many of these references contain material not included in the Life (cf. also HAMILTON, *op. cit.* [supra n. 2], p. xxxi). Caesar is mentioned in the »Moralia« seven times: there is nothing in these passages to suggest that Plutarch's acquaintance with the career of Caesar exceeded what is included in the Life.

approx. 1:3, 5 (Interestingly there is a close resemblance between the frequency of the references in the »Moralia« to the Hellenistic heroes and to their Roman counterparts). It is impossible to explain this phenomenon otherwise than with reference to Plutarch's technique of composition. Thus e. g., the fact that Tiberius Gracchus is never mentioned, and Gaius only twice in the »Moralia« can hardly be explained either by their lack of historical significance or of preeminence in Latin letters and historiography: but recalling the record of Agis and Cleomenes, who form together with the Gracchi a book of the Parallel Lives a pattern seems to emerge. The statement of Plutarch (Agis 2, 6) that he set out from the Gracchi and found Agis and Cleomenes as a fitting pair to contrast with them still need not be doubted: but it now seems that the whole book must have been composed at a very late stage of the series (and at a time probably most of the essays of the »Moralia« have been published) – a view that is, by the way, totally consistent with C. P. JONES' relative chronology. A similar situation can be discerned in regard to the »Sertorius-Eumenes«: Sertorius (admittedly not on the highest plane of historical significance) is referred to only once in the »de fortuna Romanorum«, Eumenes a single time in an anecdote that recurs also in the Life (garr. 506 E; Eum. 6–7). Again there is an indication (Sert. 1, 11) that the Roman was the starting point of the pair, and again C. P. JONES' scheme would accept this pair as one of the last of the series. We have seen that the introduction to the »Demetrius-Antony« (Demetr. 1) seems to indicate that this book was added after the completion of the bulk of the series that comprised morally excellent heroes – and this book, too, belongs according to JONES to the last part of the series.

The combined evidence thus seems to indicate that the books of Parallel Lives that included biographies of Greeks from the Hellenistic age probably did not form a part of Plutarch's original plan, but were added to the series when the success of the work and his personal satisfaction made such an extension desirable. Plutarch's procedure seems to have been to turn in the first place to the most important historians dealing with the Hellenistic age and pick from them such characters as might have seemed suitable for the series. These histories served as points of departure only: but an extensive analysis of Plutarch's sources in these Lives is not within the scope of the present paper. Still, let it be said that this procedure seems to be well in line with other facts pertaining to Plutarch's use of historical and biographical sources.

## 2. *Nepos, Plutarch and the Subjects of the Roman Lives*

We have seen that most, and perhaps all, the subjects of the Greek Lives of the classical period were also included in the »de viris illustribus« of Cornelius Nepos. Plutarch was acquainted with Nepos (Marc. 30; comp. Pel. Marc. 1 = Marc. 31; Luc. 43; TiGr. 21) and the suggestion that he might have turned to him for guidance in choosing the subjects of his Roman Lives seems so attractive, that it is surprising to find that apparently it has never been put forward. Plutarch's limitations both in Latin and in his acquaintance with Roman history are self-evident and have been mentioned above. On the other hand not only did he know Nepos' »de viris illustribus«, but this is the only collection of the sort known to us to have included a large number of Roman subjects<sup>33</sup>. The fact that the Lives were brief and written in an easy style could have been but further attractions. What work, indeed, could Plutarch's description in Demosth. 2 presuppose more convincingly than Nepos' Lives? Of course the correspondence need not have been total, nor, obviously, was Nepos the only source of influence on Plutarch: we have seen that e. g., personal reasons may have influenced his choice, as was the case with Lucullus (vide supra). Yet the almost total silence of Plutarch on a considerable number of his Roman heroes in the »Moralia« suggests that Plutarch's acquaintance with the careers of some of these men might have been minimal before he set to work on them for his Parallel Lives: the theme might have suggested itself only after reading a short work devoted to the subject, such as Nepos' Lives.

Before turning to a more detailed analysis of the connections between Plutarch's Roman Lives and Nepos some general considerations will perhaps be not entirely out of place. Almost the first facts that present themselves in a survey of Plutarch's Roman subjects is that these are Lives of Republican heroes, with a heavy preponderance of the Late Republic from the Gracchi to Brutus and Mark Antony. Neither of these facts is self-evident or self-explanatory. Though Plutarch completed the Lives of the Emperors before the Parallel Lives we must beware of the notion, based perhaps on Suetonius and the »Historia Augusta«, that biography under the Empire must have been exclusively biographies of Emperors. After all, would it have been impossible for Plutarch to compose Lives of M. Agrippa, Germanicus Caesar – or, indeed, Agricola or Thrasea Paetus<sup>34</sup>? It might be pure coincidence that the last Roman in the Parallel Lives, Antony, is also the last general who could conceivably figure in Nepos' work (and I have tried to argue elsewhere that Nepos

<sup>33</sup> Varro's *Imagines*, acquaintance with which is not attested for Plutarch, would hardly include enough material even for biographical degustation. The inclusion in this work of kings, statesmen and generals is an unproved conjecture of F. JITSCHL. *Opuscula III* (Leipzig 1877) 519f.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. A. MOMIGLIANO, *The Development of Greek Biography* (Cambridge, Mass. 1971) 99f.

did, as a matter of fact, include a Life of Antony in his book on Roman generals<sup>35</sup>, but it is the very number of coincidences that throws doubt upon their being such. To view the predilection for Late Republican subjects as something in the nature of things would mean accepting the very fallacious argument from which ZIEGLER warns us. Though of course any number of explanations can be found for this preference, for a certain period one should not discard the possibility that a Late Republican or Early Augustan author, such as Nepos, expanding his work as he was nearing his own times, is responsible for it. Another important point is the possible influence of Nepos' arrangement of Greeks and Romans on Plutarch's method of confrontation and comparison<sup>36</sup>. Nepos seems to have compared the Greek and Roman generals as groups (Nepos, Hann. 13, 4): it would be otiose to point out the difference between this and Plutarch's method of σύγκρισις, though this need not mean that the latter could not get its inspiration from the former.

But all these are general considerations rather than definite proof. Of course we know so little about the lost books of Nepos' work – and even part of this depends on Plutarch – that we can scarcely hope to advance beyond mere speculation as to their contents. Nevertheless a survey of what we know and of what we may surmise might be useful.

First the explicit references to Nepos in Plutarch. The reference to Nepos concerning Lucullus' death (Luc. 43) is revealing: the manner of the death of his heroes is something of an obsession with Nepos<sup>37</sup> and there can be no doubt that the passage in question must come from a Life of Lucullus contained in Nepos' book on Roman generals. Plutarch's main source in the central part of this Life is Sallust<sup>38</sup>, and it is doubtful how much besides our notice depends on Nepos: but the relevant fact is that both series did contain Lives of Lucullus. Next, Marcellus. Here Plutarch refers twice to Nepos (Marc. 30, comp. Marc. Pel. 1 = Marc. 31), both times in 'Zitatennester'. Nevertheless the notion that these references are at second hand can be maintained only with an old-fashioned and doctrinaire approach to Plutarchean *Quellenforschung*<sup>39</sup>. Again it is noteworthy that one of the references is to Marcellus' death and funeral, a well-known preoccupation of Nepos<sup>40</sup>.

<sup>35</sup> An Overlooked Item of the War of Propaganda between Octavian and Antony, *Historia* (forthcoming).

<sup>36</sup> L. E. LORD, *The Biographical Interests of Nepos*, *CJ* 22 (1926–1927) 499; cf. A. J. COSSAGE, *Plutarch*, in *Latin Biography* ed. T. A. DOREY (London 1967) 75 n. 48.

<sup>37</sup> All biographers are interested in the manner of death of their heroes; yet in Nepos the subject is a *sine qua non* even in the very brief biographical sketches in the chapter »de regibus«.

<sup>38</sup> PETER op. cit., (supra n. 19) 106 ff.

<sup>39</sup> PETER op. cit., (supra n. 19) 74 ff. cf. A. KLOTZ, *Die Quellen der plutarchischen Lebensbeschreibung des Marcellus*, *RhM* 83 (1934) 289 ff.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Nepos, Ages. 8, 7; Eum. 4, 4; 13, 4; Phoc. 4, 4.

The last reference to Nepos in Plutarch (TiGr. 21) concerns a statement about the family relationships of the Gracchi (Gaius married the daughter of Brutus rather than of Crassus)<sup>41</sup>: again, without entering into the notoriously difficult problem of Plutarch's sources in the Life of the Gracchi it seems clear that the information comes from a Life of Gaius Gracchus, or of both brothers. This is not to say that he (or they) was included in the book on Roman generals, as another part of the »de viris illustribus«, such as a book on Roman orators, might have been Plutarch's source (cf. n. 31 supra).

Another Roman whose life was described by both biographers is Scipio Aemilianus. Nepos' Life is not directly attested: but it seems certain that the information concerning the topography of Carthage was contained in a biography of its conqueror<sup>42</sup>. Another passage pertaining to the same Life is contained in the Nepos fragment from the Milan palimpsest of Fronto concerning a letter about some *res Numantina*<sup>43</sup>.

Another subject common to Nepos and Plutarch was the Elder Cato. As is well known Nepos composed a full-length ('volumen') Life in addition to the brief sketch extant from the book on Roman historians (Nepos Cato 3, 5), and even those most anxious to invent imaginary Roman biographies as intermediary sources could not deny Plutarch's acquaintance with Nepos' Life<sup>44</sup>.

Next, Cicero. Nepos wrote a Life of Cicero in at least two books (Gell. 15, 28, 1 = frg. 38 Malcovati), though the extant fragment from the book »de historicis Latinis« (frg. 57 Malcovati) looks rather like an apology for not including a »Cicero«, presumably taken from the preface, or the conclusion, of the book. Still it seems highly probable that, as in the case of Cato, a shorter biography, based on a longer work, was included in the series, most probably in the book on Roman orators – if there was such a book.

Lastly, Antony. Plutarch's Life of Antony is the longest biography in the series and one of his most splendid achievements of character drawing and

<sup>41</sup> For a conjecture that would absolve Nepos from a mistake here see F. MÜNZER, *Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien* (Stuttgart 1920) 270 f.

<sup>42</sup> Serv. ad. Aen. 1, 368 = frg. 9 vir. ill. PETER = frg. 49 MALCOVATI. It does not matter in this context (cf. O. METZER, *NJbb* 155, 1897, 291 n. 3), to what layer of our present text of Servius the statement belongs. Obviously the information depends ultimately on Polybius, where it must have occurred in the description of the campaign of Scipio Aemilianus: cf. App. Lib. 117, 554–555; 135, 639; Zonaras 9, 29. On the other hand the two notices from Suet, poet. 6, 1; 6, 3 = frg. 12, 13 PETER = 52, 53 MALCOVATI belong to a Life of Terence rather than Scipio.

<sup>43</sup> First identified by E. HAULER, *Neues aus dem Frontopalimpsest*, *WSt* 31 (1909) 268 f. He reaffirmed his first position in *WSt* 55 (1937) 196 ff, rejecting the conjecture of C. CICHORIUS, *Röm. Studier* (Leipzig-Berlin 1922) 102 ff; cf. also F. MÜNZER *NJbb* 1923, 38 ff. The allocation is accepted by VAN DEN HOUT p. 120 of his edition (Leyden 1954).

<sup>44</sup> See R. E. SMITH, *Plutarch's Biographical Sources in the Roman Lives*, *CQ* 34 (1940) 5; id., *The Cato Censorius of Plutarch*, *ibid.*, 105 ff.; cf. D. KIENAST, *Cato der Zensor* (Heidelberg 1954) 10 ff.

description, incorporating an unusual amount of personal observations and digressions<sup>45</sup>. I have suggested elsewhere (cf. n. 35 supra) that Nepos has written a Life of Antony and it is not impossible that Plutarch took from here his theme and perhaps also some of the details of the Life.

These seven Lives are the only ones from Nepos' work about which we know anything at all and which may have suited Plutarch's subject-matter<sup>46</sup>; the fact that all seven became subjects of Plutarchean biographies does certainly underline the general considerations that have been advanced in favour of the hypothesis that Plutarch may have turned to Nepos' »de viris illustribus« for guidance in the matter of the choice of the subjects of his Roman Lives<sup>47</sup>. Nevertheless the limited amount of information available should render us the more cautious not to try and reconstruct the contents of Nepos' book on Roman generals from Plutarch's Parallel Lives.

Another approach to the choice of Plutarch's Roman heroes is to scrutinize the feasible alternatives available to him. This is possible if we investigate the references in the »Moralia« to Roman generals and statesmen not included in the Parallel Lives. The results are unequivocal. Even the two specialist works, »de fortuna Romanorum« and »Quaestiones Romanae« do not go beyond a very restricted number of well known and fairly general historical examples: the triumvir Aemilius Lepidus is mentioned a single time (fort. Rom. 319E), together with Cicero, Hirtius and Pansa (the only reference to that unfortunate pair) and Mark Antony in an enumeration of Augustus' enemies. Others fare even worse: Cincinnatus is mentioned only fleetingly (fort. Rom. 317D: Φαβρίκιου ... και Κάμιλλοι και Δέκιου και Κικιννάτοι και Μάξιμοι Φάβιοι και Κλαύδιοι Μάρκελλοι και Σκιπίωνες), while C. Flaminius' name occurs only because of the circus Flaminius, built by Φλαμινίου τινός τῶν παλαιῶν (quaest. Rom. 66280A). Nor do great Republican personages who do not occur in these two works fare better: Regulus is mentioned once in a commonplace notice on captives (Hdt. mal. 857A), and once each Ap. Claudius the Censor (praec. reip. 794D) and M. Livius Drusus tr. pl. 91 (praec. reip. 800F). Others are mentioned only because of their links with subjects of the biographies: M. Lucullus only as caring for his brother in the latter's last years (an seni 792C), L. Valerius Flaccus only in his connexion with Cato the Censor (frg. 49), C. Laelius as the friend of Scipio Aemilianus (an seni 797D; praec. reip. 806A); Cassius – if indeed the reference at quaest.

<sup>45</sup> For a sympathetic appreciation cf. RUSSELL op. cit., (supra n. 2) 134ff.

<sup>46</sup> For a Life of Terence cf. n. 42 supra; Suet. rhet. 3 (on L. Voltacilius Pitholaus) includes material from Nepos (frg. vir. ill. 16 PETER; 56 MALCOVATI).

<sup>47</sup> One might compare with this correspondence the list of Republican heroes in the 'Heldenschau' Verg. Aen. 6, 818–847 and 855–859, only half of which are subjects of Plutarch's Lives.

conv. 9, 1 737BC is to him – though he plays a very prominent role in the Life of Brutus is referred to only in this place. Some persons occur in the »Moralia« only in anecdotes that are plainly repetitions from the Lives: thus Plutarch repeats an anecdote about Murena (inim. ut. 91DE) from Cato min. 21, a saying of Metellus Nepos (de laude ips. 542A) recurs from Cic. 26, 6. Clearly Plutarch was not shy of repeating stories – nor is he to blame considering the bulk of his extant writings. Thus an anecdote with a *bon mot* about Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus and the orator Crassus<sup>48</sup> is told three times (inim. ut. 89A; praec. reip. 811A; soll. an. 976A). Even the few Romans who occur in the »Moralia« two or three times (none more often!)<sup>49</sup> are referred to in such general terms or commonplace contexts that it would be impossible to assume that Plutarch was intimately acquainted with their careers: about Fabricius we hear that, like Epaminondas, he died childless (tranq. an. 467E) and that he was buried in the forum (quaest. Rom. 79 283A) beside a bare mention (Φάβρικιου) at fort. Rom. 317D; Mucius Scaevola is a commonplace example (fort. Rom. 317D; coh. ira 458A) like Horatius Cocles (fort. Rom. 317D; praec. reip. 820E); also the references to Catilina (praec. reip. 809E; 818D; de laude ips. 540F) and Clodius (exil. 605F; garr. 511DE) do not indicate that to Plutarch they were anything but examples of worthless rogues.

The inference from this short survey is that Plutarch's acquaintance with Republican history and its heroes was commonplace and superficial. There is no indication that he could have chosen subjects for additional biographies without engaging in special research before deciding on their suitability. This raises again the question of a guide whom Plutarch followed in his choice of Roman heroes. Nepos or another such guide, if available, looks like the easiest solution of Plutarch's difficulties and one that seems well to harmonize with his methods of composition<sup>50</sup>.

### 3. The Lives of Aemilius Paulus and Timoleon<sup>51</sup>

In the preceding two sections I have tried to put forward some profitable lines of investigation concerning the choice of Plutarch's heroes. Still, in some cases we probably shall never be able to guess his particular reasons, in others

<sup>48</sup> Cf. MÜNZER op. cit., (supra n. 40) 108.

<sup>49</sup> This does not include Varro, who is referred to as a source about half a dozen times in the »Quaestiones Romanae«.

<sup>50</sup> N. B.: If Nepos' book on Roman generals was of approximately the same size as that on foreign generals (twenty-two Lives) it consisted of roughly the same number of biographies as the books of Plutarch's Parallel Lives.

<sup>51</sup> For the approach of this chapter of P. A. STADTER, Plutarch's Comparison of Pericles and Fabius Maximus, GRBS 16 (1975) 77ff. and my own Hebrew essay, Plutarch's Lives as Literature, Eshkoloth n. s. 1 (1975–1976) 42ff.



we shall be able to do so only after a detailed analysis. It is the purpose of the present section to assail such a case and to put to test some of our assumptions.

It has been stated already that the pair »Aemilius Paullus-Timoleon« did not form part of the original plan of Plutarch but was added at a later stage when the success of the series caused him to expand it (Aem. Paul. 1). What can be ascertained about Plutarch's motives at that particular time? How far was he acquainted with the careers of the two men and what was his attitude towards them? What were the sources available to him? Was either of the two Lives the starting point to which his counterpart was added? What, finally, were the considerations that enabled him to adapt the stories of the two men to the series and to what extent did he succeed in doing so?

Unfortunately it is not possible to date the »Aemilius Paullus-Timoleon«. The series was begun perhaps in 99 and probably continued into the first years of Hadrian<sup>52</sup>: the relatively late date of the book in the series gives only a very approximate idea about the time of its composition.

As we have seen above, Timoleon, mentioned only five times in the »Moralia«, is the least often referred to of Plutarch's Greek heroes, save those of Hellenistic times (but not Demetrius Poliorcetes). It is worth while to subject these references to some scrutiny.

Only one of the five places indicates expressly its source: at quaest. conv. 6, 3 673 D (= FGrHist. 566 F 116), we are told on the authority of Timaeus the story of the omen of the celery, also narrated at Tim. 26. 1 (and retold in Polyaeus. Strat. 5, 12. 1). Timaeus was Plutarch's main source in the Timoleon (vide infra): the quaest. conv., dedicated to Sosius Senecio, are roughly contemporary with the Parallel Lives (see Jones op. cit., 72 f and cf. J. GEIGER SCI 1, 1974, 139). There is no way of ascertaining which is the primary and which the secondary place of the story, though the probabilities are that where it is incidental and anecdotal it is only secondary to the place where it is part and parcel of the narrative and derives from its main source.

At praec. reip. 808 A Timoleon, who joined the killers of his brother after he could not persuade him to give up the tyranny, is one of a number of historical examples of statesmen who preferred the common good to personal considerations: the information here given is fairly general and every educated person must have been familiar with it; also the praec. reip. is roughly contemporary with the Lives (cf. JONES op. cit., 72) and thus the mention might have been a reminiscence of the extensive version at Timol. 4-5.

Two places repeat the story of Timoleon's dedicating a shrine (or altar) to Automatia, and, in the second version, also consecrating his house to Agathos

<sup>52</sup> C. P. JONES, Towards a Chronology of Plutarch's Works, JRS 56 (1966) 70.

Daimon (praec. reip. 816 E; de laude ips. 542 E). Also this last place may be more or less contemporary with the »Timoleon« (JONES op. cit., 73) where the story also recurs (36, 6). Apparently all the versions of this story including Nepos' »Timoleon« derive directly from Timaeus<sup>53</sup>.

The last reference to Timoleon, at sera num. vind. 552 F, contains information, also quoted at Timol. 30, 4, about the seizure of the temple of Apollo at Delphi by the mercenaries who were later to join the Sicilian expedition. The terminus ante quem of the sera num. vind., dedicated to Quietus, is 107 (JONES op. cit., 71); this does not exclude the possibility that Plutarch composed at about the same time this work and the Life of Timoleon. Yet even if it was earlier than the Life the information in this Delphic dialogue could have derived from Plutarch's wide knowledge of local history (cf. ZIEGLER Plutarchos 24 ff.).

This short survey clearly indicates why Timoleon was not included in the initial plan of the series. Plutarch was never specially attracted to the figure and story of Timoleon and possibly was not acquainted with them beyond the rudimentary knowledge of a good general education. Yet the »Timoleon« is one of the most eulogistic biographies in the Parallel Lives: the sudden conversion from almost total neglect to enthusiasm invites examination.

It is well-known that Timaeus of Tauromenium (FGrHist. 566) who 'exalted Timoleon above the illustrious gods' (Plb. 12, 23, 4; cf. Marcell. vita Thuc. 27 = FGrHist 566 T 13; Cic. fam. 5, 12, 7) was the main source of the Lives by Plutarch and by Nepos as well as of the whole subsequent tradition of the subject<sup>54</sup>. Characteristically Plutarch is the only writer who has frequent references to Timaeus in a time when the ruling fashion of Atticism held him in disfavour<sup>55</sup> and even the somewhat later work of Arrian may well have been written under the influence of Plutarch<sup>56</sup>. Perhaps the most significant aspect of Plutarch's choice is the direction he took in search for

<sup>53</sup> Cf. M. SORDI, Timoleonte, Σικελικά II (Palermo 1961) 81 f.

<sup>54</sup> See H. D. WESTLAKE, The Sources of Plutarch's Timoleon, CQ 32 (1938) 65 ff; N. G. L. HAMMOND, The Sources of Diodorus Siculus XVI. II. The Sicilian Narrative, ibid., 137 ff.; vol. 4 of Κώκαλος (1958) dedicated to Timoleon; T. S. BROWN, Timaeus of Tauromenium (Berkeley and L. A., Un. Cal. Publ. Hist. 55); M. SORDI, op. cit., (supra n. 53); R. J. A. TALBERT, Timoleon and the Revival of Greek Sicily (Cambridge, 1974).

<sup>55</sup> Cf. F. JACOBY, FGrHist. IIIB p. 526; TALBERT, op. cit., (supra n. 54) 42.

<sup>56</sup> Arrian's first exercises in historiography were histories (not biographies) of Dion and Timoleon: FGrHist. 156 T 4a (= Phot. Bibl. 93 p. 73a 35 BEKKER); for the dating cf. P. A. BRUNT'S Loeb Arrian I, p. XII f.; A. B. BOSWORTH, Arrian's Literary Development, CQ 22 (1972) 167. The suggestion that he turned to the stories of Dion and Timoleon under Plutarch's influence accords well with the latter's popularity at that time: cf. R. HIRZEL, Plutarch (Das Erbe der Alten IV, Leipzig 1912) 74 ff. and (for Polyaeus) P. A. STADTER, op. cit., (supra n. 8) passim; on Arrian's use of Plutarch see R. B. STEELE, Plutarch's Alexander and Arrian's »Anabasis«, CP 11 (1916) 419 ff.

biographical material: whatever the assumptions of latter-day adherents of Ed. MEYER, it is to a historical work that Plutarch turned, not to a (hypothetical) previously written biography<sup>57</sup>. Nor should anybody doubt that this is the rule rather than the exception: Occam's razor can be applied more successfully to adherents of *Mittelquellen* than to most other perpetrators of erroneous creeds. Plutarch must have been acquainted with Timaeus before he decided to embark on a biography of Timoleon: he used him both in his »Nicias« and »Dio«, the latter of which formed part of the twelfth book of the Parallel Lives (Dio 2, 7), and thus was certainly written before the »Aemilius Paullus-Timoleon«. Unfortunately the references to Timaeus in the »Moralia« do not contain chronological clues that would enable us to ascertain whether they can be dated before the Lives.

Timoleon is coupled with Aemilius Paullus. In his case also the »Moralia« give little to hold on to. Very possibly the first mention is at fort. Rom. 318B, if we are to concur with the widely accepted, if unproven, dating of the rhetorical exercises as *juvenilia*. It is remarkable that Aemilius Paullus appears here among historical examples of Romans possessed of Fortune: he returned from Macedonia with his troops entirely unharmed. Since this is contradicted both by a reliable historical account (Livy 44, 42) and by Plutarch himself in the Life (21) – not to mention common sense – it will be reasonable to conclude that the former, inexact, notice is a generalized reminiscence of the story of Aemilius Paullus, with which no doubt every educated person – and certainly one who knew his Polybius – was acquainted. Next conj. praec. 141A. The dictum about putting away a wife like a shoe that hurts is here referred to 'a Roman' (ὁ Ῥωμαῖος): it recurs in Aem. Paul. 5 (and Jerome, adv. Iovin. 1, 148 = PL II, 292). Whether the saying is rightly or wrongly attributed to Paullus the reference in the »Moralia« certainly does not testify to any special interest in the hero<sup>58</sup>. Also the mention at tranq. an. 475A is a historical example of the most general kind – and roughly contemporary with the latter part of the Parallel Lives (JONES op. cit., 62f.). The information at quaest. conv. 1, 2 615EF on Paullus' dinner-parties after the Macedonian campaign might derive from the again roughly contemporary Life (28, 5). The last two references only mention Scipio Aemilianus as Paullus' son (cum princ. phil. 777B; praec. reip. 810B). Clearly none of these places indicates any special interest in, or acquaintance with the career of Aemilius Paullus prior to the composition of the Life. There

<sup>57</sup> Such a biography was surmised by WESTLAKE, op. cit., (supra n. 54), followed in the main (though with reservations) by TALBERT, op. cit., (supra n. 54), 22ff.; BROWN, op. cit., (supra n. 54), 85 even put a name to it; rejected by TALBERT, op. cit., 195. I hope to discuss in future the entire subject of Political Biography in the Hellenistic Age.

<sup>58</sup> JONES, op. cit., (supra n. 52), 71 dates the conj. praec. very tentatively to c. 90 – c. 100.

is no need for a detailed analysis of the Life to see that Polybius – on whose personal relations with the family of Aemilius Paullus there is no need to dwell – must have been its starting point: its very focussing upon a single period of this life – when the hero was already sixty years of age – shows how absurd it is to assume a 'biographical source' for Plutarch<sup>59</sup>.

Which Life was Plutarch's starting point and what made him join Timoleon and Aemilius Paullus in one book? It will be expedient to start with the second of the two questions. ZIEGLER (Plutarchos 262 = RE 21, 898) after conceding that some of the couples are convincing and successful, goes on to say that others are joined artificially and by force: »Was haben Aristeides und der alte Cato, Perikles und Fabius Maximus, Timoleon und Aemilius Paullus in Wahrheit miteinander gemein? Nur mittels rhetorischer Künste konnten Ähnlichkeiten zwischen solchen Männern konstruiert werden ...«. For our present purpose it will be sufficient to answer the question regarding the pair under review. As we have seen the tradition about Timoleon was uniform and went back to the eulogies of Timaeus. The prominent feature of this tradition was Timoleon's Fortune<sup>60</sup>. Plutarch put his tradition to good use and made τύχη the Leitmotiv of the entire Life. There is no need to bring examples as practically every incident in the biography is ascribed to Timoleon's τύχη, the turning-points being μεταβολαὶ τύχης: towards the end of the Life we are even assured that Timoleon's blindness was due to a congenital illness and was not the effect of τύχη (37, 7)!

The connexion of Timoleon and τύχη was traditional and well-established. Less well known is Aemilius Paullus' connexion with Fortuna. Yet Plutarch makes him refer to τύχη in his *contio* after his triumph in 167 (Aem. Paul. 36, 3ff.). That this was not an invention of Plutarch's is clear from all the parallel reports of the speech<sup>61</sup>. Moreover Paullus dedicated a statue of Athene by Phidias at the temple of Fortuna Huiusce Diei, and it is even possible that it was he who was responsible for the erection of the shrine<sup>62</sup>. Thus Plutarch had a starting point that had at least some foundation in historical fact. Still,

<sup>59</sup> On the sources of the »Aemilius Paullus« see H. PETER, op. cit., (supra n. 19) 86ff.; R. E. SMITH, Plutarch's Biographical Sources in the Roman Lives, CQ 34 (1940) 1ff., esp. 4, on account of the existence of a very small number of isolated notices on Paullus' career that apparently do not derive from Polybius surmises an intermediary biographical source.

<sup>60</sup> M. J. FONTANA, Fortuna di Timoleonte, Rassegna delle fonti letterarie, Κώσταλος 4 (1958) 3ff.

<sup>61</sup> Livy 45, 41; Val. Max. 5, 10, 2 (a verbatim passage of the speech); Vell. 1, 10, 3–5; App. Mac. 19 (this last source missing in MALCOVATI ORF<sup>3</sup> p. 101).

<sup>62</sup> Plin. n. h. 34, 54: (Pheidias fecit) et aliam Minervam quam Romae Paulus Aemilius ad aedem Fortunae Huiusce Diei dicavit; cf. ibid., 60. K. LATTE, Röm. Religionsgesch. (München 1960) 179, 4 misinterprets this passage to mean that Pliny referred to the location of the statue in his time without acknowledging that the dedication was to the goddess. This must be due to some confusion on account of the existence of two temples of the same deity in different parts of the

the joining of the two heroes and the composition of the whole book around the central feature of Fortuna is a literary device – 'rhetorical art' according to ZIEGLER – and it is as such that we have to evaluate it. Incidentally it is well possible that such an evaluation can provide the key to a well known crux regarding our book: the »Aemilius Paullus-Timoleon«, together with the »Sertorius-Eumenes« and the »Coriolanus-Alcibiades« are the only books of the Parallel Lives where the Roman biography is placed first<sup>63</sup>. It is possible to attempt at least in our case to ascribe the order of the Lives to their literary structure. Each of the two Lives demonstrates the government of τύχη centred on a single episode in the life of the hero – the battle of Pydna and the liberation of Sicily respectively. In both cases there is a μεταβολή τύχης. In the first case the victory is followed by domestic catastrophe (the death of Paullus' sons) in the second the command of the Sicilian expedition is given to Timoleon after a long period in the political wilderness which followed on the domestic catastrophe of his having to collaborate in the murder of his brother the tyrant. This last episode is told in the Timoleon at some length, and in the (for ancient prose) quite extraordinary technique of flashback. Thus the interlude of the murder of Timophanes is put between the two dramatic climaxes of the book. The first half of the book passes from success to catastrophe, the second from disaster to victory: it is possible that Plutarch departed from his usual arrangement for the sake of the effect this provided.

To return to the main issue. Literary considerations played their part not only in the composition of the book of the Lives of Aemilius Paullus and Timoleon, but also enabled the inclusion of the book in the series. A Greek and a Roman were to be found whose careers were significant enough to rank among the other great statesmen and generals of the Parallel Lives and well-attested enough to provide the skeletons of biographies. Yet this in itself was not sufficient for Plutarch's moralistic purposes. Only the discovery of an angle that could serve these purposes enabled the incorporation of the two Lives in the series. It is as well to stress that the common denominator of the two Lives, stories centred on τύχη, on virtue and fortitude overcoming the blows of Fate, had a solid foundation in historical tradition and that Plutarch's sharp eye only discovered the literary use to which this historical tradition could be turned.

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

JOSEPH GEIGER

city, since Q. Lutatius Catulus dedicated an Aedes Fortunae Huiusce Diei on the day of the battle of Vercellae (July 30th): Plu. Mar. 26, 3; 8; CIL I<sup>2</sup> p. 217, 219, 323. On the location of the two temples see PLATNER-ASHBY, Topogr. Dict. 216; the suggestion that the first shrine was erected by Aemilius Paullus: OTTO, RE 7, 52; ROSCHER I. 1514; i have not seen AUST, d: aedibus sacris 26, where the suggestion was apparently first made.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. K. ZIEGLER, Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der vergleichenden Lebensbeschreibungen Plutarchs (1907) 29 ff.

## THE TRAVELS OF SUETONIUS TRANQUILLUS

I. Writers of history tend to say very little about their occupations or peregrinations. Tacitus discloses exact knowledge of Gaul and the Rhineland. No post in those regions can be certified. For Asia an inscription registers the proconsulate, and traces of his sojourn have duly been sought in early books of the *Annales*.

Dignity and reticence advertise the senator composing Roman annals. A biographer's themes dispose him to become garrulous. Not so Suetonius. Distant and objective when chronicling enormities or trivia in the behaviour of the Caesars, he is a relentless collector. His own character comes out as diffident, perhaps difficult as well. The writing avows no concern for provinces, for far lands or for foreign policy – and no sign of a local origin.

Silence on that count often marks an immigrant author. Early in the reign of Hadrian, Hippo Regius paid Suetonius the honour of a public dedication<sup>1</sup>. After his name stands a priesthood, to be presumed local. Nothing is known to debar the African colony as the *patria* of the industrious polymath<sup>2</sup>.

II. For any employment at Rome or abroad, only external evidence avails. First of all, letters of Pliny. In the year 101 the helpful friend made approach to Neratius Marcellus and secured a military tribunate. Suetonius declined (*Epp.* III. 8.). The missives to Marcellus are absent from the collection, and Pliny, as is his wont, refrains from naming the province governed by a consular legate. It happens to be Britain<sup>3</sup>.

The birth of Suetonius falls in the vicinity of 70, perhaps in that very year<sup>4</sup>. In the ages of equestrian officers a wide variation obtained<sup>5</sup>. Likewise the length of service and the nature of a man's prospects or ambitions. Pliny's uncle passed a dozen years with the Rhine armies<sup>6</sup>. For some other knights, with no aspiration towards a military career or hope of civilian posts thereafter, a single appointment sufficed.

<sup>1</sup> Published by E. MAREC and H.-G. PFLAUM., CRAI 1952, 78 ff., whence AE 1953, 73.

<sup>2</sup> Thus Tacitus (1958), 780, with the conjecture that Pisaurum might be the 'ultima origo' of the Suetonii. The nomen, made familiar through the biographer and the illustrious general (Suetonius Paullinus), happens to be a rarity.

A firm attempt was made to link him to Ostia. For example, following F. GROSSO, R. MEIGGS., Roman Ostia (1960), 515 f.: revoked in the second edition (1973), 584; 597.

<sup>3</sup> CIL XVI. 48 (a diploma issued on January 19 of 103). His predecessor had arrived in 98 (XVI. 43).

<sup>4</sup> As proposed in JRS LXVII (1977), 44.

<sup>5</sup> E. BIRLEY, Roman Britain and the Roman Army (1961), 135 ff.

<sup>6</sup> F. MÜNZER, Bonner Jahrbücher CIV (1899), 67 ff. It is preferable to neglect K. ZIEGLER, RE XXI, 273 ff.