Plutarch's Method of Work in the Roman Lives

C. B. R. Pelling

The Journal of Hellenic Studies, Vol. 99. (1979), pp. 74-96.

Stable URL:

http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0075-4269%281979%2999%3C74%3APMOWIT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-J

The Journal of Hellenic Studies is currently published by The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies.

PLUTARCH'S METHOD OF WORK IN THE ROMAN LIVES

THIS paper is concerned with the eight Lives in which Plutarch describes the final years of the Roman Republic: *Lucullus, Pompey, Crassus, Cicero, Caesar, Cato, Brutus,* and *Antony.*[1] It is not my main concern to identify particular sources, though some problems of provenance will inevitably arise; it is rather to investigate the methods which Plutarch adopted in gathering his information, whatever his sources may have been. Did he, for instance, compose each biography independently? Or did he prepare several Lives simultaneously, combining in one project his reading for a number of different works?[2] Did he always have his source-material before him as he composed? Or can we detect an extensive use of memory?[3] Can one conjecture what use, if any, he made of notes?[4] And can we tell whether he usually drew his material from just one source, or wove together his narrative from his knowledge of several different versions?[5]

I start from an important assumption: that, in one way or another, Plutarch *needed* to gather information before writing these Lives; that, whatever may be the case with some of the Greek Lives, he would not be able to write these Roman biographies simply from his general knowledge. The full basis for this assumption will only become clear as the discussion progresses: for example, we shall find traces of increasing knowledge within these Lives, with early biographies showing only a slight knowledge of some important events, and later ones gradually filling the gaps. It will become probable that Plutarch knew comparatively little of the *detail* of Roman history before he began work on the Lives, and that considerable 'research'—directed and methodical reading—would be necessary for their composition.

This thesis must not be overstated: Plutarch would have read the standard Greek histories of the Roman world some time before he began the Lives. If the *de fortuna Romanorum* is a youthful work, he already knew Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and probably Polybius, at that time.[6] A knowledge of the outline of Roman history was a natural expectation in an educated Greek of the day. But at the same time it is clear that the Roman Lives have, in important respects, a different texture from the Greek; and one striking aspect of this is relevant here. No one can doubt that Plutarch had all his life read widely and sensitively in Greek literature, and that, even before he started work on the Lives, his memory was full of anecdotes concerning the Greek heroes he described.[7] In writing *Pericles,* for instance, he could exploit his recollections of the comic poets, of philosophers (especially Plato), of Theophrastus, of Ion of Chios.[8] In no sense had he read these authors 'for' the *Pericles*; he had read them for their own sake, and probably read them many years before. But they filled his mind with recollections and allusions, and these furnished some

[2] Simultaneous preparation is suggested by Gomme 83 n. 3, and Brożek, *Eos* liii (1963) 68–80; *cf.* Stoltz 18–19 and 67. Mewaldt had already postulated simultaneous preparation in arguing for simultaneous publication: *Hermes* xlii (1907) 564–78.

[3] A large use of memory is suggested by Zimmermann, *RhM* lxxix (1930) 61–2; *cf.* Russell, *JRS* liii (1963) 22; Jones 87; Hamilton xliii–iv; Gomme 78–81; P. A. Stadter, *Plutarch's Historical Methods* 138.

[4] Plutarch seems to have kept some 'commonplace book' in his philosophical studies (*Mor.* 464f, *cf.* 457d), but

that tells us little of his methods in the Lives. For varying views of the importance of notes, *cf.* works cited in previous note.

[5] A combination of different sources is strongly argued by Theander, especially 42 ff.; *cf.* Stadter, *op. cit.* 125–40.

[6] Most of that work is clearly drawn from Dionysius (note especially the inherited error at 318e–f); non-Dionysian material seems largely derived from oral traditions at Rome, especially those associated with surviving monuments. (On this type of material *cf.* Theander 2–32, and *Eranos* lvii [1959] 99–131.) Plutarch quotes Polybius 'in the second book' at 325f, and elsewhere book-numbers seem to imply first-hand knowledge of a work: Jones 83.

[7] For Plutarch's wide reading, *cf.* especially Ziegler, PW s.v. 'Plutarchos', 914–28.

[8] Comic poets: *Per.* 3.5–7, 8.4, 13.8–10, 24.9–10, *al.* Plato: 7.8, 13.7, 24.7, *cf.* 8.2, 15.2. Other philosophers: 4.5, 7.7, 27.4, 35.5. Theophrastus: 38.2. Ion: 5.3, 28.7. Some of these quotations may be inherited; it is hard to believe they *all* are. *Cf.* E. Meinhardt, *Perikles bei Plutarch* (Frankfurt 1957) 9–22 and *passim.*

valuable supplements to his historical sources: he could fill a whole chapter with anecdotes of Aspasia which 'just came to mind' as he wrote.[9]

Matters were different when he turned to Rome. He had learnt his Latin fairly late in life;[10] he evidently did not read Latin literature for pleasure, and therefore had no such ready fund of Latin recollections. We might have expected some quotations from Augustan poetry in *Antony*—in the descriptions of Cleopatra, perhaps, or the notices of Roman public opinion;[11] there are none. Plutarch never mentions Virgil; nor Catullus, relevant for *Caesar*; nor Ennius, though *cunctando restituit rem* would have been a useful ornament for *Fabius*.[12] Not only did Plutarch lack that general knowledge of the Roman past which a literary background could give: a man who had not read Ennius or Virgil would be unlikely to know his Livy, his Pollio, or his Sallust.[13] It is reasonable to assume that the reading of the great Roman historians was work which still lay in front of Plutarch, reading which he would have to conduct 'for' the Roman Lives.

The first section of this paper will examine the possibility that several Lives were prepared simultaneously. Various arguments will suggest that six of these eight Lives—*Pompey, Crassus, Caesar, Cato, Brutus,* and *Antony*—belong closely together, and were probably prepared as a single project. The second section will consider the manner in which Plutarch collected his information from the sources.

I. SIMULTANEOUS PREPARATION

(a) Increasing knowledge

Lucullus and *Cicero* seem to be the earliest of these eight Lives. *Demosthenes–Cicero* formed the fifth pair in the series of *Parallel Lives* (*Dem.* 3.1), and it seems likely that *Cimon–Lucullus* should be placed even earlier.[14] The *Parallel Lives* were clearly produced over a considerable period of time, and it is natural to think that Plutarch read more widely during their production; it is therefore not surprising that, in *Lucullus* and *Cicero*, he seems less knowledgeable than in the later Lives. The second half of *Cicero*, in particular, is scrappy and ill-informed, and leaves a very different impression from the detailed later accounts. It is sometimes possible to see specific cases of ignorance: for instance, Plutarch had presumably not yet discovered the item of *Crass.* 13.3–4—Cicero inculpating Caesar and Crassus in the Catilinarian conspiracy, but in a work published after both were dead.[15] Plutarch would surely have mentioned this in the context of *Cic.* 20.6–7, where he discusses Caesar's guilt: he would have welcomed the erudite allusion to Cicero's own works (*cf.* 20.3). Again, had he yet known of Cicero's support for Pompey's *curatio annonae* (*Pomp.* 49.6), he would probably have included it; after underlining Pompey's part in securing Cicero's recall (*Cic.* 33.2–4), he would naturally mention Cicero's grateful recompense. *Lucullus* offers fewer possibilities of comparison with later Lives; but, at least, the confrontation of

---

[9] ἐπελθόντα τῇ μνήμῃ κατὰ τὴν γραφήν, *Per.* 24.12.

[10] *Dem.* 2.2. On the weary question of Plutarch's Latinity, Rose, *The Roman Questions of Plutarch* (1924) 11–19, is still the soundest treatment.

[11] Cleopatra: Latin quotations would have been apposite especially (but not only) at 27.2–5, 56.6–10, and in the description of Actium (especially 66.5–8); note also 29.1, 36.1–2, and 62.1, where quotations from Plato and Euripides, rather than Latin poetry, lend stylistic height. Roman public opinion: e.g. 36.4–5, 50.7, 54.5, 55, 57.5.

[12] The reference to Horace at *Lucull.* 39.5 is an exception, so isolated that one suspects the quotation to be tralatician; but it at least shows that quotations from Latin poets were not excluded by any generic 'rules'. Had Plutarch known his Horace, a mention of him might be expected in *Brutus,* perhaps at 24.3, perhaps in the account of Philippi.—The contrast between *Caesar* and Suet. *Div. Iul.* is here eloquent, for Suet. is rich with material similar to that used by Plutarch for *Pericles*: quotations from

contemporary pamphlets and lampoons, Calvus, Catullus, Curio, etc. Plutarch has nothing like this in *Caesar.*

[13] He may have glanced at Pollio or Livy when engaged on his *Life of Augustus,* but even this is unlikely: 'the *Lives of the Caesars,* to judge from the remains, were not the fruit of deep research' (Jones 80).

[14] Jones, *JRS* lvi (1966) 67–8, places *Cim.–Luc.* in one of positions II–IV; Theander, *Eranos* lvi (1958) 12–20, in position IV; *cf.* Stoltz, table at p. 135. The principal indication is that *Pericles,* which occupied position X (*Per.* 2.5), itself quotes *Cimon* (9.5); *Dem.–Cic.* occupied position V, and, on Jones's analysis, positions VI–IX are already filled by other pairs. For reservations about this type of analysis, see below p. 81; but the early position of *Lucullus* is adequately demonstrated by its content.

[15] Presumably the 'Theopompean' *de consiliis*: so e.g. Strasburger, *Caesars Eintritt in die Geschichte* 108, and Brunt, *CR* vii (1957) 193.

Lucullus and Pompey in Cilicia is very curtly dismissed at *Luc.* 36.4. Plutarch is better informed by the time of *Pompey* (31.8–13). Finally, a very clear case is afforded by the accounts of the triumviral proscriptions. In the brief notice of *Cic.* 46.5, Plutarch clearly states that Lepidus wished to save his brother Paullus, but sacrificed him to the wishes of Antony and Octavian. By the time of *Antony* (19.3), Plutarch had discovered a different version: that Lepidus was the man who wished to kill Paullus, and the other two acceded to his wishes. That version came from a source which he could trust, and in *Antony* he prefers it: he notes the *Cicero* version merely as a variant.[16]

Such signs of increasing knowledge are not surprising; it would indeed be odd if Plutarch had *not* read more widely as the series progressed. What is striking is that *Cicero* and *Lucullus* stand so firmly isolated from the other, later Lives. We should expect to discover that Plutarch's knowledge continued to increase as his reading widened—that *Pompey*, for instance, showed more familiarity with the period than *Caesar*, for we know that *Pompey* was the later Life to be written;[17] but it is very difficult, and probably impossible, to detect such a further increase in knowledge. The full support for this negative thesis cannot, of course, be set out here: only a detailed comparison of every parallel version in every Life could establish this. But it may be helpful to examine two specific examples, taking sequences of events which Plutarch several times describes in detail: first, the formation of the triple pact in 60 B.C., and the ensuing consulate of Caesar; and, secondly, Caesar's assassination.

(i) Plutarch accepted the view of Asinius Pollio: it was the pact of Crassus, Pompey, and Caesar which set Rome on the path to civil war.[18] It was inevitable that several Lives should treat this alliance, and continue to narrate Caesar's consulate: and Plutarch duly gives accounts at *Luc.* 42.6–8, *Cic.* 30.1–4, *Caes.* 13–14, *Pomp.* 47–8, *Cato* 31–3, and *Crass.* 14.1–5. It is immediately clear that the four later accounts, especially those of *Caesar, Pompey,* and *Cato,* are better informed than those of *Lucullus* and *Cicero.* The *Lucullus* version is very skimpy: a brief and misleading reference to the formation of the pact, a mention of the fracas in the assembly, then a rather fuller treatment of the Vettius affair. All this is substantially different from the later accounts: Crassus is never again associated with Cato or Lucullus, as he is here (42.4); Vettius is never again mentioned. *Cicero* also passes swiftly over these events: no mention of the triple alliance, no formal treatment of the year 59—though a place could easily have been found among the antecedents of Cicero's exile, as *Caes.* 14.17 shows. Only a very few items are exploited, and those are misleading: the story of *Cic.* 30.3–5, Cicero's request for a legateship in Caesar's army, has something behind it, but this version is very garbled;[19] the anecdote of *Cic.* 30.5, Caesar denouncing Cicero in the assembly, is another garbling, this time of the story of Dio xxxviii 17.1–2. Neither item is exploited in the later Lives. Equally, Plutarch does not yet seem to know some material which he was later to exploit: he would surely have mentioned the story of *Cato* 32.8–10, Cicero prevailing on Cato to take the oath.

In the four later Lives, Plutarch is much richer in narrative detail; he has evidently discovered a new store of material in the interval since *Lucullus* and *Cicero.* Moreover, these later accounts are extremely similar to one another—the similarities often extend to verbal echoes;[20] and all seem to be based on the same material. Naturally, different Lives select different material for emphasis, as Plutarch tailors his material to suit the Lives' subjects and aims; but literary technique can explain all the variations, and there is no indication that he made any fresh discoveries during these Lives' composition. Literary technique would naturally lead him to be fuller in *Pompey* than in *Caesar* on

---

[16] The *Antony* version is shared by App. *B.C.* iv 12.45 (*cf.* Dio xlvii 6.3), and probably derives from Asinius Pollio.

[17] *Caes.* 35.2 refers to the projected *Pompey* in the future tense, ὡς ἐν τοῖς περὶ ἐκείνου γραφησομένοις τὰ καθ' ἕκαστον δηλωθήσεται. *Cf.* below pp. 80–2.

[18] For Pollio's view, Hor. *Carm.* ii 1.1; *cf. Caes.* 13.4–6, *Pomp.* 47.4, *Cato* 30.9.

[19] *Cf.* Cic. *Att.* ii 18.3, 19.5.

[20] Verbal similarities: e.g. *Caes.* 14.2 stigmatises the νόμους οὐχ ὑπάτῳ προσήκοντας, ἀλλὰ δημάρχῳ τινὶ θρασυτάτῳ; cf. *Pomp.* 47.5, παρεκβαίνων τὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀξίωμα, καὶ τρόπον τινὰ δημαρχίαν τὴν ὑπατείαν καθιστάς, and *Cato* 32.2, ἃ γὰρ οἱ θρασύτατοι δήμαρχοι καὶ ὀλιγωρότατοι πρὸς χάριν ἐπολιτεύοντο τῶν πολλῶν, ταῦτ' ἀπ' ἐξουσίας ὑπατικῆς αἰσχρῶς καὶ ταπεινῶς ὑποδυόμενος τὸν δῆμον ἔπραττε. *Crass.* 14.4, like *Cato* 33.5, speaks of the Gallic command establishing Caesar ὥσπερ εἰς ἀκρόπολιν; *Caesar* and *Pompey* are close to each other in their descriptions of Pompey and Crassus in the assembly (*Caes.* 14.3–6, *Pomp.* 47.6–8); and so on.

Pompey's ill-judged remark in the assembly—*Pompey* finds room to speculate on his motives (47.6–8); while *Caesar* understandably emphasises Caesar's brushes with Considius and Cato, which were not relevant for *Pompey*. *Caesar* passes over the role of Lucullus, eschewing the complicating individual; but *Pompey* has made much of the Lucullus–Pompey feud, and therefore includes the material (48.2, 7, *cf.* 4). In *Caesar* Plutarch finds it useful to treat the two agrarian bills together (εὐθὺς εἰσέφερε νόμους . . ., 14.2); but in *Cato* it is necessary to treat them separately, for each led to distinct acts of heroism on Cato's part which Plutarch wishes to include.[21] The first provoked Cato's refusal to swear to the bill (32.4–11), the second the disgraceful episode of the imprisonment (33.1–4). In this Life, Cato himself dominates all the opposition to Caesar; the role of fellow-opponents—Bibulus, Lucullus, Considius—is abbreviated or suppressed. Finally, *Crassus* understandably has the briefest treatment. Crassus had the smallest (or least public) role in these events, and Plutarch is by then hurrying on to the more rewarding theme of the Syrian command. The complex events of 60–56 are dismissed in a single chapter.

One further point confirms the close connexion of these accounts: all show similarities with the version of Cassius Dio (xxxvii 54–xxxviii 12), and the similarities are best explained in terms of shared source-material. *Pompey* and *Caesar* have the story of Pompey and Crassus in the assembly; Dio has it too, and gives a similar emphasis to Pompey's outburst.[22] *Pompey* and *Cato* have the assault on Bibulus; so does Dio, with similar details.[23] *Caesar* and *Cato* are close to Dio in the stress and interpretation given to the election of Clodius, and in the emphasis they lay on the attempt to imprison Cato.[24] Suetonius, too, shows some contact with this tradition: in particular, his versions of the attempted imprisonment and of the dynastic marriages are close to both Plutarch and Dio.[25] The natural explanation is to suppose that all Plutarch's later accounts are informed by the same source or sources, and that this material was also available to Suetonius and Dio; and this supports the hypothesis that Plutarch's four later versions are all based on the same store of material.

(ii) Caesar's assassination is naturally treated most lavishly in *Brutus* (7 ff.) and in *Caesar* (62 ff.). *Cicero* had mentioned these events briefly (42); *Antony* (13–15) has a little material on the murder, then rather more on the immediate sequel.

Cicero adds little to this analysis. Its account is brief and shows no signs of great background knowledge; but brevity is only to be expected, for Cicero's role was so small. *Antony* is more interesting, but here too the differences are explained by literary technique. For instance, it is no surprise that *Brutus* and *Caesar* omit the story of *Ant.* 13.2, Trebonius resisting the proposal to kill Antony, for this item is only a peg for the more interesting tale, drawn from the *Second Philippic*—Trebonius had earlier tried to involve Antony in the plot, and Antony had kept the secret.[26] This is an anecdote of some interest for Antony himself, but it tells us little of Caesar or Brutus, and is naturally omitted from their Lives. When *Antony* comes to the sequel of the assassination, Plutarch understandably wishes to simplify the confusing sequence of events. Two senate-sittings are conflated (14.3); *Brutus* 19 distinguishes them. The role of complicating individuals is suppressed: nothing on Lepidus, nor on Plancus, nor even on Cicero's plea for amnesty. All three are mentioned in other Lives.[27] Nor does Plutarch mention the items of *Brutus* 20.1, Antony's request for a public funeral and for the opening of Caesar's will. But none of this abbreviation is hard to understand. Plutarch's emphasis in *Antony* is simple: the brilliance of

---

[21] It is thus unnecessary to assume, with Taylor, *AJP* lxxii (1951) 265 (*cf.* Meier, *Hist.* x [1961] 72–3), that Plutarch went to a new source when composing *Cato*, and there found the distinction of two separate bills. Note the plural νόμους in *Caesar*; but Plutarch there finds it stylistically useful to speak as if the bills were debated simultaneously. The procedure of Appian (*B.C.* ii 10.35) is exactly similar. Such conflations are common in Plutarch: I hope to examine such features of his technique in a subsequent article.

[22] *Pomp.* 47.6–8, *Caes.* 14.3–6; Dio xxxviii 4.4–5.5.

[23] *Pomp.* 48.2, *Cato* 32.3; Dio xxxviii 6.3.

[24] Clodius: *Caes.* 14.16–7, *Cato* 32.10, 33.6; Dio xxxviii

12.1–2. Cato's imprisonment: *Caes.* 14.11–12, *Cato* 33.1–4; Dio xxxviii 3.2–3. The two authors give this story a different context, but seem to reflect the same original item. It was probably narrated 'out of time' in the shared source, and both authors chose to exploit it where they thought best. *Cf.* Marsh, *CJ* xxii (1927) 508–13, and Meier, *art. cit.* 71–9.

[25] Suet. *Div.Iul.* 20.4 (imprisonment); 21 (marriages).

[26] Cic. *Phil.* ii 34. For Plutarch's use of this speech, see below pp. 89–90.

[27] Lepidus: *Caes.* 67.2. Plancus: *Brut.* 19.1. Cicero: *Cic.* 42.3, *Brut.* 19.1.

Antony's conciliation, the nobility of the solution he could bring—these Plutarch describes in his most affective language (14.4). Yet this solution is swiftly and characteristically upset by Antony's impulse to play for popularity at the funeral (14.5). Had the request for a public funeral been included, Antony's demagogy might no longer seem a sudden impulse: it is therefore omitted. The other individuals who pressed for peace would equally complicate the picture: they are therefore cut away. There is certainly no need to suppose that he is less well informed here than in *Brutus* or *Caesar*.

Brutus and *Caesar* themselves pose a more complicated problem. Again, the two accounts show close similarities of language and content where they overlap;[28] but these two Lives have very different interests and aims, and the selection of material differs greatly. *Caesar* is a very historical Life. It has explained Caesar's career in terms of his popular support: from the beginning, he is the champion and the favourite of the *demos*, and he easily deceives the short-sighted optimates.[29] But as tyrant he loses his popularity, and it is then that his fortunes waver;[30] and he loses this less by his own errors than by the failings of his friends.[31] This focus on the *demos* continues in the closing chapters. Their reactions are carefully traced in chs 60–61 (where Plutarch seems to reinterpret and distort his source-material);[32] then *Caes.* 62.1 makes οἱ πολλοί turn to Brutus, whereas in *Brutus* itself it seems not to be artisans, but 'the first of the citizens', who give Brutus his encouragement.[33] *Caesar*, then, seeks the origins of the assassination in Caesar's own actions and those of his friends, and the effect of these on the *demos*. Such a reading naturally reduces the interest in the peculiar motives and characters of the conspirators; indeed, an extended treatment of Brutus and Cassius is delayed to a point where Caesar's fall already seems inevitable.[34] It is therefore natural for *Caesar* strictly to follow biographical relevance, and to suppress most of the material of *Brutus* which deals with the conspirators' side of events. *Caesar* mentions the long-nurtured resentment of Cassius only briefly;[35] and the delicate approaches to possible conspirators, fully described in *Brutus*, have no place in *Caesar*.[36]

Brutus, in contrast, is a more moralistic life than *Caesar*: 'tyrannicide' is the elevating theme which links it to its pair *Dion*. It is less concerned with the historical background than *Caesar*,[37] and here Plutarch has nothing of the *demos*-motif, nothing even of the sequence of outrages (such as the Lupercalia) which provoked such unrest.[38] He here prefers more ethically promising themes: the anecdotes of Porcia, the thoughtful justice with which Brutus tried his cases on the morning of the Ides, or the constancy with which he bore the πολλὰ θορυβώδη. The pure motives of Brutus are set off by the brooding resentment of Cassius, μᾶλλον ἰδίᾳ μισοκαῖσαρ ἢ κοινῇ μισοτύραννος (8.5)—and Cassius is a far blacker and more complex character here than in *Caesar*. This material could have had no place in *Caesar*: it is relevant to the conspirators alone, and *Caesar* is anyway not that sort of moralistic Life. There is no hint of increasing knowledge here.

---

[28] Cf. Stoltz, 75–81.

[29] *Caes.* 4.4–5, 5.3, 5.8–9, 6.3–7, etc; deceived optimates at 4.6–9, 5.8, 6.7, 7.5, etc. Cato alone saw the truth (13.3), though Cicero had earlier felt suspicions (4.8–9). By 14.6 it is too late, and the optimates can only grieve.

[30] *Caes.* 56.7, 60.1, 60.5, 61.9–10, 62.1: below n. 32.

[31] *Caes.* 51, where the διαβολή earned by the friends—ἐπὶ τούτοις γὰρ ἐδυσφόρουν 'Ρωμαῖοι, 51.3—prepares for this loss of popular support; cf. also 57.2, 57.7, 60.8, 61. See also below p. 83 and n. 66.

[32] The popular reactions to the regal salutation are traced at 60.3; to the excessive honours at 60.5 (rather uneasily, Plutarch represents them as shocked at the insult to the senate); to the Lupercalia affair at 61.6; to the tribunes' imprisonment at 61.9–62.1. App. *B.C.* ii 107–9 and Suet. *Div.Iul.* 78–9, both apparently from the same source, have no such emphasis; nor does *Ant.* 12. App. ii 109.458 further gives a different reading of the people's reaction at the Lupercalia. Plutarch stresses their resentment at the attempts to crown Caesar; for Appian, their dominant emotion was applause for his rejection of the crown. For the rather different account of Nic.Dam.

(*FGrH* 90) *vit.Caes.* 68–79, cf. Jacoby *ad loc.*

[33] *Brut.* 10.6: this was apparently the version and emphasis of the source (cf. App. *B.C.* ii 113.472).

[34] *Caes.* 62, using material treated earlier in the corresponding account in *Brutus*.

[35] *Caes.* 62.8. As the text stands, a cross-reference directs the reader to *Brutus* for a fuller treatment, here as at 68.7; cf. *Brut.* 9.9, similarly referring to *Caesar*. See below pp. 80–2.

[36] *Brut.* 11–12.

[37] Appian's account suggests that the shared source (below pp. 84–5) was much richer in historical analysis: e.g. *B.C.* ii 113.474, detail of the conspirators' background and connexions; ii 120.505–7, an analysis of the urban plebs. Plutarch here suppresses most of this: *Brut.* 12 is more interested in men who were not involved than in men who were. A terse μιγάδες at *Brut.* 18.12, and a dismissive ἐν πλήθεσι φορᾶς ἀσταθμήτους καὶ ταχείας φερομένοις at 21.2, are the only reflections of the analysis of the plebs.

[38] *Brut.* 9.9 refers to *Caesar*: above n. 35, and pp. 80–2 below.

The treatment of the Ides itself largely follows biographical relevance. *Caesar* describes events from Caesar's own viewpoint: the warnings of the soothsayers, of Calpurnia, and of Artemidorus; then the visit of D. Brutus, with his cogent arguments that Caesar must attend the senate, despite the warnings: τίνας ἔσεσθαι λόγους παρὰ τῶν φθονούντων; How close Caesar came to escape!—and yet eventually he had no choice, the pressures of rule forced him to attend: that is the tragic emphasis of *Caesar*. *Brutus* has no such theme. The delay on the morning of the Ides is there narrated from the conspirators' viewpoint, one of those θορυβώδη which Brutus impressively overcame. The focus rests on the forum and the conspirators; a message is heard that Caesar is approaching (16.1), but the narrative switches to him only at the moment of his death. Plutarch here concentrates on Brutus' own role in the killing: Caesar surrendered to his blows when he saw Brutus, too, among his foes;[39] Brutus, too, was wounded. In the sequel, *Brutus* naturally has more detail of the conspirators' movements; *Caesar* stresses the general reaction to Caesar's death—and, particularly, the recrudescence of the popular fervour which the Life has carefully traced.

A difficulty remains: the two Lives show one positive discrepancy. Both mention that Antony was delayed outside the senate-house: but who did the delaying? *Brutus*, correctly, says Trebonius (17.2); but *Caesar* says that it was D. Brutus Albinus (66.4). It is almost certain that Plutarch's principal source here named Trebonius: that is the version of Appian, and his account is so similar to Plutarch that they must share the same source-material.[40] It is possible that Plutarch has deliberately distorted his narrative in *Caesar* by transferring the act to D. Brutus: such techniques are not unknown in his work.[41] But it is easiest to assume that this is a simple error: perhaps an error of memory, if he did not have his source before his eyes when he wrote;[42] perhaps one of those slips which find their way into the most careful writing. At least, this cannot be a case of increasing knowledge, or not a significant one: his main source seems to have contained the truth, and it cannot be the case that he first discovered the correct version later than *Caesar*. Whether misremembering or distortion, it at least seems to be misremembering or distortion of an accurate original.

As in the example of the accounts of 60–59, biographical technique can explain the differences in the later Lives; and it could also again be argued that they rest on similar source-material. However, the analysis of the sources is here more complicated, and will be left until the second part of the paper.[43]

No further examples will here be pursued, but in other parts of their narrative, too, close similarities among the six later Lives are abundant, and there are no hints of increasing knowledge.[44] Such differences and discrepancies as are found are always explicable, either as conscious literary devices or as simple and natural errors.[45] The impression is unmistakable: Plutarch's knowledge of the period increases greatly between *Lucullus* and *Cicero* and the other Lives—and

[39] *Caes.* 66.12 notes this item as a λεγόμενον; *Brutus* is less punctilious. For a similar case, *cf.* Cinna's dream: ὡς φασι at *Caes.* 68.3, but no qualification in the more excited *Brut.* 20.9.

[40] App. *B.C.* ii 117.490: presumably from Pollio, *cf.* pp. 84–5 below.

[41] E.g. at *Ant.* 5.10 Antony and Cassius are given the rabble-rousing speech in Caesar's camp, though at *Caes.* 31.3 Plutarch knows that Caesar made the speech himself (*cf.* *Caes. B.C.* i 7); at *Pomp.* 58.6 Marcellus is given a proposal which Plutarch knows to be Scipio's, and a remark he elsewhere gives to Lentulus (cf. *Caes.* 30.4, 6: see K. Raaflaub, *Chiron* iv [1974] 308–9). Something similar seems to have happened at *Ant.* 5.6: there Antony is allowed to propose on 1st January, 49 that both Caesar and Pompey should disarm, while at *Pomp.* 58.8 Plutarch knows that this was proposed a month earlier by Curio (*contra* Raaflaub, *art. cit.* 306–11, who believes that Antony genuinely revived Curio's ploy at that time). In the present instance, note that D. Brutus has already had a considerable role in *Caesar*, whereas Trebonius has not been mentioned. Elsewhere we can see similar simplifications: for instance, the two names at 67.4 seem to repre-

sent a longer list in the principal source, as App. *B.C.* ii 119.500 suggests; and Plutarch may have felt that he had too many individuals already. Note that *Ant.* 13.4 has a vague ἐνίους in this context, though we should expect Trebonius to be named: he has already figured largely in that chapter. That looks like deliberate fudging, and may be the work of a man who is conscious of the inconsistency between his other two versions.

[42] *Cf.* Russell's explanation of similar errors in *Coriolanus*, *JRS* liii (1963) 22. On the possible use of memory, below pp. 92–4.

[43] Below pp. 86–7.

[44] The exceptionally curious may find further examples analysed in my doctoral dissertation on *Caesar* (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1974). Other parallel accounts where we might expect to find increasing knowledge and do not: the accounts of Luca, *Caes.* 21.3–6, *Pomp.* 51.4–5, *Crass.* 14.6–7; the analysis of Roman κακοπολιτεία, *Caes.* 28, *Pomp.* 54, *Cato* 47; the debates before the outbreak of the war, *Ant.* 5, *Caes.* 30–31, *Pomp.* 58–9; Pharsalus, *Caes.* 42–6, *Pomp.* 68–73.

[45] The literary devices I hope to analyse in a later article; for the errors, *cf.* below pp. 93–4.

then it seems to stop, with all the later Lives being based on the same store of knowledge. If this is so, it is natural to suspect that the later Lives were prepared simultaneously.

(b) Cross-references

The suggestion of simultaneous preparation would be more plausible if it could be shown that Plutarch worked in this way elsewhere; and some indications of this are afforded by his cross-references—the fifty or so notices, normally in the form ὡς ἐν τοῖς περὶ . . . γέγραπται, which are scattered among the Lives.[46] In discussing these, we should first note that simultaneous preparation need not imply simultaneous *publication*—still less simultaneous composition of final drafts, as Mewaldt once proposed.[47] The final biographies are individual works of art, and Plutarch must have given his total attention to each in turn: if several Lives had been prepared together, he would presumably complete the final drafts one after another in fairly quick succession. Therefore no argument against simultaneous preparation can be drawn from *Caes.* 35.2, where Plutarch refers to his projected *Pompey* in the future tense: this shows only that the final draft of *Pompey* was written later than that of *Caesar*. *Caes.* 35.2 might rather support the notion of simultaneous preparation, for it shows that Plutarch has already considered in some detail the range of material and the presentation of the later Life: he can already refer to it as a justification for abbreviating his present treatment. It is no surprise that he can already regard himself as engaged upon *Pompey* as well as *Caesar*, and can a few chapters later refer to *Pompey* in the present tense: δηλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς περὶ ἐκείνου γράμμασιν, 45.9.

This is relevant to the problem of the contradictory cross-references. The future tense of *Caes.* 35.2 and the present of *Caes.* 45.9 are the exception: nearly all the cross-references have perfect tenses, γέγραπται. Such references appear to provide evidence for the relative chronology of the Lives. For instance, from *Cato* 54.9, ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς περὶ Πομπηΐου γέγραπται, it seems to follow that *Cato* is later than *Pompey*; *Pomp.* 16.8 should suggest that *Pompey* is later than *Brutus*; and so on. But some of the references seem to contradict one another. *Caes.* 62.8 and 68.7 cite *Brutus*; *Brut.* 9.9 cites *Caesar*. *Tim.* 13.10 and 33.4 cite *Dion*; *Dion* 58.10 cites *Timoleon*. *Cam.* 33.10 quotes *Romulus*, and *Thes.* 1.4 and *Rom.* 21.1 quote *Numa*; but *Numa* twice quotes *Camillus*, at 9.15 and 12.13. Simple excision or emendation does not seem adequate to solve the problem.[48] Nor does Mewaldt's suggestion, that several Lives were *published* simultaneously, seem satisfactory;[49] that theory anyway implies a simplified idea of ancient 'publication', for it is hard to see why Plutarch should not have circulated a work among friends and pupils as soon as it was complete.

However, Mewaldt may still have been on the right track, for simultaneous *preparation* is more likely to afford an explanation. It certainly seems that the 'publication' dates of the three pairs *Lyc.–Numa, Them.–Cam.,* and *Thes.–Rom.* were close to one another:[50] and this is precisely

[46] The full list is given by Stoltz, 9. Study of the cross-references led Brożek, for reasons similar to those given here, to suggest simultaneous preparation of several Lives (*Eos* liii [1963] 68–80); cf. also Gomme, 83 n. 3.

[47] *Hermes* xlii (1907) 564–78, at 567–8; refuted by Stoltz 63–8.

[48] The analysis of Stoltz strongly defended the authenticity of the other, non-contradictory cross-references. Stoltz doubted the authenticity of *Dion* 58.10, *Brut.* 9.9, and *Cam.* 33.10, but even here hesitated to delete. The language of these three cross-references seems no less Plutarchean than that of the others: cf. Mewaldt, *Gnomon* vi (1930) 431–4. Note also the forceful argument of J. Geiger's doctoral dissertation: 'Should one believe that on some 1000 folio pages an author has made 45 references to other places in his work: in addition to these 3 other references, through interpolation, corruption or otherwise, have made their way into the text: and all three of them had the bad luck to have one at least of the genuine references, so sparsely sown in the text, to testify to their false pretensions?' (*A Commentary on Plutarch's Cato Minor*

[Oxford D.Phil. thesis 1971]; cf. his article 'Munatius Rufus and Thrasea Paetus on Cato the Younger', to appear in *Athenaeum*.)

[49] Stoltz 58 ff.; in particular, the aorist ἐκδόντες at *Thes.* 1.4 clearly implies that *Lyc.–Numa* had already been published. Flacelière's defence of Mewaldt (*REG* lxi [1948] 68–9) is countered by Hamilton, xxxvi–vii. Jones, *JRS* lvi (1966) 67, adopts a modified form of Mewaldt's theory, but is not convincing.

[50] The language of *Thes.* 1.4 seems to imply that *Romulus* was written soon after *Numa*: so Jones, *JRS* lvi (1966) 68 n. 57, and Bühler, *Maia* xiv (1962) 281. Nor can *Numa* and *Camillus* be far apart. *Numa* twice quotes *Camillus;* but *Numa* itself seems to be an early Life, for *Pericles,* one of the tenth pair (*Per.* 2.5), quotes *Lysander,* and *Lysander* quotes *Lycurgus* (*Per.* 22.4, *Lys.* 17.11, with Stoltz 101–2). Some reservations concerning this type of argument are given below, and conclusions as precise as those of Jones (*art. cit.* 66–8) are not possible; but this whole group of Lives does seem early.

what we should expect, if these pairs had been prepared together. This would be a sensible procedure, for *Numa, Camillus,* and *Romulus* would all involve research of a very similar type, perhaps based on the same sources.[51] The same applies to *Dion* and *Timoleon*; and we have already noticed the close similarities between *Caesar* and *Brutus,* which suggest that they are based on the same material.

If each of these three groups was the product of simultaneous preparation, two alternative explanations of the contradictory cross-references are possible. (i) Suppose, *exempli gratia,* that *Dion–Brutus* was composed earlier than *Alexander–Caesar.* The second pair would then be issued only a short time afterwards; there might then be only a small number of copies of *Dion–Brutus* in existence, circulating among Plutarch's acquaintances. It is quite possible that Plutarch himself subsequently inserted the cross-reference at *Brut.* 9.9; ancient publication is a much more continuous process than its modern equivalent.[52] The same would apply to the offending references in the other groups. (ii) But it is probably better to assume that the references were already included in Plutarch's first 'published' version. By the time he wrote *Brutus,* he was fairly sure of what he would include in *Caesar*; he may even have had some sort of draft for the later Life.[53] He might refer to this later treatment as easily as, in *Caesar* itself, he would refer to the planned *Pompey*—or as easily as a modern editor, producing a work in fascicles, would refer to a passage in a future volume with the same formula as he would use for one already published. The use of the perfect γέγραπται in such references is still odd, especially in view of the scrupulous future tenses at *Caes.* 35.2 (and at *Mar.* 29.12 and *de mal. Hdt.* 866b); but it is not really much odder than the characteristic epistolary use of past tenses, relating an action to the viewpoint of the reader.[54]

It is worth digressing to point an important consequence of this. Whatever their explanation, the contradictory cross-references remain important; for (as J. Geiger has observed in an important dissertation[55]) they greatly impugn the reliability of the other cross-references as a criterion for establishing the sequence of the Lives. On at least three occasions, the cross-references do *not* refer back from a later to an earlier Life; and it is hardly likely that these are the only such 'forward-looking'—or 'sideways-looking'—references. In these three instances, other cross-references happen to show that the natural chronological inference would be false. Most of the other references have no such control; many stand as the only such indication of the sequence of two Lives, with no references elsewhere to confirm or impugn the chronological inference. *Cato* 54.9 uses a perfect tense to refer to *Pompey*: but there, too, Plutarch might have added the reference subsequently or (more probably) might be using a past tense to refer to a projected Life. It is likely that a past tense should refer to a Life which, if not already in circulation, was at least expected soon; but that is all. It is clear that the relative chronology can only be established within wide limits, and that attempts to establish a detailed sequence on this basis are not plausible.[56]

A convenient solution, then, is afforded to the problem of the cross-references if we assume that Plutarch often combined his preparation of several Lives. If the contradictory cross-references were included in Plutarch's original versions, it seems that when composing one Life he already had a firm idea of what a later Life would contain; in that case, the instance of *Caes.* 35.2, where Plutarch has already considered the content of the projected *Pompey,* would not be an isolated example. Even if some of the references are subsequent additions made by Plutarch

---

[51] The *Quaestiones Romanae,* partly based on similar source-material, seem to have been composed at about the same time: Jones, *art. cit.* 73. They are quoted at *Rom.* 15.7 and *Cam.* 19.12.

[52] *Cf.* Ziegler, PW s.v. 'Plutarchos' 901, with *Hermes* lxvi (1931) 268–9.

[53] For the possible nature of such a 'draft', see below pp. 94–5. This may help to explain the oddity of *Tim.* 13.10, referring to a passage of *Dion* which does not seem to exist. Plutarch may have included the relevant passage in an early version of *Dion,* but excised it from his final draft, forgetting to alter the reference in *Timoleon*: so Brožek, *art. cit.* 76–7. Plutarch may equally, if *Tim.* is the earlier Life, have intended at that time to include the

passage in the planned *Dion,* but later have altered his mind or forgotten.

[54] Plutarch elsewhere uses such phrases and tenses as Γάιος δὲ Μάρκιος, ὑπὲρ οὗ τάδε γέγραπται, in the *introduction* to a Life (*Cor.* 1.1, cf. *Cic.* 1.5, *Agis* 3.3, *Ti.Gr.* 1.7); but an epistolary flavour is there felt especially strongly (cf. *Arat.* 1.5). *Flam.* 16.6, in mid-Life, is a closer parallel. See Stoltz 86.—It is of course possible that *Caesar* was expected sooner after *Brutus* than *Pompey* after *Caesar*; if a longer delay was anticipated in the second case, the future tenses at *Caes.* 35.2 are more explicable.

[55] See n. 48.

[56] Thus the detailed argument of Jones, *art. cit.* 66–8, is not cogent.

himself to the text, they still confirm that he issued a sequence of closely related Lives in quick succession. This in itself does not prove that they were prepared together, but it is certainly just what we should expect if they had been so prepared. If he followed the procedure of simultaneous preparation elsewhere, for instance in the cases of *Romulus, Numa,* and *Camillus,* it is natural to suppose that he might do the same with *Caesar, Pompey, Cato,* and the rest; and it is no surprise to find that one set of contradictory cross-references, those of *Caesar* and *Brutus,* relates to this group.

(c) 'Cross-fertilisation'

A further indication may be combined with that of the cross-references. It is natural to expect signs of 'cross-fertilisation' in the Lives—Plutarch discovering an item when working for one Life, then remembering it and exploiting it in his later writings. For instance, it was presumably when working for *Cicero* that Plutarch came across the story of *Cic.* 34, Cicero's attempt to destroy the records of Clodius's tribunate: he remembered this, and repeated it, in the later *Cato* (40). *Cicero* had mentioned the devotion felt by P. Crassus for Cicero—Publius even managed to reconcile him to his father Marcus (*Cic.* 33.8): that is remembered, and used, in *Crassus* (13.5). The *Numa* had involved Plutarch in some reading about the complexities of the Roman calendar; he later exploited some of this knowledge at *Caes.* 59.3–4. There are a fair number of such cases, identifiable with some probability. Again, one would expect these to give an indication of the Lives' relative chronology.

We duly find such cross-fertilisation among this group of Roman Lives: for instance, *Pomp.* 10.7–9 makes an astute criticism (and one which suggests first-hand knowledge) of the writings of C. Oppius, a work which Plutarch surely read for the *Caesar.*[57] But these indications are found in a very bewildering fashion, one which seems to exclude the possibility of 'earlier' and 'later' research. For instance, there are two anecdotes included in both *Pompey* and *Cato* which seem to be cases of this phenomenon. The first is the story of Demetrius of Antioch: the popular courting of this freedman of Pompey, and Cato's dignified reaction (*Cato* 13, *Pomp.* 40). The second is the tale of Pompey's offer of intermarriage with Cato: Pompey offered to marry Cato's elder niece himself, and give the younger niece to his son; the women were delighted with the proposal, and they resented Cato's refusal—but they later recognised that he had been wise (*Cato* 30, *Pomp.* 44). Both stories are likely to come from the reading for *Cato*: both focus on Cato as the wise and sober champion of political rectitude, while Pompey is in the first story incidental, in the second the butt and villain of the piece.[58] The items are presumably gleaned from that 'Catonian' literature which was abundant in the early Empire;[59] the prominent role of Munatius Rufus in the intermarriage story suggests that it is ultimately drawn from his *Memoirs,* whether or not Plutarch knew them directly.[60] The natural conclusion would be that *Pompey* is later than *Cato,* and exploits material gathered for the earlier Life;[61] yet, if the earlier analysis of the cross-references is correct, the reference to *Pompey* at *Cato* 54.9 shows that *Pompey* was at least already planned and expected soon, if not already written, and its range of material had already been considered. A similar case is found in *Brutus*: *Brut.* 33, telling the story of Theodotus the Chian, seems certainly based on material collected for *Pompey* (cf. *Pomp.* 77).[62] This should suggest that *Brutus* is the later Life; yet *Pompey* refers to *Brutus* at 16.8, and it is anyway difficult to find room for *Agesilaus–Pompey* before *Dion–Brutus,* the twelfth pair to be published.[63]

Even if the cross-references are neglected in this argument, the bewilderment is no less; for the last chapter of *Cato* exploits material which seems to have been gathered for *Brutus.*[64] This poses a familiar type of dilemma: the Demetrius and intermarriage stories suggest that *Pompey* is later

---

[57] For Oppius, see below p. 85.

[58] So Geiger, *diss. cit.,* with additional arguments.

[59] For such literature, see e.g. Afzelius, *Class. et Med.* iv (1941) 198–203.

[60] So Geiger, *diss. cit.*: perhaps transmitted by Thrasea Paetus, cf. below p. 85 and n. 84. (Geiger's arguments are repeated in his article 'Munatius Rufus and Thrasea Paetus on Cato the Younger', to appear in *Athenaeum.*)

[61] Geiger tends towards this view, but prefers to think that the *Pompey* passages are based on notes taken for *Cato,* or a draft (not the final version) of *Cato.*

[62] Presumably from Pollio, as the contact with App. *B.C.* ii 84–5 suggests.

[63] Cf. Jones, *art. cit.* 66–8, with the reservations expressed above.

[64] *Cato* 73.6 = *Brut.* 13, 53.5: some of this is apparently from Nicolaus of Damascus, as *Brut.* 53 suggests.

than *Cato*; the tale of Theodotus suggests that *Brutus* is later than *Pompey*; yet the Porcia anecdote suggests that *Cato* is later than *Brutus*. The natural escape from the dilemma is to suppose that all three Lives were prepared together: in that case, each might exploit the whole range of the reading which Plutarch had undertaken. Let us take another example: the explanation of Caesar's fall found in *Brutus* (35.4)[65] and again in *Antony* (6.7)—Caesar himself behaving in an equitable manner, but destroyed by the excesses of his friends. This seems to be taken over from *Caesar*, where it formed an important part of the Life's political analysis;[66] and *Brutus* seems further to take over some material from the preparation for *Antony* (28.1, 50 = *Ant.* 22.6, 69.2), despite the cross-reference to *Brutus* at *Ant.* 69.1. This implies a sequence of *Caesar*, then *Antony*, then *Brutus*. Yet the last chapter of *Caesar* shows knowledge of material which seems certainly gleaned from the reading for *Brutus*; and some of the assassination account in *Caesar* seems informed by the work of Bibulus and the memoir of Brutus's friend Empylus, both works which were surely read 'for' the *Brutus*.[67] The conclusion should again be the same: *Caesar*, *Antony*, and *Brutus* were prepared together, and then issued, together with their pairs, in quick succession. We cannot know what precise sequence their publication followed.

The conclusion should by now be firm. Nothing has been found to counter the assumption that *Cicero* and *Lucullus* were composed early in the sequence, and they stand apart from the six later Lives; but those six Lives—*Pompey*, *Cato*, *Crassus*, *Caesar*, *Brutus*, and *Antony*—stand closely together, and show peculiarities which are best explained in terms of simultaneous preparation.[68] One last point: five of the six Greek pairs of these Lives—*Agesilaus*, *Dion*, *Phocion*, *Alexander*, and *Demetrius*—come from the fourth and very early third centuries. The earlier Greek Lives had been fairly widely spread, but had tended to concentrate on the fifth century and earlier. These are Plutarch's historical interests of the moment: the fall of the Roman Republic, and the fourth century of Greece.

II. The Collection of Material

(a) The range of first-hand sources

However, it is still unclear what 'simultaneous preparation' really implies. If, for instance, most or all of the material of these Lives were derived from a single narrative source, 'simultaneous preparation' would simply be a grand way of saying that Plutarch read through the whole of this source before beginning to compose. If, on the other hand, it could be shown that he consulted a wider range of material—or even if the Lives were largely based on earlier biographies, as nineteenth-century researchers tended to assume—the hypothesis of simultaneous preparation would be far more substantial. It is not my concern to give a comprehensive discussion of the Lives' sources, but it may be possible, even in a brief and selective study, to gain some notion of the width or narrowness of his research. He quotes some twenty-five sources by name in the six later Lives, and a further half-dozen in *Lucullus* and *Cicero*; but it is clear that it does not know all these authors at first hand, and no criterion will tell us exactly which sources he

[65] The *Brutus* passage is corrupt as it stands: (the Ides of March), ἐν αἷς Καίσαρα ἔκτειναν, οὐκ αὐτὸν ἄγοντα καὶ φέροντα πάντας ἀνθρώπους, ἀλλ' ἑτέρων †δύναμιν ὄντα ταῦτα πρασσόντων. It is important for the logic of the passage to have some reference to 'friends': *cf.* the point of 35.5, ἄμεινον ἦν τοὺς Καίσαρος φίλους ὑπομένειν ἢ τοὺς ἑαυτῶν περιορᾶν ἀδικοῦντας. Perhaps ἑτέρων conceals ἑταίρων. Ziegler's speculative δύναμιν ὑπομένοντα ταῦτα πρασσόντων presumably captures the sense.

[66] Above p. 78. Neither *Brutus* nor *Antony* is so interested in political analysis, and in *Brutus* the notice is purely incidental. It is hardly likely that he would have elaborated this (rather unusual, though hardly profound) analysis for those Lives alone; but, once it had been developed for *Caesar*, it might readily be taken over. For a similar instance in *Brutus*, *cf.* 18.3: Plutarch there refers to Antony's ὁμιλία καὶ συνήθεια πρὸς τὸ στρατιωτικόν,

which seems to be borrowed from one of the major themes of *Antony*.

[67] Below pp. 86–7.

[68] I omit *Sertorius* from this analysis because it relates to the very beginning of the relevant period, and because its content affords little basis for comparison with other Lives. It may well be later than this group of Lives: B. Scardigli, *SIFC* xliii (1971) 33–41, argues for a late date, and a significant detail may confirm this. The early chapters of *Demetrius* point Demetrius' εὐφυΐα . . . πρὸς ἐπιείκειαν καὶ δικαιοσύνην (4.5), and Plutarch makes the most of what anecdotes he can find: note the expansive treatment of the tales of chs 3–4. Yet he omits Demetrius' pressure to save the life of Eumenes (early 316), an item which he knows at *Eum.* 18.6. This looks like a case of increasing knowledge: if so, *Sert.–Eum.* should be later than *Dtr.–Ant.*

knows directly, and which quotations are tralatician.[69] The purpose of this discussion will simply be to establish an inescapable *minimum* of *types* of literature which we must assume that Plutarch knew at first hand.

First, it is clear that the six later Lives are not based *merely* on a sequence of earlier biographies. The great similarities among these Lives, both of language and of content, have already been noted: these are odd in themselves, if Plutarch had consulted only a series of individual biographies, but perhaps not inexplicable.[70] More important is the regular contact which these Lives show with the narratives of other authors. Time and again, we find an identical narrative structure and articulation in Plutarch and in another account; or a regular tendency to reproduce the same items; or even a series of verbal echoes. One example of such contact is Plutarch's closeness to Dio in narrating Caesar's first consulate.[71] Similarly, from the year 58 onwards, Plutarch's later accounts show regular contact with the version of Appian, both in *Bellum Civile* and in the fragments of *Celtica*. Most of the parallels between the two authors can be traced in Kornemann's convenient tabulation, and there is no need to labour the point here.[72] Dio, too, often shows contact with this tradition;[73] so, rather more rarely, does Suetonius.[74] One possible explanation of this systematic contact might be that the later writers had read Plutarch himself; and it is indeed quite likely that these authors, especially Appian, did know Plutarch, and that some of the verbal parallels arise from echoes of Plutarch's own words.[75] It is, however, impossible to think that all the points of contact are explicable in this way, that Appian, Suetonius, and Dio all systematically used Plutarch as a historical authority. It is easy to show that both Appian and Dio would have to know all of Plutarch's six versions. Such a combination of biographies would be an odd procedure for any historian; for both of them, independently, it is quite impossible. So regular a contact must arise from a shared inheritance from a common source, whether or not the later authors knew that source directly; and, again, it must surely be a *historical* source which Appian and Dio are using, not a combination of biographies.

This is one occasion where the source—at least, the ultimate source—can be identified: it is surely Asinius Pollio. It was suggested earlier that Plutarch encountered a rich store of new information after *Cicero* and *Lucullus,* but before the later group of Lives. This new material appears to begin with the years 60–59: it is natural to suppose that Plutarch has encountered

---

[69] *Cf.* Jones, 84–6. For a particularly clear example, *Caes.* 22.1–5, where the citations of Tanusius Geminus and of Caesar's *commentarii* seem inherited: App. *Celt.* fr. 18, certainly from the same source, retails them in the same manner. *Caes.* 44.8 and *Pomp.* 69.7 provide a similar case: both again quote Caesar, but so does App. *B.C.* ii 79, clearly from the same source. See Peter, 120–123. Note also *Brut.* 41.7=App. *B.C.* iv 110.463, both quoting Augustus.

[70] See the remarks on the ὑπόμνημα stage of composition, below pp. 94–5.

[71] Above p. 77.

[72] *Jb. für cl. Phil.* Suppl. xxii (1896) 672–91; *cf.* Peter 125, and many works since then (bibliography at Schanz-Hosius ii⁴ 28–9).

[73] The following list is very selective: Dio xxxix 31–2 ~ App. *B.C.* ii 17–18 ~ *Pomp.* 51–3, *Crass.* 15, *Cato* 41–3; Dio xxxix 39.5–7 ~ App. ii 18.66 ~ *Crass.* 16.7–8; Dio xl 52–5 ~ App. ii 23–4 ~ *Pomp.* 55.6–11, *Cato* 48.5–10; Dio xli 41.1 ~ App. ii 40 ~ *Cato* 53.2–3, *Pomp.* 61.2; Dio xli 46 ~ App. ii 56–8 ~ *Caes.* 38; Dio xlii 3–4 ~ App. ii 84–6 ~ *Pomp.* 77–80, *Brut.* 33; Dio xlii 40.4–5 ~ App. ii 90.377 ~ *Caes.* 49.7–8; Dio xlii 57 ~ App. ii 87.367 ~ *Cato* 57–8; Dio xliii 10–12 ~ App. ii 98–9 ~ *Cato* 62–71; Dio xliii 12.1, 13.4 ~ App. ii 99.414 ~ *Caes.* 54, *Cato* 36.5; Dio xliv 8–11 ~ App. ii 107–10 ~ *Caes.* 60–61, *Ant.* 12; Dio xliv 12 ~ App. ii 112.469 ~ *Caes.* 62, *Brut.* 9–10 ~ Suet. *Div.Iul.* 80.3; Dio xlvi 49 ~ App. iii 95.392–3 *al.* ~ *Brut.* 27; Dio xlvii 47–8 ~ App. iv 114–7 ~ *Brut.* 44–5; Dio xlviii 38 ~ App. v

[73] ~ *Ant.* 32; Dio xlviii 39.2 ~ App. v 76 ~ *Ant.* 33.6–7. The similarities will be inherited from Pollio, but Dio is very unlikely to have known Pollio at first hand: he will have found his account transmitted in Livy (*cf.* below p. 91 and n. 124). Two further points are worth making. (a) The persistence of the Dio–Plutarch–Appian contact well past Philippi supports the view that Pollio continued his history to include at least the mid-thirties, and possibly Actium as well: so E. Gabba, *Appiano e la storia delle guerre civili* (1956) 242–3, *contra* J. André, *La vie et l'oeuvre d'Asinius Pollion* (1949) 46–51. (b) F. Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* 56, tentatively suggests that Dio used Plutarch's *Brutus* as a source. This will now be seen to be unlikely: Dio's relation to *Brutus* is parallel to his relation to the other five later Lives, and is best explained as a shared inheritance from a historical source.

[74] E.g. Suet. *Div.Iul.* 29.1 ~ App. *B.C.* ii 26.100–101 ~ *Caes.* 29.3, *Pomp.* 58.2; Suet. 30.4 ~ *Caes.* 46.2; Suet. 31–2 ~ App. ii 35 ~ *Caes.* 32; Suet. 36 ~ App. ii 62.260 ~ *Caes.* 39.8; Suet. 44.2–3 ~ App. ii 110 ~ *Caes.* 58; and many points of contact in the account of the assassination.

[75] For Appian's possible knowledge of Plutarch, Gabba, *Appiano* 225–8. Such verbal parallels as App. ii 14.51 ~ *Caes.* 14.8 and App. ii 27.106 ~ *Caes.* 30.2 may thus be explained: see Kornemann, *art. cit.* 577 for further close verbal similarities. It is also possible that the elaborate comparison of Alexander and Caesar which concludes *B.C.* ii is indebted to the (lost) Plutarch *synkrisis.*

Pollio's work, beginning *ex Metello consule,* or at least a work based on this.[76] Many more indications point the same way: these have long been recognised, and there is no point in going over old ground here.[77] We shall never know whether Plutarch knew Pollio at first hand, or at least in translation;[78] but, even if he did not, it at least seems certain that he derived Pollio's account from a historical, rather than a biographical, intermediary. All six of these Lives include material from this provenance, and it is hard to believe that Plutarch consulted six different biographies, each one of which chanced to be dependent on the same original account. It must be a historical source, and this seems to have been his principal authority for the fifties, forties, and thirties. For that period, sometining like three-quarters of his material shows contact with the detailed account of Appian, and seems to be owed to this source.

However, it cannot be this 'Pollio-source' alone which informs these Lives. Plutarch must have supplemented this, at the very least, from *some* biographical material. In cases where Plutarch has no such biographical source, it is normally the opening chapters of the Life which make this clear: for instance, *Fabius,* where he finds little to say about his subject's early life, and reaches his first consulate by the beginning of ch. 2; or *Camillus,* which is similar; or *Coriolanus,* where his source's few hints about Coriolanus' youth are laboriously expanded.[79] In the present group of Lives, too, we occasionally find something similar: for instance, the early chapters of *Crassus* are unusually generalised and feeble, as Plutarch makes the most of a few odd tales—tales of his marriages, of his φιλοπλουτία, of his φιλοτιμία, and so on. By ch. 4 we have reached the time of the Sullan civil wars, and material which could come from a historical source.[80] *Antony,* too, suffers from some early discomfort. Plutarch there wishes to introduce some dominant themes as soon as possible—in particular, military excellence compromised by debauchery and weakness of will; but, as we shall see, he can do no better than elaborate some hints from the *Second Philippic.* However, the other Lives are considerably richer in early detail. *Caesar* is one example: much of its early material has the flavour of a biographical source—the escape from Sulla, the trip to Nicomedes, the pirate adventure, the study under Apollonius, the early rhetorical successes at Rome. It is probable, too, that the initial lacuna contained some further details of Caesar's boyhood.[81] Some material later in the Life, especially in 17, appears to have a similar provenance: and there Plutarch quotes the work of C. Oppius for one of the anecdotes, and seems to draw several more from the same origin.[82] Plutarch elsewhere criticises Oppius in a way which suggests first-hand knowledge of his writings, and it is likely that all this biographical material is drawn from him.[83] The other Lives are similarly rich in biographical items. *Cato* is especially full of such personalia, and that material is likely to derive from the memoirs of Munatius Rufus; Munatius' account was probably transmitted to Plutarch in the biography of Thrasea Paetus.[84] *Pompey* shows similar traces of the work of Theophanes.[85]

[76] Therefore it is odd that the contact with Appian only begins with the year 58. It is possible that Plutarch drew his accounts of Caesar's consulate from a different source, perhaps Livy: the closeness to Dio's account has been observed, and Livy is likely to be Dio's source. But it is more likely that Appian, who is capable of exploiting a variety of sources (Gabba, *Appiano* 109–15), did not turn to the common source until ii 15.54. N. Barbu, *Les sources et l'originalité d'Appien dans le deuxième livre des Guerres Civiles* (1934) 28–40, 81–8, argued on different grounds for a similar view. In that case, Plutarch and Dio both reflect Pollio's version: Dio probably inherited it from Livy.

[77] Cf. e.g. Kornemann, *art. cit.*; Peter 124 ff.; A. Garzetti, comm. on *Caesar* (1954) xxii–xxxiii; Gabba, *Appiano,* esp. 119–51, 229–49; André, *op. cit.* 41–66.

[78] Sallust's *Histories* were translated into Greek in the early second century (*Suda* Z 73 Adler, *cf.* Jones 86), and nothing precludes the possibility that Pollio was translated as well. But *Caes.* 46.2 should not be used as evidence for this: Häussler, *RhM* cix (1966) 339–55, is convincing.

[79] Russell, *JRS* liii (1963) 23–5.

[80] Probably Fenestella: cf. *Crass.* 5.6. All the material of the first chapters may come from the same author: we know that Fenestella mentioned the fate of the Vestal Licinia (*fr.* 11 P; cf. *Crass.* 1.4–6). See Peter 109.

[81] I have attempted to reconstruct some elements of the lost preface from Zonaras' excerpt in *CQ* xxiii (1973) 343–4. Flacelière (Budé edn *Alex.–Caes.* 130) suggests that *Caesar* is complete as it stands, but this is quite unconvincing: *cf.* Briscoe, *CR* xxvii (1977) 177–8.

[82] Oppius is quoted at 17.7; comparison with Suet. *Div.Iul.* 53 leaves no doubt that Oppius lies behind 17.9–10; and he is again mentioned in the anecdote of 17.11.

[83] *Pomp.* 10.7–9 criticises Oppius' bias. Oppius' work is never precisely described as a biography (*cf.* Strasburger, *Caesars Eintritt in die Geschichte* 30–3), but content is here more important than form. For the fragments of Oppius' work, Peter, *HRR* ii 46–9, LXIII–IV.

[84] *Cf.* Peter 65–9; Flacelière, Budé edn *Phoc.–Cato* 65–6; Geiger, *Athenaeum,* to appear; above p. 82.

[85] *Cf.* Peter 114–17; Flacelière, Budé edn *Ages.–Pomp.* 154–6.

Brutus, too, is rich in personal detail, but here it may be misleading to think of a straightforward biography as a source. This will become clearer if we revert to the example of Caesar's murder, and try to detect the provenance of that material. A large proportion of Plutarch's narrative shows contact with Appian, and the two authors are often very close indeed.[86] This is no surprise: the contact is presumably due, as usual, to a shared inheritance from Pollio. But the amount of non-Appianic material in Plutarch's accounts is appreciably greater than usual—comparison, for instance, with the earlier chapters in *Caesar* leaves no doubt of this;[87] and this is odd, for Appian's account of these events is impressively full and detailed. It seems that Plutarch is here contaminating his Pollio-source with a larger supply of extraneous information. It will be useful to list some of these extraneous items: they include the earlier quarrels of Cassius and Brutus (*Brut.* 7.1); the ἀναμενεῖ τοῦτο τὸ δέρμα Βροῦτος story (*Brut.* 8.3, *Caes.* 62.6); Caesar's especial fear for τοὺς ὠχροὺς καὶ ἰσχνοὺς ἐκείνους (*Brut.* 8.2, *Caes.* 62.10, *Ant.* 11.6); Cassius' personal reasons for enmity with Caesar (*Brut.* 8.6–7, cf. *Caes.* 62.8); Caesar baring his neck to a hostile crowd, and bidding his enemies strike (*Caes.* 60.6, *Ant.* 12.6);[88] the stories of Porcia (*Brut.* 13, 15.6–9, 23.4–7); the version that it was Artemidorus who handed Caesar a letter revealing the conspiracy (*Caes.* 65.1–4, where the rival version of App. *B.C.* ii 116.486 is mentioned as a variant); and several details of the senatorial proceedings in the days following the murder—honours for the tyrannicides, *Brut.* 19.1; a separate session on the day after their descent from the Capitol, and the details of their provinces, *Brut.* 19.4–5; and the decision 'to honour Caesar as a god', *Caes.* 67.8.

Some of this material may have been transmitted by Appian's source, and suppressed by Appian himself: it would surprise no one familiar with Appian's technique if, after exploiting the story of Brutus' contention with Cassius over the urban praetorship, he dispensed with the similar item of the pair's earlier quarrels.[89] But one cannot believe that the source contained *all* these items. That source seems elsewhere to have had less taste for personalia and anecdote than this material suggests; and, in particular, Appian's account of the senatorial debate of 17th March is too detailed and well informed to be reconciled with the errors and confusions of Plutarch's extraneous material.[90] These mistakes surely come from elsewhere, and Plutarch has grafted them on to the more responsible version he found in the Pollio-source.

The nature of this extra material suggests a source favourable to the tyrannicides: particularly eloquent is the exaggeration of the honours and support they received from the senate. The Porcia stories seem to be drawn from the βιβλίδιον μικρὸν ἀπομνημονευμάτων Βροῦτου of her son Bibulus. Plutarch mentions and quotes the work in telling these very tales (*Brut.* 13.3, 23.7), and

---

[86] E.g. App. *B.C.* ii 109.455 ~ *Caes.* 57.7; App. ii 110 (*cf.* iii 25, 77) ~ *Caes.* 58; App. ii 107.445 ~ *Caes.* 60.4; App. ii 108–9 ~ *Caes.* 61; App. ii 112.466–7 ~ *Caes.* 62.4–6, *Brut.* 7–8; App. ii 115–6, 149.619 ~ *Caes.* 63–5, *Brut.* 14–16; App. ii 117 ~ *Caes.* 66, *Brut.* 17; and perhaps App. ii 112.469 ~ *Caes.* 62.7, *Brut.* 9–10 (though in this case Mr Moles may be right in suggesting that App.'s account is itself indebted to Plutarch; if so, it is likely that App. is incorporating the items from memory, without having Plut.'s words before his eyes).

[87] *Cf.* Garzetti, comm. on *Caesar,* xxviii–xxix.

[88] The item is given a different context in Plutarch's two accounts. *Caesar* attaches it to the story of Caesar's failure to rise before the approaching magistrates, while *Antony* links it with the Lupercalia episode. It may be that the item was given no context in the source; it is more likely that Plutarch deliberately displaces it in *Antony,* where he does not use the 'approaching magistrates' story.

[89] Urban praetorship: *B.C.* ii 112.466–7. But Appian is interested in the conspirators' motives, and does not portray them favourably: *cf.* ii 111. If he had had the story of *Brut.* 8.6–7 before his eyes he would have used it.

[90] (a) Honours were not voted to the tyrannicides, as Plutarch claims: this apparently reflects the proposal of Ti. Claudius Nero (Suet. *Tib.* 4.1), but Appian knows that this was not carried (*B.C.* ii 127.530 ff.—apparently not

put to the vote). App.'s version was doubtless that of the Pollio-source. (b) 'They voted to honour Caesar as a god' seems another error: there is no mention elsewhere of divine honours granted at this juncture, though many had already been voted during Caesar's lifetime (Weinstock, *Divus Julius,* esp. 281 ff., 287 ff.). Plutarch seems to imply consecration, which was in fact decreed on or about 1st January, 42 (Weinstock 386). (c) Plutarch's notice of the provinces granted to the tyrannicides (*Brut.* 19.5) is no less confused: Sternkopf, *Hermes* xlvii (1912) 340–9. (d) Plutarch alone attests a separate session of the senate, held mainly in honour of the assassins and in the presence of some of them, on the day after their descent from the Capitol (*Brut.* 19.4–5). This is surely an error (so Sternkopf, *art. cit.* 348–9; Motzo, *Ann. Fac. Fil. Lett. Cagliari* [1933] 26–31; *contra* e.g. Gelzer, *Cicero* 327). We should assume that Plutarch found, perhaps in Empylus, a notice of such an honorific session, and combined this as best he could with the Pollio-source. He knew from that source that the assassins had not been present at the 17th March session, for the sons of Antony and Lepidus had been sent as hostages to persuade the conspirators to descend from Capital, and the source had clearly placed this mission *after* the 17th March debate (*Brut.* 19.2, App. ii 142.594; misleadingly streamlined at *Ant.* 14.2–4). If these honours, voted in the assassins' presence, were to be introduced at all, a separate session was inevitable.

there is no reason to doubt that he knew this source at first hand.[91] But Bibulus may not have provided all the items: the debate in the senate, the past of Cassius, the Artemidorus story—these seem alien to such ἀπομνημονεύματα Βρούτου. Here we should rather think of the work of Empylus of Rhodes, mentioned at *Brut.* 2.4 in terms which strongly suggest first-hand knowledge: Empylus left a μικρὸν μέν, οὐ φαῦλον δὲ σύγγραμμα περὶ τῆς Καίσαρος ἀναιρέσεως, ὃ Βροῦτος ἐπιγέγραπται. A work περὶ τῆς Καίσαρος ἀναιρέσεως—even one entitled 'Brutus'—suggests a wider scope than mere ἀπομνημονεύματα Βρούτου.[92] Plutarch seems also to have read Brutus' own letters, or at least a selection of these: these would furnish some background material and some adorning quotations.[93] But Brutus' letters hardly provided the mass of the picturesque and inaccurate extraneous material: that is surely owed to Bibulus and Empylus.

Elsewhere, too, Plutarch shows knowledge of similar memoirs; and he seems especially to favour such literature at the richest and most intense moments of his narrative—moments, indeed, of an intensity similar to the assassination of Caesar. These, of course, are precisely the moments when Pollio's account might well seem too austere for Plutarch's purposes, and it might appear necessary to seek picturesque detail from elsewhere. The battle of Philippi is one example. As *Brutus* approaches the battle, we again find a sudden increase in non-Appianic material, and it again seems clear that Plutarch is supplementing the Pollio-source from other accounts. The extraneous material includes most of the omens of 39 and 48; Cassius and Brutus discussing the ethics of suicide, 40; the mission of Clodius, who just failed to warn Brutus of the vital success at sea, 47; most of the account of Brutus' death, 51–2; and many details of the fighting in both battles. This material does not read like Pollio, and in at least one case is inconsistent with Pollio's account.[94] It surely comes from elsewhere, and its provenance is not hard to guess. Plutarch quotes the memoirs of Messala Corvinus several times for the details of the fighting, and then the obscure work of P. Volumnius for the omens and the story of Brutus' death; and both Messala and Volumnius have a tellingly prominent role in these events.[95] They, surely, were the sources (at least the ultimate sources). It is of course possible, if Plutarch drew Pollio's account from a historical intermediary, that it was this writer rather than Plutarch who combined Pollio with Messala and Volumnius—but it is much more likely that the combination is due to Plutarch himself: this seems another instance in which he found the Pollio-source lacking in biographical and dramatic detail, and chose to supplement it from other, more promising, versions.

Plutarch's two accounts of the Parthian Wars are likely to be similar instances: the campaign of Carrhae, described at *Crassus* 17–33, and the later war of Antony (*Ant.* 33–50). Pollio, whose concern was the civil wars, is unlikely to have been so detailed on Crassus' war: it is more likely that Plutarch has consulted at least one supplementary source, though it is hard to suggest names.[96] Names are easier when it comes to Antony's Parthian campaign, on which Plutarch

[91] *Cf.* Theander, *Eranos* lvii (1959) 120–8.

[92] Empylus: *FGrH* no. 191; mentioned as an orator by Quint. x 6.4. He was a companion of Brutus (*Brut.* loc. cit.), and an enthusiastic treatment is to be expected. He does not sound a reliable man for the details of senatorial decisions; and a Rhodian orator might well be attracted by the role of the Cnidian 'sophist' Artemidorus (*Caes.* 65.1).

[93] *Cf. Brut.* 2.4–8, 21.6, 22.4–6, 24.3, 28.2, 29.8–11, 53.6–7; *Cic.* 45.2, 53(4).4. The information which Plutarch derives from these letters is independent of the historical tradition, and (at least in the case of the Latin letters) seems excellent. Various collections of Brutus' letters were published: Schanz-Hosius i⁴ 397. Plutarch's quotations, when comparable with extant letters, are close enough to suggest first-hand knowledge: esp. *Brut.* 22.4–6 ~ Cic. *ad Brut.* 24, 25 (i 16, 17); *cf.* A. Sickinger, *de linguae Latinae apud Plutarchum et reliquiis et vestigiis* (diss. Freiburg 1883) 81–3; Peter 140–1. The letters may have been read for *Cicero* (below p. 89); but there is no indication that Plutarch knew Cicero's letters to Brutus —note ὥς φασιν at *Brut.* 26.6. See also below p. 93 and n. 140.

[94] Ch. 47, the fine story of Clodius, cannot be reconciled with App.'s insistence that both sides knew of the sea-battle and its outcome, *B.C.* iv 122.513. App. and Dio agree that Brutus was forced into battle by the reproaches of his officers and men (an obvious reminiscence of Pompey at Pharsalia), and this was doubtless Pollio's version. Plutarch might well prefer the Clodius anecdote: the tragic elements, both of Brutus struggling against an adverse destiny and of his coming so close to being saved, are important to him; and the picture of Brutus which Plutarch has favoured—e.g. ὄρθιον τὴν γνώμην . . . διαφυλάττων, 29.3—would sit uneasily with Pollio's description of a man persuaded into a civil battle against his better judgment.

[95] For Messala, 40.1 ff., 40.11, 41.5, 42.5, 45.1, 45.7, 53.1, 53.3. For Volumnius, 48.1 ff., 51.1, 51.3–4, 52.2. For their works, Peter 137–9, and *HRR* ii 52–3, 65–7, and LXVII–LXVIII, LXXVIII–LXXXIII.

[96] Suggestions have included Nicolaus (Heeren, Gutschmid); Strabo (Heeren); an unevidenced memoir of C. Cassius (Flacelière); Timagenes (Regling, arguing for a combination of Timagenes with Livy); and, implausibly, Dellius (Adcock). The possibility of two sources should

again lavishes considerable dramatic art: the recurrent evocation of Xenophon's *Anabasis*, in particular, is surely Plutarch's own skilful addition.[97] Pollio, again, is unlikely to have treated the campaign in detail, and Plutarch has probably consulted at least one other version.[98] The most likely source is Q. Dellius, the infamous *desultor bellorum civilium*. We know that he wrote of the war, and he was clearly an important authority: at *Ant.* 59.6 Plutarch refers to him as Δέλλιος ὁ ἱστορικός, and expects his readers to recognise the man. It is not surprising that the one item attested for Dellius' Parthian account is consonant with Plutarch's version (*Ant.* 49.4–5 ~ *FGrH* 197 fr. 1). Once again, we shall never be quite certain that Plutarch knew Dellius at first hand; but it does seem very likely. Much of the rest of *Antony*, too, appears indebted to sources other than Pollio, particularly the imaginative final scenes. Pollio's history probably concluded with Actium (or even before), and Plutarch would anyway now have to go elsewhere.[99] The physician Olympus is quoted at 82.4, and perhaps provided some of the material; but there are clearly other possible sources, and it is likely that Plutarch consulted several authorities for these moving events.[100] One of these may again have been Dellius: it is possible that he extended his history to include Actium and Alexandria, or wrote a further work on those campaigns.[101] Few of the participants were better qualified—and it would be no surprise if some of the treatment were extravagant or scandalous.

It would be easy to extend this list: it seems likely, for instance, that Plutarch knew the work of Livy. At *Caes.* 47 he quotes Livy for some omens which accompanied Pharsalia: the item is unlikely to have been included in the Pollio-source, who had already finished with omens (*cf.* 43.4). Nor did Pollio exhaust Plutarch's taste for portents when he approached the Ides of March: at *Caes.* 63.9 he adds, as a variant, Livy's version of Calpurnia's dream. In other Lives, too, traces of Livy can be found—in *Pompey* and in *Crassus*, at the very least.[102] Perhaps Plutarch found these items in an excerpt of Livy, or in another writer's quotation or adaptation; but elsewhere, in Plutarch's treatment of earlier Roman history, it is likely enough that he knew Livy's accounts at first hand.[103] In the present group of Lives, one could further suggest the use of Sallust, of Fenestella, and perhaps of others.[104] But it is more profitable to turn from these secondary sources to those occasions on which Plutarch seems to know some contemporary material of the period.

Here there is a contrast between the early *Cicero* and the later group of Lives. *Cicero* seems to

certainly not be dismissed. Some aspects of Plutarch's version show close contact with the Livian tradition: e.g. 17.8 ~ Dio xl 13.3–4; 17.9 ~ Oros. vi 13.1–2; 19, 23.1 ~ Obs. 64, Dio xl 18–19, Val.Max. i 6.11; etc. Yet most of Plutarch's details of the fighting cannot be reconciled with Dio or the other Livian sources, even when we take into account Dio's tendency to revamp battle-descriptions according to his own stereotypes. If there is some supplementation of Livy from another authority, it is more likely to be due to Plutarch himself than to any intermediate source. Such a combination was argued (though crudely) by K. Regling, *de belli Parthici Crassiani fontibus* (diss. Berlin 1899).

[97] Most obviously at the explicit 45.12, and at 49.5; but the impression is reinforced elsewhere. The description of the χώρα as εὐδαίμων (49.6) uses a favourite *Anabasis* locution; so does the mention of κώμας οἰκουμένας (41.3). The echoes need not be derived from Dellius (*cf.* Jacoby on *FGrH* 197 fr. 1): such allusion is very much in Plutarch's manner.

[98] It is again possible that two versions are here combined: some of Plutarch's details look like doublets. *Cf.* 41 ~ 46–7, 45.3–6 ~ 49.1 (Flor. ii 20.7 attaches the item of 49.3 to the context of 45); and perhaps 47.6 ~ 49.6.

[99] On the terminus of Pollio's history, above n. 73.

[100] *Cf.* Russell, *Plutarch* 140; J. Griffin, *JRS* lxvii (1977) 25–6.

[101] Strabo xi 523e refers to ὁ Δέλλιος (Casaubon: ἀδέλφιος codd.) ὁ τοῦ 'Αντωνίου φίλος συγγράψας τὴν ἐπὶ Παρθυαίους αὐτοῦ στρατείαν, ἐν ᾗ παρῆν καὶ αὐτὸς

ἡγεμονίαν ἔχων. Jacoby (on *FGrH* no. 197) concludes that this historical work was limited to this campaign, but this is by no means certain: A. Bürcklein had some reason to suggest that Dellius continued his work at least as far as Actium (*Quellen und Chronologie der röm.-parth. Feldzüge* [diss. Leipzig 1879]). *Ant.* 59.6–7 certainly seems to imply that the tale of Dellius' desertion in 32 is drawn from his own work (note the present φησιν): the item is more likely to come from a memoir or history than from the *epistulae ad Cleopatram lascivae* (Sen. *Suas.* i 7). If Plutarch expected his readers to recognise Δέλλιος ὁ ἱστορικός, it seems unlikely that his historical fame rested on the description of just one campaign. Plutarch also mentions Dellius' role in Antony's first meeting with Cleopatra (*Ant.* 25–6): it is not unlikely that those splendid chapters are also indebted to Dellius himself. *Cf.* Russell, *Plutarch* 136.

[102] For *Crassus*, see n. 96; for *Pompey*, Peter 117 n. 1 and 119, and note the suggestive similarities between *Pompey*'s closing chapters and Lucan *B.C.* viii.

[103] *Cf.* Theander 72–8. For a possible explanation of the sparseness of these traces of Livy in the present group of Lives, see below p. 95.

[104] Sallust seems to inform the early chapters of *Pompey* (*cf.* Peter, 112–14), and has clearly influenced earlier *Lucullus* (and underlies most of *Sertorius*: Scardigli, *SIFC* xliii [1971] 33–64, esp. 41 n. 2). For Fenestella, see n. 80. Of other secondary sources Nepos, Strabo, Nicolaus, Timagenes, and Valerius Maximus are the most likely to be known at first hand.

show knowledge of many of Cicero's own writings. A large portion of the account of Catiline seems to be based on the περὶ ὑπατείας; there are also quotations from the letters and speeches; and there is more besides.[105] Nor is it just Cicero himself: Plutarch seems to know some of Brutus's letters, and he also mentions Antony's reply to the *Second Philippic*; and it appears likely that part of the account is drawn from the work of Tiro, both the biography and the *de iocis*.[106] Once read for *Cicero*, this material might be recalled, and exploited, in later Lives.[107] Yet it is striking that Plutarch seems rarely to have felt the need to undertake any *further* research of this type. There is no sign, for instance, that he knew Caesar's *commentarii* at first hand, though he certainly knew of their existence (*Caes.* 22.2).[108] He refers to the speeches of Caesar, of Crassus, of Cato, of Brutus, and of Antony—but there is no suggestion that he has read them, though many were in circulation.[109] At *Cato* 23.3 he notes only that 'they say that this is the only speech of Cato to survive'. Letters of Caesar and of Antony were available: Plutarch makes no use of them.[110] (He does use those of Brutus, but these had probably been read for use in *Cicero*.[111]) Perhaps Plutarch simply did not have access to all this material (though this argument should not be over-stressed);[112] we should still have expected him to look up the works in a library during his visits to cultural centres, especially Athens. The reason is presumably a simple one: that Plutarch was so pleased with the Pollio-source that he excused himself from any further research into primary sources. *Cicero* clearly had no such satisfactory narrative source, and Plutarch must himself have felt the inadequacy of some of his material: hence, for instance, the unusual number of *apophtheg-mata*, which could usefully fill out the second half of the Life. It is very likely that, when preparing *Cicero*, he had undertaken this wide reading of primary sources for precisely this reason: there was no satisfactory chronological and synoptic source, and the narrative would otherwise have fallen to pieces. After he had read Pollio's account, the problem was solved, and the later Lives could be built around this.

Only once do we find the later Lives making extensive use of primary sources.[113] The first thirty chapters of *Antony* show a resounding similarity to the *Second Philippic*, so close that we should assume a direct use of the speech, and a use primed by recent re-reading.[114] Here Plutarch naturally wished to foreshadow and introduce the Life's important themes: themes such as Antony's luxury, his weakness of will, and his susceptibility to subtle schemers, offset by his natural nobility and brilliance (especially as a soldier and general), and by the popularity which these qualities could excite. Ability and popularity could emerge from the historical sources, when they touched on the first episodes of Antony's life: the campaign in Syria, for instance, of ch. 3, or his authoritative demeanour after the Ides of March (14–15), or his command at Philippi (22); or even, with some straining, his exploits in the Pharsalus campaign.[115] But the historical sources would have less to say about the more private themes; nor, it appears, did Plutarch know a satisfactory biography of Antony.[116] He had probably read the *Second Philippic* some time ago, when preparing *Cicero*; if he recalled that it contained suitable material, he might naturally go back to it, and exploit its rich fund of obloquy. It is no surprise that he revises Cicero's material in a way which will suit the economy of the Life. In ch. 2, for instance, he represents Antony as far more of Curio's dupe than Cicero (*Phil.* ii 44–7) had done: Cicero had portrayed Antony as no less

---

[105] περὶ ὑπατείας: cf. Lendle, *Hermes* xcv (1967) 90–109, esp. 94–8. *Caes.* 8.4 clearly implies that Plutarch knew the work at first hand, and *Crass.* 13.4 similarly seems to show him taking a pride in his own researches. Letters: *Cic.* 24.6–9, 36.6, 37.3–4, 40.3. Speeches: 6.3, 24.6, 33.8, 48.6, 50(1).4. More besides: 5.6, 20.3, 24.4–6. In general, cf. Flacelière, Budé edn *Demosthenes–Cicero* 56–61.

[106] Brutus: 45.2, 53(4).4 (cf. n. 93). Antony: 41.6. Tiro: cf. Peter 129 ff.; Flacelière, *op. cit.* 57.

[107] Most clearly at *Pomp.* 42.13, 63.2; *Phoc.* 3.2; and cf. n. 93.

[108] The quotations at *Caes.* 22.2 and 44.8 seem inherited: above n. 69.

[109] *Caes.* 3.2–4, *Crass.* 3.3–4, *Cato* 5.3–4 and 23.3, *Brut.* 2.5, *Ant.* 2.8. For the survival of their speeches until Plutarch's day, cf. Schanz-Hosius i⁴ 336, 388–9, 396–7,

400, 490.

[110] For Caesar's letters, Suet. *Div.Iul.* 56.6, Gell. xvii 9.1–2; for Antony's, Suet. *Div.Aug.* 7.1 *al.*, Ov. *ex.P.* i 1.23, Tac. *Ann.* iv 34.

[111] Above n. 93.

[112] Cf. Garzetti, *RSI* lxv (1953) 80; Hamilton xliii n. 6.

[113] For a second, less important example, *Crass.* 13.4: above p. 75.

[114] For use of the *Second Philippic* in the early parts of *Antony*, Flacelière, Budé edn *Demetrius–Antony* 89–90, with a qualification I make in my review, *CR* xxix (1979).

[115] *Ant.* 8.1–3 seems to be making the most of slight information: 8.1 is a great overstatement of the items of *Caes. B.C.* iii 46 and 65, while 8.2–3 seems a simple inference from Antony's command of the left wing at Pharsalia.

[116] Above p. 85.

debauched than Curio himself—but Plutarch will later make much of Antony's vulnerability to others' wiles, first to Fulvia (10.5–6), then of course to Cleopatra and her κόλακες. It is useful to anticipate the theme here. Again, some of the *Second Philippic* material is delayed until after Cicero's death (*Ant.* 21, exploiting *Phil.* ii 67–9). No other account suggests that Antony's excesses were especially evident at that stage, just after the proscriptions, but Plutarch finds it useful to exploit the themes here, with 22 proceeding to stress the glory of Antony's command at Philippi and his noble treatment of Brutus' corpse. Private excesses and yet brilliant ability: the contrast is programmatic, and excellently prepares the emergence of Cleopatra, Antony's τελευταῖον κακόν (25.1). Such adaptations of the *Second Philippic* are eloquent, for they suggest that Plutarch did know the work at first hand: the rewriting is so clearly tailored to the interests and themes of the present Life. Whoever revised the original material did so in the service of precisely those points which Plutarch will later stress: and the reviser is clearly more likely to be Plutarch himself than any intermediate source.[117]

These Lives, then, are not just informed by the Pollio-source; an admixture of biographies, memoirs, histories, and even first-hand contemporary material gives depth and colour to Pollio's account. And two last types of material should be mentioned. First, there is a sense in which Plutarch, when composing the six later biographies, would sometimes be using his own earlier work as his source. Some points remembered from *Cicero* and *Numa* have already been mentioned,[118] but there are times when the whole narrative of the later Lives is so close to the language and articulation of *Cicero* that we should assume that he looked again at his earlier version, and wrote the later accounts on its basis. One example might be the account of the final Catilinarian debate,[119] another the account of the *Bona Dea* scandal in late 62.[120]

Secondly, it is very likely that oral traditions and sources played a considerable role. At the beginning of *Demosthenes* Plutarch lists the advantages to the historian of living in a great city: not merely an abundance of books, but also access to 'those stories which the written sources have passed over, but which are still recalled in the popular memory' (*Dem.* 2.1). He would have discovered some of these stories himself, during his visits to Rome and elsewhere; others would have been passed on to him by his Roman friends and acquaintances.[121] At *Caes.* 26.8 Plutarch tells an anecdote of Caesar's final battle with Vercingetorix: at the beginning things did not go well with the Romans, καὶ δεικνύουσιν Ἀρβέρνοι ξιφίδιον πρὸς ἱερῷ κρεμάμενον, ὡς δὴ Καίσαρος λάφυρον. The Arverni 'still point to' the ξιφίδιον: that item cannot be derived from a source. Plutarch heard of the ξιφίδιον and its associated local tradition, and skilfully wove it into his narrative.

The *Antony* is likely to be especially rich in this material: indeed, two substantial anecdotes are explicitly attributed to oral tradition within Plutarch's own family, the sumptuous banqueting in B.C. 41 and the hardships of Greece after Actium (28.3–12, 68.6–8). 'Greece', indeed, plays an important role in *Antony*. Antony's love for Greece is emphasised shortly after Philippi, τοῖς μὲν οὖν Ἕλλησιν οὐκ ἄτοπος οὐδὲ φορτικὸς συνηνέχθη τό γε πρῶτον . . . (23.2), and the theme soon recurs (33.7). But that τό γε πρῶτον has introduced an ominous note, and the eventual sufferings of Greece, τῆς πολλὰ δὴ τλάσης Ἑλλάδος (62.1, quoting Euripides), are given a corresponding emphasis in chs 62 and 68. Antony's love of Athens may remain unshaken (72.1)—but to this

---

[117] If the preparation of these six Lives was simultaneous, it is not surprising that reflections of this re-reading of the *Second Philippic* are found elsewhere, especially at *Caes.* 51.2; cf. also *Pomp.* 58.6, on Antony's friendship with Curio.

[118] Above p. 82.

[119] *Caes.* 7.7–8.4 and *Cato* 22.4–24.3 ~ *Cic.* 20.4–21.5: esp. *Caes.* 7.8–8.1, *Cato* 22.5 ~ *Cic.* 21.1–2; *Caes.* 8.1, *Cato* 22.6 ~ *Cic.* 21.3 (Silanus); *Caes.* 8.2, *Cato* 23 ~ *Cic.* 21.4 (Cato inculpating Caesar).

[120] *Caes.* 9–10 ~ *Cic.* 28–9. The adaptation has two curiosities. (a) At *Cic.* 28.4 the codd. have Clodius indicted by an unnamed τις; *Caes.* 10.6 specifies εἰς τῶν δημάρχων (whence Barton proposed τις ⟨τῶν δημάρχων⟩ in *Cic.*, which Ziegler accepts). But the *Caes.* version seems a mistake. The affair was raised in the senate by the

praetorian Q. Cornificius, while Clodius' formal prosecutor was L. Cornelius Lentulus Crus, the pr. 58 and cos. 49. If Lentulus was now tribune, it is odd that this is not mentioned elsewhere (e.g. at Cic. *Att.* i 14.6, i 16.3). It is easier to assume that *Caes.* is here in error; in that case, we should retain the manuscript reading at *Cic.* 28.4. Plutarch has here carelessly misread his earlier account. (b) At *Caes.* 10.3 Plutarch uses the vigorous and rare word διαπτοηθεισῶν; he had also used the word, in a quite different context, in the account of the 63 Bona Dea incident (*Cic.* 20.2). If he had recently re-read *Cicero*, the use of the same phrase in *Caesar* may unconsciously reflect that passage.

[121] It is a great merit of Theander, 2–32, to emphasise this point: cf. *Eranos* lvii (1959) 99–131.

extent has Greece, too, been reduced by Antony's Eastern extravagance and luxury. Little of this Hellenic material or this emphasis emerges in the other ancient accounts. It is likely that the development of the theme is Plutarch's own, with its material drawn from surviving oral traditions.

(b) The method of writing

This treatment has inevitably been selective, but it should be enough to suggest that Plutarch drew on a fairly wide range of material. Yet this conclusion poses its own problems. For it is still clear that the greater portion of these Lives is based on the Pollio-source alone: even on those occasions (such as Caesar's murder) where Plutarch has other sources, it is still Pollio's account which provides the basic narrative articulation, and Pollio's account which provides most of the facts. The extraneous material is not more than one quarter of the whole of Plutarch's narrative. This wide reading of other sources is surprisingly unproductive: it seems to provide only a few stray supplements and additions, and occasionally to replace the Pollio-source where that account was unsuitable. This is undeniably odd: if a modern researcher had read so widely, he would weave items from all these sources into a composite and independent narrative, owing little more to any one account than to any other; as a matter of course, he would apply the technique of 'breakdown and reconstruction' (as T. J. Luce calls it)[122] of his sources' accounts. Plutarch has no hint of this.

Yet this problem is not confined to Plutarch, nor to biography. Time and again, we find Greek and Roman historians claiming a wide range of reading, and deserving to be believed; yet, time and again, we find them demonstrably basing their narrative of individual episodes on a single source. Cassius Dio is one example: he claims to have read 'nearly every book' on Roman history—but, as he goes on to say, he 'did not write up all his material, but only a selection'.[123] We can see what he means. It is evident that, at least in his treatment of Republican history, he is generally content to draw his material from a single source at a time. His account of the sixties, fifties, forties, and thirties regularly shows close contact with the Livian tradition, and there can be no doubt that Livy has provided the basis of Dio's narrative, and nearly all his material.[124] There are times when Dio's faithfulness to a source can be traced in detail: for instance, his accounts of Caesar's campaigns are ultimately based on Caesar's *commentarii*, and there is little indication of the use of any supplementary material;[125] while his account of Catiline shows contact with Plutarch's *Cicero*, which can only be explained if both authors derive from a common source (probably the περὶ ὑπατείας).[126] It is very unlikely that Dio is following either Caesar or Cicero directly—in both cases the material was probably transmitted by Livy;[127] but the similarities at least show that Dio knew the works in a full and close copy, and was himself reluctant to intrude material from elsewhere.

Or consider Livy himself. He claimed to have read widely: he can, for instance, speak of the 'very many Greek and Roman authors' whom he has read.[128] Nor is there any strong reason to doubt these claims.[129] Yet, when we can obtain some control of his use of sources, he has one

---

[122] *Livy: the Composition of his History* (1977) 143. It will become clear that my approach to Plutarch is very similar to Luce's treatment of Livy.

[123] Fr. 1.2 (Boissevain): ⟨ἀνέγνωκα⟩ (συνέλεξα coni. Millar) πάντα ὡς εἰπεῖν τὰ περὶ αὐτῶν τισι γεγραμμένα, συνέγραψα δὲ οὐ πάντα ἀλλ' ὅσα ἐξέκρινα. So at liii 19.6 he refers to 'the many books which I have read'.

[124] This is, I trust, not controversial: the similarities may be traced in Schwartz, PW iii 1697–1714. The non-Livian material seems to increase after Caesar's death: *ib.*, 1711–14. Thus the systematic contact with Plutarch and Appian (above n. 73) is best explained by the assumption that Dio found Pollio's account transmitted by Livy.

[125] *Cf.* Schwartz, PW iii 1706–9, though not all his arguments are strong. As I hope to argue elsewhere, additions to, or revisions of, Caesar's material can always be explained by Dio's own techniques.

[126] The similarities are analysed in my doctoral thesis on *Caesar* (diss. Oxford 1974) App. 1; *cf.* n. 105.

[127] For Caesar being transmitted by Livy, Schwartz, PW iii 1706–8; for Cicero, Schwartz, *Hermes* xxxii (1897) 581 ff.; H. Willrich, *de coni. Cat. Fontibus* (1893) 45–51.

[128] xxix 27.13; *cf.* e.g. vi 12.2–3, xxvi 49.2–6, xxix 25.2, xxxiii 30.6–11. At xxxii 6.8 he refers to *ceteri graeci latinique auctores, quorum quidem ego legi annales . . .*: thus he admits that he has not read everything, but evidently claims to have read several accounts other than that of Valerius Antias (quoted at xxxii 6.5 ff.). In general, *cf.* Steele, *AJP* xxv (1904) 15–31.

[129] Luce, *op. cit.* 158–84, has strong arguments to defend Livy's wide reading. In particular, *cf.* Tränkle, *Cato in der vierten und fünften Dekade des Livius* (Abh. Mainz 1971), in defence of Livy's first-hand knowledge of Cato.

principal authority for each section of his account, and uses the rest of his reading merely to supplement this principal narrative source. This is most clear in the later surviving books, when Polybius informs nearly all Livy's account of events in Greece and Asia: there are intrusions from Roman sources into these Polybian sections, but those intrusions are very limited.[130] In the earlier books, too, we often see systematic contact with the version of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, which demonstrates that, for individual episodes, they both depend on a single authority.[131] Everything here supports Luce's conclusion: Livy read widely, but nevertheless followed a single source for a single section; within these sections, he would occasionally add supplementary items from other sources, but he would not use a number of versions to weave together a coherent and independent account of his own.[132] Moreover, the contact with Dionysius in the early books is as important for Dionysius as it is for Livy: Dionysius quotes widely among his authorities (some thirty names in the first few books)—but he, too, seems generally to be faithful to a single source in narrating an episode. And even Tacitus seems to be similar. He was quite evidently a conscientious and wide-ranging researcher; but, on the few occasions when we can control his own choice of items—most clearly in the first two books of the *Histories*[133]—he seems generally to draw the mass of his information from a single source at a time.

This seems less strange if we remember the circumstances in which these writers composed. It is known, and it is not surprising, that authors often collected all their material and read all their literature before beginning to compose.[134] What is more surprising is the lengths to which some authors took this procedure. Cassius Dio first spent ten years collecting his material, and then took twelve years to write it up; Dionysius took twenty-two years to familiarise himself with the Latin language and gather the material for his history.[135] If Plutarch chose to read all the materials for his six Lives before beginning to write, his methods were not unusual. The curious fidelity to a single source for individual episodes is most easily understood if we make a simple assumption: that, following this initial wide reading, an author would generally choose just one work to have before his eyes when he composed, and this work would provide the basis of his narrative. In Plutarch's case, this work would normally be the Pollio-source; but when this was in some way unsuitable—for the early life of a figure, perhaps, or for the Parthian Wars—it would temporarily be replaced by another work, such as Oppius or Dellius. Items from the earlier reading would more widely be combined with the principal source, but a writer would not normally refer back to that reading to verify individual references, and would instead rely on his memory, or on the briefest of notes. Alternatively, it may be that an author, immediately before narrating an episode, would *reread* one account, and compose with that version fresh in his mind.[136] This procedure might better explain such cases as the confusion between Albinus and Trebonius at *Caes.* 66, which can now be a simple slip of the memory. On either view, the important point is to explain the peculiar position of one source by the peculiar use to which it was put. Stray facts and additions would be recalled from the preliminary reading, but it would be a very different matter to recall the detail of an episode's presentation, and combine versions independently and evenly.

Such a procedure seems less perverse in view of the physical difficulties of working with papyrus rolls. These were hefty and unmanageable things; and indexing, chapter-headings, and

[130] *Cf.* Tränkle, *Livius und Polybius* (1976) esp. 28 ff., 59–72.

[131] Schwartz, PW v 939, 946–60; for the coincidences between Livy and Dionysius in their accounts of the early Republic, Tränkle, *Hermes* xciii (1965) 311–37. Plutarch offers a useful control: *Romulus, Numa,* and *Poplicola* are at times close to this tradition; elsewhere (e.g. in describing the birth of Romulus and Remus, *Rom.* 2 ff.) they show what divergences were possible.

[132] Luce, *op. cit.* 139–84, esp. 143–50 and 172 n. 73; *cf.* Tränkle, *Livius und Polybios* 20: 'ein kontinuierliches Verweben mehrerer Darstellungen wird man ihm höchstens in Ausnahmefällen zutrauen dürfen'.

[133] *Cf.* esp. Syme, *Tacitus* 180–90, 674–6: subsequent bibliography at Jones 74 n. 15. Townend, *AJP* lxxxv

(1964) 337–77, plausibly argues for the use of several sources in these books of the *Histories*; but the over-whelming predominance of a single source within a single expanse of narrative remains unimpugned.

[134] Lucian *quom.hist.* 47–8, quoted below (p. 94), with the passages collected by G. Avenarius, *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung* (1956) 71–104, esp. 88.

[135] Dio lxxii 23.5, with Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* 32–40; D.H. *Ant.Rom.* i 7.2. It is thus plausible to suggest that Livy, too, read widely in his sources before beginning to compose: Luce, *op. cit.* 188–93.

[136] *Cf.* Russell, *JRS* liii (1963) 22, who suggests a similar procedure for Plutarch in *Coriolanus*; Luce, *op. cit.* 210 ff., who makes a similar suggestion concerning Livy.

even line- and column-numbering were rudimentary or non-existent.[137] It would be easy to read a roll continuously, at the stage of the preliminary reading; but reading was a two-handed business,[138] and it would be difficult to have more than one roll under one's eyes during composition itself. Even if (for example) a slave held a second roll for an author to compare accounts, or the author himself used a book-rest, combining versions would still be awkward. If two accounts did not deal with events in the same sequence—if, for instance, one narrated chronologically, while the other ordered events thematically—it would be a cumbrous business to roll back and forth to find the parallel account. There were probably no chapter-headings to help. Systematic comparison of two accounts might still be possible; no doubt it was sometimes done.[139] But it would be very inconvenient, and it would not be surprising if authors preferred to rely on their memory.

And signs of the use of memory are duly found, especially when Plutarch exploits a non-chronological genre, such as speeches or letters—the sort of literature in which he had read widely before writing *Cicero*. In genres such as these, the relevant information might be found anywhere in the roll, and one would hardly expect a writer always to check his references. Plutarch's memory is inevitably sometimes imprecise: thus a story from *pro Plancio* is garbled and emasculated at *Cic.* 6.3–4, and the quotations from Brutus' letters at *Brut.* 22 provide a pastiche of several different passages from two different letters.[140] We should not infer that Plutarch did not know the works at first hand,[141] but he is certainly unlikely to have had them under his eyes when composing. Elsewhere, too, we can detect the use of memory when Plutarch seeks to supplement the material before him. In the *Comparison of Nicias and Crassus* (2.3) he mentions an anecdote which he had forgotten to include in the narrative of *Crassus* itself: ὅπερ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ διηγήσει παρελήλυθε. Had that story been included in the source before his eyes, he would hardly have omitted it: this is rather an item culled from the wider preliminary reading. But for the slip of his memory, he would silently have inserted it into his main source's narrative.

A different type of example is found in the account of the Gallic Wars. *Caes.* 22.1–5 tells of Caesar's slaughter of the Usipetes and Tencteri: 400,000 barbarians were killed. Both *Cato* (51.1) and the *Comparison of Nicias and Crassus* (4.2) briefly mention the same incident, and both give the figure as 300,000. There is no need to emend; still less, to give the lower figure any authority.[142] In *Cato* and in the *Comparison* Plutarch has not referred back to the source, and has misremembered the detail. But here the detail seems to have been given by Pollio himself, for Appian too has a figure of 400,000 dead (*Celt. fr.* 1.12, 18.1). In writing *Caesar*, Plutarch presumably worked carefully through the Pollio-source's account of the war, and had it before him in composing; in *Cato* or in *Crassus*, he would skim this part of the narrative, and wind through the roll quickly.[143] It is not surprising that he did not hunt carefully for the reference, but preferred to add it from memory. A similar case is *Brut.* 27.6, where Plutarch says that 'two hundred' were proscribed: this is apparently another misremembering, for *Ant.* 20.2 gives 'three hundred', and this was

[137] Cf. esp. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen* (1882) 157 ff.; Schubart, *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern*[3] (1962) 66–71. The relevance of such points was clearly seen by Nissen, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Quellen der vierten und fünften Dekade des Livius* (1863) 78–9; cf. Briscoe, *Commentary on Livy xxxi–xxxiii* (1973) 10.

[138] Birt, *Kritik und Hermeneutik des antiken Buchwesens* (1913) 303–4.

[139] E.g. Strabo xvii 790, who does seem to have collated two (closely similar) versions. And, of course, systematic comparison of texts was regular in the case of διόρθωσις, with textual variants being noted in a margin: cf. e.g. Allen, *PBSR* v (1910) 76–80. In such cases, either a book-rest or a slave's assistance (e.g. by dictating one version) was presumably used. But comparison of versions must have been more complicated for a historian, who had to deal (a) with a wider range of texts, (b) with texts which might order their material in different sequences, (c) with variants which were generally more substantial, and (d) with variants which were more diffi-

cult to note. (This footnote is indebted to discussion with Mr Parsons.)

[140] Cf. above n. 93. *Brut.* 22.4–6 has a medley of points taken from Brutus' two letters, and these points recur in an order quite different from the original. Apart from one explicit quotation (οἱ δὲ πρόγονοι . . .), itself easily memorable, the passage looks like a paraphrase from memory.

[141] As Peter 130, argued in the case of the *pro Plancio* passage.

[142] As Gelzer does: *Festgabe P. Kirn* (1961) 49 n. 19. The number may originally be derived from *Caes. B.G.* iv 15.3, who claims that the enemy had totalled 430,000; Pollio may have reasoned that very few escaped.

[143] Or, if we assume that Plutarch composed just one ὑπόμνημα for all six Lives (below pp. 94–5), he presumably worked carefully through this part of the ὑπόμνημα when composing *Caesar*, and turned the pages (or tablets) more quickly when writing *Cato* or *Crassus*.

apparently Pollio's figure (App. *B.C.* iv 7.28). In composing *Antony*, he presumably read Pollio's version thoroughly; but the proscriptions were less central for *Brutus*, and he might again wind through the account more quickly.

Elsewhere, of course, his memory would furnish him with items recalled from much further back, items which he had encountered in a different context, and had probably known for years: perhaps from the reading for *Cicero*, perhaps from his work for other Lives or essays, perhaps simply from his general knowledge.[144]

This reconstruction implies that he made little use of notes, for notes on different authors, made in a codex of parchment, of papyrus, or of wax-tablets, might easily be combined into an independent pastiche. He might perhaps have taken such notes when working in libraries during his visits to cultural centres—enjoying that 'abundance of every type of book' which he talks about at *Dem.* 2.1. He would then have known that he might not use the material for months or years; note-taking would be a natural safeguard.[145] It is much harder to believe that he took detailed notes when composing from books which were at hand.[146] He used the Pollio-source so extensively that note-taking would be superfluous: it would be far more convenient to have the account under his eyes during composition. It might seem more sensible to take notes on his preliminary reading, works such as Volumnius or Messala or Bibulus; but we should be careful not to exaggerate the time taken in composing these Lives, which (as we shall see) have their signs of haste. The whole process probably took only a few months, and the preliminary reading would still be relatively fresh in his mind when he came to compose. Even in old age, he doubtless retained an extraordinarily good memory, and an extensive use of notes might well seem an unnecessary and time-consuming luxury. If he took notes at all, they would probably form the briefest *aide-memoire*, with headings and a few important details of some good stories: they were perhaps similar to the extant *Apophthegmata*, whether or not those works are genuine. Such notes were perhaps taken in notebooks of wax-tablets, rather than papyrus or parchment: so Quintilian advises his pupils, in the interest of speed and fluency;[147] and such notes would have only a temporary use, so that reusable tablets would be a sensible economy. (Writers such as Dio or Dionysius, and perhaps Livy, who needed more long-term notes, might more naturally use parchment or papyrus.)[148]

More extensive notes seem to belong at a later stage of composition, the production of the ὑπόμνημα. The most usual method of writing seems to be that reflected by Lucian *quom.hist.* 47–8:[149] the historian should first collect his material from the most reliable sources,

καὶ ἐπειδὰν ἀθροίσῃ ἅπαντα ἢ τὰ πλεῖστα, πρῶτα μὲν ὑπόμνημά τι συνυφαινέτω αὐτῶν καὶ σῶμα ποιείτω ἀκαλλὲς ἔτι καὶ ἀδιάρθρωτον· εἶτα ἐπιθεὶς τὴν τάξιν ἐπαγέτω τὸ κάλλος καὶ χρωννύτω τῇ λέξει καὶ σχηματιζέτω καὶ ῥυθμιζέτω.

This ὑπόμνημα, this 'inartistic and uncoordinated draft', was clearly an important stage of the composition, but it is hard to know how close to the final version it would be.[150] Its precise form surely varied from author to author. Some ancient writers speak of it as if it were a mere collection of chapter-headings, others as if it were a fairly finished version, merely needing to be 'translated'

---

[144] From the reading for *Cicero* or other Lives: above p. 82. From general knowledge, or from research for other works: e.g. the digression on the Bona Dea festival, *Caes.* 9.4–8 (perhaps drawn from work for the *Quaestiones Romanae; cf.* 268de); and perhaps such cases as *Ant.* 33.2–4 and 34.9, absent from other ancient narratives of these events, but exploited by Plutarch in *de fortuna Romanorum* (319d–320a).

[145] *Cf.* Gomme 78.

[146] *Cf.* Hamilton xliv. The elder Pliny's studious practice, *nihil enim legit quod non excerperet,* is noted as a peculiarity: Plin. *Ep.* iii 5.10.

[147] *Inst.Or.* x 3.31. In general, *cf.* Roberts, *PBA* xl (1954) 170–75.

[148] In these cases, however, the possibility of marginal

jottings in the main source's account should be considered—very much after the manner of διόρθωσις: this is especially likely with Livy. The elder Pliny may be exceptional, but he not merely *excerpebat* but also *adnotabat* (Plin. *Ep.* iii 5.10), i.e. noted things in a margin, which would be a convenient way of assembling minor divergences, for instance in numbers. Livy's (though not Plutarch's) supplements to his main source are often of this type. But in this case the problems of using two rolls simultaneously would remain, and we should assume either a book-rest or some assistance from a slave. (This note is again indebted to Mr Parsons.)

[149] See Avenarius' collection of parallel passages, *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung* 85–104.

[150] *Cf.* the remarks of Millar, *A Study of Cassius Dio* 33.

into the correct literary style.[151] Plutarch, too, doubtless wrote some sort of ὑπόμνημα before proceeding to the final versions of these Lives, but we cannot know its form. He may have written several ὑπομνήματα, one for each Life, but he may well have preferred to construct just one ὑπόμνημα which would serve for all six works. We should certainly remember this stage of composition when we consider the extreme verbal similarities among the accounts. Some of them are doubtless inherited from Pollio, but the six Lives may also represent elaborations of the same draft, and it would be natural for the language of that draft to leave its mark on each of Plutarch's versions.

On this theory, then, there were three stages. (a) The preliminary reading, which would embrace the whole range of Plutarch's sources. (b) The production of the ὑπομνήματα (or ὑπόμνημα): this would normally be guided by the Pollio-source, but when that account was unsuitable Plutarch might prefer another authority, such as Oppius or Dellius. (c) The writing of the finished versions.

The discussion has so far been simplified in an important respect: for Plutarch would certainly have his slave and freedman assistants. Plin. *Ep.* iii 5, describing how the elder Pliny spent his studious days, shows how greatly he exploited such aides: he would have a *lector* to read to him while he was in the bath, or taking a walk; a *notarius* would be at hand in case he wished to dictate. Pliny was perhaps exceptional, but Plutarch may well have enjoyed some similar assistance. It is likely that much of the first stage, the preliminary reading, was read out *to* Plutarch by a *lector*: we cannot be sure that Plutarch himself read silently, and this procedure might be less time-wasting than it seems.[152] It is likely that any preliminary notes, and then the ὑπόμνημα itself, would be dictated to a slave or freedman; as reading a roll required both hands, dictation would be the most convenient method. It is likely, too, that the final version, after Plutarch had considered it carefully, was dictated as well.[153] And slaves, or more likely freedmen, might prove useful in other ways. Some authors used them very widely: Josephus exploited 'helpers in the Greek language' to aid the production of his final draft.[154] Plutarch did not need ghost writers; but he may certainly have used freedmen as research assistants, to consult the more recherché sources, report interesting stories from them, and perhaps produce epitomes.[155] The sparse traces in the Lives of such writers as Livy and Strabo may well be owed to such helpers. A whole factory of work may lie behind every ancient writer's production, and we should not expect a master to 'acknowledge' his servants' help.[156]

Such helpers would greatly ease the production of the Lives; and, artistically finished and systematically researched though they are, we should not exaggerate the diligence of Plutarch's methods. Time and again, we find signs of hasty production: the awkward intrusion of the item 'which I had forgotten to include in the narrative' in the *Comparison of Nicias and Crassus*; the confusions over the casualty figures or the numbers proscribed; the muddle over Trebonius and Albinus. Sometimes he forgets what he has, or has not, included: at *Brut.* 13.3 he mentions Porcia, who θυγάτηρ μὲν ὥσπερ εἴρηται Κάτωνος ἦν—but he has *not* in fact mentioned this at 2.1, though he doubtless meant to. A different type of example is found in *Cato*, which contrives to describe the triple alliance of B.C. 60 without mentioning Crassus; then Plutarch introduces Crassus into the account of Luca as if his role were quite familiar (41.1). Elsewhere, at *Tim.* 13.10, he refers to a passage in *Dion* which does not exist: he probably meant to include the item in *Dion*, but finally omitted to do so. Other, more trivial, awkwardnesses are frequent: two examples will suffice. At *Caes.* 24.3 he does not make it clear that Κικέρων is Quintus, not Marcus: the reader, or listener, unfamilar with the period would flounder. And at *Ant.* 19.1 the mention of οἱ τρεῖς, coming just after a sentence which links Caesar, Antony, and Cicero, would bemuse an audience which did

---

[151] The following references are drawn from Avenarius, *op. cit.* 85–9. Ammonius, *CIAG* iv 1887, ὑπομνηματικὰ δὲ καλοῦνται ἐν οἷς τὰ κεφάλαια μόνα ἀναγράφονται, suggests a very unfinished version. But there seems to have been a theory that Thuc. viii represents a ὑπόμνημα rather than a final composition (Marc. *vit. Thuc.* 44), which suggests that a ὑπόμνημα could be much more finished; the same impression is given by Jos. *c. Ap.* i 50. Mr Parsons observes that *FGrH* 533 *fr.* 2 may be a ὑπόμνημα: if so, it seems close to its final form.

[152] But, on silent reading, note the cautious remarks of Knox, *GRBS* ix (1968) 421–35.

[153] On dictation, Herescu, *REL* xxxiv (1956) 132–46.

[154] *c. Ap.* i 50; *cf.* H. Thackeray, *Josephus* (1929) 100–24.

[155] *Cf.* Quint. *Inst. Or.* x 1.128, on Seneca: 'ingenium facile et copiosum, plurimum studii, multa rerum cognitio, in qua tamen aliquando ab iis quibus inquirenda quaedam mandabat deceptus est'.

[156] Jones, 84–7, has a sensible and useful discussion of such assistants.

not know of the alliance of Caesar, Antony, and Lepidus.[157] Plutarch's research for these six Lives was systematic, sensible, and quite extensive; but the whole production might still be a comparatively speedy process. Even allowing for the parallel composition of the pairs to each Life, the whole business probably occupied months rather than years.

Finally, I stress that this analysis has been confined to a few Roman Lives; and these anyway provide a special case, for so extensive a use of simultaneous preparation cannot be traced elsewhere. It is not at all clear how much one can generalise from this study to infer his procedures elsewhere, especially in the Greek Lives. Methodical reading was necessary before writing the Roman Lives, but at least some of their Greek counterparts could be produced much more easily. In many Greek instances, particularly those drawn from the fifth century, he might be able to dispense with the preliminary general reading, for he would already be sufficiently familiar with the material. He might still have a historical source before his eyes: in writing *Themistocles*, for instance, he seems to have been heavily dependent on Herodotus and Thucydides. He would certainly still exploit his memory to add supplementary items, but it would be more usual for these to be remembered from years before, and they would often be facts which he had known since his youth. The whole process of composing a fifth-century Life could be far less methodical, and it might be misleading to speak of 'research', or of 'reading *for* a biography', at all.[158] Equally, some of the later Greek Lives—*Philopoemen*, perhaps, or *Timoleon*, or *Pyrrhus*—might be more similar to the Roman biographies: periods where his general knowledge might carry him less far, where more systematic research would be necessary.[159] As so often in the study of the Lives, each group of biographies must have posed different problems, and may have been approached in different ways.[160]

It is perhaps not too ambitious to hope that this study has a more general application. Far too often, we tend to specify 'the source' of a passage, in Plutarch or elsewhere, with no further qualification; yet this tells us little. What sort of source, and how was it used? Was it a work read for the writer by an assistant? Was it a work read some time before, and perhaps noted, in a library? Was it a work read in the preliminary stage of general reading? Or was it before the author's eyes in composition? All these classes of material contribute to Plutarch's work, but all contribute very differently; and, until we know *how* an author used a particular source, we know very little indeed.

C. B. R. PELLING

University College, Oxford

[157] It was understandable that Stegmann, followed by Flacelière, should conjecture ⟨καὶ Λέπιδον⟩ at *Ant.* 19.1; but that is more likely to correct the author than his text.

[158] In such Lives, the picture of Gomme, 77–81, is likely to be more accurate; *cf.* above pp. 74–5.

[159] This point is owed to Mr Russell.

[160] For another aspect of the differences among the Lives, *cf.* Wardman, *CQ* xxi (1971) 254–61.