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Introduction

Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ παρῄνει τὰ περὶ βασιλείας καὶ ἡγεμονίας βιβλία κτᾶσθαι καὶ ἀναγινώσκει· ἃ γὰρ οἱ φίλοι τοῖς βασιλεύσιν οὐ θαρροῦσι παραινεῖν, ταῦτα ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις γέγραπται. ¹

Demetrius of Phalerum recommended to Ptolemy the king to buy and read the books dealing with the office of king and ruler. “For,” as he said, “those things which the kings’ friends are not bold enough to recommend to them are written in the books.”

It was perhaps for this same reason that Plutarch dedicated Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata to Trajan, well aware as he was of the dangers of flattery at the imperial court.² The collection contains 494 apophthegms of the most famous monarchs, lawgivers, and commanders of antiquity (cf. 172C: τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων παρὰ τῇ Ῥωμαίοις καὶ παρ’ Ἕλληναν ἡγεμόνων καὶ νομοθέτων καὶ αὐτοκρατόρον), people with whom the Roman emperor could readily identify. The sayings (and, in fact, also some actions) are grouped together according to historical figures, who are, in turn, arranged by people in line with Plutarch’s threefold division of mankind:³ a first and shorter section presents some barbarians (172E–174F: Persians, Egyptians, Thracians, and Scythians), after which a series of Greeks follows (175A–194E: Sicilians, Macedonians, Athenians, Spartans, and Thebans), and a final part describes the Romans (194E–208A). As a consequence, the work covers a major part of ancient history, including apophthegms from, generally speaking, the Persian Wars until the creation of the Roman Principate and the Pax Romana established by Caesar Augustus (206F–208A).⁴

One might say that Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata occupy a somewhat peculiar position in the Plutarchan oeuvre.⁵ On the one hand, the work is traditionally presented as belonging to the Moralia. This rich part of Plutarch’s oeuvre consists of treatises and dialogues on moral, ethical, metaphysical, or natural philosophical issues; other works reflect

---

¹ Demetrius Phalereus (189D).
² Plutarch discusses the theme of flattery in detail in De ad. et am.
⁴ Only Cyrus (172EF), Peisistratus (189B–D), and the first Spartans (189D–190A) deal with earlier times.
⁵ On the distinction between Moralia and Lives, see Geiger (2008).
an interest in literary theories, antiquarian problems (collections such as *Quaestiones Romanae* and *Quaestiones Graecae*), etc. In terms of its format, the apophthegm collection seems to be the closest to works such as *Coniugalia praeccepta* and *Mulierum virtutes*: the former similarly offers a brief compilation, in this case of pieces of advice for the newlyweds Pollianus and Eurydice, former students of Plutarch addressed by a dedicatory letter (138B–D); in the latter Plutarch tells Clea (a friend of his, as appears from the proem, 242E–243E) a series of more lengthy stories on virtuous women.

In other respects, however, the collection’s content and goals are also quite close to the *Parallel Lives*, the other half of Plutarch’s oeuvre. The dedicatory letter addressed to Trajan with which the work begins (172B–E), introduces the series of apophthegms (172E–208A) as an abbreviation of the biographical project, written specifically for the busy Roman emperor who has no time to peruse the extensive paired *Lives* of Greeks and Romans. Thanks to the collection, so Plutarch states, he will now have the opportunity to familiarize himself with these characters “as clearly as in a mirror” (172D: ὥσπερ ἐν κατόπτροις καθαρῶς, cf. *Aem.* 1.1) and “quickly” (172E: ἐν βραχέσι), for words are the most convenient instrument for the understanding of character (172C–E, cf. *Alex.* 1.2). The letter, then, in several respects reminds one of the prologues to some biographical pairs, and this is partially confirmed by the close connection between the material included in both the *Parallel Lives* and in the apophthegm collection. Yet this is definitely not a one-to-one ratio: some heroes of the former are absent from the latter, whereas many other famous statesmen or generals are the subject of a section in the collection but do not figure in a *Life*. The same goes for the apophthegms, for not every saying in a section on a protagonist is included in his *Life* and vice versa. The dedicatory letter, then, should be read as a programmatic introduction in the first place: *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* are meant to enable the reader, especially the Roman emperor, to gain insight into and to reach a moral assessment of character, in line with the *Parallel Lives*.

---

6 *Apophth. Lac.* are a different case: they present Plutarch’s notes, not meant to be published; see Stadter (2014b).

7 Other works of the *Moralia* that are close to the biographical genre are *Dec. or. vit.* (see infra, note 987 on the questioned authenticity of the work) and *Parall. Graec. et Rom.* (probably inauthentic; see Pace (2018) 44n1 for secondary literature).

8 See Duff (1999) 13–51 on the programmatic proems of the *Parallel Lives*.

9 Roskam (2021) 109: “The goal of the collections of sayings, then, is exactly the same as that of the *Parallel Lives*: they are a project of zetetic moralism. But the collections are also presented as a kind of shortcut.”
Yet there is more in this regard. The evident implication of the letter is that a brief acquaintance with the prominent heroes of Greek and Roman history will also instruct the emperor and guide him in becoming a better ruler. As such, *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* fit within the genre of *specula principum* and could be the only undeniable proof of Plutarch’s attempt as a philosopher to enter into dialogue with a monarch as a Greek advisor in order to improve his reign or perhaps even to transform him into a true philosopher king, an ideal which the author shares with his philosophical *exemplum* Plato. The work, then, is an important source for our understanding of the Chaeronean’s philosophical-political thinking, for his views on the functions of moral *exempla* and exemplary literature (including the *Parallel Lives*), and perhaps even for his self-understanding regarding his place as a Greek public-spirited philosopher in the Roman Empire.

Scholarship, however, paid little attention to the dedicatory letter to Trajan and the apophthegm collection. From the sixteenth century on, editors and commentators expressed doubt about the authenticity of the two parts of the work. In the nineteenth century Richard Volkmann’s harsh assessment, influenced by contemporary views on what good literature should look like, dealt the final blow. The text was largely ignored until Robert Flacelière cautiously turned the tide in 1976. Today, after the introduction of Fuhrmann’s *Budé* edition favouring the genuineness of the work, and especially after Mark Beck’s convincing defence of the dedicatory letter 22 years ago, Plutarch’s authorship is generally accepted, although some scholars still remain sceptical.

Since then some progress has been made. A couple of more recent contributions briefly address the general structure of the collection and the process of composition; others discuss some of its apophthegms or sections – although usually in connection with other accounts of the same or similar stories in Plutarch’s oeuvre and other authors – and in a PhD thesis defended ten years ago Serena Citro provides a new Italian

---

11 Boulet (2005) and (2014) discusses the philosopher king in Plutarch.
12 Xylander (1570) 732; later Wyttenbach (1795) CLIX and (1810) 1039–1042.
13 Volkmann (1869) 210–234.
14 Flacelière (1976).
15 Fuhrmann (1988).
20 Esp. Citro (2019a); (2019b); (2020); (2021).
Though strides have been made lately, previous scholarship has left important questions unanswered. For example, although Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata should serve as a mirror for the emperor (for this is how the dedicatory letter introduces the work, 172D), it is not immediately clear how a series of apparently unconnected apophthegms without much context or authorial comments should instruct a ruler or which lessons are to be drawn from them; nor is it, in line with this first question, obvious how the collection as an exemplary work fits within Plutarch’s oeuvre. This book responds to these gaps, providing a first literary analysis of Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata as a whole, that does full justice to the collection as an independent literary work of art, in order to shed light on the internal cohesion and ideas expressed in the text itself, on the way in which Plutarch wanted Trajan – or any other reader – to approach the work, and, connected with this, on how its protagonists are to be assessed and how they can serve as exempla.

This book consists of three main parts:

1. **Part I** contains three preliminary chapters. (a) The first one not only presents a critical overview of the arguments in support of and against the authenticity of the dedicatory letter to Trajan and the apophthegm collection, but also provides new insights into this *quaestio vexata*. Because none of the claims against authenticity are convincing, and since various stylistic and content-related elements in fact rather prove to support Plutarch’s authorship, it will be concluded that Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata (in their entirety) are a genuine work of the Chaeronean. This chapter, then, builds on previous scholarship, but will also present various new, compelling arguments in order to convince the final sceptics. (b) The second chapter attempts to date the work. An absolute dating is difficult to reach, but a few elements from the letter and the collection seem to point towards the end of Trajan’s reign. In a next step, it is examined whether this conclusion is supported by the relative chronology of the Parallel Lives (a topic that needs reconsideration, cf. Appendix III) and the apophthegm collection. (c) The third chapter briefly discusses Plutarch’s views on the functions of the ‘genre’ of compilations of sayings and anecdotes in general and on the place of Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata in the context of contemporary, early imperial, literature specifically. A comparison with Valerius Maximus

---

21 Citro (2014) discusses the dedicatory letter (172B–E) and Agathocles (176EF), Antipater (183EF), Aristeides (186A–C), Alcibiades (186D–F), Iphicrates (186F–187B), Timotheus (187BC), Phocion (187F, 188B, 188CD), Teleclus (190A), Lysander (190D–F), and Pelopidas (194C–E).
will point out that the Chaeronean truly wrote the collection as a kind of shortcut to the *Parallel Lives* with (an) emperor(s) as its target audience in mind: the work, then, belongs to the ‘genre’ of ‘mirrors of princes’ in the first place, and is closely related to biography.

[2] **Part II**, the core of this book, presents a **literary analysis** of the entire work. It opens with a close reading of the dedicatory letter (172B–E), which has repercussions for the remaining chapters on the collection. (a) It will be argued, indeed, that the letter provides clues about the general structure of the work. This will be followed by a systematic analysis of the collection itself, dividing it into three main parts: a section on monarchs (172E–184F: barbarians, Sicilians, and Macedonians), on the Greeks of the mainland (184F–194E: Athenians, Spartans, and Thebans), and on the Romans (194E–208A). (b) The letter requires a critical and participatory attitude from its readers, who are expected to look for striking tensions inviting them to re-evaluate the characters described at the outset, and this is in line with how the following compilation of apophthegms is to be read. As a consequence, the analysis focuses on the structure and internal cohesion of (the different sections of) the collection in every detail, in order to define how Plutarch depicts the protagonists and to point out that he carefully structured the work to this end.

The literary analysis, then, examines *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* as a text which has a meaning on its own. Other works by Plutarch (or by other authors) are therefore only briefly addressed when they shed light on the plausibility of the interpretation proposed by the analysis, but never on the assumption that the apophthegm collection primarily takes its meaning from other texts.

[3] **Part III** builds on the analysis of Part II and addresses how *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* function as exemplary literature – as ‘a **guide for the emperor**’, so to speak – and how this fits within Plutarch’s overall thinking about *exempla*. It consists of three main chapters that each concern a specific level of interpretation, all of which are again announced by the dedicatory letter (172B–E). Each of these levels reflects a different application of role models. (a) The first chapter discusses the functions of famous individuals (cf. 172C: τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων) as role models and strongly depends on insights about character depiction in the collection (cf. II). (b) The second deals with groups of people or peoples as *exempla* (cf. 172C: παρὰ τε Ῥωμαίοις καὶ παρ᾽ Ἕλλησιν), in line with the more general and less nuanced image of ethnicities (cf. II): this different application of models also serves different goals. (c) The third examines mankind and human history in its entirety (cf. 172C: the notion of σύνταγμα) as a mirror for moral behaviour.

In contrast to Part II, a comparison with other works of Plutarch is of central importance in Part III. I will discuss especially the *Parallel Lives*: Plutarch’s techniques of characterization, the importance of (different
types of) synkrisis, the relevance of his tripartite division of mankind and his views on the ethnic background of historical figures for assessing their moral and political virtue, and his ideas about world history and the dynamics behind historical evolutions are all important aspects that remind one of the biographical project and play a central role in the apophthegm collection as well. Yet, when relevant, I will also address texts of the Moralia, such as De profectibus in virtute and Ad principem ineruditum: the Chaeronean’s exemplary thinking as reconstructed from his oeuvre as a whole, on the one hand, clarifies aspects of Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata as a manual for good rulership; the collection, on the other, deepens our insights into his exemplary thinking and tells us a lot about how he wanted his other works to be read.

In this way I hope to show that Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata are not a poorly composed and incoherent patchwork of sayings and anecdotes, as scholars have long assumed: instead, the text reveals a well-thought-out organization that steers the interpretation of the readers towards conclusions that are often reminiscent of other parts of Plutarch’s oeuvre. It also shows that the author practised what he preached as a Platonist writer, trying to be a supportive teacher for a ruler in his pursuit of becoming the best possible monarch. In short, Plutarch’s Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata are a well-considered and thought-provoking work that should not only activate its readers – in the first place sole rulers – to reflect on moral behaviour of the past, but is also meant to guide them in their personal progress towards virtue.
PART I

PRELIMINARIES
I

Authenticity

The authenticity of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* and the question of whether the work was meant for publication have been heavily debated. Three options have been proposed:

[1] The dedicatory letter to Trajan and the collection are both inauthentic. This was the main position in the nineteenth and twentieth century.

[2] A rather idiosyncratic position is advanced by Saß, who argues that the letter is a forgery, but that the collection was compiled – not published – by Plutarch.

[3] The entire work was written *and published* by Plutarch. Today, this is the dominant view, although there remain sceptics.

If the dedicatory letter is authentic (1.1), there is little reason to reject Plutarch’s authorship of (at least parts of) the apophthegm collection, and this would imply that the entire text was meant to be published (1.2).

1.1 The Dedicationary Letter

Scholars rejected the letter’s authenticity because of its style and content and on the assumption that Plutarch did not know Trajan personally. None of these arguments are convincing, and a close stylometric analysis in fact supports Plutarch’s authorship.


23 Xylander (1570) 732; Wyttenbach (1795) CLIX and (1810) 1039–1042; Volkman (1869) 210–234; Schmidt, C. (1879); Weissenberger (1895); Hartman (1916) 116–117; Ziegler (1951) 864; Nachstädt (1971) 1.

24 Saß (1881) 20–21. Babbitt (1931) 5–6 proposes a similar suggestion.


1.1.1 Writing Style and Content

So sehen wir, dass man in diesem Briefe auf Schritt und Tritt an einer Verkehrtheit im Gedanken oder im Ausdruck hängen bleibt. Der gleichen konnte ein Plutarch nicht schreiben: Er ist das klägliche Machwerk eines unverschämten Falsarius und man begreift nicht, wie Wytenbach sagen konnte, er habe den Ausdruck und den Stil des Plutarch ziemlich gut nachgeahmt.27

Volkmann’s harsh judgement has been the most influential attack against the letter’s authenticity, as he provides the only detailed discussion on its writing style and content. His arguments influenced scholars for more than a century, until Flacelière, Fuhrmann, and Beck demonstrated that none of them are valid.28 The next pages briefly run through these arguments contra and pro authenticity and will shed further light on this issue. The letter reads as follows (172B–E; words in bold support authenticity; words underlined were adduced as arguments against authenticity):

Ἀρτοξέρξης ὁ Περσῶν βασιλεὺς, ὁ μέγιστος αὐτόκρατος Τραϊανὲ Καῖσαρ, οὖχ ἦττον οἰόμενος βασιλικὸν καὶ φιλανθρωπὸν εἶναι τοῦ μεγάλα διδόναι τὸ μικρὰ λαμβάνειν εὐμενῶς καὶ προθύμως, ἔπει παρελαύνοντος αὐτοῦ καθ’ ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ τῶν ἐκείνων ἔτρεχεν ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ταῖς χερσὶν ἀμφοτέρων ὕδωρ ὑπολαβὼν προσήνεγκεν, ἑδέως ἐδέξατο καὶ ἐμειδίασε, τῇ προθυμίᾳ τοῦ διδόντος οὐ τῇ χρείᾳ τοῦ διδομένου τὴν χάριν μετρήσας. ὁ δὲ Λυκούργος εὐτελεστάται ἐποίησεν ἐν Ὁλοκλήρω καὶ ἔμειδίασε, τῇ προθυμίᾳ τοῦ διδόντος οὐ τῇ χρείᾳ τοῦ διδομένου τὴν χάριν μετρήσας. ἐκεῖ καὶ βίους ἔχεις τὸ σύνταγμα τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων παρὰ τε Ῥωμαίως καὶ παρ’ Ἀσσυρίας καὶ Ἐλληνας ἀπαρχὰς προσφέροντος ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας ἀμαμαματός τῆς χρείας ἀπόκειται καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς τιμᾶν ἑτοίμως δύνασθαι καὶ ῥᾳδίως ἀπὸ τῶν παρόντων. τοιαύτη ἄμα τινι γνώμη κάμου λιτά σοι δώρα καὶ ξένια καὶ κοινὰς ἀπαρχὰς προσφέροντος ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας ἀμαματός τῆς χρείας ἀποθεωρεῖν ἐκεῖ καὶ Σειράμνης ὁ Πέρσης πρὸς τοὺς θαυμάζοντας, ὅτι τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ νοῦν ἔχοντων αἱ πράξεις οὐ κατορθοῦνται, τῶν μὲν λόγων κύριος αὐτὸς εἶναι, τῶν δὲ πράξεων τὴν τύχην μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέας. ἓν καὶ Σειράμνης ὁ Πέρσης πρὸς τοὺς θαυμάζοντας, ὅτι τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ νοῦν ἔχοντων αἱ πράξεις οὐ κατορθοῦνται, τῶν μὲν λόγων ἄμα καὶ οἰκονομίας τῶν ἀνδρῶν τὰς πράξεις παρακειμένας

27 Volkmann (1869) 217–218.
Artaxerxes, the king of the Persians, O Trajan, Emperor Most High and Monarch Supreme, used to think that, as compared with giving large gifts, it was no less the mark of a king and a lover of his fellow-men to accept small gifts graciously and with a ready goodwill; and so, on a time when he was riding by, and a simple labourer, possessed of nothing else, took up water from the river in his two hands and offered it to the king, he accepted it pleasantly and with a cheerful smile, measuring the favour by the ready goodwill of the giver and not by the service rendered by the gift. Lycurgus made the sacrifices in Sparta very inexpensive, so that people might be able always to honour the gods readily and easily from what they had at hand. And so, with some such thought in mind, I likewise offer to you trifling gifts and tokens of friendship, the common offerings of the first-fruits that come from philosophy, and I beg that you will be good enough to accept, in conjunction with the author’s ready goodwill, the utility which may be found in these brief notes, if so be that they contain something meet for the true understanding of the characters and predilections of men in high places, which are better reflected in their words than in their actions. True it is that a work of mine comprises the lives also of the most noted rulers, lawgivers, and monarchs among the Romans and the Greeks; but their actions, for the most part, have an admixture of chance, whereas their pronouncements and unpremeditated utterance in connexion with what they did or experienced or chanced upon afford an opportunity to observe, as in so many mirrors, the workings of the mind of each man. In keeping here-with is the remark of Seiramnes the Persian who, in answer to those who expressed surprise because, while his words showed sense, his actions were never crowned with success, said that he himself was master of his words, but chance, together with the King, was master of his actions. In the Lives the pronouncements of the men have the story of the men’s actions adjoined in the same pages, and so must wait for the time when one has the desire to read in a leisurely way; but here the remarks, made into a separate collection quite by themselves, serving, so to speak, as samples and primal elements of the men’s lives, will not, I think, be any serious tax on your time, and you will get in brief compass an opportunity to pass in review many men who have proved themselves worthy of being remembered.
Volkmann regards the following elements as problematic (underlined):

[1] σύνταγμα: “Offenbar will doch der Autor, welcher hier unter Plutarchs Maske spricht, von den Biographien reden. Wie konnte er aber da den Ausdruck σύνταγμα brauchen, was doch nur eine Schrift, ein Buch, niemals aber ein Corpus von Büchern bezeichnet”.

Beck defends the singular: Plutarch regarded the Parallel Lives as one whole, which is in line with recent research that sees connections amongst pairs. In addition, the author mainly uses βιβλίον but never σύνταγμα when referring to a specific pair.

[2] αὐτοκράτορων: “Hat es auch bei den Griechen αὐτοκράτορες schlechthin gegeben?” Volkmann thus interprets αὐτοκράτορων in the meaning of “emperors”. Beck, on the contrary, argues that the word can just as much refer to Greeks, translating it as “rulers”, which is in line with the core meaning of the word. An examination of the 80 occurrences of αὐτοκράτωρ in the Parallel Lives shows that he is correct, but the military context in which it usually appears, suggests that “generals” would be a better translation: (a) in the Greek Lives, the word is often used as an adjective combined with στρατηγός; in three passages it appears on its own in the meaning of “general”, and it sometimes refers to men who are appointed as peace negotiators (with full power); (b) in the Roman Lives too the military context prevails, but only four passages contain the combination αὐτοκράτωρ στρατηγός, while in all other 53 cases αὐτοκράτωρ occurs as a noun. This difference with the Greek

---

29 Volkmann (1869) 216.
33 Volkmann (1869) 217.
35 LSJ, s.v. “αὐτοκράτωρ”: “one’s own master”.
36 αὐτοκράτωρ occurs 46 times in the isolated Lives: in Arat. the military context prevails; in Galba and Oth. it almost always refers to a Roman emperor. In De tuenda 123D the word refers to Titus; in De fort. Rom. 319F it concerns Antony; in De se ipsum laud. 546E it means “generals”; in Praec. ger. reip. 805A it refers to an emperor; De facie 945C uses αὐτοκράτωρ as an adjective; and it occurs five times in Reg. et impr. apophth. 37 Alc. 18.3, 19.5, 33.3; Arist. 11.1; Eum. 5.2; Dion 29.4, 48.4. Similar cases are Arist. 8.1; Nic. 12.6; and Dion 3.3.
38 Nic. 16.7; Dion 33.2; and Comp. Tim. et Aem. 2.7.
39 Phoc. 26.3; three cases in Nic. 10.4–5; three in Alc. 14.6–11.
40 Cor. 27.1; Sert. 11.1; Pomp. 61.1 and 67.7. See Mason (1974) 118 on this usage.
41 Only in Cic. 12.2 does αὐτοκράτωρ occur without a military connection; see Mason (1974) 119 on the passage.
Lives, where it is used mainly as an adjective, can readily be explained: the word often serves as the equivalent of the Latin imperator.\textsuperscript{42}

Almagor, however, is not convinced by Beck and thinks that αὐτοκρατόρων (172C) must have the very same meaning as αὐτόκρατορ in the opening line (172B; “emperor”), where Plutarch addresses Trajan.\textsuperscript{43} Yet the Chaeronean sometimes deliberately gives different meanings to the same word in one text.\textsuperscript{44} Moreover, the double use of αὐτοκράτορ intentionally and subtly connects Trajan with the men about whom he will read (despite these ‘different’ meanings). In that sense, Plutarch’s use of the term αὐτοκρατόρων may well reveal a well-considered authorial strategy.

[3] Σειράμνης ὁ Πέρσης: Volkmann points out that this Persian is unknown: “Einen Perser Σειράμνης kennt Niemand in Alterthum. Was aber diesem hier in den Mund gelegt wird, das ist bei Diodor. XV, 41 ein Ausspruch des Pharnabazus an Iphicrates.”\textsuperscript{45} Yet as Beck notes, this is not a convincing argument against authenticity – if not an argument in favour of authenticity – for it might just be an example of Anekdoten-wanderung (i.e. when the same anecdote is told about different figures).\textsuperscript{46} I add to this that examples of such confusion can also be found in other Plutarchan works whose authenticity has never been questioned: a story about Gorgias in Coniugalia praecepta (144B), for instance, closely resembles an apophthegm about Philip of Macedon told in De adulatore

\textsuperscript{42} See Mason (1974) 118 for this and other usages of the word, and for examples in Plutarch and other authors.

\textsuperscript{43} Almagor (2018) 272.

\textsuperscript{44} In Con. praec. 138B Plutarch plays with two meanings of νόμος: (1) “usage, custom” and (2) “melody”, see LSJ, s.v. “νόμος”.

\textsuperscript{45} Volkmann (1869) 217. A TLG search for this name or for possible variations (e.g. Σιράμνης and Σεράμνης) returns no results. Consulting Fraser – Matthews (1987) does not lead to any results either, but Justi (1895) s.v. “Σειράμνης” suggests that Seiramnes is in any case a possible name for a Persian. Various attempts have been made to identify Seiramnes: (1) Wyttenbach (1810) 1042: “Persicum nomen alterius, ut videtur, hominis Σισάμνης apud Herodotum V. 25. VII. 65. Voss. dat Σείσαμνος; Harl. et Jun. plenus ἤ καὶ Σεισάμνης ὁ Π.” (Froben (1542) 126 reads Σειράμνης; Wyttenbach must refer to a note of Hadrianus Junius, cf. Wyttenbach (1795) CXLIX; see Wesseling (2011) 254 on this book). The general of VII.65 is a more likely candidate than the corrupt judge of V.25. Broadhead (1960) 318–319 suggests that Σησάμας in Aeschylus’ Persae 322 could be the same name (not necessarily the same person) as Σισάμνης. (2) Müller, K. (1851) s.v. “Σεμηρώνιος Babylonius” argues that the Persian author Semeronius (mentioned in Chronicum Paschale) should perhaps be identified as Seiramnes; Justi (1895) s.v. “Σεμηρώνιος” disagrees.

et amico (70C) and the Life of Alexander (9.12–14), which occurs in the
collection as Philippus XXXI (179BC).47

[4] σχολάζουσαν φιληκοίαν: Volkmann here ignores the rhetorical
and programmatic function of the letter, writing: “als ob das nicht auch
vor der vorliegenden Apophthegmensammlung, ja von jedwedem Bu-
che gelte, das man nicht zur Arbeit, sondern zur Erholung in die Hand
nimmt.”48 Yet Plutarch defends the raison d’être of Regum et imper-
atorum apophthegmata: he already wrote some Parallel Lives, so the
reader might wonder why a collection of sayings would still be of any
use. The explanation is that the busy Roman emperor does not have the
amount of σχολάζουσαν φιληκοίαν which the Parallel Lives require. A
short compilation will solve his problem. We may note that this is not
the only instance where Plutarch defends the usefulness of a collection.
His words indeed recall the prefatory letter to Coniugalia praeccepta. Re-
cently Pollianus and Eurydice married. They were students of Plutarch,
so they might wonder why they would be in need of advice which they
had already heard. The author thus argues that his collection of pieces of
advice can more easily be remembered (138C).49

Volkmann’s remaining arguments concern expressions and ideas that
are, in fact, typical of Plutarch and will therefore be addressed below.
The following elements (highlighted in bold above) support Plutarch’s
authorship (in order of importance; some of the most compelling argu-
ments have not been made before):

[1] The Artaxerxes and Lycurgus apophthegms: two apophthegms
occur at the outset of the letter (172BC). These are also told in other works
of Plutarch, in very similar wording.50 A forger could have been familiar
with these passages, but there are two minor changes to the Artaxerxes
apophthegm that must stem from Plutarch’s pen: (a) according to TLG,
the combination εὐμενῶς καὶ προθύμως instead of mere προθύμως in the
Life of Artaxerxes (4.4–5.1) can be found in only one other ancient Greek

47 Several apophthegms in Apophth. Lac. are also told about different Spartans, see
Appendix II.3.
this point of criticism.
49 See chapter 1.2.1 for more similarities with Con. praec.; for the variety of common-
places in this collection, see Hawley (1999); Harvey (1999) 200–206 provides a bibliog-
raphy on the work.
50 Part II, chapter 1.3 provides a detailed comparison of the passages.
work, viz. Plutarch’s *De fraterno amore* (479F);\(^5\) (b) of the ten instances of οὐχ ἦττον οἴομαι in TLG, six are from Plutarch.\(^2\)

\[2\] *ei πρόσφορον ἐξει τι πρός:* a search for this phrase gives only three relevant results, all of them in Plutarch.\(^5\) The first one is the occurrence in the letter (172C); the other works are *De facie quae in orbe lunae apparent* (928C) and *De latenter vivendo* (1128E).

\[3\] *ἀποθεωρεῖν and ἀναθεώρησιν:* in studying the use of *ἀποθεωρεῖν* in Greek literature, Roskam concludes that it occurs primarily in Plutarch. The combination with ἀναθεώρησις at the end of the letter also appears typical of the author.\(^5\) This is indeed “a strong indication” of the letter’s authenticity.\(^5\)

\[4\] *κατανόησιν ἡθῶν:* this or similar combinations can be found in eight Greek works. Five of them (*Reg. et imp. apophth.* included) are attributed to Plutarch.\(^5\)

\[5\] *τοὺς λόγους ... ὡς περὶ δείγματα τῶν βίων καὶ σπέρματα:* Volkman criticizes this sentence as being incomprehensible,\(^5\) but Beck points out that *De curiositate* (516C) contains the same expression in a similar context.\(^5\)

\[6\] *κοινὰς ἀπαρχάς ... ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας:* “Apophthegmen gehen weder von Philosophie aus, noch sind es gemeinsame Erstlinge”, Volkman argues.\(^5\) Yet (a) this is a reference to Plato’s *Protagoras*;\(^6\) (b) moreover, Plutarch also compares his dialogue *De E apud Delphos* with ἀπαρχαί...

---

\(^5\) A TLG proximity search for lemmata εὐμενῶς and προθύμως (after first word) [within 5 words]. I am grateful to Bram Demulder for sharing this observation with me.

\(^6\) A TLG advanced proximity search for WI: οὐ; WI: ἦττον (after first word); and lemma: οἴομαι (after first word) [within two words] lists for Plutarch: *Ca. Mi.* 37.10; *Reg. et imp. apophth.* 172B; *Apophth. Lac.* 208D; *Mul. virt.* 262D; *De E* 386C; *Quaest. conv.* 731B. Almagor (2018) 179, however, argues that the change οἰόμενος (172B) – φαινόμενος (Art. 4.4) would be atypical of Plutarch.

---

\(^5\) A TLG proximity search for lemmata εἰ; πρόσφορον, -οῦ, τό (after first word); ἔχω (after first word) [within 15 words] gives 13 results; only two of them have a construction similar to *Reg. et imp. apophth.* 172C.

\(^5\) Roskam (2014) 182–183. The implications of this will be discussed in the literary analysis of the letter.


---

\(^5\) A TLG proximity search for lemmata κατανόησις, -εως, -ή; and ἡθος, -οῦς, τό (near first word) [within five words] lists for Plutarch: *Nic.* 1.5; *Pomp.* 37.1; *Ca. Mi.* 37.10; *Reg. et imp. apophth.* 172C; *Praec. ger. reip.* 799B.

\(^5\) Volkman (1869) 217.


\(^5\) Volkman (1869) 217.

\(^5\) Beck, M. (2002) 165. The implications of this reference are discussed in the literary analysis.
(384E), and a similar usage is met in Adversus Colotem (1117DE); (c) and the metaphor matches the context of the letter, where it connects the relationship between Plutarch and Trajan with the apophthegm on Lycurgus and the offerings in Sparta.

[7] **Juxtapositions of content-related words:** a high frequency of such pairs – at least six per Stephanus page but preferably more – can be an argument in favour of Plutarch’s authorship. The letter does not even take up an entire Stephanus page (172B–E), yet it contains more than six of these pairs.

[8] **A typical prologue:** the letter not only presents Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata as a shortened version of the Parallel Lives, but also closely resembles the prologues to some pairs in terms of its general structure and content: (a) the mirror comparison (ὡς περ ἐν κατόπτροις καθαρῶς) recalls the prologue to Aemilius–Timoleon; (b) and the notion that words reflect character more than deeds reminds one of the first chapter of the Life of Alexander. One should evidently keep the specific context of this prologue in mind, but the argument that words may be a better instrument for the understanding of a character than big actions indeed occurs elsewhere in Plutarch.

[9] **ὁ μέγιστε αὐτόκρατορ Τραϊανὲ Καῖσαρ:** on the basis of a Delphic inscription in Latin and Greek, Beck argues that μέγιστος αὐτοκράτωρ was in Plutarch’s times a correct Greek equivalent for optimus princeps, one of Trajan’s titles.
1.1.2 Plutarch and Trajan

According to Schmidt, the main argument against authenticity is that Plutarch did not know Trajan personally.\textsuperscript{71} There are two problems with his position. On the one hand, Plutarch’s personal acquaintance with the emperor is irrelevant for the question of authenticity. If Plutarch did not know Trajan, it is not inconceivable that he attempted to get in touch with him. As Stadter writes, there had been Greeks before Plutarch who became important counsellors of Roman emperors, so his letter could “be a tangible sign of the Chaeronean’s effort to establish a similar intimacy with a reigning emperor”.\textsuperscript{72} Or he might just have wanted to dedicate a work to Trajan which could help him become a better ruler, without really aspiring to a function at the imperial court; this entirely fits his philosophy.\textsuperscript{73} Additionally, there are no indications that Valerius Maximus was an associate of Tiberius either (and this even seems rather unlikely since he was probably of low birth), but he still dedicated \textit{Facta et dicta memorabilia}, a collection similar to \textit{Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata}, to him.\textsuperscript{74}

On the other hand, it is not impossible that Plutarch was indeed in contact with Trajan, at least to a certain extent. Jones, even though he does not accept the letter’s authenticity, assumes that Plutarch would definitely have pleased Trajan with his literary works and considers the note in the \textit{Suda} that Plutarch received the \textit{ornamenta consularia} from the emperor to be reliable.\textsuperscript{75} The Chaeronean was also a good friend of Sosius Senecio (\textit{consul ordinarius} in 99 and 107 to whom he dedicated the \textit{Parallel Lives}, \textit{Quaestiones convivales}, and \textit{De profectibus in virtute}) and knew many other acquaintances of the emperor.\textsuperscript{76} Finally, Plutarch

\begin{footnotes}
\item[71] Schmidt, C. (1879) 10–14. Rawson (1989) 250–251 points out that it was at least assumed in later times that there were contacts between Plutarch and Trajan. \textit{Reg. et imp. apophth.} might be responsible for this, see Schmidt, C. (1879) 73. Jones, C. P. (1966) 63–66, Swain (1991), and Bowie (1997) discuss possible connections between Hadrian and Plutarch.
\item[72] Stadter (2012b) 95 (= (2015) 208); cf. how Duff (2008c) 10–11 reads the dedication of the \textit{Parallel Lives} to Sosius Senecio.
\item[74] See chapter 3 for a comparison of \textit{Reg. et imp. apophth.} and \textit{Facta et dicta memorabilia}; and infra, note 210 on Valerius’ origins.
\item[76] Stadter (2002a) 11: “If Beck’s argument is correct, the letter not only provides us evidence for a relationship of some sort between the two men (perhaps distant, or through an intermediary, a common friend such as Senecio), but a valuable indication of how Plutarch hoped that his work would be read by the elite of the empire.” On Plutarch’s influential
\end{footnotes}
was a priest of Delphi: it seems therefore probable that Trajan at least knew of his existence.\textsuperscript{77}

1.1.3 Conclusion

There are no internal or external reasons to question the authenticity of the dedicatory letter to Trajan. On the contrary: various expressions and ideas occur elsewhere in the Chaeronean’s oeuvre and almost exclusively there, sometimes even in only one or a few other works. No forger, as skilled as he or she might have been, could have imitated Plutarch’s writing style in such detail. It is also far from unlikely that Plutarch, as a Platonist writer, tried to instruct a ruler, even in the (rather improbable) case that the emperor had never heard of him.

1.2 The Collection

Various strong arguments favour the authenticity of the collection and prove that it was meant to be published: (1) the authenticity of the letter (cf. 1.1); (2) the well-thought-out structure of the collection (cf. Part II),\textsuperscript{78} reflecting insights in line with Plutarch’s views on the functions of exempla and exemplary literature (cf. Part III); and (3) the relative chronology of the work and the Parallel Lives (cf. 2.2; this is a more speculative argument, but a certain pattern can be noted). All of this has been or will be addressed in the remainder of this book. This chapter therefore only discusses the main arguments against the authenticity of the collection: scholars have denied Plutarch’s authorship on the basis of the number of cases of hiatus (1.2.1) and the origins of the apophthegms (1.2.2). Less important arguments will be briefly addressed throughout the analysis.

1.2.1 Hiatus

The apophthegms of the collection are said to contain more hiatus than is usually met in Plutarch\textsuperscript{79} – although it is not clear how much is ‘too

\textsuperscript{77} Fuhrmann (1988) 9: “On ne sait s’il a jamais rencontré cet empereur, mais il est sûr que celui-ci connaissait au moins de réputation le philosophe de Chéronée et qu’il honorait en lui le prêtre d’Apollon”. See furthermore Stadter (2014a) 20–21 about Trajan’s interest in Delphi. Two letters to Delphi suggest that the emperor was committed to the oracle, but Flacelière (1976) 97 considers them a mere formality.

\textsuperscript{78} Cf. Fuhrmann (1988) 4 on the geographical and chronological ordering principles in the work.

\textsuperscript{79} The dedicatory letter does not contain true hiatus: in the case of μέγιστε αὐτόκρατο (172B) and ἅμα αἱ (172D) an apostrophe is to be added; see Benseler (1841) 437. The same
much’, as a result of which the amount of *hiatus* in a work is never an absolutely valid argument against authenticity.\(^{80}\) (a) Benseler suggests emending problematic passages in the apophthegm collection when possible, as he does with other Plutarchan works he deems authentic.\(^{81}\) This practice, also defended by Ziegler, is adopted by others with regard to the entire oeuvre.\(^{82}\) Yet the method is not without risk. Although many conjectures make sense, various *hiatus* probably do stem from Plutarch and can be either the consequence of negligence – because he did not deem it that important\(^{83}\) – or are stylistically motivated.\(^{84}\) (b) Volkmann, however, regards the 54 *hiatus* he counts in the apophthegm collection as a strong argument against its authenticity.\(^{85}\) The sheer number may look impressive. However, his list contains several disputable cases:

[1] As Benseler points out, a certain amount of *hiatus* is allowed in direct quotations.\(^{86}\) Volkmann lists 28 such cases.\(^{87}\)

---

\(^{80}\) On *hiatus* in Plutarch, see Benseler (1841) 314–548; Weissenberger (1895) 18–20 (on *Sept. sap. conv.*, also listing cases where *hiatus* is allowed); Schellens (1864) (esp. for the *Moralia*); Ziegler (1951) 932–935; Swain (1996) 137.

\(^{81}\) Benseler (1841) 314–394 deals with *hiatus* in the *Lives*; 394–548 concerns the *Moralia*; 436–440 discusses *Reg. et imp. apophth.*: some conjectures are convincing, others might be correct but are far from certain.

\(^{82}\) Sintenis (1846) 323–358 emends many *hiatus* in the *Lives*; Ziegler (1951) 934–935 agrees with this methodology.

\(^{83}\) As appears from *Bellone an pace* 350E; see Weissenberger (1895) 18.

\(^{84}\) E.g. Hutchinson (2018) 229 argues that the *hiatus* in *Pomp.* 74.3 (“ὁ ὁρῶ σ’” εἶπεν “ἀνερ […]”) should not be elided because of the rhythmic ending.

\(^{85}\) Volkmann (1869) 231–234, followed by Weissenberger (1895) 60.

\(^{86}\) Benseler (1841) 436–437 (on 173F): “videor mihi consilium Dionysii ab ipso his verbis expressi reperisse. Quod si est, hiatus non offendit”.

\(^{87}\) 176D: φιλοσοφία ὑφέλης; 176F: μοι ὃ; 177Β: ἐμε ἐίναι; 178Β: βασίλεια, αὐτόν; 179Β: ἐκαθεθοῦσθ’ ὑμεῖς (because an apostrophe can be added, there is in fact no *hiatus*); 181Β: κεκτημένοι οὐ; 181D: δοκεῖ ὁ ἄνθρωπος; 186Ε: εὐθύς ἐίναι (the edition used by Volkmann has εὔθυς ἐίναι); 187F: σκεπτομένον, ὁ Φοκίον; 189C: μου ἀρέσκης; 189Ε: κόμη ὑπερεπετέρσους; 189F: το, σε (Volkmann reads τεῦ εἰ); 190C: πόσοι εἰσίν, ἀλλὰ ποῦ εἰσίν; 190D: ὁ τὸν ἀνομοιότατος (Volkmann reads τὸν ἀνομοιότατος); 190Ε: ἐφικνεῖται ἥ; 193Ε: πολέμου ὀρχήστραν; 194D: δεδεμένη ὑπομένει Ἀλέξανδρον; 195Α: σοῦ ἐθελήσωσιν; 196Α: κόμη εὐπρεπεστέρους; 197D: Σύροι ὁπλαρίος; 198F: τί ἀνδριάς; 200D: ἑκάστου ἀρετῆς; 204Α: ἐμαυτῷ αὐτοκράτορι; 204D: πεινατικοῦ ἐμετικὸς; 205C: σοὶ ἐστιν; 206Β: ἐνταῦθα ἐίναι. One can add 173F (χρυσίου οὐκ), in line with Benseler (1841)
[2] In five of Volkmann’s cases (two of which are part of a saying), hiatus should be disregarded because there is a pause between two vowels.  

[3] At least two of Benseler’s emendations of hiatus listed by Volkmann are to be accepted.

I count 20 remaining cases in the Teubner edition of Nachstädt, or 0.56 per Stephanus page. A comparison with Plutarch’s Contiugalia praecerta shows that this number is not excessively high. This work is quite similar in content and format to Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata. It is a collection of pieces of advice in the form of anecdotes, customs of peoples, and poetic and philosophical quotes, introduced by a letter (138B–D) as a gift for two former students of Plutarch who, like Trajan, might have wondered why they should need this kind of instruction.

436: “in promissis Cyri continebantur, qua de causa non poterant mutari”; and 175F (παύσωνται οἱ Συρακόσιοι), again cf. Benseler.

88 Benseler (1841) 436–437 lists 173D: Ξέρξου, ὁ; 187F: οὐτε γελών ὁφθη οὔτε διάκρινω (not listed by Volkmann); 195A: γενομένοι, ἐπετραφείς (not listed by Volkmann); 198C: ἐτι, ἀπέθανεν. One can add 178F: βασιλεύ, αὐτόν (also part of a saying); 187F: σκεπτομένῳ, ὦ Φωκίων (also part of a saying); 193F: ἐρη ἔνταθα.  

89 (1) On Gaius Fabricius I (194F: Λαβιήνῳ εἶπεν, but Λαιβῖνον’ εἶπε in Nachstädt (1971), which makes more sense), see Benseler (1841) 438. (2) Volkmann reads τὴν ἑβδόμην· διὸ ὀργισθείς in Augustus XIV (207F), but Nachstädt (1971) 109 omits διό, in line with some manuscripts. The suggestion of Benseler (1841) 439 might be better: “offendit διὸ in apodosis conjicioque διοργισθεῖς (v. Agesil. c. VI.) fuisse scriptum”.  

90 174D: ξένῳ ἔδωκε; 175A: ἐπεὶ ἐθορύβησαν; 177C: μὴ ἡμὲρας; 180F: αὐλητοῦ ἐρώμενον; 181A: ἐπεὶ οὖν; 181B: καικτημένοι οὖν; 185A: οὐκέτι ἤν; 187B: παλαιὸν Ἀρμοդίου ἀπόγονον (2 hiatus); 189D: ἀγωνίζεσθαι ἐκόλουθον; 190C: μὴ ἡμέρας; 190D: αὐτὸ ἐτέρον; 195B: Πυρροῦ ἰατρὸν; 196C: αὐτῷ ἐνόπλους; 197B: γενομένοι ἐν; 200D: ἐκείνῳ ἐπερατεῖσθαιν; 202C: χωρίῳ ὀλίγον; 205B: τι εἰπόντα; 207B: ἐκείνῳ ἐξημαρτηκέναι. Volkmann counts three more hiatus: two in 191D (Ἰςοί ἄγωνισάμενοι ἐνίκησαν; Nachstädt (1971) has ἴσοις ἄγωνισάμενοι ἐνίκησαν, cf. the manuscripts) and one in 200C (ἤκεινῳ, ἔξηματήθησαν; Nachstädt (1971): ἴσειν ἔξηματήθησαν). Volkmann also mentions a hiatus in 192EF, but I could not find this one. Benseler (1841) 439 counts 17 remaining hiatus (besides four cases for which he could not find a satisfactory emendation).

91 The apophthegm part of Reg. et imp. apoph. (172E–208A[first half]) spans 35.5 Stephanus pages.

92 Apophth. Lac. were probably not meant to be published (cf. Stadter (2014b) 666–674); in Mul. virt., Plutarch claims to tell unknown stories (227D): these are much more elaborate than brief apophthegms.

93 See Pomeroy (1999) 42–43 on these students (McNamara (1999) 160 points out that the majority of the advice concerns women); on Con. praec. as a gift for the addressees, see Patterson (1992) 4714 and (1999) 131.
Leaving the letter aside, I found 22 instances of *hiatus* in the text. Twelve of them occur in a saying;\(^9^4\) one has a pause between the vowels;\(^9^5\) two are not true *hiatus* as an apostrophe is to be added.\(^9^6\) There remain five cases;\(^9^7\) or 0.67 per Stephanus page.\(^9^8\) Thus, the apophthegm collection and *Coniugalia praeccepta* have about one *hiatus* per two pages.\(^9^9\)

### 1.2.2 The Origins of the Apophthegms

Scholars have put forward four relevant possibilities concerning the origins of the collection:

[1] According to Volkmann, there is no connection between *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* and the rest of Plutarch’s work.\(^1\)\(^0\) Yet about 62% of the collection’s apophthegms occurs in other works of the Chaeronean,\(^1\)\(^1\) often in strikingly similar wording.\(^1\)\(^2\) This is a large number, even more so since about half of the oeuvre is lost.\(^1\)\(^3\) Additional-
ly, when only taking into account sections on protagonists about whom Plutarch wrote an extant Life, the percentage rises to about 85%.104

[2] Wyttenbach suggests that a forger took the apophthegms from Plutarch’s published works.105 This cannot be the case, as appears from stories of the collection that occur in at least two other texts of the Chaeronean. Beck has shown this in the case of apophthegms that are also told in one of Plutarch’s declamations and in the Parallel Lives,106 but a clearer example is Philippus XX (178D).107

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἐπεὶ δὲ ὑπὸ τινὸς</td>
<td>ἄνθρωπος αὐτὸν (sc.</td>
<td>τὸν βασιλέα Φίλιππον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ξένου κληθείς ἐπὶ</td>
<td>Philip) ἐπὶ χώρας ὡς σὺν</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας ἣκε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δεῖπνον ἐν ὅδῷ πολλοὺς</td>
<td>ὁ λίγος ὡς σὺν νομίζει</td>
<td>γὰρ ἀγνὸν πολλοὺς, τὸ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπῆρετο (sc. Philip)</td>
<td>παρεκκλάσθησεν, εἰτα</td>
<td>δὲ δεῖπνον ὡς πολλοῖς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ τὸν ξένον ἡμέρα</td>
<td>ὅρθων πολλοὺς ἄγοντα</td>
<td>ἦν παρεκκλάσθησεν∙</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θορυβούμενον (ἂν</td>
<td>παρεσκευασμένον ὡς</td>
<td>ιδὸν ὄν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γὰρ ὁ θυρίσκων ὑπὸ τὰ</td>
<td>πολλὸν ἐταράττετο.</td>
<td>θορυβούμενον τὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρεσκευασμένα),</td>
<td>συναισθόμενος ὑμῖν ὁ</td>
<td>ξένον περιέλθησε δρόμος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσπέμπων τὸν</td>
<td>Φίλιππος ὑπὲρείπον τὸν</td>
<td>τοῦ φίλου ἔπεμψε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φίλον ἡμέρα</td>
<td>φίλον ἡμέρα</td>
<td>καταληπτέων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πλακοῦντι χώραν</td>
<td>πλακοῦντι καταληπτέων</td>
<td>χώραν πλακοῦντι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκέλεμον ἀπολείπεται</td>
<td>καὶ πειθόμενοι καὶ</td>
<td>καταληπτέων κελέων∙</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἱ δὲ πειθόμενοι καὶ</td>
<td>προσδοκόντες ἡρκεσεν</td>
<td>οἱ δὲ προσδοκόντες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσδοκόντες ὑμῖν</td>
<td>ἡρκεσεν</td>
<td>ὑπὲρείποντο τὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἦσθιον πολλά, καὶ</td>
<td>o ὑπὲρείπον</td>
<td>παρακειμένον καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πᾶσιν οὕτως ἢρκεσεν.</td>
<td>ἡρκεσεν</td>
<td>πᾶσιν οὕτως ἢζηρκεσε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178D</td>
<td>Quaest. conv. 707B</td>
<td>De tuenda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

omits some genuine books that survive; on the other hand it includes some extant spuria, so that we must conclude that some of the unknowns may be spurious also”; see also Barrow (1967) 193: “also we know indirectly of 15 works which we have not got and which are not included in the Lamprias Catalogue”. It is also possible that the Lamprias catalogue contains doublets in some cases (cf. supra, note 118).

104 Cf. Appendix II.1.

105 Wyttenbach (1795) CLIX (also on Apophth. Lac.); also Hartman (1916) 116–117, based on two arguments: ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὄντα περιέλθησεν τοῦ καταληπτοῦ χώραν, οἱ δὲ πειθόμενοι καὶ προσδοκόντες ἡρκεσεν 178D–178E (this argument is rejected in the literary analysis on the passage) and a difference between Cato Maior XXV (199D: ὅς φησι) – Ca. Ma. 10.3 (αὐτὸς δὲ φησιν ὁ κάτων), although ὅς φησι can still mean that Cato himself spoke the words (cf. the LCL translation).


107 Schmidt, C. (1879) 59–65 argues that in cases such as Philippus XX the Reg. et imp. apophth. version and the other versions were based on older collections.
The wording in A, B, and C is similar (italics). Since A contains one set of elements that also occur in B, and another set corresponding to C (bold), it is unlikely that A is based on either B or C. Appendix II.3 provides an overview of many similar cases: due to the size of Plutarch’s oeuvre, it would be absurd to explain all of them as contaminations (let alone as a mere coincidence): this would mean that a forger would have had to compare all accounts of all apophthegms in all of Plutarch’s works in order to write the collection.

[3] Another possibility would be that Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata represent Plutarch’s notes, similar to Apophthegmata Laconica, not meant to be published. Yet as Philippus XX shows (and similar cases in Appendix II.3), it seems rather unlikely that A was the source of B and C, for B and C share elements absent from A (underlined). Theoretically, there are many options, but the most probable one is that A, B, and C go back to the same source – one compiled by Plutarch, as Pelling thinks.

[4] Recent scholarship therefore argues that the apophthegms in the collection are based on Plutarch’s notes, which were also used for his other texts, and that the work was meant to be published. Stadter and Pelling have a different view on the nature of such notes, but this issue

---

108 In light of this, see also Stadter (2014b) 676: “It is improbable that the anecdotes are simply excerpts from the Lives, since the collection contains anecdotes for men not found in the Lives, and skips anecdotes in the Lives.” Pelling (2002) 70–83 bases his arguments on the content of the stories in Reg. et imp. apophth. and the Lives.

109 Also Schmidt, C. (1879) 61–62 on Philippus XX: “Iaque si ex ipso Plutarcho eum hausisse statues, facere non poteris, quin ἀπ. ex duobus locis conflatum esse contendas. Quod certe abhorret a verisimilitudine”.


111 Cf. Beck, M. (2003) 187, based on a comparison of the declamations, the Lives, and Reg. et imp. apophth.: “In three cases, when three points of comparison were possible, one version did diverge significantly from the other two. In each of these three cases, however, a different work was found to be divergent from the other two.”

112 Pelling (2002) 71 rejects that the collection and the Lives coincidentally share sources, so they must be “based on something else. […] Plutarch would hardly follow anyone else’s words so closely and so regularly as we would have to assume. It is better to think of this ‘something else’ as some large-scale gathering of material by Plutarch himself, and that presumably points to some sort of preparation or note-taking.” See also Stadter (2014b) 670.

will be addressed in chapter 2, as it has no immediate relevance to the authenticity.¹¹⁴

Thus, the relationship between *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* and any other part of Plutarch’s oeuvre is not fundamentally different from that between, for instance, *De cohibenda ira* and the *Life of Alexander*. This is the case for the collection in its entirety (as appears from Appendix II), so there are no indications that the work went through different phases of composition and review. In short, there is no reason to doubt the collection’s authenticity.¹¹⁵

### 1.3 Conclusion

The dedicatory letter to Trajan is entirely in line with Plutarch’s writing style and philosophy, to an extent that seems inimitable. Arguments against the collection are mostly related to the nature of the work and seem to be influenced by modern convictions about what good literature looks like: it was thought that Plutarch, a literary genius, could not have written such a simple text containing various instances of *hiatus*, let alone that he dedicated it to a Roman emperor (whom he might have never met). Yet as *Coniugalia praecepta* shows, the Chaeronean indeed “regarded such a collection as a sensible artistic thing to do”,¹¹⁶ and the parallel of Valerius Maximus’ *Facta et dicta memorabilia* (cf. chapter 3) illustrates that an emperor would not have been offended by such a ‘simple’ gift. This is *a fortiori* the case with *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*: it would rather have been an honour for Trajan to receive a work from the famous priest of Delphi, who, in imitation of his *exemplum* Plato, attempted to educate his ruler.

---

¹¹⁴ Pelling (2002) 65–90; Stadter (2014b). Such notes are, as Stadter (2015) 128 puts it, different from “the philosophical hypomnemata well documented by the *Repetita plac­cent* project headed by Luc van der Stockt”. On these *hypomnemata*, see Van der Stockt (1999a), (1999b), (2002), (2004a), (2004b), and (2014); Van Meirvenne (2002); Xenophon­tos (2012b) and (2013); Demulder (2022), *passim* in chapter 5.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Pelling (2002) 85: the “collector was much more likely to be Plutarch: the person who knows his way best about his notes and drafts is always the author himself.”

¹¹⁶ As Pelling (2002) 85 puts it with regard to *Reg. et imp. apophth.*
2 Dating

Even the fiercest sceptics about the authenticity of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* cannot but agree that the work dates from the second or third century at the latest: Aelian might have made use of the collection in his *Varia historia*, which would suggest a dating not later than the second century;\(^{117}\) the third- or fourth-century Lamprias catalogue mentions the work;\(^{118}\) a third- or fourth-century papyrus (*P. Oxy.* 78 5155) contains a part of the text, which, as Schmidt puts it, suggests “early circulation”;\(^{119}\) the collection was consulted by Stobaeus;\(^{120}\) and it was known as a Plutarchan work by Sopater of Apamea.\(^{121}\) This chapter attempts to reach a more precise dating in the author’s lifetime, in light of the dedicatory letter to Trajan and the connection with the *Parallel Lives*.

2.1 Absolute Dating

A few elements from the dedicatory letter to Trajan are relevant for fixing an absolute dating of the work. The reference to the *Parallel Lives* (172C) provides a first *terminus post quem*, if Jones is correct that the biographies were composed after 96.\(^{122}\) In addition, Plutarch refers to his *Parallel Lives* as a coherent *project* (172C: σύνταγμα). This suggests that he had already written a significant number of biographical pairs, as

\(^{117}\) Schmidt, C. (1879) 68–74; Ziegler (1951) 864, however, is not convinced.

\(^{118}\) Definitely no. 108 (*Ἀποφθέγματα ήγεμονικά, στρατηγικά, τυραννικά*) and perhaps no. 125 (*Ἀπομνημονεύματα*; in my view, this is probably a lost work); see Nachstädt (1971) 1; Fuhrmann (1988) 3; Citro (2014) 1–2.


\(^{120}\) Saß (1881) 19–20; Babbitt (1931) 5; Ziegler (1951) 864; Nachstädt (1971) 1.

\(^{121}\) Nachstädt (1971) 1.

\(^{122}\) Jones, C. P. (1966) 70; see also Roskam (2021) 91. Delvaux (1995) 97, however, argues that the project was composed around 110–115: (1) *Sull.* 21.8 (*Lys.–Sull.* is the fourth pair in his scheme [105]) mentions that the battle of Orchomenus (86BC) took place about (σχεδόν) two hundred years ago; and (2) Sosius Senecio died around 116. Yet σχεδόν is vague, and the project might have continued after Sosius’ death. In addition, a second person singular does not necessarily refer to Sosius (*pace* Jones, C. P. (1966) 69; Delvaux (1995) 97), but might address any reader: only the pairs calling the Roman by name (*Dem.* 1.1, *Thes.* 1.1, *Dion* 1.1) certainly predate 116; the same goes for *Per.–Fab.*, predating *Dion–Brut.* (see Appendix III).
will be confirmed by the relative chronology of the biographies and the collection (chapter 2.2). Thus, since Plutarch never finished this project, *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* were probably compiled closer to his death around 120 than to ca. 96.\textsuperscript{123} The dedication to the emperor Trajan narrows this period down: in light of the reference to the *Lives*, one expects a dating close to 117, as argued by Citro.\textsuperscript{124}

An additional, but less decisive, element is in line with this. Plutarch often avoids explicit references to current affairs,\textsuperscript{125} but he does not always refrain from using allusions.\textsuperscript{126} The same goes for the apophthegm collection, as the work might refer to Trajan’s conquests. Beck regards the two Persian apophthegms in the dedicatory letter as possible allusions to the emperor’s campaign against the Parthians.\textsuperscript{127} Interestingly, the collection’s first three major sections present not only the Persians (172E–174B), but also the Thracians and Scythians (174C–F, belonging together):\textsuperscript{128} if the first indeed call the Parthian expedition to mind, the second group might allude to the Dacian wars.\textsuperscript{129} As a consequence, the opening sections include peoples that were part of the Roman Empire after Trajan’s conquests. Additionally, the overall focus on the concept of *imitatio Alexandri* (discussed in Part III, chapter 3) seems to refer to the emperor’s Parthian campaign again.

If the work indeed alludes to Trajan’s expedition in the East, this would once more point towards the end of his reign. The emperor left Rome on 11 May 113,\textsuperscript{130} but Plutarch is more likely to have made such an allusion when the war was won. *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* would then have been published after 20 February 116\textsuperscript{131} and before Trajan’s death in 117.


\textsuperscript{124} Citro (2014) 47. See also Fuhrmann (1988) 10.

\textsuperscript{125} As Pelling (2002) 253–265 and (2011) 2–13 points out, Plutarch had many opportunities to refer to contemporary events in *Caes.*, but he seems to have avoided this.

\textsuperscript{126} Pelling (2002) 261: “Plutarch likes his focus to be soft; he prefers to leave the points as contemporary *resonances, no more*”; followed by Stadter (2002b) 238, although he still sees “overt references to the previous emperor” (Domitian) in *Num.*, *Sol.*, and *Publ.* See also Stadter (2015) 178.


\textsuperscript{128} Besides the short *Reges Aegypti* (174C) placed in between the Persians and the Thracians. The analysis will address the Thracian and Scythian sections as a whole.

\textsuperscript{129} See Oltean (2007) 53–58 on these wars: the first expedition started in 101; the second in 105.

\textsuperscript{130} Lepper (1948) 28.

\textsuperscript{131} See Lepper (1948) 209 on this date of Trajan’s official victory.
2.2 Relative Dating: The Collection and the Parallel Lives

This chapter first explores the connection between *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* and the *Parallel Lives*, in order to examine whether the presence of sections on specific historical figures in the collection implies that the *Lives* of these men were written already (2.2.1). The second part, on the contrary, tries to explain why certain heroes – Romans, as will become clear – are left out from the apophthegm collection: in some cases, their absence might mean that their biographies had yet to be written (2.2.2). In light of this, the third part provides an overview of the possible relative chronology of the collection and the *Parallel Lives*, building on the chronology of the biographies as proposed in Appendix III (2.2.3). One should keep in mind that this chronology remains a difficult issue and a matter of speculation, but the table suggested here is still largely in line with the most influential one proposed by Jones in 1966, which seems to be at least generally correct.132

2.2.1 The Connection Between the Works

In light of chapter 1, there are three relevant theories concerning the relationship between the *Parallel Lives* and *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*:

1. Stadter claims that notes such as *Apophthegmata Laconica* were used for the composition of the *Parallel Lives* and *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*:

   Ap.reg. almost certainly represents a selected, edited, and modestly embellished subset of a larger collection. Ap.Lac. would have been one section of that larger collection.134

If he is correct, sections in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* do not necessarily postdate their corresponding *Lives*,135 because, as Beck has shown, Plutarch gathered such notes from his early years on, and these were used for the *Moralia* as well.136

133 Stadter (2014b).
134 Stadter (2014b) 677.
135 Stadter (2014b) 666–669 stresses that the order of the apophthegms in *Apophth. Lac.* resembles the order in the *Lives*. This only partially goes for the sections in *Reg. et imp. apophth.*., see ibid. 676.
136 Beck, M. (2003) 188 and Beck, M. (2010) 361 (“Stadter concludes that this collection dedicated to Trajan was derived from a larger collection, one that may have been started early on by Plutarch in his youth”). See Stadter (2008) on connections between *Praec. ger. reip. and Reg. et imp. apophth.*. Stadter (2014b) 677 also stresses that col-
[2] Pelling argues that a kind of historical draft, compiled when Plutarch prepared his biographies (or perhaps a series of biographies), formed the basis for both works.\textsuperscript{137}

I suggest that they [\textit{Reg. et imp. apophth.}] are subsequent to the Lives, not part of their preparation: a collection based on Plutarch’s work for the Lives, but garnered \textit{from} those Lives or the work for them, not \textit{for} them.\textsuperscript{138}

If this is the case, sections in \textit{Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata} required the preparation of specific (groups of) biographies, which implies that the corresponding \textit{Lives} of these sections would have been written or at least prepared before the collection.

[3] Verdegem suggests that the relationship between the \textit{Parallel Lives} and \textit{Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata} might not be the same throughout the entire collection:\textsuperscript{139}

In fact, nearly all the Roman apophthegms in \textit{Sayings of Kings and Commanders} may have figured in a draft for a Plutarchan \textit{Life}. When it comes to the Greeks, on the other hand, the same goes for only about two thirds of the items in \textit{Sayings of Kings and Commanders}. Since Plutarch must have known many of the Greek apophthegms since his youth, he may have well started a personal collection long before he even planned to write a series of \textit{Parallel Lives}. If so, he may have re-arranged and reworked the material he had on a particular figure when he started working on his \textit{Life}. To a certain extent, then, Pelling and Stadter may both be right about the relationship between the \textit{Parallel Lives} and \textit{Sayings of Kings and Commanders}.

A systematic comparison of the apophthegm collection and the other works of Plutarch’s oeuvre (Appendix II.1 and 2) shows that this third option is the correct one, for – \textit{generally speaking} – there is indeed a

\textsuperscript{137} Pelling (2002) 65–90.
\textsuperscript{138} Pelling (2002) 70.
\textsuperscript{139} Verdegem (2010) 404.
striking difference between the barbarian and Greek (172E–194E) and the Roman parts (194E–208A) of the apophthegm collection: 140

(a) In the first group, there are many sections on historical figures who are not the subject of a Life; if there is a corresponding Life, this often does not contain all apophthegms of the section, which are usually not told in the same order there; and many apophthegms also occur in the Moralia. In these cases, then, Stadter seems to be correct, although Pyrrhus (184CD) seems to be an exception.

(b) In the part on the Romans, however, only a few sections do not have a Life; almost all apophthegms occur in the corresponding Life, usually in the same order, but only a few in the Moralia; and often, apophthegms read as summaries of (parts of) chapters of the Life. Pelling therefore seems to be correct in the case of the Romans, although there are two exceptions: for Cato Maior (198D–199E) and Cicero (204E–205E), Plutarch seems to have consulted collections of their sayings (such as, probably, one compiled by Tiro for the orator) instead of a draft for the Lives. 141

The presence of some Greek sections, then, does not necessarily mean that the corresponding Lives were published or prepared already, but this is different with most of the Romans.

2.2.2 Romans Absent From the Collection

Every Roman Life contains apophthegms. Thus, when a Roman hero is not included in the collection, this might mean that Plutarch still had to prepare or write his biography. 142 Yet in the case of some heroes, other explanations are possible: as the dedicatory letter addresses the emperor, Brutus, Marcus Antonius, and probably also Cato Minor are not surprising absentees; and Plutarch omitted the Romans of the remote and mythical past. 143 Another explanation is less likely: Stadter claims that negative ex-

140 See in this context Pelling (2002) 1–2 (= (1979) 74–75); and also Stadter (2014b) 683: “For the Roman Lives, Plutarch’s reading neither began so early nor extended so broadly”.

141 Appendix II.1 and 2 provides a detailed overview and description of all these observations.

142 As to the non-legendary Romans (see the note below) absent from Reg. et imp. apophth., Plutarch possessed material on Brutus (Brut. 2.6–8); Ant. contains sayings in 4.9, 16.3, and 45.12; Ca. Mi. in 6.1, 9.1–2, and 13.5; Crass. in 7.1, 18.2, and 30.5; Marc. in 10.6–8, 17.1–2, and 24.4 (a letter); Sert. in 5.4, 16.8, and 23.6–7; TG&GG does not contain clear sayings of Tiberius Gracchus (but longer speeches of the man are included in 9.4–6 and 15.2–9), but provides various examples of Gaius Gracchus in 24(3).6–7 and esp. in 25(4).

143 Stadter (2008) 55: “Early legendary figures are excluded from the Roman section: there are no anecdotes for Romulus, Numa, Publicola, Coriolanus, or Camillus” (as to the Greeks, the same goes for Theseus); and ibid. 55: “Some subjects of biographies – the
empla are deliberately left out, but this is contradicted by the presence of some (rather) base barbarians and sections such as *Pyrrhus* (184CD; Pyrrhus’ presentation in the collection is much more negative than in his *Life*, as will be shown in the analysis) and *Alcibiades* (186D–F).

### 2.2.3 The Relative Chronology

The first column lists the Roman *Lives* in order of the possible relative chronology as suggested by Appendix III. The paired Greek *Lives* are only included when they are also relevant for some Roman sections. The second column refers to the corresponding (parts of) section(s) in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* – cases of lost *Lives* are indicated by a question mark – and gives their total number of apophthegms. When such a section is absent from the collection, this column either includes a possible explanation or a question mark, when the reason for the absence is unclear. The third column indicates which sections might not be (entirely) based on the (preparation of the) *Life* in question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Life of Scipio</td>
<td>Scipio Maior? 196B–197A 9</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Life of Scipio</td>
<td>Scipio Minor? 199F–201F 22</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caecilius Metellus? 201F–202A 3</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Marc.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sull.</td>
<td>Sulla 202E 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Luc.</td>
<td>Lucullus 203AB 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cic.</td>
<td>Cicero 204E–205E 20</td>
<td>Probably partially based on a collection of sayings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Publ.</td>
<td>Remote or legendary past</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gracchi, Sertorius, Crassus, Cato Minor, Brutus, Antony – are omitted, perhaps as unsuitable or unedifying”.

144 Cf. note 143; and Pelling (2002) 83: “This taste for the morally improving is indeed a tendency, no more”.

145 Examples of negative exempla amongst the barbarians are *Cyrus Minor* (173EF; he instigates internal strife) and *Anteas* (174EF; depicted as a true barbarian). Sicilian tyranny, presented in a negative way in esp. *Dionysius Maior* (175C–176C), can hardly be regarded as a system desired by Plutarch.
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Num.</td>
<td>Remote or legendary past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Rom.</td>
<td>Remote or legendary past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cam.</td>
<td>Remote or legendary past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fab.</td>
<td>Fabius Maximus 195C–196A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>Flamininus V 197CD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flam.</td>
<td>Flamininus Ia–IV</td>
<td>197A–C 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Brut.</td>
<td>Inappropriate hero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Aem.</td>
<td>Paulus Aemilius 197F–198D</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Caes.</td>
<td>Caesar 205E–206F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pomp.</td>
<td>Pompeius 203B–204E</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ca. Mi.</td>
<td>Inappropriate hero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ant.</td>
<td>Inappropriate hero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pyrrh.</td>
<td>Gaius Fabricius 194F–195B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar.</td>
<td>Marius 202A–D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Catullus Lutatius 202DE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sert.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>Crass.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>Cor.</td>
<td>Remote or legendary past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>TG</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GG</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If one accepts the relative chronology of the *Parallel Lives* as proposed by this table and Appendix III, the apophthegm collection would postdate the publication or at least preparation of the first nineteen pairs: in all of these *Lives* only the absence of Marcellus in the collection is surprising, although the small amount of apophthegms in *Sulla* (202E) might seem strange as well; in the case of the final five Romans, one can only see why Coriolanus was left out, and Crassus and the Gracchi, especially Gaius, are striking absenteees.147

---

146 Various apophthegms of *Sull.* are left out from *Sulla* (202E), see *Sull.* 21.3, 24.2, and 29.11–12.
147 Cf. supra, note 142.
2.3 Conclusion

A discussion of the absolute dating of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* in connection with the relative chronology of the *Parallel Lives* (hypothetical as it might be) and the collection leads to two conclusions:

[1] Various elements in the dedicatory letter and the apophthegm collection suggest that the work was published at the end of Trajan’s reign, after his campaigns in the East, when Plutarch would have written most pairs of the *Parallel Lives*. The proposed relative chronology of the biographies (if correct) points in the same direction: a comparison with the Romans included in and left out from the collection implies that the text was probably composed after (the preparation of) *Pyrrhus–Marius*, one of the later pairs, but before several later Roman *Lives*. The apophthegm collection, then, seems to be one of Plutarch’s latest works.

[2] The consistent image arising from all this might also have repercussions for the *Parallel Lives*: it suggests that the proposed chronology of Appendix III is at least in general correct; and it provides a (n unfortunately not significant) *terminus ante quem* for (the preparation or perhaps publication of) *Pyrrhus–Marius* and the *Lives* preceding this pair, viz. Trajan’s death in 117.
Early Imperial Anecdote Collections

Early imperial works such as Plutarch’s *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*, Valerius Maximus’ *Facta et dicta memorabilia*, and perhaps most military *compendia* of the first two centuries, such as Sextus Iulius Frontinus’ *Strategemata*, Aelianus Tacticus’ *Tactica*, and Polyae­nus’ *Strategemata*, are all examples of the same text type: ‘collections of sayings and anecdotes’. Additionally, all these collections – with the (possible) exception of Frontinus’ work written under Domitian’s reign¹⁴⁸ – are dedicated to a Roman emperor: Valerius addresses Tiberius, Aelianus Tacticus dedicates his compilation to Trajan, and Polyae­nus writes to Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus.¹⁴⁹ All these authors present their works as manuals for good generalship in the first place, except for Valerius and Plutarch: their prefaces announce a wider range of topics and material.¹⁵⁰

The goal of this chapter is not to provide a systematic discussion and overview of the (history of the) text type,¹⁵¹ but rather to point out how Plutarch thought about the ‘genre’ and the place and function of his apophthegm collection in the context of previous and especially of con­­temporary, early imperial, literature of this kind (the parallel of Valerius Maximus). An initial part therefore briefly discusses the Chaeronean’s ideas about ‘apophthegmatic’ literature and the importance of apoph­­thegms or *chreiai* in literary works, and concisely addresses the function of such ‘anecdotes’ in (rhetorical) education during the author’s lifetime (3.1). This will appear relevant for the main part of this chapter, comparing *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* with Valerius Maximus’ collection, since both works seem to be most closely related to each other in terms of content and structure (3.2). A conclusion will take insights from

¹⁴⁸ Perhaps a dedication to Domitian was removed from the text after the emperor’s death, see Turner (2007) 442–443.

¹⁴⁹ Turner (2007) 434–435 briefly compares these texts (but does not include Plutarch and Aelianus Tacticus). According to the manuscripts, Aelianus dedicated his text to Hadrian, but this should be Trajan, see Fiaschi (2014) 128. On the connection between Aelianus and Frontinus, see König (2020) 135–139 and 143–146.

¹⁵⁰ Plutarch’s letter announces ἡγεμόνων καὶ νομοθετῶν καὶ αὐτοκρατόρων (172C): only the final category concerns generals (see supra, p. 30–31); only parts of Valerius’ work include military *exempla* (7.4), see Turner (2007) 435 on this section.

¹⁵¹ On miscellanies in the early Empire, see Morgan (2007).
both parts together, in order to describe Plutarch’s views on the goals and target audience of his apophthegm collection (3.3).\footnote{I am very grateful to Professor Christopher Pelling and Professor Alexei Zadorojnyi for their suggestion to include this chapter in this book. Subchapters 3.2 and 3.3 are based on my paper “Exempla for the Emperors. A Comparison of the Prefaces to Valerius Maximus’ Facta et dicta memorabilia and Plutarch’s Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata”, presented at the 12th International Congress of the International Plutarch Society “Plutarch and his Contemporaries: Sharing the Roman Empire”, Warszawa (online via Zoom), 2–5 September 2021.}

### 3.1 Plutarch’s View on Collections of Sayings and Anecdotes

#### 3.1.1 Gnome, apophthegma, apomnemoneuma, and chreia

The words *gnome*, *apophthegma*, *apomnemoneuma*, and *chreia* are often discussed together, as they all refer to a (more or less) anecdotal element containing a saying, which can easily be incorporated in the context of an oration, treatise, or any other literary work. The meaning of *gnome* seems clear: it concerns an anonymous aphorism, describing a universal truth accepted by society.\footnote{Searby (1998) 13–14; Stenger (2006).} It is less easy to reach a well-circumscribed definition of the other terms, all referring to a brief story that is more anecdotal in nature. First, *apophthegma* and *apomnemoneuma* seem to be more or less synonymous (I systematically use the English ‘apophthegm’). Beck writes with regard to Plutarch’s collection and Valerius Maximus’ *Facta et dicta memorabilia*:\footnote{Beck, M. (2003) 171.}

> In essence these works are simply collections of *chreiai* or brief anecdotes. There is considerable semantic overlap between the terms *chreia*, *apophthegma*, *apomnēmoneuma*. If there is a detectable difference it resides in the degree of elaboration on which the *chreia* is subjected, with an elaborated *chreia* being termed an *apophthegma* or *apomnēmoneuma*.

As also appears from this quotation, the difference between a *chreia* and an apophthegm is much more complex. Stenger provides more insight into this matter, which is not entirely in line with Beck’s view:

[1] An apophthegm is a saying or reaction (not necessarily in direct speech) attributed to a(n authoritative) historical figure and can (but need not) describe the background or event provoking the saying, which therefore does not need to describe a general truth, although sometimes this is the case (in such instances, one might say that the apophthegm in fact contains a *gnome*).
In the case of a *chreia*, the description of the background of the saying is a necessary element: the situation or specific context in which a historical figure finds himself or herself and his or her response to this situation is the focus of the anecdote. Thus, the reader or audience can learn from the reaction and apply this practical lesson in similar situations in everyday life – and this is why a *chreia* is ‘useful’, of course.\footnote{155}

Despite these definitions, it sometimes remains difficult to draw a clear line between an apophthegm and a *chreia*: in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*, for example, there are many items that could be both. Yet without doubt, the two categories were not always clearly distinguished in antiquity either\footnote{156} and Plutarch seems to have regarded his work as a collection of *both* apophthegms or *apomnemoneumata* and *chreiai*, as appears from the wordplay by which he introduces the work (172C):\footnote{157}

καὶ τὴν χρείαν ἀπόδεξαι τῶν ἀπομνημονευμάτων

accept also the usefulness of my apophthegms

As a consequence, it might make sense that, in line with Searby, this chapter sometimes refers to ‘*chreia*’ “as equivalent to apophthegm, in the sense of a brief situational saying.”\footnote{158} In the remainder of this book, however, I will always use ‘apophthegm’, while acknowledging that not every element in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* might be a true apophthegm *stricto sensu*.

This brings me to another observation. Forty elements in Plutarch’s collection do not contain a saying (or contain a saying of another person than the subject of the section which the apophthegm belongs to) and might therefore not be ‘real’ apophthegms of the protagonists in question.\footnote{159} This number, which does not include less clear sayings where

\footnote{155 Paraphrased from Stenger (2006), who provides a detailed discussion of the difference between a *gnome*, apophthegm, and *chreia*, with a convenient overview on p. 219. See also Searby (1998) 13–16.}
\footnote{156 As also appears from Stenger (2006) *passim*.}
\footnote{157 Own translation.}
\footnote{158 Searby (1998) 16.}
\footnote{159 Cyrus I (172E); Cotys I (174D); Gelon II (175A); Dionysius Maior VII (175F), VIII (175F–176A), and X (176AB; although ὡς might introduce an implicit saying); Philip- pus I (177C) and XXX (179B); Alexander XIV (180D) and XXXIV (181F); Antigonus Monophthalmus II (182A); Antiochus Tertius II (183F); Antiochus Hierax (184A); Antio- chus Septimus II (184EF); Aristeides I (186A; ὡς might seem to introduce a saying, but see Arist. 2.6), IV (186B), and V (186BC); Alcibiades III (186D); Iphicrates I (186F–187A); Phocion I (187E) and XV (188F); Brasidas III (190BC); Epameinondas I (192C); Paulus}
the act of speaking is still implied, is a little bit more than 8% of the entire collection. Yet seventeen of these cases occur at the outset and at the end of a section, where they – as appears from the analysis – fit well because of structural reasons: these elements thus introduce or conclude and even (re)assess the series of the actual apophthegms on a protagonist and reflect on his life as a whole. The other 23 cases, however, usually describing memorable deeds of the protagonists, seem to contradict the letter which announces a collection of sayings. Yet this does not mean that Plutarch neglects the actual function of the text as described in his dedicatory letter (discussed in the analysis), viz. illustrating the characters of the subjects: the anecdotal value of most of these deeds serves the same goal as most sayings, so they deserve a place in the collection as well. In this respect, an observation of Stenger is relevant:

Denkbar wäre, daß der Terminus zu Plutarchs Zeiten das bezeichnet hätte, was der deutsche Ausdruck ‘Denkwürdigkeiten’ meint, also sowohl Aussprüche als auch bezeichnende Handlungen berühmter Persönlichkeiten.

Aemilius VIII (198BC); Cato Maior XXVII (199D); Scipio Minor I–IV (199F–200A) and XIV (201A); Marius I (202AB); Catulus Lutatius (202DE); Pompeius Ia (203B) and VII (204A); Cicero II (204E) and XXI (205E); Augustus VI (207C) and IX (207D). One can add Semiramis (173AB), the closing apophthegm of Darius (172F–173A), and Parysatis (174A), concluding Artaxerxes Mnemon (173F–174A); Scipio Maior VII (196E) and Scipio Minor XXI (201E) are to be taken together with their preceding apophthegms, which contain a saying (cf. Appendix I).

160 Sulla (202E); Gelon I (175A); Fabius Maximus III (195DE); Themistocles III (185A). More problematic are apophthegms that contain verbs of punishing or ordering a punishment: Artaxerxes Longimanus III (173D: τιμωρίαν ἔταξεν); Hiero V (175C: ἐζημίωσε); Alexander XXVIII (181D: ἐζημίωσε); and Pompeius II (203C: ἐκόλασε). Artaxerxes Longimanus III is perhaps still a rather clear saying, since the kind of punishment is described. In the other three cases, such a description cannot be found.

161 ‘Clear’ sayings (1) are introduced by a form of λέγω or φημί; (2) contain a command or a prohibition (often κελεύω or προστάττω); (3) contain sayings in direct speech, cf. the present tenses in Alexander XIII (180CD) and Cato Maior XXI (199B). (4) In Alexander IV (179E) and Themistocles VI (185BC), the ‘saying’ is a piece of writing.

162 See Part II, chapter 2.2.

163 Volkmann (1869) 222–223 adduces this as an argument against authenticity. Saß (1881) 4 disagrees.

164 Clear examples are Cotys I (174D) and Gelon II (175A).

In Plutarch’s view, then, an apophthegm does not always need to contain a saying, but can describe a remarkable action as well: in other words, the characters sometimes let their actions speak for themselves.\textsuperscript{166}

### 3.1.2 Anecdote Collections

Compilations of sayings existed from the early days of Greek literature on. Plutarch was well aware of these traditions and even subtly refers to this literary background in the dedicatory letter to Trajan: as discussed, he alludes to Plato’s \textit{Protagoras} 343a–b, describing the aphorisms of the Seven Wise Men dedicated to Apollo in the oracle of Delphi (172C).\textsuperscript{167} It is well known that collections of sayings of these ancient sages circulated in antiquity and that it became a ‘genre’ which was very popular.\textsuperscript{168} Plutarch knew, read, and used these texts: much material in \textit{Septem sapientium convivium} was probably taken from such compilations.\textsuperscript{169} The Chaeronean, just like Plato, considered these sayings the earliest expressions of philosophy.\textsuperscript{170} Thus, he must have regarded these collections as a \textit{philosophical} type of text, and this is in line with the function of such compilations in Hellenistic times.\textsuperscript{171}

Collections of \textit{chreiai} – since they are often attributed to a historical figure and reveal something about his or her character – are also closely connected with \textit{biography} and might even have had a strong impact on the origins of this genre.\textsuperscript{172} Skidmore argues that \textit{compendia of chreiai} on the Cynics (since this philosophical movement rather focused on the way of living and behaviour of its philosophers) and later on philosophers of other schools evolved into a kind of text type situated between philosophy and biography, and that the distinction between these collections and biographical works was not always clear.\textsuperscript{173} Whether or not

\textsuperscript{166} Cf. \textit{De gar.} 511BC, introducing an action of Heraclitus and Scilurus (told in the collection as \textit{Scilurus} [174F]).

\textsuperscript{167} See \textit{supra}, p. 33; and \textit{infra}, p. 78–79. See also Wehrli (1973) \textit{passim} on collections of sayings of the Seven.

\textsuperscript{168} Cf. \textit{De gar.} 511BC, introducing an action of Heraclitus and Scilurus (told in the collection as \textit{Scilurus} [174F]).


\textsuperscript{170} See \textit{infra}, p. 78–79.

\textsuperscript{171} Searby (1998) 35.

\textsuperscript{172} Wehrli (1973).

this means that the biographical genre is to be traced back in its entirety to such collections, apophthegms and *chreiai* were indeed obviously an important part of ancient Greek biography.\textsuperscript{174} This is no less true for Plutarch’s biographical works, as can be seen from many passages of the *Parallel Lives* that are exclusively built up from apophthegms in order to highlight a specific characteristic of the protagonist.\textsuperscript{175} Furthermore, as argued by Beck, apophthegms more than once laid the basis of a *Life*, to which Plutarch added other information during the writing process.\textsuperscript{176} In the Chaeronean’s view, then, apophthegm and *chreia* collections are inextricably linked to the content and composition of the biographical genre (as also appears from the dedicatory letter to Trajan, of course).

Yet collections of *chreiai* also had an important function in *rhetoric and rhetorical education*, at least in the early imperial period and probably earlier:\textsuperscript{177} such collections were of course especially interesting for orators, who could consult them as a source for material for their compositions. They were no less relevant for students of rhetoric, who could use them as models, since the elaboration of *chreiai* or *apophthegmata* was one of the exercises taught in the *progymnasmata*. These can be defined as\textsuperscript{178}

a series of preliminary exercises in composition which were a prelude to the study of rhetoric, that is, to the dominant form of education available to the elites from the Hellenistic period to the end of antiquity and beyond.

These exercises consisted of various small or relatively small compositions: Besides *chreiai* and *apophthegmata*, they included the writing or rewriting of, for example, γνώμαι or maxims, μυθοί or fables, ἔγκωμια or eulogies, and *ἐκφράσεις* or detailed descriptions, between which there was a certain hierarchy in terms of difficulty, as documented by various handbooks.\textsuperscript{179} The Greek textbook written by Theon (perhaps first century) could be the earliest to survive, although the dating of this manual has been questioned.\textsuperscript{180} Obviously, it was an important skill for an orator, historian, or any author to be able to adapt and elaborate material according

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{174} Cf. the examples of Skidmore (1996) 36–37.
  \item \textsuperscript{175} Examples of such chapters are *Them.* 18, *Phoc.* 8–10, *Lyc.* 19, *Ca. Ma.* 8–9, and *Cic.* 26–27.
  \item \textsuperscript{177} Searby (1998) 36.
  \item \textsuperscript{178} Webb (2001) 289.
  \item \textsuperscript{179} Paraphrased from Webb (2001) 293–298. On the teaching of history and the *progymnasmata*, see Gibson (2004) (also providing an overview of the exercises on 109–116).
  \item \textsuperscript{180} Heath (2003).
\end{itemize}
to specific contexts and goals, and the *progymnasmata* had a strong impact on nearly every page of nearly every work from the early imperial period and beyond.\(^{181}\) Plutarch’s literary output is a clear example of this, as can be seen from, for instance, the large amount of *apophthegms* and *χρεῖαι* in the *Moralia*, and the interest in ἠθοποιΐα and σύγκρισις (other examples of such preliminary exercises) in the *Parallel Lives* (and other works).\(^{182}\)

Plutarch, one concludes, connected the ‘genre’ of collections of sayings – either aphorisms or more anecdotal elements (*apophthegms* or *chreiai*) – with philosophy (as early as the wisdom to be derived from the sayings of the Seven Sages) and with (the writing of) biographies (character description by means of anecdotal material). The link between both domains is an obvious one: if biographies, in Plutarch’s view, had a moralizing function, this also goes for collections of sayings and anecdotes: philosophy and character description are thus combined.\(^{183}\) Yet Plutarch also had experience with their central function in rhetorical contexts, and his own education in the *progymnasmata* no doubt helps to explain the prominent place of *apophthegms* in his literary output.

### 3.2 Plutarch and Valerius Maximus

Valerius Maximus’ *Facta et dicta memorabilia* were written during Tiberius’ reign, some decades before *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*.\(^{184}\) One might therefore wonder whether Plutarch had the Roman’s collection in mind when composing his own. This is not *a priori* unlikely. Not only is there no doubt that the Chaeronean at least knew of the existence of the Latin work,\(^{185}\) he also read and used it, certainly in the case of the Roman *Lives* and perhaps in some other works.\(^{186}\) If Valerius Maximus, then, to some extent provides a background to the Greek collection, this raises two questions about the relationship between the texts: do the goals of the authors differ or not, and if they do, what does this tell us about the ‘genre’ of text and the intended audience of readers; and does the Greek writer attempt to imitate or emulate his Latin predecessor, or, alternatively, does he in fact criticize him? As will become clear, this partially depends on the answer to the first question.

---

\(^{181}\) Penella (2011) 88–89.


\(^{183}\) Cf. Part III, chapter 1.1.

\(^{184}\) See Briscoe (2019) 2–4 for a detailed discussion of the dating of Valerius’ work.

\(^{185}\) As he explicitly refers to *Facta et dicta memorabilia* in Marc. 30.5 and Brut. 53.5.

A comparison of the introductions to the works and its implications for the structure of the compilations provide insights into both matters.\textsuperscript{187} Of course, the prefaces are rhetorically highly elaborate, but their internal cohesion and agreement with the collections they announce show that they provide reliable information on the authors’ goals, practices, and target audience. Inevitably, the following discussion slightly overlaps with Part II of this book, in particular with the literary analysis of Plutarch’s dedicatory letter and the following overview of the general structure of the collection.

3.2.1 The Prefaces\textsuperscript{188}

As will be shown in greater detail in Part II, Plutarch’s letter consists of a first part focusing on the dedication to the emperor, and a second, apologetic, part defending the \textit{raison d’être} of the work. The same goes for the preface to \textit{Facta et dicta memorabilia}, yet there are also differences:

(a) The discussion of the usefulness of the collection opens Valerius’ introduction (\textit{urbis Romae ... labor absit}), but concludes Plutarch’s dedicatory letter (\textit{ei πρόσφορον ἔχει ... λαμβάνοντι}, 172C–E).

(b) The relationship between author and emperor concludes Valerius’ text (\textit{nec mihi ... summatim disseram}), but opens Plutarch’s work (\textit{Ἀρτοξέρξης ὁ Περσῶν ... ἀπόδεξαι τῶν ἀπομνημονευμάτων}, 172BC).

a) The Apologetic Part
This analysis follows the order of Valerius Maximus. His preface is much shorter than the Greek and is far less complicated:\textsuperscript{189} in Plutarch’s introduction, one should always keep the broader framework of his argument in mind, as he dwells upon the differences between the \textit{Parallel Lives} and \textit{Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata} in order to defend the usefulness of the latter. This sometimes obscures, but never contradicts his actual practice in the collection ([b] and [c] in the table below, then, actually concern the \textit{Parallel Lives}, but also shed light on Plutarch’s collection). At first sight, both prefaces make almost exactly the same points. Yet there are also some striking differences (underlined):\textsuperscript{190}

\textsuperscript{187} Skidmore (1996) \textit{passim} discusses \textit{Reg. et imp. apophth.} in his book on \textit{Facta et dicta memorabilia}, but does not provide a systematical comparison of the prefaces.

\textsuperscript{188} Translations of Valerius Maximus are my own.

\textsuperscript{189} For a commentary of the preface to \textit{Facta et dicta memorabilia}, see Wardle (1998) 66–74.

\textsuperscript{190} The table only cites the most relevant elements, not necessarily in the order of the texts. In Plutarch, I do not follow the LCL translation in the case of \textit{ἡγεμόνων καὶ νομοθετῶν καὶ αὐτοκρατόρων}, see \textit{supra}, p. 30–31. I also do not accept Wilamowitz’s conjecture \textit{ἔχεις}, see \textit{infra}, note 248.
### Valerius Maximus

**[a]** The authors compiled collections of anecdotes of men worthy of memory …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>facta simul ac dicta memoratu digna</td>
<td>(both the actions and sayings worthy of memory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοὺς λόγους αὐτοὺς καθ’ αὐτοὺς συνειλεγμένους</td>
<td>(the remarks, made into a separate collection quite by themselves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>άνδρῶν άξιων μνήμης γενομένων</td>
<td>(men who have proved themselves worthy of being remembered)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Plutarch

**[b]** … of various peoples (Romans and non-Romans) …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>urbis Romae exterarumque gentium</td>
<td>(of the city of Rome and foreign peoples)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων παρὰ τε Ῥωμαίοις καὶ παρ᾽ Ἕλλησιν ἣγεμόνων καὶ νομοθέτων καὶ αὐτοκρατόρων</td>
<td>(of the most noted rulers, lawgivers, and generals among the Romans and the Greeks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### [c] … which therefore contain material that can be found elsewhere too.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quae apud alios latius diffusa sunt</td>
<td>(which are among others too widely spread)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ab inlustribus electa auctoribus</td>
<td>(after selecting them from distinguished writers)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### [d] Yet both compilations will still be convenient because of their accessibility …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>latius diffusa sunt quam ut breuiter cognoscis possint</td>
<td>(which are too widely spread to get acquainted with them shortly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὖσπερ δείγματα τῶν βίων καὶ θερμάτα</td>
<td>(as samples and primal elements of the men’s lives)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### [e] … and time-saving character.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ut documenta sumere volentibus longae inquisitionis labor absit</td>
<td>(in order that those who want to use exempla are free from the toil of a long search)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐδὲν οἴομαί σοι τὸν καιρόν ἐνχλίσσειν, ἐν βραχέσι πολλῶν ἀναθεωρήσειν άνδρῶν άξιων μνήμης γενομένων λαμβάνοντι</td>
<td>([the sayings] “will not, I think, be any serious tax on your time, and you will get in brief compass an opportunity to pass in review many men who have proved themselves worthy of being remembered”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
These differences concern the authors’ [1] material, [2] goals, and [3] target audience, naturally all closely related to each other:

[1] Valerius Maximus speaks of anecdotes he took from other authors. Although this “statement of modesty” is definitely indeed a _topos_, he somehow seems to tell the truth: scholars have identified various of his sources, and the similarities between these and Valerius’ accounts often appeared so close that his practice has been described in terms of “plagiarism”.

In the case of _Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata_ the author describes a different situation: the material of the collection occurs in other works _of his own_, as is suggested by the comparison with the _Parallel Lives_. Again, there is some truth in this, as has been discussed in chapters 1 and 2: in most cases Plutarch used the same notes for the anecdote collection as for the biographies (and, in fact, often also for the _Moralia_). Thus, he did not return to his sources, but based _Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata_ upon material which he had previously collected.

[2] At first, [1] only seems a trivial difference in _modus operandi_. Yet it is also entirely in line with the specific goals as described by the prefaces: _Facta et dicta memorabilia_ should become a convenient instrument for consulting anecdotes, recorded in various works of different authors. Plutarch, on the other hand, describes _Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata_ as a kind of _abbreviation_ of the _Parallel Lives_ (of course, this should not be taken too literally, since this claim is related to the function of these two works and not to a one-to-one ratio of the material they include). He thus also considers their goals to be similar: getting insight into characters of great men of the past, in the case of the collection as quickly as possible.

This is why he only selected sayings, so he claims, regarding the utterances of historical subjects as an ideal tool to this end. Thus, although in both works “accessibility” and “brevity” are important, their goals (as presented by the prefaces) seem fundamentally different.

---

191 Burgesdijk (2022) 290 on _ut documenta […] labor absit_.
193 Welch (2013) 68 explains this “plagiarism”: “By quoting but not citing, Valerius obscures the presence of his forebears in a way that hints at plagiarism and even resonates with Seneca’s contemporary discussion of literary and declamatory theft. This plagiarism, however, is part of Valerius’ larger project of gathering and redacting material into a record of tradition. He wrests words from Cicero and Livy, to be sure, but they don’t land in his own mouth. Rather, they land in a stream of utterances handed down from text to text to text, his text included, in a way that foregrounds text over author and story over text”.
194 Cf. the prologues to _Per.–Fab._ and _Aem.–Tim._, discussed in Part III, chapter 1.
195 See _supra_, p. 34 on a connection with the prologue to _Alex.–Caes_. in this regard.
196 Skidmore (1996) 48: “All compilations by definition must aim at brevity and accessibility, but some forms are more successful in achieving these qualities”. See also
The primary target reader of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* is, according to the letter, none other than the Roman emperor: Plutarch not only addresses Trajan in order to dedicate the work to him, but also asks him to make use of it. The busy man is now able to get acquainted with Roman and Greek – and, in fact, also barbarian – “rulers, lawgivers, and generals” (172C: ἡγεμόνων καὶ νομοθετῶν καὶ αὐτοκρατόρων):197 people with whom he can identify. Valerius Maximus, on the other hand, collected “deeds and sayings of the city of Rome and foreign people” (*urbis Romae exterarumque gentium facta simul ac dicta*). This broader category is a direct consequence of his wider reading audience, consisting of anyone who faces difficulties finding relevant anecdotes in the large amount of available literature (cf. [2]). One readily thinks of students and rhetoricians.198 *Facta et dicta memorabilia*, then, are not meant for the emperor himself.

These three differences are of course relevant for the interpretation of the dedications to Tiberius and Trajan.

b) The Dedication

Valerius Maximus invokes the emperor because “by his heavenly providence virtues […] are most friendly encouraged, but vices most severely avenged” (*caelesti prouidentia uirtutes […] benignissime fouentur, uitia seuerissime uindicantur*). He continues that, just as orators and poets usually call upon some deities at the outset of their works, he himself now addresses the divine Tiberius in order to ask for his favour.199 The praising of the emperor and the description of his divinity occupy half of the preface. This contrasts sharply with Valerius’ depiction of his own personality, described by Wardle as “self-denigration”:200 he refers to himself as “my insignificance” (*mea paruitas*); and the invocation of


197 Own translation.


199 *nam si prisci oratores ab Ioue Optimo Maximo bene orsi sunt, si excellentissimi uates a numine aliquo principia traxerunt, mea paruitas eo iustius ad fauorem tuum decucurrerit* (“for if ancient orators started well from Iuppiter Optimus Maximus, if the most excellent poets commenced from one or another divinity, my insignificant self all the more justly resorts to your favour”).

the ‘new god’\textsuperscript{201} is preceded by a short digression stressing the writer’s humility and lack of talent (he does not hope to offer a complete overview, nor does he attempt to compete with his literary predecessors in any way).\textsuperscript{202} The themes of the emperor cult and the author’s modesty, then, typical elements in a preface of the early Empire,\textsuperscript{203} are taken to extremes: the suggestion is that the text only exists thanks to Tiberius, and that all its deficiencies are the result of Valerius’ poor skills.\textsuperscript{204}

As for Plutarch’s letter, the evident implications of the two opening apophthegms on Artaxerxes Mnemon and Lycurgus (172BC) remind one of the Latin preface: as will be discussed below, Plutarch twice compares himself to humble citizens, presents \textit{Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata} as a simple gift, and the Lycurgus apophthegm alludes to Trajan’s divine status:\textsuperscript{205}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Situation} & \textbf{A humble present} & \textbf{Giver} \\
\hline
Σοι (μέγιστε αὐτόκρατορ Τραianή Κάισαρ) & Λιτὰ δῶρα καὶ ἔξενια καὶ κοινὰς ἀπαρχάς (i.e. Reg. et imp. apophth.) & Κάμυοῦ (Plutarch) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{201} Wardle (1999) 524 points out that \textit{cetera diuinitas opinione colligitur, tua prae-senti fide paterno auutoque sideri par videtur, quorum eximio fulgore multum caerimoni-nis nostris inclutae claritatis accessit: reliquos enim deos acceimus, Caesares dedimus} (“though other deity is obtained by supposition, yours seems through belief in sight equal to your father’s and grandfather’s star, by whose excellent brightness much of celebrated splendor was added to our sacred rites, since we accepted the other gods, but we delivered the Caesares”) should be interpreted as follows: “the Romans took over all other gods (from whatever source), but added the Caesars to the heavenly council and to the religious calendar”; against Fowler (1988) 263–264, who suggests to read \textit{videmus} instead of \textit{dedimus}. See also Mueller (2002) 13 on the emperors as new gods.

\textsuperscript{202} Wardle (1998) 67 notices an additional \textit{topos} in this regard: “It was common in prefaces to complain of the difficulty of the task undertaken”.

\textsuperscript{203} See Janson (1964) 100–106 on these “attitudes in front of the emperor” as a typical element in prose prefaces of Latin literature in the early imperial period (104–106 briefly discuss Valerius Maximus).

\textsuperscript{204} This might even give the modern reader the impression of a parody, but there is no reason to doubt that Valerius Maximus was a genuine supporter of Tiberius, see Wardle (1997) 345: “It is best to see him as representative of a wide class of loyalists to the imperial house, which could easily be seen as a dynasty beginning with Caesar.” See also Mueller (2002) 11–20 for Valerius Maximus’ attitude towards Tiberius’ divinity.

\textsuperscript{205} Citro (2017b) 17: “In definitiva, nei \textit{Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata} osserviamo un parallelismo tra il contadino/gli Spartani/l’autore stesso, tutti rappresentati nell’atto del donare un bene, di cui dispongono al momento, ad una figura di rango su-
Yet it will also become clear that these elements are deconstructed: (1) as Citro points out, Plutarch still highlights that his gift is in fact useful, unlike the water given to Artaxerxes (cf. 172C: καὶ τὴν χρείαν ἀπόδεξαι τῶν ἄπομνημονεμάτων);\(^{206}\) (2) the reference to Plato’s *Protagoras* 343ab alludes to the Chaeronean’s Platonist background and connects him with the Seven Wise Men (esp. Lycurgus), again underscoring the philosophical value of the author and his work;\(^{207}\) and (3) ἀπαρχάς only implicitly refers to Trajan’s ‘divine status’.\(^{208}\) This shows that Plutarch’s apparent modesty is, in fact, not devoid of an awareness of his position as a celebrated intellectual, and that the vague reference to the ruler cult is only to be regarded as a traditional element with which the author likes to play.\(^{209}\)

Valerius’ preface, then, is an extreme example of flattery addressed to the emperor; in Plutarch’s text, however, both the author’s inferiority and Trajan’s divine status are intentionally kept to a minimum and even undermined. There are several possible explanations for this contrast:

[1] A *possible* difference in social status: Plutarch belonged to the local nobility, but Valerius might have been a man of low birth and little standing. It should, however, be noted that scholars disagree about the Roman’s modest origins, as this hypothesis is in the first place based on his humility in the preface\(^{210}\) (where its aim is to enhance Tiberius’ greatness and to create a transition to the collection’s first section on the worship of the gods).\(^{211}\)
[2] Plutarch’s scepticism towards ruler cults: an only implicit and passing reference to this topos of addressing an emperor does not need to compromise his philosophical ideas.  

[3] The goals of the works: if *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* should enable Trajan to gain insight into the characters of heroes (cf. the apologetic part), this is not only for the sake of this insight alone. He should also do something with it and adjust his own behaviour (the letter, as will become clear in the literary analysis, also subtly and cautiously alludes to this). In other words: Trajan needs moral improvement. He is not perfect and definitely not a god. An undue focus on the emperor’s divine status, then, would also have compromised the very goal of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*. The same goes for the topos of modesty: if Plutarch (over)stressed the deficiencies of his text and minimized his value as an author, the reader(s) would question the collection’s usefulness to his (esp. the emperor as envisaged reader) or their moral progress.

### 3.2.2 The Structure of the Collections

The main goals of the Latin and Greek works are precisely what their authors say they are: the former first of all has a rhetorical function, providing a convenient collection for other writers; the latter primarily serves ethical goals. This can also be seen from the structure of the collections. Paradoxically, precisely the arrangement of the Roman text according to moral themes (within which Romans and non-Romans are separated into two subsections) coincides with its rhetorical aims. Bloomer writes:

This work was clearly meant for specific audiences and uses; a collection of anecdotes organized under general rubrics was of most service for students and practitioners of declamation, a form of oral performance that constituted both the final stage in Roman education and, for the professional performer and the Romans who thronged the recital halls, the preeminent public art form of the early Principate.

---

212 For Plutarch’s attitude towards the imperial cult, see esp. Scott (1929). Bowersock (1973) criticizes and nuances some of Scott’s observations. For more secondary literature on this topic, see Roskam (2009) 67.

213 Lawrence (2022) provides an interesting discussion of virtues in sections on Romans as well as on *externi*.

For example, when students of rhetoric or professional orators need an anecdote on pious behaviour, they should simply consult the relevant section. The structure of *Facta et dicta memorabilia*, then, clearly serves the goals as set out in the preface. Of course, this does not mean that Valerius was not well aware of the ethical value of his work, but I would — siding with Wardle — not say that ethical goals were the author’s primary concern, as argued by Skidmore: the work is, without doubt, written for easy consultation in the first place, although one would definitely go too far by claiming that this is Valerius’ only goal, as the author ensures that his work is also interesting for “the through-reader”.

Plutarch’s work, as will be discussed in greater detail in Part II, has an entirely different structure, thus serving different goals. The various sections on kings and commanders are not ordered thematically, not even alphabetically, but according to their cultural origins. Additionally, different ethnicities do not always follow each other according to a clear rationale: the reader has no reason to expect the Macedonians (177A–184F) in between the Sicilians (175A–177A) and Athenians (184F–189D), nor does it make sense that the ancient Egyptian Pharaohs (174C) would follow the Persians (172E–174B), let alone that the Greek general Memnon (174B) closes this Persian section, if Plutarch regarded *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* as a kind of reference work for apophthegms on famous individuals. Within these larger sections, individuals admittedly follow each other more or less chronologically, but there are many exceptions to this ‘rule’.

---

215 Wardle (1998) 14, referring to Skidmore (1996): “I would argue that the serious moral purpose envisaged by Skidmore should be combined with a primary audience of those involved in declamation, the advanced stage of the élite Roman’s education, indeed perhaps the most practical aspect of his education. In urging upon this group the importance of morality, in providing material useful for declamation and in demonstrating through his prefaces and conclusions the way such *exempla* could be deployed V. is fulfilling a complex role”. Haegemans – Stoppie (2004) 167 agree with Wardle (p. 147 provides a convenient overview of relevant secondary literature).

216 Morgan (2007) 264. Langlands (2008) 161 argues: “Recent scholarship on Roman rhetoric and declamation has shown that such exercises should not be thought of as encouraging sophistry and empty rhetoric, but rather as a means both of acculturation and of moral education: rhetoric and ethics were closely entwined in Roman culture”; see also Langlands (2011) 100–122, focusing on ethics.

217 Also Stadter (2014) 675–676; and see Part II, chapter 2.2. I therefore disagree with Morgan (2007) 270, who argues that *Reg. et imp. apophth.* “could equally well be skimmed or read through.”

Plutarch’s means of achieving accessibility […] are perhaps less successful as a result of the origins of his material and of the genre in which he was writing, for not only is the genre in general related to the writing of Lives, but also in this specific case the composition of the Apophthegmata was a direct result of the writing of Plutarch’s Lives (Apophthegmata, preface, 172E).

To some extent, Skidmore is correct (although the preparation of Reg. et imp. apophth. is not related to that of the Parallel Lives alone):219 the genre of Plutarch’s collection is connected with that of the biographies, given that both works, presenting similar material, should provide insight into character. Yet precisely in this respect, the Greek text might achieve accessibility in its own way: sections concern individuals, not themes, and surprising deviations from chronology or from a more logical sequence from an ethnic point of view serve the characterization of the individuals as well, as shall become clear throughout the literary analysis of Part II.

Thus, the structure of the Greek collection is inspired by more literary or at least more biographical (characterization) and philosophical (the assessment of characters) principles, and is, unlike the Latin work, not composed for the purposes of easy consultation. This does not necessarily mean that Plutarch ignored the rhetorical eloquence of his characters or the possibility of including the apophthegms in orations or in other texts, nor that an audience reading the collection for this reason alone is not welcomed by the work (for most sayings are witty responses that might inspire and can be used by rhetoricians in their orations),220 but this was simply not the main reason why the author compiled the work.

3.3 Conclusion

In the case of Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata and Facta et dicta memorabilia, one can only formally speak of similar text types, since in terms of their main goals and target audience the texts are different. Valerius Maximus, on the one hand, claims to collect material for anyone who wants to find interesting material on specific topics, which is in line with the sometimes almost verbatim quotations of earlier authors and with the structure of the collection, designed for easy consultation. The dedication to the emperor stands alone and should, together with the excessive humility of the author, be regarded as a topos (although this

---

219 See chapter 2.2; and Appendix II.
220 Cf. Beck, M. (2002) 169: “An emperor like Trajan, who had not received the benefits of rhetorical training, would nevertheless appreciate the utility of forceful speech combined with authoritative examples.”
does not mean that Valerius is not serious about his humble position in comparison with the emperor). *Facta et dicta memorabilia*, then, are in the first place to be regarded as a manifestation of the rhetorical education and practice in the author’s days, although this aspect is, of course, not detached from moral education and the ethical value of *exempla*.

*Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*, on the other hand, are presented as an abbreviation of the *Parallel Lives*, and this is largely in line with the overlap in material in both *corpora*. Similar to the biographies, so Plutarch writes, the collection should provide insight into characters, as is supported by the structure of the work focusing on individuals and their characterization. As such, the work is closer to the early Hellenistic compilations of *chreiai* that were meant to shed light on the characters of, in the first place, philosophers, which clearly influenced Plutarch’s views on the function of the text type. This goal is somewhat detached from the role of works such as *Facta et dicta memorabilia* in the context of the rhetoric(al education) of the early Empire\(^{221}\) – even though during his own education in the *progymnasmata* Plutarch of course collected much of his (Greek) material.\(^{222}\) The envisaged reader of his collection is Trajan: as a Platonic philosopher Plutarch genuinely believes that his work might be useful to the emperor, who – as is implied – could improve his rule by reading about earlier rulers, lawgivers, and generals. Of course, other Romans and Greeks are invited to read the text as well. In light of the dedicatory letter, they might have wondered how Trajan or any other sole ruler would (or should) have responded to the text, and what this says about the image of the perfect monarch as conceived by Plutarch; perhaps they would have read the work for advice in their own everyday life, or just for their amusement; only rarely, I believe, would they have read the work for rhetorical purposes. Yet the dedicatory letter consistently presents *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* as a true ‘mirror of princes’, and this is why it merits such a reading in the first place.\(^{223}\)

\(^{221}\) Cf. Skidmore (1996) 38 on the structure of *Reg. et imp. apophth.*: “Plutarch probably reflects Hellenistic practice in arranging his examples by person rather than by theme as Valerius does”.


\(^{223}\) Beck, M. (2002) 170: “It [the dedicatory letter to Trajan] documents a Greek philosopher displaying some interest in a Roman emperor’s edification”; Roskam (2009) 84–85: “It has proven fairly difficult to find clear and explicit traces of Plutarch’s eagerness to get in touch with the emperor or even to influence him through his writings. Especially important in this respect is the dedicatory letter to *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*”. On Plutarch’s ideal of philosophers educating rulers, see Roskam (2002) 175–189.
Finally, the similarities between the Latin and Greek prefaces might seem only a consequence of convention. Yet both the fact that they are so numerous and that Plutarch knew, read, and used Valerius’ text suggests that his Roman predecessor may have instigated or at least inspired him to write his own collection. If this is true, the striking differences in focus on the emperor’s divine status and the author’s modesty are all the more relevant: the Chaeronean would definitely have frowned upon the excessive flattery directed at Tiberius, as it would have reminded him of the lack of free speech that characterized Domitian’s reign. Thus, by alluding to these two *topoi* and by at the same time subtly undermining them, Plutarch also seems to adjust Valerius’ claims and shows what should be the correct attitude towards the ruler: an emperor is no god, needs improvement, and can learn from listening to his subjects, for especially a philosopher like Plutarch can serve as his teacher. As such, then, *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* at the same time show that something had changed from Trajan’s rule on, for fear no longer dominated the Empire. This enabled Plutarch to do what he, as a Platonist writer, must have always desired: to be a monarch’s educator for the sake of the commonwealth, in the footsteps of his own great teacher and role model Plato.
PART II

A LITERARY ANALYSIS
Introduction

The approach of this full literary analysis of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* will be different from that of previous research. Often scholars have addressed only a selection of apophthegms, mainly focusing on parallel passages in Plutarch or other authors, in order to point out differences between various accounts.\(^\text{224}\) Thus, although such research can lead to important insights, little attention has been paid to the meaning of the apophthegms in the collection as an independent work. Perhaps the reason for this is that one might get the impression that an interpretation of the stories as they appear in the text can reveal nothing more than what a straightforward reading suggests – for the apophthegms are told in their most basic form, without authorial comments, and apparently detached from every context.

Precisely this final point is somewhat problematic. Every apophthegm is surrounded by other stories and in this way receives a specific meaning in the context of the collection, and this meaning can diverge greatly from what a separate reading of the apophthegm suggests. When story A relates how a general risks his life and dies in battle after claiming to protect his city, a reader might admire his bravery; when story B describes how a city is conquered because its general is dead (without specifying how he died), a reader might believe that this commander was the only talented man of his people; when taking A and B together, however, the general – if the stories indeed concern the same man – might appear to be a reckless person who caused a disaster to his country by putting his life on the line, because of which both his bravery and his military talent should be questioned. This (only partially hypothetical)\(^\text{225}\) example describes how Plutarch wants his audience to approach the collection: by structuring the work in specific ways, or by drawing verbatim and thematic connections between (series of) apophthegms and (series of) sections, he steers the readers towards certain conclusions about characters, groups of people, or events, encouraging them to actively engage with the information presented.

Of course, this does not mean that Plutarch was independent of his sources and notes: he could almost exclusively use what they offered him. As a consequence, when he had more material on a specific ruler or general, he often included more about this man (compare for example

\(^{224}\) Cf. *supra*, p. 21–22.

\(^{225}\) Inspired by the analysis of the Theban sections (192C–194E).
the length of *Lycurgus, 189D–F*, with *Agesilaus, 190F–191D*), when his notes contain various apophthegms illustrating Philip’s mildness, it is not surprising that this is one of the main characteristics described by *Philippus (177C–179C)*. Yet Plutarch still made a specific selection from his sources (for he never includes everything – quite the contrary), he ordered the stories in a particular way, often deviating from his notes (as appears from a comparison of the Spartan section with *Apophthegmata Laconica*), and he adapted this material in order to establish specific connections. Thus, even though he could not make an unlimited set of points concerning any individual, he clearly crafted his apophthegms and the entire collection in order to create a certain image of the historical figures, often in connection with each other, hereby highlighting important aspects of good rulership, generalship, and lawgiving.

The following literary analysis will therefore not focus on the material itself in the first place, but on the way in which it is presented. The emphasis will be on the internal cohesion and structure (at any level) of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* as a whole, by means of close reading: this is, I believe, the best method to interpret the text in a way that does justice to the work as a piece of literature on its own. The main question is how a critical reading that takes Plutarch’s (sometimes rather subtle) guidance into account leads to a specific picture of a protagonist or groups of protagonists. Other passages in Plutarch, then, are of minor importance (and are often only briefly addressed in the footnotes), unless deviations from or agreements with these accounts shed additional light on the apophthegm collection.

The literary analysis consists of three parts:

[1] A discussion of the dedicatory letter to Trajan (172B–E) as a programmatic proem that in several respects calls the prologues to some *Parallel Lives* to mind. This is in line with the fact that Plutarch presents the collection as being closely connected to the biographies (chapter 1).

[2] An overview of the compositional units and general structure of the collection in light of information from the dedicatory letter (chapter 2). This will be a prerequisite for [3], but at the same time distinguishes the different levels of interpretation that will form the basis of Part III.

[3] An analysis of the apophthegm collection in three parts of almost equal length: (a) the monarchical sections (172E–184F; chapter 3), (b) the Greeks of the core mainland (184F–194E; chapter 4), and (c) the Romans (194E–208A; chapter 5).

---

226 See *infra*, p. 190.
Inevitably, some apophthegms and sections will receive more attention than others: not every saying or anecdote is of equal significance for the representation of a character, and Plutarch seems to have included some stories just because of their wittiness and proverbial nature, or because of other motivations. Yet I aimed for completeness, and the following analysis intends to give due place to every element of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*. 
I

The Dedicatory Letter (172B–E)

In the dedicatory letter to Trajan, Plutarch presents *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* as a shorter alternative to the *Parallel Lives*. The text also resembles the prologues to some of the biographical pairs in terms of its wording, functions, and structure. The similar wording will be discussed in detail in the analysis. As to the functions of the prologues, Duff writes:227

First and foremost they introduce and name the subjects of both Lives of a pair […]. Most also give some brief rationale for why the Lives of the two subjects have been brought together in a single book […]. Second, prologues set the reader’s generic expectations. Some comment explicitly on the genre or purpose of the Lives […]. Prologues may also contain discussion of the nature of virtue and how to attain it; this is related to genre, in that the purpose of the Lives is sometimes said to be the revelation of the character of their subjects or the moral improvement of the reader. Third, prologues establish Plutarch’s own persona and construct his readers as people who share his values. Finally, prologues draw the reader’s attention, and arouse interest.

In the dedicatory letter, Plutarch regards the subjects of the collection as similar to those of the *Lives*. He also explains why he compiles apophthegms, reflecting on their purpose described both in terms of the revelation of character and of moral improvement, although this second element is only alluded to (see 1.2), and he connects his own practice with what he expects from the reader (see 1.1).

Duff also provides an overview of the structure of the prologues. They usually consist of two parts. The first part “contains generalized reflections” which gradually “become more specific”. Plutarch often cites some apophthegms, and the dedicatee, Sosius Senecio, is sometimes mentioned at the outset.228 In the second part,229

---

228 Quoted and paraphrased from Duff (2014) 334.
229 Duff (2014) 334. See also Duff (2011b) 218–222 on the structure and different elements of the prologues.
Part II. A Literary Analysis

Plutarch frequently refers subjectively to the writing process and occasionally here (and only here) uses the term “book” […] The presence of the narrator is generally felt more strongly in the second section, though there is a tendency to move towards more impersonal expressions as we approach the end.

Along the same lines, this chapter divides the dedicatory letter into two parts (cf. also Part I, chapter 3). The first reads as a traditional dedication to the emperor. By means of two apophthegms, it reflects on the theme of giving and taking when there is a social distance between giver and recipient. Trajan is addressed in the opening words, but these general reflections are only specified at the end of the section, where Plutarch again refers to his dedicatee (1.1). The second part can be defined as the apologetic section, a conventional topic in introductions to an ancient work and recurrent in the prologues too. It dwells upon the usefulness of the apophthegm collection, comparing the work with the Parallel Lives and defending its raison d’être. Thus, Plutarch’s presence is more pronounced than in the first part, but more general statements follow again towards the end. The author concludes the letter with a final reference to Trajan: this return to the author–reader relationship at the end is not unusual in the prologues either (1.2).

A close reading, however, shows that there is more. Plutarch subtly plays with these traditional elements in order to illustrate the eventual purpose of the apophthegm collection, which appears to be somewhat different from how he actually presents it. In line with this, a thought-provoking clash between the two parts of the text comes to light (1.3).

1.1 The Dedication (172BC)

Ἀρτοξέρξης ὁ Περσῶν βασιλεύς, ὦ μέγιστε αὐτóκρατορ Τραϊανὲ Κάισαρ, οὐχ ἦττον οἰόμενον βασιλικὸν καὶ φιλάνθρωπον εἶναι τοῦ μεγάλα διδόναι τὸ μικρὰ λαμβάνειν εὐμενῶς καὶ προθύμως, ἐπεὶ παρελαύνοντος αὐτοῦ καθ᾽ ὁδὸν αὐτοῦργος ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἰδιώτης οὐδὲν ἔχον ἐπερνὲν ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ταῖς χερσὶ ἀμφοτέραις ὕδωρ

230 Verbal similarities that keep the first part together are highlighted at the outset of chapter 1.1 below. The second part is dominated by a distinction between actions, influenced by τύχη, and words.

231 See Part III, chapter 1.2–4 passim.

232 Again noticed by Duff (2011b) 223.

233 The following pages are in various respects indebted to Beck, M. (2002) on the letter’s authenticity; and to Citro (2017b), providing up to the present day the only systematic commentary on the text. Citro (2017a) also deals with the dedicatory letter, but focuses on the values commended to a ruler and military leader.
Artaxerxes, the king of the Persians, O Trajan, Emperor Most High and Monarch Supreme, used to think that, as compared with giving large gifts, it was no less the mark of a king and a lover of his fellow-men to accept small gifts graciously and with a ready goodwill; and so, on a time when he was riding by, and a simple labourer, possessed of nothing else, took up water from the river in his two hands and offered it to the king, he accepted it pleasantly and with a cheerful smile, measuring the favour by the ready goodwill of the giver and not by the service rendered by the gift. Lycurgus made the sacrifices in Sparta very inexpensive, so that people might be able always to honour the gods readily and easily from what they had at hand. And so, with some such thought in mind, I likewise offer to you trifling gifts and tokens of friendship, the common offerings of the first-fruits that come from philosophy, and I beg that you will be good enough to accept, in conjunction with the author’s ready goodwill, the utility which may be found in these brief notes …

Plutarch opens his letter with two apophthegms on famous rulers of the past. As Beck writes, this is not only a typical feature of his style, but it evidently also provides a fitting introduction to the collection. At first sight, the stories refer to the situation of Plutarch, that is, giving a present to someone in a higher position, as described in the table on p. 62–63. This straightforward application of the apophthegms is in line with the ancient reader’s expectations in a proem and more specifically in a dedication to the emperor: it reflects the author’s modesty, for Plutarch compares himself with common men, and it refers to the imperial cult (τοὺς θεούς – σοι and θυσίας – ἄπαργάς). As discussed, it is not surprising that this second element is only alluded to, since Plutarch does not approve of religious belief in a ruler’s divine status.

Yet once the author specifies the relevance of the stories (from τοιαύτῃ on), a series of verbatim repetitions (indicated in bold and underlined) highlights that there is more than this evident application. Artaxerxes seems to be connected with Trajan’s situation, as can already be seen

235 See supra, note 212.
from the juxtaposition of their names, while Lycurgus in the first place seems to be related to Plutarch’s:

[1] The author asks the emperor to accept (ἀπόδεξαι) the usefulness (χρείαν) of the present together with his willingness (προθυμίᾳ). This is, at first sight, similar to the Persian king, who accepted (ἐδέξατο) water while taking the giver’s willingness (προθυμίᾳ) into account, instead of the usefulness (χρείᾳ) of the gift. Yet the similar wording also emphasizes a crucial difference:236 as Citro writes, Plutarch’s gift has χρείαν, for the collection will be useful for the emperor, while in the case of Artaxerxes only the προθυμία of the giver matters (οὐ τῇ χρείᾳ vs. καὶ τὴν χρείαν).237 This hints at a higher philosophical purpose of the text.

[2] In the same way as Lycurgus with regard to the gods (cf. τοιαύτη δή τινι γνώμη), Plutarch thinks that one should always be able to endow the ruler with a gift. His specific present consists of Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata (ἀπομνημονευμάτων),238 described as inexpensive and thereby recalling the cheap offerings in Sparta. An additional similarity is provided by the comparison with the sacrifice of firstlings (ἀπαρχάς – cf. θυσίας). At first sight, the metaphor functions on the level of the evident application of the Lycurgus story: as such it is part of the allusion to the imperial cult,239 and the idea of offering a part of a larger whole is a well-chosen illustration of Plutarch sending a part of his stock of notes to the emperor.240 Yet at closer inspection, there is more to it. As scholars noticed, it recalls Plato’s Protagoras 343a–b.241 The passage concerns the Seven Wise Men.242

οὗτοι πάντες ζηλωταὶ καὶ ἐρασταὶ καὶ μαθηταὶ ἦσαν τῆς Λακεδαιμονίων παιδείας, καὶ καταμάθοι ἄν τις αὐτῶν τὴν σοφίαν τοιαύτην οὖσαν, ῥήματα βραχέα ἀξιομνημόνευτα ἑκάστῳ εἰρημένα· οὗτοι καὶ κοινῇ συνελθόντες ἀπαρχὴν τῆς σοφίας ἀνέθεσαν τῷ

237 Citro (2014) 72; (2017a) 57; (2017b) 19–22. See also supra, p. 63.
238 See LSJ, s.v. “ἀπομνημόνευμα”: “memorial”, “record”, or “memoirs” (only in plural). This is similar to the meaning of ἀπόφθεγμα, see Beck, M. (2003) 171; and supra, p. 52.
240 See Jim (2011) 46–48 on this meaning of ἀπαρχή; and Citro (2017b) 17 on the use of ἀπαρχή in the letter specifically. Beck, M. (2010) 359 argues that the Lycurgus apophthegm implies “that Plutarch has a collection of apophthegmata at hand from which he has made the one he offers to Trajan.”
All these were enthusiasts, lovers and disciples of the Spartan culture; and you can recognize that character in their wisdom by the short, memorable sayings that fell from each of them: they assembled together and dedicated these as the first-fruits of their lore to Apollo in his Delphic temple, inscribing there those maxims which are on every tongue – “Know thyself” and “Nothing overmuch.” To what intent do I say this? To show how the ancient philosophy had this style of laconic brevity; and so it was that the saying of Pittacus was privately handed about with high approbation among the sages – that it is hard to be good.

The similarities with the dedicatory letter are remarkable: Plato compares sayings with ἀπαρχαί; he claims that they come from philosophy (cf. ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας, 172C); and κοινῇ recalls κοινάς (172C), which refers in the specific context of the collection to the many kings and commanders of whom sayings are brought together. The comparison with first-fruits in the letter, then, is rooted in the Chaeronean’s background as a Platonist. In addition, as Beck writes, his function as priest of Delphi is called to mind, and it even invites comparing him with the Seven Wise Men, further emphasizing his connection with Lycurgus. All this contributes to Plutarch’s self-presentation as a philosopher, which once more alludes to a possibly higher moral goal of the work.

One expects the latter to consist in the moral progress of Trajan or any other reader. This is obviously the implication of the Artaxerxes apophthegm: as the verbatim agreements suggest, the emperor should model his behaviour after the Persian king. In this way, it shows what the entire apophthegm collection should do, viz. provide moral lessons for a ruler that can lead to imitation. Yet in light of this, the application of the Lycurgus apophthegm is surprising. One would expect this man to serve as a role model for Trajan as well, for he is concerned with his subjects

---

243 See also Beck, M. (2002) 166: “Certainly the adjective, κοινάς, in the letter refers to this joint offering made by the seven wise men.”

244 Beck, M. (2002) 166: “The allusion to Delphi here also serves to call to mind Plutarch’s role as priest there”; and 165: “The author of the letter, meanwhile, parallels himself with Lycurgus, one of the seven wise men, a prudent and pious Spartan sage, who oversaw the resurrection of Sparta’s fortunes”.
and ensures that they can fulfil their duty. If the emperor wants to be a good monarch, he should share this mindset. In addition, Lycurgus will also appear on the stage in the collection: his section (189D–F) contains similar apophthegms from which the same lessons can be drawn.

In the letter, however, Plutarch only shows how he himself is instructed by this Lycurgus: he seems to copy the Spartan by explicitly adopting his attitude. The imitation Plutarch-Lycurgus thus encircles another imitation which is only implicitly (through the similar wording) desired to take place:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implicitly desired imitation</th>
<th>Explicit imitation</th>
<th>Implicitly desired imitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artaxerxes accepted small gifts</td>
<td>Lycurgus’ mindset</td>
<td>Plutarch asks Trajan to accept his small gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plutarch shares Lycurgus’ mindset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plutarch shows how he is imitating a ruler of the past. Trajan is expected to do the same. This recalls some prologues to the Parallel Lives, where the author presents himself as the paradigmatic reader of his own work. Yet there is also a difference in this regard. In the prologues, Plutarch does not refrain from stating that one should read the biographies for moral improvement. The implicitness in the letter to Trajan, however, is striking: the author will never claim that the emperor needs ethical improvement and that the apophthegm collection can contribute to this, although a more careful reading suggests that this is the case. To some extent, this implication undercuts the dedicatory aspect of the letter suggested by the straightforward application of the opening apophthegms. The text is not sent to the emperor just because he is the emperor (and a deity), as is the case with Valerius Maximus’ Facta et dicta memorabilia (cf. Part I, chapter 3). On the contrary: Plutarch offers Trajan this present because he should actually do something with it.

Finally, the dedication topos also explains why the goal of moral progress is not made explicit. Plutarch is adopting the cautious attitude expected from a subject addressing the most powerful man of the world. This caution also dominates the next part of the letter.

---

245 Lycurgus’ apophthegm, then, has a triple function: (i) the ‘straightforward application’ (described in the table supra, p. 62–63): Plutarch compares himself with the common Spartans, emphasizing his modesty, and Trajan is compared with the gods (see also Beck, M. (2002) 165 and Citro (2017b) 17); (2) it illustrates that Plutarch and Lycurgus share the same mindset; and (3) Lycurgus might serve as a role model for the emperor.

246 This will be further explored in the analysis of Lycurgus (189D–F).

247 See Part III, chapter 1.4.1–2 on Per. 1–2 and Aem. 1.
1.2 The Apologetic Part (172C–E)

At the outset of the second part, Plutarch announces two issues that will be addressed in the remainder of the letter (172C):

\[\text{... εἰ πρόσφορον ἔχει τι πρὸς κατανόησιν ἠθῶν καὶ προαιρέσεων ἣγεμονικῶν, ἐμφαινομένων τοῖς λόγοις μᾶλλον ἢ ταῖς πράξεις αὐτῶν. καίτοι καὶ βίους ἔχει τὸ σύνταγμα τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων παρὰ τε Ῥωμαίοις καὶ παρ᾽ Ἕλλησιν ἡγεμόνων καὶ νομοθέτων καὶ αὐτοκρατόρων...} \]

... if so be that they contain something meet for the true understanding of the characters and predilections of men in high places, which are better reflected in their words than in their actions. True it is that a work of mine comprises the lives also of the most noted rulers, lawgivers, and generals among the Romans and the Greeks; ...

Both issues concern the usefulness and raison d’être of Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata. In this way, there is also a connection with the preceding part that dwelt upon the utility (χρεία) of a present:

[1] A first issue is introduced by the conditional clause. The question is whether sayings truly provide a better insight into the characters of historical figures than their actions. Plutarch will have to prove the truth of this: only when this is the case can the collection be a most convenient tool for the emperor (and others).

[2] A second question is announced by καίτοι, highlighting an objection: clearly, readers need to wonder why they would be in need of the collection, if they can, after all, also read the Parallel Lives. This suggests that the goal of the biographies consists of what is described in [1] as well, viz. enabling the reader to gain insight into the characters of different heroes. In this way, Plutarch establishes a connection between Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata and the biographical project. The evident implication is that the former will be a compilation of Roman and Greek “rulers, lawgivers, and generals” too. Only from this point on is it clear what type of material the collection will contain.

\[^{248}\text{I do not follow the LCL translation of αὐτοκρατόρων, see supra, p. 30–31. Nachstädt (1971) 2 has ἔχει<ς>, a conjecture of Wilamowitz, but this emendation is not necessary. Babbitt (1931) and Bernardakis (1889), and consequently Ingenkamp – Bernardakis (2008) 1, all follow the manuscripts. See also Citro (2014) 52–53 and (2017b) 6.}\]

\[^{249}\text{LSJ, s.v. “καίτοι”}.\]
The two issues are addressed by the following three phrases, which share a similar contrast between words (in bold) and deeds (underlined) (172C–E):

... ἀλλὰ τῶν μὲν πράξεων αἱ πολλαί τύχην ἀναμεμιγμένην ἔχουσιν, αἱ δὲ γινόμεναι παρὰ τὰ ἔργα καὶ τὰς τύχας ἀποφάσεις καὶ ἀναφωνήσεις ὀσπερ ἐν κατόπτροις καθαρῶς παρέχουσι τὴν ἑκάστου διάνοιαν ἀποθεωρεῖν. ἤ καὶ Σειράμνης ὁ Πέρσης πρὸς τοὺς θαυμάζοντας, ὅτι τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ νοῦν ἐχόντων αἱ πράξεις οὐ κατορθοῦνται, τῶν μὲν λόγων ἔφη κύριος αὐτὸς εἶναι, τὸν δὲ πράξεων τὴν τύχην μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως. ἐκεῖ μὲν οὖν ἃμα αἱ ἀποφάσεις τῶν ἀνδρῶν τὰς πράξεις παρακειμένας ἐξουσαι σχολάζουσαν φιληκοΐαν ἑνταῦθα δὲ καὶ τοὺς λόγους αὐτοὺς καθ᾽ αὑτοὺς ὡσπερ δείγματα τῶν βίων καὶ σπέρματα συνειλεγμένους οὐδὲν οἴομαι σοι τὸν καιρὸν ἐνοχλήσειν, ἐν βραχέσι πολλῶν ἀναθεώρησιν ἀνδρῶν ἀξίων μνήμης γενομένων λαμβάνοντι.

... but their actions, for the most part, have an admixture of chance, whereas their pronouncements and unpremeditated utterance in connexion with what they did or experienced or chanced upon afford an opportunity to observe, as in so many mirrors, the workings of the mind of each man. In keeping herewith is the remark of Seiramnes the Persian who, in answer to those who expressed surprise because, while his words showed sense, his actions were never crowned with success, said that he himself was master of his words, but chance, together with the King, was master of his actions. In the Lives the pronouncements of the men have the story of the men’s actions adjoined in the same pages, and so must wait for the time when one has the desire to read in a leisurely way; but here the remarks, made into a separate collection quite by themselves, serving, so to speak, as samples and primal elements of the men’s lives, will not, I think, be any serious tax on your time, and you will get in brief compass an opportunity to pass in review many men who have proved themselves worthy of being remembered.

The first phrase (ἀλλὰ ... ἀποθεωρεῖν, 172CD) deals with issue [1], and the connection with [2] is not immediately clear. Plutarch only claims in general terms that actions also involve an element of chance, and that this is different with sayings. This explains why words are a more effective tool to reflect upon character and intentions. This conviction is supported by the second phrase (ἥ ... βασιλέως, 172D), which contains a third and final apophthegm of the letter. It not only shows why words display character so clearly, but also provides an example of such a saying illustrating the speaker’s personality.250

---

250 See also Citro (2017b) 26–29 on this apophthegm.
This apophthegm, however, has raised some questions, as discussed above. Nothing is known about Seiramnes, although he probably was a general, as the story seems to suggest.\textsuperscript{251} Scholars have noticed that Diodorus Siculus tells a similar story about the Persian satrap Pharnabazus\textsuperscript{252} in his treatment of the second Persian campaign against Egypt, which started in 373 BC.\textsuperscript{253} During the expedition, Artaxerxes Mnemon hired the Greek Iphicrates to come to the aid of the Persian army (\textit{Bibliotheca historica} XV.41):

\begin{quote}

έτη δὲ πλείω τοῦ Φαρναβάζου κατανηλωκότος περὶ τὰς παρασκευὰς, ὁ μὲν Ἰφικράτης ὀρὼν αὐτὸν ἐν μὲν τῷ λέγειν ὃντα δεινὸν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς πραττομένοις νοεχέλῃ, παρρησία πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐχρήσατο, φήσας θαυμάζειν πῶς ἐν μὲν τοῖς λόγοις ἐστὶν ὀξύς, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἔργοις βραδύς. ὁ δὲ Φαρνάβαζος ἀπεκρίθη, διότι τῶν μὲν λόγων αὐτὸς κύριός ἐστι, τῶν δὲ ἔργων ὁ βασιλεὺς.
\end{quote}

After Pharnabazus had wasted several years making his preparations, Iphicrates, perceiving that though in talk he was clever, he was sluggish in action, frankly told him that he marvelled that anyone so quick in speech could be so dilatory in action. Pharnabazus replied that it was because he was master of his words but the King was master of his actions.

Comparing this with the Seiramnes story, one notices the same emphasis on the opposition between words and deeds,\textsuperscript{254} and some additional agreements in wording.\textsuperscript{255} Diodorus’ and Plutarch’s account, then, probably share a common source.\textsuperscript{256} The implication is that the king whom the

\textsuperscript{251} In the prefatory letter to his collection of apophthegms (most of which were derived from \textit{Reg. et imp. apophth.} and \textit{Apophth. Lac.}, besides the \textit{Vitae philosophorum} of Diogenes Laertius, see Juhász-Ormsby (2017) 46), Erasmus (1539) 4 also assumes that Seiramnes was a general: “Siramnes Persa, Dux ut upinor”.

\textsuperscript{252} Wyttenbach (1810) 1042; Volkmann (1869) 217; Beck, M. (2002) 172; Citro (2017b) 27. Cf. supra, p. 31.

\textsuperscript{253} See Ruzicka (2012) 99–121 for a detailed historical account of this campaign.

\textsuperscript{254} The wording, however, is not entirely the same: Plutarch uses πράξεως; Diodorus speaks of ἔργα (both use λόγοι to refer to words). Instead of λέγω and πράττω, the letter contains the two nouns again.

\textsuperscript{255} Both texts contain a form of θαυμάζω, share κύριος in combination with αὐτός, and end with a reference to the βασιλεὺς, a Persian king. See Citro (2017b) 27–29 for a more elaborate comparison.

\textsuperscript{256} As appears from \textit{Art.} 24.1, Plutarch knew about the Persian campaign described by Diodorus and the disagreements between Pharnabazus and Iphicrates. According to Binder (2008) 77, the source of \textit{Art.} 24 could have been Deinon.
The first part of I contains a general claim: actions are blended with chance. In the corresponding part of III, Plutarch states that the Parallel Lives (ἐκεῖ μὲν) specifically blend words with actions. As a consequence, τύχη plays an important role in the biographies. Insight into their characters will therefore be more difficult to obtain. This is why a full understanding of men of the past requires an “unoccupied fondness for listening” (σχολάζουσαν φιληκοΐαν).

In other words, the reader needs time to read the Lives.

In the second part of I, Plutarch writes that sayings (ἀποφάσεις) and utterances (ἀναφωνήσεις) allow the audience to examine (ἀποθεωρεῖν) a person’s intentions clearly. The equivalent in III again contains a specific application of this, which now concerns Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata (ἔνταῦθα δέ): in contrast with the Lives, the sayings (λόγους) brought together in the collection will not take much time for those who want to study (ἀναθεώρησιν) characters. In line with this, the counterpart of the mirror simile in I consists of another comparison in III: words are compared with samples and seeds of lives (δείγματα τῶν βίων καὶ σπέρματα). The metaphors at first sight express the same basic idea: because of the absence of τύχη, sayings ensure that one can easily and
quickly perceive the hero’s διάνοια. The collection will therefore be a most convenient means for a busy man like the Roman emperor. The utility of the work has now successfully been defended.

Yet a contrast between the general claims in I and their specifications in III suggests that there is more than this apologetic aspect. As Roskam writes, the use of ἀποθεωρεῖν and ἀναθεωρήσεως is pregnant with meaning.²⁵⁹

In this passage, the verbs ἀποθεωρέω and ἀναθεωρέω are indeed combined with one another: the suggestion is that the convenient collection will enable Trajan (the alleged dedicatee of the work) to make himself quickly familiar with the material (the phase of ἀναθεωρήσεως) and then further reflect on it from a distance (the phase of ἀποθεωρεῖν).

In light of this, it should be noted that Plutarch refers in III only to Trajan’s act of reading the collection, which can be defined as nothing more than getting insight into characters (ἀναθεωρήσεως). Phrase I, on the contrary, concerns the possible next phase of ἀποθεωρήσεως: drawing lessons from characters after reading. It alludes, then, to the moment of moral reflection and improvement. That this expression is combined with a mirror comparison is not coincidental. Although the notion of accurate and reliable reflection is often an important element in Plutarch’s use of the metaphor, it is almost always applied in combination with human exempla for the readers, connected with the concept of imitation.²⁶⁰ The simile in the letter, therefore, might refer to lessons to be drawn from role models for the sake of improvement as well.²⁶¹

²⁵⁹ Roskam (2014) 191. Another relevant passage in this regard is the prologue to Aem.–Tim. (discussed in Part III, chapter 1.4.2), containing ἀναθεωρήσεως. Roskam (2014) 191 claims that one indeed expects this verb in a prologue, while ἀποθεωρεῖν fits well within the purpose of the synkrieseis: “In this early stage, the verb ἀναθεωρήσεως is indeed fully appropriate: Plutarch first has to make himself familiar with his material, and it is only at the end of his account that he will be able to evaluate his heroes’ achievements from a distance. Exactly this same dynamics between ἀποθεωρέω and ἀναθεωρέω can be found in the proem to the Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata”. See also Roskam (2017) 172–173.

²⁶⁰ As Zadorojnyi (2010) 173–174 states, the mirror in antiquity can indeed be “a source of veritable likenesses that enable better understanding”, but reflections can also be regarded as “deceptive, ‘bewitching’ and only apparently stable”. This ambiguous aspect of the mirror comparison might also be implied in the letter; see infra, p. 91.

²⁶¹ Beck, M. (2002) 165: “The behavior of both Artaxerxes and Lycurgus is being modeled in the apophthegms. Trajan is encouraged to understand and learn from their behavior (cf. the mirror simile)”. One should however keep in mind that this is still rather implicit in the text.
Thus, only when dealing with general claims does the author suggest that the eventual goal of apophthegms consists of the reader’s moral progress, or learning something from the characters; when Trajan’s specific situation is addressed, the text only refers to learning about them. This is in line with Plutarch’s cautious attitude: he refrains from straightforwardly stating that the emperor needs to improve his character. Yet the parallel structure of phrases I and III implies that this is still what should happen: ἀναθεώρησις will presumably take place when Trajan carefully reads the work, but Plutarch hopes that ἀποθεώρησις will follow too. And perhaps, this could also be the subtle implication of the seeds metaphor: sayings might at this later phase also plant a desire in the readers to become like their heroes and shape their own characters. At this second, implicit stage, the notion of growth is important (and in line with δεῖγμα in the meaning of “a pattern to be followed”). Hence, the use of βίος in the letter might refer not only to the actual lives of the men of the past, but also to those of the readers, an ambiguity which recalls the Parallel Lives once more.

1.3 A Clash between the Two Parts

Although the second part discusses in detail the importance of sayings for understanding character, the first part opens with two stories that only contain actions. This remarkable clash is highlighted by the Seiramnes apophthegm, which, on the contrary, contains a saying and refers to a Persian king, perhaps even the same as the one in the opening story. The suggestion is that this contrast is intentional, and that Plutarch wants to redirect the reader to the earlier stories. This, in fact, can also be seen from versions of the Artaxerxes and Lycurgus apophthegms in other works of the Chaeronean. As usual, he adapts his material to fit the specific content and goals, as appears from a comparison of different accounts of the stories:

262 A suggestion made to me by Professor Christopher Pelling.
265 In the following scheme, words in bold occur in the letter and in the other account(s). Words in italics in the right column(s) highlight differences from the letter. An apophthegm similar to the Lycurgus story occurs in fragment 47 Sandbach (Comm. in Hes.), where the final clause is also part of a saying. This apophthegm is not included in this table, since the wording is quite different, and because it is not attributed to Lycurgus. Citro (2017b) 16–17 provides a comparison of all accounts.
Ἀρτοξέρξης ὁ Περσῶν βασιλεύς,
ὡς μέγιστε αὐτόκρατορ Τραϊανὲ
Καῖσαρ, ὦ μέγιστον οἰόμενον
βασιλικὸν καὶ 
φιλάνθρωπον
εἶναι τοῦ μεγάλα διδόναι τὸ
μικρὰ λαμβάνειν εὖμενῶς καὶ
προθύμως, ἐπεὶ παρελαύνοντος
αὐτοῦ καθ’ ὁδὸν αὐτουργὸς
ἀνθρωπος καὶ ἰδιώτης οὐδὲν
ἐξὸν ἔτερον ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ
taῖς χερεῖν ἀμφοτέραις ύδωρ
ὑπολαβὼν προσήνεγκεν,
ήδεως εἶδεξάτο καὶ ἐμειδίασε,
tῇ προθυμίᾳ τοῦ διδόντος οὐ τῇ
χρείᾳ τοῦ διδομένου τὴν χάριν
μετρήσας.
Reg. et imp. apophth. 172B

“Artaxerxes, the king of the
Persians, O Trajan, Emperor Most
High and Monarch Supreme, used
to think that, as compared with
giving large gifts, it was no less
the mark of a king and a lover of
his fellow-men to accept small
gifts graciously and with a ready
goodwill; and so, on a time when
he was riding by, and a simple la-
bourer, possessed of nothing else,
took up water from the river in
his two hands and offered it to the
king, he accepted it pleasantly and
with a cheerful smile, measuring
the favour by the ready goodwill
of the giver and not by the service
rendered by the gift.”

ἐν <δὲ> τῷ δέχεσθαι χάριτας οὐχ ἦττον
toῖς διδούσιν ἢ τοῖς λαμβάνουσιν ἐν
[δὲ] τῷ διδόναι φαινόμενος εὖχαρις
καὶ φιλάνθρωπος. οὐδὲν γὰρ ἦν οὕτω
σμικρὸν τί τὸν διδομένον, ὃ μὴ
προσεδέξατο προθύμως, ἀλλὰ καὶ ῥόαν
μίαν ὑπερφυῆ μεγέθει προσέδραμεν
Ὠμίσου τινὸς αὐτῷ, “νὴ τὸν Μίθραν”
eἶπεν “οὕτος ὁ ἀνὴρ καὶ πόλιν ἄν
ἐκ μικρὰς ταχὺ ποιήσεις μεγάλην
πιστευθείς.” Ἐπεὶ δ’ ἄλλων ἄλλα
προσφέροντον καθ’ ὁδὸν αὐτουργὸς
ἀνθρωπος οὐδὲν εἶπεν ἐπὶ καιροῦ φθάσας
ἐρείν τῷ ποταμῷ προσέδέξαμε, καὶ
tαῖν χερεῖν ὑπολαβὼν τοῦ ὅποτος
προσήνεγκεν, ἠσθεὶς ὁ Ἀρτοξέρξης
φιάλην ἔπεμψεν αὐτῷ χρυσῆν καὶ
χιλίους δαρεικοὺς.
Art. 4.4–5.1

“and in his acceptance and bestowal
of favours appeared no less gracious
and kindly to the givers than to the
recipients. For there was no gift so
small that he did not accept it with
alacrity; indeed, when a certain Omisus
brought him a single pomegranate of
surpassing size, he said: ‘By Mithra,
this man would speedily make a city
great instead of small were he entrusted
with it.’ Once when he was on a journey
and various people were presenting
him with various things, a labouring
man, who could find nothing else at the
moment, ran to the river, and, taking
some of the water in his hands, offered
it to him; at which Artaxerxes was so
pleased that he sent him a goblet of gold
and a thousand darics.”
The following elements stand out:

[1] As to Artaxerxes, the story as told in the letter is split up in the Life. Between the two parts, another apophthegm occurs, which is very similar to the water story: a simple man (Ὠμίσου τινός) gives Artaxerxes a present of limited value (a pomegranate, albeit a big one), after which the king expresses his gratitude. This story, however, contains a saying. Plutarch knew the apophthegm when he wrote Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata, for it is included in the collection as Artaxerxes Mnenion II (174A). It is, therefore, striking that he opted for a story without a saying in the first part of the dedicatory letter. In addition, every detail focuses on the king’s actions: he accepts water with pleasure and smiles (ἡδέως ἐδέξατο καὶ ἐμειδίασε), elements that are absent from the Life.266

[2] As to Lycurgus, Apophthegmata Laconica and the Life of Lycurgus contain a saying in direct speech. In the letter, however, this is transformed into a single final clause without indicating that Lycurgus spoke the words.267 As a result, the reader might get the impression that it does not present a saying, but Plutarch’s interpretation of the Spartan’s action.

266 Citro (2017b) 12–13: “Il ritratto positivo del sovrano persiano è accentuato ulteriormente dall’uso dell’avverbio ἡδέως e del verbo μειδιάω, che indicano chiaramente l’apprezzamento di Artaserse per il gesto dell’uomo, apprezzamento che si traduce in un sorriso di benevolenza.” This chapter advocates a different interpretation.

267 The version which contains a saying probably precedes the version without a saying, as Apophth. Lac. might represent the notes used for Lyc. and Reg. et imp. apophth.; cf. Stadter (2014b) 666–674 and Appendix II.
Thus, Plutarch twice avoids using a saying in the first part of the letter, thereby deliberately creating a contrast with the second part. The question is why. I can think of two possible explanations, which are not mutually exclusive. The first is of a rhetorical nature, and related to the level of the letter; the other functions at the level of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* in their entirety:

[1] The first is in line with Plutarch’s overall caution. If the opening apophthegms suggest that Trajan should imitate two rulers of the past, the implication is that he has to derive lessons from them, as argued above. Yet we have already seen that the author does not want to state *explicitly* that Trajan needs such moral progress. The emperor does not, however, need to be offended: he is only implicitly asked to imitate one *act* of Artaxerxes (and perhaps of Lycurgus), and Plutarch immediately elaborates the idea that words reflect characters better than deeds. Trajan, then, is not asked to model his personality after these *exempla*, for this might go too far. In other words, the contrast between the two parts of the letter provides an additional mitigating factor which fits well within the general cautious atmosphere of the text.

This also solves an issue noticed by Almagor. He wonders why the author opens his letter with a reference to the Persian king, arguing that Plutarch would never establish such a close connection between the Roman emperor and a barbarian.268 This is indeed a surprising move in light of the recent Parthian campaigns (if Plutarch indeed had this in mind),269 since Trajan would then be asked to learn something from his enemies. In addition, Artaxerxes Mnemon is not what one would call a clear example of good moral behaviour in the *Life of Artaxerxes*, at least not in the closing chapters of the biography.270 The discrepancy between the first and second part of the letter, however, suggests that Artaxerxes might not be a true moral example for the emperor after all, or at least that this cannot be decided from his story.

268 Almagor (2018) 272. Citro (2017b) 8 also states that Artaxerxes’ appearance in the letter is surprising, but does not relate it to the question of Plutarch’s authorship.
269 On this possible reference, see also Beck, M. (2002) 165. He furthermore believes that Plutarch opted for a story concerning Lycurgus to establish a connection with Trajan too, as he “may call to mind the extremely martial and, for many years, successful city of Sparta. Undoubtedly Trajan himself was one of the most vigorously active Emperors from a military point of view”. Citro (2014) 65–67 and (2017b) 15–16 points out that there could also be another explanation, for the Spartan king could have been an example for Trajan in other respects too: as Desideri (2002) argues, Plutarch might refer to the educational reforms of the Flavians and later of Trajan by establishing a connection with Lycurgus’ educational system in *Comp. Lyc. et Num.*
By redirecting the readers, Plutarch invites them to actively think about the stories at the outset of the text. Keeping in mind that sayings are a better means to study character, they should ask what the actions and smile might tell about Artaxerxes’ true disposition. They wonder whether the motivation described in the participle clause can be regarded as the king’s actual motivation, or whether it only reflects a possible interpretation of his behaviour, suggested by the author. Similarly, it is not clear how the final clause in the Lycurgus story is to be read. At first, this again seems to have a rhetorical function at the level of the letter: it ensures that the readers will, by personal experience, be convinced of the importance of sayings, for they can more readily draw obvious conclusions from Seirannes’ apophthegm than from the opening stories. As a result, they are also persuaded of the usefulness of Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata and of this type of text in general.

Yet this is only the case so long as one only reads the letter. The first apophthegm of the collection, which not incidentally concerns a Persian king again, does not contain a saying either (172E). In addition, the analysis of the collection will point out that sayings do not always paint a clear picture at all. Even more: Plutarch often deliberately problematizes the image of the heroes, sometimes even through contradictory sayings of the same person. Claims in the letter are therefore not entirely consistent with the work, and seem to put the reader on the wrong track. The clash between the two parts of the letter, then, prepares the readers for this and shows them that a critical attitude is necessary when reading the collection: only profound reflection will provide a correct understanding of the true dispositions of characters, even when reading a compilation of apophthegms. In this way, the apparent inconsistency in the letter makes the readers reflect on the type of literature they are dealing with.

---

271 In Plutarch, smiles and laughter occur in a variety of contexts, see esp. Frazier (2000). See also Babut (1992) 195, specifically about the smile which shows the “supériorité du vrai philosophe”. See also Klaerr – Philippon – Sirinelli (1989) 299–300 about this aspect.

272 In the letter, the detail φαινόμενος that occurs in the Life is left out. Almagor (2018) 179 considers this another indication of inauthenticity: “This slight change could not have been made by Plutarch himself, aware as he was of all the nuances and subtleties of Artaxerxes’ character, but by a reader of the biography”. Yet a critical attitude of the reader with regard to Artaxerxes’ appearance is also expected in the letter, so this nuance is in fact also implied here (pace Citro (2017a) 54–55).

273 This is similar to Plutarch’s practice in some of his dialogues. As to the Delphic dialogues, Müller, A. (2012) shows that the author wants his readers to weigh up the argumentations of the characters against each other, which makes them conclude that the method of dialogue is the best option to reach the most reliable answer. In a later article on these texts, Müller, A. (2013) argues that Plutarch wants to teach his readers how a
teaches the correct reading strategy of weighing all elements of a text against each other, especially when these seem to be contradictory or problematizing.

Finally, even this might be in line with the mirror simile. Zadorojnyi writes with regard to the prologue to *Aemilius–Timoleon*:

> Reflections in mirrors can be faithful and educative, but equally they can distort, lie or harm. By the same token the subjects of Plutarch’s biographies are not out-and-out admirable or wicked; too often their motives and actions are difficult to pigeonhole. So the mirror-metaphor in *Aemilius* 1.1 carries a veiled injunction that the reader of the *Lives* must not be an idle voyeuristic onlooker but rather an intelligent and pro-active scryer who has the responsibility to investigate the text and its protagonist.

The metaphor in the dedicatory letter may well have the same implication: if sayings are comparable to mirrors, they might deceive as well. Thus, *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* after all require active and critical readers too, similar to those welcomed by the *Lives*.

### 1.4 Conclusion

Plutarch’s caution in addressing the Roman emperor dominates the entire letter. In line with this, the first part reads as a traditional dedication, and the second as a typical defence of the utility of the work, described only in terms of getting insight into character. Yet a close analysis of both sections suggests that the eventual goal of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* consists of Trajan’s moral progress (and probably also that of other readers). An intentional clash within the letter highlights that this can only be reached when adopting a critical attitude, for in the same way as the letter seems to deconstruct itself, it will not always be easy to derive clear conclusions from the sections in the collection. Thus, although reading *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* requires far less time than reading the *Parallel Lives*, reflection still remains a *condicio sine qua non* for a correct assessment of characters and, therefore, for moral progress when reading the former work as well.

---


The apophthegm collection consists of various levels that entail different interpretations. All of these are announced by the dedicatory letter (172B–E), in connection with the *Parallel Lives*: (1) the work contains apophthegms (2) of famous men of the past (τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων), (3) there are different types of rulers of various peoples (παρά τε Ῥωμαίοις καὶ παρ᾽ Ἕλλησιν ἠγεμόνων καὶ νομοθετῶν καὶ αὐτοκρατόρων), and (4) the text constitutes a whole (cf. the *Parallel Lives* as a σύνταγμα).^{275}

### 2.1 Apophthegms

*Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* consist of 494 apophthegms. These are the smallest units of the collection. All apophthegms are related to a specific moment in time or are instigated by specific circumstances.^{276} As Stenger notices, their elaboration varies widely:^{277} some consist of only one syntactic unit (but never less than one syntactic unit),^{278} for example ἔλεγεν introducing a saying without any contextual information; others give an extensive description of the historical background, and Plutarch sometimes even adds the aftermath of a story.^{279} A new apophthegm begins when there is a shift in time, circumstances, or cause.^{280}

---

^{275} As stated, most parts of this chapter are an adapted version of parts of van der Wiel (2023a), esp. 1–7. In this article I point out that the traditional division of the collection should sometimes be reconsidered. These cases are also briefly discussed in the notes below and in the literary analysis presented in the next chapters. A general overview is provided in Appendix I, also taken from van der Wiel (2023a) 23–26.

^{276} The cause or historical background can contain a saying of the subject too (so an apophthegm can contain two sayings): van der Wiel (2023a) 12–13 thus joins *Gaius Fabricius* IV and V (195AB).


^{278} van der Wiel (2023a) 9–10 thus joins *Cato Maior* I and II (198D), VI and VII (198E), and XVI and XVII (199A).

^{279} In light of this, van der Wiel (2023a) 15 takes *Scipio Minor* XX and XXI (201DE) together.

^{280} In line with this, van der Wiel (2023a) 8–9 splits *Flamininus* I (197A) after πεμφθείς δὲ; *Pompeius* I (203BC) after νέος δ' ὤν; *Lucullus* II (203AB) after προσβάς δὲ (ibid 18).
This is almost always indicated by a δέ at the outset of this new element within a section.²⁸¹

2.2 Sections on Historical Figures

A series of apophthegms on the same historical figure together form a section. The collection comprises 89 such units,²⁸² which vary substantially in length: the shortest sections contain only one apophthegm, while the longest, *Alexander* (179D–181F), has 34. The first apophthegm of a section usually does not contain δέ as its second word,²⁸³ marking a break, and always opens with the name of its subject, except for *Cyrus* I (172E).²⁸⁴ This is often combined with additional information such as family ties, important functions, nicknames, origins, or other distinctive elements. This is necessary to clarify who is the subject of the following apophthegms, for the text, as published in antiquity, probably did not provide the lemmata of the modern editions.²⁸⁵ This can be seen from *P. Oxy. 78* 5155, a third- or fourth-century copy of some Spartan sections of the collection (191EF): while apophthegms are separated from each other by a divider mark or a blank space, the transition from one individual to another is only indicated by the name at the outset of the new section.²⁸⁶ This also explains why the first section, *Cyrus* (172EF), is the only exception to this rule: a divider mark or blank space sufficed to highlight the transition from the letter to the collection.

In line with the dedicatory letter, various sections truly read as an abbreviated *Life*, or at least as the core of a *Life*.²⁸⁷ In these cases, the first

---

²⁸¹ Four exceptions can only be explained as a scribal error or inconsistency of the author: *Philippus* II (177C); *Antigonus Monophthalmus* IX (182C); *Eudamidas* II (192B); and *Parysatis* (174A), belonging to the previous section. Other cases in Nachstädt are not true exceptions, as the division in modern editions should be reconsidered: *Agis Secundus* VI (190D); *Cicero* XV (205C); *Caesar* VII (206C); and *Caesar* X (206D).

²⁸² See van der Wiel (2023a) 18–21 on *Semiramis* (173AB) and *Parysatis* (174A) as part of the preceding sections.

²⁸³ Many exceptions can be explained by connections with the preceding apophthegm(s), see van der Wiel (2023a) 3n11.

²⁸⁴ Cf. Stadter (2014b) 676. *Demetrius Poliorcetes* I (183A) is not a real exception to this rule: the first words refer to his nickname.

²⁸⁵ Cf. Babbitt (1931) 12 on their absence in the manuscripts.


apophthegm(s) often give(s) general information about the new subject (and, as discussed, do(es) not necessarily contain a saying), which reminds one of Plutarch’s biographies. Contrary to what one might expect, the Lives seldom commence with a description of the early years of the hero, but rather convey something about the character in general. Duff speaks of “proemial openings” in these cases:

Proemial openings [...] contain material drawn from any point in the subject’s life; this material, furthermore, is often not told in chronological order, or even in a way which might suggest that it is chronological. The organization is thematic, and while proemial openings may contain material from childhood, they look at the Life as a whole and contain material from adult life too. An important concomitant of this is that childhood in the Lives is rarely narrated.

Information often included in the proemial openings are “the subject’s family, character, education, physical appearance, etc.” Such elements are precisely what one finds in the opening ‘apophthegms’ of some sections in Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata: they thus have a function similar to Duff’s proemial openings, as they concern the entire life of the character and do not belong to a specific historical event, because of which the imperfect tense often dominates here.

The apophthegms following these opening ‘stories’ are usually ordered chronologically, or at least give this impression. They are also structured thematically, according to the principle of what I call ‘gradual shifting’. This means that most apophthegms share an element with the preceding one(s), in a way that recalls how Plutarch connects the pieces of advice in Coniugalia praecepta, as discussed in detail by Goessler. These common elements can be anything: a historical event (cf. the chronological structure), a theme such as justice or mildness, or even
just a word or name. In this way, Plutarch creates entire chains. In other cases, however, there is no connection between two apophthegms that follow after one another. Such breaks often separate blocks of stories.

The closing apophthegms of five sections contain a saying about its protagonist and are therefore rather atypical. Yet this is also reminiscent of Plutarch’s practice in the Parallel Lives: these five stories shed further light on the character in general and often even reassess the entire section, thus recalling the biographies that do not close with the hero’s death but assess his life as a whole.

2.3 Sections on Peoples and Types of Government

Historical figures are ordered according to the nation or city state they belong to. With a few exceptions, they follow each other chronologically within these larger sections, as noticed by Stadter. Groups of peoples, in turn, are put together according to two principles:

1) Most important is Plutarch’s threefold categorization of humanity. First, there are fifteen barbarians (172E–174F; 33 apophthegms): eight Persians (172E–174B; 23), one section on Egyptian kings in general (174C; 1), three Thracians (174CD; 4), and three Scythians (174EF; 5). Second, there are 54 Greeks (175A–194E; 294): six Sicilians (175A–177A; 31) and fourteen Macedonians (177A–184F; 111) are followed by 34 Greeks of the core mainland, viz. fourteen Athenians (184F–189D; 73), eighteen Spartans (189D–192C; 49), and two Thebans (192C–194E; 30). A series

294 Alexander XXXIV (181F); Aristeides V (186BC); Brasidas III (190BC). One should also add Semiramis (173AB) about Darius and Parysatis (174A) about Artaxerxes Mnemon.


296 Stadter (2008) 55 lists the following deviations: Semiramis (173AB; although he recognizes that this belongs to Darius); Peisistratus (189B–D), following Phocion (187E–189B); and Gaius Popillius (202E–203A), following Sulla (202E); cf. Stadter (2014b) 676 in a similar overview of the collection’s general structure. Less significant are a few Spartan men who “are grouped achronologically at the end of the Spartan section”, see Stadter (2008) 55. One can add the Diadochi, see the analysis of 181F–184F.


298 Plutarch “often denies that Macedonians are true Greeks”, see Swain (1989b) 516. This might have been an additional reason to separate them from the Greeks of the core mainland.
of 20 Romans closes the collection (194E–208A; 167). As the ancient ‘editions’ of the text probably did not contain lemmata to separate the different ethnicities from each other either,\textsuperscript{299} Plutarch sometimes clarifies a transition to a new people at the outset of these sections, especially in cases where a name alone might not suffice.\textsuperscript{300}

[2] Peoples are also ordered according to the type of rulers their sections include: barbarian sole rulers are followed by Sicilian tyrants and Macedonian monarchs. Greek generals and popular leaders are followed by those of the Roman Republic. The collection closes again with a monarch, \textit{Augustus} (206F–208A; after \textit{Caesar}, 205E–206F), which establishes a ring composition. Especially this final point is closely connected with the following level of the text that concerns \textit{Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata} as a kind of abbreviated world history.

### 2.4 A World History

In general, the collection contains two chronologies. The first consists of what can be defined as the ‘monarchical’ sections (172E–184F): the Persians, Egyptians, Thracians, and Seythians will all be defeated by the Macedonian Empire. This chronology is interrupted: after the last diadoch of the collection, \textit{Antiochus Septimus} (184D–F), Plutarch takes the reader back to the times of the Persian Wars by introducing \textit{Themistocles} (184F–185F). The logical sequence Athens – Sparta – Thebes, representing the order in which these city states once dominated the Greek world, opens a second chronology. The Romans introduce an entirely different setting, but references to the \textit{Diadochi} emphasize that this second chronology continues.\textsuperscript{301} One reads how the Romans gradually conquer their regions and the collection closes with their world dominion.

\textsuperscript{299} See esp. Nachstädt (1971) 70 on his title \textit{ΡΩΜΑΙΚΑ}: “Titulus (ut plerumque etiam lemmata) deest ubique, sed in mge ῥωμαικά JSAX V oss. 2; ἀποφθέγματα ῥωμαικά G part. II Laud. 55. De Romanis O m. post.” Titles in Valerius Maximus are not original either, see Wardle (1998) 6 and 15.

\textsuperscript{300} \textit{Polytys} (174C): Πόλτυς ὁ Θρᾳκῶν βασιλεύς; \textit{Idanthyrsus} (174E): Ἰδάνθυρσος ὁ Σκυθῶν βασιλεύς; \textit{Pérσα} at the outset of \textit{Cyrus} I (172E) immediately indicates which people will be treated first; as \textit{Lycurgus} (189D–F) follows the Athenians, he had to be explicitly introduced as a Spartan (189D: Λυκοῦργος ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος) to distinguish him from his Athenian namesake.

\textsuperscript{301} Pyrrhus plays an important role in \textit{Gaius Fabricius} (194F–195B); in \textit{Flamininus} (197A–D), the Romans have to face various Macedonian enemies in order to free the Greeks; etc.
2.5 Overview

The table below provides an overview of the general structure of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*, which coincides with the levels of interpretation announced by the dedicatory letter to Trajan. In line with this, the following analysis will divide the collection into three main parts of approximately equal length: (1) the monarchical sections (172E–184F; 175 apophthegms; chapter 3), (2) the sections on the Greeks of the core mainland (184F–194E; 152; chapter 4), and (3) the Roman sections (194E–208A; 167; chapter 5).
The general structure of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*

I The dedicatory letter to Trajan
172B–E

The letter announces in connection with the *Parallel Lives*:
1. apophthegms of famous men/individuals (τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων),
2. who are different types of rulers of various peoples (παρὰ τὰ Ῥωμαίους καὶ παρ᾽ Ἑλληνικαῖς ἡγεμόνους καὶ νομοθετῶν καὶ ἀυτοκρατόρων)
3. The reference to the *Parallel Lives* as a σύνταγμα alludes to the collection as an abbreviated world history

II The collection
172E–208A

1. Interpretation at the level of the apophthegms
2. Interpretation at the level of individuals
3. Interpretation at the level of cultural identity:
   - Barbarians: 172E–174F
   - Persians: 172E–174B
   - Egypt: 174C
   - Thracians: 174CD
   - Barbarism: 174C–F
   - Scythians: 174EF
   - Kings of Macedon: 175A–177A
   - Despotism: 172E–174F
   - Sicilian tyrants: 175A–184F
   - ‘Less typical’ Greeks: 175A–184F
   - ‘Earlier’ republic: 194E–203A
   - Athens: 184F–189D
   - Sparta: 189D–192C
   - Thebes: 192C–194E
   - Kings of Macedon: 177A–184F

4. Interpretation of the collection as an abbreviated world history: two general chronologies:
   - A first general chronology
     - From the Persian Empire to Macedonian ‘world dominion’
   - A second general chronology
     - From the Persian Wars to Roman ‘world dominion’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barbarians</th>
<th>Greeks</th>
<th>Romans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>172E–174F</td>
<td>175A–194E</td>
<td>194E–208A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despotism</td>
<td>‘Less typical’ Greeks</td>
<td>Roman Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172E–174B</td>
<td>175A–184F</td>
<td>194E–205E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persians</td>
<td>Core mainland</td>
<td>Principate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172E–174B</td>
<td>184F–194E</td>
<td>205E–208A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>‘Earlier’ republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174C</td>
<td>184F–189D</td>
<td>194E–203A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thracians</td>
<td>Sparta</td>
<td>Civil wars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174CD</td>
<td>189D–192C</td>
<td>203A–206F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbarism</td>
<td>Thebes</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174C–F</td>
<td>192C–194E</td>
<td>206F–208A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scythians</td>
<td>Kings of Macedon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3
The Monarchical Sections (172E–184F)

3.1 Persian Despotism (172E–174B)

This part consists of five units: (1) Cyrus (172EF); (2) Darius (172F–173B); (3) Xerxes (173BC); (4) a series of sections, from Artaxerxes Longimanus until Orontes (173D–174B), that all shed light on the pivotal figure of Artaxerxes Mnemon; and (5) a final apophthegm presenting Memnon (174B). As Almagor points out, the Persian section is closely connected with the dedicatory letter in three ways: the presence of Persians and more precisely of Artaxerxes Mnemon, of course; some verbatim similarities; and the dominating theme of giving and taking. As a consequence, it is to be interpreted in light of the letter in terms of its content and should be read in a similar way: the reassessment of Artaxerxes Mnemon in the letter prepares the reader for the sections on three Persian kings, viz. Darius, Xerxes, and, unsurprisingly, Artaxerxes Mnemon again. But first Cyrus the Great appears on the stage: the section dedicated to him – separated from the next one by a small chronological gap and by its different content – will serve not only as an introduction to the Persian section, but also to the monarchical sections as a whole.

302 Almagor (2018) 274 notes that Artaxerxes I is placed more or less at the center of the Persian section, but the following analysis focuses on Artaxerxes II Mnemon: (1) Artaxerxes Longimanus provides the background of Artaxerxes Mnemon (173F–174A), (2) Cyrus Minor (173EF) and Orontes (174B) reflect upon the character of Artaxerxes Mnemon, and (3) a story on Artaxerxes Mnemon opens the dedicatory letter.

303 Mossman (2010) 146 observes: “Nepos selects the following barbarian kings and generals for mention: Cyrus, Darius I, Xerxes, Artaxerxes I and II, Datames […], and Hamilcar and Hannibal. This list very largely overlaps with the sections on barbarians in Plutarch’s Sayings of Kings and Commanders […] though the Carthaginians do not figure; their sayings are included in the Sayings of Romans instead.” She refers to the conclusion of Geiger (1981) 95–99 that Nepos’ selection of historical figures had an impact on Plutarch. Geiger (1988) argues that Plutarch also borrowed the idea of comparing Greeks and Romans in his Parallel Lives from Nepos.

304 Almagor (2018) 273, on βασιλικόν (172B) – βασιλικώτερον (173D); and βίον combined with σπέρματα (172D) – σπέρματα combined with βίοι (172F).

305 E.g. no apophthegms on Cambyses II are included.
3.1.1 Cyrus (172EF)

_Cyrus_ I opens with Πέρσαι instead of with Cyrus’ name. This already suggests that the Persian section will not only focus on the characters of the kings themselves, but also on the Persian people and their relationship with their rulers: a general claim about Cyrus’ subjects is explained by their assessment of his reign. The opening apophthegm, then, does not contain a saying nor even an action. As stated, Plutarch often opens a section in this way, but it still is remarkable that, immediately after the discussion of the importance of sayings, the first apophthegm does not contain one: it only relates that the Persians love people with hooked noses because of Cyrus’ physical appearance (172E).

The next two apophthegms continue this positive image. _Cyrus_ II discusses the character of a good ruler in connection with his relationship with his subjects. The saying consists of two parts (172E). The first one is more general: Cyrus says that people who do not want to provide good things (τἀγαθά) for themselves are forced to do so for others. The second is more specific, related to the task of the king: only those who are better than their subjects are fit to rule. As both parts of the saying are presented as belonging together, the reader has to interpret them as a whole: a good ruler, who is concerned with the well-being of his subjects and who knows what is good, provides these good things for his people, not for himself. This continues the theme of giving and taking in the letter.

_Cyrus_ III (172EF) builds on this, and makes it more specific by presenting Cyrus as an example of a good ruler. As was the case with I and II, this apophthegm also connects the people with their king: he knows what is bad for his subjects and when he has to refuse their requests. When the Persians ask him to dwell in another country, he does not give in,

εἰπὼν ὅτι καὶ τῶν φυτῶν τὰ σπέρματα καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ βίοι ταῖς χώραις συνεξομοιοῦνται.

saying that both the seeds of plants and the lives of men are bound to be like the land of their origin.

---

306 The apophthegm occurs in _Praec. ger. reip._ 821E as the final story of a series of apophthegms illustrating the advantages of the people’s goodwill towards the ruler.

307 As Babbitt (1931) follows Bernardakis (1889), he does not include καὶ καλλίστους ύπολαμβάνουσι, admitting in a note that it occurs in some manuscripts. _Praec. ger. reip._ 821E contains these same words.

308 Paragraph cf. van der Wiel (2023a) 9.

309 A lengthy account of the story occurs in Herodotus IX.122.
The combination of σπέρματα and βίοι recalls the phrase δείγματα τῶν βίων καὶ σπέρματα in the dedicatory letter (172D). In that passage, Plutarch called sayings the “germs” of one’s life, the basis on which the characters of men of the past can be judged. A similar link between σπέρματα and βίοι is established in the quote above: Cyrus refuses the request of the Persian people out of regard for their character. This is why III is in fact an illustration of the truth of II and its applicability to Cyrus’ own life: the king was a good man and aimed to improve his subjects.

This educating role is a core task of the (good) monarch, entirely in line with Plutarch’s Platonic views. This especially comes to the fore when Plutarch is dealing with a monarch’s duty as a lawgiver throughout his oeuvre (one readily thinks of Lycurgus–Numa), and this will also appear as a recurrent theme in the collection: by means of laws, a ruler can improve the characters of his subordinates. That this major responsibility of the sole ruler is stressed at the outset of the work, and of the monarchical sections in particular, is not coincidental.

Cyrus thus provides a positive opening for Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata. While Cyrus I illustrates the goodwill of the Persian people towards their king, II and III gradually explain why he was beloved. This rather straightforward interpretation contrasts with the more complicated way in which the following sections are to be read. Finally, it should be noted that this is not the only case of such a difference between the opening sections and what follows, as will become clear throughout the analysis.

3.1.2 Darius (172F–173B)

Darius I, a general remark by Darius about his own character (172F; cf. the imperfect tense), seems to be rather isolated. II is more specific and tells of his mildness in collecting taxes (172F–173A). In III, the king opens a pomegranate, and when someone asks him what he would like to have as much as the seeds in the fruit, he answers (LCL): “Men like Zopyrus” (173A: Ζωπύρους), a good friend of his who returns in IV. In this apophthegm, similar to III, the king says that he would not even want to have one hundred Babylons in exchange for the mutilation of this man.

---

311 See Part III, chapter 2.4.
312 Lyc. 5.1 also connects the goodwill of the Spartans towards Lycurgus with his moral superiority.
313 The apophthegm also occurs in An seni 792C, combined with two other stories told in Reg. et imp. apophth., see infra, note 352.
(173A).\textsuperscript{314} Once more a friend is described as something valuable which one possesses. II–IV are thus connected thematically and focus on the admirable way in which Darius values the right priorities and wealth. This contrasts strikingly with Semiramis (173AB).\textsuperscript{315}

Semiramis caused a great tomb to be prepared for herself, and on it this inscription: “Whatever king finds himself in need of money may break into this monument and take as much as he wishes.” Darius accordingly broke into it, but found no money; he did, however, come upon another inscription reading as follows: “If you were not a wicked man with an insatiate greed for money, you would not be disturbing the places where the dead are laid.”

In the modern editions, this is traditionally considered the only apophthegm of a separate section on Semiramis (173AB), since it contains sayings (inscriptions) of this queen and not of Darius.\textsuperscript{316} Yet, as I discuss elsewhere, other sections also conclude with an apophthegm about the protagonist,\textsuperscript{317} and there are several reasons for considering the ‘section’ part of Darius: it concerns a Babylonian queen (which does not fit within the Persian section); it breaks the general chronological structure of the collection; and it opens with δέ. As the closing story of Darius, it should be interpreted as conveying something about the king in the first place, as is also suggested by Mossman.\textsuperscript{318}

\textsuperscript{314} These apophthegms about Zopyrus and Darius are well known from Herodotus (Darius III cf. Herodotus IV.143; Darius IV cf. Herodotus III.154 etc.), but his account of Darius III is not about Zopyrus.


\textsuperscript{316} On Plutarch’s use of inscriptions, see Buckler (1992) 4788–4799 and 4838; and Liddel (2008).

\textsuperscript{317} See supra, note 294.

\textsuperscript{318} Paragraph from van der Wiel (2023a) 19–20 (with minor changes). Mossman (2010) 147 lists Semiramis as a separate section, but adds that “this relates in fact only to Darius and seems to be taken from the inscription on Nitocris’ tomb in Herodotus 1.187”. 
A different man appears on stage in this concluding story. Darius was obviously deceived, but still he violated a grave in order to take riches. Perhaps, then, there is some truth in the inscription reproaching his avarice, and to say the very least, this complicates the image as constructed on the basis of the preceding three apophthegms. The contrast with Darius IV especially stands out, since it is linked to Semiramis by the same location, the city of Babylon, and by similarities in wording. This is a clear example of gradual shifting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Darius II (172F–173A)</th>
<th>Darius III (173A)</th>
<th>Darius IV (173A)</th>
<th>Semiramis (173AB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wealth (taxes)</td>
<td>Wealth (ἐχεῖν ἔβούλετο)</td>
<td>Wealth (ἐθελῆσαι λαβεῖν)</td>
<td>Wealth (βούλεται λαβεῖν)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good friend (Zopyrus)</td>
<td>Good friend (Zopyrus)</td>
<td>Βαβυλωνίους; Βαβυλώνας</td>
<td>Semiramis (Babylon)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Darius II–IV offer a consistent and rather positive image of the king and his relationship with possessions, but this image is immediately deconstructed by Semiramis, evoking precisely the opposite view. The final and explicit judgement of Darius’ character (κακὸς ἀνὴρ χρημάτων ἄπληστος, 173B) thus gives the entire section a darker outlook, and it is left to the readers to make their personal assessment.

3.1.3 Xerxes (173BC)

This section not only describes Xerxes’ character, but also has a transitional function. On the one hand, the opening words (173B: Ξέρξῃ τῷ Δαρείου) highlight a connection with the previous section (cf. Darius I, 172F: Δαρεῖος ὁ Ξέρξου πατήρ), and the second apophthegm takes the reader back to Babylon (173C: Βαβυλωνίους); on the other hand, some themes announced by Xerxes prepare for the following sections.

Xerxes I describes the strife between the king and his brother for the Persian kingdom (173BC).319 This connection between brotherly love and

---

319 *De frat. am.* 488D–F tells this story in similar or the same wording: Αριαμένης κατέβαινεν ἐκ τῆς Βακτριανῆς (173B) – Αριαμένης μὲν οὖν κατέβαινεν ἐκ Μηδῶν (488D); ἔπεμψεν οὖν αὐτῷ δόρα (173B) – δόρα πέμπων (488D); φράσαι κελεύσας τούς διδόντας (173B) – ἐκέλευσεν εἰπεῖν τοὺς κομίζοντας (488E); ’τούτοις σε τιμᾷ νῦν Ξέρξης ὁ ἀδελφός· ἐὰν δὲ βασιλεῖς ἀναγορευθή, πάντων ἐσθι παρ’ αὐτῷ μέγιστος.’ (173B) – ’τούτοις σε τιμᾷ Ξέρξης ὁ ἀδελφός· ἐὰν δὲ βασιλεῖς κρίσαι καὶ ψήφῳ Περσῶν ἀναγορευθή, δίδωσι σοι δευτέρῳ μεθ’ ἑαυτὸν εἶναι.’ (488E); ὁ μὲν Αριαμένης εὐθὺς προσεκύνησε καὶ τὸ διάδημα περιέθηκεν (173C) – Αριαμένης δ’
strife for power will be further thematized in the remainder of the Persian section and beyond.\textsuperscript{320} II relates how the king treats the Babylonians harshly after their failed revolt. The opening word (ὀργισθείς) is quite telling: Xerxes is angry and loses his temper. What follows is an excessive and humiliating penalty (173C). The association anger–excess will also be further explored in the remainder of the monarchical section. Xerxes III and IV are closely connected with each other, dealing with the king’s expedition against the Greeks: he refuses to eat Attic figs as long as he has not conquered Attica (173C), and allows spies to inspect his camp after catching them (173C).\textsuperscript{321} Thus, III resumes the theme of possession, which will be continued in the following sections; in IV, Xerxes shows himself to be a gentle ruler: even though one might argue that this story instead shows his confidence in his troops and perhaps even his arrogance, the emphasis falls on the fact that he did the spies no harm (note the phrase οὐδὲν ἠδίκησεν, 173C). Xerxes’ leniency thus dominates, which contrasts with Xerxes II. Again, mildness is a main theme in what follows, but IV also ensures that the readers have to deal with contradictory stories: they should wonder whether the king truly was lenient.

3.1.4 Four Sections on Artaxerxes Mnemon (173D–174B)

Artaxerxes Mnemon (173F–174A) is to be interpreted in connection with the surrounding sections, all of which describe not only their own protagonists, but this king as well. First, the subsection on his grandfather, Artaxerxes Longimanus (173DE), invites the reader to compare his character with that of his namesake. The section has two main themes, closely connected with each other and with the preceding sections: the theme of giving and taking, recalling Cyrus III (172EF), Darius III–IV (173A), and Xerxes III (173C); and the theme of punishing, announced by Xerxes εὐθὺς ἀναπηδήσας προσεκύνησε τὸν ἀδελφὸν καὶ λαβόμενος τῆς δεξιᾶς εἰς τὸν θρόνον ἐκάθισε τὸν βασίλειον (488F), in Xerxes I, Ariamenes puts the crown on Xerxes’ head; in De frat. am., he places his brother on the throne: a note might have contained both elements; ὁ δὲ Ξέρξης ἐκείνῳ τὴν δευτέραν μεθ’ ἑαυτὸν ἔδωκε τάξιν (173C) – ἐκ τούτου μέγιστος ἦν παρ’ αὐτῷ καὶ παρεῖχεν εὔνους ἑαυτόν (488F) do not agree verbally: the combination παρ’ αὐτῷ and μέγιστος of 488F occurs earlier in Xerxes I, while the combination of δίδωμι, δεύτερος and μεθ’ εαυτόν of 173C occurs in the corresponding place of De frat. am. (488E).

\textsuperscript{320} Brotherly love was close to Plutarch’s heart, as De frat. am. testifies. On the importance he attached to family, see Albini (1997), esp. 67–68 on brotherly harmony; see Bannon (1995) for the Lives.

\textsuperscript{321} Xerxes III (173C): Ἀττικὰς δὲ ἱσχάδας – negation of the predicate (with added part. aor.) – ἄλλ.; IV (173C): Ἐλληνικὰς δὲ κατασκόπους – negation of the predicate (with added part. aor.) – ἄλλα.
II (173C). *Artaxerxes Longimanus* I is a standard opening apophthegm (173D):

Ἀρτοξέρξης ὁ Ξέρξου, ὁ μακρόχειρ προσαγορευθεὶς διὰ τὸ τὴν ἐτέραν χεῖρα μακροτέραν ἔχειν, ἔλεγεν ὅτι τὸ προσθεῖναι τοῦ ἀφελεῖν βασιλικώτερόν ἐστι.

Artaxerxes, the son of Xerxes, called “Longhand,” because of his having one hand longer than the other, used to say that it is more kingly to give to one who has than to take away.

The section is introduced by typical components, such as the king’s name, family ties, his nickname (ὁ μακρόχειρ) and its explanation. Plutarch also had a clear reason to include this specific saying: it suggests a link between the nickname and the importance which the king attaches to the act of giving, although the author clearly recognizes that it originates from his physical appearance. 322 This ‘false connection’ thus creates the impression that Artaxerxes I got his nickname from how others, or perhaps he himself, assessed his moral virtues, and not just from how he looked. 323 In this way, the apophthegm is similar to *Cyrus* I, which also connects physical appearance with the evaluation of character (172E). This suggests that both men were rulers of the same kind, or at least that Artaxerxes desired to equal the elder king in terms of his greatness.

In *Artaxerxes Longimanus* II, the king allows his fellow hunters to shoot before him (173D). III narrates how he only mildly punishes bad leaders (173D). 324 Both illustrate his kindness and justice, which distinguish him – as well as his successors, as is the suggestion at this point – from predecessors such as Darius and Xerxes. This is emphasized by the double occurrence of πρῶτος δὲ (173D) at the outset of these apophthegms and by the wordplay in II (173D: Πρῶτος δὲ πρωτοβολεῖν). More specifically, the theme of mild punishments contrasts with *Xerxes* II (173BC). The same goes for *Artaxerxes Longimanus* IV: Satibarzanes, who attempts to make the king do something unjust for money, is not punished, but even receives the sum he was promised (173DE).

---

322 As he also does in *Art. 1.1*, quoted *infra*, p. 108. See also Binder (2008) 83: “Das Epitheton wird einerseits rational aufgrund einer körperlichen Anomalie, wie hier bei Plutarch (u. a. auch mor. 173D; Strabon 15, 3, 21 kennt den Beinamen ebenfalls und erklärt ihn auch rational, allerdings nicht in Bezug auf Artaxerxes, sondern fälschlicherweise auf Dareios)”.

323 On physiognomy in Plutarch, see Georgiadou (1992b); Tatum (1995) and (1996), focusing on kings.

324 The story is alluded to in *De aud. poet. 35F* and in *De sera num. 565A* (not mentioning Artaxerxes I, see Almagor (2018) 274).
more, justice and mildness are combined. Artaxerxes Longimanus II, III, and IV thus confirm the positive image established by I.

But there is more to this opening apophthegm. Several similarities in terms of wording refer back to the image of Artaxerxes Mnemon at the outset of the dedicatory letter, which calls for comparison. At a second reading there, a more nuanced image of Artaxerxes Mnemon arose and questions had to be asked about his actual disposition. This is different from Artaxerxes Longimanus, of which a straightforward interpretation suffices. The Life of Artaxerxes is in line with this. At the outset of the Life, Plutarch also describes the nickname of the protagonist’s grandfather, whose positive image remains intact (Art. 1.1):

The first Artaxerxes, preëminent among the kings of Persia for gentleness and magnanimity, was surnamed Longimanus, because his right hand was longer than his left, and was the son of Xerxes [...].

In a later passage, Artaxerxes Mnemon is explicitly compared with his grandfather (Art. 4.4):

There was, too, a certain dilatoriness in the nature of the king, which most people took for clemency. Moreover, in the beginning he appeared to be altogether emulous of the gentleness of the Artaxerxes

325 Compare the saying of Artaxerxes Longimanus I with that of Artaxerxes II in the letter: both combine a form of βασιλικός with a saying about giving and taking; see also supra, note 304.

326 Note the focus on presents and punishments, also the main themes in Artaxerxes Longimanus I (173D), as observed by Almagor (2018) 274–275, who concludes that it is possible (275) “that both anecdotes belong to a certain hypomnema and that while composing the Artaxerxes Plutarch transferred these stories from Artaxerxes I to the protagonist of the biography, using the comment on the ‘imitation’ of Artaxerxes I (Art. 4.4: ζηλούν ἑδοξε τὴν Ἀρτοξέρξου τοῦ ὁμωνύμου πραότητα) to justify this transference”.

326
whose name he bore, showing himself very agreeable in intercourse, and bestowing greater honours and favours than were really deserved, while from all his punishments he took away the element of insult or vindictive pleasure, and in his acceptance and bestowal of favours appeared no less gracious and kindly to the givers than to the recipients.

It is significant that Artaxerxes I is called gentle and magnanimous without qualification in the first words of this biography, while in the case of the second passage, all emphasis is placed on how the younger Artaxerxes appeared to be (as highlighted by the underlined words), rather than on his actual disposition.\(^{327}\) This leaves open the question of whether he was a real or only a fake imitator of his grandfather. One notices a similar difference between the characters of grandfather and grandson when comparing the dedicatory letter and *Artaxerxes Longimanus*.

There is also a tension between the unambiguous *Artaxerxes Longimanus* and the following Persian apophthegms. As Almagor points out, all of these (173E–174B), except for the last one (*Memnon*, 174B), are related to Artaxerxes Mnemon through family relations and explicit references to him.\(^{328}\) The picture is problematic. First, there is a section on his brother, Cyrus the Younger (173EF). This man tries to convince the Spartans to assist him on his expedition, by first comparing himself with Artaxerxes Mnemon, claiming (173E)

> τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ καρδίαν ἔχειν βαρυτέραν καὶ πλείονα πίνειν ἄκρατον αὐτοῦ καὶ φέρειν βέλτιον· ἐκεῖνον δὲ μόλις ἐν ταῖς θήραις ἐπὶ τῶν ἵππων μένειν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς δεινοῖς μηδὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου.

that he had a stouter heart than his brother, and that he could drink more strong wine than his brother could and carry it better; moreover, that at hunts his brother could hardly stay on his horse, and at a time of terror not even on his throne.

This saying has a double function: (1) it indirectly informs the reader of what Cyrus’ expedition is about, viz. taking the throne from his brother, thereby resuming a topic from *Xerxes* I (civic harmony and brotherly

---

\(^{327}\) According to Mossman (2010) 150, “this passage is beginning to prepare the reader for the dramatic change in Artaxerxes’ practice later in the life”. See also Almagor (2018) 279 on φαινόμενος.

\(^{328}\) Almagor (2018) 276: “the figure of Artaxerxes Mnemon dominates the second part of the Persian section, as four of the last five persons are introduced interacting with him: Cyrus talks of his brother, Parysatis is presented as his mother and Orontes as his son-in-law”.
Part II. A Literary Analysis

strife, 173BC);\textsuperscript{329} (2) and, of more direct concern, it contrasts a harsh Cyrus with a soft Artaxerxes Mnemon. This second point is important, as it is also related to the question of whether Artaxerxes is a true Persian or not: at the outset of the collection, Cyrus the Great describes the Persians precisely in terms of their roughness (he claims that his subjects should be like their land). A character’s conformity with his cultural heritage is a recurrent theme throughout the collection and is often connected with the right to rule.

In the next section (173F–174A), the reader can explore whether Artaxerxes’ softness is weakness, as Cyrus implies, or gentleness.\textsuperscript{330} In the first apophthegms (173F–174A), the second option seems to prevail. Artaxerxes Mnemon I calls his friendly grandfather to mind: he allows everyone to speak with him or with his wife (173F).\textsuperscript{331} Similar kindness appears from II and III (174A):

\begin{enumerate}
\item 2. Πένητος δ’ ἀνθρώπων μῆλον ὑπερφυὲς μεγέθει προσενέγκαντος αὐτῷ δεξάμενος ἡδέως ‘νὴ τὸν Μίθραν’ εἶπεν ‘οὗτός μοι δοκεῖ καὶ πόλιν ἄν ἐκ μικράς μεγάλην πιστευθεὶς ἀπεργάσασθαι.
\item 3. Ἐν δὲ φυγῇ τινι τῆς ἀποσκευῆς αὐτοῦ διαρπαγείσῆς ξηρὰ σῦκα φαγὼν καὶ κρίθινον ἄρτον ἄπειρος ἤμην.’
\end{enumerate}

2. A poor man brought to him an apple of extraordinary size which he accepted with pleasure, and at the same time he remarked, “By Mithras I swear it seems to me that this man would make a big city out of a small one if it were entrusted to his charge.”\textsuperscript{332}

\textsuperscript{329} The apophthegm occurs, besides a short reference in Quaest. conv. 620C, in Art. 6.2–4 too, introducing the beginning of Cyrus’ war against his brother.

\textsuperscript{330} In the Life, the story has a similar function. According to Mossman (2010) 150, the “reader may well end up believing what Cyrus says of his brother in 6”.

\textsuperscript{331} In Art. 5.6, the apophthegm concludes a series of stories illustrating 4.4 quoted above. In the Life, then, the story receives all the emphasis, also illustrated by the comment that this action of the king “gratified the Persians most of all” (μάλιστα κεχαρισμένην ὀψιν παρεῖχε τοῖς Πέρσαις). That Artaxerxes Mnemon allowed everyone to speak with himself as well is not told in the Life, but coincides with two stories earlier in the chapter (5.2–3). Plutarch also refers to the Persian (and ‘barbaric’) custom of excluding women in Them. 26.4–5. Volkmann (1869) 228 sees a problem in the deviation οἱ δεόμενοι (173F) – ταῖς δημότισιν (Art. 5.6). The version of 173F, where anyone is allowed to speak to the king’s wife, is definitely more powerful, but the variation might also be the consequence of a scribal error; cf. Nachstädt (1971) 7: “αἱ δεόμεναι? Na. cf. ταῖς δημότισιν v. Art.”

\textsuperscript{332} In the account of Art. 4.5 Artaxerxes Mnemon accepts a pomegranate instead of an apple (174A: μῆλον). Almagor (2018) 276–277 argues that this could be the consequence of Plutarch’s literary choice, but he prefers another explanation: Art. 4.5 reads ρόαν μίαν
3. Once in a precipitate retreat his baggage was plundered, and as he ate dry figs and barley-bread he exclaimed, “What a pleasure is this which has never been mine before!”\textsuperscript{333}

Various elements again recall the dedicatory letter. First, II resembles Artaxerxes’ apophthegm in 172B in terms of content and wording.\textsuperscript{334} The account of the corresponding Life has different wording in some of these cases,\textsuperscript{335} which suggests that Artaxerxes Mnemon II contains secondary changes in order to establish a closer relationship with the letter. Second, since III (174A) is in line with II (in both stories, the king appears to be happy with small things), it similarly refers back to the dedicatory letter. Finally, Artaxerxes reacts after a misfortune, which recalls Seiramnes’ saying (172D).

The precise relevance of all these connections with the letter will become clear below, after a discussion of Orontes (174B), but first there is Parysatis (174A):

Παρύσατις ἡ Κύρου καὶ Ἀρτοξέρξου μήτηρ ἐκέλευε τὸν βασιλέα μέλλοντα μετὰ παρρησίας διαλέγεσθαι βυσσίνοις χρῆσθαι ρήμασιν.

Parysatis, the mother of Cyrus and Artaxerxes, advised that he who was intending to talk frankly with the king should use words of softest texture.

\textsuperscript{333} Artaxerxes Mnemon III resembles Art. 12.5–6. There are also connections with similar apophthegms on the king: the story opening the dedicatory letter (172B), also told in Art. 5.1; and Artaxerxes Mnemon II (174A) and Art. 4.5 (two variants of the same story); see Almagor (2018) 114–118, arguing that these apophthegms are related to a story told by Ctesias and occurred in Plutarch's own notes, or a mistake during the transmission of the text.

\textsuperscript{334} Πένητος δ’ ἀνθρώπου (174A), cf. αὐτουργὸς ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἰδιώτης (172B); προσενέγκαντος (174A), cf. προσήνεγκεν (172B); δεξάμενος ἡδέως (174A), cf. ἡδέως ἐδέξατο (172B); and μικρᾶς μεγάλην (174A), recalling τοῦ μεγάλα διδόναι τὸ μικρὰ λαμβάνειν (172B).

\textsuperscript{335} Πένητος δ’ ἀνθρώπου (174A) does not occur in Art. 4.5, which has Ψήσαν τινός instead, but προσενέγκαντος (174A) can be found in the Life too. The combination δεξάμενος ἡδέως (174A) is not exactly the same in Art. 4.5 (προσεδέξατο προθύμως, but not part of the apophthegm). μικρᾶς μεγάλην (174A) occurs in both accounts: Art. 4.5 contains πόλιν ἃν έκ μικρᾶς ταχύ ποιήσευε μεγάλην.
There are two reasons to regard this as a separate section, as do the modern editions: it seems to open with the name of a new main character and additional personal information, and it does not contain δὲ. Yet there are better arguments for considering the saying part of Artaxerxes Mnemon: as a separate section, it would deviate from the chronological sequence; although Parysatis was a powerful woman at the Persian court, she does not really belong to the category of ἡγεμόνες, νομοθέται, and αὐτοκράτορες announced by the dedicatory letter; Brasidas (190BC) is another example of a section closing with a saying of the subject’s mother; and, perhaps most importantly, the saying might shed light not only on Parysatis’ character, but on that of Artaxerxes as well: the queen does not mention him by name, but one may reasonably conclude that she is advising others on how best to approach her son – the more so because Plutarch introduces her as his mother. In addition, δὲ could have been left out because the king does not play an active role in the story. If this saying is to be interpreted as a guideline to speak to Artaxerxes Mnemon, the image of the king darkens: whoever wants to speak with him μετὰ παρρησίας, should use words “made of linen” (βυσσίνοις χρῆσθαι ῥήμασιν). This phrase is often interpreted as “soft words”, but Almagor suggests another meaning: the expression refers to the concealing nature of cloth. Parysatis’ saying, then, implies that talking frankly to her son might be dangerous. By speaking in general terms she demonstrates her own caution and contributes to the truth of this image. It is now clear that the king might be not that gentle.

This reassessment of Artaxerxes’ character again recalls Plutarch’s practice in the dedicatory letter: one wonders whether this Persian king is as good as he seems, or, in line with the fourth chapter of the Life of Artaxerxes, whether his appearance is only an attempt to imitate the great character of his grandfather.

Finally, there is Orontes (174B). Its one apophthegm is in line with the argument in the dedicatory letter about the way in which words uttered

---

336 On Parysatis, see Fiehn (1949) 2051.
337 See also the LCL translation: “words of softest texture”.
339 Paragraph from van der Wiel (2023a) 20–21 (with adaptations and additions).
340 Art. 4 still invited asking questions about Artaxerxes Mnemon, but Art. 30.9 (at the end of the Life) leaves no doubts: βιώσας μὲν ἐνενήκοντα καὶ τέσσαρ’ ἐτη, βασιλεύσας δὲ δύο καὶ ἐξήκοντα, δόξας δὲ πρᾶος εἶναι καὶ φιλυπήκοος οὐχ ἥκιστα διὰ τὸν υἱὸν Ὦχον, ὦμότητι καὶ μιαφονίᾳ πάντας ὑπερβαλόμενον (“He had lived ninety-four years, and had been king sixty-two, and had the reputation of being gentle and fond of his subjects; though this was chiefly due to his son Ochus, who surpassed all men in cruelty and blood-guiltiness”); see Binder (2008) 360 about the passage). δόξας δὲ πρᾶος recalls ἔδοξε τὴν Αρτοξέρξου τοῦ ὄμωνύμου πραώτητα (Art. 4.4).
in misfortune, and subsequent actions, illustrate character (172DE). Yet even though, in light of this, Orontes at first sight seems to say something about the section’s subject, it again concerns Artaxerxes Mnemon as well: Orontes, his son-in-law, fell from his grace, and the only reason that is given is the vague δι’ ὀργήν. This reference to anger as a motivation of the king’s decision raises new questions about his character. Plutarch was familiar with all the negative consequences of anger and discussed them in detail in De cohibenda ira. It is therefore remarkable that parallels from other authors suggest that Artaxerxes’ anger may have been not entirely unjustified. That Plutarch remains silent about the full facts of the case creates the impression that, even though Orontes might not have been guilty, the king still decided against him. Actions of kings with regard to their friends are therefore compared with the fingers of mathematicians, based on their arbitrariness. This reminds one of the randomness of τύχη, although this motif is not explicitly thematized here. Thus, Seiramnes’ apophthegm from the letter (172D) is recalled in various ways: by the way in which Orontes reacts to events beyond his power; because the character of Artaxerxes Mnemon is reassessed again; and because of the king’s power over Orontes.

This connection between the dedicatory letter and the Persian section is relevant for the interpretation of the characters of the previous kings as well. The deceptive and dangerous nature and the contrasts between the true disposition and outward behaviour of Darius, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes Mnemon ensure that the readers realize that they are not dealing with essentially good monarchs, but with dangerous despots whose actions are unpredictable: in all three cases, an inconsistent image of the kings arises, which does not allow for a straightforward assessment of these whimsical characters. Thus, the connection between a king and arbitrariness established by Seiramnes (172D, note the juxtaposition τὴν τύχην μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως) suddenly has relevance beyond the interpretation of the letter.

3.1.5 Memnon (174B)

With this section, Plutarch seems to deviate from the general geographical structure of the collection: Memnon was not Persian, but Greek. Yet he fought on the Persian side, and closing the Persian section with a Greek evokes Alexander’s conquest and transformation of the Persian

---

341 Babbitt (1931) 20 reads διὰ κατηγορίαν instead of δι’ ὀργήν, based on Diodorus Siculus XV.10–11: when Tiribazus was accused by Orontes, he listed all his deeds which favoured the king, after which he was acquitted. This lead to the punishment of Orontes. One understands why Babbitt changed the text, but the vagueness of δι’ ὀργήν is probably intended by Plutarch.
Empire with which the Chaeronean inevitably had to conclude this part.\textsuperscript{342} In this context, the absence of Darius III is quite telling: the Persian section ends with Αλεξάνδρῳ as its final word, providing a striking pendant of Πέρσαι at the outset (172E).\textsuperscript{343} Furthermore, the presence of a Greek goes hand in hand with the theme of cultural identity that dominates the collection, often related to παιδεία and moral superiority: Memnon respects his opponent and asks his soldiers to do the same. Thus, after a series of apophthegms that highlight the negative sides of Persian despotism, this story closes the section on a positive note. This is in line with how Plutarch concludes other sections on peoples, as will become clear.

\section*{3.2 The Egyptian Kings (174C)}

Οἱ Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεῖς κατὰ νόμον ἑαυτῶν τοὺς δικαστὰς ἐξώρκιζον ὅτι, κἂν βασιλεὺς τι προστάξῃ κρίναι τῶν μὴ δικαίων, οὐ κρινοῦσι.

The kings of the Egyptians, in accordance with a rule of their own, used to require their judges to swear that, even if the king should direct them to decide any case unfairly, they would not do so.

This one element of the Egyptian section can hardly be regarded as a real apophthegm, as it does not concern one person but rather describes a custom of all pharaohs. By including it after the Persians, Plutarch also deviates from the general chronology. In this way, it marks a break and separates units at a larger level of the text: the Persian section is emphatically distinguished from the Thracians and Scythians, two barbarian peoples that inhabit different parts of the world and have a completely different way of living. This is in line with the strange inclusion of Memnon, which contributes to this same effect: the ring composition it creates (Πέρσαι … Αλεξάνδρῳ) marks the Persian part as a separate unit. Yet this distinction between Persians and Thracians/Scythians does not mean that certain themes are not continued: the break rather illustrates Plutarch’s conception of barbarism, as will be discussed in Part III, chapter 2.1.

\textsuperscript{342} Pace Almagor (2018) 273: “Now, the inclusion of the Rhodian Memnon, Darius Codomannus’ commander of Greek mercenaries, in the Persian section (174b) would not appear to have been made by Plutarch. It would seem to correspond to a Roman division of mankind into Romans and \textit{externi}.”

\textsuperscript{343} Almagor (2018) 273–274.
3.3 Barbarian Disarray (174C–F)

Three explicit references to historical events show that there is a chronology in the Thracian and Scythian sections as a whole: the first Thracian king belongs to the earliest period of the Trojan War (174C: ἐν τῷ Τροϊκῷ πολέμῳ); the first Scythian king lived during the Persian Wars (174E: ἐφ’ ὃν διέβη Δαρεῖος); the Scythian Anteas was a contemporary of Philip of Macedonia (174E: Ἀντέας ἔγραφε πρὸς τὸν Φιλίππον and τοὺς δὲ πρέσβεις τοῦ Φιλίππου). This is an indication that both sections should be read together, as can also be seen from the fact that they contain apophthegms of three historical figures which are structured in a parallel way and are mutually connected by thematic similarities and by their wording: Poltys, the first character of the Thracian section, is thematically linked with Idanthyrsus, the first of the Scythian section; Teres, the second Thracian, with Anteas, the second Scythian; and Cotys, the third Thracian, with Scilurus, the third Scythian:

[1] The names at the outset of Poltys (174C) and Idanthyrsus (174E) are introduced in a similar way. Both stories concern a king’s ties with a Greek and an oriental people. A war has started and the king attempts to put an end to it: Poltys, one of the few legendary figures in the collector.

344 The same almost holds true for the actual chronology: in the sequence Poltys (174C, on the Trojan War) – Teres (174CD, see Babbitt (1931) 23: “King of the Odrysae in Thrace in the earlier part of the fifth century B.C.”) – Cotys (174D, see Babbitt (1931) 24: “King of Thrace, 382–358 B.C.”) – Idanthyrsus (174E, a contemporary of Darius) – Anteas (174EF, a contemporary of Philip) – Scilurus (174F, see Babbitt (1931) 27: “King of the Scythians, second or first century B.C.”), only Idanthyrsus seems out of place.

345 Anteas III on the captured flute player Ismenias (174EF) might originate from diplomatic contacts between the Scythian and the Macedonian king too, see Gardiner-Garden (1989) 33: “Though Ismenias’ skill, wit and life-style were the subject of many anecdotes, though a meeting between Ismenias and the barbarian King Ateas may have been fabricated for its comic value, and though Ismenias is unlikely to have been captured by Ateas when it was Ateas who was defeated by Philip, it is possible that Ismenias made an appearance at Ateas’ court as a member of one of Philip’s ambassadorial parties.” Stadter (1989) 56–57 gives an overview of this Ismenias’ and his namesakes’ appearances throughout Plutarch’s oeuvre.


347 Note Poltys: Αχαιῶν (174C) – Idanthyrsus: Ἰώνων (174E) and Poltys: Τρώων (174C) – Idanthyrsus: Δαρεῖος (174E). Plutarch establishes a link between Agesilaus’ campaign against the Persians and Agamemnon’s expedition in Ages.; see Nevin (2014) 50–59. On the connection between Greeks (including Alexander the Great) and the Greeks of the Iliad, on the one hand, and that between both Romans and Barbarians and the Trojans, on the other, see Bréchet (2008).
tion, tries to prevent the Trojan War; Idanthyrsus asks for help from the Ionians against Darius. Both kings fail.

[2] The relationship between Teres (174CD) and Anteas (174EF) is more complex. In the one apophthegm of this first section, connected with Poltys by the theme of war, the king says that he does not differ from his grooms (τῶν ἱπποκόμων) in times of peace. Anteas contains three apophthegms, which are a clear example of gradual shifting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anteas I</th>
<th>Anteas II</th>
<th>Anteas III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against Philip: Macedonians fight men, Scythians fight hunger and thirst (174E); πολέμιν</td>
<td>Against Philip: Anteas is carrying his horse himself and asks whether Philip would do this as well; the negative answer surprises him (174E); πόλεμον</td>
<td>When he hears flute music, Anteas says he would rather hear his horse neighing (174EF)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Teres and Anteas thus refer to fighting, but the clearest similarity is the equation of the kings with ἱπποκόμοι. This can be read as a representation of these protagonists as humble men, especially in Anteas II (to a lesser extent also in Teres, dealing with peaceful times alone). Yet since such barbarian “absence of political organization is usually seen as a lack of civilization” in Plutarch’s works, a similar judgement might make more sense here too. More importantly, however, both sections illustrate that war is the only thing that matters for these rulers. This is the most straightforward interpretation of Teres, but a similar position was apparently taken by Anteas, as can be seen from Anteas III.

Interestingly, Teres is told about Anteas in An seni 792C. This could simply be a case of Anekdotenwanderung, but there are various other possible explanations: Plutarch could have made a mistake in one of his two accounts, perhaps by copying and recopying his notes, for example when inserting the apophthegm from his notes (such as Apophth. Lac.)

---

348 In De Al. Magn. fort. 334B and in Non posse 1095EF, Anteas III is adduced as a negative example. The wording is almost entirely the same. See also Beck, M. (2003) 184 on Anteas III and the second Alexander oration. A wall of room 19 of a school in Trimithis also seems to refer to the story, see Cribiore – Davoli (2013) 9.

349 Teres: στρατεύοιτο (174D) – Anteas I: πολέμειν (174E) and μάχεσθαι (174E).

350 Teres: ἱπποκόμοιν (174D) – Anteas II: ψήχων τὸν ἵππον (174E).


352 The apophthegm also occurs in An seni 792A–D, there combined with many other stories (e.g. with accounts of Darius I [172F] and Dionysius Maior IX [176A]).

353 Volkmann (1869) 228 considers this an argument against authenticity.

into the ὑπόμνημα used for An seni.\(^{355}\) In this case, the attribution to Teres in Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata would probably be the correct one. Yet in light of the parallel structure of the Thracian and Scythian sections, it is perhaps not unlikely that the attribution to Anteas is the original one, and that Plutarch deliberately changed the main figure in the apophthegm collection in order to complete the parallelism.

[3] In Cotys I, the king accepts a leopard and gives a lion in return (174D). In II, presents are received and given as well: because of his irascible nature, the king destroys vessels in order that, when someone were to break these, he would not punish this person too severely out of anger (δι’ ὀργήν, 174D). This strange way of expressing gratitude evokes a lack of self-control. At the same time, the connection between anger and excessive punishment also recalls some Persian apophthegms: Xerxes II (173C) and especially Orontes (174B, also containing δι’ ὀργήν) come to mind. In Scilurus, the king teaches his 80 sons that they will be strong as long as they work together, but that discord would destroy them, by showing that a bundle of spears cannot be destroyed, while each spear separately can easily be broken (174F).\(^{356}\) Another theme from the Persian section is continued, that is, the connection between civic harmony and brotherly love, the focus of Xerxes I (173BC) and Cyrus Minor (173EF).

Thematic connections between Cotys and Scilurus, then, are less clear. One can define their common theme as ‘the importance of personal relations’, in the first case concerning good friends, in the second with regard to family. This might not seem an obvious link, but the references to broken objects, expressed by similar words,\(^{357}\) are still a striking resemblance between the two sections and complete the parallelism:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political relations: diplomatic missions fail</td>
<td>Lack of political hierarchy; only war matters</td>
<td>Personal relations and their dangers; lack of self-control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{355}\) See supra, note 114 on hypomnemata; on the use of such notes in An seni, see Xenophon (2012b).

\(^{356}\) In De gar. 511C the story is cited as a second example illustrating the truth of the following question (511B): οἱ δὲ συμβολικῶς ἄνευ φωνῆς ἃ δεῖ φράζοντες οὐκ ἐπαινοῦνται καὶ θαυμάζονται διαφερόντος; (“And are not those who indicate by signs, without a word, what must be done, praised and admired exceedingly?”).

\(^{357}\) Cotys II (174D): εὖθραυστα, συνέτριψεν, συντρίβοντας – Scilurus (174F): καταθραῦσαι, συνέκλασε.
This parallel structure depicts the Thracians and Scythians as similar people and true barbarians: they are disorganized, often dangerously lack self-control, and do not know how to deal with others and other peoples. They provide food for moral reflection, but are clearly not exempla for the audience of readers. Yet Plutarch’s image is not entirely negative, for the section again concludes on a wise note, as was the case with the Persian section: Scilurus recognized the importance of brotherly harmony.  

3.4 Sicilian Tyranny (175A–177A)  

3.4.1 Gelon and Hiero (175A–C)  

Gelon (175AB) contains four apophthegms. The first emphasizes the transition from the barbarian to the Greek part of the collection and seems to mark a break: Gelon defeats the Carthaginians, forbids them to sacrifice children to Cronus and thereby puts an end to an extremely barbaric custom (175A). These promising opening lines, however, are overshadowed by the section’s final apophthegm, which relates how the tyrant asks to bring his horse to a party when music is played (175AB). This story recalls Anteas III (174EF; both apophthegms even contain a very similar structure) and compels the reader to reassess the character of the collection’s first Greek, who turns out to be less civilized. This can also be seen from the two apophthegms framed by Gelon I and IV: in II, the tyrant orders his soldiers to work the land, not only in order to improve the fields, but also to prevent them from deteriorating (175A); in III, he promises to repay citizens after a war, which he eventually does (175A). One thus notices a gradual shift from a peaceful towards a more warlike ruler: while Gelon is establishing peace in his first apophthegm, he is training his soldiers in the second, and fights a war in the third. In the fourth and last apophthegm, vigour appears to be his absolute priority:

---

358 On positive barbarians in Plutarch, see infra, note 1167.  
359 In De sera num. 552A the story illustrates that Gelon was one of the tyrants who changed for the better. González González (2019) discusses human sacrifice in Plutarch. The theme occurs in Pel. 21 (see Georgiadou (1997) 166–167), cf. Am. narr. 773B–774D; Them. 13; Ages. 5: in all these passages, the main figure is opposed to human sacrifices. Plutarch shares their opinion, cf. De sup. 171B–E, also referring to the Carthaginian habit. Gelon’s victory is also referred to in Tim. 23.8.  
360 Anteas III (174F) and Gelon IV (175AB) first describe the background of the event (music is played), after which a genitivus absolutus illustrates the reaction of the participants (174F: θαυμαζόντων δὲ τῶν ἄλλων – 175AB: ἁρμοζομένων τῶν ἄλλων ἐφεξῆς καὶ ἄρμοσεν – 175B: αὐτὸς ἀνεπήδησεν).
As a consequence, the break between the barbarian and Greek sections suddenly appears less clear, in that the theme of barbarian savagery is continued in the first Greek sayings.\footnote{Bréchet (2004) discusses barbarism and savagery in Plutarch.} Something similar appears from the next section on Hiero (175BC): παρρησία prevails, which is again not only relevant for the assessment of this tyrant. First, I and II display Hiero’s general (twice an imperfect tense) opinions about what can and cannot be said. In I, he claims that everyone can always speak frankly to him, but II limits what can be said: ἀπόρρητα should not be shared (175B). In III, Hiero indeed appreciates frank speech (175B, cf. I).\footnote{In De cap. ex inim. 90B the story illustrates that obvious truths are more likely to be heard from one’s enemies.} In IV, Xenophanes of Colophon complains (is he asking for more money?), but Hiero does not give in (175C). In V, a comic poet is punished because of something inappropriate he said (175C: τι τῶν ἀπόρρητων, cf. II). The image of Hiero, then, is not (entirely) negative, but the exclusive focus on the theme of παρρησία recalls Persian despotism and the usual flattery at a court, especially in Artaxerxes Mnemon (173F–174B).\footnote{See in this context Mossman (2010) 148 on Art.: “Artaxerxes the man remains something of a vacuum. The real star of this life is the Persian court and its luxury and cruelty.”} Although the first sections of the Sicilian part are not to be assessed in an entirely negative way, since both Gelon and Hiero are definitely the ‘better’ tyrants,\footnote{Cf. De sera num. 551F–552A (see infra, note 1151).} they are included in order to extend two important barbarian themes to this new part of the collection, albeit in a modified and more positive form. They thereby provide the framework within which the other Sicilian protagonists will be assessed.

### 3.4.2 The Dionysii (175C–176E)

Dionysius the Elder is the main figure of the Sicilian part: with thirteen apophthegms, Dionysius Maior (175C–176C) is the collection’s first section of considerable length, as none of the preceding sections comprise more than five units. Two elements indicate that it is to be read in connection with the next one on his son (176C–E). First, Dionysius Minor opens in an unusual way, with δὲ (176C). As the absence of the particle often marks a break, its presence indicates a continuation.\footnote{See van der Wiel (2023a) 3111.} Second, Dionysius the Younger twice plays a role in Dionysius Maior (III and IV,
175DE); Dionysius the Elder appears twice in *Dionysius Minor* (IV and V, 176DE). In these apophthegms, they explicitly reflect upon each other’s character. As a consequence, a central theme is the contrast between father and son, emphasized by the acquisition and preservation of absolute power by Dionysius the Elder at the outset of his section, and by the loss of power by his son at the end of *Dionysius Minor*.

a) *Dionysius Maior* (175C–176C)

*Dionysius Maior* narrates how the man is chosen στρατηγός by the people of Syracuse (175C). In line with this, II deals with the early years of his despotic rule: he refuses to abstain from power because of a conspiracy, since, so he says, fear of death, so brief a moment, does not outweigh the loss of great power (175D). III and IV (175DE) seem to shift towards another topic: the relationship between the tyrant and his son, where the former seems to be the better of the two. After describing that the young man spoiled a free person’s wife in III, Plutarch includes a short dialogue (175DE):

> ἠρώτησε μετ’ ὀργῆς, τί τοιούτον αὐτῷ σύνοιδεν. εἰπόντος δὲ τοῦ νεανίσκου ‘σὺ γὰρ οὐκ εἶχες πατέρα τύραννον’ ὅτι ἐθέλεις σὺ εἶπεν ‘ὑιὸν ἔξεις, ἐὰν μὴ πάσης ταῦτα ποιῶν.’

he asked the young man, with some heat, what act of his father’s he knew of like that! And when the youth answered, “None, for you did not have a despot for a father.” “Nor will you have a son,” was the reply, “unless you stop doing this sort of thing.”

The difference between the characters of the two Dionysii is further emphasized by IV: when the tyrant finds out that his son kept all the cups he once gave him and never made any friends with them, he cries out that there is no tyrant in him (175E: οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν σοὶ τύραννος). These two apophthegms are not independent from the preceding in terms of the way in which Dionysius the Elder obtained and maintained power: his character is a despotic one, in contrast to that of his son, who will lose tyrannical power (in *Dionysius Minor* III–V, 176DE). This provides a (first) possible answer to the question of why Dionysius the Elder preserved his power, while the Younger lost it – a question which will explicitly be asked twice in *Dionysius Minor* IV and V (176DE), redirecting the reader to this comparison of father and son.366

This despotic nature of the elder Dionysius’ reign becomes apparent from the remaining apophthegms (V–XIII, 175E–176C). Not all of these are necessarily (entirely) negative: some seem to describe the tyrant’s attempts to improve his subjects. In *Dionysius Maior* VII (175F), for ex-

---

366 Discussed more in detail in the analysis of 176DE below.
ample, he aims to keep the citizens away from getting drunk and dining. Other apophthegms might at first sight seem to point out clever insights or actions, for instance V (175EF: a clever way of collecting taxes), X (176AB: the tyrant finds out who is genuinely hostile to him), and XI (176B: he avoids being the most hated man). Yet Dionysius’ true motives behind these (apparently) positive or clever stories might not always be that admirable: the tyrant’s eventual goal in VII (175F) was probably rather to avoid his subjects being able to gather, as one would expect from a suspicious despot (cf. the final words μετ’ ἀλλήλων, receiving all the emphasis); and in the seemingly positive story of XIII (176BC), where he teaches a man to make use of his riches, a more negative interpretation is possible too, as the story seems to depict the lawlessness of the Sicilian political system.

Taking a general look at all these stories together, then, one cannot help but conclude that different themes arise which characterize a tyrannical rule, and some of which also recall barbarian despotism: arbitrariness (which can lead to fear and hate by the people of the tyrant), hate and fear by the people of their tyrant (which can lead to conspiracies, if the fear is not too great), and the fear by the tyrant of (conspiracies of) his subjects (which can lead to arbitrary actions). Arbitrariness appears from V, VI, VII, XI, and XIII; fear and/or hate by the people from V, VII, VIII, X, and XII; fear by the tyrant from VII, VIII, X and XI, and perhaps also from IX (Dionysius hopes he will never have leisure time: one might conclude from this saying that the suspicious tyrant can never let down his guard, because he is always examining his opponents). At the very least, one can say that the relationship between Dionysius the Elder and his subjects, based as it is on mutual hate and fear, is not a particularly healthy one. This is entirely in line with how his rule is described in the Life of Dion (9.3):

Οὕτω γὰρ ἦν ἄπιστος καὶ πρὸς ἅπαντα ἀνθρώπους ὑπόπτος καὶ προβεβλημένος διὰ φόβον ὁ πρεσβύτερος Διονύσιος, ὥστε…

367 Tyranny is an important theme in Sept. sap. conv.: see Aalders (1977); Leão (2009). See also Mossman (1997) 123: “Periander is undoubtedly excluded from the Seven, as Aalders suggests, because he is a tyrant”.

368 The story also occurs in Sol. 20.7.

369 An seni 792C combines the story with two other apophthegms that occur in Reg. et imp. apophth., see also supra, note 352. The reader of the collection will probably notice the same similarities, esp. between Dionysius Maior IX (176A) and Teres (174CD; cf. σχολάζοι in both apophthegms). This second apophthegm, however, concerns the flourishing of rulers in wars, but the surrounding apophthegms of Dionysius Maior IX lead to another interpretation.
For the elder Dionysius was so distrustful and suspicious towards every body, and his fear led him to be so much on his guard, that…

A series of anecdotes then illustrates the truth of this.

Finally, it should be noted that the image of Dionysius the Elder in the collection is again a problematic one. His first four apophthegms seem to give a positive image (even though the conspiracy referred to in II is already quite telling), as they highlight the tyrant’s strength and concern with his son’s morality, whereas the despotic actions and sayings in the second part seem to deconstruct this.

b) Dionysius Minor (176C–E)

The section on the elder Dionysius’ son typically opens with a general saying of the historical figure: he claims that he does not surround himself with σοφισταί out of admiration for them, but because he wants to be admired through them (176C). Dionysius Minor II shows that he is not lying on this point, for when the διαλεκτικός Polyxenus says that he had confuted him, he reacts (176CD):

‘ἀμέλει τοῖς λόγοις’ εἶπεν ‘ἐγώ δὲ σε τοῖς ἔργοις ἐλέγχω· τά γὰρ σεαυτοῦ καταλιπὼν ἐμὲ καὶ τά ἐμὰ θεραπεύεις.’

“Yes, very likely by your words, but by your deeds I confute you; for you forsake your own affairs, and pay court to me and mine.”

This Polyxenus was sent to the tyrant by none other than Plato,370 who is referred to in III. After his loss of power, Dionysius the Younger is asked how Plato was of use to him. He replies that he could more easily bear

370 Cf. Plato’s spurious Second Letter 314cd, addressed to Dionysius the Younger: περὶ δὲ Πολυξένου ἐθαύμασας ὅτι πέμψαιμί σοι· ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ περὶ Λυκόφρονος καὶ τῶν άλλων τῶν παρά σοι ὄντων λέγω καὶ πάλαι καὶ νῦν τόν αὐτόν λόγον, ὅτι πρὸς τὸ διαλεξθῆναι καὶ φύσει καὶ τῇ μεθόδῳ τῶν λόγων πάμπολυ διαφέρεις αὐτῶν, καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν ἑκὼν ἐξελέγχειαι, ὃς τινες ὑπολαμβάνουσιν, ἄλλ᾽ ἀκοντες (“You were surprised at my sending Polyxenus to you; but now as of old I repeat the same statement about Lycophron also and the others you have with you, that, as respects dialectic, you are far superior to them all both in natural intelligence and in argumentative ability; and I maintain that if any of them is beaten in argument, this defeat is not voluntary, as some imagine, but involuntary”) – Dionysius Minor II (176CD): Πολυξένου δὲ τοῦ διαλεκτικοῦ φήσαντος αὐτόν ἐξελέγχειαι ἀμέλει τοῖς λόγοις εἶπεν 'ἐγώ δὲ σε τοῖς ἔργοις ἐλέγχω κτλ. Plutarch knew Plato’s Letters and considered them authentic: on Plato’s letters and Plutarch’s Life of Dion, see Porter (1979a) XXII–XXVII, defending the authenticity of the letters referred to by Plutarch; on Plutarch’s use of Plato’s Seventh Letter for the Life of Dion, see Beneker (2012) 87–102 (also briefly De Blois (1992) 4605; Teodorsson (2005b) 225–226);
the whims of fortune (176D: τύχης μεταβολής) thanks to the philosopher. In this way, the apophthegm provides a connection between the previous and the next two sayings, in which Dionysius twice answers the question of why he lost his power (176DE):

4. Ἐρωτηθεὶς δὲ πῶς ὁ μὲν πατήρ αὐτοῦ πένης ὢν καὶ ἰδιώτης ἐκτήσατο τὴν Συρακοσίων ἀρχήν, αὐτός δὲ ἔχων καὶ τυράννου παῖς ὢν [πώς] ἀπέβαλεν, ὅ μὲν πατήρ ἔφη 'μισουμένης δημοκρατίας ἐνέπεσε τοῖς πράγμασιν, ἐγώ δὲ φθονουμένης τυραννίδος.'

5. Ὑπ’ ἄλλου δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐρωτηθεὶς ὁ πατήρ ἔφη ὅτι ἐκτήσατο τὴν ἀρχὴν, οὐ τὴν τύχην.'

4. On being asked how his father, who was a poor man and a private citizen, had gained control over the Syracusans, and how he, who held control, and was the son of a despot, had come to lose it, he said, "My father embarked upon his venture at a time when democracy was hated, but I at a time when despotism was odious."

5. Being asked this same question by another man, he said, "My father bequeathed to me his kingdom, but not his luck."

IV and V both illustrate the truth of III: as often, the way in which a historical figure deals with the τύχης μεταβολή is precisely demonstrated by a reference to the change of events and τύχη (similar to Seiramnes’ saying in the dedicatory letter, 172D). Thus, Dionysius Minor is in its entirety a clear example of gradual shifting:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dion. Min. I</th>
<th>Dion. Min. II</th>
<th>Dion. Min. III</th>
<th>Dion. Min. IV</th>
<th>Dion. Min. V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>176C: Σοφιστάς</td>
<td>176C: Πολείξενος τοῦ διαλεκτικοῦ (sent by Plato)</td>
<td>176D: Πλάτων ἐκπεσὼν δὲ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀργήν... ἀπέβαλεν ὁ μὲν πατήρ</td>
<td>176D: τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐρωτηθεῖς ὁ πατήρ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


371 As Babbitt (1931) 36 points out, this man is Philip of Macedonia in the account of Aelian’s Varia historia XII.60. It is difficult to tell whether Plutarch’s note contained Philip’s name, but he definitely knew about his meeting with Dionysius (Tim. 15.7). Perhaps he deliberately omitted Philip: all the focus should be on Dionysius.
The first two apophthegms rather shed a negative light on the tyrant, who only seems to care about his reputation, but the final two illustrate a certain greatness in his character. The placement of III at the core of the section, referring to Plato’s influence and marking a change, is significant: Plutarch paints not only a generally positive image of the Syracusan’s final years, but also depicts him as a kind of philosopher.

The references to Dionysius the Elder in III and IV redirect the reader to the first four apophthegms of the preceding section (175C–E). Again, there is a reassessment of character, but this time the other way around: although *Dionysius Maior* III emphasizes the debauchery of Dionysius the Younger (175DE), and *Dionysius Maior* IV at first sight his greed, but at a closer look also his indolence because he did nothing with the cups he received (175E: φιλον οὐδένα σεαυτῷ πεποίηκας), a rather noble personality comes to light through his own sayings. The same dynamics can be found in the *Life of Timoleon* (14–15), where Plutarch discusses the younger Dionysius’ behaviour after his arrival in Corinth, following his loss of power. First, the passage describes how people tried to explain his conduct, of which the first is in line with the image in *Dionysius Maior* III and IV (on his debauchery, cf. φιλακόλαστον in Tim. 14.4; and his laziness, cf. ῥᾴθυμον ibid.). Yet Plutarch disagrees with these explanations (Tim. 15.1):

Oὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ λόγοι τινὲς αὐτοῦ μνημονεύονται, δι’ ὧν ἐδόκει συμφέρειν τοῖς παροῦσι οὐκ ἀγεννῶς.

However, certain sayings of his are preserved, from which it would appear that he accommodated himself to his present circumstances not ignobly.

A series of apophthegms follows, the second of which is the same as *Dionysius Minor* III. This passage from the *Lives* thus confirms that *Dionysius Minor* III–V should be understood in a positive light. As in other cases, then, the process of moral reflection that is characteristic of the biographies is also desired to take place in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*, despite the absence of contextual information.

---

372 In the *Life*, Plutarch assesses the nature of the younger Dionysius in a positive way, but points out that lack of education was the greatest flaw in his character: as such, this was his father’s fault (esp. Dion 9.2).

373 Although Tim. 14.4 is related to a later phase of the tyrant’s life, it recalls the younger Dionysius’ image in *Dionysius Maior* III and IV, where the young man appears to be a licentious (the rape story in III [175DE]) and indolent man (he keeps his cups, instead of using them to make friends in IV [175E]).
c) Comparison

The eventual question of this whole section is why Dionysius the Elder preserved power and why his son lost it. A first answer has to do with the characters of both men, as the implicit connection of *Dionysius Maior* I–II and III–IV suggests: the father is a true despot, and his reign can be defined as an oppressive regime (V–XIII, 175E–176C). If the fear which he intentionally invokes does not suffice to deter his subjects from conspiracies, his permanent watchfulness helps him to get rid of his opponents. The debauchery and worthless behaviour of his son, on the contrary, will prevent him from retaining power, one should conclude. Yet a second answer, provided by *Dionysius Minor* IV (176D) and V (176DE), is definitely ‘more true’: the elder Dionysius became powerful when the people hated democracy, but his son acquired power when tyranny was hated.374 And perhaps this hate was precisely the result of his father’s despotic rule, which the reader got to know about in *Dionysius Maior* V–XIII (175E–176C): suddenly, these apophthegms might in fact provide a guide to losing power. Opposite solutions for the same issue are therefore possible, and Plutarch’s morally problematizing position again requires an active readership.

3.4.3 Dion and Agathocles (176E–177A)

*Agathocles* (176EF) is placed before *Dion* (176F–177A), although one would expect the section about Dion to follow *Dionysius Minor*.375 Dion indeed put an end to Dionysius’ rule, as Plutarch mentions at the outset of his apophthegm. Thematic motivations seem to take precedence over the general chronological structure: *Agathocles* I and II, the second of which shares similar wording to the dedicatory letter to Trajan,376 refer to the protagonist’s humble origins as the son of a potter (υἱὸς ἦν κεραμέως, 176E) and recall *Dionysius Minor* IV, in which Dionysius the Elder is described as πένης and an ἰδιώτης (176D).377 History, so it seems, is re-

---


375 Agathocles ruled Syracuse from 317–289 BC, see Babbitt (1931) 37. After his return from banishment in 357 BC, Dion soon expelled Dionysius and acquired power in Syracuse; see Occhipinti (2016) 139–140.

376 An observation made by Citro (2017b) 13: “Un’espressione simile sia per la struttura sia il significato (avverbio + verbo: πράως e μειδιάω) si ritrova in un apoftegma della raccolta relativo ad Agatocle (Plu., Reg. et imp. apoptht. 176F [...]”). See also Citro (2017a) 53.

377 *Agathocles* I (176E) occurs in *De se ipsum laud.* 544BC, for a comparison, see Citro (2014) 89–91; II (176EF) in *De coh. ira* 458EF, see again Citro (2014) 94–98; III (176F)
peating itself, and the Sicilian pendulum, which swings between freedom and tyranny, shifted again in the direction of this second political constitution.\textsuperscript{378} Agathocles therefore once more stresses the fruitlessness of tyrannical rule of which Dionysius the Younger spoke: every tyrant or despotic dynasty is doomed to be replaced by a new one.

Yet it is possible to escape from this cycle, as the one apophthegm in Dion, closing the Sicilian section, points out.\textsuperscript{379} After Dion put an end to Dionysius’ tyranny, he hears that one of his best friends might be plotting against him (176E). This recalls the ‘fear of the tyrant’ in Dionysius Maior, but unlike what tyrants would do, Dion ignores these suspicions, since (176F–177A):\textsuperscript{380}

\[\text{βέλτιον ἐἶναι φήσας ἀποθανεῖν ἢ ζῆν μὴ μόνον τοὺς πολεμίους ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς φίλους φυλαττόμενον.}\]

"It is better to die than to live in a state of continual watchfulness not only against one’s enemies but also against one’s friends."

Plutarch left out some important elements. Callippus really plotted against Dion, who eventually died at his hands. It is therefore not surprising that Plutarch refers to this story in De vitioso pudore 530C as a negative example, claiming that Dion was killed because (LCL) “he was ashamed to take precautions against one who was his friend and guest” (\(\alphaισχυνθεὶς φυλάττεσθαι φίλον ὄντα καὶ ξένον\)). The version of the Life of Dion, however, does not contain any reference to Dion’s shame, which was probably an adaptation of Plutarch in order to fit in the apophthegm with the context of De vitioso pudore, but gives another explanation.

in De sera num. 557C, combined with a similar story on Agathocles and the Corcyreans (557BC), see Citro (2014) 103–106 and (2020) 110–113. The first part of Agathocles II (176EF) is followed by a similar story on Antigonus in De coh. ira 458EF, because of which the second part of Agathocles II is told about Antigonus too. Volkmann (1869) 228–229 discusses this as an argument against authenticity, but Citro (2014) 96–97 argues that Plutarch could have made one apophthegm out of a story on Agathocles and Antigonus in the collection. This could also be yet another case of Anekdotenwanderung.

\textsuperscript{378} Agathocles I (176E: ποτήρια … χρυσᾶ) recalls Dionysius Maior IV (175E: ἐκπωμάτων χρυσῶν); Agathocles II (176EF) reminds one of Gelon III (175A).

\textsuperscript{379} Roskam (2002) 175 discusses Plutarch’s view on Plato’s influence on Dion in the Life of Dion: “he more than once emphasizes that Plato, through his pupil Dion, laid the foundation for the liberation of Sicily”; see also Roskam (2009) 43 and 47. De Blois (1997) 209–216 and (1999) focuses on the contrast between the tyrant and sage in the Life.

\textsuperscript{380} Volkmann (1869) 229 sees a problem in the use of τοὺς πολεμίους: “Unpassend werden im Ausspruch des Dion die πολέμιοι statt der ἐχθροὶ den φίλους gegenübergestellt, vgl. v. Dion. c. 56.”
Chapter 55 in the biography relates that Dion’s son had died before Callippus’ conspiracy. When he heard about the plot in the next chapter, he answered out of grief and depression (Dion 56.3)

ὅτι πολλάκις ἤδη θνῄσκειν ἕτοιμός ἐστι καὶ παρέχειν τῷ βουλομένῳ σφάττειν αὐτόν, εἰ ζῆν δεήσει μὴ μόνον τοὺς ἐχθρούς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς φίλους φυλαττόμενον.

that he was ready now to die many deaths and to suffer any one who wished to slay him, if it was going to be necessary for him to live on his guard, not only against his enemies, but also against his friends.

In this passage, Dion is even willing to die because he is in great distress. The fact that both the outcome (the actual murder by this friend) and the depression caused by the death of his son are left out of the account of the apophthegm indicates that Plutarch quotes this saying because of the general truth it contains and because it contrasts sharply with the many suspicions that characterize life at a tyrant’s court. Thus, detached from its original context, Dion’s saying seems to illustrate how he put an end to a cruel rule and established a stable reign instead, an image supported by the false chronology of placing Agathocles before Dion – for no new change in political constitution seems to follow.

This positive assessment of Dion as the person who freed the island from tyranny is basically in line with the Life, although the image of Dion is definitely more complicated in the latter. The version of the collection, then, seems to be a simplification, but this enables Plutarch to end on a positive note again: Dion provides a well-chosen conclusion for the Sicilian section, in which the dark sides of tyranny are the core theme. The message is that, in order to establish a lasting and fruitful reign, one should strive for a good relationship between the monarch and the people, which can only be based on justice and mutual trust and respect.

3.5 Macedonian Monarchy (177A–184F)

The Macedonian part comprises 111 apophthegms, of which more than half belong to Philippus (177C–179C) and Alexander (179D–181F). These are the two longest sections of the whole collection, and not without good reason: Plutarch was especially intrigued by Alexander the Great, as the Life of Alexander and De Alexandri Magni fortuna aut virtute testify, and the king is also a pivotal figure in the Parallel Lives, at least

---

381 See also Roskam (2009) 47 on the Life.
382 Alex. depicts a rather complicated image, while the laudatory essays are far more positive, see Whitmarsh (2002) 179–180; and Monaco Caterine (2017) 408 on Alexander’s
in the post-classical Lives. Alexander and his father, then, are central figures in Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata too, as can be seen from their overall presence. Themes prominent in their sections are already announced by Archelaus (177AB).

3.5.1 Archelaus (177AB)

Perhaps this section could have been structured in a more logical way. Archelaus III (177AB), for example, might have fitted better after I (177A), since both refer to Euripides, but it occurs after II on Archelaus’ witty request to a barber to cut his hair “in silence” (177A: σιωπῶν). IV (177B) would also have fitted better close to I, since both refer to an artist (the tragedian in I, a harp player in IV) and share a similar content, as will become clear. Yet various lexical and thematic elements in I, IV, and V (177B) still create a connection with the Sicilian section. Precisely through this connection, some differences stand out that are important for the remainder of the monarchical sections and beyond:

[1] In the first apophthegm, a bad person asks the king to give him a golden drinking cup (ποτήριον χρυσοῦν). The ruler responds by giving it to Euripides: the tragedian had the right to receive this present, in the same way as the wicked man had the right to ask for it, so he says (177A). This recalls two Sicilian apophthegms: Agathocles I told just before this appearance as a “philosopher-king” in this work, in contrast to the Life. For a comparison of the speeches and the biography, see also Wardman (1955); Hamilton, J. R. (1969) XXI–XXXIII, concluding (XXXIII): “We need not, and cannot, take these speeches seriously as representing Plutarch’s view of Alexander”. According to him, this difference between both works is the consequence of (ibid.) “the difference between rhetoric and biography”.


384 A reference to Alexander closes the Persian section (174B); Philip appears twice in the Scythian section (174E); a first mention of Philip in the Athenian section occurs in Hegesippus (187DE), after which the relationship between Athens and Macedonia dominates until Peisistratus (189B–D); Philip also appears in Antiochus Spartiates (192B), almost at the end of the Spartan section; some Roman sections, finally, refer back to Alexander: Caesar IV (206B); Augustus III (207AB), VIII (207CD), and X (207DE) contain explicit references to the Macedonian king; and when the Roman Republic conquers the world (194E–202E), and when Pompey is called “the Great” (203B–204E), the reader will inevitably have Alexander in mind.

385 Archelaus III (177AB) also occurs in Alc. 1 and Amatorius 770C (a mutilated fragment, see Minar – Sandbach – Hembold (1961) 435): for a comparison, see Verdegem (2010) 112–114. In these accounts, the saying is attributed to Euripides instead of the king. Perhaps, (1) Plutarch possessed two similar apophthegms about this event; (2) deliberately changed the story; or (3) made a mistake. II is told in De gar. 509A as well.
section (176E) and especially *Dionysius Maior* IV (175E). Verbal similarities create a smooth transition between the Sicilians and the Macedonians, but the reference to drinking cups also reintroduces the theme of establishing friendships by giving presents, a task neglected by the Sicilian tyrants but performed excellently by Archelaus: this king indeed used precious drinking cups as an instrument of making friends, and also carefully reflected on his choice. \[386\]

[2] In *Archelaus* IV, a κιθαρῳδός complains that Archelaus has not given enough. The king’s answer resembles his response in *Archelaus* I (177B). \[387\] Both apophthegms thus illustrate that everyone is free to ask the king for whatever he or she wishes to receive, but eventually the king himself chooses what he gives and on whom he wants to bestow his gifts. \[388\] That Plutarch includes two apophthegms that seem to make the same point announces that this will be an important theme in later sections.

[3] In *Archelaus* V, the king reacts mildly when somebody throws water over his head, ignoring the incitements of his friends (177B). It is highly doubtful that Dionysius the Elder, who even put people to death just for maligning him, would ever have reacted like that. In particular, a contrast with *Dionysius Maior* X (176AB) stands out: when people think badly of Archelaus, they are allowed to do so.

Various elements of his behaviour therefore contrast with the Sicilian tyrants, and also with the barbarian despots: the right use of riches; the mildness and forgiveness of the king (which one would not expect from barbarian despots or tyrants); the permission to speak freely (a theme recalling *Parysatis*, 174A, amongst others); and, in fact, even the presence of a poet and musician at the Macedonian court, recalling *Anteas* III (174EF) and *Gelon* IV (175AB) by contrast. \[389\] The cultural implications of this final point should not be underestimated: approaching the ‘Greeks of the core mainland’ (184F–194E), one meets more educated

---

\[386\] Cf. *Agathocles* I (176E): κεραμεᾶ ποτήρια … παρὰ τὰ χρυσᾶ; and *Dionysius Maior* IV (175E): ἐκπωμάτων χρυσῶν καὶ ἀργυρῶν.

\[387\] Also an important theme in *De am. mult.*


\[389\] Cf. the assessment of *Archelaus* I in *De vit. pud.* 531E.

\[390\] *De Al. Magn. fort.* 334B combines *Anteas* III with *Archelaus* IV (177B) too (cf. also Beck, M. (2003) 183–184), both preceded by a series of other negative *exempla* (333F–334B). The negative assessment of Archelaus’ treatment of Timotheus in the laudatory essay is the consequence of the goals of the text, aiming to praise only Alexander (as becomes explicit from 334D on); see Van der Stockt (1995) 464–465 on the passage. *Archelaus* IV (177B) does not require a negative assessment, as the story is told only a few lines after the positive story on Euripides receiving a golden cup in I (177A).
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(and, therefore, more Greek) rulers. All this illustrates that a different, more positive, and more Hellenic type of monarchy is possible. The characteristics of such a rule will be further explored in the next sections.

3.5.2 Philippus (177C–179C)

Philippus consists of two main blocks. These are separated from each other by three apophthegms (XIII–XV, 178AB) that are not connected either with what precedes or with what follows. There also seems to be no link between them, except for a single word:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First block</th>
<th>Philippus I: Theophrastus about Philip’s character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philippus II–XII: illustration of Theophrastus’ saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Philippus XIII–XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second block</td>
<td>First part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first block, depicting a univocally positive image of the king that recalls Archelaus, somewhat contrasts with the second block.

Theophrastus’ saying confirmed

Philippus opens in a typical way. Its first apophthegm, introducing the first block of the section, contains a general comment applicable to Philip’s entire life. It is not expressed by the king but by the philosopher Theophrastus. One can only regret that the text is corrupt (177C):  

---

391 Discussed in detail in Part III, chapter 2.
392 Philippus XIII and XIV are connected by the appearance of an ὄνος (178AB). XV contains the famous saying that the Macedonians call a spade a spade (178B; see Rutten (2019) 71–84 on the proverb). XIII occurs in An seni 790B (in very similar wording); XIV reminds one of Aem. 12.10; De fortuna 97D refers to the background of XV.
393 Plutarch does not seem to think positively of Philip in Pel. 26.6–8, but since Philip’s character is compared with Epameinondas here, one of Plutarch’s greatest heroes (see infra, p. 207), one should not expect to reach a similar judgement in Reg. et imp. apophth., where the king is compared with other monarchs. See also Buszard (2008) 187 about similar differences in Plutarch’s assessment of historical figures in the Parallel Lives.
394 As appears from the translation, Babbitt (1931) 40 reads μέγαν between μόνον and μεταξύ (an adaptation of the editor), probably based on μείζονα that follows.
Theophrastus has recorded that Philip, the father of Alexander, was not only great among kings, but, owing to his fortune and his conduct, proved himself still greater and more moderate.

Various emendations have been proposed, but none of them provides any certainty.\textsuperscript{395} There is, therefore, no point in basing big conclusions on the details of this apophthegm: it suffices to say that, in all likelihood, a positive image of a μέγας and μέτριος Philip arises. As is often the case, the question is whether the following apophthegms confirm this picture.

The next three sayings are related to Philip’s military successes. \textit{Philippus} II mentions Parmenio for the first time: he was the only general of the Macedonians, unlike the fortunate Athenians, who were able to appoint ten generals each year, so the king says (177C). In III, Philip hears about many of his successes (κατορθώματα) (177C). The latter are not specified, but the content of the surrounding stories implies that at least some of these might concern military achievements. In other versions, one of these events is indeed a victory of Parmenio.\textsuperscript{396} II and III therefore show Philip’s response to the good luck of others and to his own success (cf. τύχη in I). IV takes place after another military accomplishment, the defeat of the Greeks (177CD). This connects the apophthegm with II and III, but this triumph is not thematized, for IV and the next two apophthegms share a new theme: in all three, someone asks Philip to act harshly against his opponents, but he opts for the opposite. His words in IV, when he is advised to oppress the Greeks with guards, are worth quoting (177D):

\[\text{ἔφη μᾶλλον πολὺν χρόνον ἐθέλειν χρηστὸς ἢ δεσπότης ὀλίγον καλεῖσθαι.}\]

he said that he preferred to be called a good man for a long time rather than a master for a short time.

\textsuperscript{395} The \textit{apparatus criticus} of Nachstädt (1971) 17–18 lists some possible emendations.

\textsuperscript{396} The apophthegm occurs in \textit{Alex}. 3.8 and in the spurious (cf. \textit{infra}, note 985) \textit{Cons. ad Apoll.} 105AB. In both accounts, the three successes are (1) a victory of Parmenio, (2) a victory at the Olympic games, and (3) the birth of a child (Alexander in the \textit{Life}). Volkmann (1869) 230 writes: “Dem König Philipp werden bei Plutarch nicht viele glückliche Ereignisse an einem Tag gemeldet, wie im dritten Ausspruch, sondern drei.”
The connection between δεσπότης and short-term rule recalls the Sicilian section, where no dynasty managed to rule for generations precisely because of their tyrannical disposition. There is, then, some truth in the saying. This difference between Philip, who aims to be a good king, and a despot is further elaborated in what follows: he refuses to banish a slanderer (177D), and when Nicanor is speaking ill of him, he realizes that he had neglected the poor man (177DE). This theme of slander, in both cases again connected with ill advice ignored by the king (cf. Archelaus V, 177B), provides a link with VII: when the δημαγογοί in Athens malign Philip, he is even grateful to them, because he now attempts to show that they are wrong (177E). This attitude is again entirely different from how Dionysius the Elder dealt with those who spoke ill of him (Dionysius Maior X, 176AB), and Philip seems to resemble Archelaus.

One can conclude, then, that Theophrastus’ positive judgement of Philip’s character in I (177C) is confirmed by II–VII (177C–E). Gradual shifting dominates once more:

---

**Philippus I (177C)**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philippus II (177C)</th>
<th>Philippus III (177C)</th>
<th>Philippus IV (177CD)</th>
<th>Philippus V (177D)</th>
<th>Philippus VI (177DE)</th>
<th>Philippus VII (177E)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parmenio (Military)</td>
<td>success: too much</td>
<td>Military success</td>
<td>Advice not followed</td>
<td>Advice not followed – Philip maligned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μακαρίζειν</td>
<td>οἴ τύχη</td>
<td></td>
<td>Philip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

397 *De coh. ira* 457EF includes a similar, but not the same, story: the name of the slanderer is different (nor is his poverty mentioned), and Philip’s saying is not the same at all. The wording is only similar in the first part of the apophthegms: both contain ἀεὶ κακῶς λέγοντα (177D and 457E, there λέγοντος) and a combination of a form of οἴομαι, δεῖν, and an infinitive of κολάζω (*ibid.*). In 457F, the story is immediately followed by a similar apophthegm (Philippus XXVI in the collection, combined with another series of apophthegms on Philip’s way of dealing with slander, see *infra*, note 455). Apparently, Plutarch had a large amount of similar stories about this aspect of the king’s character.

398 Archelaus was also encouraged by his friends (ὑπὸ τῶν φίλων παροξυνόμενος) to punish a man, as happens in Philippus IV (177CD: συνεβούλευον ἕνας), and esp. in V (177D: τῶν φίλων κελευόντων) and VI (177D: Σμικόθον … διαβάλλοντος and τῶν ἐπαίρον οἰομένων).
The mention of the Athenians at the outset of VII connects the story with VIII (177EF), which opens similarly. In this apophthegm, the king makes a joke about the Athenians who are making various requests after he set them free without asking for a ransom: they seem to believe that they were vanquished καὶ ἀστραγάλοις (177F, LCL: “a game of knucklebones”). This is in line with his moderate character in the previous apophthegms: despite the fact that the Athenians maligned him, he still did them a favour by releasing some prisoners; despite their apparent ingratitude, he still jests. From this apophthegm on, the chain is further extended through the theme of humour: first, there is another bone-joke in IX: Philip’s collarbone (κλείς) was broken in battle and the physician is allowed to take what he wants for the cure (LCL): “for you have the key in your charge” (177F: τὴν γὰρ κλεῖν ἔχεις), so the king says. Another wordplay can be found in X (177F). Thus, the joke of VIII prompted Plutarch to include the other two apophthegms (IX and X) about a humorous Philip. This inclusion perhaps even deviates from the chronological and geographical structure: according to Riginos, Philip would have received the wound mentioned in IX (177F) during a battle against the Illyrians, in 345 or 344 BC. If this is the case, thematic motivations would again seem to take precedence over the general chronology. XI (178A) restores this deviation: it not only takes the reader back to conquered Athens, but also returns to the theme of V–VII (177DE): Philip once more ignores ill advice and opts for a lenient course. The topic of his mildness is continued by XII (178A), again combined with his humour: during a lawsuit, the king gets rid of two bad persons in a funny way, but does not punish them severely. This is the final apophthegm of the first block (I–XII, 177A–178A) that serves to illustrate the king’s greatness and moderation.

Philip and Alexander
This block in turn consists of two parts. Both start with an instruction of Philip for his son, followed by a series of illustrations of how he sticks to

399 Philippus VII: Τοῖς δὲ τῶν Ἀθηναίων δημακρινοῖς (177E) – VIII: Τῶν δ’ Ἀθηναίων (177E).
400 The reference to the defeat of the Greeks at Chaeronea in this apophthegm (177E: Τῶν δ’ Ἀθηναίων, ὅσοι περὶ Χαιρώνειαν ἑάλωσαν) seems to continue the chronology: Philippus IV seems to have taken place immediately after the battle (177C: νικήσαντι τοὺς Ἐλλήνας).
401 Concerning Philip’s wound, see Riginos (1994) 103–106 and more specifically 115–116, where this apophthegm is discussed as one of the testimonia.
403 Philippus VIII took place in Athens after the battle at Chaeronea (177EF). The same goes for XI (178A).
his own advice. Reading Philip’s first instruction in *Philippus* XVI and XVII, one is halfway through the section (178BC):

16. Τῷ δὲ υἱῷ παρῄνει πρὸς χάριν ὁμιλεῖν τοῖς Μακεδόσι, κτῶμεν ἑαυτῷ τὴν παρὰ τῶν πολλῶν δύναμιν, ἕως ἔξεστι βασιλεύοντος ἄλλου φιλάνθρωπον εἶναι.

17. Συνεβούλευε δὲ τῶν ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι δυνατῶν καὶ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς φίλους κτᾶσθαι καὶ τοὺς πονηροὺς, εἶτα οἷς μὲν χρῆσθαι οἷς δ’ ἀποχρῆσθαι.

16. He recommended to his son that he associate with the Macedonians so as to win their favour, and thus acquire for himself influence with the masses while another was reigning and while it was possible for him to be humane.

17. He also advised him that, among the men of influence in the cities, he should make friends of both the good and the bad, and that later he should use the former and abuse the latter.

Two elements indicate that both apophthegms, traditionally considered separate units, in fact are a whole: the historical context of the event is the same, and XVII does not repeat the object (τῷ υἱῷ), not even in the form of a demonstrative pronoun. Both parts discuss the importance of making friends. This is precisely what Dionysius the Elder wants his son to do (175E), and, as argued above, this theme also connects the Sicilian and Macedonian sections by contrast in *Archelaus* (177AB). In particular, the occurrence of the topic in *Philippus* is meaningful, since a link is established between Dionysius the Elder and his son, on the one hand, and the Macedonian king and his son, on the other. This will prove relevant in Philip’s second advice (178EF) as well.

The next five apophthegms (178C–E) deal with Philip’s own friendships, highlighted by lexical connections, and often indeed connect them with gift-giving. One reads, therefore, how the king gives heed to his own instruction. XXI (178E), closing this series, is at the same time

---

404 Taken from van der Wiel (2023a) 12 and n35.

405 In *Philippus* XVIII, the king’s benefactor and guest friend (ἐὐεργέτην … καὶ ξένου) refuses all gifts (178C); in XIX, he realizes during the sale of some prisoners that one of these men, who called himself a friend of his father (πατρικὸς … φίλος), is truly benevolent and a true friend (ἀληθῶς γὰρ εὖνους ὅν καὶ φίλος, 178C); in XX, Philip asks all of his friends (τῶν φίλων ἐκάστῳ) to “leave room for cake” when realizing that the preparations of their host’s (ξένου and ξένου) dinner are insufficient (178D; also told in De tuenda 123F–124A and in Quaest. conv. 707B; see Part I, chapter 1.2.2 for a compar-
connected with a new and final theme of the section, that is, Philip’s regret: in XXII and XXIII, Plutarch returns to the relationship between Philip and Alexander (178EF):

22. Πυθόμενος δ’ ἐγκαλεῖν αὐτῷ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον ὅτι παίδας ἐκ πλειόνων ποιεῖται γυναικῶν, ‘οὐκοῦν’ ἔφη ‘πολλούς ἔχων περὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἀνταγωνιστὰς γενοῦ καλὸς κἀγαθός, ἵνα μὴ δι’ ἐμὲ τῆς βασιλείας τύχῃς ἀλλὰ διὰ σεαυτὸν.’

23. Ἐκέλευε δ’ αὐτὸν Ἀριστοτέλει προσέχειν καὶ φιλοσοφεῖν, ‘ὅπως’ ἔφη ‘μὴ πολλὰ τοιαῦτα πράξῃς, ἐφ’ οἷς ἐγὼ πεπραγμένοις μεταμέλομαι.’

Learning that Alexander complained against him because he was having children by other women besides his wife, he said, “Well then, if you have many competitors for the kingdom, prove yourself honourable and good, so that you may obtain the kingdom not because of me, but because of yourself.” He bade Alexander give heed to Aristotle, and study philosophy, “so that,” as he said, “you may not do a great many things of the sort that I am sorry to have done.”

As was the case with Philippus XVI and XVII (178BC), XXII and XXIII are in fact one apophthegm. The first part, where Philip states that his son has to deserve the throne (178E), recalls the Sicilian section once more: that Dionysius the Younger was the son of a tyrant did not suffice, and the right to rule is something which one has to create oneself, not something which one can receive for free. This is a core theme of Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata, already thematized in Cyrus II (172E): moral qualities give a person the right to rule. This is why Philip asks Alexander to listen to Aristotle in the second part (178EF). The acquaintance of the future king with a philosopher again recalls Dionysius the Younger (176C–E) and his relationship with Plato (176D). There is also another connection with previous sections: the link between brotherly love and strife for kingship. While the Persian and barbarian sections contain different references to (the possibility of) armed conflicts between brothers for the rule (Xerxes I, 173BC; Cyrus Minor, 173EF; and

---

406 See van der Wiel (2023a) 12. Babbitt (1931) 48–49 also takes both parts together.
408 See again the lack of education of Dionysius the Younger, mentioned in Dion 9.3.
Part II. A Literary Analysis

Scilurus, 174F), Philip points out that moral virtues should prevail (cf. 178E: καλὸς κἀγαθός). These will lead to a healthy relationship between monarch and subjects, which results in a steady rule.

The final saying of Philippus XXIII introduces the remaining apophthegms of the section, in most of which the king makes some mistakes.\textsuperscript{410} Philip fixes his mistake, often after hearing a subject who frankly speaks the truth to his face. In line with this, it stands out that most of these apophthegms do not contain a (memorable) saying of Philip, but of his subjects instead: this is quite remarkable in Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata and enhances the image of the king as a moderate man, illustrating the importance which he attached to justice and frank speech. In the context of all these stories, Philippus XXVI–XXVII (179AB) seem to be somewhat out of place. Yet XXVI (179A) is still related to the preceding apophthegm, since both shed light on his desire to make the right decisions as a judge.\textsuperscript{412} There is also a connection with the next saying. In XXVI, the king argues that he, in order to avoid having a bad reputation, would not acquit a guilty man. XXVII (179A) continues this theme of reputation and reminds one of the first block of apophthegms (177C–178A): Philip does not punish the Greeks that malign him at the Olympic games. In this way, this story is in turn connected with XXVIII and XXIX (179B): in this second apophthegm, Parmenio has to defend Philip in front of the complaining Greeks. Thus, even though XXVI and XXVII do not show the king making a mistake, they are not irrelevant in the context of the second block. They illustrate how Philip deals with

\textsuperscript{410} There are some connections at a lower level too: Philippus XXIV (178F) and XXV (178F–179A) are connected by the theme of jurisdiction; XXVIII and XXIX (179B) by the theme of sleeping too long.

\textsuperscript{411} Philippus XXV (178F–179A: Machaetas denounces Philip for not listening attentively); XXX (179B: a musician against the king who pretends to know much about music); XXXI (179BC: Demaratus about Philip’s domestic quarrel); XXXII (179C: an old woman wants her case to be heard in court): (1) XXX (which contrasts with Per. 1.6) occurs in De ad. et am. 68A (the musician’s remark is recommended as frank speech), in De Al. Magn. fort. 334CD (contrasting Philip with Alexander, who knew when he had to be part of the audience; see also Beck, M. (2003) 184–185), and in Quaest. conv. 634D (making the same point); (2) XXXI occurs in De ad. et am. 70C (commending the remark of Demaratus) and in Alex. 9.13–14 (after the description of the dispute between Philip and his son and wife in 9.6–12; on the importance of domestic harmony for the statesman in Plutarch, see Swain (1999) 88–90); (3) XXXII is told in Demetr. 42.7–8 (Demetrius only rarely allowed his subjects to speak with him, in contrast to Philip [the passage is misinterpreted by the LCL translation, reading it as referring to Demetrius]; see Stadter (2000) 506 on a parallel in Dio about Hadrian).

\textsuperscript{412} The story is also attributed to Philip in Con. praec. 143F and De coh. ira 457F, but to Pausanias in Apophth. Lac. 230D.
slander and complaining subjects, recalling his moderate character (cf. I–XI, 177C–178A). In this way, they are in line with the apophthegms about his mistakes (XXII–XXXII, 178E–179C) in which παρρησία has a prominent place.

**Conclusion**
The picture of Philip becomes more nuanced towards the end: the first part of the section illustrates the truth of Theophrastus’ unreservedly positive judgement of the man, but the mistakes of the final apophthegms show that he was not perfect. Yet Philip recognized his imperfections, and there was always room for free speech, which in turn strengthens the positive picture again. This is in line with a second conclusion: *Philippus* not only sheds light on Philip’s character, but also shows the reader how to distinguish a true king from a despot or tyrant. As stated, this appears from the first apophthegms which connect Philip with Archelaus and contrast with the preceding barbarian and Sicilian sections, but it comes even more to the fore in the second block on friendship (in connection with the use of possessions) and frank speech. As both topics are linked to Philip’s advice for Alexander, the reader is invited to examine to what extent his son gave heed to this, and whether he proved himself to be a true king.

### 3.5.3 Alexander (179D–181F)

*Alexander* I and II refer back to Philip and describe the future king’s hunger for conquering. This theme will dominate the entire section. In his first apophthegm, Alexander, when still a child, complains that his father left him nothing to accomplish (179D). This explicitly recalls *Philippus* III, where this king’s military successes are described in similar wording. In the second story, Philip appears on the stage once more, encouraging his son to take part in the Olympic games. The latter, however, refuses on the ground that only kings can be his opponents (179D). Interestingly, it is not Philip but rather Alexander’s friends who are the interlocutors in the version of the *Life of Alexander* (4.10) and *De Alexandri Magni fortuna aut virtute* (331AB): this is clearly an adaptation

---

413 Alex. 5.4 tells the same story, followed by a comment that Alexander did not long for wealth, but for fame acquired in war (5.5–6).


415 The use of ποδώκης (179D) in the description of the young Alexander reminds one of Achilles. See in this context Mossman (1992) 92: “Alexander […] encouraged comparisons between himself and Achilles.”

in order to further expand the contrast between father and son. The relevance of Alexander III, however, is less clear: a married girl is brought to the king at night, who is angry with his servants because they almost made him an adulterer (179DE). As it no longer seems to be related to Alexander’s young years, it separates I and II from IV, highlighting that a new and first major block of apophthegms starts.417

The first main block
The fourth apophthegm connects Alexander’s early years with the period of his conquests. The young man offers large amounts of frankincense. His παιδαγωγός, Leonides, says that he will only be allowed to do so once he has become master of the land of this product. In line with his desire for glory in I and II, Alexander sends a lot of frankincense to his tutor after conquering this region (179DE).418 In this way, the apophthegm also announces the two main themes of the block it introduces (IV–XVIII, 179E–180E), which, by the way, are important topics in the Life too: Alexander’s military successes,419 and his lavish use of riches, often to the benefit of his friends.420

These two themes are also paired in Alexander V: the king encourages his soldiers to eat all they want, for the next day they will eat from their enemies’ supplies (179EF). The next two apophthegms present Alexander’s generosity: in VI, he gives a dowry of 50 talents instead of the ten which his friend asked for (179F); in VII, a similar story, Anaxarchus the philosopher even gets one hundred talents after merely asking for it (179F–180A).421 They remind one of Philip’s advice on establishing and

417 Stader (2014b) 676 divides the section as follows: “The forty-four [sic] Alexander anecdotes in Ap.reg. are arranged as childhood anecdotes (nos. 1–4), campaign stories (5–13), virtues (14–28), friends (29–30), kingship (31–32), and death (33–34).” Based on the principle of gradual shifting, this chapter proposes a different structure.

418 In Alex. 25.6–7 the story follows the capture of Gaza (25.4–5). This placement, different from its occurrence at the outset of Alexander, is significant; see Whitmarsh (2002) 189 on the Life: “Alexander’s sweet fragrance is thus linked into a complex of themes suggesting the corrupting influence of Eastern culture.” This implication is absent from the collection, rather emphasizing that the riches of the East did not corrupt the king.

419 Alexander’s military success, the consequence of his φιλιτιμία, is a main theme in Alex.–Caes. too, see Buszard (2008), esp. 188n13: “Ambition is mentioned more often in this pair than in any other.” He points out that this ambition is not always a positive value (esp. in Caes.), but argues that (ibid.) “[t]he portrayal of Alexander in his own Life is a positive one, taken as a whole.”

420 Hamilton, J. R. (1969) XL points out that “the longest digression (39–42.4)” of Alex. concerns “the king’s generosity and his loyalty to and care for his friends.”

421 Alex. 8.5 and De Al. Magn. fort. 331E contain a short reference to Alexander VII: in the Life, the mention of Anaxarchus precedes a reference to two other gifts for other
maintaining friendships (Philippus XVI–XVII, 178BC): for his friends, nothing is too much in the eyes of Alexander, and by using riches, he manages to enhance his popularity, as his father asked him to do. But Plutarch wants his readers to realize that this generosity does not imply that the king himself longed for luxury, as appears from Alexander IX, which is inserted after a short apophthegm that picks up again on the theme of war (VIII, 180A): when Alexander receives expensive foods from the Carian queen Ada, he says that (IX, 180A)

κρείττονας ἔχειν αὐτὸς ὄψοποιοὺς, πρὸς μὲν ἄριστον τὴν νυκτοπορίαν
πρὸς δὲ δεῖπνον τὴν ὀλιγαρσίαν.

he had better fancy cooks – his night marches for his breakfast, and for his dinner his frugal breakfast.

This witty saying illustrates Alexander’s frugality and self-restraint, and one concludes that wealth is nothing more than a convenient means for the king. It also emphasizes his martial character, thereby introducing four apophthegms (X–XIII) on his wars and successes on the battlefield, and on his military insights and strategic skills, of which two also concern the theme of wealth (XI and XII; X and XI are furthermore connected by a reference to Parmenio).

At first sight, Alexander XIV–XVII (180DE) switch to another topic. XIV and XVII contain criticism of Antipater and frame a pair of sayings on Alexander’s divine status. In this way, as will become clear, they lead the reader towards a specific interpretation of that pair. In XIV, the king receives a letter from his mother, containing unspecified charges (διαβολάς) against Antipater (180D).

In XVII, the criticism is more philosophically cast: in the laudatory essay, Plutarch similarly refers to Anaxarchus before a list of wise men who were bestowed with great gifts by Alexander. In both passages, this is presented as proof of Alexander’s everlasting love of philosophy.

422 The story occurs in a list of illustrations of how Alexander could master himself in different respects in Alex. 22.7–9; in De tuenda 127B, a passage which promotes a frugal lifestyle; and in Non posse 1099C, as part of a discussion concerning pleasure (and combined with another story on Alexander’s self-restraint, also told in Alex. 22.1–2). The saying is longer in the Life: Plutarch probably combined two sayings there; or perhaps he shortened the lengthy speech in Reg. et imp. apophth. in order to create a ‘real’ apophthegm.

423 Thes. 5.4 refers to Alexander’s insight described in Alexander X; XI also occurs in Alex. 29.7–9 (cf. also Arrian, Anabasis, II.25), but Alexander’s answer to Darius is here different from the collection (similar to Diodorus XVII.54). Both (parts of) the answer(s) were probably included in Plutarch’s notes.

cise: the king replies to someone who praises Antipater’s frugal lifestyle that in his outward appearance Antipater seems to be λευκοπάρυφος, but inside the man is ὁλοπόρφυρος (180E). This clashes with Alexander: his generosity and lavishness for his friends contrasts with his own rather austere way of life. Yet more importantly, this difference between façade and real disposition and true beliefs is not only relevant for Alexander’s lavish spending, but also for his attitude towards his divine status in XV and XVI (180DE). This reminds one of the Life (Alex. 28.6):

ὁ δ’ οὖν Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰρημένων δῆλός ἐστιν αὐτὸς οὐδὲν πεπονθὼς οὐδὲ τετυφωμένος, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἄλλους καταδουλούμενος τῇ δόξῃ τῆς θειότητος.

From what has been said, then, it is clear that Alexander himself was not foolishly affected or puffed up by the belief in his divinity, but used it for the subjugation of others.

This is Plutarch’s final conclusion after a series of stories about Alexander’s divinity, which follow his visit to the oracle of Ammon (Alex. 27.5–7). In the first part of this passage the king seems to be pleased and to accept his divine status (Alex. 27.8–11), but from the second part it becomes apparent that he did not genuinely believe in it. This explains why his attitude to his divinity was different when he dealt with barbarians or with Greeks (Alex. 28). Alexander XV and XVI occur in this first and second part, respectively: in the first, Alexander seems to approve of his divine status, through a more or less philosophical, though not humble saying (180D), but he rejects it in the second: when he is hit by an arrow, he quotes Homer in order to point out to his friends that blood, not divine ichor, leaves his wound (180E). His god-like status is, therefore, of similar use to his wealth: it is a means to consolidate his power of Olympias, who was loved by Alexander but nevertheless failed to influence him, see Blomqvist (1997) 79–81.

425 See LSJ, s.v. “λευκοπάρυφος”: “with white-edged robe, Alexander Magnusap. Plu.2.180e.”

426 Plutarch seems to share this view on Antipater’s character: Phoc. 29.3 also emphasizes the difference between Antipater’s behaviour and his disposition, referring to his apparently simple lifestyle, while he was, in fact, a tyrant.

427 See Plutarch’s assessment preceding this saying in the Life (Alex. 27.11): ἕτε δὲ μᾶλλον αὐτὸς περὶ τούτων <καὶ> φιλοσοφῶτερον δοξάζειν [καὶ] λέγων ὡς […] (“Still more philosophical, however, was his own opinion and utterance on this head, namely that […]”).

428 This apophthegm occurs in Alex. 28.3. In De Al. Magn. fort. 341B, Plutarch refers to the same event as part of a list of stories in which the king got wounded in battles:
but it does not affect his character. XIV and XVII therefore are relevant precisely because of their contrast with Alexander’s character in terms of his frugal lifestyle and the way in which he dealt with his divinity: while Alexander sometimes might seem ὁλοπόρφυρος in his outward behaviour, his true character remains λευκοπάρυφος. In this way, XVII is well placed at the centre of the whole section on Alexander.

The final apophthegm of the section’s first large block is in line with this, again illustrating the king’s know-how when it comes to keeping his friends, subjects, and soldiers happy, without compromising the integrity of his own character. Alexander XVIII reads as follows (180E):

Ἐν δὲ χειμῶνι καὶ ψύχει τῶν φίλων τινὸς ἑστιῶντο αὐτὸν ἐσχάραν δὲ μικρὰν καὶ πῦρ ὀλίγον εἰσενέγκαντο, ἢ ξύλα ἢ λιβανωτὸν εἰσενεγκεῖν ἐκέλευσεν.

When one of his friends was entertaining him in the cold of winter, and brought in a small brazier with a little fire in it, Alexander bade him bring in either firewood or incense.

The reference to frankincense in this story not only picks up the theme of Alexander’s lavish use of riches, but also reminds one of the allusion to Alexander’s divine status is therefore not the first reason why the story is quoted there.

Alexander XIX: ἐρῶν (180F), XX: ἐρώμενον (180F) and ἐρασθῆναι (180F), XXI: δι’ ἔρωτα (181A); XIX: ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ἠρώτησε (180F) which results in ὁμολογήσαντος (180F), XXI: ὡμολόγησε (181A), which results in ἠρώτησεν ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος (181A); XX: ἐβιάζετο (180F), XXI: βιάζεσθαι (181A). Additionally, the object of a highly positioned person’s love is a musician in the first two apophthegms (note πάλιν δὲ [180F], which connects XIX and XX): XIX: ψάλτριαν (180E), XX: αὐλητοῦ (180F). XIX occurs in Amatorius 760CD, after another story on Alexander in love; XXI in De Al. Magn. fort. 339D and Alex. 41.9–10, in a list of stories concerning Alexander’s goodwill towards his friends. See Beck, M. (2003) 186–187 for a comparison of these three passages. Note
These four stories thus have a function similar to III (179DE), as they seem to mark a break. With the second block, the readers travel to India and Alexander’s final campaign: they sense that the king’s death is near. This explains the surprising inclusion of XIX–XXII: these apophthegms suggest that some time has passed and avoid the final phase of the king’s life (in India) starting immediately after his visit to the oracle of Ammon.

In XXIII, the king is impressed by an Indian archer (181B); in XXIV, he meets the Indian king Taxiles, who wants to outdo him in bestowing gifts (181C). The next three stories all deal with the capture of rocks (181CD). In these apophthegms, something strange is going on. XXV (181C) contains a saying about the seemingly impregnable Aornos rock. It is, however, kept by a coward and therefore not that difficult to take, so the king says. XXVI (181CD) deals with a different rock (cf. ἄλλος ἔχων πέτραν), believed to be almost impossible to take as well. Yet no battle had to be fought: its ruler entrusted (ἐγχειρίσας) Alexander with his life and with his stronghold. Because of this, the king allowed him to keep his land, and even added a region to it. The first words of XXVII (181D) suggest that this story concerns the same rock as the one described in XXVI. Yet this is, in my view, rather unlikely. The apophthegm reads as follows (XXVII):

Μετὰ δὲ τῆς πέτρας ἅλωσιν τῶν φίλων λεγόντων ὑπερβεβληκέναι τὸν Ἡρακλέα ταῖς πράξεσιν, ‘ἄλλα’ ἐγώ’ εἶπε Ῥωμαίοις ἢ μάς πράξεις μετά τῆς ἡγεμονίας ἐνός οὔ νομίζω ῥήματος ἀνταξίας εἶναι τοῦ Ἡρακλέους.

After the capture of the rock his friends were saying that he had surpassed Heracles in his deeds, but he remarked, “No, I do not feel that my deeds, with my position as commander, are to be weighed against one word of Heracles.”

First, ἅλωσις can hardly refer to the peaceful transfer of the rock in XXVI, even more so since the place was in the end even given back to its former ruler – so there is no real ἅλωσις at all in the previous apophthegm. Second, the comparison with Heracles implies that a battle was

---

also the use of ἄλλα’ οὖν’ at the outset of Alexander’s reply in XX, see Roskam (2007) 185 (about De lat. viv. 1128A): “the combination of ἄλλα’ οὖν’ at the beginning of a reply is fairly common in Plutarch; see, e.g., Sept. sap. conv. 154C and 155F; Apophth. Lac. 211A; De sera num. 548B; De genio Socr. 578A; Quaest. conv. 726B; cf. also Reg. et imp. apophth. 180F.”

430 ἐγχειρίσας is translated as “surrender” by LCL, but see LSJ, s.v. “ἐγχειρίσας”: “put into one’s hands, entrust”: the verb is used in a meaning similar to πιστεύσας later in the apophthegm.

431 LSJ, s.v. “ἄλωσις”: “capture” and “conquest”.

---
fought, and there is no clear reason why Alexander’s friends would make such a comparison after the non-heroic surrender of XXVI. The πέτρα of XXVII, then, rather seems to refer back to the Aornos rock of XXV. This is confirmed by Arrian. In Anabasis V.30, a comparison with Heracles is also made after Alexander has taken the Aornos rock; in V.26, Alexander refers back to the taking of the Aornos by alluding to Heracles too (his saying, however, is different from Alexander XXVII, and he appears to be less modest).

Both Alexander XXV (181C) and XXVII (181D) thus seem to deal with the capture of the Aornos in the context of Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata. XXVI (181CD) could have been inserted after XXV because of the close thematic similarities between these stories. As a result, the reference to the rock at the opening of XXVII was no longer clear – and Plutarch himself was probably confused about all these stories concerning different rocks.

The first five apophthegms of the second main block are thus related to each other as follows (note the gradual shifting):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Τῶν δ’ Ἰνδῶν</td>
<td>εἶς τῶν</td>
<td>Ἀδρνοῦ</td>
<td>ἁλλὸς ἔχων πέτρας ἐν</td>
<td>Μετὰ δὲ τήν τῆς πέτρας ἄλωσιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰνδὸν</td>
<td>Ινδὸν</td>
<td>πέτρας ἐν</td>
<td>πέτραν</td>
<td>[in India]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεύς</td>
<td>Ίνδοῖς</td>
<td>ἄληπτον δοκοῦσαν εἶναι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, XXVII contains a reference to Alexander’s friends (181D), which instigates the inclusion of three apophthegms (XXVIII–XXX, 181DE) that again deal with the king’s friendships. The episode of Alexander and Taxiles (Alexander XXIV) is told in Alex. 59.1–5, after a series of stories dealing with the taking of strongholds (Alex. 58), one of which concerns the capture of Sisimithres’ rock (58.3–4) discussed above. The precise location of Alexander XXVI is unclear, but India is the most obvious option in light of the surrounding stories.
ever, takes the reader back to Alexander’s Indian campaign with a reference to his final great victory in the region: the well-known battle of the Hydaspes. This order seems strange, as the connection with India is interrupted for a while. From a thematic point of view, however, XXXI is in fact well placed: the previous apophthegm recalls earlier stories that deal with Alexander’s gifts for his close acquaintances (18iDE). With this apophthegm, then, Plutarch takes his reader back not only to the first part of Alexander (esp. VI and VII, 179F–180A), but all the way to Philip’s advice for his son. Thus, Plutarch wants to close Alexander’s section with apophthegms discussing Alexander’s final expeditions in India, but at the same time wants Philip’s advice for Alexander to resonate for a while. XXXI, closely connected with XXXII (18iE), in fact has a similar function:

31. Ἐπεὶ δὲ Πῶρος ἐρωτηθεὶς υπ’ αὐτοῦ μετὰ τὴν μάχην ‘πῶς σοι χρήσωμαι;’ ‘βασιλικός’ εἶπε, καὶ προσερωτηθεὶς ‘μή τι ἄλλο;’ ‘πάντα’ εἶπεν ‘ἐν τῷ βασιλικός ἐνεστι,’ θαυμάσας καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀνδραγαθίαν πλείον ἢς πρῷην εἶχε προσέθηκε.

32. Πυθόμενος δὲ ὑπὸ τινός λοιδορεῖσθαι ‘βασιλικόν’ ἐφη ‘ἔστιν ἐνθ ποιοῦντα κακῶς ἀκούειν.’

τοὺς φίλους. XXIX (also referred to in Alex. 47.9–10) concerns Alexander’s two best friends, Craterus and Hephaestion: the first loved the king, the second loved Alexander. There are three references to XXX in Plutarch’s oeuvre, which all stress Alexander’s love of philosophy: in De Al. Magn. fort. 331E and Alex. 8.5, Plutarch mentions Alexander’s 50 talents for Xenocrates in a list of gifts for other sages (one of whom was Anaxarchus, cf. also Alexander VII [179F–180A]); De Al. Magn. fort. 333B also mentions Xenocrates’ refusal of the gift, but does not cite Alexander’s saying. The reference to Porus in XXXI shows that the μάχη mentioned is the Hydaspes battle, described in Alex. 60.

436 The reference to Porus in XXXI shows that the μάχη mentioned is the Hydaspes battle, described in Alex. 60.

437 Xenocrates refuses 50 talents, after which Alexander asks whether the philosopher does not have any friends, since in his own case, the riches taken from Darius hardly sufficed for maintaining his friendships (on Xenocrates in Plutarch, see Roskam (2009) 45–46; on his influence on Plutarch, see Dillon (1999)). The story might seem to fit better in between Alexander VI and VII (179F–180A, even combined with XXX in other works of Plutarch, see supra, note 435): VII and XXX share similar wording (Ἀναξάρχῳ δὲ τῷ φιλοσόφῳ [179F] – Ξενοκράτει δὲ τῷ φιλοσόφῳ [181D], έκατον αἰτεῖ τάλαντα [179F] – πεντήκοντα τάλαντα [181D], φίλον [180A] – φίλον [181E] and τοὺς φίλους [181E]); VI and XXX also share verbal similarities (πεντήκοντα τάλαντα [179E] – πεντήκοντα τάλαντα [181D], τινος τῶν φίλων [179E] – φίλον [181E] and τοὺς φίλους [181E], similarities also shared by VI and VII), and a similar saying too (‘σοί γε’ ἐφη ‘λαβεῖν, ἐμοὶ δ’ οὐχ ἱκανὰ δοῦναι’ [179F] – ‘ἐμοὶ μὲν γὰρ’ ἐφη ‘μόλις ὁ Δαρείου πλοῦτος εἰς τοὺς φίλους ἢρκεσεν’ [181E]). Because of the reference to Darius’ defeat, however, XXX occurs later in the section (cf. the chronological structure).
31. Porus, after the battle, was asked by Alexander, “How shall I treat you?” “Like a king,” said he. Asked again if there were nothing else, he said, “Everything is included in those words.” Marvelling at his sagacity and manliness, Alexander added to his kingdom more land than he had possessed before.

32. Learning that he was being maligned by a certain man, he said, “It is kingly to be ill spoken of for doing good.”

Both apophthegms are connected through the presence of a form of the word βασιλικός. In XXXI its precise meaning and connotations might not immediately be clear, but the next apophthegm clarifies it: Alexander is maligned, but this does not anger him. His response illustrates the king’s mildness. Through the connection between both apophthegms, established by this verbal repetition and by their similarities with apophthegms of Philippus (esp. between Alexander XXXI and Philippus XXXII, 179C), a clear distinction is again made between true kingly behaviour, characterized by generosity and mildness, and despotism. The reader, therefore, interprets βασιλικός as “befitting a true king”, which implies, first of all, acting generously and mildly. The context in which the story of Alexander XXXI is quoted in De cohibenda ira is quite revealing for this precise meaning of βασιλικῶς as Plutarch conceives it (458BC).440

438 The word occurs various times in Alex. too, often illustrating that Alexander was a good king and contrasting him with the barbarism of Darius; see Schmidt, T. S. (2004) 231–232 on this matter.

439 Both Alexander XXXI (181E) and Philippus XXXII (179C) do not contain a saying of the king, but of another person who refers to the essence of being king (the old woman in Philip’s apophthegm exclaims “καὶ μὴ βασίλευε” – Porus asks to be treated “βασιλικῶς”), after which Philip and Alexander are surprised (θαυμάσας in both apophthegms) and do more than expected (Philip not only listens to the old woman, but to all cases; Alexander not only gives back Porus his own kingdom, but even more). Alexander XXXII (181E) recalls the first block of Philip’s apophthegms, in which the king was often maligned but punished no one (Philippus V–VI, 177DE), and also later, similar apophthegms in the section (esp. Philippus XXV–XXVIII, 178F–179B).

440 Zadorojnyi (2014) 304–305: “Porus’ comment must have struck a chord with Plutarch, who celebrates the notion of ideal (that is, philosophically aligned) monarchy as the best and noblest political regime”. The apophthegm also occurs in Alex. 60.14–16 and in De Al. Magn. fort. 332E, after which Plutarch argues that Alexander always acted φιλοσόφως. See Beck, M. (2003) 182 on the verbal similarities between the sayings of the three accounts.
καὶ πυθομένου ‘μή τι πλέον;’ ‘ἐν τῷ βασιλικῶς’ ἐφ’ ‘πάντ’ ἕνεστι,’
διὸ καὶ τῶν θεῶν τὸν βασιλέα ‘Μειλίχιον’ Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ‘Μαιμάκτην’
οἴμαι καλοῦσι· τὸ δὲ κολαστικὸν ἐρινυῶδες καὶ δαιμονικόν, οὐ θεῖον
οὐδ’ ὄλυμπιον.

But Alexander had behaved more harshly than was his custom to
ward Callisthenes and Cleitus. And so Porus, when he was taken cap-
tive, requested Alexander to treat him “like a king.” When Alexander
asked, “Is there nothing more?” “In the words ‘like a king,’ replied
Porus, “there is everything.” For this reason also they call the king of
the gods Meilichios, or the Gentle One, while the Athenians, I believe,
call him Maimactes, or the Boisterous; but punishment is the work of
the Furies and spirits, not of the high gods and Olympian deities.

For Plutarch, a king should be mild and forgiving. He should be μειλίχιος
and not μαιμάκτης:441 aggressive and ruthless behaviour does not suit a
true king, but is a feature of despotic and tyrannical governments. This
is in line with Alexander XXXI and XXXII.442 These two apophthegms
thus provide a fitting closure for the section, being well placed imme-
diately before XXXIII, in which the king is dying (181E), and XXXIV
(181F), in which his death is finally mentioned: at the end of Alexander’s
section, the reader acquires a full understanding of what true kingship
means, and how it characterized Alexander’s and his father’s rule.

Yet even Alexander had his flaws. Plutarch was all too aware of this,
for he does not ignore excesses such as the murder of Cleitus in the Life
of Alexander:443 But there is no trace of this negative aspect in the Alexan-
der section, contrary to most other sections which call for reassessment.
In a later section, however, Antipater refers to the murder of Parmenio,
who appeared to be a good friend of the Macedonian kings in Philippus

441 See LSJ, s.v. “μειλίχιος”: “gentle, soothing”, and esp. its second meaning: “II. later
of persons, mild, gracious” (about Zeus); and s.v. “μαιμάκτης”: “boisterous, stormy”
(again about Zeus).

442 Cf. the account of Alexander XXXII in Alex. 41: Alexander’s friends turned idle
because of their wealth and slandered him because of his military expeditions (Alex. 41.1).
After this Plutarch focuses on Alexander’s πραότης (41.2). Volkmann (1869) 229 writes:
“Was in Alexander 32. Ausspruch steht: πυθόμενος δὲ ὑπὸ τινος λοιδορείσθαι, stimmt
nicht mit v. Alex. c. 41, wo diese Anschuldigung allen Freunden des Königs zur Last
fällt.” Yet the imperfect tense in the Life highlights that the saying is not related to this
specific event alone.

443 Wardman (1955) 100–107 is not inclined to focus much on these negative elements.
Hamilton, J. R. (1969) LXIII–LXVI, however, points out that the king’s character deteri-
orates later in the Life; see in this context also Whitmarsh (2002) 186; and Buszard (2008)
188–192 on Alexander’s anger and drinking behaviour in the Life.
II (177C) and Alexander X and XI (180B), and questions whether the victim truly conspired against Alexander (183E). In this way, Plutarch still manages to problematize the positive image of the king, although the element is far removed from Alexander, thus mitigating its effect. There is, however, one other point of criticism that can be found in the section itself. It is alluded to by the last apophthegm. This one is similar in nature to Philippus I (177C), for in Alexander XXXIV one does not hear the king speaking, but only reads a quote of Demades (181F):

Τελευτήσαντος δ’ αὐτοῦ Δημάδης ὁ ῥήτωρ ἐφη ἧδι τὴν ἀναρχίαν ὁρᾶσθαι τὸ στρατόπεδον τῶν Μακεδόνων ἐκτετυφλωμένῳ τῷ Κύκλωπι.’

When he had come to his end, Demades the orator said that the army of the Macedonians, because of its lack of leadership, looked like the Cyclops after his eye had been put out.

This again emphasizes Alexander’s qualities as a general, but it also connects the previous apophthegm, in which he is dying, with the remainder of the Macedonian section: the reference to Polyphemus evokes the many movements of his arms in different directions because of the pain and confusion which Odysseus and his men had caused him. The Macedonian army is no longer an organized machine with a common purpose, but disintegrates and will from this point on be controlled by different generals and kings. The empire suffers the same fate. If Alexander’s rule had one flaw (as presented in Alexander), it was that his accomplishments did not last and that he had not consolidated the power he had built up.

Conclusion
Alexander’s generosity, mildness, and martial talent are unprecedented – at least this is how the section presents him. As for the first two aspects of his character, it stands out that he gave heed to his father’s advice: both are the consequence of his παιδεία and his familiarity with Aristotle. They also partially explain his military and political ingenuity, for they ensure that his soldiers, friends, and acquaintances are willing to follow him anywhere. Yet his love of conquering that dominates the section

444 Discussed in the analysis of Antipater (183EF). Citro (2014) 110–112, discussing this apophthegm, points out that Plutarch seems to believe in Parmenio’s innocence, as appears from the Life and De ad. et am. 65CD.

445 Plutarch also refers to the saying in De Al. Magn. fort. 336D–F (there attributed to Leosthenes); the apophthegm occurs in Galba 1.5 too (also about Demades). In both passages, the comparison with Polyphemus is based on the random movements of the Macedonian army.
from the first apophthegm on might also be the main flaw in his character. It distracted him from what a ruler should do, viz. providing internal stability and prosperity in the realm. Alexander only succeeded in this as long as he lived, but afterwards the country fell apart. If the Sicilian sections illustrated by means of negative exempla that a healthy relationship between a sole ruler and his subjects ensures a dynasty’s long-term rule, *Alexander* now suggests that this alone might not be sufficient: one should also appoint good successors. This will become apparent from the following sections on the *Diadochi*, where internal struggles and divisions of power are gradually more emphasized.\(^{446}\) Alexander should have prevented this.

### 3.5.4 The Diadochi (181F–184F)

The sequence of these sections is confusing from a chronological and geographical point of view (chronological deviations are indicated in bold).\(^{447}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical figure</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ptolemy I Soter</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>367 BC – 282 BC</td>
<td>181F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigonus I Monophthalmus</td>
<td>Asia Minor, Greece</td>
<td>382 BC – 301 BC</td>
<td>182A–183A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demetrius Poliorcetes</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>336 BC – 283 BC</td>
<td>183A–C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigonus II Gonatas</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>320 BC – 239 BC</td>
<td>183CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lysimachus</td>
<td>Thracia, Asia Minor</td>
<td>355 BC – 281 BC</td>
<td>183DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antipater</td>
<td>(General; regency)</td>
<td>397 BC – 319 BC</td>
<td>183EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus III the Great</td>
<td>Seleucid Empire</td>
<td>242 BC – 187 BC</td>
<td>183F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus Hierax</td>
<td>Seleucid Anatolia</td>
<td>263 BC – 226 BC</td>
<td>184A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eumenes II</td>
<td>Pergamum</td>
<td>197 BC – 158 BC</td>
<td>184AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrrhus</td>
<td>Epirus</td>
<td>319 BC – 272 BC</td>
<td>184CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus VII</td>
<td>Seleucid Empire</td>
<td>159 BC – 129 BC</td>
<td>184DE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{446}\) Martínez Lacy (1995) 224 observes that Plutarch regarded the reign of Philip and Alexander as rather positive, while the period of the Diadochi is often assessed negatively.

\(^{447}\) Information taken from OCD, see respectively Thompson (2012); Bosworth (2012b) and (2012d); Errington (2012a); Bosworth (2012c) and (2012e); Griffith – Sherwin-White – van der Spek (2012a and 2012c); Errington (2012b); Derow (2012); Griffith – Sherwin-White – van der Spek (2012b).
The chaos becomes real with Lysimachus (183DE), marking a first clear chronological break, and even more from Antipater on (183EF). The placement of this second section is most surprising: one would rather expect it to directly follow Alexander (179D–181F), even more because its first apophthegm (183E) explicitly refers back to Alexander’s death, while the second (183EF) contains a saying of Demades, who also figured in Alexander XXXIV (181F). This inversion of order has two functions. First, it illustrates the truth of Demades’ saying in Alexander XXXIV. Related to this, there is a structuring function. Based on the table above, the Diadochi can roughly be divided into two groups: the rulers presented before Lysimachus and Antipater, and those after these sections, continuing the inversions in chronology. The reason for this becomes clear after reading Ptolemaeus (181F) and the sections concerning the Antigonid Dynasty (182A–183D).

a) Ptolemaeus (181F)

The section on Ptolemy, son of Lagus, takes the reader to Egypt and re-states the question of how a good king should deal with wealth:

Πτολεμαῖος ὁ Λάγου τὰ πολλὰ παρὰ τοῖς φίλοις ἐδείπνει καὶ ἐκάθευδεν· εἰ δέ ποτε δειπνίζοι, τοῖς ἐκείνων ἐχρήτωμεν ἐκπώματα καὶ στρώματα καὶ τραπέζας· αὐτὸς δὲ οὐκ ἐκέκτητο πλείω τῶν ἀναγκαίων, ἀλλὰ τοῦ πλουτεῖν ἔλεγε τὸ πλουτίζειν εἶναι βασιλικώτερον.

Ptolemy, son of Lagus, used, as a rule, to dine and sleep at his friends’ houses; and if ever he gave a dinner, he would send for their dishes and linen and tables, and use them for the occasion. He himself owned no more than were required for everyday use; and he used to say that it was more kingly to enrich than to be rich.

The focus of Ptolemaeus thus causes the reader to lose sight of the theme of Demades’ saying in Alexander XXXIV (181F, on internal strife) for a while, until it will be recalled in Antipater (183EF). The apophthegm shares several elements with the preceding Macedonians (177A–181F) and with the barbarian and Sicilian sections. At first sight, the story emphasizes royal frugality, which reminds one of Philippus XXXI (179BC) and Alexander IX (180A), XXXI and XXXII (181E), and connects it with Artaxerxes Longimanus I (173D). On closer reading, however, an interesting contrast within this apophthegm emerges: Ptolemy only partially

448 Discussed in more detail in the analysis of Antipater (183D–F).
449 173D: τὸ προσθεῖναι τοῦ ἄφελείν βασιλικώτερόν ἐστι; in turn connected with the similar saying of his grandson in the dedicatory letter (172B).
sticks to his own words. It is clear that he himself is indeed not rich, but nor does he succeed in enriching his subjects. On the contrary: he is prof-

iting from the wealth of his friends. In particular, the presence of drink-
ing cups is a contrasting element: while these objects were the means by which the Macedonian kings used to make friends (cf. Archelaus I, 177A), less generous tyrants kept them for themselves (Dionysius Maior IV, 175E; and Agathocles I, 176E). Ptolemy’s place is in between both groups: he is not generous at all, since he has nothing, yet he still tries to maintain friendships by using other peoples’ possessions. The image, then, is rather positive, but also problematic.

b) The Antigonid Dynasty (182A–183D)
This series of apophthegms starts with Antigonus Monophthalmus (182A–183A). This first section takes the readers to Asia Minor; those on Antigonus’ son (Demetrius Poliorcetes, 183A–C) and grandson (Antigo-
nus Secundus, 183CD) will again introduce some rulers of Macedonian regions (182A–183D). 450

A series of good monarchs?
The contrast between Alexander and his successors is continued in Anti-
gonus Monophthalmus I (182A): 451 the king’s efforts to collect money arouse complaints that Alexander was different. II (182A) highlights an-
other difference, this one between the king’s eagerness to punish and Philip’s and Alexander’s mildness. III marks a break, announcing a char-
acter change (182A):

Θαυμαζόντων δὲ πάντων ὅτι γέρων γενόμενος ἥπιως ἐχρῆτο καὶ πράως τοῖς πράγμασι, ‘πρότερον μὲν γάρ’ εἶπε ἑνέσθης ἐδεόμην, νῦν δὲ δόξης καὶ εὐνοίας.’

When all were astonished because, after he had grown old, he han-
dled matters with mildness and gentleness, he said, “Time was when I craved power, but now I crave repute and goodwill among men.”

450 The continuation Antigonus I Monophthalmus – Demetrius Poliorcetes – Antigo-
nus II Gonatas is made explicit: Demetrius Poliorcetes I (183B): τοῦ πατρός – Antigonus Secundus (183C): Δημητρίου τοῦ πατρός – Antigonus Monophthalmus XVI (182EF) and XVIII (183A) similarly highlight the relationship between father and son.

451 If Antigonus Monophthalmus followed Alexander XXXIV (181F, Demades on the Cyclops), the contrast would have been less clear: Ptolemaeus causes a greater geographical deviation; Antigonus Monophthalmus could have been connected with Polyphemus (Plutarch never refers to Antigonus’ nickname, but Sert. 1.8 shows that he was well aware of it).
From now on, Antigonus will strive for a good relationship with his people. In line with what has been concluded from previous sections, the king realizes that this can only be obtained through leniency. At first sight, he succeeds: most of the apophthegms that follow are in line with this and show a character similar to Archelaus, Philip, and Alexander. First, *Antigonus Monophthalmus* IV and V deal with the interaction of the king with his son Philip (182B). 452 To some extent, this recalls Philip’s instructions for Alexander in *Philippus* XVI–XVII (178BC) and XXII–XXIII (178EF), but the link becomes clearer in what follows: in *Antigonus Monophthalmus* VI and VII (182BC), Antigonus is rejecting his divine status (cf. *Alexander* XV and XVI, 180DE); 453 next, he wants to be as righteous as possible, for he is not a barbarian king (cf. *Philippus* IV, 177D), 454 as is illustrated by his conduct at the trial of his brother Marsyas in IX (182C, cf. *Philippus* XXVI, 179A); he does not care about the soldiers slandering him and even orders them to continue in X (182CD, cf. esp. *Philippus* VII, 177DE; XXVII, 179A; and XXIX, 179B); 455 he does not listen to the advice of Aristodemus, 456 who wants him to re-

452 *Antigonus Monophthalmus* IV occurs in *De gar.* 506D, where the name of Antigonus’ son is not given; Antigonus’ saying showing his willingness to educate his son is recommended in the passage. It is also told in *Demetr.* 28.10, where the son in question is not Philip, but Demetrius; the apophthegm illustrates that Antigonus made his decisions on his own. V also occurs in *Demetr.* 23.6, where Antigonus’ action is clearly approved of, and the son in this account is again Philip, as in the collection. Τοῦ νεανίσκου (182B) in V clarifies that the son in question can only be the same person as τὸν υἱὸν Φίλιππον (182B) in IV. There are various possibilities to explain the difference with *Demetr.* 28.10: (1) by putting IV and V together in the collection, Plutarch might have incidentally or consciously changed Demetrius into Philip, or (2) he made a mistake in the case of *Demetr.* 28.10, or (3) intentionally attributed the story to the protagonist there.

453 *Antigonus Monophthalmus* VII occurs in *De Is. et Os.* 360D, where it is even combined with another apophthegm on the divine status of Alexander the Great (absent from *Reg. et imp. apophth.*): when Apelles painted Alexander holding a thunderbolt, Lysippus, who made statues of the king with just a spear in his hand, disapproved of it.

454 *Reg. et imp. apophth.* often connect cultural identity with true and right kingship, see Part III, chapter 2. Nikolaidis (1986) 230–231 discusses this apophthegm together with *De Al. Magn. fort.* 329D, since this fragment also illustrates “that virtue is peculiar to the Greeks whereas vice pertains to barbarians”.

455 Cf. also *Archaeus* V (177B) and *Alexander* XXXII (181E). In *De coh. ira* 457E, *Antigonus Monophthalmus* X is combined with stories about Philip (*Alexander* XXXI is told in this broader passage as well, see *supra*, p. 145–146).

456 Aristodemus, called a friend of Antigonus in this apophthegm (182D: τῶν φίλων τινῶς), appears twice in *Demetr.*: in 9.2, he is referred to as “one of his father’s friends” too (τῶν πατρῴων φίλων), while in 17.2, he is labelled as the “arch-flatterer among all his courtiers” (πρωτεύοντα κολακεία τῶν αὐλικῶν ἀπάντων).
duce the number of presents he gave in XI (182D, cf. Alexander IV–VII, 179E–180A; and XXX, 181DE); he is jesting in XII and XIII (182DE, cf. Philippus VIII–X, 177EF); and he decides not to give anything to the Cynic Thrasyllus in XIV (182E): 457

Θρασύλλου δὲ τοῦ κυνικοῦ δραχμὴν αἰτήσαντος αὐτόν, ‘ἀλλ’ οὐ βασιλικὸν’ ἔφη ‘τὸ δόμα·’ τοῦ δὲ εἰπόντος ‘οὐκοῦν τάλαντον δός μοί’, ‘ἀλλ’ οὐ κυνικόν’ ἔφη ‘τὸ λῆμμα.’

When Thrasyllus the Cynic asked him for a shilling, he said “That is not a fit gift for a king to give.” And when Thrasyllus said, “Then give me two hundred pounds,” he retorted, “But that is not a fit gift for a Cynic to receive.”

This witty apophthegm is yet another in which the topic of giving presents is combined with a form of βασιλικός, 458 and the connection with some apophthegms of Alexander in particular again stands out (Alexander XXX, 181DE, and also VII, 179F–180A). In addition, it calls Archeclus I (177A) to mind: as shown above, this king decides on his own to whom he bestows presents and what these gifts consist of. The character change introduced by III, then, seems to be genuine.

This will, however, be somewhat contradicted by the remaining three apophthegms (Antigonus Monophthalmus XVI–XVIII). XVI and XVIII focus on the interaction between Antigonus I and his son Demetrius. In XVI, Demetrius has to free the Greeks at his father’s command, who wants to spread his reputation (182EF). 459 That Antigonus attaches high importance to his fame is illustrated by XVII about a poet who writes of his great deeds (182F). 460 In XVIII, Demetrius plays a major role for a

457 According to Babbitt (1931) 73, a lengthy account of Antigonus Monophthalmus XV occurs in 551E, but this must be De vit. pud. 531EF. By claiming that Antigonus addresses Bias or Bion, Volkmann (1869) 229 misreads the passage: Plutarch first tells an apophthegm in which Antigonus indeed addresses Bias, but this is followed by an account of Antigonus Monophthalmus XV in which an unnamed Cynic (κυνικοῦ γάρ ποτε) appears on the stage. The wording is almost exactly the same.

458 See the opening apophthegm of Artaxerxes Mnemon in the dedicatory letter to Trajan (172B), Artaxerxes Longimanus I (173D), Alexander XXXI (181E), Ptolemaeus (181F). Antigonus Monophthalmus XV (182E) is the collection’s final apophthegm to establish this connection.

459 In Demetr. 8.2, Plutarch approves of this war, after which he quotes Antigonus’ saying (8.3).

460 When this poet is cooking a conger-eel. Because of this, the story is also told in Quaest. conv. 668CD, dealing with the question of whether fish or meat is to be preferred (see 667E).
second time. In this apophthegm, strategically placed since it provides a transition to the section on Demetrius (183A–C), Antigonus decides to kill Mithridates because of a dream and tells his son about it, but Demetrius saves the man (183A). A lengthy version of the same event is told in the Life of Demetrius in order to illustrate the (LCL) “strong natural bent of Demetrius towards kindness and justice” (4.5: τοῦτα μὲν οὖν εὐφυής δείγματα τοῦ Δημητρίου πρὸς ἐπιείκειαν καὶ δικαιοσύνην) and that he was (LCL) “naturally humane and fond of his companions” (4.1: καὶ φιλάνθρωπον φόσφει καὶ φιλέταιρον), despite the fact that Demetrius–Antonius primarily constitute rather negative examples. These essential good qualities of Demetrius, then, can clearly be found in Antigonus Monophthalmus as well.

Thus, although Antigonus Monophthalmus IV and V, through a comparison with Antigonus’ son Philip, open a series of apophthegms that depict a favourable image of the king, the section ends on a less positive note for this man, when he is compared with his other son Demetrius in XVIII. This again has a problematizing function: apparently, the character change announced by III was not complete and was perhaps only an outward change for the sake of his own reputation (cf. δόξης, 182A). This is in line with the placement of XVIII, showing a rather cruel king, after two apophthegms that emphasize his love of reputation and share

---

461 Antigonus Monophthalmus XVIII (183A), as transmitted by the manuscripts, is grammatically incorrect. Various emendations have been proposed. (1) At first, deleting ὁ δὲ seems to be the most obvious one, see Nachstädt (1971) 34; Babbitt (1931) 74n2 (“παραλαβὼν F.C.B.: ὁ δὲ παραλαβὼν. Some slight change is required to make the sentence grammatical. Bernardakis accomplishes the same result by omitting Ἐπεὶ δ’ and ὁ Δημήτριος”); and Fuhrmann (1988) 55. (2) As Babbitt’s note indicates, Bernardakis (1889) 30 drops ἐπεὶ δ’, and does not delete ὁ δὲ but ὁ Δημήτριος instead. A later scribe could definitely have added this name (perhaps taken from a marginal note) to the text in order to clarify to whom ὁ δὲ refers, while the addition of ὁ δὲ is far more difficult to explain if ὁ Δημήτριος was already the subject. (3) Ingenkamp – Bernardakis (2008) 30 also delete ὁ Δημήτριος, but preserve ἐπεὶ δ’. Since deleting ἐπεὶ δ’ seems unnecessary, this is perhaps the most likely reading.


463 Note however that Demetr. 19 contains some sayings of Antigonus related to his son’s extravagance, depicting a rather negative image of the young man. The king did not condemn this behaviour, because his son carried out his expeditions so successfully (19.9). Other sayings of Antigonus told in Demetr. are not included in the collection either (e.g. 6.1 and Antigonus’ final saying in 29.7). Perhaps Plutarch left them out because he did not yet possess all the material on Demetrius (cf. Part I, chapter 2.2).
similar wording to III, thereby referring back to that apophthegm and calling for reassessment.

If the first Antigonus did everything because of fame and reputation, the question is whether one can derive conclusions about the true disposition of his descendants, for the mildness and justice they exhibit might not be genuine either:

[1] In *Demetrius Poliorcetes* (183A–C), the king twice takes a city and shows clemency to the conquered: after besieging the Rhodians, Demetrius leaves his citytaker because of the courage of the inhabitants (183B); after defeating the Athenians, he gives the people grain, and when someone corrects his broken Greek, he gives even more (183BC).

Yet III might somewhat contrast with *Antigonus Monophthalmus* XVI (182EF): if he was sent to liberate the Greeks, one might wonder why the Athenians decided to revolt in his own section. Despite his leniency, which is definitely a positive characteristic, the image of the king as a liberator might therefore still be questioned.

[2] *Antigonus Secundus* (183CD) contains similar complexities. II–V (I is discussed below) are structured according to gradual shifting. II and III concern the realm of war, still connected with IV about a soldier asking for compensation. There is a certain tension between these first two: at first, both illustrate that the king knows how to motivate his soldiers, but his boasting in II does not appear justified when his army has to withdraw in III. The connection between IV and V in turn consists of the theme of reputation. In IV, Antigonus says that he only cares about a man’s virtues, not about those of his father, when giving presents. This recalls the advice of Philip for Alexander: he knows when to give and to whom, as was the theme of *Philippus* XVI and XVII (178BC) on friendships and possessions; and it reminds one of Philip’s saying that Alexander had to deserve the kingdom because of his virtues, and not because of his father (XXII–XXIII, 178EF). Yet V suggests that Antigonus II might not have the right priorities (183D):

---

464 Nachstädt (1971) 35 counts three apothegms, splitting the first between διαφθερεῖν and σπεισάμενος (183B). Babbitt (1931) 74–77 correctly takes both parts together; see van der Wiel (2023a) 12.

465 See τὴν ἑλέπολιν (183B) in the second part of *Demetrius Poliorcetes* I–II and ἑλὼν τὴν πόλιν (183B) at the outset of *Demetrius Poliorcetes* III, connecting both stories.

466 The version of *Demetrius Poliorcetes* III in the Life (Demetr. 34) focuses on Demetrius’ kindness, but does not refer to the saying nor to the fact that he did not speak correctly.

467 This Antigonus plays an important role in *Arat*. On Antigonus and Aratus of Sicyon, see Porter (1930). Porter (1979b) XIII argues that Arat. “seems to have been composed while the material collected for the *Lives of Agis and Cleomenes* was still fresh in Plutarch’s mind”: this suggests that it is a late Life (cf. the relative chronology).
Zeïnônos dé toû Kitéieos ἀποθανόντος, ὃν μάλιστα τῶν φιλοσόφων ἔθαυμασεν, ἔλεγε τὸ θέατρον αὐτοῦ τῶν πράξεων ἀνῃρῆσθαι.

When Zeno of Citium died, whom he admired most among the philosophers, he said that the audience to hear of his exploits had been taken away.

This recalls *Dionysius Minor* I (176C), where the tyrant wanted to be admired because of his acquaintance with wise men.468 *Antigonus Secundus* V seems to have a somewhat similar meaning. The readers should therefore wonder whether the king only cares about his own reputation or fame. The true disposition of all members of the Antigonid house, then, is quite vague.

**Familial harmony**

Perhaps more important is the theme of familial harmony in the Antigonid house. *Demetrius Poliorcetes* I refers to the king’s love for his father.469 After defeating the Rhodians, he is begged not to destroy the painting of Ialysus, an artwork by Protogenes.470 He answers that (183A)

\[
μᾶλλον τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς εἰκόνας ἢ τὴν γραφὴν ἐκείνην διαφθερεῖν.
\]

he would sooner destroy the statues and portraits of his father than that painting.

Love between father and son,471 expressed in a surprising way by means of this argument in *Demetrius Poliorcetes* I, is the main topic of the opening apophthegm of the following section too, where Antigonus II offers to surrender his entire realm to Seleucus, who had captured his father.

---

468 Note two forms of θαυμάζω in *Dionysius Minor* I (176C): θαυμάζων – θαυμάζεσθαι.

469 See Rose, T. C. (2015) 209–210 for accounts of the story in other authors. *Demetrius Poliorcetes* I opens with δὲ (183A) because Demetrius plays an important role at the end of *Antigonus Monophthalmus*: as in most other cases, the particle indicates that the following apophthegm concerns the same person as the protagonist of the previous one (Demetrius is, in fact, the protagonist of *Antigonus Monophthalmus* XVI); see van der Wiel (2023a) 3n8.

470 Babbitt (1931) 76: “The painting was seen by Cicero (Orator, 2 (5)) at Rhodes; later it was carried to Rome and placed in the temple of Peace (Pliny, Nat. Hist. xxxv. 36 (102)).” The episode of Demetrius’ triumph over the Rhodians is told in *Demetr.* 22–23, where the story concerning the painting occurs as well (22.5). The mention of Protogenes of Caunus in the passage is discussed by Linder (2015) 70–71, arguing that the story highlights Demetrius’ mildness.

471 See in this context *Demetr.* 3.1.
In this context, a passage of the Life of Demetrius is of paramount importance. This fragment is included after a story of Antigonus I, who was happy with the fact that his son could sit beside him with a spear in his hand (Demetr. 3.3–5):

οὕτως ἄρα πάντῃ δυσκοινώνητον ἡ ἀρχή καὶ μεστὸν ἀπιστίας καὶ δυσνοίας, ὥστ` ἀγάλλεσθαι τὸν μέγιστον τῶν Ἀλεξάνδρου διαδόχων καὶ πρεσβύτατον, ὦτι μὴ φοβεῖται τὸν υἱόν, ἄλλα προσίεται τὴν λόγχην ἐχοντα τοῦ σώματος πλησίον. οὐ μὴν ἄλλα καὶ μόνος ὥς εἰπεῖν ὃ οἶκος οὗτος ἐπὶ πλείστας διαδοχὰς τὸν τοιούτον κακῶν ἐκαθάρευσε, μᾶλλον δ` εἰς μόνος τῶν ἀπ` Ἀντιγόνου Φίλιππος ἀνείλεν υἱόν. αἱ δ` ἄλλαι σχεδόν ἄπασαι διαδοχαὶ πολλῶν μὲν ἔχουσι παίδων, πολλῶν δὲ μητέρων φόνους καὶ γυναικῶν· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀδελφοὺς ἀναιρεῖν, ὡσπερ οἱ γεωμέτραι τὰ αἰτήματα λαμβάνουσιν, οὕτω συνεχωρεῖτο, κοινὸν τι νομιζόμενον αἴτημα καὶ βασιλικὸν ὑπὲρ ἀσφαλείας.

So utterly unsociable a thing, it seems, is empire, and so full of ill-will and distrust, that the oldest and greatest of the successors of Alexander could make it a thing to glory in that he was not afraid of his son, but allowed him near his person lance in hand. However, this house was almost the only one which kept itself pure from crimes of this nature for very many generations, or, to speak more definitely, Philip was the only one of the descendants of Antigonus who put a son to death. But almost all the other lines afford many examples of men who killed their sons, and of many who killed their mothers and wives; and as for men killing their brothers, just as geometricians assume their postulates, so this crime came to be a common and recognized postulate in the plans of princes to secure their own safety.

The passage does not show an entirely positive image of Antigonus I and his descendants (as in Antigonus Monophthalmus IV and V, 182B, esp. the image of the young Philip is negative), but still illustrates that this house was a far better example compared to the other Diadochi. This puts the fragment in line with how the sections on the Antigonid Dynasty are to be read. Furthermore, the theme of internal harmony and the contrast between the Antigonid house and other rulers are particularly relevant for a general interpretation of the Diadochi sections, for it explains the strange place of Lysimachus (183DE) and especially of Antipater (183EF).

472 This apophthegm occurs in Demetr. 51.1–2.
Lysimachus (183DE), the section on Alexander’s former general and later king of Thracia, contains two apophthegms. In Lysimachus I (183DE), the ruler loses his Thracian territory due to lack of water. His words after this surrender resemble a similar saying in Dionysius Maior II, in which the tyrant decides not to give up his rule. Through this contrast, Lysimachus appears to be weak. Lysimachus II (183E), in turn, is similar to Hiero II: a friend tells him that he can share everything with him, but not his secrets. The Sicilian tyrants are thus recalled twice, steering the readers towards an interpretation not only of this story, but also of what follows, as will become clear.

A similar function can be attributed to Antipater (183EF). The picture of the section is not negative: Antipater I illustrates the importance he attached to friendship and trust (similar to Dion, 176F–177A, there presented as a positive example) and Antipater II shows his disapproval of gluttony and greed. This is remarkably different from his other appearances in Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata: his image in Philippus XXIV (178F) and especially Alexander XIV (180D) and XVII (180E; on Antipater’s own greed, note the contrast with Antipater II) is not positive at all, and the same goes for the context in which he will be referred to in Phocion XV (188F; about Antipater’s wrong expectations of his friends, note the contrast with Antipater I). Again, one has to deal with different points of view, and the picture of Antipater is highly questionable.

As stated, Antipater also has a structuring function, since both apophthegms recall Alexander XXXIV (181F): Antipater II refers to Demades and, more implicitly, the mention in Antipater I of a possible plot of Parmenio, the most trusted general of Philip and Alexander, referred to in Philippus II (177C) and in Alexander X and XI (180B), resumes the theme of internal strife too. These two apophthegms therefore also colour the way in which the reader approaches the following sections, which will recall the disintegration of the Macedonian Empire after Alexander’s death. This helps to clarify why the sections on the Diadochi (181F–184F) are split up by Lysimachus and Antipater:

---

473 The apophthegm is also told in De twenda 126EF and in De sera num. 555DE.
474 Lysimachus I and Dionysius Maior II even share some verbal similarities and similar constructions: 175D: κρατηθείς – 183D: κρατηθείς; 175D: οὕτω βραχύν – 183E: ὡς μικρᾶς ήδονῆς; 175D: ἀρχὴν ἐγκαταλιπεῖν τηλικαύτην – 183E: ἐκ βασιλέως πεποίηκα.
475 De cur. 517B and De gar. 508C tell the story because of Philippides’ saying, instead of because of Lysimachus.
477 As will be discussed in the analysis of Phocion XV–XVI (188F).
[1] In the first part (182A–183D), Ptolemaeus distracts the reader after Alexander XXXIV: the theme of internal strife is therefore not immediately continued, but the topic of the essence of good monarchy is resumed, although the picture is definitely somewhat problematic. The same goes for the sections on the Antigonid Dynasty, where another theme dominates as well: this house is characterized by familial love, which distinguishes it from the other Diadochi.

[2] Lysimachus and Antipater (183D–F) not only shed light on their own subjects, but also recall (1) themes from the Sicilian sections and (2) Demades’ saying, reintroducing the theme of civic strife. They hereby provide the interpretative background for [3].

[3] The following sections (183D–184F) also contain some problematic and even some rather bad examples of rulers, and return to the topic of internal strife, announced by Alexander XXXIV (181F) and recalled by Antipater.

d) Strife for Power (183E–184D)

Antiochus Hierax (184A), Eumenes (184AB), and Pyrrhus (184CD) all combine the theme of brotherly love and strife for power. Antiochus Tertius (183F), however, does not fit within this context. It is unclear why Plutarch included it after Antipater. Possibly he wished to create an additional chronological break, enhancing the confusion elicited by Demades’ saying: it ensures that Antiochus Hierax takes the reader back to earlier times. The section recalls apophthegms from the barbarian section: Antiochus Tertius I (183F), in which Antiochus orders that cities should ignore his unlawful commands, reminds one of the Egyptian custom (174C) and leaves a positive image; II (183F) by contrast seems to show barbarian lack of self-restraint: the king quickly leaves Ephesus after seeing the beautiful priestess of Artemis, fearing that he would not be able to master himself.\textsuperscript{479} Again, the picture is problematic.

The first example of a struggle for power between brothers concerns the fight between Antiochus Hierax and Seleucus. When the first hears that his brother has died, he mourns; when he appears to be still alive, he celebrates (184A). Eumenes tells the same story. Perseus, king of Macedonia, planned to kill Eumenes, king of Pergamum. As a consequence, he was thought to be dead (184AB). The haste with which Attalus takes his brother’s rule, and the absence of his grief, is telling. But, similar to Antiochus Hierax, the report of Eumenes’ death is false. When he meets his brother, accompanied by bodyguards and with a spear in his hand, there is a certain tension and Eumenes’ words show that he did not really appreciate Attalus’ quick response to the report of his death (184B). Yet he does his brother no harm and even bequeathes to him his rule and his

\textsuperscript{479} Cf. the analysis of the barbarian sections in chapter 3.3.
wife after his death; Attalus apparently repents, for he afterwards bestows the kingship upon Eumenes’ son, as is described in the remainder of the story. This chain of apophthegms does not end here. Pyrrhus opens as follows (184C).

Πύρρον οἱ υἱοὶ παῖδες ὄντες ἠρώτων, τίνι καταλείψει τὴν βασιλείαν· καὶ ο Πύρρος εἶπεν ἃς ἂν ὑμῶν ὀξυτέραν ἔχη τὴν μάχαιραν.’

The sons of Pyrrhus, when they were children asked their father to whom he intended to leave the kingdom; and he said, “To that one of you who keeps his sword sharper.”

In light of the preceding sections, the suggestion is not just that the most warlike son should become king, but also that a possible future quarrel about the throne is to be settled by means of the sword. This contrasts sharply with Eumenes. Although his brother clearly desires the kingdom, Eumenes avoids escalation at all cost and tries to maintain a good relationship with him. Pyrrhus, on the contrary, seems to encourage the opposite. The background of the barbarian sections, with similar references to brotherly rivalry for the kingship (esp. Xerxes I, 173BC; Cyrus Minor, 173EF; and Scilurus, 174F), is relevant in this respect, and there is a further contrast with Philippus XXII and XXIII (178EF), where this king argues that moral, true kingly virtues should decide who should rule.

Pyrrhus II (184C) is related to Pyrrhus I by the motif of excessive fondness for war and similarly recalls the barbarian and Sicilian

480 Plutarch tells both apophthegms in De frat. am.: Antiochus Hierax in 489AB (introduced as follows: Αντιόχου δὲ τῆν μὲν φιλαρχίαν ψέξειεν ἃν τις, ὅτι δ’ οὖν παντάπασιν αὐτῇ τὸ φιλάδελφον ἐνηφανίσθη, θαυμάσεων; “But Antiochus might be condemned because of his lust for dominion, yet admired because his love for his brother was not altogether extinguished thereby”), Eumenes in 489EF (assessed in an entirely positive way).

481 Braund (1997) 120–121 discusses the account of this apophthegm in Pyrrh. 9 as an example of Pyrrhus’ excessive πλεονεξία, which contrasts harshly with the image of Antigonus who attaches great importance to the education of his sons in the closing chapters.

482 As Volkmann (1869) 229 notices, Pyrrhus addresses only one of his sons in the account of Pyrrh. 9. That he speaks to all of his sons in the collection is much more powerful in the context of the theme of brotherly harmony.

483 Plutarch tells this same story in Pyrrh. 8.7, after a remark about Pyrrhus’ interest in military matters alone (8.6); see Buszard (2008) 202 on the passage and its contrast with Alexander. On Pyrrhus’ πλεονεξία in the Life, related to the poor education of his children and, therefore, his succession, see Braund (1997), esp. 126–127 (also on its contemporary relevance).

484 Cf. the context in which Pyrrhus I is cited in Pyrrh. 9 (see Nederlof (1940) 47 on this passage): the king only cared about the military education of his children. In the
section: Pyrrhus is not interested in music, only in things military (cf. Anteas III, 174EF, and Gelon IV, 175AB). Pyrrhus III and IV (184C) deal with the king’s failed military campaigns: the first one contains the well-known saying on the Pyrrhic victory, the other has the king leave Sicily for the Romans and Carthaginians to start fighting there. In V, he is addressed as “Eagle” by his soldiers (184CD): this nickname again illustrates his warlike character, and it is unlikely that Plutarch approved of such predilection for violence.

Pyrrhus VI, closing its section, is somewhat remarkable in the context of all these sayings and stories concerning war, but at close reading, one notices a similar pattern as in the preceding apophthegms. The story goes as follows (184D):

> Ἀκούσας δὲ ὅτι νεανίσκοι πολλὰ βλάσφημα περὶ αὐτοῦ πίνοντες εἰρήκασιν, ἐκέλευσεν ἀχθῆναι μεθ’ ἡμέραν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἅπαντα· ἀχθέντων δὲ τὸν πρῶτον ἠρώτησεν, εἰ ταῦτ’ εἰρήκασι περὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὁ νεανίσκος ‘ταῦτα’ εἶπεν ὃς βασιλεῦ· πλείονα δ’ ἂν τούτων εἰρήκειμεν, εἰ πλείονα οἶνον εἴχομεν.’

Hearing that some young men had made many defamatory remarks about him while in their cups, he ordered that they should all be brought before him the next day. When they were brought, he asked the first whether they had said these things about him. And the young man replied, “Yes, Your Majesty; and we should have said more than that if we had had more wine.”

The apophthegm also occurs in the Life of Pyrrhus. A comparison with this account yields two observations. The saying of the young man is followed by Pyrrhus’ reaction, which is not included in the account of the collection (Pyrrh. 8.12): γελάσας ἀφῆκε (LCL: “Pyrrhus laughed and

---

485 In Anteas III and Pyrrhus II, the subjects are famous flute players. Flute players were of little standing (at least in Athens, see Van der Stockt (1995) 463 on Alc. 2.5), so Nederlof (1940) 42–43 does not consider the inclusion of the story in Pyrrh. 8.2 successful.

486 Pyrrhus III occurs in Pyrrh. 21.14 (on its historicity, see Nederlof (1940) 152–153). After this chapter, Pyrrhus decides to go to Sicily (Pyrrh. 22 etc.), as also appears from Pyrrhus IV.

487 Plutarch includes this same saying in Pyrrh. 23.8. See again Nederlof (1940) 171 on its historicity.

488 See Pyrrh. 10.1 for the account of the Life, discussed by Nederlof (1940) 48.

489 As appears from Arist. 6.

490 See Nederlof (1940) 44–45 on a similar account of Valerius Maximus V.1.ext.3.
dismissed them”); and the apophthegm is preceded by a list of stories about his mildness and friendliness: 491 two of these are even similar to some apophthegms concerning Philip’s mildness. 492 The clearest case is the story that immediately precedes the Life’s version of Pyrrhus VI: when the king is slandered, some advise that the criticizer should be banished. Pyrrhus refuses, since he does not want the man to speak ill of him elsewhere (Pyrrh. 8.11): Philip, asked to banish a slanderer as well, makes exactly the same point in Philippus V (177D). 493 Plutarch most likely already possessed all these apophthegms when he composed the collection, 494 so it is remarkable that he chose to include only Pyrrhus VI and left out the king’s mild reaction: this apophthegm, instead of the story recalling Philip, reminds one of Dionysius Maior X (176AB), 495 and the absence of the king’s reaction leaves the reader in the dark. One simply does not know what follows, nor whether Pyrrhus will react mildly or not. In fact, the preceding apophthegms that highlight his harsh and violent behaviour, his warlike character, and the similarities with barbarian kings and Sicilian tyrants, 496 rather suggest that his response will not be lenient at all.

To conclude: especially in the second part of the Diadochi, Plutarch highlights the struggles between the different kingdoms and the internal

491 See Pyrrh. 8.8: ἦν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς συνήθεις ἐπιεικῆς καὶ πράος ὀργήν, σφοδρός δὲ καὶ πρόθυμος ἐν ταῖς χάρισιν (“He was also kind towards his familiar friends, and mild in temper, but eager and impetuous in returning favours”). Nederlof (1940) 43 writes: “Dat Pyrrhus in de omgang vriendelijk is geweest, staat buiten alle twijfel”. He further argues that Plutarch has a contrast with Demetrius’ unkind character in mind (43–44).

492 In the first apophthegm of this list, Pyrrhus blames himself that he never favoured his friend Aeropus, after this man died (Pyrrh. 8.9–10): this calls Philippus XXI (178E) to mind, who utters a similar regret.

493 The sayings of Philippus V (177D) and the apophthegm in Pyrrh. 8.11 even share verbal similarities: “αὐτοῦ μένων” ἔφη “μᾶλλον ἡμᾶς ἐν ὀλίγοις ἢ περὶ οὐκ ἀπαντάς ἄνθρωπος κακῶς λέγετο” – Philippus V (177D): ἵνα μὴ περὶ οὐκ ἐν πλείονι κακῶς λέγοι. This is a clear example of Anekdotenwanderung.

494 Cf. Part I, chapter 2.2 on the relative chronology of the collection and the Lives.

495 Note 175A: Δύο δ’ ἀκούσας νεανίσκους πολλὰ βλάσφημα περὶ αὐτοῦ – 184D: Ακούσας δὲ ὅτι νεανίσκοι πολλὰ βλάσφημα περὶ αὐτοῦ; 175A: εἰρηκέναι παρὰ πότον – 184D: πίνοντες εἰρήκασιν. This wording is absent from the Life, so these two apophthegms are modelled after each other (or at least Pyrrhus VI after Dionysius Maior X).


strife for power. These topics often remind the reader of the barbarian and Sicilian sections. Because Antigonus I Monophthalmus, his son, and grandson are assessed more positively, Plutarch decided to include their apophthegms before Lysimachus and Antipater. This does not, however, mean that an entirely positive image arises, nor that the apophthegms after Lysimachus and Antipater do not contain positive examples: the break is rather meant to highlight the excessive longing for power and, consequently, for violence, a great flaw in the characters of this second group of Diadochi in particular. This supports the criticism of Alexander in Demades’ saying: his neglect of ensuring good succession. Thus, it seems as if all efforts to unite all mankind have been in vain, not just from a political (a large empire) but also from an ethical perspective: the reader seems to be sent back to the outset of the collection on barbarians and tyrants.

e) Antiochus Septimus (184D–F)
A large chronological gap separates Pyrrhus from Antiochus Septimus, which closes the Macedonian section and indeed the whole monarchical part. This marks a break, as can also be seen from its content. Although there is some continuation – Antiochus Septimus I illustrates how the king deals with frank speech (which is also the theme of Pyrrhus VI) – there is above all a clear contrast with Pyrrhus’ harshness, for his saying sheds light on Antiochus’ mildness, through which he clearly shines out as a good exemplum: the king is dining with some of his poor subjects, who do not recognize him and discuss his mistakes. Antiochus realizes that they are telling the truth (184DE). Similar leniency appears from the second apophthegm: the king treats the Jews whom he is besieging with such kindness that they surrender (184EF). Apparently, Plutarch wants to conclude his treatment of monarchs on a positive note, as he does at the end of other major sections too. In addition, Antiochus Septimus enlarges the chronological break between the monarchs and Themistocles (184F–185F). This is especially relevant for an interpretation of higher levels of the text, as will be addressed by Part III, chapters 2 and 3.
4
The Greeks of the Core Mainland
(184F–194E)

The Greek section consists of three parts: the Athenians (184F–189D), the Spartans (189D–192C), and the Thebans (192C–194E). This reflects a certain chronology: the Athenian hegemony was followed by the supremacy of the Spartans after the Peloponnesian War, who were in turn defeated by Thebes after the battle of Leuctra. These historical events will appear to be two key points in the collection.

4.1 The Athenians (184F–189D)
4.1.1 Love of Honour and Justice (184F–186F)

So far, one has only met monarchs. The first Athenian sections therefore not only take the reader back to earlier times, but also to an entirely different society, in which ‘democracy’ prevailed. Nonetheless, this different context can provide lessons for a monarch, for it is the background par excellence in which strife to be the first, envy and jealousy, and, above all, attempts to appeal to the people predominate. In line with this, the main theme of Themistocles and the next sections is φιλοτιμία, a topic which will be explored in connection with justice.

a) Themistocles (184F–185F)
The focus on φιλοτιμία already appears from the first apophthegms: Themistocles did everything in order to become the most honoured man of his city. Although he, in his young years, liked drinking and women,

---

498 For Plutarch’s view on democracy, see Aalder (1982); Teixeira (1995); Plácido (1995); Erskine (2018) 239–245.
500 φιλοτιμία is also a main theme in the Life, discussed in detail by Martin (1961a), together with σόνεσις (sagacity) as a second main feature of Themistocles’ character (influenced by the picture of Herodotus and Thucydides); see also Zadorojnyi (2006) 262; Nikolaidis (2012) 40–43; Roskam (2021) 113–120 on φιλοτιμία in Them. On the sources of the Life, see Flacelière (1972) 22–25.
his behaviour changed radically after Marathon, as related by Themistocles I (184F–185A). He explains why (185A):

\[\text{οὐκ ἐᾷ με καθεύδειν οὐδὲ ῥᾳθυμεῖν τὸ Μιλτιάδου τρόπαιον.}\]

"the trophy of Miltiades does not allow me to sleep or to be indolent."

II builds on this (185A). When someone asks Themistocles if he would rather be Achilles or Homer, he answers with a similar question: would you rather be the victor of the Olympic games, or his proclaimer? Thus, I and II not only emphasize Themistocles’ desire to perform great actions, but especially his longing for fame and praise.

In Plutarch, such love of honour is not necessarily bad, since it can be an inspiring force, but too much is not good either. Themistocles, in the end, will rather prove this second point: his φιλοτιμία dominates his character, for he uses everything in order to become the first. One of his means to reach this goal is the Persian War, which he expects and even longs for. This appears from the next four apophthegms: when Xerxes is approaching Greece, Themistocles bribes Epicydes in order to prevent this cowardly man from becoming general (185A); when Eurybiades

---

501 Them. 3.4 and Thes. 6.9 tell the same apophthegm, focusing on love of honour. In De cap. ex inim. 92C, the story shows how an enemy can bring one to self-criticism; Praec. ger. reip. 800B describes how one should adapt one’s life to the public stage; in De prof. in virt. 84BC, Plutarch writes that Themistocles not only admired Miltiades, but also wanted to emulate him. See also Stader (2008) 59–60 for all of these accounts.

502 Achilles is also implicitly connected with the concept of being the first at the Olympic games in Alexander II (179D; cf. ποδώκης). Themistocles II does not occur in the Life, but Them. 17.4 describes how Themistocles was praised at the Olympic games after Xerxes had left Greece (Them. 16).

503 The proem to Agis&Cleom.–TG&GG and Maxime cum principibus 777EF address the theme of fame in politics; see Roskam (2009) 174. Nikolaidis (2012) 51–52 describes Plutarch’s position well: “philotimia cannot be ranked as a virtue […] because philotimia is a means or a motive, if you prefer, and not an end in itself, as a proper virtue ought to be. On the other hand, philotimia, especially if it is excessive, can be a very destructive passion […]. However, philotimia is, at the same time, the only passion that may urge one to accomplish various noble achievements motivated by the honour and reputation involved in them”. See also Duff (1999) 83–89 on its positive and negative aspects; and Roskam (2005d).

504 Cf. Them. 3.5.

505 In Them. 6.1, Themistocles III is part of a series of stories concerning Themistocles’ rivals, introduced by 5.3: Τῇ δὲ φιλοτιμίᾳ πάντας ὑπερέβαλεν (“In his ambition he surpassed all men”). In Comp. Nic. et Crass. 3.4, Themistocles’ action (risking his life for
does not want to give heed to his advice (IV and V, 185AB), he secretly sends letters to Xerxes in order to get things done in the way he wants (VI, 185BC). In line with I and II, these actions and sayings show that the Athenian does not care just about winning the war, but rather about victory obtained by him. The next two apophthegms (creating the impression of a chronological order, as they seem to concern the period after the war) show that he was successful, for he finally gets what he desires: fame (185C).

All this provides the background against which Themistocles IX is to be read. This apophthegm is placed at the core of its section, and provides an additional connection with what follows through the theme of justice. Simonides, apparently a friend of Themistocles, asks for an unjust decision from the politician, but he refuses. His answer contains a parallel structure which compares and contrasts his tasks with Simonides’ job as a poet (185CD):

---


---

his country, not allowing a bad general to be elected) is contrasted with a bad decision of Nicias, who saved himself when he was a general.

506 Themistocles IV and V are told after each other in Them. 11.2–4 too, both against Eurybiades. In IV (185AB), however, Themistocles’ interlocutor is Adeimantus in some editions, cf. also Volkmann (1869) 229. Yates (2015) 10 writes: “Plutarch draws heavily on Herodotus’ Adeimantus for his portrayal of Eurybiades, even to the point of attributing one of Adeimantus’ quips to him”. Babbitt (1931) 88–89 (and Bernardakis (1889) 36) reads as follows: Ἀδειμάντου δὲ ναυμαχεῖν μὴ τολμῶντος, εἰπόντος πρὸς τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα. Nachstädt (1971) 41, however, adds Eurybiades: Εὐρυβιάδου δὲ ναυμαχεῖν μὴ τολμῶντος, εἰπόντος δ’ Ἀδειμάντου πρὸς τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα, which is in line with Herodotus 8.59. Nachstädt’s reading might be the right one, but the reading Εὐρυβιάδου μὴ τολμῶντος, εἰπόντος πρὸς τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα (cf. Them. 11.3) could be correct too. Babbitt’s suggestion is less likely: Themistocles V and VI would be unclear without a reference to Eurybiades in IV.

507 For the lengthy account in the Life, see Them. 13–16. See also Arist. 8–10.

508 These military actions in Themistocles III–VI are connected with each other by verbal similarities too (note the gradual shifting): III (185A): αἰσχροκερδῆ καὶ δειλόν – IV (185AB); Εὐρυβιάδου καὶ ναυμαχεῖν μὴ τολμῶντος, εἰπόντος δ’ Ἀδειμάντου πρὸς τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα. V (185B): Εὐρυβιάδου – ἄκουσον δὲ – VI: (185BC): μὴ πείθων δὲ τὸν Εὐρυβιάδην.

509 Note Themistocles VII (185C): ἔνδοξός (twice) – VIII (185C): δόξαν. Both apophthegms occur in Them. 18–22 (VII in 18.5, VIII in 18.3), which only consists of apophthegms, introduced as illustrations of φιλοτιμία (Nikolaidis (2012) 41–42 does not regard them as the best illustrations of φιλοτιμία).


Simonides would not be a good poet if he sang out of tune, nor should he himself be a useful official if he gave a decision out of tune with the law.

At first, this resembles other apophthegms in which an unseemly request from a friend or acquaintance is refused by a ruler, who attaches high importance to his task of safeguarding justice.\textsuperscript{512} Usually an obviously positive assessment arises from such stories.\textsuperscript{513} Yet since Themistocles IX is inserted after a series emphasizing excessive longing for honour, one interprets it based on the pattern of expectations created by these previous stories. As a consequence, a less favourable image arises: Themistocles’ response to the poet might not reflect his righteous character, for he might only answer in this way in order to protect his good reputation.\textsuperscript{514}

What follows can also be read in this light, and a comparison with the \textit{Life} supports this interpretation. In Themistocles X (185D), the politician calls his son the most powerful Greek, because he rules his mother, who rules her husband; XI (185D) continues the theme of family ties: his daughter is going to marry and he says he likes the suitable man more than the rich one for her husband; in XII (185D), finally, connected with XI through wealth as its topic, he announces that he is selling has a good neighbour (note the gradual shifting).\textsuperscript{515} These three apoph-

\textsuperscript{512} Cf. Antigonus Monophthalmus IX (182C); Pericles III (186C). Also similar is Fabius Maximus VII (196A).

\textsuperscript{513} See infra, note 644 on Plutarch’ assessment of opposite examples.

\textsuperscript{514} (1) In \textit{Them}. 5.6, the story is also told after a series of apophthegms concerning φιλοτιμία (see also \textit{supra}, note 505; the passage reads τι τὸν οὐ μετρίων [5.6] instead of τινα κρίσιν οὐ δικαίαν [185C], probably the original wording as other accounts discussed below suggest; see also Zadorojnyi (2006) 268 on this wordplay in the \textit{Life}). Since Themistocles IX (185C) is surrounded by apophthegms that occur in Them. 18 (see \textit{supra}, note 509), all of which illustrate Themistocles’ φιλοτιμία, the reader is invited to reach an assessment similar to its meaning in the \textit{Life}. (2) In \textit{Praec. ger. reip.} 807AB, Themistocles IX is contrasted with a saying that shows an entirely different Themistocles; see also Zadorojnyi (2006) 267; and infra, p. 170–171. (3) In \textit{De vit. pud.} 534DE, Themistocles IX is combined with a similar story about Agesilaus, which does not occur in Agesilaus (190F–191D), and clashes with Agesilaus VIII (191B).

\textsuperscript{515} The theme of riches connects Themistocles XI (185D: χρημάτων and χρήματα) with XII (185D: πωλῶν); the same goes for the reference to a man’s qualities in XI (185D: ἐπιεικῆ … ἄνδρα) and XII (185D: γείτονα χρηστῶν).
The thegms occur in the same chapter of the *Life*. The final two appear in reverse order and are introduced as follows (*Them.* 18.8–9):\(^{516}\)

> Ἴδιος δὲ τις ἐν πᾶσι βουλόμενος εἶναι, χωρίον μὲν πιπράσκων ἐκέλευε κηρύττειν ὅτι καὶ γείτονα χρηστὸν ἔχει· τῶν δὲ μνωμένων αὐτοῦ τὴν θυγατέρα τὸν ἐπιεικῆ τοῦ πλουσίου προκρίνας, ἔφη ζητεῖν ἄνδρα χρημάτων δεόμενον μᾶλλον ἢ χρήματα ἄνδρός.

*Themistocles* desires to be somewhat peculiar in all that he did, when he offered a certain estate for sale, he bade proclamation to be made that it had an excellent neighbour into the bargain. Of two suitors for his daughter’s hand, he chose the likely man in preference to the rich man, saying that he wanted a man without money rather than money without a man.

When reading X–XII out of context, Themistocles would seem to possess a certain kind of wisdom. Yet they might once more highlight his love of honour in the first place, in connection with the preceding apophthegms. In this way, they call for an interpretation similar to the assessment above (in bold): Themistocles is only concerned with self-presentation.

In short, the section describes how Themistocles desires the coming war and the fame that it will entail, asserts himself when the war has finally begun, becomes famous, and enjoys his fame. The consequence of this is illustrated by the remainder of the section: in XIII, the Athenians no longer like him (185DE),\(^ {517}\) and in XV and XVI, in fact one apophthegm,\(^ {518}\) he is banished (185EF),\(^ {519}\) after insulting the Eretrians in XIV.

---

\(^{516}\) *Themistocles* X occurs in *Them.* 18.7, XI in 18.9, and XII in 18.8. X also occurs in *Ca. Ma.* 8.4, discussed *infra*, note 748. *De lib. educ.* ICD presents the saying as pronounced by Themistocles’ son; see *infra*, note 983 on the authenticity of this work.

\(^{517}\) The apophthegm contains two sayings. In *De se ipsum laud.* 541DE, both are told after each other too. In *Praec. ger. reip.* 812B, only the first occurs. In *Them.*, the first occurs in 18.4, still illustrating *φιλοτιμία*; the second in 22.1, introduced as follows: Ἦδη δὲ καὶ τῶν πολιτῶν διὰ τὸ φθονεῖν ἡδέως τὰς διαβολὰς προσιεμένων (“And at last, when even his fellow-citizens were led by their jealousy of his greatness to welcome such slanders against him”). The story is therefore placed well in *Themistocles*, further highlighting love of honour and at the same time marking a turning point. See also Stadter (2008) 56 on these different accounts of both sayings.

\(^{518}\) It describes one event (also included as one story in *Them.* 29.4–5): Themistocles responds to a question of the Persian king, see van der Wiel (2023a) 12; Babbitt (1931) 94–95 puts no. 16 between brackets. See Gera (2007) on Themistocles and the Persian king in Plutarch and others; and Zadorojnyi (2014) 307 on the story in Plutarch.

\(^{519}\) On ostracism in Athens and Themistocles’ banishment, see Barbato (2021), focusing on honour in Athenian society. See also Martin (1961a) 333 on Themistocles’ banishment as the consequence of his *φιλοτιμία* in the *Life*. 
(185E: the suggestion is probably that his arrogance annoyed the Athenians). Because of this, he has to turn to the Persian king, who enriches him in XVII (185F). In this closing apophthegm, Themistocles enjoys his wealth: being banished in fact brought him success, so he seems to claim in the presence of his sons. This final judgement confirms and darkens the image of the man: Themistocles only cared about himself, and not about his country.

Themistocles’ downfall, one concludes, is a direct consequence of a flaw in his character, his excessive φιλοτιμία. Yet this also leads to positive results: thanks to him, Athens wins the war against Persia and he does not give in to Simonides’ unjust request. This, however, does not make him a righteous person (although he was most beneficial to his country): a good statesman should put the people first, and act accordingly; Themistocles, on the contrary, put himself first.

b) Myronides (185F–186A)

The placement and content of Myronides is surprising. From a chronological point of view, one would expect it between Aristeides (186A–C) and Pericles (186C), but it instead precedes both. There is also no

---

520 Themistocles XIV (185E) reads as follows: Τοὺς δ’ Ἐρετριεῖς ἐπισκώπων ἔλεγεν ὡσπερ τευθίδας μᾶχαιραν μὲν ἔχειν καρδίαν δὲ μὴ ἔχειν (“The Eretrians, he said humorously, were like cuttle-fish in having a sword but no heart”); on μάχαιραν, see Babbitt (1931) 185: “The ‘bone’ of the cuttle-fish; cf. Aristotle, Historia Animalium, iv. 1. 12”; the Eretrians depicted a cuttle-fish on their coins in the fifth century BC, see Howorth (1893) 155: Themistocles refers to this connection. The story also occurs in Them. 11.6, after an account of Themistocles IV–V (11.2–4; Themistocles against Eurybiades): in line with these apophthegms, Themistocles only addresses one unnamed Eretrian (τοῦ δ’ Ἐρετριέως: the definite article is strange) who tries to say something about the war. The meaning is clear: the Eretrian(s) know(s) nothing about warfare.

521 Xerxes or his son Artaxerxes: in Them. 27.1–2, Plutarch admits that he is not sure about this matter.

522 εἰ μὴ ἄπωλεῖμεν refers to Themistocles’ banishment. The story is told in Them. 29.10, De Al. Magn. fort. 328EF (see also Beck, M. (2003) on Themistocles XVII and the oration), and De exilio 601F–602A. The presents given to Themistocles are three cities (Them. 29.11); on the historicity of this, see Marr (1994).

523 Themistocles’ sons were banished together with him, but were allowed to return to Athens after his death; see Frost (1980) 5; and Marr (1995) 161–163.

524 Martin (1961a) 336 on the Life: “Plutarch thus considers his personal integrity merely an expression of his philotimia: Themistocles is honest because he thereby gains recognition”. See Zadorojnyi (2006) on references to Simonides and Timocreon that reveal the Athenian’s wrong attitude towards money in the Life.

525 According to Babbitt (1931) 94–95, the battle referred to in the apophthegm could be that of Oenophyta in 457 BC, also referred to in Bellone an pace 345D. This is also
strong thematic link with the surrounding stories: it concerns a battle against the Boeotians, won by the Athenians because of Myronides’ great generalship. As often, such a break indicates that the author seeks to steer his readers towards a specific interpretation. This will become clear after reading the following section.

c) Aristeides (186A–C)
This section opens with a typical general description of Aristeides ‘the Just’, explaining why he acquired this nickname (186A):

Ἀριστείδης δὲ ὁ δίκαιος ἀεὶ καθ’ ἑαυτὸν ἐπολιτεύετο καὶ τὰς ἑταιρείας ἐφευγεν, ώς τής ἀπὸ τῶν φίλων δυνάμεως ἄδικείν ἐπαιρούσης.

Aristeides the Just was always an independent in politics, and avoided political parties, on the ground that influence derived from friends encourages wrongdoing.

This motivation for his abstinence from ἑταιρεῖαι will appear to be relevant later, but Aristeides II (186AB) first focuses on the nickname: as often in Athenian democracy, it triggers the jealousy of the people. This leads to the protagonist’s ostracization. At the same time, the story also illustrates his greatness: someone asks him to write down the name of Aristeides on his potsherd, while acknowledging that he does not know this politician. The just Athenian still does what he is asked. The theme of banishment recalls Themistocles’ downfall, who returns in Aristeides III (186B) as Aristeides’ rival: when both are sent out together on an embassy, Aristeides proposes to forget their enmity for a while. Again, his justice stands out.

Yet Plutarch does not mention that Themistocles was the one who instigated Aristeides’ banishment in order to become the first in Athens

another example of Anekdotenwanderung: Apophth. Lac. 225D attributes the same saying to Leonidas, son of Anaxandridas (compare 186A: ‘πάρεισιν’ εἶπεν ‘οἱ μέλλοντες μάχεσθαι’ – 225D: ‘οὐ γάρ’ ἐφη ‘πάρεισιν οἱ μέλλοντες μάχεσθαι; […]’).

526 The corresponding passage of Arist. 2.6 is discussed infra, p. 325–326; see also Citro (2019b) 151–153 on Aristeides I and the Life. Aristeides’ nickname is mentioned in Arist. 6.1–2; see Zadorojnyi (2018) 217 on the passage.


528 Aristeides II occurs in Arist. 7.8.

529 Praec. ger. reip. 809B recommends Aristeides’ saying; see Citro (2019b) 147–151 on the passage and Aristeides III. The saying is absent from Arist., but a similar saying occurs in 8.3–4; see Citro (2019b) 150 on the fragment.
himself.\textsuperscript{530} Perhaps, he assumed that this was well known, or perhaps he deemed it sufficient to mention the enmity of both politicians in\textit{Aristeides} III, assuming that Themistocles’ role in the previous story or at least his approval of it would become clear by itself. Another explanation, in line with the surprising inclusion of\textit{Myronides}, separating Aristeides’ section from that of his rival, would be that Plutarch possibly did not want his readers to contrast the former, known as ‘the Just’, immediately with Themistocles, who might then be labelled as ‘the Unjust’. A comparison with\textit{Arist.} 2.5–6 points in this direction. It consists of two apophthegms, one of which corresponds to\textit{Aristeides} I:

\begin{quote}
ό μὲν οὖν \textit{Θεμιστοκλῆς} εἰς ἑταιρείαν ἐμβαλὼν ἑαυτὸν εἶχε πρόβλημα καὶ δύναμιν οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητον, ὡστε καὶ πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα καλῶς ἄρξειν αὐτὸν Ἀθηναίων, ἀντερ \textit{İδσος} ἢ καὶ \textit{koinος} ἃπασι, ‘μηδέποτε’ εἰπεῖν ‘εἰς τοιούτον ἑγὼ καθίσσαμι τὸν θρόνον ἐν ὧ δὲ πλέον οὐδὲν ἔξουσιν οἱ φίλοι παρ’ ἐμοί τὸν ἀλλοτρίον.’ \textit{Αριστείδης} δὲ καθ’ αὐτὸν ὡσπερ ὀδὸν ἰδίαν ἐβάδιζε διὰ τῆς πολιτείας, πρῶτον μὲν οὐ βουλόμενος συναδικεῖν τοῖς ἑταίροις ἢ λυπηρὸς εἶναι μὴ χαριζόμενος, ἐπειτα τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν φίλων δύναμιν οὐκ ὀλίγους ὀψαίρουσαν ἄδικειν, ἐφυλάττετο, μόνῳ τῷ χρηστὰ καὶ δίκαια πράσσειν καὶ λέγειν ἀξίων θαρρεῖν τὸν ἀγαθὸν πολίτην.
\end{quote}

Themistocles joined a society of political friends, and so secured no inconsiderable support and power. Hence when some one told him that he would be a good ruler over the Athenians if he would only be fair and impartial to all, he replied: “Never may I sit on a tribunal where my friends are to get no more advantage from me than strangers.” But Aristides walked the way of statesmanship by himself, on a private path of his own, as it were, because, in the first place, he was unwilling to join with any comrades in wrong-doing, or to vex them by withholding favours; and, in the second place, he saw that power derived from friends incited many to do wrong, and so was on his guard against it, deeming it right that the good citizen should base his confidence only on serviceable and just conduct.

When compared with\textit{Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata}, some differences stand out: the apophthegm on Themistocles, which contrasts sharply with\textit{Themistocles} IX (185CD), is left out from his section;\textsuperscript{531} and Aristeides’ motivation consists of two parts, the first of which (in italics)

\textsuperscript{530} \textit{Them.} 6.7 and \textit{Arist.} 7.1 describe Themistocles’ role in Aristeides’ ostracism.

\textsuperscript{531} Plutarch was aware of the contrast between these apophthegms, as \textit{Praec. ger. reip.} 807AB (discussed \textit{supra}, note 514) points out; see also Shipley (1997) 35 on the difference between Themistocles in\textit{Arist.} and in his own\textit{Life}. 
contrasts with Themistocles’ attitude (the second tells the account of the collection). The absence of both elements in Aristeides illustrates that Plutarch did not indeed want to contrast a just Aristeides with an unjust Themistocles. Both men are therefore only to be compared with each other from Aristeides III on. Since Themistocles’ φιλοτιμία is the main theme of his section, while in Aristeides its protagonist’s selflessness is stressed, these main characteristics provide the yardstick against which both men are to be assessed.

As a consequence, when one reads that Aristeides does not enrich himself when establishing the contributions of the Delian League (IV, 186B),532 and how the Athenians look at him, hearing Aeschylus’ verses about someone who does not only want to seem, but also genuinely to be ἄριστος (V, 186BC),533 it stands out that both stories contrast with Themistocles’ use of money to feed his hunger for honour (esp. in Themistocles III, 185A; and XVII, 185F), and his rejection of Simonides’ proposal (Themistocles IX, 185CD) – a just act, but carried out for the sake of his own repute.

To conclude: Plutarch avoids a juxtaposition of Themistocles and Aristeides because he does not want to contrast unjust and just deeds, as Themistocles IX also presents a just act, and thus avoids an entirely negative image of Themistocles.534 He rather wants to show the wrong and right motivations which can incite one to justice, viz. love of honour and love of the common good, respectively (for this shows whether someone is also truly just). He wants to make this point very clear and attempts to explore this theme in greater depth in what follows. This is why Pericles arrives on the stage.

532 Also told in Arist. 24.1–2. Aristeides’ poverty is a main theme in Arist., esp. in chapter 1 and at the end of the Life (27, also concerning Aristeides’ descendants). Cf. also Part III, chapter 1.3.1 on Comp. Arist. et Ca. Ma.

533 In the Life, the apophthegm follows a most positive assessment of the selfless Aristeides (Arist. 3.4); see also Citro (2020) 115–118 on Aristeides V and the Life (and on Aeschylus’ verses, with references to secondary literature, and for a discussion of other passages where Plutarch cites them). Plutarch opts for δίκαιος in Arist. 3.5 instead of the original ἄριστος (the quote in De aud. poet. 32DE contains ἄριστος); see Babbitt (1931) 97: “On account of the reading δίκαιος in the Life of Aristeides it has been thought that the actor who spoke the words may have substituted ‘the Just’ for ‘the best’ when he saw Aristeides in the audience.” Plutarch probably retained ἄριστος in Aristeides V in order to establish a connection with Phocion IX (188C: καλὸν κἀγαθὸν).

534 Besides Arist. 2.4–6, other apophthegms are left out to this end: elements of 3.1, a story of 4, and Aristeides’ prayer after his ostracism, wishing that the Athenians would do well in the future, contrasted with a prayer of Achilles in 7.8: unlike Aristeides, Themistocles turned to the Persian side after his banishment, and the reference to Achilles would have provided an additional contrast with Themistocles II (185A).
d) Pericles (186C)
Anyone familiar with Pericles’ Life will not be surprised at the small number of apophthegms dealing with one of Athens’ most famous statesmen: as Plutarch writes in Per. 8.7, not many of his “memorable sayings” have been preserved.535 Of the three apophthegms that follow this statement, the first appears in Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata as Pericles II: Pericles orders the removal of the eye-sore of the Piraeus, Aegina (186C).536 This well-known saying hardly seems relevant in the context of the other stories, but definitely deserves a place because of its wit. More important is Pericles III. This apophthegm deserves particular attention, as it both resembles Themistocles IX (185CD) and recalls Aristeides I (186A). It reads as follows (186C):537

Πρὸς δὲ φίλον τινὰ μαρτυρίας ψευδοῦς δεόμενον, ἥ προσήν καὶ ὅρκος, ἔφησε μέχρι τοῦ βωμοῦ φίλος εἶναι.

To a friend who wanted him to bear false witness, which included also an oath, he answered that he was a friend as far as the altar.

Pericles II and III are surrounded by two stories which are related to each other, creating a ring composition. These will also steer the reader towards a specific interpretation of III. In I (186C), one reads that Pericles always said to himself that he commanded free men when he put on his general’s cloak (χλαμύς).538 In IV, also told in the Life, a dying Pericles counts himself fortunate because no Athenian ever had to put on black attire (μέλαν ἱμάτιον, providing a connection with Pericles I) through him (186C: δι’ αὐτόν).539 Pericles, then, does not care so much about himself, but puts the people he governs first: his opening apophthegm illustrates how he considers his power to be at the service of the free Greeks and Athenians; his final apophthegm should be read in light of this too, as the

536 Cited in Praec. ger. reip. 803A as an example of good use of metaphors in political rhetoric. Dem. 1 includes the saying too, but without an assessment (and Pericles’ name is not mentioned). See also Stadter (1989) 108.
537 On other accounts of this story, see infra, note 542.
538 In Quaest. conv. 620D, Plutarch describes how the saying should be adapted in order to make it relevant for a symposiarch; in Praec. ger. reip. 813E, Plutarch does the same for a politician of his own times.
539 In Per. 38.4, it is followed by a most positive assessment (39.1). Plutarch tells the same story in De se ipsum laud. 543BC, as an example of how one can adjust the reasons for which one is praised, if necessary. See also Podlecki (1987) 79; and Stadter (1989) 345–346.
words δι’ αὐτόν receive all the attention.540 The theme of selflessness and the contrast between Themistocles’ and Aristeides’ sections is therefore continued (I and IV) and again connected with justice (III).

One concludes that Pericles acted justly, and that his motivations were right.541 In this way, he resembles Aristeides. Yet, as can be seen from Pericles III, he is in some way closer to Themistocles: both men ended up in the same situation. If one now recalls Aristeides I, a contrast between this politician, on the one hand, and Themistocles and Pericles, on the other hand, stands out: Aristeides avoided bad influences from friends and would, as a consequence, never have been involved in such a predicament. This seems preferable to the situation of Pericles: one might claim that uncomfortable situations that arise from ἑταιρεῖαι should always be prevented, when truly serving one’s subjects.542 Yet one might also wonder whether Aristeides’ avoidance of political parties did not make him vulnerable for ostracism, and whether Pericles’ rule was – for this reason – not more effective. As such, then, the comparison of these men does not necessarily lead towards a clear conclusion and the moral dilemma Themistocles, Aristeides, and Pericles found themselves in provides food for thought.

e) Alcibiades (186D–F)543

Alcibiades is of an entirely different nature than the three politicians presented so far. The first three apophthegms (186D) on his younger years already illustrate his bad character (he bites his opponent while wrestling, mutilates a dog, and hits his teacher),544 and he disregards the laws

540 Per. presents Pericles’ rule as a monarchy (in line with Thucydides, see Per. 9.1). Stadter (1989) XXX argues that Plutarch paralleled Pericles and Fabius Maximus because both were accused of being tyrants.

541 Stadter (1989) XXX lists three goals of Per.: “to demonstrate through a presentation of his actions that Pericles in fact possessed and exercised the virtues of prætēs and dikaiosynē, to refute those who hold the contrary opinion, and to lead the reader to make a decision to put these virtues into practice in his own life.”

542 Cf. Plutarch’s assessment of the story in De vit. pud. 531C: Pericles should have prevented this situation by avoiding insincere behaviour. In Praec. ger. reip. 808A, the saying illustrates and specifies that a politician should not be one’s friend as far as the altar, but not farther as is just and good for the state.


544 These three apophthegms occur in Alc.: (1) I in 2.2 (see Duff (2003) 95–100 on the passage, focusing on the lion image; and Duff (2009) 38–39 on the biting metaphor in the Life); (2) II in 9.1–2 (also belonging to his earlier life; see Verdegem (2010) 161–162 on both accounts); (3) III in 7.1 (see Verdegem (2010) 151–152), where Plutarch adds that the story did not take place in his youth (Τὴν δὲ παιδικὴν ἡλικίαν παραλλάσσων; “as he
and the people in the remainder of the section. *Alcibiades* IV even explicitly contrasts him with Pericles (186E).545

Ἐλθὼν δ’ ἐπὶ θύρας τοῦ Περικλέους καὶ πυθόμενος αὐτὸν μὴ σχολάζειν ἀλλὰ σκοπεῖν, ὅπως ἀποδώσει λόγους Αθηναίοις, ‘οὐ βέλτιον’ ἔφη ‘σκοπεῖν ἢν, ὅπως οὐκ ἀποδώσει;’

He came to Pericles’ door, and upon learning that Pericles was not at liberty, but was considering how to render his accounting to the Athenians, he said, “Were it not better that he should consider how not to render it?”

The next two apophthegms illustrate that he practices what he preaches: he flees his own lawsuit, uttering a similar saying (V, 186E),546 and, related to this, argues that he would not even trust his own mother if she had to decide about his fate (VI, 186E). When he is sentenced to death in his final apophthegm (186EF), he betrays his fatherland by turning to Sparta.547 In this way, the end of *Themistocles* is called to mind (XV–XVII, 185EF): both men put themselves first, although Alcibiades goes much further in this regard.548

was getting on past boyhood”), but in the collection the changed order of II (not related to a specific moment in Alcibiades’ life, see Verdegem (2010) 162) and III ensures that the reader interprets all three apophthegms as childhood stories; see Russell (1966b) 38–42 and Duff (2003) on Alcibiades’ earlier life in *Alc. Alcibiades* I also occurs in *Apophth. Lac.* 234E, told about an unknown Spartan. It is remarkable that Alcibiades’ words in the collection are closer to this apophthegm than to the account of the *Life* (the sayings of 186D and 234E open with οὐ μὲν οὖν; *Alc. 2.3* has οὐκ ἔγωγε). Verdegem (2010) 122–125 discusses all these accounts: the relationship between *Alcibiades* I and the *Life* is difficult to define, he writes, arguing that the story might originally belong to the unknown Spartan and was deliberately attributed to the Athenian in *Alc.* and the collection. See also Verdegem (2010) 409.

545 See also Citro (2019a) 208–209, concluding: “È chiaro che Alcibiade e Pericle hanno una visione opposta dei doveri concernenti la gestione del potere.” The apophthegm occurs in *Alc. 7.3* and immediately follows the account of *Alcibiades* III; see also Verdegem (2010) 152–155 on both accounts.

546 On the absence of *Alcibiades* V from the *Life*, see Citro (2019a) 211, building on Verdegem (2010) 259.

547 *Alcibiades* VI and VII are told after each other in *Alc.* 22.2–3 too; discussed by Verdegem (2010) 258–259.

548 Alcibiades also fled to Persia, see Verdegem (2010) 32–35 for a short biographical overview of his life.
f) Comparison
One concludes that, except for Myronides, the first protagonists of the Athenian section are to be compared with each other. Aristeides and Pericles are just out of regard for the people, Themistocles acts justly out of φιλοτιμία (but his motivation does not make him a just man). Alcibiades, however, does not act justly at all and even despises the people. Plutarch constructs a gradation of just and unjust statesmen, related to their relationship with their subjects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Avoids ἑταιρεῖαι</th>
<th>Puts the people first</th>
<th>Respects the laws</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aristeides</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II, III, and IV</td>
<td>I, II, and IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pericles</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>I and IV</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themistocles</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcibiades</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Alcibiades’ witty cleverness might appeal to the reader, he is—in light of this comparison—the only man about whom almost nothing positive is told.\(^{549}\) This makes him one of the few historical figures in the collection whose image is overly negative.\(^{550}\)

4.1.2 Four Generals, Two Orators (186F–187E)

Generalship becomes the main theme in the next four sections: Lamachus (186F), Iphicrates (186F–187B), Timotheus (187BC), and Chabrias (187CD). The closing phrase of Alcibiades VII (186EF) prepares the reader for the shift: in the hyperbaton τὸν Δεκελεικὸν … πόλεμον, the final word receives all the emphasis.\(^{551}\) The theme of war will be continued in the section on the orator Hegesippus (187DE), who talks about war but is not present on the battlefield. This section and the next one on the orator Pytheas (187E) contain the first references to Philip and Alexander in the section on the Greeks of the core mainland. They thereby prepare

\(^{549}\) Stadter (2008) 56 claims that “the Apophthegmata regum omits many anecdotes, unattractive or unsuitable to imitate, that are reported in both Precepts and Lives, such as Alcibiades and the quail (799D, Alc. 10)”, but this does not mean that Alcibiades’ image in the collection is a positive one. Citro (2019a) 213, in my view, correctly summarizes his appearance in the collection: “Alcibiade appare assolutamente noncurante delle conseguenze deleterie che un comportamento scorretto ed illegale può arrecare alla prosperità della città.”


\(^{551}\) πολέμῳ in Lamachus (186F) establishes a verbal connection with Alcibiades VII (186EF).
and will shed light on a new and larger section on Phocion (187E–189B), who lived during the Macedonian rule.

a) The Four Generals (186F–187D)
Lamachus died in the Sicilian expedition.\(^{552}\) It is likely that ancient readers read his one apophthegm in light of this disaster, especially since Alcibiades precedes it and because of a reference to a military catastrophe:\(^{553}\) Lamachus says that one cannot make two mistakes in war (186F). This saying illustrates why prudence is a most important feature for a general: any misstep can lead to unforeseen disasters. The Sicilian calamity obviously illustrates this (Nicias’ absence might perhaps be explained by the relative chronology discussed in Part I, chapter 2.2, if Plutarch was not well acquainted with his sayings before composing the *Life*).

As often, *Iphicrates* (186F–187B) opens with a saying *about* this general, not with a saying by the man: as the son of a shoemaker, he was despised, but he gained a reputation by capturing an enemy soldier alive (186F–187A). Yet, as his final two apophthegms (V and VI, 187B) illustrate, he was still looked down upon by some people for his entire life: in both stories, he is mocked and reacts by praising himself. Other versions of *Iphicrates* VI (187B), however, do not concern the general’s reputation, but his sagacity.\(^{554}\) Deviations from these other accounts in the section highlight that the theme of competence is to some extent also present in the collection: after being asked why he is so arrogant during an assembly (ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ τίς ὀν μέγα φρονεῖς…, 186F), although he is not a horseman, hoplite, archer, or targeteer, Iphicrates answers that he is the competent (cf. ἐπιστάμενος) commander of all these. The words quoted do not occur in the other accounts and steer the interpretation: Iphicrates just gave his opinion on a certain military matter, and responds to the critique by claiming that he, as a commander, knows more about strategy than common soldiers. His self-praise, then, is justified by his experience, and he deserves to be respected. This also appears from the two central apophthegms that deal with the general’s fears (hereby also depicting his sagacity) and vindicate his boasting (187A):

---

\(^{552}\) The three generals of the Sicilian expedition are listed in *Alec.* 18.1–2, focusing on the prudence of Nicias, on the one hand, and the boldness of Alcibiades and Lamachus, on the other hand. *Alec.* 21.9 describes Lamachus as a warlike man without authority.


\(^{554}\) *Iphicrates* VI occurs in *De fortuna* 99E (on the importance of intelligence, for τύχη alone is not enough) and in *An virt. doc.* 440B (making a similar point). See also Citro (2019b) 146–148 on these passages.
2. Ἐν δὲ φιλίᾳ καὶ συμμάχῳ χώρᾳ στρατοπεδεύων καὶ χάρακα βαλλόμενος καὶ τάφρον ὀρύττων ἐπιμελῶς πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα 'τί γὰρ φοβοῦμεθα;' χειρίστην ἔφησε στρατηγοῦ φωνὴν εἶναι τὴν 'οὐκ ἂν προσεδόκησα'.

3. Παραταττόμενος δὲ τοῖς βαρβάροις ἔφη δεδιέναι, μὴ τὸν Ἰφικράτην οὐκ ἴσασιν, ὥς καταπλήττεται τοὺς ἄλλους πολεμίους.

2. Encamping in a friendly and allied country, he threw up a palisade and dug a ditch with all care, and to the man who said, “What have we to fear?” he replied that the worst words a general could utter were the familiar “I never should have thought it.”

3. As he was disposing his army for battle against the barbarians he said he feared that they did not know the name of Iphicrates with which he was wont to strike terror to the hearts of his other foes.

Both are related to the surrounding apophthegms and to each other (φοβοῦμεθα – δεδιέναι). Iphicrates II is connected with Lamachus, as it concerns a general’s caution. While Iphicrates III deals with Iphicrates’ reputation (the theme of the surrounding apophthegms), it at the same time notes his insight into the importance of psychological warfare. His military talent in II and III, then, again justifies his self-praise and regard for his reputation of I, V, and VI: Iphicrates’ φιλοτιμία is not directed towards himself, but to his qualities as a commander, for a good general is not only respected by his soldiers, but also feared by his enemies. Additionally, Iphicrates even refers to his reputation in order to encourage his soldiers in a subtle and original way, by giving the impression to discourage them (if the barbarians do not know Iphicrates, this might be a problem). Yet, as appears from IV (187AB), in which he is being persecuted and risks being sentenced to death, not all Athenians recognized his value as a commander.

Timotheus (187BC) continues this theme of a general’s reputation, again combining it with the importance of being cautious. In the first apophthegm (187BC), the Athenian is envied because of his εὐτυχία. When some men mock him by painting cities that were captured while

555 Self-praise is closely related to φιλοτιμία. Ingenkamp (2012) 22 therefore correctly speaks of De se ipsum laud. as “a treatise on one of the consequences of φιλοτιμία”.

556 In De se ipsum laud. 545B–D, a series of apophthegms, one of which is an account of Antigonus Secundus II (183CD), illustrates that self-praise in a time of peril is a good thing.

557 Timotheus II: μου στρατηγοῦντος; III: τῶν τολμηρῶν στρατηγῶν; IV: τῶν Ἀθηναίων στρατηγῶν.
Timotheus was asleep, he reacts by implicitly praising himself.\(^5\) In the remainder of the section, Plutarch connects this topic of an inactive Timotheus with the question of what distinguishes the general from a common soldier. Timotheus II contrasts him to another general: when one of the bold generals boasts about his wound to the Athenians, Timotheus points out that he would have been ashamed instead (187C).\(^5\) The connection with III (187C) is not just the fact that the general is twice criticizing a man, but goes much further. In this apophthegm, some rhetoricians praise Chares as a role model for Athenian generals.\(^5\) According to Timotheus, however, such a person would not be a good general, but should be the one who brings the στρώματα to a general. This can only be interpreted as a reference to his strength.\(^5\) The implication of II and III, then, as also pointed out by Citro, is that a general does not necessarily have to face danger (II), nor does he need to be a physically strong person (III): these characteristics rather befit common soldiers.\(^5\)

\(^5\) 187C: εἰ τηλικαύτας πόλεις λαμβάνω καθεύδων, τί με οἴεσθε ποιήσειν ἐγρηγορότα; (“If I capture such cities as those while I am asleep, what do you think I shall do when I am awake?”). Plutarch would have approved of such response: De se ipsum laud. describes that self-praise is allowed in defence of one’s reputation (540C–541A), although it is best not to deny the role of fortune (542CD). In De Her. mal. 856B, Timotheus I illustrates that historians are malicious when diminishing one’s exploits by ascribing too much to fortune. The reaction of Timotheus, then, is not included. In Sull. 6.5, Timotheus’ response is different and he is therefore criticized: ἀλλὰ ταύτης γε τῆς στρατείας οὐδέν Ἀθηναίοι τῇ Tύχῃ μέτεστι; (“In this campaign, at least, men of Athens, Fortune has no share”). This enhances the praise of Sulla, who accepts that he is considered fortunate. For a detailed comparison of all versions, see Citro (2021). Volkmann (1869) 229 considers the contrast between the collection and Sull. problematic, but both sayings might have circulated and fit well in their own context.

\(^5\) The apophthegm occurs in Pel. 2.6; see Citro (2019b) 140–143 for a comparison of Timotheus II and the Life. One reads there that the denounced general is Chares, the same person who appears in Timotheus III (187C). The reason why his name is left out of Timotheus II (187C) is obvious: if Plutarch mentioned that Chares was a general in II, this would contradict the next apophthegm, in which Chares is still to be chosen στρατηγός.

\(^5\) Chares will also be opposed in Phocion VIII (188B).

\(^5\) Cf. An seni 788DE, describing Chares as ἀκμάζοντα τῷ σώματι καὶ ρουμαλέον (“a powerful man at the height of his physical strength”). Timotheus’ saying is much longer in this passage: as often, Plutarch inserts only a part of a saying in the version of the collection in order to give the impression of brevity and of a witticism. See also Citro (2019b) 144–145 on the apophthegm in An seni.

\(^5\) Citro (2019b) 140–146 discusses Timotheus I and II together. See also Citro (2021) 204 on the entire section.
Chabrias (187CD) tells a similar story. The first apophthegm (187C) deals with a general’s knowledge: he needs to be aware of anything related to the enemy. In its second apophthegm, Iphicrates reappears on the stage. Together with him, Chabrias is prosecuted for treason. To some extent, then, there is a connection with Chabrias III, as it reminds one of Iphicrates III (187A), again concerning the distinction between generals and soldiers (187D):

Εἰώθει δὲ λέγειν ὅτι φοβερώτερόν ἐστιν ἐλάφων στρατόπεδον ἣγουμένου λέοντος ἢ λεόντων ἐλάφου.

He was wont to say that an army of deer commanded by a lion is more to be feared than an army of lions commanded by a deer.

This difference between commander and troops, related to the theme of cautiousness, cleverness, and reputation of the good general, dominates this part of the Athenian section: the safety of all depends on the commander’s prudence, but the crowd is not always willing to follow the wisest and most talented person, preferring men such as Chares. Not incidentally, all these insights are instigated by a reference to the Sicilian calamity, because of which Athens lost her important position in the Greek military and political landscape. In these sections, then, Plutarch explores the essence of the good general: sagacity and insight clash with vigour. This raises questions different from the previous sections, where effectiveness and usefulness clash with virtue.

b) The Two Orators (187DE)

The next two apophthegms feature two rhetoricians, but the connection with war is not completely broken: in Hegesippus (187DE), the Athenian tries to start a war (πόλεμον) against Philip, for the sake of their freedom. As Pytheas (187E) points out, they failed: the Macedonians have conquered the city, and Alexander is Athens’ new ruler. In this second section, the young orator (ἔτι μειράκιον ὤν) opposes some votes con-

564 There is a connection with Pericles IV (186C), who is glad that no Athenian ever had to wear a μέλαν ἱμάτιον because of his policy. Hegesippus wants the opposite, answering to one who says that he wants a war (187DE): ‘ναὶ μὰ Δία’ εἶπε ‘καὶ μέλανα ἱμάτια καὶ δημοσίας ἐκφορὰς καὶ λόγους ἐπιταφίως, εἰ μέλλομεν ἐλεύθεροι βιώσεται καὶ μὴ ποιήσεται τὸ προστατόμενον Μακεδόσι’ (‘“Yes, by Heaven, I am,” said he, “and black clothes and public funerals and orations over the graves of the dead, if we intend to live as free men, and not to do what is enjoined upon us by the Macedonians”). This also announces Phocion, who will call for peace.
A comparison of the men figuring in 186F–187E shows that a good statesman should be both a good general and a good orator, for the brilliant general will be unable to keep his people safe and to bring victory if he lacks oratory skills and cannot convince others; the good rhetorician, by contrast, will bring calamity if he lacks military insights. The next section on Phocion will bring onto the stage a man who possessed both talents, entirely in line with how he is presented in his Life (Phoc. 7.5):

> ὁρῶν δὲ τοὺς τὰ κοινὰ πράσσοντας τότε διηρημένους ὡσπερ ἀπὸ κλήρου τὸ στρατήγιον καὶ τὸ βῆμα […] ἐβούλετο τὴν Περικλέους καὶ Ἀριστείδου καὶ Σόλωνος πολιτείαν ὡσπερ ὅλοκληρον καὶ διηρμοσμένην ἐν ἀμφοῖν ἀναλαβεῖν καὶ ἀποδοῦναι.

He saw that the public men of his day had distributed among themselves as if by lot the work of the general and the orator. […] He therefore wished to resume and restore the public service rendered by Pericles, Aristides, and Solon, which was equally apportioned in both fields of action.

Thus, in contrast to Lamachus–Pytheas, Phocion will describe a versatile politician, similar to the men that preceded this series (Themistocles–Alcibiades).

### 4.1.3 Phocion (187E–189B)

This is the longest Athenian section, containing nineteen apophthegms. This is not surprising, as the corresponding Life is one of Plutarch’s most

---

565 The apophthegm is cited as an example of good speech in front of the people in Praec. ger. reip. 804B.

566 Preceded by six apophthegms: Lamachus (186F) and Iphicrates I–V (186F–187B); and followed by six: Timotheus I–III (187BC) and Chabrias I–III (187CD).

567 See Tritle (1992) 4272 on Phocion’s “archaiotropia”.

---
‘apophthegmatic’ biographies. This can especially be seen from some chapters that are almost entirely built up from apophthegms (e.g. Phoc. 8–10). Many of these do not occur in Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata.

Phocion and the people
Phocion’s opening apophthegm – again without a saying – deals with his apparent lack of emotion: he was never seen laughing or crying (187E). Phocion II (187EF) is in line with this, illustrating his love of laconic speech. when he is going to address the Athenians (187E: Ἐκκλησίας δὲ γενομένης), he tries to shorten his speech. I and II (187EF) thereby

568 Tritle (1992) 4296. Ibid. 4287–4290 discusses the apophthegms in Phocion and compares them with Phoc., concluding (4289–4290): “The impression produced by this comparison is that the compiler of the ‘Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata’ extracted his anecdotes from the ‘Phocion’ and at the same time summarized much of the preceding narrative, probably to make the anecdote comprehensible. In one case he adds an anecdote found in another source (Valerius Maximus), and in another states that Phocion killed Micion in a battle during the Lamian War when Plutarch states only that Micion was among the Macedonian dead. Such disagreement in the versions of these anecdotes confirms the view that the ‘Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata’ is a later non-Plutarchan work.” Yet almost all these elements can be explained if one assumes that the same Plutarchan notes (such as Apophth. Lac. or perhaps a kind of historical draft) were used for both Phoc. and Reg. et imp. apophth. As to the “disagreement”, it is unclear what Tritle means: Phocion XIII (188E) reads οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ συμβαλὼν ἐκράτησε καὶ διέφθειρε Νικίωνα [Nachstädt (1971) 52: “Μικ. vit.”] τὸν ἄρχοντα τῶν Μακεδόνων; Phoc. 25.4 has: ἐμβαλὼν δὲ τοῖς πολεμίοις καὶ κατὰ κράτος τρεψάμενος, αὐτὸν τε τὸν Μικίωνα καὶ ἄλλους πολεμίους ἀπέκτεινε.

569 Only five apophthegms of the collection occur in these chapters: III in Phoc. 8.4, IV in 8.5, V in 9.1, VI in 9.8, and VII in 10.9. V also occurs in (1) De vit. pud. 532F–533A, preceded by an account of Phocion XVI (both stories show how one can refuse difficult requests); and (2) Praec. ger. reip. 822E: Plutarch claims that one should not be ashamed to confess poverty. This is similar to the quote of Thucydides following the apophthegm in (3) De vit. pud. 533A. In addition, Plutarch writes in these final two passages that one should learn these sayings of Phocion and others by heart. The interpretation of Phocion V is closer to the Life. VI, finally, is also told in Praec. ger. reip. 811A, see infra, note 575.

570 Cf. Phoc. 4.3. Plutarch did not have much information about Phocion’s youth, see Tritle (1992) 4268–4270.

571 This is the only apopthegm of Phoc. 5 that occurs in Reg. et imp. apophth. (5.8). Dubreuil (2018) 262 points out that Phocion II takes place in an unnamed setting, while in the Life it takes place in the theatre (according to Dubreuil (2018) an important motif in the biography, emphasizing the decline of Athenian democracy).

572 In line with Phocion’s admiration for Sparta (Phoc. 20.4–6; cf. Phoc. 5 on his own short sayings). On Phocion’s brevity, see Tritle (1992) 4270.
open a first block of apophthegms (I–VII, 187E–188B) that together pro-
vide the background for the remainder of the section, and especially for
its final part (XVII–XIX, 189AB) in which Phocion is sentenced to death:

[1] In Phocion III, he claims to be the one who opposes the Athenian
people (187F). Phocion IV builds on this image:573 when the citizens ap-
prove of his opinion, he asks whether he said something wrong (188A).
This highlights that it was exceptional indeed when Phocion and the
common Athenians agreed.574

[2] Phocion V is no longer related to his speech in front of the crowd,
but still contrasts him with the people: he is the only man who refuses to
contribute financially for a feast, since he first has to pay his debts (188A).
This difference between Phocion and the multitude even outside of the
realm of politics leads to the following saying of Demosthenes, the ora-
tor’s only appearance in Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata (188A):575

Δημοσθένους δὲ τοῦ ῥήτορος εἰπόντος ‘ἀποκτενοῦσί σε Ἀθηναῖοι’
‘ἐὰν μανῶσιν [, νῇ Δίᾳ]’, εἶπε, ‘σὲ δ’ ἐὰν σωφρονῶσιν.’

Demosthenes, the orator, said to him, “The Athenians will put you to
death if they go mad.” “Yes,” he replied, “me if they go mad, but you
if they keep their senses.”

Phocion VII, connected to this apophthegm by the theme of the death
penalty, closes this first block: Phocion visits a bad person who is sen-
tenced to death (188AB).

The first block thus distinguishes Phocion from the crowd in all re-
spects.576 It emphasizes his philosophical nature and greatness and shows
that he is precisely the opposite of a flatterer of the people. This image
comes more relevant later. It also explains why Phocion died at the
hands of the people, a topic thematized in his final apophthegms and
foreshadowed by Demosthenes’ words.577

574 Erskine (2018) 250: “Agreement with the people is seen as so untypical for Phocion
that it merits an anecdote itself”.
575 In the account of Phoc. 9.8, Phocion also reacts to Demosthenes, but in Praec. ger.
reip. 811A, Demades is the interlocutor. Again, the version of the collection is closer to
the Life.
577 As stated in note 569, Phocion III–VII occur in Phoc. 8–10. The apophthegms in
these chapters are introduced by Phoc. 8.3, which is in line with the interpretation in
the collection: πλείστα τοῦ Φωκίωνος ἀντικρούοντος αὐτῷ καὶ μηδὲν εἰπόντος πώποτε
µηδὲ πράξαντος πρὸς χάριν, ὤσπερ ἄξιοῦσι τοὺς βασιλεῖς τοῖς κάλλεις κηρύσσαι μετὰ τὸ
κατὰ χειρὸς ὑδωρ, ἐχρῆθ’ οὗτος [sc. δῆμος] τοῖς µὲν κομψότεροις καὶ ἱλαροῖς ἐν παιδίας
Phocion as a versatile statesman

The next block deals with the wars against the Macedonians. Not only do Phocion’s skills as an orator come to the fore, but also his military talent and insights. Phocion VIII even combines these two themes: because the citizens of Byzantium do not trust Chares, he is sent to the city and makes Philip withdraw himself, as appears from the aftermath stressing Phocion’s military success (188B: ἐποίησε τὸν Φίλιππον ἀπελθεῖν ἄπρακτον). In X, XI, and XII (IX will be discussed below), he again gives military advice in his capacity as an orator, in which prudence is the common thread (188C–E): knowing when not to fight is also important for a strategic mind. In XIII, he has to lead the army: by ignoring the advice of others, he is victorious (188E). Both VIII (188B) and XIII (188E) thus show Phocion’s talent as a general, recalling Lamachus–Chabrias (186F–187D). The apophthegms placed in between (188C–E) remind one of Hegesippus–Pytheas (187DE). In this way, this block is in line with the Life of Phocion 7.5 cited above: as the man was truly a great rhetorician and possessed military insights, he often managed to bring either victory or safety to his city.

Phocion IX, however, concerns a different theme. Yet from a chronological point of view, it is well placed, and it is still connected with μέρει δημαγωγοῖς, ἐπὶ δὲ τὰς ἀρχὰς ἀεὶ νήψων καὶ σπουδάζων τὸν αὐστηρότατον καὶ φρονιμώτατον ἐκάλει τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ μόνον ἢ μάλιστα ταῖς βουλήσεσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁρμαῖς ἀντιτασσόμενον (“For Phocion opposed them more than anybody else, and never said or did anything to win their favour; and yet, just as kings are supposed to listen to their flatterers after dinner has begun, so the Athenians made use of their most elegant and sprightly leaders by way of diversion, but when they wanted a commander they were always sober and serious, and called upon the severest and most sensible citizen, one who alone, or more than the rest, arrayed himself against their desires and impulses”). The words in bold resemble Phocion XVI (188F).

578 Phoc. 14 contains a lengthy account of the event.

579 Phocion X occurs in Phoc. 21.1 (part of a series of apophthegms), XI in 22.5–6, XII in 23 (the first part of XII occurs in 23.2, the second in 23.5–6; the chapter, containing various similar apophthegms, is followed by Leosthenes’ death in 24.1, highlighting that Phocion’s caution was justified). XI also occurs in De coh. ira 459EF: in the same way as Phocion advises not acting in a hurry, the angry man should not take vengeance immediately.

580 The first part of the apophthegm (188E: Τῇ δ’ Ἀττικῇ … στρατιώτας δ’ ὀλίγοις) is told in Phoc. 25.1–2, the second (188E: οὐ μὴν ἄλλα συμβαλλόν … τῶν Μακεδόνων) in 25.4. These two parts in the Life surround another apophthegm, related to the same historical event.

581 Note the chronological evolution in Phocion VIII–XIV (186B–F): in VIII (188B), Philip is the enemy; in IX and X (188C), Alexander is the king; in XI (188CD), Alexander
the next apophthegm by a reference to the friendly relationship between Alexander and Phocion (188C):\textsuperscript{582}

Ἀλεξάνδρου δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως ἑκατὸν τάλαντα δωρεὰν πέμψαντο ήρώτησε τοὺς κομίζοντας τί δήποτε πολλῶν ὄντων Ἀθηναίων αὐτῷ μόνῳ ταῦτα δίδωσιν Ἀλεξάνδρος· εἰπόντων δ’ ἐκείνων ὡς μόνον αὐτὸν ἠγεῖται καλὸν κἀγαθὸν εἶναι, ‘οὐκοῦν’ ἔφη ἑασάτω με καὶ δοκεῖν καὶ εἶναι τοιούτον.

When Alexander the king sent him twenty thousand pounds as a present, he asked those who brought the money why it was that, when there were so many Athenians, Alexander offered this to him only. They replied that their king considered him only to be upright and honourable. “Then,” said he, “let him suffer me both to seem and to be such.”

Phocion is characterized both through Alexander’s action and words and through his own reaction. The king’s action recalls his generosity emphasized by \textit{Alexander} (179D–181F). In particular, a similarity with \textit{Alexander XXX} (181DE) stands out, for a gift was refused there too. This connects Phocion with Xenocrates: in this way, his philosophical nature is highlighted once more (cf. \textit{Phocion I–VII}). In addition, Alexander’s words contain an explicit characterization: only Phocion is καλὸς κἀγαθός. The Athenian’s reaction illustrates the truth of this, as it also reminds one of Aeschylus’ first verse in \textit{Aristeides V} (186BC):\textsuperscript{583} the agreement between one’s outward appearance and genuine disposition, in combination with moral excellence, are clear verbal reminiscences.\textsuperscript{584} This emphasizes Phocion’s moral superiority (cf. I–VII). It also announces the first part of the next block of apophthegms (XIV–XVI). \textit{Phocion IX} thus functions as the link between all three blocks in the section, and is therefore well placed at its centre.

\footnotesize{582 After the account of Phoc. 18.1–2, Alexander’s messengers continue to insist that Phocion accept the gift, but he refuses again with another saying (18.3–4).

583 See \textit{supra}, note 533.

584 Citro (2020) 116: “Nell’aneddoto si legge che Alessandro Magno considerava solamente Focione, tra tutti gli Ateniesi, καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθὸς. Focione orgogliosamente afferma che non solo agli occhi delle persone sembra una persona onesta, ma lo è anche intimamente. Come nell’aneddoto di Aristide, ritornano i due verbi δοκέω ed εἰμί, che rappresentano il nucleo del ragionamento plutarcheo: il valore di una persona si misura in base alla sua reale disposizione d’animo e non agli artifici che adopera per fingersi onesta in pubblico.”}
Phocion and the Macedonians

In Phocion XIV, Athens is defeated and Antipater appears on the stage for the first time in the Greek section. When the leader of Athens’ garrison (Menyllus), placed there by Antipater, wants to enrich Phocion, the Athenian answers (188EF)

\[\text{μήτε ἐκεῖνον Ἀλεξάνδρου βελτίωνα εἶναι καὶ χείρονα τὴν αἰτίαν, ἕφ᾽ ἥ λήψεται νῦν τότε μὴ δεξάμενος.}\]

that Menyllus was no whit better than Alexander, and the ground for his receiving money was not so good as before, since he had not accepted it then.

The apophthegm thus explicitly refers back to IX (188C) and continues its theme of Phocion’s relationship with rulers. At the same time, it introduces XV and XVI, once more through the principle of gradual shifting (188F):

\[\begin{align*}
15. & \text{ Ἀντίπατρος δ᾽ ἐφη ὡς δυεῖν αὐτῷ φίλων Αθήνηςιν ὄντων οὐτε Φωκίωνα λαβεῖν πέπεικεν οὔτε Δημάδην διδοὺς ἐμπέπληκεν.} \\
16. & \text{ Ἀξιοῦντος δ' Ἀντιπάτρου ποιῆσαι τι τῶν μὴ δικαίων αὐτόν 'οὐ δύνασαι,' εἶπεν, 'Ἀντίπατρε, καὶ φίλῳ Φωκίωνι χρῆσθαι καὶ κόλακι.'}
\end{align*}\]

15. Antipater said that he had two good friends at Athens; and of the two he had never persuaded Phocion to accept a gift, nor ever sated Demades by giving.

---

585 The first part of the apophthegm (188E: Μετ᾽ ὀλίγον δὲ χρόνον … ὑπ᾽ Ἀντιπάτρου; i.e. the reference to the garrison) occurs in Phoc. 28.1, the second (188EF: Μενύλλου … δεξάμενος, i.e. the actual apophthegm) in 30.1. As was the case with Phocion IX (188C) in Phoc. 18.1–2, Menyllus also continues to insist that Phocion accept his money, and Phocion again refuses with another saying (Phoc. 30.2).

586 Phocion XVI immediately follows XIV in the Life (Phoc. 30.3), while XV occurs later in the chapter (30.4). This changed order in the collection contributes to the gradual shifting: XIV (188EF): Ἀντιπάτρου and διδόντος – XV (188F): Ἀντιπάτρου, διδούς, and φίλων – XVI (188F): Ἀντιπάτρου and φίλω. The reference to the war connects XIV with XIII (188E); Antipater again appears on the stage in XVII (189A). XVI also occurs in (1) Agis 2.4 (where Plutarch adds: τοῦτο λεκτέον ἢ ὅμοιόν τι πρὸς τοὺς πολλούς· “οὐ δύνασθε τὸν αὐτὸν ἢχειν καὶ ἄρχοντα καὶ ἀκόλουθον”; “this, or something akin to this, must be said to the multitude: ‘Ye cannot have the same man as your ruler and your slave’”, recalling earlier apophthegms in which Phocion refused to please the people), (2) De ad. et am. 64C (fitting well in the context of the treatise), and (3) Con. praec. 142BC (the husband is asked to keep Phocion’s saying in mind). (4) On its occurrence in De vit. pud. 532F–533A, see supra, note 569.
16. When Antipater required as his right that Phocion do a certain act of unrighteousness, he said, “Antipater, you cannot use Phocion as a friend and flatterer both.”

Phocion’s frugality and the presence of Antipater connect XIV and XV; Antipater’s friends connect XV and XVI. In addition, XVI reminds one of Themistocles IX (185CD). But most striking is that both Demades’ gluttony and the theme of friendship are combined: the same topics constituted the only components in the two apophthegms of Antipater (183EF). These stories tell as much about Phocion’s character as about Antipater’s: as stated, his image is not positive, especially in the second apophthegm where he appears to be unjust. He therefore needs moral guidance from Phocion the philosopher.

The chain does not end with XVI: the reference to Antipater’s death in XVII (189A) connects this and the next two apophthegms to the previous ones. This story also recalls VI (188A): the Athenian and his friends are sentenced to death. There is also a link with I (187E): in XVII (189A), dealing with the moment immediately after the trial, and XVIII (189A), there is a contrast between Phocion and his associates. While the latter cry and complain, the former remains quiet.587 XIX, which closes the section, is also telling in this regard (189AB):588

’Ἡδη δὲ τῆς κύλικος αὐτῷ προσφερομένης ἐρωτηθεὶς εἴ τι λέγει πρὸς τὸν υἱόν ἑγὼγε εἶπεν ἐντέλλομαι καὶ παρακαλῶ μηδὲν Ἀθηναίοις μνησικακεῖν.’

When the cup of hemlock was already being handed to him, he was asked if he had any message for his son. “I charge and exhort him,” said he, “not to cherish any ill feeling against the Athenians.”

The story of an Athenian philosopher who annoyed the people and was therefore executed by means of poison calls Socrates to mind (he is also

587 Cf. Phocion XVII (189A): οἱ μὲν οὖν ἄλλοι κλαίοντες – τῷ δὲ Φωκίωνι σιωπῆ βαδίζοντι, followed by a calm saying of Phocion when someone spits in his face; and XVIII (189A): ἑνὸς ὀδυρομένου καὶ ἀγανακτοῦντος – followed by a calm saying of Phocion, recalling I (187E).

588 Phocion XVII–XIX (189AB) occur after each other in Phoc. 36.1–4 in the same order, and followed by an additional apophthegm absent from the collection. The first phrase of XIX (189AB: Ἡδη δὲ τῆς κύλικος αὐτῷ προσφερομένης) is not part of its account in the Life, and presents the following saying as his final words in the collection. XVIII (189A) is also told in De se ipsum laud. 541C, illustrating how unfortunate people, treated ill, can praise themselves.
recalled in the closing chapters of the *Life*). The section thus closes by stressing the philosophical image of the Athenian. Yet there is also a connection with the first part of the Athenian section (*Themistocles–Alcibiades*). As stated, this link was already emphasized by Phocion’s versatility in the second block of his section, and by apophthegms that recall *Themistocles* IX (185CD) and *Aristides* V (186BC). Phocion’s closing apophthegm now completes this picture: it recalls the final three apophthegms of *Themistocles* (185EF) and especially *Alcibiades* VII (186EF) by contrast: even when Phocion is put to death, he does not lose his love for his country.

**Conclusion**

Phocion is a versatile statesman. In line with the previous sections, the reader can draw lessons from the combination of the Athenian’s oratory skills and military talent, characterized by his caution. Yet he is also a philosopher and, connected with this, he did not flatter the Athenians, especially in the first (*Phocion* I–VII, 187E–188A) and final part (XIV–XIX, 188E–189B). As to his relationship with the people (the focus of II–VII, 187E–188A), however, one might wonder whether Phocion was not exaggerating and made himself too unpopular. After all, his death sentence (XVII–XIX, 189AB), foreshadowed by VII (188AB), helped no one: not Phocion, nor his friends, nor the people (an important aspect in *Phoc.–Ca. Mi.*). This once more stimulates moral reflection: perhaps precisely Phocion’s excessive adherence to his principles deprived the Athenians of profiting much from his talent as a versatile politician. Trajan, then, should probably learn from the philosophical aspect of Phocion’s character in another way, viz. the way in which he acted as an adviser of sole rulers in true Platonic fashion (described in IX, 188C; and XIV–XV, 188EF). The fact that Alexander, Menyllus, and Antipater held Phocion in high esteem and the description of a friendship or at least a relationship based on mutual respect between the Athenian and two of these rulers encourages the Roman emperor to give heed to philosophical guidance and to regard advising philosophers as true friends who have his best interests at heart. Interestingly, Phocion thus no longer appears

---


590 Cf. Dubreuil (2018) 275 with regard to the *Life*: “Should he honestly be celebrated for his unflinching opposition to the demos’ desires and even for his silence when this ensures not only his own death but also that of his friends? Or can a man really be blamed for refusing to act when the general sway of history marches against him? I believe Plutarch left us to decide.”
to be the actual role model in this respect. This will appear important for an interpretation of the remainder of the Athenian section.

4.1.4 Peisistratus and Demetrius of Phalerum (189B–D)

*Peisistratus* (189B–D) provides the most striking chronological break of the collection, as one would expect the section to precede *Themistocles* (184F–185F). It is probably not placed there because Plutarch would not have wanted to commence the Athenian section with a tyrant. If *Peisistratus* preceded *Themistocles*, the break between *Antiochus Septimus* and the Athenians would have been less clear, for this would have continued the theme of sole rulership. Elements such as fear for the tyrant and strife for power predominated indeed, although the image of Peisistratus is definitely not that negative: he appears to be a mild person, for in all situations where a Dionysius the Elder would have acted cruelly and oppressively, the Athenian harms no one.

Yet Plutarch could also have left out the tyrant, in the same way he excluded other prominent Athenians such as Solon and Demosthenes. There are two reasons why *Peisistratus* in fact fits well after *Phocion*: a thematic one, for the tyrant provides some continuation, since various historical figures and themes from the monarchical sections appear in *Phocion*; and a structural one: the chronological break of *Peisistratus* separates the logical sequence of *Themistocles–Phocion*, which constitutes a ring composition, from *Demetrius Phalerus*, the final Athenian apophthegm. Preceded by 247, and followed by 246 apophthegms, this saying is placed almost exactly at the core of the entire collection.

---

591 In *Peisistratus* II (189BC), a young man who has a secret relationship with the tyrant’s mother (note a similarity with *Dionysius Maior* VI, 175F) is in fear; in *Peisistratus* IV (189C), some men also seem to fear the reaction of the tyrant when they think they have misbehaved near his wife (note a similarity with *Hiero* V, 175C). Plutarch refers to *Peisistratus* II (but does not quote it) in *De coh. ira* 457F as part of a list of sayings of kings who restrain their anger – a recurrent theme in the monarchical sections.

592 Esp. in *Peisistratus* I (189B, the tyrant is betrayed by some of his friends), and perhaps also in V (189D, his children complain when he is going to marry a second time), in connection with stories concerning strife for power between brothers. V (189D) is also told in *De frat. am.* 480DE and in *Ca. Ma.* 24.7–8 (Plutarch quotes a similar saying of Cato and writes that this was in fact uttered by Peisistratus before, see *infra*, note 1038).

593 Esp. *Peisistratus* III (189C), cf. Macedonian apophthegms in which a king is asked to act harshly, but refuses wisely (esp. in *Philippus* [177C–179C]).

594 Philip in *Phocion* VIII (188B); Alexander in IX (188C), X (188C), and XI (188CD); Antipater in XIV (188EF), XV (188F), XVI (188F), and XVII (189A); and Demades in XV (188F).
The section, containing one apophthegm, deserves particular attention (189D):

Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ παρὴνε τὰ περὶ βασιλείας καὶ ἡγεμονίας βιβλία κτάσθαι καὶ ἀναγινώσκειν· ἃ γὰρ οἱ φίλοι τοῖς βασιλεύσι παραινεῖν, ταῦτα ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις γέγραται.’

Demetrius of Phalerum recommended to Ptolemy the king to buy and read the books dealing with the office of king and ruler. “For,” as he said, “those things which the kings’ friends are not bold enough to recommend to them are written in the books.”

At first sight, the reference to a king’s friends and παρρησία once more provides some continuation, since it seems to be connected with Phocion by contrast: Phocion, as a true friend, made no attempt to flatter rulers and always spoke frankly, but Demetrius claims that a king’s friend might not have the courage to say everything. Yet precisely by referring to his lack of boldness, he still suggests that Ptolemy needs improvement and should read some books. In this way, he is actually speaking frankly. 595 Demetrius wrote apophthegm collections, just as Plutarch is doing. 596 This recalls the dedicatory letter to Trajan, describing Plutarch’s own attempt to advise the emperor with a similar literary work, in a very cautious way. In line with this, it is perhaps not coincidental that Demetrius Phalereus is followed by a section on Lycurgus, one of the exempla of the letter. Thus, the break established by Peisistratus ensures that Demetrius Phalereus almost reads as a kind of introduction to Lycurgus. This may draw the reader’s attention and highlights that some sections will follow that present the core task of the good monarch.

4.2 The Spartans (189D–192C)

Various Spartan sections respond to themes of the Athenian sections, which will also be built on by the Thebans in what follows. The monarchical sections will often be recalled as well. As such, the Spartan section, as will become clear, reflects on the nature of the good political system. Almost all Spartan apophthegms occur in Apophthegmata La-

595 On Demetrius and Ptolemy I and II, see Collins (2000) 58–81; on Demetrius as librarian in the Alexandrian Library, see 82–114; Plutarch speaks of a friendship between the Athenian and Ptolemy I (De exilio 601F), see 94.

596 See Tritle (1992) 4290 on Demetrius of Phalerum: “Among his many works were collections of both apophthegmata and chreiai that were later excerpted by scholars and antiquarians such as Diogenes Laertius and Stobaeus.” See also Stenger (2006) 210.
conica: the only full exception is *Nicostratus* (192A). *Agis Secundus* VI (190D), which is in fact the second part of *Agis Secundus* V (190D), is also absent from this collection of Spartan sayings and anecdotes.597

4.2.1 Early Sparta (189D–190A)

*Lycurgus* (189D–F) only contains five apophthegms. This might disappoint the reader: the Spartan takes a central position in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* and was well known for his laconic speech. Yet this should be put in perspective. The only Spartan section that exceeds *Lycurgus* is *Agesilaus* (190F–191D), containing twelve apophthegms.598 This is not surprising, since its corresponding section in *Apopthegmata Laconica* (208B–215A, 79 apophthegms) is more than twice as long than Lycurgus’ section there (225E–229A, 31 apophthegms): Plutarch simply had much more material about Agesilaus. In addition, precisely the conciseness of *Lycurgus* – and of other Spartan sections – illustrates and emphasizes laconic brevity:599 that Lycurgus was sententious in speech, then, is not only shown by his sayings, but also visually represented by the length of the section.600 In line with this, the first apophthegm to follow *Lycurgus*, *Charillus I*, refers to the fact that Lycurgus enacted only a small amount of laws (189F). If this was preceded by an extensive section describing Spartan legislation in every detail, the reader would have to question the truth of this.

*Lycurgus* indeed focuses on this Spartan’s capacity as a lawgiver, in line with his appearance in the dedicatory letter.601 *Lycurgus* I, however,

597 Cf. Appendix II; see also Fuhrmann (1988) 8. On *Agis Secundus* VI as a continuation of V, see van der Wiel (2023a) 11.

598 *Agis Secundus* (190CD) and *Lysander* (190D–F) in fact contain five apophthegms; see Appendix I.

599 On Plutarch’s love of βραχυλογία (cf. *De gar.*), see Zadorojnyi (2014) 306–307. Lyc. 19–20 describes brevity of speech as part of the young Spartan’s education, since it made their speech more meaningful. Many other chapters of Lyc. are (almost) entirely built up from apophthegms of Lycurgus or of other Spartans.

600 On Lycurgus’ own laconic speech, see Lyc. 19.6: Καί γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ Λυκοῦργος βραχυλόγος τις ἔοικε γενέσθαι καὶ ἀποφθεγματικός, εἰ δεῖ τεκμαίρεσθαι τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν (“And indeed Lycurgus himself seems to have been short and sententious in his speech, if we may judge from his recorded sayings”), after which Lycurgus II is told (19.7); IV resembles 19.9; between the two apophthegms, Lycurgus’ measure of the dedicatory letter is included. An account of Lycurgus II also occurs in *Sept. sap. conv.* 155DE, where Chilon cites the saying.

601 Similar to the apophthegm in the letter, some elements in *Lycurgus* do not contain a real saying of the king, but describe one of his measures, followed by a purpose clause: compare the letter (172B): ἐποίησεν… (172C) ἵνα ἄει – *Lycurgus* IV (189E): ἐκώλυσεν,
is somewhat separated from this: it refers to the Spartan custom of wearing long hair (189DE). Although this apophthegm only reflects Lycurgus’ concern regarding his subjects’ physical appearance and is more general and superficial, III and IV (189E) are related to the characters of the Spartans and reveal more profound insights. Both are introduced by II (189E):

Πρὸς δὲ τὸν κελεύοντα ποιεῖν ἐν τῇ πόλει δημοκρατίαν ‘σὺ πρῶτος’ εἴπεν ‘ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ σου ποίησον δημοκρατίαν.’

To the man who urged him to create a democracy in the State his answer was, “Do you first create a democracy in your own house.”

This saying should make the readers reflect upon the preceding Athenian section and shows the superiority of the Spartan system, through the connection between domestic issues and the condition of the state (which, in fact, also recalls Philippus XXXI, 179BC): if democracy is not to be preferred in a household, then this is a fortiori the case with the organization of state structures. This announces Lycurgus III, which also refers to houses and explains why Spartan oligarchy is desirable: Lycurgus forces the Spartans to build simple homes, ensuring that they will live frugally (189E). This is in line with Cyrus III, where a king’s measure related to the dwelling place of his subjects also intended to improve them (172EF). As stated above, this educating role is a core task of the (good) monarch.

Lycurgus, as a lawgiver, clearly fulfils this function. This also appears from IV, where he forbids boxing and wrestling contests for the sake of the characters of the Spartans, ensuring that they do not create the habit of surrendering (cf. 189E: ἐθίζωνται). Lycurgus V, finally, concerns a prohibition of the king as well. In this story, which will be discussed in more detail below, he does not aim to educate his own people, but avoids educating others: the Spartans are not allowed

602 Also quoted in Lyc. 22.2 (Plutarch does not say that Lycurgus introduced the custom, but only that later Spartans remembered his saying) and in Lys. 1.3 (Lysander wore his hair long in accordance with Lycurgus’ custom).

603 Lyc. 13 is a chapter on the Spartan laws, which were not written down: part of these ‘rhetras’ are Lycurgus III and V. The value of these laws is illustrated by other apophthegms: III by one of Epameinondas; V by one of Antalcidas, also added to the apophthegm in the collection, see infra, p. 202–203.

604 See chapter 3.1.1 on Cyrus (172EF).

to fight their enemies often, since this will strengthen the latter (189EF).

The overall structure of and shift in the section is thus as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lycurgus I</th>
<th>Lycurgus II</th>
<th>Lycurgus III</th>
<th>Lycurgus IV</th>
<th>Lycurgus V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἴθισε</td>
<td>πρὸς τὸν</td>
<td>έκέλευεν δὲ τὰς</td>
<td>έκόλυσεν</td>
<td>έκόλυσεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>κελεύοντα</td>
<td>οἰκίας</td>
<td>έθίζονται</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ</td>
<td>εἰς οἰκίας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custom: physical appearance of the Spartans</th>
<th>The Spartan political system</th>
<th>The superiority of the Spartan system: law-giving</th>
<th>Lycurgus educating the Spartans</th>
<th>Avoiding educating the enemy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If the contrast between the Athenian and Spartan systems exists in the educating role of the ruler through lawgiving – as this is the perfect tool to make people accustomed to a certain behavioural pattern (cf. the use of ἐθίζω) – one concludes that leaders elected in a democracy are often unable to fulfil this pedagogical duty. In this respect, it might be interesting to take a second look at especially Phocion (but of course also at its preceding sections), where this idea is connected with the distinction between the image of a politician as a flatterer or as a true friend. As described in this section, the Athenians prefer those who flatter them above those who speak frankly and show the right path. The first clause of Phocion XVII is telling in this regard (189A):

Μετὰ δὲ τὴν Ἀντιπάτρου τελευτὴν δημοκρατίας Ἀθηναίοις γενομένης κατεγνώσθη θάνατος τοῦ Φωκίωνος ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ τῶν φίλων [...].

The death of Antipater was followed by a democratic government at Athens, and sentence of death was passed in Assembly on Phocion and his friends.

Since the crowds are often inclined to be self-destructive, there is a causal relationship between the establishment of democracy and the death of those who have their best interests at heart, as this apophthegm suggests. In line with this, a reading of Lycurgus might clarify why Phocion failed despite his talented leadership: power should not be with the common crowd, but with the wise ruler who attempts to educate them.\(^606\) Yet in light of this, one might also wonder whether Phocion – precisely because

\(^{606}\) On the philosopher king in Plutarch, see Boulet (2005) and (2014); and Demulder (2022), in chapter 4, focusing on the connection with this Platonic ideal and the demiurge.
of the different context he lived in – should not have tried to establish a healthier relationship with the people first instead of behaving as a haughty philosopher, for this might have provided a more solid basis that could have enabled him to perform his task as teacher of the people, unlike Lycurgus, who had less difficulties with the reality he lived in. Yet to what extent Phocion should have given in remains an open question.

Charillus, or the contemporary of Lycurgus, is to be read in close connection with the previous section. As stated, its first apophthegm refers to Lycurgus’ small amount of laws, also evoking Charillus’ own love of apophthegms (189F). Charillus III (189F) connects two other themes of Lycurgus: Spartans wear their hair long (cf. Lycurgus I, 189DE), and the absence of expensive and luxurious possessions in early Sparta (cf. Lycurgus III, 189E) – Charillus claims that hair is the cheapest adornment. These two apophthegms thus depict an image of the king that is similar to that of Lycurgus. In this context, Charillus II, as the most important element again placed at the core of its section, is relevant for the image of Charillus as well as of his predecessor (189F):

Τῶν δὲ εἱλώτων τινὸς θρασύτερον αὐτῷ προσφερομένου, ἃνα τῷ σιώ’ εἶπε ‘κατέκτανον κά τυ, αἰ μὴ ὠργιζόμαν.’

When one of the helots conducted himself rather boldly towards him, he said, “By Heaven, I would kill you if I were not angry.”

The horrible way in which the Spartans treated the Helots was well known in ancient times, so it is striking that the apophthegm presents a moderate king. This is important to maintain the positive image of early Sparta as a kingdom characterized by an almost philosophical rule: a reference to bold Helots in connection with a king’s mild reaction seems to suggest that such cruelties did not belong to this earlier period. This reminds one of the Life of Lycurgus. After describing the inhuman treatments which the Helots suffered, Plutarch concludes (Lyc. 28.12):

---

607 Charillus was Lycurgus’ nephew. His birth is described in Lyc. 3.
608 After a list of Lycurgus’ own apophthegms in Lyc. 19 (see supra, note 600 on this chapter), Plutarch includes sayings of other Spartans in Lyc. 20. Charillus II is included as the second.
610 Cf. de Blois – Bons (1995) 99 on Lyc.: “This Vita gave Plutarch the opportunity to present his version of an ideal state which – in his view – really came into being and did not exist in theoretical [sic] scholarly works only.”
However, in my opinion, such cruelties were first practised by the Spartans in later times, particularly after the great earthquake, when the Helots and Messenians together rose up against them, wrought the widest devastation in their territory, and brought their city into the greatest peril.

In a similar way, Plutarch manages to retain the favourable image built up by Lycurgus (189D–F): Charillus II (189F) provides an answer to questions about the position of the Helots in Sparta of yore which the ancient reader might have had in mind. This exclusively positive image differs greatly from other sections, where participatory readership usually leads to a more nuanced assessment of the characters in question. Yet it should be clear that this is in fact again in line with the Life of Lycurgus, which can hardly be considered a ‘real’ biography, but rather presents a description of the Spartan – and perhaps ideal – state; and with Plutarch’s practice elsewhere in the collection, where the first sections of a larger whole often lead to an entirely positive assessment.

Yet chapter 28 of the Life also indicates that Plutarch’s view on Sparta’s later times is different. A similar tension between early Sparta and the condition of the later city state exists in the collection too, as appears from 190A–192C. But before Plutarch moves to this part, he includes two apophthegms: one in Teleclus (190A) and one in Theopompus (190A).

The combination of justice and love of honour in the first apophthegm, on the one hand, and the scornful remark about a city wall – this does not befit true men – in the second, on the other hand, remind one of

---

612 Plutarch also praises Lycurgus for the durability of his laws in Comp. Lyc. et Num. 4.
613 For a detailed discussion of Teleclus, see Citro (2014) 257–263.
614 Lycurgus also was of the opinion that one should not make use of city walls in order to defend oneself, see Lyc. 19.11–12: “πῶς ἂν πολεμίων ἔφοδον ἀλεξοίμεθα;” “ἀν πτωχοὶ μένητε καὶ μὴ μέσδων ἅτερος θατέρω ἐρᾶτε ἦμεν.” καὶ πάλιν περὶ τῶν τειχῶν· “οὐκ ἂν ἐπὶ ἄτείχίστος πόλις ἅτις ἀνδρείοις καὶ οὐ πλινθίνοις ἐστεφάνωται” (“When they [sc. πολίται] asked how they could ward off an invasion of enemies, he answered: ‘By remaining poor, and by not desiring to be greater the one than the other.’ And when they asked about fortifying their city, he answered: ‘A city will be well fortified which is surrounded by brave men and not by bricks’”). A similar connection between riches and war will also be made later in the Spartan section.
the Athenian section and provide the background against which the following Spartans will be assessed. In this part, pressing questions arise: to what extent are those later Spartans faithful to their illustrious past and, perhaps more difficult, to what extent do they need to be?

4.2.2 A Period of Wars (190A–D)

First, there is one apophthegm on Archidamus Secundus.615 A chronological gap of almost three centuries thus follows Theopompus.616 This cannot be the consequence of lack of material, as Apophthegmata Laconica testify: Plutarch could have included plenty of apophthegms related to this period.617 Furthermore, this gap is highlighted by a reference to the Peloponnesian War at the outset of the first section: from this point on, the period of Spartan hegemony starts. The link between war and riches provides a contrast with Lycurgus’ Sparta, in which the absence of riches was accompanied by the absence of many wars.618 One now learns that the opposite applies as well: wars require limitless wealth (190A). It is clear that something has changed. This difference with early Sparta also appears from the next sections, in which many battles are fought.

Brasidas (190BC) primarily deals with the most typical aspect of Spartan warfare and generalship: boldness, a desire to fight open battles, and the importance of physical strength which enables one to fight and defend oneself. Yet a shift in the section exposes a problem. In his first apophthegm, Brasidas captures a mouse, which bites him and flees. The Spartan reacts (190B):

‘οὐδὲν οὕτως ἔφη ‘μικρόν ἐστιν, ὃ μὴ σῴζεται τολμῶν ἀμύνεθαι τοὺς ἐπιχειροῦντας.’

“There is nothing so small that it cannot save its life, if it has the courage to defend itself against those who would lay hand on it.”

615 Also told in Cleom. 48(27).3. On its occurrence in Crass. 2.9, see infra, note 689.
616 In both passages, the saying is attributed to Archidamus, but in Dem. 17.4 (following Theophrastus), Plutarch writes that “Crobylus” spoke these words – yet another example of Anekdotenwanderung. As Babbitt (1931) 123 points out, this “Crobylus” is the same person as Hegesippus, see also Hegesippus (187DE) on the orator’s nickname.
617 Theopompus lived in the eighth century BC, Archidamus II in the fifth century BC; see Babbitt (1931) 123.
618 E.g. a section on Leonidas, son of Anaxandridas (224F–225E).
619 Note the similar connection between two apophthegms in Lyc. 19.11–12, quoted supra, note 614.
619 In De prof. in virt. 79E, this is one of the stories showing that lessons can be drawn from everything one perceives.
The truth of this is illustrated by *Brasidas II*, where the Spartan kills his enemy with the spear that just wounded him (190B).\(^{620}\) but in the following apophthegm, he is less lucky: he is killed in battle (190BC).\(^{621}\) Apparently, the general saying of *Brasidas I* needs some qualification. This already announces a question that will become more important in later sections: is it sometimes better to leave aside one’s (Spartan) principles, when the outcome will in that specific case be more convenient? Thus, although one cannot deny that Brasidas’ appearance is that of a true Spartan,\(^{622}\) the section still does not call for a straightforward interpretation.

Similar boldness appears from *Agis Secundus* (190CD): in the first (190C), second (190C), and fifth and sixth apophthegms, in fact one unit, (190D), the Spartan claims that it does not matter whether the enemy outnumbers the Spartan troops.\(^{623}\) There is little point in discussing all these apophthegms in detail, but one thing is clear: the motif of a general’s caution and cleverness, so prominent in the Athenian section, is now far away. While this typical characteristic of Spartan generalship recalls Theopompus’ disregard for city walls in his one apophthegm (190A), *Agis Secundus* I, II, and V surround two apophthegms that, in turn, recall *Teleclus* (190A): in *Agis Secundus* III, the king is not impressed by the fact that the Eleans act justly for only a brief period (190CD), and *Agis Secundus* IV also shows that he attached high importance to moral qualities (190D).\(^{624}\) Again, the reader meets a true Spartan, but the same difference with ancient Sparta stands out: there are many wars to be fought. The city will not be able to continue this forever, as will be thematized in what follows.

---

\(^{620}\) Also told in *De sera num.* 548BC; see Amendola (2014).

\(^{621}\) *Brasidas III* (190BC) therefore does not contain a saying of Brasidas, but of his mother (cf. *Parysatis* [174A], closing *Artaxerxes Mnemon* [173F–174A]). The story is also told in *Lyc.* 25.8–9 as part of a series of apophthegms.

\(^{622}\) *Lys.* 1 describes a statue of Lysander, which many people thought to represent “Brasidas, an exemplar of Spartan character” instead of this “more complex figure Lysander”, as Candau Morón (2000) 455 puts it.

\(^{623}\) *Agis Secundus* thus contains a ring composition: it opens and closes with apophthegms concerning the numbers of the enemy, highlighted by verbal similarities: *Agis Secundus* I (190C): πόσοι – V–VI (190D): πόσοι. On V and VI as one unit, see van der Wiel (2023a) II.

\(^{624}\) *Agis Secundus* III, IV, and V occur in *Lyc.* 20.6, 20.5 (told about Demaratus), and *Lyc.* 20.9 (about Archidamidas); see supra, note 608 on this chapter. Volkmann (1869) 230 sees some problems: “Die Zeitangabe im dritten Ausspruch des Agis δὴ ἐτῶν τεσσάρων lautet v. *Lyc.* c. 20. δὴ ἐτῶν πέντε. Der vierte Ausspruch wird in demselben Capitel der Plutarchischen Biographie dem Demaratus, der fünfte dem Archidamidas beigelegt.” In *Apophth. Lac.*, however, IV is told about Agis Minor (216C), and V about Agis, Archidamidas’ son (215D).
4.2.3 Lysander (190D–F)

The next section is much more problematic. In its second apophthegm, to be read together with the first, the theme of boldness as a typical Spartan characteristic is continued, but this time by showing a negative example – at least from the Spartan point of view (190DE).

1. Λύσανδρος Διονυσίου τοῦ τυράννου πέμψαντος ἱμάτια ταῖς θυγατράσιν αὐτοῦ τῶν πολυτελῶν οὐκ ἔλαβεν εἰπὼν δεδιέναι, μὴ διὰ ταύτα μᾶλλον αἰσχραί φανῶσιν.

2. Πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ψέγοντας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῷ δι’ ἀπάτης τὰ πολλὰ πράσσειν ὡς ἀνάξιον τοῦ Ἡρακλέους ἔλεγεν, ὅπου μὴ ἐφικνεῖται ἡ λεοντῆ, προσραπτέον εἶναι τὴν ἀλωπεκῆν.

1. When Dionysius, the despot, sent garments of a very costly kind for Lysander’s daughters, Lysander would not accept them, saying that he was afraid that the girls would appear more ugly because of them.

2. To those who found fault with him for accomplishing most things through deception (a procedure which they asserted was unworthy of Heracles) he used to say in reply that where the lion’s skin does not reach it must be pieced out with the skin of the fox.

Lysander I (190D) is indirectly connected with Lycurgus I (189DE) and III (189E), and Charillus III (189F) by the link between the typical Spartan contempt for riches and wealth and physical beauty. This close connection ensures that Lysander I paints an image of this man as a genuine Spartan like those of Lycurgus’ time. Yet one is invited to

---

625 In Lyc. 30.1, Plutarch argues that the Lycurgus-like Sparta ended with Agis II (who introduced money), and that especially Lysander was to be blamed for the moral decline. This also appears from Lysander (190D–F).

626 See also Citro (2020) 113–115 on this aspect in Lysander II.

627 The same link is established by Charillus III (189F), and both themes occur separately in Lycurgus I (189DE) and III (189E). Note Lycurgus I (189E): αἰσχροὺς – Lysander I (190D): αἰσχραί.

628 Cf. also in Lys. 2, where the apophthegm is followed by a second apophthegm – in the same way as in Apophth. Lac. (229A). This story of the Life was usually interpreted as a second apophthegm about Lysander. Yet Sansone (1981) has proved that this apophthegm is, in fact, about another Spartan, as is the case with Apophth. Lac., if one follows the manuscripts containing Αρίστας instead of πρεσβευτής, taken from the Life by Bernardakis. That Lysander I only contains the actual apophthegm about Lysander supports this view. Changing the text of the Life (Sansone (1981) 206 suggests changing
question this when reading II (190DE): the general seems to accomplish much “through deception” (LCL) and is therefore considered “unworthy of Heracles” (LCL).\footnote{Lysander’s witty response, referring to Heracles’ lion skin, does not do away with the impression that he might be a less typical Spartan than the first apophthegm suggests.}\footnote{Thus, there is some tension between the two opening apophthegms.} Lysander’s witty response, referring to Heracles’ lion skin, does not do away with the impression that he might be a less typical Spartan than the first apophthegm suggests.\footnote{Thus, there is some tension between the two opening apophthegms.} Lysander’s witty response, referring to Heracles’ lion skin, does not do away with the impression that he might be a less typical Spartan than the first apophthegm suggests.\footnote{Thus, there is some tension between the two opening apophthegms.} Thus, there is some tension between the two opening apophthegms.

\textit{Lysander} III, IV, and V (190EF) perform a similar function.\footnote{If justice and regard for laws was an important feature of early Sparta, Lysander acts in an inappropriate way in III: he draws his sword when the Argives make a just claim about a specific region (190E). Yet the image is different in IV again: the story is similar to \textit{Theopompus} (190A) and seems to imply that he highly values open warfare (190E). \textit{Lysander} V (190EF) in turn resembles \textit{Lysander} III (190E), since in both apophthegms Lysander ignores an opponent, with a reference to territory. Precisely the dynamics between all these contradictory stories is in line with the ambiguity in Lysander’s Spartan or ‘unspartan’ character in the \textit{Life}: it is difficult to reach a clear-cut assessment of this inconsistent personality in the collection too.} Similar problems will arise in the next section on Lysander’s contemporary.

\footnote{\textit{πρεσβευτῆς} in the \textit{Life} into \textit{Ἀρίστας}), however, is not necessary, see the reaction of Renehan (1981). \textit{Lysander} I also occurs in \textit{Con. praec.} 141E.}{\footnote{Candau Morón (2000) 467 on \textit{Lys.}: “Three times he [Plutarch] mentions that Lysander belonged to the family of the Heraclidae, without once mentioning alternative hypotheses”.}{\footnote{\textit{Lysander} II also occurs in \textit{Lys.} 7.6 (see Candau Morón (2000) 469 on this passage), after he is compared with the just Callicratides in negative terms. See Davies (2018) 536–540 and Citro (2020) 113–115 for a comparison of the two passages. See also Verdegem (2010) 123–124 on the lion and fox metaphor with regard to \textit{Alcibiades} I (186D), in a note also referring to \textit{Lysander} II and other passages.}{\footnote{These apophthegms are also told in \textit{Lys.} 22.2, 22.5, and 22.3 (after \textit{Lysander} III), respectively, illustrating his harshness in speech (cf. 22.1). The chapter contains more apophthegms than these three. \textit{Lysander} V is also told in \textit{De ad. et am.} 71E. As Fernández Delgado (2008) 28 points out, the same story is told about Agesilaus in \textit{Apophth. Lac.} 212E.}{\footnote{On Lysander as a less typical Spartan and his ambiguity, see Stadter (1992); Shipley (1997) 28–32 (also on Agesilaus); Candau Morón (2000). On the origins of negative representations of Lysander, see Prentice (1934).}}}
4.2.4 Agesilaus (190F–191D)

The section opens with a typical saying, not related to a specific event in time (190F):

Ἀγησίλαος ἔλεγε τοὺς τὴν Ἀσίαν κατοικοῦντας ἐλευθέρους μὲν κακοὺς εἶναι, δούλους δὲ ἀγαθούς.

Agesilaus used to say that the inhabitants of Asia Minor were poor freemen, but good slaves.

Such opening apophthegms often announce the main theme of the remainder of a section. Thus, the contrast between freedom, related to Greeks and Greekness, and slavery, usually connected with Persian despotism (also implicitly in the saying), makes one expect that a conflict between Greeks and Persians will be fought in what follows – the well-known campaign of Agesilaus in Asia Minor against the Persian king in order to free the Greek cities (the focus of the first half of the corresponding Life). Agesilaus II seems to meet this expectation: the Spartan king does not understand why the Persian king should be called ‘Great’, since the latter should not be considered greater than he himself if he is not more just (δικαιότερος) and reasonable (σωφρονέστερος) (190F). This not only depicts Agesilaus as a true Spartan, but also evokes the theme of true kingship, connected with virtue, from the monarchical sections.

However, one wonders whether Agesilaus is more δίκαιος and σώφρων indeed. The following two apophthegms imply a positive answer: in III, the king claims that if all people were just (δίκαιοι), no one would need to be brave (190F); in IV, he says that it is difficult to have compassion and to be reasonable (191A: φρονεῖν). V closes the block II–V (190F–191A) with a ring composition. A certain surgeon calls himself “Zeus” when addressing the king in a letter. Agesilaus answers (191A):

633 See esp. Part III, chapter 2 for this theme in Reg. et imp. apophth.
634 The apophthegm occurs in Ages. 23.9, where Plutarch adds that he is, in his words, ὀρθῶς καὶ καλῶς οἰόμενος δεῖν τῷ δικαίῳ καθάπερ μέτρῳ βασιλικῷ μετρεῖσθαι τὴν ὑπεροχὴν τοῦ μείζονος (“rightly and nobly thinking that justice must be the royal measure wherewith relative greatness is measured”); in his deeds, however, he was less just, as pointed out in this chapter too. It is also told in De se ipsum laud. 545A, see infra, note 672.
635 The story immediately precedes Agesilaus II in Ages. 23.8.
636 Also told in Ages. 13.6–7, see infra, note 644 on this passage.
Agesilaus’ contempt for titles, the fact that he calls himself simply “King Agesilaus”; and the wording recall Agesilaus II (190F). The implication of this first block is clear: Agesilaus is righteous and wise indeed. These moral qualities of this genuine Spartan endow him with the right to rule, various aspects reminding one of Alexander (179D–181F; also recalling Philippus XXII–XXIII, 178EF). The contrast Greeks–Persians is relevant in this context too: a joint reading of these first five apothegms recalls the Macedonian conquest of the East. This might seem far-fetched at first sight, but Agesilaus VI, marking a break, shows that this is indeed intended. The apothegm opens a new block that darkens Agesilaus’ image: Greeks are fighting Greeks. When the king hears about the number of opponents that had fallen, he exclaims (191AB):

‘φεῦ τᾶς Ἑλλάδος’ εἶπεν ‘ἂ τοσοῦτος ύφ’ αὑτᾶς ἀπολὼλεκεν, ὅσοις Ἰρκεῖ τοὺς βαρβάρους νικῆν ἅπαντας.’

“Alas for Greece which by her ain hands has destroyed so mony men, in number eneuch to conquer all the barbarians!”

The Spartans are still victorious, but this did not last: Spartan hegemony came to an end under Agesilaus’ reign, after the battle of Leuctra. Plutarch refers to this event in Agesilaus X (191BC), but VI is first followed by three apothegms, with no clear connection (191B). As in other cases in the collection, these stories suggest that some time has passed, although they also shed light on Agesilaus’ character. In particular, VIII is relevant in this context, since it further problematizes the image as

638 Note the contrast with the words of the physician, addressing Agesilaus (191A): ‘Μενεκράτης Ζεὺς βασιλεῖ Ἀγησίλαῳ χαίρειν’ (“Menecrates Zeus to King Agesilaus, health and happiness”). Bos (1947) 130 points out that there were various other stories about Menecrates’ arrogance.


640 Told in Ages. 16.6. This lack of unity among a people is a strong uniting factor in Ages.–Pomp. as a whole: as Shipley (1997) 16 puts it, Plutarch “regrets that both Romans and Greeks engaged in conflicts among themselves instead of uniting in crusades among barbarians”. See also ibid. 41–46 on Panhellenism in Ages.

641 Sparta’s decline is also an important theme in Ages., see Shipley (1997) 24–26.

642 The relevance of Agesilaus VII (191B) and IX (191B) is less clear. IX occurs in Ages. 21.9 (see supra, note 637 on this passage) and in Lyc. 20.12, not (explicitly) attributed to Agesilaus (see supra, note 608 on this passage).
established in II–V (190F–191A): the king tries to free one of his friends (191B: τινα των φιλων), writing to Hidrieus of Caria (191B).

‘Νικιας ει μεν ουκ άδικει, άφες· ει δ’ άδικει, έμοι άφες· πάντως δ’ άφες.’

“If Nicias has done no wrong, let him go free; if he has done wrong, let him go as a favour to me; but let him go anyway.”

This contradicts both Agesilaus’ δικαιοσύνη and his φρόνησις: a king should always opt for the just decision, regardless of his personal commitment to the specific case. The contrast with some Athenian apophthegms, in which this issue was explored in greater depth, stands out (esp. Themistocles IX, 185CD; and Pericles III, 186C). Agesilaus X, following the disaster of Leuctra, on the contrary, again shows Agesilaus’ respect for the laws. Many soldiers fled from the battlefield. As a consequence, their citizenship should be taken from them. The ephors want to avoid this and therefore appoint Agesilaus as lawgiver (191C: νομοθέτην). Yet he does not want to change the laws, and says that from the next day on, the laws will apply again (191BC): in this way – and this is how Plutarch assesses the story in Ages. 30 – the king saves both the Spartan state and its constitution.

---

643 In Ages., neutrality when dealing with friends is a theme as well, see Shipley (1997) 32–35. See ibid. 194 on this unknown Nicias and Hidrieus of Caria.

644 Agesilaus VIII (191B) is introduced as follows in Ages. 13.5: τάλλα μεν γάρ ἦν ἀκριβῆς καὶ νόμιμος, ἐν δὲ τοῖς φιλικοῖς πρόφασιν ἐνόμιζεν εἶναι τὸ λίαν δίκαιον (“In deed, although in other matters he was exact and law-abiding, in matters of friendship he thought that rigid justice was a mere pretext”). The story is contrasted with Agesilaus IV in the passage: after the account of VIII, Plutarch writes (13.6): ἐν μὲν οὖν τοῖς πλείστοις τοιούτοις ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων ὁ Ἀγησιλαος· ἔστι δ’ ὅπου πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον ἐρημῆ τοῦ καιρὸ μᾶλλον (“Such, then, was Agesilaüs in most cases where the interests of his friends were concerned; but sometimes he used a critical situation rather for his own advantage”), followed by the account of IV. The interpretation of IV in Reg. et imp. apophth., where it seems to reflect Agesilaus’ φρόνησις, then, is different without this comment. VIII also occurs in Praec. ger. reip. 807F–808A, see supra, note 542. According to Stadter (2008) 58, Plutarch’s disapproval in the treatise differs from the story’s positive assessment in the collection. A reading of VIII in the context of its entire section, however, does not bring one to such a positive assessment.

645 Plutarch also praises this action in Comp. Ages. et Pomp. 2.3. In Praec. ger. reip. 817EF, Plutarch claims that a statesman should sometimes ignore the law for the sake of the public good.
Thus, in the end, the image of Agesilaus is ambiguous, as was the case with Lysander.\textsuperscript{646} Although the first apophthegms show that he possesses the right moral qualities to rule, this is nuanced by a later story; although he seems to be a military genius and promising opponent for the Persians, he fights Greeks instead of barbarians. Even worse: in Agesilaus XI, he fights on the barbarian side, assisting the Egyptian army (191CD).\textsuperscript{647} Yet the section ends on a positive note. In XII, the king is dying and asks his friends to make no image of him (191D).

\begin{quote}
\begin{greekquote}
εἰ γάρ τι καλὸν ἔργον πεποίηκα, τοῦτό μου μνημεῖον ἔσται· εἰ δὲ μηδέν, οὐδ’ οἱ πάντες ἀνδριάντες.
\end{greekquote}
\end{quote}

“For,” said he, “if I have done any noble deed, that is my memorial; but if none, then not all the statues in the world avail.”

Some of his καλὰ ἔργα can definitely be found in the section: although Agesilaus, as other kings, has his flaws, there is still much to be commended about his character. Yet he will always be remembered as the king under whose rule Sparta was deprived of its hegemonic position. This downfall can partially be explained by the moral decline after Agis II: these later Spartans lost sight of Lycurgus’ laws. This was, in fact, already announced by Lycurgus V (189EF):

\begin{quote}
Στρατεύειν δὲ πολλάκις ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐκώλυσεν, ὅπως μὴ ποιῶσι μαχιμωτέρους. ὕστερον γοῦν τοῦ Λαγησιλάου τροφθέντος ὁ Ἀνταλκίδας εἶπε καλὰ διδασκάλια παρὰ Θηβαίων ἀπολαμβάνειν αὐτὸν ἐθίσαντα καὶ διδάξαντα πολέμειν ἄκοντας.
\end{quote}

He [sc. Lycurgus] prohibited making war upon the same people many times, so that they should not make their opponents too belligerent. And it is a fact that years later, when Agesilaus was wounded, Antalcidas said of him that he was getting a beautiful return from the Thebans for the lessons he had taught them in habituating and teaching them to make war against their will.


\textsuperscript{647} For a lengthy account of this event, see Ages. 39. Plutarch strongly disapproves of this campaign in Comp. Ages. et Pomp., see also Shipley (1997) 21–23.

\textsuperscript{648} Plutarch refers to the apophthegm in Ages. 2.3–4, explaining why there are no images of the king. The story also reminds one of Agesilaus IX: note the description of images in XII (191D: μηδεμίαν πλαστὰν μηδὲ μιμηλάν; “plaster or paint”) and his lack of appreciation of an imitation of a bird in IX (191B).
This is a remarkable apophthegm, because it actually consists of two sayings. The first (Στρατεύειν ... μαχιμωτέρους) fits within the apophthegms of Lycurgus (189D–F), most of which shed light on his lawgiving reforms. The saying of Antalcidas in the second (ὦστερον ... ἄκοντας) has two functions. On the one hand, it is naturally important at the level of the ‘apophthegm’ as a whole: it is similar to the aftermath which Plutarch sometimes adds to an apophthegm, illustrating the truth of Lycurgus’ view. On the other, the saying also performs a function at the level of the Spartan section as a whole, depicting its later deviation from the early, great system of Lycurgus: some early laws were apparently forgotten in Lysander’s and Agesilaus’ time, and in fact already earlier, as the many wars in Archidamus Secundus–Agis Secundus highlighted (190A–D). Yet the question remains as to what this changed context truly tells us about the ambiguous kings and generals of later times. It is probably unreasonable to expect that they would have acted like the Spartans of old in their specific situations where ethical decision-making was far less straightforward. And it is precisely this that might also make one understand the moral ambiguity in their actions in some respects, as long as their outcome was fruitful (a theme announced by Brasidas, 190BC).

4.2.5 Nine Short Sections (191D–192C)

The Spartan section concludes with a series of nine shorter sections. Six of them contain only one apophthegm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>191D</td>
<td>Archidamus III</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Son of Agesilaus II, ruled in 360/359–338 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191E</td>
<td>Agis III</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Ruled in 338–?330 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191E</td>
<td>Cleomenes II</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Ruled in 370–309 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191F</td>
<td>Pedaritus</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Belongs to the period of the Peloponnesian War</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁶⁴⁹ Lyc. 13 also puts both apophthegms together, and refers to the first one as the “third rhetra” (see supra, note 603; see also Shipley (1997) 27). Plutarch includes both in Ages. 26.2–5 too (again as one of the three rhetras). The second apophthegm is included separately in Pel. 15.2–3, without a reference to Lycurgus’ law.

⁶⁵⁰ See chapter 2.1 on this procedure.

⁶⁵¹ Information in the scheme below is taken from Cartledge (2012) for Archidamus III; Bosworth (2012a) for Agis II; Babbitt (1931) 134 for Cleomenes II, 135 for Pedaritus, and 136 for Antiochus; and Hodkinson (2012) for Antalcidas. Nothing is known about Damonidas. Information about Nicostratus and Antiochus is taken from their sections themselves.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>191F</td>
<td>Damonidas</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192A</td>
<td>Nicostratus</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Contemporary of Archidamus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192AB</td>
<td>Eudamidas</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Succeeded Agis III in 331/330 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192B</td>
<td>Antiochus</td>
<td>Ephor</td>
<td>Time of Philip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192BC</td>
<td>Antalcidas</td>
<td>General and ephor</td>
<td>Time of Agesilaus II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first six historical figures are contemporaries, with the exception of one man, or possibly two: Pedaritus and Damonidas. Pedaritus (191F), however, is placed before Damonidas (191F) due to its thematic closeness and similar wording, as will become clear. Since nothing is known about Damonidas, it is impossible to determine whether his section deviates from the general chronological sequence: he might fit in with this series of contemporaries. Nicostratus (192A), the final Spartan of these six, is followed by two sections that refer to men who appeared in the Macedonian sections, thereby indicating that they belong to later times. Antalcidas (192BC) concludes the list, taking the reader back to the reign of Agesilaus. Despite this chronological deviation, it fits there well, as it is followed by two Thebans who belong to the same period.

In these nine sections, the two Spartan main themes are continued, viz. open warfare and moral virtue, especially justice:

[1] Archidamus Tertius is introduced as Agesilaus’ son. When he sees catapults discharging projectiles, he complains that this is the end of manly ἀρετή, after invoking Heracles (191D). This reference to Sparta’s greatest hero connects this saying with Lysander II (190DE), again underscoring the high importance which the Spartans attached to open warfare and how this shaped their identity. This theme is continued by Agis Tertius (191E; two apophthegms on war) and Cleomenes (191E; the reader again meets true Spartan boldness).

---

652 Xenocrates, who played a role in Alexander XXX (18t:DE), reappears on the stage in Eudamidas I (192A); Philip returns in Antiochus Spartiates (192B).

653 Plutarch wrote an unparalleled Life of Heracles, but this was probably motivated by the hero’s ties to Thebes, as the Chaeronean wrote Lives on other famous Boeotians too, see also Hägg (2012) 240.

654 Agis Tertius I (191E) opens with δέ, probably because it shares the very same message as Archidamus Tertius (191D), viz. direct contact between soldiers on the battlefield (taken from van der Wiel (2023a) 3n1). It is told in Lyc. 19.4 as part of a description of laconic speech (see also supra, note 600 on this chapter); as Volkman (1869) 230 notices, the unknown Athenian in the Life is Demades in Agis Tertius, but in Apophth. Lac.
Both Pedaritus (191F) and Damonidas (191F) contain only one apophthegm, concerning a different theme.\(^{655}\) In their apophthegms, the protagonists do not achieve the highest position, but do not seem to be angry or displeased with that, for they put their country first. This similarity between both stories is highlighted by their parallel structure.\(^{656}\)

The next sections combine these themes of generalship (cf. [1]) and moral superiority (cf. [2]). Nicostratus (192A), the first of these, invites the reader to reassess a historical figure who appeared a few lines earlier. Nicostratus, a general, is asked by Archidamus to betray a specific place in exchange for a great compensation, and answers (192A)\(^{657}\)

\[ \text{μὴ εἶναι τὸν Ἀρχίδαμον ἀφ’ Ἡρακλέους· τὸν μὲν γὰρ Ἡρακλέα περιιόντα τοὺς κακοὺς κολάζειν, Ἀρχίδαμον δὲ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς κακοὺς ποιεῖν.} \]

that Archidamus was not descended from Heracles, for Heracles, as he went about, punished the bad men, but Archidamus made the good men bad.

This says as much about Nicostratus’ uprightness as about Archidamus’ baseness: while this king appeared to be a genuine Spartan in his own section (191D), his moral qualities are questioned in 192A, again in terms of his Spartan nature. Thus, the reference to Heracles in both sections is not coincidental (cf. also Lysander II, 190DE). In addition, there is also a structural function: with this ring composition, Nicostratus closes the series of apophthegms of Archidamus’ contemporaries. In this way, the general disposition of all subjects placed in between Archidamus Tertius–Nicostratus might be questioned: if the straightforward interpretation of the first section already seems to be problematic, the same might be true for the evident conclusions drawn from the other sections on some ‘true’ Spartans.

---

\(^{655}\) Both Pedaritus (191F) and Damonidas (191F) contain only one apophthegm, concerning a different theme. In their apophthegms, the protagonists do not achieve the highest position, but do not seem to be angry or displeased with that, for they put their country first. This similarity between both stories is highlighted by their parallel structure.

\(^{656}\) The next sections combine these themes of generalship (cf. [1]) and moral superiority (cf. [2]). Nicostratus (192A), the first of these, invites the reader to reassess a historical figure who appeared a few lines earlier. Nicostratus, a general, is asked by Archidamus to betray a specific place in exchange for a great compensation, and answers (192A).

\(^{657}\) That Archidamus was not descended from Heracles, for Heracles, as he went about, punished the bad men, but Archidamus made the good men bad.

This says as much about Nicostratus’ uprightness as about Archidamus’ baseness: while this king appeared to be a genuine Spartan in his own section (191D), his moral qualities are questioned in 192A, again in terms of his Spartan nature. Thus, the reference to Heracles in both sections is not coincidental (cf. also Lysander II, 190DE). In addition, there is also a structural function: with this ring composition, Nicostratus closes the series of apophthegms of Archidamus’ contemporaries. In this way, the general disposition of all subjects placed in between Archidamus Tertius–Nicostratus might be questioned: if the straightforward interpretation of the first section already seems to be problematic, the same might be true for the evident conclusions drawn from the other sections on some ‘true’ Spartans.
With Eudamidas and Antiochus Spartiates, the reader reaches the time after the Macedonian conquest. Eudamidas (192AB) contains two apophthegms. Both are provoked by a similar cause and share a similar punchline: Eudamidas twice hears a philosopher speaking, in Eudamidas I about virtue (192A) and in II about good generalship, and the Spartan comments on the discrepancy between the philosopher’s words and deeds (192B). Once more, the Spartan main themes are thus combined. Antiochus Spartiates (192B) continues this: Philip returned a region to the Messenians, because of which Antiochus asks whether he also bestowed upon this people the strength to fight for their land. One might question his just nature (cf. the similar Lysander III, 190E). The first two apophthegms of Antalcidas (192BC), the last Spartan of the collection, connect the theme of moral superiority and generalship for a final time. Both stories resemble each other: an Athenian insults the Spartans, and Antalcidas reacts with a witty remark. In particular, Antalcidas II deserves attention, as it seems to serve as a kind of introduction to the Theban section (192BC):

’Ἐτέρου δ’ Ἀθηναίου πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰπόντος ἑλλά μὴν ήμεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ Κηφισοῦ πολλάκις ὑμᾶς ἐδιώξαμεν’, ‘ἡμεῖς δ’ οὐδέποτε’ εἶπεν ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ Εὐρώτα.’

When another Athenian said to him, “You cannot deny that we have many a time put you to rout from the Cephisus,” he said, “But we have never put you to rout from the Eurotas!”

Similar retorts will be made by Epameinondas (Epameinondas XV and XVI, 193CD), the first man to invade Laconia. This will be described

---

658 Its second apophthegm, however, does not contain δέ, but opens with πάλιν. In other cases throughout the collection, the adverb is followed by δέ, indicating that the situation in the apophthegm which follows is similar to the situation in the previous one, but not the same; see Dionysius Maior IV (175E); Philippus XXIX (179B); Alexander XX (180F); Epameinondas IX (192F–193A). Except for the absence of the particle, this is not different in the case of Eudamidas I (192A) and II (192B), so they should not be considered one large apophthegm (in addition, a δέ separates the stories in Apophth. Lac. 220DE, there the first and second apophthegm of Eudamidas too). See also van der Wiel (2023a) 3n8.

659 As Volkmann (1869) 230 points out, Antalcidas I (192B) is told as a saying of Pleistonax in Lyc. 20.8 (see supra, note 608 on this chapter). Lyc. 20.8 is the same story as Apophth. Lac. 231D, also told about Pleistonax. In Apophth. Lac. 217D, however, which more closely resembles Antalcidas I, the story is included in a section on Antalcidas. This is, then, a clear example of Anekdotenwanderung.

660 Not incidentally, Antalcidas II (192B) is told in Ages. 31.7, after a description of the Theban invasion in Spartan territory (combined with a similar saying of another Spartan
in the next part, but Plutarch first concludes Antalcidas and the Spartan section with a final reference to the impeccable Heracles (192C).

4.3 The Thebans (192C–194E)

Up to this point, two types of generals have appeared on the stage: in the Athenian section, caution and cleverness were regarded as indispensable characteristics of a general, but physical strength as such was not an important feature; in the Spartan section, on the contrary, most apophthegms focus on open warfare and boldness, and Plutarch did not always make a distinction between a general and a common soldier: in fact, when using military tactics the commander in question was even denounced by his fellow citizens. It is not always clear which conclusions are to be drawn from these opposing pictures. The Theban section will provide further insights on this matter. This part of the collection has only two subsections: Epameinondas (192C–194C) and Pelopidas (194C–E). Both generals lived in the same period, fought the same battles, and were friends, as is emphasized at the outset of Pelopidas. Their sections should thus be read in close connection with each other.

4.3.1 Epameinondas (192C–194C)

With 24 apophthegms, Epameinondas is the fourth-largest section of Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata. There are two reasons for this. The character of Epameinondas, a great general with a keen interest in philosophy, deeply impressed Plutarch. There is also a structural reason: a short Theban section after much longer Athenian and Spartan sections would throw the general composition of the collection out of balance. Since it is likely that Plutarch of all Thebans possessed a large amount of material on Epameinondas in the first place (and to a lesser extent on Pelopidas), he was forced to include more apophthegms in the section on this man. 

661 In the discussion of the trial of Epameinondas and Pelopidas in De se ipsum laud. 540DE, there is – in contrast with Pel. – a difference between the presentation of the great Epameinondas and the cowardly Pelopidas, see Buckler (1978) 38; Georgiadou (1992a) 4233–4234. See also the story of Epameinondas XXIII (194A–C).


663 A TLG search for lemma Ἐπαμινώνδας, -α, ὁ gives 149 results for Plutarch: he probably possessed a lot of apophthegms on this Theban in his notes.
Part II. A Literary Analysis

A first block

Epameinondas I (192C) is again a typical first apophthegm, praising the protagonist as a commander: his soldiers never panicked when he guided them. As is the case with similar openings, this one is somewhat separated from the remainder of the section, but at the same time announces its main theme: good generalship. II continues this: Epameinondas claims that death is most beautiful in war (192C), suggesting a position similar to that of the Spartans. Yet the importance and precise meaning of this saying are not immediately clear, nor is it explained in what follows, because the next three apophthegms primarily deal with another theme: poverty and frugality. In III (192CD), the Theban criticizes a fat soldier (the military context somehow still connects this with II). The next two apophthegms (192D) illustrate that he himself is (192D) εὐτελὴς περὶ τὴν δίαιταν (LCL: “frugal in his manner of living”). The topic of frugality will appear to be related to the theme of death and war at the end of the section, as is also suggested by the gradual shifting that connects all these topics.

Epameinondas VI (192E) still speaks of a frugal lifestyle, but also shifts towards another theme. When everyone is celebrating, Epameinondas does not join the party, probably because at least someone should take care of the πόλις, even during festivities. The apophthegm is not very clear, but there is no doubt that it sets the general apart from the crowd, which – contrary to II – to some extent seems to highlight a difference with the Spartan ideals. This, in turn, provides a connection with VII (192E) and VIII (192EF).

Both contrast commanders and the common folk or troops too, although this is not immediately clear in this second apophthegm, describing how Epameinondas encourages his soldiers after two contradictory oracles (192F):

---

664 If one follows the reading of the manuscripts, which all contain κάλλιστον. Nachstädt (1971) 64, however, reads ιερόθυτον: “κάλλιστον Ω hoc mge adscriptum ad genuine lectionem ιερόθυτον declarandam (349c gn. V. 28o) in textum irrepsisse recte putat Stb.” A similar saying of Epameinondas is quoted in Bellone an pace 349C, but the wording is entirely different from the short saying in Epameinondas II: if this saying derives from the (note for the) apophthegm of the oration, Plutarch changed it into a bold and general claim.

665 In Non posse 1099C, an account of Epameinondas IV (192D) is combined with Alexander IX (180A) and another apophthegm of this king, see supra, note 422 on this passage. Epameinondas V (192D) is connected with the two preceding apophthegms: μαγείρου – IV (192D): τὴν δίαιταν, δεξιόν, πεμμάτων καὶ ὄψων καὶ μύρων παρασκευήν; and III (192C): τὸ σῶμα – V (192D): τοῦ σῶματος.

666 Epameinondas VII also occurs in Praec. ger. reip. 808DE.
he arose and said, “If you are willing to obey your officers, and come to close quarters with the enemy, these are the oracles for you,” and he pointed to those of good omen; “but if you are going to play the cowards in the face of danger, then those,” and he glanced at those of ill omen.

Obeying one’s officers is defined as facing the enemy. This is the main function of the soldier. Yet the way in which this differs from a general’s task, and what should be understood by this, will again only become clear at the end of the section.

*Epameinondas* IX (192F–193A), similar to the situation in VIII (the general again has to encourage his soldiers after a sign from heaven), closes a series of sayings uttered before battles. In what follows, the reader sees the general after a battle: X–XII (193AB) are all related to his greatest success, his victory at Leuctra. This once more highlights Epameinondas’ military talent and shows that his insights should be taken seriously.

**A second block**

There is no clear connection between *Epameinondas* XII (193B) and XIII (193BC). The latter apophthegm, breaking the gradual shifting, thus opens a new block (XIII–XXIV, 193B–F) in which previous themes are taken up again and clarified. First, XIII describes how Epameinondas refuses the gold of Jason of Thessaly and thereby again presents his frugality and disregard for wealth (193BC). XIV, resembling XIII also in

---

667 Cf. πάλιν δὲ, 192F; see also supra, note 658. This is a theme in Pel.–Marc. too; see esp. Marc. 3–6 on omens.

668 In *Epameinondas* X (193A), the commander rejoices about his victory; he again takes up his attitude from VI (192E) in XI (193AB); in XII (193B), the general prevents the Spartans from hiding their great defeat. These three apophthegms thus all refer or refer back to the victory of Leuctra: X (193A): ἐν Λεύκτροις νικῆσαι Λακεδαιμονίους; XI (193A): μετὰ τὴν μάχην ἐκείνην; XII (193B): τὰ τοιαῦτα συμπτώματα. X contains a general saying, and does not necessarily precede XI from a chronological point of view, but his attitude in X resembles his happiness in the moments immediately after the battle, referred to in XI (193AB: ἐγὼ δὲς κτλ.). X occurs in Cor. 4.6 (compared with Marcius’ love for his mother), *An seni* 786D, and *Non posse* 1098AB (the happiness of Epameinondas’ mother after Leuctra is contrasted with Epicurus’ mother).

669 Epameinondas refers back to this in *De genio Socr.* 583F–584A.
terms of its structure, contains a similar response with regard to a large amount of money sent by the Persian king (193C). Second, the theme of war is retaken: XV focuses on military alliances (193CD) and is therefore in line with XIII and XIV; XVI (193D) in turn resembles XV, since in both stories, Thebes is accused, first by Athens, then by Sparta, and Epameinondas responds by referring to the mythology of Athens and to Sparta’s typical laconic speech respectively; in XVII, by contrast, the Theban enemies are forging alliances (193DE). As a consequence, war is imminent again, so in XVIII (193E) the general always keeps the Boeotian people under arms. The saying again contrasts common soldiers with their leader, a third main theme of the section as a whole. Battles are fought once more in the following apophthegms: Epameinondas minimizes the successes of Chabrias in XIX (193EF) and ridicules the new weapons acquired by the Athenians in XX (193F).

Yet especially relevant are the final four apophthegms, since these connect all these main topics also with each other. In XXI (194A), the general claims that a man who becomes rich is reluctant to face perils. The following apophthegm (194A) reads as follows: when Epameinondas is asked whether he is a better commander than Iphicrates or Chabrias, he argues that he cannot pass judgement on this matter, since they are all still alive. This can be interpreted in two ways, both of which are probably correct: [1] Epameinondas could mean that all successes and misfortunes of the entire lives of the generals should be taken into account in order to come to the right assessment; or [2] that the way in which a general dies is relevant too. Possibilities for judging Epameinondas’ career in both ways are provided by his two closing apophthegms:

---


671 *Epameinondas* XIII (193B): συμμάχου μὲν εἰς Θῆβας – XV (193C): σύμμαχοι Θηβαίων (and note XIV [193C]: τὰ συμφέροντα Θηβαίοις φρονῶν καὶ φίλον Ἐπαμεινώνδαν). As stated, XV is similar to *Antalcidas* II (192BC): *Praec. ger. reip.* 810EF therefore combines these stories (and *Phocion* VI [188A]).

672 *Epameinondas* XV (193C): κατηγόρου – XVI (193D): κατηγοροῦντας. An account of *Epameinondas* XVI occurs in *De se ipsum laud.* 545A, combined with *Agesilaus* II (190F): both stories illustrate that one can praise oneself in order to impress the foolhardy.

673 Epameinondas’ saying, calling Boeotia the (193E) πολέμου ὀρχήστραν, is also quoted in *Marc.* 21.3, there applied to Rome of Marcellus’ time.

674 Two men whom the reader met in the Athenian section, see *Iphicrates* (186F–187B) and *Chabrias* (187CD). Iphicrates is also mentioned in *Chabrias* II (187D).
In Epameinondas XXIII (194A–C), the general has to defend himself at his trial and enumerates his successes (because of which he is acquitted). This apophthegm is of exceptional length, emphasizing Epameinondas’ great military talent: based on this long saying alone, one concludes that the Theban is truly the greatest general.

Epameinondas XXIV (194C) seems to contrast with his accomplishments for the sake of his city described in the previous apophthegm, and somehow darkens the seemingly univocally positive image that has been built up by alluding to a bad future (cf. Alexander XXXIV, 181F):

Ἐν δὲ τῇ τελευταίᾳ μάχῃ τρωθεὶς καὶ κομισθεὶς ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνὴν ἐκάλει Δαίφαντον, εἶτα μετ’ ἔκεινον Ἰολαΐδαν· τεθνάναι δὲ τοὺς ἄνδρας πυθόμενος ἔκέλευε διαλύεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους, ὡς οὐκ ἄν τοὺς αὐτοῖς στρατηγοῦ. καὶ τῷ λόγῳ τὸ ἔργον ἐμαρτύρησεν, ὡς εἰδότος ἄριστα τοὺς πολίτας.

When in his last battle he had been wounded and carried into a tent, he called for Daiphantus, and next after him for Iolaïdas, and, learning that the men were dead, he bade the Thebans to make terms with the enemy, since no general was left to them. And the facts bore out his words, for he best knew his fellow-citizens.

To interpret this story correctly, one should take a second look at Epameinondas II (192C): dying in battle is the most beautiful death, as the general said. This is how Daiphantus and Iolaïdas, two generals as can be concluded from XXIV, seem to have died. ἐν δὲ τῇ τελευταίᾳ μάχῃ suggests that Epameinondas is dying as well. As a consequence, Thebes is lost, since the city no longer has a military commander. Is death on the battlefield the most beautiful death? For soldiers, perhaps, since a soldier who does not dare to risk his life, because of riches that make him too fond of his easy life, is not of any use (VIII, 192EF; and XXI, 194A). A general who risks his life, however, is at the same time putting the cause of his nation at stake. It is precisely this that constitutes a main difference between commanders and soldiers.

---

The apophthegm occurs in De se ipsum laud. 540DE: the collection’s version is much longer, which fits better after Epameinondas XXII. A short reference to the event is also made in Praec. ger. reip. 799EF. Epameinondas’ invasion in Laconia is described in Ages. 31. For a detailed comparison of all the accounts, see Buckler (1978) 37–38.

Stadter (2014b) 682 argues that this apophthegm “seems to derive from a speech in a historical work”, but adds in a note that this requires “further study”.

---
4.3.2 Pelopidas (194C–E)

A close reading shows this section to be in line with the interpretation of Epameinondas. Its first apophthegm (194C) immediately invites the reader to compare the section with the previous one, not only because Pelopidas is introduced as the συστράτηγος Ἐπαμεινώνδᾳ, but also because of its content. Pelopidas’ penchant for poverty. Pelopidas II, recalling Epameinondas II (192C), reads as follows (194D):

Τῆς δὲ γυναικὸς, ἐπὶ μάχην ἐξιόντος αὐτοῦ, δεομένης σῴζειν ἑαυτόν, ἄλλοις ἔφη δεῖν τὸ τοῦτο παραινεῖν, ἄρχοντι δὲ καὶ στρατηγῷ σῴζειν τοὺς πολίτας.

As he was leaving home for the field of battle, his wife begged him to have a care for his life. “This advice,” said he, “should be kept for others, but for a commander and general the advice should be to have a care for the lives of the citizens.”

After reading Epameinondas, the readers should realize that a general, by caring for his own life, at the same time cares for his citizens’ lives. To some extent, then, the problematic saying of Pelopidas II alludes to the Theban’s dangerous recklessness – an important theme in the Lives of Pelopidas–Marcellus as a pair, as is announced by its prologue, which argues against commanders who endanger themselves in battle. Not incidentally, III, still dealing with Pelopidas’ function as a general (194D), is followed by three apophthegms that not only highlight his reckless

---

677 Georgiadou (1997) 12 points out that “Plutarch has very little to say about Pelopidas’ early life” in Pel., see also 32 and Georgiadou (1992a) 4226–4228: the first two chapters (Pel. 3–4, after the prologue) focus on Pelopidas and Epameinondas in particular. The same goes for Pelopidas.

678 Told in Pel. 3.8 after a comparison of his and Epameinondas’ poverty (Pel. 3.6–7). See also Citro (2019a) 203 on this apophthegm and the Life (she speaks of an “imitazione dell’amico Epaminonda”); and see Georgiadou (1997) 72 (unlike the blind Nicodemus, Pelopidas is able to do more important things than acquiring money).

679 In Pel. 20.2, the story precedes the battle of Leuctra. Plutarch might have left this detail out of the collection, as the successful outcome could change the interpretation. The saying is different (20.2: τοῖς δ’ ἄρχουσιν – 194D: ἄρχοντι δὲ καὶ στρατηγῷ; see Citro (2019a) 206–207 for a detailed comparison). According to Georgiadou (1997) 162, the scene might be modelled after Andromache’s “passionate plea to Hektor to stay away from the battle” in the Iliad.

680 Pelopidas III (194D) is told in Pel. 17.2 in almost exactly the same wording. Georgiadou (1997) 149 points out that a “similarly playful stichomythy is attributed to Leonidas, Apoph. Lac. 225B; also ib. 234B.”
behaviour, but also show its consequence. All three concern his captivity by Alexander, the tyrant of Pherae.\footnote{Depicted as a most cruel tyrant in \textit{Pel.}, see Georgiadou (1992a) 4235.} in \textit{IV} (194D), he is caught and provokes the despot; the apophthegm thus not only describes the result but also an additional example of his recklessness. When Alexander’s wife comes to see him in the next apophthegm, he says that the fact that she can stand her husband amazes him (194DE). In line with \textit{IV}, this saying thus contains an insult to the tyrant.\footnote{Both apophthegms are told with various details in \textit{Pel.} 28.2–10; see Georgiadou (1997) 199–201 on this passage.} When Epameinondas sets him free in \textit{VI}, finally, he states that he is indebted to his captor (194E),\footnote{Surprisingly, \textit{Pelopidas} VI does not occur in the \textit{Life}. The reference to Epameinondas in \textit{Pelopidas} I and VI creates a ring composition; the name of Alexander connects \textit{IV}, \textit{V}, and \textit{VI}.} his actual death, alluded to by these words and in line with \textit{Pelopidas} II, is not narrated, but Plutarch tells it in the corresponding \textit{Life}: during a battle against Alexander of Pherae, he had the tyrant in his sights, and, inflamed by irrational anger,\footnote{\textit{Pel.} 32.9: \textit{οὐ κατέσχε τῷ λογισμῷ τὴν ὀργήν} (“he could not subject his anger to his judgement”).} he tried to kill him, but was slain himself (\textit{Pel.} 32). There is no clearer example of a useless death.\footnote{Cf. the prologue to \textit{Pel.–Marc}. See also Georgiadou (1997) 30.} This recalls \textit{Epameinondas} XXIV (194C) and, in line with this, the suggestion of Pelopidas’ earlier apophthegms is that he only harmed his city by his excessive boldness. One can therefore question whether he truly cared for his citizens’ lives in this way, as he claimed in \textit{Pelopidas} II.\footnote{Citro (2019a) 207 recognizes that Plutarch does not always seem to agree with claims about boldness in war similar to \textit{Pelopidas} II, referring to the prologue to \textit{Pel.–Marc}. Building on Ingenkamp (2008), however, she argues that Plutarch’s criticism there is mitigated in the \textit{synkrisis}. See also Georgiadou (1992a): Plutarch prefers Pelopidas, who can be excused because of what the bad tyrant did to him, in contrast with Marcellus (\textit{Comp. Pel. et Marc.} is discussed on 4251–4252).}

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{πεπειρᾶσθαί γάρ ἑαυτοῦ νῦν μάλιστα οὐ πρὸς πόλεμον <μόνον>,} \\
\text{ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς θάνατον εὐθαρσῶς ἔχοντος.}
\end{align*}
\]

for by actual test he had now found himself more than ever to be of good courage not only in facing war but also in facing death.
the first place be read as a reassessment. Together *Epameinondas* and *Pelopidas* elucidate the value of boldness in fighting, but make clear that this first of all befits soldiers, not commanders. This does not mean, of course, that Plutarch disapproves of apophthegms in which a general applies boldness in speech in order to encourage his soldiers, nor would he necessarily have condemned Brasidas’ death (the Spartan cause was not lost after this), or Agis’ faith in his troops despite their low numbers. The Theban section rather avoids the wrong conclusions being drawn from reading about the Spartans alone. In particular, *Epameinondas* XXIV (194C) is of the utmost importance in this regard, as it provides the background against which *Pelopidas* VI (194E) will be assessed: after a joint reading of the Athenian, Spartan, and Theban apophthegms, Pelopidas’ courage when looking death in the eyes depicts the image of a thoughtless general, at least in his later years. Because of this, he fails to serve the commonwealth, and thereby also fails to fulfil his core task as a general.687 One might conclude, then, that a general’s value is often to be assessed in light of his successes and the safety and glory he brings to his people. This recalls the interpretation of the ambiguous Spartans: perhaps their characters should not always be judged in terms of their ‘Spartanness’, but also on the basis of their achievements and efficiency. Similar themes will be prominent in the first parts of the Roman sections.

---

687 I do not, therefore, entirely agree with Citro (2019a) 208 who, based on *Pelopidas* I and II, speaks of the “immagine edificante di Pelopida, esente dal vizio della φιλοπλουτία e fautore della preminenza dell’interesse comunitario rispetto alla cura dei vantaggi personali”. 
The Roman Sections (194E–208A)

The Roman sections consist of two major parts: (1) apophthegms that focus on Romans conquering other people (194E–202E; 5.1), and (2) those that primarily concern Romans fighting their fellow countrymen, resulting in the establishment of the Principate (203A–208A; 5.3 and 5.4). These parts are separated from each other by a chronological break (Gaius Popillius, 202E–203A; 5.2).

5.1 The Conquerors of the Roman Republic (194E–202E)

5.1.1 Manius Curius and Gaius Fabricius (194E–195C)

Manius Curius (194EF) contains two apophthegms which can together be read as an introduction to the sections on the Roman Republic. The first contrasts the protagonist with his fellow citizens (194E):

Μάνιος Κούριος, ἐγκαλούντων αὐτῷ τινων ὅτι τῆς αἰχμαλώτου χώρας ὀλίγον ἑκάστῳ μέρος διένειμε τὴν δὲ πολλὴν ἐποίησε δημοσίαν, ἐπηύξατο μηδένα γενέσθαι Ῥωμαίων, ὃς ὀλίγην ἡγήσεται γῆν τὴν τρέφουσαν.

When some complained against Manius Curius because he apportioned to each man but a small part of the land taken from the enemy, and made the most of it public land, he prayed that there might never

---

688 Manius Curius fights the Samnites; Gaius Fabricius the Epirotes (led by Pyrrhus); Fabius Maximus the Carthaginians; Scipio Maior the Carthaginians and Antiochus; Flamininus the Macedonians (led by Philip) and Antiochus; Gaius Domitius Antiochus; Publius Licinius the Macedonians (led by Perseus); Paulus Aemilius the Macedonians (led by Perseus); Cato Maior (a rather exceptional section) some Spanish people; Scipio Minor the Carthaginians, Celtiberians, and Numantians; in the section on Caecilius Metellus, Plutarch mentions a war but does not name the enemies; Marius fights the Teutons, Cimbrians, and some Italian peoples; Catulus Lutatius the Cimbrians; and Sulla fights the Greeks (Athens).

689 The story also occurs in Crass. 2.10 (some editions – also LCL – attribute the story to Marius, but this is probably a scribal error): Plutarch argues that Crassus was wrong in claiming that only those who can sustain an army are rich, after referring to Archidamus Secundus (2.9): ὁ γάρ πόλεμος οὐ ταπεινόν στηρίζει (“for ‘war has no fixed rations’”). This is followed by Manius Curius I: he had an entirely different opinion, Plutarch writes.
be a Roman who would regard as small the land that gave him enough to live on.

This depicts the traditional image of the early Republic by combining frugality with the theme of working the land.\(^690\) It evidently also provides an ideal opening for the Roman section: in what follows, Rome will conquer the world! At a higher level, the apophthegm recalls Lycurgus (189D–F) and Cyrus (172EF): as one reads there, the place where people live forges their lives. This is precisely what Manius Curius means by allotting only a small piece of the conquered land to the Romans: he aims to mould and improve their characters.

Manius Curius II is closely connected with I by focusing on the theme of riches, but now illustrates Manius’ own frugality: the Samnites attempt to offer gold to the Roman when he is preparing turnips for dinner.\(^691\) As expected, he refuses the money (194EF). This is connected with the next section on Gaius Fabricius (194F–195B).\(^692\) A verbal connection with Gaius Fabricius I (194F) already suggests continuity.\(^693\) This apophthegm discusses the importance of good generalship: the Roman claims that his people are not defeated by their enemies, but their general by the Epirot king.\(^694\) This situates the remainder of the section in the period of the conflict between the Epirotes and the Romans. The following stories illustrate Fabricius’ relationship with wealth and his incorruptibility. Three times he refuses gifts or proposals from Pyrrhus (cf. Manius Curius):

[1] In Gaius Fabricius II (194F–195A), Pyrrhus’ motivation is unclear and his two presents rather seem pathetic attempts to impress the Roman.\(^695\) First, the Epirot only tries to give money (194F–195A), but his second gift is of different nature, for all the details of his exaggerated preparation focus on his desire to impress the frugal man (195A): he chooses the biggest elephant (μέγιστον ἐλέφαντα), ensures that Fabricius does not notice the animal approaching him (ἐξόπισθεν ἀγνοοῦντι τῷ Φαβρικίῳ), and makes it trumpet (ῥήξαντα φωνήν). The sharp contrast with Fabricius’ modest reply makes one almost pity the king.\(^696\)

\(^{690}\) As will be further explored in Cato Maior (198D–199E).

\(^{691}\) Also told in Ca. Ma. 2.2, see infra, p. 326. Pasco-Pranger (2015) discusses this passage.

\(^{692}\) On the virtuous image of Fabricius in Pyrrh., see Mossman (2005).


\(^{694}\) The apophthegm occurs in Pyrrh. 18.1, where Plutarch clarifies Fabricius’ saying: the defeat belongs to the general’s qualities (cf. various other apophthegms in the collection, esp. Chabrias III [187D]).

\(^{695}\) Cf. Plutarch’s interpretation of the action in Pyrrh. 20.2–5.

\(^{696}\) Note μειδιάσας, showing his moral superiority (cf. supra, note 271). Pyrrh. 20.5 contains διαμειδιάσας.
In III, Pyrrhus asks the Roman to become his commander. Its placement after II suggests that he does so because he was impressed by Fabricius’ moral superiority, which is in line with the account in the *Life of Pyrrhus*. As expected, the Roman refuses (195A).

The third case is dealt with in IV and V, in fact one apophthegm, where the theme of betrayal provides an additional connection with III. After Pyrrhus’ doctor proposed to kill the king, Fabricius discloses the plan (195AB). In what follows, the grateful Epirot wants to release some Roman captives, but Fabricius in turn releases some prisoners too (195B),

\[ μὴ δόξῃ λαμβάνειν μισθόν· οὔδὲ γὰρ χάριτι Πῦρρου μεμηνυκέναι τὴν ἐπιβουλήν, ἀλλὰ ὅπως μὴ δοκῶσι Ῥωμαίοι δόλῳ κτείνειν, ὡς φανερῶς νικάν οὐ δυνάμενοι. \]

lest he should give the impression that he was getting a reward. “For,” as he said, “it was not to win favour with Pyrrhus that he had disclosed the plot, but that the Romans might not have the repute of killing through treachery, as if they could not win an open victory.”

The story is told at length in the *Life of Pyrrhus*, with remarkable differences. First, there is the description of Pyrrhus’ reaction: Plutarch only mentions that the physician is punished in the *Life* (21.5: ἐκόλασε), but *Gaius Fabricius* V is more precise: Pyrrhus has the betrayer hanged (195C: ἐκρέμασε). Even though one expects a severe punishment for a traitor, this (unnecessary) detail still contributes to Pyrrhus’ depiction as a harsh despot, which recalls his own section and contrasts with the mildness exhibited by some of his fellow Diadochi and especially by the earlier Macedonian monarchs (177A–184F). In addition, Plutarch cites the entire letter which Fabricius sent to Pyrrhus in the *Life* (21.3–4). *Gaius Fabricius* IV, on the contrary, only contains the question of why Pyrrhus is such a bad evaluator of his friends. This turns it into a true apophthegm. Furthermore, Fabricius’ role is less significant in the biography: *Gaius Fabricius* V presents Pyrrhus as being grateful to him and releasing the prisoners because of him (195C: τῷ δὲ Φαβρικίῳ), but the *Life* mentions that he did this also for the Romans (21.5: Φαβρικίῳ δὲ καὶ Ῥωμαίοις). In addition, the decision to free captives in return is made by

---

697 *Pyrrh.* 20.8 introduces the story as follows, after an account of *Gaius Fabricius* II and another apophthegm: οὕτω δὴ θαυμάσας τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ τὸ ἤθος ὁ Πῦρρος ἐτι μᾶλλον ὑρόγεστο φιλίαν ἀντὶ πολέμου πρὸς τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶ γενέσθαι (“Thus Pyrrhus was led to admire the high spirit and character of the man, and was all the more eager to have friendship with his city instead of waging war against it”).

698 See van der Wiel (2023a) 13 on these elements as one unit.
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the Roman people and not by Fabricius.\textsuperscript{699} That Fabricius himself does not want to receive a reward from Pyrrhus can only be read in the collection. His saying, finally, occurs in the Life too, but there it is part of the lengthy quotation of Fabricius’ letter and precedes the release of the prisoners.\textsuperscript{700}

These adaptations – for in the Roman part of Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata Plutarch often seems to have created apophthegms out of larger passages (such as letters) rather than the other way around – are in line with the idealized picture of the individual heroes of the early Roman Republic. Fabricius himself refuses to accept the freed Romans for free, so he appears as a man of principle (cf. Manius Curius); the presentation of Pyrrhus as a tyrant enhances his picture as a liberator. Yet there is more: since the monarchical sections (172E–184F) often describe an understanding of and concession to practical reality, especially when dealing with gift-giving, there is an additional contrast between Pyrrhus’ gifts and Fabricius’ rigid adherence to his early republican ideals. Probably Fabricius is only an exemplum in the sense that he provides a perfect representation of a set of virtues, in line with other opening sections that depict a univocally positive image (Cyrus, Archelaus, Lycurgus and his earlier successors, Manius Curius): he observes honesty, related to open warfare, and frugality to a degree that might be inimitable in reality. Perhaps, then, imitating him is not always desirable: although his internal disposition is admirable, one might question whether a general truly puts the people’s interests first when refusing to end a war by benefitting from betrayal or to gain an advantage by receiving captives in exchange for nothing. The following sections are in line with this insight.

5.1.2 Fabius Maximus and Scipio Maior (195C–197A)

The next two sections, on Fabius Maximus and Scipio the Elder, take the reader a few decades later, to the period of the Second Punic War.\textsuperscript{701} Since these two generals applied entirely different tactics to fight the same ene-

\textsuperscript{699} Described in Pyrrh. 21.6. The motivation of the Romans is different: they do not want their enemy to favour them, nor do they want to be rewarded for doing the right thing.

\textsuperscript{700} Pyrrh. 21.4: ὁδὲ γὰρ ταῦτα σῇ χάριτι μηνύομεν, ἀλλ᾽ ὅπως μὴ τὸ σὸν πάθος ἕμην διαβολὴν ἐνέγκῃ καὶ δόλῳ δόξωμεν, ως ἄρετῇ μὴ δυνάμενοι, κατεργάσασθαι τὸν πόλεμον (“And indeed we do not give thee this information out of regard for thee, but in order that thy ruin may not bring infamy upon us, and that men may not say of us that we brought the war to an end by treachery because we were unable to do so by valour”). Note the verbal similarities with Gaius Fabricius V (195B), in bold.

\textsuperscript{701} Manius Curius was consul in 290 BC, Gaius Fabricius in 282 and 278 BC. Fabius Maximus became dictator in 217 BC; see Babbitt (1931) 154–158.
my, the reader is invited to compare their sections in order to decide who was the better of the two – if such a conclusion can be drawn.702

a) Fabius Maximus (195C–196A)

A ridiculed Cunctator

Fabius Maximus I (195C) contrasts with Gaius Fabricius IV–V (195AB) on open warfare. It indirectly introduces Fabius’ nickname (“Cunctator”), which he acquired by avoiding a clash with Hannibal. Because of his tactics, he was ridiculed (195C: καταγελώντων δὲ τῶν πολλῶν), but this did not affect him (195C):

τὸν σκώμματα φοβούμενον καὶ λοιδορίας δειλότερον ἦγείται τοῦ φεύγοντος τοὺς πολέμιους.

he thought the man who feared gibes and jeers was more of a coward than the one who ran away from the enemy.703

The next apophthegm contrasts Fabius’ strategy with that of another Roman: Minucius.704 He commands together with him and defeats some enemies (195C). Many Romans praise him for this, but Fabius reacts with a phrase structured similarly to the previous saying (195D):705

μᾶλλον ἔφη τὴν εὐτυχίαν ἢ τὴν ἀτυχίαν τοῦ Μινουκίου φοβεῖσθαι.
Fabius said that he felt more afraid over Minucius’s good luck than over any bad luck he might have.

Again, there is a contrast with a paradoxical punchline related to Fabius’ own military tactics. The truth of the saying is illustrated by the aftermath added to the apophthegm: when the overconfident Minucius is ambushed, Fabius comes to his rescue. The story concludes with a comment of Hannibal, illustrating that he understood the dangers of Fabius’ apparent caution (195D). *Fabius Maximus* III, taking place after the disaster (ἀτυχία, cf. II) of Cannae, similarly contains a saying of the Carthaginian general: once more, a Roman eager to fight Hannibal stands alongside Fabius, who, on the contrary, still wants to avoid an open conflict (195DE). This time, however, it is Hannibal’s saying that is structured similarly to the sayings in I and II (195E):

μᾶλλον φοβεῖται Μαρκέλλου μαχομένου Φάβιον μη μαχόμενον.

he had more to fear from Fabius who would not fight from Marcellus who would.

As before, there is a clash between two elements, one of which is to be feared more than the other. Again, a general’s preference is paradoxical.706 In short: I–III (195C–E) illustrate Fabius’ military skills and the successes of his tactics in light of the failure of other commanders and

---

706 The wording of Fab. 19 is similar to *Fabius Maximus* III: (1) 195D: ἡμεῖς δὲ τὴν ἐν Κάνναις ἀτυχίαν – 19.1: μετὰ τὴν μάχην; 195D: τολμῶν ἔχοντος ἀνδρὸς καὶ φῆμα αχύρου ἀνδρὸς – 19.2 καὶ πρὸς ἀνδρὰς τολμηρῶν τὸν Ἀννίβαν ἀντιτολμῶντι (part of an elaborate description of Marcellus’ recklessness in war); 195D: αὐτὸς ἡμεῖς, εἰ μηδὲς μάγιος, ταχύ τὴν ἰδίαν τὸν Ἀννίβα παρατεινομένην ἀπαγορεύσειν – 19.3: ἡμεῖς μηδὲς μαχομένου μηδ’ ἔρεθιζοντος τὸν Ἀννίβαν αὐτὸν ἐπιτεράσειν εἰς τὸν κατατριβήσειι· ἔνοχος τὸν ἐπηρεάσεις ἑαυτῷ κατατριβήσεις περὶ τὸν πόλεμον, ὥσπερ ἀθλητικὸς σώματος τῆς ἰδιόμοιος ἐπερτόνοι γινομένης. Interestingly, Hannibal’s reaction is different from his saying in *Fabius Maximus* III, see 19.5 (compare with the quote above): καὶ τελευτῶν εἰς ἀπορίαν κατέστη τοσαύτην, ὡστε Μαρκέλλοι μὲν ἀποκαμεῖν μαχόμενον, Φάβιον δὲ φοβεῖσθαι μη μαχόμενον (“And finally he was brought to such a pass that he was worn out with fighting Marcellus, and afraid of Fabius when not fighting”): if this is the original wording, Plutarch not only modelled the quote after the similar sayings in *Fabius Maximus* I and II, but also changed the content: Hannibal fears Fabius more than Marcellus in the collection (this is not the point of the *Life*). Note also another, but similar, saying of Hannibal in *Marc. 9.7*: αὐτός δ’ ὁ Ἀννίβας ἔλεγε, τὸν μὲν Φάβιον ὡς παιδαγωγὸν φοβεῖσθαί, τὸν δὲ Μάρκαλλον ὡς ἀνταγωνιστήν· ὃς’ οὗ μὲν γὰρ κολύσθαι κακόν τι ποιεῖν, ὃς’ οὐ δὲ καὶ πάθεσιν (“And Hannibal himself used to say that he feared Fabius as a tutor, but Marcellus as an adversary; for by the one he was prevented from doing any harm, while
even by the assessment of his opponent. Although the Roman is ridiculed by his people and opposed by other commanders, he never gives up his cautiousness.707 Thus, he seems to care more about the well-being of his country than about his own reputation (cf. Epameinondas and Pelopidas; 192C–194E). Fabius Maximus IV closes a series of apophthegms that depict this univocally positive image. It sheds light on another virtue of Fabius, his gentleness: when a Lucanian soldier leaves camp at night to visit his love, Fabius does not punish him, for he was a good soldier, but presents him with the girl (195EF).708

The image darkens
The next two apophthegms are related to Fabius’ capture of Tarentum, taken by deceiving Hannibal (195F–196A).709 They continue the insight that open warfare is not always the right strategy—or at least not the most convenient one. Yet they also contrast with the preceding apophthegms:

[1] One may wonder whether the people of Tarentum deserved the sacking of their city, although one can still approve of the fact that at least the images of the gods were not taken away (the saying itself, however, is quite unkind). Plutarch condemns Fabius’ treatment in the corresponding Life.710 In Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata this obviously is less clear, but the placement of Fabius Maximus V (195F) after a story that highlights his kindness and mildness is telling.

[2] Another contrast is provided by Fabius Maximus VI (195F–196A). The apophthegm is to be read together with the previous one: Marcus Livius, who kept the acropolis of Tarentum when Hannibal had taken the city,711 says that the city was retaken thanks to him (δι’ ἑαυτόν), ap-

---

707 As Stadter (1975) 81 points out, πρᾳότης or the fact that Pericles and Fabius could “endure the stupidities of the mass of common citizens and their own colleagues” connects Per.–Fab. as a pair.

708 The story occurs in Fab. 20.5–9, preceded by a similar story (20.2–3). The chapter opens as follows (20.1): Τὰς δ᾽ ἀποστάσεις τῶν πόλεων καὶ τὰ κινήματα τῶν συμμάχων ὁ Φάβιος μᾶλλον ἠπίως ἀνείργειν καὶ δυσωπεῖν (“Fabius thought that the revolts of the cities and the agitations of the allies ought to be restrained and discourteous, rather than by mild and gentle measures”). The reference to mildness for revolting cities is striking in the context of Fabius Maximus V (195EF).

709 Fabius’ plan is described in Fab. 21–22.4; the sacking of Tarentum in 22.5–6; the saying in 22.7.

710 Fab. 22.6 describes the cruelties of the Romans. Xenophontos (2012c) 174–177 discusses Fabius’ decline in these later chapters.

711 As already described by Fabius Maximus V (195F: Ταραντίνους δὲ κατέχοντα φρουρᾷ τὸν Αννίβαν πλῆν τῆς ἀκροπόλεως) and repeated here (195F: Μάρκου δὲ Λιβίου
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parently jealous of Fabius’ success. When others laugh at this (οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι κατεγέλων), it is not clear whether Marcus or Fabius is their target. Yet apparently Fabius feels compelled to defend himself, and answers (196A):

‘ἀληθῆ λέγεις· εἰ μή γὰρ σὺ τὴν πόλιν ἀπέβαλες, οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ ἀνέλαβον.’

“You are quite right; for, if you had not lost the city, I should not have recaptured it.”

This is a clever response to a man who attempts to belittle his actions. Yet οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι κατεγέλων recalls καταγελώντων δὲ τῶν πολλῶν in I (195C), and his response there contrasts with his reaction to Marcus Livius: Fabius suddenly seems to care more about his reputation than ever before. One may question whether the Roman maintained his lack of φιλοτιμία until the end of his life. Some questions might therefore be asked about his true disposition. In light of this, the reader might also doubt his motivations in Fabius Maximus VII (196A), related to the previous story by similarities in terms of wording. Fabius praises his son, when he was consul, for putting his country before his family, even though he might seem to dishonour his father. Perhaps this story only seems to close the section on a positive note: it is no less possible that the Roman only acted like this because of his reputation.

To a certain extent, then, the structure of Fabius Maximus resembles the Life, although the latter is definitely more negative: there, the capture of Tarentum is a turning point too, again contrasted with a description of Fabius’ mild character. When the Romans start plundering, Plutarch

τοῦ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν φρουροῦντος).

Interestingly, Fabius himself is laughing in Fab. 23.4: γελάσας οὖν ὁ Φάβιος· “ἀληθῆ λέγεις” ἔπειν (“At this Fabius laughed, and said: ‘You are right’”). By changing this in the collection, Plutarch not only connects Fabius Maximus VI with I, but also creates a certain ambiguity: some are laughing after Marcus’ words, which can also be interpreted in the sense that they are making fun of Fabius.

The story follows Fabius’ second triumph in Fab., described as more lustrous than the first (23.2). This irritated Marcus, described as (23.4) ὑπὸ φθόνου καὶ φιλοτιμίας ἔξενεχθείς (“carried away by his jealousy and ambition”).


The account of the story in Fab. 24.1–4 should perhaps be read in light of this too. That his son is chosen as consul is described as part of a list of examples of how the Romans honored Fabius. Xenophontos (2012c) 176–177, however, reads the episode of Fab. 24 in an entirely positive way.
writes that Fabius could not master his φιλοτιμία anymore and committed horrible actions because of this (Fab. 22.5). How the author concludes the chapter is especially interesting. After describing that Fabius established a statue of himself in the city, he writes (22.8):

πολὺ Μαρκέλλου φανείς ἀτοπώτερος περὶ ταῦτα, μᾶλλον δ’ ὦλος ἐκείνον ἀνδρὰ πραΰτητι καὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ θαυμαστὸν ἀποδείξας [...].

He thus appeared far more eccentric in these matters than Marcellus, nay rather, the mild and humane conduct of Marcellus was thus made to seem altogether admirable by contrast.

Again, love of honour and mildness are combined (cf. Fabius Maximus V–VII). The contrast with all that precedes stands out: in the previous chapters, Fabius does not care about the scorn and mockery of his fellow Romans, who prefer bold men in war (cf. Fabius Maximus I–III), but in Fab. 22 he tries to become like his opponent: he wants the Roman people to believe that Tarentum was taken in open battle. Blinded by his excessive φιλοτιμία, he even commits atrocities, which clashes with the description of his character in Fab. 20. Because of this, he could indeed not be more different from Marcellus, the man whom he tried to emulate.

b) Scipio Maior (196B–197A)
An entirely different general was Scipio Maior, who defeated Carthage and Hannibal. The section opens in a typical way (196B):

Σκιπίων δὲ ὁ πρεσβύτερος τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν στρατειῶν καὶ τῆς πολιτείας σχολὴν ἐν γράμμασι διατριβὴν ποιούμενος ἔλεγεν, ὁπότε σχολάζοι, πλείονα πράττειν.

Scipio the Elder used to spend on literature all the leisure he could win from his military and political duties, and he used to say that he was busiest whenever he had nothing to do.

This not only depicts the Roman as a philosopher, but also announces the remainder of the section. In the first seven apophthegms (in fact six, as will become clear) that follow (196B–E), Scipio is leading the Roman army in foreign countries (cf. στρατεία); in the final two (196E–197A), one reads about his public appearance in Rome (cf. πολιτεία).

716 See also Stadter (1975) 84 and Nikolaidis (2012) 37–39 on this horrible act of φιλοτιμία in Fab. 22.
717 Note also a contrast with Dionysius Maior IX (176A: σχολάζω), definitely not a philosophical character.
Scipio’s successful στρατείαι

This first block is ordered chronologically, with two exceptions. First, Scipio Maior II already refers to the defeat of Carthage (196B), although this event is yet to be dealt with in VI (196D), and will there be described in similar words. Its general applicability explains why the story is placed almost at the outset of the section: when soldiers bring a beautiful girl to Scipio, he answers that he cannot accept her, for he is a commander (196B). This claim can be seen as a kind of second opening story: it provides the background against which the first series of apophthegms is to be read, viz. Scipio’s command and a difference between a general and his soldiers (στρατείαι) – an important theme in the Greek sections as well. There is also a structural reason that explains why II is in fact well placed: II and VI, creating a ring composition, surround three apophthegms that all deal with the Second Punic War (196B–D).

These apophthegms illustrate that Scipio has a great deal of confidence in his own stratagems and troops. And rightfully so: all sayings are followed by a description of his success. In this context, the opening words of V are of particular interest. They illustrate the quickness and ease with which the talented general defeats the Carthaginians (196C):

Ἐπεὶ δὲ διάρας τῆς τε γῆς ἐκράτει καὶ τὰ στρατόπεδα τῶν πολεμίων κατέκαυσεν, οἱ δὲ Καρχηδόνιοι πέμψαντες ἐποιοῦντο συνθήκας [...].

When he had crossed over, and was master of the land, and had burned the enemy’s camps, the Carthaginians sent to him and made a treaty of peace [...].

Carthage is no real match for the Roman general. This is why the enemies want to negotiate, but they soon regret this after Hannibal’s arrival. Scipio says that he does not intend to adhere to the treaty because the enemies sent for their general, and the first words of VI again show that he made the right decision: Carthage is suddenly totally defeated (196D). Scipio now knows that he can make his demands, saying that he will not listen to the negotiators (cf. V) before Lucius Terentius is freed. The enemy complies. VII, a second chronological deviation, describes Terentius’ gratitude (196E):

Ὁ δὲ Τερέντιος ἐπηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ θριαμβεύοντι πιλίον ἐχών ὡσπερ ἀπελευθέρως· ἀποθανόντος δὲ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκφορὰν παραγενομένοις ἐνέχει πίνειν οἰνόμελι καὶ τὰ ἄλλα περὶ τὴν ταφὴν ἐφιλοτιμήθη. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὡσπερ ὁστερον.

Terentius marched behind him in the triumphal procession, wearing a felt cap just like an emancipated slave. And when Scipio died, Ter-
entius provided wine with honey for all who attended the funeral to drink their fill, and did everything else connected with his burial on a grand scale. But this, of course, was later.

The final four words often recur in the *Parallel Lives* to conclude a digression that breaks the chronology.\(^{718}\) In *Scipio Maior* VII, however, they aroused suspicion: scholars sceptical of the collection’s authenticity have argued that an inattentive forger, using Plutarch’s extant works when composing *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*, borrowed them from the *Life of Scipio Maior*, now lost.\(^{719}\) Yet the phrase fits equally well in the context of the section: VI and VII are in fact one apophthegm, as VII obviously only describes a consequence of VI (a very similar case can even be found in *Flamininus* II, 197B). The death of Scipio mentioned in *Scipio Maior* VII naturally called for the addition of ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὠν ὑστερον, as one would expect a reference to his death at the end of the section. In other words, the use of the phrase is unsurprising: it is readily motivated by the author’s practice of adding an account of the aftermath to an apophthegm, which in this specific case entails a strong deviation from the general chronological structure.\(^{720}\)

Thus, *Scipio Maior* II–VII (196B–E) are all related to each other by a chain of thematic similarities. Verbal closeness between these stories further enhances this (note the gradual shifting and the ring composition).\(^{721}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Scipio Maior</em> II (196B)</th>
<th>Ἐπεὶ δὲ Καρχηδόνα κατὰ κράτος εἶλε</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Scipio Maior</em> III (196B)</td>
<td>ὡς (sc. πόλιν) ὑπερεφαίνετο ναὸς Ἀφροδίτης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Scipio Maior</em> IV (196C)</td>
<td>πύργον ὑψηλὸν ὑπὲρ θαλάττης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τὸν στόλον</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{719}\) Hartman (1916) 116 adduces ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὠν ὑστερον as one of his main arguments against authenticity, see supra, note 105. Babbitt (1931) 4 writes: “anyone enthusiastic in supporting the genuineness of the *Sayings* might equally well suggest that this was an observation of some copyist, put down as a marginal note, which has crept into the text”; see also Saß (1881) 6.

\(^{720}\) Paragraph taken from van der Wiel (2023a) 14–15 (with some adaptations).

\(^{721}\) In the case of the connection στόλον in *Scipio Maior* IV – διάρας in V, see LSJ, s.v. “διαίρω”: “III. intr. (sc. ἑαυτόν, etc.), lift oneself over, cross, τὸ πέλαγος”. Some manuscripts read διαβάς, see Nachstädt (1971) 75.
Although VIII takes place in an entirely different setting – suddenly, the Romans have crossed another sea in order to fight Antiochus the Great – it still belongs to this first series of apophthegms. The enemy again asks to negotiate, but Scipio refuses (196E). Only this time, the saying is not followed by the outcome of the events, but this is not necessary: from Scipio Maior III on, the readers have read that every utterance of the general was followed by his successes. This image of Scipio as a good judge of his own abilities and of the value of his soldiers ensures that they can now fill in the following events themselves.

Scipio’s questionable πολιτεία

Plutarch is now able to shift towards another theme: Scipio’s time back in Rome, after his victories. When he is opposed by the treasurers in his penultimate apophthegm (196EF), and is accused by Petillius and Quintus in Scipio Maior X (196F–197A), he twice praises himself for his military exploits in order to defeat his opponents. Yet especially in the first, his haughty behaviour is somewhat questionable: the Senate decides that Scipio will receive money from the treasury, but the quaestores refuse to open it that day. Apparently, Scipio does not want to wait, and threatens to open it himself. One might argue that if a general is to be respected in military affairs (cf. II on the difference between generals and soldiers), the same goes for quaestores in terms of monetary matters. Despite its wit, then, this apophthegm does not seem to contribute to the positive image of the Roman, who no longer knows his place after his great actions as a commander.

c) Comparison

Fabius Maximus (195C–196A) and Scipio Maior (196B–197A) present two entirely different tactics in the same war. Although the virtues of the idealized Republic still shimmer in the background, as the Romans assess their commanders in terms of their boldness, the successes of Fabius Maximus’ tactics and the disasters brought by the opposite strategy

---

722 Of this section only Scipio Maior X occurs elsewhere in Plutarch: in De se ipsum laud. 540F, Scipio’s appropriate self-praise is contrasted with Cicero’s boasting; in Ca. Ma. 15.1–2, Plutarch writes that Cato instigated the prosecution. A similar story occurs at the end of Epameinondas (192C–194C); see infra, p. 243.

723 Caes. 35 and Caesar VIII (206C) tell a similar story about Caesar.
show that adhering to such ideals might not always be the right course. Yet Scipio Maior, representing an offensive approach, in turn highlights that Fabius’ way is not always the correct one either. A comparison of the two sections, then, leaves doubt as to which strategy is to be preferred. This lack of clarity seems intentional: a good general knows which tactics are to be applied at which moment. If this is the message Plutarch indeed wanted to convey, this might explain why Marcellus is left out from Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata as a separate section: Scipio shows the proficiency of his tactics, while Marcellus’ course only fits within this framework as a negative example (in the collection).\textsuperscript{724} This is why he was destined to play only a minor role in Fabius Maximus III (195DE),\textsuperscript{725} as is in line with the absence of Poseidonius’ saying in the Life of Marcellus (9.4), describing Fabius as Rome’s shield and Marcellus as her sword.\textsuperscript{726}

5.1.3 Titus Quintius Flamininus (197A–D)

The apotthegms of this section are arranged differently from the Life, in order to create (at least the impression of) a chronological organization.\textsuperscript{727} Flamininus I should be split up.\textsuperscript{728} Its first part (Τίτος Κοΐντιος … αἱρεθῆναι) again contains an observation about the subject’s entire life, summarizing his cursus honorum (197A). The next two apotthegms concern the war against Philip and the liberation of Greece. Flamininus Ib (πεμφθεὶς δὲ … συγγενεῖς) depicts the enemy king as a true tyrant, who killed his friends and family (197A); II deals with the period after Phil-

\textsuperscript{724} From Fab. 25 until the end of the Life, Plutarch focuses on Scipio’s successes over Hannibal. Fabius opposes him (cf. supra, p. 221–223 on his φιλοτιμία; see also Xenophonos (2012c) 177–179).

\textsuperscript{725} Cf. Georgiadou (1992a) 4232 on Fab., although Marcellus is only a negative exemplum in the collection, while Scipio Maior here embodies the exemplum to be followed: “Fabius’ sagacity and excessive care in planning to avoid losses, which was often censured as cowardly inactivity, sufficed only for the defensive; Marcellus’ boldness and activity was adequate for the offensive. The mixture of both virtues could only be effective in the military policy towards the Carthaginian army in Italy.”

\textsuperscript{726} I am grateful to Professor Christopher Pelling for this suggestion.

\textsuperscript{727} Schrott (2014a) and (2014b) provides a detailed commentary of Phil.–Flam. in two volumes. Parallels with Reg. et imp. apophth. are indicated briefly passim.

\textsuperscript{728} As van der Wiel (2023a) 8–9 points out, a second apotthegm starts from πεμφθεὶς δὲ στρατηγός on (note the particle). The first part occurs in Flam. 2.1–2 (focusing on Flamininus’ φιλοτιμία); the second in 17.5, as part of a series of apotthegms. Flamininus Ib contains a detail absent from the Life: (197A): τοῦ δὲ Φιλίππου λαβεῖν ὄμηρους ἀξιοῦντος (“Philip insisted that he ought to receive some Romans as a guarantee of his safety”).
ip’s defeat and builds on this image: Titus proclaims the freedom of the Greeks, an obvious contrast with the theme of despotism in Ib. Some Romans who were captured during the Second Punic War and were set free by the Greeks out of gratitude follow Titus in his triumph, dressed as emancipated slaves (197B). In the next amusing apophthegms, Titus not only appears as a liberator of the Greeks, but also points out how they can retain their freedom. He seems to behave as their general.

Compared to the previous sections, Flamininus instead shows an empty shell of a character. Although he appears to be a talented commander, there is not much more to say about his personality: he is a liberator and makes some witty remarks. Because the moral relevance of the section is not immediately clear, its main goal might exist at a higher level of the text: there is still its importance for an interpretation of the collection as an abbreviated world history, as the section reflects Rome’s military influence in Greece. But there is more in this regard. After opening the collection with despots and tyrants who conquered or ruled the world,

729 This part of the apophthegm is told at length in Flam. 10.
730 As is told in Flam. 13.5–9. The apophthegm recalls Scipio Maior VI and its aftermath described in Scipio Maior VII (196DE), encouraging these stories to be taken together, see van der Wiel (2023a) 15.
731 On liberation in Phil.–Flam., see Pelling (1989) 208–216. Of course, Greek freedom did not last. As Pelling (2012) 61 writes, “in 196 BCE Corinth witnessed that proclamation of freedom, yet exactly fifty years later Corinth met her end, destroyed ruthlessly by a Roman proconsul of a different stamp.”
732 In Flamininus III, the Roman asks the Achaeans not to fight outside of their region (197B). The apophthegm is told before the account of Flamininus Ib in Flam., as part of the same list of apophthegms (17.4). In Flamininus IV, Antiochus is on his way to the Achaeans in order to attack them, and the Roman encourages them (197C). This is the final apophthegm in Flam. 17. Flamininus’ dinner described in Flamininus IV contains an additional detail (the precise place where it took place: Chalcis; cf. Livius, Ab urbe condita, XXXV.49). In Flamininus V, the Roman jokes about Philopoemen, the Achaean general who has enough troops (this connects VI with V), but lacks riches (197CD): ‘χεῖρας ἔχει Φιλοποίην καὶ σκέλη, γαστέρα δ’ οὐκ ἔχει’ (“Philopoemen had arms and legs but no belly”). The saying is therefore told after another witty apophthegm about Philopoemen’s looks in Phil. 2.6.
733 The Life explores more aspects of Flamininus’ character, e.g. his φιλοτιμία in particular; see Pelling (1986) 84–85 and (1989) 208–210; Roskam (2011) 208; Nikolaidis (2012) 34–39; and Pelling (2012) 60–62. There is not much of this in the section, perhaps except for the closing apophthegm in which Flamininus jokes about Philopoemen’s lack of means, hereby emphasizing his own power as set out in the preceding apophthegms (see Nikolaidis (2012) 36–37 on this jealousy as a feature of Flamininus’ love of honour). On Flamininus as a true Greek in Flam. 5.6–7, see Martin (1961b) 167–168 (focusing on his φιλανθρωπία).
closing it with Romans who subjugate the same regions, explicitly announced by Manius Curius I (194E), might be a dangerous undertaking: it could connect the barbarian despots, Sicilian tyrants, and some base Macedonian monarchs with the Romans. Plutarch wanted to avoid this not only because it could insult Trajan, but also because he did not think about Roman dominion in this way: even though Greece eventually lost its freedom, the Roman authorities are not comparable to the Hellenistic monarchs, nor did Plutarch consider the Romans to be barbarians. This is why he shows how the Roman Republic fights for its own freedom, and even for the freedom of others. In short, Rome is presented as a liberating rather than as a subjugating force in the Republican sections, and this comes especially to the fore in Flamininus.

5.1.4 A General’s Experience: Three Sections (197D–198D)

Gaius Domitius (197DE, one apopthegm), Publius Licinius (197EF, one ap.), and Paulus Aemilius (197F–198D, nine ap.) also focus on generalship, more specifically on a general’s experience. Gaius Domitius fights Antiochus again (cf. Flamininus IV, 197C). When many advise him to attack immediately, he refuses and waits until the following day, on which a great victory takes place. In Publius Licinius, by contrast, the protagonist is less successful: Perseus triumphs and many Romans are killed. These sections provide the background against which Paulus Aemilius will be read.

Paulus Aemilius I (197F) is directly connected with Publius Licinius: Aemilius is appointed consul in order to defeat the same Perseus (LCL) “because of the inexperience and effeminacy of the generals” (ἀπειρίᾳ καὶ μαλακίᾳ τῶν στρατηγῶν). This sheds a negative light on the previous section and explains why its subject was vanquished, even though...

---

734 See chapter 2.3 on Plutarch’s division of mankind.

735 The manuscripts read Γάιος (see Nachstädt (1971) 78), but the story probably concerns Gnaeus Domitius Ahenobarbus, who was consul in 192 BC, see Babbitt (1931) 170–171.

736 The contrast is enhanced by the fact that Plutarch gives the total number of fallen enemies in Gaius Domitius (197E: πεντακισμυρίους τῶν πολεμίων) and of fallen Romans in Publius Licinius (197E: δισχιλίους ὀκτακοσίους). Publius Licinius’ failure is mentioned in Aem. 9.3 (this parallel is not listed by Nachstädt (1971) 78 and Babbitt (1931) 172–173).

737 The first part of the apopthegm (on Aemilius’ failed election) is told in Aem. 6.8; the second part (on the ἀπειρία of the generals) in Aem. 9 (where Publius Licinius is mentioned, see the note above); Aemilius’ successful election is mentioned in Aem. 10.1–5, and his saying occurs in Aem. 11.1–2 as part of a more lengthy speech (see Liedmeier (1935) 136–140 for a comparison of this speech in Plutarch, Polybius, and Livy).
he is not explicitly named. The next apophthegms, by contrast, deal with Aemilius’ successes in this war. They are structured chronologically. II is a witty story: when his daughter’s dog dies, Aemilius speaks of good fortune (198A: ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ), as the pet was called Perseus (197F–198A). The entire section, however, will from now on focus on the general’s experience (ἐμπειρία, in line with Paulus Aemilius I and contrasting with Publius Licinius again). The influence of τύχη, picked up only at the end of the section, will therefore be questioned.

Paulus Aemilius III reminds one of various other stories in the collection. When soldiers speak boldly about strategies, Aemilius orders them to remain silent, for he is the commander (198A). His insights as a general and a reference to arms connect this with the following apophthegm, where guards at night are not allowed to carry weapons, in order that they will not fall asleep (198A). V (198AB), finally, recalls Gaius Domitius, just as much in terms of its content as by verbal similarities. Both subjects are therefore depicted as generals with a similar profile: when Nasica asks to attack immediately, Aemilius refuses by referring to his experience (198B: πολλαί με πεῖραι κωλύουσι). This is connected with VI: after Perseus is vanquished, the general is preparing a party, saying (198B)

τῆς αὐτῆς ἐμπειρίας εἶναι στράτευμα φοβερότατον πολεμίοις καὶ συμπόσιον ἥδιστον φίλοις παρασχεῖν.

that it was a part of the same proficiency to provide an army most terrifying to an enemy and a party most agreeable to friends.

738 As appears from Aem. 10.5–8, this event immediately followed his election described in Paulus Aemilius I (197F). Perhaps this is how Ἐλθὼν δ’ εἰς οἶκον ἐξ ἀγορᾶς at the outset of Paulus Aemilius II (197F–198A) is to be read too.

739 The account of Aem. 13.6 focuses on the impatience in the army; Paulus Aemilius III focuses on boldness (198A: θρασύτητα, absent from the Life).

740 The story is told after Paulus Aemilius III in the Life too (Aem. 13.7, in similar wording).


742 The saying of the account in Aem. 17.1–5 does not contain “πεῖραι”, but “αἱ δὲ πολλαί με νῖκαι διδάσκουσι” (17.4). This (probable) adaptation establishes verbal connections in the collection.

743 Also told in Aem. 28.9 and Quaest. conv. 615E. The saying concerns his precision, as these accounts point out. Again (cf. the note above), ἐμπειρία only occurs in the collection, establishing connections with other stories.
In line with this, VII and VIII deal with Aemilius’ triumph. The closing apopthegm IX is related to VII and VIII by referring to this same triumph, and to VIII through the theme of family. This, and the reference to τύχη, also takes the reader back to II, creating a ring composition. When two of his sons die in the days of the triumph, he says (198CD)

\[\text{περὶ τῆς πατρίδος ἀδεὴς γεγονέναι καὶ ἀκίνδυνος, ὁπότε τῶν εὐτυχισμάτων τὴν νέμεσιν εἰς τὸν οἶκον ἀπερεισαμένης τῆς τύχης ὑπὲρ πάντων αὐτὸς ἀναδέδεκται.}\]

he had no fears or misgivings about his country, since Fortune had thrust upon his house the retribution due for all their good fortune, and he had received this in behalf of all.

The theme of Aemilius’ τύχη in the section (II and VII), then, is somewhat contradicted by the apopthegms it frames, which all highlight his military insights and experiences. The main reason why he was successful, then, is not (just) his fortune, but especially his talent. This also appears from a joint reading with the two preceding sections: as stated, Paulus Aemilius V, placed at the core of its section (preceded and followed by four apopthegms) and thereby again receiving full emphasis, is closely connected with Gaius Domitius. Both highlight that the experienced general should adhere to his plans, for he has a better understanding of war tactics. Publius Licinius, placed in between the two sections, offers a strong contrast: he is referred to as an inexperienced commander by Paulus Aemilius I, and the calamity he brought Rome can therefore not be defined as a matter of “bad luck” alone. Thus, in line with other sections that dealt with good generalship, a comparison of these three Romans highlights that the military successes of a country often depends on one
person, and that it is important to have the right man in the right place (cf. for example the Theban sections, 192C–194E).

5.1.5 Cato Maior (198D–199E)

With its 26 apophthegms, this is one of the longest sections of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*. This is not surprising, since many sayings attributed to Cato Maior circulated. Due to the amount of material, *Cato Maior* seems somewhat chaotic at first reading, but at a closer look it displays, in fact, a well-thought-out structure that should lead the readers to insights into this character.

*Deteriorated Romans*

The first apophthegms situate *Cato Maior* in the context of Roman history by recalling the first Roman in the collection. *Manius Curius* (194EF) described the core virtues of the early Republic: frugality and, connected with this, eagerness to work the land. *Cato Maior* I and II, in fact one apophthegm, now contrast later Rome with this image: Cato disapproves of the prodigality and great expenses in the city of his days and is amazed that an ox (cf. agriculture) is less expensive than fish (198D). *Cato Maior* III also contains criticism of his contemporaries, reminding one of *Manius Curius* II (194EF), which alluded to the Roman conquests. It reflects an additional change, for Rome has now become a major power (198D).

*Λοιδορῶν δὲ ποτε τὴν ἐπιπολάζουσαν γυναικοκρατίαν ἑπεν τούς γυναικῶν ἄρχουσιν, ἡμεῖς δὲ πάνω ἀνθρώπων, ήμῶν δὲ αἱ γυναῖκες.*

---

746 On apophthegmata collections as sources for *Ca. Ma.*, see Pasco-Pranger (2015) 302n18; and Appendix II.2.

747 In both *Cato Maior* I and II, Cato’s criticism of the profligacy of the Romans concerns food (198D): ’χαλεπόν ἐστι λέγειν πρὸς γαστέρα ὦτα μὴ ἔχουσαν’ (“it was hard to talk to a belly which has no ears”). This is different from other accounts: (1) *Ca. Ma.* 8.1–2 presents both sayings as two different apophthegms; (2) *De tuenda* 131E and *De esu* 996E only contain the first part; (3) *Quaest. conv.* 668B only the second. *Cato Maior* I and II, however, are presented as one whole in the collection: they are introduced by the same verb, and the context of the second saying in the *Life* and in *Quaest. conv.* 668B (Cato criticizes the extravagance of the Roman people) becomes the context of both sayings in *Reg. et imp. apophth.* (cf. πολυτέλεια, which appears in *Quaest. conv.* and in the *Life* only in the account of *Cato Maior* II, but is part of the introduction of both apophthegms in the collection). See also Vicente Sánchez (2008). Note from van der Wiel (2023a) 9–10n29 (adapted).

748 This is close to *Themistocles* X (185D), as Plutarch recognizes in *Ca. Ma.* 8.4; see also supra, note 516.
In bitter criticism of the prevalent domination of women, he said, “All mankind rules its women, and we rule all mankind, but our women rule us.”

*Cato Maior* thus opens in a way similar to the *Life. Ca. Ma. 2* describes that Cato lived in the vicinity of the former residence of Manius Curius, where, as Plutarch writes, the story of *Manius Curius II* (194EF) took place. This influenced Cato: Manius Curius became his role model and, until the end of his life, Cato defended Rome, no longer the small and frugal city of old, from excesses and effeminacy. This will also be illustrated by his final apophthegms (XX–XXIX, 199A–E), but first Plutarch includes a series of sayings (IV–XIX, 198D–199A) that are not related to a specific moment. As expected, the general nature of these apophthegms is highlighted by the overall use of the imperfect tense, while the aorist dominates in the surrounding stories (I–III and XX–XXIX). This invites a comparison of the two parts: the image of Cato based on his principles described in his general wise sayings provides the framework within which one will evaluate his specific measures aiming to improve the Roman people.

**Cato's sententiae**

In this part of the section, various themes are addressed in different small blocks. IV introduces a first group of general sayings that deal with making mistakes (198D):  

"Εφη δὲ βούλεσθαι μᾶλλον εὐεργετήσας μὴ κομίσασθαι χάριν ἢ μὴ ὑποσχεῖν κόλασιν ἀδικήσας, καὶ πᾶσιν ἀεὶ τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσι χωρίς ἑαυτοῦ διδόναι συγγνώμην.

He said that he preferred to receive no thanks when he had done a favour rather than to suffer no punishment when he had done a wrong, and that he always granted pardon to all who erred, with the single exception of himself.

---


750 Told in *Ca. Ma.* 8.16–17, closing a list of apophthegms.
His forgiveness will appear most important later in the section, but in what immediately follows, this saying is first adjusted:

[1] As appears from V, Cato does not mean that leaders should not censure those who do wrong (198E: τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσιν, cf. IV). VI and VII, again one unit, provide further information on this matter. The Roman mentions what he likes and dislikes about young men and soldiers (198E).\(^{751}\) As it concerns good and bad behaviour of others, it should be interpreted in line with the previous apophthegm and the second part of IV: Cato suggests what is to be recommended or rebuked.

[2] The next apophthegm deals with good behaviour of rulers, recalling Cato’s unmerciful attitude towards himself in the first part of IV: leaders should always be able to master themselves (VIII, 198E).

In line with this, IX–XI (198EF) discuss self-respect and honour.\(^{752}\) XII (198F) deals with honour and virtue. In this way, it is well placed in between IX–XI and XIII–XV (198F–199A), on justice and wrongdoing.\(^{753}\) Connections between Cato’s final general sayings are less obvious. XVI and XVII belong together and deal with moderation (199A).\(^{754}\) XVIII and XIX might be connected by the theme of reputation (199A). All of these sayings, reflecting deep insights, depict the image of Cato as a wise man: he knows how rulers should behave, what their subjects should do, and what the relationship between the two groups should look like. One concludes that he is the right person to guide the Romans. This picture will be confirmed, but also partially deconstructed, by the next part of the section.

---

\(^{751}\) See van der Wiel (2023a) 9–10 on Cato Maior VI and VII as one apophthegm, where I point out in note 30 that VI is told on its own in the Moralia (De aud. poet. 29E and De vit. pud. 528F), while Ca. Ma. 9.5 has VI and VII as one unit (χαίρειν – μισεῖν in the collection connects both sayings even more closely than the Life).

\(^{752}\) Cato Maior IX contains a more general saying (one should always honour oneself, 198E), but X is more specific, for Cato does not complain that there are no statues of him (198EF), whereas XI is again more general (suggesting how one can avoid losing one’s ἐξουσία, 198F, which has to do with honour too). X (198EF) also occurs in Ca. Ma. 19.6 and in Praec. ger. reip. 820B, where Plutarch adds that statues can make people envious. Both passages focus on the impact of praise on the public interest. The context of all the accounts varies: in the Life, the Romans set up a statue of Cato, after which Plutarch inserts this apophthegm, which took place earlier; in the treatise, Cato forbids the Romans to make statues of him; in the collection, Cato sees many statues being erected.

\(^{753}\) Cato Maior XV (199A) occurs in Ca. Ma. 9.10 (in a list of apophthegms), An seni 784A, and De vit. aer. 829F.

\(^{754}\) See van der Wiel (2023a) 10.
Cato the educator

Cato Maior XX is a transitional apophthegm: it deals with Cato’s general attitude and contains a saying related to a specific event (199AB):

Ἐπετίμα δὲ τοῖς πολίταις ἀεὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς αἱρουμένους ἄρχοντας. Ἐπετίμα δὲ τοῖς πολίταις ἀεὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς αἱρουμένους ἄρχοντας. Ἐπετίμα δὲ τοῖς πολίταις ἀεὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς αἱρουμένους ἄρχοντας. Ἐπετίμα δὲ τοῖς πολίταις ἀεὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς αἱρουμένους ἄρχοντας. Ἐπετίμα δὲ τοῖς πολίταις ἀεὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς αἱρουμένους ἄρχοντας.

He used to rebuke the citizens for electing always the same men to office. “For,” said he, “you will give the impression that you hold office to be of no great worth, or else that you hold not many men to be worthy of office.”

The relevance of Cato Maior XXI (199B) is less clear and seems a bit out of place, since XXII (199B) takes up the theme of elections. In the second apophthegm, Cato wants to be appointed censor. He presents himself as a doctor, which reminds one of I–III (198D) showing the people in need of a cure. This image of a leader as an educator also repeats themes from Manius Curius (194EF), where the Roman of old attempted to improve his subjects. Yet most strikingly, Cato calls himself ἀπαραίτητος in Cato Maior XXII. Lack of mercy contrasts with the theme of forgiveness of IV (198DE), but this is not immediately thematized: first, XXIII (199BC) illustrates that Cato sticks to the principles described in VII (198E), as both apophthegms refer to fighting and the importance of one’s voice in battle. Thus, as XXIII concerns good soldiers, it is

---

755 Cato Maior XX and XXI occur in Ca. Ma. 8.8–9 and 8.11 respectively (8 also includes Cato Maior I–III, see supra, note 747 and 748).

756 For a lengthy account of the story, see Ca. Ma. 16.4–8. There are some differences: (1) (16.6) ἥξιον τοὺς πολλοὺς εἰ σωφρονοῦσι μὴ τὸν ἥδιστον, ἀλλὰ τὸν σφοδρότατον αἱρεῖσθαι τῶν ἰατρῶν (“He adjured the people, if they were wise, not to choose the most agreeable physician, but the one who was most in earnest”), adding that he and Valerius Flaccus were such men; (2) Cato does not call himself harsh, but this is how his opponents refer to him, in connection with his adherence to the ancestral customs (16.4): οἱ δὲ μοχθηρὰ συνειδότες ἑαυτοῖς ἐπιτηδεύματα καὶ τῶν πατρίων ἐκδιαίτησιν ἐθῶν ἐφοβοῦντο τὴν αὐστηρίαν τοῦ ἀνδρός, ἀπαραίτητον ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ χαλεπὴν ἐσομένην (“those who were conscious of base practices and of a departure from ancestral customs, feared the severity of the man, which was sure to be harsh and inexorable in the exercise of power”). Plutarch probably changed the saying in the collection in order to focus more on the image of Cato as an ἀπαραίτητος.

757 Cato Maior XXIII is told in Ca. Ma. 1.8 as part of his earliest campaigns. In the collection, however, Plutarch presents the story as belonging to Cato’s later years as a commander, teaching young people (199B: Διδάσκων δὲ τοὺς νέους). The apophthegm is also referred to in Cor. 8.3: Coriolanus had a strong voice and physical strength.
also connected with XXIV–XXVII (199CD), which deal with riches acquired in the same war. In the first apophthegm, the Celtiberians are mobilized in exchange for spoils they will receive after defeating the opponents (199C); the next apophthegm follows this victory: Cato is not attracted to the enemy’s riches (199CD). In XXVI, the Roman enriches his soldiers with a modest sum and argues that governors are not allowed to become wealthier through their position (199D). Thus, he tries to make both rulers and subjects frugal, and adheres to this himself.

This emphasizes that Cato practised what he preached with regard to the correct behaviour of statesmen, generals, and soldiers in IV–XIX. This suggests that he truly wanted to restore the values of the early Republic: he appears as a genuine physician and educator of the people. Yet this is followed by Cato Maior XXVII (199D):

Πέντε δ’ οἰκέτας εἶχεν ἐπὶ τῆς στρατείας, ὅν εἰς αἰχμάλωτον τρία σώματα πριάμενος, ὡς οὐκ ἔλαθε τὸν Κάτωνα, πρὶν εἰς ὅψιν ἐλθεῖν, ἀπήγξατο.

He had five persons to wait upon him in the campaign, one of whom bought three of the captives. But when he discovered that Cato knew of it, he did not wait to come before his master, but hanged himself.

This refers back to the image of an ἀπαραίτητος Cato, as described in XXII (199B): although Cato claimed to be forgiving in IV (198DE), XXVII describes that his servant did not even dare to face him after making a mistake. That the aftermath of the story, Cato’s own reaction (which one would of course expect in an apophthegm on the man), is left out, highlights that the fear of his οἰκέτης is the true focus of the anecdote as told in the collection. XXII and XXVII thus surround stories that are entirely in line with the image of Cato’s general sayings (XXIII–XXVI),

758 All these apophthegms concern the war in Hispania Citerior and occur in Ca. Ma. 10: Cato Maior XXIV (199C) in Ca. Ma. 10.1–2, XXV and XXVI (199CD) in 10.3–5, XXVII (199D) in 10.6.

759 In Ca. Ma. 10.5, this is followed by an additional saying left out of the collection, probably because it shows a less inexorable Cato.

760 Cato Maior XXV (199CD) and XXVI (199D) are organized differently in the Life: the first part of Cato Maior XXV (199CD: Πλείονας δὲ πόλεις ... ἐν τοῖς πολεμίοις) is told in Ca. Ma. 10.3, the second part (199D: οὐδὲν αὐτός ... ἐκ τῆς πολεμίας) in Ca. Ma. 10.4, while the first part of Cato Maior XXVI is placed in between the two parts (the first phrase of Ca. Ma. 10.4; something similar to its second part occurs in Ca. Ma. 10.6).

761 Ca. Ma. 10.6, on the contrary, describes Cato’s reaction: τοὺς δὲ παῖδας ὁ Κάτων ἀποδόμενος, εἰς τὸ δημόσιον ἀνήνεγκε τὴν τιμήν (“Cato sold the boys, and restored the money to the public treasury”).
but they contradict Cato’s mildness described in this sententiae part. In this way, the image of IV–XIX (198D–199A), which justify his right to rule and to educate his subjects, is problematized by his final apophthegms. As a consequence, the reader is invited to wonder whether the apparently unforgiving Roman is not too principled. This is in line with the final two witty apophthegms, which similarly show a harsh Cato. In both stories, Greeks appear on the stage: in XXVIII, the Roman does not want to help some Greeks (199DE); \(^{762}\) in his final apophthegm, he mocks Postumius Albinus, who asked for lenience from his audience after writing a text in Greek (199E; note the verbal connection with IV, 198DE). \(^{763}\)

\[\text{δοτέον εἶναι συγγνώμην, εἰ τῶν Ἀμφικτυόνων ψηφισμένων ἀναγκασθεῖς ἔγραψε.}\]

he ought to be granted indulgence if he had written the book under compulsion by a decree of the Ampictyonic Council!

The humour mitigates the image after the switch in Cato Maior XXVII (199D). Cato’s willingness to defend his country from foreign influences is still in line with his defence of the Republican values. Yet his rejection of anything Greek in these final apophthegms again illustrates that Cato actually is too conservative. \(^{764}\) A ruler should have his principles, but an insight into practical reality is equally essential. This is something Cato lacks: he wants to restore the early Republic, but since society has changed and Rome has conquered much (cf. Cato Maior III, 198D), it is impossible and perhaps even undesirable to imitate the Romans of old in all respects. In conclusion: a certain degree of leniency and indulgence is a necessary characteristic of the good statesman. Cato knew this well, as Cato Maior IV suggests, yet in this regard alone, he did not turn his words into deeds.

5.1.6 Scipio Minor (199F–201F)

This section is even longer than Cato Maior, not because of the total amount of its apophthegms (it comprises 22), but because of their un-

\(^{762}\) Told in Ca. Ma. 9.2.

\(^{763}\) The story occurs in Ca. Ma. 12.6, introduced as follows (12.5): δι’ ἑρμηνέως ἐνέτυχε τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, δυνηθεὶς ἂν αὐτὸς εἰπεῖν, ἐμμένων δὲ τοῖς πατρίοις καὶ καταγελῶν τῶν τὰ Ἑλληνικὰ τεθαυμακότων (“[H]e dealt with the Athenians through an interpreter. He could have spoken to them directly, but he always clung to his native ways, and mocked at those who were lost in admiration of anything that was Greek”).

usual length. The opening stories are also remarkable: unlike many other sections, which start with only one general remark, *Scipio Minor* commences with four apophthegms that do not contain a saying of the Roman. This suggests a close relationship between the section and the lost *Life of Scipio Minor*.

*Scipio against the Carthaginians; Scipio as a politician*

The main topic of the first block consists of Scipio’s military exploits in the Punic War, but some apophthegms deal with Roman politics. Both themes are announced at the outset:

[1] *Scipio Minor* I both recalls and contrasts with *Cato Maior*: after a description of his frugality and self-control (similar to Cato), Plutarch adds that of all generals Scipio enriched his soldiers most (unlike Cato) after defeating Carthage (199F). Such a general claim, describing the entire life of the Roman (199F: ἔτεσι πεντήκοντα καὶ τέτταρσιν, οἷς ἔβιωσε), is a typical opening.

[2] This is followed by another general saying about Scipio Minor. There seems to be no connection with *Scipio Minor* I (199F): 766

He observed the precept of Polybius, and tried never to leave the Forum before he had in some way made an acquaintance and friend of somebody among those who spoke with him.

A comparison with *Quaestiones convivales*, where this quote opens the fourth book (659EF), shows that Plutarch changed Polybius’ saying in *Scipio Minor* II: ἀπελθεῖν is followed there only by ἢ φίλον τινα συνήθη καὶ φίλον ἁμωσγέπως τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων.

He observed the precept of Polybius, and tried never to leave the Forum before he had in some way made an acquaintance and friend of anybody among those who spoke with him.

---

765 Esp. *Scipio Minor* VIII (200BC), XIII (200E–201A), XV (201AB), and XVI (201BC).

766 See Dana (1995) 92 on this apophthegm.

767 *Quaest. conv.* 659F: φίλον δὲ δεὶ μὴ πικρῶς μηδὲ σοφιστικῶς ἀκούειν ἐκεῖνον τὸν ἁμετάπτωτον καὶ βέβαιον, ἀλλὰ κοινῶς τὸν εὐνοῦν (“we must not interpret ‘friend’ with pedantic strictness as referring to the celebrated ideal type, immutable and steadfast, but take it in a broader sense as meaning any well-wisher”; see Roskam (2009) 72n5 on this fragment and further relevant passages).
έντυγχανόντων, in order to illustrate that Polybius used φίλος in a more casual meaning.

First, Scipio’s deeds in Carthage are dealt with (cf. *Scipio Minor* I); next, his time in Rome is described (cf. II):

[1] *Scipio Minor* III concerns his earlier years and again refers to Carthage (200A). Cato the Elder, now explicitly mentioned, claims that the young Scipio is the only wise man in the army. Scipio’s military talent and the reference to the enemy city connect this story with the next series of apophthegms on the defeat of Carthage, introduced by IV (200A):

Εἰς δὲ τὴν Ῥώμην ἑλθόντος ἀπὸ στρατείας <εἰς ὑπατείαν> ἐκάλουν αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐκείνῳ χαριζόμενοι, ἀλλ’ ὡς Καρχηδόνα δι’ ἐκείνου ταχὺ καὶ ῥᾴδίως ληψόμενοι.

When he came to Rome from a campaign, the people called him to office, not by way of showing favour to him, but hoping through him to capture Carthage speedily and easily.

Its location after Cato’s quote suggests that the Roman people are influenced by his saying in III. This interpretation is supported by the fact that Plutarch connects *Scipio Minor* III with Scipio’s first consulship in *Praecepta gerendae reipublicae* (804F–805A).768 Additionally, the focus on Scipio’s swiftness recalls the contrast between *Fabius Maximus* and *Scipio Maior* earlier (195C–197A).769 Even though an explicit comparison between the younger and elder Scipio is lacking, it naturally comes to mind: this provides the background against which the military values of Scipio the Younger will be assessed.

That the Romans are right to put all their faith in Scipio is illustrated by the next apophthegm: suddenly, the Roman army has already taken possession of Carthage, with the exception of the fortress. This is why Scipio ignores Polybius, who advises him to use missiles: it would be absurd not to fight the enemy now that they are almost defeated (200AB).770 The contrast with the strategy of Fabius Maximus is obvious. The next two apophthegms describe the sacking of the city and illustrate the truth

768 Cato’s quote also occurs in *Ca. Ma.* 27.6, almost at the end of the *Life*, where Plutarch argues that he instigated the Third Punic War. After this saying, Plutarch connects it with Scipio’s swiftness, again reminding one of the connection between *Scipio Minor* III and IV (*Ca. Ma.* 27.7): ταύτην μὲν οὖν τὴν ἀπόφασιν ταχὺ δι’ ἔργων ἐβεβαίωσεν ὁ Σκιπίων (“This utterance of Cato’s, Scipio speedily confirmed by his deeds”).

769 Note the focus on the elder Scipio’s swiftness in *Scipio Maior* V (196CD).

of *Scipio Minor* I (199F): the Sicilian objects, stolen by the Carthaginians, are sent back to their hometown (VI, 200B) and Scipio does not allow his slaves or liberti to take part in the plundering (VII, 200B).\(^771\) He manages to enrich his soldiers, while his own frugality comes to the fore once more.

\[2\] From *Scipio Minor* VIII on, politics are the new main theme: Scipio helps a friend who presents himself for the consulship (200BC). This recalls II (199F), but the connection with this apophthegm especially emerges in IX (200CD), closely connected with VIII through the theme of enmity in elections. In this story, the Roman is a candidate for the censorship and his saying strongly reminds one of Polybius’ advice on making friends on the Forum in II. When his opponent, Appius Claudius, boasts that he knows all Romans, in contrast to Scipio, the latter answers that he is right (200D),\(^772\)

&lsquo;ἐμοὶ γὰρ οὐκ εἰδέναι πολλούς ἀλλ’ υπὸ μηδενὸς ἀγνοεῖσθαι μεμέληκεν.’

&lsquo;for I have not taken such pains to know many as to be unknown to none.’

*Scipio Minor* X builds on this. Scipio asks to send himself as well as his opponent as legati or tribuni militum\(^773\) in the Celtiberian War, in order to let the soldiers assess the virtues of both (200D). The result of this is described in XI: once more, the Romans put their faith in Scipio, for he is appointed censor (200DE). A witty remark in this apophthegm, in which Scipio seems to abuse his position, contains a final reference to Carthage.\(^774\) There is, then, a certain contrast with XII, describing Scipio’s sense of justice – or at least his adherence to laws (200E). Two apophthegms on his travels follow (200E–201A):\(^775\) these seem to separate the two blocks from each other.

\(^771\) *Scipio Minor* VI (200B): ἀνδριάντων and ἀναθημάτων; VII (200B): χρημάτων. Plutarch refers to VII in *De fortuna* 97D (yet without a reference to his slaves and liberti).

\(^772\) Plutarch refers to this election in *Aem.* 38, which does not contain these sayings.

\(^773\) In line with how Babbitt (1931) 191 translates ἢ πρεσβευτὰς ἢ χιλιάρχους ἢ χιλιάρχους.

\(^774\) In this story, Scipio takes away a young man’s horse. Censors had the power to do this when this person was ἀκόλαστος, as Plutarch describes in *Aem.* 38.8. The young man of *Scipio Minor* XI, however, can hardly be called ἀκόλαστος; Scipio takes his horse because he ordered a cake called “Carthage” which his guests could “spoil” (διαρπάσαι, 200DE), for in this way, he spoiled Carthage before the general did.

\(^775\) At the outset of *Scipio Minor* XIII, a Homeric verse is quoted by Cleitomachus. As Volkmann (1869) 230 writes, the verse is cited by Poseidonius in *Maxime cum principibus* 777A. This might be the correct name (see Babbitt (1931) 191, referring to Athenaeus
Scipio against the Numantians
Gradual shifting dominates once more in Scipio Minor XV–XXI (201A–E). These apophthegms concern a second war fought by Scipio. The beginning of the first apophthegm reminds one of the opening words of V (200AB): again, Scipio is appointed consul in order to defeat the enemy, this time the Numantians. He gives two possible explanations for why the Romans have not yet won the war: either the ἀνδρεία of the enemy, or the ἀνανδρία of the Roman soldiers (201AB). The next apophthegm shows that the second option is the correct one, for when Scipio reached the army, he (201B)

πολλὴν ἀταξίαν καὶ ἀκολασίαν καὶ δεισιδαιμονίαν καὶ τρυφὴν κατέλαβε

found there much disorder, licentiousness, superstition, and luxury to which he put an end by a series of measures (201BC). Yet apparently not all of them listen well: when he finds an expensive item in the luggage of one of the tribuni militum, as Plutarch describes in Scipio Minor XVII, he says (201CD):

ἐμοὶ μέν’ εἶπεν ἡμέρας τριάκοντα καὶ τῇ πατρίδι, σαυτῷ δὲ τὸν βίον ἀπαντᾷ τοιούτος δὲν ἄχρηστον πεποίηκας σεαυτόν.’

"By such conduct you have made yourself useless to me and your country for thirty days, but useless to yourself for your whole lifetime."

Although Scipio enriched his soldiers in the first block, he now seems to prefer the opposite course. This is continued by XVIII, which addresses a somewhat similar situation: to a soldier who is in the possession of a beautiful shield, Scipio says that one should have faith in one’s right hand (201D). The next apophthegm contains a parallel quote, but is no longer related to the theme of riches: a Roman complains that the wood for the palisade weighs a lot, so Scipio remarks that this man trusts the wood more than his weapon (201D). This theme of safety and de-
fence is in turn connected with XX (20ι1DE),\(^778\) which contrasts with V (20ο1AB): surprisingly enough the general now avoids open warfare. This strategy appears successful: the enemy loses the battle. A certain Numantan reacts to the fact that the Romans are suddenly victorious in XXI, which is in fact part of the preceding apophthegm (20ι1E):\(^779\)

\[\text{τὰ πρόβατα ταύτα καὶ νῦν ἔστιν, ὦ δὲ ποιμὴν ἄλλος.}\]

the sheep were still the same sheep, but another man was their shepherd.

This saying, referring back to Scipio Minor XV (20ι1AB) and highlighting its truth and Scipio’s qualities as a general, closes the block about the Numantian War, once more by creating a ring composition. There remain two apophthegms that follow the victory in the Numantian War (see Scipio Minor XXII, 20ι1E: Ἐπεὶ δὲ τὴν Νομαντίαν ἐλών, further extending the chain): Scipio is back in Rome, and is opposed by Gaius Gracchus in both stories. In the closing apophthegm, Scipio’s reaction to a threat of one of Gracchus’ men, who called for the execution of the ‘tyrant’ Scipio (20ι1E), reads as follows (20ι1F):

\[\text{oὐ γὰρ οἷόν τε τὴν Ῥώμην πεσεῖν Σκιπίωνος ἑστῶτος οὐδὲ ζῆν Σκιπίωνα τῆς Ῥώμης πεσούσης.}\]

for it is not possible for Rome to fall while Scipio stands, nor for Scipio to live when Rome has fallen.

This closing apophthegm is related to the next section.

One concludes that Scipio’s strategies in the Carthaginian War strongly differ from his methods in the Numantian War. In the first, Scipio allowed his soldiers to enrich themselves and preferred open warfare; in the second, he prefers the opposite course. This illustrates that he knows the right strategy for any situation. His versatility is to be admired: while Fabius Maximus applied one tactic, and Scipio Maior the other, Scipio Minor is able to apply the right one at the right moment. His qualities as a general are therefore assessed against the background of a joint reading of Fabius Maximus and Scipio Maior (195C–197A), where he appears superior.

\(^778\) Note Scipio Minor XX (20ι1D): τὴν ἀσφάλειαν. See also XX (20ι1D): τοῦ σιδήρου – XIX (20ι1D): τῇ μαχαίρᾳ.

\(^779\) See van der Wiel (2023a) 15. The saying recalls Chabrias III (187D) on the importance of a commander; and the series Gaius Domitius–Paulus Aemilius (197D–198D) on a general’s experience.
Epameinondas and Scipio in the collection

Conclusions about Scipio’s character as depicted in Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata are not only relevant for their own sake, but can also shed light on the question of which Scipio was paired with Epameinondas in the Parallel Lives.\textsuperscript{780} There are various surviving pairs of which both subjects are included in the collection.\textsuperscript{781} Only the Lives of Agesilacus–Pompeius and Alexander–Caesar concern men who have a section of considerable length. Since a comparison of their sections also points out why they are compared with each other in the biographical project,\textsuperscript{782} one might expect something similar in the case of the Lives of Epameinondas and Scipio and their sections in the collection.\textsuperscript{783}

[1] There is only one connection, albeit a remarkable one, between Epameinondas (192C–194C) and Scipio Maior (196B–197A). Epameinondas XXIII (194A–C) and Scipio Maior X (196F–197A) describe how their protagonists are accused of something and defend themselves by referring to their military exploits. This convinces the audience in both cases, for the people do not even vote. Appian’s comparison of these actions of both men might indeed be based on a similar comparison in Plutarch’s Parallel Lives.\textsuperscript{784}

[2] As noticed by Citro, the collection provides various arguments in favour of Scipio Minor.\textsuperscript{785} I would therefore say that the younger Scipio is a more likely candidate indeed, although this is by no means entirely certain. (a) First, this Scipio appears to be one of the most frugal Romans at the outset and at the end of his section (199F–201F). This is, as argued above, in line with the elder Cato’s defence of the early Republican values in the previous section (198D–199E), but it also reminds one of Epameinondas

\textsuperscript{780} As Dana (1995) 91 points out, Scipio Minor must contain much material from the lost Life.


\textsuperscript{782} See esp. infra, p. 267–268 on Agesilaus (190F–191D) and Pompeius (203B–204E) and on Alexander (179D–181F) and Caesar (205E–206F).


\textsuperscript{784} See Babbitt (1931) 150–151: “Appian, Roman History, Syrian Wars, 40–41, compares the action of Epameinondas with the similar action of Scipio Africanus Major (Moralia, 196F); and this suggests the probability that Appian had before him Plutarch’s Parallel Lives of Epameinondas and Scipio, now lost.”

\textsuperscript{785} In a paper presented at the XX Plutarch Network Meeting (10–11 October 2019, Madeira), Serena Citro recognizes various similarities (which she defines as ἐγκράτεια with regard to pleasures) between Epameinondas and Scipio Minor.
Although a similarity with Cato Maior seems to be the focus of Scipio’s earlier apophthegms, where he does not take part in the looting and asks his servants to do the same (Scipio Minor I, 199F), the theme of frugality as it appears in his final apophthegms (Scipio Minor XVI–XVIII, 201A–D) instead reminds one of Epameinondas as emerges from the analysis of his section: as good generals, both Scipio and the Theban realize that wealthy soldiers are of no use, since these do not dare to risk their lives.

(b) A joint reading of Epameinondas (192C–194C) and Pelopidas (194C–E) points out that a general, on the contrary, should not lose his life for the well-being of his country. A similar connection between Scipio’s life and the fortune of Rome is established in Scipio Minor XXIV (201EF). (c) In addition, Epameinondas was probably accused of tyranny at the end of his Life, as can be concluded from Epameinondas XXIII (194A–C). Something similar must have occurred at the end of the Life of Scipio Minor, as the final apophthegm of the section (201EF) quoted above suggests too.786

5.1.7 Caecilius Metellus (201F–202A)

This section contains only three apophthegms.787 In the first one, Metellus rejects the suggestion of a centurion to attack a stronghold, in order to save the lives of his soldiers (201F–202A). In the second, another commander tries to obtain information about Metellus’ plans, who again wisely refuses (202A).788 In line with earlier sections, the image of a most prudent general arises. Yet especially the third apophthegm deserves attention (202A):

Σκιπίωνι δὲ ζῶντι πολεμῶν ἀποθανόντος ἠχθέσθη καὶ τοὺς μὲν υἱοὺς ἐκέλευσεν ὑποδύνασθαι τὸ λέχος, τοῖς δὲ θεοῖς ἔφη χάριν ἔχειν ὑπὲρ τῆς Ῥώμης, ὅτι παρ’ άλλοις οὕκ ἐγένετο Σκιπίων.

He was bitterly opposed to Scipio while Scipio lived, but felt very sad when he died, and commanded his sons to take part in carrying the

786 In addition, the way in which Scipio died is discussed in Rom. 27: Plutarch concludes that the Roman died a natural death, a difference with Epameinondas that might have been addressed in a synkrisis (if he wrote one).

787 Only Caecilius Metellus II (202A) occurs in another work of Plutarch. It is likely that the material in the section was gathered for the Life of Scipio Minor, see also Appendix III.

788 The story is told in De gar. 506D, as part of a series of apophthegms (one of which is the same story as Antigonus Monophthalmus IV, discussed supra, note 452). Plutarch concludes (506E): κἂν μέμφηται δὲ τις, ἐγκαλεῖσθαι βέλτιόν ἐστι σωθέντα δι’ ἀπιστίαν ἢ κατηγορεῖν ἀπολλυμένους διὰ τὸ πιστεύσαι (“it is better that men should criticize you when they are already saved through mistrust than that they should accuse you when they are being destroyed because you did trust them”).
He said that he felt grateful to the gods, for Rome’s sake, that Scipio had not been born among another people.

One would expect to find this apophthegm at the outset of the section: it sheds light not only on Metellus’ character, but also on that of Scipio, the subject of the previous section (note the connection with the closing apophthegm, 201EF); and it seems to describe a more general condition. Yet Plutarch intentionally inserted it before Marius and Sulla (202A–E). It is clear that Metellus puts his country first, regardless of his personal enmity: the use of πολεμῶν not only continues the theme of war and generalship, but also stresses that the hostility between Metellus and Scipio was truly profound, because of which the former’s reaction is even more remarkable. A similar love for his country appeared from Scipio Minor XXIII (201EF), closing that section, and this is precisely the reason why Metellus respects him so much. As Marius and Sulla follow, one expects a strong contrast, for the conflict between the subjects of these sections brought their country much harm.

5.1.8 Marius, Sulla, and the Civil War (202A–E)

Yet such a contrast between Caecilius Metellus (201F–202A) and the sections on Marius and Sulla does not follow. Surprisingly, the latter sections and the one apophthegm on Catulus Lutatius placed in between do not belong to the second part of the Roman section presenting Romans fighting their fellow citizens. They do not even contain a single reference to the civil war they fought against each other, but only to their wars with non-Romans: Marius almost appears to be a true and traditional Republican general similar to his predecessors, as he is fighting the Teutons, Cimbrians, and Italians; Catulus Lutatius wages a war against the Cimbrians; Sulla spares the Athenians after their defeat.

---

789 A suggestion made to me by Professor Christopher Pelling.
790 Although Plutarch considered this period a decline of the Roman Republic, as Buszard (2005) illustrates through a joint reading of Pyrrh.–Mar.
791 Marius VI (202D) refers to the Social War: Ἐν δὲ τῷ ἐμφυλίῳ πολέμῳ. Babbitt (1931) 201 remarks that in Plutarch these words usually refer to a “Civil War” – for Social War, συμμαχικός is the usual adjective. Perhaps, this was a deliberate choice of the author, drawing attention to the absence of the civil war in their sections. Plutarch refers to the Social War as a pause for the enmity between Marius and Sulla in Sull. 6.2.
792 In Marius IV (202C; also told in Mar. 18.4–8, see Vicente Sánchez (2008) 213 for a comparison), V (202CD; told in Mar. 28.4 in a political context, the version of Reg. et imp. apophth. is related to a military context), and VI (202D; also told in Mar. 33.4), respectively.
793 This apophthegm (202DE) occurs in Mar. 23.
Marius I is a telling case in this regard. It opens the section in a typical way, containing general information about Marius’ descent and how he became involved in public life: when he wants to become *aedilis curulis*, he realizes that he will lose the elections, so he changes his mind and decides to run for *aedilis plebis*. He is not successful (202AB):

κάκείνης ἀποτυχών ὄμως οὐκ ἀπέγνω τοῦ πρωτεύσειν Ῥωμαίων.

Failing also to obtain that, he nevertheless did not give up the idea that he should some day be the first among the Romans.

Marius I reads as an abbreviation of chapters 3–5 in the *Life of Marius*, but no such quotation can be found there. Plutarch, therefore, consciously added it to the collection in order to steer his readers in a specific direction: they can only interpret it as foreshadowing the civil war. In line with other sections that open with similar general sayings, one expects Plutarch to further elaborate this theme in the remainder of *Marius*. The next apophthegm, however, deals with the painful surgery on Marius’ legs, which he endured without showing how he suffered (202B), illustrating, as in the *Life*, his fortitude; *Marius III* depicts the Roman as a just man, in a military context (202BC). Both apophthegms illustrate Marius’ qualities as a general (his fortitude and integrity; cf. men such as Manius Curius and Gaius Fabricius) and are in this way connected with the following stories concerning his generalship (202CD), in the wars...

794 Marius’ descent is described in similar words in *Mar.* 3.1, after which his first military deeds are described. He was admired by his commander Scipio, as is illustrated by a saying (of Scipio about Marius) in 3.4–5. This saying results in Marius’ first political steps (4.1). The first part of *Marius* I reads as an abbreviation of all this (202A). The second part is a short version of 5.1–3 (note 5.1: Μετὰ δὲ τὴν δημαρχίαν ἀγορανομίαν τὴν μείζονα παρήγγειλε – 202B: ἀγορανομίαν τὴν μείζονα παρήγγειλεν).

795 In what follows the passage in *Mar.*, Marius becomes quickly *praetor*, despite his two defeats on a single day (5.4). This event is left out of *Reg. et imp. apophth.* and replaced by the words quoted above.

796 The story is introduced as follows by *Mar.* 6.5: τῷ δὲ Μαρίῳ καὶ σωφροσύνην μαρτυροῦσι καὶ καρτερίαν, ἣς δεῖγμα καὶ τὸ περὶ τὴν χειρουργίαν ἔστιν (“There is testimony both to the temperance of Marius, and also to his fortitude, of which his behaviour under a surgical operation is a proof”).

797 See the assessment of this story in *Mar.* 14.3: μάλιστα δ’ ἡ περὶ τὰς κρίσεις ὀρθότης αὐτοῦ τοῖς στρατιώταις ἦρεσκεν (“But it was above all things the uprightness of his judicial decisions that pleased the soldiers”). This follows the description of Marius’ ferociousness and vehemence, to which his soldiers became accustomed. This contrast between Marius’ harshness and integrity is similar to the juxtaposition of *Marius* II and III (202BC).
against the barbarians listed above. In line with *Caecilius Metellus, Marius* I thus intentionally puts the readers on the wrong track: the section appears to fit entirely within those on the conquering Roman Republic, as Marius seems to exhibit true Republican virtues. As a consequence, the assessment of the Roman is entirely different from the rather negative picture that appears from his *Life*. His enmity with Sulla, a common thread throughout this biography, is mentioned not even once, and the same goes for his cruel murders of many fellow Romans, to which some sayings are related (*Mar. 43–45*).

The same dynamics exist between *Sulla* and the *Life*, which is an even more striking case: the horrible, yet famous, episode of the proscriptions – to which again some sayings relate – is entirely left out of the section, which actually consists of only one item (202E).

Sulla, who was called the Fortunate, counted two things among his greatest pieces of fortune: the friendship of Pius Metellus, and the fact that he had not razed Athens, but had spared the city.

---

798 Cf. the highly negative description already in *Mar. 2.4*. See also Buszard (2008) 205–210 on Marius as a negative example, connected with his lack of *paideia* (often illustrated by his aversion to Greekness in the *Life*). On the poor education of Marius (and Pyrrhus, see supra, notes 483 and 484), see also Duff (2008b) 17–18; Xenophontos (2017), esp. 324–325.

799 Stadter (1992) argues that a joint reading of *Lys.–Sull.* (although the image is, as always, not entirely negative) stresses Sulla’s horrible personality (much worse than Lysander’s, see 47: “The features which only disturb in the portrait of Lysander horrify in the *Life* of Sulla”). Duff (1997) however stresses the ambiguity arising from such a joint reading, see 182: “Lysander, the apparently better of the two men, is unsuccessful; Sulla, through the greater use of violence, succeeds where Lysander had failed.” See also Duff (1999) 193–200.

800 *Sull. 31*, opening as follows (31.1): Τοῦ δὲ Σύλλα πρός το σφάττειν τραπομένου, και φόνων οὐτ’ ἀριθμόν οὐθ’ ὅρον ἐμπιπλάντος τὴν πόλιν (“Sulla now busied himself with slaughter, and murders without number or limit filled the city”; there are even various verbatim agreements with *Mar. 43.2*). Note also that *Cic. 3.3* describes Sulla’s reign as a monarchy, after which the Roscius episode is told, focusing on Sulla’s cruelty.

801 *Sull. 6.8* (about Sulla’s memoirs, cf. ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι γέγραφεν) only refers to the friendship with Metellus, since this illustrates well that he seemed to “make himself entirely the creature of this deity [i.e. Fortune]” (6.9: ὅλως ἑαυτὸν τοῦ δαίμονος ποιεῖν). A reference to his treatment of Athens, a great historical event, did not fit here, but is necessary in the context of the first part of the Roman section (on Rome conquering the world). Additionally, Lucullus seems to refer to the saying in *Luc. 19.5*. 
This would again be a most typical opening: it explains Sulla’s nickname and reflects upon his entire life (cf. the imperfect ἐποιεῖτο). Yet this is all the reader hears about the dictator: what follows is, quite surprisingly, an apophthegm about Gaius Popillius.

5.2 Gaius Popillius (202E–203A)

With this section, Plutarch deviates from the chronological order for the last time, leaving the Rome of Marius and Sulla and going back to the first half of the second century BC, switching the West for the East (202EF):802

Γάιος Ποπίλλιος ἐπέμφθη πρὸς Ἀντίοχον ἐπιστολὴν παρὰ τῆς συγκλήτου κομίζων, κελεύουσαν ἀπάγειν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου τὸ στράτευμα καὶ μὴ σφετερίζεσθαι τῶν Πτολεμαίου τέκνων ὀρφανῶν ὄντων τὴν βασιλείαν […]

Gaius Popillius was sent to Antiochus bearing a letter from the Senate commanding him to withdraw his army from Egypt, and not to usurp the kingdom of Ptolemy’s children who were bereft of their parents.

The remainder of the apophthegm describes the remarkable way in which the Roman carried out his mission and made Antiochus obey the senate.803 This reflects his φρόνημα (202F), but this is not the only function of the story: it separates the preceding part of the Roman section from the following sections (Lucullus, 203AB; Pompeius, 203B–204E; Cicero, 204E–205E; Caesar, 205E–206F; and Augustus, 206F–208A). These are, therefore, meant to be read together: they deal with the death throes of the Roman Republic, share different themes, and explicitly reflect upon each other. In line with this, the reference to the strife between the Diadochi in the fragment quoted takes the reader back to the monarchical part of Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata. As a result, the reader will approach the final part of the collection (esp. Lucullus–Caesar, 203A–206F) in light of this, bearing in mind themes of these earlier sections: in contrast with Marius and Sulla (202A–E), the emphasis will henceforth be on the theme of internal strife, which Plutarch deliberately postponed until the end of his work.

802 Stader (2008) 59 speaks of an “erroneous placement”.
803 A similar story is told about Sulla and Mithridates in Comp. Lys. et Sull. 5.2: Plutarch could also have included this apophthegm in Sulla (202E), had he decided not to break the chronology.
5.3 The End of the Roman Republic (203A–206F)

5.3.1 Lucullus and Pompeius (203A–204E)

a) Lucullus (203AB)

The three apophthegms of this section – Lucullus II (203AB) should be split up – keep the reader in the East and illustrate how the general encourages his soldiers before a battle against Tigranes in Armenia. One wonders why Plutarch only includes these stories, which are all related to the same event, even though he possessed more material on the Roman. Apparently, he specifically wanted to stress Lucullus’ successes. The reason for this is that the section should be read together with the next one, in which the image of this Roman as a successful general alone will be problematized.

b) Pompeius (203B–204E)

Pompey’s section reads as a shortened version of his biography. Its opening apophthegm contains a typical general assessment of the hero, applicable to his entire life (Ia, 203B):

Γναῖος Πομπήιος ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἠγαπήθη τοσοῦτον ὅσον ὁ πατὴρ ἐμισήθη.

Gnaeus Pompey was loved by the Romans as much as his father was hated.

This opening phrase is nothing more than a summary of the first chapter of the Life of Pompeius, where father and son are compared. It stands apart from the remainder of the section, which consists of two main blocks that clash with one another: one on Pompey’s younger years, and one on the later years of his career.

804 Between σκυλεῦσαι and προσβὰς δὲ τῷ λόφῳ, see van der Wiel (2023a) 18. Luc. only includes I and IIb in 27.9 and 28.4, see ibid. 18n47.

805 Lucullus I is a story about an “unlucky day”. See Cam. 19 for an excursus on lucky and unlucky days: Plutarch addressed the theme in a treatise before (19.3: ἑτέρωθι (fr. p. 141 Bernard.) διηπόρηται).

806 Other sayings occur in Luc. 19.5, 24.7, and 39.5, to give a few examples. According to the relative chronology (Part I, chapter 2), Luc. predates Reg. et imp. apophth.

807 This procedure reminds one of Plutarch’s practice in the Parallel Lives, see infra, p. 298–303.

808 This is a typical opening ‘apophthegm’ and should be separated from Pompeius Ib, see van der Wiel (2023a) 8–9.
The young Pompey’s successes
The first apophthegms (Pompeius Ib–V, corresponding to Pomp. 6–14) of this block concern the time when Pompey served Sulla’s party, as its first phrase indicates (203B):

νέος δ’ ὄν παντάπασι τῇ Σύλλα μεριḍί προσέθηκεν αὐτόν [...].

In his youth he was heart and soul for Sulla’s Party.

He is successful in this period of his life: when Sulla orders him to present his troops, he refuses until he has won many victories;809 in Pompeius II, also showing his righteousness, he is sent to Sicily as a general, to stop his violent and plundering soldiers (203C); in III, closely related to the previous apophthegm and still situated in Sicily, he spares the Mamar- tines and Stennius, because of the latter’s plea (203CD):810

Σθενίου δὲ τοῦ δημαγωγοῦ φήσαντος οὐ δίκαια ποιεῖν αὐτόν ἀνθ’ ἕνός αὐτίου πολλοὺς ἀναιτίους κολάζοντα, τούτον δὲ αὐτόν εἶναι τὸν τοὺς μὲν φίλους πείσαντα τοὺς δ’ ἐχθροὺς βιασάμενον ἐλέσθαι τὰ Μαρίου.

But Stennius, their popular leader, said that Pompey was not doing right in punishing many innocent men instead of one man who was responsible, and that this man was himself, who had persuaded his friends, and compelled his enemies, to choose the side of Marius.

The enmity between Sulla and Marius (not mentioned so far) is casually referred to a first time. Apparently, it is only from Pompeius on that the theme of civic strife deserves a place. This is in line with the general structure of the Roman section discussed above, but the apophthegm also sheds light on Pompey’s character. More precisely, the mildness he shows after Stennius’ appeal is necessary for a positive image of the man: that he was a partisan of Sulla does not mean that he shared in his cruelty.811 A similar and equally implicit defence of Pompey is found in

---

809 The apophthegm reads as an abbreviation of Pomp. 6–8.
810 The story occurs in Pomp. 10.11–13, preceding Pompeius II. See Stadter (2008) 56 on this reversed order, and on the fact that the Mamertines become Himeraeans in the Life (which is historically correct).
811 Praec. ger. reip. 815EF combines Pompeius III with a story on Sulla’s cruelty: he ordered the killing of all the inhabitants of Praeneste, with the exception of one of his guest-friends. This man, however, decided to be murdered together with his people. Both stories recommend the act of virtue of Stennis and Sulla’s guest-friend, but also contrast Pompey’s mildness with Sulla’s cruelty. See in this context Martin (1960) 69: “Prāotēs is,
the Life. After Plutarch recounts that the young commander attached himself to Sulla by marriage (Pomp. 9), the reader might question his good disposition, since he supports the cruel tyrant and is bound to him so closely. 812 The episode of the Sicilian campaign that follows (Pomp. 10) involves not only stories about mildness, but also some atrocities: in this chapter, Plutarch first refers to Pompey’s less friendly treatment of the Mamertines of Messana (10.2–3); then he relates the outrageous execution of Carbo (10.4–6), and finally includes a story taken from Gaius Oppius, who tells that Pompey put Quintus Valerius to death (10.7–8). Yet Plutarch emphasizes that Pompey’s behaviour in Messana was rather exceptional (10.2), and argues that Oppius, who knew Caesar well, is not a trustworthy source (10.9). The murder of Carbo, for which no excuse exists, is cleverly hidden away between both stories, and the attack on Oppius’ reliability is immediately followed by Pompeius II and III, which illustrate Pompey’s mildness. 813 Thus, both in the Life and in the collection Plutarch knew that mentioning Pompey’s attachment to Sulla might depict a negative image of the man. Leaving out horrible apophthegms earlier in Sulla (202E) did not solve this problem, for the ancient readers knew what kind of person he was. Plutarch therefore ignored the apophthegms that might shed a dark light on Pompey’s character and only included Pompeius II and III (203CD). In this way, he makes one reach an assessment of Pompey’s mild character that is similar to his image in the Life, without entirely leaving out the complexities that arise from his connection with the Roman dictator.

Pompeius IV, recalling Ib (203BC), continues Pompey’s successes during Sulla’s reign: he is hailed as imperator (άυτοκράτωρ), but refuses the title so long as the enemies’ camp stands. After this, the camp is taken (203DE). 814 This culminates in V, describing an important moment in Pompey’s life: back in Rome, Sulla addresses the young man as “the

812 Pomp. 9.3: ἦν οὖν τυραννικὰ τὰ τοῦ γάμου καὶ τοῖς Σύλλα καιροῖς μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς Πομπηίου τρόποις πρέποντα (“This marriage was therefore characteristic of a tyranny, and befitted the needs of Sulla rather than the nature and habits of Pompey”).

813 But in a different order: Pompeius II (203C) occurs in Pomp. 10.14 (a striking difference is the emphasis on the violence of the soldiers in II [note ἐν ταῖς ὁδοιπορίαις ἐκτρεπομένους βιάζεσθαι καὶ ἁρπάζειν, 203C], absent from the Life [only containing ἐν ταῖς ὁδοιπορίαις ἀτακτεῖν]); III (203CD) in 10.11–13 (note the unnecessary addition of Marius’ name in Reg. et imp. apophth., not included in the Life and Praec. ger. reip. 815EF).

814 In Pomp. 11–12, the story is told at length. Its final words highlight that the episode still belongs to Pompey’s younger years: this is how the apophthegm is to be interpreted in Reg. et imp. apophth. too.
Great” (*Magnus*). This title is even more prestigious than *imperator*, as it suggests a connection between Pompey and Alexander the Great. In the remainder of the story, Pompey asks for a triumph, but Sulla refuses: the young man is not even a member of the senate. Pompey complains (203E)

…”

that Sulla did not realize that more people worship the rising than the setting sun […].

This saying, again emphasizing Pompey’s young age, makes Sulla give in.\(^{815}\) In the second part of the long apophthegm,\(^{816}\) the aristocrat Servilius is upset because of this decision, but finally realizes that Pompey is “great indeed” (203F: μέγαν ἀληθῶς).\(^{817}\) This suggests that the Roman truly deserves this title, as can also be seen from VI (203F–204A): Pompey enumerates in front of the censors the campaigns in which he took part (according to the custom for Roman knights: this provides an additional connection with the preceding apophthegm, which focuses on another Roman custom), and adds that he did all this when he himself was the commander (204A: ὑπ’ ἐμαυτῷ αὐτοκράτορι).\(^{818}\) *Pompeius VII* closes the first block, continuing the focus on his qualities as a general despite his age and illustrating his mildness: when Pompey is in possession of some letters of men asking Sertorius to come to Rome in order to take power, he forgives them by burning these letters (204A).\(^{819}\)

---

\(^{815}\) It also emphasizes his φιλοτιμία; see Pelling (2012) 65–67 on this theme in *Pomp.*

\(^{816}\) In the *Life*, another story related to the triumph is inserted between the two parts (*Pomp.* 14.6).

\(^{817}\) Besides a reference to the event in *Sert.* 18.3 (again focusing on Pompey’s young age: οὖπω γενειῶν), Plutarch tells the same story in *Crass.* 7.1 (concluding with Crassus’ joke about Pompey’s ‘greatness’), and in *Pomp.* 13–14 (the first words in 13.3 and οὖπω πάνω γενειῶν in 14.2 focus on the general’s age). See also Stadter (2008) 61–62 on these accounts: he argues that the collection’s version is to be read in an entirely positive way.

\(^{818}\) See *Pomp.* 22.5–9 for a more elaborate account of the story. The wording of the passage is similar to the version in *Reg. et imp. apophth.*; see Stadter (2014b) 678 for a comparison.

\(^{819}\) The story occurs in *Pomp.* 20.7–8 and in *Sert.* 27.1–5, almost at the end of the *Life* and again focusing on his young age: 27.4: ἔργον οὖν ὁ Πομπήϊος οὐ νέας φρενός, ἀλλ’ ἐν μάλα βεβηκυίας καὶ κατηρτυμένης ἐργασάμενος (‘Pompey, then, did not act in this emergency like a young man, but like one whose understanding was right well matured and disciplined’).
A turning point
So far, then, all the focus lies on Pompey’s military successes, which brought him great titles, and his young age. As stated, the nickname Magnus alludes to a comparison with Alexander the Great. Yet this connection is never made explicit.\textsuperscript{820} It shimmers in the background even in VIII on Pompey’s actions in the East (204A).\textsuperscript{821}

Ἐπεὶ δὲ Φραάτης ὁ Πάρθων βασιλεὺς ἔπεμψε πρὸς αὐτὸν ἄξιον ὄρῳ χρῆσθαι τῷ Εὐφράτῃ, μᾶλλον ἔφη χρῆσεσθαι Ῥωμαίους ὄρῳ πρὸς Πάρθους τῷ δικαίῳ.

When Phraates, king of the Parthians, sent to him, claiming the right to set his boundary at the river Euphrates, he said that the Romans set justice as their boundary towards the Parthians.

This recalls Lucullus (203AB): this Roman fought in this same war and all the apophthegms in his section are related to this. He will return in the next two apophthegms: as announced above, the positive image of this successful general will now be problematized. Yet at the same time, he will also cast a shadow on the later years of Pompey’s career.\textsuperscript{822}

Pompey’s downfall
In Pompeius IX, Plutarch describes how Lucullus, in the period after his military expeditions (204B: μετὰ τὰς στρατείας, referring back to the campaigns in the East of Pompeius VIII and Lucullus), enjoys a life of extravagance and luxury, while criticising Pompey’s way of life, which is not in line with his age.\textsuperscript{823} Pompey, however, argues that the opposite is true and that it is rather Lucullus’ behaviour that is not fitting for his

\textsuperscript{820} Green (1978) 4 writes about the historical truth of Pompey’s imitatio Alexandri (in contrast with Caesar, see infra, note 854): “Pompey, from adolescence onwards, had consciously modelled himself on the Macedonian conqueror, both physically and, in particular, as regards his military career.” He lists the following similarities between both men: (1) Pompey’s title Magnus, (2) his triumph, and (3) his victories in Spain (and the inscription he established there) and against Mithridates. All these elements occur in this first half of Pompeius.

\textsuperscript{821} In the account of Pomp. 33.8, Phraates also asked for the liberation of Tigranes, refused by Pompey.

\textsuperscript{822} Heftner (1995) 22–26 divides Pomp. into two parts: his “Aufstieg und Größe” (1–45) and his “Niedergang und Fall” (46–80). This coincides with the dynamics in Pompeius. Papadi (2008) describes how tragical images and references occur mainly in the second part of the Life.

\textsuperscript{823} Plutarch had a series of apophthegms on Lucullus’ love of luxury, see Stadter (2012a) 784–785.
years (204AB). This indicates that the remainder of the section concerns Pompey’s later years, suggesting that he is no longer that vigorous young man. This also appears from X: a physician advises a diet of thrushes, but these are out of season at that moment. Only Lucullus possesses these, so the sick Pompey decides to stick to a diet of feasible things (204B).

The theme of food prompted Plutarch to include an apophthegm about the shortage of grain in the city, after which Pompey set sail and returned quickly, despite a storm (204BC); more importantly, he in the following apophthegm again refers to the topic of food and eating in a saying about Marcellinus, who switched sides to the advantage of Caesar and opposes Pompey in the Senate (204C). This reference to the conflict with Caesar at the outset of the anecdote (204C: Τῆς δὲ πρὸς τὸν Καίσαρα διαφορᾶς) is of particular relevance for the comparison Pompey–Lucullus. At first sight, Plutarch only contrasted Lucullus’ profligacy with Pompey’s frugality in order to shed a negative light on the former, while praising the latter. Yet if these stories are read in connection with Lucullus (203AB), this also appears to be related to the successes of both men. As stated, one only reads about Lucullus’ great deeds in the East in his own section. This is similar to the description of Pompey’s youthful years, characterized by his great military exploits, some of which also took place in the East. The later years of the lives of both men, on the contrary, are different: Lucullus chooses a quiet life after his expeditions; Pompey opts for the opposite course and remains active in public life. Even though one can hardly doubt that Plutarch would have approved of Pompey’s course rather than of Lucullus’ Epicurean-like seclusion, the apophthegms which follow from Pompeius XII on illustrate his downfall.

---

824 This apophthegm occurs in An seni 785E–786A, Luc. 38.5 (where both Crassus and Pompey make the remark), and Pomp. 48.6–7. In this final passage, however, Plutarch adds that Pompey devoted his final years to his wife, neglecting politics as well (48.5); see Beneker (2005a) 75–81 on this passage and on Pompey’s affection for women as an explanation for his downfall in the Life (this theme is absent from Reg. et imp. apophth.).

825 Pompeius X occurs in the same works as IX: An seni 786A (after the account of IX, since both apophthegms illustrate the undignified behaviour of Lucullus in his final years: Plutarch chooses Pompey’s side), Luc. 40.2 (illustrating how Pompey makes himself popular with the saying, while Lucullus is hated; the apophthegm is again told close to Pompeius IX in Luc. 38.5; Luc. 39.4–5 furthermore describes Lucullus’ excessive wealth, there also contrasted with Pompey by sayings of both men concerning Lucullus’ estate in Tusculum), and Pomp. 2.11–12 (as part of a general description of Pompey’s character, illustrating his frugality).

826 Also told in Pomp. 50.

827 The saying also occurs in Pomp. 51.6–8.

828 Cf. Comp. Cim. et Luc. 1.3; see Roskam (2005c) 366–367 on this passage.
in his later years during the civil war: in XIII, Cato blames Pompey for not having supported him when he opposed Caesar (204D);\(^{829}\) in XIV, Pompey says (204D)

\[\text{ὡς πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ ἔλαβε θᾶσσον ἢ προσεδόκησε καὶ κατέθετο θᾶσσον ἢ προσεδοκήθη.}\]

that he had attained every office sooner than he had expected, and laid it down sooner than had been expected.

The saying occurs in almost the same words in the *Life of Pompeius* in the context of the prelude to the civil war: it was true, for Pompey often dismissed his soldiers, but when Caesar appeared to be a threat, he strived for more power (*Pomp. 54.1*). In light of the following apophthegm about Pompey’s death in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*, this contrast might stand out too, but the saying is definitely to be interpreted in a darker way: perhaps he should have laid down his office, in particular in his final years, for death now brings an end to his office. The placement of *Pompeius* XIV, then, is not coincidental: it does not belong there because of the general chronological structure, nor is it in line with the order of the *Life*, but it provides the interpretatory background of XV, in which Pompey is killed on Egyptian shores.\(^{830}\) Thus, his successes suddenly ended and his way of life does not seem preferable to Lucullus in all respects.

**Conclusion**

Plutarch created a clash between the two main blocks of *Pompeius*, clarified by the scheme below (note the gradual shifting):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pompeius Ia: general assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block 1: the young</strong> (cf. emphasis in other works) Pompey’s <strong>successes</strong> (7 apophthegms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pompeius II and III: sent by Sulla to Sicily – Pompey’s <strong>mildness</strong></strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pompeius IV: Pompey hailed <strong>imperator</strong>, Domitius defeated [Sulla]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pompeius V: Pompey the <strong>Great</strong> – Sulla</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pompeius VI: Pompey as <strong>imperator</strong></strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pompeius VII: Pompey’s <strong>mildness</strong> after the Sertorian war</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[The dominating theme of civil war announces block 2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{829}\) The story is also told in *Pomp. 60.8* and *Ca. Mi. 52.3*, in both cases after Caesar took Ariminum; see Stadter (2014b) 680 on all three accounts.

\(^{830}\) The story of Pompey’s death covers *Pomp. 78–79.*
Since the first block contains a promising picture of the Roman as a new Alexander, it is quite meaningful that it is precisely the stories after his actions in the East that introduce his downfall, when he fights his fellow Romans. The problematizing structure of the section recalls *Agesilaus* (190F–191D), where a similar promising first block suggested that a Greek triumph over barbarians would follow, in contrast with the second part in which Sparta loses her great position by fighting Greeks. This is entirely in line with the evolution throughout *Agesilaus–Pompeius* and with Nevin’s reading of the pair: Agesilaus is a failed Agamemnon, Pompey is a failed Alexander.\(^{831}\) The question one might ask, then, is whether in the end Lucullus’ or Pompey’s course is more desirable.

c) Comparison

Although Lucullus’ luxury at the end of his life should definitely be rejected, one can hardly count Pompey more fortunate or successful: the former at least knew when to withdraw (though not how to withdraw), whereas the latter did not know when to quit. In the *Lives* of both men, Plutarch connects this with their luck, as can be seen from the following passage (*Comp. Cim. et Luc.* 1.1).\(^{832}\)

Μάλιστα δ’ ἂν τις εὐδαιμονίσειε τοῦ τέλους Λεύκολλον, ὅτι πρὸ τῆς μεταβολῆς, ἣν ἤδη κατὰ τῆς πολιτείας ἐτεκταίνετο τὸ πεπρωμένον […].

---

\(^{831}\) Nevin (2014) points out that Pompey does not succeed in his *imitatio Alexandri*, in the same way as Agesilaus’ imitation of Agamemnon fails. See esp. Nevin (2014) 61: “While Pompey seemed (mistakenly) to have an air of Alexander in his early days, the likeness will prove disastrously false.” See also Shipley (1997) 9–17 on these and many more parallels, and on some major differences between *Ages.* and *Pomp.*; and Pelling (2011) 27 on the pairing of Caesar, instead of Pompey, with Alexander.

\(^{832}\) This is in line with an earlier comment in the *Life*, see *Luc.* 33.1: Μέχρι τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶ τῇ ἐν Ἑλευκόλλῳ τῆς τοῦτον ἐπομένην συστράτηγην. ἐντεύθεν δ’ ὅσπερ πνεύματος ἐπιλειπόντος προσβιαζόμενος πάντα καὶ παντάπασιν ἀντικρούων (“Up to this point, one might say that fortune had followed Lucullus and fought on his side; but from now on, as though a favouring breeze had failed him, he had to force every issue, and met with obstacles everywhere”). Lucullus stopped in time.
One might deem Lucullus especially happy in his end, from the fact that he died before that constitutional change had come, which fate was already contriving by means of the civil wars.

Pompey’s fate, described in his *Life*, illustrates exactly the opposite (Pomp. 46.1–2).833

His age at this time, as those insist who compare him in all points to Alexander and force the parallel, was less than thirty-four years, though in fact he was nearly forty. How happy would it have been for him if he had ended his life at this point, up to which he enjoyed the good fortune of Alexander!

The reference to Alexander is in line with *Pompeius*, where a comparison with Lucullus combined with allusions to this king brings the reader to the same final assessment of Pompey’s unlucky end. Yet this does not mean that it is clear which Roman is to be preferred: Lucullus’ way of living in his final years after realizing that all his military luck was spent is most shameful and does not call for imitation, in the same way as Pompey’s poor judgement of his abilities is not an example either. A joint reading of *Lucullus* and *Pompeius* thus keeps the reader in the dark. Perhaps the truth lies, as it often does, somewhere in the middle: the insight of Pompey’s saying in *Pompeius* V (203EF), when the Roman contrasted his young age and vigour with Sulla, should have helped him to prevent his own downfall by taking a step back as the *dictator* did, without entirely retiring from public life and surrendering to luxury, in contrast with Lucullus. This is in line with Plutarch’s general argument in *An seni respublica gerenda sit* (where Lucullus figures multiple times as a negative *exemplum*),834 although the collection once more raises more questions than answers, for it is unclear to what extent Pompey should have given in.

---

833 See Harrison (1995) 102 about this chapter as a turning point: “The ‘Life of Pompey’ separates at this point into two halves; Alexander is never adduced in the second half, Caesar rarely in the first.” See also Beneker (2005a) 74–75 and Nevin (2014) 64–65 on this matter.

834 *An seni* 785E–786A and 792B.
5.3.2 Cicero (204E–205E)

The section on Cicero is well placed in between Pompeius (203B–204E) and Caesar (205E–206F), as the orator often doubts whose side he has to take during their conflict. Except for this aspect, however, its broader relevance in the context of the sections on the end of the Roman Republic is perhaps not always clear (this esp. goes for the apophthegms on Cicero’s oratory skills). Yet it illustrates the character of a protagonist of this period well, it is carefully structured, and the ancient reader would have expected much material on Cicero in the collection, as he was well known for his witty sayings. Important in this respect was a collection compiled by Tiro, which might have formed the basis of at least parts of this section.835

Overview

The section opens in a typical way. Cicero I and II (204E) concern the subject’s name. Not incidentally, then, both apophthegms also occur in the first chapter of the Life of Cicero after an explanation of the meaning of ‘Cicero’ (1.4–6). III (204EF) fits well after I and II: its general saying (cf. the imperfect ἔλεγε, 204E) is to be expected rather at the outset of the section. In addition, Cicero’s jest announces the remainder of Cicero, consisting of three parts: [1] Cicero’s jests in his function of orator; [2] his rude and malicious jokes; and [3] his witticisms related to the civil war, illustrating his permanent doubt as to whose side was preferable:836

[1] The first part consists of Cicero IV–XI (204F–205B). A comparison with the Life is revealing: both IV (204F) and XI (205B) occur in Cic. 7 and are related to the Verres episode.837 They surround a series of apophthegms (Cicero V–X, 204F–205B) that are all told in Cic. 26.838

835 See Appendix II.2.
836 In Cic. 5.6, Cicero III is combined with the following comment: ἡ δὲ περὶ τά σκώμματα καὶ τήν παιδίαν ταῦτην εὐτραπελία δικανικὸν μὲν ἔδόκει καὶ γλαφυρὸν εἶναι, χρώμενος δ’ αὐτὴν κατακόρως, πολλοὺς ἔλυπει καὶ κακοηθείας ἐλάμβανε δόξαν (“And his readiness to indulge in such jests and pleasantry was thought indeed to be a pleasant characteristic of a pleader; but he carried it to excess and so annoyed many and got the reputation of being malicious”). See Kelsey (1907) 4: “there is no good reason to doubt that he was reproducing statements of a well-informed earlier author when he wrote […]”, after which he cites Cic. 5.6 and parts of 27. Kelsey does not refer to the section of Reg. et imp. apophth. On the sources of Cic., see Lendle (1967); Gudeman (1971); Moles (1988) 26–31; the first two chapters of Pelling (2002); and a short chapter in Lintott (2013) 15–17.
837 Cf. Cic. 7.6. Cicero IV and XI, told in Cic. 7.7 and 7.8, respectively, are not the only sayings in this chapter. On Cicero’s witticism during this trial, see also Kelsey (1907) 3.
838 Cicero V (204F–205A) occurs in Cic. 26.6 (and in De se ipsum laud. 541F–542A), VI (205A) in 26.9–10, VII (205A) in 26.11, VIII (205AB) in 26.3, IX (205B) in 26.5 (and in Quaest. conv. 631D), and X (205B) in 26.9 (before the account of Cicero VI. In the
This chapter, entirely built up from sayings, is followed by Cic. 27.1–2.

Τὸ μὲν οὖν πρὸς ἐχθροὺς ἢ πρὸς ἀντιδίκους σκώμμασι χρῆσθαι πικρότεροι δοκεῖ ῥητορικὸν εἶναι· τὸ δ’ οἷς ἔτυχε προσκρούειν ἕνεκα τοῦ γελοίου πολὺ συνῆγε μῖσος αὐτῷ. γράψω δὲ καὶ τούτων ὀλίγα.

Now, this use of very biting jests against enemies or legal opponents seems to be part of the orator’s business; but his indiscriminate attacks for the sake of raising a laugh made many people hate Cicero. And I will give a few instances of this also.

By creating a ring composition, Cicero IV and XI create a block of apophthegms that instigate a similar interpretation: all these stories concern Cicero’s jests related to trials and lawsuits, and contrast with the following two apophthegms.

[2] Cicero XII and XIII are told in Cic. 27.4 and 27.6 respectively, after the passage quoted, and indeed illustrate his inappropriate jests: in XII, the orator mocks the ugly daughters of Voconius (205C); in XIII, Faustus is his victim (205C). Thus, as in the Life, one reads a series of more suitable sayings related to his oratory function, contrasted with improper and offensive remarks.

[3] What follows is to be read against the background of all this. As stated, this block presents Cicero’s doubts in the civil war. It is introduced by Cicero XIV and XV (205C), which should in fact be considered one apophthegm, since XV opens with καί.

14. Πομπηίου δὲ καὶ Καίσαρος διαστάντων ἔφη ἃνοφα τὸν φύγο, μὴ γινώσκω πρὸς τὸν φύγο. 15. καὶ Πομπηίου ἐμέμψατο τὴν πόλιν

---


840 Cicero is joking about Faustus’ debts and the fact that he is selling his possessions, by referring to the proscriptions of his father Sulla (205C); see also Moles (1988) 174 and Lintott (2013) 171.

14. When Pompey and Caesar took opposite sides, he said, “I know from whom I flee without knowing to whom to flee.” 15. He blamed Pompey for abandoning the city, and imitating Themistocles rather than Pericles, when his situation was not like that of Themistocles, but rather that of Pericles.

_Cicero_ XIV (205C) is related in the _Life of Cicero_ in the context of Pompey’s departure from the city (37.3): this also suggests taking the two parts together.\footnote{Taken from van der Wiel (2023a) 11n31, where I also point out that _Cicero_ XV (205C) is not told in this _Life_, but in _Pomp._ 63.2, where Caesar expresses his surprise at Pompey’s action too (63.1). The event is also strongly criticized in _Comp. Ages. et Pomp._; see also Shipley (1997) 20. Moles (1988) 186 describes Cicero’s dilemma in _Cic._ as one “between morality (joining Pompey) and expediency (joining Caesar)”; followed by Lin-tott (2013) 190.} Cicero’s doubt in this story is closely connected with XVI, since καὶ πάλιν μετανοῶν (205CD: “after again changing his opinion”) illustrates that he was still in doubt, and contains the first jest of this block (205CD). The jokes of XVII–XIX (205DE) similarly show that he was not a convinced supporter of Pompey, recalling Plutarch’s assessment in the _Life_ (38.2).\footnote{ _Cicero_ XVI and XVII (205CD) occur in no other work of Plutarch. XVIII and XIX (205DE) can be found in _Cic._ 38.5 and 38.7, respectively, as part of a larger list of similar sayings (XIX seems to be out of place: the defeat at Pharsalus mentioned there is only referred to in _Cic._ 39.1: the apophthegm is therefore included in _Cic._ 38 because of its thematic similarities, despite the resulting chronological deviation).} There remain two apophthegms. XX (205E) is connected with XIX (205DE) by its reference to Pharsalus;\footnote{ _Cicero_ XIX (205DE): Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐν Φαρσάλῳ μάχην – XX (205E): Ἐπεὶ δὲ Καῖσαρ κρατήσας.} Cicero comments on Caesar’s restoration of some of Pompey’s statues, saying that in this way he in fact established his own images.\footnote{In the account of _Cic._ 40.4–5, Plutarch comments that Cicero did not appear in public anymore, unless in order to speak about Caesar: Moles (1988) 190 speaks of “flat-tery”, which “will also be a key element in his relations with Octavian Caesar.” In _Caes._ 57.6, the story illustrates Caesar’s clemency; its occurrence in _De cap. ex inim._ 91A is therefore not surprising.} The theme of Caesar’s clemency is also relevant for Cicero’s own life: one knows that after Pharsalus, he switched sides again and was forgiven by Caesar. In line with this, _Cicero_ closes with an apophthegm returning to Cicero’s function as an orator and getting back to normal.\footnote{The story cannot be found in any other work of Plutarch’s oeuvre.}
Conclusion
The main focus of the section consists of Cicero’s jests, sometimes inappropriate, and most importantly describing his unconvinced behaviour in the civil war: the orator always chooses the safest course. His good judgement (which is to be admired) often saves his life. Yet the general picture is not very flattering, for Cicero might appear to be a coward. Perhaps, then, the section is to be read as an adjustment to Pompeius (203B–204E): the contrast between this section and Lucullus (203AB) might yield the interpretation that one should only walk the path of success, but the (rather unattractive) picture of Cicero now suggests that Plutarch does not want to say that one should be an inconsistent personality or someone who puts one’s own interests first.

A second conclusion concerns Cicero’s sayings that are also relevant for an evaluation of Pompey and Caesar: the incapacities of the former are contrasted with the military genius of the latter. The theme of Caesar’s mildness is interesting in this respect too. All these elements are of importance for a reading of what follows.

5.3.3 Caesar (205E–206F)
In various respects, Caesar’s section resembles Pompeius (203B–204E): (1) it begins with his early years (205EF: ἐτὶ μειράκιον ὤν) during Sulla’s tyranny (205E: ὅτε Σύλλαν ἔφευγεν); (2) most of his first apophthegms (206AB) focus on his love of honour; (3) there is a comparison with Alexander the Great, although now an explicit one (206B); (4) after which most apophthegms deal with the civil war (206C–E); and (5) one of these apophthegms takes place in the East (206E). From the reference to Alexander on, the difference between both men will become apparent: Caesar deserves to be compared with the Macedonian king; Pompey does not.

Caesar’s love of honour
Caesar I, one of the longest apophthegms of the collection, describes how the young man was held in captivity by some pirates after he fled Rome during Sulla’s rule (205E–206A). This opening story also occurs near the beginning of the Life of Caesar, and stands somewhat apart from the remainder of the section.

---

848 This theme connects Dem.–Cic., see Lintott (2013) 11.
850 On the lost beginning of the Life, see Pelling (1973) and (2011) 129–132; and Schmidt, T. S. (2019) 87–88. Caesar I is told in Caes. 1–2, where Plutarch first describes the enmity between Caesar and Sulla, who wanted to kill the young man (1.1–4). This made him flee Rome, after which he was captured by pirates (1.5–8): this corresponds
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φιλοτιμία.\footnote{For Caesar’s ambition in the \textit{Life}, assessed in a rather negative way by Plutarch (in contrast with his assessment of Alexander’s φιλοτιμία), see Buszard (2008). On ζῆλος in the \textit{Parallel Lives}, see Pérez Jiménez (2002). See also Pelling (2012) 59 on Caesar’s ζῆλος and φιλοτιμία.} He wants to become either \textit{pontifex maximus} or an exile \footnote{Plutarch tells the story in \textit{Caes.} 7.1–3.} (206A),\footnote{Caes. 10.7–9 and \textit{Cic.} 29.9 tell the same story. The wording of \textit{Caes.} is closer to \textit{Caesar} III.} and divorces his wife only because of a rumour in order to protect his reputation (206AB).\footnote{Green (1978) 3, denying the historical truth of Caesar’s \textit{imitatio Alexandri}, refers to the account of \textit{Caesar} IV in the \textit{Life} as a variation of a similar anecdote that occurs in} The next two stories deserve particular attention (206B):

4. Τὰς δ’ Ἀλεξάνδρου πράξεις ἀναγινώσκων ἐδάκρυσε καὶ πρὸς τοὺς φίλους εἶπεν ὅτι ἡ ταύτῃ τὴν ἡλικίαν ἔχων ἐνίκησε Δαρεῖον, ἐμοὶ δὲ μέχρι νῦν οὐδὲν πέπρακται.

5. Πολίχνιον δ’ αὐτοῦ λυπρὸν ἐν ταῖς Ἄλπεσι παρερχόμενος καὶ τῶν φίλων διαπορούντων εἰ καὶ ἐνταῦθα τῖνες στάσεις εἰσί καὶ ἀμμαλα περί πρωτείων, ἐπιστὰς καὶ σύννοις γενόμενος ἔφη ‘ἐβουλόμην πρῶτος ἐνταῦθα εἶναι ἢ δεύτερος ἐν Ῥώμῃ.’

4. While he was reading of the exploits of Alexander, he burst into tears, and said to his friends, “When he was of my age he had conquered Darius, but, up to now, nothing has been accomplished by me.”

5. As he was passing by a miserable little town in the Alps, his friends raised the question whether even here there were rival parties and contests for the first place. He stopped and becoming thoughtful said, “I had rather be the first here than the second in Rome.”

\textit{Caesar} IV and V are told after each other in the \textit{Life of Caesar} (11.3–6), but in a different order: they do not belong to the same historical event, but are put together there because both in a similar way (cf. 11.5: ὁμοίως δὲ πάλιν) illustrate Caesar’s desire to be the first: they are telling illustrations of his φιλοτιμία.\footnote{Green (1978) 3, denying the historical truth of Caesar’s \textit{imitatio Alexandri}, refers to the account of \textit{Caesar} IV in the \textit{Life} as a variation of a similar anecdote that occurs in} In this chapter, Caesar is on his way to Spain, the province recently appointed to him after his praetorship (11.1–2). The
story of Caesar V belongs to this journey, when he crosses the Alps. Caesar IV takes place in Spain, as Plutarch writes in its account of the Life.\textsuperscript{855} This gives the impression that it belongs to the period after Caesar’s journey through the Alps, when he had reached Spain. According to Perrin, however, the event of Caesar V took place in 61 BC, while Caesar IV probably belongs to Caesar’s earlier time in Spain, in 67 BC.\textsuperscript{856} If Perrin is right, the order of Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata is the correct one from a chronological point of view and might reflect the order of Plutarch’s notes.

Yet there is a thematic explanation too: when reading the collection, one will also draw the wrong conclusions about the chronology of both stories, since Caesar IV does not mention that Caesar was in Spain, nor does V mention that he was on his way to this province. Especially in the case of this second story, this changes its interpretation, even more so when reading VI and VII (in fact one apophthegm) in which Caesar crosses the Rubicon (206 BC):\textsuperscript{857}

6. Τῶν δὲ τολμημάτων τὰ παράβολα καὶ μεγάλα πράττειν ἔφη δεῖν, ἀλλὰ μὴ βουλεύεσθαι. (7.) Καὶ διέβη τὸν Ῥουβίκωνα ποταμὸν ἐκ τῆς Γαλατικῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπὶ Πομπήιον εἰπών ‘πᾶς ἀνερρίφθω κύβος.’

6. He said that the venturesome and great deeds of daring call for action and not for thought. 7. And he crossed the river Rubicon from his province in Gaul against Pompey, saying before all, “Let the die be cast.”

In light of this, Caesar V reads as if the wars in Gaul are fought already, and as if Caesar is crossing the Alps in the direction of Rome, not the other way around as in the original context. As a consequence, Caesar IV reads as a turning point: by comparing himself with Alexander the same chapter. He points out that these stories (and their account in other authors) are the only testimonies. On Alexander and Caesar as a pair, see Pelling (2011) 25–35.\textsuperscript{858} Caes. 11.5: ὁμοίως δὲ πάλιν ἐν Ἰβηρίᾳ σχολῆς οὔση (“In like manner we are told again that, in Spain, when he was at leisure […]”).\textsuperscript{859} Perrin (1919a) 468 and esp. 469: “Suetonius (Div. Jul. 7) and Dio Cassius (xxxvii. 52, 2) connect this anecdote more properly with Caesar’s quaestorship in Spain (67 B.C.), when he was thirty-three years of age, the age at which Alexander died.” See also Pelling (2011) 183–184. Yet Plutarch does not explicitly connect Caesar V to a later period, but only included it there because of its thematic similarities with Caesar IV (a similar case in Cic. 38 is described supra, note 843).\textsuperscript{860} See van der Wiel (2023a) 11 on these elements as one apophthegm, in line with the absence of δὲ and the presence of καί at the outset of VII. Nachstädt (1971) 104 puts no. 7 between brackets. The saying occurs in Caes. 32.8 and Pomp. 60.3–4.
Great, the Roman realizes that he has not yet achieved anything at all. Immediately afterwards, he marches on the capital. This interpretation is not only supported by the topographic information which is included and excluded, but also by the content of the saying of V: Caesar claims that the only thing that matters to him is to be the first, no matter where. In what follows, he will risk everything in order to reach that goal.

*The civil war*

From now on, things are moving fast: after crossing the Alps (*Caesar V*) and the Rubicon (VI–VII), Caesar has suddenly already reached Rome in VIII. In this apophthegm, he tries to take riches from the Roman treasure, after threatening to kill Metellus, since the latter refuses to help him. Meanwhile, Pompey has left the city and crossed the sea (206C).\(^{858}\) IX and X, of which the subdivision should be reconsidered, continue Caesar’s movement (206CD):\(^{859}\)

9. Τῶν δὲ στρατιωτῶν αὐτῷ βραδέως εἰς Δυρράχιον ἐκ Βρεντεσίου κομιζομένων λαθὼν ἅπαντας εἰς πλοῖον ἐμβὰς μικρὸν ἐπεχείρησε διαπλεῖν τὸ πέλαγος· συγκλυζομένου δὲ τοῦ πλοίου ποιῆσας τῷ κυβερνήτῃ φανερὸν ἀνέβησε ‘πίστευε τῇ τύχῃ γνοὺς ὅτι Καίσαρα κομίζεις.’ 10. Τότε μὲν οὖν ἐκωλύθη τοῦ χειμῶνος γενομένου καὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν συνδραμόντων καὶ περιπαθούντων, εἰ περιμένει δύναμιν ἄλλην ὡς ἀπιστῶν αὐτοῖς[.]

épeι δὲ μάχης γενομένης νικῶν ὁ Πομπήιος οὐκ ἐπεξῆλθεν, ἀλλ’ ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον, ‘τήμερον’ εἶπεν ‘ἔντι ἡ νίκη παρὰ τοῖς πολεμίοις, ἀλλά τὸν εἰδότα νικάν οὐκ ἔχουσιν.’

9. As the transportation of his soldiers from Brundesium to Dyrrachium proceeded slowly, he, without being seen by anybody, embarked in a small boat, and attempted the passage through the open sea. But as the boat was being swamped by the waves, he disclosed his identity to the pilot, crying out, “Trust to Fortune, knowing it is Caesar you carry.” 10. At that time he was prevented from crossing, as the storm became violent, and his soldiers quickly gathered about him in a state of high emotion if it could be that he were waiting for other forces because he felt he could not rely on them.

---

\(^{858}\) *Caes.* 35.6–11 and *Pomp.* 62.1 contain the same story. The version of *Caes.* is much more elaborate and contains an additional saying of Caesar in 35.6.

\(^{859}\) See van der Wiel (2023a) 15–17 on the reddivision of these apophthegms, based mainly on ἐπεὶ δὲ at the outset of Xb, used as an opening for 44 apophthegms (μὲν οὖν continues the story, see Denniston (1954) 470–481), on a comparison with *Caes.* 38.3–7 and 39.8, and on the contrast πίστευε – ἀπιστῶν in IX–Xa.
A battle was fought and Pompey was victorious; he did not, however, follow up his success, but withdrew to his camp. Caesar said, “To-day the victory was with the enemy, but they have not the man who knows how to be victorious.”

The direction in which Caesar is going in IX–Xa is not immediately clear. As Pompey’s departure from Rome is described in the previous apophthegm (206C: Ἐπεὶ δὲ Πομπηίου φυγόντος ἐπὶ θάλασσαν ἐκ τῆς Ῥώμης), Caesar at first sight seems to be crossing the sea from Brundisium to Dyrrachium in order to pursue his enemy. Only at the end does one realize that Caesar in fact is already on the other side of the sea and is trying to go back, out of fear of an attack when most of his soldiers have still to be transported. The reference to his faith in τύχη during the storm and the complaints of his soldiers provide the background against which Xb will be read: after IX and Xa, the reader might conclude that τύχη has abandoned Caesar, for he fails to cross the sea due to a storm, and that his lack of confidence in his troops says something about his military capacities, for his soldiers seem to think that their presence alone suffices. Xb, however, shows that both conclusions are wrong. Caesar’s fear and lack of confidence was not unfounded, for Pompey indeed wins the battle. This obviously illustrates Caesar’s military insight. Furthermore, τύχη has not forsaken him, for he is not utterly destroyed by his enemies. In addition, Caesar’s saying concerning the incompetence of his enemies contrasts with his own strategic genius (206D). This is in line with what follows: XI deals with the moments before Pharsalus, when Caesar points out that Pompey made an error of judgement. The reader knows what the outcome will be (206DE).

There remain four apophthegms. Caesar XII and XIII deal with the final battles of the civil war: Caesar utters his famous words veni vidi

---

860 The story fills Caes. 38, where the account is much clearer. See also De fort. Rom. 319B–D (where the outcome of the event is left out: Caesar could not cross the sea), describing the role of fortune in Caesar’s life. Beck, M. (2003) 176–177 provides a detailed comparison of all accounts.

861 The following element of the Life is left out (39.1): Ἐκ τούτου κατέπλευσε μὲν Ἀντώνιος, ἀπὸ Βρεντεσίου τὰς δυνάμεις ἄγων, θαρρήσας δὲ Καῖσαρ προ الغذόκελτῳ Πομπηίῳ (“After this, Antony put in from Brundisium with his forces, and Caesar was emboldened to challenge Pompey to battle”): Caesar’s forces were present, but this did not suffice.

862 Fortune is one of the explanations for Pompey’s mistake in the account of Caes. 39.8; Pomp. 65.8 provides two other explanations for his restraint from routing the enemies: μὴ δυνηθεντος ἢ φοβηθεντος (“either because he could not, or because he feared to do so”).

863 The story is also told in Caes. 44.7–8 and Pomp. 69.7–8.
vici after the defeat of Pharnaces (206E);\textsuperscript{864} and complains after Cato’s suicide, since he was not able to spare the man (205E; the apophthegm recalls his clemency from Cicero, 204E–205E).\textsuperscript{865} Caesar XIV and XV are a typical closure, prefiguring Caesar’s death (206EF).\textsuperscript{866} The general structure of Caesar, then, is as follows (note the gradual shifting):

| Caesar I: typical opening (time of Sulla) |
| Love of honour at all cost | Caesar II: Caesar runs for pontifex maximus |
| Caesar III: Caesar divorces only because of rumours |
| Caesar IV: turning point – comparison with Alexander the Great |
| Caesar V: Caesar wants to be the first |
| Crossing the Alps |
| The civil war |
| Caesar VI and VII: alea iacta est |
| Caesar VIII: Caesar takes money from the treasure |
| Caesar IX: Caesar’s fortune |
| Brundisium – Dyrrhachium |
| Caesar X: Caesar’s fortune, Pompey’s incapacity |
| Dyrrhachium |
| Caesar XI: Pompey’s incapacity |
| Pharsalus |
| Caesar XII: veni vidi vici, Caesar as a great general |
| The East |
| Caesar XIII: Cato’s suicide |
| Africa |

\textsuperscript{864} The saying occurs in Caes. 50.3, where Plutarch adds that it sounds much better in Latin (Caes. 50.4); see also Pelling (2011) 393. On Plutarch and (his knowledge of) Latin, see Rose, H. J. (1924) 11–19; Jones, C. P. (1971) 81–87; Moya del Baño – Carrasco Reija (1991); De Rosalia (1991); Titchener (1992) 4130; Strobach (1997) 33–39; Zadorojnyi (2005) 496–497; Setaioli (2007); Stadter (2010b) and (2012a); Pelling (2011) 43–44; Setaioli (2019).

\textsuperscript{865} Caes. 54.1–2 and Ca. Mi. 72.2 also contain the saying. Caesar’s mildness reminds one of Cicero XX (in line with Ca. Mi. 72.3: had Caesar spared Cato’s life, this would have enhanced his good repute).

\textsuperscript{866} In IV, Caesar says that Antony and Dolabella do not scare him, but that he does not trust Brutus and Cassius (206E). Three Lives contain the story: Ant. 11.6, Brut. 8.2, and Caes. 62.10 (the chapter contains other sayings about Caesar’s murderers too). See Pelling (2011) 464–465 on all accounts. In XV, Caesar claims that he prefers an unexpected death (206F). The saying occurs in Caes. 63.7: this chapter contains different anecdotes on various signs prefiguring Caesar’s death. On Caesar’s downfall and the final chapters of the Life, see Pelling (1997b).
Conclusion
The reader is invited not only by the similarities in structure between Pompeius (203B–204E) and Caesar (205E–206F), but also by their comparison in Cicero (204E–205E) to contrast the image of the two Romans. The question is why Caesar won while Pompey lost. A first answer, already suggested by the earlier comparison of Pompey and Lucullus, concerns the fortune of both men. Τύχη stood with Caesar, and no longer with Pompey in his final years. The latter should therefore perhaps have taken a step back. Second, the qualities of both generals are compared, already in Cicero. Caesar prevails in this regard too, and Pompey makes the greatest mistakes that lead to his own destruction and that of others. In light of this, when both protagonists are compared with Alexander the Great as a key figure (the tertium comparationis is twice their love of honour, resulting in their wars), the connection Caesar–Alexander appears more justified than Pompey–Alexander. Precisely this was the reason for the pairing of Alexander–Caesar and of Agesilaus–Pompey in the Parallel Lives. At first, one therefore concludes that the image of Caesar seems much more positive.

Yet the theme of internal strife darkens the image. Plutarch ensures that this receives all the attention in Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata, not only by the content of these sections, but also by postponing the mention of a civil war between Sulla and Marius until Pompeius, and by introducing the later Roman sections (Lucullus–Caesar) with a reference to the Diadochi, recalling the themes of internal harmony and durability of an empire from the monarchical sections (172E–184F). Once more, a comparison with the Parallel Lives is interesting in this regard. First, the downfall of Agesilaus and Pompey is accompanied by a change of opponents: after fighting other people, both suddenly turn against their fellow Greeks or Romans, which leads to their downfall.667 This similarity between both men is an important theme in their Lives too, and one of the reasons why they are paired with each other. The nature of the wars fought by Alexander and Caesar, however, was different: the former defeated barbarians; the latter also fought Roman citizens. Although this contrast is not stressed in Alexander–Caesar, it is emphasized by the collection. The readers can therefore wonder whether Caesar is not to be blamed for this: the Macedonian Empire stayed together as long as Alex-

667 Nevin (2014) 66–67 writes about Ages.–Pomp.: “Both subjects were great military figures who might have defeated foreign foes, but both missed this goal because their desire for preeminence led them into conflict with their own peoples. The allusions to Agamemnon and Alexander show the failed potential of their careers. Negative comparison thus clarifies the theme that permeates the pair, namely the personal and civic damage that is caused by excessive desire for victory.” On these Lives as a pair, see also Hefner (1995) 19–22.
ander lived, but Caesar did his own country much harm. One concludes, then, that despite the fact that this Roman is the greatest general, and despite his unparalleled clemency, his image is definitely not univocally positive, for his excessive φιλοτιμία brought the Romans no good. This is of paramount importance for a reading of Augustus.

5.4 The Roman Principate: Augustus (206F–208A)

Plutarch closes his collection with the first Roman emperor. The section opens with a comprehensive apophthegm (206F–207A):

Καῖσαρ ὁ πρῶτος ἐπικληθεὶς Σεβαστὸς ἔτι μειράκιον ὄν Ἀντώνιον ἀπήτει <τάς> δισχιλίας πεντακοσίας μυριάδας, ἀς τοῦ πρῶτου Καῖσαρος ἀναπαυθεντος ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας πρὸς αὐτόν ὁ Ἀντώνιος μετήνεγκεν, ἀποδοῦν τὸ καταλειφθὲν ὑπὸ Καῖσαρος, ἑκάστῳ δραχμὰς ἑβδομήκοντα πέντε· τοῦ δ’ Ἀντωνίου τὰ μὲν χρήματα κατέχοντο, ἐκεῖνον δὲ τῆς ἀπαιτήσεως ἀμελεῖν, εἰ σωφρονεῖ, κελεύουσα· καὶ τὴν δωρεὰν ἀποδοὺς εὔνοιαν μὲν αὑτῷ, μῖσος δ’ ἐκείνῳ παρὰ τῶν πολιτῶν περιεποίησεν.

Caesar, who was the first to bear the title of Augustus, was only a youth when he made formal demand upon Antony for the million pounds which had belonged to the first Caesar, who had been assassinated, and which Antony had transferred from Caesar’s house to his own keeping; for Augustus wished to pay to the citizens of Rome the sum which had been left to them by Caesar, three pounds to each man. But when Antony held fast to the money, and also suggested to Augustus that, if he had any sense, he had better forget about his demand, Augustus announced an auction of his ancestral property and sold it; and by paying the bequest he fostered popularity for himself and hatred for Antony on the part of the citizens.

---


869 The story occurs in Ant. 16.1–6; Brut. 22.1–3; Cic. 43.8 (cf. Moles (1988) 194; and Lintott (2013) 201–202).
This opening story is well chosen (cf. the words in bold): it relates to Augustus’ younger years; it refers back to Caesar’s death, to which the two final apophthegms of Caesar (206EF) allude too (the first of these mentions Antony as well); the enmity between Augustus and Antony connects it with the next two apophthegms (207AB); and, finally, Augustus’ generosity, which aims at gaining popularity among the people, recalls Alexander’s largesse (esp. Alexander IV–VII, 179E–180A; and Alexander XXX, 181DE) and Philip’s advice for his son that he should win the love of the masses especially in his younger years (Philippus XVI–XVII, 178BC): this is precisely what Augustus does, and this will form a solid basis for his later successes described in the remainder of the section.

In contrast to the preceding sections focusing on civil wars, Plutarch does not want to focus too much on the war between Augustus and Antony: only Augustus II and III deal with this topic. In II, the Thracian king Rhoemetalces supports Augustus after betraying Antony (207A); in III, Antony has already been defeated when Augustus takes Alexandria (207A). While the people of this city fear harsh treatment, the emperor acts mildly (207B).

\[ \text{πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τὸ μέγεθος καὶ τὸ κάλλος, ἐπείτα διὰ τὸν κτίστην Ἀλέξανδρον, τρίτον δὲ ὂν ἄρειον τὸν φίλον.} \]

first because of its [Alexandria’s] greatness and beauty, secondly because of its founder, Alexander, and thirdly because of Areius his own friend.

Alexander the Great is mentioned here for the first time in the section on Augustus. He will return in VIII, where the emperor is explicitly compared with him (207CD), but Plutarch first inserts other stories instigated by the apophthegm quoted. First, the mention of Alexandria leads to the inclusion of IV, about the procurator of Egypt (Ἔρως ὁ τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ διοικῶν) who is punished in a horrible way by Augustus because he ate a victorious quail (207B). This contrasts sharply with Augustus’ mildness in III and problematizes the image a first time.

870 Note ἐτι μειράκιον ὤν at the outset of Caesar (205EF) as well.
871 Also told in Rom. 17.3 (on the betrayal of Tarpeia), combined with a similar saying of Antigonus.
872 Plutarch tells this apophthegm in Ant. 80.2 (in a different order: Alexander is mentioned first) and in Praec. ger. reip. 814D (the elements occur in the same order as in Reg. et imp. apophth.). See Stadter (2008) 62–63 for a more detailed discussion of these accounts.
873 According to Brenk (2002) 79 (= (2007) 167), “Egyptian material in the Lives is mostly limited to Agesilaos, Alexander-Caesar, and Antony.” If the Life of Augustus had survived, it might have been part of this list.
In addition, the mention of Areius in III, a friend of Augustus, provides a link with V, in which this man plays a role too: he becomes procurator of Sicily (207B). This apophthegm, in turn, is connected with VI by the theme of friendship: on every birthday, Augustus receives a φιάλη from Maecenas, his confidant (207C: συμβιωτής). This brings the reader to VII. In this story, Athenodorus, a philosopher and advisor of Augustus, is of great age and therefore wants to leave. The emperor allows him to do so. When the old man is about to go home, he says (207C):

‘ὅταν ὀργισθῇς, Καῖσαρ, μηδὲν εἴπῃς μηδὲ ποιήσῃς πρότερον ἢ τὰ εἴκοσι καὶ τέτταρα γράμματα διελθεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτόν[.]’

“Whenever you get angry, Caesar, do not say or do anything before repeating to yourself the twenty-four letters of the alphabet[.]”

Because of this saying, Augustus realizes that he is still in need of the philosopher’s help and therefore asks him to stay. When one recalls Augustus’ punishment of Eros in IV (207B), this seems to be a wise decision. At the same time, a relationship between ruler and philosopher once more calls Alexander to mind, who was asked by Philip to listen to Aristotle’s advice in order to avoid mistakes (Philippus XXII and XXIII, 178EF). This reminiscence leads to the core apophthegm, Augustus VIII (207CD, preceded and followed by seven apophthegms):

Ἀκούσας δὲ ὅτι Ἀλέξανδρος δύο καὶ τριάκοντα γεγονὼς ἔτη κατεστραμμένος τὰ πλεῖστα διηπόρει τί ποιήσει τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον, ἐθαύμαζεν, εἰ μὴ μεῖζον ποιήσει τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον, ἐθαύμαζεν, εἰ μὴ μεῖζον Ἀλέξανδρος ἔργον ἡγεῖτο τοῦ κτῆσασθαι μεγάλην ἡγεμονίαν τὸ διατάξαι τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν.

He learned that Alexander, having completed nearly all his conquests by the time he was thirty-two years old, was at an utter loss to know what he should do during the rest of his life, whereat Augustus expressed his surprise that Alexander did not regard it as a greater task to set in order the empire which he had won than to win it.

In line with VII (207C), VIII thus recalls the Macedonian sections too. The story refers to the great flaw of Alexander, which provided the main point of criticism in his section: he was mainly concerned with conquering and waging wars against barbarians. Because of his singular focus,
The Macedonian Empire disintegrated after his death (cf. esp. *Alexander XXXIV*, 181F; and the following sections on the *Diadochi*, 181F–184F).

These two themes of, on the one hand, mildness and restraint of anger, and, on the other hand, the longevity of a great empire are continued in Augustus’ final apophthegms (207D–208A): three stories follow, in which the emperor becomes furious and either restrains himself or repents after an outburst of anger; and two related to the durability of the Roman Empire. In *Augustus* IX, the emperor attacks a man who would have been involved in the adultery committed by his daughter, Iulia (207D: Ἰουλίᾳ τῇ θυγατρί). Augustus immediately repents because he lost his self-restraint out of anger (207D: ὑπ’ ὀργῆς). In this way, the apophthegm fits within the theme of VII (207C); furthermore, it is connected with X by the reference to Iulia (207DE). In this story, Augustus sends his daughter’s son (τὸν θυγατριδοῦν), Gaius, to Armenia, while asking (207E):

παρὰ τῶν θεῶν εὐνοιαν αὐτῷ τὴν Πομπηίου, τόλμαν δὲ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου, τύχην δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ παρακολουθῆσαι.

the gods that the popularity of Pompey, the daring of Alexander, and his own good luck might attend the young man.

Some historical facts, not mentioned, were undoubtedly known by the ancient reader: Gaius was severely injured during this campaign and died soon after. Augustus then had to find another heir to the throne. There is, therefore, an implicit connection with *Augustus* XI (207E):

Ῥωμαίοις δὲ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἔλεγεν ἀπολείψειν διάδοχον, ὃς οὐδέποτε περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πράγματος δὶς ἐβουλεύσατο, Τιβέριον λέγων.

He said that he would leave to the Romans as his successor on the throne a man who never had deliberated twice about the same thing, meaning Tiberius.

The theme of the sustainability of the Roman Empire is not only present through the historical background of *Augustus* X (207DE) and its link with this apophthegm (207E), for the reference back to Alexander in the context of Gaius’ campaign to the East also connects X with VIII (207CD, on the durability of the Macedonian Empire).876 The reader con-

---

876 The account of *Augustus* X in *De fort. Rom.* 319DE (see Zadorojnyi (2018) 226 on this and similar passages) contains some differences: (1) Plutarch does not mention where Gaius’ campaign took place and (2) the saying does not mention Alexander, but refers to Scipio, who is in turn absent from *Augustus* X. Scipio is not mentioned in *Reg. et imp. ap-
cludes that Augustus, after the eastern campaign of Gaius, was concerned with his succession and, therefore, with the longevity of his dynasty. This contrasts with Alexander in a positive way, although Augustus’ concern probably came too late: it was well known that the emperor was at first in doubt whether he had to appoint Tiberius as his successor or not, and “never deliberating twice about the same thing” can hardly be seen as a good characteristic – definitely not in comparison with Augustus, who repented after giving in to his excessive anger in IX.878

Augustus XII relates to Augustus’ later years. This announces that the remainder of the section belongs to this period of his life (207E):

Θορυβοῦντας δὲ τοὺς ἐν ἀξιώματι νέους καταστεῖλαι βουλόμενος, ὡς οὐ προσεῖχον ἀλλ’ ἐθορύβουν, ‘ἀκούσατε’ εἶπε ‘νέοι γέροντος, οὐ νέοι γέροντες ἣκουον.’

When he was trying to quiet the young men in high station who were in an uproar, and they paid no heed, but continued with their uproar, he said, “Do you young men listen to an old man, to whom old men listened when he was young.”

Augustus tries to calm down agitated young men. He himself was volatile once too. In this way, XII marks a break between XI (207E) and XIII and XIV (207EF), repeating Augustus’ restraint of anger (also recalling Philip):879 in XIII, the emperor does not treat the Athenians harshly despite his anger (207EF); in XIV, he gets angry because of the frank speech of the only remaining descendant of Brasidas, but treats him mildly (207F).880 A somewhat more moderate, elder Augustus therefore

ophth. because of the connection Augustus–Alexander (Pompey the Great fits here too), while the broader passage of De fort. Rom. 318D–320A only contains Roman examples. For the same reason, the reference to Armenia is necessary in the collection, while its absence is not a problem in De fort. Rom. (where the connection Augustus–Alexander is irrelevant). Beck, M. (2003) 177–178 also compares the two accounts, concluding (178): “It would not be too far fetched to conclude that Plutarch inserted Alexander in place of Scipio on the eve of Trajan’s Parthian expedition since the aemulatio Alexandri motif would loom large for any leader venturing on a campaign of conquest in that part of the globe.”

877 See in this context also De gar. 508AB. Suetonius, Tiberius 21 describes Augustus’ doubts, but concludes that in the end the emperor was convinced that he made the right decision.

878 I am grateful to Professor Christopher Pelling for this suggestion.


880 Thucydides’ book referred to in the apophthegm is book VII of the ancient division (in thirteen books), describing a campaign of Brasidas (now the fourth book); see Babbitt (1931) 235; Parke (1955) 69.
appears from XII on. In this respect, the account of this story in *An seni respublica gerenda sit* is worth quoting (784D):\(^{881}\)

Καίσαρος δὲ τοῦ καταλύσαντος Ἀντώνιον οὔτι μικρῷ βασιλικότερα καὶ δημωφέλέστερα γενέσθαι πολιτεύματα πρὸς τῇ τελευτῇ πάντες ὁμολογούσιν: αὐτὸς δὲ τοὺς νέους ἔθεσι καὶ νόμοις αὐστηρῶς σωφρονίζων, ὡς ἐθορύβησαν, ἀκούσατ’ εἶπε ἄνεοι γέροντος οὐ νέου γέροντες ἥκουσαν.

In the case of the Caesar who defeated Antony, all agree that his political acts towards the end of his life became much more kingly and more useful to the people. And he himself, when the young men made a disturbance as he was rebuking them severely for their manners and customs, said, “Listen, young men, to an old man to whom old men listened when he was young.”

The use of βασιλικότερα is striking. The precise meaning of the word does not become clear from this passage, not even through its combination with δημωφέλέστερα, used in Plutarchan fashion as a further specification:\(^{882}\) one does not hear what “a more kingly government” or “a policy which is more useful to the subjects” consists of. This is why the inclusion of *Augustus XII* in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* is telling: it relates to the ruler’s mildness (an important theme in *Augustus* in general, esp. in *Augustus XIII*, which immediately follows). It is, therefore, not unlikely that the passage of *An seni respublica gerenda sit* should be read in light of this: Augustus’ rule became milder as the emperor grew older. Such interpretation is in line with the development throughout *Augustus*, where his restraint of anger is a main theme and the same apophthegm as the one of the treatise marks a turning point.\(^{883}\)

*Augustus* XV closes not only the section, but also the entire collection. It one last time comes back to the longevity of the Roman Empire (208A):

---

\(^{881}\) Jones, C. P. (1971) 79 comments on this passage: “The notion that Augustus’ rule changed with time, growing ‘more kingly and public spirited’, was a commonplace. It had grown naturally out of an implied claim of Augustan propaganda, that the emperor, after the necessary measures to defeat the hordes of the East, had transferred power from himself to the senate and turned a new leaf in his own history and the state’s.”

\(^{882}\) Cf. Teodorsson (2000). See also supra, p. 34.

\(^{883}\) As Jones, C. P. (1971) 79 and Ash (1997) 191 point out, *Augustus* could shed light on the lost *Life of Augustus*. Restraint of anger, then, might have been a core topic in the work. Geiger (2005) 234–235 suggests that Augustus’ building projects might have been discussed in the *Life* (cf. *Per*). Yet, as Boatwright (2002) 269 observes, Plutarch also omits the theme of building policy from *Alex*. 

Πείσωνος δὲ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐκ θεμελίων ἄχρι τῆς στέγης ἐπιμελῶν ὄικοδομοῦντος, 'εὔθυμον' ἔφη 'με ποιεῖς οὕτως οἰκοδομῶν, ὡς οἴδίου τῆς Ῥώμης ἐσομένης.'

When Piso built his house with great care from the foundation to the roof-tree, Augustus said, "You make heart glad by building thus, as if Rome is to be eternal."

This reference to Rome’s hopefully eternal durability is the perfect closure of the work, as it is the culmination of Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata as an abbreviated world history. It is probably not by chance that the reader meets all the people to whom Plutarch devoted a section in his collection throughout Augustus: there is a Thracian king in II (207A); one travels to Egypt in III and IV (207AB); one goes to Sicily in V (207B); the Macedonian Alexander the Great is mentioned in III (207AB), VIII (207CD), and X (207DE), in which Gaius is dispatched to Armenia; the Athenians and the Spartan Brasidas are referred to in respectively XIII and XIV (207EF). These references not only recall, at the level of the text as a whole, all of its main sections, but also, at the level of contemporary reality, almost all the people that were in Trajan’s day part of the Roman Empire (cf. Part I, chapter 2).

An overview of the section’s structure is now convenient (note the gradual shifting). Augustus III (207AB) introduces IV–VIII (207B–D); VII and VIII (207CD) introduce IX–XV (207D–208A):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Augustus I:</th>
<th>Augustus is beloved by the people, Antony is hated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Augustus II:</td>
<td>Augustus and the Thracian king against Antony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus III:</td>
<td>(Antony is defeated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria (Egypt) – friendship with Areius – Alexander the Great</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus IV:</td>
<td>Egyptian Procurator (διοικῶν)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus V:</td>
<td>Friendship with Areius, who becomes the Sicilian procurator (διοικητήν)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus VI:</td>
<td>Friendship with Maeceas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus VII:</td>
<td>Friendship with Athenodorus, which reminds one of Alexander and Aristotle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restraint of anger (ὀργισθῇς)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus VIII:</td>
<td>Alexander the Great Durability of an empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus IX:</td>
<td>Augustus attacks a young man out of anger (ὑπ’ ὀργῆς) and repents – adultery committed by his daughter (τῇ θυγατρί) Iulia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustus X:</td>
<td>Gaius Caesar, son of Augustus’ daughter (τὸν θυγατριδοῦν) and (although not explicitly stated) his successor, is sent to Armenia – reference to Alexander</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Augustus XI: Tiberius as successor (cf. the durability of the empire)

Augustus XII: From now on, Augustus’ later years

Augustus XIII: Augustus is angry with the Athenians, but does not punish them

Augustus XIV: Augustus is angry, but remains mild. Similar to Philip

Augustus XV: durability of the empire

One concludes that Augustus establishes a ring composition by recalling the monarchical sections. The image of the first emperor is similar to that of many Macedonian kings, and especially to Philip and Alexander the Great, as he needs philosophical guidance to help him to restrain his anger – the idea that rulers should practice philosophy is a key point of Plutarch’s thinking and is not incidentally stressed once more at the end of the work. Augustus, then, is not perfect, but tries his best and aims to suppress his sometimes rather explosive character in order to be a lenient ruler. In this way, he clearly has his subjects’ best interests at heart. Yet precisely this, in fact, also appears from a difference with Alexander the Great: he wants to establish stability and prosperity in the Roman Empire, and conquering is no longer a main goal. This reference to the Pax Romana alludes to the possible perpetuity of the Roman Empire.
Concluding Remarks

The dedicatory letter to Trajan in various respects reminds one of proems to pairs of the *Parallel Lives*, which coincides with the fact that *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* are introduced as an abridged version of the latter and should familiarize Trajan with the greatest heroes of the past. A critical attitude expected from the reader reveals a clash within the programmatic letter, highlighting that participatory readership is essential for getting acquainted with characters in literature. As such, the letter has a metatextual function: it makes readers reflect upon the way they should deal with apophthegms, and this should have repercussions for how the following collection will be approached. In short, the letter trains its readership.

In line with these expectations of the readers, the analysis of the apophthegm collection has shown that the work is, generally speaking, carefully structured at all levels – which are also announced by the dedicatory letter – in a way that should guide the readers towards a specific interpretation and judgement:

1. Within sections on famous individuals (cf. 172C: τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων), apophthegms (172C: ἀπομνημονευμάτων) usually give at least the impression of being a chronological summary of the hero’s life (or *Life*). In most cases they are connected with each other through the principle of gradual shifting, but sometimes Plutarch deviates from this practice in order to achieve a certain literary effect. Similarly, not all apophthegms are equally relevant for characterization: some in the first place seem to perform a structuring function (for example separating blocks of apophthegms), but in this way they are still an important device to guide the reader.

2. Groups of people (cf. 172C: παρὰ τε Ῥωμαίοις καὶ παρ᾽ Ἕλλησιν) and types of rulership (cf. 172C: ἡγεμόνων καὶ νομοθετῶν καὶ αὐτοκρατόρων) divide the text into three parts of almost equal length: a first part on monarchs (barbarians, Sicilians, and Macedoni-
ans, 172E–184F), a second one on the Greeks of the mainland (Athenians, Spartans, and Thebans, 184F–194E), and a third one on the Romans (194E–208A). Plutarch often seems inclined to open (and sometimes to conclude, cf. Dion, 176F–177A) sections concerning a people on a positive note. The implications of this are discussed in Part III.

Frequently the image of a people influences the portrait of the individuals: the general evolution throughout the Sicilian sections tells much about the paranoid behaviour described in Dionysius Maior (175C–176C); the overall picture of ‘the Spartan’ has an impact on the way Lysander (190D–F) and other sections should be read.

[3] In general, there are two main chronologies in the work: one consisting of the monarchical sections (172E–184F), and a second one including the Greeks of the mainland and the Romans (184F–208A). The break is located between Antiochus Septimus (184D–F) and Themistocles (184F–185F): before the former, the focus lies on the rulers’ mildness or harshness towards their subjects; from the latter on, the collection explores topics such as strife in society amongst equals, and closely connected with this the difficulties statesmen (orators or generals) might face in their attempt to persuade the masses, flattered by their opponents. Yet a certain degree of consistency can be noted across both parts, as the relationship between rulers and peoples is always central at this level of the text.

When the readers follow Plutarch’s guidance, often expressed through verbatim and thematic connections, they reach an assessment of the hero’s character. However, with the possible exception of some opening sections such as Cyrus (172EF), Archelaus (177AB), Lycurgus–Theopompus (189D–190A), and Manius Curius–Gaius Fabricius (194E–195B), this assessment is only rarely straightforward. Barbarian kings do not seem to act consistently, Macedonian rulers seem far better persons than the despots and tyrants until Plutarch stresses their flaws, Greek democracy is dominated by the difficult question of when it is appropriate to compromise one’s principles, and it is not always clear to the Athenian, Spartan, Theban, or Roman generals and orators (and, as a consequence, to the audience of readers) which tactics are to be applied in a war. In almost every character, then, there are many features to admire; at the same time, there is almost always at least something to disapprove of.

The idea that only positive exempla figure in Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata should therefore be rejected (although there does indeed seem to be a tendency to leave out the most horrible episodes of ancient history). Virtues such as justice, mildness, bravery, sagacity, and

---


885 Cf. also supra, note 144 on Pelling (2002) 83.
temperance are not the only protagonists in the collection, for the work also shows respect for human nature with all its shortcomings: vices such as jealousy, arrogance, suspicion, anger, and lack of self-restraint often receive ample attention as well. The collection, then, is much closer to the complexities of the Parallel Lives than is generally assumed.

The dedicatory letter raises some questions in this respect. The analysis has shown that in this ‘programmatic proem’ Plutarch not only states that the reader can quickly gain insight into characters of the past thanks to the apophthegm collection, but he also suggests that a further step of the reader’s moral improvement should eventually take place. This means that in essence Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata are a piece of exemplary literature. A case such as Lysander (190D–F), however, makes one wonder whether he truly is a role model, and if he is an exemplum, in what sense he can be one; when the unprincipled Themistocles saves his homeland (184F–185F), it is unclear to what extent he is to be imitated; and even a most philosophical character such as Phocion (187E–189B) does not simply call for μίμησις, for despite (or perhaps precisely because of) his virtues he brought death not only to himself but also to his friends. Part III will address such issues and examines how Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata function as exemplary literature.
PART III

A GUIDE FOR THE EMPEROR
Introduction

Part III, building on the literary analysis of Part II, discusses *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* as exemplary literature, examining how the work serves as a guide for the Roman emperor (since he is presented as the target reader), in the context of Plutarch’s oeuvre. When referring to ‘Trajan’, however, I do not only mean the emperor as a historical figure, but also – and in the first place – Trajan as the reader implied in and constructed by the text: the person whom the audience will inevitably have in mind when reading the collection, imagining how Plutarch expected a ruler to respond to the text, and what this says about his ideas about the perfect monarch and good rulership. Of course, a reader might have approached the work in other ways as well, but the text presents itself as a ‘mirror of princes’, and this is why it should be read as such in the first place.\(^{886}\)

As announced by the dedicatory letter (172B–E), the collection applies role models at three levels: that of the individual sections; of groups of sections on a people and groups of peoples (cultural identity and types of rulership); and of the work as a whole (as a world history). A chapter will be dedicated to each level:

[1] Chapter 1 deals with the 89 sections on the individual characters. The first part addresses the functions of moralism in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* and its connection with characterization in the sections on historical figures, in light of Plutarch’s practice in the *Parallel Lives* (1.1).\(^{887}\) Closely connected with this, the next subchapters discuss Plutarch’s views on the function of different types of individual role models (negative, virtuous, and basically positive *exempla*) as described in the *Parallel Lives* (mainly in the prologues) and in *De profectibus in virtute* (84B–85C), and examines the implications for the apophthegm collection (1.2–4). This will clarify how this level of the text should function as a guide for the emperor (1.5).

[2] Chapter 2 focuses on the level of the peoples and their rulers, which implies a much more generic and because of this perhaps more straightforward application of role models: the question is how groups of protagonists can teach specific lessons, and how these lessons differ from instructions that result from reading about individuals. The chapter consists of four parts: 2.1 deals with the three types of barbarians in

\(^{886}\) Cf. Part I, chapter 3.

\(^{887}\) As a consequence, this subchapter is indebted to Duff (1999) and Pelling (2002) 237–251.
the collection, the Persians, the Egyptians, and the Thracians–Scythians (172E–174F); 2.2 examines the Sicilian tyrants (175A–177A); 2.3 addresses the Macedonian monarchy (177A–184F); and 2.4 takes a look at other types of government, in the first place ‘democracy’ (184F–206F). Because these groups of sections explore the essence of good rulership, parallels with *Ad principem ineruditum* are of central importance in this chapter.

[3] Chapter 3 discusses *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* as a world history. Perhaps it is not immediately clear how this level of the text can be regarded as an actual ‘model’. Yet human history provides the context within which Trajan (or ‘Trajan’) will act: he will continue the story of mankind, inspired by his predecessors and instigated by the desire to become a role model himself in the future. The apophthegm collection as a whole, then, raises awareness about one’s position in the chain of *exempla* it presents, encouraging the reader to approach the work in a way that ensures a positive effect on the further development of history. Thus, the past (in its entirety) can truly serve as a mirror for moral behaviour.

The chapter first discusses Dillon’s article on Plutarch’s idea of the ‘end of history’ (3.1). A next part addresses the implications of world history as represented in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* (3.2). I will point out that the Chaeronean advises the emperor to deal with *exempla* correctly – i.e. in a way that neglects his love of personal honour acquired in war – in order to serve his subjects to the best of his abilities, establishing a peaceful and prosperous future. In the context of Trajan’s military campaigns, then, the highest level of the text might serve as a warning for the emperor (3.3).

In the concluding remarks, I will briefly point out how these three levels interact with and influence each other.

---

888 Dillon (1997).
The Individual Characters

1.1 Moralism and Characterization

Duff argues that ethics and morals are inseparable from characterization in ancient Greek literature in general and in Plutarch’s biographies in particular. That this not only holds true for the Parallel Lives, but also for how the author thought about the function of Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata and the ‘genre’ of collections of sayings and anecdotes in general, has been discussed in Part I, chapter 3: in the Chaeronean’s point of view, character description is combined with philosophy (or at least with a moral assessment and guidance) in such texts. In light of these insights, the following pages further explore this connection between moralism and characterization in the apophthegm collection, which will raise interesting questions concerning the way in which the individual characters of the work should function as role models, thus providing the basis of the next subchapters on Plutarch’s exemplary thinking and its connections with this specific work.

1.1.1 Moralism

a) Descriptive or protreptic?

Pelling distinguishes two types of moralism in the Parallel Lives, which are not mutually exclusive: a protreptic type, which means that one tries to affect the audience’s behaviour; and a descriptive one, defined as “being more concerned to point truths about human behaviour and shared human experience”. Pelling’s view inspired various other scholars studying Plutarch and his distinction has proven very valuable in their
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889 Duff (1999) 13 (in a chapter on the prologues to the Lives): “In Greek thought, character had an ethical element, conceived in terms of right and wrong, virtue and vice, in terms of conformity to or divergence from moral norms, and this was revealed by deeds. Ancient conceptions of character were therefore less centred on the private, inner world of the individual; more with actions, and their evaluation.”

890 See esp. Part I, chapter 3.1.2.


research,\textsuperscript{893} for it takes into account that there are different Lives from which it is most difficult to derive clear-cut moral lessons applicable in everyday life.\textsuperscript{894} In line with this, this subchapter applies these categories to Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata, since they might shed light on the collection as well, as one expects because of its close connection with (the Plutarchan) biographies.

A first question concerns the kind of moralism dominating the apophthegm collection as a whole:

[1] The dedicatory letter (172B–E) provides a first insight into the matter. As discussed, Plutarch only claims that the collection will enable Trajan to get acquainted with the characters of figures of the past. This suggests that moralism in the work will be entirely descriptive. Yet the distinction between ἀναθεώρησις and ἀποθεώρησις,\textsuperscript{895} the mirror metaphor, and the dynamics between the apophthegms dominating the letter imply that, after observing human behaviour of previous times (the descriptive aspect), Trajan can and should also take a further step and attempt to improve his character. Thus, the letter points out that a protreptic effect is, in the end, still desired to follow moral reflection.

[2] At first sight, this can also be seen from the specific historical figures included in the collection. Most of them are men with whom Trajan can identify. This suggests that the protreptic function of the work is – in general – perhaps even more straightforward than that of the Parallel Lives. In the case of the collection one can readily see how figures such as Alexander the Great or Agesilaus, the most prominent rulers of their society, might serve as role models for the Roman emperor, and this is even more obvious in the case of Caesar and Augustus, Trajan’s Roman predecessors;\textsuperscript{896} in the biographical project, by contrast, this seems less evident, as it is often unclear to what extent the readers should draw moral lessons for their own ethical conduct from heroes who lived not only in a distant past, but also in an entirely different context.\textsuperscript{897}

\textsuperscript{893} Cf. esp. Verdegem (2010) 25–27. See e.g. also Xenophontos (2012a) 628; Chrysanthou (2018) 1; Roskam (2021) 93.

\textsuperscript{894} See also Roskam (2021) 92–95 on the “purpose of the Parallel Lives”.

\textsuperscript{895} Cf. Roskam (2014).

\textsuperscript{896} Note also the overall focus on generalship in sections that deal not with monarchs, but with other state structures: a joint reading of the Athenian, Spartan, and Theban sections (184F–194E) pointed out that there should be limits to a general’s boldness; the earlier Roman sections (194E–202E) together highlighted, in line with this, the importance of military insight and experience. From many of these apophthegms, Trajan, himself the highest military power, can often derive specific lessons (cf. the way in which Jacobs (2018) reads the Parallel Lives).

Yet every biography as a rule contains something useful for the reader’s own life and situation. Often this will concern moral insights and instructions of a more general kind – and this is precisely what Plutarch would have thought. To put it differently: a social, geographical, or chronological distance between readers and their exempla does not prevent them from assessing these characters, and this assessment, one expects, should enable them to distinguish right from wrong, which should have repercussions for their own everyday behaviour.

This is important for a second question, dealing with a lower level of the collection. Some sections could be more relevant for Trajan than others and might, therefore, to some extent be more protreptic. This once more reminds one of Pelling, who concludes that moralism does not have the same purpose in all the Lives:

some Lives, like Caesar, veer to the descriptive end of the spectrum, while others, like Aristides or Brutus or Aemilius Paullus, tend to the protreptic. But it is also now clearer that there is indeed a spectrum, that the distinction between protreptic and descriptive moralism is a blurred one, and the two forms go closely together.

In Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata, the apophthegms of the early Spartans (189D–190A), for example, do not contain evident moral lessons. One cannot imagine that Lycurgus (189D–F) advises Trajan to promulgate similar laws, viz. to make the Roman people wear their hair long (cf. I, 189DE) or to use only simple tools to build their homes (cf. III, 189E). These sections, therefore, rather seem to describe a peculiarity in human behaviour of the past. Augustus (206F–208A) is entirely different. Just to give an example, when the first emperor attempts to ensure succession to the throne – even though he might have been forced to make the wrong decision – and tries to establish stability in the Empire in XI (207E), it is not difficult to see what Trajan should learn from this, especially after a difficult period in Roman history. Yet it would also be wrong to say that Lycurgus only serves a descriptive goal. Despite the witty oddities it includes, the section stresses the ruler’s educating role, as pointed out by the analysis. This obviously entails an important

---

898 In De prof. in virt. 79C–80A, Plutarch expresses the idea that one can always derive something beneficial and useful from everything that has been said and done; in De aud. poet., he claims that one can always deduce something useful from every text, as long as one knows how to engage with literary works properly.


900 See also chapter 3.
lesson for any emperor. In line with what has been concluded about the relevance of some *Parallel Lives*, then, one should keep in mind that Trajan is able to draw moral lessons from every section, albeit sometimes of a more general nature, if he is willing to participate in the reading process the text attempts to elicit, which should bring him to a specific assessment.

One concludes that, in the same way as there is a spectrum between descriptive and protreptic moralism in the *Parallel Lives*, some sections in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* seem to be more descriptive than others, but only in the sense that one can less readily draw specific instructions from them. Yet the possibility of affecting Trajan’s or any other reader’s character and behaviour is never excluded and even always desired throughout the entire work, as this is expected to follow the first stage of moral reflection.

b) Explicit or implicit?
Duff provides another way of defining types of moralism in the *Parallel Lives*, which will further deepen our understanding of the collection as well and thus deserves a place in this chapter too. He speaks of explicit as opposed to implicit moralism when the narrator comments on specific events. As the narrator’s voice is usually absent from the narratives of the *Parallel Lives*, Duff argues that its moralism mostly is of the second type. As a consequence, it is not always clear how certain actions are to be assessed. This resembles Plutarch’s practice in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*, but the collection is definitely a more extreme example of such implicit moralism: there is not a single trace of the narrator’s opinions or judgements in what seems to be nothing more than a list of sayings and a few actions. Of course, this does not mean that the narrator does not guide his readers: as the analysis of the entire work points out, the selection of material and the way in which it is presented leads them to a specific interpretation and, therefore, judgement of the subject’s morality. Yet this does not do away with the fact that the readers eventually have to do the job themselves: much depends on their willingness and capacity to follow the crumbs attempting to lead them through the text. Plutarch obviously expects his readers to be able to do that, as can also be seen from his practice in other works: these contain various

---

902 Duff (1999) 54: “In the body of the *Lives* themselves – as opposed to the formal *synkriseis* – moralism is almost invariably of the second sort” (adding that there are many cases where the narrative does not seem to deal with character as such, but rather with historical facts) and 55: “most Lives provide very little explicit guidance as how to understand the moral position of their subjects or of the actions narrated.”
indications that he wants his audience to draw certain conclusions which he – or at least the narrator – does not formulate explicitly.\textsuperscript{903}

One might think that this extreme implicitness in the apophthegm collection is only the consequence of the type of text and the tradition which the work belongs to. However, this is only partially true. Valerius Maximus sometimes introduces groups of stories with short comments and even reflections.\textsuperscript{904} ‘Thus, the narrator is not entirely absent from his work. Plutarch could have done something similar: he could have written an introduction for a series of apophthegms at any level of the text, perhaps for each person, each dynasty, or even every single section, if he wanted to do so.\textit{Coniugalia praeecepta} illustrate this well: most pieces of advice are accompanied by comments of the narrator, who does not refrain from explaining how the stories, quotes, or other types of advice can help the newlyweds.\textsuperscript{905} In this way, this work provides an example of a similar text type by the same author in which a more explicit protreptic moralism prevails. One must conclude, then, that the implicitness in \textit{Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata} was a conscious choice of Plutarch. Two reasons come to mind:

[1] Implicit moralism is the consequence of the collection’s target reader. This can be seen from the author’s caution in the dedicatory letter: if he avoids commending moral progress to the emperor there, as is expected from a subject addressing a monarch, he can hardly do the opposite in the collection. In other words, the absence of explicit moralism goes hand in hand with the fact that he avoids giving the impression of protreptic moralism. Even explicit moralizing claims of a merely descriptive kind would break with that practice, for – as discussed above – protreptic conclusions can and should often be drawn from such information. This reminds one of \textit{Demetrius Phalereus} (189D), placed almost exactly at the centre of the text and recalling the dedicatory letter: the Athenian realizes that it is not evident for a ruler’s friends to give moral lessons or to rebuke him for certain actions or behaviour. This is why he recommends some books to Ptolemy.\textsuperscript{906} Plutarch does exactly the same: he does not give instructions as such, but lets the apophthegms speak for themselves. Yet precisely by focusing on his caution in the letter and by the remarkable

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item Konstan (2004) argues that in Plutarch’s view the readers give the eventual meaning to the text, not the author, which calls Barthes’ ‘The Death of the Author’ to mind. See also Duff (2011a) on the critical reader in Plutarch.
  \item Often to indicate why he includes a specific theme. A chapter on omens for example opens with a motivation for why it belongs to the theme of religion (I.5,praef.). At the outset of his second book, Valerius Maximus also dwells upon his moral purpose: one can learn from examining institutions of old, so he writes (II,praef.).
  \item See also Part I, chapter 1.2.1 on \textit{Con. praec.} and \textit{Reg. et imp. apophth.}
  \item Probably Ptolemy I, see also supra, note 595.
\end{itemize}
location of the Demetrius apophthegm, the author also emphasizes that he knows what he is doing and that he consciously assumes the attitude expected from a citizen addressing the emperor. This highlights that his caution is not the result of his fear, but rather reflects a common practice: it is a traditional attitude with which Plutarch likes to play.

[2] This conventional caution, however, definitely is not Plutarch’s most important motivation. The author simply does not like to provide clear-cut moral instructions: he often enjoys letting his readers search for an ethical or even metaphysical truth themselves,\textsuperscript{907} and, in line with a recent book by Roskam, one might even say that philosophical ζήτησις dominates the Chaeronean’s oeuvre.\textsuperscript{908} In light of this,\textit{ Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata} are a typically Plutarchan work, for its audience has to enter a complex and participatory readership in order to decide how the moral behaviour of the subjects is to be assessed.\textsuperscript{909} This recalls the \textit{Parallel Lives} once more, and is also in line with Chrysanthou’s reading of the biographical project.\textsuperscript{910}

This aspect will be further explored in the following overview of strategies of characterization in the collection.

1.1.2 Characterization

In the collection implicit moralism goes hand in hand with almost entirely implicit characterization. In the few cases where a personality is explicitly described, this – with a few exceptions\textsuperscript{911} – happens through

\textsuperscript{907} For example \textit{De E}, reflecting on the nature of Apollo, is dominated by ζήτησις, see Bonazzi (2008); Thum (2013) \textit{passim}. Obsieger (2013), however, claims that \textit{De E} is not to be taken seriously, but see Roskam (2015) 319: “In my view, Obsieger is right in arguing that nobody, not even Ammonius, is meant to speak the last word about this topic, but he overstates his case by overemphasising the role of humour. In fact, Obsieger underestimates, in my view, the multifaceted dynamics of Plutarch’s philosophical ζήτησις”; cf. van der Wiel (2021) 72n2 on this matter.

\textsuperscript{908} Roskam (2021) \textit{passim}.

\textsuperscript{909} Roskam (2021) 110 argues that “the collections of sayings aim at zetetic moralism in its light version.”

\textsuperscript{910} Chrysanthou (2018).

\textsuperscript{911} In \textit{Cotys I} (174D), the Thracian king is described as follows: \textit{Φύσει δ’ ὦν ὀξὺς ἐν ὀργήν καὶ πικρὸς τῶν ἁμαρτανόντων ἐν ταῖς διακονίαις κολαστής} (“He was by nature very irascible and prone to punish severely any lapses in service”). This is a straightforward interpretation of the apophthegm which follows. Something similar occurs in \textit{Epameinondas IV} (192D): \textit{Οὕτω δ’ ἦν εὐτελῆς περὶ τὴν ἄθρακαν, ὡστε […]} (“He was so frugal in his manner of living that once […]”), again followed by a story which can only be interpreted in this way. Such explicit authorial interpretations are rare in the collection.
another character talking about the subject in question (cf. the absence of the narrator’s voice). Because the reliability of these speakers is often to be questioned, the reader is in such instances always invited to measure the truth of their remarks by sayings of the character discussed. In other cases (albeit rarely), a protagonist describes his own personality. Again, the reader is expected to measure the validity of such comments by other apopthegms on the same historical figure.

This already illustrates that characterization is a process that primarily takes place in the reader’s mind. Every single piece of information that can be related to a character will influence the way in which the audience perceives his or her personality: it can confirm the image that has been built up, it can add something new to this picture, but it can also contradict and deconstruct it. This happens at several levels of the text, which once more recalls Plutarch’s practice in the Parallel Lives:

1. Characterization of a subject within his own section;
2. Characterization of a subject in sections other than his own;
3. Characterization through direct or indirect synkrisis. This partially falls within the two preceding levels.

All those levels, constituting the process of assessment and reassessment, can in turn be influenced by a text-external factor:

4. The reader’s acquaintance with the subject. As the audience will have read about the exempla often before, they will already have a certain image of these men when reading the text. In other words, the characters in the apopthegm collection are (almost) never built entirely from the ground up.

a) Characterization within the section of the subject

In studying characterization in the Parallel Lives, Pelling speaks of “integrated characters”. These are:

---

912 Examples of explicit characterization are listed infra, note 919.

913 Clear examples are Darius I (172EF) and Cyrus Minor (173EF), where these kings praise themselves.

914 Not necessarily in the character’s own section: Cyrus Minor (173EF) only contains one apopthegm, so Cyrus’ self-characterization cannot be compared with other apopthegms in his own section, but his image can be contrasted with his brother (see 1.1.2.c on synkrisis).

915 Exceptions might be some less well-known people, such as some barbarians, Hellenistic rulers, or obscure Spartans, although this often depends on the reader’s education and knowledge too.

not stereotypes nor monolithic characters, but those in which traits cluster readily together: a person’s qualities are brought into some sort of relation with one another, and every trait goes closely with the next.

Again, this observation influenced other scholars, such as Candau Morón, who examines Lysander and Sulla as integrated characters.\footnote[917]{Candau Morón (2000). See also note 918 below on Verdegem (2010).} Pelling’s view is also relevant for Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata. A central concept in this respect is gradual shifting, which is the overall structuring and ordering principle of a series of apophthegms within a section. If every single apophthegm represents a certain characteristic or perhaps a set of characteristics, a connection between apophthegms suggests a similar relationship between the various features they illustrate. This creates a ‘blended’ image similar to the “integrated characters” of Pelling’s analysis.

A clear and not too extensive example of this is Anteas (174EF). The analysis has shown that Anteas I and II (174E) are connected by the presence of Philip, and II and III (174EF) by a reference to a horse. This goes hand in hand with the characterization of the Scythian king: the first apophthegm contains a general representation of the Scythians as true barbarians, dealing with the limited supplies they need. Anteas is one of them. This becomes clearer in Anteas II, where the king does not make a distinction between himself and the common people. He does not enjoy pomp and circumstance; he is a no-nonsense man. The closing apophthegm is in line with this, showing the king’s disregard for music, and also his warlike personality. He still appears to be a simple man and a true barbarian. There is, therefore, a connection between all of these characteristics, and this is highlighted by verbal and thematic similarities.

Yet more is going on in this section, since the first apophthegm also represents the most general claim, further developed and deepened by the next ones. Anteas is no exception in this regard: in many other cases, gradual shifting also entails a transition from rather general to more specific aspects. This is often (but not necessarily) accompanied by a shift from a clear to a more problematic picture. This once more reminds one of Pelling.\footnote[918]{Pelling (2002) 293 (cf. (1988a) 269). See Verdegem (2010) 163–164 on Alc. 2–9 as an example of such “progressive redefinition of character”.

One typical feature of Plutarch’s technique is his progressive redefinition of character. He tends to begin by presenting traits or themes rather crudely and bluntly, only later complementing and refining and adding the subtleties, and a character tends to become more singular as his Life progresses.
It does not, therefore, come as a surprise that in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* most cases of explicit characterization occur at the outset of a section. The same goes for the description of physical features connected with a general assessment of the personage, and the frequent use of the imperfect tense in such opening apophthegms, which often concern the hero’s entire life. The few stories on childhood function in a similar way, as they often reflect a feature that will dominate the section or will be further explored, such as Alexander’s and Themistocles’ *φιλοτιμία* (*Alexander I and II, 179D*; and *Themistocles I, 184F–185A*) and Alcibiades’ lack of morality (*I, 186D*). Pelling writes concerning character development in Plutarch.

With idiosyncratic characters, development is typically problematic. For Plutarch it is much simpler. A few childhood traits, broadly

919 The clearest examples are *Darius I (172F)* and *Philippus I (177C)*. In *Scipio Maior III (200A)*, one of the section’s opening stories, Cato gives an explicit description of the young Roman’s character. Of a similar nature, although less explicit character descriptions, are *Cyrus I (172E)* and *Pompeius Ia (203B)*: both men are described as beloved from the perspective of their people. *Phocion IX (188C*, Phocion is praised by Alexander) and *Pompeius V (203EF*, Sulla about Pompey) illustrate that such explicit descriptions can also occur later in a section; and in other cases, a character is even described in the section of another subject, such as *Cyrus Minor (173EF)*, both describing its own subject and that of the following section, *Artaxerxes Mnemon (173F–174A)*. The inscription of *Semiramis (173AB)*, finally, is an interesting case: it addresses anyone who would break into the tomb, which turns it into an explicit description of Darius once he enters the place.

920 The examples are *Cyrus I (172E)* and *Artaxerxes Longimanus I (173D)*.

921 Cf. Part I, chapter 2.2 on the general structure of sections of *Reg. et imp. apophth.* Such opening apophthegms often announce the theme of the entire section (e.g. the general remark in *Epameinondas I* [192C], announcing that generalship will be the main theme). This sometimes also goes for a first apophthegm that does not contain an imperfect tense. Examples are *Gelon I (175A)*, where the specific event of the Carthaginian defeat announces the theme of barbarism; *Dionysius Maior I (175C)*, in which the tyrant announces that he will be a monarch (the entire section that follows explores what his rule looks like); *Pyrrhus I (184C)*, illustrating his warlike character that will dominate the section; *Iphicrates I (186F–187A)*, concerning the importance of a general’s reputation.

922 Other stories on a hero’s younger years are *Iphicrates I (186F–187A)*, about his first great deed; *Pytheas (187E)*; the section, however, only contains one apophthegm; *Scipio Minor III (200A)*, describing his early military exploits; *Caesar I (205E–206A)*, about Caesar and the pirates; and *Augustus I (206F–207A)*, concerning Caesar’s inheritance. Plutarch always stresses that these stories indeed deal with the hero’s earlier years, usually with ἐτὶ μερίκων ὄν, or other phrases: ἐτὶ παῖς ὄν (*Alexander I and Alcibiades I*), ἐτὶ δὲ νέος ὄν (*Scipio Maior III*), or πρὸς τὸν (*Iphicrates I*).

sketched, can suffice, not because the adult personality is going to show only those traits, but because any new adult traits will naturally complement the ones we know from childhood.

Thus, this also applies to childhood stories and other opening apophthegms in the collection: all such instances give a clear and rather unproblematic image, and sayings that immediately follow often seem to confirm that picture, further clarifying and defining aspects of it. The most straightforward example of this is *Philippus*: the truth of the first apophthegm (177C), containing Theophrastus’ explicit character description, is supported by the next eleven stories, which at the same time illustrate various elements. Yet, as also appears from this section, such clarity does not always remain intact until the end, especially in longer sections, not in spite of, but often precisely by means of Plutarch’s application of gradual shifting:

[1] The further exploration of certain characteristics by connecting various stories often leads to more complexity. The block *Dionysius Maior* VII–X (175F–176B) contains two apophthegms dealing with the tyrant’s punishments. VII (175F) seems to highlight his cleverness, as its place before VIII (175F–176A) implies, but the position of X (176AB) after IX (176A) suggests that he lives in a perpetual state of suspicion and

---

924 Similar cases are: *Alexander* (179D–181F), where almost all apophthegms in the section illustrate his love of honour announced by I (179D); *Antigonus Monophthalimus* III (182A), confirmed from IV (182B) on; Pyrrhus’ warlike character described by *Pyrrhus* I (184C), further deepened by II–V (184D); *Themistocles* II–VIII (185AB), in line with I (184F–185A), and all that follows is to be read in light of this; *Aristides* I (186A), describing the man as “just”, as is proved by what follows (186A–C); the amorality in *Alcibiades* I (186D), illustrated by the remainder of the section (186D–F); *Agesilaus* I (190F), confirmed by the four following apophthegms (190F–191A); the tactics of Fabius Maximus described in his first apophthegm (195C), dominating the entire section (195C–196A); and *Scipio Minor* I (199F), reading as a summary of the section as a whole.

925 See *infra*, note 930 on the contrast between the two main blocks in this section and in similar cases.

926 There are various sections in which the picture is not problematized by gradual shifting. These are, not taking sections of one or two apophthegms into account: *Cyrus* (172EF); *Artaxerxes Longimanus* (173DE), although the section should also be seen as part of a series of sections problematizing *Artaxerxes Mnemon*; *Archelaus* (177AB); *Pyrrhus* (184CD; a one-sidedly negative section); *Aristeides* (186A–C); *Pericles* (186C); *Alcibiades* (186D–F; a one-sidedly negative section); *Iphicrates* (186F–187B); *Timotheus* (187BC); *Chabrias* (187CD); *Peisistratus* (189B–D); *Lycurgus* (189D–F); *Charillus* (189F); *Agis Secundus* (190CD); *Gaius Fabricius* (194F–195B); *Scipio Maior* (196B–197A); *Flamininus* (197A–D); and *Paulus Aemilius* (197F–198D). In almost all of these cases, however, the image of these men is problematized by other strategies.
distrust. Dionysius’ ability to judge wrongdoers, then, can be assessed in two ways. Thus, even when focusing on the same aspect of a character (Dionysius’ eagerness to punish) through similar apophthegms (Dionysius Maior VII and X), a reader will not necessarily draw the same conclusions from them. It is precisely gradual shifting that contributes to this effect, as it steers the readers to focus on specific connections between certain stories.  

[2] In addition, Plutarch often includes contradictory stories. He prefers to do so at the end of a section. This can happen in various ways. In the case of Darius (172F–173A), the final apophthegm (Semiramis, 173AB) is still connected with the preceding story and continues the gradual shifting, focusing on wealth and on the idea of having the right priorities, but at the same time shows a radically different image of the king. In Gelon (175AB), on the contrary, gradual shifting mitigates the contrast: the first (175A) and final apophthegm (175AB) clash harshly, but the stories in between (175A) ensure a smooth transition. Yet this does not do away with the fact that the picture is less clear than it seemed to be at first sight.

[3] In other cases, Plutarch separates various blocks of apophthegms. Sometimes, their content can clash. In this way, the obvious break in grad-

---

927 Similar examples are Alexander XV (180D) and XVI (180E), which discuss Alexander’s attitude towards his divine status, but show a different image; and Themistocles IX (185CD), which seems to highlight his justice, and the apophthegms that follow (185DE), all to be read in light of Themistocles’ φιλοτιμία described in I–VIII (184F–185C). Note also how bravery in Pelopidas (194C–E) turns out to be recklessness through gradual shifting, and how Phocion (187E–189B) combines the image of the great politician with that of the philosopher, which together raises questions.

928 A similar break occurs in Dionysius Minor (176C–E), from the appearance of Plato in III (176D) on, still continuing the gradual shifting. Antigonus Monophthalmus (182A–183A) is another example, containing a break from III (182A) on, which is, however, still connected with II (182A). The final apophthegm of Epameinondas (194C) also entails a far less positive image (Thebes is lost; the apophthegm is still closely linked with XXII and XXIII, 194A–C). Another example is Fabius Maximus (195C–196A): open warfare is still avoided at the end of the section, but a different image of the Roman arises from V (195F) on.

929 The same procedure can be found in Xerxes (173BC): in II (173C), the king is cruel, but in IV (173C), he is mild. III (173C) is placed in between as a transition. Something similar occurs in Hiero (175BC): all apophthegms deal with frank speech, but there gradually appear to be some limitations. Another example is Alexander XXXIV (181F), which fits well after an apophthegm announcing his death, but is partly to be interpreted as criticism. A clear instance is Brasidas (190BC): in I (189B), he claims that everyone can defend himself, but he dies in III (189BC). The contrast is mitigated by II (189B), in which he gets wounded.
ual shifting marks a contrast between two pictures of the subject. A clear instance is *Agesilaus*, which shows a conflict between I–V (190F–191A) and VI–XII (191A–D) – a symptom of a complex personality.\(^{930}\)

To conclude: gradual shifting constitutes the main driver of characterization *within* a section. It blends the apophthegms into an image of the subject’s character. This does not, however, necessarily result in a clear assessment. In many cases, Plutarch even ensures that it contributes to the opposite effect. As strange as this might seem, this problematizing aspect is actually entirely in line with the author’s practice in his *Parallel Lives*: it encourages moral reflection and raises challenging questions that do justice to the complexities of life and history.

b) Characterization of the subject in other sections
Various apophthegms (re)introduce the subject of one of the preceding or following sections. The pictures these evoke tends to be less favourable to the hero than his own apophthegms: a clear example is the positive image in *Lucullus* (203AB), contrasting with the subject’s appearance in *Pompeius* (203B–204E). Reassessment in this way is often more negative than the re-evaluation instigated by gradual shifting, although there are some exceptions.\(^{931}\) To a certain extent, this is again in line with the biographies: as noticed by various scholars, the image of a hero is often represented more positively in his own *Life* than in another biography.\(^{932}\)

---

\(^{930}\) Other sections containing this strategy are *Philippus* (177C–179C), where XIII–XV (178AB) marks a break (the second block [178B–179C] deals with Philip’s mistakes, although his rule seemed impeccable in the first block [177C–178A]); *Cato Maior* (198D–199E), where a clashing series of apophthegms follows from XXII (199B) on; note also Pompey’s downfall after *Pompeius* VIII (204A), contrasting with his youthful success in the first block (Ia–VII [203B–204A]; a case similar to *Agesilaus* [190F–191D]). Yet blocks of apophthegms do not always show contrasting images (cf. *Alexander* [179D–181F]): sometimes, a break in gradual shifting just marks different phases in the hero’s life.

\(^{931}\) *Alcibiades* IV (186E) paints a positive picture of Pericles, in line with the preceding section (186C); the image of Demetrius is positive in *Antigonus Monophthalmus* XVIII (183A); the reference back to Lycurgus in *Charillus* I (189F) is entirely in line with his own section (189D–F) that immediately precedes this; and there is the entirely positive image of Scipio Minor in *Caecilius Metellus* III (202A), also told quickly after this man’s own section (199F–201F). One might be inclined to count the picture of Pyrrhus in *Gaius Fabricius* (194F–195B) as a positive reassessment, but his behaviour is to be assessed against the background of the morally superior Gaius Fabricius.

\(^{932}\) See Jones, C. P. (1971) 80 on the absence of the Vettius episode in *Pomp.*, although it is told in *Luc.* Another example is the trial of Pelopidas discussed by Buckler (1978) 41; see also *supra*, note 661.
In *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*, this procedure of reassessment takes place in two ways: explicitly, when the subject is named, and implicitly:

[1] Instances of the first kind do not necessarily occur closely to the subject’s section.\(^{933}\) The clearest example is Antipater. Before reaching his own section (183EF), the reader has already met him a few times.\(^{934}\) After his own apophthegms, he will appear on the stage a few more times (*Phocion* XV–XVI, 188F). Almost every appearance of the man is negative,\(^{935}\) except for his own apophthegms. When comparing these contradictory stories, a most problematic picture arises.

[2] Allusions to a subject of another section create the same effect. To ensure that the reader interprets them as related to the historical figure in question, such cases are placed directly after his section and are thematically connected with it. Two examples are *Orontes* (174B), referring back to *Artaxerxes Mnemon* (173F–174A), and *Paulus Aemilius I* (197F), related to *Publius Licinius* (197EF).

\(^{933}\) Although this is often the case, due to the chronological structure and the arrangement according to family ties. Examples are: *Idanthyrsus* (174E), presenting Darius as a true despot, stronger than in *Darius* (172F–173B); *Dionysius Maior* III and IV (175DE), containing a bad image of his son, contrasting with his own section (176C–E), in turn referring back to the elder Dionysius in order to problematize his image; *Antipater I* (183E), containing a reassessment of *Alexander* (179D–181F); *Demetrius Phalereus* (189D), where Ptolemy is advised to improve himself (although a careful reader will realize that the king needs this from *Ptolemaeus* [181F] too); *Lycurgus V* (189EF), highlighting what is wrong with Agesilaus’ generalship (described in 190F–191D); perhaps *Lysander I* (190D), where Dionysius sends a present to this Spartan’s daughters (the theme of gift-giving reminds one of the Sicilian sections, but this generosity is assessed negatively); *Nicostratus* (192A), where Archidamus’ character is described in a negative way, different from what one will conclude from *Archidamus Tertius* (191D) itself; *Epameinondas VII* (192E), in which Pelopidas’ behaviour is presented as unworthy of a general; in *Scipio Maior* VIII (196E), Antiochus the Great is outdone by Scipio: this same king also appears in *Flamininus IV* (197C) and *Gaius Domitius* (197DE) as a kind of tyrant, which contrasts with *Antiochus Tertius* (183F). In *Pompeius IX* and *X* (204B), Lucullus appears to be a luxurious man. See also the rather negative image of Pompey in *Cicero XIV–XV* (205C) and *Caesar* Xb (206D), although both instances explain Pompey’s downfall described in his own section (203B–204E) and are as such perhaps a clarification rather than a real reassessment.

\(^{934}\) As discussed in the analysis of *Antipater* (183EF).

\(^{935}\) *Philippus XXVIII* (179B), where the king has much faith in Antipater as his general, might be an exception, although the reader still might wonder whether his faith is entirely justified.
Finally, one should keep in mind that these apophthegms at the same time shed light on the subject of their own section. When Alcibiades questions Pericles’ behaviour (Alcibiades IV, 186E), this says as much, if not more, about him than about his tutor: this apophthegm, therefore, still functions at the level of the procedures described in (a).

c) Synkrisis

Synkrisis is an important feature of the Parallel Lives.\(^{936}\) First, there are the so-called ‘formal synkrisiseis’: with a few exceptions, all paired biographies conclude with an explicit comparison of the heroes.\(^{937}\) Second, there is ‘internal synkrisis’, as set out by Hans Beck in a seminal article, showing that one should not only look for comparisons within a pair:\(^{938}\)


The strategies he mentions are: (1) cross-references between Lives, and (2) the function of what he calls “Folienfiguren”, who are of greater importance when they are also the subject of a separate biography (and as a consequence in fact almost function as cross-references).\(^{939}\)

Despite some significant differences, various aspects of synkrisis in the Lives also occur in Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata:

[1] As a consequence of the implicit moralism predominant in the collection, ‘formal synkrisis’ is entirely absent from the work. This does not mean, however, that characters are never explicitly compared: Plutarch sometimes includes apophthegms in which two or more subjects (whether they have a section in the collection or not) are contrasted by a certain character.

\(^{936}\) Synkrisis is not just an aspect of characterization, but also a feature of Plutarch’s moralism, see Verdegem (2010) 27–32 in a chapter on “comparative moralism”.

\(^{937}\) The only pairs that lack a formal synkrisis are Alex.–Caes., Phoc.–Ca. Mi., Pyrrh.–Mar., and Them.–Cam. On these formal synkrisiseis, see Erbse (1956); Russell (1966a) 150; Stadter (1975) for Comp. Per et Fab.; Pelling (1986); Nikolaidis (1988) for Comp. Nic. et Crass.; Larmour (1992); Duff (1999) 252–257 (part of a chapter on synkrisis in general) and a shorter version in Duff (2000); Larmour (2014); Roskam (2021) 98–99.


In other cases, *synkrisis* is only implicit, and it is left to the readers to draw conclusions. This mostly concerns contemporaries (such as Epameinondas and Pelopidas, 192C–194E).

When *synkrisis*, either explicit or implicit, involves the protagonist of a section, it is much more powerful than when it concerns minor figures. There are many examples of such minor figures: Zopyrus in *Darius* III and IV (173A); Semiramis in *Semiramis* (173AB); Euripides in *Archelaus* I (177A) and III (177AB); Leonidas in *Alexander* IV (179E); Leosthenes in *Phocion* XII (188DE), to name a few. Some of these minor figures are more important than others. The single reference to Postumius Albinus in *Cato Maior* XXIX (199E) is less relevant than Parmenio or Demades, who appear more than once throughout the collection. In other words: the more the audience hears about a person, the more elaborate the *synkrisis* can and will be.

**Explicit synkrisis**

As stated, *synkrisis* is often part of the types of characterization discussed on the previous pages, since it can contribute to the picture of a subject within his own section (a), and in the section of another hero (b). There are four possibilities:

1. In *Cyrus Minor* (173EF), the subject attempts to prove that he is superior to his brother through an explicit comparison. His saying characterizes his own personality (cf. a), but also provides the negative background against which *Artaxerxes Mnemon* (173F–174A) will be read (cf. b). Other examples of this procedure also tend to shed a negative light on the subject of the other section.

2. In *Phocion* XV (188F), Antipater compares Phocion with the base orator Demades. As stated, this sheds a rather negative light on the Macedonian ruler (cf. b), but this stands apart from the comparison, as it does

---

940 Parmenio appears in *Philippus* II (177C), XXIX (179B), *Alexander* X (180B), XI (180B), and *Antipater* I (183E); Demades in *Alexander* XXXIV (181F), *Antipater* II (183EF), *Phocion* XV (188F), and *Agis Tertius* I (191E).

941 This evidently also holds true for implicit *synkrisis*, but here it depends on the willingness of the reader to enter into the process of comparison.

942 Other apophthegms comparing the subject of their own section with one or more subjects of other sections are: *Anteas* II (174E): Anteus and Philip; *Dionysius Maior* III (175DE): Dionysius the Younger and his father; *Antigonus Monophthalmus* I (182A): Antigonus and Alexander; *Antigonus Monophthalmus* VIII (182C): Antigonus and barbarian kings; *Chabrias* II (187D): Chabrias and Iphicrates; *Pytheas* (187E): Pytheas and Alexander; * Agesilaus* II (190F): Agesilaus and Artaxerxes Mnemon; *Epameinondas* XXII (194A): Epameinondas, Chabrias, and Iphicrates; *Gaius Fabricius* III (195A): Gaius Fabricius and Pyrrhus; *Pompeius* V (203EF): Pompey and Sulla; *Caesar* IV (206B): Caesar and Alexander.
not involve his own character. The *synkrisis* itself contributes to the positive image of Phocion (cf. a). The image of the minor figure Demades is negative. In most cases of this procedure, the subject compares himself with another person, but some cases are similar to *Phocion* XV (188F), where another person makes the comparison. The subject of the section in question is in most instances favoured, at least at first sight.  

[3] A contrasting example is *Cicero* XV (205C), where the orator compares Pompey with Themistocles and Pericles (this example falls under the category of explicit characterization of a man in the section of another hero). As discussed, the story fits well within the process of gradual shifting. In this way, it says something about Cicero’s character (cf. a), but this stands apart from the process of *synkrisis*, which only involves Pompey and the two Greeks, providing a rather negative picture of the Roman (cf. b). Similar cases also tend to shed a negative light on the subjects of another section.

[4] A personage can compare two minor figures. In these cases, *synkrisis* is not related to the strategies described in (a) or (b), for it does not involve protagonists of the collection. These instances are therefore less important.

Thus, the general observations described in (a) and (b) apply to these cases: when a subject is compared with someone else in his own section (cf. a), this usually fits within the gradual shifting. When he is compared with one or more historical figures in the section of another subject (cf.

---

943 Other examples where *synkrisis* only involves the subject of the section in question are: *Alexander* XI (180B): a comparison with Parmenio; *Alexander* XXVII (181D): Heracles; *Themistocles* VII (185C): a Seriphean; *Iphicrates* V (187B): Harmonius; *Timotheus* II (187C): a bold general; *Phocion* VI (188A): Demosthenes; *Teleclus* (190A): Teleclus’ brother; *Pelopidas* I (194C): Nicodemus, a crippled person; *Fabius Maximus* III (195DE): Marcellus; *Cato Maior* XXII (199B): candidates for the censorship; *Scipio Minor* III (200A): Scipio’s fellow soldiers; *Scipio Minor* IX (200CD): Appius Claudius; *Scipio Minor* XXI (201E): the generals who preceded Scipio.

944 Similar cases are *Phocion* XIV (188EF): comparing Alexander with Menyllus; *Nicostatus* (192B): Archidamus and Heracles; *Epameinondas* VII (192E): Pelopidas and a certain mistress.

945 Examples are *Archelaus* I (177A): comparing one of the king’s base friends with Euripides; *Philippus* X (177F): a witty comparison of the brothers Ἀμφοτέρος and Ἐκτατέρος; *Alexander* XXIX (181D): Craterus and Hephaestion; *Pyrrhus* II (184C): two flute players, but a general is preferred; *Themistocles* II (185A): Achilles and Homer; *Themistocles* XI (185D): comparing men who want to marry his daughter; *Epameinondas* XX (193F): Antigenidas and Tellen; *Caesar* XIV (206E): Antony and Dolabella, on the one hand, and Brutus and Cassius, on the other. These cases are meant to convey something about the person who makes the comparison.
b), this often problematizes the image that arises from a reading of his own apophthegms. This discrepancy between the picture of a subject’s own section and the one resulting from comparison is, in fact, also in line with the *Parallel Lives*, where the formal *synkrisis* at the end of a pair often complicates the narratives of the biographies themselves.

*Implicit synkrisis*

The observations about explicit *synkrisis* also apply to this type of *synkrisis*, where it relies sometimes exclusively on the reader’s willingness to contrast two historical figures. Take *Cicero* XV (205C) again: although the orator is not part of the explicit comparison, nothing prevents the readers from comparing him with Pompey, or even with Themistocles and Pericles, if they see a reason to do so. Using various strategies, Plutarch invites his reader to make such comparisons, but not all of them are equally strong. There is, therefore, a gradation from cases where *synkrisis* is instigated clearly, to those where it is entirely up to the reader to see a certain *tertium comparationis* (the examples given below concern subjects who have a section in the collection, but one might of course also compare ‘minor figures’ with each other):

[1] Mentioning a historical figure by name offers an obvious call for comparison. The clearest examples are those where the relationships between successive sections are explicitly described (in most cases, these concern family ties). At the beginning and end of *Pelopidas* (194C–E), Plutarch mentions his association with Epameinondas. As the sections of both men also share many themes, the reader should naturally compare them.

---

946 See also *supra*, note 933 for examples of negative reassessments of a hero in another section.

947 Cf. chapter 1.3.1 on the case of *Comp. Arist. et Ca. Ma.*

948 Cases such as *Hieron I* (175B), which mentions that he followed Gelon; *Dion* (176F–177A), mentioning the end of Dionysius’ reign; *Philippus VII* (177E), referring to the leaders of Athens; *Philippus XVI* (178B), XVII (178BC), XXII (178E), and XXIII (178EF), which invite the reader to compare the rule of Philip and his son; *Philippus XXIV* (178F) and XXVIII (179B), which mention Antipater; in *Alexander I* (179D), the young boy complains that his father is conquering everything (this can perhaps also be seen as an explicit comparison); *Demetrius Poliorcetes* (183A–C) is announced by *Antigonus Monophthalmus* XVI (182EF) and XVIII (183A), and mentioned again in *Antigonus Secundus* I (183C); *Demetrius Poliorcetes* I (183A), in turn, again refers back to *Antigonus Monophthalmus* (182A–183A); *Aristeides III* (186B) invites a comparison of the man with *Themistocles* (184F–185F); *Gaius Domitius* (197DE) refers to Scipio the Elder, the subject of another section (196B–197A); *Pompeius* (203B–204E) mentions Caesar in XII and XIII (204CD); *Caesar* (205E–206F), in turn, refers back to Pompey in VIII (206C), Xb (206D), and XI (206DE); Caesar is mentioned in *Augustus I* (206F–207A); Alexander in *Augustus III* (207AB) and VIII (207CD).
[2] In other cases, two heroes (usually following each other) are connected by a shared topic, often expressed in similar wording. *Fabius Maximus* (195C–196A) and *Scipio Maior* (196B–197A), included immediately after the first section, deal with the same war. As a consequence, the reader is expected to compare the tactics of the two generals. Many more examples of this procedure can be found, which shows that anything can lead to a comparison at any level of the text.949

[3] In many other cases a reader might feel compelled to compare two or more heroes. Since there is no indication in the text that Plutarch desired his readers to make these comparisons, these instances (such as the hypothetical and perhaps unlikely example of *Cicero* XV, 205C, described on the previous page) will not be addressed here.

Implicit *synkrisis* often has a problematizing function too. Take the example of *Pelopidas* (194C–E) again: after a comparison with *Epameinondas* (192C–194C), the reader will conclude that his courageous nature should perhaps rather be defined as overboldness. The contrast between the tactics applied in *Fabius Maximus* (195C–196A) and *Scipio Maior* (196B–197A) also calls for *synkrisis*, which does not result in a clear conclusion: it raises questions about the nature of good generalship, as it is not made explicit which strategy is to be applied at which moment.

*To conclude*

Similar to other strategies of characterization, *synkrisis* – whether explicit or implicit – entirely fits within Plutarch’s zetetic moralism.950 It requires an active and participatory role of the readers, and provides them

---

949 For instance the theme of punishing and giving and taking that dominates the Persian sections (172E–174B) and invites a comparison of all the kings; the parallel structured sections of the Thracians and Scythians (174C–F), highlighting the similarities between these men; *Gelon IV* (175AB), which recalls some barbarian apophthegms, in this way calling for comparison; the reference to cups in *Archelaus I* (177A), which recalls the Sicilian sections (175A–177A) and invites a comparison of the Macedonian with the tyrants; *Philippus* (177C–179C), often stressing that the king does not want to be a despot, thus recalling the theme of tyranny in earlier sections; there are also many similarities between *Antigonus Monophthalmus* (182A–183A), *Philippus* (177C–179C), and *Alexander* (179D–181F); note also the close connection between *Antiochus Hierax* (184A), *Eumenes* (184AB), and *Pyrrhus* (184CD), also reminding one of the themes of tyranny, and contrasting with the Antigonid dynasty (182A–183D); also striking are the themes shared by *Themistocles* (184F–185F), *Aristeides* (186A–C), *Pericles* (186C), and *Alcibiades* (186C–F); *Peisistratus* (189B–D) again recalls themes of the monarchical sections (172E–184F); the sections about the fall of the Roman Republic (203A–206F) and *Augustus* (206F–208A) remind one of the monarchical sections too.

950 Roskam (2021).
with more questions than answers: in the comparison of two or more heroes it is often possible to argue pro and contra the same person, because of which it is difficult to find out who is to be preferred. Once more, this is not different from the function of synkrisis in the Parallel Lives.

d) The reader’s background knowledge
In some cases, text-external factors have serious repercussions. The ancient reader would probably never have accepted the apparently positive image arising from Marius (202A–D) and Sulla (202E). The opposite goes for Pyrrhus (184CD): Plutarch deliberately depicts a highly negative image of the man, which is to some extent different from the traditional Pyrrhus, often presented as a mild and kind ruler. Sometimes, then, the audience’s background knowledge performs a problematizing function. This can work in various directions: Plutarch wants his readers either to question the image of these men in the collection, or to challenge the conventional picture, or both. What he tries to achieve can be seen from how he presents his material and how this contributes to the reliability of the image he depicts. As to the examples mentioned, these take the following form:

[1] The total absence of any reference to the civil war in the Roman sections – to which Plutarch even draws attention – shows that the author does not want the unconventional picture to be welcomed by his audience. Yet he is still challenging the traditional image, by pointing out that the two ‘villains’ might have had some virtues. Their behaviour and sayings, then, provide interesting food for moral reflection.

[2] The case of Pyrrhus is somewhat different. Its first apophthegms are in line with the Epirot’s well-known warlike nature. After these, Plutarch concludes the section with an incomplete apophthegm, where the king is slandered. It is left to the reader to fill in the outcome, and to question whether he would have reacted leniently or not. In this way, Plutarch does not directly deny the traditional image, but he plays with gradual shifting and its implications for characterization (cf. Pelling’s “integrated characters” discussed in (a)): after reading about Pyrrhus’ excessive love of war, the readers should doubt whether mildness fits within his character (cf. the ‘blended’ image). The author, then, is challenging the traditional image precisely by exploiting it.

---

951 See supra, note 491.
952 See for example supra, note 791 on the use of ἐμφύλιος in Marius VI (202D).
1.1.3 Conclusion: A Collection of Problematic Heroes?

In *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* moralism is not only descriptive but also has a protreptic function, and is entirely implicit. This is closely connected with characters and characterization in the work: most sections concern subjects with whom Trajan can identify (although this is not always necessary for his moral progress), and they are usually characterized in an implicit way. One would, therefore, expect a participatory reading to bring the target reader to certain conclusions about ethical conduct that invite him to adapt his own behaviour. Yet a closer look at the various strategies of characterization shows that Plutarch applies every tool in order to complicate the image of the historical figures: gradual shifting, characterization in other sections, *synkrisis*, and even the reader’s prior knowledge all often contribute to this effect. If it is difficult to reach a clear assessment of these characters, this means that moralism in the collection is essentially problematic as well – at least at the level of the individual sections. As a consequence, it is not entirely clear how the work should instruct the emperor as its implied reader.

One might therefore wonder what the precise function of this problematizing aspect is and whether this can be reconciled with the protreptic goals of the work. In addition, there are some sections from which, at first sight, a clear image arises. These are rather exceptional, so the question is why Plutarch sometimes deviates from his general practice. In the following chapters, it will be argued that an explanation for these issues can be found by examining Plutarch’s views on the function of role models, and by comparing them with his strategies in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*. There are three types of role models in the collection:

1. Negative: *Pyrrhus* (184CD) and *Alcibiades* (186D–F).
2. Univocally positive: *Cyrus* (172EF), *Archelaus* (177AB), the early Spartans (189D–190A), and the early Romans (194E–195C).
3. Basically positive. This is the largest group. Even *Aristeides* (186A–C) and *Phocion* (187E–189B) should be counted among them: they are most virtuous men, but the former was banished and the latter was put to death together with his friends.

The following pages first address Plutarch’s views on the function of negative examples, as this has significant repercussions for interpreting [1] (1.2). The next part studies Plutarch’s opinion about perfection, which is important for how the collection’s most virtuous men are to be assessed [2] (1.3). The third part analyses how Plutarch thinks about basically positive role models (1.4). This will offer insights for an adequate understanding not only of [3], but also of [2] again.

---

953 Cases such as *Memnon* (174B), the remarkable ‘apophthegm’ of *Reges Aegypti* (174C), or *Dion* (176F–177A), all containing only one unit, are not taken into account.
1.2 Negative Exempla
1.2.1 The Prologue to Demetrius–Antonius
In the prologue to Demetrius–Antonius, Plutarch dwells upon the function of negative role models. The passage is highly rhetorical and should be read in connection with the two narratives that follow. Yet the text also informs us of the author’s true worries about the issue: these are in line with his view on the relevance of negative examples in his treatises of Seelenheilung.954

a) Literary analysis
The following literary analysis is inevitably highly indebted to the analysis of Duff.955 The structure of the prologue to Demetrius–Antonius consists of three parts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>General claim: every τέχνη also studies the opposite of what it tries to accomplish (1.1–1.4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>The motivation including negative examples in the Parallel Lives (1.5–1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Specifically on the pair Demetrius and Antony, focusing on their similarities (1.7–1.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As appears from the table, there is a shift from general to specific claims, as often in Plutarch.956

A General claim (Demetr. 1.1–4)
Plutarch first points out a similarity between the arts (τέχναι; in the sense of technical knowledge) and the senses (αἰσθήσεις): they are capable of making distinctions (1.1). But there is also a difference in this respect. The senses receive every single impression that reaches them by chance. These impressions are passed on to the understanding (τὸ φρονοῦν). The function of the senses, then, consists of nothing more than the accidental perception of distinctions, and it is up to reason to do something with

---

954 Ingenkamp (1971) discusses De coh. ira, De gar., De cur., De vit. pud., and De se ipsum laud. as treatises of Seelenheilung; see also Ingenkamp (2000). Nikolaidis (2011) speaks of “‘Minor’ Ethics” in the case of De gar., De cur., and De vit. pud. The distinction κρίσις – ἄσκησις can be found in other Plutarchan works as well: Van Hoof (2010) 41–65 discusses Plutarch’s “Practical Ethics” in light of this (see also Van Hoof (2014) on this group of texts); Demulder (2022) 175–176 discusses κρίσις and ἄσκησις in De tranq. an. In the Lives such patterns can be found too, see for example chapter 1.4.1 on Per. 1–2.
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The arts are different, for they are supported by one’s intellect (μετὰ λόγου συνεστῶσαι) and have a specific focus. Yet occasionally, art also has to study the opposite of this focus. Medicine studies health, but a physician also needs to have knowledge about diseases. This unpleasant examination of the opposite, therefore, is a logical and necessary consequence of the goal of the art in question (1.3).

As Duff points out, various elements in this passage (1.1–3) recall the prologue to *Pericles–Fabius Maximus*, which had also begun with a contrast between the senses and reason: our physical senses, Plutarch had argued, must receive every stimulus that strikes them, whereas with our mind we can choose to concentrate only on objects which are beneficial to us – such as the virtuous deeds of others.

The *Parallel Lives*, this prologue suggests, focus on virtues, and the implication seems to be that Plutarch only selects the best men of the past. Notably, this is different from the prologue to *Demetrius–Antonius*, written at a later stage of the biographical project: although the author has not yet referred to his biographies in the general claims of [A], the first section suggests that he now has realized that the focus should not exclusively lie on the virtues. Thus, the various similarities between the prologues to *Pericles–Fabius Maximus* and *Demetrius–Antonius*, both in terms of content and wording, are not coincidental: the latter can truly be read as an addition to statements presented in the former.

---

957 κατὰ συμβεβηκός is to be translated as “by accident” (LCL has “incidentally”), but this does not mean that studying the opposite is not an inevitable consequence. It should therefore rather be read in the meaning of “rarely”, “not as its main goal”, and perhaps even to a certain extent as “unwillingly”. Duff (2004) 274 writes: “The point is perhaps that negative examples should not be considered interesting in themselves […] Bad examples can be valuable, but are not to be sought out as of themselves absorbing or titillating. This is a point to which Plutarch will return in 1.5.”


960 Note the wording shared by both prologues: *Demetr.* 1.1: αἰσθήσεσιν – *Per.* 1.2: αἰσθήσει; *Demetr.* 1.1: ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι – *Per.* 1.2: ἀντιλαμβανομένη; *Demetr.* 1.2: ἐντυγχάνουσαν – *Per.* 1.2: τῶν προστυγχανόντων; *Demetr.* 1.6: Ἰσμηνίας – *Per.* 1.5: Ἰσμηνίας; *Demetr.* 1.6: αὐλοῦντας, twice αὐλεῖν, αὐλητῶν – *Per.* 1.5: twice αὐλητής; *Demetr.* 1.6: ἀκροᾶσθαι – *Per.* 1.6: ἀκροᾶσθαι; *Demetr.* 1.6: προθυμότεροι – *Per.* 1.4: προθυμίας, 2.2: προθυμίαν; *Demetr.* 1.6: θεαταί – *Per.* 1.6: θεατής, 2.1: θεασάμενος, 2.4: θεατήν; *Demetr.* 1.6: μιμηταί – *Per.* 1.2: μιμητικός, 2.4: μιμήσει; *Demetr.* 1.6: ἱστορίᾳ (the similarities listed are only relevant similarities
The moral implications of all of this become more explicit in the final part of [A], still of a rather general nature (1.4):

ai te pasōn teleōtatai teχνōν, σωφροσύνη kai δικαιοσύνη kai
φρόνησις, ou kalōn mónon kai δικαίων kai ὧφελίμων, ἀλλὰ kai
βλαβερῶν kai aἰσχρῶν kai ἀδίκων κρίσεις οὔσαι, tīn āpeiría tōn
kakōn kallassiαζομένην ἀκακίαν οὐκ ἐπαινοῦσιν, ἀλλ' ἄβελτεριαν
ηγοῦνται kai ἄγνοιαν ὃν μάλιστα γινώσκειν προσήκει toûs ὀρθῶς
μετησομένους.

and the most consummate arts of all, namely, temperance, justice, and wisdom, since their function is to distinguish, not only what is good and just and expedient, but also what is bad and unjust and disgraceful, have no praises for a guilelessness which plumes itself on its inexperience of evil, nay, they consider it to be foolishness, and ignorance of what ought especially to be known by men who would live aright.

This is connected with [B]. As Duff again writes, it enables Plutarch to make his previous claims specifically relevant for the Parallel Lives. A second connection, I would add, is more subtle: the words in bold remind one of Plutarch’s practice in his treatises of Seelenheilung, which aim to heal specific vices. As Ingenkamp has shown, these texts consist of two main parts: κρίσις, in which the theoretical part of the cure is set out, and ἄσκησις, containing exercises of theoretical (ἐπιλογισμοί) and practical (ἐθισμοί) nature in order to remove the κακόν. Negative exempla play a role in the first part, precisely because they offer a frightening picture of how a bad characteristic can bring shame (αἰσχῦναι) and harm (βλάβαι). By responding to the readers’ sense of honour, they convince them of the truth of a certain theoretical point of view, because of which they will attempt to remove the evil from which they (might) suffer. The focus on what is harmful, on what is fitting, and on praise and blame in the prologue (Demetr. 1.4) indicates that Plutarch has something similar in mind. This will become more explicit in [B].

---


962 Ingenkamp (1971).

963 This social aspect is in line with Van Hoof (2010) on Plutarch’s “Practical Ethics.”
1.5 οἱ μὲν οὖν παλαιοὶ Σπαρτιᾶται τοὺς εἵλωτας ἐν ταῖς ἑορταῖς πολὺν ἀναγκάζοντες πίνειν ἄκρατον εἰσῆγον εἰς τὰ συμπόσια, τοῖς νέοις οἷόν ἔστι τὸ μεθύειν ἐπιδεικνύοντες· ἡμεῖς δὲ τὴν μὲν ἐκ διαστροφῆς ἑτέρων ἑπανόρθωσιν οὐ πάνυ φιλάνθρωπον οὐδὲ πολιτικὴν ἡγούμεθα, τῶν δὲ κεχρημένων ἀσκεπτότερον αὐτοῖς καὶ γεγονότον ἐν ἐξουσίας καὶ πράγμασι μεγάλοις ἐπιφανῶν εἰς κακίαν οὐ χεῖρον ἴσως ἐστὶ συζυγίαν μίαν ἢ δύο παρεμβάλειν εἰς τὰ παραδείγματα τῶν βίων, οὐκ ἐφ' ἡδονῇ μα Δία καὶ διαγωγῇ τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων ποικίλλοντας τὴν γραφὴν, 1.6 ἀλλ' ὡσπερ Ἰσμηνίας ὁ Θηβαῖος ἐπιδεικνύμενος τοῖς μαθηταῖς καὶ τοὺς εὖ καὶ τοὺς κακῶς αὐλοῦντας εἰώθει λέγειν "οὕτως αὐλεῖν δεῖ" καὶ πάλιν "οὕτως αὐλεῖν οὐ δεῖ", ὁ δ' Ἀντιγενείδας καὶ ἥδιον ᾤετο τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀκροᾶσθαι τοὺς νέους ἑποιήσατο τοὺς νέους αὐλητῶν, ἐὰν καὶ τῶν φαύλων πείραν λαμβάνωσιν, οὕτως μοι δοκοῦμεν ἡμεῖς προθυμότεροι τῶν βελτιών έσεσθαι καὶ θεαταὶ καὶ μιμηταὶ βίων, εἰ μηδὲ τῶν φαύλων καὶ ψεγομένων ἀνιστορήτως ἐξομέν.

Accordingly, the ancient Spartans would put compulsion upon their helots at the festivals to drink much unmixed wine, and would then bring them into the public messes, in order to show their young men what it was to be drunk. And though I do not think that the perverting of some to secure the setting right of others is very humane, or a good civil policy, still, when men have led reckless lives, and have become conspicuous, in the exercise of power or in great undertakings, for badness, perhaps it will not be much amiss for me to introduce a pair or two of them into my biographies, though not that I may merely divert and amuse my readers by giving variety to my writing. Ismenias the Theban used to exhibit both good and bad players to his pupils on the flute and say, “you must play like this one,” or again, “you must not play like this one”; and Antigenidas used to think that young men would listen with more pleasure to good flute-players if they were given an experience of bad ones also. So, I think, we also shall be more eager to observe and imitate the better lives if we are not left without narratives of the blameworthy and the bad.

The humiliation of the helots builds on the convincing aspect of negative examples alluded to in [A]: the Spartans realized that these bad para-
The individual characters digms show what one does not want to become, because of the shame and blame they suffer (cf. the notion of exhibition in ἐπιδεικνύντες). As Plutarch evidently does not approve of Sparta’s cruel custom, he will only make use in his Parallel Lives of people who already became bad by themselves.\textsuperscript{965} His insistence on the fact that he will only include \textit{a few} of these pairs (LCL: “a pair or two”), stressed by the position of μίαν ἢ δύο after συζυγίαν, is telling in two respects:

[1] This claim is again in line with [A]: a certain τέχνη only occasionally studies the opposite of what it tries to accomplish. This is not different with the τελεώταται τέχναι. In the Parallel Lives, then, only a few negative examples may suffice. Plutarch’s readers should not be exposed to vice longer than necessary. This also alludes to the possible dangers of evil models, a theme that will implicitly be developed later in the passage.\textsuperscript{966}

[2] It also suggests that Plutarch will on occasion include more than one negative pair. The chronology of the Parallel Lives suggests that Pyrrhus–Marius, containing many vices, followed quickly or perhaps even immediately. Coriolanus–Alcibiades, of which the second subject is definitely a bad person, also seems to belong to this final period of the series. As argued by various scholars, this implies that after a while Plutarch grew more eager to include negative examples in his biographical work.\textsuperscript{967} In light of this, he seems to motivate this change from Demetrius–Antonius on at the outset of the pair, which, in line with [A], again supports the view that it is to be read as an adjustment to the prologue to Pericles–Fabius Maximus.

Even though his motivation as described up to this point in [B] (οἱ μὲν οὖν – εἰς τὰ παραδείγματα τῶν βίων) is sufficiently clear, Plutarch apparently still feels compelled to stress what his motivation is \textit{not} like: in the next part he notes that these negative examples are not included for the sake of his readers’ amusement.\textsuperscript{968} When only reading the first part (οὐκ ἐφ’ ἡδονῇ μὰ Δία καὶ διαγωγῇ τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων), the suggestion is that biographies of bad men \textit{in themselves} could be entertaining literature (cf. [A]). But the words that follow quickly (ποικίλλοντας τὴν

---

\textsuperscript{965} Duff (2004) 276 describes the Spartan story as “a negative example to illustrate how not to use negative examples.” As discussed by the analysis, Charillus II (189F) refers to the treatment of the helots in Sparta.

\textsuperscript{966} See Duff (2008c) 14 on a connection with Plato in this respect.

\textsuperscript{967} Cf. Appendix III on the relative chronology of the Parallel Lives.

\textsuperscript{968} Duff (2004) 278 writes that Plutarch is “at pains to emphasise that the purpose of narrating the Lives of such less-than-perfect-men is not at all the pleasure of the casual reader, who might take pleasure in spicy, exciting tales (1.5). […] [T]he pleasure that arises from such narrative is not to be seen as the goal for the serious reader”.
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γραφήν) clarify that this is not what Plutarch wants to say – at least not explicitly. He only writes that varietas delectat: in a collection of men of great virtues, biographies about some ‘villains’ (as is the suggestion) might keep the entire project interesting. Yet this is not what the author wants to accomplish.

This is once more in line with the apologetic function of the text. In his prologues, Plutarch often has to defend the choices he made and attempts to clarify the position of the Lives in question in the entire project.669 By referring to the diverting aspect of his work at the outset of Demetrius–Antonius, he defends himself against the possible accusation that he might give the impression of enjoying studying vices, or that he is writing sensational history.670 He therefore claims that if there were to be any diverting aspect to these negative Lives – which is evidently not his goal – it would consist in the fact that one will like the other biographies more. Thus, precisely the fact that Demetrius–Antonius is not an amusing pair (which will, however, be contradicted later in the prologue and does not coincide with the pair itself) might give it diverting power, as is the implication at this point (1.5).

The apology continues in 1.6. The author tells two anecdotes that are (only at first sight) similar to each other. Both refer to a well-known flute player:

[1] The story on Ismenias repeats Plutarch’s motivation for including negative exempla. This is highlighted by a verbal connection with the Spartan story, but the Ismenias anecdote illustrates Plutarch’s practice better.671 The famous musician asked his students to listen to good and

669 Claims in Alex. 1 (Plutarch writes lives instead of history) can also be read in light of this apologetic function of the prologues; in Dem. 1–3, Plutarch defends himself for his limited access to books, his knowledge of Latin, and the fact that he does not discuss the speeches of Demosthenes and Cicero; in Nic. 1, he claims that he is not writing the work in order to compete with other authors; in Thes. 1, he explains why he included mythological characters in his series. See Chrysanthou (2018) 27–34 on this aspect of these prologues.

670 See Duff (2004) 279 on the topos “that rival historians indulged in sensationalist narrative either lacking in moral content or transgressing the basic rules of historical accuracy”. See also infra, note 988 on Cim. 2.5: historians should be favourably disposed towards the subjects of their inquiry, Plutarch claims. This is also an important theme in De Her. mal., and Pearson – Sandbach (1965) 5–6 in my view seem correct in reading this pamphlet in light of Plutarch’s idea that historical literature should focus on virtues in order to educate its readers. Thus, when the Chaeronean reached Demetr.–Ant., he must have felt compelled to defend himself for something that might be interpreted as an inconsistency on his part.

671 Cf. ἐπιδεικνύντες (Demetr. 1.5) and ἐπιδεικνύμενος (1.6): the perception of others is in line with the notion of αἰσχῦναι and βλάβαι.
bad performances, in order to show what should be imitated and avoided. Thus, the teacher applies bad role models in order to teach explicit lessons in a direct way.

[2] The anecdote about Antigenidas has a different focus and seems to illustrate a more indirect function of such models. It also alludes to what should not be regarded as Plutarch’s motivation, viz. the diverting aspect resulting from the inclusion of negative exempla. Although he has stressed that variety is not what he aims at, his mere mention of this possibility highlights his awareness that this might be a side-effect. The Antigenidas story now clarifies that this side-effect is, in fact, not unwelcome. The implication seems to be that Plutarch is aware of the entertaining function of the Parallel Lives, and that an alternation of such pairs as Demetrius–Antonius and biographies of good men keeps the reader interested. Although varietas is not his eventual goal, it still can and will have a positive effect on his audience. Thus, one should not read οὐκ ἐφ’ ήδονή too strictly, as only becomes clear at this stage of the text.

The closing words of [B] (οὕτως μοι … ἔχοιμεν), explaining the relevance of the anecdotes for the Parallel Lives, somehow problematize all this by clarifying that this effect of ήδονή is embedded in the process of Seelenheilung. This conclusion highlights that the entertaining aspect, illustrated by the Antigenidas story,972 actually precedes the act of imitating positive role models referred to by Ismenias, although it is told later.973 Being acquainted with bad people, again described in terms of blame (ψεγομένων) and thus envisioning what one does not want to be (cf. Antigenidas), creates a desire to hear about the positive exempla again. This will, in the end, result in an imitation of this second group (cf. Ismenias). Thus, ήδονή suddenly appears not as a welcome side-effect anymore, but even almost as a prerequisite for moral improvement.

At a closer look, the image becomes even more problematic. Plutarch does not mention that the bad Lives themselves will entertain the readers, but he still suggests that it is a possibility:

[1] The structure of the phrase οὐκ ἐφ’ ήδονή … τὴν γραφήν is striking. As stated, Plutarch first refers to the ήδονή of his readers, which suggests for a while that this pleasure should be seen as related to a reading of the negative Lives themselves. Only at the end does Plutarch clarify that the entertaining effect should be read in terms of variety.

[2] θεαταὶ καὶ μιμηταί in the closing words of [B] is pregnant with meaning. The metaphor of the readers as spectators and actors of a play

972 Cf. the double use of φαύλων (in the Antigenidas story and in the concluding phrase).
973 Note καὶ θεαταὶ καὶ μιμηταί βίων: imitation (also the goal of Ismenias’ practice, but not explicitly named as Antigenidas’ goal) follows perception.
is used in connection with the better *Lives*. At first sight, then, it refers to both the descriptive and protreptic moralism in these works. But there is more. The biographies (*Demetr.*–*Ant.*) that follow – and which were up to this point depicted as univocally bad *exempla* – will precisely be presented as theatre pieces: this will even be the strongest component that forges the two narratives into a whole. Plutarch, therefore, not only suggests that his negative biographies can, in the end, be amusing too in the eyes of some readers, but he also ensures that they *will* be amusing. As a consequence, there will be ἡδονή that does not result from variety but from the author’s artistic skills.

The question at stake is why Plutarch is doing this. He might point out that caution should be exercised when reading the following narratives: readers should not let themselves get carried away by the appealing style of the literary work, for it does not describe how they should try to become. Thus, in the case of this pair, one should only be a θεατής, not a μιμητής. The theatre metaphor, then, as far as it concerns *Demetrius–Antonius* and other pairs of base men, should rather be read in light of the function of negative role models as known from Plutarch’s *Seelenheilung* treatises: a tragedy often shows the suffering of people (cf. βλάβη); a comedy makes one laugh (cf. αἰσχύνη). This is in line with the dangers of literature, especially relevant for theatrical genres and poetry that might lead the audience to the wrong conclusions when not read in the correct way. Thus, by referring to these issues in his prologue and by continuously stressing the dramatic structure of his *Lives*, Plutarch warns and continues warning his readers of the risks of reading such ‘negative’ pairs. These risks also explain why Plutarch only includes a few biographies on bad men.

---

974 See also the first section of chapter 1.1.1, building on Pelling (2002) 237–251 (= (1995b)).


976 Plutarch addresses such issues in *De aud. poet.*, see Hunter – Russell (2011) 2–17. They argue that Plato’s *Republic* provides the background: unlike Plato, Plutarch does not want to banish poetry, for if young men know how to read poetry, they will benefit much from it. Yet Roskam (2021) 56n46 points out that (with references to secondary literature) “more recent discussions have shown the essential similarities between the views of both thinkers”; see esp. Zadorojnyi (2002). For the Platonic background in *Demetr.* 1, see Duff (2004).
C. The similarities between Demetrius and Antony (Demetr. 1.7–8)

Plutarch is now able to take his final step, viz. introducing the specific Lives. He does so in his typical way, by listing some striking similarities between the Greek and the Roman. The opening phrase might pose some difficulties (1.7):

Περιέξει δὴ τοῦτο τὸ βιβλίον τὸν Δημητρίου τοῦ Πολιορκητοῦ βίον καὶ τὸν Ἀντωνίου τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος, ἀνδρῶν μάλιστα δὴ τῷ Πλάτωνι μαρτυρησάντων, ὅτι καὶ κακίας μεγάλας ὥσπερ ἀρετάς αἱ μεγάλαι φύσεις ἐκφέρουσι.

This book will therefore contain the Lives of Demetrius the City-besieger and Antony the Imperator, men who bore most ample testimony to the truth of Plato’s saying that great natures exhibit great vices also, as well as great virtues.

Although the pair is at first introduced as entirely negative, Plutarch now turns to the idea of ‘great natures’. It is unclear whether he means at this point that one example of such μεγάλαι φύσεις (such as Demetrius and Antony) only possesses κακίας μεγάλας while another only has ἀρετάς, or whether one ‘great nature’ has both vices and virtues, but I prefer the second reading, since it is undeniable that the narratives of Demetrius–Antonius themselves show that these men had their good characteristics too. One therefore wonders whether this compromises Plutarch’s arguments earlier in the prologue. This does not need to be the case. Despite some virtuous acts, Demetrius and Antony indeed remain rather bad examples, in the same way as quite good men have their vices too. Thus, as Duff states, “the programme has not changed”, but the focus is somewhat different: because of this shift Plutarch considered it appropriate to write the prologue in question (once more in line with its apologetic function).

b) Conclusion

In the prologue to Demetrius–Antonius, Plutarch feels compelled to defend himself against two possible accusations. He writes about vices, which might give the impression that he enjoys doing so, and he thereby seems to deviate from his practice in other pairs, especially from how it is described in the prologue to Pericles–Fabius Maximus: he will no

---

980 Duff (1999) 64.
longer avoid rather negative heroes. Yet despite the strong rhetorical and apologetic aspect of the text, the prologue to *Demetrius–Antonius* recalls Plutarch’s treatises of *Seeelenheilung* in various respects. As a consequence, it seems to reflect his actual opinion about the function of negative role models: although an overload of vices could be dangerous, it is sometimes necessary to depict a frightening image of harm and blame, for this can persuade the (high-class) audience to avoid certain thoughts and actions. When finally convinced, one will study the opposite behaviour more, which can result in imitation.

### 1.2.2 Negative Exempla in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*

Three elements illustrate that the presence of negative *exempla* in the collection is in line with Plutarch’s views on such role models as described in the prologue to *Demetrius–Antonius*:

1. [1] There are only two clear negative examples, *Pyrrhus* (184CD) and *Alcibiades* (186D–F). As in the *Parallel Lives*, the number of bad models is kept to a strict minimum.
2. The location of *Pyrrhus* and *Alcibiades* illustrates that negative examples are meant to convince one that the opposite is preferable: both sections are framed by characters who exhibit virtuous behaviour. *Pyrrhus* I (184C) follows two sections that deal with the same topic: the unity among brothers (*Antiochus Hierax* and *Eumenes*, 184AB). The image of the Epirote as a true tyrant suggests that he will not accept frankness in speech in his final apophthegm (184D), which clashes with the first story of the next section (184DE), in which Antiochus VII is glad to hear the truth about himself. *Alcibiades* similarly concludes a series of sections that dwell upon the same themes: justice and respect for the people (*Themistocles*, and esp. *Aristeides* and *Pericles*, 184F–186C). It hereby strengthens the positive image of those who preceded (in particular *Pericles*, 186C; cf. esp. the reference to Pericles in *Alcibiades* IV, 186E). Thus, *Pyrrhus* and *Alcibiades* indeed perform a convincing function, and the placement of the sections ensures that the audience is able to distinguish what is wrong (cf. Ingenkamp’s κρίσις).
3. The issue concerning the possibly entertaining aspect of negative *exempla* is also relevant in the context of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*. First, there is the concept of *varietas delectat*. If Plutarch truly thought in this way about his worst models in the *Parallel Lives*,

---

981 One might be inclined to count *Cyrus Minor* (173EF) as a negative *exemplum*, but the section only contains one apophthegm, which sheds light on the section of his brother (173F–174A) in the first place. It presents Artaxerxes Mnemon as weak. If this accusation is valid, Cyrus might be preferable in some respects, which means he falls under the category of dubious men.
he might have had something similar in mind when including *Pyrrhus* and *Alcibiades* in the collection: an alternation between better and worse protagonists will keep the readers interested. But more important is the humour in both sections. Pyrrhus is a tragicomic figure. Despite his ‘victories’ and eventual defeat (III and IV, 184C), he behaves like a *miles glorusus* (I and II, 184C; and V, 184CD). He becomes even more pathetic in VI, when some young men deride him (184D). This image is also in line with his appearance in *Gaius Fabricius*: all his pomp and circumstance fails to impress the Roman, who makes fun of the Epirote (194F–195B). This embarrassing scene (cf. *αἰσχύναι*) demonstrates what one does not want to become like. Most apophthegms on Alcibiades are witty too, at least to some extent, although he appears to be more vicious than Pyrrhus. He tries to escape justice (186E). Yet it does him no good: in the end, he is still sentenced to death and feels forced to turn against his country (186EF). The damage (cf. *βλάβαι*) he causes to himself and his homeland again depicts a nightmare view of what one could become. It calls to mind the theatre metaphor so prevalent in *Demetius–Antonius*, and shows that the entertaining aspect is not meant to make the audience sympathize with such characters. On the contrary: it is entirely in line with their dissuading function as described in [2].

### 1.3 ‘Perfect’ Exempla

> τελείους δ’ ἀνθρώπους ἡγοῦμαι τοὺς δυναμένους τὴν πολιτικὴν δύναμιν μεῖξαι καὶ κεράσαι τῷ φιλοσόφῳ, καὶ δυεῖν ὄντοι μεγίστοι ἐπηβόλους ὑπολαμβάνω, τοῦ τε κοινωφελοῦς βίου πολιτευομένους, τοῦ τ’ ἀκύμονος καὶ γαληνοῦ διατρίβοντας περὶ φιλοσοφίαν. (De lib. educ. 7F–8A)

And I consider those who can mix and blend political power with philosophy to be perfect persons, and I assume that they are in possession of two good things that are the greatest, both of the life of common utility, being active in politics, and of the waveless and calm life, busying oneself with philosophy.

The passage quoted is one of the few definitions of the perfect life in the Plutarchan oeuvre, but unfortunately the authenticity of the work is disputed. Yet it still basically reflects Plutarch’s views. The next pages

---

982 As stated in the acknowledgements, this chapter, except for 1.3.2, presents a slightly adapted version of van der Wiel (2023b). I use my own translations, as I did in this earlier version.

983 Ziegler (1951) 810–811. For a discussion and biographical overview of this debate, see Abbot (1980) ix–xxxi; Albini (1997) 69n2; Xenophontos (2016) 27n21.
argue that he was indeed of the opinion that perfection, from a moral point of view, consists of finding the right balance between political life and philosophy.

There are six occurrences of τελειότης in Plutarch. One of these is found in a disputed work. Nine of which in disputed works. Limiting myself to the undisputed texts and to the relevant passages, a consistent image arises:

[1] Plutarch does not believe that human beings can attain perfection, but one should still try to come as closely as possible to the ideal. This explains why Plutarch often refutes the Stoics in this regard: if it were impossible to become a true sage, and if progress towards virtue did not matter, moral behaviour would no longer make sense.

---

984 The result of a TLG search for lemma τελειότης, -ητος, ἡ in Plutarch. The only passage that concerns human perfection is De aud. poet. 25A. In other passages, τελειότης refers to: (1) the completeness of a life (Cam. 43.2), (2) adulthood or being full-grown (Cons. ad Apoll. 113C, Quaest. conv. 638A), and (3), in line with this, strength (Quaest. conv. 638A, Gryllus 992A, De comm. not. 1066C).


986 A TLG search for lemma τέλειος, -α, -ον in Plutarch gives 103 results, but the final two concern the same fragment: Sandbach 157 and Jacoby FGrH 3B 388 Fi. Looking for τελείος gives three results.

987 De lib. educ. 7C and 7F–8A; Cons. ad Apoll. 109E, 112B, 113E, 119F; De fato 572E; Dec. or. vit. 843E; Aqua an ignis 957A. On the disputed authenticity of De lib. educ., see supra, note 983; for Cons. ad Apoll., see supra, note 985; for De fato, Aqua an ignis, and Dec. or. vit., see Ziegler (1951) 725–727 and 878–879.

988 As is the implication of Comp. Arist. et Ca. Ma. 4-3, discussed below. A similar point is made in Cim. 2.5 (which, however, does not contain τέλειος): historians should not focus on the bad characteristics of their subject, ὡσπερ αἰδουμένους ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως, εἰ καλὸν οὐδὲν εἰλικρινὲς οὐδ’ ἀναμφισβήτητον εἰς ἀρετὴν ἥθος γεγονός ἀποδίδωσιν (“as if showing mercy to human nature, if it does not render a good character which is pure and indisputable as regards virtue”). See also Stadter (2000) 506; and Verdegem (2010) 24–25 on this passage, and on the fact that there are no perfect heroes in the Parallel Lives.

989 Roskam (2005b) 221–222 distinguishes three groups of works in which Plutarch criticizes the Stoic view: (1) “formal polemics against Stoicism” (221), (2) treatises containing “occasional anti-Stoic criticism” (221), and (3) a group “that stands midway between the other two” (222). Passages of (1) where τέλειος is used in the context of refutations of the Stoic doctrine concerning human perfection are: De Stoic. rep. 1046F (two occurrences); Stoic. absurd. poet. 1058B; De comm. not. 1061F, 1068C, 1069F, 1070B, and 1070D. For treatments of human perfection in (3), containing τέλειος, see: De prof. in virt. 75C, 76A, 82E, and 84D (this passage will appear relevant, see chapter 1.4.3). For a full
[2] A higher degree of perfection comes from philosophy, reason, and education. It is connected with a certain set of virtues, such as φρόνησις, σωφροσύνη, and δικαιοσύνη, and the ability to control one’s emotions. There is a close link with αὐτάρκεια.

[3] Politics are an indispensable part of the perfect life. Anyone familiar with Plutarch will not be surprised by this. He wrote several works on the importance of a philosopher’s participation in public life, and he practised what he preached. The passage that most explicitly connects political life and τελειότης is the Comparison of Aristeides and Cato Maior, which is the focus of this chapter. A literary analysis will show that, in Plutarch’s opinion, the demands of politics and philosophy can...

discussion of this work, see Roskam (2005b) 222–363. See also Babut (1969) 319–322 for Plutarch’s ideas about the Stoic sage and moral progress.

990 See De aud. 37F, but also De aud. poet. 25A: only philosophers know what happiness is – i.e. the perfect life, in this passage equated with the full possession of what is good. In De soll. an. 962C, Plutarch writes that perfect λόγος is the result of careful attention and training (ἐξ ἐπιμελείας καὶ διδασκαλίας). In De fortuna 99C, he points out that reason and sagacity lead to the τελειοτάτη τέχνη. For a similar argument, see An virt. doc. 440A.

991 Demetr. 1.4 calls these virtues πασῶν τελεώταται τεχνῶν. An seni 789F refers to the φρόνησις of old men as a perfect consequence of their age.

992 In Tim. 6.7, Plutarch contrasts Timoleon’s distress after he rightfully killed his brother with a story of Aristeides the Lorician who stuck to what he said, despite the horrible consequences. He concludes by calling this an example of a τελειοτέρα ἀρετή. For a similar reason, Aemilius is called τελειότερος in Comp. Tim. et Aem. 2.10. In De aud. poet. 26A, Plutarch refers to men in poetry as not perfect, but surrendered to πάθη and wrong opinions.

993 Comp. Arist. et Ca. Ma. 4.3 and 5.3, discussed below. This also appears from many other passages that contain τέλειος – even those that do not concern human perfection. Agis&Cleom. 2.1 is interesting in this regard too.

994 In An seni and Praec. ger. reip., Plutarch gives advice on public life. De unius is a (perhaps spurious: see Roskam (2009) 25n52 for an overview of secondary literature on this complex debate) fragment of a treatise concerning forms of government, see Ziegler (1951) 823–824. In particular Maxime cum principibus and Ad princ. iner. focus on the importance of a philosopher’s influence on politicians; see Roskam (2009) 63–69 and Pelling (2014) on Plutarch’s (Platonic) political theory. That Plutarch wrote De lat. viv. to reject Epicurus’ λάθε βιώσας is then not surprising; see Roskam (2007) 87.

995 On Plutarch’s own political career, see Ziegler (1951) 657–659; Roskam (2009) 17–19.

996 Comp. Arist. et Ca. Ma. 3.1. An seni 790A calls kingship the most perfect political function, but does not refer to πολιτεία as a necessary part of the perfect life. In Non posse 1088E, there is also a connection between perfection and the active life: Theon argues against the Epicureans, claiming that perfection (τι κρεῖττον … καὶ τελειότερον) cannot
clash, and that it is a sign of a higher perfection when one is able to walk the path of the golden mean.

1.3.1 The Comparison of Aristeides and Cato Maior

a) Literary analysis

Plutarch as a rule starts a *synkrisis* by privileging one hero, and then systematically prefers the other. This is no different in his comparison of Aristeides and Cato Maior, although in this case, the heroes are recommended and denounced for the same characteristics. The general structure – which is not to be taken too strictly – is as follows:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Introduction (1.1–3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>In terms of military exploits and speech, Cato is superior (1.4–2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>In terms of wealth, Cato is superior (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C'</td>
<td>In terms of wealth, Aristeides is superior (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B'</td>
<td>In terms of military exploits and speech, Aristeides is superior (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A'</td>
<td>‘Concluding’ assessment (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The theme of perfection is addressed multiple times from C on, but the entire text should be taken into account for a full understanding.

* A *Introduction (i.1–3)*

Most *synkrisis* intend to highlight the differences between a Greek and a Roman, in order to enable the reader to decide who was the better

be found in bodily pleasures, but in the soul, in the way contemplative and politically active men do (ὥσπερ οἱ θεωρητικοὶ καὶ πολιτικοὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν).


Agis 2.1, quoted *infra*, p. 333, suggests something similar and connects it with perfection too, but does not problematize this issue.

Duff (1999) 257–262 discusses this in detail. He speaks of (261) “Equality of treatment”, of which *Comp. Arist. et Ca. Ma.* is a striking example (261–262). Attempts to deny the authenticity of the *synkrisis* have been rejected, and today, Plutarch’s authorship is generally accepted. See Duff (1999) 256 on this matter, with references to relevant secondary literature.

The first phrase of B (1.4) is closely connected with A; the opening words of C (3.1) continue the theme of politics which concludes B (2.4); B’ builds on the image of the αὐτάρκης Aristeides in C’ (from 4.2 on); the opening of A’ (6.1), finally, still concerns Cato’s praise described in B’ (5.3).

Erbse (1956) 401; Pelling (1986) 90; see also Duff (1999) 256, with nuance: “In general, where they exist, formal prologues bring out the similarities between the two
of the two. In the opening phrase of the Comparison of Aristeides and Cato Maior, Plutarch argues that this is a difficult case, since the two share too many similarities (1.1). Yet in the first example, he already notes a difference: both acquired political power and fame (πολιτείαν καὶ δόξαν) because of their innate virtue and power (ἀρετῇ καὶ δυνάμει), but the context was entirely different (1.2). This becomes apparent from the parallel structure of 1.2–3:

1.2

M.C. φαίνεται δ’ οὖν Ἀριστείδης ὁ δὲ Κάτων

1.3

τὸ γὰρ μέγιστον ἦν τίμημα τὸν πεντακόσιον μεδίμνον, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον ἵππεις τριακόσια, οὔκετα Κουρίων καὶ Φαβρικίων καὶ Ατιλίων ἔργον οὖσαν ἡγεμόνων […] ἀλλὰ πρὸς γένη μεγάλα καὶ πλούτους καὶ νομὰς καὶ σπουδαρχίας ἀποβλέπειν εἰθισμένην

[I] shows the similarity between both men: [1] their modest living place and [2] their frugal lifestyle. At the same time, it also points to a different subjects; synkriseis bring out the differences, though there is considerable variation from this pattern.”


1003 1.2: “And Aristeides, on the one hand, seems to have become a prominent man when Athens then was not yet great and after associating with popular leaders and generals who were similar and equal in terms of riches. For the greatest estimation of wealth at the time counted five hundred medimnoi, the second three hundred, and the final and third two hundred”; 1.3: “Cato, on the other hand, leaving a small village and a lifestyle that seemed rustic, threw himself, as if into an immense sea, into the politics in Rome, which was no longer the work of men such as Curius and Fabricius and Atilius as rulers […], but which used to pay attention to the great gentes and their riches and donations and eagerness to rule”. As to αὐτὸν ὄσπερ εἰς πέλαγος ἀχανές in 1.5, Sansone (1989) 236 (translating with “the yawning billows”) points out that this is a “favorite expression of Plutarch’s”, and lists the following passages: Aem. 25.6, Cic. 6.4, Mar. 26.2, De prof. in virt. 76C, and Non posse 1107A. One can add: Alex. 31.10 and De lat. viv. 1130E.
ence: in the case of Aristeides, the general condition of an entire city state is described; in the case of Cato, it concerns his specific dwelling place. This refers back to the Life of Cato Maior, where Plutarch describes Cato’s home before he participated in Roman politics: he lived close to the former residence of the poor Manius Curius, whom he took as his model (Ca. Ma. 2.1–3). This is important for the interpretation of [III]: simple, early Athens, still following Solon’s legislation, is contrasted with Rome, described in highly negative terms. Yet Rome once looked like Athens in the ancient times of Manius Curius. The comparison between Cato and these Romans of old thus depicts him as an anachronism.

This first paragraph, therefore, does not yet contain an explicit assessment of the heroes. It only describes the context in which they lived. This different background provides the argument in B.

B Cato’s superiority: military exploits and speech (1.4–25)
The introductory phrase of B is closely connected with A. Plutarch again contrasts Aristeides’ Athens with Cato’s Rome, in connection with wealth and descent (1.4).  

οὐκ ἦν δ’ ὅμοιον ἀντιπάλῳ χρῆσθαι Θεμιστοκλεῖ, μὴτ’ ἀπὸ γένους λαμπρό και κεκτημένου μέτρια – πέντε γάρ ἦ τριών ταλάντων οὐσίαν αὐτῷ γενέσθαι λέγουσιν ὅτε πρῶτον ἤπτετο τῆς πολιτείας – καὶ πρὸς Σκιπίωνας Αφρικανοὺς καὶ Σερουίους Γάλβας καὶ Κουίντιους Φλαμινίνους ἁμιλλᾶσθαι περὶ πρωτείων, μηδὲν ὁρμητήριον ἔχοντα πλὴν φωνὴν παρρησιαζομένην ὑπὲρ τῶν δικαίων.

And it was not the same to deal with Themistocles as antagonist, who did not come from an eminent house and had acquired moderate possessions – for they say that he possessed five or three talents when he for the first time engaged in public life – and to contend with men such as Scipio Africanus and Servius Galba and Quintus Flamininus about the first place, without any incentive except for his [Cato’s] voice that spoke frankly about justice.

The different situation brings Plutarch to a first criticism of Aristeides: in military campaigns, he never prevailed (which is, as Sansone writes,
not in line with the Life), contrary to his Roman counterpart (2.1–3). Plutarch’s argument is surprising: as Duff states, the author prefers Cato’s victories in small Spanish towns and a war against Antiochus to the greatest Greek victories in the period of the Persian Wars; moreover, he ignores Themistocles’ military talent and thus minimizes his value as a rival. This is not fair to Aristeides, and in particular this second point also contradicts the Life.

The second part of B discusses the political career of the two men. The image of Aristeides deteriorates further: Themistocles caused him to be ostracized, but Cato survived every lawsuit (2.4–5). Cato’s rhetorical talents, as his only weapon (1.4), become the explanation for his superiority at the end of B. This even leads Plutarch to compare him with Aristotle (2.5).

For Plutarch, persuasiveness is an important feature of the statesman and this motif is reflected here as well. Yet in the episode of Aris-

---

1006 Sansone (1989) 236: “In the Life of Aristeides, however, Plutarch portrayed him as commander in chief at Plataea (11.1).”

1007 Note πρώτους ἁμιλλωμένους ύπερβαλόμενος in 2.1, resembling ἁμιλλᾶσθαι περὶ πρωτείων in 1.4.

1008 Duff (1999) 261. Concerning the description of Antiochus’ defeat in 2.3, Sansone (1989) 237 points out that the “wording encourages us to recall that Aristeides too (9.5–6) had been responsible for expelling Asiatic invaders from Greece”; see Comp. Arist. et Ca. Ma. 2.3: ἡ νίκη, περιφανῶς ἔργον οὖσα Κάτωνος, ἐξήλασε τῆς Ἑλλάδος τὴν Ἀσίαν – Arist. 9.6: Ἀριστείδης [...] ἐκέλευε [...] ὅπως τὴν ταχύτητην ἐκβάλλοσι τὸν Μῆδον ἐκ τῆς ᾿Ελλάδος.

1009 The enmity between Aristeides and Themistocles is described in Arist. 2–3.4, which shows that it was not easy at all to have Themistocles as an opponent.

1010 See ἀντιπάλοις χρώμενος, similar to ἀντιπάλῳ χρῆσθαι in 1.4. On the wrestling metaphor in this synkrisis, see Sansone (1989) 237.

1011 Compare πρόβλημα τοῦ βίου καὶ δραστηρίων οργανόν ἔχον τον λόγον ("having his speech as a barrier of his life and efficacious instrument") in 2.5, and μηδὲν ὁρμητήριον ἐξοντα πλὴν φονῆν παρρησιαζομένην ὑπὲρ τῶν δικαίων (translation: see supra, p. 320) in 1.4 again.

1012 Plutarch cites Antipater’s “praise of Aristotle” elsewhere in the Lives too, see van Raalte (2005) 103–104.

1013 Agis 2.1, cited infra, p. 333. See also Praec. ger. reip. 801C–804C on the importance of a statesman’s persuasiveness and the right ways to address the people. 801E reminds one of Comp. Arist. et Ma.: ἦ που δυνατὸν ἄνθρωπον ἰδιότην ἐξ ἵματος καὶ σχήματος δημοτικοῦ πόλιν ἐγειρεῖν καὶ κρατῆσαι τῶν πολλῶν, εἰ μὴ λόγον ἔχοι συμπαθητάντα καὶ προσαγόμενον; (“Or is an ordinary man with common clothes and appearance, who wants to lead a city, in some way able to prevail and rule over many, if he would not have speech which persuades and wins over?”). Precisely his persuasiveness provides Cato’s power in the synkrisis too.
teides’ banishment in the *Life*, Plutarch tells an anecdote about how he did not even try to defend himself and wrote down his own name on the ostracon of an illiterate man, who admitted he did not even know Aristeides (*Arist.* 7.7–8).\footnote{The story is also recalled by B’ and will therefore be discussed in more detail below.} Aristeides, therefore, was not forced to leave Athens because he lacked persuasiveness, but because he did not want to use his voice.

*C* *Cato’s superiority: wealth (3)*
The reference to Aristotle at the end of B brings Plutarch to a more philosophical reflection on human perfection (3.1):

\begin{quote}
"Ὅτι μὲν δὴ τῆς πολιτικῆς ἄνθρωπος ἀρετῆς οὐ κτᾶται τελειοτέραν, ὡμολογούμενον ἔστι ταύτης δὲ ποι μόριοι οἱ πλείστοι τὴν οἰκονομικήν οὐ σμικρὸν τίθενται [...]."
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
It is generally believed that a human being can acquire absolutely no more perfect virtue than that of civic affairs; and most people regard the virtue of managing one’s household to be no little part of it.
\end{quote}

Perfection means taking part in politics, and Plutarch explains how one can become a good politician. A similar connection of private and public life can be found in *Septem sapientium convivium*, where Chilon combines household management with the task of the statesman, adding a story on Lycurgus (155DE).\footnote{See Sansone (1989) 237: “Plutarch is here influenced by Aristotle, according to whom (*Eth. Nic.* 1094b8–9, *Pol.* 1252a5) the good of the state is greater and more comprehensive than the good of individual citizens. [...] The virtue that is exercised in civic life, which Plutarch carefully refrains from naming, is justice (*Pol.* 1253a37), the virtue that comprehends the rest (see *Eth. Nic.* 1129b25, Plato *Rep.* 434c) and of which Aristeides is the conspicuous exemplar. Thus the criticism of Aristeides in this chapter is subtly undercut.” Yet in what follows, Plutarch will precisely claim that Aristeides was *not* just by being poor.}

This Spartan king also appears on the stage in the next phrase of the *synkrisis* in comparison with Cato. Not only did the Roman give heed to Lycurgus’ insight, but he also taught the people to do so (3.1–2).\footnote{Praec. ger. reip. also closes with a call to avoid private quarrels, since these often affect the entire state (825A–F); see Swain (1999) 88–90. On this statement in the *synkrisis*, see Sansone (1989) 237 again: “Further Aristotelian influence; cf. *Pol.* 1252b16 and 28, 1253b3.”}

This Spartan king also appears on the stage in the next phrase of the *synkrisis* in comparison with Cato. Not only did the Roman give heed to Lycurgus’ insight, but he also taught the people to do so (3.1–2).\footnote{In *De se ipsum laud.* 544C, Cato depicts the opposite image of his own character: οἷς [sc. φάρμακα for self-praise] καὶ Κάτων ἐχρῆτο φθονεῖσθαι λέγον, ὅτι τῶν ἰδίων ἀμελεῖ καὶ τὰς νύκτας ἀγρυπνεῖ διὰ τὴν πατρίδα (“Cato too used these things while say-
comparison and the motif of Cato as the teacher of the people recall Plutarch’s image of the philosopher king.\textsuperscript{1018} It is a core task of the good ruler to educate the masses, and Cato apparently fulfilled this mission.\textsuperscript{1019}

Aristeides, on the contrary, did not follow Hesiod’s and Homer’s advice on household management (3.2–3). The reference to these poets continues the series of paradigms,\textsuperscript{1020} while Cato is compared to two Greek role models (Aristotle and Lycurgus), and prominent ones, Aristeides ignores the advice of Homer and Hesiod, essential to Greek παιδεία.\textsuperscript{1021} The Roman, then, is more Greek than the Athenian, which contrasts sharply with the Lives that depict Cato as rejecting anything Greek.\textsuperscript{1022}

The term δικαιοσύνη in the reference to the epic poets is also striking: through his entire life, Aristeides was praised for his justice (“ὁ Δίκαιος” was his nickname). Again, the picture of the biographies is subverted.\textsuperscript{1023} Using a body metaphor,\textsuperscript{1024} Plutarch points out that, by remaining poor, Aristeides in fact did injustice to his household and descendants (3.4). However, it is less clear how his poverty defiled his political career. An explicit contrast with Cato provides a first explanation: his offspring performed important political duties for many generations; Aristeides’ family could not even dream of this (3.5). This further highlights the damage the Athenian caused to his children, but also that he hurt his city, for his family was a costly burden to the community, and was not able properly

\textsuperscript{1018} Roskam (2002) 181: “Once the ruler has been fully educated, he can assume the arduous task of educating in turn his own people.” See also de Blois – Bons (1995) 106; Roskam (2009) 66–67. See also Hershbell (1995) about the educational role of the lawgivers Lycurgus and Numa. Although Cato is definitely not a philosopher king, Plutarch would have appreciated his attempts to improve the Romans. See also supra, note 606.

\textsuperscript{1019} Plutarch has Cato’s De agricultura in mind; see Sansone (1989) 238.

\textsuperscript{1020} In his article on “Plutarch’s Use of the Poets”, de Wet (1988) 19 briefly refers to the passage.

\textsuperscript{1021} As Bréchet (2003) 527–528 points out, Homer and Hesiod are examples of παλαιοί. These are connected with wisdom and virtues, see also section 1.3.1.b of this chapter. In De aud. poet., Plutarch presents reading poetry as a suitable way of preparing young people for philosophy: even though he is a Platonist, he still incites his readers to study the poets (but see supra, note 976).

\textsuperscript{1022} Plutarch discusses this in Ca. Ma. 25: Cato not only enjoyed mocking Greeks, but also hated philosophy. On the Romans and their acceptance of or aversion to Greekness in Plutarch, see Swain (1990), discussing Ca. Ma. on pp. 126–128.

\textsuperscript{1023} Aristeides’ nickname is dealt with in Arist. 6–7. Plutarch presents it as one of the reasons for his banishment (cf. the analysis of his section, 186A–C, in Part II).

\textsuperscript{1024} Sansone (1989) 238 points out that Plutarch has Plato, Prot. 334b–c in mind.
to serve the country. In line with Lycurgus’ saying earlier in the paragraph, one concludes that the poor truly harm the commonwealth more than the rich.

There is also another, implicit explanation, to be derived from a further contrast with Cato. The Roman shows his subjects the right path, as a good politician should do. Aristeides, however, did quite the contrary. By being poor, he, in a certain sense, provided a bad model for the people: if they all were to follow his example, it would damage the state. Thus, Aristeides is to be blamed for neglecting his educating role too, as seems to be the implication at this point in the *synkrisis*: Cato is the better politician.

C’ Aristeides’ superiority: wealth (4)

"Ἡ τοῦτο πρῶτον ἀμφιλογίαν ἔχει;

Or is this the first point which could tell either way? [Pelling]1026

This brief quotation marks a break.1027 From now on, Aristeides is univocally praised. Poverty, Plutarch continues, can also be a sign of a great character, if it does not originate from indolence and negligence (4.1). This contrasts with the quotation of Homer and the reference to Hesiod: although their claims might be right, they do not apply to Aristeides. The difference between C and C’ is continued in what follows, recalling 4.2 (note the verbal references):1028

οὐ γὰρ ἔστι πράττειν μεγάλα φροντίζοντα μικρῶν, οὐδὲ πολλοῖς δεομένοις βοηθεῖν πολλῶν αὐτῶν δεόμενον. μέγα δ’ εἰς πολιτείαν ἐφόδιον οὐχὶ πλοῦτος, ἀλλ’ αὐτάρκεια, τῷ μηδενὸς ἰδίᾳ τῶν περιττῶν δεῖσθαι πρὸς οὐδεμίαν ἀσχολίαν ἄπαγοισα τῶν δημοσίων. ἀπροσδεής

1025 Plutarch writes that Aristeides’ descendants themselves asked for public money (3.5). Sansone (1989) 238 notes a contradiction with Arist. “27.2 and 27.5, where we are told that the citizens of Athens gave grants to some of Aristeides’ female descendants (but not that the latter begged for them).”

1026 The precise meaning of πρῶτον is difficult to define. Although the LCL text has πρῶτον, Perrin (1914) 393 translates: “Possibly this point invites discussion”, ignoring the word. Sansone (1989) 169 reads: “Or does this matter allow of debate beforehand?” Adverbial use might be correct, but I decided to follow the translation of Pelling (2002) 275 (= (2004) 415).

1027 Also Duff (1999) 261–262.

1028 Sansone (1989) 239 sees a reference back to Ca. Ma. 21.8 in this passage, where Plutarch “criticized Cato for calling ‘god-like’ the man who increases the value of the estate that he inherits.”
μὲν γὰρ ἄπλως ὁ θεὸς, ἀνθρωπίνης δ’ ἀρετῆς, ὃ συνάγεται πρὸς τούλαχιστον ἡ χρεία, τούτο τελειότατον καὶ θειότατον.

For it is not possible to perform great actions while giving heed to small things, nor to help the many who are in need while you are in need of many things yourself. And not wealth, but self-sufficiency is a great support for politics, which does not lead one to any negligence of public affairs, by having need of nothing that is superfluous in one’s private life. For, on the one hand, god is absolutely without want; as regards human virtue, on the other hand, that part of it which reduces need to its smallest extent, is most perfect and most divine.

This is in line with other Plutarchan passages on perfection: τελειότης is connected with αὐτάρκεια and is beyond reach for human beings.\footnote{As discussed at the outset of this chapter (1.3).} At first sight, the definition provides a second contradiction with C: it is not doing politics but rather αὐτάρκεια that is the most perfect virtue. Yet perhaps it should rather be read as an adjustment: αὐτάρκεια is recommended precisely because it enables one to better perform public duties. The term ἐφόδιον is well chosen in this respect, as it often refers to the means that enable one to fulfil a certain task.\footnote{See LSJ, s.v. “ἐφόδιον”: “supplies for travelling, money and provisions, esp. of an army”.} Plutarch’s claim, therefore, is somewhat paradoxical: independence from wealth is presented as the right ἐφόδιον for political life.

Yet the question is how αὐτάρκεια can be of help to the politician. The reason Plutarch gives (wealth distracts from politics) contrasts with C. It also differs from the description of Aristeides as an αὐτάρκης in the Life and his value in this respect for public affairs (Arist. 2.6; Aristeides is contrasted with his rival Themistocles, who opted for the opposite course):

Ἀριστείδης δὲ καθ’ αὑτὸν ὃσπερ ὃδον ἰδίαν ἐβάδιζε διὰ τῆς πολιτείας, πρῶτον μὲν οὐ βουλόμενος συναδικεῖν τοῖς ἑταίροις ή λυπηρός εἶναι μὴ χαριζόμενος, ἐπειτα τὴν ἄπο τῶν φίλων δύναμιν οὐκ ὀλίγους ἑπαίρουσαν ἀδικεῖν, ἐφυλάττετο, μόνῳ τῷ χρηστά καὶ δίκαια πράσσειν και λέγειν ἄξιων θαρρεῖν τὸν ἀγαθὸν πολίτην.

Aristeides, on the other hand, walked through politics on his own, as if on a private road, first because he did not want to act unjustly together with his friends or to cause sorrow by not favouring them; second because he observed that the power from friends brought not a few to injustice, he was on his guard, since he thought that the good citizen is only of good courage by doing and saying useful and just things.
Compared with this, Plutarch’s argument in the *synkrisis* appears rather weak. Despite the fact that C’ contains some truth, it does not do away with the arguments of C: Aristeides still damaged his house, and consequently his country. It is therefore striking that the remainder of C’ does not expand on the importance of poverty for politics at all, although this is what Plutarch, in fact, should do, if he wants to defend Aristeides against the negative image he just painted: in what follows, the author only dwells upon αὐτάρκεια as a perfect virtue and indeed how it sets free one’s mind.

This argument again opens with a body comparison (4.3), which further connects and contrasts C’ with C, where Plutarch draws on the same metaphorical field in order to defend a different position. A similar procedure can be noticed in 4.4–5, which again sets Aristeides in opposition to Cato. The Athenian is listed together not only with Epameinondas, but also with Manius Curius and Gaius Fabricius (4.4). In the next phrase, on the contrary, Cato is presented as a hypocrite: he cooked turnips (γογγυλίδας) but talked and wrote about becoming rich (4.5). This root vegetable is not randomly chosen as Cato’s favourite meal. It once more refers back to an apophthegm told in the *Life*, where Manius Curius is preparing the same dish (*Ca. Ma. 2.2*). Stories as these instigated Cato to take this man as his *exemplum* (2.3). Thus, the image of Cato as an anachronism, evoked by A, is rejected by this reference in C’: he is just a superficial imitator of the Romans of yore, while Aristeides deserves to be compared with them. In other words: at first Cato seemed to live according to the prescriptions of the greatest Greeks (Aristotle and Lycurgus) in B and C, but in C’, Aristeides is the one who finally resembles the early men of Rome’s cultural heritage.

Plutarch subsequently illustrates the truth of his view by citing an apophthegm of Aristeides (4.6) to argue that the Athenian was definitely not indolent (4.7). The chapter concludes with a reference back to the opening words of C’.

---

1031 And which Plutarch could have done: in *Praec. ger. reip.* 822D–823E, he argues that the good politician does not need to be wealthy.

1032 Note *Ca. Ma. 2.2*: ἕψοντα γογγυλίδας – *Comp. Arist. et Ca. Ma.* 4.5: γογγυλίδας … ἕψοντι. Sansone (1989) 239 sees a problematic contradiction between these passages: “Plutarch is either very careless or is trying to engage in deception. It was not Cato but Curius […] who was discovered boiling turnips himself, nor was anything said about him regarding them as the finest delicacy.”

1033 The apophthegm concerns the trial of Callius, presented as the wealthiest man in Athens in *Arist.* 25. This passage contains a similar apophthegm of Aristeides (25.7–8).

1034 4.1: ῥᾳθυμίας – 4.7: ῥᾳθυμίας.
B’ Aristeides’ superiority: military exploits and speech (5)
The first word of this paragraph introduces this new topic: στρατηγίαι (see B). Both passages are closely connected by means of references to the same [1] wars and battles, [2] names of opponents, and [3] other similarities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>B'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[1] Μαραθώνι (2.1), Πλαταιαίς (2.1), Μαραθώνος, Σαλαμίνος (2.2), Πλαταιαίς (2.2), Ἰβηρικόν πόλεμον (2.3), ἐπ Αντίοχον (2.3)</td>
<td>[1] Μαραθών (5.1), Σαλαμίς (5.1), Πλαταιαί (5.1), Ἀντίοχον (5.2), Ἰβηρικών πόλεων (5.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2] Θεμιστοκλεῖ (1.4), Σκιπίωνας Αφρικανούς (1.4), Θεμιστοκλής (2.2), Σκιπίώνι (2.3)</td>
<td>[2] Θεμιστοκλεῖ (5.4), Σκιπίωνι (5.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3] ἀντιπάλῳ χρήσθαι (1.4), δόξαν (2.3), ἀντιπάλους χρώμενος (2.4), ἀήττητοι (2.4)</td>
<td>[3] δόξης (5.2), ἀντιπράττων (5.4), ἀήττητον (5.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It goes without saying that Plutarch attempts to redirect his readers to B. Surprisingly, he claims that it is not worthwhile to compare the battles fought by the two men (5.2: οὐκ ἄξιον δήπου παραβαλεῖν), even though this is precisely what he did in B. In addition, this point resembles what he said in 1.4: opposing Themistocles is not the same as competing with the illustrious Romans of Cato’s days. Thus, as was the case with C–C’, Plutarch constructs arguments of similar nature to defend different positions in B–B’ as well.

In what follows, the conflict between the two parts of the synkrisis continues. While praising Cato’s persuasiveness in B, Plutarch sheds a negative light on this characteristic in B’: the Roman was fond of self-praise. This also casts shadow over his military exploits, since it seems to imply that he only was the first because one could always hear him boasting. Furthermore, this argument defends Aristeides from the fact that he never prevailed: he simply did not care about fame and did not talk himself to the top. Plutarch is therefore able to continue a theme of C’: the Athenian’s αὐτάρκεια – making him more perfect – was not only directed at πλοῦτος, but also at δόξα (5.2–3). This once more leads to a reflection on perfection (5.3–4):

τελειότερος δέ μοι δοκεὶ πρὸς ἀρετήν τοῦ πολλάκις αὑτὸν ἐγκωμιάζοντος ὁ μηδ’ ἑτέρων τοῦτο ποιοῦντον δεόμενος. τὸ γάρ ἀφιλότιμον οὐ μικρὸν εἰς πρᾳότητα πολιτικὴν ἐφόδιον, καὶ τοῦναντίον ἡ φιλοτιμία χαλεπὸν καὶ φθόνου γονιμωτατον [...].
In my view, more perfect in virtue than the man who often praises himself, is the man who has no need of others to do so either. For the absence of love of honour is no small help for statesmanlike mildness, and the opposite, love of honour, is hard to deal with and the greatest source of jealousy.

This quote is followed by two phrases, containing a parallel structure and contrasting Aristeides with Cato: the first worked together with his opponent, and saved his city; the latter did the opposite, and almost damaged his country (5.4). This shows that φιλοτιμία can truly be a destructive force. Yet here too, there is a contrast with B, which mentions Aristeides’ ostracism. As Plutarch states there, this was instigated by Themistocles (2.4). This naturally comes to mind when the author describes Aristeides’ assistance of his enemy in B’ (5.4), as indeed happened after his banishment (Arist. 8). In addition, Plutarch focuses on the jealousy (φθόνος) of the people in the story of the ostracism, where he adds a short digression on this Athenian practice (Arist. 7.2):

μοχθηρίας γὰρ οὐκ ἦν κόλασις ὁ ἐξοστρακισμός, ἀλλ’ ἐκαλεῖτο μὲν δι’ εὐπρέπειαν δόγκου καὶ δυνάμεως βαρυτέρας ταπείνωσις καὶ κόλουσις, ἤν δὲ φθόνον παραμυθία φιλάνθρωπος […]

For ostracism was not a punishment for depravity, but one called it, as a pretext, an abasement and berth of esteem and too strong power, although it was a lenient abatement of envy.

This summons some questions about B’: apparently, Aristeides was still a victim of envy, so for him, absence of φιλοτιμία did not suffice to get rid of it. This time, references to an earlier chapter therefore function in the opposite way: statements in the latter chapter are to be questioned.

A’ ‘Concluding’ assessment (6)
This final paragraph does not entirely stand apart from B’, as the theme of praise and fame is continued. Yet there is also a break, since it concerns the one event in Cato’s life for which he deserves the most blame. An initial reading of this section therefore gives the impression of some kind of conclusion: after all, Cato is to be rejected and the more perfect
Aristeides is the true role model. Such an interpretation, however, would be a sudden change of practice. It will therefore not come as a surprise that at a closer reading a more problematic picture arises.

A’ refers back to the Life: when it was discovered that he secretly slept with a slave girl in his later years, Cato married a young girl of low birth (Ca. Ma. 24). In this passage, Plutarch does not assess the episode, unlike in the synkrisis. Yet he does not conclude the work by rebuking Cato for these actions as such (6.1–2), although this would suffice to end on a negative note with regard to the Roman. On the contrary: he closes his text with the importance of honour and power that comes with marriage, and which Cato should have exploited. The following passage follows a reference to the reason Cato gave for his second marriage (Ca. Ma. 24.4). After a complaint by his son, he claimed that he just wanted more children like him (6.3):

εἰ γὰρ ἐβούλετο παῖδας ἀγαθοὺς ὁμοίως τεκνῶσαι, γάμον ἔδει λαβεῖν γενναῖον ἐξ ἀρχῆς σκεψάμενον, οὐχ ἔως μὲν ἐλάνθανεν ἀνεγγύω γυναικὶ καὶ κοινῇ συγκοιμώμενος ἀγαπαν, ἐπεὶ δ’ ἐφωράθη, ποιήσασθαι πενθερόν ὃν ῥᾷστα πείσειν, οὐχ ᾧ κάλλιστα κηδεύσειν ἐμελλεν.

For if he wanted to procreate equally good children, he should have considered from the beginning to choose a marriage with a high-born. He should not have been satisfied as long as he secretly slept with an unbetrothed and common woman, nor should he, when discovered, have made as his father-in-law the one whom he would persuade most easily, instead of with whom he would be most beautifully allied in marriage.

The focus on the girl’s low birth recalls the contemporary status of Rome described in A: the city is ruled by the great gentes alone, with whom Cato’s family cannot be identified. In other words: while the first half of the synkrisis depicts the Roman as an anachronism and praises him for this, and while this image is rejected by the second half, the last paragraph denounces him precisely because he does not comply with the historical

---

1037 See also Sansone (1989) 240: “Plutarch’s tendentiousness is apparent from his decision to emphasize this incident at the very end of the comparison.”

1038 In Ca. Ma. 24.5, however, Plutarch adds that this saying was uttered earlier by Peisistratus, an apophthegm which also occurs in Reg. et imp. apophth. as Peisistratus V (189D) and in De frat. am. 480DE (cf. supra, note 592). It is not clear whether he means that the saying is wrongly attributed to Cato, but at least in the synkrisis, he presents it as authentic.
reality of his times. Apparently, honour does matter. It is not immediately clear what one should think of this.

b) Consistent inconsistency

A superficial reading of the *Comparison of Aristeides and Cato Maior* makes one conclude that Plutarch, in the end, unambiguously prefers Aristeides.\(^{1039}\) The Greek seems to be more perfect, but at a closer look, a more problematic image arises. There appear to be some contradictions between the *synkrisis* and the *Lives*. As Duff points out, such instances are no exception in the *Parallel Lives*.\(^{1040}\) He concludes.\(^{1041}\)

The *synkrisis* do not give the reader a summary of the content or the moral issues raised in the preceding narratives. Rather they give a new and often different view of the protagonists from the one given in the narrative. This is partly a result of the rhetorical structure of the *synkrisis*; the two different ways of constructing the past inevitably give different pictures. But the dissonance between narrative and *synkrisis* seems deliberate. Sometimes, furthermore, the text actually draws attention to the dissonance by means of unresolved contradictions between Life and *synkrisis*.

I have shown that this also applies to the *Comparison of Aristeides and Cato Maior*, although in this case even more striking ‘contradictions’ occur within the text. These are definitely not coincidental, since they are highlighted by various attempts to redirect the reader by means of a network of verbal and thematic similarities. One can only conclude that Plutarch deliberately makes his own text deconstruct itself.\(^{1042}\)

Yet despite these apparent contradictions, there is still a certain degree of consistency. This will be illustrated by a chronotopic analysis. Such an approach has proved useful in research on Plutarch: Banta analysed

\(^{1039}\) See also Sansone (1989) 240: “By concluding his comparison with an assertion of Aristeides’ possession, and Cato’s lack, of this cardinal virtue [sc. self-control], Plutarch leaves us no doubt as to which of the two men he regards as morally superior.” In addition, arguments that favour Cato appear weaker than those praising his Greek counterpart. As Duff (1999) 261 puts it: “Plutarch plainly struggled to find arguments in Cato’s favour”.

\(^{1040}\) See Duff (1999) 263–283, who speaks of “closural dissonance”; also Duff (2011a) 74–75. Verdegem (2010) 29–32, however, is not inclined to read too much into discrepancies between *Lives* and *synkrisis*.

\(^{1041}\) Duff (1999) 286.

\(^{1042}\) Konstan (2004) 14 argues that “Plutarch’s approach is not so very far removed from that of modern deconstructionist critics”, in the context of his approach to poetry. The confusion elicited by *Comp. Arist. et Ca. Ma.* suggests that this is in line with how he wanted his own works to be read.
passages of the *Life of Romulus* in light of Ladin’s local chronotopes and pointed out how these refer to and contrast with each other (he speaks of “chronotopic conflicts”). This works for the *Comparison of Aristeides and Cato Maior* as well. In 1.2–4, four chronotopes can be distinguished:

1. Athens of simple means, in the period of the Persian Wars (the time of Themistocles and Aristeides);

2. Later, great Athens, in terms of its virtues similar to later Rome (this is not explicitly described, but evoked by the description of earlier Athens in terms of its contrast with the later condition of the city);

3. Rural republican Rome, of simple means, before its greatest conquests (the times of men such as Manius Curius);

4. Later republican Rome, characterized by the rule of rich families who flatter the degenerated people (the time of Cato the Elder and men such as Scipio Africanus).

[1] and [3] belong together: they describe the time before the greatness of a city, which is in the case of Rome described in [4], and for Athens [2] alluded to by [1]. This distinction reminds one of Bréchet’s extensive study of the image of the παλαιοί in Plutarch. Bréchet points out that, although the Ancients have their flaws, they are often connected with a certain set of virtues and contrasted with later times (of a degenerated people). Thus, although more recent periods are associated with civilization, in contrast with the more primitive status of earlier societies, these elder times remain more perfect in terms of morality. The same can be seen from the “conflicting chronotopes” in the *Comparison of Aristeides and Cato Maior*: Aristeides belongs to the παλαιοί chronotope [1], Cato to the other [4].

This provides an important key for a correct understanding of the synkrisis. When Cato is rightfully praised (B and C), it is because he conforms to the historical reality of [4]. When he is denounced, it is because he does not (5.3). All the arguments in B and C that present Cato as more virtuous – i.e. as virtually belonging to [3] – are deconstructed in B’ and C’. Yet this does not contradict the overall picture that he was a good or at least a successful politician.

---


1044 Note the focus on the difference between past and future Athens: (1.2) ὁὖν τότε – (1.2) ἔτι – (1.3) τότε.

When Aristeides, on the contrary, is praised in C’ and B’, it is because of his virtues: he appears as a true παλαιός [1]. Claims that he was not virtuous in B and C are also dismissed there. Arguments (C’ and B’) that praise his political career, however, are weak and should be questioned, and those that blamed him as a politician (in B and C) are not rejected in the following paragraphs, or at least not successfully. In particular, the story of his ostracism raises questions.

To conclude: a chronotopic analysis points out that the synkrisis contrasts the image of the virtuous παλαιός (cf. 1.1: ἀρετῇ καὶ δυνάμει) with that of the successful statesman (cf. 1.1: πολιτείαν καὶ δόξαν) in times of degeneration. After all, the first phrase appears not to be applicable to both heroes, but they can be praised for their own reasons, related to the specific chronotope they belong to. If the Parallel Lives, dedicated to the influential Roman politician Sosius Senecio, provide a set of role models from which men of public affairs can derive moral lessons, the Comparison of Aristeides and Cato Maior illustrates that Plutarch is not merely advising his audience to copy the more virtuous man in all respects: philosophy comes first, as his preference for Aristeides seems to indicate, but he is, for example, not advising his readers to become as poor as the Athenian. Adaptability is a necessary characteristic and a sign of perfection too: sometimes, it might be a good thing to set aside one’s principles, since the public good does not always benefit from an overly rigid attitude.

c) Conclusion

The two definitions of perfection in the synkrisis, viz. performing political duties (3.1) and αὐτάρκεια (4.2 and 5.3–4), should not be read as mutually exclusive. On the contrary: the politician is to be denounced when he lacks philosophical virtues; the philosopher when he does not adapt to practical reality in order to serve the commonwealth. This is similar to Plutarch’s claims in other works. In particular, a passage from the prologue to Agis and Cleomenes–Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus comes to

---

1046 On Sosius and Plutarch, see Stadter (2015) 36–42.
1047 See also Stadter (2015) 228 in a short discussion of this synkrisis: “In the end, as in the beginning, the investigation remains paradoxical for Plutarch’s contemporary reader: neither protagonist can be imitated directly. Yet the exercise has not been useless. The two lives have set the philosophical discussion of simplicity and detachment from possessions firmly in a historical and personal context.”
1048 See Nikolaidis (1995) on this theme in Plutarch.
1049 A theme which one would, however, rather connect with Cato Maior in the narrative of the Lives themselves.
1050 Cf. Ad princ. iner. and Maxime cum principibus; see also supra, note 994 on these works.
mind. The quote below follows a chapter that warns about the dangers of excessive φιλοτιμία (2.1):

‘Ο μὲν γὰρ ἀπηκριβωμένος καὶ τελείως ἄγαθὸς οὐδ’ ἂν ὅλως δόξης δέοιτο, πλὴν ὅση πάροδον ἐπὶ τὰς πράξεις [καὶ] διὰ τοῦ πιστεύοντος διδώσῃ […].

For he who is perfect and absolutely good will altogether not be in need of fame, except for fame of that kind which gives a way to successes by being trusted.

The similarities with the *Comparison of Aristeides and Cato Maior* are striking: the passage connects perfection and the idea of αὐτάρκεια, and also adds that one should never lose sight of reality. But while this passage at the beginning of the *Life* seems to teach a straightforward lesson, the *synkrisis* keeps the reader in the dark and highlights that it is never easy to decide between contemplative and active life. As stated, this problematizing aspect is in line with Plutarch’s practice in other comparisons, but it does not merely serve a rhetorical goal: by inviting its readers to argue *pro* and *contra*, it teaches them the deliberative skills needed on their path to perfection.

Finally, the *Comparison of Aristeides and Cato Maior* also shows in this way that it is almost impossible to combine both aspects of the perfect life. This might explain why Plutarch was of the opinion that a human being cannot reach perfection, as the right practice in morally challenging situations is often unclear, an inevitable consequence of active and public life. This difficulty is emphasized by *De liberis educandis* 7F–8A as well – the one who *can* mix politics and philosophy is perfect – a passage which, therefore, truly seems to reflect Plutarch’s position, even if he did not write it.

### 1.3.2 Perfect Exempla in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*

If perfection is, in Plutarch’s eyes, unattainable, this raises questions about the univocally positive examples in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*: certain heroes seem to have reached some degree of perfection. Yet when one takes a look at which specific sections concern these one-sidedly virtuous men, the *Comparison of Aristeides and Cato Maior*

---


1052 Roskam (2011) 210 and 223.

1053 On theory and praxis in Plutarch, see Bonazzi (2012).
provides an answer to this difficulty. The only sections of a certain length that might qualify as ‘perfect’ are Cyrus (172EF), Archelaus (177AB), the early Spartans (189D–190A), and the early Romans (194E–195B). All of these occur at the outset of a larger section: they are the eldest of their people (or are at least presented as such) and can therefore be defined as true παλαιοί. This can also be seen from the sections that follow them: since such παλαιοί are often considered of central importance for the cultural heritage and, as a consequence, education of the society of which they laid the foundations, it is no coincidence that themes explored in their sections are often further developed in those of later men, who consider these ancient values as the core of their cultural identity – although they do not always act in accordance with this.1054

This is illustrated most clearly by the Spartan and Roman sections. In the case of Lycurgus–Theopompus (189D–190A), the focus lies on what is presented as typical Lacedaemonian values, viz. frugality, open warfare, and justice. Against this background, the remaining Spartans will be judged by the reader, as this is also how these men judge themselves and their fellow citizens: they often refer back to their predecessors, assessing their virtues and those of others in terms of their similarities with the Spartans of yore.1055 The same happens in the case of the Romans: Manius Curius (194EF) and Gaius Fabricius (194F–195B) depict the virtues that characterize the early Roman Republic, once more justice, frugality, and open warfare. In what remains, these themes are continued: in one of the first apophthegms that follow, Fabius Maximus is criticized when he avoids a direct clash with Hannibal, while Minucius is called a man worthy of Rome because of his boldness (195CD). This background is still important much later in the Roman section: Cato Maior attempts to restore the virtues of old, as already becomes apparent from his first apophthegm (198D), and this theme dominates his entire section (198D–199E).

Less clear in this regard are perhaps the Persian and Macedonian sections, but the same procedures can be found here. In Cyrus III (172EF), the king describes the Persians of his time as a rough people. When Artaxerxes Mnemon is ridiculed in the section of his brother, this is precisely because he is a soft ruler and, one concludes, not a true Persian (173EF). Archelaus, finally, represents the main virtues of a Macedonian monarch: he is just, and knows by himself when to give and when not

---

1054 See also supra, note 269 on education in Lyc.–Num.
1055 An important person is Heracles, the greatest Spartan of old, often referred to in the Spartan sections: Lysander II (190DE), Archidamus Tertius (191D), Nicostratus (192A), and Antalcidas III (192C). These references are always connected with the ancient virtues mentioned.
to (177AB). Philip, Alexander, Ptolemy, and the Antigonids try to stick to these principles, although they do not always succeed (177C–183D).

The positive opening sections, then, indeed remind one of the ‘synkri-sis’ image of the παλαιός. Yet they also raise some questions, similar to the clash between the virtuous men of old and the successful statesmen in this same text. As has been discussed in 1.1.1, moralism in Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata also has a protreptic aspect, but this does not do away with the fact that some sections entail less clear moral lessons or instructions (and seem to be more ‘descriptive’). The example given there was Lycurgus (189D–F). This is not incidentally one of the παλαιοί in the work. Take Gaius Fabricius (194F–195B): this Roman is able to end a war with the help of Pyrrhus’ physician in IV–V, but refuses for the sake of Rome’s virtuous reputation alone (195AB). This seems to be moralism of a rather descriptive kind too, as these apophthegms raise challenging questions: does Plutarch truly want Trajan to put the lives of many Roman soldiers and citizens at risk because deceit in war might not be considered honourable? Or take Archelaus V: even though one can only admire this king’s reaction when someone throws water over his head (177B), the question remains of whether Plutarch is advising the emperor to let himself be insulted – and even almost attacked physically – by someone who thinks badly about him because of the wrong reasons. After all, a monarch should be respected by his subjects in order to make his rule sufficiently effective.

Thus, these models, virtuous as they might be, cannot be considered straightforward guides for the right conduct in practical reality. Rather they represent the mindset of the ‘perfect’, self-sufficient human being. Yet one should know when to give in, as also pointed out in the Comparison of Aristeides and Cato Maior. As a consequence, more can be learned from men such as Fabius Maximus, Philip, and even Lysander. These men have their imperfections, but the fact that they lived in a situation more or less similar to that of the people of Plutarch’s and Trajan’s days – in reality, so to speak – makes them much more interesting.

---

1056 Themes such as mildness, justice, and gift-giving dominate Philippus (177C–179C) and Alexander (179D–181F). Ptolemaeus (181F) and Antigonus Monophthalmus (182A–183A), and also the other Diadochi (183A–184F) are judged and judge themselves and others based on these virtues as well.

1057 See also Citro (2020) 113–115 on Lysander II (190DE) and its occurrence in Lys. 7.6 specifically: “Certamente da una prospettiva etica lo spartano dimostra negligenza di alcuni valori quali l’onestà e la correttezza. Ma, in considerazione dei risultati militari conseguiti, pur mediante raggiri, il personaggio è totalmente condannabile? Il giudizio di Plutarco, come si è detto poc’anzi, appare ambiguo e per nulla dirimente. È sempre, in ogni circostanza, possibile condurre un’azione che sia utile militarmente e politicamente ed al contempo anche eticamente giusta?”
relevant, real, and human. A case that represents this most clearly is Alexander, especially the apophthegms concerning his generosity and his divinity (180DE). The king led a frugal life and did not truly believe that he descended from Zeus (cf. the mindset of the παλαιός). Yet he realized how he could make his rule more successful by exploiting riches and the belief of others (cf. social and political reality). When such concessions serve the commonwealth, they might sometimes be justifiable, as long as they do not affect one’s personality.

To conclude: the same dynamics between the virtuous παλαιός and the statesman dealt with in the synkrisis also dominate Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata. These contrasting images serve a similar goal, as they call for deliberation. This is in line with the problematizing function of comparison in the collection (1.1.2.c): the virtues of the elder are compared with the issues with which the later statesmen are confronted. When this second group deviates from the core values of their ancestors, for the sake of the public good, this raises questions similar to those elicited by the Comparison of Aristeides and Cato Maior. Answers remain difficult: a critical reading of the collection does not point out to what extent one should give in, in the same way as the synkrisis keeps its readers in the dark.

1.4 Positive Exempla

Two prologues discuss the function of good role models: those of Pericles–Fabius Maximus and Aemilius–Timoleon. Claims made in these texts call to mind De profectibus in virtute (84B–85C). The first parts of this chapter will analyse these three passages in order to reconstruct Plutarch’s views on this matter (1.4.1–1.4.3). In the subsequent section, the implications for Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata will be addressed (1.4.4).

---

1.4.1 The Prologue to *Pericles–Fabius Maximus*

This passage is almost certainly the earliest surviving explicit discussion of the purpose of the *Parallel Lives* and of the way in which any moralising programme might work.\(^\text{1060}\)

This quotation, taken from Duff’s extensive discussion of the prologue, not only explains why this chapter should address this text first,\(^\text{1061}\) but also highlights its value for a study of Plutarch’s views on the function of role models in general. As was the case with the prologue to *Demetrius–Antonius*, a literary analysis will reveal insights that appear relevant beyond the purpose of these specific biographies and even the entire project of the *Parallel Lives*, despite the rhetorical character of the text.

a) Literary analysis
As is often the case in Plutarch, a network of verbatim repetitions steers the interpretation. This divides the prologue into five parts (which, of course, also build on each other):

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>One should focus on what is useful (1.1–1.3: ξένους … ἐκκαλεῖ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>This means focusing on virtue, for this leads to μίμησις (1.4: ταῦτα … πρᾶξαι)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A’</td>
<td>One should focus on what is useful (1.4–2.2: πολλάκις … θεωμένους)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B’</td>
<td>This means focusing on virtue, for this leads to μίμησις (2.2–2.4: ὅθεν … παρεχόμενον)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Implications for the <em>Parallel Lives</em> (2.5: ἔδοξεν … γραφομένων)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A’ further clarifies A, B’ clarifies B, and C reads as a kind of conclusion. A close reading of these parts in connection with each other will show that, perhaps surprisingly, not μίμησις, but critical readership, which can be defined as ἱστορία, is the first goal of the *Parallel Lives*.

\(^{1060}\) Duff (2001) 353.

\(^{1061}\) On the chronology of the *Parallel Lives*, see Appendix III. *Per.–Fab.* is the tenth pair, but, as Duff (2001) 353 points out, there is no clear discussion of the function of the biographical project in the first nine pairs (but the lost *Epameinondas–Scipio*, probably the first pair, might have contained such a discussion).
A On usefulness

On seeing certain wealthy foreigners in Rome carrying puppies and young monkeys about in their bosoms and fondling them, Caesar asked, we are told, if the women in their country did not bear children, thus in right princely fashion rebuking those who squander on animals that proneness to love and loving affection which is ours by nature, and which is due only to our fellow-men.

This apophthegm (1.1) opens the prologue in a way typical of Plutarch. The Caesar mentioned is probably Augustus, who was well known for his attempts to restore moral order in Rome. This story seems to support this view. As a consequence, it responds to the aristocratic values of Plutarch’s audience, in the first place of his Roman readers. In this context, it is significant that the victims of the emperor’s disapproval are strangers, not Romans: morally correct behaviour, which should above all be exercised by the aristocracy, is closely connected with identity issues. It goes without saying that a well-educated Roman citizen of the upper class will look down upon a group of foreigners who are behaving badly, or at least in an un-Roman way. Thus, at the outset of this prologue, Plutarch clearly wants to achieve a certain effect on his audience and attempts to address the way in which they perceive their own position: they are above the others, not only in terms of their influence, but also because of their superior morality and the ‘Romanness’ this entails.

Holden (1894) 73 argues that Sintenis’ conjecture ἔκγονα (instead of τέκνα) “is superfluous as well as a less suitable word for pointing the contrast”. Stadter (1989) 53 argues that the use of the same word some lines further on suggests that ἔκγονα might be correct, although recognizing that Plutarch also uses τέκνα for animals.


And also for “laws encouraging fertility”, see Stadter (1989) 53.

This is an important aspect of Reg. et imp. apophth. as well, and will be discussed in chapter 2.
The comment following the apophthegm (ἡγεμονικῶς … ὀφειλόμενον), which makes the story fit well within the specific context of the prologue, is in line with this. By first claiming that Augustus’ reaction is that of a true ruler, Plutarch once more appeals to the status of his audience, as they perform public functions too – albeit at a lower level. They should, therefore, immediately learn from the emperor’s behaviour: not only do they have to act in a certain moral way, but they also need to be a paradigm for others, showing the people what is right and wrong. As a consequence, their moral superiority entails their duty to rule.

The focus on ἀνθρώποις ὀφειλόμενον at the end of the phrase builds on this. By opting for this verb, Plutarch establishes a connection between the apophthegm and its clarification in what follows (1.2): Augustus’ criticism was right, for it is wrong to waste one’s time on what is unworthy of one’s attention (μηδεμιᾶς ἄξια σπουδῆς), while ignoring what is good and useful (τῶν δὲ καλῶν καὶ ὠφελίμων). The apparent figura etymologica (a form of ὀφείλω, “owe” – a form of ὠφέλιμος, “useful”) stresses that one is really obliged to do what is useful, and to avoid what is not. This goes especially for aristocrats.

Later in the prologue, Plutarch will expand on this, but first he includes a theoretical discussion of how one should try to pursue these useful things. Perception (αἴσθησις) is forced to accept every single impression without making any distinctions, for it is up to the mind (νοῦς) to focus on what is best.1067 That the best is also the most useful, is illustrated, perhaps somewhat paradoxically, from the realm of αἴσθησις: some colours are more advantageous for one’s sight than others.1068

B On virtue
Plutarch now points out what these things deserving attention are (1.4):

tαύτα δ’ ἔστιν ἐν τοῖς ἀπ’ ἀρετῆς ἔργοις, ἃ καὶ ζῆλόν τινα καὶ προθυμίαν ἀγωγὸν ἐις μίμησιν ἐμποιεῖ τοῖς ἱστορήσασιν· ἐπεὶ τῶν γ’ ἄλλων ὤκ εὐθὺς ἰδεῖ θαυμάσαι τὸ πραχθὲν ὁρμή πρὸς τὸ πρᾶξαι, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ τοῦναντίον χαίροντες τῶν ἔργων τοῦ δημιουργοῦ καταφρονοῦμεν […]

Such objects are to be found in virtuous deeds; these implant in those who search them out a great and zealous eagerness which leads to imitation. In other cases, admiration of the deed is not immediately accompanied by an impulse to do it. Nay, many times, on the contrary, while we delight in the work, we despise the workman […]

1067 As stated, Demetr. 1 recalls this passage, and a series of striking similarities (listed supra, note 960) ensures that it can be read as an adjustment to these earlier claims of Per. 1–2.
The observation of virtue instigates a desire to imitate, which implies that it is useful (cf. A). The second part of the quotation (from ἐπεί on) shows that Plutarch, in this context, has role models in mind: only when one also admires the man who performed the deed is one dealing with an act of virtue. This obviously shows that studying role models is an important and fruitful occupation, since virtuous people will lead one to both admire and imitate them. The suggestion is that the two Lives introduced are about such morally superior men, even though the passage quoted does not yet explicitly refer to them. Plutarch, the reader must conclude, will offer such great exempla that will enable them to do their duty, viz. focusing on what is useful (cf. A). This will make it possible to become like Pericles and Fabius Maximus. The author, then, seems to have done the job of his audience’s νοῦς: he has selected what will be fruitful for his aristocratic readership.

This straightforward interpretation, however, will be somewhat disturbed by the use of ἱστορήσασιν – if one accepts this reading. The word commonly means “observe something because of which one will be informed”, and this, indeed, is to some extent in line with the repeated use of θεωρέω and related terms in A. The implication at this point seems to be that the reader just has to read the Lives, containing all these virtues, and will be incited to imitate its protagonists. Later on in the text, however, it will become apparent that more is going on. But first, there is A’, where Plutarch repeats an earlier theme.

A’ On usefulness

Similar to A, A’ appeals to the aristocratic feelings of the target audience. Plutarch first refers to the low social status of people such as perfumers and dyers, after which he tells two apophthegms dealing with musical performances (1.5–1.6). The first concerns the famous flute player Is-
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menias, also a man of lower class. He is rebuked by the philosopher Antisthenes, who claims that one who can play so well can only be a bad person. The point is that he wasted his time on a useless skill (cf. A), instead of studying virtue (cf. B). The second apophthegm (1.6) suggests something similar, but it also recalls Augustus’ saying (1.1): the story is about Alexander the Great. As a young man he is denounced by Philip for beautifully playing a stringed instrument. Plutarch adds that the father is right, for a ruler should listen to music but not play it (1.6). This comment recalls the addition of ἡγεμονικός to Augustus’ story in A. Again, Plutarch has his readers’ political functions in mind.

All this, however, does not mean that the apophthegms of A and A’ serve the same goal. Augustus rather describes Plutarch’s theory as set out in what follows, whereas the two stories of A’ have a convincing function. If the reader is not yet persuaded by the claims in A and B, the harm (cf. βλάβαι) illustrated by Ismenias, and the shame (cf. αἰσχῦναι) of the Alexander story will be helpful, depicting an image of what one does not want to be or become like. In this way, these negative role models fulfill the same function as those in the κρίσις part of a treatise of Seelenheilung. The same can be said about the series of artists listed in 2.1: no boy of good birth (οὐδεὶς εὐφυὴς νέος) wants to be like these men, despite the great art they created. Plutarch again ensures that his readers’ aristocratic feelings dominate: such examples responding to their sense of honour should have a positive effect.

Thus, A’ does not simply confirm the preceding sections. By showing a frightening and dishonourable picture, it also reads as an addition to A: actions that are truly of no use for those who perceive them are not just useless as such, for when imitating them, one can be harmed as well. As a consequence, they are even to be avoided to a certain extent. By A’ the reader will therefore be convinced of Plutarch’s claims in A. As stated, this connection between the two parts is supported by a series of verbatim agreements.

---

1073 Scholars often refer to Alc. 2.6–7, emphasizing the low esteem for flute players in classical Athens: see Mooren (1948) 72n4; Podlecki (1987) 28. See also supra, note 485.

1074 See Zadorojnyi (2006) 268 for a list of similar anecdotes that depict the statesman’s superiority over artists.

1075 It is not surprising that an apophthegm about Ismenias is followed by one on Philip; see supra, note 345 on the connection between the men in various apophthegms.

1076 See supra, p. 307 and 312 on the function of βλάβαι and αἰσχῦναι in these works, based on Ingenkamp (1971).

1077 See Chrysanthou (2018) 40 on “Plutarch’s use of strong indicatives and evaluative terms” in the prologue.

1078 Α’: Φιλίππος and βασιλεύς (1.6) – Α: Καίσαρ and ἡγεμονικός (1.1); Α’: θεατής (1.6), θεασάμενος (2.1), θεωμένους (2.2) – Α: φιλοθέαμον (1.1), θεάματα (1.2), θεωρή
Part III. A Guide for the Emperor

B’ On virtues

Something similar goes for the many verbal similarities between B and B’. The sections seem to make the same point: Plutarch claims that only deeds that lead to imitation are useful, and again adds that virtue brings one to it. Yet B’ closes with a phrase that seems to deny certain arguments in B. This apparent contradiction has raised questions (Per. 2.4):

τὸ γὰρ καλὸν ἐφ’ αὐτό πρακτικὸς κινεῖ καὶ πρακτικὴν εὐθὺς ὀρμήν ἐντίθησιν, ἠθοποιοῦν οὐ τῇ μιμήσει τὸν θεατήν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἱστορίᾳ τοῦ ἔργου τὴν προαίρεσιν παρεχόμενον.

For the good moves actively towards itself and inserts straightway an active impulse (cf. LCL), by moulding the spectator’s character not through imitation, but by providing a moral choice through the investigation of the work. [own translation]

“Shaping character” and “providing with προαίρεσις” is, at first sight, to be interpreted in more or less the same way: as Duff points out, προαίρεσις, in the meaning of moral choice, is strongly connected with character. In other words, a change in προαίρεσις entails a change in character. In this way, the phrase seems to reject earlier claims in the prologue that stress the importance of imitation: apparently, only ἱστορία can change a personality. This also differs from how one might expect Plutarch to think about μίμησις:

Plutarch, in accordance with much ancient thought, related character (ἦθος) with habituation (ἔθος), so imitation would naturally have an important role in any theory of character formation of improvement.

(1.2), θεωρεῖν (1.2), θεάμασιν (1.3); A’: ῥᾳθυμίας (2.1) – A: ῥᾷστα (1.2); A’: τέρπει (2.1) – A: τερπινόν (1.3); A’: ἄξιον σπουδῆς (2.1) – A: ἄξια σπουδῆς (1.2); A’: ὀφελεῖ (2.1) – A: ὀφελέμον (1.2), note also ὀφειλόμενον (1.1).

B’: μιμητικός (2.2), μιμήσει (2.4) – B: μίμησιν (1.4); B’: ζῆλος (2.2), ζηλοῦσθαι (2.2) – B: ζῆλον (1.4); B’: προθυμίαν (2.2) – B: προθυμίαν (1.4); B’: ὁρμή (1.4); B’: ἀρετή (2.2), ἀρετῆς (2.3) – B: ἀρετή (1.4); B’: πράξεως (2.2), πράξεις (2.3) – B: πραγμάτων (1.4), πράξει (1.4); B’: θαυμάζει (2.2) – B: θαυμάζω (1.4); B’: ἔργα (2.2), εἰργασμένους (2.2), ἔργου (2.4) – B: ἔργοις (1.4); B’: ἱστορία (2.4) – B: ἱστορήσασιν (1.4).

Duff (1999) 39 (= (2001) 357), after which he concludes: “The reader’s character, then, is moulded, as he observes and investigates the character of the great men of the past. By doing this, he gains προαίρεσις, gains the ability to make correct moral choice. This naturally leads to or involves imitation.”

One therefore understands why Duff argues (1) that *Per.* 2.4 should perhaps be emended by adding μόνον after οὐ, or (2) that, if the text is not changed, one should still interpret the phrase in this meaning of “not so much … but more …”. Yet this fragment, in fact, also makes sense in the most straightforward interpretation.

First, ἱστορία recalls ἱστορήσασιν in B. As Duff writes, Plutarch in this prologue “links and merges the activity of the heroes of the past, of the writer, and of the reader”, using the double sense of various words, of which ἱστορέω – ἱστορία is an example; even though Plutarch has not yet referred to his biographies up to this point in the text, both the noun and the verb obviously allude to his act of writing the *Parallel Lives* after his research on his subjects, and also to the act of reading the work. This equates Plutarch’s writing process with the activity of his audience: the author carried out his inquiry and wrote down his *Parallel Lives* after his research on his subjects, and also to the act of reading the work. It will first of all be an act of critical examination.

If the straightforward interpretation of *Per.* 2.4 is correct, ἱστορήσασιν in B is to be read in an exclusive way and meaning “examination”: only those who have scrutinized virtuous actions (cf. τὸ καλὸν in 2.4) will be instigated to imitate them, since only they are endowed with the right προαίρεσις, for one will only realize what is truly good after close examination. The implication is that inquiry or ἱστορία precedes imitation. This, in fact, is in line with the first part of B’ quoted: what is good will indeed make one do what is good (μίμησις). But first, one needs to know what these good things are (ἰστορία).

---

1082 In line with Jones, C. P. (1971) 103n2: “Since Plutarch clearly does not mean to deny that imitation affects character (cf. *Per.* 1. 4), μόνον has perhaps disappeared before τὸν θεατήν” (Podlecki (1987) 29 also sees a problem in the text), and in line with the use of μη μόνον … ἀλλὰ καί, Duff (1999) 38 (= (2001) 356) writes: “Perhaps the best response to this apparent contradiction is to emend the text by the addition of μόνον before τῇ μιμήσει”, adding in a note that a καί after ἀλλὰ is not necessary. See also Zadorojnyi (2012) 181–182.

1083 Duff (1999) 38 and Duff (2001) 356, based on similar occurrences in some biblical passages.


1085 Cf. the various meanings of the verb listed *supra*, note 1070.


1087 μίμησις in the meaning of “imitation of general virtues or qualities rather than specific acts”, as Duff (2001) 354 puts it.
C On the Parallel Lives
The closing part of the prologue (2.5) makes all the foregoing explicit for the *Parallel Lives*. Verbal connections with A–A’ and B–B’ ensure that it reads as some kind of conclusion. Based on the arguments he gave in A, Plutarch claims that he decided to write *Lives* and *Pericles–Fabius Maximus* specifically. As he usually tends to do in the prologues, he lists the similarities between both men. These are their virtues (ἀρετάς) and usefulness (ὠφελιμωτάτων) for their country. This is in line with claims made earlier in the text: Plutarch chose these men because he wants to focus on what is advantageous (cf. A) – i.e. focusing on ἀρετή (cf. B). Yet in the final phrase, he suggests that the reader might conclude he has the wrong focus (2.5):

εἱ δ’ ὀρθῶς στοχαζῷμεθα τοῦ δέοντος, ἔξεστι κρίνειν ἐκ τῶν γραφομένων.

But whether I aim correctly at the proper mark must be decided from what I have written.

On the one hand, such a claim is to be expected at the end of a prologue: Plutarch likes to conclude his introductions with such an appeal to his readers as a transition to the narratives themselves, thereby also expressing his own modesty. Yet, on the other hand, this call for an assessment of the author’s moral focus is also in line with claims in B and B’, where ἱστορία on the readers’ part appeared to be of central importance: even if Plutarch is focusing on the right things, this does not mean that his audience should just read and imitate. It is the process of examination that moulds character. Thus, Plutarch’s *inquiry* is to be repeated by his readers if they want to improve. Only this can firmly establish a deep understanding of a hero’s ἀρετή, because of which they will make the right choices when facing moral issues (μίμησις).

b) Conclusion
The prologue has its relevance for the pair that follows. Similarities with treatises of *Seelenheilung* are important in this regard. The focus on the

1088 C: ἀρετάς (2.5) – B: ἀρετής (1.4), B’: ἀρετῆς (2.2), and ἀρετῆς (2.3); C: ωφελιμωτάτων (2.5) – A: ωφελίμων (1.2), note also ωφελόμενον (1.1), and A’: ωφελεῖ (2.1); note also the use of στοχαζῷμεθα τοῦ δέοντος (2.5) in C, recalling the discussion in A (one should focus on what is useful), and κρίνειν (2.5), recalling the use of ἱστορήσασιν (1.4) in B and ἱστορίᾳ (2.4) in B’.

1089 Cf. Demetr. 1.

1090 Another example is *Aem.* 1, discussed in the next subchapter; see Duff (2011a) 77 on such closing phrases as a call for ἱστορία.
status and honour of the readers in combination with a series of negative exempla is the main convincing strategy that often dominates the first part of such treatises. In line with this, the prologue reads as a kind of κρίσις. The Lives themselves, then, can be considered the ἀσκησις part, as the call for ἱστορία at the close announces: the biographies will be an exercise in turning the theory of the prologue into practice (the dangers of having the wrong focus). This explains the stress on αἴσθησις: in the first Life of the pair, Plutarch will include an extensive discussion of Athens’ marvellous Acropolis. The prologue, therefore, already warns its readers that they should not let themselves be excessively impressed by these magnificent buildings. Yet this does not imply that nothing can be learned about Pericles’ goals as a statesman from these buildings, as they brought great glory to his city: a careful examination of his true motivations will lead one to an insight into Pericles’ ἀρετή, which should be the main focus when reading the Parallel Lives.

Yet perhaps there is also an apologetic element. Plutarch is not only training his readers, but also defending himself for this comprehensive description of monuments that clearly amazed him, and protecting himself against possible criticism. This is why, at the outset of the work, he already anticipates that this interest in the Acropolis, as far as it concerns the art, is nothing more than admiration. He does not want to become a Pheidias.

All these rhetorical motivations, however, do not interfere with the sincerity of Plutarch’s claims. They indeed reflect how he actually thought about his biographies and about role models in general. In this regard, Duff’s words are again worth quoting:

The correct response to the Lives is not simply to “look”, nor only to imitate, but to investigate, consider, and test; to apply, as Plutarch might have put it, philosophy and reason.

---


1092 See Chrysanthou (2018) 54–56, concluding (55–56): “It is true that Pericles’ building programme is not presented as producing any eagerness for imitation of the works or the craftsmen, which is Plutarch’s actual emphasis in the prologue; but it constitutes itself part of Pericles’ virtuous deeds (cf. Per. 2.2: τὰ ἔργα), which, as made clear in the prologue, can elicit admiration as well as imitation of a correct moral choice and action (Per. 2.2–4).”

1093 Which recalls once more the implicit apology in Demetr. 1, see chapter 1.2.1.

1094 As Chrysanthou (2018) 55 points out, the reference to Pheidias both in the prologue (2.1) and in the Life (13.14) links the two parts of the work. This is emphasized by the mention of this artist at the end of the description of the Acropolis, there presented as the most important man of the project.

The only thing I would add to this is that imitation is not to be placed at the same level as investigation. It is the very consequence of this investigation: only when ἱστορία has firmly established knowledge of and insight into a hero’s virtues in one’s soul will one also – and automatically – do what is good (μίμησις). Precisely how this works can be seen from a discussion of the following two works.

1.4.2 The Prologue to *Aemilius–Timoleon*

That claims in the prologue to *Pericles–Fabius Maximus* truly reflect Plutarch’s position – at least on the function of the *Parallel Lives* in general – can be seen from similar statements at the outset of *Aemilius–Timoleon*. This pair was written shortly after *Pericles–Fabius Maximus* and provides additional information about the issue at stake.¹⁰⁹⁶ ‘This suggests that Plutarch’s thinking evolved when the project continued.

**a) Literary analysis**

The prologue is much shorter than that to *Pericles–Fabius Maximus*, but still contains similar complexities. This already appears from 1.1–2:

Ἐμοὶ [μὲν] τῆς τῶν βίων ἅψασθαι μὲν γραφῆς συνέβη δι’ ἑτέρους, ἐπιμένειν δὲ καὶ φιλοχωρεῖν ἡδὴ καὶ δι’ ἐμαυτόν, ὤσπερ ἐν ἐσόπτρῳ τῇ ἱστορίᾳ πειρώμενον ἀμώς γέ πως κοσμεῖν καὶ ἀφομοιοῦν πρὸς τὰς ἐκείνων ἁρετὰς τὸν βίον. οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀλλ’ ἢ συνδιαιτήσει καὶ συμβιώσει τὸ γινόμενον ἑοικεν, ὅταν ὥσπερ ἐπιξενούμενον ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἐν μέρει διὰ τῆς ἱστορίας ὑποδεχόμενο καὶ παραλαμβάνοντες ἁναθεωρῶμεν.

‘ὁσσος ἐην οἶός τε’ (Hom. II. 24, 630),

τὰ κυριώτατα καὶ κάλλιστα πρὸς γνῶσιν ἀπὸ τῶν πράξεων λαμβάνοντες.

I began the writing of my “Lives” for the sake of others, but I find that I am continuing the work and delighting in it now for my own sake also, using history as a mirror and endeavouring in a manner to fashion and adorn my life in conformity with the virtues therein depicted. For the result is like nothing else than daily living and associating together, when I receive and welcome each subject of my history in turn as my guest, so to speak, and observe carefully

“how large he was and of what mien,”

¹⁰⁹⁶ See Appendix III on the relative chronology of the *Parallel Lives*. 
and select from his career what is most important and most beautiful to know.

Two observations are relevant for Plutarch’s views on the function of role models:

[1] The passage seems entirely in line with the prologue to *Pericles–Fabius Maximus*. Once more, Plutarch’s activity is connected with that of the reader: what he started to do for the sake of his audience appears useful for himself as well, for writing *Lives* changes the author’s character too. How this change works, is first described in terms of μίμησις again: although the word is not mentioned, the mirror imagery, in combination with ἀφομοιόω, suggests that a far-reaching imitation is the primary goal of the *Parallel Lives*. The first occurrence of ἱστορία is to be read as referring to Plutarch’s written accounts, which contain these virtues to be imitated: the *Lives* themselves are compared with a mirror.

This somewhat contrasts with the second phrase. Although συνδιαίτησις and συμβίωσις are to some extent still related to the concept of close imitation, this notion disappears in what follows. From now on, the importance of inquiry *preceding* imitation will dominate. This can be seen from τὸ γινόμενον. The precise meaning of this participle is, at first sight, rather vague, but the ὅταν clause provides clarification. It starts with a second simile concerning guest-friendship. Every single man (ἕκαστον) about whom Plutarch wrote a *Life* is compared with a ξένος invited at home. This person does not stay too long, but leaves after a while, making room for the next (cf. ἐν μέρει). During this temporary visit, Plutarch examines the hero in question: ἱστορία no longer refers to a written text, but must in the first place be interpreted in the mean-

1098 See Verdegem (2010) 20 on the use of the first person in this prologue.
1099 Duff (1999) 33 on the prologue: “Plutarch presents himself as meeting these virtuous men personally, but he does this ‘through history’ (or possibly, ‘through research’). For the reader, the two meanings dovetail; one reads of the virtuous lives of the great men of the past through Plutarch’s own *Lives*. But the purposeful confusion between, on the one hand, the actual lives and virtues of his subjects, and, on the other, Plutarch’s own literary representation of them, allows him to make a subtle claim for the worth of his writings: his *Lives* invite the reader to model himself *as it were directly* on the lives of virtuous men”.
1100 From the perspective of the readers; see Duff (1999) 32–34 on the ambiguity of the metaphor.
1101 LSJ, s.v. “συνδιαίτησις”: “living together, intercourse”; and s.v. “συμβίωσις”: “living with, companionship […]; of wedded life”.
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ing of “inquiry”, in line with ἀναθεωρῶμεν.\(^\text{1102}\) What this examination looks like, can be seen from the final part of 1.2, following the Homeric quotation: Plutarch’s investigation entails that he selects the best actions his heroes performed. Again, the first chapters of the Life of Pericles come to mind, stressing that one should focus on what is good, which will automatically lead to an imitation of these ἀρεται. A close reading of the prologue to Aemilius–Timoleon suggests similar implications: τὸ γνώμενον in the main clause is what comes into being every time when Plutarch investigates the characters of his subjects and selects their virtues. This consists in “living closely together” with these men of the past. As this expression is connected with μίμησις in 1.1, the implication is that ἱστορία indeed precedes imitation. Both prologues are, therefore, notably similar up to this point. The same can also be said about 1.3–1.4, reading as a kind of conclusion of 1.1–1.2: building on a quotation of Sophocles (1.3), Plutarch claims that this selection of τὰ κυριώτατα καὶ κάλλιστα – which can be defined as his ἱστορία – provides great pleasure and is a most effective improvement of character (1.4). In short, a first stage of character change or ἠθοποιΐα is connected with the process of ἱστορία by the prologue to Aemilius–Timoleon too.

[2] But there is more to 1.1–2. It contains a paradox stressing insights absent from Per. 1–2. Although the process of inquiry is compared with a visit of guest-friends, none of whom stay for a long time, its result is described as a much more abiding relationship: one will live closely together with the exempla in question, for a long time. Plutarch will return to this paradox later in the text, but first, he needs to dwell on the idea of selecting what is best from his heroes’ lives, building on 1.3–1.4.

Plutarch first refers to Democritus’ theory of advantageous and evil spirits: one should wish to be visited by the first rather than by the second group. This is rejected by the Platonist writer, as it leads to superstition (1.4).\(^\text{1103}\) Yet it shows – albeit only to a certain extent (viz. the focus on what is good) – his own experience in writing his Lives (1.5):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἡμεῖς δὲ τῇ περὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν διατριβῇ καὶ τῆς γραφῆς τῇ συνηθείᾳ παρασκευάζομεν ἑαυτούς, τὰς τῶν ἀρίστων καὶ δοκιμωτάτων μνήμας ύποδεχομένους αἰτὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς, εἰ τι φαύλον ἢ κακόθες ἢ ἀγεννές αἰ τῶν συνόντων ἢξ ἀνάγκης ὁμιλίαι προσβάλλουσιν, ἐκκρούειν καὶ διωθεῖσθαι, πρὸς τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν παραδειγμάτων ἱλεῖ καὶ πραξεῖν ἀποστρέφοντες τὴν διάνοιαν. \\
\end{align*}
\]

\(^\text{1102}\) See Roskam (2014); see also Part II, chapter 1 on the verb in the dedicatory letter (172B–E).

\(^\text{1103}\) Plutarch’s aversion to superstition appears from De sup., a lengthy discussion of the topic.
But in my own case, the study of history and the familiarity with it which my writing produces, enables me, since I always cherish in my soul the records of the noblest and most estimable characters, to repel and put far from me whatever base, malicious, or ignoble suggestion my enforced associations may intrude upon me, calmly and dispassionately turning my thoughts away from them to the fairest of my examples.

The observations on 1.1–2 are relevant here as well:

[1] In the first part (ἡμεῖς … ἑαυτούς), Plutarch once more refers to two meanings of ἱστορία: the act of investigation (τῇ περὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν διατριβῇ) and its product, the written Lives (τῆς γραφῆς). Both elements recall 1.1 and 1.2 and should be read in connection with the author’s arguments there. This can also be seen from the use of συνήθεια, recalling συνδιαίτησις and συμβίωσις in 1.2: all these words refer to a close and intimate relationship with someone or something. This leads to an interpretation in line with the first part of the prologue: one needs both the act of occupying oneself with history and its result, this deep familiarity with the writing that represents the historical figures. This has a strong implication for the reader, again in line with the prologue to Pericles–Fabius Maximus: reading a text as such does not suffice. Plutarch expects a critical, investigative attitude from his reader, similar to his own inquiry: only this can, in the end, bring one to μίμησις.

[2] In the remainder of the passage, Plutarch returns to the paradoxical tension between a short-term investigation of historical figures and the result of an everlasting intimacy with them. First, ὑποδεχόμενος refers back to 1.2, where the same verb occurs in the ὅταν phrase, describing how ἱστορία functions. In addition, ἀεί provides a contrast with this earlier part, as it concerns this long-term effect: Plutarch already explained there how one should briefly examine the past. He will now explain how the resulting long-term relationship (cf. τῆς γραφῆς τῇ συνήθείᾳ) works. This goes as follows. Examining a series of heroes and selecting what is best enables one to recall these best persons (cf. τὰς τῶν ἀρίστων καὶ δοκιμωτάτων μνήμας); when this knowledge is rooted deeply in the mind, one is able to cope with morally challenging situations at any time (cf. ὑποδεχομένους ἀεί): if, in everyday life, Plutarch finds himself in a difficult position, he just reminds himself of his most beautiful exempla.
A contrast with Democritus stands out: the philosopher only wished that he would encounter what is right and advantageous in his life, but Plutarch knows that he will not always be able to avoid bad influences (cf. ἐξ ἀνάγκης). This is why he equips himself with the right tools (cf. παρασκευάζομεν): he has closely examined the characters of his heroes and carefully measured what was good or bad in their actions, so every single time when he finds himself in a complex situation, he does not need to panic (cf. ἵλεω καὶ πρᾳεῖαν), unlike a superstitious man. He only has to recall the virtues he investigated and will act accordingly.

The last sentence (Aem. 1.6), finally, concludes the text in the same way as the prologue to Pericles–Fabius Maximus: Plutarch names his subjects, Timoleon and Aemilius Paulus, and describes their similarities, viz. the choices they made and their good fortune. But he also calls for examination in this regard: it will be difficult to decide whether their greatest deeds were the consequence of this good fortune or of their φρόνησις. In this way, the text again closes with emphasis on ἱστορία, the requisite for moral improvement: only after acquiring a certain insight through inquiry can the recollection of the exempla be useful; only then is it possible to become or act like one’s heroes.

b) Conclusion
An analysis of the prologue to Aemilius–Timoleon points out not only that Plutarch’s views closely resemble his position described at the outset of Pericles–Fabius Maximus, but also that he adds something new, viz. the focus on one’s familiarity with the subjects. This further explains why ἱστορία precedes μίμησις. Thus, based on both prologues, one concludes that the study of role models for the sake of moral improvement functions as follows:

[1] The stage of ἱστορία: one examines great people of the past and tries to find out what their virtues are. This can either happen through the investigation of these men themselves (Plutarch’s ἱστορία based on his sources), or through a critical reading of a Plutarchan biography (ἱστορία of Plutarch’s readers) or of other literary works, one presumes.

[2] The stage of συνήθεια: this examination leads to a close familiarity with these heroes (one knows what they were like). As a consequence,

and the resulting συνήθεια (one can imagine what a hero would have done) can lead to μίμησις.

1106 Note also the verbal repetition of φαῦλα (in the reference to Democritus’ philosophy; 1.4) – φαῦλον (in the description of Plutarch’s practice; 1.5).
1107 On fortune as an important theme in Aem.–Tim., see Pelling (1986) 94; Swain (1989a), esp. 283–284.
1108 This reminds one of De fort. Rom., see Teodorsson (2005b) 221.
when finding oneself in a morally challenging situation, one can easily recall instructions from [1].


1.4.3 De profectibus in virtute 84B–85C

That insights from the two prologues analysed so far are not only relevant for the Parallel Lives but reflect Plutarch’s general position about role models can be seen from two chapters of De profectibus in virtute, where similar points are made. A comparison of this passage with claims in both prologues will also adjust the scheme above and further clarify how the process of μίμησις precisely functions.

a) Interpretation

De profectibus in virtute is one of Plutarch’s later works, but still predates Sosius’ death and, if the dating suggested in Part I, chapter 2 is correct, Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata as well.\(^{1109}\) In this treatise, Plutarch aims to reject the Stoic doctrine of moral progress (and its implication, the concept of the σοφὸς διαλεληθώς):\(^{1110}\) when making moral progress, this can be perceived through various signs, as the Chaeronean attempts to prove. Chapters 14–15 (84B–85C) describe one of these signs: putting one’s judgements (κρίσεις) into actions (πράξεις) (84B).\(^{1111}\) This might seem to contradict Per. 1–2, where the author claims that if one knows what is good, virtuous acts will automatically follow. In other words, κρίσις, the acquisition of knowledge of virtues, should always lead to good actions, this prologue suggests. Yet one could react to this by saying that when someone’s deeds are in accordance with his or her ideas, this shows that he or she is also truly convinced of them and that he or she has reached certain insights that are more complete than those that do not instigate virtue. Thus, De profectibus in virtute does not need to contradict the prologue at all.

\(^{1109}\) See Roskam (2005b) 222–223, providing an overview of the scholarly debate on this matter. The treatise is dedicated to Sosius Senecio, who probably died in 116; see also Jones, C. P. (1966) 73.

\(^{1110}\) As Roskam (2005b) 222 points out, “the explicit attack on the Stoic doctrine is mainly concentrated in the first two chapters of the essay, where the problem is set in a clear and economic way.”

\(^{1111}\) This is in line with the focus on the importance of consistency throughout the treatise; see Roskam (2005b) 321 on the importance of the “harmony between λόγοι and πράξεις” and 276 on an earlier part of the treatise.
This difference between the superficial acceptance of a theoretical point of view and a thorough understanding and appropriation of its validity is, in fact, alluded to in the next part of the treatise, where Plutarch first continues to discuss how it can be perceived that one is willing to act in line with one’s κρίσεις. A first indication that this is happening, he writes, is ζῆλος: at this point in the text, role models appear on the stage, and, as Roskam points out, the wording is again close to the prologue to Pericles–Fabius Maximus. An apophthegm of Themistocles (84BC), told in the collection as Themistocles I (184F–185A), illustrates this ζῆλος well. The Athenian felt a great desire to imitate Miltiades, after this man’s victory at Marathon. He has, therefore, made more progress than the common citizens, who only praise the general. This highlights that there is indeed a difference between real awareness of the moral superiority of an exemplum, and an only limited admiration for the person in question: the Athenians expressing their admiration for Miltiades know that he is a brave man, but Themistocles’ hunger for similar actions suggests that he has a more profound insight instigating a desire to act.

In what follows, Plutarch discusses at length what the desired imitation looks like (84C–F). Two elements now remind one of the prologue to Aemilius–Timoleon: the concept of a far-reaching μίμησις, and, in line with this, the words describing this in terms of a sexual relationship with one’s role models. In De profectibus in virtute, both aspects gradually become more extreme. In a first stage, erotic love is only compared with the desire of the προκόπτων: when in love, one feels φθόνος, jealousy, similar to the ζῆλος felt by those making progress. This ζῆλος, Plutarch adds, longs for satisfaction (ἀναπληρώσεως ὀρεγόμενον). An additional similarity between sexual desire and a willingness to imitate arises: in both situations, one wants to be closely together with another person, and even merge one’s identity with him or her. This becomes most explicit in 84EF, leaving little to the imagination. One can hardly read it in another way than becoming an exact copy of the role model:

Ὁταν οὖν οὕτως ἀρχώμεθα τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐρᾶν, ὥστε μὴ μόνον κατὰ Πλάτωνα (legg. 711e) μακάριον μὲν αὐτὸν ἡγεῖσθαι τὸν σώφρονα, ‘μακάριον δὲ τὸν ξυνήκοον τῶν ἐκ τοῦ σωφρονοῦντος στόματος ἱόντων λόγων’, ἀλλὰ καὶ σχῆμα καὶ βάδισμα καὶ βλέμμα καὶ

---

1112 Roskam (2005b) 333.
1113 Langlands (2020) 90–92 argues that Plutarch’s interaction with “Roman exemplary ethics” also appears from how he uses this apophthegm in De prof. in virt.
1114 Langlands (2020) passim sees a connection in this metaphor between Plutarch and “Roman exemplary ethics”.
1115 See also Roskam (2005b) 329: “It is clearly a very close imitation, down to the smallest detail, which Plutarch has in mind here.”
μειδίαμα θαυμάζοντες αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀγαπόντες οἱ συναρμόττειν καὶ
συγκολλάν οἵμεν ἐαυτοὺς, τότε χρῆ νομίζειν ἄληθῶς προκόπτειν.

Whenever, therefore, we begin so to love good men, that not only,
as Plato puts it, do we regard as blessed the man himself who has
self-control, “and blessed, too, anyone of the company which hears
the words that come from the lips of such a man,” but also, through
our admiration and affection for his habit, gait, look, and smile, we
are eager to join, as it were, and cement ourselves to him, then we
must believe that we are truly making progress.

In what follows, the comparison between erotic love and longing for
μίμησις is extended even further: in the same way as someone in love
accepts the physical deficiencies of the beloved, one who is making
progress will still love his or her role model in times of misfortune
(84F–85A).

The concept of becoming an exemplum’s facsimile raises questions
about the feasibility of the entire process of imitation. Yet one should
not forget that, up to this point, Plutarch has only described what the
 προκόπτοντες desire (ζῆλος), and not what they will actually do (the
‘real’ μίμησις). This can also be seen from the reference to a “good and
perfect man” (84C: ἀνδρὸς ἀγαθοῦ καὶ τελείου) whom the προκόπτοντες
take as their role model. As according to Plutarch human perfection is
as good as unattainable, this expression should be understood as part of
a rather theoretical discourse.1116 It is, therefore, not surprising that both
the notion of perfection and of exact imitation disappear later in the text,
when Plutarch clarifies how μίμησις works in reality (85AB):

1116 Cf. chapter 1.3 on perfection in Plutarch.
1117 After a short discussion of this fragment, Verdegem (2010) 22 concludes: “In order
to make true moral progress, one should rather try to ‘act in the spirit’ of good men. This
requires active involvement: one has to reflect upon the actions of one’s role models (cf.
Aem. 1.2: ἀναθεωρῶμεν) and compare oneself to them”.

ἤδη δὲ τοῖς τοιούτοις παρέπεται βαδίζουσιν ἐπὶ πράξεις τινὰς ἢ
λαβοῦσιν ἄρχην ἢ χρησαιμένους τύχη τίθεσθαι πρὸ ὑφθαλμῶν τοὺς
ὸντος ἀγαθοῦς γεγενημένους, καὶ διανοεῖσθαι ‘τι δ’ ἄν ἔπραξεν
ἐν τούτῳ Πλάτων, τι δ’ ἄν εἶπεν Ἑπαμεινώνδας, ποίος δ’ ἄν
ὁφθη Λυκοδύργος ἢ Αγησίλαος’, οἷον πρὸς ἔσοπτρα κοσμοῦντας
ἐαυτοὺς καὶ μεταρρυθμίζοντας, ἢ φωνής ἁγεννεστέρας αὐτῶν
ἐπιλαμβανόμενους ἢ ἀντιβαίνοντας. οἱ μὲν γὰρ
ἐκμεμαθηκότες τὰ τῶν Ἰδαίων ὀνόματα Δακτύλων
χρῶνται πρὸς τοὺς φόβους αὐτοῖς ὡς ἀλεξικάκοις,
ἄτρεμα καταλέγοντες ἐκαστον·
With men of this sort it has already become a constant practice, on proceeding to any business, or on taking office, or on encountering any dispensation of Fortune, to set before their eyes good men of the present or of the past, and to reflect: “What would Plato have done in this case? What would Epameinondas have said? How would Lycurgus have conducted himself, or Agesilaus?” And before such mirrors as these, figuratively speaking, they array themselves or readjust their habit, and either repress some of their more ignoble utterances, or resist the onset of some emotion. True it is that those who have got by heart the names of the Idaean Dactyls use them as charms against terrors, repeating each name with calm assurance; but it is also true that the thought and recollection of good men almost instantly comes to mind and gives support to those who are making progress towards virtue, and in every onset of the emotions and in all difficulties keeps them upright and saves them from falling.

Those who constantly reflect on how their role models would have acted are closer to the ideal. These exempla are not only people who live in the present, but also – and perhaps in the first place – those of the past: the men Plutarch lists all died a long time ago. Except for the first one (although Plato plays an important role in Dion’s biography), these are also the protagonist of a Life. This can hardly be coincidental: if *De profectibus in virtute* is one of Plutarch’s later works, he probably had his biographies in mind when he wrote the treatise. As a consequence, the passage quoted is, as Roskam writes, “certainly of paramount importance for a correct evaluation and interpretation of the Plutarchan Lives”.\(^{1118}\) In this context, various elements recall the prologue to *Aemilius–Timoleon*:

[1] The most striking resemblance between the texts is definitely the mirror metaphor:\(^{1119}\) one embellishes one’s life (note a form of κοσμέω in *Aem. 1.1* too) by looking at the βίοι of others. These lives can also be seen as literary texts, not only in the prologue:\(^{1120}\) information about all the men to whom Plutarch refers in the passage of *De profectibus in virtute* can of course primarily be derived through literature too.

---

\(^{1118}\) Roskam (2005b) 332.

\(^{1119}\) Also Roskam (2005b) 334–335.

\(^{1120}\) See Duff (1999) 33 on *Aem. 1*: “‘life’ (βίος) can refer both to the character and career of a man, and to the written record of such”.
In line with this, the prologue suggested that literature can replace association with real people.\textsuperscript{1121} This appeared to be connected with Plutarch’s writing process, which he described as if he truly spent time with the subjects of his biographies, resulting in an everlasting familiarity with them (\textit{Aem.} 1.1–2).\textsuperscript{1122} In \textit{De profectibus in virtute}, he similarly claims that those who are making progress are constantly accompanied by their role models, as the text stresses the durability of the relationship between the προκόπτοντες and their exempla multiple times.\textsuperscript{1123} In this context, the comparison with the Idaean Dactyls is well chosen.\textsuperscript{1124} By enumerating their names, those facing fear can keep off evil. This illustrates the final function of role models: when finding oneself in a difficult situation, one easily recalls them to keep oneself on the right path. The prologue to \textit{Aemilius–Timoleon} made exactly the same point, with a similar focus on quiet fearlessness (\textit{Aem.} 1.5).

Finally, the use of the plural, which also dominated in the prologue to \textit{Aemilius–Timoleon}, suggests that people need more than one role model.\textsuperscript{1125} In \textit{De profectibus in virtute}, however, this seems to contradict earlier claims in the text: as stated, Plutarch first speaks of one exemplum – the “perfect person” – but this suddenly becomes “good men” when he describes how this imitation of good exempla functions in reality.\textsuperscript{1126} This goes hand in hand with the fact that the notion of perfection has disappeared too. This is not surprising: since full perfection seems unreachable, one will never be able to bear a clear-cut, one-sidedly positive role model in mind. This is why it is essential to have more examples: in an ethically difficult situation, one should recall various great people, all of whom must have had their flaws too. The question to be asked about every single one of them will be if and why their actions were good in their specific cases, and which response might be preferable in one’s own situation. The men Plutarch lists should, therefore, not be interpreted as each related to a different moral dilemma. On the contrary: all should be compared with each other when facing one particular difficulty. This is also the implication of the use of ἕκαστον in the reference to the Idaean Dactyls.

\textsuperscript{1121} As appears from συνδιαιτησις, συμβίωσις, συνήθεια, and the comparison with ξενία.

\textsuperscript{1122} Note µνήµη in 85B – µνήµας in \textit{Aem.} 1.5.

\textsuperscript{1123} Cf. παρέπεται, ἐπίνοια καὶ µνήµη ταχὺ παρισταμένη, and the use of the present tense in \textit{De prof. in virt.} 85AB.

\textsuperscript{1124} On these mythical Idaean Dactyls, see Rose – Dietrich (2012).

\textsuperscript{1125} Note the plural of γεγενηµένους; the list of role models; ἔσοπτρα; αὐτῶν; τὰ τῶν Ἰδαίων ὀνόµατα Δακτύλων; ἀνδρῶν in \textit{Aem.} 1.

\textsuperscript{1126} In 84EF, the singular dominates: τὸν σώφρονα; τοῦ σωφρονοῦντος; αὐτοῦ.
b) Conclusion
In line with the two prologues, *De proiectibus in virtute* 84B–85C at first seems to suggest that role models should be imitated almost exactly. Once more, this focus disappears when dealing with practical reality: because of the fallibility of human nature, it is extremely unlikely to find an *exemplum* that should be copied in all respects; because of the differences between present and past, the right response in one situation might be wrong in another one. It is now clear why there is a need for more than a single role model: a comparison enables one to decide what the best possible action is – or could be – in a specific, difficult case. This functions as follows: when someone has carefully studied characters of a series of historical figures (ἱστορία), he or she can imagine and recall how all of them would have reacted in this specific case (cf. συνήθεια). In every single (hypothetical) reaction, something virtuous might be found. Only when comparing these is it possible to decide what the best option might be: σύγκρισις, then, precedes the right response to ethical difficulties.

To summarize, the picture of the function of good role models can now be completed. For Plutarch there are four stages when dealing with *exempla*:

1. ἱστορία: a close examination of great people of the past to find out about their specific ἀρεταί (Per. 1–2 and Aem. 1).
2. συνήθεια: a familiarity with the heroes (as a result of the examination), which will be a help when being confronted with a morally challenging situation (Aem. 1 and De prof. in virt. 84B–85C).
3. σύγκρισις: comparing the actions of various role models to reach the right decision (Aem. 1 and De prof. in virt. 84B–85C).
4. μίμησις: acting accordingly (Per. 1–2, Aem. 1, and De prof. in virt. 84B–85C). Imitation, then, does not just consist of copying heroes, but means that one is inspired by them.

This explains various aspects of the *Parallel Lives*. First, there is the importance of active and participatory readership: without ἱστορία on the part of the audience, reading the biographies can hardly be effective, for this will not lead to συνήθεια. Second, if comparison is a central concept in dealing with role models, one can readily see why Plutarch wrote *Lives* in parallel and why he often concludes a pair with a formal *synkri-sis*. It is not only a means of actively engaging with stories from the past (cf. ἱστορία), nor should it only be regarded as an important aspect of characterization, but it is also a deliberative tool, a prerequisite for making correct decisions. In line with this, it is also clear why Plutarch wrote an entire series of biographies, which should all truly be considered part

---

1127 Also Zadorojnyi (2012) 183: “As narratees we must stay awake and participate in the contextualization of mimetic situations.”
of the same major project, and why he so often applies internal *synkrisis*: the *Parallel Lives* provide a set of role models who should all be recalled and compared with each other in difficult cases. Finally, one should not be surprised by the fact that the biographies deal with people of the past who lived in a context entirely different from that of Plutarch’s readers: μίμησις is based on insight into character, and should not be regarded as an exact imitation of a person who found himself in precisely the same situation (although perhaps rarely it might be).

### 1.4.4 Positive Exempla in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*

All this is in line with the apophthegm collection:

1. First, we may again recall the problematizing nature of the work. Ιστορία or critical readership is of central importance here as well. As often in the *Parallel Lives*, readers have to find out for themselves what the true motivations of the historical figures are, for Plutarch will never give a clear-cut image of the men he describes (cf. implicit moralism and characterization), since this would not lead to an understanding of these characters (and their situations) that includes all their complexities.

2. A thorough encounter with the protagonists will lead to συνήθεια. But there is also an additional element in this regard. Apophthegms can be remembered easily. As a consequence, they can be recalled quickly in challenging situations (cf. the reference to the Idaean Dactyls in *De prof. in virt.* 85B). As such, apophthegm collections should be a most convenient tool in this regard. This reminds one of how Fundanus aims to arm himself against anger, as he describes in *De cohibenda ira* (457DE):

> διό καὶ συνάγειν ἀεὶ πειρῶμαι καὶ ἀναγινώσκειν οὐ ταῦτα δὴ νοῦν μόνα τά τῶν φιλοσόφων, οὔς φασι χολήν οὐκ ἔχειν οἱ <οὐκ> ἔχοντες, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τά τῶν βασιλέων καὶ τυράννων […]

For this reason I always strive to collect and to peruse, not only these sayings and deeds of the philosophers, who are said by fools to have no bile, but even more those of kings and despots.

After this passage, Fundanus quotes a series of such examples: apophthegms about Antigonus I, Philip, Magas, Ptolemy, and Alexander are cited (457E–458B), three of which also occur in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*.¹¹² Whenever Fundanus feels his anger arise, he can just recall these stories in order to keep calm: the same obviously goes for the reader of the apophthegm collection, as also appears from the overlap

---

¹¹² *Philippus* XXVII (179A); *Alexander* XXXI (181E); *Antigonus Monophthalmus* X (182CD).
in material. The shortness and wittiness of apophthegms, then, strongly contributes to the stage of συνήθεια (cf. μνήμη).

[3] Similar to the biographies, σύγκρισις does not belong only to the stage of characterization or ἱστορία either. As stated, Plutarch knew only too well that the right response to a difficult question is not always clear and that it is often impossible to give straightforward advice. In the collection, this also appears from the comparison of virtuous παλαιοί with the practical reality in which their descendants live: they acted differently in specific situations because the apparently most virtuous option might sometimes be damaging for the commonwealth. Thus, as the prologues and De profectibus in virtute suggest, the different ways in which role models could have acted should be recalled calmly and should be contrasted with each other, in order to make the best possible decision. Interestingly, the case of Cicero XIV–XV describes this practice well: the orator compares Pericles and Themistocles in his assessment of Pompey’s action of leaving Rome when Caesar was approaching (205C).

[4] These comparisons, finally, should provide the basis on which Trajan, or any other possible reader, will be able to make the right, or the most right, decision and to act accordingly (μίμησις).

Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata, one concludes, should not – or at least not in the first place – be regarded as a collection of ready-made answers, often witty, to any possible situation a ruler might encounter. On the contrary, the work is truly about gaining insight into characters, in line with the way it is introduced by the dedicatory letter: Trajan should get acquainted with all the individuals in the text that have something good in them. These men should accompany him throughout his reign, and help him cope with his most difficult moments.

Working with Exempla: The Roman Perspective
Rebecca Langlands sees a close connection between Plutarch and “Roman exemplary ethics”, which she does not believe to be based on intertextuality but rather on a shared cultural background: the typical Roman practice of telling stories about exempla and reflecting on them at various events of social life. She lists many similarities that call to mind the conclusions described above:

[1] She points out that, in Plutarch, “exempla do not just inspire to virtue but also stimulate moral debate and hone moral discernment”, which is in line with Roman ethics.

[2] In her view, Plutarchan synkrisis should be seen in light of this:

---

1130 Langlands (2020) 82.
1131 Langlands (2020) 83.
In Roman exemplary ethics multiplicity is closely related to situational sensitivity, the principle that virtues needs to be enacted differently in different circumstances, and that it is important to be able to judge what the specific requirements of one’s own situation are when one is making a moral decision, and to tailor the requirements of one’s behaviour accordingly.

[3] There is also a connection with “Roman exemplary ethics” in both “the importance of the critical reader” and the “living presence of the exemplum”.  
[4] In light of these similarities, Langlands concludes with regard to De profectibus in virtute and the Parallel Lives: Indeed in these works Plutarch explicitly theorises a Roman cultural practice which we barely find described at all either in earlier or contemporary Latin sources although it is absolutely implicit there as an underlying framework. Perhaps he does so because, whereas his Latin-writing contemporaries can take for granted their readers’ familiarity with these models and ideas, Plutarch is introducing them to a new Greek-speaking audience, who may be unfamiliar not only with the historical figures and events that he writes about in his Roman lives, but also with the whole conceptual, ethical framework within which he makes sense of them.

This chapter has shown that there might be some truth to all this, although I would not say that the whole framework of Plutarch’s ideas about exemplarity is not also, at least in general, essential to Greek culture, education, historiography, and other types of literature. Yet the stage of ἱστορία indeed reminds one of points [1], [2], and [3] as described by Langlands; συνήθεια of [3]; and σύγκρισις of [2]. As to [4], it also appears that Plutarch does not just theorize the ethics behind Roman exemplarity – if he was indeed influenced by it – but also systematizes it: each stage of Plutarch’s system is a prerequisite for the next one, for without ἱστορία, there will be no συνήθεια, without which σύγκρισις in challenging situations cannot take place. The Chaeronean, if Langlands is right, thus might have done more than just adopting – whether consciously or not – principles he became acquainted with during his interaction with Rome and Roman elite, if not earlier during his Greek education in the progymnasmata, in which character depiction and concepts such as σύγκρισις play a prominent role as well. Plutarch, then,

---

1132 Langlands (2020) 83 and 84; also referring to Duff (2011a).
1133 Langlands (2020) 93.
1134 Discussed in Part I, chapter 3.1.
actively engaged with these ideas: throughout his literary career (as the cumulative information arising from a chronological reading of *Per.* 1–2, *Aem.* 1, and *De prof. in virt.* 84B–85C suggests) he gradually developed a theoretical and systematic framework within which he expected ethical progress based on dealing with role models to take place. And he advocated this framework not only to his Greek readers, but also to his Roman audience and even to the emperor, for the same principles of ἱστορία, συνήθεια, and σύγκρισις seem to be the foundation of a reading of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* that will, or should, in the end lead to the desired μίμησις.

1.5 Conclusion

Plutarch’s views on the function of role models explain various aspects of the moralism and – closely intertwined with this – characterization in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*:

[1] The implicit and problematic nature of characterization and, therefore, moralism is in line with the importance of ἱστορία, συνήθεια, and σύγκρισις. This is connected with the fact that μίμησις means that role models in this way guide one in ethical decision-making: the collection should rather influence one’s behaviour in the sense that it provides the deliberative tools needed in everyday life, where good and bad are not always clearly distinguished.

[2] Apparently ‘perfect’ exempla do not depict reality and thus clash with category [1]. Precisely in this way, they in fact contribute to the overall problematizing moralism in the collection, for they provide the background against which the actions of ‘real’ humans are assessed: sometimes, one acts in accordance with the παλαιοί; sometimes, one does the opposite due to certain circumstances; and it is often difficult to determine which option is the better one. These seemingly ‘perfect’ παλαιοί themselves, however, do not have much to contribute to decision-making in morally challenging situations, precisely because they do not live in practical reality. This is why their sections rather exhibit moralism of a more descriptive kind, in the sense that they provide little support in specific situations, although this does not mean that such sections do not teach lessons of a more general nature that can and should influence the readers’ behaviour, or at least their convictions and beliefs.

[3] The few clearly negative exempla, finally, stand apart from the procedures described above. By depicting shame and blame, they appeal to the readers’ sense of honour and thereby persuade them that certain opinions and actions are to be avoided. Their protreptic aspect thus obviously consists in the fact that they depict what is undesirable.
Peoples and Their Rulers

The collection makes the readers reflect on the correct response to challenging situations. This, however, does not mean that there is no general and univocal ethical paradigm within which such difficult decisions are to be made. This task is fulfilled by higher levels of the text, viz. those concerning cultural identity and types of rulership. These two structuring principles are closely intertwined (because of which ethnic distinctions are in fact deconstructed): the chronological gap between Antiochus Septimus (184D–F) and Themistocles (184F–185F) not only separates monarchy from other state structures, but also draws a line between more and less typical Greeks. Only when taking both aspects into consideration will general instructions for the good monarch appear, and the scale that exists between barbarism and Greekness will seem to go hand in hand with the scale between despotism and a philosophically inspired (and therefore more Hellenic) type of monarchy.

2.1 Three Types of Barbarians

The location of Reges Aegypti (174C) between the Persian (172E–174B) and the Thracian–Scythian sections (174C–F) creates a chronological and geographical deviation. As a consequence, two groups of barbarians are separated by a third one. The nature of this one Egyptian ‘apophthegm’ emphasizes this break even more, for it is the only unit that deals with a group of people presented as if they all acted the same for centuries.

Schmidt’s research on the representation of barbarians in Plutarch’s oeuvre provides an explanation for this practice. He points out that the Chaeronean makes a distinction between two types of ‘barbarian’ political organizations. See also Part II, chapters 2.3 and 2.4. Studies of Plutarch’s work on the use of words concerning Greekness and barbarism reveal that concepts such as φιλανθρωπία and πραότης are related to the first and their opposites to the second category, see Schmidt, T. S. (2000). See also Whitmarsh (2002) 177–178; and Schmidt, T. S. (2002) 57–58. Bréchet (2004) studies ἀγριότης in Plutarch, linked with barbarism too. Nikolaidis (1986) 244 provides an overview of Greek and barbarian features.

[1] Barbarians often function as “paradigms of monarchy”, specifically a negative form of sole rulership that is close to despotism. Schmidt notes that this is “not peculiar to Plutarch: ever since the Persian Wars, the barbarians have been associated with the idea of absolute monarchy”.\footnote{Schmidt, T. S. (2004) 229–230, also referring (230) to “the abuse of power at the Persian court” in Art.}

[2] Sometimes, Plutarch refers to barbarians as “lawless peoples”. With this category, also characterized by lack of organization and by savagery, Schmidt rather associates “peoples located on the fringe of the world, like the Scythians and the Indians (cf. Pomp. 70.4), but it also applies to various other peoples.”\footnote{Schmidt, T. S. (2004) 228–229. In this context, Schmidt also refers to Spanish tribes, the Cimbri, the Teutones, and finally to the Thracians.}

Egypt does not belong to either of these two categories. Plutarch often shows a deep respect for Egyptian culture and society (see De Iside et Osiride), as did many Greeks before him, and a Greek might even learn much from their ancient wisdom.\footnote{Pelling (2016a). See also Richter (2001) on De Is. et Os.; and Meeusen (2017) on Egyptian influence in Quaest. conv., concluding that (226) “Egypt served as some kind of a ‘barbaric’ paradigm or mirror culture for Plutarch (a proto-Hellenic society perhaps?) in which he could see the reflection, not only of his own Greek identity but also – and more importantly – that of a divine, transcultural entity.”}

Perhaps, then, one should instead make a distinction between three types of barbarians: the despots, the disorganized savages, and the sages of old.

This is entirely in line with the analysis of the barbarian sections in Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata:

[1] The figure of Artaxerxes Mnemon, who dominates the Persian section, is darkened precisely by the focus on his arbitrariness and the fear it generates in everyday life at his court (173D–174B). Something similar goes for the unpredictable and perhaps even deceptive nature of Darius and Xerxes (172F–173C). The Persians as a group, then, truly reflect the ‘despotic side of barbarism’ and thus rather represent a negative form of monarchy.

[2] The parallelism that strongly connects the Thracian and Scythian section (174C–F) depicts them as almost exactly the same kind of peoples. That precisely a lack of political hierarchy (cf. ‘barbarian’ lawlessness and disorganization) and a dangerous lack of self-control (cf. ‘barbarian’ savagery) are two of the main characteristics they share shows that they are depicted as the ‘true barbarians’ of Schmidt’s second group.
The way in which *Reges Aegypti* divides the barbarian section (172E–174F) into two parts is therefore closely connected with Plutarch’s view on barbarism as recognized by Schmidt. Yet the Egyptian kings do more than this alone. They also serve as a kind of mirror image, as they possess precisely the opposite characteristics of the barbarians surrounding them (174C):

> Οἱ Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεῖς κατὰ νόμον ἑαυτῶν τοὺς δικαστὰς ἐξώρκιζον ὅτι, κἂν βασιλεῖς τι προστάξῃ κρίναι τῶν μὴ δικαίων, οὐ κρινοῦσι.

The kings of the Egyptians, in accordance with a rule of their own, used to require their judges to swear that, even if the king should direct them to decide any case unfairly, they would not do so.

Unlike the Persians, the Egyptians oppose any form of arbitrariness that characterizes a despotic rule; unlike the Thracians and Scythians, they have a well-organized legal system where kings hold the highest positions. In this way, they show what the safe middle ground of monarchy looks like. A sole ruler has the greatest power and should act accordingly, but he should also be aware that there are higher powers: justice still rules the ruler, as Plutarch puts it in *Ad principem ineruditum* 780C.

This also calls a later passage of this treatise to mind (781BC):

> ὁ μὲν Ζεὺς οὐκ ἔχει τὴν Δίκην πάρεδρον, ἀλλʼ αὐτὸς Δίκη καὶ Θέμις ἐστὶ καὶ νόμων ὁ πρεσβύτατος καὶ τελειότατος· οἱ δὲ παλαιοὶ οὕτω λέγουσι καὶ γράφουσι καὶ διδάσκουσιν, ὡς ἄνευ Δίκης ἄρχειν μηδὲ τοῦ Διὸς καλός δυναμένου. [...] φοβεῖσθαι δὲ δεῖ τὸν ἄρχοντα τοῦ παθεῖν κακῶς μᾶλλον τὸ ποιῆσαι· τοῦτο γὰρ αἰτίον ἐστιν ἑκείνου καὶ οὕτος ἐστιν ὁ φόβος τοῦ ἄρχοντος φιλάνθρωπος καὶ οὐκ ἀγεννής, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀρχιμένων δεδιέναι μὴ λάθωσι βλαβέντες,

> ἃς δὲ κύνες περὶ μῆλα δυσωρήσονται ἐν αὐλῇ θηρὸς ἀκούσαντες κρατερόφρονος’ (Κ 183 sq.),

> οὐχ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἄλλʼ ὑπὲρ τῶν φυλαττομένων.

---

1141 Τίς οὖν ἄρξει τοῦ ἄρχοντος; οὐκ ὁ νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεὺς θνητῶν τε καὶ ἀθανάτων’ ὡς ἔφη Πίνδαρος (fr. 169), οὐκ ἐν βιβλίοις ἐξο χεραμμένοις οὐδὲ τισι ξύλοις, ἀλλʼ ἐμψυχός ἃν ἐν αὐτῷ λόγος, ἀεὶ συνοικών καὶ παραφωλέττων καὶ μηδέποτε τῆς ψυχῆς ἐδῶν ἐμημον ἰγμονίας (“Who, then, shall rule the ruler? The law, the king of all, both mortals and immortals, as Pindar says – not law written outside him in books or on wooden tablets or the like, but reason endowed with life within him, always abiding with him and watching over him and never leaving his soul without its leadership”).
But if a guess about this matter is proper, I should say that Zeus does not have Justice to sit beside him, but is himself Justice and Right and the oldest and most perfect of laws; but the ancients state it in that way in their writings and teachings, to imply that without Justice not even Zeus can rule well. “She is a virgin,” according to Hesiod, uncorrupted, dwelling with reverence, self-restraint, and helpfulness; and therefore kings are called “reverend,” for it is fitting that those be most revered who have least to fear. But the ruler should have more fear of doing than of suffering evil; for the former is the cause of the latter; and that kind of fear on the part of the ruler is humane and not ignoble to be afraid on behalf of his subjects lest they may without his knowledge suffer harm,

Just as the dogs keep their watch, toiling hard for the flocks in the sheepfold,
When they have heard a ferocious wild beast,

not for their own sake but for the sake of those whom they are guarding.

A joint reading of the barbarian sections in general gives rise to a similar insight regarding the limits of monarchy. Justice should always prevail, and precisely this component is lacking in a despotic society; the good monarch should act as a protector of the people, a task neglected by the Thracian and Scythian type of barbarians: the δῆμος truly needs a guide. This shows that the monarch needs to know his precise place, as did the Egyptians of old.

2.2 Sicilian Tyranny

The Sicilian section (175A–177A) also introduces the entire Greek section. One who is well acquainted with Plutarch expects this shift to be accompanied by an ethical transition: scholarly research has pointed out that the Chaeronean connects ‘barbarism’ with a certain set of vices, in the same way as ‘Greekness’ entails a series of the corresponding virtues. Yet precisely this, in fact, also shows that being a Greek from an ethnic point of view does not always need to mean the same as being a good and well-educated person, for ‘being Greek’ should in some respects rather be considered an ethical quality instead of related to ethnicity. Thus, in the same way as a certain ‘barbarian’ might be more

---

1142 Cf. Martin (1961b) 167: “These three concepts—philanthrōpia, civilization, Hellenism—seem almost inseparable for Plutarch.”

1143 Cf. also Schmitz (2012) 83, with references to secondary literature.
Greek than an ‘actual Greek’, an ‘actual Greek’ might also be more of a ‘barbarian’. This, in fact, also emerges from the Sicilian section, where tyranny is the main theme: its positive and promising opening apophthegm is gradually overshadowed by the negative aspects of tyrannical rule, because of which the line between ‘Greeks’ and ‘barbarians’ has to be questioned.

In this context, Schmidt’s position is again of relevance. He has pointed out “that there is a cluster of ideas between tyranny, despotism and barbarians in Plutarch’s works”. Thus, from a thematic point of view, the placement of the Sicilian tyrants after the barbarians is not surprising, as they are more ‘barbaric Greeks’. This also explains why the Sicilians do not belong to the ‘core Greeks’, although their ‘Greekness’ is – from an ethnical point of view – definitely far less questionable than that of the Macedonians (who are, on the contrary, placed immediately before the Greeks of the core mainland because of their ethical qualities). As a consequence, the following three “negative components of barbarian monar-chy”, as again defined by Schmidt and often occurring in Plutarch’s oeuvre, characterize the Sicilian section too (esp. in Dionysius Maior, 175C–176C, the core of the Sicilian section): (1) “absence of law (i.e. despotism, arbitrary rule)”, (2) “absence of freedom”, and (3) “absence of free speech”. In particular, this third theme is prominently present. One concludes that – even though there is a slight improvement when the
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1144 This is even expressed explicitly in Comp. Lyc. et Num. 1.10–12: a Roman ruler might be more Greek than a Greek ruler, if his reign is milder.

1145 This explains why Timoleon is left out of the Sicilian section. Of course, he was a Corinthian (but note that the Greek general Memnon got a place in the Persian section too [174BC]) and, as Teodorsson (2005b) 224 points out, there was not much apophthegmatic material available about the man (although there was, as always, at least some material), but the most important motivation is definitely of a thematic nature: Plutarch decided to conclude his Sicilian section with only one effective apophthegm on Dion, who, as a liberator of Syracuse, can be considered Timoleon’s predecessor: Dion (176F–177A) illustrates what was essentially wrong with the Sicilian tyrants, and provides, in this way, a perfect closure. From a literary and structural point of view, then, the inclusion of Timoleon would have broken the effectiveness of Dion (176F–177A): the Sicilian section is about tyrants, not about liberators. For similarities between The Life of Dion and Tim., see Schneider (2019).

1146 See the analysis of Gelon (175AB).


1149 The theme dominates Hiero (175BC), is subtly present in Dionysius Maior VII (175F), is the main theme in Dionysius Maior X (176AB), and occurs in Dionysius Minor I (176C).
tyrants are compared with their ‘barbarian’ colleagues\textsuperscript{1150} – the Sicilian section in fact continues ‘barbarian’ themes.

As such, then, the Sicilians do not provide many new insights into what the negative pole of sole rulership looks like: the lessons to be drawn from, again, a general interpretation of their apophthegms is basically the same:\textsuperscript{1151} “there is an important limit to monarchical power, namely law and justice”, as one might put it. This does not, however, mean that the section does not contribute something new to this in another way. By building on the ‘theory’ of the barbarian sections, the Sicilian section performs a persuasive function. This happens by means of the focus on the painful position of all tyrants, who do not have real friends and always have to be on their guard for traitors and conspiracies, as appears from the series of changes of power.\textsuperscript{1152} This horrible, generalized image of the life of ‘the tyrant’\textsuperscript{1153} reminds one of the function of the negative exempla at a lower level of the text, in line with Plutarch’s Seelenheilung: it aims to convince the reader that the frightening situation described is not desirable at all (cf. βλάβαι and αἰσχῦναι: the tyrants are harmed by their wrong opinions, and dishonoured when losing their power).

In light of this, the description of the tyrant’s life also clarifies a point made in Ad principem ineruditum 781BC, cited above: for a ruler, doing something bad leads to suffering something bad. A tyrant has to fear for his life precisely because he harms his people, who therefore want to get rid of him. Something similar also appears from a later passage in the same work (781E):

\textsuperscript{1150}This is the suggestion of Gelon I (175A) and of the rather positive image of Hiero (175BC). Note also the ambiguity in Dionysius Maior (175C–176C), where many of his lawless actions might also be regarded as reflecting some insight. The image of Dionysius Minor (176C–E) is not that negative either. Thus, there is – in general – some improvement when barbarians and Sicilians are compared.

\textsuperscript{1151}Only from a general interpretation: even though Plutarch was indeed a great opponent of tyranny (see Nikolaidis (1995) 301 and 307–308; Teixeira (1988) 56), the section is not entirely negative: as also discussed in the note above, Gelon I (175A), the first apophthegm of the Sicilian section, can only be assessed in a positive way, and the same can be said of Hiero’s appreciation of free speech (175BC), just to give a few examples. This is in line with Plutarch’s assessment of both tyrants in De sera num. 551F–552A. See also Dion 5.8–10 for a positive assessment of Gelon, in contrast with the rule of Dionysius the Elder, who made fun of this tyrant in this passage (a story also told in De se ipsum laud. 542D). Teixeira (1988) 51 also points out that not all tyrants are inherently bad in Plutarch’s eyes.

\textsuperscript{1152}See also Teixeira (1988) 49–50.

\textsuperscript{1153}As appears most clearly from a joint reading of Dionysius Maior and Dionysius Minor (176C–E), but it is also the suggestion of the reversed order of Agathocles (176EF) and Dion (176F–177A).
τῷ γὰρ ὄντι δεδίασιν οἱ βασιλεῖς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀρχομένων, οἱ δὲ τύραννοι
tοὺς ἀρχομένους· διὸ τῇ δυνάμει τὸ δέος συναύξουσι, πλειώνον γὰρ
ἀρχοντές πλείονας φοβοῦνται.

For in reality kings fear for their subjects, but tyrants fear their sub-
jects; and therefore they increase their fear as they increase their pow-
er, for when they have more subjects they have more men to fear.

Good rulers are only occupied with the well-being of their subjects, not
with their own, but in precisely this way they also have a care for their
own lives. This is a fortunate byproduct of their love for the people,
contributing to the sustainability of their reign and dynasty. Yet with re-
gard to the Sicilian sections, the opposite seems to be the case: the ap-
ophthegms appeal to fear for one’s life and should convince the target
audience (monarchs such as Trajan) to rule mildly and in accordance
with justice (cf. the Seelenheilung process). In other words: careful at-
tention for the people’s well-being seems to be an expected and desired
byproduct of the rulers’ fear for their own lives, who now know that, if
they want to be safe, they should strive for a rule opposite to tyranny
and despotism (and perhaps this is also indirectly the case with Ad prin.
iner). What this ‘opposite’ looks like is the main subject of the Macedo-
nian sections.

2.3 True Monarchy

The general image arising from a joint reading of especially Archelaus,
Philippus, and Alexander (177A–181F) is to be contrasted with that of the
barbarians and the Sicilian tyrants. This happens by means of various
themes through which the essential differences between their political
systems are highlighted. This is accompanied by a geographical evolu-
tion: the readers leave the realm of barbarians and despots, and the closer
they get to the Greeks of the core mainland, the more they are approach-
ing a better – one might say a more Greek – type of monarchy. Such con-
nections between topographical information and ethical values can be
found elsewhere in Plutarch too. When Alexander, in his Life, marches to
the East, this is accompanied by a deterioration of his character;1154 when
Pyrrhus reaches Sicily, he actually becomes a tyrant.1155 Something simi-
lar, then, happens in Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata, although it
there concerns the general image of a group of people.

In the Macedonian section, justice is recommended as the princip-
apal virtue once again. Yet it also explores various aspects of this virtue.

1155 See supra, note 497.
Knowing when to give and when to take, knowing that mildness and self-restraint are required even when being slandered, knowing when not to punish even when a subject has done wrong, all these insights, strongly contrasting with barbarian despotism and Sicilian tyranny, might be regarded as belonging to this core value. Only when rulers truly possess this will they be able to establish a healthy relationship with their subjects and at the same time a long-lasting reign. This can be seen from the fact that the first Macedonian dynasty survives for more generations – a strong contrast between the pair Dionysius Maior – Dionysius Minor (175C–176E) and Philippus–Alexander (177C–181F), as highlighted by the analysis. This recalls Ad principem ineruditum again (779D–F):

διὸ τοῖς ἄρχουσι χαλεπῶν ἐστὶ σύμβουλον περὶ ἀρχῆς γενέσθαι· τὸν γὰρ λόγον ὑσπερ ἄρχοντα παραδέξασθαι φοβοῦνται, μὴ τῆς ἐξουσίας αὐτῶν τὸ ἄγαθὸν κολούσῃ τῷ καθήκοντι δουλωσάμενος. οὐ γὰρ ἰσαὶ τὰ Θεοπόμπου τοῦ Σπαρτιατῶν βασιλέως, ὡς πρῶτος ἐν Σπάρτῃ τοῖς βασιλέωσι καταμίξας τοὺς ἐφόρους, εἶτ' ὀνειδιζόμενος ὑπὸ τῆς γυναικός, εἰ τοῖς παισίν ἐλάττονα παραδώσει τὴν ἀρχὴν ἧς παρέλαβε, 'μείζονα μὲν οὖν' εἶπεν 'ὅσῳ καὶ βεβαιοτέραν'· τὸ γὰρ σφοδρὸν καὶ ἄκρατον ἅμα τῷ φθόνῳ διέφυγε τὸν κίνδυνον.

And that is why it is difficult to give advice to rulers in matters of government, for they are afraid to accept reason as a ruler over them, lest it curtail the advantage of their power by making them slaves to duty. For they are not familiar with the saying of Theopompus, the King of Sparta who first made the Ephors associates of the Kings; then, when his wife reproached him because he would hand down to his children a less powerful office than that which he had received he said: “Nay, more powerful rather, inasmuch as it is more secure.” For by giving up that which was excessive and absolute in it he avoided both the envy and the danger.

Theopompus, it seems, might not just have taken this measure because the opposite would mean the end of his power, but also because this was the just thing to do (cf. τῷ καθήκοντι). This improved his relationship with the people. This relationship, one concludes from the passage, is one of mutual trust: the citizens are prepared to follow their ruler, since

1156 Archelaus I (177A), IV (177B); Philippus XVIII (178C), XXI (178E); Alexander V (179EF), VI (179F), VII (179F–180A), XVIII (180E), XXIV (181C), XXX (181DE).
1157 Philippus V (177D), VI (177DE), VII (177E), XXVI (178B); Alexander XXXII (181E).
1158 Archelaus V (177B); Philippus IV (177CD), XI (178A), XIX (178CD); Alexander XII (180C), XXI (180F–181A), XXII (181AB), XXIII (181B), XXXI (181E).
they know that this person has their best interests at heart because of the leniency he displays (cf. τὸ γὰρ σφοδρὸν ἀνεὶς καὶ ἄκρατον αὐτῆς); the rulers put their subjects first, and precisely because of this, they need to have no fear (cf. διέφυγε τὸν κίνδυνον).

Yet self-preservation – although it also contributes to the commonwealth by bringing stability\textsuperscript{1159} – is not the most important reason why a ruler should establish such a good relationship. Leniency on the ruler’s part should also ensure indulgence on the people’s part in cases where it is impossible to give in: when certain unpopular measures are taken, a bond of trust between the monarch and his subjects ensures that they know that these are to be taken for their own sake and well-being. This topic, related to the ruler’s educational function, is alluded to by Ad principem ineruditum 780B:

δεῖ δ', ὥσπερ ὁ κανὼν αὐτὸς ἀστραβὴς γενόμενος καὶ ἀδιάστροφος οὔτως ἀπευθύνει τὰ λοιπὰ τῇ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐφαρμογῇ καὶ παραθέσει συνεξομοιῶν, παραπλησίως τὸν ἄρχοντα πρῶτον ἀρχὴν κτησάμενον ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ κατευθύναντα τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ καταστησάμενον τὸ ἕθος οὔτω συναρμόττειν τὸ ὑπήκοον […].

But just as a rule, if it is made rigid and inflexible, makes other things straight when they are fitted to it and laid alongside it, in like manner the sovereign must first gain command of himself, must regulate his own soul and establish his own character, then make his subjects fit his pattern.

This passage suggests that a good relationship based on a lenient and just rule – for this is the consequence when a ruler first takes care of his own character, as appears from other parts of the treatise cited\textsuperscript{1160} – enables the ruler to improve his subjects.

This theme, however, which is of central importance in Plutarch’s Platonic conception of the philosopher king, does not seem to be prominently present in Archelaus–Alexander (177A–181F), and not even in the monarchical sections as a whole. The only clear exception is the first section on Cyrus (172EF): he was the most beloved king of the Persian people, but not because he gave his subjects everything they wanted. All the measures he took were inspired by his love for the people and aimed to improve them. As such, then, the opening section not only announces a main theme of the monarchical sections – that one should establish a healthy

\textsuperscript{1159}This rather belongs to the interpretation of Reg. et imp. apophth. as a world history, addressed in the following chapter.

\textsuperscript{1160}Cf. esp. the story of Theopompus in Ad princ. iner. 779D–F cited above.
relationship with one’s subjects – but also alludes to its eventual goal, viz. improving one’s subjects, which should happen through lawgiving.

Although this theme is not further explored in the monarchical sections themselves, it occurs – perhaps surprisingly – in the sections presenting other state structures. Demetrius Phalereus (189D), an apophthegm that recalls the dedicatory letter preceding Cyrus, reads as a kind of introduction to Lycurgus (189D–F). It thereby puts this Persian and Spartan section at the same thematic level, and the placement of sections on Lacedaemonian oligarchy, surrounded by ‘democratic’ sections, also leads one to a comparison of these different ruling systems and to a general lesson that recalls Cyrus and Ad principem ineruditum 780B.

2.4 Other Types of Government

In political systems where rulers are to be chosen by the people, future leaders often need to please the people; once they are chosen, they usually are still forced to do the same if they want to protect themselves. As a consequence, most democratic rulers are unable to take the people’s best interests to heart: they either have to succumb to the whims of the masses, or they might be removed from power in a violent or non-violent way. In Plutarch’s view, then, democracy – at least the type that gives too much power to the people – does not seem to be an ideal context for the good politician.

In the collection, this theme is closely intertwined with that of generalship, a topic which dominates the non-monarchical sections: it is often stressed that generals who only attempt to please the people – usually by their bold behaviour, either by risking their own lives or by overconfidently sending their soldiers into the battlefield – are detrimental to the common good. Yet in a democratic system, it is precisely these popular men who are often chosen to lead the army. Good generals, then, either in ancient Athens or in the early Roman Republic, need to maintain their position and try to convince the people that this position is the correct one. Yet too often this might seem almost impossible to achieve.

---

1161 Plutarch even speaks of a kind of enslavement in this respect, see Roskam (2011) 210 on Agis 1.1–4.

1162 As Erskine (2018) 239–245 points out, Plutarch did not think entirely negatively of democracy, but the type that gives too much power to the people (cf. Athens after Ephialtes’ reforms) is definitely a bad state structure.

1163 See e.g. Timotheus II and III (187C); Phocion XII (188DE); the theme is prominently present in the Theban section (192C–194E); Fabius Maximus II and III (195C–E); Publius Licinius (197EF); Paulus Aemilius V (198AB); Caecilius Metellus I and II (201F–202A).

1164 A prominent theme in Themistocles (184F–185F; he even bribes his opponents to save his city); Iphocrates–Chabrias (186F–187D), and also Hegesippus (187DE; he is an
This also applies to other levels of decision-making. Sections such as *Aristeides* (186A–C), *Phocion* (187E–189B), and *Cato Maior* (198D–199E) illustrate that the masses rarely trust and elect those who truly serve the commonwealth, and, as stressed in the Athenian section, they often even banish their great leaders or sentence them to death. This deficit in (semi-)democratic systems is thematized in *Lycurgus* (189D–F) and closely connected with lawgiving: the Spartan system is superior to those of the surrounding sections, for in such a system, rulers who truly care about their subjects do not need to flatter them, but try to improve them by means of laws and can also act as strict teachers when necessary. A certain distance between ruler and subjects, then, is desirable, for when rulers try to please and flatter their subjects, they are not real rulers: they are dominated by and are forced to yield to the will of the people. They have, therefore, no real power. This deprives them of the ability to fulfil their most important function: the education of their subjects.

If the monarchical sections, then, show that rulers should not make themselves hated among the people, the sections that deal with other state structures highlight that the opposite – an excessive pursuit of love from and approval by the people – is not what they should strive for either. Good, philosophically inspired monarchs know by themselves what is good for their subjects and attempt to achieve this, usually by lawgiving, always steadily keeping their own course. Plutarch, one concludes, attempts to stress that the correct relationship between ruler and subjects is situated right in between an oppressive rule and excessive complacency.

### 2.5 Conclusion

An interpretation at a higher level of the text entails a different application of role models: speaking about groups of people in general, one makes bolder claims that do not always seem valid at a lower level focusing on individuals and all their complexities. This appears most clearly from the barbarian sections. Although ‘barbarian’ despotism and lawlessness is presented as a negative form of monarchy, some Persian sections show a positive picture of the king in question, such as *Cyrus* (172EF) and *Artaxerxes Longimanus* (173DE). The same can be said about the Scythians and Thracians, where *Scilurus* (174F) illustrates that good kings existed orator, but tries to convince the Athenians of the war); *Phocion* (187E–189B); and the sections on the conquering Roman Republic (194E–202E).

1165 *Themistocles* XV–XVII (185EF); *Aristeides* II (186AB); *Alcibiades* VII (186EF); *Chabrias* II (187D); *Phocion* XVII–XIX (189AB).

1166 Alcibiades is a clear example of a flatterer of the people, an aspect which is connected with his ϕιλοτιμία; see Nikolaidis (2012) 44. See also Russell (1972) 117–129 on Alcibiades as a flatterer.
amongst those peoples as well. Yet precisely by attributing certain
categories to a group of people, Plutarch is able to introduce more
clear-cut lessons into his collection, something he is unable to do when
dealing with the essentially problematic nature of individual ethical de-
cision-making in everyday life alone.

It is difficult to tell whether these possibilities of a more generic ap-
lication of exempla are essential to Plutarch’s views on exemplarity: in
his oeuvre, there seems to be no passage that theorizes this idea. Yet
it is now clear that the Chaeronean was at least aware of these possibili-
ties. This appears especially from Reges Aegypti (174C): the only ‘ap-
ophthegm’ about a group of people is to be contrasted with the general
image that arises from a joint reading of the apophthegms on two other
groups of people, which leaves no doubt as to which type of rulership is
to be followed. Plutarch, then, knew very well what he was doing.

The general lessons arising from this interpretational level often call
Ad principem ineruditum to mind. This is no coincidence: the treatise
attempts to set out some guidelines for the good monarch. They can be
summarized as follows:

[1] Sole rulers should first take care of their own characters. Once phi-
losophy has removed all excess, this will result in a lenient and balanced
and therefore just rule. This rule is also characterized by stability, be-
cause of the resulting good relationship between monarch and subjects.

[2] As a consequence of this relationship, sole rulers can also act
strictly when necessary: they can fulfil their educational function, im-
proving their subjects.

As to the collection, [1] especially appears from the monarchical sections
(172E–184F; and, in fact, also from Augustus, 206F–208A; and perhaps
from Caesar, 205E–206F, and Pompeius, 203B–204E, recalling the mon-
archical sections in various respects) recommending mildness to the
emperor; [2] is the theme of the second half of the work (184F–208A),
highlighting – in connection with this educational function – that exces-
sive indulgence is not desirable. The contrast between the two parts of
the collection, then, corresponds to the logical order as described by Ad
principem ineruditum: concern for one’s character comes first, for only
this can provide the solid basis that enables rulers to perform their core
function as guides of their subjects.

---

1167 Even though barbarians lacked Greek paideia, good barbarians and even barbarian
sages occur in Plutarch as well; see e.g. Georgiadou (1992a) 424–4245 on the rather
positive representation of Hannibal in Pel. The most important example in this regard
is Anacharsis; see Schmidt, T. S. (2004) 230. His absence in Reg. et imp. apophth. is not
surprising: he does not fit in the categories of rulers, lawgivers, and generals.
Thus, that moralism at the level of the individuals is essentially problematic does not mean that the work promotes a nihilistic view, for a higher interpretational level still provides a certain paradigm within which challenging situations are to be solved. It is up to the rulers to always try to act in accordance with this, although it will not always be clear whether they are succeeding in the specific situations they are confronted with.
3
A World History

As *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* comprise sections on barbarian, Greek, and Roman heroes, almost from the earliest history known to Plutarch up to only a few decades before his own birth, the entire work can be read as an abbreviated world history – and this probably even to a larger extent than the *Parallel Lives*, not only because of the inclusion of some barbarians, but also because a general chronological arrangement is prominently present in the collection. This chapter discusses an interpretation at this highest level of the text, focusing on how it reveals a message for the Roman emperor specifically. The first part concerns Dillon’s thought-provoking article inspired by Fukuyama’s *The End of History and the Last Man* (3.1), as this will appear to be an ideal starting point for a discussion of this theme in the collection (3.2).

3.1 Plutarch’s ‘End of History’

Plutarch, Dillon argues, believed that history had reached some kind of endpoint after the establishment of the Roman Principate, which had created peace and freedom for all human beings (at least to a certain extent). The key passage on which his argument is based is *De fortuna Romanorum* 316E–317A, where the Chaeronean indeed seems to express this idea:

---

1168 See Pelling (2005) 339 on the *Parallel Lives* as “a compendious history of Greece and Rome”, and esp. Pelling (2010) on the idea (217) “that the entire series of *Parallel Lives* is constructed to go together, with the *Lives* combining to build global histories of classical Greece and of the Roman Republic” (although Pelling also nuances this later in the article).


1170 There is much secondary literature on Plutarch’s belief that the Roman Empire was desired by god/providence: Candau Morón (2000) 462–463 provides a convenient overview.

1171 Dillon (1997) 236–238. In this passage, Plutarch compares evolutions throughout history with Epicurean cosmology and with the Platonist cosmology of the *Timaeus*. The conclusion to be made from this metaphor is described well by Dillon (1997) 236: “the Roman Empire becomes analogous to the orderly cosmos, which, now that it has been established, will continue, by the will of God, to subsist forever.” See in this context also Teodorsson (2005a) 435 on the oration.

1172 I deleted the colon after ἀγκυρηβόλιον in the *Teubner* edition, in line with the LCL translation.
Ἐγὼ δὲ, ὅτι μὲν, εἰ καὶ πάνυ πρὸς ἰλλῆλας ἂει πολεμοῦσι καὶ
dιαφέρονται Τύχη καὶ Αρετή, πρὸς γε τηλικαύτην σύμπηξιν ἀρχῆς καὶ
dυνάμεως εἰκός ἔστιν αὐτὰς σπεισαμένας συνελθεῖν καὶ συνέλθουσας
ἐπιτελεῖσθαι καὶ συναπεργάσασθαι τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἔργων τὸ
kάλλιστον, ὀρθῶς ὑπονοεῖν οἴομαι. καὶ νομίζω, καθάπερ Πλάτων
(Tim. p. 28b 32b) φησίν ἐκ πυρὸς καὶ γῆς ὡς ἀναγκαίων τε καὶ πρώτων
gεγονέναι τὸν σύμπαντα κόσμων, ἵν' ὅρατος τε γένηται καὶ ἀπτός,
γῆς μὲν τὸ ἐμβριθές καὶ στάσιμον αὐτῷ συμβαλλομένης, πυρὸς δὲ
χρῶμα καὶ μορφήν καὶ κίνησιν, αἱ δ' ἐν μέσῳ φύσεις, ὕδωρ καὶ ἀήρ,
μαλακώσασθαι καὶ σβέσασθαι τὴν ἑκατέρου τῶν ἄκρων ἀνομοιότητα
συνήγαγον καὶ ἀνεμίξαντο τὴν ὕλην δι' αὐτῶν, οὕτως ὁ τὴν
Ῥώμην ὑποβαλόμενος χρόνος μετὰ θεοῦ τύχην καὶ ἀρετὴν ἐκέρασε
καὶ συνέζευξεν, ἵν' ἑκατέρας λαβὼν τὸ οἰκεῖον ἀπεργάσηται πᾶσι
ἀνθρώποις ὧς ἔρημος καὶ ἀνησιδώρας καὶ ὑποφερομένος τοῖς πράγμασι
ἀγκυρηβόλων σάλου καὶ πλάνης' ὡς φησι Δημόκριτος (B 148).

I believe myself to be right in suspecting that, even if Fortune and
Virtue are engaged in a direct and continual strife and discord with
each other, yet, at least for such a welding together of dominion and
power, it is likely that they suspended hostilities and joined forces;
and by joining forces they co-operated in completing this most beau-
tiful of human works. Even as Plato asserts that the entire universe
arose from fire and earth as the first and necessary elements, that
it might become visible and tangible, earth contributing to it weight
and stability, and fire contributing colour, form, and movement; but
the medial elements, water and air, by softening and quenching the
dissimilarity of both extremes, united them and brought about the
composite nature of Matter through them; in this way, then, in my
opinion, did Time lay the foundation for the Roman State and, with
the help of God, so combine and join together Fortune and Virtue
that, by taking the peculiar qualities of each, he might construct for all
mankind a Hearth, in truth both holy and beneficent, a steadfast cable,
a principle abiding for ever, “an anchorage from the swell and drift,”
as Democritus says, amid the shifting conditions of human affairs.

One should, however, have two important reservations with regard to
this text:

[1] De fortuna Romanorum is a laudatory essay. It is, therefore, not
unlikely that some claims in the work do not reflect Plutarch’s views,

1173 Ziegler (1951) 720 did not even regard the work as to be taken seriously. Swain
(1989b) attempts to point out which parts of the oration represent Plutarch’s ideas, and
which are the consequence of the text’s rhetorical nature.
and that others show a distorted picture of what he actually believed. There are also major differences between the presentation of Alexander the Great in *De Alexandri Magni fortuna aut virtute*, another epideictic oration, and that of his *Life*.\(^{1174}\) This is an obvious and inevitable consequence of the type of text, and it would be hard to claim that the biography’s more complex and human picture of the Macedonian king does not coincide with Plutarch’s actual view, in contrast with the oration’s univocally positive image.\(^{1175}\) Something similar, then, must be the case for *De fortuna Romanorum* and the author’s personal opinions about at least some of the issues at stake.\(^{1176}\)

[2] Most scholars agree that *De fortuna Romanorum* is one of Plutarch’s earliest works.\(^{1177}\) If the passage did reflect the youthful author’s genuine beliefs, it is by no means certain that he maintained this view until the time of his more mature literary career (esp. in the case of the *Parallel Lives* and *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*, as these are probably among Plutarch’s later writings).

Dillon also quotes two other fragments in order to corroborate his argument. The first one is *De Pythiae oraculis* 408BC, where Theon approves of the contemporary peace and quiet in Greece, and argues that the lack of complex political situations explains why the Delphic oracles are no longer formulated in verse.\(^{1178}\) Yet he only describes the current situation (τὰ δὲ νῦν πράγματα καθεστῶτα; LCL: “the settled conditions prevailing at present”), and there is no indication that he believes that this will last forever. Something similar can be said about the second passage (*Praec. ger. reip. 824CD*):

\(^{1174}\) See also *supra*, note 382.


\(^{1176}\) Swain (1989b) 516 concludes that “while there are many points of detail where *de fort. Rom.* diverges from comparable material in the *Lives* and the *Moralia*, the way in which fortune works, indeed the whole idea that events of history, especially Roman history, have been to some extent predetermined, squares firmly with Plutarch’s serious believes.” The concept of “the end of history” is a different matter, of course.

\(^{1177}\) Dillon (1997) 236 acknowledges this, but argues in 239n5 that it bears witness to a profound knowledge of Latin sources: “It cannot, therefore, be too early a work”; against Hartman (1916) 143.

\(^{1178}\) Hartman (1916) 174 believes that this praise closing the text aimed to please the Roman audience. Theon’s position is, as Dillon (1997) 235 writes, “presumably that of Plutarch.” On Theon representing Plutarch’s point of view in *De Pyth. or.*, see Schröder (1990) 16.
āora γάρ, ὅτι τῶν μεγίστων ἀγαθῶν ταῖς πόλεσιν, εἰρήνης ἐλευθερίας ἐνυπηρίας εὐνοοῦσας, πρὸς μὲν εἰρήνην οὐδὲν οἱ δῆμοι τῶν πολιτικῶν ἐν γε τῷ παρόντι χρόνῳ δέονται, πέρευγε γάρ ἐὰν ἡμῶν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῶν πάς μὲν Ἐλληνῶν πάς δὲ βάρβαρος πόλεμος· ἐλευθερίας δ’ ὅσον οἱ κρατοῦντες νέμουσι τοῖς δῆμοις μέτεστι καὶ τὸ πλέον ὑπὸ ὧν ἅμιαν· εὐφορίαν δὲ γῆς ἀφθονήν εὐμενή τε κρᾶσιν ὡρῶν, καὶ τίκτειν γυναῖκας ‘ἐοικότα τέκνα γονεῦσι’ (Hes. OD 235) σωτηρίαν τε τοῖς γεννωμένοις εὐχόμενος ὅ γε σώφρων αἰτήσεται παρὰ θεῶν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ πολίταις.

For observe that of the greatest blessings which States can enjoy, – peace, liberty, plenty, abundance of men, and concord, – so far as peace is concerned the peoples have no need of statesmanship at present; for all war, both Greek and foreign, has been banished from among us and has disappeared; and of liberty the peoples have as great a share as our rulers grant them, and perhaps more would not be better for them; but bounteous productiveness of the soil, kindly tempering of the seasons, that wives may bear “children like to their sires,” and that the offspring may live in safety – these things the wise man will ask the gods in his prayers to grant his fellow-citizens.

In my view, Dillon might read too deeply into this passage as well. Once again, there is a focus on the present condition (ἔν γε τῷ παρόντι χρόνῳ) alone. In addition, the context of the fragment should be considered: in what follows, Plutarch argues that the only thing a statesman (a πολιτικός) should try to establish is ὁμόνοια. He has private quarrels in mind, but he concludes by claiming that precisely these can become a detriment for the entire state (824F–825A):

ὁσπερ ἐμπρησμὸς οὐ πολλάκις ἐκ τόπων ἱερῶν ἄρχεται καὶ δημοσίων, ἀλλὰ λύχνος τις ἐν οἰκίᾳ παραμεληθεὶς ἢ συρφετὸς διακαείς ἀνῆκε φλόγα πολλὴν καὶ δημοσίαν φθορὰν ἀπεργασαμένην, οὕτως οὐκ ἄπα στάσιν πόλεως αἱ περὶ τὰ κοινὰ φιλονεικίαι διακᾶσαι, ἀλλὰ πολλάκις ἐκ πραγμάτων καὶ προσκρουμάτων ιδίων εἰς δημόσιον αἱ διαφοραὶ προελθοῦσαν συνετάραξαν ἀπασαν τὴν πόλιν […].

But just as a conflagration does not often begin in sacred or public places, but some lamp left neglected in a house or some burnt rubbish causes a great flame and works public destruction, so disorder in a State is not always kindled by contentions about public matters, but frequently differences arising from private affairs and offences pass thence into public life and throw the whole State into confusion.
The image of a possible public disaster and overall chaos as a consequence of lack of concord in a state contrasts sharply with the peaceful, free, and prosperous society set out at the beginning of 824CD. One can only conclude that ὁμόνοια is the basis of all other ἀγαθά mentioned there.1179 Thus, this passage highlights important aspects of Plutarch’s views on history and the circumstances in his own days: first, there is a strong focus on how individuals influence historical developments; second (but in fact a result of this rather individualistic approach), there is no guarantee that individuals will, in the future, no longer have a negative impact on, or confuse, or perhaps even overthrow the Roman Empire. Praecepta gerendae reipublicae, then, not only seems to praise the situation in Plutarch’s own days, but also warns of a possible decline in later times. History, one concludes, does not necessarily seem to have come to an end in the Chaeronean’s eyes.

This is in line with Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata as a world history (3.2). At first, the fact that Augustus (206F–208A) – the establishment of the Roman Principate ruling all people and bringing them peace1180 – concludes the work seems to support the way Dillon reads the Plutarchan passages discussed (3.2.1).1181 Yet when taking a closer look at how the author presents the driving forces behind historical developments throughout the collection, the reader is invited to ask the same questions as those elicited by Praecepta gerendae reipublicae 824C–825A (3.2.2).

3.2 World History in Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata

The collection does not always provide a clear chronological overview of historical events. There are several minor deviations within sections on certain peoples. Because these usually intend to steer the reader towards a specific interpretation of individual characters, these cases are of less importance for this chapter.1182 Additionally, the order in which

1179 See Cook (2004) on ὁμόνοια in Praec. ger. reip. 814B; Roskam (2005a); and de Blois (2005) 148 on this aspect in Praec. ger. reip. in general and in Lyc.

1180 The war between Augustus and Antony is only dealt with in Augustus I–II (206F–207A). The remainder of the section only focuses on how the first emperor attempts to be a mild ruler, in line with Alexander, and how he aims to establish peace and stability in his empire, unlike Alexander.

1181 Dillon (1997) 239n7 writes on the comparison of Platonist cosmology and the establishment of the Roman Principate (De fort. Rom. 316E–317F): “This analogy, incidentally, would give Augustus a position very similar to the Platonic Demiurge, though I am not aware that Plutarch explicitly made the comparison.”

1182 Such deviations often create structural entities at various levels of the text, in order to create groups of sections that will be read together and should be compared with each other. The clearest examples of this are Dion (176F–177A), contrasting with the previous
different people follow each other is not always straightforward. In particular, the placement of the Macedonians raises questions. This has been addressed in 2.3, but the explanation provided there does not yet clarify why Plutarch concludes the section with *Antiochus Septimus* (184D–F), thereby further stressing a gap of a few centuries between this section and the next one on Themistocles (184F–185F). This large break, as will now become clear, is especially relevant for an interpretation at the highest level of the text, for it also separates two general chronologies:

1. A first chronology starts with Cyrus’ beloved rule and ends with the chaotic situation during the period of the *Diadochi*.
2. A second one begins with Themistocles’ successes against the Persian Empire and concludes with the establishment of the Roman Principate.

A comparison of both chronologies is in line with 3.1.

### 3.2.1 Two Paralleled Chronologies

The two chronologies do not exist entirely independently from each other, for an underlying parallel structure connects them. Generally speaking, both consist of two parts: a first one on great ‘nations’ that lose their freedom and power (sections on ‘the conquered’) and a second one on those that subdue most of these ‘nations’ (sections on ‘the conquerors’).

a) The sections on the conquered

The first parts consist of the series *Cyrus–Dion* (172E–177A) for the first chronology and *Themistocles–Pelopidas* (184F–194E) for the second. In these sections, the focus lies on the internal instability of a ‘nation’ or dynasty. They show how a people often loses its independence and how a powerful reign can come to its end because of this:

1. As to the first chronology, this stands out most clearly in the Persian section. *Cyrus Minor* (173EF) deals with the war this man started against his brother, which contrasts sharply with Xerxes’ action in his first apophthegm (173BC). In *Artaxerxes Mnemon* (173F–174A) and *Orontes* (174B), the situation is hardly better: the king distrusts his own entourage. This lack of harmony does the Persian Empire no good: the next and final section on Memnon (174B), concluding with Ἀλέξάνδρῳ, tyrants; *Myronides* (185F–186A), separating *Themistocles* (184F–185F) from *Aristeides* (186A–C) and strongly affecting the way in which the two men are compared; *Peisistratus* (189B–D), which turns *Demetrius Phalereus* (189D) into a kind of introduction to *Lycurgus* (189D–F); *Gaius Popillius* (202E–203A), because of which the sections on the death struggle of the Roman Republic will be read as one whole. These cases have been addressed in detail in the analysis.
illustrates how the Macedonian king brought an end to its existence. As to the other barbarian sections (174C–F), something similar can be said. It is no coincidence that Anteas (174EF), whose section is dominated by references to Philip, is followed by an apophthegm on brotherly harmony in Scilurus (174F): the implication is that barbarian lack of self-restraint and absence of organization makes them no match for the Macedonian conqueror.\textsuperscript{1183} In the case of the Sicilians (175A–177A), finally, the core theme consists of the mutual distrust between a tyrant and his people, and how this eventually often leads to the downfall of a dynasty.

[2] The same happens to the Greeks in the first part of the second chronology. At first, things seem to go well in Athens. Themistocles (184F–185F) takes the reader back to the times of Darius and Xerxes, described at the outset of the Persian section (172F–173C) and hereby further highlighting the parallel between both chronologies. Its subject’s φιλοτιμία explains why the Greeks could survive the Persian Wars. Yet precisely φιλοτιμία will also mean the end of Athens. The city’s democratic system is dominated by individuals who often care too much about their own powerful position in society and too little about the well-being of their fellow citizens.\textsuperscript{1184} As a result of this instability, Athens is unable to cope with foreign threats: when Alcibiades, in disregard for both the law and the people, turns against his homeland (186D–F), this says enough about the internal condition of the πόλις, and it is not surprising that Athenian hegemony came to an end.\textsuperscript{1185} The same goes for all Greeks together: Agesilaus’ campaigns against the Persians only failed because of the lack of unity among the Greek cities.\textsuperscript{1186} Internal strife in Hellas where every entity longs for dominion (the Athens–Sparta and Sparta–Thebes conflicts), then, explains why Philip was able to conquer the Greeks rather quickly in the end, an idea which Plutarch expresses elsewhere in his oeuvre as well.\textsuperscript{1187}

\textsuperscript{1183} On the conflicts between Philip and Anteas, see Rolle (1980) 143–145 and Gardiner-Garden (1989).

\textsuperscript{1184} This theme is stressed most explicitly in the sequence Themistocles–Alcibiades (184F–186F).

\textsuperscript{1185} Note also how the Sicilian calamity is followed by a series of sections on generalship (186F–187D), also focusing on φιλοτιμία.

\textsuperscript{1186} As Agesilaus explicitly says in his sixth apophthegm (191AB).

\textsuperscript{1187} Pelling (2012) 62 makes a similar point with regard to Phil.–Flam.: “In this pair he connects the collapse of Greece to that self-destructive Greek φιλοκνωσία: Rome might be the agent of Greece’s fall […] but it was really Greece that destroyed herself.” See also Pelling (1986) 86–87.
b) The sections on the conquerors

The second parts concern the Macedonians (177A–184F) and the Romans (194E–208A):

[1] Philippus (177C–179C) and Alexander (179D–181F) relate how both kings subdue almost the entire world known to them. Of course, their empire falls apart afterwards, but the sections on the Diadochi (181F–184F) do not yet describe how these smaller kingdoms eventually lose their freedom to the Romans. This will only be related in [2]. As such, then, one is still reading about subjugators.

[2] Similar to the Macedonians, republican Rome gradually becomes master of its part of the globe (esp. in 194E–202E, but also in the remainder of the Roman section). The result of this is illustrated by Augustus (206F–208A), in which all the people who figured in Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata appear on the stage for one final time. Roman world domination, bringing peace to all ethnicities, seems a fact.

Plutarch is paralleling both peoples, which suggests that history repeats itself. In light of this, it is most important that almost all parts of the empire built up in [1] become part of the one established in [2]. Various aspects in this regard remind one of Dillon’s position:

[1] When, after Alexander’s death, his empire disintegrates into a patchwork of smaller kingdoms fighting each other, these ‘nations’ suffer the same fate as the people they once conquered because of their own lack of internal stability and unity. In other words, Alexander’s attempt to join all people under one reign in the end failed. Thus, if the Roman conquests – of which the Diadochi are victims too – mirror his achievements, the suggestion is that they restore order and fulfil his mission of creating a stable and eternal world empire, by replacing the Macedonian rulers. The theme of an empire’s durability in Augustus, at least at a first and superficial reading, suggests that the Roman Principate truly reached this point.

---

1188 The sections on the Diadochi do not show how these kingdoms fall, with the only exception being Antigonus Secundus I (183C), where the surrendering of Antigonus’ kingdom is only discussed in order to describe his love for his father Demetrius: the theme of loss of power is entirely absent from the remainder of this section.

1189 Lucullus (203AB) deals with an expedition in Armenia; in Pompeius VIII (204A), there is a conflict with the Parthian Phraates; in Caesar XII (206E), Pharnaces of Pontus is defeated; in Augustus III (207AB), Egypt finally becomes part of the Roman Empire, and X (207DE) describes another expedition to Armenia. Although the later Roman sections focus on Romans fighting civil wars, there is still some continuity with the earlier sections where republican heroes conquer the world.
[2] As stated in the analysis of *Flamininus* (197A–D), this parallel between Romans and Macedonians is not to be taken too strictly: the Romans are not to be regarded as subjugating forces in the way the Macedonian monarchs – or sometimes rather ‘tyrants’ (cf. esp. Pyrrhus) – are presented, for precisely the Roman Republic defeats a series of these base kings. The apophthegm collection, then, describes Rome as a liberating force. This is not only the consequence of the fact that the opposite might be insulting to the emperor and the broader Roman readership. It is also particularly relevant for the interpretation as an abbreviated world history: the world order with which the text concludes is a harmonious, peaceful, and free one, in line with how a stable and apparently eternal world empire should look like.

Rome possesses what Macedonia lacked, and is therefore able to complete its task. Because of this, history seems to have come to its end. Yet in line with the reservations expressed in 3.1, one might wonder whether *Augustus* describes more than just the contemporary status of the Roman Empire. The answer to this question again seems negative: in line with *Praecepta gerendae reipublicae* 824C–825A, the overall focus on individual φιλοτιμία, often undermining ὁμόνοια, shows that every powerful empire is always in danger.

3.2.2 The Driving Force Behind History: φιλοτιμία

*Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* describe a history of ruling individuals: the work hardly takes the ‘bigger picture’ into account, for it does not represent historical developments as being influenced by, for example, factors of a social and economic nature. When empires are being built up or preserved, this is due to the great qualities of one or a few men; when empires fall down, this is the consequence of their flawed characters. The main characteristic – both the quality and the flaw – that is presented as the driving force behind all this is love of honour: φιλοτιμία incites men to great deeds, but especially when it means the end of ὁμόνοια, it becomes destructive to the commonwealth. The analysis in 3.2.1 has shown that this message is stressed multiple times throughout the collection (in the sections on the conquered, but in the end also in those on the *Diadochi*).

---

1190 This is not different from the *Parallel Lives*, see Roskam (2011) 208: “history often appears as a battlefield of empty ambitions that bring about wickedness rather than tranquility of mind.”

Plutarch, then, could hardly have been blind to the dangers of excessive φιλοτιμία as a destructive power for Roman society as well.\textsuperscript{1192} The focus on the civil war preceding the establishment of the Principate (203A–208A) illustrates this well: this moment of discord could have meant the end of Roman world dominion, but it only resulted in the end of the Republic. That Alexander the Great serves as a model in both *Pompeius* (203B–204E) and *Caesar* (205E–206F) is telling in this regard: in the description of Pompey’s and Caesar’s excessive φιλοτιμία (where the Macedonian is always a background figure)\textsuperscript{1193} that leads to a major clash, the possibility of a great empire’s downfall always looms in the background, as the dynamics of world history emphasize.\textsuperscript{1194} Thus, the existence of Rome was once threatened too.\textsuperscript{1195}

Augustus knew this all too well. His section (206F–208A) not only illustrates his great respect for the Macedonian king, but also the insight that his accomplishments were not fruitful. Alexander both conquered all ethnicities and failed to keep them united because of his φιλοτιμία: on the one hand, this characteristic was the very reason why he established such a powerful empire; on the other hand, his excessive focus on conquering also made him neglect internal harmony in the realm, a requisite for the durability of his military exploits. Augustus, therefore, realized that there should be limits to one’s *imitatio Alexandri*, as also appears from his actions: being aware of the flaws in his character, the first emperor gave heed to philosophical advice in a way that resembles Alexander’s acquaintance with Aristotle; contrary to this king, however, he cared less about conquests than about the stability of his empire.\textsuperscript{1196} Precisely this balance in his rule made Rome, in the end, more successful than Macedonia.

\textsuperscript{1192}See also Pelling (2012) 64–67 on the theme of φιλοτιμία in the *Lives* that concern the late Republic. See Hefnner (1995) 37–38 on this aspect in *Pomp.*, as the cause of the civil war.

\textsuperscript{1193}Alexander comes to mind when Pompey is addressed as Magnus and asks for a triumph in *Pompeius* V (203EF); the Macedonian is explicitly referred to in *Caesar* IV (206B), before Caesar decides to take power in Rome.

\textsuperscript{1194}As Shipley (1997) 46 puts it, “[t]he anti-Persian project was still in mind in the unhappy report of the Roman civil wars (*Pomp.* 70.2–5), where Plutarch seems to recall the earlier folly of the Greeks (ch. [*Ages.*] 15. 3).”

\textsuperscript{1195}Pelling (2012) 66–67 argues that the fact that Rome had already conquered many barbarians, unlike the Greeks, explains why it survived internal clashes (67): “Was there something about Rome that delayed its final collapse, whereas Greek states were so dysfunctional that they could not even get to the starting gate? Something that allowed Rome to handle and survive its excesses of φιλοτιμία in ways that Greece had not? I think there was, and I think Plutarch knew it”.

\textsuperscript{1196}Augustus explicitly expresses this position in *Augustus* VIII (207CD).
Yet there is more. Augustus also knew that this durability would not necessarily be an established fact from his reign on, as difficult issues such as throne succession could occur in the future as well.\textsuperscript{1197} If, after his reign, an uneducated ruler were to seize power, flaws in this man’s character might lead to public disasters. The final words of \textit{Augustus} illustrate this concern (208A):

Πείσωνος δὲ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐκ θεμελίων ἄχρι τῆς στέγης ἐπιμελῶς ὁικοδομοῦντος, ἐεὐθυμοῦν ἑφη ἡμ μὲ ποιεῖς οὕτως ὁικοδομῶν, ὡς ἀιδίου τῆς Ρώμης ἐσομένης.

When Piso built his house with great care from the foundation to the roof-tree, Augustus said, “You make my heart glad by building thus, as if Rome is to be eternal.”

The subjective ὡς in this apophthegm is not just a detail, definitely not when it comes from the first Roman emperor: Augustus appreciates Piso’s faith in the future (or what he interprets as such), but he does not necessarily share it.\textsuperscript{1198} The dynamics throughout \textit{Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata} as a world history – which can be defined as the dangerous balance between individual φιλοτιμία and common ὁμόνοια – highlight that this cautiousness is entirely justified: history might repeat itself, and the fact that Rome survived a series of civil wars does not mean that it can deal with a new one. This was something which Plutarch almost experienced in his own lifetime\textsuperscript{1199} (as Candau Morón observes, this should make one doubt that Dillon’s interpretation is entirely correct),\textsuperscript{1200} which might also explain the prominent place of the late republican biographies in the \textit{Parallel Lives}.\textsuperscript{1201} The collection, then, does not describe a firm belief that ‘history has come to an end’. It only expresses the hope that this will be the case.

\textsuperscript{1197} Augustus XI (207E).

\textsuperscript{1198} The \textit{genitivus absolutus} expresses Piso’s goals, but the addition of ὡς highlights the subjectivity of his motivation, which is not necessarily shared by Augustus; cf. Kühner – Gerth (1966) 93–95.

\textsuperscript{1199} See Jones, C. P. (1971) 125: “Just as Marius nearly destroyed Rome by his quarrel with Sulla, so the folly of Nero nearly overturned the empire by setting in train the civil wars of Plutarch’s youth. Nothing was more to be cherished than the peace that Roman power guaranteed”.

\textsuperscript{1200} See Candau Morón (2000) 465 on “intervals of unrest and social turbulence” during Plutarch’s lifetime, because of which “the statements formulated by Dillon (1997) 465 are hardly credible”.

3.3 Conclusion: A Warning for the Emperor

Once more, *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* correspond with other parts of the Plutarchan oeuvre. In line with what Dillon observes with regard to the Chaeronean’s other works – and about early imperial literature in general – the collection also seems to express the “idea that Roman rule is a kind of culmination of all previous political arrangements.” This does not, however, necessarily imply that history is at an end. On the contrary: similarly to *Praecepta gerendae reipublicae*, the collection alludes to a possible downfall instigated by lack of concord, often the result of individual issues neglected by rulers.

As to the focus on the individual, there is both a striking similarity and a great difference between the apophthegm collection and the *Parallel Lives*. Pelling writes with regard to the latter as a world history and the place of individual characters within this broader story:

> So the *Lives* do come together to depict ‘global history’, or at least those parts of it that are most relevant. But that history is valuable not for its own sake, but for the light it sheds on the individuals; and that is why the global history does not need to be comprehensive, for it need illustrate only the worlds and the periods where Plutarch’s great individuals belonged.

In *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* as well, Plutarch uses historical background to explain why a hero acted in one way or the other: as discussed, the context in which a series of παλαιοί lived has strong repercussions for the way in which their behaviour is to be judged, and the same goes for their descendants and their specific situations. Yet in the collection, the individuals in turn also shed light on world history, as they are depicted as those who *created* the past, and this highest level of the text is also important for its own sake as it describes its own message. This is also why ‘global history’ is more comprehensive in the collection than in the *Parallel Lives*.

This is a consequence of a difference in target audience, and perhaps even of the precise historical context in which the collection was written. The focus on the dangers of φιλοτιμία and lack of concord, often connected with the main figure of Alexander the Great, entails a strong warning message for the Roman emperor. If the dating of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* as proposed is correct, this means that Trajan’s campaigns in the East, which can obviously be seen as an act of *imitatio Alexandri*, came just before the composition of the work. In light

---

of the observation about φιλοτιμία as the driving force of world history, it might not be too far-fetched to believe that Plutarch regarded these military exploits as something that might bring the emperor to neglect internal harmony and peace, things that should really matter for the good and well-educated ruler. And if the author wanted to warn his ruler of this possible danger, he could probably not have found a better way to do so than through Augustus’ mouth as his cautioning device.

Finally, it is no coincidence that this most concrete lesson appears from an interpretation where world history or humanity in its entirety serves as a role model, so to speak, for it becomes very clear that Trajan’s reign and that of any possible future ruler will become part of history, and that their concern for their own characters will be assessed in either a positive or a negative way in light of the impact they had on the lives of their subjects and the future course of their empire. In other words, they will continue the story, and might themselves one day become new exempla instructing new rulers. This awareness of their own position in the continuous narrative of mankind should truly persuade them to welcome the two tools the collection offers them: a general ethical framework that teaches what a good rulership looks like (chapter 2), and the deliberative skills they need in order to act in accordance with this framework when facing difficult times (chapter 1). As such, then, Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata can truly serve as a guide for the emperor.
Concluding Remarks

*Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* serve as a guide for Trajan at three levels of the text in a way that is reminiscent of other works of Plutarch’s oeuvre. These levels influence each other:

[1] The sections on historical figures share several features with the individual biographies of the *Parallel Lives*: characterization is usually implicit and almost never clear-cut and the same holds for the moralism resulting from this; the driving forces behind characterization such as gradual shifting and *synkrisis* – reminding one of Pelling’s “integrated characters”\(^{1204}\) and the different levels of comparison in the biographical project – all contribute to the essentially problematic nature of moralism in the collection. Every single section, then, to some extent functions as an abbreviated *Life*, and this is also how the author introduces the apophthegm collection in the dedicatory letter (172B–E).

This problematizing aspect is in line with Plutarch’s views on the functions of role models. With the exception of two clearly negative *exempla* (*Pyrrhus*, 184CD; and *Alcibiades*, 186D–F) that, in line with the prologue to *Demetrius–Antonius*, highlight which opinions and deeds are to be avoided at all cost for the sake of honour and reputation and one’s well-being (cf. the notion of *ἀἰσχύναι* and *βλάβαι*),\(^ {1205}\) all the protagonists raise more questions than answers with regard to the correct responses in challenging situations. This to a certain extent also applies to the most virtuous figures, often the eldest men of the collection (such as *Cyrus*, 172EF; *Lycurgus*, 189D–F; *Charillus*, 189F; *Manius Curius*, 194EF; and *Gaius Fabricius*, 194F–195B): they act in a simple society where decision-making is not influenced by the need to compromise, for the good deed always seems to be the act of virtue. In this way, the *παλαιοί* provide little direct guidance for combining the contemplative life with the public life in everyday reality (cf. *Comp. Arist. et Ca. Ma.*). In this respect, they are, in fact, rather problematic *exempla*.

As a consequence, readers benefit much more from role models who live in a similarly complex context. This is why the largest group of *exempla* in *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* consists of figures who have great qualities but whose behaviour and decisions still raise questions about the correct response in difficult times: (a) they activate the readers to empathize with their experiences and to examine their virtues (*ἰστορία*); (b) this active participation ensures that the readers will be thoroughly acquainted with these *exempla* (*συνήθεια*); (c) thus, when facing a moral dilemma they can

---

1204 Pelling (2002) 283–300 (= (1988a)).
1205 Ingenkamp (1971).
recall their models and envisage how the latter would have acted in this situation: comparing their (hypothetical) responses with each other and trying to find out what would be the best possible reaction (συγκρισις), (d) the readers are finally able to act accordingly (μιμησις). This is precisely how Plutarch describes the function of role models in the prologues to *Pericles–Fabius Maximus, Aemilius–Timoleon*, and in *De profectibus in virtute* (84B–85C).

[2] Groups of sections on a people, however, provide the general framework within which difficult decisions are to be made. As such, then, *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* can sometimes still teach clear-cut moral instructions, albeit only at a higher level of the text. This is a natural consequence of the fact that speaking about groups of people leads to more general (and often less nuanced) conclusions: even though there is no proof that Plutarch theorized the possibilities of applying role models in a generic way, it is clear that he exploited them in the collection at the level of ethnicities and types of rulership.

An interpretation at this level in various respects calls *Ad principem ineruditum* to mind: as in the treatise, the author recommends mildness to the ruler, for this ensures a good relationship with his subjects, a prerequisite for a stable reign; excess in this respect, however, is discouraged, since too much complacency can result in the ruler being ruled by the people, bereft of his educating function. Thus, Trajan should always respect these general guidelines when being led by his role models in everyday life [1].

[3] As a world history, *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* encourage Trajan to give heed to the general guidelines of [2]: the highest level of the text ensures that he is aware of his position as the man who will now continue the narrative of the collection. In the future, then, a section on apophthegms of Trajan might describe the dos and don’ts for new rulers. He should therefore be careful about the way he deals with models himself, if he wants to become a positive exemplum. His Parthian imitatio Alexandri is of paramount importance in this regard, as this will have a strong impact on how his successors will assess his reign: will they wonder, like Augustus did with regard to Alexander the Great, why Trajan only cared about conquering and in the meanwhile neglected the internal harmony of the Roman Empire; or will he, in the footsteps of the first emperor, attempt to establish a new Pax Romana and ensure prosperity for his subjects?

The three levels of interpretation thus all interact with each other: without the essential desire triggered by [3], Trajan will not feel compelled to establish a stable reign in line with the general guidelines of [2]; without the general guidelines of [2], Plutarch would have left the emperor in the dark about the right direction for his rule, whenever in morally challenging times he recalls the exempla provided by the apophthegm collection [1].
General Conclusion

This book inevitably began with a discussion of the authenticity of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*, now proven to be a genuine work of Plutarch, meant to be published. The dedicatory letter to Trajan (172B–E) at the outset of the text provided the most compelling evidence in this regard: several phrases, expressions, and metaphors are typical of the author or sometimes even occur (almost) exclusively in Plutarch; the letter also contains more than six juxtapositions of words with a related meaning, another feature of his writing style; and as a programmatic proem it is in various respects reminiscent of the prologues to some pairs of the *Parallel Lives*, especially in terms of its structure.

The letter cannot be separated from the apophthegm collection (172E–208A). At first sight, this appears most clearly from a series of verbatim connections. Focusing on the theme of giving and taking, the Artaxerxes story at the outset (172B) closely links the letter not only with the Persian section (172E–174B), but also with several apophthegms included later in the work, similar in terms of their content and wording (*Artaxerxes Longimanus* I, 173D; *Alexander* XXXI, 181E; *Ptolemaeus*, 181F; *Antigonus Monophthalmus* XV, 182E). In addition, a construction similar to the combination τῶν βίων … σπέρματα (172D) at the end occurs in *Cyrus* III (172EF: τὰ σπέρματα καὶ … οἱ βίοι). Yet more important is that the letter introduces – in connection with a reference to the *Parallel Lives* – all aspects of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*: the collection contains apophthegms (172C: ἀπομνημονευμάτων) of famous men (172C: ἐπιφανεστάτων) of different types of rulers of various peoples (172C: παρά τε Ῥωμαίοις καὶ παρ᾽ Ἕλλησιν ἡγεμόνων καὶ νομοθετῶν καὶ αὐτοκρατόρων), and, as a whole, the work reads as an abbreviated world history (in line with the idea of σύνταγμα, 172C). All these elements constitute the different levels of interpretation of the text, where 494 apophthegms are grouped into 89 sections on individuals, who are put together according to ethnicity, including all the peoples that were part of the Roman Empire in Trajan’s days.

Since the letter is genuine and inextricably tied to the collection, the collection itself must be authentic as well, and was meant to be published.

Arguments against Plutarch’s authorship of the collection mainly concerned the number of cases of *hiatus* and the origins of the apoph-
The former is always a risky argument: not only has the maximum amount of hiatus Plutarch would have allowed never been fixed (if that is even possible at all), but the genre of text might also have had an impact on this feature of his writing style. In this context, a comparison with Coniugalia praecepta, a work of Plutarch’s oeuvre that is amongst all other undisputed texts the most closely related to Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata, suffices to show that about one hiatus per two Stephanus pages is not too much in this type of text. As to the origins of the apophthegms, the relationship between the accounts of the collection and other works of Plutarch is not different from that between those of two or more undoubtedly authentic texts: they often seem to go back to earlier notes of Plutarch. Finally, there is no proof whatsoever that the collection went through different stages in the editorial process.

In short, there are no convincing arguments against the authenticity of the apophthegm collection and the former communis opinio appears to have been influenced by anachronistic conceptions of good literature, according to which it seems inconceivable that a man of literary talent like Plutarch would have written and published such an incoherent patchwork of raw apophthegms and dedicated it to the most powerful man in the world, whom he might never have met. Yet even in this regard, appearances are deceptive: the literary analysis has shown that the collection in fact reflects a well-thought-out and balanced structure at all levels of the text, aiming to direct the readers towards a specific assessment of the characters and groups of peoples included in the work in a way that calls to mind the Parallel Lives and Moralia; often subtle adaptations to apophthegms (usually in terms of wording) contribute to the same effect. Writing such a collection, even though it does not reflect the narrative complexities of the biographies or the argumentative sophistication of the moral treatises, thus still requires much literary talent and experience.

The fact that there are no (clear) indications that Plutarch knew Trajan personally does not need to pose a problem either. It still is likely that the emperor would at least have heard about the prolific writer and priest of Delphi from his entourage at the court (men such as Sosius Senecio, with whom Plutarch was well acquainted), and even if this were not the case, there is nothing surprising about a Platonist writer trying to influence a ruler’s political course as a philosophical advisor. In fact, in light of works such as Praecepta gerendae reipublicae and especially Maxime cum principibus philosopho esse disserendum and Ad principem ineruditum, one even expects Plutarch to write a work that, taking into

---

1206 Other more detailed arguments are of minor importance, such as Hartman (1916) 116–117 on ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὕστερον in 196E and deviations between the accounts of Reg. et imp. apophth. and other works of Plutarch (mainly addressed in the footnotes: these can usually be explained as stylistically motivated or as examples of Anekdotenwanderung).
account Trajan’s busy life, could provide convenient advice for the ruler. A parallel, such as Valerius Maximus’ *Facta et dicta memorabilia* dedicated to Tiberius, finally shows that an emperor would not be insulted by receiving such a ‘simple’ gift – quite the contrary.

As to the **dating** of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*, the dedication to Trajan (and, in line with this, the reference to the *Parallel Lives* in the dedicatory letter) indicates that the work was published between 98 and 117. More hypothetically, the Persian apophthegms in the letter, the Persian (172E–174B) and Thracian–Scythian (174C–F) sections, and the overall focus on the concept of *imitatio Alexandri* in the collection might allude to Trajan’s greatest conquests, suggesting a dating in 116–117. The relative chronology of the *Parallel Lives* and the Roman part of the apophthegm collection, speculative as it might be, seems to confirm this view, if one accepts Verdegem’s suggestion that Plutarch used notes such as *Apophthegmata Laconica* for the Greek part of the work (the position of Stadter), but a penultimate historical draft related to the process of composition of the *Parallel Lives* for the Roman part (the position of Pelling)\(^\text{1207}\) – a suggestion indeed generally supported by a systematic comparison of the collection and the remainder of the Plutarchan oeuvre.

If this relatively late moment of composition and publication is correct, this has strong repercussions for an interpretation of the work as a world history.

In Plutarch’s view on the type of text of **collections of sayings and anecdotes**, works such as *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* are rooted in a philosophical tradition and are closely related to biography. Of course, collections of apophthegms and *chreiai* were of great use to students of rhetoric, in line with the education in the *progymnasmata*, and to professional orators, and Plutarch was well acquainted with this tradition. Yet this did not influence how he thought about the main function of his work: as appears from a comparison of his collection with Valerius Maximus’ *Facta et dicta memorabilia*, the first goal of the Greek author is truly to provide insight into characters of the past and to instruct the emperor in this way. His work, then, indeed belongs to the ‘genre’ of ‘mirrors of princes’.

The **literary analysis** of the dedicatory letter reveals much about how the apophthegm collection should be read. Plutarch claims that only sayings can provide a quick and clear-cut insight into characters of men of the past in the second part of the letter (172C–E), because of which his representation of Artaxerxes at the outset of the first part (172BC: Plutarch only describes actions) should be questioned. He thereby encourages his

readers to assume a critical attitude towards the text: not every piece of information he provides should necessarily be taken at face value in its entirety, so the audience should carefully read the text with an eye on elements that might further modify the portrait of a character, or on possible contradictory apophthegms problematizing the image in the way Artaxerxes’ picture was deconstructed in the letter.

As a consequence, the readers often grope in the dark in their attempts to assess the kings and commanders of the work. Plutarch applies every tool of characterization to this end. Gradual shifting, which means that most apophthegms are connected with the previous story or stories through verbatim, thematic, or chronological links by means of which the author creates chains throughout a section on a protagonist, usually also entails a shift from a clear and almost stereotypical image to a more ambiguous and idiosyncratic one (cf. “integrated characters”). When this is not the case, Plutarch sometimes breaks the gradual shifting in order to create blocks of apophthegms illuminating different and clashing sides of a character (cf. Agesilaus, 190F–191D); in other instances, the portrait of a man in his own section can be adjusted or even contradicted by his appearance in the section on another subject, because of which the readers have to deal with several contrasting pictures of the same person (e.g. the image of Antipater throughout the work). Synkrisis similarly raises many pressing questions. When comparing two men – usually contemporaries – it is almost never clear who is to be admired most: in politics, the virtuous approach can be less fruitful than the course of φιλοτιμία and self-preservation; in war, the talented general who lacks persuasive skills might be disregarded, unlike the successful orator who is inexperienced in military tactics and, because of this, sometimes detrimental to his city state or nation.

This does not mean that every individual character is essentially problematic. Plutarch frequently opens sections on peoples with protagonist(s) from ancient times who are presented as highly virtuous without qualification. The image of these παλαιοί provides the background against which the other men will be assessed and assess themselves and their fellow countrymen, as the Spartan section illustrates well. In some cases, Plutarch closes a section on a people on a positive note. These apophthegms usually play a role at the level of ethnicity too: Memnon highlights Greek superiority over barbarians in terms of morality (174B); Dion uncovers the issues of the Sicilian political system of tyranny (176F–177A). Pyrrhus (184CD) and Alcibiades (186D–F), finally, are two examples of obviously negative sections and, as such, do not raise questions as to whether they or their predecessors or contemporaries are to be preferred. Yet such clear-cut pictures are the exception rather than the rule.

---

The literary analysis thus has demonstrated that *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* require a participatory readership that closely takes all aspects of the text into account. Indeed, it is an independent literary work and deserves to be read as such. Other accounts of the apophthegms in Plutarch’s oeuvre, then, should by no means be the main focus when interpreting their meaning in the collection. Yet, often, the interpretation of the collection still leads to conclusions that are in line with the other Plutarchan accounts, especially when these concern the *Parallel Lives*: excessive φιλοτιμία is no less one of the main themes in *Themistocles* (184F–185F) than in the *Life*; allusions to Pompey’s failed *imitatio Alexandri* dominate both his section (203B–204E) and his biography. Furthermore, (slight) deviations from parallel passages can be illuminating, for frequently they support the initial interpretation as proposed in the analysis: this can range from minor changes in terms of wording (e.g. *Scipio Minor* II, 199F) to the omission of the full facts of a story (e.g. *Dion*, 176F–177A). These adaptations serve specific goals and steer the audience towards certain judgements of the characters and their value, and these are usually but not necessarily the same as in the *Life* or in other works.

*Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* not only aim to allow the reader to gain insight into the characters of the protagonists. The collection should also be a device helping the reader to become a better person. Although anyone might benefit from the work in this regard, the target reader is Trajan, of course: either Trajan as a historical figure or ‘Trajan’ as the reader implied in and constructed by the text, kept in mind by the audience envisaging how an emperor would (have to) respond to the work. In that respect, the protagonists included in the text have an additional relevance: all these kings, generals, and lawgivers are, one might say, the Roman emperor’s predecessors, which suggests that Trajan (or ‘Trajan’) is desired to learn from their behaviour, as he should be able to identify readily with them. Thus, *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* should also be a guide for the emperor.

Yet in the dedicatory letter Plutarch avoids stating that Trajan can improve his character by means of the work. Only very subtly does he highlight that this is an additional goal: the opening apophthegms suggest that Trajan should model his behaviour after Artaxerxes (and, perhaps, after Lycurgus as well), albeit only at a superficial level, for he is only implicitly asked to imitate actions; and a close reading of the second part of the letter shows that, when speaking about Trajan’s specific situation, Plutarch describes the function of the collection only in terms of character depiction, although he alludes to the notion of moral progress when speaking in general terms (the mirror metaphor and the distinction
between the stages of ἀναθεώρησις and ἀποθεώρησις). This caution in advising a ruler of course reflects the way in which any citizen would have approached the Roman emperor, but there is more to this than just convention: again, the author expects a critical attitude from the readers that is in line with how they should approach the collection; more interestingly, Plutarch in fact exploits the conventional attitude in order to draw attention to the role of an advising philosopher he would like to perform, at the same time stressing that he hopes that Trajan will indeed be interested in, and will even actively pursue, moral progress. That the apophthegm of Demetrius of Phalerum is placed at the very centre of the collection is telling in this regard: he asks Ptolemy to read some books on kingship because a monarch’s friends only rarely have the courage to give proper advice (189D).

Plutarch applies role models at three levels of the text. As to the sections on historical figures, three groups can be distinguished. The smallest group consists of the two negative sections, Pyrrhus (184CD) and Alcibiades (186D–F): they describe what the emperor should not imitate, persuading him to avoid certain deeds and ideas that might harm not only society but also himself by causing shame and pain. In this way, they also strengthen the positive image of the men surrounding them and encourage the audience to give heed to these exempla in the first place. This procedure is embedded in Plutarch’s process of Seelenheilung, and in various respects recalls the prologue to Demetrius–Antonius.

Entirely virtuous men constitute a second group. These are, as stated, the παλαιοί of the collection (and, as a consequence, occur at the outset of sections on a people). Although their picture is usually clear-cut, their function as role models is highly problematic: they live in a remote past and a simple society that does not pose many ethical problems, because of which virtuous behaviour is, in a way, self-evident to them. A reader like Trajan, who faces moral dilemmas on a daily basis in the complex political reality of the Roman Empire where the most virtuous response might not always be the best for the people, does not get far with these exempla as his only guides. All this reminds one of the difficult balance between the contemplative and public life as described by the Comparison of Aristeides and Cato Maior.

Basically positive but problematic exempla are the largest group. In line with Plutarch’s thinking about the function of role models as described in the prologues to Pericles–Fabius Maximus, Aemilius–Timoléon, and in De profectibus in virtute (84B–85C), they are expected to guide Trajan as follows: a critical and participatory reading of their sections – a complex scrutinization of their προαιρέσεις, as one might put it (ιστορία)
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ensures that the emperor will be well acquainted with these subjects (συνήθεια). The witiness and memorable aspect of apophthegms and the brevity of the sections further enhance this effect. When finding himself in a morally challenging situation, Trajan will thus be able to recall these role models quickly and calmly, envisioning how they would have reacted. As one can always argue pro and contra a specific response, the (hypothetical) reactions of the exempla are compared with each other in order to find out what the best possibility might be. Σύγκρισις, then, performs an important function with regard to Plutarch’s attitude towards exemplary models in Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata as well. The final step consists of μίμησις: Trajan acts in accordance with what he learned from the comparison, inspired by his role models without literally copying them.

Thus, at the level of the individual sections, the apophthegm collection does not give straightforward instructions but provides the reader with the deliberative tools needed in the difficult process of ethical decision-making in everyday life. This is different from how groups of people and types of rulership function as role models in Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata: when speaking in general terms Plutarch is able to teach more direct lessons. This explains why the only apophthegm dealing with a group of people is Reges Aegypti (174C): the readers are expected to compare all Egyptian kings with all Persians (172E–174B) and all Thracians–Scythians (174C–F), and they have to conclude that a monarch should always strive for a just rule (in contrast to Persian despotism) and should at the same time be a guide for the people (unlike the disorganized barbarian ‘savages’). The Sicilian section (175A–177A) builds on this, stressing that a tyrannical rule despising laws and justice hurts not only society, but also the rulers themselves: a troubled relationship between the tyrant and the people leads to revolts and changes of power. This frightening image encourages the ruler to become a good monarch, modelled on the lessons to be drawn from the Macedonian section (177A–184F), recommending mildness: only this can establish a bond of mutual trust between ruler and his subjects and only this will result in a long-lasting, stable, effective, and fruitful reign.

Yet Plutarch also advises against excessive complacency, as appears from a general reading of the sections on other types of government (184F–205E on generals and popular leaders): when giving in too much to the desires of the masses, rulers will no longer be able to perform their function as educators of the people. Trajan’s reign, then, should be a just and mild one, situated in between despotic arbitrariness and unbridled leniency, if he wants to be a guide for his subjects. This instruction, recalling Ad principem ineruditum in various respects, provides the general framework that the emperor should always keep in mind when making decisions in challenging dilemmas.
Even more specific is the instruction taught at the highest level of the text: *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* as a world history, a theme that is more prominent in this work than in the *Parallel Lives*. Although the assumption that Plutarch thought that history had come to an end after the establishment of the Roman Principate might go too far, one still concludes from works such as *Praecepta gerendae reipublicae* (esp. 824C–825A) that he hoped that this would be the case. This is why the collection as a whole seems to read as a warning for Trajan, in light of the recent Parthian campaigns – if the dating of the work suggested is correct – that bear witness to the emperor’s *imitatio Alexandri*. In *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* the overall focus on *φιλοτιμία* as the driving force behind historical developments, building up empires and tearing them down, suggests that the contemporary state of the Roman Empire, joining together all peoples and bringing them peace and prosperity, might not last forever. Bearing this in mind, it is up to Trajan to decide how he wants to be remembered: will he, in his desire to conquer, neglect internal harmony and jeopardize the future of the empire; or will he give heed to the advice described at lower levels of the text in order to establish a peaceful future for his subjects? As such, world history as presented in the collection raises awareness of the target reader’s own position in the chain of role models provided by the work: Trajan will write a new chapter in the story of mankind and will become a new *exemplum* himself, either one to be followed and admired or one to be avoided and despised.

As a piece of exemplary literature, *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* perfectly fit within Plutarch’s oeuvre. One can only admire how the author, working exclusively with anecdotal material from the past that seems to have left little room for authorial comments and personal adjustments or additions, still managed to include all these complex lessons, instructions, and portraits of individuals and groups of people at the different levels of the collection, in his desire to become a philosophical advisor for the emperor on his journey towards the ideal of the Platonic philosopher king. The work, then, truly serves as a guide and mirror for Trajan. Yet this mirror is indeed an opaque one, for Plutarch knew only too well that the road to human perfection can never be mapped out clearly but is an endless search characterized by failure and success, the challenging scrutinization of all sides of stories and moral issues within a certain ethical framework, and, above all, by an unrelenting but insatiable willingness to become a flawless person.

---
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Appendices

Appendix I: A Restructuring of the Collection

The first columns give an overview of the composition of Reg. et imp. apophth. and of the total number of apophthegms in every (sub)section according to the subdivision proposed by van der Wiel (2023a), from which this appendix is taken (pp. 23-26; only slightly adapted). The final column indicates where (some) modern editions deviate from this division. I have taken the following editions into account:

Be.: the *Teubner* of Bernardakis (1889)
Ba.: the *Loeb* of Babbitt (1931)
Na.: the *Teubner* of Nachstädt (1971)
Fu.: the *Budé* of Fuhrmann (1988)
In.: the *editio maior* of Ingenkamp – Bernardakis (2008)

For example: in the case of *Cotys* (174D), Bernardakis, Babbitt, and Ingenkamp print I and II as a unit, as indicated by the final column. The division proposed by this appendix considers them to be two separate apophthegms, as do Nachstädt and Fuhrmann. For ease of reference the numbering of the apophthegms follows Nachstädt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nº</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>PAGES</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>DEVIATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Entire collection</em></td>
<td>172E–208A</td>
<td>494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>15 Barbarians</td>
<td>172E–174F</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ia</td>
<td>8 Persians</td>
<td>172E–174B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Cyrus</td>
<td>172EF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Darius</td>
<td>172F–173B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Xerxes</td>
<td>173BC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Artaxerxes Longimanus</td>
<td>173DE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Cyrus Minor</td>
<td>173EF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Artaxerxes Mnemon</td>
<td>173F–174A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>All editions list <em>Semiramis</em> as a separate section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Orontes</td>
<td>174B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 Memnon</td>
<td>174B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>All editions list <em>Parysatis</em> as a separate section; Be. and In. join <em>Artaxerxes Mnemon</em> II and III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Pages</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Deviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ib</td>
<td>Egyptian custom</td>
<td>174C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Reges Aegypti</td>
<td>174C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ic</td>
<td>Thracians</td>
<td>174CD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Polys</td>
<td>174C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Teres</td>
<td>174CD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cotys</td>
<td>174D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Be., Ba., and In. join I and II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Id</td>
<td>Scythians</td>
<td>174EF</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Idanthyrsus</td>
<td>174E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Anteas</td>
<td>174EF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Be. and In. join I and II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Scilurus</td>
<td>174F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Greeks</td>
<td>175A–194E</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa</td>
<td>Sicilians</td>
<td>175A–177A</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Gelon</td>
<td>175AB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hiero</td>
<td>175BC</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Dionysius Maior</td>
<td>175C–176C</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Dionysius Minor</td>
<td>176C–E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Agathocles</td>
<td>176EF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Dion</td>
<td>176F–177A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>Macedonians</td>
<td>177A–184F</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Archelaus</td>
<td>177AB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All editions present XVI and XVII as two different apophthegms; Na. and Fu. present XXII and XXIII as two different apophthegms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Philippus</td>
<td>177C–179C</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>179D–181F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Ptolemaeus</td>
<td>181F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Antigonus Monophthalmus</td>
<td>182A–183A</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Demetrius Poliorcetes</td>
<td>183A–C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Na. and Fu. present I and II as two different apophthegms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Antigonus Secundus</td>
<td>183CD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Lysimachus</td>
<td>183DE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Antipater</td>
<td>183EF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## I. A Restructuring of the Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Antiochus Tertius</td>
<td>183F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Antiochus Hierax</td>
<td>184A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Eumenes</td>
<td>184AB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Pyrrhus</td>
<td>184CD</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Antiochus Septimus</td>
<td>184D–F</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IIc</strong> 14 Athenians</td>
<td><strong>184F–189D</strong></td>
<td><strong>73</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Themistocles</td>
<td>184F–185F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>All editions present XV and XVI as two different apophthegms, but Ba. seems inclined to join them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Myronides</td>
<td>185F–186A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Aristeides</td>
<td>186A–C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Pericles</td>
<td>186C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Alcibiades</td>
<td>186D–F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Lamachus</td>
<td>186F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Iphicrates</td>
<td>186F–187B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Timotheus</td>
<td>187BC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Chabrias</td>
<td>187CD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Hegesippus</td>
<td>187DE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Pytheas</td>
<td>187E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Phocion</td>
<td>187E–189B</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Peisistratus</td>
<td>189B–D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Demetrius Phalereus</td>
<td>189D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IID</strong> 18 Spartans</td>
<td><strong>189D–192C</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Lycurgus</td>
<td>189D–F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Charillus</td>
<td>189F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Teleclus</td>
<td>189F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Theopompus</td>
<td>189F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Archidamus Secundus</td>
<td>190A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Brasidas</td>
<td>190BC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Agis Secundus</td>
<td>190CD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>All editions present V and VI as two different apophthegms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Lysander</td>
<td>190D–F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Agesilaus</td>
<td>190F–191D</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nº</td>
<td>SECTION</td>
<td>PAGES</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>DEVIATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Archidamus Tertius</td>
<td>191D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Agis Tertius</td>
<td>191E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Cleomenes</td>
<td>191E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Pedaritus</td>
<td>191F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Damonidas</td>
<td>191F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Nicostratus</td>
<td>192A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Eudamidas</td>
<td>192AB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Antiochus Spartiates</td>
<td>192B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Antalcidas</td>
<td>192BC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Epameinondas</td>
<td>192C–194E</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Pelopidas</td>
<td>194C–E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>20 Romans</td>
<td>194E–208A</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Manius Curius</td>
<td>194EF</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Gaius Fabricius</td>
<td>194F–195B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Fabius Maximus</td>
<td>195C–196A</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Scipio Maior</td>
<td>196B–197A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Flamininus</td>
<td>197A–D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>All editions present IV and V as two different apophthegms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Gaius Domitius</td>
<td>197DE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Publius Licinius</td>
<td>197EF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Paulus Aemilius</td>
<td>197F–198D</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Cato Maior</td>
<td>198D–199E</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>All editions present I and II, VI and VII, and XVI and XVII as different apophthegms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Scipio Minor</td>
<td>199F–201F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>All editions present XX and XXI as two different apophthegms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Caecilius Metellus</td>
<td>201F–202A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Marius</td>
<td>202A–D</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Catulus Lutatius</td>
<td>202DE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Sulla</td>
<td>202E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Gaius Popillius</td>
<td>202E–203A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## I. A RESTRUCTURING OF THE COLLECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
<th>PAGES</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
<th>DEVIATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Lucullus</td>
<td>203AB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No editions split II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Pompeius</td>
<td>203B–204E</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>No editions split I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td>204E–205E</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>All editions present XIV and XV as two different apophthegms, but Na. seems inclined to join them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Caesar</td>
<td>205E–206F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>All editions present VI and VII as two different apophthegms, but Na. seems inclined to join them. IX and X require a redivision (cf. p. 264–265)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
<td>206F–208A</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II: The Collection and the Plutarchan Oeuvre

1 List of Parallel Passages

The following table lists which Plutarchan works contain an account of the apophthegm of *Reg. et imp. apophth.* in the left column. For the references to these other works, I mainly took the LCL text of Babbitt (1931) and the *Teubner* text of Nachstädt (1971) into account (except for stories in other Plutarchan works that are only remotely similar; stories that are partially told elsewhere, however, are included in this table).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Cyrus</em> (172EF)</td>
<td><em>Praec. ger. reip.</em> 821E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Darius</em> (172F–173B)</td>
<td><em>An seni</em> 792C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Semiramis (173AB)]</td>
<td>[I] V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Xerxes</em> (173BC)</td>
<td><em>De frat. am.</em> 488D–F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Artaxerxes Longimanus</em> (173DE)</td>
<td><em>Art. 1.1</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>De aud. poet.</em> 35F</td>
<td><em>De sera num.</em> 565A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cyrus Minor</em> (173EF)</td>
<td><em>Art. 6.2–4</em></td>
<td><em>Quaest. conv.</em> 620C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Artaxerxes Mnemon</em> (173F–174A)</td>
<td><em>Art. 5.6</em></td>
<td><em>Art. 4.5</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Parysatis (174A)]</td>
<td>[I] IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Orontes</em> (174B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Memnon</em> (174B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Reges Aegypti</em> (174C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Poltyx</em> (174C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Teres</em> (174CD)</td>
<td><em>An seni</em> 792C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cotys</em> (174D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Idanthyrsus</em> (174E)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anteas</em> (174EF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Scilurus</em> (174F)</td>
<td><em>De gar.</em> 511C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gelon</em> (175AB)</td>
<td><em>De sera num.</em> 552A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hiero (175BC)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>De cap. ex. inim. 90B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dionysius Maior (175C–176C)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Sol. 20.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>An seni 792C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dionysius Minor (176CD)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Tim. 15.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Agathocles (176EF)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>De se ipsum laud. 544BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dion (176F–177A)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De vit. pud. 530C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De coh. ira 458EF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>De sera num. 557C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Archelaus (177AB)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Alc. 1.5</td>
<td>Amatorius 770C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Philippos (177C–179C)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Alex. 3.8</td>
<td>Cons. ad Apoll. 105AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>De coh. ira 457EF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>An seni 790B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>De fortuna 97D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI–XVII</td>
<td>Praec. ger. reip. 806B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>De tuenda 123F–124A</td>
<td>Quaest. conv. 707B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII–XXIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVII</td>
<td>Con. praec. 143F</td>
<td>De coh. ira 457F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>De ad. et am. 68A</td>
<td>De Al. Magn. fort. 334CD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**
- The table lists the works of various authors, including Hiero (175BC), Dionysius Maior (175C–176C), Dionysius Minor (176CD), Agathocles (176EF), Dion (176F–177A), Archelaus (177AB), and Philippos (177C–179C).
- Each entry includes the author's name, the year(s) of composition, and the titles or references of the works listed in the table.
- The table format helps organize the information, making it easier to follow the collection and oeuvre of Plutarch's works.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| XXXI | Alex. 9.12–14  
*De ad. et am.* 70C |
| XXXII | Demetr. 42.7–8 |
| **Alexander (179D–181F)**<br>I | Alex. 5.4 |
| II | Alex. 4.10  
*De Al. Magn. fort.* 331AB |
| III |  |
| IV | Alex. 25.6–7 |
| V |  |
| VI |  |
| VII | Alex. 8.5  
*De Al. Magn. fort.* 331E |
| VIII |  |
| IX | Alex. 22.7–9  
*De tuenda* 127B  
*Non posse* 1099C |
| X | Thes. 5.4 |
| XI | Alex. 29.7–9 |
| XII |  |
| XIII |  |
| XIV | Alex. 39.8  
*De Al. Magn. fort.* 332F–333A  
*De Al. Magn. fort.* 340A |
| XV | Alex. 27.11 |
| XVI | Alex. 28.3  
*De Al. Magn. fort.* 341B |
| XVII |  |
| XVIII |  |
| XIX | *Amatorius* 760D |
| XX |  |
| XXI | Alex. 41.9–10  
*De Al. Magn. fort.* 339D |
| XXII |  |
| XXIII |  |
| XXIV | Alex. 59.1–5 |
| XXV | Alex. 58.3–4 |
| XXVI |  |
| XXVII |  |
| XXXIII |  |
| XXXIV | Galba 1.5  
*De Al. Magn. fort.* 336D–F |
| **Ptolemaeus (181F)** |  |
| I |  |
| **Antigonus Monophthalmus**<br>(182A–183A) |  |
| I |  |
| II |  |
| III |  |
| IV | Demetr. 28.10  
*De gar.* 506D |
| V | Demetr. 23.10 |
| VI |  |
| VII | *De Is. et Os.* 360D |
| VIII |  |
| IX |  |
| X | *De coh. ira* 457E |
| XI |  |
| XII |  |
| XIII |  |
| XIV |  |
| XV | *De vit. pud.* 531EF |
| XVI | Demetr. 8.2 |
| XVII | Quaest. conv. 668CD |
| XVIII | Demetr. 4 |
| **Demetrius Poliorcetes (183A–C)** |  |
| I–II | Demetr. 21–22 |
| III | Demetr. 34 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Antigonus Secundus (183CD)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Demetr. 51.1–2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Pel. 2.4&lt;br&gt;De se ipsum laud. 545B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>De vit. pud. 534C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Lysimachus (183DE)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>De tuenda 126EF&lt;br&gt;De sera 555DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Demetr. 12.9&lt;br&gt;De gar. 508C&lt;br&gt;De cur. 517B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Antipater (183EF)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Phoc. 1.3&lt;br&gt;De cap. div. 525C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Antiochus Tertius (183F)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Antiochus Hierax (184A)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>De frat. am. 489AB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Eumenes (184AB)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>De frat. am. 489EF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pyrrhus (184CD)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Pyrrh. 9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Pyrrh. 8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Pyrrh. 21.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Pyrrh. 23.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Pyrrh. 10.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Pyrrh. 8.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Antiochus Septimus (184D–F)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Themistocles (184F–185F)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Them. 3.4&lt;br&gt;The. 6.9&lt;br&gt;De prof. in virt. 84BC&lt;br&gt;De cap. ex inim. 92C&lt;br&gt;De sera num. 552B&lt;br&gt;Praec. ger. reip. 800C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>II</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Them. 6.1&lt;br&gt;Comp. Nic. et Crass. 3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Them. 11.2–3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Them. 11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Them. 13–16&lt;br&gt;Arist. 8–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Them. 18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Them. 18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Them. 5.6&lt;br&gt;De vit. pud. 534E&lt;br&gt;Praec. ger. reip. 807B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Them. 18.7&lt;br&gt;Ca. Ma. 8.4–5&lt;br&gt;De lib. educ. 1C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Them. 18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Them. 18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Them. 18.4&lt;br&gt;Them. 22.1&lt;br&gt;De se ipsum laud. 541E&lt;br&gt;Praec. ger. reip. 812B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Them. 11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XV–</td>
<td>Them. 29.4–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XVI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XVII</td>
<td>Them. 29.10&lt;br&gt;De Al. Magn. fort. 328EF&lt;br&gt;De exilio 602A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Myronides (185F–186A)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Aristides (186A–C)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Arist. 2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Arist. 7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Praec. ger. reip. 809B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Arist. 24.1–2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Arist. 3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pericles (186C)</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Quaest. conv. 620D&lt;br&gt;Praec. ger. reip. 813E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Per. 8.7&lt;br&gt;Dem. 1.2&lt;br&gt;Praec. ger. reip. 803A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>De vit. pud. 531CD&lt;br&gt;Praec. ger. reip. 808AB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| IV | Per. 38.4  
De se ipsum laud. 543BC |
| Alcibiades (186D–F) |  |
| I | Alc. 2.2–3 |
| II | Alc. 9.1–2 |
| III | Alc. 7.1 |
| IV | Alc. 7.3 |
| V |  |
| VI | Alc. 22.1 |
| VII | Alc. 22.3 |
| Lamachus (186F) |  |
| I |  |
| Iphicrates (186F–187B) |  |
| I |  |
| II |  |
| III |  |
| IV |  |
| V |  |
| VI | De fortuna 99E  
An virt. doc. 440B |
| Timotheus (187BC) |  |
| I | Sull. 6.5  
De Her. mal. 856B |
| II | Pel. 2.6 |
| III | An seni 788DE |
| Chabrias (187CD) |  |
| I |  |
| II |  |
| III |  |
| Hegesippus (187DE) |  |
| I |  |
| Pytheas (187E) |  |
| I | Praec. ger. reip. 804B |
| Phocion (187E–189B) |  |
| I | Phoc. 4.3 |
| II | Phoc. 5.8 |
| III | Phoc. 8.4 |
| IV | Phoc. 8.5 |
| V | Phoc. 9.1  
De vit. pud. 533A  
Praec. ger. reip. 822E |
| VI | Phoc. 9.8  
Praec. ger. reip. 811A |
| VII | Phoc. 10.9 |
| VIII | Phoc. 14 |
| IX | Phoc. 18.1–2 |
| X | Phoc. 21.1 |
| XI | Phoc. 22.6  
De coh. ira 459F |
| XII | Phoc. 23.2–6 |
| XIII | Phoc. 25.1–4 |
| XIV | Phoc. 28.1  
Phoc. 30.1 |
| XV | Phoc. 30.4 |
| XVI | Phoc. 30.3  
Agis 2.4  
De ad. et am. 64C  
Con. praec. 142BC  
De vit. pud. 532F–533A |
| XVII | Phoc. 36.1–2 |
| XVIII | Phoc. 36.3  
De se ipsum laud. 541C |
| XIX | Phoc. 36.4 |
| Peisistratus (189B–D) |  |
| I |  |
| II |  |
| III | De coh. ira 457F |
| IV |  |
| V | Ca. Ma. 24.7–8  
De frat. am. 480DE |
| Demetrius Phalereus (189D) |  |
| I |  |
| Lycurgus (189D–F) |  |
| I | Lyc. 22.2  
Lys. 1.2–3  
Apophth. Lac. 228E |
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| II   | Lyc. 19.7  
|      | Sept. sap. con. 155DE  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 228D  |
| III  | Lyc. 13.5  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 227BC  |
| IV   | Lyc. 19.9  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 228D  |
| V    | Lyc. 13.8–11  
|      | Ages. 26.2–5  
|      | Pel. 15.3  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 213F  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 217DE  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 227CD  |

### Charillus (189F)

| I    | Lyc. 20.2  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 232B  |
| II   | Apophth. Lac. 232C  |
| III  | Apophth. Lac. 230B  |

### Teleclus (189F)

| I    | Apophth. Lac. 232B  |

### Theopompus (189F)

| I    | Apophth. Lac. 221E  |

### Archidamus Secundus (190A)

| I    | Cleom. 48(27).3  
|      | Crass. 2.9  
|      | Dem. 17.4  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 219A  |

### Brasidas (190BC)

| I    | De prof. in virt. 79E  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 219C  |
| II   | Apophth. Lac. 219C  
|      | De sera num. 548C  |
| III  | Lyc. 25.8–9  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 219D  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 240C  |

### Agis Secundus (190CD)

| I    | Apophth. Lac. 215D  |
| II   | Apophth. Lac. 215D  |
| III  | Lyc. 20.6  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 215F  |
| IV   | Lyc. 20.5  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 216C  |

### V–VI  
| Lyc. 20.9  
| Apophth. Lac. 215D  |

### Lysander (190D–F)

| I    | Lys. 2.7–8  
|      | Con. praec. 141D  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 229A  |
| II   | Lys. 7.6  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 229B  |
| III  | Lys. 22.2  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 229C  |
| IV   | Lys. 22.5  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 229D  |
| V    | Lys. 22.3  
|      | De ad. et am. 71E  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 229C  |

### Agesilaus (190F–191D)

| I    | Apophth. Lac. 213C  |
| II   | Ages. 23.9  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 213C  
|      | De se ipsum laud. 545A  |
| III  | Ages. 23.8  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 213BC  |
| IV   | Ages. 13.6–7  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 209EF  |
| V    | Ages. 21.10  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 213A  |
| VI   | Ages. 16.6  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 211EF  |
| VII  | Apophth. Lac. 208F–209A  |
| VIII | Ages. 13.5  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 209E  
|      | Praec. ger. reip. 807F–808A  |
| IX   | Ages. 21.9  
|      | Lyc. 20.12  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 212F  |
| X    | Ages. 30.5–6  
|      | Comp. Ages. et Pomp. 2.3  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 214B  |
| XI   | Ages. 39.1–10  
|      | Apophth. Lac. 214F–215A  |
| XII  | Ages. 2.3–4  
<p>|      | Apophth. Lac. 215A  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Section/Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archidamus Tertius</td>
<td>191D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Apophth. Lac. 219A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agis Tertius</td>
<td>191E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Lyc. 19.4 Apophth. Lac. 216C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Apophth. Lac. 215CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleomenes</td>
<td>191E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Lyc. 20.14 Apophth. Lac. 224BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedaritus</td>
<td>191F</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Lyc. 25.6 Apophth. Lac. 231B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damonidas</td>
<td>191F</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Sept. sap. conv. 149A Apophth. Lac. 219E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicostratus</td>
<td>192A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>De vit. pud. 535AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eudamidas</td>
<td>192AB</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Apophth. Lac. 220D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Apophth. Lac. 220E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiochus Spartiates</td>
<td>192B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Apophth. Lac. 217F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antalcidas</td>
<td>192BC</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Apophth. Lac. 217D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Ages. 31.7 Apophth. Lac. 217D Praec. ger. reip. 810F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Apophth. Lac. 217DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epameinondas</td>
<td>192C–194C</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Bellone an pace 349C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Non posse 1099C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Praec. ger. reip. 808DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cor. 4.6 An seni 786D Non posse 1098AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>De genio Socr. 583F–584A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Praec. ger. reip. 810F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>De se ipsum laud. 545B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marc. 21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>De se ipsum laud. 540DE Praec. ger. reip. 799EF Praec. ger. reip. 817EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelopidas</td>
<td>194C–E</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Pel. 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Pel. 20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Pel. 17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Pel. 28.1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Pel. 28.5–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manius Curius</td>
<td>194EF</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Crass. 2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Ca. Ma. 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaius Fabricius</td>
<td>194F–195B</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Pyrrh. 18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Pyrrh. 20.2–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Pyrrh. 20.8–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IV–V</td>
<td>Pyrrh. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabius Maximus</td>
<td>195C–196A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Fab. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Fab. 8–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Fab. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Fab. 20.5–9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Fab. 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Fab. 23.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Fab. 24.1–4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scipio Maior (196B–197A)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI–VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Ca. Ma. 15.1–2
- De se ipsum laud. 540F–541A

**Flamininus (197A–D)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ia</th>
<th>Flam. 2.1–2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ib</td>
<td>Flam. 17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Flam. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flam. 13.5–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Flam. 17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Flam. 17.7–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Phil. 2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gaius Domitius (197DE)**

| I   |

**Publius Licinius (197EF)**

| I   |

**Paulus Aemilius (197F–198D)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>Aem. 6.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aem. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aem. 10.1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aem. 11.1–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Aem. 10.5–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Aem. 13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Aem. 13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Aem. 17.1–5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| VI  | Aem. 28.9   |
|     | Quaest. conv. 615EF |
| VII | Aem. 34.3   |
| VIII| Aem. 28.10–13|
| IX  | Aem. 35–36  |

**Cato Maior (198D–199E)**

<p>| I–II | Ca. Ma. 8.1–2 |
|      | De tuenda 131D|
|      | Quaest. conv. 668BC|
|      | De esu 996E   |
| III  |               |
| IV   | Ca. Ma. 8.16–17|
| V    |               |
| VI–VII | Ca. Ma. 9.5 |
|       | De vit. pud. 528F |
| VIII |               |
| IX   |               |
| X    | Ca. Ma. 19.16 |
|      | Praec. ger. reip. 820B |
| XI   |               |
| XII  |               |
| XIII |               |
| XIV  |               |
| XV   | Ca. Ma. 9.10  |
|      | An seni 784A  |
|      | De vit. aer. 829F |
| XVI–XVII |       |
| XVIII|               |
| XIX  |               |
| XX   | Ca. Ma. 8.8–9 |
| XXI  | Ca. Ma. 8.11  |
| XXII | Ca. Ma. 16.4–8|
| XXIII| Ca. Ma. 1.8   |
|      | Cor. 8.3     |
| XXIV | Ca. Ma. 10.1–2|
| XXV  | Ca. Ma. 10.3–4|
| XXVI | Ca. Ma. 10.4–6|
| XXVII| Ca. Ma. 10.6  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXVIII</td>
<td>Ca. Ma. 9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIX</td>
<td>Ca. Ma. 12.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scipio Minor (199F–201F)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Quaest. conv. 659EF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Ca. Ma. 27.5–7 Praec. ger. reip. 804F–805A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>De fortuna 97D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Aem. 38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX–XXI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catulus Lutatius (202DE)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Mar. 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sulla (202E)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Sull. 6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gaia Popillius (202E–203A)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lucullus (203AB)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Luc. 27.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIb</td>
<td>Luc. 28.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pompeius (203B–204E)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ia</td>
<td>Pomp. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ib</td>
<td>Pomp. 6–7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Pomp. 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Pomp. 10.11–13 Praec. ger. reip. 815EF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Pomp. 11–12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Pomp. 14.2–4 Crass. 7.1 Praec. ger. reip. 804EF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Pomp. 22.5–9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Pomp. 20.7–8 Sert. 27.1–5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Pomp. 33.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Pomp. 48.6–7 Luc. 38.5 An seni 785E–786A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Pomp. 2.11–12 Luc. 40.2 An seni 786A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Pomp. 50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Pomp. 51.6–8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Pomp. 60.8 Ca. Mi. 52.2–3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>Pomp. 54.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>Pomp. 78–79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cicero (204E–205E)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Cic. 1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Cic. 1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caecilius Metellus (201F–202A)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>De gar. 506D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marius (202A–D)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Mar. 3–5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Mar. 6.5–7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Mar. 14.1–3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Mar. 18.4–8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Mar. 28.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Mar. 33.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III</th>
<th>Cic. 5.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Cic. 7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| V    | Cic. 26.6  
  *De se ipsum laud.*  
  541F–542A |
| VI   | Cic. 26.9–10 |
| VII  | Cic. 26.11 |
| VIII | Cic. 26.3 |
| IX   | Cic. 26.5  
  *Quaest. conv.* 631D |
| X    | Cic. 26.9 |
| XI   | Cic. 7.8 |
| XII  | Cic. 27.4 |
| XIII | Cic. 27.6 |
| XIV–XV | Cic. 37.3 (XIV)  
  *Pomp.* 63.1 (XV) |
| XVI  | Cic. 38.5 |
| XVII | Cic. 38.7 |
| XVIII| Cic. 40.4–5  
  *De cap. ex inim.* 91A |
| XX   | Cic. 40.4–5  
  *De cap. ex inim.* 91A |
| XXI  | Cassius 205E–206F |
| I    | Caes. 1–2 |
| II   | Caes. 7.1–3 |
| III  | Caes. 10.8–9  
  Cic. 29.9 |
| IV   | Caes. 11.3 |
| V    | Caes. 11.2 |
| VI–VII | Caes. 32.8  
  *Pomp.* 60.2 |
| VIII | Caes. 35.9–10  
  *Pomp.* 62.1 |
| IX–Xa| Caes. 38  
  *De fort. Rom.* 319B–D |
| Xb   | Caes. 39.8  
  *Pomp.* 65.7–8 |
| XI   | Caes. 44.7–8  
  *Pomp.* 69.5 |
| XII  | Caes. 50.3 |
| XIII | Caes. 54.2  
  *Ca. Mi.* 72.2 |
| XIV  | Caes. 62.10  
  *Ant.* 11.6  
  *Brut.* 8.2 |
| XV   | Caes. 63.7 |
| *Augustus (206F–208A)* |
| I    | *Ant.* 16.1–5  
  *Brut.* 22.2–3  
  Cic. 43.8 |
| II   | *Rom.* 17.3 |
| III  | *Ant.* 80.1–2  
  *Praec. ger. reip.* 814D |
| IV   | *V* |
| V    | *VI* |
| VI   | *VII* |
| VII  | *VIII* |
| VIII | *IX* |
| IX   | *X*  
  *De fort. Rom.* 319DE |
| X    | *XI* |
| XII  | *XII*  
  *An seni* 784D |
| XIII | *XIII* |
| XIV  | *XIV* |
| XV   | *XV* |
2 Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata and the Parallel Lives

Based on the table presented above, some important conclusions can be drawn with respect to the connection between Reg. et imp. apophth. and the Parallel Lives. These — in general — support the position of Verdegem that the Greek sections (and, I add, the barbarian apophthegms) were taken from a larger collection of apophthegms, of which Apophth. Lac. would have been part, compiled from Plutarch’s early literary career on (and also used for the Moralia), while the Roman sections were mainly based on a draft for the Parallel Lives.1212

2.1 The Barbarian and Greek Sections and the Parallel Lives

All fifteen barbarians (172E–174F), except for Artaxerxes Mnemon (173F–174A), are not the subject of a Life. This also goes for all six Sicilians (175A–177A), except for Dion (176F–177A; only one apophthegm), and all fourteen Macedonians (177A–184F), with the exception of Alexander (179D–181F), Demetrius Poliorcetes (183A–C; only two apophthegms), and Pyrrhus (184CD). In the Athenian section (184F–189D), Myronides (185F–186A), Lamachus (186F), Iphicrates (186F–187B), Timotheus (187BC), Chabrias (187CD), Hegesippus (187DE), and Pytheas (187E) do not have a Life; the Spartan section (189D–192C) contains even many more examples.

Of all sections on a subject of a Life, the connection between the biography and the collection is least clear in Alexander (179D–181F): of its 34 apophthegms, only sixteen occur in the Life in a very different order, and eleven are found in the Moralia or other Lives. Of the sixteen items in Themistocles (184F–185F), only one is lacking in the Life, where the order of the other apophthegms is slightly different, and seven occur in the Moralia or other Lives. Aristeides (186A–C) contains five apophthegms, four of which are told in the Life in a slightly different order, whereas the other one occurs in the Moralia. Only two of the five apophthegms in Pericles (186C) are also told in the Life, but all occur in the Moralia. In the seven items of Alcibiades (186D–F), one is absent from the Life, where the order of the remaining six is slightly different.1213 Five of the nineteen apophthegms in Phocion (187E–189B) are told in the Moralia, but all of them occur in the Life in more or less the same order. As to the three Spartan sections who have a Life, Lycurgus (189D–F), Lysander (190D–F), and Agesilaus (190F–191D) all seem to be based on Apophth. Lac. (this is also supported by section 3 of this Appendix), and various apophthegms are told in the Moralia. In the case of Pelopidas (194C–E),

---

1213 See Verdegem (2010) passim for a comparison of the section and Alc.
the first five of six apophthegms occur in Pel. in a slightly different order. None are found in the Moralia.

All of this suggests that Stadier is correct about the type of notes used for the barbarian and Greek part of the collection: a large compilation of apophthegms, of which Apophth. Lac. would have been part, seems to have formed the basis of this portion of Reg. et imp. apophth. Yet the connection between the Lives and the apophthegm collection seems closer in the case of Pyrrhus (184CD). For the composition of this section, then, Plutarch might have used a draft compiled for the Lives. An observation by Pelling is relevant here: some of the later Greek Lives – Philopoemen, perhaps, or Timoleon, or Pyrrhus – might be more similar to the Roman biographies: periods where his [Plutarch’s] general knowledge might carry him less far, where more systematic research would be necessary.

The connection between Pyrrhus (184CD) and Pyrrh., which suggests that (at least the preparation of) Pyrrh.–Mar. predates Reg. et imp. apophth., is in line with the observations on Marius (202A–D) and Gaius Fabricius (194F–195B) presented in Part I, chapter 2 (and Appendix III).

2.2 The Roman Sections and the Parallel Lives

Of the 20 Romans, only the short sections on Manius Curius (194EF; two apophthegms), Publius Licinius (197EF; one apophthegm), and Gaius Popillius (202E–203A; one apophthegm) do not have a Life. Other sections without a biography are related to a Life on another subject: Gaius Fabricius (194F–195B) contains four apophthegms from Pyrrh. (in the same order); the one item of Catulus Lutatius (202DE) occurs in Mar. 23; Schmidt thinks that the apophthegm of Gaius Domitius (197DE) was part of the Life of Scipio Maior, and that the three apophthegms of Caecilius Metellus (201F–202A) occurred in the Life of Scipio Minor.

The connection between the Roman sections and their corresponding Lives is very close. All apophthegms occur in the Life, with the exception of Lucullus IIa (203AB), and Flamininus V (197CD), which describes Phi-

\[\text{1214} \text{Stadier (2014b).} \]
\[\text{1215 Pelling (2002) 25 (= (1979) 96).} \]
\[\text{1216 Schmidt, C. (1879) 30–48 (also arguing that the apophthegms of Epameinondas [192C–194C], Scipio Maior [196B–197A], and Scipio Minor [199F–201F] would have occurred in their corresponding Lives, now lost). See Babbitt (1931) 197 on Caecilius Metellus (201F–202A): “Distinguished Roman general, consul 143 B.C.; sometimes confused with Q. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus, whose life Plutarch either wrote or intended to write (Life of Marius, chap. xxix.).” Perhaps, then, these sayings are related to the lost Life of Metellus (if it existed) instead of to the Life of Scipio Minor.} \]
lopoemen’s physical appearance and is therefore told in Phil. 2.6 (the Life of the contemporary Greek paired with Flam.). There are only a few clear deviations from the order of the apophthegms in the Life: Flamininus Ib (197A), which maintains the chronological order,\textsuperscript{1217} Paulus Aemilius VIII (198BC) because all apophthegms on the campaign against Perseus are put together (I–VII, 197F–198A), and Pompeius VII (204A), X (204B), and XIV (204D). Some apophthegms even read as summaries of chapters of the Life. Clear examples of this occur in Fabius Maximus (195C–196A): I summarises Fab. 5; II contains elements from 8–12; III is much more developed in 19; IV in 20; etc.\textsuperscript{1218} In addition, only fourteen of the 121 Roman apophthegms (without Cato Maior and Cicero, cf. infra) occur in the Moralia. As expected, some apophthegms occur in more Lives that concern the same period and milieu: in the case of the Romans of the end of the Republic, various apophthegms are shared by Ant., Brut., Caes., Ca. Mi., Cic., and Pomp., since Caesar III (206AB) occurs in Caes. 10.8–9 and Cic. 29.9; VII (206BC) in Caes. 32.8 and Pomp. 60.3–4; VIII (206C) in Caes. 35.9–10 and Pomp. 62.1; X (206D) in Caes. 39.8 and Pomp. 65.7–8; XI (206DE) in Caes. 44.7–8 and Pomp. 69.7–8; XIII (206E) in Caes. 54.2 and Ca. Mi. 72.2; and XIV (206E) in Caes. 62.10, Ant. 11.6, and Brut. 8.2.

Plutarch therefore indeed seems to have used the drafts for his Roman Lives for the Roman sections in the collection, as argued by Pelling,\textsuperscript{1219} but there are two exceptions: Cato Maior (198D–199E) and Cicero (204E–205E). Twelve of the 29 apophthegms in Cato Maior do not occur in Ca. Ma., four are also told in the Moralia, and the order of the apophthegms differs significantly from that of the Life. In the (less striking) case of Cicero, three of its 21 apophthegms do not occur in Cic., nor in any other Plutarchan work, and three are also found in the Moralia (the order of apophthegms in Cicero, however, is almost exactly the same as in Cic.). The connection between these sections and the Parallel Lives, then, is far less significant than in the case of the other Romans, especially in Cato Maior. This is not surprising. In antiquity, collections of sayings by Cato Maior and Cicero (probably compiled by Tiro) circulated.\textsuperscript{1220} Plutarch must have made use of them, as the many apophthegms in Ca. Ma. (e.g. chapters 8–9) and Cic. (e.g. chapters 26–27) and the corresponding sections in Reg. et imp. apophth. testify.\textsuperscript{1221} Based on these

\textsuperscript{1217} In Ib, Flamininus has a meeting with Philip, who is defeated in II.

\textsuperscript{1218} Cf. Schmidt, C. (1879) 26 on the difference in length between Greek and Roman apophthegms in the collection.

\textsuperscript{1219} Pelling (2002) 65–90.

\textsuperscript{1220} Kelsey (1907) 7: “After Cicero’s death a collection of his witticisms was circulated, arranged in three books; by some it was thought to be the work of his freedman Tiro”.

\textsuperscript{1221} Cf. Smith (1940a) 154 on the sources of Cicero’s De senectute and Plutarch’s Ca. Ma.: “Both were dependent on biographical sources whose origins may be dated to that
collections, the Chaeronean could have made his own collection, similar to *Apophth. Lac.*, from which he could select and reorder different material when composing the biographies, the sections in *Reg. et imp. apophth.*, or any other text of the *Moralia*. The process of composition of *Cato Maior* and *Cicero* thus might have resembled that of the barbarian and Greek sections, although this is less clear in the case of the orator. A suggestion of Pelling concerning his section could be correct as well:

The obvious explanation is that the ὑπόμνημα gathered a large number of such stories, and that later two separate, independent selections were made, one by Plutarch for the various clusters in the Life and one for the *Apophthegmata*. (Nor is it difficult to guess where most of this material originally came from: Tiro collected three books of Cicero’s witticisms in his *de iocis*, and also wrote a biography which presumably included much of the same material.)

### 3 Apophthegms Occurring in Two Other Plutarchan Works

The following table cites the apophthegms of *Reg. et imp. apophth.* (left column) that occur in at least two other works of Plutarch (right column). The account of *Reg. et imp. apophth.* is referred to as version A; the second, third, etc. other accounts as versions B, C, etc. When B and C share elements absent from A, it is unlikely that A was the source of B and C. When A and B share one set of elements, and A and C another one, A can hardly have been based on B or C. The most plausible option in such cases, then, is that A, B, and C are based on the same source, version X (probably a note of Plutarch’s archive). Connections between apophthegms are highlighted as follows:

1. *In italics:* word(s) or phrase(s) shared by all accounts.
2. *In bold:* word(s) or phrase(s) shared by A and at least one but not all of the other accounts.

---

Underlined: word(s) or phrase(s) absent from A but present in two or more of the other accounts.

The remaining words or phrases are only present in that specific version of the apophthegm.

Below the Reg. et imp. apophth. version a short note describes the relationship between all accounts on the basis of their significant similarities and differences. These notes take the following form: “X>ABC”, which means that X (a preliminary note of Plutarch) was probably the source of A, B, and C. Sometimes, it seems possible that one of the accounts was the source of all other versions (cf. the first case of Artaxerxes Longimanus III, 173D). I have always tried to include all possibilities in the note for the sake of completeness, e.g.: “X>ABC or A>BC” (this does not mean that A was the source of B and C, but rather that A was a more or less exact copy of X). I applied a different practice in the Spartan part: the account of Apophth. Lac. often seems to have been the source of the other accounts.

Below the Reg. et imp. apophth. version a short note describes the relationship between all accounts on the basis of their significant similarities and differences. These notes take the following form: “X>ABC”, which means that X (a preliminary note of Plutarch) was probably the source of A, B, and C. Sometimes, it seems possible that one of the accounts was the source of all other versions (cf. the first case of Artaxerxes Longimanus III, 173D). I have always tried to include all possibilities in the note for the sake of completeness, e.g.: “X>ABC or A>BC” (this does not mean that A was the source of B and C, but rather that A was a more or less exact copy of X). I applied a different practice in the Spartan part: the account of Apophth. Lac. often seems to have been the source of the other accounts.\footnote{In line with Stadter (2014b) 666–674.}

\textbf{Reg. et imp. apophth. version} \hspace{1cm} \textbf{Other Plutarchan versions}

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
Α Πρώτος δὲ τοῖς ἁμαρτάνονσι \hspace{0.5cm} Β καθάπερ γὰρ οἱ τὰ ἱμάτια μαστιγοῦντες οὐχ ἀποθεμένων. \\
τῶν ἡγεμονικῶν τιμωρίαν \hspace{0.5cm} τὸ σῶμα
έταξεν, ἀντὶ τοῦ \hspace{0.5cm} καθάπερ γὰρ οἱ τὸ σῶμα
τὸ σῶμα μαστιγοῦσθαι καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν \hspace{0.5cm} μαστιγοῦσθαι
ἀποτίλλεσθαι μαστιγοῦσθαι \hspace{0.5cm} μὲν ἀποδυσαμένων τὰ ἱμάτια,
μὴ μαστιγοῦσθαι \hspace{0.5cm} τιὰραν
τὴν κεφαλὴν \hspace{0.5cm} τὰ τιάραν
παρυσαμένων. \hspace{0.5cm} ἀποθεμένων.
\textit{Artaxerxes Longimanus} III \hspace{0.5cm} \textit{De aud. poet. 35F}
(173D) \hspace{0.5cm} C ὡς γὰρ ἐν Πέρσαις τὸν κολαζομένων τὰ ἱμάτια
X>ABC or A>BC \hspace{0.5cm} καὶ τὰς τιάρας ἀποτύλλονσι καὶ μαστιγοῦσιν
\textit{De sera num. 565A} \hline
Α Κῦρος ὁ νεώτερος τοὺς \hspace{0.5cm} Β οὐχ ἦττον οὖν τοῖς ἄνω πιστεύων ὁ Κῦρος
Λακεδαιμονίους συμμαχεῖν αὐτῶν \hspace{0.5cm} ἢ τοῖς περὶ αὐτόν, ἐπεχείρει τῷ πολέμῳ· καὶ
παρακαλῶν ἔλεγε τὸ ἄδελφον \hspace{0.5cm} ἐπεχείρει τῷ πολέμῳ· καὶ
καρδίαν ἔχειν \hspace{0.5cm} ἐκείνον \hspace{0.5cm} ἐκείνον \hspace{0.5cm} ἐκείνον
πλείον πίνειν \hspace{0.5cm} καὶ \hspace{0.5cm} ἐκείνον \hspace{0.5cm} καὶ \hspace{0.5cm} ἐκείνον
άκρατον \hspace{0.5cm} πέρι \hspace{0.5cm} πέρι
καὶ \hspace{0.5cm} καὶ \hspace{0.5cm} καὶ \hspace{0.5cm} καὶ
φέρειν βέλτιον· ἐκείνον \hspace{0.5cm} φέρειν βέλτιον· ἐκείνον \hspace{0.5cm} ἐκείνον
μόλις \hspace{0.5cm} οὐκ \hspace{0.5cm} οὐκ \hspace{0.5cm} οὐκ
ἐπὶ \hspace{0.5cm} ἐπὶ \hspace{0.5cm} ἐπὶ \hspace{0.5cm} ἐπὶ \\
τῶν \hspace{0.5cm} τῶν \hspace{0.5cm} τῶν \hspace{0.5cm} τῶν
\end{tabular}

\footnote{The presence of articles and the difference between forms of λέγω and φημί and other verbs with similar meanings that are perfectly interchangeable are not proof of a closer relationship between two or more accounts. The same goes, I believe, for cases such as βελτίων, κρέεττον, or ἄμείνον (e.g. Alexander IX, 180A).}
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A Ισμηνίαν δὲ τὸν ἄριστον αὐλητήν λαβὼν αἰχμάλωτον ἐκέλευσεν αὐλῆσαι· θαυμαζόντων δὲ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ κροτούντων, αὐτὸς ὤμοσεν ἥδιον ἀκούειν τοῦ ἵππου χρεμετίζοντος.

Antaeus III (174EF)
X>ABC or B>AC

A Δίων ὁ Διονύσιον ἐκβαλὼν ἐκ τῆς τυραννίδος, ἀκούσας ἐπιβουλεύειν Κάλλιππον, ὃς μάλιστα τῶν φίλων καὶ ξένων ἐπίστευεν, οὐχ ὑπέμεινεν ἐλέγξαι, βέλτιον εἶναι φήσας ἀποθανεῖν ἢ ζῆν μὴ μόνον τοὺς πολεμίους ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς φίλους φυλαττόμενον.

Dion (176F–177A)
X>ABC

A Τοῦ δ' Εὐριπίδου τὸν καλὸν Ἀγάθωνα περιλαμβάνοντος ἐν τῷ συμπόσιο καὶ καταφιλοῦντος ἡδὴ γενειῶντα, πρὸς τοὺς φίλους εἶπε ἡμῖν ἦταν ἡθικὴ γένεσις: τοὺς γάρ καλὸν καὶ τὸ μετόπωρον καλὸν ἔστιν.'

Archeleaus III (177AB)
B is only a short reference to the story.
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ἄριθμόν, ἄλλα μέτρον ἔσεσθαι. μεγαληγορῶν δὲ περὶ αὐτοῦ πολλά, καὶ καρδιάν ἔφη τοῦ ἀδέλφου φορεῖν βαρυτέραν, καὶ φιλοσοφεῖν μᾶλλον, καὶ μαγεύειν βέλτιον, οὖν δὲ πλείονα πίνειν καὶ φέρειν· ἐκεῖνον δ᾽ ὑπὸ δειλίας καὶ μαλακίας ἐν μὲν τοῖς κυνηγεσίοις μηδ᾽ ἐφ᾽ ἦπου, ἐν δὲ τοῖς κυνηγεσίοις μηδ᾽ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου καθήσατο.

Art. 6.2–4
C ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ὁ Κῦρος ἔλεγεν πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους γράφων, ὅτι τὰ τ᾽ ἄλλα τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ βασιλικώτερος εἴη καὶ φέροι καλῶς πολὺ ἄκρατον· De Al. Magn. fort. 334B
C Ἀτέαν, ὃς Ἰσμηνίου τοῦ αὐλητοῦ ληφθέντος αἰχμαλώτου καὶ παρὰ πότον ἀκούειν τοῦ ἵππου χρεμετίζοντος; Non posse 1095F

A Ὁ Διονύσιον ἐκβαλὼν ἐκ τῆς τυραννίδος, ἀκούσας ἐπιβουλεύειν Κάλλιππον, ὃς μάλιστα τῶν φίλων καὶ ξένων ἐπίστευεν, οὐχ ὑπέμεινεν ἐλέγξαι, βέλτιον εἶναι φήσας ἀποθανεῖν ἢ ζῆν μὴ μόνον τοὺς πολεμίους ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς φίλους φυλαττόμενον.

Dion (176F–177A)
X>ABC

Α Ταῖνιάν ἡμεῖς ἔριζον καλὸν Ἀγάθωνα, περιλαμβάνοντος ἐν τῷ συμπόσιο καὶ καταφιλοῦντος ἡδὴ γενειῶντα, πρὸς τοὺς φίλους εἶπε ἡμῖν ἦταν ἡθικὴ γένεσις: τοὺς γάρ καλὸν καὶ τὸ μετόπωρον καλὸν ἔστιν.' Archelaus III (177AB)
B is only a short reference to the story.

A Τοῦ δ’ Εὐριπίδου τὸν καλὸν Ἁγάθωνα περιλαμβάνοντος ἐν τῷ συμπόσιο καὶ καταφιλοῦντος ἡδὴ γενειῶντα, πρὸς τοὺς φίλους εἶπε ἡμῖν ἦταν ἡθικὴ γένεσις: τοὺς γάρ καλὸν καὶ τὸ μετόπωρον καλὸν ἔστιν.’

Archeleaus III (177AB)
B is only a short reference to the story.
Α Πολλῶν δὲ κατορθωμάτων αὐτῷ καὶ καλῶν ἐν μίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιτέθην, τὸν τοποτὸν δὲ τούτον καὶ τηλικοῦτον ἀγαθῶν ποίησον.

Πhilippus ΠΔΙ (177C)

X>ABC or C>AB

Β Φιλίππης δ’ ἀρτι Ποτείδαιαν ἠρηκότι Πολλῶν δὲ κατορθωμάτων αὐτῷ καὶ καλῶν ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ προσαγγελθέντων, 'ὦ τύχη' εἶπε, 'μικρὸν τι μοι κακὸν ἀντὶ τῶν τοσούτων καὶ τηλικοῦτων ἀγαθῶν ποίησον.'

C Φιλίππω δ' ἄρτι Ποτείδαιαν ᾑρηκότι τρεῖς ἧκον ἀγγελίαι κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον, ἡ μὲν Ἰλλυριοὺς ἡττῆσθαι μάχῃ μεγάλῃ διά Παρμενίδου, ἡ δ' Ὀλυμπίαν ὑπ’ ἕνα καιρόν κέλητι νενικηκέναι, τρίτη δὲ περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου γενέσεως.

Alex. 3.8

C Φίλιππος δ’ ὁ τῶν Μακεδόνων βασιλεὺς τριῶν αὐτῷ προσαγγελθέντων εὐτυχημάτων ὑφ’ ἕνα καιρόν, πρώτου μὲν ὅτι τεθρίππῳ νενίκηκε Παρμενίων, δευτέρου δὲ ὅτι Ὀλυμπία άππῳ κέλητι νενικηκέναι, τρίτου δ’ ὅτι ἄρρεν αὐτῷ παιδίον τέτοκεν ἡ Ὀλυμπιάς, ἀνατείνας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν τὰς χεῖρας 'ὦ δαῖμον' εἶπε, 'μέτριόν τούτοις ἀντὶ θες ἐλάττωμα', εἰδὼς ὅτι τοῖς μεγάλοις εὐτυχήμασι φθονεῖν πέφυκεν ἡ τύχη.

Cons. ad Apoll. 105AB

A Ἐπεὶ δὲ ὑπό τινος ξένου κληθεὶς ἐπὶ δεῖπνον ἐν ὁδῷ πολλοὺς ἐπήγετο καὶ τὸν ξένον θορυβούμενον (ἦν γὰρ οὐχ ἱκανὰ τὰ παρεσκευασμένα), προσ πέμπων τῶν φίλων ἑκάστῳ, πλακοῦντι χώραν ἐκέλευεν ἀπολιπέσαι. οἱ δὲ πειθόμενοι καὶ προσδοκῶντες οὐκ ἠσθιοῦν πολλά, καὶ πᾶσιν οὕτως ἠρκεσεν.

Philippus ΧΧ (178D)

X>ABC

A Ἀγανακτούντων δὲ τῶν φίλων, ὅτι συρίττουσιν αὐτὸν ἐν Ὀλυμπίοις εὖ πεποθότες οἱ Πελοποννήσιοι, 'τί οὖν' εἶπεν, 'ἐὰν κακῶς παθήσῃς;' Φιλίππης ΧΧΧΧ (179A)

C is not told about Philippus, but something similar to C could have been the source of A, B, and D: X>ABD

Β καὶ πρόχειρον ἔχειν τὸ τοῦ Φιλίππου. λέγεται γὰρ ἐκείνοι ὑπὸ τῶν φίλων παροξυσμένοις ἐπὶ τοῦς Ἐλλήνας ὡς εἰ πάσχωσαν καὶ κακῶς αὐτὸν λέγοντας εἰπεῖν 'τὶ οὖν, ἄν [καὶ] κακῶς ποιῶμεν αὐτοῦς.'

Con. prac. 143F

C Τὸν δὲ φυγάδων αὐτὸν προτρεπομένον ἐπὶ τοῦς Αθηναίους ἄγειν τὴν στρατιὰν λεγόντων τοῖς Ἐλλήνας ὡς εἰ πάσχωσαν καὶ κακῶς αὐτὸν λέγοντας εἰπεῖν 'τὶ οὖν, ἄν [καὶ] κακῶς ποιῶμεν αὐτῶς.'

Apophth. Lac. 230D
Α Ψάλτην δὲ τινα βουλομένου παρά δείπνων ἐπανορθοῦν αὐτοῦ καὶ λαλεῖν περὶ κρουμάτων ὁ ψάλτης. τιμῇ γένοιτο σοι! ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα τῆς Ἠδύνης, ἂς οἴμοι λέγοντας, ἵνα ταῦτ' ἐμοὶ βέλτιον εἴδηζι.

*Philippus XXX (179B)*

A similar story is told in *Con. praec.* 144B about Gorgias.

Σ' εὐθὺς ὁ μὲν ψάλτης οὐκ ἀπιθάνως οὐδ' ἀμούσως ἐπεστόμισε τὸν Φίλιππον ἐπιχειροῦντα περὶ κρουμάτων διαφέρεσθαι πρὸς αὐτὸν, εἰπὼν, "μὴ γένοιτο σοι οὔτος ὁ βασιλεὺς κακῶς, ἵν' ἐμοὶ ταῦτ' εἰδῇς·" οἷον ἐστὶν, ἄσπασα δὲ τῆς ὁμοφροσύνης τῆς Ἑλλάδος, ὃς τὸν οἶκον τὸν σεαυτοῦ τοσαύτης καὶ κακῶν ἐμπέπληκας." οὕτω δὲ συμφρονήσας ὁ Φίλιππος ἔπεμψε καὶ κατήγαγε πείσας διὰ τοῦ Δημαράτου τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον.

*Alex. 9.12–14*

Σ' ἐπεί δὲ διενεχθέντος αὐτοῦ πρὸς Ὀλυμπιάδα τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἦκε Δημάρατος ὁ Κορίνθιος, ἐπενθαύνετο, πόσα πρὸς ἄλλης ἔχουσιν <ὁμονοίας> οἱ Ἑλληνες καὶ ὁ Δημάρατος "πάνω γοῦν" ἐφε' "σοι περὶ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὁμονοίας ὁ λόγος ἐστί, οὕτω πρὸς σε τῶν οἰκειοτάτων ἐχόντων." οἱ δὲ συμφρονήσας ἐπαύσατο τῆς ὀργῆς καὶ διηλλάγη πρὸς αὐτοὺς.

*Philippus XXXI (179BC)*

A similar story is told in *Con. praec.* 144B about Gorgias.
Appendices

A Ἐλαφρὸς δ’ ὦν καὶ ποδώκης [καὶ] παρακαλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς Ὀλυμπία<σιν> δραμεῖ στάδιον, 'έγε' ἐφα 'βασιλεῖς ἐξειν ἐμέλλον ἀνταγωνιστάς.'

Alexander II (179D)

X>ABC or A>BC or B>AC

A Τῆς δὲ τῶν Καρῶν βασιλισσῆς Ἀδας ὅψα καὶ πέμματα παρεσκευασμένα περιττῶς διὰ δημιουργῶν καὶ μαγείρων φιλοτιμουμένης αἰεί πέμπειν πρὸς αὐτῶν ἐφα κρείττονας ἔχειν αὐτῶς ὀψοποιοὺς, πρὸς μὲν ἄριστον τὴν νυκτοπορίαν πρὸς δὲ δεῖπνον τὴν ὀλιγαριστίαν.

Alexander IX (180A)

X>ABCD or A>BCD or B>AC

A ἔως γὰρ ἀπὸ παντὸς οὔτε πάσαν ἡγάμα δόξαν, ὡς Φίλιππος λόγου τε δεινότητι σοφιστικῶς καλλοπιζόμενος, καὶ τὰς ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ νίκας τῶν ἀρμάτων ἐγχαράττων τοῖς νομίσμασι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν ἀποπειρωμένον, εἰ βουλοῦτ’ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ὀλυμπίασι ἀγωνίσασθαι στάδιον, ἴν γὰρ ποδώκης, "εἰ γε" ἐφα "βασιλεῖς ἐμέλλον ἐξειν ἀνταγωνιστάς."

Alex. 4.9–10

C ὁ μέντοι πρὸς φιλοσοφίαν ἐμπεφυκὼς καὶ συντεθραμμένος ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς αὐτῷ ζῆλος καὶ πόθος οὐκ ἐξερρύη τῆς ψυχῆς, ὡς ἡ περὶ Ἀνάξαρχον τε τιμὴ καὶ τὰ πεμφθέντα Ξενοκράτει πεντήκοντα τάλαντα καὶ Δάνδαμις καὶ Καλανός οὕτω σπουδασθέντες μαρτυροῦσι.

Alex. 8.5

C καὶ πῶς μὲν εἶχε πρὸς Ἀριστοτέλην εἴρηται καὶ ὅτι τὸν μὲν ἁρμονικὸν Ἀνάξαρχον ἐντιμότατον τῶν φίλων ἐνόμιζε· Πύρρωνι δὲ τῷ Ἠλείῳ πρῶτον μυρίους χρυσοῦς ἔδωκε, Ξενοκράτει δὲ τῷ Πλάτωνος συνήθει πεντήκοντα τάλαντα δωρεὰν ἐπέμψεν· Ὀνησίκριτον δὲ τὸν Διογένους τοῦ Κυνὸς μαθητὴν ὃτι ἄρχοντα τῶν κυβερνητῶν κατέστησεν, ὧν πλειόνων ἰστόρηται.

De Al. Magn. fort. 331E

Τῆς δὲ τῶν Ἁλίφου δ’ ἔτη καὶ πολλῆς ἔμφασεν ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς Ὀλυμπία<σιν> ἐγκρατέστατος, καὶ τοὔτ’ ἄλλος τε πολλοῖς ἐδώλος καὶ τοὺς ἄλλος ἀγάπην τοῖς ἀριστοτέοις, ἑκατὸν αἰτεῖ τάλαντα, 'καλῶς' ἔφη 'ποιεῖ γινώσκων ὅτι φίλον ἔχει καὶ δυνάμενον τηλικαῦτα δωρεῖσθαι καὶ βουλόμενον.'
Δέλεται δὲ καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος εἰπεῖν τοὺς τῆς Ἀδας ὀψοποιοὺς ἀποστέλλων, ὡς ἔχει θελλιόνας ἀεὶ σὺν αὐτῷ, πρὸς μὲν τὸ ἄριστον τὴν νυκτοπορίαν, πρὸς δὲ τὸ δείπνον τὴν ὀλιγαριστίαν.

De tuenda 127B

ὅπου καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ἀπεώσατο τῆς Ἀδας τοὺς μαγείρους αὐτὸς εἰπὼν ἔχειν ἀμείνονας ὀψοποιοὺς, πρὸς μὲν ἄριστον τὴν νυκτοπορίαν πρὸς δὲ δείπνον τὴν ὀλιγαριστίαν.

Non posse 1099C

Ἀ Ἑπιστολὴν δὲ παρὰ τῆς μητρὸς ἁγιανίας ἀναγινώσκων αἰτίας ἀπορρήτους ἀρέσκον τῷ Ἑρασίωτος ὀδοπέρ εἰόθει συναναγινώσκοντος, ὥσπερ ἔδινεν ἀφελότατος τὸν ἑαυτοῦ στόματι τὴν σφραγῖδα ἐπέθηκεν. Αἰγ. 39.8

ἐπιστολὴν δὲ ποτὲ τῆς μητρὸς ἀπορρήτου διερχομένης, Ἑρασίωτος ὥσπερ ἔδινεν παρακαθημένου καὶ ἁπλῶς συναναγινώσκοντος, οὐκ ἐκώλυσεν, ὡς δ' ἀνέγνω, τὸν δακτύλιον ἀφελότατος τὸν αὐτοῦ προσέθηκε τῷ Ἡφαιστίωνος στόματι φιλικῇ πίστει τὴν σιωπήν· φιλοσόφως. εἰ γὰρ ταῦτ᾽ οὐκ ἔστι φιλοσόφως, τίν᾽ ἐστὶν ἄλλα; De Al. Magn. fort. 332F–333A

Τοξεύματι δὲ πληγεὶς εἰς τὸ σκέλος, ὡς πολλοὶ συνέδραμον τῶν πολλάκις αὐτὸν εἰωθότων θεὸν προσαγορεύειν, διαχυθεὶς τῷ προσώπῳ ἄλλα τοῦτο μὲν αἷμα εἶπεν 'ὡς ὁρᾶτε καὶ οὐκ ἢχωρ, οἷός πέρ τε ῥέει μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν.'

Alexander XVI (180E)

ὑστερον δὲ πληγῇ περιπεσὼν ὑπὸ τοξεύματος καὶ περιαλγής γενόμενας· "τοῦτο μὲν" εἶπεν "ὁ φίλοι τὸ ῥέον αἷμα καὶ οὐκ (Hom. Η. 5, 340) ἢχωρ, οἷός πέρ τε ῥέει μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν;" De Al. Magn. fort. 340Α

Α Τοξεύματι δὲ πληγεὶς εἰς τὸ σκέλος, ὡς πολλοὶ συνέδραμον τῶν πολλάκις αὐτὸν εἰωθότων θεὸν προσαγορεύειν, διαχυθεὶς τῷ προσώπῳ 'τοῦτο μὲν αἷμα' εἶπεν 'ὡς ὁρᾶτε καὶ οὐκ (E 340) ἢχωρ, οἷός πέρ τε ῥέει μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν.'

Alexander XVI (180E)

Β ὥσπερ τὸν κύλικα τοῦ Βούλαντος καὶ περιαλγής γενόμενας εἶπεν "ὁ φίλοι τὸ ῥέον αἷμα καὶ οὐκ (Hom. Η. 5, 340) ἢχωρ, οἷός πέρ τε ῥέει μακάρεσσι θεοῖσιν;" De Al. Magn. fort. 341B
Ἀ Αποστέλλοντος δ’ αὐτοῦ τῶν Μακεδόνων τοὺς νοσοῦντας καὶ ἀναπήρους ἐπὶ θάλασσαν ἐνεδείχθη τις ἐπὶ τοὺς νοσοῦντας ἀπογεγραμμένος ἐπὶ τῆς θάλασσᾶς ἐπειδ’ ἦν ἀπιόουσα. Ὅμως δέ, τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας αὐτοῦ καὶ γέροντας ἐπὶ οἶκον ἀποστέλλοντι, Ἐυρύλοχος Ἀιγαῖος ἐνέγραψεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς τοὺς νοσοῦντας, εἶτα πυθόμενος δ’ ἐλευθέραν οὖσαν ὡς ἦν ἐξερραγήσεις ἀναμίξας ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀπογραψάμενος, ὡς ἐλήφθη μηδὲν κακὸν ἔχων, ἀλλὰ προσποιούμενος ἀρρωστίαν τινά, ἀνὴρ πολεμικὸς καὶ τραυμάτων τὸ σῶμα μεστὸς ὀφθεὶ τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον· πυνθανομένου δὲ τὴν αἰτίαν ἀπογεγραμμένος ἔρη Τελεσίππας ἐρᾶν καὶ συνακολουθεῖν ἐπὶ θάλασσαν ἀπιόουσαν μὴ δυνάμενος ἀπολειφθῆναι. ’ Καὶ πῶς μὲν εἶχε πρὸς Ἀριστοτέλην εἴρηται καὶ ἃτον τὸν μὲν ἁρμονικὸν Ἀνάξαρχον ἐντιμότατον τῶν φίλων σπουδασθέντες μαρτυροῦσιν. Ὀνησίκριτον δὲ τὸν Διογένους τοῦ Κυνὸς μαθητὴν ὅτι ἄρχοντα τῶν κυβερνητῶν κατέστησεν, ὑπὸ πλειόνων ἱστόρηται.
Δ Ξενοκράτης, πεντήκοντα τάλαντα δωρεάν Ἀλεξάνδρου πέμψαντος, ὡς οὐκ ἔλαβε θαυμάζομεν· τὸ δὲ δοῦναι, οὔ; ἢ οὐχ ὁμοίως καταφρονεῖν χρημάτων δοκοῦμεν τὸν μὴ προσέμενον καὶ τὸν χαριζόμενον; οὐκ ἐδεῖτο πλούτου Ξενοκράτης διὰ φιλοσοφίαν, Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ἐδεῖτο διὰ φιλοσοφίαν, ἵνα τοιούτοις χαρίζηται.

De Al. Magn. fort. 333B

Α Ἐπεὶ δὲ Πῶρος ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μετὰ τὴν μάχην 'πῶς σοι χρήσωμαι;' 'βασιλικῶς' εἶπε, καὶ προσερωτηθείς 'μή τι ἄλλο;' 'πάντα' εἶπεν 'ἐν τῷ βασιλικῶς ἔνεστι,' θαυμάσας καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀνδραγαθίαν πλείονα χώραν ἧς πρῴην εἶχε προσέθηκε.

Alexander XXXI (181E)

The second part of the apophthegm only returns in B as well.

As to the first part, the most plausible option is X>ABCD

Δημάδης (fr. 15 de Falco) μὲν γὰρ Ἀλεξάνδρου τελευτήσαντος εἴκαζε τὴν Μακεδόνων στρατιὰν εκτεταμένην ἑαυτῇ καὶ περιπληκτῶς ἑοικέναι τῷ Κύκλωπι μετὰ τὴν τύφλωσιν ἑκτείνοντι πανταχοῖ τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' οὐδένα σκοπὸν φερομένας· οὕτως ἐρρέμβετο κενεμβατοῦν καὶ σφαλλόμενον ὑπ' ἀναρχίας τὸ μέγεθος αὐτῆς.

De Al. Magn. fort. 336EF

C ἐπείσι μοι τὸ τοῦ Πῶρου δεῦρο μετενεγκεῖν. ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ὡς ἠχθη πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον αἰχμάλωτος, πυθομένου 'μή τι πλέον;' 'οὔδέν' εἶπεν 'πάντα γὰρ ἔνεστιν ἐν τῷ βασιλικῶς.'

De coh. ira 458B

Τελευτήσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ Δημάδης ὁ ρήτωρ 'ὅμοιον' ἔφη 'διὰ τὴν ἄναρχην ὁρᾶσθαι τὸ στρατόπεδον τῶν Μακεδόνων ἑκτεταμένῳ τῷ Κύκλωπι.'

Alexander XXXIV (181F)

X>ABC or A>BC


Alex. 60.14–16

C ἔπεισί μοι τὸ τοῦ Πῶρου δεῦρο μετενεγκεῖν. ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ὡς ἠχθη πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον αἰχμάλωτος, πυθομένου 'μή τι πλέον;' 'οὔδέν' εἶπεν 'πάντα γὰρ ἔνεστιν ἐν τῷ βασιλικῶς.'

De Al. Magn. fort. 332E

X>ABC or A>BC
Α Πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱὸν Φιλιππον πυθόμενον πλλάδιον παρόντος ἔπειτα μέλλον σῆμα ἄλλημα ἀναλαμβάνειν: τί δέδοικας; εἶπε ‘μὴ μόνος σῆς σάλπιγγος οὐκ ἀκούσης;’    
Antigonus Monophthalmus IV (182B)  
X>ABC

Β λέγεται γοῦν μεσάρικον ἐπὶ δικαστὴν τοῦ Διηθηρίου αὐτοῦ πυθέσθαι, πότε μέλλον σῶμα ἄλλημα ἀναλαμβάνειν: τί δ’ εἶπεν πρὸς ὅρην: ᾧ αἶγανι μὴ μόνος σ_tileς σάλπιγγος οὐκ ἀκούσης;’    
Demetr. 28.10

C Αντίγονος γοῦν ὁ βασιλεύς [ἕκεινος] ἐρωτήσαντος αὐτοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ περί μεσάρικα μέλλον σῶμα ἄλλημα ἀναλαμβάνειν: τί δέδοικας; εἶπε ‘μὴ μόνος οὐκ ἀκούσης σῆς σάλπιγγος;’    
De gar. 506CD

Α Μέλλων δὲ ναυμαχεῖν πρὸς τοὺς Πτολεμαίου στρατηγοὺς, εἰπόντος τοῦ κυβερνῆτος πολὺ πλείονας εἶναι τὰς τῶν πολεμίων ναῦς καὶ τοῦ δ’ εἰπεῖν πρὸς αὐτόν: εἰπεῖν ‘τί δέδοικας;’ εἶπε ‘μὴ μόνος ὅτι μὴ ναυμαχεῖς;’    
Antigonus Secundus II (183CD)  
X>ABC or B>AC

A Λυσίμαχος ἐν Θρᾴκῃ κρατηθεὶς ὑπὸ Δρομιχαίτου καὶ διὰ δίψαν ἑαυτὸν καὶ τὸ στρατεύμα παραδοὺς ὡς ἐπιεῖν ἀιχμάλωτος γενόμενος, ἔτι ὧν θεοί εἶπεν ὡς μικρᾶς ἡδονῆς ἕνεκα δοῦλον ἐμαυτὸν ἐκ βασιλέως πεποίηκα.’    
Lysimachus I (183DE)  
X>ABC

B ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ ὁ Λυσίμαχος ἐν Γέταις συσχεθεὶς δίψῃ καὶ παραδοὺς ἑαυτὸν μετὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος ἀιχμάλωτον εἶτα πιὼν ὕδωρ ὡς ἀπεβαλόμην’    
De tuenda 126E

C οἷον ἱστοροῦσι δήπου Λυσίμαχον ὑπὸ δίψης ἐκβιασθέντα καὶ παραδόντα τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὴν δύναμιν, ὡς ἐπιεῖν ὑποχείριος γενόμενος, εἰπεῖν ‘φεῦ τῆς ἐμῆς κακίας, ὃς δι’ ἡδονὴν ὑποχείριος γενόμενος, ἐμαυτὸν ἐκ βασιλέως πεποίηκα.’    
De sera num. 555DE

A Πρὸς δὲ Φιλιππίδην τὸν κωμῳδοποιὸν φίλον ὑπὸ καὶ συνήθη ’τίνος σοι σ.seeking’ ‘τῶν ἐμῶν μεταδῶ;’ κάκεινος ’οὐ βούλει πλὴν τῶν ἀπορρήτων.’    
Lysimachus II (183E)  
The absence of φιλοφρονουμένου in A and D seems coincidental. The variation of βούλει (A and C) – ὦ βασιλεῦ πλὴν τῶν ἀπορρήτων. (D and B) could be coincidental as well. X>ABCD would then still be possible, unless one assumes that there are two groups.  

B φιλοφρονουμένου δὲ ποτὲ τοῦ Λυσιμάχου πρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰπόντος ’οὐ βασιλεῦ, τίνος σοι τῶν ἐμῶν μεταδῶ;’ ’μόνον’ ἔφη ’ βασιλεῦ μὴ τῶν ἀπορρήτων.’    
Demetr. 12.9

C Ὁρθῶς οὖν Φιλιππίδης φιλοφρονουμένου τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτῶν ’οὐ βούλει πλὴν τῶν ἀπορρήτων.’    
De gar. 508C

D διὸ καλῶς Φιλιππίδης καὶ αὐτῶν ποτὲ Λυσιμάχου τοῦ βασιλέως ’τίνος σοι τῶν ἐμῶν μεταδῶ;’ ’μόνον’ εἰπέν, ’οὐ βασιλεῦ, μὴ τῶν ἀπορρήτων.’    
De cur. 517B
The COlleCTiOn And The pluTArChAn Oeuvre

A Δημάδου δὲ τοῦ ῥήτορος ἠδή πρεσβύτου γεγονότο γεγονότο ἔφη καθάπερ ἱερείου διαπεπραγμένου καταλείπεσθαι μόνην τὴν γαστέρα καὶ τὴν γλῶτταν. Antipater II (183EF)

X>ABC or B>AC

B Δημάδης μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸς ἦν ναυάγιον τῆς πόλεως, οὕτως ἀσελγῶς βιώσας καὶ πολιτευσάμενος, ὥστε Ἀντίπατρον εἰπεῖν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ γέροντος ἠδή γεγονότο, ὅτι καθάπερ ἱερείου διαπεπραγμένου γλῶσσα καὶ κοιλία μόνον ἀπολείπεται. Phoc. 1.3

C καὶ διὰ τούτῳ Ἀντίπατρος εἶπε θεασάμενος αὐτὸν γέροντα καθάπερ ἱερείου διαπεπραγμένος μηδὲν ἐτίλοιπον ἢ τὴν γλῶσσαν καὶ τὴν κοιλίαν μόνον ἀπολείπεται. De cup. div. 525C

A Θεμιστοκλῆς ἦτο μειράκιον ὡν ἐν πότοις ἐκυλινδεῖτο καὶ γυναιξίν· ἐπεὶ δὲ Μιλτιάδης στρατηγῶν ἐκείνης τῆς μάχης πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους γενομένης καὶ τῆς Μιλτιάδου στρατηγίας διαβοηθείσης, σύννους ὑπόσθησα τὰ πολλὰ πρὸς ἑαυτῷ καὶ τὰς νύκτας ἀγρυπνεῖν καὶ τοὺς πότους παραιτεῖσθαι τοὺς συνήθεις, καὶ λέγειν πρὸς τοὺς ἐρωτῶντας καὶ θαυμάζοντας τὴν μεταβολὴν, ὡς καθεύδειν αὐτὸν ὅπερ ὑπόσθησα τὸ Μιλτιάδου τρόπαιον. Them. 3.4

C πεπονθὼς ὡς θαυμάσαι πολλοὺς Θεμιστοκλῆς ἔπαθε καὶ εἶπεν, ὡς καθεύδειν αὐτὸν ὅπερ ὑπόσθησα τὸ Μιλτιάδου τρόπαιον. Thes. 6.9

D ἐπεὶ πάντα γ' Ἀθηναίους εἰκός ἦν ἐπαινεῖν τὴν Μιλτιάδου τόλμαν καὶ ἀνδρείαν, Θεμιστοκλῆς δ' εἶπον ὡς οὐκ ἄλλο καθεύδειν αὐτὸν ἀλλ' ἕκ τὸν ἱππὸν ἀνίστησι τὸ Μιλτιάδου τρόπαιον, οὐκ ἐπαινῶν μόνον καὶ θαυμάζον ἀλλὰ καὶ ζηλῶν καὶ μιμοῦμενος εὐθὺς ἦν καταφανῆς. De prof. in virt. 84BC

E ὡς Θεμιστοκλῆς ἔλεγεν οὐκ ἐὰν αὐτὸν καθεύδειν τὴν ἐν Μαραθῶνι Μιλτιάδου νίκην. De prof. in virt. 84BC

De cap. ex intim. 92C

F οὕτως καὶ Θεμιστοκλῆς ἀπέστη χρόνους πολλὰς καὶ ἐπαινοῦσαν τὸν Μιλτιάδου τόλμαν καὶ τὸν κόμμαν ἑαυτὸν, ἀγρυπνεῖσθαι δὲ καὶ νήφων καὶ πεφροντικός ἔλεγε πρὸς τοὺς συνήθεις, ὡς οὐκ ἄλλο καθεύδειν αὐτὸν τὸ Μιλτιάδου τρόπαιον. Praec. ger. réip. 800C
Α Ξέρξου δὲ καταβαίνοντος ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τῷ μεγάλῳ στόλῳ, φοβηθεὶς Ἐπικύδην τὸν δημαγγοὺς αἰσχροκερδῆ καὶ δειλὸν ὄντα, µὴ στρατηγὸς γενόμενος ἀπολέσῃ τὴν πόλιν, ἔπεισεν ἄργυρῳ τῆς στρατηγίας ἀποστῆναι. Themistocles III (185A) X>ABC

Α Πρὸς δὲ Σιμωνίδην ἐξαιτοῦµεν τινα κρίσιν οὐ δικαίαν ἔφη µήτ' ἂν ἐκεῖνον γενέσθαι ποιητὴν ἀγαθὸν ᾄδων παρὰ μέλος, µήτ' αὐτὸν ἀρχώντα χρηστὸν δικάζοντα παρὰ τὸν νόµον. Themistocles IX (185CD) X>ABCD

Α Τὸν δὲ υἱὸν ἐντρυφῶντα τῇ µητρὶ πλεῖστον Ἑλλήνων ἔλεγε· τῶν γὰρ Ἑλλήνων Ἀθηναίους, Ἀθηναίων δὲ ἑαυτόν, ἑαυτοῦ δὲ τὴν ἐκείνου µητέρα, τῆς δὲ µητρὸς ἐκείνου. Themistocles X (185D) X>ABC

COMP. NIC. ET CRASS. 3.4

Them. 6.1 Καίτοι Θεμιστοκλῆς, ἵνα μὴ φαῦλος ἄνθρωπος ἐν τοῖς Περσικοῖς καὶ ἄφρων στρατηγήσας ἀπολέσῃ τὴν πόλιν, ἀργυρίῳ τῆς ἀρχῆς ἀπέστησαν αὐτὸν.

Them. 5.6 Καίτοι δὲ Θεμιστοκλῆς πρὸς τὸν Σιμωνίδην ἀξιοῦντα τι τῶν µὴ δικαίων 'οὔτε ποιητὴς ἀγαθὸς ἐπὶ 'οὔτ' ἂν σὺ ποιητὴς ἀγαθὸς ᾄδων παρὰ μέλος, 'οὔτ' ἂν ἐγὼ χρηστός ἀρχὸν παρὰ νόµον κρίνων.' Praec. ger. réip. 807B

Them. 18.7 Καίτοι δ' ὃς πρὸς τὸν Σιμωνίδην ἀξιοῦντα τι τῶν ὡς πρὸς Σιμωνίδην τὸν Κεῖον εἰπεῖν, αἰτοῦµεν τι τῶν οὐ μετρίων παρ' αὐτοῦ στρατηγοῦντος, ὡς οὔτ' ἂν σὺ ποιητὴς ἀγαθὸς ᾄδων παρὰ μέλος, οὔτ' ἂν ἐγὼ χρηστὸς ἀρχων παρὰ νόµον κρίνων.' Ca. Ma. 8.4–5

[De lib. educ. 1C: Pseudo-Plutarch?]
A Τῶν δ’ Ἀθηναίων αὐτὸν προπηλακίζοντον ‘τί κοπιάτε’ εἶπεν ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν πολλάκις εὐχρηστούμενος, καὶ ταῖς πλατάνοις ἀπείκαζεν αὐτὸν, αἷς ὑποτρέχουσι χειμαζόμενοι, γενομένης δ’ εὐδίας τύλλουσι παρερχόμενοι καὶ κολούουσιν. Themistocles XIII (185DE) X>ABCD

A Πολλῶν δὲ δωρεῶν ἀξιωθεὶς καὶ ταχὺ πλούσιος γενόμενος πρὸς τοὺς παῖδας εἶπεν ὡς παῖδες, ἀπωλόμεθ’ ἄν, εἰ μὴ ἀπωλόμεθα.’ Themistocles XVII (185F) X>ABCD

A Περικλῆς, ὃποτὲ μέλλοι στρατηγεῖν, ἀναλαμβάνων τὴν χλαμύδα πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἔλεγεν ὑπὸ πρὸς τοὺς παῖδας παῖδες, ἀπωλόμεθ’ ἄν, εἰ μὴ ἀπωλόμεθα.’ Pericles I (186C) X>ABC
Ἀ Ἐκέλευσε δὲ τοὺς Ἀθηναίους τὴν Ἁγίναν ὁσπερ λήμνην ἁφαρεῖν τοῦ Πειραιῶς.

Pericles II (186C)
D is only a short reference to the anecdote.
X>ABC or B>AC or C>AB

Ἀ Πρὸς δὲ φίλον τινὰ μαρτυρίας ἐμακάριζεν ἃτοι ἐστειάζεν ὡς ἑπτῆν, ἢ προσήν καὶ ὅρκος, ἐφησε μέχρι θαυμάζειν ὅτι τὸν Πειραιῶς ἀφελεῖν καὶ τὴν Ἁγίναν ὡς λήμνην τοῦ Πειραιῶς κατελέβην.

Pericles III (186C)
C is only a short reference to the anecdote.

Α Πρὸς δὲ φίλον τινὰ μαρτυρίας ἐμακάριζεν ἃτοι ἐστειάζεν ὡς ἑπτῆν, ἢ προσήν καὶ ὅρκος, ἐφησε μέχρι θαυμάζειν ὅτι τὸν Πειραιῶς ἀφελεῖν καὶ τὴν Ἁγίναν ὡς λήμνην τοῦ Πειραιῶς κατελέβην.

De vit. pud. 531CD
C δὲ γὰρ οὗτος ἔστι καὶ τὴν Αἴγιναν ὡς λήμνην τοῦ Πειραιῶς ἀφελεῖν εἶνα τῇ μὴ συνεπιορκεῖν, ὡς ποτὲ Περικλῆς εἶπεν

Praec. ger. reip. 808AB

Α Ἀλκιβιάδης ἔτι παῖς ὢν ἐλήφθη λαβὴν ἐν παλαίστρᾳ· καὶ μὴ δυνάμενος διαφυγεῖν ἔδακε τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ καταπαλαίοντος· εἰπόντος δὲ ἔκεινον ἵνα γυναῖκες· όμοιος τοῦ γυναικός· οὐ μὲν οὖν ἔγωγε· ἀλλ' ὡς οἱ λέοντες.

Alcibiades I (186D)

B ἀπομνημονεύεται δὲ ὀλίγα παντάπασιν, οίον τῷ τὴν Ἁγίναν ὁσπερ λήμνην τοῦ Πειραιῶς ἀφελεῖν κατελέβην.

Per. 8.7
C καὶ τὴν Ἁγίναν, ἢ τὸν Ἀττικὸν τις ἐκέλευν ὡς λήμνην τοῦ Πειραιῶς ἀφελεῖν,

Dem. 1.2
D καὶ Περικλῆς τὴν λήμνην τοῦ Πειραιῶς ἀφελεῖν κατελέβην

Praec. ger. reip. 803A

Β ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲ τὸ τοῦ Περικλέους ἀποδέχομαι πρὸς τὸν ἀξιοῦντα μαρτυρίαν ψευδῆ μαρτυρῆσαι φίλον, ὧς προσῆν καὶ ὅρκος, εἰπόντος 'μέχρι τοῦ βωμοῦ φίλος εἰμί'· λίαν γὰρ ἔγγορον ἦλθεν.

B ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῷ παλαίειν πιεζούμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ πεσεῖν ἀναγάγεται πρὸς τὸ στόμα τὰ ἅμματα τοῦ πιεζοῦντος οἷος ἦν διαφαγεῖν τὰς χεῖρας. ἀφέντος οὖν τὴν λαβὴν ἔκεινον καὶ εἰπόντος 'δάκνεις θαυμάζειν ὅτι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τῶν πολιτῶν [Ἀθηναίων] μέλαν ἱμάτιον περιεβάλετο.'

Per. 38.4
B καὶ τὸ τοῦ Περικλέους ἐτι μᾶλλον· ὅλοφυρόμενοι γὰρ, ὡς οἶκεν, ἤδη καταστρέφοντος αὐτοῦ καὶ δυσφοροῦντες οἱ ἐπιτήδειοι τῶν στρατηγιῶν ἐμέμνησαν καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ὅσα δὴ τρόπαια καὶ νίκαις Ἀθηναῖοι κτησάμενος ἀπολέλοιπεν· ὁ δὲ μικρὸν ἐπαναστὰς ἐμέμψατ' αὐτούς, ὡς κοινὰ πολλῶν καὶ τῆς τύχης ἔνια μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐγκώμια λέγοντας, τὸ δὲ κάλλιστον καὶ μέγιστον καὶ ἴδιον αὐτοῦ παραλείποντας, ὅτι δὲ αὐτὸν οὐδεὶς Ἀθηναῖοι μέλαν ἱμάτιον ἀνείληφε.

De se ipsum laud. 543BC
C tells the same anecdote about an unknown Spartan.

X>AB

C Ἐν χειραψίᾳ περικρούοντος τοῦ προστραχηλίζοντος κενοσπούδως καὶ κατασπῶντος ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, ἐπειδὴ τῷ σώματι ἐλείπετο ὁ προσπεσών, ἔδακεν τὸν βραχίονα· καὶ ὁ ἑτερος εἶπεν ὑμῖν ἢ φέρετε ἄλλα, ἔσπερ ἑτεροι γνωάκες.

Apophth. Lac. 234E

X>ABC is the most plausible option

B Ἠρώτα τις Ἰφικράτην τὸν στρατηγόν, ὥσπερ ἐξελέγχων, τίς ἐστιν; 'οὔτε γὰρ ὁπλίτης οὔτε τοξότης οὔτε πελταστής'. κἀκεῖνος 'ὁ τούτοις' ἔφη· πᾶσιν ἐπιτάττων καὶ χρώμενος'.

De fortuna 99E

A Τιμόθεος εὐτυχὴς ἐνομίζετο στρατηγὸς εἶναι, καὶ φθονοῦντες αὐτῷ τινες ἐζωγράφουν τὰς πόλεις εἰς κύρτον αὐτομάτως ἐκείνου καθεύδοντος ἐν δυομένας· ἔλεγεν οὖν ὁ Τιμόθεος 'εἰ τηλικαύτας πόλεις λαμβάνω καθεύδων, τί με οἴεσθε ποιήσειν ἐγρηγορότα;'

Timotheus I (187BC)

X>ABC or C>AB

B ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔπαθε ταὐτὸ Τιμοθέῳ τῷ τοῦ Κόνωνος, ὅς, εἰς τὴν Τύχην αὐτοῦ τὰ κατορθώματα τῶν ἐχθρῶν τιθεμένων, καὶ γραφόντω τῶν ἐχθρῶν κοιμώμενον ἐκεῖνον, τὴν δὲ Τύχην δικτύῳ τὰς πόλεις περιβάλλουσαν.

Sull. 6.5

A Πρὸς δὲ θυσίαν τινὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων αἰτούντων ἐπιδούσεις καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐπιδιδόντων, κληθεὶς πολῖτις 'αἰσχυνομήν ἢ εἶπεν ἢμῖν μὲν ἐπιδούσεις, τούτῳ δὲ μὴ ἀποδιδοὺς', ἀμα δεικνύον τὸν δανειστήν.

Phocion V (188A)

X>ABCD, but A seems closer to B

B Πρὸς δὲ θυσίαν τινὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων αἰτούντων ἐπιδούσεις καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐπιδιδόντων, κληθεὶς πολῖτις, "τοῦτος αἰσχυνομήν ἢ; ἢμῖν μὲν ἐπιδούσεις, τούτῳ δὲ μὴ ἀποδιδοὺς;", δείξας Καλλικλέα τὸν δανειστήν.

Phoc. 9.1

C καὶ πρὸς τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπιδούσας καλεύοντες αὐτὸν ἐν ἑορτῇ καὶ κροτοῦντος πολλάκις ἢ ἀποδιδοὺς τούτῳ δὲ μὴ ἀποδιδοὺς; Καλλικλέα δείκτης τὸν δανειστήν.

De vit. pud. 533A

D οὕτως μὲν γάρ, ἀξιοῦντων αὐτὸν ἐν θυσίᾳ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπιδούσας καὶ κροτοῦντων πολλάκις αἰσχυνομήν ἢ; ἢμῖν μὲν ἐπιδούσεις, Καλλικλέα δὲ τούτῳ μὴ ἀποδιδοὺς; δείκτης τὸν δανειστήν.

 Praec. ger. reip. 822DE

II. THE COLLECTION AND THE PLUTARCHAN OEUVRE

431
Δημοσθένους δὲ τοῦ ῥήτορος εἰπόντος: ἀποκτενοῦσι σὲ Ἀθηναίοι· ἂν μανῶσιν, εἶπε, ἂν δὲ ἂν σωφρονοῦσιν.

Phocion VI (188A)
X>ABC or A>BC or B>AC

Λόγου δὲ περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τελευτῆς ἐμπεσόντος ἀδεσπότου καὶ τῶν ῥητόρων ἀναπηδώντων εὖθες ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα καὶ μὴ μέλλειν ἄλλα πολεμεῖν ἣδη κεκραγότος Ἀθηναίοι· ἂν μανῶσιν, εἶπε, ἂν δὲ ἂν σωφρονήσωσι.

Phocion XI (188CD)
X>ABC or A>BC

Α Λόγου δὲ περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τελευτῆς ἐμπεσόντος ἀδεσπότου καὶ τῶν ῥητόρων ἀναπηδώντων εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα καὶ μὴ μέλλειν ἀλλὰ πολεμεῖν ἤδη κελευόντων ὁ Φωκίων ἠξίου περιμεῖναι καὶ γνῶναι βεβαίως.

Praec. ger. reip. 811A

Ἀντιπάτρῳ δὲ τραχύτερον ἀπεκρίνατο, βουλομένῳ τι γενέσθαι δι’ αὐτοῦ τῶν μὴ πρεπόντων· ἂν δύναται εἰπεν ἂν καὶ φίλῳ καὶ κόλακι χρῆσθαι.

Phoc. 30.3

Α Τῶν δὲ μελλόντων συναποθνῄσκειν ἕνως ὁ δυρμομένως καὶ ἀγαμακτοῦντος· οὐκ ἄγαπης, εἶπεν, οὐ Θοῦδίππε, μετὰ Φωκίονος ἀποθανοῦμενος.

Phocion XVIII (189A)
X>ABC or A>BC

Β ἐπεὶ δὲ Ὁθιδίππος ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ γενόμενος, καὶ τὸ κόνον ὄρνιν τριβόμενον, ἠγανάκτησε καὶ κατέκλαιε τὴν συμφοράν, ὡς οὐ προσηκόντως τῷ Φωκίῳ συναπολλύμενος, εἶπεν· τί διὰ Φωκίονος ἀποθανοῦμενος; εἶπεν ὅτι μετὰ Φωκίονος ἀποθανοῦμενος.

Phoc. 36.3
A Lykourgos ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος εἶθισε τοὺς πολίτας κομὰν λέγων ὅτι τοὺς μὲν καλοὺς ἢ κόμη εὑρεπεστέρους ποιεῖ, τοὺς δὲ αἰσχροὺς φοβεροτέρους.

Lycurgus I (189DE)

D>ABC

A Πρὸς δὲ τὸν κελεύοντα ποιεῖν ἐν τῇ πόλει δημοκρατίαν ' τὸ πρῶτος' ἐπέπειτα 'ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ σου ποίησον δημοκρατίαν.'

Lycurgus II (189E)
The variation κελεύοντα – ἀξιοῦντα is insignificant.

D>ABC, but A might seem closer to B (ποιεῖν)

A Ἐκέλευε δὲ τὰς οἴκιας ποιεῖν ἀπὸ πρίονος καὶ πελέκεως μόνον· αἰσχυνεῖσθαι γὰρ εἰς οἰκίας λιτὰς ἐκπώματα καὶ στρώματα καὶ τραπέζας πολυτελεῖς εἰσφέροντας.

Lycurgus III (189E)

C>AB seems the most plausible option.
C Πάλιν δ’ ἐπιζητοῦντος τινῶν, διὰ τὶ ὀροφὴν ἀπὸ πελέκεως ταῖς οἰκίαις ἔπιπετήθη προσεταξέ, θύραν δ’ ἀπὸ πρίονος μόνον καὶ μηδὲν τῶν ἄλλων ἐργαλείων, ὡς τούτον ἔφη ἐμετρίξοντον οἱ πολίται περί πάντα, ὡς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν εἰσάγοντο, καὶ μηδὲν τῶν παρ’ ἄλλους ἠλομένων ἔχονσιν.’
Apophth. Lac. 227BC

A Πυγμὴν δὲ καὶ παγκράτιον ἀγωνίζεσθαι ἐκώλυσεν, ἵνα μηδὲ παίζοντες ἀπαυδᾶν ἐθίζωνται.
Lycurgus IV (189E)

C Πολλάκις ἐπί τούτων ἀγωνίζεσθαι έκώλυσεν, ὅπως ἄν’ ἔφη ‘μετριάζωσιν οἱ πολῖται περὶ πάντα, ὅσα εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν εἰσάγουσι, καὶ μηδὲν τῶν παρ’ ἄλλοις ἠλομένων ἔχουσιν.’
Apophth. Lac. 228D

A Στρατεύειν δὲ πολλάκις ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐκώλυσεν, ὡς ταῖς συνεχέσι καὶ πυκναῖς εἰς τὴν Βοιωτίαν ἐμβολαῖς καὶ στρατείας τοὺς Θηβαίους ἀντιπάλους τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις κατασκευάσαντος. διὸ καὶ τετρωμένον αὐτὸν ἰδὼν Ἀνταλκίδας, "Καλὰ" ἔφη "τὰ διδασκάλια παρὰ Θηβαίων ἀπολαμβάνεις, μὴ βουλομένους αὐτοὺς μηδ’ εἰδότας μάχεσθαι διδάξαντα." Λύκιος 13.8–10

B Καὶ τὸ περὶ τῶν ἀθλημάτων, ταῦτα μόνα μὴ κωλύσαντος ἀγωνίζεσθαι τοὺς πολίτας ἐν οἷς οὐκ ἀνατείνεται.
Lyc. 19.9

C Μόνα δὲ ταῦτα τῶν ἀθλημάτων ἐφέντος αὐτοῦ τοὺς πολίτας ἀγωνίζεσθαι, ὅπως ἄν’ ἔφη ‘μηδεὶς αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ πονεῖν ἀπαυδᾶν ἐθίζηται.’
Apophth. Lac. 228D

A Στρατεύειν δὲ πολλάκις ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐκώλυσεν, ὡς ταῖς συνεχέσι καὶ πυκναῖς εἰς τὴν Βοιωτίαν ἐμβολαῖς καὶ στρατείας τοὺς Θηβαίους ἀντιπάλους τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις κατασκευάσαντος. διὸ καὶ τετρωμένον αὐτὸν ἰδὼν Ἀνταλκίδας, "Καλὰ" ἔφη "τὰ διδασκάλια παρὰ Θηβαίων ἀπολαμβάνεις, μὴ βουλομένους αὐτοὺς μηδ’ εἰδότας μάχεσθαι διδάξαντα.” Λύκιος 13.8–10

B Τρίτην δὲ ῥήτραν διαμνημονεύουσι τοῦ Λυκοῦργου, τὴν κωλύουσαν ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς πολεμίους πολλάκις στρατεύειν, ἵνα μὴ ἀμύνεσθαι συνεθιζόμενοι πολεμικοὶ γένωνται. καὶ τοῦτο γε μάλιστα κατηγόρουν Ἀγησίλαος τοῦ βασιλέως ὕστερον, ὡς ταῖς συνεχέσι καὶ πυκναῖς εἰς τὴν Βοιωτίαν ἐμβολαῖς καὶ στρατείας τοὺς Θηβαίους ἀντιπάλους τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις κατασκευάσαντος. διὸ καὶ τετρωμένον αὐτὸν ἰδὼν Ἀνταλκίδας, "Καλὰ" ἔφη "τὰ διδασκάλια παρὰ Θηβαίων ἀπολαμβάνεις, μὴ βουλομένους αὐτοὺς μηδ’ εἰδότας μάχεσθαι διδάξαντα.” Λύκιος 13.8–10

C ὥστε καὶ τρωθέντος αὐτοῦ τότε τὸν Ἀνταλκίδαν ἐπείπειν: “ἡ καλὰ τοῦ διδασκάλου παρὰ Θηβαίων ἀπολαμβάνεις, μὴ βουλομένους αὐτοὺς μηδ’ ἐπισταμένους μάχεσθαι διδάξαντα.” τῷ γὰρ ὄντι Θηβαίους αὐτοὺς ἑαυτῶν πολεμικοὺς τότε γενέσθαι φασὶ, ταῖς πολλαῖς στρατείας τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ἔσπερ ἐγγυμνασμένους. διὸ καὶ Λυκοῦργος ὁ παλαιὸς, ὡς ταῖς καλουμέναις τρισὶ ῥήτραις ἐπείπει πολλάκις ἀπὸ τούτων στρατεύεσθαι ὡς μή πολεμεῖν μανθάνοσιν.

Ages. 26.3–5

D διὸ καὶ φασίν Ἀνταλκίδαν τὸν Σπαρτιάτην ὡς Ἀγησίλαος ἐπανήλθεν ἐκ Βοιωτίας τετρομένους, εἰπεῖν πρὸς αὐτὸν: “ἡ καλὰ διδασκάλια παρὰ Θηβαίων ἀπολαμβάνεις, μὴ βουλομένους αὐτοὺς πολεμεῖν καὶ μάχεσθαι διδάξαντα.” Πέλ. 15.3
Ε Συνεχῶς δ’ αὐτοῦ τοῖς Θηβαίοις πολεμοῦντος καὶ προθέντος ἐν τῇ μάχῃ, φασὶ τὸν Ἀνταλκίδαν εἰπεῖν ’εεκάλα τὰ διδασκάλια παρὰ Θηβαίοιν ἀπολαμβάνεις, μη βουλουμένους αὖτως μηδ’ ἐπισταμένους μάχεσθαι διδάξας.’ τὸ γὰρ ὄντι Θηβαίοις αὖτους ἑαυτῶν πολεμικωτάτους τότε φασὶ γενέσθαι ταῖς πολλαῖς στρατείαις τῶν Ἀποφθ. Λακ. 213F Πρὸς δ’ Ἀγησίλαον πληγέντα ἐν μάχῃ ὑπὸ θηβαίων ἀπέχεις’ εἶπε ’τὰ διδασκάλια, μὴ βουλομένους αὐτοὺς μηδ’ ἐπισταμένους μάχεσθαι διδάξας.’ ἐδόκουν γὰρ ταῖς συνεχέσιν ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς τοῦ Ἀγησιλάου στρατείαις μάχιμοι γεγονέναι. Ἀποφθ. Λακ. 217DE Πρὸς δὲ τὸν πυθόμεν διὰ τί κομῶσιν εἶπεν ὅτι τῶν κόσμων ἀδαπανώτατος ὦτός ἐστι. Ἀποφθ. Λακ. 232B Β Πυθόμεν δὲ τὸν πυθόμενον διὰ τί κομῶσιν ἐπείν ὅτι τῶν κόσμων ἀδαπανώτατος ὦτός ἐστι. Αποφθ. Λακ. 230B

A Χάριλλος ο βασιλεὺς ἐρωτηθείς, διὰ τί νόμους ὄλγους οὕτω Λυκοῦργος ἔθηκεν, ἀπεκρίνατο τοὺς χρωμένους ὄλγους λόγους μὴ δέσαθαι νόμον πολλόν. Χαρίλλος I (189F) C>AB is possible, but A seems close to B.

Β Χάριλλος ο δ’ ὁ αδελφιδοῦς τοῦ Λυκοῦργου περὶ τῆς ὀλιγότητος αὐτοῦ τῶν νόμων ἐρωτηθείς, ἐπείν ὡς οἱ λόγοις μὴ χρώμενοι πολλοίς οὐδὲ νόμον δέονται πολλῶν. Λύκ. 20.2 Β is told about Nicander. The one similarity between A and B seems coincidental.

C Χάριλλος ἐρωτηθεὶς διὰ τί τῶν νόμων ὁ Λυκοῦργος οὕτως ἔθηκεν, ’ὁτι’ ἐφῆ ’τοῖς ὀλίγα λέγοντον ὄλγον καὶ νόμον ἐστὶ χρεία.’ Ἀποφθ. Λακ. 227CD
A Θεόπομπος ἐν τινι πόλει πρὸς τὸν ἐπιδεικνύμενον τὸ τεῖχος αὐτῷ καὶ πυνθανόμενον, εἰ δοκεῖ καλὸν καὶ ψηφιλὸν εἶναι, ἤδη ὑπακοὺν ἐπειν ἢν>.

Theopompos I (190A)

D>A

The presence of “καλὸν” in A seems coincidental.

B Ἐπεδείκνυνε τις αὐτῷ τῆς πόλεως τὸ τεῖχος ὑψηλό καὶ καρτερῶς ἐξῳκοδομήμενον καὶ ἠρώτα εἰ καλὸν αὐτῷ φαίνεται· 'νὴ Δί' ἐφη 'καλὸν, οὐχ ὡς ἀνδράσι δὲ ἀλλ' ὡς γυναιξὶν ἐνοικείν.'

Apophth. Lac. 212E

C Διερχόμενος δὲ τὰ τῶν Κορινθίων τείχη καὶ θεασάμενος ὑψηλὰ τε καὶ ὀχυρὰ ἐπὶ πολὺ τε παρατείνοντα, 'τίνες' εἶπεν 'αἱ τὸν τόπον κατοικοῦσαι γυναῖκες.'

Apophth. Lac. 215D

D Ἐπιδεικνυμένον δέ τινος αὐτῷ τεῖχος καὶ πυνθανομένον εἰ καρτερὸν καὶ ὑψηλόν, 'οὐδ' εἰ γυναικῶν ἐπείν 'ἦν.'

Apophth. Lac. 221E

E Πανθοίδας πρεσβεύων εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν, ἐπιδεικνύντων αὐτῷ τινων τεῖχος μέγα καὶ ὑψηλόν, εἶπε νὴ τοὺς θεούς, ὦ ξένοι, καλὴ γυναικωνῖτις.'

Apophth. Lac. 230C

A Ἀρχίδαμος ἐν τῷ Πελοποννησιακῷ πολέμῳ τῶν συμμάχων ἀξιούντων ὁρίσαι τοὺς φόρους αὐτοῖς, εἶπεν 'ὁ πόλεμος οὐ τεταγμένα σιτεῖται.'

Archidamus Secundus I (190A)

E>A, for ζητεῖ probably replaced the original σιτεῖται.

B λέγεται δὲ καὶ Ἀρχίδαμος ὁ παλαιὸς ὑπὸ τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ Πελοποννησικοῦ πολέμου, κελευόντων τὰς εἰσφορὰς τάξαι τῶν συμμάχων αὐτόν, εἰπεῖν 'ὥς ὁ πόλεμος οὐ τεταγμένα σιτεῖται.'

Cleom. 48(27).3

C οὐ τεταγμένα σιτεῖται κατὰ τὸν Ἀρχίδαμον, ὥσθ' ὁ πρὸς πόλεμον πλοῦτος ἀόριστο

Crass. 2.9

D ὅτε καί φησι Θεόφραστος, (fr. 145 W), ἀξιούντων τῶν συμμάχων ὁρίσαι τὰς εἰσφορὰς, εἰπεῖν 'ὁ πόλεμος οὐ τεταγμένα σιτεῖται.'

Dem. 17.4

E Τῶν δὲ συμμάχων ἐν τῷ Πελοποννησιακῷ πολέμῳ ἐπιζητούντων, πόσα χρήματα ἀρκέσει, καὶ ἀξιούντων ὁρίσαι τοὺς φόρους, 'ὁ πόλεμος' ἔφη 'οὐ τεταγμένα στείρα.'

Apophth. Lac. 219A

A Βρασίδας ἐν ἰσχάσι συλλαβὼν μὲν καὶ ὀχιθοῖς ὑφῆκεν· εἶτα πρὸς τοὺς παρόντας 'οὐδὲν οὕτως' ἐφη 'μικρὸν ἐστιν, ὃ μὴ σύζεται τοιλιῶν ὁμόνεσται τοὺς ἐπιχειροῦντας.'

Brasidas I (190B)

C is not attributed to Brasidas, but to Agesilaus.

D>AB

B Βρασίδας δὲ μὲν τινα συλλαβὼν ἐν ἰσχάσι καὶ ὀχιθοῖς ὑφῆκεν· εἶτα πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ὁ Ἡράκλεις· ἐφη, 'ὡς οὐδὲν ἐστι μικρὸν ὁπτὸς οὐδ' ἀμένεν, ὃ μὴ κρίνεται τοιλιῶν ἄμονασθαι.'

De prof. in virt. 79E

C Ἀλλ' ἰδον μὲν ἐκλάμον μὲν ὁ θυρίδος υπὸ παθοῦριου, ἐπεὶ ὃ μὲν ἐπιστραφεὶς δόκας τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ κρατοῦντος καὶ ἐφυγεν, ἔπειδης τοὺς παροδίδεσι εἶπεν ὅταν τὸ ἐλάχιστον ζῶον οὕτως ἀμόνηται τοῖς ἀδικοῦνταις, τί τοὺς ἀνδρὰς προσήκει ποιεῖν λογίζεσθε;'
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Βρασίδας ἐν ἰσχάσι συλλαβὼν μῦν καὶ δήχθαις ἀφήκεν· εἶτα πρῶς τοὺς παρόντας ἑαυτῷ τὸν πολέμον ἀφῆκεν, ὡς ὧν σαφέται τοίμων ἀμέσως τοὺς ἐπιχειροῦντας. Ἐπερωτηθεὶς ὅμως ἐτρώθη, "προδούσης με" ἔφη τῆς ἀσπίδος.

De sera num. 548BC

Α' Ἐν δὲ μάχη διὰ τῆς ἀσπίδος ἀκοντισθεὶς καὶ τὸ δόρυ τοῦ τραύματος ἐξελκύσας αὐτῷ τὸν πολέμον ἀπέκτεινεν· ἐπερωτηθεὶς δὲ πώς ἐτρώθη, "μικρὸν ἐστὶν, ὃ οὐ σῴζεται τὸν ἐπιχειροῦντα."

Apophth. Lac. 219C

There seem to be two groups:
C>A and D>B

B' Ἐν δὲ τινι μάχη διὰ τῆς ἀσπίδος ἀκοντισθεὶς καὶ τὸ δόρυ τοῦ τραύματος ἐξελκύσας αὐτῷ τὸν πολέμον ἀπέκτεινεν, ἐγκωμιαζόντως δὲ τῶν Θρᾳκῶν καὶ λεγόντως ὡς οὐδεὶς ἄλλος ἐστι τοιοῦτος, "ἀγνοεῖτε" εἶπεν ὦ ξένοι· Βρασίδας γὰρ ἦν μὲν ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός, πολλοὺς δ' ἄνδρας Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἔχει τήνου κάρρονας.

Apophth. Lac. 219C

C ὁ μὲν γὰρ Βρασίδας ἔστι γὰρ ἐξελκύσας τὸ δόρυ τοῦ σώματος αὐτῷ τὸν βαλόντα πατάξας ἀνεῖλεν· Ἐπεὶ δὲ συνέβη πεσεῖν αὐτὸν ἐλευθεροῦντα τοὺς ἐπὶ Θρᾴκης Ἕλληνας, οἱ δὲ πεμφθέντες εἰς Λακεδαίμονα πρέσβεις τῇ μητρὶ προσῆλθον αὐτοῦ, πρῶτον μὲν ἠρώτησεν εἰ καλῶς ὁ Βρασίδας ἐτελεύτησε, ἐγκωμιαζόντως δὲ τῶν Θρᾷκων καὶ λεγόντως ὡς οὐκ ἔχει τοιοῦτον ἄλλον η Σπάρτη, "μὴ λέγετε" εἶπεν ὦ ξένοι· καλὸς μὲν γὰρ ἦν καὶ ἀγαθός ὁ Βρασίδας, πολλοὺς δ' ἄνδρας Λακεδαιμόνιοι ἔχει τήνου κάρρονας."

Lyc. 25.8–9

Ἀργιλεωνὶς ἡ Βρασίδου μήτηρ τελευτήσαντος τοῦ υἱοῦ, ὡς παραγενόμενοι τινες τῶν Ἀμφιπολιτῶν ἧκον πρὸς αὐτὴν, ἠρώτησεν εἰ καλῶς τῆς Σπάρτης ὁ υἱὸς ἐτελεύτα, μεγαλυνόντως δ' ἐκείνων τὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ λεγόντων ὡς ἔστι τοιοῦτον ἄλλον ἢ Σπάρτη, "μὴ λέγετε" εἶπεν ὦ ξένοι· καλὸς μὲν γὰρ ἦν καὶ ἀγαθός ὁ Βρασίδας, πολλοὺς δ' ἄνδρας ἔχει τήνου κάρρονας."

Apophth. Lac. 240C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E</th>
<th>Epainouménōn dē tōn Ἡλείων ἐπὶ τῷ Ὄλυμπῃ καλὸς ἄγειν 'τ' dē' ἐπε' ποιοῦσι θαυμαστόν, εἰ δ' ἐτῶν τεσσάρων μεθ ἡμέρα χρόνον τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ', ἐπιμενόντων δὲ τοῖς ἐπαινοῖς, ἔφη 'τ' θαυμαστόν, εἰ πράγματι καλῶς ἄγειν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ; Agis Secundus III (190CD) C&gt;AB, but A is somewhat closer to B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Ἀγις δ', ἐπαινοῦντων τινῶν τοὺς Ἡλείους ώς καλός τῷ Ὄλυμπῃ καὶ δικαίως ἄγοντας, &quot;καὶ τι μέγα&quot; ἐφη &quot;Ἡλείοι ποιοῦντι δ' ἐτῶν πέντε ἀμέρα μεθ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ;&quot; Lyc. 20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ἐπαινοῦντων δὲ τινῶν Ἡλείους, ὃτι δικαίωτα εἰσὶ περὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα τῶν Ὀλυμπίων, 'καὶ τι μέγα' εἶπεν ἄνθρωπος; Apophth. Lac. 215F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Πρὸς δ' ἄνθρωπον πονηρὸν ἐρωτῶν τίς ἄριστος Ἡλείους, εἶπεν ὁ τίς ἀνομοιότατος. Agis Secundus IV (190D) C&gt;AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Δημάρατος, ἄνθρωπου πονηροῦ κόπτοντος αὐτὸν ἀκαίροις ἐρωτήμασι, καὶ δὴ καὶ τοῦτο πολλάκις ἐρωτῶντος, τίς ἄριστος Ἡλείους, ἐφη· ὁ τίς ἀνομοιότατος. Lyc. 20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Πρὸς δ' ἄνθρωπον πονηρὸν ἐρωτῶν τίς ἄριστος Ἡλείους, εἰπὼν 'ὁ σοὶ ἀνομοιότατος.' Apophth. Lac. 216C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ἑτέρου δὲ πυνθανομένου πόσοι εἰσὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι 'ὅσοι' εἶπεν 'ἱκανοὶ τοὺς κακοὺς ἀπείργειν.' Agis Secundus V (190D) D is told about Ariston. C&gt;AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Ἀρχιδαμίδας δὲ πρὸς τὸν πυθόμενον πόσοι εἰσὶ Σπαρτιᾶται, ἐφη· ὁ τίς ἀνομοιότατος; 'ὁ ξένοις κακοὺς ἀπερύκειν.' Lyc. 20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Πυνθανομένου δὲ τίνος πόσοι Λακεδαιμόνιοι, 'ὅσοι' εἶπε τοὺς κακοὺς ἀπερύκειν.' Apophth. Lac. 215D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Πυνθανομένου δὲ τίνος Σπαρτιᾶτος τὸ πλῆθος, 'ὅσοι' εἶπε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἀπερύκειν.' Apophth. Lac. 218A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Λύσανδρος Διονυσίου τοῦ τυράννου πέμψαντος οὐκ ἔλαβεν αὐτοῦ τὰς θυγατράς τῶν πολυτελῶν, εἰπὼν δεδιέναι, μὴ διὰ ταῦτα μᾶλλον αἰσχραὶ φανῶσιν. Lysander I (190D) D is told about Archidamus. E&gt;ABC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Διονυσίου δὲ τοῦ τυράννου πέμψαντος αὐτοῦ τὰς θυγατρὰς πολυτελῆ χρύνα τῶν Σικελίκων, οὐκ ἔλαβεν, εἰπὼν φοβεῖσθαι μὴ διὰ ταῦτα μᾶλλον αἰσχραὶ φανῶσιν. Άλλος δὲ τῷ πυρόν ἦσαν τούς τοῦτον θυγατρὰς τούτους ἐξοδεύσαντος ἀμφότεροι αὐτῶν ὁ εὐφόρησε καὶ κελεύσαντος ἑαυτὸν ἀνακύσεως καὶ λαβὼν ἀμφοτέρως ἀφῆλθεν. Lys. 2.7–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ταῖς Λυσάνδρου θυγατράσι τοῦ τυράννου πέμψατος οὐκ ἔλαβεν αὐτοῦ τὰς θυγατρὰς πολυτελῆ χρύνα τῶν Σικελίκων, οὐκ ἔλαβεν, εἰπὼν φοβεῖσθαι μὴ διὰ ταῦτα μᾶλλον αἰσχραὶ φανῶσιν. Άλλος δὲ τῷ πυρόν ἦσαν τούς τοῦτον θυγατρὰς τούτους ἐξοδεύσαντος ἀμφότεροι αὐτῶν ἀμφότεροι ἀφῆλθεν. Con. praec. 141D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ταῖς δὲ θυγατράσιν αὐτοῦ ἱματισμὸν πολυτελῆ Διονυσίου τοῦ Σικελίας τυράννου πέμψατος, οὐκ ἔδέξατο εἰπὼν "φοβοῦμαι μὴ περιθέμεναι αἱ κόραι φανόσι μοι αἰσχραί.

Apophth. Lac. 218E

Ε Λύσανδρος, Διονυσίου τοῦ τῆς Σικελίας τυράννου πέμψαντος αὐτοῦ ταῖς θυγατράσιν ἱματια πολυτελῆ, οὐκ ἔλαβεν εἰπὼν δεδιέναι, μὴ διὰ ταῦτα μᾶλλον αἰσχραί φανόσιν. 1 α. ἄλλ' ἐλίγον οὕστερον πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν τύραννον ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως ἀποσταλεὶς πρεσβευτής, προσπέμψαντος αὐτὸς τοῦ Διονυσίου δύο στολὰς καὶ κελεύσαντος ἣν βούλεται τῇ θυγατρὶ κομίζειν, αὐτὴν ἐκείνην ἔφη βέλτιον αἱρήσεσθαι· καὶ λαβὼν ἀμφοτέρας ἀπῆλθεν

Apophth. Lac. 229A

Πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ψέγοντας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῷ δι' ἀπάτης τὰ πολλὰ πράσσειν ὡς ἀνάξιον τοῦ Ηηρακλέους ἔλεγεν, ὅπου μὴ ἐφικνεῖται ἡ λεοντῆ, προσραπτέον εἶναι τὴν ἀλωπεκῆν.

Lys. 7.6

Πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ψέγοντας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῷ δι' ἀπάτης τὰ πλεῖστα πράττειν ὡς ἀνάξιον τοῦ Ηηρακλέους καὶ δόλῳ, οὐκ ἄντικρυς κατορθοῦντα, γελῶν ἔλεγεν, ὅπου μὴ ἐφικνεῖται ἡ λεοντῆ, προσραπτέον εἶναι τὴν ἀλωπεκῆν.

Apophth. Lac. 229B

Πρὸς δ' Ἀργείους δικαιότερα τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων λέγειν περὶ τῆς ἀμφισβητουμένης χώρας δοκοῦντας σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν ὅ ταύτης ἔφη 'κρατῶν βέλτιστα περὶ γῆς ὅρων διαλέγεται'.

Lysander III (190E)

Aυτῶν became τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων in A and B because Plutarch left out πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους twice.

Πρὸς δὲ τῶν ψέγοντας αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῷ δ' ἀπάτης τὰ πλεῖστα πράττειν ὡς ἀνάξιον τοῦ Ηηρακλέους καὶ δόλῳ, οὐκ ἄντικρυς κατορθοῦντα, γελῶν ἔλεγεν, ὅπου μὴ ἐφικνεῖται ἡ λεοντῆ, προσραπτέον εἶναι τὴν ἀλωπεκῆν.

Apophth. Lac. 229C

Ἀργείοις μὲν ἀμφιλογουμένοις περὶ γῆς ὅρων, καὶ δικαιότερα τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων οἰομένοις λέγειν, δείξας τὴν μάχαιραν "ὁ ταύτης" ἔφη "κρατῶν βέλτιστα περὶ γῆς ὅρων διαλέγεται".

Lys. 22.2

Πρὸς δ' Ἀργείους δὲ περὶ γῆς ὅρων ἀμφισβητοῦντας πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους καὶ δικαιότερα λέγειν αὐτῶν φάσκοντας σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν ὅ ταύτης ἔφη 'κρατῶν βέλτιστα περὶ γῆς ὅρων διαλέγεται'.

Apophth. Lac. 229D

Αὐτῶν δὲ Λακεδαιμονίους ὁρῶν ὁκνοῦντας προσμάχεσθαι τοῖς τείχεσι τῶν Κορινθίων, ὡς εἰδε λογον ἐξαλλόμενον ἐκ τῆς τάφρος, 'τοιούτος' ἔφη 'φοβεῖθη σωματίως, ὅν οἱ λαγοὶ δὲ ἀργίαν ἐκ τοῖς τείχισιν ἐγκαθέδουσιν;

Lysander IV (190E)

Β ἔπει δὲ τῶν Κορινθίων ὀρθῶτον παρερχόμενοι πρὸς τὰ τείχη τῶν Λακεδαιμονίους ἐσώρο προσβάλλεις ὁκνοῦντας, καὶ λαγοὶ τὰς ὀψιθ ἐκτιμοῦντο τὴν τάφρον, "οὐκ ἀτίγθησθε" ἔφη "τοιούτοις φοβοβιομένοις πολεμίους, ὅν οἱ λαγοὶ δὲ ἀργίαν τοῖς τείχισιν ἐγκαθέδουσιν;"
A similar story is told about Archidamus in Apophth. Lac. 218D.

A Megareos δ’ ἀνδρός ἐν κοινῷ συλλόγῳ παρρησία χρησιμένου πρὸς αὐτὸν, ’οἱ λόγοι σου’ ἔπει “πόλεως δέονται.”

Lysander V (190EF)

D is told about Agesilaus.

C Λύσανδρος μὲν γὰρ ὡς ἔοικε πρὸς τὸν Ἐρωτηθεὶς δὲ ὁποῖοι ἄνδρες εἰσὶν οἱ Ἴωνες, ’μειράκιον’ ἔφη, ’οἱ λόγοι σου πολλῆς δυνάμεως δέονται.’

Agesilaus I (190F)

C is told about Callirhotides.

A Περὶ δ’ ἀνδρείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης ἐρωτηθεὶς ποτέρα βέλτιον ’οὐδὲν ἄνδρείας’ ἔφη ’χρῄζομεν, ἐὰν πάντες ὀμνεν δίκαιοι.’

Agesilaus III (190F)
A Νυκτὸς δὲ μέλλων κατὰ τάχος ἀναζευγνύειν ἐκ τῆς πολεμίας καὶ τὸν ἐρώμενον ὁρῶν ἀπολειπόμενον δι᾽ ἀσθένειαν καὶ δακρύον, 'χαλεπὸν' εἶπεν ἅμα ἐλεεῖν καὶ φρονεῖν.'

Agesilaus IV (191A)
C>AB

A Λακεδαιμονίων δὲ νικησάντων Ἀθηναίων καὶ τοὺς συμμάχους ἐν Κορίνθῳ πυθόμενος τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πολεμίων νεκρῶν ὑφ᾽ αὑτῆς ἀπολώλεκν, ὅσοι ζῶντες ἐδύναντο νικᾶν ὁμοῦ σύμπαντας τοὺς βαρβάρους μαχόμενοι.'

Agesilaus VI (191AB)
C>AB

A Μενεκράτους δὲ τοῦ ἰατροῦ, ὡς κατατυχὼν ἔν τισιν ἀπεγνωσμέναις θεραπείαις Ζεὺς ἐπεκλήθη, φορτικῶς ταύτῃ χρωμένου τῇ προσωνυμίᾳ, καὶ δὴ πρὸς τὸν Ἀγησίλαον ἐπιστεῖλαι τολμήσαντος οὕτως 'Μενεκράτης Ζεὺς Αγησιλάῳ βασιλεῖ χαίρειν', οὐκ ἀναγνοὺς τὰ λοιπὰ ἀντέγραψε 'βασιλεὺς Ἀγησίλαος Μενεκράτει ὑγιαίνειν.'

Agesilaus V (191A)
C>AB

A Ἐρωτηθεὶς δέ ὅποτε ὁποτέρα βελτίων τῶν ἀρετῶν, ἀνδρεία ἢ δικαιοσύνη, οὐδὲν ὄφελος ἄνδρειας ἡγασθεὶς εἶναι μη παροῦσης δικαιοσύνης: εἰ δὲ δίκαιοι πάντες γένοιτο, μηδὲν ἄνδρειας δεηθήσεσθαί.

Apophth. Lac. 213BC
| A Παρατούμενος δὲ τίνα τὸν φίλον παρὰ τοῦ Καρῶς Ἴδριέος ἐγράψε πρὸς αὐτὸν 'Νίκιας εἰ μὲν οὐκ ἀδικεῖ, ἄφες· εἰ δ' ἀδικεῖ, ἐμοὶ ἄφες· πάντως δ' ἄφες.  
| Agesilaus VIII (191B) C>ABD |

| Α Τοῦ δὲ μιμουμένου τὴν τῆς ἀηδόνας φωνὴν ἀκοῦσαι παρακαλούμενος ἐλεύθερος εἶπεν 'ἄκουσα πολλάκις.'  
| Agesilaus IX (191B) D>ABC |

| A Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐν Λεύκτροις μάχην, πάντας τοὺς τρέσαντας ἀτίμους εἶναι τοῦ νόμου κελεύοντος, ὁρῶντες ὅτι ἐν καλῶς ἐναρξαμενός ἐκέλευσε τοὺς νόμους ἀπὸ τῆς αὐράρης ἐπιτίμησε.  
| Agesilaus X (191BC) |

| Β Γάνα σφέρεται σου ἐπιστόλος αὐτοῦ πρὸς Ἰδριέα τὸν Κάρα τοιοῦτο· ἴτι· 'Νίκιας εἰ μὲν μὴ ἀδικεῖ, ἄφες· εἰ δ' ἀδικεῖ, ἀμῖν ἄφες· πάντως δ' ἄφες.'  
| Apophth. Lac. 211EF |

| Β δὲ δεινὸν οὖν τοίον πολλοὺς, οὐκ ὀλίγων δεομένη στρατιωτῶν καὶ νομοθέτην αἱροῦται τὸν Ἀγησίλαον. ὁ δὲ μήτε προσθείς τι μήτε ἀφελὼν μήτε μεταγράφεις, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων· καὶ φήσας ὅτι τοὺς νόμους δεῖ σήμερον ἑαυτὸς καθεύδει, ἐκ δὲ τῆς αὐράς ἡμέρας κυρίως εἶναι πρὸς τὸ λοιπὸν, ἄμα τοὺς τοὺς νόμους τῇ πόλει καὶ τοὺς ἀνδρὰς ἐπιτίμησε εὐφύλαξε.  
| Ages. 30.5–6 |
A Ἐπεὶ δὲ πεμφθεὶς τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Αἰγυπτίων σύμμαχος ἐπολιορκεῖτο μετὰ αὐτοῦ πολλαπλασίων τῶν πολεμίων καὶ περιταφρευόντων τὸ στρατόπεδον, κελεύσαντος ἐπεξιέναι καὶ διαμάχεσθαι τοῦ βασιλέα, οὐκ ἔφη διακωλύσειν τοὺς πολεμίους ἴσους αὐτοῖς γενέσθαι βουλομένους. ἔτι δὲ μικρὸν ἀπολειπούσης τῆς τάφρου συνάψαι, κατὰ τοῦτο παρατάξας τὸ διαλεῖπον καὶ πρὸς ἴσους ἴσοις ἀγωνισάμενος ἔνικησεν. Agesilaus XI (191CD)
B is a highly elaborate version of the story.
C>AB

A Ἀποθήκησον δὲ τοὺς φίλους ἐκέλευσε μηδεμίαν μηδὲ μιμηλὰν ποιήσασθαι, τὰς εἰκόνας οὕτω προσαγορεύων: ’Ει γάρ τι καλὸν ἔργον πεποίηκα, τοῦτο μου μνημεῖον ἔσται· εἰ δὲ μηδέν, οὗτο ὁ πάντως ἀνδριάντες.’ Agesilaus XII (191D)
All apophthegms concern Agesilaus.
D>AB

B τῆς δὲ μορφῆς εἰκόνα μὲν οὐκ ἔχομεν (αὐτός γὰρ οὐκ ἠθέλησεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ θνῄσκων ἀπεἶπε μὴ πλαστὰν μήτε μιμηλὰν τινα ποιήσασθαι τοῦ σώματος εἰκόνα), λέγεται δὲ μικρός τε γενέσθαι καὶ τὴν ὅψιν εὐκαταφρόνητος: Ages. 2.3–4
C Τῶν δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἑλληνικῶν ἐθνῶν ψηφισαμένων ἐν ταῖς ἐπιφανεστάταις πόλεσιν εἰκόνας ἀνιστᾶν αὐτοῦ, προσέρχετο: ’Εμοὶ μηδεμία εἰκόνα ἔστω μὴ πλαστῇ μήτε κατασκευαστῇ.’ Agesilaus XI (191D)
A Ἐπελθόντων δὲ τῶν πολεμίων καὶ περιταφρευόντων τὴν πόλιν [...] τὸ δὲ διαλεῖπον ἴσον ἔδωκεν καὶ δικαίῳ μέτρῳ διαμάχεσθαι πρὸς αὐτοὺς [...] καὶ πολλοὶ μὲν ἀνῃρεθήσαν, οἱ δὲ φεύγοντες ἐσκεδάσθησαν καὶ διερρύησαν. Ages. 39.1–10
C Περιταφρευόντων δὲ τῶν πολεμίων τὸ στρατόπεδον διὰ τὸ πλῆθος, καὶ Νεκτανάβιος, ὁ συνεμάχει, ἀξιοῦντος ἐπεξιέναι καὶ διαμάχεσθαι, οὐκ ἔφη διακωλύσειν τοὺς πολεμίους ἴσους αὐτοῖς γενέσθαι βουλομένους. ἔτι δὲ μικρὸν ἀπολειπούσης τῆς τάφρου συνάψαι, κατὰ τοῦτο παρατάξας τὸ διαλεῖπον καὶ πρὸς ἴσους ἴσοις ἀγωνισάμενος τροπὴν ἔποιησε καὶ πολὺν φόνον τῶν πολεμίων ὀλίγοις τοῖς περὶ αὑτὸν στρατιώταις καὶ χρήματα πολλὰ τῇ πόλει διεπέμψατο. Apophth. Lac. 214F–215A

A Ἐπεὶ δὲ πεμφθεὶς τὸ βασιλεία τῶν Αἰγυπτίων σύμμαχος ἐπολιορκεῖτο μετὰ αὐτοῦ πολλαπλασίων ὄντων τῶν πολεμίων καὶ περιταφρευόντων τὸ στρατόπεδον, κελεύσαντος ἐπεξιέναι καὶ διαμάχεσθαι τοῦ βασιλέα, οὐκ ἔφη διακωλύσειν τοὺς πολεμίους ἴσους αὐτοῖς γενέσθαι βουλομένους. ἔτι δὲ μικρὸν ἀπολειπούσης τῆς τάφρου συνάψαι, κατὰ τοῦτο παρατάξας τὸ διαλεῖπον καὶ πρὸς ἴσους ἴσοις ἀγωνισάμενος ἔνικησεν. Agesilaus XI (191CD)
B is a highly elaborate version of the story.
C>AB

A Άπει ἐπὶ τοῖς ῥητορεῖς τῷ βασιλείᾳ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων σύμμαχος ἐπολιορκεῖτο μετὰ αὐτοῦ πολλαπλασίων ὄντων τῶν πολεμίων καὶ περιταφρευόντων τὸ στρατόπεδον, κελεύσαντος ἐπεξιέναι καὶ διαμάχεσθαι τοῦ βασιλέα, οὐκ ἔφη διακωλύσειν τοὺς πολεμίους ἴσους αὐτοῖς γενέσθαι βουλομένους. ἔτι δὲ μικρὸν ἀπολειπούσης τῆς τάφρου συνάψαι, κατὰ τοῦτο παρατάξας τὸ διαλεῖπον καὶ πρὸς ἴσους ἴσοις ἀγωνισάμενος ἔνικησεν. Agesilaus XI (191CD)
B is a highly elaborate version of the story.
C>AB
Α΄ ὁ δὲ νεώτερος Ἀγίς,

Δημάδου λέγοντος ὅτι τὰ Λακωνικὰ ξίφη διὰ μικρότητα καταπίνουσιν οἱ θαυματοποιοί, 'καὶ μὴν' ἔφη 'οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τῶν πολεμίων τοῖς ξίφεσιν ἐφικνοῦν τοῖς πολεμίων τοῖς ξίφεσιν ἐφικνοῦνται.'

Agis Tertius 1 (191E)  
C>AB

Κλεομένης πρὸς τὸν ὑπισχνούμενον αὐτῷ δώσειν ἀποθνῄσκοντας ἐν τῷ μάχεσθαι 'μὴ σὺ εἶπεν 'ἀλλὰ δός μοι τῶν κατακτέννοντων ἐν τῷ μάχεσθαι.'

Cleomenes I (191E)  
X>ABC?

Πεδάριτος οὐκ ἐγκριθεὶς εἰς τοὺς τριακοσίους, ἥτις ἦν ἐν τῇ πόλει πρωτεύουσα τιμὴ τῇ τάξει, ἱλαρὸς καὶ μειδιῶν ἀπῄει, χαίρειν λέγων εἰ τριακοσίους ἡ πόλις ἔχει πολίτας ἑαυτοῦ βελτίονας.

Pedaritus I (191F)  
C>AB

Δαμωνίδας δὲ ταχθεὶς εἰς τὴν τελευταίαν τοῦ χοροῦ τάξιν ὑπὸ τοῦ χορὸν ἱστάντος 'εὖ γε' εἶπεν 'ἐξεῦρες, πῶς καὶ αὕτη ἔντιμος γένηται.'

Damonidas I (191F)  
C is told about Agesilaus and should not be taken into account.  
D>AB

Β Άγις μὲν οὖν ὁ βασιλεύς, σκόπτοντος Αττικοῦ τινος τὰς Λακωνικὰς μαχαίρας εἰς τὴν μικρότητα, καὶ λέγοντος ὅτι ράδιως αὐτὰς οἱ θαματοποιοί καταπίνουσιν ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις, “καὶ μὴν μάλιστα” εἶπεν “ἡμεῖς ἐφικνοῦμεθα τοῖς ἐγχειρίδιοι τῶν πολεμίων.”

Lyceus 19.4  
C Άγις ο λεώτερος, Δημάδου λέγοντος ὅτι τὰ Λακωνικὰ ξίφη διὰ μικρότητα καταπίνουσιν οἱ θαυματοποιοί, 'καὶ μὴν' ἔφη 'οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τῶν πολεμίων τοῖς ξίφεσιν ἐφικνοῦν τοῖς πολεμίων τοῖς ξίφεσιν ἐφικνοῦνται.'

Apophth. Lac. 216C

Β νεανίσκος δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἐπαγγελλόμενον αὐτῷ δώσειν ἀλεκτρυόνας ἀποθνῄσκοντας ἐν τῷ μάχεσθαι, "μὴ σὺ γε" εἶπεν, "ἀλλὰ δός μοι τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων τοῖς ἐγχειρίδιοι τῶν πολεμίων."  
Κλεομένης ὁ Κλεομβρότου, διδόντος αὐτῷ τινος μαχίμους ἀλεκτρυόνας καὶ λέγοντος ὅτι μαχόμενοι ἀποθνῄσκουσιν περὶ νίκης, 'τῶν κατακτεινόντων τοῖνυν αὐτούς' ἔφη 'τινὰς δός μοι, ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ τούτων ἀμείνους.'

Apophth. Lac. 224BC

Β οἱ μὲν γὰρ Πεδάριτος οὐκ ἐγκριθεὶς εἰς τοὺς τριακοσίους, ἱλαρὸς καὶ μειδιῶν ἀπῄει, πῶς καὶ αὕτη ἔντιμος γένηται; Ἐξεῦρες, ὡς καὶ αὕτη ἔντιμος γένηται.

Lyc. 20.14  
Οὐκ ἐγκριθεὶς δ΄ εἰς τοὺς τριακοσίους, ἥτις ἦν ἐν τῇ πόλει πρωτεύουσα τιμὴ τῇ τάξει ἦν, ἱλαρὸς καὶ μειδιῶν ἀπῄει· ἀνακαλεσαμένων δ’ αὐτοὺς τῶν ἐφόρων καὶ πυνθανομένων διότι γελᾷ, εἶπε· 'διότι συγχαίρω τῇ πόλει τριακοσίους κρείττονάς μου πολίτας ἔχομαι.'

Apophth. Lac. 231B

Β καὶ τοῦ Δάκωνος ἦσσα ἁυλότερος, δς ἐν χορῷ τινα κατασταθεῖς εἰς τὴν ἐσχάτην χώραν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄρχοντος 'εὖ γ’ εἶπεν 'ἐξεῦρες, ὡς καὶ αὐτὰ ἔντιμος γένηται';  
Sept. sap. conv. 149A
The Collection and the Plutarchan Oeuvre

C Ἐτι δὲ παιδά αὐτὸν ὄντα, γυμνοπαιδίας ἄγομένης, ὁ χοροποιὸς ἔστησεν εἰς ἄσημον τόπον· ὁ δ' ἐπεισθεὶς καίπερ ἣν βασιλεὺς ἀποδεδειγμένον καὶ εἶπεν εὖγε· δείξω διότι οὐχ οἱ τόποι τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐντίμους, ἀλλ' οἱ ἄνδρες τοὺς τόπους ἐπιδεικνύουσιν.'

Apophth. Lac. 208DE

D Λαμονίδας ταχθεὶς ἐξαγομένης τοῦ χοροῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ τὸν χορὸν ἴσταντος εὖγε εἶπεν· ὦ χοραγέ, ἐξεῦρες πῶς καὶ αὕτη ἡ χώρα ἄτιμος οὖσα ἐντίμους γένηται.'

Apophth. Lac. 219E

A and C are told about Antalcidas; B and D about Pleistonax.

Therefore:

C>A
D>B

A Ανταλκίδας πρὸς τὸν Ἀθηναῖον ἀμαθεῖς ἀποκαλοῦντα τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους· μόνοι γοῦν εἶπεν ἡμεῖς οὐδὲν μεμαθήκαμεν κακὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ τὸν χορὸν ἱστάντος· εὖγε εἶπεν, οὐδὲν μεμαθήκαμεν κακὸν παρ’ ὑμῶν.

Antalcidas I (192A)

B Πλειστόναξ δ' ὁ Παυσανίου, ῥήτορος Ἀθηναίου· μόνοι γοῦν Ἑλλάνων ἡμεῖς οὐδὲν κακὸν μεμαθήκαμεν παρ’ ὑμῶν.

Lyc. 20.8

B λέγεται δὲ καὶ Ἀνταλκίδας, Ἀθηναίου τινὸς ἀμφισβητοῦντος ὑπὲρ ἀνδρίας πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ εἰπόντος· ἡμεῖς μέντοι πολλὰς ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ Κηφισοῦ ἐδιώξαμεν· 'ἀλλὰ ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐδέποτε ἀπὸ τοῦ Εὐρώτα.'

Ages. 31.7

B λέγεται δὲ καὶ Ανταλκίδας, Ἀθηναίον τινὸς ἀμφισβητοῦντος ὑπὲρ ἀνδρίας πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ εἰπόντος· ἡμεῖς μέντοι πολλὰς ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ Κηφισοῦ ἐδιώξαμεν· ὑποτυχεῖν· 'ἀλλὰ ἡμεῖς ἡμᾶς οὐδέποτε ἀπὸ τοῦ Εὐρώτα.'

Praec. ger. reip. 810F
Ἡδίστον δὲ πάντων τῶν αὐτὸν γεγονότοιν καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι ἔλεγε τὸν Ἐπαμεινόνδαν [τῶν γειναμένων αὐτὸν] τοῦ πατρὸς ἄντων καὶ τῆς μητρὸς ἐν Λεύκτροις νικῆσαι Λακεδαιμονίους.

Epameinondas Χ (193Α)

X>ABCD

Ἀ’ Ἑπεὶ δ’ ἐκ τῆς Λακωνικῆς ύποστρέψας ἔφευγε θανάτου δίκην μετὰ τῶν συστρατηγῶν ὡς ἐπιβαλὼν τῇ βοιωταρχίᾳ παρὰ τὸν νόμον τέσσαρας μήνας, τοὺς μὲν συνάρχοντας ἐκέλευς ὡς ἐκ βοιωταρχίας ἐπιβαλὼν τῇ βοιωταρχίᾳ παρὰ τὸν νόμον τέτταρας μῆνας, τοὺς μὲν συνάρχοντας ἐκέλευς ὡς ἐκ βοιωταρχίας ἐπιβαλὼν τῇ βοιωταρχίᾳ παρὰ τὸν νόμον τέτταρας μῆνας, 

Epameinondas ΧΧΧΙΙΙ (194Α–C)

C1 is only a short reference to the story, C2 is only a reference to the first part of the story.

X>ABC2
A † Petillius ἔπες καὶ Καίνιον πολλὰ πρὸς τὸν θάνατον ἐκτίθεμεν Πετίλιον. Πολλά πρὸς τὸν δῆμον αὐτοῦ κατηγοροῦντας, εἰπὸν ὅτι τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ Ἀρκηδονίου καὶ Ἀννίβαν ἐνίκησεν, αὐτὸς ἔφη στεφανωσάμενος ἀναβαίνειν εἰς τὸ Καπιτώλιον, τὸν δὲ βουλόμενον περὶ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ταῦτ' εἰπὼν ἀνέβαινεν, ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἐπηκολούθησε τοὺς κατηγόρους ἀπολιπὼν λέγοντας.

B Scipio Maior X (196F–197A)

B οὐκ ὡς ἐπὶ Σκιπίωνα τοὺς περὶ Πετίλιον τοῦτον μὲν οὖν ἀπ' οἴκου τε μεγάλου καὶ φρονήματος ἀληθινοῦ ποιησάμενον ἀφῆκε δεκαετίαν, τοῖς δὲ καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι Κικέρωνι μὲν ἐδυσχέραινον ἐγκωμιάζοντι πολλάκις ἑαυτοῦ τὰς περὶ Κατιλίναν πράξεις, Σκιπίωνι δὲ εἰπόντι μὴ πρέπειν αὐτοῖς κρίνειν περὶ Σκιπίωνος, δι' ὅτι ἔχουσι τὸ κρίνειν πᾶσι ἀνθρώποις, στεφανωσάμενοι συνεδρία τοῦ Καπιτώλιον καὶ συνέδρασαν.

De se ipsum laud. 540F–541A

A Νικήσας δὲ τὸν Περσέα καὶ τὰς ἐπινικίους ποιούμενος ἑστιάσεις ἔλεγε τῆς αὑτῆς ἐμπειρίας εἶναι στράτευμα φοβερῶτατον πολεμίοις καὶ συμπόσιον ἥδιστον φίλοις παρασχεῖν.

Paulus Aemilius Vi (198B)

Χ>ABC or A>BC

A Κάτων ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἐν τῷ δήμῳ τῆς ἀσωτίας καὶ πολυτελείας καθαπτόμενος εἶπεν ὡς χαλεπὸν ἐστιν πρὸς γαστέρα ὥστε μὴ ἔχοιναν. Cato Maior I (198D)

Cato Maior I and II (198D) should be considered one unit. X>ABCD or A>BCD or B>ACD

A Κάτων ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἐν τῷ δήμῳ τῆς ἀσωτίας καὶ πολυτελείας καθαπτόμενος εἶπεν ὡς χαλεπὸν ἐστιν πρὸς γαστέρα ὥστε μὴ ἔχοιναν. Cato Maior I (198D)

Cato Maior I and II (198D) should be considered one unit. X>ABCD or A>BCD or B>ACD

B Εἰς ἑπτὰν τὸν Ρωμαίων δῆμον οὐχιμενὸν ἀκαίρῳς ἐπὶ στιςμορίας καὶ διανομὴς ἀποτρέπειν, ἐρᾶτο τὸν λόγον ὡς: ὁ χαλεπὸν μὲν ἐστιν ὥστε πρὸς γαστέρα λέγειν ὡς ὄν. ὡς Ἐλεγεὶ Κάτων, διαμηχανητεῖν τῇ ποιότητι τῆς τροφῆς ἑλαφρότερον ποιεῖν τὸ πλῆθος.
Α Θαυμάζειν δὲ πώς σώζεται πόλις, ἐν ἣ πολεῖται πλείονος ἱζθῆς ἢ βοῶς.
_Cato Maior_ II (198D)
X>ABC or A>BC or B>AC

Β ... ἔχουσαν.’ Κατηγοροῦν δὲ τῆς πολυτελείας ἔρημα γελανόν εἶναι σωθῆναι πόλιν ἐν ἣ πολεῖται πλείονος ἱζθῆς ἢ βοῶς.
_Ca. Ma. 8.2_

C ο γοῦν Κάτων σύν ὑπερβολικῶς ἀλλ’, ἀληθῶς πρὸς τὴν τρυφὴν καὶ πολυτελείαν τῆς πόλεως δημηγοροῦν εἶπεν, ὅτι πλείονος πιστάσκεται ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἱζθῆς ἢ βοῶς κεράμιον ταρίχους πωλοῦσι τιμῆς, ὅσην οὐκ ἂν ἑκατόμβη βοῦπρωρὸς ἄλφοι κατακοπέσῃ.
Quaest. conv. 668BC

Α Τῶν δὲ νέων έφη χαίρειν τοῖς ἐρυθριῶσι μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς ὠχριῶσι.
_Cato Maior_ VI (198E)
There seem to be two groups: AB and CD.

Α Τὸν δὲ νέον έφη χαίρειν τοῖς ἐρυθριῶσι μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς ὠχριῶσι.
_Ca. Ma. 9.5_

C ὁ δὲ Κάτων ἔλεγεν φιλεῖν τοὺς ἐρυθριῶντας μᾶλλον ἢ τοὺς ὠχριῶντας.
_De aud. poet. 29E_

Δ ὁ μὲν οὖν Κάτων ἔλεγε τῶν νέων μᾶλλον ἀγαπᾶν τοὺς ἐρυθριῶντας ἢ τοὺς ὠχριῶντας.
_De vit. pud. 528F_

Α Πολλῶν δ’ ὁρῶν ἀνισταμένους ἀνδριάντας ‘περὶ ἐμοῦ δ’ ἔφη ‘βούλομαι ἐρωτᾶν μᾶλλον τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, διὰ τί ἀνδριὰς οὐ κεῖται ἢ διὰ τί κεῖται.’
_Cato Maior_ X (198EF)
X>ABC or B>AC

Α Πολλῶν δ’ ὁρῶν ἀνισταμένους ἀνδριάντας ἐχόντων οὐκ ἔχει, μᾶλλον γάρ’ ἔφη ‘βούλομαι ζητεῖσθαι, διὰ τί μου ἀνδριὰς οὐ κεῖται ἢ διὰ τί κεῖται.’
_Ca. Ma. 19.6_

C ὁ δὲ Κάτων, ἤδη τότε τῆς Ῥώμης καταπιμλαμένης ἀνδριάντων, οὐκ ἐῶν αὑτοῦ γενέσθαι μᾶλλον ἐφ’ οὗ ἔφη ‘βούλομαι πυνθάνεσθαί τινας, διὰ τί μου ἀνδριὰς οὐ κεῖται ἢ διὰ τί κεῖται’.
_Praec. ger. reip. 820B_

Α Τῷ δὲ γῆρᾳ πολλῶν αἰσχρῶν παρόντων ἠξίου μὴ προστιθέναι τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας αἰσχύνην.
_Cato Maior_ XV (199A)
X>ABCD or B>ACD

Β πρὸς δὲ τούς θαυμαζόμενους, ὅτι πολλῶν ἀδόξων ἀνδριάντας ἔχοντων εὔει ὡς ἔχει, μᾶλλον γάρ’ ἔφη ‘βούλομαι ζητεῖσθαι, διὰ τί μου ἀνδριὰς οὐ κεῖται ἢ διὰ τί κεῖται’.
_Ca. Ma. 9.10_

C ὁ γὰρ Κάτων ἔλεγεν, ὅτι πολλὰς ἀδέξεστι τῷ γῆρᾳ κῆρας οὐ δεῖ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας ἑκόντας ἑπάγειν αἰσχύνην.
_An seni 784A_

D ὁ Κάτων πρὸς τινα προεβότην πονηρευόμενον ἀνδριάντας, τί τῷ γῆρᾳ ἔφη ‘πολλὰ κακὰ ἔχοντι τὴν ἐκ τῆς πονηρίας αἰσχύνην προστίθησής.’
_De vit. aer. 829F_

Α Διδάσκουν δὲ τοὺς νέους εὐθαρσῶς μάχεσθαι πολλάκις ἐλεγε τοῦ ξίφους τὸν λόγον μᾶλλον καὶ τὴν φονήν τῆς χειρὸς τρέψειν καὶ καταπλήττειν τοὺς πολεμίους.
_Cato Maior_ XXIII (199CD)
X>ABC

Β λόγῳ δ’ ἀπειλή καὶ τραχύτητι φωνῆς πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους ἐχρήντο, ὅρθως καὶ διανοούμενοι καὶ διδάσκουν ὅτι πολλάκις τὰ τοιοῦτα τοῦ ξίφους μᾶλλον καταπλήττεται τὸν ἐναντίον.
_Ca. Ma. 1.8_
Α "Ετι δὲ νέος ὄν τοσαύτην εἴχε δόξαν ἀνδρείας καὶ συνέσεως, ὡστε Κάτων μὲν τὸν πρεσβύτερον εἰπεῖν ἑρωτηθέντα περί τῶν ἐν Καρχηδόνῃ στρατευομένων, ἐν οἷς καὶ Σκιπίων ἦν, (κ 495) ὑμένος πέπνυται, τοὶ δὲ σκιαὶ ἀίσσουσιν. Σκιπίων Minor III (200A) X>ABC

Β οὕτω μὲν ἐξεργάσασθαι λέγεται τὸν τρίτον καὶ τελευταῖον ὁ Κάτων ἐπὶ Καρχηδονίους πόλεμον, ἀρξαμένων δὲ πολεμεῖν ἐτελεύτησεν, ἀποθεσπίσας περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἐπιθήσειν τῷ πολέμῳ τέλος ἀνδρός, ὃς ἦν μὲν τότε νεανίας, χιλιαρχὸς δὲ στρατευόμενος ἔργα καὶ τόλμης πρὸς τοὺς ἀγῶνας. ἀπαγγελομένων δὲ τούτων εἰς Ῥώμην, πυνθανόμενον τὸν Κάτωνά φασιν εἰπεῖν (Od. 10, 495)· ὑμένος πέπνυται, τοὶ δὲ σκιαὶ ἀίσσουσιν ταύτην μὲν οὖν τὴν ἀπόφασιν ταχὺ δι’ ἔργων ἐβεβαίωσεν ὁ Σκιπίων. Praec. ger. reip. 805A

Α Μαμερτίνους δὲ τῆς ἐναντίας γενομένους μερίδος οἷός [τε] ἦν ἀποσφάτειν ἅπαντα· Σθενίου δὲ τοῦ δημαγωγοῦ φήσαντος οὐ δίκαια ποιεῖν αὐτὸν ἀνθ᾽ ἑνὸς αἰτίου πολλοὺς ἀναιτίους κολάζοντα, τοῦτον δὲ αὐτὸν εἶναι τοὺς μὲν φίλους πείσαντα τοὺς δ’ ἐχθροὺς βιασάμενον· τοῦτον δὲ αὐτὸν Εὔρηκα (κ 495) ὑμένος πέπνυται, τοὶ δὲ σκιαὶ ἀίσσουσιν. ἐρομένου δ’ ἑκείνου τίνα λέγει τὸν αἴτιον, ἑαυτὸν ὁ Σθέννως ἔφη, τοὺς μὲν φίλους πείσαντα τῶν πολιτῶν, τοὺς δὲ ἐχθροὺς βιασάμενον, ἄγασθείς οὖν τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ αἴτιον ὁ Πομπήιος ἔφη. Μαμερτίνους δὲ τῆς ἐναντίας γενομένους μερίδος οἷός [τε] ἦν ἀποσφάτειν ἅπαντα· Σθενίου δὲ τοῦ δημαγωγοῦ φήσαντος οὐ δίκαια ποιεῖν αὐτὸν ἀνθ᾽ ἑνὸς αἰτίου πολλοὺς ἀναιτίους κολάζοντα, τοῦτον δὲ αὐτὸν Εὔρηκα (κ 495) ὑμένος πέπνυται, τοὶ δὲ σκιαὶ ἀίσσουσιν. Praec. ger. reip. 805A

Πομπήιος III (203CD) X>ABC
Ἀ Ἐπανελθόντα δ’ αὐτὸν ὁ Σύλλας ταῖς μὲν ἄλλαις τιμαις ἔδεξατο φιλοφρόνως καὶ Μάγνον προσηγόρευε τῷ πρῶτος αὐτὸν, θριαμβεύσαι δὲ βουλόμενον οὐκ εἶ διὰ μὴν μετέχοντα βουλής, εἰπόντος δὲ τοῦ Πομπηίου πρὸς τοὺς παρόντας ἀγνοεῖν τὸν Σύλλαν ὅτι καὶ τὸν ἥλιον ἀνατέλλοντα πλείονες ἢ δύομεν προσκυνοῦσιν.

Πομπ. 14.2–4

C Χνία δὲ Πομπήιος αὐτὸν, εὐημερῶν ἐν ἡγεμονίαις, καὶ πρὶν ἢ βουλῆς μεταλαβεῖν θριαμβεύειν, καὶ Μᾶγνος, ὃς ἐστὶ μέγας, ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτῶν ἀναγορευθείς. καί ποτε καὶ φήσαντός τινος, ὡς Πομπήιος Μᾶγνος πρόσεισι, γελάσας ἠρώτησεν ὡς "πηλίκος."

Crass. 7.1

D Πομπήιος δὲ καὶ θριαμβεύειν ἠξίου μήπω παριὼν εἰς σύγκλητον· οὐκ ἐῶντος δὲ Σύλλα, 'πλείονες' ἔφη 'τὸν ἥλιον ἀνατέλλοντα προσκυνοῦσιν ἢ δυόμενον.' καὶ Σύλλας ὑπεῖξε τοῦτ᾽ ἀκούσας.

Πραεκ. ger. reip. 804EF

Β ο ὁ γὰρ Περπέννας τὸν Σερτώριον γραμμάτων γεγονές κύριος, ἐδείκνυεν ἐπιστολὰς τῶν ἐν Ρώμῃ δυνατοτάτων ἀνδρῶν, οἵ τα παρόντα κινῆσαι βουλόμενοι πράγματα καὶ μεταστῆσαι τὴν πολιτείαν, ἐκάλουν τὸν Σερτώριον εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν. φοβηθεὶς οὖν ὁ Πομπήιος ταῦτα, μὴ μείξοντας ἀναστήσας τῶν πεπαυμένων πολέμων, τὸν τε Περπένναν ἀνείλε, καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς οὐδ᾽ ἀναγνοῦς κατέκαυσε.

Πομπ. VII (204A)

A Τῶν δὲ Σερτωρίου γραμμάτων κρατήσας ἐν Ἰβηρίᾳ, ἐν οἷς ἦσαν ἐπιστολαὶ πολλῶν ἡγεμόνων ἐπὶ νεωτερισμῷ καὶ μεταβολῇ τῆς πολιτείας τὸν Σερτώριον εἰς Ἰταλίαν καλοῦντος, κατέκαυσεν καὶ βελτίονας γενέσθαι τους πονηρούς.

Πομπ. VII (204A)
A Λευκίου δὲ Λευκούλλου μετὰ τὰς στρατείας ἀφεικότος αὑτὸν εἰς ἡδονὰς καὶ πολυτελῶς ζῶντος, τὸν δὲ Πομπῆιον ὡς παρ’ ἡλικίας τὸ τρυφᾶν ἀωρότερον εἶναι τοῖς τηλικούτοις ὥσπερ οὐ τοῦ τρυφᾶν μᾶλλον τοῖς τηλικούτοις παρ’ ἡλικίας ὥσπερ οὐτοῦ τοῦ πολιτεύεσθαι καὶ στρατηγεῖν.

Pompeius IX (204B) X>ABCD

A Νοσοῦντι δ’ αὐτῷ κήλην ὁ ἰατρὸς λαβεῖν προσέταξεν: οἱ δὲ ζητοῦντες οὐχ εὗρον (ἦν γὰρ παρ’ ὥραν), ἔφη δὲ τὶς εὐρεθείσασθαι παρὰ Λευκούλλῳ ὅτι ἔτους τρεφομένης: ‘εἰτ’ ἔφη ‘εἰ μὴ Λευκούλλος ἐτρύφα, Πομπῆιος οὐκ ἂν ἔζησε’; καὶ χαίρειν ἔσσασιν τὸν ἰατρὸν ἐλαβέ τι τῶν εὐπορίστων.

Pompeius X (204B) X>ABCD

B Κάτων δ’ ὥσπερ καὶ φοιβολήτος ἐν τῇ βουλῇ τὰ μέλλοντα τῇ πόλει καὶ τῷ Πομπῆιῷ προηγόρευε, Λεύκολλος δ’ ἡσυχίαν ἦγεν, ὡσπερ οὐκέτι πρὸς πολιτείαν ὡραῖος· ὅτε δὴ καὶ Πομπῆιος ἔφη γέροντι τὸ τρυφᾶν ἀωρότερον εἶναι τοῦ πολιτεύεσθαι.

Pomp. 48.6–7

C οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Κράσσον καὶ Πομπῆιον ἐχλεύαζον τὸν Λεύκολλον εἰς ἡδονὴν ἀφεικότα καὶ πολυτέλειαν αὑτόν, ὥσπερ οὐ τοῦ τρυφᾶν μᾶλλον τοῖς τηλικούτοις παρ’ ἡλικίας ὥσπερ οὐ τοῦ πολιτεύεσθαι καὶ στρατηγεῖν.

Luc. 38.5

D οὐδὲ τῇ τοῦ Πομπῆιο Μάγνου φωνῇ διατραπέντες, τῇ πρὸς Λεύκολλον ἢν εἶπεν, αὐτὸν μὲν εἰς λουτρὰ καὶ δείπνα καὶ συνουσίας μεθημερινὰς καὶ πολὺν ἄλυν καὶ κατασκευὰς οἰκοδομήσωσι παρὰ Λευκούλλῳ καὶ πολιτείας ἀφεικότας, τῷ δὲ Πομπῆιῷ φιλαρχίαν ἐγκαλοῦντα καὶ φιλοτιμίαν παρ’ ἡλικίας· ἔφη γὰρ Πομπῆιος ἀωρότερον εἶναι γέροντι τὸ τρυφᾶν ἢ τὸ ἄρχειν· ἐπεὶ δὲ νοσοῦτι συνέταξεν [see the case below]

An seni 785E–786A


Pomp. 2.11–12

C ὁ γοῦν Πομπῆιος εὐδοκίμησεν <ὅτι> νοσῶν, τοῦ μὲν ἰατρὸς κήλην αὐτῶν λαβεῖν κελεύσαντος, τῶν δ’ οἰκετῶν οὐκ ὡς ἐτρύφαν ἀλλὰ ὡς θεραπεύων Θέου ἐρήμων δήλῳ κήλην ἢ παρὰ Λευκούλλῳ στευμομένην, οὐκ εἴπεν λαβεῖν ἑκείθεν, ἀλλ’ εἰπὼν πρὸς τὸν ἰατρὸν ‘οὐκόν εἰ μὴ Λευκούλλος ἐτρύφα, Πομπῆιος οὐκ ἂν ἐξῆσθαι; ἄλλο τι παρασκευάσατο τῶν εὐπορίστων ἐκέλευσε.

Luc. 40.2
Ἀ Πρὸς δὲ Κάτωνα πικρῶς καθαψάμενον, ὅτι πολλάκις αὐτοῦ προαγορεύοντος τὴν Καίσαρος δύναμιν καὶ αὐξηθην ὁ Κάτων ἂν ἦν δὲ δυσπόριστο καὶ παρ᾽ ἡμῶν ἔφη δὲ τις εἶναι παρὰ Λευκόλλῳ πολλὰς τρεφομένας, οὕτω ἄπειμεν οὐδ᾽ ἔλαβεν εἰπών 'οὐκοῦν, εἰ μὴ Λεύκολλος ἔτρυψα, Πομπήιος οὐκ ἂν ἔζησεν'.

Ἀν σελ. 786Α

Pompeius X1II (204С)
X>ABC or B>AC

A Πρὸς δὲ Κάτωνος ὑπομιμνῄσκοντος ὧν ἐν ἀρχῇ περὶ Καίσαρος αὐτῷ προεἶπεν, ἀπεκρίνατο ἀντίπραττεν αὐτῷ, ὅτι πολλὰς τρεφομένας οὐκ ἔπεμψεν οὐδ᾽ ἔλαβεν εἰπών 'οὐκοῦν, εἰ μὴ Λεύκολλος ἐτρύψα, Πομπήιος οὐκ ἂν ἔζησεν'.

Pomp. 60.8

A Πρὸς δὲ τὸν δοκοῦντα Λίβυν ἀπὸ γένους εἶπε· ἀπὸ γένους εἰναι, φήσαντα δ᾽ αὐτοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν λέγοντος, 'καὶ μὴν οὐκ ἄτρυπωτον ἔχεις τὸ οὖς'.

Cicero Ἐπιστ. laud. 541F–542Α

A Πρὸς δὲ τὸν Οκταούιον αἰτίαν ἔχων ἔκ φήσαντα δ᾽ αὐτοῦ φάσκοντα μὴ ἀκούειν, 'καὶ μὴν τετρυπημένον' ἔφη 'ἔχεις τὸ οὖς'.

Quaest. conv. 631D

A Ἐπει δὲ Καίσαρ κρατήσας τὰς Πομπηίου καταβεβλημένας εἰκόνας ἀνέστησε μετὰ τιμῆς, ἔφη περὶ αὐτοῦ [λέγων ὁ Κικέρων] ὅτι 'τοὺς Πομπηίου Καίσαρ ἰστός ἀνδρίαντας τοὺς αὐτοῦ πήγνυσιν'.

Cicero X1II (205Ε)
X>ABCD seems to be the most plausible option.
The Collection and the Plutarchan Oeuvre

ἀνδριάντας τοὺς ἰδίους ἐπήξε. τῶν δὲ φίλων ἀξιούντων αὐτὸν ὑφοροπείσθαι καὶ πολλῶν ἐπὶ τούτο παρεχόντων ἑαυτούς, οὐχ ὑπέμεινεν, εἰτῶν ὃς βέλτιον ἦστιν ὑπενθανεῖν ἢ ἄει προσιδοκάν.

Caes. 57.6–7

D τῷ Καίσαρι κελεύσαντι τὰς Πομπηίου τιμὰς ἀνασταθῆναι καταβεβλημένας ο Κικέρων ‘τοίς Πομπηίου’ φησιν ἀνδριάντας ἑστηκαί, τοὺς δὲ σοὺς ἐπῆξες’.

De cap. ex inim. 91A

A Πομπηίαν δὲ τὴν γυναίκα κακῶς ἀκούσασαν ἐπὶ Κλωδίου κελεύσαντι ἀνασταθῆναι καταβεβλημένας ο Κικέρων ‘ἄνδριάντας ἐστήσας, τοὺς δὲ σοὺς ἐπηξέσθαι.

Caesar III (206AB) X>ABC

A Καὶ διέβη τὸν ’Ῥουβίκωνα ποταμὸν ἐκ τῆς Γαλατικῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπὶ Πομπηίον εἰπών ‘πᾶς ἀνερρίφθω κύβος’.

Caesar VII (206C) X>ABC or A>BC or C>AB

A Ἐπεὶ δὲ Πομπηίου φυγόντος ἐπὶ θάλασσαν ἐκ τῆς Ρώμης Μέτελλος ἐπιτίθεντος τοῦ ταμιείου βουλόμενον αὐτοῦ ἀνερρίφθω κύβος ἐκ ἄλλων ἐκ τούτων ἐκέλευσεν. αὖθις δ’ ἐνισταμένου τοῦ Μετέλλου καὶ τοιούτων ἐπικαλούμενον ἀνερρίφθω κύβος, διεβίβαζε τὸν στράτον.

Caesar VIII (206C) X>ABC

A Ταῦτα πρὸς τὸν Μετέλλον εἰπόν, ἐβάδιζε πρὸς τὰς θύρας τοῦ ταμιείου. μὴ φαινομένων δὲ τῶν κλειδῶν, χαλκεῖς μεταμεμφασμένους ἐκεῖνην ἐκέλευσεν. αὐτῆς δ’ ἐνυπηρετοῦσαν τοῦ Μετέλλου καὶ τινῶν ἐν πολλῷ εἰπομένοις, διατείνων ἀποκτενεῖν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τούτων, εἰ μὴ παύσαι τὸ παρεκκλήσιν: “καὶ τοῦτ” ἐπη “μετράκιον οὐκ ἀγνοεῖς ὅτι μοι δυσκολότερον ἦν εἰπεῖν ἢ πράξαι.”

Caes. 35.9–10
Ἀ Τὸν δὲ στρατιωτῶν αὐτῷ βραδέως εἰς Δυρράχιον ἐκ Βρεντεσίου κομιζομένων λαθὼν ἅπαντας εἰς πλοῖον ἐμβὰς μικρὸν ἐπεχείρησε διαπλεῖν τὸ πέλαγος· συγκλυζομένου δὲ τοῦ πλοίου ποιήσας τῷ κυβερνήτῃ φανερὸν ἑαυτὸν ἀνεβόησε ’πίστευε τῇ τύχῃ γνοὺς ὅτι Καίσαρ κομίζεις.’ Καίσαρ ἀναδείκνυσιν ἑαυτὸν, καὶ τοῦ κυβερνήτου λαβόμενο τῆς χειρὸς, ἐκπεπληγμένου πρὸς τὴν ὄψιν, “ἰθι” ἔφη “γενναῖε, τόλμα καὶ δέδιθι μηδὲν ἢ Καίσαρα φέρεις καὶ τὴν Καίσαρος Τύχην συμπλέουσαν.”

De fort. Rom. 319CD

Α Τότε μὲν οὖν ἐκωλύθη τοῦ χειμῶνος ἰσχυροῦ γενομένου καὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν συνδραμόντων καὶ περιπαθούντων, εἰ περιμένει δύναμιν ἄλλην ὡς ἀπιστῶν αὐτοῖς· ἐπεὶ δὲ μάχης γενομένης ἄνεξαντός ἐστὶν, ἀλλὰ καθείρξας εἰς τὸν χάρακα τοὺς φεύγοντας ἀνεχώρησεν, εἶπεν ἄρα πρὸς τοὺς φίλους ὁ Καῖσαρ· “σήμερον ἂν ἢ νίκη παρὰ τοῖς πολεμίοις ἦν, εἰ τὸν νικῶντα ἐγὼ.”

Pomp. 65.7–8
A Ἐν δὲ Φαρσάλῳ Πομπηίου παρατεταγμένην τὴν φάλαγγα κατὰ χώραν ἑστάναι καὶ προσδέχεσθαι τοὺς πολεμίους παρεγγύσασθον ἀμαρτεῖν αὐτὸν ἔλεγε τὸν εἶπον ἐπιδρομῆς μετ’ ἐνθουσιασμοῦ τόνον καὶ ῥοῖζον ἐκλύσαντα τῶν στρατιωτῶν.

_Caesar XI (206DE)_

X>ABC

Pelling (2002) 80: “Should we then prefer to think of a single shared ὑπόμνημα for both Lives [Caes. and Pomp.], which for his own reasons he [Plutarch] chose to follow closely in Pompey and more distantly in Caesar? That is tempting – but the argument is inconclusive. If there were different ὑπομνήματα for each Life, we could equally presume that the two drafts for Caesar and for Pompey might each include the story in a similar form, and that he kept to that form more closely in the one case than in the other.”

_Caes. 44.7–8_

B Ἐπεὶ δὲ σημαίνειν ἔμελλον ἀμφότεροι τὴν ἔφοδον, Πομπήϊος μὲν ἐκέλευσε τοὺς ὁπλίτας ἑστῶτας ἐν προβολῇ καὶ μένοντας ἀραρότως δέχεσθαι τὴν ἐπιδρομὴν τῶν πολεμίων, μέχρι ὧν ὁσοῦ βολῆς ἐντος γένωται. Καῖσαρ δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦτο διαμαρτεῖν φησιν αὐτόν (b. c. 3, 92, 4. 5), ἀγνοήσαντα τὴν μετὰ δρόμου καὶ φορᾶς ἐν ἀρχῇ γινομένην σύρραξιν, ὡς ἔν τε ταῖς πληγαῖς βίαν προστίθησι, καὶ συνεκκαίει τὸν θυμὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἀπαντᾶν ἀναρριπιζόμενον.

_Pomp. 69.7–8_

A Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐν Λιβύῃ τῶν περὶ τὸν Σκιπίωνα φυγήν καὶ ἡτταν Κάτωνος ἑαυτὸν ἀνελόντος 'φθονῶ σοι, Κάτων,' εἶπε 'τοῦ θανάτου· καὶ γὰρ σὺ ἐμοὶ τῆς σαυτοῦ σωτηρίας ἐφθόνησας.'

_Caesar XIII (206E)_

X>ABC or A>BC or B>AC or C>AB

C ὡς δ' ἤκουσε τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ, λέγεται τοσοῦτον εἰπεῖν· "ὦ Κάτων, φθονῶ σοι τοῦ θανάτου· καὶ γὰρ ἐμοὶ σὺ τῆς <σῆς> σωτηρίας ἐφθόνησας."

_Caes. 54.2_

C ὡς δ' ἤκουσε τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ, λέγεται τοσοῦτον εἰπεῖν· "ὦ Κάτων, φθονῶ σοι τοῦ θανάτου· καὶ γὰρ ἐμοὶ σὺ τῆς <σῆς> σωτηρίας ἐφθόνησας."

_Ca. Mi. 72.2_

A Ἀντώνιον δὲ καὶ Δολοβέλλαν ύπορωμένων ἐνίων καὶ φυλάττεσθαι κελεύσας, οὐ τούτους ἐξῆι δεδίειν τοὺς βαναύσους καὶ λιπῶντας, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἰσχυροὺς καὶ ὁχήρους ἐκείνους, δείξας Βροῦτον καὶ Κάσσιον.

_Caesar XIV (206E)_

X>ABCD

B πάλιν δὲ λέγεται περὶ Ἀντωνίου καὶ Δολοβέλλας διαβολῆς πρὸς αὐτῶν ὡς νεοτερίζοντες ἐλθούσης, "οὐ πάντως φανίνα "τούτους δέδοικα τοὺς παχεῖς καὶ κομήτας, μᾶλλον δὲ τοὺς ὁχήρους καὶ λεπτοὺς ἐκείνους", Κάσσιον λέγων καὶ Βροῦτον.

_Caes. 62.10_

C λέγεται γὰρ ὡς, ἀμφότερος τινὸς ὁμοῦ διαβάλλοντος πρὸς αὐτῶν, ἐποίησον μὴ δεδίειν τοὺς ψευδές τούτους καὶ κομήτας, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ὁχήρους καὶ λεπτοὺς ἐκείνους, Βροῦτον λέγων καὶ Κάσσιον, ὧν ἐν ἑμεῖς ἐπιβολευθεῖς ἀναφερέσθαι.
D καὶ πρῶτον μὲν Ἀντωνίου καὶ Λολοβέλλα λεγομένων νεωτερίζειν, οὐκ ἔρη τοὺς παγάζες καὶ κομὴτας ἐνοχλεῖν <αὐτόν>, ἀλλὰ τοὺς οὐροὺς καὶ ἰσχυνοὺς ἰκείνους, Βροῦτον λέγει καὶ Κάσσιον· Brut. 8.2

Α Καῖσαρ ὁ πρῶτος ἐπικληθεὶς Σεβαστὸς ἔτι μειράκιον ὢν Ἀντώνιον ἀπῄει <τὰς> δισχιλίας πεντακοσίας μυριάδας, ὡς τοῦ πρῶτου Καίσαρος ἀναιρεθέντος ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἀντώνιος μετήνεγκεν, ἀποδοῦντος Ὀμηρίας βουλόμενος τὸ καταλείφθην ὑπὸ Καίσαρος, ἐκάστῳ δραχμᾷ ἑβδομήκοντα πέντε· τοῦ δ' Ἀντωνίου τὰ μὲν χρήματα κατέχοντος, ἐκεῖνον δὲ τῆς ἀπαίτησις ἀμελεῖν, εἰ σοφρονεῖ, κελεύοντος, ἐκήρυττε τὰ πατρῷα καὶ ἐπίπρασκε· καὶ τὴν δωρεὰν ἀποδοὺς εὔνοιαν μὲν αὑτῷ, μῖσος δ' ἐκείνῳ παρὰ τῶν πολιτῶν περιεποίησεν. Augustus I (206F–207A)

C έν δ' Ἀπολλωνία διέτριβεν ὁτὲ Καῖσαρ ἀνηρέθη, σχολάζων περὶ λόγους κἀκεῖνον ἐπὶ Πάρθους ἐλαύνειν εὐθὺς ἐγνωκότα προσκόμιον. Ἀπειράδεις ὁτὲ Καῖσαρ παραγενόμεθα τόν τε κλῆρον ἀνεδέξατο τοῦ Καίσαρος ἐκείνου καὶ περὶ τῶν δισχιλίων πεντακοσίων μυριάδων, ἀφ' ὁ Αντώνιος ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας κατεῖχεν, εἰς diaphoron κατέθη πρὸς αὐτὸν. Cic. 43.8

Brut. 22.2–3

C έν δ' Ἀπολλωνία διέτριβεν ὁτὲ Καῖσαρ ἀνηρέθη, σχολάζων περὶ λόγους κάκεινον ἐπὶ Πάρθους ἐλαύνειν εὐθὺς ἐγνωκότα προσκόμιον. Ἀπειράδεις ὁτὲ Καῖσαρ παραγενόμεθα τόν τε κλῆρον ἀνεδέξατο τοῦ Καίσαρος ἐκείνου καὶ περὶ τῶν δισχιλίων πεντακοσίων μυριάδων, ἀφ' ὁ Αντώνιος ἐκ τῆς οですよね λοφους κατεῖχεν, εἰς diaphoron κατέθη πρὸς αὐτὸν. Cic. 43.8
A Tōn δ' Ἀλεξάνδρεων μετὰ τὴν ἁλωσιν τὰ δεινότατα πείσεσθαι προσδοκῶντον ἀναβὰς ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα καὶ παραστησάμενος Ἀρειον τὸν Ἀλεξάνδρεα φειδεθαι τῆς πόλεως ἐρή πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τὸ μέγεθος καὶ τὸ κάλλος, ἐπείτα διὰ τὸν κτίστην Ἀλέξανδρον, τρίτον δὲ δι᾽ Ἀρειον τὸν φίλον.

Augustus III (207AB)

X>ABC

B Αὐτὸς δὲ Καῖσαρ εἰσῆλαυνεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν, Αρειὼ τῷ φιλοσόφῳ προσδιαλεγόμενος καὶ τὴν δεομένοις προσδοκῶσι καὶ τὴν δεξιὰν ἐνδεδωκώς, ἵνα εὐθὺς ἐν τοῖς πολίταις περὶβλεπτος εἴη καὶ θαυμάζωται τιμώμενος ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ διαπρεπῶς. εἰς δὲ τὸ γυμνάσιον εἰσελθὼν καὶ ἀναβὰς ἐπὶ βῆμα τι πεποιημένον, ἐκτελεσθησάμενον ὑπὸ δέους τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ προσπιπτόντων, ἀναστῆναι κελεύσας ἔφη πάσης αἰτίας τὸν δῆμον ἀφιέναι, πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τὸν κτίστην Ἀλέξανδρον, δεύτερον δὲ τῆς πόλεως θαυμάζον τὸ κάλλος καὶ τὸ μέγεθος, τρίτον δὲ Ἀρειὼ τῷ ἑταίρῳ χαριζόμενος.

Ant. 80.1–2

C Ἄρειόν τε Καῖσαρ, ὅτε τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν εἴλε, διὰ χειρὸς ἔχων καὶ μόνῳ προσομιλῶν τῶν συνήθων συνεισάγας, ἐνα τοῖς Ἀλεξάνδρευσι τὰ ἐσχάτα προσδοκῶσι καὶ δεομένοις ἐφῇ διαλέγεσθαι διὰ τὸ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς πόλεως καὶ διὰ τὸν οἰκιστὴν Ἀλέξανδρον, 'καὶ τρίτον' ἐφῇ 'τῷ φίλῳ μου τούτῳ χαριζόμενος.'

Praec. ger. reip. 814D
Appendix III: The Relative Chronology of the Parallel Lives

Various scholars have attempted to establish the order of publication of Plutarch’s Parallel Lives. All resulting chronologies contribute much to our understanding on this matter, but none of them are, in my opinion, entirely correct. Although full certainty can probably never be reached, it still is valuable to make yet another attempt, for previous research never took the relationship between the Lives and Reg. et imp. apophth. into account in discussing this topic.

1 Methodology

As appears from previous research, the relative chronology of publication of the Parallel Lives can be based on three pillars (in order of importance):

[1] The position of three pairs: Plutarch introduces Dem.–Cic. as the fifth pair (Dem. 3.1), Per.–Fab. as the tenth (Per. 2.5), and Dion–Brut. as the twelfth (Dion 2.7).

[2] The cross-references further complete the picture: they are, in my view, related to the process of publication rather than to the order of composition, because they should direct the reader to (often a fuller account in) another narrative. When Plutarch refers back to an earlier published pair in Dem.–Cic. (no. 5), this means that the former must be one of the first four. There are, however, a few contradictory cross-references that complicate the picture: (a) Them.–Cam. refers back to Thes.–Rom. (Cam. 33.10), which itself refers back to Lyc.–Num. (Rom. 21.1), which, in turn, presents Them.–Cam. as finished (Num. 9.15 and 12.13); (b) Aem.–Tim. would follow and precede Dion–Brut. (Dion 58.10; Tim. 13.10 and 33.4), and (c) Dion–Brut. would have been completed after Alex.–Caes. (Brut. 9.9), which itself refers back to Dion–Brut. (Caes. 62.8 and 68.7). Stoltz cautiously questioned the authenticity of the contradictory cross-references of Brut., Cam. and Dion, but Geiger correctly points

---

1225 Lion (1837); Michailis (1875), followed by Holden (1894) XXV–XXVII; Mewaldt (1907); Stoltz (1929); Ziegler (1951) 899–903; Theander (1958); Jones, C. P. (1966); Delvaux (1995); Nikolaidis (2005).


1227 In Aem.–Tim., Cor.–Alc., and Sert.–Eum., the Roman Life precedes the Greek. Some editions change the order (e.g. LCL places Tim. before Aem. and Alc. before Cor.) but the order should be preserved, see Geiger (1981) 104 (focusing on Aem.–Tim.); Pelling (1986) 94; Duff (1999) 206; Pelling (2002) 357. See also an extensive note of Stiefenhofer (1914) 470–471, who sees no reason to change the order of Aem.–Tim. and Sert.–Eum., but changes Cor.–Alc. (since Alcibiades is always mentioned first in the synkrisis).

1228 It is, however, unclear to which passage Tim. 13.10 refers, see Mewaldt (1907) 573; Nikolaidis (2005) 294–296.
out that this is statistically highly improbable.\textsuperscript{1229} Thus, the authenticity of all cross-references is to be accepted.\textsuperscript{1230} Additionally, in my view the contradictory ones do not necessarily undermine the (general) reliability of all other cross-references,\textsuperscript{1231} for it seems unlikely that Plutarch erred about which Lives he had already published, and one can hardly see why he would put his readers on the wrong track.\textsuperscript{1232} In line with an influential article by Mewaldt,\textsuperscript{1233} Jones provides an explanation:\textsuperscript{1234}

To meet this difficulty, it was suggested by J. Mewaldt that the Parallel Lives were not all issued one pair at a time, as had been generally assumed, but that certain pairs were published in groups. Plutarch might have issued one group consisting of Themistocles-Camillus, Lycurgus-Numa, and Theseus-Romulus, and another consisting of Dio-Brutus, Aemilius-Timoleon, and Caesar-Alexander; and thus there would have been no difficulty for the reader in consulting, for example, the Dio while reading the Timoleon and vice versa.\textsuperscript{1235}

Jones does not entirely agree with Mewaldt: in what follows, he argues that Lyc.–Num. must have been published separately, because “Plutarch clearly speaks of the Lycurgus–Numa as already published”.\textsuperscript{1236} The cross-reference in question reads as follows (Thes. 1.4):\textsuperscript{1237}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Geiger (1979) 61n47; against Stoltz (1929) 57 and 95.
\item Already Mewaldt (1907) 566 and today the communis opinio.
\item See however Pelling (2002) 9 (= (1979) 81), building on Geiger (1979) 61n47.
\item Mewaldt (1907).
\item Jones, C. P. (1966) 66–67. Pelling (2002) 8–9 (= (1979) 80–81), however, is not convinced by Mewaldt: Plutarch could have inserted the contradictory references in a published Life at a later stage, or (according to Pelling more likely) he could just have inserted the cross-reference to a Life which was not finished yet, because he knew what he was going to write in the planned Life.
\item Such simultaneous publications might sometimes be indicated by a present tense (Caes. 45.9, referring to Pomp.; Nic. 11.2, to Alc.; Num. 12.13, to Cam.; Nikolaidis (2005) 285 and 287–289 regards this as an indication of simultaneous preparation) or a future tense (Caes. 35.2, referring to Pomp.; Nikolaidis (2005) 285 and 287–289 argues that the Life, prepared together with Caes., still had to be written; I believe Pomp. was published simultaneously with and included after Caes.).
\item Delvaux (1995) 100 cites Thes. 1.4 to point out that the hypothesis of simultaneous publication is incorrect: “Cette hypothèse, à son tour, est inacceptable car la Vie de Romulus est à ranger parmi les dernières de toutes, ainsi car Plutarque le declare lui-même dans la Vie de Thésée 1, 4”. I do not see how this can be deduced from Thes. 1.4. See also Bühler
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸν περὶ Λυκούργου τοῦ νομοθέτου καὶ Νομᾶ τοῦ βασιλέως λόγον ἐκδόντες, ἐδοκοῦμεν οὐκ ἂν ἀλόγως τῷ Ῥωμύλῳ προσαναβῆναι, πλησίον τῶν χρόνων αὐτοῦ τῇ ἱστορίᾳ γεγονότες [...] 

But after publishing my account of Lycurgus the lawgiver and Numa the king, I thought I might not unreasonably go back still farther to Romulus, now that my history had brought me near his times.

In my opinion, however, this can equally well mean that Thes.–Rom. was attached to Lyc.–Num. in a group of simultaneously published pairs. Whatever the case, it is clear that Thes.–Rom. immediately follows Lyc.–Num., and that at least Them.–Cam. was published together with Thes.–Rom. and attached after this pair in the series. Thus, these three pairs form one block. As such, then, contradictory references do not need to be problematic, but can even be convenient for the relative chronology: if Them.–Cam. is referred back to in another pair, this means that Lyc.–Num. and Thes.–Rom. precede the latter as well (and in this order).

[3] Finally, the content of the biographies can provide some insights.
(a) Nikolaidis perceives different categories in the Parallel Lives: a first group (A) “In answer to friendly suggestions”; and a second group (B) consisting of Lives which were selected by Plutarch, not by his friends, with three subgroups: “B.1. Written for Plutarch’s own sake”, “B.2. A negative parenthesis” and “B.3. A mixed category”. (b) Hans Beck’s influential contribution on ‘internal synkrēsis’ has shown that Plutarch wants his reader to see connections between non-paired Lives (esp. between Thes.–Rom. and Lyc.–Num.) that he did not intend to present in this order.

(1962) 281 (based on Thes. 1.4, Thes.–Rom. cannot be the final pair as it immediately follows Lyc.–Num.); and Nikolaidis (2005) 302–303 against a late position of the pair.

1238 Jones, C. P. (1966) 67 explains the contradictory cross-references in Num. as follows: “It is true that those who read the Numa at publication would not have been able to make use of Plutarch’s references to the Camillus, but Plutarch elsewhere alludes to a Life that was still in process of composition (Caes. 35, 2; 45, 9), and the interval before the appearance of the Camillus could have been very short.”

1239 Jones, C. P. (1966) 67 explains the opening words of Them. (Θεμιστοκλῆ εὐς) in light of this: “Since the Lycurgus-Numa had already appeared, the Themistocles-Camillus must have been published simultaneously with the Theseus-Romulus. The Themistocles will therefore have followed directly on the Romulus, and it is appropriate that the reference to the begetting of Theseus that closes the Romulus (35, 7) should have been followed by the discussion of Themistocles’ humble origins that opens the Themistocles (i, i)”. Nikolaidis (2005) 304–305 is not convinced and argues that Sol.–Publ. preceded Them.–Cam., and that Θεμιστοκλῆ εὐς contrasts with Solon. Duff (2008a) 201; (2008d) 176–179; and (2011) 218, however, argues that the beginning of the Life is lost. See also Verdegem (2008) on the simultaneous preparation of Lyc., Num., and Cam.

1240 Cited from the scheme in Nikolaidis (2005) 318; see Holden (1894) XX–XXVIII, in line with Michailis (1875), on similar categories of the Parallel Lives.
those dealing with contemporaries). One therefore expects thematic links between biographies that were published simultaneously or close after each other. (c) Also important in this regard is Pelling’s observation about “increasing knowledge”, because Luc. and Cic. were written at an earlier stage than the other Late Republican Lives, it is “not surprising that in Lucullus and Cicero he seems less knowledgeable than in the later Lives”. This final point is related to the process of composition in the first place, but it might shed light on the order of publication as well.

Once a relative chronology has been established on the basis of [1] and [2] (2), it will be examined whether [3] confirms this image and whether it can further clarify it (3).

2 The Cross-References: Jones (1966) Revisited

Jones establishes the relative chronology of publication solely on the basis of the cross-references. He does so in six steps. Most of these make sense, but some should be reconsidered:

[1] Jones assumes that the lost Epameinondas–Scipio – either Maior or Minor – opened the Parallel Lives, as is the communis opinio today. The absence of a general proem to the entire series may indeed corroborate this view: such a proem (if it existed) most likely introduced Epameinondas–Scipio, as this is – at least to our knowledge – the only lost pair.

---

1244 Nikolaidis (2005) 284 observes a major gap between the time of composition and publication, but Lives which seem to have been prepared together were often published closely to each other or even simultaneously (cf. chapter 3.1 of this appendix).
1245 Plutarch wrote a biography of both Scipiones, one of which was probably an unpaired Life. Ages. 28.6 refers back to the Life of Epameinondas; Pyrrh. 8.5 to a Life of Scipio Maior or possibly Minor; TG 21.9 and GG 31(10).5 to a Life of Scipio Minor. Ἐπαμεινώνδας καὶ Σκιπίων is the seventh item in the Lamprias catalogue, which does not refer to other unknown pairs (items 26–40, however, are all isolated Lives, of which only Galba and Oth.) (32) and Arat. (40) are preserved; there is therefore no reason to assume more losses.
1246 Of course, this is not entirely certain; see the scepticism of Duff (2011b) 259.
1249 Mar. 29.12 refers to a Life of Metellus in the future tense; De Her. mal. 866B to a Life of Leonidas. These Lives are absent from the Lamprias catalogue. It is therefore unclear whether they were completed and, if they were, whether they were part of the Par-
[2] Jones' second step concerns the Lives between the fifth (Dem.–Cic.) and tenth pair (Per.–Fab.). He argues that the four places can be filled by Lyc.–Num., Thes.–Rom., Them.–Cam., and Lys.–Sull., because (a) Thes.–Rom. refers back to Dem.–Cic. (Thes. 27.8); (b) Lyc.–Num., Thes.–Rom., and Them.–Cam. are one block (henceforth called the ‘Lyc. series’); (c) Per.–Fab. refers back to Lys.–Sull. (Per. 22.4); (d) Lys.–Sull. in turn seems to refer back to Lyc.–Num.\textsuperscript{1251} Yet (d) is by no means certain, for Lys. 17.11 might equally refer to another work.\textsuperscript{1252} One can, however, still deduce that the Lyc. series precedes Per.–Fab. in another way: (a) Alex.–Caes. refers back to Lyc.–Num. (Caes. 59.4); (b) Dion–Brut. is the twelfth pair; (c) Dion–Brut., Aem.–Tim., and Alex.–Caes. are one group\textsuperscript{1253} (henceforth the ‘Dion series’), because of which the Lyc. series must precede Dion–Brut. too; and (d) there is only one place in between Per.–Fab. (no. 10) and Dion–Brut. (no. 12), because of which the Lyc. series must precede the tenth pair as well. That Lys.–Sull. belongs in between nos 5 and 10, however, is no longer confirmed by the cross-references.

[3] Jones subsequently argues that Aem.–Tim. and Alex.–Caes. (not necessarily in this order) take positions 13–14, following Dion–Brut., as they are part of the Dion series, and that Ages.–Pomp. must have followed immediately.\textsuperscript{1254} I agree that the cross-references in Caes. suggest that Ages.–Pomp. is situated directly after Alex.–Caes. and, in line with Mewaldt,\textsuperscript{1255} I am even inclined to consider Ages.–Pomp. part of the Dion series (cf. the present tense in Caes. 45.9);\textsuperscript{1256} Alex.–Caes. and Ages.–Pomp., then, must have followed Dion–Brut. in the series, for there is

\textit{allel Lives.} (a) Von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff (1926) 258 believes that the Life of Metellus and Leonidas were never finished; Nikolaidis (2005) 287 claims that the Life of Metellus was never finished, considering Pyrrh.–Mar. the last pair of the collection (286 and 318). (b) Ziegler (1951) 896–897 believes that both Lives were completed; Holden (1894) xxiv thinks that the Life of Metellus was part of the Parallel Lives.

\textsuperscript{1250} A late position of Thes.–Rom. is correctly rejected by Nikolaidis (2005) 302–303, see supra, note 1237.


\textsuperscript{1252} See Delvaux (1995) 101. Mewaldt (1907) 576 is convinced that Lys. 17.11 must refer to Lyc. 30; according to Perrin (1916) 281 it is Apophth. Lac. 239F; Nikolaidis (2005) 321 names various candidates: “Ag./Kl. 3.1,5? Lyk. 30.1? [Inst. lac.] 239 E-F? other?”.


\textsuperscript{1254} Jones, C. P. (1966) 67.

\textsuperscript{1255} Mewaldt (1907) 568.

\textsuperscript{1256} Caes. 35.2 refers to Pomp. in the future tense; Caes. 45.9 in the present tense. Ages.–Pomp. also refers back to Epameinondas–Scipio (Ages. 28.6); Lyc.–Num. (Ages. 4.3 and 20.9); and Dion–Brut. (Pomp. 16.8).
only one place between *Per.–Fab.* and *Dion–Brut*. It is, however, less clear why Jones assumes that *Aem.–Tim.* cannot have been the eleventh pair, so I will not follow this argument.

[4] In the next step, Jones fills in two places in between the first (*Epameinondas–Scipio*) and fifth (*Dem.–Cic.*) pair with *Cim.–Luc.* and *Pel.–Marc.*, because (a) the tenth pair (*Per.–Fab.*) refers back to these *Lives* (*Per.* 9.5 to *Cim.–Luc.*; *Fab.* 19.1–2 and 22.8 to *Pel.–Marc.*); and (b) in his table *Lys.–Sull.* belongs to the pairs between 5 and 10, because of which there are only three places left between 1 and 5 before *Per.–Fab.*

Yet since *Lys.* 17.11, as we have seen, does not necessarily refer back to *Lyc.*, this argument no longer stands (cf. [2]). As a consequence, *Pel.–Marc.* can also take position 6 or 9; *Cim.–Luc.* can also be 6 (but not 9, since *Thes.* 36.2 refers back to this pair).

Based on the cross-references, then, one can at this point only conclude the following concerning the relative chronology of the first fourteen or fifteen pairs:

### Provisional relative chronology of pairs 1–14 or 1–15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th><em>Epameinondas–Scipio</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2–4</td>
<td><em>Pel.–Marc.</em>? [if not 6 or 9] – <em>Cim.–Luc.</em>? [if not 6] – <em>Lys.–Sull.</em>? [if not 6 or 9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[At least two of these three pairs belong to 2–4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>Dem.–Cic.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–9</td>
<td><em>Cim.–Luc.</em>? [as 6 if not 2–4] – <em>Pel.–Marc.</em>? [as 6 or 9 if not 2–4] – <em>Lys.–Sull.</em>? [as 6 or 9 if not 2–4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Lyc.–Num.</em>, <em>Thes.–Rom.</em>, <em>Them.–Cam.</em> [in this order as 6–7–8 or 7–8–9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>Per.–Fab.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>Aem.–Tim.</em>? [if not 13 or 15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>Dion–Brut.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–15</td>
<td><em>Aem.–Tim.</em>? [if not 11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Alex.–Caes.</em> and <em>Ages.–Pomp.</em> [in this order]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This scheme is in various cases more cautious than Jones’ first table, but does not contradict it. It stands out that there is only one vacant place in the first ten pairs (2, 3, 4, 6, or 9), and possibly a second one in 11.

---

1257 The reference to *Brut.* in *Pomp.* 16.8 is not evidence if *Ages.–Pomp.* is part of the *Dion* series.


1259 Jones, C. P. (1966) 67. I already added *Cim.–Luc.* and *Pel.–Marc.* to this scheme, but Jones includes them only in his second scheme on p. 68.
In what follows, Jones attempts to point out which pairs postdate Ages.–Pomp. I follow his arguments. The pairs in question are: (a) Nic.–Crass. and Alc.–Cor., most likely in this order.

The Nicias–Crassus and the Alcibiades–Coriolanus appear to have been published within a short time of each other, since the Alcibiades (13, 9) refers to the Nicias, and the Nicias (11, 2) in the present tense to the Alcibiades. Since there is no place in I–XV for two pairs published closely together, these two must belong in XVI–XXIII; and with this agrees the fact that the Coriolanus (39, 11) refers to the Numa (VI), and the Nicias (28, 4) to the Lysander (VII–IX).

In line with Mewaldt, I would in this case even speak of simultaneous publication; (b) Demetr.–Ant., referring back to Dion–Brut. (Ant. 69.1–2); (c) Phoc.–Ca. Mi., citing Ages.–Pomp. (Ca. Mi. 54.10), and Dion–Brut. (in Ca. Mi. 73.6; Ca. Mi. 22.4 and probably Phoc. 29.1 also refer to Dem.–Cic.); (d) Pyrr.–Mar., referring to Alex.–Caes. (Mar. 6.4; Mar. 10.2 also refers to Lys.–Sull., and Pyrrh. 8.5 perhaps to Epameinondas–Scipio, depending on which Scipio’s Life is cited). Based on these cross-references, Jones seems to be correct.

Jones’ final step deals with the five remaining pairs: Sol.–Publ., predating the Nic.–Crass. and Alc.–Cor. group (Cor. 33.4); Agis&Cleom.–TG&GG, which cannot be earlier than the eleventh pair; Phil.–Flam., published before Arist.–Ca. Ma. (Ca. Ma. 12.4); Arist.–Ca. Ma., predating Phoc.–Ca. Mi. (Ca. Mi. 1.1); and Sert.–Eum., about which no additional information is provided by the cross-references. The main

1260 Jones, C. P. (1966) 68.
1261 Jones, C. P. (1966) 68. In addition, Crass. 11.11 refers back to Pel.–Marc. Nikolaidis (2005) 312–314, however, argues that Alc.–Cor. precedes Nic.–Crass.; I read Nic. 11.2 as a reference to a published Life that must have followed immediately.
1262 Mewaldt (1907) 573. Note the present tense in Nic. 11.2, cf. supra, note 1256 on Alex.–Caes. and Ages.–Pomp.
1263 Perrin (1919b) 286 omits the cross-reference of Ca. Mi. 22.4: “καὶ Κικέρωνος σοι Σιντενίς for the corrupt MSS. ὃς ἐν τοῖς περὶ Κικέρωνος γέγραται; Coraës and Bekker adopt the early anonymous correction καὶ Κικέρωνος, ὃς ἐν τοῖς περὶ ἐκείνου γέγραται”. The Teubner text indicates a lacuna after γέγραται. This reference is of minor importance, because Ca. Mi. refers back to Brut.
1264 Jones, C. P. (1966) 68.
1265 Cleom. 33(12).5 refers back to Lyc.; Cleom. 45(24).9 refers back to Phil.: since there is only one place left in between 2–9, this would belong to Phil.–Flam. if Agis&Cleom.–TG&GG were to predate Dion–Brut., see Jones, C. P. (1966) 68. In addition, TG 21.9 and GG 31(10).5 refer back to the lost Scipio Minor.
questions are which of these pairs should fill out the one (position 2, 3, 4, 6, or 9) or possibly two (11) vacant places in 1–12, and whether a certain chronology can be established amongst the later pairs as well. Cross-references are not helpful in this regard, so it is time to take a look at some content-related criteria.

3 Content-Related Criteria

Based on the secondary literature, one can distinguish between three types of criteria, all of which are of course highly hypothetical: [1] Lives that present the same milieu and time; [2] thematic connections between Lives that are not related to the historical context; and [3] categories of pairs:

[1] Historical context. Plutarch prepared Lives belonging to the same period together. Pelling demonstrates this with regard to the six latest Republican Lives (Pomp., Ca. Mi., Caes., Brut., Crass., and Ant.),\(^1\) although scholars today suggest that Crass. might stand apart.\(^2\) Yet, as appears from the provisional relative chronology of the first fourteen or fifteen pairs (presented in section 2), Plutarch also often seems to have published these Lives in group or closely together: Tim. and Dion (11 and 12 or 13 and 12) concern more or less the same time and place, as both men oppose Dionysius II,\(^3\) and the same goes for Brut., Caes., and Pomp. (12 and 13–15). It is no coincidence that Nic. and Alc. form one block, nor is it surprising that Thes.–Rom. immediately follows Lyc.–Num., as the pairs describe mythical (Thes.–Rom.) or almost legendary (Lyc.–Num.) times, as is thematized by Thes. 1.4. In line with this, one expects that:

(a) Pel.–Marc. immediately follows Epameinondas–Scipio as the second pair,\(^4\) since Pel. and Epameinondas – and perhaps also the Lives on their Roman counterparts\(^5\) – deal with the same period in the same polis, and because Pel. 3–4 (containing an extensive comparison of the

\(^1\) Pelling (2002) 1–44 (= (1979)).
\(^2\) See the Postscript of Pelling (2002) 26–29: he defends his original view, (29) based on the fact that “the Lives’ relative chronology suggests that Crassus was written at much the same time as the other relevant Lives”. Nikolaidis (2005) 289–290 argues in favour of the separate preparation of Crass. (that Ant. stands apart as well is less certain). Chlup (2013) 118 regards Crass. as “a late addition to the later Roman Lives, or at the very least the final Life of the group”.
\(^3\) A joint reading of the Lives also reveals interesting insights; see de Blois (1997).
\(^4\) Cf. Nikolaidis (2005) 299, also referring to Plutarch’s Boeotian patriotism.
\(^5\) If the paired Roman was Scipio Maior, Marc. and the lost Life would have dealt with the Second Punic War; see also Nikolaidis (2005) 298–299 in favour of Scipio Maior.
two Thebans and describing the origins of their friendship) seems to assume some acquaintance with Epameinondas’ character.\footnote{Cf. Pel. 3.1: ὁσπέρ Ἐπαμεινώνδα (“as was Epaminondas”), without further explanation.}

(b) Ca. Mi. and Ant., dealing with the death struggle of the Roman Republic, are published quickly after Brut., Pomp., and Caes.,\footnote{See the first chapter of Pelling (2002) \textit{passim} (= (1979)) on the simultaneous preparation of Ca. Mi. and Ant.} which is in line with the contemporary subjects of Phoc. and Alex.

(c) Demetr. and Pyrrh. also belong together (Plutarch refers 28 times to Δημήτριος in Pyrrh.; Πύρρος occurs eighteen times in Demetr.),\footnote{Nikolaidis (2005) places Pyrrh.–Mar. at the end of the series, with some distance from Demetr.–Ant.} and perhaps the Hellenistic Eum. was published afterwards, which seems to be supported by the connection between Mar. and Sert.\footnote{Nikolaidis (2005) 315 on Eumenes, “whose Life Plutarch had decided to write and probably drafted, when he was at work on Demetrios.”}

(d) Sol.–Publ. are published closely together with the Lyc. series, as it also deals with the remote past: more likely is the sixth position, before Lyc.–Num., rather than the ninth after Thes.–Rom. and Them.–Cam.\footnote{Nikolaidis (2005) 304–305, however, puts Sol.–Publ. in between Thes.–Rom. and Them.–Cam. as the eighth pair.}

(e) Luc. precedes or follows Cic. in position 4 or 6, although 4 seems more probable in light of (d).\footnote{See in this regard Pelling (2002) 2–7 (= (1979) 75–80) on “increasing knowledge” (Plutarch is better informed in the Republican Lives other than Luc. and Cic.). On connections between Luc. and Cic., see Theander (1958) 15–17 (who also sees a link with Sert.). Delvaux (1995) 103 attributes the third position to Cim.–Luc., because “le général romain se comporta en bienfaiteur de Chéronée et celle-ci, reconnaissante, lui éleva une statue.”}

(f) If these assumptions are correct, all the places of 1–10 are taken (in line with the cross-references, Lys.–Sull. can only be the third pair), and some connections amongst the later pairs arise. This not only confirms but also adds further precision to the table presented in section 2.

[2] \textbf{Thematic motivations}. These partially overlap with [1], but there are also some obvious connections between Lives that do not concern contemporaries. An example is that the subject of Cam., who follows Rom., (LCL) “was styled a Second Founder of Rome” (Cam. 1.1: κτίστης δὲ τῆς Ῥώμης ἀναγραφεὶς δεύτερος).
(a) First, *Arist.–Ca. Ma.* and *Phoc.–Ca. Mi.* seem to be so closely related to each other that one expects the first to precede the second.\(^{1278}\)

(b) Theoretically, *Phil.–Flam.* could have been published immediately before *Arist.–Ca. Ma.* and after *Alex.–Caes.* and *Ages.–Pomp.*, but it seems more likely that the pair takes the eleventh position (cf. [1] (f) and *Ca. Ma.* 12.4), followed by *Dion–Brut.* and *Aem.–Tim.* (which, as a consequence, must take position 13):\(^{1279}\) this is supported by the theme of liberation and opposition to tyranny, Macedonian suppression, and Caesar’s attempts to establish a monarchy shared by these three pairs. To a certain extent, it also makes sense from a chronological point of view (*Flam.* and *Aem.* belong to more or less the same period).

\[3\] **Categories of Lives.** I do not follow Nikolaidis’ distinction between pairs written “in answer to friendly suggestions” and those “written for Plutarch’s own sake”\(^{1280}\) but there is definitely a difference between a first group of rather positive examples and a second one that shows more negative or doubtful exempla. This change is announced by *Demetr.–Ant.*, which must therefore be the first of this group.\(^{1281}\) Other pairs that seem to belong here are: *Pyrrh.–Mar.*, *Sert.–Eum.* (which probably appeared soon after *Pyrrh.–Mar.*, see [1]),\(^{1282}\) *Nic.–Crass.*, *Cor.–Alc.* (prepared and

---

\(^{1278}\) Not just because the Greeks were Athenians and because of the family connection between the Romans (which is stressed in the first words of *Ca. Mi.*; this suggests that *Ca. Ma.* immediately preceded it): Aristeides the Just (cf. *Arist.* 6.1–2) and Phocion the Good (cf. *Phoc.* 10.4) have to deal with the whims of the masses when sticking to their philosophical convictions, connected with the theme of rigidity explored in *Ca. Ma.* and esp. in *Ca. Mi.* (cf. Duff (2008c) 12 on *Ca. Mi.*; see also Demulder (2022) 127–140 on *Phoc.–Ca. Mi.*). Delvaux (1995) 110 also puts the pairs together.

\(^{1279}\) The reference to *Tim.* at the end of *Dion* (58.10) seems to introduce the Greek *Life* of the pair that immediately follows; the first words of *Tim.* seem to refer back to the closing chapters of *Dion*: this is a strong indication that these *Lives* followed each other immediately in the order *Dion – Tim.*

\(^{1280}\) Nikolaidis (2005) 297 etc. and 318. In my view, he reads too much in the prologue to *Aem.–Tim.*: Plutarch’s claim (he starts to realize that his *Lives* are also valuable for his own sake and not only for his readers) is in line with the author–reader connection established in other prologues, see esp. Part III, chapter 1.4.1–2. In addition, *Aem.* 1 contains no indication that in the first group (Nikolaidis (2005) 297) “others, most probably his Roman friends, asked Plutarch to compose the biographies of certain illustrious men”, while the heroes “of this second category (a bigger one, as it eventually turned out), were mainly selected by Plutarch himself.”

\(^{1281}\) *Demetr.* 1, discussed in detail in Part III, chapter 1.2.1.

published closely together), and perhaps Agis&Cleom.–TG&GG, though definitely not all of these four Lives are that negative.\textsuperscript{1283} One might perhaps also expect Lys.–Sull. (no. 3) in this list if one reads the pair in a negative light,\textsuperscript{1284} but this is contradicted by the cross-references.\textsuperscript{1285} In this context, Delvaux points out that Lys.–Sull. fits well within the series of Epameinondas–Scipio, Pel.–Marc., and Cim.–Luc., which are all connected by Plutarch’s local pride.\textsuperscript{1286} This might indeed have repercussions for the prologue to Dem.–Cic., where the author dwells upon writing history in his small village.\textsuperscript{1287}

4 Conclusion

Although the relative chronology will never be established with full certainty (including not by the table below), the cross-references (2) and historical and thematic connections throughout various pairs (3) lead to a consistent image:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed chronology of the Parallel Lives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1283} Cf. Zadorojnyi (1997) 172.
\textsuperscript{1284} Candau Morón (2000) 455–456 notes some virtues in the pair too; see also Alexiou (2010) 351–352.
\textsuperscript{1285} Nikolaidis (2005) 306–308 argues against a position of the (rather) negative Lys.–Sull. close to Per.–Fab. with its proem calling for imitation and favours a late position, in line with Mar. and Sert. (308 and 314–315), but an earlier one also makes sense, if it is true that (306) “Plutarch wants to be more informative in those earlier books”; see also Delvaux (1995) 104–105 on the historical interest in Sull. and the first five pairs.
\textsuperscript{1286} Delvaux (1995) 103.
\textsuperscript{1287} Delvaux (1995) 103–104.
This table is still largely in line with Jones’ conclusion. As appears from Part I, chapter 2, a comparison with Reg. et imp. apophth. supports this picture, at least to a certain extent.

1288 Jones, C. P. (1966) 68.
Plutarch: Moralia


— (1968), *Plutarchi Vitae parallelae. Vol. II. Fasc. 2*, Leipzig [Pel.–Marc.; Phil.–Flam.; Alex.–Caes.].


Other


Translations

Plutarch: Moralia


**Plutarch: Lives**


**Other**


Secondary Literature

Abbot, N. J. S. (1980), The treatise De liberis educandis attributed to Plutarch, Oxford [diss.].
Barrow, R. H. (1967), Plutarch and his Times, London.


Benseler, G. E. (1841), De hiatu in oratoribus Atticis et historicis Graecis, Freiburg.


Bos, I. (1947), Plutarchus’ leven van Agesilaus. Inleiding – tekst – commentaar, Groningen – Batavia [diss.].


BibrOgrAphy


Buchler-Isler, B. (1972), Norm und Individualität in den Biographien Plutarchs. Untersuchungen zu seiner Charakterdarstellung, Bern – Stuttgart [diss.].


Demulder, B. (2022), Plutarch’s Cosmological Ethics, Leuven.


Erasmus, D. (1539), Apophthegmatum opus cum primis frugiferum, uigilanter ab ipso recognitum auctore, è Graeco codice correctis aliquot locis, in quibus interpres Dio- genis Laërtii fefellerat, Lugduni.


BIBLIOGRAPHY


Justi, F. (1895), Iranisches Namenbuch, Marburg.


Leo, F. (1901), Die Griechisch-Römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form, Olms.

Lepper, F. A. (1948), Trajan’s Parthian War, Oxford.


Lion, A. (1837), Commentatio de ordine quo Plutarchus vitas scripserit. Retractavit atque iterum edidit Alberius Lion, Göttingen.


Mewaldt, J. (1907), “Selbstcitate in den Biographieen Plutarchs”, *Hermes* 42.4, 564–578.

Michaelis, C. T. (1875), *De ordine Vitarum Parallelarum Plutarchi*, Berolini [diss.].


Nederlof, A. B. (1940), *Plutarchus’ Leven van Pyrrhus. Historische commentaar*, Amsterdam [diss.].


Rose, T. C. (2015), A Historical Commentary on Plutarch’s Life of Demetrius, Iowa City [diss.].
— (2005b), On the Path to Virtue. The Stoic Doctrine of Moral Progress and its Reception in (Middle-)Platonism, Leuven.
— (2009), Plutarch’s Maxime cum principibus philosopho esse disserendum. An Interpretation with Commentary, Leuven.
— (2021), Plutarch, Cambridge.
— (1972), Plutarch, London.
Saß, F. (1881), Plutarchis Apophthegmata regum et imperatorum: Teil 1, Ploen.
Schellens, I. (1864), De hiatu in Plutarchi moralibus, Bonnæ [diss.].
Schmidt, C. (1879), De apophthegmatum quae sub Plutarchi nomine feruntur collectionibus, Greifswalde.
Schneider, M. T. (2019), “Success Against All Odds, Failure Against All Logic: Plutarch on Dion, Timoleon, and the Liberation of Sicily”, in Reid, H. L. – Ralkowski, M.


— (2015), Plutarch and his Roman Readers, Oxford.


Weissenberger, B. (1895), Die Sprache Plutarchs von Chaeronea und die pseudoplutarischen Schriften, Straubing.
— (1810), Πλούταρχου του Χαιρωνεως τα ήθηκα. Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia, id est opera, exceptis vitis, reliqua. Tomus VI. Pars II, Oxonii.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aelianus</td>
<td>Varia historia: 43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XII.60: 123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aelianus Tacticus</td>
<td>Tactica: 51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeschylus</td>
<td>Persae: 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>322: 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appianus</td>
<td>Syriaca: 243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40–41: 243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristoteles</td>
<td>Historia animalium: 168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV.524b: 168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrianus</td>
<td>Anabasis: 139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.25: 139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV.21: 143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V.26: 143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V.30: 143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicero</td>
<td>Orator: 155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5: 155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dio Cassius</td>
<td>Historia Romana: 263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXXXVII.52: 263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diodorus Siculus</td>
<td>Bibliotheca historica: 113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XV.10–11: 113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XV.41: 31, 83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XVII.54: 139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diogenes Laertius</td>
<td>Vitae philosophorum: 55, 83, 189</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontinus</td>
<td>Strategemata: 51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus</td>
<td>Historiae: 104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I.187: 104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III.154: 104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV.143: 104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V.25: 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII.65: 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII.59: 165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX.122: 102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livius</td>
<td>Ab urbe condita: 228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXXV.49: 228</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ps.-)Plato</td>
<td>Epistulae: 122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II.314cd: 122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VII: 122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protagoras</td>
<td>343ab: 33, 55, 63, 78–79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rectuplica: 312</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Timaeus: 375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plinius</td>
<td>Naturalis historia: 155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXXV.36: 155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyagenus</td>
<td>Strategemata: 51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plutarchus – Moralia</td>
<td>De lib. educ.: 315–316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1CD: 167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7C: 316</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Range</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7F–8A</td>
<td>315–316, 333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De aud. poet.</td>
<td>287, 312, 323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25A</td>
<td>316–317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26A</td>
<td>317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29E</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32DE</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
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