

HELLENIC CULTURE AND THE ROMAN HEROES OF PLUTARCH

PLUTARCH of Chaeroneia stands almost alone among Greeks of the Roman Empire in displaying in his works an extensive knowledge of, and interest in, Rome and Romans. The knowledge of Roman history and the many notes on Roman institutions and usages seen in the *Lives* together with the work specifically devoted to Roman customs, the *quaest. Rom.*, and the celebration of Rome's good fortune, the *de fort. Rom.*, testify to his great sympathy with the Roman way of life. For us Plutarch is a unique bridge between Greece and Rome. But what sort of bridge does he himself envisage between Rome and his own world? In particular, how far does Plutarch believe that Romans share his own Hellenic culture? In answering this question I shall argue that in his presentation of Romans Plutarch often shows himself to be conscious that Hellenic culture had been imported to Rome and could never be fully taken for granted among Romans as it could among Greeks, and that as a consequence it is worthwhile for him as a student of character to consider how well and with what benefit Romans absorb it.

I. HELLENIC INFLUENCE AT ROME

Plutarch's interest in Hellenic culture at Rome is restricted almost entirely to effects on the individual. If we leave this area aside for the moment, it will be found that he is silent on wide areas where we would see Hellenic influence at work in Roman life, from portrait statues to imitation of Alexander and claims to divinity by Republican grandees.¹ The silence extends to influences which the ancients often noticed themselves. The generally accepted topos of the Greek origin of the Latin language has almost no attraction for him (cf. *Marc.* 22.7, *Numa* 13.9–10).² Similarly, he makes surprisingly little effort to discover Greek *aitia* behind Roman customs.³ In *Marc.* Plutarch does address the effect of Hellenic art introduced by Marcellus on the Roman society of the time, but his remarks there are designed principally to complement the favourable characterization of the hero, as we will see, for it is the benefits of Hellenism which are highlighted, while hardly anything is made of the suggestion voiced by the older citizens that Hellenic civilization was challenging traditional Roman culture (*Marc.* 21.6). Only at *Cato Maj.* 23.2–3 is a direct Roman attack on Hellenic culture as a

For helpful suggestions and criticisms of this paper I am indebted to E. L. Bowie, J. L. Moles, and C. B. R. Pelling.

¹ For statues, cf. *Cato Maj.* 19.5–6, *praec. ger. reip.* 820b (Rome began to be full of portrait statues in the time of Cato the Elder; Plutarch knows of earlier Greek statues at Rome, cf. *Numa* 8.20 with Pliny *HN* xxxiv 26). The similarity of Greek and Roman portrait statues is noted by Dio of Prusa (lxxii 5), who also says nothing on Greek origins (contrast Pliny *HN* xxxiv 27). The Roman fascination with Alexander (bibliography in P. A. Stadter, *Arrian of Nicomedia* [Chapel Hill 1980] 211 n. 14) might have been exploited rather more by Plutarch regarding Pompey's craving for power and plans for world conquest (*Pomp.* 38.4–5; comparison is made on other levels at 2.2–4, 34.7–8, 46.1–4), the eastern adventures of Antony (cf. *Ant.* 37.5), and Caesar's monarchy and divinity

(cf. *Caes.* 11.6, *Ant.* 6.3, *Alex.* 28).

² Greek origin: E. Gabba, in *Studi Rostagni* (Turin 1963) 188–94, F. della Corte, *La filologia latina dalle origini a Varrone*² (Florence 1981) 169–75. Plutarch's caution towards Juba's suggestion of Greek influence in Latin at *Numa* 13.9–10 (ὁ Ἴβος . . . γλιχόμενος ἐξελληνίσαι . . . εἰ γε δὴ δεῖ πρὸς τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν διάλεκτον ἐξάγειν) should be remembered when he mentions Juba in connection with the statement that Greek and Latin were mixed together in ancient Italy (*Numa* 7.10–11 [cf. *Marc.* 5.5, *quaest. Rom.* 40, 274c], *Rom.* 15.4). Greek etymologies are uncommon in Plutarch, and when they do occur (e.g. *quaest. Rom.* 277d, 280a–b) we may attribute them to his sources, since the idea is ridiculed at *quaest. conv.* viii 6, 726d–727a.

³ The closest he comes is to cite Greek parallels (e.g. *quaest. Rom.* 5, 264f; 37, 273d).

destructive influence at Rome cited and refuted.⁴ Plutarch's silence on these matters is attributable partly to a lack of interest, partly to a lack of awareness, coupled with a genuine appreciation of Rome's separate development.⁵ He must, though, have known of Romans' special fears about social and moral decay as the Greek disease.⁶ His silence here must be deliberate. Indeed, in the case of Lucullus who spectacularly combined intellectual and material Hellenism he implicitly denies Greek responsibility.⁷ Yet there is nothing which directly links Antony's moral decline with his sojourns in Asia,⁸ and in *Sulla* Plutarch avoids the connection Sallust made easily between Asia's *loca amoena voluptaria* (BC 11.5–7) and Sulla's army, and portrays Sulla and his men as corrupting, rather than being corrupted by, Greece (12.9–14).

One other Greek at least was aware of this possible link. Cato the Elder's reproach of Roman luxury, that a fish sold at Rome for more money than an ox,⁹ goes back to Polybius (xxx1 25.5a), who introduces it while tracing the origins of Roman luxury to the adoption of Greek εὐχέρεια during the Second Macedonian War (xxx1 25.4).¹⁰ Plutarch knows that Romans had linked the decline of Greece with particular Greek cultural practices (*quaest. Rom.* 40, 274d–e). Why then does he ignore the connection made between Roman degeneration and Greek culture?

Plutarch has much to say on the kind of corruption which stems from great wealth. But he does not hold that moral degeneracy is a necessary consequence of money.¹¹ Human nature, not money, is what matters. At *Cato Maj.* 18.4–5 he discusses love of wealth purely as a disease of man imposed upon the soul by 'the vulgar beliefs of the outside world'.¹² There is no hint that love of money by Romans is a phenomenon arising from contact with Greece or Asia. By the first or second century AD it would have required a great deal more imagination than Sallust had needed to envisage Greece as capable of corrupting the heroes of the Republic. Rather, Plutarch thinks of Greece and Asia at that time as impoverished and humiliated.¹³ And he notes critically the vast increase in wealth and luxury from Republican to Imperial times at Rome itself.¹⁴ As for Polybius' εὐχέρεια, he applies the term equally to Greeks and to Romans (*Nic.* 8.6, *Crass.* 7.7).

Plutarch's exposition of moral and political corruption is concerned in fact only with power. There is a notable similarity in the way he sets out the development and effect of

⁴ Cato said that 'the Romans would lose their empire when they had become infected with Greek letters. But time, in which the city's empire reached its greatest extent and Greek learning and culture as a whole became familiar, shows that this gloomy forecast was empty.'

⁵ *Flam.* 11.7 ἐναύσματα μικρά καὶ γλίσχροα κοινωνήματα παλαιοῦ γένους ἔχειν δοκοῦντες [*sc.* οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι] should not be pressed: *Flam.* 11 does represent Plutarch's thoughts, but the words are dramatized as those of the Greeks following Flamininus' proclamation of Greek liberty at Corinth. Lack of interest must also account for the silence of Plutarch and other Greeks on the Roman origin of contemporary cultural intrusions in Greece such as pantomime and gladiatorial games, for these activities were closely connected with the Roman imperial festivals (S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and power. The imperial cult in Asia Minor* [Cambridge 1984] 89).

⁶ Cf. *graecari, pergraecari, congraecare*.

⁷ Cf. *Luc.* 41.2 for the Greeks who were troubled by Lucullus' excessive hospitality ὄντως Ἑλληνικόν τι παθόντας. On Lucullus, see N.

Petrochilos, *Roman attitudes to the Greeks* (Athens 1974) 85.

⁸ Asian Greeks are not differentiated from peninsular Greeks in the *Ant.*: when Plutarch talks of Antony behaving properly to the Greeks 'at least at first' (23.2), he is talking of all the Greeks, and Antony's later bad behaviour is his carousing in Asia at the expense of the Asian cities (24 ff.). This and other aspects of *Ant.* are discussed in a paper of mine to appear in *QUCC*.

⁹ *Cato Maj.* 8.2 = *reg. et imp. apophth.* 198d, *quaest. conv.* iv.4, 668b–c.

¹⁰ From the Polybian passage come also Athenaeus *deipn.* 274f–275a and Posidonius F 211c Theiler (Diodorus Siculus xxxvii 3.6). See also Polybius ix 10 on the moral damage caused to Rome by acquiring the rich artefacts of Syracuse.

¹¹ Cf. e.g. *Art.* 24.9, *Cam.* 2.6.

¹² Cf. further *Nic.–Cras. synk.* 1.4, *de cupid. divit., On Wealth fr.* 149–51.

¹³ *Sulla* 12.5–14, 25.4–5, *Sert.* 24.5, *Luc.* 7.6–7, 20.1–4, *Cim.* 1.3–2.2, *Ant.* 24.5–8, 62.1, 68.6–8.

¹⁴ *Marius* 34.4, *Luc.* 39.2, *Publ.* 15.3–6.

power in Greek and Roman history:¹⁵ for example, the idea that the people arrogate power to themselves as the power of the state grows,¹⁶ or the idea that in the early days of empire the δῆμος is still basically virtuous.¹⁷ The parallels between early fifth century Athens and second century Rome (both seen as aristocratic) and the later emergence of pernicious democratic elements, together with a departure from the ancestral constitution, are clear.¹⁸ In earlier times political disputes are still moderate.¹⁹ Later, the underlying split between the people and the ruling class becomes apparent.²⁰ The truly able leader must control the δῆμος, resist their impulses,²¹ and prevail over their sycophants.²² Similar phraseology helps to identify common trends. For example, at *Them.* 4.5 Plutarch wonders whether Themistocles destroyed τὴν ἀκρίβειαν καὶ τὸ καθαρὸν τοῦ πολιτεύματος, and at *Cato Maj.* 4.2 explains that ἤδη τότε τῆς πολιτείας τὸ καθαρὸν ὑπὸ μεγέθους οὐ φυλαττούσης. Pericles has to 'impose a bridle' on the people (*Per.-Fab synk.* 1.4), which is what Scipio Nasica wants to do at *Cato Maj.* 27.3. The pattern Plutarch works with is the familiar one: 'power corrupts'. Compare *Cato Maj.* 4.2 again where the degeneration of the government is introduced early on: in the second century 'the state had already become too large to preserve its integrity, but control in many spheres and over many men brought a mixture of many customs and the acceptance of all kinds of ways of life'. *Per.* 15.1,2 offer good parallels. Again, Sparta gives up her hegemony when she sees her generals corrupted by 'the magnitude of their powers' (*Arist.* 23.7). The corruption of Roman society is caused δι' ὄγκον . . . καὶ δύναμιν (*Arist.-Cato Maj. synk.* 1.3), not by luxury, eastern promise, or Hellenic culture.

II. HELLENIC INFLUENCE ON ROMANS

Plutarch ignores Roman myths about the effect of Hellenism on Roman society. His interest lies in the effect of Hellenism on Romans as people. The attainment of Hellenic culture and education occupies a central position in his thought as a moralist and a biographer because of its importance to character formation.²³ Plutarch's ideas here, as set out especially in *de virt. mor.*, are Aristotelian. The soul has a rational and an irrational part (442a-c). Character (ἦθος) is the quality which the irrational takes on through habit (ἔθει) as it is moulded by the rational, enabling the rational to control the passions (443c-d).²⁴ The ἔξις ('established state') of the soul is the condition of the irrational ἐξ ἔθους ἐγγενομένη, κακία μὲν, ἄν φαύλως, ἀρετὴ δ', ἄν καλῶς, ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου παιδαγωγηθῆ τὸ πάθος (443d). Education is a crucial part of this habit-

¹⁵ For Plutarch's similar presentation of day-to-day politics in Greece and Rome, cf. H. Aalders, *Plutarch's political thought* (Amsterdam 1982) 28, 30, 35, 37, and particularly on his fondness for the βουλή-δῆμος opposition see C. B. R. Pelling, in *Past perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman historical writing*, ed. I. Moxon, J. Smart, A. Woodman (Cambridge 1986) esp. 175 ff.

¹⁶ *Them.* 19.5, *Arist.* 26.2, *Cato Maj.* 14.4, 27.3.

¹⁷ *Arist.* 22.1,4, *Cato Maj.* 16.8, esp. *Aem.* 10.1, 11.3-4, *Aem.-Tim. synk.* 2.2.

¹⁸ E.g. *Arist.* 2.1, *Aem.* 38.2,6; *Cim.* 15.1-2, *Per.* 7.8, *Gracchi* 16.1, 26.3-4, *Caes.* 14.2.

¹⁹ *Cim.* 17.9, *Gracchi* 20.1.

²⁰ *Per.* 11.2-3, cf. e.g. *Alc.* 13.5, *Nic.* 6.1, *Phoc.* 34.6; *Gracchi* 20.1, *Mar.* 35.1, *Caes.* 6.1 ff., cf. e.g. *Pomp.* 25.7, *Cic.* 33.2. The opposition between the people and the establishment is also the back-

ground to politics in the very early period (*Thes.* [24-25, 32.1-2], *Sol., Rom.* [13.7, 27.8-9], *Numa* [2.3,5], *Publ., Cor., Cam.*).

²¹ *Per.* 15.1, 20.3, *Aem.* 11.2, 38.2,6.

²² *Alc.* 19.7, 34.10, *Phoc.* 32.3, *Luc.* 42.8, *Cato Min.* 18.3.

²³ Educational works in the *Moralia* include *de aud. poet.*, *de aud.*, *de prof. in virt.*, *max. cum princ. phil. esse dis.*, *ad princ. indoct.*; lost works include *Lamp. Cat.* 106 *The proper use of school exercises*, 223 *Introductions to philosophy*, fr. 128-33 from *The necessity of educating one's wife*. The relationship between character and education is discussed more fully by me in *Phoenix* xliii (1989) 62-8.

²⁴ τὴν ποιότητα ταύτην καὶ τὴν διαφορὰν ἔθει λαμβάνει τὸ ἄλογον ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου πλαττόμενον. For ἦθος/ἔθος, cf. *de sera num. vind.* 551e, Aristotle, *EN* 1103a17 f., Plato *Laws* 792e.

forming,²⁵ for Plutarch also envisages λόγος ('reason') co-operating with νόμος ('law' or 'custom') as an external force—παιδεία—keeping the passions in check (452d). As he puts it at *de soll. anim.* 962c, 'λόγος is implanted by nature, but σπουδαῖος λόγος καὶ τέλειος is the product of care and instruction'. Similarly, when the soul has acquired bad habits a course of (re-)training is needed to restore it.²⁶

It is no surprise that Plutarch should be interested in the question of how education affects individuals; the surprise is that he approaches the question differently for Greeks and for Romans. The evidence assembled in the following pages, which is drawn mostly from the *Parallel lives*, suggests that Romans are far more likely to be scrutinized from the angle of education than Greeks, and that when Greeks are scrutinized in this respect the examination is far less thorough. The only plausible explanation of this situation is that Plutarch feels that good education cannot be assumed for Romans as it can for Greeks, since παιδεία had not been available from the start at Rome but had been introduced later on (as a result of contact with Greece). As a consequence an effective method of evaluating character in the *Lives* of Roman heroes is to ask with what benefit they had absorbed Greek culture.²⁷ The picture which emerges from the *Parallel lives* may be introduced by material in the *Moralia*, which shows a similar approach to Romans who are Plutarch's contemporaries. Here Plutarch is not concerned with character, but he does seem to expect a somewhat lower standard of culture from Romans than from Greeks, and to suggest the importance for Romans of acquiring and utilizing Hellenic culture. As we would expect, in the *Moralia* Roman examples in essays concerned with cultural, social, and philosophical issues are quite rare. It is worth making this point because Plutarch takes his illustrations of statecraft readily from both Greece and Rome (*de cap. ex inim. util.*, *an seni resp. ger. sit.*, *praec. ger. reip.*). Works dedicated to Plutarch's Roman friends are for the most part intellectually undemanding, while in the after-dinner conversations of the *quaestiones convivales* Plutarch's Roman hosts/guests seem to be wary of falling short intellectually and to be ready to defer to the dominant Hellenism.

Several of Plutarch's works are dedicated to Romans. Sosius Senecio, recipient of the *Parallel lives*, is also the dedicatee of *de profectibus in virtute* and the *quaestiones convivales*.²⁸ Paccius, an unknown, receives on request *de tranquillitate animi*.²⁹ The brothers Avidius Nigrinus and Avidius Quietus are honoured with *de fraterno amore*, and Quietus with *de sera numinis vindicta*.³⁰ Herennius Saturninus receives *adversus Colotem*.³¹ Further, two of Plutarch's dialogues have Roman interlocutors: Sextius Sulla and Minicius Fundanus share *de cohibenda ira*, and Sulla takes part in *de facie quae in orbe lunae apparet*.³² It has been pointed out that Greek authors of the late second to early first centuries BC and later did not dedicate difficult works to Roman patrons.³³ Plutarch's dedications, though not to patrons, are comparable. *De prof. in virt.*, *de tranq. an.*, *de frat.*

²⁵ It is aided by age, *de sera num. vind.* 552d, *Fab.* 3.7, *Them.* 2.7.

²⁶ Cf. *de vit. pud.* 530e, *de sera num. vind.* 551d, *de gen. Socr.* 584e.

²⁷ As D. A. Russell, *Plutarch* (London 1973) 132 observes with regard to the hero Marius who rejects the benefits of Hellenism, 'Most Romans, for Plutarch, had a potentiality for barbarism.'

²⁸ C. P. Jones, *JRS* lx (1970) 98–104, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford 1971) 54–7. The suggestion that Sosius Senecio in fact hailed from the East (R. Syme *Historia* xvii [1968] 101 n. 127 = *Roman Papers* ii, ed. E. Badian [Oxford 1979] 688 n. 3, Jones [1970] 103) is insecure. The only probable basis is the phrase τὴν ἐκ προγόνων εὐνοίαν εἰς τὴν

πόλιν in a *titulus honorarius* (IGRR iv 779) cited by Jones from the Phrygian town of Apameia honouring Sosius' daughter. The words are more likely to refer to Sosius' father-in-law, Sex. Iulius Frontinus, than to Sosius himself. The argument for discounting eastern origin will be elsewhere set out by me more fully.

²⁹ Jones (n. 28) 59–60.

³⁰ Jones (n. 28) 51–3.

³¹ Jones (n. 28) 57, 63.

³² Sulla: Jones (n. 28) 60; Fundanus: Jones 58–66.

³³ E. Rawson, *Intellectual life in the late Roman republic* (London 1985) 57.

am., the *quaest. conv.*, *de sera num. vind.*, are not difficult works. The same is true of *de cohib. ira*. Only *de fac. quae in orbe lun. app.* and *adv. Col.* require any philosophical understanding. Sextius Sulla, who speaks in the former, is 'a man who lacks neither learning nor charm' (*Rom* 15.3); Saturninus, recipient of the latter, is hailed as φιλόκκλον και φιλάρχαιον (*adv. Col.* 1107e). But it is unlikely that Saturninus, a career soldier, or even the amiable Sulla are ever thought of by Plutarch as philosophers (Romans are in fact hardly ever so described).³⁴ The level of understanding attributed to them is more a mark of honour than of reality.

Sextius Sulla appears also in the *quaest. conv.* He is clearly a good friend of Plutarch, for we find him hosting a dinner to welcome Plutarch back to Rome after a long absence (*quaest. conv.* viii 7–8). Here as elsewhere in the *quaest. conv.* Greek culture dominates. The *cena adventicia* (viii 7.727b τὸ ὑποδεκτικόν) is hijacked by the guests into a discussion of Greek philosophy without mention of the Roman music and poetry traditional to it.³⁵ Plutarch, whose modesty is not always apparent in the *quaest. conv.*, tells us that his words gave the others (not all Romans) λόγων ἄδειαν ('licence to speak', 7.728b).³⁶ Sulla, though, in alluding to the myth of Tereus, Procne, and Philomela, is careful to accord with Greek convention in making Philomela the swallow rather than the nightingale as Romans usually did (7.727d–e).³⁷ This may be out of deference to Plutarch or from his own inclination, or one may suggest that in writing the question up Plutarch substituted what he considered to be the correct version.

There is a parallel to this in the presentation of Sosius Senecio, one of the two major Roman dining companions. At i 5. 623c Sosius quotes Sophocles' lines about Thebes: ὁμοῦ μὲν θυμιαμάτων . . . ὁμοῦ δὲ παιάνων τε καὶ στεναγμάτων (*OT* 4–5). This is one of Plutarch's favourite quotations,³⁸ and he always takes the lines as a pointed paradox ('hymns of joy and lamentations'). This reading was surely not Sophocles' own (in his city 'paean' must mean 'prayers for deliverance'), though it may have become the standard one (*cf.* Athenaeus *deipn.* 420f).³⁹ Sosius uses the paradox to illustrate the confused soul of the lover, and Plutarch also uses it of the soul at *de superstit.* 169d and *de virt. mor.* 445d. It seems likely that Plutarch's interpretation and application of the lines have come to be Sosius' own. This would fit in with his general presentation as a man of good average intelligence who is familiar with the major Greek poets and philosophers, and no more.⁴⁰ Sosius appears in no question which requires serious independent thought.⁴¹ Typical of his characterization is the question where Plutarch, displaying his own erudition by citing an obscure author, abandons the dramatic representation to explain to Sosius that 'the Prokles I mean was a fellow-student of Xenocrates in the Academy' (v 3. 677b).⁴² We should not forget that this Roman soldier at some point confides in Plutarch his problems in attaining true virtue and elicits from him a guide on how to make progress towards it (*de prof. in virt.* 75a ff.).⁴³

The presentation of Plutarch's other main Roman companion, Mestrius Florus, is

³⁴ See n. 69 with text.

³⁵ A traditional Roman occasion—R. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *A commentary on Horace: Odes Book 1* (Oxford 1970) 401–2, on Horace *Odes* i 36 (*Et ture et fidibus iuvat*); music and poetry—O. Murray, *JRS* lxxv (1985) 47.

³⁶ Modesty: v 2. 674f–675b, v 3. 677b (see below).

³⁷ Roscher iii 2. 2347, 3024.

³⁸ 95c, 169d, 445d, *Ant.* 24.3.

³⁹ *Cf.* C. B. R. Pelling, *Plutarch: Life of Antony* (Cambridge 1988) 178–9.

⁴⁰ He cites Homer, Pindar, Sophocles, Menander, Theophrastus, Hecataeus of Abdera,

and knows something of the Stoics (ii 3, 637a, *cf.* *de prof. in virt.* 75d) and Epicureans (v intro. 672d).

⁴¹ He appears six times on six separate occasions (i 1, i 5, ii 1, ii 3, iv 3, v 1).

⁴² For Prokles, see Müller *FHG* ii 342 *Menecrates fr.* 2 with note; F. Fuhrmann, *Plutarque: œuvres morales (Coll. des univ. de France)* ix 2 (Paris 1978) 169. Suspension of dramatic representation: Fuhrmann *ib.*

⁴³ The date of *de prof. in virt.* is unknown (before 116—C. P. Jones, *JRS* lvi [1966] 73), though Plutarch may imply that Sosius is still a νέος (i.e. under 30 or so; *cf.* 79a, 85c–d).

comparable.⁴⁴ Florus, who is about Plutarch's age,⁴⁵ emerges as a more educated man than Sosius. Plutarch describes him as having a philosophical nature (viii 10. 734d). He likes the philosophers, especially Plato.⁴⁶ He is φιλόρραχος (vii 4. 702d), and Plutarch uses the speculations of his son and his son-in-law on archaic Roman customs in the *quaest. Rom.* (vii 4. 702d–704b; *quaest. Rom.* 64, 279d, 75, 281f). But Florus defers wholly to Hellenic culture in the questions. He demands 'a good Hellenic answer' to a query at v 10. 685a. He pretends to be in love with a Greek dinner guest, Tyndares, at viii 2. 718f–719a. And in the discussion about σκιά (vii 6), which is pursued at his request (707c), the answers about this prevalent Roman habit (707a, 708b) draw exclusively on Greek literature without commenting on the origin of the term. Like Sosius Florus tends only to ask questions, not to answer them.⁴⁷

Plutarch expects his Roman dining companions to use Hellenic culture in the conversations while paradoxically presenting them as being not fully and absolutely at ease with it. He is convinced of the need to encourage them to acquire it more completely (*de prof. in virt.*). With this experience of his Roman friends, it is quite understandable that he is interested in examining how far and with what benefit Hellenic culture is absorbed by his Roman heroes in the *Lives*, who are also thought of, with their Greek pairs, as guests whom he is entertaining (*Aem.* 1.2 συνδιαιτησει και συμβιωσει . . . επιξενούμενον ἕκαστον . . . ὑποδεχόμενοι).⁴⁸

III. HELLENIC EDUCATION IN THE ROMAN LIVES

I turn now to the evidence on Romans and Hellenic education afforded by the *Parallel lives*. I shall outline first Plutarch's understanding of the advent of Hellenic education at Rome, and the differing approaches which he adopts towards Romans and Greeks in relation to education. Then as examples I shall take *Coriolanus*, showing a hero suffering from the absence of παιδεία in early Rome, *Marius*, which with its pair *Pyrrhus* shows clearly the contrasting approach to Romans and Greeks, and finally *Marcellus* and *Lucullus* which illustrate in different ways Plutarch's interest in bringing out the benefits of Hellenic culture.⁴⁹

Plutarch traces the beginning of Hellenic culture at Rome in *Marcellus*.⁵⁰ We tend to think of Marcellus as an archetypal Roman soldier, but Plutarch tells us at the beginning of his *Life* that he was also 'an enthusiast for Hellenic learning and literature' (1.3). The silence on Greek culture in the biography of his contemporary, Fabius Maximus, serves to highlight the unexpected presentation. The emphasis on Hellenism

⁴⁴ For Florus see Jones (n. 28) 48–9. He obtained for Plutarch his Roman citizenship (*SIG*³ 829A). Florus appears in thirteen questions on ten separate occasions (i 9; iii 3, 4, 5; v 7; v 10; vii 1; vii 2; vii 4; vii 6; viii 1, 2; viii 10).

⁴⁵ Jones (n. 28) 49.

⁴⁶ He also mentions Aristotle, Protagoras, Pyrrhon, and the historian Phylarchus.

⁴⁷ Sosius: see i 1, 613d, ii 1, 629f, v 1 (no speech); Florus: i 9 (no speech), iii 5, 651f, 652b, v 10, 684e, vii 1, 698e, vii 2, 701a, vii 4, 702e, vii 6, 707c, viii 10 (no speech); note, though, that Sosius does speak in i 5, 623a–d, ii 3, 636e–638a (a long speech), and iv 3, 666d–667a, and Florus speaks in iii 3 and iii 4, 650a, 651c–e (the same meal as iii 5), v 7, 680c–f, viii 1, 717d–e, and viii 2, 719a–c (the same meal as viii 1).

⁴⁸ Note that two of the surviving single *Lives*,

Galba and *Otho*, concern men who lived during Plutarch's lifetime. Plutarch is not interested in the education of these heroes, though he does observe the consequences for Rome of not having educated leaders in the period after Nero's death at *Galba* 1.3–4 (cf. A. Georgiadou, *ICS* xiii.2 [1988] 349–65).

⁴⁹ I am not concerned with Romulus, Publicola, or Camillus, whose *Lives* offer nothing on the subject, nor with Numa, who is a semi-divine, semi-mythological hero, and something of a special case (but see n. 75).

⁵⁰ Cf. Porcius Licinus fr. 1 Buechner: *Poenico bello secundo Musa pinnato gradu | intulit se bellicosam in Romuli gentem feram*; but Plutarch (or his source) is unlikely to have been affected by this tradition (for which see F. Leo, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* i [Berlin 1913] 388, 436).

may be Plutarch's development of Marcellus' description of Archimedes, in which he alludes to the culture of the *symposion* (17.2). It is probably encouraged by Poseidonius' narrative of Marcellus' campaign in Sicily. Marcellus' Hellenism is closely associated with Plutarch's stress in the *Life* on the propriety and Hellenic character of Roman religion at the time (3.6), a stress which ties in with themes in the paired *Pelopidas* (*Pel.* 21.5–6). Plutarch's interest in Marcellus' Hellenism leads him to extenuate his war crimes in Sicily (*Marc.* 20). He is keen to applaud him for introducing Rome to 'Hellenic grace' in the form of works of art taken from Syracuse (21.4), and to be able to present to us the hero who 'taught the Romans to give honour and admiration to the beauties and marvels of Greece' (21.7). The special stress on Hellenism in *Marc.*, is paralleled well in *Lucullus*, where the hero's education and culture are accorded great prominence (*cf.* esp. 1.4–8, 42.1–4), no doubt principally because of his political aid to Chaeroneia and Greece during the Mithridatic War (7.4–7, 20.1–6; *Cim.* 1–2). In *Lucullus*' age Hellenic education is no surprise in itself. In Marcellus' Rome Plutarch is aware that Hellenic culture is not readily available. Hence Marcellus, despite his Hellenic tastes, is not fully educated and succumbs to a fatal ambition in old age (28.6). One may compare Flamininus. He is 'a naturally good man' (2.5) who is 'humane in appearance, a Hellene in voice and in language' (5.7); but he too lacks a proper Hellenic education (1.4), and he too later becomes the victim of φιλοτιμία (20–21). The surrender to ambition is closely connected with insufficient παιδεία, for φιλοτιμία is particularly dangerous to statesmen unless regulated by education.⁵¹

Aemilius Paullus is the first hero we hear of who is said to receive 'a native and ancestral education' (*Aem.* 6.8),⁵² and also the first to set aside the traditional pursuits of Roman youth (litigation and levées) in order to win a 'reputation for courage, justice, and trust' (2.6). The Hellenic tone of this has no doubt been invented by Plutarch on the basis of what Polybius says about the upbringing and education of Aemilius' son, Scipio Aemilianus (xxxii 25–30). Scipio rejects similar traditional activities of Roman youth (xxxii 25.8, 29.8–12) in favour of securing a reputation for σωφροσύνη and καλοκάγαθία (28.10), and it is likely that Plutarch has simply transposed the education given to the son by the father to the father himself (though he is careful not to fabricate details of specific teachers or syllabuses).⁵³ Plutarch's assumption that Hellenic παιδεία is available to Aemilius' sons at Rome (*Aem.* 6.8–9) is clearly based on Polybius xxxii 24.6–7, where Polybius tells Scipio shortly after 167 that he will not lack tutors in the subjects which interest him owing to the present influx of teachers from Greece.⁵⁴ One suspects in fact that Polybius' Greek educators are anachronistic: certainly at this time

⁵¹ Particularly dangerous for statesmen: *Ag./Cleom.* 2.3, *Arist.-Cato Maj. synk.* 5.4, *praec. ger. reip.* 819f–820f, 825f (note that φιλοτιμία can be a good thing; see n. 61); regulated by education: *de virt. mor.* 452d τὰ πάθη τῶν νέων . . . φιλοτιμίαν. ὧν ἐμμελῆ καὶ σωτήριον ἄφην ἀπτόμενος ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ νόμος εἰς τὴν προσήκουσαν ὁδὸν ἀνυσίμως καθίστησι τὸν νέον. See generally A. Wardman, *Plutarch's Lives* (London 1974) 115–24. Note that Plutarch thinks that Romans are particularly prone to one form of ambition, φιλαρχία—at any rate 16 of the 18 instances of the word in the *Lives* concern Roman heroes (and of these 5 are to do with Pompey).

⁵² It is not clear what Plutarch means by this—probably military training (*cf.* *Cor.* 1.6), probably also (forensic) oratory which he thinks of, perhaps anachronistically, as characterizing even early

Rome (*Publ.* 2.1, *Cor.* 27.1, 39.6, *Fab.* 1.7–9, *Luc.* 1.3); see below, p. 137.

⁵³ Similarly there are no details about the education of Cato the Elder who is well versed in Greek life and letters (*Cato Maj.* 2.3–6, 4.1, 8.4, 8.14, 9.3, 13.1, 20.3, 24.8) in spite of apparent hostility (22, 23.1–24.1); he is merely described as an 'opsimath' (2.5).

⁵⁴ πολὺ γὰρ δὴ τι φῦλον ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐπιρρέον ὄρω . . . τῶν τοιοῦτων ἀνθρώπων. The date is indicated by Scipio being eighteen (xxxii 24.1)—see F. Walbank, *A historical commentary on Polybius iii* (Oxford 1979) 497 *ad loc.* It is reasonable to assume that παιδεία was also an important element in Plutarch's lost *Scip. Aem.*, but impossible to estimate how important (*cf.* *Luc.* 38.4 on Scipio's unseasonable ambition in later years).

Aemilius himself had to import a teacher for his sons from Athens.⁵⁵ But Plutarch, while generally aware of the timescale of the introduction of Hellenic culture, would not have argued with him.⁵⁶ Plutarch's own statement that a real influx of 'philosophies, sophistries, and casuistry'⁵⁷ had already occurred by the time of the Cimbric wars (*de fort. Rom.* 318e, 322d) is basically correct, even if there were no major scholars at Rome for a while after Polybius and Panaetius.⁵⁸

By the late Republic Plutarch can of course take the availability of Greek education for granted, and is free to explore its effects. There is a good deal on particular teachers and studies.⁵⁹ One might expect that the education of Roman heroes would in most cases simply be assumed. But Plutarch's treatment of the subject differs wildly. In some *Lives* there is little on it, in others a lot. The amount of information Plutarch inherits from sources does not seem greatly to determine the extent and relevance of education in a *Life*. For example, there was obviously a good deal more material available on education for Cicero than for Lucullus, yet education is of great importance in the *Lives* of both men. There is a variety of factors at work. One certain reason for examining a hero from this angle is his degree of contentedness and freedom from ambition (*cf.* 000). To take Lucullus and Cicero, it is explicitly stated that Lucullus overcomes φιλοτιμία and is happy to give up politics for study because he has benefited from παιδεία (*Luc.* 1.6, 42.4), whereas Cicero's early political career is dominated by φιλοτιμία and a yearning for δόξα which continues despite attempts to reason himself out of it (6.4–5). In the personal crisis of exile Cicero's education again fails to help him (32.5–7), and the attentions of philosophers are unable to console him after his daughter's death (41.8).⁶⁰ Similarly, Marius' unhappy ambition in old age is clearly associated by Plutarch with his rejection of Hellenic values (*Marius* 1.3–4, 45.10–46.5).

However, Plutarch by no means feels that ambition is always or necessarily a bad thing.⁶¹ After Marius Caesar is his most ambitious Roman (*Caes.* 58.4–5); but no link is made between φιλοτιμία and education, perhaps because Caesar's ambition—while not finally satisfying (*cf.* 69.1)—is not destructive to him. In fact there is very little information at all on Caesar's education, which is not due simply to the loss of the early chapters, since the theme is not developed later,⁶² but rather to Plutarch's overriding interest in the political background.⁶³ Pompey and Crassus are also ambitious men and are not criticized for it in respect of education or anything else, perhaps because there is

⁵⁵ This was Metrodorus, *pictor idemque philosophus* (Pliny *HN* xxxv 135).

⁵⁶ *Cf.* *Arat.* 38.12—Phylarchus is not trustworthy 'unless supported by the testimony of Polybius'.

⁵⁷ λόγοι, σοφίσματα, στωμυλία; for στωμυλία ('clever talk', 'philosophers' claptrap') *cf. de aud.* 42e, *Cim.* 4.5.

⁵⁸ *Cf.* Rawson (n. 33) 5. Plutarch will mention the presence of Greek scholars at Rome (Polybius *Cato Maj.* 9.2–3, Blossius *Gracchi* 8.6, Philon *Cic.* 3.1, Panaetius ? *Scip. Aem.*), and knows of their stimulating effects on Roman philosophy (Lucullus' support of Antiochus against Cicero's support of Philon *Luc.* 42.3–4), but is not interested in who was where at what time.

⁵⁹ Note that we do not really have anything in the *Lives* on what Romans rejected in Greek education: at *quaest. Rom.* 274d–e Plutarch remarks on their strong aversion to athletics (*cf.* H.-I. Marrou, *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*⁶ [Paris 1965] 363–6), and at *Cic.* 5.2 notes τὰ Ῥωμαίων

τοῖς βαναυσοτάτοις πρόχειρα καὶ συνήθη ῥήματα Γραικὸς καὶ σχολαστικὸς.

⁶⁰ For excessive grief as a sign of ineffective education, *cf.* *Cato Min.* 11.3 ἐμπαθέστερον . . . ἢ φιλοσοφώτερον (Cato's reaction to Caepio's death), *consol. ad uxor.* 608c, 609b, 611a (the need for 'correct reasoning').

⁶¹ *Cf. de cap. ex inim. util.* 92d, *de virt. mor.* 452b, *Ages.* 5.5, *Lys.* 2.4.

⁶² Loss of early chapters: C. B. R. Pelling, *CQ* xxxiii (1973) 343–4.

⁶³ There is a little on Caesar's rhetorical education under Apollonius Molon (3.1, corresponding to Alexander's tuition under Aristotle, *Alex.* 7–8). Note how Plutarch uses Caesar's study with Apollonius to introduce his prosecutions of Cornelius Dolabella and Antonius Hybrida (4.1–3), whereas in fact these unsuccessful trials (in 77–6) were followed by the stay on Rhodes (75; Suetonius *DJ* 4.2, M. Gelzer, *Caesar. Der Politiker und Staatsmann*⁶ [Wiesbaden 1960] 20–1).

no element of κακοήθεια to their ambition (*Pomp.* 49.14; *Crass.* 7.5).⁶⁴ As with Caesar there is nothing substantial on education in their *Lives*, which may again be due to the dominance of other themes.⁶⁵ In the case of Crassus Plutarch does at least suggest that his φιλοπλουτία was due to 'an instability and discordance of character' (*synk.* 1.4), which is often indicative of deficient education.⁶⁶ Sulla is another late Republican hero who displays ἀνωμαλία in character (*Sulla* 6.14–15, 30.6); but again no connection is made between his failings and education, probably because Plutarch develops other themes rather than because Sulla's success in life makes moralizing about deficient education otiose.⁶⁷ With Antony, a particularly complex creation, Plutarch may have felt that his degeneration could not be crudely attributed to poor education (and in *Ant.* he is not so interested anyway in Helleno-Roman contrasts).⁶⁸

More interesting are Cato the Younger and Brutus. Cato is one of a very few Romans—politicians or scholars—who is ever called 'philosopher'.⁶⁹ He is not described thus in his own *Life*, and I have argued elsewhere that his importance to Plutarch is principally as a statesman.⁷⁰ However, in the *Life* Plutarch does present him as having a wide interest in philosophy, particularly Stoic philosophy. Education is not connected with routine flaws in *Cato*. Rather, Plutarch uses Stoicism to illustrate the flaws of Cato's statemanship, and he goes as far as to blame Cato's philosophical principles for the outbreak of the Civil War (30.9–10, 49.6, 50.2; *Phoc.* 3.2). Plutarch is also interested in philosophy in *Brutus*, where Brutus' education is tempered especially by Platonism (1.3, 2.2–3). It is probably because of his Platonism that Brutus' rigid principles, which in reality have a strong Stoic colour like Cato's, are never criticized in the context of his own political failures.⁷¹

There is an important difference between the *Lives* of the Roman and the Greek heroes. Although Plutarch can assume that his Greek heroes have a Greek education, the effects of this παιδεία are not regularly explored to any great extent. This is the more surprising because in most of the *Parallel lives* Plutarch is careful to interweave themes developed in one *Life* with those in the other.⁷² This is the case in *Pyr.-Marius*; but only

⁶⁴ Contrast *Marius* (*Marius* 25.8) and *Cicero* (*Cic.* 5.6).

⁶⁵ Note *Pomp.* 8.7: Plutarch has no time to dwell on Pompey's early life. Pompey is pictured as having an interest in literature and philosophy (10.8, 42.9–11, 52.5, 75.4–5); see Rawson (n. 33) 104–9. Crassus 'is said to have had an encyclopaedic knowledge of history, and was also something of a philosopher, holding with the doctrines of Aristotle' (3.6); cf. *Cic.* 25.4 (interest in Stoic doctrine).

⁶⁶ Cf. *Arat.* 10.5 τὴν δὲ τοιαύτην ἀνωμαλίαν ἔνδεια λόγου φιλοσόφου... ἀπεργάζεται. Note that Crassus' wide education (*Crass.* 3.6; see n. 65) is only alleged (λέγεται).

⁶⁷ Note that Sertorius like Sulla undergoes a change of character (*Sert.* 10.5–7, *Sulla* 30.6), but Plutarch has nothing in this *Life* on education and affirms that Sertorius' προαίρεσις and φύσις were in fact noble.

⁶⁸ Plutarch does comment dryly on Antony's 'schooling' in uxoriousness and pleasure (10.6 διδασκάλια... πεπαιδαγωγημένον, 29.1 διεπαιδαγωγώγει).

⁶⁹ *Cato Maj.* 27.7, *Brut.* 2.1, *Pomp.* 40.2. The only other examples seem to be the astrologist, scholar, and philosopher P. Nigidius Figulus (*an seni resp. ger. sit* 797d; used at *quaest. Rom.* 268f; cf. *Cic.* 20.3), and the polymath M. Terentius Varro

(*Rom.* 12.3; used on several occasions, cf. E. Valgiglio, in *Atti del congresso internazionale di studi Varroniani* [Rieti 1976] 571–95).

⁷⁰ In a paper to appear in *Hermes*.

⁷¹ A good illustration of Plutarch's suppression of Stoicism in *Brut.* is the contrast between his silence on Antiochus of Ascalon's Stoic leanings at *Brut.* 2.3 and his interested comments at *Cic.* 4.2 and *Luc.* 42.3–4 (cf. D. Babut, *Plutarque et le Stoïcisme* [Paris 1969] 198–200). Brutus was formally a Platonist, which is course the basic for the comparison with Dion (cf. *Dion* 1). On his actual tendency towards Stoicism, see J. L. Moles, *QUCC* xxv (1987) 64–5. It may be thought surprising that we find nothing in *Gracchi* on the limitations of idealism in politics: the reason is probably that the Gracchi are destroyed not by a blind reforming zeal like Cato, but by a φόβος ἀδοξίας (*Ag./Cleom.* 2.7) which Plutarch considers to be no bad thing (ib. ἐκ προφάσεως οὐκ ἀγεννοῦς, cf. 30.4–5).

⁷² The standard exploration of this aspect of Plutarch's methodology is P. A. Stadter, *GRBS* xvi (1975) 77–85 (on *Per.-Fab.*); see also H. Erbse, *Hermes* lxxxiv (1956) 398–424; C. B. R. Pelling, in *Miscellanea Plutarchea. Atti del I convegno di studi su Plutarco* (Ferrara 1986) 83–96; F. Frazier, *RPh* lxi (1987) 65–75; D. H. J. Larmour, *TAPA* cxviii (1988) 361–75; my papers in *ICS* xiii.2 (1988) 335–47; *Historia* xxxviii (1989) 314–34.

in the Roman *Life* is education introduced to explain failings common to both heroes (even though Plutarch does know something of Pyrrhus' education, *Pyrr.* 1.4, 8.3,6). In *Demosthenes-Cicero* Demosthenes like Cicero suffers an exile which he bears $\mu\lambda\alpha\kappa\omega\varsigma$ (*Demosth.* 26.5), and the death of a daughter which he bears well (22.3). Demosthenes is 'uneducated in the subjects which are suitable and proper for a free-born child' (4.4). Yet Plutarch makes no attempt to connect his education or lack of it with his ability to resist emotion.⁷³ Again, in *Coriolanus-Alcibiades* Alcibiades' failings may be pointed out by Socrates (*Alc.* 6.5), but in the rest of the *Life* Plutarch never refers back to his education under the philosopher (4), even when he notes 'the instability of his nature' (16.9), whereas he strongly implies that Coriolanus' lack of $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ is the root cause of his failings (*Cor.* 1.3-6, 15.4-5). Where a Roman's education is greatly emphasized (Marcellus, Aemilius, Lucullus), the education of his Greek counterpart may be largely ignored (cf. *Pel.* 4.1-2, *Tim.* 6.1; *Cim.* 4.5): education is not regularly a vital feature in the pairings. Perhaps, indeed, it is only in *Philopoemen-Flaminius* that Hellenic influences lead to the same result (of benefiting Greece). But even here in the individuals' own lives we have something of the same pattern: Philopoemen's education is stressed (*Phil.* 1.2-5, 4.6-8), but is not then clearly connected with the good or bad in his character, whereas Flaminius' lack of any deep education is the implicit cause of his later ambition (cf. 132 p. above).

In general, where there is important material on Greeks' education (*Alc.* 4; *Alex.* 7.2-8.5; *Sol.* 3.6-6.7; *Dion, Per., Them., Arat.*, see below), Plutarch very rarely uses it to explore or illustrate virtue and vice. Dion has much contact with philosophy. At *Dion* 47.4 he says that he has long practised in the Academy to overcome $\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\nu\iota\kappa\iota\alpha$ and will not kill the demagogue Heraclides; typically Plutarch does not comment on his education when he records his continuing contentiousness and later murder of his enemy (52.5, 53.5). *Pericles*, with a good deal on education (4-6.1) and culture (esp. 12.1, 13.5, *synk.* 3.7), merits a few more words. Pericles is an ambitious man (10.7) and indulges in political rivalry (11.3), but his ambition is entirely free of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\omicron\varsigma$ (10.7), as is also his public speaking (5.1), and his chief characteristics, $\pi\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\varsigma$ and $\phi\iota\lambda\alpha\theta\rho\omega\pi\iota\alpha$, are elsewhere thought of by Plutarch as means between the passions brought about by $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ (*de virt. mor.* 445a, 451e). Further, Plutarch plays down Pericles' $\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\nu\iota\kappa\iota\alpha$ (29.8, 31.1 before the Peloponnesian War) and the surrender of his $\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\tau\acute{\eta}$ to $\pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta$ during the plague (38.2). All of this could be indirectly attributable to education and culture. However, had Pericles been Roman, the attribution would surely have been as explicit as in *Luc.* and *Marc.*: the significance of culture and education in his resistance to passions, which Plutarch emphasizes so greatly, would have been brought out into the open in a Roman *Life*. In *Per.* Plutarch's major interest in Pericles' education seems to be in his beautification of Athens, which is extolled for two long chapters in the *Life* (12-13) and saluted proudly at the end of the *synkrisis* (3.7). In those Greek *Lives* where a clear causal connection is suggested between education and character the theme is again barely developed or explored. In *Themistocles* and *Aratus* Plutarch attributes $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\mu\alpha\lambda\iota\alpha$ to deficient $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ and $\pi\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ (*Them.* 2.3,7) or an $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\upsilon$ $\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\sigma\acute{o}\phi\omicron\upsilon$ (*Arat.* 3.3, 10.5). At first this seems a deeper, more illuminating point than the analysis of a similar instability in *Sulla* (cf. p. 134 above), but still one notices how little is made of it: again one feels that in most Roman *Lives*, if not in *Sulla* itself, the early identification of such a cause would have been followed by a more insistent and explicit tracing of the theme through the narrative (as we will see in *Cor.* and *Marius*).⁷⁴

Naturally it is not always true that Plutarch has more on Romans' education. The

⁷³ Cf. Erbse (n. 72) 399-400, 406-13 on the closely paralleled structure of *Demosth.-Cic.*, and 406-7 on the exposure of both heroes to $\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\tau\iota\mu\iota\alpha$.

⁷⁴ In the case of *Sulla* it should be remembered that Plutarch offers no reason for the instability in the first place.

paradox indeed is that there is often more material about education on the Greek side of a pair than on the Roman (*Alex.-Caes.*, *Cor.-Alc.*, *Lyc.-Num.*, *Per.-Fab.*, *Phil.-Flam.*, *Sol.-Publ.*, *Them.-Cam.*), but that Plutarch does little with it. In a number of Roman *Lives* (*Aem.*, *Brut.*, *Cato Maj.*, *Cato Min.*, *Cic.*, *Cor.*, *Luc.*, *Marc.*, *Marius*) concerns about education and culture emerge prominently in a manner which is unrepresentative of the source material and independent of thematic structures which run through a pair as a whole. Plutarch seems ready to examine Romans' education and culture in a way he does not think of doing with Greeks. He is aware that Greek culture had been imported to Rome, had never been fully naturalized, and hence cannot simply be taken for granted. He frequently recalls this difference between Greece and Rome and makes use of it as an interesting criterion for analysing the character of his Roman heroes.

IV. CORIOLANUS

The Rome of the *Coriolanus* is certainly pre-Hellenic.⁷⁵ It is a pure age without corruption (*Cor.* 14.3–6), the era of peasant-patriarchs (24.8). Plutarch's *Coriolanus* is a noble savage. His nature is γενναία and ἀγαθή, and he displays strong natural qualities of ἐγκράτεια, δικαιοσύνη, and ἀνδρεία which stem from his ἀπάθεια towards pleasure, labour, and money (1.4, cf. *synk.* 5.2). However, he suffers from insufficient παιδεία (1.3), and his φύσις is a εὐγενῆς χώρα lacking the farmer's due care (ib., cf. *Arat.* 10.5). Alcibiades, the paired hero, is luckier in having Socrates to look out for him when he is like 'a tree in blossom shedding and destroying its own fruit' (*Alc.* 4.1, cf. *Cato Maj.* 3.3). As at *Marius* 2.4 (see p. 138 below) Plutarch affirms that the greatest benefit man can enjoy from the Muses is to ἐξημεροῦσθαι τὴν φύσιν ὑπὸ λόγου καὶ παιδείας τῷ λόγῳ δεξαμένην τὸ μέτριον καὶ τὸ ἄγαν ἀποβαλοῦσαν (*Cor.* 1.5). Coriolanus, however, has no Hellenic learning. Nor does he have the opportunity. Plutarch knows that Hellenic culture had not reached Rome by Coriolanus' day. He observes that in those times the Romans concentrated on the aspect of ἀρετή which concerns warfare: 'evidence for this is found in the fact that they call ἀρετή by the one term they have for ἀνδρεία, and the word they specifically use for ἀνδρεία serves as the generic term' (1.6).⁷⁶ This is a simple Rome where environmental conditions mould character.⁷⁷

The good old antique virtues are not sufficient in all walks of life. Plutarch takes over from Dionysius of Halicarnassus⁷⁸ a picture of political activity in Coriolanus' Rome which is sometimes out of step with his own presentation of more simple social conditions. In this climate Coriolanus' anti-social nature, like that of Marius, leads to political ineptitude (*synk.* 4.7–9, 5.1; *Marius* 32.2). He is especially prone to φιλοτιμία (4.1–3), and lacks the mixture of τὸ ἐμβριθὲς καὶ τὸ πρᾶον which is an indispensable part of political virtue and a mixture made by λόγος and παιδεία (15.4, cf. *Brut.* 1.3). Owing to his simple ways (15.5, *synk.* 2.1) he makes the mistake of believing that to win all is a sign of ἀνδρεία, whereas really it is ἀσθένεια and μαλακία (15.5). One recalls a number of passages in the *Moralia* where Plutarch ascribes to ignorance and self-deception and flattery the dangerous practice of extenuating failings by giving them the names of virtues.⁷⁹ Education, leading to self-awareness, is the only antidote for such troubled natures.

⁷⁵ Although Plutarch presents Numa as enjoying contacts with Pythagoras in the regal period (cf. *Numa* 8, 22.5), Numa's 'most beautiful and most just system' quickly fails 'because it lacked the cohesive force that is παιδεία' (*synk.* 4.12, cf. *Numa* 1.3).

⁷⁶ Cf. Polybius xxxi 29.1: ἀνδρεία is 'a most important item . . . particularly at Rome'.

⁷⁷ Cf. educational conditioning in Sparta at *Lys.* 2.4, *Ages.* 5.5.

⁷⁸ The main source (quoted at *synk.* 2.4); see D. A. Russell, *JRS* liii (1963) 21–8.

⁷⁹ *de adul. et amico* 56b–f, *de cohib. ira* 462f, *animi an corp. affect. sint peiores* 500e–501b, *de vit. pud.* 529d, *fr.* 161 from the *Letter on friendship*; cf. *Alc.* 16.4.

Despite his lack of education Coriolanus is a brilliant orator (27.1, 39.6), if not a good extempore speaker (20.6, cf. *Alc.* 10.4). It has been noted already that Plutarch thinks of rhetoric as characteristic of even early Rome;⁸⁰ in the case of Coriolanus he may also be influenced by Dionysius' verdant speeches, or by a desire to compare Coriolanus with Alcibiades who aims at popular support through oratory (*Alc.* 10.3–4). In other respects Plutarch keeps to his picture of a Rome lacking education. Later Romans may be scrutinized from the angle of παιδεία (which is taken to be available to them): for example, Cicero's surrender to emotion during his exile is taken as an opportunity to comment on his claims to be an educated man (*Cic.* 32.5–7). Coriolanus has no pretensions to education. Plutarch can only underline its absence at the beginning of the *Life*. Thus there is no comment when Coriolanus goes into exile at 21.1 ἐμπροσθὴς ὑπ' ὀργῆς καὶ βαρυφροσύνης, or when his πάθος at seeing his mother turns him from his reasoning (34.3; a similar change of mind at *Tim.* 6.1 is felt—unusually in a Greek *Life*—to reveal a deficiency of λόγος and φιλοσοφία). But though Plutarch cannot openly use education as a tool to analyse Coriolanus' character and must rather examine him on moral grounds alone as he does with Alcibiades (15.4–5, 18.3, 21.1–2, 35.5, *synk.* 5.1–2), he does at least imply strongly that Coriolanus' failings should be connected with his lack of Hellenic culture (1.3–6, 15.4, 21.1).

V. PYRRHUS–MARIUS

Marius differs from Coriolanus in that Plutarch can and does insist that he is culpable for rejecting the Hellenic education which is available to him. To understand Plutarch's attitude it is well first to consider the paired *Pyrrhus* which offers interesting correspondences with the themes we are concerned with.

I concentrate on Pyrrhus in the West. His adventures in Italy and Sicily are bracketed by two forceful comments on the misuse of fortune (13.1, 26.1–2), which is a major failing both in him and in Marius. In Italy Pyrrhus encounters Romans who are paragons of virtue. The meeting is fertile ground for moral exploitation.⁸¹ One of Plutarch's sources for the narrative, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (cf. 17.7, 21.13), makes use of it as part of his broader aim of showing that the Romans lived by a high moral code. Plutarch's intention is rather to highlight Pyrrhus' faults. To this end Romans are given a good press. The Tarentines have gone to war with them 'owing to the reckless depravity of their demagogues' (13.4), and their love of luxury is brought out forcefully in the tale of Meton.⁸² The moralizing becomes still more obvious in the next chapter as Pyrrhus' agent Kineas vainly demonstrates to the king that power will win him no happiness.

From the very start Pyrrhus has a high opinion of his Roman enemies: 'when we have conquered the Romans there is no barbarian or Greek city there which will be a match for us' (14.6). His respect for them increases still more on seeing their discipline before the battle of the Siris: (16.7) 'he was amazed, and addressing the nearest of his friends, said, "Megakles, the formation of the βάρβαροι is not βάρβαρος—but we shall know from their actions"'. After the battle Pyrrhus is 'very proud . . . to have overcome the Romans' great power' (17.10). He next sends Kineas to Rome to see if the Romans will come to an agreement. 'While he was on this mission he made it his business to make a thorough investigation of their way of life and to discover the ἀρετή of their

⁸⁰ See n. 52.

⁸¹ Note that Plutarch detests the Hellenistic monarchs of which Pyrrhus is a prime example (7.3, 12.2–12), if better than most (8.2, *Demetr.*

41.4–5); cf. *Arist.* 6.2–5, *Demetr.* 3.3–5, 42.8–11, *ad princ. indoct.* 78of.

⁸² τῆς ἀνὴρ ἐπιεικῆς 13.6–11; cf. Dionysius xix 8.

system of government' (19.6). He duly reports to Pyrrhus that the senate is 'a council of many kings',⁸³ and that the masses are like the 'Lernaean Hydra' (19.6–7). In the next chapter Pyrrhus comes face to face with Fabricius, who is 'a good man and a good soldier, but extremely poor' (20.1). Plutarch follows Dionysius (xix 14) in having Pyrrhus try to corrupt Fabricius financially. Plutarch's Roman, without recourse to Dionysius' long moralizing speech, functions perfectly as an embodiment of poverty and hence as a foil to the king. This emerges particularly in the story of Pyrrhus' banquet (20.6–7): 'all sorts of topics were discussed, particularly Greece and her philosophers, and Kineas, happening to mention Epicurus, went through their doctrines . . . about placing the highest good in pleasure . . . but while he was still speaking, Fabricius cried out and said, "O Hercules, may Pyrrhus and the Samnites cherish these notions as long as they are at war with us!"'. Plutarch, aware that Greek παιδεία had not yet come to Rome, passes by the opportunity of portraying Fabricius as cultured and knowledgeable about Greece and philosophy in order to emphasize his native virtue.

Fabricius is a man content with little, he is modest, yet is held in the highest esteem at Rome (20.1). His virtue (and the Romans'—21.4, 11) appears especially in the warning he sends to Pyrrhus about his doctor (21.1–5). In the *Pyr.* Fabricius and his countrymen effectively expose the king's character. They also have a wider function within the pair as a whole: as Romans of virtue they form an important contrast with the following subject, Marius.

Marius lives to a miserable old age where he is prey to an insatiable ambition and a craving for fame (*Marius* 34.5–6, 45.10–12; *Luc.* 38.3; *Sulla* 7.2). In 2 Plutarch tells us why he ends up this way: he is wilfully ignorant of Greek culture. 'It is said that he did not study Greek literature and did not employ the Greek language for serious subjects, thinking it risible to study literature whose teachers were other people's slaves' (2.2). Plutarch goes on (2.4) to record Plato's advice to the sullen Xenocrates, that he should sacrifice to the Graces, 'and if someone had persuaded Marius to sacrifice to the Greek Muses and Graces . . ., he would not have been beached on the shore of a most cruel and savage old age'.⁸⁴ That Marius' attitude to culture is of great importance in the *Life* is shown by the final words of 2: 'these matters should be examined straight away in the facts themselves'.⁸⁵

In assessing Marius' attitude towards Greek culture Plutarch has been influenced by comments such as survive at Valerius Maximus ii 2.3 (*senectutem tuam . . . victor devictae gentis facundia politioem fieri noluit . . . litterarum gloriosissimum contemptorem*) or Sallust *BJ* 63.3 (*non Graeca facundia . . . sese exercuit*; cf. Marius' own words at 85.32).⁸⁶ This traditional picture, whatever its truth, suits Plutarch's interpretation of Marius as a man who lacks control when in contact with power. 'By nature he was virile and fond of war, his παιδεία being that of the soldier rather than the civilian, and he showed extreme temper when in positions of power' (2.1). We are reminded of Coriolanus (*Cor.* 1.2 ff.) and Flaminius (*Flam.* 1.4) with their military upbringing. But there is a difference, for Plutarch considered that Greek culture had been available to Romans from before the time of Marius' birth (cf. *Aem.* 6.8–9). Unlike Coriolanus or Flaminius, Marius in Plutarch's eyes does have the opportunity to benefit from Hellenism (one can only reject openly what is offered openly). In fact his traditional

⁸³ The one true valuation ever made of the senate according to Livy ix 17.14; for Kineas' visit, cf. Livy *Per.* 13.

⁸⁴ 'Greek Muses', cf. *Cor.* 1.5; for Plato's advice, cf. *conj. praec.* 141f, *amat.* 769d. For 'beached' (ἐξοκέιλας), cf. 45.10 *Luc* 38.3 (of Marius).

⁸⁵ Cf. similarly *Flam.* 2.5, *Arat.* 10.5, *Per.* 2.5, 9.1, *Cim.* 3.3, *Ag./Cleom.* 2.9, *Phoc.* 3.9, *quaest. conv.*

vii intro. 697e.

⁸⁶ Plutarch cites Val. Max. at *Brut.* 53.5, *Marc.* 30.5; Sallust at *Lys.-Sulla synk.* 3.3, *Luc.* 11.6, 33.3 (Sallust may have been used in translation, cf. *Suda* Z 73 Adler). There is no evidence that Posidonius' unfavourable account of Marius (cf. J. Malitz, *Die Historien von Posidonios* [Munich 1983] 394 ff.) has affected Plutarch's position here.

education most probably included tuition in Greek 'at the level of the *grammaticus Graecus*'.⁸⁷ Plutarch ignores this (which he might have assumed had he not factually known it) and says that Marius' life at Arpinum displayed 'a boorish view towards smart urban life, but was proper and resembled the upbringing of the ancient Romans' (3.1). Valerius Maximus praises Marius for refusing to pursue Greek rhetoric in his old age; Plutarch strongly implies that Marius is hostile to Greek learning from the very start of his life. The facts of the narrative, which reveal Marius' acquaintance with Greek modes of thought, do not bear him out.⁸⁸

It is no surprise that without παιδεία Marius succumbs to ambition in old age (*Luc.* 38.3, cf. 1.6). The senile Marius acts φιλοτιμῶς πάνυ και μειρακιωδῶς (34.5; cf. 29.6).⁸⁹ His lack of education comes out in politics too. We have seen that Plutarch does not associate with Coriolanus' lack of philosophical λόγος a corresponding absence of oratory. Marius, however, is unsuccessful in politics because he does not have oratorical λόγος (6.3; cf. 28.1–2, 32.2).

In the last chapters of the *Life* Plutarch makes himself quite clear in his comments on Marius' use of fortune. Having attacked Marius' ambition (45) he contrasts the dying Plato who 'sang the praises of his δαίμων and his τύχη because firstly he had been born a man, and not a beast with an irrational nature, and secondly a Greek, and not a barbarian, and in addition to this, that his birth had fallen in the times of Socrates'. This picks up the advice which Plutarch says Marius should have followed at 2.3–4, and Plutarch stresses here most obviously the need for Greek culture ('a Greek, and not a barbarian'). This is backed up by observing the soul's need of a foundation made firm by λόγος and παιδεία (46.5).

In *Marius* the hero's wilful ignorance of Greek learning is closely linked with his inability to withstand changes in fortune and his insatiable ambition. We have seen that Plutarch includes a note on Marius' traditional and antique education at Arpinum. It suits him well to emphasize Marius' rusticity and opposition to newer ways. But Marius falls between two stools. He has been brought up with ταῖς πάλαι Ῥωμαίων τροφαῖς (3.1), then succumbs, perhaps to bribery (28.8), certainly to luxury (34.3,6). Men with whom Marius is contrasted appear as examples of good old-fashioned Roman integrity (Catulus [23.5], Metellus [28.6], Octavius [42.7]). The distinctive and antique Roman virtues (political and military honesty) exemplified by a Fabricius do not require Greek παιδεία to bring them out. In a Marius such virtues are undermined by love of glory and ambition exacerbated by power, to which Marius' nature was especially vulnerable (2.1). Marius is unable to combat his passions by the only effective method, education, because he has utterly rejected this path.

Plutarch might have made the point that although Pyrrhus was a Greek and therefore has had a Greek education (cf. *Pyr.* 1.4; 8.3,6 φιλοσοφῶν αἰεί in military science), he does not benefit from it in the least. But he almost always takes the παιδεία of Greeks for granted, and moral failing (or success) is explained without reference to education. Romans are seen differently. Hence Plutarch does not simply take the traditional picture of Marius as uneducated and boorish, leaving him noble but exposed (like Coriolanus). His Marius consciously repudiates παιδεία, as he makes quite clear in 2. Plutarch invites us to measure Marius' moral defects during his life directly against his

⁸⁷ T. Carney, *A biography of C. Marius*, *PACA* Suppl. i (1961) 14.

⁸⁸ Carney (n. 87) 12–14 pointing to 2.2 (Greek games given at the dedication of Marius' temple of Honos and Virtus), 8.5 (Marius says he has fastened an ἀλάστωρ on Metellus), 29.5 (Marius describes Metellus by quoting from Pindar [this is rather Plutarch speaking]), 45.9 (Marius speaks of Hellen-

istic τύχη). It would certainly have jarred with Plutarch's presentation if he had recorded Marius' appearance after Vercellae as *Neos Dionysus* (Carney 12 n. 70).

⁸⁹ Cf. Marcellus (*Marc.* 28.6 μειρακιῶδες... και φιλοτιμότερον πάθος) and Flamininus (*Flam.* 20.1 νεανίζοντα τῷ πάθει).

lack of Hellenic culture (2.4), and at the end of the biography, where Marius' shortcomings come to a head, he once more invokes Plato to confirm his correct identification of where Marius goes astray.

VI. MARCELLUS

By contrast with *Marius* the *Marcellus* shows a hero who benefits himself and others with Hellenic culture. Marcellus is 'by nature fond of war . . . , but in other respects his character was σώφρων and φιλόνητος, and he was an enthusiast for Hellenic learning and literature . . . , though owing to his occupations he was unable to attain the levels of practice and knowledge that he desired' (1.2-3). As Alan Wardman remarks, 'the reader who is used to a stereotype of Marcellus as the warlike Roman . . . , will be surprised'.⁹⁰ As Wardman notes, Rome's atrocities in Sicily under Marcellus are not brought out by Plutarch at all. Rather, Marcellus 'seems at that time to have been the first to show the Greeks that the Romans were δικαιοτάτους' (20.1).⁹¹ At 20.2 Plutarch feels he can say that 'if Henna or Megara or the Syracusans met with any action which was οὐκ ἐπιεικές, the blame for this seems to have lain with the sufferers rather than the perpetrators'. Even Livy says of the massacre at Henna that 'Henna was held *aut malo aut necessario facinore*' (xxiv 39.7). Plutarch continues his narrative by giving details of what happened to the pro-Roman Nicias at Engyium and of Marcellus' leniency to the town (20.2-11).

These comments on Roman policy in Sicily come immediately after the storming of Syracuse (18-19) and before notes on Marcellus' taking of spoils from the city (21). Polybius condemns this action on grounds of morality and expediency (ix 10). Livy too is scathing about the taking of the *signa tabulasque*, feeling that Marcellus had set a precedent for despoiling temples (xxv 40.1-3), and at xxvii 16.7-8 he says of the art treasures which Fabius Maximus took from Tarentum that 'they almost equalled the Syracusan *ornamenta*; but Fabius refrained from this type of plunder *maiore animo* than Marcellus'.⁹²

Plutarch is presumably responding to Livy's comparison when he suggests in *Fab.* that Fabius at Tarentum was ἀτοπώτερος than Marcellus, 'or rather showed that that man was quite remarkable for his πρότης and his φιλανθρωπία (as has been written in his *Life*)' (*Fab.* 22.8). Plutarch means that Marcellus did not incur the charges of 'treachery and brutality', which Fabius does at Tarentum (22.5), for Marcellus acted with moderation (*Marc.* 19.6) in not harming the free citizens.⁹³ The moral attributes of πρότης and φιλανθρωπία (*et sim.*) are brought out in *Marc.* too (1.3, 10.6, 23.8, 28.1), and at 1.3 are closely associated with Hellenic παιδεία.

Marcellus differs from his contemporaries, who gave no proof of εὐγνωμοσύνη, φιλανθρωπία, or πολιτική ἀρετή (20.1). In 21 Plutarch records his transportation of *objets d'art* to Rome with an approval, though cautious, unexpected in one so keen on Greece's heritage: 'until then Rome neither knew nor possessed any stylish or outstanding design work, and she showed no love for such grace and refinement' (21.2). The warlike appearance of Rome at that time is contrasted with the 'Hellenic grace'

⁹⁰ Wardman (n. 51) 130.

⁹¹ Note the *v. l.* at *Marc.* 20.1 δικαιοτέρους ('juster'); Plutarch should not be taken as intending a comparison with Greeks (the Romans were now 'very just' or 'juster' than they had been).

⁹² The example Livy gives in this passage, which is partially the basis of *Marc.* 21.4-5 (see below), is of Fabius leaving behind the colossal statues of the gods; Pliny (*HN* xxxiv 40) reports

that Fabius left the colossus of Jove because he could not move it, and did in fact take the statue of Heracles (as Plutarch notes, *Fab.* 22.8).

⁹³ Πρότης and φιλανθρωπία do not refer to Marcellus' taste in art as is sometimes asserted. Cf. Cicero, ii *Verr.* 4.120-21, on Marcellus' *humanitas* in sparing Syracuse and not denuding it entirely of treasures (unlike Verres).

(21.4) imported by Marcellus. Plutarch then (21.4–5) includes a comparison made by older Romans between Marcellus and Fabius: Fabius had left the gods' statues at Tarentum, whereas Marcellus had taken them from Syracuse, and (21.6) Marcellus had made the city odious and corrupted the δῆμος, previously used only to 'fighting or farming', by 'filling them with leisure and chatter, so that they spent a great deal of the day urbanely discussing art and artists'.

Plutarch knows that it was not until much later that Greek learning and ideals established themselves among the Romans, and if we may judge from *Cato Maj.* and *Aem.* believed that the Roman people were basically well-behaved for a good many years after Marcellus (see above p. 128 at n. 17). At *Marc.* 21.4 ff. he is perhaps building on Polybius when he talks of moral corruption, but he places the criticisms in the mouths of the older citizens and we need not seek his own views. On occasion Plutarch does express criticism of the fate of Greek artefacts at Rome (cf. *Demetr.* 22.7, *Publ.* 15.4). But in *Marc.* he is very far from excoriating his hero, and at the end of 21 we read that Marcellus 'would talk with pride of these things, even to Greeks, saying that he had taught the Romans to give honour and admiration to the beauties and marvels of Greece which they had not known how to do' (21.7). Any disapproval on Plutarch's part has been muted: Rome needed art at this time, and if she could be taught genuine appreciation by a man whose own motives could be seen as sincere, that might pass.⁹⁴

Where does Plutarch get the idea that Marcellus, the 'sword of Rome',⁹⁵ is a *connoisseur* of art and a frustrated *littérateur*? Posidonius may be the source. He probably affects Plutarch's projection of Marcellus' campaign in Sicily (the tale of Nicias in 20 comes from him, *FGrH* 87 F 43). But there is no real reason to ascribe to Posidonius the remarks on Marcellus' Hellenism (1.3) along with those which Plutarch attributes on the origin of Marcellus' name (1.1–2).⁹⁶ Nor is there good cause to believe that Plutarch's approval of Marcellus' use of Syracusan art comes from him.⁹⁷ The slant is Plutarch's own. He may have developed the idea of Marcellus' παιδεία from his famous remark about Archimedes (17.2), recorded first by Polybius (viii 6.6, cf. Athenaeus *deipn.* 634b), that Archimedes was a geometrical giant who was using Marcellus' ships like wine-glasses and ejecting his σαμβῦκαι (instruments both of music and of war) from the party. Marcellus' references in Plutarch's version to Briareos and to 'the hundred-handed giants of mythology' are additional. The original comment demonstrates an ability to pun in Greek on the Greek culture of the *symposion*, and Plutarch may have felt that a man who could do this might supply an apt allusion from Greek mythology (here Hesiod *Theog.* 147 ff.). This specific instance perhaps explains the general reference to Greek λόγοι at 1.3 (Plutarch does not—or cannot—find another concrete example). The general assumption will have reinforced what Plutarch knows from Posidonius about the campaign in Sicily, and encouraged his presentation of Marcellus' view of Syracusan art in 21 in terms of cultural rather than financial gain.

Another reason for thinking that the emphasis on Hellenism is Plutarch's own is that it chimes with the stress in the *Life* on the proper and Hellenic character of Roman

⁹⁴ Cf. C. B. R. Pelling, 'Plutarch: Roman heroes and Greek culture', in *Philosophia Togata*, ed. M. Griffin, J. Barnes (Oxford 1989) 202 'the criticism [21.4 ff.] . . . seems very mild'.

⁹⁵ For 'sword of Rome', cf. 9.7, *Fab.* 19.4, Posidonius *FGrH* 87 F 42ab.

⁹⁶ As is done by Edelstein-Kidd *fr.* 261 and Theiler F 92 (but not Jacoby *FGrH* 87 F 41), and accepted by Malitz (n. 86) 363; Theiler ii 89 notes that *Marc.* 1.3 is Plutarch's addition. On Plutarch's relationship with Posidonius I have not seen M.

Mühl, *Posidonios und der plutarchische Marcellus. Untersuchungen zur Geschichtsschreibung des Posidonios von Apamea* (Berlin 1925), reviewed by F. Münzer, *Gnomon* i (1925) 96–100.

⁹⁷ Though note that Posidonius knows of (and presumably approved of) dedications from the spoils at Lindos on his adopted Rhodes (and elsewhere), *Marc.* 30.6–8, *FGrH* 87 F 44; it is possible that he approved of the dedication of much of the booty which was brought to Rome (cf. Livy xxv 40.3, Cicero ii *Verr.* 4.121).

religion, a stress which is demonstrably his. In the sphere of religion Plutarch suggests that the Romans of Marcellus' time are already like Greeks. His comments are made as a result of the live burial of two Greeks and two Gauls before the Insubrian invasion of 225. The Romans, says Plutarch, 'made an innovation in their sacrifices. For although their rites contain nothing βαρβαρικόν or ἔκφυλον, but as far as possible in their attitudes to the divine they act Ἑλληνικῶς and πρῶως, at the time when the war fell upon them they were forced to obey certain oracles from the Sibylline Books' (3.5–6). At *Them.* 13.3 (cf. *Arist.* 9.2; *Pel.* 21.3) there is no attempt to defend a similar sacrifice of Persians as an act of faith. In *Marc.* a defence has to be made, for Greeks are among the victims.

Plutarch argues from the premise that the Romans are not barbarians (he is explicit about this at *Flam.* 5.6 ff.), and therefore cannot practise barbarian rites. In the following chapters of *Marc.* (4, 5) he very carefully stresses their commitment to proper and ancestral religion, ending with the statement at 5.6 that they kept to τὰ πάτρια and did not become involved in δεισιδαιμονία.⁹⁸ This theme offers an obvious link between *Marc.* and the pair *Pel.*, where Plutarch, doubtless expressing his own view (cf. *de Stoic. repug.* 1051b–d), condemns those who held that there were evil daimons which delighted in the βάρβαρος καὶ παράνομος θυσία of human sacrifice (*Pel.* 21.5–6).⁹⁹ Given the emphasis on religious scruples it is no surprise to find Marcellus himself stepping down from the consulate owing to ill omens (*Marc.* 12.2). And his death, like that of Pelopidas (*Pel.* 31.3–4), is anticipated by his disregard of obviously bad signs (29.9–11). In Plutarch's writings there are a number of passages where Roman superstition is noted.¹⁰⁰ It is even pointed out once in *Marc.* (6.11). The main stress in the *Life*, though, is on the correctness of Roman religion and its similarity to Greek practice.¹⁰¹

Plutarch's suggestion that Roman religion in Marcellus' age is essentially Hellenic in character is clearly intended to support his proposition that Marcellus is highly interested in Hellenic culture and that the people of Rome are receptive to its introduction. Religion aside, the suggested Hellenism of Marcellus and the Romans owes little to the themes and concerns of *Pel.* There the education of Pelopidas is in doubt (cf. 3.6–7, 4.1–2), and Plutarch takes no interest in the subject in his *Life*. This contrast between *Pel.* and *Marc.* is reflected more glaringly still in *Cim.-Luc.*, where despite the existence of close thematic ties between the *Lives* Plutarch firmly denies to Cimon the Hellenic education which he attributes so forcefully to Lucullus. We will see below that the availability of Greek education to Lucullus is assumed by Plutarch and that there is nothing in his *Life* on Greek teachers or specific studies. In *Marc.* Plutarch is aware that Greek culture is not established at Rome until Marcellus himself introduces it (21). Marcellus' education is incomplete—Plutarch points to the constant wars fought by his generation as an excuse (1.2–5, cf. *Cor.* 1.6–2.1, *Flam.* 1.4)—and this is the implied cause of his fatal ambition in old age (28.6, cf. Flamininus, Marius). Plutarch has nevertheless gleaned from his sources enough to build up a distinctive and novel characterization and to suggest that in a noble warrior lies hidden a scholar and a gentleman. This characterization is guided by his preoccupation with Hellenic education and culture.

⁹⁸ For barbarous rites contrasted with approved ancestral practice see *de superst.* 166b and *de fac. quae in orbe lun. app.* 935b; cf. also *amat.* 756c, where the god Eros is οὐδ' ἔπηλυς ἔκ τινος βαρβαρικῆς δεισιδαιμονίας.

⁹⁹ Cf. *Ages.* 6.7–8, *de superst.* 171b–e; for 'barbarous and abnormal' views about deities, cf. *de Is. et Osir.* 358e–f, *de def. orac.* 418e. On barbarian and Hellenic religious practices in Plutarch's eyes, cf. Aalders (n. 15) 20, A. Nikolaidēs, *WS* xx (1986) 233–5.

¹⁰⁰ *Sulla* 12.7, 35.3, *Numa* 10.4, 22.12, *Caes.* 63.11, *Brut.* 39.6, *Cam.* 19.12, *quaest. Rom.* 83, 283f–284c (a later sacrifice of two Greeks and two Gauls ordered by the Sibylline Books for ἀλλοκότοις τισὶ δαίμοσι καὶ ξένοις; in *Marc.* Plutarch cannot invoke strange daimons, but must insist on propriety in Roman religion to match *Pel.* and protect Marcellus' Hellenism).

¹⁰¹ Note *Fab.* 4.4 also plays down Roman superstition during the Hannibalic War; this ties in with *Per.* (cf. 6.1).

VII. LUCULLUS

As surprising as the Hellenic characterization of Marcellus is the emphasis on Hellenism in the biography of Lucullus, for like Marcellus' Lucullus is usually remembered for something other than his devotion to Hellenic culture, that is his luxury.¹⁰² In the introduction to *Cimon-Lucullus* Plutarch tells us that he has chosen Lucullus as a subject of his aid to Chaeroneia during the Mithridatic War: 'though we are separated by many generations, we believe that the gratitude [for his actions] extends even to us who are alive now' (2.2). Plutarch continues by asserting that his character portrait is independent of this gratitude, and that he will not ignore Lucullus' flaws; on the other hand 'we should not point out [failings] in our narrative superfluously and with excessive zeal, but as it were in a tone of apology for human nature if it produces no character which is purely good and indisputably set on virtue' (2.5). This line of thought may be paralleled.¹⁰³ That it is voiced here as part of the introduction to a biography where the hero's luxury and extravagance are to be underplayed suggests a conscious attempt by Plutarch to make his audience well disposed towards his favourable presentation.

Both Lucullus and Cimon are presented in the pair as great benefactors of the Greeks. Lucullus restores the people of Cyrene (*Luc.* 2.4–5). He frees the cities of Asia from the depredations of Roman tax gatherers (which Plutarch stresses, 7.6–7, 20.1–6, 23.1–2). He fights barbarians, liberating Greeks from Mithridates at Kabera and from Tigranes at Tigranokerta (18.1, 29.5). He is distressed when he cannot save the city of Amisos from fire during the war and is prevented from fulfilling his 'ambition of displaying his goodness to the Greeks' (19.4–5; 32.6). And his harsh treatment of the people of Mytilene is excused in a way which recalls Marcellus in Sicily (4.2–3, *Marc.* 20). Similarly, Cimon's exploits are among the few which magnify Athens (*Cim.* 8.2, 10.6, 13.5–7, *synk.* 1.5) without harming Greece (11.2; 18.1), and he enjoys a προεδρία among generals for his deeds against barbarians (13.3; *synk.* 2.1), which were not to be matched (19.3–4; cf. *Flam.* 11.6).

Since Cimon is one of Greece's greatest benefactors, it might be thought that Plutarch would suggest that he is acquainted with Hellenic culture. After all, in the final words of his biography he is ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς ἡγεμὼν (19.5). There is nothing except a casual remark on his ability to sing (9.1, cf. *Per.* 5.3). Plutarch may be hampered by a lack of information; but since he records Cimon's later beautification of Athens (13.7), he does not have to accept Stesimbrotus' report that Cimon was entirely uneducated (4.5), still less to confirm it by appending a quotation from Euripides which he uses at *Marc.* 21.6 to illustrate the state of the Roman δῆμος before the introduction of Hellenic culture.¹⁰⁴

By contrast Lucullus' education and culture are much emphasized. At *Luc.* 1.4–9 we learn that he was fluent in Latin and Greek, in forensic and other types of oratory, and had from childhood enjoyed a liberal education ἐπὶ τῷ καλῷ (1.5, cf. *synk.* 1.4). He even wrote a history of the Social War in Greek for a wager (1.7–8). By nature Lucullus is φιλότιμος (*synk.* 1.8), but when he is older and has leisure time it is his practice of theoretical philosophy that enables him to curb ambition against Pompey (1.6, 42.4; cf. 5.5). Hellenism is the key to Lucullus' moral outlook. His δικαιοσύνη and

¹⁰² To avoid cross-references I have preferred to repeat here some material on Lucullus from a paper to appear in *RhM*.

¹⁰³ 'We should not point out failings'—see *de Herod. Mal.* 3, 855c–d; 'no character which is purely good'—*de laude ips.* 545e, *Sulla* 30.6, *Sert.*

10.5–7.

¹⁰⁴ φαῦλον, ἄκομψον, τὰ μέγιστ' ἀγαθόν' (Euripides *Likymnios* fr. 473 N²). Plutarch refuses to believe Stesimbrotus on Themistocles (a pupil of Anaxagoras and Melissus, *Them.* 2.5), and criticizes him also at *Per.* 13.16, 26.1.

φιλανθρωπία are explicitly associated with his education (29.6). Moreover his qualities are often underlined in the context of his dealings with Greeks (2.1–2, 4.2, 18.9, 19.4, 20.1, 23.1, 29.6, 42.1). Here is where *Luc.* departs from *Cim.*: both heroes are praised greatly by Plutarch for their attitude towards Greece, but only with Lucullus is this attitude associated with the possession of Hellenic culture and education.

On his return to Rome Lucullus presents something of a problem to Plutarch, for he gives up an active life for a sedentary one. Plutarch offers two reasons for this: either he realized that public life was now corrupt and out of control, or 'as some say' he had had enough of glory and had decided to indulge himself in luxurious living (38.2). Plutarch mentions that 'some people' favourably contrasted Lucullus' decision to withdraw from politics with the unseasonable ambition of Marius, Cicero, and Scipio Aemilianus (38.3–4). This accords with the notice at 1.6 on Lucullus' ability to control ambition during his retirement through the study of φιλοσοφία, and is developed at 42.4–43.1.¹⁰⁵ For the moment Plutarch explores the alternative explanation. He records Pompey's and Crassus' criticisms of Lucullus' luxury (38.5), and dwells on the subject for the next three chapters (39–41). Having established the facts, Plutarch then sets about restoring Lucullus' reputation by focusing on his cultural attainments, again picking up the first chapter of the *Life*. On his return to Rome Lucullus sets up a library (42.1).¹⁰⁶ Greeks benefit especially. 'The Greeks had unrestricted access to the covered walkways and study-rooms, and would make visits there, as if to some caravanserai of the Muses, and spend the day in each other's company' (42.1). Not only scholars, but also politicians came there, so that the house was 'really both a home and a Greek town hall for those who arrived in Rome' (42.2). Plutarch goes on to report Lucullus' fondness for philosophy, and his particular adherence to Plato and the Old Academy as represented by Antiochus of Ascalon (42.3–4). He explains Lucullus' rôle in the dialogue Cicero named after him.¹⁰⁷

In the *Moralia*, apart from a reference to his closeness to his brother (*de frat. amore* 484d–4) and to his rise to power under Sulla (*praec. ger. reip.* 805e–f), it is Lucullus' luxury and time-wasting that are singled out (*ad princ. indoct.* 782f; *an seni resp. ger.* 785f–786a, 792b–c). There is nothing on his cultured retirement (792b βίον ἄπρακτον καὶ δίαιταν οἰκουρὸν καὶ ἄφροντιν). His luxury is familiar in the *Lives* too (*Cato Min.* 19.8, *Pomp.* 2.12, *Marius* 34.4).¹⁰⁸ In his own *Life*, though, it is his Hellenism, cultural and political, that is introduced and stressed heavily throughout. Cicero also chooses to emphasize the Hellenic culture of Lucullus (along with that of Catulus and Hortensius) in *Acad. Priora*.¹⁰⁹ It is difficult to say whether Plutarch knew his work well enough to have been influenced by his suggestion of Lucullus' learning.¹¹⁰ It seems rather that his

¹⁰⁵ Lucullus' infighting with Pompey 42.4 ff. is less serious than at *Pomp.* 46.5–6, 48.2, 4, 7 and *Cato Min.* 31.1, 7.

¹⁰⁶ Plutarch veils the fact that the books were booty (ἢ τε χρήσις ἢ φιλοτιμοτέρα τῆς κτήσεως); see J. van Ooteghem, *L. Licinius Lucullus* (Brussels 1959) 184.

¹⁰⁷ Plutarch seems to know the basic argument of Cicero's *Lucullus* (*Acad. Priora*); there is an unattributed quotation from it at *Cic.* 24.5 (ii 119), and C. P. Jones, *Hermes* cx (1982) 254–6 argues correctly for an intransitive sense to ἀντετάττετο at 42.3, so that Lucullus himself 'opposed' Cicero as in Cicero's work. But Plutarch is unaware of *Acad. Post.* (in which Lucullus' part was disparagingly transferred to Varro; Cicero *ad Att.* xiii 12.3, 13.1, 16.1, 19.5, Ooteghem [n. 106] 25–7), and it is hard to say whether he had actually read *Acad. Priora*

himself (as is suggested by Babut [n. 71] 198–200).

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Velleius Paterculus ii 33.4 (*profusae huius . . . luxuriae primus auctor*), Athenaeus *deipn.* 274e–f, 543a, resting on Nicolaus *FGrH* 90 F 77ab ('foremost guide of the πολυτέλεια which now flourishes', 'pioneer of τρυφή among the Romans').

¹⁰⁹ *Esp.* ii 4; see Rawson (n. 33) 57, 81. The emphasis is quite hypocritical—see n. 107.

¹¹⁰ See n. 107. Plutarch's φιλοσοφίαν δὲ πᾶσαν μὲν ἠσπάζετο καὶ πρὸς πᾶσαν εὐμενῆς ἦν καὶ οικεῖος (42.3) may reflect Cicero's *cum omni litterarum generi tum philosophiae deditus* (ii 4), though both statements look like generalizations. Note, however, J. Gucker, *Antiochus and the late Academy* (Göttingen 1978) 27: 'Lucullus the philosopher is a creation of Cicero'.

stress on Lucullus' Hellenism is his own. It has been pointed out that Lucullus' predilection for the Old Academy and for Antiochus of Ascalon has been introduced by him.¹¹¹ The Hellenism may appear especially adventitious because it is not related to any period of study in Greece.

In *Cim.* Plutarch establishes Cimon as a benefactor of Athens and of Greece, in brief, 'the Hellenic general' (19.5). In *Luc.* he responds to this theme as fully as he can. Lucullus like Cimon fights barbarians and aids Greeks. Both are Hellenists. With Lucullus alone Plutarch feels compelled to account for this Hellenism. There are two reasons why this is so. One is that Plutarch tends to work up themes in the second *Life* of a pair which he has introduced in the first *Life*.¹¹² In *Luc.* he establishes the basis for the hero's Hellenic ideals. Assuming an education ἐπὶ τῷ καλῷ (*Luc.* 1.5) he gathers together relevant information (the library, the history of the Social War, the appearance in Cicero's *Lucullus*), inferring what he does not really know (the love of the Old Academy and of Antiochus), and carefully integrates Lucullus' virtues with his relations with Greeks. The second reason is that Lucullus is a Roman: as such he might have lacked Hellenic manners. Plutarch is surely correct in trying to pinpoint why he differs in his attitude to Greece from so many of his contemporaries (cf. *Sulla* 12.9–14). His conclusion is that Lucullus' actions are deeply rooted in his possession of Hellenic παιδεία.

★ ★ ★

The examples of Coriolanus, Marius, Marcellus, and Lucullus show different aspects of Plutarch's interest in the education and culture of his Roman heroes. We should remember that he does not explore their culture as an end in itself. The *Parallel lives* were composed πρὸς ἐπανάρθωσιν ἡθῶν (*Aem.* 1.3),¹¹³ and Plutarch's interest in the παιδεία of his Roman heroes is a subordinate part of his general concern about the relation between education and character development. He feels that since Hellenic education cannot be taken for granted among Romans, it may be applied as an effective criterion for bringing out their character. We should not imagine that Plutarch is sneering at heroes who lacked παιδεία like Coriolanus or Marius, or patronizing those like Marcellus and Lucullus whom he presents as possessing it.¹¹⁴ Plutarch examines the character of all his heroes, Greek and Roman, not to applaud or to condemn them, but to improve and correct the morals of his audience. He bids us, not them, take notice of the benefits Hellenic culture has to offer and of the detriment which may be occasioned by its absence.

S. C. R. SWAIN

All Souls College, Oxford

¹¹¹ See Glucker (n. 110) 21–7, Rawson (n. 33) 81, both observing that Antiochus was more useful to Lucullus as a guide to eastern affairs than to philosophy. Note that Cicero's Lucullus becomes attached to Antiochus not through love of the Old Academy but because Antiochus enjoys the best reputation among the philosophers of his day (ii 4, 113). Note further that Lucullus' generous sentiments about the grammarian Tyrannion (*Luc.* 19.8–9) are also really Plutarch's own (see J. Christes, *Sklaven und Freigelassene als Grammatiker*

und Philologen im antiken Rom [Wiesbaden 1979] 29).

¹¹² Cf. Pelling (n. 72) 94.

¹¹³ See Jones (n. 28 [1971]) 103–9 (103 n. 1 citing earlier literature), Wardman (n. 51) 18–26.

¹¹⁴ I see no reason to agree with R. Flacelière, *AC* xxxii (1963) 33–4: 'Naturellement Plutarque se fait un malin plaisir de montrer... que la plupart de ceux-ci [Roman heroes]... étaient pénétrés de culture grecque'.