humanitas supplementum

Symposion and Philanthropia in Plutarch

José Ribeiro Ferreira, Delfim Leão
Manuel Troster e Paula Barata Dias
(eds.)

IMPRENSA DA UNIVERSIDADE DE COIMBRA
COIMBRA UNIVERSITY PRESS
ANNABLUME

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

Symposion and Philanthropia in Plutarch

José Ribeiro Ferreira, Delfim Leão
Manuel Troster e Paula Barata Dias
(eds.)

IMPRENSA DA UNIVERSIDADE DE COIMBRA
COIMBRA UNIVERSITY PRESS

ANNABLUME

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

Editors
José Ribeiro Ferreira, Delfim Leão, Manuel Tröster & Paula Barata Dias

Title
Symposion and *Philanthropia* in Plutarch

Publisher
Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra
Centro de Estudos Clássicos e Humanísticos da Universidade de Coimbra

Academic Co-ordinator of the Editorial Plan
Maria do Céu Fialho

Editorial Board
José Ribeiro Ferreira, Maria de Fátima Silva, Francisco de Oliveira & Nair de Castro Soares

Technical Director of the Collection
Delfim F. Leão

Revision Assistants
Ália Rodrigues & Rodolfo Lopes

Designer
Rodolfo Lopes

Printing
Simões & Linhares, Lda.
Av. Fernando Namora, nº 83 - Loja 4
3000 Coimbra

ISBN: 978-989-8281-17-3
ISBN Digital: 978-989-26-0908-9
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.14195/978-989-8281-17-3
Legal Deposit: 302102/09

@ Imprensa da Universidade de Coimbra
@ Centro de Estudos Clássicos e Humanísticos da Universidade de Coimbra

Published under the Programme POCI 2010 - Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia.

POCI/2010

Published under the Project "Plutarch and the founding of a European identity"

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, photocopying, or otherwise, without the written permission of the publisher.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

Contents

Preface i
Editors

Introduction iii
Christopher PELLING (Christ Church, Oxford)

Opening Session

The place of Plutarch in the literary genre of *Symposium* 3
Sven-Tage TEODORSSON (Göteborg University)

Section 1: Philosophical and Literary Contexts of the *Symposion*

Trabajos y Días como hipotexto de las obras simposíacas de Plutarco 19
José Antonio FERNÁNDEZ DELGADO (Universidad de Salamanca)

Moderación en el simposio en *Sobre la vida y poesía de Homero* de Pseudo-Plutarco 31
Josefa FERNÁNDEZ ZAMBUDIO (Universidad de Murcia)

Plato's *Symposium* and Plutarch's *Alcibiades* 37
Timothy E. DUFF (University of Reading)

"In learned conversation". Plutarch's symposiac literature and the elusive authorial voice 51
Frederick E. BRENK (Pontifical Biblical Institute of Rome)

Plutarch's *techne rhetorike* for the symposium in *Quaestiones Convivales*: the importance of speaking well to cultivate friendship 63
Lluís GONZÀLEZ JULIÀ (University of Barcelona)

Influencia de los *progymnasmata* en la composición de los *symposia* de Plutarco: el caso de *El Banquete de los Siete Sabios* 75
Ana VICENTE SÁNCHEZ (Universidad de Zaragoza)

Simposio e filosofia: il problema del "Dio geometra" 87
Franco FERRARI (Università di Salerno)

Riddling at table. *Trivial ainigmata vs. philosophical problemata* 97
Simone BETA (University of Siena)

The reading of texts at the Graeco-Roman symposium and in the Christian gathering 103
Valeriy ALIKIN (University of Leiden)

Plutarco e la lettura nel simposio 113
Gennaro D'IPPOLITO (Università di Palermo)

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

Section 2: The *Symposion* as a Space for Social and Political Gatherings

Leading the party, leading the city: the symposiarch as *politikos* 123
Philip A. STADTER (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill)

A "barbarian" *symposium* and the absence of *philanthropia* (*Artaxerxes* 15) 131
Eran ALMAGOR (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)

Cena apud Catones: ideology and sympotic behavior 147
Mark BECK (University of South Carolina, Columbia)

Banquet and philhellenism in the *Lives of Flamininus* and *Aemilius Paullus* 165
Manuel TRÖSTER (University of Coimbra)

Crassus as symposiast in Plutarch's *Life of Crassus* 181
James T. CHLUP (University of Manitoba, Winnipeg)

Section 3: Disruptive *Symposia*

Drunken violence and the transition of power in Plutarch's *Alexander* 193
Jeffrey BENEKER (University of Wisconsin, Madison)

Política y confrontación en los banquetes macedonios
en la obra de Plutarco 201
Antonio Ignacio MOLINA MARÍN (Universidad de Murcia)

The banquets of Alexander 211
Pilar GÓMEZ & Francesca MESTRE (University of Barcelona)

Crossing status barriers: the disruption of an imperial banquet
by angry soldiers in Plutarch's *Otho* 223
Lukas DE BLOIS (Radboud University of Nijmegen)

Festins de sangue: a tradição do banquete aziago em Plutarco 231
Nuno Simões RODRIGUES (Universidade de Lisboa)

El banquete traicionero en las *Vidas* de Plutarco 245
Israel MUÑOZ GALLARTE (Universidad de Groningen)

Veneno simposíaco: envenenamiento en los banquetes
en la obra plutarquea 255
Dámaris ROMERO GONZÁLEZ (Universidad de Birmingham)

Section 4: *Philanthropia*, *Philia* and *Eros*

La notion de *philanthropia* chez Plutarque:
contexte social et sources philosophiques 263
Francesco BECCHI (Université de Florence)

Philanthropia as sociability and Plutarch's unsociable heroes 275
Anastasios G. NIKOLAIDIS (University of Crete, Rethymno)

È il dio degli Stoici filantropo? 289
Paola VOLPE CACCIATORE (Università di Salerno)

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

Harvesting the fruits of virtue: *philia*, *eros* and *arete* in Plutarch 297
Toni BADNALL (University of Nottingham)

Eros em Plutarco e a apologia do amor conjugal 307
Maria Leonor Santa BÁRBARA (Universidade Nova de Lisboa)

Krasis oinou diken. Amore coniugale e linguaggio del simposio nell'*Amatorius* di Plutarco 313
Rosario SCANNAPIECO (Università di Salerno)

Tragedy and *philanthropia* in the *Lives of Demosthenes and Cicero* 333
Marta VÁRZEAS (University of Oporto)

Amistad, filantropía y *eros* en la *paideia* plutarquea: la *Vida de Catón el Viejo* 341
Vicente M. RAMÓN PALERM (Universidad de Zaragoza)

Filantropía en la *Vida de Catón el Viejo* 351
José M. CANDAU MORÓN (Universidad de Sevilla)

O sentido de *philanthropia* nas biografias de Coriolano, Cícero e Catão de Útica 359
Joaquim J. S. PINHEIRO (Universidade da Madeira)

Section 5: *Quaestiones Convivales*

Educating the young ... over wine? Plutarch, Calvenus Taurus, and Favorinus as convivial teachers 369
Geert ROSKAM (Catholic University of Leuven)

"Vinous babbling". The symposium in Plutarch's *Table Talk* VII, 9 – VIII, Proem (714A – 717A) and Maximus of Tyre's *Oration* XXII 385
Jeroen LAUWERS (Research Foundation – Flanders; Catholic University of Leuven)

The role of reality in Plutarch's *Quaestiones Convivales* 395
Frances B. TITCHENER (Utah State University, Logan)

Dancing with Plutarch. Dance and dance theory in Plutarch's *Table Talk* 403
Carlos A. Martins de JESUS (University of Coimbra)

The omnipresence of philosophy in Plutarch's *Quaestiones Convivales* 415
Rodolfo LOPES (University of Coimbra)

"And who did not attend the banquet?" Evocative contexts of women in Plutarch's *Quaestiones Convivales* 425
Ália Rosa C. RODRIGUES (University of Coimbra)

Truffles and thunderbolts (Plu., *Quaest. conv.* 4.2, 1-2) 439
Aldo SETAIOLI (University of Perugia)

Astrometeorología e influencia lunar en las *Quaestiones Convivales* de Plutarco 447
Aurelio PÉREZ JIMÉNEZ (Universidad de Málaga)

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

SECTION 6: *CONVIVIUM SEPTEM SAPIENTIUM*

EL *BANQUETE DE LOS SIETE SABIOS* DE PLUTARCO Y LOS TEMAS DE SABIDURÍA PRÁCTICA 459
José VELA TEJADA (Universidad de Zaragoza)

EL *BANQUETE DE LOS SIETE SABIOS* COMO *TOUR DE FORCE* ESCOLAR 471
Rodolfo GONZÁLEZ EQUIHUA (Universidad de Salamanca)

HISTORICAL FICTION, BRACHYLOGY, AND PLUTARCH'S *BANQUET OF THE SEVEN SAGES* 481
Lawrence KIM (University of Texas, Austin)

ANIMAL *PHILANTHROPIA* IN THE *CONVIVIUM SEPTEM SAPIENTIUM* 497
Stephen T. NEWMYER (Duquesne University, Pittsburgh)

MUSIC AND SYMPOSIUM IN PLUTARCH'S *CONVIVIUM SEPTEM SAPIENTIUM*: A BRIEF NOTE 505
Roosevelt Araújo da ROCHA JÚNIOR (Federal University of Paraná)

THE *TYRANNOS* AS A *SOPHOS* IN THE *SEPTEM SAPIENTIUM CONVIVIUM* 511
Delfim F. LEÃO (University of Coimbra)

INDEX RERUM 523

INDEX LOCORUM 533

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS 567

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

Preface

The volume that is now being published assembles great part of the papers presented during the Eighth International Conference of the International Plutarch Society – IPS, held at Coimbra from 23 to 27 September 2008. The contributions deal with *symposion*, *philanthropia*, and related subjects in six major sections: after an overview on Plutarch's place in the genre of *symposion*, the first two sections focus on the philosophical, literary and socio-political functions of Plutarchan banquets. This is followed by a number of papers on violence and conflict in disruptive *symposia* and by studies of the key concepts of *philanthropia*, *philia* and *eros*. Finally, separate sections are devoted to two specific works, viz. the *Quaestiones convivales* and the *Convivium septem sapientium*.

The intended audience of this book extends well beyond the growing community of Plutarchists and includes anybody who makes regular or occasional use of the *Lives* or of the *Moralia*. Considering the scope and nature of Plutarch's multi-faceted work, the studies presented will be of interest to scholars and students from a whole range of disciplines, such as history, politics, philosophy, literature, education and arts.

The book may be used as a guide to study the *symposion* as a literary genre, thus helping to analyse, from a structural and compositional point of view, works that have the banquet as a scenario. At the same time, it shows the broad range of functions and connotations associated with the *symposion* as a space for philosophical, political and social gatherings. Beyond this, the volume is designed to deepen the understanding of artistic expressions, such as poetry, music and dance, by reading the *symposion* as a performative space and as a place that encourages the participants to develop affective ties among themselves.

The organization of the conference and the publication of this volume would not have been possible without the support of the International Plutarch Society, the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology - FCT (through the project "Plutarch and the Founding of a European Identity"), the

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, the SoPlutarco (Portuguese branch of the IPS), and the Centre of Classical and Humanistic Studies at the University of Coimbra. The editors should also like to express their gratitude to the editorial board of *Classica Digitalia* for having so readily accepted to include this volume in the *Humanitas Supplementum* series.

Special thanks are owed to Christopher Pelling, president of the IPS, for all his support and for having agreed to write the introduction to the volume, tying together the many strands covered both by the individual contributors and by Plutarch himself. The editors are equally grateful to the international board of independent referees for their willingness to collaborate and for their helpful criticism. Finally, thanks should be given to Ália Rodrigues and Rodolfo Lopes, who spent many hours editing the individual contributions and preparing the *Index Locorum* and *Index Rerum* to the volume.

Coimbra, November 2009

The editors,
J. Ribeiro Ferreira, D. Leão, M. Tröster & P. Barata Dias

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

Introduction

Christopher Pelling
Christ Church, University of Oxford

Symposion and *philanthropia*, civilised drinking and friendship towards one's fellow-humans: the two things have always gone closely together, and were appropriately linked as the subject of the eighth International Conference of the International Plutarch Society.

In his smug Roman way, Cicero claimed that the Latin notion of *convivium* was somehow superior to the Greek *symposion*, because the Greek word focused just on communal drinking while the Latin extended to the whole notion of a shared life (*ad Fam.* 9.24.3, *de Senectute* 45). But Greeks, and Plutarch in particular, knew that there was a lot more to the *symposion* than simply drinking. Indeed, one could reply to Cicero that the *symposion*, when it went well, did *not* embrace every aspect of shared human life, but rather some of its highest elements – as Plutarch might put it himself (see Lopes' paper in this volume), goodwill (*eunoia*), fellowship (*koinonia*), friendship (*philia*), and of course *philanthropia*, that warm affection for one's fellow human beings. Those qualities gave participants much to talk about at the conference, which was held at Coimbra in Portugal on 23–27 September 2008.

Any reader of this volume will be struck by the range of topics that are covered. As Teodorsson brings out in his introductory essay, *symposia* were important features both of real Greek life and of the Greek literary landscape; and inevitably the literary and the social aspects interact in multiple ways, as the literary descriptions both reflected and provided a model for real-life behaviour: that suggests a rather refined sense of 'realism' in the portrayal, a topic discussed by Titchener. That 'modelling', educational aspect is indeed important, for just as real-life *symposia* provided an opportunity for the younger participants to learn from the elder, so Plutarch's own representations of fictional *symposia* provide a picture of how such occasions ought to proceed: one can learn manners, certainly, and also a vast range of other things, as the more experienced and better-informed give a practical illustration of the

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

ways to carry, and convey, one's learning lightly (Roskam). One catches the personal note here of Plutarch himself: contrast Maximus of Tyre, with his view of *symposia* as a threat to proper education, and his advice to the aspiring philosopher to stay away if he is wise (Lauwers).

In real life, *symposia* can go wrong; in Plutarch's historical writings, we see examples of that in plenty, and it is normally because those ideal qualities are travestied or reversed, with hatred and hostility replacing friendship and goodwill, and wine producing violence rather than good fellowship. That is especially clear in a barbarian *symposion* such as that of Artaxerxes: Almagor traces the way in which features of an idealised Greek *symposion* are there subtly travestied and juggled to produce off-key, sometimes inverted, versions of what it ought to be: the host's character indeed emerges, just as it should, but here in a chilling way. This notion of a bloody feast builds on a long literary tradition (Rodrigues), but on real life as well. In Greek as in Persian and Roman culture, feasts were one of the few opportunities when the powerful mingled with an extended company and – precisely because of all those relaxed and friendly features of the ideal *symposia* – might be off their guard (Muñoz Gallarte); poisoning was always a possibility too (Romero González). A banquet was indeed a disturbingly dangerous place to be.

Macedonian *symposia* might be a special case, more drunken than the Greek, with arms readily available, so that the potential for violence was even more acute (Molina Marín). The banqueting of Alexander therefore provided a specially rich theme, and one can see the skill with which Plutarch integrated the theme within the texture of a particularly complex *Life*. Beneker brings out the comparison with Alexander's father Philip, whose wedding with Cleopatra provided so clear a warning of how a feast can go violently wrong: Alexander, so highly educated in Greek culture, has every opportunity to do better than his father – but, in a pattern that is distinctively Plutarchan, ends by falling back into tellingly similar behaviour, with the murder of Cleitus evoking memories of that disastrous early wedding-scene. Gómez and Mestre relate the development to the evolving character of Alexander, and particularly the effect of his interaction with eastern culture and the difficulties he finds in integrating the two worlds: that makes it an especially challenging test-case for how an ideal ruler should behave, and how far Alexander falls short of that ideal.

In Plutarch's own day there were new rulers: the men of Rome, men with different values and a different mode of dining, one with greater excess and – generally – rather less culture. Not that all Roman habits were bad ones; there are times when one can sense the influence of Roman ideas of *humanitas* (Molina Marín); Roman banquets were certainly more civilised than their Parthian equivalents (Chlup); and Plutarch, with his typically advanced views about women, would at least be torn on the Roman practice of a female presence at the banquet, even if in his own constructed *symposia* the female dimension is found rather in the nature of the topics discussed than in the presence of women to discuss them (Rodrigues). The character of a person's *symposia* certainly provided a useful register for gauging a Roman's Hellenism,

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

and in particular that crucial characteristic of *philanthropia* (Pinheiro, Tröster, Chlup). And Romans could often outdo Greeks in their organisational skill in putting together banquets and other spectacles if they so chose – but there remained an uncomfortable taste of the military about it all (Tröster); there was often some trumpeting of social standing (de Blois), something that a tactful host would try to sidestep in a Greek *symposion*; and an imperial banquet could go very badly wrong indeed, again owing to an uncomfortable intrusion of the military and a reversal of the proprieties of imperial authority (de Blois again).

If Alexander's banquets were the great test-case in the Greek *Lives*, the Catos' *symposia*, and especially the elder Cato's, were an equivalent among the Romans. As so often – more on this below – Plato's Socrates is in the background as a permanent benchmark of comparison, one that is especially clear in the *Younger Cato*; the Roman dinners there come out less well (Beck). As for the elder Cato, *philanthropia* is once again the key quality for evaluation throughout the *Life* (Ramón Palerm, Candau Morón, Beck again), and Cato is several times found wanting, at the dinner-table as with his slaves and his wives: it is paradoxical, perhaps, that he falls down most in his marital behaviour towards the end of his life, at the time when he was finally more receptive to Greek culture. It is striking too that *philanthropia* so often becomes a crucial register for assessing the behaviour of a more powerful person towards those who are weaker, as it is in Cato's treatment of his slaves; that is also clear in *Demosthenes–Cicero*, a most carefully worked pair, and Várzeas there argues for the importance of Sophocles' *Antigone*, especially his Creon, as giving an intertextual register for this exploration of humane generosity in power.

So even within these historical descriptions in the *Lives*, we find thought-provoking exploration of moral questions, and especially questions that concern the nature of power and the behaviour of the powerful. That is also true as we turn to the fictional *symposia* in the *Moralia*. Two works are particularly relevant here, the *Septem Sapientium Convivium* and the *Quaestiones Convivales*. The *Septem Sapientium Convivium* is often viewed as a fairly early work (and González Equihua agrees); if so, it is particularly interesting to see how features of Plutarch's later thinking and artistic technique are already developing – the suggestive use of animal imagery (Newmyer), the preference for practical wisdom, the synkritic technique, the deft characterisation, and particularly the deft use of pointed anecdotes and sayings, *chreiai* (González Equihua again). That last feature in particular was one whose incorporation sometimes stretched Plutarch's historical and literary imagination (Kim). Then the *Quaestiones Convivales*, clearly a work of Plutarch's maturity, are dedicated to Q. Sosius Senecio, twice Roman consul, accomplished military man and civilised Hellenophile – an instance in his own person of the humane mix of cultures that the *Quaestiones* optimistically represent. Senecio is also the dedicatee of the *Parallel Lives*, and it may well be that Plutarch regarded the *Lives* and the *Quaestiones Convivales* as his major works: they are certainly the longest and arguably the most ambitious. So the *symposion* is indeed a

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

The Reading of texts at the Graeco-Roman Symposium

Public reading in antiquity could be performed in various social settings. Dio Chrysostom describes how, walking through the hippodrome, he encountered people playing the flute, dancing, performing tricks, reading out a poem, singing, and recounting a history or tale[5]. The most common context, however, was the after-dinner symposium.[6] Numerous Greek and Roman authors give descriptions of banquets at which the reading of texts played a prominent role. The reading of texts at a symposium usually served two purposes. First, it provided entertainment for the guests. Juvenal writes in his *Satirae*: "My party today will offer other forms of entertainment. We'll have a recitation from the author of *Iliad* and from the poems of Virgil which challenge Homer's supremacy. With poetry like this, it hardly matters how it is read"[7]. Second, the reading of texts at banquets could give the impulse for a good conversation and, according to Plutarch, also help "to raise morals to a higher standard of fairness and kindness"[8].

At the symposium various types of texts could be read: philosophy, scientific treatises, history, poetry, and comedy. According to Aulus Gellius, at a banquet of the philosopher Taurus the *Symposium* of Plato was read.[9] At the dinner of the philosopher Favorinus "there was usually read either an old song of the lyric poets, or something from history, now in Greek and now in Latin"[10]. Gellius once heard the reading of a passage from the treatise of Gavius Bassus *On the Origin of Verbs and Substantives*[11]. Plutarch notices that, as entertainment at a banquet, the dialogues of Plato could be recited and even performed[12]. According to Lucian, the blessed ones who live on the Isle of the Blest enjoy a symposium accompanied by poetry and songs. Here, mostly the poems of Homer are read or recited[13]. In Lucian's *Symposion*, the grammarian Histiaios recited a combination of verses of Pindar, Hesiod and Anacreon[14]. Plutarch states that the comedian Menander is particularly fit to be read at symposia[15].

The reading at symposia could be performed by persons of various statuses. First, the person who read the literary text could be the author of the text himself, who by reading his composition hoped to elicit the comments and reactions of the participants in the banquet[16]. Petronius relates that Trimalchio

[5] D. Chr., XX 10.

[6] Plu., *Quaest. conv*. 7.711b-712c; Plin., *Epist*. 1.15.2.

[7] Juv., *Sat*. 11.180.

[8] Plu., *Quaest. conv*. 7.712d.

[9] Gell., *NA* 17.20.

[10] Gell., *NA* 2.22.

[11] Gell., *NA* 3.19.

[12] Plu., *Quaest. conv.* 7.711c.

[13] Luc., *VH* 2.15.

[14] Luc., *Symp.* 17.

[15] Plu., *Quaest. conv.* 7.712b.

[16] E. J. Kenney, "Books and Readers in the Roman World", in E. J. Kenney & W. V. Clausen (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature Volume II: Latin Literature*, Cambridge, 1982,

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

at his banquet read his last will and also some poetry of his own making.[17] Second, the reading could be performed by the host of the banquet. Third, the task of reading could be assigned to a special reader (ἀναγνώστης, lector). Such readers would often be educated slaves, whose duty in Roman houses was to entertain their master and his guests at table by a recitation in Greek and/or Latin[18].

Atticus, for instance, had very good readers, whom he thought indispensable at dinner parties[19]. Gellius relates that a slave usually stood by the table at dinner with the philosopher Favorinus[20]. Plutarch states that slaves could be charged with the recitation and performance of Plato's dialogues[21]. The evidence cited so far may suffice to warrant the conclusion that reading of literary compositions at symposia was a widely spread custom.

The Reading of texts in the Gatherings of Christians

Generations of scholars have traced the reading of Scripture in early Christian communities back to the reading of the Law of Moses in the Jewish synagogue. In this traditional and still current view, it is taken for granted that the reading of Scripture in Christian assemblies goes back to the reading of the Law in the synagogue if only for the fact that it was the Jewish Scriptures that were read in the Christian gatherings[22]. The earliest Christians, who were Jews, would have taken over not only the custom of meeting weekly to read and interpret the Law and the Prophets but also the practice of singing psalms and saying prayers and thanksgivings. Jews would have held their scrolls in great veneration, a respect that was enhanced by the ritualized reading in a religious setting. In time, the reverence for the word of God and the use of sacred books in religious gatherings would have become characteristic of Christians as well[23]. This argument for tracing back the reading of Scripture among Christians to the synagogue profits from the fact that there are no clear-cut or convincing parallels for the cultic reading of texts in other religions than Judaism, apart from religions that have been influenced by Christianity itself. Thus, on the assumption that there was historical continuity between Jewish and Christian cultic practices, scholars inferred and still infer that the reading of Scripture in the Christian gathering has its roots in Judaism or has been influenced by Judaism in one way or another[24].

However, the view that the reading of texts in Christian communities derives from the practice of reading and studying the Law in Jewish

p. 11; R. Starr, 1987, p. 213.

[17] Petron., *Satyr*. 71.4; 55.

[18] See J.W. Duff and A. J. S. Spawforth, "anagnostes," in *OCD*[3], p. 80.

[19] Nep., *Att.* 13.3; 14.1.

[20] Gell., *NA* 3.19.

[21] Plu., *Quaest. conv.* 7.711c.

[22] F. Young, 2004, p. 91.

[23] Ibid., 92.

[24] G. Rouwhorst, 2002, p. 305.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

communities does not seem to be confirmed by the data contained in early Christian literature.

To clarify the origin of the reading of Scripture in the gatherings of Christians it is necessary to look at the context of reading in the Christian Church during the first and second centuries.

In the last ten years there has been a substantial shift in the way scholars viewed the periodical gatherings of the early Christians. This shift began with the publication of *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft* by Matthias Klinghardt (1996)[25] and became stronger through studies by H. J. de Jonge (2001) and D. Smith (2003)[26]. The essence of these authors' new approach can be formulated as follows: the local early Christian community, as a sociological phenomenon, functioned as a voluntary religious association just like many other associations in the Graeco-Roman world of the first century CE. There is firm evidence from the first two centuries CE to support this view. For instance, in 55 CE Paul compares the local Christian community with pagan religious associations in Corinth[27]. In 112 CE Pliny does the same in his correspondence with the Roman Emperor Trajan[28]. Lucian in the second century CE calls the leader of a Christian community a *thiasarches*, that is, leader of a cult association[29]. About 200 CE Tertullian compares meals of the Christian communities with meals of various other religious associations such as the *collegia Saliorum* and the Dionysus and Sarapis cults[30].

Recent scholarship mostly accepts and subscribes to the view that, sociologically, early Christian communities functioned as Hellenistic cult associations. Such associations, whether pagan, Jewish, or Christian, held periodical gatherings that had a bipartite structure: a meal (*deipnon*) and a drinking party (*symposion*) afterwards. Most descriptions of Christian gatherings in the first three centuries present these gatherings as banquets that took place weekly on Sunday evening (Paul, Pliny, Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Municius Felix, Tertullian). Basically, the early Christian gathering was a supper with a drinking party, not a meeting for the study of the Bible, as was the synagogue meeting on Sabbath. The early Christians met in private houses on Sunday evening and held their symposia more or less the same way as other groups did in those days. During the symposium part of the evening, Christians not only engaged in such oral communication as prayer, singing, speeches, homilies, lessons and revelations, they also practised public reading of texts.

It may seem exaggerated to seek the roots of the reading of texts in the gatherings of Christians one-sidedly and exclusively in the Hellenistic symposium, and not both in synagogue and symposium. There are, however,

[25] M. Klinghardt, 1996, pp. 269-378.
[26] H. J. de Jonge, 2001, pp. 209-37; D. Smith, 2003.
[27] 1 Cor. 10:16-21.
[28] Luc., *Peregr.* 11.
[29] Plin., *Epist*. 10.96.
[30] Tert., *Apol*. 39.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

strong reasons to trace the Christians' reading exclusively to the symposium. The meeting in the synagogue took place on Saturday in the morning did not comprise a meal or a symposium. The literary evidence from Philo and Josephus suggests that the synagogue was used primarily for reading and interpreting the Law of Moses[31]. Christians did not read the Torah or the Law of Moses as was the custom in the synagogual meeting. Moreover, during the first century, Christians read texts without any interpretation that followed the reading. There simply no continuity: neither between the ceremonies involved, nor between the texts read.

The first Christian texts to be read in Christian gatherings were apostolic letters, for instance, those of Paul. These were read from the middle of the first century onwards. This can be inferred from the Pauline correspondence and the Book of Acts[32]. At first, the reading of the apostles' letters was not yet a liturgical practice; rather these letters were read just as letters received. In certain cases, the messenger who brought them could read such letters to the audience.[33] Many early Christian letters were intended to be heard by all members of the community to which they were addressed; this means that they had to be read aloud in that community's weekly gathering at the symposium.

It should be admitted that reading at the Hellenistic symposium could have different functions and goals, and that various genres were read. But one function could certainly be the instruction or edification of the audience, which comes close to that of the reading of apostolic letters among Christians. Plutarch said that one should read moral stuff, especially Plato's dialogues.[34] Moreover, one should not conceive of the apostolic letters read in the Christian communities as documents of high canonical, holy or divine status. At first, they were no more than messages from contemporary teachers, and documents almost of the level of every-day life; nothing particularly special. Furthermore, it is already significant of and in itself that reading occurred at the Christian symposium: why would one suppose that this has other roots than reading at symposia in general. That the genres that were read could vary, both within paganism and between paganism and Christianity, does not alter the fact that reading at symposia was the continuation of the reading at symposia in general.

Around 100 CE the author of 1 Timothy admonishes his addressee to devote himself to the public reading of the Scriptures.[35] Since there is no evidence that there existed special meetings intended only for the reading of Scripture and preaching, it is probable that 1 Timothy means that portions of the Old Testament in Greek should be read at the symposium on Sunday evening. Until the third century[36] there is no indication that Christians in their

[31] Philo, *Som*. 2.127; Jos., *Ant*. 16.2.4.

[32] 1 Thess. 5:27, Acts 15:31; Col. 4:16.

[33] Luc., *Symp*. 21.

[34] Plu., *Quaest. conv*. 7.711.c.

[35] 1 Tim. 4:13.

[36] Or., *Hom. Josh*. 4.1; *Hom. Gen*. 12.1. According to Melito of Sardes, *On Pascha*, he read

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

gatherings read the Law of Moses; it is most probable, therefore, that they read other books of the Old Testament, for example, the Prophets or the Psalms.

In the second century, in addition to letters and Prophets, the writings read at Christian symposia included sermons, apocalypses and accounts of Christian martyrdoms[37].

Explicit information about the reading of Gospels in the gatherings of Christians is provided by Justin Martyr (*ca*. 155):

> On the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together in one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits. Then, when the reader has finished, the president in a discourse instructs and exhorts to the imitation of these good things[38].

Thus, in Justin's Church in Rome, the reading of Gospels and/or Prophets was followed by a speech, including ethical exhortations, and prayers. Only then would the supper begin.

Some decades later, the reading of Gospels in gatherings of Christians is attested by the *Acts of Peter*, written between 180 and 190 CE. Here Peter is said to have entered the house where the Christians had gathered. When he came into the dining-room (*triclinium*), "he saw that the gospel was being read. And rolling it up he said, 'Men, who believe in Christ and hope in him, you shall know how the holy scriptures of our Lord must be explained …. Now I will explain to you that which has been read to you.'"[39] The reading and exposition of Scripture are concluded with a supper (ch. 22). The course of things described here must be that of the Roman Church in the late second century.

In about 200 CE, Tertullian gives a brief description of the Christian gathering in North Africa. With respect to the reading of Scripture in this gathering he observes:

> We assemble to read our sacred writings, if any peculiarity of the times makes either forewarning or reminiscence needful. However it be in that respect, with the sacred words we nourish our faith, we animate our hope, we make our confidence more steadfast; and no less by inculcations of God's precepts we confirm good habits[40].

Interestingly, in Tertullian's view the reading has a pastoral purpose. The hearing of Scripture strengthens the listeners' faith, hope and morality.

Whereas at Graeco-Roman symposia the reading of texts normally took place after the supper, the evidence in Justin and Tertullian suggests that, in

---

Ex. 12 on Easter day, but this is of course a special case; it is not the reading in a regular Sunday gathering.

[37] *2 Clem.* 19.1.; Rev. 1:3-8, 11; Herm., *Vis.* 2.8.4; *Canon Muratori*, lines 71-78; *M. Polyc.* 20.

[38] Just., *1 Apol.* 67.3.

[39] *Acta Petri* 20.

[40] Tert., *Apol.* 39.3.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

the second century, Christians reversed the order and put the reading before the communal meal. The easiest explanation of this reversal is that it allowed those who were not yet full members of the community, the catechumens, to participate in the gathering until the supper began, from which moment on they were excluded[41]. If the reading of Scripture took place *after* the supper it was difficult to arrange for the catechumens to arrive precisely in time to hear the reading. It was, thus, much more practical to put the reading, together with the exposition, before the supper.

The office of "reader" or "lector" has arisen in the Church at the end of the second century: Tertullian in North Africa is the first to attest the existence of the function of reader[42]. The office originated certainly some time before Tertullian makes mention of it.

Before the office of reader originated, the reading of Scripture in Christian gatherings must have been performed by ordinary members of the community. This earlier practice is reflected in Revelation 1:3, where a blessing is pronounced over "the one who reads" the Book of Revelation out loud in Church. Obviously, this reader does not yet have an official capacity, for he is designated with the participle ἀναγνώσκων, not with the noun ἀναγνώστης. On the other hand, in 1 Timothy 4:13, the responsibility for the reading of Scripture is assigned to the leader of the community. Apparently, around the turn of the first to the second century, practices as to who performed the reading still varied.

Towards the middle of the second century we encounter someone who reads his own composition in a Christian congregation, namely the author of the homily known as *2 Clement*. This author concludes his homily by stating: "Brothers and sisters, … , I am reading to you an exhortation to pay attention to that which is written, that you may save both yourselves and the one who reads among you"[43]. Obviously, "reading" is the delivering of the homily; it is read aloud by the author himself.

Justin's account of the Sunday gathering mentions "the person who reads [namely, a passage from a Gospel or a Prophet]"[44]. But Justin does not use a noun designating the reader and it cannot be inferred from this passage that he already knew the office of lector. Tertullian, however, as already stated, is acquainted with the reader as an official of the Church.[45] From the third century onwards the reader regularly appears as an official functionary who, at various places, assists bishops and other clergy in conducting the service of Christian congregations. The ceremony of the appointment of a reader is mentioned in a mid-third-century manual on Church practice from Rome, the *Apostolic Tradition*; it states: "A reader is installed as the bishop hands him a book. He

[41] *Did*. 9.5.
[42] Tert., *Praescr*. 41.8.
[43] *2 Clem*. 19.1.
[44] Just., *1 Apol*. 67.4.
[45] Tert., *Praescr*. 41.8.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

has no laying on of hands"[46]. Around the same time, the appointment of *lectores* is attested by other authors in Rome and Carthage[47]. In the *Syriac Didascalia* (*ca*. 215 CE?) it is not a reader, but the bishop himself who performs the reading from the Scriptures.[48]

One may find it difficult to accept that readers in Christian communities are analogous with the slave lectors at Graeco-Roman symposia. However, as it has been stated in the beginning of this article the reading at symposia could have been performed by various persons provided they have ability to perform the reading. As long as Christian communities conducted theirs gatherings in the evening following the standard pattern of meal plus symposium the reading of various texts could be performed by host himself, his educated slave or any member of the community who could do it. Christian communities may have lacked educated slaves who read texts at Hellenistic symposia, but with time they began to appoint some members of their congregations to perform reading of authoritative texts in their gatherings. In any case the office of reader in Christian Church can be best traced back to reader at symposia in the Graeco-Roman world in general.

Conclusion

Christians in the first and second centuries met in private houses on Sunday evening. They held their symposia in the same way as other, non-Christian, groups did in those days. Accordingly, they practised public reading of texts at their symposia and had special readers to do the reading, at least from some point of time in the second century onwards. The reading of authoritative writings took place in the social gathering that followed the supper. This was the context in which apostolic and other important letters, Prophets, Gospels and other genres were read aloud to the community. There is a close analogy between the reading of texts at non-Christian banquets and the reading of texts in the weekly gatherings of Christians. This analogy cannot be incidental. We are witnessing here one and the same phenomenon in both non-Christian and Christian contexts. The analogy challenges the current view, recently upheld by some scholars, according to which the reading of the Scriptures in the gatherings of Christians should be traced back to the Jewish practice of reading and studying the Law of Moses on Sabbath in the synagogue. There is no continuity between the reading in the synagogue and that in the Church. The public reading of Scripture in Christian communities goes back, not to the reading of the Law in the synagogue, but to the reading of literature at the Hellenistic banquet in general.

---

[46] *Trad. ap.* 11.

[47] Eus., *Hist*. 6.43.11 (Rome, 251 CE); Cypr., *Epist.* 29.1 (Carthage, *ca*. 250 CE).

[48] *Did. ap*. 2.58. The bishop is supposed to perform the reading in a sitting position.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

Works cited

Achtemeier, P., "Omne Verbum Sonat: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity", *JBL*, 109 (1990), pp. 3-27.

Dunbabin, Katherine. "Convivial Spaces: Dining and Entertainment in the Roman Villa", *JRA*, 9 (1996) 66-80.

———— "Ut Graeco more bibetur: Greeks and Romans on a Dining Coach". In I. Nielsen & H. S. Nielsen (eds.), *Meals in a Social Context*, Aarhus, 1998, pp. 81-101.

Gilula, D., "Menander's Comedies Best with Dessert and Wine (Plut. *Mor*. 712C)", Athenaeum, 65 (1987), pp. 511-16.

Jones, Ch. ,"Dinner Theater", In W. Slater (ed.), *Dining in a Classical Context*, Michigan, 1991, pp. 191-92.

Jonge, de H. J., "The Early History of the Lord's Supper". In J. W. van Henten & A. Houtepen (eds.), *Religious Identity and the Invention of Tradition*, Assen, 2001, pp. 209-37.

Kenney, E. J., "Books and Readers in the Roman World". In E. J. Kenney & W. V. Clausen (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature Volume II: Latin Literature*, Cambridge, 1982, pp. 3-32;

Klinghardt, M., *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft. Soziologie und Liturgie frühchristlicher Mahlfeiern*. Tübingen/Basel, 1996.

Markus, D., "Performing the Book". Classical Antiquity, 19 (2000), p. 138-179.

Romeri, L., *Philosophes entre mots et mets. Plutarque, Lucien et Athénée autour de la table de Platon*. Grenoble, 2002.

Rouwhorst, G., "The Reading of Scripture in Early Christian Liturgy". In L. Rutgers (ed.), *What Athens has to do with Jerusalem. Essays on Classical, Jewish, and Early Christian Art and Archaeology in Honor of Gideon Foerster*, Leuven, 2002, pp. 305-31.

Slater, Wiliam J. (ed.), *Dining in a Classical Context*. Michigan, 1991.

Smith, D. E., *From Symposium to Eucharist. The Eucharist in the Early Christian World*. Minneapolis, 2002.

Starr, R., "The Circulation of Literary Texts in the Roman World". *CQ*, 37 (1987) 213-223.

———— "Reading Aloud: Lectores and Roman Reading", *CJ*, 86 (1990-1991) 337-43.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

Stein-Hölkeskamp, E. *Das römische Gastmahl. Eine Kulturgeschichte*, München, 2005.

Young, F., "Christian Teaching", in F. Young & L. Ayres (eds.), *Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, Cambridge, 2004, pp. 91-104.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

Plutarco e la lettura nel simposio

Gennaro D'Ippolito
Università di Palermo

Abstract
In the symposium, by then merged into the banquet, Plutarch practises, in accordance with the rules of his "ethical anthropology", the collective reading of poetry and prose writers not only for mere entertainment but as a stimulus for a debate of high cultural dignity, always directed to improve man. Refusing many authors of popular convivial praxis, e. g. Aristophanes, he prefers Plato among the prose writers and Homer and Menander among the poets.

Rispetto al simposio greco del periodo arcaico e classico e al banchetto-spettacolo romano, il simposio greco d'età postclassica non godeva di molta attenzione da parte degli studiosi sia per un'obiettiva carenza di fonti sia per la falsa idea che esso avesse perduto d'importanza. Ma negli ultimi anni sono apparsi diversi lavori[1] che hanno ribadito, anche per l'età alessandrina e romana, il suo ruolo come istituzione sociale e come luogo di presentazione di letteratura attraverso letture o esibizioni attoriali[2].

Fra gli autori greci della prima età imperiale, a Plutarco si devono le testimonianze più importanti sul simposio. Esse ci dimostrano la sua vitalità ed insieme la sua trasformazione[3].

Com'è noto, a parte gli episodi simposiaci che s'incontrano nelle *Vite* e contribuiscono alla caratterizzazione morale dei personaggi[4], due dei *Moralia* sono proprio dedicati al simposio: uno è il Συμπόσιον τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν (cito secondo il *Catalogo di Lampria*), l'altro i Συμποσιακά. Il primo, il *Septem sapientium convivium*[5], ci riporta, col tipico gusto nostalgico di Plutarco e sulla scia dei due *Simposi* precedenti, di Platone e di Senofonte, ad un simposio arcaico e indubbiamente inventato, dove si segue l'esempio di Platone, centrato sulla discussione, piuttosto che quello di Senofonte, che, dando rilevanza allo spettacolo, con le sue *performances* meliche, orchestiche, drammatiche, mimiche o acrobatiche, riproduceva più fedelmente il costume conviviale greco. I Συμποσιακά, che opportunamente, nella edizione napoletana del *Corpus Plutarchi Moralium*, vengono presentati come *Conversazioni a tavola*[6], in effetti

---

[1] Mi riferisco soprattutto al capitolo III ("The symposium": pp. 71-103) del volume callimacheo di A. Cameron, 1995, e ad una serie di convegni sull'argomento (O. Murray, 1990; W. J. Slater, 1991; O. Murray & M. Tecuşan, 1995).

[2] In un volume sulla lettura nel mondo ellenistico L. Del Corso, 2005, dedica un paragrafo (pp. 114-25) a "La lettura in gruppo e il simposio", non trascurando Plutarco.

[3] Sul simposio in Plutarco cf. A. M. Scarcella, 1998, pp. 117-33, F. Pordomingo Pardo, 1999 e M. Vetta, 2000.

[4] Cf. A. Billault, 2008.

[5] Cf. F. Lo Cascio, *Plutarco. Il convito dei sette sapienti* (introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento a c. di F. L. C.), Napoli, 1997.

[6] Editi finora solo i libri I-IV: A. M. Scarcella 1998 e Idem, *Plutarco. Conversazioni a tavola. Libro quarto* (introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento a c. di A. M. S.),

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

In fact, these banquet scenes, in our view, stress two interrelated themes: first, the model of Hellenicity, and therefore of Hellenization, that Alexander wishes to impose; and second, the virtues of the good ruler – an issue of particular interest to the authors of the Empire[59]. The banquet, then, can be taken as a symbol of the ancient Hellenic institutions, the institutions which Alexander will now adapt in his attempts to make the Hellenic universal.

Works cited

Duff, T., *Plutarch's* Lives. *Exploring Virtue and Vice*, Oxford, 1999.

Frazier, F., *Histoire et morale dans les* Vies parallèles *de Plutarque*, Paris, 1996.

Gómez, P. & Jufresa, M., "La risa y el vino en los escritos simposíacos de Plutarco", in J. G. Montes Cala et al. (eds.), *Plutarco, Dioniso y el vino*, Actas del VI Simposio Español sobre Plutarco (Cádiz, 14-16 de Mayo, 1998), Madrid, 1999, pp. 255-67.

Mestre, F. & Gómez, P., "*Tyche* e individuo: ambigüedad de usos en las *Vidas Paralelas* de Plutarco", in A. Pérez Jiménez & F. Titchener (eds.), *Valori letterari delle Opere di Plutarco. Studi offerti al Professore Italo Gallo dall' International Plutarch Society*, Málaga-Utah, 2005, pp. 295-306.

Murray, O. (ed.), *Sympotica. A symposium on the Symposion*, Oxford, 1990.

Mossman, J. M., "Tragedy and Epic in Plutarch's *Alexander*", *JHS*, 108 (1988) 83-93.

Paul, G., "Symposia and Deipna in Plutarch's *Lives* and in Other Historical Writings", in W. J. Slater (ed.), *Dining in a Classical Context: Contrast and Parallels*, Ann Arbor, 1991, pp. 157-69.

Pellizer, E., "Outlines of a Morphology of Sympotic Entertainment", in O. Murray (ed.), *Sympotica. A symposium on the Symposion*, Oxford, 1990, pp. 177-83.

Prandi, L., "L'Alessandro di Plutarco (Riflessioni su *De Al. Magn. Fort.* e su *Alex.*)", in L. Van der Stockt (ed.), *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch*, Leuven, 2000, pp. 375-86.

Romeri, L., *Philosophes entre mots et mets. Plutarque, Lucien et Athénée autour de la table de Platon*, Grenoble, 2002.

Rösler, W., "Wine and Truth in the Greek *Symposion*", in O. Murray & M. Tecuşan (eds.), *In vino veritas*, Oxford, 1995, pp. 106-12.

[59] Alexander is in fact the protagonist of two of Dio of Prusa's speeches on kingship: one of them (*Or.* II) is a dialogue between a young Alexander and his father Philip, while the other (*Or.* IV) evokes a meeting between the king and Diogenes the Cynic.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

Rossi, L. E., "Il simposio greco arcaico e classico come spettacolo a se stesso", in Centro di studi sul teatro medioevale e rinascimentale (eds.), *Spettacoli conviviali dall'antichità classica alle corti italiane del' 400.* Atti del VII Convegno di Studio, Viterbo, 1983, pp. 41-50.

Schmitt-Pantel, P., *La cité au banquet*, Rome, 1992.

Sirinelli, J., *Plutarque*, Paris, 2000.

Stadter, P. A., "Drinking, *Table-Talk*, and Plutarch's Contemporaries", in J. G. Montes et al. (eds.), *Plutarco, Dioniso y el vino*, Actas del VI Simposio Español sobre Plutarco (Cádiz, 14-16 de Mayo, 1998), Madrid, 1999, pp. 481-90.

Suárez de la Torre, E., "Diálogo, filosofía y simposio en Plutarco", in M. Jufresa et al. (eds.), *Plutarc a la seva època: paideia i societat*. Actas del VIII Simposio español sobre Plutarco, Barcelone, 2005, pp. 463-84.

Titchener, F., "Everything to do with Dionysus", in J. G. Montes Cala et al. (eds.), *Plutarco, Dioniso y el vino*. Actas del VI Simposio Español sobre Plutarco (Cádiz, 14-16 de Mayo, 1998), Madrid, 1999, pp. 491-99.

Whitmarsh, T., "Alexander's Hellenism and Plutarch's Textualism", *CQ*, 52 (2002) 174-92.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

Crossing status barriers: the disruption of an imperial banquet by angry soldiers in Plutarch's *Otho*

Lukas de Blois
Radboud University of Nijmegen

Abstract

In his *Life of Otho,* chapter 3, Plutarch describes a dinner that the emperor Otho had with 80 senators, some of whom had brought their ladies with them. The dinner was disturbed by soldiers of the praetorian guard, who felt very uneasy and distrustful against the senators, and thought that they had to save the emperor from a senatorial conspiracy after having seen weapons loaded upon wagons. Violating the exclusivity of the imperial dinner, in other words breaking through an important status barrier, they inverted the positive effect of this great banquet, and thus damaged Otho's reputation among the upper classes beyond repair. In Plutarch's *Galba* and *Otho*, which should be read as one *opus*, this dinner story negatively inverts an important means of imperial representation and thus indicates how weak Otho's position really was. It presents as well a clear symptom of the serious deterioration of military discipline that in this year of civil strife (AD 68-69) manifested itself and may be seen as a consequence of bad leadership at the top (by Galba and Otho) and at the second level of authority (by people such as Nymphidius Sabinus, Vinius, Laco, Icelus and Otho's cronies). By choosing an imperial banquet, which should be a place of friendship with high status *amici Caesaris,* a show-case of imperial power and *paideia*, and a mirror of hierarchies within the urban Roman elite, as the scene where the utter escalation of military misbehaviour and the total loss of imperial authority over the military mob came to light, Plutarch accentuates the social and representational importance of such banquets.

In *Otho* 3.3-7 Plutarch tells us that near Rome soldiers of the praetorian guard became suspicious when they noticed that weapons were loaded on wagons (probably to equip soldiers who were to participate in the war against the Vitellians, LdB). Some soldiers attacked the wagons, others killed two centurions who opposed them, as well as Crispinus, the higher officer in charge. Apparently the soldiers thought that a coup against the emperor Otho was at hand, which they wanted to prevent. The whole mob, putting themselves in array and exhorting one another to go to the help of the emperor, marched to Rome. Here, learning that eighty senators were at supper with Otho – some of them with their wives – they rushed to the palace, declaring that now was a good time to take off all the emperor's enemies at one stroke. In the palace there was dire perplexity, which fell upon Otho and his guests, who kept their eyes fixed upon him in speechless terror. But he sent the prefects of the guard with orders to explain matters to the soldiers and appease them, while at the same time he dismissed his guests by another door; and they barely made their escape as the soldiers, forcing their way through the guards into the great hall, asked what was become of the enemies of Caesar. In this crisis, then, Otho stood up on his couch, and after many exhortations, and entreaties, and not without plentiful tears, at last succeeded in sending them away (Plutarch, *Otho* 3.4-7).

Is this just a minor episode in a chaotic year, the year of the four emperors, which was full of usurpations, civil strife, killing and plundering? Why does Plutarch give us this dinner story, in this very short biography of Otho, when he

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

could have opted for seemingly more important things, such as heroic episodes in battles and sieges, or political upheavals, or other spectacular events? It is well known that Plutarch in his *Alexander* 1.2 explicitly indicates that the description of the *ethos,* the character, of his heroes was his primary goal, and that trivial things sometimes showed this better than battles and sieges would do. However, this episode is more than such a trivial detail. The suspicious behaviour of some praetorians, who saw weapons being loaded on wagons, and the ensuing disruption of Otho's banquet by soldiers of the praetorian guard is also treated with some emphasis and in full detail by Tacitus, and is more briefly mentioned by Suetonius and Cassius Dio[1]. So four important authors or their sources considered this disruption of Otho's dinner an important event, important enough to insert it in their account of Otho's reign. This should not come as a surprise to us. Banquets were of great consequence in Roman social life, they gave the rich and powerful opportunities to show off, to trumpet their own standing, as John Donahue puts it (Donahue 2004, 113). The sharing of food with people of lower status, with equals or among large numbers was a constant feature of social and cultural elite life in Rome and other Roman towns (ibid. 116) and attending dinners gave plenty of opportunities to communicate with equals, or with people of higher or lower standing, to men as well as women. As recently published works have shown, to Roman emperors dinners were an important means to share opinions with senators and other important people, and to show their good character. Imperial dinners were show-cases of imperial *gratia* and *paideia*, and unveiled existing hierarchies within the upper layers of society[2]. To give dinners in the right and proper way was one of many means through which emperors could enhance their reputation; it was one of many ritualized standard practices that enabled emperors to show that they were the right persons in the right place, in other words, could legitimize their position. Other such standard practices were sessions of the senate presided by the emperor, *adlocutiones, adventus,* or even better, triumphal processions, which showed the emperors' military prowess. Yet other ones were *salutationes,* receiving embassies, distributing *congiaria* or *donativa* and attending the games at Rome. Some of those standard practices, such as *adlocutiones, adventus,* and *liberalitates*, were regularly propagated on coins, in inscriptions, or even in sculpture (think of Trajan's arch at Beneventum), but other ones, like imperial dinners, stayed outside this form of imperial representation. The reason must be that the elite audience that was involved could be present personally or could hear about it first hand, and that other people had nothing to do with it. In this respect imperial dinners were an in-crowd form of imperial representation

[1] Tacitus, *Histories* 1.80-82; Suetonius, *Otho* 8.1f.; Cassius Dio 64.9.2. See K. Vössing, 2004, p. 347 and E. Stein-Hölkeskamp, 2005, p. 49.

[2] See J. F. Donahue, 2004, pp. 67-72; K. Vössing, 2004, pp. 265-539; E. Stein-Hölkeskamp, 2005, pp. 41-55. In general on Roman upper class banquets see J. D'Arms, 1999; K. M. D. Dunbabin, 2003; J. F. Donahue, 2004, esp. 113 and 116; K. Vössing, 2004, pp. 187-264; E. Stein-Hölkeskamp, 2005.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

aiming at a very limited group of senators and other important high status people. So in this case there was a status barrier, which precluded any other people. General advertisement of this type of ritualized standard practice would destroy its exclusive character and break the status barrier.

Ritualized standard practices can be transposed to different contexts, or even inverted into their reverses, in a kind of dynamic of rituals. In this way an author can attack and de-legitimize a ruler, by inverting the standard practices through which he usually shows his prowess, effectiveness, liberality and culture into their negative counterparts. Just one example. The author of the *Historia Augusta,* who clearly wished to give an utterly negative image of the emperor Elagabalus, portrays him giving an *adlocutio* to the prostitutes of Rome, instead of to the military (*HA, Vita Heliogabali* 26.3-4). *Adlocutio* was an important ritualized standard practice of emperors going to war[3], but instead Elagabalus is portrayed as plunging into every kind of debauchery instead after his oration to the prostitutes. In *Historia Augusta* 26.3-4 we read:

> He gathered together in a public building all the harlots from the Circus, the theatre, the Stadium, and all other places of amusement, and from the public baths, and then delivered a speech to them, as one might to soldiers, calling them 'comrades' (*commilitones,* LdB) and discoursing upon various kinds of postures and debaucheries[4].

A second example is Nero's triumphal procession after his voyage through Greece during which he won many prizes at the great Greek games. The procession was about victories in Greek games, not about successful battles and sieges. Soldiers forming a special guard, the *augustiani,* had to act as a kind of claque, which had to praise Nero's qualities as a performer at the Greek games. Nero may have staged the procession himself, thinking it would enhance his reputation of a cultured and educated ruler, but if this was the case it completely backfired, for this triumphal procession is utterly condemned by the literary sources in which it is described, which must echo upper class feelings in Rome[5]. In *Nero* 25.1 Suetonius tells us:

> … but at Rome he (= Nero) rode in the chariot which Augustus had used in his triumphs in days gone by, and wore a purple robe and a Greek cloak adorned with stars of gold, bearing on his head the Olympic crown, and in his right hand the Pythian, while the rest were carried before him with inscriptions telling where he had won them and against what competitors, and giving the

[3] A fine example of the propagation of an *adlocutio* in Severan times is depicted on a medallion published by F. Gnecchi, 1912, II, pl. 93,8. See M. Christol, 1997, p. 10.

[4] *HA, Vita Elagabali* 26.3-4: *Omnes de circo, de theatre, de Stadio, et omnibus locis et balneis meretrices collegit in aedes publicas et apud eas contionem habuit quasi militarem, dicens eas commilitones, disputavitque de generibus schematum et voluptatum.* See on this emperor and his image in ancient and modern literature M. Icks, "Heliogabalus, a Monster on the Roman Throne. The Literary Construction of a Bad Emperor", in I. Sluiter & R. M. Rosen (eds.), *KAKOS. Badness and Anti-Values in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden, 2008, forthcoming.

[5] On Nero's voyage to Greece (AD 67) see Suetonius, *Nero* 22-26 and Cassius Dio 63.8-9.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

> titles of the songs or the subject of the plays. His car was followed by his claque and by the escort of a triumphal procession, who shouted that they were the attendants of Augustus and the soldiers of his triumphs[6].

In his *Life of Otho,* chapter 3, Plutarch gives us another example. Otho's high status dinner with 80 senators and their ladies was disturbed by soldiers, who felt very uneasy and distrustful, especially against the senators, and thought that they had to save the emperor from a senatorial conspiracy as soon as they had seen weapons loaded upon wagons. Violating the exclusivity of the imperial dinner, in other words breaking through an important status barrier, they inverted the positive effect of this great banquet, and thus damaged Otho's reputation among the upper classes beyond repair. This is how Plutarch presents the story to us. Giving this story relatively much space within this short *Vita,* he emphasized how little authority Otho had and how weak his position really was. In contrast, in *Histories* 1.82 Tacitus has the soldiery come to its senses and return to discipline after speeches of the praetorian prefects. In 1.83 f. he adds an oration to the praetorians, which is put into Otho's mouth, and in which the existence of the senate is defended in very positive tones. Tacitus' story is more optimistic about the soldiers of the guard than Plutarch's is, and Tacitus sees fit to use this event to insert a laudatory oration on the position of the senate into his report.[7] He thus gives us a much more positive image of Otho than Plutarch does. So Plutarch must have deliberately painted Otho's authority in very dark colours, in this way inverting an important, exclusive representation of his power into its negative counterpart.

In my view this dinner story is not fictional. In *Otho* 3.3-7 Plutarch gives us a clever rhetorical elaboration of a story that seems to be historical, given the fact that three other literary sources tell it as well, however briefly or elaborately[8]. I think that the account of the disruption of Otho's banquet, which Plutarch must have found in his written sources or may have got from

[6] Suetonius, *Nero* 25.1: "… *sed et Romam eo curru, quo Augustus olim triumphaverat, et in veste purpurea distinctaque stellis aureis chlamyde coronamque capite gerens Olympiacam, dextra manu Pythiam, praeeunte pompa ceterarum cum titulis, ubi et quos quo cantionum quove fabularum argumento vicisset; sequentibus currum ovantium ritu plausoribus, Augustianos militesque se triumphi eius clamantibus.*

[7] I owe thanks to Christopher Pelling for pointing this out to me during the discussion that followed my lecture at the eighth conference of the International Plutarch Society, Coimbra, Portugal, 24 September 2008.

[8] An common source of Tacitus, Suetonius, and Plutarch might have made up this story, in which case it could be largely fictional. I do not believe this, because the story, especially in the versions given by Tacitus and Plutarch, contains too many specific details and because this source, if it had been historiographical, which it probably had, would have been a contemporary of the events of AD 68-69. He would have had to take into account that many eye-witnesses were still around, who would not easily have accepted a fictional story about emperors and their praetorians that had been inserted into an historical work.[I am not so sure about this!] I owe thanks to Philip Stadter, who brought this up during the discussion that followed my lecture at the eighth conference of the International Plutarch Society, Coimbra, Portugal, 24 September, 2008.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

hearsay, suited him well. In the opening lines of his *Galba,* Plutarch gives us the main theme of his *Galba* and *Otho*, which should be read as one narrative[9]. This theme is the escalation of military misconduct in times of diminished or missing leadership. In *Galba* 1 Plutarch observes:

> Iphicrates the Athenian used to think that the mercenary soldier might well be fond of wealth and fond of pleasure, in order that his quest for the means to gratify his desires might lead him to fight with greater recklessness; but most people think that a body of soldiers, just like a natural body in full vigour, ought to have no initiative of its own, but should follow that of its commander. Wherefore Paullus Aemilius, as we are told, finding that the army which he had taken over in Macedonia was infected with loquacity and meddlesomeness, as though they were all generals, gave out word that each man was to have his hand ready and his sword sharp, but that he himself would look out for the rest. Moreover, Plato (*Resp.* 376c) sees that a good commander or general can do nothing unless his army is amenable and loyal; and he thinks that the quality of obedience, like the quality characteristic of a king, requires a noble nature and a philosophic training, which, above all things, blends harmoniously the qualities of gentleness and humanity with those of high courage and aggressiveness. Many dire events, and particularly those which befell the Romans after the death of Nero, bear witness to this, and show plainly that an empire has nothing more fearful to show than a military force given over to untrained and unreasoning impulses[10].

The disruption of Otho's banquet not only shows Otho's hopeless position, but is also one of many examples of a deterioration of military discipline as a function of bad leadership at the top (by the emperors Galba and Otho) and at the second level of authority (by people such as Nymphidius Sabinus, Vinius, Laco, Icelus and Otho's cronies). By now soldiers of the guard at Rome thought that they could do anything they liked. In Plutarch's *Galba* the worst kind of leadership is displayed by the emperor himself and by his close assistants, men such as Vinius, Laco, and Icelus. Those second line leaders were rapacious and acted in an arbitrary, selfish, tyrannical way. In practically all literary sources

---

[9] On Plutarch's *Galba* and *Otho* being one story see C. B. R. Pelling, 2002, p. 188 (+ 195 n. 68), and p. 383 n. 11.

[10] Plutarch, *Galba* 1: Ὁ μὲν Ἀθηναῖος Ἰφικράτης τὸν μισθοφόρον ἠξίου στρατιώτην καὶ φιλόπλουτον εἶναι καὶ φιλήδονον, ὅπως ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις χορηγίαν ἐπιζητῶν ἀγωνίζηται παραβολώτερον, οἱ δὲ πλεῖστοι, καθάπερ ἐρρωμένον σῶμα, τὸ στρατιωτικὸν ἀξιοῦσιν ἰδίᾳ μηδέποτε χρώμενον ὁρμῇ συγκινεῖσθαι τῇ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ. διὸ καὶ Παῦλον Αἰμίλιον λέγουσι τὴν ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ δύναμιν παραλαβόντα λαλιᾶς καὶ περιεργίας, οἷον διαστρατηγοῦσαν, ἀνάπλεων, παρεγγυῆσαι τὴν χεῖρα ποιεῖν ἑτοίμην καὶ τὴν μάχαιραν ὀξεῖαν ἕκαστον, αὐτῷ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων μελήσειν. ὁ δὲ Πλάτων οὐδὲν ἔργον ὁρῶν ἄρχοντος ἀγαθοῦ καὶ στρατηγοῦ στρατιᾶς μὴ σωφρονούσης μηδὲ ὁμοπαθούσης, ἀλλὰ τὴν πειθαρχικὴν ἀρετὴν ὁμοίως τῇ βασιλικῇ νομίζων φύσεως γενναίας καὶ τροφῆς φιλοσόφου δεῖσθαι, μάλιστα τῷ πρᾴῳ καὶ φιλανθρώπῳ τὸ θυμοειδὲς καὶ δραστήριον ἐμμελῶς ἀνακεραννυμένης, ἄλλα τε πάθη πολλὰ καὶ τὰ Ῥωμαίοις συμπεσόντα μετὰ τὴν Νέρωνος τελευτὴν ἔχει μαρτύρια καὶ παραδείγματα τοῦ μηδὲν εἶναι φοβερώτερον ἀπαιδεύτοις χρωμένης καὶ ἀλόγοις ὁρμαῖς ἐν ἡγεμονίᾳ στρατιωτικῆς δυνάμεως. On this passage see for example R. Ash, 1997.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

Galba is reproached with giving them too much latitude, whereas he refused to give the soldiers their due. He never gave them a proper donative, not even at the occasion of the adoption of an heir, Piso, and he tried in an exaggerated way to be an example of old-fashioned *severitas* towards the soldiers, even if they had more or less justified claims to make. Galba decimated, for example, fleet soldiers, and a band of German bodyguards, for no good reasons. Plutarch tells us that the soldiers began to cherish a dire and savage hatred towards Galba, because he was defrauding them and so doing laid down instructions for succeeding emperors. By treating too positively some of Vindex' supporters, and by not explicitly siding with the soldiers of Verginius Rufus, who had put down Vindex' rebellion in Gaul in AD 67, Galba also lost the support of the armies of the Germaniae, which ended up supporting the ensuing usurpation of Vitellius[11].

Otho was really no better leader than Galba had been. In *Otho* 3.2-6 Plutarch tells us that Otho was placing his government on a sound basis and took a number of wise decisions, but all available sources show that Otho was not the master of the soldiers and their officers, but their plaything. In *Otho* 5.3 Plutarch speaks of the disorderly and arrogant spirit of the soldiers, their *ataxia* and *thrasutès.* Otho did not behave as a good, strong leader would have done, and did not overcome the disciplinary problem. His best act seems to have been his impressive suicide[12]. In this context an elaborate story about the disruption of Otho's banquet by the soldiery fits in well, showing how low military discipline had become and to what depth Otho's authority over the soldiers and their officers had sunk.

In conclusion. In Plutarch's Galba and Otho, which in my opinion should be read as one story, this dinner story negatively inverts an important means of imperial self-representation and so indicates how weak, in Plutarch's opinion, Otho's position really was. It is as well one of many examples of a serious deterioration of military discipline as a function of bad leadership at the top and at the second level of authority. By choosing an imperial banquet, which should be a place of friendship with high status *amici Caesaris,* a show-case of imperial power and *paideia*, and a mirror of hierarchies within the urban Roman elite, as the scene where the extreme escalation of military misbehaviour and the total loss of imperial authority over the military mob came to light, Plutarch highlights the social importance of such banquets.

---

[11] On Galba's reign see Tacitus, *Histories* 1.4-41; Suetonius, *Galba* 11-20; Plutarch, *Galba* 10-28; Cassius Dio 64.1-6. On the decimation of the fleet soldiers see Suetonius, *Galba* 12.2 and Plutarch, *Galba* 15.3-4. Cf. Tacitus, *Histories* 1.6. In the same paragraph, *Galba* 12.2, Suetonius narrates that Galba also disbanded a cohort of Germans, whom the previous Caesars had made their body-guard and had found absolutely faithful in many emergencies. On Galba, Otho, their assistants, and the soldiers see L. De Blois, 2008.

[12] On Otho's reign see Tacitus, *Histories* 1.44-47; 71-90; 2.11-56; Suetonius, *Otho* 7-12; Plutarch, *Otho* 1-18; Cassius Dio 64.7-15. On Otho's suicide see Tacitus, *Histories* 2.48-49; Suetonius, *Otho* 10-11; Plutarch, *Otho* 16-18 and Cassius Dio 64.13-15.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

Works cited

Ash, R., "Severed Heads: Individual Portraits and Irrational Forces in Plutarch's *Galba* and *Otho*," in J. M. Mossman (ed.), *Plutarch and his Intellectual World*, London, 1997, pp. 189-214.

De Blois, L., "Soldiers and Leaders in Plutarch's Galba and Otho", in V. Hirschmann et al. (eds.), *A Roman Miscellany. Essays in Honour of Anthony R. Birley on his Seventieth Birthday*, Gdansk, 2008, 5-13 or http://www.phil-fak.uni-duesseldorf.de/geschichte/xaltegeschichte/birley/fsbirley.html.

Christol, M., *L'empire romain du IIIe siècle. Histoire politique (de 192, mort de Commode, à 325, concile de Nicée)*, Paris, 1997.

D'Arms, J., "Performing Culture: Roman Spectacle and the Banquets of the Powerful", in B. Bergmann & C. Kondoleon (eds.), *The Art of Ancient Spectacle*, Washington, 1999, pp. 301-19.

Donahue, J. F., *The Roman Community at Table*, Ann Arbor, MI, 2004.

Dunbabin, K. M. D., *The Roman Banquet. Images of Conviviality*, Cambridge, 2003.

Gnecchi, F., *I medaglioni Romani*, Milan, 1912.

Pelling, C. B. R. , *Plutarch and History*, London, 2002.

Schettino, M.-T., "I soggetti politici e I conflitti civili del 68/69 d.C. in Plutarco", in L. de Blois et al. (eds.), *The Statesman in Plutarch's Works.* Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference of the International Plutarch Society, vol. II, (Nijmegen/ Castle Hernen, May 1-5, 2002), Leiden/ Boston, 2005, pp. 351-61.

Scuderi, R., "Le Vite Plutarchee di Galba e di Otone: Teoria e prassi politica nella successione imperiale", in I. Gallo & B. Scardigli (eds.), *Teoria e prassi politica nelle opere di Plutarco.* Atti del V convegno Plutarcheo (Certosa di Pontignano, 7-9 Giugno, 1993), Naples, 1995, pp. 399-413.

Stein-Hölkeskamp, E., *Das römische Gastmahl*, Munich, 2005.

Vössing, K., *Mensa regia. Das Bankett beim hellenistischen König und beim römischen Kaiser*, Munich/Leipzig, 2004.

Wiedemann, T. E. J., "From Nero to Vespasian", in A. K. Bowman et al., *The Cambridge Ancient History* X², Cambridge, 1996, pp. 256-82.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

and condemns the young daughter of Oedipus for disobeying his decree. With this example Demosthenes censures Archias and, by extension, Antipater and the whole Macedonian cause, for having chosen, in the theatre of life, to play the role of Creon, the powerful character, insensible to another's suffering and incapable of dealing in a dignified manner with a fellow human being, even when he is dead, all of which adds up to an act of offence to the gods themselves. In a certain way, is also the figure of Antigone that arises here, adding to the tragedy of the moment. In fact, Demosthenes demonstrates the same capacity for self-determination and a sense of courage equal to the tragic heroine, by escaping, through his own devices, the humiliation of a dishonorable and cruel death. This attitude will be praised by the biographer in the *synkrisis* with which the telling of these *Parallel Lives* concludes.

The tragic framing of this episode seems, then, to have been inspired by what Plutarch knew about the reaction of Demosthenes himself. Knowing Archias's theatrical heritage, from that he takes the ironical opportunity to accuse him of hypocrisy and inhumanity – the exact antithesis of *philanthropia*. But there is no doubt that Plutarch, taking advantage of the parallelism with the Sophoclean play suggested by the orator, develops and exploits it, creating a scenic context of great dramatic force.

The other episode that I refer to above occurs in the *synkrisis* as a way for Plutarch to recall the action of Cicero as a statesman and the way in which he exercised power. This is what he says (52. 2-3):

> ὃ δὲ δοκεῖ μάλιστα καὶ λέγεται τρόπον ἀνδρὸς ἐπιδεικνύναι καὶ βασανίζειν, ἐξουσία καὶ ἀρχὴ πᾶν πάθος κινοῦσα καὶ πᾶσαν ἀποκαλύπτουσα κακίαν, Δημοσθένει μὲν οὐχ ὑπῆρξεν ... Κικέρων δὲ ταμίας εἰς Σικελίαν καὶ ἀνθύπατος εἰς Κιλικίαν καὶ Καππαδοκίαν ἀποσταλείς, ... πολλὴν μὲν ἐπίδειξιν ὑπεροψίας χρημάτων ἐποιήσατο, πολλὴν δὲ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ χρηστότητος.
>
> But what is thought and said most of all to reveal and test the character of a man, namely power and authority, which rouses every passion and uncovers every baseness, this Demosthenes did not have … whereas Cicero was sent out as quaestor to Sicily, and as pro-consul to Cilicia and Cappadocia … and gave many proofs of his contempt for wealth, and many of his humanity and goodness.

This is not, of course, a direct reference to the Sophoclean play. Rather we should note that it was a traditional thought attributed variously to some of the Seven Sages[15]. We may argue that it was perhaps this proverbial wisdom that Plutarch had in mind, as the verbal forms δοκεῖ and λέγεται seem to indicate. But the idea that only the exercise of power completely reveals the character of a man is not echoed simply as a short maxim but developed into an extension

[15] Diogenes Laertius (1. 77), for example, attributes the maxim *power shows a man* (ἀρχὴ ἄνδρα δείξει) to Pittacus.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

that recalls *Antigone* 175-177. From the reader's point of view and given the previous reference to the tragedy, this is a logical association. In that play the thought is expressed by Creon, a situation that constitutes one of the ironies of the tragedy, since that is the opinion voiced through the character himself to whom that idea justly applies[16]. But, taken up at the end of the narration, these words show us the kind of morality that can be extracted from the *Lives* of Demosthenes and of Cicero as they touch upon the practice of politics: the action of governing requires an exemplariness of character which is reflected in the absence of greed, in honesty and in *philanthropia*. Indeed, it is in his capacity to treat the other, the weaker one, with compassion and benevolence that the *ethos* of a powerful man truly manifest itself, or rather, that his humanity emerges freeing itself in this way from the bestiality that would animalize him. Bestiality is precisely the attitude that the biographer denounces in another passage, when he refers to the agreement between Octavius Augustus, Mark Antony and Lepidus that resulted in the death of Cicero. Plutarch's words (46.6) are well aimed and remind us of certain of Thucydides's words with respect to the excesses committed during the Peloponnesian War:

> Οὕτως ἐξέπεσον ὑπὸ θυμοῦ καὶ λύσσης τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων λογισμῶν, μᾶλλον δ' ἀπέδειξαν ὡς οὐδὲν ἀνθρώπου θηρίον ἐστὶν ἀγριώτερον ἐξουσίαν πάθει προσλαβόντος.
>
> So far did anger and fury lead them to renounce their human sentiments, or rather, they showed that no wild beast is more savage than man when his passion is supplemented by power.

Philanthropia is, then, the complete antithesis of this: it is a rational attitude that dominates unbridled and selfish passion, the ideal attitude of one who governs, whose power does not manifest itself in the humiliation of the weak, but in benevolence and clemency which are the signs of the nobility of the soul.

But *philanthropia* is also a sense of compassion and of *sympatheia* based on the recognition of a common destiny that affects all men. That is perhaps why, at the end of the *synkrisis,* Plutarch appeals to the reader's humanity by taking up the description of the death of Cicero in summary form. In fact, this is hardly a dignified moment for evaluating the *ethos* of the orator. If in certain traces of his personality, namely those which have to do with the love of wealth, Cicero showed himself to be nobler than Demosthenes, his end contrasts decisively with the dignity that Demosthenes showed before inevitable death. Plutarch summarizes in brief but significant and no less dramatic brush strokes the sequence of events that led to the assassination of Cicero in a context whose tragic tone derives less from the grandeur of the personage than from the weakness of his character, as he ends of suffering

[16] Plutarch knows well this characteristic of Sophocles tragic style, to which he refers in *De audiendis poetis* 27f.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

a dishonorable death after various attempts at escape. This image of an old man who desperately tries to escape death, without the courage to accept and confront it is the image of the sum of human misery for which, as in tragedy, Plutarch proposes the best possible response – that of compassion (οἰκτίσαι), which is, in the end, the basis of *philanthropia*.

Works cited:

Brandão, J. L., "A formação do leitor em Plutarco: poesia, filosofia e educação em *De audiendis poetis*", in J. R. Ferreira (ed.), Actas do Congresso *Plutarco Educador da Europa*, Porto, 2002, pp. 197-211.

Brenk, F. E., "The Dreams in Plutarch's *Lives*", *Latomus,* 34.2 (1975) 336-49.

Carrara, P., "I poeti tragici maestri di virtù nelle opere di Plutarco", in J. R. Ferreira et al. (eds.), *Philosophy in society: Virtues and Values in Plutarch*, Leuven-Coimbra, 2008, pp. 65-74.

Ferreira, J. R., "La douce caresse de la *philanthropia*", in J. R. Ferreira et al. (eds.), *Philosophy in society: Virtues and Values in Plutarch*, Leuven-Coimbra, 2008, pp.99-105.

Lacy, P. de, "Biography and Tragedy in Plutarch", *AJPH,* 73 (1952) 159-72.

Martin Jr., H. M., "The concept of *Praotes* in Plutarch's *Lives*", *GRBS,* 3 (1960) 65-73.

_____ "The Concept of *Philanthropia* in Plutarch's *Lives*", *AJPh,* 82 (1961) 164-75.

Mossman, J. M., "Tragedy and Epic in Plutarch's *Alexander*", *JHS,* 108 (1988) 81-93.

Romilly, J. de, *La douceur dans la pensée grecque*, Paris, 1979.

Serra, P., "Alexandre educador ou o império da finitude", in J. R. Ferreira (ed.), Actas do Congresso *Plutarco Educador da Europa*, Porto, 2002, pp. 93-102.

Teodorsson, S-T., "Four Terms of Friendly Emotion in Plutarch: Φιλανθρωπία, φιλία, ἔρως, φιλοστοργία", in J. M. Nieto Ibañez & R. López López (eds.), *El Amor en Plutarco.* Actas del IX Simposio español sobre Plutarco (28-30 Septiembre, 2006) León, 2007, pp. 187-97.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

AMISTAD, FILANTROPÍA Y *EROS* EN LA *PAIDEIA* PLUTARQUEA: LA *VIDA DE CATÓN EL VIEJO*[1]

Vicente M. Ramón Palerm
Universidad de Zaragoza

Abstract

The present contribution reviews some ethical and emotional criteria that underlie the *Life of Cato the Elder* in order to determine the real meaning of the Plutarchan *paideia*. In that sense, Plutarch shows that friendship, philanthropy and eros constitute (*in praesentia aut in absentia*) a proper manner to describe Cato's personality and education, which must improve as he becomes increasingly familiar with the above-mentioned Greek concepts. Finally, Plutarch seems to maintain that the right use of these concepts has an effect on both the moral and the political education of the statesman.

En el estado actual de la investigación plutarquea, podemos desprender ciertas observaciones sobre el programa educativo del biógrafo. Efectivamente, Plutarco presenta el inventario de categorías éticas al servicio de una planificación didáctica, de una *paideia* político-moral que revierta en beneficio del lector cuya instrucción integral se pretende. Al respecto, Plutarco traza un diseño de morfología retórica que, por expresarlo con términos acuñados en corrientes de hermenéutica literaria, se articula en torno a un triple eje: emisor, mensaje y receptor. De este modo, el emisor (es decir, el biógrafo como autor) exhibe una retórica moral o retórica de la virtud – expresado en palabras del profesor Stadter – fomentada en el bagaje retórico-escolar del propio Plutarco[2]; el mensaje (o sea, el personaje concretamente implicado) es sometido a una moralización literaria merced a la caracterización que el héroe biografiado experimenta con la educación recibida, con sus acciones y con el ejercicio de la palabra; por último, el receptor (el lector destinatario de la obra) aprehende el legado de una *paideia* eficaz, la cual contribuirá a sellar la personalidad de un ciudadano – futuro mandatario acaso – capaz, discretamente crítico y cómodamente integrado en el sistema político.

A decir verdad, como ha explicado inteligentemente P. Stadter, el biógrafo expone sus posiciones ético-políticas ante un público de relaciones con el poder frecuentemente estrechas[3]: este factor y la comprometida situación vivida en época de Domiciano reclamaban, con Trajano, unos modos públicos de mesura, la prudencia del posibilismo histórico, un equilibrio en el fondo y en la forma de hacer política. El caso es que los nuevos tiempos exigían nuevas soluciones; y Plutarco, vocacionalmente adepto al platonismo medio, propuso con sagacidad categorías doctrinales que conciliaran su adscripción filosófica y el pragmatismo recabado de la nueva política. Ello explica, a la

[1] El presente artículo se ha beneficiado del Proyecto HUM 2007-64772, financiado por la DGI española.

[2] P. A. Stadter, 2000.

[3] P. A. Stadter, 2000, pp. 493-4.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

postre, que el biógrafo sugiera para el gobernante cabal las virtudes cardinales de la ἀνδρεία, la φρόνησις, la σωφροσύνη y la δικαιοσύνη, es decir el valor, la sensatez, la prudencia y la justicia, criterios morales que ha estudiado modélicamente la profesora F. Frazier[4]; y explica también que estas virtudes presenten su correlato en maneras suaves y atemperadas como la πρᾳότης, la φιλανθρωπία y la ἐπιείκεια, o sea la delicadeza, la filantropía humanitaria y la generosidad práctica. En suma, he aquí la adecuación de la forma y el fondo en las virtudes de los héroes biografiados, un principio axiomático que conforma la educación del buen estadista en la arquitectura de la *paideia* plutarquea y, de paso, prescribe el ennoblecimiento ético-político para el lector amigo[5].

Por mi parte, no insistiré aquí en el papel, capital sin duda, que Plutarco confiere al sistema educativo en la promoción correcta del individuo[6]. Quiero decir que no procede demorarme en esas virtudes de fondo, por lo demás bien reseñadas, que singularizan (*in praesentia* o *in absentia*) la instrucción y condición moral del mandatario correspondiente. Sin embargo, es momento de atenerme a algunas de las virtudes formales que, bien imbricadas, deben complementar y acompasar a las cardinales en la trayectoria de una personalidad definida y paradigmática, como emulación moral para las nuevas generaciones de políticos. Permítaseme que lo exprese de este modo: si la educación académica y convencional se mueve en tres niveles operativos que, como queda dicho, afectan al emisor-autor, al mensaje-personaje y al receptor-lector, nos las vemos ahora con una educación sentimental y concerniente asimismo a los tres niveles citados. Dicho en términos modernos, la inteligencia emocional que también defiende Plutarco constituye una declaración programática y persuasiva que define al autor, caracteriza al personaje y alecciona al lector sobre las bondades de la misma en un doble sentido: como valor intrínsecamente ético y como instrumento de seducción para el arte de la política. Por lo demás, está escrito que, a juicio de Plutarco, el estadista de envergadura debe serlo, sí, y debe parecerlo en el entramado de sus relaciones sociales o afectivas[7].

Pues bien, con el propósito de ilustrar el tema que nos ocupa, me ha parecido conveniente traer a colación la figura de M. Catón, cuya *vida* traza Plutarco en una combinación translúcida y sutil de aspectos positivos y negativos sobre la prosopografía del héroe romano. Y es que, dada la técnica compositiva que observamos, esta biografía merece una ponderación exquisita en el quehacer literario de Plutarco[8]. En efecto, una panorámica sobre la estructura de la biografía revela incidencias de interés, ya que la consideración de las categorías ético-emocionales en que nos hemos detenido (la amistad, la filantropía, el *eros*) perfilan con maestría la semblanza de Catón y destilan

---

[4] F. Frazier, 1996, pp. 177 sqq.

[5] T. Duff, 2007/2008, defiende una lectura de las *Vidas* en clave filosófico-moral.

[6] Cf. algunos trabajos recientes y significativos sobre la cuestión: A. Pérez Jiménez, 2002; T. Duff, 2005; S.-T. Teodorsson, 2005.

[7] Cf. A. Pérez Jiménez, 2002.

[8] M. Beck, 2000, p. 20 (y n. 28), indica sin ambages: "The life of the elder Cato certainly ranks as one of Plutarch's best".

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

las admoniciones pertinentes para las enseñanzas político-morales del lector. Se da la circunstancia añadida de que las observaciones sobre la educación sentimental y la ductilidad de las maneras personales en Catón se adecuan perfectamente a los pormenores de su educación convencional. Veámoslo con un ejemplo singular: una tónica del relato plutarqueo consiste en deslizar la interpretación de que Catón (cuya fama era proverbial en la conciencia colectiva del hombre romano) limó las asperezas de su educación gracias a los contactos que experimentó con el mundo y las letras de Grecia. Sobre el particular, resulta atractivo el pasaje en que Plutarco refiere el cambio de orientación intelectual – en un proceso de *mímesis* – que observa nuestro personaje tras su encuentro con el pitagórico Nearco (2, 3-6): "En la época en que Fabio Máximo tomó la ciudad de Tarento, Catón, aún muy joven, se hallaba en la campaña bajo sus órdenes. Allí trabó amistad con un tal Nearco, extranjero de la escuela de los pitagóricos, y se apresuró a participar de sus enseñanzas. Una vez que escuchó a este hombre pronunciarse sobre los temas que ha tratado también Platón, quien califica el placer como el mayor señuelo del mal y el cuerpo como la primera desgracia del alma, cuya liberación y purificación se logran mediante la reflexión, que es lo que más la aleja y la disocia de las sensaciones del cuerpo, sintió aún más la inclinación por la austeridad y la continencia. Por lo demás, se dice que comenzó demasiado tarde a instruirse en la cultura griega, que su edad era ya muy avanzada cuando cogió entre sus manos libros en griego y que para el ejercicio de la retórica sacó algo de provecho de Tucídides, y más de Demóstenes. No obstante, su prosa está bastante salpicada de proverbios e historias de los griegos, y en sus máximas y sentencias hay muchas traducciones literales del griego"[9]. Como puede verificarse, este fragmento es de escogida importancia: Catón, que halló en las enseñanzas de Nearco ese espejo modélico para su código ético, pulió las imperfecciones de su instrucción cultural – ya en edad provecta – merced también a las letras griegas[10]. A tenor de lo antedicho, Plutarco contrapone virtudes y defectos en la instrucción cultural de Catón; y

[9] Φαβίου δὲ Μαξίμου τὴν Ταραντίνων πόλιν ἑλόντος ἔτυχε μὲν ὁ Κάτων στρατευόμενος ὑπ᾽ αὐτῷ κομιδῇ μειράκιον ὤν, Νεάρχῳ δέ τινι τῶν Πυθαγορικῶν ξένῳ χρησάμενος ἐσπούδασε τῶν λόγων μεταλαβεῖν. Ἀκούσας δὲ ταῦτα διαλεγομένου τοῦ ἀνδρός, οἷς κέχρηται καὶ Πλάτων, τὴν μὲν ἡδονὴν ἀποκαλῶν μέγιστον κακοῦ δέλεαρ, συμφορὰν δὲ τῇ ψυχῇ τὸ σῶμα πρώτην, λύσιν δὲ καὶ καθαρμὸν οἷς μάλιστα χωρίζει καὶ ἀφίστησιν αὑτὴν τῶν περὶ τὸ σῶμα παθημάτων λογισμοῖς ἔτι μᾶλλον ἠγάπησε τὸ λιτὸν καὶ τὴν ἐγκράτειαν. Ἄλλως δὲ παιδείας Ἑλληνικῆς ὀψιμαθὴς γενέσθαι λέγεται καὶ πόρρω παντάπασιν ἡλικίας ἐληλακὼς Ἑλληνικὰ βιβλία λαβὼν εἰς χεῖρας βραχέα μὲν ἀπὸ Θουκυδίδου, πλείονα δ᾽ ἀπὸ Δημοσθένους εἰς τὸ ῥητορικὸν ὠφεληθῆναι. Τὰ μέντοι συγγράμματα καὶ δόγμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς καὶ ἱστορίαις ἐπιεικῶς διαπεποίκιλται· καὶ μεθηρμηνευμένα πολλὰ κατὰ λέξιν ἐν ταῖς γνωμολογίαις τέτακται. La traducción española de los pasajes oportunos procede de L. Conti, 2003. El texto griego proviene de R. Flacelière & E. Chambry, *Plutarque. Vies*, V, Paris, 1969.

[10] Cf. M. Beck, 2000, p. 24. Por lo demás, la aversión por la cultura griega (que Plutarco glosa en el capítulo 23) acompañó a Catón durante buena parte de su vida; por ello, si bien se mira, el pasaje citado redime parcialmente al personaje de su actitud. Para esta anotación y otras implicaciones adicionales del fragmento referido, cf. V. Ramón Palerm, "Plutarco y la biografía política en Grecia: aspectos de innovación en el género", in AA.VV., *La biografía como género literario: de la Antigüedad al Renacimiento*, *Veleia* (Anejos). (en prensa).

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

la presencia del legado griego permite corregir ciertos deslices de la educación convencional en el personaje. Pues bien, del mismo modo, Plutarco alterna aspectos positivos y negativos en la educación sentimental de Catón; y dejará entrever – con nitidez oscilante – que la adecuación del gobernante a esas categorías formales, de señalada impronta griega, contribuye a su perfección ética y al provecho de su actividad política. Así ocurre, verbigracia, con los pasajes en que Plutarco muestra (de manera explícita o implícita) las relaciones que establece Catón con la amistad, la filantropía, el *eros*[11]. Y debo anticipar que, en líneas generales, el resultado es como sigue: la amistad es divisa fundamental y altamente positiva en el talante de Catón; en segundo lugar, Catón parece escasamente proclive a una conducta filantrópica y, cuando Plutarco menciona detalles al respecto, lo hace de una manera críticamente reservada, negativa en puridad; en última instancia, las actitudes eróticas presentan un curso cambiante en Catón y merecen el elogio cierto o la censura severa, respectivamente, de Plutarco. A continuación, expongo los pasajes representativos sobre las categorías correspondientes.

1. De la amistad

– 2, 3 (cf. supra): como ha sido observado, la amistad de Nearco proporciona al joven Catón un contacto ennoblecedor en su trayectoria (Νεάρχῳ δέ τινι τῶν Πυθαγορικῶν ξένῳ χρησάμενος ἐσπούδασε τῶν λόγων μεταλαβεῖν). Por añadidura, no debemos soslayar la circunstancia de que el testimonio, el cual transmite Cicerón (*Sobre la vejez* [4, 10; 12, 39]), puede responder a un artificio documental, ideado por Cicerón con intención propagandística y adaptado por Plutarco con un tono moralizante[12]. Obviamente el término implicado, φιλία, no consta fehacientemente, pero el contenido amistoso del pasaje resulta incontrovertible. Además, si admitimos que en Plutarco menudea el denominado moralismo *implícito* – común en el relato general de las semblanzas – por oposición al moralismo *explícito* que sobresale en las συγκρίσεις[13], deberá igualmente aceptarse la expresión de virtudes formales respectivamente *implícitas* o *explícitas*.

– 3, 1-4: “Había un patricio, uno de los romanos más influyentes y poderosos, de sorprendente capacidad para apreciar la virtud en el momento

[11] En general, sobre la tradición griega de las categorías que manejamos y la acepción genuina de las mismas en Plutarco, cf. S.-T. Teodorsson, 2007. En todo caso, la utilización de los mencionados conceptos para nuestro trabajo debe entenderse *lato sensu*, razón por la que hemos renunciado a la expresión de los términos en su versión estrictamente griega.

[12] Cf. J. M. Guzmán Hermida, 2007, p. 68 n. 10. Por otra parte, debe subrayarse que el testimonio sobre enemistad más relevante en esta biografía es relativo a la figura de Escipión el Grande y difiere de otras informaciones histórico-biográficas. Escribe Plutarco (11, 1): “Mientras Catón permanecía todavía en Hispania, Escipión el Grande, que era su enemigo (ἐχθρός) y pretendía contrarrestar sus éxitos y asumir los asuntos de Hispania, consiguió obtener aquella provincia como sucesor suyo”. Sin embargo, como documenta L. Conti, 2003, p. 108, n. 279), los datos que consignan Tito Livio (34, 43) y Nepote (*Ca.* 2, 2) discrepan del testimonio plutarqueo; de hecho, niegan que Escipión recibiera entonces la Hispania Citerior.

[13] T. Duff, 2002, especialmente pp. 53 sqq.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

que brota y con buena disposición a alimentarla y encaminarla hacia la fama: Valerio Flaco [...]; ...lo convenció con sus consejos (i.e. a Catón) para que se dedicara a la carrera política en Roma. Así, pues, Catón se dirigió allí y enseguida se granjeó admiradores y amigos con sus discursos de defensa; y mucha fue, además, la honra e influencia que Valerio añadió a su persona. El de tribuno militar fue el primer cargo que obtuvo, y más tarde desempeñó el de cuestor. A partir de entonces, gozando ya de luz propia y de popularidad, hizo junto al propio Valerio la carrera hacia las más altas magistraturas y llegó a compartir con él el consulado y, en otra ocasión, la censura"[14].

– 10, 1: "Designado cónsul junto con Valerio Flaco, íntimo amigo suyo, recibió la provincia que los romanos llaman Hispania Citerior. Allí, mientras sometía a unos pueblos y se granjeaba la amistad de los otros con su diplomacia, cayó sobre él un gran ejército de los bárbaros y corrió el riesgo de ser expulsado deshonrosamente; por ello buscó atraerse la alianza con los vecinos celtíberos"[15].

Como puede comprobarse, frente a lo que sucede frecuentemente en los *Moralia*, los ejemplos en que la amistad comparece no adquieren ribetes de moralización explícita: son aquí aducidos para caracterizar implícitamente el *ethos* del personaje y manifestar el rendimiento político que el ejercicio de la amistad procura en quienes la cultivan.

2. De la filantropía

– 3, 7: "El caso es que Escipión hizo ver en Roma los preparativos de la guerra como anticipo de la victoria y se mostró como alguien alegre durante el tiempo libre que compartía con sus amigos, pero en modo alguno negligente con los asuntos serios e importantes por llevar una vida muelle, con lo cual pudo hacerse a la mar rumbo a la guerra"[16].

– 5, 5: "Y es que no se debe tratar a los seres animados como sandalias o utensilios, que se tiran cuando están rotos y desgastados por el uso, sino que hay que proponerse ser afable y dulce con ellos, aunque sólo sea por el afán de humanidad"[17].

[14] Ἦν δέ τις ἀνὴρ εὐπατρίδης μὲν ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα Ῥωμαίων καὶ δυνατός, ἀρετὴν δὲ φυομένην μὲν αἰσθάνεσθαι δεινός, εὐμενὴς δὲ καὶ θρέψαι καὶ προαγαγεῖν εἰς δόξαν, Οὐαλέριος Φλάκκος [...] ...προετρέψατο καὶ συνέπεισεν ἅψασθαι τῆς ἐν Ῥώμῃ πολιτείας. Κατελθὼν οὖν εὐθὺς τοὺς μὲν αὐτὸς ἐκτᾶτο θαυμαστὰς καὶ φίλους διὰ τῶν συνηγοριῶν, πολλὴν δὲ τοῦ Οὐαλερίου τιμὴν καὶ δύναμιν αὐτῷ προστιθέντος χιλιαρχίας ἔτυχε πρῶτον, εἶτα ἐταμίευσεν. Ἐκ τούτου δὲ λαμπρὸς ὢν ἤδη καὶ περιφανὴς αὐτῷ τῷ Οὐαλερίῳ πρὸς τὰς μεγίστας συνεξέδραμεν ἀρχάς, ὕπατός τε μετ᾽ ἐκείνου καὶ πάλιν τιμητὴς γενόμενος.

[15] Ὕπατος δὲ μετὰ Φλάκκου Οὐαλερίου τοῦ φίλου καὶ συνήθους ἀποδειχθεὶς ἔλαχε τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν ἣν Ἐντὸς Ἱσπανίαν Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦσιν. Ἐνταῦθα δ᾽ αὐτῷ τὰ μὲν καταστρεφομένῳ τῶν ἐθνῶν, τὰ δ᾽ οἰκειουμένῳ διὰ λόγων πολλὴ στρατιὰ τῶν βαρβάρων ἐπέπεσε καὶ κίνδυνος ἦν αἰσχρῶς ἐκβιασθῆναι· διὸ τῶν ἐγγὺς Κελτιβήρων ἐπεκαλεῖτο συμμαχίαν.

[16] Ὁ μὲν οὖν Σκιπίων ἐν τῇ παρασκευῇ τοῦ πολέμου τὴν νίκην ἐπιδειξάμενος καὶ φανεὶς ἡδὺς μὲν ἐπὶ σχολῆς συνεῖναι φίλοις, οὐδαμῇ δὲ τῷ φιλανθρώπῳ τῆς διαίτης εἰς τὰ σπουδαῖα καὶ μεγάλα ῥᾴθυμος, ἐξέπλευσεν ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον.

[17] Οὐ γὰρ ὡς ὑποδήμασιν ἢ σκεύεσι τοῖς ψυχὴν ἔχουσι χρηστέον κοπέντα καὶ κατατριβέντα

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

– 22, 2: “Al punto, los jóvenes más amantes de las letras acudieron al encuentro de estos hombres (i.e. filósofos), a quienes escuchaban con admiración. Fue sobre todo el carisma de Carnéades, cuya autoridad era enorme y cuya reputación no era menor que su autoridad, el que atrajo grandes auditorios interesados por los asuntos humanos y el que, como un viento, barrió la ciudad con sus ecos”[18].

Los tres pasajes aducidos presentan una importancia nada desdeñable, pese a su aparente y tangencial relación con la figura de Catón[19]. En el primero de ellos, se contraponen a la personalidad austera de Catón los modos de Escipión el Grande (rival y enemigo político del héroe biografiado), cuyo talante desprendido y filantrópico con sus íntimos no empece a la seriedad de la actividad política que despliega. En el segundo fragmento, la sobriedad en exceso cicatera de Catón (quien proponía desechar a los esclavos viejos por inservibles [cf. 4,5; 5,1]) da paso a cierto comentario del queronense sobre la necesidad de ser indulgente con los seres vivos, en términos absolutos, siquiera por razones humanitarias[20]. En el tercer pasaje, los jóvenes romanos, atraídos por cuestiones de importancia para el ser humano, comparecen con interés a las conferencias de filósofos griegos en Roma; y ello contrasta con el carácter desdeñoso de Catón en relación con la cultura griega y con los efectos de esta sobre las generaciones más jóvenes. En síntesis, da la impresión de que Plutarco confronta las actitudes humanitarias y filantrópicas que personalmente defendía para la comunidad grecorromana[21] con la indiferencia llamativa de Catón sobre el particular, lo cual parece encerrar una fina crítica implícita al proceder de nuestro personaje mediante una intención que rebasa, seguramente, el puro desliz moral para alcanzar repercusiones de índole política.

3. Del *eros*

– 20, 1-4: “Fue también un buen padre, un marido honrado con su mujer y un administrador no desdeñable [...]. Desposó a una mujer más noble que rica, pues creía que, aunque ambos tipos de mujeres eran serias y sensatas, las de buen linaje se avergonzaban ante lo deshonroso y eran más sumisas a sus maridos en lo que atañe a la virtud. Decía que un hombre que golpeaba a su esposa o a su hijo ponía sus manos sobre los seres más sagrados. Le parecía más

ταῖς ὑπερεσίαις ἀπορριπτοῦντας, ἀλλ’ εἰ διὰ μηδὲν ἄλλο, μελέτης οὕνεκα τοῦ φιλανθρώπου προεθιστέον ἑαυτὸν ἐν τούτοις πρᾶον εἶναι καὶ μείλιχον.

[18] Εὐθὺς οὖν οἱ φιλολογώτατοι τῶν νεανίσκων ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἵεντο καὶ συνῆσαν ἀκροώμενοι καὶ θαυμάζοντες αὐτούς. Μάλιστα δ’ ἡ Καρνεάδου χάρις, ἧς <ἦν> δύναμίς τε πλείστη καὶ δόξα τῆς δυνάμεως οὐκ ἀποδέουσα, μεγάλων ἐπιλαβομένη καὶ φιλανθρώπων ἀκροατηρίων ὡς πνεῦμα τὴν πόλιν ἠχῆς ἐνέπλησε.

[19] Para un comentario exhaustivo y provechoso de las implicaciones convenientes sobre los pasajes citados (implicaciones de orientación ético-política), remito al estudio de J. M.ª Candau que consta en el presente volumen (“Filantropía en la *Vida de Catón el Viejo*”).

[20] Esta circunstancia es asimismo detectable en los escritos *zoopsicológicos* de Plutarco. Cf., en general, la introducción que proporciona G. Santese en L. Inglese & G. Santese, 1999.

[21] Cf. G. D’Ippolito, 2005, pp. 180-2.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

digno de alabanza ser un buen esposo que un gran senador. En efecto, Catón no admiraba nada del antiguo Sócrates salvo el hecho de que, a pesar de tener una mujer difícil y unos hijos necios, los tratara toda su vida con benevolencia y dulzura. Nacido su hijo, no hubo para él ninguna obligación, salvo las de carácter público, que fuera tan perentoria que le impidiera ayudar a su mujer mientras bañaba y envolvía en pañales a su hijo”[22].

– 24, 1: “Es evidente que...Catón no quedó libre de la venganza divina, pues perdió tanto a su esposa como a su hijo. Pero él, que era de constitución robusta y se mantenía fuerte y vigoroso, resistió durante muchísimo tiempo, de modo que, aun siendo ya anciano, tenía con frecuencia contacto sexual con alguna mujer y, en contra de lo que conviene a su edad, contrajo de nuevo matrimonio...”[23].

– 6, 1-3 (σύγκρισις): “El matrimonio del propio Catón, sin embargo, impropio tanto de su honor como de su edad, infundió a este respecto sospechas importantes y serias. En efecto, el que un anciano de tanta edad y con un hijo ya adulto...despose a la hija de un sirviente suyo...no está nada bien. Tanto si lo hizo buscando placer como si fue por vengarse del asunto con la hetera, la acción y su motivo son por igual vergonzosos. El argumento al que acudió con tono irónico ante su hijo no era cierto, pues si hubiera querido traer al mundo hijos tan nobles como éste, debería haber reparado en ello desde un principio y haber contraído matrimonio legal en lugar de contentarse con cohabitar con una mujer ilegítima y compartida mientras pasó inadvertido y, una vez que fue descubierto, hacer suegro suyo a quien era más fácil de convencer, y no a aquel con quien hubiera resultado más honroso crear lazos familiares”[24].

Es perceptible que la indicación de los lances erótico-amorosos en la *Vida de Catón* ofrece una perspectiva doble y palmariamente opuesta sobre la actitud del

[22] Γέγονε δὲ καὶ πατὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ περὶ γυναῖκα χρηστὸς ἀνὴρ καὶ χρηματισμὴς οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητος [...]. Γυναῖκα μὲν γὰρ εὐγενεστέραν ἢ πλουσιωτέραν ἔγημεν, ἡγούμενος ὁμοίως μὲν ἀμφοτέρας ἔχειν βάρος καὶ φρόνημα, τὰς δὲ γενναίας αἰδουμένας τὰ αἰσχρὰ μᾶλλον ὑπηκόους εἶναι πρὸς τὰ καλὰ τοῖς γεγαμηκόσι. Τὸν δὲ τύπτοντα γαμετὴν ἢ παῖδα τοῖς ἁγιωτάτοις ἔλεγεν ἱεροῖς προσφέρειν τὰς χεῖρας. Ἐν ἐπαίνῳ δὲ μείζονι τίθεσθαι τὸ γαμέτην ἀγαθὸν ἢ τὸ μέγαν εἶναι συγκλητικόν· ἐπεὶ καὶ Σωκράτους οὐδὲν ἄλλο θαυμάζειν τοῦ παλαιοῦ πλὴν ὅτι γυναικὶ χαλεπῇ καὶ παισὶν ἀποπλήκτοις χρώμενος ἐπιεικῶς καὶ πρᾴως διετέλεσε. Γενομένου δὲ τοῦ παιδὸς οὐδὲν ἦν ἔργον οὕτως ἀναγκαῖον, εἰ μή τι δημόσιον, ὡς μὴ παρεῖναι τῇ γυναικὶ λουούσῃ τὸ βρέφος καὶ σπαργανούσῃ.

[23] Καὶ...φαίνεται γεγονὼς οὐκ ἀνεμέσητος· καὶ γὰρ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἀπέβαλεν. Αὐτὸς δὲ τῷ σώματι πρὸς εὐεξίαν καὶ ῥώμην ἀσφαλῶς πεπηγὼς ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἀντεῖχεν, ὥστε καὶ γυναικὶ πρεσβύτης ὢν σφόδρα πλησιάζειν καὶ γῆμαι γάμον οὐ καθ᾽ ἡλικίαν…

[24] …αὐτοῦ δὲ τοῦ Κάτωνος ὁ παρ᾽ ἀξίαν ἅμα καὶ παρ᾽ ὥραν γάμος οὐ μικρὰν οὐδὲ φαύλην εἰς τοῦτο διαβολὴν κατεσκέδασε. Πρεσβύτην γὰρ ἤδη τοσοῦτον ἐνηλίκῳ παιδὶ...ἐπιγῆμαι κόρην ὑπηρέτου...οὐδαμῇ καλόν, ἀλλ᾽ εἴτε πρὸς ἡδονὴν ταῦτ᾽ ἔπραξεν εἴτ᾽ ὀργῇ διὰ τὴν ἑταίραν ἀμυνόμενος τὸν υἱόν, αἰσχύνην ἔχει καὶ τὸ ἔργον καὶ ἡ πρόφασις. Ὧι δ᾽ αὐτὸς ἐχρήσατο λόγῳ κατειρωνευόμενος τὸ μειράκιον, οὐκ ἦν ἀληθής. Εἰ γὰρ ἐβούλετο παῖδας ἀγαθοὺς ὁμοίως τεκνῶσαι, γάμον ἔδει λαβεῖν γενναῖον ἐξ ἀρχῆς σκεψάμενον, οὐχ ἕως μὲν ἐλάνθανεν ἀνεγγύῳ γυναικὶ καὶ κοινῇ συγκοιμώμενος ἀγαπᾶν, ἐπεὶ δ᾽ ἐφωράθη ποιήσασθαι πενθερὸν ὃν ῥᾷστα πείσειν, οὐχ ᾧ κάλλιστα κηδεύσειν ἔμελλεν.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

46-96 135 n. 28

Zeno Citieus 10

Zeno Eleaticus 443

Zenobius
Paroemiographi
4.5 135 n. 24

Zonaras
9.24.4 173 n. 41

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

List of contributors

Aldo Setaioli is professor emeritus at the University of Perugia. His scholarly activity centers on Latin literature but he also devotes constant attention to Greek literature. He has devoted books and papers on Seneca, Virgil, Servius, Petronius, as well as to many other authors and problems.

Ália Rosa C. Rodrigues translated the seventh book of the *Quaestiones Conuiuales* and assists the scholars working on the Portuguese *Plutarch Project*. Moreover, she is preparing a translation of the *Life of Fabius Maximus*. At the moment, she is working on her master's thesis on *Poetics and Hermeneutics* and is also a collaborator on the *Ancient Women's Dictionary*. She is about to start her PhD thesis on Plutarch's *Lives of Lycurgus and Numa*.

Ana Vicente Sánchez is Assistant Professor of Greek Philology at the University of Zaragoza (Spain) and has done research on Greek epistolography, the history of the Greek language and late antique literature.

Anastasios G. Nikolaidis, Ph.D (London, King's College) is Professor of Classics at the University of Crete, Greece. His research interests and publications comprise Plutarch (mostly), Greek and Roman historiography (Herodotos, Thukydides, Sallust, Tacitus), Greek and Roman ethics (Platon, Aristoteles, Seneca), and Latin love elegy (Ovid).

Antonio Ignacio Molina Marín is Doctor of Ancient History at Murcia University, Spain. He has done research on the history of ancient Macedonia (Alexander the Great) and Greek geography.

Aurelio Pérez Jiménez is Professor of Greek Philology at the University of Málaga, Spain. He has been president of the Spanish Plutarch Society ever since its foundation in 1987, and presided over the International Plutarch Society from 2002 to 2005. Among his works on Plutarch are Spanish translations of fourteen Lives (1985, 1996, 2006) and the edition of the *De capienda ex inimicis utilitate* (2008) for the *Corpus Plutarchi Moralium*.

Carlos A. Martins de Jesus is a PhD student at the University of Coimbra and fellow of the Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (FCT). He is currently working on Greek literature and myths, while preparing his PhD thesis on Bacchylides. Among other things, he is the author of several books and papers on Greek archaic poetry. He has also translated into Portuguese Archilochus' fragments, Aristophanes' *Wasps* and Epictetus' *Encheiridion*. As for Plutarch, besides some papers in national and international conferences, he has translated books 4 and 6 of *Table Talk*, *Amatorius* and *Amatoriae Narrationes*, and is now working on a Portuguese version of the *Life of Themistocles*.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

Dámaris Romero González is a postdoctoral researcher at the Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing at Birmingham University, England. Her research fields are Plutarch, women in antiquity and the semantics of the New Testament.

Delfim Leão is professor of Classics at the University of Coimbra. He has a deep interest in law, politics and the constitutional history of ancient Greece, as well as in theatrical practice and the Roman novel. He is one of the editors (together with E. M. Harris and P. J. Rhodes) of *Law and Drama in Ancient Greece* (Duckworth, forthcoming).

Eran Almagor is a post-doctoral scholar based at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel. His PhD dissertation (2007) was a historical and literary commentray on Plutarch's *Life of Artaxerxes*. He is interested in Achaemenid history, ancient ethnography, narratology in Plutarch and perceptions of the "other" in ancient Classical and Jewish literature.

Frances B. Titchener is Professor of History and Classics at Utah State University, USA. She has published research on the development of biography and autobiography, as well as the works of Plutarch. She serves as International Coordinator of the International Plutarch Society and co-editor of its journal, *Ploutarchos*.

Francesca Mestre has been Tenured Lecturer of Greek Philology at the University of Barcelona since 1988. Her main fields of study are Greek Literature in the Roman Empire, the Second Sophistic, authors such as Lucian, Plutarch and Philostratus, historiography, and Hellenism. Since 2001 she has led the research group "Graecia Capta" on Greek culture under the Roman Empire.

Francesco Becchi is professor of Greek Language and Literature at Florence University ("G. Pasquali" Dept. of Ancient Classics), Italy. He studied ethical literature in its historical development from the classical to imperial age (Theophrastus, Stoics, Posidonius, Middle Platonism, Alcinous, Peripatetics, Aspasius, Neopythagoreans, Plutarch of Chaeronea, Alexander of Aphrodisias, Galenus). Among his works on Plutarch, he has published a critical edition with introduction, translation and commentary of the *De virtute morali* and of the *De fortuna*.

Franco Ferrari is full professor of the history of ancient philosophy at the University of Salerno. He has a PhD in Philosophy (University of Torino: 1993) and in History (University of San Marino: 1997). He was Alexander-von-Humboldt Fellow at the University of Münster in Germany (1997-1999), where he worked on the project "Der Platonismus in der Antike" directed by Matthias Baltes. Since 1999 he has been teaching at the University of Salerno.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

He is member of the Editorial Board of the International Plato Society and of the Academia Platonica.

Frederick E. Brenk is Emeritus Professor of the Greek and Roman Background of the Old and New Testament at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome. He has written many articles on Plutarch, in particular on the *Moralia*, and several monographs treating Plutarch, along with Greek and Roman literature, religion, and philosophy, especially during the first century.

Geert Roskam is research professor at K.U. Leuven. He has published extensively on Hellenistic and Middle Platonist philosophy, including *On the Path to Virtue. The Stoic Doctrine of Moral Progress and its Reception in (Middle-) Platonism* (2005), *Lathe biôsas. On the Vicissitudes of an Epicurean Doctrine* (2007), *A Commentary on Plutarch's De latenter vivendo* (2007), and *Plutarch's Maxime cum principibus philosopho esse disserendum. An Interpretation with Commentary* (2009).

Gennaro D'Ippolito teaches Greek literature at the Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia of the University of Palermo. He has published widely on poetry (Homer and the minor poets, Mimnermus, Euripides, Callimachus, Pantaleon, Gregory of Nazianzus, Synesius, Tryphiodorus, Nonnus, Kavafis, Seferis, Elytis) and, in the area of prose writing, on the novel and especially on Plutarch. He has participated in 15 conferences on Plutarch and is a Council member of the Italian section of the IPS. Moreover, he is co-director of the *Corpus Plutarchi Moralium*, which is being published at Naples.

Israel Muñoz Gallarte is PhD Researcher of Greek Religion at Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, The Netherlands. He has done research on semantic of New Testament Greek and on Plutarch, esp. on historical and religious topics.

James T. Chlup is Assistant Professor of Ancient History at the University of Manitoba. In addition to Plutarch, his research interests include Greek and Latin historiography and the Roman Middle East. He has written articles on Thucydides and Livy, and it currently working on a commentary on Plutarch's *Life of Crassus*.

Jeffrey Beneker is assistant professor of Classics at the University of Wisconsin in Madison.

Jeroen Lauwers is currently preparing his PhD as a research assistant of the Research Foundation Flanders. His research revolves around authorial self-presentation and the use of authority in Imperial Greek Literature (the era of the so-called 'Second Sophistic'), with a particular interest in Maximus of Tyre.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

Joaquim J. S. Pinheiro is Assistant Professor of Classics and Humanistic Studies at Madeira University, Portugal. In 2007 he finished his PhD thesis on *Time and Space of Paideia in Plutarch's* Lives. Presently he is member of the Project *Plutarch and the Founding of an European Identity* and he also conducts research in Greek literature and culture, especially on political thought, education and rhetoric.

José Antonio Fernández Delgado is Professor of Greek Philology at the University of Salamanca (Spain). He has been the head of nine research projects financed by the Spanish Ministry and the Government of Castilla and León, by which his research team has been recognised as Group of Excellence. He has supervised ten Ph. D. Theses, has participated in more than 30 International Congresses, and has occupied important posts in the University Government. He has done research mainly on Hesiod and Archaic and Classical poetry, on different texts about Greek education, on school influence on Greek literature, and on Plutarch from this and other points of view.

Josefa Fernández Zambudio works on the web page http://interclassica.um.es, which is concerned with the study and diffusion of the ancient Greek and Roman worlds. She has done research on ancient biography, especially the *Lives* of Homer and Alexander the Great, and is currently working on the influence of ancient mythology in Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz.

José María Candau Morón is Professor of Greek Philology at Seville University, Spain. He has done research on Greek historiography, Plutarch and Julian the Apostate and has published translations into Spanish of Zosimus, Cassius Dio and Polybius.

José Vela Tejada is Permanent Professor of Greek Philology at the University of Zaragoza, Spain. He has done research on the history of the Greek language (koiné and atticism), Greek historiography, especially Xenophon, and on Plutarch by attending five conferences of the IPS, contributing to the Studies in honour of Prof. Stadter and editing the Proceedings of the 5th Spanish Conference of the IPS.

Lawrence Kim is Assistant Professor of Classics at the University of Texas at Austin. His research focuses on Greek literature under the Roman Empire and his publications include articles on the ancient novel, Strabo, Dio Chrysostom, and Atticism. His book, *Homer between History and Fiction in Imperial Greece* is forthcoming from Cambridge University Press.

Lluís Gonzàlez Julià is preparing his PhD thesis at the University of Barcelona, Spain, on Lucian's declamations. He conducts research on ancient education, rhetoric, and declamation.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

Lukas de Blois has been since 1980 professor of ancient history at the Radboud University of Nijmegen in The Netherlands. He published books and articles on the history of the Roman Empire in the third century A.D., the history of the Late Roman Republic, ancient historiography (Sallust, Tacitus, Cassius Dio), Plutarch's works, and Greek Sicily in the fourth century B.C. He has also published a manual, together with R.J. van der Spek (English ed.: L. de Blois & R.J. van der Spek, *Introduction to the Ancient World*, Routledge, London/ New York, 2nd ed. 2008, 1st ed. 1997). He is a member of the editorial board of the international network Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, 200 B.C. – A. D. 476).

Manuel Tröster studied History and Politics at Trier, London, and Cambridge, writing his doctoral thesis on *Themes, Character, and Politics in Plutarch's* Life of Lucullus (Stuttgart, 2008). He currently holds a postdoctoral fellowship funded by the DAAD at Coimbra University. His principal fields of research are Roman Republican history, Plutarch's *Lives*, and foreign relations in the ancient and modern worlds.

Maria Leonor Santa Bárbara is professor of Greek and Greek Literature at the Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas of the Universidade Nova de Lisboa. She is also responsible for the research group of Studies on Antiquity, at the Centro de História da Cultura of the same University. She has been working mainly on the Hellenistic age, namely on the *Greek Anthology*.

Mark Beck is Assistant Professor of Classics at the University of South Carolina in Columbia, South Carolina, USA. He has published numerous articles on Plutarch and is currently working on a monograph *Distinguishing the Individual: Ideology and Individuality in Ancient Greek Biography* and is editor of the forthcoming *Blackwell Companion to Plutarch*.

Marta Isabel de Oliveira Várzeas is professor of Classical Studies at the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Oporto. Her area of research covers Greek Literature, Rhetoric and Poetics.

Nuno Simões Rodrigues has a PhD in Classical History and is Professor of Classical History at the University of Lisbon. He has published *Mitos e Lendas da Roma Antiga* (Lisboa, 2005) and *Iudaei in Vrbe. Os Judeus em Roma do tempo de Pompeio ao tempo dos Flávios* (Lisboa, 2007).

Paola Volpe Cacciatore is Professor of Greek at Salerno University, Italy. She has done research on Byzantine philology, Attic theater, Plutarch and humanistic translations from Greek texts. At present, she is engaged in the critical edition of Aeschylus' *Persae*. She is President of the Italian section of the International Plutarch Society.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

Philip A. Stadter is Professor of Classics Emeritus at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He has published extensively on Greek historical authors, especially Plutarch, including *A Commentary on Plutarch's* Pericles (Chapel Hill, 1989), *Plutarch and the Historical Tradition* (London, 1992) and introductions and notes to *Plutarch, Nine Greek* Lives (Oxford, 1998) and *Plutarch, Eight Roman* Lives (Oxford, 1999).

Pilar Gómez has been Tenured Lecturer of Greek Philology at the University of Barcelona since 1988. She has published on the Greek fable and Aesop, as well as on Plutarch, Lucian and the Second Sophistic. She is a member of the research group "Graecia Capta".

Rodolfo González Equihua is currently studying for his Ph.D. degree at the University of Salamanca. He is working on the reception of the full progymnasmata in Heliodoros.

Rodolfo Lopes is a researcher in the Centro de Estudos Clássicos e Humanísticos at the University of Coimbra. He is currently preparing a doctoral thesis on the myths of Plato.

Roosevelt Araújo Rocha Júnior is Professor of Greek at the Universidade Federal do Paraná, in Curitiba (Paraná – Brazil). For his Ph.D. thesis, he made a translation into Portuguese of the Plutarchean work *De musica*, together with notes and a study of important aspects of this work. He is researching on ancient Greek music and archaic Greek poetry (lyric, elegy and iambus), and working on translations into Portuguese of authors such as Aristoxenus and some lyric poets (Stesichorus, Alcman, Alcaeus, etc.).

Rosario Scannapieco has achieved a "PhD" in Classical Philology at the Università degli Studi di Salerno; his studies concern Greek prose of the Imperial period, especially Dio Chrysostom's and Plutarch's, in both its contents and textual aspects.

Simone Beta is currently Research Assistant of Classical Philology in the Department of Classical Studies at the University of Siena (Italy). His research interests include classical theatre (mainly Greek comedy and its reception), Greek epigrams and novels, rhetoric, wine, and symposium. He is the author of *Il linguaggio nelle commedie di Aristofane* (Rome, 2004); he has also published *Vino e poesia. Centocinquanta epigrammi greci sul vino*, an anthology of Greek epigrams on wine (Milan, 2006), and *I comici greci*, an anthology of Greek comic fragments (Milan, 2009).

Stephen T. Newmyer is Professor of Classics and Chairman of the Department of Classics at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA. He is author of a number of studies of Plutarch's attitudes toward animals, viewed

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt

both in their ancient context and in their relation to modern animal rights philosophy.

Sven-Tage Teodorsson is Professor of Greek at Göteborg University, Sweden. He has done reseach on the history of the Greek language (phonology), Anaxagoras' theory of matter, and on Plutarch, especially a Commentary on his Table Talks.

Timothy E. Duff is Reader in Classics at the University of Reading. His publications include *Plutarch's* Lives*: Exploring Virtue and Vice* (Oxford University Press 1999).

Toni Badnall is a University Teacher in Greek Literature at the University of Nottingham, where she finished her PhD in 2008. Her research interests focus on gender in Greek literature, and her thesis examined the function of the wedding song in Greek literature and culture. This has inspired her interest in ἔρως and gender relations in later Greek prose, and her project will explore the construction of gender in Plutarch.

Valeriy Alikin, born in Kemerovo, Russia, is currently a PhD researcher of the Faculty of Humanities at Leiden University, Netherlands. He does research in the area of early Christianity and the Graeco-Roman world. He has several forthcoming publications on the history of early Christian gatherings and Church History.

Vicente Ramón Palerm is Associate Professor (Profesor Titular) of Greek Philology at Zaragoza University, Spain. He is currently working on Greek historiography and Greek literature of the classical period. His main focus is on Plutarch. He is presently Secretary of the Spanish Section of the I.P.S.

Versão integral disponível em digitalis.uc.pt