



Ministry  
of Education  
and Science



Uniwersytet  
Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego  
w Warszawie



**AIAS**  
AARHUS INSTITUTE  
OF ADVANCED STUDIES

XII International Congress  
of International Plutarch Society

## **Plutarch and His Contemporaries: Sharing the Roman Empire**

2nd–5th September 2021  
on-line via ZOOM platform

Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw  
Aarhus Institute of Advanced Studies

### **Abstracts**

---

**ERAN ALMAGOR**

*Parallel Contemporaries: Plutarch and Josephus*

This paper examines some shared features between the lives, writings and attitudes of the two contemporary priests and authors, Flavius Josephus of Jerusalem (37– c. 100 AD) and Mestrius Plutarch of Chaeronea (c. 45– c. 125 AD). Although concurrent, and at some point even potentially residing in Rome at the same time, and perhaps associated with members of the same intellectual milieu and elite of the city, the two never mention each other. Therefore, the first part of the paper shall only be a *comparatio* between the two persons.

Both are poised between two worlds and two cultures – their own heritage and a foreign one. Both describe how they took pains to learn the foreign language and culture – Greek in the case of Josephus (*AJ* 20.263) and Latin in Plutarch's case (*Demosth.* 2.2-4). Both authors became Roman citizens – Josephus highlights this fact in his *Life* (76), while Plutarch suppresses this detail. Both are ostensibly not critical of the current Roman rule, while using subtle literary devices to express their thoughts concerning Roman imperialism. The two rewrite stories of their nations' past and combine them with latest occurrences: Josephus joins biblical stories (books 1–11 of his *Antiquities*) with the more recent history of the Jewish people, from the Hellenistic era to his own days (books 11–20); Plutarch unites a Greek person (belonging to the past) and a Roman figure (part of the ideological and political present) in a construction of parallel pairs. Both authors emphasize philosophical and religious points in polemical or rhetorical works (in Josephus' case, the *Against Apion*). In the last part of the paper scenarios will be examined to explore the remote possibility that the two authors were aware of each other's works.

---

**COLIN BAILEY**

MacEwan University

*Cattle in the Marketplace: The Abandoned Agora in Dio Chrysostom and Plutarch*

Plutarch reports that Timoleon, after saving the city of Syracuse from conquest by the Carthaginians and the rule of tyrants, found the agora of the city so disused that the citizens had begun to use the area as pasturage for cattle. He adds that the city was so depopulated that Timoleon was compelled to invite new settlers from across the Greek world, but, as Alcock (1993) and others have shown, this image is not simply (or even) a reflection of declining populations in the Hellenistic or early Imperial periods. The image of the abandoned agora, though, is not unique to Plutarch: Dio Chrysostom's herdsman discovers a similarly overgrown agora in his own *polis* 'nearly in the centre of Greece' (*Or.* 7). In this paper, I consider the image of the abandoned agora in Plutarch's *Life of Aemilius* and Dio Chrysostom's *Euboean Oration*, arguing that both authors use it to comment not on the population but on the health of the *polis*. As citizens are prevented from exercising their proper roles in the city, or as they choose to abdicate those roles, the agora becomes not a centre of commercial and political life, but rather a field for cultivation or pasturage as the *polis* falls apart from within.

---

**KRYSTYNA BARTOL**

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

*Philoxeni in Plutarch and Athenaeus*

After Geert Roskam in his comments (CQ 56.2006) on my interpretation of Athenaeus' passage on Philoxenus (CQ 54.2004) turned my attention to Plutarch's testimony on some issues regarding the behavior of gluttons, I began to think about the relationship between Plutarch's and Athenaeus' portrayals of that figure. This is how the idea of this paper was born, whose purpose is to discover how the two Greek authors of the imperial era, Plutarch and Athenaeus, dealt with the question of typical features and special qualities attributed to Philoxenus by tradition.

Since in ancient times there were many misunderstandings about the identity of Philoxeni, the question arises which of them (the one of Leucas or the one of Cythera) should be considered in a given case. I will discuss those passages from the writings of Plutarch as well as from Athenaeus' *Deipnosophists* that refer to Philoxenus (no matter which of the two or even three Philoxeni mentioned in the ancient texts is presented in a particular place). They reflect the interests of both writers in some areas and topics, and show their approach to the way Philoxeni were treated in earlier sources. I will try to answer the question "are the accounts by Plutarch and Athenaeus convergent in their treatment of Philoxenus or do they give two contrasting portraits of this / these figure(s)?"

The fragments that will be analyzed in the paper illustrate the reception of traditional patterns of the Philoxenean legend, and – at the same time – the use of the potential of the long-established image of Philoxeni for a specific place and time, i.e. Greece of the 2nd century.

---

**MARK BECK**

University of South Carolina at Columbia

*Empathy in Seneca and Plutarch*

This paper will explore the political and social importance of empathy in the writings of Seneca and Plutarch. Modern theories of leadership stress the importance of empathy and discern a close relationship between empathy and social skill. The effective leader equipped with these interpersonal skills is able to foster an atmosphere of sensitivity and cooperation, including cross-cultural sensitivity (Goleman 2001: 7). Despite its Greek origin, the word "empathy" is of relatively recent provenance and made its first appearance in English in 1909, when Edward

Bradford Titchener coined the term to convey the German word “Einfühlung”. In Plutarch, a search for rough semantic equivalencies leads to the terms *praotēs*, *hēmerotēs*, *philanthrōpia*, and *philophrosunē*, while in Seneca, the words *clementia* and *humanitas* would seem to overlap semantically (at least partially) with our concept of empathy. The focus initially will be on Plutarch. This paper will take up the theme of empathy primarily in several *Lives* (*Solon*, *Pericles*, *Cimon*, and *Agesilaus*), while subsequently exploring a certain lack of empathy notable in the *Lives of Agesilaus* (towards Lysander), *Demetrius*, *Cato the Elder*, *Cato the Younger*, *Coriolanus*, and *Alcibiades*. Seneca’s writings (especially the *De clementia*) will then serve as a point of contrast to elucidate its importance from a Roman and a Stoic perspective. The aim of this paper will be to show the differential treatment of empathy as a component of leadership in the works of two philosophically trained intellectuals in the Imperial era.

---

**JEFFREY BENEKER**

University of Wisconsin

*Greeks and Romans in Plutarch’s Philopoemen–Flaminius*

Plutarch’s *Philopoemen–Flaminius*, the only book of *Parallel Lives* to feature subjects who appear as characters in each other’s biographies, relies on both external and internal synchronism to narrate and contextualize the accomplishments of both men. In the first *Life*, Plutarch presents Philopoemen as a champion of the Greeks who delivers freedom and enjoys great acclaim, but by the end of the second *Life*, Flaminius upstages his Greek rival by establishing a freedom that is more authentic and more enduring. That narrative trajectory of these *Lives*, which follows the historical development of Roman control over mainland Greece, appears to show the Romans, and Flaminius in particular, as comparatively better than the Greeks, and Philopoemen in particular. In this regard, the *Philopoemen–Flaminius* reflects the general acceptance of Roman imperial rule of Greece. Plutarch, however, seems unwilling to let such a simple lesson stand, and so he concludes the *Life* with Flaminius’ persecution of Hannibal. In a synchronic shift, Hannibal becomes the comparand for Philopoemen, while Flaminius plays the role of Deinocrates, who captured and killed Philopoemen. The nobility of the two men’s deaths combined with the culpability of their captors problematizes the moral lesson of the book. In this paper, I examine the intertwined narratives of these two *Lives* and show how Plutarch describes the historical reality of Roman superiority and yet draws his characters with a complexity that allows the defeated Greek to contend with the victorious Roman.

---

**LAURA BOTTENBERG**

Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa

*Friends as One Body: Plutarch’s De amicorum multitudine and Lucian’s Toxaris*

In his dialogue *Toxaris*, Lucian alludes to Plutarch’s treatise entitled *Περὶ πολυφιλίας* (*Mor.* 93A–97B). In *Tox.* 37, the adjective *πολύφιλος* echoes the subject of the treatise, and Lucian uses Plutarch’s simile of adulterous women to reject friendships based on more than two or three persons (cf. *Mor.* 93C, 95C). More generally, with regard to ideals in friendship, both texts present the same set of concepts of benevolence, reciprocity, and solidarity. This indicates that they refer – in different ways and for different purposes – to a common ethical system, which appears to be largely indebted to Aristotle’s concepts about friendship.

This paper proposes to compare Lucian’s dialogue and Plutarch’s treatise, focusing on one idea in particular, that true friends constitute one single body. This idea finds similar forms of expression in both texts, as e.g. their recourse to themes and citations taken from Attic tragedies, or their use of the prefix *συν-* in the same systematic and prolific way show. Most remarkably, they both employ the image of a many-headed monster to explain principles of union and dispersion in friendship (*Tox.* 62, *Mor.* 93C). The meaning of this image

of friends forming one body, in Plutarch's treatise, is to describe ethical self-fashioning in relation to the other. In Lucian's dialogue, the image becomes the emblem of cultural syncretism. But what did it mean for their socio-cultural environment? How was friendship conceived with regard to the relation between the self and the other?

By answering these questions, the paper not only aims to shed light on how specific ideas and their forms (metaphors, sayings, and citations) circulated and were re-functionalised in the early imperial period, but also to point to concerns of ethical and cultural self-definition in that period.

---

**FREDERICK BRENK**

Pontifical Biblical Institute

*All for Love: Plutarch and His Contemporaries*

At the opening of his *Dialogue on Love*, the *persona* Flavian alludes with dislike to writers producing slavish imitations of Plato's *Phaedrus*. Plutarch, the author, then sets out to produce a Platonic style dialogue which is quite different from these imitations. One scholar (Goldhill 1995) has described the work as "problematic" and another as a refutation of Plato (Rist 2001). As is his custom, Plutarch does not cite any contemporary authors in either his *Advice to a Bride and Groom* or in the *Dialogue on Love*. Different types of treatises and dialogues on love were written. Plutarch has much in common with Musonius Rufus, a Roman philosopher who wrote in Greek about the same time as Plutarch and whom Plutarch might have met on one of his trips to Rome (Pomeroy 1999, Reydam's Schils 2004). Both Musonius and Plutarch were strong advocates of education for women and "companionate marriage." He may also have been influenced by the Greek novelists, some of whom would have been writing in Plutarch's time (Konstan 1994, Hunter 2012, Makowski 2014). Another influence would be Greek and Roman authors, writing about love and marriage in Rome. One might think of Livy and Dionysus of Halicarnassus, of a generation before Plutarch, and other sources for his *Lives*. One cannot omit Seneca, who was hardly silent about love and marriage (Wildberger 2018). Another author, born earlier, but whose life overlapped somewhat with that of Plutarch is Paul of Tarsus. To some extent both would have been influenced by the same intellectual and religious currents (Brenk 2012). Though Paul's attitude toward love, women, and marriage may have been more conservative than Plutarch's, some aspects such as the dignity and virtue of women and their capability, of obtaining a blessed eternal destiny are similar.

---

**BOGDAN BURLIGA**

University of Gdańsk

*Of Arrian Correcting Plutarch, or What Did Alexander Send to the Goddess Athena after the Battle at Granicus?*

Except for the works of Ptolemaeus and Aristobulos, Arrian does not mention in the so-called first preface to his *Alexandrou Anabasis* the names of the other historians with whom he argues. In the paper I will try to point out that Plutarch from Chaeronea should be included in this number as much as possible. So far, none of the modern researchers has paid sufficient attention to the fact that Plutarchan *Life of Alexander*, probably written shortly before Trajan's war with the Parthians (as J.R. Hamilton maintains in his commentary), must have been a kind of inspiration for a relatively young writer from Bithynia to write his own, correct story of Alexander's expedition. This means that Plutarch's biography of the Macedonian warrior – the latest and most widely read literary achievement ("the last word" on this subject) – was for Arrian to some extent more important than other, older Alexander-books from Hellenistic times; it also means that it was more important in a negative sense, providing an opportunity to correct many episodes erroneously repeated by Plutarch. It turns out that when describing

the same episodes, Arrian most often “improves” his Boeotian fellow-writer which at the same time means a kind of literary competition (*aemulatio*) with him. I obviously do not claim that Arrian only disputes with Plutarch, but since Plutarch’s work has survived, we have the opportunity to compare the accounts of both authors. A case study can be the story about what exactly Alexander sent to Athens after his victory at the Granicus River: while Plutarch (*Alex.* 16. 17) talks about 300 shields (τριακοσίας ἀσπίδας), Arrian has “panoplies” (τριακοσίας πανοπλίας Περσικὰς; *Anab.* 1. 16. 7). I will argue that this difference is not accidental, but is part of Arrian’s broader criticism of Plutarch as a biographer of – and, inevitably, also as a historian of Alexander.

---

**ANDREA CATANZARO**

University of Genova

*Avoiding Tyranny through Education. Plutarch, Dio Chrysostom and Seneca’s Drugs for the Illness of the Roman Principatus*

From the political and institutional perspectives, the long transition from the Roman Republic to the principatus cannot be conceived as totally completed in the first century AD. Although it results clear enough that the political power has become absolute and *the one* – the *princeps* – has achieved a strongest position of power whereas both *the few* – the aristocrats – and *the many* – the mass – have been gradually marginalised from ruling, this absolutism is not still completely shaped from an institutional perspective, particularly with regard to the issue of the choice of the ruler. What is shared among some political authors in this period is focusing on the lack of opportunity – both for *the few* and *the many* – in playing a significant role in the appointment process of the *princeps*. The designation of the ruler is always more frequently out of control of the ruled people – both in its aristocratic and popular components – and the spaces of manoeuvre within the political institutions appear drastically made smaller. In such a particular context, part of the political literature aims to fix this problem through the *specula principis*: if there is little space – or not at all – for being involved in the choice of the *princeps*, it becomes essential working on the ruler and/or the possible successors with a view to allowing them to be good governors and not cruel tyrants. Starting from this point, the paper is aimed at analysing, in a comparative perspective the prince’s educational plots in the Plutarchean political *Moralia*, the *Discourses on Kingship* by Dio Chrysostom, and the *De Clementia* by Seneca, in order to stress the elements of continuity and discontinuity among these works with particular regard to their respective educational solutions to the twofold crucial problem of having a good princeps and avoiding tyranny.

---

**SERENA CITRO**

Università degli Studi di Salerno

*Anecdotes and Rhetorical-Lexical Structures in Plutarch, Valerius Maximus and Polyaeus*

The Plutarchean work *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*, the anecdotal collection *Facta et dicta memorabilia* by Valerius Maximus and the *Strategemata* written by Polyaeus show striking connections and affinities in relation to various issues. For instance, in the preface to their anecdotal books, all of them dedicate the work to a Roman emperor, respectively Traianus in Plutarch, Tiberius in V. Maximus and the couple Marcus Aurelius–Lucius Verus in Polyaeus; in these preliminary sections there is a significant analogy of purposes regarding the composition of the collections: to provide patterns and paradigms of behaviour drawn from ancient history and concisely narrated, which may be useful especially to those engaged in military or political activity, who have little time to spend on reading.

This contribution will initially highlight similarities and discrepancies in both content and language that can be found in the introductions to these treatises, also underlining a possible

connection between the works and the genre of the chreia. Afterwards, the analysis will focus on the comparison of a series of anecdotes cited by both Plutarch and V. Maximus in some cases, both by Plutarch and Polyaeus in others. The same anecdote is cited with some variants, that sometimes appear not very relevant, instead other times they are significant. This comparison allows us to express some considerations on the specificity of the Plutarchean style and technique of composition than the other two authors. The investigation will be based both on the lexical study of the anecdotes and on the analysis of the rhetorical devices adopted, in order to bring out how the rhetorical-stylistic choices almost never have a simple ornamental purpose, but contribute to draw the reader's attention to a specific ethical pattern.

---

**MARIA ELENA DE LUNA**

Alma Mater – Bologna University

*Aspetti della memoria culturale in età imperiale: erudizione e uso della storia locale nelle Quaestiones graecae*

The paper aims to analyse some significant steps of Plutarch's *Quaestiones graecae*, in order to meet two main purposes: to highlight, on one hand, Plutarch's methodological debt with the Aristotelian, and more generally peripatetic, *Problemata*; to identify, on the other hand, by examining a sylloge of *exempla*, the original way in which he uses this philosophical and cultural genre, as a framework for inscribing erudite and antiquarian curiosities—a typical interest of the cultural background of the Greeks in the Roman age.

The second purpose is to outline specific Plutarch's approach to the historical and cultural memory of Arcadia, Boeotia, and Messenia, to which some *Quaestiones* are dedicated, and to compare this approach with that of Pausanias, who in the Antonine age devotes three books to these regions, thus recovering a memory at risk of oblivion. This method will highlight the narrative strategies used by Plutarch and Pausanias to emphasize rare aspects of the cultural identity of these regions, ranging from the past to their time, permeated by a 'two-faced' culture. Furthermore, this comparison has a twofold aim. Firstly, it will allow us to catch similarities and differences in the authors' analyses of the local and 'intentional' versions of certain myths, in their interpretation of rituals and cults, and in their investigation of the *aitia* of the places' names. Secondly, it will allow us to consider the weight the authors attribute to the historical and philosophical elements through the exegesis of some expressions and customs of these regions, which otherwise would remain little evident, if not obscure, not only to us, but also to ancient readers.

---

**CARLO DELLE DONNE**

Sapienza-Università di Roma

*Socrates, God and Politics: Plutarch and His Contemporaries*

Is there a relationship between Plutarch's philosophy (or rather, certain aspects of it) and the Pseudopythagorica treatises – especially those dealing with ethics (Centrone 1990) and politics (Delatte 1922)? And what are we to think of the relationship between Plutarch and Aspasius' commentary on Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (Becchi 1994)? Even though some papers have shed light on these issues (Bellanti 2007, Centrone 2005, Donini 1974, Becchi 2003), there are, at least, two aspects which still deserve to be properly examined.

As for the first couple (Plutarch–Pseudopythagorica), a far deeper insight into God's political role would be required; while, as far as Aspasius is concerned, it is his portrayal of Socrates that is likely to prove rather interesting when compared to Plutarch's own image of Socrates. Last but not least, Plutarch's peculiar account of the "ethical virtue", as it emerges mainly from the *IX Platonic Question* (Bellanti 2007) and *On Moral Virtue* (Bellanti 2003; e.g. Becchi 2014, 2012, 2007, 2005, 2004, 2004a, 1999, 1996), appears to bear a significant resemblance to both the

Pseudopythagorica (Becchi 1992) and Aspasius. So, what I set out to provide is a broad assessment of Plutarch's ethical (Ferrari 2007/2008) and political theory in the context of the Pseudopythagorean writings and of Aspasius' commentary. This will hopefully turn out to be beneficial in order to reach a deeper and far more complete knowledge of Plutarch's thought with regard to some influential (and rather contemporary) philosophical traditions.

---

**BRAM DEMULDER**

Leiden University

*Heavenly and Common Love in Plutarch and His Contemporaries*

In Plato's *Symposium* (180d) we learn about an apparently well-known distinction between the Heavenly Aphrodite and the Common Aphrodite. The character Pausanias, who is speaking in this part of Plato's work, invokes this familiar pair in order to introduce a distinction between Heavenly and Common Eros (180e–185c). This paper focuses on the philosophical and cultural reception of these distinctions in the work of Plutarch and his contemporaries.

The first part of this paper looks at how Plutarch and Philo of Alexandria conceptualise the distinction between heavenly and common Eros / *erôs*. Looking at their interpretations of Plato's *Symposium*, I show how their take on the distinction ties in with their contrasting attitudes towards bodily aspects of human love. Furthermore, I show how these attitudes are underpinned by their interpretation of (Platonic) physics and metaphysics.

The second part of the paper connects the philosophical inquiry of the first part with the larger cultural framework of 1st- and 2nd-century literature. In particular, I will discuss if and how mentions of Heavenly and Common Aphrodite in the works of Cornutus, Pausanias, Lucian, and Achilles Tatius are mediated by Plato's work and thought.

Thus, this paper will contribute to the (largely neglected) study of the reception of Plato's *Symposium* while also giving insight into the philosophical and cultural connections and divergences between Plutarch and his contemporaries.

---

**CHIARA DI SERIO**

Central European University

*Plutarch and the Jewish Abstinence from Meat*

In the *Quaestiones convivales* (669 E – 671 B) Plutarch introduces the topic of the Jewish abstinence from pork. The solution to the question proposed by the participants in the banquet is that this animal is kept in great honour among that people and therefore it is neither killed nor eaten. The justification thus put forward clearly reveals the Greek point of view on the customs and bans on food, as well as the religion of other peoples. During the discussion a comparison is proposed with the religious practices of the Egyptians, who worshipped animals such as the beetle, the vulture, the crocodile, and the cat. In addition, an analogy is also established with the Pythagoreans who venerate the white rooster and avoid eating fish. In order to fully understand the meaning that the Greeks attributed to this type of abstinence, it is necessary to go through what Theophrastus had written in *De pietate* (Stern 1976), according to which the Jews practice animal sacrifice, but in a different way from that of the Greeks. In fact, they do not eat meat, and sacrifice only holocausts. Therefore, this research aims at investigating the possible connections between the Plutarchian text and other sources that deal with this Jewish practice – such as Petronius, Epictetus, Tacitus, Juvenal –, in order to clarify the mechanism by which classical culture defined and distanced itself from other civilizations.

---

Dio Chrysostom, Pliny the Elder, Polemon of Laodicea, Suetonius – each of these men wrote works, which are full of physiognomical beliefs and lived in Plutarch's period. For a philosopher from Cheronea physiognomy was as well an important tool with which he could better show characters of people, whom he described in *Lives*. Advocates of physiognomy stated, that face as no other part of body shows attributes of soul – so for Plutarch Philopomen's face was royal (Plut. *Philop.* 1.2), Sulla's face was scary (Plut. *Sull.* 2.1) and Pyrrhus had a jaw defect (Plut. *Pyrrh.* 3.6). Possibility to predict future from someone's face and recognize one's virtue is not only skill of such thinkers like Teanor (Plut. *De genio* 16), but also of anonymous, like the one who had predicted that Titus would become caesar (Suet. *Tit.* 2). Apart from believing in the signs of soul, which can be observed in a face, physiognomics compared people to animals. Plutarch praised Apelles for his great painting of Alexander, where his leonine nature is shown (Plut. *De Alex.* 2.2). It was the nature of courageous, bold and very ambitious people (Polemon, *Phys.* 2). When Plutarch had not any mentions of his hero's appearance, he used sculptures as summarize of character (Plut. *Brut.* 58), as Pliny did with a Pericles statue (Pliny, *NH.* 34.19.74). Beauty of man shines from his body and is a reflection of beauty of his soul, both for Plutarch (Plut. *Amat.* 21) and for Dio (D. Chr. 7. 33).

In my study I examine fragments from Plutarch's corpus, which are containing physiognomical ideology. For better understanding of it I compare these excerpts with the works of other authors. My presentation would be an occasion to put Plutarch on a map of fashion of physiognomical ideology in 1st and 2nd c. CE.

---

**FILIP DOROSZEWSKI**

*Omen of the Supreme Rule: Caesar's Incestuous Dream in Plutarch, Suetonius and Cassius Dio*

Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University

Suetonius, Plutarch and Cassius Dio all narrate an incestuous dream in which Julius Caesar engages in an unlawful intercourse with his own mother. However, the way in which Plutarch tells the story stands out. Both Suetonius (*Jul.* 7.2) and Cassius Dio (37.52.2) place the dream in the early days of Caesar's career, i.e. during his quaestorship in Spain (69 BC), and mention a favourable interpretation put on the dream by the seers: mother stands for the native country and the intercourse means the future power. Unlike the two authors, Plutarch moves the event to the critical point of Caesar's life: crossing the Rubicon (49 BC). The dream comes the night before and the sexual act is called an *arretos mixis* 'unspeakable union' (*Caes.* 32.9). Apart from this, however, the dream is left uncommented. No doubt, placing the dream right in the decisive moment of Caesar's career makes it even more dramatic: invading Italy is like violating Caesar's own mother. And yet, as I will argue, Plutarch's interpretation of the dream which is hidden between the lines of the *Life* proves quite similar to that of Suetonius and Cassius Dio. While describing the mysteries of Bona Dea held in Caesar's house (9.4–10.10), Plutarch applies the adjectif *arretos* to Persephone, the *mother* of Dionysus-Zagreus, who conceived her son of an incestuous rape by Zeus, her father. In fact, a divine rape like this one was called by the Greeks *mixis*. I will claim, therefore, that throughout the *Life* Plutarch draws a parallel between Zagreus, Zeus' son destined to rule over the cosmos, and Caesar who ultimately becomes the monarch of Rome. This claim will be further supported by examining an allusion to the Titans tearing Zagreus apart that is made by Plutarch in the scene of Caesar's death.



The main purpose of this paper is to show how Plutarch reflects the galenic conception of the veins as well as the medical procedures where veins were implied as taking the pulse or practicing phlebotomy. For that aim, Plutarch's references to the topic will be compared with significant Galen's passages. Some questions will be answered: 1. What are the galenic 'vein procedures' mentioned by Plutarch and in what literary contexts they appear? 2. Concerning the wide controversy on venesection at the time, what was Plutarch's position? 3. Comparing the texts, is it possible to establish a direct intertextuality between Galen and Plutarch? 4. What is the Plutarchan contribution to our knowledge of the medical practices of the time? In sum, despite the dispersion of medical content in Plutarch's oeuvre, it will be showed that it is possible to gain through his writings a global perspective on his thought and context.

---

**EVA FALASCHI**

Center of Hellenic Studies, Washington DC

*Wandering in Rome with Plutarch and Pliny*

This paper intends to offer some reflections on the reception of Greek art and artists in Plutarch's works and Pliny the Elder's *Naturalis Historia*. In particular, Plutarch's and Pliny's experiences among the streets of Rome, their judgements on the city and on the presence of Greek art in the public and private places will be considered. This investigation will be conducted also in the light of the new technologies (GIS, Geographical Information System) applied to the study of the *Naturalis Historia*'s art books (33–36) and to the role of the *Urbs* in Pliny's selection and organization of the information on the Greek artworks (the so-called *nobilia opera*) "re-staged" in the city.

On the other side, I intend to investigate the presence of "Roman" art in Plutarch's works and offer a new, more complete picture of how Plutarch viewed the city and its artistic offer. To this purpose, I will not only consider the *Quaestiones Romanae* and the studies dedicated to this work by John Scheid, but also explore the entire *corpus* of the *Moralia* and the *Vitae*. Finally, Pliny's inclusion of "Roman" and contemporary art, and of the workshops of the city, in his art historical accounts on Greek art will be investigated and compared with Plutarch's view.

---

**REBECCA FRANK**

Oberlin College

*The Voice of the God? Delphic Divination in Imperial Greek Literature*

The first and second centuries CE saw an increase in philosophical discussions of oracular divination, as philosophers debated the veracity of oracles, the source of their prophetic power, and their role in the Imperial Roman world. The Delphic oracle lies at the heart of many of these discussions. Although the Delphic oracle's political power decreased from the Hellenistic age onwards, Delphi still held a prominent position in the literature of the imperial era. While scholars have focused on the physical state of the Delphic oracle during the Second Sophistic (e.g. Weir 2010, Heineman 2018), or on the way authors in this period treat divination more broadly (e.g. van Nuffelen 2011), I assess how Plutarch and his contemporaries discuss Delphi and Delphic divination in their writings.

In Plutarch's Delphic dialogues, the interlocutors discuss specific claims about the oracle as well as their theological implications. These claims include that the god delivered deliberately ambiguous oracles, that it is not the god but *daimones* who are responsible for the oracular responses, explanations for why the oracle no longer delivers verse oracles, and speculations as to why the god gives oracles. In this paper, I contextualize the claims voiced in the Delphic

dialogues with the treatment of the oracle in the works of other Imperial Greek authors, including Dio Chrysostom (*Discourse* 10), Lucian (*Zeus Rants, Dialogues of the Gods* 16), Oenomaus of Gadara (*The Unmasking of the Swindlers*), and Maximus of Tyre (*Oration* 11, 29). In the process, I demonstrate how the Delphic oracle was used as a prominent literary motif and a key medium through which philosophers debated questions of the gods and divination in the Imperial Greek world.

---

**MARTINA GATTO**

University of Rome “Tor Vergata”

*Lycurgus of Sparta in the Imperial Age: Plutarch, Pausanias and Lucian*

Plutarch dedicates one of his Lives to Lycurgus of Sparta. However, the exemplum of the Spartan lawgiver attracted not only his attention but also the interest of several imperial authors. This paper offers a comparative approach to Lycurgus’ representation in the imperial literature, focusing in particular on Plutarch, Pausanias, and Lucian.

First, Pausanias gives the general coordinates on Lycurgus and its legislation in his historical introduction to Laconia (3, 1–10), following closely the Herodotean model. A general comparison between Plutarch and Pausanias can be valuable because their accounts present some interesting differences to focus on. For example, Pausanias inserts Lycurgus in the Agiad royal house (following Herodotus) whereas Plutarch prefers the most well-known Euripontid genealogy. Also, according to Pausanias, Lycurgus changed the human sacrifice into the whipping of ephebes, saving some young Spartans from certain death: though Plutarch stress very much Lycurgus’s generosity, he does know nothing about the conversion of the deadly ritual.

Secondly, Lucian’s Anacharsis is worthy of interest because it is one of the rare cases in which some topical motifs of Sparta’s ideal representation are criticized and even mocked: the “reversal” humor involves both the practices of the agogé and their creator, Lycurgus. Through a technique repeatedly used by Lucian, Solon is asked a series of questions and receives some objections from the barbarian Anacharsis, which often sound comical because expressed from the unusual point of view.

Therefore, as we will see, both Lucian and Pausanias offer different perspectives on Lycurgus: the main purpose of this paper is to compare their outlooks with the “standard” and idealized image of Plutarch’s Lycurgus.

---

**OLIVIER GENGLER**

Heidelberg Academy of Science and Humanities

*Reshaping Spartan Memory and Identity under the Antonines: Plutarch and Pausanias*

The city of Sparta and its past occupy a prominent position in Plutarch’s work, in the *Vitae* and in the *Moralia*, with a strong focus on the Lycurgean institutions and on history, from the Persian Wars to the 3rd c. Just as Pausanias the Periegete, who gave a description of Sparta in the time of Marcus Aurelius, Plutarch seems at first sight to be only interested in the distant past of the city, which make its fame. However, a close reading of the texts of those two authors in parallel with the numerous spartan inscriptions from the Antonine period that have been preserved reveals striking similarities in the image of Sparta’s past that they convey. In this paper, I want to explore how Plutarch, Pausanias and their Spartan contemporaries – with which at least Plutarch had lasting contacts – reshape Spartan memory and identity by promoting a certain vision of the past for the present.

---

In a paper from 1994 Françoise Frazier presented how the *Quaestiones Convivales* by Plutarch and the *Symposion* by Lucian refer to a common sympotic social code, although their *mise en scene* works in a complete opposite direction („Deux images des banquets de lettrés: les Propos de Table de Plutarque et le Banquet de Lucien“, 125–130) She refers also to some intertextual references between both works, an evident one in the quotation μισέω μνάμονα συμπόταν placed at the beginning of both literary symposia (Q.C. 612C, Symp. 3). Starting from this point of view, the proposed contribution will analyse some other intertextual elements between the sympotical writings of both authors.

One example is Plut. Q.C. V 4. Here Plutarch presents a philological discussion about the meaning of Homeric ξωρότερον as it appears in *Il.* 9.203. This seems to have been a common philological subject as already Aristoteles in *Po.* 1461a discusses different meanings of this word. ξωρότερον appears also in Lucian's symposium (*Symp.* 14) in a highly Homeric context. Although the philological discussion is avoided here, we will argue that this passage should be considered an ironic reference to a usual philological discussion on the meaning of this word, and probably an intertextual reference to Plutarch's *Quaestiones Convivales* itself.

The analysis on intertextuality between both works will be completed with the examination of the *Lexiphanes* and the *Convivium Septem Sapientium* to get a broader overview of the sympotic literature of Plutarch and Lucian. At the end it should answer the question, whether Lucian refers in his sympotic works to the author Plutarch itself or more generally to the literary genre of philological dialogue represented by the *Quaestiones Convivales*.

---

NOREEN HUMBLE  
*Asserting Greekness through Redeployment of Xenophon's Barbarians*

University of Calgary

In this paper I want to examine how Plutarch along with other Greek authors spread, both spatially and temporally, throughout the Roman empire, reused and refashioned particular motifs from Xenophon's works as strong markers of their self-identification as Greek authors; and, further, that these repeated redeployments of Xenophonic motifs constitute a sort of meta-dialogue among these authors. That is, as they carefully employed key elements, themes, and stories from Xenophon in new and innovative ways, they did so not just as a deep link to their shared heritage but to build connective tissues binding them all together and anchoring them firmly as Greek in the ever-changing and culturally diverse world of the Roman Empire. (And so I will expand on P. Stadter's 2012 article 'Staying up late': Plutarch's reading of Xenophon' by situating Plutarch's reading more widely). The particular example which this paper will focus upon will be the many different deployments of the story of Panthea from Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*. Plutarch himself uses it repeatedly in his essays (e.g., *Mor.* 31c; 84f; 521f; 706d; 1093c), but also in his *Lives*, as Jeff Beneker has shown in *The Passionate Statesman*. A. Capra (2009) 'The (un)happy romance of Culreio and Liliet', notes examples in other authors (though missing the clever refashioning in Lucian, on which see K. Sidwell (2002) 'Damning with great praise: paradox in Lucian's *Imagines* and *Pro Imagines*') on the way to demonstrating that Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaka* is an anti-tragic reworking of the story. Though Prodicus' Choice of Hercules (*Xen. Mem.* 2.1.21–34) is similarly ubiquitous, the quiet irony of a story of love and continence among barbarians becoming, through a myriad of complex appropriations, a marker for expressing Greekness in the Roman world serves to make the point more vividly.

## SUSAN JACOBS

*From Hero to Zero and Back: Exile in Plutarch's Lives* [cancelled]

Exile—either voluntary or forced—was a feature of the ancient world and the Roman Empire, and thus connected Plutarch's era to the Greek and Roman past. Exile was discussed by writers who had experienced it – such as Seneca and Dio Chrysostom – as well as by Plutarch in an essay, *On Exile*, and in many *Lives*. While Van Hoof, in *Plutarch's Practical Ethics*, compared Plutarch's *On Exile* with works of other writers, in this paper I examine how Plutarch treated exile in the *Lives*. More specifically, I ask: In what ethical and pragmatic contexts did Plutarch's heroes in exile provide exempla to guide political leaders in his own day? And, how do Plutarch's portraits reinforce or depart from advice in other writers?

The analysis is presented in three parts. After a brief review of exile under the Empire and the advice offered in the literature (including *On Exile*), I move in Part 2 to Plutarch's portrayal of statesmen in exile in *Themistocles-Camillus*, *Coriolanus-Alcibiades* and *Demosthenes-Cicero*. In particular, I look at (1) the various circumstances precipitating exile, (2) the conduct of the heroes in exile, and (3) the reactions of the heroes to recall. Finally, I review how the lessons embedded in these *Lives* intersect the guidance found in other writers.

---

## ORESTIS KARAVAS

University of the Peloponnese Kalamata-Greece

*Fragments of Wisdom? The Manipulated Use of the Citations by the Authors of the Second Sophistic*

In the present paper I will examine a rhetorical game played by several authors of the Second Sophistic as writers and readers (namely Plutarch, Lucian, Dio Chrysostom and Aelius Aristides). This game consists of quoting mutilated verses, verses where the authors have replaced one or more words in the original text, and verses that are included in the writings of these authors as if they were prose written by the authors themselves. Decoding these tampered citations was the so-called rhetorical game, and the more complicated the manipulation of the alteration in the quoted text, the greater the satisfaction *pepaideumenoï* experienced.

---

## LAWRENCE KIM

Trinity University

*Plutarch and Pliny the Younger on Oratorical Style*

In this paper, I compare the very different ways in which Plutarch and Pliny the Younger evaluate and categorize rhetorical style. There are several good reasons to examine these two together: both were active under Trajan, moved in the same social circles (sharing a close friend, Q. Sosius Senecio), and at some point in their careers, were orators and deeply informed by rhetorical culture (even if Plutarch had abandoned that career at an early age), but not professional rhetoricians or critics (like Quintilian or 'Longinus'). Despite some surface similarities, however, their understandings of style are based on fundamentally different presuppositions. I am especially interested in the way each author employs the traditional scheme, found in rhetorical treatises, of the *genera dicendi*, which distinguished three basic styles: plain, middle, and grand. Pliny, whose comments on the subject in *Ep.* 1.20 and 9.26 have been much studied, follows Cicero and Quintilian in paying lip service to the virtues of the 'middle' way, while consistently advocating for the grand style. At first glance, Plutarch appears to adopt a similar tripartite system in his remarks on oratorical style in *Political Precepts* (802E–803A), *On Listening* (40F–42E), and *Progress in Virtue* (79B). I show, however, that the resemblance is only apparent: in these texts Plutarch defines and criticize two rhetorical extremes, but they do not quite correspond to the 'plain' and 'grand' styles (much less 'Attic'

and ‘Asian’, as some scholars have suggested). In fact, while Plutarch occasionally refers to a ‘plain’ or ‘Attic’ style, he consistently avoids incorporating it into his categorization of the various ways of speaking. The ‘moderate’ style he champions is not a ‘middle’ between two antithetical poles but rather a ‘third’ way, characterized by *êthos*, and seemingly lying outside traditional rhetorical theory.

---

**TOMOHIKO KONDO**

Hokkaido University

*The Incomplete Feminisms of Plutarch and Musonius Rufus*

While Plutarch and Musonius Rufus have sometimes been considered to be the forerunners of feminism, both of their ‘feminisms’ have been rightly criticised as being ‘incomplete’ (cf. Nussbaum 2002). What has not been fully explored, however, is the precise difference in their ‘incompleteness’ between the two thinkers. This paper will compare Plutarch’s views on women and marriage, especially in the *Coniugalia Praecepta*, the *Mulierum Virtutes* and the *Amatorius*, with those of Musonius, in order to better understand to what extent Plutarch’s ‘incomplete feminism’ can be attributed to the author rather than the shared cultural background of the period.

It has been well observed that, while the thesis that the virtue of man and woman is one and the same is endorsed by both Plutarch and Musonius, they practically restrict women’s sphere of virtue to a subsidiary role (Plutarch) or within the household (Musonius). However, their justifications are different from each other. Musonius considers external circumstances, including the traditional gender division of labour, to be irrelevant to the exercise of virtue. In contrast, Plutarch considers the female nature to be distinct from the male nature in accordance with his Platonic metaphysics and psychology, thereby distinguishing the proper sphere of virtue between women and men, with emphasis laid on the emotional contribution of women following the lead of men.

This resonates with their respective views on marriage. In contrast to Musonius, who focuses on procreation as the function of marriage as well as of sexual intercourse, Plutarch puts much importance on companionship between husband and wife. Correspondingly, they offer different reasons for avoiding adultery and for taking a negative attitude towards same-sex intercourse. Although emphasis on marital affection is most distinctive of Plutarch, it makes his ‘feminism’ even more incomplete because of its unequal distribution of ‘emotional labour’ between wife and husband.

---

**INGER KUIN**

University of Virginia

*Losing Your Religion: Plutarch and Lucian on the Causes of Disbelief and Religious Doubt*

Why and under what circumstances do people start doubting the existence and power of the gods? This question remains unresolved today as shown by the ongoing controversy over secularization theory. In the first two centuries of the common era there was a vibrant conversation about religious doubt and disbelief in the Greek-speaking Roman east, but archeological and epigraphic sources show that there was no decline in religious practice (MacMullen 1981; Petropolou 2008). My ongoing research project investigates why this conversation took place at the time, and what kinds of explanations imperial Greek authors proposed for religious doubt and disbelief.

As part of this project I have compared how Plutarch and Lucian view the causality of (perceived) decline in religious practice. While much work has been done on Lucian as an (alleged) disbeliever himself (e.g. Berdozzo 2011, 2019) the topic of the representation of disbelief within his corpus is understudied. In Plutarch’s case his aversion of disbelief has been

taken simply as a given (Moellering 1963; Bowden 2008; Van Nuffelen 2011: 69), with the result that his analysis of the phenomenon has not received the attention it deserves.

In both Plutarch and Lucian we find a tension between two different ways of conceptualizing the causes of decline in religious practice. On the one hand, agency is attributed to the gods to explain the disappearance of certain oracular sites or festivals by suggesting that the gods 'have left', either of their own accord or in response to human behavior. But at other moments both authors do recognize human agency as a factor in fluctuations in religious practice, for instance when philosophers are seen as threatening sacrificial practice by openly questioning divine providence.

In my paper I investigate if there is any way these two competing models for understanding religious decline in Lucian and Plutarch can be reconciled, or if they are rather two different types of explanations working on different levels. Secondly, I will consider whether Plutarch and Lucian should be seen as participating in a shared conversation, or as successive stages in a developing understanding of the issue of causality and declining religious practice.

---

**WIM NIJS**

KU Leuven

*"Cease provoking the god, my dear Planetiades". How Plutarch deals with Epicurean and Cynic anti-oracular polemics*

In his dialogues *De Pythiae oraculis* and *De defectu oraculorum* Plutarch also leaves some room for representatives of Epicureanism and Cynicism, two philosophical schools who famously criticize divination and the legitimacy of oracles. In both dialogues Epicureanism's critical views on providence and oracular practice are presented and refuted. In *De defectu oraculorum* we also see how the Cynic Didymus Planetiades makes a spirited, but rather short appearance. When he is subsequently rebuked for his provocative behavior, he leaves the scene in a hurry. Epicurean and Cynic sources, however, show that the actual opponents of divination had stronger arguments and were far more persistent than Plutarch's dialogues would have us believe. Among Plutarch's rough contemporaries we find several authors who criticized the legitimacy of oracles. One of them is the Epicurean Diogenes of Oenoanda. Another is the Cynic satirist Lucian, whose Alexander treats of the Amastrian Epicureans' campaign against the prophet Alexander of Abonoteichos. This same Lucian playfully questions the concept of divine providence and the usefulness of soothsaying in his *Iupiter confutatus*. Of great interest is the work Γοήτων φώρα by the Cynic Oenomaus of Gadara, in which he satirically exposes oracles, including the Delphic one, as charlatans. This paper aims to study Plutarch's treatment of his Epicurean and Cynic opponents in its proper polemical context. I want to establish how Plutarch's representation of these opponents and their arguments relates to the actual criticisms voiced by his Epicurean and Cynic contemporaries. Not only will this paper determine which polemical strategies Plutarch adopts in order to deal with the criticisms in his dialogues, but also which criticisms he chooses to omit from them and why he does so, thus allowing us to gain a better understanding of Plutarch's polemical position within the early empire's intellectual debate on divination.

---

**DAWN LAVALLE NORMAN**

Australian Catholic University

*Permission to Speak? Cleobulina in Plutarch's Symposium of the Seven Sages and Mary in the Dialogic Gospels*

In his life, Plutarch publicly claims to have had fulfilling intellectual conversations with intellectual women such as Clea, the dedicatee of both *De Is. et Os.* and *De mul. vir.* Within his literary worlds too, women are reported to have dialogued with wise men. Yet, in his multiple

philosophical dialogues, none of these philosophical, verbal women are allowed to carry on these conversations out loud while “on-stage” in the dialogues. Plutarch’s *Symposium of the Seven Sages* provides the clearest example of this avoidance. Cleobulina, although depicted as wanting to speak, maintains silence while Aesop speaks up for her, quoting her previous speech, and leaving her maidenly modesty intact. In my paper I will contrast Plutarch’s use of silent women in his dialogues with the “dialogue gospels”, popular in the 1st–4th centuries, which frequently depicted female disciples in privileged conversation with the resurrected Jesus. Their verbosity is also resisted by some of the men present within the fictional world, but permission is granted to them from Jesus to continue speaking. In particular, I will examine the roles played by Mary in the *Gospel of Mary* (late 1st–2nd century) and the *Pistis Sophia* (3rd century).

Plutarch’s discomfort with women’s direct voices comes from his imitation of Plato’s similar avoidance in the *Symposium* and the *Menexenus*. But these strategies of ventriloquism are abandoned in the early Christian writings. This was to herald a new period of dialogic writing, when women would begin to be depicted “on-stage” speaking in their own voices (e.g. Methodius’ *Symposium*, Gregory of Nyssa’s *On the Soul and Resurrection*, Augustine’s dialogues). Examining the hinge generation of Plutarch and the dialogic gospels will illuminate the causes of this change in generic expectation.

---

**DELFIN LEÃO**

University of Coimbra

*Petronius’ Cena Trimalchionis and Plutarch’s Quaestiones Convivales: a comparative approach to the banquet and to the banqueteers*

This common approach to Petronius’ *Satyricon* (and in particular to the central episode of the *Cena Trimalchionis*) and to Plutarch’s *Quaestiones Convivales* does not intend to suggest that the biographer was somehow influenced by the work of the Roman author. This direct relation would, in fact, be quite improbable, given the way Petronius’ work was conceived and disseminated. Nevertheless, this does not prevent both authors from having several points of contact, most probably because they are embedded in a common Greek and Roman culture and especially a common literary tradition: the Greek influx in Petronius is detectable throughout the entire *Satyricon*, and Plutarch, despite being a Greek, wrote under Roman domination and could count as well on a Roman audience of his work (as was masterly shown by Ph. Stadter, *Plutarch & His Roman Readers*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2015).

This proposal will, therefore, analyze the way concepts and ideas, literary *topoi* and *exempla*, rhetorical and narrative strategies are used by both authors in those two works. Global issues regarding the making of a banquet and the role played by the host of a banquet are particularly present in Book I of the *Quaestiones Convivales*, offering an illuminating and contrasting ‘proof of concept’ in the *Cena Trimalchionis*. However, more specific questions aroused throughout the other Books of the QC (principally in Book VII) find also parallels in the *Satyricon* that mutually help to enlighten the understanding of similar situations and of the narrative strategies used to deal with them.

---

**LINDY LENK**

Wayne State University

*Exploring the Parallel Lives of Plutarch and Luke the Evangelist*

Did the paths of Plutarch and Luke the Evangelist intersect over the course of their lives? Christianity was on the rise during the first century when Plutarch and Luke were writing in Greece. Two of their works (*Parallel Lives* and the Bible) stood side-by-side, equal in popularity, in the United States and elsewhere.

Plutarch and Luke shared a passion for religion, a loyalty to their birth cities, and both were diplomatic regarding the Romans. They were virtuous men who contributed, significantly, to the preservation of history through the retelling of momentous events that shaped the lives of, or were shaped by, great men. And although they have often been seen as historians, neither claimed to be such; each wrote from meticulously compiled research and created character-driven, dramatic scenes. They both had unique biographical styles that revealed a man's true nature through the intimate details of his life. Both emphasized genealogy and used comparable literary devices: prologues, parallelism, and parables.

While both men lived in Boeotia and traveled in similar circles—there are no extant writings that indicate they knew each other. In this paper I will explore the parallel lives of Plutarch and Luke, illustrating how their paths would have had an excellent opportunity of intersecting and how that interaction could have influenced Plutarch's writing.

---

**RENAN MARQUES LIPAROTTI** Università degli Studi di Salerno / Universidade de Coimbra  
*Plutarch's Defense of Alexander against the Roman 'Speech of Fortune' Texts*

Plutarch's speeches that go under the name "The Fortune or the Virtue of Alexander the Great" seem to work as a kind of response to the «Speech of Fortune» texts (326D). We do not have any full example of this kind of speech, but we may find some passages in which there are some traces of them which we aim to analyse in order to find out their principal ideas and to observe how Plutarch answered them in order to have a better understanding of his dialogue with the Roman political and cultural world. Diodorus was the first to declare that Macedonians began to imitate the custom of the Persians (D. S. 17.77.4), attitude which Livy (9.18) described with visible displeasure. Plutarch, however, defended the adoption of clothing as the strategy of a conqueror, but which did not change Alexander's way of thinking (330B). Moreover, Cicero (*Off.* 1.26) said that Alexander had become too presumptuous for his own good fortune. He, therefore, according to Curtius, intended to equate himself with the gods to the point of demanding the prostration of his subjects. In addition, Seneca (*Dial.* 3.17) focused on Alexander's ferocity manifested in episodes of anger. In opposition to this view, Plutarch developed the model of philosopher-king (329B, 330F, 331A). Furthermore, there was the declaration that Alexander died without having trod the diminishing steps of Fortune (Liv. 9.17), to which Curtius attributed the greater weight of his feats. Plutarch's response was a wound catalogue (327B, 339D) and a speech addressed to the Fortune (326E). Therefore, these discourses, composed by cynic and stoic philosophers, imposing upon the deity Fortune the responsibility for his deeds, criticised Alexander as a model for kingship to the Flavian emperors. Plutarch, on the other hand, deconstructed this idea, valorizing by many arguments the virtues of Alexander.

---

**SEAN MCGRATH**

Trinity College Dublin

*The Dogfish Shark as an Anti-Stoic Paradigm in Plutarch and Oppian*

In the Imperial philosophical landscape, ethical theories were often anchored in the study of animal behaviour, most elaborately in case of the Stoic concept of *oikeiōsis* (Klein 2016). For Stoics, both the behaviour of animals and the human pursuit of virtue were manifestations of the innate tendency of any organism to pursue its proper activities. This discourse contributed to moral interpretations of animal behaviour in which certain animal species embodied specific virtues and vices.

An important, heavily debated virtue in this context was *philostorgia* ('parental affection') among animate beings. The Stoics in particular argued that *philostorgia* is universal and natural.



They also drew a sharp distinction between humans and other animals: where human *philostorgia* led to the development of communality and justice, fundamental to human civilization, animals cannot advance beyond *philostorgia* because they lack reason.

These assumptions were refuted by other thinkers through the interpretation of animal behaviour. In this paper, I will explore the discourse about *philostorgia* through the example of the dogfish shark (*kuōn* or *galeos*). Its care for its offspring is mentioned already by Aristotle (*HA* 565b23), presented as a purely biological fact. In Plutarch's *De sollertia animalium*, however, this behaviour is interpreted as a paradigm of *philostorgia* and used to refute the Stoic position that animals do not possess reason. Similarly, in *De amore prolis*, the dogfish's parental affection features in the context of a diatribe against the Epicurean denouncement of *philostorgia* (as Roskam 2011 interpreted Plutarch's text). The dogfish's *philostorgia* also has philosophical significance in Oppian's *Halieutica*, a didactic epic about fishing (176–180 CE). Oppian uses the same fish to argue, against the Stoics, that animals also develop communality and have a faculty of choice (*proairesis*). Both authors therefore give their dogfish anecdotes philosophical significance.

---

## MICHIEL MEEUSEN

### *Plutarch and the 'Age of Hypochondria'*

As the “most Greek of Greeks” (Nutton 2013<sup>2</sup>, 14) Plutarch had a keen interest in the world of medicine: by far the most Greek art (τέχνη) of all. Throughout his writings, Plutarch quotes past doctors in support of his own arguments and stages contemporary physicians as interlocutors in fictional debates. In his *Precepts of Healthcare*, most notably, we find a lively dialogue between a physician and his friend concerning the impact of intellectual living on the human body and mind. Plutarch there instrumentalises a vast range of medical knowledge in support of his ethical agenda of *Seelenheilung* (dubbed ‘diet-ethics’: Van Hoof 2010, 211–54). But debates on medical topics are also described, for instance, in the sympotic *Table Talk*, where the approach is more intellectualist in kind (Meeusen forthcoming 1), and where a medical intertext is present throughout (Vamvouri Ruffy 2012).

As the evidence shows, there seems to have been something of a trend towards medical vulgarisation in the Early Roman Empire, with certain theories, concepts and beliefs relating to health and healing becoming increasingly ‘popular’ – to the extent that some even speak of an ‘Age of Hypochondria’ (Bowersock 1969, 71–5, Baldwin 1975, 27). Numerous other eminent authors from this period (such as Apuleius, Aristides, Athenaeus, Celsus, Epictetus, Favorinus, Gellius, Pliny, Seneca) wrote extensively about medicine and health related topics, and also expected their readers to share that interest. Apart from scholars showing linguistic interest in medical definitions (e.g., Gellius in his *Attic Nights*: Meeusen forthcoming 2), medical topics were popular topics of debate at symposia and dinner parties (e.g., Athenaeus' *Deipnosophists*: Flemming 2000), and medical arguments were produced as supporting evidence even in court (Apuleius' *Apology*: Israelowich 2016).

The existence of such learned lay men and women, including amateur doctors (*filiatroi*), is a characteristic that distinguishes Graeco-Roman medicine from that of many other societies (Jouanna 1999, 351–2; Luchner 2004; on lay attitudes towards medicine in classical antiquity more generally: Nutton 1985). Within this fascinating, and still under-explored field, my interest will be specifically in the uptake and use of medical knowledge in contemporary literate milieus, in particular Plutarch's. By using the *Moralia* and *Vitae* as its starting points, this study aims to contribute to our better understanding of how, as a branch of learning, medicine became so indispensable to the educated elite (*pepaideumenoi*) in the Early Imperial era serving as a token of Greek culture/acclturation in an increasingly Roman world.

Given the comparative nature of this Congress, in this paper we will analyze the different vision of Pliny the Younger and Plutarch regarding the activity to be performed by upper-class men during their old age. Both authors, although contemporary and belonging to the social elite, show clear discrepancies regarding the consideration of the role that elders should play in their respective societies. Thus, while the former defended in his *Epistulae* that a man, after a long life devoted to the service of the State, could (and should) withdraw from political life and enjoy a well-deserved *otium*, for Plutarch this attitude was totally unacceptable since the elder, in his opinion, should remain, as is perfectly stated in *An seni sit gerenda res publica* – one of his best-known treaties inside the *Moralia*, strongly linked to the politics of his community, since his experience could still be very useful at several different levels. In this paper we will try to explain the possible causes of this divergence of opinions, considering aspects such as the different social extraction of these authors (Pliny the Younger was a senator who was named *consul suffectus* in 100 CE, while Plutarch was just a member of the Achaian elite) or the different background of their writings. In the last section of the paper we will evaluate Plutarch's reaction to the attitude of those characters who, inside his *Parallel Lives*, abandoned their public functions in their last years to enjoy *otium*. Given the necessary brevity of this paper, only the cases of Sulla and Lucullus will be analyzed.

During the second part of the 20th century, modern historiography has taken a keen interest in the historical processes on the Eastern shores of the Adriatic that eventually led to the formation of the province of Illyricum. The information stemming from Appian, Cassius Dio, Caesar, Suetonius, Cicero, Velleius Paterculus *etc.* has served as the basis for modern analyses of the political, social and military aspect of Illyricum until the integration of indigenous populations of the Eastern Adriatic into the Roman system. Yet, when it comes to Gaius Julius Caesar, *lex Vatinia* and the effective formation of the province of Illyricum in 59 B.C., this information, although studied in detail, is often contradictory and does not give a clear picture on the extent of Caesar's imperium. Questions such as whether Caesar commanded over Illyricum as a part of his imperium over the Gauls or not are still considered problematic. However, despite the tendency of modern historiography to revise old theories with a thorough analysis of all the available information, Plutarch and his contribution to the topic have been neglected so far. Therefore, this paper intends to give several key aspects of Plutarch's information on Illyricum in the middle of the first century B.C., with emphasis on *lex Vatinia* and Caesar's governorship of Illyricum. That is, the paper will: 1) analyse the misuse of Plutarch's information in arguing the circumstances revolving Caesar's command over Illyricum; 2) provide new insights on Plutarch's use of sources when writing about Illyricum in the first century B.C.; 3) expand on the existing analyses of Plutarch's (un)consistency of using one information in several of his biographies (with regard to Illyricum); and 4) provide new views on Plutarch's value not only as a source for the history of the first century B.C. but for studying the processes that formed the province of Illyricum.

**REBECCA MOORMAN**

Providence College

*In Response to Plato: Plutarch and Apuleius on the Ancient Quarrel*

This paper will trace the development of Platonic attitudes toward poetry and rhetoric in the first and second centuries through the writings of Plutarch and Apuleius. Each author's harmonious incorporation of philosophy and poetic discourse appears to mark a significant change in thinking from the fourth century BCE, when Plato described rhetoric as a "pseudo-art" and banned poetry from his ideal city (*Gorg.* 463a–465e, *Phaedr.* 260d–261a, *Rep.* 10.607d–e). Rather than a betrayal of Plato, however, Plutarch and Apuleius' use of poetry and rhetoric is consistent with each author's personal interpretation of Plato's doctrine. In his two major pedagogical treatises, *How to Study Poetry* and *On Listening to Lectures*, Plutarch supports a mixture of philosophy and poetic discourse in which poetry and rhetoric are complementary to philosophy.

Going even further, Apuleius in the *Florida* promotes pleasurable diction and style to a status equal to philosophy. The two components of philosophical discourse are *tempore iugis*: they occur at the same time, without one holding precedence over the other (Fl. 13.3). Apuleius and Plutarch's welcoming attitudes toward rhetoric and poetry represent a general movement in Middle Platonism to reconcile the "ancient quarrels" between poetic discourse and philosophy.

---

**DANIELE MORRONE**

University of Bologna

*Chemical Wonders in Plutarch and Apuleius*

In the last decades, natural philosophy has come to be recognized as an important part of Plutarch's intellectual profile. Shortly after Plutarch's death, Apuleius was born. He was a (Middle) Platonist as well, and displayed, like Plutarch, both a high regard for natural philosophy and an active engagement in scientific research and aetiology (as explicitly attested in the *Apologia*). It appears to be no coincidence that Apuleius makes of his fictional *alter ego* Lucius a descendant of Plutarch, as the philosophical attitudes of these authors do share common traits: both show disregard for superstitious beliefs, and prefer to maintain a rational, and always pious, disposition towards phenomena. This is exhibited by Plutarch when he tries to account for the *mirabilia* scattered throughout his *corpus*: in the *Vitae parallelae* entire digressions are dedicated to the natural causes of alleged supernatural omens, and the *Moralia* abound in explanations of phenomena that cause astonishment (*thaumázein*) due to their apparent unreasonableness or rarity. Apuleius's *Metamorphoses* is also packed with wondrous events for the entertainment of the reader – such as *praesagia* of which no rational account is ever given – but *mirabilia* can also be found in Apuleius's other works, sometimes with a scientific framing (e.g. the notes on the chemical composition of daemons in *Deo Socr.* IX–X, qualified as possible *incredibilia*). In this paper I will focus on marvellous events of chemical relevance – i.e. concerning the behaviour and state of non-living matter – in the works of Plutarch and Apuleius, to compare their different philosophical and/or literary functions, stylistic features and scientific frameworks. Then, since Plutarch wrote *Quaestiones* and Apuleius, apparently, a collection of astonishing *Astronomica* (fr. 22–25 Beaujeau), I will also link both authors to the philosophical and literary traditions of *problemata physika* and paradoxography, to discover elements of continuity as well as personal traits.

**THIERRY OPPENEER**

*Speaking to the People in Theory and Action: Plutarch's Political Precepts and Dio's Assembly Speeches*

Ghent University

In the *Political precepts*, Plutarch advises his readers on the political life of the Greek city under Rome. Whereas other philosophers merely encourage their audience to engage in politics but offer no instructions on how to do so, Plutarch claims to provide his readers with the instructions they need to become successful in the political life of their hometowns. Many scholars, however, regard his portrayal of the civic statesman as highly idealistic, quaintly ambitious and out of touch with the political norms of the period; an effect that has been ascribed to the author's philosophical and moralising agenda. This paper, by contrast, examines the practical usefulness of Plutarch's advice by comparing it to the speeches Dio of Prusa pronounced before the assembly of his native city (*Orr.* 40, 43–48, 51). Although the *Political Precepts* is best known for the few passages that vividly depict the impact of Roman rule on the Greek city, most instructions deal with the relationship between politicians and the people (§3–9, 24–31). While the *Political Precepts* contains the advice of one elite politician to the other, the orations of Dio were designed to persuade the city's *demos* gathered in the assembly. The works of Dio and Plutarch thus provide us with two radically different perspectives on the phenomenon of popular politics, which, as recent studies have shown, still constituted a vital aspect of civic life in the imperial period. In this paper, I will compare Plutarch's advice on demagogic rhetoric (§5–9) to Dio's rhetorical strategies in order to discern the different ways in which these authors responded to, and engaged in, the political life of the imperial *poleis*. This makes it possible to evaluate Plutarch's claims about the usefulness of his advice and improve our understanding of the text and the meaning it had for its original audience. The conclusions of this paper are likely to give further reasons for considering Plutarch not only as a philosopher or moralist but also as someone whose works actively shaped the political life of his time.

---

**CHARLES W. OUGHTON**

*Pliny and Plutarch on the Indefatigable Commander*

Brigham Young University

This project examines how the character sketches of Trajan and Caesar in Pliny's *Panegyricus* and Plutarch's *Life of Caesar*, respectively, draw a powerful connection between these two commanders, despite the reluctance that Plutarch shows for connecting his Caesar with Trajan elsewhere (Pelling 2002 and 2011). In so doing, I build upon scholarship on the complicated nature of ambition and military prowess in the *Lives* (Duff 1999, Buszard 2008, Beneker 2012), the relationship between Caesar and other Late-Republican subjects (Pelling 2002, Beneker 2004), as well as studies on the purpose of Pliny's *Panegyricus* (Henderson 2011, Roche 2011, Bartsch 2012) and the contemporary fervor for Republican nostalgia (e.g. Van der Blom 2017). Pliny's *Panegyricus* is effusive in its praise of the emperor. Pliny's character sketch (12–13) invites comparisons to notable generals of the past. The subsequent narrative of Trajan's journey from Spain to Germany (14) draws parallels to Caesar—a comparison Trajan himself favored. Pliny's description of the emperor's military prowess lists qualities ancient authors consider the hallmarks of good generalship: the endurance of hot and cold, hunger and thirst; venturing into the thick of the battle; and the ability to shirk sleep or, when forced, to sleep in simple circumstances. While Plutarch's sketch in the *Life of Caesar* (15–17) contains similar qualities, the subjects of other *Lives* call to question whether these are positive traits or not: e.g. *Mar.* 7, *Philop.* 3–5, *Pyrrh.* 8, and *Cor.* 1–2. Another intertextual node to which Pliny and Plutarch allude here recalls the sketches of Hannibal (Livy 21.4), Catiline (Sal. *BC* 5) and Jugurtha (*BJ* 6), who each posed a serious threat to Rome. The web of references to the sketches of earlier generals complicates Pliny's seemingly straightforward praise of Trajan while Plutarch's more nuanced

take reveals how contemporary views of generalship may have colored the reception of these figures.

---

**GIOVANNA PACE**

University of Salerno

*Plutarch, Seneca and the Greek tragedy*

This paper aims to compare the reuse of the text of Greek tragedy in Plutarch and Seneca (both in his own tragedies and in the few quotations in his prose works), in order to observe analogies and differences in the approach of these two different types of thinkers and writers. Some quotations from Euripides by Plutarch adhere to the original context, that is also reproduced in Seneca's tragedies. Similarly, the Plutarchean criticism (*De aud. poet.* 28A) to the attribution of guilt by Helena to Hecuba in Euripides' *Troades* corresponds to the omission of this aspect in the tragedy by Seneca. Conversely, the quotation of Soph. *OT* 110 s. in *De fort.* 98A aims to counter the stoic idea that the virtues are a product of *tyche*, whereas in the (Stoic-inspired) *Oedipus* by Seneca *fatum* plays an important (even if not exclusive) role. In the pseudo-Plutarchean *Consolatio ad Apollonium* the quotation of Soph. *OT* 479 (117A) is modified in order to communicate the idea that the man (not the god) is responsible for his own suffering, just like in Sen. *Oed.* 630 s. *patria, non ira deum, / sed scelere raperis*; the quotation of Eur. *Tr.* 636 (109F) introduces the idea (absent in the original context) of the identity of life before and after the death, for which we can compare Sen. *Tr.* 407 s. For what concerns the two Euripides' verses quoted both by Seneca and Plutarch, the first (*Ph.* 469), because of its sententious nature, is reused by the two writers to strengthen their arguments in contexts different from the original one and each from another; the second (*Cresph.* 449,4), originally part of a *laudatio mortis*, is subject to comic distortion, in Seneca's *Apokolokyntosis* directed against Claudius and in Plutarch's *Quaestiones convivales* against a haughty stranger in a symposiac context.

---

**FRANCESCO PADOVANI**

Università di Pisa

*Plutarch and Lucian about Herodotus' Historiography: A Matter of Paideia?*

Plutarch was deeply concerned with Greek cultural self-representation in the highly competitive context of the Greco-Roman world. His wide conception of *paideia* couldn't avoid a confrontation with history, one which goes beyond the composition of the historical-biographical accounts of the *Parallel Lives*. We know from *Lamprias' Catalogue* that Plutarch composed a work on *How to write History* (n. 124) but no critical attention has been devoted to the comparison with Lucian's work on the same theme. Plutarch's essay *De Herodoti malignitate* displays the author's aversion to Herodotus' historiography. His criticism indirectly raises the crucial question: What's the aim of history? and highlights Plutarch's worries about the ethical implications of historiography. He and Lucian share the concern about truth and correctness in judgement, but the two authors show a different conception of both values and enact different strategies in developing their points of view. They also give a different evaluation of Herodotus' historiography: both of them appreciate his literary style (Lucian even wrote a praise of Herodotus as a kind of sophist *ante litteram*), but consider Thucydides the unparalleled master of Greek historiography. They diverge primarily in their political perspectives: Lucian's essay targets the historians of his time supportive of the Roman government, while Plutarch apparently aims to correct Herodotus' mistakes about Greece's past. This paper aims to offer a comparative analysis of Plutarch's and Lucian's attitude towards history from a theoretical standpoint, focusing on their different evaluation of Herodotus' historiography. Particular attention will be devoted to their different conceptions of *paideia* and to the ethical and political repercussions their approaches involve. The comparison with other writers such as Maximus of

Tyre, Aelius Aristides and Dionysius of Halicarnassus should lead to a more precise understanding of the contemporary debate about history in which Plutarch and Lucian developed their reflections.

---

**AURELIO PÉREZ-JIMÉNEZ**

Universidad de Málaga

*Las Vidas Paralelas de Plutarco y la Literatura Cristiana Antigua. El Caso de Alejandro*

It is well known the Plutarch's influence on the Christian thought of the imperial era, especially in authors such as Clement of Alexandria, Origenes, Eusebius of Caesarea and Basil the Great, who not only cite him, but even, without explicit citing, are directly inspired by some Plutarch's theological and ethical treatises concerning the structure of their writings related to same topics as those of the Cheronense. In this sense, the use of the *Moralia* by Greek Christian Apologists and Fathers of the Church has received sufficient attention from modern bibliography, especially in the last decades of the twentieth century and so far in the 21st century. Less researched has been, however, the imprint left by the *Parallel Lives* on the Greek Christian authors of the first five centuries of our Age. My paper will focus on this aspect of Plutarch's reception. The first part will provide an overview (based on modern literature about this topic and on the reading of Christian texts) of possible references in Ancient Christian Literature to the characters of Plutarch's *Lives*. In the second part I will focus on the Plutarch's Alexander as being a moral model, an object of apologetic criticism or a historical reference for Christian authors, as well as on the reproduction of specific passages in their writings, such as Alexander's meeting with the Brahman sages in the *Stromata* of Clement of Alexandria. Alexander and the Christians has been the subject of recent studies by Christian Thru Djurslev, whose PhD Thesis (*The Christian Alexander. The Use of Alexander the Great in Early Christian Literature*) will be published as a monograph during next December (expected 12.12.2019). This work, which I have not yet been able to consult, seems to have broader interests that exceed the *Quellenforschung* when analyzing Alexander's presence in early Christian Literature. My approach (modifiable to the extent required by the reading of this monograph) will pay attention only to the themes of Plutarch's works on Alexander.

---

**KATARZYNA PIETRUCZUK**

University of Warsaw

*Telling History through the Stories of Libraries in Plutarch*

In his seminal discussion titled 'Libraries and *paideia* in the Second Sophistic: Plutarch and Galen' (in König, Oikonomopoulou and Woolf 2013), Alexei Zadorojnyi observed that while sparing his readers details on contemporary libraries and his visits and work in these, Plutarch mentions in his writings famous libraries of the past and 'these libraries are treated as sites where powerful Romans interact, sometimes drastically, with book culture'. I argue that passages in Plutarch on the history of famous libraries – such as the passages on how the Brucheion, one of the two royal libraries of Alexandria, was accidentally burned by Julius Caesar (*Caes.* 49.5–8), on the presenting of the book collection of the Pergamene library by Antonius to Cleopatra (*Ant.* 58.9), on the confiscation of the library of Aristotle from Apellicon by Sulla during the sack of Athens (*Sull.* 26.1) – allow us to reach further conclusions regarding Plutarch's view of history. The famous book collections that are iconic of the main cultural centres before the Imperial age, namely Athens, Alexandria and Pergamum, belong in Plutarch's narratives to the discourse on decay, whereas the context for mentioning Roman libraries is their foundation and organization, as is the case with the dedication of a library to the memory of Marcellus by Octavia (*Marc.* 30.11) or the library of Lucullus, whom Plutarch introduces as the ideal Roman user of the heritage of the Greeks (*Luc.* 42.1–4). Plutarch, whose representations of

contemporary intellectual life involve the model of education through lively debate rather than antiquarian pursuits, may be seen to be telling the history of the Hellenistic age as the history of pre-Roman libraries; their seizure or destruction closely accompanies the Roman conquest of the world. By reading Plutarch's accounts on the ruin of famous libraries against sources on the same episodes by other authors, I will discuss in my paper the distinctive feature of the former ones, which will allow me to cast light on Plutarch's broader agenda. I will approach Plutarch's vision of the history of book collections as a key to understanding the purport of his narrative on the main cultural centres of the Hellenistic age and their relationships with one another.

---

#### ELENI PLATI

*Image as a Reflection of 'Genre' in Plutarch's Quomodo adulescens poetas audire debeat and Lucian's Quomodo historia conscribenda sit*

Both Plutarch's and Lucian's texts exhibit a profound awareness of the metaphorical relationship between image (εἰκόν) and genre. The aim of this paper is to explore the metaphorical role of visual imagery in defining genre in Plutarch's treatise *How a young man should listen to the poets* and in Lucian's one *How to write history*. Shifting from the different addressee of each treatise (i.e. that of historian, in the case of Lucian, and that of the reader of poetry, in the case of Plutarch), I analyze the points of convergence reflected in their image metaphors. Both writers emphasize the role of the reader as spectator, who must have the impression of seeing before his eyes what is described either by the poet or by the historian. It is thus the metaphor of 'reader as spectator' which constitutes the basic 'inter-generic' crossing of history and poetry. As for Lucian, the addressees of history are not constrained to the role of spectator. Rather they are "all eyes like Argus, but keener than he (ὀξύτερον μὲν τοῦ Ἄργου ὀρῶντας), who test every word as a moneychanger might his coins, rejecting the false on the spot, but accepting the good and heavy and true" (10.5–12). In addition, the famous saying of Simonides: "ζωγραφίαν μὲν εἶναι φθεγγομένην τὴν ποίησιν, ποίησιν δὲ σιγῶσαν τὴν ζωγραφίαν", quoted by Plutarch (17e–18f) underlines the role of *mimesis* comparing poetry to painting "which speaks". In this respect, I point to parallels between Plutarch's and Lucian's treatises focusing on metaphors that are based on vision (of catoptric, mirroring or representative art). To sum up, I conclude with representational types of metaphorical images, which function as indicators of genre.

---

#### GEERT ROSKAM

KU Leuven

*Plutarch and Maximus of Tyre on Epicurean Pleasure*

In his dialogue *Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum*, Plutarch tries to refute the Epicurean philosophy of pleasure from the inside. He accepts, for the sake of the argument, Epicurus' ideal and doctrines and then shows that it is impossible to live a pleasurable life on the basis of such philosophical principles. The implication of Plutarch's argument is clear: Epicurean philosophy fails to reach its own goal and Platonism is a much better alternative when it comes to pursuing pleasure.

Maximus of Tyre confronts virtue and pleasure in a series of orations (*Orat.* 29–33). Like Plutarch, he rejects Epicurus' view, but rather than systematically undermining Epicurus' position from the inside, he prefers to argue *in contrarias partes*, by attacking, defending, and again attacking the Epicurean ideal. At the end of the series, the exercise of wisdom is enthroned as the proper human ideal of life.

While both authors obviously follow a different argumentative strategy, they nevertheless have much in common, as will be shown in this paper. Plutarch and Maximus share the same Platonic tradition and the same critical reception of Epicurus. Moreover, they make use of similar arguments (both in favour of and against Epicurus), which they cleverly adapt to the needs of their own authorial goals. The paper, however, will also throw light on the differences between the two authors (both regarding the content of their arguments and regarding their general philosophical approach and methodology).

---

**THOMAS SCHMIDT**

University of Fribourg

*“Leave Them to the Sophists!”: The Persian-Wars Theme from Plutarch to Lucian*

In a well-known and much-discussed passage of his *Political Precepts* (*Praec. ger. reip.* 814a–c), Plutarch advises the young Menemachos of Sardis (and, through him, all Greek political leaders of his time) to avoid the topic of the Persian Wars in public speech and to “leave Marathon, the Eurymedon, Plataea, and all the other examples which make the common folk vainly to swell with pride and kick up their heels, to the schools of the sophists”. Plutarch himself abundantly treated the Persian Wars in his *Parallels Lives*, but, as other scholars have shown, this does not stand in contradiction with his appeal for caution in handling this potentially dangerous theme in public. To what extent was this advice followed by Plutarch’s contemporaries? Although the Persian Wars seem to have been a popular theme among the sophists of the Second Sophistic, as can be deduced from Philostratos’ account in his *Lives of the Sophists*, too little remains of their works as to allow a fair answer to this question. However, by briefly looking at the treatment of the Persian Wars in various texts ranging from Plutarch to Lucian, focusing especially on Dio of Prusa, Polemon of Laodiceia and Aelius Aristides, I will argue that each generation of Greek intellectuals in the time of the Second Sophistic seems to have had a different way of responding to Plutarch’s advice (and, more generally, to Roman rule), in accordance with the changing political circumstances under the High Roman Empire.

---

**ELSA GIOVANNA SIMONETTI**

KU Leuven

*The Concept of σωτηρία in Imperial Philosophy*

Thirst for salvation acquires an unprecedented importance in the philosophy of the first two centuries AD. Plutarch of Chaeronea is one of the thinkers that have developed an original soteriological theory, with complex ontological and theological overtones, together with Apuleius of Madauros, Maximus of Tyre, Numenius of Apamea.

This paper aims to show the possible overlaps, differences and interactions amongst the respective accounts of σωτηρία developed by these authors, the theoretical background and ethical foundation of this notion, the relationship in which it stands with theological knowledge, and the interferences between philosophical discourse and mystery rites.

By so doing, the present contribution will address the following core questions: is it possible to detect a unified perspective on σωτηρία shared by these writers? Do they hint to a universal form of salvation, or do they rather argue for an individualistic or even elitist soteriological path? Is σωτηρία something that pertains exclusively to the transcendent dimension, or can it be reached in this world, *hic et nunc*? And, more generally, what does it mean to ‘achieve salvation’ in the early imperial times?

---



Plutarch was, in Donald Russell's words, 'a declared and consistent Platonist'. He regarded both Stoics and Epicureans as pernicious rivals. Ten of his essays are devoted to attacks on Epicurean philosophy, some in more general terms and some through detailed attention to Epicurean arguments (notably *In Colotem* and *non posse suaviter vivi...*). But *de tranq. animi*, for example, has a rather Epicurean theme, and some of its points seem more Epicurean than Plutarch knows (e.g. his use of the familiar sceptical argument about how tastes change in illness (468F), and his discussion of instability of self (473D)). *De cohibenda ira* seems to show familiarity with Seneca's work on the subject as well as Philodemus'.

Epicurean philosophy was a frequent object of philosophical attack in the Augustan period (Diog. Laert. 10.1-9). Is Plutarch, in attacking Colotes for example, simply taking part in centuries-old debates? I look at the evidence for the continued flourishing of Epicurean philosophy into the second century and beyond. Galen, for example, owned eight anti-Epicurean books. Diogenes of Oenoanda is a prime example of a second century Epicurean, while Diogenes Laertius states that the school had a long unbroken history. Plutarch makes clear that he was a participant in a lively discussion-group on the subject, even if some of the interlocutors he names cannot be further identified.

Plutarch's most detailed discussions of Epicurean philosophy are the focus of this paper, which sets out to examine Plutarch's engagement with Epicurean opponents and the quality of his arguments. Is Plutarch fair to the Epicureans? Sometimes he certainly misrepresents Epicurean ideas (*Brutus* 36ff), as Cicero, it can be argued, had done before him; a common distortion is the presentation of Epicurus' 'hedonism' as debauchery. But the arguments in the major essays are intricate and serious, though I hesitate to say that Plutarch wins.

The paper is part of a larger project to investigate the philosophical affinities of Epicureanism in the ancient world.

Plutarch opens his biography of Lycurgus with a discussion of the difficulties arising from dealing with various versions of his life and work. He then refers to the Spartan lawgiver's famous ancestors, recounts his deeds and concludes with an encomium and the story of his death. *Prima facie*, the *Life of Lycurgus* seems like a typical Plutarchan biography. However, while the work retains its biographical structure, the bulk of it is devoted to the Spartan constitution. Why does Plutarch go astray from the genre of biography, mixing it with *politeia*? The explanation lies in the nature of his hero as well as his attitude towards contemporary politics.

This study examines the *Life of Lycurgus* in three stages: first, a scrutiny of its structure and contents; second, a comparison of the *Lycurgus* with Plutarch's other biographies, of both historical and mythical figures; and third, a comparison of Plutarch's *Lycurgus* with Tacitus' *Agricola*, its almost exact contemporary, and with the biographies of Suetonius, its near contemporary. It will be argued that although Plutarch does not define Lycurgus as a mythical character, and although he makes clear that Theseus and Lycurgus belong to different periods of time, his working methods and the contents of the *Lycurgus* suggest otherwise. In writing the biography of the Spartan lawgiver, Plutarch faced problems similar to those encountered by the writers of myths, above all the scarcity of reliable information. It is possible, therefore, that he mingled the Lakedaimonian *politeia* in the biography of its "father", aiming to add both substance and credibility to the *bios* of a figure deliberately presented by him as historical.

Moreover, while Suetonius opts for a different structure, arranging part of his material *per species*, Tacitus, like Plutarch, amalgamates biography with other literary genres and makes extensive use of digressions in his *Agricola*. It appears that both Tacitus and Plutarch employ these literary techniques to convey their concern with political issues of the age of Trajan. Whereas Tacitus' historical narrative and geographical depiction of Britain serves the political agenda of the *Agricola*, Plutarch, by praising the Spartan public education and preferring it to the Roman educational system, not only shows his attitude towards Greek cultural heritage, but also contributes to the discussion of the nature of education that was alive in Rome in his day.

---

**FABIO TANGA**

Università degli Studi di Salerno

*Artemid. Oneirocrit. 4.72 and Plutarch's Last Premonitory Dream*

Plutarch's *Vitae Parallelae* and *Moralia* show multiple references to dreams as crucial moments and distinctive features for the understanding of the Plutarchan thought inside the philosophical, literary and intellectual culture of the early imperial period. And Artemid. *Oneirocrit. 4.72*, in a section entitled Περὶ θεῶν ἀνοικείων σκευῆν ἐχόντων, describes Plutarch trying to interpret a premonitory dream in one of the last moments of his life. So, the biographer's view about dreams crosses the dreams of the biographer through the point of view of a contemporary writer. And the quotation of a meaningful moment of Plutarch's life in Artemidorus' work, as model for a contemporary narrative and rhetorical strategy, creates an interesting intersection between oneiric dimension, investigation of dreams, comparative and philological approach, literary analysis, reception and identification of themes and individualizing modifications realized by authors of the early empire.

---

**THEOFANIS TSAMPOKALOS**

Universität Trier

*Plutarch in the Middle of a Conflict between Epictetus and Favorinus*

Due to a reference by Galen in his work *On the Best Instruction* we can infer that at some point in the course of the second century A.D., the name of Plutarch was entangled in a conflict between two contemporary philosophers, namely Favorinus of Arles, a friend and adherent of Plutarch, and the famous Stoic teacher Epictetus. The cause behind this conflict was the allegedly controversial way in which some modern-day Academic philosophers, in their teaching, were employing suspension of judgment. According to Galen, Favorinus defended this method in three different texts he wrote: a treatise *On the Academic Disposition*, also called *Plutarch*, a dialogue entitled *Against Epictetus*, in which a certain Onesimus, a slave of Plutarch's, was supposed to exchange arguments with the Stoic philosopher, and a book bearing the title *Alcibiades*. This is all the more surprising since Plutarch never mentions Epictetus in his writings. However, research in Arrian's *Discourses of Epictetus* has already indicated passages that make it quite plausible that Plutarch possibly stood behind the method that Favorinus defends. What is still lacking is more stable evidence from Plutarch's own texts. With this end in view, Plutarch's dialogue *On the Cleverness of Animals* appears quite promising. For the most part this dialogue portrays a semi-rhetorical/semi-dialectical debate between two students in Plutarch's own philosophical school in Chaeronea. My aim in this paper is to examine whether the portrayal of this debate can help us better contextualise Plutarch in regard to the epistemological conflict between Favorinus and Epictetus which Galen refers to.

---

## MARIA VAMVOURI

### *Cosmopolitization and Multi-Local Identities in Plutarch's, Favorinus' and Dio's Writings on Exile*

The paper examines the ways Plutarch, Favorinus and Dio represent the space of the interconnected world of the Roman empire in which they lived. In their treatises *On Exile*, all the three writers offer a solace to exile and invite the reader or the audience to think about the deeper meaning of space, homeland and exile. Through specific proposals and discursive devices, they expose the artificiality of exile and borders, but they also question and undermine, the autocratic power of the emperor who banishes his enemies. Plutarch's exhortation to look up to the sky, Favorinus' proposal to wear a mask and to momentarily become someone else as an actors does, Dio's in-betweenness, all these constructed positionalities underline how multi-local and decentered a person, exile or not, is or should be seen.

The construction of multilocal and de-centered identities within the discourse, reflects the social reality of cosmopolitization i.e the accumulation of identities and experiences that raised awareness of belonging to a common world. But to what extent the construction of multi-local identities in these treatises hides a critical stance towards the closure of space the banished were faced with, and towards the authority that was responsible for their exile? Is philosophical cosmopolitization a subversive answer to exile, an act of resistance against authoritarian power, exclusion and confinement? Finally, what is Plutarch's specific technique to refer to politics and to Roman policy about space?

---

## LAURENS VAN DER WIEL

KU Leuven

### *Exempla for the Emperors. A Comparison of Valerius Maximus' Memorabilia and Plutarch's Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*

There are many similarities between Valerius Maximus' *Facta et dicta memorabilia*, written during Tiberius' reign, and Plutarch's *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*, of which the authenticity has been convincingly defended by recent scholarship and which was presumably written during the reign of Trajan. Both the Greek and the Latin text are anecdote collections which open with a dedication to the Roman emperor, and contain short stories about Romans, Greeks, and barbarians. This paper will start with a detailed comparison of the introductions at the outset of both collections. First of all, an answer to the following questions concerning the similarities between these two dedicatory introductions will be provided: what does the resemblance between these texts tell us about the type of text we are dealing with? And is it possible that Plutarch had Valerius Maximus' text in mind when he wrote his collection? Secondly, the differences between the statements in the two introductions will be taken into account: these reveal how Valerius Maximus' and Plutarch's way of thinking, their way of working while compiling their anecdote collections, as well as their goals, differ from each other. Subsequently, the anecdote collections themselves will be addressed, focusing on the following issues: are these collections consistent with the statements of the authors in their introductions? And to what extent do the differences between the two introductions explain the discrepancies in their authors' approach in structuring their collections? In the concluding remarks, two last questions will be dealt with: what is the relevance of these works for the Roman emperors? And can we, despite the many differences between the Greek and Latin work, still speak of the same type of text?

**PAOLA VOLPE**

University of Salerno

*Ps.-Plutarch's De fato: Fate and Free Will*

What is fate? How does it affect men's lives? And are they free, or are their actions conditioned by this looming force? These were the questions that the ancients asked themselves or tried to answer. Fate, according to Chrysippus, is "ordinem seriemque causarum, cum causae causa nexa rem ex se gignat" (Cic. *div.* 1.125). So, fate is "the reason why the past has been, the present is, the future will be" (SVF II 913) and it is an "eternal, continuous and orderly movement" (SVF II 916). According to this idea, that was explained also by Seneca, only the wise man, acting in accordance with it, can recognize – and does not complain about – the inexorable law to which he does not obey. And the Epicureans and Academic-Peripatetic philosophers were against this idea. Taking inspiration from the definition of crisis, we want to retrace the various stages of this theory, starting from the Ps.-Plutarch's idea of fate, and also considering the qualitative comparison with the law of the State, which "subordinates (...) most of its prescriptions on a condition (...) <and> embraces the State with formulas of universal importance" (569D5–7). So, we will recall Heraclitus' work (*Vors.* 22 B 114 D.K.), Empedocles' work (*Vors.* 31 B 135 D.K.), and, later, Plato's work (*Leg.* 904) to investigate some passages of Plutarch's work, trying to realize a comparative study with other authors who wrote about fate and free will in the period between the 1st and the 2nd century A.D.

---

**LUNETTE WARREN**

*The 'Problem' of Gender in Plutarch*

Plutarch has a high opinion of women's intellect. In his work, he creates space for women to attain virtuous masculinity. By submitting the feminine part of her soul, her emotions, to the masculine reason of her mind she can achieve harmony in her household and her soul. Plutarch is responding to contemporary discourse; his views on women has many parallels in Musonius Rufus' lectures and Hierocles' *Elements of Ethics*. The masculine woman is ideally feminine, but small exceptions can be made. She should never forget that it is her soul that is masculine and not her body. *Advice and Virtues* codifies what that means. Don't grieve too hard, don't wear shiny things, don't talk too much, always support your man. From this same time around the rise of the Roman empire to the start of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century CE, a significant body of work on queerness is extant. Ovid explains in the *Metamorphosis* how Hermaphroditus came to be intersex, and Lucian in *Dialogues of the Courtesans* pens a suggestive conversation between courtesans in which sex and gender are destabilised. Plutarch himself writes of Hypsicrateia, a woman so masculine Mithridates called her Hypsicrates. Compared to Valerius Maximus, who refers to Hypsicrateia as queen and wife to Mithridates, Plutarch's view is not favourable; to him she is a *pallakē*. The manly woman and the effeminate man are a consistent obstacle in Plutarch's attempt to exalt the women in his life for their masculine virtue. They cause the fall of empires and civilisations, topple kings to take their thrones, and meddle in the business of men. To solve this problem, Plutarch turns to metaphysics, where Truth awaits. Is gender... *real*? According to Plato (says Plutarch), it depends whose gender we're talking about.

---

**ALEXEI V ZADOROJNYI**

University of Liverpool

*The Elephant in the Room? Plutarchan Legacy in Philostratus' Life of Apollonius of Tyana*

Plutarch was on the radar of Flavius Philostratus, to judge especially by the overt if cryptic reference in Philostratus's *Letter* 73. The intertextual relationship between Philostratus's *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* and the Plutarchan oeuvre remains, however, an open question (Van der

Stockt 2009 addresses some of the interpretative problems as well as opportunities; there is no way of telling whether Philostratus was drawing upon Plutarch's *Life of Nero*). This paper aims to take the debate further by exploring several instances of latent polemical response to Plutarch in the *Life of Apollonius* (hereafter *VA*).

Typically, *VA* forays into Plutarchan discursive turf for the sake of framing the superior insight of Philostratus's characters (*VA* 6.11.16 on oracles in verse; *VA* 5.13.2 ~ *Galba* 1.8; *VA* 2.14.1 on love for offspring) or the knowledge of the narrator (*VA* 2.20.3–21.2 and 2.12.2 on king Porus and his elephant); likewise, the challenges and threats faced by Apollonius can be emphasized via juxtaposition with *prima facie* Plutarchan material (*VA* 7.21 ~ *Aristides* 7.7–8). In short, it is tempting to read into *VA* a competitive attitude towards Plutarch as an influential author from the era which *VA* labels “neither ancient nor modern” (1.2.1). Yet such a reading carries the risk of confirmation bias – after all, Philostratus never mentions Plutarch explicitly in *VA*. It is, therefore, important to ask whether *VA* seeks to revise and outsmart specifically Plutarch, rather than assorted elements from the Hellenic tradition in the sense of cumulative, shared and, ultimately, “anti-intertextual” (cf. Welch 2013: 76) cultural resource. At the same time, the figure of *VA*'s protagonist transcends the fuzziness of anecdotal tradition, given how keen the Philostratean narrator is on documentary provenance and authenticity of Apollonius's deeds and, saliently, pithy phrases (*VA* 7.31.2); the latter passage allows for stimulating comparisons with the Plutarchan use of apophthegms.