

A Proposal for Restructuring Plutarch's *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata*

Laurens van der Wiel

PLUTARCH ARRANGED the many apophthegms of *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* according to various principles. Titles and numberings in modern editions attempt to bring order to apparent chaos but are not in line with what the text would have looked like in antiquity. At first sight, this may seem to be a matter of only minor importance, but in some cases it leads to misrepresentations and misinterpretations. To address this problem, in this article I review all the places where the structure in modern editions should be reconsidered and show how this can contribute to a better understanding of the text. In the appendix I provide a full schematic representation of the composition of the work as a tool for future study.¹

1. *The ancient 'editions' of a complex text*

1.1. Compositional units

The following compositional units can be distinguished at different levels of the collection:

[1] The smallest units are the apophthegms. According to the

¹ Greek texts are cited from the Teubner of W. Nachstädt, *Plutarchi Moralia* II (Leipzig 1971); translations from the Loeb of F. C. Babbitt, *Plutarch's Moralia* III (London 1931). A reference to a section in *Reg.ap.* (see §1.1.[2]) looks as follows: *Philippus* (177C–179C); a reference to an apophthegm within a section (see §1.1.[1]): *Philippus* VIII (177E–F), viz. the eighth apophthegm of *Philippus* in Nachstädt.

division proposed in this paper, the work comprises 494 (see the Appendix). It should be noted, however, that not all of these are real apophthegms in the sense that they contain a saying²—although most do contain one—and there are even a few cases where an ‘apophthegm’ is, in fact, nothing more than a short general statement about a historical figure in order to introduce a section (see §1.1.[2]).³ The elaboration of the apophthegms varies widely: some consist of only one syntactic unit,⁴ for example ἔλεγεν introducing a saying without any contextual information;⁵ others give an extensive description of the historical background;⁶ and Plutarch sometimes even adds the

² This seems to contradict the dedicatory letter to Trajan at the outset of *Reg.ap.* (172B–E), which explicitly introduces the work as a collection of sayings. R. Volkmann, *Leben und Schriften des Plutarch von Chaeronea* (Berlin 1869) 222–223, considers this an argument against authenticity; F. Saß, *Plutarchs Apophthegmata regum et imperatorum I* (Ploen 1881) 4, does not see a problem: “Aber ist Plutarch wohl das erste Beispiel in der Litteratur, daß ein Schriftsteller seinem Buche einen falschen Titel gab?” For a defense of the letter’s authenticity see R. Flacelière, “Trajan, Delphes et Plutarque,” in F. Chamoux (ed.), *Recueil Plassart: Études sur l’antiquité grecque offertes à André Plassart* (Paris 1976) 97–104; the introduction in F. Fuhrmann, *Plutarque. Œuvres morales III* (Paris 1988); M. Beck, “Plutarch to Trajan: The Dedicatory Letter and the *Apophthegmata* Collection,” in P. A. Stadter et al. (eds.), *Sage and Emperor: Plutarch, Greek Intellectuals, and Roman Power in the Time of Trajan* (Leuven 2002) 163–173; G. Roskam, “ἀποθεωρεῖν / ἀποθεώρησις: a Semasiological Study,” *Glotta* 90 (2014) 180–191, at 190–191. S. Citro, *Traduzione e Commento ai Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata di Plutarco* (diss. Coimbra 2014) 28–48, provides a chronological overview of the scholarly debate. E. Almagor, *Plutarch and the Persica* (Edinburgh 2018) 271, remains skeptical about authenticity.

³ Examples are *Cyrus I* (172E), *Philippus I* (177C), *Phocion I* (187E), *Flaminius Ia* (197A), and *Pompeius Ia* (203B). These last two cases will be discussed in §2.1.1.

⁴ But never less than one. Some cases from *Cato Maior* (198D–199E) will therefore be reconsidered in §2.1.2.

⁵ E.g. *Cyrus II* (172E), *Hiero I* (175B), and *Dionysius Minor I* (176C).

⁶ Examples are *Eumenes I* (184A–B) and *Scipio Minor VIII* (200B–C).

aftermath of a story.⁷ A new apophthegm begins when there is a shift in time, circumstances, or cause. This is almost always indicated by a δέ at the outset of this new element *within* a section.⁸

[2] A series of apophthegms on the same historical figure together form a section. The collection has 89 such units (see Appendix),⁹ which vary substantially in length.¹⁰ Usually the first apophthegm of a section does not contain δέ as its second word,¹¹ marking a break, and almost always opens with the

⁷ These cases will be discussed in §2.1.4.

⁸ There are three exceptions in Nachstädt that can only be explained as a scribal error or inconsistency of the author: *Philippus* II (177C), which has μὲν οὖν instead of δέ; *Antigonus Monophthalmus* IX (182C); and *Eudamidas* II (192B). (A fourth might be *Parysatis* (174A), see §2.2.) Other cases in Nachstädt are not true exceptions, as the division in modern editions should be reconsidered: *Agis Secundus* VI (190D), *Cicero* XV (205C), *Caesar* VII (205C), and *Caesar* X (206D). These cases will be addressed in §2.1. G. N. Bernardakis, *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia* II (Leipzig 1889), and Babbitt, *Plutarch's Moralia*, suggest that there are four more exceptions, but for those Nachstädt follows the MSS. that have δέ: *Philippus* XXI (178E); *Brasidas* III (190B), where Nachstädt reads ἐπεὶ δέ, and other MSS. have ἐπειδή, an expectable variation; *Agesilaus* III (190F); and *Cato Maior* XIX (199A). Fuhrmann, *Plutarche*, follows Nachstädt; the *editio maior* of H. G. Ingenkamp, *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia* I (Athens 2008), follows Nachstädt only in *Brasidas* III and *Cato Maior* XIX.

⁹ *Semiramis* I (173A–B) is in fact the final apophthegm of *Darius* (172E–173A); one could also consider *Parysatis* I (174A) part of *Artaxerxes Mnemon* (173F–174A); see also §2.2.

¹⁰ The shortest sections, such as *Dion* (176F–177A), feature only one apophthegm; the longest, *Alexander* (179D–181F), contains 34.

¹¹ There are six exceptions: *Dionysius Minor* I (176C), *Demetrius Poliorcetes* I (183A–B), *Aristeides* I (186A), *Agis Tertius* I (191E), *Damonidas* I (191F), and *Scipio Maior* I (196B). Some of these can be explained by close similarities to what precedes: the subject of *Demetrius Poliorcetes* I plays a major role in the final apophthegm of the preceding section on his father (183A); *Agis Tertius* I shares the very same message as *Archidamus Tertius* (191D), viz. direct contact between soldiers on the battlefield; *Damonidas* I and the preceding *Pedaritus*

name of the subject.¹² This is often combined with additional information such as family ties,¹³ important functions,¹⁴ surnames,¹⁵ origins,¹⁶ or other distinctive elements.¹⁷

[3] Historical figures are ordered according to the nation or city state they belong to. As Stadter noticed, with a few exceptions they follow each other chronologically within these larger sections.¹⁸ Groups of peoples in turn are put together according

(191F) share thematic similarities too, and even a parallel structure: Πεδάρτιος – Δαμωνίδας / οὐκ ἐγκριθείς – ταχθείς / εἰς τοὺς τριακοσίους – εἰς τὴν τελευταίαν τοῦ χοροῦ τάξιν.

¹² See also P. A. Stadter, “Plutarch’s Compositional Technique: The Anecdote Collections and the *Parallel Lives*,” *GRBS* 54 (2014) 665–686, at 676. The only real exception is *Cyrus I* (172E), see n.23 below.

¹³ Especially in sections on monarchs, as Plutarch often includes various members of the same dynasty: *Darius I* (172F), *Xerxes I* (173B), *Artaxerxes Longimanus I* (173D), *Artaxerxes Mnemon I* (173F), *Orontes I* (174B), *Teres I* (174C), *Philippus I* (177C), *Ptolemaeus I* (181F), *Archidamus Tertius I* (191D). See §2.2 on *Parysatis I* (174A).

¹⁴ *Polys I* (174C), *Idanthyrsus I* (174E), *Gelon I* (175A), *Hiero I* (175B), *Peisistratus I* (189B), *Charillus I* (189F), *Teleclus I* (190A), *Agis Secundus I* (190C), *Nicostratus I* (192A), *Epameinondas I* (192C), *Pelopidas I* (194C), *Cicero I* (204E).

¹⁵ *Artaxerxes Longimanus I* (173D), *Artaxerxes Mnemon I* (173F), *Antiochus Hierax I* (184A), *Aristeides I* (186A), *Hegesippus I* (187D), *Sulla I* (202E), *Augustus I* (206F). A special case is *Demetrius Poliorcetes I* (183A) Ῥοδίου δὲ πολιορκῶν ὁ Δημήτριος, which refers to his surname. In almost all these cases the nicknames are relevant for an interpretation of the apophthegm(s) that follow, so they are more than distinctive information alone.

¹⁶ *Phocion I* (187E), *Demetrius Phalereus I* (189D), *Lycurgus I* (189D). See also §1.1.[3].

¹⁷ *Cyrus Minor* (173E) Κῦρος ὁ νεώτερος; *Memnon I* (174B) Μέμνων, ὁ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ πολεμῶν; *Dionysius Maior I* (175C) Διονύσιος ὁ πρεσβύτερος; *Dionysius Minor I* (176C) Ὁ δὲ νεώτερος Διονύσιος; *Antigonus Secundus I* (183C) Ἀντίγονος ὁ δεύτερος; *Antiochus Tertius I* (183F) Ἀντίοχος ὁ τρίτος; *Agis Tertius I* (191E) Ὁ δὲ νεώτερος Ἄγις; *Scipio Maior I* (196B) Σκιπίων δὲ ὁ πρεσβύτερος; *Cato Maior I* (198D) Κάτων ὁ πρεσβύτερος; *Scipio Minor I* (199F) Σκιπίωνα τὸν νεώτερον.

¹⁸ P. A. Stadter, “Notes and Anecdotes: Observations on Cross-Genre *Apophthegmata*,” in A. G. Nikolaidis (ed.), *The Unity of Plutarch’s Works: Moralia*

to the threefold categorization of humanity characteristic of Plutarch.¹⁹ First, there are fifteen barbarians (172E–174F; 33 apophthegms): eight Persians (172E–174B; 23), one section on Egyptian kings in general (174C; 1), three Thracians (174C–D; 4), and three Scythians (174E–F; 5). Second, there are 54 Greeks (175A–194E; 294): six Sicilians (175A–177A; 31) and 14 Macedonians (177A–184F; 111) are followed by 34 Greeks of the core mainland, viz. 14 Athenians (184F–189D; 73), 18 Spartans (189D–192C; 49), and two Thebans (192C–194E; 30). A series of twenty Romans closes the collection (194E–208A; 167).²⁰ The transition to a new people is sometimes made explicit at the outset of these sections, usually when a name alone does not suffice to mark a shift.²¹

Themes in the Lives, Features of the Lives in the Moralia (Berlin 2008) 53–66. At 55 he lists the following deviations: *Semiramis* (173A–B; although he recognizes that this belongs to *Darius*, see also §2.2); *Peisistratus* (189B–D), following *Phocion* (187E–189B); and *Gaius Popillius* (202E–203A), following *Sulla* (202E) (also noticed and listed by Stadter, *GRBS* 54 [2014] 676, in a similar overview of the collection’s general structure). Less significant are a few Spartan men who “are grouped achronologically at the end of the Spartan section” (*The Unity* 55).

¹⁹ On this tripartite division of mankind see S. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50–250* (Oxford 1996) 350–352; and J. M. Mossman, “A Life Unparalleled: *Artaxerxes*,” in N. Humble (ed.), *Plutarch’s Lives: Parallelism and Purpose* (Swansea 2010) 145–168, at 145–146 (also on *Reg.ap.*). Almagor, *Plutarch and the Persica* 273, also recognizes the “threefold division of humanity observed in Plutarch’s work” in the apophthegm collection.

²⁰ The numbers given are in accord with the division proposed in the Appendix.

²¹ In *Polys* I (174C) Πόλυς ὁ Θρακῶν βασιλεύς; *Idanthyrus* I (174E) Ἰδάνθυρος ὁ Σκυθῶν βασιλεύς; and *Ephameinondas* I (192C) Ἐφαιμεινώνδου τοῦ Θηβαίου (in these first two instances, the reason might be that the wider reading audience was less well acquainted with these men). Πέρσαι at the outset of *Cyrus* I (172E) immediately indicates which people will be treated first. As *Lycurgus* (189D–F) follows the Athenians, he had to be explicitly introduced as a Spartan (189D Λυκοῦργος ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος) to distinguish

1.2. The ancient presentation of the text

Ancient 'editions' did not succeed in bringing order in this complex text:

[1] The ancient texts separated apophthegms from one another only by a divider mark or a blank space, as can be seen in *P.Oxy.* 5155, a third- or fourth-century copy of some Spartan apophthegms of the collection.²² This is far less conspicuous than the text editions that nowadays list and distinguish individual apophthegms from each other by numbering.

[2] Sections were not clearly marked either. When a new section began, this was merely indicated by placing the subject's name at the outset of only his first apophthegm:²³ the lemmata in modern editions that highlight a subdivision at this level of the text cannot be found in the papyrus, and their absence in the manuscripts is in line with this.²⁴

him from his Athenian namesake. In the cases of *Gelon* I (175A), *Themistocles* I (184F), and *Manius Curius* I (194E), their names sufficed to introduce the transition to a new people.

²² The papyrus contains 191E–F (parts of *Agis Tertius*, *Cleomenes*, *Pedaritus*, and *Damonidas*). See P. J. Parsons and W. B. Henry, in *P.Oxy.* LXXVIII (London 2012) 95–96, for a description and the text of the papyrus, and especially 95 on how apophthegms are distinguished: "In some examples this sign [the divider mark] serves to separate sections or blocks of text, rather than individual sentences. In 5155 this distinction does not apply, since each new sentence is in fact a new anecdote: individual anecdotes end with the divider, and where the end occurs in mid-line, the scribe leaves a blank of *c.*5 letters." See T. Schmidt, "Plutarch and the Papyrological Evidence," in S. Xenophon et al. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plutarch* (Leiden 2019) 79–99, for a discussion and overview of all Plutarchan papyri, with references to relevant secondary literature.

²³ As discussed in §1.1.[2]. This explains why *Cyrus* I (172E), the very first section, is the only exception to this rule: a divider mark or blank space sufficed to highlight the transition from the dedicatory letter to the collection itself. *Demetrius Poliorcetes* I (183A) is no real exception, as it opens with an obvious reference to the king's surname, see also n.15 above.

²⁴ See Babbitt, *Plutarch's Moralia* III 12, a note added to lemma ΑΠΟΦΘΕΓΜΑΤΑ ΚΥΡΟΥ: "These headings are regularly omitted in the MSS";

[3] The heading in today's editions that separates the Romans from the barbarian and Greek sections is lacking in most manuscripts too.²⁵ Thus, ancient 'editions' did not even include lemmata to separate the different ethnicities from each other.

2. *A restructuring of Reg. ap.*

This lack of clarity in the ancient presentation of the text has led to wrong readings. In this section I examine all the cases where the division in modern editions should be reconsidered and discuss which division is the original in the few cases where editors disagree.²⁶ My aim is to reconstruct the ancient form of

Bernardakis, *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia* 2: “ΑΠΟΦΘΕΓΜΑΤΑ ΚΥΡΟΥ] deinde ΚΥΡΟΥ. ΣΕΜΙΠΑΜΙΔΟΣ. omniaque similia lemmata hic et infra omiserunt mei quidem codices”; and Ingenkamp, *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia* 2: “út. άποφθ. Κύρου] huius modi lemmata, quae in marginibus codd. nonnullorum manu post. saepe addita sunt, suppl. edd.”

²⁵ See a similar note of Babbitt, *Plutarch's Moralia* III 154, added to the title ΡΩΜΑΙΩΝ ΑΠΟΦΘΕΓΜΑΤΑ: “ρωμαιων αποφθεγματα. μανιου κουριου, etc.] these headings are usually omitted in the MSS.”; and Nachstädt, *Plutarchi Moralia* II 70, on his title ΡΩΜΑΙΚΑ: “Titulus (ut plerumque etiam lemmata) deest ubique, sed in mge ρωμαικά JSAX Voss. 2; άποφθέγματα ρωμαικά G part. II Laud. 55. De Romanis O m. post.” Additionally, titles in Valerius Maximus are not original either, see D. Wardle, *Valerius Maximus. Memorable Deeds and Sayings. Book I* (Oxford 1998) 6 and 15.

²⁶ The division of Nachstädt, *Plutarchi Moralia*, is identical to that of Fuhrmann, *Plutarque*, except that the latter makes a mistake in the numbering of *Cato Maior* III, IV, and V (198D–E, p.101, only in the Greek text). Nachstädt and Fuhrmann disagree with Bernardakis, *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia*, in five instances: Bernardakis joins *Artaxerxes Mnemon* II and III (174A; probably because of the thematic similarities between them); *Cotys* I and II (174D; probably because I is quite short); *Anteas* I and II (174E–F; perhaps because both refer to Philip of Macedonia); *Philippus* XXII and XXIII (178E–F); and *Demetrius Poliorcetes* II and III (183A–B). In these last two cases Bernardakis' division seems the better one; in the other three, Nachstädt and Fuhrmann are to be followed (see §2.1). The structure of the *editio maior* of Ingenkamp, *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia*, is identical to that of Bernardakis. Babbitt, *Plutarch's Moralia*, usually follows Bernardakis but with Nachstädt and Fuhr-

the collection as far as possible and to attain a higher degree of consistency in the presentation of the work. Where applicable, the implications for the interpretation will also be briefly addressed.

2.1. The subdivision of apophthegms

In keeping with §1.1.[1], the following instances require re-consideration:

2.1.1. Short openings

Some ‘apophthegms’ open sections with general information about the new protagonist that applies to his entire life. One might regard them as a kind of introduction to the section in question. Take *Cyrus* I (172E), for example, whose opening describes the everlasting appreciation of the Persian people for their greatest king. This shapes the way in which *all* the apophthegms of the section are read: because Cyrus is an extraordinary example for future rulers, one can learn much from his sayings and actions. Thus, modern editions correctly separate *Cyrus* I from II (172E), as this second unit, the first real apophthegm, contains the first saying of the king’s section and obviously concerns an entirely different context (Cyrus himself is speaking). Yet the editions do not follow this principle in the case of *Flaminius* I (197A) and *Pompeius* I (203B–C), whose openings similarly contain a general assessment of, or claim about, their subjects.²⁷ For these too the first real apophthegm follows the opening.²⁸ The failure to separate can confuse the reader: it

mann splits *Artaxerxes Mnemon* II and III (174A) and *Anteus* I and II (174E–F). See the Appendix for an overview.

²⁷ *Flaminius* Ia: Τίτος Κοίντιος οὕτως ἦν εὐθύς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐπιφανής, ὥστε πρὸ δημαρχίας καὶ στρατηγίας καὶ ἀγορανομίας ὑπατος αἰρεθῆναι (“Titus Quinctius, from the very first, was a man of such conspicuous talent that he was chosen consul without having been tribune, praetor, or aedile”); *Pompeius* Ia: Γναῖος Πομπήιος ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἠγαπήθη τοσοῦτον ὅσον ὁ πατήρ ἐμισήθη (“Gnaeus Pompey was loved by the Romans as much as his father was hated”).

²⁸ *Flaminius* Ib opens with πεμφθεὶς δὲ στρατηγὸς ἐπὶ Φίλιππον (“he was

suggests that the opening merely introduces the first apophthegm, when in fact it introduces the entire section.

2.1.2. One syntactic whole

There are cases in which a verb seems to introduce two different quotations. A clear example is *Cyrus II* (172E):

2. Ἔλεγε δὲ Κῦρος ἑτέροις <δεῖν> ἀναγκάζεσθαι τὰγαθὰ πορίζειν τοὺς αὐτοῖς μὴ θέλοντας· ἄρχειν δὲ μηδενὶ προσήκειν, ὃς οὐ κρείττων ἐστὶ τῶν ἀρχομένων.

2. Cyrus said that those who are unwilling to procure good things for themselves must of necessity procure them for others. He also said that no man has any right to rule who is not better than the people over whom he rules.

The content of the first part (ἑτέροις ... θέλοντας) is more universal and seems to concern human activities in general. The second (ἄρχειν ... ἀρχομένων) more specifically relates to the nature of a king. Yet precisely because both clauses are presented as a syntactic whole one should read them as such: a good ruler—who knows what is good and therefore has the right to rule—provides these good things for his people, not for himself. In other words, both assertions concern good rulership, which consists in improving one's subjects. By reading them together we discern a coherent philosophical view of good rulership. Thus, modern editions correctly print them together but are inconsistent in three similar cases in *Cato Maior* (198D–199E) which are introduced by the same verb of saying: I and II (198D), VI and VII (198E), and XVI and XVII (199A). As with *Cyrus II*, these should also be kept together. This in turn will shape their interpretation: *Cato Maior* I and II obviously concern the same topic (luxury in Rome),²⁹ and the same

sent in command of the army against Philip”), *Pompeius* Ib with νέος δ' ὧν (“in his youth”). Both obviously introduce a first short narrative.

²⁹ *Cat.Mai.* 8.1–2, however, seems to present both sayings as two different apophthegms; in *De tuenda* 131E and *De esu* 996E only the first part occurs; in *Quaest.conv.* 668B, only the second part is told. Yet in the collection these

goes for VI and VII (Cato describes what he likes and hates).³⁰ Less transparent is the connection between XVI and XVII, but in both Cato seems to call for μετριοπάθεια in social contact.

2.1.3. Two sayings, one apophthegm

In other cases two sayings are introduced by two different main verbs, but since the second is obviously a continuation of the first both still belong to the same apophthegm:

[1] In three instances, this is highlighted by καί.

(a) A first example is *Cicero* XV. Nachstädt seems inclined to join this tentatively to XIV, which he indicates by bracketing the number 15 (205C):

14. Πομπηίου δὲ καὶ Καίσαρος διαστάντων ἔφη “γινώσκω ὄν φύγω, μὴ γινώσκων πρὸς ὄν φύγω,” (15) καὶ Πομπήιον ἐμέμψατο τὴν πόλιν ἐκλιπόντα καὶ Θεμιστοκλέα μᾶλλον ἢ Περικλέα μιμησάμενον, οὐκ ἐκείνοις τῶν πραγμάτων ἀλλὰ τούτοις ὁμοίων ὄντων.

14. When Pompey and Caesar took opposite sides, he said, “I know from whom I flee without knowing to whom to flee.” (15) He blamed Pompey for abandoning the city, and imitating Themistocles rather than Pericles, when his situation was not like that of Themistocles, but rather that of Pericles.

It is important to present both parts together and let this shape

apophthegms are introduced by the same verb, and the context of the second saying in the *Life* and in *Quaest.conv.* 668B (Cato criticizes the extravagance of the Roman people) becomes the context of both I and II in the collection (cf. πολυτέλεια, which appears in the *Life* and *Quaest.conv.* only in the account of *Cato Maior* II but is part of the introduction of both apophthegms in the collection). *Reg.ap.* thus intentionally presents both sayings as one apophthegm.

³⁰ Although *Cato Maior* VI occurs separately in *De aud. poet.* 29E and in *De vit. pud.* 528F, *Cat.Mai.* 9.5 presents *Cato Maior* VI and VII as one saying too (as part of a list of apophthegms concerning useful and useless men). This account does not contain (198E) μισεῖν: the contrast χαίρειν – μισεῖν in the collection creates a closer connection between the two sayings, and the parallel structure highlighting the antithesis is an additional argument to take the two together.

the interpretation: XV specifies that Cicero disagrees with Pompey's tactics, and his lack of military insight is why in XIV he does not know whether it is a good choice to take his side. The man whom he wants to flee, then, can only be Caesar.³¹

(b) *Nachstädt* also hesitates to take together *Caesar* VI–VII (206B–C). Caesar's attitude in VI (he argues that one should act, not think, if one wants to achieve great things) explains why he crosses the Rubicon in VII (from *καί* on), which leads to his famous saying *iacta alea esto*.³² Thus, *Caesar* VI and VII together depict a man of action, a conclusion which one does not necessarily reach from a separate reading of VII.

(c) A third example, perhaps less clear and less relevant, consists of *Agis Secundus* V–VI (190D): *καί* at the outset of VI highlights that both sayings concern the same moment in time, and they should therefore be read in this way.³³

³¹ *Cicero* XIV (205C) is related in *Cic.* 37.3 in the context of Pompey's departure from the city: this also suggests taking the two parts together. *Cicero* XV (205C) is not told in this *Life* but can be found in *Pomp.* 63.1.

³² VI does not occur in the *Life*, but the saying itself (VII) is quoted in *Caes.* 32.8 (and also in *Pomp.* 60.2). As *esto* is a better Latin translation of the Greek imperative *ἀνεπίρρωθω*, I follow (e.g.) Lewis & Short s.v. "alea."

³³ 5. Ἐτέρου δὲ πυνθανομένου πόσοι εἰσὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι "ὄσοι" εἶπεν "ἴκανοὶ τοὺς κακοὺς ἀπείργειν." 6. Καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐτέρου πυνθανομένου, "πολλοὶ σοὶ" ἔφη "δόξουσιν εἶναι, ἐὰν αὐτοὺς ἴδῃς μαχομένους." ("5. When another man inquired about the number of the Spartans, he said, 'Enough to keep away all bad men'. 6. When another asked the same question, he said, 'You will think they are many, if you see them fight'."). Not only does the absence of *δέ* in VI indicate that both V and VI belong to the same apophthegm, but also the fact that they are related to the same historical event (or at least are presented as such) and share a similar punch line. Additionally, there is the parallel structure and repetition of *ἐτέρου ... ἐτέρου ...* (which should not be translated "another ... another ...," as Babbitt does, but rather "one man ... another man ..."). *Agis Secundus* V–VI is very similar to the third apophthegm of this same section (190C–D): 3. Ἐπαινουμένων δὲ τῶν Ἡλείων ἐπὶ τῷ τὰ Ὀλύμπια καλῶς ἄγειν "τί δέ" εἶπε "ποιοῦσι θαυμαστόν, εἰ δι' ἐτῶν τεσσάρων μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ χρωῶνται τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ;" ἐπιμενόντων δὲ τοῖς ἐπαίνοις,

[2] In other instances similar to those in [1] there is δέ instead of καί.³⁴ In these only the content shows that the second saying continues the first: *Philippus XVI* (178B) and *XVII* (178B–C: the context of both parts of the apophthegm is the same, viz. Philip advising his son),³⁵ *Philippus XXII* (178E) and *XXIII* (178E–F; Philip again advises his son), taken together by Bernardakis, Babbitt, and Ingenkamp; *Demetrius Poliorcetes I* (183A–B) and *II* (183B), printed as one apophthegm by the same editors (both I and II similarly depict the king's mildness in the same war); *Themistocles XV* and *XVI* (185E–F: both sayings are related to the same historical event and are triggered by the same cause: the Persian king bids Themistocles speak, Themistocles answers),³⁶ where Babbitt seems inclined

ἔφη “τί θαυμαστόν, εἰ πράγματι καλῶ καλῶς χρῶνται, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ;” (“3. When the Eleans were commended for conducting the Olympic games honourably, he said, ‘What wonderful feat is it if they practise justice on one day in four years?’ And when these same persons were persistent in their commendation, he said, ‘What wonder if they practise honourably an honourable thing, that is, justice?’”). This apophthegm contains two sayings with two different punch lines but both are a reaction on the same event (the opening genitive absolute is presupposed by the second). Once more, both share a parallel construction: τί ποιῶσι θαυμαστόν – τί θαυμαστόν / εἰ ... – εἰ ... / χρῶνται τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ – χρῶνται, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. *Dionysius Minor IV* and *V* (176D–E) *prima facie* seem similar. Yet in these apophthegms there is no repeated construction like ἕτερος ... ἕτερος ..., and both sayings are not necessarily pronounced at the same moment. Therefore, one is dealing here with two different apophthegms.

³⁴ Of course not every δέ in the collection highlights the beginning of a new apophthegm within a section (cf. §1.1.[1]); the conjunction can also occur *within* an apophthegm.

³⁵ The object (τῷ υἱῷ) is not repeated in the second part (not even by a demonstrative pronoun): this also indicates that XVI and XVII form a whole.

³⁶ They are also told together in *Them.* 29.4–5. On this story in Plutarch and other authors see D. L. Gera, “Themistocles’ Persian Tapestry,” *CQ* 57 (2007) 445–457.

to join them;³⁷ and *Gaius Fabricius* IV and V (195A–B).³⁸

2.1.4. The aftermath of an apophthegm

As stated, the aftermath or reactions of others are sometimes added to an apophthegm (which in consequence can contain a saying of both the protagonist and someone else). Examples of this are *Fabius Maximus* II (195C–D) and III (195D–E). In both, Fabius is followed by Hannibal, who reflects on Fabius' military ingenuity. In this way the reader is invited to share his opinion. Modern editions, therefore, are correct in not splitting up these apophthegms, but should do the same in similar instances:

[1] *Scipio Maior* VI and VII (196D–E).

6. Ἐπεὶ δὲ νικηθέντες οἱ Καρχηδόνιοι κατὰ κράτος περὶ σπονδῶν καὶ εἰρήνης πρέσβεις ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτόν, ἐκέλευσεν εὐθὺς ἀπιέναι τοὺς ἤκοντας, ὡς οὐκ ἀκουσόμενος πρότερον αὐτῶν ἢ Λεύκιον Τερέντιον ἀναγάγῳσιν· ἦν δὲ Ῥωμαῖος ὁ Τερέντιος, ἐπεικῆς ἀνὴρ, γεροντὸς αἰχμάλωτος ὑπὸ Καρχηδονίων.³⁹

³⁷ Babbitt, *Plutarch's Moralia* III 94–95 puts number 16 between brackets.

³⁸ In IV Gaius Fabricius sends a letter to Pyrrhus about his physician plotting against him, bidding him note (195B) ὅτι καὶ φίλων κάκιστός ἐστι κριτὴς καὶ πολεμίων (“why he was the worst possible judge both of friends and of foes”). In V Pyrrhus wants to thank Gaius Fabricius and releases his Roman prisoners in gratitude. Fabricius releases his prisoners in return because he does not want to be rewarded: οὐδὲ γὰρ χάριτι Πύρρῳ μεμνηνέκῃ τὴν ἐπιβουλὴν, ἀλλ’ ὅπως μὴ δοκῶσι Ῥωμαῖοι δόλῳ κτείνειν, ὡς φανερώς νικᾶν οὐ δυνάμενοι (“‘For’, as he said, ‘it was not to win favour with Pyrrhus that he had disclosed the plot, but that the Romans might not have the repute of killing through treachery, as if they could not win an open victory’”). Since the first saying is clearly presupposed by the second, one could consider IV and V one apophthegm (both are also related at length one after the other in *Pyrrh.* 21). This agrees with the fact that *Philippus* VI (177D–E), *Antiochus Hierax* (184A), and *Phocion* XII (188D–E) should not be split up (cf. the division of the modern editions): these cases have two parts too, the first again furnishing in part the historical background and cause of the second.

³⁹ A similar description of a minor figure (ἦν δὲ Ῥωμαῖος ... Καρχηδονίων)

ἐπεὶ δὲ ἦκον ἄγοντες τὸν ἄνδρα, καθίσας ἐν τῷ συμβουλίῳ παρ' αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος, οὕτως ἐχρημάτισε τοῖς Καρχηδονίοις καὶ κατέλυσε τὸν πόλεμον.

7. Ὁ δὲ Τερέντιος ἐπηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ θριαμβεύοντι πιλίον ἔχων ὡσπερ ἀπελεύθερος· ἀποθανόντος δὲ τοῖς ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκφορὰν παραγενομένοις ἐνέχει πίνειν οἰνόμελι καὶ τὰ ἄλλα περὶ τὴν ταφὴν ἐφιλοτιμήθη. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὕστερον.

6. When the Carthaginians had been utterly overthrown, they sent envoys to him to negotiate a treaty of peace, but he ordered those who had come to go away at once, refusing to listen to them before they brought Lucius Terentius. This Terentius was a Roman, a man of good talents, who had been taken prisoner by the Carthaginians. And when they came bringing the man, Scipio seated him on the tribune next to himself in the conference, and, this done, he took up the negotiations with the Carthaginians, and terminated the war.

7. Terentius marched behind him in the triumphal procession, wearing a felt cap just like an emancipated slave. And when Scipio died, Terentius provided wine with honey for all who attended the funeral to drink their fill, and did everything else connected with his burial on a grand scale. But this, of course, was later.

The final four words often recur in the *Parallel Lives* to conclude a digression that breaks the chronology.⁴⁰ In *Scipio Maior* VII, however, they aroused suspicion: scholars skeptical of the collection's authenticity have argued that an inattentive forger borrowed them from Plutarch's *Life of Scipio Maior*, a work now lost but still available to him when composing *Reg.ap.*⁴¹ Yet this

occurs in *Darius* III (about Zopyrus).

⁴⁰ The same or similar phrases can be found, e.g., in *Rom.* 9.3, *Lyc.* 7.5, *Alc.* 7.6, *Phil.* 13.9, *Pyrrh.* 3.9, *Pomp.* 2.12, *Alex.* 56.1, *Caes.* 4.9, *Dem.* 20.5, *Ant.* 5.1, 50.7, *Flam.* 12.13, 14.3, *Marc.* 5.5, *Sull.* 6.23, *Luc.* 36.7, and *Crass.* 3.8. For this phrase, which is often applied as a “transition from proemial opening to lives proper,” see T. E. Duff, “The Structure of the Plutarchan Book,” *CLAnt* 30 (2011) 213–278, at 229.

⁴¹ D. Wyttenbach, *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia* I (Oxford 1795) CLIX, for

phrase fits equally well in the context of the section: VI and VII are in fact one apophthegm, as VII obviously only describes a consequence of VI. (A very similar case can even be found in *Flaminius* II, 197B.) The death of Scipio mentioned in *Scipio Maior* VII naturally called for the addition of ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὕστερον, as one would expect a reference to his death at the end of the section. In other words, the use of the phrase is unsurprising: it is readily motivated by the author's practice of adding an account of the aftermath to an apophthegm, which in this specific case entails a strong deviation from the general chronological structure.

[2] *Scipio Minor* XX and XXI, as with *Fabius Maximus* II and III (195C–D), should be regarded as one unit: the Numantians praise Scipio's talent as a general in XXI (201E) after their defeat is described in XX (201D). This highlights that the Romans obtained the victory through him and him alone.

[3] A final case is *Caesar* IX–X (206C–D):

9. Τῶν δὲ στρατιωτῶν αὐτῷ βραδέως εἰς Δυρράχιον ἐκ Βρεν-
τεσίου κομιζομένων λαθῶν ἅπαντας εἰς πλοῖον ἐμβὰς μικρὸν
ἐπεχείρησε διαπλεῖν τὸ πέλαγος· συγκλυζομένου δὲ τοῦ πλοίου

example argues that *Reg.ap.* were taken from Plutarch's extant works. J. J. Hartman, *De Plutarcho scriptore et philosopho* (Leiden 1916) 116, shares this opinion, adducing ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὕστερον as one of his main arguments. Babbitt, *Plutarch's Moralia* III 4, reacts to such claims: "anyone enthusiastic in supporting the genuineness of the *Sayings* might equally well suggest that this was an observation of some copyist, put down as a marginal note, which has crept into the text" (cf. also Saß, *Plutarchs Apophthegmata* 6). For the modern debate on the origins of the collection see M. Beck, "Plutarch's Declamations and the Progymnasmata," in B. J. Schröder et al. (eds.), *Studium declamatorium: Untersuchungen zu Schuliübungen und Prunkreden von der Antike bis zur Neuzeit* (Munich 2003) 169–192, and "Plutarch's *Hypomnemata*: Standard *Topoi* and Idiosyncratic Composition in the *Moralia*," in M. Horster et al. (eds.), *Condensing Text – Condensed Texts* (Stuttgart 2010) 349–369; C. B. R. Pelling, *Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies* (Swansea 2002) 65–90; Stadter, in *The Unity of Plutarch's Works* 53–66, and *GRBS* 54 (2014) 665–686.

ποιήσας τῷ κυβερνήτῃ φανερόν ἑαυτὸν ἀνεβόησε “πίστευε τῇ τύχῃ γνοῦς ὅτι Καίσαρα κομίζεις.”

10. Τότε μὲν οὖν ἐκωλύθη τοῦ χειμῶνος ἰσχυροῦ γενομένου καὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν συνδραμόντων καὶ περιπαθούτων, εἰ περιμένει δύναμιν ἄλλην ὡς ἀπιστῶν αὐτοῖς· ἐπεὶ δὲ μάχης γενομένης νικῶν ὁ Πομπήιος οὐκ ἐπεξήλθεν, ἀλλ’ ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον, “τήμερον” εἶπεν “ἦν ἡ νίκη παρὰ τοῖς πολεμίοις, ἀλλὰ τὸν εἰδότα νικᾶν οὐκ ἔχουσιν.”

9. As the transportation of his soldiers from Brundisium to Dyrrachium proceeded slowly, he, without being seen by anybody, embarked in a small boat, and attempted the passage through the open sea. But as the boat was being swamped by the waves, he disclosed his identity to the pilot, crying out, “Trust to Fortune, knowing it is Caesar you carry.”

10. At that time he was prevented from crossing, as the storm became violent, and his soldiers quickly gathered about him in a state of high emotion if it could be that he were waiting for other forces because he felt he could not rely on them. A battle was fought and Pompey was victorious; he did not, however, follow up his success, but withdrew to his camp. Caesar said, “To-day the victory was with the enemy, but they have not the man who knows how to be victorious.”

Modern editions are correct in recognizing two apophthegms here. But the text should be split up between ἀπιστῶν αὐτοῖς and ἐπεὶ δέ, for τότε μὲν οὖν ... ἀπιστῶν αὐτοῖς deals with the events immediately after Caesar’s saying during the storm and describes the outcome of, and reactions to, his action. This is consistent with the *Life*. In *Caes.* 38.3–7 Caesar also tries to cross (he is in fact already in Dyrrachium but tries to go back to Brundisium) and utters a similar saying. When he returns the soldiers complain. Pompey’s victory and Caesar’s reaction are not immediately described in the *Life* after these events, but they are in *Caes.* 39.8. In addition, ἐπεὶ δέ is a typical opening for an apophthegm in the collection (note also the particle),⁴²

⁴² The combination ἐπεὶ δέ occurs 44 times at the outset of an apo-

while μὲν οὖν is not an unusual expression to continue a narrative.⁴³ If the first part of *Caesar* X is interpreted as the aftermath of IX, this once again has implications for the interpretation: it then turns out that Caesar's faith in τύχη does not seem justified, as he failed to cross the sea; furthermore his lack of faith in his troops is not appreciated by his soldiers (the contrast between these two elements is emphasized by πίστευε – ἀπιστῶν). Caesar's attempt, one concludes at this point, was perhaps a bad choice: perhaps, he should at least have pretended to believe in the abilities of his army.

2.1.5. Different situations, different apophthegms

Because every apophthegm is related to a specific moment in time and/or is provoked by specific circumstances, then *Artaxerxes Mnemon* II (174A),⁴⁴ *Cotys* I (174D),⁴⁵ and *Anteas* I

phthegm (including *Caesar* Xb); *Darius* IV (173A); *Dionysius Maior* II (175D), XII (176B); *Archelaus* IV (177B); *Philippus* IV (177C–D), XX (178D), XXVI (179A), XXXI (179B–C); *Alexander* X (180B), XXIV (181C), XXVI (181C–D), XXXI (181E); *Antigonus Monophthalmus* X (182C–D), XVIII (183A); *Antigonus Secundus* IV (183D); *Pyrrhus* III (184C), IV (184C); *Themistocles* XV (185E); *Aristeides* II (186A–B); *Phocion* IV (188A); *Peisistratus* III (189C); *Brasidas* III (190B–C); *Agésilau* XI (191C–D); *Epameinondas* VIII (192E–F), XV (193C–D), XVII (193D–E), XXIII (194A–C); *Pelopidas* IV (194D); *Gaius Fabricius* V (195C); *Fabius Maximus* II (195C–D); *Scipio Maior* II (196B), V (196C–D), VI (196D–E); *Cato Maior* XXIV (199C); *Scipio Minor* V (200A–B), XVI (201B–C), XXII (201E); *Marius* III (202B–C); *Pompeius* II (203C), VIII (204A); *Cicero* XX (205E); *Caesar* VIII (206C), Xb (206D); *Augustus* II (207A).

⁴³ On the usages of μὲν οὖν see J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*² (Oxford 1966) 470–481. In *Caesar* Xa this combination occurs with an adversative meaning.

⁴⁴ In *Artaxerxes Mnemon* II the king reacts with wonder to someone who brings him a big apple; in III he is robbed and has to eat figs and bread, after which he expresses joy. Bernardakis and Ingenkamp print both apophthegms together, but we are clearly dealing with two different stories here (cf. the other editions).

⁴⁵ *Cotys* I: Κότυς τῷ δωρησαμένῳ πάρδαλιν ἀντεδωρήσατο λέοντα (“Cotys was once presented with a leopard, and he presented the donor with a lion in return”); a different story begins with Φύσει δ' ὢν ὀξὺς εἰς ὀργήν (“He was

(174E–F)⁴⁶ should indeed be separated, as some editions do, from the apophthegms that follow them. Yet in keeping with this *Lucullus* II should also be split (203A–B):

2. Τοὺς δὲ καταφράκτους μάλιστα φοβουμένων τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἐκέλευε θαρρεῖν· πλεῖον γὰρ ἔργον εἶναι τοῦ νικῆσαι τὸ τούτους σκυλεῦσαι. προσβὰς δὲ τῷ λόφῳ πρῶτος καὶ τὸ κίνημα τῶν βαρβάρων θεασάμενος ἀνεβόησε “νενικήκαμεν, ὦ συστρατιῶται.” καὶ μηδενὸς ὑποστάντος διώκων πέντε Ῥωμαίων ἀπέβαλε πεσόντας, τῶν δὲ πολεμίων ὑπὲρ δέκα μυριάδας ἀπέκτεινε.

2. His soldiers feared most the men in full armour, but he bade them not to be afraid, saying that it would be harder work to strip these men than to defeat them. He was the first to advance against the hill, and observing the movement of the barbarians, he cried out, “We are victorious, my men,” and, meeting no resistance, he pursued, losing only five Romans who fell, and he slew over an hundred thousand of the enemy.

Since what triggers each saying is different, a second apophthegm starts with προσβὰς δὲ τῷ λόφῳ. The context of the first is the soldiers’ fear; the second is motivated by Lucullus’ view on the enemy. From reading these apophthegms separately one cannot even conclude that they concern the same battle.⁴⁷

2.2. The subdivision of sections

Concerning this level of the collection, there are two cases

by nature very irascible”), as Nachstädt and Fuhrmann recognize.

⁴⁶ In *Anteas* I the Scythian king sends a letter to Philip; in II he asks a question of Philip’s ambassadors. Only Bernardakis and Ingenkamp take both stories together.

⁴⁷ τῷ before λόφῳ might seem strange, but splitting *Lucullus* II would not make it any more so (a possible solution can be found in the *apparatus criticus* of Nachstädt, *Plutarchi Moralia* 95: “δέ τῳ = δέ τιτι Ku., sed v. vit.”). Moreover, if one considers *Lucullus* I (203A) a separate apophthegm, since in it the general also encourages his soldiers before a battle, one should also do the same with IIa and IIb (203A–B). Then *Lucullus* contains three apophthegms on Lucullus’ encouragement of his soldiers before a battle. In the *Life* only I and IIb are told (*Luc.* 27.9, 28.4).

where the modern editions should be reconsidered (in line with §1.1.[2]):

[1] *Semiramis* (173AB):⁴⁸

Σεμίραμις δὲ ἑαυτῇ κατασκευάσασα τάφον ἐπέγραψεν “ὅστις ἂν χρημάτων δεηθῆ βασιλεύς, διελόντα τὸ μνημεῖον ὅσα βούλεται λαβεῖν.” Δαρεῖος οὖν διελὼν χρήματα μὲν οὐχ εὔρε, γράμμασι δὲ ἑτέροις ἐνέτυχε τάδε φράζουσιν· “εἰ μὴ κακὸς ἦσθ’ ἀνὴρ καὶ χρημάτων ἄπληστος, οὐκ ἂν νεκρῶν θήκας ἐκίνεις.”

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

This apophthegm follows *Darius* (172F–173A), who plays a major role in this story as well. The chief motivation for making *Semiramis* into a separate section is clear enough: it contains (inscribed) sayings by Semiramis, not Darius. Yet other sections also conclude with an apophthegm *about* the protagonist,⁴⁹ and there are several reasons for considering the ‘section’ part of *Darius*: it concerns a Babylonian queen (which does not fit within the Persian section); it breaks the general chronological structure of the collection; and it opens with δέ. As the closing story of *Darius*, it should be read as revealing something about the king instead (as was already suggested by Moss-

⁴⁸ All editors place this apophthegm below a new lemma.

⁴⁹ *Alexander* XXXIV (181F: Demades talks about the Macedonian army after Alexander’s death); *Aristeides* V (186B–C: Aeschylus’ verses about Amphiarus are interpreted by the audience as referring to Aristeides); *Brasidas* III (190B–C: people talk about Brasidas after he died in battle).

man).⁵⁰ If so, the closing image of the Persian is far from flattering.

[2] The second case, *Parysatis*, is less obvious, but it reminds one of the situation in *Semiramis*. It contains only one apophthegm and is about the mother of Cyrus and Artaxerxes Mnemon. There is therefore an immediate link with the two preceding sections, which deal with these two men (173E–174A). The sole apophthegm describes how one should approach the Persian king (174A):

Παρύσατις ἡ Κύρου καὶ Ἀρτοξέρξου μήτηρ ἐκέλευε τὸν βασιλεῖ
μέλλοντα μετὰ παρρησίας διαλέγεσθαι βυσσίνοις χρῆσθαι
ῥήμασι.

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

There are two reasons to regard this as a separate section: (a) it seems to open with the name of a new main character and additional personal information, (b) and it does not contain δέ (cf. §1.1.[2]). But there are better arguments to consider the saying part of the preceding *Artaxerxes Mnemon* (173F–174A): (a) as a separate section it would deviate from the chronological sequence; (b) although Parysatis was a powerful woman at the Persian court,⁵¹ she does not really belong to the category of rulers and commanders (cf. the dedicatory letter introducing the work at 172B–E), deviating from the subjects of all other sections; (c) and, perhaps most importantly, her saying not only sheds light on her own character but also on the character of Artaxerxes. The queen does not explicitly mention him by name, but one may reasonably conclude that she is advising others on how best to approach her son—the more so because

⁵⁰ Mossman, in *Plutarch's Lives* 147, lists Semiramis as a separate section but adds that “this relates in fact only to Darius and seems to be taken from the inscription on Nitocris’ tomb in Herodotus 1.187.”

⁵¹ K. Fiehn, “Parysatis,” *RE* 18 (1949) 2051–2052.

Plutarch introduces her as his mother.⁵² If the saying is interpreted thus, once again the image of the king is not positive: whoever wants to speak with him μετὰ παρρησίας should use words “made of linen” (βυσσίνους χρῆσθαι ῥήμασιν). This phrase is often interpreted as “soft words,”⁵³ but Almagor suggests another meaning: the expression refers to the concealing nature of cloth.⁵⁴ Parysatis’ saying, then, implies that talking frankly to her son might be dangerous. By speaking in general terms she demonstrates her own caution and contributes to the truth of this image.⁵⁵

2.3. The subdivision of peoples

A final issue concerns the title with which modern editions separate the Greek from the Roman part of the collection. This seems a problem of only minor importance, but it wrongly suggests that the barbarians should be taken together with the Greeks, given that no title separates them from each other. This would contradict Plutarch’s tripartite categorization of mankind, clearly one of the dominant structuring principles in the work as described in §1.1.[3]. Additionally, it might even cause one to consider the Roman apophthegms as a separate work.⁵⁶ The title, then, is deceptive, and a reader of the

⁵² δέ could have been left out because the king does not really play an active role in this apophthegm; or it could have been deleted by a later scribe who misinterpreted *Parysatis* as a separate section.

⁵³ Cf. the LCL translation “words of softest texture.”

⁵⁴ Almagor, *Plutarch and the Persica* 277–278, referring to Gera, *CQ* 57 (2007) 453, who holds to the notion that the softness of linen is in view but connects it with deception.

⁵⁵ *Brasidas* III (190B–C) is another apophthegm closing the section with a saying by the subject’s mother.

⁵⁶ Mossman, in *Plutarch’s Lives* 146, makes an interesting observation on the selection of heroes in *Reg.ap.* and seems to consider the Roman part of the collection a separate work: “Nepos selects the following barbarian kings and generals for mention: Cyrus, Darius I, Xerxes, Artaxerxes I and II, Datames [...], and Hamilcar and Hannibal. This list very largely overlaps

collection should keep in mind that it does not derive from ancient times.

3. *Conclusion*

Although modern editions succeed in presenting *Reg.ap.* in a way that is much more convenient than what we find in the ancient sources, their subdivision of the text is sometimes misleading, sometimes even incorrect. Because the presentation can lead to distortions or misinterpretations, it is important for scholars who study how the text was read in antiquity not to overlook the fact that redividing is sometimes necessary if we hope for a better, more accurate understanding. Here I have discussed all the cases that call for caution. An overview is given in the Appendix, in hopes of assisting future research on this intriguing work.⁵⁷

November, 2022

Faculty of History
University of Warsaw
Krakowskie Przedmieście 26/28
00-927 Warsaw, Poland
l.van-der-wiel@uw.edu.pl

with the sections on barbarians in Plutarch's *Sayings of Kings and Commanders* [...] though the Carthaginians do not figure; their sayings are included in the *Sayings of Romans* instead."

⁵⁷ I wrote the first version of the article as part of the KU Leuven C1 project "Longing for Perfection. Living the Perfect Life in Late Antiquity – A Journey between Ideal and Reality." The work was also supported by the National Science Centre, Poland, under the project "Thinking of Thinking. Conceptual Metaphors of Cognition in the Plutarchan Corpus" (UMO-2021/42/E/HS3/00259). I am very grateful to Professors Geert Roskam and Joseph Verheyden for their many valuable suggestions and comments. I also want to thank Gorik Rutten, Reuben Pitts, and the editor, Professor José M. González, for correcting my English.

APPENDIX

The first columns give an overview of the composition of *Reg.ap.* and of the total number of apophthegms in every (sub)section according to the subdivision proposed in this paper. The final column indicates where (some) modern editions deviate from the division proposed. I have taken the following editions into account:

B: the Teubner of Bernardakis

L: the Loeb of Babbitt

N: the Teubner of Nachstädt

F: the Budé of Fuhrmann

I: the editio maior of Ingenkamp

For example: in the case of *Cotys* (174D), Bernardakis, Babbitt, and Ingenkamp print I and II as a unit, as indicated by the final column. The division proposed here considers them to be two separate apophthegms, as do Nachstädt and Fuhrmann. For ease of reference the numbering of the apophthegms follows Nachstädt.

N°	Section	Pages	Count	Deviations in the editions
	<i>Entire collection</i>	172E-208A	494	
<i>I</i>	<i>15 Barbarians</i>	172E-174F	33	
<i>Ia</i>	<i>8 Persians</i>	172E-174B	23	
1	<i>Cyrus</i>	172E-F	3	All editions list <i>Semiramis</i> as a separate section
2	<i>Darius</i>	172F-173B	5	
3	<i>Xerxes</i>	173B-C	4	
4	<i>Artaxerxes</i>	173D-E	4	
5	<i>Longimanus</i>			All editions list <i>Parysatis</i> as a separate section; B and I join <i>Artaxerxes Mnemon</i> II and III
5	<i>Cyrus Minor</i>	173E-F	1	
6	<i>Artaxerxes Mnemon</i>	173F-174A	4	
7	<i>Orontes</i>	174B	1	
8	<i>Memnon</i>	174B	1	
<i>Ib</i>	<i>1 Egyptian custom</i>	174C	1	
9	<i>Reges Aegypti</i>	174C	1	
<i>Ic</i>	<i>3 Thracians</i>	174C-D	4	
10	<i>Polrys</i>	174C	1	B, L, and I join I and II
11	<i>Teres</i>	174C-D	1	
12	<i>Cotys</i>	174D	2	
<i>Id</i>	<i>3 Scythians</i>	174E-F	5	

24 RESTRUCTURING PLUTARCH'S *REGUM APOPHTHEGMATA*

13	<i>Idanthyrsus</i>	174E	1	B and I join I and II	
14	<i>Anteas</i>	174E-F	3		
15	<i>Scilurus</i>	174F	1		
<i>II 54 Greeks</i>				<i>175A-194E</i>	<i>294</i>
<i>IIa 6 Sicilians</i>				<i>175A-177A</i>	<i>31</i>
16	<i>Gelon</i>	175A-B	4		
17	<i>Hiero</i>	175B-C	5		
18	<i>Dionysius Maior</i>	175C-176C	13		
19	<i>Dionysius Minor</i>	176C-E	5		
20	<i>Agathocles</i>	176E-F	3		
21	<i>Dion</i>	176F-177A	1		
<i>IIb 14 Macedonians</i>					<i>177A-184F</i>
22	<i>Archelaus</i>	177A-B	5	All editions present XVI and XVII as two different apophthegms; N and F present XXII and XXIII as two different apophthegms	
23	<i>Philippus</i>	177C-179C	30		
24	<i>Alexander</i>	179D-181F	34		
25	<i>Ptolemaeus</i>	181F	1		
26	<i>Antigonus</i>	182A-183A	18		
27	<i>Demetrius Poliorcetes</i>	183A-C	2		N and F present I and II as two different apophthegms
28	<i>Antigonus Secundus</i>	183C-D	5		
29	<i>Lysimachus</i>	183D-E	2		
30	<i>Antipater</i>	183E-F	2		
31	<i>Antiochus Tertius</i>	183F	2		
32	<i>Antiochus Hierax</i>	184A	1		
33	<i>Eumenes</i>	184A-B	1		
34	<i>Pyrrhus</i>	184C-D	6		
35	<i>Antiochus Septimus</i>	184D-F	2		
<i>IIc 14 Athenians</i>					<i>184F-189D</i>
36	<i>Themistocles</i>	184F-185F	16	All editions present XV and XVI as two different apophthegms, but L seems inclined to join them	
37	<i>Myronides</i>	185F-186A	1		
38	<i>Aristeides</i>	186A-C	5		
39	<i>Pericles</i>	186C	4		
40	<i>Alcibiades</i>	186D-F	7		

41	<i>Lamachus</i>	186F	1	
42	<i>Iphicrates</i>	186F-187B	6	
43	<i>Timotheus</i>	187B-C	3	
44	<i>Chabrias</i>	187C-D	3	
45	<i>Hegesippus</i>	187D-E	1	
46	<i>Pytheas</i>	187E	1	
47	<i>Phocion</i>	187E-189B	19	
48	<i>Peisistratus</i>	189B-D	5	
49	<i>Demetrius Phalereus</i>	189D	1	
<hr/>				
<i>II d</i>	<i>18 Spartans</i>	<i>189D-192C</i>	<i>49</i>	
50	<i>Lycurgus</i>	189D-F	5	
51	<i>Charillus</i>	189F	3	
52	<i>Teleclus</i>	189F	1	
53	<i>Theopompus</i>	189F	1	
54	<i>Archidamus Secundus</i>	190A	1	
55	<i>Brasidas</i>	190B-C	3	
56	<i>Agis Secundus</i>	190C-D	5	All editions present V and VI as two different apophthegms
57	<i>Lysander</i>	190D-F	5	
58	<i>Agesilaus</i>	190F-191D	12	
59	<i>Archidamus Tertius</i>	191D	1	
60	<i>Agis Tertius</i>	191E	2	
61	<i>Cleomenes</i>	191E	1	
62	<i>Pedaritus</i>	191F	1	
63	<i>Damonidas</i>	191F	1	
64	<i>Nicostratus</i>	192A	1	
65	<i>Eudamidas</i>	192A-B	2	
66	<i>Antiochus Spartiates</i>	192B	1	
67	<i>Antalcidas</i>	192B-C	3	
<hr/>				
<i>II e</i>	<i>2 Thebans</i>	<i>192C-194E</i>	<i>30</i>	
68	<i>Epameinondas</i>	192C-194C	24	
69	<i>Pelopidas</i>	194C-E	6	
<hr/>				
<i>III</i>	<i>20 Romans</i>	<i>194E-208A</i>	<i>167</i>	
70	<i>Manius Curius</i>	194E-F	2	
71	<i>Gaius Fabricius</i>	194F-195B	4	All editions present IV and V as two different apophthegms
72	<i>Fabius Maximus</i>	195C-196A	7	
73	<i>Scipio Maior</i>	196B-197A	9	All editions present VI and VII as two different apophthegms
74	<i>Flaminius</i>	197A-D	6	
				No editions split I

26 RESTRUCTURING PLUTARCH'S *REGUM APOPHTHEGMATA*

75	<i>Gaius Domitius</i>	197D-E	1	All editions present I and II, VI and VII, and XVI and XVII as different apophthegms	
76	<i>Publius Licinius</i>	197E-F	1		
77	<i>Paulus Aemilius</i>	197F-198D	9		
78	<i>Cato Maior</i>	198D-199E	26		
79	<i>Scipio Minor</i>	199F-201F	22		All editions present XX and XXI as two different apophthegms
80	<i>Caecilius Metellus</i>	201F-202A	3		
81	<i>Marius</i>	202A-D	6		
82	<i>Catulus Lutatius</i>	202D-E	1		
83	<i>Sulla</i>	202E	1		
84	<i>Gaius Popillius</i>	202E-203A	1		
85	<i>Lucullus</i>	203A-B	3	No editions split II	
86	<i>Pompeius</i>	203B-204E	16	No editions split I	
87	<i>Cicero</i>	204E-205E	20	All editions present XIV and XV as two different apophthegms, but N seems inclined to join them	
88	<i>Caesar</i>	205E-206F	14	All editions present VI and VII as two different apophthegms, but N seems inclined to join them. IX and X require redivision (see §2.1.4)	
89	<i>Augustus</i>	206F-208A	15		