# The Opening of Plutarch's *Life of Themistokles*

*Timothy E. Duff*

THE OPENING CHAPTERS of many Plutarchan Lives deal with a fairly standard set of subjects, such as family, appearance, education, or character,[1] and the *Life of Themistokles* is no exception; its first chapter contains material relating to Themistokles' family and parentage. Scholarly attention on the opening of the *Themistokles* has generally focused on the historical accuracy and origins of the details Plutarch records. The focus of this paper, however, is on the logic of the selection and organisation of this material, and the way in which it is integrated into the *Life of Themistokles* as a whole. I shall attempt to demonstrate that Plutarch's discussion of Themistokles' family in *Them.* 1 plays an important "proemial" role within the Life in which it is placed: it introduces themes and images which will be of importance throughout the Life, and implicitly reveals character-traits of the subject which will be developed later.[2]

## 1. *Themistokles' parentage*

As it stands in our manuscripts,[3] the *Life of Themistokles* begins, as do so many Lives, with a discussion of ancestry (1.1–4). Themistokles' father was not very conspicuous, Plutarch tells

[1] F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form* (Leipzig 1901) 180–182.

[2] P. A. Stadter, "The Proems of Plutarch's *Lives*," *ICS* 13 (1988) 275–295, at 288, briefly notes the "proemial function" of the opening of the *Them.*, but sees it in terms of arousing the reader's interest and establishing good will towards the author through the citation of sources. My aim here is rather different.

[3] There is probably a lacuna preceding the first words (Θεμιστοκλεῖ δέ): see the Appendix below for details.

*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 48 (2008) 159–179

us, "but on his mother's side he was a *nothos*." Plutarch supports this claim by quoting an elegiac couplet, probably a funerary epigram (1.1):

Ἀβρότονον Θρήισσα γυνὴ γένος· ἀλλὰ τεκέσθαι
τὸν μέγαν Ἕλλησίν φημι Θεμιστοκλέα.

I am Habrotonon, a Thracian woman by race. But I declare that for the Greeks I gave birth to the great Themistokles.[4]

We cannot be certain of the original context in which this couplet was composed or propagated, or its date, though it need not be seen, as is sometimes claimed, simply as an item of anti-Themistoklean propaganda:[5] it makes a contrast, not necessarily to Themistokles' discredit, between his lowly origins and his great success. But in its Plutarchan context, the couplet is cited to confirm Plutarch's claim that Themistokles was a *nothos*.[6]

Some commentators, assuming that Plutarch saw in it proof of Themistokles' *notheia* simply in the fact that his mother was foreign, have accused Plutarch of a crass anachronism. As they point out, marriages between Athenian men and foreign women were perfectly possible in Themistokles' period, that is, before Perikles' citizenship law of 451 B.C., and having a foreign mother, provided that one's parents were legally married,

[4] Or "I declare to the Greeks that I gave birth to the great Themistokles," or "I declare that I gave birth to Themistokles, who is great to the Greeks." The couplet is also quoted at Ath. 576C and *Anth.Gr.* 7.306. For a similarly-worded claim, cf. the fourth-century inscription put up to commemorate the chariot victories of the Spartan princess Kyniska, preserved on stone (*CEG* 820) and in *Anth.Gr.* 13.16, "I declare that I alone of women from the whole of Greece won this crown" (μόναν δ' ἐμέ φαμι γυναικῶν Ἑλλάδος ἐκ πάσας τόνδε λαβεῖν στέφανον).

[5] Anti-Themistoklean: L. Piccirilli in C. Carena, M. Manfredini, L. Piccirilli (eds.), *Le Vite di Temistocle e di Camillo* (Milan 1983), and J. L. Marr, *Plutarch: Life of Themistocles* (Warminster 1998), ad loc.

[6] The couplet is introduced with ὡς λέγουσιν ("as they say"), which marks that it is a quotation (cf. C. B. R. Pelling, *Plutarch: Life of Antony* [Cambridge 1988] on *Ant.* 2.2, 77.3), and is not an expression of doubt or distance. See B. Cook, "Plutarch's Use of λέγεται: Narrative Design and Source in *Alexander*," *GRBS* 42 (2001) 329–360, esp. 342, "What Plutarch is doing, in fact, [i.e. in such uses of λέγεται, φασι, λέγουσι etc.] is assuring the reader that the material comes from the tradition."

neither denied one citizenship nor made one illegitimate.[7] It is most unlikely, however, that Plutarch has simply forgotten the citizenship law. He shows himself elsewhere perfectly well aware of it; indeed it is to Plutarch that we owe our most detailed description of it (*Per.* 37.2–5). He was also well aware that other men of Themistokles' period had foreign mothers and yet were not barred from either inheritance or citizenship. He records, for example, that Kimon had a Thracian mother, though a high-born one, the daughter of king Oloros (*Cim.* 4.1).

The point of Plutarch's inclusion of the couplet must be rather that he saw in it evidence for the fact that Themistokles' mother was a *hetaira* or concubine and so not married to his father.[8] The fact is not spelt out here explicitly, though there was certainly a tradition of this: Athenaios prefaces his quotation of the same epigram by asking simply "Was not Themistokles himself born of a *hetaira* named Habrotonon?" (576C). But the name itself would probably have been a sufficient signal. The only three other individuals called Habrotonon of whom we know are fictional *hetairai*.[9] Furthermore, female names which are neuter in form were traditionally associated with *hetairai* (though there are exceptions);[10] indeed Herodian, in discussing the declension of such female names, states

[7] E.g. M.-F. Billot, "Antisthène et le Cynosarges dans l'Athènes des V$^{e}$ et IV$^{e}$ siècles," in M.-O. Goulet-Cazé and R. Goulet (eds.), *Le Cynisme ancien et ses prolongements* (Paris 1993) 69–116, at 81; Marr, *Life of Themistocles* ad loc., "Plutarch, however, considers Themistocles' illegitimacy to be the consequence of his mother's non-Athenian nationality. But this is an anachronistic view, since it was only after Pericles' nationality law in 451 (*Ath. Pol.* 26.4, *Pericles* 37.2–3) that children of a marriage between an Athenian father and non-Athenian mother were disqualified from citizenship and considered to be *nothoi*, illegitimate."

[8] Cf. D. Ogden, *Greek Bastardy in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods* (Oxford 1996) 56.

[9] In Men. *Epitrep.* and *Perikeir.*; Lucian *Dial.meretr.* 1. Cf. Plut *Amat.* 753D: better to marry "some Thracian Habrotonon or Milesian Bacchis … for a price." Cf. Marr, *Life of Themistocles* ad loc.

[10] E.g. the *hetairai* in Lucian's *Dial.meretr.* Cf. Plut. *Aem.* 8.11: Perseus of Macedon is said to have been illegitimate (lit. "not *gnesios*"), as the son of a certain seamstress Gnathainion; on the latter name and its associations with *hetairai*, see A. S. F. Gow, ed., *Machon: The Fragments* (Cambridge 1965) 8.

simply, "*habrotonon* [neuter] is the name of a herb, Habrotonon [feminine] is the name of a *hetaira*."[11] Pliny, furthermore, claims that the plant of this name had aphrodisiac qualities (*HN* 21.162). Finally, the etymology of the name, from ἁβρός ("soft, luxuriant"), makes it particularly appropriate for a *hetaira*.[12] The mention of Thrace may also be intended to imply that his mother was a slave (and prostitutes might, of course, often be slaves):[13] although in Themistokles' own period other elite Athenians took foreign wives, including Thracians, in later periods this detail may have been seized upon, or alternatively invented, because of the association of Thrace with slaves.[14]

Plutarch's quotation of the couplet is intended, then, to confirm Themistokles' *notheia* by providing evidence that his parents were not legally married. Plutarch goes on to cite counter-claims about Themistokles' mother, which he ascribes to Phanias and Neanthes (fourth and third centuries B.C.). Phanias, Plutarch tells us (Φανίας μέντοι), accorded Themistokles' mother a different name; Neanthes added (προστίθησι) that she was a native of the Greek city of Halikarnassos (1.2).[15] Once again we cannot be certain of the purpose or context of these claims as originally made, though taken together they do certainly suggest that Themistokles' origins had been a theme for heated debate in the centuries following his death.[16] But

[11] Herodian *On the declension of names* (Περὶ κλίσεως ὀνομάτων) 3.2 (757.23–25 Lentz).

[12] Wilamowitz, *Menander. Das Schiedsgericht (Epitrepontes)* (Berlin 1925) 48, suggests the derivation is "softly-stretched," describing the plant's stem.

[13] E.g. Habrotonon in Menander's *Epitrepontes*.

[14] Themistokles' mother need not, of course, have in reality been either a *hetaira* or called Habrotonon. Attacks of this nature on political opponents were common, and it may well have been accusations that she was a *hetaira* which later promoted the ascription of the name to her in the first place.

[15] Plutarch implies that Neanthes, like Phanias, gave the name, but in addition a city too. Ath. 576D cites Neanthes for the name alone.

[16] Cf. the attempt of P. Bicknell, "Themistokles' Father and Mother," *Historia* 31 (1982) 161–173, to reconcile the claim of the couplet that Themistokles' mother was Thracian, with the evidence of Phanias and Neanthes that she was from Caria, and with Nepos' claim in his *Them.* 1.2 that she was an Acarnanian citizen (*Acarnanam civem*), by arguing that Caria and

Plutarch deploys them here as counter-evidence to what had gone before (hence the μέντοι). The logic seems to be that if Themistokles' mother had a more respectable name and was from a Greek city, it was more likely that she was the properly betrothed wife of his father, and not, therefore, a *hetaira* or concubine. It is not clear whether Plutarch saw these claims as counter-evidence to Themistokles' being a *nothos*, or merely to his mother's being a *hetaira*, implying that his *notheia* must have had some other cause. At any rate, the fact of his being a *nothos* is taken for granted in the next sentence, "For this reason" (i.e. because he was a *nothos*), "and because the *nothoi* used to frequent the Kynosarges …" (1.3).

What exactly *notheia* meant at Themistokles' period, and what Plutarch or his readers might have understood by the term, are both complex issues. But the claim for Themistokles' *notheia* need not perhaps be dismissed out of hand as historically implausible, as is done by most commentators.[17] After all, on one definition *nothoi* are simply the children of parents who had not been married by *engue*, and at least one of whom, normally the father, was a citizen.[18] Another narrower definition limits *notheia* only to the "paternally acknowledged" children of such

---

Acarnania are corruptions of Cardia, a Greek city in Thrace. Cf. also J. K. Davies, *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford 1971) 212–213; D. M. Lewis, "Themistocles' Mother," *Historia* 32 (1983) 245. C. Cooper, "Phaenias of Eresus on Solon and Themistocles," *EMC* 39 (1995) 323–335, argues that the work of Phanias, whom Plutarch cites elsewhere in the Life (7.7, 13.5, 27.8, 29.11), was his *Pros tous sophistas*.

[17] E. Hruza, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des griechischen und römischen Familienrechtes* II *Polygamie und Pellikat nach griechischen Rechte* (Leipzig 1894) 111–112 and 120–122, because this would be inconsistent with his being a citizen; A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens* (Oxford 1968) I 25, because it would be inconsistent with his being an archon; F. J. Frost, *Plutarch's Themistocles: A Historical Commentary* (Princeton 1980) 62, because it would be inconsistent with his being from an aristocratic family, citing Lysias (30.27–28) and Aristotle (*Ath.Pol.* 28.1); S. Humphreys, "The *nothoi* of Kynosarges," *JHS* 94 (1974) 88–95, at 88, without discussion; Piccirilli, *Temistocle*, and Marr, *Life of Themistocles* ad loc. Neither Davies in *APF*, nor P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford 1981) ad *Ath.Pol.* 22.7, 26.4, and 28.1 (279, 332, 344), comment on Themistokles' *notheia*.

[18] Harrison, *Law* I 61–68.

unmarried parents, and envisages some kind of stable concubinal relationship.[19] Both these definitions could encompass Plutarch's Themistokles perfectly well. Indeed, the fact that *nothoi* had to have, and perhaps be acknowledged by, an Athenian citizen father might help explain Plutarch's otherwise rather strange designation of Themistokles as *nothos* "on his mother's side" (πρὸς μητρός): he was not simply illegitimate; he was a recognised child of his father, Neokles, who was himself, as Plutarch makes clear (1.1), an Athenian citizen.[20] As to whether in Themistokles' period it was impossible to be both a *nothos* and a citizen, as is sometimes claimed, there is probably too little evidence to draw firm conclusions. It is not certain that even after 451 children born of citizen parents who were not formally betrothed were always excluded from citizenship;[21] it is therefore not out of the question that Themistokles, born at a time when the non-Athenian status of his mother would not have been an issue, could have been a *nothos* and a citizen.[22] At any rate, Plutarch was aware of how surprising his

[19] C. Patterson, "Those Athenian Bastards," *CSCA* 9 (1990) 40–73, though for some reason she dismisses without discussion the possibility that Themistokles might have been a *nothos* (63, citing Humphreys, *JHS* 94 [1974] 88). Cf. D. Lotze, "Zwischen Politen und Metöken: Passivbürger im klassischen Athen?" *Klio* 63 (1981) 159–178.

[20] Cf. Pollux 3.21, which defines *nothos* and *gnesios* on the basis of the status of the mother, not the father, who is assumed to be a citizen: γνήσιος μὲν ὁ ἐκ γυναικὸς ἀστῆς καὶ γαμετῆς—ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς καὶ ἰθαγενής—νόθος δ' ὁ ἐκ ξένης ἢ παλλακίδος.

[21] Harrison, *Law* I 61–68, and D. M. MacDowell, "Bastards as Athenian Citzens," *CQ* 26 (1976) 88–91, argue that they were not; P. J. Rhodes, "Bastards as Athenian Citizens," *CQ* 28 (1978) 89–92, that they were.

[22] Cf. Ogden, *Greek Bastardy* 15–17 and 44–58 (54–58 on Themistokles). He argues that *nothoi* proper were normally excluded from citizenship well before 451, but suggests that the term might have been used *informally* of children born of a marriage between a citizen father and a foreign mother, i.e. the group to be excluded from citizenship after 451. This has the advantage of providing a mechanism by which Themistokles' citizenship might be reconciled with Plutarch's calling him a *nothos*. But it entails assuming that his parents were married, which, as we have seen, goes against the implications of the couplet which Plutarch quotes. Frost, *Plutarch's Themistocles* 63, thinks along these lines, but implies that the application of the term *nothos* to Themistokles occurred only later.

claim for Themistokles' *notheia* would appear to his contemporary readers: the opening words of the Life draw attention to it as unusual and striking.[23]

But although the couplet is introduced to substantiate Plutarch's claim that Themistokles was a *nothos*, it also serves a very literary function: like many of the other details in this chapter it prefigures and signals themes which will recur in the rest of the Life. First, with its emphatically placed τὸν μέγαν, the couplet serves to set the tone for the rest of the Life: this will be the Life of an emphatically "great" man. Of course in one sense all of Plutarch's subjects are by the mere fact of inclusion in the *Parallel Lives* considered great.[24] But in this Life there will throughout be a recurrent stress on Themistokles' greatness or "great deeds"; μέγας and its compounds will recur frequently, though early in the Life there is some doubt implied as to whether Themistokles will use this "greatness" for good or ill. In the next chapter, for example, he is characterised as *megalopragmon* ("fond of great action," 2.1); this fondness for practical action leads his schoolteacher to declare, "You will not turn out to be anything small, my child, but great, for sure, either good or bad" (2.3), and, later in life, Themistokles himself is said to have boasted that although he did not know music "he did know how to take a small and inglorious city and make it great and glorious" (2.4). His neglect of real education in favour of practical training meant, Plutarch continues, that his nature produced great changes of behaviour "to both sides" (i.e. to both the good and the bad)—as his teacher had implied (2.7). Perhaps not surprisingly, then, once politically prominent, he stirs up the people and imposes "great novelties" (3.3).

The early chapters, then, will emphasise Themistokles' great-

[23] Note that the first sentence of the *Camillus*, the Life paired with the *Themistokles*, also contains a paradox: despite the many successes and many other offices held by Camillus, including being dictator five times and celebrating four triumphs, he never held the consulship (*Cam.* 1.1).

[24] Cf. Plutarch's invoking of Plato's idea, propounded in the *Republic*, of "great natures" in several pairs: T. E. Duff, *Plutarch's Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice* (Oxford 1999) 47–49, 60–65, 205–208, 224–228, and index. On the importance of this Platonic paradigm for the *Them.*, see Duff, "Plutarch's *Camillus*," in N. Humble (ed.), *Parallelism in Plutarch's Lives* (forthcoming).

ness but also suggest some ambiguity about its results. But as the Persian invasion threatens, his greatness is presented unambiguously as used for good. Plutarch lists various other achievements of Themistokles before the invasion, concluding, "But the *greatest* of all his achievements was his stopping Greek wars and reconciling the cities with each other" (6.5). His success in convincing the Athenian people to evacuate Athens is also described as "great," as, it seems, is his arranging for the recall of Aristeides (11.1).[25] Themistokles is explicitly, then, a great man, and a performer of great deeds.[26] Indeed Plutarch will go so far as to apply the term "heroic" (ἡρωϊκός) to him, or more properly his appearance (22.3)—one of only two uses of the term for a protagonist of the Lives.[27]

The couplet quoted in *Them.* 1.1, therefore, introduces and foreshadows the theme of the greatness of Themistokles. It also foreshadows the notion of Themistokles' service to the whole of Greece, not just Athens. The couplet mentions "the Greeks" (Ἕλλησιν). In both grammar and sense, this can be taken with both φημι ("I declare to the Greeks"), τεκέσθαι ("I declare that I bore to the Greeks"), and τὸν μέγαν ("the one who is great for

[25] ταῦτά τε δὴ μεγάλα τοῦ Θεμιστοκλέους καὶ … The suggestion of G. E. Vasmanolis, "Κριτικὰ καὶ ἑρμηνευτικὰ εἰς Πλουτάρχου *Θεμιστοκλέα*," *Platon* 25 (1973) 281–293, at 285, without evidence, that μεγάλα here is corrupt should be rejected in view of the centrality of this theme.

[26] Other examples of Themistokles' "greatness": 13.4, οἷον εἴωθεν ἐν μεγάλοις ἀγῶσι καὶ πράγμασι χαλεποῖς; 27.2, περὶ πραγμάτων μεγάλων; 31.3, δωρεὰς μεγάλας; 32.5, where Themistokles' tomb is described as near the "great harbour" of Peiraeus and its base as εὐμεγέθης. The motif of greatness in fact provides another point of comparison between the *Themistokles* and *Camillus*. It is present from the first line of the *Camillus*, "Concerning Furius Camillus, many great things have been said" (*Cam.* 1.1), and recurs several times later: 2.1, 5.1, 7.1, 42.1. Cf. P. A. Stadter, "Searching for Themistocles: A Review Article," *CJ* 79 (1983/4) 356–363, at 358–359, on the presentation of Themistokles and Camillus here as heroes, and D. H. J. Larmour, "Making Parallels: *Synkrisis* and Plutarch's 'Themistocles and Camillus'," *ANRW* II.33.6 (1992) 4154–4200, at 4198–4199, on allusions to Achilles.

[27] The other is *Demetr.* 2.2. The term is also used in *Lys.* 5.8 ("they admired Kallikratidas' virtue as they would the beauty of a heroic statue"): see Duff, *Plutarch's Lives* 168–170.

the Greeks"). Either way, in its original context, the point must have been the contrast with Θρήισσα: although "Thracian by birth," Habrotonon was actually a benefactor of Greece. This notion of benefaction to Greece, introduced in passing in the couplet here, will in fact be a major theme in the rest of the Life. Themistokles was an Athenian, but Plutarch will later place emphasis on the way he benefited the whole of Greece rather than just Athens.[28] In ch. 3, for example, Themistokles does not consider the Athenian victory at Marathon to be the end of the war but "the beginning of greater struggles, for which he began anointing himself *on behalf of all Greece*" (3.5). Shortly afterwards, when Plutarch describes Themistokles' encouraging of the Athenians to build warships in the nick of time, he pauses to discuss the effect which this naval policy had on Athens. Some, Plutarch argues, quoting Plato, thought that this damaged the Athenians morally; "but that salvation (σωτηρία) for the Greeks came at that time from the sea and that those triremes restored again the city of Athens, Xerxes himself is the strongest witness" (4.4–5). And as we have noted, Plutarch calls "the greatest of his deeds" his stopping of "Greek wars" (6.5). Later, Themistokles persuades his fellow citizens to recall Aristeides because "he feared that … [Aristeides] might destroy the cause of Greece" (11.1). And, when after the war Themistokles is cheered in the stadium at Olympia, he remarks to his friends "that he was enjoying in full the fruit of his labours on behalf of Greece" (17.4).

Of course, the themes of Themistokles' greatness and his benefaction to Greece were already, in a sense, built into the couplet itself: it was presumably for exactly these implications, and for the contrast between his humble birth and later greatness, that the couplet was first composed or quoted. But by choosing to include the couplet, and to quote it rather than merely refer to it, Plutarch exploits it not just for the evidence it provides for Themistokles' *notheia*, the explicit reason for its in-

[28] This contrast is perhaps implied by the designation of Themistokles' father as "not one of the very eminent *at Athens*" to be followed by "for/to the Greeks" in the couplet.

clusion, but to signal and prefigure themes which his own text will develop.[29]

2. *Themistokles and Kynosarges*

There then follows a story of Themistokles' success in persuading the well-born youth of Athens to exercise with him (literally "anoint themselves") in a gymnasium dedicated to Herakles outside the city. "By this event," comments Plutarch, "he seems to have cunningly (πανούργως) removed the distinction between illegitimate and legitimate" (1.3). The existence of an area sacred to Herakles, southeast of the city near the Ilissos, and containing both a gymnasium and a *palaistra* (both probably open spaces rather than buildings at this period), is well-attested, as is its association with *nothoi*.[30] The precise details of Themistokles' action, on the other hand, are unclear, as is its historical reliability.[31] But, as so often with such characterising anecdotes in the Lives, their historicity is not important for the function they play within the text in which they are placed. The story is in fact typical of Plutarchan childhood, or youthful, anecdotes in the Lives in general: that is, it is presented without narrative context (simply "he set about persuading") and is therefore difficult to place chronologically; it

[29] The same can be said of the claims of Neanthes and Phanias (1.2). While Plutarch seems to reject them, or at least, seems to reject the possibility of using them as evidence of Themistokles' own legitimacy, their inclusion is still significant. As so often, Plutarch is prepared to make use for "literary" purposes even of stories the truth of which he doubts or rejects (e.g. *Sol.* 27.1; *Alc.* 3.1–2, with T. E. Duff, "Plutarch on the Childhood of Alkibiades," *PCPhS* 49 [2003] 89–117, at 92–93 and 106–109; *Cam.* 5.5–6, 6.1–6). At one level, the citation of conflicting evidence on Themistokles' parentage suggests how controversial a figure Themistokles was to be. On another level, by detailing such evidence Plutarch also demonstrates his own historical competence, his ability to sift and compare variant traditions. In addition, the mention of Halikarnassos as a possible origin for Themistokles reminds the reader of Herodotos, also of Halikarnassos, knowledge of whose work is assumed throughout the Life (cf. n.39 below).

[30] J. Travlos, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens* (London 1971) s.v.; R. E. Wycherley, *The Stones of Athens* (Princeton 1978) 229–231; Billot, in *Le Cynisme* 81.

[31] See e.g. Humphreys, *JHS* 94 (1974) 88; Patterson, *CSCA* 9 (1990) 63–65; Billot, in *Le Cynisme* 81–85; Ogden, *Greek Bastardy* 56–58.

may indeed be apocryphal. But like many such anecdotes occurring near the starts of Lives, it prefigures both traits of the subject's character and themes which will recur as the Life progresses.[32]

First, this anecdote introduces Themistokles' cunning and persuasiveness.[33] Both characteristics will soon be in evidence: for example, when he persuades the Athenians to use the silver from the Laureion mines to build a fleet (4.1–3); when he famously tricks Xerxes into engaging the Greek fleet at Salamis (12.3–5); or when he tricks the Spartans over the walling of the Peiraeus (19.1–3).[34] The notion that a statesman's later popularity and powers of leadership might be prefigured by his popularity and persuasiveness when young recurs in anecdotes at the start of several others Lives: the young Alkibiades being mobbed by his school mates after an act of childhood bravado, for example, or rejecting the *aulos*, and persuading the other boys to do so (*Alc.* 2.3–7),[35] or the young Cicero walking in procession surrounded by admiring school friends (*Cic.* 2.2). In the same way here Themistokles' later popularity and leadership are prefigured by his success with the noble-born youth.

Furthermore, the description of Themistokles persuading

[32] For the characterising and prefiguring function of childhood anecdotes (e.g. *Alex.* 5.1–6, 6.1–8; *Cic.* 2.1–5; *Alc.* 2.1–3.2; *Cato Min.* 1.3–3.10), see P. A. Stadter, "Anecdotes and the Thematic Structure of Plutarchean Biography," in J. A. Fernández Delgado and F. Pordomingo Pardo (eds.), *Estudios sobre Plutarco: Aspectos formales* (Madrid 1996) 291–303; Duff, *PCPhS* 49 (2003) 89–117, and "Models of Education in Plutarch," *JHS* 108 (2008). Cf. also C. B. R. Pelling, "Childhood and Personality in Greek Biography," in *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature* (Oxford 1990) 213–244 (repr. in *Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies* [London 2002] 301–338).

[33] H. Martin, "The Character of Plutarch's Themistocles," *TAPA* 92 (1961) 326–339, at 337, in passing; Larmour, *ANRW* II.33.6 (1992) 4182–4183 and 4187–4189, who also lists later examples of his cunning; Cooper, *EMC* 39 (1995) 330 (who suggests the anecdote was taken from Phanias). Plutarch notes in *De Herod. malig.* 869F that Themistokles was actually nicknamed Odysseus by some διὰ τὴν φρόνησιν.

[34] Other examples of his persuasiveness, often involving some element of deceit, include 6.5, 7.1–2, 10.1–5, 20.3, 29.8.

[35] On these and other childhood anecdotes prefiguring Alkibiades' later popularity, see Duff, *PCPhS* 49 (2003) 100–106.

others "to come down" (καταβαίνοντας) to the gymnasium and "anoint themselves" (ἀλείφεσθαι) with him prefigures some of his later successes and the language with which they are described. He will later "anoint himself" (ἤλειφε) in preparation for the war, which only he could see coming, and begin "training" the city (3.5).[36] The word καταβαίνω is a common term in athletic contexts for entering a stadium etc. to compete.[37] But καταβαίνοντας here has also been carefully chosen for the parallel with Themistokles' later action in persuading the Athenians to build triremes; he is said to have "gradually lured and brought the city down (καταβιβάζων) to the sea," thus beginning a new naval orientation for Athens (4.1–4).[38] In both cases Themistokles is the trainer or instigator of preparations for contest. Later, when Xerxes "descends" on Greece (καταβαίνοντος ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα, 6.1)—as though, that is, for an athletic contest—the Athenians will be glad of Themistokles' foresight in training them and making them ready. The real athletics of ch. 1, in other words, prepare for the later athletic metaphors, by which preparations for, and the run-up to, the Persian invasion are described. The story of Themistokles at Kynosarges, then, is so fashioned as to prefigure not only Themistokles' characteristics—cunning, persuasiveness—but also key moments in his later success.

Indeed, Kynosarges itself had associations with the Persian Wars: it was the place where Herodotos has the Athenians camping after their forced-march back from Marathon: "they set out from one Herakleion, that at Marathon, and camped at another, that at Kynosarges" (1.116). If one were to take Themistokles' championing of Kynosarges as a real historical event

[36] Athletic metaphors are common in Plutarch: F. Fuhrmann, *Les images de Plutarque* (Paris 1964) 48–49, 126, 244–246. But "anointing" (ἀλείφω etc.) is not (though cf. *Per.* 4.2). Its use in 3.5 plainly recalls 1.3.

[37] LSJ s.v. I.3. It is not normally used of going from inside a city to outside, though cf. *Quomod adulesc.* 33C, καταβαίνουσιν εἰς Ἀκαδήμειαν.

[38] κατὰ μικρὸν ὑπάγων καὶ καταβιβάζων τὴν πόλιν πρὸς τὴν θάλατταν (4.4), where the prefix ὑπ- suggests stealth and cunning (see LSJ s.v. ὑπάγω A.III). This incident finds its parallel in *Cam.* 4.3, where the Veian seer is lured into leaving the city: κατὰ μικρὸν οὕτω διαλεγόμενος καὶ ὑπάγων αὐτόν.

and to imagine it as taking place after 490 (Plutarch gives no indication of date), then its association with Marathon might help explain both Themistokles' own choice of Kynosarges as a training ground, and the readiness of others to join him there. But whatever the dating or historical reality of the incident, its placement at this point in the Life is significant. Throughout the rest of the Life, especially the narrative of the Persian Wars, knowledge of Herodotos is assumed on the part of the reader: for example, Plutarch seems to expect his readers to know the text of "the oracle" (10.3), which he discusses but does not quote, and merely alludes to the Battle of Plataia (16.6) and Themistokles' ostracism (22.4) without actually explaining either.[39] Many of Plutarch's readers, then, would have made the connection with Marathon: mention of Kynosarges both reminds the reader of Herodotos and looks forward to Themistokles' own successes against the Persians. It also perhaps functions to show us something of the psychology of Themistokles, as Plutarch presents him. Later, Plutarch will talk of the young Themistokles' obsession with Miltiades' trophy after Marathon, which did not allow him to sleep (3.4); here we have him exercising in the place where the Athenians camped after Marathon.[40] Marathon, it is implied, dominates his thoughts.

By his action at Kynosarges, Themistokles is said to have "removed the distinction between legitimate and *nothos*." This prefigures his later political radicalism. In the Persian Wars such radicalism would have a positive result: Themistokles' naval policy, Plutarch tells us, turned the Athenians "from sturdy hoplites" to "ship-goers and seafarers" (4.4, quoting Plato *Leg.* 706C). This, Plutarch insists, had a positive result in the short term ("salvation for the Greeks came at that time

[39] Indeed, rather than reproducing Herodotean material, Plutarch seems to prefer to assume knowledge of the latter's narrative and *supplement* it with new material: C. B. R. Pelling, "*De Malignitate Herodoti*? Plutarch, Herodotos and the Persian Wars," in E. E. Bridges, E. M. Hall, P. J. Rhodes (eds.), *Cultural Responses to the Persian Wars: From Antiquity to the Third Millenium* (Oxford 2007) 145–164, at 151–161. For knowledge of Herodotos assumed, cf. also Stadter, *CJ* 79 (1983/4) 359.

[40] On Miltiades' trophy and Themistokles see Duff, in *Parallelism*, and "The Text of Plutarch, *Themistokles* 2.3," *Philologus* (forthcoming).

from the sea"). Later in the Life, however, Themistokles will be presented as harming Athens by promoting the interests of the poor: he "increased the power of the *demos* against the best men, and filled them with boldness, since power passed to sailors, boatswains, and helmsmen" (19.3–5). In this anecdote we see these revolutionary tendencies prefigured.

In explaining why the Herakleion at Kynosarges was associated with *nothoi*, Plutarch draws a parallel between Herakles and Themistokles: "he too (κἀκεῖνος) was not legitimate among the gods." The parallel is suggestive of Themistokles' heroic status; indeed it lends to Themistokles' *notheia* an elevated sense, redolent of the mythic heroes and gods. On the other hand, the parallel with Herakles also suggests Themistokles' cultural inadequacy. Herakles was known for his great achievements, just as Themistokles will be, but hardly for his cultural accomplishments. Indeed, the young Herakles was a famously wild and reluctant pupil; he even murdered his teacher Linos, a scene which is depicted on several vase paintings from the first half of the fifth century.[41] Some versions of the story have him killing Linos with the lyre which he was unable to play (e.g. Diod. 3.67.2, Apollod. 2.63). The young Themistokles was, as the next chapter will show, also a wild pupil who neglected "those studies which form character or are pursued with a view to any pleasant or liberal accomplishment," and famously did not learn to play the lyre (*Them*. 2.4). The mention of Herakles, then, is also suggestive of Themistokles' character, and his poor education and wild youth, to which Plutarch turns in ch. 2.

The link between Themistokles and Herakles which is suggested here may in fact be continued a few chapters later in 3.4, where, as we have seen, Plutarch comments on the effect that Miltiades' victory at Marathon, and his resulting fame, had on the ambitious Themistokles, keeping him awake at night. In fact, in the *Life of Theseus* the same image is used, in

[41] Examples are given in F. Beck, *Album of Greek Education: The Greeks at School and at Play* (Sydney 1975) 5–6 (plates) and 10–11, and in *LIMC* IV.1 1667–1673. A fragment of the Old Comedian Alexis (fr.140 K.-A.) has Linos attempting to teach Herakles literature, but he is only interested in food.

very similar language, of the effect which Herakles' deeds had on the young Theseus, which keep him awake at night, together with a direct reference to Miltiades' trophy and Themistokles (6.8–9).[42] The *Theseus – Romulus* was probably composed at roughly the same time as the *Themistokles – Camillus* and the *Lycurgus – Numa*; they may have been published as a bundle together or in quick succession.[43] If the reader approached the *Themistokles* after reading the *Theseus*, and calls *Thes.* 6 to mind when reading *Them.* 3, the effect might be to reinforce the ambiguous link between Themistokles and Herakles suggested in *Them.* 1.[44]

### 3. *Themistokles and the Lykomid shrine*

Plutarch finishes his discussion of Themistokles' family with the claim that he had a "connection" with, or "was a member

[42] As Pelling points out, the erotic image is not found in other treatments of the relationship of Herakles and Theseus and is almost certainly Plutarch's own psychological reconstruction: *Characterization* 229 = *Plutarch and History* 311.

[43] This is a deduction from the mutual cross-references in these three pairs (*Thes.* 1.4, *Rom.* 21.1, *Cam.* 33.10), and is advocated by J. Mewaldt, "Selbstcitate in den Biographien Plutarchs," *Hermes* 42 (1907) 564–578; C. P. Jones, "Towards a Chronology of Plutarch's Works," *JRS* 56 (1966) 61–74, at 66–68 (= B. Scardigli [ed.], *Essays on Plutarch's Lives* [Oxford 1995] 106–111); L. Piccirilli, "Cronologia relativa e fonti della *Vita Solonis* di Plutarco," *AnnPisa* III.7 (1997) 999–1016, at 999–1004, and "Cronologia relativa alle fonti delle *Vitae Lycurgi et Numae* di Plutarco," in *Φιλίας Χάριν: Miscellanea di studi classici in onore di Eugenio Manni* V (Rome 1980) 1751–1764, at 1753–1755; C. B. R. Pelling, "Plutarch's Method of Work in the Roman Lives," *JHS* 99 (1979) 74–96 (= Scardigli, *Essays* 265–318, and *Plutarch and History* 1–44); M. van der Valk, "Notes on the Composition and Arrangement of the Biographies of Plutarch," in M. Naldini (ed.), *Studi in onore di Aristide Colonna* (Perugia 1982) 301–337, at 304–307; A. G. Nikolaidis, "Plutarch's Methods: His Cross-references and the Sequence of the Parallel Lives," in A. Pérez Jiménez and F. Titchener (eds.), *Historical and Biographical Values of Plutarch's Works. Studies Devoted to Professor Philip Stadter* (Malaga/Utah 2005) 283–324, at 290–292.

[44] The parallel between *Them.* 3.4 and *Thes.* 6.8–9 might also suggest another link between Themistokles and Theseus: the saviour of Athens with its founder. That notion is then taken up in the paired Life: Camillus, as Plutarch reminds us in the first sentence of the *Cam.*, was dubbed a second founder of Rome.

of" (μετεῖχε) the Lykomid *genos* (1.4). While earlier Plutarch had used the word γένος loosely, as he often does at the start of Lives both Roman and Greek, to mean simply "family" or "ancestry," here he seems to use it in a more technical Athenian sense ("clan").[45] Plutarch's sources here almost certainly go back ultimately to contemporary or near contemporary debate and propaganda, in which the Lykomids were trying to assert their own power. One strand of this debate, recorded in 15.3, claimed that a Lykomedes was the first Greek to capture an enemy ship at Salamis.[46] But whatever the reliability of such claims, and whatever the context in which they were originally made, this material is deployed for specific effect here. First, Plutarch has already assumed that Themistokles was a *nothos* but the evidence he mentions here of a Lykomid connection shows that his background was rather more elevated than many readers might have expected of a *nothos* (hence the "however," μέντοι).[47] Second, the use of the word *genos* rounds off the discussion of Themistokles' ancestry, introduced in 1.1 with the same word (τὰ μὲν ἐκ γένους), before the transition in 2.1 to discussion of his character and education. Thirdly, the mention that the Lykomid shrine of initiation (*telesterion*) at Phlya was burned by the Persians and later restored by Themistokles is brought in explicitly to prove his connection with the Lykomid *genos*; but implicitly it also once again looks forward, both to the Persian invasion and to Themistokles' success. Just as he restored the fortunes of Phlya, so will Themistokles re-

[45] γένος is the usual Plutarchan word for family or "descent," and introduces the topic in Roman Lives as much as in Greek: e.g. *Rom.* 2.2, *Num.* 1.5, *Pub.* 1.2, *Cato Mai.* 1.1, *Fab.* 1.2, *Cic.* 1.2, *Sert.* 2.1, *Cato Min.* 1.1 (cf. *Phoc.* 4.1), *Brut.* 1.5; cf. *Galba* 3.2. There is thus no compelling reason to see it as having its technical Athenian sense in *Them.* 1.1, pace W. R. Connor, "Lycomedes against Themistocles? A Note on Intragenos Rivalry," *Historia* 21 (1972) 569–574, at 573 n.11.

[46] Or Artemision (Hdt. 8.11). The Lykomid *genos*: Connor, *Historia* 21 (1972) 569–574; Piccirilli, *Temistocle*, and Marr, *Life of Themistocles* ad 1.4 and 15.3.

[47] And should perhaps be used to refine our picture of both Athenian *gene* and *notheia*, as Ogden does (*Greek Bastardy* 54–58), not to reject out of hand Themistokles' *notheia* as inconsistent with his membership of the *genos*.

store the fortunes of Athens after she too had been "burnt by the barbarians" (1.4, 19.1–3).

4. *Conclusions: the openings of Lives*

The mention of the sack of the *telesterion* at Phlya in 480 B.C., and of its restoration at some later date, makes clear an important structural feature of this section of the *Themistokles*, as of the early sections of most Plutarchan Lives: they are organised thematically, not chronologically. Ch. 1 deals with the question of Themistokles' lineage and family connections; the couplet and the incidents at Kynosarges and Phlya are introduced to illustrate and confirm the claims made on this topic. The next chapter will discuss Themistokles' character, and likewise cites in illustration various anecdotes drawn both from his childhood (composing speeches in the school yard; his teacher's comment on his greatness: 2.1–3) and from his adult life (e.g. being mocked "later" for his lack of culture: 2.4). The presence of μέν in 1.1 (τὰ μὲν ἐκ γένους), to be picked up by the δέ in 2.1 (ἔτι δὲ παῖς ὢν ὁμολογεῖται φορᾶς μεστὸς εἶναι) makes clear that these sections are articulated thematically.[48] Thus no deductions can be made about the relative chronology of such incidents merely on the basis of the sequence in which they are invoked in these early chapters. There is no reason to date Themistokles' success at Kynosarges early in his life merely because of its placement early in Plutarch's text; nor in 2.8, when Plutarch mentions various stories relating to Themistokles' mother and father, introduced to illustrate Themistokles' love of practical action, is there any *a priori* reason to date these incidents, if they ever occurred, as later than the incident at Kynosarges.[49]

The opening chapter of the *Themistokles* does not, then, contain chronological narrative. But, as I have tried to show, it is

[48] Cf. the similar thematic articulation in the *Alc.*: τὸ Ἀλκιβιάδου γένος (1.1) … περὶ μὲν οὖν τοῦ κάλλους (1.4) … τῇ δὲ φωνῇ (1.6) … τὸ δὲ ἦθος αὐτοῦ (2.1).

[49] One might, of course, be tempted to treat the reference to Phlya as a *prolepsis*, a momentary flash-forward, of the kind which is common in both modern fiction and ancient historiography. But that would be to presuppose a chronological structure.

fully integrated into the Life as a whole. The material on Themistokles' family introduces themes which will recur later in the Life and sketches out implicitly some of Themistokles' character-traits, which will be developed as the Life progresses. This phenomenon, whereby the opening sections of Lives play a proemial role, setting out implicitly many of the themes and images which will be central to what will follow, is characteristic of many other Lives too.[50] Most Lives begin, as the *Themistokles* does, with material relating to a fairly predictable set of topics, such as ancestry, appearance, education, or character. These passages often, as in the *Themistokles*, raise a number of important historical issues. But to focus only on the historical authenticity of the details that the opening chapters include is to fail to see the literary function of such material within the work which it introduces.

## APPENDIX: The Text of *Them.* 1.1

The first words of the *Life of Themistokles*, and so of the *Themistokles – Camillus* book as a whole, are Θεμιστοκλεῖ δέ.[51] Several scholars have suggested that the presence of δέ here is unusual, and suspected that something was missing,[52] though neither Ziegler in his Teubner text, Flacelière in the Budé, nor Perrin in the Loeb mark this as in any way unsatisfactory.[53] There are good grounds for suspecting a

[50] See Duff, *Plutarch's Lives* 165–168, on *Lys.* 1; *PCPhS* 49 (2003) 89–117, on *Alc.* 2–3; and "How Lives Begin," in A. G. Nikolaidis (ed.), *Lives in Moralia, Moralia in Lives* (New York/Berlin 2008), on *Alc.* 1 and *Per.* 3–6. On a subject's ancestors prefiguring important themes, see Pelling, *Plutarch: Life of Antony* 117 (on *Ant.* 1); Duff, *Plutarch's Lives* 206 and 310–311.

[51] Θεμιστοκλεῖ δὲ τὰ μὲν ἐκ γένους ἀμαυρότερα πρὸς δόξαν ὑπῆρχε· πατρὸς γὰρ ἦν Νεοκλέους οὐ τῶν ἄγαν ἐπιφανῶν Ἀθήνησι.

[52] K. Sintenis, *Ausgewählte Biographien des Plutarch* III *Themistokles und Perikles*[4], ed. K. Fuhr (Berlin 1880); H. A. Holden, *Plutarch's Life of Themistocles* (Cambridge 1884); Marr, *Life of Themistocles*, all ad loc. B. Perrin, *Plutarch's Themistocles and Alcibiades* (New York 1901) ad loc., also suspected a lacuna, but makes no mention of this in her 1911 Loeb. The translation of R. Waterfield (*Plutarch: Greek Lives* [Oxford 1998]) marks a lacuna. Frost, *Plutarch's Themistocles* ad loc., notes that "some scholars" have suggested a lacuna.

[53] R. Flacelière in his 1972 edition (*Plutarque: Vie de Thémistocle* [Paris 1972]), though not in the Budé edition of 1961 (below, n.55), saw the problem, and deleted the δέ. But it is hard to explain how a superfluous δέ might have found its way into the opening of a work. Piccirilli, *Temistocle* ad loc., cites J. D Denniston, *The Greek*

lacuna. There is nothing unusual in a Plutarchan Life beginning with δέ: there are seventeen such examples, some picking up a μέν at the end of the Life before.[54] But all these examples belong to the start of Lives which fall *second* in a pair. First Lives never elsewhere begin with δέ. Thus, although the first lines of e.g. the *Cato Maior* (Μάρκῳ δὲ Κάτωνί φασιν ἀπὸ Τούσκλου τὸ γένος εἶναι), *Cato Minor* (Κάτωνι δὲ τὸ μὲν γένος) or Cicero (Κικέρωνος δὲ τὴν μὲν μητέρα) may seem superficially parallel, the crucial difference is that these Lives all fall second in their pair. Better parallels would be the beginnings of, e.g., the *Aristeides* (Ἀριστείδης ὁ Λυσιμάχου), or *Coriolanus* (ὁ Μαρκίων οἶκος), both first Lives and beginning without any connective.

Flacelière and Jones, in an attempt to defend the manuscript reading, suggested that the δέ might indicate continuation from another pair of Lives.[55] It is probable that the *Themistokles* – *Camillus* was written at roughly the same time as the *Lycurgus* – *Numa* and *Theseus* – *Romulus*.[56] The final sentence of the *synkrisis* to the *Theseus* – *Romulus* (5.7), which is also the final sentence of the book as a whole, ends with the statement that the birth of Theseus might have been "contrary to the will of the gods" (παρὰ γνώμην θεῶν γεγονέναι τὴν Θησέως τέκνωσιν). Jones proposed that that could have been picked up in *Them.* 1.1 by the statement that Themistokles' family was obscure (Θεμιστοκλεῖ δέ…). But there is no parallel for such a direct link between Plutarchan pairs, and as we have noted δέ occurs at the start of no other first Life. Furthermore, the comment on Theseus' birth is itself part of a δέ clause, which picks up a μέν clause about Romulus; it is most unlikely that Θεμιστοκλεῖ δέ could have been intended to follow this. It is safe to assume, therefore, that something

*Particles*[2] (Oxford 1954) 172–173, to argue that it is possible to find examples of "inceptive" uses of δέ. But Denniston's examples do not concern the start of *works*.

[54] *Pub.* 1.1, *Cam.* 1.1, *Cato Mai.* 1.1, *Luc.* 1.1 (picking up μέν in *Cim.* 19.5), *Fab.* 1.1, *Crass.* 1.1, *Cic.* 1.1 (μέν in *Dem.* 31.7), *Cato Min.* 1.1 (μέν in *Phoc.* 38.5), *Brut.* 1.1, *Tim.* 1.1 (μέν in *Aem.* 39.11), *Eum.* 1.1, *Flam.* 1.1, *Marc.* 1.1, *Gracch.* 1.1, *Num.* 1.1, *Sulla* 1.1 (μέν in *Lys.* 30.8), *Pomp.* 1.1.

[55] Flacelière in R. Flacelière, E. Chambry, M. Juneaux (eds.), *Plutarque Vies* II *Solon – Publicola, Thémistocle – Camille* (Paris 1961) ad loc.; Jones, *JRS* 56 (1966) 67 (= Scardigli, *Essays* 108). A parallel problem is provided by the beginning of Xenophon's *Hellenica* (μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα), which has been taken either as a literary device to suggest that the *Hellenica* is a continuation of Thucydides or as an indication that something has been lost (e.g. P. Krentz, *Xenophon: Hellenika I–II.3.10* [Warminster 1989] ad loc.). Whether a deliberate device or a result of a lacuna, the presence of δέ there is consistent with the content, which begins *in medias res*: "After these events, not many days later, Thymochares came from Athens with a few ships …"

[56] See 173 above.

has been lost and that the *Themistokles – Camillus* book did not begin here.[57]

But what might the lacuna have contained? Many pairs of Lives begin with a prologue, which precedes both Lives of the pair and sets out some of the similarities between the two subjects.[58] It is possible that the lacuna here may have contained such a prologue.[59] But eight other books of *Parallel Lives*, besides this one, do not have such prologues, and it is therefore far from certain that the *Themistokles – Camillus* did.[60] Furthermore, the body of a first Life never begins with a δέ, *even after a prologue*.[61] So whether or not a prologue has been lost, the lacuna must also have contained at least some of the *Life of Themistokles* itself. It may have contained as little as one sentence. Perhaps it mentioned some other Athenian leaders who were from renowned families, or a quotation or maxim about the importance of birth, possibly with μέν, to be then picked up by Θεμιστοκλεῖ δέ. Or perhaps it began with a mention of Camillus. The first sentence of the *Phocion* (*Phoc*. 4.1) would make an interesting parallel. After a prologue which discusses both Phokion and Cato Minor, Plutarch

[57] Nikolaidis, in *Historical and Biographical Values* 304–305, suggests that the contrast intended might have been with the noble birth of Solon. But the *Solon* is a first Life, so the reader would not have progressed directly from it to the *Themistokles*, and it is hard to see how the end of the book (*Sol.* – *Pub*. 4.6), could be picked up by Θεμιστοκλεῖ δέ.

[58] E.g. the *Alexander – Caesar* (*Alex*. 1) or *Pericles – Fabius* (*Per.* 1–2). Of the surviving 22 pairs of Lives 13 have such a prologue (what Stadter, *ICS* 13 [1988] 275–295, calls a "formal" prologue).

[59] Sintenis/Fuhr, *Themistokles*; Holden, *Plutarch's Life of Themistocles*; Frost, *Plutarch's Themistocles*; Marr, *Life of Themistocles*, all ad loc.

[60] However, the *Themistokles – Camillus* also lacks a closing *synkrisis*. The lack of both is most unusual: only one other pair, the *Pyrrhus – Marius*, lacks both prologue and *synkrisis*, the two elements, that is, that allow Plutarch to set out explicitly some of the similarities and differences between the two men. In the latter case, the final chapter of the book, *Mar*. 46, does provide a final moral assessment which might equally apply to both men, and so might possibly explain the absence of a *synkrisis*. For possible reasons why these two pairs, plus the *Phocion – Cato Minor* and *Alexander – Caesar*, lack a *synkrisis*, see C. B. R. Pelling, "Is Death the End? Closure in Plutarch's *Lives*," in D. H. Roberts, F. M. Dunn, D. Fowler (eds.), *Classical Closure. Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature* (Princeton 1997) 228–250, at 244–250 (= *Plutarch and History* 377–382), and "Synkrisis Revisited," in Pérez Jiménez/Titchener, *Historical and Biographical Values* 325–340 n.49; Duff, *Plutarch's Lives* 252–255.

[61] Of the 13 first Lives preceded by a prologue, asyndeton occurs at the opening of 9. The other four cases (*Per*. 3.1, *Phoc*. 4.1, *Demetr*. 2.1, *Nic*. 2.1) have, as Stadter points out, *ICS* 13 (1988) 276, a logical particle (γάρ, μὲν οὖν, τοίνυν, οὖν respectively)—but never the connective δέ.

turns first to Cato, the subject of the second Life, and declares: "Cato's family, it is admitted (τὸ μὲν οὖν Κάτωνος ὡμολόγηται γένος), was from illustrious stock, as will be reported [i.e. in the *Cato Minor*]; but Phokion (Φωκίωνα δέ) was, I judge, not from an altogether ignoble or lowly one. For if, as Idomeneus says, his father was a pestle-maker…" Note that μέν and δέ here do not mark a total contrast—rather they mark balance and a sort of half-contrast (Cato was from a noble family, Phokion was from a not altogether ignoble one). So in the *Themistokles* Plutarch might have made the reverse point: "<Camillus was from a not particularly famous family>[62] but Themistokles' family was too obscure to further his reputation. For his father…"[63]

*February, 2008*

University of Reading /
Freie Universität Berlin
t.e.duff@rdg.ac.uk

[62] E.g. <Ὁ Καμίλλου οἶκος οὐκ ἦν ἄγαν λαμπρός>. Cf. *Cam*. 2.1: οὔπω δὲ τότε περὶ τὸν Φουρίων οἶκον οὔσης μεγάλης ἐπιφανείας. Perrin, *Plutarch's Themistocles* 173–174, suggests something along these lines, though she seems to see the lacuna as forming part of the formal prologue.

[63] A version of this paper was presented at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. I am grateful to Jeffrey Beneker, Marc Domingo Gygax, Stephen Oakley, Christopher Pelling, Philip Stadter, and the anonymous referee for *GRBS* for their helpful comments. I also gratefully acknowledge the support of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.