

FOR JAMES H. OLIVER

# Plutarch's *De facie*: the Recapitulations and the Lost Beginning

*Hubert Martin, Jr*

## I. The Problem

THE ESSAY *De facie in orbe lunae* is complex in structure.<sup>1</sup> The dialogue proper is a conversation reported by Plutarch's brother Lamprias, who was a chief speaker and who, during chapters 1–23, joined with one Lucius in recapitulating for the six other interlocutors some previous discourse (or discourses) that occurred under unspecified circumstances.<sup>2</sup> The reason these circumstances are unspecified, as well as those of the conversation itself, is surely that the beginning of the *De facie* is lost.<sup>3</sup> As the dialogue now

<sup>1</sup> The following references will be used for works cited frequently: ADLER, *Fontes*: M. Adler, *Quibus ex fontibus Plutarchus libellum "De facie in orbe lunae" hauserit* (Diss. Phil. Vind. 10.2 [1910]). ARNIM: H. von Arnim, *Plutarch über Dämonen und Mantik* (Amsterdam 1921). CHERNISS: Harold Cherniss, *Plutarch's Moralia XII* (LCL 1957). DÜBNER: Fr. Dübner, *Plutarchi Scripta Moralia II* (Paris 1890). GÖRGEMANN, *Mg.*: Herwig Görgemanns, *Plutarch: Das Mondgesicht* (Zürich 1968). GÖRGEMANN, *Us.*: Herwig Görgemanns, *Untersuchungen zu Plutarchs Dialog De facie in orbe lunae* (Heidelberg 1970). HIRZEL: Rudolf Hirzel, *Der Dialog II* (Leipzig 1895). KEPLER: Ch. Frisch (ed.), *Joannis Kepleri Opera Omnia VIII.1* (Frankfurt 1870). POHLENZ, *Mor.*: M. Pohlenz et alii, *Plutarchi Moralia V.3* (BT, Leipzig 1960). PRICKARD: A. O. Prickard, *Plutarch on The Face which appears on the Orb of the Moon* (London 1911). RAINGEARD: P. Raingeard, *Le Περὶ τοῦ προσώπου de Plutarque* (Paris 1935). For my Greek text I have relied simultaneously on Cherniss and Pohlenz; where their pagination clashes, I follow Cherniss. Though I disagree with Cherniss on certain points and have a fundamental disagreement with Görgemanns, I regard their works as indispensable to the proper study of the *De fac.*

<sup>2</sup> That Lamprias is the narrator of the dialogue is obvious from 937c–d, 940f, 945d. On the interlocutors, see Cherniss 3–8, 14–18.

<sup>3</sup> In accepting the beginning as lost, I agree with Kepler 76; Dübner 1126; Prickard 5–7; Pohlenz, *BPW* 32 (1912) 649 (cf. Pohlenz, *Mor.* x–xi); Arnim 38; Raingeard 49–50; Konrat Ziegler, *RE* 21 (1951) 851 s.v. "Plutarchos" and *Plutarch: über Gott und Vorsehung, Dämonen und Weissagung* (Zürich and Stuttgart 1952) 43; Cherniss 2–3; and Görgemanns, *Mg.* 15 and *Us.* 21–31. As against Wilamowitz, *Commentariolum Grammaticum III* (1889) 27=*Kleine Schriften IV* (Berlin 1962) 654; Hirzel 186 n.6; Adler, *Fontes* 88–89; and C. Kahle, *De Plutarchi ratione dialogorum componendorum* (Diss. Göttingen 1912) 15–17. Cherniss 2 n.b summarizes the attitudes of Xylander and Wyttenbach, whose editions I have not seen.

stands, the reader is thrust, amid a corrupt text and without any prefatory *mise-en-scène*, into the conversation itself, which in turn confronts him almost immediately (920B) with an enigmatic reference to the matter being recapitulated (*τί δ' οὐκ ἐμέλλομεν*;

The missing text undoubtedly furnished enough background information to preclude the basic problem of this study.<sup>4</sup> Stated in simplest form, it is: what was recapitulated by Lamprias and Lucius in chapters 1–23? My answer will necessarily reveal something of the circumstances under which these two heard the material they later summarized and, therefore, some of the information Plutarch must have furnished in the dialogue's lost beginning. Previous inquiries into the *De facie* have assumed that all the summarized material derives from a *single* discourse, which has been variously depicted as a discussion<sup>5</sup> or as a lecture.<sup>6</sup> I will argue instead that there are *two* earlier discourses, one a lecture by an anonymous comrade, the other a discussion precipitated by the lecture but fully separate from either the lecture or the question-discussion part of the lecture format. The purpose of the conversation, I will contend, was for Lamprias and Lucius, who had attended both the lecture and the separate discussion, to relate to the other speakers the substance of this discussion, since these had attended only the lecture. This being the situation, the primary object of recapitulation was the discussion. Some recapitulation of the lecture, however, is obvious; and this will be traced to the thematic connection of the lecture with the discussion and to the presence of Sulla, who had attended neither.

Two preliminary items deserve comment. First, my inquiry will be limited to dramatic, as against historical, or source-critical, matters. In other words, I will not search for Plutarch's sources, nor will I ask whether the conversation and the recapitulated discourses actually occurred;<sup>7</sup> my task will be to explain the dramatic situation prior to

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Prickard 6–7; Pohlenz, *Mor.* x–xi; and Görgemanns, *Us.* 25, 27–31; as well as the manner in which the dialogues examined *infra* (pts. II and V) begin.

<sup>5</sup> By Prickard 6–7 and Cherniss 14–17.

<sup>6</sup> By Hirzel 184 and n.2; Kahle, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 16 and nn. 3–4 (*cf.* 28, 46); J. J. Hartman, *De Plutarcho scriptore et philosopho* (Leiden 1916) 557; Arnim 38; Raingeard 49; Pohlenz, *Mor.* xi; Görgemanns, esp. *Mg.* 11 and *Us.* 56–57, 66–68, 78 (on *Us.*, see my review, *CW* 65 [1971] 65–66); and Daniel Babut, *Plutarque et le Stoïcisme* (Paris 1969) 130.

<sup>7</sup> On the *De fac.* sources, see Cherniss 23–26 and *cf.* my articles “*Amatorius*, 756B–F: Plutarch's Citation of Parmenides and Hesiod,” *AJP* 90 [1969] 186 and n.7; and “Plutarch's Citation of Empedocles at *Amatorius* 756D,” *GRBS* 10 [1969] 59 and n.8. On its fictitious elements, see Siegmund Günther, *Vergleichende Mond- und Erdkunde* (Braunschweig 1911)

and during the conversation.<sup>8</sup> Second, the anonymous comrade mentioned in 921F, 929B and 929F may well be Plutarch himself, and he may have been so identified in the dialogue's lost beginning. Since, however, his identity is controversial and only tangentially related to the immediate problem, I prefer to remain academically neutral on this issue and will refer to him simply as "the comrade."<sup>9</sup>

## II. The Objects of Recapitulation

Numerous references and allusions (e.g. at 920F, 932D and 937C) do no more *per se* than indicate an oral source for the summarized material. Others argue specifically for recapitulation of a discussion. Most prominently, Lamprias opens (920B) his response to the textually problematic query with which our text begins by remarking *τί δ' οὐκ ἐμέλλομεν*; ("Of course we did").<sup>10</sup> Whatever the exact sense of the query, *ἐμέλλομεν* by its tense furnishes a sure sign that summary of a previous discourse is at hand and by its person and number leads us to expect a summary of a discussion in which the speaker participated.<sup>11</sup> And this expectation seems confirmed at 921F, when Lamprias turns to Lucius with the request *ὁ πρῶτον ἐλέχθη τῶν ἡμετέρων ὑπόμνησον*. An additional set of references, however, discloses summary of some type of lecture delivered by the comrade. At 929B Lucius observes that the comrade won approval "in his discourse" (*ἐν τῇ διατριβῇ*) by

24; Cherniss 16–17; and Görgemanns, *Us.* 21–89 *passim*; and cf. D. A. Russell, "On Reading Plutarch's *Moralia*," *G&R* 15 (1968) 140–41.

<sup>8</sup> On the questions of composition date and of dramatic date and location, see the varied answers by Ziegler, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 709–10, 856; Cherniss 8–14; Pohlenz, *Mor.* xi; C. P. Jones, "Towards a Chronology of Plutarch's Works," *JRS* 56 (1966) 70; and Görgemanns, *Us.* 29.

<sup>9</sup> For differing identifications of the comrade, see Cherniss 15, 48 n.a (cf. Hirzel 166, 173 n.2, 184 and n.2) and Görgemanns, *Us.* 31, 39, 66–68, 78.

<sup>10</sup> On the text of the query, see Cherniss' and Pohlenz' editions and Görgemanns' discussion (*Us.* 21–27). Cherniss and Görgemanns correctly interpret *τί δ' οὐκ ἐμέλλομεν*; Cherniss translates "What else would you expect us to have done?", and Görgemanns offers three possibilities: "Aber natürlich" (*Mg.* 15) and "Wie hätten wir das nicht tun sollen?" or "Natürlich haben wir das getan" (*Us.* 23). Dübner 1126 translates accurately ("Sane attulimus"), since he reads *προσανεκρούσαθε*, rendered "attulistis," in the preceding sentence. Kepler 77; Prickard 17; and Raingeard 2, 51 offer faulty or obscure translations. Mine is based on *LSJ s.v. μέλλω* i.f (cf. H. W. Smyth and Gordon Messing, *Greek Grammar* [Cambridge (Mass.) 1956] §1959.d).

<sup>11</sup> Görgemanns rightly observes (*Us.* 24): "Dass diese Untersuchung in der Vergangenheit liegt, wird durch das Imperfekt *ἐμέλλομεν* bewiesen." Because of the loss of the opening, Lamprias is not identified as the speaker until 937D.

demonstrating Anaxagoras' theory that the moon receives its brightness from the sun.<sup>12</sup> And it must be that Sulla has this same *διατριβή* in mind when, shortly afterwards (929E–F), he interrupts Lucius to ask whether the comrade dealt with the strongest argument against his thesis that the moon's brightness is reflected sunlight. Again, similarity in subject matter—namely, the composition of the moon and the origin of its brightness—marks the *διατριβή* as the object of recapitulation when Lamprias explains (921F–922A) how the comrade disposed of the Stoic belief in a moon composed of fire and air.

It is evident we are confronted with recapitulation of two discourses: a lecture of some variety delivered by the comrade and attended by Lamprias and Lucius and a discussion in which these two participated. It remains to decide whether the *διατριβή* and the discussion were part of the same event or there were two separate events. The latter decision is forced upon us by what Lucius says at 929B:

Our comrade in his discourse (*ἐν τῇ διατριβῇ*) won approval by demonstrating this theory of Anaxagoras' that "the sun imparts brightness to the moon," but I will not talk about what (*ταῦτα . . . ἄ*) I learned from you (*παρ' ὑμῶν*) or with you (*μεθ' ὑμῶν*) but . . . will go on to the rest (*τὰ λοιπά*).<sup>13</sup>

The phrase "from you" appears to clash with its context, since it raises the question how Lucius could have learned "from you" by listening to the comrade's discourse. (An answer will be offered presently.) Nevertheless, the phrase "with you" is contextually appropriate; and *ταῦτα . . . ἄ* refers to what was learned during the *διατριβή*, so that we may conclude that Lamprias' and Lucius' listeners had heard it (I shall argue in part IV that only Sulla had not).<sup>14</sup> We

<sup>12</sup> The *διατριβή* will soon emerge as a formal lecture (*cf.* the observation by Görgemanns, *Us.* 31 n.46: ". . . alle Andeutungen weisen auf die zusammenhängende Rede eines einzigen Sprechers hin"). At this point, however, I have chosen Cherniss' translation of *ἐν τῇ διατριβῇ*. On the article as a possessive, see Smyth-Messing, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.10) §1121. *τῇ* is so rendered also by Kepler 86; Prickard 28; Raingeard 19; and Görgemanns, *Mg.* 36 and *Us.* 46; but not by Dübner 1137.

<sup>13</sup> On the problematic text represented by dots after "but," see the editions of Raingeard, Cherniss and Pohlenz and the comment by Görgemanns, *Us.* 46 n.17. This problem does not affect my argument.

<sup>14</sup> Cherniss 16 n.b and Görgemanns, *Us.* 47–48 are keenly aware of the problems posed by *παρ' ὑμῶν ἢ μεθ' ὑμῶν*, though their solutions impress me as unrealistic. Even Görgemanns admits that Lucius speaks "als ob alle Anwesenden bei dessen [the comrade's] Vortrag dabei gewesen wären" (48). *Cf.* Hartman's assertion, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.6) 557, that all except Sulla attended the lecture.

may, furthermore, infer that they had not heard τὰ λοιπά—that is, what Lucius is about to recapitulate. Since there is evidence in chapters 1–23 for only two objects of recapitulation, the διατριβή and the discussion, the referent of τὰ λοιπά is necessarily the discussion. Also, this discussion must be both the primary object of recapitulation and distinct from the διατριβή since Lamprias’ and Lucius’ audience had attended the lecture but not the discussion.

Let us further consider the nature and relationship of the two events. Lucius appends to his summary of a portion of the comrade’s lecture the observation (930E): “. . . but it was impossible for him to construct a diagram while speaking, especially since he was before a large audience” (σκευωρεῖσθαι δ’ ἄμα λέγοντι διάγραμμα, καὶ ταῦτα πρὸς πολλούς, οὐκ ἐνῆν).<sup>15</sup> For knowledge of the format of such a lecture, we may resort to the *De recta ratione audiendi*, whose central theme is proper behavior at lectures, designated twice in this essay as διατριβαί (43E). The *De recta* reveals that in Plutarch’s day the customary format was quite informal. Lectures were immediately followed by discussion among the audience and between audience and lecturer (40A and 41A–B), and questions were addressed to the speaker throughout his lecture (42F–43E, 47C–D and 48A–B). In fact, a lecturer sometimes spoke directly to a listener (46C–47B), or asked his audience to raise questions and propose problems (42F–43A). Plutarch elsewhere (*Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum* 1086D–1087A) records an occasion on which one of his own lectures (designated a διατριβή at 1086D) aroused a protest from the audience.<sup>16</sup>

This information from the *De recta* and the *Non posse* offers a ready solution to the problem created by the phrase “from you” in Lucius’ remark at 929B: his “with you” refers to what he and the other interlocutors learned from the comrade’s lecture, his “from you” to what he himself learned from these same interlocutors during the question and discussion portions of the lecture session.

<sup>15</sup> See pt. III on Lucius’ summary, which begins at 930A, in reply to a question from Sulla, and ends with the passage under scrutiny. My interpretation of this passage agrees precisely with that of Pohlenz (he points out in his *Mor.* apparatus that τῷ ἐταίρῳ is to be understood with οὐκ ἐνῆν as the noun modified by λέγοντι) and Görgemanns (*Us.* 31, 49 and n.25, 62; cf. his translation in *Mg.* 41). Dübner 1139 and Prickard 30 translate accurately; but Raingeard 21, 103 misunderstands the passage. Cherniss 111 incorrectly supplies μοι with οὐκ ἐνῆν.

<sup>16</sup> On this protest, see Benedict Einarson and Phillip De Lacy’s Loeb edition (*Mor.* XIV [1967] 181 and n.a).

The comrade's lecture was presented to a large audience. It is, therefore, the discussion that was fully separate from the lecture and is the primary object of recapitulation—and not the lecture or any discussion that was part of its format—to which Lucius refers at 933c: *παρήμι δ' ὄσα χωρὶς ἰδίᾳ* (“in private”) *πρὸς τὰς βάσεις καὶ <τὰς> διαφορῆσεις ἐλέχθη*.<sup>17</sup> Although this discussion was private, in subject matter it shared much with the public lecture; for the nature and composition of the moon was a topic at both. In his lecture the comrade presented the moon's brightness as reflected sunlight (929B), opposed the Stoic theory of a moon composed of fire and air (921F–922A), and buttressed his own theories about moonlight with catoptric arguments (929E–930A and 930E). And the discussion covered such topics as the phases of the moon (933c), the figure seen in the moon's orb (920B–c), and the source of the moon's brightness (929B–c, beginning with *τὰ λοιπά*).

The lecture and the private discussion were thus separate in time and circumstance, but thematically united by common subject matter. The dramatic conditions surrounding three other Plutarchan dialogues will disclose what type of setting would have accommodated this arrangement.

In the *De sollertia animalium*, the points of departure for its initial

<sup>17</sup> Cherniss reads *φάσεις* for *βάσεις* and omits <τὰς>. The key word for my interests is *ἰδίᾳ*, which I render “in private.” Nor, with the aid of Wyttenbach (*Lexicon Plutarcheum* I [Oxford 1830] s.v. *ἴδιος*) and *LSJ* (s.v. *ἴδιος* vi.2 [*ἰδίᾳ*]), do I find lexical justification for the meanings assigned *ἰδίᾳ* by previous translators, whether it is combined with *χωρὶς* into a single semantic unit (Pickard 33: “I omit the points of detail mentioned as to bases and permeations”; and Görgemanns, *Mg.* 46: “Ich übergehe das, was speziell zu der Bahn und den Querläufen [des Mondes] gesagt wurde”) or the two words are treated separately (Kepler 91: “Omitto autem quae seorsim singulis propria . . .”; Dübner 1142: “Omitto autem quae seorsim et peculiariter de basi et transitu dicta sunt”; Raingeard 26 [cf. 112]: “Je passe tout ce qui indépendamment a été dit de particulier touchant la course et les irrégularités de la lune”; Cherniss 129: “I pass over all that was said besides with particular reference to the phases and variations”; and Görgemanns, *Us.* 50: “Ich übergehe aber, was gesondert für sich bezüglich des Voranschreitens und der Querläufe gesagt wurde”). These translators render *ἰδίᾳ* as though it were *ἰδίως* (see *LSJ* s.v. *ἴδιος* vi.1 [*ἰδίως*]). To my knowledge, *ἰδίᾳ* in Plutarch always refers to the situation of persons and means “in private” or something close to that, as at *Comp. Alc. Cor.* 4.2 (contrasted with *δημοσίᾳ*) and at *Fab.* 11.1 (*ἰδίᾳ καὶ χωρὶς*). At *Mor.* 43E it obviously means “in private” in its first occurrence; that it bears the same meaning in its second and again at 43F–44A is shown by the context, in which public lectures are contrasted with private conversations (43E–44A). Note *ἰδίᾳ* in Plato *Resp.* 363E, rendered by *LSJ* as “in ordinary talk” (s.v. *ἴδιος* vi.2.b [*ἰδίᾳ*]), and at *Resp.* 366E *ἴδιοι λόγοι*, which *LSJ* explains as “ordinary private conversation” (s.v. *ἴδιος* III); and cf. Plutarch's use of *ἴδιος* and *τὰ ἴδια* in passages in which he is contrasting private with public matters (*Mor.* 222E, 801A, 824F–825A, 825A, 868E, *Nic.* 4.2, 5.4, *Cor.* 22.2 and *Ant.* 51.4).

conversation between Autobulus and Soclarus are two events that took place the day before: a formal encomium of hunting (959B–C), which both attended and which was presented by an unnamed speaker to a moderately large audience, and a discussion (960A–B), in which both played a part. The discussion was thematically connected with the encomium. For Autobulus' criticism of the encomiast's remarks leads him directly to an account of the discussion (959D–960A); and during the discussion Autobulus, among others, opposed the encomiast's claim that animals are devoid of intelligence.<sup>18</sup> In view of this opposition and the fact that the discussion occurred during the evening (it was a sympotic affair, 960B), we conclude that the discussion was aroused by but separate from the encomium.

Also instructive is a pair of companion dialogues, the *Adversus Colotem* and *Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum*. The former, an academic lecture delivered by Plutarch and designated a *διατριβή* (1086D; cf. 1107F–1108B), aroused a protest, before the lecture session was dismissed, from the Epicureans among the audience (1086E–1087A).<sup>19</sup> In the latter, Plutarch himself recounts a discussion subsequent to this lecture session and precipitated by it. This discussion developed spontaneously among a small party (Aristodemus, Theon, Zeuxippus and Plutarch, though some students are present [1104A] as silent auditors) that went from the lecture hall to the gymnasium after the audience disbanded (1086D–1087C). Although this discussion was chronologically and circumstantially distinct from the lecture and the immediate controversy it provoked, Plutarch presents the discussion as the thematic complement to the lecture. For at the beginning of the *Non posse* (1086C–D) the two are explicitly connected as joint ventures against the Epicureans, and the catalyst that set the discussion in process was the protest delivered by the Epicureans during the lecture session (1086E). The discussion proper began (1087A) with a reference to a point made in the lecture and continued with a systematic dismemberment of Epicurean philosophy.

From the perspective of these three dialogues, it appears that the *De facie*'s lost beginning depicted a situation in which the comrade's lecture on the moon, together with the immediate discussion it

<sup>18</sup> Soclarus discloses the claim at 959c, and Autobulus reveals his opposition at 960a: "Yesterday . . . we proposed the thesis that all animals partake in one way or another of reason and understanding . . ." (transl. W. C. Helmbold, *Mor.* XII [LCL 1957]).

<sup>19</sup> See *supra* n.16.

aroused, inspired among a remnant of the audience a later discussion about the moon, probably on the same day.<sup>20</sup>

### III. The Dramatic Structure of Chapters 1–23

The knowledge that Lamprias and Lucius are summarizing primarily the later discussion may now be applied to a survey of the dramatic structure of chapters 1–23.

The point must be made at the outset that not everything said by Lamprias and Lucius in these chapters is recapitulation, though it is usually difficult and often impossible to determine exactly where summary ends and original contributions begin. It is certain, however, that Lucius makes an original contribution at the end of chapter 18, where he appends to an explanation of the moon's brightness the following statement (931c):

Give me leave then to put it in geometrical fashion in terms of a proportion (*ἀναλογία*). Given three things approached by the light from the sun: earth, moon, air; if we see that the moon is illuminated not as the air is rather than as the earth, the things upon which the same agent produces the same effects must be of a similar nature.

Chapter 19 opens with general approval, followed by congratulations from Lamprias for having added to a fine account a fine *ἀναλογία* (931D), “for you must not be defrauded of what belongs to you” (*οὐ γὰρ ἀποστερητέον σε τῶν ἰδίων*).<sup>21</sup> Lamprias' response marks at least the statement by Lucius quoted above as an original contribution. Too, Lucius' immediate decision to use another *ἀναλογία*, which he presents as the logical complement to the former, does the same for roughly the first half of chapter 19. He introduces the second at 931D “in order that we may prove the moon to be like the earth not only because the effects of the same agent are the same on both but also because the effects of both on the same patient are the same,” and brings it to conclusion at 932A: “If the effect is similar, the agents are

<sup>20</sup> Plato's *Hp.Mi.* takes place soon after Hippias has performed and all have departed except Eudicus, Socrates and Hippias; and the conversation develops from remarks made by Hippias during his performance. I find among the Platonic and Xenophontic corpora no other parallel to the Plutarchan dramatic situations under view.

<sup>21</sup> All *De fac.* translations in pts. III–V are by Cherniss, excepting the passages from 929B and 937c, which I render myself. On Lucius' originality, see Cherniss 16 n.c and Görge-manns, *Us.* 49, 121 (trans.), 123, 130. On the force of *τὰ ἴδια* (931D), cf. that of *ἴδιον* at *Mor.* 428B, 921B, 1121F.



similar, for it must be the same agents that cause the same things to happen to the same subject.”

Two other factors indicate we are to regard substantial portions of what Lamprias and Lucius say either as independent of their summaries or as a conversational mixture of fresh and recapitulated arguments. One is the common use of the present tense in presenting their own thoughts as well as those of opposing philosophical schools. For instance, in arguing against a postulated Stoic opponent at 924F Lamprias remarks, “I do not see (οὐχ ὁρῶ) for what reason he does not apply (οὐκ ἀνταποδίδωσιν) . . . but allows (ἐᾶ) . . . .”<sup>22</sup> The other is that Plutarch casts Lamprias and Lucius as freely answering queries and challenges from the other speakers. Aristotle’s complaint at 928E–F, for example, elicits a reply from Lucius that extends for about a page through 929A.<sup>23</sup>

We may now examine in order of occurrence the references and allusions to the objects of recapitulation. Lamprias’ remark τί δ’ οὐκ ἐμέλλομεν; near the beginning of our text (920B) assures us that summary of the discussion is taking place; and although the following comparison (920B–C) appears to be a new contribution by Lamprias, as does his explanation of one of Clearchus’ theories in response to a query from Apollonides (920F–921B), much of what he says down to Lucius’ interruption at 921F is undoubtedly summary of the discussion. This is indicated by his statement at 920F that an argument he has just introduced οὐκ ἀπιθάνως ἐδόκει λέγεσθαι against Clearchus,<sup>24</sup> and by Apollonides’ question at 921B as to how he argued against Clearchus’ explanation of the face in the moon: ἀλλὰ πῆ τὸν ἔλεγχον ἀντῶ προσῆγες;<sup>25</sup> Lamprias replies by summarizing his argument (921Bff); and the chapters under immediate scrutiny (1–4) end at the

<sup>22</sup> For parallel uses of the present tense, see, e.g., 925A–B, 925C, 925E, 926C, 927A (ch. 13), 927E, 928B.

<sup>23</sup> Similar interchanges occur at 933F–934B, 935D–F, 936D.

<sup>24</sup> Cherniss 15, 39 n.b and Görgemanns, *Us.* 41 also treat ἐδόκει λέγεσθαι as proof that Lamprias is summarizing. Note the imperfect ἦν at 920F (ch.3). On the lacuna which initiates Lamprias’ reference to Clearchus, see Dübner 1127; Raingeard 3, 55; Cherniss 38–39; and Pohlenz, *Mor.* We are not to suppose that this Clearchus, the pupil of Aristotle, attended the discussion (see Cherniss 39 nn. c, d).

<sup>25</sup> Adler’s προσῆγες (προσῆγε MSS) is cogently justified by its author (“Zu Plutarchs *Moralia*,” *WS* 31 [1909] 306) and by Cherniss 15 n.e, who translates (43) “but how did you proceed to bring your counterargument against it?” For opposition, see Pohlenz (*Mor.* apparatus to προσῆγε and rev. of Adler’s *Fontes* in *BPW* 32 [1912] 649) and Görgemanns (*Us.* 42 and n.6 and transl. in *Mg.* 18). Dübner 1128; Prickard 18; and Raingeard 4, 57 seem merely perplexed. Kepler 78 was rendering a text which apparently offered ἀλλὰ πῆ . . . πρόσαγε.

conclusion of his reply, when he asks Lucius to remind him how they began the general presentation of their own theories about the moon (921F): *ὁ πρῶτον ἐλέχθη τῶν ἡμετέρων ὑπόμνησον.*

Lucius instead instructs Lamprias to address himself to the Stoic theory that the moon is a mixture of air and fire (ch.5, 921F). In the process, he gives a quick summation of this theory and indicates he is requesting consideration of it out of deference to their fellow interlocutor, Pharnaces the Stoic. Lamprias retorts (921F) that the comrade spoke the truth when he bluntly rejected the theory, and offers a brief summary (921F–922A), in indirect discourse, of the comrade's opinion. Lamprias' own orderly refutation of the theory, which is presented in the present tense, begins in 922A (with *ὅτι μέντοι*) and extends to the end of the chapter (922F). Only the indirect statement summarizing the comrade's opinion is traceable to the lecture. The remainder of the chapter leaves the clear impression that it is either new argumentation or recapitulation of the discussion.

The same impression is left by Lucius' remarks in chapter 6 (Lamprias does not speak in this chapter), for they are elicited by Pharnaces' complaint at 922F and seem to formulate Lucius' own thinking about the moon. Nor is there any indication that chapters 7–15 (923F–928D) are derived from the comrade's lecture. The speaker is again Lamprias; and his purpose is to demolish the Stoic doctrine of natural place, which was set forth by Pharnaces at the end of chapter 6 (923E–F). Lamprias never refers to the comrade's lecture and is obviously presenting his own arguments in his own manner; for he enters the verbal fray at 923F to relieve Lucius, incorporates into his discourse a special remark to Apollonides (925A), and speaks in the present tense and first person. What is not clear is whether Lamprias' arguments are new formulations or recapitulations of arguments presented during the discussion. Apparently Plutarch's dramatic intent is for them to come across as some combination of the two.

Early in chapter 16 (at 928F), Lucius assumes the rôle of chief speaker and summarizer to reply to a complaint from Aristotle. Lucius notes (929B) that the comrade won approval during his lecture by demonstrating Anaxagoras' thesis about the moon's brightness, but he rejects further recapitulation of the lecture on the grounds that the company is familiar with its content. Instead, he elects to "go on to the rest" (*τὰ λοιπά*). Since "the rest," as previously explained, refers to the discussion, we may classify the remainder of chapter 16,

in which Lucius presents in his own words and person the theory that moonlight is reflected sunlight, as basically recapitulation of the discussion.

At the beginning of chapter 17 (929E–F), Sulla recalls Lucius to the lecture by asking if the comrade dealt with a certain counterargument. This query marks Lucius' reply, which continues to the end of chapter 17 (930E), as summary of the lecture. There Lucius concludes his recapitulating of the lecture with the observation that the comrade was unable to construct a diagram because of the size of his audience.

With the opening of chapter 18 (930E), Lucius returns to presentation of his own thoughts, whether they be new or summarized from the discussion. This leads up to the original *ἀναλογία* (931c) for which he wins approval at the beginning of chapter 19 (931D); but there are no firm indications as to how far back into chapter 18 his new contributions extend. Much of the chapter may well be summary of the discussion. It has already been determined that roughly the first half of chapter 19 (931D–932A), in which Lucius sets forth his second *ἀναλογία*, is also a new contribution. The second half (beginning with *εἰ δ' οὐχ οὕτως* 932A), in which he continues his explanation of eclipses, is summary of the discussion, as is revealed by the question to Lamprias with which he opens (932D) chapter 20: "Well now, which of the proofs came after this?"

Lamprias' answer, "that the moon is subject to the same eclipse," leads Lucius to ask permission to omit this proof from his summary. Theon, however, requests the proof (932D–E); and Lucius responds with a presentation in three parts (*πρῶτον* 932E; *δεύτερον* 932F; *τρίτον* 933A–B), which ends approximately two-thirds of the way through the chapter (933c), when he states that he will omit some things said *ἰδίᾳ*, that is, during the discussion. The presentation thus derives from the discussion. The final third of chapter 20 is recapitulation of the discussion and/or fresh argumentation, for Lucius speaks in the present tense and makes no reference to the lecture.

Lamprias returns as chief interlocutor in chapter 21, to answer a series of complaints and queries posed by Apollonides and Pharnaces at 933F (ch.21), 935D–E (ch.22) and 936D (ch.23). At the beginning of chapter 24 (937c) Lamprias remarks that he and Lucius have reported "as much of what was said there" as they can remember ("*ἡμεῖς μὲν οὖν*" *ἔφην* "*ὅσα μὴ διαπέφευγε τὴν μνήμην τῶν ἐκεῖ λεχθέντων ἀπηγγέλλομεν*"). Since the discussion is the primary object of recapitulation

and since the comrade's lecture was last mentioned in chapter 17 (929F–930E), this remark must refer to the discussion. As the conclusion to the 'scientific' portion of the *De facie*, it is a dramatic tag with which Plutarch reminds us that much of what Lamprias has said in chapters 21–23, as well as substantial portions of what he and Lucius have spoken throughout the preceding chapters, is recapitulation of the discussion. At the same time, Plutarch's determination to portray conversation realistically is strikingly in evidence in chapters 21–23, for he furnishes no signs as to the junctures of new and summarized arguments or to the proportions in which Lamprias has combined the two.

The *διατριβή* has emerged from this survey as an identifiable object of recapitulation only in chapter 17 (929F–930E), and, more briefly, in chapters 5 (921F–922A) and 16 (929B). The bulk of Lamprias' and Lucius' summarizing was of the discussion, and it was carried out in such a manner as to imply that they were the chief speakers in that discussion.

#### IV. The Interlocutors

Of Lamprias' and Lucius' audience, Sulla had not attended the lecture, as his question at 929F reveals: "... but what tells most strongly on the other side, did our comrade explain that away or did he fail to notice it?" Nor had Sulla attended the discussion. Though his remarks 920B are fraught with textual difficulties, it is obvious he is requesting information; for there are no cruces in *πρῶτον ἡδέως ἄν μοι δοκῶ πυνθέσθαι*, his concluding words.<sup>26</sup> And the referent of this request is the discussion, since Lamprias opens his reply with an imperfect in the first person plural: *τί δ' οὐκ ἐμέλλομεν;*

The remaining interlocutors are Theon, Apollonides, Pharnaces, Aristotle and Menelaus;<sup>27</sup> and there is no evidence that any of them is to be exempted from the plural "you" in Lucius' assertion (929B) that he will not talk about what he learned "from you or with you" but will instead summarize the discussion. We, therefore, conclude that these five had attended the lecture but not the discussion. Two

<sup>26</sup> Pace Raingeard 49–51, it is certainly Sulla who makes this request. See Dübner 1126; Prickard 17; Arnim 38; Cherniss 3, 34–35; Pohlenz, *Mor.* 31 (apparatus to 1.1); and Görge-manns, *Mg.* 15 and *Us.* 21–29.

<sup>27</sup> Menelaus does not speak in the dialogue as preserved.

passages, moreover, specifically establish the absence of Apollonides and Theon from the discussion.<sup>28</sup> After Lamprias reveals (920F) that a theory of Clearchus' was treated during the discussion, Apollonides asks Lamprias what the theory was (920F) and how he refuted it (921B). And, when Lucius asks (932D) whether the group wants a discourse (*μελέτη*) on a particular topic covered in the discussion, Theon insists on the discourse with the explanation that he has never heard a full treatment of the topic (932D-E). Also, Theon's *τούτοις καὶ ἐμμελέτησον* (932D),<sup>29</sup> spoken in reply to Lucius' question, furnishes another sign that all but Lamprias and Lucius were absent from the discussion.

Sulla's position among the interlocutors is unique in that he alone had attended neither the lecture nor the discussion; and he is summoned to prominence by Lamprias at 937C-D: "And it is time to call on Sulla too, or rather to demand his narration [of the myth], inasmuch as he became a listener on certain conditions" (*οἶον ἐπὶ ῥητοῖς ἀκροατῆν γεγεννημένον*). The conditions must have been specified in the lost beginning, and we may infer what they were: Sulla would be admitted to the group about to hear Lamprias' and Lucius' summary, if he in return would narrate the concluding myth (chs. 26-30, 940F-945D).<sup>30</sup> The rest of the group had attended the lecture but not the discussion and, therefore, had a prior claim on hearing a summary of the discussion, the thematic complement to the lecture. Sulla could make no such claim, so that it was appropriate for him to be admitted on special conditions. He functions as an outsider, and the uniqueness of his circumstances matches the uniqueness of his mythological contribution and marks him as a character dramatically suited to add as he does a new perspective to the consideration of the nature and function of the moon within the universe.

## V. The Lost Beginning

We may conclude by outlining what, in view of the preceding inquiry and a comparative examination of Plutarch's other dialogues,

<sup>28</sup> With my interpretation of these passages *cf.* those of Adler, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.25) 306, and Cherniss 15 and nn. e-f.

<sup>29</sup> *Kaί*, omitted by Raingeard and Cherniss, is retained by Dübner 1141 and Pohlenz.

<sup>30</sup> My explanation of the conditions is indebted to those of Arnim 38; Cherniss 14; and Görgemanns, *Us.* 28-29 and n.28.

must have transpired in the *De facie*'s lost beginning.<sup>31</sup> The introduction to the dialogue proper would have been provided by its narrator Lamprias, though it is unknown to whom he addressed his remarks. It is remotely possible that no addressee was specified, as in the *Non posse*, and that Lamprias is, in effect, speaking directly to the reader. The possible analogue furnished by the *Non posse*, however, is questionable evidence. The Saturninus to whom Plutarch dedicates the *Adversus Colotem* (1107E) is probably the implied addressee of the *Non posse*, its companion piece. If Saturninus is so regarded, there is within the Plutarchan corpus no parallel for a dialogue narrated directly to the reader.

It is likely Lamprias narrated the *De facie* to a specified person. This may have been a silent party, such as the Terentius Priscus to whom Lamprias reports the *De defectu oraculorum* (409D–E), especially since there are other Plutarchan parallels for this type of narrative arrangement. The Nicarchus to whom Diocles reports the *Septem Sapientium convivium* never speaks (146B–C, 164D); nor do Sarapion, Quietus, Sossius Senecio and Saturninus, to whom Plutarch addresses his own accounts, respectively, of the *De E apud Delphos* (384C–D), *De sera numinis vindicta* (548A–B), *Quaestiones convivales* (612C–E)<sup>32</sup> and *Adversus Colotem* (1107D–E). It is unclear whether Lamprias' Priscus and Plutarch's Quietus are addressed *in absentia* or are to be viewed as quietly present. Sarapion of the *De E*, Senecio of the *Quaestiones convivales* and Saturninus of the *Adversus Colotem* are presented as the absent recipients of written accounts; while Nicarchus is present for Diocles' report of the *Septem Sapientium convivium*.<sup>33</sup> Lamprias' silent addressee in the *De facie*, if such he was, could, therefore, have been depicted as either absent or present—or the matter could have been left unclear.

Another possibility is that Lamprias' account was requested by a specified person during a preliminary conversation. Analogues are provided by four Plutarchan dialogues: the *De tuenda sanitate praecepta* (Zeuxippus narrates for Moschion), *De Pythiae oraculis* (Philius narrates for Basilocles), *De genio Socratis* (Caphisias narrates for Archedamus), and *Amatorius* (Autobulus narrates for Flavian). Silent

<sup>31</sup> I exclude from consideration Plutarch's "dramatic" dialogues (*De coh. ira*, *De soll. an.*, *Bruta rat. uti* and *De comm. not.*), since they have no narrator.

<sup>32</sup> There are rededications to Senecio at the beginning of each book of the *Quaest. conv.* Senecio of course speaks in some of the *Quaestiones*.

<sup>33</sup> See *De E ap. Delph.* 384E; *Quaest. conv.* 612E, 629D–E, 645C, 672D, 697E, 717A, 736C; *Adv. Col.* 1107E; and *Sept. Sap. conv.* 146B–C, 164D.

auditors attend Caphisias' conversation with Archedamus (575E-F) and Autobulus' with Flavian (748F-749A); still, I am inclined to view the ἡμῖν in Moschion's and in Basilocles' requests for a narrative "to us" (122E-F and 394E respectively) as an editorial plural and to recognize single auditors for Zeuxippus' and Philinus' narratives. At any rate, despite the formal similarities between the *De facie* and the *De defectu oraculorum* (in each Lamprias is both the narrator of the dialogue and the chief speaker), the evidence is not sufficient to demand that we fasten on the *De defectu*, with its silent addressee, as the only available model for reconstructing the opening of the *De facie*.<sup>34</sup> The latter may well have begun with a preliminary conversation between Lamprias and his future auditor, with or without a group of silent attendants. That this hypothetical party is not mentioned at the end of the *De facie* has no bearing on the question, since his counterpart remains unmentioned at the end of the four dialogues cited above.

The *De facie*, in summary, opened either with remarks by Lamprias to a silent party (perhaps even one *in absentia*) or with a conversation between Lamprias and his future auditor. Immediately after this preface, Lamprias began his report of the dialogue. Whether in the preface or at the start of the dialogue, Plutarch somehow set forth the following details: there was once a conversation in which Lamprias and Lucius recapitulated an earlier discussion about the moon; this discussion had been precipitated by a comrade's lecture on the same subject; a remnant of the lecture audience had been present for the discussion; of the group assembled for the recapitulating, Lamprias and Lucius alone had attended both the lecture and the discussion; and their summaries were requested by the others, who (excepting Sulla) had heard only the lecture. Also, Sulla's absence from both the lecture and the discussion, together with the arrangements for him to narrate his myth, was explained. So much information must have been furnished before our text begins; when it does (920B), the dialogue proper is under way and summary of the discussion has started.

No means exist to determine how many of these details were presented in the preface and how many were reserved for the dialogue

<sup>34</sup> On the similarities, see Wilamowitz, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.3) 27-28=654-55, and *Der Glaube der Hellenen* II<sup>2</sup> (Tübingen 1955) 403 n.1; Hirzel 196-97; Adler, *Fontes* 115-17; Raingeard xxvii-xxviii; Cherniss 13-14; and Görgemanns, *Us.* 30-31.

proper. Plutarch's other dialogues offer parallels for various combinations of the two arrangements. Autobulus' prefatory narrative to Flavian (*Amat.* 748E–750A), for example, is long and detailed; while Plutarch's own corresponding narrative in the *Non posse* (1086c–d) is brief, much of the introductory information being provided by the speakers at the beginning of their conversation (1086d–1087c). Nor can we determine who besides Lamprias and Lucius attended the discussion. Perhaps the comrade was there as a complaisant auditor. At least this is the rôle assumed by Plutarch for the *Non posse* (1087c), after he had delivered the *Adversus Colotem* (1086c–d).<sup>35</sup>

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
October, 1973