THE SOCIAL AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF PLUTARCH'S *EROTIKOS*

by

GEORGIA TSOUVALA

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Classics in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The City University of New York

2008

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Classics in satisfaction of the Dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Ronnie Ancona

_____ _____
Date Chair of Examining Committee

Dee L. Clayman

_____ _____
Date Executive Officer

Robert B. Koehl: _____

Jørgen Mejer: _____

Sarah B. Pomeroy: _____

Jennifer T. Roberts: _____
Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

THE SOCIAL AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF PLUTARCH'S *EROTIKOS*

by

Georgia Tsouvala

Adviser: Professor Ronnie Ancona

This dissertation is a study of the geographical, historical, social, and religious context of Plutarch's *Erotikos* (*Mor*. 748A-771E), a philosophical dialogue between Plutarch and his friends at Thespiai and the Valley of the Muses in Boiotia, that considers the role of love (*eros*) and conjugality through a scandalous story of kidnapping and marriage between a wealthy widow (Ismenodora) and a younger man (Bacchon). Plutarch's *Erotikos* is unique in Greek literature in combining a philosophical discussion of *eros* (love) with historical material on Greek, and especially Boiotian, imperial society at the end of the first and beginning of the second centuries CE. The dialogue covers a wide range of subjects including, social, intellectual and economic history, religion, philosophy, and is one of the richest primary sources for the history of Roman Greece during the early Empire. My study, which would be of interest to classicists as well as to scholars of history, epigraphy, religion, and gender studies, includes chapters on

the life of Plutarch and his milieu, the historicity of the characters in the *Erotikos*, and the geographical, historical, and religious background of the city of Thespiai and of the Valley of the Muses. My methodologies, approaches, and data are drawn from a variety of disciplines, including classics, history, epigraphy, and archaeology.

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation covers a wide range of subjects, including literature, epigraphy, archaeology, and political, social, and intellectual history. I was grateful to have been able to discuss these subjects and have learned from a great number of scholars and am thankful to the many people and institutions that have supported my research.

I would like to thank the members of my dissertation committee, Ronnie Ancona, Robert Koehl, Jørgen Mejer, Sarah Pomeroy, and Jennifer Roberts for their lucid and insightful comments and for editorial advice and support. Special thanks are due to Ronnie Ancona and Sarah Pomeroy, two women who have had a great impact on me both because of their scholarship and of their friendship. They have supported me, urged and gently goaded me, when necessary, since my undergraduate years at Hunter College, while always allowing me to pursue my goals and ideas in my own way. The support and confidence they have shown me through the years have kept me going. I owe a special debt to Sarah Pomeroy, who not only introduced me to Plutarch and the *Erotikos* but gave up the topic on which she was planning to write and allowed me to make it my own. Despite her retirement from CUNY, she remained a great force behind this dissertation. I am grateful to Jørgen Mejer who read the *Erotikos* with me when he was Director of the Danish Institute for Classical

Studies in Athens. I benefited not only from his friendship and deep familiarity with Hellenistic philosophy, but also from his interest in making distinctions between normative behavior and utopian ideology, and from his keen comments and criticism of the manuscript.

It is a pleasure to thank the members of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (ASCSA), where I spent the first two years of dissertation research and writing. The ASCSA offered me much more than just one of the best libraries in the world; it offered a vigorous and supportive intellectual community of scholars and teachers in diverse fields who were always willing to discuss and provide help with one's research. The ASCSA offered me intellectual and professional opportunities that would not have been possible otherwise at my home institution. I owe a special debt to Nigel Kennell and Molly Richardson who taught me almost everything I know about epigraphy and who were willing to discuss the inscriptions that were of interest to me in excruciating detail. Molly's attention to detail and Nigel's overarching insight of history and epigraphy in Roman Greece kept me grounded in the evidence and gave me the freedom to draw my own conclusions. Other members of the ASCSA have taught me much including Judith Bender, Nancy Bookidis, Glenn Bugh, John Camp, Hermione Eliadou, Kevin Glowacki, Edward Harris, Maria Liston, Gary Reger, Jim Sickinger, and Steve Tracy, as well as the associate and

regular members of the School during my two years of tenure there. Very special thanks are due to Ms. Maria Pilali whose help and support were invaluable for acquiring the needed permissions for the study of the inscription at the Thebes Museum; and to the library staff, especially to Maria Tourna and Ben Miles, who truly went the extra mile to facilitate my research. Finally, I would like to thank the ephor of antiquities at Thebes, Vasilis Aravantinos, and his staff for facilitating my work and for their generous hospitality during my numerous visits. Generous financial assistance for the 2004/5 academic year was provided by the Mario Capelloni Dissertation Fellowship of the Graduate School and University Center, CUNY and by the Doreen C. Spitzer Advanced Fellowship of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Furthermore, the ASCSA provided the Broneer Travel Award that allowed me to travel to the Thebes Museum and to Thespiai and its surrounding area.

As I began presenting my research to conferences, I incurred another set of debts to those who provided encouragement, questions, and cross-references: to Lukas de Blois, Anastasios Nikolaidis, Christopher Pelling, Philip Stadter, Yannis Tzifopoulos; to Jeff Beneker, Frederick Brenk, Herwig Görgemanns, Fritz Graf, and Aldo Setaioli for early versions of their articles and papers; and to those institutions and organizations that provided financial support that made travel to the conferences possible: CUNY Graduate School Travel Fund,

Women's Classical Caucus, American Philological Association, and the history department of Western Illinois University.

I am grateful to the faculty and students of my *alma mater*, the Classics department of the Graduate School and University Center of the City University of New York, past and present. The broad perspective of my own work is the result of the freedom that the Classics program at the Graduate Center allows its students in pursuing varied and diverse interests and courses in literature, philosophy, history, archaeology, and gender studies, in addition to their required coursework. In a very concrete way, the program at the Graduate Center encapsulates the definition of what it means to be a classicist.

Friends and family members have offered all manner of scholarly and practical support. Thanks to my parents, Sofia and Dimitrios, who were perceptive enough to instill the value of knowledge and education in their daughters; and to my sister Emmanouela, who dared pursue her dreams. Last, but certainly not least, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to two people without whom this project could not have materialized: to Theano Albert, my dearest friend and warmest supporter, with whom I have shared countless discussions not only about Classics and Greece but also about life and self; and to Lee L. Brice with whom I share my interest in the historian's craft and love for

adventure. For their immense generosity, astute insights, and passion for life, a great thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

An Introduction…….....1

1: A Life of Plutarch……11

2: The Individuals of the *Erotikos*……..86

3: The Social and Religious Context of Plutarch's *Erotikos*…….141

Conclusions....……221

Bibliography…….…….226

An Introduction[1]

Plutarch's works, and more particularly the *Lives*, have been mined as ancient secondary sources for information that has aided historians in the reconstruction of archaic, classical and Hellenistic history, but they have been neglected as primary sources themselves for the history of Imperial Greece.[2] While the *Life of Perikles*, for example, has been valuable to historians for the reconstruction of the society of fifth century Athens, it has its limits as an ancient secondary source since it was written almost six centuries after the events and figures it describes. In Plutarch's accounts of the great generals and politicians of the past, both Roman and Greek, the author imposes his own value and moral system, reflective of his own times and his own distinctive background. On the other hand, Plutarch is a contemporary (i.e. a primary) source for the late first and early second centuries CE, the period during which it is generally accepted that he lived and wrote, and could provide useful information for the early imperial period of the Greek mainland. In fact, interest in the history of Imperial

[1]Although I prefer using Greek transliteration in rendering Greek words whenever possible so that they will not be denied their original "voice," some inconsistency remains with words that have become part of the English vocabulary (e.g. Plutarch, Delphi, Athens, Greece, etc.).

[2]First noted in R. H. Barrow, *Plutarch and His Times* (Bloomington, IN, 1967), xv: "…there is evidence abundant and convincing, and Plutarch himself is part of that evidence," but to no avail.

Greece has developed only in the last five to ten years.[3] Both historians and archaeologists are still struggling to find a uniform way of addressing this particular historical era. As interest in Greece during the Empire gains momentum, we can expect to see the judicious use of Plutarch's works for the reconstruction of the history of Greece in the first and second centuries CE, and a number of publications on Plutarch's corpus as a primary source for the same period.

Plutarch's narratives offer information not only about the intellectual and daily lives of the Greek provincial elite, but also about the perspective and ideology of the upper classes on a wide variety of topics. In the *Erotikos* (often translated as *Amatorius* in Latin or *Dialogue on Love* in English), which is the focus of this dissertation, Plutarch provides the modern historian with information about the lives and roles of women and men, marriage practices and customs, religion and festivals, education and intellectual life in the imperial period, as well as a provincial ideology of *eros* (love) in conjugal and in same-sex relationships.

---

[3]I prefer the term "Imperial Greece" or "Greece in the early Roman Empire" to describe the first centuries of the common era, to "Greece under Rome," as the latter suggests a relationship of conquest rather than a name for this historical period. Furthermore, "Roman Greece" might be too vague as it would have to include the later Hellenistic period as well, when Greece was initially conquered by the Romans.

More importantly, perhaps, Plutarch imparts a voice for the provincial elite of the Greek mainland. While Plutarch was not unique in this effort, he is probably the first representative of the so-called "Second Sophistic" of the second century and thus can be said to communicate an early vision for the intellectual and political Greek and Roman elites. Rome had established a military and administrative presence in Greece since the late Hellenistic period, and any hopes for Greek liberty and independence from Roman rule had been weakened. The Greek provincial elite, therefore, faced a challenge in negotiating for itself the newfound roles it had to play within the Roman empire as well as its relationship with the center of that empire, Rome and its emperor. At the same time, members of the Greek elite had to negotiate their position within the *poleis* of the Greek world and its relationship to their fellow citizens, who might not enjoy the economic and social benefits Roman rule imparted to the upper classes. Historians might never tap into the thoughts and feelings of the provincial poor, but Plutarch's writings provide a voice and a vision for the Greek provincial elites to both Rome and Greece by advising and, sometimes, haranguing his Graeco-Roman audiences.

Both in the biographies of the illustrious Greek and Roman generals and statesmen to which Plutarch gave the name *Βίοι* (or *Lives*), and in the topics raised in a great number of essays, collectively given the name Ἠθικά by

Byzantine scholars (*Moralia*, in Latin, often translated into English as *Moral Writings* or *Ethics*), Plutarch's vision for the Graeco-Roman world of the late first and early second centuries CE was written with a didactic and a philosophical voice, at times echoing the dialogues of Plato, whom he greatly admired. This didactic language, however, has designated and condemned Plutarch as a moralist; for this very reason the *Moralia*, in particular, have been ignored by historians and have been perceived as the manifestation of Plutarch's self-righteous sermonizing on virtue and the good. Judging from his voluminous work, Plutarch had much to say, but, ironically, his present-day historical voice has been only a whisper. The time, however, appears to be ripe, as current interest in globalization and in postcolonial and border theory is developing, for Plutarch and (all of) his works to find their appropriate place in historical discourse, *i.e.* as primary sources for the history of Imperial Greece.

A number of problems confront the historian who approaches the Plutarchean corpus as a source of the period and society to which it belongs. Firstly, the sheer volume of the corpus can be overwhelming and the student of Plutarch has to return to each work with fresh eyes time and time again. Thankfully, a number of good editions of the original text and translations are now available. One can only hope that interest in Plutarch will continue to grow

as it has in the past twenty years and that more commentaries will become available to historians and philologists.

Secondly, the chronology of Plutarch's life and works is problematic. I attempt to provide a new approach and a corrective, based on evidence drawn from the *Erotikos*, to the chronology of Plutarch's life in Chapter 1. Although what is included is not a comprehensive or even a thoroughly detailed account, it is my hope that it will stimulate interest in further discussion and future research.

The ramifications of an accurate chronology for Plutarch and his works are innumerable. At a very basic level, without a proper chronology, it is impossible to place Plutarch's words in their accurate historical context and to see the inter-relationships between his works and those of his contemporaries in both the Greek East and in Rome. For the purposes of this dissertation, not knowing, for example, when exactly Plutarch's marriage to Timoxena took place, which would provide a secure dramatic date for the dialogue, limits the conclusions one can make about the chronology of any other individuals that appear in the *Erotikos.* Furthermore, a secure chronology of the life of Plutarch could benefit many other disciplines; for example, those historians interested in provincial festivals could date the occurrence of the Thespian festival to Eros in this dialogue, and epigraphists could benefit greatly in dating certain Thespian,

Theban and other Boiotian inscriptions (a small number of which will be discussed in Chapter 2).

A third problem an historian has to overcome in the study of Plutarch is that this author belongs to a period that has not been thoroughly investigated, and to a period that covers both Greek and Roman history. A student of Plutarch, therefore, is required to be like Plutarch himself: a polymath. The Plutarchean corpus demands that one be versed adequately not only in both Greek and Roman literature and history, but also in both institutional and social topics, and in a number of disciplines and sub-disciplines in order to be able to draw evidence from a wide variety of documents and sources. In writing this dissertation, I have used methods and resources from history, epigraphy, philology, gender studies, numismatics, archaeology, and others.

The task of studying Plutarch as a primary source for his own period often comes up against unsolved (for now) questions and creates new ones. I provide here a brief example to illustrate some of the difficulties and opportunities one is faced with when studying Imperial Greek history and Plutarch: A great number of books and articles have been written on Greek women and on Roman women since 1975 when the seminal study of women in antiquity, *Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves*, was published by Sarah B. Pomeroy. Classical and Hellenistic Greek women have been investigated to (a certain degree of) satisfaction and the

same can be said of Roman women as well. I first became interested in the *Erotikos* in one of Dr. Pomeroy's graduate classes on Plutarch. When I began researching my dissertation topic, I was under the naïve impression that writing an account of the dialogue's main heroine, Ismenodora, would be a relatively easy task: I would lament the lack of sources and evidence for yet another woman, and assume her (along with many others) to be strictly a literary and, therefore, a fictional character playing a sexually and socially active role in the dialogue by kidnapping her younger male lover, thus reversing gender roles in the dialogue, and causing havoc in the small Greek society of Thespiai. She is never allowed to speak a single line in the dialogue, and yet she is a strong, assertive, and even an aggressive figure in the kidnapping of her young lover. Because of her aggressive behavior and role in the kidnapping (an act previously reserved only for goddesses), Ismenodora is unlike any mortal woman in all of Greek literature up to this point in time, and yet Plutarch has only praise for her in the *Erotikos*.[4] Assuming that Plutarch's prescriptive support for Ismenodora's behavior and for marital *eros* was the "norm" in Greek society, I hardly considered how representative Ismenodora was of her class and period, until I

[4]For a list of abductions of men by goddesses and immortal women, see M. R. Lefkowitz, ""Predatory" Goddesses," *Hesperia* 71.4 (2002): 325-44, and esp. 325-6. For a list of abductions of women by men in Greek literature, see D. Lateiner, "Abduction, Marriage in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*," *GRBS* 38 (1997): 409-39. Cf. J. Evans-Grubbs, "Abduction Marriage in Antiquity: A Law of Constantine (CTh IX.24.I) and its Social Context," *JRS* 79 (1989): 59-83.

met Dr. Mejer, who asked this particular question and, thus, set my thinking about my topic into a different trajectory.

Investigating the issues surrounding Ismenodora created a number of new questions: Which of the characteristics and liberties of the life of a Hellenistic or Roman woman apply to a Greek, Boiotian woman of the imperial period? Would an imperial Greek woman be allowed to choose her husband and under which circumstances would she be permitted to do so? Would she live in the house of her husband or in her own after a marriage, and under which circumstances would the latter be possible? Were Greek nuptial customs and marital choices affected by Roman customs and trends or did they retain their Classical format? Were Ismenodora's actions a manifestation of the changes Greek society had undergone since the Golden Age of Athens? Why was the dialogue set at Thespiai? Was it a typical Greek provincial town? What constitutes a "Greek" city in an imperial society? Was there any significance to Ismenodora's Thespian identity? More importantly, was Ismenodora a Greek or Roman woman? Was her behavior in kidnapping the man she chose as her husband influenced by the relative liberty allowed to Roman wives of emperors and senators? What constitutes a "Greek" and a "Roman" woman or man or citizen or custom or ideology in the first and second centuries CE? Which are the markers of identity for this period? Which are the markers of Greek and Roman

identity in Plutarch? How does Plutarch deal with issues of identity and conquest? This sample of questions provides, I believe, an illustration of some of the issues one is faced with when studying Plutarch as a primary source for the history of Greece in the imperial period. In attempting to investigate one question, ten others appeared, often making the undertaking a Sisyphean task. Many of the questions have remained unanswered. As the inquiries about and publications on the imperial provinces multiply and grow over the next decade or so, I expect that the study of Plutarch's works as primary sources for the history of imperial Greece will become not only more effective and easier, but absolutely necessary. Plutarch is the most voluminous and prolific writer of a subjected people, and, therefore, is in a unique position to inform us about the late first and early second centuries CE.

On account of Plutarch's importance as a major historical figure in the religious, political, didactic, and literary life of early imperial Greece and, also, on account of the speculation and postulation in which his person and his chronology have been shrouded, a sketch of a life of Plutarch and a corrective are provided in Chapter 1 based on evidence from inscriptions, his own works, archaeology and secondary literature.[5] Undoubtedly, what follows does not

[5]The bibliography of Plutarch is enormous and includes monographs and journal articles in most European languages (see the volumes of *L'Année philologique* or their electronic version at http://www.annee-philologique.com/aph/, as well as the bibliography on the International

claim to be either comprehensive or definitive (quite the opposite), and conjectures necessarily have been made, but it provides, I believe, a new point of view for the examination of Plutarch, his works and historical context. In Chapter 2, I consider the historicity of the characters in the *Erotikos* by examining both Plutarch's references in his works and epigraphic evidence whenever available, and by providing historical profiles for each individual. Chapter 3 is dedicated to the geographical, social and religious context of the *Erotikos* as it provides an account of the geography and history of Thespiai (the *polis* in which the action of the dialogue takes place) and of the nearby sanctuary of the Valley of the Muses (which provides the setting for the philosophical discussion). Chapter 3 concludes with a discussion of the two festivals that figure in the *Erotikos*, the Mouseia (in honor of the Muses and the emperor) and the Erotideia (in honor of Eros/Cupid). The philosophical background of the work, the structure and the tradition of the dialogue, as well as a running commentary of the *Erotikos* will be pursued in the future and developed from this dissertation.

Plutarch Society website at http://www.usu.edu/history/ploutarchos/plutbib.htm). The standard works in English on Plutarch and his times remain those of R.H. Barrow, *Plutarch and His Times* (Bloomington, IN, 1967); C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (New York, 1971); *idem*, "Towards a Chronology of Plutarch's Works," *JRS* 56 (1966): 61-76; and D. A. Russell, *Plutarch* (London, 1973). These authors based much of their conclusions on R. Hirzel, *Plutarch. Das Erbe der Alten* (Leipzig, 1912); and K. Ziegler, "Plutarchos," *RE* 21 (1894-1980): 635-962; republished by *idem*, *Plutarchos von Chaironeia* (Stuttgart, 1964). See also the entry in *PIR*^{2} P 526.

CHAPTER 1

A Life of Plutarch

A chronology of Plutarch's corpus as well as a reconstruction of his life and that of his family are generally based on a small number of inscriptions that connect him with Chaironeia and Delphi, and on his own unsystematic and fleeting references to himself, his friends, his students and his family in his works.[6] As a result, Plutarch's life and works cannot be accurately or precisely dated and this prolific author of the late first and early second centuries CE remains a mysterious and controversial figure for scholars of Plutarch and of ancient history, who have painstakingly tried to piece together his life. Over time, these reasoned reconstructions have been accepted for ease and

---

[6]See footnote 4 in the previous chapter for the secondary works on Plutarch's life and chronology. Inscriptions from Chaironeia: *IG* VII 3422 probably of Plutarch himself: Φιλεῖνος Πλού | ταρχον τὸν εὐ[ε]| ργέτην | θεοῖς | [ἀ]νέθηκεν; *IG* VII 3423 of a member of kin – nephew? son? grandson?- possibly dating to mid- or late 2nd century CE: Λ(ούκιον) Μ[έσ]τριον Αὐτόβουλον φιλόσο | φον Πλατωνικὸν Φλάβιος Αὐτόβου | λος τὸν πρὸς μητρὸς πάππον; *IG* VII 3424 of another member of the same family: [— — — —]Ο[— —] | [— — Φλ]άβι[ον] | [Αὐτόβ]ουλο[ν —] | [— — —] [— —]; *IG* VII 3425 of a 3rd century descendant of Plutarch: Σέξτον Κλαύδιον Αὐτόβουλον, ὁμώνυμον τῶι | πατρί, ἕκτον ἀπὸ Πλουτάρχου, ἀρετὴν πᾶσαν | ἐν βίωι καὶ λόγοις ἐπιδειξάμενον, ἐντ<ελ>[ῆ] | φιλόσοφον, ἐτῶν [κ]β′, ἡ πρὸς μητρὸς| μάμμη Καλλίκλε[ια κα]ὶ οἱ γονεῖς καὶ αἱ ἀδελ | φαὶ τ<ὸ>ν ἥρω[α]. <ψ>η[φίσματι] β(ουλῆς) δ(ήμου).

convenience and standard compilations have transmitted the same facts, presumptions, and errors inadvertently.[7] The meager, extant "hard" evidence about Plutarch, therefore, requires a constant re-examination in light of new compilations of documents and recent arguments regarding the history of Greece during the Roman Empire, so that this important political and literary figure and his prolific work can find their suitable place in the social and historical context of Greece and Rome.

Chaironeia

Plutarch is said to have been born in Chaironeia, a small town in northwestern Boiotia in central Greece, the scene of a number of famous battles, and to have lived there all his life.[8] Plutarch calls Chaironeia his own fatherland (*Mor.* 515C: τὴν ἐμὴν πατρίδα) and held the wedding of his son, Autoboulos,

[7]See for example the article in one of the standard reference works: D. Russell, "Plutarch," *OCD*[3] (New York, 1999), 1200-01. Cf. *PIR*[2] P 526.

[8]Identified with the modern village of Chaironeia or Kapraina; see P. Roesch, "Chaironeia, Boiotia, Greece," in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*, eds. R. Stillwell, W. L. MacDonald & M. H. McAllister (Princeton, 1976), 215-6. For Chaironeia in the Roman period, see Plut. *Sul.* 16.5-21.4; Polyb. 27.5.2-3; J. M. Fossey, "The Copaic Basin in the 2nd Century A.D.," in *Papers in Boiotian Topography and History* (Amsterdam, 1990), 249-253. Phillip II and Alexander fought an alliance of southern Greek states at Chaironeia in 338 BCE (Plut. *Dem.* 19.2-21.2), and Sulla fought Mithridates VI of Pontus in 86 BCE there. Sulla erected two victory monuments after the war with Archelaos in 86 BCE: the one near Chaironeia was found in 1990 by a group of Berkeley University students, while the one in the neighboring Orchomenos was found in early December, 2004. Fragments of the monument are now at the Thebes museum (see the report by Derek Gatopoulos, "Greek Farmer Finds 2,000-Year-Old Monument," for the Associated Press on December 9, 2004 at http://www.livescience.com/history/sullas_monument_041209.html (accessed on April, 10, 2006).

there (*Mor*. 666D). A number of his *Tabletalks* also were held during *symposia* at Chaironeia (e.g. *Mor.* 683C, 710B). On the other hand, Boiotia would not have been the appropriate place for a young man on the rise, and it is clear that Plutarch was not fond of his fellow Boiotians; he calls them senseless, naïve (*Mor.* 995E) and illiterate (*Mor*. 575E). That they were illiterate, as Plutarch claims, is certainly doubted, but disqualifying, abusing, and mocking the Boiotians had become a habit for the Athenians starting in the fifth century BCE; Boiotia was perceived as the backwater of Greece from that time onward.[9] In the second century CE, for example, the poet Ammianos made the following statement about a rhetor from Thebes, the most famous of Boiotian cities: "Asiatikos is suddenly a rhetor…. It's nothing incredible, only another prodigy in Thebes" (*Greek Anthology* 11.146). Ammianos' point was that it is extremely difficult for a rhetor of any real stature to emerge from the agrarian background of Boiotia. If Plutarch was born and raised in Chaironeia, he would have had to have faced similar limitations and prejudice.

It is generally accepted that Plutarch resided throughout his life in Chaironeia because of his comment in *Dem*. 1.3 about his decision to live in his fatherland during the writing of the life of *Demosthenes*: (…τὴν δ' ἀρετήν, ὥσπερ

[9]S. C. Bakhuizen, "The Ethnos of Boeotians," *Boiotika. Vorträge vom 5. Internationalen Böotien-Kolloquium zu Ehren von Professor Dr. Siegfried Lauffer, Institut für Alte Geschichte, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München, 13-17 Juni 1986*, eds. B. Hartmut and J. Buckler (Munich, 1989), 65-72, esp. 68.

ἰσχυρὸν καὶ διαρκὲς φυτόν, ἐν ἅπαντι ῥιζοῦσθαι τόπῳ, φύσεώς τε χρηστῆς καὶ φιλοπόνου ψυχῆς ἐπιλαμβανομένην. ὅθεν οὐδ' ἡμεῖς, εἴ τι τοῦ φρονεῖν ὡς δεῖ καὶ βιοῦν ἐλλείπομεν, τοῦτο τῇ σμικρότητι τῆς πατρίδος, ἀλλ' αὐτοῖς δικαίως ἀναθήσομεν). To argue on the basis of this passage that Plutarch spent all his life at Chaironeia is unfounded, however. In fact the sentence that precedes the comment about the smallness of his native city suggests quite the opposite: i.e., the author, like a hardy plant which can grow roots everywhere, can grow roots, also, in his native land, despite its size or lack of resources. What becomes evident from his comment in *Dem*. 1.3 is that Plutarch was a resident of Chaironeia at the time of that work's composition, and that he could have lived and thrived elsewhere before he made the decision to return to his fatherland.[10] Therefore, *Dem*. 1.3 is not adequate in providing a certain and permanent place of abode for Plutarch and any mention of "home" in his works cannot be assumed to be situated necessarily at Chaironeia. At *Mor.* 642F, Plutarch mentions his holding the eponymous archonship "at home" (ὅτε τὴν ἐπώνυμον ἀρχὴν ἦρχον οἴκοι…), but what is meant by "home" is also unclear.[11]

---

[10]See also *Dem*. 19.2 (παρ' ἡμῖν ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ), but *Sul.* 16.8 (ἡ μὲν οὖν πόλις ἡμῶν παρὰ τοσοῦτον ἐξέφυγεν τὸν κίνδυνον) can be ascribed to anyone whose roots were from Chaironeia.

[11]Plutarch and his family could have owned a number of houses including ones at Chaironeia, Delphi, Athens, or Rome depending on the travel needs of the occupants. It is likely, for example, that Plutarch and his family owned (or rented) a house at Aidepsos in Euboia, a popular resort, and spent some of their time there during the spring months (667C). The family's

Plutarch's remarks about the smallness of his fatherland were probably related to the sad state of economic affairs in the area as a result of Boiotia's involvement in the wars of the Late Republic that had occurred more than a century and a half earlier.[12] The destruction these wars brought to Boiotia in conjunction with the limited agricultural resources of the area had not allowed the Chaironeians to recover financially without difficulty. Chaironeia lacked a well-defined permanent agricultural area in the late Hellenistic and early Imperial periods as the plain often turned to a swamp because of the recurrent flooding of the lake Kopais.[13] Chaironeia's agricultural land, therefore, was limited, and a rare and prime commodity. This limitation, however, led to the creation of profitable industries in the area. In fact, according to the second century CE traveler, Pausanias (9.41.7), the swamps around lake Kopais were a source of income as the Chaironeians distilled perfumes from various marsh flowers.[14] The industrial nature and relative prosperity of the city would have

---

house at Chaironeia could have offered reprieve from a busy and onerous political and priestly life at Delphi and elsewhere.

[12]For an example of the economic difficulties Boiotian cities experienced before and during the battle of Actium, see note 17 below.

[13]The flooding of lake Kopais was a serious problem that the emperors Hadrian and Antoninus Pius tried to resolve by funding major projects for the creation of dikes in the area; see, J. M. Fossey, "The City Archive at Koroneia Boiotia," *Euphrosyne* 11 (1981-3): 45-60.

[14]The flowers which were used as unguents according to Pausanias included the lily, rose, iris, and narcissus. It appears that the Chaironeians planted irises in the marsh. See also J. M. Fossey, *Topography and Population of Ancient Boiotia* (Chicago, 1988), 375-85; and *idem,* "The

made it attractive to newcomers looking for business opportunities. In fact, archaeological and epigraphic evidence indicates that Chaironeia was the only *polis* in Western Boiotia to show settlement and population increase during the Roman period.[15]

Family Wealth and Ancestry

It is unclear how Plutarch's family acquired its wealth, but we are told that he came from an elite provincial family, which might have claimed descent from the Thessalian king, Opheltas and the Phokian *archon* Daiphantos, son of Bathyllios (*Mor*. 558A).[16] Plutarch's father, Autoboulos, had always been the

---

Copaic Basin in the 2nd Century A.D.," in *Papers in Boiotian Topography and History* (Amsterdam, 1990), 215-66, esp. 253 and 256 for a discussion of the flora and fauna of lake Kopais which contributed to the industries and economic life of the area (e.g. fish and eels, reeds for weaving and flute making, and *phleos* fruit for soap).

[15]See Fossey, *Topography and Population*, 447; *idem*, *Papers of Boiotian Topography*, 264.

[16]The text at *Mor.* 558A is problematic, however, as the numerous entries in the *app. crit*. attest. See argument in B. Einarson, "Plutarch's Ancestry," *CP* 47.2 (1952): 99 and *idem*, "Plutarch's Ancestry Again," *CP* 50.4 (1955): 253-5, against K. Ziegler, "Plutarchs Ahnen," *Hermes* 82 (1954): 499-501, in which Ziegler also argues that Timon was not the brother but half-brother of Plutarch. A proponent of nobility, Plutarch wrote a treatise on the subject. He also composed the life of Daiphantos, which has not been preserved (cited in *Mor*. 244B and as No.38 in the catalog of Lamprias), but Plutarch only mentions King Opheltas of Thessaly in the life of *Cimon* 1.1, as the leader of those Thessalians who settled at Chaironeia, guided by the seer Damon Peripoltas. The Thessalian connection is attested also in the work of the second century CE traveler Pausanias, where the Boiotians appear to have inhabited Thessaly in the old days and to have been called Aeolians (*Phocis* 8.4). Finally, it should be noted that a third century BCE Opheltas from Boiotia is unfavorably described by Polybios in *The Histories* as a chief conspirator and abuser of public funds and favors from magistrates (20. 6). If Plutarch's family had any connection with this Opheltas, it is suppressed by the author of the *Moralia*.

proud owner of "the best horses" (*Mor.* 642A), an activity reserved for the very wealthy. Well-to-do Greeks and Romans travelled on horseback (*Mor.* 284A; Apul. *Met.* 1.2) and used horses in the military as well as in postal service (Ov. *Am.* 2.16.49-50; Prop. 4.8.15) and in chariot racing. Breeding horses for chariot-races or entering one's horses in such races, which were popular all over the Mediterranean world during the Empire, was a pursuit of the nobility,[17] and it is clear that Autoboulos and his family were members of the affluent provincial elite. It is expected that, in addition to breeding horses, the family would have owned agricultural land, a mark of wealth in ancient societies and directly connected to commercial activity (i.e., production and trade). If the family resided permanently in Chaironeia, it is possible that it was involved also in the production of unguents, which was a rather profitable local industry and contributed to the prosperity of the town in the Imperial period. A great number of slaves would be required to attend to the horses, cultivate the land, and work in the perfume industry, and Plutarch's family would have owned a considerable number of slaves as well.

[17]D. S. Potter, "Entertainers in the Roman Empire," in *Life, Death, and Entertainment in the Roman Empire*, eds. D. S. Potter and D.J. Mattingly (Ann Arbor, MI, 1999), 256-325, esp. 284-303 on chariot racing.

Plutarch's father and grandfathers

Plutarch's male family members appear frequently in his works. One of his great-grandfathers, Nikarchos, is mentioned in the life of *Antony* (68.4-5). Nikarchos had participated in the transportation of grain to the ports on the north side of the Korinthian gulf near Antikyra during the battle of Actium in September 31 BCE.[18] On a different occasion, Plutarch describes one of his grandfathers, Lamprias, who appears as a speaker in a number of the *Tabletalks*, as a convivial host, and most ingenious and eloquent when drinking (*Mor.* 622E).[19] Taking into account ancient demographics, Plutarch was fortunate to have met his grandfather, who clearly had contributed also to his grandson's basic education, since Plutarch credits him for his instruction in letters and

[18]In preparation for the battle at Actium, Mark Antony's army had stripped the Greeks of money, slaves, and beasts of burden. During the battle, he required them also to give a stipulated measure of grain, which was transported to the ports on the north side of the Korinthian gulf near Antikyra. Transport over land, and especially over mountain ranges such as Mt. Parnassos and Helikon, was always a slow and expensive process, but, in this case, it "was quickened by the whip." Once the news of Antony's defeat arrived, his army fled and the Greeks divided the grain among themselves; this helped preserve the cities. Later, Octavian distributed the rest of the grain among the Greek *poleis*.

[19]Plutarch's grandfather, Lamprias, always derided the Jews for abstaining from pork (*Mor.* 669C); he was in favor of adequate hospitality for the right number of guests at a *symposion* given in honor of Plutarch upon his return from Alexandria in *Mor.* 678D-679E; he was well versed in literature and philosophy (684A-D) and in rhetoric (738B-C); he was acquainted with Philotas, a doctor from Amphissa, who had been a young student at Alexandria during the time when Mark Antony was also there (*Ant*. 28.2) between 41 and 31 BCE. On Philotas and Onasiphoros, sons of Nikon see also, W. A. Oldfather, "A Friend of Plutarch's Grandfather," *CP* 19.2 (1924): 177.

sounds (738B).[20] Multigenerational families –often the exception in Graeco-Roman literature and documents— appear also in Plutarch's *Crassus* 1 and *Aemilius Paullus* 5, which suggests that Plutarch was familiar with that arrangement and, in all likelihood, grew up in such a family.[21] While in Classical Athens, it had been customary for the sons to take care of their parents in old age, especially since they were the heirs of the paternal *oikos* (Her. 2.35), under Roman law, sons could be compelled by a judge to take care of their elderly parents if they could afford to do so.[22] Under these customary and legal standards, we may suppose that Lamprias was the paternal grandfather; one of Plutarch's brothers was named after him.[23]

---

[20]Both Plutarch and his brother Lamprias had met their grandfather. Lamprias seems to have acquired a certain awareness of Jewish customs from his grandfather. He comments on his grandfather's derision of the Jews for not eating seafood, for example (669C-E), and provides contemporary beliefs on the reasons the Jews abstain from hare and pig meat (670E-671C).

[21]In addition to Plutarch, standard citations for multigenerational families include also Valerius Maximus 4.4.8; *D*. 7.8.4-6, Ulpian, Paulus.

[22]Tim Parkin, "Out of Sight, Out of Mind: Elderly Members of the Roman Family," in *The Roman Family in Italy: Status, Sentiment, Space*, eds. B. Rawson and P. Weaver (New York, 1999), 123-48, esp. 124-39.

[23]This statement is only a supposition based on Greek tradition and Roman law, and we cannot exclude the possibility that Lamprias was the maternal grandfather. There was a tradition in Greece, which continues today, to name the first-born son after the paternal grandfather and the second after the maternal grandfather. In either case, Lamprias Jr, Plutarch's brother, was either the eldest or second eldest son of the family. For Classical and Hellenistic naming practices, see S. B. Pomeroy, *Families in Classical and Hellenistic Greece: Representations and Realities* (New York, 1998), 72-5.

Plutarch's father, Autoboulos, was an educated man versed in philosophy and literature, who appears as a speaker in two of the works in the *Moralia*.[24] As mentioned earlier, he was the proud owner of the best horses of Boiotia, if not Greece, and could provide advice on how colts can become the swiftest horses (641F-642B). Although Plutarch's ancestors seem to have been well-educated men of the world, none of them appears to have traveled outside of Greece or to Rome.[25] His grandfather, Lamprias, however, might have lived at Delphi where he could have met Philotas, the doctor from nearby Amphissa, as well as many Romans that visited the sanctuary.[26] Delphi had been a cultural and religious center for centuries, and it would have been a place that could afford an up-and-coming provincial the opportunities and connections necessary for a professional or political career.

---

[24]Autoboulos, Plutarch's father, is the speaker in a number of the *Tabletalks* (e.g., *Mor*. 615E-616C and 619B-F arguing the proper etiquette for the sitting arrangements of guests at *symposia*; 641F-642B discussing the meaning of the word *lycospades* and describing how colts become swift and fine horses; 655E-657A versed in philosophy, and in Aristotle in particular, a participant in the local festival of Agathos Daimon), and in *The Intelligence of Animals* (*Mor*. 959A-965D: well versed in literature and philosophy).

[25]The reference sometimes attributed to Autoboulos (Plutarch's father) as a spectator in the theater of Marcellus when the aged Vespasian (69-79CE) was present, is actually spoken by Aristotimos (or, possibly, by another one of the contenders in that dialogue since there is not indication how long the lacuna in the MSS. may be) and refers not to Plutarch's but to Aristotimos' father (*Mor*. 974A). A similar argument can be made about the reference in *Mor*. 973B-C, sometimes attributed to Plutarch and which has led to the conjectures made about a visit to Rome [Cf. C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (New York, 1971), 21].

[26]Oldfather, "Friend of Plutarch's Grandfather," 177.

Brothers

Plutarch's brothers, Timon[27] and Lamprias, the eldest or second-eldest, often appear as discussants in the *Moralia*.[28] Although Timon does not speak in 619B-F, he was present at that conversation. Timon, like his brother Plutarch, was a self-professed admirer of Alexander (557B) and the host of dinner parties that afforded socializing with the well-connected men of his day. In *Mor.* 615C-E and 616C-616F, he is the lax host of a large party that included friends, magistrates and kinsmen from home and abroad; his laxity caused a dispute between him and his father, who was keen on attending to the proper etiquette regarding sitting arrangements at a dinner party. In a number of the *Moralia*, Timon appears to be younger than Plutarch. In the essay on *Brotherly Love* (*Mor*. 478A-492D), Plutarch provides a number of paradigms of devotion and admiration between a younger and an older brother (487C-D) and concludes

---

[27]I reject Ziegler 1954, 499-501, who argued that Plutarch had a step-mother, and that Timon was his half-brother. From this supposition Ziegler contended, also, that the argument mentioned in the beginning of the *Erotikos* was between Plutarch and his step-mother (749B: Ὁ γὰρ πατήρ, ἐπεὶ πάλαι, πρὶν ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι, τὴν μητέρα νεωστὶ κεκομισμένος ἐκ τῆς γενομένης τοῖς γονεῦσιν αὐτῶν διαφορᾶς καὶ στάσεως ἀφίκετο τῷ Ἔρωτι θύσων…). Although ancient demographics allow for the presence of step-parents, the genitive plural αὐτῶν referring to Plutarch and Timoxena (i.e. the argument of their parents) makes it clear that it was an argument between the families of the newly-married Plutarch and of his new bride, Timoxena.

[28]There was a tradition of naming the first-born son after the paternal grandfather, and the second son after the maternal grandfather. The naming of children after a parent also occurred and was particularly popular in the late Hellenistic and Roman periods; see P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews, eds., *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names, 4 vols.* (New York, 1987); certain parts of the printed work can be accessed online at *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names,* http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk/names/practices.html (accessed on 9/11/2007).

those remarks by writing that Timon's affection for him has always been above all else, a fact that was well known to their friends, Quietus and Nigrinus, the two brothers to whom Plutarch dedicated this essay (487E, cf. 478B).[29] Timon also appears as an interlocutor in *Mor.* 548B, 549E, 556E-557E; he was well versed in mythology and history, but was unable to compete very successfully with his brother's wide-ranging knowledge. He was often interrupted and his arguments were criticized by an older and broadly-trained Plutarch.[30] In 639B-D, Timon once again shows off his knowledge of Homer and is beaten down by his brother's comments. In fragments 177 and 178 from the essay *On the Soul* attributed to Plutarch in Wyttenbach's edition of the *Moralia*, Timon appears versed in Platonism and Epicureanism, however, which suggests that he, too, received philosophical training.

---

[29]Nigrinus and Quietus belong to a well known family attested in inscriptions and in Pliny. See *PIR*^{2} A1407 (Avidius Nigrinus, the proconsul under Domitian), A1408 (C. Avidius Nigrinus, son of Avidius Nigrinus, *cos. suf*. in 110, propraetorian legate under an emperor, possibly Trajan; he was sent to Delphi to judge border disputes between Delphi and its neighbors), A1409 (T. Avidius Quietus was proconsul of Asia in 125-126 CE), and A1410 (Avidius Quietus proconsul of Achaia in 91/2 CE). The repetition of the names for father and sons makes it difficult to identify with any certainty specific members of that family with the characters in Plutarch's works.

[30]Plutarch calls Timon "ὦ τᾶν" a term often translated into English as "my friend" or "sir," but such translations miss the implied and nuanced familiality and hierarchy between addressor and addressee that cannot be appropriately expressed in English. "ὦ τᾶν" is used by Plutarch, also, at *Phoc.* 16.3, *Artax.* 15.4 and 15.7, *Mor.* 73B, 85C, 558B, 646A, 692E, and 711D.

Possibly Timon and certainly Lamprias had travelled to Athens.[31] Plutarch describes Lamprias as sarcastic and jovial, as someone who loved a good laugh (726E: Ὑβριστὴς δ' ὢν καὶ φιλόγελως φύσει ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἡμῶν Λαμπρίας…; cf. 740B). Lamprias had to have been a stout character, who enjoyed food, a trait to which he readily admitted (643E). The Epicurean Xenokles of Delphi taunted Lamprias for his "Boiotian gluttony" at a *symposion* held at the house of Glaukias, the rhetor at Eleusis (635A-D). Not only Plutarch but his brother, too, knew the Platonic philosopher Ammonios and had associations with both Delphi and Athens.[32] A young Lamprias appears as a speaker in *Mor.* 384D with Ammonios and others when Nero was at Delphi (likely, in 66 CE during his grand tour of Greece).[33] Lamprias is accused by Ammonios of fabricating an explanation

[31]While at the house of the Athenian Nikostratos, one of Plutarch's brothers (it is not clear which one) argues that it is fitting to deliberate matters over wine (715B: ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἡμῶν…). Cf. *Mor.* 740B-E, 747B.

[32]It has been argued that Ammonios from the Athenian *deme* of Cholleidiai, who appears on a number of Attic inscriptions, is the same as the philosopher and teacher of Plutarch, and the three times Athenian *strategos* (hoplite general). See C. P. Jones, "The Teacher of Plutarch," *HSCP* 71 (1967): 205-13, *stemma* of family 210; revised by E. Kapetanopoulos, "Three Athenian Archons et alia," *Ἑλληνικά* 29 (1976): 257-8; and accepted by J. S. Traill, "Greek Inscriptions from the Athenian Agora: Addenda to the Athenian Agora, Vol. XV, Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors," *Hesperia* 47.3 (1978): 269-331, esp. 300-2.

[33]Arguing that Ammonios the general is the same as the philosopher, Jones proposes the period from 66 to 81 CE for the terms in office based on the dramatic date of *The Delphic "E"* and Nero's visit to Greece (Jones, "The Teacher of Plutarch," 210), while Traill suggests the existence of an Ammonios "the Younger," who served as *antistrategos* (possibly, *propraetor*) to his father Ammonios "the Elder" (the *strategos*) around 70-80 CE (Traill, 301). Even if we are to accept the identification of Ammonios the philosopher with Ammonios the *strategos*, the dating of his terms in office remains dubious.

regarding the letter E at Delphi and stirring up the persons connected with the temple against him (385B-386B). Apparently, Lamprias had a loud voice and strong opinions, as well. At a different occasion and having being encouraged to attack Hagias' notions, Lamprias argued his position on proper etiquette and seating arrangements at a *symposion* (643E-644D). He criticized Plutarch for being snobbish in arranging dinner guests at a table according to their family ties, wealth, and official position in the way the chair (προεδρία) of the Amphictyons arranges the members' rank during voting at the Delphic Amphictyony's meetings (618A). We can extrapolate from Lamprias' comment that Plutarch might have been *proedros* of the Amphictyony at the time of this dialogue. A more mature Lamprias appears at Delphi again, this time at the house of Kallistratos, son of Leon, an *epimeletes* (director or overseer) of the Amphictyony, advising the young men present against recklessness (704E-706E).[34]

Finally, during a dinner conversation which took place at the house of Ammonios in Athens during the festival of the Muses there, Lamprias is criticized because he should have been more familiar with the Delphians' beliefs

[34]Kallistratos, son of Leon, was *epimeletes* sometime between 79 and 87 CE, according to J. Pouilloux, "Les épimélètes des Amphictions: tradition delphique et politique romaine," in *Mélanges de litterature et d'epigraphie Latines d'histoire ancienne et d'archeologie. Hommage a la memoire de Pierre Wuilleumier* (Paris, 1980), 281-300; and the revisions of B. Puech, "Prosopographie et chronologie delphique sous le Haut-Empire: l'apport de Plutarque et de l'histoire littéraire," *Topoi (Lyon)* 8.1 (1998): 261-66, esp. 264.

regarding the relation between the Muses and the regions of the universe (745A). This off-hand remark suggests that Lamprias, at least, had spent a great deal of time at Delphi before his arrival at Athens, was familiar with the religious notions that circulated in the city of Delphi and, thus, the Delphians' accepted wisdom regarding the Muses should not have escaped his argument (but it would have enhanced it). This last dialogue, as well as the rest of the dinner conversations in book nine of the *Tabletalks*, are worth examining more closely because of the light they shed on Lamprias' age and, by extension, on Plutarch's age and education.

We are informed in the introduction of book nine of the *Tabletalks* that these dinner conversations took place at Athens during the Mouseia, when Lamprias was *pais* (747C) and Ammonios *strategos* (hoplite general, 736C-D), an important civic and judicial office,[35] also associated with the ephebic institutions and training of the *ephebes*.[36] Ammonios had seen the *apodeixis* (demonstration)

[35]Ammonios was elected *strategos* three times (720C), but the chronology of those terms in office has been based on mere supposition (cf. Jones, "The Teacher of Plutarch," 206-7, speculates that Ammonios was in his first or second *strategia* during Nero's visit in 66/7 CE, and therefore, he was in his third term in the 70s or early 80s CE). See also footnotes 31-32 above. On the different magistracies in Athens in the Roman period and, especially, on the role of the *strategos*, see D. J. Geagan, "The Athenian Constitution after Sulla," *Hesperia Suppl.* 12 (1967): 1-242, esp. 18-31.

[36]On the ephebate in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, see now N. M. Kennell, *Ephebeia: A Register of Greek Cities with Citizen Training Systems in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Hildesheim, 2006), ix-xv. The activities of the ephebate included monthly contests and participation in public festivals held at the gymnasium in honor of gods, kings, emperors and benefactors (*ibid*., xiii), marching in parades, usually under arms, to meet distinguished Romans

of the skills of the *ephebes* receiving training at the school of Diogenes, and called the prize-winning teachers and students to dinner (736D, 747A).[37] It becomes evident from this reference that it was customary for the *strategos*, in his judicial capacity, to be invited to observe the quarterly demonstrations of ephebic skills put up by the Athenian schools during the Early Empire. Lamprias is described as *pais* (747C), a technical term used for the first phase of military and cultural training in the gymnasium.[38] We are told by Plutarch that Lamprias was

---

visiting the city or accompanying the biers of local benefactors or participating in the official cult celebrations (ibid., xii). While military, physical and philosophical training constituted the major part of the curriculum (*ibid*., x), during the Hellenistic and Roman periods, education in philosophy, literature and other subjects continued to be a concern peripheral to athletic and military training (*ibid*., xii). Upon completion of the ephebate, citizenship was granted. During the Roman period, the Greek ephebate underwent a level of "privatization," whereby some of the expense that was previously met by the state had to be paid now by the *ephebes* themselves and their prominent families, who undertook the epigraphic habit of inscribing the names of their friends and fellow *ephebes* as memorials to their own prestige and generosity (*ibid*., x, and xiv).

[37]*Apodeiksis* is a technical term here used to describe the public demonstrations of the *ephebes'* physical, military, and cultural skills three times a year. Cf. *EKM* 1. Beroia 1: [ὁ γυμνασίαρχος] ἐπαναγκαζέτω δὲ καὶ τοὺς παιδοτρίβας ποιεῖσθαι ἀπόδειξιν τῶν παίδων | [τ]ρὶς ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ κατὰ τετράμηνον καὶ καθιστάτω αὐτοῖς κριτάς…).

[38]I would like to thank Nigel Kennell for his help on this reference. According to the Hellenistic Gymnasiarchic Law of Beroia [*EKM* 1. Beroia 1 =*Meletemata* 22.2 (1996) 75, 60], the *ephebate* included young men of different age groups who practiced certain military skills such as the throwing of the javelin and archery. Groups in the *ephebate*, in ascending order, included those of *pais*, *neaniskos*, *ephebe* and *neos*. The Hellenistic Gymnasiarchic Law of Beroia distinguishes between the *paides*, the *neaniskoi*, the *ephebes*, and those under twenty-two: *EKM* 1. *Beroia* 1, Face B, l. 10-13: …ἀκοντίζειν δὲ καὶ τοξεύειν μελετάτωσαν οἵ | τε ἔφηβοι καὶ οἱ ὑπὸ τὰ δύο καὶ εἴκοσιν ἔτη καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, ὅταν | οἱ παῖδες ἀλείψωνται, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐὰν ἕτερόν τι ἀναγκαῖον φαίνη| ται τῶν μαθημάτων. *vac.* …; *id*, l. 70-75: λαμπαδαρχῶν αἵρεσις· | αἱρείσθω δὲ ὁ γυμνασίαρχος τῶν ἐκ τοῦ τόπου λαμπαδάρχας τρεῖς ἐν τῶι | Γορπιαίῳ μηνί, οἱ δὲ αἱρεθέντες παρεχέτωσαν ἔλαιον τοῖς νεανίσκοις ἕκαστος | [ἡ]μέρας δέκα· αἱρείσθω δὲ καὶ τῶν παίδων λαμπαδάρχας τρῖς, οἱ δὲ αἱρεθέντες παρεχέ | τω{ι}σαν ἔλαιον τὰς ἴσας ἡμέρας…According to the *LSJ*, a *pais* in Sparta was a young man in his fifth year of education, i.e. 11 years old, but that does not have to be the case in Athens during the Roman period.

appointed *krites* (judge or evaluator) along with Meniskos the *paidotribes* (trainer), because Lamprias gave a good performance of the pyrrhic dance and was considered to be the best of the young men in the group known as *paides* (747B). Lamprias then was probably in his early teens and Plutarch would have been at least a year (or more) younger than his brother. In light of this information and Plutarch's previous remark on his brother's intimate knowledge of Delphic ideas about the Muses (745A), it is possible that these two young men had spent a great deal of time at Delphi, possibly, as children, before the family either moved or sent them to Athens so that they might continue their education (I will return to Plutarch's education later in this chapter). It is not surprising, therefore, that Lamprias appears more often than anyone else in Plutarch's works; the two men were probably very close because of their age affinity and shared experiences at Athens and Delphi.

Not unlike other well-educated Greeks, Lamprias had training not only in Platonic but also in Peripatetic philosophy (617E-619F, 626A-C, 635B; 740B-E). He says that he honors the school of Aristotle above that of Epicurus (635B), but he did not consider himself a philosopher. In fact, in 618A, he separates himself from his brother Plutarch, whom he calls a philosopher. Plutarch, certainly, agrees with his brother's evaluation since he made a point in 626A indicating that Lamprias had not read Hieronymos, the peripatetic philosopher from

Rhodes, whom Lamprias had quoted in the dialogue, but had chanced upon the right quote only because of his intelligence. Like Plutarch, Lamprias learned Latin as a young man, although his fluency is not easy to discern from his limited knowledge of Latin cognates (726E-727A). After his education at Athens, Lamprias returned to Delphi. It is not possible to determine from Plutarch's writings whether his brother remained at Delphi, but it is generally accepted because of epigraphic evidence that Lamprias became archon of Delphi around 115 CE or later.[39]

A Lamprias appears also as the narrator of the dialogue on *Oracles in Decline* (Mor. 409E-438E) dedicated to Terentius Priscus. The dramatic date for this dialogue falls under the *epimeleteia* of Kallistratos, son of Leon (i.e., under Kallistratos' directorship of the Amphictyonic Council some time between 79 and 87 CE).[40] Lamprias describes himself as a man of some years (435E-F) and he calls upon Plato and the doctrines of the Academy for assistance with his argument (430E). In this dialogue, Lamprias had already disagreed with Aristotle (424C), whom he had claimed to admire elsewhere (635B). Because of the serious tone in this dialogue compared to the joviality of the others in which

---

[39]*FD* III 4.109 (dated to 119/20 or 123/4): ……ον Θεσπιῆ | Δελ | [φοὶ Δελφὸν ἐποίησαν. ἄρχ]οντος Λαμπρία, | [βουλευόντων ……..κ]αὶ Εὐδώρου. | [καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἡ προεδ]ρία. ἄρχοντος Πο. Αἰ | [λίου Πυθοδώρου, μηνὸς …….ο]υ κα′; cf. *RE s.v.* Lamprias.

[40]For a discussion of Delphic *epimeleteis* and their role during the early Empire, see Pouilloux, "Les épimélètes des Amphictions," 294-7.

Lamprias is the narrator, it is arguable that the Lamprias who appears here was not the brother of Plutarch but their aged grandfather.[41] In either case, the early connection of the family with Delphi is sustainable. It is clear from the *Obsolescence of Oracles* that Lamprias (Plutarch's brother or grandfather) was in touch with Ammonios and cultivated relationships with the Romans of his day.[42] While Plutarch is absent from *The Face in the Moon*, a Lamprias plays the leading role as speaker and narrator (937D, 938C-940F, 942C-D, 945D). The dialogue makes a reference to a total solar eclipse (931D-E), which has been dated to either January 5, 75 CE or December 27, 83 CE.[43] The former date corresponds with a total solar eclipse visible in Rome and Carthage and the latter with one visible in Alexandria. Considering that the person who refers to this eclipse is Lucius from Etruria, who also appears as a guest at a dinner in honor of Plutarch in Rome (727B-728E), it can be assumed that the dialogue dates to sometime after 75 CE,

---

[41]It is not necessary to assume that Lamprias the grandfather was the son of Nikarchos the great-grandfather, and to create a possible but forced chronology for them.

[42]Ammonios is described as a philosopher and not as a *strategos* in this dialogue (410F), which suggests either a different person by the name Ammonios or a date before Ammonios' Athenian *strategeiai*. Lamprias' Roman friends included Terentius Priscus, who is mentioned in this dialogue (409E).

[43]A generally accepted argument by F. H. Sandbach, "The Date of the Eclipse in Plutarch's *De Facie*," *CP* 23.1 (1929): 15-6; who, in view of the evidence regarding Kallistratos' *epimeleteia* at Delphi, argued that the eclipse in the dialogue could not have been the one visible in Chaironeia in 71 CE, but the one of 75 CE visible in Rome or 83 CE visible in Alexandria. Cf. the more recent discussion of the eclipse by F. R. Stevenson and L. J. Fatoohi, "The Solar Eclipse described by Plutarch," *Histos* 2 (1998), http://www.dur.ac.uk/Classics/histos/1998/stephenson.html accessed on October 29, 2007.

and that by that time Lamprias would have completed his mathematical and philosophical education, as he appears to be well versed in both. Even if Lamprias was not in Rome at the dramatic date of *The Face in the Moon*, it is clear that he had a wide circle of international friends common to both brothers. Some of the characters present in this dialogue re-appear in other works of Plutarch – for example, Sextius Sulla the Carthaginian held a dinner for Plutarch in Rome where Lucius from Etruria, and Theon ὁ γραμματικός were also guests (727B). Traditional rules of guest-friendship (ξενία) and international connections made at Delphi and Athens would have allowed Lamprias and Plutarch to travel widely in the Mediterranean world.

Female relatives

Turning now to the references to his female relatives, Plutarch's works are almost devoid of the names of his kinswomen. Although Plutarch often refers to and provides the names of his brothers, father, and grandfather, the names of his mother, grandmother, and of his sisters, if he had any, are not known. Plutarch's practice follows traditional Greek etiquette of not naming respectable women in public, unless they are women of shady reputation, women connected with the

speaker's opponent, or dead.[44] The name of his little daughter, Timoxena, for example, is revealed only after her death and in a personal letter to his wife –also by the same name. It is only in private correspondence that women of Plutarch's circle are mentioned or addressed by name.[45] The consolatory letter to his wife (*Mor.* 608A-612A), which deals with the death of their little daughter, and the *Advice on Marriage* (*Mor.* 138A-146A), which refers to Eurydike, his student, on account of her marriage to Pollianos, son of Plutarch's friend, Soklaros of Tithora (see chapter 2), were probably personal letters and they may have been published after Plutarch's death.[46] In addition, it is likely that these letters were published either after the death of their recipients or at a time when the Greek practice of not naming respectable women in public had changed.

---

[44]S.B. Pomeroy, "Reflections on Plutarch, *A consolation to His Wife*," in *Plutarch's Advice to the Bride and Groom and A Consolation to his Wife*, ed. S.B. Pomeroy (New York, 1999), 75-81, esp. 80. Mentioning Memmia Leontis in *Virtues in Women* is an example of providing the name of a contemporary woman after her death. In that essay, Plutarch reminds Clea to whom he dedicated *Virtues in Women* of the conversation he had with her after the death of Memmia Leontis (*Mor.* 242F). See also, J. Bremmer, "Plutarch and the Naming of Greek Women," *AJPh* 102.4 (1981): 425-6; citing D. Shaps, "The Woman Least Mentioned: Etiquette and Women's Names," *CQ* 27 (1977): 323-30, esp. 328.

[45]Ismenodora in the *Erotikos* is the obvious exception, which will be discussed in chapter 2.

[46]Memmia Eurydike had been Plutarch's student. Plutarch had been acquainted with her mother, Clea, as well, to whom he dedicated *Virtues in Women* (*Mor.* 242 E-263C) and *Isis and Osiris* (*Mor.* 351C-384C), both of which could have been of private nature and published after the author's death. On Clea, Eurydike and Pollianos, see S. B. Pomeroy, "Commentary on Plutarch, *Advice to the Bride and Groom*," in Pomeroy, *Plutarch's Advice and Consolation*, 42-3, and B. Puech, "Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque," *ANRW* II.33.6 (1992): 4842 and 4849 with bibliography.

It is likely that Plutarch did have sisters since he refers to three men related by marriage to him (γαμβρός) in his works: Kraton (*Mor*. 620A),[47] Firmos (636A) and Patrokleas (642C).[48] The term γαμβρός can mean any first degree relation by marriage, such as son-in-law or brother-in-law, suggesting that any of these men could have been the husband of a sister, daughter, or niece, and even the brother of Plutarch's own wife.[49] Firmos is a Roman name, which suggests that at least one member of the family had already married outside the Greek community.[50]

---

[47]The speaker in *Tabletalks (Mor*, 612E-615C: versed in philosophy, present with Plutarch, Ariston, and Sossius Senecio at Athens; 620A-622B with Plutarch and his friend Theon; and 640B-641A with Plutarch and Philo at the house of Soklaros at Athens). See also *Mor*. 669C, where if it is the same Kraton, he appears to be a physician in the company of Polykrates, Symmachos, Lamprias and others at Aidepsos in Euboia.

[48]The speaker in *God's Slowness to Punish* (*Mor*. 548B-549B, 552E, 553D-E, 560D-E) with Plutarch and his brother Timon, and with Olympichos at Delphi; in *Tabletalks* (*Mor*. 642B-E) with Plutarch, Plutarch's father Autoboulos, and others; (681D-682A) with Plutarch, Soklaros, Gaius, the son-in-law of Mestrius Florus, at the house of the later; (700E) at Delphi with Euthydemos (possibly the same as C. Memmius Euthydamos, Plutarch's colleague in priesthood) present; and in *On Soul* (frag. 177 and 178 arguing the Epicurean view against Timon about death and the immortality of the soul).

[49]*LSJ* s.v. γαμβρός, meanings (I) and (II) stand against *RE* s.v. *Plutarchos* (2), 651 where it is assumed to be the husband of a niece because, presumably, Plutarch has only one daughter.

[50]The name Firmos appears in a great number of inscriptions from Attica and Asia Minor. It also occurs twice on inscriptions from Delphi (*FD* III 4.111 and 4.326) and once from Thespiai (*IG* VII 1769) -all dating to the first and second centuries CE. Based on the rarity of the name in Central Greece, Puech, "Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque," connects him with the archon of Delphi, T. Calavius Firmos (*FD* III 4.111).

Education and date of birth

Before turning to a discussion of Plutarch's married life and children, it is important to explore certain assumptions that have been made regarding the date of his birth (and by extension, death) and his education, which is invariably linked to the arguments concerning his birth date. Although there is no clear indication of Plutarch's dates of birth and death, "before 50 to after 120 CE" is the traditionally accepted chronology for the Chaironeian.[51] Most situate Plutarch's birth before 50 CE because of his own references in the *Moralia*, and in *The Delphic "E"*, in particular.

In *The Delphic "E"* (*Mor.* 384D-394C), a dialogue which discusses the possible meanings of the Greek letter "E" found on the temple of Apollo, Plutarch writes that he was once present at Delphi when the emperor Nero visited the city, where he heard Ammonios and others (Theon, Eustrophos, Nikandros, and his own brother, Lamprias, among others) having a conversation about the letter "E" (*Mor*. 385B).[52] Plutarch, then, proceeds to relate what he had

---

[51]See, for example, Russell's article in the *OCD*[3] s.v. "Plutarch," also Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, 13n2, accepted by S. C. R. Swain, "Plutarch, Hadrian, and Delphi," *Historia* 40 (1991): 318-30, and esp. 320.

[52]Lamprias has been discussed above. Ammonios appears also in *Oracles in Decline* and in a number of *Tabletalks.* Book nine of the *Tabletalks* apparently took place at his house in Athens during the festival of the Muses, while he was still *strategos* (hoplite general) of the city. In *The Delphic "E"* however, Ammonios is described only as a philosopher (see also footnotes 31, 32, 34, and 41). Theon, the *hetairos* (companion) of Plutarch, whose country and profession are not mentioned, appears as a speaker in *Why Are Delphic Oracles no Longer Given in Verse?*, in *Tabletalks* and in *Not even a Pleasant Life is Possible on Epicurean Principles*. Eustrophos of Athens also

heard years earlier in a letter to Sarapion and his circle in Athens.[53] According to his own account, at the dramatic date of this particular dialogue at Delphi, Plutarch was interested in mathematics but he had not yet entered the Academy, where he would learn to pay honor to the maxim "Avoid extremes" (*Mor.* 387F). Thus Plutarch suggests that his defense of and reliance on mathematics in *The Delphic "E"* had been somewhat immoderate, excessive, and, perhaps, immature –appropriate to his limited learning and age at the time.[54] Indeed, after the young Plutarch and another interlocutor, Eustrophos, enthusiastically shared their knowledge on numbers, Ammonios, rather dismissively, pointed out that it was not worth arguing too precisely over these (i.e., mathematical) matters with the young (τοῖς νεοῖς), since each one of the numbers could provide much to those who wish to sing its praises.[55]

---

appears in *Tabletalks*. Finally, Nikandros was a priest at Delphi and does not appear in any other dialogue, but *On Listening to Lectures* was addressed to him.

[53]On Sarapion of Athens, see Puech, "Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque," 4874-8.

[54]*Mor*. 387F: …ἀλλ' τηνικαῦτα προσεκείμην τοῖς μαθήμασιν ἐμπαθῶς, τάχα δὴ μέλλων εἰς πάντα τιμήσειν τὸ 'μηδὲν ἄγαν' ἐν Ἀκαδημείᾳ γενόμενος. "Μάθημα" may be translated "general learning" or "mathematics." Taking into account the subsequent discussion regarding numbers, which Plutarch puts forth, "mathematics" is preferable.

[55]*Mor.* 391E: … οὐκ ἄξιον πρὸς ταῦτα λίαν ἀκριβῶς ἀντιλέγειν τοῖς νεοῖς, πλὴν ὅτι τῶν ἀριθμῶν ἕκαστος οὐκ ὀλίγα βουλομένοις ἐπαινεῖν και ὑμνεῖν παρέξει.

The currently accepted argument regarding Plutarch's date of birth that has been made based on these passages is as follows:[56]

1) Plutarch was present at Delphi when Nero visited the sanctuary.
2) Nero is known to have traveled to Delphi during his major tour of Greece during which, at the agora of Corinth, he gave *libertas* (freedom) to the Greeks in 66/67.
3) Therefore, Plutarch in the company of his teacher, Ammonios, was present at Delphi in 66/7 during Nero's tour.
4) Ammonios refers to Plutarch as "νέος," which suggests that Plutarch was a young man.
5) If the age of twenty is taken to satisfy (3) and (4), then Plutarch was born in 47 CE and possibly earlier.

Indeed, the only attested visit of Nero to Delphi and to Achaia is in the years 66/67, when during the Isthmian Games at Corinth he proclaimed the freedom and autonomy of Greece (*Flam*. 13.8). According to Juvenal's scholiast, Nero was accompanied by his third wife, Statilia, whose family was connected with Thespiai, and by the future emperor Vespasian (Suet. *Vesp*. 4.4; Cassius Dio

[56]Outlined in Barrow, *Plutarch and His Times*, xii; and accepted by Jones, "The Teacher of Plutarch," and subsequently many others.

62.10).[57] It can be assumed that the reference in *The Delphic "E"* is made in respect to that visit.

Plutarch's age during that visit, however, is more difficult to ascertain. Plutarch portrays himself as a young man in this dialogue and, according to his own comments, still emergent in philosophical discussion. Ammonios refers to him as νέος (young), a general term used for children, adolescents, and young adult males.[58] It follows, therefore, that the general attribution of twenty to Plutarch during Nero's visit to Greece in 66/7 CE is rather arbitrary.

That Ammonios was Plutarch's teacher already in 66/67 is equally an arbitrary proposition. Plutarch might have studied science under Oneisicrates, the doctor, who appears to invite only dear friends and close relatives to his dinner party at *Mor.* 678C, and philosophy under the Platonist Ammonios in Athens (*Them*. 32.6: …Θεμιστοκλῆς Ἀθηναῖος, ἡμέτερος συνήθης καὶ φίλος παρ' Ἀμμωνίῳ τῷ φιλοσοφῷ γενόμενος) an extremely prominent man in

---

[57]On Nero's visit to Greece in 67, see S. Alcock, "Nero at Play? The Emperor's Grecian Odyssey," in *Reflections of Nero: Culture, History and Representation*, eds. J. Masters and J. Elsner (London, 1995), 98-111; and N. Kennell, "Neron Periodonikes," *AJPh* 109 (1988): 239-51, esp. 242-50. Nero pillaged the sanctuary and took the sacred land of Apollo (also known as the land of Chirrha and an important source of income for the sanctuary) for his veterans (Cass. Dio 63.14.2).

[58]Νέος was also the technical term used for youths (20-22 years old), who had completed the last stage of military and cultural training in the *ephebeia*; cf. *EKM* 1. Beroia=*Meletemata* 22.2 (1996): 75, 60; *IK* Sestos 1=*OGIS* 339. It is impossible to know whether the general or technical sense of the word is meant here, but the educational curriculum for entrance to the Platonic Academy suggests that the former is intended.

Athenian politics, as he had served three times as *strategos* (hoplite general).[59] The office of the *strategos* was one of the most important in Roman Athens, since the *strategia* was a magistracy that dealt with all administrative matters crucial to the well-being of the city.[60]

Ammonios' dates are not secure, however, but they have been postulated from an even more insecure Plutarchean chronology and a number of inscriptions that may refer to Ammonios' progeny.[61] Eunapios relates that Plutarch wrote that Ammonios died in Athens (*Vit. Phil.* 2.7) but that reference has not survived in Plutarch's extant works. To complicate the dating for Ammonios even further, Plutarch's reference to one who would recognize Athens after a lapse of thirty years, has been taken by Barrow and Jones to refer to Plutarch's own experience, but such postulation is unwarranted by the Greek (*Mor.* 559B: γνοίη γὰρ ἄν τις ἰδὼν τὰς Ἀθήνας ἔτει τριακοστῷ...). As a result, Plutarch's stay, education in, and subsequent visits to Athens cannot be extracted

[59]*Mor.* 736D: Ἀμμώνιος Ἀθήνησι στρατηγῶν ἀπόδειξιν ἔλαβεν ἐν τῷ Διογενείῳ τῶν γράμματα καὶ γεωμετρίαν καὶ τὰ ῥητορικὰ καὶ μουσικὴν μανθανόντων ἐφήβων…; *Mor.* 720C: a discussion held at the house of Ammonios, already serving his third term as *strategos* in Athens (ἐστρατήγει δὲ τὸ τρίτον ὁ Ἀμμώνιος), during which Boethos was still *neos* (*Mor.* 720E), occupied with unproven arguments derived from geometry.

[60]D. Geagan, "Tiberius Claudius Novius, the Hoplite Generalship and the *Epimeleteia* of the Free City of Athens," *AJPh* 100.2 (1979): 279-87, and esp. 279.

[61]See for example Jones, "The Teacher of Plutarch," 205-13, with bibliography.

from any references in his own works or from any of the Athenian inscriptions that might or might not refer to his teacher Ammonios and to Ammonios' son.

Even if one is to accept the arguments proposed by Barrow and Jones that the philosopher Ammonios is the same as the Athenian *strategos*, that he became the head of the Academy around 50 CE, and that he held a number of important offices in Athens, including the highest political magistracy in the city, i.e., the *strategia*, around 67 CE (neither of which can be established with any certainty and independently from Plutarch's chronology), Ammonios would not necessarily be Plutarch's "revered teacher" at "about 67," as Jones would have it.[62]

What is certain is what Plutarch writes in *The Delphic "E"*: i.e., during Nero's visit (in 66/7 CE), he was well-versed already in mathematics but had not yet entered the Academy. Since Plato's Academy required that everyone be educated in geometry before admission, Plutarch was most likely still taking preparatory lessons in mathematics at the time of the discussion concerning *The Delphic "E"* at Delphi. Without a formal public system of education in place, the

---

[62]See Jones, "The Teacher of Plutarch," 208; *idem, Plutarch and Rome*, 13-19; Puech, "Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque," 4835-6; Ammonius was from Egypt originally but he became a citizen of Athens and was enrolled in the *deme* of Cholleidai (*IG* II^2 3558). According to Plutarch, Ammonios was *strategos* three times (*Mor.* 720C). He probably received Roman citizenship [(M. Annius) Ammonius] through M. Annius Afrinus. Although his dates are not certain, it has been suggested by Jones (above) that Ammonius' political career occurs under Nero's reign and the beginning of 80 CE. Jones assumed, also, that Ammonius died sometime after 85 CE.

student presumably could enter the Academy as soon as he or she had made sufficient progress in geometry to be accepted. The "typical" two-stage curriculum, first under a *grammatistes* or *litterator* from the ages of seven to eleven and then under the care of a *grammatikos or grammaticus* from the ages of twelve to fifteen, has been shown to be flawed when applied to schools and teachers serving a privileged clientele, which require a more advanced and specialized education.[63] The children of the upper classes, both boys and girls, received a liberal-type education well beyond the basics in letters and arithmetic, basics which had been designed to improve mainly the employability of slaves and of the lower classes.[64] There is no record of Plutarch's early education or early teachers (but for his grandfather –see above), perhaps because he was schooled at home before he was sent off to Athens. Since Plutarch and his family belonged to the provincial elite, he would be expected to attend a "liberal-type school" which would have allowed him to continue his education well beyond the basic curriculum of *mousike* and *gymnastike* and to receive tutoring in

[63]A. D. Booth, "Elementary and Secondary Education in the Roman Empire," *Florilegium* 1 (1979): 1-14; A.C. Dionisotti, "From Ausonius' Schooldays? A Schoolbook and Its Relatives," *JRS* 72 (1982): 83-125, esp. 120-21; with R. A. Kaster, "Notes on 'Primary' and 'Secondary' Schools in Late Antiquity," *TAPA* 113 (1983): 323-46.

[64]A. D. Booth, "The Schooling of Slaves in First-Century Rome," *TAPA* 109 (1979): 11-9, accepted also for the late Empire by Kaster, "Notes on Schools," 346.

geometry, rhetoric and philosophy, as well, in order to refine his skills of persuasion.

Plutarch would have also had to enroll in the *ephebeia*, an institution which continued well into the Empire and which provided not only cultural and social education but also military training.[65] The institution also granted citizenship to its members upon its successful completion. According to the Hellenistic Gymnasiarchic Law of Beroia, the military groups of the *ephebate* included the *paides*, the *neaniskoi*, the *ephebes*, and "those under twenty-two" (probably the *neoi*); the gymnasiarch was responsible for all these groups of the *ephebate*.[66] In addition to *The Delphic "E"* (*Mor.* 385B), Plutarch describes himself as *neos* in *Tabletalks* (*Mor.* 649A), where he distinguishes himself from the *neaniskoi* present. More importantly, in *Mor.* 720E-F, Plutarch describes his interlocutor, Boethos, in

[65]See note 30 above.

[66]*EKM* 1. *Beroia* 1, Face B: ἀκοντίζειν δὲ καὶ τοξεύειν μελετάτωσαν οἵ | τε ἔφηβοι καὶ οἱ ὑπὸ τὰ δύο καὶ εἴκοσιν ἔτη καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, ὅταν | οἱ παῖδες ἀλείψωνται, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐὰν ἕτερόν τι ἀναγκαῖον φαίνη| ται τῶν μαθημάτων. *vac.* περὶ παίδων· εἰς τοὺς παῖδας μὴ εἰσπορευ | έσθω τῶν νεανίσκων μηθείς, μηδὲ λαλείτω τοῖς παισίν, εἰ δὲ μή, ὁ γυ | μνασίαρχος ζημιούτω καὶ κωλυέτω τὸν ποιοῦντά τι τούτων· ἅπαν | τάτωσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ παιδοτρίβαι ἑκάστης ἡμέρας δὶς εἰς τὸ γυμνάσιον | τὴν ὥραν ἣν ἂν ὁ γυμνασίαρχος ἀποδείξῃ, ἐὰν μή τις ἀρρωστήσῃ *v* | ἢ ἄλλη τις ἀναγκαία ἀσχολία γένηται· εἰ δὲ μή, ἐμφανισάτω τῶι γυ | μνασιάρχῃ· ἐὰν δέ τις δοκῆι ὀλιγωρεῖν τῶν παιδοτριβῶν καὶ μὴ παραγίνε | σθαι τὴν τεταγμένην ὥραν ἐπὶ τοὺς παῖδας, ζημιούτω αὐτὸν καθ' ἡμέ | [ρ]αν δραχμαῖς πέντε· κύριος δὲ ἔστω ὁ γυμνασίαρχος καὶ τῶν *v* | παίδων τοὺς ἀτακτοῦντας μαστιγῶν καὶ τῶν παιδαγωγῶν, *v* | ὅσοι ἂν μὴ ἐλεύθεροι ὦσιν, τοὺς δὲ ἐλευθέρους ζημιῶν· ἐπαναγ | κ̣αζέτω {ι} δὲ καὶ τοὺς παιδοτρίβας ποιεῖσθαι ἀπόδειξιν τῶν παῖδων *v* | [τ]ρὶς ἐν τῶι ἐνιαυτῶι κατὰ τετράμηνον καὶ καθιστάτω αὐτοῖς κριτάς, | [τ]ὸν δὲ νικῶντα στεφανούτω θαλλοῦ στεφάνωι…

the same way: "When silence fell, Boethos said that although he was still *neos* and occupied himself with academic pursuits by using assumptions from geometry and by accepting unproven hypotheses, now he was going to use some of the things that had been proven by Epikouros."[67] It becomes apparent from this statement that the educational curriculum of a *neos* incorporated the construction of sophistic or persuasive arguments by using mathematical theorems and knowledge. The ephebic curriculum at the school of Diogenes in Athens, too, included letters, geometry, rhetoric, and music (*Mor.* 736D: Ἀμμώνιος Ἀθήνησι στρατηγῶν ἀπόδειξιν ἔλαβεν ἐν τῷ Διογενείῳ τῶν γράμματα καὶ γεωμετρίαν καὶ τὰ ῥητορικὰ καὶ μουσικὴν μανθανόντων ἐφήβων…).[68] As noted above, *neaniskos* is the term used by Plutarch to refer to a man younger than him, but it is also the technical term used for the second military age group participating in the *ephebeia*. If we are to consider the technical definitions of *neos* and *neaniskos* here, Plutarch can be said to have been somewhere between twenty and twenty-two years old in *Tabletalks* 720E-F.

It is most likely that Plutarch went through the *ephebeia* in Athens, since he was given citizenship in that city as well. Like his poet friend, Sarapion, Plutarch

---

[67]*Mor.*720E-F: Ἡσυχίας δὲ γενομένης Βόηθος ἔφη νέος μὲν ὢν ἔτι καὶ σοφιστεύων ἀπὸ γεωμετρίας αἰτήμασι χρῆσθαι καὶ λαμβάνειν ἀναποδείκτους ὑποθέσεις, νυνὶ δὲ χρήσεσθαί τισι τῶν προαποδεδειγμένων ὑπ' Ἐπικούρου.

[68]Cf. *IG* II^2 1011, 1078, 2221.

became a member of the Attic tribe of Leontis.[69] The Academy's emphasis on physical education, practical problems, and public service was the appropriate place for the higher education of an up-and-coming provincial young man, who would end up serving not only his hometown but also Greece and the Roman Empire well.[70] How the Academic curriculum was organized and whether it provided preparatory courses in mathematics are questions that require future research that is beyond the limits of this dissertation. Provided that the head of the Academy is the same Ammonios that appears in *The Delphic "E"*, it is not surprising to find a head of a major philosophical school and magistrate of Athens at Delphi during an emperor's visit. The discussion in *The Delphic "E"* would have allowed young Plutarch to show off his persuasive skills and mathematical knowledge to the head of the Academy. What one may deduce from the reference in *The Delphic "E"*, therefore, is that Plutarch was a young adolescent man in 66/7, studying mathematics and aspiring to continue his schooling in philosophy in Plato's Academy. It is impossible to know how old

---

[69]*Mor.* 628A: Ἐν δὲ τοῖς Σαραπίωνος ἐπινικίοις, ὅτε τῇ Λεοντίδι φυλῇ τὸν χορὸν διατάξας ἐνίκησεν, ἑστιωμένοις ἡμῖν ἅτε δὴ καὶ φυλέταις οὖσι δημοποιήτοις οἰκεῖοι λόγοι τῆς ἐν χειρὶ φιλοτιμίας παρῆσαν. The dialogue took place during one of C. Iulius Antiochos Epiphanes Philopappos' *agonothesia* and *choregia* of the Dionysia (cf. *PIR*[2] I.151, lived c.??-114/6, *cos. suff.* 109). On Sarapion, see Puech, "Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque," 4874-8: dates his *floruit* to the reign of Hadrian, 4876n.172; and J. H. Oliver, "Two Athenian Poets," *Hesperia Suppl.* 8 (1949): 243-58, esp. 245-6, reconstructs the inscription which bears one of Sarapion's poems at the Asklepeion on the south side of the Akropolis.

[70]On Greek education in the Roman period, see A. J. Papalas, "Herodes Atticus: An Essay on Education in the Antonine Age," *History of Education Quarterly* 21.2 (1981): 171-88.

he was in that dialogue, but he had to be old enough and versed sufficiently in oratory to be allowed to participate in discussion. Young elite men were groomed early in their lives to be able to participate in conversation and to be persuasive.[71] It becomes evident from Plutarch's works on *The Fortune of Rome* (*Mor.* 316B-326C) and *Which is More Useful, Fire or Water?* (*Mor.* 955D-958E) that he had studied rhetoric.

Plutarch also studied Latin, but did not claim to be fluent in it (*Dem*. 2.2).[72] It is not necessary to assume that Plutarch was being literal when he admitted that he did not speak Latin well, as modesty would have required him to say so, even if he were fluent in Latin but still had an accent, for example. At what age Plutarch studied Latin is not known. He says that he learned Latin late in life but that could mean that he did not acquire formal instruction or facility in the language during childhood. Latin was not his mother tongue, but he did learn it since it was the language of official documents in the Empire. It is generally accepted that most educated members of the Greek and Roman elite were,

---

[71]Philostr. *Imag*. 1.36 relates that at age sixteen Herodes Attikos, the famous second century Athenian millionaire and sophist, heading a group of Athenian *ephebes*, was sent to the Danube to congratulate Hadrian for his accession in 117 CE. During this meeting with the emperor, Herodes was expected to deliver a previously rehearsed speech, but he broke down and threatened to drown himself in the river, probably in shame for his failure.

[72]Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, 8, suggests that Plutarch used bilingual assistants, but P. A. Stadter, "Reviews of Jones' Plutarch and Rome," *American Classical Review* 2.6 (1972): 256-7; and D. A. Russell, *Plutarch* (London, 1973), 54 disagree. On ancient bilingualism, see J. N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge, 2003).

indeed, bilingual during the first and second centuries. Facility in both languages would have allowed them to easily communicate in all political, economic, and cultural matters.

Marriage

It is generally accepted that Plutarch was married early in his life, and it has been assumed that his marriage to Timoxena was his first and only one. One has to account, however, for both widowhood and divorce, which were common in the Graeco-Roman world. In fact, it would not be surprising if this was not the first marriage for either one of them. Based on a reference in a consolatory letter to his wife upon the death of their two-year old daughter, Timoxena, it has been proposed that mother and daughter were homonymous.[73] In the letter, Plutarch points out that the deceased child was his favorite for two reasons: a) because she was the daughter his wife had desired so much after the birth of four sons, and b) because he was able to name the child after its mother (*Mor*. 608C: οἶσθα δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ τοσούτων μοι τέκνων ἀνατροφῆς κοινωνήσασα, πάντων ἐκτεθραμμένων οἴκοι δι' αὐτῶν ἡμῶν, τοῦτο δέ, ὅτι καὶ σοὶ ποθούσῃ θυγάτηρ μετὰ τέσσαρας υἱοὺς ἐγεννήθη κἀμοὶ τὸ σὸν ὄνομα θέσθαι παρέσχεν

[73] On Timoxena see Pomeroy, *Plutarch's Advice and Consolation*, 55; and *Der Neue Pauly* (*DNP*) s.v. *Timoxena*.

ἀφορμήν, [οἶδα] ἀγαπητὸν διαφερόντως γενόμενον). A Timoxena, presumably Plutarch's wife also, is mentioned in the *Advice on Marriage* as someone who wrote to an otherwise unknown Aristylla a letter or a treatise about the love of ornament, a work that has not survived (*Mor*. 145A). Timoxena had received an education and she, along with her husband and father-in-law, was responsible for the education of her children at home. Indeed, in the *Consolation to My Wife*, Plutarch and Timoxena are revealed as the proud parents of children who had been raised at home, and she is praised for her role in their upbringing.

Nothing is known about Timoxena's family or its provenance with any certainty, but it is expected that it would have been of a similar pedigree to that of Plutarch. The isolated reference in the *Tabletalks* to a πενθερός –often translated "father-in-law", but also "brother-in law" or "son-in-law"- might suggest that Timoxena was related to a certain Alexion (*Mor*. 701D: Ἀλεξίων ὁ πενθερός).[74]

[74]A certain Alexion is attested epigraphically on *IG* VII.3366 and 3369, both dated to the 2nd c. BCE, as *eponymous* archon of Chaironeia, and another Alexion, son of Alexion, shows up as an *ephebe* at Delphi (*FD* III.2.26) in 96 BCE. None of them, however, can be said with any certainty to have been related to Plutarch's father-in-law.

Epigraphically, the name Τιμοξένα (or Τειμοξένα) is rare and attested on only two imperial inscriptions from Central Greece, both from Thespiai.[75] These inscriptions acquire a special significance considering the dramatic setting of the *Erotikos*, the city of Thespiai. At the beginning of the dialogue, Autoboulos, one of Plutarch's sons to whom I shall return later, informs a certain Flavianos that his parents, as newly-weds, arrived at Thespiai to attend the festival of Eros and to sacrifice to the god. Plutarch brought his new bride to the festival after the occurrence of a disagreement and friction (*stasis*) between their parents. Autoboulos goes on to say that Plutarch brought his wife to the festival, because the prayer and sacrifice to Eros required her presence and was to be made, in fact, by her (*Mor.* 749B: Ὁ γὰρ πατήρ, ἐπεὶ πάλαι, πρὶν ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι, τὴν μητέρα νεωστὶ κεκομισμένος ἐκ τῆς γενομένης τοῖς γονεῦσιν αὐτῶν διαφορᾶς καὶ στάσεως ἀφίκετο τῷ Ἔρωτι θύσων, ἐπὶ τὴν ἑορτὴν ἦγε τὴν μητέρα· καὶ γὰρ ἦν ἐκείνης ἡ εὐχὴ καὶ ἡ θυσία). Like the young male character of the dialogue (Bacchon), Plutarch is presented here as having a minor public role at this Panhellenic festival. If we are to interpret the *Erotikos* as an allegory or metaphor for Plutarch's and Timoxena's marriage, we could postulate that

---

[75] *IG* VII 2151: ἐπὶ | Μενάνδρωι Δορκύλου | καὶ | Τιμοξένᾳ Ὀλυμπίχου | γυναικὶ δὲ | Ἀθανίου τοῦ Εὐξένου; *IG* VII 1867: Φλαουίαν Ἀρχέλαν τὴν | καὶ Τειμοξέναν, Λυσάν| δρου καὶ Δορκύλου θυ | γατέρα, ἱέρειαν διὰ βίου | Δήμητρος Ἀχέας, ἔκγο | νον δὲ τῶν τὸν Διό | νυσον ἀναθέντων, | Φλάουιος Μόνδων Φι | λείνου υἱὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ | γυναῖκα. The name also appears on *IG* VII 1441 (from Tanagra, uncertain date), 3025 (from Koroneia, uncertain date).

Plutarch should be cast as the young and inexperienced Bacchon, whose decision to marry the older, wiser, and wealthier widow brought disagreement and *stasis* in the private and public sphere of the *polis*. Although Timoxena's attendance at the Erotideia was more important than that of her husband, it was still customary in Greece for respectable women to be accompanied by their husbands in matters of public life, even if the women were the ones to play the most significant role in it.[76] This early in her married life the Erotideia presented an opportunity for a wealthy and respectable woman such as Timoxena to demonstrate her elite status, as well as that of her family and husband, by praying and sacrificing to the local patron god.

Furthermore, *IG* VII 1867 suggests that Timoxena and her family might have had connections with a Roman senatorial Thespian family.[77] Timoxena might have been related to Flavia Archela Teimoxena, daughter of Lysander and Dorkylos, who was a priestess for life of Demeter Achea (Demeter the Sorrowful) and a descendant of a family that sacrificed to Dionysos (a god worshipped also

---

[76]Cf. *Mor.* 667B, where Theon explains to the Roman Sossius Senecio that although most of the activities relating to a wedding are in the hands of women, it is necessary wherever women are present to include their husbands (ὅπου δὲ γυναῖκες πάρεισι, καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστι παραλαμβάνεσθαι).

[77]On this Thespian family, see C. P. Jones, "A Leading Family of Roman Thespiae," *HSCP* 74 (1970): 223-55, esp. 230-2. Jones postulates that Flavia Archela Teimoxena's *floruit* was c. 50-90(?) CE. See also Pomeroy, *Plutarch's Advice and Consolation*, 44, for a discussion of Flavia Archela Teimoxena.

at Delphi).[78] This Flavia Archela Teimoxena was the wife of Flavius Mondon, son of Phileinos. Their son, Phileinos, generously supported the games and the local sanctuary as an *agonothetes* of the Erotideia.[79] A certain Phileinos also set up a dedication at Chaironeia to Plutarch, whom he addressed as "benefactor."[80] Finally, a Philinos (possibly the same as T. Flavius Phileinos of Thespiai) appears frequently in Plutarch's writings: he is present and participates in conversations set at Delphi (638D and 394E), Hyampolis (660F), and Rome (727B) where he is called ἡμέτερος (our Philinos) by Plutarch, signifying not only that Philinos was a compatriot in Rome but also, and more probable, that Philinos was a relative.[81] As mentioned earlier, the rarity of the name Timoxena, and the fact that at least one member of this leading Thespian family was not only friendly with but, possibly, also related to Plutarch (ἡμέτερος), strongly suggest, at least to me, that

---

[78]The feminine "Dorkylis" as an alternative reading is also possible; autopsy of the inscription is required to verify the reading. Demeter Achea: see Pomeroy, *Plutarch's Advice and Consolation*, 43-44, for bibliography on the cult of Demeter Achea and for a discussion of Plutarch's friendly associations with at least three Boiotian families whose daughters were priestess of Demeter. Plutarch was well-informed about the cult of Demeter Achea, which he connected with that of the Athenian Demeter Thesmophoros (*Mor.* 372D-E and 378C-E). The festival to Demeter Achea was held in the month of Damatrios (i.e. October-November, the season of sowing), during which the Mouseia were held at Helikon in the second century CE (*SEG* 3.334).

[79]*IG* VII 1830: Φιλεῖνος Μόνδωνος καὶ Ἀρχέλας υἱὸς | ἀγωνοθετῶν ἀνέθηκεν τὸν Ἔ| ρωτα καὶ τὰ ἐν τῶι προναΐωι θυ | ρώματα ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων τό τε ἰε | [ρὸ]ν ἐπεσκεύασεν.

[80]*IG* VII 3422: Φιλεῖνος Πλού | ταρχον τὸν εὐ[ε] | ργέτην θεοῖς | [ἀ]νέθηκεν.

[81]The same expression (ἡμέτερος) is used also of the Roman Avidius Quietus in *Mor.* 632A. On Philinos, see Jones, "Family of Roman Thespiae"; and Puech, "Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque," 4869.

Timoxena came from Thespiai. In all likelihood, she was the connecting link between Plutarch and this Romanized Thespian senatorial family.[82] Such supposition would explain Timoxena's significant role and substantial participation in the rites of the Thespian Eros, as a citizen and former inhabitant of Thespiai. More importantly, it would elucidate further Plutarch's considerable familiarity with the city (beyond the fact that he was a Boiotian himself) and his sympathetic treatment not only of Anthemion, Bacchon's cousin and a member of this same leading Thespian family,[83] but also of Ismenodora, the wealthy and noble widow, who like Plutarch's own wife, had Roman citizenship (see chapter 2), was young and fertile, and could also provide the necessary political contacts and acquaintances for an up-and-coming young provincial man. Finally, it might explain Plutarch's required attendance at Bacchon's and Ismenodora's wedding sacrifice at the end of the dialogue (*Mor*. 771D).

---

[82]See J. H. Oliver, "Roman Senators from Greece and Macedonia," in *Atti del Colloquio Internazionale AIEGL su Epigrafia e Ordine Senatorio II*. *Tituli* 5 (Rome, 1982a): 583-602, and esp. 591-2, on the senatorial status of this family.

[83]Jones, "Family of Roman Thespiae," 232. See also entry in Chapter 2.

Other female kin

No other female kin is revealed in Plutarch's works but, in the *Consolation to My Wife* (*Mor.* 608B), a θυγατριδῆ is mentioned. Upon his arrival at Tanagra, Plutarch was informed of his little daughter's death by his θυγατριδῆ. As is the case with many Greek words pertaining to kinship, the word θυγατριδῆ is also problematic and a number of translations have been proposed for it.[84] Since the root of the word is based on θυγατήρ (daughter), I believe that it means either a "grand-daughter" (i.e., the daughter of his daughter), or an "adopted daughter," or a "daughter-in-law." One might wish to reject "grand-daughter" as a possible translation on account of the reference in the *Consolation* that the child that died was the much desired daughter after the birth of sons and the only one that the couple had up to this point. Such conclusion would be based, however, on the unfounded assumption that the marriage that produced the aforementioned children was the first one for both Plutarch and Timoxena; either or both could have had children from previous marriages, in addition to their own. Therefore, Plutarch could have had a step-daughter or a daughter from a previous marriage, who would remain unnamed due to the traditional rules of etiquette,

[84]Pomeroy, *Plutarch's Advice and Consolation*, 78 and 208, with previous bibliography argues for "grand-daughter."

which discouraged one to name respectable women.[85] Besides, θυγατριδῆ might refer to an adopted daughter; if Plutarch and Timoxena had trouble producing a female child for many years, the couple might have decided to adopt before Timoxena gave birth to the little one.[86] Finally, "daughter-in-law" is also possible on account of the sons the couple had, although attributing a wife to Autoboulos, as Babut would have it, is arbitrary and possibly at variance with the tradition of the bride inhabiting the house of the groom after marriage.[87]

Children

In addition to the young Timoxena, who died, the marriage produced at least four sons: Soklaros (15A), Autoboulos (666D, 719C, 1012A), Plutarch

[85]*Id.*, 78.

[86]Adoptions of women in Greece and Rome have not received scholarly attention. Such adoptions were not common but they did occur; see for example, *IG* VII 1867: Φλαουίαν Ἀρχέλαν τὴν | καὶ Τειμοξέναν, Λυσάν| δρου καὶ Δορκύλου θυ | γατέρα, ἱέρειαν διὰ βίου | Δήμητρος Ἀχέας, ἔκγο | νον δὲ τῶν τὸν Διό | νυσον ἀναθέντων, | Φλάουιος Μόνδων Φι | λείνου υἱὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ | γυναῖκα. Flavia Archela here was the daughter of Lysander and of Dorkylos.

[87]D. Babut, "À Propos des enfants et d'un ami de Plutarque: essai de solution pour deux enigmes," *REG* 94 (1981): 47-62, esp. 61; and *idem*, "Sur Soclaros de Chéronée et sur le nombre des enfants de Plutarque: méthodologie d'une mise au point," *RPh* 73 (1999): 175-89, has suggested "daughter-in-law," and postulates that the θυγατριδῆ Plutarch visited at Tanagra was the wife of Autoboulos (186). Such an assumption suggests that Autoboulos left his father's home at Chaironeia (or Delphi) and lived at Tanagra with his new bride, but Autoboulos' behavior would be unlikely and at variance with the Greek custom that required the bride to live with her husband's family.

(1012A), and Chairon (609D).[88] The account at *Mor.* 725F indicates that Plutarch had at least three sons (τῶν υἱῶν μου τοὺς νεωτέρους ἐν θεάτρῳ προσδιατρίψαντας ἀκροάμασι καὶ βράδιον ἐπὶ τὸ δεῖπνον ἐλθόντας…). The comparative νεωτέρους suggests that at least two of them were young at the time, yet old enough also to attend the theater and be invited to dinner and to a philosophical discussion at Theon's house.[89] It is possible that there was a sixth child, the eldest, which Timoxena had lost during a pregnancy, and as such it might have not be given a name (609D: ἤδη δὲ καὶ περὶ τα τοιαῦτα πολλὴν εὐστάθειαν ἐπεδείξω τὸ πρεσβύτατον τῶν τέκνων ἀποβαλοῦσα καὶ πάλιν ἐκείνου τοῦ καλοῦ Χάρωνος ἡμᾶς προλίποντος).[90]

Considering ancient demographics, it is not surprising that Plutarch and Timoxena lost a number of children. One of their sons, possibly Soklaros, appears to have died before the composition of *The Creation of the Soul in Plato's*

---

[88]Babut, "Sur Soclaros de Chéronée," 175-89, proposed that the sense of the *Consolation to My Wife* required that Plutarch have four sons and one daughter.

[89]Theon was a close friend of Plutarch and he appears more often than anyone else in Plutarch's works except for the author's brother, Lamprias. See *RE* s.v. Theon 2059-66. Plutarch's sons arrived late at the dinner because of their attendance at the musical performance in the theater and as a result they were teased by the sons of their host, Theon.

[90]It was common to give a name to a son after nine days and to a daughter after eight. Both C. P. Jones, "Towards a Chronology of Plutarch's Works," *JRS* 56 (1966): 61-74; and J. Sirinelli, *Plutarque de Chéronée: un philosophe dans le siècle* (Paris: 2000), suggest that the first child born to Plutarch and Timoxena died shortly after its birth and remained nameless. Babut, "Sur Soclaros de Chéronée,"178, rejects this argument.

"Timaeus" (*Mor.* 1012A-1030C), since he is not one of the dedicatees (Autoboulos and Plutarch) in that work.[91]

It has been proposed that Soklaros was the eldest surviving son, named either after one of Plutarch's grandfathers or after Soklaros of Tithora, a friend of the family.[92] This naming pattern, however, does not follow usual custom, which requires that the first son be named after the paternal father or grandfather and the second after the maternal equivalents. If Soklaros was the eldest and was named after his paternal grandfather, then Lamprias, the grandfather discussed above, was Plutarch's maternal grandfather; such a supposition could stand if one of Plutarch's brothers were also named Soklaros, which, as far as we are told, is not the case. If Soklaros was named after Plutarch's friend from Tithora, he had to be one of his youngest sons on whom he would bestow the name of a

[91]Pomeroy, *Plutarch's Advice and Consolation*, 79.

[92]See the most recent argument with bibliography in Babut, "Sur Soclaros de Chéronée," 175-89, who maintains that Autoboulos is the second eldest son of Plutarch and Timoxena. Babut argues that the eldest, Soklaros, died during adolescence, while the other two sons included Plutarch [the Younger] and Chairon, who most likely died as a toddler. According to Babut, Soklaros was named after Plutarch's grandfather, but according to Pomeroy, who follows Puech Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque," 4879-83 and *idem*, "Soklaros de Tithorée, ami de Plutarque, et ses descendants," *REG* 94 (1981): 186-92, the son was named after one of Plutarch's friends, Soklaros of Tithora. In addition to their sons, the couple had a daughter, who died at the age of two and was named after her mother, Timoxena, as the *Consolation to My Wife* reveals. Pomeroy, *Plutarch's Advice and Consolation*, 78, suggests that the couple could have had more than five children.

benefactor or a patron after the family name had been secured.[93] Whatever the case may be concerning Soklaros' name and provided that Soklaros was, indeed, dead well before *The Creation of the Soul in Plato's "Timaeus"* (*Mor.* 1012A-1030C) was composed, he must have died a young man since he had to be at least twelve years old to be formally instructed in poetry (cf. *Mor*. 15A).

There is no indication of Chairon's age at the time of his death, but he would have to have been old enough to have been given a name and, perhaps, must have been an *ephebe* to be described as καλός (handsome). As was the case with the death of little Timoxena, Plutarch was away from home again when Chairon died.[94] It has been conjectured in the sixteenth century manuscript by Xylander that Chairon (or Charon) was named after the eponymous hero of Chaironeia and might have been the fourth or youngest son.[95] Nothing can really be conjectured about Plutarch "Jr." (*Mor.* 1012A).

More information, however, has been preserved in Plutarch's writings about Autoboulos, named after Plutarch's father in accordance with Greek

---

[93]Jones, "The Teacher of Plutarch," 71, wants Soklaros born after the death of little Timoxena, thus making him not only the youngest son but also the youngest child.

[94]Pomeroy, *Plutarch's Advice and Consolation*, 79.

[95]*Ibid*., and Babut, "Sur Soclaros de Chéronée."

custom (see also entry in chapter 2).[96] This traditional practice combined with Autoboulos' testimony in the *Erotikos* (*Mor.* 749B: πρὶν ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι), may lead one to assume that he could be regarded as the first of Plutarch's surviving children with Timoxena. Autoboulos, whose name means "self-willed," was married at Chaironeia (*Mor.* 666D), where the guests included all of his relatives and father's friends and acquaintances of any kind as was customary, such as Sossius Senecio and Theon (*Mor.* 667A).

A certain L. Mestrios Autoboulos, a Platonic philosopher, appears on a late first-early second century CE inscription from Chaironeia; considering that Mestrios was also one of Plutarch's Roman names, we can suggest that L. Mestrios Autoboulos of *IG* VII 3423 is Plutarch's son.[97] Autoboulos followed in his father's footsteps as a Platonic philosopher and teacher (see discussion in chapter 2).[98] Philosophers were not poor men; they charged fees, held endowed chairs, had libraries and, in general, represented the financial and intellectual

---

[96]According to Babut, "Sur Soclaros de Chéronée," 184, Autoboulos was the second son. See also, R. Flacelière, "Plutarque dans ses 'Oeuvres Morales,'" in *Plutarque: Oeuvres Morales, I.1*: *Introduction générale* (Paris, 1987), xxxvii-xxxviii.

[97]*IG* VII 3423: Λ(ούκιον) Μ[έσ]τριον Αὐτόβουλον φιλόσο | φον Πλατωνικὸν Φλάβιος Αὐτόβου | λος τὸν πρὸς μητρὸς πάππον.

[98]Plutarch was a teacher of philosophy and had his own circle of students and listeners according to Flacelière, "Plutarque dans 'Oeuvres Morales,'"xiii-xiv. Autoboulos continued the family tradition: *Syll*[3] 2, 844A=*IG* VII 3423 (from Chaironea): Λ(ούκιον) Μ[έσ]τριον Αὐτόβουλον φιλόσοφον Πλατωνικὸν Φλάβιος Αὐτόβουλος τὸν πρὸς μητρὸς πάππον. The philosophical tradition of the family continued well into the third century CE: cf. *Syll*[3] 2, 844B= *IG* VII 3425 and *Syll*[3] 2, 845.

aristocracy of the Empire.[99] The Flavians founded chairs in Rome and Athens and, in 75 CE, Vespasian exempted teachers, who educated, civilized and made good citizens of the young, from civic burdens in the cities in which they resided. Furthermore, teachers were allowed to hold lectures and conferences in a sacred place of their choosing.[100]

Residence at Delphi

Delphi, as the internationally acclaimed religious center of the province, would constitute a prime location for the establishment of a philosophical school that would have the potential of being visited by a great number of the most significant people of the Roman Empire, including the imperial family and its representatives. A number of Platonists, in fact, were honored by the city or by its Amphictyony in the late first and early second centuries, including Plutarch.[101]

---

[99]Philostr. *Vit. Soph.* 604. See also, John McK. Camp, *The Athenian Agora. Excavations in the heart of classical Athens* (London, 1986), 208-9, and *idem*, "The philosophical schools of Roman Athens," in *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire: Papers from the tenth British Museum classical colloquium*, *BICS Suppl.* 55, eds. S. Walker and C. Averil (London, 1989), 50-55.

[100]Notice that the philosophical discussion of the *Erotikos* is also set at a sacred place, the Valley of the Muses.

[101]*Syll*[3] 843A: Δελφοὶ Χαιρωνεῦσιν ὑμοῦ Πλούταρχον ἔθηκαν | τοῖς Ἀμφικτυόνων δόγματι πειθόμενοι. See also, R. G. A. Weir, "Roman Delphi and its Pythian Games" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1998), 292-6, for a discussion and a list of sophists and philosophers honored by the city of Delphi and its Amphictyony. Weir suggests that some deliberate building program was at work at Delphi in the late first century under Domitian, which was continued in the early second century under Hadrian, considering the intellectual activity, imperial interest and considerable building activity in the area.

His connection with the sanctuary in his late years has long been appreciated (and will be discussed later in this chapter), but Plutarch's early presence at Delphi at the beginning of his married life with Timoxena has never to my knowledge been established.[102] Drawing from internal evidence in the *Erotikos*, I will establish a dramatic date for the dialogue, and will postulate not only that the end of the Flavian dynasty provides a *terminus post quem* for the marriage to Timoxena but also that Plutarch and his new family were already residents of Delphi. As such the *Erotikos*, and the story of Empona in particular, becomes essential in a partial reconstruction of Plutarch's family life, friends and chronology.[103]

---

[102]Cf. R. Flacelière, *Plutarque: Oeuvres Morales, X: Dialogue sur l'amour* (Paris, 1980a), 8, postulates from the same evidence that Plutarch was a priest of Apollo at Delphi.

[103]I agree with *Ibid*., 31-9, here and consider the *Erotikos* to be an authentic work of Plutarch. See further, P. G. Barberà, *Plutarco. El Erótico: Diálogo filosófico sobre Eros, o la confrontación de los amores pederástico y conyugal* (Barcelona, 1991), 17-22; C. Hubert, *De Plutarchi Amatorio* (PhD diss., Berlin, 1903) who argues also that Plutarch left the *Erotikos* unfinished; Ziegler, *RE* 21.1, cols 675-76; Sandbach, "Rhythm and Authenticity in Plutarch's *Moralia*," *CQ* 33 (1939): 197-8; H. Martin, Jr. "Amatorius (Moralia 748E-771E)," in *Plutarch's Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature*, ed. H. D. Betz (Leiden, 1978), 442-537. For arguments against its authenticity, see E. Graf, *Commentationes Philologae für O. Ribbeck* (Leipzig, 1887), 68-70; R. Hirzel, *Der Dialog*, II (Leipzig, 1895), 233-6; C. Cichorius, *Römische Studien: Historisches, Epigraphisches, Literargeschichtliches aus vier Jahrhunderten Roms* (Berlin, 1922), 406-11.

The Dramatic Date of the *Erotikos* and its Significance in a Biography of Plutarch

Provided that Autoboulos was faithful in his rendition of the dialogue as he had heard it from his father numerous times (and there is no reason to suggest otherwise), the text at *Mor.* 749B and forward can be securely postulated to belong to Plutarch. At the end of his discussion of successful conjugal unions, Plutarch offers the story of the Gallic Empona as a paradigm of wifely fidelity and loyalty even after her husband's unsuccessful mutiny against the emperor Vespasian (*Mor.* 770C-771D).[104] Empona remained faithful and of service to her husband under adverse and life-threatening conditions during months and years of hiding.[105] Both Julius and Empona were eventually executed by Vespasian

[104]The account of the so-called rebellion of Julius Civilis, also known as the *imperium Galliarum*, which occurred under Vespasian (69-70 CE), is controversial [B. Levick, *Vespasian* (New York: 1999), 107-5]. A less romantic version of the mutiny and of the couple appears also in Tacitus (*Hist.* 4.67) and Dio Cassius (66.3). According to Dio, Sabinus raised an army and claimed to be a descendant of Julius Caesar (65.3). Julius "Caesar" Sabinus became the leader of the Lingorians in the Gallic rebellion, who were defeated by Roman allies in April of 70 CE. On the commonalities between Plutarch's and Tacitus' narration of the events of 68-69, see R. Flacelière , "Tacite et Plutarque," in *Melanges de literature et d'epigraphie latines, d'histoire ancienne et d'archeologie. Hommage a la memoire de Pierre Wuilleumier* (Paris, 1980b), 113-119, who argues for a common source for the two authors; with Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, 74. On Empona, also known as Peponila (Cass. Dio 66.16.2) or Epponina (Tacitus), see *RE* 6.260 and *PIR*^{2} E 81. On Julius Sabinus, see *RE* 10.795-796 and *PIR*^{2} I 535. See also, S. Romani, "Empona e Sabino. Plutarco (amat. 24,770-25,771c)," in *Eros. Antiche trame greche d'amore*, ed. A. Stramaglia (Bari, 2000), 147-154.

[105]Plutarch reports that Empona lived with her husband underground for seven months initially; but after their unsuccessful ruse in Rome, she returned and continued to live underground with him for many years (771A: καὶ τὰ μὲν πολλὰ [understand "ἔτη"] ἐκείνῳ συνῆν ὑπὸ τῆς γῆς). Tacitus reports nine years (*Hist.* 4.67.2). Nine years was, in practice, the length of Vespasian's reign. Although Tacitus might be using a *topos* here, it appears that his

(69-79 CE)[106] but not before the couple produced two sons (771C: καὶ τοὺς γενομένους ὑπεθρέψατο σκύμνους ἄρρενας· δύο γὰρ ἔτεκε).[107] Plutarch is the only author who provides in the *Erotikos* information regarding the fate of these sons: one died in battle in Egypt, but the other had visited them at Delphi "not long ago" (771C: τῶν δ' υἱῶν ὁ μὲν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ πεσὼν ἐτελεύτησεν, ὁ δ' ἕτερος ἄρτι και πρῴην γέγονεν ἐν Δελφοῖς παρ' ἡμῖν ὄνομα Σαβῖνος).[108] Vespasian, Plutarch writes, put Empona to death but he was punished, for his whole line was killed in a short time (771C: Ἀποκτείνει μὲν οὖν αὐτὴν ὁ Καῖσαρ; ἀποκτείνας δὲ δίδωσι δίκην, ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ τοῦ γένους παντὸς ἄρδην ἀναιρεθέντος).[109]

---

account agrees with that of Plutarch, namely, that Vespasian perished shortly after the execution of Empona (771C).

[106]According to Dio Cassius (65.16), the whole family was brought to Rome and executed, but Plutarch reports that, while Empona was killed along with her husband, her two sons survived. Her final fatal audience with the emperor is variably reported by Dio and Plutarch. Dio reports (65.16) that Peponila threw the children at the emperor's feet and pled on their behalf; although she caused Vespasian and the rest to weep, there was no mercy shown to any of them. On the other hand, Plutarch reports that her courage and pride raised pity among the spectators, which infuriated Vespasian, and when she realized that there was no hope for saving herself, she asked Vespasian to change places with her by saying that she had enjoyed life more in the underground darkness than he did ruling thus.

[107]These sons need not be twins, for Plutarch could have used διδύμους to denote such a situation, but they might have been born at any point during the years of hiding.

[108] Plutarch uses the same construction (παρ' ἡμῖν+ἐν+name of town in the dative case) to signify residence at the time elsewhere. See, for example, παρ' ἡμῖν ἐν Χαιρωνείᾳ (*Mor.* 267D, 318D, 666D); cf. *Mor.* 683B, 710B.

[109]Vespasian died on June 24, 79 CE either because of gastrointestinal problems or because he was poisoned. Plutarch might present here an alternative to Suetonius' tradition (possibly, of Trajanic or Hadrianic date). Dio reports that there was a different opinion

There are several points to be made here resulting from this description:

1) Julius Sabinus and Empona produced two sons during their years of hiding (i.e., sometime between 71 and 79 CE, but before Vespasian's death).
2) These (unnamed) sons survived Vespasian's death (79 CE).
3) One of them (son A) fell in battle in Egypt.[110]
4) One of them (Sabinus "Jr.") visited Plutarch and his family at Delphi. This visit occurred sometime after his brother's death (i.e., after 89-97 at the absolute earliest).

---

supported by Hadrian: that Vespasian, like Claudius (his patron and political model) had been poisoned by Titus (66.17.1). See also Levick, *Vespasian*., 197: "The symptoms were not unlike those of Claudius, and Titus was suspected of poisoning, notably by the Emperor Hadrian, a measure of his perceived ambition," with M. G. Schmidt, "Claudius und Vespasian: eine Interpretation des Wortes 'vae, puto, deus fio' (Suet. *Vesp*. 23, 4)," *Chiron* 18 (1988): 83-9. C. L. Murison, *Rebellion and Reconstruction: Galba to Demo. An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History, Books 64-67 (A.D. 68-96)* (Atlanta, 1999), 175-6, notes that it is unlikely that Hadrian knew Titus personally, and attributes the story to Trajan instead.

[110]It was common for men to be recruited into the army between the ages of eighteen and twenty one [Y. Le Bohec, *The Imperial Roman Army* (New York: 1994), 73, with earlier bibliography on recruitment, 295]; so son A would have been at least that old when he died in Egypt. The events in Egypt, therefore, would have to have a *terminus post quem* of the years between 89-97 CE at the absolute earliest and, more likely, later than that. See M. Pucci Ben Zeev, *Diaspora Judaism in Turmoil, 116/117 CE: Ancient Sources and Modern Insights* (Leuven, 2005), 153-55, who places this war at the end of Trajan's reign and the beginning of Hadrian's. Trajan sent L. Quietus as governor of Judaea at about this time. Whether this revolt in Egypt is what is meant in the *Erotikos*, it cannot be established with any certainty but it remains possible. Plutarch mentions a war in Egypt in *Isis and Osiris* (380B-C), a work dedicated to Clea [cf. Juvenal 15.27; Dio of Prusa 32, 72; W. Christ, *Geschichte der griechischen Literature 4* (1905): 675]. For a Jewish revolt in Cyrene which spread to Cyprus, Palestine, and Mesopotamia, see *SEG* 48.2057 and E. M. Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian* (Leiden, 1976), 393 ff..

5) Vespasian and his line (i.e., the Flavians, Domitian was killed in 96 CE) were already dead and no longer ruling.[111]

The conclusions that can be drawn from these points, based on the assumption that Plutarch is still the speaker at this point of the dialogue, are as follows:

1) Based on points (3), (4), and (5) above, the dramatic date of the *Erotikos* belongs to sometime after the end of the Flavian dynasty in 96 CE,[112] and
2) Plutarch's marriage to Timoxena, mentioned at the beginning of the *Erotikos* also took place after 96 CE.[113]
3) Based on point (4) above, Plutarch and Timoxena had an abode at and were permanently living at Delphi already during the early years of their marriage.[114]

---

[111]Plutarch presents an alternative tradition here regarding Vespasian's death, which has been dismissed by modern commentators as showing disfavor for Vespasian [see for example, E. L. Minar Jr., F.H. Sandbach, W.C. Helmbold (trans.), *Plutarch. Moralia. Volume IX* (Cambridge, MA, 1999 reprint), 439n.c.]. While it is possible for Plutarch to have disliked Vespasian, since the emperor had withdrawn Nero's declaration of liberation and autonomy of the Greeks, it should be remembered also that Plutarch's patron, L. Mestrius Florus had been consul under Vespasian (cf. Suet. *Vesp.* 22.3). In addition, Plutarch was probably already aware of the ancient rumors circulating, even in the imperial court, regarding Vespasian's poisoning by Titus (see note 108 above).

[112]The date of its composition would have to be much later. Jones, "Chronology of Plutarch's Works," 72, argued that the *Erotikos* was composed after 96, but he insists that Plutarch did not outlast Trajan's reign (66). Sirinelli, *Plutarque de Chéronée*, 410, places the composition of the dialogue sometime between Hadrian's accession in 117 and Plutarch's death.

[113]If Sabinus' son A died during the Jewish revolt in Egypt, which cannot be established with any certainty however, the *terminus post quem* for the dramatic date of the *Erotikos* should be pushed to 117 CE. Again, it is not necessary to assume that this marriage was the first one for either Plutarch or Timoxena.

His magisterial and diplomatic role at Delphi would require Plutarch to live there and travel as needed; for example, to Thespiai in the *Erotikos*, or to Athens and Tanagra in the *Consolation to My Wife*, to Achaia as an ambassador to the proconsul while Plutarch was still *neos* (νέον ἔτι) in *Rules for Politicians* (*Mor.* 816C-D), to Alexandria in *Tabletalks* (*Mor.* 678C-D),[115] to North Italy at least once with Mestrius Florus (*Mar.* 2.1, *Otho* 14.2-3 and 18.1-2), to Rome on different occasions,[116] and so on.[117]

Furthermore, the friends mentioned at the beginning of the *Erotikos* (749B-C) have to be reconsidered under Plutarch's permanent residence at Delphi (see also chapter 2). Plutarch came to Thespiai with his "usual friends from home" and, at Thespiai, he found Daphnaios son of Archidamos, Lysandros, who was in love with the daughter of Simon and who was the most favored of her suitors,

---

[114]Such a conclusion is not unexpected considering that Plutarch might have already been the head of a philosophical school there, was a citizen of Delphi, served as an *epimeletes* and priest of the sanctuary at some point in his life and, possibly, as archon of that city as well.

[115]P. A. Stadter, "Plutarch: Diplomat for Delphi?" in *The Statesman in Plutarch's Works, Vol. I*, eds. L. De Blois et al. (Boston, 2004), 19-31, esp. 22 postulated that Plutarch traveled to Alexandria in 69 or 70 on an embassy to Vespasian's imperial court (Vespasian remained in Egypt after the troops proclaimed him emperor in July of 69), but a date for such a visit cannot be established.

[116]On Plutarch's trips to Rome, see Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, 21-25. He suggests one visit to Rome under Vespasian and other visits to Rome in the winter of 88/89 and in 92/93, but again the chronology is not certain.

[117]Plutarch's presence at Delphi during Nero's visit to Delphi in 66/7 CE could be established further, in fact, if we are to assume that Autoboulos (the father) and his family were already residents of Delphi and with guest-friendship ties to Ammonios from Athens (*Mor.* 385B).

and Soklaros son of Aristion, who arrived from Tithora, in addition to his Boiotian acquaintances (τῶν γνωρίμων) (749B: τῶν δὲ φίλων οἴκοθεν μὲν αὐτῷ παρῆσαν οἱ συνήθεις, ἐν δὲ Θεσπιαῖς εὗρε Δαφναῖον τὸν Ἀρχιδάμου καὶ Λυσάνδρον[118] ἐρῶντα τῆς Σίμωνος καὶ μάλιστα τῶν μνωμένων αὐτὴν εὐημεροῦντα, καὶ Σώκλαρον ἐκ Τιθόρας ἥκοντα τὸν Ἀριστίωνος; see also chapter 2). The friends here (Daphnaios son of Archidamos, Lysandros, and Soklaros son of Aristion) have to be understood as friends from Delphi. Whatever their original hometown might have been, they were in one way or another associated with Delphi or with its Amphictyony. At least one of the aforementioned friends, Soklaros son of Aristion, also known as T. Flavius Soklaros, is attested epigraphically as archon of Delphi during Caristanius Iulianus' proconsulship (ἀνθύπατος) of Achaia in 100/1 or 101/2.[119] Soklaros is described as "coming from Tithora," probably, because he stopped at his hometown of Tithora on his way to Thespiai from Delphi to visit with family who could provide him with shelter and sustenance during the two-day trip. On

---

[118]The text here is corrupt but appears as such in the only surviving manuscripts (E and B). I accept "καὶ Λύσανδρον" because it is fitting and expected in a paratactic construction for a list of friends (καὶ...καὶ), but more importantly because Plutarch, following proper Greek etiquette, does not provide the names of respectable Greek women casually in passing. See also Chapter 2.

[119]*FD* III.4: 47 and Puech, "Soclaros de Tithorée, ami de Plutarque, et ses descendants," 261. On Soklaros, see chapter 2. Perhaps, one can now look for the rest of Plutarch's friends in the Delphic inscriptions as well.

the other hand, Protagenes of Tarsos and Zeuxippos the Lacedemonian are described by their ethnic names and as ξένοι (friends from abroad).

Friends and Patrons

Plutarch's friends, both Greek and Roman, have been discussed by others and will not be the focus here except for the ones who appear as interlocutors in the *Erotikos*.[120] These individuals will be discussed in chapter two. Mestrius Florus, Plutarch's patron, however, should be noted, since Plutarch, as a young man, traveled to Rome and Italy with him (*Mar.* 2.1; *Otho* 14.2-3, 18.1-2). It was through Florus that Plutarch received Roman citizenship.[121] When the two men met is unclear. Mestrius Florus was a senator and in Otho's suite at Brixellum (*Otho* 14.2-3); he had also fought for Otho (unwillingly, he says) at Bedriacum, but he was close to Vespasian (who would correct his Latin pronunciation, Suet. *Vesp*. 22). Mestrius Florus' proconsulship of Asia is attested on inscriptions and a letter from Ephesos and coins from Smyrna dating to the reign of Domitian (c.

[120]On Plutarch's friends, see Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, S. Follet, "Flavius Euphanès d'Athènes, ami de Plutarque," *Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie greques offerts a Pierre Chantraine* (Paris, 1972), 35-50, and most recently, Puech, "Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque," 4831-93, with earlier bibliography and epigraphic evidence.

[121]Plutarch's Roman name appears only on one official, public inscription of Hadrianic date from Delphi; *SIG*^{3} 829A=Flacelière no.3=*FD* III 4.472: …τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀμφικτυόνων, ἐπιμελητεύοντος ἀπὸ Δελφῶν Μεστρίου Πλουτάρχου τοῦ ἱερέως.

87/8 or 88/9 CE).[122] It is to be expected that he stopped at Delphi on his way from and to Rome at least once during that time. During his travels to Rome and Italy, Plutarch would have met with Mestrius Florus' friends and with men such as Q. Sosius Senecio (twice consul in 107/8) to whom he dedicated the *Tabletalks* and the *Parallel Lives*,[123] as well as Iunius Rusticus, Fundanus,[124] Paccius, Saturninus,[125] Favorinus and others.[126] Plutarch did not have to go all the way to Rome, of course, to meet Roman citizens. Many of them would have travelled through Delphi on their way to Athens and Asia, and others who lived and worked in the

---

[122]Inscriptions found at Ephesos dating to 88/9 CE: *Ephesos* 741=*IEph* 234: Dedication to Domitian by the demos of Keretapa (Karia/Phrygia); *Ephesos* 742=*IEph* 2048: Dedication to Domitian (to Vespasian, after erasure) by the demos of Synaos on base. *Ephesos* 211= *IEph* 213: Letter of L. Pompeius Apollonios of Ephesos to proconsul L. Mestrius Florus concerning the festival of Demeter Karpophoros and Thesmophoros and the Divi Augusti dating to 83/4 CE. Coins from Smyrna baring his name: *RPC* II.1, 198, nos. 1018-1021.

[123]*Mor*. 75B, 612C-E, 613C-D, 666D-E, etc.; *Thes.* 1.1; *Dem.* 1.1, 31.4; Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, 54ff. Sosius Senecio was an old friend of Hadrian, and probably met Plutarch in Achaia [A. R. Birley, *Hadrian: The Restless Emperor* (New York, 1997), 62]. Plutarch dedicated the nine books of *Tabletalks* to Senecio, which recall their talks in Athens, Patras, Chaeronea, and Rome. Senecio had also attended the wedding of Plutarch's son.

[124]A friend common to Hadrian and Plutarch was Minicius Fundanus of Ticinum, Pavia (*suff.* in 107), and a friend of Pliny: R. Syme, "Municius Fundanus from Ticinum," in A. Birley (ed.), *Roman Papers*, VII (Oxford, 1991), 603-19; Birley, *Hadrian: The Restless Emperor*, 62.

[125]L. Herennius Saturninus (*PIR*^{2} H 126), cos. 100, was the proconsul to whom Plutarch dedicated the book *Against Colotes* (*Mor.* 1107D-1127E) and to whom Trajan wrote a letter on behalf of the Delphians; see, J. H. Oliver, *Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors from Inscriptions and Papyri* (Philadelphia, 1989), 132-6.

[126]According to P. E. Easterling and B.M.W. Knox, eds., *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature: I. Greek Literature 4* (New York, 1989), 234, Plutarch traveled to Rome c. 92/3.

province already would have visited the sanctuary during religious festivals, the Pythian Games and imperial visits.[127]

Citizen

With the support of his political connections and acquaintances in his role as philosopher and teacher at Delphi and, perhaps, because of his admiration of Plato and the philosopher-king, Plutarch turned to the political life of his day.[128] Plutarch was one of the Greek provincial notables who preferred (or was limited to) intellectual activities and political administration within the bounds of their fatherland to a seat in the Senate.[129] This attachment to one's own *polis*, region,

---

[127]M. Antonius Sospes, *agonothetes* thrice, curator *annonae* and *duomvir* at Corinth was probably one such friend (*Tabletalks* and see also, J. Wiseman, "Corinth and Rome I: 228 B.C.-A.D. 267," *ANRW* II.7.1 (1979): 438-548, and esp. 507). Also, Gn. Cornelius Pulcher, (*PIR*^{2} C 1424; CP 81) from Epidauros, procurator of Epiros around 114 or earlier, was among Plutarch's friends to whom he dedicated *How to Profit from Your Enemies* (*Mor.* 86B-92E). Gn. Cornelius Pulcher was a man of great wealth from Epidauros. He had served in numerous municipal posts in Corinth, and also became helladarch of the Achaian League, high priest of Greece, and Panhellenic archon. His public career was under Trajan's and Hadrian's reigns [J. H. Kent, *Corinth: Results of the excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, VIII.3: The Inscriptions 1926-1950* (Princeton, 1966), 64-5]. Avidius Nigrinus (possibly the annual proconsul/imperial legate, settling boundary disputes between Delphi and its neighbors in 111/114), his father with the same name, and his uncle Avidius Quietus were friends of Plutarch (*Mor*. 478B, 487E, 548B, 632A; Birley, *Hadrian: The Restless Emperor*, 62; Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, 51ff.). C. Julius Antiochus Epiphanes Philopappus, archon and benefactor of Athens; Roman senator; consul *suffect* in 109 (the year after Hadrian); *Mor*. 48E, 628A-B; *PIR*^{2} J 151) and his cousin, the Spartan C. Julius Eurycles Herculanus, to whom Plutarch dedicated *Self-Praise Without Offence* (*Mor.* 539A-547F) to Herculanus (*Mor*. 539A; 546D-E; Birley, *Hadrian: The Restless Emperor*, 63). Herculanus had become Roman senator, quaestor of Achaia, a tribune of the plebs, praetor, and legate to a proconsul in Baetica (Hadrian's home province).

[128]He calls Plato "divine" in *Per*. 8.2.

[129]Cf. *Dem*. 2.2.

and to Hellenism is characteristic of Plutarch and other intellectuals of the Greek East.[130] The top magistracies associated with Delphi and its sanctuary in the imperial period included, but were not necessarily limited to, the *epimeleteia* (directorship) of the Delphic Amphictyony, the priesthood of Apollo at the Delphic sanctuary, and the annual archonship of the city of Delphi. The sequence of these magistracies (or *cursus honorum*) has not been established and requires scholarly investigation which cannot be undertaken here. One is to assume, however, that after serving at the highest levels of the Amphictyony as *epimeletes*, the successful Boiotian would become citizen of the *polis* of Delphi, whence he could run for the archonship of the city. Presumably, the priesthood of Apollo could be held later.

Plutarch writes that he held the *eponymous* archonship "at home," (*Mor.* 642F: Ὅτε τὴν ἐπώνυμον ἀρχὴν ἦρχον οἴκοι…). Whether Delphi or Chaironeia is intended by the term οἴκοι, cannot be determined. Furthermore, whether the *eponymous* archonship is indicated also at 693F (ἄρχοντος οὖν ἐμοῦ) is equally uncertain, as is again the city at which he would have held this magistracy. In this passage Plutarch's collocutors are Soklaros, Kleomenes the physician and others. If we are to assume that this Soklaros is his longtime friend from Tithora,

---

[130]Intellectuals from Asia Minor, such as Arrian, Dio of Prusa, Polemo and others are discussed in G. Salmeri, "Dio, Rome, and the Civic Life of Asia Minor," in *Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy*, ed. S. Swain (New York, 2000), 53-92, esp. 57-63.

who had also held the archonship and *epimeleteia* (c. 100) at Delphi, then one cannot reject the possibility that the reference at 693F is to Plutarch's archonship at Delphi.

According to Pausanias, the Boiotians sent two representatives to the Delphic Amphictyony, which consisted of a total of thirty delegates from the Greek mainland and Euboia (10. 8.4-5).[131] The hierarchy of the Delphic Amphictyony is not established, but it appears that during the early Empire there was a chair (*proedros*) who presided over the voting. As we have seen, Lamprias criticized Plutarch for being snobbish because Plutarch arranged dinner guests at a table according to their family ties, wealth, and official position in the way the chair (προεδρία) of the Amphictyons arranged the members' rank during voting at their meetings (*Mor.* 618A). It might not be too presumptuous to explain Lamprias' comment as suggesting that Plutarch was a member and, more likely, *proedros* of the Amphictyony at the narrative time of that dialogue. Plutarch might have held the *proedria* in his capacity as *epimeletes* (director) of the Amphictyony.

In all likelihood, the *epimeletes* was a citizen of a member city of the Amphictyony, who had to have Roman citizenship. Plutarch or his family, then,

---

[131]Cf. Hadrian's changes regarding the Amphictyonic Council in Oliver, *Greek Constitutions*, 183-193.

would have become Roman citizens before his holding of the post. As an *epimeletes* of the Delphic Amphictyony, and a local magnate with important connections in the outer world, Plutarch was responsible for the financial management and maintenance of the sanctuary.[132] The *epimeleteia* greatly benefited the construction of buildings and upkeep of the Delphic sanctuary, while the private means of the provincial aristocracy from which its members were drawn guaranteed in a way the skillful handling of the god's money. While the city of Delphi had its own *archon*, the *epimeletes* acted as an *eponymous archon* for the Delphic Amphictyony; namely, the name of the *eponymous archon* helps date the constructions and events surrounding the sanctuary and the Amphictyony. Furthermore, although the *epimeletes* did not preside over the Pythian Games, an honor reserved for the *agonothetes*, he was responsible for the maintenance of their traditions and regulations. For example, Kallistratos of Delphi, son of Leon, an *epimeletes* of the Amphictyony sometime in 79-83 or 83-87 CE, had the right by law to (and did, according to Plutarch) disqualify a flute-player because he had registered late for the Pythian Games, although the

[132]For a discussion of Delphic *epimeleteis* and their role during the early Empire, see Pouilloux, "Les épimélètes des Amphictions," 294-300. In Athens the *epimeleteia* of the city could be held for life [J. H. Oliver, "Imperial Commissioners in Achaia," *GRBS* 14 (1973): 389-405], but it cannot be established that the same applied to the *epimeletes* of the Delphic Amphictyony. Pouilloux dates Plutarch's *epimeleteia* to the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian (300), while Puech, "Prosopographie et chronologie delphique," estimates that Plutarch served in the post between 115 and 117 CE -but she assumes that Plutarch was already dead in 117 during the priesthood of Aristoteimos.

contestant was a fellow-citizen and a friend of Kallistratos (*Mor*. 704C). More importantly, the *epimeletes* acted as a mediator between the Roman administration and the Amphictyony.[133] Plutarch would have been the designated official of the Amphictyony to the emperor and the provincial governor, and its spokesperson.

Stadter has recently argued that Plutarch used his friendships with powerful Romans and his trips to Rome and elsewhere to win favors for Apollo's sanctuary, including the archonship of the emperor Titus at Delphi, the rebuilding of the temple of Apollo by the emperor Domitian in 84 CE, Trajan's support of Delphi and his intervention regarding a boundary dispute almost three hundred years old through the favorable judgment of the emperor's propraetorian legate, Avidius Nigrinus the Younger (c. 111-114 CE), which incorporated sacred land into Delphic territory and reaffirmed its boundaries.[134] Since Plutarch's *epimeleteia* can only be dated with the phrase "during the reign of Hadrian," it might be too ambitious to assign specific accomplishments to him in respect to Delphi, but suffice it to say that Plutarch's education and rhetorical

---

[133]Pouilloux, "Les épimélètes des Amphictions," 296-7.

[134]For the diplomatic role of Plutarch at Delphi see now Stadter, "Plutarch: Diplomat for Delphi?," 19-31 with bibliography. Taking into account the role of the *epimeletes* for the Delphic Amphictyony renders Stadter's article much less "necessarily speculative" than he had suspected (30). Cf. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, 29-30, questioned by Swain, *Hellenism and Empire*, 171-2.

skill served the sanctuary well as he had the ear of the imperial representatives in the province and in Rome, if not of the emperor himself.[135]

Priest

The Amphictyony erected a statue to Hadrian at Delphi under Plutarch's concurrent *epimeleteia* and priesthood.[136] Since arguments surrounding the later life and death of Plutarch have been inadvertently based on extrapolations regarding his priesthood, presumably, of the Delphic Apollo, it is necessary to examine next the evidence in detail from the inscriptions and from the later accounts (namely, those of the *Suda* and Synkellos).

It has been naturally assumed that the term "τοῦ ἱερέως" refers to Plutarch's priesthood of the Delphic Apollo considering the frequent reference to and long term relationship the author had with Delphi and its Amphictyony. Such an assumption, however, requires closer examination for the reasons mentioned above. Inscriptions from Delphi refer to the priests of Apollo as ἱερεῖς Ἀπόλλωνος, with the name of the god provided in the genitive and

[135]Cf. *Mor*. 546D-F.

[136]*FD* III. 4: 472 (dated to 117-138 CE) = *SIG*[3] 829A =*CID* 4, no. 150: [Αὐτοκ]ράτορα Καίσαρα | [θε]οῦ Τραϊανοῦ Παρθι | κοῦ υἱὸν θεοῦ Νέρβα | υἱωνὸν Τραιανὸν Ἁδρι | ανὸν Σεβαστὸν τὸ κοι | νὸν *folium* τῶν Ἀμφικτυ | όνων, ἐπιμελητεύον | τος ἀπὸ Δελφῶν Μεσ | τρίου Πλουτάρχου | *folium* τοῦ ἱερέως. *folium* | *vac*.

clearly stated.[137] If Plutarch in the capacity of priest of Apollo was meant in *FD* III.4:472, the descriptive Ἀπόλλωνος should have accompanied the noun ἱερέως; but that is not the case. Although Plutarch held the priesthood of Apollo when he was older, according to his own description in *Old Men in Politics* (*Mor.* 783A-797F), this particular priesthood might not be intended on the inscription. In fact, it seems that it was possible for one to hold a number of priesthoods concurrently.[138] Furthermore, it was not uncommon for the Amphictyonic *epimeletes* to be ἀρχιερέας Σεβαστῶν (chief priest of the *Sebastoi* or *Augustales*) during the empire.[139] The term *hiereus* (priest), however, is not the same as *archiereus* (chief priest), and therefore, the former might still refer to a priest of Apollo, although it does not follow a citation of the god.

---

[137]The inscriptions referring to priests of Apollo in the *Fouilles de Delphes* volumes are too many to cite here, but any perusal of those volumes proves the point that whenever a priest or priests of Apollo is meant, the inscription states so clearly.

[138]P. Memmius Reglus, for example, was priest in three systems of priesthood in the first century CE, according to *FD* III.1:532: [Πόπ]λιον Μέμμιον | Ποπλίου υἱὸν Ῥῆγλον | ὕπατον πρεσβευτὴν Σε | βαστῶν ἀντιστράτηγον | ἱερέα ἐν τρισὶ συστήμασι| ἱερεωσυνῶν ἀνθύπατον | Ἀσίας καὶ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ.

[139]Ti. Claudius Kleomachos of Nikopolis held the *epimeleteia* and the priesthood of the *Sebastoi* under Nero's reign (*FD* III.3.181); also, P. Memmius Kleandros in 54-55 CE (*FD* III.4.258) and T. Flavius Megaleinos (*Syll*.[3] 813C) held both administrative and priestly offices c. 87-91 CE; for their dates see Pouilloux, "Les épimélètes des Amphictions," and the revisions of Puech, "Prosopographie et chronologie delphique." A monograph on the cult of the *Sebastoi* is lacking and would be most welcome. I. Gradel, *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion* (New York, 2002), 228-30, argues that the *Augustales* were not official members of an office or priesthood, but of an order –the local equivalent of the *ordo equester*, second only to the senatorial order in Rome- which formed an important part of the structure of euergetism in their townships.

The Later Years

The political and priestly career of a provincial often differed from that of his Roman contemporary. The trajectory for such a career changed over time. A late first or early second century example is provided in *IG* IX 2.44 =*SEG* 3.460 (1) and (2), which describes the different magistracies and the *cursus honorum* of a certain T. Fl. Kyllos of Hypata in Thessaly.[140] Kyllos had been *archiereus* of the *Sebastoi*, *agonothetes* of the Sebasteia and of the Pytheia, *epimeletes* of the Amphictyony and *Helladarch*.[141] The office of the *helladarch* was modeled on the analogous office of the "Asiarch," who was responsible for arbitrating and hearing difficult cases that could not be dealt with by the local courts in the province, or cases involving Roman officials that should have been tried in Rome but could not be easily, because of the distance involved between Rome and the province. The title "*helladarch*," which was held for life, appears to have been established by Hadrian, although the office might have existed informally before

---

[140]*IG* IX 2.44 with *SEG* 3.460 (1) and (2): πόλις Ὑπάτα| Τ(ίτον) Φλαούϊον | Τ(ίτου) Φλαουΐου Κύλ | λου υἱὸν Εὐβίοτον | τὸν ἀρχιερέα [κ]αὶ ἀγωνοθέτην τῶν Σεβαστῶν | Θεῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς δύο στεφά[νοις καὶ ἀγω]νοθέτην | τῶν μεγάλων Πυθίων καὶ ἐπιμελητὴν | τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ἀμφικτυόνων καὶ | ἑλλαδάρχην τὸν εὐεργέτην. | *vacat* | ἐπιμεληθέντος Βρούτου Ἀλ[εξ]άν | δρου τοῦ ταμίου κατὰ τὸ τοῦ δή | μου ψήφισμα.

[141]Kyllos was *epimeletes* of the Amphictyony under the proconsulship of Avidius Quietus, i.e. sometime between 91 and 96 CE, according to Pouilloux, "Les épimélètes des Amphictions," with revisions in Puech, "Prosopographie et chronologie delphique." But also cf. *FD* III 1.538 which dates the inscription to c. 107 CE.

him.[142] T. Statilius Memmianos, son of Lamprias Timokrates, provides the only instance on the epigraphic record where the office of *helladarch* of the Greeks is distinct from that of *helladarch* of the Amphictyons, at least for a brief period of time in the early to mid-second century.[143] There is no other instance for such a distinction and the term *helladarch* is not attested anywhere else in the epigraphic record. A number of individuals who held the office of the *helladarch* and the *archierosyne* (chief priesthood) of the Greeks or the *koinon* of Achaia for life went on to hold the *epitropeia* (procuratorship) of Epeirus and the *dikaiodosia* (*juridicus*) of Egypt and Alexandreia.[144] Some *helladarchs* went on to become archons of the Panhellenion and priests of Hadrian *Panelleniou*. Such was the case of Gn.

---

[142]J. H. Oliver, "Helladarch," *RSA* 8 (1978): 1-6 and *idem*, "Roman Senators," 596.

[143]*IG* IV 590 (130-138 CE from Argos): ἁ πόλις | ἁ τῶν Ἀργεί | ων Τ(ίτον) Στατίλιον Λαμ | πρίου ὑὸν Τιμοκράτη | Μεμμιανόν, Περσέος καὶ | Διοσκούρων ἀπόγονον | τὸν ἑλλαδάρχαν καὶ ἀρχι | ερέα διὰ βίου τῶν Ἑλλάνων, | στρατηγήσαντα τῶν Ἀχαι| ῶν □—□ γ′, ἀγωνοθέταν Ἡραί | ων καὶ Νεμείων καὶ Σεβα | στείων καὶ Νεμείων καὶ Ἀν | τινοείων ἐν Ἄργει καὶ Ἀν | τινοείων ἐν Μαντινείᾳ | καὶ Ἀσκλαπείων ἐν Ἐπι | δαύρῳ, καὶ ἀμφικτύονα καὶ | ἑλλαδάρχαν ἀμφικτυόνων | καὶ Πανέλληνα καὶ ἕλληνο | ταμίαν καὶ ἀγορανομήσαντα | καὶ στρατηγήσαντα τρὶς καὶ τα | μιεύσαντα καὶ πρεσβεύσαν | τα ὑπέρ τε τᾶς πατρίδος | καὶ τῶν Ἑλλάνων πρός τε | τὰν σύνκλητον καὶ πρὸς βα | σιλέας καὶ τὰ ἄλλα καὶ λό{γο} | γοις καὶ ἔργοις πολειτευσά | μενον ἄριστα καὶ φιλοτειμό | τατα, ἀρετᾶς ἕνεκα.

[144]*SEG* 26.253 (131/2 CE from Athens):… [Γναῖον Κορνήλ]ιον Ποῦλχ[ρον ἀρχιερέα] | [τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ] Ἑλλαδάρχην. — — — — | [— — ἐπίτροπον] Ἠπείρου, δικα[ιοδότην] | [Αἰγύπτου καὶ Ἀλε]ξανδρεία[ς — — — —]…;*Corinth* 8.1 80, 81 and 138 (reign of Hadrian from Corinth); IG IV 590 (130-138 CE from Argos); *IG* V 1.512 (mid 2nd c. CE from Sparta); *IG* V 1.1451(reign of Antonius Pius from Messene); *IG* V 1.1455 (2nd c. CE from Messene); *Syll.*[3] 846 (180-190 CE from Delphi): ἀγαθὴ τύχη. | Τιβ. Κλ. Πολυκράτειαν Ναυσικάαν | τὴν κρατίστην καὶ ἀρχιέρειαν τοῦ κοινοῦ | τῶν Ἀχαιῶν, Τιβ. Κλ. Πολυκράτους ἀρχιερέως | καὶ ἑλλαδάρχου διὰ βίου τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν | καὶ Τιβ. Κλ. Διογενείας ἀρχιερείας τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν | Ἀχαιῶν θυγατέρα, νννν τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀμφι | κτυόνων καὶ τὸν κοινὸν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν | νννν ἀρετῆς νν ἕνεκεν.

Cornelius Pulcher, son of Ti. Cornelius Pulcher Fabia, from Epidauros, whose family had received citizenship under Augustus and was familiar to Plutarch.[145] Plutarch dedicated *How to Profit from Your Enemies* (*Mor.* 86B-92E) to him, and Pulcher told him that he enjoyed reading the *Rules for Politicians* (*Mor.* 798A-825F). Although it cannot be established with absolute certainty, it is possible that Plutarch had a comparable professional trajectory, but only his *epimeleteia* can be verified by inscriptions and his own testimony. In none of our extant sources is Plutarch called a *helladarch per se*; on the other hand, Byzantine sources such as Synkellos and the Suda provide additional information regarding Plutarch's life and career that suggest that he might have held such, and even a higher, position.

---

[145]*Corinth* 8.1 80 (reign of Hadrian from Corinth): Γν(αῖον) Κορνήλιον Τιβ(ερίου) Κορνηλίου Πούλχρου υἱὸν Φαβία Ποῦ[λ]χρον στρατηγὸν | τῆς πόλεως Κορινθίων πενταετηρικόν, ἀγωνοθέτην Καισαρείων Ἰσθμίων, ἀρχιερ[έα] | τῆς Ἑλλάδος καὶ ἑλλαδάρχην ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν συ[νεδ]ρίου διὰ βίου, Ἠπείρου | ἐπίτροπον, Αἰγύπτου καὶ Ἀλεξανδρείας δικαιοδότην, ἄρχον[τα τοῦ] Πανελληνίου καὶ ἱερέα | Ἀδριανοῦ Πανελληνίου, ἄλλας τε μεγάλας δωρεὰς ἐπιδόντα καὶ τὴν ἀτέ[λειαν] τῇ πόλει παρασχόντα | Καλπουρνία Φροντεῖνα ἡ ἀδελ[φή]; see also, *Corinth* 8.1 81; *IG* IV 795 and 1600; *PIR*^{2} C1424, G. W. Bowersock, "Some Persons in Plutarch's *Moralia*," *CQ* 15 (1965): 267-270, and esp. 269-70, and Puech, "Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque," 4843, accept the identification of Cn. Cornelius Pulcher with Plutarch's friend. Pulcher held the procuratorship of Epeirus sometime between 103 and 114 CE, according to Th. Sarikakis, "Συμβολὴν εἰς τὴν Ἱστορίαν τῆς Ἠπείρου κατὰ τοὺς Ρωμαϊκοὺς Χρόνους," *Hellenica* 19 (1966): 193-215; Bowersock, "Persons in Plutarch's *Moralia*," 270, agrees with a date before 114.

Synkellos[146] writes that Plutarch reached seniority and the post of the *epitropos* (procurator) of Greece (possibly, under Hadrian): Πλούταρχος Χαιρωνεὺς φιλόσοφος ἐπιτροπεύων Ἑλλάδος ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος [Ἀδριανοῦ] κατεστάθη γεραιός. Σέξτος φιλόσοφος καὶ Ἀγαθόβουλος καὶ Οἰνόμαος ἐγνωρίζετο (659 Dindorf).[147] In addition, the Suda reports that Trajan (98-117 CE) gave Plutarch a proconsulship (τῆς τῶν ὑπάτων ἀξίας) and ordered the archons of the province of Illyria not to take any action unless they had first consulted Plutarch: Πλούταρχος, Χαιρωνεὺς τῆς Βοιωτίας, γεγονὼς ἐπὶ τῶν Τραιανοῦ τοῦ Καίσαρος χρόνων καὶ ἐπίπροσθεν. Μεταδοὺς δὲ αὐτῷ Τραιανὸς τῆς τῶν ὑπάτων ἀξίας προσέταξε μηδένα τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἰλλυρίδα ἀρχόντων παρὲξ τῆς αὐτοῦ γνώμης τι διαπράττεσθαι. ἔγραψε δὲ πολλά (Suda *sv*. Πλούταρχος 1793 Adler).[148] Although, little credit is given typically to the Suda and Synkellos, it is now generally accepted that Plutarch received some

[146]Swain, "Plutarch, Hadrian, and Delphi," 318, argues that this account was given by Synkellos and not Eusebios, whose translator, Jerome, records under the year 119 CE only that, "Plutarch of Chaironeia and Sextus and Agathoboulos and Oinomaos the philosophers were famous." No procuratorship is mentioned in Jerome (Euseb. *Chron*. 415 Helm).

[147]An alternate reading of the manuscript is provided in R. Helm, ed., *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*[2] (Berlin, 1956), 415, no. 198a: Πλούταρχος Χαιρωνεὺς φιλόσοφος ἐπιτροπεύειν Ἑλλάδος ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος [Ἀδριανοῦ] κατεστάθη γηραιός. Σέξτος φιλόσοφος καὶ Ἀγαθόβουλος καὶ Οἰνόμαος ἐγνωρίζετο. Helm proposes the present infinitive ἐπιτροπεύειν instead of the participle ἐπιτροπεύων. In my opinion, Dindorf's reconstruction of the text is more fitting to the passive voice construction (passive verb+ ὑπὸ+genitive of agent) and a present participle to indicate a concurrent and parallel event.

[148]Accepted by Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, 29-30, questioned by S. R. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50-250* (New York, 1996), 171-2. But see now Stadter, "Plutarch: Diplomat for Delphi?," 31n.58.

kind of provincial governorship.[149] Furthermore, although most scholars agree that Plutarch was given the insignia of a consul or *consularia ornamenta*, they disagree on whether Trajan (98-117 CE) or Hadrian (117-138 CE) was the emperor who made the bestowment.[150] It is possible that these Byzantine sources are accurate in that they describe two different emperors and two different appointments for Plutarch. It is important that the words used by Synkellos and the Suda are not identical nor are the provincial assignments; while the former reports a procuratorship of Hellas (ἐπιτροπεύων Ἑλλάδος), the latter describes a consular procuratorship of Illyria (τῆς τῶν ὑπάτων ἀξίας…κατὰ τὴν Ἰλλυρίδα). On the other hand, the words used by Byzantine authors to describe imperial posts might have been different from the ones used by the Greeks of the early Empire, and it is difficult to know what type of provincial governorship is intended here. Alternatively, a late fourth or early fifth century inscription from

---

[149]H. –G. Pflaum, *Les carriers procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain* III (Paris, 1961), 1071, accepts Plutarch as a procurator of Achaia around 117-120 CE.

[150]According to J.H. Oliver, "Arrian in Two Roles," *Hesperia Supplement* 19, *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History and Topography. Presented to Eugene Vanderpool* (1982b): 122-9, esp. 126, it is possible that Hadrian is meant in the Suda, since he adopted the name P. Aelius Traianus Hadrianus and confusion might have arisen later. Oliver argues that Plutarch's position was unique and special, in that "Hadrian appointed Plutarch as procurator with *ornamenta consularia* to be his representative in dealings with the philosophical schools in Athens" (126-7 and n.10). A procuratorial appointment is accepted also by G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford, 1969), 57n.6, and Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, 34, who propose that Plutarch might have been procurator of Achaia; vs. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire*, 171-2. He might have been appointed nominal procurator of Greece by Hadrian, according to M. Drury's appendix of authors and works in P. E. Easterling and B.M.W. Knox, eds., *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature: I. Greek Literature 4*, 234.

Megara states that the citizens of that city set up a painting for a certain Plutarch (possibly a descendant of the biographer?) from the renowned line of consular and praetorian legates.[151] It is not possible to know if a descendant of Plutarch was meant on the inscription, however, as the name is not uncommon in the Greek world.

Nevertheless, it is likely that Suda refers to Trajan giving Plutarch a procuratorship in which he was to act as a consular legate (*pro consule*) of the emperor in Illyria.[152] Having held a number of local offices and priesthoods at Delphi and having published widely on a great number of topics with broad appeal for both Greeks and Romans in which he professed concord among the two people, it would not be surprising for Plutarch to have been honored by the emperor in such a manner.[153] During his governorship of Illyria, which he could

---

[151]*IG* VII 94: ἐκ γενεῆς περίβωτον ἀπ' ἀνθυπάτων κ(αὶ) ὑπάρχ[ων] | Πλούταρχον, καθαρῇσιν ἀοίδιμον εὐνομίῃσιν, | προφρονέως Μεγαρῆες ἀειμνήστοις ἐπὶ ἔργοις | εἰκόνι λαϊνέῃ στῆσαν ἀγασσάμενοι; see Oliver, "Roman Senators," 595-6, on this inscription and cf. *IG* II² 4226 and *Mor.* 816D (ἀνθύπατος), 814D (ἐπιτροπάς).

[152]Trajan held the consulship in 91, 98 (as *ordinarius*) and in 100.

[153]On Plutarch's positive attitude towards Rome and the *Pax Romana*, see R. Flacelière, "Rome et ses empereurs vus par Plutarque," *AC* 32 (1963): 28-47. For Plutarch's general attitude towards Rome, its history and traditions, see Swain, *Hellenism and Empire*, 137ff.; Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, 88-102; C. B. R. Pelling, "Plutarch: Roman Heroes and Greek Culture," in *Philosophia togata, I*, eds. M. Griffin and J. Barnes (Oxford: 1989), 199-232; R. Lamberton, "Plutarch and the Romanization of Athens," in *The Romanization of Athens*, eds. M. C. Hoff and S. I. Rotroff (Oxford, 1997), 151-60.

have held *in absentia*, Plutarch advised the local archons on administrative and judicial matters.

At some point after his governorship, Plutarch assumed the office of *epitropos* of Hellas (or *helladarch* according to the later Hadrianic designation, see above); while in that office, Hadrian made him γεραιός or, as I will argue next, a member of the Senate. The meaning of γεραιός in Synkellos is unclear, but because of this statement, it has been generally assumed that Plutarch was a very old man by the time of ascension of Hadrian in 117 CE. Many prefer to interpret Synkellos' statement in terms of age rather than status, in part because of certain suppositions about the first senators from the Greek mainland, and in part because of a persistent attempt to date Plutarch's birth and death between 40 or 45 and 125 or 127 CE respectively, which would preclude any truth in the Byzantine sources, as Plutarch would have to have been in his late seventies when Hadrian became emperor and too weak and old to hold such a post.[154] In fact, when Plutarch died remains a mystery, although a date around 125 or 127 has been postulated.[155] Most scholars follow Jones in his argument that Plutarch

[154]The Greek senators of the mainland are discussed in Oliver, "Roman Senators," 583-602, according to whom the first Athenian family, for example, to enter the Roman Senate was that of Ti. Claudius Atticus Herodes of Marathon (584 with previous bibliography).

[155]Puech, "Prosopographie et chronologie delphique," 265n.15, citing Jones, "Chronology of Plutarch's Works," 63-6, and *Syll*.[3] 835B argues for a death of shortly after Hadrian's ascension in 117 and closer to 124/125 CE. R. Flacelière, "Hadrien et Delphes," *CRAI* (1971): 168-85 and also

died around 125 CE based on the information from *Syll*.[3] 835B, on which T. Fl. Aristoteimos, who dedicates a statue to Hadrian in 124/5 CE, is the one and only of the required two Delphic priests named on the inscription.[156] Jones' argument can be summarized thus:

1) Plutarch was a Delphic priest and an *epimeletes* in 117 according to *FD* III 4.472;

2) Aristoteimos was the only Delphic priest in 124/5 according to *Syll*.[3] 835B;

3) Two Delphic priests are to hold the priesthood at the same time; and therefore,

4) since T. Fl. Aristoteimos alone erects the statue to Hadrian, Plutarch must have died in 124/5.

It was indeed common to have two priests of Apollo (one senior and one junior) but there were a number of exceptions to that rule as well.[157] It is possible,

---

idem, *Plutarque: Oeuvres Morales*, 8, argues, although not very convincingly, for a date around 127 CE.

[156] Flacelière, *Plutarque: Oeuvres Morales*, 8, dates Plutarch's priesthood of Apollo to 85-95. Plutarch refers to a certain Euthydamos as his συνιερέα (co-priest) in *Mor.* 700E, whom Puech, "Prosopographie et chronologie delphique," believes it to be C. Memmius Euthydamos, priest c. 100 CE (*FD* III 6.133[3]). Fl. Aristoteimos appears also on *FD* III. 4.304 and 4.304[2], and 4.144, as well as in *CID* 4.152=Vatin, *Delphes* (PhD diss., 1965) 7-21.

[157]In the early first century BCE, for example, there were three priests of Apollo at Delphi (*FD* III.6.54), while it was also common to have only one priest on inscriptions from the second century BCE (for example, *FD* III.6.117, 3.122, 3.17).

however, that Aristoteimos had to act on his own "according to the decrees of the Amphictyony and the Delphians," while his colleague (if that colleague even has to be Plutarch) was otherwise engaged. I also have shown above that the priesthood Plutarch might have held during Hadrian's reign, while he was an *epimeletes*, is not necessarily that of the Delphic Apollo and, in fact, that he could have held a number of concurrent priesthoods. Taking all of these objections into consideration, requiring that T. Fl. Aristoteimos' dedication to Hadrian in 124/5 should have included Plutarch or that otherwise it proves Plutarch's date of death becomes moot. Plutarch might have been not only alive in 124/5 but it is possible, in fact, that he could have undertaken other imperial assignments as an older and more experienced man.

Returning to the Byzantine evidence again, "old man" is possible as a translation for the adjective γεραιός in Syncellos, although the noun γέρων would have been preferred for such a translation.[158] Vespasian thought of himself as *senex* (old man) at the age of sixty-one (Suet. *Vesp*. 12), and Plutarch considered himself an old man in *Old Men in Politics* (*Mor*.783B-787, where he uses forms of γέρων, γῆρας, and πρεσβύτερος throughout). Sixty years old would also make Plutarch an old man by ancient demographic standards, but he could have lived long afterwards, having retreated to his beloved Chaironeia at

[158]Compare the terms in *LSJ*, for example.

some point to write the life of Demosthenes, and traveling when only absolutely necessary. Alternatively, the Greek root of the word provides the term *gerousia,* an office present not only in archaic Sparta but throughout the Hellenistic world of the East. Inscriptions, again, provide the evidence for the term as an official position in Asia Minor.[159] Surprisingly, the term does not appear on inscriptions from the Greek mainland and the islands, although there is plenty of evidence that points to a *gerousia* in the Greek *poleis.* The Byzantine author might have been using a term familiar to Asia Minor or to his period. If we are to use Sparta's age requirements for the *gerousia*, since Sparta was a Dorian city as well, it is possible that Plutarch was sixty years old, when he became γεραιός under Hadrian; such postulation would place Plutarch's birth at c. 57 CE, which does not disagree with anything we have argued thus far in this chapter, including Nero's visit in 66/7 CE when Plutarch would have been a young student of geometry, his marriage to Timoxena after 96 (which need not be his first

[159]From Karia: *Kidrama* 8: an honorary or funerary inscription for […]llas Papou by the *boule*, the *demos* and the *geraioi*; *Tabai* 9: honorary inscription for Attalos Solonos, a gymnasiarch of the *geraioi*, by the demos and the *geraioi*. From Ephesos: *Ephesos* 389: a second century inscription for the restoration of a temple in accordance with the decision of those in the circle of M. Aurelius Alexandros, *geraios*; *id.* 466: second century list of Kouretes, among them Tryphon *geraios*, under the *prytaneia* of T. Flavius Saturninus Vestricianus; *id.* 559: imperial list beginning with Ti. Claudius Quadratus, *geraios*; *id.* 612: imperial thanksgiving by Kleandros Teimotheou, *geraios*. From Paphlagonia: Marek, *Kat. Kaisareia Hadrianop.* 6: third century dedication to the emperor M. Aurelius Antoninus by the *geraioi* and the *demos* of the Kimistes. From Pisidia (Sagalassos): Lanckoronski, *Städte Pamph. U. Pisid.* II 230, 218: a dedication to Iada daughter of Krateros Neon by the *boule*, the *demos*, and the *geraioi*. From Attaleia: *BCH* 1883, 265.6: dedication of the *geraioi* for M. Petronios Firmos Calpurninus Saiclarion. From Lycia: *TAM* II 130: honorary inscription for Leontomenes Apollonidou Arymaxea *geraios* for life.

marriage necessarily), or receiving the *consularia ornamenta* and a procuratorship of Illyria under Trajan in his forties and, then, the *epitropeia* of Hellas, which will be renamed *helladarchy* under Hadrian.[160] In fact, a similar social and political trajectory would have been common for an elite Roman politician, and although provincial appointments differed somewhat during the early Empire, it is possible that the political career of a Romanized wealthy provincial, such as Plutarch, with the appropriate connections was comparable. Even if Plutarch's wife Timoxena was not a member of the Thespian family of Phileinos (a family that is the first epigraphically attested Thespian family to gain entrance to the Roman senate possibly in the late second century CE), as I have argued earlier, Plutarch's friendly association with that leading family would have been one such important political connection for him.[161] A person who was either an *eques* with *consularia ornamenta* or a procurator of the Greek mainland or a *helladarch* was assimilated to a senator, and Plutarch according to these later sources, had at least one (if not all three) of those prerequisites.[162] Furthermore, the Latin

---

[160]Unlike the case in other provinces, such as Egypt, in Greece, the governor, legates, and regulators or *correctors* (i.e. imperial representatives who supervised the free cities in Greece) were all senators, which might explain why we do not find many predicates of rank on Greek inscriptions referring to them, except for κράτιστος/η and λαμπρότατος/η, according to Oliver, "Roman Senators," 592-8.

[161]A monograph on intermarriage between provincials and Romans, as well as the role of women in such marriages, is currently lacking.

[162]Oliver, "Roman Senators,"596.

equivalent of the Greek word γεραιός is *senex*, from which the Romans established the word *senatus* or senate. It would not be surprising, if "senator" is to be understood in Synkellos. Under Hadrian Plutarch, therefore, would have gained entrance to the Roman senate, the one office that carried much status and prestige for leading provincial families of Greece because it had been extremely rare before Trajan. As *FD* III 4.472 (above) testifies, Plutarch was certainly alive, a priest and an *epimeletes* in 117 when Hadrian became *princeps*; Plutarch's "helladarchy" and entrance to the Senate, then, would have to have a *terminus post quem* of 117.

In 124/5, Hadrian, possibly accompanied by Herodes Attikos and his father, visited Delphi on his way back to Rome from Asia Minor.[163] Perhaps, that is the time when Plutarch received his new posts. In 125, Hadrian was still thinking of making the Delphic Amphictyony the Panhellenic Council or Panhellenion.[164] Six years later, for reasons unknown, the Panhellenion was

---

[163]R. Syme, "The Journeys of Hadrian," *ZPE* 73 (1988): 159-70, esp. 162, with bibliography, dates the visit to early 125. Accompanied by his friend, Herodes Attikos: Birley, *Hadrian: The Restless Emperor*, 117. In 125, T. Flavius Aristoteimos, the Delphic priest, erects a statue to Hadrian.

[164]A. Spawforth, "The Panhellenion Again," *Chiron* 29 (1999): 339-42, esp. 341-2; Birley, *Hadrian: The Restless Emperor*, 186-7 and 218-20; D. Willers, *Hadrians panhellenisches Programm* (Basel, 1990), 99-100. On Hadrian's and Plutarch's relationship with Delphi, see Stadter, "Plutarch: Diplomat for Delphi?," 19-31; Puech, "Prosopographie et chronologie delphique," 261-66; Swain, "Plutarch, Hadrian, and Delphi," 318-30; M.-A. Zagdoun, "Plutarque à Delphes," *REG* 108 (1995): 586-92; Flacelière, "Hadrien et Delphes," 19-31.

established at Athens instead, and was inaugurated in the winter of 131/2 by the emperor.

Presumably after Plutarch's death, the Delphians set up a headless herm-like pillar representing Plutarch with the following epigram to honor him, *Syll*.[3] 843=*CID* 4, no. 151: Δελφοὶ Χαιρωνεῦσιν ὑμοῦ Πλούταρχον ἔθηκαν | τοῖς Ἀμφικτυόνων δόγματι πειθόμενοι. It now stands in the Museum at Delphi, the city that Plutarch spent time in and served during a great part of his life.

CHAPTER 2

The Individuals of the *Erotikos*

Epigraphic evidence has confirmed that in the *Moralia* Plutarch uses widely known anecdotes and historical persons (members of his family, friends, and others) to make his didactic arguments more accessible to his Graeco-Roman audience.[165] Without denying the literary and philosophical dimension of the dialogue's characters, which has been discussed previously by others, this chapter seeks to contribute to discussion of their historicity by placing these individuals in their historical and social context.[166] The entries are based on evidence from both Plutarch's works, and, whenever possible, inscriptions. Occasionally, the paucity of the documents is such that it becomes difficult to contextualize a specific character beyond Plutarch's works; that is not to deny, however, the historicity of these individuals, who would have been familiar to the author and easily recognizable by his audience. Such recognition by

[165]See, for example, Puech, "Prosopographie et chronologie delphique," and Babut, "Sur Soclaros de Chéronée," for the most recent discussions.

[166]For the literary and philosophical context of the characters, see Flacelière, *Plutarque: Oeuvres Morales*, 11-20.

contemporaries would compel Plutarch to be as precise and factual as possible in his characterizations of individuals and accounts of events. Such practice would only increase the author's credibility and bestow increased *auctoritas* on his didactic and philosophical arguments, while inaccuracies and falsehoods, on the other hand, could have proven disastrous. With these factors in mind, the individuals below are assumed to be historical figures even when epigraphic evidence is not available at present.

The characters of the *Erotikos* are individuals from Boiotia, Phokis, Kilikia, and Lacedaimonia. Both sides in the dialogue have a member from Thespiai and from Plutarch's circle. Possibly, all characters are citizens of a Greek *polis* and of the empire, although their Roman *tria nomina* are never used. Since the archaic period, it was customary that whenever citizens from different *poleis* gathered at a given place (here, Thespiai), the obvious way to identify an individual was by using the adjectival form of the city's name (or *polis*-ethnic) added to the individual's name (e.g., Protogenes Tarseus, Zeuxippos Lakedaimonios, and so on).[167] Since most of the characters in the dialogue are familiar to the author and his circle, no distinction by *polis*-ethnic is provided; instead most of them are identified by their patronymic (e.g., Daphnaios son of Archidamos, Soklaros son

[167]M. H. Hansen, "City-Ethnics as Evidence for *Polis* Identity," *Historia Suppl.* 108 (1996): 169-96, on general naming practices and political identity in the Classical period.

of Aristion, and so on) to distinguish them from other homonymous individuals or simply by their name (Bacchon, Ismenodora, and so on.). Some individuals in the *Erotikos* remain obscure and unnamed, and are described simply by the collective noun οἱ συνήθεις (the usual friends) (*Mor.* 749B: τῶν δὲ φίλων οἴκοθεν μὲν αὐτῷ παρῆσαν οἱ συνήθεις). In 754E the same word is applied to Ismenodora's friends. The term οἱ συνήθεις can also mean those friends one acquired during his training in the *ephebate* and, therefore, these individuals are men and women of the same age as the author.[168]

Anthemion:[169] The Thespian Anthemion was not part of the initial group of friends and acquaintances that Plutarch encountered at the festival of Eros, but someone who (along with Peisias –see below) joined the interlocutors of the dialogue at the encampment near the Valley of the Muses at Mt. Helikon (749D). As Bacchon's older first-cousin, he was interested in the well-being of the young man; therefore, it is not surprising that he (and his rival in the dialogue, Peisias) brought up the complex and cantankerous family issue, of whether Bacchon's

[168]See also, for example: Plut. *Demetr*. 4.1: Μιθριδάτης ὁ Ἀριοβαρζάνου παῖς ἑταῖρος ἦν αὐτοῦ [Δημητρίου] καὶ καθ' ἡλικίαν συνήθης…; *Mor*. 736D: Ἀμμώνιος Ἀθήνησι στρατηγῶν ἀπόδειξιν ἔλαβεν ἐν τῷ Διογενείῳ τῶν γράμματα καὶ γεωμετρίαν καὶ τὰ ῥητορικὰ καὶ μουσικὴν μανθανόντων ἐφήβων, καὶ τοὺς εὐδοκιμήσαντας τῶν διδασκάλων ἐπὶ δεῖπνον ἐκάλεσεν. Παρῆσαν δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων φιλολόγων συχνοὶ καὶ πάντες ἐπιεικῶς οἱ συνήθεις.

[169]Entries are in alphabetical order.

marriage to Ismenodora was a fitting one, to Plutarch and his friends to ponder and judge (749E-750A). Bacchon's confidant and a defender of the young man's character and interests, Anthemion was an advocate of the marriage with the wealthy widow (755C-E). When the clamor in town worsened and the gymnasiarchs, who were the moral supervisors of the *ephebes* at Thespiai, could not agree on how to proceed in dealing with Bacchon's "kidnapping," Anthemion was summoned by Ismenodora (756A). Clearly, he knew the young woman and, in the absence of a father for Bacchon and of kinsmen for Ismenodora, Anthemion was the logical choice and a man with some authority to mediate for the young couples' interests. Anthemion, whose patronymic is not given, was a man of renown and standing (ἄνδρες ἔνδοξοι) at Thespiai.

Other evidence, too slight to build on here, is worth mentioning in connection with the inscriptions relating to a certain Polykratides, son of Anthemion, the benefactor of the Roman community at Thespiai.[170] His patron was T. Statilius Taurus, one of the early *negotiatores* (businessmen) to appear at

[170]P. Roesch, *Études béotiennes* (Paris, 1982), 171-2, no. 24 (revised from squeeze, Museum of Thebes, inv. 1048) =Jamot, *BCH* 26 (1902) 297-8, no. 16=Jones 1970, 225, no. 3=Müller, "Marcus Aurelius Olympiodoros, ἔκγονος Ἱπποδρόμου," *ZPE* 3.3 (1968): 197-220, esp. 220: Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ πραγματευόμενοι ἐν Θες | πιαῖς Πολυκρατίδην Ἀνθεμίωνος | πρῶτον ἀναθέντα καὶ αὐτοῖς γυ | μνάσιον καὶ ἄλιμμα διὰ βίου. Polykratides is known to have had two sons, Lysander [*IG* VII 2517= Jamot, *BCH* 26 (1902): 293, no. 7= Jones, "Family of Roman Thespiae," 229, no. 10] and L. Markios Kallipos (*IG* VII 1860; not mentioned in Jones), and a daughter Ameinokratea (Jamot, *BCH* 26 (1902): 291-2, nos. 2-3= Jones, "Family of Roman Thespiae," 228, nos. 7-8).

Thespiai on inscriptions of the first century.[171] As noted by Jones, the name "Anthemion" does not occur in the inscriptions of the family of Polykratides after the first century, but then (as Jones also accepts) there are many other members of it who are unattested on stone.[172] The family of Polykratides, son of Anthemion, was one of the leading families of Thespiai and was related not only to Flavia Archela (also known as Timoxena) but also to her sons Lysandros and Phileinos, the latter of whom makes frequent appearances in Plutarch's works.[173] Although it is impossible to prove with any certainty, if the individual named "Anthemion" in the *Erotikos* was, indeed, descended from the family of Polykratides and was connected to that of Phileinos, it would not be necessary for Plutarch to provide a patronymic, since he would have been easily recognized by his audience. Furthermore, as a descendant of a Thespian family which had acted as benefactors to the early Roman community in the city, Anthemion might have been more sympathetic to the idea of his younger cousin, Bacchon, marrying into a Romanized or, even, Roman family and gaining the benefits that such a union could provide.

---

[171]Jamot, *BCH* 26 (1902): 291, no.1= Jones, "Family of Roman Thespiae," 227, no. 6: Πολυκρατίδης Ἀνθεμίωνος ἱερατεύων Τίτον | Στατείλιον Ταῦρον τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πάτρωνα | θεοῖς.

[172]Jones, "Family of Roman Thespiae," 232.

[173]See Chapter 1 and Jones, "Family of Roman Thespiae." Surprisingly, Phileinos does not appear in the *Erotikos*.

Autoboulos (see also chapter 1): Probably the first of Plutarch's surviving sons with Timoxena, Autoboulos, whose name means "self-willed," is confined to the role of a faithful declaimer in the *Erotikos*.[174] According to his collocutor, Flavianos, Autoboulos asked his father, numerous times in the past, to relate to him the conversation on love that took place at the Valley of the Muses. Autoboulos had either written down or memorized by heart the dialogue on *eros* (748E). From what follows, it becomes clear that the latter was true, as Autoboulos prays to Mnemosyne and faithfully recites the dialogue from memory (749B).

The invocation of the Muses is a Homeric and Hesiodic convention by which the narrative voice (Autoboulos, here) asks for help with the exceptional task of recall (ἀνάμνησις) of his father's past conversation. Autoboulos is concerned here not only with the faithful recitation of his source of inspiration (i.e. with his father's words) but also with his own interpretation of those words. He hopes, however, never to intervene in his father's original thoughts and words.

---

[174]According to Babut, "Sur Soclaros de Chéronée," 184, Autoboulos was the second son. See also, R. Flacelière, "Plutarque dans ses 'Oeuvres Morales,'" in *Plutarque: Oeuvres Morales, I.1*: *Introduction générale* (Paris, 1987), xxxvii-xxxviii.

This narrative technique of closely reporting a conversation that occurred in the past was common in the Greek philosophers of the fourth century BCE. Xenophon started the *Oikonomikos* with a similar narrative technique as he uses the verb ἤκουσα (I heard) to relate Sokrates' conversation with Kritoboulos.[175] Plato had employed a similar technique in the *Symposium*: the narrator, Apollodoros, reports an event which had taken place when he was a child and which he heard about many years later from Sokrates and from Sokrates' friend, Phoenix. More importantly, Flacelière has pointed out that Autoboulos here plays the role of Euklides of Megara in Plato's *Theatetos* 143A-C in reporting the conversation accurately.[176] In that Platonic dialogue, Sokrates has died and it is Euklides, who has his servant read the book in which the Sokratic dialogue was recorded. Euklides made his report of the conversation with Sokrates not only from memory but as accurately as possible since he was the one who took notes and corrected them after questioning Sokrates on numerous occasions. If there is indeed such purposeful literary allusion, are we to assume, then, that Plutarch, like Sokrates, was dead by the time of the recitation? Such a conclusion,

---

[175]S. B. Pomeroy, *Xenophon Oeconomicus: A Social and Historical Commentary* (New York, 1994), 215.

[176]Flacelière, *Plutarque: Oeuvres Morales*, 48 n.1. The similarities of this elaborate narrative technique in the *Theatetos* and the *Erotikos* are remarkable. Although Sokrates' digressions are welcomed by Theodoros and Theatetos, the mark of cultured and philosophically minded men, Flavianos and his friends, in the *Erotikos*, ask Autoboulos to avoid Platonic and poetic flourishes (749A).

although possible, is not required. Whatever the case may be, the evidence from the *Erotikos* postulates that the oral tradition continued to be regarded as trustworthy during the Empire, and that Autoboulos and Plutarch reveal themselves as the heirs of that tradition.

Providing that Plutarch composed the *Erotikos* in its current form, he constructed the beginning of the work in a way that presents Autoboulos as his student and heir of his philosophical works and school. Perhaps in the *Erotikos*, we are to imagine a mature Autoboulos, one past his ephebic years, who has completed his education in philosophy and rhetoric, and who might have already had his own students and school.

Autoboulos followed in his father's footsteps as a Platonist philosopher and teacher.[177] A certain L. Mestrios Autoboulos, a Platonic philosopher, appears on a late first-early second century CE inscription from Chaironeia; [178] considering that Mestrios was also one of Plutarch's Roman names, we can suggest that L. Mestrios Autoboulos of *IG* VII 3423 is Plutarch's firstborn son, who continued the family's Platonic tradition.

---

[177]Plutarch was a teacher of philosophy and had his own circle of students and listeners according to Flacelière, "Plutarque dans 'Oeuvres Morales,'" xiii-xiv.

[178]Autoboulos continued the family tradition: *Syll*[3] 2, 844A=*IG* VII 3423 (from Khaironea): Λ(ούκιον) Μ[έσ]τριον Αὐτόβουλον φιλόσοφον Πλατωνικὸν Φλάβιος Αὐτόβουλος τὸν πρὸς μητρὸς πάππον. The philosophical tradition of the family continued well into the third century CE: cf. *Syll*[3] 844B= *IG* VII 3425 and *Syll*[3] 845.

Bacchon: One of the significant Thespian characters in the dialogue, a relative of Anthemion and the lover of Peisias, Bacchon was the young man with whom the wealthy widow, Ismenodora, fell in love and whom she kidnapped with the intention to marry. Bacchon, evocative of the god of wine and theater, is referred to as καλός in the dialogue (*Mor*. 749C: …Βάκχωνι δὲ τῷ καλῷ λεγομένῳ…). As an adjective, καλός is often translated "handsome" with all of its classical connotations of noble birth, honor, virtue and courage. The name "Bacchon" appears on a number of inscriptions from imperial Thespiai,[179] one of which, in particular, is of importance to the present discussion:

Εἰ<σ>ίω[ν] Κάλλος (*sic*)[180] Βάκχωνος

The inscription preserves a typical Greek expression of the *tria nomina* (i.e., *praenomen*, *nomen*, and *cognomen*) convention of Roman nomenclature. The name is stated in a combination of a *nomen-cognomen* and patronymic: Eision Kallos,

[179]See for example, *IG* VII 2442, line 5, Σφόδρις Βάκχωνος (1st c. BCE-1c. CE); 2444, IVb1, line 16, Βάκχων (2nd c. CE); *SEG* 22.397 (imperial)= Keramopoulos 1936, no. 205 =Plassart, *BCH* 82 (1958), 166, line 2: Ζ Νέων Βάκχω[ν]ος; *SEG* 22.383= Plassart, *BCH* 82 (1958): 157, no. 7, line 3: Εἰ<σ>ίω[ν] Κάλλος (*sic*) Βάκχωνος.

[180]*SEG* 22.383= Plassart, *BCH* 82 (1958) 157, no. 7, line 3. According to the description of its editor, the inscription is "très mal gravée," which compelled him to add "(*sic*)" in his manuscript.

son of Bacchon. The inscription points, also, to the name of Eision's father, namely, Bacchon Kallos.[181] Consenquately, the question posed by these texts is whether the adjective (or predicate) "*kalos*" in the *Erotikos* and the name *Kallos* on *SEG* 22.383 are to be understood of being analogous, thus "stripping" the predicate of the *Erotikos* from its adjectival meanings and restoring it as part of the name of Bacchon.

While the nominative of Kallos is rare and not attested on inscriptions from Central Greece, the possible genitive "Kallonos" is rather common, but the alternative "Kallou" is not.[182] It is difficult, at present, to draw any safe conclusions from the appearance of Kallos on *SEG* 22.383 and *kalos* in Plutarch's *Erotikos*. Autopsy and verification are required of both the inscription and of the two extant manuscripts of the dialogue, neither of which I have been able to see.[183] It remains possible, however, that the word *kalos* in the current editions of the dialogue is not the adjective but the *nomen* of this particular character.

---

[181]Bacchon's patronymic cannot be safely conjectured. Based on Greek nomenclatural practices "son of Eision" is a possibility.

[182]On the other hand, Kalos and Kalou (with one lambda) are attested epigraphically from the regions around the Black Sea as well as from Delos, an island famous for its early Roman community (e.g. *ID* 1416, 1417, 1442, 1452).

[183]The text survives only in E (=*Parisinius gr.* 1672; late thirteenth or early fourteenth century) and B (=*Parisinius gr.* 1675; fifteenth century) and both manuscripts have several common lacunae. On the manuscript tradition of the text, see M. Manfredini, "Sulla traditione manoscritta dei 'Moralia' 70-77," in *Sulla tradizionne manoscritta dei 'Moralia' di Plutarco, o,* Atti del Convegno salernitano del 4-5 dic. 1986, ed. I. Gallo (Salerno, 1988), 123-38, contents that the E and B are independent manuscripts; vs. R. Flacelière, ed., *Plutarque. Oeuvres Morales, X: Dialogue sur*

Although Bacchon might have been a strikingly handsome man, a quality that would have made him especially attractive to both male and female suitors (such as Peisias and Ismenodora respectively), Plutarch does not dwell on this particular point as a necessary trait for a desirable male partner (whom he would rather see be self-controlled and reasonable, *Mor.* 753F, 754B, 755D), or as a prerequisite for a successful marriage, which, at least in this dialogue, depends more on the appropriate qualities of the bride than of the groom. Instead, Plutarch focuses on and responds to the perceived problems for the match: Ismenodora's love, wealth, social status, and age (*Mor.* 749E, 753C-754E). While these qualities are discussed in the entry for Ismenodora in this chapter, it is in comparison to her that we can make certain conjectures about Bacchon: namely, he is younger and of lower status than the widow, both financially and socially. As for his feelings toward her, we only need to consider the text: a fit young man like Bacchon, who often exercised at the *palaistra*, and his friends, who were with him at the time, did not put up a fight during or after the kidnapping (*Mor.* 754E-F). The so-called kidnapping, therefore, is nothing more than a posturing, which allows the young man not only to "escape the clutches of his male lovers," as

---

l'amour (Paris, 1980a), 39-47 who argues that B descends from E; R. G. Manton, "The Manuscript Tradition of Plutarch's *Moralia*." *CQ* 43.3/4 (1949): 97-104; F.H. Sandbach, "Some Textual Notes on Plutarch's Moralia," *CQ* 35.3/5 (1941): 110-18, esp. 113.

Soklaros suggests (755D), but also to retain his respectability in the community after a marriage that had caused much discussion and strife in the city.

In respect to the couple's age and status disparity, we cannot assume that either was great, for ancient etiquette, especially in respect to status, would not have allowed it.[184] Hesiod's advice on the age of the partners, cited by Protagenes, and Plutarch's example of the age difference between the mythological figures of Iolaos and Megara are used as symbolic paradigms to add an authoritative voice to the arguments against and for the marriage under discussion by the two camps.[185] One should not, therefore, assume that these references provide concrete evidence for the precise ages of the protagonists (i.e., Bacchon and Ismenodora) in this dialogue, but consider instead the evidence from the text and its Graeco-Roman context.

On the one hand, as an elite woman, Ismenodora was married off to her first husband, probably, while still in her teens. Considering ancient demographics and the silence of the text in respect to the children that marriage

---

[184]Distinctions of status became more and more important in the Empire, since they brought privileged treatment in some areas of Roman law. See B. W. Frier and T. A. J. McGinn, eds., *A Casebook on Roman Family Law* (New York, 2004), 97-8.

[185]Protagenes citing Hesiod (753A): μήτε τριηκόντων ἐτέων μάλα πόλλ' ἀπολείπων | μήτ' ἐπιθεὶς μάλα πολλά· γάμος δέ τοι ὥριος οὗτος· | ἡ δὲ γυνὴ τέτορ' ἡβώοι, πέμπτῳ δὲ γαμοῖτο; Plutarch (754D-E): Τὸ δ' ὅλον… καὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα Βοιωτοὺς ὄντας ἔδει σέβεσθαι καὶ μὴ δυσχεραίνειν τῷ παρ' ἡλικίαν τοῦ γάμου, γιγνώσκοντας ὅτι κἀκεῖνος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα Μέγαραν Ἰολάῳ συνῴκισεν ἑκκαιδεκαέτει τότ' ὄντι τρία καὶ τριάκοντ' ἔτη γεγενημένην. The camps for the debate: Protagenes and Peisias, on the one hand, are against Ismenodora's marriage to Bacchon, while Anthemion, Daphnaios, and Plutarch support such marriage.

could have produced, she lost her husband while she was still young and attractive (*Mor.* 753C). After the obligatory period of mourning, she returned to her customary activities, which included promoting a marriage for an acquaintance or relative of hers with Bacchon, at which point she fell in love with the youth and considered marriage again. Marriage was the only socially acceptable setting for a respectable elite woman to pursue a relationship with a man without damaging her reputation, when that relationship became public knowledge.

On the other hand, Bacchon is at the liminal stage of completing the ephebate and becoming a full citizen of the *polis*. Although he is called μειράκιον several times in the dialogue, it is clear that Bacchon is at, or possibly past, the final stages of the *ephebeia*.[186] While the term *meirakion* usually describes an adolescent male, in the *Erotikos* -as in the *Lives*- the word has the additional connotation of *eromenos* (beloved).[187] Although the common word used to signify the *eromenos* in a same-sex male relationship is *pais* in the classical period,

[186]Bacchon is called μειράκιον in *Mor.* 749D (by Plutarch, through Autoboulos, while setting the stage for the dialogue), 749F and 752E-F (by Peisias, the supporter of pederastic love), 754E (by Plutarch, again through Autoboulos, describing Ismenodora's decision to kidnap Bacchon). *Meirakion*, usually translated into English as "young man" or "lad", appears several times in the works of Plutarch, often denoting the passive partner in a pederastic relationship.

[187]For example, both Plut. *Phil.* 6 and Polyb. 2.68.2 refer contemptuously to Philopoimen as a *meirakion*, although he was thirty years old, but in *Brut.* 27, he defines a *meirakion* as someone under twenty one years old (see also, the scholiast to Pind. *Pyth*. 2.75).

meirakion or *meirakiskos* were also used during the Empire.[188] While in classical Athens, a same-sex relationship was expected to end at the age of eighteen, (i.e., when the young man would become an adult and a citizen of the *polis*), the same age limit did not hold true for Boiotia, famous for the Sacred Band of Epameinondas, and for imperial Greece. [189] The basic assumption that the relationship would reach its conclusion when the young man became a citizen, however, was still practiced. Bacchon is the beloved of Peisias, who, according to Anthemion's accusation, is holding his young lover back denying him a marriage, an estate, and a career in order to see him naked in the *palaistra* (749F). Clearly, Bacchon has reached the age of becoming an adult and a husband, leaving behind his former life and moving on to enter the elite citizenry of the city and the empire. Furthermore, sometimes a character described as *meirakion* is treated also as a *neos*, a *neanias*, and a *neaniskos*, terms which apply to "young" men, in general, as well as to a particular stage of the ephebate. Bacchon is called both *neos* (751E) and *neaniskos* in the dialogue (752E, 755D); it appears that these

[188]*Meirakion* as *eromenos* also by a number of first to third century authors: Herod. Med. 58.109 (Fuchs); Aret. *SD* 1.13; Hld. 419. Galen calls a *merakion* the young man past puberty and Pollux a man 14-21 yrs old (2.4). See also, F. Buffière, *Eros adolescent: la pédérastie dans la Grèce antique* (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1980), 306-7.

[189]Buffière, *Eros adolescent*, 606. The age of adulthood for Greek men during the empire could be determined by the allowable age for office.

terms are equal to each other in the *Erotikos*.[190] That he is in the ephebate is evidenced by his clothing and activities.[191] More importantly, after the so-called kidnapping the gymnasiarchs, who were responsible for the *ephebes*, were called to the doors of Ismenodora to decide what to do with Bacchon (*Mor.* 755A). Their disagreement about whether they should claim him from the widow or not meddle in the affair, might not be simply a difference of opinion between the two gymnasiarchs but an indication that Bacchon is about to "graduate" (or has recently "graduated") from the ephebate, a state of affairs which would not render him under the gymnasiarchs' direct and immediate control. In this context, Ismenodora's request that Bacchon's relative and, possibly, guardian Anthemion return to town is not surprising (*Mor.* 756A).

While the opinion of Bacchon's concerned mother regarding the marriage is presented in the dialogue, there is no mention of that of his father because he was no longer alive (*Mor.* 749E). Clearly, Bacchon's father had died while Bacchon was still young, and his closest (paternal?) male relative, Anthemion, acted as a father for the underage boy, looking after Bacchon's interests. Since

---

[190]As a *neos* in the ephebate, Bacchon would be about 20-22 years old.

[191]Bacchon wears a *chlamys* (cloak), which was a conventional garment for *ephebes* (*Mor.* 752F, 754F, 755A); he also exercises (754F) and hunts with his comrades (749E). Both activities were associated with the ephebate and military training. See Kennell, *Ephebeia*, x. Boiotia was famous for its hoplites and cavalry and many tombstones and altars from Thespiai, now in the museum of Thebes, portray men (and women) riding on or standing by horses.

Roman law required the consent of the partners and their guardians' under whose *manus* (authority) they were, Anthemion's presence at the house of Ismenodora after the kidnapping becomes necessary. With his consent, the nuptial ceremony can proceed without an impediment at the conclusion of the *Erotikos*.

Both Anthemion and Plutarch perceive the marriage to Ismenodora as profitable and beneficial for Bacchon, because it will provide the young man with an estate (i.e., improved income and status), a marriage (i.e., a wife and heirs), and "great things" (749F: πραγμάτων μεγάλων), namely, important social connections that would afford the young man higher social prominence.[192] Ismenodora is still young (which implies fertility), wealthy, beautiful and a member of the aristocracy; these qualities make her a suitable and desired partner, since the purpose of a marriage was to create heirs and to join families together, both financially and politically.

On the other hand, being the older, wiser, wealthier, and of higher status partner in a marriage was supposed to be the prerogative of men, not of women. The weight of Ismenodora's house (i.e., her family name and social standing) along with her age are viewed in a negative way by certain members in the

[192]Cf. Plut. *Dion* 52.4, where the same Greek phrase is used: Dion adhered to the teachings of the Academy and showed himself modest in his high status; a philosopher and politician, he showed self-restraint and an attitude towards money that was suitable to a politician.

dialogue, such as Protagenes, who describes her as an unrespectable and sexually aggressive woman who takes on the role of the *erastes* (*Mor.* 753A-B). The acceptable behavior for a respectable woman of her social class would have been that she sit decently at home waiting for her eager suitors instead of playing the role of the aggressive partner in the relationship. Instead, Protagenes says, she goes to Bacchon's doors with her friends, serenades him, hangs garlands on his portraits and fights off her rivals like a pangkratiast (i.e., a type of a boxer). These should be the actions of a true male lover, of a male *erastes* who pursues his *eromenos*, not that of a modest and respectable woman. If a woman proclaims her love, Protagenes says, a man should run away, not marry her.

The fear of certain members of provincial society that Ismenodora would dominate Bacchon and the marriage is expressed in the language of gender role reversal, which reduces the young man to a position customarily occupied by women in Graeco-Roman literature. Quite remarkably, although Plutarch always keeps an eye for the negative elements in the personality of his characters, here, an emphasis on Ismenodora's shortcomings remains completely absent.[193] This woman meets even the highest moral demands for Plutarch. Protagenes' remarks about Ismenodora's sexual aggressiveness and

[193]Cf. Chilonis in Plutarch's *Agis* 11.8; 17.2-18.3 as well as Agesistrata and Archidamia 20.2-7.

inappropriate behavior are answered by Plutarch with examples of concubines and courtesans that underscore such negative qualities and juxtapose Ismenodora's respectability and character (*Mor.* 753D-F).[194] Furtermore, Plutarch addresses the fear that Bacchon will be emasculated and nullified by the widow's status and wealth by repositioning Bacchon in control of the relationship and, by extension, of his civic status, by means of his character and intelligence (*Mor.* 753F-754B). The inversion of gender relations contained in the asymmetrical partnership between the "dominating" Ismenodora and the "emasculate" Bacchon reflects elite alarm over perceived restrictions on personal male autonomy and diminished capacity for public action. The *Erotikos* underscores the necessity for young elite men to make the normative transition from adolescence to adulthood, from passive, pursued boys to active, pursuing men, and from disenfranchised young individuals to full citizens and political men. The age and status disparity between Bacchon and Ismenodora and the explicit inequity such difference would cause to the marriage are topics addressed in the dialogue at some length, since they were intrinsically

[194]On the corrupting effects of female wealth, see Plut. *Agis* 4.1: Agis was nurtured amid the corrupting influence of the wealth and luxury of the Spartan women, but he surpassed any difficulties thanks to his good nature (εὐφυίαι).

intertwined with issues of social hierarchy, and a citizen's status and control in his personal, and by extension, political life.[195]

Political men, who became the prey of women, such as the Babylonian king Ninos the Great and the Macedonian kings of Egypt Ptolemy II and IV, were weak and soft personalities already, Plutarch says (*Mor.* 753F). On the other hand, there were poor and obscure men who married rich and renowned women and did not lose their good sense and dignity (*Mor.* 753F-754A). In the same way, it is through Bacchon's personality and traits such as ἐγκράτεια (composure), φρόνησις (good sense and discretion), ἦθος (disposition), and βάρος (*gravitas*, seriousness and importance) that the young man would overcome the challenges of this unequal marriage, enter the circles of the elite citizenry of his city and of the empire, and successfully take on the responsibilities of a statesman (*Mor.* 754B).

Daphnaios, son of Archidamos: Daphnaios was one of Plutarch's friends from Delphi.[196] A cursory search of inscriptions from Central Greece reveals that

[195]A thorough discussion of these topics cannot be undertaken here, but they will be pursued in the future.

[196]Delphi as the place of residence for Plutarch at this time has been discussed in Chapter 1, pp. 60-3; *Mor*. 749B: τῶν δὲ φίλων οἴκοθεν μὲν αὐτῷ παρῆσαν οἱ συνήθεις, ἐν δὲ Θεσπιαῖς εὗρε Δαφναῖον τὸν Ἀρχιδάμου [καὶ] Λυσάνδρας ἐρῶντα τῆς Σίμωνος καὶ μάλιστα τῶν μνωμένων αὐτὴν εὐημεροῦντα, καὶ Σώκλαρον ἐκ Τιθόρας ἥκοντα τὸν Ἀριστίωνος. Against

the name "Daphnaios" appears once on a third century BCE inscription from Delphi, while "Archidamos" as a magistrate of the city appears on a great number of inscriptions (at least 50) ranging in date from the third century to the first century BCE.[197] By comparison, the same two names are not attested on any inscriptions from Thespiai, Chaironeia, or any other Boiotian city. My previous supposition that friends from Delphi are to be understood by the term οἴκοθεν at at the beginning of the *Erotikos* (*Mor.* 749B) is supported by these findings as well.

At this point of the *Erotikos*, the text in the surviving manuscripts (E and B) is corrupt and has been amended to read that Daphnaios is the suitor of Lysandra, daughter of Simon (*Mor*. 749B: …Δαφναῖον τὸν Ἀρχιδάμου [καὶ] Λυσάνδρας ἐρῶντα τῆς Σίμωνος καὶ μάλιστα τῶν μνωμένων αὐτὴν εὐημεροῦντα…).[198] I propose instead that the text reveals another individual in Plutarch's circle: Lysander. I suggest that the text should read "Δαφναῖον τὸν Ἀρχιδάμου καὶ Λύσανδρον" for two reasons: 1) because the name of an individual is fitting and expected in a paratactic construction of a list of friends

---

Puech, "Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque," 4844; and Flacelière, *Plutarque: Oeuvres Morales*, 15, who identified Daphnaios as a Thespian.

[197]Daphnaios: *FD* III. 4.358 from Delphi (262/1 BCE?).

[198]I have not seen the original manuscripts. The argument that Daphnaios is a proponent of heterosexual love on account of his *eros* for Lysandra by Flacelière, *Plutarque: Oeuvres Morales*, 15, is based on this (corrupt) passage.

(καὶ...καὶ), and more importantly, 2) because Plutarch, following proper Greek etiquette of not discussing respectable women in public, does not casually provide the names of contemporary women, who are still alive, in any of his works.[199] In the *Erotikos*, his own wife remains unnamed as is Bacchon's mother. It would only be appropriate that Simon's daughter is not named as well. Of course, the exception in the dialogue is Ismenodora, who is discussed in a separate entry in this chapter. If we are to accept the proposal here (καὶ λύσανδρον), we have to recognize another character from Delphi, Lysander, who is in love with the unnamed daughter of Simon and the most successful of her suitors. The historicity of Lysander is discussed under a separate entry in this chapter. Nothing further can be added at this point in respect to the historicity of Daphnaios, son of Archidamos.[200]

---

[199]Other than queens, mythological figures, or women who were already dead (such as Leontis, 242F), Plutarch mentions Aristylla (*Mor.* 145A), his own wife Timoxena (145A), and Memmia Eurydike to whom he dedicated the *Advice on Marriage*. He also dedicated the treatises on *Isis and Osiris* and *Virtues in Women* to Fl. Clea. All of these works seem to be of a personal nature and might have been published after his death. In the *Advice*, which was dedicated to a newly-wed couple, it was appropriate to mention other contemporary women as paradigms for the new bride, Eurydike. Both the *Virtues in Women* and the *Isis and Osiris* might have been of a personal nature, possibly epistolary treatises, dedicated to a distinguished priestess of Delphi and Plutarch's close friend, Clea. Furthermore, *Virtues in Women* was dedicated to Clea on the occasion of the death of a certain woman called Leontis that suggests the personal nature of that work as well.

[200]On Daphnaios' position in support of heterosexual *eros*, see Flacelière, *Plutarque: Oeuvres Morales*, 15.

Diogenes: A Thespian and friend of Peisias, Diogenes is the individual who brings the news that the wedding is underway and requires the presence of Plutarch and his friends. Although the name "Diogenes" was common throughout Greece, it is not attested on any inscriptions from Thespiai.

Flavianos: This otherwise unknown character appears to be a friend or even a student of Autoboulos, son of Plutarch. It is not improbable that like the other characters in the dialogue (and throughout Plutarch's works) Flavianos, too, is a historical person and not a mere literary construction.[201] He is the one and only interlocutor in the dialogue who is addressed by his Roman name, which clearly identifies him as a person of Roman citizenship. [202] Such identification, however, does not automatically establish him as an individual with Roman ancestry as well. It is not unlikely that Flavianos was a Romanized

[201]One can gather over a hundred names from the *Tabletalks* alone. Most of them have Greek names, but sixteen have Roman names. There is no reason to doubt that these are names of real people [c.f. R.H. Burrow, *Plutarch and his Times* (Bloomington, IN, 1967), 14]. Plutarch, himself a historical person and a Roman citizen, never refers to himself with his Roman name, L.(?) Mestrius Plutarchus, but uses his Greek name, Plutarchos, instead.

[202]In view of the vocative at 748F, ὦ Φλαουιανέ, and again at 749A, ὦ ἄριστε Φλαουιανέ, it becomes clear that the name of this character is Flavianos and not Flavian as it has appeared in some popular English translations [see, for example, W.C. Helmbold (Loeb, 1961) and R. Flacelière (Budè, 1980a)]. Should the man's name have been Flavian, Autoboulos would have addressed him as Φλάβιε or Φλαύιε.

Greek from one of the eastern Roman provinces, possibly from Asia Minor.[203] Although Flavianos' historical identity eludes us at this time, a summary of Graeco-Roman onomastic practices and a comparison with Plutarch's procedure of addressing Romanized Greeks might help one pinpoint Flavianos' identity in the future.

During the late Republic and early Empire the Roman onomastic formula on inscriptions written in the Greek language has been characterized most often by the *tria nomina* (e.g. Ti. Iulius Patricius), while the Greek onomastic formula remained faithful to the *onoma* plus patronymic in the genitive case (e.g. Leon Epagathou).[204] In the late first and second centuries CE, however, when more and more Greeks received Roman citizenship, Greek onomastic practices changed and, thus, become problematic to epigraphists and prosopographers. Often on Greek imperial inscriptions, for example, the first Roman name (or *praenomen*) was omitted, especially when the Greek dedicators of an inscription referred to copatriates (e.g., Aurelios Kleopatros instead of M. Aurelius

---

[203] The name is attested on a great number of imperial Greek inscriptions mostly from Asia Minor (51), although a number of them have also been found in Attica (6), Peloponnese (3), Northern Greece (2), Thrace and the Lower Danube (6), Aegean Islands (4), Greater Syria and the East (1), Egypt and Nubia (2), Italy and Magna Graecia (2). The name is also attested on Latin inscriptions from Thrace and the Lower Danube (9, mostly military), Upper Danube (1), Dalmatia (1), Asia Minor (3), Egypt (1). The list of Latin attestations presented here does not include inscriptions from Rome proper.

[204] G. Daux, "La formule onomastique dans le domain Grec sous l'empire Romain," *AJPh* 100.1 (1979): 13-30, esp. 14, bases his remarks on a survey of inscriptions from Delphi.

Kleopatros). From the previous example also, it becomes obvious that sometimes a patronymic is not assigned to those Greeks who had Roman citizenship; yet other times the patronymic is provided.[205]

In addressing the characters in his works, Plutarch uses a rather simple formula. When addressing his Romanized friends T. Flavius Soklaros and T. Flavius Pemptides, for example, Plutarch uses their Greek *onoma* or Roman *cognomen*; thus they become "Soklaros" and "Pemptides" respectively, and [L.] Mestrius Ploutarchos, the author himself, appears as "Ploutarchos" in the *Moralia*. Sometimes, the old Greek onomastic practice of including name and the patronymic is followed in order to describe and distinguish a particular character further. For example, in the descriptive introduction of the *Erotikos* where Plutarch's friends are listed by Autoboulos (749B), [Ti. Flavius] Soklaros is further described as son of Aristion to distinguish him possibly from his grandson, [Ti. Flavius] Soklaros son of Pollianos, whom Autoboulos would have known.[206] The next onomastic paradigm derives from the *Advice on Marriage* (138A: Πολλιανῷ, who has been identified with Lucius Flavius Pollianos

[205]*Ibid*., 19. I follow Daux's examples here of names that appear on Delphic inscriptions.

[206]For the genealogical tree of this family, see Pomeroy, *Plutarch's Advice and Consolation*, 43; and this chapter s.v. "Soklaros."

Aristion).[207] In the case of Pollianos, both Greek and Roman naming practices are present.; while the name Lucius Flavius Pollianos follows the Roman practice of *tria nomina*, Aristion, the name of Pollianos' father, is also attached to the end of the name in the nominative case as a kind of descriptive epithet for Pollianos. The inclusion of the patronymic (in the genitive case), then, was a Greek onomastic practice, but it was adopted into Romanized nomenclature over time, where it appears in the nominative case, almost like an epithet or a descriptive.

What becomes clear is that, in general, Plutarch follows the practice of addressing his male friends (both Romanized Greeks and Romans) by their *cognomen*, which acts as the Greek *onoma*.[208] If this naming practice can be extended to the case of Flavianos, who appears in the beginning of the *Erotikos*, we are faced with two possibilities:

---

[207] See Pomeroy, *Plutarch's Advice and Consolation*, 43, who observes that although Pollianus is addressed by his Roman name, his bride, Eurydike, is addressed by her Greek name. Pomeroy explains this phenomenon as a reflection of the greater assimilation of men than women to the ruling class. See also this chapter s.v. "Ismenodora."

[208] A cursory investigation reveals that the following persons are addressed by their third name (*cognomen*) by Plutarch: M. Annius Ammonios, T. Flavius Aristotimos, T. Flavius Eubiotos, Fl.avius Euphanes, G. Memmius Euthydamos, T. Calavius Firmos, L. Herennius Saturninus, G. Memmius Nicandros, (M. Pacuvius?) Optatos, C. Iulius Pardalas, T. Flavius Pemptides, L. Cassius Petraios, T. Flavius Philinos, L. Flavius Pollianos Aristion, Ti. Claudius Polykrates, Ti. Claudius Pythocles, Ti. Flavius Soklaros, Q. Marcius Straton, M. Annius Thrasyllos. Exceptions to this general rule include: C. Iulius Eurycles Herculanus L. Vibullius Pines (addressed as "Herculanus"), C. Iulius Antiochos Epiphanes Philopappos (addressed as "Philopappos). For the identifications of Plutarch's friends with historical persons, see Puech, "Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque,"4831-93.

A) If we suppose that he was a Romanized Greek, then Flavianos could have been named in the following general formula and its variations:

(unknown *praenomen*) (unknown *nomen*) Flavianos (+unknown patronymic in the nominative or genitive case).

B) On the other hand, if we suppose that Flavianos is a Roman, his name would have followed the typical Roman *tria nomina* formula: (unknown *praenomen*) (unknown *nomen*) Flavianos.

Unfortunately, until more information becomes available, it is impossible at this time to provide a historical identity for this character of the *Erotikos*. Flavianos' nomenclature reflects some of the problems that face prosopographers and ancient historians researching the society of imperial Greece.

Furthermore, what emerges from this discussion is that nomenclature was considered a marker of ethnic identity in the early empire. Onomastic practices of the Greeks of the early empire show how uncomfortable and hesitant the Greeks were in outright adopting of Roman nomenclature. One, however, has to recognize also the flexibility with which the Greeks adopted Roman nomenclature. On the one hand, as more and more of the provincial elites were gaining Roman citizenship, they would have been keen to publicly advertise the status and privileges that such citizenship endowed on them and their families.

On the other, this type of public statement would have brought them at odds with the majority of the Greek population which did not enjoy the same status and privileges in the Greek *poleis*. Therefore, the members of the Romanized Greek elite had to find new ways of expressing both their Hellenic and Roman identity in their onomastic practices. Even when they followed the Roman *tria nomina* formula, they often included the patronymic. A formula such as "L. Fl. Pollianos Aristion," for example, allowed for both Greek and Roman onomastic practices to be included in the same name. Such practice, at least, was adopted for official documents and public dedications for the second generation of Romanized Greeks.

Plutarch's literary texts, however, preserve not the official name but the name that distinguishes a particular individual. More often than not that name was the individual's Roman *cognomen* or Greek *onoma*. Patronymics and ethnics were provided only to distinguish that individual from another one with a similar name who would have been known to Plutarch's audience.

Flavianos, however, does not seem to belong to the Graeco-Roman world of Delphi and Boiotia. The gloss at *Mor.* 748F regarding the Ἐρωτίδεια, the famous Thespian festival to Eros, which attracted the benefactions of Hellenistic kings and queens and imperial visits by Nero and Hadrian, suggests that Flavianos and his circle are ignorant of the festival and the Valley of the Muses

near Thespiai. A Greek audience would have been privy to such information and would not require an explanation. Flavianos, then, is probably a foreigner to mainland Greece, and certainly to Boiotia. He is clearly an important and wealthy man, since Autoboulos addresses him with the adjective ἄριστος (*Mor.* 749A), and possibly, his patron or student. The word ἀκρόασις is the technical term for "recitation" or "lecture" (*Mor.* 748F: οἱ πρὸς τὴν ἀκρόασιν ἥκοντες). Furthermore, the present infinitive ἀπαγγέλλειν (to recite) at the very first sentence of the dialogue implies a recitation as well. An educated man, Flavianos and his circle know of Plutarch and his Platonic background. Although he is interested in Greek culture and philosophy, Flavianos must not be a Platonist, since his request that Autoboulos skip any Platonic references when relating the dialogue on love between Plutarch and his friends (*Mor.* 749A), indicates that he looks down upon Platonic *topoi*, such as poetic language or the "sacred landscape of the Ilissos," the setting of Plato's *Phaedros*.[209]

Ismenodora: Ismenodora of Thespiai is the young, wealthy, and respectable widow in the *Erotikos*, who, while acting as a matchmaker for a marriage with Bacchon and a woman of appropriate status to his family, met the

[209]Pl. *Phdr*. 229a, 230b.

young man and fell in love with him.[210] Hearing positive things about him, but also observing the crowd of the noble male lovers who courted him, she was encouraged in her decision to marry him rather than live with him in secret.[211] Apparently, Ismenodora's proposition was considered unusual and had caused various people within Bacchon's familial circle to object to it: his mother because of the socio-economic disparity between the two families, his friends because of the age difference, and his *erastes* Peisias because of his personal benefit. Even Bacchon was apprehensive about Ismenodora's marital status, i.e. widowhood (*Mor*. 749D-E). Her decision to marry this handsome, young man, therefore, caused much tension and strife in the city, and led to the discussion between Plutarch and his friends at a campsite near the Valley of the Muses. Not deterred by the objections of Bacchon's family and friends, Ismenodora was convinced that the young man was not against the marriage but that he was embarrassed by those who were against it; so, she decided not to let her beloved go. She and her friends, clearly with the consent of the young man, kidnapped Bacchon as he and his friends were passing by her house, something they often did, freshly

---

[210]Women, and especially mothers, played a part into arranging marriages for their children and relatives, but did not necessarily have as an active role in the process as fathers did. Some mothers were especially active (Plut. *Pomp*. 9), but their involvement in marriages was supported more by society and tradition rather than by law.

[211]It would be inappropriate for a respectable woman to enter in a sexual relationship and live with a man without entering into a legal marriage. Such quasi-legal arrangement is described as concubinage, unsuitable for an elite woman. See also B. W. Frier and T. A. J. McGinn, eds., *A Casebook on Roman Family Law* (New York, 2004), 51-3.

anointed and bathed after time at the *palaistra* (754E-756A). Uproar ensued in the city as the gymnasiarchs were called to decide Bacchon's position and as the community abandoned the festival and gathered at the doors of Ismenodora. By the end of the dialogue, all disagreements will be resolved and the marriage will proceed without further impediment.

Although Ismenodora is the main female character of the *Erotikos*, she never utters a word. She, similarly to women since the Archaic period, is defined by the praise and blame expressed in the discussions of men, as well as by her social and marital status. From the traditional Greek point of view, therefore, her initiative, self-determination, aggressiveness and, more importantly, independent actions are inappropriate and reverse established gender roles. In the Greek context, it is not surprising that she is accused for being licentious and even having been struck by the "sacred disease" (or epilepsy), and for subverting the laws of the city and of nature, which require her to act as a woman who stays passively at home and patiently awaits the advances of her suitors (*Mor.* 755B-C and 755E).

The name "Ismenodora" is both unusual and rare. In addition to its appearance in the *Erotikos* and in Lucian's *Dialogues of the Courtesans*,[212] the name

[212]Lucian, *Dial. meret.* 291.4: Ἤκουσα, ἔφην ἐγώ, τῆς Βοιωτίας αὐλητρίδος Ἰσμηνοδώρας διηγουμένης τὰ ἐφέστια παρ' αὐτοῖς, ὡς γένοιτό τις ἐν Θήβαις ἐκ γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ, ὁ δ' αὐτὸς καὶ μάντις ἄριστος, οἶμαι, Τειρεσίας τοὔνομα.

is epigraphically attested only once: on *IG* VII 1777, an imperial inscription from Thespiai. On account of the date and the locality in which the inscription was found, the rarity of Ismenodora's name, the commonalities of status, of independence and presence in an all-male context, and of association with the *gymnasium* between the two Ismenodoras, I have proposed that Markia Ismenodora of *IG* VII 1777 is the same as Plutarch's widow in the *Erotikos*.[213] Such identification proposes that Plutarch's Ismenodora is a Roman citizen from a distinguished family of Thespiai.

In 2005, I was fortunate to get permission from the Greek Ministry of Culture to study the inscription closely, and a new edition of it is provided below:[214]

---

[213]The initial findings were presented at the American Philological Association Meeting in Boston, 2005.

[214]This inscription with an *apparatus criticus* and a commentary is currently under preparation for publication. Special thanks to Nigel Kennell, Molly Richardson, and Glenn Bugh for their help and expertise, and to Stephanie Kennell and Maria Liston for their company and the provision of sustenance.

[Ἄρ]χοντ̣ος Π̣ο̣πλίου Ж τοῦ Δέκμου μηνὸς Βουκα-
τίου ν οἱ ἄρχοντες Μ. Ἀντώνιος Πρῖμος καὶ Μ. Ἀν-
τώνιος Ζώσιμος καὶ Π. Καστρίκ̣ιος Λάκιμος
ἐστηλογράφησαν τοὺς ἐν τῶ ἄνω γυμνάσιω
ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων·

Μ. Ἰσμηνοδώρα
Μ. Θάλερος
Μᾶρκος Μάρκου
Παράμονος Πεπτᾶς
Στερτίννιος Φῆλιξ
Ἐπαφρᾶς Βαλαρίων
Ἀπελλᾶς Κοΐντου
Ζώσιμος Διομήδου
Παράμονος Σω<σ>ικλεῦς
Κόϊντο<ς> Λόξιος
Φίλων Ἐπαφροδείτου
Ὀνήσιμος Τερτίου
Ἐπάγαθος Σιμαλίωνος
Ἐπαφρόδιτος βαυνᾶς
Λ. Ἀφροδάτης
Νο̣υσικὸς Κοστρᾶς
Ὀνήσιμος Λαιδρός
Ἐπί<ν>ικος Σιμίου
Ἀτέλλιος Σώταιρος
Εἰσίων Ὀνησίμου
Κρεπερήιος Κόγνιτος
Σωτήριχος Ἀθηνοδώρου
Ἀπολλόδωρος Νικοκράτους
Ἀφροδᾶς Μενεκράτους
Διοκλῆς Δημητρίου
Σωτᾶς Τύλλιος
Ἀφροδᾶς Ἡμιμναίου
Μοσχίων Ζωσίμο̣υ

Ἐπαφρίων Ἀφροδεισίου
Ἀφροδᾶς Φίλωνος
Εὔτυχος Χίλωνος
Λικίννιος Πριμίων
Ὁμολωΐων Παραμόνου
Εὐέλπιστος δημόσιος
Παράμονος Διοκλέους
Πειθέρω<ς> βυρσεὺς
Μ. Ἀτείμητος
Φιλάδελφος Ἀφροδάτου
Ζώσιμος Βεικερίου
Ζώπυρος Μινυκίου
Σωτήριχος Δαμαρίωνος
Σεραπίων Ἐπικτήτου
Θεόφιλος Ἐπαφρᾶ
Παράμονος Ὁμολωΐωνος
Ἕλενος Ὁμολωΐωνος
Σωτήριχος Φιλέρωτος
Εὐφρόσυνος ζωγράφος
Νικηφόρος Τυλλίου
Ἀττικίων Ἀντέρωτος
Θεόξενος Παραμ<έ>νο<ν>τος
Διονύσιος Μελανκόμας
Εὔπορος > Κράνου
Ζωσᾶς Ὁμολωΐχου
Εἰσιγένης Ζωΐλου
[-c.3-4-]ΣΗ̣Σ̣ Σω̣ξ̣ένου̣

Col. III: 33-54

Ἀθήναιος | Εὐμάρρωνος | παρακληθὶς || εἰσῆλθεν | [[εἰς τὸ| γυμνάσιον]]| καὶ Εὐμά|ρων Ἀθη||ναίου καὶ | ἀνέθηκαν |[[- - - - - - - -]]| ἐλαίου με|τρητὰς δέ||κα - καὶ τὸ | πυριατήρι|<ο>ν ἐσίρωσαν | Σωτήριχος | Ἐπαφρᾶ || *vacat* | Σωτήριχος | *vacat* | Σωτ

The inscription was found in Boiotia, north of Thespiai (at the village of Kaznesi, next to Vayia), and was first published by Stephanos Koumanoudes in 1882, who suggested a second or third century date based on the lettering.[215] Next, Lolling, the editor of *IG* VII, observing that the inscription does not include imperial names (such as Iulius, Claudius, Flavius, and so on), dated it to no later than the first century. The stone is broken at the top and bottom, while the left and right sides are original. The text consists of four parts: The superscript, which occupies the full width of the stone with right hand indentations in lines 3 and 4, and three –more-or-less-regular columns below it. Following the dating formula (*eponymous archon* and month), the Roman names of the three *archontes* (possibly the gymnasiarchs), who registered on stone those in the upper gymnasium using their own money, appear.[216] The name M. Ismenodora (line 5) is on the same line as the phrase ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων which constitutes the end of the superscript. There are three columns below the superscript: the first two are lists of names, while

[215]S. A. Koumanoudes, *Athenaion* 10 (1882): 406-8, no. 1.

[216]J. Delorme, *Gymnasion: Études sur les monuments consacrés à l'éducation en Grèce (des origins à l'Empire romain* (Paris, 1960), 205-6, has argued that the "upper gymnasium" refers to the one dedicated by a local benefactor, Polykratides son of Anthemion (*BCH* 26 (1902): 297, no. 16, and entry under "Anthemion" in this chapter), to the community of Roman merchants at Thespiai in the late first century BCE. The identification of several *nomina* (Castricii, Licinnii, Antonii, Marcii, Crepereii, Quinctii, Stertinii, Tertii) as those of tradesmen from Southern Italy by Hatzfeld elaborates Delorme's suggestion, but no archaeological evidence can collaborate such identification. If "the upper *gymnasium*" is, indeed, the same *gymnasium* that Polykratides had dedicated to the Roman community, *IG* VII 1777 has a *terminus post quem* of at least 14 CE, since Polykratides was still alive at the end of the Augustan era (cf. *BCH* 6 (1882): 275-7=*CIL* III. 7301).

the third consists of the names of fathers and sons who have provided something special for the *gymnasium*, like oil, and some kind of filtering of the *pyriaterion*, a round, sauna-type bath building that used dry heat, often located near a *palaistra*, where the athletes could sweat and anoint themselves with oil.[217] Looking at all the names that appear on the inscription, we observe that the list includes Greek and Roman names in the traditional formulas, as well as different variants of both, and (finally) some Greek names with a professional designation.[218] The appearance of an Ismenodora from Thespiai in the all-male context of the dialogue and the *gymnasium* both in *IG* VII 1777 (line 5) and in the *Erotikos* is fascinating.[219] Clearly, the inscriber intentionally places her in a distinct position, probably to indicate her high status.

---

[217]The verb *esirosan* might signify the collection and filtering of olive-oil-and-sweat by-products from the *pyriaterion*, which were highly valued for their medicinal qualities. See N. M. Kennell, "Most Necessary for the Bodies of Men: Olive Oil and its By-Products in the Later Greek Gymnasium," in *In Altum: Seventy-Five Years of Classical Studies in Newfoundland*, ed. M. Joyal (St. John's, Newfoundland, 2001), 119-33. On the *pyriaterion*, similar to *laconicum*, see R. Ginouvès, *Balaneutikè: Recherches sur le bain dans l'antiquité grecque* (Paris, 1962), 136-7 (on the evidence for the earliest such building being the *laconicum* at Gortys in Arcadia); Vitruvius (V. 10.5) distinguishes the *laconicum* and the *suedatorium*, both steam rooms, as the first providing dry heat and the second moist heat (cf. Athen. XI.501e). Plutarch in the *Life of Kimon* (1.7) suggests that anointing taking place in the *pyriaterion* at Chaironeia and he might reflect the practice of his time.

[218]See for example, Col. I, line 18: Epaphroditos the forger, Col. II, line 11: Euelpistos the public slave, line 13: Peitheros the cobbler, and line 24: Euphrosynos the painter.

[219]J. Harries, "The Cube and the Square: Masculinity and male social roles in Roman Boiotia," in *When men were men: masculinity, power and identity in Classical antiquity*, eds. L. Foxhall and J. Salmon (London, 1998), 191-2, was the first to notice the coincidence but did not provide the evidence to substantiate her conjecture that Ismenodora was either Plutarch's heroine or a relative of hers.

Koumanoudes, like others after him, assumed that all names that appear on the inscription were male and, thus, suggested that *IG* VII 1777 might indicate either a list of *ephebes*, or of benefactors, or of members of the *gymnasium*. Since the inscription includes a female name, however, we can now safely reject the suggestion of an *ephebic* inscription, while the inclusion of both Greek and Roman names of varying socio-economic background strongly suggests that this is not a list of benefactors. Additionally, the language used on this inscription does not appear to conform to the formulas used for honorary inscriptions of benefactors. In fact, it clearly commemorates and registers on stone "those in the upper gymnasium" [ἐστηλογράφησαν τοὺς ἐν τῶ ἄνω γυμνάσιω (*sic*)].

My examination, following a suggestion by Nigel Kennell, led me to the initial conclusion that this is a list of members of a *collegium* (club) associated with the *gymnasium*.[220] Individual *collegia* could have a socially disparate membership, which would also explain the socio-economic diversity that exists in the inscription. Membership in this particular *collegium* was probably inherited, unless a special invitation was issued, as in the case of Athenaios Eumarronos (lines 33-38), who was invited (παρακληθίς) to enter the

[220]G. G. Fagan, *Bathing in Public in the Roman World* (Ann Arbor, 1999), 207 and n.55: "Baths operated by *collegia* are exceptions, since they were not open to the general public. Individual *collegia* could have a socially diverse membership, so that even within these organizations, different classes could attend the same bathhouse (including imperial and private slaves, free people, men and women, rich and poor)".

gymnasium. Unfortunately, I have not been able to find comparable epigraphic lists that have been identified with any certainty as membership lists of *collegia* from this period, although Plutarch attests to one such *collegium* at Delphi; in the λέσχη Κνιδίων (*collegium* of the Knidians), the members were anointed and watched the athletes (*Mor*. 412D). I believe that the lack of comparable data from epigraphic evidence is due to the customary identification of lists of names associated with a *gymnasium* as *ephebic* or honorary.

Having argued for the existence of a *collegium* associated with the bath and a *gymnasium* at Thespiai, one cannot disregard the possibility that the list of names might be a list of members of the *gymnasium*. Until recently no such lists that included female names were available, because women were not expected to appear in the context of the *gymnasium*. Originally published in 1993, an imperial inscription from the island of Kos attests the name of a Roman(ized?) woman, who became a member of the *presbytikan palaistra* (possibly, the *palaistra* used by men and women who had completed their education and had received citizenship).[221] Further research is necessary to identify the context of this inscription as well as the meaning of the term "*presbytikan palaistra*". It is certain

[221]*ED* 228, Pl. 67 (from Kos, 1st c. CE): Ἐπὶ μ(ονάρχων) Ἑρμία καὶ Διογένους· οἵδε εἰσήλθον ἐς | τὰν πρεσβυτικὰν παλαίστραν, γυμνασιαρχοῦν | τος Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Ἀλκιδάμου υἱοῦ Ἀλκιδά | μου – καὶ ἐπιμελητᾶ Σέξτου Ποπιλλίου Σέξ | του υἱοῦ Λωρείκα φιλοκαισάρων – (list of names of inductees, mostly in the *tria nomina* formula but also with a *nomen* and a patronymic appear in lines 5-35) | Γάϊ(ος) Ἰούλιος Ἐπάγαθος· | Ἑτερηία Γα(ΐου) θυ(γάτηρ) Πρόκιλλα.

now, however, that Markia Ismenodora's situation in neither an all-male context nor in the context of the *gymnasium* is unique in the epigraphic record of the first and second centuries CE.[222] Probably the only surviving member of her immediate family, Markia Ismenodora of *IG* VII 1777 might very well be the heiress to her family's membership and financial burdens.

In the *Erotikos*, Ismenodora breaks the mold of traditional female behavior in Greek society. She reverses the gender roles and marriage standards for Boiotia that demanded that a young woman marry an older man, often twice her age. After finding a suitable partner, the arrangements were supposed to be made between the father of the bride-to-be and the interested groom –and certainly not by the bride herself. In spite of Ismenodora's behavior her respectability and good name are maintained by Plutarch throughout the dialogue, where she is praised as leading a life without fault, appropriately fitting to her family's name and *gravitas* (749D: …γυνὴ πλούτῳ καὶ γένει

[222]A certain Tate from Herakleia Salbake also appears as the only woman in the company of men in a different context. Tate, a *stephanephoros* and a *gymnasiarch* and the daughter of a *stephanephoros* and a *gymnasiarch*, was "the first of the women" to be admitted to "the sacred *geraioi*," that is to say to the *gerousia*. In addition, Menodora from the Pamphylian city of Sillyon in the second half of the second century CE, who was a high priestess of the emperors, of Demeter, and of all the gods, a *hierophant*, a *gymnasiarch*, was allowed to become a *demiourgos*, and a *dekaprotos*. L. Robert observed that both the *demiourgia* and the *dekaprotia* were commissions that had been previously held only by men. Menodora, like Ismenodora, was probably the only surviving member of her family capable of carrying on the family tradition and liable for taking on civic burdens not only of these offices, but of several others as well. See R. van Bremen, *The Limits of Participation: Women and Civic Life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Amsterdam, 1996), 77, and 344.

λαμπρὰ καὶ νὴ Δία τὸν ἄλλον εὔτακτος βίον· ἐχήρευσε γὰρ οὐκ ὀλίγον χρόνον ἄνευ ψόγου…; 753C: …βαρεῖα γὰρ καὶ πλουσία· τί δ' εἰ καλὴ καὶ νέα; τὶ δ' εἰ γένει σοβαρὰ καὶ ἔνδοξος;). Certainly, the distinctiveness of Ismenodora and her unique behavior can be explained by the senatorial status of her family (749D: …γυνὴ πλούτῳ καὶ γένει λαμπρὰ; 753C: τὶ δ' εἰ γένει σοβαρὰ καὶ ἔνδοξος).[223] The Greek word λαμπρὰ is the equivalent of the Latin *clarissima*. The *clarissimi*, Roman and Romanized senators and their immediate families, were the Empire's elite.[224]

Under Roman law, which also applied to the provinces, it was permissible for Ismenodora and Bacchon to conclude a valid marriage provided that they were of the minimum age to procreate (usually twelve years old for women and fourteen for men), there was agreement (*consensus*) between them (if they were *sui iuris*) or between their parents or guardians (if they were in their power), and the capacity to engage in a legal marriage (*conubium*). According to Augustus' *lex Iulia*, senatorial daughters and sons could not marry freedpersons or members

---

[223]γένει λαμπρὰ: cf. 752E; 753C: βαρεῖα... καὶ πλουσία; 749F, marriage with Ismenodora brings πράγματα μεγάλα; 749E: βάρος τοῦ οἴκου καὶ ὁ ὄγκος. The adjective λαμπρός (as well as κράτιστος) was used in the 2nd and 3rd c. CE to indicate senatorial families; see Oliver, "Roman Senators," 583-602, and esp. 591-2 which discusses the evidence for the well-known Thespian family of T. Flavius Philinos, who was the first senator of that family. His wife, Flavia Amphikleia is called λαμπροτάτη (*Deltion* 1966, 143-4), the Latin equivalent of *clarissima*.

[224]B. W. Frier and T. A. J. McGinn, eds., *A Casebook on Roman Family Law* (New York, 2004), 97-8.

of families that acted on stage; but there were no other prohibitions.[225] It is apparent from the text that both Bacchon and Ismenodora are of minimum age. It is evident as well that Bacchon's father is dead, because his thoughts on the marriage are not provided, and that Bacchon is under the (legal?) guardianship of his older cousin, Anthemion. Nor are any male relatives or guardians associated with Ismenodora present in the dialogue. Consent, therefore, of all parties could be obtained without any impediments.

Whether both Bacchon and Ismenodora had *conubium* (i.e., the legal term for the capacity to engage in a legal marriage with a Roman citizen) can only be assumed. Based on the inscription and the *Erotikos*, I have argued that Ismenodora had Roman citizenship and senatorial status. Furthermore, as a young man completing the ephebate at Thespiai, Bacchon had local citizenship. Whether he held Roman citizenship as well is not known at this time. If he did have Roman citizenship as well, then there would not be a legal problem regarding the citizenship and status of the couple's children; they would be Roman citizens, as well as Thespian citizens upon their completion of the ephebate. Since we do not know Bacchon's legal status, however, it is difficult to speculate on whether he had the right to marry a Roman citizen (*conubium*). Although foreigners might not have *conubium*, they could (and did) marry

[225]*Ibid.*, 34.

Romans. It appears that *conubium* was directly related to the status of the couple's children as well as to the status of the *peregrinus* parent. Suffice it to say that according to Roman law, if a Roman citizen woman married a *peregrinus* (free foreigner) who had *conubium*, her children would be considered foreigners as well under Roman law. Therefore, if we are to assume that Bacchon did not have Roman citizenship, he could be considered a *peregrinus* with *conubium* under Roman law; as a result, his children with Ismenodora would have the status of foreigner as well under Roman law. On the other hand, if the *peregrinus*-husband did not have *conubium*, the children of the marriage would take the mother's status and be Roman citizens.[226] In this case, if Bacchon is considered a *peregrinus* without *conubium*, his children with Ismenodora would be Roman citizens. This arrangement, of course, would have been the most beneficial for the couple. Whether these children would legally be under the authority and *manus* of their mother rather than of their father, as had been customary in the Graeco-Roman world, requires further investigation.

Lysandros, the suitor of Simon's daughter (see also, "Daphnaios, son of Archidamos")**: "**Lysandros," reminiscent of the famous Spartan general, was a common Boiotian and Doric name. The information provided in the *Erotikos*

[226]*Ibid.*, 32.

(749B) regarding Lysandros' love for the daughter of Simon and his favorable position as one of her suitors is not simply gossip. Such blather would be unfitting of a man of Plutarch's status and principles, who would be expected to be respectful of the reputation of Simon's daughter. Lysandros, therefore, must have been one of Plutarch's intimate friends from Delphi, with whom he had previously discussed the object of his affection as well as his success in his pursuit.[227] Lysandros is attested on inscriptions from both Thespiai and Delphi.[228] More importantly, the name appears on inscriptions that are connected with both a leading family at Thespiai and with Phileinos, Plutarch's close acquaintance. While it remains possible that the Lysandros of the *Erotikos* is related to the Thespian family, nothing further can be postulated with any

[227]Since Autoboulos is the narrator of the dialogue, it remains possible also that Lysandros was one of Autoboulos' close friends from Delphi. At any rate, it is clear that the two families knew each other rather intimately.

[228]*IG* VII 2517 (1st c. CE, currently at Thebes, but probably from Thespiai), a dedication to Lysandros son of Polykratides for being the *agonothetes* Καισαρή| ων Ἐρωτιδίων Ῥω| μαίων and an *archiereus*; also from Thespiai, *IG* VII 1867 (possibly dated to the reign of Vespasian or Domitian): Φλαουίαν Ἀρχέλαν τὴν | καὶ Τειμοξέναν, Λυσάν | δρου καὶ Δορκύλου θυ | γατέρα, ἱέρειαν διὰ βίου | Δήμητρος Ἀχέας, ἔκγο | νον δὲ τῶν τὸν Διό | νυσον ἀναθέντων, | Φλάουιος Μόνδων Φι | λείνου υἱὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ | γυναῖκα; and *ibid.*, 1871: [Φλαουία Δορ] | κυλὶς Ἀρτέμ[ιδι] | Εἰλειθυίῃ | τὸν ἴδιον υ[ἱὸν] | Τ(ίτον) · Φλάουιο[ν] | Λύσανδ[ρον]. Finally, from Delphi (180-200 CE), *SEG* 12.265=*BCH* (1952) 627, no. 3: Τίτον Φλάουιον Φιλεῖν[ον] | τὸν κράτιστον ὑπατικό[ν], | Φλαουίων Λυσάνδρου | καὶ Δημοκλείας υἱόν, | Φλαουία Ἀμφίκλεια, | Φλαουίου Ἀμφικλέους | καὶ Πλωτίας Ἀγησικρίτας θυγάτηρ, | τὸν γλυκύτατον καὶ σεμνότατον ἄνδρα, | ψηφίσματι Ἀμφικτ[υόνων]. | *hedera*. Fl. Demokleia was a Thespian woman as *IG* VII 1868 was set up there in her honor by her son T. Fl. Fileinos and the decree of the *boule*.

confidence at this point without a proper verification of the inscriptions and of the manuscripts.

Peisias: Like Anthemion's, Peisias' patronymic is not provided. He is a Thespian and Bacchon's *erastes*, who accuses Anthemion of surrendering his young cousin to Ismenodora (*Mor.* 749E-F). A feisty and indignant individual, who at the end surrenders Bacchon to Ismenodora and becomes a leading member of the wedding party by putting on a chaplet and a white *himation* and conducting the nuptial procession from Ismenodora's house through the marketplace to the precinct of Eros.[229] Peisias might be acting as a νυμφαγωγός or νυμφοστόλος in the wedding, responsible for the conveyance of the bride to the groom's house.[230] The name does not appear on any extant inscriptions from Thespiai.

---

[229]See also, Flacelière, *Plutarque: Oeuvres Morales*, 15-6.

[230]In Boiotia, it was customary to burn the wheel of the chariot on which the bride was conveyed to the groom's house, in order to signify that the bride had to be devoted to her husband and to her household (*Mor*. 271D). Cf. Hes. *Sc.* 273. Hesychius relates that, although it was customary for the groom to convey the bride to the groom's house on a chariot or on foot, this practice was not allowed for those marrying for the second time.

Pemptides: One of the interlocutors in the *Erotikos* (755E), Pemptides is not among those introduced at the beginning of the dialogue.[231] While at first, one would assume Pemptides to be a Thespian, the allusion in 761B makes it clear that this character is a Theban (Παρ' ὑμῖν δ', ὦ Πεμπτίδη, τοῖς Θηβαίοις…). The historical identity of Pemptides is confirmed also by epigraphy and numismatics; the name appears on inscriptions that suggest that he was a Roman citizen and a member of a family of priests from Thebes. Pemptides was involved in the imperial cult and in the mystery cult of the Kabeirioi, both positions important for the administration and religious activity of the city, and typical of the provincials in Plutarch's circle.[232] Son of the *archiereus* Pemptides, who is attested on the only bronze coins minted under Galba's reign (68-69 CE), T. Fl. Pemptides was the husband of Pythis, daughter of Aristogeiton, with whom he produced at least one child, Flavia Athenais, also a

[231]For Pemptides' Epicurean leanings, see Flacelière, *Plutarque: Oeuvres Morales*, 17-8; and J. M. Rist, "*Amatorius*: A Commentary of Plato's Theories of Love?" *CQ* 51.2 (2001): 557-75.

[232]For the most recent discussion of the epigraphic evidence, see Puech, "Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque,"4866-7. For family *stemmata*, see also, S. N. Koumanoundes, *Χαριστήριον εἰς Ἀ. Κ. Ὀρλάνδον*, II (1964): 1-21= *SEG* 22.413-415 and 418; *id.*, Θηβαϊκή Προσωπογραφία (Athens: 1979), 169 nos. 1631-1632, with earlier bibliography. *Hierarches*: *SEG* 22.418 (from Thebes, 1st-2nd c. CE, the reference to the *Sebastoi* here is probably to Vespasian and Titus): Θεοῖς Σεβαστοῖς Με<γ>άλοις Κα | βείρω<ι> καὶ Παιδὶ Θηβαῖοι ἐκ τῶν | τῆς ταμίας <ίερ>ῶν προσόδων τὸ | Ἀνάκτορον ἀνέθηκαν, ἐπιμεληθέν | τος τῆς κατασκευῆς <τοῦ> ἱεράρχου | Τίτου Φλαβίου Πεμ<τί>δ<ο>υ {A}; *SEG* 22. 414=IG VII 2514 (from Thebes; badly damaged and supplemented by Koumanoundes): Τ(ίτον) Φλάουιον Π[εμπτίδην (?)] | ἄριστα πο̣λ̣ει̣τ̣ευσάμ[ενον].

priestess.[233] T. Flavius Pemptides' activity is dated to the end of the first and the beginning of the second century CE.

Protogenes of Tarsos: The name "Protogenes" is a common Greek name and it appears on a number of inscriptions from Thespiai, Delphi, Athens, Kilikia and elsewhere, but it is not possible at this point to identify this individual with any of those attested epigraphically.[234] Like Zeuxippos, Protogenes of Tarsos, a city in Kilikia, was attached to Plutarch by ties of *xenia* (hospitality, *Mor.* 749B-C). The Kilikians enjoyed no favorable reputation among the Greeks. Plutarch's contemporary, Dio Chrysostom of Prusa called Tarsos a brothel and accused the

[233]Coins under Galba: *RPC* I.1, 268, nos. 1334-6; Tyche or Nike appear on the coins with the inscription ΕΠΙ ΑΡΧΙ ΠΕΜΠΤΙΔΟΥ ΘΗΒΑΙΩΝ. Husband of Pythis, daughter of Aristogeiton: *IG* VII 2490 and 2491 (now lost)=*SEG* 22.413 (from Thebes, 1st -2nd c. CE): Θηβαίων ἡ β[ουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος] | Πῦθιν Ἀριστ[ογείτονος, Πεμ-] | πτίδου δὲ τ[οῦ - - γυναῖκα, ἀρε-] | τῆς καὶ σωφ[ροσύνης ἕνεκεν.]. Father of Flavia Athenais: *IG* VII 2523=*SEG* 22.415 (from Thebes, 2nd c. CE): Ἡ βουλὴ καὶ <ὁ> δῆμος | Φλαουί<αν> Ἀθηναΐ<δα Τ.> Φλαουίου Π<εμ>τί<δ>ου | θυγατέρα <ὑ>π<ο>ζακορεύσασα<ν>.

[234]A certain Protogenes, son of Protarchos, is attested on inscriptions from Thespiai, which might be worthy of further research, but they have been dated to the first century BCE on account of their lettering. Without a more secure method of dating these inscriptions it is not possible to make any conjectures here. See *IG* VII 1861, revised by Roesch, *Etudes béotiennes*, 172-3: (from Thespiai, 1st c. BCE): [ὁ δῆμος] Πρωτογένην Πρωτάρχου δ[ιὰ] | [τέχνην] τὴν παιδικὴν καὶ τὰς γινομέ | νας εἰς τοὺς παιδευτὰς τῶν παί | δων δαπάνας *vac.* θεοῖς; and *IG* VII 1862 (from Thespiai, 1st c. CE): Θεσπι[έω]ν οἱ παῖδες καὶ παροίκων. [κα]ὶ Ῥωμα[ίω]ν. τῶν πρα[γματευ] | ομένων ἐν Θεσπιαῖς Πρωτογένην Πρωτάρχου τὸν κρίσ[ε]ι πατέ | ρα καὶ εὐεργέτην ἑαυτῶν.

city of homoeroticism, which he perceived as a vice (*Or*. 33.36, 60).[235] As the representative of Tarsos, then, Protogenes is portrayed as the leading supporter of homoerotic love and a stern opponent of the proposed marriage between Bacchon and Ismenodora, whom he slanders and vilifies in the *Erotikos*.[236] He was related also to someone at Soli in Kilikia in Plutarch's *God's Slowness to Punish* (*Mor*. 563B-F: Οὕτως οὖν ἔφην ὅτι Σολεὺς ἀνήρ, ἐκείνου τοῦ γενομένου μεθ' ἡμῶν ἐνταῦθα Πρωτογένους οἰκεῖος καὶ φίλος… Ὅπερ ἦν ἀληθές, ὡς αὐτὸς διηγεῖτο τῷ τε Πρωτογένει καὶ τοῖς ὁμοίως ἐπιεικέσι τῶν φίλων).[237]

If we are to put any weight on Daphnaios' words that Protagenes came to Athens to watch the handsome young men and to mingle with them (750B), we can identify this Protogenes with the *grammatikos* by the same name, who appears elsewhere in Plutarch's *Moralia* (*Mor.* 698D: Τοιαῦτα τοῦ Νικίου διεξιόντος ὁ γραμματικὸς Πρωτογένης ἔφη…; *Mor.* 723F: Παυσαμένου δὲ τοῦ

---

[235]The meaning of the term ῥέγκειν in Dio's remarks about Tarsos' notoriety as a city where homoeroticism was common is uncertain, but it is thought to refer to nasal snorting during pederastic and passive adult male (homosexual) intercourse; see, S. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, A.D. 50-250* (Oxford, 1996), 214-16; and J. S. Houser, "Eros and *Aphrodisia* in the Works of Dio Chrysostom," *ClassAnt* 17.2 (1998): 235-58, esp. 253-5.

[236]Mor. 750C-751B, 753A-B. Daphnaios accuses Protogenes of leaving Kilikia for Athens, like the mythological Laios, to look at the handsome young men and to be in their company (*Mor*. 750B). See also the discussion in Flacelière, *Plutarque: Oeuvres Morales*, 15-16; and Puech, "Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque,"4874.

[237]The *God's Slowness to Punish* is addressed to T. Avidius Quietus and it has been suggested by Jones, "Chronology of Plutarch's Works," that it was written either before 103 or after 111.

Σώσπιδος, Πρωτογένης ὁ γραμματικὸς …; also in Athens during the Mouseia in the presence of Ammonios, Hermeias and Plutarch, *Mor.* 737E: Προὔτεινεν οὖν Ἑρμείας ὁ γεωμέτρης Πρωτογένει τῷ γραμματικῷ πρῶτος αἰτίαν εἰπεῖν; *Mor.* 741C: ἐπαναστὰς οὖν ὁ Πρωτογένης…; present also in *Mor.* 741D). True to Daphnaios' accusation, the Tarsian sophist frequented Ammonios' school and house, where he could have met and mingled with the young men easily. As a young man, also, Plutarch met Protogenes during his time in Athens.

Soklaros son of Aristion: In the *Erotikos* Soklaros arrived from Tithora, a city of Phokis in central Greece, northwest of Chaironeia.[238] A Phokian, Soklaros was well acquainted with Plutarch's family and friends and he appears numerous times in Plutarch's works, especially in the *Tabletalks*. The two men certainly knew each other from Athens and Delphi. In *Tabletalks*, Soklaros entertained Plutarch, Crato and Philo at his gardens near the Kephissos River in Athens (*Mor.* 640B). Soklaros appears to be older than the young married men who were present at the discussion concerning the suitable time for sexual intercourse (*Mor.* 654D). Likely, he is also the same one whom Plutarch describes as *hetairos* (companion) in *The Intelligence of Animals* (*Mor.* 964D: ἔχει γὰρ ἑτέραν

[238]On Tithora, see Mr. H. McAllister, "Tithorea (Velitsa) Phokis, Greece," in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*, eds. R. Stillwell, W., L. MacDonald & Mr. H. McAllister (Princeton, 1976), 926-7. Inscriptions attest that the city was famous for its cult of Isis, Serapis and Anubis, while Pausanias writes that the holiest sanctuary of Isis in all of Greece was at Tithora (10.32).

ὁδὸν ἐκεῖ τὸ δίκαιον οὐ σφαλερὰν καὶ παράκρημνον οὕτω και διὰ τῶν ἐναργῶν ἀνατρεπομένων ἄγουσαν, ἀλλ' ἥν, Πλάτωνος ὑφηγουμένου, δείκνυσιν οὑμὸς υἱὸς, ὦ Σώκλαρε, σὸς δ' ἑταῖρος...). The term *hetairos* does not denote age parity, necessarily, but could refer also to members of the same philosophical school.[239] Older than Plutarch, Soklaros often enhances and, sometimes, corrects the young man's remarks and approach (cf. *Mor.* 764A). He knew Lucius Mestrius Florus and his son-in-law Gaius, since he was a guest at the former's house (*Mor.* 680C; 682F). In *Mor.* 726B, he is a guest at Theon's house, probably at Delphi. In the *Erotikos*, he appears to be an experienced, intelligent and witty man; he is the character in the dialogue who suggests that Bacchon's kidnapping was a stratagem of Bacchon himself because he wanted to escape the clutches of his male lovers and to marry a noble and wealthy woman (*Mor.* 755D).

That Soklaros was already a resident of Delphi when the events of the *Erotikos* took place is supported by the text itself. In the introduction to the dialogue, Autoboulos lists and describes the friends who joined Plutarch at Thespiai thus: τῶν δὲ φίλων οἴκοθεν μὲν αὐτῷ παρῆσαν οἱ συνήθεις, ἐν δὲ

[239] ἑταῖρος: not friend so much as the one belonging in the same philosophical school, according to Puech, "Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque," 4886, with reference to J. Gluckee, *Antiochus and the Late Academy* (Göttingen, 1978), 265-6. If Puech is correct, then this particular meaning of the word *hetairos* appears only in Plutarch. The word used to describe age parity is ἡλικιώτης.

Θεσπιαῖς εὗρε Δαφναῖον τὸν Ἀρχιδάμου καὶ Λυσάνδρον[240] ἐρῶντα τῆς Σίμωνος καὶ μάλιστα τῶν μνωμένων αὐτὴν εὐημεροῦντα, καὶ Σώκλαρον ἐκ Τιθόρας ἥκοντα τὸν Ἀριστίωνος (749B). Plutarch came with his usual friends from home (οἴκοθεν) and, at Thespiai, he found Daphnaios son of Archidamos, Lysandros who was in love with the daughter of Simon and who was the most favored of her suitors, and Soklaros who came from Tithora. I have already argued in Chapter 1 that the term οἴκοθεν should be understood in conjunction with Plutarch's residence at Delphi in Phokis and not at Chaironeia in Boiotia.[241] Autoboulos' clarification that Soklaros arrived from Tithora, then, is to be understood in this context: although Soklaros was a resident of Delphi at the time, he stopped at his hometown, Tithora, on his way to Thespiai.

Soklaros' identification on inscriptions has been problematic, although the name is attested at Chaironeia, Tithora, and Delphi. Soklaros' identification is tightly intertwined with Plutarch's life and the assumptions and conjectures modern scholars make about that life (this author not excluded). Therefore, because of Soklaros' connection with Plutarch and the general assumption that Plutarch and his family lived at Chaironeia (see chapter 1), based on the text at

[240]See entries under Daphnaios and Lysandros in this chapter.

[241] Plutarch's acquaintances from Boiotia are also singled out to distinguish them from his friends at Delphi: Βοιωτῶν δ' ὁ πατὴρ ἔφη τῶν γνωρίμων τοὺς πλείστους παρεῖναι (479C). On the other hand, Protagenes of Tarsos and Zeuxippos the Lacedemonian are described by their ethnic and as ξένοι, "friends from abroad."

Mor. 726B, some have postulated that Soklaros, too, was a resident of Chaironeia.[242] It is now certain that Soklaros son of Aristion is not be identified with L. Mestrius Soklaros of Chaironeia, who witnessed the verdict regarding a land dispute between the city of Daulis and a certain Memmius Antiochos on November 118 CE at Chaironeia (*IG* IX 1.61), but with T. Flavius Soklaros, who set up dedications at Tithora and was actively involved in the life of the sanctuary at Delphi[243].

Unfortunately, the inscriptions from Delphi and Tithora, which attest to Soklaros' and his descendants' accomplishments, are not without problems. The practice of naming sons after their fathers or grandfathers has created the problem of homonyms, which sometimes prevent one from making definitive statements about the male members of a family. Furthermore, although it is apparent from the inscriptions that Soklaros held certain civic posts and supported building repairs and construction at the Delphic sanctuary, neither the chronology nor the sequence of those posts have been established with any

[242]*RE* s.v. Plutachos (2), 684. The discussion in *Mor.* 726B takes place at the house of Theon, to which Plutarch and his sons were invited. The younger sons, however, were late arriving because of a musical performance at the theater. Ziegler assumed that their attendance at the theater took place at Chaironeia. Theon, however, is clearly associated with Delphi in *The Delphic "E"* and in *Why Are Delphic Oracles No Longer Given in Verse?*, and it is not unfathomable that he lived at Delphi, where the dinner could have taken place.

[243]L. Mestrius Soklaros, like Plutarch's family, received his Roman citizenship from L. Mestrius Florus. He is clearly related to Plutarch in some way. He could be his son, uncle, cousin, etc. Babut, "Sur Soclaros de Chéronée," 184, proposes that L. Mestrius Soklaros was the eldest of Plutarch's and Timoxena's children.

certainty.[244] Only autopsy and an updated and comprehensive study of the Delphic inscriptions can answer these questions definitively.

A certain Titus Flavius Soklaros, along with certain members of his kin (most likely his sons), Lucius Flavius Pollianos Aristion and Flavius Agias, dedicated a statue in honor of Nerva in 98 CE at Soklaros' hometown, Tithora.[245] Lucius Flavius Pollianos Aristion has been identified as the husband of Memmia Eurydike, to whom Plutarch dedicated the *Advice on Marriage* upon their marriage.[246] Additionally, an inscription that has been dated to the beginning of the second century CE attests to a certain Soklaros, son of Aristion, who was one

---

[244]It is not clear at this point what the *cursus honorum* was for the city of Delphi or for the Amphictyony. An investigation of this issue, which is beyond the limits of this dissertation, would prove valuable to the chronology of the different magistracies of the city. A preliminary, but cursory, investigation suggests that after one's post as *epimeletes* of the Amphictyony and depending on his performance and euergetism to the sanctuary and the city, he (and often his family) would be granted Delphic citizenship, after which one could be appointed archon of the city (e.g., *FD* III 4.62). The Delphic archonship was an important and distinguished post, since it had been held even by Roman emperors, such as Titus in 79, Hadrian (twice) and Antoninus Pius; see Daux 1943 (in need of revision now) and R. K. Sherk, "The Eponymous Officials of the Greek Cities, II: Mainland Greece and the Adjacent Islands," *ZPE* 84 (1990): 231-95, esp. 254-5 for Delphi. At which point of one's career, however, and whether one could hold the Delphic priesthood concurrently with a civic magistracy or not, are questions that cannot be answered without further investigation.

[245]*IG* IX 1.200, from Tithora dated to 98 CE: Αὐτοκράτορα Νέρβαν Καίσα[ρα], | ἀρχιερέα μέγιστον, δημαρχικ[ῆς] | ἐξουσίας, ὕπατον τὸ δ', | πατέρα πατρίδος, ἡ πόλ[ις] | Τιθορέων καὶ Τ(ίτος) Φλάβιος Σ[ώ] | κλαρος καὶ Τ(ίτος) Φλάβιος Ἀ<γί>ας | καὶ Λ(ούκιος) Φλάβιος Πωλλιανὸς Ἀριστί[ων]; cf. *IG* IX 1.190 and 192 (from Tithora, beginning of 2nd c. CE) for magistracies held by Soklaros' sons.

[246]Puech, "Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque," 4873 and Bowersock, "Persons in Plutarch's *Moralia*," 267-270, identified him as T. Flavius Soklaros of Tithora, the archon at Delphi early under Trajan's reign, father to L. Flavius Pollianos Aristio (*sic*), father-in-law to Memmia Eurydike (Plutarch's student) and grandfather to Flavia Clea, to whom Plutarch dedicated the *Isis and Osiris*.

of the three witnesses during the manumission and dedication of a young girl (κοράσιον) by the name Euphrosyna to the god Serapis at Tithora.[247] More importantly, T. Flavius Soklaros was *eponymous archon* of Delphi under Trajan, while Caristanius Iulianus was the proconsul (ἀνθύπατος).[248] The archonship of T. Fl. Soklaros at Delphi can thus be securely dated to 100/1 or 101/2 CE.[249] T. Fl.

---

[247]*IG* IX 1. 193 (from Tithora, dated to the beginning of the 2nd c.): θεὸς τύχαν ἀγαθάν. ἄρχοντος ἐ | ν Τιθόρᾳ Ἀρίστωνος τοῦ Ἀρίστω | νος νεωτέρου, ἱερητεύοντος δὲ | τῷ θεῷ τῷ Σεράπι Σώσωνος τ | οῦ Παραμόνου, μηνὸς τρίτου, ἀ | πέδοτο Νικάρετος Πίστου καὶ Οἰνάνθη Ἡρακλ | είδου, συνευαρεστέοντος καὶ τοῦ υ | ἱοῦ αὐτῶν Παραμόνου, τῷ θε | ῷ τῷ Σεράπει κοράσιον, ὀνόμα | τι Εὐφροσύναν, ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ, ὥστ | ε εἶναι αὐτὰν ἐλευθέραν καὶ ἀν | έπαφον παραμείνασαν Νεικαρέτῳ καὶ Οἰ | νάνθῃ τὸν τᾶς ζωᾶς χρόνον, τειμᾶς ἀργυρ | ίου μνᾶν δέκα. τὰν τειμὰν ἔχουσι πᾶσαν. β | εβαιωτὴρ κατὰ τὸν νόμον· Παράμονος | Νεικαρέτου. θρεψάτω δὲ Εὐφροσύνα Π | αραμόνῳ παιδίον διετὲς καὶ παραδότω, | ἢ δηνάρια διακόσια. μὴ καταδουλεξ | άτω δὲ αὐτὰν μηδεὶς κατὰ μηδέν | α τρόπον· εἰ δὲ μή, ἀποτεισάτω μ | νᾶς τριάκοντα, καὶ ἐξέστω προστᾶμε | ν τῷ θέλοντι Φωκέων, καὶ τὸ μὲν ἥμισον ἔσ | τω τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ δὲ ἥμισον τοῦ προστάντο | ς, ἀνυπευθύνου ὄντος καὶ ἀζαμίου. ἁ ὠνὰ | ἀνεγράφη ἐν ἱερῷ τῷ Σεραπείῳ καὶ παρὰ τῷ ἄ | ρχοντι Ἀρίστωνι, δούσας τᾶς πόλιος τὸ ψάφισ | μα ἐπὶ ἄρχοντι Ἑλλανείκῳ Ἑλλανείκου ἐν | ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ. μάρτυ[ρε]ς· Σώκλαρ | ος Ἀριστίωνος, Εὔφρων Στρατάγου, Τείμω | ν Νεικαινέτου. χεὶρ Παραμόνου τοῦ Νεικαινέτου· γ | έγονα βεβαιωτὴρ ἐπὶ τᾶς προγεγραμμένας ἰαρ | ανθεσίας κατὰ τὸν νόμον. μάρτυρες οἱ προγεγρ | αμμένοι.

[248]*FD* III. 4: 47 (from Delphi, dated to 100/1 or 101/2 CE): θεός. τύχᾳ ἀγαθᾷ. | ἄρχοντος ἐν Δελφοῖς Τ. Φλαουίου Σω | κλάρου, μηνὸς Ἐνδυσποιτροπίου ζ, | ἐν προσκλήτῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, δόγμα βουλῆς | καὶ δήμου. ἐπειδὴ Καριστάνιος Ἰουλι | ανὸς ἀνθύπατος, ἀνὴρ καλὸς κἀγαθός, τῆς | τε ἄλλης Ἑλλάδος σεμνῶς καὶ ἀξιολόγως | διέπει τὴν ἡγεμονίαν, καὶ τῶν τοῦ μεγίστο<υ> | Αὐτοκράτορος Νέρβα Τραιανοῦ Καίσαρος Σ[ε] | [βα]στ[οῦ Γερμα]νι[κ]οῦ [πρός τε ἡμᾶ]ς καὶ τ[ὸ] | [ἱερὸν προσταγμάτων ἰδί]ᾳ κ[αὶ φ]ιλανθρώ | [πως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ὡς οὐδεὶ]ς ἄλλος πώποτε | [ὑπακούει· ἔδοξε τῇ βουλῇ κα]ὶ τῷ δήμῳ μαρτυρῆσαι αὐτῷ | [τὴν ἡμετέραν προαιρέσιν, κα]ὶ στῆσαι δὲ εἰκόνα χαλκῆν ἐν τῷ | [ἐπισημοτάτῳ τοῦ ἱεροῦ] τόπῳ, δοῦναι δὲ καὶ αὐτῷ καὶ γένει | [πολειτείαν, καὶ προεδρί]αν αὐτῷ Πυθίοις, ἀναγορευομένου ἀεὶ | [τοῦ κηρυκεύοντ]ος κήρυκος, γραφῆναι δὲ καὶ πρὸς Ἀμφικτύ | [ονας εἰς τὴν ὀπωρι]νὴν πυλαίαν ὅπως κἀκεῖνοι διά τε τὴν | [πρὸς τὸν θεὸ]ν αὐτοῦ εὐσέβειαν καὶ τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς εὔνοιαν | [τειμῶσι τα]ῖς πρεπούσαις τὸν ἄνδρα τειμαῖς, καὶ γράψωσι | [ὡσαύτως]· ἔδοξε δὲ καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα τοῦτο ἐνχαραχθῆναι | [εἰς τὸ]ν [ἐπ]ισημότατον τοῦ ἱεροῦ <τόπον>, καὶ γραφῆναι αὐτῷ ἵνα εἰδῇ | [τὴν τῆ]ς πόλεως ἡμῶν διάθεσιν. πρεσβευτὴς ἡρέθη Μᾶρκος | [Πακούι]ος Ὀπτάτος.

[249]Puech, "Prosopographie et chronologie delphique," 261.

Soklaros was the *eponymous archon* of Delphi also, when the city rewarded a certain C. Caristanius Sagarus (probably a member of the proconsul's family) and his descendants with Delphic citizenship.[250] Based on *FD* III. 4: 47, I suggest that *FD* III. 3:232 dates to 100/1 or 101/2 CE as well. Finally, it is not certain whether Titus Flavius Soklaros is the same person as a Flavius Soklaros who served as archon of the city around 130 CE, or whether the latter is a kinsman.[251]

However, this Flavius Soklaros was *epimeletes* of the Delphic Amphictyony around 95-99.[252] Under Flavius Soklaros' *epimeleteia*, the

---

[250]*FD* III. 3:232 (from Delphi, originally dated to 98/9 CE): [θεό]ς. τύχα ἀγαθά. | Δελφοὶ ἔδωκαν Γ. Καριστανίῳ Σαγάρι | πολειτείαν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκγόνοις αὐτοῦ | προμαντείαν, προξενίαν, προδικίαν, | ἀσυλίαν, προεδρίαν, ἀτέλειαν πᾶσαν, γᾶς | καὶ οἰκίας ἔνκτησιν καὶ τἆλλα τείμια ὅσα | τοῖς καλοῖς καὶ ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσι δίδοται. | ἄρχοντος Τ. Φλαβίου Σωκλάρου, βουλευ | όντων Δάμωνος τοῦ Ποπλίου καὶ Μη | νίου τοῦ Σωτηρίδα.

[251]The following inscriptions have been dated to c. 130 CE by Puech, "Prosopographie et chronologie delphique," 261-2, based on the chronology of the philosopher C. Xenon; *FD* III 4. 62 (from Delphi, originally dated to 125-150 CE): θεός. [τύχᾳ ἀγαθᾷ]. | [Δ]ελφοὶ ἔδω[κ]αν Μ[……] | ἐπιμελητῆ Ἀμφ[ι]κ[τιόνων, αὐτῷ τε καὶ αὐτοῦ γυναι] | κὶ καὶ ἐκγόνο[ις, π]ολε[ι]τε[ίαν, προμαντείαν, προδικί] | αν, ἀ[τέ]λειαν, [γῆς] κ[αὶ] οἰ[κίας ἔγκτησιν, καὶ τἆλλα] | τείμια [ὅ]σ[α καὶ τοῖς καλοῖς κἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσι δίδο] | ται ἐπ' εὐσε[βείᾳ τῇ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ εὐνοίᾳ τῇ] | [π]ρὸς τὴν π[όλιν. ἄρχοντος Φλαβίου Σωκλάρου, βου] | λευόντω[ν Φιλοδάμου τοῦ Λαμπρίου καὶ Φιλλέου τοῦ] | Εὐβουλίδο[υ]; *FD* III 4. 103 (from Delphi, dated to c. mid-2nd c. CE): θεός. τύχα ἀγαθά. | Δελφοὶ ἔδωκαν Γαίῳ | Ξένωνος φιλοσό[φῳ] | πολειτείαν αὐτῷ [καὶ] | ἐγγόνοις αὐτοῦ, [προ] | [μαντ]είαν, προξεν[ί] | [αν], προεδρίαν, προδ[ι] | κίαν, ἀσυλίαν, ἀτέλ[ει] | αν πᾶσαν, γᾶς καὶ ο[ἰκί] | ας ἔνκτησιν καὶ τἆλ | λα τείμια ὅσα τοῖς | καλοῖς καὶ ἀγαθοῖς | ἀνδράσι δίδοται. | ἄρχοντος Φλαβίου | Σωκλάρου, βουλε[υ] | όντων Φιλλέου το[ῦ] | Εὐβουλίδου καὶ Φιλ[ο] | δάμου τοῦ Λαμπρίο[υ].

[252]Puech, "Prosopographie et chronologie delphique," 264, and *id*., "Soklaros de Tithorée," 188.

Amphictyony constructed the house of the Pythia and the library, and built a new addition to the *structorium* (an unidentified type of building).[253]

Whether the *epimeletes* Flavius Soklaros is the same as T. Fl. Soklaros, the archon of Delphi for 100/1 or 101/2 CE, has not been established, but Flavius Soklaros has been proposed to be Plutarch's friend. I propose here that Flavius Soklaros is indeed the same man as T. Flavius Soklaros. Apparently, the nomenclature on the inscriptions is inconsistent. Such inconsistency, however, can be explained by the fact that often Greeks did not provide the full Roman name of another Greek when the inscription was for Hellenic consumption. Such was the case for Soklaros' *epimeleteia* and mid-century archonship. On the other hand, both *FD* III 4. 47 and *FD* III 3.232 attest Soklaros' full Roman name because they refer to and "address" Roman citizens. It is certain that Flavius Soklaros was active at Delphi both in the very end of the first century and in the middle of the second century. He held the *epimeleteia* in 95-99 and after the completion of a successful magistracy, he was honored by the city with citizenship, at which

[253]The following inscriptions come from Delphi and were dated originally to 99-103 CE; *CID* 4.146=*Syll*.[3] 823A: τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀμφικτυ̣όν̣ω̣ν̣ [ἐκ τῶν τοῦ] | θεοῦ χρημάτων ὑπὸ τὴν Φλαουί[ου Σ]ω̣ | κλάρου ἐπιμελητείαν τὴν οἰκίαν | τῇ Πυθίᾳ, κατεσκεύασεν; *CID* 4.147=*Syll*.[3] 823B: τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀμφικτυόνων ἐκ τῶν τοῦ | θεοῦ χρημάτων ὑπὸ τὴν Φλαουίου Σω | κλάρου ἐπιμελητείαν τὴν βυβλιοθήκην | κατεσκεύασεν; *CID* 4.148=*Syll*.[3] 823C: τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἀμφικτυόνων | ἐκ τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ χρημάτων | ὑπὸ τὴν Φλαουίου Σωκλάρου | ἐπιμελητείαν τὸ στρου | κτώριον ἐποικοδόμησεν *vv* P.

point he could run for the local magistracies. Thereafter, he held the archonship in either 100/1 or 101/2 CE, and then again around 130 CE.[254]

Zeuxippos of Lakedaimon: Zeuxippos, whose name means "horse yoker," was related to Plutarch and his family through the ties of *xenia.* His name suggests that he was a member of the elite in Sparta and, in a typical Spartan fashion, Zeuxippos' character is rather laconic in the *Erotikos*. Using epigraphic evidence, Puech 1992 has attempted to identify this Zeuxippos with the son of the Lakedaimonian Tyndares, who also appears in the *Moralia*.[255] Zeuxippos, the friend of Plutarch, was an *eponymos archon* and a member of the *gerousia*, local magistracies typical of men in Plutarch's circle.[256]

---

[254]If I am correct in my supposition, Plutarch's *epimeleteia* has to be dated after Soklaros', i.e., after 99 CE, since Soklaros was older than Plutarch. As far as I know the *epimeleteia* was not an age-specific post, but one can expect that the *epimeletes* of the Amphictyony would have reached a level of maturity appropriate to the post's importance.

[255]See Puech, "Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque," 4889-92, on Zeuxippos, whom she postulates to have been born around 50CE, and his father Tyndares. Although I have some reservations regarding the family's *stemma*, which I plan to explore in the future, I generally support Puech's methodology.

[256]*IG* V 1.81 (From Sparta, 1st c. CE): …,.ς Λυ̣σάν̣[δρου]. | [νο]μοφύλα[κες ἐπὶ] | [Ζευ]ξ̣ίππου, | ὧ̣ν π̣[ρέσβυς] | …Γ[— — —]; *IG* V 1.97 (Sparta, late 1st c. CE): γέροντες [ἐπ]ὶ Γ(αΐου) Ἰου(λίου) Φιλοκλίδα, ὧ̃[ν] | πρέσβυς Διο[φάν]ης Νικία τὸ ε′· | Τ(ιβέριος) Κλαύδιος Νικ[ιππί]δας, ὑὸς . τὸ δ′, | Ἀριστομένης [Ἐπ]ικτήτου τὸ γ′, | Ἀριστονικίδα[ς Ε]ὐτυχίδα τὸ γ′, | Δαμοκράτης Φ[ιλέρ]ωτος τὸ γ′, | Γράνιος Γρα[νίο]υ τὸ γ′, | Σώανδρος Τι[μί]ωνος τὸ γ′, | Νικοκράτης [Νικ]οβούλου τὸ γ′, | Ἀριστόβιος Ἀ[ρισ]τοβίου [τὸ γ′], | Ἀγιάδας Δαμ[οκρ]ατίδα τὸ γ′, | Ἀριστοκλῆς [Καλ]λικράτους τὸ β′, | Τ(ιβέριος) Κλαύδιος ,α [— — — τὸ β′], | Ἀντίοχος Ἀν[τιό]χου Ζευξ̣ίππ̣ῳ κ̣[άσεν τὸ β′], | Τ(ιβέριος) Κλαύδιος Ἀ[ρμό]νικος τὸ β′, | Ἀλεξίμαχος [Σ]ω̣τηρίχου τὸ α′, | Ἄλκαστος Τ[ιμο]κρίτου τὸ β′, | Τιμοκλῆς Θ[εο]δ̣ώρου τὸ β′, | Σωκλίδας

Κ[λε]ωνύμου, | Χάλινος Χαλ[ίνο]υ Ἐνυμαντιάδα̣ κ(άσεν), | Ἱεροκλῆς Ἱε[ρο]κλέους Ἐνυμαντ(ιάδα̣ κάσεν), | Νικίας Τετ[αρτ]ίωνος, | [Ἱερο]κλῆς Δ[εξ]ίππου, | [Ἀρισ]τοκλῆ[ς Κ]αλλικράτους νε(ώτερος). | [γραμμ]ατε[ὶς· Γ(άϊος)] Ἰού(λιος) Πωλλίων Ῥούφο[υ], | [— — — —]ας [τὸ .′, μ]άγιρος τὸ γ′·| {*versus a margine dextra sursum legendus*:} Μ(ᾶρκος) Ἐπαφρόδιτος.; *IG* V 1.446 (From Sparta, 147 CE): ἁ πόλις | Τί(βεριον) Αὐρήλιον Βῆρον Καίσαρα [διὰ] | ν<ο>μοφυλάκων, ὧν πρέσβυς | Ἀγαθοκλῆς Φιλίππου, | Ἀντώνιος Ὠφελίων, | Ζεύξιππος Τυνδάρους, | Φιλοκράτης Κλεάνδρου γρα(μματο)φύ(λαξ), | Μνάσων Λυσίππου; *IG* V 1.87 (Sparta, 147 CE): νομοφύλακες ἐπ[ὶ —] | .ωνος, ὧν πρέσβυς | Ἀγαθοκλῆς Φιλίππου, | Ἀντώνιος Ὠφελίωνος, | Ζεύξιππος Τυνδάρο[υς], | Φιλοκράτης Κλεάνδρου̣ | Μνάσων Λυσίππου; *IG* V 1.111 (Sparta, mid-2nd c. CE): [γερουσία]ι οἱ ἐπ[ὶ Κ]λ̣α̣[υ] | [δίο]υ̣ Σεϊανοῦ, ὧ̣[ν πρέσβυς] | [Δι]ά̣ρης . γ̣ε̣ρ̣ο̣[ντεύων τὸ .′]· | Φιλουμενὸς Σ[ωτηρίδα], | Φιλωνίδας Εὐκρί̣νο̣υς, | Σωσικράτης Σώ̣τ̣ο̣υ, | Ἰού(λιος) Νέας [Σ]ωσικρ̣ά̣τ̣ο̣υ̣ς, | Κ̣α̣λλικρά̣τ̣η̣ς Σ[ωκ]ρ̣άτ[ους], | Σπαρτιάτης Σωσιδ<ά>μου, | Εὐδαιμάκων Εὐκτή̣(μονος), | Ἀντώνιος Ὠφελίων, | Ἰούλιος ., *vac.* | Ζεύξιππος Τυνδά̣ρ̣ο̣[υς], | Κλαύδιος Διονυσ[— —], | Μᾶρκος Νεικη[φόρου], | Καλλικρα̣τ̣[— — — —], | Μνάσ[ων Λυσίππου], | Φιλ[— — — — — — —] | Ο[— — — — — — — —]

CHAPTER 3

The Social and Religious Context of Plutarch's *Erotikos*

The events of the *Erotikos* take place at Thespiai in Boiotia during the festival to Eros, while most of the philosophical argument between Plutarch and his interlocutors occurs at a campsite near the sanctuary of the Muses at the foot of Mount Helikon. This chapter provides the geographical, social and religious context of the dialogue and it includes an examination of Thespian history from the Neolithic to the Hadrianic period, as well as discussions on Mt. Helikon, the Valley and sanctuary of the Muses, and the festivals to Eros (Erotideia) and to the Muses (Mouseia).

Although historians in the past have dealt with the reconstruction of a history of Thespiai through the classical and early Hellenistic periods, evidence from Plutarch, epigraphy and archaeology allow us today to attempt the same for the neglected late Hellenistic and Roman periods, through the reign of Hadrian (117-138 CE).[257] Such narrative will be useful to anyone interested in

[257] *OCD*[3] *s.v.* Thespiae with relevant bibliography; M. H. Hansen and T. H. Nielsen (eds.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (New York, 2004), 431-61 on Boiotia in general, and 457-8 specifically on Thespiai. Thespian history continues well past the reign of Hadrian, of course,

Boiotian and Greek history in the first and second centuries CE. Furthermore, it is important to consider the pre-existing conditions (economic and cultural) that affected the territory especially during the late Hellenistic period and which contributed to Thespian prosperity under the Empire. Such an assessment provides a much more complex account of the impact of Roman conquest on the city and its territories and allows for a picture of cultural "hybridity" to emerge when discussing the history of the Greek *poleis* in the Imperial period and the "Romanization" of the East. Finally, this chapter includes an examination of the area's two major festivals, the Erotideia and the Mouseia, and their geographical and religious context.

Thespiai

Thespeia, according to Homer (*Il*. 2.498), Thespia according to Pausanias (9.13), and Thespeia or Thespiai according to Strabo (9.409-410), was a significant polis in size (104 *ha*) in central Southern Boiotia during the empire, situated on

---

but since the later period does not provide a context for the *Erotikos*, I ignore it here. Thespiai, for example, sent volunteers to Marcus Aurelius (161-80 CE) in his fight against the enemies at the Danube and Mesopotamia. Furthermore, two Roman senators are attested from Thespiai in the second and third centuries CE: Titus Flavius Philinus and Titus Flavius Mondo (On Philinus and his family, see *PIR*^{2} F 331; *AD* 1966, 143-4; *IG* VII 1866; *BCH* 1952, 627-30; Jones 1970, 223-55 and Oliver, "Roman Senators." On Mondo, see Plassart, *Laographia* 7 (1923): 184-5; J. H. Oliver, "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 11.1 (1942): 29-90, esp. 71-4; Roesch, *Études béotiennes*, 178-82, no. 28). Also, a copy of Diocletian's Price Edict (301 CE), copies of which have also been found at Thebes, Plataiai, and Lebadeia was preserved also from Thespiai, attesting to the city's continuous economic status and commercial importance (see Fossey, *Topography and Population*, 448).

the plain between Thebes and Mt. Helikon and on the right bank of the Thespios river (modern Kanavari).[258] Rising above the ancient city are the twin hills on which the modern villages of Thespies (formerly Erimokastro) and Leondari (formerly Kaskaveli) lay. According to nineteenth century travelers, travelling on a mule and on foot, the ancient city was two and one-half hours southwest of the modern town of Thebes and about one hour southeast from the slopes of Mt. Helikon and the sanctuary of the Muses.[259] From the vicinity of Thespiai, Varro calls Mt. Helikon "*Thespia rupes*" (*Ling*. 7.2) while the Muses are called Thespiades and Helikoniades (Lucr. 3.1050).

Thespiai in Mythology

In one myth, Thespiai received its name from the daughter of Asopos, Thespia, and according to another tradition, from Thespios, the son of the early

---

[258]On the geographic features of Boiotia, see Plin. *NH* 4.25-36; J. M. Fossey, *Papers of Boiotian Topography and History* (Amsterdam, 1990), 3-11; *idem*, *Topography and Population of Ancient Boiotia*, Vols. 2 (Chicago, 1988), 3-12. On Thespiai, Thespike, and the port of Siphai, see Fossey, *Topography and Population*, 134-76; J. Bintliff, "Pattern and Process in the City Landscapes of Boeotia from Geometric to Late Roman Times," in *Territoires des cités grecques, BCH* Suppl. 34, ed. Michèle Brunet (1999): 15-33; N. Παπαχατζής, *Παυσανίου Ἑλλάδος Περιήγησις. V. Βοιωτικὰ καὶ Φωκικά*, 2nd ed. (Athens, 1981), provides some pictures and maps of the areas under discussion; P. Roesch, "Thespiai, Boiotia, Greece," in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*, eds. R. Stillwell, W. L. MacDonald & M. H. McAllister (Princeton, 1976), 911-2.; M. H. McAllister, "Kreusa (Livadhostro), Boiotia, Greece," in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*, eds. R. Stillwell, W. L. MacDonald & M. H. McAllister (Princeton, 1976), 470.

[259]W. M. Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece*, 4 vols. (London, 1835), 478-485, probably traveling on foot and on a donkey or mule.

Athenian king Erechtheos (Paus. 9.26.4).[260] The latter story, in addition to providing an etiology for the city's name, points to the mixed ethnic roots of the Thespians and might explain their special relationship with Athens during the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars.

According to Pausanias (9.29.2) and Strabo (9.410), the Thespians were not of the same racial stock as the Thebans but were descended from the Thracians who reportedly founded Larissa in Thessaly and then moved to the area of Mt. Helikon. Pausanias' and Strabo's accounts may provide a rationalization of the hostility between the Thespians and Thebans. It is important to point out that, unlike the Athenians who prided themselves on their autochthonous birth, the Boiotians (Thespians included) traced their descent from a mix of peoples, such as Ionians, Dorians, and Thracians. For example, Thespios or Thestios (an Athenian/Ionian) was the king also, who entertained Herakles (a Dorian) when the latter was hunting the lion on Mt. Kithairon, for fifty nights. According to this tradition, Herakles slept with all but one of the daughters of Thespios and fathered some 49, 50, or 52 sons known as the Thespiadai (or Heraklidai). Similarly, in nearby Thebes, Pausanias relates that the local peoples (the Aiones)

---

[260]T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Artistic and Literary Sources* (Baltimore, 1993), 379; Schachter, "Cult Patterns in Boeotia," 22-28. The virgin daughter of Thespios became Herakles' priestess for life, and provides an etiology for the cult's virgin priestess who served for life. According to one version of the story, Herakles' friend Iolaos settled forty of the Thespiadai in Sardinia. Of the remaining nine, two went to Thebes and seven remained at Thespiai, where they were called δημοῦχοι, protectors or possessors of the land (Diod. Sic. 4.29.4).

united with their foreign invaders in marriage (ἀναμιχθῆναι) when the founder of Thebes, the Phoenician Kadmos, marched into Boiotia (5.1-2). Later, Kadmos took as his wife the daughter of Aphrodite and Ares, Harmonia, and the Muses sang at their wedding (Paus. 12.7). In both of these Boiotian myths, the foreign element, which is sometimes more powerful than the local element, is allowed to mix with the indigenous peoples in a sexual union or in marriage. In his construction of the *Erotikos*, Plutarch, a Boiotian and a citizen of Rome (a city that also prided itself on its mixed racial stock), operates within the same tradition and tells a story of initial discord, intermixing, and ultimate union and harmony between Bacchon and Ismenodora, between *xenoi*, friends and strangers, and between Greeks and Romans.

The Sources

Pausanias and Plutarch on Thespiai

Pausanias reports that there were still many temples and important sites at Thespiai in the second century CE, which confirms that the city was and had been one of the important cities of Boiotia especially in the imperial period (9.26.4-27.5). There was a bronze statue of Zeus Eleutherios (the Savior) in the city and near it a statue of Tyche and Dionysos. Elsewhere one could see statues of Hygeia, Athena Ergane (Worker) and Pluto standing beside her. In another

part of the city, there were statues of Eros (see below, Erotideia) and near them the marble statues of Aphrodite and Phryne by Praxiteles. Elsewhere was the temple of Aphrodite Melainis (the Black), a theater, and the agora, in which the bronze statue of Hesiod stood. Not far from the agora was a bronze statue of Nike and a small temple to the Muses. Finally, there was also a temple of Herakles, whose priestess remained a virgin for life (Paus. 9.26.5). Additionally, the *Erotikos* reveals that there was more than one theater at Thespiai (749C, διὰ τῶν θεάτρων), at least two *gymnasia*, which could include a *palaistra* (749C and 750A, ἐν ταῖς παλαίστραις), and that one had to walk through the *agora* to the precinct of Eros (771D, ἡγεῖσθαι δι' ἀγορᾶς πρὸς τὸν θεόν).

The excavations

Today, the literary testimonies of ancient authors and a lonely marble block marking a crossroad in the plain are all that survive from the buildings and monuments of the ancient city. The French "excavations" of P. Jamot and his team destroyed the Late Roman/Byzantine wall (Kastro), which was still standing in 1888-1991, to facilitate the harvesting of the large number of inscriptions that it was holding. Jamot abandoned the French excavations in the area of Thespiai and of the nearby sanctuary of the Muses in favor of the

sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi.[261] In the 1960s and 1980s interest in the area returned with the surveys of Fossey and the Cambridge/Bradford Boiotian Expedition under the direction of Snodgrass and Bintliff respectively.[262] Bintliff has continued the efforts to survey the area in recent years under the auspices of The Leiden-Ljubljana Ancient Cities of Boiotia Project.

The approximate line of the late Roman/Byzantine wall was discovered in the 1960s but it, along with the extent of the late Roman and Byzantine settlement at Thespiai, was retraced in 2006.[263] The small temple of the Muses (16.80 x 35.60m), which Pausanias mentions, has been located within the Kastro area along with a fifth century BCE peripteral temple to Apollo two miles southwest from the Kastro. The *polyandreion* (common tomb) and its lion have been thoroughly excavated as well.[264] In 2006, the theater was discovered as

---

[261]For a history of the French excavations, see C. Müeller, "Les recherches française à Thespies et au Val des Muses," in *La Montagne des Muses*. Recherches et Rencontres, vol. 7, eds. A. Hurst and A. Schachter (Geneve, 1996), 171-184; Fossey, *Topography and Population*, 135-40, with bibliography.

[262]For a summary of these investigations and their problematic nature, see Fossey, *Topography and Population*, 401-7. The most recent summary of the 2007 activities and survey results of the Leiden-Ljubljana Boiotia Project can be found in J. Bintliff and B. Slapšak, "The Leiden-Ljubljana Ancient Cities of Boiotia Project 2007," *Teiresias* 37.2 (2007): 2-24.

[263] Fossey, *Topography and Population*, 525, and Bintliff and Slapšak, "The Leiden-Ljubljana Boiotia Project," 11.

[264]The famous lion of Chaironeia was modeled on the lion at Thespiai. On the excavations of the Thespian *polyandreion* see D. U. Schilardi, *The Thespian Poliandrion (424 B.C.): The Excavations and Finds from a Thespian State Burial*, vols. 3 (Ph.D. diss., Princeton, 1977).

well.[265] Archaeological interest in the site of Thespiai led to the surveying of the area around the modern village in the 1980s and 1990s but failed to identify a city core; therefore, any hope for further excavation of the site has been abandoned, but thankfully surveying continues.[266] Sporadic finds and a large number of inscriptions from the plain and adjacent villages have been collected over the years and are now stored at the museum in Thebes, in a storage facility at the village of Thespies, and at the National and Epigraphical museums in Athens. Some 1400 inscriptions found at Thespiai have been published, albeit hastily at times, and are extremely valuable for the history of the city and its territory. Their systematic study, however, is encumbered by the number and diversity of French, Greek and English publications in which new inscriptions and editions of old ones have appeared. A revised edition of *IG* VII and a systematic corpus of Thespian inscriptions is lacking at this time to make a comprehensive study possible.[267] Additionally, the chronology of Thespian inscriptions is highly problematic since it is often based on the shape of letters and on the presence (or absence) of Greek and Roman nomenclature. Even good epigraphists can err in

[265]Bintliff and Slapšak, "The Leiden-Ljubljana Boiotia Project," 11.

[266]I would like to thank the ephor, Vasilis Aravantinos, who provided this information during one of my visits to the Museum at Thebes in spring 2004.

[267]Paul Roesch's *Les Inscriptions de Thespies* was published online last spring, but not in time for me to make use of it in this dissertation.

their estimates by decades and even centuries, when dating an inscription by lettering style.[268]

In spite of the difficulties posed by the sources, however, it is possible to attempt an impressionistic history of the city for the late Hellenistic and Roman periods, through the reign of Hadrian (117-138 CE). This reconstruction of Thespian history will be useful to anyone interested in Boiotian and Greek history under the early empire.

Thespiai in History

From the Neolithic through the Classical Period (a summary)[269]

Neolithic finds suggest that the area was inhabited early. The city's name appears for the first time along with other Boiotian cities in Homer's "Catalog of Ships" (*Il*. 2.498). Early on, Boiotian cities were involved in the colonization of Aiolis in Asia Minor, Propontis and the areas around the Black Sea, and southern

[268]It is possible to study and date an inscription by lettering style but "only if a large, well-preserved sample of lettering" exists from an established period in a polis, as has been argued by S. V. Tracy, "Hands in Greek Epigraphy –Demetrios of Phaleron," *Boeotia Antiqua* 4 (1994): 151-61, and *idem*, *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 68 BC* (Berkeley, 1990).

[269]Since most published manuscripts and articles dealing with Thespiai cover these periods, I only provide a summary of their history here. For a history of Boiotia and its confederacy in the classical and Hellenistic periods, see R. J. Buck, *History of Boeotia* (Edmonton, Alberta, 1979), *idem*, *Boiotia and the Boiotian League 423-371 B.C.* (Edmonton, Alberta, 1994); P. Roesch, *Thespies et la Confédération Béotienne* (Paris, 1965); *idem*, *Études béotiennes*; *OCD*[3] *s.v.* Boeotia and Boeotian Confederacy.

Italy.[270] According to Schachter, Thespiai was founded twice; once in the early Archaic period and again after the defeat of the Persians at nearby Plataiai (479 BCE).[271] The first foundation included inhabitants of Southern Boiotia, immigrants of Northern Thessaly and of Kyme in Aiolis. The Boiotian artistic and architectural conservatism and independence from Athenian and Korinthian influence in the Archaic period as well as the slow rise in Boiotian population in the Classical period, gave Boiotia (Thespiai included) its notoriety as a remote, isolated and backwards area.[272] The second foundation of Thespiai was helped by the Athenians, Korinthians and Spartans after the Persian wars. The Thespians associated themselves with the Spartans, and like them, they were aristocratic, did not wall their city (at least early on) and disliked manual labor.

During the Persian Wars, only Thespiai and Plataiai of the Boiotian cities did not surrender by giving "earth and water" to the Great King. In 480, seven hundred Thespians fought and died on the side of king Leonidas at Thermopylai (Hdt. 7.132, 202, 222) and for that reason, the Persian king Xerxes destroyed

---

[270]Boiotian involvement in colonization might include the cities of Metapontion in Southern Italy, Lesbos, Troy, Byzantion, Parion, Astakos, Kalkedon, Kieros, Herakleia, Krenides, Kabeira, Messembria, Kallatis and Khersonesos; J. M. Fossey, "Boiotia and the Pontic Cities in the Archaic and Hellenistic Periods," *Boeotia Antiqua* 4 (1994): 107-15.

[271]A. Schachter, "Reconstructing Thespiai," in *La Montagne des Muses*. *Recherches et Rencontres* 7, eds. A. Hurst and A. Schachter (Paris, 1996), 99-126.

[272]Fossey, *Boiotian Topography and History*, 202-3.

Thespiai before moving on to Attica and Athens (Hdt. 8.50). The Thespians, however, had sought cover in the Peloponnese and, the next year, sent 1800 hoplites to Plataiai (Hdt. 9.30). After the death of Mardonios, the Thespians returned to their city and rebuilt it with the help of the Athenians. Athenian artisans, such as Polygnotos, created murals at Thespiai and local workshops were influenced by Athenian artists. The Athenian general Themistokles sent his manumitted slave Sikinos to Thespiai after the battle of Salamis, and in an attempt to recover their population losses, the Thespians gave citizenship to anyone who moved to their city after the Persian Wars. After the battle of Koroneia in 447, Thespiai joined with other Southern Boiotian cities and districts (Eutresis, Leuktra, the sanctuary of the Muses, Kreusis, Thisbe, Siphai/Tiphai and Khorsiai) to form the Boiotian League. As the leader of the Boiotian League, Thespiai controlled three important ports (Khorsiai, Kreusis and Siphai/Tiphai) on the Korinthian Gulf, which contributed to the city's enrichment at this time.

During the Peloponnesian Wars, the Boiotians supported Sparta, and the Thespians suffered many heavy losses at Delion in 424 BCE (Thuc. 4.96). Their dead were buried in a *polyandreion* at Thespiai.[273] The following year, the city's walls were again destroyed by the Thebans, who accused Thespiai of atticizing

[273]Schilardi, *The Thespian Poliandrion*.

(Thuc. 4.133). After the King's Peace in 387/6, the Spartans rebuilt the Thespian walls and the city became an independent polis again, and minted silver coins.[274]

In the first quarter of the fourth century, Thespiai continued to be under the protection and influence of Sparta. According to Plutarch, it was not a Boiotian but the Spartan king Agesilaos (c. 445-359 BCE) who was sent to Egypt for the decipherment of an old inscription found near the Boiotian town of Haliartos (577E and 578E-579A), and which inscription might have led to the establishment of the public festival of the Muses at Mt. Helikon, which was later supported by the Athenians as well (see below, Mouseia). The cult of Artemis Agrotera at Thespiai may have had Spartan origin as well, while the cult of Aphrodite Melainis and that of the Korinthian *hetaira* Lais may have been imported from Korinth.[275]

After 379, Thespiai was a mainstay for the Spartans again in their fight against Thebes, and Spartan personnel was stationed in the city and the area beyond. As a result, hostility between the Thespians and Thebans continued. Right before the battle of Leuktra in 371 BCE, Epaminondas and the Thebans destroyed the walls once again, took control of the city and forced the democratic element of Thespiai to go to Athens, as they had done before in 414 (Thuc.

---

[274]Fossey, *Topography and Population*, 164-7.

[275]Schachter, "Reconstructing Thespiai," 116-7.

6.95).[276] After Leuktra, Thespiai lost its say in the Boiotian League until 362. Finally, after Khaironeia in 338 and the rise of Macedonia, Thespiai became one of the independent cities of Boiotia again and a member of the Boiotian Confederacy, and joined forces with Alexander in the destruction of Thebes in 335 BCE.

The Late Hellenistic Period and the Arrival of the Romans

During the Hellenistic period, Thespiai was not a leading polis. Both Cicero (Cic. *Verr*. 4.4) and Strabo (9.410) write that there was nothing else in the city to see but the statue of Eros by Praxiteles. The nearby sanctuary of the Muses, however, which was under Thespian administration, enjoyed the support of the Attalids of Pergamum and of the Ptolemies of Egypt (see below, Sanctuary of the Muses). The third son of king Attalos I, Philetairos, for example, provided the sanctuary with a perpetual grant of land, which might have been administered by the society of the *synthytai Philitereieis*.[277]

---

[276]See also C. J. Tuplin, "The Fate of Thespiae during the Theban Hegemony," *Athenaeum* 64 (1986): 321-41, who argues that the Thespians were forced to live in the *chora* or countryside during the events of 371 BCE but that there was an expulsion of the democratic elements from Boiotia to Athens after the battle at Leuktra.

[277]*IG* VII 1788-1790 on the gifts by Philetairos; *OGIS* 311; P. Foucart, "Donation de Philéteros aux Muses de l'Helicon," *BCH* 8 (1884): 158-60; *idem*, "Inscriptions de Béotie," *BCH* 9 (1885): 405, no. 16; Α. Δ. Κεραμόπουλλος, "Ἐπιγραφαὶ Θεσπιῶν," *AD* (1931-2): 32-3; W. Peek, "Hesiod und der Helikon," *Philologus* 121 (1977): 173-5, argues that *IG* VII 1785 (no longer extant) refers to the revenue producing property which belonged to the *synthytai* (a collegium of fellow-

In 197, after the defeat of the Macedonian king Philip V by T. Quinctius Flaminius at Kynokephalai, Greece came under the influence of the Romans and during the war against Antiochos III in 193/190 BCE, the Romans used the Thespian fortified port of Kreusis as a stronghold. In theory, Greece was free and autonomous after Kynokephalai, but Rome did mix in Greek political affairs and in 188 and 166 BCE, the Romans were the ones to define "what was just for the Lacedaimonians and for the Achaians." After the last Macedonian War and Perseus' defeat at Pydna in 168, Macedonia became a Roman province and in 151 Rome was already setting the "proper behavior" of the Oropians in Northeastern Boiotia towards the Athenians as well. During the war, the Thespians had sided with the Romans in 172/1 BCE and accepted the terms of Q. Marcius Philippus (Polyb. 27. 1).

In 146, Boiotia and, possibly, Thespiai took part in the Achaian uprising; the Roman general C. Caecilius Metellus came to Greece, occupied Thebes and defeated Kritolaos and his Theban and Euboian allies.[278] His successor, L. Mummius was assigned the task by the Roman Senate of bringing the fighting among the Greeks to an end and of putting down the revolt of the Achaian Confederacy, known as the "Achaian War" (146/5 BCE). He was successful.

---

sacrificers) of the Muses; cf. G. Shipley, *The Greek World After Alexander 323-30 BC* (New York: 2000), 163, on the relationship of the collegium with the ruler-cult of the Attalids.

[278]P. Wallace, "Boiotia in the time of Strabo," *Teiresias* Suppl. 1 (1972): 71-5, and fig. 5.

Following the destruction of Korinth in 146, Mummius broke up the Boiotian League and ordered the Boiotians and Euboians to pay one-hundred talents to Herakleia, against which they had been fighting. He also ordered that an additional tax be paid by all cities that had fought in the "Achaian War." After dissolving any democratic governments, Mummius established timocratic ones everywhere. According to Polybius, many statues and paintings from Korinth and Acarnania were sent to Rome at this time (39.3) and Dio Chrysostom reports that Mummius took a statue from Thespiai and put on it the name of a Roman while on the statues of young men, Mummius inscribed the names of Nestor and Priam. If we are to judge the position Thespiai took during the Achaian War from the actions of Mummius towards the city's monuments, we can assume that Thespiai chose the losing side in this affair. With Mummius in 145, Greece officially lost its independence.

Having already suffered the earlier wars of the Hellenistic period, Thespiai was the only Boiotian city not to side with Mithridates VI and his general Archelaos of Sinope (or of Amisus) during the Mithridatic wars of 88-85 BCE (App. *Mithr*. 29).[279] Because of the Thespian resistance, Archelaos besieged the city, but he had to abandon it and return to Athens when Bruttius Sura

[279] A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Foreign Policy in the East 168 B.C. to A.D. 1* (London, 1984), 132.

arrived from Rome (Plut. *Sull*. 12-25). With the arrival of Sulla and his five legions in 87 BCE, most of the Boiotian cities joined Thespiai on the Roman side and provided Sulla with much needed supplies (App. *Mithr*. 29); he went on to win the battles at Khaironeia and Orchomenos against Archelaos in 86 BCE. The Thespians made dedications to a number of Romans at this time, including Sulla.[280]

Peace lasted until the civil war between Pompey and Caesar in 48. Having been cut off from Rome, Pompey demanded troops and supplies from the cities of Boiotia before he was defeated by Caesar at Pharsalos in Thessaly in the summer of 48 BCE. The Boiotians helped Pompey with both food and manpower, and in 42 they helped the losing side of Brutus and Crassus. Finally in 31 BCE, the Boiotians supported Antony against Octavian. Plutarch's great-grandfather, Nikarhos, was among the carriers of grain from Khaironeia to Antikyra. Plutarch's grandfather told him that the soldiers of Antony were pressing the Khaironeians towards the ports with whips to carry on their shoulders the grain they had asked from them. As this was going on, however, the news of Antony's defeat at Actium arrived and the soldiers left; the grain remained in storage and was later distributed to the starving population by Octavian (Plut. *Ant*. 65).

---

[280] A. Plassart, "Inscriptions," *BCH* 50 (1926): 383-462, esp. 436 no. 72-85.

By 27 BCE, Boiotia was part of the province of Achaia, which had been formed temporarily under Caesar in 46 BCE and was re-established by Augustus in 27.[281] The province of Achaia under Augustus, which in addition to the southern and central mainland included Epirus and Thessaly, was administered by a procurator in Korinth and an itinerant proconsul (Philostr. *VA* 8.23). Thespiai had been acknowledged as *civitatem liberam et immunem* (i.e. a free city) by Caesar in 47 BCE,[282] and at first, Achaia excluded a number of free cities, such as Athens, Sparta, Delphi, Elis, Tanagra and, of course, Thespiai[283] "Freedom" meant that Thespiai was not covered by the *formula provinciae*, was outside the direct control of the Roman governor, and was, perhaps, also immune from imperial taxes.[284] Thus, Thespiai was not taxed heavily and occupied by Roman garrisons, and enjoyed local autonomy but, when necessary, it could ask the

[281]*OCD*[3] *s.v.* Achaia.

[282]Plin. *NH*. 4.7.25 calls Thespiai *liberum oppidum*. On free cities, see B. Burrell, *Neokoroi: Greek Cities and Roman Emperors* (Boston, 2004), 344; J. Deininger, *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Munich, 1965), 35, 88-91; R. Bernhardt, *Imperium und Eleutheria* (Hamburg, 1971); J. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (London, 1982), nos. 14, 16; P. Hermann, "Inschriften von Sardis," *Chiron* 23 (1993): 233-66, esp. 246.

[283]*OCD*[3] *s.v.* free cities –although it does not list Thespiai and Tanagra.

[284]Free cities embedded in Achaia included Athens, Delphi, Sparta, Thespiai and Nikopolis. See also the list in A. H. M. Jones, *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian* (Oxford, 1940), 129-30, and notes 62-63. Jones includes the following free cities in the province of Achaia: Amphissa, Ozolian Lokris, Tanagra, Abai, Elatea, and the eighteen cities of the Eleutherolakones; Trajan added Mothone in Messenia, Hadrian added Thessaly, and Antonius Pius Pallantium in Arcadia to the free cities of Achaia. Free cities elsewhere in Greece and the islands included: two cities on Crete, Corcyra, Cephallenia, Zakynthos, Aegina, Thasos, Samothrake, Apollonia on the Ionian Sea, Thessalonika, Amphipolis, Skotussa, Pharsalos, Abdera, and Ainos.

governor to look into its affairs and local disputes.[285] In spite of their "freedom", however, the cities of Achaia were dependent on Rome implicitly and were liable to Roman encroachment and sudden cancellation of their privileged status.

Thespiai and the Roman Empire (through the reign of Hadrian)

Thespiai appears to have escaped the fate of most Boiotian towns (pillage, heavy indemnities, and complete destruction), possibly because it had backed the right sides during the wars of the late Republic and more likely because of its Roman and Italian population, which would have acted to preserve their interests in the city and thus spared it from utter destruction (see below, The Roman and Italian Element).[286] Under Augustus (27 BCE-14CE), both Thespiai and Tanagra enjoyed some economic success compared to other Boiotian poleis, while other cities of Achaia and Macedonia were pressured and extorted by Roman proconsuls,[287] which was the reason that Tiberius made Achaia and Macedonia part of the imperial provinces and joined them with Moesia in 15 CE

---

[285]T. Elliott, *Epigraphic Evidence for Boundary Disputes in the Roman Empire* (PhD diss., Chapel Hill, 2004), 62.

[286]Boiotian influence in Italy, especially southern Italy, was established as early as the eighth century BCE; see D.W. Roller, "Boiotians in South Italy: Some Thoughts," *Boeotia Antiqua* 4 (1994): 63-70.

[287]Such as L. Calpurnius Piso (58/55 BCE) was (see Cic. *in Pis*. 16 and *de prov. cons*. passim). On Tanagra's "philo-Roman" history, see D. W. Roller, "Recent Investigations at Grimádha (Tanagra)," *Boeotia Antiqua* 1 (1989): 129-63, esp. 139-40.

under the command of the imperial legates of Moesia, C. Poppaeus Secundus (15-35 CE) and P. Memmius Regulus (35-41/4 CE) (Tac. *Ann*. 1.76.4 and 1.80.1).[288] Under Tiberius' reign (14-37 CE), Thespiai probably joined the Achaian League (i.e. the *koinon* of the Achaians), which included Boiotia, Korinth, Euboia, Lokris, and Phokis.[289] Achaia came under senatorial control again with certain precautions in 41 or 44 CE during the reign of Claudius (41-57 CE), (Suet. *Claud.* 25.3, 25.9; Cass. Dio 60.24.1).[290] Thespiai, probably, did not escape the famine, which was a common occurrence in Achaia, of 51/2 CE when L. Junius Gallio, the son of L. Annaeus Seneca, was proconsul in Korinth under Claudius (Tac. *Ann*. 12.43.1; Suet. *Claud*. 18.2).[291]

During his tour of Greece in 66/67 CE, Nero (54-68 CE), accompanied by his third wife Statilia Messalina, gave *libertas* or freedom and immunity from taxes to the Greek cities of Achaia on November 28, 66 CE (*IG* VII 2712; Plut.

---

[288]J. H. Oliver, "Imperial Commissioners," 309; Wiseman, "Corinth and Rome," 503.

[289]B. Levick, "Greece and Asia Minor," *CAH*[2] (Cambridge, 2000) 604-34, esp. 605; Wiseman, 500. For the *koinon* and its date, see J. H. Oliver, "Panachaeans and Panhellenes," *Hesperia* 47.2 (1978): 185-91, esp. 187-9.

[290]D. Geagan, "Roman Athens: Some Aspects of Life and Culture I. 86 B.C. – A.D. 267," *ANRW* II.7.1 (1979): 371-437, esp. 379; Oliver, "Imperial Commissioners in Achaia," 390.

[291]See also Wiseman, "Corinth and Rome," 505n.260. L. Junius Gallio was the adopted son of Junius Gallio, but the natural son to the orator Seneca and brother to the philosopher.

Flam. 12.8; Suet. *Ner.* 24.2).[292] Soon after his accession in 69/70 CE, however, Vespasian, alleging civic disturbances but more likely prompted by financial reasons and pressures, revoked Nero's grant of freedom and reconstituted the province of Achaia (Suet. *Vesp*. 8.4; Paus. 7.17. 3-4; Philostr. *VA* 5.41). Vespasian also withdrew the right of civic coinage, and no coins were issued in Achaia during his reign (69-79 CE) or during the reign of his successor, Titus (79-81 CE). It is not known whether Thespiai remained a free city after Vespasian's reconstitution.[293] I am inclined to suppose that Thespiai soon recovered its free status, since it is described as *liberum oppidum* by Pliny (*NH*. 4.7.25) and was one of the few cities in Boiotia that had the right to mint imperial coins under Domitian.[294]

Under Domitian (81-96 CE) the cities that were given permission to produce coins were Korinth (a Roman colony and the principal mint in the province), Patras (another Roman colony), the Aegean island of Syros, the cities

---

[292]Oliver, *Greek Constitutions*, 572-5 no. 296; A. Burnett, M. Amandry, and P.P. Ripollès, *Roman Provincial Coinage, Vol. II.1: From Vespasian to Domitian (AD 69-96)* (London and Paris, 1999), 55.

[293]After Vespasian's repeal, Delphi, for example, remained free and autonomous.

[294]Thespiai's earliest issues of coins were concentrated in the fourth century BCE. After 146 BCE and in the early first century CE, Thespiai was allowed to mint bronze provincial coins like other cities. Under Domitian, however, Thespiai is given the privilege of minting imperial coins, and it is only under his reign that imperial issues from Thespiai survive.

of the Thessalian League (Demetrias and Larissa) and Thespiai.[295] The Thespian imperial coins are of small denominations (1/2 and ¼ assarion), while the main design on the reverse is that of Apollo Kitharoidos (Apollo the *kithaira* player).[296] On one of them (*RPC II*, no. 274), Domitian is portrayed with a radiate head and is likened to Helios on the obverse, while a seated Apollo with plectrum and lyre appears on the reverse. Seven out of the nine surviving imperial coins portray a female figure sometimes standing next to a child (nos. 268-269) or above an altar (nos. 270-271) holding a cornucopia (no. 267) or a *patera* (nos. 267, 270). The iconography of Thespian coinage and its symbolism have not been studied.

Under the Flavians (69-96 CE), prosperity continued to have a narrow base and reached only a few cities, mainly Korinth, where building activity increased after the earthquake in 77 CE[297] till the end of Hadrian's reign, Patras and Nikopolis (all three were Roman colonies), Athens (the banking center of Greece), Sparta (which achieved particular wealth during the Principate), and Thespiai.[298] It is evident that Hadrian (117-38 CE) became especially interested in

---

[295] A. Burnett, M. Amandry, and P.P. Ripollès, 22-3.

[296] *Id*. 66-7, nos. 266-274 and pl. 13; it is not certain, however, that all the designs depict Apollo.

[297] Wiseman, "Corinth and Rome," 506n.265.

[298] B. Levick, "Greece and Asia Minor," *CAH*[2] (Cambridge, 2000), 609, also argues that "the entry of men into legions and advancement in the procuratorial service and the Senate suggests that it [=prosperity] was more thinly spread."

the affairs of Greece in general and Boiotia in particular.[299] He is known to have visited nearby Delphi and Koroneia c. 110/111 CE,[300] while Mt. Helikon was visited sometime c. 121-125 CE during the emperor's first provincial tour. While there, Hadrian hunted a she-bear on the mountain[301] and dedicated the bear's "best part" (or head) along with the following hendecasyllabic poem, which he composed, to the god Eros (*IG* VII 1828; now in storage at the Epigraphical Museum in Athens):

ὦ παῖ τοξότα Κύπριδος λιγείης
Θεσπιαῖς Ἑλικωνίαισι ναίων
ναρκισσοῦ παρὰ κῆπον ἀνθέοντα,
ἱλήκοις· τὸ δέ τοι δίδωσι δέξο
ἀκροθείνιον Ἁδριανὸς ἄρκτου,
ἣν αὐτὸς κάνεν ἱππόθεν τυχήσας.
σὺ δ' αὐτῷ χάριν ἀντὶ τοῦ σαόφρων
πνέοις Οὐρανίας ἀπ' Ἀφροδίτης.

Child, archer of melodious Cypris,
You who live at Helikonian Thespiai

[299]Hadrian is known to have also contributed to the efforts of stopping the flooding of Lake Kopais in Boiotia and to have met the Hellenes at Plataia (Levick *CAH*[2], 621). Also, he went to Thebes in 125 CE and funded the building of the Oidipodian spring [S. Symeonoglou, *The Topography of Thebes from the Bronze Age to Modern Times* (Princeton, 1985), 151; Α. Δ. Κεραμόπουλλος, "Θηβαϊκά," *AD* 3 (1917): 1-503, esp 398]. While Plutarch was the incumbent priest and secretary at Delphi, the Delphic Amphictyony passed a decree in Hadrian's honor for his efforts there (*SEG* 32, 460-3).

[300]Birley, *Hadrian: The Restless Emperor*, 64; Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, 26 and 43; but S. Swain, "Plutarch, Hadrian, and Delphi," *Historia* 40 (1991): 318-30, esp. 323-4 argues against any imperial visits by Hadrian to Delphi before 125 CE. Hadrian is known to have visited Korinth in 126 and/or 128/9, according to Wiseman, "Corinth and Rome," 507.

[301]Birley, *Hadrian: The Restless Emperor*, 184-5, estimates the visit to have taken place in the spring of 125.

Near the blooming garden of Narcissus
Be gracious; and accept that which
Hadrian gives you, the head of the bear,
Which he himself slew from his horse.
But you, wise child, may you send forth to him in return
the grace of Ouranian Aphrodite.[302]

Robert argued that the spoils dedicated to Eros at Thespiai were from Hadrian's hunt in Mysia during his Asian tour in 123/124 CE, at which time it is likely that Hadrian encountered his favorite, Antinoos, and that that encounter was the reason for the emperor to dedicate the symbols of his successful hunt to Eros.[303] Additionally, Flacelière estimates that Plutarch died c. 127 CE and that the *Erotikos* was written towards the end of Plutarch's life.[304] Accepting Flacelière and Robert, we may suppose that the *Erotikos* was written in view of Hadrian's hunt. Whatever the date for the hunt on Mt. Helikon may be, however, a visit to nearby Thespiai by Hadrian at the same time would have also been possible.

Under Hadrian's reign Thespiai would have been one of the cities of the Hellenic League attested on a late first century inscription (*IG* VII 2509: Tò

[302]All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

[303]L. Robert, "Documents d'Asie Mineure, V-XVII,"*BCH* 102 (1978): 395-543, esp. 440-1.

[304]On date of death: Flacelière, "Hadrien et Delphes," *CRAI* (1971): 168-185. On the date of composition: Flacelière, *Dialogue sur l'amour,* 7-11

κοινὸν συνέδριον τῶν Ἑλλήνων τῶν εἰς Πλατήας | συνιόντων…)[305] and in Plutarch (*Arist.* 19.7: νῦν ἔτι τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἐν Πλαταιαῖς ἀθροίζεται συνέδριον). Hadrian met with the Hellenes at Plataiai around 125 CE (before his return to Rome that summer) and, surely, representatives from Thespiai were also present at the meeting.[306] The Hellenic League that met at Plataiai dedicated a statue to Hadrian at Delphi, which the emperor also visited on his way to Rome (*Syll.*[3] 835A: Αὐτοκράτορι Ἁδριανῷ σωτῆρι, ῥυσαμένῳ | καὶ θρεψάντι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ Ἑλλάδα, οἱ ἰς | Πλαταιὰς συνιόντες Ἕλληνες χαριστήριον | ἀνέθηκαν).

Finally, 125 CE is also the year that Hadrian sent P. Pactumeius Clemens, a young senator from Cirta in Numidia, to Greece as his representative (*legatus*) to settle some kind of difference or dispute on behalf of Athens, Plataiai, Thespiai and Thessaly, which might have been brought to the emperor's attention during the meeting of the Hellenic League at Plataiai.[307] The Thespians honored Hadrian as their founder and benefactor after he acquired the title Hadrianus

---

[305]*IG* VII 2509 dates to the priesthood of "Ti. Claudius Atticus Marathonius," the father of the famous Herodes Atticus the sophist (cf. *IOlymp.* 359=Ameling II, no. 124).

[306]G. Thériault, *Le culte d'homonoia dans les cités grecques* (Lyon and Quebec, 1996), 125.

[307] legato divi/ Hadriani Athenis Thespiis Plataeis item in Thessalia… (*CIL* VIII 7059=*ILS* 1067; *ILAlg*. II, 645 at Cirta, Numidia; Guerber 1997, 218). For the *legati* and the commissioners that were sent to free cities to settle differences in the faction-ridden world of local Greek politics, see Oliver, "Imperial Commissioners in Achaia;" *CAH*[2], 278-86. L. Aemilius Iuncus (cos. 127) was another such official sent to Athens, Sparta and Delphi by Hadrian in 134/5 (*Hesperia* 36 [1967]: 42-56; *SEG* 48.592).

Augustus or Σεβαστός (*IG* VII 1841, dated after 123 CE: Αὐτοκράτορα Τραϊανὸν Ἁδριανὸν | Καίσαρα Σεβαστόν, τὸν εὐεργέτην | καὶ κτίστην, ἡ πόλις τῶν Θεσπιέων | θεοῖς).[308] The literal meaning of κτίστης is "city-founder," and although the term was often used as an inflated equivalent of εὐεργέτης or "benefactor," it would be a redundancy to do so on this particular inscription.[309] It is possible that the Thespians were honoring Hadrian in gratitude for the role he played in bringing to a successful end the aforementioned dispute or in hopes for imperial favor in the same case. Whatever the reasons for the dedication, Hadrian must have provided also funds for a building program at Thespiai for which he was acknowledged at this time as the city's benefactor. Furthermore, a plethora of honorific inscriptions to Hadrian in the Greek East were due to the establishment of the Attic Panhellenion (or the league of all Greek cities) in 131/2 CE, and which, undoubtedly, Thespiai would have joined.[310] With Hadrian and

---

[308] The Plataians referred to Hadrian as founder (κτίστης) as well: A.D. Keramopoulos, *AE* (1934-5) *Chronika*, 15, no. 180: Αὐτοκράτορα Τραϊανὸν Ἁδριανὸν, Ὀλύμπιον, | ἡ πόλις ἡ Πλαταιέων τὸν κτίστην. *Olympios* is an epithet given to Hadrian from the year 129 CE onwards; see Birley, *Hadrian: The Restless Emperor*, 220.

[309] On *ktistes* and *euergetes* as equivalents, see M. T. Boatright, *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire* (Princeton, 2000), 31; cf. A.D. Keramopoulos, *AE* (1934-5) *Chronika*, 15, no. 180, where the Plataians also refer to Hadrian as founder (κτίστης): Αὐτοκράτορα Τραϊανὸν Ἁδριανὸν, Ὀλύμπιον, | ἡ πόλις ἡ Πλαταιέων τὸν κτίστην; and *IG* VII 1840, also from Thespiai, Hadrian is called savior and founder of the world (Αὐτοκράτορι | Καίσαρι Τραϊανῷ Ἁδριανῶ[ι] | Σεβαστῷ | σωτῆρι καὶ κτίστη[ι] | τῆς οἰκουμένης).

[310] On the Panhellenion, see Oliver, "Panachaeans and Panhellenes," 185-91; C. P. Jones, "The Panhellenion," *Chiron* 26 (1996): 29-56 with earlier bibliography.

the Pax Romana well established, Thespiai flourished with relative order, prosperity, and concord.

Thus far I have provided a narrative of the history of Thespiai and its incorporation into the Roman Empire, but it is important to consider also the economic and cultural pre-conditions that affected the territory especially during the late Hellenistic period and which contributed to the city's prosperity under the Empire. Such an assessment provides a much more complex account of the impact of Roman conquest on the city and its territories. What follows, therefore, is an account of the demographic and economic conditions of Thespiai in the late Hellenistic and early Roman period.

Population: The Question of *Oliganthropia*

The poverty and smallness of the Boiotian cities during the Roman period is described by a number of ancient authors, including Plutarch who complains that all of Greece could no longer put into the field the 3000 hoplites (or ex-ephebes) that Megara alone had provided against the Persians in the late fifth

century (*Mor*. 414A) and that even the Delphic oracle saw much less business compared to the past (*Mor*. 413F-414C). Some scholars dismiss the testimonies provided by Greek and Roman writers, such as Plutarch (*Mor*. 413F-414C), Strabo (9.403 on the desolation of Thebes, and 9.410 on Thespiai and Tanagra still standing), Polybius (36.17.5-9 on the lack of men), and Dio Chrysostom (*Or*. 7) as literary *topoi*.[311] It is true that Plutarch, Dio Chrysostom and the other representatives of the so-called Second Sophistic appear to have an "obsession" with Greece's glorious past and the "golden olden days" as compared to its (defeated and dependent) present. This "obsession" can be explained as nostalgia for the glorious days of the past, when the Greek poleis were independent, and for members of a conquered population, such a perspective is perhaps to be expected. It is also true that any political and military decline might be expressed by these ancient authors as "lack of citizen-men" or *oliganthropia*; from their perspective perhaps a conquered Greece would automatically become "depopulated". Such an assessment by ancient authors, however, is to be expected since there is a direct correlation between manpower and political strength in ancient societies. Polybius' or Plutarch's statement on the lack of hoplites and manpower should be understood with that correlation in

[311] S. E. Alcock, "The Roman Territory of Greek Cities," in *Territoires des cités grecques, BCH* Suppl. 34, ed. Michèle Brunet (1999): 167-73, esp. 168.

mind.[312] Certainly, the fact that Thespiai had a large and prosperous population in the fifth and fourth centuries allowed it to participate in the Persian and the Peloponnesian Wars. The heavy loses Thespiai suffered at Delion in 424 BCE, for example, reflect the weak state of the city, and can explain the destruction of its walls by the Thebans and the city's dependency on Thebes for more than three decades after that.[313] The same, however, can be said to be true of the Greek poleis' dependence on Rome in the late Hellenistic and early imperial period. *Oliganthropia* can be detrimental to a polis' means of military, economic and political survival and must not, therefore, be dismissed as a "literary *topos*."

Even when a certain degree of bias and exaggeration is expected and acknowledged from the representatives of a conquered peoples (such as Plutarch, Dio or Pausanias) when describing the state of affairs in Greece compared to the "the golden days" of the past (i.e. to the classical period), archaeological evidence supplements the literary record and substantiates the sentiments and complains of the ancient authors.[314] Intensive archaeological

---

[312]Fossey, *Topography and Population*, 480-1; *idem*, *Boiotian Topography and History*, 202-3. The Boiotian population reached its zenith in the fourth century BCE, a fact which coincides with the Boeotian hegemony of Greece for a short period of time. Compare, also, Sparta in the late Hellenistic and Roman periods provides a patent example of the problems a society can face when there is a lack of men.

[313]It is after the King's Peace (387/6 BCE) that Thespiai mints coins and is an independent polis again.

[314]Fossey, *Topography and Population*, 446, for a summary; J. Bintliff and A. Snodgrass, "From Polis to Chorion in South-West Boeotia," in *Boiotika. Vorträge vom 5. Internationalen*

surveys confirm that sites, not only in Boiotia but throughout Greece, show shrinkage in the area they occupied or even completely disappeared by the early imperial period.[315] What emerges from these numbers is an undeniable picture of social and economic decline in many –if not most— parts of Greece by Augustus' reign and the time of Roman supremacy.[316] In Southwestern Boiotia in particular, there was a 21.6% reduction of sites in the Hellenistic period and 32.8% in the imperial period; that is to say a total reduction of 47.3% of sites compared to the Classical period.[317] The city shrank from 100 hectares in the Classical period to 40 hectares in the Late Hellenistic, a dramatic change over time.[318] Furthermore, the rural settlements of Thespiai exhibited a severe

---

Böotien-Kolloquium zu Ehren von Professor Dr. Siegfried Lauffer, Institut für Alte Geschichte, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München, 13-17. Juni 1986, eds. Hartmut B., et al. (Munich, 1989), 285-299, and fig. 34-62: this article (esp. 288ff) examines the sites of Thespiai, Haliartos, and Askra; J. L. Bintliff and A.M. Snodgrass, "Mediterranean survey and the city," *Antiquity* 62 (1988): 57-71; J. L. Bintliff and A.M. Snodgrass, "The Cambridge/Bradford Boeotian Expedition: The First Four Years," *JFA* 12.2 (1985): 123-61.

[315] Strabo, writing under Augustus, was in Corinth two years after Actium in 29 BCE and describes the cities of Boiotia as hamlets or ruins but for Thespiai and Tanagra; see also P. Wallace, "Boiotia in the time of Strabo," *Teiresias*, Suppl. 1 (1972): 71-5. For evidence from archeological surveys see J. Bintliff, "Pattern and Process in the City Landscapes of Boeotia from Geometric to Late Roman Times," in *Territoires des cités grecques, BCH* Suppl. 34, ed. Michèle Brunet (1999): 27 and Fig. 12; S.E. Alcock, "Archaeology and Imperialism: Roman Expansion and the Greek City," *JMedA* 2 (1989): 87-135, provides evidence from a variety of sites that have been surveyed from all parts of Greece; Fossey, *Topography and Population*, 440-50, on the reduction of sites during the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

[316] J. Bintliff, "Pattern and Process," 28, and n.21.

[317]Fossey, *Topography and Population*, 441 for the statistical breakdown, and 480-1 for its correlation to population numbers.

[318]Bintliff and Slapšak, "The Leiden-Ljubljana Boiotia Project," 11.

contraction of population between 200 BCE and 300 CE compared to the earlier period. By 300 CE, the urban center of Thespiai was concentrated in the sector enclosed by the late Roman/Byzantine wall (Kastro) and immediately to the east of that wall.[319]

By the time of Augustus and the early empire, the Boiotian poleis had buckled under the strains of power struggles and the demands for men, food, supplies and equipment. One is not to imagine, of course, a catastrophic population loss, but a degree of demographic decline is to be expected due to war, soil exhaustion, famine, disease and ancient birth and mortality rates that created a relapse for Boiotia's political, military and economic activity in the late Hellenistic period. A degree of population shift and decline, combined with the political changes Roman occupation brought, set the stage for further changes in the economic and social sectors. It is important, therefore, to take into account the pre-existing conditions of the late Hellenistic period at Thespiai and its territory in assessing the effects of its incorporation into the Roman Empire. It is to the economic preconditions that I turn to next.

---

[319] J. Bintliff and A. Snodgrass, "From Polis to Chorion in South-West Boeotia," in *Boiotika. Vorträge vom 5. Internationalen Böotien-Kolloquium zu Ehren von Professor Dr. Siegfried Lauffer, Institut für Alte Geschichte, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München, 13-17. Juni 1986*, eds. Hartmut B., et al. (Munich, 1989), 288, and fig. 51.

The Thespian Economy

Economic changes (first century BCE-first century CE)

Bintliff has argued that the late Hellenistic and early Roman demographic decline observed in the survey data from Thespiai had more to do with soil exhaustion than with the impact of Roman conquest.[320] It appears that, by the late Classical period, Boiotian farmers were increasingly under pressure from overpopulation and declining crop yields that drove them to extreme measures, such as recurrent and massive agricultural manuring programs, to stave off starvation. Ultimately, these measures failed.[321] Years of wars during the Hellenistic period combined with soil exhaustion brought loss of property and poverty to the average Boiotian farmer by the last century of the same period.[322]

---

[320]J. Bintliff, "Town and Chora of Thespiae in the Imperial Age," in *Roman Rule and Civic Life: Local and Regional Perspectives. Impact of Empire, vol. 4*, eds. L. de Ligt, E.A. Hemelrijk, and H.W. Signor (Amsterdam, 2004).

[321] J. L. Bintliff, "Explorations in Boeotian Population History," *AncW* 36 (2005): 5-17; J. L. Bintliff, "Town and Chora," argues that the late Hellenistic/early Roman demographic decline had more to do with soil exhaustion than with the impact of Roman conquest; J. L. Bintliff and A. M. Snodgrass, "The Boeotian survey. A Preliminary Report: the First Four Years," *JFA* 12 (1985): 123-61.

[322] J. Bintliff, "Pattern and Process," 27-28, and fig. 12: "Rural farms of the entire period of Late Hellenistic and Early Roman times [i.e. 200 BC to 300 AD according to Bintliff] are few in number in the intensively surveyed South-Western Boiotia district. Moreover the towns suffer shrinkage (Askra, Thespiai and Hyettos) or even disappear (Haliartos destroyed and not reoccupied till medieval times)"; see also, J. Bintliff and A. M. Snodgrass, "The End of the Roman

Boiotia, like the rest of Greece, was ripe for exploitation by stronger military and financial powers from the outside. Cheap land and labor afforded new opportunities and brought an influx of wealthy Romans and Italians to the area who, in alliance with important indigenous families, created large villa-type estates.[323] As a result, these men *and women* from local and foreign aristocratic families controlled medium and large parcels of land, as well as production and trade.[324]

The position of women and the economy

With social status and economic power based upon landownership, one expects change in the position of women in the late Hellenistic period. With the series of wars, civil strife, and population decline, accumulation of landholding in the hands of elite local women and foreign families is to be expected. Such accumulation is not unusual as the case of Hellenistic Sparta has shown as well.

Countryside: A View from the East," in *First Millennium Papers: Western Europe in the First Millennium A.D., BAR International Series* 401, eds. R. F. Jones, J. H.F. Bloemers, S.L. Dyson, and M. Biddle (1988): 175-217.

[323] J. Bintliff, "Pattern and Process," 29. Villa-type structures have been found in Eutresis, Kreusis, and Siphai.

[324] On land concentration in the hands of the few aristocratic families and the creation of large estates, see S. Alcock, *Graecia Capta*, 1993; *eadem*, "Archaeology and Imperialism: Roman Expansion and the Greek City," *JMA* 2 (1989): 87-135; U. Kahrestedt, *Das Wirtschaftliche Gesicht Griechenlands in der Kaiserzeit* (Bern, 1954), 98-100, applied this theory to the area of Tanagra as well.

Women became proprietors of lands and riches and lent money to their cities and to individuals. Epigraphic evidence shows that a number of Boiotian and Thespian women owned and divested themselves of properties with which they had been endowed.[325] Nikareta of Thespiai, for example, loaned money to the nearby city of Orchomenos. At the end of the third century BCE, Nikareta's father, the Thespian Theon, negotiated a large sum of money with the Orchomenians. However, Theon died before the liquidation of the operation, and Nikareta took it up. She did not need the authorization, intervention or representation of her husband, Dexippos, in the management of her patrimony.[326] Menia, Philotis, Dorothea, Aristogitis are all Thespian women to whom patrimony was handed down.[327] Additionally, two Boiotian sisters, Kleuandra and Olympicha (*IG* VII 2610; *SEG* 22.432), heiresses of a large patrimony loaned

---

[325]On wealthy Boiotian women, see J. D. Sosin, "A Missing Woman; the Hellenistic Leases from Thespiae Revisited," *GRBS* 41 (2000): 47-58 on Menia of Thespiai; Κεραμόπουλλος, "Ἐπιγραφαὶ Θεσπιῶν," 22 on Philotis (second century BCE); H. van Effenterre, *Les Béotiens. Aux frontiers de l'Athènes antique* (Paris, 1989), 193-6; P. Roesch, "La femme et la fortune en Boétie," in *La femme dans le monde méditerranen I* (Lyon, 1985), 71-84; R. van Bremen, *The Limits of Participation: Women and Civic Life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods* (Amsterdam, 1996), 208-12.

[326]The whole process becomes clear from the inscription found at the basilica of Skripou (mod. Orchomenos) that outlines the details of the loan to the city of Orchomenos: *IG* VII 3171-3172; Roesch, *Thespies et la Confédération*, 146-52, 166-70; L. Migeotte, *L'emprunt public dans les cites grecques* (Paris, 1984), no. 13.

[327]Roesch, "La femme et la fortune," 71-84.

money to their own city in the area of Kopais, near modern Topolia.[328] The two sisters disposed of large sums of money and invested their capital without male representation.

Although the realm of politics remained out of the question for women, they could express their influence and wealth through their religious participation and city benefactions. In the second century BCE, a woman from Akraiphia, Pythis, established the society of the *heroistes* as a remembrance to her children, Epaminondas and Theokrine (*IG* VII 2725), presumably, with her own money.[329] Boiotian women appear also as dedicators of imperial statues. Caecilia Lampris of Khaironeia set up a statue of the emperor Vespasian in her hometown, while Flavia Zoila of Hyettos had her own statue, which the council of the city decreed to be set up for her virtue and the generosity she showed to her fellow citizens. What exactly this generosity included is not made clear, however. In addition to local benefactions and patronage, women could operate as mediators between their communities and the imperial center just like their male counterparts, using rank and connections to protect their client-cities. Similar dedications of and honors to women because of their patronage to their

[328]Migeotte, *L'emprunt public*, no. 15.

[329]Also Roesch, *Études béotiennes*, 136-138.

cities can be found throughout the empire.[330] Thespian elite women, such as Ismenodora in the *Erotikos*, should be included in the list of benefactors, patrons and moderators of the city. The dedication of statues of individuals, in general, and of imperial statues, in particular, required a certain level of expense that only the wealthy could undertake. Next, I will turn to the economic resources available to Thespian elites.

Thespiai and Trade

Strabo, who may have been in Boiotia after Actium, writes that Thespiai and Tanagra were still standing in his time.[331] Surveying confirms that despite the general demographic reduction of the rural areas belonging to Thespiai, the region remained relatively prosperous for over four centuries (200 BCE- 250 CE).[332] Economic resources for the people of Thespiai and Thespike (i.e. the area

[330]See E. Hemelrijk, "Patronage of Cities: The Role of Women," in *Roman Rule and Civic Life: Local and Regional Perspectives. Impact of Empire, vol. 4*, eds. L. de Ligt, E. A. Hemelrijk, H. W. Singor (Amsterdam, 2004), 415-27, on women as patrons and mediators between their cities and the imperial center.

[331]P. Wallace, "Boiotia in the time of Strabo," *Teiresias*, Suppl. I (1972): 71-5.

[332]J. Bintliff and A. Snodgrass, "From Polis to Chorion in South-West Boeotia," in *Boiotika. Vorträge vom 5. Internationalen Böotien-Kolloquium zu Ehren von Professor Dr. Siegfried Lauffer, Institut für Alte Geschichte, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München, 13-17. Juni 1986*, eds. Hartmut B., et al. (Munich, 1989), 294.

controlled by Thespiai)[333] came from agriculture (vines, grains, beets, olives), pastoralism, hunting, fishing, trade, port revenues, and income from the public property and sacred land of the sanctuaries –especially from the one to the Muses, which had the support of kings and emperors.[334] In addition to supporting the "right" sides during the wars of the late Republic, its agricultural and animal products, the revenues from the Mouseia and the Erotideia as well as the income from the leasing of sacred and public lands, Thespiai was situated on an important trade and communications route. Thespiai (like Tanagra) was unique in that it controlled not only significant land routes but vitally important ports as well. Larger landholdings, concentration of property in fewer hands, increase in pastoral activity, abandonment of marginal land, preference for nucleate living in either the urban centers of individual poleis or larger agglomerated settlements in the countryside, and rise in trade characterize the

---

[333]For the topography of Thespike, a map, and bibliography, see J. M. Fossey, *Topography and Population*, 134-65.

[334]*IG* VII 1826 (a *limenarch* suggests the collection of port revenues); *IG* VII 1828 (on hunting); Athen. 1.4d; Pollux 6.63 (on the famous beets of Askra); Paus. 9.28.1 (on the cultivated trees, probably olives, on Mt. Helicon); Arist. *Hist. Anim.* 2.13 (on a particular species of fish caught in the bay of Siphai); see also Fossey, *Topography and Population*, 165 with bibliography; Roesch, *Thespies et la Confédération*, 220-24. On the gifts of land to the city of Thespiai and the nearby sanctuary of the Muses, see *IG* VII 1786; A. Plassart, "Fouilles de Thespies et de l'hieron des Muses de l'Helicon: Inscriptions," *BCH* 50 (1926): 383-462, esp. 392; and Κεραμόπουλλος, "Ἐπιγραφαὶ Θεσπιῶν," 15-18 on donations of land to be leased to the sanctuary of Hermes at Thespiai, and Ptolemy IV Philopator provided money for the Thespians to buy land for the sanctuary of the Muses and, thus, to increase its income. On the economic sources of Boiotian cities in general, see L. Migeotte, "Resources financiers des cites béotienne," *Boeotia Antiqua* 4 (1994): 3-15.

early imperial period.[335] The ports of Thespiai played a vitally important role in the whole process.

Surrounded by mountains and situated on the fertile plain at the foot of Mt. Helikon and the borders with Phokis, Thespiai and its territory controlled the mountain passes from the west. On the south, its two fortified ports, Kreusis and Siphai/Tiphai, on the Korinthian Gulf were significant for the movement of goods and troops from the west and south to central Boiotia and the Euboian Gulf.[336] The Spartans, for example, used the port of Kreusis to move their troops against the Thebans (Xen. *Hell*. 5.4.16-17) and during the war against the Seleucid king Antiochos III, the Romans used it as a base of operations (193-190 BCE)

[335]Alcock, "The Roman Territory of Greek Cities," 168-71; J. L. Bintliff, "Explorations in Boeotian Population History," *AncW* 36 (2005): 10-11.

[336]I am at variance here with Fossey, *Topography and Population*, 164-7, and Roesch, *Thespies et la Confédération*, 5, who do not include Siphai among the ports of Thespiai. Although Fossey recognizes the problems of establishing "borders" for this area (1988, 164-7) and cites Thuc. 6.76 and Ap. Rhod. *Argon*. 1.105, who consider Siphai to be part of Thespian territory, he ignores the primary evidence and follows Roesch's conviction that Siphai was an independent polis after the disbanding of the Boiotian Confederation by the King's Peace in 386 BCE (174 n. 18) for which he does not provide a rationale. There is no reason to assume that Siphai was an independent *polis*. Even if we accept that Siphai was an independent city for a brief period in the fourth century, it would have had to survive exclusively on trade and tariffs since its territory is exceptionally limited and extremely mountainous and arid. Without a fertile plain, it would have to depend on Thespiai for agricultural and animal products. Even today, Siphai (modern Aliki) is not inhabited during the winter and depends on Thebes and the nearby villages for provisions and food during the busy with tourists summer months. At least during the Imperial period, Siphai was dependent on the powerful city of Thespiai –the only one along with Tanagra to still make an impact in Boiotia, according to Pausanias. It is also presumed here that Thisbe and its port Chorsiai were independent from Thespian control at this time. If, however, Thisbe and Chorsiai were still dependent on Thespiai, as they had been during the fourth century BCE, then Thespiai controlled three important ports near the Isthmus in the late first century BCE. Perhaps, future epigraphic evidence will be able to shed light to this problem of borders and city-port interdependence.

(Paus. 9.32.1-2; Livy 44.1.4).[337] Kreusis was an important trading post on the Korinthian Gulf according to Livy (36.21.5, Thespiensium emporium) and among the few in the East to count *limenarchs* (port officials) among its magistrates during the empire (*IG* VII 1826: Δέκμος Στερτίνιος Εἰσίων | λιμεναρχήσας δίς | Διοσκούροιν καὶ τῇ πόλι).[338] Furthermore, these ports became even more important after the destruction and abandonment of Korinth in 146 until its re-foundation as *Colonia Laus Iulia Korinthiensis* by Caesar in 44 BCE.[339] Situated closest to the Lechaion and the Isthmus which were controlled previously by Korinth, the ports of Thespiai (along with the Megarean port of Aigosthena further to the east) would have been the only northern harbors on the Korinthian Gulf directly on the route from west and the Isthmus to the east and the Aegean. Siphai and Kreusis' position on the Korinthian Gulf and the Isthmus helps explain the importance of trade for Thespiai and its territory. In other words,

---

[337]M. H. McAllister, "Kreusa (Livadhostro), Boiotia, Greece," in *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*, eds. R. Stillwell, W. L. MacDonald & M. H. McAllister (Princeton, 1976), 470.

[338]A similar office is attested at Karystos in Euboia with its seven *limenophylakes* (*IG* XII 9), at the Hellespont (*li[menophrouros]*), in Egypt in 104 CE (*limenarches*), and in 118 CE at Bosporus (*ellimenistai*). Roesch, *Thespies et la Confédération*, 216-7, also lists the *pentekostologoi* of Kyparissia among the port officials. Cf. *IG* VII 2225; Κεραμόπουλλος, "Ἐπιγραφαὶ Θεσπιῶν," 30 suggested that Thespiai had nine *limenarchs*, three for each port (Khorsiai, Siphai, and Kreusis), during its leadership of the Boiotian League. This inscription has been revised by Roesch, *Thespies et la Confédération*, 19, who dates it between 220-215 and 210-208.

[339]Korinth's port, the Lechaion, is situated directly across from Kreusis. On the relations between Thespiai and Korinth, see L. Robert, *Hellenica, Recueil d'épigraphie de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques*, II (Paris, 1946), 10-15: the Korinthians participated in the Thespian Erotideia and the Mouseia, and sometimes their inhabitants had citizenship in both cities.

Thespiai and its surrounding area controlled both the land and sea routes from the Ionian Sea and the western empire to the Aegean Sea and the eastern empire.[340]

Having turned to the cultivation of specialized crops destined for exportation, the owners of medium and large villa estates sold their products to the imperial cities and the Roman frontier armies, while they also remained the main providers of foodstuffs for their workforces and regional towns.[341] Plutarch and his wife Timoxena as well as Bacchon and Ismenodora in the *Erotikos* would have been raised in such elite Boiotian families - although differentiation in assets could have existed among them. Urban centers, such as Thespiai, would have attracted anyone who looked to diversify his or her household income and who sought the protection and the gifts of elite families, both Greek and Roman.[342] It is not surprising, therefore, that Thespiai is the only attested city in Boiotia that attracted Roman senatorial interest and Roman and Italian *negotiatores* or πραγματευόμενοι (businessmen) in the first century BCE.[343]

---

[340]Cf. Livy 36.21 describes Cato's trip in 191 BCE from Kreusis to Patras, Korkyra, Hydrunte, and Via Appia.

[341] J. L. Bintliff, "Explorations in Boeotian Population History," *AncW* 36 (2005): 10.

[342]Alcock, "Roman Territory," 171.

[343]K. Freitag, *Der Golf von Korinth* (Munich, 2000), 159-170; Roesch, *Études béotiennes*, 171-77, dates the arrival of Roman businessmen in Boiotia to the second century BCE based on J. Hatzfeld, *Les trafiquants italiens dans l'Orient hellénique* (Paris, 1919), 26-8, but agrees that the term

The Roman and Italian element at Thespiai

Most of the evidence regarding Romans and Italians in the Greek world depends on nomenclature from Hellenistic and Imperial inscriptions. The general practice among epigraphists and historians of assuming that the occurrence of any part of a Roman name (*praenomen*, *nomen*, or *cognomen*) betrays a "Roman" or "Italian" person is replete with problems, since it is often difficult –and at times impossible- to distinguish between Romans and Romanized Greeks (or Greeks and Hellenized Romans) based on nomenclature alone. Errors are bound to occur; it is safe, however, to assume that a Roman name betrays Roman citizenship and, therefore, a certain level of *Romanitas*.

The first mention of the Roman residents of Thespiai, along with a certain group of people called *paroikoi*, appears on *IG* VII 1862, an inscription of late Hellenistic date.[344] Roman and Italian businessmen appear at the end of the first

---

Ῥωμαῖοι πραγματενόμενοι is attested only at Thespiai and at the very end of the first century BCE (Roesch, *Études béotiennes*, 171).

[344]*IG* VII 1862=Roesch, *Études béotiennes*, 172-3, no. 25: Θεσπιὲων οί παῖδες καὶ παροίκων καὶ Ῥωμαίων τῶν πραγ[ματευ] | ομένων ἐν Θεσπιαῖς Πρωτογένην Πρωτάρχου τὸν κρίσει πατέ | ρα καὶ εὐεργέτην ἑαυτῶν. The inscription was dated to 80 BCE by Hatzfeld, who does not offer an explanation for the date, and to the second-first century BCE by Roesch on account of its letters. Perhaps, the Thespian *paroikoi*, like the Lacedaimonian *perioikoi*, were the inhabitants

century BCE at Thespiai,[345] and number of them, Roman citizens and freedmen, were associated with the cult of Augustus in 14 CE.[346] Sometime at the very end of the first century BCE and the beginning of the first century CE, Roman aristocratic families and Italian *negotiatores* received their own gymnasium by a Greek *euergetes* (benefactor) by the name Polykratides son of Anthemion, a member of an important Thespian family.[347] It is clear that Polykratides' position as the benefactor to the Roman and Italian community in the city was directly related to his Roman patron, T. Statilius Taurus.[348]

---

of the surrounding area controlled by Thespiai (cf. Roesch, *Études béotiennes*, 173, with bibliography).

[345]A recent discussion of the *negotiatores* at Thespiai appears in C. Müller, "Les Italiens in Beotie," in *Les Italiens dans le monde grec: II^e siècle av. J.-C.- I^er siècle ap. J.-C., BCH Suppl*. 41, eds. Ch. Müller and C. Hasenohr (2002): 89-100.

[346]The inscription, *BCH* 6 (1882) 275-7=*CIL* III 7301=Roesch 1982, 173-7, no. 26, is securely dated to November 12, 14 CE.

[347]P. Jamot, "Fouilles de Thespies: Deux familles thespiennes pendant deux siècles," *BCH* 26 (1903) 291-320, esp. 297-8, no. 16: Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ πραγματευόμενοι ἐν Θεσ | πιαῖς Πολυκράτην Ἀνθεμίωνος | πρῶτον ἀναθέντα καὶ αὐτοῖς γυ | μνάσιον καὶ ἄλιμμα διὰ βίου; following Jamot, Polykratides was also incorrectly reported as Polykrates in C. P. Jones, "A Leading Family of Roman Thespiae," *HSPh* 74 (1970): 223-55, esp. 231, and H. Müller, "Marcus Aurelius Olympiodoros, ἔκγονος Ἱπποδρόμου," *ZPE* 3.3 (1968): 197-220, esp. 220, who ignored the revision by Roesch, *Thespies et la Confédération*, 231n.1. As a result, the *stemmata* for Polykratides' family have to be reworked. The inscription has been subsequently republished by Roesch, *Études béotiennes* 171-2, no. 24 as follows: Ῥωμαῖοι οἱ πραγματευόμενοι ἐν Θεσ | πιαῖς Πολυκρατίδην Ἀνθεμίωνος | πρῶτον ἀναθέντα καὶ αὐτοῖς γυ | μνάσιον καὶ ἄλιμμα διὰ βίου. Roesch dates the inscription to the end of the second to the beginning of the first BCE on account of the lettering.

[348] On the the Statilii and their connections with Lucania, Italy and Thespiai, see Roesch, *Études béotiennes*, 171-77, G. Camodeca, "Ascesa al senato e rapporti con I territory d'origine Italia: Regio I (Campania, esclusa la zona di Capua e Cales), II (Apulia e Calabria), III (Lucania et Brutii)," *Tituli* 5 (1982): 101-63, esp. 155-6; and more recently M. Kajava, "Cornelia and Taurus at

The family of the Statilii Tauri had reached great power with T. Statilius Taurus, the general of Augustus, *consul suffect* in 37 BCE and governor of Macedonia before 26 BCE, and *ordinarius* in 26 BCE.[349] T. Statilius Taurus' children were T. Statilius Taurus, the moneyer in the year 8 BCE, and a certain Statilia, who married L. Calpurnius Piso Pontifex, consul in 15 BCE and later proconsul of Asia (died c. 32 CE). It is with the third generation (i.e. with the children of the T. Statilius Taurus, the moneyer), however, that the relationship of this particular family with the city of Thespiai became close, and it involved two brothers: T. Statilius Taurus, consul with M. Aemilius Lepidus in 11 CE, and Sisenna Statilius Taurus, consul in 16 CE.[350] It is the consul of 11 CE, T. Statilius Taurus whom Polykratides honored, probably as the former's *libertus* or freedman (*CIL* III 7301).[351] Sometime between 14 and 29 CE, a victors' list from the Mouseia attests to the composition of an *encomium* to Taurus

---

Thespiae," *ZPE* 79 (1989): 139-49; L. Moretti, "Iscrizione di Tespie della prima età imperiale," *Athenaeum* 59 (1981): 71-7.

[349]Moretti, "Iscrizione di Tespie della prima età imperiale," 74-5; *OCD*[3] *s.v.* T. Statilius Taurus.

[350]Moretti, "Iscrizione di Tespie della prima età imperiale," 71-7; Kajava, "Cornelia and Taurus at Thespiae," 139-49, however, argues that Sisenna and Taurus are one and the same person (i.e. T. Statilius Taurus), and that the Thespian inscriptions refer not to the moneyer but to the *triumphalis* and general of Augustus, T. Statilius Taurus.

[351] Polykratides also drew up a decree in honor of a Roman proconsul of Achaia, by the name [?] Futius Longus, possibly, in the late Augustan period, see Kajava, "Cornelia and Taurus at Thespiae," 145n26.

(ἐνκωμιογράφος εἰς Ταῦρον), certainly, to give thanks to the city's benefactor and his family.[352] T. Statilius Taurus received cult at Thespiai and further epigraphic evidence shows that Polykratides was its *pontifex*.[353] A certain Cornelia and a member of Sissena's family, was also honored by another inscription from Thespiai (*IG* VII 1854).[354] Finally, Statilia Messalina, great-great-granddaughter of T. Statilius Taurus (the general of Augustus) and probably the daughter of T. Statilius Taurus (consul in 44 CE) married Nero in 66 CE, after the emperor put her fourth husband, Iulius Vestinus Atticus, to death.[355] The same year, she accompanied Nero on his artistic tour of Greece where she was honored (*ILS* 8794), possibly for her role in the emperor's grant of freedom to the Greeks. Statilia Messalina was noted for her eloquence and literary culture as well as for her beauty. After Nero's suicide and although older than Otho,

---

[352]J.-P. Michaud, "Chronique des Fouilles en 1973," *BCH* 98 (1974): 649-51 and discussion in Kajava, "Cornelia and Taurus at Thespiae," 143-6; Moretti, "Iscrizione di Tespie della prima età imperiale," 74-7.

[353]Jamot, "Fouilles de Thespies," 291 no.1: Πολυκρατίδης Θεμίωνος ἱερατεύων Τίτον | Στατείλιον Ταῦρον τὸν ἑαυτοῦ πάτρωνα; see also Moretti, "Iscrizione di Tespie della prima età imperiale," 71-5.

[354]Kajava, "Cornelia and Taurus at Thespiae," 139-49.

[355]*OCD*[3] *s.v.* Statilia Messal(l)ina.

Messalina was courted by Otho who contemplated marriage with her before his suicide in 69 CE (Suet. *Ner.* 35.1 and *Otho* 10.2).[356]

Thespiai, therefore, was directly linked with important Roman families since the late Hellenistic period, and by 14 CE, there seems to be an integration of the Hellenic and Roman elements in Thespian society.[357] Surely, divisions among the Thespian elite between supporters and opponents of Roman rule are to be expected.[358] Foreign influence and integration into the local community, however, came early, as Polykratides' offering of a gymnasium to the Roman contingent shows. The gymnasium and its association with the ephebate (i.e. the civic institution that provided military, athletic, and cultured training) was the cornerstone of Hellenic education and civic life. Greek *gymnasia* were often condemned by Roman Republican standards, and perhaps initially rejected by those Romans who immigrated into Greek communities in the late Hellenistic

[356]Otho committed suicide on April 16, 69 CE, when he was thirty seven (Plut. *Otho* 18.2) or thirty eight (Suet. *Otho* 11.2) years old, and left Messalina in charge of his corpse and memory in a note to her (Suet. *Otho* 10.2), which implies that she was in charge of his ashes and the construction of his tomb. However, Otto was hastily buried in a modest tomb at Brixellum in North Italy, according to Plutarch (*Otho* 18.2).

[357]Roesch, *Études béotiennes*, 176.

[358]Cf. the case of Athens in D. Geagan, "The Athenian Elite: Romanization, Resistance, and the Exercise of Power", in *The Romanization of Athens: Proceedings of an International Conference held at Lincoln, Nebraska (April 1996)*. Oxbow Monograph 94, eds. M. C. Hoff, and S. I. Rotroff (Oxford, 1997), 19-32, who argues for similar divisions. Geagan sees hoplite generalship as a vehicle for exerting Roman influence over the city of Athens.

period.[359] It would require a certain level of openness and "hellenization" on the part of the Roman community to accept such a gift. Polykratides' gift shows that the Romans who migrated to Thespiai were willing to participate in a purely Hellenic institution, which would grant local citizenship to those who joined the ephebate.[360] Polykratides' euergetism need not be viewed as a reflection of exclusivity on the part of the local Greek population but rather as an extension of including and welcoming the Roman community into Thespian society and of offering local citizenship for those who desired it. Besides, local elite members of Thespian society acquired Roman citizenship as part of Roman provincial policy. On the other hand, both Polykratides' gift and the establishment of a cult to Taurus Θεός demonstrate that at least certain members of the local Greek elite were accepting of and even honoring Roman benefactors and officials as divine in the early first century CE. Influence and euergetism, both local and foreign, could be exercised through the offices of the *agonothetes* of the Mouseia and the Erotideia, of the gymnasiarch in the Thespian *gymnasia*, and of other local

[359]Z. Newby, *Greek Athletics in the Roman World: Victory and Virtue* (Oxford, 2005), 45, argues that in time, during the first and second centuries CE, the populace in Rome was adapting Greek athletics into the structure of their spectacles and leisure activities.

[360]On the ephebate in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, see Kennell, *Ephebeia*, ix-xv. On the changing Roman attitudes towards Greek gymnasia, athletics, and festivals in the first-third centuries CE, see Z. Newby, *Greek Athletics in the Roman World: Victory and Virtue* (New York, 2005).

magistracies and priesthoods.[361] It is expected that client relationships of local elite families and wealthy patrons –both Greek and Roman- also developed at this time.

Thespiai and "Romanization"

Historians, in an attempt to understand the dynamics between "conqueror" (Rome) and "conquered" (the provinces, including Greece), have begun to view the process of "Romanization" in the East as a multidirectional flow of influence from the center (Rome) to the periphery (the provinces) and vice-versa. Thespiai has the prerequisites to provide a good case study for such an investigation as more evidence and a comprehensive corpus of inscriptions becomes available. What emerges from this brief account, I believe, is a complex picture of integration and "hybridity" that began with the *cosmopolis* of the Hellenistic world after the conquests of Alexander the Great and continued well into the imperial period and Roman political rule. There is no doubt that Romans who moved to the cities of the East participated in Greek institutions and festivals, and formed their own associations modeled directly upon Greek

[361]On these magistracies during the Hellenistic period, see Κεραμόπουλλος, "Ἐπιγραφαὶ Θεσπιῶν," 28-40 revised by Roesch, *Thespies et la Confédération*, 3-28.

institutions. They were welcomed and absorbed in the civic and cultural life of the cities they migrated to by acquiring citizenship and participating in the city's ephebate.[362] At the same time, the Thespians absorbed important elements of Roman culture and accommodated themselves to Roman political domination by including and honoring the emperor and his circle in the athletic and religious festivals of the city (see below, Erotideia and Mouseia). Neither Thespians nor Romans appear to have carried with them ethnic stereotypes and intellectual prejudices that would discourage entrance and acceptance into each other's culture. It is probable that the Thespians became "Romanized" as quickly as the Romans became "Hellenized," thus setting the stage for a new (ethnic?) identity for both.

In the process, Thespiai became one of the most important and prosperous centers of Boiotia during the empire because it had the economic and social preconditions that favored its position in the area. Thespian tombstone inscriptions from the imperial period attest to the prosperity and population of the city at this time.[363] One third of *all* Boiotian inscriptions that refer to the

---

[362]E. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (Ithaca, NY, 1992), 234; R. M. Errington, "Aspects of Roman Acculturation in the East under the Republic," in *Alte Geschichte und Wissenschaftsgeschichte, Festschrift für K. Christ zum 65. Geburtstag*, eds. Kneissl and Losemann (Darmstadt, 1998), 140-157, esp. 144-50.

[363]See table in Fossey, *Topography and Population*, 447-8; the number (22.8%) of Thespian tombstone inscriptions of imperial date is significant but superceded by Thebes (23%), Kopai

dedication of statues of imperial date come from Thespiai, an act requiring a certain expense, which can be undertaken more commonly by the more prosperous cities.[364] In spite of its relative prosperity, Thespiai must have had a number of citizens, who, like other Boiotians, lived a life of luxury beyond their means and fell into debt; this situation is probably the reason that Plutarch wrote his treatise *Against Borrowing Money* (*Mor.* 827D-832A) in which he asks the Boiotians not to borrow but to save. The economic and social circumstances of Boiotia, in general, and Thespiai, in particular, at the end of the Hellenistic period and the beginning of the empire provide insight into the weight that Plutarch places on matrimony and the opportunities a "good marriage" could provide for a young Boiotian male member of the elite, such as Bacchon, in the *Erotikos* (749F, οἴκου καὶ γάμου καὶ πραγμάτων μεγάλων).

The Religious Context of the *Erotikos*

(26%), Khorsiai (41.7%) Khaironeia (45.2%) and Plataia (50%), possibly due to a higher death rate in these cities compared to Thespiai which was a more prosperous city.

[364]Fossey, *Topography and Population*, 448 with bibliography and fig. 55. Other cities in which similar inscriptions of Imperial date have been found include Thebes, Koroneia, Lebadeia, Chaironeia, Akraiphia, Hyettos, Tanagra, Plataia, and possibly Kopai.

Eros and the Erotideia at Thespiai[365]

Both Eros and the Muses were worshipped at Thespiai in Boiotia and festivals were held in their honor every four (=five inclusive) years. According to Pausanias, the *polis* center housed famous statues of the god, and a small temple not far from the agora was dedicated to the Muses with their statues in it (9.27.1-4).[366] It was not uncommon for the two divinities to be worshipped together in other parts of Greece during the Roman period. At Sparta, sacrifices were offered to both of them before a battle (Plut. *Lyc*. 21; Paus. 3.17.5) The Muses and Eros had altars in Plato's Academy (Paus. 1.30.1-2) as well as below the temple of Olympian Zeus near the Ilissos River in Athens (Paus. 1.19.5 on the altar of the Muses).[367] These gods were associated with the gymnasium, the education of young men and the afterlife.

---

[365]A study of the cult and festival of Eros in the Hellenistic and Roman periods is currently lacking. The main reference works (such as L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, 4 vols. (Oxford, 1909), which devotes two sentences on the cult of Eros, which he separates from that of Aphrodite [2.625-6]) treat the cult in the Classical and early Hellenistic periods. For the cult of Eros in the Classical period, see also, Buffière, *Eros adolescent*, 342-9; *OCD*[3] *s.v.* Eros: on the Akropolis with Aphrodite; at Philadelphia, Leuktra, Velia, Parion; *DNP* 4 *s.v.* Eros [1]; *LIMC* 3/1 and 4/1 *s.v.* Eros/Amor, Cupido; *RE* 6 *s.v.* Eros.

[366]According to J. M. Fossey, *Topography and Population*, 137, the French excavators found a temple apparently dedicated to the Muses in the town; unfortunately, it was not published and, thus, forever lost as none of it survives today.

[367]On the *temenos* of the Muses in Plato's Academy, see R. E. Wycherley, *The Stones of Athens* (Princeton, 1978), 221, with additional bibliography. Gymnasia, including that of the Kynosarges (cf. 749F) are ubiquitous in the area of the Ilissos river, while the hill overlooking them was known as Helikon: Wycherley, *The Stones of Athens*, 170; see also J. Travlos, *Pictorial Dictionary of Athens* (New York, 1971), 290ff.

Thespiai was among the most important and ancient cult centers of Eros.[368] According to Pausanias (9.27.1), the Thespians worshipped this god "above all others", which might explain Hesiod's unique appointment of the god as a primordial force of generation and reproduction springing out of chaos (*Theog*. 120-3).[369] In tandem with Pausanias, the epigram attributed to the third century BCE poet, Leonidas of Tarentum, makes reference to the only god, Eros son of Kythereia (i.e. Aphrodite), whom the Thespians worship (*AP* 16.206=89 *HE*).[370] Little is known about the cult of Eros not only at Thespiai but at any of its centers.[371] It appears to have been a mystery cult similar to (or even associated with) that of Dionysos (*Mor*. 505E).

The god's most ancient image, a rough and unhewn stone (Paus. 9.27.1), was at Thespiai, but other statues of Eros at Thespiai were more famous. Cicero says that there was no other reason to visit the city of Thespiai at his time but to

---

[368] On other centers of worship for Eros, see Paus. 9.27.1 at Parion in Mysia, with Plin. *Hist. Nat.* 36.23 who describes another statue of Eros by Praxiteles there. Ath. 8.561d-562a: in the Academy in Athens along with Athena; at all public sacrifices; before a battle in Lacedaimon and Crete; during the Eleutheria in Samos.

[369] For the creation of the Hellenistic Hesiod by the Thespians, see Lamberton, "Plutarch, Hesiod, and Mouseia," 491-504.

[370] Θεσπιέες τὸν Ἔρωτα μόνον θεὸν ἐκ Κυθερείης | ἄζοντ', οὐχ ἑτέρου γραπτὸν ἀπ' ἀρχετύπου, | ἀλλ' ὃ Πραξιτέλης ἔγνω θεόν, ὃν περὶ Φρύνῃ | δερκόμενος σφετέρων λύτρον ἔδωκε πόθων. The emendation ἐκ Κυθερείης instead of ἐν Κυθερείης which is proposed in K. Gutzwiller, "Gender and Inscribed Epigram: Herennia Procula and the Thespian Eros," *TAPA* 134.2 (2004): 383-418, esp. 399-400.

[371] Buffière, *Eros adolescent*, 342-9.

see the marble statue of Eros by Praxiteles (*Verr*. 4.4; Str. 9.2.25; see also [Luc.] *Am*. 2.17; Plin. *HN* 36.45). Eros was depicted as a standing nude *ephebe* with wings, but without a bow.[372] It is said that Praxiteles modeled the statue on the desire he felt for his lover, the famous Thespian *hetaira* Phryne. He, then, gave the statue to Phryne, who dedicated it to Eros at her hometown, Thespiai. The statue was removed to Rome in the reign of Gaius, later returned to Thespiai by Claudius, removed again by Nero (Paus. 9.27.3; Plin. *NH* 36.22), who then placed it in the *porticus* of Octavia where it perished in a fire, possibly in that of 80 CE. According to Pausanias, the Thespians replaced the statue with a copy made by Menodorus of Athens (9.27.3; Plin. *NH* 34.91) but, according to a later testimony, Menodorus' Eros flaunted gilded wings (Julian. *Or*. 2.54b-c Hertlein). Many epigrams have been attributed to the base on which Praxiteles' Eros or its copies stood, including one by a woman, Herennia Procula, dating to the Flavian period.[373] After Praxiteles, Lysippos had made a bronze statue of the god as well (Paus. 9.27.3).[374]

Where these statues stood is presently unknown, but, presumably, Eros had his own sanctuary and, possibly, temple in or near a prominent place, such

---

[372]The bibliography on Praxiteles' Eros is rich; see Gutzwiller, 383-418.

[373]Gutzwiller, 388-92, identifies this Herennia Procula with the one at Thessalonica (66/7 CE).

[374]Cf. E. Lopes, "Cheronea: Eros oltre morte," *PP* 57 (2002): 372-84 with bibliography.

as the agora or a gymnasium, at Thespiai (cf. *Mor.* 753F). That this sanctuary had to belong primarily to Aphrodite, as some scholars maintain, is questionable, however.[375] Although it is known that Eros and Aphrodite were worshipped together on the North Slope of the Akropolis in Athens, Eros still enjoyed his own altar and sanctuary near the Academy.[376] There was a sanctuary to Aphrodite Melainis at Thespiai, where Eros could have also been worshipped as a secondary god. To assume, however, that the patron god of Thespiai was not housed in his own sanctuary or temple is highly problematic. Pausanias makes it clear that the patron god occupied a primary position in the city and was worshipped at Thespiai above all other gods (θεῶν δὲ οἱ Θεσπιεῖς τιμῶσιν Ἔρωτα μάλιστα ἐξ ἀρχῆς). There is, therefore, no reason to deny Eros his own sanctuary and temple in which Aphrodite might be worshipped as the secondary goddess along with other "visiting" deities. As such, the statue of Phryne, a benefactress to the sanctuary of Eros and to the city and the representation of Aphrodite on earth, was also erected in the precinct (753F).

---

[375]Cf. Gutzwiller, 410, implies that the *temenos*, where the statue of Eros by Praxiteles was placed, was dedicated primarily to Aphrodite; cf. A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia*, vol. 1 (London, 1981), 216-18; A. N. Οἰκονομίδης, "Ἀφροδίτη Θεσπία," *Platon* 7 (1955): 342, n. 6. Oikonomides' emendation of Paus. 9.27.1-5, which places the temple of Eros in the sanctuary of Aphrodite, is a conjecture based on the assumption that Aphrodite, as a goddess of the famous Olympian pantheon, is the primary goddess worthy of a sanctuary.

[376]I would like to thank Kevin Glowacki for these references and for pointing out the logical fallacies behind the claims of a sanctuary dedicated primarily to Aphrodite and secondarily to Eros.

The Erotideia

The Thespian festival to Eros has not received scholarly attention previously, and much of what is presented below is new. My conclusions are based on Plutarch, Pausanias, archaeology and a number of Thespian inscriptions.

The name of the Thespian festival to Eros in the surviving manuscripts E and B of Plutarch's *Erotikos* is Ἐρωτικά. The word was amended by Hubert (1903) following Winkelmann (1836), probably to reflect the name of the festival as it appears in Athenaios (ἐρωτίδεια, according to Kaibel) and on the inscriptions (Ἐρωτίδεια or Ἐρωτίδηα).[377] Ἐρωτίδαια and Ἐρώτια also appear.[378]

The information provided by Plutarch is the earliest literary evidence for the Erotideia at Thespiai that has survived, followed by Pausanias' (9.31.3) and Athenaios' (13.526e) *testimonia*.[379] It is through the *Erotikos* that we learn that this festival was pentaeteric, for example, and that it included competitions of *kithaira*

---

[377]See app. crit. in the Teubner edition; *IG* VII 48 (Ἐρωτίδεια), 1857 (Ἐρωτίδηα), 2517-2518 (Καισάρεια Ἐρωτίδηα Ῥωμαῖα).

[378]See P. Jamot, "Fouilles de Thespies: Les jeux en l'honneur d'Éros," *BCH* 19 (1895): 366-74, esp. 367.

[379]Paus. 9.31.3: περιοικοῦσι δὲ καὶ ἄνδρες τὸ ἄλσος, καὶ ἑορτήν (festival) τε ἐνταῦθα οἱ Θεσπιεῖς καὶ ἀγῶνα (games) ἄγουσι Μουσεῖα· ἄγουσι δὲ καὶ τῷ Ἔρωτι, ἆθλα (prizes) οὐ μουσικοῖς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀθληταῖς τιθέντες; Athen. 13.561e: Θεσπιεῖς τε τὰ Ἐρωτίδια τιμῶσιν καθάπερ Ἀθήναια Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Ὀλύμπια Ἠλεῖοι Ῥόδιοί τε τὰ Ἁλίεια.

singers (cf. ἀργαλέον ἀγῶνα κιθαρῳδῶν, 749C). Pausanias, although he does not name the festival, suggests that the competitions dedicated to Eros took place at the grove of the Muses and that cash prizes (ἆθλα) were given not only to musicians but also to athletes. Pausanias' *testimonium* contradicts Plutarch regarding the location of the festival, but confirms that both athletic and musical competitions took place during it. Pausanias was a foreigner to Boiotia; probably from Magnesia ad Sipylum in western Asia Minor, he toured and wrote about the sites of old Greece.[380] Although he is a reliable witness to the objects he saw, Pausanias is not always accurate in his descriptions of rural and urban topography, often providing frustration and confusion to archaeologists.[381] According to Autoboulos, Plutarch and his friends having spent two or three days at the *gymnasia* and the theaters in the city of Thespiai, left town for Mt. Helikon, near the sanctuary of the Muses, after a feud broke out among the *kithaira* players (749C). The theaters and *gymnasia* at Thespiai could easily

[380] Pausanias' book 9 was probably written c. 180 CE according to E. Bowie, "Inspiration and Aspiration: Date, Genre, and Readership," in *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*, eds. S. E. Alcock et al. (New York, 2001), 21-32, esp. 21-2; and C. Habicht, *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Sather Classical Lectures 50), Rev. ed. with new preface (Berkeley, 1998); see also *OCD*[3] *s.v.* Pausanias (3).

[381] See, for example, the discussion in S. Alcock, "The Peculiar Book of IV and the Problem of the Messenian Past," in *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*, eds. S. E. Alcock et al. (New York, 2001), 142-53.

support musical and athletic contests.[382] The evidence from the *Erotikos* should be considered more credible, since Plutarch was well acquainted with the area, as well as with its festivals and customs.

Pausanias might not be entirely incorrect, however; the location of the *musical* competitions during the Erotideia could have changed, possibly, after Hadrian's reorganization of the festival in honor of the Muses (see below, Mouseia). The two festivals appear to have been joined together as early as Augustus' reign.[383] Although the *polis* of Thespiai had a small temple to the Muses not far from the *agora*, it is clear from the material remains at the Valley of the Muses that the Mouseia, at least, were celebrated at their sanctuary below Mt. Helikon; the theater there could house the multiplicity of musical events taking place during the festival. Since no gymnasium or stadium survives in the Valley, however, it would not have been possible for the athletic competitions of the Erotideia to have been held there. As one would expect with festivals that

---

[382]The text reads ἐν ταῖς παλαίστραις (749C); technically the term *palaistra* indicates a wrestling school. *Palaistra*, however, is often used interchangeably with γυμνάσιον (a general purpose gymnastic building), because the two buildings were more often than not physically connected. In the imperial period, a gymnasium would include baths, as well. See Miller, 245; Wycherley, *The Stones of Athens*, 225.

[383]Jamot, "Fouilles de Thespies," 290-1, nos. 18-19: ὁ δῆμος Ἀρίστωνα Φιλείνου... ἀγωνοθετήσαντα δὲ Ἔρω | τιδήων καὶ Καισαρήων καὶ Μουσήων | καὶ Σεβαστῆς Ἰουλίας; ἡ πόλις Ἀρίστωνα Φιλίνου… ἀγωνοθετήσαντα δὲ Ἔρωτι | δήων καὶ Και[σαρ]ήων καὶ Μουσήων καὶ Σε[βα]στῆς Ἰουλίας | δίς, (vacat) Μούσ[αις]; cf. Moretti, "Iscrizione di Tespie della prima età imperiale," 71-7 on the fusion of the Erotideia and the Mouseia in the second century CE.

included multiple events, both the Mouseia and the Erotideia lasted several days.[384]

Athenaios (second/third century CE) provides another point of reference by comparing the Erotideia to the Athenaia in Athens, the Olympia at Elis, and the Halieia in Rhodes. Nothing is known of the Rhodean Halieia. According to Plutarch (*Thes*. 24) and Pausanias (8.2.1), the Athenaia was the older name for the Panathenaia, the festival in honor of the patron-goddess of the Athenians. Both the Panathenaia and the Olympia were among the most famous panhellenic, pentaeteric games. The Panathenaia included a procession, sacrifices and gymnic (γυμνικὸς ἀγών), music (μουσικὸς ἀγών) and equestrian (ἱππικὸς ἀγών) competitions classified by age, i.e. ephebes eighteen years old (παῖδες), nineteen years old (ἀγένειοι) and twenty years old (ἄνδρες).[385] The Olympia, on the other hand, did not include a music competition and the classification of the participants was confined to two age groups (παῖδες and ἄνδρες).

[384]On the nine-day festival to the Muses that Alexander the Great held at Dion in Macedonia in 335/4 BCE, see Diod. Sic. 17.16.3-4 and Arr. 1.11.1.

[385]For a recent short discussion of the Olympic Games and the Panathenaia, see S. G. Miller, *Ancient Greek Athletics* (New Haven, 2004), 113-28, and 132-45.

Epigraphic evidence supplements our knowledge of the Erotideia, but does not clarify it necessarily.[386] Jamot and early epigraphists have doubted the literary evidence from Plutarch, Pausanias and Athenaios regarding the musical events of the festival and maintained that there were no musical contests during the festival.[387] As a result, the published fragments attributed to the Erotideia consist only of victor-lists of athletic and equestrian competitions. However, *IG* VII 1772.1-10 and *SEG* 29.452.10, both dating to the first century CE, confirm the literary testimonies by providing evidence for a ποιητὴς χορῶν (choric poet) and for *encomiographers*.[388] Furthermore, Keramopoullos has argued that, during the Hellenistic period, the office of the ἐνδέκαρχοι (five supervisors of eleven) was responsible for the supervision of the choric competitions and of the sacrifices of young men and women, who participated in the festival, while the office of the

---

[386]Erotideia: e.g. *IG* II² 1054 (Ἐρωτίδεια καὶ Ῥωμαῖα); *IG* VII 48 (Ἐρωτίδεια), 1764(?), 1765(?), 1766, 1769, 1770(?), 1772, 1857 (Ἐρωτίδηα), 2517 (Καισάρηα Ἐρωτίδια Ῥωμαῖα) 2518 (Καισάρεια Ἐρωτίδηα Ῥωμαῖα), *BCH* 19 (1895): 369-70, no. 19.

[387]See Jamot, "Fouilles de Thespies," 367-9, and the organization of the *IG* VII volume. On the other hand, Σ. Ν. Κουμανούνδης, *Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Στερεοελλαδικῶν Μελετῶν* 4 (1973): 355-66 accepts that music contests were part of the Erotideia.

[388] *AD* 24 (1969) *Χρονικά*, 183 and pl. 193γ: ἐνκωμιογράφον εἰς Ἔρωτα και Ῥωμαίους (ll. 10-11), εἰς τὰ[ς] Μο[ύ]σ[α]ς (l. 12). The date of *IG* VII 1772 is according to Jamot 1895, 369, who, nevertheless, doubts the musical component of the games, because, as he explains, a ποιητὴς χορῶν is equal to "un chef d'orchestre" whose presence does not qualify the existence of musical contests. See also, Roesch, *Études béotiennes*, 181. On the role of Plutarch as the *encomiographer* of Eros in chs. 13-18 of the *Erotikos*, see H. Görgemanns, "Eros als Gott in Plutarchs *Amatorius*," in *Gott und die Götter bei Plutarch. Götterbilder-Gottesbilder-Weltbilder. Religionsgeschichtlische Versuche und Vorarbeitern*, ed. R. Hirsch-Luipold (Berlin, 2005), 169-95. I would like to thank Professor Dr. Görgemanns for sending me an early version of his paper in March 2005 and before it was published in the aforementioned monograph.

ὁδηγοί (three guides) were responsible for leading the procession.[389] Other problems with the epigraphic evidence include the chronology and provenance of the inscriptions that are not always securely established, thus, welcoming misidentification of the festival in question. Most fragments have been roughly dated to the period between the first century BCE and the early third century CE often on account of their lettering (not the most felicitous method for dating inscriptions) or on account of the presence (or absence) of Roman names on the victor-lists, which are dated to the vague "imperial" period.[390] The scrappy and problematic nature of the evidence for the Erotideia is compounded by the fact that the thousands of inscriptions, which survive from the Valley of the Muses and the surrounding area belonging to Thespiai, when published (and republished), appear haphazardly in a wide variety of French and Greek journals that makes their study not only cumbersome but difficult, and exposes the absolute necessity for a systematic corpus of Thespian inscriptions and a revised

[389]Κεραμόπουλλος, "Ἐπιγραφαὶ Θεσπιῶν," 34-6 and 38. The supervisors of the processions would have been responsible for the procession to the sanctuary of the Muses during the Mouseia as well. For a different perspective on the function of the ὁδηγοί, see Roesch, *Thespies et la Confédération*, 244-5.

[390]For a relative chronology of some of the inscriptions pertaining to the Erotideia and the Mouseia, see Jamot, "Fouilles de Thespies," 311-85; M. Feyel, *Contribution à l'épigraphie béotienne* (Strasbourg, 1942), 88-132, has doubted that the Erotideia were celebrated before the very end of the first century BCE; Feyel goes on to substantiate a hypothesis, first proposed by Foucart *BCH* 9 (1885): 407 no. 20, that both the Erotideia and the Mouseia had only one *agonothetes* (123-32). For a discussion of late first century BCE inscriptions pertaining to the Mouseia, the Erotideia and other Boiotian festivals, see A. Gossage, "The Comparative Chronology of Inscriptions relating to Boiotian Festivals in the First Half of the First Century B.C.," *BSA* 70 (1975): 115-34.

edition of *IG* VII. The lists of winners, however, provide the historian with the magistracies and priesthoods responsible for the organization of the festival as well as with types of events comprising the Erotideia and the places of origin of the participants.

The first epigraphic attestation of the Erotideia, dating to the first century BCE, is a fragmentary decree from Athens (*IG* II² 1054) in honor of an *architheoros* (chief observer) and possibly four *theoroi* (observers), who represented their town at the Ἐρωτίδεια καὶ Ῥωμαῖα at Thespiai.[391] By the first century BCE, therefore, the Erotideia had already been assimilated into the so-called imperial cult and were attracting the attention of cultural centers such as Athens and Korinth. As I have already mentioned, the Erotideia were subsequently fused with the Kaisareia, Mouseia, and Sebasteia possibly under Augustus' reign or later.

The contestants, many of them professional athletes, come from the Greek mainland, the islands and Asia Minor, and testify to the panhellenic character of these games.[392] It is difficult to posit that the contestants were only Greeks, since the inscriptions of imperial date, especially, include Roman names.[393] Since the

---

[391]The date according to Roesch, *Thespies et la Confédération*, 226-227, and n.2.

[392]See for example, L. Robert, *Hellenica, Recueil d'épigraphie de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques*, II (Paris, 1946), 1-14=Plassart, *Laographia* 7 (1923) 180-2, no. 2=*SEG* 3.335=Keramopoullos, *AE* (1936): 44, no. 221; *IG* VII 1799.

[393]See, for example, Robert, *Hellenica*, 1-14.

Erotideia were initially established as ephebic *agones*, it is safe to assume that the Romans that appear on the inscriptions are ephebes, who have received already Greek citizenship. The competitions were classified by agonistic age (παῖδες, ἀγένειοι, ἄνδρες) and included gymnic, equestrian and music competitions, similar to the classification and program of the Panathenaia.[394] The gymnic and equestrian events included boxing (πυγμήν), wrestling (πάλη), combination of boxing and wrestling (πανγκράτιον), a footrace of 600 ancient feet (=στάδιον, σταδιοδρομία), a footrace of 1200 ancient feet (=δίαυλον, διαυλοδρομία), a *diaulos* in armor (ὁπλειτοδρομία), a long-distance footrace (δόλιχος), a horseback race on a foal (ἵππος πωλικός, πῶλος κέλης), a six-lap long horseback race on a mature horse (ἵππος τέλειος, κέλης τέλειος), a race with a pair of foals (συνωρὶς πωλική), a race with a pair of mature horses (συνωρὶς τελεία), a chariot race with foals (ἅρμα πωλικόν), a chariot race with mature horses (ἅρμα τέλειον) and possibly others. Torch-races (λαμπάδα) are also known (*IG* VII 1764), possibly similar to those at the Panathenaia (λαμπαδηδρομία) that allowed ephebes to run from the altar of Eros at the Academy (Plut. *Sol*. 1.4) to the altar of

[394] *IG* VII 1765, dating possibly to the first century BCE, includes older *paides* (παίδων τῶν πρεσβ[υ]τέρων) and assumes that there was a category of younger *paides* (παίδων τῶν νεωτέρων) as well. Roesch, *Études béotiennes*, 339-53, suggests that the *neoteroi* were young men between 12 to 14 years old, the *neaniskoi* 15 to 17 and the *epheboi* 18 to 20; but his discussion is superceded now by Kennell, *Ephebeia*, ix-xv. In a private communication (July 25, 2006), Dr. Kennell suggested that Roesch is simply wrong; his own findings are forthcoming. Cf. P. Gauthier and M. E. Hatzopoulos, *La loi gymnasiarchique de Béroia. Meletemata 16* (Athens and Paris, 1993).

Athena Polias on the Acropolis. The music events at the Erotideia included competitions for *kithaira* singers (according to Plutarch) and for choric poets (*IG* VII 1772). Whether the music competitions were similar in structure with those at the Panathenaia, which included competitions for *kithaira* singers, *aulos* singers, *kithaira* players and *aulos* players, is not clear. Finally, the festival was supervised by an *athlothete* and, probably, paid by three *agonarchoi* during the Hellenistic period.[395]

Finally, there is no indication of the season during which the Erotideia took place, except whatever is hinted at in the *Erotikos*; the weather would have had to be warm enough for Plutarch and his friends to camp out near the Valley of the Muses (749C). Both the Olympia and the Panathenaia were celebrated in the summer (July-August).[396] It appears that Hadrian reorganized the Mouseia, possibly after his visit to Mt. Helikon (c. 124/125 CE) and his subsequent dedication to Eros. Perhaps the Mouseia and the Erotideia were celebrated consecutively, allowing for their final fusion in the second century CE. When the Erotideia became part of the Mouseia, they were celebrated during the month of Damatrios, the eleventh month of the Boiotian calendar and the equivalent of

---

[395]Κεραμόπουλλος, "Ἐπιγραφαὶ Θεσπιῶν," 38. Evidence from the Roman period is lacking.

[396]See Miller, *Ancient Greek Athletics*.

October-November in the Julian calendar.[397] According to Plutarch, this was the season of sowing (*Mor*. 378E). Damatrios, named after the goddess of agriculture and fertility Demeter, was also the month during which the rites of Demeter Achaia (the Sorrowful) took place in Boiotia (*Mor*. 378D-E: similar to the Thesmophoria in Athens).[398] In *Isis and Osiris*, Plutarch writes that Demeter Achaia along with Isis cares for things concerning *eros* (*Mor*. 377A: τῆς τῶν ἐρωτικῶν ἐπιμελείας). In all probability, the Erotideia were celebrated during the month of Damatrios at the time of Plutarch as well.

Mount Helikon and the Muses[399]

Mt. Helikon is associated with the Muses, who were introduced to the area by the founders of the town of Askra, the birthplace of Hesiod and a deserted town by Plutarch's time (cf. Str. 9.2.25; Paus. 9.28.1-31). The Valley of the Muses and their sanctuary (see below) rests at the foot of the mountain.[400]

---

[397]Roesch, *Études béotiennes*, 41-2; see also ibid., 33-54, for a discussion of the Boiotian calendar in general.

[398] Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia* 1981, 171.

[399]On the cult of the Muses in the Classical period, see Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, 5.434-7. An outdated study of the cult and its relationship with the different philosophical schools that utilizes both Imperial Greek and Latin sources is that of P. Boyancé, *Le culte des Muses chez les philosophes grecs* (Paris, 1937).

[400]R. J. A. Talbert, ed., *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World, 2 vols.* (Princeton, 2000), 55; for the military topography of Mt. Helicon, see A. R. Burn, "Helikon in History," *BSA* 44 (1949): 313-24 pl. 42.

Hesiod is said to have been inspired by the Muses on this mountain as he was tending to his sheep (*Theog*. 22-35), while the legendary tripod, which he won in the alleged contest with Homer, was also set there, according to Pausanias (31.3).[401] Still pastoral, Mt. Helikon can be seen clearly from Thespiai, while it is at its base that the Valley of the Muses, and the setting for most of the philosophical discussion in the *Erotikos*, lies. Pausanias (28.1) describes Mt. Helikon as fertile, with much food (wild grasses, strawberries, and cultivated trees –olives, perhaps), rich in water and springs, and where the vipers are not

---

[401]The bibliography regarding the association of Hesiod and Mt. Helicon is rich: C. Calame, "Montagne des Muses et Mouseia: la consecration des Travaux et l'héroïsation d"Hésiode," in *La Montagne des Muses*. Recherches et Rencontres, vol. 7, eds. A. Hurst and A. Schachter (Geneve, 1996), 43-56, discusses the Helicon passages of Pausanias to demonstrate the heroization of Hesiod in the Roman period; A. Hurst, "La stele de l'Hélicon," *La Montagne des Muses*. Recherches et Rencontres, vol. 7, eds. A. Hurst and A. Schachter (Geneve, 1996), 57-72; and A. Veneri, "L'Elicona nella cultura tespiese all III sec. a. C.: la stele di Euthy[kl]es," in *La Montagne des Muses*. Recherches et Rencontres, vol. 7, eds. A. Hurst and A. Schachter (Geneve, 1996), 73-86, demonstrate that the cultural landscape of Thespiai in the Hellenistic period was influenced by Hesiod; on the historic interpretation of Hesiodic Boiotia see P.W. Wallace, "Hesiod and the Valley of the Muses," *GRBS* 15 (1974): 5-24, esp. 22-3; R. Lamberton, "Plutarch, Hesiod, and the Mouseia of Thespiai," *ICS* 13.2 (1988): 491-504, argues that Plutarch provides the perceptions dominant among men of letters of the first century CE about Hesiod that "served the interests of the institution that taken possession of Hesiod and his poetry –[namely] the Festival of the Muses sponsored by the people of Thespiai in central Boeotia" (493). According to Lamberton, Hesiod and his association with the Heliconian Muses is a Hellenistic construction possibly linked to the reorganization of the Mouseia, the festival to the Muses, at the end of the third century BCE (496-7); See also, P. Angeli-Bernardini, "Esiodo e l'Elicona nella parodia di Luciano: Adversus indoctum 3," in *La Montagne des Muses*. Recherches et Rencontres, vol. 7, eds. A. Hurst and A. Schachter (Geneve, 1996).

poisonous.[402] This description is in line with the religious landscape of the mountain as well as with the ancient *topos* of the *locus amoenus*.

The setting of the greatest part of the *Erotikos* at the foot of Mt. Helikon is the descendant of the Hellenistic settings and images (found often in poetry) that praised the good life amid pastoral quiet.[403] Plutarch's exodus from the city during the noise of the festival and its musical contests (749C) to the bucolic environment of the grove of the Muses adds a feeling and an image of an oasis of peaceful and religious meditation. The setting of the *Erotikos* at Mt. Helikon acts as an antidote to the fighting of the contesters in the theater at the Thespiai and the civic turmoil that occurs in the city after Bacchon's "abduction." Mt. Helikon and its association with the Muses and Eros, that is with deities connected with the gymnasium and the education of young men, are evoked here by Plutarch.

---

[402]M. Rocchi, "Le mont Hélicon: un espace mythique," in *La Montagne des Muses*. Recherches et Rencontres, vol. 7, eds. A. Hurst and A. Schachter (Geneve, 1996), 15-26: Rocchi shows how the text draws on mythological associations and background to create a sacred space. The landscape of Mt. Helicon with its cultivated (ἥμερα) trees and harmless snakes, where celestial animals (eg. Pegasus), heroes (Herakles, Narkissos) and gods played (where Hermes gave the infant Dionysos to the nymphs of Nysa to raise) is the perfect environment for the Muses, who represent culture and live in a harmonious physical environment.

[403]See Theocritus's *Idylls*, for example. Furthermore, Roman poets of the early Principate (e.g. Virgil's *Georgics*) had adopted bucolic imagery that evoked the serenity of pastoral life, which served as the symbolic expression of the active and contemplative life. See also, G. Argoud, "L'Hélicon et la littérature grecque," in *La Montagne des Muses*. Recherches et Rencontres, vol. 7, eds. A. Hurst and A. Schachter (Geneve, 1996), 27-42, discusses the corpus of literary extracts mentioning the mountain, and the physical description of the mountain, including Strabo 9.2.25, Paus. 9.28.1, Hes. *Theog*. 1-34, Hes. *Op*. 630-59, Eur. *HF* 240-46., Callim. *Hymn 4* 4.79-82.

Considering the didactic program of the author, the *Erotikos* is a philosophical dialogue addressed to the youth of the empire.

The Muses

The Muses were conceived, first, as nymphs (Schol. *ad Theocr*. 7.92; Hesych. *s.v.* "*numphe*"; Serv. *ad Virg. Eclog*. 7.21) but in Hesiod they appear as divinities of culture and the source of all poetic and musical inspiration (*Theog*. 1-115).[404] The Muses of Helikon seem to have been three and not nine at an early stage (Plut. *Mor*. 744C-D, 745B-C; Diod. Sic. 4.7.2; Paus. 9.29.2ff). According to Pausanias (9. 29.1-2), the Thessalian founders of Askra, Otos and Ephialtes, introduced three Muses (Melete, Aoede, Mneme, daughters of Gaia and Uranos) to the area, but some time later Pieros of Macedon established the worship of the traditional nine Muses, daughters of Zeus and Mnemosyne, at Thespiai.[405] Their

[404]A. Schachter, "Reconstructing Thespiai," in *La Montagne des Muses*. Recherches et Rencontres, vol. 7, eds. A. Hurst and A. Schachter (Geneve, 1996), 99-126, esp. 100: The Muses were only one of several Boiotian deity groups of the same type who had the power to drive men mad or to inspire them (e.g. the Three Maidens of Eleon, the Muses of Mt. Thourion, the Leibethrian Nymphs); see also, *idem*, *The Cults of Boiotia, vol I* (London, 1981), 218-9; *idem*, *The Cults of Boiotia, vol.II* (London, 1986), 150-65; T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources* (Baltimore, 1993), 54-5.

[405]A. Schachter, "Some Underlying Cult Patterns in Boeotia", *Teiresias*, Suppl. 1 (1972): 17-30, esp. 27 n.6; B.A. van Groningen, "Les trios Muses de l'Helicon," *Antiquite classique* 17 (1948): 292-6. Pausanias' explanation rationalizes the number and names of the Muses of his day. Their number was by no means fixed in antiquity. Homer (*Od*. 24.60) mentions that all nine are present for Achilles' funeral but their names appear for the first time in Hesiod's *Theogony* (76-9), perhaps as a Hellenistic addition; cf. Lamberton 1988, 491-504 on the Hellenistic refinements of the

association with the springs of Aganippe and Hippocrene on Mt. Helikon, and possession of powers of fertility and inspiration classify the Muses with other divine female trinities found in Boiotia: the Charites of Orchomenos (Hes. *Theog*. 907-9) and the Three Parthenoi of Eleon (attested on Augustan coins and in Plutarch's *Mor*. 301A-C) and possibly the three Aphrodites of Thebes (i.e. Ourania, Pandemos, and Apostrophia attested in Paus. 9.16.3-4), the three Praxidikai of Telphoussion, and the Sphragitid Nymphs of Mt. Kithairon.[406] A hint that they might have been in origin fertility goddesses may be found in an inscription (*SEG* 13.347) from Mt. Helikon, which lists the attributes of each Muse. Among these attributes are λέκτρα (marriage bed), γένος (offspring), φυή (growth), ὠδίς (pangs of childbirth); these aspects are not normally associated with the Muses but are suitable for goddesses of fertility.[407]

Their powers of poetic and musical inspiration are well known from Homer and Hesiod. The Muses were associated with Apollo who was their choral leader (χορηγός). On the other hand, according to the *Homeric Hymn to*

Hesiodic text and the effect of the Hellenistic Mouseia on the construction of a "historical" Hesiod. See also Str. 410 for the Thracian roots of the Helikonian Muses.

[406]Schachter, "Cult Patterns in Boeotia," 17-30, esp. 17-18.

[407]The Muses as creators of the cosmos and harmony, see Aelius Aristides' account of Pindar's lost *Hymn to Zeus* (Pind. *Fr*. 31 Snell-Maehler). On the Muses as representing a primordial ordering power in Greek myth, see S. H. Lonsdale, Dance and Ritual Play in Greek Religion (Baltimore, 1993), 56-8.

Hermes, even Apollo draws inspiration from them and is in a sense subordinate to them (*Hymn. Hom. Mart.* 450-52). As sources of creative inspiration, the Muses keep alive and perpetuate the past (both divine and heroic) through poetry, music and dance. In the Roman period, the Muses came to be associated with divination and with the afterlife,[408] and often sarcophagi of the first and second century CE include the Muses (as well as Erotes) in their iconography.[409] Worship of the Muses included dedications that kept alive the memory of the departed and secured one's *ὑστεροφημία* (posthumous fame and glory).[410] By the first century CE, the Muses had come to be especially worshipped as patron deities of the immortality of the soul.[411] At Delphi, Plutarch writes, they were considered to be the assistants of Gaia (whose cult had been established there before Apollo's) and the guardians of prophesy (*Mor*. 402C: τὰς δὲ Μούσας ἱδρύσαντο παρέδρους τῆς μαντικῆς καὶ φύλακας αὐτοῦ παρὰ τὸ νᾶμα καὶ τὸ

[408]The Muses were introduced to the Romans through their contact with the Greeks. Fulvius Nobilior, Ennius' patron, is said to have brought their statues from Greece to Italy founding the temple of Hercules Musarum (Enn. *Ann*. 15).

[409]See R. Cohon, "A Muse Sarcophagus in its Context," AA (1992): 109-19; F. Cumont, *Afterlife in Roman Paganism* (New Haven, 1937), 115, 120.

[410]Boyancé 1937, 329-35; *IG* XII^3 330 (=the testament of Epicteta at Thera).

[411]D. P. Harmon, "Religion in the Latin Elegists," *ANRW* II. 16.3 (1986): 1909-73, esp. 1921; also, for their Roman associations with the Eleusinian mysteries and celestial justice, see A. Hardie, "The *Georgics*, the Mysteries and the Muses at Rome," *PCPhS* 48 (2002): 175-208; cf. the similar role of Venus and Amor in Rome: P. Grimal, *Love in Ancient Rome* (New York, 1967), 161. Plutarch writes that the Romans identify Libitina (a Roman funerary goddess) with Aphrodite in *Mor*. 269B, while in the *Erotikos*, Eros promises felicity and rebirth in the "meadows of Selene and Aphrodite" (see below, 766B).

τῆς Γῆς ἱερόν, ἧς λέγεται τὸ μαντεῖον γενέσθαι διὰ τὴν ἐν μέτροις καὶ μέλεσι χρησμῳδίαν).[412] It is not unlikely that Plutarch's syncretism accepts both Gaia and Mnemosyne as mothers of the Muses when he has Autoboulos pray to her in the *Erotikos* (749B). In *Tabletalks*, during a conversation that takes place during the festival of the Muses at Athens when Plutarch was a student there under Ammonios (c. 65-70 CE?), the author attributes to his brother, Lamprias, the opinion that philosophical, rhetorical and mathematical knowledge were the gifts of the Muses (*Mor*. 744D: ἁπάσας δ' ὡς ἐγὼ νομίζω τὰς διὰ λόγου περαινομένας ἐπιστήμας καὶ τέχνας οἱ παλαιοὶ καταμαθόντες ἐν τρίσι γένεσιν οὔσας, τῷ φιλοσόφῳ καὶ τῷ ῥητορικῷ καὶ τῷ μαθηματικῷ, τριῶν ἐποιοῦντο δῶρα καὶ χάριτας θεῶν ἃς Μούσας ὠνόμαζον). In *Isis and Osiris*, Plutarch considers Isis, whose name he says derives from the verb εἰδέναι (to know), as the goddess of knowledge, wisdom and intelligence (*Mor*. 351F-352A).

At Athens, an inscription dating between 98 and 102 CE reveals that the Philosophical Muses had their own priest;[413] Titus Flavius Pantainos, the son of

---

[412]In spite of Plutarch's assertion here, no sanctuary of the Muses has been established yet at Delphi; see M. del Carmen, Barrigón Fuentes, "Sobre el culto de las Musas en Delfos," *CFC(G)* 6 (1996): 237-250.

[413]Ἀθηνᾷ Πολιάδι καὶ Αὐτοκράτορι Καίσαρι Σεβαστῷ Νέρβᾳ Τραιανῷ Γερμανικῷ καὶ τῇ πόλι τῇ | Ἀθηναίων ὁ ἱερεὺς Μουσῶν Φιλοσόφων Τ. Φλάβιος Πάνταινος Φλαβίου Μενάνδρου διαδόχου | υἱὸς τὰς ἔξω στοὰς, τὸ περίστυλον, τὴν βιβλιοθήκην μετὰ τῶν βιβλίων, τὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς πάντα | κόσμον, ἐκ τῶν ἐδίων μετὰ τῶν τέκνων Φλαβίου Μενάνδρου καὶ Φλαβίας Σεκουνδίλλης ἀνέθηκε; published by B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 15 (1946) 233, no. 64 and republished with further discussion by J. H. Oliver, "Flavius Pantaenus, Priest of the Philosophical Muses," *HThR* 72 (1979): 157-60, esp. 159.

the head of a philosophical school (*diadochos*), together with his children made the gift of a "library with the books" to the city.[414] As one of the three Athenian *diadochoi*, Flavius Pantainos had inherited the positions of head librarian and director of one of the three major philosophical schools that traced themselves respectively to Plato, Zeno, and Epicurus.[415] The emperor Trajan was also worshipped in the school of Pantainos; while at Alexandria, the Museum was organized as a *thiasos* over which a priest of the Muses presided.[416] Furthermore, as the founder of the Academy, Plato was divinized, received cult and was called the son of Apollo.[417] Philosophical schools, therefore, operated much like a religious community, and Plutarch's religious setting of the dialogue

---

[414] The "library of Pantainos," as it is often called, has been identified by the director of the American School of Classical Studies Agora excavations J. M. Camp as the complex next to the Stoa of Attalos in the Agora in "The Philosophical Schools of Roman Athens," in *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire, ICS* Suppl. 55, eds. S. Walker and A. Cameron (London, 1989), 50-5, with illustrations and bibliography, and *idem*, *The Athenian Agora* (New York, 1986), 187-93. Camp suggests that the villa attached to the library is part of the complex of Pantainos' library and one of the famed philosophical schools of Athens. On the *diadoche* in Athens, see J. H. Oliver, "The Diadoche at Athens under the Humanistic Emperors," *AJPh* 98.2 (1977): 160-78.

[415]Oliver, "Flavius Pantaenus," 159. A few years later, Pantainos received Athenian citizenship and became archon of Athens some time between 102 and 110 CE.

[416]On Trajan's worship in the school of Pantainos, see Camp, *The Athenian Agora*, 190. On the organization of the Mouseion in Alexandria, see Boyancé, 231-37.

[417] C. A. Talbert, "Biographies as instruments of Religious Propaganda," *ANRW* II.16.2 (1978): 1619-51, esp. 1646.

operates well within the same parameters, with Plutarch as the "high priest" of the philosophical outing.[418]

The association of the Muses with fertility, inspiration, philosophy, knowledge and culture is appropriate in the context of the *Erotikos*, as the dialogue proper includes *nymphai* (i.e. brides or young wives –both Ismenodora and Bacchon are "brides," as is the newly-wed Timoxena), a question of age and fertility (Ismenodora's at 753A and 754C), and an epistemological discussion on the divinity of Eros and his role in human relationships and in the institution of marriage, in particular (756A ff.). Nor is it surprising that the dialogue is placed in the mouth of Autoboulos, the son of Plutarch and the future *diadochos* of his school at Chaeroneia and Delphi.

The Valley and the Sanctuary of the Muses

The archeological evidence

In a quote attributed to Plutarch (Pl. *Fr*. 82), the area below the road that leads to Askra (now Πυργάκι, Hesiod's village) is called a Μουσεῖον (οἱ ἐπὶ τὸ Μουσεῖον ἀπιόντες). Pausanias places the sanctuary of the Muses in a valley northwest of Thespiai below Askra (9.29.3), but their cult was not confined to the valley and it was practiced also on the mountain and in the glade of

[418]Cf. Plut. *Mor*. 1117B-C on the holy mysteries of Epicurus.

Hippocrene.[419] Strabo (9.2.25) locates Askra and the Valley of the Muses some forty *stadia* northwest of Thespiai, a short distance from the *polis* (4.6 miles or 7.4 kilometers and about one hour away, according to the early traveler Colonel William Martin Leake). The evidence agrees with Plutarch's account in the *Erotikos*: the Valley of the Muses is close to Thespiai to allow quick access for Plutarch and his friends to the quiet of the countryside (749C), but far enough from the *polis* to require a runner (771E) or a horseman (754E) in order to send out a quick message in an emergency.

The valley, formerly wooded, held the sanctuary or Sacred Grove of the Muses below Mt. Helikon.[420] The French "excavations" that took place in the turn of the nineteenth century at the Valley of the Muses and at nearby Thespiai involved the tearing down of half a dozen small chapels in the valley and the late antique fortification wall that was still standing at Thespiai in order to harvest the inscriptions these structures held. The archeological reports of these "excavations" were not always published and work was abandoned in the area in order to pursue the opportunity presented to the French at Delphi. An important attempt to synthesize the scraps of the French work at the sanctuary of

---

[419]For the cult on the mountain, see V. L. Aravantinos, "Topographical and Archaeological Investigations on the Summit of Helikon," in *La Montagne des Muses*. Recherches et Rencontres, vol. 7, eds. A. Hurst and A. Schachter (Geneve, 1996), 185-92, esp. 190-1.

[420]For an overview of the sanctuaries dedicated to the Muses in the Greek East, see G. Roux, "Le Val des Muses et les Musées chez les auteurs anciens," *BCH* 78 (1954): 22-48, esp. 38-41.

the Muses by George Roux came some eighty years after the initial "excavations".[421] As a result, the picture of the sanctuary and its surrounding area that has been transmitted to us is, to say the least, fragmentary.

The sanctuary has been securely identified by inscribed statue bases and other material remains, including a theater, two stoas, and an altar together with a number of inscriptions, statues and votive material. The buildings date to the early Hellenistic period at the earliest, while the lists of victors indicate that the festival to the Muses (see below, Mouseia) was celebrated from the third century BCE to the third century CE. Certainly, Plutarch and his family had first-hand experience with the topography of the area and had visited the Valley and Thespiai numerous times. His hometown, Chaeroneia, is about forty kilometers northwest of the Valley of the Muses, just a day's walk or shorter on horse and carriage. It remains unclear, however, whether the term Μουσεῖον, which Plutarch provides, refers to the altar of the Muses or to their temple or to some

[421]For the most recent work on the Valley of the Muses, see J. Bintliff, "The Archaeological Survey of the Valley of the Muses and its Significance for Boeotian History," in *La Montagne des Muses*. Recherches et Rencontres, vol. 7, eds. A. Hurst and A. Schachter (Geneve, 1996), 193-224 with figures and bibliography; J. Fossey, *Topography and Population*, 141, and Roesch, "Sanctuary of the Muses, Mt. Helikon, Greece," 806, for a summary of the remains and additional bibliography. For a synthesis of the "excavations" in the Valley of the Muses by the French in the late 1880s, see G. Roux, 22-48, who identified the Great Altar of the Muses, previously thought to be by P. Jamot, the French excavator of the Valley, their temple, and the notes in N. Παπαχατζής, Παυσανίου Ἑλλάδος Περιήγησις, V (Athens, 1969), 178-90. See also, P. Jamot, "Fouilles de Thespies: Le Monument des Muses dans le bois de l'Hélicon et le poète Honestus," *BCH* 26 (1903): 129-160; P. Jamot and A. de Ridder, "Fouilles de Thespies et de l'hiéron des Muses de l'Hélicon," *BCH* 46 (1922): 217-306: publication of the statuary, pottery and architectural fragments.

other library-like building, which could have been built by his time but which has not survived or has not yet been found.[422] According to Pausanias, the area also contained statues of gods and goddesses, poets, kings and queens who had supported the arts (9.29.3-31.3), all of which Plutarch and his friends would have seen as well.[423] Walking towards the grove of the Muses, Pausanias reports, one could see the fountain of Aganippe on the left, and further on the statues of Eupheme (nurse of the Muses) and Linos. In addition, on the mountain there were bronze statues of Apollo and Hermes in a lyre contest, and the Dionysos of Myron which Sulla placed there having taken it from Orchomenos. There were also statues of poets and musicians: the blind Thamyris holding his broken lyre, Hesiod with a *kithaira* on his knees, and Orpheus singing and surrounded by stones and bronze animals. There was the statue of Telephus being fed by a deer, and next to him an ox and a statue of Priapus, as well that of "Arsinoe who

[422]Pausanias does not describe any buildings in the grove of the Muses; instead, he does mention the temple of the Muses not far from the agora in the city of Thespiai (9.27.5: τῆς ἀγορᾶς οὐ πόρρω…ναὸς Μουσῶν ἐστὶν οὐ μέγας). Perhaps, his silence about the buildings at the Valley of the Muses provides evidence that he did not even visit the sanctuary *per se*, but that he might have used hearsay or local guides from whom he could have received most of his information on it. See also Roux, 38, who states that Jamot's excavations in the Valley of the Muses were exhaustive and that it is unlikely that any important monument escaped him.

[423]Cf. P. Foucart, "Donation de Philétaeros aux Muses de l'Hélicon," *BCH* 8 (1884): 158-60, on the son of Attalus of Pergamon, Philetairos, and his donation to the Muses; A. Plassart, "Fouilles de Thespies et de l'hieron des Muses de l'Helicon: Inscriptions," *BCH* 50 (1926): 383-462; W. Peek, "Die Musen von Thespiai," in ΓΕΡΑΣ Ἀντωνίου Κεραμοπούλλου (Thessaloniki, 1953): 609-34; W. Peek, "Hesiod und der Helikon," *Philologus* 121 (1977): 173-5, argues that *IG* VII 1785 (no longer extant) refers to the revenue producing property which belonged to the *synthytai* (a collegium or club of fellow-sacrificers) of the Muses. See Shipley, 163, on the relationship of the society with the ruler-cult of the Attalids.

married her brother Ptolemy" on an ostrich.[424] Ptolemy and Arsinoe here probably refer to queen Arsinoe III, who was worshipped as the Tenth Muse, and her husband, Ptolemy IV Philopator.[425] On the other hand, Arsinoe II Philadelphos, who married to her brother Ptolemy Keraunos, could be a candidate also, since she patronized the arts and Hellenistic poetry, in particular.[426]

The Mouseia

The epigraphic record for the Thespian festival to the Muses (or Mouseia) is richer than that for the Erotideia but equally problematic, as a systematic study of the chronology of imperial Boiotian inscriptions is still lacking.[427] On the other hand, in addition to Plutarch's *Erotikos* (748F), literary evidence for the Mouseia

---

[424]Cf. Paus. 9.29.1, 9.30, 9.31.3; Str. 410, 471; Serv. *ad Virg. Eclog*. 10.11.

[425]*OCD*[3] *s.v.* Muses, and Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia* 1986, 147-79 on the cult of the Helikonian Muses.

[426]See Κεραμόπουλλος, "Ἐπιγραφαὶ Θεσπιῶν," 16 n.1, argues that both Arsinoe II and Arsinoe III had statues at Thespiai. On Arsinoe II as the patroness of Theocritus, see S. B. Pomeroy, *Women in Hellenistic Egypt* (New York, 1984), 20.

[427]Mouseia: e.g. *IG* VII 1735 (Μουσεῖα ἐν Θεσπιαῖς), 1760, 1761, 1762(?), 1763(?), 1773, 1774-1776 (μεγάλα Καισάρηα Σεβαστῆα Μουσεῖα); 1819, 2410, 2519; supplemented by *BCH* 19 (1895): 311-66, esp. nos. 1, 4-6, 8-12, 16 (τῶν μεγάλων Τραϊανήων Ἀδριανήων Σεβαστήων Μουσήω{ν]), 17 (cf. Feyel 1942, 88-132); *Polemon* 3 (1947-8): 75; *AD* 26 (1971) *Χρονικά*, 226, no. 16; possibly *AE* (1917): 166-7.

includes Strabo (10.410 and 471), Pausanias (9.31.3) and Athenaios (14. 629a).[428] According to Plutarch, it was the Spartan king Agesilaos who was sent to Egypt for the decipherment of an old inscription found near the Boiotian town of Haliartos (577E and 578E-579A). The oracle in Egypt told Agesilaos that the inscription asked the Greeks to set their differences aside and to celebrate an *agon* in honor of the Muses; this became the beginning of a public cult of the Muses. Since there is no reference or epigraphic evidence currently that supports a cult or sanctuary of the Muses at Haliartos, it is possible that the testimonial in Plutarch refers to the establishment of their cult and festival at Mt. Helikon.[429] Thus, a pentaeteric festival, the Mouseia were established sometime in the fourth century BCE and included a religious feast and dramatic and musical competitions in honor of the Muses.[430] Unlike the Erotideia, the Mouseia did not include athletic games (cf. *IG* VII 1760-1763, 1773-1776). The re-organization of the Mouseia during the Hellenistic period (sometime between 220 BCE and 208 BCE), gave the festival its panhellenic character, and was patronized by cities

[428]Athenaios cites Amphion of Thespiai (an otherwise unknown writer) and the second book of his work *On the Mouseion on Helikon*, which quotes an ancient epigram, dealing with the dances of boys held in the sanctuary.

[429]According to Pausanias (9.32.5), there was direct access from Haliartos to Thespiai, and even today a direct road connects Haliartos with the entrance of the Valley of the Muses at Palaiopanagia; cf. Fossey, *Topography and Population*, 308.

[430]Oxen are known to have been sacrificed during the festival; see Κεραμόπουλλος, "Ἐπιγραφαὶ Θεσπιῶν," 14 regarding a gift of 4,000 drachmas, from the interest of which oxen were to be sacrificed during the Mouseia.

such as Athens that set its cultural tone.[431] After the reorganization, the festival carried the titles ἀγὼν θυμελικός (i.e. a contest which includes music, dancing, etc.), στεφανίτης (contest for crowns), and ἰσοπύθιος (equal to the Pythian Games at Delphi), placing the Mouseia among the most famous festivals in Greece (*IG* VII 1735). While the victors at the Erotideia were awarded cash prizes (ἆθλα), according to Pausanias, the victors at the Mouseia were awarded crowns. As at the Erotideia, the contests at the Mouseia were frequented by professional artists from all major guilds (τεχνῖται) from Asia Minor, Boiotia, Athens and other parts of mainland Greece.[432]

Some of the inscriptions that have been found are of the imperial period when the Mouseia had acquired first the title Μεγάλα Καισάρηα Σεβαστῆα

---

[431]P. Jamot, "Fouilles de Thespies: Les jeux en l'honneur des Muses" *BCH* 19 (1895): 311-66, esp. 314-16. On the reorganization of the Mouseia by the Ptolemies, see S. Barbantani, "Competizioni poetiche tespiesi e mecenatismo tolemaico : un gemellaggio tra l'antica e la nuova sede delle Muse nella seconda metà del III secolo A.C. : ipotesi su SH 959," *Lexis* 18 (2000): 127-174; D. Knoepfler, "La reorganization du concours des Mouseia à l'époque hellénistique: esquisse d'une solution nouvelle", in *La Montagne des Muses*. Recherches et Rencontres, vol. 7, eds. A. Hurst and A. Schachter (Geneve, 1996), 141-170, sets 220 BCE as the *terminus post quem*; Lamberton, "Plutarch, Hesiod, and Mouseia," 491-504; Roesch, *Thespies et la Confédération*, 221, argues that the reorganization was dependent on the largest recorded gift of 25,000 drachmas given to the sanctuary of the Muses on Mt. Helikon by Ptolemy IV Philopator; A. Schachter, "A note on the reorganization of the Thespian Mouseia," *NC* 7th Ser. (1961): 67-70, looks at a series of bronze coins, which he argues that were issued after the reorganization of the Mouseia, that the woman with the *polos* or *stephanos* shown is Arsinoe II and that the coins were struck c. 210-208 BCE; G. M. Sifakis, "Organization of Festivals and the Dionysiac Guilds," *CQ* 15 (1965): 206-14 with earlier bibliography, dates the decree of the organization to 220-208 BCE.

[432]For example, see *IG* VII 1773=Jamot, *BCH* (1895): 341, no. 15; and Robert, Hellenica II (Paris, 1946), 11-2; Sifakis, 213 with examples throughout, for the participation of Athenian, Isthmian, Nemean, Ionian and Hellespontian guilds. Local branches of the Isthmian and Nemean guilds were also established at Thespiai, *ibid*., 208.

Μουσεῖα (cf. *IG* VII 1774-1776) and in the second century CE, under Hadrian's reign, the title Μεγάλα Τραϊανῆα Ἀδριανῆα Σεβαστῆα Μουσῆα [*BCH* 19 (1895), 34, no. 16= *SEG* 3.334].[433] The festival took place during the month of Damatrios [*BCH* 19 (1895), 34, no. 16= *SEG* 3.334]. The inscriptions of the early first century BCE and CE reveal that the magistrates that presided over the success of the contests at the Mouseia included the eponymous magistrate (ἄρχων), the supervisor of the games (ἀθλοθέτης), the organizer of the games (ἀγωνοθέτης), the priest of the Muses (ἱερεὺς Μουσῶν), the priest of the guild of artists (ἱερεὺς τεχνιτῶν), the bearer and keeper of the sacred fire (πυρφόρος), and the secretary (γραμματεύς/γραμματιστὴς) (*BCH* 19 nos. 6-14).[434] The existence of a keeper of the sacred fire and of a poet of the processional ode (ποιητὴς προσοδίου) suggests that a procession from the small temple of the Muses near the *agora* at Thespiai to their sanctuary in the Valley is likely.[435] Similar processions occurred during the Panathenaia in Athens, the Olympia in Elis, the Pythia at Delphi, and assuming the Halieia in Rhodes (cf. Athen. 13. 561e). At the end of the first to the beginning of the second century CE, the

[433]For the Roman interest in Thespiai, see this chapter; in the Mouseia, see L. Robert, *Hellenica, vol. 2* (Paris, 1946), 5-14; Schachter, Boiotian Cults, 161-2.

[434]The chronology here is generally based on Jamot, "Fouilles de Thespies," 311-66. For the magistrates responsible for the Mouseia during the Hellenistic period, see Roesch, *Thespies et la Confédération*, 225-9 and Κεραμόπουλλος, "Ἐπιγραφαὶ Θεσπιῶν," 38.

[435]Cf. the *pyrphoros* at Delphi, *SIG* 711D; at the Eleusinian mysteries, *SEG* 30.93.

priests of the Muses and of the artists no longer appear on the inscriptions; the other magistrates continued to be responsible for the organization of the games.

A wide variety of events and the names of the winners are included on these fragmentary lists: poet of the processional ode (ποιητὴς προσοδίου), herald (κῆρυξ), trumpeter (σαλπικτής), epic poet (ἐπῶν ποιητής), rhapsode (ῥαψῳδός), flute player (αὐλητής), flute singer (αὐλῳδός), *kithaira* player (κιθαριστής), *kithaira* singer (κιθαρῳδός), a poet of satire (σατύρων ποιητής), poets of old and tragedy and comedy (ποιητής παλαιᾶς τραγῳδίας, ποιητής καινῆς τραγωδίας, ποιητής παλιᾶς κωμῳδίας, ποιητής καινῆς κωμῳδίας), as well as actors of old tragedy and comedy (ὑποκριτής παλαιᾶς τραγῳδίας, ὑποκριτής καινῆς τραγωδίας, ὑποκριτής παλιᾶς κωμῳδίας, ὑποκριτής καινῆς κωμῳδίας). Under Claudius (and possibly earlier), *encomiographers* created lyric compositions both to the Muses and to the emperor and sometimes to other male and female members of the imperial family, while epic poetry was also composed for the emperor and the Muses.[436] New events and titles included πυθαύλας (or the flutist playing the *nomos* expressing the battle between Apollo

[436]The "poems" were probably epic, according to Jamot, "Fouilles de Thespies," 364. Notice, also, that the title "epic poet" disappears in the Hadrianic inscriptions. An *encomiographer* to Sebaste Iulia Mnemosyne (i.e. to Livia) and another to Messaleinos appears in T. Spyropoulos, "Ἀρχαιότητες καὶ μνημεῖα Βοιωτίας-Φθιώτιδος," *AD* 26 (1971): *Χρονικά*, 226, no. 16; further examples in Roesch, *Études béotiennes*, 181. For an association of *encomiasts* at Thespiai, probably related to the *encomiographers* of the Mouseia, see Roesch, *Études béotiennes*, 179-82.

and Python), χοραύλης (or the flutist who accompanies the chorus), and νεαρῳδός (or younger singer, whose exact role remains unclear). Finally, a crown was given also to one who showed his superiority above all others (διὰ πάντων).

After the Mithridatic Wars, the Mouseia and the Erotideia attracted competitors from all over the empire, and ultimately they appear to have been fused together and assimilated into the imperial cult and the cult of Rome, with the Mouseia being celebrated well into the third century CE.[437] The celebration of panhellenic festivals, such as the Mouseia and the Erotideia, brought to Thespiai, in addition to fame and resources from the kings and emperors, an influx of contestants and tourists from all over the empire and of local people that enhanced the economy and social life of the city regularly every four years. Festivals were occasions for the elites of the empire to socialize and to show off their wealth.[438] The Erotideia allowed the young members of the elite (both local and foreign) to compete in equestrian and running *agones*, contests usually associated with the aristocracy, while the Mouseia allowed for public displays of

[437]Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia* 1981, 216-19; *idem*, *Cults of Boiotia* 1986, 147-79; Gossage, 115-34.

[438]A. Spawforth, "Agonistic Festivals in Roman Greece," in *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire*, eds. S. Walker and A. Cameron (London, 1989), 193-7.

their artistic skill and Hellenic education. Wealthy men and their families financially supported such Panhellenic contests, and both women and men, such as the ones in the *Erotikos*, showed off their culture and wealth by sacrificing to the gods and participating in philosophical discussions and debates.

Conclusions

When I commenced this project, it had been envisioned as a social and historical commentary of Plutarch's *Erotikos*. As I began working on the commentary, however, I realized that many questions could not be answered without placing the dialogue in its appropriate historical and social context, a task that has not been without problems and insurmountable difficulties at times (see Introduction). As a result, this project has been transformed necessarily into the chapters which initially I had planned to be the introductory chapters of the commentary. Despite the departure from my original plan, it is my belief that this dissertation, in essence a kind of prolegomenon to the *Erotikos*, has contributed in meaningful ways to the study of Plutarch and to the history of Roman Greece.

In Chapter 1, a biography of Plutarch and his family was attempted, in which I argued, based on evidence provided in the *Erotikos*, in the *Moralia*, and on inscriptions, against suppositions made in the past and proposed the following points: 1) Plutarch's date of birth should be placed in the late 50s CE and not in the 40s or early 50s; 2) Plutarch was not necessarily born and raised in Chaironeia nor did he necessarily live all his life there, but it is much more likely

that he spent most of his life at Delphi instead; 3) his marriage to Timoxena should be dated to *post* 96 CE; 4) Plutarch was one of the early *helladarchs* and provincials who gained entrance to the Senate, positions which I have dated to *post* 117 CE and during Hadrian's reign; and 5) Plutarch's date of death remains a mystery, but it may be related to Hadrian's decision to move the establishment of the Panhellenion from Delphi to Athens in 131/2.

Chapter 2 dealt with the historicity of the characters in the *Erotikos*. After proposing that the characters of the dialogue are not mere figments of Plutarch's imagination, but also without denying their literary dimension, I created short prosopographies for these characters based on information gathered from the *Erotikos* and from inscriptions. In this chapter, I proposed that the predicate "kalos" describing Bacchon in the dialogue (*Mor.* 749C) may need to be revised to "Kallos," a name which appears on *SEG* 22.383 (Eision Kallos Bacchonos). Investigation of the extant manuscripts and of the inscriptions is necessary to prove such a proposal. Also in this chapter, I argued that T(itus) Fl(avius) Soklaros and Fl(avius) Soklaros, who appear on inscriptions from Delphi and Tithora, are the same person. Soklaros, of course, is one of the characters and friends of Plutarch in the *Erotikos* and appears in many of Plutarch's other dialogues, as well. Perhaps the most important contribution of this chapter is the identification of Ismenodora in the *Erotikos* with M(arkia) Ismenodora on *IG* VII

1777, as it reveals her to be a woman with Roman citizenship in the all-male context of the gymnasium.

The final chapter discussed the geographical, social, and religious context of the *Erotikos*. It therefore included sections on the history and society of Thespiai, with a special emphasis on the late Hellenistic and early Imperial periods, and on two of the most important sanctuaries and festivals of the city: the Erotideia at Thespiai, and the Mouseia at the nearby Valley of the Muses and Mt. Helikon. The three main topics of this chapter have not been discussed in any of the standard reference works about religion, or about the archaeology and the history of Thespiai.

Although there were a number of archaeological studies on Roman Greek material culture when I began my research for this project, there were very few articles and even fewer manuscripts available dealing with the history or literature of Early Imperial Greece. Current interest in globalization and postcolonial theories, however, has brought attention to Rome and its provinces and to the history of Greece during the Empire, in particular. The proliferation of current publications on Roman Greece should make future research on Plutarch, his works, and his times more manageable and even more profitable. I aim to complete the initial project of writing a commentary of Plutarch's *Erotikos*

in the next few years, and to include an introductory chapter on marriage and philosophy, which I could not pursue here.

Plutarch's prolific output (especially, the *Lives*) has been mined by ancient historians as a source for the history of Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic Greece, and of Republican Rome. However, his essays and dialogues, collectively referred to as *Moralia*, have been dismissed as being didactic and philosophic diatribes without much value to historians. This dissertation has aimed to correct such a limited view and to place the *Moralia*, in general, and the *Erotikos*, in particular, in their historical context. An active member of the provincial elite, Plutarch lived at the time of the Roman domination of Greece, and his works (both the *Lives* and the *Moralia*) should be placed in that social and historical context (i.e., in the mid-first and second centuries CE). Plutarch reflects the ideas and traditions of the aristocracy of his own time regarding the past and its generals and statemen, but also provides glimpses of the life, customs, religion, economy, politics, philosophy, and ideology of the Greeks and the Romans of his time. As such he is of great interest not only to historians and classicists, but also to scholars of religion, philosophy, economics, and gender studies. Finally, the ramifications of placing Plutarch in his appropriate historical and social context are great because such an approach will not only allow all of his works to find their appropriate place in historical discourse as primary sources for the history

of imperial Greece, but will also require that most of Greek and much of Roman history that has been based on Plutarch's works be re-evaluated. It is my hope that this dissertation is a seed for the discussion that may follow.

Bibliography

Editions of Greek and Latin authors have not been included in the bibliography. Journal titles are abbreviated according to the form in *L'Année philologique*. Accepted abbreviations are used for standard works and epigraphic corpora throughout the manuscript. Lists of such abbreviations may be found in reference books such as the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* and in the major Greek and Latin dictionaries. Both English and Latin translations of the Greek titles of Plutarch's *Ἠθικά* are a matter of editors' choices and preferences and they tend to vary in editions and translations. The titles here follow those found in the translations of Donald Russell. Editions of Greek inscriptions follow the ones found in the standard epigraphic collections, such as *Inscriptiones Graecae, Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* etc., and which are being collected and (sometimes) revised in the on-line version of the Cornell Greek Epigraphy Project's database of Greek inscriptions, *Searchable Greek Inscriptions: A Scholarly Tool in Progress*, http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions.

Adams, J. N. *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*. Cambridge, 2003.

Alcock, S. "Archaeology and Imperialism: Roman Expansion and the Greek City." *JMA* 2 (1989): 87-135.

——. *Graecia Capta: The Landscapes of Roman Greece*. New York, 1993.

——. "Nero at Play? The Emperor's Grecian Odyssey." In *Reflections of Nero: Culture, History and Representation*, edited by J. Masters and J. Elsner. London, 1995, 98-111.

——. "The Roman Territory of Greek Cities." In *Territoires des cités grecques, BCH* Suppl. 34, edited by Michèle Brunet. Paris, 1999, 167-73.

——. "The Peculiar Book of IV and the Problem of the Messenian Past." In *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*, edited by S. E. Alcock et al. New York, 2001, 142-53.

Angeli-Bernardini, P. "Esiodo e l'Elicona nella parodia di Luciano: Adversus indoctum 3." In *La Montagne des Muses*. *Recherches et Rencontres* 7, edited by A. Hurst and A. Schachter. Geneva, 1996, 87-96.

Aravantinos, V. L. "Topographical and Archaeological Investigations on the Summit of Helikon." In *La Montagne des Muses*. *Recherches et Rencontres* 7, edited by A. Hurst and A. Schachter. Geneva, 1996, 185-92.

Argoud, G. "L'Hélicon et la littérature grecque." In *La Montagne des Muses*. *Recherches et Rencontres* 7, edited by A. Hurst and A. Schachter. Geneva, 1996, 1996, 27-42.

Babut, D. "À Propos des enfants et d'un ami de Plutarque: essai de solution pour deux enigmes." *REG* 94 (1981): 47-62.

——. "Sur Soclaros de Chéronée et sur le nombre des enfants de Plutarque: méthodologie d'une mise au point." *RPh* 73 (1999): 175-89.

Bakhuizen, S. C. "The Ethnos of Boeotians." In *Boiotika. Vorträge vom 5. Internationalen Böotien-Kolloquium zu Ehren von Professor Dr. Siegfried Lauffer, Institut für Alte Geschichte, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München, 13-17. Juni 1986*, edited by B. Hartmut and J. Buckler. Munich, 1989, 65-72.

Barbantani, S. "Competizioni poetiche tespiesi e mecenatismo tolemaico: un gemellaggio tra l'antica e la nuova sede delle Muse nella seconda metà del III secolo A.C.: ipotesi su SH 959." *Lexis* 18 (2000): 127-174.

Barberà, P. G. *Plutarco. El Erótico: Diálogo filosófico sobre Eros, o la confrontación de los amores pederástico y conyugal*. Barcelona, 1991.

Barrow, R. H. *Plutarch and His Times*. Bloomington, IN, 1967.

Bernhardt, R. *Imperium und Eleutheria*. Hamburg, 1971.

Bintliff, J. "The Archaeological Survey of the Valley of the Muses and its Significance for Boeotian History." In *La Montagne des Muses*. *Recherches et Rencontres* 7, edited by A. Hurst and A. Schachter. Geneva, 1996, 193-224.

——. "Pattern and Process in the City Landscapes of Boeotia from Geometric to Late Roman Times." In *Territoires des cités grecques, BCH* Suppl. 34, edited by Michèle Brunet. Paris, 1999, 15-33.

——. "Town and Chora of Thespiae in the Imperial Age." In *Roman Rule and Civic Life: Local and Regional Perspectives. Impact of Empire, vol. 4*, edited by L. de Ligt, E.A. Hemelrijk and H.W. Signor. Amsterdam, 2004, 199-229.

——. "Explorations in Boeotian Population History." *AncW* 36 (2005): 5-17.

Bintliff, J. and B. Slapšak, "The Leiden-Ljubljana Ancient Cities of Boiotia Project 2007," *Teiresias* 37.2 (2007): 2-24.

Bintliff, J. and A. Snodgrass. "The Cambridge/Bradford Boeotian Expedition: The First Four Years." *JFA* 12.2 (1985): 123-61.

——. "Mediterranean survey and the city." *Antiquity* 62 (1988): 57-71.

——. "The End of the Roman Countryside: A View from the East." In R. F. Jones, J. H.F. Bloemers, S.L. Dyson and M. Biddle (eds.), *First Millennium Papers: Western Europe in the First Millennium A.D., BAR International Series* 401 (1988): 175-217.

——. "From Polis to Chorion in South-West Boeotia." In *Boiotika. Vorträge vom 5. Internationalen Böotien-Kolloquium zu Ehren von Professor Dr. Siegfried Lauffer, Institut für Alte Geschichte, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München, 13-17. Juni 1986*, edited by Hartmut B., et al. Munich, 1989, 285 299 and fig. 34-62.

Birley, A. R. *Hadrian: The Restless Emperor*. New York, 1997.

Blanc, N. and F. Gury. "Amor, Cupido." *LIMC* III.1 (1986): 952-1049.

Boatright, M. T. *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire*. Princeton, 2000.

Bohec, Y. Le. *The Imperial Roman Army*. New York, 1994.

Booth, A. D. "The Schooling of Slaves in First-Century Rome." *TAPA* 109 (1979a): 11-9.

——. "Elementary and Secondary Education in the Roman Empire." *Florilegium* 1 (1979b): 1-14.

Bowersock, G. W. "Some Persons in Plutarch's *Moralia*." *CQ* 15 (1965): 267-270.

——. *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*. Oxford, 1969.

Bowie, E. "Inspiration and Aspiration: Date, Genre, and Readership." In *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*, edited by S. E. Alcock et al. New York, 2001, 21-32.

Boyancé, P. *Le culte des Muses chez les philosophes Grecs*. Paris, 1937.

Bremmer, J. "Plutarch and the Naming of Greek Women." *AJPh* 102.4 (1981): 425-6.

Buck, R. J. *History of Boeotia*. Edmonton, Alberta, 1979.

——. *Boiotia and the Boiotian League 423-371 B.C.* Edmonton, Alberta, 1994.

Buffière, F. *Eros adolescent: la pédérastie dans la Grèce antique*. Paris, 1980.

Burn, A. R. "Helikon in History." *BSA* 44 (1949): 313-24, pl. 42.

Burnett, A., M. Amandry, and P. Ripollès. *Roman Provincial Coinage, Vol. II.1: From Vespasian to Domitian (AD 69-96)*. London and Paris, 1999.

Burrell, B. *Neokoroi: Greek Cities and Roman Emperors*. Boston, 2004.

Calame, C. "Montagne des Muses et Mouseia: la consecration des Travaux et l'héroïsation d"Hésiode." In *La Montagne des Muses*. *Recherches et Rencontres* 7, edited by A. Hurst and A. Schachter. Geneva, 1996, 43-56.

Camodeca, G. "Ascesa al senato e rapporti con I territory d'origine Italia: Regio I (Campania, esclusa la zona di Capua e Cales), II (Apulia e Calabria), III (Lucania et Brutii)." *Tituli* 5 (1982): 101-63.

Camp, J. M. *The Athenian Agora. Excavations in the heart of classical Athens*. London, 1986.

——. "The Philosophical Schools of Roman Athens." In S. Walker and A. Cameron (eds.), *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire, ICS* Suppl. 55 (London, 1989): 50-5.

Christ, W. *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur 2*. Munich, 1905.

Cichorius, C. *Römische Studien: Historisches, Epigraphisches, Literargeschichtliches aus vier Jahrhunderten Roms*. Berlin, 1922.

Cohon, R. "A Muse Sarcophagus in its Context." AA (1992): 109-19.

Cumont, F. *Afterlife in Roman Paganism*. New Haven, 1937.

Daux, G. "La formule onomastique dans le domain Grec sous l'empire Romain." *AJPh* 100.1 (1979): 13-30.

Deininger, J. *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Munich, 1965.

del Carmen, M. and Barrigón Fuentes. "Sobre el culto de las Musas en Delfos."

CFC(G) 6 (1996): 237-250.

Delorme, J. *Gymnasion: Études sur les monuments consacrés à l'éducation en Grèce (des origins à l'Empire romain*). Paris 1960.

Dionisotti, A. C. "From Ausonius' Schooldays? A Schoolbook and Its Relatives." *JRS* 72 (1982): 83-125.

Easterling, P. E. and B. M. W. Knox, eds. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature: I. Greek Literature, 4*. New York, 1989.

Einarson, B. "Plutarch's Ancestry." *CP* 47.2 (1952): 99.
——. "Plutarch's Ancestry Again." *CP* 50.4 (1955): 253-5.

Elliott, T. "*Epigraphic Evidence for Boundary Disputes in the Roman Empire*." PhD diss., University of North Carolina, 2004.

Errington, R. M. "Aspects of Roman Acculturation in the East under the Republic." In *Alte Geschichte und Wissenschaftsgeschichte, Festschrift für K. Christ zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by Kneissl and Losemann. Darmstadt, 1998, 140-157.

Evans-Grubbs, J. "Abduction Marriage in Antiquity: A Law of Constantine (CTh IX. 24. I) and Its Social Context." *JRS* 79 (1989): 59-83.

Farnell, L. R. *The Cults of the Greek States*. 4 vols. Oxford, 1896-1909.

Fagan, G. G. *Bathing in Public in the Roman World*. Ann Arbor, 1999.

Feyel, M. *Contribution à l'épigraphie béotienne*. Strasbourg, 1942.

Flacelière, R. "Rome et ses empereurs vus par Plutarque." *AC* 32 (1963): 28-47.
——. "Hadrien et Delphes." *CRAI* (1971): 168-85.
——. *Plutarque: Oeuvres Morales, X: Dialogue sur l'amour*. Paris, 1980a.
——. "Tacite et Plutarque." In *Melanges de literature et d'epigraphie latines, d'histoire ancienne et d'archeologie. Hommage a la memoire de Pierre Wuilleumier*, edited by H. Le Bonniec and G. Vallet. Paris, 1980b, 113-119.
——. "Plutarque dans ses 'Oeuvres Morales.'" In *Plutarque: Oeuvres Morales, I.1*: *Introduction générale*. Paris, 1987, xxxvii-xxxviii.

Follet, S. "Flavius Euphanès d'Athènes, ami de Plutarque." In *Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie greques offerts a Pierre Chantraine*, edited by A. Ernout. Paris, 1972, 35-50.

Fossey, J. M. "The City Archive at Koroneia Boiotia." *Euphrosyne* 11 (1981-3): 45-60.
——. *Topography and Population of Ancient Boiotia*. Chicago, 1988.
——. *Papers of Boiotian Topography and History*. Amsterdam, 1990.
——. "The Copaic Basin in the 2nd Century A.D." In *Papers in Boiotian Topography and History*. Amsterdam, 1990.
——. "Boiotia and the Pontic Cities in the Archaic and Hellenistic Periods." *Boeotia Antiqua* 4 (1994): 107-15.

Foucart, P. "Donation de Philétaeros aux Muses de l'Hélicon." *BCH* 8 (1884): 158-60.
——. "Inscriptions de Béotie." *BCH* 9 (1885): 403-33.

Fraser, P. M. and E. Matthews, eds. *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names. Vol. IIIB: Central Greece from the Megarid to Thessaly*. New York, 2000.

Freitag, K. *Der Golf von Korinth*. Munich, 2000.

Frier, B. W. and T. A. J. McGinn, eds. *A Casebook on Roman Family Law*. New York, 2004.

Gantz, T. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Artistic and Literary Sources*. Baltimore, 1993.

Gatopoulos, Derek. "Greek Farmer Finds 2,000-Year-Old Monument." for the Associated Press on December 9, 2004 at http://www.livescience.com/history/sullas_monument_041209.html (accessed on April, 10, 2006).

Gauthier P. and M. E. Hatzopoulos. *La loi gymnasiarchique de Béroia. Meletemata 16*. Athens and Paris, 1993.

Geagan, D. "The Athenian Constitution after Sulla." *Hesperia Suppl.* 12 (1967): 1-242.
——. "Tiberius Claudius Novius, the Hoplite Generalship and the *Epimeleteia* of the Free City of Athens." *AJPh* 100.2 (1979): 279-87.

——. "Roman Athens: Some Aspects of Life and Culture I. 86 B.C. – A.D. 267." *ANRW* II.7.1 (1979): 371-437.
——. "The Athenian Elite: Romanization, Resistance, and the Exercise of Power." In *The Romanization of Athens: Proceedings of an International Conference held at Lincoln, Nebraska (April 1996*), Oxbow Monograph 94, edited by M. C. Hoff and S. I. Rotroff. Oxford, 1997, 19-32.

Ginouvès, R. *Balaneutikè: Recherches sur le bain dans l'antiquité grecque*. Paris 1962.

Gluckee, J. *Antiochus and the Late Academy*. Göttingen, 1978.

Görgemanns, H. "Eros als Gott in Plutarchs Amatorius," In *Gott und die Götter bei Plutarch. Götterbilder-Gottesbilder-Weltbilder. Religionsgeschichtlische Versuche und Vorarbeitern*, edited by R. Hirsch Luipold. Berlin, 2005, 169-95.

Gossage, A. "The Comparative Chronology of Inscriptions relating to Boiotian Festivals in the First Half of the First Century B.C." *BSA* 70 (1975): 115-34.

Gradel, I. *Emperor Worship and Roman Religion*. New York, 2002.

Graf, E. *Commentationes Philologae für O. Ribbeck*. Leipzig, 1887.

Graindor, P. *Un milliardaire antique: Hérode Atticus et sa famìlle*. Cairo, 1930.

Grimal, P. *Love in Ancient Rome*. New York, 1967.

Gruen, E. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca, NY, 1992.

Gutzwiller, K. "Gender and Inscribed Epigram: Herennia Procula and the Thespian Eros." *TAPA* 134.2 (2004): 383-418.

Habicht, C. *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece* (Sather Classical Lectures 50), Rev. ed. with new preface. Berkeley, 1998.

Hansen, M. H. "City-Ethnics as Evidence for *Polis* Identity." *Historia Suppl.* 108 (1996): 169-96.
_____. "Boiotia." In *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, edited by M. H. Hansen and T. H. Nielsen. New York, 2004, 431-61.

Hansen, M. H. and T. H. Nielsen, eds. *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*.

New York, 2004.

Hardie, A. "The *Georgics*, the Mysteries and the Muses at Rome." *PCPhS* 48 (2002): 175-208.

Harmon, D. P. "Religion in the Latin Elegists." *ANRW* II. 16.3 (1986): 1909-73.

Harries, J. "The Cube and the Square: Masculinity and male social roles in Roman Boiotia." In *When Men Were Men: masculinity, power and identity in Classical antiquity*, edited by L. Foxhall and J. Salmon. London, 1998, 184-94.

Hatzfeld, J. *Les trafiquants italiens dans l'Orient hellénique*. Paris, 1919.

Helm, R., ed. *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*^{2}. Berlin, 1956.

Hemelrijk, E. "Patronage of Cities: The Role of Women." In *Roman Rule and Civic Life: Local and Regional Perspectives. Impact of Empire, vol. 4*, edited by L. de Ligt, E. A. Hemelrijk and H. W. Singor. Amsterdam, 2004, 415-27.

Hermann, P. "Inschriften von Sardis." *Chiron* 23 (1993): 233-66.

Hermary, A., H. Cassimatis, R. Vollkommer. "Eros." *LIMC* III.1 (1986): 850-942.

Hirzel, R. *Der Dialog, II.* Leipzig, 1895.
——. *Plutarch. Das Erbe der Alten*. Leipzig, 1912.

Houser, J. S. "Eros and *Aphrodisia* in the Works of Dio Chrysostom." *ClassAnt* 17.2 (1998): 235-58.

Hubert, C. "*De Plutarchi Amatorio*." PhD diss., University of Berlin, 1903.

Hurst, A. "La stele de l'Hélicon." In *La Montagne des Muses*. *Recherches et Rencontres* 7, edited by A. Hurst and A. Schachter. Geneva, 1996, 57-72.

International Plutarch Society.
http://www.usu.edu/history/ploutarchos/plutbib.htm.

Jamot, P. "Fouilles de Thespies: Les jeux en l'honneur des Muses." *BCH* 19 (1895): 311-66.

——. "Fouilles de Thespies: Les jeux en l'honneur d'Éros." *BCH* 19 (1895): 366-74.
——. "Fouilles de Thespies: Deux familles thespiennes pendant deux siècles." *BCH* 26 (1903): 291-320.
——. "Fouilles de Thespies: Le Monument des Muses dans le bois de l'Hélicon et le poète Honestus." *BCH* 26 (1903): 129-160.

Jamot, P. and A. de Ridder. "Fouilles de Thespies et de l'hiéron des Muses de l'Hélicon." *BCH* 46 (1922): 217-306.

Jones, A. H. M. *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*. Oxford, 1940.

Jones, C. P. "Towards a Chronology of Plutarch's Works." *JRS* 56 (1966): 61-76.
——. "The Teacher of Plutarch" *HSCP* 71 (1967): 205-13.
——. "A Leading Family of Roman Thespiae." *HSCP* 74 (1970b): 223-55.
——. *Plutarch and Rome.* New York, 1971.
——. "The Panhellenion." *Chiron* 26 (1996): 29-56.

Kahrestedt, U. *Das Wirtschaftliche Gesicht Griechenlands in der Kaiserzeit*. Bern, 1954.

Kajava, M. "Cornelia and Taurus at Thespiae." *ZPE* 79 (1989): 139-49.

Kapetanopoulos, E. "Three Athenian Archons et alia." *Ἑλληνικά* 29 (1976): 257-8.

Kaster, R. A. "Notes on 'Primary' and 'Secondary' Schools in Late Antiquity." *TAPA* 113 (1983): 323-46.

Kennell, N. "Neron Periodonikes." *AJPh* 109 (1988): 239-51.
——. "Most Necessary for the Bodies of Men: Olive Oil and its By-Products in the Later Greek Gymnasium." In *In Altum: Seventy-Five Years of Classical Studies in Newfoundland*, edited by M. Joyal. St. John's, Newfoundland, 2001, 119-33.
——. *Ephebeia: A Register of Greek Cities with Citizen Training systems in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Hildesheim, 2006.

Kent, J. H. *Corinth: Results of the excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, VIII.3: The Inscriptions 1926-1950*. Princeton, 1966.

Keramopoulos, A. D. "Θηβαϊκά." *AD* 3 (1917): 1-503.

——. "Ἐπιγραφαὶ Θεσπιῶν." *AD* 14 (1931-2): 12-40.

Knoepfler, D. "La reorganization du concours des Mouseia à l'époque hellénistique: esquisse d'une solution nouvelle." In *La Montagne des Muses*. *Recherches et Rencontres* 7, edited by A. Hurst and A. Schachter. Geneva, 1996, 141-170.

Koumanoudes, S. A. *Athenaion* 10 (1882): 406-8, no. 1.
——. *Χαριστήριον εἰς Ἀ. Κ. Ὀρλάνδον*, II. 1964, 1-21.
——. *Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Στερεοελλαδικῶν Μελετῶν* 4 (1973): 355-66.
——. *Θηβαϊκή Προσωπογραφία*. Athens, 1979.

Lamberton, R. "Plutarch, Hesiod, and the Mouseia of Thespiai." *ICS* 13.2 (1988): 491-504.
——. "Plutarch and the Romanization of Athens." In *The Romanization of Athens*, edited by M. C. Hoff and S. I Rotroff. Oxford, 1997, 151-60.

L'Année philologique. http://www.annee -philologique.com/aph/.

Lateiner, D. "Abduction Marriage in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*." *GRBS* 38 (1997): 409-39.

Leake, W. M. *Travels in Northern Greece*, 4 vols. London, 1835.

Lefkowitz, M. R. "'Predatory' Goddesses." *Hesperia* 71.4 (2002): 325-44.

Levick, B. *Vespasian*. New York, 1999.
——. "Greece and Asia Minor." *CAH*^{2} (2000): 604-34.

Lexicon of Greek Personal Names. http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk/names/practices.html (accessed on 9/11/2007).

Lonsdale, S. H. Dance *and Ritual Play in Greek Religion*. Baltimore, 1993.

Lopes, E. "Cheronea: Eros oltre morte." *PP* 57 (2002): 372-84.

Manfredini, M. "Sulla traditione manoscritta dei 'Moralia' 70-77." In *Sulla tradizionne manoscritta dei 'Moralia' di Plutarco, o*, Atti del Convegno salernitano del 4-5 dic. 1986, edited by I. Gallo. Salerno. 1988, 123-38.

Manton, R. G. "The Manuscript Tradition of Plutarch's *Moralia*." *CQ* 43.3/4 (1949): 97-104.

Martin Jr., H. "Amatorius (Moralia 748E-771E)." In *Plutarch's Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature*, edited by H. D. Betz. Leiden, 1978, 442-537.

McAllister, M. H. "Kreusa (Livadhostro), Boiotia, Greece." In *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*, edited by R. Stillwell, W. L. MacDonald & M. H. McAllister. Princeton, 1976, 470.

——. "Tithorea (Velitsa) Phokis, Greece." In *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*, edited by R. Stillwell, W. L. MacDonald & H. McAllister. Princeton, 1976, 926-7.

Meritt, B. D. "Greek Inscriptions." *Hesperia* 15 (1946): 169-253.

Michaud, J. P. "Chronique des Fouilles en 1973." *BCH* 98 (1974): 649-5.

Migeotte, L. *L'emprunt public dans les cites grecques*. Paris, 1984.

——. "Resources financiers des cites béotienne." *Boeotia Antiqua* 4 (1994): 3-15.

Miller, S. G. *Ancient Greek Athletics*. New Haven, 2004.

Moretti, L. "Iscrizione di Tespie della prima età imperial." *Athenaeum* 59 (1981): 71-7.

Müller, C. "Les recherches française à Thespies et au Val des Muses." In *La Montagne des Muses*. *Recherches et Rencontres* 7, edited by A. Hurst and A. Schachter. Geneva, 1996, 171-184.

——. "Les Italiens in Beotie." In *Les Italiens dans le monde grec: II^e siècle av. J.-C.- I^er siècle ap. J.-C., BCH Suppl*. 41, edited by C. Müller and C. Hasenohr. 2002, 89-100.

Müller, H. "Marcus Aurelius Olympiodoros, ἔκγονος Ἱπποδρόμου." *ZPE* 3.3 (1968): 197-220.

Murison, C. L. *Rebellion and Reconstruction: Galba to Demo. An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History, Books 64-67 (A.D. 68-96)*. Atlanta, 1999.

Newby, Z. *Greek Athletics in the Roman World: Victory and Virtue*. New York, 2005.

Oikonomides, A. N. "Ἀφροδίτη Θεσπία." *Platon* 7 (1955): 342-4.

Oldfather, A. "A Friend of Plutarch's Grandfather." *CP* 19.2 (1924): 177.

Oliver, J. H. "Greek Inscriptions." *Hesperia* 11.1 (1942): 29-90.
——. "Two Athenian Poets." *Hesperia Suppl.* 8 (1949): 243-58.
——. "Imperial Commissioners in Achaia." *GRBS* 14 (1973): 389-405.
——. "The Diadoche at Athens under the Humanistic Emperors." *AJPh* 98.2 (1977): 160-78.
——. "Helladarch." *RSA* 8 (1978): 1-6.
——. "Panachaeans and Panhellenes." *Hesperia* 47.2 (1978): 185-91.
——. "Flavius Pantaenus, Priest of the Philosophical Muses." *HThR* 72 (1979): 157-60.
——. "Roman Senators from Greece and Macedonia." *Atti del Colloquio Internazionale AIEGL su Epigrafia e Ordine Senatorio II. Tituli 5* (1982a): 583-602.
——. "Arrian in Two Roles." *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History and Topography. Presented to Eugene Vanderpool*. *Hesperia Suppl.* 19 (1982b) 122-9.
——. *Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors from Inscriptions and Papyri*. Philadelphia, 1989.

Oulhen, J. "Phokis." *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, edited by M. H. Hansen and T. H. Nielsen. New York, 2004, 399-430.

Papahatzes, N. *Παυσανίου Ἑλλάδος Περιήγησις. V. Βοιωτικὰ καὶ Φωκικά*, 2nd ed. Athens, 1981.

Papalas, A. J. "Herodes Atticus: An Essay on Education in the Antonine Age." *History of Education Quarterly* 21.2 (1981): 171-88.

Parkin, Tim. "Out of Sight, Out of Mind: Elderly Members of the Roman Family." In *The Roman Family in Italy: Status, Sentiment, Space*, edited by B. Rawson and P. Weaver. New York, 1999, 123-48.

Peek, W. "Die Musen von Thespiai." In *ΓΕΡΑΣ Ἀντωνίου Κεραμοπούλλου*. Thessaloniki, 1953, 609-34.
——. "Hesiod und der Helikon." *Philologus* 121 (1977): 173-5.

Pelling, C. B. R. "Plutarch: Roman Heroes and Greek Culture." In *Philosophia*

togata, I, edited by M. Griffin and J. Barnes. Oxford, 1989, 199-232.

Pflaum, H. -G. *Les carriers procuratoriennes équestres sous le Haut-Empire romain* III. Paris, 1961.

Plassart, A. *Laographia* 7 (1923): 184-5
——. "Inscriptions." *BCH* 50 (1926): 383-462.
——. "Fouilles de Thespies et de l'hieron des Muses de l'Helicon: Inscriptions." *BCH* 50 (1926): 383-462.

Plutarch. Moralia. Volume IX. Translated by E. L. Minar Jr., F. H. Sandbach, W. C. Helmbold. Cambridge, MA, 1999.

Pomeroy, S. B. *Women in Hellenistic Egypt*. New York, 1984.
——. *Xenophon Oeconomicus: A Social and Historical Commentary*. New York, 1994
——. *Families in Classical and Hellenistic Greece: Representations and Realities*. New York, 1998.
——, ed. *Plutarch's Advice to the Bride and Groom and A Consolation to his Wife.* New York, 1999.

Potter, D. S. "Entertainers in the Roman Empire." In *Life, Death, and Entertainment in the Roman Empire*, edited by D. S. Potter and D.J. Mattingly. Ann Arbor, MI, 1999, 256-325.

Pouilloux, J. "Les épimélètes des Amphictions: tradition delphique et politique romaine." In *Mélanges de litterature et d'epigraphiw Latines d'histoire ancienne et d'archeologie. Hommage a la memoire de Pierre Wuilleumier*, edited by H. Le Bonniec and G. Vallet. Paris, 1980, 281-300.

Pucci Ben Zeev, M. *Diaspora Judaism in Turmoil, 116/117 CE: Ancient Sources and Modern Insights*. Leuven, 2005.

Puech, B. "Soklaros de Tithorée, ami de Plutarque, et ses descendants." *REG* 94 (1981): 186-92.
——. "Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque." *ANRW* II.33.6 (1992): 4831-93.
——. "Prosopographie et chronologie delphique sous le Haut-Empire: l'apport de Plutarque et de l'histoire littéraire." *Topoi (Lyon)* 8.1 (1998): 261-66.

Reynolds, J. *Aphrodisias and Rome*. London, 1982.

Rist, J. M. "*Amatorius*: A Commentary of Plato's Theories of Love?" *CQ* 51.2 (2001): 557-75.

Robert, L. *Hellenica, Recueil d'épigraphie de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques*, II. Paris, 1946.
——. "Documents d'Asie Mineure, V-XVII." *BCH* 102 (1978): 395-543.

Rocchi, M. "Le mont Hélicon: un espace mythique." In *La Montagne des Muses*. *Recherches et Rencontres* 7, edited by A. Hurst and A. Schachter. Geneva, 1996, 15-26.

Roesch, P. *Thespies et la Confédération Béotienne*. Paris, 1965.
——. "Thespiai, Boiotia, Greece." In *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*, edited by R. Stillwell, W. L. MacDonald & M. H. McAllister. Princeton, 1976, 911-2.
——. "Chaironeia, Boiotia, Greece." In *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*, edited by R. Stillwell, W. L. MacDonald and M. H. McAllister. Princeton, 1976, 215-6.
——. "Sanctuary of the Muses, Mt. Helikon, Greece." In *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*, edited by R. Stillwell, W. L. MacDonald & M. H. McAllister. Princeton, 1976, 806.
——. *Études béotiennes*. Paris, 1982.
——. "La femme et la fortune en Boétie," In *La femme dans le monde méditerranen I*. Lyon, 1985, 71-84.

Roller, D. W. "Recent Investigations at Grimádha (Tanagra)." *Boeotia Antiqua* 1 (1989): 129-63.
——. "Boiotians in South Italy: Some Thoughts." *Boeotia Antiqua* 4 (1994): 63-70.

Romani, S. "Empona e Sabino. Plutarco (amat. 24,770-25,771c)." In *Eros. Antiche trame greche d'amore*, edited by A. Stramaglia. Bari, 2000, 147-154.

Roux, G. "Le Val des Muses et les Musées chez les auteurs anciens." *BCH* 78 (1954): 22-48.

Russell, D. A. *Plutarch*. London, 1973.
——. "Plutarch." *OCD*[3] (1999): 1200-01.

Salmeri, G. "Dio, Rome, and the Civic Life of Asia Minor." In *Dio Chrysostom: Politics, Letters, and Philosophy*, edited by S. Swain. New York, 2000, 53-92.

Sandbach, F. H. "The Date of the Eclipse in Plutarch's *De Facie*." *CP* 23.1 (1929): 15-6.
——. "Rhythm and Authenticity in Plutarch's *Moralia*." *CQ* 33 (1939): 197-8.
——. "Some Textual Notes on Plutarch's Moralia." *CQ* 35.3/5 (1941): 110-18.

Sarikakis, T. "Συμβολὴν εἰς τὴν Ἱστορίαν τῆς Ἠπείρου κατὰ τοὺς Ρωμαϊκοὺς Χρόνους." *Hellenica* 19 (1966): 193-215.

Schachter, A. "A note on the reorganization of the Thespian Mouseia." *NC* 7th Ser. (1961): 67-70.
——. "Some Underlying Cult Patterns in Boeotia." *Teiresias*, Suppl. 1 (1972): 17-30.
——. *Cults of Boiotia*, 4 vols. London, 1981.
——. "Reconstructing Thespiai." In *La Montagne des Muses*. *Recherches et Rencontres* 7, edited by A. Hurst and A. Schachter. Geneva, 1996, 99-126.

Schilardi, D. U. "*The Thespian Poliandrion (424 B.C.): The Excavations and Finds from a Thespian State Burial*," vols. 3. PhD diss., Princeton University, 1977.

Schmidt, M. G. "Claudius und Vespasian: eine Interpretation des Wortes 'vae, puto, deus fio' (Suet. *Vesp*. 23, 4)," *Chiron* 18 (1988) 83-9.

Shaps, D. "The Woman Least Mentioned: Etiquette and Women's Names." *CQ* 27 (1977): 323-30.

Sherk, R. K. "The Eponymous Officials of the Greek Cities, II: Mainland Greece and the Adjacent Islands." *ZPE* 84 (1990): 231-95.

Sherwin-White, A. N. *Roman Foreign Policy in the East 168 B.C. to A.D. 1*. London, 1984.

Shipley, G. *The Greek World After Alexander 323-30 BC*. New York, 2000.

Sifakis, G. M. "Organization of Festivals and the Dionysiac Guilds" *CQ* 15 (1965): 206-14.

Sirinelli, J. *Plutarque de Chéronée: un philosophe dans le siècle*. Paris, 2000.

Smallwood, E. M. *The Jews under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian*. Leiden,

1976.

Sosin, J. D. "A Missing Woman; the Hellenistic Leases from Thespiae Revisited" *GRBS* 41 (2000): 47-58.

Spawforth, A. "Agonistic Festivals in Roman Greece." In *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire*, edited by S. Walker and A. Cameron. London, 1989, 193-7.

——. "The Panhellenion Again." *Chiron* 29 (1999): 339-42.

Spyropoulos, T. "Ἀρχαιότητες καὶ μνημεῖα Βοιωτίας-Φθιώτιδος" *AD* 26 (1971) *Χρονικά*: 195-238.

Stadter, P. A. "Reviews of Jones' *Plutarch and Rome*." *American Classical Review* 2.6 (1972): 256-7.

——. "Plutarch: Diplomat for Delphi?" In *The Statesman in Plutarch's Works, Vol. I.*, edited by L. De Blois et al. Boston, 2004, 19-31.

Stevenson, F. R. and L. J. Fatoohi. "The Solar Eclipse described by Plutarch." *Histos* 2 (1998). http://www.dur.ac.uk/Clssics/histos/1998/stephenson.html. (accessed on October 29, 2007).

Swain, S. C. R. "Plutarch, Hadrian, and Delphi." *Historia* 40 (1991): 318-30.

——. *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50-250*. New York, 1996.

Syme, R. "The Journeys of Hadrian." *ZPE* 73 (1988): 159-70.

——. "Municius Fundanus from Ticinum." In *Roman Papers*, VII, edited by A. Birley. Oxford, 1991, 603-19.

Symeonoglou, S. *The Topography of Thebes from the Bronze Age to Modern Times*. Princeton, 1985.

Talbert, C. A. "Biographies as instruments of Religious Propaganda." *ANRW* II.16.2 (1978): 1619-51.

Talbert, R. J. A. (ed.). *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World, 2 vols.* Princeton, 2000.

Thériault, G. *Le culte d'homonoia dans les cités grecques*. Lyon and Quebec, 1996.

Tracy, S. V. *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 68 BC*. Berkeley, 1990.
——. "Hands in Greek Epigraphy – Demetrios of Phaleron." *Boeotia Antiqua* 4 (1994): 151-6.

Traill, J. S. "Greek Inscriptions from the Athenian Agora: Addenda to the Athenian Agora, Vol. XV, Inscriptions: The Athenian Councillors." *Hesperia* 47.3 (1978): 269-331.

Travlos, J. *Pictorial Dictionary of Athens*. New York, 1971.

Tuplin, C. J. "The Fate of Thespiae during the Theban Hegemony." *Athenaeum* 64 (1986): 321-41.

van Bremen, R. *The Limits of Participation: Women and Civic Life in the Greek East in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. Amsterdam, 1996.

van Effenterre, H. *Les Béotiens. Aux frontiers de l'Athènes antique*. Paris, 1989.

van Groningen, B. A. "Les trios Muses de l'Helicon." *Antiquite classique* 17 (1948): 292-6.

Veneri, A. "L'Elicona nella cultura tespiese all III sec. a. C.: la stele di Euthy[kl]es." In *La Montagne des Muses*. *Recherches et Rencontres* 7, edited by A. Hurst and A. Schachter. Geneva, 1996, 73-86.

Wallace, P. "Boiotia in the time of Strabo." *Teiresias*, Suppl. 1 (1972): 71-5 and fig. 5.
——. "Hesiod and the Valley of the Muses." *GRBS* 15 (1974): 5-24.

Weir, R. G. A. "Roman Delphi and its Pythian Games." PhD diss., Princeton University, 1998.

Willers, D. *Hadrians panhellenisches Programm*. Basel, 1990.

Wiseman, J. "Corinth and Rome I: 228 B.C.-A.D. 267." *ANRW* II.7.1 (1979): 438-548.

Wycherley, R. E. *The Stones of Athens*. Princeton, 1978.

Zagdoun, M. A. “Plutarque à Delphes.” *REG* 108 (1995): 586-92.

Ziegler, K. “Plutarchs Ahnen.” *Hermes* 82 (1954): 499-501.
——. “Plutarchos.” *RE* 21 (1894-1980): 635-962 = *Plutarchos von Chaironeia* (Stuttgart, 1964).