

PLOUTARCHOS, n.s.

Scholarly Journal of the

INTERNATIONAL PLUTARCH SOCIETY

Plutarchus



Plutarchus ein natürlicher maister vnd auffspringender geistlicher maister ein gepie-
ter vñ amichter des kaisers Craym ist zu dieser zeit in dem Dolicates in fern-
wüdigkeit in fast großer achung gewest. von dem Dolicates in fern-
Plutarchus der natürlich maister ist in dem heilighumb schen der sitzen ein so-
gewest das er leichtlich ein gepietet des kaisers hat migen erkant werden also
dicht. sein selb er samkeit der kaiser seinen unger vñ der vnderthanen lieb vñ
sachen in freichschem vñ hohgeleitet man gar vil bacher von mancherley materien vñ
tapfretet bey Craymo angenehme begabung erlangt.

VOLUME 2 (2004/2005)

UNIVERSITY OF MÁLAGA (SPAIN)
UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY, LOGAN, UTAH (U.S.A.)

Elle en consacre une autre (p. 161-162) à Callistratos, fils de Léon, autre personnage des *Propos de table* (IV, 4-6 ; VII, 5). C'était sans doute un Delphien. Il pourrait être le bouleute mentionné dans un décret de citoyenneté très mutilé (*FD* III, 4, 111) qui date de la fin du I^{er} ou du début du II^e siècle, sous l'archontat de Tiberius Calavius Firmus, qui était lui aussi, semble-t-il, un proche de Plutarque.

Enfin, une inscription d'Éleusis (n° 180) datant du III^e siècle concerne le héraut sacré et sophiste Nicagoras. Il est qualifié de « descendant des philosophes Plutarque et Sextus ». Comme le remarque à juste titre B. Puech, l'absence de gentilice a pour effet de présenter Nicagoras comme l'égal des deux philosophes. Le sophiste avait sans doute préparé lui-même l'inscription. B. Puech ajoute que l'on aperçoit peut-être l'aïeule ou la parente de Nicagoras dans les *Métamorphoses* d'Apulée (II, 2). Dans ce roman, le narrateur proclame d'ailleurs qu'il descend lui aussi, par sa famille maternelle, de Plutarque et de Sextus (I, 2). B. Puech considère que, par cette référence, Nicagoras entend, comme le personnage d'Apulée, se réclamer d'une certaine tradition platonicienne.

Les inscriptions présentées par B. Puech permettent ainsi d'apercevoir certains personnages de Plutarque et certains signes de sa gloire posthume.

ALAIN BILLAUT

PLUTARQUE, *Oeuvres morales* IV. *Conduites méritoires de femmes, Étiologies romaines, Étiologies grecques, Parallèles mineurs*, texte établi et traduit par Jacques Boulogne, Collection des universités de France, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 2002. ISBN 2-251-00499-8, ISSN: 0184-7155.

The latest volume of the C.U.F. (Budé) *Moralia* provides a rich harvest of quite disparate works, although all fit under Ziegler's

rubric of "antiquarischen Schriften". *Meritorious deeds of Women* (*Mul. virt.*) offers twenty-seven historical or semi-historical narratives, *Roman Aetiologies* (*Qu. rom.*) one hundred thirteen inquiries into Roman customs, *Greek Aetiologies* (*Qu. gr.*) fifty-nine explanations of unusual Greek practices, and finally *Lesser Parallels* (*Par. min.*), generally considered as non-Plutarchan, forty-one pairs of rather bizarre incidents from Greek and Roman myth, legend and history. The works document that Plutarch's moral philosophy was intimately related to his extensive reading in local history and religious ritual and cult. For him, reading about, telling stories of and speculating on customs and religious practice was a fundamental mode of understanding people. If on the one hand he was alert in his major writings to the rhetorical and literary elements of his task, in these works he lets us see his curiosity about human behavior and the lengths to which he will go in his reading to satisfy it.

I will consider the construction of the text first, then treat each work individually. B. does not claim a thorough new collation, but prefers as a rule to accept the text of Nachstädt for *Mul. virt.* and *Par. min.*, and that of Titchener for *Qu. rom.* and *Qu. gr.* (X). For his basic stemma he relies chiefly on Irigoin's study in vol. I of the series. The detailed collations of *Par. min.* by A. De Lazzer (*Plutarco: Paralleli minori*, Naples 2000 [CPM 33] 89-139) appeared too late to be used; the *CPM* editions of the other works are still being prepared. For this review I have sampled sections of B.'s text of *Mul. Virt.* and *Par. Min.*

In *Mul. virt.* B. devotes very few notes to textual issues: for the twenty Stephanus pages of this work, I counted twelve. Five consider names; three justify accepting a reading already in Nachstädt; one discreetly points to his own conjecture at 250B6, a correction that is not necessary, but is suggested by some variant readings. The remaining three justify keeping the reading of the mss.

against emendations accepted by Nachstädt at 249A, 250B, and 250D. In fact, although B. does not refer to the strictures of I. Gallo against the Teubner edition's normalization of Plutarch's language, or the more passionate sentiments of G. Giangrande in the same volume, B. not infrequently prefers the mss. to Nachstädt's text when the mss. are in agreement: in the first five pages he accepts 243D *ekbiazōsi* (vs. *ekbibazōsi*), 243D *bebaiois* (vs. *bebaian* <*alloys*>), 243E *de* (vs. *dei*), *eu te kai kalōs* (Nachstädt obelizes the passage), and *poiein autous* (vs. *poiein hautois* <*tous*>), 244D *tauta* (vs. *tautá*). At 246D9, *Kruasan* seems a misprint for *Kruassan*, used below at 246F10, and in the translation. B. follows Nachstädt in accepting Dinse's emendation at 243B of the optative after *ean* to a subjunctive. He silently passes over many conjectures recorded but not accepted by Nachstädt, as he does my own suggestion to read Evadne for Eirene at 243D (*CQ* 25 [1975] 157-58). Unlike Nachstädt, he does not try to avoid hiatus in the text.

B.'s edition of *Par. min.* gives only that work, without the parallels reported by Nachstädt and De Lazzer. Jacoby called for a full reconstruction of the original work of which he thought *Par. min.* an epitome (*FGrHist* 3A, p. 369). B. rejects this approach, asserting that *Par. min.* is the original work, and the other versions are derivative. In the first ten pairs B. differs some eighteen times from Nachstädt, thirteen from De Lazzer (who differs from Nachstädt ten times), most often on names (Postumios Albinos 306B,

Trisimachos 307A, Konatios [B.'s own conjecture, supported by CIL VII, 1336] 307B, Kritolaos 307B, Koklēs 307D, Entoria 307E [n. 73 suggests Satoria]). B. does not mark the lacunae postulated by Nachstädt when author names are missing at 307C and E, and accepts *pemptō* at 308C. He rejects emendations for *duo* 306B and *timion* 306F, but accepts *erēmias* 306B, *lithinos* 306F, and *hētēmenou* 307C. Altogether his editing practice is more conservative than Nachstädt, but less so than De Lazzer. The apparatus is rather full, but more condensed than De Lazzer's.

Meritorious Acts of Women (Mulierum Virtutes)

Plutarch's collection surprises for the variety of actions presented as virtuous, quite different from what we know of other collections of warrior women in antiquity (e.g., the *Anonymous de mulieribus*, recently translated and annotated by D. Gera²). B.'s introduction reviews the major issues: the locations, times, and types of action treated, other catalogues of women³, and the meaning of *aretē* when applied to women (though B. notes that the title is probably not Plutarch's). Plutarch's method is to argue by examples, but the comparative method proposed in his introduction is left implicit in the stories that follow. Unfortunately S. B. Pomeroy's book *Plutarch's Advice to the Bride and Groom and A Consolation to his Wife* (Oxford 1999), which contains useful essays on Plutarch's attitude toward and literary treatment of women, apparently appeared too late to be used.

¹ I. GALLO, "Ecdotica e critica testuale nei 'Moralia' di Plutarco", and G. GIANGRANDE, "Testo e lingua nel de Alexandri fortuna aut virtute plutarcho" in *Ricerche plutarchee*, ed. I. GALLO, Naples 1992, pp. 11-37, 39-84. Cf. the review by A. B. BOSWORTH, *Ploutarchos*, 11.1 (Nov. 1994) 24-28 and the response of GIANGRANDE, *L'Antiquité Classique*, 65 (1996) 217-23. Gallo laments the reluctance of the earlier C.U.F. editors of Plutarch's *Moralia* to challenge more often the Teubner edition's readiness to emend the text of the manuscripts.

² *Warrior Women: the Anonymous Tractatus de Mulieribus*, Leiden, 1996.

³ Cf. also on medieval catalogues G. MCLEOD, *Virtue and venom. Catalogs of women from antiquity to the Renaissance*, Ann Arbor, 1991.

B. notes that the general tone of the essay is one of curiosity regarding customs, history, and religion, a tone that appears also in the *Quaestiones* which follow. Moreover, like *Qu. rom.*, *Mul. virt.* often gives variant accounts. But B. perhaps underrates the narrative technique of the stories, a topic which is addressed neither in the introduction nor the notes. The stories vary from brief notices (the women of Ceos, no. 12) to long narratives presented in multiple episodes (Mikka and Megisto, no. 15). It surely is not enough to credit Phylarchus with the narrative of the latter: Plutarch presumably reshaped it for this collection (e.g., by eliminating Hellanicus' threat to betray the conspirators, found in Justin). Some comment on the structure, tone, and style of these narratives would have been instructive.

For the date of composition, B. argues from parallels with the *Lives* and calculations concerning the recently deceased Leontis and Clea, the dedicatee, to arrive at a time ca. 110. The date would probably be earlier if the elder Clea is meant, as I believe. The fundamental source question is the relation between *Mul. virt.* and the many similar stories in Polyaeus' *Strategemata*. B. accepts my argument of 1965⁴ that Polyaeus took those stories from Plutarch rather than a common source (31-38). The stories, he concludes, come in large part from reading done while preparing the *Lives*, and are derived from a large number of sources. Women frequently achieve the overthrow of tyrants (nos. 15, 19, 25, 26) as well as other dangers: a sign, perhaps, that in Plutarch's thinking, as in Attic tragedy, women step in to defend society when men are unable to do so. More might have been said on Plutarch's dialogue with Herodotus, Phylarchus, and other major historians: does his introduction of variants or diverse emphases tell us something about

his own thinking, or is it part of the show of erudition essential for a prominent literary figure in Plutarch's day?⁵

While we may think the stories trivial, the surprisingly large number of translations and plays based on these stories composed since the Renaissance show that the collection played an influential role in defending women's independence of action. B. recalls Aulotte's observation of its significance in the sixteenth century for the *querelle sur les femmes*.

B.'s thirty-six pages of notes are quite full on sources and historical matters, according to the new practice of the C. U. F. series, and will be very convenient for consultation. Several times the notes justify B. in preserving in his translation a 'Greek' flavor for words commonly used to translate Latin terms, thus "commandant supreme" for *hypatos*, the usual Greek word for consul (n. 164). However, in the notes as in the introduction, B. is usually silent on literary or stylistic matters.

Roman Aetiologies (Quaestiones Romanae)

The standard treatment of *Qu. rom.* by H. J. Rose is now almost ninety years old (though it was published in 1924 and reprinted in 1975, it was largely completed before the First World War). Rose gives a thorough discussion, supplying comparative material in the Frazierian tradition. I have not seen the introduction, translation, and notes of M. López Salva (Plutarco, *Obras morales y costumbres* V, Madrid 1989). Just before the present work was published, and too late to be more than mentioned in the preface, M. Nouilhan, J.-M. Pailler and P. Payen produced their introduction, translation, and notes to both *Roman and Greek Questions, Grecs et Romains en parallèle* (Paris 1999). B.'s own thorough study in

⁴ *Plutarch's Historical Methods*, Cambridge MA, 1965, pp. 13-29, cf. now also M. T. SCHETTINO, *Introduzione a Polieno* [Pisa, 1998], pp. 184-88.

⁵ Cf. T. WHITMARSH, *Greek literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*, Oxford 2001.

ANRW and his book⁶, which provide an overview of the larger issues raised this work, especially Plutarch's attitude toward Rome, are now complemented by his introduction in the present text.

The *Roman Questions* are valuable to us as a source of customs and rites, but for Plutarch they are an attempt to bridge a gulf of difference between Roman and Greek traditions. Roman practices elicit from Plutarch a variety of responses, characterized by B. as characterological, ethical, historical, mythological, and physical (i.e., based on natural philosophy). Multiple explanations pile up for almost every topic, and it is not easy to decide when or whether Plutarch has a preference for one or the other. Plutarch's attempts at explanation often tell us more about him than about the Romans. B. sees Plutarch as attempting an 'ethnography' or a 'hermeneutic' of Roman society and practices, and speaks of Plutarch's 'hellenization' of the Romans, but notes (99) that through study of the Romans Plutarch attempts to express a general notion of human behavior. This could be pursued. Plutarch explores difference in terms of similarity, demonstrating that what in Roman customs at first seems strange to a Greek fits into standard patterns familiar to his audience: a historical moment preserved in a ritual or customary practice, the expression of an underlying social good, or of an ethical or philosophical truth. What is most remarkable is that in all the 113 questions, none of the Roman practices is interpreted as bad, harmful, or foolish. Time and again the

strange or 'other' is shown to be similar to practices found also in Greece⁷, or alluded to in a Greek poet, or consonant with Greek philosophy, but never reprehensible⁸. Roman practices are sometimes to be preferred to the Greek, as in beginning the day at midnight and the year after the winter solstice. Plutarch argues that while not intuitively obvious, the Roman usage is astronomically and philosophically profound (84, 284C-F; 19, 267F-268D). Plutarch can even seem to share the Romans' distaste for Greek practices: "The Romans have strong reservations about oiling the body, and think that there is no greater cause for the Greeks' slavery and softness than the gymnasiums and palaestras, which engender much boredom and idleness in the cities, as well as time-wasting and pederasty" (274D). The first person plural in this work often refers to Greeks, but more frequently refers to human beings in general, suggesting a fundamental unity of viewpoint and interests among all peoples. A comparison with modern Western European and American criticisms of practices in some contemporary Islamic countries (treatment of women, the legal code) reveals Plutarch's openness and an underlying desire to stress concord over opposition. The Romans are presented as one unusual and especially interesting group within a larger whole, to which the Greeks also belong.

While admitting that citation does not need to mean direct reading, B. believes that Plutarch himself, not some earlier scholar, was the learned man who did most of the reading in both the Roman and Greek

⁶ "Les 'Questions romaines' de Plutarque", *ANRW* II.33.6 (1992), 4682-4708 and *Plutarque. Un aristocrate grec sous l'occupation romaine*, Lille, 1994, 75-146, with the observations of S. SWAIN, *Ploutarchos* 12,2 (1995-96) 16-20.

⁷ Twice Plutarch mentions practices 'among us' in Chaeronea (267D) or Boeotia (271D). Cf. also 278D, apparently referring to Chaeronea.

⁸ Even the sacrifice of two Greeks and two Gauls is accepted as ordered by oracles (83, 283F-84C). Cf. as well the detailed description of the living burial of an unchaste vestal at *Numa* 10, where Plutarch recognizes the horror of the punishment, but does not condemn it, as does Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* 4.11).

sources he cites, perhaps helped by secretaries or students. B. argues reasonably that Plutarch read Latin as he required information, and not for pleasure, though I do not expect that we would find indications of leisure reading in Latin in his published works in any case. He places the composition of the work ca. 100-110 A.D., as Plutarch was beginning work on the *Parallel Lives*, the sources of which it shares⁹. However, Plutarch may well have begun his reading much earlier, since both his *Lives of the Caesars* and *Fortune of the Romans* show his deep interest in Roman affairs. Cluvius Rufus, cited at *Qu. rom.* 289C, is also cited at *Otho* 3.2¹⁰. The reference to his younger contemporary Favorinus (271C) is intriguing: from a lecture, or a conversation at a symposium (cf. *Qu. Conv.* 734D, where Favorinus shares a conversation with Plutarch, his sons, and Mestrius Florus).

The notes are quite full, and serve on the whole to replace Rose. As is to be expected, they are chiefly informational, explaining Plutarch's references and citing other ancient passages and modern discussions. *Roman Questions* is full of oddities, and B. follows every trail as far as possible. In this sense his notes complement those of Nouilhan and Pailler, who are much more brief on factual information, but attempt an interpretation of each question as a whole, looking at what it reveals about Plutarch's thinking (cf. the section in their introduction, "How should we read the *Roman and Greek Questions* today?", 48-55). The contrast is apparent in the treatment of the four proposed responses on 18, 'Why do many

wealthy Romans tithe to Heracles?'. B. gives notes on Heracles' supposed visit to Rome, the identification of Roman Hercules with Greek Heracles, the Roman "tithe" to Hercules¹¹, the nature of offerings to Heracles, the source of the explanations (not necessarily Varro), and the Hippocratic *Aphorisms* as source for the idea of maintaining health by removing the superfluous (326-27). These notes are fuller than Rose's, but do not comment, e.g., on why Plutarch seems to prefer the last response (indicated both by *ê mallon* and the climactic position). Nouilhan and Pailler (92-93) follow a fixed format (cf. pp. 60-61): sources (Varro and the *Aphorisms*), historical and linguistic clarifications (Hercules in other of the *Questions*, the Ara maxima, the tithe to Heracles [with fewer parallel passages than B.], Heracles' offerings and virtue). In their rubric 'interpretation' they read the four hypotheses as progressively moving from less to more certain, leading to a true understanding of Heracles and his benefactions. For them, Plutarch's account of the tithe supports the *topos* of noble frugality in early Rome. Their sense of a progressive search for a deeper explanation seems right, though the final reference to early Rome is perhaps unwarranted, since Plutarch in the *Lives* cites the dedication of tithes to Hercules in the case of Sulla and Crassus (*Sull.* 35.1, *Cras.* 2.3, cf. 12.3), hardly examples of archaic frugality (Diod. Sic. 4.21.3-5 gives the equally late example of Lucullus). Neither commentary mentions that the tithes actually cited in these passages (and cf. *Macr. Sat.* 4.3.12.2) take the form of a feast for the populace, and so unite the notions of

⁹ A further indication of a date ca. 100 may be the absence of late Republican material. Most of the *Lives* treating that era belong to the later period of Plutarch's work.

¹⁰ On the possible Vespasianic date of the *Caesars*, see P. A. Stadter, "Revisiting Plutarch's *Lives of the Caesars*," forthcoming in A. Pérez Jiménez (ed.), *Literary Values of Plutarch's Works. Studies devoted to Professor Italo Gallo by the International Plutarch Society*, 61-77.

¹¹ Note 72, which explains the ten percent tax imposed by the Etruscans and not the tithe to Hercules, is misleading placed.

Heracles as glutton and as benefactor. Plutarch's interest in the tithes perhaps should be connected rather with the euergetism, including public meals, of his own day¹².

Greek Aetiologies (Quaestiones Graecae)

In his introduction, B. notes the quite different form of *Qu. gr.*, which often ask not 'why?' but 'who?' or 'what?', and regularly give only one response, narrating a historical cause or clarifying an antiquarian point. Plutarch presents the meaning of these practices as knowable, and usually easily explained. He does not indulge here the speculative mode found in *Roman Questions*, and there is correspondingly less incentive to explore his own preoccupations and attitudes. His intended audience is not clear. He seems not to refer to 'we' as in *Qu. rom.*, except for a single 'in our day' (299F), and many of the oddities he mentions would have escaped the notice of Greek as well as Roman readers. B. suggests that there is a contrast between Greek pluralism, seen in the different customs of many districts, and Roman unity, but Plutarch may also intend to suggest that there are strange customs in Greece as well as Rome, though they require less universalizing explanations. Notably, no examples are drawn from Athens or Sparta, the two cities which dominate the *Parallel Lives*.

Comparison between the editions of W. R. Halliday, P. Payen in *Greco et Romains en parallèle*, and B. is instructive. Halliday's *The Greek Questions of Plutarch* appeared in 1928 (reprinted 1975) as a kind of companion to

Rose. His commentary is much more loquacious than Rose's, imitating the accumulative technique of Frazier. B. is briefer, more succinct here than for the *Roman Questions*, but covers the historical and religious information well. Payen's commentary follows the same format as Nouilhan and Pailler's, including a paragraph of interpretation for each question. (An idea of relative prolixity: for the first question, Halliday's notes run 107 lines, B.'s 17, Payen's 40; for the second, 165, 36, and 48 respectively).

Lesser Parallels (Parallela minora)

The pseudo-Plutarchan *Parallela Minora* presents two difficult issues: first, in what circumstances and by whom was it composed, and second, what is its relation to the extensive similar accounts in Stobaeus and other authors (the divergences are such that Nachstädt's Teubner edition prints texts from Stobaeus and others following individual paragraphs of *Par. min.*, as does De Lazzer). Two additional problems attach to the first issue: whether the numerous authors cited as sources (usually one for each story) are real or invented, and the treatise's relation to the *De fluviis*, which is similar in style and method of citation¹³. Felix Jacoby attempted in 1940 to resolve these issues¹⁴. He concluded, as his title indicates, that most of the source citations were invented (in his *FGrHist* they are grouped together as 3A, nos. 284-96) and presented an elaborate stemma of several epitomes to explain the relations with Stobaeus and other works; our present text would be an epitome of a previous compilation, the original ps-Plutarch. The issues

¹² For a possible parallel, cf. J. D'ARMS, "Between public and private: the epulum publicum and Caesar's Horti trans Tiberim?" in M. CIMA and E. LA ROCCA (edd.) *Horti Romani* (*BullCom* suppl. 6, 1998) 33-43.

¹³ I have not seen E. CALDERÓN DORDA, A. DE LAZZER, and E. Pellizer (eds.), *Plutarco. Fiumi e monti*, Naples, 2003 (*CPM*).

¹⁴ "Die Überlieferung von ps-Plutarchs *parallela minora* und die Schwindelautoren", *Mnemoysne*, 8 (1940) 73-144, reprinted in his *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung*, ed. H. BLOCH, Leiden, 1956.

have now been reexamined by B. in his introduction to this text, as well as by A. De Lazzer in his recent edition for the *Corpus Plutarchi Moraliū* (Plutarco, *Paralleli minori*, Naples 2000), with differing conclusions.

Whereas De Lazzer basically follows Jacoby, though with some caveats, in regard to both the role of epitomators and the inauthenticity of most of the source citations, B. returns to the position of I. Schlereth (*De Plutarchi quae feruntur parallelis minoribus*, Freiburg 1931) and accepts most if not all citations as genuine. *Parallela minora* (like *De fluviis*) is remarkable for a very high percentage of citations of unknown authors or works. Nevertheless, B. argues, “le nombre des livres perdus est trop incommensurable pour que la prudence ne s'impose pas, et comme par ailleurs rien dans cette collection de paradoxes ne suggère la parodie, il convient d'accorder le bénéfice du doute” (231). Scholars have doubted the author's erudition because of the lack of discernible order in the collection, and a number of gross historical errors (conveniently listed by Ziegler in *RE* s.v. Ploutarchos). B., however, uncovers a complex and flexible thread of links uniting the forty-one pairs of stories, based on subject, source, analogy, or era, which enlivens the mechanical sequence of pairs. The style, often criticized as atrocious, he considers artful, and speaks of “la nervosité du style ou sa sécheresse” which represents a conscious striving after “concision et efficacité” (238).

Convinced that the work represents a literary endeavor meant for publication (though well below the level of Plutarch), noting the impressive list of authors cited, and accepting the date in the first third of the second century A.D. suggested by Schmid, B. proposes that the work was composed in immediate associ-

ation with Plutarch, by one of the secretaries the sage must have employed (239-40). He imagines the author working in Plutarch's well-stocked historical library, reading little-known historical authors, even when their works treated diverse topics (Aristides of Miletus, e.g. is cited for *Italica*, *Historiai*, *Persica*, and *Sicilica*). Since several of the Roman stories refer to periods treated by Plutarch in the *Lives*, especially *Romulus* and *Publicola*¹⁵. B. suggests that they were written while Plutarch was writing the *Lives*, or shortly after his death. His hypothesis brings together Plutarch, estimated date, historical research, and an author with some literary pretensions. We might add that Plutarch apparently gathered historical anecdotes and arranged them in some way, though the exact relation of these collections to the *Lives* and to the apophthegmata collections found in the *Moralia* is disputed¹⁶. Unfortunately we have no evidence for Plutarch's use of research secretaries, whether students, freedmen, or slaves, on the order of Cicero's learned and indefatigable Tiro, though they have been hypothesized by e.g. Jones and Pelling. Pliny the Elder used assistants (Pliny *Ep.* 3.5), but he did his reading (or often, listening) himself. Might an assistant with literary ambitions have marked passages for his own use, while reading to the master, or working in the library, and later produced *Par. min.*? In many ways B.'s hypothesis is more attractive than Jacoby's. It has a major weakness, however, that B. does not address in any detail: the problem of the variant traditions in Stobaeus and other authors. B. indicates briefly that he thinks that the differences in their texts reflect a desire to expand the brevity of *Par. min.* (238). But the situation is quite complex and many more factors may be at work.

¹⁵ On p. 239, for *Pericles* 6 read *Publicola* 6 (and on p. 233, n. 65, line 4, read 9 for 8).

¹⁶ See C. PELLING, “Plutarch's *Apophthegmata Regum et Imperatorum* and Plutarch's Roman Lives” and P. A. STADTER, “Before Pen Touched Paper: Plutarch's Preparations for the *Parallel Lives*,” both forthcoming in *Weaving Text and Thought. On Composition in Plutarch*, edited by L. VAN DER STOCKT and P. A. STADTER; Pelling's article has been preprinted in his *Plutarch and History*, London, 2002.

The notes to this text are most often either historical or references to the source citations or parallel versions. They also explain B.'s translation of Plutarch's Greek words for Roman institutions, as in *Qu. rom.*: thus *agora* is translated 'place du marché' at 306F, then explained in n. 44, "à savoir le Forum." This is usually alright, but the translation 'assemblée' for *sunklêtos* at 305C is misleading. Plutarch's usual word for Roman assemblies is *ecclêsia* (*Rom.* 27.6 and often); *sunklêtos* in Greek is used for a specially summoned body, and often for a *boule* or other council, different from the assembly (cf. Aristotle *Pol.* 1275b8), and as far as I can see, Plutarch never uses it in his Greek lives, but reserves it for the Roman senate.

The whole volume is concluded by separate indices of names for each work.

We are all indebted to B. and the C.U.F. for a very solid new volume, bringing a conservative text, new interpretations, and thorough commentaries to four quite disparate works. Let us hope that the *Moralia*, begun over thirty years ago, will soon be brought to completion, despite the recent blow caused by a disastrous fire in the warehouse of Les Belles Lettres.

PHILIP STADTER

TIM G. PARKIN, *Old Age in the Roman World: a cultural and social history*, Baltimore-London, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003, XIII + 495 p. ISBN 080187128X.

En tant qu'éditrice des actes du colloque sur « L'ancienneté chez les Anciens » (Montpellier, 22-24 novembre 2001), il m'a été demandé de rendre compte de l'ouvrage de T. Parkin, qui, très agréable à lire, est aussi très richement documenté. Se proposant d'étudier la vieillesse dans l'Empire romain, l'auteur distingue néanmoins – sans justifier la dissociation – l'Empire romain proprement dit et l'Égypte romaine (cf. 2^e partie, c. 4 et 5).

La perspective comparatiste entre l'Antiquité et nos sociétés, exprimée de façon répétée (p. 21, 22, 25, 35 et encore en

exergue au chapitre de conclusion, p. 273), n'est pas absolument pertinente. En dépit des nombreuses fluctuations pour fixer l'âge de la vieillesse dans l'Antiquité (cf. c. 1 : de 42 à 77 ans [p. 19] ou de 50 à 60 ans [p. 24]), l'auteur s'en tient à l'*opinio communis* de 60 ans (cf. p. 16 et 25). Or, dans nos sociétés, contrairement à ce que pense G. Parkin (p. 25), ce n'est pas là l'âge de la vieillesse, qui a considérablement reculé, étant donné nos conditions de vie et les progrès de la médecine. À l'inverse cependant, si déterminer un âge, quel qu'il soit, est très difficile dans un monde où, comme le souligne G. Parkin, les documents officiels ne présentent pas l'exactitude des nôtres et où on compte généralement en valeur arrondie, la comparaison avec l'époque moderne (p. 35) peut apparaître comme contestable car il existe encore des peuples chez lesquels l'âge est toujours « présumé ». Il faut donc rester très prudent quand on compare l'Antiquité à notre époque.

Le livre est divisé en quatre parties avec, dans chacune, des chapitres en nombre décroissant : 3 dans la première et la seconde, 2 dans la troisième et un seul dans la dernière partie. Ce déséquilibre dans la structure de l'ouvrage reflète l'importante place accordée aux données purement historiques dans les deux premières parties (« Uncovering Aging Romans » et « Old Age in Public Life »), au détriment de l'aspect plus spécifiquement culturel (« Old Age in Private Life » et « Putting Older People in their Place »). C'est bien dommage, car, sur un plan historique décliné en considérations sociales, économiques et politiques (cf. p. 25), T. Parker n'apporte pas grand-chose de nouveau à une bibliographie déjà fort riche sur le problème de la vieillesse dans l'Antiquité et dans laquelle il occupe lui-même une place (cf. en effet *Demography and Roman Society*, Baltimore-Londres, 1992). En revanche, un certain nombre de remarques auraient gagné à être développées. Ainsi de la perception subjective de l'âge, que l'auteur traite trop brièvement à notre gré (p. 23-25), à travers la comparaison jeune/vieux, le senti-