

Die bei Dio überlieferten ‚Reichsteilungspläne‘ des Tiberius bei der Senatssitzung am 3. 9. 14 n. Chr. sind demnach als eine *sententia* des neuen Princeps aufzufassen, das System der von Augustus 27 v. Chr. eingeführten Provinzialverwaltung beizubehalten. Sie sind zugleich als Teil einer programmatischen Regierungs-erklärung zu verstehen, die *res publica restituta* augusteischer Provenienz weiter mit Leben zu erfüllen. Tiberius ist dieser Maxime allen Widerständen zum Trotz zeit seines Principates treu geblieben³⁵). Die bisherigen Kommentierungen dieser Dio-Nachricht beruhen dagegen – und hier wird man den Historiker selbst wohl einbeziehen müssen³⁶) – auf einem dem Entwicklungsstand des Principats unangemessenen Konstitutionalismus, der 14 n. Chr. weder eine kaiserliche Oberherrschaft über das ganze Reich noch auf anderen Verfassungsgrundsätzen und geostrategischen Kriterien beruhende Reichsteilungspläne der Spätantike kannte.

Bonn

Paul Schrömbges

35) Vgl. P. Schrömbges (Anm. 2), bes. 93 ff., ders. (Anm. 18) 23 ff.; J. Bergmanns (Anm. 4) 22 ff. und H. Jaeger (Anm. 4) 18 f.

36) S. o. Anm. 14. Zu den terminologischen und sachlichen Schwierigkeiten bei der Deskription des augusteischen Principats vgl. B. Manuwald (Anm. 4) 21 ff., 77 ff., 86 f.

PLUTARCH'S CHARACTERIZATION OF LUCULLUS

There are two key elements to Plutarch's characterization of Lucullus: Lucullus' Hellenic culture and his benefactions to Greece. This latter theme is paramount and central to the *Cimon-Lucullus* as a whole, as is clear from the introduction at Cim. 1–3. Here Plutarch tells us that he chose Lucullus as a subject because of his aid to Chaeroneia during the Mithridatic War: 'though we are separated by many generations, we believe that the gratitude

[for his actions] extends even to us who are alive now' (Cim. 2.2)¹. Cimon was chosen as the pair. He was hardly less admired by Plutarch. His exploits are among the few which magnified Athens (Cim. 8.2, 10.6, 13.5–7, synk. 1.5) without doing violence to Greece (11.2, 18.1). He enjoys a *προεδρία* among generals for his deeds against the barbarians (13.3, synk. 2.1), deeds which were not to be matched (19.3–4, cf. Flam. 11.6). Mirroring his foreign efforts was the concord of his domestic politics (3.1). All of this fits Lucullus well – Lucullus also fought against barbarians, was not involved in civil war, and lived lavishly (3.1–3).

At Cim. 2.5 Plutarch states with regard to Lucullus that, 'we should not point out [failings] in our narrative superfluously and with excessive zeal, but as it were in a tone of apology for human nature if it produces no character which is purely good and indisputably set on virtue'. The line of thought may be paralleled². That it is voiced here suggests a wish to underplay Lucullus' vices, at least to some extent; that Plutarch is predisposed so to do is implied by Cim. 2.3, where he feels the need to assert the integrity of his character portrait and its independence from the gratitude owed to his hero.

There are several pairs among the *Parallel Lives* in which Plutarch examines the Roman hero from the viewpoint of education and upbringing in a way which it does not occur to him to do with the Greek. The clearest examples are Coriolanus versus Alcibiades, Marius versus Pyrrhus, and Marcellus versus Pelopidas³. Cimon and Lucullus too show the contrasting approach. Since Cimon was one of Greece's greatest benefactors, it might be thought that Plutarch would at least have suggested that he was acquainted with Hellenic culture. After all, he is in the final words

1) On the situation remedied by Lucullus, see C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, Oxford 1971, pp. 6–7.

2) 'We should not point out failings' – see *De Herod. mal.* 3, 855c–d; 'no character which is purely good' – *De laude ips.* 545e, *Sull.* 30.6, *Sert.* 10.5–7.

3) Much stress is laid upon Coriolanus' lack of *παιδεία* (esp. *Cor.* 1.3–6, 15.4–5), whereas although Alcibiades' faults are pointed out by Socrates (cf. *Alc.* 6.5) they are not contrasted later with his education under the philosopher (4). Marius is criticized for repudiating Hellenic culture (*Ma.* 2.2–4, 6.3, 46.1–5), whereas no connection is made between Pyrrhus' education (*Pyr.* 1.4, 8.3.6) and his similar failings. Marcellus has much in common with Lucullus, for Plutarch presents him as having a strong interest in Hellenism which seems to be absent from the sources (*Marc.* 1.3, 21.4.7); Pelopidas' education is by contrast doubtful (*Pel.* 3.6–7, 4.1). Aemilius Paulus, Brutus, the Elder and the Younger Cato, and Cicero are other Roman heroes whose education and learning is scrutinized closely by Plutarch.

of his biography ὁ Ἑλληνικὸς ἡγεμῶν (19.5). In fact there is only one casual remark on Cimon's ability to sing (9.1, cf. Per. 5.3), and nothing more. Plutarch may have been hampered by a lack of information; but since he reports Cimon's later beautification of Athens (13.7), he did not have to accept Stesimbrotus' report that Cimon was entirely uneducated (4.5), nor more surprisingly to confirm Stesimbrotus by appending to his remarks a quotation from Euripides describing his favourite mythological hero, Heracles⁴).

Lucullus is a different matter. His education and (Hellenic) culture receive much emphasis, especially at 1.4–9. Here we learn that he was fluent in Latin and Greek, and in forensic and other types of oratory. He wrote a history of the Social War in Greek for a bet (1.7–8)⁵, and had from boyhood enjoyed a liberal παιδεία, the aim of which was τὸ καλόν (1.5, cf. synk. 1.4). By nature Lucullus was φιλότιμος (synk. 1.8). When he was older and had leisure time, it was his practice of theoretical philosophy which enabled him to restrain ambition against Pompey (1.6, 42.4; cf. also 5.5). Lucullus' virtues of δικαιοσύνη and φιλανθρωπία are also explicitly associated with his education (29.6)⁶).

Lucullus' career of helping Greeks begins in Cyrene (2.4–5), where finding the people 'in a state of turmoil arising from continuous tyrannies and wars, he restored them and fixed the constitution'. Lucullus sees himself as fulfilling a prediction Plato made about the Cyreneans (cf. Ad princ. indoct. 779d); later on he himself is portrayed as a devotee of the Old Academy (42.3). Next, in Greece, he persuades those who have sided with the enemy to change allegiance (3.3). At 3.8 Plutarch offers three reasons why Lucullus let go off Mithridates by failing to cooperate with Fimbria. He is unwilling to criticize any aspect of Lucullus' command (cf. synk. 1.8).

Before narrating Lucullus' actions against Mithridates, Plu-

4) 'φαῦλον, ἄκομφον, τὰ μέγιστ' ἀγαθόν' (Euripides *Likymnios* fr. 473 N.²)... ταῦτα γὰρ ἔστι τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Στησιμβρότου γεγραμμένοις ἐπειπεῖν. This quotation is used also at Marc. 21.6 to describe the uncultured condition of the Roman δῆμος. Plutarch rightly refuses to believe what Stesimbrotus said about Themistocles (that he was a pupil of Anaxagoras and Melissus, Them. 2.5), and criticizes the pamphleteer also at Per. 13.16, 26.1. For Heracles, whose *Life* Plutarch wrote (Lamp. Cat. 34, fr. 6–8), as a true Hellene, cf. Ag./Cleom. 37.6, synk. 2.5, Arat. 38.7.

5) Cicero *Ad Att.* 1.19.10 tells us he added errors to show he was Roman.

6) Lucullus of course possessed virtue by nature too (18.9 φύσει χρηστὸν ὄντα καὶ φιλάνθρωπον). On his virtues, see 33.3, 36.5, 36.7, synk. 1.4.

tarch makes some interesting remarks which are designed to account for the king's success among the Greeks (7.4–7): 'Mithridates burst into Bithynia, and not only were the cities there glad to welcome him again, but all Asia had a recurrence of its former diseases, because of the unbearable sufferings inflicted on it by the usurers and tax gatherers of the Romans. These Lucullus later drove off, Harpies that they were, snatching their food; at that time his effort was directed to making them more moderate by admonishment, and at putting an end to insurrections in the city-states, hardly any one of which was calm.' The allusions to Roman maladministration in Asia at Sull. 25.4–5 and even the open statement of the problem at Sert. 24.5 are overshadowed by the really very strong language of Luc. 7.4–7. Plutarch's comments do not jar in any way: Lucullus was charged with reorganizing Asia, and the Romans knew of the faults of their administration. Mention of the depredations is less criticism of Roman policy towards Greece and more praise of Lucullus, who excites stiff loyalty among the Greeks (cf. 9.4 of Kyzikos).

After Lucullus has forced Mithridates to seek refuge with Tigranes, he brings a final settlement on the Asian cities. Once again Plutarch lists the grievances and sufferings of the towns caused by debt (20.1–2). Debt is given a vigorous treatment in Plutarch's essay *De vit. aere alieno*. There the usurers (δανεισταί) are assumed to be foreign βάρβαροι, invading Greece like the Persians of old (828f–829b)⁷). The imagery of the debtor as slave is frequent (828b, 828c, 828f, 832a); it occurs also at Luc. 20.1–2⁸). At the end of the essay (832a) there is an image of money-lenders as Harpies seizing the debtors' food; this is also used in *Lucullus* (see above). Romans and Italians are conspicuous by their absence from the *De vit. aere alieno*⁹). Similarly, it may be that the adject-

7) This was a safe way of alluding critically to Rome – cf. Praec. ger. reip. 814c (τῶν ἄνω δυνατοτάτων with Jones [n. 1], 113 n. 22, 114 n. 27 on ἄνω which elsewhere in Plutarch indicates Persia or its successors [e.g. Them. 16.1, Ages. 14.1, Demetr. 46.7]), 815e (ὁ Πέροης); what Plutarch is doing should not be confused with the tendency of some Second Sophistic authors to apply classical Greek terms relating to Persia to contemporary Roman institutions (see H. Mason, *The Roman Government in Greek Sources*, Phoenix 24, 1970, p. 157, E. L. Bowie, *The Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic*, in M. I. Finley, ed., *Studies in Ancient Society*, London/Boston 1974, p. 201 n. 95, C. P. Jones, *Culture and Society in Lucian*, Cambridge Mass. 1986, p. 56).

8) Note too the reference to Solon's reforms at 828f and Luc. 20.2 (quite bitter).

9) They are alluded to at 831a: 'a Corinthian usurer or broker, then a Pat-

tive 'Ρωμαϊκός at Luc. 7.6 in some way distances the Romans from the usurers¹⁰). In any case the parallels with the essay show that Plutarch is not simply describing an historical situation, but has strong feelings on what was still a problem in his own days. In *Lucullus* he is pleased to stress Lucullus' participation in justice and law (20.1 ff.). Justice is clearly important to him (cf. 29.6, 36.5.). Previously, too, he had shown himself 'honest, just, and even mild' in collecting Sulla's fine on Asia (4.1). Plutarch appreciates the loss of popularity among Romans from helping Greeks (20.5, cf. 14.2–3, 33.3–4), but this is overshadowed by the fact that 'Lucullus was loved not only by the peoples who had benefited from him, but was longed for by the other provinces who congratulated the good fortune of those that were lucky enough to have such a governor' (20.6).

While Lucullus is engaged in restoring the cities his legate Ap. Clodius (i.e. Ap. Claudius cos. 54) was sent to Tigranes to demand the surrender of Mithridates and to determine whether Tigranes would go to war (21–22). Plutarch makes it plain what sort of a man Tigranes was by singling out his treatment of Greeks, who found Armenian rule 'intolerable' (21.3)¹¹). He notes Tigranes' policy of transferring Greeks and other races (21.4–5, cf. 14.6, 26.1.), and highlights his and Mithridates' behaviour towards two Greeks who made the mistake of working for them, the historian Metrodoros of Skepsis and the rhetor Amphikrates (22.2–7). Juxtaposed to this is Lucullus, who had 'filled Asia to the brim with πολλή εὐνομία and πολλή εἰρήνη' (23.1). Lucullus is highly honoured by the cities, like an earlier liberator Flamininus (Flam. 16.5–7). In addition he is given 'what is sweeter than honour, ἡ ἀληθινὴ εὐνοία' (23.1, cf. similarly of Cimon at Cim. 8.1–2).

Lucullus is not, of course, responsible for liberating the Asian Greeks, but Plutarch does present him as freeing Greeks (and others) who had been captured by Mithridates and Tigranes. He gives new life to the Greeks and kinsmen of Mithridates whom he

raean one, then an Athenian one' – on these centres of Roman economic activity, see G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World*, Oxford 1965, pp. 92–96.

10) The adjective can mean Roman people (e.g. Polybius 30.18.3), but in Plutarch it tends to signify things associated with Romans (ship Arat. 12.5; swords, phalanx Luc. 7.5; a [Greek] informer working for Rome Cim. 2.1; transport animals Aem. 18.2; camp id. 18.9; 'Ρωμαϊκῶς using a sword 'in the Roman fashion' id. 13.6; for more examples, see Ziegler's index to the *Lives*, IV 162).

11) For Plutarch's blackening of Tigranes' record, see L. Pulci Doria Breglia, *Plutarco e Tigrane II Φιλέλλην*, AFLN 16, 1973/1974, pp. 37–67 (who does not, however, appreciate Tigranes' rôle as a foil to the Hellenic Lucullus).

liberates at Kabera (18.1). By those freed from Tigranokerta he is 'loved as benefactor... and founder' (29.4). As with Flaminius (Flam. 12.9–10) many peoples and kings come to him voluntarily (29.7). And he is greatly upset when owing to the action of its commander, Kallimachos, he cannot save the city of Amisos from flames (19.5, cf. Brutus at Brut. 31.6). Eventually Lucullus catches up with the hapless Kallimachos and punishes him for having 'robbed him of φιλοτιμίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ χρηστότητος ἐπίδειξιν πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλληνας' (32.5). This attitude extends even to those Greeks who have chosen to do the Romans wrong, such as the people of Mitylene: Lucullus 'wished them to be sensible and to accept a reasonable penalty for their errors concerning Manius' (4.2)¹². How similar this is to Marc. 20.2, where Plutarch denies that Marcellus was responsible for Roman atrocities in Sicily¹³. Needless to say, Lucullus was not prevented from taking Mitylene by storm (4.3), the excuse for his action being that the Mityleneans are κακοδαιμονοῦντες (4.2). Similarly, the siege of Sinope is justified because the inhabitants are Cilicians who have murdered most of the original Greek population already (23.2).

Back in Rome Lucullus presents Plutarch with something of a problem. As he puts it at synk. 1.8, 'if Lucullus had died while still in the field and commanding, not even the most captious and critical person could have found grounds to slander him'. But Lucullus lived on in a hedonistic retirement and died verging on insanity. Plutarch introduces the final years by speculating on why Lucullus gave up politics: it was either because he saw the corrupt condition of the state, or 'as some say' because he preferred a life of luxury and ease (38.2). Plutarch meets the second alternative by contrasting Lucullus favourably with the unseasonable political ambition of Marius, Cicero, and Scipio Aemilianus (38.3–4). Then he gives the views of Crassus and Pompey, who were critical of Lucullus' luxuriousness. 'It is, then, possible, to read Lucullus' life like the Old Comedy, with periods of statesmanship and command at first, then later on drinking sessions and dinners...' (39.1). The lavishness is reproved in a series of anecdotes and stories to the end of 41. The dinners were *nouveau riche* (40.1),

12) That is, M'. Aquilius cos. 101; this reference is an addendum to Ziegler's index to the *Lives* (IV 24 s.v. Ἀκύλλιος Μάνιος).

13) Noting Marcellus' justness during the invasion (20.1) Plutarch says that, 'if Henna or Megara or the Syracusans met with any action which was not fair, the blame for this seems to have lain with the sufferers rather than the perpetrators'. On Marcellus and Hellenic culture, see n. 3.

and the wealth was used wantonly as if it were a barbarian prisoner of war (41.7).

At the turning point in Lucullus' military career, when misfortune began to replace success, Plutarch emphasized Lucullus' virtues (33.3). And he does what he can now to restore Lucullus' reputation after his command by dwelling on his cultural attainments. This harks back to the first chapter. Plutarch records that on his return to Rome Lucullus set up a library (42.1). The use he made of the books was φιλοτιμότερα than his acquisition of them¹⁴). It was Greeks who benefited particularly. 'The Greeks had unrestricted access to the covered walkways and study-rooms, and would make visits there, as if to some caravanserai of the Muses, and spend the day in each other's company' (42.1). Not only scholars, but also πολιτικοί came there, so that the house was 'really both a home and a Greek town hall for those who arrived in Rome' (42.2). Plutarch goes on to say that Lucullus was fond of all philosophy, and adhered particularly to Plato and the Old Academy as represented by Antiochus of Ascalon (42.3–4). He notes Lucullus' appearance in the dialogue Cicero named after him¹⁵).

In the *Moralia*, apart from a reference to Lucullus' closeness to his brother (De frat. amore 484d–e) and to his rise to power under Sulla (Praec. ger. reip. 805e–f), it is the luxury and time-wasting that are singled out (Ad princ. indoct. 782 f., An seni resp. ger. 785f–786a, 792b–c). Anecdotes about this side of the man stuck in the mind (cf. Cato Min. 19.8, Pomp. 2.12, Ma. 34.4)¹⁶); but Plutarch could easily have brought out the scholarly side of Lucullus' old age in the *An seni resp. ger. sit* rather than deny it completely (792b βίον ... ἄφροντιν). In the *Life*, however, it is

14) Plutarch implies but does not say that Lucullus' library was in fact booty from Asia (J. van Ooteghem, L. Licinius Lucullus, Brussels 1959, p. 184).

15) Plutarch seems to know the basic argument of Cicero's *Lucullus* (*Academica Priora*); there is an unattributed quotation from it at Cic. 24.5 (2.119), and C. P. Jones, Plutarch, Lucullus 42, 3–4, *Hermes* 110, 1982, pp. 254–256, has correctly argued for an intransitive sense to ἀντιτάττετο at 42.3, so that Lucullus himself 'opposed' Cicero as in Cicero's work. But he is unaware of *Academica Posteriora* (in which Lucullus' part was disparagingly transferred to Varro; Cicero Ad Att. 13.12.3, 13.1, 16.1, 19.5, Ooteghem [n. 14] 25–27), and it is difficult to say whether he had actually read *Lucullus* himself (as is suggested by D. Babut, Plutarch et le Stoïcisme, Paris 1969, pp. 198–200).

16) Velleius Paterculus speaks of Lucullus as *profusae huius ... luxuriae primus auctor* (2.33.4); Athenaeus Deipn. 274e–f, 543a, resting on Nicolaus (FGrH 90 F 77ab), notes that he was the 'foremost guide of the πολυτέλεια which now flourishes', and the 'pioneer of τρυφή among the Romans'.

Lucullus' Hellenism, cultural and political, that is introduced and stressed heavily throughout¹⁷). This Hellenism appears the more adventitious because Plutarch has been unable to relate it to any period of study in Greece. Further, it has been pointed out that Lucullus' special love of the Old Academy and of Antiochus is an introduced trait, and again that his generous sentiments in favour of Tyrannion (19.8–9) are also really Plutarch's own¹⁸).

Hellenism is the key to Lucullus' moral outlook. His qualities are often underlined in the context of relations with Greeks (2.1–2, 4.2, 18.9, 19.4, 20.1, 23.1, 29.6, 42.1). And whereas Plutarch often makes the same quality or interest responsible for a hero's good and bad points, there is naturally no suggestion here that the luxury and lavishness are corruptions which arise from Lucullus' Hellenic tastes¹⁹). Indeed, Plutarch always avoids this connection²⁰).

It has been suggested that 'the reason for what seems the exaggeration of the first chapter [of *Lucullus*] is that Plutarch has

17) Note that Cicero also chose to emphasize the Hellenism of Lucullus (along with Catulus and Hortensius) in the first version of the *Academica* (2.4; E. Rawson, *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*, London 1985, p. 81). We cannot say to what extent (if any; see n. 15) Cicero's hypocritical report of Lucullus' learning influenced Plutarch. It should be noted that Cicero's Lucullus becomes attached to Antiochus not through a love of the Old Academy as in Plutarch, but because Antiochus had the best philosophical reputation of his age (2.4, 113). Plutarch's stress is particular to him (see n. 18). It is possible that his φιλοσοφίαν δὲ πᾶσαν μὲν ἠσπάζετο καὶ πρὸς πᾶσαν εὐμενῆς ἦν καὶ οἰκεῖος (42.3) has been affected by Cicero's *cum omni litterarum generi tum philosophiae deditus* (2.4), but both authors are speaking generalities, and Plutarch says almost the same of Brutus at Brut. 2.2.

18) On Lucullus' attachment to the Old Academy and to Antiochus, see J. Glucker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*, Göttingen 1978, pp. 21–27, Rawson loc. cit., both observing that Antiochus was more useful to Lucullus as a guide to eastern affairs than to philosophy. Plutarch's συμβιωτής (Luc. 42.3) may imply such a close and trusted adviser (pace Rawson who glosses 'house philosopher') – cf. Brut. 2.3 (Aristus, Antiochus' brother), Cato Min. 25.2 (Munatius Rufus), Reg. et imp. apophth. 207c (Maecenas), though at Gal. 19.4 it is used in a bad sense of Otho as a crony of Nero (see further in Stephanus). On Lucullus' remarks about Tyrannion, see J. Christes, *Sklaven und Freigelassene als Grammatiker und Philologen im antiken Rom*, Wiesbaden 1979, p. 29.

19) Cf. N. Petrochilos, *Roman Attitudes to the Greeks*, Athens 1974, p. 85: 'In Lucullus, the material and intellectual sides of Greek culture were conspicuously united'.

20) Cf. the story at 41.2 of the Greeks who were troubled by Lucullus' excessive hospitality ὄντως Ἑλληνικόν τι παθόντας. For Plutarch love of money and luxury were diseases common to all (see Cato Mai. 18.4–5, Nic.-Crass. synk. 1.4, De cup. div., Περὶ Πλοῦτου fr. 149–151).

in mind a comparison between Lucullus and Marius²¹). It is certainly true that Plutarch partially defends Lucullus in the *Life* by criticizing Marius for his relentless ambition in old age (38.3). In *Marius* also Marius' ambitious nature is scrutinized unfavourably and the defects of his old age are explicitly connected with his rejection of Hellenic culture²²). In the case of Lucullus, Plutarch states that his love of theoretical philosophy preserved him from τὸ φιλότιμον, especially against Pompey (1.6). Although the narrative shows that Lucullus was not free from political rivalry, Plutarch manages the facts as best he can. The wrangling with Pompey is fiercer at Pomp. 46.5–6, 48.2,4,7 and Cato Min. 31.1,7, while at Luc. 42.4–8 the politicking is blamed on others. Similarly in the meeting between Lucullus and Pompey in Galatia Luc. 36.2,4 omits Lucullus' abuse of Pompey which is recorded in the parallel account at Pomp. 31.7–8,11–13.

However, Lucullus' Hellenism is not stressed at the beginning of the *Life* simply because through παιδεία Lucullus helped himself fight ambition in a way not open to, say, Marius (or others such as Cicero and Scipio Aemilianus). Culture is stressed also because Lucullus was an active benefactor and liberator of Greeks²³). This is the way he is introduced to us at Cim. 1–3, and we have noted that Plutarch's unique assertion of the integrity of the portrait implies a readiness to underplay his hero's faults. In *Cimon* the shortest of the *Parallel Lives* apart from *Eumenes*, Plutarch managed to make much of the scanty material (cf. 8.1) to present Cimon as a benefactor of Athens and Greece, and in a word, 'the Hellenic general' (19.5). *Cimon* establishes the themes to which *Lucullus* responds. *Lucullus* does so on two levels. First and simply, Lucullus aids Greeks. Second, Plutarch accounts for the fact that Lucullus was so different in this respect from his contemporaries (cf. Sull. 12.9–14) by making sure that his actions are seen to be firmly rooted in an Hellenic mode of thought (something he feels no need to do with Cimon). This stress on Lucullus' Hellenism leads Plutarch to pay less attention to his flaws than he

21) A. Wardman, *Plutarch's Lives*, London 1974, p. 218.

22) See n. 3 (esp. Ma. 2.4, 34.5, 45.10–46.5). On control of τὰ πάθη including φιλοτιμία by education, see *De virt. mor.* 452d.

23) It is probably no coincidence that Plutarch suggests divine support for Lucullus during his campaigns (3.8, 10.1, 13.5, 15.3, 19.6, 28.7, 33.1; cf. R. Flacelière, *Plutarque, Vies VII*, Paris 1972, pp. 53–55), for similar support is important for two other liberators of Greeks, Flamininus and Timoleon (*Flam.* 12.10, *Tim.* 16.11, 19.1, 21.4–5, 36.4–5).

might have done. Plutarch avoids exploring the more complicated personality of Lucullus, and suggests in the end that the only reason he degenerated in later life while Cimon did not was because he happened to live longer than Cimon; had Cimon lived longer also he might have gone the same way (synk. 1.7–8).

By speculating thus at synk. 1.7–8 Plutarch affirms once more his belief that Cimon and Lucullus were basically alike (see Cim. 3.3). Finally he feels that it is impossible to judge between them: the solution is to follow the gods, who had given their vote to both men 'because in their natures both were good and god-like' (synk. 3.6).

Oxford (Wolfson College)

S. C. R. Swain

REDEN UND SCHWEIGEN IM TACITEISCHEN *DIALOGUS DE ORATORIBUS**)

*La véritable éloquence consiste à dire tout
ce qu'il faut et à ne dire que ce qu'il faut*
(La Rochefoucauld, Réflexions morales 250)

Der Rednerdialog des Tacitus ist, wie weithin anerkannt, ein für die Entwicklung des Tacitus, ja für die römische Literatur- und Ideengeschichte hochbedeutsames Werk. Er ist zugleich – und auch dies dürfte kaum bestritten sein – eine schwer deutbare Schrift. Die Schwierigkeiten ergeben sich nicht zuletzt daraus, daß nicht von vornherein klar ist, wer von den Anwesenden seine Ansicht zu dem erörterten Grundproblem, den Gründen für den Niedergang der Redekunst, geäußert hat und wenn, dann in welchem Sinne – eine Unklarheit, die engstens mit einer größeren Textlücke im letzten Drittel des Werkes zusammenhängt. Gerade

*) Der Artikel ist die um die Anmerkungen erweiterte Fassung eines Vortrags, gehalten auf dem Eirene-Kongreß im September 1988 in Budapest sowie auf dem Symposium Philologicum im Januar 1989 in Marburg.