



## Durham E-Theses

---

### *An examination of the sources of Plutarch's lives of Nicias % Lysander*

Luft, H. M.

#### How to cite:

---

Luft, H. M. (1952) *An examination of the sources of Plutarch's lives of Nicias % Lysander*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/9656/>

#### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

VOLUME 2

PARTS III - V

Plutarch's Life of Lycurgus.

Epilogue.

Select Bibliography.

187

PART III

PLUTARCH'S LIFE OF LYSANDER

Section 1

In marked contrast with the unpretentious and unexciting life of Nicias, Lysander was fair game for the historians, rhetoricians, political pamphleteers, memoirists and biographers of the Fourth and Third Centuries B.C., and later. For his life was provocative and challenging, with a sufficient undercurrent of mystery; a whole crop of stories and rumours sprang up about him. The independent streak in his character was unusual enough for a Spartan, while his career implied intrigue, possibly treason. Also, the circumstances of his day - the ruin of the Athenian Empire and its replacement by a Spartan hegemony, with all the possibilities therein implied of favourable and unfavourable comparison - were bound to make him more noteworthy or notorious than if he had held command contemporaneously with Brasidas or the older Pausanias. If Lysander had merely been the Spartan general who happened to be in actual, although not nominal, command of the Peloponnesian forces which brought to a successful conclusion the long Peloponnesian War, that

by itself were sufficient notoriety for him to qualify for a Hellenistic biography or for adequate treatment by the historians of the School of Isocrates. But when, in addition, there seemed to be a current rumour that his Spartan orthodoxy was in question and that he had plotted to replace the hereditary double kingship at Sparta by an elective dyarchy,<sup>1</sup> one must assume that he could not easily have been ignored either by contemporary writers, if they were aware of these rumours, or by the later historians and biographers. As D.R. Stuart<sup>2</sup> comments, "Across the stage was moving ..... a brilliant series of figures calculated to arrest men's gaze. Protagoras and Gorgias, Pericles and Cimon, Anaxagoras and Socrates, Alcibiades, Cleon, Critias, Theramenes, Phidias, Euripides and Sophocles - all were shining lights. Ignored they could not be. Eulogy or condemnation were the alternatives in which that candid directness of the Greek genius..... could vent itself".

What was true of vice or excellence in Athenian political life, was also true of the exceptional characters who from time to time appeared in rival cities. The very character of Lysander would demand eulogy or condemnation from his biographers, and whatever was written about him ( as the separate subject of a biographical work, or as one of the

<sup>1</sup> of Aristotle, Pol., V, 1, 5; Diodorus, XLV, 13; Nepos, Lysander, III; Plutarch, Lysander, XLV, 2 - XXVI.

<sup>2</sup> Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography, p. 42.



leading Spartan officers who figured in any serious historical writing ) would without doubt be coloured by the prejudices and antipathies of those who were writing about him.

Apparently the triumphs of Lysander did move various poets during his lifetime to glorify his deeds in encomiastic poems. Such is the evidence of Duris of Samos,<sup>1</sup> writing about his own island some hundred and fifty years after the events. A pro-Spartan tradition might gladly perpetuate the legend of Lysander's prowess and ability. It is perhaps significant that the Hellenica of Theopompus covered just that short period of Greek history ( 411 - 394 B.C. )<sup>2</sup> which was monopolised by the personality and achievements of Lysander; Theopompus, looking for a central figure around which to build up his historical narrative, the ideal of a strong man who had the capability to unite the scattered city-states of Greece and weld them into some system of unity, might well have found possibilities in Lysander - at any rate, his meagre fragments<sup>3</sup> seem to suggest a sympathy towards the Spartan admiral. Xenophon also, whose Hellenica is obviously biased in favour of Sparta, and whose hero is his friend, Agesilaus, gives us a very fair and not dishonourable picture of Lysander, not attributing to him great ambition, but representing him as

---

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XVIII, 5; Athenaeus, XV, 696 E; F.Gr.H., II A, p. 154, 71; II C, p. 128, 71.

<sup>2</sup> Diodorus, XIV, 84, 7.

<sup>3</sup> cf. G. & H., fr. 21 a & b.

the mere instrument of general Spartan policy.

On the other hand, we might expect an Athenian source, such as Ephorus, or a contemporary source used by Ephorus, such as Cratippus, or later writers following the Ephoran tradition, to blacken the character of Lysander or depreciate his achievements.<sup>2</sup>

Again, if Lysander did in fact attempt to undermine the traditional constitution of Sparta, even writers with Spartan sympathies, or writers using Spartan sources ( particularly any source which drew upon the memoirs or pamphlets of the Spartan king, Pausanias the Younger<sup>3</sup> ), would be unlikely to paint a fair picture of their famous admiral, whatever his achievements for Sparta in the Peloponnesian War.

It must, then, be most difficult for us today to arrive at a fair estimate of the character of Lysander, as it was equally difficult for Plutarch to assess with fairness and accuracy the true character of his hero, although there were in his day many more available sources upon which he could draw, if he so desired.

Perhaps the most noticeable feature in Plutarch's Life of Lysander is Plutarch's attempt, despite all the prejudice against the Spartan expressed in the Life, to give both sides

<sup>1</sup> Of course, Xenophon, writing the early part of the Hellenica c. 380, may have known nothing about Lysander's plan to overthrow the traditional dyarchy; if he had known about it, he would hardly have excluded it from his history, for he is not averse to anecdote & certainly has some strictures to make upon the stupid & cruel behaviour of Spartan harmosts (Hell. V, 4, 22; Agesilaus, XLV.).

<sup>2</sup> But, as will be seen, there is little evidence from Diodorus of any specific bias in Ephorus against Lysander.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Strabo, VIII, 5, 5 ( C 366 ).

of the picture. The Life is clearly drawn from biased, and at the same time conflicting, sources; it contains in toto the jaundiced account of Nepos, although there seems to be lacking Nepos' innuendo and imputation of motive, and it must be noted as significant that Plutarch is only antipathetic towards his hero when he is following the same source which supplied Nepos with all his 'hostile' information. But this part of the Life of Lysander is really very small; it has affinities with Ephorus, as will be demonstrated later, although Diodorus,<sup>2</sup> like Xenophon, represents Lysander as the instrument of general Spartan policy, while Plutarch and Nepos<sup>3</sup> agree in stating quite definitely that Lysander was chiefly actuated by a personal ambition for power, and himself initiated the establishing of 'decadarchies' in the cities of Asia Minor and the islands of the Aegean.

At the same time, whatever virtues Lysander may have possessed, are incorporated in the Plutarchan account, for the greater part of Plutarch's Life of Lysander follows fairly closely in its historical narrative the tradition of Xenophon,<sup>4</sup> which is most fair in its treatment of Lysander and records nothing dishonourable<sup>5</sup> about him.

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, XI.11, 5 - 9: XIX & XX: XXIV, 2 - XXVI: XXX, 3 - 5.

<sup>2</sup> Diodorus, XIV, 13, 1 : *διέταξε κατὰ τὴν αὐτῆς ἐπιτομῆς ὑπομνήσιν.*

<sup>3</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XI.11, 5; Nepos, Lysander, 1.

<sup>4</sup> Hellenica, 1, 5 - 111, 5.

<sup>5</sup> Except perhaps Lysander's treatment of Callicratidas; cf. Xenophon, Hellenica, 1, 6, 4 - 16, & Plut. Lysander, V, 7 - VII, 1.

Thus, the prejudice of one set of authorities does not blind Plutarch to another tradition, with which he was apparently familiar, whose set purpose was to glorify the Spartan and extol his personal character and reputation. Therefore, in one way or another, Plutarch has preserved a great deal of the conflicting estimates of Lysander which were current in the century which followed his demise. Yet it is also noticeable that in the Comparison, in which we naturally expect Plutarch to express his own views independently of his sources, he is almost entirely sympathetic towards Lysander and, as will be shown later, there ascribes to him many more virtues than are allowed in the Life itself.

J. E. Powell, writing on the sources of Plutarch's Life of Alexander, says, " What kind of sources would a professional biographer like Plutarch be expected to prefer for such a work as this ? Clearly, for the historical sections, he would want a full history of Alexander - the fuller the better, as he would then, in epitomising, be able to select just those details which suited his biographical purpose. Besides this standard voluminous history, he would welcome any book which gave him that wealth of personal anecdote in which a history might be deficient. In addition, his memory or his common-place books would no doubt retain a considerable number of significant facts culled from earlier reading. What we should

<sup>1</sup>J. H. S., Vol. LIX, 1939, p. 229.

not expect from Plutarch is careful and constant comparison of authorities regarding those historical events to which he was comparatively indifferent". Such a statement may well be an oversimplification in the case of the Life of Alexander,<sup>1</sup> but we may find that, taken as a generalisation, it is true for the Life of Lysander. A Hellenistic biographer, to whom Nepos also may have been indebted, may have supplied to Plutarch the personal anecdote, recorded with bias to exemplify one side of the character of Lysander; while the historian (either Xenophon at first hand, supplemented with additional information about Lysander from another historian, or a pro-Spartan historian, himself making use of the Hellenica of Xenophon and expanding his narrative) may have given to Plutarch the wealth of historical detail which we find in a Life which, to all intents and purposes, covers morely the last ten years of the Spartan's career. There are, in addition, many paragraphs<sup>2</sup> - even chapters - which seem to be the result of Plutarch's own earlier research, or contain his own comments, relevant and irrelevant, or his digressions from the main study to illustrate further a point in question, or to give his readers additional topographical and historical details.

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. Farn & Griffith, Hellenistic Civilisation, 3rd Ed., p. 289; Farn, Alex. the Great, Vol. II, Append. 16.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Lysander, I, XII, XVII, 7 - 11, XIX, 8 - 12, XXII, 1 - 5, XXVIII, 7 - 9, XXIX, 5 - 12.

In his Life of Lysander, Plutarch refers by name to ten authorities - Ephorus,<sup>1</sup> Theopompus,<sup>2</sup> Theophrastus,<sup>3</sup> Xenophon,<sup>4</sup> Anaxandrides,<sup>5</sup> Aristotle,<sup>6</sup> Duris of Samos,<sup>7</sup> Daimachus,<sup>8</sup> Androclides,<sup>9</sup> Theopompus Comicus<sup>10</sup> - apart from a reference to Anaxagoras<sup>11</sup> and to "one who was both a historian and a philosopher"<sup>12</sup>, and the frequent use of such phrases as *ὡς ἐνίοι φασιν, λέγουσι, δοκεῖ εἶναι*,<sup>13</sup> which are characteristic of most of Plutarch's Lives and may indicate that the biographer is unaware of the name of the authority whose words he is quoting through some intermediary. Of these authorities, two only (Ephorus and Theopompus) could in any strict sense of the word be termed historians who might have supplied Plutarch with his material for the narrative and historical portions of the Life. Yet it is obvious that a considerable part of the Life must ultimately have been taken from the Hellenica of Xenophon,<sup>14</sup> although Plutarch does not refer by name to this work of Xenophon either in the Lysander or in any other Life.

<sup>1</sup> XV11, 3: XX, 9: XXV, 3: XXX, 3.

<sup>2</sup> XV11, 3: XXX, 2.

<sup>3</sup> XI11, 2: XIX, 5.

<sup>4</sup> IV, 7: The 'Symposium' of Xenophon.

<sup>5</sup> XV111, 3.

<sup>6</sup> I, 5.

<sup>7</sup> XV111, 5.

<sup>8</sup> XI1, 6.

<sup>9</sup> VII1, 4.

<sup>10</sup> XI11, 8.

<sup>11</sup> XI1, 3.

<sup>12</sup> XXV, 5.

<sup>13</sup> cf. 1, 2: I, 1: VII1, 1 & 4: XI1, 1 & 3: XIV, 6: XV, 3: XVI, 2 etc.

<sup>14</sup> Hellenica 1, 5 - III, 5.

Thus, the Life of Lysander may be divided into two parts:

1 ) The historical narrative - by far the greater part of the Life - which, with the biographer's own personal comments and additions, is almost entirely laudatory;

2 ) Material of a hostile nature ( also used by Nepos ), which seems to have been entirely post-Aegospotami, is partly indebted to Ephorus, and is confined in the main to the recording of four separate allegations against Lysander - that he used his position as a Spartan admiral to win power for himself, that his cruelty was a byword among the cities of Greece, that the Persian satrap, Pharnabazus, denounced him to the Spartan authorities, and that he conceived a plan to overthrow the hereditary kingship of Sparta.

An examination will first be made of those chapters of the Life which seem to have been based by Plutarch upon a historical source, which was favourably disposed towards Sparta and her admiral.

CHAPTER I

The introductory chapter to the Life of Lysander, which contains some iconographic detail about the Spartan admiral, is obviously derived from various different sources and seems to bear witness to Plutarch's own interest in Delphi and what he himself had seen there.

The biographer tells us that the Treasury of the Acanthians at Delphi bears the inscription: " Brasidas and the Acanthians, with spoil from the Athenians " <sup>1</sup>; and that within the Treasury itself there is a marble statue of Lysander, often incorrectly identified as that of Brasidas.

Plutarch has made reference elsewhere <sup>2</sup> to this Treasury of the Acanthians at Delphi, in words which suggest that he had seen it for himself. Here he described the statue as *Λίδιος* , saying that many people suppose it to be that of Brasidas, because it is with the Treasury of the Acanthians, whereas in fact it is a statue of Lysander. <sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> of. Thucy., IV, 84-88: In 424 B.C. Brasidas won Acanthus, on Chalcidice, away from its Athenian alliance.

<sup>2</sup> De Pyth. Graec., 400 F; of. Lysander, XVIII, 1, where Plutarch refers to a gold and ivory trireme, presented to Lysander by Cyrus, which was stored in the Treasury of the Acanthians at Delphi; in the same chapter he describes a bronze statue of Lysander, set up by the Spartan at Delphi.

<sup>3</sup> A detailed examination will be made of the statues and votive offerings of Lysander at Delphi and elsewhere, in chapter XVIII, 1.



The statue of Lysander<sup>1</sup> is described by Plutarch as being long-haired and with a "generous growth of beard"; and this description introduces a digression, which continues for the remainder of the chapter, on the long hair of the Spartans.

It seems that here, as in his Life of Lycurgus<sup>2</sup>, Plutarch is anxious to ascribe to Lycurgus the custom of growing the hair long, which was prevalent among the Spartans. For this reason he rejects two other theories:

1) "As some authorities state", the Spartans had grown their hair long since their victory over the Argives, in reply to the Argive clipping of their hair in sorrow at the loss of Thyrea in 546 B.C. This theory, no doubt, came originally from Herodotus<sup>3</sup>, who tells us that the Spartans, who had previously worn their hair cut short, after this battle with Argos, made a law to wear their hair long. Later writers, including Ephorus, passed on further information about the results of this battle.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch refers again to this same marble statue of Lysander (De Pyth. Orac., 397 F), but here he tells us that it became overgrown with grass and weeds just before the battle of Leuctra (371 B.C.) - a fact to which Cicero bears witness; "Eadenque tempestate multis signis Laedaeoniis Leuctricae pugnae calamitas donuntiabatur. Namque et Lycandri, qui Laedaeoniorum clarissimus fuit, statucae, quae Delphis stabat, in capite corona exstitit, ex asperis horbis et argentibus stellerque aureae, quae Delphis orant a Laedaeoniis positae post navalem illam victoriam Lycandri..... paulo ante Leuctricam pugnam deciderunt, neque repositae sunt" (De Div., 1, 34, 75).

<sup>2</sup> Lycurgus, XXII, etc.

<sup>3</sup> 1, 82.

<sup>4</sup> Apparently the festival of Gymnopœdia was instituted at Sparta in honour of this battle, at which the songs of Thales were sung; Ephorus (apud Strabo, X, 4, 380) had much to say about Thales of Miletus, instructor of Lycurgus, φιλοποιοῦς ἀνθρ καὶ νομοθετικῶς.

2) When the Bacchiadae, an oligarchic family deposed from rule in Corinth by Cypselus about 650 B.C., fled to Sparta, they looked so mean and unsightly from having shaved their heads that the Spartans decided themselves to wear long hair in future. Herodotus tells us that Cypselus killed or banished from Corinth all the family of the Bacchiadae, but makes no reference to their flight to Sparta, or to their unsightly appearance there with shaven heads.

Plutarch rejects these two theories and ascribes to Lycurgus the Spartan custom of wearing the hair long. He is following a well-established precedent, for everything noteworthy and valuable, both in the Spartan constitution and in Spartan customs, was ascribed to Lycurgus by almost all writers from the time of Herodotus.<sup>2</sup> It was an invariable practice in the ancient world to claim the authority of a great name and the sanction of a great lawgiver for every custom, however late it might prove to be. Apparently Hellanicus<sup>3</sup> was the only dissentient from the Lycurgan tradition, as he attributed the Spartan constitution to the original Heraclid founders, Eurysthenes and Procles.

---

<sup>1</sup> V, 92: cf. Pausanias, II, 4.

<sup>2</sup> 1, 65.

<sup>3</sup> For this he was rebuked by Ephorus, who most enthusiastically upheld the Lycurgan tradition; cf. F.Gr.H., II A, 70, f. 118: Strabo, VIII, 5, 5.

The earliest reference to this saying of Lycurgus about long hair is found in the Xenophonic Constitution of Sparta.<sup>1</sup> Xenophon was indebted for much of the material of his Constitution to the Athenian politician Critias, once a pupil of Socrates, who wrote a prose and verse Constitution of Sparta;<sup>2</sup> Critias may thus have included this saying of Lycurgus in his work. But earlier than this we cannot go, for although Herodotus<sup>3</sup> ascribes to Lycurgus the entire system of laws observed by the Spartans ( given to him by the oracle at Delphi ), and the alteration of most of their customs, he makes no specific mention of the growth of long hair by the Spartans.

Plutarch himself repeats this saying of Lycurgus elsewhere.<sup>4</sup>

It seems most likely that the first chapter of the Life of Lysander consists of small details of information ( much of it irrelevant to a life of Lysander ) known to Plutarch and collected by him from various sources. He himself may have seen the statue of Lysander at Delphi, when he was priest of Apollo there,<sup>5</sup> or *λυυροβέρυς* at the Pythian games;<sup>6</sup> and, noting the beard and long hair, takes this opportunity

<sup>1</sup> XI, 3: " Lycurgus permitted men who were past their first prime to wear long hair, believing that it would make them look taller, more dignified and more terrifying ".  
<sup>2</sup> cf. Xen., Const. Sparta, V, 6, with the quotation in Athenaeus, II, 432 D, and Const. Sparta, II, 1, with Plato, Protagoras, 325 D.  
<sup>3</sup> 1, 65. "Lycurg., XIIII; Imp. Apoph. 189 EF; Apoph. Lac. 228F  
<sup>4</sup> Sympos., VII, 2, 2. <sup>5</sup> Sympos., V, 2, 3.  
<sup>6</sup> 230B

in his Life of Lysander of digressing - a not infrequent habit of his - upon Spartan customs attributed to Lysurgus.

It is quite unnecessary to suppose that this information was given to Plutarch 'ready-made' by any of the sources used by him for the rest of his biography.

CHAPTER II

This chapter is ' eideological ' ; it paints a most favourable picture of the Spartan admiral and his people, praising his poverty, courage and self-control, and attributing his ambitious spirit to his excellent Spartan training when he was a youth.

Plutarch calls Lysander the son of Aristocleit<sup>1</sup>, reputed to be of the lineage of the Heraclidae, but not of the royal family. That Lysander claimed to have been a Heraclid was very likely and probably well known to those who wrote about him. In a later chapter<sup>2</sup> Plutarch suggests that there was a numerous and flourishing stock of Heraclids still in Sparta in the days of Lysander. Lysander was of this stock and he resented the fact that the kings of Sparta were only chosen from the two houses of the Heraclidae called Eurypontidae and Agiadae. He therefore ( according to one of the two theories propounded by Plutarch ) planned to restore the kingship to all the Heraclids in common on an elective basis, in the hope that he might himself have the opportunity of being chosen.

---

<sup>1</sup> In a number of references, Pausanias calls his father 'Aristocritus' III, 8, 6: VI, 3, 14; X, 9, 7.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XXIV, 3.

The alternative theory ( attributed by Plutarch to Ephorus<sup>1</sup> ) was to make the kingship accessible to all the Spartans, irrespective of birth. This theory of Ephorus presupposed no knowledge of Lysander's claim to kinship with the Heraclids. Certainly Diodorus<sup>2</sup> has no knowledge of this claim; on the contrary, he expressly states that Lysander planned to overthrow " the kingship of the Heraclidae ". Ephorus would hardly have expressed it in this way if he had really been aware of the claim of Lysander to be a Heraclid. Nor does Nepos<sup>3</sup> apparently know anything of this claim; he follows the Ephoran tradition.

We must therefore assume that this information about Lysander's descent did not come to Plutarch through his Ephoran source ( the ' Hostile Source ', which seems to have been a biographical work ), but through some other source which was intent on giving a favourable picture of the Spartan who, although of noble birth, was yet reared in poverty and learnt to bear poverty well, in accordance with the best traditions of Sparta.

It is noteworthy that Plutarch knows nothing of the story that Lysander was a ' mothax ', of Spartan father and Helot mother. This theory is mentioned by Aelian<sup>4</sup>, who says

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, XXX, 3

<sup>2</sup> XIV, 13, 2

<sup>3</sup> Nepos, Lysander, III: " .... ex omnibus dux & eligatur ".

<sup>4</sup> V. H., XII, 34.

that Callieratidas, Gylippus and Lysander were all 'nothakes'; and by Athenaeus, who attributes his statement to the XXVth Book of the Histories of Phylarchus, saying that afterwards Lysander was made a citizen in recognition of his merit. This information is, of course, very late, for Phylarchus continued the History of Duris of Samos<sup>2</sup>, and may have been posterior to the 'Hostile Source' who perhaps supplied to Plutarch and Nepos their Ephoran material. Aelian may well have got hold of some late authority who was trying to depreciate Spartan character and to prove that any well-known and reputable Spartan was not really a Spartiate, but owed his streak of genius to his Helot ancestry.

The succeeding sentence about Lysander's poverty (an antithesis to his noble birth) is most likely to have come from the same source which supplied the Heraclid information; and here we are on a more certain footing. For there is considerable evidence that much of this chapter is similar to, if not taken from, the Hellenica of Theopompus, perhaps even at first hand, and according to Athenaeus<sup>3</sup>, from the Tenth Book of the Hellenica.

Plutarch tells us here<sup>4</sup> that Lysander was "reared in

<sup>1</sup> VI, 271 F.

<sup>2</sup> F.Gr.H., II A, p. 161 et seq.

<sup>3</sup> XII, 543 B.

<sup>4</sup> Lysander II, 2 and 6 - 8.

poverty..... superior to every pleasure..... and was never mastered or corrupted by money ". He confirms this in chapter XXX,<sup>1</sup> or at least tells us there that the poverty of Lysander was made manifest at his death; he attributes his information to Theopompus, " who is more to be trusted when he praises than when he blames ", although he does not attempt to reconcile his statement about the poverty of Lysander, and his refusal to use wealth as a means for self-aggrandisement, with the theories which he himself seems to accept<sup>2</sup> that Lysander had been guilty of very considerable bribery during his lifetime.

5 After this reference to Lysander's poverty in his youth, Plutarch eulogises his hero in words which are very similar to those used by Theopompus in his estimate of the character of Lysander.<sup>3</sup> The whole of Plutarch's long description of the character of Lysander may in fact be taken from Theopompus, including Plutarch's laudatory sentences about the Spartans and Spartan training. But it is likely that in part of those paragraphs<sup>4</sup> we have Plutarch's own comments on the information which he had received from Theopompus about Lysander's character.

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, XXX, 2

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XLV, 3

<sup>3</sup> G. & H., 21 a ( Athen., 543 B )  
 φιλόπονος ἦν καὶ θεραπεύειν δυνάμενος  
 καὶ ἰδίως καὶ βασιλῆς, αὐτῶν ἂν καὶ  
 τῶν ἑθνῶν ἑλλῶν κρείττων.

Lysander, II, 2-5; cf. XXX, 2.  
 καὶ παρέσχεν αὐτὸν .....  
 κρείττονα πάντες ἑθνεῶν .....  
 θεραπευτικός δὲ τῶν δυνατῶν.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Lysander, II, 3: ταύτης δὲ οὐκ ἀσχερὸν ἔστιν ζητᾶσθαι τὸς νόους ...  
 II, 4: ὁ πολιτικῆς δυνάμετος ὃ μίσην ἔποι ποιῶνται μέρος.



For, while Plutarch seeks to justify and explain the ambition of Lysander by reference to his early training in Sparta, the sentence, " a trait which some hold to be no small part of political ability ", seems rather like his own criticism of such a writer as Theopompus, who of course would probably believe that to be at times " subservient to men of power and influence " is a characteristic of political ability.

The quotation from Aristotle's Problems<sup>1</sup> may have been one well-known to Plutarch, noted down by him some years previously, and used in this biography because it offered some information about the character of Lysander which he could not afford to ignore. But it does seem rather strange that Plutarch should use it now, for it bears little relation to what has preceded or to what follows. Plutarch refers to the melancholy of Socrates, Plato, Heracles - in that order - and then Lysander. The order of Aristotle is quite different.<sup>2</sup> Again, Plutarch's words that Lysander was a prey to melancholy, " not immediately, but when he was an older man ", seem slightly inconsistent with what he says about Lysander in a later chapter,<sup>3</sup> where he implies that Lysander had been melancholic most of his life.

The truth may be that Plutarch found the quotation from

<sup>1</sup> XXX, 1: cf. Cicero, Tusc. Disp., I, 30, 80: " Aristoteles quidem ait omnes ingeniosos melancholicos esse ".

<sup>2</sup> He names Heracles, Lysander ( πρὸ τῆς τελευτῆς ), Ajax, Bellerophon, Empedocles, Plato and Socrates.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XLVIII, 1: τὴν φιλαρχολίαν ἐπιτείνουσαν εἰς γῆρας.

Aristotle in Theopompus and excerpted it from a very much wider context.

8

The last three paragraphs of this chapter contain high praise for Lysander; Plutarch tells us that Lysander " bore poverty well..... was never corrupted by money... and kept not a single drachma for himself " out of the vast stores of gold and silver which came into his hands after the final victory of the Peloponnesian War; but the biographer also admits that unfortunately the Spartan did the greatest harm to his country by bringing into her so much wealth from his conquests abroad. That Lysander was never corrupted by money is certainly not the evidence of Nepos;<sup>2</sup> and Athanasius reminds us that " practically all authorities record that Pausanias and Lysander were notorious for luxury. Hence Agis said, ' Here is a second Pausanias that Sparta has produced '. But Theopompus..... says just the opposite. "<sup>3</sup>

It is significant that never in this Life of Lysander does Plutarch accuse Lysander of greed, or even suggest that he kept back for himself part of the money or property captured by him. The arrest and execution of Thorax for being in possession of money,<sup>4</sup> and the statement about the pillaging by

<sup>1</sup> cf. Lysander, XVII, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Nepos, Lysander, III: " pecunia fidens "; IV: " avaro fecisset... eius avaritiam .... "

<sup>3</sup> XII, 543 B.

<sup>4</sup> Lysander, XIX, 7.

Lysander of the territory of Pharnabazus, might perhaps imply a similar accusation against Lysander; but even in Plutarch's version of the Pharnabazus' letter there is no accusation of 'avaritia'.

It seems to have been generally agreed that Lysander filled his city with wealth and love of wealth; many different authorities have testified to this. Pausanias<sup>3</sup>, in an important passage in which he assesses the character of Lysander as partly deserving praise and partly blame, reproaches him for arousing in the Spartans a strong desire for riches, although an oracle had warned Sparta that only love of money could destroy her, and therefore the Spartans were not even in the habit of using coinage. Aelian<sup>4</sup> affirms that Lysander brought money into Sparta and so taught his fellow-citizens to disobey the law. Athenaeus<sup>5</sup> testifies that gold and silver were brought to Sparta by Lysander. Plutarch also says elsewhere<sup>6</sup> that, when Lysander had taken Athens, he brought home much gold and silver, which was accepted by the Spartans, while they honoured the bearer; and in a later chapter of the Life of Lysander<sup>7</sup> he tells us that Theopompus bears witness to the great accumulation of wealth by Lysander, which he did not use for personal or domestic aggrandisement.

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, XX, 3 - 4.

<sup>2</sup> cf. chapter XVII, in the analysis of which these points will be examined at more length.

<sup>3</sup> IX, 32, 5 - 10

<sup>4</sup> V.H., XIV, 29.

<sup>5</sup> 233 F.

<sup>6</sup> Instit. Lac., 239 F.

<sup>7</sup> Lysander, XXX, 2.

There follow two short anecdotes, the first of which illustrated what Theopompus has to say about Lysander, that he never sought to amass money for the aggrandisement of his family:

1 ) In his first anecdote Plutarch records that Dionysius the tyrant sent some costly Sicilian tunics to the daughters of Lysander, but their father would not receive them, saying that they would make his daughters appear more ugly.<sup>2</sup>

Now this is just the sort of anecdote which one would expect to find in any writer who was setting out to glorify the character of a Spartan, illustrating the Spartan disdain for wealth and for luxurious apparel. The fact that Plutarch tells it of Archidamus as well as of Lysander makes its veracity suspect. It may well be compared with Theopompus' anecdote about Agesilaus,<sup>3</sup> which illustrates the austerity of the Spartan and his contempt for luxury; it may also be compared with a story which is recorded by Aelian<sup>4</sup>, which illustrates the continence of Lysander in refusing for himself the gift of a *πλακάς* from the Ionians, and presenting it instead to the Helots.

We have no evidence that Lysander either was in Sicily

<sup>1</sup> cf. Lysander, XXXI, 2: G. & H., 21 b.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Plutarch, Conjug. Praec., 141 D, "these robes will shame rather than adorn my daughters"; Reg. et Imp. Apoph., 190 E & 229 A, where the story is repeated in similar words; but in Reg. et Imp. Apoph., 218 E the incident is recorded about Archidamus and not Lysander.

<sup>3</sup> G. & H., 22 a; Athenaeus, XLV, 657 B - C; Plutarch, Agesilaus, XXXVI: Apoph. Lac., 210 B-C; Nepos, Agesilaus, VII.

<sup>4</sup> Aelian, Hist. An., X, 10.

or had any dealings with Dionysius. Diodorus says that Sparta sent Aristus<sup>1</sup> to Syracuse nominally to put down the tyranny there, but in fact to put Dionysius under an obligation to Sparta.

It is certain that Sparta had some sort of interest in Syracuse, and Theopompus ( from whom this incident may have been taken ) could hardly have failed to make reference to it; for Diodorus<sup>2</sup> says that Theopompus wrote three βύβλοι about affairs in Sicily. According to Diodorus, Theopompus' account of Sicilian affairs was contained in Book XIII of the Philippica, but it is inherently possible that a section of the Hellenica was also devoted to Sicilian history.<sup>3</sup> Certainly the extravagant clothing of the Syracusan tyrants had become a byword in Greece ( and therefore likely to be stigmatised by the austere Theopompus ! ), for Athenaeus<sup>4</sup> speaks of the ἐσθής ποιητήν of Nysaeus, son of the elder Dionysius.

2 ) This second anecdote<sup>5</sup> is more difficult to place. Plutarch says that Lysander was sent to Syracuse as Spartan ambassador, and when Dionysius presented him with two dresses, asking him to choose one for his daughter, he went off with both. We might assume from the second anecdote that Lysander

<sup>1</sup>XIV, 10, 2: ἄνδρα τῶν ἐπιφανῶν .

<sup>2</sup>XVI, 71, 3: ἀρχαίονος δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ Διονυσίου τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου τυραννίδος διήλθε χρόνῳ ἑτῶν πενήκοντα καὶ κατέστρεψεν εἰς τὴν ἐκείνου Διονυσίου τὴν νεωτέραν.

<sup>3</sup>cf. G. & H., 179, 187, 190.

<sup>4</sup>X, 436 A.

<sup>5</sup>Repeated word for word by Plutarch, Apoph. Lac., 229 A.

had only one daughter, but the first story refers to 'daughters', and indeed the second tale in its portrayal of character does not diverge far from the first. For it illustrates the smart Laconic attitude towards the non-Hellenic Greek which one might expect from a Spartan, a sort of contempt for the slick Sicilian.

Both stories may be ultimately from Theopompus, for the evidence of the chapter as a whole, with its praise of Lysander and respect for Spartan education, points to a Theopompan source. There is nothing recorded in the chapter which one might not reasonably expect to find in the Isocratean historian. Undoubtedly, if the Tenth Book of the Hellenica covered the period of the last ten years of the life of Lysander, when he was prominent at Sparta, one would expect to find in it very considerable digressions about his character, as well as anecdotes illustrative of the man.

---

' In Lysander, IX, 6, 'daughters' are mentioned.

CHAPTER 111

This short chapter consists mainly of a brief resumé of the last few years of the Peloponnesian War, the appointment of Lysander to supersede Cratesippidas ( 408 - 7 B.C. ) and the settlement of his headquarters at Ephesus, where he began to build triremes and to bring back business and prosperity to that city.

Up to the appointment of Lysander, Plutarch gives us no information which is not to be found in Thucydides,<sup>1</sup> Xenophon<sup>2</sup> or Diodorus.<sup>3</sup> He then suggests that Sparta felt the need of " an able leader and a more powerful force ", to challenge the naval successes of Alcibiades, and therefore appointed Lysander to take the place of Cratesippidas.

Xenophon<sup>4</sup> says that Lysander sailed first to Rhodes, where he reinforced his ships, and then on to Miletus, taking up his final station at Ephesus, where he augmented his fleet to the number of seventy, while he awaited the arrival of Cyrus, the younger son of the Persian king, at Sardis. Diodorus<sup>5</sup> agrees with Xenophon.

<sup>1</sup> VIII, 2 et seq.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, 1, 1 et seq.

<sup>3</sup> XIII, 70 et seq.

<sup>4</sup> Hellenica, 1, 5, 3 - 10

<sup>5</sup> XIII, 70.

Plutarch merely states that Lysander sailed to Ephesus, pitched camp there and made preparations for the building of triremes.

4 But Plutarch has, in addition, a great deal to say about Ephesus itself ( which is not to be found in Xenophon or Diodorus ), and the information which the biographer passes on about this great city of Asia Minor is all very reasonable and likely to be true.

Ephesus, says Plutarch, was " well disposed towards Lysander and very zealous in the Spartan cause ", but in a low state of prosperity and very considerably under the ( pernicious ) influence of the Persians, through its proximity to Sardis and its use by the Persian generals as a headquarters. We do not know exactly when Ephesus seceded from the Athenians, but according to Thucydides, after the revolt of the Chians and Miletus from Athens ( 412 B.C. ), and the agreement made between the Persian satrap Tissaphernes and the Spartans, one of the Chian ships pursued by the Athenian vessels under Diomedon put in at Ephesus, which was apparently already friendly towards Sparta. Xenophon also speaks<sup>2</sup> of Ephesus as being, in 410 B.C., an ally of the foes of Athens.

Now Plutarch's information about Ephesus is most interesting. He speaks of the city as being impoverished economically and

VIII, 19.

<sup>2</sup>Hellenica, 1, 2, 6.



socially ' modernized ' ; but after the arrival of Lysander there was a great change, a boom in trade and a revival in business, bringing wealth into the city. If this was directly the result of Lysander's arrival, the Ephesians would have good reason to be grateful to the Spartan - and that they were, seems to be made plain by the assistance which they gave to Lysander at the battle of Aegospotami. Pausanias tells us that after Aegospotami the Ephesians set up in the sanctuary of Artemis at Ephesus not only a statue of Lysander, but also statues of Eteonicus, Pharak and other Spartans who took part in the final victory of the Peloponnesians.

Plutarch concludes his chapter with the comment that " from that very time, through the influence of Lysander, the city of Ephesus had hopes of achieving the stateliness and grandeur which it now enjoys ". These words about Ephesus, particularly the reference *ὡς ἔστω* , could in all probability only have been applied to the city in the First or Second Century A.D. For Ephesus, destined to become of greater importance than Sardis or even Pergamos, became in fact the principal city of the Roman province of Asia, the seat of the Roman government there, a great emporium for trade, and a resort for the numerous votaries of the goddess Artemis. It was also one of the principal seats of Oriental magic,<sup>2</sup> and was most

<sup>1</sup> VI, 3, 15.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Plutarch, Sympos., VII, 5, 4: τὰ Ἐφέσια γράμματα.

famous for its beautiful temple of Artemis,<sup>1</sup> which owed much of its original magnificence to Croesus, and was famous even in the time of Herodotus.<sup>2</sup> This temple was burnt down in 356 B.C., but rebuilt during the lifetime of Alexander the Great, and became one of the Seven Wonders of the world. Although probably robbed by Nero,<sup>3</sup> it would be standing in all its magnificence when Plutarch was writing his Lives.

For his information about the revival of Ephesus ( ascribed to the work and influence of Lysander ) Plutarch may have been indebted to Theopompus, who being a Chian<sup>4</sup> and obviously showing sympathy towards the cities of Ionia, as well as support for Sparta, would have given credit to Lysander for the revival of Ephesian trade. As Theopompus was born in Chios some thirty four years after the arrival of Lysander at Ephesus, he would be familiar with the reports of Lysander's prowess and benefactions towards some of the Ionian cities. At any rate, there seems to be no doubt that the Ionian cities held Lysander in high repute, and Diodorus<sup>5</sup> tells us that it was the Chians and other allies of Sparta assembled at Ephesus who requested the Spartans to send out Lysander for a second time as their admiral.<sup>6</sup> One may also detect, in Plutarch's reference to Ephesus as being

<sup>1</sup> cf. Acts, XLIX, 23 - 41.

<sup>2</sup> II, 148

<sup>3</sup> cf. Tacitus, Annals, XV, 45.

<sup>4</sup> Thucydides ( VIII, 24, 4 & 40, 2 ) says that the Chians approximated most to the social and economic institutions of Sparta. It seems very likely that Plutarch is here using an ' Ionian ' source.

<sup>5</sup> XLII, 100.

<sup>6</sup> cf. Plutarch, Lysander, VII, 2.

in danger of becoming "barbarized by the Persians", a suggestion perhaps of the natural feeling of Theopompus towards the 'barbarian' Persians, to whom the Spartans finally ( 386 B.C. ) ceded the Greek cities of Asia Minor. For we must assume that, apart from his 'Panhellenism' and antipathy towards Persia, which he probably inherited from his master, Isocrates, Theopompus must have felt somewhat aggrieved at the way in which his native place was entrusted to the influence of Persia by the Spartans, when his own father had been exiled from Chios for Spartan sympathies.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, II, 3. κινδυνεύουσιν ἐκβαρβαρωθῆναι τοῖς Περσικοῖς ἔθουσιν.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Phot. Bibl., 176 p. 120 b 19: F.Gr.H., II D, p. 352.

CHAPTER IV

The historical narrative continues in this chapter; and here, for the first time, there are distinct similarities between the account of Plutarch and those of Xenophon and Diodorus. We must, of course, remember that the Hellenica of Xenophon was one of the sources used by Ephorus,<sup>1</sup> which will account for the fact that so often in Plutarch's Life of Lysander, where we can see the influence of Xenophon, we can also see a likeness to what is recorded by Diodorus.

2           But Plutarch gives a great deal more information here than is supplied by either Xenophon<sup>2</sup> or Diodorus.<sup>3</sup> These authors agree with Plutarch that Lysander went up to Sardis to confer with Cyrus when the Persian arrived there. Cyrus, the younger of the two sons of the Persian king, Darius, had been sent out by his father as satrap of Lydia, Greater Phrygia and Cappadocia. His command did not include the Greek cities on the coast which were still under the control of Tissaphernes and Pharnabazus.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Although he preferred the Oxyrhynchus historian to Xenophon.

<sup>2</sup> Xenophon, Hellenica, 1, 5.

<sup>3</sup> Diodorus, XIII, 70, 3.

<sup>4</sup> Xenophon, Anabasis, 1, 1, 6 - 8.

Diodorus omits any mention of accusations against Tissaphernes of slackness in prosecuting the war with the Athenians. Xenophon does mention briefly charges against Tissaphernes; but Plutarch alone goes on to detail these charges. He tells us that Tissaphernes showed lack of zeal in his prosecution of the war against Athens, and gave meagre subsidies to the Spartan and allied fleets, because of the influence which Alcibiades had over him. Cyrus was apparently pleased to hear Lysander making these accusations against Tissaphernes, " a base man and privately at feud with him ".<sup>2</sup> It seems to be a natural characteristic of most men to delight in hearing their predecessors maligned; but Xenophon<sup>3</sup> states quite the opposite about the relations between Cyrus and Tissaphernes. It is most significant that Plutarch's source is ready to malign the character of any Persian with whom Lysander and the Spartans were forced to have any dealings. The tone of many of the historical sections of this Life is not only pro-Spartan, but particularly anti-Persian.<sup>4</sup> This may be due to the influence of Theopompus, whose fragments leave us in no doubt as to his antipathy towards

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch's account here is very similar to what he records in Alcibiades, XLIV & XLV, but very condensed in the Lysander.

<sup>2</sup> of. Plutarch, Alcibiades, XLIV: οὐκ ἂν ἐπιλοῦς, ἀλλὰ κικλήσκει καὶ φιλοκόνηρος.

<sup>3</sup> Anabasis, 1, 1, 2: λαβὰν τισσαφέρνην ὡς φίλον.

<sup>4</sup> Lysander, VI, 4: τὰ κακὰ κείνου καὶ φασὶν ἐπὶ θύμῳ ἐνθρῶπιων βαρβάρων. VI, 8: ἕως φοβεροὶ τοῖς βαρβάροις εἶεν αὐτοῖ ; XLI, 1: ἕως ἀκαχέουσιν Ἕσπερος ; XLVII, 3, etc.

the barbarian; and the remainder of this chapter consistently paints an attractive picture of the Spartan admiral.

One must assume that Plutarch's source felt that the Spartans were entitled to use the money of the barbarians to finish off the Peloponnesian War - that is perhaps the real substance of the complaint against Tisaphernes (γλήχως χορηγῶν); Persian darics were acceptable, but Persian men and manners were reprehensible.

Lysander won the friendship of the young Cyrus, τῷ βασιλευσσιδῶν<sup>2</sup> ἐκείνῳ τῆς Ἀσίας, and encouraged him to renew with vigour the war against Athens. As a result of this friendship, when entertained by Cyrus and urged by him to ask for a special boon, Lysander requested nothing for himself, but an extra obol a day as payment for his soldiers. Plutarch's version of the anecdote illustrates the personal incorruptibility of Lysander, and his regard only for the well-being of his troops.

Xenophon<sup>3</sup> has very much more to tell us. We read in his account that, before the feast, Cyrus had said that he had brought 500 talents with him and would devote them all to the Spartan cause; if this were insufficient, he would use his private funds; if these too failed, then he would coin his throne into silver and gold.<sup>4</sup> Lysander and his colleagues

<sup>1</sup> of. G. & H., fr. 121, 283 a, inter alia.

<sup>2</sup> of. G. & H., fr. 21 a: καὶ βασιλευσσιδῶν ἐκείνου (ἀγ.) καὶ ἰδίου καὶ βασιλείου.

<sup>3</sup> Hellenica, 1, 5, 3 - 5.

<sup>4</sup> Plutarch refers later ( Lysander, 14, 1 ) to Cyrus' offer to coin down his throne.

were delighted, and thereupon asked for a restoration of the sailors' pay to an Attic drachma per head - the rate promised by Tissaphernes, when he first invited the Spartans to Ionia. But Cyrus refused, saying that the rates of pay had been fixed by the Persian king in the terms of the treaty.

Plutarch knows nothing about this; he merely tells his story about the feast given by Cyrus, and the generous offer made by the Persian at the banquet. Xenophon<sup>2</sup>, who mentions the feast, and Diodorus<sup>3</sup> ( who has no record of it ) refer to Cyrus' offer and to Lysander's reply; Xenophon using the words, *προσθέσθαι ὀβολόν*, which are found in Plutarch, while Diodorus says, *μυρίας δραχμὰς ἔλαβεν ἕως τῶν στρατιωτῶν μισθόν*. Thus, Plutarch's account is a combination of Xenophon and Ephorus.

The increase of pay for the Spartan sailors led to discontent among the Athenian naval forces, and a higher morale among Lysander's troops. Notwithstanding, says Plutarch, Lysander shrank from a sea battle<sup>4</sup> through fear of Alcibiades, who was keen, up to then had been uniformly victorious, and had a larger fleet.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Xenophon is probably mistaken there; cf. Thucydides, VIII, 18 - 37, & 58, where a specific rate of pay is not mentioned.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, I, 5, 6; cf. Xen. Oecon., IV, 20, where there is a description of Lysander's admiration of Cyrus' garden; cf. also, Justin, V, 5.

<sup>3</sup> XIII, 70. <sup>4</sup> *ἔσυχίαν ἔργον*, says Xenophon, Hell. I, 5, 10.

<sup>5</sup> *Διὰ τὸ πολλὰς ναυὸν ἔχοντάς τε*, says Xenophon, who records that the fleet of Alcibiades numbered 95, while Lysander had 90 ships.

CHAPTER V

The narrative continues in this chapter with a description of the battle of Notium ( 407 B.C. ). Plutarch follows the accounts of Xenophon<sup>1</sup> and Diodorus,<sup>2</sup> which are very similar, although there is much more detail to be found in Diodorus than in Xenophon. If anything, Plutarch's account is more close to that of Xenophon, certainly with regard to the number of ships involved and the number of losses sustained by the Athenians.

2 Plutarch and Xenophon agree that Alcibiades sailed from Samos to Phocaea, which had been in Spartan hands<sup>3</sup> since 412 - 411.

Diodorus<sup>4</sup> says that he sailed to Cyme and laid waste its territory but failed to take the city; the Cymeans therefore sent an embassy to Athens, complaining about his depredations; this embassy was in a large measure responsible for the subsequent disgrace of Alcibiades. Nepos,<sup>5</sup> whose ultimate source seems to be Ephorus, is also aware of this expedition to Cyme. But neither Xenophon nor Plutarch know anything about this alleged visit of Alcibiades to Cyme.

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, 1, 5, 11 - 15.

<sup>2</sup> X111, 71.

<sup>3</sup> of. Thucydides, VIII, 31, 2.

<sup>4</sup> X111, 73.

<sup>5</sup> Alcibiades, VII.



During the absence of Alcibiades, Antiochus was left in charge of the Athenian fleet. In his Life of Alcibiades, Plutarch makes allusion to Alcibiades' specific command to Antiochus not to fight the Spartans during his absence,<sup>2</sup> but he does not refer to this command in the Life of Lysander.

Antiochus, says Plutarch, sent two of his triremes into the harbour of Ephesus, and provoked a general conflict; Lysander was victorious, captured fifteen Athenian triremes and set up a trophy.

Xenophon<sup>3</sup> speaks of two Athenian ships provoking the conflict. Diodorus<sup>4</sup> says that Antiochus filled ten ships; he then gives us considerably more information than either Xenophon or Plutarch about the sea-fight, and puts the Athenian losses at twenty-two.

Plutarch's account is almost identical with that of Xenophon.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Alcibiades, *XXXV*: in the same chapter Plutarch gives us further information about Antiochus, *ἀναβὰς μὲν ἐν κυβερνήτης, ἀνόητος δὲ τῶν καὶ φορτιῶν*.

<sup>2</sup> As is confirmed by Xenophon.

<sup>3</sup> *Hellenica*, 1, 5, 12:

<sup>4</sup> *XIII*, 71, 2.

<sup>5</sup> of. Pausanias, *III*, 17, 4: "On the west portico of the temple of Athena at Sparta there are two eagles, and upon them two victories, dedicated by Lysander to commemorate his two exploits at Ephesus and Aegospotami"; Pausanias mentions ( *IX*, 32, 6 ), among Lysander's exploits worthy of praise, that when he was in command of the Spartan fleet, he waited until Alcibiades was absent from his command, then led on Antiochus to fight and finally overcame him not far from Colophon.

4 According to Plutarch, the final result of the battle of Notium was that the people of Athens, angry with Alcibiades, " deposed him " (ἀπέχριστον); Alcibiades, insulted by the sailors at Samos, fled to the Chersonese.

Xenophon and Diodorus differ slightly from Plutarch, but principally in supplying further information.

Xenophon<sup>1</sup> says that the Athenians were extremely annoyed at Alcibiades, and " chose another ten generals " for the year 407 - 406 B.C. Alcibiades, therefore, " being ill spoken of in the army " sailed to the Chersonese, to his own fortresses there. Plutarch's account in his Life of Alcibiades<sup>2</sup>, is very similar to that of Xenophon, for there he refers to Alcibiades' fortress in Thrace near Bisanthe, and to the election by the Athenians of other generals in his place.

Diodorus<sup>3</sup> gives a very long description of the disgrace and humiliation of Alcibiades, mentions the accusations of the Gyneans against him, and says that he sailed to Pactya in Thrace.

Nepos<sup>4</sup> is obviously following the sources of Diodorus; he has knowledge of the Gyne accusations, and names the three forts near Pactya to which Alcibiades sailed.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, 1, 5, 16 - 17: πονήρως καὶ ἐν τῇ στρατίᾳ φερόμενος. of Plutarch's ἀπέχριστον.

<sup>2</sup> Alcibiades, XXVI.

<sup>3</sup> XIII, 71 - 74.

<sup>4</sup> Nepos, Alcibiades, VII: " Se Pactyon contulit ibique tria castella communiter, Ornos, Bisanthen, Econtichos ".

Plutarch alone uses the word ἀποχρηστικῶς of Alcibiades, unless we assume that Nepos' words, " ut absentium magistratum abrogarent ", are the Latin equivalent. Yet we have no other evidence that Alcibiades was brought to trial. From the account of Xenophon we merely assume that he failed to be reappointed at the forthcoming elections, like his colleague, Theramenes.

We are given here a great deal of information about the organisation by Lysander of political clubs in the cities of Asia Minor. Plutarch points out that the result of these " decarchies ", as he calls them, was to create a strong body of support for Lysander personally in Asia Minor, so as to make it difficult for the Spartans to appoint a successor with equal influence. This, of course, was very hard on Calliarchidas, who did succeed Lysander in 407 - 406 B.C.; and Plutarch concludes his chapter with words of praise for the character of Calliarchidas, who is to monopolise chapter VI.

It is in chapter V ( from paragraph 5 onwards ) that for the first time in the Life of Lysander we find the suggestion of criticism of Lysander, and the imputation of an unfavourable side to his character; at the same time, there is a certain similarity to what Diodorus<sup>2</sup> has to say about the

---

<sup>1</sup> of. Lycias, Defence ag. Bribery (XXI), 7, who suggests that Alcibiades was deposed from his command: ἄρ' ἔτι μὲν αὐτὸς τῶν ἄλλων ; In Photius ( Bibl. 377 ) a reference is made to an indictment of Alcibiades by Cleophon - there may, therefore, have been a prosecution in 407 B.C., at the instigation of Cleophon.

<sup>2</sup> XIII, 70, 4.

" decadarchies " - information which is not found in Xenophon.<sup>1</sup>

Diodorus<sup>2</sup> describes how, before the battle of Notium and just after his first meeting with Cyrus, Lysander summoned to Ephesus the chief men of rank and excellence and of them formed *ἐταίρια* in the cities of Asia Minor, which were later to be useful in destroying democracy and setting up forms of government favourable to himself.<sup>3</sup> But Diodorus does not call these groups " decadarchies ".<sup>4</sup>

Plutarch says that Lysander summoned to Ephesus men of spirit and daring, " sowed in their minds the seeds of revolutionary decadarchies, afterwards instituted by him ", urging them to form *ἐταίρια* and to take an interest in public affairs, so that when the Athenian empire was destroyed, they could wipe out the democracies in their cities and become themselves supreme in the government of their affairs.

Now these words of Plutarch, although similar to Diodorus, are not like the paragraph about the " decadarchies ", found in Nepos' Life of Lysander.<sup>5</sup> Nepos' passage is much closer to chapter XIII of Plutarch's Life of Lysander;<sup>6</sup> and Nepos is implying that the formation of these political clubs

<sup>1</sup> But cf. Xenophon, Hellenica, III, 4, 2, where Xenophon alludes to the *δενδέρχια* set up by Lysander and dismissed by the ephors.

<sup>2</sup> XIII, 70, 4. <sup>3</sup> Diodorus, loc. cit. *Ἐπὶ τῷ ἀγῶνι ἀνέβη..... ἄπορον τὴν ἀναμύθησιν πάντων τῶν εἰς πόλεμον κρησίσμων.*

<sup>4</sup> The passage in Diodorus (XIV, 10, 1), where mention is made of 'harbours', will be considered later, in an examination of chapter XIII of the Lysander.

<sup>5</sup> Nepos, Lysander, 1: " Nam undique qui Atheniensiū rebus studiōsent civitatis, decem delegerat in unaquaque civitate, quibus summum imperium potestatemque omnium rerum committeret..... "

<sup>6</sup> XIII, 5 - 7.

took place after Aegospotami, as is Plutarch also perhaps in his later chapter. The whole of Nepos' biography of Lysander is chronologically post-Aegospotami.

It seems very likely that Plutarch's information in this chapter about the inciting of the Asiatic Greeks to form "revolutionary decadarchies" is not from Nepos' source at all (not from our assumed 'Hostile-biographical' source, or any anti-Lysander political pamphlet), but - despite its rather vague similarity to Diodorus - probably taken by Plutarch from the historical narrative (a combination of Xenophon and Theopompus?), which he has so far been using for his Life of Lysander. This is shown to be likely by the reference to Callistratus in this chapter, and by the wholly encomiastic account of that Spartan found in the following chapter.

8 Let us examine in detail the remainder of chapter V. We find that in fact Plutarch does not give us here any unworthy picture of his hero, as he does later on in the biography in those chapters where he must be drawing upon a 'hostile source'. It may surely be assumed to be an act of statesmanlike foresight and confidence to prepare, in those cities which for so long had been under Athenian influence, an alternative body of politicians to take over affairs when Athens fell, as Lysander hoped she would. Lysander welded those

groups together and to himself, by the promise of power for their members when the democracies fell at the dissolution of the Athenian empire.

The remainder of the chapter may well be Plutarch's own comment upon Lysander's personal power and influence, and the unpopularity of Callieratidas. The only suggestion of evil in the character of Lysander is to be found in the words, " taking a share himself in their injustice and wickedness, in order to gratify their rapacity ";<sup>1</sup> and even this is so vague and so unsubstantiated as to mean very little. In any case, it leads on to a comparison with Callieratidas, whose character is painted in glowing colours by both Diodorus and Xenophon, and whose pan-Hellenic ideals ( if we can trust our authorities about them ! ) would undoubtedly have been acceptable to any pupil of Isocrates.

The straightforwardness and pan-Hellenic patriotism of Callieratidas would make him preeminent among his contemporaries as a somewhat rare character. Ephorus apparently had a very high opinion of him, for Diodorus, after terming him the " most upright of the Spartiates ",<sup>2</sup> devotes no small space to an account of his early successes in the Aegean,<sup>3</sup> emphasising his justice and incorruptibility.

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, V, 6: συναδικῶν καὶ συνεξαμαρτάνων αὐτὸς ἐπὲρ τῆς ἑαίνας πλεονεξίας.

<sup>2</sup> XIII, 76, 2: νέος γὰρ ἦν πανταχῶς. ἄλλοκος δὲ καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπλοῦς.

<sup>3</sup> XIII, 76 - 79.

Xenophon also accounts Callieratidas an honourable man, and it is in connection with Callieratidas, and Lysander's treatment of the man, that anything dishonourable about Lysander is suggested by Xenophon; for it was, apparently, the friends of Lysander in Asia Minor who took amiss the replacement of Lysander by Callieratidas, and did their best to discredit him.<sup>2</sup>

Plutarch's words of praise for Callieratidas are high indeed; he was "the justest and noblest of all men", and he pleased the allies of Sparta by his Doric simplicity and the sincerity of his leadership. But, for all that, says Plutarch, although they admired the *ἀρετή* of Callieratidas, they were dejected and wept for Lysander.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, 1, 6, 1 - 11.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, 1, 6, 4.

CHAPTER VI

This chapter continues the story of Callieratidas and his unhappy experiences at the hands of the friends of Lysander in Asia Minor, and through the insulting attitude of the Persian prince, Cyrus. It is obviously built upon a foundation of Xenophon, yet with considerable additions peculiar to Plutarch, and a few minor points which disagree with Xenophon. It has nothing in common with Diodorus. A comparison of Plutarch with Xenophon reveals the following similarities:

Plutarch: <sup>1</sup>	Xenophon: <sup>2</sup>
1 ) Callieratidas superseded Lysander as <i>διάδοχος τῆς ναυαρχίας</i> .	1 ) Callieratidas superseded Lysander, 407 - 406 B.C.
2 ) Lysander's friends inevitably miss him, and, fearful for their interests, are hostile towards Callieratidas.	
3 ) Lysander returns to Cyrus the remainder of the money given to him, telling Callieratidas to ask for it himself if he wants it.	
4 ) Callieratidas refutes the boast of Lysander that he was handing over <i>θαλασσοκρασίαν τὸ ναυτικόν</i> .	2 ) Callieratidas refutes the boast of Lysander that he was <i>θαλαττοκράτης</i> when he handed over to him the fleet.
	3 ) Callieratidas increased his fleet to 140 ships. <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, V, 7-8; VI, 1-8.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, 1, 6, 1 - 11.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Diodorus, XIII, 76.



- 4 ) Marked opposition to Calli-  
cratidas by the friends of  
Lysander.
- 5 ) Calliocratidas makes a speech to  
the Spartans.
- 5 ) Calliocratidas in dire need  
of money; he had brought  
none from Sparta, and did  
not wish to enforce  
contributions from the  
cities of Asia Minor,  
*πολλὰν ἑπαισίους*; reluctance  
of Calliocratidas to  
approach Cyrus.
- 6 ) Calliocratidas goes to  
Cyrus for money; lengthy  
anecdote - refused money  
and insulted by Persians.
- 6 ) Calliocratidas goes to Cyrus, who  
bids him wait for two days.
- 7 ) Anger of Calliocratidas; he  
goes to Ephesus, cursing  
the Persians and saying  
that he will do his best  
to reconcile the Greeks  
when he returns home.
- 7 ) Calliocratidas, in anger, curses  
the Persians and says he will  
do his best to reconcile Athens  
& Sparta when he returns home;  
he goes off to Miletus.
- 8 ) Calliocratidas sends to Sparta  
for money.
- 9 ) Calliocratidas makes a speech to  
to the people of Miletus, in  
which he mentions incidentally  
that Lysander had returned to  
Cyrus the remainder of the  
money which had been given to  
him by the Persian.

Now, as this chapter of Plutarch contains a series of incidents which reflect upon the relations between Lysander and Calliocratidas, and as this is the sole dishonourable action attributed to Lysander by Xenophon, it must be examined carefully. None of the chapter is apparently taken from Ephorus, but at least two of the anecdotes are obviously taken from Xenophon, either at first or second hand.

Plutarch and Xenophon are in agreement about three facts; firstly, that Lysander boasted that he was lord of the sea when he handed over his fleet to Callieratidas, and that Callieratidas refuted his boast; secondly, that Lysander handed back to Cyrus the remainder of the money which Cyrus had given to him for the prosecution of the war; thirdly, that Callieratidas was ignominiously treated by Cyrus when he went to see him.

Yet in the interpretation of these facts there is considerable disagreement between the two authors.

1) In Xenophon, the boast of Lysander implies no stigma to the character of Lysander; it was, after all, the natural boast of a Spartan admiral who had had a not unsuccessful year of office, who was obviously reluctant to lay down his office before his work was finished, and who - in a manner characteristic of most men - assumed that he was better able to complete the work which he had so successfully started, than a newcomer who seems to have been his junior in years. Lysander had laid a sound foundation for Spartan supremacy, had won over to the Peloponnesian cause most of the Ionian cities, and had taken the measure of the Athenians at sea.

Plutarch, on the other hand, whatever his source, is determined to glorify the character of Callieratidas, and to do this, he emphasises the disadvantages under which Callieratidas laboured from the very commencement of his command. Thus,

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. Diodorus, XIII, 76, 2: νέος γὰρ ἦν παντελῶς .

in Plutarch, Lysander's boast is the final thrust at Calli-  
cratidas; and Plutarch carefully enumerates the disadvantages  
which faced Lysander's successor. Lysander had made the  
Spartan allies more disaffected towards Calliocratidas; he had  
returned to Cyrus the remainder of his money, telling his  
successor to ask for it himself from the Persian, if he wanted  
it; finally, he had boasted that he was leaving him a fleet  
which had proved its superiority over the Athenians and was  
master of the sea.

There is one very small point of difference in fact  
between the two accounts. Xenophon says that Calliocratidas  
ordered Lysander, if he really was master of the sea, to sail  
to Miletus from Ephesus " on the left of Samos ". Plutarch  
says, " keeping Samos on the left ", that is, ' sailing west?  
of Samos ', presumably a far more dangerous route.

2 ) In his description of Calliocratidas' speech to  
the Milesians, Xenophon records that Calliocratidas mentions,  
quite incidentally, that Lysander had handed back to Cyrus  
the remainder of the money given to him. So far Plutarch  
agrees ( except that he does not set the fact within the context  
of a speech ), but he adds that Lysander " bade Calliocratidas  
ask for the money himself, if he wanted it, and see to the  
maintenance of his soldiers ".

---

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, 1, 6, 2: αὐτὸν ἐκέλευεν ἐξ Ἐφέσου ἐν ἄριστορᾷ ἑάρου περιπλύνεσθαι ...  
Lysander, VI, 2: λαβῶν ἐν ἄριστορᾷ ἑάρου καὶ περιπλύνεσθαι εἰς Μίλητον.

W. K. Prentice<sup>1</sup> suspects the whole incident; he points out that Xenophon cites as his authority for this statement a speech which he alleges Callieratidas made to the Milesians, and adds, "The story certainly makes Lysander appear ambitious, and - to say the least - ungenerous to his successor: but no one would condemn a man solely on this account". But, if the story is true, it suggests an even blacker side to the character of Lysander. For we know that at the close of the war Lysander sent back to Sparta the residue of Cyrus' money,<sup>2</sup> instead of returning it to the Persian. Then, at any rate, if he was honest, he should have returned it to Cyrus. But to return it to Cyrus in the middle of a campaign, merely because he was temporarily deprived of his command, was obviously a manoeuvre to cripple his successor, and not the fulfilment of any obligation.

3) Xenophon describes<sup>3</sup> how Callieratidas went to Cyrus for money, was ordered by him to wait for two days, turned in anger to abuse the Persians and to swear that he would reconcile Athens and Sparta, and eventually sailed back to Miletus.

Plutarch, however, has made very much more of the story; he does not mention a delay of two days, but he describes

---

<sup>1</sup> A.J.A., Vol. XXXVIII, 1934, 'The character of Lysander', p. 38.

<sup>2</sup> Xenophon, Hellenica, II, 3, 8; Plutarch, Lysander, XVI, 1.

<sup>3</sup> Hellenica, I, 6, 7.

in detail the insulting tones of Cyrus' doorkeeper, the simplicity of Calliceratidas' reply, the laughter of the barbarians, the second call of Calliceratidas upon Cyrus, when he was refused admittance, and his final departure for Ephesus, swearing to reconcile the Greeks when he got back to Sparta.

Plutarch's last paragraph - a very considerable enlargement of Xenophon<sup>2</sup> - with its pan-Hellenic idealism and its obvious detestation of the barbarian, might have come straight from the pen of Isocrates !

Plutarch does not record: 1 ) the increasing of the Spartan and allied fleet to 140 ships by Calliceratidas; 2 ) the speech of Calliceratidas to the Spartans upon his arrival in Asia Minor; 3 ) the appeal of Calliceratidas to Sparta for funds; 4 ) the speech of Calliceratidas to the people of Miletus - all of which are to be found in Xenophon. But, of course, none of these points would in any case have made any important addition to Plutarch's treatment of the character of Calliceratidas in this chapter.

But, apart from what has already been mentioned ( and Plutarch's initial antipathy towards Lysander is no doubt due to his desire to glorify the character of Calliceratidas ), Plutarch does make additions to the record of Xenophon, of a nature to suggest that he is indebted <sup>for</sup> to them to a narrative source, for they cannot merely be his own reflexions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, VI, 8.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, I, 6, 7.

We have a passage describing the perplexity of Calli-  
 cratidas, who had brought no money with him and could not  
 bear to impose a forced levy on the cities of Asia Minor,  
 " when they were already in an evil plight ". These last  
 words may suggest our source, for it seems likely that  
 Calliocratidas, of whom both Xenophon and Diodorus speak  
 highly, had his supporters also among the Spartan allies  
 of Asia Minor. If therefore he left behind him the reputation  
 for refusing to overburden Ionia with taxes towards the  
 prosecution of the war ( while Persia or Sparta could supply  
 funds ), the reputation for simplicity, sincerity and  
 incorruptibility of life<sup>2</sup> in the very midst of intrigue,  
 corruption and barbarism, the reputation for an idealistic  
 pan-Hellenism which would unite Sparta and Athens against  
 their hereditary foe - then he could not but win the approval  
 of Theopompus of Chios, who apparently shared all these ideals,  
 or at any rate opposed their opposites. Moreover, Theopompus  
 would be able to find in Xenophon<sup>3</sup> much other evidence about  
 the practical pan-Hellenism of Calliocratidas.

Plutarch suggests extreme reluctance on the part of  
 Calliocratidas to approach the Persian for money. Xenophon,

<sup>1</sup> This, of course, is implied in Xenophon, Hellenica, 1, 6, 6.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Lysander, V, 7: *ἀπλοῦς καὶ δίκαιότατος* .....  
 VI, 4: *ἀγῆ ἐλευθέρῳ καὶ βασιλοφρον...*  
 VII, 1: *γενομένου τοῦ ἀπλοῦς ἐνάρετος τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐπὶ δικαιοσύνην  
 καὶ βασιλοφρονίαν καὶ ἀρετήν.*

<sup>3</sup> Hellenica, 1, 6, 15.

however, gives the impression that he would not have been loth at all to receive Persian pay, and does pass on one unfavourable anecdote about Callicratidas, which tells how he broke his promise not to sell Athenian captives into slavery.

---

Hellenica, 1, 6, 15.

CHAPTER VII

The first three sections of this chapter seem to follow the same source or sources as chapters II - VI; they do not disagree with Xenophon<sup>1</sup> or Diodorus<sup>2</sup> on any important points.

After eulogising the character of Callieratidas, Plutarch refers in the briefest detail to his death at Arginusae ( July - August, 406 B.C. ), using the same unusual verb as Xenophon, *ἔθανίσθη*. Diodorus' description of the battle and the exploits of Callieratidas therein is both prolix and exaggerated; he terms Arginusae, " the greatest sea-fight ever fought between Greeks ". All the details about Arginusae, with its gains and losses, and the trial of the Athenian generals after the battle, are excluded by Plutarch from his biography.

Xenophon and Diodorus agree with Plutarch that the allies sent an embassy to Sparta and asked that Lysander be reappointed admiral, and that Cyrus joined in supporting their request. Xenophon specifically mentions the Chians as taking the lead in sending this embassy.<sup>3</sup> Plutarch's sentence, " declaring that they would grapple much more

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, 1, 6, 8-- II, 1, 7.

<sup>2</sup> XIII, 97 - 100.

<sup>3</sup> Hellenica, II, 1, 6.



vigorously with the situation if Lysander were their commander", is a natural enough reflexion on the situation in Asia Minor.

Both Xenophon and Diodorus refer, in very similar words to those of Plutarch,<sup>1</sup> to the old Spartan tradition of their generals holding commands for one year only, and the way in which the Spartans circumvented their own law, both to gratify their allies, and no doubt also because they realised that Lysander had showed himself the right man for the post. The Spartans had recognised that some of their old traditions were by now insufficient to meet the needs of modern war; yet, being reluctant to abrogate or change their law entirely,<sup>3</sup> they sent out Aracus<sup>2</sup> as admiral, with Lysander as his 'epistoleus'.<sup>4</sup> The latter office must have been originally that of secretary or despatch-bearer of the 'nauarch', but by the time of the Peloponnesian War it was tantamount to deputy-commander-in-chief. Diodorus<sup>5</sup> knows nothing of any official standing which Lysander had in the fleet; he merely records that the Spartans sent out Lysander as ἱδρύτης with the newly-appointed admiral.

<sup>1</sup> Xenophon, Hellenica, II, 1, 7: οὐ γὰρ νόμος αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν ναυαρχεῖν. Diodorus, XIII, 100, 8: οὐ εἰς ἄλλους νόμον ἔχοντες εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν μὴ περῆεν. Plutarch, Lysander, VII, 3: νόμος ἦν ἵνα εἴη εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν ναυαρχεῖν. cf. Aristotle, Constit. of Athens, XXXIV, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Aracus (called Aratus by Diodorus) was ephor in 409-8 (Xen., Hellen. II, 3, 10), leader of an embassy to Darius II in Asia Minor in 398 (Hellen. III, 2, 6-9), and ambassador at Athens, 370-369 (Hellen. VI, 5, 33).

<sup>3</sup> No doubt for fear of what did actually happen, in the case of the older Pausanias: cf. Thucydides, I, 79 et seq.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Pollux, Onom., I, 96.

<sup>5</sup> XIII, 100, 8.

The powers of the Spartan admiral and his second in command were very extensive, indeed so great that Aristotle disapproved.

The remainder of this chapter and the whole of chapter VIII are devoted to descriptions and illustrations of the character of Lysander by anecdote and by quotation - "das eideologische", as Weizsäcker calls it.<sup>2</sup> Plutarch's picture of Lysander in these sections is very different from anything which he has previously written about the subject of his biography, and it bears a close relation to the unfavourable portraiture found in the later chapters<sup>3</sup> of the Life.

Here we have an obvious comparison between Lysander and Callieratidas, perhaps suggested by the accounts of Callieratidas' honourable reaction to the wretched circumstances in which he found himself, recorded in the previous chapter. There follow a series of uncomplimentary characteristics imputed to Lysander, the saying about the lion's skin and the fox's skin, an anecdote illustrating the treachery of Lysander, and a further saying of Lysander's about the value of oaths.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pol. 1271 A; cf. Thucydides, IV, 2, 4, where Demosthenes sailed as *ἑκαστῶν* with the fleet of Eurymedon and Gophocles - apparently with no official status, yet obviously with some authority; perhaps Ephorus saw some parallel between the position of Demosthenes in 425 B.C., and that of Lysander in 405 B.C.

<sup>2</sup> Untersuchungen über Plutarchs biog. Technik, Stuttgart, 1927, p. 76.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XLIII, 5-9; XLX; LII; XLIII, 1-5; XLIV, 3-6; XLV; XLVI; XLVII, 3-5.

This section has a very loose historical and chronological connection with Callieratidas; and the anecdote about Lysander's dealings with Miletus,<sup>1</sup> although it seems to be out of chronological order here, is a good illustration of the sort of character which is attributed to Lysander at the end of chapter VII. Plutarch repeats what he has already said about Callieratidas; those Ionians who hoped to gain important positions in their cities by the influence of Lysander when the democracies were overthrown, were pleased to welcome Lysander back - but those who liked "simplicity and mobility in their leaders" (obviously Callieratidas) felt that Lysander was an unscrupulous σοφιστής. There follows a series of accusations against Lysander, substantiated by two sayings of his and one anecdote.

Lysander was a past-master in the art of deceit,<sup>2</sup> a consummate opportunist, with no regard for justice, making no distinction between truth and falsehood, but "bounding his estimate of either by the needs of the hour". From whatever source Plutarch formed this opinion of Lysander, he had already<sup>3</sup> recorded the same estimate in almost identical words.

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, VIII, 1 - 3.

<sup>2</sup> Διαποικίλλων ἀπάταις; cf. Lysander, VIII, 3: διαποικίλλει.

<sup>3</sup> Apoph. Lac., 229 A.

To illustrate the deceitfulness of Lysander, inappropriate to one who claimed to be of the stock of the Heracleidae,

Plutarch records a saying of Lysander's: *ὅπου γὰρ ἡ λέωνος μὴ ἐφικνέται  
προσραϊστὸν ἐκεῖ τὴν ἀλωπεκῆν.* <sup>2</sup>

The point of the saying is clear; the lion's skin is typical of Heracles, hence, of valiant and honourable deeds; the fox, of course, was and still is typical of *πανουργία* and deceit.<sup>3</sup> In other words, where valour alone will not suffice, use a bit of trickery - good advice, surely, for a general to accept and follow!

Polyaenus<sup>4</sup> quotes the same saying, but attributes it to Cleandrides, the father of Gylippus. It may well be an old Spartan saying; it certainly seems consistent with what we know of Spartan education, and may have been attributed to many different Spartans, when it suited their characters, by non-Spartan writers.

<sup>1</sup> of. Lysander, *li*, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Plutarch had already attributed the saying to Lysander, in *Apoph. Reg. et Imp.*, 190 B and 229 B.

<sup>3</sup> of. Horace, *Ars Poetica*, 437.

<sup>4</sup> *li*, 10, 5: *ὅπου μὴ ἐφικνέται ἡ λέωνος, τότε καὶ τῆς ἀλωπεκῆς προσραϊστὸν.*  
Cleandrides had been sent out by Sparta to advise and help the young king, Ploistoanax, in his invasion of Attica. Pericles was said to have bribed them both to evacuate Attica. They were condemned at Sparta and banished. Cleandrides never returned, but settled at Thurii (Thucydides, I, 114; V, 16; Plutarch, Pericles, *liii*), where he was appointed general of the citizens in their war against Tarentum (Diodorus, *xli*, 11; Strabo, VI, 264; Plutarch, Pericles, *liii*). His son, Gylippus, disgraced himself by falling a prey to love of money (Plutarch, Nicias, *xviii*, 4; Lysander, *xvi*, 2 - 4).

But there are all manner of varieties of the connection between the lion and the fox, Plutarch himself giving us two further examples, in his Life of Sulla<sup>1</sup> and - of great importance and significance - in his Comparison between Lysander and Sulla,<sup>2</sup> where he says that Lysander perpetrated no act of youthful folly or wantonness, while he enjoyed great power, and so he "avoided, if ever man did, the praise and reproach of the proverb, οἰκοὶ λέοντες, ἐν ἐρείθῳ δὲ ἀλώπηκες." Aelian<sup>3</sup> says quite the opposite about Lysander.

That the proverb, in another form, antedates Lysander is made clear from Aristophanes' Peace<sup>4</sup> (which was produced in 421 B.C.), although the scholiast,<sup>5</sup> in his interpretation of these lines, is guilty of an obvious anachronism.

Perhaps, in his Comparison between Lysander and Sulla, Plutarch has got hold of the original form of the saying.<sup>6</sup>

It may well be that a Spartan proverb, typical of Spartan education and in fact complimentary to the Spartan character, known to Aristophanes and the Athenians at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War, attributed to Cleandridas or to any other Spartan in an adapted form, and finally associated with Ephesus,<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> xviii, 6.

<sup>2</sup> iii, 2.

<sup>3</sup> V.H., xiii, 8: Λύσανδρον ... ἐν τῇ ἰωνίᾳ ... φασὶ ... διατετρώσθαι τὸν βίον. Λαρία γὰρ ἢ Ἀττικῇ ἐταίρα εἶπεν, οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος λέοντες ἐν ἐρείθῳ γυγόνασιν

<sup>4</sup> 1189 - 1190: ὄντες, οἰκοὶ μὲν λέοντες ἐν μάχῃ δὲ ἀλώπηκες. ἀλώπηκες.

<sup>5</sup> Schol. on Peace, 1190: Περιποίησις παρὰ τοὺς ἐν Κρίῳ Λάκωνας ὑποχέαντας οἰκοὶ λέοντες, ἐν ἐρείθῳ δὲ ἀλώπηκες.

<sup>6</sup> cf. Epict. Diatr., iv, 5, 37: οἰκοὶ λέοντες, ἐν ἐρείθῳ δὲ ἀλώπηκες. Petronius, Gen. Trin. 44, "Domi leones, foras vulpes".

<sup>7</sup> The only place outside the Peloponnese where the Spartans had their headquarters and exercised considerable influence over a long period of time.

became attached to Lysander and associated with his name and activities in Asia Minor by later writers, who disliked Lysander and the Spartan influence, and interpreted the original saying so as to give it a bad implication.

## CHAPTER VIII

There follows the Miletus incident, recorded here by Plutarch to illustrate the deceit of Lysander!

Plutarch states that the friends of Lysander at Miletus, who had his assurance that they would hold the power when the democracies had been abolished, became reconciled to their political enemies, much to the disgust of Lysander. He urged them to make a fresh insurrection against the popular party, himself entered their city, promised no counter-measures against the democrats and lulled them into a false sense of security, so as to prevent their escape and to make easy their slaughter; and " all who put their trust in him were slaughtered ".

Now it seems most unlikely that Miletus, after dependence upon Sparta and Persia for five years, would still have a democratic form of government. The truth probably is that there were in the city two parties of oligarchs, one of which was more closely connected with the Spartans in general, and with Lysander in particular. No doubt, as soon as Lysander reappeared in Asia Minor, his partisans in many of the Ionian cities gained control of their governments.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> According to Smits, Plutarchus' Leven van Lysander, Amsterdam, 1939, p. 107, the same incident is recorded again in chapter XLX, 3, to illustrate his vindictiveness ( ' wraakgierigheid ' ).

<sup>2</sup> This, at any rate, is suggested by Nepos, Lysander, II.

The basis of this anecdote was apparently found in Ephorus; but Diodorus<sup>1</sup>, far from attributing to Lysander responsibility for the massacre of the 340 democrats and the exile of 1000 others, does not even mention his name in connection with this incident. But it was possible for a later writer, making use of Ephorus, to assume Lysander's part and presence in the massacre; for Diodorus sandwiches the incident between the arrival of Lysander at Ephesus in 405 B.C., where he was entrusted by Cyrus with the government of, and tax-collecting from, his province<sup>2</sup>, and the destruction by Lysander of the town of Iasus in Caria - with the slaughter of 800 males and the selling into slavery of the women and children - before his departure for Attica.

No doubt, Nepos' source<sup>3</sup> confused Iasus with Thasos, so that Nepos' information here is ultimately from Ephorus, through some intermediary<sup>4</sup>; Nepos also may have had the numbers of the slain passed on to him by his source, but that we do not know, as his chapter is defective.

Polyaenus<sup>5</sup> is aware of a massacre of democrats at Miletus, as well as at Thasos, and his account is very similar to that of Plutarch; he gives no numbers of the slain, but refers

<sup>1</sup> Diodorus, XIII, 104, 5 - 6.  
<sup>2</sup> cf. Lysander, IX, 2.  
<sup>3</sup> And also the source of Polyaenus, I, 45, 4.  
<sup>4</sup> The same must be true of Plutarch, Lysander, XIX, 3; for, although Miletus is named, the numbers of the slain given by Plutarch in that chapter (800) are the same as those recorded by Diodorus of Iasus.  
<sup>5</sup> Polyaenus, I, 45, 1.



to Lysander's promise to give freedom to the democrats.

Plutarch takes the Miletus incident as an illustration of the deceit of Lysander, and caps it with a saying of Lysander's, which he attributes to Androcleides' authority:

τοὺς μὲν παῖδας δεσπογύλοις,  
τοὺς δὲ ἄνδρας ὄρκοις ἐξέκαταν.

The same saying is known to Diodorus<sup>1</sup> and Polyaeus<sup>2</sup>; and Plutarch elsewhere<sup>3</sup> repeats the saying, localising it at Miletus, but when he quotes the same saying in his 'De Fortuna Alexandri'<sup>4</sup>, he attributes it to Dionysius of Syracuse.

Aelian<sup>5</sup> also quotes the same saying, adding that some call it a saying of Lysander<sup>6</sup>, while others attribute it to Philip of Macedon. The two passages, in Plutarch and in Aelian, are by no means identical, yet there is sufficient similarity in the Greek to postulate one common source.

<sup>1</sup> R, 9, 1: Λύσανδρος .... ἀποφαίνεται τοὺς μὲν παῖδας δεσπ. ἐξακκατῶν τοῖς δεσπογύλοις, τοὺς δὲ ἄνδρας τοῖς ὄρκοις.

<sup>2</sup> 1, 45, 3: Λύσανδρος περιγύρῃσεν ἐξακκατῶν χρόναι παῖδας μὲν δεσπογύλοις, πολυτέρους δὲ ὄρκοις.

<sup>3</sup> Apoph. Reg. of Imp., 229 B: ἐπιτροφεύμενον δ' ἑτέραν αἰτίαν ἐπὶ ταῖς παρεμβάσει τῶν ὄρκων, ὡς ἐν περὶ τῆς ἐπιτροφῆς, ἔλεγε τοὺς μὲν παῖδας δεσπ.

<sup>4</sup> 330 F.

<sup>5</sup> V.H., VII, 12; it seems likely that Aelian's source is the same as that of Plutarch, for Aelian goes on to add: ὁποτέρου δ' ἂν ᾖ, οὐκ ὀρθῶς λέγεται, κατέ γε τὴν ἐρῆν γνώρην.... ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐπρωτῆς while Plutarch, after quoting the saying, claims that it was quite improper ( οὐκ ὀρθῶς ) for Lysander, who was only a general, to imitate in this way Polycrates, of Samos, who was a tyrant.

<sup>6</sup> cf. Dio Chrysost. Or. 74, 15, p. 640 G: τὸν δὲ Λύσανδρον ..... γνώρην ἀποφύγεσθαι λέγεται, ὅτι τοὺς μὲν παῖδας δεσπογύλοις καὶ σφαιραῖς ἐξακκατῶν δεσπ., τοὺς δὲ ἄνδρας ὄρκοις καὶ χρόναισιν.

Plutarch himself<sup>1</sup> is not completely certain whether this saying should be attributed to Lysander; he does suggest, by his reference to Polycrates, the tyrant of Samos (c. 520 B.C.), that the 'apophthegma' may also be attributed to him. But it is possible to read too much into the casual mention of Polycrates, who in any case was well known for his perfidy and ambition, and therefore might be assumed to be a fair parallel for Lysander, if one accepts that sort of interpretation of the character of Lysander.

In all probability this saying about the 'knuckle-bones', like that about the lions and the foxes, may have been well known and in general currency in the Fourth Century B.C., so that it could be put into the mouth of any suitable character.<sup>2</sup>

Plutarch adds that the saying is attributed to Lysander by Androcleides, whoever he may be! Finally, Plutarch suggests that to act in this deceitful way, and to cherish a proverb of this type, is quite untypical of Sparta.

It is extremely difficult to guess from what sources Plutarch gleaned his 'Apophthegmata', if indeed that work is really by the biographer. Probably they were collected by him over many years into a sort of 'common-place' book, which he must have found useful later, when he was compiling his Lives.

<sup>1</sup> Apart from De Fort. Alex., 330 B, where he does attribute the saying to Dionysius.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Diog. Laert., IV, 34, where another version of the saying is attributed to Arcesilaus, the Sceptic.



closely Ephorus' account of Lysander's cruel treatment of Iasus. It is, of course, possible that Plutarch found in Theopompus some mention of a massacre of democrats in Miletus, and himself somewhat embroidered the tale, adding two of his 'apophthegms' to illustrate the deceitful side of the character of his hero. At any rate, it may be significant that after the purely narrative chapters, with which the biography commences, and which may be taken from a single authority,<sup>2</sup> we notice again the frequent interposition of such phrases as "They say", or "It is recorded", or "As he says", which may suggest composite sources.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, III - VII, 3.

<sup>2</sup> And that authority seems to be Theopompus, himself making use of the Hellenica of Xenophon.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. VIII, 1, *ἱστοροῦται* ; VIII, 4, *ἀπομνημονεύεται* ; VIII, 5, *ὡς φησι* with 1, 2, *ὡς ἔνοι φασιν* ; 1, 3, *καί φασιν* ; II, 1, *λέγεται* & II, 4, *δοκεῖ*

CHAPTER IX

Plutarch now returns to the historical narrative; he tells us nothing of the arrival of Lysander at Ephesus in the early part of 405 B.C., when he took over from Metrochus the hundred ships which the latter had collected, together with the sums of money which he had had to demand of the Chians.<sup>1</sup>

Cyrus summoned Lysander to Sardis, offered him gifts, promised him part of his own fortune and said that, if necessary, he would cut up the gold and silver throne on which he sat and mint it into coinage.

Then, as he was on his way to Media to visit his father, he assigned to Lysander the tribute of the cities over which he had jurisdiction, nominating him to rule temporarily in his place, and urging him not to fight the Athenians at sea until he returned, when he promised additional naval forces.

This second interview, given by Cyrus to Lysander, is mentioned both by Xenophon<sup>2</sup> and Diodorus.<sup>3</sup> Xenophon does not say that Cyrus summoned Lysander to Sardis, but he does make it clear that Cyrus gave Lysander some money, and promised him

<sup>1</sup> Xenophon, Hellenica, II, 1, 10 et seq.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, II, 1, 10 - 12.

<sup>3</sup> XIII, 104, 3 - 4.

more. Curiously enough, Plutarch's words about Cyrus' offer to give of his own private fortune and, if necessary, to cut up his throne for funds, are found in a much earlier chapter of Xenophon, at Cyrus' first interview with Lysander. It must be observed that, in chapter IV,<sup>2</sup> where Plutarch is referring to Cyrus' first meeting with Lysander, one might have expected him to insert the reference to the throne of Cyrus, if he had been there following the account of Xenophon at first hand.

The metaphor about coining down one's property seems to have been a favourite one ascribed to Persian rulers and satraps; at any rate, the same sort of idea was expressed by Tissaphernes, according to the words of Alcibiades.<sup>3</sup>

Xenophon says that a message had reached Cyrus, summoning him to his father Darius, who was ill in Media; therefore, he entrusted to Lysander "all the tribute from the cities which were under his jurisdiction".<sup>4</sup> This implies only the revenues due personally to Cyrus; but Plutarch is suggesting that Cyrus offered Lysander all the revenues of the Ionian cities. Xenophon adds that Cyrus urged Lysander

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, I, 5, 3: Ἐὰν δὲ ταῦτα ἐκλήσῃ, τοῖς ἰδίοις χρήσεσθαι ἔφη, ἢ ἑπιπέσει αὐτῷ ἔδωκεν: ἐὰν δὲ καὶ ταῦτα, καὶ τὸν θρόνον κατακόψειν, ἐφ' οὗ ἐνάθητο, ἔντα ἀργυροῦν καὶ χρυσόν.

Lysander, IX, 1: εἰ μὴ δὲν ἔπιπέσει διδόνῃ, καταχορηγήσειν τὰ σπείρα· καὶ ἐπιπέσει πάντα, κατακόψειν ἔφη τὸν θρόνον ἐφ' οὗ καθήματος ἐχρημάτισε, χρυσόν καὶ ἀργυροῦν ἔντα

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, IV, 6.

<sup>3</sup> Thucydides, VIII, 91, 3.

<sup>4</sup> Hellenica, II, 1, 13: πάντας τοὺς πόρους τῆς ἐκ τῶν πόλεων, οἳ αὐτῷ ἰδίοις  
ἔδωκεν

not to fight against the Athenians, " unless he had many more ships ", and promised to bring back further naval forces.

Diodorus says that Darius summoned Cyrus to Persia and that Cyrus assigned the tribute of his cities to Lysander and entrusted to him the *ἐπιτροπὴν* of his cities<sup>1</sup> - a step taken apparently by Cyrus because he had confidence in Lysander and found him a useful alternative to a Persian deputy who might prove to be a serious rival to himself.

Xenophon makes no mention of this superintendence by Lysander of Cyrus' satrapy during his absence, which is recorded by Plutarch and Diodorus.

Plutarch now interposes Lysander's excursion across the Aegean to Attica, and in his chronology agrees with Diodorus.<sup>2</sup> But Xenophon,<sup>3</sup> from whom most of Plutarch's information must ultimately be derived, assigns Lysander's ravaging of Aegina and Salamis to a time immediately prior to the siege of Athens and after the battle of Aegospotami.

According to Plutarch, since Lysander could not fight a sea-battle on equal terms,<sup>4</sup> nor remain inactive with such a large fleet, he put out to sea, making for Attica via the north of the Aegean; he reduced " some of the islands ", overran Aegina and Salamis, and landed in Attica, where he greeted the

<sup>1</sup> XIII, 104, 4: τὴν δὲ ἑαυτῶν πόλιν τὴν ἐπιτροπὴν παρέδωκε.

<sup>2</sup> XIII, 104, 8.

<sup>3</sup> Hellenica, II, 2, 9.

<sup>4</sup> Apparently he had just under two hundred ships; cf. Hellenica, II, 2, 5.

Spartan king, Agis, whose headquarters were at Decclea.<sup>1</sup> He then displayed his fleet, "like one who sailed where he pleased and was master of the sea", but on the approach of the Athenians fled by another route to Asia.

Apart from the reference to Lysander's flight back to Asia, Plutarch is following closely Xenophon's account<sup>2</sup> of Lysander's victorious voyage to Athens immediately after Aegospotami. Xenophon says<sup>3</sup> that after the departure of Cyrus Lysander sailed to Rhodes and the south coast of Caria, and thereafter to Lampsacus. After Aegospotami<sup>4</sup> he sailed to Attica, ravaged Aegina and Salamis, and met Agis.

Chronologically Plutarch is following Diodorus,<sup>5</sup> but he has very little in common with the facts recorded by Diodorus. The latter refers to Lysander's departure from Ephesus for Iacus<sup>6</sup>, where he was guilty of a massacre, and on to Rhodes, and finally across the Aegean, putting in at some of the islands and landing in Attica and Aegina.

This alleged expedition to Attica, immediately after the departure of Cyrus for Persia, is indeed suspect. It is inconceivable that a cautious general like Lysander would leave behind in Asia an Athenian fleet (equal in numbers to

<sup>1</sup> Fortified by the Spartans in 413 B.C., at the suggestion of Alcibiades.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, ii, 2, 9.

<sup>3</sup> Hellenica, ii, 1, 15.

<sup>4</sup> Hellenica, ii, 2, 9.

<sup>5</sup> Hist., 104, 7 - 8.

<sup>6</sup> But cf. Thucydides (VIII, 28, 2); here we are told that Iacus had been for some time in Spartan hands.



his own ) and sail across to Athenian territory, before he had challenged and mastered their fleet. The suggestion in Plutarch seems to be that Lysander was so certain of the strength and superiority of his forces that he could sail where he wished. This idea of pride is perhaps Plutarch's own comment on the vanity of Lysander, who wished to show off to the troops of Agis what he had made of the Spartan fleet.

Plutarch now adds that when Lysander realised that the Hellespont was unguarded, he sailed to lay siege to Lampascus by sea, while Thorax assaulted it by land; the city was taken and plundered. Meanwhile, 180 ships of the Athenians arrived at the Chersonese and put in at Sestos, provisioning there and then sailing on to Aegospotami. This Athenian fleet was under the command of several generals, including Philocles, who had persuaded the Athenian assembly to pass a decree that the right thumbs of all prisoners of war should be cut off.

Xenophon<sup>1</sup> to a great extent, and Diodorus<sup>2</sup> to a lesser extent, confirm what Plutarch says. Thorax is not mentioned at this point by Diodorus, although he does say later<sup>3</sup> that Thorax was left in charge of Samos by Lysander. Plutarch introduces Thorax here quite naturally ( where he is following a historical narrative, which has previously mentioned Lysander's second-in-command ), giving no details about him, but assuming

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, II, 1, 18 - 20.

<sup>2</sup> XIII, 104 - 106.

<sup>3</sup> XIV, 3.

that his readers are familiar with his name. But in chapter XII, where Therax is quoted as an example of the corruption found among Lysander's friends and colleagues, he is referred to by Plutarch as if nothing had been previously said about him.

Xenophon and Diodorus<sup>2</sup> agree that, after the capture of Lampsacus, the city was plundered; but Xenophon<sup>3</sup> adds that Lysander "let go all the free men in the city".

Xenophon<sup>4</sup> and Diodorus<sup>5</sup> agree with Plutarch about the number of the Athenian ships which put in at Oestus and finally sailed on to Aegospotami.

Plutarch specially selects for mention here the name of Philocles,<sup>6</sup> one of the Athenian generals, because he was alleged to have been one of the prime movers in the passing of a decree by the Athenian assembly that they should cut off the right thumbs of prisoners, to prevent them in future from throwing a spear, although they might still be able to row an oar.

Now Xenophon's version<sup>7</sup> of the accusation against Philocles is quite different from that of Plutarch. According to

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, XII, 7; we may assume that Plutarch's source for this later chapter had introduced Therax to his readers for the first time, showing that he was τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ (i.e. Lysander) καὶ συστρατήγων ἐν αὐτῷ, whom one might naturally suspect to be akin to Lysander in character and conduct.

<sup>2</sup> XIII, 104, 8: τὰς ἀρχαίας ἐπειθείας ... τὴν περὶ Ἀθηναίων στρατὸν ἄφηνεν ἐπιπέμπειν.

<sup>3</sup> Hellenica, II, 1, 19. <sup>4</sup> Hellenica, II, 1, 20. <sup>5</sup> XIII, 105, 1.

<sup>6</sup> Plutarch has more information to give us later (XIII, 1-2) about Philocles and his execution by Lysander after Aegospotami, where the information is attributed to Theophrastus (fr. 137, W.).

<sup>7</sup> Hellenica, II, 1, 31 et seq.

Xenophon, the Athenians had passed a decree that, if they were victorious in the sea-fight, they would cut off the right HAND of every prisoner; and the crime for which Philocles was tried before Lysander at Lampsacus was that he had ordered the crews of two captured Corinthian and Andrian triremes to be thrown over a precipice. Thus, in Xenophon, the barbaric decree was that of the Athenians ( and not of Philocles ), while responsibility for the slaughter of two crews was attributed to Philocles; the mutilation was of the right HAND ( and not the thumb ), and it only applied to this one battle.

Plutarch knows nothing about the execution of the crews by Philocles, refers generally to this decree as if it applied to any future engagement, and gives specific information that, with the loss of the thumb, the captured enemy could still row, but not fight.

It is not necessary to assume<sup>1</sup> that this anecdote is taken from Theophrastus, merely because Plutarch ascribes to Theophrastus his account of the death of Philocles.<sup>2</sup> It is much more likely to be taken from the pen of a writer like Theopompus, who may have had available first hand evidence about Aegospotami and its results, had little to say in favour of Athens, and was probably familiar with the decree reputed to have been passed against the people of Aegina by Athens in either 456 or 431 B.C. Neither Thucydides<sup>3</sup> nor Diodorus<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>As does Busolt, Griech. Gesch., III, 2, p. 748, note 3.

<sup>2</sup>Lysander, XIII, 2.

<sup>3</sup>I, 108; II, 27.

<sup>4</sup>XI, 76; XII, 44.

refer to any such decree of the Athenians against Aegina,<sup>1</sup> information about which may in the first instance have been found in Theopompus.

Ultimately, then, as is also clear in chapters III - VII of this Life, the 'Grundquelle' of this chapter is Xenophon, but obviously an adapted Xenophon. Although Plutarch follows the chronological order of events which was found in Ephorus, and which includes a short visit by Lysander to Attica before the battle of Aegospotami, yet there is no evidence whatever that an Ephoran source was used for this chapter. In one short sentence alone<sup>2</sup> Plutarch passes on some information which is peculiar to Diodorus and not found in Xenophon; but, even so, there is not a great similarity between what Plutarch says and the words of Ephorus.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Aelian, V.H., XI, 9, where the words of the Athenian decree are the same as in Plutarch, but the sufferers are the people of Aegina: *δια ἐψηφίσαντο Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ πάντα ἐν δημοκρατίᾳ, Αἰγινητῶν μὲν ἐκάστω τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀποκοῦσαι τῆς χειρὸς ἐλάκτυλον τῆς δεξιᾶς, ἵνα ἔσῃ μὲν βασιλεὺς μὴ δύνασται, καὶ τὴν δὲ ἐλάσσειν δύνασται,*

Δ Cicero, De Officiis, III, 11, 46, "Athenienses.... seiverunt ut Aeginetis qui classe valebant, pollices praeciderentur". Mention is made of the restoration of Aegina by Lysander in Plutarch, Lysander, XLV, 4, and Xenophon, Hellenica, II, 2, 5-9.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, LX, 2: *καὶ τὴν αὐτῶ ἐπιστάμενον ἄρχῆν.*  
Diodorus, XIII, 104, 4: *τῶν ἐφ' αὐτὸν πόλεων τὴν ἐπιστάμενον παρέδωκε.*

It certainly seems strange that, if Plutarch was following closely the narrative of Xenophon, he should diverge from his authority in two important points of chronology - to assign Cyrus' statement about cutting up his throne to his second interview with Lysander after Arginusae, and to insert, before the battle of Aegospotami, the record of Lysander's approach to the shores of Attica.

If, on the other hand, we assume that Plutarch did not in fact make first hand use of Xenophon, but followed the account of Theopompus, then we must also assume that Theopompus, who obviously made extensive use of the Hellenica of Xenophon, had good reasons for his alteration of the chronology of Xenophon. As an Ionian, Theopompus would presumably have access to contemporary records, written from a Chian point of view: and, although Lysander's early visit to Attica is unlikely, a persistent rumour may have been prevalent in Ionia that he did in fact make this journey before Aegospotami. Durius of Samos, even in his day, over a hundred years after the event, was aware of the great reputation left behind by Lysander.<sup>2</sup> The Spartan general who was able finally to vanquish those doughty sea-fighters of Athens, would no doubt have ascribed to him an ability in nautical matters even before the disastrous defeat of the Athenian fleet. If then Theopompus is the

---

<sup>1</sup>of. G. & H., fr. 23, where Theopompus is accused of plagiarism and whole-sale copying from Xenophon: ..... κατὰ τὸν Ξενοφῶντος ἀνὰ παρατίθεται κειμήλια ..... καὶ διὰ τῆν κλονίην κτλ.

<sup>2</sup>Lysander, XVIII, 5; Athenaeus, XV, 696 B-F.

source of Plutarch, he may merely have expressed the view that Lysander was able, notwithstanding the presence in the Aegean of a large Athenian fleet, to sail the waters at his will and land on Attic soil, and have justified this statement by referring to an alleged visit to Attica prior to the battle. Plutarch's comment upon this,<sup>1</sup> and his interpretation of it as an act of vain-glory, will not therefore be taken from his source.

---

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, IX, 4: *ὡς κτείνετο ἡ βάρβατος, κρατῶν τῆς θαλάσσης.*

CHAPTERS X and XI

It is clear that, in his description of the battle of Aegospotami ( September, 405 B.C. ), Plutarch is following closely the account of Xenophon,<sup>1</sup> but with a few alterations and additions which suggest that either he had available another authority, or that his source was reinterpreting and rewriting Xenophon's account. In these two chapters there is nothing but praise for Lysander; the whole plan of the battle is attributed to him,<sup>2</sup> in a way which is not suggested by Xenophon. Plutarch's conclusion is that the Peloponnesian War was " brought to a close by the prudence and ability of one man ", despite a suggestion of treachery on the part of the Athenian generals.<sup>3</sup> This is indeed high praise for Lysander, and very different from the estimate of Nepos.<sup>4</sup>

Diodorus' account of the battle is very brief,<sup>5</sup> and indeed very different in many respects, especially in his description

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, II, 1, 20 - 30.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Lysander, X, 1, and XI, 11 - 13.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XI, 1.

<sup>4</sup> Nepos, Lysander, 1, " ... magnam reliquit sui famam, magis felicitate quam virtute partam ".

<sup>5</sup> XIII, 105 - 106.

of Alcibiades' offer of help and advice to the Athenian generals.

This paragraph is identical with Xenophon, except that the latter does not suggest that Lysander, even before the battle, had already formed the plan of capturing the Athenian triremes while their crews were on the shore.

This paragraph is also identical with the account of Xenophon, who agrees that Lysander refused to put out from his naval base at Lampsacus and accept the Athenian challenge. In this respect Diodorus uses very similar words to those of Plutarch; but Plutarch is more precise about the challenge, and so is Xenophon. The challenge issued by the Athenians continued for three days, and only on the fourth day did Lysander decide to take action.

There is one slight addition made by Plutarch, which we do not find in Xenophon, and which seems to be inserted quite naturally by Plutarch into his account - " Lysander sent out despatch-boats to the foremast of his ships, ordering them to keep quiet and remain in line, not getting into confusion nor sailing out to meet the enemy ". For a Life of Lysander this is a quite meaningless and useless addition, and its insertion can only suggest a narrative historical source, other than Xenophon, which Plutarch used.

---

<sup>1</sup> XIII, 105, 2: ἐπιπέσαντες ταῖς πολεμίοις καθ' ἕνα εἰς ναυμαχίαν προσήλθοντο.  
Lysander, R, 2: τῶν Ἀθηναίων ... ἐπιπέσαντες καὶ προκαλούμενοι.



These two sections also follow the order and description of Xenophon. Lysander held his ships in check and refused to allow them to attack the provocative Athenian fleet. But he sent out two or three ships to reconnoitre, when the Athenians had departed. The inactivity of the Spartans filled the Athenians with courage and contempt for their foe.

The account of Diodorus<sup>2</sup> is quite different; he tells us that, far from feeling more confident about their future and contemptuous of their enemies, the Athenians were at a loss to know how they could sustain and victual their forces in such an unsuitable position.

In his description of the arrival of Alcibiades, Plutarch is quite clearly in no way indebted to Ephorus. He follows entirely the tradition of Xenophon.

Plutarch says that Alcibiades rode up from his neighbouring fortress to the Athenian forces and censured the Athenian generals, first, for pitching camp in a bad position, on an open beach; and second, for having to victual their forces from distant Sestos, while it was possible for them to sail into the harbour of Sestos itself; and, adds Plutarch, they were at the mercy of troops under the command of a single general, " the fear of whom led them to obey his every order promptly ". The Athenian generals refused to accept the

<sup>1</sup> Polyænus, 1, 45, 2, mentions two triremes; Xenophon, Hellenica, II, 1, 24, says τὰς τριήρεις τὰς δύο.

<sup>2</sup> XIII, 105, 2.

advice of Alcibiades, but began to insult him, Tydeus insolently reminding Alcibiades that he was no longer an Athenian general.

In all this, Plutarch follows closely the account of Xenophon; but the short sentence about the Spartans being under a single command is peculiar to Plutarch. Xenophon adds the name of Menander to that of Tydeus for the insulting words addressed to Alcibiades.<sup>2</sup>

Plutarch's account in his Life of Alcibiades<sup>3</sup> of Alcibiades' visit to the Athenian generals at Aegospotami is very similar to what he records in the Life of Lysander. There he repeats, although in different words, his sentence about the unified command of the Spartans, and uses the same words to describe the insult of Tydeus.

But Ephorus' tradition about Alcibiades' visit and advice is very different. Diodorus<sup>4</sup> and Nepos<sup>5</sup> represent Alcibiades as wishing to be readmitted to a share in the command of the fleet, and as promising, if this was granted, that he would assemble a body of Thracians, under their kings, Medocus and Scuthes, attack Lysander by land, and force him to fight or retreat. But the Athenian generals refused his help because he would gain the glory if the battle were successful, and they would have to bear the blame, if things

<sup>1</sup> This is attributed to Theopompus by R. Dippel, *Quae ratio intercedat....*, Giespen, 1898, p. 50, quoted by J. Smits, *Ibid.* p. 120; certainly, Theopompus would see nothing but confusion in the democratic system of a multilateral command, prevalent at Athens.

<sup>2</sup> *Hellenica*, II, 1, 26.

<sup>3</sup> *Alcibiades*, XXXVI & XXXVII.

<sup>4</sup> XIII, 105, 3.

<sup>5</sup> *Nepos*, *Alcibiades*, VIII.

went wrong. Plutarch certainly does allude to help from the Thracians, but in such a way as to suggest that it was merely a report of a vague boast made by Alcibiades.

The conclusion which we draw from an examination of this chapter is that Plutarch is in no way indebted to Ephorus. He either used Xenophon at first hand, and added a comment or two from some other source ( probably Theopompus ), which was attributing the whole success of Aegospotani to the skilful planning of Lysander and the fact that the Spartans had a unified command; or ( and this seems perhaps more likely ) he made use directly of Theopompus, and indirectly of Xenophon, whose information he had available in the Hellenica of Theopompus. The picture of Alcibiades in this chapter is consistently favourable, and his advice ( as is also made clear by Xenophon ) is statesmanlike and reasonable. Nepos<sup>2</sup> bears witness to the uniformly favourable estimate of Alcibiades given by Theopompus, which may be a further argument in favour of Theopompus. But the suggestion of help from the Thracians, put into the mouth of Alcibiades by Ephorus, is as impossible as it is unlike Alcibiades; for he would hardly have promised a force of Thracians to fight Lysander, when he knew how unlikely it was that he could get them across the Hellespont in the face of Lysander's still unconquered fleet.

---

<sup>1</sup> Alcibiades, XXXVII.

<sup>2</sup> Nepos, Alcibiades, II, " duo maledicentissimi, Theopompus et Timaeus, necesse quo modo in illo uno laudando consentiunt ".

CHAPTER XI

Plutarch's account of the seizure of the Athenian ships follows most closely the tradition of Xenophon, deviating from him only to supply additional information, which would seem to have been taken ultimately from an eyewitness on the Spartan side.

Plutarch says<sup>1</sup> that Alcibiades suspected that some treachery was afoot and therefore departed. To this suspicion of treachery Xenophon<sup>2</sup> bears witness, although he does not tell us that Alcibiades was suspicious; and other writers ( for the most part, later ), including Lysias<sup>3</sup>, Isocrates<sup>4</sup>, Demosthenes<sup>5</sup> and Pausanias<sup>6</sup>, agree that it was generally held in Athens that Adoimantus and Tydeus had had treacherous dealings with Lysander.

But Plutarch most briefly passes over the suspicion of treachery, as if his source had little information about it; and indeed, if Theopompus is his ultimate authority, it is

<sup>1</sup> As in Alcibiades, XXXVII, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, II, 1, 32.

<sup>3</sup> Cont. Alcib., (XIV), 38, where he alleges that Alcibiades and Adoimantus together planned to betray the fleet; cf. (Lysias), II, Epitaph., 53: "The ships were destroyed at Acgospotani, *ἐν τῷ ἑσπέρῳ κακίᾳ ἐπὶ τοῖς Σπάρταις* " .

<sup>4</sup> Ad Phil., V, 70.

<sup>5</sup> XIX, 91.

<sup>6</sup> IV, 17, 3, where Pausanias says that the Spartans were the first to give bribes to the enemy, " buying Adoimantus and other Athenian generals "; and II, 9, 11, where Tydeus is named as a traitor. cf. also, Demosth. De Fala. Legat., 57, where Conon accused Adoimantus of bribery.

unlikely that the Isocrates would give much credit to this tale of bribery, which would in any case not reflect credit upon Lysander or upon the Spartans. Indeed, Plutarch's conclusion of his chapter<sup>1</sup> suggests that the Spartan victory at Aegospotami was due, not to the bribery of the generals (as is naturally suggested by such Athenian sources as the Attic orators), nor to the lack of discipline and incompetence of the Athenian troops (as we find suggested in Diodorus<sup>2</sup> and Nepos<sup>3</sup>), but to the prudence and ability of Lysander.

Diodorus<sup>4</sup>, it is true, suggests information about Athenian dispositions and habits, passed on to Lysander; but there is no suggestion in him or in Nepos of the corruption of the Athenian generals.

These sections are very similar to Xenophon.<sup>5</sup> Such differences as there are, are mainly additional comments or small details passed on by Plutarch, which give the impression of a Spartan eye-witness account. There are four examples of this sort of thing:

1) Plutarch speaks of a "bronze shield"<sup>6</sup> being hoisted by the Spartans, as a signal for the attack; but Xenophon, who certainly refers to a shield, tells us nothing about the material of the shield.

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, XI, 11 - 13.

<sup>2</sup> XIII, 105. <sup>3</sup> Alcib. VIII & Lysan. I.

<sup>4</sup> XIII, 106, 2.

<sup>5</sup> Hellenica, II, 1, 25 - 29.

<sup>6</sup> So does Polyaenus, 1, 45, 2.

2 ) Plutarch<sup>1</sup> describes Lysander as himself, in person, visiting his pilots and trierarchs, and encouraging them for the battle; Xenophon makes no mention of this.

3 ) Plutarch<sup>2</sup> records that the Spartan land force advanced along the shore to seize the promontory, only fifteen stades distant from the peninsula; Xenophon, who has previously mentioned the distance from the promontory to the peninsula, at this point merely states that "Therax advanced along the shore with the infantry"<sup>3</sup>.

4 ) Plutarch<sup>4</sup> adds considerable details about Conon's alarm and his attempts to man the triremes, and about the dispositions of the Athenian sailors, referring to the "inexperience of their commanders" - all this information is not found in Xenophon.

The escape of Conon with eight ships to Evagoras of Cyprus is attested by Xenophon<sup>5</sup>, who includes the 'Paralus' in the nine ships which he mentions, and says that Conon first crossed the strait to Cape Abarnia, where the sails of Lysander's fleet lay unguarded; these he took away, to lessen the Spartans' chances of pursuit.

Lycias<sup>6</sup> says that twelve ships escaped, as does Isocrates<sup>7</sup> also. Diodorus<sup>8</sup>, who speaks of ten ships escaping,

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, XI, 3.      <sup>2</sup> XI, 4.      <sup>3</sup> Hellenica, I, 1, 21.

<sup>4</sup> Lysander, XI, 6 - 8.      <sup>5</sup> Hellenica, I, 1, 29.

<sup>6</sup> Apolog. (XII), 9-11.      <sup>7</sup> Ad Call. (XVIII), 59-60.

<sup>8</sup> XIII, 106, 6.

adds that Conon fled to Evagoras, who was his friend, " in fear of the anger of the Athenian people ". Plutarch elsewhere<sup>1</sup> tells us that Conon remained at Cyprus, " awaiting a change in the Athenian government "; and Isocrates<sup>2</sup> suggests that Conon hoped to be able to assist his city in the future from Cyprus.

Diodorus'<sup>3</sup> description of the battle of Aegospotami is quite different from that of Xenophon or Plutarch. Apparently, the Ephoran tradition recorded that Philoelos, before the actual engagement, set out for sea with thirty ships, ordering the other generals to follow him. But, before his order could be carried out, Lysander was upon them, and his skill routed the confused Athenians, turned them to land and captured their fleet.

Pausanias,<sup>4</sup> who has only a superficial reference to the battle, agrees in brief with Xenophon and Plutarch - that when the Athenian fleet of 100 ships anchored at Aegospotami, Lysander captured the vessels, waiting until the sailors were scattered for food and water.

The account of Nepos<sup>5</sup> is also very short; but the reference to Aegospotami in Polyaeus is longer, and quite

<sup>1</sup> Artaxerxes, XLII.

<sup>2</sup> Evag., 52; or. Justin, V, 6,10:  
" crudelitatem civium metuens..."

<sup>3</sup> XLII, 106.

<sup>5</sup> Nepos, Alcibiades, VIII.

<sup>4</sup> II, 32, 7.

close to Plutarch in smaller details; he agrees with Plutarch that a 'brazen' shield was hoisted as the signal by the reconnoitring ships.

In these sections Plutarch also follows Xenophon.

Lysander captured the whole Athenian fleet, except the 'Paralus' and the ships which escaped with Conon, taking prisoner many Athenians with their generals.

But Plutarch alone gives us the number of the prisoners taken by Lysander - three thousand<sup>2</sup> - a ridiculously small number, surely, for so many ships, unless Plutarch's source was only referring to native Athenians; and even in that case the number seems small, although Plutarch has admitted that many of the Athenians were slain as they rushed to board their triremes.

Plutarch alone mentions the plundering of the Athenian camp; and he alone describes the "pipes and paeans of victory" sung by the Spartans as they towed back the Athenian vessels to Lampsacus.

13 The remainder of this chapter is peculiar to Plutarch, and may be his own reflexions upon the end of the Peloponnesian War, which had been concluded at Aegospotami by Lysander. The style of this section is highly rhetorical, and the substance

---

<sup>1</sup> 1, 45, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Pausanias, IX, 32, 9, mentions four thousand prisoners.



really a panegyric upon the work of Lysander; to him alone is attributed the successful conclusion of the great struggle, with its varying incidents and fortunes, and its great losses in men and in generals. There is not one suggestion in this section of the chapter that good luck or the lack of discipline of his enemies wrought the victory for Lysander. Here Plutarch ignores the viewpoint of the consistently hostile source of which he makes considerable use in the later chapters of the Life.<sup>1</sup>

But it is possible that the concluding paragraphs of the chapter, instead of being the expression of Plutarch's own opinion, are in fact a synopsis from the historical source which supplied Plutarch with his information about the battle of Aegospotami. It has been shown that the tone of the first eleven chapters of this biography is consistently favourable towards Lysander;<sup>2</sup> it also seems likely that chapter XI is not taken solely or directly from Xenophon, but from Theopompus, who was himself making extensive use of Xenophon.<sup>3</sup> Such an assumption seems to be proved correct by the type of information

<sup>1</sup> The avowed aim of this 'Hostile Source' was to denigrate the character and depreciate the achievements of Lysander; but apparently it had little or nothing to say about him until after Aegospotami - which is perhaps an argument in favour of its being a Spartan, rather than an Athenian, source - for once Lysander had cleared the sea of the Athenian fleet, Sparta probably did find his abilities a nuisance and his ambition a danger.

<sup>2</sup> Except in chapters VII and VIII, where Lysander's ability cannot bear comparison with the moral qualities of Callicratidas.

<sup>3</sup> As has been indicated in the other chapters, where much of the information given by Plutarch is found in Xenophon's Hellenica.

which is peculiar to Plutarch in this chapter, and which points to an eyewitness, even an Ionian or Chian, source. Xenophon does not describe the material of which the signal-shield was made; he does not refer to the personal exhortation by Lysander of his soldiers and sailors; he does not give us, as does Plutarch, a vivid description of the dispositions of the Athenian sailors; he does not specify the numbers of prisoners taken by the Spartans; he does not mention the plundering of the Athenian camp, nor the playing of pipes or singing of hymns of victory by the Spartans as they sailed back to Lampsacus.

If then Theopompus supplied Plutarch with his account of Aegospotami ( so different from that of Diodorus and so similar to that of Xenophon ), he may also have offered to Plutarch a rhetorical flourish with which to conclude his chapter; and Plutarch's brief summary of the battle, which so magnificently brought the war to an end, serves as an introduction to the following chapter,<sup>2</sup> in which Plutarch examines in detail the portents and omens which were alleged to have been observed both during and after the battle. In addition, in the Comparison between Lysander and Sulla<sup>3</sup> ( where one expects Plutarch to give his own views ), he certainly does not express in such grandiloquent language as here his opinion of Lysander's success.

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, XI, 7: ἡ γὰρ ἄβαν, ἐκλυῶντο κατὰ τὴν χεῖρα, ἐκάλανδαν... ἡριστοτατοῦτο  
εἰ.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XI, 13: Διὸ καὶ θείον τινα ἡγγέμετο ταῦτο τὸ ἔργον.

<sup>3</sup> Comparison, IV.

CHAPTER XII.

Plutarch has introduced the substance of this chapter in the last sentence of chapter XI. Some divine intervention was thought to have brought about so great a disaster for the Athenians. But Plutarch only mentions two portents which have any connection with Aegospotami, and the latter - the falling of a meteorite some sixty two years before the battle - is so very loosely connected with Lysander's victory at Aegospotami that we must assume it to be almost an excuse for a long digression about meteorites. Such digressions in Plutarch, as has been noticed, are very common, for the biographer very often diverges completely from his 'Hauptquelle' ( who may in fact have supplied the original idea, which Plutarch wishes to elaborate ), to pass on a great deal of information which he has collected from various sources.

The first portent noted by Plutarch is the appearance of the twin stars, Castor and Pollux, on either side of Lysander's ship as he sailed out against the Athenian fleet. It was, of course, generally recognised that the Dioscuri

---

cf. Aemilius, XIV, 3, where there is a similar sort of excursus.

helped their Dorian kinsmen in the Peloponnesian War; while in a later period the heavenly twins were the patrons of mariners!

Plutarch is vague about his authorities here; he merely states that "there were some who said that the Dioscuri appeared". It has been inferred<sup>2</sup> that Plutarch is here referring to Anaxandrides of Delphi, whom he quotes as an authority in a later chapter<sup>3</sup> for Lysander's deposits at Delphi, after he has mentioned that Lysander had dedicated at Delphi golden stars of the Dioscuri, "which disappeared before the battle of Leuctra".

The remainder of the chapter is devoted to a discussion on meteorites. Apparently, a large stone had fallen from the sky at Aegospotami (in 470/469 or 468/467 B.C.<sup>4</sup>), and in the common belief it portended disaster. Plutarch does not claim to have seen this meteorite, but he states that in his day it was the object of reverence to the inhabitants of the Chersonese.

<sup>1</sup> cf. Seneca, *Quaestiones Naturales*, 1,1,13: 'In magna tempestate apparere quasi stellae solent velo insidentes: adiuvari se tunc periclitantes aestimant Pollucis et Castoris numine'; cf. also Schol. Euripides, *Orestes*, 1632; Cicero, *De Div.*, 1,34,75; Pliny, *N.H.*, II, 101. The 'Twins' were reputed to appear to sailors in what is now known as 'St. Elmo's Fire'.

<sup>2</sup> Ziegler, *Plutarch's Lysander*, XII, 1 (Teubner).

<sup>3</sup> *Lysander*, XVIII, 3; Anaxandrides, or Alexandrides, has been discussed in the notes on this chapter.

<sup>4</sup> Parian marble, cp. 57; Pliny, *N.H.*, II, 149 ff.

9 There follows an extensive digression on the nature of falling heavenly bodies and shooting-stars, in which Plutarch quotes the opinions and states the views of Anaxagoras, Daimachus and other authorities, whom he does not name.

4 Plutarch quotes Anaxagoras, but in such a way<sup>1</sup> as to suggest that he is not using the philosopher at first hand; indeed, he does not seem to give his readers here a correct exposition of the teaching of Anaxagoras, who was tried at Athens principally for his astronomical views. Although a complete reconstruction of the system of Anaxagoras is not possible, the following facts seem to be clear. Anaxagoras believed and taught that 'Nous' ( 'Mind' ), the animating principle of animals and plants, was also the originator of cosmic action; 'Nous' starts a *περιχώρησις* which gradually spreads; thus, *σπέρματα* are separated out, the dense, moist, gold and dark (*σθε* ) going to the centre, their opposites (*λεβή* ) to the circumference<sup>2</sup>; the *λεβή* consists of fire<sup>3</sup>, and the heavens are *λεβήρος περιφορά*<sup>4</sup>. Heavenly bodies are stones, torn from the earth and thrown off by centrifugal force, which

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, XII, 3: λέγεται... Αναξαγόραν προσηκόν (Diels, Vorsokr. 46 A, 12). For Anaxagoras, cf. Nicias, XXXIII, 3, where Plutarch's brief reference may have been taken over from Timaeus, his principal source.

<sup>2</sup> Diog. Laert., II, 8. <sup>3</sup> Dēstius, II, 13: *λεβήρος πύρρον.*

<sup>4</sup> Hippol., Refutatio Omnium Haeresium, I, 8, 6.

motion makes red-hot.<sup>1</sup> Thus, the sun is a red-hot stone, but the moon, which receives its light from the sun,<sup>2</sup> is earth.<sup>3</sup> Shooting-stars are stones, which are thrown off like sparks from heavenly bodies and fall down from the sky.<sup>4</sup>

Plutarch first expounds what he believes to have been the theory of Anaxagoras, that if there should be any tossing or slipping (σέλος .. ἐλίεσθαι<sup>5</sup>) of the heavenly bodies, one of them would break away and fall to earth; for none of the stars remained stationary - they were in constant motion, due to centrifugal force, and their light was caused by friction (ἀντίρροισις<sup>6</sup>). This 'whirling' force prevented the stars in the first instance from falling earthwards (δάρρο). Much of this information, which Plutarch attributes to Anaxagoras, is irrelevant to the falling of a meteorite at Aegospotami.

Plutarch now quotes what he assumes to be an alternative and more plausible (πιθανωτέρα) theory, which denies that shooting-stars (οἱ διαίτητοις ἀστέραις) are sparks generated ἐν ἄρει, or a blazing up of ἀήρ which has made its way into the upper regions.

J. Smits<sup>6</sup> examines in detail the confusion of thought

---

<sup>1</sup> Aëtius, II, 13.      <sup>2</sup> Plato, Cratylus, 409 A.      <sup>3</sup> Hippol., Refut. 1, 8.  
<sup>4</sup> Diog. Laert., II, 9; Hippol. Refut., 1, 8; Aëtius, III, 2.  
<sup>5</sup> Pliny, N.H., II, 149, says that Anax. had exactly foretold when the stone would fall at Aegospotami.  
<sup>6</sup> Plutarch, Leven van Lybantor, pp. 135 - 141.

apparent in this chapter, pointing out that the quotation from Anaxagoras has nothing to do with shooting-stars, and that Plutarch digresses again to introduce a theory about shooting-stars, in the belief that it contradicts Anaxagoras' teaching about meteorites.

It is probable that Plutarch in this paragraph is referring to Aristotle, although he does not name him, who seems to have held the opinion that shooting stars are "plunging and falling heavenly bodies, carried out of their course by some slackening of their rotation". Plutarch is obviously most reluctant to accept Anaxagoras' version of the falling of the stone at Aegospotami, despite the fact that he proceeds to quote an anecdote from Daimachus, which supports the theory.

Plutarch says that Daimachus,<sup>2</sup> in his work *Περὶ ἀστέρων* (otherwise, not known), confirms the theory of Anaxagoras. Daimachus is alleged to have written that for seventy five days a fiery body<sup>3</sup> was seen in the sky, moving irregularly, with fiery fragments bursting from it, like shooting-stars. But, when it fell at Aegospotami, there was no sign of fire -

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, XII, 5: *εἰρηκότων ἐρίων* : Arist. Meteorologica, 341 B.

<sup>2</sup> F.Gr.H., II A, p.16, 8: II C, p.5, 8; this may, or may not, be Daimachus of Plataea, whom Ephorus used for early Boeotian history. But apparently there was another Daimachus, a century later, who wrote a work called *Ἰνδία*.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Pliny, N.H., II, 149.

it was only a stone, of very large size. Plutarch makes it clear that he finds it hard to accept this theory, which - he admits, refutes a more reasonable theory ( probably that of Aristotle<sup>1</sup> ) that the stone in fact was a portion of a mountain, broken off in a storm and carried some distance away. Thus - and this seems to be Plutarch's own conclusion - it may be that fire was really seen in the sky and that explosions in the atmosphere produced a change in the air which caused violent winds and the consequent fall of the stone from a mountain top.

It is impossible to name the source or sources to which Plutarch is indebted for all the material which his chapter contains. The reference to the Dioscuri may have been taken from Theopompus,<sup>2</sup> and so may have been the anecdote about the fall of a meteorite at Aegospotami.<sup>3</sup> It is possible that Theopompus discussed at length, in a voluminous digression, the theories of Anaxagoras, Aristotle ( and Daimachus, if the Boeotian historian is the author of the treatise to which Plutarch refers ) and other writers, himself refuting Anaxagoras and showing preference for Aristotle's interpretation of the falling of meteorites. Certainly, Plutarch does not want to

<sup>1</sup> cf. Aristotle, Meteor., 342 A.

<sup>2</sup> To whom Anaxandrides was indebted for his information: cf. Lysander, XVIII, 1 - 3, where the Theopompan origin of the reference to the Dioscuri is discussed.

<sup>3</sup> Theopompus certainly described τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἄκρην τῶν Ἀττικῶν at Aegospotami; Anon. Vit. Thucy., V; G. & H., fr. 6 d.



accept the theories of Anaxagoras.

But we must allow to Plutarch a personal interest in matters such as these, and it is not unlikely that he gathered together his material for this digression<sup>1</sup> from various sources, after an initial mention of the meteorite by his principal authority.

---

<sup>1</sup>Plutarch admits the digression, XII, 9: τὰτα γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο γένος  
 γὰρ τῆς διακριβωτοῦ.

CHAPTER XIII, 1 - 4

After his long digression on the two portents visible at Aegospotami, Plutarch returns to his narrative source. He describes the condemnation of the three thousand Athenian prisoners, with Philocles their general, by Lysander, and the noble example of courage shown by Philocles to his fellow-citizens.

This paragraph is identical with Xenophon<sup>1</sup>, except that, as noted before, Plutarch gives us a definite number of prisoners ( which is lacking in Xenophon ), and his source is obviously not following Xenophon in the details about the charges levied against Philocles after the battle<sup>2</sup>.

Here is material peculiar to Plutarch, who quotes Theophrastus<sup>3</sup> as his authority for the noble bearing of Philocles in the face of death. Philocles sternly repudiated the fiction of a quasi-legal trial, bade Lysander execute him outright, and putting on his best robes, led his fellow-citizens to execution. Xenophon says nothing about the manner of his dying.

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, II, 1, 31 ff.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Lysander, IX, 7.

<sup>3</sup> F. Wimmer, Theo. Ersc. Opera, p. 448, fr. 137.

Diodorus<sup>1</sup> refers most briefly to the execution, with no details; while Pausanias<sup>2</sup> makes it a reproach to Lysander that he executed four thousand Athenian prisoners and their general, Philocles, and refused them burial.

If this anecdote about the death of Philocles is taken directly by Plutarch from Theophrastus, it may well be from the treatise, *Πολιτικά τὰ πρὸς τοὺς κλεινούς*. But the same argument holds good here, as in the Life of Nicias,<sup>3</sup> that Plutarch may be indebted to Theopompus for all his quotations from Theophrastus.

Pausanias' allegation about the refusal of burial to the executed Athenians must be derived from a very late authority; Xenophon, Ephorus and Plutarch know nothing about it, nor does the consistently antipathetic Nepos.

Plutarch continues with a brief account of Lysander's activities after the battle. He sailed " to the cities " ( of Asia Minor ? ), ordering all Athenians on pain of death to return to their city, thereby intending to swell the population of Athens and make a long siege of the city unlikely through shortage of food-supplies.

Xenophon<sup>4</sup> gives further details about this decree. Apparently, all the Athenian cleruchies in Aegina, Meles and the Chersonese,

<sup>1</sup> XIII, 106.

<sup>2</sup> IX, 32, 9.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Diog. Laert., V, 45; and Plutarch, Nicias, IX - XI, where Plutarch's use of Theophrastus directly or indirectly is considered.

<sup>4</sup> Mem., II, 8, 1; II, 10, 4; Symp., IV, 31; cf. Demosthenes, Contra Lept., 14 and 24.

and the leading philo-Athenians at Thebes, Byzantium and other dependent cities, were also forced to seek shelter in Athens.

In these two sections Plutarch is following Xenophon<sup>1</sup> closely, except that Xenophon mentions Byzantium and Chalcedon by name as submitting to the Spartan authorities, while Plutarch more vaguely refers to "the cities".<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Hellenica, II, 2, 1 - 2.

<sup>2</sup>The remaining sections of this chapter ( XIII, 5 - 9 ) will be considered under a separate heading, that of the ' Hostile Source ', which was the sole authority of Nepos for his Life of Lysander.

## CHAPTER XIV

This chapter takes us back to the historical narrative and to Xenophon, for after the few paragraphs at the end of chapter XIII,<sup>1</sup> which epitomise Lysander's arrogant and cruel behaviour, Plutarch continues with a description of Lysander's progress to Athens, detailing his activities, both good and bad, but passing little comment upon them.

Much of this chapter has affinities with Xenophon,<sup>2</sup> but there is little similarity to Diodorus, while very considerable sections of the chapter are peculiar to Plutarch, if not actually contradictory to the tradition of Xenophon. It must particularly be noticed that Plutarch ascribes to Lysander personally the taking of Athens, although this is denied by Xenophon and Diodorus. Again, the chronological order of events in this chapter is somewhat different from Xenophon and Diodorus. One assumes from Xenophon's account<sup>3</sup> that Lysander spent some time in Asia Minor after the battle of Aegospotami, taking over Chalcedon and Byzantium, setting up a 'decadarchy' at Lesbos and Thasos, and meeting little or no opposition,

---

<sup>1</sup>Lysander, XIII, 5 - 9

<sup>2</sup>Hellenica, II, 2, 8 - 22.

<sup>3</sup>Hellenica, II, 2, 1 - 22.

except at Samos, where the garrison held out and was not reduced until after the capitulation of Athens.

Plutarch, on the other hand, describes the junction of Lysander, Agis and Pausanias in Attica, their difficulty in taking the city of Athens immediately, with the resultant departure of Lysander again for Asia Minor, where he set up further 'decadarchies', captured Samos, divided up for settlement among his sailors the city of Sestus, restored the Aeginetans, Melians and Scironaeans, and finally received the surrender of Athens.

This paragraph is confirmed by both Xenophon and Diodorus. Xenophon<sup>1</sup> says that Lysander sent word to Agis and the Spartans at Decelea that he was on his way to Athens with two hundred ships.<sup>2</sup> Diodorus<sup>3</sup> estimates Lysander's fleet as "more than two hundred", and he agrees with Plutarch that Lysander met Agis and Pausanias in Attica. Xenophon, on the other hand, does not refer to the arrival of Pausanias at this point.

It is most interesting to note that Plutarch has no word to say about the effects upon the Athenians of the tragic news of Aegospotami brought to them by the 'Paralus' (an

---

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, II, 2, 7.

<sup>2</sup> Yet in Hellenica, II, 2, 9, Xenophon refers to 150 ships - perhaps Lysander had left fifty behind to besiege Samos.

<sup>3</sup> XIII, 107.

omission of a fact of interest, surely, to him ! ), which may offer us further evidence that he did not use Xenophon<sup>1</sup> at first hand, and was rather indebted to Theopompus; at any rate, almost all the narrative sections of this Life are written from a Spartan or allied point of view.

Plutarch describes Lysander's difficulty in taking Athens, and his resolve in the circumstances to go back to Asia Minor, where he suppressed further democratic governments and took the island of Samos.

Xenophon does not agree with this at all. He says that it was the definite policy of Lysander to starve Athens into submission without a fight; and while he was waiting for this plan to come to fruition he crossed over to Asia Minor to supervise the settlement of the governments of the cities there, and to lend a hand in the blockade of the island of Samos, which still held out.<sup>2</sup> In fact, Samos was not taken until after the capitulation of the city of Athens, probably at the end of the summer of 404 B.C.<sup>3</sup>

Diodorus is inconsistent; in one place<sup>4</sup> he suggests that Samos was captured immediately after Aegospotami, in another<sup>5</sup> he tells us that it was taken after the fall of Athens, and that Thorax was left there as 'harpost'.

<sup>1</sup> cf. Hellenica, II, 2, 3 - 4.

<sup>2</sup> Samos alone remained faithful to Athens and prepared to defy Sparta; cf. Greek Hist. Inscr., M.N.Tod, No. 96, p. 231, Vol. 1 (2) No. 97, pp.1-4, Vol. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Hellenica, II, 3, 6 - 7.

<sup>4</sup> III, 106, 8.

<sup>5</sup> XIV, 3, 4.

Xenophon confirms that the Samian democrats were exiled, and that the oligarchs, who had been driven out in 412 B.C., were restored to govern their island. These Samian oligarchs, as Plutarch suggests, showed their pleasure at their restoration by proposing that their festival of Hera should be renamed the 'Lysandrocia'.

Plutarch continues his description of Lysander's settlements before the fall of Athens. He refers to the capture of Sestus, on the Thracian Chersonese, used as a base by the Athenians before they sailed on to Aegospotami.<sup>2</sup> Lysander handed over this town to his sailors; but his action was not confirmed by the Spartan authorities, who later restored the place to the original inhabitants.

Also ( to the approval of all the Greeks, says Plutarch ), Lysander restored Aegina to the Aeginetans, and likewise allowed their former inhabitants to return to the island of Melos, and to Scione on the Chalcidic peninsula.

Sestus had been taken over by the Athenians in 479 B.C.,<sup>3</sup> and since that time had remained an outpost of the Athenian Empire. It was of sufficient strategical importance to be taken over by Lysander, yet curiously enough Xenophon makes no

<sup>1</sup> Lysander XVIII, 6.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, IX, 6.

<sup>3</sup> Thucydides, I, 89; Herodotus ( IX, 115 ) describes Sestus as a " garrison and guardpost of the whole of the Hellespont ".  
cf. also, Thucydides, VIII, 62, and Xenophon, Hellenica, II, 1, 25.



mention of its capture; Diodorus' refers most briefly to its seizure.

The whole of the third section of the chapter is peculiar to Plutarch, who is following a source which was obviously describing Sestus as a reward given to Lysander's pilots and sailors (presumably Ionian and allied naval forces) for faithful service. If Lysander did in fact hand over Sestus for occupation to some of his troops - and it is not unreasonable to believe so - he would not have done it until after the fall of Athens, for he would hardly have begun to disband his army before the war was over. It therefore seems likely that Plutarch is here anticipating (as he has done in the case of Samos) several of the actions of Lysander before he finally returned to Sparta after the surrender of Athens. All this information about Sestus doubtless came from the same source (Theopompus) which had already supplied Plutarch with so much detailed information about affairs in Asia Minor.

But, unless Plutarch is here making reference to what did happen later on,<sup>2</sup> it is hard to believe that there was already in Sparta an active opposition to a general who had so far conducted himself with such signal success. Perhaps the mention of Pausanias together with Agis by his source included a reference to Pausanias' jealousy of Lysander, which was known both to

---

<sup>1</sup> XLII, 106, 8.

<sup>2</sup> of Lysander, XLII, 9, and XLII, 5 - 6.

Xenophon<sup>1</sup> and Diodorus,<sup>2</sup> and the way in which Pausanias later used his influence to undermine the authority of Lysander. Therefore, the restoration of Sestus to the Sestians may have been part of the Spartan reaction against Lysander ( c. 403 - 402 B.C. ), of which Plutarch tells us so much in later chapters of this Life.<sup>3</sup>

But this incident does not reflect any discredit upon Lysander, for Plutarch merely suggests that it did not meet with everyone's approval.

The Aeginetans had been expelled from their island by the Athenians in 431 B.C., at the commencement of the Peloponnesian War;<sup>4</sup> to some of them the Spartans had given Thyrea, on the borders of Argos and Laconia, as an habitation; the remainder were dispersed throughout the Peloponnese. Now they were restored to their island by Lysander, as is confirmed by Xenophon.<sup>5</sup>

In similar manner the Melians also were restored, who had been so cruelly treated by Athens in 416 - 415 B.C.<sup>6</sup> Although Thucydides states that the whole male population was exterminated, no doubt a few escaped or were spared to return at last to their homes.

Plutarch also tells us that Scione, which had been captured and depopulated by Athens in 421 B.C., and given over

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, III, 4, 2.

<sup>2</sup> XIV, 33.

<sup>3</sup> XXI, 2 et seq.

<sup>4</sup> Thucydides, II, 27.

<sup>5</sup> Hellenica, III, 2, 9.

<sup>6</sup> Thucydides, V, 84 - 116.

to the Plataeans for occupation, was included by Lysander among the number of cities which were restored to their original inhabitants. Neither Xenophon nor Diodorus mentions Scione.

10 These sections, and the first section of chapter XV, describe the steps leading up to the complete capitulation of Athens. Plutarch's account is very brief, and while it diverges from Xenophon and Diodorus on a few points, it principally differs in attributing to Lysander, rather than to King Agis and the Spartans generally, the reception of the Athenian surrender.

According to Xenophon,<sup>2</sup> the Spartans and their allies took over the Athenian fleet, and the surrender of the city was made to Agis, and not to Lysander, who was apparently absent. According to Diodorus,<sup>3</sup> Agis, Pausanias and Lysander together took over the city.

But in Plutarch [ perhaps naturally enough, because Lysander is the subject of the Biography ! ) it is Lysander who issues commands,<sup>4</sup> it is Lysander who takes possession of the Athenian ships, it is Lysander who plans to supervise the changing of the Athenian constitution.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Thucydides, V, 32.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, II, 2, 17 - 22.

<sup>3</sup> XIII, 107.

<sup>4</sup> But Plutarch admits, XIV, 7, : τὸ δ' ἡγεθῆναι δόξα τῶν ἑσθέρων ἄλλως εἶχε.

<sup>5</sup> cf. Lysander, XV, 5 - 6, and XVI.

In Xenophon's long account, after famine had begun to affect the citizens, the Athenians sent envoys to Agis, proposing to become allies of the Spartans, while retaining their fortifications. Agis sent these envoys to the ephors, who refused to admit them to a deliberation, or to consider any terms which allowed the Athenian fortifications to remain standing. Accordingly, Theramenes volunteered to go to Lysander, and on to Sparta, to attempt to reach agreement.

He was detained for three months by Lysander, and when released and allowed to return to Athens, was sent out by his people to accept peace on any terms, so desperate was the state of the city by that time. There is at least one curious inconsistency in Xenophon's account; he says that before the Athenians asked for terms, provisions in the city were completely exhausted;<sup>2</sup> yet Theramenes delayed with Lysander a further three months until all the supplies were finished.

Lysias<sup>3</sup> confirms much of what Xenophon says, but he alleges that Theramenes spent the three months at Sparta. It is probable that, as Xenophon and Lysias were antipathetic towards Theramenes, all their references to him and his part in the peace negotiations are wholly prejudiced and unreliable.

Plutarch briefly refers to the capture of Athens, reduced to misery by famine and forced to accept Lysander's terms.

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, II, 2, 10 - 23.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, II, 2, 11.

<sup>3</sup> Cont. Agorat., 9 - 12; Cont. Erat., 65 - 71.

Those terms, which Plutarch admits were not Lysander's own, were so harsh that apparently a story became current some years after the fall of the city, which sought to some extent to palliate the Spartan authorities. According to this story, Lysander wrote to the ephors, " Athens has been taken "; to which the ephors replied, " It is sufficient just to have taken the city ". But, says Plutarch, this story was invented, *ἐπιφανέως ἄπειρα*, that is, to paint a fair picture of the Spartan authorities; and Plutarch suggests that the story originated in Sparta. It may indeed bear witness to a later attempt made at Sparta to clear the Spartan authorities, by ascribing to Lysander responsibility for the harshness of the terms. But it seems obvious that Plutarch's source is not going to allow Lysander to be saddled with responsibility, for the actual words of the decree of the ephors are then quoted.

This translation, and this interpretation of the story, seems to be more reasonable than to assume that the anecdote merely illustrates the " Spartan passion for brevity of speech ", as is suggested by B. Perrin ( Plutarch's Lives, Vol. IV, Loeb, 1916, Life of Lysander, p. 271 ). Perrin translated, " It is true one hears it said by Lacedaemonians that Lysander wrote to the ephors thus: ' Athens is taken '; and that the ephors wrote back to Lysander: ' Taken, were enough '; but this story was invented for its neatness' sake. " Such a translation seems to ignore the meaning of *καίτοι* (XIV, 6), and makes the anecdote irrelevant; for surely the point is not Laconic brevity, but moderation on the part of the victors - " If you have taken the city, that is quite sufficient - don't do any further harm to its people " !

Plutarch now passes on the words of the ephors' decree ( in Doric Greek ) - words which have a genuine ring about them. Xenophon and Diodorus, who paraphrase the decree, differ in small points.

Diodorus' details four points in the decree:

- 1 ) Destroy the walls and the Piraeus,
- 2 ) Keep no more than TEN ships,
- 3 ) " Leave all the cities ",
- 4 ) Acknowledge Spartan leadership.

According to Xenophon,<sup>2</sup> the decree consisted of four major points:

- 1 ) Destroy the walls and the Piraeus,
- 2 ) Keep no more than TWELVE ships,
- 3 ) Allow the exiles to return,
- 4 ) Acknowledge the Spartan leadership.

Diodorus makes no mention of the restoration of the Athenian exiles, while Xenophon does not directly stipulate the departure of Athenians from all the allied cities.

In Plutarch, the decree of the ephors is quoted as if in the original words;<sup>3</sup> it contains the following requirements:

- 1 ) Tear down the Piraeus and the long walls,
- 2 ) Leave all the cities and keep to your own land,
- 3 ) Restore your exiles,
- 4 ) Whatever is decided on the spot about ships, must be carried out by the Athenians.

<sup>1</sup> XIII, 107, 4.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, I, 2, 20.

<sup>3</sup> Plutarch probably got the original words of the decree from Theopompus; Xenophon was less likely to have the original decree available at the time when he wrote the Hellenica.

This decree of the Spartan ephors Plutarch calls a *εὐνομία*, here using the words for the first time and giving no explanation of it, as might have been expected. Yet, in chapter XLX,<sup>1</sup> he passes on most detailed information about the nature of the *εὐνομία*. Presumably at this point his narrative source used the word and volunteered no information about it, nor did Plutarch think it worth-while to elaborate about its nature, as he intended to do so later on.

10 Theramenes advised his fellow-citizens to accept these harsh terms. But Plutarch gives us no information about the high-spirited minority in the Athenian assembly who protested against acceptance of such a disgraceful peace which Theramenes had brought back from Sparta.<sup>2</sup> Insteads, he records an anecdote in which he describes Theramenes' attempt to justify his acceptance of the Spartan terms; and the story is told in such a way as to lead us to assume that Plutarch himself felt that Theramenes' pleas were convincing. Lysias<sup>3</sup> lays the whole blame for this humiliating peace upon Theramenes;<sup>4</sup> but it is clear that Plutarch's source did not impute any special responsibility to Theramenes,<sup>5</sup> although Lysias, Xenophon and Diodorus, all of whom were presumably using Athenian sources,

<sup>1</sup> Lycander, XLX, 8 et seq.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, II, 2, 23.

<sup>3</sup> Cont. Brat., 70 - 74.

<sup>4</sup> of. Lysias, Cont. Agorat., 12 - 20.

<sup>5</sup> Plutarch dismisses Theramenes' part in the surrender of his city in a few words, "on the advice of Theramenes, son of Hagnon".

deal at very considerable length with the part he played in the final agreement between the Spartans and the Athenians, and the capitulation of the city.

Although the anecdote about Theramenes and Cleomenes is peculiar to Plutarch, the charge levied against Theramenes by Cleomenes ( that he dared to act and speak contrary to Themistocles, by surrendering to the Spartans the walls which Themistocles had erected in defiance of the Spartans ) is also to be found in Lysias, although without reference to any Cleomenes.

Plutarch says that Theramenes was asked by one of the younger demagogues, Cleomenes ( probably one of the minority who repudiated the Spartan terms ) how he dared to surrender to Sparta the walls which Themistocles had built in defiance of Sparta. Theramenes replied that, as the walls were originally built by Themistocles for the safety of the city,<sup>2</sup> so he was agreeing with their destruction for the safety of the city. Plutarch concludes his anecdote with a few words which may be interpreted as laudatory of unwallied Sparta: " If walls made cities prosperous, then Sparta must be in the worst plight of all, since she has none ".

---

<sup>1</sup>Cont. Hist., 63: " Themistocles for his part built these walls against the wishes of the Spartans, while Theramenes had deceived his fellow-citizens and pulled them down ".

<sup>2</sup>Thucydides, 1, 89 - 93.



There is nothing in this chapter which may not ultimately have been derived by Plutarch from Theopompus; where Plutarch passes on information which is not to be found in Xenophon, Lysias or Diodorus, such information at least suggests a pro-Spartan or Ionian source. Examples of this are to be seen in Lysander's dealings with Sestus<sup>1</sup>, in the Spartan aphorism, sent in reply to Lysander's message<sup>2</sup>, and in the original words in dialect of the ephors' decree<sup>3</sup>. Plutarch seems to have no information about the internal state of affairs in the city of Athens during the siege, or the protracted negotiations before a final settlement; and he knows little about Theramenes<sup>4</sup>, apart from the fact that he was the Athenian who advised his fellow-citizens to accept the Spartan terms.

---

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, XIV, 3.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XIV, 6 - 7; if this is correctly interpreted, Plutarch's version of the story absolves Lysander from any responsibility for the harshness of the terms.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XIV, 8.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Nicias, II, 1.

CHAPTER IV

This chapter, in which Plutarch is indebted to his narrative source, contains many sections of material which are peculiar to Plutarch, with only occasional similarities to the account of Xenophon.

Plutarch describes the surrender of Athens, the change of government in the city ( attributed to Lysander ), the proposal made to the Spartans to wipe out Athens completely, and the refusal of the allied leaders to accept such a proposal. There follows a brief description, told from a Spartan viewpoint, of Lysander's victorious entrance into Athens, and the setting up of the Thirty and a decarchy. The chapter concludes with an anecdote about Callibius, the Spartan ' harmost ' at Athens.

Xenophon agrees that Lysander allowed the Athenians to keep twelve vessels, and himself took possession of the remainder.

Plutarch alone gives precise information about the day on which Athens was entered by the Spartans and their allies, " on the sixteenth day of the month Munychion "; writing also

---

Hellenica, II, 3, 8; but in Lysander, IV, 5, Plutarch alleges that the rest of the Athenian ships were burnt, whereas Xenophon says that Lysander took them back to Sparta.

that on the selfsame day ( 480 B.C. ) the Athenians had defeated the Persians at Salamis. He gives us the same day for the battle of Salamis, elsewhere; but in his Life of Camillus<sup>2</sup>, he states quite definitely that Salamis was won on the twentieth day of the month Boedromion; the latter date would be towards the end of September, while the sixteenth day of Munychion was at the end of April.

Plutarch gives no actual duration for the war; Diodorus<sup>3</sup> says that it lasted for twenty-seven years, but Xenophon's<sup>4</sup> computation of twenty-eight and a half years is one year out.<sup>5</sup>

It is not unlikely that Plutarch's precisising naming of the day of Athens' fall was taken ultimately from one of the Attidographers, perhaps Philochorus, with whose works his contemporary, Theopompus, would certainly be familiar. The information may have been passed on to Plutarch by his narrative source, or he himself may have noted it down previously from his reading of one of the Athenian Attidographers. It seems strange that no other extant writer has taken note of such a fateful day !

This paragraph, which suggests the responsibility of

<sup>1</sup> De Glor. Athon., 349 F.

<sup>2</sup> XLX, 6.

<sup>3</sup> XLII, 107.

<sup>4</sup> Hellenica, II, 3, 9.

<sup>5</sup> of. Thucydides, V, 26; The Spartans counted the duration of the War from the 15th year after the foundation of the Thirty Years Peace ( i.e. from April, 431 B.C. ), to the return of Lysander to Sparta after the reduction of Samos, in the autumn of 404 B.C.

Lysander for the setting up of the Thirty in Athens, and notes that the opposition of the Athenians to this change of government was Lysander's real reason for proposing a reconsideration of the terms to be offered to Athens, is certainly not found in Xenophon. The letter merely says<sup>1</sup> that the Athenians decided to set up the Thirty; he knows nothing about an alleged violation by the Athenians of the terms of their surrender.

On the other hand, Diodorus<sup>2</sup> confirms what Plutarch here says, but he gives much more detail than Plutarch, and describes in full the part played by Theramenes in all the negotiations between Lysander and the Athenians. Lysias also,<sup>3</sup> who is at pains to lay at the feet of Theramenes complete responsibility for the shameful peace terms, and the setting up of the Thirty by his deceitful actions, assures his hearers that Lysander alleged that the Athenians were guilty of breaking the truce,<sup>4</sup> and that unless Athens accepted a new form of government, "it wouldn't be a question of constitution, but of survival". Lysias does not explain in what particular way the Athenians had been guilty of breaking the truce, but Diodorus<sup>5</sup> agreed with what Plutarch says about the failure of the Athenians to pull

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, II, 3, 2 - 3; but one may perhaps read into the words, *ταύτων δὲ πρῶτον ἀπέλασε Λυσάνδρος πρὸς Σάμον*, a suggestion of cooperation, if not partial responsibility, on the part of Lysander and Agis.

<sup>2</sup> XIV, 3.

<sup>3</sup> Cont. Erat., 71 - 78.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Lysias, Ibid. 74, *παρμεκρόνους ὄρας ἔχει*, with Lysander, XV, 2, *ἔφαθ' ἵν' πόλιν εὐχόμενοι παρεσπονδύμεν*.

<sup>5</sup> XIV, 3, 6.

down their walls within the specified time. Xenophon, of course, has nothing whatever to say about this.

If the reading *ἀποκρίσας* is correct,<sup>1</sup> Plutarch alone assumes that Lysander was not present in Athens during all these negotiations, but sent his requirements by embassy. Diodorus, Lysias, and Aristotle<sup>2</sup> indicate his actual presence.

Plutarch alone goes on to say that Lysander intended to present anew to the authorities the case of the Athenians, and then informs us<sup>3</sup> that there were those among the allied forces who proposed to sell the Athenians into slavery, and a Theban, Mrianthus, argued for the utter razing of the city itself. Plutarch then introduced an anecdote, in which a strain of Euripides, sung by a Phocian at a banquet of the allied leaders, moved them<sup>4</sup> to compassion for a city which had produced such poets.<sup>5</sup>

Xenophon's account<sup>6</sup> does not bear out very much of what Plutarch says. According to him, the Corinthians and the Thebans particularly maintained that no terms should be offered to Athens, but their city should be destroyed. But the

<sup>1</sup> And not *ἀπαλήσας* ; cf. Smits, *Leven van Lysander*, p. 155.

<sup>2</sup> Constitution of Athens, XXXIV, 3.

<sup>3</sup> As in fact Xenophon had done (*Hell.* II, 2, 19-20) before the terms of surrender had been accepted, and before the change of government at Athens.

<sup>4</sup> Apparently the Spartans were very musical, and without having learnt music were able to judge what was good and what bad, as Aristotle admits (*Pol.*, 1339 B.); cf. Plutarch, *Lycour.*, XXI, 4; *Pratinas apud Athen.*, XIV, 632 F, 633 A.

<sup>5</sup> Reminiscence of Nicias, XXX, 3ff.    <sup>6</sup> *Hellenica*, II, 2, 19 - 20.

Spartans replied that they could not enslave a Greek city which " had wrought such noble deeds in the day of Greece's greatest danger " .

Xenophon knows nothing of a particular Theban, Erianthus; he has no record of a feast of the Spartan and allied leaders; and the reason for the sparing of the Athenians, put into the mouth of the Spartans by him, is the great services of the Athenians to Greece in the past, and not, as Plutarch says, because Athens was " famous and produced such poets " .

Diodorus gives us no information about any of these proposals.

Although Xenophon does not name this man, Erianthus, as the chief spokesman for the destruction of Athens, he does tell us later<sup>1</sup> that the Thebans tried to excuse themselves for this proposal by blaming one of their number, " who happened to be seated among the allies " .

Pausanias<sup>2</sup> bears witness to the existence of a man of this name; he mentions *Ἐριάνθης* , a Boeotian, among the allied leaders who assisted Lysander at Aegospotami, and whose statues were erected at Delphi.

The outrageous proposal of the Thebans was never forgotten by Athens, and it is confirmed by later writers.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, III, 5, 8.

<sup>2</sup> X, 9, 9 - 10.

<sup>3</sup> of. Demosthenes, De Fal. Legat., 361; Demosthenes also says (XII, 65) that the Phocians pleaded for Athens - in Plutarch's anecdote, the plea of the Phocians takes the form of a recitation of a chorus from Euripides' *Mecetra*.

Plutarch says here that all the allied leaders, not specifically the Spartans, were unanimous in their decision to spare Athens; Xenophon attributes to the Spartans alone the decision to spare Athens, and so also does Andocides.<sup>2</sup>

Of course, we have some glimpses of later modifications<sup>3</sup> of the incident, in both Pausanias and Polyænus. Pausanias<sup>4</sup> says that after Aegospotami Lysander and Agis violated the oaths which Sparta as a state had sworn by the gods to Athens, and, on their initiative and without the approval of Sparta, they "introduced to their allies a proposal to wipe out the city of Athens". We may assume that this information came to Pausanias from a source whose avowed purpose was to blacken the reputation of both Lysander and Agis, and this source may well have been the political pamphlets of the exiled king Pausanias.<sup>5</sup> Polyænus' version of the incident is very different and much more favourable to Lysander; he says<sup>6</sup> that when Sparta and the allies wished to raze Athens, Lysander said that it was not expedient, for Thebes would then become more powerful; but if they controlled Athens "by tyrants",

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, II, 2, 20.

<sup>2</sup> Peace, 21.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Justin, V, 8, 4: "Cum multi dolendum Atheniensium nomen urbemque incendio consumendam censerent, negarunt se Spartani ex duobus Graeciae oculis alterum eruturos"; in Aristotle (Rhet., III, 10, 7) the saying is attributed to one, Leptines, that "Greece should not be permitted to be left one-eyed".

<sup>4</sup> III, 8, 6.

<sup>5</sup> cf. Strabo, VIII C 366.

<sup>6</sup> I, 45, 5; cf. Aelian, V.H., IV, 6: "When the Spartans planned to destroy Athens and consulted the oracle, the god replied:

τὴν κατὰ τὴν ἑστῆσαν τῆς Ἑλλάδος μὴ κινῆσαι.

they could keep watch on Thebes. Polyagnus adds that the opinion of Lysander prevailed.

This section, which describes Lysander's victorious entry into Athens, is almost identical with the account of Xenophon.<sup>1</sup>

Xenophon refers to the return of the Athenian ( oligarch ) exiles with Lysander, a fact which is omitted by Plutarch, while the latter describes more fully the joyous behaviour of the Spartans and their allies. In one important point Plutarch and Xenophon disagree; Plutarch says here<sup>2</sup> that Lysander burnt the Athenian fleet, while Xenophon tells us that Lysander took back to Sparta all the Athenian triremes except twelve.<sup>3</sup>

The setting up of the Thirty in Athens, the appointment of a ' decarchy ' in the Piraeus, and the establishment of a Spartan garrison in the Acropolis, under a ' harmost ' named Callibius, are here attributed by Plutarch to Lysander.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Xenophon, Hellenica, II, 2, 23:

Λυσάνδρος κατέσχευε εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ καὶ οἱ  
φυγάδες κατήσαν καὶ τὰ πλοῖα κατέσκαπτον  
ἐπ' ἀληθείαν πολλὰ προθυμίᾳ, κοπιῶντες  
ἐκείνη τὴν ἡμέραν τῆ Ἑλλάδι δεχόμενοι τὴν  
ἐλευθερίαν.

Plutarch, Lysander, XV, 5:

Λυσάνδρος ..... πολλὰ μὲν ἐξ ἕτους  
μεταπεριφύροντες ἀληθείαν, πέρας δὲ τὰς  
ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ συναγωγῶν, τὰ πλοῖα  
κατέσκαπτε καὶ τὰς τριήρεις κατέσχευε  
πρὸς τὸν ἀπὸν, ἐσποφηνώμενον καὶ  
καίοντων ἕνα τῶν συμμάχων ὡς ἐκείνην  
τὴν ἡμέραν δεχόμενοι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν.

<sup>2</sup> As also in the Life of Alcibiades, XXXVII, 5.

<sup>3</sup> Hellenica, II, 3, 6; cf. Lysias, Cont. Agorat., 34: " Your ships were handed over to the Spartans ".

<sup>4</sup> Diodorus, XIV, 3, 4, attributes full responsibility to Lysander for allowing the appointment of the Thirty, in defiance of Theramenes & the popular democratic element at Athens; Lysias (Cont. Erat., 74) says that Lysander supported Theramenes' proposal for the establishing of the Thirty, and forced them upon the Athenians.



Neither Lysias, Diodorus, Nepos or Justin refer to the appointment of a 'decadarchy' in the Piraeus; nor indeed does Xenophon in the place<sup>1</sup> where he describes the formation of the Thirty. But he tells us the name of a member of this 'decadarchy' later on<sup>2</sup> - which implies that he knew of its existence. Aristotle<sup>3</sup> confirms the existence of this 'decadarchy', but he says that it was established later, some time after the Thirty had seized power.

Plutarch is not particularly interested in precise chronology in his Lives, and he is probably anticipating when he describes the appointment of a 'harmost' and the sending of a Spartan garrison to the Acropolis by Lysander - as presumably simultaneous with the setting up of the Thirty.

Xenophon<sup>4</sup> says that the Thirty decided that it would assist them in their revolutionising of Athenian political life, and crushing of all opposition, if they had the assistance of a Spartan garrison: they therefore sent to Lysander who was in Sparta, and persuaded him to send a garrison to Athens,<sup>5</sup> and he "sent them a garrison under Callibius". Diodorus<sup>6</sup> also refers Callibius and his Spartan garrison to the express request of the Thirty. Aristotle<sup>7</sup> represents the summoning of the Spartan

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, II, 3, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, II, 4, 19:

<sup>3</sup> Const. of Athens, 35.

<sup>4</sup> Hellenica, II, 3, 13 - 14.

<sup>5</sup> cf. Lysias, Cont. Agorat., 46: "The Spartans occupied your Acropolis".

<sup>6</sup> xlv, 4, 3,

<sup>7</sup> Const. of Athens, 37.

Garrison as subsequent to the death of Theramenes.

Plutarch concludes his chapter with an anecdote about Callibius, the Spartan 'harmost', which throws a most favourable light upon Lysander.

Autolykus, the athlete, when threatened by Callibius with a stick, seized the Spartan and threw him to the floor. Lysander, to whom the matter had been referred, supported the Athenian, saying that Callibius did not know how to govern free men.

This anecdote is not to be found in any other extant authority except Pausanias<sup>1</sup>, for Diodorus<sup>2</sup> merely records that the Thirty "also killed Autolykus, *ἄνδρα πικρατικόν*". Pausanias, whose story differs from that of Plutarch in a number of details, says that Autolykus had a dispute with Eteonicus of Sparta about a piece of property. Eteonicus assaulted Autolykus, and when the latter resisted, he summoned him before Lysander, who was still in Athens: but Lysander condemned Eteonicus and reprimanded him. Pausanias passes on this anecdote as an illustration of one of the ways in which Lysander was worthy of the highest praise. It is not possible to name his source, although it must ultimately be the same as that used by Plutarch. Perhaps Plutarch's account is the more reliable, for we know from other writers<sup>3</sup> that Callibius had

<sup>1</sup> IX, 32, 8.

<sup>2</sup> XIV, 5, 7.

<sup>3</sup> Xenophon, Hellenica, II, 3, 13-14; Diodorus, XIV, 4.

been appointed ' harmost ' shortly after the fall of Athens; and, although Eteonicus was one of Lysander's officers and had been left in Thrace by Lysander,<sup>1</sup> we have no evidence that he held any official position in Athens. Of course, Pausanias does not say that he was the ' harmost '.

Plutarch adds that the Thirty, some little time afterwards, put Autolycus to death, to please Callibius. Xenophon, who knows nothing of this incident, makes it clear<sup>2</sup> that the Thirty paid court to Callibius, as was only to be expected.

It is quite impossible to say with any degree of certainty from what source or sources Plutarch took the material which comprises this chapter. As with most of his historical narrative, there is a certain amount which is taken ultimately from Xenophon, and it seems likely that this has been passed on by Theopompus; for we have no clear evidence that Plutarch used Xenophon's Hellenica at first hand. On the contrary, this chapter may confirm the view that Plutarch did not in fact use Xenophon's Hellenica for himself. Plutarch describes<sup>3</sup> Autolycus as the athlete, " whom Xenophon makes the chief character in his ' Symposium ' ". This information is quite correct, for Autolycus had been invited, with his father and Socrates and other friends, to the house of Callias, where the scene of the

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, II, 2, 5.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, II, 3, 14.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XV, 7.

' Symposium ' is set. But it does seem strange that, if Plutarch is using the Hellenica of Xenophon at first hand in this Life, he never acknowledges his indebtedness to Xenophon, and only names him here as the author of the ' Symposium ', and that only in connection with a brief and rather unimportant anecdote.

Again, there is but the slightest similarity, <sup>to</sup> and very much divergence from, the accounts of Lysias and Diodorus, where the last two authors have anything to record about matters mentioned by Plutarch.

The most one can say is that, as in chapter XLV, so also in chapter XV, there is nothing which might not have been written by Theopompus in his Hellenica, in the composition of which he made substantial use of Xenophon. Plutarch's source apparently made use of an Atticographer for the precise date of the fall of Athens ( unless we assume that Plutarch himself had previously taken note of this date ), had some knowledge of the Speeches of Lysias against Agoratus and Eratosthenes, was aware of the name of the Theban who proposed the utter annihilation of Athens, knew of a banquet of the Spartans and their allies at which some lyrics of Euripides were sung by a Phocian, described the almost riotous joy of the Spartans and their

---

It is only fair to add that Plutarch, who wrote a Symposium of his own, would therefore be likely to be interested in the Symposium of Xenophon more than in his Hellenica; but even if Plutarch had available at Chaeronea a copy of the Hellenica of Xenophon, it is not necessary to assume that he would make use of it for his Life of Lyсандor.

allies when they entered the city of Athens, and had heard a story about the Spartan ' Harmost ', Calliphus, which reflected credit upon Lysander.

CHAPTER XVI

Plutarch continues his narrative by recording that Lysander himself, after settling affairs in Athens, sailed for Thrace, when he had first despatched to Sparta, under the guardianship of Gylippus, the remainder of his funds and all the gifts and crowns which he had received.

Xenophon knows nothing whatever about a visit to Thrace by Lysander in person, after the fall of Athens. On the contrary, he writes that, after the battle of Aegospotami, when on his way to Athens, Lysander sent Eteoniceus<sup>1</sup> with ten ships to the regions of Thrace; he adds<sup>2</sup> that, after Lysander has assisted in the establishment of the Thirty at Athens, he sailed for Samos, which had been invested before the fall of Athens, and completed its capture; then ( at the end of the summer, 404 B.C. ), he himself sailed for Sparta to hand over to the authorities the prizes, booty, gifts and monies which he had accumulated. Nor does Xenophon refer to any further military activity on the part of Lysander until the summer of 403 B.C.,<sup>3</sup> when the Thirty sent

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, I, 2, 5: *ὅς τὰ ἐκείν' πάντα πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους μετέβηκεν.*

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, II, 3, 7 - 9.

<sup>3</sup> Hellenica, II, 4, 28.

a request to Lysander in Sparta for help against the democrats, by then strongly entrenched in the Piraeus.

Xenophon's account implies that for a year Lysander had remained inactive at Sparta, which is probably quite unlikely. It has already been noted that Plutarch, or his source, made a mistake about the time of the final capitulation of Samos; but we have every reason to suppose that Lysander may have gone off to Thrace (either before his final return to Sparta, or immediately after he had reported to the authorities there) to put an end to any pro-Athenian opposition which may have continued in the cities of Chalcidice. For the question remains to be faced, when did Lysander lay siege to Aphytae in Thrace, to which both Plutarch<sup>2</sup> and Pausanias<sup>3</sup> refer?

Lysander's Thracian expedition may have taken place in 405 B.C., immediately after Aegospotami and before the capitulation of Athens, as is suggested by Plutarch's reference to Delone in chapter XIV.<sup>4</sup> But as Plutarch's chronology about Samos is faulty, it may also be faulty in the case of Delone. It seems more likely that Lysander after Aegospotami assigned particular areas in the northern Hellespont to his officers, Thorax being left at Byzantium to mop up, and Eteonious being sent to Thrace; for he would wish to reach Attica as soon as possible. Then,

<sup>1</sup> cf. Lysander, XIV, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XII, 5.

<sup>3</sup> III, 18, 3.

<sup>4</sup> Lysander, XIV, 4.

after he had reported to Sparta, he set out for Thraee ( 404 - 403 B.C. ), and it was probably during this Thracian expedition that there occurred the alleged massacre<sup>1</sup> of Athenian supporters in Thraee.

The chronology which lies behind Lysander's actions subsequent to Aegospotami will be considered later;<sup>2</sup> but it is obvious that Lysander must have been present in the Hellespont later on ( 404 - 403 B.C., or 403 - 402 B.C. ? ), to give rise to the accusations of pillaging which Pharnabazus is supposed to have brought against him.<sup>3</sup>

Diodorus<sup>4</sup> tells us that Lysander sent off Gylippus to Sparta with the monies which he still had in hand, but he puts it in 405 B.C., immediately after Aegospotami and the capture of Sestus.

Xenophon<sup>5</sup> says that Lysander sailed back to Sparta after the capitulation of Samos, taking with him all the trophies which he had won.

There follows the story ( told here in full by Plutarch<sup>6</sup> ) of Gylippus' infamous theft of a portion of the money with which he had been entrusted by Lysander. Diodorus<sup>7</sup> and Athenaeus<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> cf. Nepos, Lysander, li; Polyaeus, 1, 45, 4. <sup>2</sup> Lysander, xlx, 7.

<sup>3</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, xlx, 7 & xx, 1-5; Nepos, Lys., lv; Polyaeus, vii, 19

<sup>4</sup> xlii, 106.

<sup>5</sup> Hellenica, li, 3, 8: τὴν τῶν δειφραδῶν τῶν ἐκ τῆς Σαμῶς καὶ τῆς ἐκ τῆς Πέρσης τοῦτο πλὴν δῶσαν καὶ στεφάνους κτλ.

<sup>6</sup> cf. Pericles, xxii, 4; Nicias, xxviii, 4.

<sup>7</sup> xlii, 106-108.

<sup>8</sup> vii, 19.



also have a record of this story. Xenophon naturally does not mention it, for he has said that Lysander took home and handed over in person his war treasures to the Spartans.

In Plutarch's account, Gylippus was entrusted with the guardianship of Lysander's trophies and money, but he ripped open the sacks which contained the money and extracted from each sack " a large amount of silver "; he then sewed up the sacks, not being aware that there was in each sack a *γερρατίδιον*,<sup>2</sup> indicating how much money it should contain. The extracted money he hid under the tiling of his house. The ephors, finding that the money in the sacks did not tally with the amount indicated in the *γερρατίδια*, were considerably perplexed until a servant of Gylippus informed against his master by giving an explanation to the authorities by way of a riddle ( " many owls are sleeping under the tiles " - the owls being the stamp upon Athenian coinage ! ). Then, says Plutarch,<sup>3</sup> " after adding a deed so disgraceful and ignoble as this to his previous great and brilliant achievements ", Gylippus removed himself from Sparta.

Now in his Life of Nicias,<sup>4</sup> Plutarch attributes this story to the authorship of Timaeus, in whose history it illustrates the *μικρολογία* and *πλεονεξία* of Gylippus; and in his

<sup>1</sup> In Nicias, XXVIII, 4, he specifies thirty talents out of the thousand which Lysander had sent to Sparta.

<sup>2</sup> *ταυράδιον*, says Diodorus, XII, 106, 9.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XVII, 1.

<sup>4</sup> Nicias, XXVIII, 4.

Comparison between Timoleon and Aemilius Paulus,<sup>1</sup> he also refers to Timaeus as his authority for Gylippus' greed and love of money, although he does not there recount this incident.

But the account in the Life of Nicias is very brief ( " Gylippus himself, for abstracting thirty talents from the thousand which Lysander had sent to Sparta, and hiding them in the roof of his house - as an informer showed - was banished in the deepest disgrace: but this had been told with more detail in the Life of Lysander " ). Curiously enough, Plutarch there says that Gylippus extracted thirty of the thousand talents which were sent, while in the Life of Lysander he specifies no number of talents stolen. Again, in the Nicias, Gylippus is coupled with his father Cleandridas, who was convicted by the Spartans of taking bribes and had to flee from his city.

In his Life of Pericles,<sup>2</sup> Plutarch refers most briefly to the bribing of Cleandridas, and adds that his son Gylippus, " after noble achievements was caught in base practices and banished from Sparta in disgrace ".

Diodorus<sup>3</sup> says that Gylippus extracted three hundred of the fifteen hundred silver talents sent by Lysander, and sewed up the bags, not knowing that there was a *sewly* in each of them.

<sup>1</sup> ii, 4; cf. also, De Liber. Educ., X A - B.

<sup>2</sup> Pericles, XXII, 4.

<sup>3</sup> XXII, 106, 8 - 10: Xenophon says that 470 talents were taken by Lysander to Sparta.

More of the story apparently he does not know; but he adds that Gylippus fled from Sparta and was condemned to death; and, after making reference to his father's fate, calls them both *ἄνδρες ἱκανοί*. Diodorus quotes no authority for his anecdote, nor again does Athenaeus,<sup>2</sup> whose account is very brief, and who says that Gylippus starved himself to death.

Now it seems quite unreasonable to assume that Plutarch is indebted to Timaeus for his version of the Gylippus-anecdote in the Life of Lysander, merely because he refers the anecdote to Timaeus in his Life of Nicias;<sup>3</sup> in any case, he tells us in the last reference that he has already written a fuller account of the same story in his Life of Lysander.<sup>4</sup> In the Life of Nicias Plutarch certainly does not refer to the "great and brilliant achievements of Gylippus in Sicily",<sup>5</sup> nor suggest that this was the only disgraceful act to mar the Spartan's record. No doubt, many contemporary writers were aware of Gylippus' dishonour, and recorded it in their works. Diodorus may have found the incident in Ephorus or, indeed, in Timaeus, if he was using parts of Timaeus for that section of his work. On the other hand, it is not unreasonable to assume that Theopompus is the original source of the story, both for Timaeus

<sup>1</sup> XIII, 106, 10: *ἄνδρες ἱκανοὶ τᾶλλα δοξάντες εἶναι, τὰτα πράξαντες τὸν ἄλλον βίον αὐτῶν κατήχευαν.*

<sup>2</sup> VI, 233 F - 234 A.

<sup>3</sup> Nicias, XVIII, 4.

<sup>4</sup> Of course, Plutarch's words in Nicias, XVIII, 4: *τὰτα... ἄλλον διακρίβωται*, and in Pericles, XIII, 4: *τὰτα... δοξάζομεν*, may have been added afterwards by Plutarch in a brief revision of his work.

<sup>5</sup> Lysander, XVII, 1.

and for Plutarch - that it was Theopompus who gave Plutarch the information that Lysander went on to Thrace after the fall of Athens, and sent back Gylippus to Sparta with his money. In this case, Timaeus ( who probably made use of Theopompus for his Sicilian History, and is assumed also to have copied Ephorus ) may have taken the anecdote from Theopompus or from Ephorus, ignored the praise implied in both historians for Gylippus' achievements in Sicily ( which, in any case, Timaeus did not recognise ) , and gladly passed it on as a further illustration of Gylippus' weakness of character.

Thus, in his Life of Nicias, where he is obviously using Timaeus at first hand, Plutarch may have recorded Timaeus' version of the Gylippus-incident; while in his Life of Lysander, he is following the original authority for the story, passes on greater detail, and sums it up with the comment, which he would probably have found in his source, that the brilliant record of the Spartan was thus unfortunately obtained by one sordid act of peculation.

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. Polybius, Xll, 28.

CHAPTER XVII

After a brief reference to the expulsion of Gylippus from Sparta for his peculation, Plutarch renews his charge against Lysander of bringing wealth into Sparta. The wisest of the Spartans, says Plutarch, urged the ephors to purify (ἀποδιοπομπεύσαι) the city of gold and silver.

Plutarch then digresses to pass on information about the traditional type of coinage in use among the Spartans.

Lysander's friends in the city opposed the measure to ban gold and silver, and it was decided by the authorities to allow the use of this sort of money for public purposes, but in no circumstances - on pain of death - was it to remain in private hands.

There follows a series of moralising reflexions upon the stupidity of such a decree.

That Lysander filled his city with gold and love of gold is a charge brought against him by many authorities; Pausanias,<sup>2</sup> Aelian<sup>3</sup> and Athenaeus<sup>4</sup> all testify to the introduction

<sup>1</sup> cf. Lysander, II, 6; Lycurgus, XXX, 1.

<sup>2</sup> IX, 32, 5 - 10.

<sup>3</sup> V.H., XIV, 29.

<sup>4</sup> VI, 233 F.

into Sparta by Lysander of a coinage which was contrary to the laws of Lycurgus and a dangerous defiance of the Pythian oracle which had declared that only love of money could destroy Sparta. Plutarch is well aware of this, for he says elsewhere<sup>2</sup> that, when Lysander had taken Athens, he brought home much gold and silver which was accepted by the Spartan authorities, who honoured the bearer of this wealth.

Without doubt, there was always a very strong reactionary element in Sparta which looked with misgivings upon any action which tended to be contrary to the traditional decrees of Lycurgus; this element was quite incapable of adaptation to the changing circumstances brought about by the Peloponnesian War; that it would oppose the introduction of gold and silver into the city, goes without saying. Plutarch's source must have been aware of the refusal of the Spartan authorities (with but few exceptions) to modify their constitution and make it suitable to the development of their new empire. For the first time in this life, Plutarch refers to Theopompus as his authority, and joins his name with that of Ephorus. According to Theopompus, Sciraphidas was the name of the ephor who declared that Sparta

---

<sup>1</sup> For this Pythian oracle, cf. Aristotle, *apud* Zenob., II, 24; Schol. on Aristophanes, *Peace*, 622; Schol. on Euripides, *Andromache*, 443; Diodorus, VII, 12; Cicero, *De Officiis*, II, 22, 77; Guidas G.V. *Λυκούργος*.

<sup>2</sup> *Instit. Lac.*, 239 F.

ought to prohibit the import of gold and silver; Ephorus called him Phlogidas. But both authorities may be correct, for both these Spartans may have been among the ephors elected for the year, 405 - 404 B.C.

If - as seems likely - Plutarch is still following the account of Theopompus, then we may assume that Theopompus<sup>1</sup> himself quoted the opinion of his contemporary, Ephorus,<sup>2</sup> for what it was worth, about the actual name of the ephor who led the opposition to Lysander's treasures.

It should be noted that Plutarch is here using some comparatively rare, and certainly late, words.<sup>3</sup>

5 These paragraphs, which describe the national iron coinage of Sparta and suggest that Sparta had in fact preserved a primitive form of coinage which was once universal, may be the expression of Plutarch's own reflexions and the fruit of earlier reading and research, or he may have taken this information from his narrative source, Theopompus.

Now Plutarch tells us elsewhere<sup>4</sup> that Lycurgus introduced iron coinage into Sparta; but in his Life of Lycurgus, he gives<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> G. & H., 303; F.Gr.H., II D, p. 605, 332

<sup>2</sup> F.Gr.H., II A, p. 103, 205; II C, p. 95, 205.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, IV11, 2 - 4: *κῆρες* is rarely found in prose writers ( yet of. Plato, Laws, 937 D, and G. & H., 272, where there is quoted one example of its use by Theopompus ); *ὑποδίο πορπίδων*, *βυβίσταθρον*, *δυσισπακόμειον*. Three of these words are certainly used by Plut. in other of his writings, but at the same time they do suggest a source later than Plato, probably to be associated with the middle of the Fourth Century B.C.

<sup>4</sup> Apoph. Lac., 226 D.

<sup>5</sup> Lysander, IV 2 - 3

much more information about this νόμισμα σιδηρέων<sup>1</sup>; although the information given in the Life of Lycurgus is generally similar to what Plutarch writes in the chapter XVII of the Life of Lysander, his choice of words is different,<sup>2</sup> which might perhaps suggest different authorities using the same ultimate source. Plutarch's words about the Spartan iron coinage ( " a great quantity and weight of it had but little value "<sup>3</sup> ) may be compared with Pollux' description of the same coinage.<sup>4</sup> It seems very likely that Plutarch and Pollux are drawing upon the same source; and Pollux<sup>5</sup> quotes Aristotle as his authority, when referring to the origin of ὀβολοί .

<sup>1</sup> of. Xenophon, Constitution of Sparta, VII, 5; Xenophon says that the Lycurgan system of coinage was such that " even sums of ten minae..... would fill a large space and need a wagon to draw them "; Pseudo-Plato, Eryxias, 400 B; Polybius, VI, 49 ( who reminds us that in Sparta Lycurgus had abolished all money ); Justin, III, 2, 11 - 12; Seneca ( De Benefic., V, 14, 4 ) is mistaken when he speaks of the Spartans using leather money.

<sup>2</sup> Apart from the use of ἀβρανεῖς in Lysander, XVII, 4, and Lycurgus, IX, 3; yet there is also a similarity between Lysander, XVII, 4: ὄγκου μικρὰν τινα ἄξιαν δυνάμενος, and Lycurgus, IX, 2: ὄγκον δύνανται ὀλίγην ἔδωκεν .

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XVII, 4: ὄγκου μικρὰν τινα ἄξιαν δυνάμενος.

<sup>4</sup> Onom., IX, 79: σιδηρῶν δὲ νομισμάτων καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι χρῶνται, ἐκ πολλῶν ὄγκων ὀλίγη δυνάμενος ; Pollux adds that vinegar was used to make the iron brittle ( as does Plutarch ) .

<sup>5</sup> Onom., IX, 77.



It may be that Theopompus ( who may be assumed to have passed on to Plutarch the quotation from Aristotle's Problems in chapter 11 of the Life of Lysander ) has also culled the information about the Spartan coinage from Aristotle, and passed it on to Plutarch in his Hellenica; for it is hardly to be expected that Plutarch would make a first hand reference to Aristotle for this small piece of information about Spartan coinage and its history ( which, in any case, is somewhat of a digression ), unless he already had it noted in his common-place book. Let it be admitted that Plutarch not infrequently does digress to pass on information which he has remembered or has previously noted in any of his works; but in this case it is more likely that he found the information about the iron coinage conveniently noted in his source, Theopompus, whose digressions on all manner of subjects were quite notorious.<sup>2</sup>

It is also probable that this paragraph also is taken over from Theopompus, who is indebted to Aristotle for his information. Plutarch is suggesting that all ancient money was similar to the Spartan iron coinage, some peoples using iron or bronze ' spits ' for coins ( ὀβελίαι ); hence, says Plutarch, even in his day,<sup>3</sup> small coins are called ὀβολοί<sup>4</sup>, and

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, 11, 5.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Dion. Hal., ad Pomp., VI.

<sup>3</sup> καὶ νῦν ; Plutarch's day, or his source's ?

<sup>4</sup> From ὀβελίαι - ' spits '.

οἱ δὲ ὀβολοὶ make a δραχμή ( as many as can be grasped in the hand - δρᾶί τεσθαι ).

The ultimate authority for this information, so far as can be judged, is Aristotle.

The similarities between Plutarch and Pollux postulate the same ultimate source, although probably in the case of Plutarch, via Theopompus.

After his digression, Plutarch goes on to explain the effect of the ephors' declaration against the introduction into Sparta of gold and silver. The friends of Lysander in Sparta urged the authorities to allow the money to remain in the city. Therefore, says Plutarch, the ephors decreed that " money of this sort could be introduced for public use, but if any private person should be found in possession of it, he

<sup>1</sup> Apud Pollux, IX, 77; Pollux, who describes the ὀβολοὶ εἰδηροὶ as νομισμα εἰδηρῶν τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Βυζαντίων ( Onom., IX, 105 ), had previously referred to the authority of Aristotle for his information about the origin of the words ὀβολός and δραχμή ( ὀβολός and ὀβελός being only different in the Ionic and Attic pronunciations ).

<sup>2</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XVII, 5:  
 Κινδυνάσει δὲ καὶ τὸ πάμπαν ἀρχαίων ὄπως ἔχον, ὀβελίομαι χρωμένων νομισμασι εἰδηροῖς, ἐτίμων δὲ χαλκοῖς. ἀρῶν παραρήναι πηγήθος ἔτι καὶ νῦν τῶν κορμάτων ὀβολοῖς καλλίσθησι, δραχμῆν δὲ τοὺς ὄξ ὀβολοῖς. τοσούτων γὰρ ἢ χεῖρ περιεδράττετο.

Pollux, Onom., IX, 77:

τὸ μῦθος τῶν ὀβολῶν ἄνομα οἱ μὲν ἔτι καὶ βουκόροις ὀβελίοις ἐχρῶντο πρὸς τὰς ἀραιὰς, ἐν τῷ δὲ τῆς δρακμῆς πηγήθος ἐδόκει καλεῖσθαι δραχμῆν, καὶ δὲ ὀνόματα καὶ τοῦ νομισματός, μεταπέσοντος εἰς τὴν νῦν χρῆσιν ἐνεργήσαν ἐκ τῆς μύθους τῆς πελαγίας.

Pollux adds: Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ τῶν λέγων ἐν Σικυωνίων πολιτικῆς εἰρηρῶν τι κεινοποιῆν, ὀβελίοις αὐτῶν τῶν ὀνομασθῆναι λέγων, but this later interpretation is highly unlikely.

<sup>3</sup> Who must have been influential and, no doubt, included in their number Agesilaus, destined to succeed Agis as king in 398 B.C.: cf. Lysander, XXII, 6 and XXIII, 4: ἐν μάχῃσιν αὐτῶν πρώτῃ τῶν φίλων χορηγός.

should be punished with death", as if (commonly Plutarch) Lycurgus feared the coin itself, and not the "covetousness" which the coin produced".

Plutarch's source is obviously here referring to the oracle purported to have been given by Delphi to Lycurgus. This oracle, which declared that 'love of greed alone would destroy Sparta', is not quoted by Plutarch here, or in his Life of Lycurgus; but it was well-known and frequently quoted by late writers. According to Xenophon,<sup>2</sup> Lycurgus obtained the sanction of Apollo to strengthen the authority of his constitution; but later writers<sup>3</sup> state that he was inspired originally by the Pythia in framing his proposals.

To this Delphic oracle<sup>4</sup>, and to the dangers attendant upon the introduction into Sparta of gold and silver, many authorities<sup>5</sup> bear witness. Plutarch, who quotes the words of the oracle elsewhere<sup>6</sup>, says in his Life of Agis<sup>7</sup> that "the first symptoms of corruption and degeneracy in the Spartan state

<sup>1</sup> cf. Lyсандor, XLX, 7, where this decree is enforced against Thoral.

<sup>2</sup> Constitution of Sparta, VIII, 5.

<sup>3</sup> e.g. Dion. Hal., Antiq. Rom., II, 61, 2; Justin, III, 3, 10; Pausanias, III, 2, 4; Polyænus, 1, 16, 1.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Aristotle, apud Zenob., II, 24 ( fr. 544, Rose ): *ἡ φιλοχρηματία ἐκέρτην ἔλατ, ἄλλο δὲ ὠδέν.*

<sup>5</sup> Schol. on Aristophanes, Peace, 622; Schol. on Euripides, Androm., 445; Diodorus, VII, 12; Cicero, De Officiis, II, 22, 77; Plutarch, Agis, IX, 1; Suidas s.v. *λυκοδραγός*; cf. also a fragment of Theopompus, apud Diog. Laert., 1, 11, 116 ( G. & H., 66 ):

<sup>6</sup> Apoph. Lac., 239 F: *Ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ θεοπόρως τοῖς βασιλεύσιν χρεώριος ὤδης: ἡ φιλοχρηματία ἐκέρτην ὤδης, ἄλλο δὲ ὠδέν.*

<sup>7</sup> V, 1.

appeared at the time when the Spartans had entirely destroyed the Athenian empire, and began to bring gold and silver into Sparta", as if the degeneration of Sparta could be so simply explained. The explanation given by Polybius is more reasonable and more scholarly, for as a result of her victory in the Peloponnesian War, Sparta had fallen into circumstances which rendered the traditional constitution of Lycurgus obsolete and quite incapable of continuing to guide imperial Sparta in the future.

The concluding paragraphs of the chapter, which are an indictment of the Spartan authorities for hoping to allow money to be used in Sparta for public purposes, and at the same time to deny its use to private citizens, together with the metaphor - taken from medicine - of the parts infecting the whole, seem likely to be Plutarch's own reflections and observations on the decree of the ephors. He stigmatises the Spartan authorities for not truly observing the spirit of Lycurgus' decrees against wealth in Sparta, and attributes to their decision the desire for wealth which later became characteristic of the Spartans; and he concludes his moralising with the reminder that he has already criticised the Spartans for this weakness " in another treatise "

---

<sup>1</sup> VI, 49, 8: ἐπὶ δὲ σκόλοισι μὲν ὑπεβάλλοντο κατὰ θάλατταν ἐπιέρπειν στρατίαν ἐκ περὶ σκόλοισι στρατοπέδοις ἔξω Πελοποννήσου, ὅθιλον ἄς αὐτὰ νόμιμα εἰς εὐδαίμων, αὐτὸ δὲ τῶν εὐτατέων καρπῶν ἀλλαγὴ πρὸς τὰ λειπόμενα ἵνα ἡσυχίᾳ ἔρασαν αὐτοῖς ἔξαρσέν κἀκὴ τὴν Λυκούργου νομοθεσίαν....

<sup>2</sup> Inst. Lac., 42.

Thus, in this chapter, Plutarch perpetuates the old legend that Sparta did not use gold and silver coinage, but made sole use of the old and inconvenient iron coinage. But in fact it can be demonstrated that, whatever laws about coinage were supposed to have been enacted by Lycurgus, Spartans used gold and silver as much as any other nations, although there was no mint at Sparta until 280 B.C.

---

of Herodotus, VII, 134, where the names of two wealthy Spartans are mentioned, and Thucydides, v, 50, where a Spartan, Lichas, (presumably wealthy) is described as having won the chariot race at Olympia in 420 B.C.; Plato says (Alcib., I, 122 C) that there was more gold and silver held privately in Sparta than in the whole of Greece. For the whole question of Spartan coinage, cf. H. Michell, Sparta, C.U.P., 1952, pp. 298 - 307, especially p. 303, "That Lycurgus ever forbade the use of any money other than the iron pelanora is a pure fairy tale invented .... to combat corruption among the officials and generals. All through their history the Spartans were plagued with official corruption ..... in order to put some curb upon it a law was passed forbidding the private ownership of the precious metals".

CHAPTER XVIII

This chapter contains a heterogeneous mass of material, collected apparently by Plutarch from different sources<sup>1</sup>, and serves as an introduction to quite a large section of the Life of Lysander<sup>2</sup> which cannot be based upon the narrative source which Plutarch seems to have used for the greater part of the Biography, suggests a biographical source, and in the main is excessively hostile towards Lysander. But chapter XVIII does not itself contain material of a hostile nature - it merely tabulates the dedications of spoil made by Lysander, discusses the honours conferred upon him by the various Ionian cities which attributed to him their liberation from the Athenians, and gives examples of his treatment of some Ionian poets who were eager to employ their literary gifts in his honour.

The first three paragraphs of the chapter may be the result of Plutarch's own investigations, made locally

---

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch refers to Anaxandrides of Delphi, and Duris of Samos.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XLX, LXXI, LXXIV, 2 - LXXVI, LXXI, 3-5, and also XLIII, 6-9.

at Delphi, when he was priest of Apollo there; while the latter half of the chapter seems to be entirely derived from Duris of Samos.

Plutarch here records that out of the spoils of the Peloponnesian War Lysander set up at Delphi bronze statues of himself and his generals, and golden stars of the Dioscuri ( which disappeared before the battle of Leuctra, 371 B.C. ); in the Treasury of Brasidas and the Acanthians he also dedicated a trireme of gold and ivory which Cyrus the Persian had given him as a prize for his victory.

A certain amount of this information has already been given by Plutarch in the first chapter of the Life of Lysander. But there, curiously enough, he describes Lysander's statue as *λίθινος*<sup>1</sup>; here it is called *χάλκινος*. It may well be that there were two statues of Lysander at Delphi, and this would account for another apparent contradiction. In the first chapter of the Life of Lysander,<sup>2</sup> Plutarch records that the statue of Lysander is often mistaken for that of Brasidas, because it stands by the door of the Treasury of Brasidas and the Acanthians at Delphi. In chapter XVIII he does not tell us where these bronze statues stood, although he does in the same chapter<sup>3</sup> make reference to the Treasury of Brasidas and the Acanthians. The solution of the difficulties may be that there were two statues

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. Plutarch, De Pyth. Orac., 397 F.; Cicero, De Div., I, 34, 75.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, I, 1.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XVIII, 2.

of Lysander, one ( of marble ) standing within the Treasury of Brasidas and the Acanthians at Delphi, and the other ( of bronze ) standing with the other statues of gods and admirals in a large chamber, or portico, on the right of the Sacred Way, close to the main entrance of the precinct.<sup>1</sup>

Plutarch refers again<sup>2</sup> to the marble statue of Lysander, saying that it became overgrown with grass and weeds just before the battle of Leuctra - an omen of the defeat of the Spartans in that battle, as Cicero<sup>3</sup> interprets it; and Cicero also confirms, in more detail, the brief information given by Plutarch about the golden stars of the Dioscuri.

Pausanias<sup>4</sup>, with considerable detail, enumerates the offerings made by the Spartans at Delphi out of the spoils of the Athenians. He tells us of a group of nine statues - to the Dioscuri, to Zeus, Apollo, Artemis, Poseidon, to Lysander ( being crowned by Poseidon ), to Agias, the soothsayer of Lysander,<sup>5</sup> and to Hermon, who steered his flag-ship. In addition, there were, behind this group, twenty-eight statues set up for the nauarchoi, who helped Lysander to win his victory; and these included statues of Aracus<sup>6</sup> of Sparta, Eriantes<sup>7</sup> of Boeotia, Timarchus and Diagoras of Rhodes, and Eteonious<sup>8</sup> of Sparta.

<sup>1</sup> As suggested by M.N.Tod, Selection of Greek Historical Inscript., Vol 1, 2nd Edition, p. 229.

<sup>2</sup> De Pyth. Orac., 397 F.      <sup>3</sup> De Div., 1, 34, 75; cf. Lysander, XII, 1.

<sup>4</sup> X, 9, 7 - 10.      <sup>5</sup> cf. Lysander, XXVIII, 10.

<sup>6</sup> cf. Lysander, VII, 3.      <sup>7</sup> cf. Lysander, XV, 3.

<sup>8</sup> cf. notes on Lysander, XVI.



Beneath this statue of Lysander there was apparently a limestone base, which survives in mutilated form,<sup>1</sup> containing an epigram by Ion of Samos, who added his signature in pentameter verse:

Εἰκόνα εἰς ἀνέθηκεν [ἐπ'] ἔργῳ τῷδε, ὅτε νικῶν  
 νῆσιν θαλαῖς πέραν κε[κ]ροικίδαν δύναμιν,  
 Λύσανδρος, Λακεδαιμόνα ἀπόρθητον στεφανώσασ[α].  
 Ἑλλάδος ἀκρόπολιν, κ[α]λλιχορον πατρίδα.  
 Ἐξάριον ἔρφισύτ[ου] τῷδε ἐλαγῆσαν Ἴων.

The presentation by Cyrus to Lysander of a gold and ivory trireme to commemorate the victory of Aegospotami, and the depositing of it at Delphi in the Treasury of Brasidas and the Acanthians, is not referred to by any other writer than Plutarch. But it is well to remember that Plutarch had spent some time at Delphi and may have seen for himself Lysander's dedications there. It is possible that this valuable trireme remained there for some time, but it is hardly likely that it survived to Plutarch's day. Delphi certainly profited from the Spartan victory at the end of the Peloponnesian War, receiving the chief monuments of both the Spartan commanders; for Agis, who had been in command of the Spartan forces at Decelca, consecrated to Apollo tithes of the spoil,<sup>2</sup> and erected a monument on which he called himself " King of sea and land ".

<sup>1</sup> cf. S.I.G., 115, and M.N.Tod, *Ibid.* pp. 228 - 230.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Lysander, *XCVII*, 4.

While describing the trireme given to Lysander by Cyrus, Plutarch mentions a statement of Anaxandrides of Delphi that Lysander had also stored at Delphi some further personal booty, a talent of silver, fifty-two minae and eleven staters; but he then rejects the veracity of his authority by pointing out that this allegation seems quite inconsistent with the "generally accepted accounts of Lysander's poverty".

Ziegler<sup>1</sup> suggests that Plutarch is indebted for his information about the Dioscuri in chapter XII<sup>2</sup> to Anaxandrides, and also presumably here<sup>3</sup>. This Anaxandrides<sup>4</sup>, who lived perhaps at the end of the Third Century B.C., was the author of a work: *Ἐπεὶ τῶν εὐχῶν ἑστῶτων ἐν Δελφοῖς ἀναθημάτων*. So apparently was Theopompus<sup>5</sup>, whose book on the dedications at Delphi was either a separate work, or perhaps part of Book XXVI of the Philippica. Thus, Anaxandrides may have been indebted to Theopompus for much of his information, and Plutarch may well have had his Theopompan source (which possibly contained this material about Lysander's dedications at Delphi) confirmed by a reference to Anaxandrides, whose works would undoubtedly have been preserved at Delphi until Plutarch's day<sup>6</sup>. Of course, Plutarch would not necessarily know that Anaxandrides had gained his information from Theopompus.

<sup>1</sup> Plut. Vit., 111, 2nd Ed., Teubner, p. 116.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XII, 1.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XVIIII, 1 & 3.

<sup>4</sup> Or Alexandrides, of uncertain date: cf. Schol. Eurip. Orestes, 1632; Muller, F.H.G., 111, 106; cf. Lysander, XII, 1.

<sup>5</sup> cf. Athenaeus, XII, 532 D-E; XIII, 604F -605 D; G. & H., 240-241.

<sup>6</sup> cf. Solon, XI, 2, where P. refers to *Δελφῶν ἀναθημάτων* with which he must have been familiar when he was priest there.

Thus, the reference to the Dioscuri<sup>1</sup> may have come from Theopompus, and this information about Lysander's dedications at Delphi<sup>2</sup> may also have been found in Theopompus, as well as in Anaxandrides. When Plutarch says that a deposit of money by Lysander at Delphi is quite inconsistent with the generally accepted views of Lysander's poverty, he might almost be quoting Theopompus, for that was certainly Theopompus' own opinion.<sup>3</sup> It must be remembered that private Spartans, prohibited from possessing gold or silver,<sup>4</sup> were in the habit of depositing their wealth outside Sparta. Pogeidonius<sup>5</sup> says that rich Spartans kept their money in Arcadia; and the tale may have been current that Lysander, made wealthy by the fall of Athens, was bound to have left a great part of the booty for his private use at Delphi. However that may be, Plutarch scouts the suggestion.

There follows a series of anecdotes about Lysander, illustrative of his power, his influence and his pride.

5 Lysander now had greater power than any Greek before his time, and according to Duris of Samos, he was the first Greek to whom "the cities" erected altars, made sacrifices

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, XII, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XVIII, 1 - 3.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Lysander, XII, 2.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Lysander, XVII, 6; Xenophon, Const. of Sparta, VII, 6.

<sup>5</sup> Apud Athenaeus, VI, 233 F; F.Gr.H., II A, p. 255, 48: II C, p. 190, 48.

as to a god, and sang songs of triumph. One of these paeans is quoted by Plutarch:

τὸν Ἑλλάδος Λυκοθέου  
στρατηγὸν ἐπὶ ἀστυχόρου  
Σπάρτης ἐπύθομεν, ὡς  
τῷ Κείνῳ.

It was inevitable that the cities of Asia Minor particularly should bestow great honours upon Lysander, for, apart from the tremendous power which he held as representative of Spartan might and as friend of Cyrus, he had freed them from the tyranny of Athens. Thucydides<sup>1</sup> tells us that the Amphipolitans sacrificed to Brasidas as to a 'hero', after his death in 422 B.C., and honoured him with games and annual sacrifices. Undoubtedly, similar honours would be paid to the Spartan Lysander during his lifetime.<sup>2</sup>

According to Plutarch, Duris of Samos<sup>3</sup> testified to the popularity of Lysander in his native Samos,<sup>4</sup> by quoting the words of a paean sung there in praise of Lysander. Whether or not this song was still remembered and quoted in Duris' own day (one hundred and fifty years after Aegospotami) is not made clear. Duris may have been quoting it from some Samian chronicle.

<sup>1</sup> V, 11.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Diodorus, XVI, 20, 6, where Dion is honoured in this way by the Syracusans; and Plutarch, Apoph. Lac., 21C D, where we read that Agocleus refused to allow statues of himself to be erected in Asia Minor, although Thasos wanted to pay him divine respects.

<sup>3</sup> F.Gr.H., II A, p. 15A, 71: II C, p. 128, 71.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Lysander, XLV, 2.

Athenaeus,<sup>1</sup> without giving the words of the poem, refers to the testimony of Duris of Samos that such a song was sung at Samos in honour of Lysander.

Pausanias<sup>2</sup> bears witness to the gratitude of the Samians to Lysander for their liberation, for he says that the Samians set up a statue of Lysander at Olympia ( as the Ephesians did also in the sanctuary of Artemis at Ephesus, both for Lysander and also for Eteonicus, Pharak and other Spartans<sup>3</sup> ), and he then quotes the words of the two inscriptions beneath this statue:

Ἐν πολυθαύτῳ τρένεται Δίῳσ δ'φιρέδοντος  
 ἔστι κ' ἀνθέντων δηροσίη Σαρίων.  
 Ἰθάκῃται πάτρῃ καὶ Ἀριστοφάνῳ κλέος ἔργων,  
 Λύσανδρ', ἐκτελέσας δόξαν ἔχων ἀρετῆς

Certainly Lysander preserved his reputation for ἀρετή at Samos.

It is quite unnecessary to exaggerate the influence of the East upon the Greek cities of Asia Minor, and to assume that no Greek cities of the mainland would have conferred divine honours on a Greek general. For what became official in the case of the successors of Alexander, Seleucus, Ptolemy, Antigonus and Demetrius, had been inherent in popular Greek religion for many years. There would not be much difference between the

<sup>1</sup> XV, 696 B : ἐν τοῖς Σαρίων ἀπεγρυφόμενοι Ἄρεος.

<sup>2</sup> VI, 3, 14 - 15.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Lysander, III, 3.

honours paid to Brasidas and those paid to Lysander.

Theological speculation frequently busied itself with the possibility of heroes ultimately becoming gods,<sup>1</sup> and - of course - it was part of the common Hellenistic belief, and no doubt pre-Hellenistic belief also, that men could turn into gods, if sufficiently virtuous.

Thus, Duris of Samos is correct when he refers to sacrifices made to Lysander as to a god,<sup>2</sup> but he is probably not right when he claims that Lysander was the first Greek to whom the cities erected altars and made sacrifices.

The author of the brief song of praise which is here quoted by Plutarch is not named by him, and not known - unless it be that Aristonous, ὁ κίθαρῶδός , who is mentioned at the end of the chapter.<sup>3</sup>

Plutarch now records that the Samians decreed that their festival of Hera should in future be called *Αὐγαλῶσα* . This information, following as it does upon Plutarch's reference to Duris of Samos, is almost certainly taken from Duris' Samian Chronicles. That there was a sanctuary of Hera in Samos is testified by Pausanias,<sup>4</sup> who makes it clear that there were important festivals in honour of Hera held in Samos and also in Argos.

<sup>1</sup> cf. Plutarch, De Defect. Orac., 415 B.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Athenagoras, Suppl., 14: *Ἐπίτασις Αὐγαλῶσα ἐν τοσαύταις ἀγῶνι καὶ τοσαύταις κερῶνι (ἰδούρασι θεῶν).*

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XVIII, 10.      <sup>4</sup> VII, 4, 4; cf. Athenaeus, XV, 672 A.

No extant authority other than Plutarch refers to the change of name of the Samian festival of Hera.<sup>1</sup>

It seems likely that the first three paragraphs of this chapter are the result of Plutarch's own prolonged stay at Delphi, and his investigations of the records and memorials there; but the remaining paragraphs<sup>2</sup> are in all probability from the Samian Chronicles of Duris of Samos, for almost all the information given to us by Plutarch about the poets who were included in Lysander's retinue, or competed at the Lysandreia, may in some way be identified with Samos, or with the Ionian cities on the nearby coast.

Plutarch says that Lysander kept CHOERILUS in his retinue, "to adorn his achievements with verse", and rewarded ANTILOCHUS for writing verses in his honour.

Choerilus was an epic poet of Samos who wrote a Persica, and apparently an epic poem about his native Samos; he is cited several times by Aristotle, and may be the poet named together with Niceratus<sup>3</sup> by Marcellinus.<sup>4</sup>

Of Antilochus nothing more is known except this anecdote recorded by Plutarch.

<sup>1</sup> HESYCHIUS: Ἀεὶδῶσαν Παναγίας, καὶ Ἀεὶδῶσαν Ἐρακλεῖαν. Ἔγρητο δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ Ἐρατὴ καὶ Οὐσία.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XVIII, 4 - 10.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Lysander, XVIII, 8.

<sup>4</sup> Vita Thucy., 29: cf. Suidas s.v.; Choerili Samii Quae Supersunt Coll., F. Naacke, Leipzig, 1817; Epic. Graec. Frag., 308 - 311, G. Kinkel, 1877.

Plutarch now says that when ANTIMACHUS of Colophon and NICERATUS of Horaclea were competing at the Lysandreia, Lysander awarded the prize to Nicoratus, to the chagrin of Antimachus, who was, however, cheered by the consoling words of Plato - then a young man - that " the ignorant suffer from their ignorance, as do the blind from their blindness ".

Antimachus of Colophon<sup>1</sup> was an older contemporary of Plato and a poet of some prominence; he wrote at least two poems of some importance - a Thebais, and two books of elegies, called ' Lyde ', in memory of his dead wife. But he was not apparently rated very highly by some of the Alexandrians or by later writers.<sup>2</sup>

Little is known of the poet Nicoratus of Horaclea - he is called *ἠπικεῖος* by Marcellinus,<sup>3</sup> and reference is made to him by Aristotle.<sup>4</sup>

It is quite likely that these two Ionian poets competed against one another at a Samian festival, and if there really was an important festival at Samos which had been called the Lysandreia, then it is most likely that Lysander himself, if he were in the vicinity, would be asked to judge some of the contents. But it is quite impossible to tell whether this

<sup>1</sup> Or, perhaps, of Clarus - in either case, near to Ephesus; cf. Ovid, *Tristia*, I, 6, 1; Cicero, *Brutus*, 51, 191.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Callimachus, fr. 74 b, Schneider; Catullus, XCV, 10; Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.*, X, 1, 53; Plutarch, *Timoleon*, XXXVI, 2; *De Garrul.*, 513 B; *Po. Plut.*, *Consol. ad Apoll.*, IX, 106 B; D. Wyse, *Antimachi Colophonii Reliquiae*, 1936; G. Wentzel, *Antimachos*, in *P-W*, I, pp. 2433 - 2436.

<sup>3</sup> *Vita Thucy.*, 29.

<sup>4</sup> *Rhet.*, III, 11.



contest which is mentioned by Plutarch took place shortly after Lysander had captured the island of Samos and driven out the democrats<sup>1</sup> ( 405 - 404 B.C. ), or whether it was much later, during the expedition of Agesilaus to Asia Minor<sup>2</sup> ( 396 B.C. ), when Lysander was so badly treated by Agesilaus because of the latter's jealousy of Lysander's popularity and influence in Ionia. The later date seems likely, for probably the many invitations of this type given to Lysander by the Samians and people of Ephesus and other Ionian cities aroused the envy of Agesilaus.

Plato is referred to as νεός ἄν ᾤετο ; if this anecdote is to be dated 404 B.C., he would be about twenty-three; if, on the other hand, it took place in 396 B.C., Plato would be thirty-one.

It is not possible to estimate the veracity of the story which Plutarch records about Plato and Antimachus, for it is peculiar to Plutarch. We know, however, from a fragment of Heraclides Ponticus<sup>3</sup> that Plato sent Heraclides to Colophon to collect the poems of Antimachus, because he had the greatest regard for his poetry. Cicero<sup>4</sup> also knows of the connection between Plato and Antimachus, and has a curious variant of Plutarch's anecdote, which seems at least to confirm that Plato

<sup>1</sup> cf. Lysander, XLV, 2.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Lysander, XXXIII, 5.

<sup>3</sup> Proclus in Plato, Timaeus, 1, 28 C; Diehl, 1, 90, 21. This same passage, incidentally, refers later to Duris of Samos in such a way as to suggest that Plutarch's anecdote about Plato and Antimachus may have been taken from Duris of Samos: *βλέπῃ δὲ φησὶν ἄντιμαχῶν καὶ ἀντιπλάτωνος ὡς ὅντος ἰσχυρῶς κρίνειν ποιητῆς.*

<sup>4</sup> Brutus, 51, 191.

was present in Colophon or Samos to hear Antimachus recite his Thebais!

It is, of course, possible that the words of Heraclides Ponticus<sup>2</sup> may in fact be referring to a contest at which Antimachus was worsted, and that Plutarch ( or his source ) has called Antimachus' successful opponent Nicocrates, whereas he was really Cheorillus,<sup>3</sup> who was kept in Lysander's retinue.

The concluding paragraph of the chapter contains perhaps the only anecdote about Lysander in the whole chapter which might be given a bad interpretation and reflect some discredit upon Lysander. But even this is doubtful, for Lysander is represented by Plutarch as rebuking a patronising κίθαρῶδός , to the satisfaction of the reader.

Plutarch says that ARISTONOUS the harper, who had been victor at the Pythian games six times, told Lysander φιλοφρονήματος that, if he was victor again, he would allow the herald to proclaim him under Lysander's name; to which the Spartan admiral replied, " Yes, as my slave ".

One cannot with certainty identify this Aristonous; there was a Corinthian citharode, Aristonous, son of Nicosthenes,

<sup>1</sup> Cicero, *Ibid.*: " . . . nec enim posset idem Demosthenes dicere, quod dixisset Antimachum, Clarium poetam, Forunt, qui cum convocatis auditoribus legeret eis magnum illud, quod novistis, volumen suum et cum legentem omnes propter Platona reliquissent. ' Legam ', inquit, ' nihilominus: Plato enim mihi unus instar est Cecum milium. ' Merito ille et recte: poema enim reconditum paucorum approbationem, oratio popularis assensum vulgi debet movere "

<sup>2</sup> *Apud Proc., Ibid.*: ὅτι τῶν Χαερῶν τότε ἀδικροῦνται. <sup>ἤλιτον τὰ Ἄντιμάχου</sup> <sup>πρωτίηρα.</sup>

<sup>3</sup> *cf. Lysander, IVIII, 7.*

to whom the Delphians gave certain privileges because of the excellence of his rendering of a hymn to Apollo ( according to a ' stele ' found at Delphi<sup>1</sup> ). But, according to Pentov,<sup>2</sup> this ' stele ' may be dated about 222 B.C., which would make the poet even later than Duris of Samos. Crusius<sup>3</sup>, however, identifies the two and suggests that Aristonous also wrote the paeon to Lysander which is quoted in part earlier in the chapter.<sup>4</sup>

In conclusion, it seems likely that paragraphs 4 - 10 of this chapter have been taken from Duris of Samos, although whether directly or indirectly is not clear. Almost all the information given here may be localised at or around Samos, and may have been found in the Samian Chronicles of Duris. There is no reason to suppose that Plutarch may not have used Duris at first hand, for he frequently quotes<sup>5</sup> from him in his other Lives, usually without whole-hearted approval ( although we must not assume that every citation of Duris is at first hand ).

<sup>1</sup> B.C.H., XVII, 1894, pp. 563 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Klio, 1914, p. 305.

<sup>3</sup> P-W, II, p. 967, s.v. Aristonous.

<sup>4</sup> Lysander, XVIII, 5.

<sup>5</sup> cf. Pericles, XVIII, 2; Alcibiades, XXII, 2; Agonillaus, III, 2; Demosthenes, XIX, 3 and XXII, 4; Phocion, IV, 3 and XVII, 10; Eumenes, I, 1; Alexander, IV, 2.

CHAPTER XXII, 2 - 7.

After his long and uncomplimentary digression upon Lysander's actions in the Hellespont and Thrace, Plutarch returns to his narrative source. He tells us that the Spartan kings, being jealous of Lysander's power and influence, deposed his 'decadarchies' during his absence ( in the Hellespont ? ), and restored to many of the Greek cities their original forms of government. But fresh disturbances broke out *προς τὰς*, and the Athenians from Phyle, under Thrasybulus, were successful against the Thirty. Lysander, therefore, returned to Sparta and persuaded the authorities to send him out to Athens to punish the Athenian democrats. As both kings were jealous of Lysander, they arranged that one of the two, Pausanias, should also set out for Athens - where he reconciled the opposing factions in the city, and thus robbed Lysander of his hopes of mastery there. But shortly afterwards, when the Athenians revolted again, Pausanias was censured for allowing Athens too much liberty; and praise was given to Lysander, whose actions were identified with the good of Sparta.

There is some slight similarity between this account of Plutarch and that of Diodorus,<sup>1</sup> and more similarity between Plutarch's version and that of Xenophon;<sup>2</sup> but on many points Plutarch disagrees with both these authorities.

In this paragraph Plutarch is referring to the opposition towards Lysander which was beginning to show itself at Sparta. While Lysander was away from the city, the kings began to undermine his power and influence, by apparently interfering with the decadarchies which he had set up. But Plutarch is most vague, and does not refer by name to any particular place or city where the government set up by Lysander was deposed by the kings. He does, however, suggest<sup>3</sup> that, as a result of regal interference with Lysander's decadarchies, the democratic party at Athens was emboldened and encouraged to fight against the Thirty.

Plutarch's chronology may be completely at fault here; Xenophon records<sup>4</sup> that the ephors began to restore the old forms of government to those cities which had had decadarchies imposed upon them by Lysander; but this was much later than the successful action of the Athenian democrats against the Thirty, and later than the arrival at Athens of Lysander and his brother; so that it could not have given encouragement to

<sup>1</sup> XIV, 32.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, II, 4, 28 - 38.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XXI, 3.

<sup>4</sup> Hellenica, III, 4, 2.

Pharasybulus and his followers.

So far as can be judged from Xenophon, the intervention of Lysander and Pausanias at Athens was in 404 - 3 B.C., perhaps in the spring of 403; and by that date, according to Xenophon, there had been no signs of open opposition to Lysander at Sparta. But it is important to remember that the ephors, under whom the great successes of Lysander had been won in 405 - 404 B.C., passed out of office in September, 404 B.C. and gave place to others; the latter were perhaps more disposed to support king Pausanias, who - according to the testimony of Xenophon<sup>1</sup> - was jealous of Lysander, and had some influence over at least three of the five ephors appointed for the new year.<sup>2</sup>

Plutarch talks of both kings being jealous of Lysander, and taking measures to depose his decarchy. Xenophon, Diodorus and Justin<sup>3</sup> refer only to the jealousy of Pausanias.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, II, 4, 29; and also Diodorus, XIV, 33, 6.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, II, 4, 29.

<sup>3</sup> V, 10, 7.

<sup>4</sup> One may note a resemblance between the words of Plutarch: τὰς πόλεις... δια παντός ἔχει καὶ κύριος ἐστὶ τῆς Ἑλλάδος and those of Theopompus: γονόμορος... τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἔχει δὲ συνέως κύριος (G. & H., 21 a); but this resemblance should not be pressed too far, for Plutarch is in fact quoting his own words of chapter XVI, 1: καὶ τρόπον τινα κύριος τῆς Ἑλλάδος, nor can one assume that κύριος was such a rare word that its appearance in a fragment of Theopompus implies that the Isocratean must inevitably have been the authority used for this chapter.

Here Plutarch refers most briefly to the considerable success which Thrasybulus and the democratic refugees at Phyle had gained over the Thirty. He suggests that it was the change of attitude towards Lysander's decedarchies, showed by the Spartan authorities, which was responsible for the outbreak of open strife at Athens against the government, and says that Lysander came home ( from the Hellespont ? ) to persuade the Spartans to help the Athenian tyrants.

Actually, it was from Thebes<sup>1</sup> and with Theban money that Thrasybulus, Anytus and Archinus, with a force of between fifty and a hundred refugees, occupied the frontier fortress of Phyle, and were so successful that they seized the Piraeus and inflicted a severe defeat upon the Thirty.<sup>2</sup>

Xenophon<sup>3</sup> agrees with Plutarch that Lysander persuaded the Spartans to send help to the Athenian oligarchs, and that the Spartan authorities sent him out with a hundred talents<sup>4</sup> for the successful prosecution of the war against the Athenian democrats. But Xenophon suggests that Lysander engineered ( *συνέπεισεν* ) the passing of a motion that he should be sent out as ' harmost ', and his brother Libys as nauarch; Plutarch merely stated that the Spartans sent out Lysander as general -

<sup>1</sup> of. Lysander, *XXVII*, 7; *Xen. Hell.*, *II*, 4, 2; *Diodorus*, *XIV*, 32, 1.

<sup>2</sup> of. Xenophon, *Hellenica*, *II*, 4, 2; *Lysias*, *Cont. Agor.*, 64; *Aristotle*, *Const. of Athens*, 37 - 38; *Aeschines*, *Cont. Ctes.*, 62; *Demosthenes*, *Cont. Timocrat.*, 34; *Diodorus*, *XIV*, 32, 1; *Pausanias*, *I*, 29, 3; *Justin*, *V*, 9, 6.

<sup>3</sup> *Hellenica*, *II*, 4, 29.

<sup>4</sup> *Demosthenes*, *Cont. Lept.*, 10, tells us that the money borrowed by the Thirty was later refunded to Sparta; cf. *Isocrates*, *Areop.* 28; *Lysias*, *Cont. Erat.*, 59; *Aristotle*, *Const. of Ath.* 40, 3.

he knows nothing of the appointment of Lysander's brother.

Diodorus<sup>1</sup> does not mention the sum of talents, but he says that the Spartans sent out with Lysander forty ships and a thousand soldiers.

Xenophon can hardly be correct when he mentions Lysander's command as that of a 'hermost', unless he is using the word in a very loose sense. So far as we know, Callibius was not superseded by him, for Aristotle<sup>2</sup> says that Callibius was still present in Athens, assisting the Thirty.

While Plutarch refers to the jealousy of both kings, Xenophon and Diodorus attribute jealousy to Pausanias alone.

6 There is only one short sentence<sup>3</sup> in these paragraphs which is anything like the words of Xenophon. The remainder is peculiar to Plutarch, although it is undoubtedly implied in Xenophon's account, which suggests that if Lysander had been allowed free scope, he would have reduced the Piraeus and imposed his own terms upon Thrasybulus.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> XIV, 33; cf. Lysias, Cont. Frat., 60.

<sup>2</sup> Const. of Athens, 38.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Plutarch's τοὺς Ἀθηναίους διαλλάξας καὶ καταπαύσας with Hellenica, II, 4, 38: οἱ δὲ διαλλάξαντες ἔπειτα ἐπέστην ἕκαστον κατὰ τὴν εὐρίαν.  
cf. also, Aristotle, Const. of Athens, 38, 4; Lysias, De Don. Nic. Frat., 8 - 12.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Hellenica, II, 4, 35: ὁ δὲ Πausanίας ... λάβει πέμπων ἐξέδωκε τοὺς ἐν Πειραιῶν οὐκ ἐπὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων πρὸς ἑαυτὸν καὶ τοὺς πρὸς τὸν ἐφόρον.  
II, 4, 36: εὐὸς τῶν ἐφόρων... ἀρμότεροι τῶν πρὸς Πausanίον γνώμενα ὄντες ἀλλήλων τῶν Πausanίον; cf. also, Hellenica, III, 5, 25; Pausanias, III, 5, 1, and Plutarch, Lysander, XXX, 1, where one of the accusations against Pausanias after Haliartus was that he had allowed the Athenian democrats to escape when they were in his power at Piraeus. But in Lysander, III, 5 - 6, Plutarch states, much more explicitly than is even suggested by Xenophon, that Pausanias' sole purpose in exercising his command in Athens was to frustrate the ambitions of Lysander.



This concluding paragraph contains high praise of Lysander, coupled with reproach and blame of Pausanias for his weak attitude towards the Athenian democrats. Plutarch says that shortly afterwards the Athenians revolted again;<sup>1</sup> but it is not at all clear what he means by "shortly afterwards", or even by "revolted again". Xenophon has no record of any second 'revolt' of the Athenians; in fact, according to his account, the intervention of Pausanias and his final settlement with Thrasybulus was a death-knell to the Thirty, whose final elimination followed shortly afterwards;<sup>2</sup> the Athenian democracy would have no reason for a second revolt, as it had already gained from Pausanias and the Spartan authorities all it desired.

Perhaps Plutarch is here vaguely referring to the 'Corinthian War'<sup>3</sup> (395 - 387 B.C.), occasioned by the aggression of Sparta and resulting in an alliance between Athens, Thebes, Corinth and Argos against Sparta. But this can hardly be termed "shortly afterwards", nor indeed could it be called a 'revolt' of Athens, unless the Spartans did consider it revolt on the part of Athens to join the former allies of Sparta against Sparta.

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, III. 7: ἀλίγῃ ὀλίγον ἔτι σταύρον πάλιν τῶν Ἀθηναίων.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, II, 4, 40.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Lysander, XXVII and XXVIII.

The truth probably is that Plutarch's information is confused; there was no second revolt of the Athenians of the popular party against Sparta, although they certainly wiped out the Thirty after the Spartans had left their city. But accusations were brought against Pausanias - but at a much later date - which, according to Xenophon,<sup>1</sup> contained references to his deliberate policy of allowing the Athenian democrats to escape when he had them in his power. This was after the battle of Haliartus in 395 B.C., in which Lysander was slain; and these accusations against Pausanias, for his conduct at Athens in 403 B.C., for his late arrival at Haliartus, and for the truce which he there made with the enemies of Sparta, resulted in his condemnation and exile.

Whatever the truth, Plutarch's source ( which is probably Theopompus for the whole chapter ) turns the whole incident at Athens to the credit of Lysander, and concludes with high praise for him.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, III, 5, 25; Pausanias ( III, 5, 2 - 5 ) says that Pausanias was charged at Sparta in 403 B.C. with having failed to carry out the orders of the ophors, but was acquitted by 19 to 15 votes; in 395 B.C. he was accused a second time of the same, with additional charges, and was condemned 'in absentia'.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XII, 8: *ἄνδρὸς οὐ πρὸς ἑτέρων χεῖριν οὐδὲ θεατρικῶς, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ τῆς ἑπικρατῆς συμφέρον κλειστάτως στρατηγούστος.*

Any general who fought against the more extreme forms of democracy at Athens would undoubtedly win the approval of Theopompus, who had little good to say of the radical element in Athens and elsewhere ( cf. G. & H., 65 etc. ).

CHAPTER XXII

The first five paragraphs of this chapter, ' eideological ' in form, are inserted into his narrative by Plutarch with no clue whatever as to their ultimate source. They consist of four ' apophthegmata ', attributed to Lysander; yet Plutarch was not averse to attributing a saying to one man in one particular work which he attributed to an entirely different character in another of his works, although perhaps in slightly different words.

There are four apophthegms, all of which purport to illustrate the " grim and terrifying " side of Lysander's character.

When the Argives disputed with the Spartans about a matter of boundaries, and the former considered that they had justice on their side, Lysander showed his sword and said, " He who is master of this discourses best about boundaries ".

In two other places<sup>2</sup> Plutarch also attributes this saying to Lysander; but the general idea which lies behind the saying, that ' might is right ', is expressed in other words and

<sup>1</sup>As noted in Lysander, VII, 6 and VIII, 4 - 5.

<sup>2</sup>Reg. of Imp. Apoph., 190 E and 229 C.

attributed to other Spartans by Plutarch; he puts a very similar saying into the mouths of Agesilaus,<sup>1</sup> Antalcidas<sup>2</sup> and Archidamus,<sup>3</sup> son of Agesilaus. No doubt, the saying was considered typical of any Spartan, and Plutarch would be able to find many varieties of the same saying in different authorities.

During some conference, says Plutarch, a Megarian grew bold in his speech, whereupon Lysander rebuked him with the words, "Your words, stranger, lack a city"; now in three other places<sup>4</sup> Plutarch attributes this same saying to Lysander, but very similar words are attributed by Plutarch to Agesilaus,<sup>5</sup> also in reply to a man of Megara. In any case, the saying is rather a commonplace one, and the first record of anything like it appears in Herodotus.<sup>6</sup>

Lysander asked the double-dealing Boeotians whether he should march through their country with spears upright or levelled; the same saying is attributed once more to Lysander by Plutarch.<sup>7</sup> But in the Life of Agesilaus, a similar question, although in slightly different words, is asked of the Thracians

<sup>1</sup> Apoph. Lac., 210 E; but of course many apophthegms are attributed to Agesilaus, erstwhile friend of Lysander; cf., inter alia, Agesilaus, XVI, 3 & 4.

<sup>2</sup> Apoph. Lac., 217 E.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. 218 F.

<sup>4</sup> Reg. et Imp. Apoph., 190 E, 229 C; Quomodo Ac., 71 H; οἱ λόγοι αὐτοῦ ... πόλεως εἰσονται.

<sup>5</sup> Apoph. Lac., 212 E: οἱ λόγοι ... εἰσονται πολλῆς δυνάμεως.

<sup>6</sup> VIII, 61, where Adimantus attacks Themiocles, εἰγὼν το καλέων τῆ εἴ ἐστι πικρῆς.

<sup>7</sup> Apoph. Lac., 229 C.

by Agesilaus.<sup>1</sup>

This paragraph gives us the last of the four ' apophthegmata ', which is on two other occasions attributed by Plutarch to Lysander.<sup>2</sup> When the Corinthians had revolted from Sparta, and the Spartans were laying siege to their city, the Spartan troops hesitated to make a frontal attack; but when a hare was seen to jump over the Corinthian ditch, Lysander said to his soldiers, " Are you not ashamed to fear enemies who are so lazy that hares sleep on their walls ? ".

It is quite impossible to trace sayings such as these back to their original sources, especially when the occasions on which they were supposed to have been quoted seem to be so vague or even dubious. Of these four sayings, three at least Plutarch attributes to other Spartans as well as to Lysander, and thereby seems to convict himself of uncertainty as to their authenticity, as well as their origin. Not one of these sayings is uncomplimentary to a great Spartan general, whose reputation was so high that he was bound to have attributed to him not only deeds of valour, but also sayings of point and wit, illustrative of Laconic brevity.

<sup>1</sup> Agesilaus, XVI, 1: ποτέρον ως φησίαν ἢ ως παλαιάν διαπορεύεται τὴν χώραν.

<sup>2</sup> Reg. et Imp. Apoph., 190 II, and Apoph. Lac., 229 G.

Peripatetic writings must have been full of them. It is quite likely that Plutarch had many of these sayings noted in his common-place books many years before he began to write his Lives, and selected them as appropriate illustrations of the character of his hero, to supplement his historical narrative at this point. It seems most unlikely, although not impossible, that he found the four sayings in the narrative of Theopompus.

13 These paragraphs describe the appointment of Agesilaus ( half-brother of the dead king Agis ) as king of Sparta instead of Leotychidas, reputed son of Agis; and the part which was played by Lysander in bringing about the election of Agesilaus. In most of this section of the chapter Plutarch follows the account of Xenophon<sup>2</sup>, but he passes on a great deal more information, either peculiar to himself, or substantiated by other extant authorities, although not found in Xenophon.

9 After the death of Agis in 398 B.C., Agesilaus his brother<sup>3</sup>, who had been an *ἐπαρτίς* of Lysander<sup>4</sup>, was persuaded by Lysander to lay claim to the throne, as being a genuine 'Heraclid'; for it was said of Leotychidas (*ὕιος βασιλέως* of Agis )

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. Nagesander's Commentaries, apud Atheneus, X, 431 D; Frontinus has culled some other saying of Lysander's from one of his sources - he records ( Strat., IV, 1, 9 ) that when Lysander had flogged a soldier for leaving the ranks on the march, and the soldier said that he had not left to plunder, Lysander retorted, " I won't have you look as if you were going to pillage ".

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, 111, 3, 1-4.

<sup>3</sup> "Half-brother": Plut. Ages., 1, 1.

<sup>4</sup> Plutarch, Agesilaus, 11, 1.

that he was the bastard son of Timaco, wife of Agis, who had been corrupted by Alcibiades during the latter's exile in Sparta. Agis, aware of the length of time during which he had been absent from Sparta before the birth of the child to his wife, repudiated Leotychidas and refused to acknowledge him as his true son, until his death-bed. Then, under persuasion from Leotychidas and his friends, he declared in the presence of several witnesses that Leotychidas was his true son.

All this information is repeated by Plutarch in his Life of Agesilaus,<sup>1</sup> although in much greater detail, and that part of it which concerned Alcibiades is also to be found in the Life of Alcibiades.<sup>2</sup>

Xenophon's account<sup>3</sup> is much more sober, although in some ways more graphic than that of Plutarch, for he passes on the actual words of the arguments employed by both Leotychidas and Agesilaus when they both laid claim to the throne. He tells us that Agis was taken ill at Moraea, and carried back to Sparta where he died; there his son Leotychidas and his brother Agesilaus contended for the throne. Xenophon knows nothing of Lysander being an ἐπαρτυς of Agesilaus, or of persuading

<sup>1</sup> Agesilaus, 1 - III.

<sup>2</sup> Alcibiades, XXIII, 7 - 8, where Alcibiades' boast that he wished his sons to be kings of Sparta is attributed to the authority of Duris of Samos.

<sup>3</sup> Hellenica, III, 3, 1 - 4; cf. Nepos, Agesilaus, 1, 4; Pausanias, III, 8, 4 & 7; Justin, V, 2.

Agosilaus to lay claim to the kingdom<sup>1</sup>. He alleges the bastard birth of Leotychidas, but with no reference to Alcibiades; he refers to the computation of the time by Agis since a portent<sup>2</sup> drove him from the bed of his wife, and the ultimate birth of a child to the wife. But he has nothing to say about Agis later acknowledging Leotychidas as his true son. On the contrary, the charge which Agosilaus brings against Leotychidas implies that Agis never recognised him as his son.<sup>3</sup>

13 In his claim for the kingship<sup>4</sup> Agosilaus was championed by Lysander, but he had to contend with an oracle which was produced by the well-known Diopceithes. This oracle warned the Spartans against a "lame sovereignty" - an obvious reference to Agosilaus' infirmity,<sup>5</sup> in the opinion of Diopceithes and the friends of Leotychidas. But, says Plutarch, Lysander offered an alternative interpretation, alleging that the oracle might be more correctly interpreted as a warning against a bastard line of kings in Sparta.

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. Hellenica, III, 3, 3: *Λύσανδρος εἰς τὴν Ἀγγελίαν ἀντιέειπεν.*

<sup>2</sup> cf. Plutarch, Alcibiades, XXIII, 7, where Plutarch refers to an earthquake which had forced Agis to run in terror from the bed of his wife, and to refrain from intercourse with her for 10 months.

<sup>3</sup> Hellenica, III, 3, 3: *ὅν τινος κατὰ πατέρα, ὡς ἔφη, ὅτι εἶναι ἐκωτῶ.*

<sup>4</sup> cf. Nepos, Agosilaus, 1, 4; Athenaeus, XII, 535 B.; Pausanias, III, 8, 4 & 7-9.

<sup>5</sup> There is the interesting question why Agosilaus was not condemned at birth (cf. Plutarch, Lycurgus, XVI, 1, for the exposure of children at Sparta who did not pass the Spartan physical tests); perhaps the Spartan law did not apply to the royal houses, or the lameness of Agosilaus only developed later in his life.



Xenophon's account of this controversy over Diopceithes' oracle is very close to that of Plutarch,<sup>1</sup> except that he does not quote the actual words of the oracle.

Plutarch quotes in full the words of the oracle:<sup>2</sup>

Φράζεο δή, δῆρτη, καίτερον βασιλῆαχος εἶδαι,  
 ἢ ἔσθαι ἀετίποδος βλάστη χελὴν βασιλεία.  
 Σηρὸν γὰρ μόχθοι σε κατασχέουσιν ἀλπίτοι  
 φθειρίβροτον ἢ ἐπὶ κῶμα κυλινδόμενον πολέροτο.

and the same oracle is quoted in the Life of Agesilaus<sup>3</sup> in almost identical words; and when Pausanias<sup>4</sup> quotes the oracle, his words also are the same as those of Plutarch here.

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XXII, 10: Διοπεΐθης, ἀνὴρ εὐδοκίμος ἐπὶ χρηρομολογίᾳ.  
 Lysander, XXII, 12: οὐ γὰρ ἐν προσπάτειαις τις ἄεκη Λακεδαιμονίων, εὐσχεραίνων τὸν θεόν, ἀλλὰ χελὴν εἶναι τὴν βασιλείαν εἰ νόθοι καὶ κακῶς γαγονότες βασιλεύουσι καὶ ἢ Ἐρακλείδαι.

Xenophon, Hellenica, III, 3, 3: Διοπεΐθης, βασιλῆα χρηρομολόγος ἀνὴρ, ..... εἶπεν ὡς καὶ Ἀπολλωνος χρεῖρος εἶη, φυλάξασθαι τὴν χελὴν βασιλείαν. Λύσανδρος δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν δὴτῆρ Ἀγγελικίων ἀντίπαυ ὡς οἶα οἶστο τὰ θεῶν τοῦτο καλεῖσθαι φυλάξασθαι, ἢ προσπάτειαις τις χελωνίαις (τὴν βασιλείαν add. οὗτο), ἀλλὰ μὲλλον ἢ ἢ ἢ αὐτὸν τῶν γένος βασιλεύουσι, παντάπασιν γὰρ ἐν χελὴν εἶναι τὴν βασιλείαν, εἴποτε ἢ οἱ ἄρ' Ἐρακλείδαι τῶν πόλεως εἶγοντο.

This Diopceithes may perhaps be identified with the Athenian Diopceithes, to whom reference is made by Aristophanes in the Knights, 1085; Wasps, 380; Birds, 988; cf. also, Plutarch, Pericles, XXXII, 1. The greatest χρηρομολόγος had inter-Hellenic reputations.

<sup>2</sup> For this oracle, cf. Xenophon, Agesilaus, I, 6-7; Plutarch, De Pyth. Orac., 399 B; Justin, VI, 2, 4.

<sup>3</sup> III, 7 - but νόθοι is here written instead of μόχθοι, and φθειρίβροτον instead of φθειρίβροτον.

<sup>4</sup> III, 8, 9: Pausanias uses the word φθειρίβροτον.

All the authorities who refer to this oracle, with the exception of Xenophon, suggest that Diopceithes had consulted Delphi and received a new oracle. But Diodorus ( who in any case does not refer this oracle to the controversy over the succession of Agesilaus ) dates it much earlier; for he records that in 477 B.C., when the Spartans were debating whether or not to challenge the Athenians in war, they remembered an old oracle, in which the god " warned them to beware of a lame leadership; and they said that this oracle could only refer to their present circumstances - for the rule would be lame if they lost one of their two leaders ".<sup>1</sup>

Plutarch agrees very closely with Xenophon's account of the way in which Lysander's interpretation of the oracle against Leotychidas influenced the Spartans to elect Agesilaus; the only idea which is peculiar to Plutarch is contained in the three words, *δυναμειος πληστον εστις*, by which Plutarch attributes greater influence to Lysander than does Xenophon. Pausanias<sup>3</sup> agrees with Plutarch; for, after recording the oracle, he says that the Spartans did not refer the disputed interpretation to Delphi, the reason being - in his opinion - that Lysander, an active supporter of Agesilaus, would have him king at all costs.

---

<sup>1</sup> X1, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Busolt ( G. G., 3, p. 71, note 2 ) maintains that the account of Diodorus was invented by a Fourth Century author, after the response of the oracle had already been used in the case of Leotychidas.

<sup>3</sup> 111, 8, 9.

Apart from the first five paragraphs of the chapter, whose sources cannot be determined, we may attribute the chapter to the Hellenica of Theopompus. It suggests a Xenophontic framework, in common with most of the narrative portions of this Life; naturally enough, it is very close in language to the relevant portions of Plutarch's Life of Agesilaus, for which Plutarch seems to have been greatly indebted to Theopompus.<sup>1</sup> Nor is there anything uncomplimentary to Lysander, whose considerable influence in Sparta is noted, nor any suggestion of any ulterior motive in his support of the candidature of Agesilaus, as there would undoubtedly have been if Nepos had got hold of the account in a Hellenistic biography.

---

<sup>1</sup> There are four explicit references to Theopompus in the Life of Agesilaus: X, 10; XXXI, 4; XXXII, 14, and XXXVI, 11.

CHAPTER XXIII

The narrative continues, Plutarch superimposing upon his Xenophontic framework a great deal of information which is peculiar to himself. He describes the expedition of Agesilaus into Asia Minor against Artaxerxes, the Persian king, and Agesilaus' treatment of Lysander, whose influence was still very great in the Greek cities of Ionia, and who - according to Plutarch - had been responsible for encouraging Agesilaus to undertake the expedition. The whole story of Agesilaus' insulting treatment of Lysander and the latter's reaction to it ( told in much greater detail by Plutarch than by Xenophon ) reflects very great credit upon Lysander in the account of Plutarch, despite the latter's reference to Lysander's ambition. It seems fairly obvious that Plutarch is following an authority who, himself following the account of Xenophon, is at pains to paint a most complimentary picture of Lysander, while at the same time attempting to be as scrupulously fair to Agesilaus as his conduct warranted.

Immediately after the election of Agesilaus as king, Lysander urged him to lead an expedition into Asia, suggesting that he could easily defeat the Persians, and make a great name for himself; Lysander wrote to his friends in Asia Minor, bidding them ask the Spartans to send out Agesilaus to lead them against Persia.

Plutarch has no knowledge of any ulterior motive behind Lysander's encouragement. But Xenophon,<sup>1</sup> who agrees that Lysander persuaded Agesilaus to undertake the expedition, adds that Lysander himself was eager to go, "so that he might restore the 'decarchies', once set up by him and afterwards deposed by the ephors". For by this time (396 B.C.), Lysander's decarchies had been completely abolished.<sup>2</sup> Since Plutarch shows great interest in these decarchies of Lysander, and has already<sup>3</sup> referred to the action of the Spartan kings in deposing the governments set up by Lysander, he would hardly be expected to omit this bit of information if he had known of it. But it seems clear that he is not following Xenophon at first hand.

Neither Xenophon<sup>4</sup> nor Pausanias<sup>5</sup> have any information about Lysander's letters to his friends in Ionia, which we find only in Plutarch, here and in the Life of Agesilaus.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, 111, 4, 2.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Hellenica, 111, 5, 13.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XXI, 2.

<sup>4</sup> Hellenica, 111, 4, 2; Agesilaus, 1, 7.

<sup>5</sup> 111, 9, 1.

<sup>6</sup> VI, 3.

By this request of the Asiatic Greeks for Agesilaus to lead them against the Persians, the Spartan king obtained an honour not inferior to that of being made king. The implication in Plutarch is that Agesilaus was indebted to Lysander for two most important positions, his kingship at Sparta, and his leadership of a Greek confederacy against the barbarian.

Xenophon agrees that Lysander persuaded Agesilaus to lead the expedition, but he does not in any way suggest the very great importance of the command, or stress that it was an unselfish desire for Agesilaus' good which prompted Lysander to encourage him to go. Plutarch repeats this indebtedness of Agesilaus to Lysander in his Life of Agesilaus,<sup>1</sup> and in the Comparison<sup>2</sup> between Agesilaus and Pompey.

This paragraph of moral reflexion is peculiar to Plutarch, and may be described as the biographer's own short prologue to his account of the unhappy results to Lysander of Agesilaus' command in Asia Minor. Although Plutarch's references are vague enough, it seems certain that he must be applying the words about "ambitious natures" to Agesilaus, and not to Lysander; this seems to be made clear by the preceding and the following paragraphs.

<sup>1</sup> VI, 5

<sup>2</sup> I, 4.

5 Agesilaus took Lysander to Asia with him, among his thirty counsellors, "intending to treat him with special favour, as his chief friend". But when they arrived in Asia Minor, the Greeks there, knowing Lysander well enough, flocked round him to make requests, ignoring Agesilaus whom they had never previously met.

Xenophon<sup>1</sup> records that Agesilaus took with him to Asia Minor thirty Spartiates, two thousand *τεῶν νεοδαμῶδων*, and six thousand allied troops; and while Plutarch refers vaguely to his arrival in Asia, Xenophon specifically mentions Ephesus.

Diodorus<sup>2</sup> refers to thirty Spartiates and six thousand troops.

In his Life of Agesilaus,<sup>3</sup> Plutarch repeats his information about the thirty Spartiates taken by Agesilaus as *εὐβουλοὶ*, adding that Lysander was soon at their head; and that in addition Agesilaus led from Greece two thousand newly enfranchised hekots and six thousand allies.

At this point in his Life of Lysander Plutarch passes on no information about Agesilaus' attempted sacrifice of a hind at Aulis, in imitation of Agamemnon, before his departure for Ionia.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, III, 4, 2; Agesilaus, 1, 7.

<sup>2</sup> XIV, 79, 1; Justin (VI, 2, 7) merely says, "Agesilaum cum ingentibus copiis in Asiam misere".

<sup>3</sup> VI, 4 - 5.

<sup>4</sup> of. Lysander, XXVII, 3; Ages., VI, 6 - 11; Polop., XXI, 5; Xenophon, Hellenica, III, 4, 3 - 4; Pausanias, III, 9, 1 - 5.

That the Greeks of Asia Minor flocked to Lysander rather than to Agesilaus, and made their requests of their old favourite and champion, was natural enough, as is made clear by Xenophon; but Xenophon states more clearly than does Plutarch the reason for the courting of Lysander by the Asiatic Greeks - " because they thought that Lysander would be able to gain for them from Agosilaus all they wanted ".<sup>2</sup>

Again,<sup>3</sup> Plutarch gives what must be his own moral reflexions on the invidious situation created both for Lysander and Agosilaus in Ephesus. His simile here about the actor who, although taking a minor part, monopolises the play, may be compared with his simile about the horse, used in a previous chapter.<sup>4</sup>

Paragraph 7 of this chapter serves as an introduction to Plutarch's account of the treatment meted out to Lysander by the jealous Agesilaus; but there is no suggestion of this in Xenophon. The latter, of course, was a personal friend of

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, III, 4, 7: καὶ διὰ ταῦτα (sc. ἕτα γιγνόμενοι πάντες τὸν Λύσανδρον) διὰ περιλήθους ὄχλος θεραπειῶν αὐτὸν ἐκολούθει.

Plutarch, Lysander, XXIII, 5: τὸν δὲ Λύσανδρον ἐκ πολλῆς τῆς πρόσθεν ἐμιχίας ..... θεραπειῶντες ..... ἐποίων ἐπὶ θύρας καὶ παρακολούθων

<sup>2</sup> For Lysander's influence in Ionia, especially in Ephesus, cf. Plutarch, Ages., VII, 1 - 3; Lysander, III, 4.

<sup>3</sup> As in Lysander, XXIII, 3.

<sup>4</sup> <sup>xx<sup>8</sup></sup>: The concluding words of XXIII, 6: τὸ δὲ βασιλεῖ τούτῳ τῆς συνήμεως ἔργον ἀπελείπετο are sufficiently close in idea to Xenophon's, ἔργον ἄλλοτρίως ἰδιώτης ἐφαίνετο, ὃ δὲ Ἀγασίλαος βασιλεῖς. The Agosilaus of Xenophon in no way suggests any rivalry between Agesilaus and Lysander.



Agesilaus, accompanied him on several of his campaigns, and wrote a laudatory Life of the Spartan king. He would not therefore be likely to insert into his narrative any information which was uncomplimentary to Agesilaus; and it is significant that in this incident, which in fact reads to the credit of Lysander, no jealousy is imputed by Xenophon to Agesilaus, but the latter is made to act against Lysander only to satisfy the agitation of the other Spartiates who by this time were jealous of him.<sup>1</sup>

In his Life of Agesilaus,<sup>2</sup> Plutarch follows more closely the Xenophontic account, and states explicitly that there was no envy in Agesilaus' nature or jealousy of honours paid to merit; but through fear for his own reputation he was forced to take action against Lysander. But in the Life of Lysander,<sup>3</sup> Plutarch rebukes Agesilaus for his shameful and ungrateful treatment of Lysander.

10

In these paragraphs Plutarch describes the measures taken by Agesilaus against Lysander:

- 1 ) He assigned no commands to him, and gave him no opportunity for exercising his influence;
- 2 ) He showed no favour to Lysander's friends, " thus quietly undoing and chilling his influence ".

<sup>1</sup> cf. Hellenica, III, 4, 8.

<sup>2</sup> VII, 4.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XXIII, 7: τὸ δὲ ... προσηλακίᾳ διὰ δόξαν εὐσεβέστερον ἄνδρα καὶ φίλον αὐτῷ ἢ ἑἶπον Ἀθηναίων προσεῖναι . διὰ δόξαν may mean " for fame's sake " ( as B. Perrin, Plutarch's Lysander, p. 299 ), or " because of Lysander's influence and reputation " ( as J. Snits, Leven van Lysander, p. 219: " wegens het aanzien dat hij (Lys) genoot " ).

Therefore Lysander, seeing that his exertions on behalf of his friends were in fact an obstacle to them, begged them not to ask for his aid; and although they obeyed him in this respect, they continued to pay court to him, thereby annoying Agesilaus the more.

A similar account is given by Plutarch in his Life of Agesilaus<sup>1</sup>.

Xenophon's account<sup>2</sup> is not very different; but he has no word to say about Lysander's friends still continuing to court him, when asked by him not to beg any further requests of him, or of Agesilaus' increasing annoyance, "through envy of the honour paid to Lysander".

This paragraph, which describes the appointment of Lysander as *προβαίτης* to Agesilaus, is peculiar to Plutarch; he refers to it again in the Life of Agesilaus<sup>3</sup>, but there he writes that the office was given to Lysander "to mortify him still further". In the Life of Lysander, the alleged reason for appointing him to the office of 'meat-carver' was to insult the Ionians; but when Plutarch refers elsewhere<sup>4</sup> to Lysander as the *προβαίτης* of Agesilaus, his words suggest that such an office was a high honour.

<sup>1</sup> VII, 5 - 8.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, III, 4, 8.

<sup>3</sup> VIII, 1.

<sup>4</sup> Quaest. Symp., 644 B: *Λακ. δὲ προβαίτης εἶχον οὐ τοῖς τυχεύουσιν ἀλλὰ τοῖς πρώτοις εὐδαίμοις.* Pollux (Onom., VI, 34), after quoting the authority of Xenophon for the existence of such an office at Sparta, adds: *ἔτι δὲ καὶ παρὰ Λακ. ἔχει τὸν ἔκπροβαίτης*. It is difficult to know for certain what were the official functions of the *προβαίτης*; he may have been official distributor of meat at public festivals, or (cf. Michell, Sparta, p. 150) "mess president who presided over the dinners at the *Syssitia*".

Lysander, therefore, had a conference with Agesilaus, at which he rebuked the Spartan king and asked for another post under his command, where he could be more serviceable.

Plutarch's account is very similar to that of Xenophon; but Xenophon is somewhat longer, and commences with the words, " Lysander was annoyed at this dishonour " ( absent from the account of Plutarch ).

One short sentence only is peculiar to Plutarch; " a brief and laconic dialogue passed between them " .

The whole of this chapter is so very close to Xenophon that it must ultimately be based upon his Hellenica. But, if Xenophon's account reflects great credit upon Lysander, Plutarch's does even more so. For Plutarch has no mention of any ulterior motive behind Lysander's persuading of Agesilaus to undertake the command of an expedition into Asia Minor, and he is less inclined than Xenophon to whitewash Agesilaus' handling of the unfortunate situation which arose in Ephesus.

As the chapter is based upon Xenophon, and is remarkably favourable towards Lysander, we may suppose that Plutarch is still following Theopompus as his primary authority; for, apart from those paragraphs<sup>2</sup> where Plutarch is himself

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, III, 4, 9 - 10.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XIII, 3 and 6.

reflecting upon the situation which has arisen, there is nothing here which he may not have found in Theopompus. It is indeed possible that Plutarch's words about Agosilaus, "to cast off and insult a benefactor and friend was not worthy of the character of Agosilaus",<sup>1</sup> may also have been taken from Theopompus, whose opinion of Agosilaus was very high - to judge from the available fragments.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, XXIII, 7.

<sup>2</sup> cf. G. & H., 22 a; and 294 = Plutarch, Agosilaus, X, etc.  
The fact that Plutarch describes as an "insult to the Ionians" the appointment of Lysander as *Kero Saitys*,<sup>?</sup> may be an added argument in favour of a Theopompan source for this chapter.

CHAPTER XXIV

The first paragraph of this chapter continues the account of Lysander's treatment by Agosilaus, and describes how Lysander at his own request was sent to the Hellespont as *πρεσβυτής*, where he induced the Persian Spithridates to revolt from Pharnabazus and join the forces of Agosilaus. But, as the Spartan king made no further use of his services, Lysander returned to Sparta, "enraged at Agosilaus".

At this point Plutarch breaks off from his Xenophontic source to recount in full the story of Lysander's alleged plot against the hereditary kingship of the Spartans. Xenophon has no knowledge whatever of this plot, and Plutarch is indebted for his information about it to the 'Hostile Source'. The story of Lysander's plot occupies chapters XXIV ( 2 - 6 ), XXV and XXVI; and the point at which Plutarch returns to his Xenophontic source at the beginning of chapter XXVII<sup>1</sup> seems to follow on quite naturally from the conclusion of the first paragraph of chapter XXIV.

---

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, XXIV, 2: ἀπέπλευσεν εἰς τὴν ἐξέστην ἀτίμως — ἐταλεύτηκε δὲ πρὶν εἰς Ἀσίαν ἐπανελθεῖν τὸν Ἀγγείλοον ( XXVII, 1 ).

Lysander was sent by Agesilaus as πρεσβυτής to the Hellespont, possibly as 'harpost' of Abydos.

Xenophon<sup>1</sup> says that when he arrived at the Hellespont and realised that Spithridates had some grievance against Pharnabazus, he persuaded him to take his children and money and two hundred cavalry, and join forces with Agesilaus. Leaving his money at Cyzicus, he took Spithridates and his son, Megabates, to Agesilaus, who was delighted at his action.

Plutarch's own account in his Life of Agesilaus<sup>2</sup> is closer in some details to that of Xenophon than is his information in the Life of Lysander; for in the former he refers both to the treasure of Spithridates,<sup>3</sup> and his two hundred cavalry.

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, III, 4, 10.

<sup>2</sup> VIII, 3.

<sup>3</sup> This Spithridates ( γενναῖος ἄνηρ ) had previously fought under Pharnabazus against the Greek Ten Thousand ( Xen. Anab., VI, 5, 7 ); apparently his quarrel with Pharnabazus was about his daughter, for although Pharnabazus was affianced to the daughter of Spithridates, yet he was also seeking the hand of the daughter of Artaxerxes ( Xen. Agesilaus, III, 3 ). Spithridates' son, Megabates, later became the lover of Agesilaus ( Xen. Ages., V, 4; Hellenica, IV, 1, 28; Plutarch, Ages., XI, 5-7 ). The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia ( XVI, 4 ) contains no mention of the part played by Lysander in bringing Spithridates over to Agesilaus: ὁ δὲ ἐπιθευδάτης τὸ μὲν γένος ἦν Πέρσης, διατρέψαν δὲ ἐκπρὸς τῷ Φαρναβάζῳ καὶ θοραπέυων αὐτόν, ἔπειτα δὲ εἰς ἔχθραν καταστὰς πρὸς αὐτόν, φοβηθεὶς μὴ καταληφθῆναι καὶ κακόν τι πάσχειν, ἑκρωστίκα μὲν ἀπέφυγεν εἰς Κύζικον, ἑσπερῶν δὲ ὡς Ἀγγελίδαον ἦκεν ἄγαν μεγαβήτην, εἶόν τετον ὄντα καὶ καλόν. Α.Ρ.Δ.

Plutarch then concludes his account of the part played by Lysander in Agesilaus' expedition to Asia Minor. The Spartan king made no further use of Lysander, and he, " when his time had expired ", sailed back to Sparta, " without honour, enraged at Agesilaus and hating the whole form of government more than even before ".

In Xenophon there is not the suggestion of disgrace or of anger; Xenophon merely says that at the end of the year Lysander and the thirty Spartiates sailed home.

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, III, 4, 20: δαΐδοχοι δ' αὐτοῖς οἱ περὶ Ἡλείουσαν παρεῖσαν.

CHAPTER XXVII

The remainder of the Life of Lysander seems to be almost entirely derived from the narrative source, Theopompus, whom Plutarch has followed for the greater part of the Life; the exceptions in the last four chapters are the Haliartus legends,<sup>1</sup> the oracles associated with Haliartus and the geographical descriptions of parts of Boeotia,<sup>2</sup> and the account ( attributed to Ephorus ) of the discovery in Lysander's house after his death of some treasonable pamphlets.<sup>3</sup>

Chapter XXVII is devoted by Plutarch to an account of the complaints which Lysander ( i.e. the Spartans ) had against the Thebans, as a result of which the Corinthian War ( 395 - 387 B.C. ) broke out.

Lysander died before Agesilaus returned from Asia Minor; before his death, he had " plunged into, or plunged Greece into ", the Boeotian War. This war is usually termed the Corinthian War<sup>4</sup>; but there is no need to assume<sup>5</sup> that because Plutarch calls

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, XXVIII, 7-9.      <sup>2</sup> Lysander, XXXIX, 7-11.      <sup>3</sup> Lysander, XLII, 3 - 5.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Pausanias, IV, 17, 14: ὁ τε ἰσχυρῶς Κορινθιακὸς πόλεμος ἐπὶ τῷ τῷ  
ἐξ ἡμῶν τῶν Ἰσπάρτων.

<sup>5</sup> As does R. Dippel, Ibid. p. 101, quoted by J. Smits, Plutarchus, Loven van Lysander, p. 235.



it the " Boeotian War ", he is therefore here using an unknown Boeotian source; for it was natural enough for Plutarch, himself a Boeotian, to apply the name of his state to the war, as Thebes played a greater part in the conflict than did Corinth.

Plutarch is completely non-committal about the cause of, and responsibility for, the war. He says that some writers consider that Lysander was responsible ( but by Lysander he obviously means the Spartans ); others attribute responsibility to the Thebans. But, despite this refusal of Plutarch to commit himself about the responsibility, he seems to be drawing upon a source which held that the Thebans were to blame for the outbreak of the war - for the chapter consists of four charges brought by Lysander against the Thebans. At the same time, it is clear that Plutarch approves of the general attitude of the Thebans towards the Spartan decrees.

According to Plutarch, the Spartans charged the Thebans with:

- 1 ) Throwing down from the altar the sacrifices which Agesilaus had made at Aulis,
- 2 ) Accepting Persian bribes to stir up war in Greece against Sparta,
- 3 ) Being the only Spartan allies to lay claim to a tenth part of the spoils of the Peloponnesian War,
- 4 ) Encouraging the Athenian democrats to action against the Spartan-sponsored Thirty, by offering asylum to

Athenian refugees, and sending arms and money to Thrasybulus and his troops.

Xenophon makes it clear<sup>1</sup> that the Spartans were glad to seize the pretext for a campaign against Thebes, and enumerates four complaints of the Spartans against Thebes, three of which are mentioned by Plutarch in this chapter. But Xenophon's order is different. He first describes<sup>2</sup> the bribing of the Thebans, Corinthians and Argives by the Persian, ~~Thithraustes~~, and their attack upon the Phocians, who appealed to Sparta for aid.

He then<sup>3</sup> gives three reasons for the undertaking of the war against Thebes:

- 1 ) Spartan anger at the Theban claim to a tenth part of the spoils of war,
- 2 ) Theban unwillingness ( shared by the Corinthians ) to join with the Spartans in an attack upon the Piraeus, when it was held by the democrats from Phyle,
- 3 ) Spartan recollection that Thebans had cast down from the altar at Aulis the sacrifices made by Agesilaus, and had refused to accompany him to Asia Minor.

Plutarch makes this last charge his first: " that the Thebans had cast away the sacrifices at Aulis ". According to

---

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, III, 5, 5.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, III, 5, 1 & 3 - 4.

<sup>3</sup> Hellenica, III, 5, 5.

Xenophon, Agosilaus determined, before he sailed to Ephesus, to offer sacrifices at Aulis, " where Agamemnon offered sacrifices before he sailed to Troy ". But when he was there, *οἱ Βοιωτάρχαι*, learning that he was sacrificing, sent a force of cavalry to forbid the sacrifices and they tore down from the altar the offerings which he had already made.

The same story, with various additions, is told elsewhere by Plutarch.<sup>2</sup>

Pausanias<sup>3</sup> says that armed Thebans came upon Agosilaus as he was sacrificing, threw his sacrifices from the altar and drove him from the sanctuary.

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, III, 4, 3 - 4.

<sup>2</sup> In the Life of Agosilaus ( VI, 6 - 11 ), Plutarch says that Agosilaus was commanded to offer the sacrifices by a vision which appeared to him in a dream; he therefore offered a garlanded hind, and ordered the priests of the goddess to make the sacrifices, and not the priests appointed by the Boeotians. The Boeotians therefore threw down his sacrifices, and Agosilaus departed, angered at the Thebans.

In the Life of Pelopidas a different tradition is being followed; for the goddess herself appeared to Agosilaus in a dream, asking for the sacrifice of his daughter; but he refused, and *ἀπαρῆλθαισθεῖς κατέλυσε τὴν στρατίαν, ἔδωκεν καὶ ἑταίῳ*. (Pelopidas, XXI, 5).

In both these references, Agosilaus is the protagonist, and not Lysander; yet Plutarch, Lysander, XXVII, 3, seems to imply that the insult was directed against Lysander by the Thebans.

<sup>3</sup> III, 9, 1 - 5.

Plutarch's second charge against the Thebans is that two of their representatives, ANDROCLEIDES and AMPHITHEUS, accepted bribes from the Persians to cause a war against the Spartans in Greece; and invaded the territory of the Phocians, the allies of Sparta.

This is confirmed by Xenophon<sup>1</sup>, whose more detailed account states that the Persian Tithraustes, in an attempt to drive Agesilaus from Asia, sent Timocrates of Rhodes with fifty talents to bribe τὸν ἑποβητικόν ἐν ἰσθμῷ to stir up war in Greece against Sparta. Timocrates gave bribes to ANDROCLEIDAS, ISMENIAS and GALAXIDORUS in Thebes, to Timobaus and Polyanthes in Corinth, and to Cylon and others in Argos. Although the Athenians accepted no bribes, they were eager to assist against Sparta. With the aid of the Opuntian Locrians, the Thebans invaded Phocis, whose inhabitants invoked Spartan aid.

Pausanias<sup>2</sup> says that ANDROCLEIDES, ISMENIAS and AMPHITHEUS, the Thebans, were bribed by Tithraustes to stir up war against Sparta in Greece, and so force the Spartans to recall their troops from Asia.

Polyaenus<sup>3</sup> gives a different version; he writes that Conon, now an ally of Pharnabazus, persuaded the Persian ( while Agesilaus was ravaging Asia Minor ) to send money to the democratic elements in the Greek cities, who urged their

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, 111, 5, 1 - 4.

<sup>2</sup> 111, 9, 8.

<sup>3</sup> 1, 48, 3: cf. Lysias ( XVI, 13 ) & Andocides ( 111, 25 ).

fellow-citizens to war against Sparta. Thus the Corinthian War broke out and the Spartans were forced to recall Agesilaus.

The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia<sup>1</sup> has a long and detailed account of the outbreak of the Corinthian War; its author refers both to the influence of Tithraustes,<sup>2</sup> and to that of Conon, now an ally of Pharnabazus.<sup>3</sup> The sum of two hundred and twenty talents, out of a total sum of seven hundred talents which was given to Tithraustes for the prosecution of the war against the Spartans, is mentioned as having been given by Tithraustes to Conon.<sup>4</sup> The names of the democratic leaders in Thebes are given as ISMENIAS, ANTITHEUS and ANDROCLEIDAS;<sup>5</sup> but, according to this author, the Corinthian War had already broken out before any financial help was received from the Persians.

It may be noted that Plutarch and Xenophon alone seem to single out the Thebans for special accusation for these actions which they seem to have shared in common with the Corinthians, Argives, and indeed Athenians.

Plutarch notes the anger of Lysander against Thebes on two further points. They alone of the Spartan allies laid claim to a tenth part of the spoils of the Peloponnesian War, and were indignant about the money which Lysander had sent to Sparta. They also gave help to the enemies of the Thirty tyrants set up

<sup>1</sup> XI - XII

<sup>2</sup> VIII, 1-2; XIV, 1 & 3; XVI, 1.

<sup>3</sup> XIV, 1 - 3.

<sup>4</sup> XIV, 3.

<sup>5</sup> XI, 1.

by Lysander, by decreeing that Boeotia should welcome Athenian refugees, and by allowing Thrasybulus and his followers to use Theban arms and money to counter-attack the tyrants at Athens.

Xenophon<sup>1</sup> says that the Spartans had been angry with the Thebans for some time; he specifies by name no one but the Thebans as having actually made the demand for a share in the spoils; but there is a subsequent passage<sup>2</sup> in Xenophon which shows that not only the Corinthians, but other allies also, sympathized in it. This request<sup>3</sup> of Thebes, which annoyed the Spartans so much, is not recorded by Xenophon in what one might assume to be the most appropriate context, but he alludes to it as having occurred before. Xenophon says nothing specifically about the Thebans' indignation at the sending of money<sup>4</sup> to Sparta by Lysander at the close of the Peloponnesian War.

Plutarch claims that the Thebans helped the Athenians to free themselves from the Thirty, (whose power had been increased by the Spartan decree that all Athenians throughout Greece should return to their city ) by ordering asylum to be offered in Boeotia to Athenian refugees, by laying down a fine of one talent upon any Boeotian who failed to help Athenian

---

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, 111, 5, 5.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, 111, 5, 12.

<sup>3</sup> Justin ( V, 10, 2 ) mentions the Theban demand, which was refused by the Spartans: " Thebani .... legatos ad Lacedaemonios mittunt, qui ex manubiis portionem praedae communis belli periculique peterent " .

<sup>4</sup> For the money sent to Sparta, cf. Lysander, XVI, 1, and Hellenica, 11, 3, 8.

fugitives, and by arming and financing the troops of Thrasybulus at Phyle.

Xenophon is certainly aware that Thrasybulus used Thebes as a starting-off point from which to occupy Phyle; but although he mentions that many Athenian exiles from the city flocked to Megara and Thebes,<sup>2</sup> he has no knowledge of any Theban decree that under pain of fine Boeotians must help Athenians refugees, or of any active assistance given by the Thebans to Thrasybulus and his fellow-democrats. Nor indeed does Xenophon record any decisions made by the Spartans after the setting-up of the Thirty, that all Athenian refugees should be sent back to their city under pain of enmity with Sparta.<sup>3</sup>

Plutarch states explicitly that the power of the Thirty had been increased by the driving back to Athens of all Athenian fugitives; but neither Xenophon nor Diodorus express it like this. Diodorus<sup>4</sup> confirms what Plutarch has written about the Spartan decree to drive back to Athens all her citizens, and about the Theban counter-decrees, to the effect that Boeotia should welcome under pain of a fine all Athenian fugitives; but Diodorus makes the fine five talents, while Plutarch refers to one talent only.

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, II, 4,2; Diodorus, XIV, 32, 1; Lysander, XXI, 3 - 4.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, II, 4, 1.

<sup>3</sup> For in Hellenica, II, 2,2, Lysander forces the Athenians to return to their city under safe conduct, so that the eventual fall of the city might be expedited through lack of food: cf. Lysander, XIII, 3.

<sup>4</sup> XIV, 6, 1: ἐγγράψαντο γὰρ τοὺς Ἀθηναίων πολέμιους ἐξ ἑαυτῶν τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἑταίρους τοὺς ἰσπεκοντο ἄντι.

Lysander, XXVII, 5: ἐγγράψαντο τοὺς πολέμιους ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν ἑταίρους ἑαυτῶν πανταχόθεν.

Justin ( V, 9,4 ): " ... civitates exules recipere prohibebantur "

But Diodorus places this much earlier, immediately before the fall of Athens and the setting-up of the Thirty; and to the same time he refers the counter-decrees of the Thebans.<sup>1</sup>

The words of praise for the Theban decrees<sup>2</sup> are peculiar to Plutarch, and naturally to be expected from a Boeotian who is happy to record anything complimentary to his own state; Heracles and Dionysus<sup>3</sup>, both sons of Zeus, were gods held in principal honour among the Boeotians, second only to Apollo.

While the greater part of this chapter is peculiar to Plutarch, it is based upon Xenophon ( although it does not follow his order of events ), but has some similarity to the record of Diodorus, particularly where Plutarch is referring to the Theban attitude towards Sparta after the fall of Athens. The sentences, and paragraphs, peculiar to Plutarch seem to be for the most part the biographer's own reflexions and comments upon the events themselves.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> XIV, 6, 1-3.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XXVII, 6 & 7: *πρέποντα καὶ ἰδελγὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησι καὶ Διορίσῳ ἡγεῖσθαι . . . Ἕλλησιν καὶ φιλήθροισιν.*

<sup>3</sup> cf. Lysander, XXVIII, 7.

<sup>4</sup> e.g., XXVII, 1-2 is a non-committal presentation of two viewpoints about the outbreak of the Corinthian War; XXVII, 6-7 contain praise for the Theban counter-decrees because of their philanthropic sentiments. Paragraphs 4, 5 & 7 alone introduce new facts; XXVII, 4, expresses indignation of the Thebans at the sending off of money to Sparta by Lysander; in XXVII, 5, the effect of the Spartan decree is to increase the fear-inspiring power of the Thirty at Athens; in XXVII, 7, Plutarch says that the Thebans provided Thrasybulus and the defenders of Phyle with arms, money, secrecy and a base of operations.



If the assumption is correct that Plutarch took his information from Theopompus, then we may ascribe any additional information in this chapter, and any divergencies from Xenophon, to Theopompus and his sources. Certainly, Plutarch's source seems to be somewhat pro-Theban' ( unless Plutarch's patriotism has coloured his account ), and antipathetic towards Sparta, although not necessarily antipathetic towards Lysander himself. While Plutarch states the grounds of complaint which Sparta had against Thebes, and thereby implies the responsibility of Thebes for the outbreak of the war, yet one may assume from this chapter that the actions of the Thebans are in fact approved by the biographer or his source. It is not necessary, however, to assume that Plutarch found in Theopompus personal responsibility ascribed to Lysander, for Plutarch himself would obviously substitute the name of Lysander for that of the Spartans, which he would find in his source, when it seemed likely to him that Lysander was taking an active part in any negotiations, discussions or military actions.

---

Of course, it is not impossible that Theopompus, like Ephorus, made use of Daimachus of Plataea for those parts of his history which concerned Boeotia.

CHAPTER XXVIII

Plutarch describes the events which led up to the death of Lysander outside the walls of Haliartus. Lysander is the protagonist in this chapter - he urges the ephors to undertake the war; he assumes the command and sets out for Boeotia; fulfilling his part in the campaign, he takes over Orchomenus and plunders Lebadeia, then sends a dispatch to Pausanias, bidding him join forces at Haliartus. This dispatch is intercepted by the Thebans, who leave an Athenian garrison in Thebes and arrive at Haliartus before Lysander. The latter, tired of waiting for Pausanias, makes an attack on the city and is killed, with a thousand of his troops.

Clearly, much of this chapter is based ultimately upon Xenophon; but it seems obvious that Plutarch is in possession of additional information, which seems to be given from a Theban viewpoint, and which offers a different interpretation of some of the facts.

---

Hellenica, III, 5, 6 & 17 - 19.

In this paragraph Plutarch's language is somewhat obscure; he seems to suggest that Lysander, now in old age a harsh and melancholic man,<sup>1</sup> persuaded the ephors to fit out an expedition against Thebes,<sup>2</sup> and assumed command of it; afterwards, the ephors also sent out Pausanias with an army.

Xenophon says nothing about Lysander's initiative; he has just expressed the view that Sparta was glad to seize the pretext for a campaign against the Thebans, and after enumerating the grounds of complaint against Thebes, he records that the ephors " prepared an expedition and sent out Lysander to the Phocians ". So far from Lysander being in command of considerable forces, Xenophon states explicitly that Pausanias " was intended to take command " , and had arranged to meet Lysander at Haliartus on an agreed day.

The Hellenica Oxyrhynchia<sup>3</sup> refers the outbreak of the war to an appeal by the Phocians to Sparta for help against the Boeotians.<sup>4</sup>

Diodorus' brief account<sup>5</sup> says that the Spartans sent out Lysander with a few soldiers. He thus agrees with Xenophon rather than with Plutarch; for Plutarch gives the impression that two armies were sent out by the Spartans, one under Lysander

<sup>1</sup> cf. Lysander, II, 5, and XXII, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XXVIII, 1: φῆναι φρονεῖν; cf. Hellenica, III, 5, 6: φρονεῖν ... οἱ ἔφοροι ἔφαινον.

<sup>3</sup> XIII, 4.

<sup>4</sup> As indeed does Xenophon, Hellen., III, 5, 4.

<sup>5</sup> XIV, 81, 1.

(*εργαζόμενος ἔχει πολλούς*), and the other, afterwards, under the king Pausanias. But Xenophon makes it clear that Lysander was to raise a force of allies in Phocis and the neighbouring countryside, with which Pausanias was to unite his troops.<sup>1</sup>

Plutarch suggests that the plan of action was for Pausanias to make a circuit of Mount Cithaeron and invade Boeotia from the south, while Lysander marched through Phocis to join forces with him from the north. Plutarch gives much more geographical information about the movements of Lysander and Pausanias towards Haliartus than is found in Xenophon or Diodorus. This does perhaps suggest that Plutarch is here dependent upon local information, for Orchomenus, Lebadeia and Haliartus were all a very short distance from the biographer's native Chaeronea; and records of the battle, oral if not written, may well have been preserved up to Plutarch's own day.

Xenophon says that the prearranged plan of the Spartans was for Lysander and Pausanias to meet at Haliartus, after Lysander had collected allied troops in Phocis; this Lysander did, after winning over Orchomenus from the Thebans. But Xenophon does not mention the capture of Lebadeia, and suggests that Pausanias delayed at Tegea collecting troops, and then marched into Boeotia with all his forces.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, III, 5, 6.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, III, 5, 17.

5

According to Plutarch, after the sacking of Lebadœia Lysander sent a letter to Pausanias, who was at Plataea, to bid him advance to Haliartus where Lysander himself would arrive at day-break. This letter fell into the hands of the Thebans, who left an Athenian force to guard Thebes, and marched forthwith, " early in the night ", to Haliartus; there, anticipating Lysander, they augmented the garrison with many of their own troops.

Little of this information is to be found in Xenophon, who has already stated that the plan agreed upon by the Spartan authorities was that Pausanias and Lysander should join forces at Haliartus. Xenophon does not refer to Pausanias' presence at Plataea; he knows nothing of any letter sent by Lysander to Pausanias and falling into the hands of the Thebans. While he seems to agree that the Athenians guarded Thebes when the Thebans took the offensive<sup>1</sup>, he says that Lysander reached Haliartus before the main body of the Thebans arrived at the city, tried to win it over to the Spartan side by persuasion, but was foiled by some Thebans " on the walls ", and therefore made an attack upon its fortifications.

Pausanias<sup>2</sup> states that Lysander came to Phocis, collected the whole army of the Phocians and assaulted the walls of Haliartus. Already a band of Athenians and Thebans had secretly

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. Hellenica, 111, 5, 16-17.

<sup>2</sup> 111, 5, 3.

entered the city; they came out and offered battle, killing several Spartans, including Lysander.

Diodorus<sup>1</sup>, who relates most briefly the defeat and death of Lysander, says that Lysander first captured Haliartus and the Boeotians found it occupied by him when they arrived.

It may be noticed that Plutarch does not in fact diverge very much from Xenophon and Pausanias; his points of difference consist of additional information of an intensely local character; he describes the attack upon Haliartus and the death of Lysander beneath its walls with much greater detail than is found in Xenophon, giving the impression that he is following an eye-witness account.

7 Lysander decided at first to wait for Pausanias outside Haliartus; but as the day advanced, he grew impatient<sup>2</sup> and led his troops along the road to the city. Those Thebans who had remained outside the city advanced upon his rear at the spring called *Κισσαῖον*. The 'road' to which Plutarch refers must be the main highway south of Lake Copais, from Lebadeia via Coronea to Haliartus.

Xenophon's account is brief and not dissimilar.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> XLV, 81, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XXVIII, 6: *ἀπερεῖν ὡς θυμῶνος*. According to J. Smits, *Ibid.* p. 244, *ἀπερεῖν* is an Ionic word for the *ἔσυχιν ἔχον* of Xenophon.

<sup>3</sup> *Hellenica*, III, 5, 18 - 19: *ὁ δὲ Λύσανδρος ἔγχευ τὸ ἐπὶ θάλασσαν ... ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν, ἔπειτα τὸν Πανσθένειον ἐν τῷ Ἀλιάρτῳ γινόμενος ... ἐν οἷς ἔχον ἔειπε πρὸς τὸ τέλος τῶν Ἀλιάρτιων ... ἐκείθεν δὲ ταῦτα οἱ Θηβαῖοι ἐσπῶν ἐβούλευσαν οἷα τε δὴ κῆρυξ καὶ οἱ ἱππῆες.*

At this point in his narrative Plutarch digresses to pass on some information about Haliartus and its local legends with which he was familiar. This information has no bearing upon the Life of Lysander, nor connection with the attack of Lysander upon Haliartus. But, as Plutarch is here describing his own home-state, he may be pardoned for yielding to the temptation to record a number of local legends which he would hope that his readers would find interesting. There were three places of local interest near Haliartus, with each of which a legend was associated:

1 ) The spring called *Κισσόνεσσα* ; apart from Plutarch's reference here to this spring ( and his mention<sup>1</sup> of a spring called *Κισσόνεσσα* near to Haliartus ), we have no other evidence of its existence. But Pausanias<sup>2</sup> tells us that there was a spring, *Τραφόνεσσα* , some fifty stades from Haliartus.

A legend records that his nurses bathed the infant Dionysus in this spring<sup>3</sup> after his birth - hence the sparkle, clarity and sweetness to the taste of its water ( Plutarch is surely writing from experience ! ). A tale of this type was not uncommonly associated with other places also which claimed to be the birth-places of the god.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Narr. Amat., 772 B.

<sup>2</sup> IX, 33; called *Τραφόνεσσα* by Strabo, IX, 9.

<sup>3</sup> The name of the fountain is interesting, for it is etymologically akin to the Greek for ivy (*κισσός* ), associated with the worship of Dionysus, one of the gods specially revered by the Boeotians ( cf. Lysander, XVII, 6 ).

<sup>4</sup> Diodorus ( III, 66 ) says much the same about the town of Teos, on the coast of Asia Minor.

2 ) Near this spring there grows in profusion " Cretan storax-shrub ", a plant producing a sweet-smelling resin. This plant was not peculiar to Crete or Boeotia, for Herodotus<sup>2</sup> noted its growth in Arabia, and tells us that it was a source of frankincense; while Strabo<sup>3</sup>, following the authority of Artemidorus, places the site of its growth on the African continent, at the south of the Red Sea, among the Ichthyophagi; from there it would be carried over to Arabia. Pliny<sup>4</sup> specifies Syria as an abundant source of the plant, while Vergil<sup>5</sup> speaks of " Storax Idaeus ".

Plutarch says that the people of Haliartus interpreted the presence of ' storax ' near this spring as a proof that Rhadamanthus once dwelt there, and point out his tomb, which they call *Ἄλεα*.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> cf. Aristotle, H.A., IV, 8, 27; Theophrastus, H. P., IX, 7, 3; Diosc., I, 79; Strabo, XII, 7, 3.

<sup>2</sup> III, 107.

<sup>3</sup> XIV, 4.

<sup>4</sup> N.H., XII, 124.

<sup>5</sup> Georg., 167.

<sup>6</sup> *Ἄλεα* (Teubner); it is not clear what Plutarch means by the naming of the tomb of Rhadamanthus as *Ἄλεα*; in De Gen. Soc., 578 A, he twice refers to a hero, Aleos; yet Aleos was the name of the honoured hero of Tggee ( cf. Pausanias, VIII, 4, 4 ). Rhadamanthus, son of Zeus and Europe, one of the judges of the underworld ( Vergil, Aeneid, VI, 566; Ovid, Metamorphoses, IX, 435; Pausanias, VIII, 53 etc. ), was born in Crete, according to tradition, although he later ruled over some of the islands of the Cyclades. He fled from his brother Minos to Boeotia, where he married Alkmene, widow of Amphitryon, and retired to Ocaloa, which lies between Coronea and Haliartus ( cf. Apollodorus, Biblioth., II, 4, 11, 7; III, 1, 2, 3. ).



3) Nearby is also the tomb of Alcmena, mother of Heracles<sup>1</sup>, and wife of Amphitryon and Rhadamanthus; Plutarch records the claim of the Haliartians that she was buried in Boeotia. Pausanias<sup>2</sup> says that the people of Megara claimed that the tomb of Alcmena was in their territory.

It is certain that all these local legends were well-known to Plutarch, probably by oral tradition; the long association of Heracles and Dionysus with Boeotia was bound to give rise to a whole crop of stories about them and their connections, and these stories persisted until the days of Plutarch and beyond.

12 After his digressions on the Haliartus legends, Plutarch returns to his account of the battle outside the town and the death of Lysander. He says that when the Thebans in the town saw Lysander approach, they suddenly throw open the gates and fell upon him and his troops. Lysander himself was killed (by Neochorus of Haliartus<sup>3</sup>), with his soothsayer and a few of his men; the remainder fled back to the main body of troops, which was hard-pressed by the Thebans and fled to the hills, losing a thousand of their men. Three hundred Thebans, who showed

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. Lysander, XLVII, 6.

<sup>2</sup> 1,39,4; 1,41,1; IX,16,7; but cf. Plutarch, De Gen. Soc., 577 E.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XXIX, 9.

the greater recklessness because their good faith had been in doubt, were slain as they pursued the Spartans over difficult terrain.

The account of Diodorus<sup>1</sup> is most brief; he merely states that Lysander fell in the fighting inside Haliartus with many of the Spartans and allies, and about two hundred Thebans also lost their lives.

There is a longer account in Xenophon,<sup>2</sup> which in some respects is close to that of Plutarch. He says that when Lysander attacked the fortifications of Haliartus, the Theban heavy-armed troops and cavalry attacked him (presumably, from the rear). Xenophon then expresses doubt as to whether Lysander was aware of the presence of these Thebans outside the town - at any rate, the battle took place "alongside the fortifications". Lysander was killed, and the Thebans eagerly pursued his troops to the hills, where advancing over rough country they were driven back, with the loss of more than two hundred. But Xenophon knows nothing about Lysander's *μάρτυς*<sup>3</sup>; he gives no numbers of the Spartan slain, and has no information about the special reason (given by Plutarch) for the eager and rash pursuit of the Spartans by some of the Thebans, whose good faith was in doubt and who were anxious to clear themselves of this charge.

<sup>1</sup> XIV, 81, 1-2.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, III, 5, 19 - 20.

<sup>3</sup> Was this the same soothsayer as the Agias, mentioned by Pausanias (X, 9, 7) as having a statue erected to himself at Delphi? Or was it perhaps one of the ephors sent to superintend Lysander; we know that part of the functions of the ephorate was to watch the heavens and act as astrologers (cf. Cicero, De Div., I, 43, 96; Plut., Cleom., VII; Pausanias, III, 26, 1; cf. H. Michell, Sparta, p. 120).

Again, it seems likely that Plutarch's principal source is Theopompus, using Xenophon. But it is certain that Plutarch supplemented his source with many additional details which he may well have found in the local records of Haliartus. Apart from paragraphs 7 - 9, where the tradition seems to be oral, there is much information in this chapter of an eye-witness nature, which is only to be expected. Haliartus was not much more than twenty miles from Chaeronea, where Plutarch was writing his Lives, and the town would undoubtedly cherish its records about the last fight in which the famous Lysander was engaged and perished - to the credit of the Haliartians.

Almost all the information peculiar to Plutarch is local, and may have been gained from Haliartians themselves by Plutarch, rather than through his principal source, Theopompus. This local information includes the plundering of Lebadeia by Lysander, the interception by the Thebans of Lysander's dispatch to Pausanias, the three specific references to the time<sup>2</sup>, the detailed account of the troop-movements of the Thebans inside and outside the town of Haliartus, the mention of Lysander's soothsayer as being killed with him, the numbers of the slain ( especially the high numbers of the Spartans - a thousand ), and the knowledge of a body of Thebans who throw away their lives for honour's sake,

---

<sup>1</sup> Polybius ( XII, 27, 4 ) seems to suggest that many towns had their own libraries or collections of records and documents;  
cf. E.A.Parsons, The Alexandrian Library, London, 1952, pp. 16 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XXVIII, 3: ἐπὶ ἡμέρῃ ; XXVIII, 5: περὶ πρῶτον ἡμέραν;  
XXVIII, 6: περὶ ἑξῆς τῆς ἡμέρας.

since they had been accused of favouring Sparta!

All this information ( with much of chapter **XXIX** also<sup>1</sup> ) testifies to a local source, for it describes the engagement from a Theban viewpoint.

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. also, Lysander, **XXIX**, 9, where similar local information passes on the name of the man of Haliartus who actually killed Lysander in the fight; he, no doubt, would be honoured for all time in his native town.

<sup>2</sup> Especially, **XXIX**, 9 - 12.

CHAPTER XXIX

The greater part of this chapter is peculiar to Plutarch. He describes the arrival of Pausanias at Haliartus, on receipt of the tidings of the disaster, and his disagreement with the Spartan ' elders ' about the advisability of making a truce with the Thebans. The truce was made with the Thebans, and the body of Lysander was recovered and buried just beyond the borders of Boeotia.

There follows an anecdote, illustrated by an oracle, about the death of Lysander - with an alternative interpretation of the oracle, and then a further oracle about the battle of Haliartus. The information given in these paragraphs<sup>1</sup> is only to be found in Plutarch.

Plutarch repeats his information about Pausanias' encampment at Plataea,<sup>2</sup> and describes how the Spartan king received the tidings of the disaster as he was moving from Plataea to Thespiae, and hastened on to Haliartus.

---

<sup>1</sup> XXIX, 5 - 12.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Lysander, XXVIII, 3.

Xenophon<sup>1</sup> does not tell us exactly where Pausanias had encamped. We hear that he was at Tegea in Arcadia,<sup>2</sup> and then appeared at Haliartus after the battle. Nor does Xenophon mention the arrival of Thrasybulus from Thebes, as does Plutarch; he merely states that Athenian troops arrived at Haliartus one day after Pausanias, and two days after the battle.

3 It seems very likely from these paragraphs that Plutarch's source set out to blacken the character of Pausanias; for, according to Plutarch, when Pausanias intended to ask for the bodies of the dead under a truce, the Spartan 'elders' objected and urged the king to recover the body of Lysander by force of arms - if they were unsuccessful in a battle, "it would be a glorious thing to lie dead with their general". But Pausanias determined to ask for a truce for two reasons:

- 1 ) It would be difficult to conquer the Thebans, now "flushed with victory",
- 2 ) Lysander's body lay near the fortifications; so that, even if they were successful enough to approach the walls of Haliartus, they could not even then retrieve the body without presumably capturing the town.

Xenophon's account is quite different;<sup>3</sup> he knows nothing about any discussions between Pausanias and his advisers, and

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, 111, 5, 2 - 22.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, 111, 5, 7.

<sup>3</sup> Hellenica, 111, 5, 22 - 24.

he makes it clear that the Spartan King and his military colleagues had substantial reasons for requiring a truce. He says that Pausanias called together all his officers and deliberated whether to fight it out or to ask for the bodies of the slain under a truce. They all agreed to ask for a truce for those reasons:

- 1 ) Lysander was dead and his army defeated and dispersed,
- 2 ) The Corinthians had been unwilling to support the Spartans in this Boeotian venture, and those allied troops which Pausanias had with him were not enthusiastic,
- 3 ) The enemy's cavalry were superior to their own,
- 4 ) " Most of all " ( and in this point alone Xenophon agrees with Plutarch ), the dead lay beneath the walls, and even if the Spartans were successful in an engagement, it would not be easy to take up the bodies because of the guards on the walls of Haliartus.

Xenophon also adds that the Thebans were unwilling to agree to a truce unless the Spartans evacuated Boeotia.

This paragraph is peculiar to Plutarch. As soon as the Spartans had evacuated Boeotia, they buried the body of Lysander just within the borders of Phocis, in the territory of their

allies, the Panopeans, " where his monument now stands, by the road leading from Delphi to Chaeronea ".

This Panopeus<sup>1</sup> lies on the borders of Boeotia and Phocis, twenty stades from Chaeronea.<sup>2</sup> Pausanias<sup>3</sup> says that the tomb of Lysander is in Haliartus; but Plutarch no doubt indicates, by his use of the word  $\nu\nu\nu$ , that Lysander's spulchre - or what purported to be his tomb - lying so close to his native Chaeronea, was still to be seen in his day; and Plutarch would certainly have visited the place.

7 There follows an anecdote, leading up to the interpretation of an oracle alleged to have been given to Lysander. Plutarch says that while the Spartans were encamped at Panopeus in Phocis, a certain Phocian who had taken part in the fighting outside Haliartus was recounting the story to a fellow-Phocian, when a Spartan from Pausanias' forces heard him say that Lysander had been killed shortly after 'crossing the 'Hoplites'. The Spartan inquired the meaning of 'Hoplites', to be told that it was a river flowing past Haliartus. Whereupon, the Spartan in great grief said that man could not escape his destiny, for thus the fate of Lysander had been foretold to him

---

<sup>1</sup> Called  $\phi\alpha\nu\omega\pi\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$  by Thucydides ( IV, 89, 1 ) and Strabo ( IX, 423 ), in the district of  $\phi\alpha\nu\omega\pi\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$  ( Thucy., IV, 76, 3 ); but referred to as ' Panopeus ' by Homer ( Iliad II, 520; XVII, 307; Odyssey XI, 581 ), and Pausanias ( X, 4, 1 ).

<sup>2</sup> cf. Pausanias, X, 4, 1.

<sup>3</sup> IX, 32, 5.



in an oracle:

Ὀπλίτην κηλεύδοντα φηλέσθαι σε κελώνω  
γῆς τε δρᾶκονθ' εἶον δόλιον κηλέπεσθαι ἴοντα.

A stream named the 'Hoplitos' near Haliartus is otherwise not known; Pausanias<sup>2</sup> refers to the river Lophis (έν τῇ Ἀλικαρτίᾳ ), which flows into Lake Cópais. The Lophis and the Hoplitos may be one and the same stream, Pausanias giving the name by which it was known in his day. But Plutarch is not himself sure about this river, for he quotes an alternativo, and more reasonable, interpretation of the oracle<sup>3</sup>, where the word 'hoplites' must be interpreted as indicating the soldier from Haliartus who killed Lysander.<sup>4</sup>

The anecdote about the Phocian is passed on by Plutarch, for what it is worth, without reference to any authority,<sup>5</sup> and without the expression of Plutarch's own views about its reliability. But he seems to suggest that the application of the word 'Hoplites' to a river near Haliartus is probably unlikely.

Plutarch proceeds to explain that some writers say that the Hoplites is a winter torrent near Coronea, which joins the Philarus;<sup>6</sup> this torrent, formerly called the 'Hopliss',

<sup>1</sup> of. Plutarch, De Pyth. Orac., 408 A - B.

<sup>2</sup> IX, 33, 3.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XXXIX, 8 - 9.

<sup>4</sup> In this case, the word κηλεύδοντα ( an Epic word ) must be translated by " shouting " or " raising a cry of victory ".

<sup>5</sup> Lysander, XXXIX, 5: λόγεται.

<sup>6</sup> Teubner: Φάλαρος.

was called the ' Isomantus ' in Plutarch's day. Therefore, suggests Plutarch, the former interpretation of the oracle is a false one. It is more reasonable to assume that the oracle referred to the soldier of Haliartus who killed Lysander in the fight, and was wearing the emblem of a dragon upon his shield.

As in chapter XXVIII, much of the information here is local; and Plutarch was, of course, familiar with the names of the streams in the neighbourhood of his birthplace, and with any stories and legends associated with, or attached to, them.

The name of Neechorus, the killer of Lysander, with the details of his shield-emblem, was probably to be found in the oral or written traditions of Haliartus; and it is perhaps likely that Lysander's oracle was known and quoted locally.

12

While Plutarch is mentioning Lysander's oracle and its possible interpretations, he is reminded of an oracle which the Thebans also received, and which could be interpreted in terms of the battle of Delium<sup>2</sup> ( 424 B.C. ), in which the Boeotians were successful, or of the battle of Haliartus, in which Boeotia fought and defeated her former ally, Sparta.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pausanias ( IX, 34, 5 ) makes reference to the river Phalarus near Coronea. The small stream, the Koplias, was probably a tributary of the Phalarus, and, in Plutarch's own opinion ( or so it seems ), had no connection with this oracle about the fate of Lysander.

<sup>2</sup> of. Thucydides, IV, 89 - 90.

Plutarch says that this oracle was given to the Thebans, during the Peloponnesian War, at the sanctuary of Ismenus.

Pausanias<sup>2</sup> tells us that there was a hill sacred to Apollo near the city of Thebes, by which flowed the river Ismenus; and it is made clear by earlier writers that there was a temple of Apollo on this hill - possibly a colony from that at Delphi, for Ismenus was one of the sons of Apollo.<sup>3</sup>

Apparently an oracle was given to the Thebans at this sanctuary, which was interpreted as applying to the two invasions of Boeotia by enemies. After quoting the oracle, Plutarch interprets parts of it:

*Ἐσχυτιᾶν περὶ ἄλφο Λύκους κατὰ κέσσι δοκίμων  
καὶ λόγον ὄρχαλίδων, ὃν ἄλφειος ἄπορε λυίται.*

The border, says Plutarch, means the parts of Boeotia around Delium to the north east, bordering on Attica;

'Orchalides' is the hilly country to the south of Lake Copais, from Haliartus up to Mount Helicon. Plutarch

adds that 'Orchalides' was called 'Fox-hill' (Ἀλώϊσκας) in his day.

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, XXXIX, 10: ἐν Ἴσμενίῳ ; ἐν Ἴσμενίῳ (Toubner).

<sup>2</sup> IX, 10, 2.

<sup>3</sup> Pindar (Pyth., XI, 1 - 10) calls on the Theban heroines, Semelo, Ino Loucothea and Alcmene, to come to the temple honoured by Apollo and called by him the 'Ismenian shrine', the seat of truthful oracles (Ἴσμενίον δῖόν τε φανερὸν ἄλφειον ἄπορε λυίται). Herodotus also (I, 92; V, 59; VIII, 134) refers to the temple of Ismenian Apollo near Thebes; cf. also, Sophocles, O.T., 21: ἐπὶ Ἴσμενίῳ τε παντὶ ἄπορε λυίται.

Although it may be assumed that a certain amount of information in this chapter was taken by Plutarch from his source Theopompus ( who may, in fact, have had little time for the Spartan king, Pausanias, and was glad enough to ascribe to him responsibility for the death of Lysander, and the dishonourable truce made with the Thebans<sup>1</sup> ), yet it is certain that the greater part of the chapter is the result of local information. Theopompus may have been familiar with the anecdote about the Phocian and the Spartan, and he may have recorded that Lysander had received an oracle about his own death; for the words of the Spartan soldier<sup>2</sup> do not reflect such credit upon the Thebans for their good fight as one would expect from an anecdote of Theban origin.<sup>3</sup> But if Plutarch found the oracle quoted in Theopompus, he obviously made local inquiries about the names of the rivers, and found a tradition still surviving about Neochorus of Haliartus and his dragon-emblazoned shield. The last three paragraphs of the chapter can hardly have been culled from his principal source.

<sup>1</sup> cf. Lysander, XXX, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XXIX, 7: *Σπάρτιόν ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος τὸ παρρωπίον.*

<sup>3</sup> Nor do the words of the oracle, " an earth-born dragon craftily coming behind you ", suggest a Theban origin; they are not complimentary to Theban fighters. Unless Plutarch had available a collection of oracles relative to Boeotia, one must assume that this oracle came to him from a Spartan or pro-Spartan source; it was not Xenophon, and may therefore have been Theopompus.

CHAPTER XXX

The last chapter of the biography is somewhat scrappy and disconnected, and may be divided into four distinct parts. Plutarch records the exile of Pausanias from Sparta on the ground that his failure to give Lysander adequate military support led to his death; he then affirms that the excellence of Lysander's character was made more clear by his poverty at death; and adds, as if to offset this complimentary picture, the discovery in Lysander's house after his death of a treasonable pamphlet advocating the dissolution of the hereditary kingship; and the chapter concludes with a reference to the honours ( ? ) paid by the authorities to the memory of Lysander after his death, and a description of the Spartan laws governing marriage.

Plutarch says that the Spartan authorities were so indignant with Pausanias for his responsibility in the death of Lysander that they summoned him to Sparta for trial for his life; but he fled to Tegea, where he spent the remainder of his life as a suppliant in the sanctuary of Athena.

Apparently, Plutarch only knows ( or is only interested in ) this one charge against Pausanias.

Xenophon's<sup>1</sup> account is much more detailed; he makes it clear that Pausanias was tried for his life on the following charges:

- 1 ) He arrived late at Haliartus, although an agreed date had been decided upon by Lysander and himself,
- 2 ) He recovered the bodies of the slain by a truce, and not by a battle,
- 3 ) He had allowed the Athenian democrats to escape when they were in his power in the Piraeus,<sup>2</sup>
- 4 ) He was not present in Sparta to stand his trial.

He was therefore condemned to death, but had already fled<sup>3</sup> to Tegea, where he eventually died of disease.

Plutarch ( or his source ) seems to be only interested in the charge respecting Lysander's death before Haliartus, although one must not assume that Theopompus did not quote in his account all the accusations against Pausanias. It is very likely that Plutarch selected this one charge, either because it was emphasised by Theopompus, or because Plutarch might have felt that it would be irrelevant to incorporate all the accusations against Pausanias in a biography of Lysander. It seems possible that Theopompus ( and it is likely that Plutarch is still following his narrative ) had little good to say of

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, III, 5, 25.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Lysander, XXI, 5 - 6; Pausanias ( III, 5, 2 ) tells us that the Spartan king had already been tried for this in 403 B.C., and acquitted.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Justin, VI, 4, 7; Diodorus ( XLV, 89, 1, says: ἐγκαλοῦμενος εἰς τὸ τῶν πολεμίων εἶμαρ.

Pausanias, although the reason is obscure, unless it was that Pausanias openly showed his jealousy of Lysander - the better Spartan, in the opinion of the Isocratean. At any rate, it is significant that on each occasion on which Pausanias is mentioned in the Life of Lysander ( in chapters which may perhaps be attributed to Theopompus ) something is recorded to his detriment, and usually to the credit of Lysander.<sup>1</sup>

Pausanias<sup>2</sup> confirms what Plutarch says about the Spartan king's exile in Togeia as a suppliant in the shrine of Athena; as does Strabo<sup>3</sup>, who alleges that, after Pausanias had been banished because of the hatred of the Eurypontids ( himself being of the house of the Agiads ), while in exile in Togeia he prepared a *λόγος* on the Laws of Lycurgus, who belonged to the house which banished Pausanias.

Here Plutarch, in words of unmixed praise, makes a reference to the *ἀρετή* of Lysander,<sup>4</sup> saying that the discovery that Lysander died a poor man - despite his many opportunities of amassing personal wealth - made his excellence more apparent to all.

Plutarch attributes this statement to Theopompus; and Grenfell and Hunt<sup>5</sup> couple Plutarch's quotation from Theopompus

<sup>1</sup> of. Lysander, XXI, 5 - 7; XXVIII, 6; XXXII, 2 - 3; XXX, 1.

<sup>2</sup> III, 5, 6. <sup>3</sup> VIII, 366.c.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Lysander, I, 1 - 2; XI, 12 ; XXI, 7.

<sup>5</sup> G. & H., 21 b; F.H.G., I, p. 281, 22; F.Gr.H., II B, p.606, 333.

with a quotation from Theopompus in Athenaeus,<sup>1</sup> who refers his quotation from Theopompus to the Tenth Book of the Hellenica. But it is very likely that Plutarch's earlier quotations<sup>2</sup> from Theopompus ( which are quite close in language to the quotation found in Athenaeus ) were from the Tenth Book of the Hellenica, while these concluding references of Plutarch which he attributes to Theopompus may in fact be from a later Book of the Hellenica, where Theopompus is writing a post-mortem evaluation of the Spartan admiral. The Hellenica, in twelve books, covered a period of seventeen years,<sup>3</sup> from Cynossema, 411 B.C., to Gnidus, 394 B.C., and the death of Lysander would probably be recorded in the last book.

Plutarch then passes an interesting comment upon his principal source - a comment which may perhaps explain and account for the uncomplimentary picture of Pausanias given in this biography ! " Theopompus is more to be trusted ", says Plutarch, " when he praises than when he blames; for he takes more pleasure in blaming than in praising ".

This weakness of Theopompus is well attested by other writers<sup>4</sup> who had his works available, and has been considered in detail in the Life of Nicias.

<sup>1</sup> X11, 543 B - C.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, II, 2 - 4.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Diodorus, XIV, 84, 7.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Polybius, VII, 11 - 13; X11, 25: Nepos, Alcibiades, XI: Dion. Hall., Ep. ad Pomp., VI: etc.



Sections 3 - 5 of this chapter, which deal with the finding in Lysander's house after his death of a treasonable speech, will be examined under the heading of the ' Hostile Source ' .

---

cf. Lysander, XLIV, - XLVI, where Plutarch is describing in detail the alleged plot of Lysander to overthrow the constitutional dyarchy of Sparta, and substitute an elective dyarchy in its place; he concludes chapter XLVI with the words, " This was not found out while Lysander was alive, but only after his death " .

8 Plutarch says that, despite the discovery of this treasonable speech, the Spartans honoured Lysander greatly after his death. But, curiously enough, Plutarch tells us of no specific honour paid to Lysander's memory, but merely refers to a fine levied upon two Spartans who dishonoured their engagement to Lysander's daughters when they discovered that he had left no fortune behind him. They were fined, says Plutarch, because they courted Lysander when they thought that he was rich; but when his poverty showed him to be just and good, they forsook him. Plutarch then adds that there was at Sparta a penalty for no marriage, for a late marriage, and for a bad marriage- and the last was defined as a marriage with wealthy instead of with *ὕπεροι* and *ἀκεία*; "such, then, are the accounts we have found given of Lysander".

The anecdote about Lysander's daughters is recorded elsewhere<sup>1</sup> by Plutarch, in very similar words, except that Plutarch there states explicitly that it was the ophors who fined the two men.

Aelian tells the same story twice, but refers only to one suitor and one daughter, applying the story to Lysander's daughter,<sup>2</sup> and also referring it to the daughter of Aristides.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Apoph. Lac., 230 A.

<sup>2</sup> V.H., VI, 4.

<sup>3</sup> V.H., X, 5; cf. Plutarch, Aristides, II 1, and XVII, 1, where Plutarch says that the daughters of Aristides remained unmarried for a long time because of the poverty of their father, until the state financed their espousals; cf. also, Nepos, Aristides, III, 3: "Quo factum est ut filiae eius publice alerentur et de communi aorario dotibus datis collocarentur".

Plutarch makes it clear<sup>1</sup> that Lycurgus forbade the giving of dowries; and this perhaps suggests that the suitors of Lysander's daughters were fined by the ephors for arranging their marriages in the hopes of a large dowry; but if that were so, it would hardly be conferring an honour upon the dead Lysander to make sure that one of Lycurgus' marriage laws was carried out. In fact, it seems unlikely that this law against dowries ever existed in Sparta, for certainly in later times dowry-hunting became a serious scandal. In any case, Plutarch's words are exceptionally vague; he refers to a law at Sparta allowing a penalty for no marriage or a late marriage or a bad marriage ( i.e. seeking to marry the daughters of the wealthy rather than the daughters of the noble ), and his implication is that the suitors of Lysander's daughters came under the penalty for the last offence.

Pollux<sup>2</sup> testifies to this Spartan law against bachelors; as does Ariston of Chios<sup>3</sup> - and both in words which suggest that they are indebted for their information to the same ultimate source as Plutarch. But it is quite impossible to do more than guess at the source. The Spartan authorities were well aware of the dangers of a diminishing birth-rate and therefore offered special privileges to the fathers of sons, as they applied

<sup>1</sup> Apoph. Lac., 227 F; cf. Justin, III, 3, 8: " virginos sine doto nubere iussit ".

<sup>2</sup> Onom., III, 48, and VIII, 40: Ήσαν δὲ καὶ ἑταίρια δίκαι πολλὰ καὶ ὀφειλάριον καὶ παρογαρίον.

<sup>3</sup> Apud Stob. Flor., LXVII, 16: Σπάρτιων νόμος πάντες ἑταίρια τὴν πρὸς πρῶτον, ἑταίρια, τὴν δευτέραν ὀφειλάριον, τὴν τρίτην καὶ τετάρτην παρογαρίον.

special penalties and insults to bachelors or others who married late. References to this are quite numerous, although all in late authors.

Aristotle<sup>2</sup> has a great deal to say about Spartan women, of whom he disapproves, their luxury, wealth and position in marriage. He may well have added elsewhere to the little information he gives in the Politics about Spartan marriage laws and customs. Perhaps Plutarch is drawing this information from Theopompus, who found it in Aristotle.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> of. Plutarch, Lycurgus, XV; De Amor. Prob., 11: Aelian, V.H., VI, 6; Pollux, Onom., VIII, 40 etc.

<sup>2</sup> Pol., 11, 1269 B - 1270 A.

<sup>3</sup> As seems to be the case in Lysander, XVII, 5 ( where Aristotle's information, also found in Pollux, is probably passed on to Plutarch via Theopompus ), and in Lysander, 11, 5 ( where Plutarch may have taken over the quotation from Aristotle's Problems from his source ).

It has been noted that in the narrative sections of his *Life of Lysander* Plutarch seems to supply information which is largely taken from the *Hellenica* of Xenophon. But there are also certain omissions of material of interest from Xenophon, and very considerable additions to the Xenophontic material. These additions seem to supply the material which gives the favourable portraiture of Lysander; they have affinities with the Greek cities of Ionia; they are generally pro-Spartan and anti-Persian, and it seems reasonable enough to assume that they are taken from the *Hellenica* of Theopompus. Now we know little more about the *Hellenica* of Theopompus than that, in twelve books, it commenced with the year 411 B.C. (where the history of Thucydides breaks off), and concluded with the battle of Cnidus in 394 B.C.<sup>1</sup> No doubt it was but a fragment of an undertaking originally designed on a more comprehensive scale, for the battle of Cnidus could hardly have been adopted by a writer like Theopompus to conclude his historical treatise. Polybius<sup>2</sup> tells us that Theopompus had originally contemplated a work of greater extent under the title of *Hellenica*, and the cause of his change of plan was the impression made upon him by the achievements of Philip of Macedon and his desire to make Philip's life the centre of a great

<sup>1</sup> Diodorus, XIV, 84, 7.

<sup>2</sup> VIII, 9 - 12.

historical compilation. But, as Philip of Macedon dominated the period covered by the Philippica of Theopompus, so Lysander of Sparta dominated the period covered by the much shorter work, the Hellenica. It is, therefore, most unlikely that Plutarch would fail to make reference to this work of history, which probably had very much more to say about Lysander and his achievements than has the Hellenica of Xenophon, which covers a much longer period of history.

Our examination of the narrative sections of the Life of Lysander suggests that Theopompus supplied much of the material. But did Plutarch use Xenophon and Theopompus side by side and both at first hand? This seems unlikely, for it is certain that the Hellenica of Theopompus was itself based upon Xenophon's work; at any rate, Theopompus is alleged to have been guilty of plagiarism and to have copied Xenophon extensively.<sup>1</sup> Plutarch may not have been aware of this; but the following considerations make it seem likely that the biographer used his Theopompus at first hand and was indebted to Theopompus for the Xenophontic material which is incorporated into the Life:

1 ) Although an argument from silence is inevitably weak, yet neither in the Lysander nor elsewhere does Plutarch refer to Xenophon by name in circumstances in which we can identify a reference to the Hellenica of Xenophon.

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. Porphyrius ap. Euseb., Praep. Evang., X, 465, B - C ; G. & H., fr. 23.

2 ) The narrative sections of the Life contain a whole mass of material which is interwoven into the Xenophontic material. All this information seems 'Theopompan.', and contains details which are partly irrelevant to a life of Lysander, but which can be explained naturally if one assumes that Plutarch is following a single historical authority, from whom he is excerpting material about Lysander's achievements.

- ' of. III, 3-4: additional information about Ephesus;
- VI, 1,4,6-8: enlarged portraiture of Callicratidas;
- VIII, 1-3: Lysander's massacre at Miletus;
- IX, 2: Lysander's superintendence of Cyrus' satrapy;
- X,2: XI, 2 & 3: additional information about Aegospotami - the sending out of dispatch ships, the hoisting of a bronze shield, Lysander in person visiting & encouraging his troops;
- XI, 11: the pipes & hymns of victory after Aegospotami;
- XIII, 2: description of Philocles' courage in facing death;
- XIV, 3 & 4: capture of Sestos and restoration of Scione;
- XIV,8: alternative, and probably more accurate, version of the Spartan peace terms;
- XV,1: precise date of fall of Athens;
- XV,2: alleged violation by Athens of terms of treaty;
- XV,7-8: anecdote about Callibius, the Spartan harmost;
- XVI,2-4: story of Gylippus' greed and theft;
- XVII, 11: quotation in full of the words of the oracle about a lame sovereignty at Sparta;
- XXIII, 1: additional information about the sending of letters by Lysander to his friends in Ionia;
- XXIII, 11: appointment of Lysander as *κεκοβιτης* ;
- XXVII, 5-8: description of the Theban counter-decrees about assisting Athenian refugees;
- XXVIII, 2-10: mass of additional information about the strategy of Lysander and Pausanias in Bœotia - the capture of Lebaœia, the interception by the Thebans of a Spartan dispatch, the presence of Pausanias at Plataea;
- XXIX,1: the specific naming of Thrasybulus & his arrival at Haliartus ( Xen.Hell. III,5,22, merely states that Athenians arrived );
- XXIX, 2-3: detailed account of the disagreement between Pausanias and the ephors about the advisability of asking for a truce after Haliartus.

- 3 ) There is an anti-Persian flavour about the narrative which is not strongly present in Xenophon.<sup>1</sup>
- 4 ) There are two minor chronological differences.<sup>2</sup>
- 5 ) There are several instances in Plutarch where the biographer contradicts Xenophon and passes on a quite different version.<sup>3</sup>
- 6 ) There are specific numbers mentioned by Plutarch which are not found in Xenophon.<sup>4</sup>
- 7 ) There are omissions of Xenophontic material which would have been of interest to Plutarch.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> of. Lysander, IV.1: VI.4: VI.8: XXIII,1: XXVII,3.

<sup>2</sup> IX,3-4: the ravaging of Aegina and Salamis, and landing at Attica, which Xenophon, Hell. II,2,9, puts just before the siege of Athens; XIV,2: the capture of Samos, which Plutarch dates before the fall of Athens, but Xenophon, afterwards ( Hell. II, 3, 6 ).

<sup>3</sup> IX,7: the charges against Philocles;  
 XIV, 9-10: the estimate of Theramenes;  
 XV,5: the burning of the Athenian fleet;  
 XVI,1: the sailing of Lysander to Thrace after the fall of Athens;  
 XXI,4: the jealousy of both Spartan kings.

<sup>4</sup> X,3: 2 or 3 ships sent out to reconnoitre: Xenophon (Hell. II,1,24 ) says the 'swiftest of his ships';  
 XI,10: 3000 sailors captured at Aegospotami: Xenophon gives no numbers;  
 XXVII,11: 1000 Spartans and 300 Thebans killed at Haliartus: Xenophon says that more than 200 Thebans died ( III,5,20 ).

<sup>5</sup> of. Hell. II,2,3-4: the effect on the Athenians of the tragic news of Aegospotami;  
 Hell. II,4,29: mention by Xenophon of Libys, brother of Lysander, as nauarch;  
 Hell. III,4,2: allegation of ulterior motive in Lysander's encouragement of Agesilaus to campaign in Asia Minor ( " to restore his Decarchies " );  
 Plutarch ( XXX,1 ) seems to know of only one charge against Pausanias after Haliartus; of course, this was the only charge which actually concerned Lysander.



These points of difference do seem to suggest that Plutarch was using his Theopompus at first hand and drawing his Xenophontic material from the narrative of Theopompus . Of the two historians, Theopompus would make the greater appeal to Plutarch the biographer; and he would not need to supplement his Theopompan material ( based as it was, upon Xenophon ) by reference to the Hellenica of Xenophon.

PART III.

PLUTARCH'S LIFE OF LYCANDER

Section 2

THE HOSTILE SOURCE ( Chapters XIII, 5 - 9:  
XIX - XX: XXIV, 2 - XXVI: XXX, 3 - 5 . )

It has been shown that the greater part of the Life of Lycander was based upon one continuous narrative source - a source which had made use of the Hellenica of Xenophon, and which was, on the whole, favourably disposed towards the cause of Sparta and particularly well-inclined towards her admiral, whose efforts had brought the Peloponnesian War to a successful conclusion. It seems likely that this source was the Hellenica of Theopompus, used by Plutarch at first hand, and supplemented by occasional anecdotes and apophthegms, which had been noted down by Plutarch in earlier reading, or by his own specific eye-witness accounts of topographical or archaeological details, which principally concerned the Spartan monuments at Delphi, or the legends, folklore and historical records of those parts of Boeotia neighbouring upon Chaeronea.

Thus, the Theopompan sections of the Life may be identified as chapters II - XI: XIII, 1 - 4: XIV - XVII, 1 - 5: XXI, 2 - 7: XXII, 6 - XXIV, 1: XXVII - XXVIII, 6: XXVIII, 10 -

XXIX, 4: and XXX, 1 - 2.

Those sections of the Life which appear to be the result of Plutarch's own personal investigations, studies and reflexions may be identified as chapters 1: ( possibly, VII, 5 - 6, and VIII, 4 - 5 ) XII: XVII, 6 - 11: XVIII ( where the Chronicles of Duris of Samos were partly used ): XVIII, 7 - 9: XXIX, 5 - 12: and XXX, 6 - 8.

On the whole, it is true to say of these portions of the Life that they are favourable towards Lysander; they make no attempt to denigrate his character; and, if there had been no further additions to the Life, then the over-all portrait of Lysander is very fair and not unflattering. He is depicted as a loyal Spartan, relentless in battle against the enemies of his country, stern and almost ascetic in personal character, ambitious more for his city than for himself, with little desire for personal aggrandisement and no regard for wealth or possessions. True, he was not universally popular, for he was bound to have his enemies at Sparta ( the king Pausanias, his jealous rival, and a body of ephors who were naturally suspicious of his increasing power and popularity, and were certain to be on their guard lest he become too great for his position ); and the Athenians and their allies would hardly be expected to give wholehearted approval to one who had destroyed their empire and undermined the democratic governments of their own and allied cities.

But, despite all this, a very fair picture is given

of Lysander, and one that seems to ring true to history and to reason.

It is now necessary to examine and attempt to identify a small section of the Life of Lysander, which is derived from what may best be described as the " Hostile Source ", for it is a complete antithesis to the remainder of the Life, and it seems to insert into the more sober historical narrative mere suspicious gossip and doubtful allegations of discoveries made among the papers of Lysander after his death.

This hostile source concerns itself with four important allegations:

1 ) That Lysander used his position as a Spartan admiral to win power for himself, by appointing his own creatures to posts of influence and by uniting the cities of Asia Minor and the islands in loyalty to him by setting up decadarchies;

2 ) That Lysander's cruelty was a byword in the cities of Greece, especially his treatment of the peoples of Miletus and Phasos;

3 ) That the Persian satrap, Pharnabazus, was so outraged by the behaviour of Lysander in Asia Minor that he denounced him by letter to the Spartan authorities;

4 ) That Lysander, finding that his ambitious spirit could never be satisfied so long as the Spartan form of government remained unchanged, took a number of steps, including the bribing of oracles, to overthrow the hereditary kingship

of the Spartans, and substitute an elective dyarchy; but his plan, which was discovered after his death, came to nought.

All this information and all these allegations are found in Plutarch's Life of Lysander and in Nepos' Life of Lysander,<sup>1</sup> with such similarity both of fact and of interpretation that it is obvious that Plutarch and Nepos drew upon the same source for their information. For this reason, it will be necessary at this stage to examine in full Nepos' Life of Lysander.

The short and biased biography of Nepos, with its defective second chapter and its account of the trick played upon Lysander by Pharnabazus,<sup>2</sup> lends itself readily for comparison with what Plutarch also recorded, and with the relevant passages in Diodorus. It is evident that Nepos' source, whoever he may have been, had nothing good to say about the Spartan admiral, but was consistently abusive of him, refusing to acknowledge any virtues in the man and making no mention of his poverty, his zeal for the Spartan cause, or his courage in battle.

A brief resumé of Nepos' Life of Lysander gives us the following facts:

CHAPTER 1: Lysander ended the power of Athens and won the battle of Aegospotami, not by the valour of his troops, but by the ' *immodestia adversariorum* ', thus gaining his

<sup>1</sup> And also, to a very much more limited extent, in Diodorus; but not at all in Xenophon.

<sup>2</sup> Nepos, Lysander, IV.

reputation ' magis felicitate quam virtute '. He was impudent and ambitious even before the battle; now, in the joy of his success, he acted in such a way by his cruelty and irresponsibility ' ut eius opera in maximum odium Graeciae Lacedaemonii pervenerint '. He brought under his own control the city-states of Greece, although he pretended ' id se Lacedaemoniorum causa facere ' ; and he maintained his own personal supremacy by appointing in every city-state ' decadarchias ', chosen from among his own friends.

Chapter II: In this unfinished chapter one example is given of Lysander's cruelty and treacherous dealings - his massacre of the people of Thasos. Nepos suggests that this is but one example among many which he will not quote, ' ne de eodem plura enumerando defatigemus lectores '.

Chapter III: The Spartan authorities abolished Lysander's decadarchies, and therefore ( ' quo dolore inensus ' ) he plotted to abolish the royal power at Sparta. To do this, he attempted bribery upon the oracle of Apollo at Delphi, the oracle of Zeus at Dodona in Epirus, and the oracle of Zeus Ammon in Libya. These attempts were reported to the Spartans, and Lysander was accused but acquitted. Evidence for his corruption was found in a speech discovered in his house, after his death at Haliartus. He had hoped ( ' pecunia fidens ' ) that he would

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. Nepos, Alcibiades, VIII, ' In eo erat occupatus ut bellum quam diutissimo duceret, quod ipsis pecunia a rege suppeditabatur .... '

be elected to supreme power when the kings were abolished.

Chapter IV: Lysander was himself trapped by a trick played upon him by the Persian Pharnabazus. ' Ita ille imprudens ipse suus fuit accusator '; this is an obvious case of ' the biter bit ', and Nepos recounts the story with no little satisfaction, as if he felt that the injustice and treachery which marked Lysander's whole life were in the end appropriately enough rewarded.

These chapters of Nepos' Life of Lysander must now be examined in close detail with the relevant chapters of Plutarch and with the Ephoran tradition which is found in Diodorus.

412

NEPOS' LIFE OF LYCANDER, CHAPTER 1

Nepos alone suggests that the reputation of Lycander was gained ' magis felicitate quam virtute ', and he draws this inference from the fact that Aegospotami was lost by the ' immodestia ' of Athenian troops rather than by the courage or skill of the Spartan forces and their commander. Not only does he depreciate the military skill of Lycander, but he belittles also the ability of the Spartans under his command.

Plutarch<sup>1</sup> makes reference to the bad generalship of the Athenians and to their dangerous position on the Chersonese; Diodorus,<sup>2</sup> whose account is very brief, merely states that the Athenian triremes had not been manned when the Spartans arrived. Thus, while both Plutarch and Diodorus imply that the Athenian lack of discipline was ultimately responsible for their defeat in the battle, neither attributes Lycander's reputation merely to good-luck; on the contrary, Plutarch - who is using Theopompus for his description of Aegospotami - ascribes the Spartan victory to the prudence and ability of Lycander.

HAC VICTORIA LYCANDER ELATUS, CUM ANTEA SEMPER FECTIOSUS  
AUDACQUE FUISSET, SIC SIBI INDULSIT UT EIUS OPERA IN MAXIMUM ODIIUM  
GRACIAE LACEDAEMONII PERVENERINT.

Plutarch certainly refers to the ambitious spirit and wanton

---

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, Lycander, X & XI: here Plutarch follows closely the account of Xenophon ( Hellen. II, 1, 20 - 30 ), especially with regard to the intervention of Alcibiades and his offer of service; Nepos does not here refer to the intervention of Alcibiades, but he does mention it in his Life of Alcib. (VIII), where his account is close to that of Diodorus.

<sup>2</sup> XIII, 106, 3.



behaviour of Lysander<sup>1</sup>; but Diodorus<sup>2</sup> only once mentions Lysander's ambitions in a passage where he seeks to explain Lysander's conduct by his passion for supreme power, and so brings forward the story of his attempts to overthrow the Heraclid kings by working the oracles.

The words of Nepos about the hatred felt for the Spartans by the rest of Greece are very similar to Plutarch's own comment, " He gave the Greeks no worthy specimen of Spartan rule "<sup>3</sup>.

NIHIL ALIUD MOLITUS EST QUAM UT OMNES CIVITATES IN SUA TENERET POTESTATE, CUM ID DE LACEDAIMONIORUM CAUSA FACERE SIMILARET.

This certainly seems to be the opinion of Plutarch<sup>4</sup> also; but Ephorus apparently said nothing about Lysander seeking to gain power for himself - on the contrary, Diodorus<sup>5</sup> assures us that all the actions of Lysander were strictly in accordance with the wishes of the ephors.

DECEM DELEGERAT IN UNAQUAQUE CIVITATE QUIBUS SUUM IMPERIUM POTESTATEMQUE OMNIUM RERUM COMMITTERET. HORUM IN NUMERO PLENO ADMITTEBATUR, NISI QUI .... EIUS HOSPITIO CONTINERETUR.

Plutarch also refers to the setting up of 'decadarchies' by Lysander, and in very similar words to those used here by

<sup>1</sup> cf. Plutarch, Lysander, VII, 5: XVIII, 4: XIX, 1, etc.

<sup>2</sup> XIV, 13, 2.

<sup>3</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XIII, 7: *ὅτι ἐπεικὲς εἶδεν τοῖς Ἕλλησι δοῦναι τῆς Λακ. ἀρχῆς.*

<sup>4</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XIII, 6: *κατασκευάζοντας ἑαυτῶν τὴν πρὸς Ἑλλάδος ἡγεμονίαν.*  
and XXI, 2: *ταῖς ἀναρχαῖς τὰς πόλεις κατέχων διὰ παντός ἔχει καὶ κύριός ἐστι τῆς Ἑλλάδος.*

<sup>5</sup> XIV, 13, 1: *κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἐφόρων γνώμην...*

Nepos<sup>1</sup>.

Nepos makes no mention of ' harmosts '. Plutarch<sup>2</sup> refers to one harmost and one decadarchy left in each city by Lysander; while Diodorus<sup>3</sup> says that, after the setting up of the Thirty at Athens, Lysander was instructed by the ephors to set up harmosts in all the cities taken over by the Spartans, for the Spartans " wished to govern these cities by means of oligarchies, when the democracies had been destroyed ".

---

<sup>1</sup>Plutarch, Lysander, XLIII, 7: *ἐταπεινὰ καὶ βίβλια κερφόμενος τὰ πρυτανεὶα καὶ ἀρχαίαι ἰσχυρὰ πρὸς τὸ καὶ ἀσπιδόεως.*  
of. also Plutarch, Lysander, V, 5, where - after Notium - Lysander is described as collecting together likely members of his future decadarchies, and sowing in their minds the seeds of pro-Spartan revolution. Diodorus ( XLIII, 70, 4 ) is nearer to Plutarch, Lysander, V, 5, than he is to Nepos; he refers to the formation of political clubs by Lysander, which are later to be useful in destroying democracy and in setting up forms of government favourable to Lysander. But Diodorus places this before the battle of Notium, and just after Lysander's first meeting with Cyrus. He describes how Lysander summoned to Ephesus τὸς δεκαρχαίους, and of them formed societies to be the basis of a government later subservient to him.

<sup>2</sup>Plutarch, Lysander, XLIII, 5.

<sup>3</sup>XLV, 10, 1:

ΜΕΡΟΣ' LIFE OF LYSANDER, CHAPTER II.

This incomplete chapter apparently refers to a massacre by Lysander of Athenian partisans at Thasos, after they had been led by deception into a state of confidence. It commences with a statement of the supreme power now in the hands of Lysander by means of his decadarchios ( ' Ipsius nutu omnia gerobantur ' ), and then quotes one of several implied examples of his cruelty and treachery.

Plutarch, after describing the composition of the decadarchios, tells his readers that Lysander " took part himself in many massacres, driving out the enemies of his friends " <sup>1</sup>, but without quoting a specific example in that chapter. But, in two other chapters, <sup>2</sup> he records a very similar trick on the part of Lysander to destroy the pro-Athenian element at Miletus, following his account of the incident in the later chapter with a reference to Pharnabazus' hostility towards Lysander.

In Diodorus, <sup>3</sup> who describes a massacre at Miletus - but not in connection with Lysander - there is no suggestion

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XIII, 7.

<sup>2</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, VIII, 1 - 3 and XIX, 3 - 4.

<sup>3</sup> XIII, 104, 5.

whatever of any personal hostility of Pharnabazus or animosity to Lysander, although Diodorus mentions that the democrats of Miletus fled to the Persian satrap, who received them kindly.

Plutarch puts the responsibility for the Milesian massacre upon Lysander, although the actual killing was done by the oligarchs of Miletus. The numbers of the slain in Plutarch<sup>1</sup> are eight hundred, and in Diodorus three hundred and forty.

Apart from the names of the places ( Miletus in Plutarch, and Thasos in Nepos ), there are a few similarities between the two records, but it is not necessary to suppose that the incidents are identical. For Polyaeus<sup>2</sup> tells us of a massacre of democrats at Thasos, arranged by Lysander; but he also records<sup>3</sup> a similar instance at Miletus - and Nepos himself says, ' satis est unam rem exempli gratia proferre ne de eodem plura enumerando defatigemur lectores ', as if he was aware from his source of the same device being employed by Lysander on more than one occasion.<sup>4</sup>

As has been noted, Diodorus<sup>5</sup> mentions a massacre of democrats at Miletus. But he does not actually lay the responsibility upon Lysander, although he may be suggesting that the massacre was indirectly the work of Lysander, for he sandwiches it between the arrival of Lysander at Ephesus ( where he was entrusted by Cyrus

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XLX, 3.

<sup>2</sup> Strat., 1, 45, 4 - this account will be examined later.

<sup>3</sup> Strat., 1, 45, 1.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Plutarch, Lysander, XLII, 7 and XLX, 4.

<sup>5</sup> XLII, 104, 5 - 6.

with the government of his province and the collecting of taxes from it<sup>1</sup>) and the destruction by Lysander of the town of Iasos in Caria, with the slaughter of eight hundred of its male inhabitants, before his departure for Attica.

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. Plutarch, Lysander, lxi. 2.

NEPOS' LIFE OF LYSANDER, CHAPTER III.

ITAEQUE HI DECEM VIRALEM ILLAM POTESTATEM AB ILLO CONSTITUTAM  
SUSTULERUNT.

As the end of the second chapter is missing, we can but surmise that Nepos is suggesting that the cruelty, treachery and high-handed policy of Lysander prompted the authorities ( ' HI ' - the kings or ephors ? ) to end his power by putting down the decadarchies set up by him.

Plutarch<sup>1</sup> also makes reference to the attempts made by the Spartan kings to abolish the decadarchies established by Lysander; but he ends his chapter with the suggestion that any interference by the Spartan kings in the policy of Lysander was not for the ultimate good of Sparta, and his last few words about Lysander<sup>2</sup> ( in a chapter in which he seems to be mainly indebted to Theopompus for his material ) are eulogistic rather than defamatory.

Diodorus<sup>3</sup> in one place only suggests that Pausanias was jealous of Lysander.

QUO DOLORI INCENSUS INIIT CONSILIA REGES LACEDAEMONIORUM TOLLERE.

Plutarch<sup>4</sup> places Lysander's plot to abolish the hereditary kingship of Sparta after his return from the Hellespont, enraged

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XL, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XL, 7: πρὸς τὴν δόξαν ἐπιπέσει ἀθανάτους στρατηγόντων.

<sup>3</sup> XLV, 33.

<sup>4</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XLV, 2.

and discomfited by the treatment noted out to him by Agesilaus; but, although Plutarch suggests that his anger against Agesilaus impelled him to take steps to carry out his plot, he admits that the plans of Lysander were " devised and concocted some time before ".

Diodorus puts the plot after the death of Alcibiades, and not long after the fall of Athens.

OMO SENTIEBAT ID SE SINE OPE DEORUM FACERE NON POSSE, QUOD LACEDAEMONII OMNIA AD ORACULA REFERRE CONQUERANT.

Nepos, Plutarch<sup>1</sup> and Diodorus<sup>3</sup> all agree that Lysander was aware that he would have to play upon the superstitions of his fellow-citizens first, so as to induce them to listen to his arguments for the abolition of the hereditary kingship.

PRIMUM DELPHICUM CORRUMPERE EST CONATUS. CUM ID NON POTUISSET, DODONAM ADORTUS EST. HINC QUOQUE REPULSUS DIXIT SE VOTA SUSCEPISSIM, QUAE IOVI HAMMONI SOLVERET, EXISTIMANS SE AFROS FACILIUS CORRUMPTURUM. HAC SPE CUM PROFECTUS ESSET IN AFRICAM, LULULI EUM ANTISTITIBUS IOVIS PERCELLERUNT. NAM NON SOLOM CORRUMPI NON POTUERUNT, SED ET IAN LEGATOS LACEDAEMONIUM MIZERUNT QUI LYANDRUM ACCUSARENT, QUOD SACERDOTES FAVI CORRUMPERE CONATUS ESSET. ACCUSATUS HOC CRIMINE IUDICUMQUE ABSOLUTUS SENTENTIIS .....

Nepos, Plutarch and Diodorus also agree about Lysander's attempts to corrupt the priestesses at Delphi and Dodona, and the priests of Zeus Ammon in Cyrene. Their accounts are almost

---

<sup>1</sup> XLV, 13, 2: *δίωνες ἐπὶ τοῖσιν (i.e. the end of the war) κερρονγραμμαίονος διοτίτο  
καταλύσαι τὴν τῶν Ἑρακλειδῶν βασιλίαν.*

<sup>2</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XLV, 2: *ὡς δὲν ἀφελύσσονος ... εἰ μὴ φόβος θεῶν πῶ  
καὶ διαβουλίαι προεπέληξας ...*

<sup>3</sup> XLV, 13, 3: *θαυρῶν δὲ τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις μέγιστα τοῖς πάντοις προσέχοντες ...  
εἰ κερρον δάβοι εὐρυχῶν καὶ ἰδίαις ἐπιβολαῖς, ἐβίως ἔδειν ἐπὶ  
τέλος τὴν κροαίαν.*

identical. But Plutarch mentions a certain Pherecles, who was Lysander's go-between at Dedona. Diodorus<sup>2</sup> calls him Pherecratos - and then adds a detail of considerable interest, which Plutarch would without doubt have added to his biography if he had known of it. The Ephoran tradition apparently contained the story that Lysander hoped to be able to influence a local chieftain at Ammon, named Libys, who was a family friend, and after whom Lysander's brother had been named Libys.

Nepos, Plutarch and Diodorus all agree about Lysander's acquittal after the accusations levied against him by the priests of Cyrene.

Nepos, Plutarch<sup>3</sup> and Diodorus<sup>4</sup> place Lysander's death next in chronological sequence, Nepos making the briefest mention of his death at Haliartus.

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XXV, 3: ἔφορος γὰρ οὖν φησὶν αὐτὸν, ὡς τὴν τοῦ Κυβίαν ὑπερηβείας διαφθεῖραι καὶ τὴν Λαδωνίδας αἰτίας ἀναπέθετον εἰς Φερεκράτους ἀπαύτην, εἰς Ἄρπυριον ἀναβῆναι . . . . .

In Lysander, XX, 6 - 8, Plutarch does give the other reason for Lysander's visit to Libya, τὴν δὲ οὖν οὖσαν οὐσίας εἰς εὐχαιοὺς ἠρῶ τῶν ἀγῶνων, suggesting there that his visit to Cyrene was an excuse to get away from Sparta and be free of the authorities, at least for a time; but he also adds that Ephorus assigns another reason for this absence abroad, which he intends to mention.

<sup>2</sup> XIV, 13, 4: Φερεκράτης, Ἀπολλωνιάδος τὸ γένος, ἔχων κυρθεῖαν πρὸς τοὺς περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν διατριβήνας.

Plutarch also adds considerable information, found in neither Nepos nor Diodorus, which will be examined and discussed later - in particular, a detail about the comment of the Libyans upon Lysander's acquittal at Sparta ( XXV, 4 ), and a whole chapter ( XXVI ) devoted to the story of the boy Silenus.

<sup>3</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XXVIII, 10.

<sup>4</sup> XIV, 81.



Again, Nepos, Plutarch<sup>1</sup> and Diodorus<sup>2</sup> record similar accounts of the finding in Lysander's house after his death of a treasonable speech written by Cleon of Halicarnassus, in which arguments are put forward for the abolition of the hereditary Spartan kingship.

UT REGIA POTESTATE DISSOLUTA EX OMNIBUS DUX DELIGATUR AD BELLUM GERENDUM.

In the last chapter of his Life<sup>3</sup>, when describing this treasonable speech, Plutarch agrees that Lysander's plan was to make available the kingship to any worthy aspirant; but in chapter XLIV he acknowledges two traditions - to take away the government from the two Houses and restore it to all the Heraclidae in common, or, " as some say, not to the Heraclidae, but to all the Spartiates in general ".

Diodorus,<sup>4</sup> following Ephorus, says that the plan was to make the kingship available to all the Spartiates.

That these facts about the plot of Lysander were found out by the Spartan authorities after and not before the death of Lysander, is found in Plutarch,<sup>5</sup> Diodorus<sup>6</sup> and Nepos, all agreeing that Lysander hoped that he would gain the chief position in Sparta, if it was awarded on the elective principle.

<sup>1</sup> Briefly in Lysander, XLV, 2, and with more detail in XXX, 3 - 5.

<sup>2</sup> XLV, 13, 8: but Diodorus does not mention the name of the author of the speech.

<sup>3</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XLV, 4: *ὅτι πρότερον αὐτῶν καὶ ποτεῖσθαι τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκ τῶν ἀρχόντων.*

<sup>4</sup> XLV, 13, 8: *ὅτι ἐκ τῶν ἰσθίων τῶν ἀρχόντων ἀρχὴν γενέσθαι βούλοιντο.*

<sup>5</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XLVI, 6: XXX, 4.

<sup>6</sup> XLV, 13, 8.

NEPOS' LIFE OF LYSANDER, CHAPTER IV.

This chapter seems to be an afterthought and is recorded by Nepos almost with malicious delight. Diodorus has no record of it, although he does describe the treacherous hand which Pharnabazus had in destroying Alcibiades.

The accounts of Nepos and Plutarch<sup>2</sup> are very similar, although the Plutarchan version is more expanded.

Nepos writes simply: NAM CUM LYSANDER PRAEFECTUS CLASSIS IN BELLO MULTA CRUELITER AVAREQUE FECISSET DEQUE IIS REBUS SUSPICARETUR AD CIVES SUOS ESSE PERLATUM, PETIIT A PHARNABAZO UT AD EPHOROS SIBI TESTIMONIUM DARET.....

Plutarch suggests<sup>3</sup> that Pharnabazus had in the first instance denounced Lysander to the Spartans for pillaging his territory; and the ephors, after finding money in the possession of Thorax, a friend of Lysander, sent a *curia* to Lysander to recall him. Therefore Lysander begged Pharnabazus to send another letter to the Spartan authorities.

In Nepos, who has nothing to say about a prior quarrel between Lysander and Pharnabazus, the substance of Lysander's request is positive ( ' quanta sanctitate bellum gessisset sociosque tractasset ' ), while in Plutarch the request is negative, and expressed from the point of view of Pharnabazus, " that he had not been wronged and had no complaints to make ".

<sup>1</sup> XIV, 11.

<sup>2</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XX, 1 - 5.

<sup>3</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XIX, 7.

The descriptions of the substituted letters, both in Nepos and in Plutarch, are very similar.

Nepos and Plutarch agree about the signing of the letters by Pharnabazus, Nepos alone adding that in the second letter, ' accuratissimo avaritiam eius perfidiamque accusarat '.

They both agree that the ephors, after reading the letter from Pharnabazus, showed it to Lysander.

In chapter XX,<sup>1</sup> Plutarch suggests that Lysander was allowed by the ephors to depart from Sparta immediately for a visit to the shrine of Zeus Ammon in Cyrene - that is to say, no action was taken against him; but Plutarch does admit in the following chapter<sup>2</sup> that Lysander had great difficulty in procuring his release by the ephors.

Nepos dramatically concludes his short biography with the epigrammatic words: ' Ita ille imprudens ipse suus fuit accusator ',<sup>3</sup> as if rejoicing that he could round off his Life of Lysander with the assurance to his readers that the vices of Lysander were known to the authorities during his lifetime, and that even the subtlety of Lysander did in the end find its match in Pharnabazus.

The account of this incident in Polyaeus<sup>4</sup> is so completely

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XX, 6.

<sup>2</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XXI, 1: *ποῦτος δὲ καὶ χαλκῶς ἐπεθῆναι διαπραξαίμενος.*

<sup>3</sup> Which may perhaps be compared with the two quotations found in Plutarch, Lysander, XX, 2: *πρὸς κέρτα ..... ἀπρὸς τὴν* , and XX, 5: *ἀλλ' ἔτι ὀβριότης ἐστὶν ἀφύκτος πάθος.*

<sup>4</sup> Strat., VII, 19.

identical with that of Plutarch that one might have supposed that Polyaeus took it verbatim from Plutarch's Life of Lysander, had it not been for the short sentence with which Polyaeus concludes his account. For, after following the account of Plutarch - in almost the same words - up to the showing of the letter to Lysander by the ephors, Polyaeus adds: *ἔδειξαν αὐτῷ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν προκείμετος μὲν ἀπολογίας δεῖσθαι αὐτὰ καθ' αὐτὰ γράμματα κεῖσθαι.*

This short comment ( *αὐτὰ καθ' αὐτὰ* ) - allegedly by the ephors - corresponds to the Latin of Nepos, ' Ipse suus fuit accusator ' ; but it is obvious, from the additional detail supplied by Polyaeus, and also found in Plutarch, that Polyaeus' account is not a transliteration from the Latin of Nepos. Probably, instead of using Plutarch, Polyaeus had direct reference to the source common to both Nepos and Plutarch; and this is made more likely by the fact that Polyaeus gives us the conclusion of the anecdote about Lysander's cruelty and treachery towards the democrats of Thages, commenced by Nepos in his unfinished chapter.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Strat., 1, 45, 4.

<sup>2</sup> Nepos, Lysander, 11.

425

This comparison of Nepos' Life of Lysander with the relevant passages in both Plutarch and Diodorus makes it clear that Plutarch used the same source as Nepos for the information which he passes on in common with Nepos.

Plutarch's information is much closer to that supplied by Nepos than to that supplied by Diodorus, and the following points suggest that Plutarch did not use Ephorus at first hand, but that he and Nepos were indebted to a source which had made partial use of Ephorus:

1 ) Plutarch and Nepos recount the story of the trick of Pharnabazus, while Diodorus makes no mention of it.

2 ) Plutarch and Nepos assign personal responsibility to Lysander for the setting up of the decarchies, and suggest that it was a deliberate attempt on his part to secure and maintain his own power. Diodorus does not share this view.

3 ) Plutarch holds Lysander responsible for the treacherous massacre of the democrats at Miletus.

Nepos holds Lysander responsible for the treacherous massacre of the democrats at Thasos.

Polyaenus refers both massacres to the responsibility of Lysander.

But Diodorus mentions a massacre at Miletus without any reference to Lysander by name, although it is clear that any reader who so wished might assume it to have been the work of Lysander.

4) Plutarch and Nepos describe the efforts made by the Spartan authorities to put down the Decadarchies of Lysander. This is not found in Diodorus, and only in one place does Diodorus suggest that Pausanias was jealous of Lysander.

5) Plutarch and Nepos name the author of the treasonable speech found in the house of Lysander after his death; Diodorus apparently found no mention of his name in his source.

6) Diodorus passes on from Ephorus an interesting detail about Lysander's relationship with Libys, one of the native chieftains of Cyrene. Without doubt, Plutarch would have valued this bit of information and included it in his biography, if he had been using Ephorus at first hand.

We may thus assume that, although Plutarch refers to Ephorus as his authority for one or two details which we find in the 'hostile' section of the Life, he did not in fact use Ephorus directly, but through the medium of another source, whose work was based to a very great extent on Ephorus.<sup>2</sup> We do not need to be surprised at Plutarch's reference to Ephorus by name, even if he did not use Ephorus directly -

<sup>1</sup> XIV, 33, 1; cf. also Xen. Hell., III, 4, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Assuming that the relevant passages in Diodorus are taken directly from Ephorus, but there seems no reason to doubt that it was the practice of Diodorus to use only one author for any given section of his work: cf. Hammond, G.O., XCIII, 1938, p. 149.

421  
for the source which Plutarch used, if it was the same as that used by Nepos, would no doubt try to substantiate and justify the dishonourable picture which he painted, by reference to a reasonably contemporary writer of such repute as Ephorus.

An attempt will be made to identify this source, after a careful examination of all the material which we find in the ' hostile ' sections of Plutarch's Life of Lysander.

PLUTARCH'S LYSANDER, CHAPTER, XLII, 5 - 9.

It has already been noted that the whole of Nepos' jaundiced Life of Lysander is contained in Plutarch, that those portions of Plutarch's Life of Lysander which are identical in fact with Nepos are antipathetic towards Lysander, and that, as Nepos' brief Life does not supply any information about Lysander prior to Aegospotami, so it is after Aegospotami that Plutarch seems to inkorit his prejudice against Lysander.

The Nepos source was indebted to Ephorus, and perhaps to Spartan political pamphlets; it seems to have been consistently hostile towards Lysander as an individual rather than to the Spartans as a nation. Although it passes on information which we know to have been derived from Ephorus, it attributes to Lysander's initiative actions which we learn from Dioḍorus were ordered by the Spartan government.

7 These paragraphs describe the tyrannical way in which Lysander suppressed the democracies in the various cities of Asia Minor, set up decadarchies and harmosts, established for himself supremacy in Greece by appointing his own creatures to govern in these cities, himself joined in massacres and

---

'As will be demonstrated later.



ruled with such cruelty that he gave Greece no " worthy specimen of Spartan rule " .

As has been noted, Plutarch is very similar to Nepos; there are, in fact, such close verbal parallels<sup>1</sup> that one cannot resist the conclusion that Plutarch and Nepos drew directly from the same source.

Diodorus confirms a certain amount of this information; but he says nothing about Lysander gaining power for himself - on the contrary, he gives a description of Lysander as the agent of the ephors. He refers to the setting up by Lysander of political clubs - but before Aegospotami.<sup>2</sup> Again, while Nepos makes no mention of harmosts, Diodorus<sup>3</sup> ( who dates the appointment of harmosts after the establishment of the Thirty in Athens ) says that Lysander was instructed to do this by the ephors.

<sup>1</sup>The following are examples of these parallels:

- Plutarch, XIII, 5: κατὰ τὴν τοῦ δήμου καὶ τῆς ἑλλήνων πολιτείας;
- Nepos, 1: 'Undique qui Atheniensium robus studuissent oiectis';
- Plutarch, XIII, 5: δεκά τετρακτίους ἐκ τῶν θη' αὐτῶ συγκροτηθέντων κατὰ πόλιν ἐπαρτίων;
- Nepos, 1: 'Decem dolo gerat in unaquaque civitate quibus summum imperium potestatemque omnium rerum committeret';
- Plutarch, XIII, 6: κατασκευάζοντας ἑαυτῶ τὴν τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἡγεμονίαν;
- Nepos, 1: 'Omnes civitates in sua potestate teneret, cum id se Lacedaemoniorum causa facere simularet';
- Plutarch, XIII, 7: ἐπαρτίους καὶ βετίους χερσέφους τὰ πρῶτα καὶ κρείους ποίων;
- Nepos, 1: 'Horum in numerum nemo admittobatur, nisi qui.... eius hospitio contineretur';
- Plutarch, XIII, 7: οὐκ ἕπιπαύεις εἶδον τοῦ Ἑλλήνων δόγμα τῆς Λακ. ἀρχῆς;
- Nepos, 1: 'Hius opera in maximum odium Graeciae Lacedaemonii pervenerint'.

<sup>2</sup> XIII, 70, 4: as does Plutarch in Lysander, V, 5.

<sup>3</sup> XIV, 10, 1.

730

Xenophon makes reference to the changes of government inaugurated by Lysander in the cities of Ionia; he says that, immediately after his visit to Byzantium and Chalcedon, Lysander went to Lesbos where he established oligarchies in Mytilene and in other cities.

The only information in these paragraphs which is really peculiar to Plutarch is:

- 1 ) that Lysander set up decarchies and established harbours in both hostile and allied cities;
- 2 ) that Lysander had no regard for birth or wealth in his selection of members of these decarchies;<sup>2</sup>
- 3 ) that Lysander took part in many massacres.<sup>3</sup>

9 The concluding paragraphs of the chapter exemplify this harsh and cruel side of Lysander's character. His conduct, says Plutarch, was so intolerable that Theopompus the comedian was thought to be absurd for likening the Spartans to tavern-women, who giving the Greeks at first a sweet sip of freedom, then poured in a mixture of vinegar; for - says Plutarch - from the very beginning the rule of Lysander was harsh and bitter, in that he refused to allow the people to govern their affairs, but handed over the cities of Greece to the " boldest and most contentious of the oligarchs ".

---

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, II, 2, 5.

<sup>2</sup> Which may well be implied in the words of Nepos, ' nemo admittebatur nisi qui aut eius hospitio contineretur aut se illius fore proprium fide confirmaret'; it is not necessary to assume that Plutarch's information is taken here from Theopompus because he uses the rare adverb *κατατίθεσθαι* also used by Theo. (C. & H. fr. 217 ).

<sup>3</sup> This is exemplified in Nepos, Lysander, II.

It is quite impossible to say whether Plutarch had actually read at first hand the plays of Theopompus Comicus, who wrote a comedy entitled 'The Tavern-women'. But it seems likely that Plutarch, or his source, misunderstood the lines of Theopompus. No doubt, the comedian was pointing out that the Greek city-states which had been members of the Athenian Confederacy were released from their bondage to Athens only to become subject to another master. Curiously enough, Plutarch's last paragraph seems to have been written from a democratic point of view; for Lysander's principal crime was that not only did he not (*οὐκ*) allow the democrats to govern, but actually (*καὶ*) handed over the governments to the worst oligarchs. Such a comment (if it is not Plutarch's own) seems to prove that Plutarch is not following here his principal narrative source, for Theopompus Historicus had little sympathy with the democratic element in the cities of Greece. But it does suggest that the source used by both Plutarch and Nepos was perhaps of Athenian origin, or at any rate was interpreting history with a pro-Athenian bias.

---

'Theopompus Comicus was a late contemporary of Aristophanes (c. 410 B.C. - ): cf. F.C.G., II, 792 ff.; C.A.F., I, 733 ff.; Pollux, Onom., VII, 153, refers to a comedy called the 'Tavern-women' by Theopompus, and Koek (C.A.F., I, 750) ascribes this quotation to the *καταγλιδας*: Meinecke (F.C.A., I, 240) refers this fragment to the *κείρα*. Suidas lists 24 plays, includ. *καταγλιδας* and *εἰρηνη*.

CHAPTER XLIX

The first six paragraphs of this chapter describe and illustrate the ambition of Lysander, with its effect upon his general character.

His ambitious tendencies, says Plutarch, were annoying to the *κράτες* and *ἰσότητες* ( i. e. the Spartan kings, especially Pausanias, the Spartan ephors and his colleagues in the Spartan forces ), and showed themselves in an increasing haughtiness and severity. He displayed no moderation as would be expected of a popular leader ( *δημοτικός* ), conferred upon his favourites absolute power and sovereignty over the cities of Greece ( although Plutarch does not quote a single example ), and could only be satisfied by the complete destruction of his enemies.

To illustrate the vindictiveness of Lysander and his desire to eliminate his enemies, Plutarch first records briefly an anecdote about the destruction of the democrats of Miletus. He has previously described the same incident,<sup>2</sup> but in such a way and with such different detail as to suggest that the source used for the earlier chapter is different from that of this chapter.

<sup>1</sup> of. Nepos, Lysander, 1: 'quibus summum imperium potestatemque omnium forum committeret'.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, VIII, 1 - 3

In chapter VIII, oligarchs and democrats had become reconciled at Miletus, to the great disgust of Lysander. Although he pretended to be pleased, in secret he incited the oligarchs to renew their conflict with their political opponents. He then entered the city, made a pretence of punishing the oligarchs so as to lull the suspicions of the democrats, and finally took bloody revenge on all the democrats who trusted his words.

In chapter XIX, Lysander, fearing lest the leading democrats should go into exile, and desiring to bring forth from hiding those who had already disappeared, swore an oath that he would do them no harm. Both parties ( *οἱ τῶν δῆμων ἀποστάται* and *οἱ κερυφάται* ) accepted his word, but were handed over by him to the oligarchs of Miletus, and were all slain - to the number of eight hundred.

As has already been suggested, it is most unlikely that Miletus, after its dependence upon Sparta and Persia for five years, would still have a democratic form of government, or an active democratic opposition. If there is any truth behind this alleged massacre, it is probable that there were two rival groups of oligarchs in the city, one of which had the support of Lysander and welcomed his return to Ionia.

The basis of the Miletus incident was apparently found in

---

<sup>1</sup> of. Lysander, VIII, 1 - 3.

Ephorus; but, far from attributing to Lysander responsibility for the massacre of the three hundred and forty democrats and the exile of one thousand others, Diodorus does not even mention his name in connection with the incident. However, from its chronological position in Diodorus ( between the arrival of Lysander at Ephesus in 405 B.C., and his destruction of the town of Iasos in Caria, with the slaughter of eight hundred males ) it might be inferred that Lysander had a hand in it. Polyænus' account of the massacre at Miletus<sup>2</sup> is much closer to Plutarch's earlier account<sup>3</sup> of the same massacre, than to that recorded in this chapter.

A comparison of Plutarch's second description of the massacre at Miletus with the accounts of the massacre at Thasos in Polyænus<sup>4</sup> and in Nepos,<sup>5</sup> and the slaughter wrought by Lysander, recorded in Diodorus,<sup>6</sup> reveals certain similarities which make it likely that they are all describing the same incident, but attributing it to different places.

Although Plutarch names Miletus in chapter XLX, he does not in any way suggest that he has already mentioned a massacre at Miletus. Either he has forgotten what he has written in chapter VIII, or - as is more likely - he is following two

<sup>1</sup> Diodorus, XIII, 104, 5 - 6.

<sup>2</sup> Strat. 1, 45, 1.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, VIII, 1 - 3.

<sup>4</sup> 1, 45, 4.

<sup>5</sup> Lysander, II - a defective chapter

<sup>6</sup> XIII, 104, 7.

different authorities, his source for chapter XLII ( or perhaps the biographer himself ) mistakenly passing on the name of Miletus for that of Iasus or Thasos.

Then, Diodorus gives the number of the slain at Iasus as eight hundred males, exactly the number of the dead democrats at Miletus, according to Plutarch. The source of both Polyaeus<sup>1</sup> and Nepos<sup>2</sup> ( which seems to be the same ) may well have confused Thasos and Iasus; Nepos commences the story, which is related in full by Polyaeus - that Lysander gathered together the Thasians in the temple of Heracles, encouraged them to state their opinions freely under the solemn promise of an amnesty, and when those who were in hiding came forth, after a short interval ordered them to be seized and put to death. There are sufficient similarities between Plutarch and Polyaeus to warrant the same ultimate source, although Plutarch makes no mention of the temple of Heracles, and Polyaeus gives no numbers of the slain. As Nepos' chapter is defective, we cannot tell whether his account contained any numbers of the dead.

Dates do not help us much; Plutarch says vaguely that the massacre took place *ἔσχατον*, which may mean after the fall of Athens, if we can trust his chronology. But it is more likely that the word *ἔσχατον* was taken over by Plutarch from the source which he is now beginning to use - the ' Hostile Source '. This source may have commenced with an evaluation

<sup>1</sup> 1, 45, 4.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander II.

of Lysander's character ( as does Nepos ), and have therefore been " ecological " at first. Diodorus makes it clear that the massacres of Miletus and Iasus took place in 405 B.C., before the battle of Aegospotami. Nepos, with his ' victor ex Asia cum revertetur Thasumque divertisset ', must mean immediately after Aegospotami.

It is likely that Plutarch, Nepos and Polyaeus are all indebted for their information about these massacres to a source which had made use of Ephorus. For massacres at Miletus and at Iasus are recorded by Diodorus, who ( although he does not give any information about Pharnabazus' hostility towards Lysander<sup>1</sup> ) mentions that the democrats of Miletus fled to Pharnabazus, who received them kindly.<sup>2</sup> It may be noted that the Pharnabazus dispatch to the ephors at Sparta is recorded next in order by Plutarch, after a few apophthegms and comparisons.

Plutarch then refers<sup>3</sup> vaguely to other massacres of Lysander's, and in such words of contempt as are not found in other parts of this Life, except in chapter XIII,<sup>4</sup> where he is also following the same source as Nepos.

<sup>1</sup> cf. Lysander, XIX, 7 and XXI, 1 - 5.

<sup>2</sup> XIII, 104, 6.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XIX, 4: τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐν ταῖς πόλεσσι Σηρατικῶν φόρος οὐκ ἐπιθρηγτός. cf. Nepos, Lysander, II: ' cibus de crudelitate ac perfidia satis est unam rem exempli gratia proferre.... '.

<sup>4</sup> Lysander, XIII, 7: πολλὰς δὲ παραγινόμενος αὐτὸς σφαγαῖς καὶ εὐσεβάλλων τοῖς τῶν φίλων ἔχθροις.



Plutarch now quotes an apophthegm about Lysander and attributes it to Eteocles the Spartan; but, at the same time, he claims - on the authority of Theophrastus - that the same saying was used about Alcibiades by Archestratus:

Ὀὐκ ἔν η̄ Ἑλλῆς δύο Λυσάνδρους ἔνευκε.

The author of this saying was " Eteocles the Spartan ", according to Plutarch and Aelian; and the same saying is quoted by Athenaeus<sup>2</sup>, but he seems unaware of its authorship. The identity of this Eteocles is not clear. Plutarch refers elsewhere<sup>3</sup> to a brave and witty saying of a certain ephor at Sparta named Eteocles ( μετὰ τῆς Ἁγίδος ἔτεκεν , i.e. 331 B.C. ), and the same ephor may have originated the not very original saying about Lysander. But there were, as Plutarch reminds us, other versions of the apophthegm - that " Athens could not have borne two Alcibiades ",<sup>4</sup> and this version was attributed to Archestratus. This Archestratus seems to have been an Athenian, and a contemporary of Alcibiades.<sup>5</sup> Plutarch refers the latter apophthegm to the ultimate authority of Theophrastus,<sup>6</sup> but it

<sup>1</sup> V.H., XI, 7.

<sup>2</sup> XI, 535 E.

<sup>3</sup> Apoph. Lac., 235 B.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Plut., Alcib., XVI, 8.

<sup>5</sup> cf. Plut. Alcib., XVI, 8 and Aelian, V.H., XI, 7: there is also a reference in Aristides, 1, 3, to a certain Archestratus, a χοροδιδάσκαλος and contemporary of Aristides - but later in the same chapter (1, 6) Plutarch gives his own opinion that Archestratus was later than Aristides & produced tragedies during the Peloponnesian War.

<sup>6</sup> Perhaps from his Πολιτικά πρὸς Καίωνα : cf. Lysander, XIII, 2, and also many references in the Lives of Pericles and Nicias.

seems unlikely that he took it directly from Theophrastus for this Life; either it was already to be found at hand in his common-place book, or else he took it over from the source he used for the rest of the chapter.

In its original form the apophthegm was probably capable of a complimentary interpretation - Lysander was such a unique character that Sparta could not have produced two such. But Aelian and Plutarch - or his source - give it the worst interpretation, and Plutarch concludes his paragraphs with a moralising comparison of the vices of Lysander and Alcibiades.

Plutarch says that the Spartan authorities paid no attention to other accusers of Lysander, but they could not ignore a charge brought against him by the Persian satrap, Pharnabazus. The latter, in whose territory Lysander was operating, accused the Spartan of pillage and denounced him to the Spartan government. The ephors took immediate action; they condemned to death and executed Thorax, one of Lysander's friends, for being in possession of money, and sent a *εκκλησία* to Lysander to recall him from the Hellespont.

It is necessary to inquire when this pillaging by Lysander was supposed to have taken place, if there is any truth at all in the story. Xenophon knows nothing about it, nor does Diodorus, and Xenophon has no record of a visit to Thrace by Lysander in person. Xenophon's account is quite

clear - after Aegospotami, Lysander, on his way to Athos, sent Eteonicus with ten ships to Thrace; after the fall of Athens, Lysander sailed for Samos, which he reduced, and then went back to Sparta.<sup>2</sup> He remained inactive in Sparta until the summer of 403 B.C., when he sailed for Athens to put down the successful opponents of the Thirty.<sup>3</sup> There is no mention by Xenophon of any further activity of Lysander until after 398, when Agis died and Agesilaus successfully laid claim to the throne.<sup>4</sup>

It is possible that the following dating of relevant activities of Lysander is near to the truth:

- 405 - 404            Battle of Aegospotami; Thorax left in the Hellespont to ' mop-up ', and Eteonicus sent to Thrace; the fall of Athens; Lysander at Athens; the capture of Samos - Thorax sent there as harbormaster; return of Lysander to Sparta.
- 404 - 403            Alleged Thracian expedition of Lysander;<sup>5</sup> if there was a massacre at Thasos, it occurred during this expedition; return of Lysander to Sparta.<sup>6</sup>
- 403 ( Summer )    Lysander set out with his brother Libys to assist the Thirty against the Athenian democrats; his rival and opponent Pausanias intervened in favour of the democrats.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, II, 2, 5.    <sup>2</sup> Hellenica, II, 3, 7 - 9.

<sup>3</sup> Hellenica, II, 4, 28.    <sup>4</sup> Hellenica, III, 3, 3.

<sup>5</sup> Lysander, XX, 5; Pausanias, III, 18, 3.

<sup>6</sup> Nepos, Lys., I; Polyaeus, I, 45, 4.

<sup>7</sup> Hellenica, I, 4, 28.

Late 403 - 402

Lysander went to the Hellespont; during his absence, his influence at Sparta was broken. His rival Pausanias, in a lawsuit of high treason ( probably brought against him by Lysander's partisans for his action at Athens ), must have been outspoken against Lysander and denounced his ' ambitious ' schemes. Pausanias was acquitted.<sup>1</sup>

402

Alleged accusations by Pharnabazus ; Lysander recalled from the Hellespont;<sup>2</sup> Thorax executed; Lysander's measures in Sestos undone by the ephors.<sup>3</sup>

Late 402

Lysander departed from Sparta for Libya.<sup>4</sup>

Since the capture of Lampsacus and the occupation of Sestos by Lysander, Spartan influence ( and particularly the influence of Lysander's nominees ) must have been very great in the Hellespont and considerably encroached upon the Persian authority in the north of Asia Minor. Plutarch says that other peoples had accused Lysander of cruelty and oppression, but the Spartan authorities were forced to listen to the accusations of the important Persian satrap of Dascylium. Although Pharnabazus is called a good friend of the Spartans by Plutarch,<sup>5</sup> he did in fact change sides; for after giving the Spartans

<sup>1</sup> Pausanias, III, 5, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XLX, 7:XX, 1-5; Nepos, IV.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XLV, 3.

<sup>4</sup> Lysander, XX, 6; but cf. XLIV, 2: *ἐρχομένων τότε καὶ τῆς Διμυράλλου*, which suggests that the visits to Delphi, Dodona and Gyrene were made in 396, after his return from Asia.

<sup>5</sup> Lysander, XX, 4.

support in 413 B.C.<sup>1</sup>, he accepted the bribes of Alcibiades;<sup>2</sup> but later he returned to his Spartan allegiance, treacherously murdering Alcibiades ( 404 B.C. ) at the request of the Spartan ephors, conveyed by Lysander.<sup>3</sup>

When Lysander returned to the Hellespont ( 403 - 402 ), perhaps to inspect the colony of allied troops which he had stationed at Sestos after its capture,<sup>4</sup> and on route to visit Thorax, his friend and fellow-general, whom he had left in the Hellespont in 405 B.C. and later put in charge of Samos as harmost,<sup>5</sup> his activities around Sestos, Lampacus and Cyzicus were interpreted by Pharnabazus as an encroachment upon his territories, and he accordingly sent men to Sparta to denounce him. One must assume that by now there was a strong body of Spartans, probably under the influence of Pausanias, who were looking out for an opportunity to disgrace Lysander. The fact that Pausanias was acquitted<sup>6</sup> of the charges of treason at Athens brought against him in Sparta in 403 implies that the anti-Lysander element in the city was quite strong. Therefore, when the ephors received Pharnabazus' accusations, they seem to have looked about them for some tangible proof of Lysander's misdeeds - and found it

<sup>1</sup> Hellenica, 1, 3, 1 - 7.

<sup>2</sup> Hellenica, 1, 3, 8.

<sup>3</sup> Plut., Alcib., XXXIX, 1; Diodorus, XIV, 11; Nepos (Alcib. X) seems to suggest that the Thirty at Athens brought pressure upon Lysander, who in turn brought pressure upon Pharnabazus, who reluctantly carried out his wishes.

<sup>4</sup> Lysander, XIV, 3; Diodorus, XIII, 106, 8. <sup>5</sup> Diodorus, XIV, 3, 5.

<sup>6</sup> Only by the small majority of four: cf. Pausanias, III, 5, 5.

in the private possession of money by Thorax, a personal friend of Lysander.

It has been noted that in an earlier mention of Thorax by Plutarch,<sup>1</sup> no personal information about him is given, but his name occurs quite naturally in the narrative as if he had been referred to previously. But here Plutarch gives a few facts about Thorax, as if introducing him to his readers for the first time.<sup>2</sup> Possibly Thorax had been recalled to Sparta from Samos even prior to Lysander's departure for the Hellespont. He certainly seems to have been in Sparta when Pharnabazus' accusations arrived, and when he was found to have sums of money in his private possession, the ephors invoked against him the new law against the private possession of money,<sup>3</sup> and executed him. No doubt, he had a public trial at Sparta, which would be used by Pausanias' partisans at Sparta to denigrate still further the character of Lysander.

12

The remaining paragraphs of this chapter describe in detail the nature of the *εὐταλὴ* - the Spartan method of conveying secret messages - which was used by the ephors to recall Lysander from the Hellespont.<sup>4</sup>

Now Plutarch has previously used the word *εὐταλὴ* in

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, IX, 5.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XLX, 7: τῶν γὰρ φίλων αὐτοῦ καὶ εὐεργετηγῶν ἐν Σπάρτῃ λαβόντες ...

<sup>3</sup> cf. Lysander, XVII, 6.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Polyænus, VII, 19.

this Life, without giving any explanation of the term in the earlier chapter - but here he decides to explain the word, and give some account of the way in which the *συνουσία* worked. It is therefore likely that Theopompus ( whom Plutarch seems to have used as his authority for the material of chapter XLV ) used the word *συνουσία* quite naturally in his narrative, without thinking it necessary to give an explanation of a contemporary Spartan device. Apparently, the Spartan *συνουσία* was well-known throughout the cities of Greece - but whether its nature was generally understood is another matter.<sup>2</sup>

Plutarch's ' Hostile Source ' may have included a fairly full description of the procedure involved, for the benefit of readers not familiar with the term. This seems, perhaps, more reasonable than to assume that all this information about the *συνουσία* was sought out by Plutarch and culled from various sources specifically for this chapter; otherwise, it is hard to see why Plutarch did not use his information in the chapter where he first employed the term.

Plutarch's explanation of the working of the *συνουσία*<sup>3</sup> makes it seem so simple a device that one is led to suspect that the Spartans could not have adopted so childish a method of

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, XLV, 9.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Thucy., 1, 131; Aristophanes, Lycis., 991; Xen., Hell. 3, 3, 8-9; Schol. Pindar, Olyn., VI, 154; Schol., Arist., Birds, 1283; Aristotle, Fr. 466; Athenaeus, X, 451 D; Auson., Epist. 28, 23; Clem., Strom., 2, 4, 19; Nepos, Pausanias, III: ' ... legatos cum CLAVA ad eum miserunt, in qua more illorum erat scriptum... '.

<sup>3</sup> Which is identical with information supplied by Aulus Gellius, Noct. Attic. XVII, 9, 6.

transmitting secret messages.

According to Plutarch, the *scawily* consisted of two identical sticks, one given to a general by the ephors when he left Sparta for a campaign, the other retained by the authorities. When the ephors wished to send a secret message to their general, they wound a strip of parchment in a spiral course about their wooden stick, wrote upon the parchment, and then sent off the parchment to the general. He could only get any meaning out of the parchment strip by rewinding it upon his own stick.

Of course, we have some evidence that Spartan messages were usually deciphered with ease by their enemies; but even so, it seems unlikely that this childish method was really adopted by the astute Spartans.<sup>2</sup> A passage of Dioscurides, quoted in Photius,<sup>3</sup> says that "at Sparta lenders used to divide a stick in the presence of two witnesses, writing the agreement upon each piece. They gave one piece to one of the witnesses and kept the other themselves". Such a system of 'tally-sticks' in Sparta may have been used - with slight modifications - by the ephors when they sent a general out on active service. The stick may have been split lengthwise, one half retained by the ephors, the other by the general;

<sup>1</sup> cf. Plutarch, Alcibiades, XXVIII; Lysander, XXVIII, 4.

<sup>2</sup> cf. J.H. Leopold, 'De Boytala Laconica', *Memosyno*, XXVIII, 1900, pp. 365 ff.; H. Nicholl, *Sparta*, pp. 273-4.

<sup>3</sup> *D.V. Eurythy* : F.H.C., II, p. 193.



and any dispatch of the ephors to the general was sent - either oral or written - by a messenger who carried with him the ephors' half of the stick, the fitting of the two halves together serving as the credentials of the messenger.

If this latter is the more correct interpretation of the *scandal*, then it seems unlikely that this part of Plutarch's 'hostile' information is from a Spartan source; and the very fact that an explanation of the *scandal* is either given or considered necessary probably postulates a later source than the Fourth Century B.C.

---

'Unless, of course, we assume that Plutarch considered some explanation necessary for his readers, and therefore gathered together some material from outside the source which he was using for the rest of this chapter.

CHAPTER XXX

Plutarch here tells, in considerable detail, the story of Pharnabazus' trickery; similar accounts are also to be found in Nepos<sup>2</sup> and in Polyaeus<sup>3</sup>.

1 Plutarch, Lysander, XII, 1 - 5: ὁ δὲ Λυσ., ἐλθούσης τῆς σκυτάλης πρὸς αὐτὸν αἰς τὸν Ἑλλησποντον, διαταράχθη, καὶ μάλιστα τὰς τοῦ Φαρναβάζου δεδιώς κατηγορίας, ἐπιπέμπειν εἰς λόγους αὐτῷ εὐελθεῖν, ὡς λέγουσι τὴν διαφορὰν. καὶ εὐελθεὶν ἔδωκε γράμμαι ἰσχυρὰς πρὸς τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἑτέραν ἐπιστολὴν ἣν αὐτὸν ἠδικημένον οὐδ' ἔγκαιλόντα. πρὸς κρήτη δὲ ἔγρα, τὸ τοῦ λόγου, κρητίξων ἠγνῶτα τὸν Φαρναβάζον. ὑποχώρησεν γὰρ ὑπὸ πάντα ποιήσας, φανερώς μὲν ἔγραψεν ὅτι δ' Λυσ. ἤξιωσε ἐπιστολὴν, κρύφα δὲ εἶχεν ἑτέραν αὐτῷ γράμματα. ἐν δὲ τῷ τὰς σφραγίδας ἐσβαλλέντι ἐναλλάξ τὰ βιβλία μὲν διαφέροντα τῷ ὄψει, εἰδῶσιν ἐκείνην αὐτῷ τὴν κρύφα γράμματα. ἄριστος οὖν δ' Λυσ. εἰς Λακεδαιμόνα καὶ παρρησίαι, ὥστε ἔθος ἐστίν, εἰς τὸ ἄρχεσθαι, ἀπέδωκε τοῖς ἐφόροις τὰ γράμματα τοῦ Φαρναβάζου, πεπερημένος ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, τὸ μείψασθαι αὐτῷ τῶν ἐγκαλημάτων. ἠγχιώτατο γὰρ ὁ Φαρναβάζος ὑπὸ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων, πρῶτον οὖν ὅτι τῷ πολέμῳ τῶν βασιλέως στρατηγῶν γεννημένος. ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀναγκάστες οἱ ἔφοροι τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἔδοξαν αὐτῷ, καὶ εὐχόμενος ὡς οὐκ ἔρ' ὄβυσσόν ἐστιν κέρυκος μόνος, τότε μὲν ἰσχυρῶς παρορμηθέντος ἀπέλθεν.

2 Nepos, Lysander, IV: ' Nam cum Lysander praefectus classis in bello multa crudeliter avaraque fecisset de quo iis rebus suspicaretur ad cives suos esse perlatum, petiit a Pharnabazo ut ad ephoros sibi testimonium daret, quanta sanctitate bellum gessisset sociosque tractasset, de quo ea re accurate scriberet: magnam enim eius auctoritatem in ea re futuram. Huic illo liberaliter pollicetur: librum grandem verbis multis conscripsit, in quibus summis cum effortu laudibus. Quem cum legisset probassetque, dum signatur, alterum pari magnitudine, tanta similitudine, ut discerni non posset, signatum subiecit, in quo accuratissime eius avaritiam perfidiamque accusarat. Lysander domum cum redisset, postquam de suis rebus gentis apud maximum magistratum quae voluerat dixerat, testimonium loco librum a Pharnabazo datum tradidit. Hunc dumnote Lysandro cum ephori cognosset, ipsi legendum dederunt. Ita illo imprudens ipse suus fuit accusator '.

3 Polyaeus, VII, 19: Φαρναβάζος κατὰ Λυσ. Λακεδαιμονίους ἔγραψεν. οἱ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας αὐτὸν ἀποκαλέσαντο σκυτάλην πέρφρατες. Λυσ. ἰσχυρὰς Φαρναβάζου ἔλαβεν ἐπιστολὴν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ γράμμαι φιλάνθρωπων. Φαρναβάζος ὑποχώρησεν φανερώς μὲν ἔγραψεν ὅτι δ' Λυσ. ἤξιωσε, κρύφα δὲ εἶχεν ἑτέραν γράμματα, ἐν δὲ τῷ τὴν σφραγίδα ἐσβαλλέντι, ἐναλλάξ τὰ βιβλία μὲν διαφέροντα τῷ ὄψει, εἰδῶσιν αὐτῷ τὴν κρύφα γράμματα. Λυσ. εἰς Λακεδαιμόνα τοὺς ἐφόρους κατὰ τὸ ἔθος ἀπέδωκε τὰ γράμματα, οἱ δὲ ἀναγκάστες ἔδοξαν αὐτῷ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, προκρίνοντες μὲν ἀπολογίαις εἰδῶσιν αὐτὸν καθ' ἑαυτοῦ γράμματα πορεύσαντα.

441

There is such a striking similarity between these three accounts that they must ultimately come from the same source. Parts of the version of Polyaeus are so completely identical with that of Plutarch, using almost the same words, that one might have assumed that Polyaeus took over his account verbatim from Plutarch, had it not been for the additional information given by Plutarch ( which Polyaeus would have had no reason to omit ), and particularly for the short sentence with which Polyaeus concludes his version of the story. For, after following the account of Plutarch in almost the same words, up to the showing of the letter of Pharnabazus to Lysander by the ephors, he adds *πρῶτοις* ( i.e. the ephors ) *μὴδὲν ἀπολογίης εἶσθαι ἀλλὰ καθ' αὐτῶν γράμματα κομίσαντα.*

This corresponds exactly to the Latin of Nepos, ' Ipse suus fuit accusator ', and it is not included in Plutarch's account; but he, in its place, quotes an iambic trimeter of doubtful authorship: *ὦν ἄρ' Ὀδυσσεύς ἐστιν ἀφύλος μόνος.*

This similarity between Plutarch and Polyaeus would disprove any theory that Plutarch was not in the habit of taking his anecdotes verbatim from his sources, for obviously Plutarch and Polyaeus used the same source for this story and both seem to have made an accurate copy of it.

There are certain small points of difference between the three versions of the story. Plutarch and Polyaeus both state

---

<sup>1</sup>This had been mentioned in our examination of chapter IV of Nepos' Life of Lysander.

that Pharnabazus had sent a dispatch to Sparta to accuse Lysander; Polyaeus also agrees with Plutarch that the Spartans sent a *causally* to recall Lysander.

Nepos is not as definite as this; he merely stated that Lysander had suspected that the Spartans had been informed of his cruelty and greed.

The substance of Lysander's request in Plutarch is that Pharnabazus should write another letter to the ephors, stating that he " had not been wronged at all and had no complaints to make "; Polyaeus merely states that the request was " to write another, and friendly , letter on his behalf "; the request in Nepos is positive, ' quanta sanctitate bellum gessisset sociosque tractasset, deque ea re accurate scriberet '.

At this point<sup>1</sup> Plutarch inserts into his narrative a proverbial saying,<sup>3</sup> which is not found in Nepos or Polyaeus, and a little further on there is an addition to the story which is peculiar to Plutarch. He describes Pharnabazus

<sup>1</sup> For, although Plutarch refers to *κατηγόρους* in XIX, 7, he implies a letter: cf. XII, 2: *ἐπέμψεν ἐπιστολήν*.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XII, 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Paroem. Gr.*, 1, 507: *II*, 811: *πρὸς κρήτα . . . τὸ τοῦ λόγου, κρητίζεν*. This was probably a well-known and frequently used saying, for the Cretans were a byword for lying and trickery - as is made clear by the hexameter verse of Epimenides, poet and priest of Cnossos in Crete, who visited Athens c. 596 B.C.

*κρήτες δὲ ψεύσται, κρητὴ θεοῖα, γυβήτορες ἀγαοί.*

The first part of this verse is quoted by Callimachus, in his Hymn to Zeus, 1, 8, where he applies it to the Cretan legend about the tomb of Zeus in Crete; cf. also, Polybius, IV, 8: VI, 46 - 47: VIII, 18; Theopompus, fr. 69 - 70, G. & H.; Paul, *Hp. Tit.*, 1, 12.

as a man held in high regard by the Spartans because he had supported their cause in the Peloponnesian War more eagerly than any other of the Persians. This is not found in Nepos or Polyaeus, unless we assume that Nepos' words, 'magnam enim eius auctoritatem in ea re futuram', are his shorter version in Latin of the same idea expressed in Greek by Plutarch.

The conclusion of the anecdote in Plutarch is different from that of Nepos or Polyaeus, although the ultimate meaning is perhaps the same. Plutarch concludes with a quotation - Lysander realised, after he had read the second letter of Pharnabazus, that "Odysseus is not the only man of guile".<sup>2</sup> While Plutarch is thus suggesting that Lysander found that he had been tricked by a greater trickster than himself, Nepos and Polyaeus are alleging that Lysander, by requesting a letter of testimony from Pharnabazus, had in fact brought home evidence in writing against himself.

But the whole incident of the Pharnabazus letter is suspect and most unlikely. W.K. Prentice says,<sup>3</sup> "All these things may be merely exaggerations, distortions of fact, or malicious gossip by some person or persons who disliked Lysander or had some end of their own to serve". Certainly,

---

<sup>1</sup> Plutarch does not seem to notice the inconsistency of ascribing to such a man such an unnecessary act of trickery.

<sup>2</sup> K. Ziegler, *Plut. Vit.*, 3, 2, p. 129 (Teubner) attributes this quotation to the 'Telophus' of Euripides; cf. *Roek*, II, fr. 715; *Stob. Flor.*, 29, 55.

<sup>3</sup> *A. J. A.*, XXXVIII, 1934, p. 39.

the three authorities are very late, and probably unreliable, because none of these facts are substantiated by contemporary and Fourth Century writers. Xenophon knows nothing about any disagreement between Lysander and Pharnabazus, or any recall from Asia Minor, or of any disgrace at Sparta. Diodorus<sup>1</sup> makes it quite clear that Lysander always acted in harmony with the wishes of the ephors, and knows nothing of any shameful recall.

Moreover, there seems to be very little point in the trick of an exchange of letters, when Pharnabazus was alleged to have sent previously a dispatch to Sparta, presumably giving therein full details of his charges against Lysander.

Finally, it is inconceivable that the ephors would take no positive action against Lysander if such accusations had really been sent to them. The powers of a Spartan nauarch were so considerable<sup>2</sup> that tenure of the office was not extended beyond a year, and it is likely that the ephors would scrutinize most carefully the actions of any Spartan who held or had held such absolute authority, especially if information was laid against him. If Pasippidas, nauarch at Thasos, was banished; if Spartan kings like Pausanias the Elder and the Younger, and

---

<sup>1</sup> XIII, 14, 1.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Aristotle, Pol., 1271 A; Nepos, Lysander, IV, calls Lysander 'praefectus classis'.

Spartan officers like Gylippus and Therax, were condemned to death or to exile, the ephors would not have ignored charges of this nature brought against Lysander. Yet, according to Plutarch, the result of Lysander's appearance before the ephors, after being recalled by a *συντάλη*, was merely that Lysander left the presence of the ephors "seriously disturbed" (*ἰσχυρῶς τοσοῦτον βυβρῆτος*); and - even more inconceivable - that he asked for, and received, permission from the ephors to be allowed to leave Sparta to visit a shrine in an oasis in the great desert of Libya.

Therefore, in any attempt at identification of the source or sources used by Plutarch in these chapters, we must assume the possibility that this incident (and also probably the allegation of Lysander's conspiracy against the hereditary kingship of Sparta) is wholly untrue and probably invented to bring posthumous disgrace upon Lysander and defame his character, or is an exaggeration based upon a very small nucleus of fact. It is not inconceivable that Pharnabazus might complain to the ephors about Lysander's encroachment upon his territories; such complaints may well have formed the basis of this 'cock-and-bull' story which Plutarch, Nepos and Polyænus found in their source. No doubt, the Spartan king, Pausanias, and his partisans - if they were on the look-out for an opportunity against Lysander,

---

Although Plutarch does admit (Lyc., III, 1): *ῥόητος δὲ καὶ χαλεπῶς ἀποθῆναι διαπραξαίμενος.*

could find it in the complaints of Pharnabazus, and in the illegal possession of money by a friend of Lysander.

A later writer, finding accounts of trials at Sparta of the Spartan king Pausanias, a rival of Lysander, and of Thoraax, a friend of Lysander, and, in addition, records of a series of complaints against Lysander sent by a Persian satrap, could easily build up from such meagre material a not very flattering account of Lysander's popularity at Sparta.

7 Plutarch tells us that, immediately after the reading of Pharnabazus' letter, Lysander obtained permission from the ephors to leave Sparta for a visit to North Africa, to sacrifice to Zeus Ammon in Cyrene, to whom he had vowed sacrifices " before the battles " ( *πρὸ τῶν ἐκτάκτων* ). Some authorities state, says Plutarch, that when Lysander was laying siege to Aphytis in Pallene, Ammon appeared to him in a dream; whereupon, at the command of the god, Lysander raised the siege and was eager to go to Libya, at the first possible moment, to propitiate the god.

It must be assumed that Lysander did in fact visit Thrace and Chalcidice in the course of his ' mopping-up ' operations after the fall of Athens, although Xenophon makes no mention of it. Xenophon suggests that, after Aegospotami, Lysander spent some time in Asia Minor, taking over Chalcedon

---

' Hellenica, II, 2, 1 - 22.



and Byzantium, setting up a docndarchy at Lesbos, and meeting with little opposition except at Samos. During this time he probably took over Sestos.

But, when did he capture Scione, on the Chalcidic peninsula<sup>2</sup>? Xenophon<sup>3</sup> merely says that Lysander sent Eteoniceus with ten ships to Thrace, to bring these regions over to the Spartan side. If Lysander went in person to Thrace, it was probably after the fall of Athens, some time during the year 404 - 403 B.C. - to assist Eteoniceus and to superintend the subjugation of the Athenian allied cities on the Chalcidic peninsula and the coast of Thrace. Probably during this expedition Thasos was taken over.<sup>4</sup>

Pausanias<sup>5</sup> writes that, when Lysander was besieging Aphytis in Palleno, Ammon appeared by night and declared that it would be better for him and for Sparta if they ceased from warring against Aphytis; and so Lysander raised the siege and induced the Spartans to worship the god still more. In Plutarch's account, Lysander ordered the Aphytaeans to make sacrifices to Ammon, and was himself eager to go to the parent shrine in Libya. Pausanias<sup>6</sup> tells us that the people of Aphytic worship Ammon no less reverently than the Libyans;

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, XIV, 3.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XIV, 4.

<sup>3</sup> Hellenica, II, 2, 5.

<sup>4</sup> Unless the source of Nepos, II, and Polyaeus, 1, 45, 4, identified Thasos with the Iasus named by Ephorus.

<sup>5</sup> III, 18, 3.

<sup>6</sup> III, 18, 2.

but this may refer to a worship established at Aphytis after the deliverance of their city from Lysander because of the miraculous intervention of the god.

That there had been for centuries in the deserts of Libya a temple and oracle of Zeus Ammon, is well attested by Greek and Roman writers. Herodotus<sup>1</sup> affirms that at a very early date the Gamians had tenanted the oasis of Siwah, and the oracular shrine long continued in great repute.

It is not clear exactly what Plutarch means when he refers to the vows taken by Lysander " before the battles "; if he means before Lysander was appointed to command the Spartan fleet in 408 - 407 B.C., then it would appear that Lysander had prior associations with the shrine of Zeus Ammon, and had vowed, before he ever took a command, to pay sacrifices to Ammon if success was granted to him. This could be explained by the reference of Diodorus<sup>2</sup> to a Libyan king of the tribes living in the locality of the oracle, named Libys, who was a friend of the father of Lysander; in recognition of this friendship, Lysander's brother had been named Libys. Plutarch, of course, was not aware of this, for he did not use his Ephorus at first hand.

Plutarch concludes his chapter with three distinct

<sup>1</sup> 111, 26; cf. Herodotus, 11, 55; Ovid, Met. XV, 310; Lucret., VI, 147; Curtius, IV, 7; Strabo, I, 11; Pausanias, IV, 23; Plutarch, Gimon, XVIII, 6.

<sup>2</sup> XIV, 13, 6.

explanations of, and reasons for, Lysander's departure for Libya:

1 ) " As some say ", he left Sparta because he had made the vow and wished to fulfil it in person.

2 ) " Most people believed " that the god was a mere pretext, for Lysander was impatient of control after his years of independence and freedom abroad, and wished to get away from the authorities at home, " like a horse which comes back to his stall from unrestricted pasturage in the meadows, and is put once more to his accustomed work ".

3 ) " Ephorus assigns another reason for this absence abroad, which I shall mention shortly "..... that Lysander had conceived a plan to overthrow the hereditary kingship and wished to influence the oracles to support his plot.

Plutarch is obviously aware of different interpretations of Lysander's journey abroad, and these three distinct reasons given by different authorities imply Plutarch's own conviction that Lysander did go to Libya. But what must be noticed is that Plutarch is most fair; whatever authorities he is here using, he is at pains to give all suggested reasons for Lysander's departure from Sparta, perhaps suggesting that he himself would accept the second reason.

---

/ of. Lysander, *XIV*, 3 ff.; Ephorus attributed Lysander's journey to Libya exclusively to his desire to change the kingship.

It is not impossible that Plutarch found in his narrative source, Theopompus, either a reference to Lysander's journey to Libya, or a brief account of that journey. It certainly seems likely that such a journey was made, and that contemporary opponents of Lysander, and later writers who wished to vilify his character, would suggest such reasons for the journey as would suit their own allegations. Clearly, if it was believed that Lysander had plotted to overthrow the hereditary monarchy, and if malicious gossip had enlarged and exaggerated these allegations after Lysander's death, any unusual activity on his part would be interpreted in the worst possible light.

Plutarch sums the matter up by saying that the ephors reluctantly and grudgingly gave Lysander permission to go abroad. But reluctance on the part of the ephors would be expected, even if there were no breath of suspicion associated with Lysander, for it was never the policy of Sparta willingly to allow her citizens to enjoy liberty of action outside Sparta which she denied them inside the city.

Plutarch now introduces his lengthy account of Lysander's plot against the hereditary kingship of Sparta; apparently he sets it chronologically after the return of Lysander from Agesilaus' expedition to Asia Minor, in 396 B.C. But, although he assigns the working out of the details of the plan to the period after Lysander's return, he makes it clear that these plans had been devised some time before<sup>1</sup>; thus, he is not in complete disagreement about the timing of the plan with Ephorus, who<sup>2</sup> attributes the scheme of Lysander to the year 403 B.C., after the death of Alcibiades and not so very long after the fall of Athens.

Xenophon seems to have had no knowledge whatever of this alleged treasonable plan; he states<sup>3</sup> that Lysander returned from Asia Minor with the other thirty Spartiates who had accompanied Agesilaus, and gives no suggestion of disgrace. This is probably quite significant, for no doubt Xenophon had himself personal knowledge of Lysander when he was campaigning with Agesilaus, and was in a position, when living in Elis, to

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. Lysander, XLIV, 2: τὰ πάλαι διακείμενα ; and XL, 9, where he mentions Ephorus' interpretation of the reason for Lysander's visit to Libya, probably late in 402 B.C.

<sup>2</sup> Diodorus, XIV, 13.

<sup>3</sup> Hellenica, III, 4, 20.

be familiar with current rumours and stories about Lysander, if any existed. But in fact he tells us nothing dishonourable about Lysander, except perhaps his treatment of Callieratidas, although he has many strictures to pass upon other Spartans who dishonoured their city by their actions.<sup>2</sup>

Plutarch commences his account of Lysander's plot by describing in brief the method of selection of the Spartan kings. He follows the ancient tradition that the Dorians were Heraclids,<sup>3</sup> claiming descent from Heracles, and that long after the synoecism of the Dorian tribes which had conquered the valley of the Eurotas, certain families were able to trace back their ancestry to Heracles. But not every Heraclid family participated in the royal succession, the kings being chosen from two families only, the Eurypontids and the Agiads.<sup>4</sup>

The double kingship of Sparta was no doubt a retention of a primitive system of chieftainship which sought a practical compromise between the claims of two or more royal houses to domination; and, as Plutarch points out, no other Spartans had special privileges in the government of their city by reason

<sup>1</sup> Which has been discussed above, in chapters V, 7 - VII, 1.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Xenophon, *Hell.*, V, 4, 22; Agesilaus, XIV.

<sup>3</sup> *Thucy.*, I, 12; Pausanias, II, 28; Strabo, VIII, 8, 5.

<sup>4</sup> The origin of these names is explained by Ephorus, apud Strabo, VIII, 5, 5; cf. Pausanias, III, 7, 1; Herodotus, VI, 51 - 53. Apollodorus (II, 8, 2) says that the Heraclid Aristodemus was killed by lightning at Naupactus when preparing to invade the Peloponnese; his two sons, Eurysthones & Procles, drew lots

of ἐδύετο . Succession passed from father to eldest son,  
and if no sons were left at the king's death, to the next male  
in strict line of succession.<sup>2</sup>

Plutarch says that Lysander belonged to one <sup>of</sup> the  
↑  
families of the Heraclidae. When he had become great and  
famous in his city, and was supported by a considerable body  
of patrons and followers, he was annoyed to think that his  
city, which had increased her power by his efforts, was ruled  
by men of no better birth than himself. He therefore planned  
to take away the kingship from the two royal houses and give  
it back ( ἀποδοῦναι ) to all the Heraclidae ( or, as some say,  
to the Spartiates as a whole ), on the elective basis of a  
man's worth, hoping by these means to be chosen himself.

There are some interesting points of difference here  
between what Plutarch says and what was apparently written by  
Ephorus. In the first place, Plutarch makes it clear that  
Lysander claimed to be of the family of the Heraclidae; but  
he does not remind his readers that he has already mentioned  
this claim in a previous chapter,<sup>3</sup> where his authority is  
probably Theopompus. Ephorus cannot have been aware of this  
claim of Lysander's; otherwise he would hardly have referred to

---

(\*) with the other Heraclids, Tomenus and Cleophontes, & obtained  
Laconia. Eurysthenes' son, Agis, gave his name to the Agiads,  
while Procles' son, Eurypides, gave his name to his descendants.

<sup>1</sup> of. Herodotus, VII, 3.    <sup>2</sup> of. Xen. Hell. III, 3, 3; Nepos, Ages., 1.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, II, 1.

10

Lysander's desire to put an end to the kingship of the Heraclids.<sup>1</sup> Secondly, Plutarch here<sup>2</sup> seems to suggest that Lysander's principal reason for seeking to change the method of selection of the Spartan kings was the fact that he himself had done a great deal to increase the power of Sparta in Greece, and yet others of no higher birth than himself were allowed to govern his city and, presumably, to gain credit for, if not the advantages of, his conquests. Lysander's reason for the change is expressed here very mildly and indeed very reasonably, when compared with what Plutarch has previously written:<sup>3</sup> " He sailed back to Sparta, without honour..... hating the whole form of government more than ever, and resolved to put into execution at once.... the plans for a revolutionary change " .

Diodorus is quite brief; he says<sup>4</sup> that Lysander, " becoming presumptuous and arrogant at this ( i.e. at the successful conclusion of the Peloponnesian War ), resolved to end the kingship of the Heraclids and made the choice of rulers common to all the Spartiates, hoping that he himself would gain the power because of his great achievements " .

Nepos<sup>5</sup> puts forward another reason: ' Itaque hi decem-

---

<sup>1</sup> Diodorus, XLV, 13, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XXXIV, 4.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XXXIV, 2.

<sup>4</sup> XLV, 13, 2 et seq.

<sup>5</sup> Nepos, Lysander, lil.



virescentem illam potestatem ab illo constitutam sustulerunt.  
Quo colore incensus inicit consilia reges Lacedaemoniorum  
tollere'. Unfortunately, the end of chapter II of his Life  
of Lysander is missing, so that we can only surmise that he  
is alleging that the cruelty and treachery of Lysander prompted  
the kings or the Spartan authorities ( ' hi ' ) to end his  
power by putting down his decarchy. Therefore, says Nepos,  
Lysander plotted to end the power of the kings. Nepos agrees  
with Diodorus that the choice of kings should be made open to  
all Spartans ( ' ex omnibus dux deligatur ' ).

Plutarch, in this chapter, is acknowledging two  
distinct traditions:

1 ) that the kingship, taken from the two royal houses,  
should be made available to all Heraclids:

2 ) that, " as some say " ( obviously Ephorus<sup>1</sup> ) the  
kingship should be open to all Spartiates.

Plutarch adds to the second tradition the comment  
that even those Spartans who could not claim descent from  
Heracles might, by showing their virtue, like Heracles himself  
receive the reward of election to the royal position.

No doubt, the Boeotian in Plutarch prompted this reference to  
the glorious achievements of the patron god of Boeotia.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> cf. Lysander, XXX, 3 - 4; Diodorus, XIV, 13.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Lysander, XXVII, 6.

Apart from Ephorus, Plutarch and Nepos, there are allusions to this plot of Lysander's in Aristotle, who says that conspiracies against the state are inevitable when great men are disgraced by those who have received higher honours than themselves, to whom they are in no way inferior in abilities, " as Lysander by the kings ".

---

Pol., V, 1, 5, 1301 B: V, 7, 2, 1306 B: cf. Cicero, De Div., 1, 43: ' Lycurgus quidem, qui Lacedaemoniorum rem publicam temperavit, leges suas auctoritate Apollinis Delphici confirmavit. Quas cum vollet Lysander commutare, eadem est prohibitus religione '.

CHAPTERS XXV, XXVI, and XXX, 3 - 5.

The first step taken by Lysander in his attempt to overthrow the hereditary dyarchy was to persuade the Spartans themselves of the reasonableness of his plan; to this end, he committed to memory a speech written by Cleon of Halicarnassus.

Plutarch gives much greater detail about this speech in chapter XXX,<sup>1</sup> where he attributes his information ultimately to Ephorus;<sup>2</sup> and, although the anecdote about the finding of the speech in Lysander's house after his death is more detailed in Plutarch than it is in Diodorus,<sup>3</sup> it is likely that the whole story was to be found in Ephorus, whence, suitably embroidered, it passed on into Plutarch's 'Hostile Source'.

In chapter XXX, Plutarch says that some dispute had arisen between Sparta and her allies and it became necessary for the ephors to examine a number of state documents which still reposed in Lysander's house. Agesilaus, in searching the house, found the "speech on the constitution". Astonished and dismayed, he determined to make public the speech,

<sup>1</sup> Lysander, XXX, 3 - 5.

<sup>2</sup> F.Gr.H., II A, p. 103, 207: II C, p. 96.

<sup>3</sup> XIV, 13, 2 ff.

464

and show up the character of the dead Lysander; but he was restrained by Laeratiadas, the principal ephor and a prudent man, who argued that they ought not to "dig up Lysander again, but rather to bury the speech along with him", on the grounds that the speech was plausible, and therefore dangerous.

Plutarch tells the same story in his Life of Agesilaus,<sup>1</sup> with very slight differences. There he says that Agesilaus found an association banded together against him, which Lysander had organised after his return from Asia Minor. Agesilaus, therefore, desiring to show up Lysander, found the speech among Lysander's effects and wished to make it public; but "one of the elders", fearing the "cleverness of the speech, advised him not to dig Lysander up again, but rather to bury the speech along with him".

<sup>2</sup> Elsewhere, Plutarch calls the ephor who dissuaded Agesilaus "Cratidas, at that time head of the ephors", and gives as his reason for checking Agesilaus, "lest the speech, when read, should persuade anyone".

<sup>3</sup> In the Life of Agesilaus, Plutarch suggests that a conspiracy had been engineered by Lysander against Agesilaus personally, but he gives no information as to how the speech

---

<sup>1</sup> Agesilaus, XI, 3 - 5, and also Apoph. Lac., 212 F, in almost identical words with the Agesilaus account.

<sup>2</sup> Apoph. Lac., 229 F: the name of Cratidas is recorded as ephor in one inscription - S.G.D.I., IV, p. 690.

<sup>3</sup> XI, 3 - 5, and Apoph. Lac., 212 F.

was discovered; he merely suggests that Agonilaus was ' looking for trouble '.

In Lysander XXX, Plutarch implies that it was necessary to consult some documents in Lysander's house, although it is unreasonable to think that Lysander would have important state documents in his private house.

Both Diodorus<sup>1</sup> and Nepos<sup>2</sup> record very similar accounts to that of Plutarch of the finding of this speech in Lysander's house. The account of Nepos is brief, but he does mention the name of the author of the speech, which is omitted by Diodorus.

The whole anecdote<sup>3</sup> about the speech is suspect, for Lysander would have had sufficient sense, when his plot failed to reach fruition, to destroy any written evidence against himself. In any case, Plutarch tells us that Lysander memorised the speech, presumably so as to be able to destroy the original. The story is akin to most of the information derived from the ' Hostile Source ', whose set purpose was to vilify Lysander's character, and to that end seems to have distorted or magnified what Ephorus may have recorded as current and unconfirmed rumours.

<sup>1</sup> XLV, 13, 8.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, III: ' quam vere de eo foret iudicatum, oratio indicio fuit, quae post mortem in domo eius reperta est..... hanc et scripsisse Cleon Halicarnadius dicitur '. This Cleon of Halicarnassus is otherwise not known.

<sup>3</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XXV, 1 and XXX, 3 - 5.

We must suppose that Lysander was going to bring his plan out into the open and argue in public for a change of kingship, in the hope of winning the support both of the ephors and of the Spartiates in general. How he could hope to do this, or would even dare to make an attempt so shortly after the unsuccessful conspiracy of Cinadon in 398 B.C., is naturally not explained. If we assume that Plutarch's chronology is correct, and that Lysander began to set his plan in action immediately after his return from Asia Minor in 396 B.C., this would imply that a mere year or two after a dangerous conspiracy against the state had been crushed, Lysander made an equally dangerous attempt against the kingship. Cinadon's attempts were ruthlessly and quickly brought to nought - his hopes of equality were soon nullified. It is unlikely that an astute Spartan like Lysander would raise a similar cry within such a short time; unless, of course, Lysander had made his plans long before the conspiracy of Cinadon, and the fate of Cinadon caused him to retract and do no more than leave about the dangerous evidence of his own treason.

It is not inconceivable that rumours and reports of rebellion and conspiracy in Sparta, which penetrated the

<sup>1</sup> cf. Xenophon, Hellenica, III, 3, 4 - 11.

<sup>2</sup> Xenophon, Hellenica, III, 3, 11: *μυστὸς ἦν τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν Λακεδαιμονίᾳ.*

Laconian ' iron curtain ' and reached the ears of other Greeks, may have been written up at the time by others than Xenophon, who without full knowledge of the facts passed on mere stories, and even attributed to Lysander some of the schemes of Cinadon. The weakness of these stories lies in the fact that Lysander was apparently acquitted of all charges brought against him during his lifetime, and continued to enjoy the confidence of the ephors up to his death.

4

Plutarch now suggests that Lysander realised that Cleon's speech of itself would hardly produce the results which he desired; he therefore decided upon another method of influencing the Spartans. He began to tamper with the oracular shrines of Greece, in an attempt to play upon the superstitions of his fellow-countrymen. He felt that if he could gain oracles favourable to his cause ( which advocated a change in the methods of electing the kings of Sparta ), the plausible speech of Cleon would have more effect upon his hearers.<sup>2</sup>

Diodorus and Nepos confirm this.

<sup>1</sup> cf. Plutarch, Lysander, XX, 5 and XXV, 4; Nepos, Lysander, 111: ' accusatus hoc crimine iudiciumque absolutus sententiis '.

<sup>2</sup> Plutarch, Lysander, XXV, 2: Nepos, 111: Diodorus, XIV, 13, 3:   
 ὡς αὖ δὲν ἐφελγόμενος εἰπὼ θεωρῶν δὲ τοῖς Λακ.   
 τῆς Κλεῶνος δεινότητος, εἰ μὴ μάλιστα τοῖς μαντικαῖς   
 φόβῳ θῶν τινι καὶ δεισιδαιμονίᾳ προσέχοντας, ἐπεχτήρα...   
 προεκλήξας καὶ χερσὶ κέρνας ἐνόησε γὰρ, εἰ χρεῖν ἂν   
 διαγάγοι πρὸς τὸ λόγον τοῖς λάβοι εὐρυμυχὸν τοῖς ἰδίοις   
 πολιταῖς. ἐπιβολαῖς, ἐν δὲ τῷ ἔξεν ἐπὶ   
 τέλος τὴν προαίρεσιν.

4 Quoting the authority of Ephorus, Plutarch now notes three distinct attempts made by Lysander to corrupt oracular shrines by means of bribes:

1 ) Lysander attempted to corrupt the Pythian priestesses.

2 ) Lysander attempted to persuade the priestesses at Dodona through the agency of a certain Pherecles.

3 ) Lysander went to the temple of Ammon and tried to bribe the god's interpreters there, but they denounced him to the Spartan authorities.

Plutarch's account of these three attempts to tamper with shrines is almost identical with what we find in Diodorus and Nepos.

Diodorus adds an extra comment about Pherecrates ( ' Pherecles ', says Plutarch ), whom Lysander used as his go-between, and a detail about a Libyan chieftain named Libya, known to the family of Lysander;<sup>2</sup> but otherwise he records little that is not found in Plutarch. He refers to the speech found in Lysander's house after his death, but does not give the name of the author, and adds this detail rather as an afterthought than as the first method adopted by Lysander to win over the Spartans ( as Plutarch suggests ).

Nepos makes no reference to Pherecrates or Pherecles, but otherwise follows Diodorus most closely, although he

<sup>1</sup> XIV, 13, 4: Φερακράτης, Ἀπολλωνιάτου μὲν τὸ γένος, ἔχοντος δὲ συγγένειαν πρὸς τοὺς περὶ τὸ ἱεῖον διατετιβότας.

<sup>2</sup> XIV, 13, 6.



names Cloon of Halicarnassus as the author of the speech.

Plutarch only diverges from Diodorus and Nepos in the order of the incidents ( the speech first, and then the attempts to corrupt the oracles ), and in the additions which he makes about the Libyan embassy which came to Sparta to denounce Lysandor. The Libyans, says Plutarch, disappointed at the acquittal of Lydandor, remarked on their departure, " We will judge better than you, Spartans, when you come to dwell with us in Libya " - thus referring to an oracle which bade the Spartans settle in Libya. It is possible that this oracle about the colonization of Libya by the Spartans is the same one which Herodotus<sup>1</sup> claims was given by Delphi to Theras ( uncle of Procles and Eurysthenes ) , whose island of Thera did in fact send out a colony to Cyrene.<sup>2</sup> There are no other references to oracles about Spartans or Dorians settling in Libya; and if Plutarch is here referring to the same oracle which is mentioned by Herodotus, we can only assume that in his anecdote the Libyans were quoting an old oracle which they knew to have been already fulfilled.

This paragraph introduces what Plutarch seems to be

<sup>1</sup> IV, 147 - 153.

<sup>2</sup> of. Herodotus, V, 42, where we read that Dorion, step-brother of Cleomenes, in chagrin at not being chosen king of Sparta, left Sparta and, without taking counsel of the oracle at Delphi, sailed to Libya under the guidance of certain Theracans; but, being expelled from Cyrene, he eventually sailed to Sicily.

describing as Lysander's third and final step in his scheme to overthrow the Spartan hereditary dyarchy. Plutarch says that this third step of Lysander's ( a gigantic scheme to dupo the Spartans through the reading of certain hidden Delphic oracles by a supposed son of Apollo ) was most carefully planned and intricately worked out; therefore, in his description of it, he will follow the account of one who was " both a historian and a philosopher " .

Who this authority is, cannot be stated with certainty. J. Smits<sup>1</sup>, who is inclined to think that Theophrastus<sup>2</sup> is meant, assumes that Plutarch cannot be still following Ephorus because his words,<sup>3</sup> " Now Ephorus tells us ... " and " But the whole plot.... " imply that Ephorus is not full enough and therefore Plutarch has to go over to another source which gave a more detailed account of the whole plot. But this may easily be reading too much into Plutarch's rather loose way of quoting his authority. He has previously<sup>4</sup> indicated that he is going to mention in some detail Ephorus' reasons for Lysander's absence abroad; and we may assume that the whole of chapter XLVI is also included by Plutarch in the Ephoran account, especially as Plutarch concludes chapter XLVI

<sup>1</sup> Plutarchus' Leven van Lysander, Amsterdam, 1939, pp. 230-232, & Intro., XI.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Plutarch, Alcibiades, II, 4, where Theophrastus is described:  
*ἀνδρὶ φιληγαθῷ καὶ ἰσοπορικῷ καὶ ἔντινῶν τῶν φιλοσόφων.*

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XLV, 3: *Ἐφορος μὲν ἂν φησιν* ; XLV, 5: *τὴν δ' ἄλην ἐπιβολὴν.....*

<sup>4</sup> Lysander, XI, 9.

with the words ( found also in Diodorus<sup>1</sup> ) that all those facts were found out after the death of Lysander.

One argument against identifying Ephorus as the ' historian-philosopher<sup>2</sup> ' is the difficulty of calling Ephorus a philosopher; at the best, he was a historian writing history under the influence of rhetoric.

Jacoby<sup>3</sup> thinks that Poseidonius<sup>4</sup> is here meant. But this is surely too easy a guess to resolve a difficult problem of authorship ! It is a common exaggeration to trace to Poseidonius anything in late Greek writers which deals with any of his many and varied subjects, and cannot be definitely assigned to another source.

But, if chapter XXVI cannot be assigned to Ephorus,<sup>5</sup> and if there is little evidence of Theophrastan authorship, then we can only assume either that Plutarch found the story in his ' Hostile Source ', or that he culled it from some other unknown source.

---

<sup>1</sup> XLV, 13.

<sup>2</sup> As does B. Perrin, Plutarch's Life of Lysander, Vol. IV, Loeb, p. 205.

<sup>3</sup> F.Gr.H., II C, p. 96.

<sup>4</sup> of. F.Gr.H. III, pp. 245 - 296.

<sup>5</sup> There is certainly no record of it in Diodorus or Nepos - but an argument from silence is a weak one !

CHAPTER XXVI

The anecdote here recorded by Plutarch seems to be an alternative plan of Lysander's; for, while Plutarch says in the previous chapter<sup>2</sup> that Lysander was unsuccessful in his attempts to corrupt the priests at Delphi, in this chapter<sup>3</sup> he maintains that some, at any rate, of the priests at Delphi were privy to his scheme.

The story itself seems simple enough. A woman of Pontus<sup>4</sup> claimed that Apollo was the father of her son, Silenus, and her allegation was believed even by some influential people. Lysander, hoping to make use of this youth for his own ends, arranged for a response of the oracle at Delphi to be circulated in Sparta - that there were certain very old oracles at Delphi, "in secret writings", which could only be read by a descendant of Apollo. Silenus was to go to Delphi, give proof of his divine birth, and then read out the prophecies, especially the one relating to the Spartan kingship, which declared that it would be better for Sparta if her kings were

---

<sup>1</sup> And therefore from a source other than Ephorus ?

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XXV, 3.

<sup>3</sup> Lysander, XXVI, 4.

<sup>4</sup> cf. Diodorus, XIV, 13, 4, where Lysander's go-between is named Pherecrates of Apollonia ( probably, the Apollonia in Mysia in the Hellespont, not far from Dascylium ): this Hellespontine may serve as a bridge between chapters XXV and XXVI, and suggest that this Pontic tale was also to be found in Ephorus ?

chosen " from the best citizens ". But the whole scheme failed because, at the critical moment, one of the participants lost his nerve and backed out of the plot.

If there is any truth in this childish story, we may assume that Lysander heard of Silenus and met him in the Hellespont either in 407 - 405 B.C. ( before or after Aegospotami ), or late in 403 B.C. ( when he seems to have been in the Hellespont, and incurred the wrath of Pharnabazus<sup>2</sup> ), or even in 396 B.C. ( when he was sent by Agesilaus as ambassador to the Hellespont, possibly as harpost of Abydos<sup>3</sup> ).

But the story ( like all the allegations of the 'Hostile Source ' ) seems to be most unlikely for a number of reasons. In the first place, as stated, it implies collusion on the part of the priests at Delphi, although all the other accounts imply that they indignantly refused his bribes. Secondly, it is not easy to see how Lysander could have been rich enough to attempt to bribe such well-known and important oracles as those at Delphi and Dodona. Plutarch<sup>4</sup> himself elsewhere testifies to his poverty and incorruptibility, and Xenophon says that he gave over to his government all the spoils of the war. Thirdly,

<sup>1</sup> In this respect, at any rate, the story is Ephoran.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Plut. Lysander, XLX, 7 and XX, 1-5; Nepos, Lysander, 1V.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Xen., Hell., III, 4, 10; Plutarch, Agesilaus, VIll, 3.

<sup>4</sup> Lysander, II, 6; XXX, 2; Xen. Hell., II, 3, 8; but cf. Lysander, XVI, 1: XVII, 3; in the latter reference Plutarch admits that it might have been possible for Lysander to store up at Delphi sums of money for his own future use.

it is quite inconceivable that the Spartan ephors would allow Lysander to leave Sparta or would send him abroad with an army to Boeotia, if any sort of report had reached them about his attempts to bribe oracles - let alone a serious accusation brought in person by the ambassadors of Ammon in Libya. The story of Silenus may not have been found out until after the death of Lysander - but Plutarch clearly stated that Lysander was brought for trial on the other charges of corrupting oracles.

IDENTIFICATION OF THE ' HOSTILE SOURCE ' .

This comparison of Plutarch's ' hostile ' chapters with Nepos' biography and the relevant chapters in Diodorus makes it clear that ultimately the greater part of Plutarch's ' hostile ' material, and the material of Nepos, goes back to Ephorus. But it is not at all clear that Plutarch and Nepos used Ephorus at first hand. On the contrary, the evidence before us suggests that they did not.

Both Plutarch and Nepos allege personal responsibility on the part of Lysander for the establishing of decarchies; they both emphasise, by examples, the cruelty and ambition of Lysander. There is not a single case where Nepos includes an incident recorded by Diodorus and omitted by Plutarch; but there is one whole incident and several details common to Plutarch and Nepos, which are omitted by Diodorus. In no instance does Nepos support Diodorus against Plutarch, while on several of the occasions when their versions differ, as has been noted, Nepos supports Plutarch against Diodorus. In addition, some personal information about Lysander's family friendships in Libya, found in Diodorus, is omitted

---

<sup>1</sup>The Pharnabazus letter; the name of the author of the speech found in Lysander's house; and the Miletus-Thasos massacres.

476  
by Plutarch and Nepos.

For these reasons, it is impossible to believe that Plutarch and Nepos used the historical narrative of Ephorus at first hand; yet it is obvious that, whatever source they did use, was to some extent indebted to Ephorus. A reasonable solution of this problem of authorship may be to suggest that Nepos and Plutarch were both indebted ( Nepos, for all the information supplied in his brief Life; and Plutarch, for that small part of his Life of Lysander which is identical with Nepos ) to the work of a biographer of the Third or Second Century B.C., who drew almost all his information from Ephorus.

Nepos' short Life is a most interesting study; he has no virtues to find in Lysander; his biography is a record of vice, the brief description of a man without military talent, favoured by fortune, the mistakes of his opponents and his own presumptuous impudence - ambitious, corrupt, deceitful, cruel and treacherous - with no regard for religion, and inspired by no love of his country.

Although we know so very little about Hellenistic biography, it seems likely that we find in Nepos' Life a typical example of Peripatetic biography at its worst. It was written to prove a point, exemplify a moral, and give a warning. From its first few words of scornful denunciation ( ' famam magis felicitate quam virtute - ἀερί - partam ' ) to its



411

crowning stigma ( ' Ipse suus fuit accusator ' ) , it is an ethical history-lesson, illustrated by anecdote, in the true manner of the Hellenistics, an awful warning of what wickedness in high places may become and may effect; and - in a negative sort of way - an encouragement to honesty and virtue.

There is no evidence of any historical research here, no suggestion that the careless Nepos has culled his information from any historian; we are presented with a character-study, with a minimum of historical detail, each anecdote illustrating a different side of the evil character of Lycander.

It seems quite clear that Nepos had available a short Greek Life of Lycander, of the type produced by such Hellenistic biographers as Antigonus of Carystus, Hermippus or Satyrus, which Nepos, in his usual manner, compressed and translated into Latin, for the edification of his readers.

That a biography of Lycander of Peripatetic extraction was available to Nepos and Plutarch is most likely. As has been noted in Part I of this thesis, the Peripatetics poured out masses of memoirs and biographies, both factual and ethical, both of intellectuals, and also of soldiers and statesmen. Their attitude towards their subjects was that of moral philosophers; they were not interested in military or political

---

<sup>1</sup> As there is in the Pelopidas, 1 : ' Verior... ne non vitam .... enarrare, sed historiam videtur scribere '.

478

activities, except in so far as they illustrated character; and, to make clear the moral or drive home the lesson, not only did they exaggerate, but we may suspect that they set a high value on sensational anecdotes or scandalous tales. Villains as well as heroes must have occupied their attention, for pride and ambition, when depicted in exaggerated colours, can prove to be as powerful a warning against vice as the examples of honesty and virtue can induce men to live quiet and godly lives. Cicero<sup>1</sup> reminds us that there were masses of Greek panegyrics produced, on Themistocles, Aristides, Agesilaus, Epaminondas, Philip, Alexander and other famous Greeks. As the Third Century B.C. was a time when the noteworthy career in any walk of life was to furnish a biographer with sufficient excuse to use it for praise or blame, it would be a strange commentary on human nature if only works of praise were produced at that time. We have plenty of evidence of the interest which the character of Lysander aroused in writers of the Third and Second Centuries; there are many anecdotes, scandalous and complimentary, recorded about him, so that biographers would not want for facts. Athenaeus alone refers to four Hellenistics, Hermippus, Agatharchides, Hegesander and Phylarchus, in whose works were recorded

---

<sup>1</sup> De Orat., II, 84, 341.

incidents or details about the Spartan admiral<sup>1</sup>.

It is, however, quite impossible to identify this Hellenistic source or name the biographer whose work was used by Nepos and Plutarch. But it is not difficult to go beyond the biographer and postulate the historian Ephorus as the ultimate authority for most of the information. The evidence supplied by Diodorus ( to say nothing about Plutarch's own references to Ephorus<sup>2</sup> ) makes it clear that the anonymous biographer based his work upon Ephorus, selecting

<sup>1</sup> Athenaeus (XII, 555 C ) says that Hornippus, in his 'Lawgivers' (F.H.G., III, 37 ), records the fining of Lysander for disobeying the Spartan marriage customs; again, (XII, 550 D ) that the European Histories of Agatharchides contains an anecdote about Lysander reviling Naucleides for wanton & profligate living; again (X, 431 D ), that Hegesander (F.H.G., IV, 417) records that when watered wine was being sold in the Spartan camp, Lysander ordered it to be sold stronger; again (VI, 271 F ), that in the XXV Book of his Histories, Phylarchus (F.H.G., I, 347) writes that Lysander was a 'mothax'.  
cf. Aelian, V.H., III, 20, for an illustration of the continence of Lysander, and V.H., XIII, 6, for an illustration of his incontinent life in Asia Minor.  
cf. Frontinus, Strat., IV, 1, 9, for the story of Lysander ordering a Spartan soldier to be flogged for pillaging, ' cui dicenti ad nullius rei rapinam se ab agmine recessisse, respondit "Ne speciam quidem rapturi praebeam volo" '.  
cf. Pausanias, IX, 32, 5 ff., for an estimate of the character of Lysander, worthy of both praise and blame, illustrated by reference to his actions, including an alleged refusal of burial to those Athenians who were executed after Aegospotami; cf. also, Pausanias, III, 8, 6, for an allegation that Agis & Lysander proposed to destroy Athens after its capitulation.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XII, 9; XXV, 3; XXX, 3.

from the historian a few anecdotes of a derogatory nature, upon which to base his ethical biography, and possibly adding a few details ( e.g. the Pharnabazus letter ) from another source.

If this is true, then the Hellenistic biography used by Plutarch and Nepos constitutes a synopsis of the worst and most biased incidents which relate to the career of Lysander. The author, culling them from Ephorus, has put his own unfair interpretation upon them ( although this seems to have been toned-down by Plutarch ); he has omitted any real achievements of Lysander's which Ephorus may have mentioned; he has deliberately perverted the avowed implication behind the words of Ephorus<sup>1</sup> that Lysander always acted for, and on behalf of, the Spartan ephors. So far as can be judged from the selection of Ephorus made by Diodorus, Ephorus was not so excessively biased against Lysander, although naturally his history was written from an Athenian standpoint and with a bias against Sparta, for there is evidence of some anti-Spartan feeling.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Diodorus, XLV, 13, 1.

<sup>2</sup> cf. Diodorus, XV, 29 & 46 & 63; Ephorus was bound to have been influenced by Isocrates, whose Panath. shows how unfair he could be towards Sparta, cf. Diodorus, XLV, 2 & 82: IV, 1. In the list of famous men, which accompanies the eulogy of Epaminondas, only one Spartan, Agocleus, is mentioned (Diodorus, XV, 88). Ephorus' treatment of Aristides and Cimon ( D. XI, 46-47; XI, 63, ff) suggests that he was under the influence of democratic ideas at Athens: this may explain Lysander, XLX, 2 & 4, where *δημοκρατικός* is used twice and there is a strong criticism of the absolute tyrannies set up by Lysander - Plutarch may have taken over a democratic viewpoint from his Ephorus-derived biog. source.

Ephorus apparently knew nothing about the trick played upon Lysander by Pharnabazus, unless Diodorus omitted to include the story. But our assumed Hellenistic biographer would not necessarily confine himself to Ephorus, and may have picked up this anecdote from some other source, as will be suggested later. At any rate, it is the sort of story which would have appealed to a Peripatetic Biographer.

It is impossible to estimate the length or scope of the work of this anonymous biographer. Obviously, Nepos would be satisfied with a short synopsis of the work, and as he must have found his source uniformly antipathetic towards Lysander, he may have been content to select his few incidents from the source, to illustrate in brief the character of Lysander. Plutarch, on the other hand, may have incorporated into his Life the whole of the biographical work, or at least those additional portions of it which he found useful for depicting the other side of the character of his hero. It would be most satisfying to be able to prove that Plutarch had preserved for us in his 'hostile' chapters the whole of the anonymous biographer's work; but we certainly cannot be sure of that. For Plutarch very often adds his own comments, or includes details and incidents from earlier reading. Therefore, some of the 'hostile' material found in Plutarch<sup>2</sup> and not present in Nepos may not have been included in the source.

---

<sup>1</sup> Nepos, Praefatio: "Plura perspicui magnitudo voluminis prohibet."  
<sup>2</sup> e.g. refer. to Theopompus Comicus ( XLII, 8 & 9 ); saying of Hecleus ( XLIX, 5 & 6 ); description of 'deytale' ( XLIX, 8 - 12 ); Libyan oracle ( XLV, 4 ); the Dionus story of chapter XLVI.

We can be fairly certain that the first three chapters of Nepos' Life of Lysander are ultimately derived from Ephorus; but to trace back and to track down the sources used by Ephorus for those incidents is not an easy task. For the latter part of the Peloponnesian War, and the early years of the Fourth Century B.C., Ephorus seems to have used many different authorities, possibly Xenophon and the shadowy Cratippus, probably the Hellenica Oxyrhynchia, the Atthis of Androtion and Fourth Century pamphleteers, including the document about the Spartan Constitution, written by Pausanias II in exile.

It was perhaps from Cratippus<sup>2</sup> or some other Athenian source that Ephorus inherited his bias against Sparta<sup>3</sup>, and this source may have supplied him with his information about the Spartan decadarchies ( although, of course, it was left for the Hellenistic biographer to use them as examples of the wickedness of Lysander ), and his examples of the cruel treatment of the people of Miletus and Iason by the Spartans. But Ephorus is fair to Lysander, and we must assume that it was the biographer who used Ephorus ( and acknowledged that use ) who imputed to Lysander personal responsibility and selfish reasons for acts which he performed according to the orders of

<sup>1</sup> of. G.L.Barber, The Historian Ephorus, pp. 113 - 137.  
<sup>2</sup> P.Gr.H., II A, p. 13; G. & H., Crat. Fr. 1 - 4; Plut., De Glor. Athon., 345 C - E.  
<sup>3</sup> of. Diodorus, XIII, 66, 6; XIV, 10, 1-4; XIV, 12, 2-9, for tyranny of Sparta after her victory, and cruelty of Clearchus at Byzantium.

his government.

But it seems clear that a Spartan source must have supplied the account of Lysander's plot against the Spartan kingship, and it may well be that this source was the quasi-historical document written by king Pausanias in exile. Strabo<sup>1</sup> says that Pausanias, the Agiad king of Sparta ( 408 - 395 B.C. ), " after he was banished<sup>2</sup> because of the hatred of the Eurypontidae ( i.e. Ageilaus )..... when in exile, prepared a *λόγος* on the Laws of Lycurgus, who belonged to the house that banished him, in which he also tells the oracles that were given out to Lycurgus concerning most of the laws ".

Of course, the jealous rivalry of the Spartan kings was notorious enough<sup>3</sup>; but Pausanias, who seems to have been a philo-Athenian,<sup>4</sup> was also jealous of Lysander, and may have had a great deal to write about him in his pamphlet. No doubt, Pausanias passed on considerable information about Lycurgus, his constitution and the oracles reputed to have been given to him. This genuine Spartan source must have been widely used ( and not only by Ephorus ) in the Fourth Century, when writers were interested in political constitutions and much was written about the best forms of government.

<sup>1</sup> VIII, 5, 5 ( C 366 ); Ephorus is certainly one of the principal sources of Strabo, who quotes him by name more often than any other authority; Strabo probably found this information in Ephorus, who must have been familiar with Pausanias' document.

<sup>2</sup> Xenophon, *Hell.*, III, 5, 25.

<sup>3</sup> Aristotle, *Pol.*, 1271 A.

<sup>4</sup> of his activities at Athens in 403 B.C.: Xen., *Hell.*, II, 4, 28; Aristotle, *Const. of Athens*, XXXVIII, 4; Plut. *Lyc.*, XXXI, 7.

Probably Aristotle made use of it for his information about the Spartan constitution, and found in it his reference to Lysander's plot against the state!

Thus, if we are right in assuming the direct use by Ephorus of Pausanias' treatise on the Spartan Constitution, we can trace to Pausanias the alleged plot of Lysander against the hereditary dyarchy, and also probably the Silenus story, which is recorded by Plutarch.<sup>2</sup>

Omissions in Diodorus do not, of course, imply that the material was not found in Ephorus, and it is just possible that the story of Pharnabazus' letter was also found in the history of Ephorus, taken ultimately from the Pausanias document. Pausanias would be glad enough to record any charges against Lysander of which he had some knowledge, however vague.

It is not impossible that the Hellenistic biographer based his work upon Ephorus and Pausanias, for he would not necessarily know or assume that Ephorus had also made use of the Spartan source; he certainly used Ephorus at first hand, and may well have supplemented his extractions from Ephorus by a direct reference to the Pausanias document.

<sup>1</sup> Pol., 1301 B, and 1306 B.

<sup>2</sup> Lysander, XXVI: it has been noted that this chapter assumes the Ephoran version of Lysander's plan - a dyarchy elected from all the best citizens, not merely from the Heraclidae. of. Lysander, XXVI, 3, *περὶ ἀλλοιοί... πέντε κρηετοί* and Nepos, III: 'oratio...reperta est...sic scripta, ut deum videretur congruere sententiae, quam ille se habiturum pecunia fidens non dubitaret'. This suggests that the speech of Cleon contained a forged oracle, and may be a brief reference by Nepos to the longer account of Silenus & his part in the working of the oracle, in Plutarch.



Thus, although in the very nature of things it is quite impossible to make a detailed reconstruction of the whole of our "anonymous biography", it is at least reasonable to assume that it contained the following information about Lysander, all of which is post-Aegospotami.

1 ) An introductory chapter, which was anti-Spartan and moderately democratic, which contained Nepos' estimate of the character of Lysander, which gave a description of the setting up of decadarchies by Lysander, as a means to fulfil his ambitious hopes and increase his power, and possibly concluded with the quotation from Theopompus Comicus, to illustrate the hatred felt by all the Greeks for Sparta in general, and Lysander in particular.

2 ) A number of examples of the treachery of Lysander and his cruelty towards the ' liberal ' element in the cities of Asia Minor and the Greek mainland; this would include the massacres at Miletus and Thasos ( Iacoe ).

3 ) A detailed account of Lysander's plot against the Spartan kingship, with additional information about Cleon of Halicarnassus' speech, about the Libyan ambassadors, and about Silenus, alleged son of Apollo.

4 ) The Pharnabazus story and, possibly, the account of the working of the Spartan ' scytale ', with a quotation or two to round off the biography.

To recapitulate, it seems likely from the evidence that Plutarch's Life of Lysander was based principally upon the Hellenica of Theopompus ( which supplied the Xenophontic material and additional information about Lysander's exploits in Asia Minor and at Athens ), a very fair and favourable picture being given therein of the Spartan admiral, who worked for the common good of his state, rather than for the satisfaction of his personal ambitions.

But, unfortunately, Plutarch also made use of a most biassed Hellenistic biography of Lysander, which lent a readier ear to unverified scandal and improbable allegations than to the facts of history; this biography derived its hostility from the personal animosity and jealousy of the contemporary Spartan king, Pausanias, whose military exploits were quite overshadowed by those of his brilliant subordinate.

These two sources Plutarch wove together, adding a certain amount of extra material culled from his own earlier reading, and himself commenting and passing personal reflexions upon the character of his hero, as he wrote the Life.

The result is a curiously contradictory biography - although by far the greater part of the Life is a sober record of virtue, industry and devotion. It is quite significant that, in the rather superficial Comparison, where Plutarch has to force a parallel between Lysander and Sulla, and where Plutarch's own opinion of Lysander is clearly

expressed, there is high praise for Lysander. For Plutarch tells us there that it was " a peculiar virtue in Lysander that he obtained all his offices with the consent of his fellow-citizens .... nor did he acquire anything by power contrary to the laws ". Again, Plutarch refers to the personal continence and integrity of his hero, who " appears to have perpetrated no act of wantonness or youthful folly while he enjoyed such great authority and power ", and " sent home for public use even the presents which had been given to him along with the rest of his spoils ". The ' Hostile Source ' is clearly ignored when Plutarch says that the Spartan " achieved all his successes with the co-operation of the authorities at home " .

Even when Plutarch refers in his Comparison to those allegations which he found in the ' Hostile Source ', it is to make allowances and excuses for his hero. Although Lysander tried to change the government of Sparta, it was " by milder and more legal methods than Sulla's..... for it seemed but natural justice that the best of the best should rule in a city which had the leadership of Greece, by virtue of his excellence and not of his noble birth ". Plutarch admits that Lysander was guilty of acts of cruelty, but the Spartan committed most of his transgressions " for the sake of

---

<sup>1</sup> Comparison, 1: *ὁ κατὰ τὴν ἀρίστην κρίσιν ἐκρίνετο καὶ πρῶτον ἀρῆτος.*

his friends, and most of his massacres were perpetrated to maintain their power and sovereignty " .

This is a very different picture from that drawn by the Hellenistic biographer whom both Nepos and Plutarch used; but, despite the bias of his source, Plutarch was able to conclude his Comparison with the assurance that, although Lysander fell behind Sulla in generalship and in valour, he was the better man in character, because of his *εὐκρατία* and his *σωφροσύνη* .

No doubt, it is due more to Nepos, and to a lesser extent to Diodorus, than to Plutarch ( who seems to have toned-down very considerably the extravagant language of denunciation employed by the ' Hostile Source ' ) that an unfavourable opinion of Lysander is embodied in many modern accounts of his life and achievements; and it is now perhaps time for a restatement of the real achievements for Sparta of her admiral, and a rehabilitation of his character.

<sup>1</sup> cf. J.B. Bury, History of Greece, London, 2nd Ed., rev., 1929, pp. 533 - 536; C.A.H., Vol. VI, pp. 31 ff. ; P-W, III, Kahstedt, on Lysander.

PART IV.

EPILOGUE

This examination of Plutarch's Lives of Nicias and Lysander makes clear certain points about the biographer himself.

In the first place, it would seem to be quite incorrect ever to assume that Plutarch, like Diodorus or Nepos, was a mere copyist, tied to a single authority and never diverting from a stereotyped method of adopting sources for his Lives. The evidence from all his Lives suggests that he used a great deal of judgment and commonsense in his selection of his authorities and in his adaptation of these authorities to meet the needs of each biography. He seems to have treated each Life as a separate problem, requiring separate examination, and although he was limited by the necessities of his library at Chaeronea and, by his conception of the nature of biography, he was at pains to select carefully ( although not scientifically ) what he considered to be suitable authorities. Of course, at times he chose bad authorities, and included in his Lives some material of a worthless kind; yet he tried to select just those authors who offered him the stories of men and the sayings of men without which it is well-nigh impossible to assess character.

Secondly, he never made any pretensions to the writing of history, and there<sup>fore</sup> had little use for a comprehensive examination of all the available sources. Naturally enough, his Lives will not stand a test at the bar of history (as Plutarch would be the first to admit); they do contain their considerable element of sensational anecdotes and scandalous flights of fancy, according to the sources which he used. But it is not difficult to identify those parts of the Lives which are based upon unreliable sources, or to assess the value of the substantial remainder. When Plutarch himself is suspicious of his sources, he usually says so, and with a discerning eye he seeks himself to separate the dross from the gold.

It is foolish to study Plutarch in the hope that we may find in all his pages accurate details or historical veracity. We may regret that he did not more widely make use of the sources which were available to him and which are lost to us; we may deplore the fact that he did not record for us a more objective presentation of history. But, despite this, he is of immense value to the historian, for he has preserved for us some of the very things which Thucydides so rigorously excluded from his great scientific work - the allegations of political pamphlets, the insinuations of comic poetry, and a whole mass of biographical detail, which supply one side of character which is omitted in a more objective historical account.

He tells us something of what the non-historical contemporaries or the Hellenistic memoirists thought about their illustrious predecessors; he draws aside the curtain of objective historiography, and invites us to gaze upon the scene of life as the Fourth and Third Century writers and thinkers conceived it. It is no exaggeration to say that he tells us more about life in the Fourth Century and the Hellenistic Age than he does about the men whose lives he wrote. Theopompus and Ephorus, Timaeus and Duris of Samos, Hermippus and Dasyrus, become living figures in his works; and although - to our great loss - their books are not preserved, yet we may find in Plutarch a partial resurrection of their shadowy forms and a restatement of their conception of the task of the writer. Living in a troubled and revolutionary period of history, they were essentially analysts, by turns indignant, satirical and prophetic, of an order of life and society in rapid dissolution.

Perhaps Plutarch's treatment of the drama of life is as effective as that of the historians; for with the wisdom and prudence of a scholar who is also a humanitarian, he remoulds the material of his authorities, both good and bad, himself being the 'running commentary' upon his subjects and upon his sources.

Behind each Life there lies the accumulated wisdom of a lifetime, the study, the reading, the criticism of years.

But, above all, through his pages there beats the heart of a good and godly man, with no little knowledge of the frailty and weaknesses of human nature, its depths of villainy and its heights of excellence, and with a profound yearning for the betterment of mankind.

The biographer does not write solely for his readers - each Life is an object-lesson to himself. His standards are moral standards, and his object that of the 8th Century prophets of Israel, the moral enlightenment by precept and by example of his readers and of himself.



PART V.

SUBJECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott M., History of Greece, 3 Vols , London, 1893.

Barbar G. L., The Historian Ephorus, Cambridge, 1935.

Barbu N. J., Les procédés de la peinture des caractères et la vérité historique dans les biographies de Plutarque, STRASS., 1933.

Bursian G., Jahresberichte über die Fortschritte der Altertumswissenschaft, 1873 - .

Bury J. B., Barber E. A., Ewan E. A., & Tarn W. W., The Hellenistic Age, Cambridge, 2nd Ed., 1925.

Bury J. B., History of Greece, London, 2nd Ed., reptd., 1929.

Busolt G., Griechische Geschichte, 3 Vols, Gotha, 1893 - 1904.

Cambridge Ancient History ( Ed., Bury, Cook & Adcock ), Vols V - VII, Cambridge, 1924 - 1932.

Carcopino J., L'ostracisme Athénien, Paris, 2nd Ed., 1935.

Cochrane G. N., Thucydides and the Science of History, Oxford, 1929.

Dill S., Roman Society, from Nero to Marcus Aurelius, London, 2nd Ed., reptd., 1925.

Ehrenberg V., The People of Aristophanes, Oxford, 2nd Ed., 1951.

Ferguson W. B., Hellenistic Athens, London, 1911.

Ferguson W. B. - Athenian Studies presented to - Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Suppl. Vol., 1, 1940.

Fisch M. H., Alexander and the Stoics, American Journal of Philology, LVIII, 1937, pp. 129 - 151.

- Glover T. R., *From Pericles to Philip*, London, 2nd Ed., 1918.
- Glover T. R., *The Conflict of Religions in the early Roman Empire*, London, 12th Ed., 1932.
- Gomme A. W., *Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, Oxford, Vol. 1, 1945.
- Grenfell B. F., and Hunt A. S., *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*, Oxford, 1909.
- Grenfell B. F., and Hunt A. S., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, London, 17 Vols., 1898 - 1927.
- Grote G., *History of Greece*, London, 10 Vols, 1888.
- Grundy G. B., *The Policy of Sparta*, J. N. S., *XXIII*, 1912, pp. 261 - 269.
- Grundy G. B., *Thucydides and the History of his Age*, 2 Vols, Oxford, 2nd Ed., 1948.
- Hammond N. G. L., *The Sources of Diodorus Siculus XVI*, C. Q., *XXIII*, 1938, pp. 137 - 151.
- Heitland W. F., *The Topography of Syracuse*, C.R., *VIII*, 1894, pp. 123-4.
- Heitland W. F., *Thucydides and the Sicilian Expedition*, J. Phil., *XXIII*, 1895, pp. 45 - 75.
- Hirschel R., *Plutarch*, Leipzig, 1912.
- Holden H. A., *Plutarch's Life of Nicias*, Cambridge, 1887.
- Holt A., *The History of Greece*, 4 Vols, London, reprinted, 1899.
- Jacoby F., *Atthis*, Oxford, 1949.
- Jacoby F., *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker (F.Gr.H.)*, Berlin, 1923 -
- Jacoby F., *Some Remarks on Ion of Chios*, C. Q., *XXI*, 1947, pp. 1 - 17.
- Jacoby F., *The Authorship of the Hellenica of Oxyrhynchus*, C. Q., *XLIV*, 1950, pp. 1 - 8.
- Jaeger W., *Paideia*, Oxford, 3 Vols, 1939 - 1944 - 1945.

- Kenyon F. G., Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome, Oxford, 1932.
- Kock T., C. A. F., Leipzig, 3 Vols, 1880 - 1888.
- Laistner M. L. W., History of the Greek World from 479 to 323, London, 2nd Ed., 1947.
- Leo F., Die griechisch-römische Biographie, nach ihrer litterarischen Form, Leipzig, 1901.
- Lindskog and Ziegler, Plutarchi Vitae, 4 Vols in 8 parts, Teubner, 1914 - 1935.
- Mahaffy J. P., History of Classical Greek Literature, 2 Vols, London, 2nd Ed., revised, 1883.
- Meyer Ed., Forschungen zur alten Gesch., 2 Vols, Halle, 1892 - 1899.
- Nicholl H., Sparta, Cambridge, 1952.
- Nisener G., Iconistic Portraits, Classical Philology, XLX, 1924, pp. 97 - 123.
- Moore P. H., Hellenistic Philosophers, Princeton, 1923.
- Muller H., E. H. G., 5 Vols, Paris, 1841 ff.
- Muller K. O., and Donaldson J. W., History of the Literature of Ancient Greece, 3 Vols, London, 1858.
- Murray G., Four Stages of Greek Religion, New York, 1912.
- Murray G., Greek Studies, Oxford, 1947.
- Murray, G., History of Ancient Greek Literature, London, 1897.
- Nichtuhr B. G., Lectures on Ancient History, London, 1852.
- Oxford Classical Dictionary ( Ed. Cary etc. ), Oxford, 1949.
- Parker H. W., History of the Delphic Oracle, Oxford, 1939.
- Parsons E. A., The Alexandrian Library, London, 1952.

- Paton W. R., Plutarch and Sisyphus, G.R., XLVII, 1913, pp. 131-2.
- Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften, Stuttgart, 1893 -
- Pearson L., Early Ionian Historians, Oxford, 1939.
- Perrin B., Plutarch's Lives, Vols III & IV, Loeb, 1915-16.
- Powell J. E., The Sources of Plutarch's Life of Alexander, J.H.S., LIX, 1939, pp. 229 - 240.
- Powell J. U., and Barber H. A. ( Ed. ), New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature, Oxford, Series 1 & 2, 1929, Series 3, 1933.
- Prentice W. R., The Character of Lysander, A. J. Arch., XLVII, 1934, pp. 37 ff.
- Rose H. J., Handbook of Greek Literature, London, 2nd Ed., 1942.
- Rose H. J., Handbook of Latin Literature, London, 1936.
- Rostovtzeff M., History of the Ancient World - Greece, Oxford, 1926.
- Rostovtzeff M., Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World, 3 Vols, Oxford, 1941.
- Sandys J. E., Aristotle's Constitution of Athens, London, 1893.
- Sinclair T. A., A History of Greek Political Thought, London, 1952.
- Smith R. E., Plutarch's Biographical Sources in the Roman Lives, G. Q., XXXIV, 1940, pp. 1 - 10.
- Snite J., Plutarchus, Leven van Lysander, Amsterdam, 1939.
- Stuart D. R., Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography, U.S.A., 1928.
- Tarn W. W., Alexander the Great, Cambridge, Vol. 2, 1948.
- Tarn W. W., and Griffith G. T., Hellenistic Civilization, London, 3rd Ed., 1952.
- Tillyard H. J. W., Agathocles, Cambridge, 1908.

- Tod M. H., Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions, Oxford, Vol. 1, 2nd Ed., 1946, Vol. 2, 1948.
- Toynbee A., The Growth of Sparta, J.H.S., LXXIII, 1913, pp. 246 - 275.
- Urkull-Gyllenband W. Graf, Plutarch und die griechische Biographie, Stuttgart, 1927.
- Von Fritz K., Pythagorean Politics in S. Italy, New York, 1940.
- Von Fritz K., The Historian Theopompus, American Historical Review, XLVI, 1941, pp. 765 - 787.
- Wade-Gery H. T., Thucydides, Son of Melesias, J. H. S., LII, 1932, pp. 205 - 227.
- Walbank F. W., The Causes of Greek Decline, J. H. S., LXIV, 1944, pp. 10 - 20.
- Weizsäcker A., Untersuchungen über Plutarchs biographische Technik, Berlin, 1931.
- West A. B., Notes on Athenian Generals of the year 424/3, A.J.Phil., XLV, 1924, pp. 141 - 160.
- West A. B., Pericles' Political Heirs, Classical Philology, XLX, 1924, pp. 124 - 146, and 210 - 228.
- Westlake H. D., Sources of Plutarch's Pelopidas, C. Q., XXXIII, 1939, pp. 11 - 22.
- Westlake H. D., Sources of Plutarch's Timoleon, C. Q., XXXIII, 1938, pp. 65 - 74.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff U. von, Die griechische und lateinische Literatur, Berlin, 3rd Ed., 1924 (Edited).
- Wright F. A., History of Later Greek Literature, London, 1932.
- Ziegler K., Plutarchos von Chaironeia, Stuttgart, 1949.
- Zimmern A. B., The Greek Commonwealth, Oxford, 5th Ed., revised, 1947.