

PAUSANIAS AND PLUTARCH'S *EPAMINONDAS*

The view that Pausanias 9. 13. 1–15. 6 is a simple epitome of Plutarch's lost *Epaminondas*, first advanced by Wilamowitz in 1874 and later elaborated by Wilamowitz himself and by Ludwig Peper, has commonly been accepted, with little or no further discussion, by students of Plutarch, Pausanias and fourth-century history.¹ In a recent general reaffirmation of the thesis John Buckler does note that what Pausanias says about Mantinea is hard to square with Plutarchan evidence and he therefore admits some contamination of the hypothetical source with non-Plutarchan material.² But Buckler's discussion of the matter within the framework of a book on the Theban hegemony is necessarily brief and somewhat unsystematic, and may be thought over-ready to assume Plutarchan connections where none can be demonstrated. The purpose of this paper is to show that the Wilamowitz/Peper hypothesis in its pure form (as accepted apparently by such authorities as Ziegler and Sandbach) cannot reasonably be sustained, that at the very least some degree of contamination must be presumed, and that the existence of a direct connection between Pausanias and Plutarch can hardly be regarded as established beyond reasonable doubt.

I

9. 13. 1–15. 6 is not the only passage in the *Periegesis* that refers to events involving Epaminondas, and scholars have often claimed to find Plutarchan traces elsewhere. In no case are these claims well founded, and in some cases there is reason positively to deny them.

(i) When Wilamowitz and/or Peper³ (followed by Ziegler and Sandbach) affirm that 4. 26–7 (the foundation of Messene), 8. 6. 2 (Sparta's desertion by the Arcadians), (parts of) 8. 8. 4 f. (Mantinean history), (parts of) 8. 11. 7–10 (Epaminondas' death, and an evaluation of him as second to none among Greek generals⁴), 8. 27. 1–2, 8 (Megalopolis founded on Epaminondas' advice in 371/0), 8. 52. 4 (the Spartan 'empire' destroyed by Conon and Epaminondas), or 9. 6. 4 (description of Leuctra as the greatest victory of Greeks over Greeks) are items culled from *Epaminondas*, they

¹ U. Wilamowitz, *Herm.* 8 (1874), 439 n. 2; id. *Commentariolum Grammaticum* 1. 11 f. (= *Kleine Schriften* 4. 595 f.); L. Peper, *De Plutarchi Epaminonda* (Weidae, 1912), 15 ff.; K. Ziegler, *RE* 21. 896; F. H. Sandbach, *Plutarch: Moralia XV* (Harvard, London, 1969), 74–5; O. Regenbogen, *RE* Supplbd. 8. 1045, 1068 (contrast slight, but unelaborated, reservations at 1072, 1076); M. Segre, *Historia* 1 (Rome/Milan, 1927), 202 ff., 2 (1928), 217 ff., *Athen.* n.s. 7 (1929), 465 ff.; H. Hitzig/H. Blumner, *Pausaniae Descriptio Graeciae* (Berlin, 1896–1910), 3. 429; H. Swoboda, *Rh.M.* n.f. 55 (1900), 461; H. D. Westlake, *CQ* 33 (1939), 12; M. Fortina, *Epaminonda* (Turin, 1958), 9; F. Carrata Thomes, *Egemonia beotica e potenza marittima nella politica di Epaminonda* (Turin, 1952), 10; E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* 5 (Stuttgart, 1902), 410; G. Shrimpton, *The Epaminondas Tradition* (diss. Stanford, 1970), 53; G. L. Cawkwell, *CQ* n.s. 22 (1972), 255; H. Beister, *Chiron* 3 (1973), 79; J. Buckler, *WS* 90 (1977), 79 n. 12.

² *The Theban Hegemony* (Harvard, 1980), 272–4. Such a conclusion does not represent so decisive a departure from what Peper at least actually said, as distinct from what he is often taken to have proved.

³ Wilamowitz, *Comm. Gramm.* (n. 1), 11 f.; Peper (n. 1), 20 ff.

⁴ Cf. Cic. *Ad Fam.* 5. 12. 5 (Ep.'s death a popular pathetic story). The reference in 8. 11. 9 to Ep.'s remarkable effect on Theban fortune is not (*pace* Wilamowitz) an item only appropriate to the Boeotian Plutarch (cf. A. D. Momigliano, *AR* 37 [1935], 101 ff.; Shrimpton [n. 1], *pass.*; id. *Phoen.* 25 [1971], 310 ff.).

do so for no reason save the prior assumption that 9. 13. 1–15. 6 is an epitome of that work.

(ii) In *Plutarch als Biograph*⁵ Wilamowitz added two further items to the list of putative Plutarchan passages, 4. 16. 7 (Aristomenes' shield and its dedication at Lebadeia, where Pausanias professes to have seen it) and 4. 32. 4–6 (a Messenian story, heard by Pausanias during enquiries at the 'Place of Sacrifice', that Aristomenes helped the Thebans at Leuctra; and a confirmatory Theban story, heard by Pausanias at Thebes, that Trophonius advised the use of Aristomenes' shield as a talisman⁶). But, whatever may have been fashionable in Wilamowitz's day, we have no right to proceed on the assumption that when Pausanias claims personally to have collected local material he is lying; and even if we *were* to make that assumption, it would be more logical to classify his 'real' source as periegetic.

(iii) More recently, Shrimpton (op. cit. [n. 1], 52 f.) has offered an objective reason for associating Paus. 8. 11. 7–10 with Plutarch. Noting the close similarity between that passage and *Suda* s.v. 'Επαμεινώνδας he argues that probability (bolstered by the resemblance of entries s.vv. *Κύλλας* and *Λούκουλλος* to passages in Plutarch's *Sulla* and *Lucullus*⁷) favours *Epaminondas* over Pausanias as *Suda*'s source, and that Pausanias loc. cit. is therefore an independent excerpt from the Plutarchan *Life*. This will not do.

(a) It is unlikely that an excerpt by Pausanias would be as close to its original as would one by a Byzantine excerptor: if Pausanias *were* using Plutarch it is improbable that his version would be so very similar to that in *Suda*.⁸

(b) *Suda* does contain excerpts from Pausanias. Most are from Book 6 and concern famous athletes,⁹ but there are also four from Book 8.¹⁰ Of these, two come from Pausanias' 'life' of Philopoemen¹¹ and a third reports the story about Hannibal's death which Pausanias (8. 11. 7 f.) used as a parallel for Epaminondas' misunderstanding of the Pelagos oracle – surely a virtual guarantee that Pausanias not Plutarch lies behind the appearance of the latter s.v. 'Επαμεινώνδας.¹²

(c) The entries on Lucullus and Sulla certainly contain Plutarchan material (the latter actually mentions Plutarch), but the *Suda* compiler (or his predecessors) did not extract it from Plutarch: the similarities are not exact enough for that to be the case. In fact, John of Antioch is their immediate source:¹³ this is certain for the entry on

⁵ *Reden und Vorträge* 2⁴ (Berlin, 1926), 268 n. 1; id. *Textgeschichte der griechischen Lyriker* (Berlin, 1900), 102 n. 1. Contrast Beister (n. 1), 80 n. 54.

⁶ Trophonius appears elsewhere (Diod. 15. 53. 4, Callisth. 124F22, Polyaen. 2. 3. 8), though not, as it happens, in Plutarchan texts. Pausanias' details are unique.

⁷ *Sulla* 7. 6–10, 26. 1, 34. 3, 35. 5–10, *Lucull.* 12. 1–2, 19. 1, 26. 1, 27. 4, 28. 7.

⁸ Where we can check them, *Suda* excerpts are essentially verbatim reproductions of the original, with occasional slight abridgements; cf. exx. in nn. 9, 10, 15.

⁹ S.vv. 'Ακροχειριστής (Paus. 6. 4. 1–3), 'Αναξιμένης (6. 18. 2 f.), Γλαῦκος (6. 10. 1–3), Εὐθυμος (6. 6. 4–10), Θεαγένης (6. 11. 2–3), Ἰππόμαχος (6. 12. 6, 13. 3), Κλειτόμαχος (6. 15. 3–5), Κλεομήδης (6. 9. 6–7), Μίλων (6. 14. 5–8; cf. s.v. ταῖνια, 6. 14. 7–8), Νίκων (6. 11. 4–8; misapplication of a passage about Theogenes), Πολυδάμας (6. 5. 1 ff.), Τιμάνθης (6. 8. 4).

¹⁰ S.vv. Ἄγρις, Ἄγριδος (8. 8. 7–8; cf. C. J. Tuplin, *CQ* n.s. 29 [1979], 357), Ἀντίβας (8. 11. 11–12), ἀπέδει (8. 49. 3), Φιλοποίμην (8. 49).

¹¹ S.vv. ἀπέδει, Φιλοποίμην. These are indisputably from Pausanias, not Plutarch, since they contain specifically Pausanian features (e.g. Philopoemen's ugliness: cf. n. 21) and are roughly *verbatim* quotations of his text.

¹² The exact history of the intermediate stages of excerption/transcription does not, of course, matter here.

¹³ On him cf. recently F. R. Walton, *Hist.* 14 (1965), 236 ff.

Sulla¹⁴ and highly probable for that on Lucullus, whose relationship to the Plutarchan *Life* is very much like that between s.v. *Σύλλας* and *Sulla*. (Certainly we cannot support any alternative explanation of s.v. *Λούκουλλος* by appealing to other evidence for excerption of Plutarchan *Lives* in the lexical tradition represented by *Suda*, because no such evidence exists.¹⁵)

It is likely that the source of the entry on Epaminondas was a collection of excerpts about oracles which included items about Hannibal and Epaminondas taken from Pausanias. Naturally, just as the entries on Lucullus and Sulla ended up containing Plutarchan material transmitted *via* John of Antioch and the excerptors, so the Epaminondas entry might theoretically have ended up with Plutarchan material transmitted *via* Pausanias and the excerptors – but only if Pausanias contains Plutarchan material in the first place, which is the question at issue.

In short: any attempt to prove Pausanias' use of *Epaminondas* must depend solely on 9. 13. 1–15. 6, where there is at least a *prima facie* case for *some* biographical source being involved.

II

Granted that we are not entitled to assume that material about Epaminondas outside 9. 13. 1–15. 6 has anything to do with Plutarch, we might ask whether there are other features of the rest of *Periegesis*, specifically other biographical sections, which make the Wilamowitz/Peper thesis antecedently probable. The evidence is perhaps ambiguous, but not ultimately favourable to that thesis, especially in its pure form.

On the one hand we have (a) 1. 11. 1–13. 9, which even the most cursory examination will show to have no significant connection at all with Plutarch's *Pyrrhus*, (b) 2. 8. 2–9. 5, which is somewhat more like *Aratus* (though where there are resemblances they are exceedingly general) but still contains sufficient peculiarities to render the hypothesis of simple epitomization of that *Life* unacceptable,¹⁶ and, perhaps less significantly, (c) the two cursory 'lives' of Agesilaus (3. 8. 7–10. 2) and Lysander (9. 32. 5–10), which were evidently not compiled with Plutarch's assistance.¹⁷ (There

¹⁴ Cf. the Athos fragment of John in Walton (n. 13), 240.

¹⁵ (i) Of other *Suda* passages which name Plutarch (s.vv. *Κάλλιππος* (cf. *Dion* 54), *νάφθα* (cf. *Alex.* 35), *κυκχός* (*Mor.* 87AB), *τοῦ κελίνου δέεται* (cf. *Timol.* 26; *Mor.* 676D), *ὑπερκύπτω* (cf. *Lycurg.* 15), *ὠβάξ* (cf. *ibid.* 6)), only one (s.v. *κυκχός*) actually quotes a Plutarchan work, and only one (s.v. *Κάλλιππος*) is at all 'biographical'. The rest are in the nature of short lexical notes (and not devoid of inaccuracies). (ii) Other *Suda* entries on subjects of Plutarchan *Lives* produce no examples of excerption, and can often be traced to other sources (ss.vv. *Ἀριστέιδης*; *Ἀλέξανδρος* (Arr. 3. 10. 2, 4. 19. 5 f., 6. 13. 4, 7. 28. 1 f., John of Antioch fr. 41–2 M); *Ἀρατος* (Polyb. 4. 8. 1 f., 4 f.); *Ἀλκιβιάδης*; *Κάτων* (App. *Iber.* 39; the story of Cato's quotation of *Od.* 10. 495 is not exactly quoted from Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 27, *Mor.* 200A, 805A; ? = Polyb. 36. 8. 7); *Μάρκιος* (D.H. *Ant. R.* 7. 67, 8. 60 ff.); *Νομάς* (? John of Antioch); *Ὅθων* (id. fr. 94M); *Λυκούργος* (inter alios Nic. Dam. 90F56); *Θεμιστοκλῆς* (Hesych. s.v. + sch. Ar. *Eq.* 84); *Πύρρος* (D.H. *Ant. R.* 20. 8–9); *Πομπήιος* (? John of Antioch fr. 70M).

¹⁶ Note 2. 8. 4 (Persæus' death), 5 (Agis' attack on Pellene), 9. 1 (remarks on Cleomenes), 2 (violation of Antigonus' treaty), 3 (restoration of Spartan constitution; Cleomenes' fate), 4 (Micon, Euryalus). F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie* (Leipzig, 1901), 158 postulated a common biographical source.

¹⁷ (i) Agesilaus: in the succession narrative Pausanias makes Agesilaus, not Lysander central, does not name Diopieithes, excludes references to Alcibiades, and adds that Agis' behaviour repeated King Ariston's folly (3. 8. 7–10). The excuses of Athens, Thebes and Corinth for not helping Agesilaus in 395 (3. 9. 2–3), Tithraustes' and Timocrates' activities (ib. 8), the Locrian-Phocian quarrel (ib. 9–11) are not in *Agesilaus*. (Buckler's suggestion (n. 2), 272, that Pausanias used *Agesilaus* to supplement Xenophon does not match the evidence.) (ii) Lysander: the incitement of Antiochus in 9. 32. 6 is not Plutarchan; Eteonicus (ib. 8) corresponds to Callibius in *Lysand.* 15; 4,000 Athenians are executed at Paus. 9. 32. 9, 3,000 in *Lysand.* 13.

is also Pausanias' arguable failure to use Plutarch's (lost) *Daiphantus* in 10. 1. 3 ff.;¹⁸ but that is not a formally parallel case.¹⁹)

On the other hand (perhaps) we have 8. 49. 1–51. 8. This passage has sometimes been classified as an epitome of *Philopoemen*,²⁰ but there are divergences which make the case anything but straightforward.²¹ A recent discussion concludes:²² '...at least in his account of Philopoemen's last campaign, he (sc. Pausanias) made use of a Polybian source; and there is evidence that strongly suggests that he may have used this for other parts of the narrative. On the other hand the general character of his chapters on Philopoemen, and his possible citation of information from Aristocrates, suggests almost as strongly that Plutarch's *Philopoemen* was used as a general scheme.' The argument about Aristocrates hardly deserves the special stress that Errington appears to give it;²³ but even if we accepted that the general scheme of *Philopoemen* was used for the sake of convenience (which we need not²⁴), Pausanias' 'life' would not be an epitome of that work in any useful sense of the word.²⁵ If Pausanias 8. 49. 1–51. 8 survived and Plutarch's *Philopoemen* did not, the hypothesis that Pausanias offered a summary of Plutarch would doubtless be as tempting as the Wilamowitz/Peper thesis about 9. 13. 1–15. 6 – and would also be decidedly misleading.

In sum, although it may not be demonstrable that Pausanias was, for all practical purposes, ignorant of Plutarch's *Lives*, it is also not demonstrable that he was in the habit of simply epitomizing them. The thesis that 9. 13. 1–15. 6 is an example of his doing just that must stand or fall on its intrinsic merits.

¹⁸ For (*Life of*) *Daiphantus* cf. Lamprias Catalogue no. 38, *Mor.* 244B.

¹⁹ Pausanias' passage is about Phocian history, not *Daiphantus*' life; but it does lack the stress on *Daiphantus* that must have resulted from using the *Life* as an historical source. (An example is his failure to figure in the story of the Phocian women's suicide pact: contrast *Mor.* 244B f.) For *indirect* connection with the Plutarchan tradition cf. P. Stadter, *Plutarch's Historical Methods* (Harvard, 1965), 37. (Wilamowitz noted Pausanias' failure to use *Daiphantus*: op. cit. [n. 5], 268 n. 1.)

²⁰ H. Nissen, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Quelle... Livius* (Berlin, 1863), 287 f.; M. Segre, *Athen.* n.s. 7 (1929), 481. The case was adduced by Peper (n. 1), 17 to justify regarding 9. 13. 1 ff. as Plutarchan.

²¹ Pausanias has extra items of various sorts at points corresponding to *Plut. Philop.* 1. 2 (49. 2), 5. 1 (49. 4), 5. 2 (49. 4), 9. 1 (50. 1), 9. 2 (50. 1), 10. 8 (50. 2), 11. 2 (50. 3), 11. 3 (50. 3), 12. 2 (50. 4), 14. 3 (50. 7), 15. 2 (50. 10), 16. 1 (51. 1), 16. 3 (51. 3), 17. 3 (51. 4). Where Plutarch asserts polemically that Philopoemen was not ugly (2. 1 f.), Pausanias asserts that he was (49. 2); the story of the spear wound at Sellasia is different and more improbable in Pausanias (8. 49. 5 f.; cf. *Plut.* 6); Philip's assassins come to Argos in *Plut.* 12, to Megalopolis in *Paus.* 8. 50. 4; the Spartan offer of money to Philopoemen comes out differently in *Paus.* 8. 51. 2 and *Plut.* 15 (especially apropos of Timolaus; and it is placed differently *vis-à-vis* Diophanes' march on Sparta); the versions of Philopoemen's last campaign diverge (*Plut.* 18 f., *Paus.* 8. 51. 5 f.).

²² R. M. Errington, *Philopoemen* (Oxford, 1969), 240.

²³ Plutarch (16) says that Polybius gave the number of a body of Spartan exiles as 80, Aristocrates as 350. Pausanias asserts that there were 300 (8. 51. 3). 'It is possible that Pausanias had looked at Aristocrates' own account and miscopied or adapted it in some confused way, perhaps in the light of Polybius' figure. But...it seems more likely that he misunderstood Plutarch's information in this way; there is no other evidence that he knew Aristocrates' work' (Errington [n. 22], 239). The speculations seem premature, since Pausanias does not say what Plutarch (or Aristocrates) said, and adds in the same context extra information about the sale of 3,000 helots, which shows that his text cannot be wholly explained in terms of extant writings.

²⁴ Errington (n. 22), 238 notes that 'Pausanias follows [Plutarch's] order of arrangement even where this is not chronological'. But Pausanias' order is not demonstrably non-chronological where it matches Plutarch's (this includes *Paus.* 8. 50. 4–5/*Plut.* 12), and the orders differ at 8. 51. 1–2/*Plut.* 15. 2–16. 1.

²⁵ Cf. Ebeling, *CW* 7 (1913/14), 141.

III

Wilamowitz's original claim was not merely that Pausanias 9. 13. 1–15. 6 was an excerpt of *Epaminondas*, but that it was a 'fairly careful' one ('ein ziemlich sorgfältiger Auszug'), a claim that he later modified only to the extent of admitting Pausanias' introduction of some *ineptiae*.²⁶ On the whole, those who have followed Wilamowitz have failed to make it clear whether or not they endorse the proposition that Pausanias was generally careful, or indeed what they take the proposition to mean. If the claim is that Pausanias' chapters are a fair and balanced representation of the factual contents of *Epaminondas* – a natural enough understanding of Wilamowitz's words – , one can only say that it is an astonishing one. Perhaps this is obvious; but the point is worth making, not as an *ad hominem* argument against Wilamowitz, but as part of a characterization of Pausanias 9. 13. 1–15. 6.

1. The 'biography' occupies fewer than 200 (Teubner) lines, about the same as the chapters on Philopoemen, a subject on whom Plutarch wrote a *Life* perhaps only half the length of *Epaminondas*.²⁷

2. Nearly half of those 200 lines is devoted to one set of events, the Leuctra campaign. Important though Leuctra was, this cannot reasonably be taken to reflect the overall proportions of *Epaminondas*. Moreover, Pausanias' treatment must still be regarded as an inadequate summary of Plutarch (if it is a summary at all): certain matters are treated quite fully, but others are completely ignored. I give two examples. (i) If, *ex hypothesi*, Plutarch could report an omen given to the Spartans before Leuctra (cf. Paus. 9. 13. 4), then he surely dealt with the favourable and unfavourable omens given to the Thebans, and especially with Epaminondas' reactions to them; references to such omens appear in the surviving Plutarchan tradition,²⁸ and a passage in *Demosthenes* (20) speaks of Epaminondas' unwillingness to be deflected from a 'right' course by apparently bad omens. (Diodorus' account of Epaminondas' philosophic disdain for bad omens and cynical production of good ones illustrates the possible substance behind this remark.²⁹) (ii) Although the battle-narrative in *Pelopidas* concentrates on Pelopidas, it preserves traces of the engagement's tactical novelties, and Plutarch knew perfectly well that their author was Epaminondas and that a central feature was attack on the left wing;³⁰ and a passage in *Quaestiones Convivales* offers further confirmation of his knowledge of and interest in the new military formations employed by Epaminondas at Leuctra and Mantinea.³¹ The topic will unquestionably have received attention in *Epaminondas* and its absence in a supposed excerpt is, by any ordinary standards of care, inexcusable – especially since Epaminondas' tactics were one cause of a phenomenon which Pausanias does mention, viz. the disproportionately heavy Spartiate losses.

²⁶ *Comm. Gramm.* (n. 1), 11 f.

²⁷ *Philop.* has 20 chapters; *Epam.* was surely closer to *Ages.* (40) or *Pelop.* (35).

²⁸ *Mor.* 192F (to be impressed by bad omens is mere cowardice), 774D.

²⁹ 15. 52. 2–7 (cf. *Front. Str.* 1. 12. 5), 53. 4; cf. also *Polyaen.* 2. 3. 8, *Xen. Hell.* 6. 4. 7. (All subsequent references to Xenophon are to *Hellenica*.)

³⁰ *Pelop.* 23; *Mor.* 282E.

³¹ *Mor.* 618C. Epaminondas' alteration of infantry formations is mentioned alongside Pammenes' remark that Nestor was wrong to advise phalanx organization by clans rather than by pairs of lovers (cf. *Pelop.* 18, *Mor.* 761B), and it might seem that Plutarch is thinking solely about the Sacred Band. But the fact that he elsewhere associates the Band's formation and development with Gorgidas and Pelopidas (*Pelop.* 18; contrast *Max. Tyr.* 18. 2, *Dio Chrys.* 22. 3, *Athen.* 602A) encourages one to refer the comment about Epaminondas to the tactics of the major battles.

3. In the remainder of the 'life' major transactions are sometimes represented by single items extracted from a full account: so, the peace conference in 372/1 is reduced to an interchange between Epaminondas and Agesilaus,³² and the Mantinea campaign to an identification of Epaminondas' killer.³³ (In both cases Pausanias' single item is arguably unPlutarchan: see below.) Elsewhere we have more or less curt summaries of whole transactions, and due proportion is hardly maintained: the extreme brevity of e.g. 9. 14. 5 (ἀφικόμενος τῷ στρατῷ πρὸς τὴν Σπάρτην, ὡς οὐκ ἀντεπήγεν Ἀγχιλαος μαχοῦμενος) or 7 (on the trial) contrasts with the relative length of 6–7 (fighting at 'Lechaeum' and 'the Athenians' city') or 15. 1–2 (Pelopidas' arrest and rescue) or 4 (Phoibia).³⁴ Above all, some sets of events which must have appeared in *Epaminondas* are wholly ignored. I note three examples.³⁵ (i) Epaminondas was not one of those who returned from exile in 379 to murder the pro-Spartan polemarchs; but he did have a part in the story of the Liberation as Plutarch knew it. He remained in Thebes (as a philosopher he was accounted politically harmless), encouraging the young men to wrestle with the Spartans so that he could use their sporting victories as proof that Thebes ought not to be subject (*Pelopidas* 7); and, along with Gorgidas, he made arrangements in the city before the exiles' arrival and was prominently active straight after the polemarchs' assassination.³⁶ The *Life* will have had more to say about this. (Compare the interest in these events displayed by the setting of *De Genio Socratis*.) (ii) History recorded a companion-piece to the clash with Agesilaus in 371, viz. a debate with Callistratus before the Arcadian Federal Assembly. This story was known to Plutarch, appears in the Plutarchan *Apophthegmata* and surely figured in the *Life*.³⁷ (iii) Plutarch was certainly well acquainted with Epaminondas' Naval Expedition of 364,³⁸ as emerges from *Philopoemen* 14, where he remarks that Epaminondas was much less successful on sea than on land and explains that this was said by some to be due to his fear of the morally deleterious effects of τὰ κατὰ θάλασσαν. The *Life* will obviously not have ignored this topic.

It is clear, therefore, that Pausanias 9. 13. 1–15. 6 cannot be regarded as a fair and balanced representation of *Epaminondas* or, for that matter, as a systematic list of the major events of Epaminondas' career. But if Wilamowitz did not mean to claim that it was, he can only have been claiming that the items which Pausanias *did* retail were at least accurately reproduced from the source. But that, of course, can only be *presumed* – indeed, it is one of two presumptions that must be made if the hypothesis

³² Ἐξαλείψαι in the elliptical summary in *Ages*. 28 implies Plutarch's knowledge of a version like that in Xen. 6. 3. 19, where the Thebans are first inscribed as Θηβαῖοι and then request an alteration to Βοιωτοί. This will have been set out clearly in *Epam*.

³³ Other Plutarchan material on the campaign: *Ages*. 34, *Mor*. 193F (?), 194C, 214CD, 346C, 761D.

³⁴ Similarly the brief (and unremarkable) comments about Epaminondas' education can hardly properly reflect the attention that the philosopher Plutarch surely paid to that topic. For Epaminondas as philosopher-statesman cf. *Mor*. 8B, *Pelop*. 27. 4; and notice Plut.'s interest in the intellectual associates of fifth-century Athenian *politikoi* (*Them*. 2, *Pericl*. 4, *Alc*. 4). We might guess that Plutarch offered some qualification of the stereotypic contrast between Epaminondas and Pelopidas (cf. *Pelop*. 7. 3, *Mor*. 192C, 585D, 594A; contrast Nep. *Epam*. 3, Plut. *Pelopid*. 4. 1) and (cf. Peper [n. 1], 64 f.) discussed contacts with Simmias.

³⁵ One might add Philip's sojourn at Thebes (*Pelop*. 26. 5) or Epaminondas' relations with Jason of Phrae (*Mor*. 193A, 585F), whose role at Leuctra was surely not omitted (cf. Xen. 6. 4. 20 f.).

³⁶ Cf. *Mor*. 594B, 598CD, *Pelop*. 12 for prominence after the murders; 594B, at least, asserts prior organization.

³⁷ *Mor*. 193CD, 810F; cf. also Nep. *Epam*. 6. 1 f., (?) Diod. 15. 38. 3.

³⁸ Diod. 15. 78. 4–79. 3, Isoc. 5. 53, Aeschin. 2. 105, Buckler (n. 2), 160 ff.

of a direct connection between Pausanias and Plutarch is to be investigated at all: given two works, A (extant) and B (lost), and given such means of establishing B's contents as we possess in the case of *Epaminondas*, we cannot reasonably hope to convince anyone that A is an excerpt of B if there are inconcinnities which have to be attributed to carelessness on the part of A's author. The other necessary presumption is that material about Epaminondas in surviving Plutarchan texts is a true guide (so far as it goes) to what was said in the *Life*.³⁹ The situation with the surviving *Lives* is reasonably encouraging in this respect, but the presumption must be made in any case. Any other approach must tend to a process of guessing that *Epaminondas* actually said what Pausanias says (if necessary, despite evidence to the contrary), which ultimately makes the assertion that Pausanias excerpted *Epaminondas* rest on nothing more than the circumstances that 9. 13. 1–15. 6 contains a set of facts about Epaminondas (from birth to death) in (more or less) chronological order and that a Plutarchan *Life* of Epaminondas existed at the time at which Pausanias wrote. But reliance on these circumstances begs the question; and antecedent probabilities provide little encouragement for doing so.

To summarize so far: 1. The hypothesis that Pausanias used Plutarch's *Epaminondas* must stand or fall by 9. 13. 1–15. 6 alone. 2. Those chapters are *at best* a set of arbitrary excerpts from the store of facts in *Epaminondas*. 3. They can only be that if (a) none of their contents looks unPlutarchan and (b) at least some of them look positively Plutarchan. Lacking these conditions (which, it must be conceded, are in the nature of things difficult to meet and can only be met at all by making certain working assumptions) we shall have to admit contamination of sources and perhaps no direct connection at all. I turn therefore to an examination of the contents of Pausanias 9. 13. 1–15. 6.

IV

1. *Unclassifiable material*. A majority of the items which make up Pausanias' 'life' actually resist classification as positively Plutarchan or positively unPlutarchan, either because they agree with the Plutarchan tradition without doing so distinctively⁴⁰ (notable here are two cases where parallels between Pausanias and Plutarch should be seen in the light of similar material elsewhere in the *Periegesis* rather than as reflections of *Epaminondas*⁴¹) or because, although not inconsistent with anything in

³⁹ For these purposes the (probably) pseudo-Plutarchan *Apophthegmata* count as Plutarchan, since their material is regularly found in the *Lives*, sometimes at much greater length, e.g. 194D (nos. 4, 5: 10 lines) = *Pel.* 28 (40 lines).

⁴⁰ 9. 13. 1: poverty (*Mor.* 467E, 527B, 583C f., 633E, 823E, *Pel.* 3, *Fab.* 27, *Arist.* 1, *Nep. Ep.* 2, *Ael. VH* 2. 13, 11. 9), musical skill (*διδάγματα ἐπιχώρια*: *Nep.* l.c., *Aristox.* 96 Wehrli), *Lysis* (*Mor.* 578D etc., *Aristox.* 68 Wehrli, *Cic. off.* 1. 155, *de or.* 3. 139, D.L. 8. 6, *Diod.* 10. 11. 2, *D. Chr.* 49. 5, *Greg. Naz. PG* 36. 994). 9. 13. 6 f.: boeotarchs' disagreement (*Pel.* 20, *Diod.* 15. 53. 5, who also refers to an earlier *decision* to evacuate women/children [52. 1]). 9. 13. 9: disenchanting Spartan allies (*Ages.* 28, *Xen.* 6. 4. 15, *Cic. off.* 2. 26). 9. 13. 10: Cleombrotus' death (*Ages.* 28, *Agis* 21, *Comp. Lys. Sul.* 6, *Diod.* 15. 33. 3, 55. 5, *Xen.* 6. 4. 13, *Paus.* 1. 13. 4 etc.). 9. 14. 4 f.: bare facts that Ep. unsuccessfully attacked Sparta (*Ages.* 31, *Pel.* 24, *Xen.* 6. 5. 22 f., *Diod.* 15. 62. 3 f.), refounded Messene (*Ages.* 34, *Pel.* l.c., *Diod.* 15. 66, *Paus.* 4. 26 f.), escaped conviction for extending his boeotarchy (*Pel.* 24 f., *Mor.* 194C, 540E, 799F, 817F, *Nep. Ep.* 7, *Cic. inv.* 1. 55, *App. Syr.* 41, *Arist.* 2. 520D). 9. 15. 6: epigram (first line quoted in *Mor.* 1098A, *Cic. Tusc.* 5. 49; but it appeared on the statue which occasions Pausanias' 'life', so periegetic sources/autopsy might be relevant; cf. *Paus.* 8. 49. 1–52. 6, starting and ending with a text not in *Philop.*).

⁴¹ 9. 13. 11 (*Θηβαίοις μὲν ἡ νίκη κατείργαστο ἐπιφανέστατα πασῶν ὁπόσας κατὰ Ἑλλήνων ἀνείλοντο Ἕλληνες*) resembles Plutarch's evaluation in *Ages.* 29, but also *Paus.* 9. 6. 4

Plutarch, no precisely relevant Plutarchan tradition survives with which to compare them. Items in the latter category are often entirely peculiar to Pausanias;⁴² where this is not so, they are occasionally shared with other sources,⁴³ but more frequently in (erroneous) conflict with them.⁴⁴ On the whole, therefore, they cannot be classified as belonging to any particular non-Plutarchan tradition. In Pausanias' narrative some are linked with material paralleled only in Plutarch, but a greater number are linked with arguably unPlutarchan material – so argument from association does not serve to make them look more Plutarchan than not. In general, we are not entitled to assume that what appears to us to be Pausanian (i.e. not readily classifiable in terms of any particular source-tradition) actually represents the Plutarchan tradition as it might have been expressed in *Epaminondas*; such an identification would, of course, be among the interesting inferences to be drawn if Pausanias could be proved to have excerpted *Epaminondas*. The most that can be said about these unclassifiable items is that, by not manifestly contradicting Plutarchan material, they do nothing to disprove the hypothesis – and to say even that much depends on ignoring the likelihood that the items discussed in n. 41 should not be regarded as Plutarchan and the objections one might feel to saddling Plutarch with apparent errors of fact (cf. n. 44).

2. *Plutarchan material*. There are just four items which find their only or closest parallel in the Plutarchan tradition.

(i) Epaminondas and Pelopidas at Mantinea (9. 13. 1): the possibly unhistorical story that Epaminondas saved Pelopidas' life at Mantinea during the Spartan attack of c. 385 is reported in some detail in *Pelopidas* (4), must have been at least mentioned in *Epaminondas*, and appears in no other surviving source. (Of course, Plutarch's statement (*Pel.* 4. 4) that οἱ... πολλοὶ νομίζουσιν αὐτοῖς τὴν σφοδρὰν φιλίαν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν Μαντινείᾳ γενέσθαι στρατείας confirms that it was not newly introduced to

(ἐπιφανεστάτην νίκην ὅπως γενομένης Ἑλλήσιν ἔμμεν κατὰ Ἑλλήνων); there is no reason why the latter passage should be from *Epam.* (would Plutarch have said that Leuctra caused the dissolution of decarchies or omitted to mention Cersesus (cf. n. 42) in a list of Boeotian victories?). 9. 14. 4: *Pel.* 24. 5 (on unification of Arcadia) conceivably suggests that *Epam.* concurred with Pausanias' view that Ep. persuaded the Arcadians to found Megalopolis; but cf. 8. 27. 2 also, and the (false) belief that the Peloponnesian expedition followed Leuctra closely is consistent with the dating of Megalopolis' foundation in 8. 27. 8 'a few months after Leuctra'.

⁴² 9. 13. 3: refs. to Cephissian Lake, Ambrossus and Chaereas (for context cf. Xen. 6. 4. 3, Diod. 15. 52, 53). 9. 13. 4: the *katoïades* omen (vague refs. to omens in *Epam.* fr. 1 (*Ages.* 24); different omens in *Lys.* 18, *Mor.* 397F). 9. 13. 5: the rapists' names. 9. 13. 6, 15. 1: boeotarchs' names (note that 9. 1. 4 names a boeotarch without this normally being called Plutarchan information). 9. 14. 2 f.: Thespians captured at Cersesus, fulfilling an oracle issued after the archaic battle there (Plut.'s knowledge of this is not proved by his report (*Cam.* 19) that 5 Hippodromios was the date of Leuctra and the archaic battle – which he envisages differently from Paus.: *Cam.* l.c., *Mor.* 866F). 9. 15. 4: release of exiles at Phoibia (Ephorus mentioned Phoibia (70F81): the story would exemplify the Plutarchan Ep.'s *epieikeia*, *Philop.* 3, *Comp. Pel. Mar.* 1).

⁴³ 9. 13. 8: Thespian withdrawal (Polyaen. 2. 3. 3; the ultimate common source might also have had the Cersesus story; cf. n. 42). 9. 13. 10: fight over Cleombrotus' body (Xen. 6. 4. 13, Diod. 15. 56. 1). 9. 14. 7: Iphicrates thwarts attack on 'Athenians' city' (? Polyaen. 3. 9. 28).

⁴⁴ 9. 13. 2: 47 Boeotian dead (300 in Diod. 15. 56. 4). 9. 14. 1: immediate dismissal of Spartan allies (false: Xen. 6. 4. 26 f., Diod. l.c.). 9. 14. 4 (and 8. 8. 10): Ep. responsible for synoecism of Mantinea (prob. false: Xen. 6. 5. 3 f.). 9. 15. 2–4: dating of Orchomenus' destruction during Ep.'s period of exclusion from boeotarchy and his absence in Thessaly (368) (surely false: Diod. 15. 79. 2 places it during Ep.'s naval expedition, 364). 9. 15. 4: victory over Spartans, Pelleneans, Athenians under Chabrias at Lechaeum (either amalgamation of fighting near Cenchræe involving Pelleneans (Xen. 7. 1. 15 f., Diod. 15. 68. 2) and near Lechaeum involving Chabrias (Xen. 7. 1. 18, Diod. 15. 69. 1, *Mor.* 193F) or wrong location of first).

the Epaminondas tradition by Plutarch, so there is no necessity to identify Plutarch as Pausanias' source.⁴⁵)

(ii) Daughters of Scedasus (9. 13. 5): Pausanias agrees with *Pelopidas* (20 f.) and *Amatoriae Narrationes* (773B f.) in recording an unsuccessful attempt by Scedasus to secure redress for his daughters' death which is ignored in the rest of the tradition.⁴⁶ (Other elements of the story in Pausanias are, however, unPlutarchan: see below.)

(iii) The dead at Leuctra (9. 13. 11–12): the separate collection of Spartan and allied dead is otherwise recorded only in the Plutarchan *Apophthegmata* (*Mor.* 193B) and presumably appeared in *Epaminondas*. The same passage agrees with Pausanias in giving the number of Spartan dead as 'more than 1,000' (*Ages.* 28 says precisely 1,000), for which the nearest non-Plutarchan parallel is Xenophon's ἐγγύς χιλίων (6. 4. 15).

(iv) Orchomenus (9. 15. 3): the destruction of Orchomenus is described in Diodorus (15. 79. 2 f.), but, as things stand, Pausanias' report is more closely comparable with the *Comparison of Pelopidas and Marcellus* (1. 1), where Plutarch says that the Thebans 'would not have treated the Orchomenians as they did if Pelopidas and Epaminondas had been present'. (But it is difficult to attribute Pausanias' *dating* of the event to Plutarch: cf. n. 44 and below.)

3. *UnPlutarchan material*. There are eleven items (in six different narrative contexts) which arguably do not consort with the Plutarchan tradition as we are compelled to reconstruct it from surviving Plutarchan texts. (They are also, it should be noted, not distinctively associable with any other single source tradition.)

(i) Epaminondas and Agesilaus in 371 (9. 13. 2): (a) the apophthegm reported by Pausanias is not found in the Plutarchan collection (*Mor.* 192C–194C); and in *Agesilaus* (27 f.), which reports the confrontation with the Spartan king, the form of the reciprocal questions posed by the protagonists is different from that in Pausanias. Can we assume that Plutarch would have changed it between *Epaminondas* and *Agesilaus*? The parallel provided by Plutarch's two versions of the quarrel of Agesilaus and Lysander in 396 (*Ages.* 7 f., *Lys.* 23 f.), in which, despite differences of emphasis and interpretation (e.g. about the explanation of the Asiatic Greeks' courting of Lysander), the laconic dialogue between the adversaries is the same, does not encourage such an assumption. (b) There is no cause to think that Plutarch would have used the confusing term 'Peace of Antalcidas' for the peace of 371. On the face of it Pausanias has simply erroneously applied to 387/6 a story which really belonged in 371 and which Plutarch, for one, knew belonged there. Peper himself noted Pausanias' error here (18).

(ii) Daughters of Scedasus (9. 13. 5): (a) the victims' names appear elsewhere only in *Amatoriae Narrationes*, where neither of the versions given (Hippo and Miletia; Theano and Euxenippe) is the same as Pausanias'. (b) That they killed themselves out of shame is also asserted by Xenophon, Diodorus, Aelian and Jerome (cf. n. 46). *Pelopidas* is unspecific on the point, but *Amatoriae Narrationes* (like the other sources: cf. n. 46) says that they were killed by the rapists. If this *was* the version known to Plutarch, he and Pausanias are in disagreement. (c) The performance of religious rituals at the girls' tombs in 371 appears also in Xenophon and the Plutarchan tradition. In the latter the sacrifice is prompted by a dream in which Scedasus appears

⁴⁵ *Contra* Buckler (n. 2), 273.

⁴⁶ *Am. Narr.* is pseudonymous; but its version matches *Pel.* l.c., where comparison is possible and can arguably be used as evidence of the form of the Scedasid story known to Plutarch. Other sources: Xen. 6. 4. 7, Diod. 15. 54. 2, Ceressus oracle ap. Paus. 9. 14. 3, Ael. fr. 77 H, Jerome PL 23. 284, Nonnus PG 36. 992 = Cosmas PG 38. 621 f. = Eudocia 630 (approx.) = Apostol. 15. 53.

to Pelopidas demanding a *παρθένος ξανθή*, subsequently identified (after initial consternation) as a foal. It is hard to believe that this eccentric feature could fail to be registered in Pausanias if he were using a source in which it appeared at all prominently; and although the story was particularly associated with Pelopidas it is unlikely to have been lacking in *Epaminondas*.

(iii) The Peloponnesian invasion of 370/69 (9. 14. 4–7): (a) Pausanias says that Epaminondas decided to leave *Messenia* because his allies were dispersed ravaging Laconia. Plutarch offers three explanations for the Thebans' withdrawal from *Laconia*, viz. that the Arcadians went home when the weather deteriorated, that three months of plundering had sated their appetite, and that the Spartans bribed the boeotarchs (*Ages.* 32. 8). On the face of it they are simply talking about two different decisions, and we cannot know whether Pausanias agrees with what Plutarch said about the decision to leave Messenia – though one might well doubt it, since Pausanias' statement (taken literally) seems historically absurd. The only way to render the two passages more strictly comparable would be to suppose that Pausanias' statement confuses departure from Laconia with departure from Messenia (a type of error arguably exemplified by the second explanation of the former in Plutarch, which confuses the length of the whole Peloponnesian campaign with the time spent in Laconia⁴⁷). But this expedient is of little value in the present context. For *either* Pausanias was adopting an error from the equivalent point in Plutarch's narrative (not Plutarch's error, but someone else's quoted by Plutarch and mistaken by Pausanias for Plutarch's opinion); *or* the putative error was committed by Pausanias, in which case we have to suppose that he found a statement of Epaminondas' motives for leaving *Laconia* between the narratives of Laconian and Messenian events in Plutarch, mistook it for an explanation of his motives for leaving *Messenia*, and therefore kept it in reserve until he had set down the cross-reference to 4. 26 f. which replaced Plutarch's account of Messene. Moreover, the alleged motive does not actually match any of the relevant motives which *Agesilaus* 32 shows to have been known to Plutarch. The hypothesis that Pausanias was epitomizing Plutarch here is anything but economical. (b) Pausanias reports that the returning Thebans defeated an Athenian force under Iphicrates, son of Timotheus (the patronymic is known only from this passage), near Lechaem. According to Plutarch (*Pel.* 24) and Xenophon (6. 5. 46 f.) the engagement occurred near Cenchreae, and there is no ground for thinking Plutarch got this right in *Pelopidas* and wrong in *Epaminondas*. Pausanias' error may derive from misidentification of a source's unspecific reference to 'the port of Corinth'; but why should a (presumably) fairly detailed account in Plutarch have employed such vague terminology?⁴⁸

(iv) Pelopidas' arrest and rescue (9. 15. 1–2): (a) the suggestion that Pelopidas visited Alexander unwarily *ὡς παρὰ ἄνδρα ἰδίᾳ τε εὖνουν αὐτῷ καὶ Θηβαίων φίλον τῷ κοινῷ* hardly consorts with *Pelopidas* (27), where his entourage know that Alexander is *ἐξώλη* . . . *καὶ μαιφόνον* but think that they will be protected by their personal reputation and that of their city. (b) The impression that Alexander surrendered Pelopidas as soon as Epaminondas superseded Cleomenes and Hypatus contradicts the story as told in *Pelopidas* (and as known to the Ephoran tradition: *Diod.* 15. 71. 3, 7, 75. 3), in which a second expedition had to be sent after the first had safely returned to Boeotia.

(v) A second Peloponnesian invasion (9. 15. 4): this invasion, which Pausanias

⁴⁷ The whole campaign is variously estimated as lasting for 85 days (*Diod.* 15. 67. 1) or for four months (*Pel.* 25, *Mor.* 194A, 817F, *Ael. VH* 13. 42, *Nep. Ep.* 7) or six months (*App. Syr.* 41) beyond the winter solstice. Three months is surely too long for the time in Laconia proper.

⁴⁸ More Lechaem/Cenchreae confusion appears in 9. 15. 4 (cf. n. 44).

quite deliberately places after the rescue of Pelopidas,⁴⁹ actually occurred in summer 369, and a passing reference in *Pelopidas* (26. 1) indicates that Plutarch was perfectly well aware of this fact. We face two options. The first is that Pausanias has simply placed incidents from the second invasion (of 369) at the date of the third invasion (Xen. 7. 1. 41 f.; Diod. 15. 75. 2), which *did* postdate Pelopidas' rescue (cf. Buckler [n. 2], 249 f.) – but this is an error which nobody will wish to attribute to Plutarch. The other option is to suppose that Plutarch arranged Epaminondas' career after early 369 non-chronologically, with Peloponnesian events (369–362) coming after central/north Greek events and the naval expedition (369–364), and that Pausanias excerpted items from the account in the order in which he found them.⁵⁰ But this is not a legitimate way to establish Pausanias' use of *Epaminondas*, because we should also have to admit that, having made his (arbitrary) excerption, Pausanias then made matters still worse by wilfully introducing a false relative chronology – and this admission contravenes our initial working assumptions (above p. 352). In any case, it is unlikely that Plutarch actually composed *Epaminondas* in the manner suggested, which is hardly paralleled in the Greek *Lives*, least of all where the relative order of the main events of the subject's career was easily determined from historical sources.

(vi) Mantinea (9. 15. 5): Pausanias concentrates solely on the claim that Epaminondas was killed by an Athenian and that that Athenian was Xenophon's son Gryllus.⁵¹ Plutarch displays some interest in the identity of Epaminondas' killer, but knows nothing of the claims of Gryllus and speaks instead of the Spartan Anticrates and his descendants, the so-called *μαχαιρίωνες* (Ages. 35).⁵² This presumably has some indirect connection with the versions recorded in Pausanias 8. 11. 5, in which one Machairion, variously said to be Spartan or Mantinean, is the killer (Peper, op. cit. [n. 1], 21, unnecessarily conjectured that Pausanias was engaging in polemic against Plutarch), but no connection with the present passage. Pausanias refers to Euphranor's painting of Mantinea, in which Gryllus was allegedly shown killing Epaminondas, on several occasions (1. 3. 4, 8. 9. 8, 11. 6). It is clear that this identification of the protagonists came to Pausanias from Athenian sources (cf. 8. 11. 6);⁵³ and, as our evidence stands, it is peculiar to him. When Plutarch mentions the same picture in *De Gloria Atheniensium* (346DE) he treats it as a depiction of a cavalry engagement by the walls of Mantinea some time prior to the main battle (cf. Xen. 7. 5. 16) and does not name the protagonists; he cannot, therefore, have thought that it had anything to do with Epaminondas' death, and we are not entitled to assume that he took a different view in *Epaminondas*,⁵⁴ especially since Pausanias' version is certainly historically inaccurate.⁵⁵

4. *Conclusion.* The four items which are only, or most closely, paralleled in

⁴⁹ In terms of Pausanias' narrative *ὡς δὲ βοιωταρχεῖν ἀθθις ἤρηντο* deliberately asserts that the invasion came when Ep. resumed the boeotarchy, following the period as a private citizen during which Pelopidas was rescued and Orchomenus destroyed (cf. n. 44).

⁵⁰ So events get out of order, and we can assume that it was arbitrary omission of the naval expedition which produced the impression that Orchomenus was destroyed during an earlier absence of Epaminondas.

⁵¹ For his presence at Mantinea cf. Ephor. 70F85, Suda s.v. *Κηφισόδωρος*, Harpoc. s.vv. *Γρύλλος*, *Κηφισόδωρος*.

⁵² In *Mor.* 214C the killer is an anonymous Spartan.

⁵³ It was perhaps an Athenian habit to discover sons of Xenophon everywhere; cf. 1. 22. 4 'whether the statues represent the sons of Xenophon or are merely decorative I cannot say'.

⁵⁴ Buckler (n. 2), 273 claims Pausanias' knowledge of the painting as a sign of use of Plutarch, even though what Pausanias says about the painting is unPlutarchan. But why should he not have seen it for himself?

⁵⁵ Xenophon's eulogy in 7. 5. 16 surely guarantees that Gryllus died in the preliminary cavalry skirmish.

Plutarchan texts can strictly prove nothing about Pausanias' direct use (spasmodic or otherwise) of *Epaminondas* unless we add to our existing working assumptions (above p. 352) a third assumption, that non-attestation outside Plutarch and Pausanias creates a presumption in favour of direct connection between the two authors. (This is a type of assumption regularly made in *Quellenforschung*. I am inclined to think that it is more valuable for the identification of (ultimate) connections between an early and a late source than for the identification of (direct) connections between two late sources.) If we do not make that extra assumption, the four items in question are merely consistent with the hypothesis under investigation, whereas we have eleven items which appear to be inconsistent with it; it should therefore be rejected. If we *do* make the extra assumption, then we have in all fairness to accept that the same type of argument from silence can apply to the two items attested only in Pausanias and Polyaeus (cf. n. 43), i.e. that they must be classified as unPlutarchan – in which case four Plutarchan items must be set against thirteen unPlutarchan ones. The arguments for classifying particular items as unPlutarchan are, of course, more finely balanced in some cases than others, but the general effect can hardly be denied. To put it briefly: (i) the Wilamowitz/Peper hypothesis in its pure form must be unequivocally rejected; (ii) at best Pausanias 9. 13. 1–15. 6 is a contamination of *Epaminondas* with non-Plutarchan material (which is the most that arguments from analogy would permit anyway: cf. section II); (iii) it remains perfectly possible that there is no direct connection with *Epaminondas* at all.

It must be stressed again that these propositions result from strict application of two or three working assumptions, all of which might be wrong. But if we decline to make at least two of those assumptions the attempt to use the actual *contents* of 9. 13. 1–15. 6 as a means of evaluating its likely source(s) becomes quite futile, and we shall have to fall back on arguments from analogy (which are weak) or on the assumptions (a) that Pausanias would not have wanted to compile the 'life' from a variety of historical and biographical sources but merely to tinker here and there with a single biographical source, and (b) that *Epaminondas* would have constituted 'the most convenient and simply the most obvious source'.⁵⁶ It may well be that many of those who have followed Wilamowitz and Peper have in reality done so more because of acceptance of these two assumptions than because of objective assessment of the contents of the Pausanian 'life'. If so, they were on weak ground; for, even if assumption (a) be accepted for the sake of argument, assumption (b) looks decidedly unattractive. One thing which appears reasonably clear about hellenistic and early imperial period biographical writing, not least as it relates to classical Greek political/military heroes, is the existence of a *genre* of compendious works *de viris illustribus* (or the like), containing relatively small-scale biographies of great men.⁵⁷ A source of this species would certainly be no less convenient than Plutarch's life (more convenient, one would think, since shorter) and would just as easily admit of enlargement or alteration by Pausanias, perhaps particularly in that part of Epaminondas' career which ends up being treated at disproportionate length, namely the Leuctra campaign. The complete absence in Pausanias of such matters as the naval expedition would not be surprising in a source of this type (judging at least by the

⁵⁶ Regenbogen (n. 1), 1068.

⁵⁷ The existence of a wide range of biographies on anything like Plutarchan scale about classical Greek political/military heroes (apart from lawgivers or tyrants) strikes me as much less certain; but that is a matter for discussion elsewhere. In any case, Epaminondas might have been one of the more likely subjects even if such works were not common; and Plutarch's *Epaminondas* could have superseded other comparable works by Pausanias' time.

arbitrary selectivity characteristic of some items in *Nepos de ducibus* – our only available exemplar); and the vagueness which may have caused Pausanias' confusion of Lechaeum and Cenchreae, or of the Peace of Antalcidas with that of 371, is more easily attributed to the author of such a work than to Plutarch. At any rate the alternative exists; and to describe Plutarch's life as 'the most obvious source' betrays a perspective too much influenced by the isolated survival of a large *corpus* of Plutarchan biographies – and by the frustrating fact that it does not include *Epaminondas*.

University of Liverpool

C. J. TUPLIN