Classical Quarterly **43** (ii) 468–474 (1993) *Printed in Great Britain*

DIONYSIAC TRAGEDY IN PLUTARCH, *CRASSUS*

It has recently and rightly been observed that Plutarch is exceptional as a prose author in the finesse with which he employs tragedy in his Lives. And, one might add, in the extent to which he does so. His dislike for the sensationalism of 'tragic history' was no obstacle to his use of 'the sustained tragic patterning and imagery which is a perfectly respectable feature of both biography and history'.[1] The primary purpose of the present discussion is to draw attention to the profound importance of tragedy, particularly of Euripides' *Bacchae*, to the Carrhae narrative in Plutarch's *Crassus*. It is argued that details in *Crassus*' version of Carrhae recall the tragedy of Pentheus and, in so doing, substantially advance the portrayal of Crassus' character.

As seems now to be accepted, it was the portrayal of character, to protreptic and moral ends, that was the governing principle of Plutarch's biographical writings. Moreover, that principle was followed in *Crassus* with such vigour that most of the narrative of Crassus' life is omitted or over-condensed. Instead, the Life is devoted, in turn, to Crassus' experiences in the civil conflicts of the 80's, to his defeat of Spartacus and to his own final defeat at the hands of the Parthians at Carrhae in 53 B.C. The latter episode is accorded slightly more than half the entire Life. In consequence, *Crassus* has been adjudged 'a peculiarly lightweight and anecdotal Life'.[2] And so it is, for three reasons. First, because the Life threatened to repeat material better dealt with in the Lives of more important figures, probably composed and produced at the same time. Second, narrative was best reduced because the subject offered a good opportunity for an unencumbered, powerful characterisation and moral point: in essence, the folly of greed in all its forms. Finally, because Plutarch considered Nicias a good Greek parallel for Crassus. Nicias' most famous moment, the defeat in Sicily, suggested comparison with Crassus' defeat at Carrhae. But Plutarch considered that Thucydides' account of Nicias could not be bettered, so that the biographical principle must be given full rein. It may be suspected that the literary imperative which directed the composition of *Nicias* also encouraged the omission of historical narrative from its Roman counterpart.[3]

In the pursuit of characterisation, reference to tragedy constituted a simple but powerful strategy. In *Crassus*, so bent on that end, the strategy was employed to memorable effect. The final chapter of *Crassus* could hardly make more of the *Bacchae*: it is a re-enactment of the climax of that play. In that chapter, the disembodied head of the dead Crassus is used as a grisly prop in a performance of

[1] J. M. Mossman, 'Tragedy and epic in Plutarch's *Alexander*', *JHS* 108 (1988), 83–93, esp. p. 85 for quotation, with full bibliography on earlier discussions of Plutarch and tragedy, notably P. De Lacy, 'Biography and tragedy in Plutarch', *AJPh* 73 (1952) 159–71. I have benefited significantly from the advice of several colleagues at Exeter; also from that of *CQ*'s reader, whom I wish to thank. Any blame is mine.

[2] For the judgment, C. B. R. Pelling, 'Plutarch and Roman politics', in I. S. Moxon, J. D. Smart and A. J. Woodman (edd.), *Past perspectives: studies in Greek and Roman historical writing* (Cambridge, 1986), 159–87, at p. 161. For a persuasive hypothesis on the composition of the Lives of Crassus and his contemporaries, see *id.*, 'Plutarch's method of work in the Roman Lives', *JHS* 99 (1979), 74–96.

[3] Plut. *Nicias* 1 is both a rejection of historical narrative in the face of Thucydides and an assertion of the appropriateness of the comparison of Nicias and Crassus. On the place of this passage in Plutarch's principles of biography, see C. B. R. Pelling, 'Plutarch's adaptation of his source-material', *JHS* 100 (1980), 127–40, esp. p. 135.

Agave's famous scene. And the final scene of *Crassus* is so striking that it has found a place in the most sober modern narratives of Republican history.[4] However, the power of Plutarch's image seems not to have encouraged curiosity. The re-enactment of the end of the *Bacchae* at the end of Crassus' life invites explanation, particularly because no trace of the story is found in extant sources earlier than Plutarch. That is, the connection between the fate of Crassus and the fate of Pentheus in the *Bacchae*, if not Plutarch's own creation, was certainly selected by him for special attention from the pool of different versions available to him. It remains to explain Plutarch's choice.

There was an evident literary gain: as we have seen, the substitution of Crassus' head for Pentheus' was a powerful image. Moreover, that image evoked both the cruelty commonly attributed to barbarians and, rather discordantly, their cultural development: the reader is offered a memorable glimpse of a barbarian savagery which expressed itself in the discourse of civilisation, at once accomplished and perverted. It is the final demonstration of the extent to which Crassus underestimated the Parthians. At the same time, there was a rather different compositional benefit for Plutarch. The prominence of Euripidean drama at the end of *Crassus* improved the comparison with the fate of Nicias. Plutarch ends *Nicias* with another powerful, though quite different, reference to Euripides. He relates the story that, after final defeat on Sicily, some of Nicias' soldiers were released from captivity as a reward for quoting from Euripides' plays, while others who had evaded capture were given food and drink in return for singing some Euripidean verses (*Nicias* 29.2–3; cf. *Synkr.* 4.3). There is no specific reference to the *Bacchae* (in 413 it had not yet been written) and Nicias' head did not suffer the indignity of Crassus', but the prominence of Euripides at the end of both Lives can hardly be accidental.

However, in addition to these gains, there is a more profound reason for Plutarch's substitution of Crassus' head for Pentheus. It is the culmination of a similarity which runs deeper in the Life, particularly in the Carrhae episode, where Crassus' greed for wealth becomes greed for fame as well: in that episode, Plutarch's Crassus resembles Euripides' Pentheus in much more than simply the fate of his head. Plutarch, so concerned with tragedy and so bent on the comparison of lives, might well deploy a character from tragedy to inform his account of Crassus in defeat and death. Pentheus was so famous in Plutarch's day that Tacitus could allude to him in Latin and in a firmly non-Greek context, describing the antics of Messalina and her friends: in addition to drama, it seems that Dionysiac ritual practices fostered a discourse within which Pentheus was a principal symbol. As an initiate himself in the rites of Dionysus, Plutarch was at home in that discourse. Nor should it surprise us that not every detail was transferred from Euripides' play to the biography of Crassus, for there were inescapable differences between Pentheus and Crassus: for example, Crassus was old, while Pentheus was young. A crude, blow-by-blow transferral would have been both banal and unconvincing: a lighter touch was needed. Yet it is also a very definite touch, for much detail was transferred, undermining the quest for a positivistic reality in Plutarch's composition.[5]

[4] W. W. Tarn, *CAH* IX (1932), p. 612 gives it a full half-page.

[5] Tac. *Ann.* 11.31 with A. Henrichs, 'Greek maenadism from Olympias to Messalina', *HSCPh* 82 (1978), 121–60, esp. p. 159. On Plutarch's initiation, *Mor.* 611d; cf. Dionysiac elements at, for example, *Ant.* 24 and *Alex.* 67. Note Plutarch's references to Agaue elsewhere: *Mor.* 167c–d; 501 b–c (citing Euripides, *Bacchae*). For positivism, try, for example, A. M. Ward, *Marcus Crassus and the late Republic* (Columbia, Mo., 1977). Rather more critical of the sources is B. A. Marshall, *Crassus: a political biography* (Amsterdam, 1976).

I

First, there is the problem of knowledge: who knew anything about Crassus' death or about the treatment of Crassus' body? Plutarch gives us his answer: no Roman who could know about Crassus' death had lived to tell the tale. There were radically different accounts of his death, based on conjecture.[6] Myth might be a better term. The defeat and killing of Crassus became ever more significant as Roman relations with Parthia developed through the civil wars and Principate that soon followed. Each time a campaign was mooted or conducted against the Parthians, the story of Crassus acquired a fresh significance. Crassus' defeat was seen as the origin of all that followed, as Cassius Dio observes, taking the opportunity to survey Romano-Parthian relations down to the third century A.D.:

> 'This [i.e. Crassus' campaign] was the beginning for the Romans of warfare against the Parthians... But now also, to this day, whenever they become embroiled in wars against us, they hold their own.'
>
> (Dio 40.14.1–4)

For Romans after 53 B.C., Crassus' defeat was a challenge, a dishonour to be avenged, a rare failure to be rectified. But it was also a warning: Crassus' defeat illustrated the severity of that challenge. As Dio's evidence indicates, for centuries after 53 B.C. no Roman could consider Parthia, still less engage in diplomacy or campaigning in that regard, without envisioning the spectre of Crassus. Augustus' recovery of Crassus' standards in 20 B.C. did more to increase that spectre than to diminish it: the success was vigorously publicised in art and literature, compared and contrasted with Crassus' failure.[7] In consequence, for example, Tacitus, Plutarch's contemporary, imagines that the Parthians still prided themselves on the slaughter at Carrhae in the first century A.D.[8] Though Crassus was a real person who suffered real defeat and death, he became, nevertheless, a myth for succeeding generations.

Nor is Plutarch's version of his myth the only one available: lack of hard information offered a large space within which Crassus' myth could develop, while the scale and continued relevance of his disaster encouraged such development. From the first there had been controversy. Crassus had left Rome for Parthia against vigorous opposition: Cicero makes it clear that some soon sought to shift blame for the ensuing disaster from Crassus to those who opposed him.[9] It is to be noted that much of this opposition was expressed through religion, while Crassus' movements thereafter until his death were dogged, we are told, by signs of divine opposition. At the same time, Cicero claims that Crassus had been given false encouragement by a vain Chaldaean prophecy of success. That is, he heeded the spuriously supernatural, but ignored the gods, who might well oppose an unjust war. In short, the impact of the disaster at Carrhae was so profound that, controversial from the first, its

[6] There has been much speculation on the sources available for the Parthian campaign: the best summary is E. Rawson, 'Crassorum funera', *Latomus* 41 (1982), 540–49, at pp. 548–9. See also Pelling, 'Plutarch's method...' p. 87 n. 96, for features of Plutarch's *Crassus* which show close contact with what he terms 'the Livian tradition', in which he locates Cassius Dio, on whom more below.

[7] Note, for example, how Ovid recounts Crassus' disaster to praise Augustus' success, *Fasti*, 5.579–98; cf. 6.465–8. See in general, especially for the triumviral period and Antony, D. Timpe, 'Die Bedeutung der Schlacht von Carrhae', *MH* 19 (1962) 104–29; thereafter, P. Zanker, *The power of images in the age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor, 1988), esp. pp. 185–92.

[8] Tac. *Ann.* 2.2.3. For a more reasoned Parthian perspective, see E. Dabrowa, *La politique de l'état parthe à l'égard de Rome* (Krakow, 1983).

[9] Cic. *De Div.* 1.29; cf. Plut. *Crassus*, 16; Ward, *Marcus Crassus*... p. 285. Cic. *ad Att.* 4.13 offers a contemporary glimpse of Crassus' departure.

antecedents swiftly became the object of claim and counter-claim in the scramble to apportion blame and to explain away a rare military humiliation. Religious controversy combined with political controversy to generate a multiplicity of versions and viewpoints.[10]

Valerius Maximus focusses on the prodigies which presaged the disaster, the scale and disgrace of the disaster itself, Crassus' sight of his dead son and 'the general's body cast forth among the undistinguished heaps of corpses to be torn apart by birds and beasts'. The disaster illustrates man's folly in setting his own plans above those of the gods. Plutarch might concur. But Valerius shows no awareness of the story of Crassus' head: he says only that the body was left unburied, though not, it seems, decapitated. Similarly, Velleius Paterculus has nothing to say of Crassus' head.[11]

Cassius Dio offers a different account of Crassus' end, which he evidently found in the tradition. Although he is eloquent on the significance of Crassus' defeat and although he allots it appropriate space in his work, Dio admits substantial ignorance as to his death.[12] Of the stories available to him, Dio relates only one. He reports a version according to which the Parthians killed Crassus and poured molten gold into his mouth, in mockery. But Dio says nothing of decapitation. The mockery was appropriate, for it was Crassus' greed that had killed him, as Dio and Plutarch agree.[13] In other words, this version of Crassus' end had a strong internal coherence. Nor was such an end peculiar to Crassus' myth: it was too fitting a fate for the greedy general to be monopolised even by Crassus.[14] The death was a fatal variation on the notion that gold is ultimately useless since it cannot be eaten, in essence the myth of Midas. To satisfy the greedy was to stuff their mouths with gold, for gold might be held in the mouth as well as in the pocket. To kill Crassus by pouring gold into his mouth was finally to satisfy his greed and to show his ultimate folly. The Parthians' mockery was barbarian cruelty perhaps, but it was also firmly rooted in traditional Greco-Roman thought and it had a point.[15]

II

Plutarch's account is evidently part of a myth of Crassus' death which encompassed several versions. As we have seen, there is no trace of the 'Pentheus story' before Plutarch. Although there is nothing to be gained here from *Quellenforschung*, there is much to be gained from attention to the version of the myth which Plutarch presents and to the points of contact between Plutarch's Crassus and Euripides' Pentheus. For, like the version related by Dio, Plutarch's version has a strong internal coherence.

[10] Cicero tells the famous story of the Caunian fig-seller at Brundisium, for which Plutarch substitutes a pointed exchange with King Deiotarus: *De Div.* 2.84; Plut. *Crassus*, 17.1–2. False Chaldaean prophecy: *De Div.* 2.99. A war without cause: Cic. *De Fin.* 3.75. The legal basis for Crassus' Parthian War also became a matter of dispute: see Timpe, 'Die Bedeutung...', pp. 106–11 and R. Seager, *Pompey: a political biography* (Oxford, 1979) p. 130 for sources and discussion.

[11] Val. Max. 1.6.11: *corpus imperatoris inter promiscuas cadaverum strues avium ferarumque laniatibus obiectum... sic deorum spreti monitus excandescunt, sic humana consilia castigantur, ubi se caelestibus praeferunt.* Cf. Val. Max. 6.9.9; 9.4.1. Vell. Pat. 2.46.

[12] Cassius Dio, 40.12–28; 27.2–3. [13] Cassius Dio, 40.27.3; 12.1. Cf. Florus, 1.46.

[14] See App. *Mithr.* 80 on M'. Aquillius.

[15] On the ultimate uselessness of gold: e.g. Ananius, fig. 3 (M. L. West (ed.), *Iambi et elegi Graeci* (Oxford, 1972) vol 2, p. 35). Midas: e.g. Ovid, *Met.* 11.85–145, wherein note the role of Dionysus, on whom more below. Feeding the greedy with riches: Aristoph. *Peace* 644–5; *Plutus* 379. Gold in the mouth: Aristoph. *Wasps* 609, 791; *Birds* 503; *Eccl.* 818; cf. Hdt. 6.125, also a humourous context. The comic contexts of these passages highlight the potential for mockery in the Parthians' act.

Throughout Euripides' play, Pentheus is a figure of tragic fun: Dionysus mocks him from first to last. Plutarch's Crassus is similarly the butt of humour from the onset of his Parthian campaign: his age is mocked by Deiotarus as unfit for his campaign when he departs from Brundisium (*Crassus*, 17.1–2) and his campaign is later mocked by the Parthians, who know better (*Crassus*, 18.2). Pentheus was both king and general, while Crassus was certainly a general and in an autocratic position while in the field. And, like Pentheus, Crassus did not maintain the self-control that was considered the linch-pin of proper monarchical conduct.[16] Plutarch stresses that, although Crassus had many virtues, he was a slave to his avarice (*Crassus*, 2.1 and throughout). Like Pentheus, it is Crassus' lack of self-control, manifested particularly as greed, that drives him to behave improperly towards the gods: he pays no heed to the divine warnings he receives in plenty both in Rome and in the field (*Crassus*, 16.3ff.). And, as with Pentheus, it is his lack of self-control that makes Crassus easy to trick into disaster (*Crassus*, 21.7). Like Pentheus, Crassus sets off to do battle with opponents who seem weak and effeminate, but who are strong and will destroy him (*Crassus*, 18.4; 24.2). Like Pentheus' opponents, Crassus' enemies are also of Asia. Moreover, their location is similarly 'other': Pentheus' mountains are Crassus' desert. Like Pentheus, Crassus has a deceitful and mocking guide, who is to be the prime cause of his death: 'a chief of the Arabs, Ariamnes by name, a deceitful and treacherous man, the greatest and most accomplished of all the evils which fortune made conspire to disaster' (*Crassus*, 21.1; 22.6). Crassus displays toward this guide the 'almost childlike compliance'[17] which Pentheus shows towards Dionysus. So much so that the very Roman Cassius addresses Ariamnes thus:

> 'Which devilish spirit has brought you to us, abominable man? What drugs and witchcraft have you used to persuade Crassus to pour the army into a gaping, awful emptiness, fit for the travels of a nomad bandit-boss more than a Roman general?'
>
> (*Crassus*, 22.4)

Ariamnes is certainly not Dionysus, but he is seen as an agent of superhuman forces, himself the master of supernatural trickery. When he rides off, his position is taken by a second untrustworthy guide, one Andromachus, 'the most unreliable of all men' (*Crassus*, 29.2). Like Pentheus, Crassus does not heed the good advice that is available: to that extent, the worthy Cassius, himself the stuff of myth by Plutarch's day, plays Teiresias to Crassus' Pentheus.[18]

As Crassus' death approaches, similarities with Pentheus become more overt and specific. In Plutarch's version, Crassus' enemies covered themselves with robes and skins to hide their armour (*Crassus*, 23.6). Pentheus' opponents are similarly clad in robes and skins (e.g. *Bacchae* 695–70). Moreover, Plutarch makes much of the reverberating *tympana* of the Parthians who face Crassus, which help to disorientate and to terrify Crassus and his men (*Crassus*, 23.6; 26.3). These are characteristic

[16] On Pentheus as general, J. R. March, 'Euripides Bakchai: a reconsideration in the light of vase paintings', *BICS* 36 (1991), 33–65. On Roman governors as kings, see, for example, D. Braund, 'The growth of the Roman empire', in D. Braund (ed.), *The administration of the Roman empire, 241 B.C.–A.D. 193* (Exeter, 1988), 1–13, esp. pp. 6–7, with the literature cited therein.

[17] So R. Seaford, 'Dionysiac drama and the Dionysiac Mysteries', *CQ* 31 (1981), 252–75, at p. 273.

[18] On the myth of Cassius, see E. Rawson, 'Cassius and Brutus: the memory of the Liberators', in I. S. Moxon, J. D. Smart and A. J. Woodman (edd.), *Past perspectives: studies in Greek and Roman historical writing* (Cambridge, 1986), 101–20, who, evidently sensing drama, observes that Cassius 'repeatedly plays Cassandra to the expedition' (p. 111). He is not Cassandra, but Teiresias, if the *Bacchae* is the play in question.

instruments of orgiastic ritual, commonly wielded by Dionysiac maenads: what is more, they occur with some prominence in Euripides' play (*Bacchae*, 59, 124). Crassus' changes of mood also find a counterpart in Pentheus' changing mental state.[19] Crassus is unstable from the first (*Crassus*, 16.2). In the field, he is completely shattered with fear (23.3), then carried away with optimism (23.5–6), then cast down into despair (25.1). While his son is being killed, Crassus in his ignorance takes heart (26.1), awaiting his son's return. But on discovering his son's death, he is gripped simultaneously by many conflicting emotions (26.3), reason abandoned. Only then, confronted with the head of his son, brandished on a spear by taunting Parthians, does Crassus become a true Roman general. Striding through the ranks he attempts valiantly to rally his troops with a stirring speech, involving earlier Roman victories in the East (26.5–6). But even that is not the work of reason: it is an emotion (26.5). Accordingly, it does not last: that night Crassus lies alone on the ground, covered by darkness, in complete despair (27.4–5). At this point, Plutarch interjects: while most would perceive Crassus' case as an example of *tyche*, the wise understand it differently. Crassus was not satisfied that he excelled the great majority: in having two men (Caesar and Pompey) his betters, he felt he had nothing at all (27.4). As we shall see, the interjection is of the first importance to Plutarch's characterization of Crassus as Pentheus.

Yet even at this stage, it was only as a result of a deception that the Parthian commander succeeded in capturing Crassus (*Crassus*, 30.1). Crassus had by now learnt from his sufferings: he suspected trickery, and was driven into Parthian hands only by his fear at the unreasoning anger of his own soldiers. And even in fear he exhibited a new nobility of spirit (30.5). Plutarch describes Crassus' death in a confused scuffle: his head and hand were sent to the Parthian king in Armenia, while his 'double' was marched in a mock triumph at Seleucia (31–2). The Parthian general had selected the Roman prisoner who bore the closest resemblance to Crassus (one Gaius Paccianus) and paraded him in Crassus' stead. He dressed this 'double' in the clothes of a queen and made him play the part of Crassus. A procession was formed which included Seleucian courtesans who sang outrageous songs on the effeminacy and unmanliness of Crassus (32.1–3).

The procession was of course a parody of a Roman triumph, wherein even scurrilous verses (directed at the triumphing general by his own soldiers) would not be out of place. But the triumph was closely associated with Dionysus. Moreover, in Euripides' play, Dionysus makes Pentheus imagine his triumphal procession after victory over the maenads. Further, if we pursue the similarities between Crassus and Pentheus, it must be significant that the substitute Crassus is dressed, like Pentheus, as a woman, like a transvestite initiate.[20] The Parthian general, his conqueror and the tormentor of his 'double', is himself androgynous: he exhibits a femininity adjudged discordant with his military prowess (24.2). In Euripides' *Bacchae*, of course, Dionysus similarly combines an effeminate appearance with conquering power and is underestimated for that reason (e.g. *Bacchae*, 252). While Ariamnes, and after him Andromachus, fulfilled some of the functions of Euripides' Dionysus, other functions were left to the Parthian general.

However, it is in the final scene that drama and narrative at last come together explicitly. We are asked to believe that Crassus' head arrived at Orodes' banquet in Armenia just as an actor reached the point in his performance of the *Bacchae* where

[19] On which, R. Seaford, *art. cit.* (n. 17), pp. 254–6.

[20] Eur. *Bacchae* 965–70 with Seaford, *art. cit.* (n. 17), esp. p. 259. For Dionysus and the triumph, see H. S. Versnel, *Triumphus* (Leiden, 1970).

Agave appears on stage with the head of Pentheus. The actor took his cue: Crassus' head became Pentheus' head. And to point the interaction of drama and narrative, when the actor, still in character, claimed the honour of killing Pentheus/Crassus, the Parthian who killed Crassus (who happened to have made the journey from Carrhae) seized the head from the actor and claimed that the right to speak the line was his. As Plutarch remarks 'the generalship of Crassus ended just as a tragedy' (*Crassus*, 33.4).

As we have seen, this version of the myth has an internal coherence, like the version which had Crassus' mouth filled with molten gold. Crassus is not like Pentheus in every detail: far from it. But the identification of Crassus as a Roman Pentheus encapsulates much of his character. Whereas in the version preferred by Dio, stress is laid on greed for riches alone, Plutarch's suggestion that Crassus is like Pentheus constitutes a broader assessment of his character and its faults.[21] Various points of similarity have been indicated: these serve to build the composite figure of Crassus-as-Pentheus. However, the central similarity which Plutarch presents by bringing Crassus together with Pentheus is left unstated. The essence of Crassus' folly is his selfish pursuit of his dishonourable ends: he is blind to the real interests of his community, his family and himself. So much may be said also of Pentheus in Euripides' *Bacchae*: he is concerned for his community, but his concern is misdirected and leads to disaster. Ultimately his folly, like Crassus', is revealed and horribly punished by a force of the east.[22]

In the version of Crassus' end favoured by Plutarch, it is a much more generalised greed that is suggested. It is not merely greed for gold, but a broader unreasoning insatiability that leads to his disastrous end. Crassus' insatiability evidently encompasses greed for gold, but it manifests itself more unusually and spectacularly in his lust to be first in power, as Plutarch makes explicit at the vital moment (*Crassus*, 27.4). This is his downfall.

Crassus was a scapegoat for Rome, as was Pentheus for Thebes.[23] The Roman defeat at Carrhae could be explained away as a consequence of individual folly, not communal failure. Excellent Romans litter Plutarch's narrative to make the point: not only Cassius but also Crassus' son, Publius, and others besides. It is stressed that the whole expedition was launched in the face not of factional opposition but of communal opposition and the opposition of the gods whose will engendered Roman imperial rule (16.3). It is depicted as the selfish scheme of an individual, made possible by his powerful 'friends'. For Caesar wrote from Gaul to encourage Crassus, while Pompey personally escorted him out of the city against the most vigorous resistance (16.3–4). In that sense, from Plutarch's perspective well into the Principate, Crassus' disaster was not only a personal folly but also a symptom of the malaise of the late Republic.[24]

University of Exeter DAVID BRAUND

[21] On the judgmental purpose of ancient biography, see C. Gill, 'The question of character-development: Plutarch and Tacitus', *CQ* 33 (1981), 469–87.

[22] See March, *art. cit.* (n. 16), p. 38 on Pentheus and the polis.

[23] Eur. *Bacchae*, 963 with Dodds *ad loc.*

[24] Dionysiac hostility to Crassus may be seen as a consequence of his suppression of Spartacus, whose spouse was a follower of Dionysus (*Crassus*, 8.3; cf. the vines of 9.2). Plutarch makes little of her, though there may have been more in his sources.