of the Truth by J. Opsomer are included in the bibliography; however, I could not find the former mentioned anywhere in the footnotes, while the latter is not cited for discussion of Plutarch's standing *vis-à-vis* Academic scepticism (p. 67 n. 95). Likewise, when talking about Plutarch's views on the void, atomic movements, and magnetism (pp. 77–80), B. fails to refer to Opsomer's 1999 article on *antiperistasis* in A. Pérez Jiménez et al. (edd.), *Plutarco, Platón y Aristóteles*, Madrid, pp. 417–29. The list could go on. It is emblematic that in the opening lines of B.'s introduction we are directed, for the *état présent* of Plutarchan research, to a bibliographical survey (by R. Flacelière) that was published in 1968!

Proof-reading is below par throughout the book: 'Ieal' for 'Ideal' (p. 27 n. 49), 'rejtée' (p. 111), 'Diels/kranz' (p. 76 and n. 16 *ibid.*), *Προπτρεπτικός* (p. 33); unnecessary 'ï's (p. 152 n. 9). There are two typos in Empedocles' name in Greek (p. 100 nn. 104 and 109); Isnardi Parente is just as unlucky—she gets italicized (p. 210 n. 60) and rebaptized 'Margharita' (p. 86). On p. 154, l. 10 'que le plaisir' appears to be printed twice; p. 94 n. 79 should read 'Two studies'; p. 196 n. 64 needs *τύχωσι* to complete the sentence; an obviously Freudian slip in reference to Babut (p. 223 n. 20). Bibliography, too, displays a rash of typos and inaccuracies (cf. entries for Adorno, Farrington, Freymuth, Gallo, Geigenmüller, Miller, 'Momogliano', Russell, etc.). Portalupi features in footnotes, but not in the bibliography. This is not to mention missing inverted commas, brackets, and the like—as well as thoroughly haphazard capitalization in Anglophone titles . . .

B.'s book is a useful, logically presented (yet regrettably non-indexed) collection of evidence. As such, it will be of service to scholars both of Plutarch and of Epicureanism, even though on the interpretative side it may not stand up to the demanding expectations of today.

University of Liverpool ALEXEI ZADOROJNYI
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni255

PLUTARCH AND TRAJAN

P. A. Stadter, L. Van der Stockt (edd.): *Sage and Emperor. Plutarch, Greek Intellectuals, and Roman Power in the Time of Trajan (98–117 AD)*. (Symbolae Facultatis Litterarum Lovaniensis, Series A, 29.) Pp. viii + 354, ills. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002. Cased, €42.60. ISBN: 90-5867-239-5.

Plutarch, author of one of the largest corpora to survive from classical antiquity, famously claimed that he came from a small town and stayed there so that it did not become smaller (*Dem.* 2.2). Many of his dialogues are set either in his own house in Chaeronea or in neighbouring towns or locales: Thespiae, Delphi, Athens, Eleusis. Recent studies have tended to emphasize this Greek background, seeing Plutarch as moving in an essentially Greek world, writing for a Greek audience, and insulated from, if not deliberately ignoring, Roman power. Against this view, Philip Stadter has argued in a number of recent papers (e.g. in L. Van der Stockt [ed.], *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch* [Leuven, 2000], pp. 493–510) for a Plutarch much more politically engaged with the centre of power in Rome. Plutarch mentions a number of

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni256 Published online by Cambridge University Press

important Romans, and dedicates many of his works to them—indeed, the *Parallel Lives* are dedicated to one of the highest-flying Roman statesmen and generals of the Trajanic era, Sosius Senecio, twice *consul ordinarius* and a legionary commander in Trajan's Dacian War. So when Plutarch discusses in theory what it means to be a good statesman, or explores the question in practice in the *Lives*, might he not have had exactly such high-ranking Roman readers in mind, perhaps even the emperor Trajan?

Yes, says Stadter in his introduction to this volume, and yes say many of its contributors. The highlight is perhaps Mark Beck's analysis of the dedicatory letter, long considered spurious, to the *Sayings of kings and commanders*, in which the author addresses the Emperor Trajan directly. In fact, argues Beck convincingly, there is no compelling reason to doubt its authenticity. Another highlight is Stadter's own paper, which plots a number of intersections between the themes of Pliny's *Panegyric* and passages of the *Lives*. Neither Pliny nor Plutarch could take the risk of offering direct advice to the new emperor. Pliny's strategy is to praise Trajan for qualities which he hoped Trajan might show, while Plutarch performs what Stadter calls his own 'extended meditation on leadership' through turning to examples of the great men of the past, both Greek and Roman. Stadter is careful to nuance his comments: the *Lives* address issues of contemporary concern, but in general steer clear of too obvious direct allusion. But, in the second half of the paper he does make a good case for seeing the image of the tyrannical Domitian, who is directly criticized by Plutarch in *Numa* 15.5–6 and mentioned again in passing in *Numa* 19.7, as hovering in the background of the *Numa* and the *Solon—Publicola*.

Other papers illuminate Plutarch's political theory (e.g. Van der Stockt on the theme of friendship in politics, or Van Meirvenne on how to offer advice), or compare Plutarch to other Greek literary figures of his day (Bowie and Dillon). The papers of Opsomer and Zadorozhnyi are rather less relevant to the overall theme of the collection, but no less welcome for that. Opsomer, in an impressively clear paper, shows how in the *On exile* Plutarch is able to write within a traditional framework and take up Stoic commonplaces from such exile-literature, while subtly Platonizing them. In a similar vein, Zadorozhnyi looks at the *On how to read the poets*. This text is often taken as evidence of a disagreement with Plato, who is never mentioned; Zadorozhnyi demonstrates that in fact Plutarch's recommendations for the use of the poets in early education is thoroughly consistent with Plato's position in the *Republic*.

Most of the other papers push in the direction of a Plutarch fully engaged with and responding to imperial policy and ideology. Brenk surveys Trajanic building activity in Egypt, and shows how its vision of ancient Egypt shares some of the emphases of Plutarch's *On Isis and Osiris*, though does not claim any direct link. Several contributions, however, are likely to be more controversial. Desideri discusses Plutarch's comments in the *syncrisis* to the *Lycurgus—Numa* about the Spartan education system; this, he argues, is an expression of support for Trajan's supposed programme of state-funded education. But the evidence for the latter seems shaky, at least as regards the education of *children*, and praise of Spartan education is, after all, a traditional Greek aristocratic reflex. A similar claim, with similar difficulties, is made by Schettino. She discusses a paragraph in the *syncrisis* of *Lysander and Sulla*, where Plutarch comments, with apparent admiration, on Lysander's failed plans to replace Sparta's hereditary monarchy with an elective one, in which, as Plutarch puts it, 'the best of the best' would rule. Schettino claims that this is a reference to Trajan's accession and his title of *Optimus*. But the idea of kings appointed not by birth but for their virtue is, once again, as old as Plato. Furthermore, what of the context?

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni256 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lysander is presented in the Life as brutal and immoral; if Schettino is right and Plutarch's readers would have seen a link between this passage and Trajan, then its implications would be distinctly disturbing.

Roskam's analysis of *Philosophers and men in power*, where Plutarch argues the very Platonic principle that the philosopher should not be detached from politics but should try to influence the powerful, raises different problems. Roskam sees this as Plutarch's personal manifesto for the new age of Trajan, when, according to Tacitus, it was possible to 'think what one wants and write what one thinks' (Tac. *Hist*. 1.1). But this entails a number of assumptions: first, that this text is a direct representation of Plutarch's own views rather than a display-speech or exercise, and unaffected either by the literary tradition or by the context in which it was delivered or intended to be read; second, that Tacitus' famous claim about Trajan's reign really tells us any more than that this is what the new emperor wanted to hear; and third that when Plutarch speaks of men in power he is thinking of an imperial context rather than a *polis* one. If we do, then, link *Philosophers and men in power* with the emperor, the link once again is surely rather less direct and more complex than Roskam implies. Tim Whitmarsh's cautions about the complex ways in which the Greek texts of this period fashion their authors' self-presentation (*Greek Literature in the Roman Empire* [OUP, 2001]) are relevant here—though Whitmarsh's book had not yet, of course, appeared when this volume went to press.

If most papers in the volume set about finding links between Plutarch's writings and Trajanic ideology, Pelling is a lone voice arguing the opposite case. In the *Caesar*, Pelling argues, Plutarch deliberately avoids raising themes which his readers might associate with contemporary issues. For example, when discussing Caesar's plans for future conquests, which were cut short by his death, Plutarch uses a strange circumlocution to avoid mentioning the word 'Dacia'—which might have brought to mind Trajan's Dacian campaigns. There may certainly, then, be 'resonances' of contemporary debates, Pelling argues, but Plutarch works hard to keep these resonances muted; he prefers to concentrate on 'timeless' themes. Pelling had argued a similar case about Plutarch's treatment of the Roman conquest of Greece in an earlier study of the *Philopoemen—Flamininus* (in Innes, Hine and Pelling, *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell* [Oxford, 1995], pp. 205–20), there as here concluding that it is the very lack of a too close engagement with themes of particular contemporary interest which has contributed to Plutarch's lasting relevance to later ages.

Pelling's paper, then, should sound a warning note to those who assume that overlaps with elements of contemporary ideology, or parallels with contemporary events, indicate deliberate authorial comment. But to be fair that is not what most of the papers in this volume claim. Furthermore, Pelling does not deny that some of Plutarch's readers might have been looking for such authorial comments: indeed, as Pelling argues, the lengths to which Plutarch goes to avoid raising such themes suggests that there were indeed readers who had one ear cocked for such contemporary comment. Whether, as Stadter claims, the description of Solon's reaction to the wealth of Croesus' palace in *Solon* 27 is actually an allusion to Domitian's opulent Domus Flavia, and to Trajan's more restrained style, some readers may have taken it like that. This makes all the more urgent a study of Plutarch's readership. Who were they? And who did Plutarch imagine he was writing for? What does dedication to Trajan or to prominent Romans like Sosius Senecio actually mean: does it really imply that such figures were expected to read these texts, or that they were written with an audience of such men in mind? If this volume makes us think

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni256 Published online by Cambridge University Press

about such questions, and helps us to situate Plutarch's work more firmly in the age which produced it, it will have succeeded admirably.

University of Reading TIMOTHY E. DUFF

doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni256

MORE DIOGENES OF OENOANDA

M. F. SMITH: *Supplement to Diogenes of Oinoanda: The Epicurean Inscription*. (Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Filosofici: La Scuola di Epicuro, Supplemento 3.) Pp. 164, ills. Naples: Bibliopolis, 2003. Cased. ISBN: 88-7088-441-4.

This supplementary edition of Diogenes of Oinoanda by Martin Smith, both the discoverer and first editor of more than half of the known fragments of the important inscription, is most welcome to all who are interested in the tradition of Epicureanism and its cultural context of the second century A.D. to which the inscription most probably belongs. Smith's magisterial edition of the Epicurean inscription that was carved in a stoa of the Greek town Oenoanda and was arranged in seven courses, as S. believes, or in five, as others argue, was completed in 1991 and published in 1993. Further exploration at Oinoanda in 1997 by S. and a team of representatives of the Fethiye Museum, archaeologists and workmen (M. F. Smith, 'Digging up Diogenes: New Epicurean texts from Oinoanda in Lycia', in M. Erler, R. Bees [edd.], *Epikureismus in der Späten Republik und in der Kaiserzeit* [Stuttgart, 2000], pp. 64–75, 67) brought more finds to light, and studies were made to improve our knowledge of what already had been discovered. During the 1997 season three trenches were opened up on the 'Esplanade'. S. found eight reused blocks of Diogenes' inscription. In addition, two more fragments were discovered, which raised the total of known fragments to 223. The new fragments extend the text by roughly 500 words. S. first published the text of these new fragments (NF 125–35) in *Anatolian Studies* 48 (1998), 125–70. Of the nine new fragments, which contribute significantly to our knowledge of the text (NF 135 offers only a few letters which cannot be attributed to any position in the text), two (NF 126–7) form part of the Physics part and introduce fr. 20, two (NF 128–9) belong to the Ethics part, two to Diogenes' defence of 'Old Age' (NF 133–4) and three (NF 130–2) are 'Maxims', most probably written by Diogenes himself. S. now republishes the fragments in this supplement. He also prints a discussion of reviewers' criticism of his 1993 edition (pp. 35–41). The reader is offered a bibliography of work done on the inscription since 1993 and, most importantly, additions and correction to S.'s introduction of the 1993 edition (pp. 57–60) and the edition itself (pp. 63–140) are presented and discussed. All this testifies to the ongoing work on the inscription, its importance and the lively debate stimulated by S.'s edition. In the back of the book, a plan of the 'Esplanade' showing the three trenches excavated in 1997 and photographs of some of the blocks are presented. All of the discovered texts are of interest.

The newly discovered maxims deal with the fear of death (NF 130); they discuss vain desires that are hard to satisfy, interestingly focusing on fame as an unlimited desire (fr. 139). They confirm that fortune and chance for Epicureans are synonymous and assure us that usually we are in control (NF 132). NF 133 belongs to the parts of

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni256 Published online by Cambridge University Press