

## PLUTARCH AND THE POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT OF PERICLES

BY

A. B. BREEBAART

In his masterly introduction to the commentary on Thucydides, Gomme wrote that "Plutarch's Life of Pericles is the most complex and the most interesting of his biographies on 5th century Athenian statesmen, and the most valuable to historians; it best discovers Plutarch's own strength and weaknesses"<sup>1</sup>). Whatever may be its value as a source on 5th century history, it clearly demonstrates the difficulties of a conscientious biographer in dealing with the sources on this period, so often distorted by political bias, panegyric or slander. We have often been told that Plutarch's picture of Pericles is far from consistent. Such an inconsistency must be due to the variety of opinions in his sources: in fact, Plutarch knew that it was nearly impossible to attain truth in the brushwood of conflicting testimonies. To trace Plutarch's sources has been the object of many scholarly publications<sup>2</sup>). Such studies are useful and necessary, though we should, for all that, never forget that Plutarch does something more than simply register his 'Quellen'<sup>3</sup>); the problem of the specific Plutarchean perspective, however, has not yet received the attention it deserves. If it is true that "l'image que Plutarque nous laisse de Périclès reste floue"<sup>4</sup>), he certainly en-

1) Vol. I, 65 ff.

2) H. Sauppe, *Die Quellen Plutarchs für das Leben des Perikles* (1867), F. Rühle, *Über die Quellen des plutarcheischen Perikles*, Jb. f. Kl. Phil. 1868. Cf. the useful monograph of E. Meinhardt, *Perikles bei Plutarch* (Frankfurt 1956). A good survey on the 'Quellenfrage' is to be found in the review of this work by S. Buchner, *Gnomon* 1960, 307 ff.

3) Cf. the excellent evaluation of Plutarch as a historian in Ph. A. Stadter, *Plutarch's Historical Methods. An Analysis of the Mulierum Virtutes* (Cambr., Mass. 1965), 125 ff.

4) R. Flacelière, *Plutarque, Vie de Périclès* (ed. Budé, tome III), introduction, p. 4.

visaged to offer a consistent picture. There is no doubt that this biography is the result of a more or less fortunate selection of traditions.

In this article I want to examine Pericles' career as traced by Plutarch. I hope to show that his picture is not more inconsistent than it is often thought. The history of Athenian politics is often seen in the light of Pericles as a statesman and a politician.

In chapter 9 Plutarch starts with Thucydides II 65, who, according to Gomme, is a 'kind of aristocratic' view of Pericles. The opinion that Pericles was the cause of the cleruchies and gratifications, made by Plutarch does not take side, but the causes of this change by looking at the sources.

What does μεταβολή mean? Gomme is confronted with such authorities as Thucydides and Plato, and others like Plato, to choose a choice. "Both must be right"<sup>1</sup> and he recognises that Thucydides and Plutarch offer only a partial solution of the problem, while there must have been a radical change in the conducting public affairs, amounting to a complete change: he was first a demagogue, and then a statesman. We may ask, however, whether Plutarch presented with such uncorroborated evidence called a solution to a problem. And it is not clear that Plutarch really shared the view of Pericles the scapegoat for the moral decline of Athens. Even if the idea of a change in Pericles' character is something arbitrary, it does not prevent us from trying to distinguish certain periods in his life. Finally, it is very doubtful whether there was a change in Pericles' character.

1) Gomme, *o.c.*, 65 ff.

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT  
OF PERICLES

BY

E. E. BAART

In the commentary on Thucydides, the life of Pericles is the most complex biography on 5th century Athenian life to historians; it best discovers "weaknesses" <sup>1</sup>). Whatever may be its history, it clearly demonstrates the biographer in dealing with the sources misled by political bias, panegyric or that Plutarch's picture of Pericles inconsistency must be due to the fact, in fact, Plutarch knew that it was a man in the brushwood of conflicting sources has been the object of such studies are useful and necessary, never forget that Plutarch does not list his 'Quellen' <sup>3</sup>); the problem perspective, however, has not yet been solved. If it is true that "l'image que nous en avons est restée floue" <sup>4</sup>), he certainly en-

*Leben des Perikles* (1867), *Deutsches Perikles*, Jb. f. Kl. Phil. 1868. *Perikles bei Plutarch* (Frankfurt) 'Anfrage' is to be found in the review of 1860, 307 ff.

Plutarch as a historian in Ph. A. Stadter, *Analysis of the Mulierum Virtutes* (Cambr.,

*Périclès* (ed. Budé, tome III), introduc-

visaged to offer a consistent picture of the Athenian statesman. There is no doubt that this biography is more than simply the result of a more or less fortunate attempt to account for different traditions.

In this article I want to examine some aspects of Pericles' political career as traced by Plutarch. I hope to show that his picture is less inconsistent than it is often thought to be. Though his understanding of Athenian politics is often defective, he tried to do justice to Pericles as a statesman and a politician.

In chapter 9 Plutarch starts from the famous description of Thucydides II 65, who, according to Plutarch, qualified Pericles' government as a 'kind of aristocracy'. However, many others were of the opinion that Pericles was the first one to spoil the people by cleruchies and gratifications, making it reckless and undisciplined. Plutarch does not take side, but proposes to his readers to observe the causes of this change by looking into the facts.

What does *μεταβολή* mean? Gomme thought that Plutarch, confronted with such authorities as Thucydides, to whom Pericles was *σπουδαῖος*, and others like Plato, to whom he was not, could not make a choice. "Both must be right" <sup>1</sup>). But Plutarch did not sufficiently recognise that Thucydides and Plato used different standards. "His only solution of the problem, which is really not there at all, is that there must have been a radical change in Pericles' methods of conducting public affairs, amounting practically to a change in character: he was first a demagogue, then a true leader of the people". We may ask, however, whether the notion of a *μεταβολή* which is presented with such uncorroborated evidence, could really be called a solution to a problem. As we shall see, there is no evidence that Plutarch really shared the point of view of those who made Pericles the scapegoat for the deterioration in Athenian public morality. Even if the idea of a sudden 'transformation' has something arbitrary, it does not preclude that Plutarch had some grounds for distinguishing certain periods in Pericles' political career. And, finally, it is very doubtful whether we are entitled to speak of a change in Pericles' character.

1) Gomme, *o.c.*, 65 ff.

The great μεταβολή seems to take place after 443. It is said that Pericles "was no longer the same man as before, nor alike submissive to the people and ready to yield and give in to the desires of the multitude as a steersman to the breezes. But rather forsaking his former lax and languid management of the people . . . he struck the high and clear note of aristocratic and kingly statemanship" (Perrin's Loeb translation, modified).

So the change in 443, after the ostracism of Thucydides Melesiou, brought about the Thucydidean Pericles. But this transformation was only a return to the 'real' Pericles. As Connor rightly remarked, there were really two changes in Pericles' political career<sup>1</sup>). In 7,3 we are told that Pericles, at the start of his career, chose the sides of the poor and the many "against his natural disposition, which was not δημοτικός at all". So the transformation of 443 was only a return to his true self. This precludes the idea of a change in character. In fact, the 'democratic' phase is presented in a curious way: "Pericles chose the 'role' of a democrat in order to establish for himself a safe position and a good base for action against Cimon" (7, 4). This has nothing to do, then, with political convictions, but very much with a kind of sound political 'opportunism', in view of the *ad hoc* political situation. The changing political context, evidently, was of much greater importance than character or ideology. It is of some interest that Plutarch asks his readers in 9,1 to follow the 'transformation' through the facts themselves. It is not so much the 'conversion' as the changing circumstances he asks his readers to look upon.

The reason for placing the μεταβολή passage and the contrasting views of Thucydides and 'many others' at the beginning of chapter 9 is to be seen in the fact that, henceforth, Pericles' opposition to Cimon got a more outspoken, public character. Political measures such as state-payment for the δίκασται etc. are part of his

1) W. R. Connor, *Theopompus and Fifth-Century Athens* (Cambr., Mass. 1968), 179 n. 32: "it should be noted that the change is really a reversion to Pericles' aristocratic disposition (compare chapter 7 of the Life). There are thus two changes in Pericles, the first upon his entry in politics, the second on his acquisition of political predominance". Connor quotes B. Perrin (Trans. of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 15, 1909): "the assumption of a change in Pericles after his acquisition of complete power is original with Plutarch . . .".

design to outdo Cimon. The turn and more in the spirit of the corollary 9,1 than any other passage in the biography. But Plutarch stresses not only these new measures as the strenuous statesman, for which he needed this reason he exaggerates the importance of the 'revolution' of 462, which was really

There is, however, something more in 9,1. What does the μεταβολή refer to? It is a change from a hesitating political alignment to a more definite one, away from demagogics. If we take the μεταβολή as a caesura in Pericles' career, an interval between the introduction and the development of his policy, suggested by ἐν ἀρχῇ μὲν γὰρ . . . But the introduction, in which the identification of Pericles with the δημοτικός is mentioned before the opening of the Pericles period, does not seem to give a good period, which was, as Plutarch knows, the period of the Thucydidean Pericles was referring to. If we conclude that the change after 443, it is somewhat surprising that the conversion of 443 would be hinted at so as the notion of μεταβολή remains in the chapters of great importance and we reach the ἀκμή of Pericles' career.

It is hard to say what 'transformation' means. But he would hardly have understood that there were periods in Pericles' career. In the Thucydidean Pericles was brought about a development in character and a change in political context that e

1) 7,5 Διὸ καὶ μᾶλλον ἰσχύσας ὁ Περικλῆς τὸν δῆμον τοῦ Περικλέους.

2) Cf. R. Meiggs, *The Crisis of Athens*, the period of the fifties: "The Pericles meet in Thucydides. He is nearly twice as ambitious, with clearcut ideas of empirical policy to fulfil . . .".

... after 443. It is said that before, nor alike submissive give in to the desires of the masses. But rather forsaking his duty to the people . . . he struck a new note of "wisdom and kingly statemanship"

... of Thucydides Melesiu, etc. But this transformation is not a simple one. As Connor rightly remarked, "Pericles' political career"<sup>1</sup>). In 7,3 we find that Pericles, in his career, chose the sides of the conservative disposition, which was not a change of 443 was only a return to a change in character. In a curious way: "Pericles sought to establish for himself a safe position against Cimon" (7, 4). This has many implications, but very much with in view of the *ad hoc* political context, evidently, was of much ideological significance. It is of some interest to follow the 'transformation' so much the 'conversion' as readers to look upon.

... passage and the contrasting character at the beginning of chapter 9 worth, Pericles' opposition to his character. Political measures taken etc. are part of his

... *5th-Century Athens* (Cambr., Mass. change is really a reversion to chapter 7 of the *Life*). There are his entry in politics, the second Connor quotes B. Perrin (Trans. *Plutarch*, 1909): "the assumption of complete power is original

design to outdo Cimon. The tone of this chapter is rather critical and more in the spirit of the complaints of the conservatives from 9,1 than any other passage in the *Life*. Pericles seems a true demagogue. But Plutarch stresses not so much the odious consequences of these new measures as the strengthening of Pericles' position as a statesman, for which he needed the sympathy of the people<sup>1</sup>). For this reason he exaggerates the influence of Pericles in the political 'revolution' of 462, which was really the work of Ephialtes.

There is, however, something strange in the *μεταβολή* passage of 9,1. What does the *μεταβολή* refer to? In 9 a new phase begins: from a hesitating political alignment Pericles turns over to unveiled demagogues. If we take the *μεταβολή* as relative to this important caesura in Pericles' career, an immediate relation is established between the introduction and the next sentences. This is also suggested by *ἐν ἀρχῇ μὲν γὰρ . . .* But the difficulty is that in this case the introduction, in which the idea of the Thucydidean *ἀριστοκρατικός* is mentioned before the opinion of the conservative enemies of Pericles, does not seem to give a good background for the 'democratic' period, which was, as Plutarch knew, anterior to the period Thucydides was referring to. If we conclude that the *μεταβολή* refers to the change after 443, it is somewhat strange that the sudden political conversion of 443 would be hinted at already at this stage, the more so as the notion of *μεταβολή* remains rather unspecified and many chapters of great importance and stuffed with facts follow, before we reach the *ἀκμή* of Pericles' career in 443.

It is hard to say what 'transformation' Plutarch had in mind. But he would hardly have understood our problem. It was evident that there were periods in Pericles' political conduct<sup>2</sup>). Also, the late, Thucydidean, Pericles was brought about not so much as a result of a development in character or political experience, as by the changing political context that enabled him to become the *ἀριστο-*

1) 7,5 Διὸ καὶ μᾶλλον ἰσχύσας ὁ Περικλῆς. . . Τοσοῦτον ἦν τὸ κράτος ἐν τῷ δήμῳ τοῦ Περικλέους.

2) Cf. R. Meiggs, *The Crisis of Athenian Imperialism*, HSCP 1963, 000 on the period of the fifties: "The Pericles of these years is not the Pericles we meet in Thucydides. He is nearly twenty years younger, less cautious, more ambitious, with clearcut ideas of empire to realize and a social and economical policy to fulfil . . .".

κρατικός he had always been by birth, wealth and education. So, what Plutarch had to explain was the context and the changing political environment which enabled Pericles to 'change' his conduct in 443. Of course, these political factors were determined by his own actions. But the whole democratic period prepared for the change in 443, which was, after all, the logical consequence of his successful bid for the highest power in the state. It is wrong to over-stress the μεταβολή isolated from the context. And it is precisely the 'cause' of the transformation Plutarch asks us to observe.

Plutarch invites us to look for this cause διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων αὐτῶν; this implies that he attempts to account for Pericles' political conduct in terms of interrelation between political conditions *ad hoc* and his personal response to them. In chapter nine he closely follows Aristotle in making Pericles' moves in democratic radicalism a response to Cimon's euergetism and ensuing popularity<sup>1</sup>). Chronology is sacrificed to the 'eidology' of the battle with Cimon. In the *Athen. Pol.*, the payment of the δίκασται chronologically belongs to the period after 462, and rightly so. Plutarch heaps everything together in the period before that crucial year. This is untenable, given the relative weakness of Pericles' position before Cimon's banishment; however, it is all the more characteristic of Plutarch's method. He clearly chose to envisage the second period of Pericles' opposition to Cimon in a different light. The period of the fifties, before Cimon's recall from banishment<sup>2</sup>), is painted as a time of

1) *Ath. Pol.* 27, 3 ἐποίησε δὲ καὶ μισθοφόρα τὰ δικαστήρια Περικλῆς πρῶτος, ἀντιδημαγωγῶν πρὸς τὴν Κίμωνος εὐπορίαν . . . 4 πρὸς δὲ ταύτην τὴν χορηγίαν ἐπιλειπόμενος ὁ Περικλῆς τῇ οὐσίᾳ, συμβουλευσάντος αὐτῷ Δαμωνίδου τοῦ Οἴηθεν . . . ἐπεὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις ἠτῶτο, δίδόναι τοῖς πολλοῖς τὰ αὐτῶν, κατεσκεύασε μισθοφορὰν τοῖς δικασταῖς. — Hignett rightly argues against giving Pericles a great share in the reforms of 462 (*History of the Athenian Constitution* (1952), 215 ff., 342 ff.). As has been noticed by R. Sealey (*Pericles' Entry into Politics*, *Hermes* 1956, 212), there is a great difference between the precise and circumstantial language of *Ath. Pol.* 25, 1-2 (on Ephialtes) and the tendentious passage 27, 1 (on Pericles).

2) The vexed problem of Cimon's return before 451 bears on the historical value of Theopompus frg. 88 and Nepos, *Vita Cimonis* 3, 2 ff., which seems to go back to the tradition of Theopompus. That Pericles, after the Egyptian disaster, was inclined to make a political concession to the Cimonians seems plausible. But it is certainly tendentious to make the recall of Cimon the only way left to peace with Sparta, and to connect it closely with the lost

general disillusion with Cimon's a and Pericles is shown to have b giving in to the people's wishes position not by radical laws but his opponents (chapter 10).

From chapter 10 onwards to chessboard is viewed as an immr situation created by his political countered by Pericles' use of τὰ δ the battle of Tanagra, returns fi cause, Pericles' political friends real motives. Pericles, then, tries gallantry by exposing himself a After the Athenian defeat, howev and Pericles does not hesitate t called back from exile. After Cin the new moves of the aristocr Melesiou by an immense progr ambitious programs of colonisati tries to envisage Pericles' political is shown by such words and for καὶ δοκεῖ (10), διὸ καὶ τότε μάλιστ Plutarch had a specific source for politics in these years, but it is as al according to a perspective of h to overdo his case. If it is true aristocratic opposition towards hard to understand why Pericles πρὸς χάριν (11, 4), a conduct wl in face of a leader who would extremism. We shall return to th

Pericles' political career betw the year of the ostracism of Thu set of moves in order to gain the

battle of Tanagra, the more so as the s pressed by Theopompus (in fact, it is *Pericles* 10). For a good discussion se

h, wealth and education. So, he context and the changing Pericles to 'change' his con- l factors were determined by cratic period prepared for the the logical consequence of his the state. It is wrong to over- ontext. And it is precisely the n asks us to observe.

his cause διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων account for Pericles' political been political conditions *ad hoc* chapter nine he closely fol- ves in democratic radicalism ensuing popularity <sup>1</sup>). Chro- the battle with Cimon. In the και chronologically belongs to Plutarch heaps everything to- year. This is untenable, given ition before Cimon's banish- characteristic of Plutarch's the second period of Pericles' ght. The period of the fifties, nt <sup>2</sup>), is painted as a time of

ρα τὰ δικαστήρια Περικλῆς πρώτος, . . . 4 πρὸς δὴ ταύτην τὴν χορηγίαν ουλεύσαντος αὐτῷ Δαμωνίδου τοῦ οἷς πολλοῖς τὰ αὐτῶν, κατεσκευάσε ν argues against giving Pericles a of the Athenian Constitution (1952), ealey (*Pericles' Entry into Politics*, ce between the precise and circum- a Ephialtes) and the tendentious

n before 451 bears on the historical ita Cimonis 3, 2 ff., which seems to That Pericles, after the Egyptian oncession to the Cimonians seems to make the recall of Cimon the o connect it closely with the lost

general disillusion with Cimon's absence (the lost battle of Tanagra), and Pericles is shown to have been a fair and flexible statesman: giving in to the people's wishes to recall Cimon he strengthens his position not by radical laws but by a politics of concession even to his opponents (chapter 10).

From chapter 10 onwards to 15 every move on the political chessboard is viewed as an immediate reaction of Pericles to the situation created by his political opponents. Cimon's generosity is countered by Pericles' use of τὰ δημόσια. When his opponent, before the battle of Tanagra, returns from exile to fight for the patriotic cause, Pericles' political friends send him away in distrust of his real motives. Pericles, then, tries to match Cimon's reputation for gallantry by exposing himself and fighting very bravely (10, 2). After the Athenian defeat, however, the people long back for Cimon and Pericles does not hesitate to yield to their wishes: Cimon is called back from exile. After Cimon's death at Salamis he counters the new moves of the aristocratic opposition under Thucydides Melesiou by an immense program of public works, festivals and ambitious programs of colonisation (11, 4). How seriously Plutarch tries to envisage Pericles' political moves in terms of 'cause and effect' is shown by such words and formulas as διὸ καὶ μᾶλλον (9, 5), διὸ καὶ δοκεῖ (10), διὸ καὶ τότε μάλιστα (11, 4). We do not know whether Plutarch had a specific source for this particular version of Athenian politics in these years, but it is as likely that he arranged his material according to a perspective of his own. Sometimes Plutarch seems to overdo his case. If it is true that Thucydides Melesiou lead an aristocratic opposition towards Pericles' democratic policy, it is hard to understand why Pericles τῷ δήμῳ τὰς ἡνίας ἀνεῖς ἐπολιτεύετο πρὸς χάριν (11, 4), a conduct which would appear more plausible in face of a leader who would try to outdo him in democratic extremism. We shall return to this phrase.

Pericles' political career between the midst of the sixties and the year of the ostracism of Thucydides Melesiou is depicted as a set of moves in order to gain the supremacy in the state. In all this,

battle of Tanagra, the more so as the success of Oinophyta was probably suppressed by Theopompus (in fact, it is entirely absent in Nepos and Plutarch, *Pericles* 10). For a good discussion see Connor, *o.c.*, 24 ff.

Pericles has very little of the doctrinarian about him. Though it is nowhere denied that Pericles had to resort to demagogic measures, it also becomes clear that the ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἀνδρὸς ἀρχή did not come about by that kind of flattery that was, according to Thucydides, harmful to the Athenian commonwealth and characteristic for the demagogues after Pericles' death. Even in passages like 9, 2-5, in which a critical tone cannot be missed, stress is put on Pericles' ascendancy over the people, not on the noxious consequences of this policy on public morality, as suggested by the severe criticism of the conservatives. One can hardly suspect Plutarch to have been very enthusiastic about Pericles' backing of Ephialtes, who turned the state εἰς ἄκρατον δημοκρατίαν (*Cimon* 15, 2). But, even if the policy in the year of Cimon's dethronement shows Plutarch's dislike of democratic radicalism, his account of Pericles' opposition towards Cimon is rather mild to Pericles. In the Life of Cimon already Plutarch praised him for his πραότης towards the conservative statesman. There also Pericles' readiness to call back Cimon from exile after Tanagra is praised as an example of admirable political behaviour; personal feelings were subordinated to the πατρίδος καίροι (17, 6) <sup>1</sup>). In the Life of Pericles (10, 6) it is emphatically stated that Pericles was very mild in his accusation of Cimon. His behaviour during this process is used as a testimony against the slander of Idomeneus, who accused Pericles of having murdered Ephialtes. If Plutarch took time to refute indignantly such insinuations, this can only be explained by his wish to exculpate Pericles of petty motives in his political proceedings. The murderers of Ephialtes are openly called ὀλιγαρχικοί. Pericles' φρόνημα εὐγενες and his ψυχὴ φιλότιμος are praised and opposed to the mentality of his political enemies (10, 7).

In chapter 11 Thucydides Melesiu enters the political scene <sup>2</sup>).

1) Cf. the whole passage 17, 6: οὕτω τότε πολιτικά μὲν ἦσαν αἱ διαφοραὶ, μέτριοι δ' οἱ θυμοὶ καὶ πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν εὐανάκλητοι συμφέρον, ἢ δὲ φιλοτιμία πάντων ἐπικρατοῦσα τῶν παθῶν τοῖς τῆς πατρίδος ὑπεχώρει καιροῖς.

2) On Thucydides Melesiu cf. Kirchner, *Pros. Att.*, 7268; Fiehn, RE VI A (1936), Thuk. 2; H. T. Wade-Gery, JHS 52 (1932), 205 ff., G. Prestel, *Die antidemokratische Strömung in Athen des 5ten Jahrh.* (1939), 50; H. D. Meyer, *Thukydides Melesiu und die oligarchische Opposition gegen Perikles*, Historia 1967, 141 ff.; A. E. Raubitschek, *Theopompus on Thucydides the Son*

Plutarch's presentation of this no is somewhat embarrassing. In or monarchy Thucydides is said to unto a 'party', thereby bringing dimly visible, the cleft between 'aristocratic' conviction. Meyer v this 'Periodisierung' is the wor however, ask why he made a ca politics precisely at this point.

Lack of corroborating evidence it very difficult to ascertain how f teresting that, again, Pericles' situation is mainly seen as a *react* of Thucydides Pericles veered out duced his ambitious programme o ding program.

Unfortunately, we know next t the internal political battle in th certainly a more difficult politica sources describe him as a man of m Many people may have been ak called his 'tyrannical arrogance' of the Athenians in the Aegean. stand for the rights of the σύμμα even the arguments of 12 do not i Prinzip angegriffen gewesen und gefordert worden war". There making him a Panhellenist *avant* well-known article.

If Plutarch made Thucydides a vative policy, he may easily have l of the 'two parties' as we find it i ides as the representative of the

of Melesias, Phoenix 1960, 81-95; F. Melesias, and *Athenian Politics before t*

1) Plato *Meno* 94 d. Cf. Plut. *Peri* δίδου καὶ Περικλέους.

2) Meyer, *art. cit.*, 149.

rian about him. Though it is resort to demagogic measures, πρώτου ἀνδρὸς ἀρχή did not at was, according to Thucyd-wealth and characteristic for Even in passages like 9, 2-5, sed, stress is put on Pericles' the noxious consequences of ested by the severe criticism uspect Plutarch to have been ing of Ephialtes, who turned mon 15, 2). But, even if the ment shows Plutarch's dislike f Pericles' opposition towards the Life of Cimon already s towards the conservative liness to call back Cimon as an example of admirable were subordinated to the Pericles (10, 6) it is emphatic- l in his accusation of Cimon. ed as a testimony against the Pericles of having murdered e refute indignantly such ind- ed by his wish to exculpate l proceedings. The murderers xoi. Pericles' φρόνημα εὐγενες opposed to the mentality of

enters the political scene <sup>2</sup>).

τε πολιτικαὶ μὲν ἦσαν αἱ διαφοραὶ, τοῖσι συμφέρον, ἢ δὲ φιλοτιμία πάντων χάριτι καιροῖς.  
 2) Pros. Att., 7268; Fiehn, RE HS 52 (1932), 205 ff., G. Prestel, es 5ten Jahrh. (1939), 50; H. D. eutsche Opposition gegen Perikles, heopompus on Thucydides the Son

Plutarch's presentation of this new phase of Athenian political life is somewhat embarrassing. In order to check Pericles' progress to monarchy Thucydides is said to have reorganised the aristocrats unto a 'party', thereby bringing to light what up till now was only dimly visible, the cleft between people of a 'democratic' and an 'aristocratic' conviction. Meyer was probably right in thinking that this 'Periodisierung' is the work of Plutarch himself; we may, however, ask why he made a caesura in the history of Athenian politics precisely at this point.

Lack of corroborating evidence from contemporary sources makes it very difficult to ascertain how far Plutarch was right. But it is interesting that, again, Pericles' attitude in respect of this new situation is mainly seen as a *reaction*: as an answer to the challenge of Thucydides Pericles veered out the reins to the people and introduced his ambitious programme of relief, colonisation and his building program.

Unfortunately, we know next to nothing about the real issues of the internal political battle in the years 450-443. Thucydides was certainly a more difficult political opponent than Cimon; ancient sources describe him as a man of much influence and many 'friends' <sup>1</sup>). Many people may have been alarmed by what Pericles' enemies called his 'tyrannical arrogance' and by the growing unpopularity of the Athenians in the Aegean. According to Plutarch, he made a stand for the rights of the σύμμαχοι. But, as Meyer pointed out <sup>2</sup>), even the arguments of 12 do not imply "dass die Seebundspolitik im Prinzip angegriffen gewesen und eine fundamentale Neuordnung gefordert worden war". There is not the slightest ground for making him a Panhellenist *avant la lettre*, as Wade-Gery did in his well-known article.

If Plutarch made Thucydides a convinced champion of a conservative policy, he may easily have been influenced by the schematism of the 'two parties' as we find it in Aristotle's *Ath. Pol.* 28: Thucydides as the representative of the ἐπειχειεῖς versus the προστάται τοῦ of Melesias, Phoenix 1960, 81-95; F. J. Frost, *Pericles, Thucydides, Son of Melesias, and Athenian Politics before the War*, Historia 1964, 385 ff.

1) Plato *Meno* 94 d. Cf. Plut. *Pericles* 6 δεῖν . . . δυναστείων, τῆς Θουκυδίδου καὶ Περικλέους.

2) Meyer, *art. cit.*, 149.



δήμου<sup>1</sup>). But if Thucydides was such a powerful opponent, he must have rallied a great number of Athenians behind him. There may be something in the tradition voiced by Aristeides of Smyrna, that Thucydides was popular with the demos<sup>2</sup>). To Theopompus he was probably a demagogue just like all the others, including Cimon<sup>3</sup>). We should not lapse into the mistaken opinion that demagogical means imply a 'democratic' conviction, for, as Finley pointed out<sup>4</sup>), in the Athenian state every politician had to be more or less a 'demagogue', if one was to carry the assembly. So Plutarch can have had valid reasons, after all, to picture him as a spokesman of an aristocratic opposition. But Thucydides M. will not have despised the backing of those who distrusted and opposed Pericles for all possible kinds of reasons: his aristocratic background and environment, his personal behaviour. As was pointed out by Frost<sup>5</sup>) with regard to the conflicts of the thirties, the political adversaries were often democratic egalitarians, who distrusted and hated the enlightenment of the aristocratic circles, to whom Pericles, Anaxagoras and Phidias belonged. We should not forget that, even according to Plutarch, it was mainly the power of Pericles, his similarity to the 'tyrants', that was attacked by the comic poets as being not in harmony with democracy.

1) Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 28, 2 Περικλῆς μὲν τοῦ δήμου (προειστήκει), Θουκυδίδης δὲ τῶν ἐτέρων, κηδεστής ὢν Κίμωνος.

2) Aristeides, 118 (= 160 Dindorf) ᾧ ποτε Ἀθηναῖοι τὰ πολιτικά ἐπιτρέψαντες ἐπέιθοντο πάντες (cf. Schol. A).

3) Cf. Connor, *o.c.*, 43: "There is surely little to show that Theopompus regarded Thucydides as a commendable and virtuous aristocratic statesman". On Thucydides as leader of the demos cf. the anonymous *Life of Thucydides*, 6-7 (cf. Raubitschek, *art. cit.*, 88). On Cimon as a 'demagogue' cf. W. R. Connor, *Theopompus' Treatment of Cimon*, Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies 1963, 107 ff. This, however, does not imply that Theopompus made Cimon a democrat, as Connor thinks.

4) M. I. Finley, *Athenian Demagogues, Past and Present* (1965), 16 ff.

5) Frost, *art. cit.*, 392 ff. against the more conformistic views of D. Kienast, *Gymnasium* 1953, 210 ff. But Frost goes too far in another direction. Certainly, the weapons of superstitious fear and contempt for intellect, as the means to influence the assembly, may have been used mainly by 'Pseudo-egalitarians' like Cleon and his friends. But why should not some real 'oligarchs' have made use of the opportunity to attack Pericles by the same means? Athenian political groups show a remarkable capacity for making similar *ad hoc* alliances.

Anyhow, if Pericles chose *πολιτική* implies that he had to bid for the have been illogical in the face of :

Plutarch's schematism oversim well understood if we take into activities of Pericles in the fifties. by the biographer as the great ti half of the whole commonwealt colonisation, his building program of the urban poor<sup>1</sup>); full employ the glory of Athens. Such a man course, *δημοτικός* in a specific sens viewed Pericles' building program characteristic of his own days. F enthusiasm for the Periclean mo: Pericles becomes the great benefa cratic opposition became simp

Rounding off this phase of Peri how completely the Athenian de Ostracism, in 443, seems less a t himself than a 'referendum' ab otherwise than Pericles coming o

The real problem for Plutarch of Pericles as a democrat or an importance was the question ho should be evaluated. We have ai career was described in the light

1) ἐπανορθούμενος τὰς ἀπορίας τοῦ employment. 5 ὁ βάναισος ἔχλος... πρόφασιν ἀπὸ τῶν δημοσίων ὠφελείσθαι τὴν εὐπορίαν.

2) Frost, *art. cit.*, 389 ff. I share notions about Pericles' 'welfare' prog position against Pericles' so-called remarks of A. M. Burford, *The Econ. Cambr. Philol. Society* 1965, 25.

3) It is remarkable how soon the turns into a group of 'enemies' (ἐχθροὶ) (διέβαλλον, ἐβάσκαλλον, βοᾶν).

powerful opponent, he must  
 ns behind him. There may be  
 Aristeides of Smyrna, that  
 os<sup>2)</sup>. To Theopompus he was  
 e others, including Cimon<sup>3)</sup>.  
 en opinion that demagogical  
 for, as Finley pointed out<sup>4)</sup>,  
 n had to be more or less a  
 assembly. So Plutarch can  
 icture him as a spokesman  
 Huydides M. will not have  
 trusted and opposed Pericles  
 aristocratic background and  
 s was pointed out by Frost<sup>5)</sup>  
 ties, the political adversaries  
 ho distrusted and hated the  
 es, to whom Pericles, Anaxa-  
 ld not forget that, even ac-  
 ower of Pericles, his similarity  
 the comic poets as being not

ἢ δήμου (προειστήκει), Θουκυδίδης  
 εότε 'Αθηναῖοι τὰ πολιτικά ἐπιτρέ-

little to show that Theopompus  
 virtuous aristocratic statesman".  
 e anonymus Life of Thucydides,  
 ion as a 'demagogue' cf. W. R.  
 Greek Roman and Byzantine  
 t imply that Theopompus made

st and Present (1965), 16 ff.  
 re conformistic views of D. Kie-  
 es too far in another direction.  
 r and contempt for intellect, as  
 ve been used mainly by 'Pseudo-  
 But why should not some real  
 y to attack Pericles by the same  
 remarkable capacity for making

Anyhow, if Pericles chose πολιτεύεσθαι πρὸς χάριν τῷ δήμῳ, this implies that he had to bid for the favour of the demos, which would have been illogical in the face of a purely aristocratic opposition.

Plutarch's schematism oversimplifies the facts. But this can be well understood if we take into account his conceptions about the activities of Pericles in the fifties. This period, clearly, was envisaged by the biographer as the great time of the welfare-program on behalf of the whole commonwealth. Pericles' ambitious designs in colonisation, his building program, serve to increase the prosperity of the urban poor<sup>1)</sup>; full employment is the main motive next to the glory of Athens. Such a man, an εὐεργέτης of his town, was, of course, δημοτικός in a specific sense. Frost<sup>2)</sup> suggested that Plutarch viewed Pericles' building program in the light of civic euergetism, characteristic of his own days. Plutarch is so carried away by his enthusiasm for the Periclean monuments that from a 'demagogue' Pericles becomes the great benefactor of the community. The aristocratic opposition became simply ἐχθροί<sup>3)</sup>, spreading calumny.

Rounding off this phase of Pericles' career Plutarch demonstrates how completely the Athenian demos was won over to his policy. Ostracism, in 443, seems less a test to which Pericles had to submit himself than a 'referendum' about which nobody could expect otherwise than Pericles coming off as the victor.

The real problem for Plutarch was not the political conviction of Pericles as a democrat or an aristocratic leader. Of far greater importance was the question how Pericles' 'monarchical' position should be evaluated. We have already seen that Pericles' political career was described in the light of his bid for supreme power. In

1) ἐπανορθούμενος τὰς ἀπορίας τοῦ δήμου. 12, 4 εὐπορία ἐτοίμη and full-employment. 5 ὁ βάνουσος ὄχλος... ἵνα μηδὲν ἦττον τῶν πλεόντων... ἔχη πρόφασιν ἀπὸ τῶν δημοσίων ὠφελείσθαι κτλ. 6 αἱ χρειᾶ διένεμον καὶ διέσπειρον τὴν εὐπορίαν.

2) Frost, *art. cit.*, 389 ff. I share his doubts concerning the Plutarchean notions about Pericles' 'welfare' programme. On the arguments of the opposition against Pericles' so-called 1000 talent-temples cf. the judicious remarks of A. M. Burford, *The Economics of Greek Temple Building*, Proc. Cambr. Philol. Society 1965, 25.

3) It is remarkable how soon the 'honourable opposition' of chapter 11 turns into a group of 'enemies' (ἐχθροί), taking refuge in cries and slander (διέβαλλον, ἐβάσκαλλον, βοᾶν).

his prime Pericles was distrusted for his likeness to the tyrant Pisistratus (7, 1). He was afraid to be under suspicion of sympathy for a 'tyranny' (7, 4). The aristocrats, headed by Thucydides Melesiou, tried to prevent a monarchical power of Pericles (11, 1). His φιλοτιμία made him the initiator of the musical agon at the Panathenaea (13, 11). He was τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη πρωτεύων and obtained an ἀρχὴ καὶ δυναστεία for fifteen years. His δύναμις was a fact, as Thucydides knew; but the charges against his ἐπίφθορος ἴσχυς (39) were so often voiced by comedians and other sources that Plutarch had to take them into account<sup>1</sup>). It is easy to accuse him of lack of discernment as to the value of his sources. But we should not forget that the one great historian he could use as a source, Thucydides, dismissed all biographical details. Lesser authorities saw politics mainly in the light of personal and private interests, as is amply shown by the history of Pericles' initiatives with regard to the Peloponnesian war<sup>2</sup>). By making serious decisions the result of sometimes whimsical or purely private motives, such authors confronted Plutarch as a biographer with the problem of Pericles' personal powers. Even for Plutarch, it was not always easy to decide whether there was a 'tyrannical' vein in Pericles, as his discussion of the motives of Pericles to start the Peloponnesian war may prove. The case for ἀυθαδεία and φιλονικία is not entirely ruled out<sup>3</sup>).

But the Thucydidean picture could not be wrong. A πρῶτος ἀνηρ in the sense of Thucydides, of course, could never be a demagogue, and, since the fourth century conservative tradition tended to identify 'demagogues' and radical democrats, Pericles had to be made ἀριστοκρατικός or even βασιλικός. Connor<sup>4</sup>) observed that, after 15, the expected examples that would show Pericles as a

1) Cf. the important passage 16, 1 (Thucydides versus the comedians and their malignant interpretation of Pericles' power). It is interesting to observe that criticism of Pericles' monarchical behaviour was apparently voiced by those that were worried about the fate of democracy. This may be the Plutarchean interpretation. But perhaps it mirrors the fear of the small people for the highly intellectual upper-class regent.

2) Cf. chapter 31 (and Ephorus' ill-famed aetiology of the Peloponnesian war in Diod. XII 38 ff.).

3) 31, 1 οἱ δὲ μᾶλλον ἀυθαδεία τινα καὶ φιλονικία πρὸς ἔνδειξιν ἰσχύος περιφρονησαὶ Λακεδαιμονίων.

4) Connor, *o.c.*, 114.

conservative in domestic matter narrow a conception of Plutarch which must not be interpreted in a way for which evidence in this part of his work is lacking. What is stressed, the φρόνημα μέγιστον, the scope of Pericles' military and domestic policy, is to keep back the people from rash actions. These are the typical qualities of the good ruler, as are as evident as his unwillingness to let his unselfishness<sup>2</sup>). In comparison with Pericles' rhetorical powers are obvious. Plutarch heavily stresses the lack of eloquence; certainly, less benevolent criticisms have been voiced by enemies of Pericles. This character in this aspect of the story perhaps leading back to Theophrastus and Valerius Maximus<sup>3</sup>). More interesting is the fact that Pericles does not appear to play any role in the story far from criticising Pericles for his actions. He seems rather to praise him for the good steersman during a gale, not for the actions of the sailors.

The summary in chapter 39, as well as the picture of Pericles as a monarch. There is no word of Pericles' power was odious and unpopular. It appeared to be salutary after his death. It was the fatal development, for corruption was the root of the state. Here, again, Plutarch's point of view with 4th century conservative state after 462. The dangerous te

1) Cf. 18 εὐδοκίμει διὰ τὴν ἀσφάλειαν τῆς ἀρχῆς (Pericles' grave forebodings as to the future of the state come true); 19, last sentence, 20, 3; 20, 3; 21, 1.

2) 39, 1.

3) Pericles' power of speech: 15, ψυχαγωγίαν οὖσαν κατὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν. Valerius Maximus *Interfuit nisi quod illi gessit?* Plut. *Pericl.* 7 and W. R. Connor, *Constitutional History of the Roman Republic*, 23 (1962), 23-33.

ed for his likeness to the tyrant  
to be under suspicion of sympathy  
stocrats, headed by Thucydides  
archical power of Pericles (II, 1).  
iator of the musical agon at the  
σσαράκοντα ἔτη πρωτεύων and ob-  
teen years. His δύναμις was a fact,  
arges against his ἐπιφθονος ἰσχυς  
omedians and other sources that  
ccount <sup>1</sup>). It is easy to accuse him  
alue of his sources. But we should  
torian he could use as a source,  
phical details. Lesser authorities  
personal and private interests, as  
Pericles' initiatives with regard  
aking serious decisions the result  
private motives, such authors con-  
with the problem of Pericles' per-  
It was not always easy to decide  
ein in Pericles, as his discussion  
art the Peloponnesian war may  
λονικία is not entirely ruled out <sup>3</sup>).  
uld not be wrong. A πρώτος ἄνηρ  
ise, could never be a demagogue,  
onservative tradition tended to  
democrats, Pericles had to be  
λικός. Connor <sup>4</sup>) observed that,  
that would show Pericles as a

Thucydides versus the comedians and  
s' power). It is interesting to observe  
behaviour was apparently voiced by  
of democracy. This may be the Plut-  
mirrors the fear of the small people  
gent.

imed aetiology of the Peloponnesian

λονικία πρὸς ἔνδειξιν ἰσχύος περιφρονῆ-

conservative in domestic matters are missing. This implies too narrow a conception of Plutarch's ideas on Pericles' 'aristocracy', which must not be interpreted in the strictly party-political sense for which evidence in this part of the biography is lacking indeed. What is stressed, the φρόνημα μέγα symbolised in the grandeur and scope of Pericles' military and diplomatic undertakings, his power to keep back the people from rash adventures and megalomania <sup>1</sup>), are the typical qualities of the good ruler; his πραότης and ἐπιεικεία are as evident as his unwillingness to be carried away by passion and his unselfishness <sup>2</sup>). In comparison with these moral qualities, Pericles' rhetorical powers are only secondary in importance, and Plutarch heavily stresses the 'Platonic' character of Pericles' eloquence; certainly, less benevolent judgments on Pericles as a speaker have been voiced by enemies who detected a 'Pisistratean' character in this aspect of the statesman. Such a characterisation, perhaps leading back to Theopompus, can be read in Valerius Maximus <sup>3</sup>). More interesting is the fact that constitutional behaviour does not appear to play any role at all as a virtue. In 33, Plutarch, far from criticising Pericles for not calling together the assembly, seems rather to praise him for this conduct: Pericles behaves like a good steersman during a gale, not caring for the tears and lamentations of the sailors.

The summary in chapter 39, again, is an evaluation of Pericles as a monarch. There is no word on 'party'-politics. Monarchical power was odious and unpopular to many contemporaries but appeared to be salutary after his death. Pericles was the man who held up the fatal development, for corruption and vice were already at the root of the state. Here, again, Plutarch tries to combine the Thucydidean point of view with 4th century ideas on the decline of the state after 462. The dangerous tendencies of democratic radicalism

1) Cf. 18 εὐδοκίμει διὰ τὴν ἀσφάλειαν; 18, 3 (reaction of the people when Pericles' grave forebodings as to Tolmides' overconfidential undertaking come true); 19, last sentence, 20, 3; 21, 1.

2) 39, 1.

3) Pericles' power of speech: 15, 2 ἔδειξε τὴν ῥητορικὴν κατὰ Πλάτωνα ψυχαγωγίαν οὖσαν κτλ. Valerius Maximus VIII 9, 2, 3 *Quid enim inter Pisistratum et Periclem interfuit nisi quod ille armatus, hic sine armis tyrannidem gessit?* Plut. *Pericl.* 7 and W. R. Connor, *Vim quandam incredibilem*, *Class. et Mediaev.* 23 (1962), 23-33.

could not be denied in the face of the testimonies of the 'many' of chapter 9. But the solution of the problem was not found in making Pericles the scapegoat, such a judgment being incompatible with Thucydides. Instead of such a view Plutarch seems to remain in the line of Isocrates' moderate appreciation of the state of Athenian affairs in his speech on the Peace 126: Καίτοι Περικλῆς . . . . παραλαβὼν τὴν πόλιν χεῖρον μὲν φρονοῦσαν ἢ πρὶν κατασχεῖν τὴν ἀρχήν, and Aristotle *Ath. Pol.* 28, 1: "Ἐως μὲν οὖν Περικλῆς προειστήκει τοῦ δήμου, βελτίω τὰ κατὰ τὴν πολιτείαν ἦν, τελευτήσαντος δὲ Π. πολὺ χεῖρω.

Plutarch's problem was the relation between Pericles the party-leader and Pericles the statesman. In a way, this is still our problem with regard to the great Athenian leader. The distinction he made between the periods of party-leadership and aristocratic statesmanship cannot be maintained; it is too crude, as Jacoby rightly pointed out<sup>1</sup>). But in stressing this sharp distinction we do Plutarch less than justice. For, in a way, he was not interested in the constitutional position of Pericles and the political machinery of the Athenian state: what he wanted to bring out was the way along which Pericles attained that position of authority that made him a master of the state. Even as a party-leader Pericles was only reacting to the moves of political opponents, never becoming a dogmatist or a real demagogue. Pericles was interesting as a ruler, a 'princeps'. And a great ruler he became, finally, by his own abilities and more or less in spite of the demos. Plutarch does not answer our questions about the character of the interplay between the nearly monarchical powers of Pericles and the democratic system. But we can hardly reproach him for that; the glory that was Athens meant a living tradition, but its democracy was only a vaguely understood past.

AMSTELVEEN, Vogelkerslaan 34

1) *F. Gr. Hist.* IIIb, vol. II, p. 388 (on Philochorus frg. 119): "The distinction and characterisation, however, of the two periods made by Plutarch in his *Pericles* . . . . seems much too crude, and the detailed discussion shows how onesidedly the great political measures are judged when seen in the light of the conservative or Platonic view, which Plutarch does not even share here".

## NEHALENNIA AND THE

B

H. WAGI

Procopius, lawyer, historian ar A.D. at Caesarea in Palestine, def Spätzeitmensch', a versatile sc Germanic world. He knew Gothic people and had respect for the n inspires confidence when relating coast opposite England lie variou their living with fishing and ag trade<sup>2</sup>). Moreover, so he says, t

\* See my article *The Journey of tl Blessed*, *Mnemos.* IV 24 (1971), 113 ff.

1) R. Rubin, *RE* 23, 273-599.

2) Rubin, *loc. cit.*, 339, 50. 350, 22. I would not dare to aver, even thou more places suitable for the passage come especially into consideration is Calais), e.g. Boulogne s.M. or the v (*B.G.* V 2, 3) *commodissimum in Britan m.p. XXX a continenti*. Did Claudi this place in mind when he wrote the

Est locus extremum pandit qua C  
Oceani praetentus aquis, ubi ferti  
sanguine libato populum movisse  
Illic umbrarum tenui stridore vol  
flebilis auditur questus; simulacr  
pallida defunctasque vident migr.

If this is so we have here again a cas phases: there are visible shades on the of Odysseus points to the existence ( on their way to the Isles of the Blesse As K. ter Laan, *Nederlandse Overl* observes—he collected some data with here in the West the road of the so Again rightly, he adds, with a refer *Mythologie*, that in the first centuries

*Mnemosyne* XXIV

Western Michigan University Interlibrary

Loan



ILLiad TN: 44302

**Borrower:** VZS

**Lending String:** DUQ,\*EXW,EZC,IOG,UCW

**Patron:** Curley, D DEPT; clas st  
STATUS;fac

**Journal Title:** Mnemosyne.

**Volume:** 24 **Issue:**  
**Month/Year:** 1971**Pages:** 260-272

**Article Author:**

**Article Title:** Breebaart, AB; Plutarch and the  
development of Pericles

**Imprint:** Lugduni Batavorum ; E. J. Brill,

**ILL Number:** 9496277



**Call #:** PA9 .M6

**Location:** WLL

**ARIEL**  
**Charge**  
**Maxcost:** \$0 IFM

**Shipping Address:**  
SKIDMORE COLLEGE LIBRARY  
ILL  
815 N BROADWAY  
SARATOGA SPRINGS NY 12866

**Fax:** 518-580-5540  
**Ariel:** 141.222.135.98