PLETHO AND HERODOTEAN MALICE.

Peter Allan Hansen.

In 1969 I published the article 'The Manuscript Tradition of Plutarch's De Malignitate Herodoti' and stated on p. 13: 'I shall not try here to place in the tradition the excerpts made in Marc. Gr. 517 by Pletho. For our piece they seem inconclusive,...' Subsequent inspection of the MS showed that something definite can in fact be said about their place in the tradition.

I here reproduce Pletho's excerpts from De Malignitate, which may serve as an example of the way in which Pletho excerpted from Plutarch and other authors. The text is followed by a general note about the contents of the excerpts and by the placing of them in the MS tradition. I have normalized accents and punctuation and introduced capital letters in the customary way. Otherwise, the text has been left to stand as found in the MS. There appear to be no itacisms or other errors attributable to Pletho; recourse to a text of Plutarch (Pearson's Loeb text) will show where Pletho's source contained errors which he either did not notice or could not emend.

1. From 858A-B.

(74F) δι’ Ἀθηναίων καὶ Μιτυληναίων περὶ Σιγείου ἄλληλοις πολεμοῦντων, καὶ Φρύνωνος τοῦ στρατηγοῦ Ἀθηναίων προκαλεσαμένου τὸν βουλόμενον εἰς μονομαχίαν, ἀπήντησε Πιττακός ὁ τῶν ἐπτὰ σοφῶν. καὶ δικτύῳ περιβαλὼν τὸν ἄνδρα μέγαν τε καὶ ὑμαλέον δύνα ἀπέκτεινεν. ἐκ δὲ τούτου τῶν Μιτυληναίων δορεὰς αὐτῷ μεγάλας διδόντων, τὸ δόρυ ἀκοντίσας

---

τούτο μόνον τὸ ἕκωσε λαβεῖν ὅποσον ἢ αἰχμὴ ἔπεσεν, οὗ καὶ ἐκαλεῖτο ὃστερον Πιττάκειον.

2. From 859C-D.

ὅτι συχναὶ τυραννίδες ὑπὸ λακεδαιμονίων ἐν τῇ Ἐλλάδι κατελύθησαν. ὁδὸι γὰρ ἐκ μὲν Κορίνθου καὶ Ἀμπρακίας κυψελίδας ἐξέβαλον, ἐκ δὲ Ἀθηνῶν τοὺς Πεισιστράτου παιδες, ἐκ δὲ Σικυώνος Αλσίνη, ἐκ δὲ Θάσου Σύμμαχον, ἐκ δὲ Φωκέων Αδλίν, ἐκ δὲ Μιλήτου Ἀριστογένη. ἔπαυσαν δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐν Θετταλοῖς δυναστείαν, Ἀριστομήδη καὶ Ἀγγελον καταλῦσαν διὰ τοῦ βασιλέως Δεσποτήδου.

3. From 859F-860C.

ὅτι τοὺς ὑπὸ Περιάνδρου παρὰ Ἀλυάτην ἐπὶ ἐκτομὴν πευμονόν ς Κερκυραίων παιδέας, Κνίδιοι ἀπεπλεόντες εἰς Σάμον, καὶ τοὺς μὲν (74) Περιάνδρου φύλακας ἐξελάσαντες τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐν φιλοτείχι τούτου καὶ παιδες καταπεφευγότες ἦσαν, τοὺς δὲ παιδες αὐτοὶ ἀναλαβόντες εἰς Κερκυραν ἀποκατέστησαν, ὅτω Ἀντήνωρ τοῖς τοῦ Κρήτη καὶ Διονυσίῳ τοῖς Χαλκιδίζων ἱστορήσαντος. ἦσαν δὲ καὶ Κνίδίως παρὰ Κερκυραίως τιμαὶ τε καὶ ἀτέλεια ἐφησισμεναι.

4. From 861B.

ὅτι Ἐρετρείες, καθ' αὐτοὺς πρότερον, στόλῳ βασιλικῷ ἐκ Κύπρου τῇ Ἰωνίᾳ προσπελέσαντες ἐξο ἐν τῇ Παμφυλίᾳ πελάγει ἀπαντήσαντες κατεναυμάχθησαν. εἰτ' ἐκεῖθεν ἀναστρέφαντες καὶ ἐν Ἕβεον τὰς ναὸς καταλημμένας μετ' Ἀθηναίων Σάρδης ἐπέθεντο. καὶ πᾶν τό ἄστυ πλῆς τῆς ἀκρόπολες ἐλόνες, τελευτάντες πλήθους σφίσθη συχνὸν ἐπικυθέντος εἰς Μίλητον ἐπανεχάρσαν, ὅτω δυσανίου τοῦ Μαλλώτου ἱστορήσαντος.

5. From 864E-866C.

ὅτι τῶν περὶ Δεσποτῆς ἐξελάτων ἐκ Σπάρτῆς ἀγώνα ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἐπιτάφιον ἡγοῦσαντο δακεδαίμονιο, ὅν καὶ πατέρες τε αὐτῶν καὶ μητέρες ἐδείωσαν, αὐτοῖς δ' ὁ Δεσποτής πρὸς μὲν τὸν εἰσάγωνα πάνυ ὀλίγους ἐξάγεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὴν μάχην, πολλοὺς μὲν οὖν

---

2 There is a lacuna here as the result of an erasure. The word erased was presumably ἐξέγεισαι (sic) found in both E and B.
τεθνησμένους, ἐφη. πρὸς δὲ τὴν γυναῖκα πυνθανομένην ἔξιόντος εἰ τι λέγοι, ἀγαθοῖς, εἰπε, γαμεῖσθαι καὶ ἀγαθὰ τίκτειν. θῆβησι δὲ γενόμενος καὶ ἐγκοιμηθείς τῷ ἱερῷ τοῦ Ἰσακλέους ὁνορ εἴδε τοιοῦτο. ἔδειξεν ἐν δαλάττῃ πολὺν τε ἐχόουσῃ καὶ τραχύν κλύδωνα τὰς μεγίστας καὶ ἐπιφανεστάτας τῆς Ἐλλάδος πόλεις ἀνωμάλως διαφέρεσθαί τε καὶ σαλεύειν, τὴν δὲ θηβαίων ὑπερέχειν τε πασῶν καὶ μετέωρον πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἀρθεῖσαι εἰς ἔξαιρης ἀφανισθῆναι. ὁ τοῖς δὲτερον χρόνῳ πολὺ περὶ τὴν πόλιν συμπεσοῦσιν βοιωτικῇ ὀφθη. ἐν δὲ θερμοτύλαις μετὰ τὴν κύκλωσαν δύο τῶν ἀπὸ γένους ὑπεξελέσθαι (75ε) ὁ δευνίδας βουλόμενος τῷ μὲν ἐπιστολῆν ἐδίδου καὶ ἔπεμπεν, ὁ δὲ οὕκ ἐδέξατο φήσας· μαχατά τοι, οὕκ ἀγγελιαφόρος, εἰπόμαν [sic]. ὁ δὲ τετερος κελεύοντος εἰπεῖν τι πρὸς τα τέλη τῶν ἑπαρτιατῶν ἀπεκρίνατο· τὰ πράγματα, καὶ τὴν ἀστίδα λαβὼν εἰς τἀξιν κατέστη. οὐ δὲ οὖν περὶ δευνίδων οὐδεὶς ἑπαρτιάται ἐπειδή τὴν τῶν πολεμίων νῦκταρ ἐπιθύνοντο περίοδον, ἀναστάντες ἔξω ἐβάδειον ἐπὶ τὸ στρατόπεδον καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν ὀλύγου δεῦν τὴν βασιλέως ὡς ἐκείνον αὐτὸν ἀποκτενοῦντες καὶ περὶ ἐκείνης τεθνησμένους, καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς θεσπιῶν τε καὶ θηβαίων οἱ παρόντες, δὲν ἤγετο Ἀνάξανδρος ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης ὑπὸ ἑστόρηκα καὶ Νικανόρος ὁ Κολοφύνιος, μέχρι μὲν οὖν τῆς σκηνῆς κτείνοντες ἀεὶ τὸν ἐμπόδον. τοὺς δὲ τρεπόμενοι προῆλθον. ἐπεὶ δὲ οὐκ ἐνετύχανον δέξει, ἦταντες ἐν μεγάλῳ καὶ ἄκαθεί στρατεύματι καὶ πλακώμενοι μόνιμο υπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων πανταχόθεν περιχυθέντων διεφθάρμασαν. οὐ δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει θηβαίων, ἐπεὶ τῶν παρόνων κρατῆσας ὁ βαρβάρος ἐν τοῖς ὄροις ἦν καὶ ἰδιόματος ὁ ἑπαρτιάτης διὰ ἑβηνίας εὕνους δὲν Ἀτταγίνῳ τῇ τῆς ὀλιγαρχίας προεστάτω διεπράξατο φίλον τε αὐτὸν καὶ ἐξόνων γενέσθαι βασιλέως, ἐδέξαντο τε τὰς διαλύσεις τὰς πρὸς βασιλέα, καὶ προδύνως ἐμῆδοσαν οἱ περὶ Ἀτταγίνῳ μάλιστα αὐτῶν ὀλιγαρχίοι.

6. From 869B-C.

ὅτι Νάξιοι ἐκ τοῦ κοινοῦ ἔξ ἐπεμψαν εἰς Σαλαμῖνα ναῦς τοῖς Ἐλλησι βοηθοὺς, ὡς Ἐλλάνικος ἑστόρηκεν, καὶ Δημόκριτον στρατηγῶν, οὐ καὶ τὴν ἀριστείαν Σιμώνίδης ἐπιγράμματι ἐδήλωσε.
Δημόκριτος τρίτος ἦξε μάχης ὅτε πάρε Ἐλληνες Μῆδους σύμβαλον ἐν πελάγει.
πέντε δὲ νῆας ἔλευν ὅηρν, ἑκτην δ’ ὑπὸ χειρὰ
ρόσατο βαρβαρικὴν ἀφρίδα ἀλισκομένην.

7. From 870E-871B.

(75) ὃτι ἔξιοντων τῶν περὶ Ἀδειμάντων Κορινθίων δυνατὸν εἰς Ἐλλάνων τοῖς Ἐλλησιν εὔξαντο καλὴν τίνα καὶ δαιμόνιον εὐχήν τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ αἱ γυναῖκες, ἔρωτα τοῖς ἀνδρῶι τῆς πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους μάχης ἐμβαλεῖν τὴν θεόν, ἵνα εὐχήν καὶ Σιμωνίδης ἐδήλωσεν ἐν τῇ εἰς τὸν νεῶν τῆς αὐτῆς θεοῦ ἀνασταθεῖσθαι χαλκῶν εἰκόνων ἐπιγράφαται.

αἱδ’ ὑπὲρ Ἐλλάνων τε καὶ Πομάχων πολιτὰν ἔσταθεν εὐξάμεναι Κύπριοι δαιμόνιαι.
οὐ γὰρ τοξοφόροισιν ἐμήδετο δι’ Ἀφροδίτα
Μῆδοις Ἐλλάνων ἀκρόπολιν προσδόμεν.

ὡς δὲ καὶ παρῆσαν Κορινθιαὶ τῇ Σαλαμίνι ναυμαχίᾳ, τάδε τὰ ἐπιγράφατα μαρτυρεῖν. ἐν μὲν Ἐλλαμίνι παρὰ τὴν πόλιν ὁδὸς ἐδώκαν αὐτοῖς Ἀθηναῖοι τοὺς ἀποθανόντας τὰς ἐπεγέραπτο.

ὡς ἔδεν, εὐφρόνων ποτ’ ἐναίομεν ἄστυ Κορινθίου,
νυν ὁ ἀνάματος νάσος ἔχει Σαλαμίς.

ἐνθάδε Πέρσας καὶ Φοινίκας νῆας ἔλοντες καὶ Μῆδους ἱερὰν Ἐλλάδα υδαίμεθα.

τὸ δ’ Ἰσθμοὶ κενοτάφιον ἐπιγραφῆν εἰς τήν ἄνθες.

ἀκμάς ἐστακυλαν ἐπὶ ξυροῦ Ἐλλάδα πᾶσαν
tαῖς αὐτῶν ψυχαῖς κεῖμεθα υδαίμενοι.

Διοδόρου δὲ τῶν τινῶν Κορινθίων τριημαρχῶν ἐν ξυροῦ Δητοῦς ἀναδέησι κείμενοι τόδε ἐπεγέραπτο.

ταῦτ’ ἀπὸ δυσμενέων Μῆδων αἶτε Διοδόρου
οὔπλ’ ἀνέθεντο λατοῦς, νυνάματα ναυμακίας.

ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἀδειμάντου τάφῳ τόδε ἐπεγέραπτο.

οὗτος Ἀδειμάντου κείμου τάφος, ὅν διὰ πᾶσα
Ἐλλάς ἐλευθερίας ἀμφέθετο στέφανον.
8. From 862B and 864D.

δ' τι παρ' Ἀθηναίων δέκα τάλαντα δωρεᾶν Ἐρώτοτος ἔλαβεν ὁ συγγραφέας, ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναίος Δίγλος ἱστόρηκεν. ὡς δὲ καὶ παρὰ θηβαίων χρήματα μὲν αἰτήσας σούκ ἔλαβεν, ἐπιχειρῶν δὲ τοῖς νέοις διαλέγεσθαι (76\textsuperscript{2}) καὶ συσκολάξειν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων ἐκκυλθῆ, Ἀριστοφάνης γέγραφεν ὁ Βοιώτος.

Pletho's purpose in making these excerpts is very clear: he wanted historical facts concerning events and persons of interest to him. He only in part preserved Plutarch's sentences, largely putting the information into his own words, even where considerations of brevity did not necessitate this. When several events are mentioned, they are not given in the order found in Plutarch if that is not chronological, but carefully turned into a chronological sequence. To the historical facts extracted from Plutarch, Pletho added the sources cited by Plutarch as well as quotations (i.e. epigrams) given by Plutarch in corroboration of his statements. The excerpts show us a painstaking historian who is not concerning himself with the literary or psychological aspects of the essay he is searching for historical information. The name of the essay is not given at the beginning of the excerpts, and Pletho's entire setting aside of its nature is underlined in an amusing way by the last excerpt where, after finding no place for the name of Herodotus in the preceding excerpts, Pletho when giving information about Herodotus finds it necessary to qualify his name by the addition ὁ συγγραφέας.

The information, also when given in Pletho's own words, renders faithfully what is found in Plutarch, with two exceptions. One is the perplexing passage describing the Eretrians' meeting and defeating a Cyprian detachment of the king's fleet (861B = excerpt 4). The text would seem to be in further disorder (more deficient) than indicated by the small lacuna in the two MSS.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{3} Cf. Rühl, Ἱμ 67 (1912) 163-167.
stand as it was and at the same time not taking into account the possibility of Cyprians on the king's side at the time in question, Pletho made the improbable guess that resulted in the paraphrase in the excerpt. The other exception is the end of excerpt 6 where Pletho rounds off with his own flourish: καὶ προθύμως ἐμηδέσαν οἱ περὶ Ἀταγίνων μάλιστα αὐτῶν ὀλιγαρχικοὶ.

Pletho's interest in ancient history is a matter which needs no proving; it will be recalled that his works include a continuation of Xenophon's Hellenica based on Diodorus and Plutarch, and that he also freely included historical and mythological references to antiquity in his non-historical works; see, e.g., his Συμβουλευτικός πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην Θεόδωρον περὶ τῆς Πελοποννήσου, passim. Pletho seems to have excerpted extensively from ancient authors, to judge from the three MSS of which Aubrey Diller has enumerated the contents. The MS used by Pletho for his excerpts from Plutarch in all probability belonged either to John Palaeologus or to Pletho himself. R. and F. Masai consider that Pletho could not have been the owner: 'Si Pléthon avait été l'heureux propriétaire du fameux manuscrit de Plutarque vu par A. Traversari ... dans les mains de l'empereur, il n'aurait sans doute pas eu l'idée d'en transcrire d'aussi copieux extraits.' When the question is of excerpts, one's mind at once goes to the Elder Pliny's 'electorum ... commentarios centum sexaginta ... opisthographos quidem et

---

4 Lionel Pearson is not wrong in saying (p. 49 of the Loeb edition) that 'A different text is implied in Pletho's paraphrase', but we should add explicitly that the text implied is Pletho's emended version of the text known to us.


6 Scriptorium 10 (1956) 27-41.

7 Diller, Scriptorium 8 (1954) 127; cf. my note 10.

minutissimis scriptos' (Plin., Ep. 3.5.17), and even if it has since become easier to check a passage in a book, the inclination of scholars to make excerpts for their own use remains essentially the same. It suffices to quote a passage from Arnold Toynbee's *Experiences* (1959) 98: 'From about 1922 onwards I started to take notes in notebooks on points, in books that I was reading, which seemed likely to come in useful for something that I was going to write ... By this year 1969 I have more than thirty of these notebooks, full to the brim. They have, long since, become my most relevant immediate source of the information that I need for writing ...' In neither of these so different cases does the ownership of the book excerpted from seem relevant: Pliny probably possessed all, Toynbee probably possesses a good many, of the books in question.

The main interest of the excerpts to the student of Plutarch would be if they were to prove independent of both E and B. I have already given my view of excerpt 4. The cases of Pletho's giving the truth or what appears to be the truth against the consensus of E and B are the following:

Excerpt 1 προσκαλεσαμένου (thus the Basle edition) : προσκαλεσαμένου,
ib. Πιττάκιον (thus Cobet) : Πιττάκιον,
excerpt 5 μέν οὖν (thus Reiske) : μέν,
ib. Ἀπαγίνω (thus Reiske from Hdt.) : Ἀπαγίνω,
excerpt 7 τὸν Θεόν (thus Turnebus and Stephanus) : τὸν Θεόν,
ib. πολιτῶν (thus iadem) : πολιτῶν,
ib. δὲ τ’ Ἀφροδίτα (thus iadem) : δὲ τ’ Ἀφροδίταν,
ib. ἀμφέθετο (thus the Basle edition) : ἀμφέθετο.

The fact that these corrections have all been found independently by other scholars, shows their nature more clearly than any evaluation.

υυυ in the second line of the Salamis epigram (excerpt 7) might at first sight look like an independent reading. The word ἀνήματος in the same line is a faultless formation from
νάμα (cf. ἄχρηματος, ἀναίματος, etc.), meaning 'carens fontibus' (Wyttanbach, Index Graecitatis; the metrical Latin translation has 'pauper aquae'), and it very neatly and appropriately corresponds to the preceding εὐμοῦροι. The reader who has no outside information (Dio Chrysostom 37 or the remains of the monument) will therefore only consider this word corrupt if he finds himself unable to believe in the metrical error it involves when used at the end of the first half of a pentameter. Although even Wyttanbach - who did have outside information - found himself able to tolerate the word (see his note ad loc.), it is unthinkable that Plutarch could have thought this type of error possible in an official epigram like the one in question. Therefore, the corrupt form of the line cannot stem from Plutarch, and as ἀναίματος cannot have been in the text written by Plutarch, there is no reason why the wrong vuví should have been. Accordingly, it is a conjecture metri gratia, and the obvious explanation is that it should be fathered on Pletho like the above conjectures.

In the same epigram the form of the next line is very clearly not the original reading; a transposition was made metri gratia by someone not familiar with, or not prepared to accept in the present context, the Doric form Πέοος (Buck, §78). Again, the obvious candidate is Pletho.

As there is thus no doubt that the excerpts belong in the tradition known to us, it only remains to attempt the placing of them in this tradition. Diller in discussing the excerpts suggested that they were made from the MS E. For De Malignitate at least, this is not supported by a collation of the excerpts with the MSS E and B.

Pletho's excerpts agree with B against E in the following instances:

---

While the last three could well be independent corrections, the same hardly holds good for the first two. The form Ἀμπρακία was the one in use from long before Plutarch, and that it was also the form used by Plutarch himself is supported by Per. 17.2 and Pyrrh. 6.4, 8.11. One can assume that the same spelling was used by Pletho, and it is not easy to suggest any reason why Pletho, if finding Ἀμβρακίαc in his source, should have changed this into a form he neither knew from Plutarch nor used himself. That the conjecture Ἀγγελον is wrong, has been certain since Hubert made his correction into Ἀγέλαον. I am inclined to consider it a doubtful coincidence that the wrong conjecture Ἀγγελον should have been hit upon twice over. But even if this point be not granted, it remains that one should have expected Pletho to have known that Ἀγγελος is not a very good guess for the name of an ancient Greek, even if it does occasionally occur in Byzantine times as the sole name of a person; to my knowledge, it is found only once in ancient literature (Plut., Pyrrh. 2.1). Further, the conjecture goes somewhat beyond what Pletho allowed himself in his other conjectures, whereas his retaining the form if finding it in his source is consistent with his cautious and meticulous treatment of that source.

On the other hand, there are the following agreements with E against B:

Excerpt 5 εἰπόμαν : εἰπόμαν B,
Excerpt 7 ἔσταδεν : ἔσταδεν B,
ib. ἐπεγέγραπτο : ἐπιγέγραπται B,
ib. ναυμαχίας : ναυμαχίας B,
ib. Ἐλλάς : Ἡ Ἐλλάς B,
ib. Σαλαμίνι : Σαλαμίνι B.
Of these the last four do not help in the present connexion: ἐπεγέγρατο would be the tense used by Pletho in his paraphrase whether he found the perfect or the pluperfect in Plutarch; B's ναυμαχίς follows immediately upon a word with a Doric alpha; B's Ἡ Ἑλλάς is metrically wrong; and in the last instance B has a simple error in the accentuation of a common word. They are, in other words, all four alterations which could be made without much thought, especially by the man who was capable of the eight conjectures first listed above. It remains to consider εἴπόμαι and ἔσταθεν. These two readings rule out B even more decisively than Ἀμμαχίς and Ἀγγελον ruled out E. In all the other instances considered, the Aldine agrees with B, and this is the normal state of affairs throughout De Malignitate. In the case of ἔσταθεν the Aldine is non-committal with ἔσταθεν, but over the other word it shows one of its extremely rare agreements with E. In my previous article (pp. 13-15) I gave in detail the reasons for considering that the Aldine derives from the Vorlage of B. The obvious conclusion is that Pletho's excerpts come from the same source. Might perhaps the MS first used by Pletho and later (in 1509) found at Venice, be 'the Emperor's Plutarch' rather than the MS E? ¹⁰ My placing of the excerpts in the tradition as taken from B's Vorlage is not affected by the acceptance or rejection of this suggestion, as the MS used by Pletho and the MS exhibited by the emperor need not be identical.¹¹

¹⁰ I suggest this against Diller's tentative identification (Scriptorium 8 p. 127) of 'the codex the Byzantine emperor showed to Traversari in Ferrara in 1438 when he and Pletho were attending the Council' (Scriptorium 10 pp. 29 f.) as the MS E.

¹¹ I am grateful to Mr. Sten Ebbesen of Copenhagen University, who read my draft and made some very useful comments and suggestions.