Confronti con i *Precetti politici*

*Vita di Solone* 20. 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| τῶν δ᾽ ἄλλων αὐτοῦ νόμων ἴδιος μὲν μάλιστα καὶ παράδοξος ὁ κελεύων ἄτιμον εἶναι τὸν ἐν στάσει μηδετέρας μερίδος γενόμενον. βούλεται δ᾽, ὡς ἔοικε, μὴ ἀπαθῶς μηδ᾽ ἀναισθήτως ἔχειν πρὸς τὸ κοινόν, ἐν ἀσφαλεῖ θέμενον τὰ οἰκεῖα καὶ τῷ μὴ συναλγεῖν μηδὲ συννοσεῖν τῇ πατρίδι καλλωπιζόμενον, ἀλλ᾽ αὐτόθεν τοῖς τὰ βελτίω καὶ δικαιότερα πράττουσι προσθέμενον, συγκινδυνεύειν καὶ βοηθεῖν, μᾶλλον ἢ περιμένειν ἀκινδύνως τὰ τῶν κρατούντων. | Among his other laws there is a very peculiar and surprising one which ordains that he shall be disfranchised who, in time of faction, takes neither side. He wishes, probably, that a man should not be insensible or indifferent to the common weal, arranging his private affairs securely and glorying in the fact that he has no share in the distempers and distresses of his country, but should rather espouse promptly the better and more righteous cause, share its perils and give it his aid, instead of waiting in safety to see which cause prevails. |

*Vita di Pericle* 9. 1 e 11. 4-5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ἐπεὶ δὲ Θουκυδίδης μὲν ἀριστοκρατικήν τινα τὴν τοῦ Περικλέους ὑπογράφει πολιτείαν, ‘λόγῳ μὲν οὖσαν δημοκρατίαν, ἔργῳ δ᾽ ὑπὸ τοῦ πρώτου ἀνδρὸς ἀρχήν,’ (II 65. 9) ἄλλοι δὲ πολλοὶ πρῶτον ὑπ᾽ ἐκείνου φασὶ τὸν δῆμον ἐπὶ κληρουχίας καὶ θεωρικὰ καὶ μισθῶν διανομὰς προαχθῆναι, κακῶς ἐθισθέντα καὶ γενόμενον πολυτελῆ καὶ ἀκόλαστον ὑπὸ τῶν τότε πολιτευμάτων ἀντὶ σώφρονος καὶ αὐτουργοῦ,  …  διὸ καὶ τότε μάλιστα τῷ δήμῳ τὰς ἡνίας ἀνεὶς ὁ Περικλῆς ἐπολιτεύετο πρὸς χάριν, ἀεὶ μέν τινα θέαν πανηγυρικὴν ἢ ἑστίασιν ἢ πομπὴν εἶναι μηχανώμενος ἐν ἄστει καὶ ‘διαπαιδαγωγῶν οὐκ ἀμούσοις ἡδοναῖς’ τὴν πόλιν, ἑξήκοντα δὲ τριήρεις καθ᾽ ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ἐκπέμπων, ἐν αἷς πολλοὶ τῶν πολιτῶν ἔπλεον ὀκτὼ μῆνας ἔμμισθοι, μελετῶντες ἅμα καὶ μανθάνοντες τὴν ναυτικὴν ἐμπειρίαν. [5] πρὸς δὲ τούτοις χιλίους μὲν ἔστειλεν εἰς Χερρόνησον κληρούχους, εἰς δὲ Νάξον πεντακοσίους, εἰς δὲ Ἄνδρον τοὺς ἡμίσεις1 τούτων, εἰς δὲ Θρᾴκην χιλίους Βισάλταις συνοικήσοντας, ἄλλους δ᾽ εἰς Ἰταλίαν οἰκιζομένης Συβάρεως, ἣν Θουρίους προσηγόρευσαν. καὶ ταῦτ᾽ ἔπραττεν ἀποκουφίζων μὲν ἀργοῦ καὶ διὰ σχολὴν πολυπράγμονος ὄχλου τὴν πόλιν, ἐπανορθούμενος δὲ τὰς ἀπορίας τοῦ δήμου, φόβον δὲ καὶ φρουρὰν τοῦ μὴ νεωτερίζειν τι παρακατοικίζων τοῖς συμμάχοις. | Thucydides describes the administration of Pericles as rather aristocratic, — ‘in name a democracy, but in fact a government by the greatest citizen.’ But many others say that the people was first led on by him into allotments of public lands, festival-grants, and distributions of fees for public services, thereby falling into bad habits, and becoming luxurious and wanton under the influence of his public measures, instead of frugal and self-sufficing.  ….  At this time, therefore, particularly, Pericles gave the reins to the people, and made his policy one of pleasing them, ever devising some sort of a pageant in the town for the masses, or a feast, or a procession, ‘amusing them like children with not uncouth delights,’ and sending out sixty triremes annually, on which large numbers of the citizens sailed about for eight months under pay, practising at the same time and acquiring the art of seamanship. [5] In addition to this, he despatched a thousand settlers to the Chersonesus, and five hundred to Naxos, and to Andros half that number, and a thousand to Thrace to settle with the Bisaltae, and others to Italy, when the site of Sybaris was settled, which they named Thurii. All this he did by way of lightening the city of its mob of lazy and idle busybodies, rectifying the embarrassments of the poorer people, and giving the allies for neighbours an imposing garrison which should prevent rebellion. |

*Vita di Focione* 8. 1 e 19. 3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| οὕτω δὲ συντάξας ἑαυτόν ἐπολιτεύετο μὲν ἀεὶ πρὸς εἰρήνην καὶ ἡσυχίαν, ἐστρατήγησε δὲ πλείστας οὐ μόνον τῶν καθ᾽ ἑαυτόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ στρατηγίας, οὐ παραγγέλλων οὐδὲ μετιών, ἀλλ᾽ οὐδὲ φεύγων οὐδὲ ἀποδιδράσκων τῆς πόλεως καλούσης, ὁμολογεῖται γὰρ ὅτι πέντε καὶ τεσσαράκοντα στρατηγίας ἔλαβεν οὐδ᾽ ἅπαξ ἀρχαιρεσίοις παρατυχών, ἀλλ᾽ ἀπόντα μεταπεμπομένων αὐτὸν ἀεὶ καὶ χειροτονούντων,  … αὐτὴ δὲ ἡ γυνή, ξένης τινὸς Ἰωνικῆς ἐπιδειξαμένης χρυσοῦν καί λιθοκόλλητον κόσμον ἐν πλοκίοις καί περιδεραίοις, ‘ἐμοὶ δέ,’ ἔφη, ‘κόσμος ἐστὶ Φωκίων εἰκοστὸν ἔτος ἤδη στρατηγῶν Ἀθηναίων.’ | Having taken this stand, his civil policies were always in favour of peace and quiet; and yet he held the office of general more frequently than any man, and I speak not only of the men of his own time, but also of those who came before him. He did not seek the office or canvass for it; nor, on the other hand, did he flee or run away when his city called him. It is generally admitted, indeed, that he held the office of general forty-five times, although he was not even once present at the election but was always absent when the people summoned and chose him.  …  … And this very wife, when an Ionian woman who was her guest displayed ornaments of gold and precious stones worked into collars and necklaces, said: ‘My ornament is Phocion, who is now for the twentieth year a general of Athens.’ |

Le idee di Plutarco sulla guerra

*Vita di Alessandro* 1. 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| οὔτε γὰρ ἱστορίας γράφομεν, ἀλλὰ βίους, οὔτε ταῖς ἐπιφανεστάταις πράξεσι πάντως ἔνεστι δήλωσις ἀρετῆς ἢ κακίας, ἀλλὰ πρᾶγμα βραχὺ πολλάκις καὶ ῥῆμα καὶ παιδιά τις ἔμφασιν ἤθους ἐποίησε μᾶλλον ἢ μάχαι μυριόνεκροι καὶ παρατάξεις αἱ μέγισται καὶ πολιορκίαι πόλεων, | For it is not Histories that I am writing, but Lives; and in the most illustrious deeds there is not always a manifestation of virtue or vice, nay, a slight thing like a phrase or a jest often makes a greater revelation of character than battles where thousands fall, or the greatest armaments, or sieges of cities. |

*Vita di Aristide* 19. 4-6

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [4] λέγονται γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν τριάκοντα μυριάδων τετρακισμύριοι φυγεῖν σὺν Ἀρταβάζῳ, τῶν δ᾽ ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀγωνισαμένων ἔπεσον οἱ πάντες ἐπὶ χιλίοις ἑξήκοντα καὶ τριακόσιοι. τούτων Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν ἦσαν δύο καὶ πεντήκοντα, πάντες ἐκ τῆς Αἰαντίδος φυλῆς, ὥς φησι Κλείδημος, [5] ἀγωνισαμένης ἄριστα: διὸ καὶ ταῖς Σφραγίτισι νύμφαις ἔθυον Αἰαντίδαι τὴν πυθόχρηστον θυσίαν ὑπὲρ τῆς νίκης, ἐκ δημοσίου τὸ ἀνάλωμα λαμβάνοντες: Λακεδαιμόνιοι δ᾽ ἑνὶ πλείους τῶν ἐνενήκοντα, Τεγεᾶται δ᾽ ἑκκαίδεκα. θαυμαστὸν οὖν τὸ Ἡροδότου, πῶς μόνους τούτους φησὶν εἰς χεῖρας ἐλθεῖν τοῖς πολεμίοις, τῶν δ᾽ ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων μηδένα. καὶ γὰρ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πεσόντων μαρτυρεῖ καὶ τὰ μνήματα [6] κοινὸν γενέσθαι τὸ κατόρθωμα: καὶ τὸν βωμὸν οὐκ ἂν ἐπέγραψαν οὕτως, εἰ μόναι τρεῖς πόλεις ἠγωνίσαντο, τῶν ἄλλων ἀτρέμα καθεζομένων:  τόνδε ποθ᾽ Ἕλληνες νίκας κράτει, ἔργῳ Ἄρηος,  Πέρσας ἐξελάσαντες ἐλευθέρᾳ Ἑλλάδι κοινὸν  ἱδρύσαντο Διὸς βωμὸν ἐλευθερίου. | [4] Out of three hundred thousand, only forty thousand, it is said, made their escape with Artabazus. Of those who contended in behalf of Hellas, there fell in all one thousand three hundred and sixty. Of these, fifty-two were Athenians, all of the Aeantid tribe, according to Cleidemus, which made the bravest contest [5] (for which reason the Aeantids used to sacrifice regularly to the Sphragitic nymphs the sacrifice ordained by the Pythian oracle for the victory, receiving the expenses therefor from the public funds); ninety-one were Lacedaemonians, and sixteen were men of Tegea. Astonishing, therefore, is the statement of Herodotus,[1](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0009%3Achapter%3D19%3Asection%3D5#note1) where he says that these one hundred and fifty nine represented the only Hellenes who engaged the enemy, and that not one of the rest did so. Surely the total number of those who fell, as well as the monuments erected over them, testifies that the success was a common one. [6] Besides, had the men of three cities only made the contest, while the rest sat idly by, the altar would not have been inscribed as it was:  Here did the Hellenes, flushed with a victory granted by Ares Over the routed Persians, together, for Hellas delivered,  Build them an altar of Zeus, Zeus as Deliverer known. |

*Vita di Artaserse* 8-13

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 8. 1 τὴν δὲ μάχην ἐκείνην πολλῶν μὲν ἀπηγγελκότων, Ξενοφῶντος δὲ μονονουχὶ δεικνύοντος ὄψει, καὶ τοῖς πράγμασιν, ὡς οὐ γεγενημένοις, ἀλλὰ γινομένοις, ἐφιστάντος ἀεὶ τὸν ἀκροατὴν ἐμπαθῆ καὶ συγκινδυνεύοντα διὰ τὴν ἐνάργειαν, οὐκ ἔστι νοῦν ἔχοντος ἐπεξηγεῖσθαι, πλὴν ὅσα τῶν ἀξίων λόγου παρῆλθεν εἰπεῖν ἐκεῖνον. 2 - ὁ μὲν οὖν τόπος, ἐν ᾧ παρετάξαντο, Κούναξα καλεῖται καὶ Βαβυλῶνος ἀπέχει σταδίους πεντακοσίους.  9. 4 τὸν μὲν οὖν Ἀρταγέρσην ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὸ τοῦ Κύρου σχεδὸν ἅπαντες ὁμολογοῦσι: περὶ δὲ τῆς αὐτοῦ Κύρου τελευτῆς ἐπεὶ Ξενοφῶν ἁπλῶς καὶ συντόμως, ἅτε δὴ μὴ παρὼν αὐτός, εἶπεν, οὐδὲν ἴσως κωλύει τὰ Δείνωνος ἰδίᾳ καὶ πάλιν τὰ Κτησίου διελθεῖν.  10 [1] φησὶν οὖν ὁ μὲν Δείνων ὅτι τοῦ Ἀρταγέρσου πεσόντος εἰσελάσας βιαίως ὁ Κῦρος εἰς τοὺς προτεταγμένους τοῦ βασιλέως κατέτρωσεν αὐτοῦ τὸν ἵππον, ὁ δὲ ἀπερρύη Τηριβάζου δὲ ἀναβαλόντος αὐτὸν ἐπ᾽ ἄλλον ἵππον ταχὺ καὶ εἰπόντος, ‘ὦ βασιλεῦ, μέμνησο τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης: οὐ γὰρ ἀξία λήθης ἐστί,’ πάλιν ὁ Κῦρος ἐνσείσας τῷ ἵππῳ κατέβαλε τὸν Ἀρτοξέρξην. [2] πρὸς δὲ τὴν τρίτην ἐπέλασιν δυσανασχετήσας ὁ βασιλεὺς, καὶ εἰπὼν πρὸς τοὺς παρόντας ὡς βέλτιόν ἐστι μὴ ζῆν, ἀντεξήλαυνε τῷ Κύρῳ προπετῶς καὶ ἀπερισκέπτως εἰς ἐναντία βέλη φερομένῳ. καὶ βάλλει μὲν αὐτὸς ἀκοντίῳ, βάλλουσι δὲ οἱ. [3] περὶ αὐτόν, πίπτει δὲ ὁ Κῦρος, ὡς μὲν ἔνιοι λέγουσι, πληγεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως, ὡς δὲ ἕτεροί τινες, Καρὸς ἀνθρώπου πατάξαντος, ᾧ γέρας ἔδωκε τῆς πράξεως ταύτης ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀλεκτρυόνα χρυσοῦν ἐπὶ δόρατος ἀεὶ πρὸ τῆς τάξεως ἐν ταῖς στρατείαις κομίζειν: καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοὺς Κᾶρας ἀλεκτρυόνας οἱ Πέρσαι διὰ τοὺς λόφους, οἷς κοσμοῦσι τὰ κράνη, προσηγόρευον.  11 [1] ἡ δὲ Κτησίου διήγησις, ὡς ἐπιτεμόντι πολλὰ συντόμως ἀπαγγεῖλαι, τοιαύτη τίς ἐστι. Κῦρος ἀποκτείνας Ἀρταγέρσην ἤλαυνεν εἰς αὐτὸν βασιλέα τὸν ἵππον, καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς ἐκεῖνον, ἀμφότεροι σιωπῇ: φθάνει δὲ βαλὼν Ἀριαῖος ὁ Κύρου φίλος βασιλέα, καὶ οὐκ ἔτρωσε: βασιλεὺς δὲ ἀφεὶς τὸ δόρυ Κύρου μὲν οὐκ ἔτυχε, Σατιφέρνην δέ, πιστὸν ἄνδρα Κύρῳ καὶ γενναῖον, ἔβαλε καὶ ἀπέκτεινε.  11. 5-6 [5] ἀδυνάτως δ᾽ ἔχοντα καὶ δι᾽ αὑτοῦ προθυμούμενον βαδίζειν ὑπολαβόντες ἦγον, τῷ μὲν σώματι καρηβαροῦντα καὶ σφαλλόμενον, οἰόμενον δὲ νικᾶν ἀκούοντα τῶν φευγόντων ἀνακαλουμένων Κῦρον βασιλέα καὶ φείδεσθαι δεομένων. ἐν δὲ τούτῳ Καύνιοί τινες ἄνθρωποι κακόβιοι καὶ ἄποροι καὶ ταπεινῶν ὑπουργημάτων ἕνεκα τῇ τοῦ βασιλέως στρατιᾷ παρακολουθοῦντες ἔτυχον συναναμιχθέντες ὡς φίλοις τοῖς περὶ τὸν Κῦρον ὡς δὲ μόλις: [6] συνεῖδον τὰ ἐπιθωρακίδια φοινικᾶ, λευκοῖς χρωμένων τῶν βασιλικῶν ἁπάντων, ἔγνωσαν πολεμίους ὄντας, εἷς οὖν ἐκείνων ἐτόλμησεν ἀγνοῶν ἐξόπισθεν βαλεῖν τὸν Κῦρον ἀκοντίῳ. τῆς δὲ περὶ τὴν ἰγνύαν φλεβὸς ἀναρραγείσης πεσὼν ὁ Κῦρος ἅμα παίει πρός τινι λίθῳ τὸν τετρωμένον κρόταφον καὶ ἀποθνῄσκει, τοιοῦτος μὲν ὁ Κτησίου λόγος, ᾧ καθάπερ ἀμβλεῖ ξιφιδίῳ μόλις ἀναιρῶν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀνῄρηκεν.  13. 3-4 [3] ἐξεληλάκει δέ, ὡς ὁ Κτησίας φησίν, ἐπὶ τὴν μάχην τεσσαράκοντα μυριάσιν: οἱ δὲ περὶ Δείνωνα καὶ Ξενοφῶντα πολὺ πλείονας γενέσθαι λέγουσι τὰς μεμαχημένας. ἀριθμὸν δὲ νεκρῶν ὁ Κτησίας ἐνακισχιλίους ἀνενεχθῆναί φησι πρὸς τὸν Ἀρτοξέρξην, αὐτῷ δὲ δισμυρίων οὐκ ἐλάττους φανῆναι τοὺς κειμένους, ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἔχει διαμφισβήτησιν: ἐκεῖνο δὲ τοῦ Κτησίου λαμπρὸν ἤδη ψεῦσμα, τὸ πεμφθῆναι φάναι πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας αὐτὸν μετὰ Φαλίνου τοῦ Ζακυνθίου καί τινων ἄλλων. [4] ὁ γὰρ Ξενοφῶν ἠπίστατο συνδιατρίβοντα βασιλεῖ Κτησίαν: μέμνηται γὰρ ι αὐτοῦ καί τοῖς βιβλίοις τούτοις ἐντετυχηκὼς δῆλός ἐστιν οὐκ ἂν οὖν ἐλθόντα καί λόγων τοσούτων ἑρμηνέα γενόμενον παρῆκεν ἀνώνυμον, Φαλῖνον δὲ τὸν Ζακύνθιον ὠνόμαζεν. ἀλλὰ δαιμονίως ὁ Κτησίας, ὡς ἔοικε, φιλότιμος ὢν καί οὐχ ἧττον φιλολάκων καί φιλοκλέαρχος ἀεί τινας ἐν τῇ διηγήσει χώρας ἑαυτῷ δίδωσιν, ἐν αἷς γενόμενος πολλὰ καί καλὰ μεμνήσεται Κλεάρχου καί τῆς Λακεδαίμονος. | Now, since many writers have reported to us this battle, and since Xenophon brings it all but before our eyes, and by the vigour of his description makes his reader always a participant in the emotions and perils of the struggle, as though it belonged, not to the past, but to the present, it would be folly to describe it again, except so far as he has passed over things worthy of mention. 2] The place, then, where the armies were drawn up, is called Cunaxa, and it is five hundred furlongs distant from Babylon.  Thus Artaserses died at the hands of Cyrus, as nearly all writers are agreed in saying; but as regards the death of Cyrus himself, since Xenophon makes simple and brief mention of it,[1](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0010%3Achapter%3D9%3Asection%3D4#note1) because he was not present himself when it happened, there is no objection perhaps to my recounting, first what Deinon says about it, and then what Ctesias says.  [1] Accordingly, Dinon says that after Artaserses had fallen, Cyrus charged furiously into those drawn up in front of the king, and wounded the king's horse, and that the king fell to the ground; but Teribazus quickly mounted him upon another horse, saying, ‘O king, remember this day, for it deserves not to be forgotten’; whereupon Cyrus again plunged in and dismounted Artaxerxes. [2] But at his third assault, the king, being enraged, and saying to those who were with him that death was better, rode out against Cyrus, who was rashly and impetuously rushing upon the missiles of his opponents. The king himself hit him with a spear, and he was hit by the attendants of the king. [3] Thus Cyrus fell, as some say, by a wound at the hands of the king, but as sundry others have it, from the blow of a Carian, who was rewarded by the king for this exploit with the privilege of always carrying a golden cock upon his spear in front of the line during an expedition; for the Persians call the Carians themselves cocks, because of the crests with which they adorn their helmets.  [1] But the narrative of Ctesias, to give it in a much-abbreviated form, is something as follows. After he had slain Artaserses, Cyrus rode against the king himself, and the king against him, both without a word. But Ariaeus, the friend of Cyrus, was beforehand in hurling his spear at the king, though he did not wound him. And the king, casting his spear at Cyrus, did not hit him, but struck and killed Satiphernes, a trusted friend of Cyrus and a man of noble birth.  [5] But since he was unable to ride and desired to go on his own feet, they supported him and led him along. His head was heavy and he reeled to and fro, but he thought he was victorious because he heard the fugitives saluting Cyrus as king and begging him to spare them. Meanwhile some Caunians—low and poverty-stricken men who followed the king's army to do menial service—chanced to join the party about Cyrus, supposing them to be friends. [6] But when at last they perceived that the tunics over their breastplates were of a purple colour, whereas all the king's people wore white ones, they knew that they were enemies. Accordingly, one of them, not knowing who Cyrus was, ventured to smite him from behind with his spear. The vein in the ham of Cyrus was ruptured and he fell, and at the same time struck his wounded temple against a stone, and so died. Such is the story of Ctesias, in which, as with a blunt sword, he is long in killing Cyrus, but kills him at last.  He had marched out to the battle, as Ctesias says, with four hundred thousand men. But Deinon and Xenophon say that the army which fought under him was much larger. As to the number of his dead, Ctesias says that it was reported to Artaxerxes as nine thousand, but that he himself thought the slain no fewer than twenty thousand. This matter, then, is in dispute. But it is certainly a glaring falsehood on the part of Ctesias to say that he was sent to the Greeks along with Phalinus the Zacynthian and certain others. 4] For Xenophon knew that Ctesias was in attendance upon the king, since he makes mention of him and had evidently read his works; if, then, Ctesias had come to the Greeks and served as an interpreter in so momentous a colloquy, Xenophon would not have left him nameless and named only Phalinus the Zacynthian. The truth is that Ctesias, being prodigiously ambitious, as it would seem, and none the less partial to Sparta and to Clearchus, always allows considerable space in his narrative for himself, and there he will say many fine things about Clearchus and Sparta. |

*Vita di Emilio Paolo* 15-21

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 15. 3 o 5 (Emilio Paolo) ἡσθεὶς οὖν ὁ Αἰμίλιος δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς (Scipione Nasica e Fabio Massimo) οὐχ ὅσους Πολύβιος εἴρηκεν, ἀλλ᾽ ὅσους αὐτὸς ὁ Νασικᾶς λαβεῖν φησι, γεγραφὼς περὶ τῶν πράξεων τούτων ἐπιστόλιον πρός τινα τῶν βασιλέων, οἱ μέν ἐκτὸς τάξεως Ἰταλικοὶ τρισχίλιοι τὸ πλῆθος ἦσαν, τὸ δ᾽ εὐώνυμον κέρας εἰς πεντακισχιλίους, | [3] o 5 Aemilius, accordingly, delighted, gave them, not as many men as Polybius states, but as many as Nasica himself says they took, in a short letter which he wrote concerning these exploits to one of the kings, that is, three thousand of his Italians who were not Romans, and his left-wing numbering five thousand. |
| 16. 2 o 3 τούτοις ὁ μὲν Πολύβιός φησιν ἔτι κοιμωμένοις ἐπιπεσεῖν τοὺς Ῥωμαίους, ὁ δὲ Νασικᾶς ὀξὺν ἀγῶνα περὶ τοῖς ἄκροις γενέσθαι καὶ κίνδυνον, αὐτὸς δὲ Θρᾷκα μισθοφόρον εἰς χεῖρας συνδραμόντα τῷ ξυστῷ διὰ τοῦ στήθους πατάξας καταβαλεῖν, ἐκβιασθέντων δὲ τῶν πολεμίων, καὶ τοῦ Μίλωνος αἴσχιστα φεύγοντος ἄνευ τῶν ὅπλων μονοχίτωνος, ἀσφαλῶς ἀκολουθεῖν, ἅμα καταβιβάζων εἰς τὴν χώραν τὸ στράτευμα. | [2] o 3 These men, according to Polybius, were still asleep when the Romans fell upon them; but Nasica says that a sharp and perilous conflict took place for possession of the heights, and that he himself slew a Thracian mercenary, who engaged him, by striking him through the breast with his javelin, and that after the enemy had been driven away, and while Milo was flying most disgracefully without his armour or his cloak, he followed after them without danger, and brought his army with him down into the plain. |
| 19. 2 καὶ πολλάκις ὕστερον ἐμέμνητο τοῦ πάθους ἐκείνου καὶ τῆς ὄψεως, τότε δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαχομένους ἐπιδεικνύμενος ἵλεω καὶ φαιδρὸν ἑαυτόν ἄνευ κράνους καὶ θώρακος ἵππῳ παρήλαυνεν. ὁ δὲ τῶν Μακεδόνων βασιλεύς, ὥς φησι Πολύβιος, τῆς μάχης ἀρχὴν λαμβανούσης ἀποδειλιάσας εἰς πόλιν ἀφιππάσατο, σκηψάμενος Ἡρακλεῖ θύειν, δειλὰ παρὰ δειλῶν ἱερὰ μὴ δεχομένῳ μηδ᾽ εὐχὰς ἀθεμίτους ἐπιτελοῦντι.  19. 4 οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ Ποσειδώνιός τις ἐν ἐκείνοις τοῖς χρόνοις καὶ ταῖς πράξεσι γεγονέναι λέγων, ἱστορίαν δὲ γεγραφὼς περὶ Περσέως ἐν πλείοσι βιβλίοις, φησὶν αὐτὸν οὐχ ὑπὸ δειλίας οὐδὲ τὴν θυσίαν ποιησάμενον αἰτίαν ἀπελθεῖν, ἀλλὰ τῆι προτέραι τῆς μάχης τυχεῖν λελακτισμένον ὑφ᾽ ἵππου τὸ σκέλος· ἐν δὲ τῆι μάχηι καίπερ ἔχοντα δυσχρήστως καὶ κωλυόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν φίλων ἵππον αὑτῶι κελεῦσαι τῶν φορέων προσαγαγεῖν καὶ περιβάντα συμμῖξαι τοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς φάλαγγος ἀθωράκιστον· φερομένων δὲ παντοδαπῶν ἑκατέρωθεν βελῶν παλτὸν ἐμπεσεῖν ὁλοσίδηρον αὐτῶι καὶ τῆι μὲν ἀκμῆι μὴ θιγεῖν, ἀλλὰ πλάγιον παρὰ τὴν ἀριστερὰν πλευρὰν παραδραμεῖν, ῥύμηι δὲ τῆς παρόδου τόν τε χιτῶνα διακόψαι καὶ τὴν σάρκα φοινίξαι τυφλῶι μώλωπι πολὺν χρόνον διαφυλάξαντι τὸν τύπον. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ὁ Ποσειδώνιος ὑπὲρ τοῦ Περσέως ἀπολογεῖται. | [2] often in after times he used to speak of his emotions at that time and of what he saw. But then, showing to his soldiers a glad and cheerful countenance, he rode past them without helmet or breastplate. The king of the Macedonians, on the other hand, according to Polybius, as soon as the battle began, played the coward and rode back to the city, under pretence of sacrificing to Heracles, a god who does not accept cowardly sacrifices from cowards, nor accomplish their unnatural prayers.  [4] However, a certain Posidonius, who says he lived in those times and took part in those actions, and who has written a history of Perseus in several books, says it was not out of cowardice, nor with the excuse of the sacrifice, that the king went away, but because on the day before the battle a horse had kicked him on the leg. He says further that in the battle, although he was in a wretched plight, and although his friends tried to deter him, the king ordered a pack-horse to be brought to him, mounted it, and joined his troops in the phalanx without a breastplate; [5] and that among the missiles of every sort which were flying on all sides, a javelin made entirely of iron smote him, not touching him with its point, indeed, but coursing along his left side with an oblique stroke, and the force of its passage was such that it tore his tunic and made a dark red bruise upon his flesh, the mark of which remained for a long time. This, then, is what Poseidonius says in defence of Perseus. |
| 21. 3 o 7 λέγονται γὰρ ὑπὲρ δισμυρίους πεντακισχιλίους ἀποθανεῖν. τῶν δὲ Ῥωμαίων ἔπεσον, ὡς μὲν Ποσειδώνιός φησιν, ἑκατόν, ὡς δὲ Νασικᾶς, ὀγδοήκοντα. | For it is said that over twenty-five thousand of their enemies were slain; while of the Romans there fell, according to Poseidonius, a hundred, according to Nasica, eighty. |

*Vita di Nicia* 1; 19. 4-5; 28. 4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1 [1] ἐπεὶ δοκοῦμεν οὐκ ἀτόπως τῷ Νικίᾳ τὸν Κράσσον παραβάλλειν, καὶ τὰ Παρθικὰ παθήματα τοῖς Σικελικοῖς, ὥρα παραιτεῖσθαι καὶ παρακαλεῖν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας τοῖς συγγράμμασι τούτοις, ὅπως ἐπὶ ταῖς διηγήσεσιν αἷς Θουκυδίδης, αὐτὸς αὑτοῦ περὶ ταῦτα παθητικώτατος, ἐναργέστατος, ποικιλώτατος γενόμενος, ἀμιμήτως ἐξενήνοχε, μηδὲν ἡμᾶς ὑπολάβωσι πεπονθέναι Τιμαίῳ πάθος ὅμοιον, [2] ὃς ἐλπίσας τὸν μὲν Θουκυδίδην ὑπερβαλεῖσθαι δεινότητι, τὸν δὲ Φίλιστον ἀποδείξειν παντάπασι φορτικὸν καὶ ἰδιώτην, διὰ μέσων ὠθεῖται τῇ ἱστορίᾳ τῶν μάλιστα κατωρθωμένων ἐκείνοις ἀγώνων καὶ ναυμαχιῶν καὶ δημηγοριῶν, οὐ μὰ Δία “παρὰ Λύδιον ἅρμα πεζὸς οἰχνεύων” ὥς φησι Πίνδαρος, ἀλλ᾽ ὅλως τις ὀψιμαθὴς καὶ μειρακιώδης φαινόμενος ἐν τούτοις, καὶ κατὰ τὸν Δίφιλον “παχύς, ὠνθυλευμένος στέατι Σικελικῷ” πολλαχοῦ δ᾽ ὑπορρέων εἰς τὸν Ξέναρχον, [3] ὥσπερ ὅταν λέγῃ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις οἰωνὸν ἡγήσασθαι γεγονέναι τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς νίκης ἔχοντα τοὔνομα στρατηγὸν ἀντειπόντα πρὸς τὴν στρατηγίαν, καὶ τῇ περικοπῇ τῶν Ἑρμῶν προσημαίνειν αὐτοῖς τὸ δαιμόνιον, ὡς ὑπὸ Ἑρμοκράτους τοῦ Ἕρμωνος πλεῖστα πείσονται παρὰ τὸν πόλεμον: ἔτι δ᾽ εἰκὸς εἶναι τὸν Ἡρακλέα τοῖς μὲν Συρακουσίοις βοηθεῖν διὰ τὴν Κόρην, παρ᾽ ἧς ἔλαβε τὸν Κέρβερον, ὀργίζεσθαι δὲ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, ὅτι τοὺς Αἰγεστέας, ἀπογόνους ὄντας Τρώων, ἔσωζον, αὐτὸς δ᾽ ὑπὸ Λαομέδοντος ἀδικηθεὶς ἀνάστατον ἐποίησε τὴν πόλιν. 4] ἀλλὰ τούτῳ μὲν ἴσως ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐμμελείας ταῦτά τε γράφειν ἐπῄει καὶ τὴν Φιλίστου διάλεκτον εὐθύνειν, καὶ τοῖς περὶ Πλάτωνα καὶ Ἀριστοτέλην λοιδορεῖσθαι: ἐμοὶ δ᾽ ὅλως μὲν ἡ περὶ λέξιν ἅμιλλα καὶ ζηλοτυπία πρὸς ἑτέρους μικροπρεπὲς φαίνεται καὶ σοφιστικόν, ἂν δὲ πρὸς τὰ ἀμίμητα γίγνηται,  5] καὶ τελέως ἀναίσθητον. ἃς γοῦν Θουκυδίδης ἐξήνεγκε πράξεις καὶ Φίλιστος, ἐπεὶ παρελθεῖν οὐκ ἔστι, μάλιστά γε δὴ τὸν τρόπον καὶ τὴν διάθεσιν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ὑπὸ πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων παθῶν καλυπτομένην περιεχούσας, ἐπιδραμὼν βραχέως καὶ διὰ τῶν ἀναγκαίων, ἵνα μὴ παντάπασιν ἀμελὴς δοκῶ καὶ ἀργὸς εἶναι, τὰ διαφεύγοντα τοὺς πολλούς, ὑφ᾽ ἑτέρων δ᾽ εἰρημένα σποράδην ἢ πρὸς ἀναθήμασιν ἢ ψηφίσμασιν εὑρημένα παλαιοῖς πεπείραμαι συναγαγεῖν, οὐ τὴν ἄχρηστον ἀθροίζων ἱστορίαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν πρὸς κατανόησιν ἤθους καὶ τρόπου παραδιδούς.  19. 4-5 Τίμαιος δὲ καὶ τοὺς Σικελιώτας φησὶν ἐν μηδενὶ λόγῳ ποιεῖσθαι τὸν Γύλιππον, ὕστερον μὲν αἰσχροκέρδειαν αὐτοῦ καὶ μικρολογίαν καταγνόντας, ὡς δὲ πρῶτον ὤφθη, σκώπτοντας εἰς τὸν τρίβωνα καὶ τὴν κόμην. εἶτα μέντοι φησὶν αὐτὸς ὅτι τῷ Γυλίππῳ φανέντι καθάπερ γλαυκὶ πολλοὶ προσέπτησαν ἑτοίμως στρατευόμενοι. καὶ ταῦτα τῶν πρώτων ἀληθέστερά εἰσιν: ἐν γὰρ τῇ βακτηρίᾳ καὶ τῷ τρίβωνι τὸ σύμβολον καὶ τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς Σπάρτης καθορῶντες συνίσταντο. [5] κἀκείνου τὸ πᾶν ἔργον γεγονέναι φησὶν οὐ Θουκυδίδης μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ Φίλιστος, ἀνὴρ Συρακούσιος καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ὁρατὴς γενόμενος. τῇ μὲν οὖν πρώτῃ μάχῃ κρατήσαντες οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τῶν Συρακουσίων ὀλίγους τινὰς ἀπέκτειναν καὶ Γογγύλον τὸν Κορίνθιον, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπιοῦσαν ἡμέραν ἔδειξεν ὁ Γύλιππος οἷόν ἐστιν ἐμπειρία. τοῖς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὅπλοις καὶ ἵπποις καὶ χωρίοις χρησάμενος οὐχ ὡσαύτως, ἀλλὰ μεταθεὶς τὴν τάξιν,  28. 4 Δημοσθένην δὲ καὶ Νικίαν ἀποθανεῖν Τίμαιος οὔ φησιν ὑπὸ Συρακουσίων κελευσθέντας, ὡς Φίλιστος ἔγραψε καὶ Θουκυδίδης, ἀλλ᾽ Ἑρμοκράτους πέμψαντος, ἔτι τῆς ἐκκλησίας συνεστώσης, καὶ δι᾽ ἑνὸς τῶν φυλάκων παρέντων αὐτοὺς δι᾽ αὑτῶν ἀποθανεῖν: τὰ μέντοι σώματα πρὸς ταῖς πύλαις ἐκβληθέντα κεῖσθαι φανερὰ τοῖς δεομένοις τοῦ θεάματος. | I think that Nicias is a suitable parallel to Crassus, and the Sicilian to the Parthian disaster. I must therefore at once, and in all modesty, entreat my readers not to imagine for an instant that in my narration of what Thucydides has inimitably set forth, surpassing even himself in pathos, vividness, and variety, I am so disposed as was Timaeus. [2] He, confidently hoping to excel Thucydides in skill, and to make Philistus seem altogether tedious and clumsy, pushes his history along through the conflicts and sea-fights and harangues which those writers had already handled with the greatest success, showing himself, in rivalry with them, not even so much as By Lydian car a footman slowly plodding, to use Pindar's comparison, nay rather a perfect example of senile learning and youthful conceit, and, in the words of Diphilus, Obese, stuffed to the full with Sicilian grease. Indeed, he often lapses unawares into the manner of Xenarchus, as, for instance, when he says he thinks it was a bad omen for the Athenians that Nicias, whose name was derived from victory, declined at first to head their expedition; also that, by the mutilation of the ‘Hermae,’ Heaven indicated to them in advance that by the hands of Hermocrates the son of Hermon they were to suffer most of their reverses during the war; and, further, that it was fitting that Heracles should aid the Syracusans, for the sake of their goddess Cora who delivered Cerberus into his hands, but should be angry with the Athenians because they were trying to succour the Egestaeans although they were descendants of the Trojans, whose city he had once destroyed because of the wrong done him by Laomedon their king. As for Timaeus, he may possibly have been moved to write thus in the exercise of the same critical taste which led him to correct the language of Philistus and abuse Plato and Aristotle; but as for me, I feel that jealous rivalry with other writers in matters of diction is altogether undignified and pedantic, and if it be practised toward what is beyond all imitation, utterly silly. [5] At all events, those deeds which Thucydides and Philistus have set forth,—since I cannot entirely pass them by, indicating as they do the nature of my hero and the disposition which lay hidden beneath his many great sufferings,—I have run over briefly, and with no unnecessary detail, in order to escape the reputation of utter carelessness and sloth; but those details which have escaped most writers, and which others have mentioned casually, or which are found on ancient votive offerings or in public decrees, these I have tried to collect, not massing together useless material of research, but handing on such as furthers the appreciation of character and temperament.  [4] Timaeus says that the Sicilians also made no account of Gylippus, later on, indeed, because they learned to know his base greed and penuriousness; but as soon as they set eyes upon him they jeered at his cloak and his long hair. Then, however, Timaeus himself says that as soon as Gylippus showed himself, for all the world like an owl among birds, many flocked to him, with ready offers of military service. This latter statement has more truth in it than his first, for in the staff and cloak of Gylippus men beheld the symbols of the majesty of Sparta, and rallied round them. [5] Moreover, that the whole achievement of deliverance was his, is the testimony not only of Thucydides, but also of Philistus, who was a Syracusan, and an eyewitness of the events thereof. Well, then, in the first battle the Athenians were victors and slew some few of the Syracusans, and also Gongylus the Corinthian; but on the day following, Gylippus showed what a great thing experience is. Although he had the same infantry and the same cavalry and the same localities to deal with he did not do it in the same way as before, but changed his tactics, and thereby conquered the Athenians.  4 Timaeus denies that Demosthenes and Nicias were put to death by the orders of the Syracusans, as Philistus and Thucydides state; but rather, Hermocrates sent word to them of the decision of the assembly while it was yet in session, and with the connivance of one of their guards they took their own lives. Their bodies, however, he says, were cast out at the prison door, and lay there in plain sight of all who craved the spectacle. |

*Vita di Silla* 6. 2-5

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| … Σύλλας δὲ πολλὰ δράσας ἄξια λόγου δόξαν ἔσχεν ἡγεμόνος μεγάλου μὲν παρὰ τοῖς πολίταις, μεγίστου δὲ παρὰ τοῖς φίλοις, εὐτυχεστάτου δὲ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς. [3] ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἔπαθε ταὐτὸ Τιμοθέῳ τῷ τοῦ Κόνωνος, ὅς, εἰς τὴν τύχην αὐτοῦ τὰ κατορθώματα τῶν ἐχθρῶν τιθεμένων καὶ γραφόντων ἐν πίναξι; κοιμώμενον ἐκεῖνον, τὴν δὲ Τύχην δικτύῳ τὰς πόλεις περιβάλλουσαν, ἀγροικιζόμενος καὶ χαλεπαίνων πρὸς τοὺς ταῦτα ποιοῦντας ὡς ἀποστερούμενος ὑπ᾽ αὐτῶν τῆς ἐπὶ ταῖς πράξεσι δόξης, ἔφη ποτὲ πρὸς τόν δῆμον, ἐπανήκων ἐκ στρατείας εὖ κεχωρηκέναι δοκούσης, ‘ἀλλὰ ταύτης γε τῆς στρατείας οὐδέν, ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τῇ τύχῃ μέτεστι.’ [4] πρὸς Τιμόθεον μὲν οὖν φασιν οὕτω φανέντα φιλότιμον ἀντιμειρακιεύεσθαι τὸ δαιμόνιον, ὥστε μηδὲν ἔτι πρᾶξαι λαμπρόν, ἀλλὰ ὅλως ἀποτυγχάνοντα ταῖς πράξεσι καὶ προσκρούοντα τῷ δήμῳ τέλος ἐκπεσεῖν τῆς πόλεως: Σύλλας δὲ οὐ μόνον ἡδέως προσιέμενος τόν τοιοῦτον εὐδαιμονισμὸν καὶ ζῆλον, ἀλλὰ καὶ συναύξων καὶ συνεπιθειάζων τὰ πραττόμενα, τῆς τύχης ἐξῆπτεν, εἴτε κόμπῳ χρώμενος εἴθ᾽ οὕτως ἔχων τῇ δόξῃ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον, 5] καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι γέγραφεν ὅτι τῶν καλῶς αὐτῷ βεβουλεῦσθαι δοκούντων αἱ μὴ κατὰ γνώμην, ἀλλὰ πρὸς καιρὸν ἀποτολμώμεναι πράξεις ἔπιπτον εἰς ἄμεινον. ἔτι δὲ καὶ δι᾽ ὧν φησι πρὸς τύχην εὖ πεφυκέναι μᾶλλον ἢ πρὸς πόλεμον, τῇ τύχῃ τῆς ἀρετῆς πλέον ἔοικε νέμειν καὶ ὅλως ἑαυτὸν τοῦ δαίμονος ποιεῖν … | … Sulla, on the other hand, did much that was memorable, and achieved the reputation of a great leader among his fellow-citizens, that of the greatest of leaders among his friends, and that of the most fortunate even among his enemies. [3] But he did not feel about this as Timotheus the son of Conon did, who, when his adversaries ascribed his successes to Fortune, and had him represented in a painting as lying asleep, while Fortune cast her net about the cities, was rudely angry with those who had done this, because, as he thought, they were robbing him of the glory due to his exploits, and said to the people once, on returning from a campaign in which he was thought to have been successful: ”In this campaign, at least, men of Athens, Fortune has no share”. [4] Upon Timotheus, then, who had shown himself so covetous of honour, the deity is said to have requited his youthful petulance, so that from that time on he did nothing brilliant, but miscarried in all his undertakings, gave offence to the people, and was finally banished the city; whereas Sulla not only accepted with pleasure such felicitations and admiration, but actually joined in magnifying the aid of Heaven in what he did, and gave the credit of it to Fortune, either out of boastfulness, or because he had such a belief in the divine agency. [5] For in his Memoirs he writes that, of the undertakings which men thought well-advised, those upon which he had boldly ventured, not after deliberation, but on the spur of the moment, turned out for the better. And further, from what he says about his being well endowed by nature for Fortune rather than for war, he seems to attribute more to Fortune than to his own excellence, and to make himself entirely the creature of this deity … |

*Comp. Licurgo e Numa* 4. 7-8

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ‘τί οὖν,’ φήσει τις, ‘ οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον ἡ Ῥώμη προῆλθε τοῖς πολεμικοῖς;’ ἐρωτῶν ἐρώτημα μακρᾶς ἀποκρίσεως δεόμενον πρός ἀνθρώπους τὸ βέλτιον ἐν πλούτῳ καὶ τρυφῇ καὶ ἡγεμονίᾳ μᾶλλον ἢ σωτηρίᾳ καὶ πρᾳότητι καὶ τῇ μετὰ δικαιοσύνης αὐταρκείᾳ τιθεμένους, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο Λυκούργῳ που δόξει βοηθεῖν, τὸ Ῥωμαίους μὲν τὴν ἐπὶ Νομᾶ κατάστασιν ἐξαλλάξαντας ἐπιδοῦναι τοῖς πράγμασι τοσοῦτον, [8] Λακεδαιμονίους δὲ ἅμα τῷ πρῶτον ἐκβῆναι τὴν Λυκούργου διάταξιν, ἐκ μεγίστων ταπεινοτάτους γενέσθαι καὶ τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἡγεμονίαν ἀποβαλόντας κινδυνεῦσαι περί ἀναστάσεως, | [7] ‘What, then!’ someone will say, ‘was not Rome advanced and bettered by her wars?’ That is a question which will need a long answer, if I am to satisfy men who hold that betterment consists in wealth, luxury and empire, rather than in safety, gentleness, and that independence which is attended by righteousness. However, it will be thought, I suppose, to favour the superior claims of Lycurgus, that, whereas the Romans increased in power as they did after abandoning the institutions of Numa's time, [8] the Lacedaemonians, on the other hand, just as soon as they forsook the precepts of Lycurgus, sank from the highest to the lowest place, lost their supremacy over the Greeks, and were in danger of utter destruction. |