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Abstract

This analysis will look at the narration and structure of Plutarch’s *Agesilaos*. The project will offer insight into the methods by which the narrator constructs and presents the story of the life of a well-known historical figure and how his narrative techniques effects his reliability as a historical source. There is an abundance of exceptional recent studies on Plutarch’s interaction with and place within the historical tradition, his literary and philosophical influences, the role of morals in his *Lives*, and his use of source material, however there has been little scholarly focus—but much interest—in the examination of how Plutarch constructs his narratives to tell the stories they do. An examination of Plutarch through a narratological lens will illuminate the narrative of *Agesilaos* through functional analysis. Such a study can prove the utility of approaching any of Plutarch’s *Bioi*, individually and collectively, with this method and how it can offer new insights into this author, ancient narrative techniques and devices, and how stories are created, changed, and received. Looking at the construction of narrative and its effects will aid investigations into many of these and other questions.
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Introduction

Form and Use of Commentary

This analysis will look at the narration and structure of Plutarch’s *Agesilaos*. The project will offer insight into the methods by which the narrator constructs and presents the story of the life of a well-known historical figure and how his narrative techniques effects his reliability as a historical source. There is an abundance of exceptional recent studies on Plutarch’s interaction with and place within the historical tradition,¹ his literary and philosophical influences,² the role of morals in his *Lives*,³ and his use of source material;⁴ however there has been little scholarly focus—but much interest—in the examination of how Plutarch constructs his narratives to tell the stories they do.⁵

The commentary is intended to serve as a guide through the narrative of *Agesilaos* and an analysis of its structure, narrative voice, and the relationship between the narrator and narratee. As will be discussed in more detail in the following section, the term “narratee” is used to denote the one who is the addressee of the narrator, whether named or implied. Because a narrative may have innumerable readers from diverse cultural or temporal backgrounds who are not immediately deducible from the text, the term “narratee” has been adopted for this study since the narratee’s role as the receiver of the narrative can be inferred from the text. I have included the Greek text of *Agesilaos*, adopted from the Teubner edition, so that the reader may follow along closely while reading the commentary.⁶ Each Greek passage is followed by an English translation to facilitate the reader’s interaction with the text. All translations within the

---

¹ See especially the edited volume on these topics, Stadter (1992) *passim*.
⁵ For an extensive bibliography on these and other topics on the Greek Lives discussed by scholars from 1951-1988, see Podlecki and Duane (1992) 4053-4127.
⁶ C. Lindskog, ed. (1906).
commentary are my own unless otherwise noted. The standard numeration of the forty chapters is used for ease in referring the reader to specific passages in the text. I have divided the text of *Agesilaos* into ten parts for discussion. I delineated what I consider to be narrative wholes, that is, sections that have cohesion in context, theme, or focus. I have included a table below that illustrates the divisions within the commentary. The delineations are not intended to argue for a standard method of dividing the story and doubtlessly the text may be partitioned into different sections. For those readers who are unfamiliar with the narratological terminology that is used in this study, I have included a short Glossary of terms frequently employed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commentary Part</th>
<th>Plutarch, <em>Agesilaos</em> chapters</th>
<th>Context, theme, and focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Family lineage, birth, education, physical description, youth, and ascension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>Preparations for campaign against Persia, Agesilaos’ arrival in Asia Minor, conflict with Lysander, and commencement of expedition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>9-15</td>
<td>Actions and conduct of Agesilaos in Asia Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>16-19.3</td>
<td>Agesilaos’ return from Asia Minor, movements through Thrace and Boiotia, and dedication of tithe at Delphi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>19.4-22</td>
<td>Agesilaos’ conduct at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>23-25</td>
<td>Agesilaos’ hatred of Thebes, Peace of Antalkidas, and the Phoibidas and Sphodrias affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>26-29</td>
<td>The decline of Agesilaos’ reputation and Sparta’s hegemony, defeat at Leuktra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>30-33</td>
<td>Invasion of Lakonia by Epaminondas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>34-35</td>
<td>Agesilaos’ defense of Sparta and the Battle of Mantinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>Agesilaos in Egypt and death</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why Narratology?

Narratology is a literary analysis of narratives that focuses upon the distinctions between events of a story and how they are narrated in a text. It offers scholars a systematic approach to the mechanics of narrative and provides a toolbox with which to explain how a narrative builds meaning. Narratology is an endeavor to approach texts with an analysis of the narrative methods employed in a text in order to structure meaning. Narratologists attempt to expose the deep structure of narratives by a systematic analysis of the order, rhythm, and narration of a story’s events in a text.

Greimas, an early twentieth-century scholar in linguistics, attempted such a structural analysis of linguistic meaning by building off the distinction made between “story,” or the sequence of events narrated, and “plot,” the form in which these events are presented, a distinction put forward by the Russian Formalist Vladimir Propp. Greimas believed that every sentence is comparable to a drama and identified six “roles”, which he called “actants,” that words can take on: subject-object, sender-receiver, helper-opponent. His work, however, deals with the level of the story, not the textual level of the plot, which is the level that my project analyzes. Nevertheless, his work was important to the development of structuralist narratology.

Roland Barthes, who was working at the same time as Greimas, undertook a more literary and less abstract approach to narratives that work on the level of the plot.\(^7\) His work transferred the focus of narratology from the story/structural level to that of the narrator and point of view. He made distinguishable the layers of control and interference in the transmission of a narrative: Real Author, Implied Author, Narrator, Narratee (Implied Reader), and Real Reader. The central three in particular can be analyzed on the level of the text. The Implied Author is the one who

\(^7\) See especially Barthes (1974) [1970].
selects events for narration, omits others, and determines the order of the events and structure of
the plot; the Narrator is the “voice” that relates the story; the Narratee is the ideal receiver of the
narrative who will accept the text as it is presented by the Narrator.

Barthes also identified elements, which he named “functions,” in narratives that are the
single events that produce the outline of a story. He proposed that there are two types of
functions: core and catalyst. Core functions are those that form the essential actions of the story
and if any one of them were omitted, the story would be significantly altered. Catalysts are those
smaller elements of core functions that modify the development of the action, but do not have a
significant impact on the outcome of the action. Likewise, he distinguishes between “informants”
and “indices”; the former gives necessary information (Agis was the brother of Agesilaos), while
the latter provides circumstantial information on the setting, characters, etc. (Agesilaos was
competitive and hostile to Thebes).

Following Barthes, who eventually gave up trying to find a scientifically precise manner
to analyze texts, Gérard Genette aimed to provide a general theory on how a narrative presents
the story that it does. He improved upon the distinction between story and plot by adding a third
level, narration, and analyzed the relationships between a sequence of events (histoire), the
narrative of those events (récit), and the narrating of those events.8 In his study of these
relationships, Genette looked at the order of events in a story and how their arrangement and
repetition affects the overall functions of the narrative. He examined in depth the way in which a
narrative can move forward and backward in time to relate events that have not happened yet or
had happened before the events that were previously being narrated in the text. He called these
“anachronies” collectively and labeled the narration of previous events “analepsis” and that of
future events “prolepsis.” Genette also analyzed the rhythm of a narrative and how a narrator can

8 Genette (1980).
slow down or speed up the story down by using “scene” and “summary,” a distinction Wayne Booth made between the narrator “showing” or “telling” the events. The narrator slows the story down by showing the events with a scene that may also contain characters’ speech or speeds it up by telling what happens without presenting speech or all details, but instead passes over some events and condenses others.

Another of the most important distinctions Genette made was between “who is speaking” and “who is perceiving;” the perception of the narrated events is what he called “focalization.” Most significant for this present study is the differentiation between “internal focalization,” which assumes the perspective of one of the characters in the narrative without actually adopting his voice, and “external focalization,” which assumes an external perspective and does not supply any of the thoughts or emotions of the characters.

Mieke Bal further differentiated between the three layers that contribute to a narrative, which she termed “fabula” (which Genette called histoire), “story” (récit in Genette), and “text” (narration in Genette). Bal defines fabula as a “series of logically and chronologically related events caused or experienced by actors.” i.e. in this study, the biological-historical life of Agesilaos constitutes the fabula. She defines story as “a fabula that is presented in a certain manner,” which is both Plutarch’s selection of events from Agesilaos’ life that were preserved in sources and his arrangement of these events into a sequence. The text is that “in which an agent relates a story in a particular medium;” this is the text of the Agesilaos complete with events of Agesilaos’ life that are arranged in a particular sequence and “filled out” by the narrator to produce an aesthetic unity.

Much of Bal’s attention focused upon the function of the narrator in the relationship between the fabula and its focalization in the story. The aspects of the narrator’s focalization in

---

9 Bal (1997). These terms and more can be found in the Glossary.
various narrative situations and the narrator’s manipulation of ordering and rhythms affects the
collections between the fabula and the story as well as those between the narrators and the
receivers of the narration, the narratees.

More recently, de Jong, Stoddard, and Winkler have each demonstrated how such an
approach to ancient texts gains us new insights and tools with which to read ancient literature.10
De Jong’s exceptional analysis of the narration of the Iliad demonstrated the utility of such an
examination in the field of Classics and, indeed, was successful at bringing completely new
insights into one of the world’s most read and studied literary works. De Jong adopted the
methodology developed by Bal and, through Bal’s work, Genette’s distinction between “who
speaks” and “who perceives,” which de Jong calls the narrator and the focalizer. Her clearly
presented approach centers on narration and focalization and how by looking at these functions
we can understand more about the relationship between narrators and narratees. She called the
“primary narrator-focalizer” the one who selects, arranges, perceives, and judges events and
effects the temporal progression of the narrator by providing anachronies. More significantly, she
showed that often there is a “secondary narrator-focalizer” (or tertiary, etc.) who introduces his
perception of events into the text of the primary narrator-focalization, labeled “embedded
focalization.” With such devices as embedded focalization, the narratee is given glimpses into
the minds of a character without that character directly speaking. Sometimes, however, there is
no obvious signal, like a verb of thinking or perceiving, to the narratee that a secondary narrator-
focalizer is presenting his or her perception. De Jong calls these situations “complex narrator-
text” and supports their distinction by demonstrating that certain adjectives that express
emotional judgments only appear is a character’s quoted speech or in complex narrator-text.11

De Jong later organized other classicists who were examining ancient narratives and inaugurated the *Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative* with the illuminating first volume on narratives ranging from the poetic, dramatic, rhetorical, and historical. The variety of scholars included in this and the second volume, which explores ancient authors’ expression and manipulation of time and chronology in their texts, reflects the growing interest and the recognized benefits of a narratological approach to classical texts.¹²

My own method of approaching the narrative text of *Agesilaos* has been largely influenced by the methods and observations of these scholars. Their foundational studies, it must be noted, principally explored narratives in fictive and/or poetic works. It was Dorrit Cohn who demonstrated the utility of narratological approaches to *non*-fictive, *non*-poetic works. He stipulated that to the traditional tripartite levels of fabula, story, and text there should be the added level of reference.¹³ This level between the fabula and the text is an important feature in studying the narration of Plutarch. In other words, when we consider the techniques by which a non-fiction or historical author composes his text, we must take into account what information was available to the author to employ and to what degree he “filled in the gaps.” By recognizing the gaps we are better able to assess the historical reliability of the text, but by analyzing how and when the narrator fills in those gaps that we gain insight into the aims of the author himself—thus we come to understand better why the author related what he did in the manner he did. Recently, several modern historians have recognized the benefits of using the tools provided by narratology to gain a more sophisticated understanding of how ancient historical texts “worked.” Rood has found that using narratological analysis can help solve many of the problems critics have of Thucydides’ handling of time and focalization; his study focuses

---

¹³ Cohn (1999).
primarily on focalization, perception, omission, and manipulation of time. In a similar vein, Baragwanath employs the hermeneutic tools of narratology to illuminate character and narratorial motivations in Herodotus. She argues that Herodotus was not only concerned to tell the events that happened, but also the perceptions that shaped those events. Moreover, she demonstrates that rather than being naïve, Herodotus’ work is that of “an author acutely aware of the problems of historiography; of one possessing the extra perceptions available to the careful analyst, who is deeply mindful of the contested nature of the past, and sensitive to the opposing views it provokes.”

Scholars of Plutarch and ancient biography have often noted aspects of texts upon which narratologists focus and have highlighted the importance of these same features in their own studies. In discussing one of the defining characteristics of biography as a genre, that of omission, Momigliano notes that, “fortunately or unfortunately, nobody has ever succeeded in giving, or perhaps ever attempted, a complete account of what one man did during his lifetime. But this seems to be the paradoxical character of biography: it must always give partem pro toto; it must always achieve completeness by selectiveness.”

Russell has illuminated the literary purposes and methods of Plutarch by analyzing the treatment of the bios of Coriolanus in comparison with Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ historical narration of the same story. As the Coriolanus is a unique example in which scholars can confidently point to Plutarch’s predominate reliance upon a single authority, Russell exposes points in the text where Plutarch expands, contracts, or elaborates Dionysius’ account according to his literary purposes. Similarly, Pelling has compared the chronological inconsistencies in

---

Plutarch’s relation of the same events narrated in Brutus, Crassus, Caesar, Antony, Cicero, and Cato.\(^\text{19}\) He demonstrates that Plutarch modifies the sequence of events, or even the inclusion of them, frequently in order to most aesthetically achieve his aims of unity or presentation of character.

Elsewhere, Pelling has briefly but fruitfully looked at the relationship between the primary narrator and narratee of Plutarch’s Bioi and how the narrator works to convince the narratee of his reliability.\(^\text{20}\) Restricting his scope to the examination of the functions behind the narrator’s use of ‘me’ and ‘you’, Pelling has shown how these are used as devices to establish narrative authority—an important aspect of the relationship between the narrator and narratee of a non-fictive work.

My intention is not to argue for the superiority of using a narratological analysis of historical narratives over more traditional commentaries, like that of Shipley on Plutarch’s Agesilaos, that investigate possible source materials, literary influences, and historical reliability. Rather, this analysis should be viewed as a supplement to such critical approaches as a fresh way of understanding historical narratives and narrative techniques. The Plutarchian narrator of the Alexander makes it absolutely clear that he does not consider his Bioi to be historical texts, but as something unique from historical, diachronic narratives of momentous events: οὐτὲ γὰρ ἱστορίας γράφομεν, ἀλλὰ βίους (Plut. Alex. 1.2). Ancient critical approaches to historical writing largely focused on how “truthful” an account was, the sources used, and the bias of the author. In fact, Plutarch’s own essay against the historical accuracy of Herodotus, De Herodoti Malignitate, focuses on precisely this last feature and criticizes Herodotus’ “malignant” treatment of Thebes. Modern historians, however, are well aware that no historical accounts can

\(^{19}\) Pelling (1994) 125-154.

ever be deemed as completely truthful and that the reader must be well equipped to ask more questions of the text than “is it truthful?” Rood, in his examination of the narrative techniques of Thucydides, has demonstrated “the dangers of separating Thucydides’ literary brilliance from his historical aims and splintering his varied emotional, rhetorical, and analytical registers. Features that may at first seem odd can be explained by sensitive analysis of how Thucydides’ text as a whole works.” Narratology offers the tools that enable a sensitive analysis of how a text works by systematically exploring the role and voice of the narrator, variations of chronology and time, characterization, and the diverse options for the presentation of thoughts, ideas, and events that are available to a narrator. My study will use narratology to explore the Plutarchian narrator’s use of focalization, rhythm, characterization, and commentary. The narrator uses focalization for character building and varied perspective as well as to maintain distance between himself and his subject. His treatment of narrative rhythm, using summaries and ellipses to move the story forward and scenes to slow the narrative down and focus the narratee’s attention or add dramatic elements and the manipulation of chronology to his literary aims, will be a primary focus in the commentary. Most importantly, however, is the narrator’s characterization of individuals within the story, especially Agesilaos, as well as his own self-characterization and his subtlety in establishing his authority with the narratee and directing the interpretation of the story through direct commentary.

**Why Agesilaos?**

I selected Plutarch’s *Agesilaos* for this study for several reasons, not least of which is that there has been increased attention from scholars on Agesilaos both as a historical figure and a subject of biography. In particular, D. R. Shipley’s commentary offers excellent textual and

---

historical notes on the work—such commentaries on Plutarch’s *Bιοι* being rare—\(^{22}\) and provides a solid foundation from which I may build a discussion that explores the work’s narrative in detail. Furthermore, questions about the impact that the historical Agesilaos had upon Sparta’s policies, diplomatic relations, and hostilities in the fourth century have garnered much attention from excellent scholars. Cartledge’s exceptional volume on Agesilaos and his role in the deterioration of Sparta’s hegemony reflects a new interest in reexamining the impact that the long-reigning king had on the course of Spartan and Greek history.\(^ {23}\) He attributes much responsibility to Agesilaos personally for the brief rise of the Thebans to power during the first half of the fourth century and for fostering the chaos in Greece that Philip of Makedon would be able to take advantage of in the second half of the century. Although Cartledge cites Xenophon’s accounts more frequently, it is his synthesis of Plutarch’s far less encomiastic and fuller text with these that provides him the material with which he is able to construct his penetrating examination into the complexities behind Sparta’s slide from hegemony. His synthesis of Plutarch’s more critical portrayal of Agesilaos reveals the influence the narrative has upon the historical judgment of important modern scholars. In a similar vein as Cartledge, Hamilton has produced two books that critically present Agesilaos as the individual most accountable for the policies and hostilities of Sparta during the fourth century, one of which has the telling name \textit{Agesilaos and the Failure of Spartan Hegemony}.\(^ {24}\) With such attention being paid to the historicity of Plutarch and his methods of work as well as the historical examinations of Agesilaos and Sparta under his reign, the time is ripe for a detailed look at Plutarch’s presentation of the story of the king.

\(^{22}\) Note, for example, Duff’s opening statement in his review of Shipley’s commentary: “There is a small, though growing, number of modern commentaries on \textit{Lives} of Plutarch which treat Plutarch’s texts as texts, not simply as mines for history.” Duff (2000) 163.

\(^{23}\) Cartledge (1987).

Not only did modern scholarly attention to Agesilaos make this particular work of
Plutarch a choice selection for study, but also Plutarch’s own repeated reflection upon the
historical figures of fourth century in different biographic pairs enables this work to reveal
narrative variation between the texts. Because Agesilaos was not the only figure of this time
period upon whom Plutarch focused his sight, other bioi that narrate events which are also found
in Agesilaos, most notably in Lysander, Alkibiades, and Pelopidas, provide the opportunity for
cross-comparison of the narration of the same events in different stories by the same author.

Furthermore, scholars have noted that Plutarch’s treatment of Agesilaos is markedly
different from that which the Spartan receives from Xenophon in the Hellenika and Agesilaos.\(^\text{25}\) Xenophon’s Hellenika and Agesilaos will be cited and discussed often in the commentary as they
offer frequent opportunities for fruitful comparison with Plutarch’s text. Not only are they useful
since Xenophon was a primary source in Plutarch’s composition of Agesilaos, and the only fully
extant one at that, but by comparing the two Agesilaos and Hellenika we can also bring into sharp
focus the differences in methods of selection, narration, and narratorial effect upon the reader
between the varied accounts.

That is not to say that Xenophon was the only historical source Plutarch used in
composing his work.\(^\text{26}\) Plutarch directly cites Xenophon four times in the Agesilaos, but also
mentions Theopompos (three times), Theophrastus (twice), Duris of Samos (once), Hieronymus
(once), Dikaiarchos (once), Callisthenes (once), and Dioscorides (once).\(^\text{27}\) In addition, although
not cited within the Agesilaos, Plutarch likely made use of the fourth-century historian Ephorus

\(^{25}\) Hamilton (1994) 212.
\(^{26}\) Shipley (1997) 46-55 offers a thorough yet concise discussion of Plutarch’s sources for the Agesilaos. See also
\(^{27}\) Hamilton (1994) 206.
of Cyme as well; his work is cited by Plutarch in the *Lysander* and *Pelopidas*.\(^{28}\) Although several authors are cited within *Agesilaos*, it is Xenophon’s narratives that are most frequently invoked and the only ones available to us for comparison. In addition to the direct citations of Xenophon, there are several passages in the *Agesilaos* that are similar to what is preserved in Xenophon’s texts, but with significant differences in their narration. Contrasting these narratives provides the opportunity to highlight the distinctiveness of the narrators and their objectives.

Hamilton has hypothesized that Plutarch may have had access to Boiotian sources that were more critical of the Spartan king and that Plutarch’s incorporation of these sources, which are no longer extant, enabled him to present a more balanced and historically reliable representation of the events narrated.\(^{29}\) It is his opinion, therefore, that Plutarch’s *Agesilaos* in particular warrants the careful attention of historians.\(^{30}\) Hamilton, however, compared only three of the events related in Plutarch and Xenophon’s accounts: the struggle for ascension, the incident at Aulis, and the humiliation of Lysander. My study will consider the work as a whole in order to offer a fuller investigation of Plutarch’s *Agesilaos* and compare the work to those of Xenophon at more frequent junctures.

**Selection, Direction, and Rhythm in *Agesilaos***

It has been long since Friedrich Leo demonstrated differences between Suetonius’ thematic arrangement within his *Vitae* and Plutarch’s chronological arrangement within his *Bioi*.\(^{31}\) Although it may at first glance seem a simple one, the decision by Plutarch to adopt a chronological presentation affected the very nature of the *Bioi* themselves. Adherence to a

---

\(^{28}\) Schwartz (1957) 3-26 and 27-31 offers discussion of Ephorus and Duris.


\(^{30}\) Hamilton (1994) 212.

\(^{31}\) Leo (1901).
chronological arrangement largely dictates where the author is to begin and end, and what direction and rhythms he is to adopt in order to skillfully progress from that beginning to that end. To begin at birth and end at death may seem an uncomplicated presentation; to achieve balance in the chronology and the development both of the character and the historical events in which the subject is entailed requires remarkable artistic dexterity.

The remark of Momigliano quoted above about the selective nature of biographic writing highlights the element of omission that is an inescapable feature of biography. Plutarch acknowledges this process of conscious selection and his participation in it in the oft-quoted prologue to Alexander-Caesar:

Τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον τοῦ βασιλέως βιοῦ καὶ τοῦ Καίσαρος, ὑφ’ οὗ κατελύθη Πομπήιος, ἐν τούτῳ τῷ βιβλίῳ γράφοντες, διὰ τὸ πλήθος τῶν ὑποκειμένων πράξεων οὐδὲν ἄλλο προεροῦμεν ἢ παρατησόμεθα τοὺς ἀναγιγνώσκοντας. Εάν μὴ πάντα μηδὲν καθ’ ἐκαστον ἐξειργασμένως τι τῶν περιβοήτων ἀπαγγέλλωμεν, ἀλλὰ ἐπιτείμνοντες τὰ πλεῖστα, μὴ συκοφαντεῖν, οὕτε ταῖς ἐπιφανεστάταις πράξεις πάντως ἐνεστὶ δῆλωσιν ἅρετής ἢ κακίας, ἀλλὰ πράγμα βραχὺ πολλάκις καὶ ῥήμα καὶ παιδιά τις ἐμφασιν ἡδονὸς ἐποίησε μᾶλλον ἢ μάχαι μυριόνεκροι καὶ παρατάξεις αἰι μέγισται καὶ πολιορκίαι πόλεων. Ὡσπερ οὖν οἱ ζωγράφοι τὰς ὁμοιότητας ἀμύ τοῦ προσώπου καὶ τῶν περὶ τῆς ὄψιν εἰδών, οἷς ἐμφαίνεται τὸ ἡθος, ἀναμβάνουσιν, ἐλάχιστα τῶν λοιπῶν μερῶν προτίτουντες, οὕτως ἡμῖν δοτέον εἰς τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς σημεία μᾶλλον εἰνδύεσθαι καὶ διὰ τούτων εἴδοποιεῖν τὸν ἐκάστου βιοῦ, ἐάσαντας ἐτέρως τὰ μεγέθη καὶ τοὺς ἀγώνας.

It is the life of Alexander the king, and of Caesar, who overthrew Pompey, that I am writing in this book, and the multitude of the deeds to be treated is so great that I shall make no other preface than to entreat my readers not to complain, in case I do not tell of all the famous actions of these men, nor even speak exhaustively at all in each particular case, but in epitome for the most part. 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; rather, 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. Accordingly, just as painters get the likeness in their portraits from the face and the
expression of the eyes, wherein the character shows itself, but
make very little account of the other parts of the body, so I must be
permitted to devote myself rather to the signs of the soul in men,
and by means of these to portray the life of each, leaving to others
the description of their great contests.32

As the Plutarchian narrator of Alexander-Caesar above implies, selectivity is one way in
which the narrator controls the story and is able to produce a desired effect upon the narratee. It
is not only selection of some events over others, however, but also the arrangement of the
selected events and the direction taken by the narrator within the story that are fundamental to
producing a narrative that dynamic in its presentation rather than static. In Xenophon’s
Agesilaos, the story is static; the anecdotes and events are predominantly presented under
categorical heading, much like the biographies of Suetonius. In contrast, the story of Plutarch’s
Agesilaos is far more dynamic and largely maintains a forward chronological direction that is
interrupted by anachronies. These anachronies, along with the narrator’s commentaries that
punctuate the story, create a rhythm in the story that impacts the comprehension and
interpretation of the events by the narratee. In addition to anachronies and narratorial
commentaries, effects upon the story’s direction and rhythm are achieved by the use of summary
and ellipsis to quicken the narrative pace and also descriptive scenes to slow the rhythm or focus
the narratee’s attention upon an event or its perceived significance.

Rather than jump to hypotheses about the overall message or effect that Plutarch aims to
communicate in his Bioi individually or collectively, we will benefit much to examine the
architecture of a Bios itself, which is what this project aims to do. By considering the selection,
arrangement, direction, and rhythm of the text we will gain insight into how the narrator
maintains structural cohesion and influences the narratee’s reception of the story.

Narrator, Narration, and the Narratee in Agesilaos

The subtle interactions between the narrator and his reader make Plutarch’s Lives decidedly unique among surviving biographic stories and those interactions that are scattered throughout the story will be examined in this project. The way the narrator presents and characterizes himself to the narratee plays a critical role in setting the tone of the story and establishing a relationship with the reader. There are innumerable ways in which a narrator can present himself within a text. He may be external to the events he is describing or internal and appear in the story as a character; he may be dramatized and speak directly of himself as a character or as his role as narrator; he may overtly speak about his narratorial activities and the efforts he has taken to compose the story; he may characterize himself as reliable and strive to earn his narratee’s trust or intentionally unreliable and misrepresent or withhold information from his reader. Observations on the narrator’s presentation of himself, his self-characterization, and his efforts to establish an objective and authoritative persona will be central to the goals of this commentary.

The Plutarchian narrator has to convince his reader of his authority and erudition in matters not only of history, but also in his ability to present and astutely comment upon the nature of a man’s ethos and the effects of this ethos upon the course of history. He builds his authority with the narratee in several ways that will be examined in detail in the commentary. The narrator frequently invokes the reference level by citing names of his sources, comparing his own research to those of others, employing “to this day” examples of continuity to support his narrative, and references other works he has authored on related subjects. Additionally, he avoids

---

33 Booth (1961) *The Rhetoric of Fiction* is a foundational work in the study of the narrator and many of these concepts, including dramatized or unreliable narrators, are derived from his work.
making direct characterizations or presentations of characters’ motives and instead uses focalization to do this; this is especially true when a negative aspect of character is involved. When he does make direct characterizations and presentations of motives, he follows his comments with focalizations or example events that corroborate his narrative.

Commentary from the narrator (“narratorial commentary”) directs the narratee’s reception and interpretation of events and actions selected for presentation. Hillman called these “authorial statements” and argued against their being labeled as digressions since that term implies a departure from the subject at hand. It is not exactly the author who speaks, however, but the narrator. While Plutarch is the author of the Lives, the information contained in each varies and, as will be examined in the commentary, the same event or episode may be narrated in very different ways in different Lives. Moreover, the narrator of the synkrisis, as we will see in that of Agesilaos-Pompey, will at times disagree with what was presented in the individual’s biography. The author of both is the same, but the narrator is different. Therefore, I have adopted the term narrator rather than author to emphasize this difference. Much insight into the relationship between the narrator and narratee stands to be gained by a thorough study of the narration of the Agesilaos. As Hillman stated, “only a detailed analysis of authorial statements in a single Life will clarify how closely related to the narrative they are and how integral to the portrayal of the subject’s character.” This is precisely what I aim to offer with my study.

---

34 Hillman (1994) 255-256.
35 Hillman (1994) 255.
Part One: chapters 1-5

The first five chapters of the Agesilaos establish the subject, time, setting, and themes of the story while covering the family lineage, birth, education, physical description, youth and ascension of Agesilaos. In addition, the narrator establishes his own characterization as being external to the events and yet authoritative, which he establishes through overt direct commentary as well as invocation of other authors through embedded focalization and narration. The narratee is not dramatized, but he is overt and the narrator remains ever aware of his presence throughout the narrative without ever directly addressing him. Finally, the omnipresent narrator exhibits in these opening chapters the techniques (especially fluctuations in narrative rhythm, narratorial commentary, anachronies, and focalization) he will employ throughout his narrative by which he will direct the narratee’s focus and interpretation.

The story begins in the year of Archidamos’ death, 427 B.C.E., but in the opening five chapters the narrator broadly covers the fabula years of 445-398 B.C.E., as framed by the events of Agesilaos’ birth and his ascension. The subject’s youth and education are admittedly covered quickly, but still receive considerable attention, especially when compared to how little of Agesilaos’ life before his ascension is recorded. However, the narrator dedicates more story time to the embedded narrative of Timaia’s alleged affair with Alkibiades and its creation of a political dilemma upon the death of Agis than he does to any single episode of Agesilaos’ youth. The reported scandal sets up the context of the dispute between Leotychides and Agesilaos via Lysander for the vacant Spartan throne. The struggle for the ascension is the climactic event of these chapters; the selected episodes build to this struggle and the subsequent narrative elaborates upon the significance of the struggle from a constitutional and philosophical perspective.

36 I have followed Cartledge (1987) for the dating of events.
Archidamos, son of Zeuxidamos, having ruled brilliantly over the Lakedaimonians, left a son by the noble woman Lampido, Agis; and a much younger son by Eupolia, the daughter of Melesippidas, Agesilaos. And since it seemed, because the kingship belonged to Agis according to law, that Agesilaos was to lead the life of an ordinary Spartan, he was enrolled in what is called the “agoge” in Lakedaimon which is strict in its manner of life and full of suffering, yet train the youths to be under command. And it is because of this, they say, that Sparta was called “tamer of mortals” by Simonides, since of all the nations it especially made its citizens obedient to the laws and tame, just as horses straight from the beginning are broken in. The law exempted from this necessity the children being raised for the kingship. And so for Agesilaos befell this unique circumstance: that he came to control not untrained in being under control. Indeed it was because of this that more than any other king he proved to be most in harmony with his subjects, having gained in addition to his inborn qualities of a king and leader those from the agoge: congeniality and humanity.

The narrator begins the story with a chronological arrangement of names (Archidamos, Agis, and Agesilaos) in the opening sentence, thus suppressing the identification of the subject until the last word of the sentence. This construction mimics one of the events of the subject’s life that the narrator will soon relate: the succession of Agesilaos to his father’s, Archidamos, throne after the intermediate reign of Agesilaos’ older brother, Agis. The way the narrator

37 The text is adopted from the Teubner edition: Lindskog (1906).
constructs this first sentence reflects the chronological events of the fabula itself: Archidamos’ reign, Agis’ reign, and finally the reign of our biographical character: Agesilaos.\(^{38}\)

Although the narrator does not explicitly identify the subject of his story as Agesilaos in this first sentence, nevertheless the narratee is presented with the names of three Spartan kings and the names of the two sons’ mothers. The narratee at this point is already informed that this will be a story about Sparta’s kingship and the unusual identification of the two Spartan wives indicates that wives will be an important topic in the story.\(^{39}\) The narrator establishes that both sons were lawfully and well born; legitimate birth will become a topic when the conception and birth of Leotychides will be narrated in chapter 3.

The narrator casts the roles of Archidamos, Agis, and Agesilaos as Spartan kings and indicates to the narratee how each man performed his role: Archidamos ruled \(\varepsilon \pi \rho \alpha \nu \varphi \omega \varsigma\), Agis’ reign passes almost without comment except that it was inherited \(\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \tau \delta \omicron \nu \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron\), and Agesilaos was \(\epsilon \upsilon \alpha \rho \mu \omicron \sigma \omicron \tau \omicron \alpha \tau \omicron \zeta\) of all the kings. The narrator indicates that the Spartan kingship will be a central theme in this \(b\i o\i s\) by using words starting with \(\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda\)- five times and words starting with \(\alpha \rho \chi\)- four times in this opening chapter alone.

Having introduced the subject, Agesilaos, and his family in the first sentence, the narrator then sets up the coming theme of the circumstances of Agesilaos’ ascension to the Spartan throne with the second sentence of the text. Agis, as the eldest son, became king after Archidamos \(\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \tau \delta \omicron \nu \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron\); this will be quite different from how Agesilaos will become king, as the narrator will show in chapters 3 and 4. The arrangement of \(\iota \delta \iota \omega \tau \eta \varsigma\) directly following \(\tau \delta \omicron \nu \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron\) puts into

---

\(^{38}\) Although the exact date for Agesilaos’ birth is not established securely, it was likely in or soon after the year 445 B.C.E. Cartledge (1987) 8, 21-22; Shipley (1997) 58.

\(^{39}\) Bremmer (1981) 425-426 notes the rarity of the inclusion of women’s names in Greek authors except those women who were known as villianous or somehow unusual. Plutarch’s interest in women’s names is therefore quite unique. Shipley (1997) 57: “In identifying the wives of Archidamos, Plutarch evinces a personal interest in the women of the family, which contributes to the artistic ornamentation [of the framing of names in the text].” For Eupolia, see also Le Corsu (1981) 19.
sharp contrast the situation of the two men’s youth: as Agis was the heir apparent, his life was guided by the requirements of custom. Agesilaos, in contrast, was to lead a “private” life, which in Sparta, the narrator explains, meant that Agesilaos was reared as a typical Spartiate and so trained in the agoge as a soldier-citizen. In short, Agis was set apart, Agesilaos was not.

Upon introducing the agoge to the narratee, the narrator defines and characterizes the Spartan education system and indicates its importance as a theme in this Bios. The narrator uses passive verbs more frequently once he introduces the theme of agoge education. The language used casts the agoge as a dominant force over the pupils and is characterized as rigorous and austere.

Thereafter, the narrator places the quotation from Simonides to support his association of Agesilaos’ disciplined character with his rearing in the agoge, an association that will become a central theme in the narrative. The agoge created men who were obedient yet formidable and produced a unique king who “came to rule not untrained in being ruled”. By including the quotation from Simonides that also casts Sparta and the Spartan system as grueling, the narrator establishes his assessment of the agoge as valid. The narrator thus characterizes himself as authoritative by citing support for his connection by an older, external source which authenticates the narrator’s assessment.

Immediately upon describing the agoge and its effects on Spartan youths, the narrator informs his readers that Spartan law exempted the royal heirs from this compulsory training. Because the narratees just learned that Agis was the heir apparent and Agesilaos was to lead a private Spartiate life, they can surmise that this king was indeed unique in that he became king.

---

40 It is well-known from Plutarch’s other writings that he was much-interested in the education of youths and so the opportunity to include educational training in one his Bioi is seized and made a prominent component (perhaps not without reason) in his construction of Agesilaos’ life and character. For childhood and personality in Greek biography, see Pelling (2002) 301-338; for the “filling out” of subjects’ childhood in the Lives, see Pelling (2002) 153-157. For Plutarch’s notions of the role of education in shaping ethos, see Duff (1999) 72-77.
and was reared in the *agoge*. Although the reader may know that other Spartan kings had received *agoge* training, the narrator tells his narratees that Agesilaos was a unique king since he had been raised in the traditional system and thus the narratee’s interest is piqued and an incentive to read on is established.41 Shipley notes that although Agesilaos’ indoctrination into the *agoge* system is here presented as a singular occurrence as he was not expected to rule Sparta, there were other Spartan kings who were similarly trained. The narrator omits this fact from the story, for it would greatly reduce the effect he is creating that Agesilaos was a unique king.42

The last sentence of the paragraph provides the narratees with a brief characterization of Agesilaos that will be further developed throughout the *Bios*: he was a unique king in that he was raised as a citizen in the *agoge*, thus he was trained the Spartans’ harsh and disciplined way of life, because of his rearing in the *agoge* with the other citizens Agesilaos was the most harmonious with his subjects of all the Spartan kings, and although he already possessed “kingly” traits, this training added to his *ethos* affability and benevolence. The narrator remarks that *agoge* also added to Agesilaos’ character the quality of *demotikos* and this may strike the narratee as surprising; that the *agoge* system, which was reserved only for the small Spartiate class of Lakedaimonia, is attributed with making Agesilaos *demotikos* seems a contradiction. The narrator’s use of the term, however, does not extend to Agesilaos’ political ideology, but to his treatment of other Spartiates within the *agoge* system. Indeed, Agesilaos’ high regard for his fellow Spartiates will be a recurring theme throughout the story.43

41 Hdt. 5.40.2 and 7.20: Leonidas was similarly not the heir apparent and educated in the *agoge*. Plutarch knew Herodotus’ work well and likely expected his reader to have been familiar with the work.
42 Shipley (1997) 62: “Agesilaos’ typical Spartan upbringing is significant, although it is an exaggeration to say that he was unique. Leonidas I, a younger son, also by a different wife (Hdt. 5. 40. 2), became king (Hdt. 7. 204); and Kleombrotos, Agesilaos’ co-king, succeeded his elder brother Agesipolis.”
43 As for example at 7.3; 16.3-4; 20.5; and 25.4.
In this first chapter, the narrator identifies his subject, the subject’s family, the circumstances for the subject’s upbringing, and the characterization of the *agoge* system and its effects upon the nature of Agesilaos’ reign. The story’s starting point is announced (Agesilaos’ family and youth) and the narratees are told the subject will become king, but the ending is not overtly indicated, although the narratees can expect that the story will end with the death of Agesilaos as dictated by loose conventions of the genre.

2.1-2.2

'Εν δὲ ταῖς καλομέναις ἁγέλαις τῶν συντρεφομένων παίδων Λύσανδρον ἔσχεν ἐραστήν, ἐκπλαγέντα μάλιστα τῷ κοσμίῳ τῆς φύσεως αὐτοῦ. Φιλονικότατος γὰρ ὄν καὶ θυμοειδέστατος ἐν τοῖς νέοις και πάντα πρωτεύειν βουλόμενος, καὶ τὸ σφοδρὸν ἔχων καὶ βαγχαίον ἀμαχον καὶ δυσεκβιστον, εὐπειθεία πάλιν αὐ καὶ πραγματι τοιούτος ἦν, οἷος φόβῳ μηδέν, αἰσχύνη δὲ πάντα ποιεῖν τὰ προσταττόμενα, καὶ τοῖς ψόγοις ἀλγοῦσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ τοὺς πόνους βαρύνεσθαι.

And while in what are called “herds” of boys who are reared together, he took Lysander as his lover, who was especially knocked senseless by his orderly nature. For though he was the most competitive and energetic among the youths and was always wanting to win, and possessed a vehemence and ferocity that were undefeatable and immovable; yet on the other hand he possessed such ready-obedience and mildness that he did nothing out of fear but with humility performed everything demanded of him and was more distressed by reprimands than he was oppressed by hard work.

Chapter 2 continues the forward chronology briefly, but focuses primarily on presenting a snapshot of the attributes of Agesilaos’ character and physical stature. One important addition to the narrative is the ushering of Lysander into the story; and his introduction to the narratees at the very start of the second chapter highlights his importance in the story. Further narratorial motivation for introducing the relationship at this point in the chronology, while the two
characters are youths in the *agoge*, provides the opportunity to pause and explain why Lysander was drawn to the future king: his traits of both character and physique.

The narrator begins with a prepositional phrase that returns the narrative to the topic of Agesilaos in the *agoge*. This maintains the chronology loosely and will be the only information the narratee receives that comes close to covering the years of Agesilaos’ youth. The forward chronological progression that governs the story makes discussion of the youth’s upbringing here logical, but the narrator provides no specifics and relates no events from the period Agesilaos spent among his age group in the *agoge*. Instead, the *agoge* provides the opportunity for the narrator to introduce Lysander and the broader theme of *philia* and *eros*, as Lysander’s identification as the youth’s early *erates* clearly does. Agesilaos’ relationship with the influential Lysander will be a dominant theme in the story and one to which the narrator will often return and use to build tension. In the story, the two will have a close give-and-take relationship throughout their lives and the relationship will be employed in the as the primary example of Agesilaos’ use and abuse of friendship (*philia*).

After introducing Lysander, the narrator discloses that he was “struck out of his wits” by Agesilaos and uses focalization to present to the narratee Lysander’s assessment of Agesilaos’ character. The narrator’s use of focalization, represented by an objective clause, is a means to indirectly pronounce to the narratee an assessment of Agesilaos that the primary narrator-focalizer cannot make without seeming encomiastic. The narrator maintains distance, which further characterizes him as objective and authoritative, by avoiding such a biased and

---

44 On the age-classes in the Spartan *agoge* and an examination of the sources to determine the ages for the classes, see Billheimer (1947) 99-104.
46 See Dover (1988) 117-118 for questions on whether the older lover was chosen and assigned to a younger companion in the *agoge*. For broad studies on Greek homosexuality, see Dover (1989) *passim*. 
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unverifiable assessment of Agesilaos’ *physis* as “orderly” (κοσμίος). The assessment is grammatically set off as a focalization by the accusative clause modifying Lysander.

After the focalization through Lysander, the narrator presents the reason Lysander was “struck out of his wits” by Agesilaos. The explanation of what the natural beauty consisted of is threaded out by a long, balanced period, which first lists superlative excessive qualities (including excessiveness itself) that are not negative, but potentially dangerous without moderation (φιλονικότατος, θυμοειδέστατος, πρωτεύειν βουλόμενος, τὸ σφοδρὸν ἔχων). The narrator then balances the assessment out with πάλιν αὖ and elaborates on Agesilaos’ obedience and humility (εὐπειθείᾳ, προφτητί, αἰσχύνῃ, τοῖς ψόγοις ἀλγύνεσθαι). The narrator will return to these amorphous qualities and give examples of all of them by narrating the episodes and anecdotes that will form the emerging *Bios*. This catalogue of qualities, however, encapsulates the entire character the narrator will build in the text and introduces to the narratee early in the text the characteristics they are to retain and recall when they recur later in the narrative.

2.2-2.3

Τὴν δὲ τοῦ σκέλους πήρωσιν ἢ τε ὀρα τοῦ σώματος ἀνθυόντος ἐπέκρυπτε, καὶ τὸ ῥάδιως φέρει καὶ ἱλαρώς τὸ τοιούτο, παίζοντα καὶ σκωπτοῦντα πρῶτον ἑαυτὸν, οὐ μικρὸν ἦν ἐπανόρθωμα τοῦ πάθους, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν φιλοτιμίαν ἐκδηλοτέραν ἐποίη, πρὸς μηδένα πόνον μηδὲ πράξιν ἀπαγορεύοντος αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν χωλότητα. Τῆς δὲ μορφῆς εἰκόνα μὲν οὐκ ἔχωμεν (αὐτὸς γὰρ οὐκ ἤθελεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ θυμίκως ἀπείπτε μήτε πλαστάν μήτε μιμητάν τινα ποιήσασθαι τού σώματος εἰκόνα), λέγεται δὲ μικρός τε γενέσθαι καὶ τὴν ὄψιν εὐκαταφρόνητος ἢ δ’ ἱλαρότης καὶ τὸ εὐθυμοῦν ἐν ἀπαντὶ καιρῷ καὶ παιγνιώδες, ἀχθεινόν δὲ καὶ τραχὺ μηδέποτε μήτε φωνῇ μὴτ’ ὀχεῖ, τῶν καλῶν καὶ ὤραιῶν ἐρασιμώτερον αὐτὸν ἄχρι γῆρος παρεῖχεν. Ἡς δὲ Θεόφραστος ἰστορεῖ, τὸν Ἀρχίδαμον ἐξημίωσαν οἱ ἔφοροι γῆμαντα γυναῖκα μικράν’ “οὐ γὰρ βασιλεῖς” ἐφασαν “ἀμιν, ἀλλὰ βασιλείδια γεννάσει.”
And the deformation of his leg, which in fact the flower of his blossoming body concealed, even this he bore easily and with humor, the first to joke and scoff at himself; and this was no small correction for his condition, but even made his ambition more conspicuous since he would abandon no labor or endeavor because of the lameness. And though we have no likeness of his person—for he himself did not want one, but even while dying he forbade there to be a molded or copied image of his body made—he was, however, said to have been short and unimpressive to behold, but his mirth, good spirit in every situation, and playfulness while never being wearisome or harsh either in conversation nor in countenance made him more desirable even into extreme old age than those who were gorgeous and in full bloom. But as Theophrastos records, the ephors fined Archidamos for marrying a small woman, “For you will produce for us not kings,” they said, “but little kinglets.”

Turning from internal traits to external ones, the narrator enters into a physical sketch of the youth. The sketch begins with the future-king’s lameness, presented to the narratee at the very opening of the sentence and without any actual physical descriptive details. That Agesilaos was “lame” is said as if a fact already established with the narratee. The lameness will play a further role in the story, as the narrator will soon tell it, but here used as a character, rather than a physical, trait. To the narratees, the physical lameness is presented as a point of weakness turned into a virtue and accentuates his *philotima* (used by the narrator as a defining trait of his subject). Moreover, the narrator does not mention the deformity until after describing how and why Lysander became enamored with the young Agesilaos and therefore the reader is made to duplicate the experience of the Spartan youths and especially of Lysander himself. The reader is presented with the positive character traits of Agesilaos and the note on his deformity is tucked into the narrative, much in the same way that it is obscured by his *φόρα*.

---

47 Spartan infants were presented to the gerousia for inspection and were rejected and killed if any infirmity was found (Plut. *Lyk.* 16.1-2). Cartledge (1987) 22 suggests the reason Agesilaos escaped this fate may have been that his deformity was not obvious and he passed the other tests of endurance, such as being bathed in wine, or even that he was spared because Sparta was experiencing a severe shortage of manpower. It is interesting that Plutarch, who writes about Spartan infanticide in the *Lykougos*, does not pause to delve into the problem of Agesilaos’ survival here.
The narrator begins Agesilaos’ physical description with a discussion of his deformity only after which he informs the narratee that there is no actual image preserved of him. The narrator and narratee suddenly become overt and dramatized by ἐξομέν, which calls attention to the chronological distance between the narrator and narratee on one side and the subject himself on the other. The narrator does not directly call attention to his writing activity, but exposes some of his dependence for his story upon the reference level (i.e. whether information was available or not).

After this abrupt announcement, the narratee is told why no image is preserved; this excuses the narrator for not being able to provide more description. The excuse comes in the form of a brief prolepsis that takes the narratee all the way to the subject’s deathbed (and generically, to the end of the story). To maintain authority the narrator cannot invent a description of the man’s physique that the narratee may know is fabricated, so instead of providing such a description, the narratee is presented with a prolepsis that both excuses the lack of description and illustrates Agesilaos’ character instead of his physique.

After disclosing that no image of Agesilaos was preserved, the narrator has little else to say about the physique of his subject (“he was short”) and even this is given indirectly with λέγεται. The narrator then enters into a catalogue of positive descriptions of the man’s temperament that once again stand in for physical description. These temperamental qualities, the narrator tells, made the man “more desirable” (ἐρασμῶτερον) into “extreme old age” (ἄχροι γήρως) than any young, well-formed man. Thus the end of the story is forecast (the subject will die old and apparently in good spirits).

---

48 Cf. Xen., Ages. 11.7 where he emphasizes that Agesilaos preferred to leave monuments of his mind rather than statues believing that latter appropriate for the rich and the former appropriate for the virtuous.
49 For discussion of this reference level, see the Introduction above and the Glossary.
The narrator closes the narrative on Agesilaos’ youth and physique with a rhetorical device like that used in the previous chapter: citing another, authoritative source to validate the narrative just presented. The narrator enters a focalization through Theophrastus, again signaled by the accusative clause, to relate an external analepsis about Archidamos. The external analepsis itself contains yet another focalization, in the form of a direct quote or character-text, through the ephors who fine Archidamos. The focalization through Theophrastos authorizes the narrator and, additionally, the focalization through the ephors supports the narrator’s version of Agesilaos being μικρός.

The character text of the ephors chiding and fining Archidamos for his choice of wife is a humorous segue into the next, more serious internal analepsis about Agis’ wife Timaia which the narrator will enter upon in the next section. More than that, however, the narrator may be aligning himself with his narratee, who, like the narrator, understands that the ephors as well as Theophrastos were misled by external trivialities, like appearance, while the narrator and narratee understand that Agesilaos’ greatness came from his internal characteristics.

3.1-3.2

Βασιλεύοντος δ’ Ἀγιδός ἦκεν Ἀλκιβιάδης ἐκ Σικελίας φυγάς εἰς Λακεδαίμονα· καὶ χρόνου οὕπω πολύν ἐν τῇ πόλει διάγονι αὐτίκα ἔσχε τῇ γυναικὶ τοῦ βασιλέως Τιμαία συνεῖναι. Καὶ τὸ γενηθεῖν παιδάριον ἔξ αὐτῆς οὐκ ἔφη γιγνώσκειν ὦ Ἀγις, ἀλλ’ ἔξ Ἀλκιβιάδου γεγονέναι. Τούτῳ δ’ οὐ πάνυ δυσκόλως τῇ Τιμαίαν ἐνεγκεῖν φησὶ Δοῦρις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ψιθυρίζουσαν οίκοι πρὸς τᾶς εἰλιστίας Ἀλκιβιάδην τὸ παιδίον, οὐ λεωτυχίδης, καλεῖν’ καὶ μέντοι καὶ τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην αὐτόν οὐ πρὸς ὑβρίν φάναι τῇ Τιμαίᾳ πλησίαζειν, ἀλλὰ φιλοτιμούμενον βασιλεύοντος Σπαρτάτας ὑπὸ τῶν ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγονότων. Διὰ ταύτα μὲν δὴ τῆς Λακεδαίμονος ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης ὑπεξῆλθε φοβηθεὶς τὸν Ἀγιν’ ὁ δὲ πᾶς τοῦ μὲν ἄλλου χρόνου ὑπόπτος ἦν τῷ Ἀγιδι καὶ γυναῖκι τιμήν οὐκ ἔχει παρ’ αὐτῷ, νοσοῦντι δὲ προσπεοῦν καὶ δακρύων ἔπεισεν ὑάν ἀποφήγει πολλῶν ἐναντίον.
During the time when Agis was king, Alkibiades came from Sicily to Lakedaimon as a fugitive; and he had not spent much time in the city when he incurred the charge of sleeping with the king’s wife, Timaia. And the little boy that was born to her Agis refused to recognize as his own, but as fathered by Alkibiades. But Timaia was not much upset by this, Douris says, but even whispering to her Helot maids within the home to call the little boy Alkibiades, not Leotychides; and moreover he says that even Alkibiades himself said that it was not in consequence of lust that he approached Timaia, but because he was ambitiously eager for the Lakedaimonians to be ruled by those descended from himself. And indeed, because of these things, Alkibiades secretly withdrew from Lakedaimon afraid of Agis. But as for the boy—although he was always viewed with suspicion by Agis and did not receive the honor of recognition from him, when Agis was laying sick, however, falling upon him and sobbing, he persuaded Agis to recognize him as his son in the presence of many.

The third chapter opens by setting narrative time for an embedded story (analepsis) within the forward chronology as “during the reign of Agis” when Alkibiades came from Sicily to Sparta as an exile in 415 B.C.E. The narration does not so much relate the story of the alleged affair of Alkibiades with Agis’ wife Timaia as disclose evidence for its occurrence through focalization. The occurrence of the affair itself is not what the narrator selects to present as important and so its narration is brief; it is the much later effects of the bastard’s questioned legitimacy that are important to this story. How Agis responded to claims against the virtue of his wife, how Leotychides was rejected initially by the king and only recognized at the latter’s sickbed, how this questionable legitimacy ultimately led to what is important to our story: the rejection of Leotychides as the new king in favor of the philonikos Agesilaos.

The background to the dispute for the throne is thus summarily given in the first two periods of the chapter. The connection between Alkibiades’ affair with Timaia and its relevance in the narrative of Agesilaos’ bios is not made immediately clear to the narratee. After setting the

---

50 For discussion of Alkibiades’ sojourn in Sparta, the affair with Timaia, his relationship with Agis, and his influence on Spartan policy see Westlake (1938), esp. 33-35. For Alkibiades’ amorous adventures, see Littman (1970) 263-276. Littman (1969) 269-277 rejects a date near 412 B.C.E. for the birth of Leotychides and posits a date near 425 B.C.E. instead; he therefore also rejects that Alkibiades could have been the father.
narrative time, the narrator states that Alkibiades incurred the charge of adultery with Timaia soon after his arrival in Sparta. The verity of the charge is not discussed; rather it is presented to the narratee as fact. Indeed the narratee is not invited to question the charge as he is informed up front that Agis himself would not recognize the child born to Timaia as his own, but thought it the son of Alkibiades.

Once this is established, the narrator presents an unverifiable anecdote about Timaia’s behavior upon becoming pregnant. This dramatized episode of Timaia whispering instructions to her household Helots to call the new child Alkibiades is given through the focalization of Duris. Again, the primary narrator avoids reporting such private gossip directly in order to maintain distance from his subjects and to characterize himself as authoritative. Using Duris as the source for the episode both corroborates the primary narrator’s statement of the affair as having occurred and allows the narratee to enter into the minds of Timaia and Alkibiades themselves. In order to present this sensational episode that includes Timaia’s whispers to her slaves and Alkibiades’ ambitions to have his offspring rule Sparta, the primary narrator has to transfer the narrative to another narrator-focalizer lest he risk loosing the authority he has established with his narratee. He does this by using three other focalizers to relate the episode: Duris, Timaia, and Alkibiades. Duris is employed to relate the private desires of Timaia and Alkibiades, both of whom provide their focalization of the event.51 The primary narrator-focalizer (narrator of bios) states the occurrence of the affair but gives its interpretation to a secondary narrator-focalizer (Duris), who, in turn, relates the private thoughts of Timaia, the tertiary narrator-focalizer (“Do

51 Cf. Plut. Alk. 23.7, where the same anecdote on Alkibiades’ corruption of Timaia is told, but in briefer fashion and without citing any sources. The narrator there states the occurrence in simple narrator text and thus allows no doubt that the affair took place. Complex narrator text is used to give the intentions of Alkibiades to have his offspring rule Sparta, but again Douris is not named as a source. The narratorial motivation in that passage is to characterize Alkibiades as an opportunist changling who adapts his habits to his surroundings rather than, as here, to establish the authenticity of the alleged affair.
not call him Leotychides, but after his father instead”). Likewise, the primary narrator-focalizer states the occurrence of the affair and then uses a secondary narrator-focalizer (Duris) to relate the private motives of Alkibiades, a tertiary narrator-focalizer. The reason Alkibiades seduced Timaia was because he was φιλοτιμούμενος; thus the narrator is using the same vocabulary for Alkibiades’ impetus for action that he uses to describe Agesilaos character. As the story will unfold, the narrator will demonstrate that philotimia, a central theme in the Bios, is capable of inspiring men to positive action, but can be destructive when taken to the extreme.

Once the narrator has used a secondary narrator (Duris) to relate the details of the affair between Alkibiades and Timaia and the birth of Leotychides, he resumes his voice to maintain forward chronology and summarily relate in simple text that Alkibiades left Sparta out of fear of Agis. Alkibiades exits the narrative as well and is no longer a part of the story. The narrative now shifts to focus on Leotychides and his rejection by Agis as legitimate and thus the analepsis’ relevancy to Agesilaos’ bios becomes far clearer at this point.

The narrator quickens the chronological pace with τὸν μὲν ἄλλον χρόνον, and the years of Leotychides’ relationship with his father, Agis, are given a broad summary treatment. “For the rest of time” Leotychides was suspect to his father and not recognized as legitimate. There is no support for this private estimation of Agis toward his son other than the narrator’s indicative statement. The μὲν of the first summary clause is balanced out in the δὲ clause that brings the chronology to a specific event: Agis’ deathbed recognition of Leotychides. The recognition event, however, will immediately be followed in the narrative by οὐ μὴν ἄλλακα thereby building tension and anticipation that the recognition will be refuted.

---

52 This word is not used to describe Alkibiades in the narration of this anecdote in Plut. Alk. 23.7; its employment here points to its thematic importance in the Agesilaos.
53 On the usage of οὐ μὴν ἄλλακα, see Denniston (1959), 28-30.
And yet, after Agis had died, Lysander, by now having subjugated the Athenians at sea and possessing the greatest authority in Sparta, promoted Agesilaos for the kingship on grounds that it did not belong to Leotychides since he was a bastard. And also, many of the other citizens—because of Agesilaos’ greatness and his fellow rearing and shared experience in the agoge—eagerly pursued Lysander’s plan and assisted him enthusiastically. Now there was in Sparta a man who divined oracles, Diopeithes, who was stuffed full of ancient oracles and considered to be wise and eminent in divine matters. This man said it was not right according to the gods that a lame man become ruler of the Lakedaimonians and he read this oracle at the trial:

Take heed forthwith, Sparta, although greatly boasting now, lest from you who are of sound foot there grows a lame kingship; for all too long will miseries afflict you unexpectedly and onward rolling waves of man-destroying war!

In response to this Lysander said that, if the Spartiates were entirely afraid of the oracle, then they must guard themselves against Leotychides; for it made no difference to the god if someone with a limp in his foot should be king, but if he was not legitimately born and not a Herakleid, then the kingship would be lame.

After the brief analepses of Alkibiades, the birth of Leotychides, and Agis’ deathbed recognition the narrator returns to the forward chronology of the story and begins to narrate the dispute for the throne. Before the dispute itself is related, however, Plutarch resets the narrative time to alert the reader to the resumption of the chronology with “after the death of Agis”.

33
Lysander, having entered the story in the previous chapter, is reintroduced to the narratees, but this time as a colossal figure of power rather than a young, awe-struck lover. It is Lysander whom the narrator signals as responsible for placing Agesilaos on the throne and Agesilaos seems to play little part in his own ascension. The narrative of the debate over the throne is dominated by and focuses almost completely on Lysander. This focus on Lysander’s essential role in Agesilaos’ ascension reiterates to the readers the strong relationship between the two men and further develops the theme of friendship that is central in this bios.

Lysander will be the central force in securing the throne for Agesilaos, but the narrator has already established (chapter 1) that Agesilaos was popular with the Spartan citizens because of his common rearing with them in the agoge. Here this popularity is reintroduced as a factor in Agesilaos’ ascension. The narrator summarily presents Agesilaos’ popular support as broadly due to his aretê and agoge education and that it was because of these features that the people supported Lysander’s plan to elevate Agesilaos to king. Thus the narrator has craftily brought together in this third chapter the topics he had selected for discussion in the first two chapters: Agesilaos’ agoge education, his philanthropia and philonikia, and his relationship with Lysander. In the third chapter the narrator makes these topics culminate into the pivotal elements that win the dispute for the kingship.

Diopeithes, whose name itself means “obedient to Zeus”, is introduced to the narratee with terminology that establishes the seer as an authoritative mouthpiece of the gods. He is also the only character in the story, either individually or collectively, who voices opposition to the ascension of Agesilaos at the trial (δίκη) to determine the next king. With the characterization of Diopeithes as sophos and perissos established, the quoted oracle that follows carries weight both among the Spartans, who now hesitate to declare Agesilaos king outright, and the narratees, who
now feel tension that Agesilaos’ reign may in fact bring great woe to Sparta. The narrator introduces to the story a sub-theme of Agesilaos’ complex relationship with the gods by elaborating upon the episode of the oracle as the main obstacle to his securing the throne.

The oracle episode is presented through several focalizations. The primary narrator introduces the extraordinary Diopeithes who condemns Agesilaos on religious grounds and then relates the oracle as his support. The refutation of Diopeithes’ interpretation by Lysander is presented after this as the closing argument. Lysander’s response is given full narration, like the oracle, to make it a significant element of the story which the narratee is to hold in his mind.

Indeed, this oracle and its interpretation will again be visited in the story through the focalization of the Spartans after the Theban invasion of Lakonia (chapter 30). The focalization in chapter 3 dramatizes the episode, although not to the degree as that of Xenophon Hell. 3. 3. 2-4, discussed below, and removes the primary narrator from the obligation of directly interpreting the oracle himself. The motivation for this narrative is shown by the narrator in the Synkrisis wherein he rejects Lysander’s interpretation and directly blames Agesilaos for unlawfully seizing the throne as well as Lysander for bulldozing the Spartans with his prestige.54

3.5.3

54 Ages.-Pomp. Synk 1.2: Ἀγησίλαος δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν ἐδοξε λαβεῖν οὔτε τὰ πρὸς θεοὺς ἀμετατος οὔτε τὰ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους, κρίνας νοθείας λεωτυχίδην, ὅπως αὐτοῦ ἀπέδειξεν ὁ ἀδελφὸς γυνίσιον, τὸν δὲ χρησιμὸν κατειρωνευόμενον τὸν περὶ τῆς χαλάτητος. “But Agesilaos seemed to acquire the kingship blameless neither in the eyes of gods nor men, since he accused Leotychides of being a bastard, whom his brother accepted as his legitimate son, and since he manipulated the oracle about his lameness.” It is interesting that the responsibility of “manipulating the oracle” is transferred from Lysander to Agesilaos in the Synkrisis. Ages.-Pomp. Synk 2.1: Ἀγησίλαος δὲ Λακεδαιμονίων ἀκούσας καὶ προειδότας οὐκ εἶπε φυλάξασθαι τὴν χαλή βασιλείαν. καὶ γὰρ εἰ μυρίακες ἡλέγχθη λεωτυχίδης ἀλλότριος εἶναι καὶ νόιθε, οὐκ ἂν ἰητόρεις Εὐρυπωντίδαι γυνίσιον καὶ ἀρτίποδα τῇ Σπάρτῃ βασιλεία παρασχεῖν, οἱ μὲ δὲ Ἀγησίλαος ἐπεσκότησε τῷ χρήσιμῳ Λύσανδρος. “But Agesilaos would not allow the Lakedaimonians to guard against “the lame kingship” even though they heard and knew about it beforehand. For even if Leotychides was proven ten thousand times to be an outsider and bastard, the Euryptidai would not have been unable to furnish Sparta with a legitimate and sound-footed king, had not Lysander obscured the oracle on behalf of Agesilaos.”
And Agesilaos said that even Poseidon bore witness to Leotychides’ bastard birth when he cast Agis from his bedroom with an earthquake; and after this more than ten months had passed before Leotychides was born.

An awkward episode of Agesilaos’ claim to Poseidon’s sign is forced into the end of the chapter to give some responsibility for winning (or coercing) the ascension to Agesilaos himself. Xenophon’s version in *Hell.* 3.3.2 of the ascension dispute makes this issue central to Agesilaos’ argument against Leotychides’ legitimacy where the debate between the two rivals on the significance of the earthquake episode is narrated in character text. There, it is the oracle that is added at the end of the ascension narrative to add weight to Agesilaos’ claim that Poseidon drove Leotychides’ father, Alkibiades, from Timaia’s bed chamber and that time bore witness that Leotychides was born in the tenth month after the earthquake. The man who was driven from the house by the earthquake is not, however, identified by name as Alkibiades in Xenophon’s version and this has led to confusion as to what this recorded episode actually meant.55 Nevertheless, Plutarch’s version has eradicated the difficulty of identifying the fleeing man and the witness who saw him by changing the anecdote slightly, but significantly. In our version, the narrator identifies the man cast from Timaia’s bed by an earthquake as Agis, not Alkibiades, and uses the argument of time differently in order to substantiate this. In Xenophon’s version, Leotychides was born “in the tenth month” (δεκάτω μηνὶ ἐγένετο) after the earthquake thereby certifying after-the-fact that the fleeing man is to be identified as the one who impregnated Timaia. In Plutarch’s version, Agis was cast from his wife’s bed by the earthquake and Leotychides was born “more than ten months” later (πλέον ἦ δέκα μηνῶν διελθόντων) and

55 See also Shipley (1997) 89-90 for interpretation and explanation of Xenophon’s version.
Agis therefore could not have been the father. Plutarch has therefore taken the anecdote from Xenophon and changed two important aspects of it, the identity of the fleeing man and the time of Leotychides’ birth, in order to clarify the argument used by Agesilaos. It is perhaps due to the confusion of the identities of the fleeing man and the witness in Xenophon’s version that Plutarch chose to subordinate the argument to that centered on the oracle. Nevertheless, since it was the basis of Agesilaos’ denouncement of Leotychides in the *Hellenika*, Plutarch may have chosen to include it in his story in an altered and abbreviated form.

That Plutarch used Xenophon’s *Hell*. 3. 3. 2-4 as a source for his narrative of the ascension is clear from a comparison of the two accounts. But the differences are just as obvious as well; the arrangement of the events in the episode in Plutarch’s version is the opposite of the arrangement in Xenophon’s. His narrative of the contest between Agesilaos and Leotychides begins with a direct dialogue between the two characters about the earthquake and the timing of Leotychides’ birth. After this dialogue, the narrator mentions but does not quote the oracle delivered by Diopeithes. It is only after this that the narrator introduces Lysander and his response to the oracle into the episode.

We can compare both of these narratives covering the ascension with that in Xenophon’s *Agesilaos* as well. As an encomium that avoids discussion of anything that might cast a shadow on the subject, Xenophon’s *Agesilaos* barely mentions the contest at all and completely removes Diopeithes’ oracle as well as Lysander from the narration of the ascension. Rather, it is the πόλις that decides Agesilaos should be king and judges him as “more irreproachable” (ἀνεπικλητότερον) simply on points of his γένος and ἀρετή.

By comparing the narration of the ascension in Plutarch’s *Agesilaos* with that of Xenophon and his *Hellenika* we can see the choices Plutarch made in the arrangement of the
material available. The arrangement here emphasizes Lysander’s role as powerful friend and the 
case made against Agesilaos by Diopeithes and the oracle. Agesilaos’ own involvement is 
practically a footnote. But if we compare the narration of the ascension in Plutarch’s Aesilaos 
with its discussion by the narrator in the Synchronic we can understand the narratorial motivation 
in the episode as well as the whole of Aesilaos. In it, the dramatized narrator objects to his own 
version of events as biased. Why narrate the episode this way if the narrator will only turn 
around and refute it later? Because the narrator’s aim is not to provide an accurate reconstruction 
of the historical circumstances of Agesilaos’ ascension, but to portray Agesilaos at this early 
point in the story as a man of aretē and dependant upon Lysander for his advancement. As the 
story progresses, the narrator will portray an Agesilaos whose own ambitions will not only 
complicate the image of Agesilaos with unflattering examples of his character in action, but also 
will sever the politically powerful bond between Agesilaos and Lysander.

4.1.1-4.1.2

Οὐτώ δὲ καὶ διὰ ταῦτα βασιλεὺς ἀποδείχθης ὁ Ἀγησίλαος εὐθὺς εἰς χρήματα τοὺς Ἀγιδούς, ὡς νόθου ἀπελάσας τὸν Λεωτυχίδαν. Ὄρων δὲ τοὺς ἀπὸ μητρὸς οἰκείους ἐπιείκεις μὲν οὐτας, ἰσχυρῶς δὲ πενομένους, ἀπένειμεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἱμίσεα τῶν χρημάτων, εὐνοιαν ἑαυτῷ καὶ δόξαν ἀντὶ φθόνου καὶ δυσμενείας ἐπὶ τῇ κληρονομίᾳ κατασκευαζόμενος.

So indeed, by these methods Agesilaos was appointed king and immediately took 
control of Agis’ wealth, having banished Leotychides as a bastard. Seeing that 
those of his mother’s household were good people, but had to toil laboriously for 
their living, he imparted to them half of the inheritance—fostering amity and a 
good reputation for himself in place of envy and enmity because of the 
inheritance.

The first sentence continues the forward chronology and segues from the narration of the 
ascension to a pause in the story’s chronology in order to develop the theme of Agesilaos as
philanthropon and demotikon. The short section addresses a question perhaps in the reader’s mind: how did Agesilaos assuage any animosity towards himself after the ascension? He gave away half the estate inherited from Agis to τοὺς ἀπὸ μητρὸς οἰκείους. The narratorial motivation of including this event is multi-faceted. It smoothly takes the narrative from the chronological event of the ascension to the narrative theme of Agesilaos’ congeniality and how that served to disrupt the Spartan constitution by removing contention from the relationship between ephors and the kings. It also is an incident included by Xenophon and warrants a brief discussion on its historicity.56

Scholars have argued over whether Agesilaos gave the inherited wealth to his own mother or the mother of Leotychides.57 Shipley argues that the narration here would not make sense if Agesilaos gave the money to his own mother as that would seem not to quell any jealousies against Agesilaos after his successful challenge to the throne.58 He believes that what is meant is that, although Agesilaos expelled Leotychides from Sparta as a bastard, he nonetheless shared Agis’ wealth with Leotychides’ (supposedly adulterous) mother, Timaia. By this move Agesilaos would be able to silence opposition to his seizure of the throne. However this too makes little sense. Why would Timaia’s family, the wife of the recent king, be worthy but poor and why should the adulterous wife’s family be rewarded? The Greek suggests that is was in fact with Agesilaos’ own mother’s family that he shared the inheritance. There is no indication of a switch in subject that would suggest that the ἀπὸ μητρὸς οἰκείους refers to Leotychides rather than Agesilaos and no third-person pronoun modifies μητρὸς that would suggest the reference is to Leotychides and not Agesilaos. Regardless, the narrator does not need to clarify the incident in order to employ it in his story. It is enough to demonstrate to the

---

56 Xen. Ages. 4.5.
57 For property ownership in classical Sparta by women see Hodkinson (2004) 103-136.
narratee with this event that Agesilaos was indeed demotikos and philanthropos. The episode provides the narrator with a convenient segue from a chronological event to a commentary on the effects of Agesilaos’ character upon Sparta’s fortunes.

4.1.3-4.4

“Ο δὲ φησιν ὁ ζευοφῶν, ὅτι πάντα τῇ πατρίδι πειθόμενος ἔσχε πλείστον, ὡστε ποιεῖν ὁ βουλευτὴς, τοιούτων ἦστι. Τῶν ἐφόρων ἦν τότε καὶ τῶν γεροντῶν τὸ μέγιστον ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ κράτος, ὅπως ἐνὶ ἔνιαυτῶν ἀρχουσι μόνον, οἱ δὲ γέροντες διὰ βίου ταῦτην ἔχουσι τὴν τιμήν, ἐπὶ τῷ μὴ πάντα τοῖς βασιλεύσις ἔξεινα συνταχθέντες, ὡς ἐν τοῖς περὶ Λυκούργου γέγραπται. Διὸ καὶ πατρικήν τινα πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ παλαιοῦ διετέλου ἐύθες οἱ βασιλεῖς φιλονικίζοντας ταῖς διαφοράς παραλαμβάνοντες. Ο δ’ Ἀγησίλαος ἐπὶ τὴν ἐναυτιαν ὁδὸν ἔλθε, καὶ τὸ πολεμεῖν καὶ τὸ προσκρούειν αὐτοῖς ἔσασα ἐθεράπευε, πάσης μὲν ἀπ’ ἐκείνων πράξεως ἀρχόμενος, ἐδὲ κληθείς, βάπτων ἤ βάδην ἐπειγόμενος, ὅσκις δὲ τύχοι καθίμενος ἐν τῷ βασιλικῷ θόκῳ καὶ χρηματίζων, ἔπισσοι τοῖς ἐφόροις ὑπεξανίστατο, τῶν δ’ εἰς τὴν γερουσίαν ἀεὶ κατατατμισών ἐκάστῳ χλαῖναι ἐπεμπεὶ καὶ βοῦν ἄριστον. Εἰ δὲ τοῦτων τιμᾶν δοκῶν καὶ μεγαλύνειν τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς ἐκείνων ἀρχῆς ἑλάνθανεν αὐξῶν τὴν ἐαυτοῦ δύναμιν καὶ τῇ βασιλείᾳ προστίθεις μέγεθος ἐκ τῆς πρὸς ἐαυτὸν εὐνοίας συγχωρούμενον.

But as to what Xenophon said—that by obeying the fatherland in every way he gained immense authority so that he could do as he wished—there is the following. At that time the ephors and the gerontes possessed the most sovereignty, the former were in power for only one year, while the latter held their same office for life, both having been set up so that not all power would lay with the kings, as I have written in my work on Lykourgos. Because of this, there continued straight down from ancient times a kind of competitiveness and opposition with them that the kings inherited. But Agesilaos took the opposite path and giving up the warring and colliding against them, he courted them; beginning all of his undertakings after consulting them, and if summoned, he hurried to them on the double, and whenever he happened to be seated in his royal throne and conducting business, he would rise if the ephors came in; and to each of those when they were appointed life-members of the gerousia he sent a cloak and bull as a mark of honor. Seeming from these actions to honor and exalt the honor of their office, he escaped any notice of increasing his own power and connecting to the kingship a greatness that was agreeably given because of the good feelings for him.
Chapter 4 began with the chronological opening that switched to a specific example of Agesilaos’ *philanthropia* after gaining the throne. The narrator then jumps from this singular event to a summary of Agesilaos’ behavior during his entire reign that he interprets as resulting in the subservience of the ephors and *gerousia* to Agesilaos while king. In order to make this transition fit smoothly into the narrative, the narrator identifies Xenophon as the originator of the idea that Agesilaos did all the ephors and *gerousia* wished in order that he might do all he wished in return. By focalizing the idea through a contemporary and authoritative source, the narrator is absolved from having to present and defend the idea as his own and can instead continue on to elaborate upon the idea with summarized examples of behavior.

It is after the focalization of Xenophon that the narrator introduces what will become a governing theme of the narrator’s interpretation of the fabula in this story: the competition between Spartan branches of constitutional power as a microcosmic mirror of competition between *neikos* and *eros* in the universe. By the narrator’s estimation, the Spartan constitution as Lykourgos intended it requires competition between the *gerousia* and, especially, the ephors and kings in order to remain strong. In the next chapter, the narrator will discuss this necessary competition in the broadest of contexts by elaborating upon the Pre-Socratic concept of universal *harmonia*.

The narratorial motivation for this chapter is to introduce and give context to the *harmonia* theme. The narrator accomplishes this by starting from a concrete chronological event that closes the topic of the ascension from the previous chapter and moves to the theme of Agesilaos’ *philanthropia*. The example here of Agesilaos’ eagerness to please early in the chronology makes a transition to a summary estimation of Agesilaos’ entire reign as focalized

60 On the role of Spartan kings see Thomas (1974) 257-270.
through Xenophon, which supports the image of an amiable Agesilaos. This is immediately followed by the narrator in turn offering to back up Xenophon’s estimation with specific examples as evidence that carries the narrative forward. Before this evidence is provided, however, the narrator gives an explanation of the offices of ephors and gerousia as well as the purpose of the offices as intended by Lykourgos. This explanation is presented to the narratee as fact and is to be accepted as such by him as a basic principle in order for the narrator to successfully use it to frame his entire work. The narrator further supports this explanation (albeit by circular rhetoric) by referring the narratee to the implied author’s own works on Lykourgos.61

The narrator then gives the examples that depict Agesilaos as showing the ephors and gerousia, with whom he should be at variance, respect and obedience and thus disrupting with excessive political philia the balance in government created by φιλονικία. The narrator finally states what he had set out to demonstrate in this chapter: Agesilaos’ sowing and reaping of benefits from friendship increased his power to the point that it had an irreversible detrimental effect on the Spartan system.

5.1-5.2

Ἐν δὲ ταῖς πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους πολίτας ὁμολίαις ἑχθρός ἢν ἀμεμπτότερος ἢ φίλος. Τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ἑχθροὺς ἀδίκοις οὐκ ἐξελπτεῖ, τοὺς δὲ φίλους καὶ τὰ μὴ δίκαια συνέπραττε. Καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἑχθροὺς ἤσχυνετο μὴ τιμᾶν κατορθοῦντας, τοὺς δὲ φίλους οὐκ ἤδυνατο ψέγειν ἀμαρτάνοντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ βοηθῶν ἡγάλλητο καὶ συνεξαμαρτάνοναν αὐτοῖς· οὐδὲν γὰρ ᾦτο τῶν φιλικῶν ὑποργημάτων αἰσχρόν εἶναι. Τοῖς δ’ αὖ διαφόροις πταίσασι πρώτος συνοχθήμονος καὶ δενθεῖται συμπράττων προθύμως ἐδημαγγέλγει καὶ προσήγειτο πάντας. Ὁρῶντες οὖν οἱ ἑφοροὶ ταύτα καὶ φοβοῦμενοι τὴν δύναμιν ἐξημίωσαν αὐτόν, αἰτίαν ὑπειπότες, ὅτι τοὺς κοινοὺς πολίτας ἰδίους κτάται.

And in his interactions with the other citizens, he was a more blameless enemy than friend. For while he did not unjustly injure his enemies, he did, however,

assist his friends in wrong-doings. And while he was ashamed not to honor his enemies who were successful, he could not, however, censure his friends who went amiss, but he even took delight in helping them and joining in on their misdeeds; for he thought there was no shame in services done for a friend. And on the other hand, being the first to commiserate with his opponents when they stumbled and eagerly bringing aid to those who asked for it, he curried favor and won over all. And so the ephors, observing these things and fearing his power, fined him, laying the charge that he was acquiring the public citizens as his own.

In chapter 5 the narrator continues developing the theme of Agesilaos’ philanthropia, but adds to it an element of excess that disrupts harmonia. He also broadens the focus of the analysis of the king’s philanthropia from his relations with the five ephors, to his relationships with the citizens, to that with the generalized philoi and echthroi. By the end of the chapter the narrator’s analysis will encompass the negative effects of excessive harmonia on the entire Spartan system and how Agesilaos’ immoderate philanthropia created a political environment that was contrary to the natural order of the universe. It was this imbalance that Agesilaos created with his relationships that brought Sparta out of harmony with the Greeks and ended its supremacy.

The narrator opens the chapter with a seemingly eulogistic summary of Agesilaos’ relationships with friends and enemies that is reminiscent of Xenophon’s encomium. But what follows next is a complex definition of what the narrator means by his simple statement. The narrator gives an extreme characterization of Agesilaos that depicts him as overly gracious to enemies and conniving with friends.

Agesilaos’ relationships and treatment of friends and enemies is one of the central themes of this story. The extreme characterization that he ἔχθρος ἤν ἀμεμπτότερος ἢ φίλος will be developed over the remainder of the bios, however it will be imperfectly developed. Readers will

---

62 Xenophon Agesilaos 6.8: Τοιγαρούν τοισιτα ποιῶν τοίς μὲν πολεμίοις δεινός ἤν, τοῖς δὲ φίλοις βάρρος καὶ ῥώμην ἐνεποίειν, ὥστε ἀκαταφρόνητος μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν ἔχθρων διετέλεσεν, ἄξιόν δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν πολίτων, ἀμεμπτός δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν φίλων, πολυεστότατος δὲ καὶ πολυπαινετοτάτος ὑπὸ πάντων ἀνθρώπων. “Therefore, by doing such things he was a terror to enemies, while an encouragement to his friends and he gave them strength. As a result, he continued to be never despised by his enemies, while unpunished by his citizens, never blamed by his friends, and exceedingly loved and praised by all men.”
be presented with episodes reflecting these relationships in which the narrator will criticize Agesilaos for being a cruel enemy and spiteful friend, quite the opposite of what he is telling readers here. Indeed, in the *Synkrasis* the narrator will harshly condemn Agesilaos for unjustly casting aside friends (*Synk.* 1.2), transgressing justice for the sake of lust or personal relationships (*Synk.* 1.4), and acting mercilessly towards his enemies (*Synk.* 3.2). The narrator reserves his blunt criticism until the *Synkrasis*. The analysis of Agesilaos’ relationships in the *Bios* will seem inconsistent because of this intentional reservation of opinion during the course of the story. The narrator’s desired effect in the *Bios* differs from that in the *Synkrasis*; in the story itself, the narrator is constructing an *ethos* from the episodes known from the figure’s life, inconsistencies in character are left unresolved rather than discussed in order to produce a somewhat complex, but clear presentation of a type of man. In the *Synkrasis*, the narrator allows himself much freer rein to represent his own opinion of the man’s character and actions; the narratee suddenly is presented with a rather different, and quite darker, assessment of Agesilaos. The reader receives a subtle hint of the narrator’s reserved opinion of the potential harm of Agesilaos’ personal relationships. This is conveyed through the focalization of the ephors, who provide the narratees the interpretation of Agesilaos’ actions as threatening and their charge of disruption of the constitution by ὁτι τοὺς κοινοὺς πολίτας ἰδίους κτάται. By including this

---

63 *Synk.* 1. 2: …Ἀγησίλαος δὲ Λύσανδρον ἐκ τῆς τυχούσης προφάσεως ύπεξέρριψε καὶ καθύβρισε. …while Agesilaos had cast out Lysander on a chance pretext.” *Synk.* 1. 4: Ἀγησίλαος δὲ Σφοδρίαν μὲν ἐφ’ ὅλις Ἀθηναίοις ἡδίκησεν ἀποθανεῖν ὀφείλοντα τῷ τοῦ παιδὸς ἔρωτι χαρίζομενος ἐξηράσασε, Φοιβίδα δὲ Θηβαίοις παρασπονύσαντες δήλος ἢν δὲ αὐτὸ τὸ ἀδίκημα προθύμος βοηθῶν. “But Agesilaos snatched Sphodrias away from the death he was due to die for the wrongs he did to the Athenians because he wanted to indulge his son’s desire, while when Phobidas broke the treaty with the Thebans, it was clearly because of the wrong-doing itself that he eagerly helped him.” *Synk.* 3. 2: οἴμαι δὲ καὶ τῇ πρὸς τοὺς πολέμους ἐπιείκείᾳ διαφέρον τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦ ἄνδρος. ὦ μὲν γὰρ ἀνδραποδίσεσθαι Θῆβας καὶ Μεσσήνην ἐξοικείσασθαι βουλέουσας, ἢν μὲν ὀμόκληρον τῆς πατρίδος, ἢν δὲ μητρόπολιν τοῦ γένους, παρ’ ὀυδὲν ἤλθε τὴν Σπάρτην ἀποβαλεῖν, ἀπέβαλε δὲ τὴν ἤγεμονίαν. “But I also think that regarding fairness towards enemies the one man differs from the other. For one, by wanting to reduce Thebes to slavery and depopulate Messene, the former being a coheir of his father’s line, while the latter was a mother-city of his race, came close to losing Sparta and did lose the hegemony.”

64 Cawkwell (1976) 63 and no. 1 doubts this claim of prosecution by the ephors as akin to the Theophrastos reference in 2.6 that Archidamos was fined for marrying a short woman.
event at the end of the chapter, the narrator both validates his presentation of Agesilaos’ excess with a historical event and interprets this excess as threatening while maintaining his authoritative distance by using focalization.\(^5\) In addition to providing authoritative distance from pronouncing direct judgment on Agesilaos’ actions, the narratorial focalization through the ephors may suggest that the narrator regards the ephors’ charge as disingenuous and does not ascribe to the notion that Agesilaos was transforming public citizens into his personal support base.

The narrator has established that Agesilaos’ philia was excessive and that the ephors saw this as a threat to the Spartan constitution. The narrator’s commentary continues through the rest of the chapter as he goes on to report what happens when there is too much philia: harmonia is destroyed—be it in government or in the universe.

5.3-5.4

\[\text{Καθάπερ γάρ οἱ φυσικοὶ τὸ νείκος οἴονται καὶ τὴν ἔριν, εἰ τῶν ὅλων ἔξαιρεθείς, στηνὶ μὲν ἀν τὰ υἱόνια, παύσασθαι δὲ πάντως τὴν γένεσιν καὶ κίνησιν ὑπὸ τῆς πρὸς πᾶντα πάντων ἀρμονίας, οὕτως ἔοικεν ὁ Λικσωνίκος νομοθέτης ὑπέκαμψε τῆς ἀρτῆς ἐμβαλὼν εἰς τὴν πολιτείαν τὸ φιλότιμον καὶ φιλότιμον, άεὶ τινα τοῖς ἄγαθοις διαφορὰν καὶ ἄμιλλαν εἶναι πρὸς ἀλλήλους βουλόμενος, τὴν δ’ ἀνθυπείκουσαν τῷ ἀνελέγκτῳ χάριν ἁργήν καὶ ἀνανταχόνιστον οὐσαν οὐκ ὅρθῳς ὀμόνοιαν λέγεσθαι. Τούτο δ’ ἀμελεί συνεωρικάναι καὶ τὸν Ἄμηρον οἴονται τῖνες οὐ γὰρ ἂν τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα χαίροντα ποιήσας τῷ Ὀδυσσέως καὶ τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως εἰς λοιδορίαν προσαχθέντων ἐκπάγλοις ἐπέδεισεν, εἰ μὴ μέγα τοῖς κοινοίς ἄγαθον ἐνόμιζεν εἶναι τὸν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ζῆλον καὶ τὴν διαφορὰν τῶν ἀριστώς. Ταῦτα μὲν οὖν οὔκ ἂν οὕτως τὸς αὐτῶς συγχωρήσειν· αἱ γὰρ ὑπερβολαὶ τῶν φιλονικῶν χαλέπαι ταῖς πόλεσι καὶ μεγάλους κινδύνους ἐχουσαι.}\]

\(^5\) Shipley (1997) 109: “…at the conclusion of the account…Plutarch uses the ephors’ fine imposed on Agesilaos to present criticism indirectly: Agesilaos achieved the power which the ephors feared by the innovatory pursuit of support and favour and by exploiting his own special qualities, τὸ δημοτικὸν καὶ φιλόνθρωπον…not by competition… Plutarch now explains (γάρ)—and justifies—the ephors’ punishment of Agesilaos by his own indictment that he was weakening the Lykourgan constititue.”
For just as *physikoi* maintain, that if contention and strife were expelled from all things, then the heavens would stand still and the genesis and movement of everything would be halted because of the harmony of everything in relation to everything, and so it seems that the Spartan Lawgiver was of this mind when mixing into the constitution the desire for superiority and recognition as the fodder for excellence, wishing there always to be a kind of opposition among the best men and a grappling with one another for primacy, and that kindness which yields without refutation—being useless and unearned—is incorrectly labeled as “like-mindedness”. And this is the view that some think even Homer doubtlessly held; for he would not have made Agamemnon enjoy Odysseus and Achilles being carried away in abusing each other with “vehement words”, if he did not think it was a great good for the rest of the men that there be rivalry with one another and variance among the leading men. And yet as such, one ought not absolutely yield and assent to these things; for excessive ambition is a burden for cities and brings great dangers.

The pause continues as the narrator introduces the Pre-Socratic concept of a harmonic universe through the focalization of generalized *physikoi*. The transition to the discussion of this concept from the previous section on Agesilaos and the ephors before is made by *καθαρπ*.

This also signals the narrator’s agreement with the *physikoi’s* concept that he is about to narrate and which the narratees are to accept as corroborated fact.

The narrator goes on to associate the *physikoi’s* philosophy with Lykourgos’ political philosophy (and thus brings the digression into direct relevance to the story) through the secondary and impersonal focalization “it seems.” The word gives a little distance between the narrator and the inference of Lykourgos’ intentions and also casts the inference as being an obvious deduction. The impersonalized deduction presents a concept of a harmonious Spartan constitution as focalized through Lykourgos. The narrator uses this indirect focalization of Lykourgos to present his point and motivation for the present narrative: Lykourgos introduced ambition and contention to the constitution because without them a false harmony would be created that in reality was nothing more than complacency. The narrator thus brings together the

---

67 For the relationship of the rhetras to the concept of kosmos, see Bringmann (1975) 513-538.
focalized concepts he just presented into one interpretation that bears direct relevance upon the story: Agesilaos brought complacency, not unity (ὅμονια), to Sparta and this is will destroy it.

The narrator validates the parallelism he draws between a harmonious universe and harmonious Spartan polity by bringing Homer into the narrative.68 “Some people” think Homer agreed with this concept of *neikos* as essential to balance, which is why he made Agamemnon, like Lykourgos, pleased at the quarrel between Odysseus and Achilles. (Agamemnon will become an important element of the story later when the narrator draws parallels between the hero and Agesilaos.) There are four levels of focalization here: the primary narrator-focalizer transitions to a secondary narrator-focalizer (τινες), who give distance, and it turn morphs into a tertiary narrator-focalizer (Homer), who provides authority, and supplies the fourth narrator-focalizer (Agamemnon), who provides the reaction to the example quarrel. The primary narrator-focalizer then supplies his interpretation of the tertiary narrator-focalizer’s motivation; this in turn supports the primary narrator-focalizer’s own motivation. Thus, there is a circular validation of narrative through focalization.69

Following these embedded focalizations, the narrator then immediately become overt and communicates caution to the narratee lest he in turn misinterpret the narrator’s intention as support for excessive *neikos*. The narrator balances out the chapter by returning to the definition of true *harmonia* as consisting of both *philia* and *neikos* while false *harmonia* has too much of one or the other. Agesilaos’ *philia* created false harmony in Sparta which ultimately ruined the

---


69 NF is narrator-focalizer abbreviated and the subscript numbers indicate the focalization level (primary, secondary, tertiary, etc.); borrowed from de Jong (1987) *passim.*
hegemony of the city. Likewise a *polis* that was excessively *philoneikos* would be out of balance and ultimately eroded.\textsuperscript{70}

The narrator will go on to all these interpretations and parallels in the rest of his story and here alerts the reader to be watchful of coming examples that will illustrate this. We end the first section (chaps 1-5) with a foreshadowing of where the narrator will be leading the story and the principles that will govern the subject’s actions. Agesilaos abused his characteristic *philanthropia* and by creating a false harmony with his excessive *philia* he led Sparta towards destruction. His abuse of *philanthropia* was spurred by his *philonikia* and because of the latter, he used the former to take *philia* beyond a moderate level; this created a false harmony of excessive *philia* that results in complacency to Agesilaos’ ambition.

\textsuperscript{70} Hillman (1994) 273-274 convincingly shows in his examination of the narrative of the *Pompey* that the other half of this argument (what happens when there is *too* much competition) is in the *Pompey*. The downfall of the republic of Rome is the result of what happens when excessive competition is given prominence in politics. This correlation between the two halves of the argument lends positive proof that the two *Lives* were to be read as one.
Part Two: chapters 6-8

The next three chapters treat only the fabula year of 396 B.C.E. and recount the preparations for the campaign against Persia, Agesilaos’ arrival in Asia, and the commencement of his expedition. Much of the narrative, however, deals not with battles and movements, but with Agesilaos’ treatment of friends, enemies, and allies. The narrative for the first three chapters of this section delves more deeply into the theme of Agesilaos as philos—particularly as philos of Lysander. Lysander is shown to be the great benefactor of Agesilaos’ rise to power, but the excessive philonikia inherent in both men destroys their strong philia.

The narrator returns the story from his lengthy commentary on the Spartan constitution and the components of cosmic harmony to fabula events that occurred after Agesilaos’ ascension. The first event after Agesilaos has secured the throne that the narrator selects for inclusion in the story is the news of Persian preparations of a navy. This becomes the point of departure for the narrative of chapters 6-15 that will treat Agesilaos’ activities in Asia Minor. Although the campaign only lasted a little over two years of Agesilaos’ total reign of nearly forty years, the events of the expedition constitute some twenty-five percent of the story time.

Instead of immediately launching into a narrative of sequences of events and actions undertaken by Agesilaos against the Persians in Asia Minor, the narrator spends much story time revealing the actorial motivations of Lysander and Agesilaos for undertaking the campaign and exploring the complexities of the relationship between these two powerful men. Additionally, the narrator includes a lengthy episode at Aulis that serves two main functions in the story; the narrator uses it to strengthen the comparison between Agesilaos and Agamemnon, and even more significantly, he crafts the events at Aulis to plant the seed for the theme of Agesilaos’ hatred of Thebes that will dominate the second half of the story.
While Agesilaos had still recently succeeded to the throne, some men who had come from Asia reported that the Persian king was preparing with an enormous fleet to drive the Lakedaimonians from the sea.

The narrator begins with a genitive absolute that briefly picks up the chronology of events after Agesilaos’ appointment as king and marks a shift forward in the chronology. The narrator then quickly moves to the news on Persian naval preparations; this is the first event of Agesilaos’ kingship that the narrator relates; it ushers in the story of Agesilaos’ reign. This first sentence establishes the temporal setting and circumstances for the coming episodes that will elaborate with upon the themes of *philia* and *philotimia* with specific events.

The narrator presents to external (the reader) and internal (those who heard the news) narratees the news of Persia’s naval preparations and the interpretation of the King’s intentions through the embedded focalization of “certain men from Asia”. The narrator does not identify, as Xenophon does, Herodas as the source. In Xen. *Hell.* 3.3.4 the Syracusan Herodas is clearly identified as the informer of Persian naval preparations. Herodas was working in Phoenicia with a shipowner and thus witnessed the warships being constructed. The *Hellenika* episode continues with Herodas sailing to Greece in order to tell the Lakedaimonians that the Persian king and Tissaphernes were preparing a fleet, but that he did not know where the fleet would sail (Ὥποι δὲ οὐδὲν ἔφη εἰδέναι). In the version of the episode in our *Agesilaos*, all of this is condensed into “some men who had come from Asia reported that the Persian king was preparing with an enormous fleet to drive the Lakedaimonians from the sea.” The narrator’s motivation is to
present the impetus that set in motion the Lakedaimonian invasion of Asia, not to present a
detailed accounting of how the Persian preparations were discovered and reported; the fact that
they were reported by men who had come from Asia is sufficient for the narrator to move the
story forward.

There is a significant ellipsis of events from historical (fabula) time between Agesilaos’
ascension and the news from Asia. Although it was also completely omitted from Xenophon’s
Agesilaos, we know from his Hellenika that Agesilaos was faced with a serious threat at home
before he began his campaign in Asia Minor. According to Hellenika 3.3.4-11, in the time
between the ascension and departure for Asia there was a conspiracy in Sparta led by Kinadon
which threatened widespread revolt in Lakonia and against which Agesilaos and the ephors took
decisive action.⁷¹ This event is not even hinted at in Plutarch’s Agesilaos. The reason for
omitting the Kinadon conspiracy, as Shipley has also observed, may have been twofold.⁷² Firstly,
as Xenophon records it, the conspiracy was disclosed to Agesilaos by a seer who was
interpreting sacrifices for him, but the actual exposure of the plot by an informant was made to
the ephors and it was the ephors who took decisive action against those involved. Thus,
Agesilaos’ involvement was more indirect and was likely omitted by our narrator as something
which would not elucidate Agesilaos’ character in action. Secondly and more to the point, the
narrator did not want to hint at Spartan internal dissent at this early point in the story, preferring
instead to delay discussion of such dissent until later in the narrative when Sparta’s decline
becomes a central theme.

The omission of the lengthy episode from our story elucidates possible narratorial
motivations; including the threat of revolution at this point in the narrative, directly after our

narrator has gone to elaborate lengths to construct an image of Agesilaos as “the most harmonious king,” would destroy this characterization. It is too early in the story, wherein the subject has not quite yet reached the pinnacle of power from which he will gradually slide, to introduce a theme of dissatisfaction among Lakonians. Moreover, the narrator has portrayed Lysander as the dominant agent at this point in the story; he is responsible for bringing Agesilaos to the throne just as he will be the one responsible for securing command of the Greek forces in Asia for Agesilaos. According to Xenophon’s account, Agesilaos and the ephors took decisive action against the conspiracy and thus Agesilaos is represented as independently decisive in crisis at an early point in his reign. Should this episode be included in such a way at this early point in the *Bios*, it would have disrupted the portrayal of Agesilaos as almost dependant on the advice of his influential friend, Lysander, at the beginning of his reign. The only conspiracies against the Spartan system that will be developed in this story will be those of Lysander in the following chapters and of disenfranchised citizens during the Theban invasion of Lakonia in chapter 32. Moreover, Lysander’s plotting will result directly from the humiliation he is about to suffer at the hands of Agesilaos in the next chapter, rather than a general dissatisfaction of the lower social classes of Lakonia.\(^73\)

6.1.2-6.2.1

\[ Ο\] δὲ Λύσανδρος ἐπιθυμῶν αὐθεντήσει ἀναπόστασις καὶ βοηθήσαι τοῖς φίλοις, οὕς αὐτὸς μὲν ἁρχόντας καὶ κυρίους τῶν πόλεων ἀπελίπει, κακῶς δὲ χρώμενοι καὶ βιαιῶς τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐξέπεπλεροῦν ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ ἀπέθυμησαν, ἀνέπεισε τὸν Ἀγησίλαον ἐπιθέσθαι τῇ στρατείᾳ καὶ προπολεμῆσαι τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀπωτάτῳ διαβάντα καὶ φθάσαντα τὴν τοῦ βαρβάρου παρασκευήν. Ἀμα δὲ τοῖς ἐν Ἁσια φίλοις ἐπέστελλε πέμπτειν εἰς Λακεδαίμονα καὶ στρατηγὸν Ἀγησίλαον αἵτεισθαι.

And as Lysander was itching to set out for Asia again and help his friends, whom he had left behind to be leaders and masters over their cities, but—since they used their authority wickedly and violently—had been driven away by their citizens and even killed, he persuaded Agesilaos to undertake the expedition and make war on behalf of Hellas crossing far off to the other side and anticipate the preparations of the barbarian. And at the same time he wrote to enjoin his friends in Asia to send men into Lakedaimonia to ask that Agesilaos be commander.

Like the narration of the ascension, Lysander dominates the narration of this episode as well. The narrator has already established Lysander as “the most powerful man in Sparta” (μέγιστος ἐν Σπάρτῃ δυνάμενος) in chapter 3 and so only needs to build off of this portrayal here to depict him as the motivator behind Agesilaos’ command over the Greek expedition into Asia. In the present story, it logically follows that Lysander would be the aggressive force promoting an expedition, as well as the one to persuade Agesilaos to lead the expedition; and he was equally as instrumental in securing the command for Agesilaos as he was in securing the throne. In this version of the episode, Lysander is the primary force in convincing Agesilaos to support the expedition and the Spartans to support Agesilaos as commander. These are the same circumstances as those narrated in the Hellenika (3.4.1-2); Lysander was the motivator who persuaded Agesilaos and the Spartans. In Xenophon’s Agesilaos (1.6-7), however, the king himself is the aggressive force; he is independently motivated by a desire for a panhellenic preemptive offense against a possible Persian invasion. Xenophon’s encomiastic narrative ends the expedition with the positive judgment of Agesilaos’ expedition and emphasizes that Agesilaos’ panhellenic conquest of Persia was only interrupted because Agesilaos dutifully answered the ephors’ call for aid.74

Shipley postulates that the ultimate ineffectiveness of the expedition to free the Asiatic Greeks, much less to subdue the Persian King, motivated both Xenophon in his Hellenika and

74 Xen. Ages. 1.36.
Plutarch here to transfer the impetus for invasion to the more controversial Lysander. Thus, by portraying Lysander as the motivating force who persuades both Agesilaos and the Spartans to undertake the expedition under the pretext of a panhellenic offensive, responsibility for the ultimately fruitless expedition lay only partly with Agesilaos. Moreover, up to this point in our story, the narrator has been portraying Lysander as the dominant force while Agesilaos, not yet independent of Lysander, is compliant. To present Agesilaos as the instigator of the Asian invasion would disrupt the story’s progression and dull the climatic scene between Lysander and Agesilaos in the coming chapters where the king begins to act independently and breaks free from the influence of his advisor (chapters 7-8).

Motivation for the expedition to Asia is focalized through Lysander (Ὅ δὲ Λύσανδρος ἐπιθυμῶν αὖθις εἰς Ἀσίαν ἀποσταλῆναι καὶ βοηθῆσαι τοῖς φίλοις). The narratees were just informed that the Persians were preparing an attack on the Lakedaimonians, but then the narrator relates that while that may have been the public reason, the private reason for the expedition lay wholly with Lysander. The narrator presents the focalization (“he was eager to go out and help his friends”) and then explains the focalization with a summary internal analepsis: his friends were those whom he had set up in various cities as dekarchies and whom the citizens now have driven out from their cities or executed.

Immediately after the narrator explains Lysander’s internal motives, he relates Lysander’s external action: he persuades (ἀνέπειος) Agesilaos to take command and anticipate the Persians. In other words, Lysander stimulates the king to action with the same goad—the Persian threat which began this episode—that will be used to urge the Spartans to elevate Agesilaos to command of the expedition. It is his own philoi, however, whom Lysander, the engineer of this expedition, intends to aid and to whom he turns for support.

And so coming forward before the assembly, Agesilaos said he would undertake the war if they would give him thirty Spartiate commanders and advisors, as well as two thousand chosen enfranchised citizens and a force of allies numbering six thousand. And with Lysander lending his aid, they enthusiastically voted for all this and straightaway sent out Agesilaos with thirty Spartiates, of whom Lysander was the foremost, not only because of his reputation and influence, but also because of the friendship of Agesilaos, to whom it seemed a greater boon than the kingship that Lysander had gained for him this command.

Agesilaos receives the nomination for the command and his request for thirty Spartiates and troops without incident. This nomination is hardly a surprise as the narrator has already established Agesilaos’ accord with the ephors, gerousia, and fellow Spartiates; but what the narrator makes far more significant is the instrumental role of Lysander. Once again the narrator makes it obvious that just as Lysander maneuvered Agesilaos onto the throne, he now maneuvers him to the command of the allied Greeks invading Asia. The attribution of Lysander’s appointment as the foremost advisor to his enormous authority and friendship with Agesilaos brings together the two major themes of this episode that will culminate in the final contest between the two ambitious men.

---

76 This must mean the Spartan assembly, on which see Andrewes (2002) 51-57.
77 On the νεοδαμώδεις see Shipley (1997) 122.
Agesilaos’ gratitude to Lysander for securing his commander is presented through an embedded focalization (ὤ μείζον ἐδόκει τῆς βασιλείας ἀγαθῶν διαπετράχθαι τὴν στρατηγίαν ἐκείνην) that validates the narrator’s explanation that Lysander’s appointment as foremost advisor was partly due to his relationship with the king. It also connects this episode with that of Lysander’s role in the ascension narrated two chapters before and further strengthens the characterization of the men’s *philia* already elaborated upon. As the narrator continues to build an image of a towering Lysander and an impenetrable friendship, he builds tension with his narratee; in the next chapter he will completely subvert this image with a complete and dramatic reversal of the position of Lysander and the strength of the friendship.

6.4

Αθροιζομένης δὲ τῆς δυνάμεως εἰς Γεραστόν, αὐτὸς εἰς Ἀύλιδα κατελθὼν μετὰ τῶν φίλων καὶ νυκτερεύσας ἔδωξε κατὰ τοὺς ὑπόνους εἰπεῖν τινα πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἡ ὁ μὲν οὐδεὶς τῆς Ἑλλάδος ὁμοῦ συμπάσις ἀπεδείχθη στρατηγίας οὐ πρότερον Ἀγαμήμων καὶ σὺ νῦν μετ’ ἐκείνου, ἐννοεῖς δὴ πολύθεν ἐπεί δὲ τῶν μὲν αὐτῶν ἀρχεῖς ἐκείνῳ, τοῖς δ’ αὐτοῖς πολεμεῖς, απὸ δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν τόπων ὀρμᾶς ἐπὶ τὸν πόλεμον, εἰκὸς ἔστι καὶ θύσαι σε τῇ θεῷ θυσίαν, ἢν ἐκείνος ἐνταύθα θύσας ἐξέπλευσεν.

While the forces were mustering in Gerastos, he himself went down to Aulis with friends and was spending the night when he thought someone said to him in his sleep, “O king of the Lakedaimonians, seeing that no one has been appointed commander of all the Hellenes joined together other than Agamemnon—and now you after him, you ought perhaps then to consider that since you are leading the same men as he, and against the same enemies, and that from the very same location you are setting out for war, it is reasonable that you also make the same sacrifice to the goddess, which he had made here before sailing out.”

The remaining narrative of this chapter relates the episode of Agesilaos at Aulis before he embarks upon the expedition to Asia Minor. Here again it is useful to elucidate the narratorial motivations of this narrative by comparing it to the narration of the Aulis episode as given in
Xenophon’s *Hellenika*. In the episode related in *Hellenika* 3.4.3-4, Agesilaos desired to go to Aulis with the specific intention of making a sacrifice that would emulate that of Agamemnon before his departure for Troy. In contrast, the narrative in Plutarch’s story gives no motivation for Agesilaos going to Aulis whatsoever. The narratees are simply told that while the allied forces were mustering at Gerastos, Agesilaos went with his *philoi* to spend the night at Aulis. The visit is unexplained and presented as if Agesilaos went by chance to Aulis without any specific purpose in mind. Indeed, as Shipley points out, the stay at Aulis has a purpose only after the dream is presented to the narratees. The idea to sacrifice at the place in emulation of Agamemnon instead comes to Agesilaos through a divinely inspired dream. The comparison of Agesilaos to Agamemnon is peppered throughout the story (as will be his comparison to Alexander); the initial comparison of the two men directly is made here, but not by the narrator himself. That the narrator did not follow Xenophon’s *Hellenika* version of this episode, wherein Agesilaos himself makes the comparison to Agamemnon, indicates that the narrator’s motive for the dream episode was to remove the responsibility for the comparison from both the narrator and Agesilaos. As the dream becomes the source for the comparison, it immediately acquires legitimacy as it originates from a divine source. Moreover, it shows Agesilaos as an obedient rather than boastful king; as the subject’s obedience has been a prominent theme in the story, this portrayal is more thematically in line with the narrative.

---

78 Xen. Hell. 3. 4. 3: αὐτὸς δ’ ἐβουλήθη ἐλθὼν θύσαι ἐν Ἀὐλίδι, ἐφαπερ ὁ Ἀγαμέμνων ὅτ´ εἰς Τροίαν ἐπηλε ἢθετο. “But he himself wished to go and sacrifice in Aulis, the exact place where Agamemnon had offered sacrifice when he sailed for Troy.”


80 Shipley (1997) 125: “Dreams are a recognized vehicle for divine communication, used, like oracles, to reveal or deny support for human action, and it may be Plutarch’s intention to portray this here. He could have secured greater verisimilitude by placing the dream at Geraistos, for a planned visit involving sacrifice seems the more likely, and the spread of news of the intention would explain the timely arrival of the Boiotians, as in Xenophon’s account.” See also Brenk (1975) 336-349.

81 I disagree with C. D. Hamilton (1991) 30-32, who interprets the dream episode as an attempt to portray Agesilaos as arrogant. The emphasis of the narrator is upon Agesilaos’ receiving and obeying a direct command from the
The narrator uses focalization to dramatically relate the dream-event and the remarks of the dream are given in direct character quotation. The primary narrator-focalizer relates the dream, which in turn becomes the secondary narrator-focalizer, who addresses both the primary narratees, the readers of the story, as well as the secondary narratee, Agesilaos. The comparison of Agesilaos to Agamemnon is made and encouraged by the dream that also instructs Agesilaos to perform sacrifice there in imitation of Agamemnon. This sacrifice will soon be interpreted by the Boiotians as unlawful; however, the responsibility for the action lay only indirectly with Agesilaos, as the dream’s instruction was the original impetus for the sacrifice. Although responsibility does still lie with him as he will be liable for his next action—assigning his own minister for the sacrifice, which will be the Boiotians’ cause for objection.

6.5

And at that moment somehow it came upon Agesilaos—the sacrificing of the girl, whom her father had slaughtered in obedience to the seers. Of course it did not confound him, but getting up and recounting in detail to his friends the visions, he said that he would honor the goddess with that which it was fitting for her to enjoy—being a goddess—however he would not imitate the insensitivity of the commander of that former time. And so decking out a deer with garlands, he

\[\text{divine and his attempt to make his sacrifice more sophisticated than that of Agesilaos’ counterpart, Agamemnon. If the narrator intended Agesilaos to seem arrogant, he would more likely have followed Xenophon’s version of events and made the king the instigator of the sojourn to Aulis and his own imitation of Agamemnon. That Agesilaos just happens to go to Aulis in this version and then have a dream wherein he receives divine orders removes all possible responsibility from the king as arrogantly having such designs in mind. It is also interesting to compare this version in Agesilaos to that in Plut. Pelopidas 21.3. There, the narrator clearly identifies “the goddess” (ἡ θεός) as the one who appears to Agesilaos in a dream and she specifically asks him to sacrifice his daughter (τὴν θυγατέρα). The narrator goes on to say that Agesilaos was too soft-hearted to sacrifice his daughter and this was the very reason for the failure of his expedition (“ἀλλ’ ἀπομαλβακωθεὶς κατέλυσε τὴν στρατείαν ἀδυνάτω καὶ ἀτελῆ γενομένην”).} \]
ordered his own seer to begin the sacrifice, not—as was held custom—the one who was appointed by the Boiotians to perform this function.

The dramatic narrative continues after the dream-voice ceases to be the focalizer. The primary narrator resumes his mantle, but the focalization through Agesilaos continues. The narratees are told the unknowable thoughts of Agesilaos upon waking from the dream and his remembrance of Agamemnon’s sacrifice of Iphigenia. Agesilaos thereupon summons his *philoi* and, assuming the role of secondary narrator-focalizer, relates the dream and his interpretation of it to his friends, who themselves become the secondary narratees for the episode. Agesilaos’ relation of the dream to his friends is given in indirect statement, where as the words of the dream were given in direct statement in the section before. The indirect speech dampens some of the dramatic effect of the scene while allowing the primary narrator to indirectly defend Agesilaos’ choice of a deer, rather than human, sacrifice as more fitting for the goddess and devoid of the bad judgment displayed by Agamemnon.

After the embedded narrative of Agesilaos, the primary narrator then resumes the forward chronology and summarizes the subsequent actions for preparing the sacrifice before stressing Agesilaos’ next important action: assigning his own seer for the sacrifice instead of those designated by the Boiotians. It is this decision by Agesilaos that mobilizes the Boiotarchs to action and the narrator immediately launches into a focalization that explains their motivations. The Boiotarchs, upon hearing of Agesilaos’ actions, were moved to anger and sent officials to stop Agesilaos’ offering because he was transgressing the laws and customs of the Boiotians. Their official reason is provided through the focalization of the Boiotarchs and a negative purpose clause: Μὴ θύειν παρὰ τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὰ πάτρια Βοιωτῶν.
And so upon hearing this, the Boiotarchs, in anger, sent attendants to forbid Agesilaos from making sacrifice contrary to the laws and customs of the Boiotians. And they then made these announcements and threw the thigh pieces from the altar. And Agesilaos, fuming, sailed away, both incredibly incensed at the Thebans and having become despondent about the omen that his enterprise would be incomplete and the campaign would not reach a fitting end.

The primary narrator resumes his voice and briefly tells of the Boiotian officials’ actions: they made their pronouncement against Agesilaos and then threw down the offerings from the altar. The narrator relates that Agesilaos was deeply vexed by this, but rather than act against the Thebans, he sailed away angry at Thebes and despondent about the omen. This final sentence of the chapter focalizes Agesilaos’ response to the Theban intervention through the king and sets up tension that the coming expedition will not be completed.

This episode is related in Xenophon’s *Hellenika* 3.4.4, but with significant differences. In that work the narrator explains “[Agesilaos] himself wished to go and sacrifice at Aulis, the place where Agamemnon had sacrificed when he sailed to Troy. But when he got there, the Boiotarchs heard that he was sacrificing, sent out horsemen, told him not to complete the sacrifice, and threw from the altar those offerings that already happened to have been sacrificed. Agesilaos called upon the gods as witnesses and enraged, embarked on his trireme, and sailed away.”

Hamilton observes that this account “represents the Boeotarchs as acting deliberately and
apparently without cause to provoke Agesilaus to anger.”83 In Plutarch’s version, the Boiotarchs did not act without cause, but in direct response to Agesilaos’ appointment of his personal seer to the sacrifice. Hamilton speculates that the differences in the versions can be explained by Xenophon’s use of the Spartan official version of events and Plutarch’s use of the Theban version of events “which may have been elaborated and then released to gain sympathy for the Theban cause. The effect of including the apparently innocuous remark about Agesilaus’ using his own seer, contrary to local custom (and the antiquarian and proud Boeotian Plutarch may be right about that) serves to exonerate the Boeotarchs from any charge of having acted wrongly and to shift the hubris squarely onto Agesilaos’ shoulders.”84

While Hamilton’s speculations about Plutarch attempting to exonerate his fellow Boiotians from wrongdoing may be valid, we need not make such speculations in order to explain the differences in the two versions. Rather, the differences between this version and that in the Hellenika highlight the attempt of primary narrator in Plutarch’s Agesilaos to create a narrative whole. The Boiotarchs’ intervention might have been viewed as unprovoked in Xenophon, but in Plutarch’s story the officials acted against Agesilaos because he transgressed local laws by appointing his own seer to the sacrifice. In this story, the Thebans will be shown as responsible for disrupting Agesilaos’ Asian ambitions both at the outset and at his return. They spoiled the sacrifice at the commencement of the expedition and thus angered the king and they will foment war in Greece while Agesilaos is in Asia and will be the cause of his recall from Asia—thus leaving his expedition incomplete. These events will help explain Agesilaos’ unbridled hostility towards the Thebans—a theme that will dominate the narrative after the king’s return to Greece. Plutarch does not, however, relate in the story that Thebes conspicuously

83 Hamilton (1979) 156.
84 Hamilton (1979) 157.
refused to participate in Agesilaos’ “panhellenic” expedition. Thebes’ refusal to contribute men to Agesilaos’ forces was likely a greater cause for the king’s obsessive anger at the Thebans than the spoiled sacrifice, which was just icing on the cake. That this is not even mentioned in this story may indicate an attempt on the part of the narrator to whitewash Theban hostilities towards Agesilaos’ ambitions or, more convincingly, that he aimed to present Agesilaos’ expedition as Panhellenic.

But after he arrived in Ephesos, straightaway the enormous reputation and sway surrounding Lysander annoyed and wore at him, seeing that there was a throng of people waiting at his doors at all times and everyone following him about and fussing over him, so that while the title and outward appearance of commander belonged to Agesilaos officially, when in fact Lysander had authority over everything and the ability to do and carryout anything.

The narrator resumes forward chronology moving Agesilaos from Aulis to Ephesus in Asia Minor. Once again, after chronology is briefly established at the beginning of an episode, the narrative shifts to focus on a particular theme. The theme which will be elaborated upon here and in the immediately subsequent chapters is that of Agesilaos as *philos*, but the characterization that the narrator constructs here is far more complex than that which he presented in chapter 5. In that section, Agesilaos is labeled an over-indulgent friend who would even join in his friends’ misdeeds. Here, as the opening makes clear, Agesilaos is a loyal *philos* so long as his friend, here Lysander, does not outshine him on the public stage. This chapter will
develop the theme of Agesilaos as *phi*los by taking into account his inherent *phil*otimia, which drives his actions toward Lysander in Asia, and thereby combines two characterization themes in one episode.

The chapter opens with a summarization of the reception of the Spartans, and particularly Lysander, by the citizens in the Greek *poleis* of Asia Minor that were in turmoil. The reception is initially focalized through Agesilaos, who focuses solely upon Lysander’s preferential treatment by the Asiatic Greeks. Agesilaos’ focalization is loosely maintained and extended to include the Asiatic Greeks who perceive Lysander as the truly authoritative figure while Agesilaos was commander in name alone.

Lysander’s name is used twice and both times the narrator reserves it to the end of the clause to give the statements more impact. The first instance surprises the narratee as it is not the power of Agesilaos, but that of Lysander that narrator uses to open the Asian expedition. The second closes both the sentence and the μέν…δέ clause contrasting the two subjects.

7.2

*Οὐδεὶς γὰρ δεινότερος οὐδὲ φοβερότερος ἐκεῖνοι τῶν εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἀποσταλέντων ἐγένετο στρατηγῶν, οὐδὲ μείζονα τοὺς φίλους ἀνήρ ἄλλος εὐεργέτησεν οὐδὲ κακὰ τιλικαῦτα τοὺς ἔχροντας ἐποίησεν. Ἡν ἐτί προσφάτων ὄντων οἱ ἄνθρωποι μιμομοιένοντες, ἄλλως δὲ τὸν μὲν Ἀγησίλαον ἀφελή καὶ λιτῶν ἑν ταῖς ὀμιλίαις καὶ δημοτικῶν ὀρώντες, ἐκείνῳ δὲ τὴν αὐτὴν ὀμοίως σφοδρότητα καὶ τραχύτητα καὶ βραχυλογίαν παροῦσαν, ὑπέπιπτον αὐτῷ παντάπασι καὶ μόνῳ προσείχον.*

For no one was held more in awe or fear than that one—no one of those who had set out into Asia as commander—no other man had done greater favors for his friends nor brought about such great harm to his enemies. With all this still being fresh in men’s minds, they saw on top of it all that Agesilaos was plain and simple in his interactions and a man of the people, while Lysander, on the other hand, still had the same vehemence as well as harshness and brevity in communication as before, so that they fawned upon him exclusively and turned to him alone.
The narrator continues the summary and explains Lysander’s immense authority through a generalized analepsis encompassing the strategoi who had previously led an expedition into Asia, which included Lysander, who was sent to Asia in 405 B.C.E., as well as Thibron and Derkylididas, who were commanders there in 400-399 and 399-397 B.C.E., respectively. He then assigns this notion to the memories of the local people (focalized internal analepsis) and then enters into a focalization of the perception Agesilaos’ demeanor (itself generalized) compared to that of Lysander (also generalized) through these same generalized anthropoi. Although generalized, the demeanors presented build upon the characterizations of the two men that narrator has been constructing for his narratee and now assigns these characterizations to Agesilaos’ contemporaries.

Because of this, at first the other Spartiates were vexed that they were attendants of Lysander rather than advisers of the king, but then Agesilaos himself, even though he was not an envious man and had no objection to men receiving honor, was nevertheless exceedingly hungry for distinction and rivalry and worried that any of his undertakings that might achieve some distinction would be attributed to Lysander through popular opinion of the man.

After the primary narrator’s summary of the Spartans’ reception by the Asian Greeks and Agesilaos’ irascibility at Lysander, he broadens the focalized sentiment to include the other twenty-nine chosen counselors of the king. The priority given in the construction to the

---

complaints of the Spartiates softens, or at least somewhat justifies, Agesilaos’ own indignation at Lysander’s preferential treatment. The narrator continues this briefly by stating directly that Agesilaos was not unjustly scornful, but concedes that he was excessively ambitious and contentious. It is, of course, *philotimia* and *philonikia* that are the reason for Agesilaos’ ire and which will spur the coming action. Thus, although the narrator initiates the reaction against Lysander with the Spartiates, it is Agesilaos’ attributes of character that will lead to the actions taken against him.

Therefore, this is what he did: first, he defied Lysander’s advice and any dealings that Lysander was especially ardent about, these he dismissed and disregarded and did the opposite instead. Next, of those who came to him seeking favors, those whom he thought put too much confidence in Lysander he sent away frustrated. And likewise, in regard to judicial trials, those whom Lysander had treated despitefully were sure to get off successfully; and contrarily, those whom Lysander clearly was eager to help found it hard to get off with even a fine. And as these things were happening not by chance but consistently as though from preparation, Lysander, understanding the reason, did not hide it from his friends, but told them that it was because of him that they were being slighted, and exhorted them to pay court to the king and those more influential than himself.

The narrator continues with the summary iterative narration of Agesilaos’ repeated actions, all of which are non-specific events. This summarized iterative action is introduced in
the narrative with ὀὖν, signaling the action that was taken was the result of the actorial motivation presented above in 7.3, namely that Agesilaos’ feared his efforts in Asia Minor would be ascribed to Lysander. Agesilaos’ dealings with the Ionian Greeks are presented by the narrator as a maneuver calculated to subvert the authority of Lysander in the region. His decisions for and against complainants were determined by his perception of their relationships with Lysander rather than from any sense of justice; he had, in other words, allowed his personal emotions to govern his public duties.

Once the narrator has condensed Agesilaos’ dealings with the Ionian Greeks into a brief summary of iterative action, he focalizes the interpretation of the king’s actions through Lysander. The narratee is told that Lysander understood that Agesilaos was making his decisions as an attempt to humiliate him. The narrator offers no explanation for Agesilaos’ judgments other than this. That Lysander also interpreted the king’s actions in this way and reacted specifically in response to this validates the summarized actions that the narrator presented. In the next sentence, at the start of the next chapter, the narratee will be presented with an interpretation of Lysander’s own response as focalized through Agesilaos. The narrator’s presentation and analysis of the events at the start of the Asian campaign are at first generalized and summarized by the primary narrator, then focalized through the two subjects in turn, and will culminate in a direct character-dialogue between the two men. At that point, the primary narrator will step in again to offer the narratee a lengthy commentary that will explain the episodes he presented above as well as the resultant dissolution of philia between the two men through the story’s dominant themes of philotimia and philonikia.

Although the narrator is presenting an episode with historical significance, i.e. the state of affairs in Asia Minor after the dissolution of the dekarchies and the subsequent turmoil in the
region, the analysis focuses solely upon Agesilaos’ reactions to Lysander’s notoriety and Lysander’s reaction to Agesilaos’ snubbing. There is no discussion of the causes for turmoil, the reaction of those aided or punished by Agesilaos, or the effects of renewed Spartan involvement in the poleis. The focus remains upon the personal relationship between these two philoi and the effects of this relationship upon political decisions.

8.1

And as it seemed that Lysander did and said these things so as to contrive ill-will against him, Agesilaos, wanting to assail him even more, appointed him meat-carver and, as the story goes, said while there were many people listening, “Fine then, now let these men go off and fawn upon my meat-carver.”

Agesilaos interprets Lysander’s instructions to his friends as a means of humiliating and bringing even more odium upon himself. The narrator invites the narratee to share in Agesilaos’ interpretation with ἔδοκει. The sentence progresses from motivation for the coming action (ἔδοκει Agesilaos interprets Lysander’s action), to purpose (ἔτι μᾶλλον...καθάψασθαι βουλόμενος), to result (ἀπέδειξε κρεοδαίτην: action originates from the focalized interpretation).

The narrator follows this rapid progression from interpretation to action with direct speech from the subject himself. That this was said in the presence of many listeners besides Lysander (all of whom become internal character secondary narratees) not only humiliates Lysander all the more, but also disgraces the Ionian philoi who had been seeking audiences with

86 On this, see Cartledge (1987) 208-214.
Lysander. It is not a flattering moment for Agesilaos, whom the narrator presents as so consumed by his annoyance with Lysander that he will humiliate the Greeks whom he was sent to aid as well. The narrator is careful to assure his narratee that he is not fabricating this embarrassing moment of bad diplomacy by inserting ὡς λέγεται before the account that Agesilaos spoke πολλῶν ἀκουόντων.

8.2

Ἀχθόμενος οὖν ὁ Λύσανδρος λέγει πρὸς αὐτόν· ὡς Ἡδεῖς ἀρα σαφῶς, ὥς Ἀγησίλαε, φίλους ἐλαττοῦν. Ἄν ἔνοικομενον δύνασθαι βουλομένους. “Ἀλλ’ ἵσως” ἔφη ἔμου μεῖζον λέειται βέλτιον ή ἐμοί πέπρακται. Δός δὲ μοί τινα τάξιν καὶ χώραν, ἐνθα μὴ λυπῶν ἔσομαι σοι χρήσιμος.”

So Lysander, exasperated, said to him, “You really know well, Agesilaos, how to demean your friends.” “Yes, by Zeus” he said, “at least those who want to be more powerful than me.” And Lysander responded, “Well then, perhaps what you’ve said is better than what I’ve done. But at least give me some post and assignment where I won’t annoy you and can be useful to you.”

This section is one of the few instances of direct speech from Agesilaos in the story and the only direct dialogue between these two characters. Lysander’s remark that Agesilaos was well versed in humiliating his philoi at first seems to contradict what the narrator presented in chapter 5 on the king’s overindulgence of his friends. Lysander here charges Agesilaos not only with humiliating him, who arguably has been his most vital friend, but perhaps also the Ionian philoi whom Agesilaos has come to aid. Agesilaos’ response to this charge, however, corroborates the narrator’s characterization; it is because Agesilaos thinks that Lysander aims to

---

87 In Lysander 23.7 it is precisely the Ionians whom Agesilaos means to insult along with Lysander.
88 I follow Cobet’s emendation of the text as the infinitive Ἡδεῖσθαι makes little sense.
89 The other quotations from Agesilaos are at 9.5, 11.7, 12.3-5, 13.4, 16.2 and 4, 21.4-5, 22.3, 23.5, 26.5, 32.2, 37.4, 38.2, 39.2-3.
supplant his authority that the king humiliated him. Thus Agesilaos’ response supports the
narrator’s previous characterization of the man as philonikos—although he is a devoted philos,
Agesilaos’ lust for superiority over a rival drives him to treat philoi as echthroi. The narrator
uses direct quotation from Agesilaos as irrefutable authentication for his complex portrayal of
the interplay of philia and philonikia in the man’s character and how it propelled his actions. The
dialogue ends with Lysander’s request for a sphere of influence where he would not continue to
aggravate Agesilaos, but could still exert his authority. This quoted request ends the exchange
between characters and returns the narrative to the forward chronology of the story. It also ushers
in the next sentence that explains where Lysander was assigned and how he was useful to
Agesilaos. Once again, action—Lysander’s assignment to the Hellespont—follows motivation—
Agesilaos had become hostile to Lysander.

Before continuing on to the next section, let us briefly turn to the narration of these same
actions and dialogue as they are presented in Plutarch’s Lysander 23-24. The narrator there
elaborates upon the Ionians’ favoritism to Lysander and justifies it as a natural consequence of
their familiarity with Lysander because of his prior involvement in the area. The narrator
dramatically compares the circumstances to those in tragedies wherein the audience is captivated
by some messenger or servant who plays a leading role while the king, who has only a small
part, is not even heard when he speaks. No mention is made in the Lysander narrative of the
other Spartiates’ annoyance at their subservience to Lysander as consequence of his influence;
rather, the narrator makes Agesilaos the sole aggressor and portrays him as excessively
vindictive.

When the two men enter into direct dialogue in Lysander 23.8-9, the wording of the
quoted exchange differs from that presented here in Agesilaos. In particular, Agesilaos rejoins
Lysander’s charge that he knows well how to φιλος ἔλαττον with a slightly different response to what is presented above. In Lysander 23.8 Agesilaos’ reply is over twice as long: Ἄν γε ἔμοι βούλωνται μείζονες εἶναι τοὺς δὲ αὔξοντας τὴν ἐμὴν δύναμιν καὶ μετέχειν αὐτῆς δίκαιον (“Indeed I do—those who wish to be greater than me; but those who augment my power also get to share in it.”) The difference in the quotations elucidates narratorial motivation. Agesilaos’ comment that his friends who augment his own authority get to share in it reinforces the thematic portrayal of the man in Agesilaos as one who favors and elevates his friends justly or unjustly. This characteristic of Agesilaos has not, of course, been a theme in the Lysander and so the narrator includes it in the quotation instead. Contrarily, the narrator does not include this part of the quotation in the Agesilaos because the narrator has already discussed Agesilaos’ favoritism of friends and to include it again here would dull the king’s retort to Lysander. Moreover, at this point in the Agesilaos, the friendship between the two men is about to dissolve and Lysander will leave the action of the story. To include at this point in Agesilaos the quotation that Agesilaos shares his power with those who have increased it would not be very effective. Not only does Lysander not have the chance thereupon to change his ways and share in the king’s power, as he is about to be removed from the story, but the narratee has been presented up to this point with Lysander’s repeated efforts to augment Agesilaos’ power—if only as a means to augment his own—and would therefore find this version of the quotation out of place at this point in the narrative.

8.3

Εκ τούτου πέμπται μὲν ἔφ’ Ἑλλησπόντου, καὶ Σπηθριδάτην, ἀνδρα Πέρσην, ἀπὸ τῆς Φαρναβάζου χώρας μετὰ χρημάτων συχνών καὶ διακοσίων ἰππέων ἤγαγε πρὸς τὸν Αγησίλαον, σὺκ ἔληγε δὲ τῆς ὀργῆς, ἀλλὰ βαρέως φέρων ἢδη τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνου ἐπεβουλεύειν, ὡς τῶν δυεῖν οἰκῶν τὴν βασιλείαν ἀφελόμενος εἰς μέσον ἀπασιν ἀποδοθεὶ Σπαρτιάταις. Καὶ ἐδόκει μεγάλην ἀν
On that account although Lysander was sent to the Hellespont, and there brought Spithridates, a Persian man from the territory of Pharnabazos, along with a lot of money and two hundred horsemen over to the service of Agesilaos, he nonetheless did not let go of his anger, but, oppressed by it to the very end of time, he plotted how he could have the kingship taken away from the two households and set it before all the Spartiates. And it is thought that a widespread revolution would have resulted from this very spat, if Lysander had not first died while leading forces against the Boiotians.

This is the first interaction between the Spartans and Persians since the commencement of the expedition that the narrator presents. That it is accomplished by Lysander, not Agesilaos, may seem a little ironic except that up to this point in the story Lysander has been the driving force behind Agesilaos’ actions. This action, however, is presented in an adversative sentence that will bring the narrator’s focus back to the friendship between the two men and its potential harm to the constitution of the Spartan state. For although Lysander continued to accomplish much in service to the state, his humiliation at the hands of Agesilaos, which the narrator just presented for his narratee, became the spur for Lysander’s plotting of a revolution in Sparta (which the narrator will pick up again in chapter 20 and discuss when the story has reached the point in chronology wherein Agesilaos finds Lysander’s papers).

The narrator uses ἔδοκει again as a generalized focalizer that authenticates his presentation of the plot as a substantial threat by citing general assent. Lysander’s death is an internal prolepsis that brings the narrative to the end of one character’s life; the event of his death will be repeated several times in this story, but will never be fully narrated. This is the last action

90 Cf. Xenophon Hellenika 3. 4. 5 wherein Tissaphernes’ missive to Agesilaos inquiring about his intentions for the expedition and the king’s confident reply is the first action of the expedition. Only after Agesilaos makes a truce with Tissaphernes and proves himself an honorable leader does the narrator present the argument between Agesilaos and Lysander (which ends with Agesilaos assigning him to the Hellespont, not with Lysander’s anger and plotting).
of Lysander in this story; although it is not the end of his life, he no longer will play a persuasive role in the story of Agesilaos. After this point, Agesilaos is presented in the narrative as accomplishing his own actions.

8.4

Οὕτως αἱ φιλότιμοι φύσεις ἐν ταῖς πολιτείαις τὸ ἀγαν μὴ φυλαξάμεναι τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μείζον τὸ κακὸν ἔχουσι. Καὶ γὰρ εἰ Λύσανδρος ήν φορτικός, ὡσπερ ἦν, ὑπερβάλλων τῇ φιλοτιμίᾳ τὸν καιρὸν, οὐκ ἤγγει δήποτεν Ἀγησίλαος ἔτέραν ἀμεμπτοτέραν ἐπανόρθωσιν οὕσαν ἀνδρός ἐνδόξου καὶ φιλοτιμίου πλημμελοῦντος. Ἀλλ′ ἐοικε ταύτῳ πάθει μὴτ ἐκεῖνος ἄρχοντος ἐξουσίαν γνῶναι μὴθ οὕτως ἄγνοιαν ἐνεγκείν συνήθος.

And so it is that ambition-driven natures in polities, if they do not guard against excessiveness, wreak more harm than good. For even if Lysander was a burden, as indeed he was, by overstepping his bounds for the sake of ambition, surely Agesilaos was not ignorant of other less blameworthy means of correcting a man of such high repute and ambition when erring. But it seems that it was due to the same passion that the one could not recognize the authority of the one in power while the other could not tolerate the lack of recognition by an intimate friend.

The narrator pauses the action of the story to communicate directly with the narratee and present his final commentary on how the attributes of character of these two men affected their relationship and historical events. This is the first direct communication of the narrator to his reader since his extended commentary in chapter 5. Up to this point in the Asian expedition narrative, the rivalry between Agesilaos and Lysander had been presented through the focalization of one or the other of the men. Here, the narrator intervenes after the presentation of

91 This narratorial commentary on the conflict between the two men is very similar to that given in Lysander 23, but the arrangement within the narrative differs significantly. There, the narrator opens the Asian expedition narrative with his commentary on the men whose ambitious natures would turn them into rivals instead of helpers along the path to virtue (23.2.2). What is more, the narrator directly criticizes Agesilaos for insulting and casting off Lysander entirely instead of finding a more gentle way of handling his excessive ambition (23.5). Thus, in that version, the narrator concludes and interprets the conflict between Agesilaos and Lysander for the narratee before the actual dispute is narrated.
the episode to directly effect the narratee’s reception of the events; the narratee is told that, in fact, Lysander stepped out of line with his behavior.

The narrator explains how Lysander became such a burden and acted out of line by returning to the characterization themes of *philotimia* for elucidation. The narrative makes evident that the excessive desire for rivalry and recognition inherent in both characters was the factor responsible for destroying their bond. In the last sentence alone, *philotimos* is used three times; the narrator is making it as clear as possible for his narratee how to interpret the destruction of this relationship. This narratorial commentary brings the discussion of excessiveness and contention out from the two individual men and applies it to all polities, thus making it a universal principle that picks up and reiterates what was said in chapter 5 on the dependence of universal harmony upon the balance of love and strife. In chapter 5, the narrator told the narratee that too much *philia* subverted the Lykourgian principles of Spartan government by making the ephors and gerousia complicit to Agesilaos. Here he demonstrates that the excessive rivalry inherent in the men’s φόσεις not only destroyed this powerful relationship, but also very nearly threatened the Spartan state with revolution. In both passages, the narratorial commentaries provide structure to the narrative by continually interweaving the same themes throughout different episodes in the story.
Part Three: chapters 9-15

At the end of the previous section, the dispute between Agesilaos and Lysander climaxes, concludes, and is commented upon by the narrator in relation to story themes. At this point in the story a major transition takes place as the narrator characterizes Agesilaos as having broken away from his powerful advisor and hereafter acting independently of Lysander. At the start of chapter 9, the narrator turns from Agesilaos’ internal personal affairs to his external diplomatic interactions in Asia Minor, and this is the point of departure for the following section. Chapters 9-15 cover the fabula years of 395-394 and contain the narration of Agesilaos’ actions in Asia Minor against Persia.

The narrator does not, however, devote much story time to recounting Agesilaos’ actions and battles while in Asia Minor. Instead, he provides vignettes that are illustrative of Agesilaos’ diplomacy, leadership, and affability while largely condensing his military actions into summaries. In this section, it will once again prove useful to compare this version of Agesilaos’ activities in Asia Minor to that preserved in Xenophon’s *Hellenika* in order to elucidate the Plutarchian narrator’s restructuring and condensation of events.

9.1

Ἐπεὶ δὲ Τισσαφέρνης ἐν ἀρχῇ μὲν φοβηθεὶς τῶν Ἀγησίλαιον ἐποίησατο σπουδᾶς, ὡς τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶ τὰς Εὐληνίδας ἀφῆσαιν τοὺς αὐτονόμους βασιλέως, ὕστερον δὲ πεισθεὶς ἔχειν δύναμιν ἰκανὴν ἐξήνεγκε τὸν πόλεμον, ἀσμενὸς δὲ Ἀγησίλαος ἐδέξατο.

Afterwards, since Tissaphernes was afraid of Agesilaos at first, he made a treaty with him saying that the Greek cities would be freed and made independent of the King; but later, when he was convinced he had a sufficient force, he declared war and Agesilaos gladly accepted.
After the extended pause for commentary on the dissolution of friendship between Lysander and Agesilaos, the narrator returns to the chronology of events in Asia Minor. He opens this section with an explanation of the treaty struck between Tissaphernes and Agesilaos. The event itself (striking a treaty) follows after the disclosure of the actorial motivation (Tissaphernes was afraid of Agesilaos and therefore sought a truce). Following the motivation and event is an explanation in complex text of the terms proffered by Tissaphernes. Nothing more on the treaty is discussed, instead, the narrator marks an ellipsis (ὑποτεθεὶς) and, continuing in complex text with the focalization of Tissaphernes, ushers in the next event (declaration of war) which once again follows after actorial motivation (Tissaphernes was convinced he was now prepared for war). The final event (Agesilaos’ acceptance of war) ends the progression of events in simple text. An explanation follows in the next section that will answer why (actorial motivation) Agesilaos “gladly accepted” war.

The placement of this event (Tissaphernes’ seeking of a truce) at this point in the story, after the first actions in Asia Minor, including the Lysander affair and, via prolepsis, his winning over of Spithridates for Agesilaos, differs markedly from its arrangement in the narrative of the Hellenika. In Hell. 3.4.5-6, Tissaphernes contacts Agesilaos as soon as he arrives in Ephesus and inquires about his purposes in Asia Minor. Agesilaos responds that he is liberating the Greeks, at which point Tissaphernes negotiates a truce with him so that he may seek instructions from the King. Agesilaos accuses Tissaphernes of attempting to deceive him, but still agrees to the truce on Tissaphernes’ word and they exchange oaths, which Agesilaos upholds and Tissaphernes breaks. It is only after these initial contacts, wherein Agesilaos is portrayed as cunning, undeceived, and, significantly, as acting independently of Lysander, that the narrator relates the breakdown in the relationship between Lysander and Agesilaos (Hell. 3.4.7-10).
The rearrangement of events in Plutarch’s version sheds light on narratorial motivations and the deliberate restructuring of events to create a narrative whole. The displacement maintains the narrator’s portrayal of Agesilaos as almost “riding the coat tails” of Lysander to ascendency and forestalls the portrayal of the king as true head-of-state until after Lysander has been removed from the action. Moreover, Plutarch has not significantly altered the fabula chronology by moving this event up in the story; however, the manipulation of the sequence of events has enabled him to create a pivotal moment in the story. His break with Lysander becomes both a turning point in the life of Agesilaos, whereupon he becomes an independent actor, as well as a turning point in the expedition itself, whereupon the action itself transfers from the internal negotiations among the Asiatic Greeks and Agesilaos’ Spartans to the external struggles with the Persians on the battlefield.

9.2.1

Προοδοκία γὰρ ἦν μεγάλη τῆς στρατείας καὶ δεινὸν ἦγείτο τοὺς μὲν σὺν ξενοφώτῳ μυρίους ἤκειν ἐπὶ θάλασσαν, ὡσάκις ἠβουλήθησαν αὐτοὶ τοσαυτάκις βασιλέα νενικήτως, αὐτοῦ δὲ Λακεδαιμονίων ἀρχοντος ἡγουμένων γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης μηδὲν ἔργον ἄξιον μνήμης φανήσαι πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλλήνας.

For there was a great expectation for the expedition; and Agesilaos thought it dreadful that while those ten thousand with Xenophon had made it to the sea and had vanquished the King as often as they wanted, he, although leading the Lakedaimonians, who were the commanders of land and sea, would bring about no deed worthy of the remembrance of the Greeks.

Having said that Agesilaos “gladly” accepted war, the narrator now suggests why he would have been so amenable to renewed hostilities. The narrator begins by stating that the expectation for the expedition objectives was great and then, in complex narrator text, he explains the actorial motivation through the focalization of Agesilaos that suggests he was aware
of this great expectation and was reacting to it. In the embedded focalization, Agesilaos himself makes the internal analeptic comparison between his expedition and that of Xenophon’s Ten Thousand. The focalized comparison continues as Agesilaos reflects on his role as heading the Lakedaimonians and the Lakedaimonians’ role as the leader of Greeks (both focalized characterizations) and projects an unreal external prolepsis wherein Agesilaos has no place in the collective Greek memory. This entire focalization, complete with comparison and anachronies, becomes the motivation for Agesilaos’ next action: renewing hostilities with Tissaphernes.

9.2.2-9.3.1

And so straightaway defending himself against Tissaphernes’ perjury with a justified ploy, he made it known that he would advance towards Karia. But when the barbarian had assembled his forces there in Karia, Agesilaos invaded and conquered Phrygia. He took many cities and became master of wealth in abundance, showing his friends that to violate a treaty is to despise the gods, while in misleading enemies there is not only justice, but also much glory and profit to be had along with pleasure.

The narrator now enters upon his presentation of the events of 396 B.C.E. and begins with summary in simple narrator text. First, he reveals Agesilaos’ motivation for his first move; Tissaphernes had lied about the treaty and so Agesilaos employed trickery in response. This motivation is given twice (in the first and third sentences above); both occur in complex narrator text with Agesilaos’ focalization and condemn Tissaphernes’ deception while excusing Agesilaos’ own use of trickery as a justified defense against the injustice of the Persian. There is
a moral hierarchy implied by the narrator here that attempts to minimize Agesilaos’ lie by repeatedly emphasizing that Tissaphernes committed the greater wrong and did so first when he swore a false oath; thus, while both men lied, Tissaphernes is presented as lying to the god while Agesilaos merely lies to Tissaphernes, a man who has disrespected the gods.

The narrator illustrates exactly what Agesilaos’ “trickery” was with a series of compressed and summarized events; Tissaphernes’ forces assemble in Karia to fight Agesilaos, but Agesilaos invades and conquers Phrygia instead. The details of the action are not provided; only the results of Agesilaos’ strategic deceit are summarized. The series of action ushers in a series of three resultant events; the first two summarize the material gains of Agesilaos, and the third is a focalization of Agesilaos’ moralization of his use of deceit. The focalized moralization, received by the philoi as secondary narratees, excuses Agesilaos from charges of impropriety while at the same time denouncing Tissaphernes as impious (a focalized characterization).

The Plutarchian narrator omits a significant detail here that is preserved in Xenophon’s *Hellenika*. In *Hell* 3.4.13-14, Pharnabazos’ cavalry comes upon and routs Agesilaos’ horsemen and this forces Agesilaos to come and bring them aid with his hoplites. This skirmish takes place in Xenophon’s story immediately before Agesilaos performs the sacrifices and it is the combination of this defeat of his horsemen by Pharnabazos and the malformed livers at the sacrifice that impel Agesilaos to retreat to Ephesos and raise a cavalry. The Plutarchian narrator’s omission of this first hostile encounter with Pharnabazos, which highlighted Agesilaos weakness in horse, serves to compress the events for a briefer presentation without significant loss in comprehension of the progression of events as the narrator will again state twice that Agesilaos was weak in cavalry.\(^9^2\) Furthermore, the Plutarchian narrator does not introduce Pharnabazos to the story until 11.1, after he has removed Tissaphernes from the story with his

\(^{9^2}\) 9.3.2 and 10.1.
execution at the end of chapter 10. By doing so the narrator simplifies the story for the narratee by presenting Agesilaos as having only one primary Persian opponent at a time, and such simplification of the historical events enables the narrator to focus more fully on his narrative objectives: the demonstration of Agesilaos’ *êthos* in action.

9.3.2-9.4

Since he was inferior in cavalry and the livers from sacrifices were missing their lobes, he withdrew to Ephesos and gathered cavalry, proclaiming to those well off that if they did not wish to take the field then they could each supply a horse and rider in place of himself. And there were many who did just this and it soon came about that Agesilaos had many warlike horsemen instead of cowardly hoplites. For those who were unwilling to take the field hired those who were willing to take the field, and those unwilling to be horsemen hired those who were willing to be horsemen.] For even Agamemnon did well when, taking a good mare, he released a worthless and rich man from service.

The next event, Agesilaos’ withdrawal to Ephesos, is introduced via actorial motivation. The actorial motivation is two-fold and represents both the practical reason (he lacked a cavalry) and the religious (the omens were bad). The narrator’s slowly evolving characterization of Agesilaos as possessing military acumen and being religiously devout is therefore furthered.94

The narrator moves Agesilaos to Ephesos with a summary statement and then devotes the rest of

---

93 The brackets are inserted by Lingskog (1906) and are discussed below.
94 Cf. 2.2 and 6.5.
this narrative section to the method by which he raised a strong cavalry. The slow down in
rhythm to outline Agesilaos’ method of raising a cavalry emphasizes the significance the narrator
places on this action—an emphasis that is made clearer with a pause for the narrator’s direct
commentary on the king’s strategy. Agesilaos’ proclamation to those who did not wish to take
the field with him is given in complex narrator text; this is followed by the summarized resultant
event in simple narrator text that interprets for the narratee the good effects of Agesilaos’
proclamation.

The narrator then explains his comment on the quality of the horsemen whom Agesilaos
gained by his strategy and thus reiterates his interpretation of the action as a success. This
reiteration has caused some editors to bracket off the clause or the entire sentence as spurious.95
C. Sintenis deleted the entire sentence in his nineteen-century recension of the text, feeling that
they simply repeated the idea before.96 Lindskog notes, however, that, in actuality, the sentence
performs a function, “nam explicant optime vocem πολεμικοῦς. Bellicosos—quare bellicosos?
‘Nam qui nolebant’ cet.”97 When we consider the narrative function itself, the reiterative
sentence actually performs two functions in the text. First, it clarifies the narrator’s comment that
“warlike horsemen” replaced “cowardly hoplites,” as noted by Lindskog, and prevents the
narratee from inferring that the narrator believes hoplites are generally cowardly and cavalrymen
are warlike by nature. Secondly, it elucidates how Agesilaos’ orders were carried out and
reiterates that his orders resulted in the mustering of formidable cavalry.98

Following this summarized event and explanation, the narrator pauses the story briefly to
provide commentary in the form of an external analepsis. The narrator pronounces that

95 The entire sentence is likewise bracketed by Bos (1947) 7 and Flacelière and Chambry (1973) 106.
96 Lindskog (1906) 13.
97 Lindskog (1906) 13.
98 Agesilaos will take great pride in this cavalry in 16.5 when they defeat the Pharsalians and the narrator will
remind the narratee that the king had raised the cavalry himself while in Asia Minor.
Agamemnon did well to replace a rich man with a good mare and the narratee infers that Agesilaos thus also did well to imitate Agamemnon. As well as providing support to the narrator’s positive interpretation of Agesilaos’ method of raising cavalry, the brief analepsis further develops his comparison of Agesilaos to Agamemnon via the intertextual link to Iliad 23. The analepsis strengthens the estimation of Agesilaos’ method of building cavalry as prudent and successful (rhetorical device) and marks the event as a significant demonstration of Agesilaos’ character in context.

9.5

Επεί δὲ κελεύσαντος αὐτοῦ τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους ἀποδύνυτες ἐπίπρασκον οἱ λαμυροπώλαι, καὶ τῇς μὲν ἔσθητος ἦσαν ὤνηται πολλοί, τῶν δὲ σωμάτων λευκών καὶ ἅπαλων παντάπασι διὰ τὰς σκιατροφίας γυμνουμένων κατεγέλων ὡς ἁρχήσων καὶ μηδενὸς ἀξίων, ἐπιστὰς ὁ Ἀγησίλαος “Ὅταν μὲν” εἶπεν “οἷς μάχεσθε, ταῦτα δ’ ὑπὲρ ὧν μάχεσθε.”

And afterwards, having ordered that the retailers sell off as booty the stripped-naked captives, there were many buyers of the clothing, but the naked bodies, which were pasty-white and altogether delicate on account of being reared in the shade, were ridiculed as useless and of no value. Agesilaos, understanding the matter, said, “While these are the men whom you fight, these are the things for which you fight.”

The series of events that make up the narrative for Agesilaos’ first invasion and attack upon Persian territory now culminates in a scene. It opens with an ellipsis (Ἐπεί), but the time and setting are not clarified.99 The scene combines simple narrator text for description, complex narrator text for the internal characters’ interpretation of the scene, and ends with a sage

99 This event occurs at Hell. 3.4.11-26 at roughly the same point in the chronology, that is, after returning to Ephesos from plundering Phrygia and before the battle with Tissaphernes’ forces at Sardis. However, there, the event takes place after Agesilaos has already bolstered his troops’ spirits with a series of competitions and the selling of captives is the last on a list of actions taking place in Ephesos, forming a period to the series of events before the Battle of Sardis. Here, the event is singled out as representative of the means and ways by which Agesilaos prepared his army for battle mentally as well as physically while at Ephesos.
observation of Agesilaos in character-text that announces the meaning of the scene for both the internal characters (and therefore the secondary narratees) and the primary narratee. The position of this scene at the end of the narrative of the first encounters between Agesilaos and Tissaphernes provides an over-arching positive assessment of the results of the preceding events and characterizes Agesilaos and his men as superior to their opponents. It also further characterizes Agesilaos as holding simplicity in high regard while the Persians are shown to be luxurious and yet ruined by this luxury.

10.1-10.2.1

And when the time was right again to make an invasion into enemy territory, Agesilaos proclaimed he would come to Lydia, not again deceiving Tissaphernes at that time; but Tissaphernes tricked himself thoroughly, distrusting Agesilaos because of the trick before and believing that now at least he would attack Karia since it was bad for riding and he was far inferior in cavalry. But then, just as he had said, Agesilaos came to the country around Sardis and Tissaphernes was forced to come from Karia again to bring aid in haste; and riding through there with his cavalry Tissaphernes destroyed many of the wandering soldiers out plundering the plain.

The narrative of the second invasion into Persian territory in 395 begins this time with Agesilaos making the first move. The section opens with a statement of actorial motivation: it was “the right time” to make another attack. Agesilaos’ ability to intuit the kairos, particularly in a military setting, will become one of the main themes of his characterization in the latter part of
the story. The significance of the term and the narrator’s use of it in this story becomes more convincing when we consider that the Xenophonic narrator of Hellenika 3.4.20 states that it was because a new council of thirty Spartiates had arrived and Agesilaos wanted them to prepare immediately for the contests ahead that he chose this time to invade. The Plutarchian narrator condenses these explicit reasons in the Hellenika into a single word and concept: it was kairos and Agesilaos could intuit this.

Kairos motivates Agesilaos to his next action: his proclamation of his invasion into Lydia (complex narrator text). The narrator pauses briefly to communicate directly to the narratee that, unlike the earlier proclamation by Agesilaos, this time there was no attempt at deception. Only the primary narratee is privy to this, however, as the narrator then explains that Tissaphernes (the secondary narratee of Agesilaos’ pronouncement) deceived himself nevertheless. The narrator then explains this comment by using Tissaphernes’ focalization in complex narrator text; he no longer trusted Agesilaos because of the earlier trick (this focalization thus also provides structure to the text by reminding the narratee of the earlier event) and since Agesilaos lacked good cavalry (Tissaphernes’ focalization of Agesilaos’ motivation), he believed he would attack Karia instead. The next sentence proves Tissaphernes’ reasoning invalid with a summary of subsequent action (Agesilaos invaded Lydia as he said he would), which also sets up the coming Battle of Sardis.

10.2.2-10.3.2

100 Discussion of Agesilaos’ comprehension and exploitation of kairos recurs most frequently during his tenure in Egypt (chapters 36-40).
And Agesilaos, noting that the enemy’s infantry had not yet arrived while nothing was missing from his own forces, was keen for battle. So mixing his cavalry with his peltasts, he ordered them to advance as quickly as possible and to attack the enemy, while he directly brought on the hoplites himself. And once the barbarians were put to flight, the Greeks, following hard upon them, took their camp and killed many.

The narrator slows the story rhythm to present the battle scene, but maintains focus upon Agesilaos and his able command. The scene opens with focalized actorial motivation; because Agesilaos noticed the enemy had not fully arrived, he wanted to take advantage of the situation and attack straightaway. Apparently this is exactly what he does as the next sentence summarizes his preparation of his troops and his instructions for engagement. Not a single detail of the actual battle is narrated; only the resultant event of Agesilaos’ victory is given in summary. The structure of the narrative allows only a positive assessment of Agesilaos’ second invasion.101 He comprehended the kairos, proclaimed his plans, was true to his word (this time), and was able to take advantage of Tissaphernes’ blunder by acting immediately and decisively on the battlefield.

10.3.3-10.5.1

101 De Voto (1988) 41-53 attempts to reconcile the different accounts of Xenophon, Plutarch, Diodoros, with the Oxyrhynchos Historian on the Battle of Sardis and concludes that Xenophon unfairly represented Tissaphernes as a coward.
As a result of this battle, it happened that they were not only able to lead and carry off plunder freely from the King’s territory, but also to witness Tissaphernes suffer punishment—an unscrupulous man and thoroughly detested by the Greek race. For at once the King sent Tithraustes to him, who cut off the man’s head, and asked that Agesilaos leave off from his attack and sail homeward; he even sent men to offer him money. But Agesilaos said that the polis has the authority over peace, while he took delight in enriching his soldiers rather than being enriched himself; besides, of course, Greeks considered it virtuous to take no gifts except spoils from enemies. But all the same, wanting to gratify Tithraustes, seeing that he took vengeance out on the common enemy of the Greeks, Tissaphernes, Agesilaos conveyed his army into Phrygia, taking thirty talents from him to pay for the journey.

Two significant results of the battle are now summarized before being narrated in more detail: Agesilaos won the ability to plunder Persian territory at will and Tissaphernes was executed. The narrator himself characterizes Tissaphernes as “unscrupulous” and as “detested” from the Greeks’ focalization; the narratee is to share in this assessment of Tissaphernes and sympathize with the Greeks’ elation at his execution. Agesilaos’ refusal of the proffered peace, given indirectly in complex narrator text, reiterates the obedience of Agesilaos to his state and devotion to his men, a characterization that the narrator has been constructing since the start of the story (1.3, 2.1, 3.3, 4.3).102 The emphatic particle μέντοι hints to the shared (Greek) values between the narrator and the narratee; while the narratee may not be expected know that Agesilaos delighted himself in enriching his soldiers over himself, he is envisioned as empathetic to the Greek virtue of despoiling enemies.

Agesilaos’ motivation for accepting the Persian’s money, after denying that Greeks accept gifts from enemies, is that he wanted to show gratitude to Tithraustes for carrying out

---

102 Agesilaos’ deference to the state will later be used as a pretext, from the narrator’s perspective, to accomplish betrayal of Tachos in Egypt in chapter 37.
Tissaphernes’ execution and the section ends with Agesilaos’ withdrawal into Phrygia with a gift of thirty talents. In *Hell. 3.4.25-26*, however, Tithraustes says that if he would leave Asia, the Greek cities would be independent, only paying a tribute to the King; Agesilaos says his city must decide that matter, but is persuaded by Tithraustes to await the answer in Phrygia with the provisions that he demanded and received for the trip. Plutarch’s narrator transfers Agesilaos’ motivation for accepting Tithraustes’ terms from the need to await word from home to Agesilaos’ desire to thank Tithraustes for executing Tissaphernes on behalf of all Greeks, thus refocusing the panhellenic light in which the narrator has cast the Asian expedition. This transfer of motive to a desire to show gratitude to Tithraustes also functions as an approximate absolution of Agesilaos from any accusation that he took a bribe from the Persian.

10.5.2-10.6

And while on the road he received a skytale from the magistrates at home bidding him to take command of the navy as well. This was granted to Agesilaos alone of all men before. And while he was considered by common consent the greatest and most distinguished man of all living at that time, just as even Theopompos said somewhere, he did indeed pride himself more on his virtue than his hegemony. But when he then appointed Peisander as commander of the navy he seemed to have erred—seeing that there were older and more prudent men available—he was not looking after the fatherland, but was honoring family ties and indulging his wife, whose brother was Peisander, when he handed over the admiralty to him.
The chronology is continued and the next event takes place while Agesilaos is on his way to Phrygia; he receives a scroll from Sparta that granted him the command of the navy as well as the land forces. At this point, the narrator pauses for extended explanation and commentary to guide the narratee’s reception of the event and Agesilaos’ appointment of Peisander. The narrator begins with a comment that Agesilaos was the first of all men to receive this distinction and substantiates this with a generalized focalization that characterizes Agesilaos as worthy of the distinction because of his perceived excellence. To support this focalization, in turn, the narrator refers to a quote of Theopompos that echoes the sentiments of the narrator and generalized focalizers.

The three-tiered praise is interrupted by the narrator who discloses the related event that Agesilaos appointed Peisander as naval commander. At this juncture, he enters into a commentary that chastises his subject for allowing nepotism to motivate his choice of admirals and bases his criticism on his statement that there were “older and more prudent men available” for appointment. The narrator suggests that this criticism is not his alone and was laid against Agesilaos by his contemporaries, as “he seemed” to have erred in his appointment of Peisander. That the criticism comes at the point in the story where Agesilaos has reached a new pinnacle of success signals to the narratee that trouble may lie ahead. The Plutarchian narrator is not alone in his criticism of Agesilaos for his appointment of Peisander, but it is more marked than the suggestion of criticism by the Xenophonic narrator at *Hell* 3.4.26. There the narrator characterizes Peisander as courageous and ambitious, but also inexperienced. There is no mention of Agesilaos’ appointment being motivated by family-ties. The Plutarchian narrator, in contrast, signals clearly to his narratee that his appointment would not be a successful one.

---

103 For discussion of Agesilaos’ neglect of the Persian naval threat and the revolt of Rhodes, home of the Spartan naval base in the region, see Cartledge (1987) 358.
104 And one which will be repeated at the very end of the story (40.2) to summarize the life of Agesilaos at his death.
11.1

Αὐτὸς δὲ τὸν στρατὸν καταστήσας εἰς τὴν ὑπὸ Φαρναβάζου τεταγμένην χώραν οὐ μόνον ἐν ἀρθόνοις διήγει πᾶσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ χρήματα συνήγει πολλά καὶ προελθὼν ἄρχει Παφλαγονίας προσηγάγετο τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Παφλαγόνων Κότυν, ἐπιθυμήσαντα τῆς φιλίας αὐτοῦ δὲ ἁρετὴν καὶ πίστιν.

But he himself, having stationed the army in the country appointed to Pharnabazos, not only spent the time in every abundance, but even collected a quantity of money; and advancing as far as Paphlagonia, he brought over the king of the Paphlagonians, Kotys, who was desirous of his friendship on account of his virtue and faithfulness.

The narrator leaves aside his criticism and returns to the events of Agesilaos’ Asian campaign and summarizes the time spent in Pharnabazos’ territory as bringing Agesilaos enormous financial gains. The change in focus and return to the (positive) narration of Agesilaos’ actions is signaled by αὐτὸς positioned at the start of the sentence. Agesilaos’ movements into Paphlagonia are also quickly summarized and the actions culminate in the acquisition of a new ally, Kotys. Kotys’ motivation for seeking alliance with Agesilaos reiterates the narrator’s characterization of Agesilaos’ reputation.

11.2-11.4.1

Ὁ δὲ Σπιθριδάτης, ὡς ἀποστάσας τοῦ Φαρναβάζου τὸ πρῶτον ἠλθε πρὸς τὸν Ἀγησίλαο, ἀεὶ συναπέδημει καὶ συνεστράτευεν αὐτῷ, κάλλιστον μὲν υἱὸν ἑχὼν Μεγαβάττην, οὗ παιδὸς ὄντος ἕρα σφοδρῶς ὁ Ἀγησίλαος, καλὴν δὲ καὶ θυγατέρα παρθένον ἐν ἡλικία γάμου. Ταύτην ἐπείει γῇμαι τὸν Κότυν ὁ Ἀγησίλαος· καὶ λαβὼν παρ’ αὐτοῦ χιλίου ἱππεῖς καὶ δισικίλιος πελταστὰς αὐθίς ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς Φρυγίαν καὶ κακῶς ἐποίει τὴν Φαρναβάζου χώραν οὕτω υπομένουσας οὐδὲ πιστεύουσας τοῖς ἔρμασιν, ἀλλ’ ἑχὼν αἰ τὰ πλεῖστα οὕνεις ἐαυτῷ τῶν τιμῶν καὶ ἀγαπητῶν ἐξεχώριε καὶ ὄπεφευγεν ἀλλοτ’ ἀλλαχόσε τῆς χώρας μεθίδρουσεν, ἀρχεὶ οὗ παραφυλάξας αὐτὸν ὁ Σπιθριδάτης καὶ παραλαβὼν Ἡριπίδαυ τὸν Σπαρτιάτην ἐλαβε τὸ στρατότεθυ καὶ τῶν χρημάτων ἀπάντων ἐκράτησεν. ἔνθα δὴ πικρὸς ὣν ὁ Ἡριπίδας ἐξετασθης τῶν κλαπέντων καὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους ἀναγκάζων ἀποτίθεσθαι καὶ πάντα
And Spithridates, on the grounds that having defected from Pharnabazos he first came over to Agesilaos, always went abroad and campaigned with him, having a most beautiful son, Megabates, a youth whom Agesilaos feverishly desired, and also a pretty daughter, a maiden of marriageable age. This girl Agesilaos persuaded Kotys to marry; and taking from him a thousand horsemen and two thousand peltasts, he once again withdrew into Phrygia and did damage to Pharnabazos’ territory, who was neither standing his ground nor trusting in his defenses, but always keeping most of his costly and beloved possessions with him as he retreated and evaded from one part of the country to another always on the move, until Spithridates, who had been watching him closely, along with Herippidas, a Spartiate, as an ally, captured his camp and became master of all his money. At this point Herippidas, being a spiteful assessor of stolen loot and forcing the barbarians to stow it away, was overseeing and searching through everything and exasperated Spithridates to the point that he left straightway for Sardis along with the Paphlagonians.

The narrator introduces another new character and ally, Spithridates, and summarizes his defection and subsequent involvement with Agesilaos. There is then a pause to introduce Spithridates’ son and daughter; the daughter is immediately relevant to the story and is married to Kotys, also just introduced, to cement the alliance with him, but the mention and characterization of Megabates is a seed—he will not become relevant to the story until later in the chapter, but his inclusion here still makes logical sense in the context of the marriage alliance.

Following the slow down in rhythm, a series of events is quickly narrated: Agesilaos receives forces from Kotys, he returned to Phrygia, and continued ravaging Pharnabazos’ territory. This leads the narrator to summarize Pharnabazos’ evasive movements as well as his motivation for avoiding conflict—he did not trust that his defenses could protect the enormous wealth that he was carrying around with him. The image of Pharnabazos projected here by the narrator is of a somewhat cowardly, but stereotypically luxurious satrap; with this
characterization, the scene in chapter 12 of the meeting between Agesilaos and Pharnabazos will be all the more significant when Agesilaos’ humble demeanor causes Pharnabazos to alter his behavior.

After the summary of Pharnabazos’ movements, the subject switches abruptly to Spithridates, who was recently introduced to the story, and Herippidas, who enters and exits the narrative in this section. In a very short summary, the narrator runs through Spithridates’ actions: he was watching Pharnabazos and then somehow captured his camp. How this was brought about is not disclosed and is superfluous to the story at hand; the importance point will be that Herippidas’ behavior drove Spithridates away and this upset the story’s hero, Agesilaos, and thus the narrator makes the episode directly relevant to the story. The narrator characterizes Herippidas as a miserly overseer in simple text, leaving no room for interpretation from the narratee; Herippidas is confined to a specific and narrow role in the story and once he has fulfilled this role, the narrator quietly ushers him out of the text. The narratorial motivation for disclosing this series of events is revealed at the end of the episode: Herippidas’ behavior compels Spithridates to take the Paphlagonians and leave for Sardis. This event returns the narrative to the story’s focus, Agesilaos, as the narrator will now turn his attention to how Spithridates’ withdrawal affected the Spartan king.

11.4.2-11.5.1

Τούτο λέγεται τῷ Ἀγησιλάῳ γενέσθαι πάντων ἀνιαρότατον. Ἡχθετο μὲν γὰρ ἄνδρα γενναῖον ἀποβεβληκός τὸν Σπιθριδάτην καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ δύναμιν οὐκ ὁλίγην, ἰσχύετο δὲ τῇ διαβολῇ τῆς μικρολογίας καὶ ἀνελευθερίας, ἢς οὐ μόνον ἑαυτὸν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν πατρίδα καθαρεύοντας ἀεὶ παρέχειν ἐφιλοτιμεῖτο. Χωρὶς δὲ τῶν ἐμφανῶν τούτων ἐκνιζέν αὐτὸν οὐ μετρίως ὁ τοῦ παιδὸς ἔρως ἐνεσταγμένος, εἰ καὶ πάνυ παρόντος αὐτοῦ τῷ φιλονίκῳ χρώμενος ἐπειράτο νεανίκως ἀπομάχεσθαι πρὸς τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν.
This is said to have been most distressing of all for Agesilaos. For on the one hand he grieved from having been robbed of the noble man Spithridates and with him a considerably sizable force, and on the other he was ashamed of the accusation of pettiness and stinginess, from which he had always eagerly strived to keep not only himself, but also his fatherland pure. But apart from these obvious reasons, the desire that the boy instilled in him tortured him beyond measure, and yet, if the boy was present, he made use of his fondness for mastery and tried vigorously to fight against his desire.

The motivation for narrating the previous episode between Spithridates and Herippidas is now made apparent: Agesilaos was extremely upset by Spithridates’ withdrawal. He opens with anonymous authorization (λέγεται) for the resultant event of Spithridates’ departure (Agesilaos’ distress); this authorization is significant, as the narrator feels compelled to support his explanation of Agesilaos’ personal emotions that follows. At this point, the narrator pauses the forward movement of the story for an extended embedded focalization of Agesilaos’ motivation for his distress, which itself also serves to set up the coming scene between Megabates and Agesilaos. Within the focalization, the narrator lays out three separate reasons for Agesilaos’ distress, each one becoming more personal than the one before. The immediate result was that Agesilaos lost a good ally as well as the large force that Spithridates took with him. More personally, Agesilaos was ashamed of being associated with Herippidas’ miserly behavior, as it was contrary to his own character and that of Sparta. Agesilaos’ simplicity and avoidance of wealth, introduced in 4.1, will continue to be a major theme of characterization in the narrative. The first two motivations for Agesilaos’ distress are brushed off as “obvious” and the narrator begins discussing the third and most personal cause for the anxiety in depth. Megabates, who had been favorably introduced at the start of the chapter, now becomes relevant to Agesilaos’ story as the main reason for the king’s disappointment in Spithridates’ actions. The narrator had characterized Megabates as beautiful and the target of Agesilaos’ feverish desire; now the
narratee will be presented with a scene that fleshes out the nature of this desire in what is ultimately a positive exposition of Agesilaos’ own self-control.

11.5.2-11.7

And one time, when Megabates was approaching to embrace and kiss him in greeting, Agesilaos turned away. And from then on Megabates, ashamed, stopped his approaches and henceforward addressed him from afar; anguished once more anew and repenting his avoidance of the kiss, Agesilaos pretended to wonder what was bothering him that Megabates would not greet with him with kiss. “You, of course, are the reason,” those close to him said, “since you did not submit yourself, but turned away from the pretty boy’s kiss, being afraid; and even now he could be persuaded to come to you within kissing distance; provided that you do not again flinch away.” After some time keeping silent by himself, Agesilaos said, “You need not persuade him; for I’m sure I would more gladly fight that battle over the kiss again than have all that which I hold turn into gold for me.” Such he was when Megabates was present; indeed, when he was away he was so inflamed that it would be difficult to say if the boy were to turn back again and be in his presence whether he would persist in not receiving his kiss.

The narrator continues the pauses in forward chronology to narrate an internal analeptic scene (signaled by Kaí ποτε) that serves to elaborate upon the motivation for Agesilaos’ vexation narrated above as well as embellish the characterization of Agesilaos as self-controlled.
even when overwhelmed by his passions for young men.\textsuperscript{105} The scene is presented vividly with multiple focalizations of Agesilaos, then Megabates, and then Agesilaos’ associates; as well as character-text between Agesilaos and his (here anonymous) \textit{philoi}. The Megabates scene is a dramatic pause from the chronological narrative that provides the narratee with additional anecdotal information which elicits sympathy for Agesilaos mourning his loss of the boy with Spithridates withdrawal. The narration is made dramatic by the quotations from internal characters and multiple focalizations while the narrator himself makes no interruption or commentary on the events. Furthermore, the character-text of Agesilaos is in Doric dialect, which adds authenticity to the scene as if an eyewitness had reported it to the narrator and may also remind the narratee of the Doric relationship with pederastic love.

The narration of the Megabates affair is the culmination of the events begun with Spithridates’ monitoring and capturing of Pharnabazos’ camp. From there, the narrator turns to the results of the seizure: Spithridates abandons Agesilaos with his troops. The narrator then relates these events to the emotional effects upon Agesilaos and uses it as an opportunity to build upon his characterization of the king as a practical commander, who is distressed by the loss of a serviceable ally, as a king who actively shuns greed for personal and civic wealth, and a man who regrets the absence of a handsome companion as a lost opportunity to exercise his self-control. It is this last characterization of an enamored Agesilaos that the narrator selects for elaboration by anecdote. This anecdote on Agesilaos’ bashfulness in front of an attractive young man becomes not an opportunity for comment upon Agesilaos’ physical desires, but a chance to exemplify his mastery over his desires. It is, in short, an anecdote illustrating Agesilaos’ self-control; but it is not self-control per se that spurs Agesilaos to tame his emotions, but his \textit{philotimia} that fuels his self-control.

\textsuperscript{105} Agesilaos’ relationships with young men enters the narrative again at 13.1-3 and 20.5-6.
Beck highlights the modifications Plutarch made to the Megabates anecdote preserved in Xenophon’s *Agesilaos* in order to incorporate the theme of *philotimia* as the source of Agesilaos’ strength in resisting his desires. Unlike Xenophon, who isolates this episode and presents it under his discussion of Agesilaos’ control over his emotions, Plutarch does not use the anecdote strictly as an example of Agesilaos’ self-control, but to show the man tossed about by his desires and reproached by his friends at which point he employs his *philotimia* in order to tame his desire.

In the next narrative section, the narrator moves from this illustration of self-control in front of the boy Megabates to an anecdotal scene between Agesilaos and the satrap Pharnabazos that demonstrates his admirable simplicity in its opening, before it moves to its other intended demonstration, that of Agesilaos’ justice towards his enemies.

12.1.1

Μετὰ ταύτα Φαρνάβαζος εἰς λόγους αὐτῶς σουναλθεῖν ἡθέλησε, καὶ συνῆγαγεν ἀμφότεροι ὃν ξένον ὁ Κυζικηνός Ἀπολλοφάνης.

After these things occurred, Pharnabazos wanted to meet with him in conference, and a *xenos* of them both, the Kyzikean Apollophanes, brought them together.

We return to the story time after the Megabates episode with an ellipsis (Μετὰ ταύτα), followed by the actorial motivation for the coming event (the meeting) as focalized through Pharnabazos (he desired the meeting), followed by the event itself (Apollophanes brought them together). The narrator has now summarily given the circumstances and context of the meeting between the Persian satrap and Spartan king; thus he can now slow down the rhythm and present the scene fully.

---

12.1.2-12.2.1

And Agesilaos arrived at the place earlier along with his *philoi* and threw himself down under some shade where the grass was deep and awaited Pharnabazos. And when he arrived, although soft fleeces as well as colorful rugs were being laid down for him, he felt so ashamed before Agesilaos who was lying down in such a manner that he even laid down himself in the grass on the ground as he chanced to be, even though he had been clothed in attire that was wondrous in its delicacy and dyeing.

The narrator slows down the rhythm for an extended descriptive scene of the meeting between Agesilaos and Pharnabazos. As may now be apparent from the earlier scenes, the narrator uses embedded focalizations and character-text to heighten the drama and vividness. This scene will place an important structural role in the text; later, when Agesilaos arrives in Egypt (chapter 36) there will be a scene that mirrors this one, but will be used to illustrate Agesilaos’ very different circumstances. Here, the narrator uses the scene to characterize Agesilaos’ Spartan simplicity and humility; and this characterization is indirectly validated by Pharnabazos’ imitation. Pharnabazos has already been characterized by the narrator as luxuriant and obsessed with wealth (11.3) and the narratee is now given an illustrative image of the man and his trappings that corresponds to the previous characterization. Upon seeing Agesilaos casually reclining, however, Pharnabazos is motivated to imitate the Spartan and thus indirectly substantiate the narrator’s positive portrayal of Agesilaos’ Spartan simplicity.
And once they greeted one another Pharnabazos was not at a loss for justifiable complaints, seeing that in fact he had often and greatly been of service to the Lakedaimonians in the war against the Athenians, but now was being ravaged by them; while Agesilaos, seeing the Spartiates who were with him stooping to the earth in shame and at a total loss (since they saw Pharnabazos as wronged), said to him, “We, Pharnabazos, when we were friends of the King in earlier times, dealt with his affairs as friends and now as enemies since we have become enemies. And so seeing that you want to be one of the King’s possessions, it’s reasonable that we injure him through you. But from the day that you deem yourself a friend and ally of the Greeks rather than called the slave of the King, you can consider this phalanx as well as the hoplites and ships and everything that is ours to be the guardians of your possessions and freedom, without which there is nothing of beauty nor worth for men.”

The narrator began with the circumstances leading to the scene (which also resituated the reader in the chronology), moved to a description of the scene setting (which also served to exemplify Agesilaos’ simplicity), and now provides his rendition of the verbal exchange between the two men in character-text (which itself will demonstrate Agesilaos’ justice towards his enemies). Pharnabazos’ opening complaints are only summarized in complex text, but interpreted as “justifiable” by the narrator (and thus for the narratee), who then explains why this is so with an analeptic summary that provides the historical context (Pharnabazos’ aid to Sparta during the war with Athens). Before his response in character-text, Agesilaos (a secondary narratee, along with his philoi, of Pharnabazos’ words) interprets the Spartiates’ reception of and
reaction to Pharnabazos’ complaints (and the narrator himself discloses the Spartiates’
motivation for their “shame”) and their reaction, in turn, affects Agesilaos’ response to the
Persian satrap. As with the Lysander episode (7.3), the Spartiates motivate Agesilaos’ action and
this attribution of motivation demonstrates his sensitivity to his peers’ opinions and his astute
reactions to these. The character-text of Agesilaos reinforces the images projected by the narrator
in chapter 5 of the king’s righteousness in dealing with enemies; he is respectful and attempts to
induce his narratee (Pharnabazos) to recognize the Greek value of “freedom” (which was
Agesilaos’ ostensible reason for undertaking the Asia Minor campaign, 6.1.) and shake off the
burden of “slavery.” A gesilaos’ words are intended to persuade not only Pharnabazos of the
value of freedom, but also the narratee. The effect is to create a sense of shared values between
the narrator and the narratee just as much as between the two characters, Agesilaos and
Pharnabazos.

12.5

Εκ τούτου λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Φαρνάβαζος ἵνα εἴση διάνοιαν. “Εγώ γὰρ
εἶπεν ἃν μὲν ἄλλον ἐκπέμψῃ βασιλεὺς στρατηγόν, ἔσομαι μεθ’ ὑμῶν, ἕαν δὲ
ἐμοὶ παραδῶ τὴν ἤγεμονίαν, οὐδὲν ἐλλείψω προθυμίας ἁμισύνειος υμᾶς καὶ
κακῶς ποιῶν ὑπὲρ ἐκείνου.” Ταῦτ’ ἀκούσας ὁ Ἀγγεῖλαος ἦσθη, καὶ
λαβόμενος τῇς δεξίας αὐτοῦ καὶ συνεξαναστάς “Εἰθε” εἶπεν ἃ Φαρνάβαζε,
tοιοῦτος δὲν φίλος ἡμῖν γένοιο μάλλον ἡ πολέμιος.”

After this Pharnabazos said to him what he had in mind. “For myself,” he said, “if
the King should send out another general, I will be with you; if, however, he
should give the command to me, then I will lack no eagerness to take vengeance
upon you and do harm on his behalf.” Having heard this, Agesilaos was delighted,
and having taken his right hand and rising with him, said, “Oh how I wish,
Pharnabazos, that a man such as you would be our friend rather than our enemy.”

107 The levels of perception in Agesilaos’ statement are also interesting. He tells Pharnabazos that he ought to
recognizes himself (internal) as a friend of the Greeks rather than be called (external) a slave to the King. This
juxtaposes internal worth (Greek) against false external reputation (Barbarian); similar to the internal worth of
Agesilaos prevailing over the external display of wealth by the Barbarian Pharnabazos in this scene.
The exchange continues in character-text and the narrator quotes Pharnabazos’ response to Agesilaos’ appeal. How the narratee is to interpret Pharnabazos’ comment is directed by Agesilaos’ own favorable interpretation; Pharnabazos’ conduct and remarks during the scene have earned Agesilaos’ respect. Agesilaos’ response to Pharnabazos characterizes him as one who respects an enemy who puts obedience to his superiors first and fulfills his posts to the utmost of his ability, but who, should he not be made commander against the Greeks, would fight as an ally on behalf of freedom. The final quote of Agesilaos, and of the scene, echoes the opening narratorial statement in chapter 5 that Agesilaos was a better enemy than friend and structures the story’s themes.

13.1-13.2.1

And when Pharnabazos was leaving with his friends, his son, who was left behind, ran up to Agesilaos and said smiling, “I make you my xenos, Agesilaos,” and holding a spear in his hand, he gave it to him. And Agesilaos, accepting it and pleased both by the appearance and the friendliness of the boy, looked at those present to see if someone should have something worthy to be given to the handsome and noble boy as a gift in exchange. And seeing the clerk Idaios’ horse adorned with a decorated harness, he quickly took it off and gave it to the lad.

This chapter begins by continuing the scene of the meeting between Agesilaos and Pharnabazos. It will then transition to the theme of Agesilaos as philos once more, thus reiterating anew the narrator’s characterization of Agesilaos in chapter 5 and further refining it with examples. In chapter 5, the narratee was told Agesilaos was almost too good to his friends;
he was loyal in their bad deeds as well as their good. In this chapter, the narrator presents a similar image but refines it by weaving the theme of Agesilaos’ *sophrosune* into the assessment. This theme of *sophrosune* has been incorporated more heavily into the story over the last chapter; Kotys was impressed with this quality, for example, and Agesilaos displayed self-control in the Megabates affair.

Here, the meeting-scene continues, but the focus shifts to Pharnabazos’ son who, after the meeting, asks Agesilaos to become his guest-friend. The narrator provides no actorial motivation for the boy’s actions, but he does disclose Agesilaos’ motivation for accepting the offer; he thought the boy handsome and friendly, which recalls the draw Agesilaos felt toward Megabates. In exchange, Agesilaos offers the boy a harness taken from Idaios’ horse. The scene elaborates upon the story-theme of Agesilaos as *philos* and, in the following passages, the narrator will refine his characterization of the king presented in chapter 5 wherein the narrator said that Agesilaos’ indulgence of his friends’ desires often led him astray of justice. Having established the boy as Agesilaos’ guest-friend, the narrator will continue with a prolepsis that illustrates Agesilaos’ indulgence of the boy by transgressive means.

13.2.2-13.3.2

And for the rest of time, he never ceased to remember this, but even at a later time when the boy had been driven from home and was banished by his brothers into the Peloponnesos, he paid the boy very much attention; and what is more, he even took part in his love affairs. For he was in love with a young athlete from Athens,
but since the youth was large and brawny, he risked being expelled from the Olympic games; the Persian appealed to Agesilaos and asked for aid on behalf of the youth. And Agesilaos, wishing to indulge him with even this, with considerable difficulty accomplished it with much wheeling-and-dealing.

The narrator pauses the chronology for an internal prolepsis that completes the scene before and illustrates Agesilaos’ loyalty as *philos*. The narrator begins the prolepsis with a summary of the circumstances which brought the boy into Agesilaos’ protective hospitality in Sparta; he then presents a scene that provides the narratee with a specific example of Agesilaos’ loyalty to his friends (here his young Persian *xenos*) and the lengths he will go to gratify them. Agesilaos humors the now young man and aids him in his amorous pursuits, but the narrator states that he only accomplished this with great difficulty and perhaps questionable methods (resultant event). This proleptic scene, therefore, not only completes the *xenos*-scene with the boy in Asia Minor, but also corroborates the narrator’s commentary on Agesilaos’ occasional transgression of justice in his eagerness to aid his friends that was presented in 5.1. One example, however, is not sufficient for the narrator to make his point; he follows this prolepsis with two further examples of Agesilaos’ manipulation of justice on behalf of his *philoi*.

13.3.3-13.4.1

Τάλλα μὲν γὰρ ἦν ἁκριβὴς καὶ νόμιμος, ἐν δὲ τοῖς φιλικοῖς πρόφασιν ἐνόμιζεν εἶναι τὸ λίαν δίκαιον. Ἀναφερότατα γοὺν ἐπιστόλιον αὐτοῦ πρὸς Ἰδρίεα τὸν Κάρα τοιούτως ὧν Ἀκιάς εἰ μὲν μὴ ἀδίκει, ἀφεῖ εἰ δὲ ἀδίκει, ἀμιν ἀφεῖ, πάντως δὲ ἀφεῖ.

For while he was otherwise particular and an adherent to law, in the affairs of friends, however, he considered absolute justice to be a pretext. It has been reported at any rate that a note of his to Hidrieos the Karian went like this: “If Nikias did no wrong, let him off; however, if he did do wrong, let him off for me; but in any case, let him off.”
The narrator does not yet return to the story chronology, but presents another, more obvious and egregious example of Agesilaos’ transgressions of justice for friends. Here, the narrator presents an atemporal anachrony that completely lacks context or setting; the narrator’s motivation for including this anecdote is to further his characterization of Agesilaos as philos, rather than having any intrinsic value for the presentation of the chronological events. The narrator sets up the anecdote by directing the narratee’s interpretation before its presentation; he informs his reader that the anecdote he is about to present is an example of Agesilaos regarding justice as inapplicable in the case of his otherwise unknown friend, Nikias. The anecdote is authenticated by the use of the Doric dialect in the character-text and validated by the rhetorical use of “it is reported that…” The φέρεται itself is qualified by the particle γούν that signals the following anecdote that gave rise to the narrator’s comment that Agesilaos considered absolute justice in the case of his friends to be nothing more than pretext.

13.4.2-5

Ἐν μὲν οὖν τοῖς πλείστοις τοιούτοις ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων ὁ Ἅγισιλαος ἦστι δ’, ὅπου πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον ἔχρητο τῷ καίρῳ μᾶλλον, ὥς ἐδηλώσεν, ἀναζυγήσει αὐτῷ δορυβωδεστέρας γενομένης, ἀσθενεύτῳ καταλιπών τὸν ἐρώμενον. Ἐκείνου γὰρ δεομένου καὶ καλοῦντος αὐτὸν ἀπίστα τις ἀρχήσαις εἴπεν, ὡς χαλεπῶς ἐλεεῖν ἀμα καὶ φρονεῖν. Τοιτι μὲν οὖν ἱερώνυμος οἱ φιλόσοφος ἱστορήκεν.

And so, while in most cases this was the sort of man Agesilaos was for his friends, nonetheless, at times he made use of an opportunity for his own advantage instead—as he proved when during a rather turbulent decampment he left behind a boyfriend who was sick. For when the boy was begging and calling out to him while he was leaving, Agesilaos turned around and said that it was difficult to show pity and be sensible at the same time. At any rate, this Hieronymous the philosopher has recorded.

---

The pause in chronology continues for the third and final example of Agesilaos’ manipulation of propriety (if not justice directly). The narrator authorizes the anecdote retroactively with a named source (reference level) and distances himself somewhat from the rather unflattering anecdote of Agesilaos’ opportunism.

The arrangement of events and anecdotes in this chapter served to briefly continue and close the scene of chapter 12 before pausing the fabula-time to give three internal anachronies; the first closed the scene with Pharnabazos’ son and moves to theme of Agesilaos-philos, the second and third anachronies are examples that refine the narrator’s characterization of Agesilaos-philos; the segment ends with an authentication of the final example via the reference level.

14.1.1

"Ηδη δε περιόντος ἐνιαυτοῦ δευτέρου τῇ στρατηγίᾳ πολὺς ἀνω λόγος ἐξώρει τοῦ Ἀγησιλάου, καὶ δόξα θαυμαστὴ κατείχε τῆς τε σωφροσύνης αὐτοῦ καὶ εὐτελείας καὶ μετριότητος.

And when two years had already passed on campaign, much talk about Agesilaos had spread into the interior and a wondrous opinion prevailed of his self-control as well as his frugality and moderation.

With an ellipsis the narrator resituates the story in the chronology and the Asia Minor setting, but then pauses the time again for an analeptic summary to reflect on Agesilaos’ spreading reputation for sophrosune—this sets the chapter theme, which will be fleshed out with focalizations, examples, and commentary. What follows is a summary of Agesilaos’ behavior and conduct while on campaign that will portray Agesilaos at the pinnacle of influence and good reputation. This is a pivotal point in the main story just before Agesilaos’ recall to the war at home; the climax of Agesilaos’ Asian campaign is marked in the story’s rhythm by a pause to
discuss Agesilaos at his pinnacle in Asia. After elevating the story hero to this height, the
narrator will introduce an event, his recall, which will knock Agesilaos down from this summit
and force him to abandon lofty ambitions.

14.1.2-14.2.1

For when abroad, he stayed by himself in the most sacred temples; the things
which most men do not observe us doing, of these he made the gods spectators
and witnesses; while among so many thousands of soldiers one could not easily
find a more inadequate mattress than that of Agesilaos. And even against heat and
cold he held up as if he alone had been born to be always accustomed to the
seasons as god had created them.

The narrator continues the pause and gives examples that illustrate the theme of
Agesilaos’ good reputation, which he had just introduced in the narrative. In simple narrator text,
he summarizes Agesilaos’ behavior in the company of gods and men that won him such
widespread respect. Agesilaos is characterized here as so blameless in his habits that he dared
even to allow the gods witness his behavior by staying within the most sacred spaces. The
placement of the temple anecdote at this point in the narrative was loosely inspired by
Xenophon’s *Agesilaos* 5.4-7; there, the anecdote follows hard upon the Megabates episode that
was given as evidence for Agesilaos’ extreme self-control in matters of desire. Therefore, the
temple anecdote in Xenophon supports his portrayal of a controlled Agesilaos in the Megabates
episode; i.e., Agesilaos did nothing untoward with Megabates and, in fact, kept the gods as
witnesses so that he could not do anything untoward at any time. The temple anecdote is used
somewhat differently here; it follows a little distance from the Megabates episode and, rather than reflecting back to the Megabates affair, it is projected over the entire Asian campaign; i.e. it is used as evidence for Agesilaos’ self-control in general, not just in love affairs.

What is more, the narrator exhibits some of Agesilaos’ habits among his men (keeping the simplest bed among them and maintaining indifference to the elements) that substantiate the characterization presented in the opening chapters of the story. It was emphasized that Agesilaos had won the hearts and minds of his fellow Spartans because of his rearing in the agoge (1.3; 3.3) and while there he had displayed a singular eagerness to undertake hardships (2.1). The characteristics of behavior selected for narration are the particularly “Lykourgan” ones which the agoge education was meant to foster.109

Shipley notes that the Asian campaign narrative in Xenophon’s Agesilaos ends with a eulogistic passage (1.35-39) and it seems that the narrator in Plutarch’s Agesilaos likewise is attempting to create a climax in the narrative before Agesilaos is recalled and has to abandon his expedition.110 By giving the illusion of continued chronological narrative by returning the story to the Asia Minor campaign, the narrator can use indirect characterization via collective focalization of those in Asia Minor spreading word on Agesilaos to reflect upon the achievements of Agesilaos’ expedition and create a climax not of events, but of the achievements of character.

14.2.2

"Ἡδιστον δὲ θέαμα τοῖς κατοικούσι τὴν Ἀσίαν Ἄγηλησιν ἢσαν οἱ πάλαι βαρεῖς καὶ ἄφορητοι καὶ διαρρέουτες ὑπὸ πλοῦτον καὶ τρυφῆς ὑπάρχοι καὶ στρατηγοὶ δεδιότες καὶ θεραπεύουτες ἄνθρωπον ἐν τρῖβων περιόντα λιτῶν,

---

καὶ πρὸς ἐν ρήμα βραχὺ καὶ Λακωνικὸν ἁρμόζοντες ἑαυτοὺς καὶ
μετασχηματίζοντες, ὡστε πολλοῖς ἐπήει τὰ τοῦ Τιμοθέου λέγειν,
"Ἄρης τύραννος: χρυσὸν δὲ Ἑλλὰς οὐ δεδοίκε." 

And it was an exceptionally sweet sight to the Greeks who were settled in Asia to see those who earlier were oppressive and intolerable and who wasted away in wealth and luxury, the lieutenants and generals, now fearing and paying court to a man wearing a simple threadbare cloak; and with one short and Lakonic address, they were adapting and transforming themselves, so that it occurred to many to repeat the words of Timotheos,
"Ares is tyrant; Hellas fears not gold."

The pause and indirect characterization continues in complex text and the narrator returns to the generalized focalization of the Asian Greeks that began the chapter. A comparison is made within the focalization between the unidentified “oppressive” lieutenants and generals who “wasted away in wealth” and Agesilaos “wearing a simple threadbare cloak” who bends these men to his will simply by his Lakonic utterances and bearing. The quote at the end of the section is placed into the minds of the collective focalizers (Asian Greeks) and is used to support their own characterization of Agesilaos just presented.

15.1

"Κινούμενης δὲ τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ πολλαχῶν πρὸς ἀπόστασιν ὑπεικούσης ἁρμοσάμενος τὰς αὐτὸν πόλεις, καὶ ταῖς πολιτείαις δίχα φόνου καὶ φυγῆς ἀνθρώπων ἀποδοῦς τὸν προσίκατον κόσμον, ἐγνώκει πρόσω χωρεῖν καὶ τὸν πόλεμον διάρας ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς βαλάττης περὶ τοῦ σώματος βασιλεῖ καὶ τῆς ἐν Εκβατάνοις καὶ Σοῦσοις εὑδαιμονίας διαμάχοσθαι, καὶ περιστάσαι πρῶτον αὐτοῦ τὴν σχολήν, ὡς μὴ καθέζοιτο τοὺς πολέμους βραβεύων τοῖς Ἑλλησι καὶ διαφθείρων τοὺς δημιουργούς."

111 Shipley (1997) 198-199, discusses the possible identities of these luxuriant men as being either the Persians or the wealthy Greeks living in Asia. Possibilities do indeed abound, but the story structure and narrative suggest the immediate comparison is to the Persians and particularly to Pharnabazos, whom the narrator portrayed in all his finery, but still influenced by Agesilaos’ simple Spartan style.

112 See Shipley (1997) 200, for an example of how Plutarch uses this same quote, but differently in Demetrius 42.3.
And with Asia having been stirred up and given over to revolt in many places, Agesilaos was setting the cities in order on the spot and returning proper order to the governments without slaughter or banishment of men; he was determined to go further and move the war from the Hellenic Sea to contend for the person of the King and the wealth in Ekbatana and Sousa and primarily to strip from him his leisure, so that he could not sit arbitrating wars for the Greeks and corrupting the demagogues.

At the start of the chapter, the narrator returns to the story-time to summarize activity and give Agesilaos’ focalized intentions; this section heightens the praise and celebration of Agesilaos’ Asian achievements immediately before the narrator includes the recall from home. Focalization presents fantastic (and unattained) goals of Agesilaos to conquer Persia in the vein of Alexander, apparently. The narrator imprints upon his character a sense of panhellenism throughout the story (6.1; 6.4; 16.6) and here shows these aspirations dashed by incessant inter-poleis warfare. Although this is really the narrator’s commentary, which adds weight to his Agesilaos-Alexander comparison, it is put in the mind of Agesilaos to elicit sympathy from narratee at his frustration when summoned home.

But at this point Epikydidas, a Spartiate, came to him and announced that a great war among Greeks has come upon Sparta and the ephors summon him and bid him to help those at home.

After summarizing Agesilaos’ actions and intentions in superlative assessments, the narrator presents the next event: the recall. Epikydidas becomes the spokesman for the ephors and the witness that there is a significant war threatening home. This is the pivotal event to
which the narrator was leading the narratee with his laudatory summarization of Agesilaos’ actions while on campaign in the previous sections. At his point, the narrator pauses the story chronology to provide an extended narratorial commentary in which he becomes dramatic and overt.

15.2.2-15.3

“O what barbarous evils the Greeks invent”
For what else could someone say about the resentment and conflict at that time and the contingents of Greeks set against themselves? They laid hold of fortune borne upon the heavens; and the weapons that were in sight of the barbarians and war that had already been banished from Greece, they once again turned upon themselves. I do not agree with the Korinthian Demaratos who said that those Greeks were deprived of an exceptional pleasure who missed seeing Alexander sitting on the throne of Darius, rather, I think in all likelihood they would weep upon contemplating that these very deeds they left to Alexander and Makedon—those who at that time then depleted the generals of Greece at Leuktra and Koroneia and Korinth and Arkadia.

The narrator now pauses the story-time for a lengthy narratorial commentary by suddenly interjecting a Euripidean quotation. The tragic quote, interjected at a pivotal point in the narrative, elicits an emotional response from the narratee; the narratee is to interpret the recall of Agesilaos at his pinnacle in Asia Minor as a tragic turn in events. After the quotation he uses an anonymous interlocutor to create concordance with the narratee. The narrator leaves no room for

113 Trojan Women, 764.
interpretation on the part of his reader and directs the reception of the turn of events with direct commentary. Suddenly with the use of the first-person, the narrator becomes overt and dramatic and inserts himself into a hypothetical discussion on the pleasure of Greeks who later witnessed Alexander overthrow the Persian Empire. This external prolepsis, like all the external anachronies in the story, communicates to the narratee the narrator’s interpretation of Agesilaos’ story in the larger context of Greek history. Two sides of the argument are presented, but the narrator strongly dismisses the first in favor of his own interpretation of future Greek sentiments (a projected focalization). The battles which “depleted the generals of Greece” have not yet happened at this point in the story chronology and the narrator is projecting his opinion for the narratee about the ultimate results of the coming engagements: the battles that Agesilaos will have a hand in fostering will be responsible for the deterioration of all Greek hegemony and open the door for Makedon’s dominance. The overt comments by the narrator characterize him as someone who laments Greece’s continual internal warfare, which he sees as the cause for its retardation and eventual subjugation. Not all narratees might agree and the narrator gives play to this alternate view by presenting the statement of Demaratus only to disagree with him. There is an unstated contrary to fact implied here: if the war had not killed all the great Greek generals, then one of them, perhaps even Agesilaos, would have conquered Persia instead of Alexander of Makedon. This implies the narrator’s approval of Agesilaos’ (supposed) plans to penetrate deep into Persia and compels the reader to complete the syllogism, hence mentally agreeing with the narrator.

15.4

Ἀγησιλάω μέντοι οὐδὲν κρείττον ἢ μεῖζόν ἐστι τῆς ἀναχωρήσεως ἐκείνης διαπεταμένου, οὔτε γέγονε παράδειγμα πειθαρχίας καὶ δίκαιοποίησις ἐτερον κάλλιον. Ὅπου γὰρ Αννίβας ἢδη κακῶς πράττων καὶ περιωθούμενος
Agesilaos, however, accomplished nothing greater or more esteemed than his retreat nor had there been another example of obedience to command and justice more beautiful. For whereas Hannibal was doing poorly and being pushed from Italy, he still only scarcely complied with those calling him to the war at home; and Alexander even joked when learning of Antipater’s battle against Agis, saying, “It seems, men, that while we have been vanquishing Darius here, over there in Arkadia has been some sort of battle among mice.”

The narrator returns to his subject (Agesilaos), but the pause for commentary continues. In this section, he makes two external proleptic comparisons to Agesilaos’ response to his recall in order to emphasize the singularity of Agesilaos’ obedience to command even when greater glory was lying within his grasp.

15.5-15.6.1

How was it not worthy to deem Sparta privileged by Agesilaos’ esteem toward her and his discretion to the laws? Who, as soon as the dispatch came to him, giving up and abandoning such great success, such power at-hand and long-standing hopes that were guiding him on, at once sailed off ‘with task uncompleted,’ leaving behind a great desire for him among his allies; and thus the greatest disproof of the adage of Erasistratos son of Phaiax who said that in public the Lakedaimonians are better, but in private, the Athenians. For exhibiting himself an optimum king and general, he still proved privately a better and more pleasant friend and intimate to his associates.
The pause continues and the narrator interjects another rhetorical question and uses one event (Agesilaos’ departure) as validation of his interpretation of events as well as a refutation of Erasistratos’ adage, which itself echoes the theme of Agesilaos and his friendships. The Homeric echo recalls Agesilaos’ sentiments about the Theban interruption of his sacrifice at Aulis (6.6); thus the narrator has brought the story of the Asian campaign full circle.

The narrator’s high style marks this passage as a climactic point in the narrative wherein Agesilaos is at his pinnacle of power and the object of outright praise by the narrator. The narrator suggests that not only should the narratee hold Agesilaos in high esteem for abandoning his success in Asia Minor to obediently return to Greece, but also should recognize that Sparta itself was privileged to have such a virtuous and dutiful king who was willing to lay aside his personal aspirations and immediately come to the aid of his state. It is not just in the public sphere, however, that the narrator insists Agesilaos was a great man, but he adds to the estimation the ascertain of Agesilaos’ superiority in his treatment of friends and associates. Thus, Agesilaos is to be admired by the narratee for his public actions as well as his private behavior.

15.6.2

Τοῦ δὲ Περσικοῦ νομίσματος χάραγμα τοξότην ἔχοντος, ἀναξιωματικῶν ἔφη μυρίων τοξόταις ὑπὸ βασιλέως ἐξελαύνοντο τῆς Ἀσίας τοσούτων γὰρ εἰς Ἀθηνᾶς καὶ Θῆβας κομισθέντων καὶ διαδοθέντων τοῖς δημαγωγοῖς ἐξεπολεμώθησαν οἱ δήμοι πρὸς τοὺς Σπαρτιάτας.

Now, since the impress of Persian coinage was of an archer, he said while packing up camp that he was being driven out of Asia by tens of thousands of the King’s archers; for so much coin was being given to the Athenians and Thebans and distributed among the demagogues that the people became hostile to the Spartans.
This is a sudden, awkward return to story-time and the departure of Agesilaos. This anecdotal scene both marks the departure of the expedition from Asia and sets the blame for the war on the Theban and Athenian (though they, in fact, did not accept the money) acceptance of Persian bribes. The Plutarchian narrator uses this bribery anecdote to act as a period on the long chapter of Agesilaos’ Asian campaign, but has charged the Greeks and their incessant internecine warfare with being primarily responsible for preventing Agesilaos from conquering Persia. This charge of bribery is included almost as an afterthought and an opportunity to display Agesilaos’ wit.

This arrangement is markedly different from that in Xenophon’s *Hellenika* 3.5.1. There, the narrative detailing the Persian bribery of the Greeks is placed immediately after Agesilaos was given command of the navy and he appointed Peisander as nauarch. Moreover, it is Tithraustes who resents Agesilaos’ plans to overthrow the King and thus sends Timokrates of Rhodes to Greece with a quantity of gold with the intention of inciting a war in Greece that would require Agesilaos to depart from Asia. Thereafter, a lengthy narrative follows (3.5.1-15) that describes Timokrates’ dealings with and corruption of the cities, especially Korinth, Thebes, and Athens (who wants war, but rejects the bribe). Following this lengthy account, the narrator returns to Agesilaos in Asia (4.1.1), who is just about to win over Kotys as an ally and before Spithridates captures Pharnabazos’ camp. Thus, if the Plutarchian narrator was concerned with chronological precision, he would have mentioned the bribery just before the start of chapter 11, not here at the end of chapter 15. Chronological precision, however, is not an objective of the Plutarchian narrator. Should the anecdote have been included at that point, it would have lessened the narrator’s charge against the Greeks at 15.2-4 and more fully implicated Tithraustes, who receives Agesilaos’ gratitude at 10.4-5, as responsible for fomenting war in Greece.
Part Four: chapters 16-19.3

These four chapters close the narrative describing Agesilaos while on campaign in Asia Minor and relate his movements into Thrace and, eventually, Boiotia, where he will engage the Thebans and their allies in the Battle of Koroneia. A single year, 394 B.C.E., is covered in these chapters with an ellipsis in the story occurring after the dedication of the war booty at Delphi. The amount of story-time in these chapters are predominantly devoted to the summer of 394 B.C.E., the period during which Agesilaos crossed the Hellespont, made his way through northern Greece, fought at the Battle of Koroneia, and dedicated the tithe of booty from Asia at Delphi.

In the first sections, the narrator presents a sequence of events that both move Agesilaos and his forces through northern Greece and, more notably, characterize Agesilaos’ strong diplomatic and military leadership in a series of encounters with barbarians and hostile Greeks. This series of demonstrations of leadership in the field will be complemented in chapters 19.4-22, where the main narratorial motivation will be to characterize Agesilaos’ social conservatism at home. Both here and in the following sections, the narrator will use the historical context of events to frame and explore Agesilaos’ ethos in action.

The use of apothegms becomes more frequent in these chapters as the events are punctuated with quotations of Agesilaos before the narrator moves on to the next event. This, in addition to the use of embedded focalization, serves to substantiate the narrator’s presentation of character, instill a sense of factual representation of the events, and to structure the sequence of hostile encounters into delineated sections. In addition to furthering the theme of the king’s military acumen, the narrator revisits the themes of Agesilaos’ regard for his friends, his tenacity in the face of enemies, and his hostility toward Thebes. Furthermore, events from earlier in the
story, most notably Agesilaos’ raising a cavalry and his acquisition of funds for Sparta from his
Asia campaign, maintain narrative cohesion.

16.1-16.2.1

And so having passed over the Hellespont, he proceeded through Thrace. He asked for nothing from the barbarians, but sending men to each he inquired whether he should traverse their country as a friend or as an enemy. And while all the others greeted him as a friend and escorted him along as each was able, those called the Trochalians, to whom even Xerxes, it is said, had bestowed gifts, demanded from Agesilaos as the fee for passage one hundred talents of silver and as many women. But he bantered in reply, “Why, then, haven’t they immediately come to take it?” He marched on and engaging those who drew up for battle, he put them to flight and killed many.

After the pause for commentary and gradual resumption of the forward chronology of the last section, the narrator quickens the rhythm with a summary of events that brings Agesilaos over the Hellespont and into Thrace. After summarizing the first results of his communications with the barbarians, that all received him as a friend and let him pass through their territory, he presents the hostile response of the Trochalians and their demands for passage. The narrator, before presenting these demands, heightens the characterization of the Trochalians as hostile by an external analepsis, authorized by anonymous spokesmen (“it is said”), that recalls Xerxes’ difficulty in dealing with these people and his submission to their demands. This sets up
juxtaposition between the Persian king and Agesilaos wherein the narrator will demonstrate that Agesilaos was superior to the Persian in that he would not submit to their demands.

The Plutarchian narrator implies what the Xenophonic narrator of Ages. 2.1 made explicit; Agesilaos followed the same route into Greece that Xerxes had taken, but Agesilaos took only a month to cross into Greece whereas Xerxes took a year. Rather than emphasize the swiftness of Agesilaos’ movements in comparison to Xerxes, the Plutarchian narrator highlights Agesilaos’ superiority in another way. Specifically, he states that while Xerxes acquiesced in the Trochaliants’ demands and paid them tribute, Agesilaos rebuffs their demands with a classic Lakonic reply.

The terms of the Trochaliants’ demands are presented directly by the narrator and this sets up the first of Agesilaos’ apothegms in the chapter. Here, as in the following episodes of this chapter, the narrator reports the opponents’ reactions to Agesilaos’ demands directly to the reader in simple text and then gives Agesilaos’ apothegm in character text. The journey from Asia into Greece is represented by a series of episodic events that are used to exemplify Agesilaos’ astute generalship; he assesses and reacts to each situation correctly. He displays contempt in the face of haughtiness with the Trochaliants, decisiveness in the face of the Makedonian’s hesitation, outright hostility to declared enemies, and diplomacy and concern in the face of the Larissians’ aggression and threat to friends. Each episode, therefore, becomes a snapshot from the march into Greece that is made memorable for the narratee by inclusion of Agesilaos’ clever remarks, which themselves serve to characterize Agesilaos as an astute

114 Shipley (1997) 212-213 points out the chastic construction of the chapter, which “contains a rhetorical series of six cases, in two sets of three…illustrating Agesilaos’ wit, laconic brevity, confidence, and bluff…Either a peaceful passage or an enforced passage ensues, resulting from the three possibilities: diplomatic agreement, resistance, aggression.”
commander. The Trochalian episode closes with summary of action taken against those who took
the field against Agesilaos.

16.2.2-16.3.1

This same question he then sent on to the king of the Makedonians; and when the
king answered that he would think about it, Agesilaos said, “Fine, let him go on
thinking; but we’ll go ahead and march on.” So then, being astounded by the
nerve of the man and alarmed, the king gave word that he should go on as a
friend. But since the Thessalians were allied with his enemies, he ravaged their
country.

The narrator maintains the rhythm and continues the forward chronology at the same
pace. After meeting with hostility from Trochalians, Agesilaos is met with hesitation from the
Makedonian king. This leads to the second character text apothegm of the chapter. Agesilaos is
once again shown as successfully sizing up the situation and in the face of his boldness the
Makedonian king abandons his hesitation and welcomes Agesilaos’ army on friendly terms. The
fourth interaction with barbarians on the return march is with the Thessalians. They are presented
as enemies already and so there is no need for words; Agesilaos ravages their territory.

16.3.2-16.4

Eis δε Λάρισσαν ἐπέμψε ξενοκλέα καὶ Σκύθην περὶ φιλίας’ συλληφθέντων δὲ
tούτων καὶ παραφυλαττομένων οἱ μὲν άλλοι βαρέως φέροντες ἄνωτο δεῖν
τὸν Ἀγησιλάου περιστρατοπεδέσαντα πολιορκεῖν τὴν Λάρισσαν, ὃ δὲ
φήσας οὐκ ἂν ἔθελήσαι Θεσσαλίαν ὅλην λαβεῖν ἀπολέσας τῶν ἀνδρῶν τὸν
ἐτερον ὑποστόνδους αὐτούς ἀπέλαβε. Καὶ τούτ’ ἵσως ἐπ’ Ἀγησιλάου
θαυμαστὸν οὐκ ἦν, ὡς πυθόμενος μάχην μεγάλην γεγονέναι περὶ Κόρινθου
And into Larissa he sent Xenocles and Skythes to negotiate friendship, but they were apprehended and put under heavy guard; and while the others, distressed, thought Agesilaos ought to set up camp and besiege Larissa, instead he said that he would not wish to capture all of Thessaly if it meant losing either of the men and got them back under treaty. This perhaps was not uncommon with Agesilaos, who, when he learned of the great battle that took place at Korinth [and that men of the highest repute were lost in an instant] and that although few of the Spartans in all were killed, a great number of the enemy had fallen, he was not seen exuberant nor elated, but groaning very deeply he said, “Oh Hellas! what great men have been destroyed by her, who alive could have together conquered all the barbarians in battle.”

The narrator continues the forward chronology and presents the forth episodic example of Agesilaos as *strategos* in the chapter; this time Agesilaos attempts a treaty of friendship by sending two of his *philoi* as envoys. When the two men are arrested by the Larissians, those around Agesilaos push for battle. He, however, sets aside his *philotimia* and expresses his regard for men that outweighs his desire for conquest and sues for the men’s return. This is followed by a pause in the story-time for an internal analepsis, the news of the battle at Korinth, that further highlights Agesilaos’ *philanthropia* and panhellenism, an image of the king that the narrator has been steadily building. The analepsis culminates in character-text expressing Agesilaos’ lamentation and, furthermore, the apothegm returns the reader to the theme of Agesilaos’

---

115 This line is bracketed by Lindskog (1902) 24 and deleted by Schaefer because it is not contained in the anecdote as preserved in Mor. 211f (*Apophth. Lak.*). This does not, of course, preclude the possibility that Plutarch fleshed out the anecdote in this rendition.
potential to be equal to or greater than Alexander, a comparison the narrator has built since the start of the Asian expedition.116

The episode of the philoi’s arrest by the Larissians and Agesilaos’ peaceful negotiations for their return is not mentioned by Diodoros or Xenophon and thus Plutarch must have discovered it in another source. By including the episode in this section, the narrator is able to present a fuller spectrum of Agesilaos as strategos; the negotiations for his friends’ return demonstrates that Agesilaos did not meet every challenge with hostility, but was able to temper his responses to the appropriateness of the situation. In addition, Agesilaos’ treatment of and loyalty to his friends is one of the dominant themes of the story, as the narrator signaled in his direct characterization of the man in chapter 5, and this episode contributes to the strength of that characterization. In support of this characterization, the narratee is presented with an event that clearly demonstrates Agesilaos’ subordination of his own personal glory to the higher loyalty to his philoi. Furthermore, it provides the narrator with the opportunity to discuss Agesilaos’ high valuation of men, especially soldiers, so as to act as a segue into the analepsis of his reaction to the news of the victory at Korinth.

We know from Hell. 4.3.1-3 that Agesilaos had received the news of Korinth while he was still in Amphipolis on his return from Asia. In Xenophon’s Agesilaos, however, the event is not included in the chronological narrative of the second chapter, but is reserved until 7.5 where it is used as evidence of Agesilaos’ panhellenism.117 Likewise in our Plutarchian version, the news of the victory at Korinth is incorporated into the story out of the chronological context in order to exemplify a characteristic of Agesilaos. In Xenophon’s encomium, the motivation was

116 Cf. the apothegm preserved in Moralia 191b where it is only the number of enemy dead that Agesilaos laments and there is no mention of the small number of Spartan and allied deaths.

117 See Shipley (1997) 217, Xenophon records the news in the Hellenika, but no moral is drawn; Agesilaos simply receives the news and passes it on to the Asian allies. The Plutarchian narrator, in constrast, uses the event to draw a moral.
to display Agesilaos’ desire that the Greeks focus their energies against their common enemy, Persia, rather than weakening themselves from within by internal warfare and thereby making themselves vulnerable to injury from the Persians. In comparison, the narratorial motivation behind the displaced event in Plutarch’s biography is to substantiate the narrator’s presentation of the Larissian event as being evidence of Agesilaos’ high regard for his men’s lives. The analepsis is not significantly displaced in the chronology, but reserving mention of the Korinthian battle until this point enabled the narrator to use the event in a way that corroborates his characterization of Agesilaos more effectively.

But when the Pharsalians were closely following him and abusing the troops, he ordered five hundred cavalrymen to attack with him and having routed them he set up a trophy at the foot of Mt. Narthakion. And this victory in particular made him exceedingly pleased because—having collected the cavalry himself—with himself and only these, he prevailed over those who thought themselves the best at horsemanship.

After the internal analepsis and Agesilaos’ mournful response to the Korinthian news, the narrator returns to the forward chronology and the confrontations Agesilaos met during his return march. This last action with the barbarians in northern Greece is summarized with little detail about the actual confrontation. The harassments by the Pharsalians are presented as an ongoing event by use of the genitive absolute, but the confrontation is given as a singular occurrence. In *Hell.* 4.3.3–9, however, there were several groups of people, including the Larissians,
Krannonians, Scotussaians in addition to the Pharsalians who were following and harassing Agesilaos’ army. In that version Agesilaos takes a stand against these attackers with his hoplites before sending his cavalry after them and securing a victory (4.3.5). Here, the harassment and confrontations are condensed into a single episode and the aggressors are simplified into a single identification as the Pharsalians. As with the pervious episodes of the chapter, the narratorial motivation is to present Agesilaos’ astute generalship within chronological context, not to present the full chronology of events. Thus, the resultant confrontation between the Pharsalians and Agesilaos’ cavalry is summarized and the action rapidly culminates in victory and the trophy erected at Narthakion. The narrator ends the chapter with the focalization of Agesilaos, who takes great delight in this final victory since it proved that his self-raised cavalry was superior to the Pharsalians, who thought that they were expert horsemen—a boast that Agesilaos proves hollow. This focalization is, in turn, the motivation for the inclusion of the event; the narrator demonstrates that Agesilaos, who had been inferior in horse in Asia (emphasized at 9.3, 10.2), had indeed trained a formidable cavalry.

17.1-17.2.2

Ενταύθα Διφρίδας οίκοθεν ἔφορος ὤν ἀπήντησεν αὐτῷ κελεύων εὖθὺς ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν Βοιωτίαν. Ὁ δὲ, καίπερ ἀπὸ μείζονος παρασκευῆς ύστερον τούτῳ ποιῆσαι διανοούμενος, οὐδὲν ὤστε δεῖν ἀπειθεῖν τοῖς ἀρχουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τε μεθ' ἣσευτον προείπεν ἐργῇς εἶναι τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐφ' ἢν ἐς Ἀσίας ἤκουσι, καὶ δύο μόρας μετεπέμψατο τῶν περὶ Κόρινθου στρατευομένων. Οἱ δ' ἐν τῇ πόλει Λακεδαιμονίων τιμῶντες αὐτὸν ἐκήρυξαν τῶν νέων τὸν βουλόμενον ἀπογράφεσθαι τῷ βασιλεῖ βοηθεῖν. Ἀπογραφαμένοι δὲ πάντων προθύμωσι, οἱ ἀρχουσις πεντήκοντα τοὺς ἀκμαιοτάτους καὶ ῥωμαλεωτάτους ἐκλέξαντες ἀπέστειλαν.

Right then Diphridas, an ephor, came from home bidding him to invade Boiotia immediately. And he, although intending to do this later after more preparation,

thought he ought not disobey the magistrates, but he said to those who were with him that the day was at hand for which they had come from Asia and sent for two *morai* of the army near Korinth. And the Lakedaimonians in the city, to honor him, gave public notice that any youth wanting to give aid to the king would be enlisted. And since everyone was enlisting enthusiastically, the magistrates selected and sent out fifty recruits who were the strongest and at the peak of perfection.

The narrator continues the forward chronological progression from the section before and indicates that the arrival of Diphridas was a synchronous event with the victory at Mt. Narthakion. The marching orders to Agesilaos are followed by his focalized internal response that indicates he was planning to invade Boiotia, but only after he was better prepared. This sets up juxtaposition with his external response, his obedience to the command, that brings to the fore Agesilaos’ unquestioning obedience to the ephors. Once again, the event is narrated in such a way that it indirectly adds to the narrator’s characterization of Agesilaos as steadfastly obedient to the state. Agesilaos was already planning to invade Boiotia, but needed more preparation; thus, he was willing to violate his tactical considerations for obedience to the magistrates. Agesilaos’ internal reaction to the orders also leads the narrative seamlessly into the next series of events: Agesilaos’ mental preparation of his troops, his calling for the *mora* stationed near Korinth, and the enlistment of chosen recruits at Lakedaimon. With this series of events, the narrator sets up the expectation that the invasion into Boiotia will be a significant one, as indeed the Battle of Koroneia will prove it to be.

The narrator states that the Lakedaimonians were motivated by a desire to honor Agesilaos and so recruited an honor guard to aid the king. This actorial motivation contributes to the image of Agesilaos as near the pinnacle of his career and reputation at this point in the story; the narrator will continue this image of unwavering popularity until chapter 23 wherein examples and discussion of the deterioration of Agesilaos’ reputation will begin to pepper the story. The
mention of the fifty chosen recruits at this point contributes to the story’s structure as well; these will be the men whom the narrator will credit with saving Agesilaos from death during the battle at Koroneia in chapter 18.\textsuperscript{120} Here he establishes that the recruits were chosen from among the best of the best, all of who were eager to volunteer themselves to protect Agesilaos. In the later chapter, the narrator demonstrates that these recruits were indeed as dedicated and gifted as they are characterized here.

17.2.3-17.3

And Agesilaos was marching through Thermopylai and traveling through Phokis—as it was an ally—when as soon as he stepped foot into Boiotia and had set up camp near Chaironeia, at that moment the sun was hidden and to the eye looked like a crescent shape, while in the same instant Agesilaos heard that Peisander was dead—defeated in a naval battle off Knidos by Pharnabazos and Konon. And so he was dejected, as is reasonable, at these tidings—both on behalf of the man and on behalf of the city—but in order that timidity and fear not infect the troops who were on the verge of entering battle, he ordered those messengers who had come from the shore to say the opposite instead: that they were victorious in the naval battle. And he himself went around wearing garlands and celebrated the good news with sacrifices and distributed portions from the sacrifices among his friends.

\textsuperscript{120} See Shipley (1997) 222-223 for discussion of rarity of such calls for volunteers and their possible identity.
The narrator briefly summarizes Agesilaos’ movements into Boiotia and the story rhythm slows once he has moved into and encamped near Chaironeia.\textsuperscript{121} At this point, the narrator discusses three synchronous events: Agesilaos’ arrival in Boiotia, the eclipse of the sun, and the arrival of news from Knidos.\textsuperscript{122} The synchrony of the events has a dramatic and foreboding effect for the external narratee as well as Agesilaos, the internal narratee, and thus the narrator builds more tension before narrating the Battle of Koronea. Of the synchronous events, the narrator singles out the defeat at Knidos as the most significant.\textsuperscript{123} The narrator had directly commented at 10.6 on the poor choice Agesilaos made in assigning Peisander to command the navy and here the outcome of Knidos has proven his words apt. He does not comment on this again, but instead comments upon Agesilaos’ reception of and reaction to the news. He then pauses the story action for Agesilaos’ reaction. He states that Agesilaos was dejected at the news and interjects directly to support Agesilaos’ reaction was “reasonable”. This overt narratorial interjection elicits empathy on the part of the narratee, who is invited to share in the sentiment. The pause continues for an explanation of Agesilaos’ feeling of dejection; he was upset personally by the loss of the man, Peisander, and publicly for what the loss meant to his city.

It is the actions Agesilaos took next that the narrator singles out for fuller narration as an indicator of the man’s character as commander. Before telling how Agesilaos had the messengers reverse the news of the defeat, the narrator first discloses the actorial motivation: Agesilaos did not want fear to infect his troops before the coming battle. The Plutarchian narrator has slightly altered and condensed the account given in \textit{Hell} 4.3.13; there, it is Agesilaos himself who reverses and reports the news as he offers sacrifice. After his announcement his troops win a

\textsuperscript{121} For discussion of the possible routes and their topographies, see Shipley (1997) 223-224.
\textsuperscript{122} The eclipse took place on August 14, 395 BCE; see Cartledge (1987) 218.
\textsuperscript{123} It seems that he is following Xenophon’s lead in \textit{Hell}. 4.3.10 by presenting these events as synchronous, but in Xenophon’s version, the narrative diverts to discuss the details of the naval battle whereas our narrator maintains his focus upon Agesilaos and his reception of the news.
skirmish with the enemy, a victory that the narrator directly attributes to Agesilaos’ reversal of
the news. In our version, Agesilaos orders the messengers to reverse the news and he performs a
sacrifice and celebration in thanksgiving, an act that authenticates the news of the heralds.

18.1.1-18.1.2

Afterwards, when he had advanced and was on the plain of Koroneia, he caught
sight of the enemy and had them in view and drew up two contingents of
Orchomenians on the left wing, while he led the right himself. And the Thebans
took the right themselves, while the Argives were on the left.

The narrator moves the chronology and action forward to the battlefield with an ellipsis
(Επεί) and summarizes the positions taken in the battle lines on both sides. The contingents and
identities of the opposing sides are simplified in this version of events to the Thebans and
Argives confronting Agesilaos’ army from Asia along with two contingents of Orchomenians. In
comparison, Xenophon’s Hellenika 4.3.15 identifies the Boiotians, Athenians, Argives,
Corinthians, Aenianians, Euboians, and the East and West Lokrians as forming the force opposed
to Agesilaos with the Lakedaimonian contingents who came from Korinth, half a regiment of
Orchomenians, Phokians, as well as the helots, foreigners and Asiatic Greeks who had formed
the expedition force in Asia Minor. This single example makes it clear that the Plutarchian
narrator’s purpose is not to analyze the historical details of the battle, but to expose the subject’s
character as it manifests itself in action. Indeed, the most detailed narrative of the battle in this

124 Cartledge (1987) 218 interprets the sacrifice as Agesilaos’ attempt “quite literally to ‘beef them up…” so that
they were fortified for the battle ahead.
chapter (18.3) focuses solely on the action centered around Agesilaos and, in the next chapter, his actions and decisions immediately after the battle.

18.1.3

Λέγει δὲ τὴν μάχην ὁ Ζενοφών ἐκείνην οἵαν οὐκ ἄλλην τῶν πόλεων γενέσθαι καὶ παρῆν αὐτὸς τῷ Ἀγησιλάῳ συναγωγιζόμενος ἐξ Ἀσίας διαβεβηκός.

And Xenophon says that battle was like no other ever before; and he himself was there with Agesilaos having joined with him after he had crossed over from Asia.

Before narrating the action of the battle, the narrator pauses the story-time for a focalization of Xenophon, who had claimed in the *Hellenika* (4.3.16) as well as the *Agesilaos* (2.9) that the battle proved to be like none other of his time. The narrator then steps back in to validate Xenophon’s judgment by stating that Xenophon was present with Agesilaos at the battle and therefore was an eyewitness of the events. Thus, the narrator is using Xenophon not so much as a historical source who wrote about the battle, but as a documentary source who witnessed the events firsthand. By presenting the focalization of Xenophon as an eyewitness, the narrator establishes with his narratee that his coming narrative will be reliable as he is evidently acquainted with Xenophon’s documentation of the battle. The focalization also transfers the judgment of the uniqueness of the battle to Xenophon, who, unlike the narrator, could pronounce such a judgment since he was there firsthand.

18.2

125 I disagree with Shipley (1997) 229 who states, “Plutarch notes Xenophon’s presence only to validate the description of the battle as unique, not to substantiate his own account.” The claim of the battle’s uniqueness is correctly ascribed to Xenophon, but the invocation of Xenophon, here an eyewitness, has been used repeatedly by the narrator throughout the story to maintain a level of reliability with his narratee. There is no reason to assume that this is not also the case here.
So then, the first clash did not have vigor nor much struggle, but both the Thebans quickly routed the Orchomenians and Agesilaos the Argives; but when each side got word that their left wings had been pressed and turned in flight; then although certain victory would have been his if he had mind to slacken the assault against the Thebans along the frontlines and to strike by pursuing those who pass through the lines; but under the sway of anger and ambition, he drove head-on against the men, wanting to push them back by force.

The narrator now returns to the events of the battle and summarizes the opening moves and outcome of the initial clash, which he had first premised as lacking drive. This is juxtaposed in a μέν…δέ construction with the second clash, which will give the narrator cause for direct commentary. The narrator pauses the action to comment on the course of action taken by Agesilaos by presenting an alternative and unreal course of action, which Agesilaos might have taken, but did not. This, in turn, sets up an unreal juxtaposition with the actual course of events; Agesilaos did not allow the Thebans to pass, but attacked them head-on. The narrator uses the juxtaposition as an opportunity to interpret the actorial motivation and he does this by reestablishing story themes. Agesilaos met the Thebans head-on because he was under the influence of anger (thumos) and ambition (philonikia), key terms of this passage. This presentation is similar to that given at Hellenika 4.3.19, where the narrator claims one could say Agesilaos acted courageously, but he did not choose the safest course of action by meeting the Thebans directly. There is, however, a significant difference between the two accounts. There is no actorial motivation ascribed to Agesilaos by the Hellenika narrator; Agesilaos’ action is viewed as dangerous, but courageous. In contrast, the narrator of our version, although closely
echoing the Xenophonic narrative at this point, is careful to present Agesilaos’ action as motivated by his hatred of Thebes and his overweening ambition. This presentation, in turn, elucidates the narratorial motivation: our narrator intended the narratee to interpret Agesilaos’ actions through the lens of the characterization of the man as presented in this *Bios*.

There is a more significant difference in the versions and the actorial motivation for the second confrontation. In both Xen. *Hell.* 4.3.18 and Ages. 2.11 the motivation for action by Agesilaos against the Thebans is the need to protect the baggage train that was carrying the enormous loot from Asia. Here in Plutarch’s version, the entire context of the need to protect this loot is omitted; the events are compressed (resulting in a somewhat confusing narrative) and twisted to better fit the themes of this story. The actorial motivation for such a dangerous assault in Plutarch’s version was not the immediate need to secure the baggage train, but the unchecked passions of a possessed man. These passions, anger (*thumos*) and a lust for victory (*philonikia*), are two of those that the narrator has been establishing as characteristic of Agesilaos and which, when uncontrolled, are deleterious to *harmonia* and *arete*. Thus, the events of the fabula are compressed, simplified, and presented in this story to serve as the chronological context for the development of the story’s themes.

18.3

Οἱ δ’ οὖν ἦττον ἐφρωμένως ἐδέξαντο, καὶ μάχη γίνεται δι’ ὅλου μὲν ἰσχυρὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος, ἰσχυρότατη δὲ κατ’ ἐκεῖνον αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς πεντήκοντα τεταγμένοι, ὅν εἰς καρπὸν ἔοικεν ἡ φιλοτιμία τῶν βασιλείων γενέσθαι καὶ σωτηρίας. Αγωνιζόμενοι γὰρ ἐκθύμοις καὶ προκινδυνεύοντες ἀτρωτὸν μὲν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ ἑξουσίας φυλάξαν, πολλάς δὲ διὰ τῶν ὑπλῶν εἰς τὸ σῶμα δεξάμενον πληγάς δόρασι καὶ ξίφος μόλις ἀνήρπασαν ζώντα, καὶ συμφράζαντες πρὸ αὐτοῦ πολλοὺς μὲν ἀνήρους, πολλοὶ δ’ ἔπιπτον.

But they, received them no less vigorously and a battle occurred that, while fierce amongst all the troops, was the fiercest around that man himself amid his fifty
men drawn up in order, whose daring at the right time seemed to be the king’s very deliverance. For even though they were contending crazily and bearing the brunt of the battle, they still were unable to keep him unharmed; he received many blows through his armor and into his body from spears and swords and was scarcely dragged off alive; and closing around him they killed many, although many of them fell.

Direct narration continues with a summary of the second confrontation. The narrator, once again, focuses his attention on the action that directly involved Agesilaos. The recruits who were introduced in 17.2 are now brought into the action of the story and are credited with saving the life of Agesilaos. This brings the narrator’s presentation of these recruits full circle; they had been introduced to the story as motivated by an eagerness to assist the king and here are shown with that same zeal in his deliverance. Furthermore, their successful salvation of the king’s life validates their presentation as the Spartan’s best of the best.

The focalization of Agesilaos that closed the section before, specifically his motivation for meeting the foe head-on, is dropped for the narrator’s assessment of the action. The focus is primarily on the fifty select recruits and their heroic defense of the king, which highlights both Agesilaos’ rashness in the frontal attack and the excellence of the youths who were astutely selected by the Spartan magistrates for precisely this type of situation in 17.2.2. Although the narrator has summarized the action, the dramatic effect of the scene is not lost, and, in fact, the quick pace of the narrative adds excitement to the passage. Agesilaos is no longer the agent of the action, as in the passage before, but is victim to the events surrounding him. Specifically, the action comes to Agesilaos and the fighting consolidates around him, but it is the recruits who bear “the brunt of the battle” and can scarcely rescue their wounded king from the battlefield. The narrator highlights the recruits’ selfless heroism by attributing to them Agesilaos’ salvation and the slaying of many opponents while many lost their own lives as a result.
But as it was a great task to repulse the Thebans head-on, they were forced to do the very thing that from the beginning they did not want to do. That is, they made way for their ranks and stood back, and then once the enemy troops were moving on in more disarray, having thus passed all the way through, they struck in the flanks having followed upon and outrun them. However, they did not in fact rout them, but the Thebans withdrew to Mt. Helikon priding themselves on the battle, as, according to them, they were undefeated.

The narrator broadens his focus from Agesilaos and his bodyguard to the closing actions of the larger battle. He directly states that the frontal attack was a difficult undertaking, as the preceding section demonstrated, and that this motivated Agesilaos’ men to do what they did not want to do. This is then explained by the next event wherein the ranks are opened and the Thebans allowed to pass. The resultant event is summarized: Agesilaos’ men attack the Thebans’ flanks after they have passed through the ranks, but they were unable to rout them and the Thebans were able to withdraw to Mt. Helikon. The interpretation of the final actions of the battle is presented not by the narrator, but focalized through the Thebans, who consider themselves the victors. This focalization suggests that it was the Thebans alone who considered themselves victors and, with the narrator’s silence on the validity of this claim, the narratee is alerted to the uncertain results of this battle.
Agesilaos δὲ, καὶ περ ὑπὸ τραυμάτων πολλῶν κακῶς τὸ διακείμενος, οὐ πρότερον ἐπὶ σκηνήν ἀπῆλθεν ἢ φοράδην ἐνεχθῆναι πρὸς τὴν φάλαγγα καὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς ἱδεῖν ἐντὸς τῶν ὑπάλλων συγκεκομισμένους. Ὄσοι μὲν τοῖς πολεμίων εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν κατέφυγον, πάντας ἐκέλευσεν ἁφεθῆναι. Πλησίον γὰρ ὁ νεὼς ἐστὶ τῆς Ἰτωνίας Ἀθηνᾶς, καὶ πρὸς αὐτοῦ τρόπαιον ἐστηκεν, ὁ πάλαι Βοιωτοὶ Σπάρτῶνος στρατηγοῦντος ἐνταῦθα νικήσαντες Ἀθηναίους καὶ Τολμίδην ἀποκτείναντες ἐστησαν.

But Agesilaos, even though badly affected by many wounds, would not go into his tent until he was carried around in a stretcher to the troops and saw that the dead were carried within the camp. And on top of that, all those of the enemy who had fled to the temple he ordered to be released. For close-by was the temple to Athena Itonia, and in front of it a trophy had been set up by Boiotians long ago when, with Sparto in command, they defeated the Athenians and killed Tolmides.

The narrative of chapters 16-18 has largely been concerned with presenting Agesilaos as strategos while giving a condensed account of the events that occurred along the march from Asia to Sparta. The narrator continues this presentation in this chapter by giving four examples that illustrate his affection for his men, his piety towards the gods, his tenacity in the face of the enemy, and his fulfillment of religious obligation. These are all characteristics that have been presented by the narrator throughout the story and are here further illustrated.

The narrator follows upon the action of the previous section, wherein the fighting condensed around Agesilaos and his bodyguard, with the actions and behavior of the king directly after the battle, which are presented as a sequence of events. The narrator tells his reader that Agesilaos’ first action was to see to the well being of his men and the war dead and that he did this even though he was seriously wounded. Moving from the theme of Agesilaos’ treatment of friends to his treatment of the enemy and respect of the gods, the narrator says Agesilaos ordered all those who sought sanctuary in the temple to Athena Itonia were to be released. At this point, the narrator pauses the chronology and enters upon an external analepsis that explains a local monument by reference to a previous Boiotian victory explanation: the pause and reference
to the local monument serves no apparent purpose for the story of Agesilaos. Therefore, it has been suggested that this is a bit added by the narrator as an opportunity to highlight local, Boiotian history and topography. Rather than being simply an opportunity for the narrator to celebrate Boiotian history, the analepsis explaining the monument demonstrates Boiotia’s previous glory and ability. As a result, this substantiates the display of strength shown in the battle against Agesilaos and thus is directly relevant to this story and the characterization of Boiotia’s growing military and political prowess.

And as soon as it was day, wanting to put the Thebans to the test to see if they would fight, Agesilaos ordered his troops to garland themselves while the flute-players played and they erected and adorned a trophy as the victors. And thus when the enemies sent to request permission to take up their dead, he made a truce; and thus having established his victory, he took himself off to Delphi, where the Pythian Games were going on, and even participated in the procession to the god and offered a tenth of the spoils from Asia amounting to one hundred talents.

After the digression on the Boiotian monument, the narrator returns to the story and chronology by setting the story time as the next morning. Agesilaos’ next action is preceded by a focalization of his motivation: he wanted to test the Thebans and see if they would fight. Indeed,
the narrator had closed the battle narrative at 18.4 by focalizing the Thebans’ view that they had defeated Agesilaos. Here, however, we see that this was no more than that, a character’s focalization of the outcome. Agesilaos’ actions make it clear that he considered his side to have been victorious and his bold pre-emptive celebration here proves to convince even the Thebans of his victory.

His final action on his return home to Sparta is the fulfillment of his religious obligation by dedicating a tithe of the spoils from Asia. This final act of his Asia Minor expedition glorifies Agesilaos—he successfully conducted a campaign that brought in substantial revenue for Sparta and obediently shared this revenue with the god. Hence, he is the quintessential general. This event effectively closes the narrative of the Asian expedition that had begun in chapter 6.
This narrative section covers the fabula years of 393-388 B.C.E. The narrator has ended the account of the Asian expedition and Agesilaos’ return march, which dominated the previous section and was framed by a largely chronological sequence of events, and here employs a looser chronological framework to illustrate Agesilaos’ behavior at home and in politics during these years. The narrator has reached the midway point in the story and throughout the majority of this section he pauses the narration of events in order to reestablish story themes and a positive characterization of Agesilaos at his pinnacle before entering upon the second, more inglorious half of the *Bios*.

In these chapters, the narrator reestablishes those themes introduced and elaborated upon in the previous chapters, especially in the characterization chapters 1-5, and provides illustrative examples of these character motifs before moving into the next phase of the story where Agesilaos’ reputation will be shown in decline. It is important to note that the narrator has selected particular characterization themes to highlight at this mid-point in the story and that many major themes are not singled out for elaboration, including that of the dominant motif of Agesilaos’ *philotimia*. The majority of the themes that are selected for inclusion in this section are positive traits or ones that had not been explicitly discussed with illustrative examples elsewhere in the narrative. In addition, the narrator reintroduces the themes that will become more important in the second half of the story, most notably Agesilaos’ hostility towards Thebes as well as his subordination of popular Greek sentiments to Spartan interests. The themes that are selected for the narratee’s re-acquaintance include Agesilaos’ Spartan simplicity in his manner of life, his valuation of the *agoge* system as a means to foster obedience and leadership, his

---

127 First introduced at 1.2-3 and 2.1.
ability to subvert opposition by turning opponents into allies,¹²⁹ his shunning of popular Greek entertainment and fame in favor of traditional Spartan competition,¹³⁰ his hatred of Thebes,¹³¹ and, briefly, his military acumen.¹³²

Not only does the narrator take the opportunity midway through the story to reacquaint the reader with his characterization of Agesilaos, but he also reestablishes his own self-characterization as an authoritative narrator and even makes a case for the superiority of his own narrative over that of previous authors. He implicitly conveys his authority to pronounce positive judgments upon his subject’s behavior at home as well as employing character-text and apothegms to substantiate as valid the portrayal of character and motivation for action that he presents. Furthermore, the narrator explicitly asserts his authority by calling attention to his own research that he contends is superior to previous authors and by referring his narratee to another Bios he had written as proof of the credibility of his commentary on Spartan behavior.

19.4-19.6

¹²⁹ First introduced at 4.2-4; 5.1-2.
¹³⁰ Implicitly introduced at 2.1-3.
¹³¹ Begun with the incident at Aulis in chapter 6.
¹³² Developed throughout chapters 9, 10, 16, 17, and 18.
satisfied with what was at-hand, he did not change his dinner, nor his bath, nor service done to his wife, nor the adornment of his armor, nor the condition of his house, rather he even left the doors as they were although they were exceptionally ancient, as they seemed to be the very same ones which Aristodemos set up.

The narrator resumes forward chronology briefly (epei...oikade) and ends the long excursion of Agesilaos in Asia and away from Sparta. The narrator now departs from a chronological narrative of events to a discussion of Agesilaos’ behavior and reception at home after his absence. The forward chronology is paused, but a sense of time passing is conveyed by relating anecdotes of Agesilaos’ activities in Sparta that could loosely belong to this chronological period. In comparison, Agesilaos returns home in Xenophon’s *Hellenika* 4.4.1 and is not mentioned again until the attack on the Argives at 4.4.19. That Agesilaos falls out of the *Hellenika* narrative after his return home is understandable given that the *Hellenika* is a narrative of sequences of events and is not focused upon a single historical figure. In Xenophon’s *Agesilaos*, however, wherein the narrator focuses his attention solely upon the king as the subject of his encomium, there is a complete ellipsis in the chronology after the return home and the invasion of Agesilaos into Argive-held Korinth.\(^{133}\) In Plutarch’s story, however, a sense of time passing is accomplished by including a discussion of Agesilaos’ character in the home arena before continuing the narration of the Corinthian War in chapter 21.

The narrator fleshes out this period by supplying the narratee with examples of Agesilaos’ behavior in the domestic sphere which he introduces with the king’s reception by the Spartan citizens upon his return to the city from the Asian expedition. The focalization of “the citizens” in complex narrator text expresses Agesilaos’ popularity at home and reintroduces the characterization theme of Agesilaos’ simplicity as the motivation for the focalized sentiment.

The narrator follows the focalized praise with an explanation in simple text of summarized

---

examples of behavior that validate the citizens' praise. The focalization transfers the praise of Agesilaos’ simplicity from the narrator to internal characters thus lending it both vividness and credibility. The summary of Agesilaos’ behavior is given as a list of what he did not change (his meals, bath, service to his wife, armor, and house) and ends with an anonymous spokesmen device (“seemed to be”) that substantiates the narrator’s claim that the doors to the house were exceptionally ancient. This structuring of the narrative can be compared to Xenophon’s *Agesilaos* 8.6-7 where the narrator disparages the Persian king’s cherishing of wealth and favorably contrasts Agesilaos’ simple home. He then immediately calls upon any who might doubt his statement to view the ancient doors as proof of the validity of his praise. In contrast, the Plutarchian narrator compares Agesilaos’ simplicity not to the luxury of the Persian king, but to unnamed Spartan commanders who had gone abroad and returned home with their behaviors changed by their exposure to and acquisition of foreign wealth.

19.5.2

Καὶ τὸ κάνναθρον φησιν ὁ ξενοφῶν οὐδὲν τι σεμινότερον εἶναι τής ἐκείνου θυγατρὸς ἢ τῶν ἄλλων. Κάνναθρα δὲ καλούσιν εἰδωλα γρυπῶν ξύλινα καὶ τραγελάφων, ἐν οἷς κομίζουσι τὰς παιδὰς ἐν ταῖς πομπαῖς.

And Xenophon says the kannathron of his daughter was no more majestic than any others’. They call kannathra the wooden images of griffins and goat-stags, in which they carry their daughters in processions.

The narrator continues the pause and invokes Xenophon as a contemporary witness and thus a reliable source for judging the plainness of the *kannathon* in which Agesilaos’ daughter rode. This focalization of Xenophon corroborates the narrator’s examples of Agesilaos’

\[134\] Xen. Ages. 8.7. The Xenophonic narrator uses the kannathon as an example of Agesilaos’ shunning of ostentatious wealth in comparison with the Persian king. It immediately follows the invitation for doubters to view
simplicity after returning from abroad. After referring to Xenophon’s opinion, the narrator directly interjects to explain to his narratee what a “kannathron” was. This explanation may suggest something about whom the narrator envisioned as his narratee (non-Spartan?) and at least signals that he expected his reader would need clarification as to the definition of a “kannathron.”

Now although Xenophon did not record the name of Agesilaos’ daughter, and Dikaiarchos was indignant that neither Agesilaos’ daughter nor Epaminondas’ mother are known to us, we, however, have found in the Lakonian records that the wife of Agesilaos was named Kleopa, and the daughters Eupolia and Proauga. And it is even possible to see his spear on display even to this day in Lakedaimon, in no way differing from those of others.

The narrator sustains the pause and turns the narratee’s attention fully onto the narrator himself. He shifts the focus of the story away from fabula events and onto his research activity in order to characterize himself as the superior narrator and author. He does this by commenting that Xenophon did not include the women’s names and that Dikaiarchos, a student of Aristotle who had written a Βίος τῆς Ἑλλάδος, was frustrated (an embedded focalization) that the information the doors upon Agesilaos’ house which Aristodemos set up as proof of validity of the narrator’s comparison. See also Bremmer (1981) 426 on the attention this anecdote received in antiquity; also Le Corsu (1981) 246-247. 135 This can be compared to Plutarch’s explanation of Roman terms and practices in several of his Roman Lives; a feature which is often cited as evidence that a primarily Greek audience was envisioned (most recently, see Duff 2007/2008). This assumption of a primarily Greek readership, however, has been hotly debated and has been refuted by Stadter (in Ostenfeld, ed., 2002) and others (Stadter and Van der Stockt, eds., 2002).
was lost. The narrator suddenly becomes overt and dramatized (ἡμεῖς δ’ εὑρομεν), meaning that his agency in creating this story is made apparent by his self-reference and he thus becomes a character himself, and discusses his own research that procured better and fuller accounts than those of Xenophon and Dikaiarchos. Thus the narrator firmly asserts his authority with his narratee as a reliable narrator who is even more informed than the two historical sources whom he calls into reference. In short, this sentence has nothing to do with Agesilaos or his character and everything to do with the narrator’s self-characterization as authoritative and better informed than those whom he invokes as references. In the next sentence, the narrator remains overt and dramatic; he suggests that he has seen Agesilaos’ spear himself and, as an eyewitness, can present his judgment that the spear is an ordinary one. The reference to the narrator’s own time (ἄχρονον) establishes distance between the narrator and his story. It also authorizes the narrative and substantiates narrator’s research efforts; his suggestion that he has seen Agesilaos’ spear signifies that the narrator did go to Sparta and not only saw the spear, but also investigated the otherwise unknown “Lakonian records.”

20.1

Οὐ μὴν ἀλλ’ ὀρῶν ἐνίοις τῶν ποιτών ἄφ’ ἱπποτροφίας δοκοῦντας εἶναι τινὰς καὶ μέγα φρουροῦντας ἔπεισε τὴν ἀδελφήν Κυνίδαν ἀρμα καθείσαν Ὄλυμπίασιν ἀγωνίσασθαι, βουλόμενος ἐνδειξασθαι τοῖς Ἑλλησίου, ὡς οὐδεμιᾶς ἐστιν ἀρετῆς, ἀλλὰ πλοῦτου καὶ δαπάνης ἢ νίκη.

136 For recent work on and discussion of the fragmentary texts of Dikaiarchos, see Fortenbaugh and Schütrumpf (2001) passim and especially 255-278.
137 I borrow the notion of dramatic narrator from Booth (1961) passim, especially 151-153.
138 See also Bremmer (1981) 425-426 for discussion of this passage and Plutarch’s independent research.
139 For similar discussion of the use of references to the narrator’s time in Xenophon’s Cyropaedia, see Gray (2004) 392-393.
140 For speculation as to what these records might have been, see Shipley (1997) 244. For autopsy in Plutarch, see Buckler (1992) 4788-4830.
And yet, seeing some of the citizens were deeming themselves somebodies from breeding race horses and boasting, he persuaded his sister Kyniska to enter a team of horses to compete at the Olympics, wanting to prove to the Hellenes that it is not a triumph of excellence, but one of wealth and money spent.

The narrator marks the return to fabula events with ὅμων ἀλλ’ and resumes a subtle sense of forward chronology. The particle phrase also marks a contrast of Agesilaos in the previous sections, where the narrator demonstrated Agesilaos’ rejection of ostentation, and Agesilaos here, who persuades his sister to enter the Olympics. Although Agesilaos does push Kyniska to enter a team of horses in the Games, he does so to make a point to the Greeks. The narrator uses the anecdote about Agesilaos’ attitude toward the Olympic horse races to demonstrate the man’s superiority over the popular exhibitionist behavior of wealthy Spartans. The anecdote is narrated through the focalization of Agesilaos, which contains not only his motivation for persuading Kyniska to enter the races in 392 B.C.E., but also his focalized intention to prove to the Greeks that such pursuits were meaningless displays of wealth and no more.141 In a similar vein of the anecdote given above at 19.5 about the modesty of Agesilaos’ lifestyle, crafted in order to contrast the king’s simplicity upon his return from Asia with previous Spartan commanders, whom the narrator implied were altered by their exposure to luxury, this anecdote about his encouragement to his sister Kyniska that she breed race horses is given as proof of his rejection of Greek ostentation of wealth in the Olympic games.

Both anecdotes are preserved in the same sequence as narrated here at Xenophon’s Agesilaos 8.6-7 and 9.6-7, respectively; but in that work, the Xenophonic narrator celebrates

---

141 On the significance of Kyniska and her Olympic victory, as well as a discussion of the epigraphic evidence, see Shipley (1997) 247-248. See also the Posidippus epigram that presents Kyniska’s victory as something glorious; epigram 87 in the new Milan papyrus, translated by Nisetch (2005) 36; see Fantuzzi (2005), 253-258 and 261-264 for discussion. Since Kyniska’s victory was celebrated in epigram by Posidippus, it may be that our Plutarchian narrator has twisted the positive popular reception of the event into something shameful for the purposes of his portrayal of Agesilaos’ attitude toward the display of wealth associated with breeding racing horses.
Agesilaos’ modest mode of life by contrasting him with the Persian king’s pursuit of luxuries. We can thus clearly see that the Plutarchian narrator borrowed from the structure and tone of Xenophon’s encomium, but recrafted the anecdotes to his own purpose. Here, the Plutarchian narrator is not concerned with vilifying the Persians, but with Agesilaos’ own Greek peers as a means to powerfully characterize the Spartan’s unique modesty among his Greek contemporaries and near-contemporaries.

20.2.1

Ξενοφὼντα δὲ τὸν σοφὸν ἔχων μεθ’ αὐτοῦ σπουδαζόμενον ἐκέλευε τοὺς παιδίας ἐν Λακεδαιμόνι τρέφειν μεταπεμψάμενον, ὡς μαθησομένους τῶν μαθημάτων τὸ κάλλιστον, ἀρχεσθαι καὶ ἀρχεῖν.

And having the learned Xenophon with him and looked after, he bid him send for his children and raise them in Lakedaimon, so that they would learn the very best of lessons: to be ruled and to rule.

This anecdote about Agesilaos’ urging Xenophon to rear his children under the Spartan system situates the learned man at the king’s side.142 The narrator has repeatedly called the narratee’s attention to Xenophon as a source in order to authorize his narrative,143 but Xenophon has also appeared at one other point in the narrative as an internal character, as here.144 Incorporating Xenophon as a character not only links the philosopher to the king, a Plutarchian ideal, but also certifies Xenophon as an eyewitness and thereby strengthens his role as a source.

Agesilaos encourages Xenophon to move his children to Sparta so that they might acquire the same quality that the primary narrator claimed (1.3) made Agesilaos a unique king:

142 There has been discussion in recent scholarship about Plutarch’s vision of philosopher king and rulers, especially Dionyios II, and their relationships with philosophers. See de Blois (1999) 299-304; Roskam (2002) 175-189. See Humble (2004) 231-250 for an in depth discussion of Xenophon’s sons being raised in Sparta.
143 Plut. Ages. 4.1; 18.1; 19.5; 19.6; 29.2; 34.4
144 Plut. Ages. 9.2.
his ability to “be ruled and to rule”. This statement, the actorial motivation for Agesilaos’ urging, echoes chapter 1, but here is presented chiastically and emphasizes obedience, which will be a theme that closes the event that immediately follows.\textsuperscript{145}

20.2.2-20.3.2

And although Lysander was dead, Agesilaos discovered that a large coalition had arisen, which Lysander immediately had formed against him after returning from Asia; thus, he roused himself to expose the kind of citizen Lysander was when alive; and after reading a speech that had been left in a book, which Kleon of Halikarnassos wrote, but Lysander had adopted and intended to read before the people about a revolution and a change of the government; Agesilaos wanted to bring it forth before all. But when one of the \textit{gerontes}, having read the speech and fearing its potential, advised that he not dig up Lysander, but rather bury the speech along with him, he obeyed and kept quiet.

This third episode of the chapter repeats the event of Lysander’s death and the conspiracy he formed upon returning from Asia, which was mentioned in chapter 8 as an internal prolepsis.\textsuperscript{146} The narrator has now brought the story to the point in chronology wherein Agesilaos discovers the conspiracy and takes counsel. The narrator restates that Lysander formed this coalition upon his return from Asia and thus directly links the event to the episodes of chapter 8. There, the narrator stated that Lysander’s conspiracy to reform the Spartan

\textsuperscript{145} Shipley (1997) 249.
\textsuperscript{146} Cartledge (1987) discusses the conspiracy of Lysander and its discovery on pp. 77-98, 162-163, see especially 94-96.
constitution was the direct result of Agesilaos’ slighting of Lysander and here he picks up the connection between Lysander’s slighting in Asia and his plans for revolution. In this story, the actorial motivation for Lysander’s conspiracy is his humiliation at the hands of Agesilaos; the narrator emphasized at the end of chapter 8 that the unchecked competitive nature of the two men made it so that “the one could not recognize the authority of the one in power while the other could not tolerate the lack of recognition by an intimate friend.”¹⁴⁷ In the story of Agesilaos, the narrator relates all major narrated events to the subject of the *bios*, as here, where the conspiracy of Lysander is made the direct result of Agesilaos’ actions.

This rendition of events differs markedly from those related in *Lysander* 24-26. There, Lysander’s primary motivation stems not from his quarrel with Agesilaos, although the details of the conspiracy follow the narration of the quarrel in Asia, but from his own pride of accomplishment and frustration with the Spartan constitution. In that story, the narrator introduces the conspiracy by reviewing the history of the Spartiate and royal households and Lysander’s situation therein. His plans for revolution are laid out step by step, including his memorization of the speech of Kleon, but his quarrel with Agesilaos is portrayed as an ancillary, rather than primary motivator to action. Lysander returned to Sparta still angry with Agesilaos and prepared to put into action his revolutionary plans that he had already begun to form.

Contrarily, in the *Agesilaos*, the sequence of events has been manipulated so that Lysander’s revolutionary designs directly stem from his humiliation by Agesilaos as it was at that very point that Lysander decided to attempt an overthrow of the constitution.¹⁴⁸

The narratorial motivation for including the discovery of Lysander’s papers at this point in the story is to continue the theme of Agesilaos’ activities at home and, more precisely, to

¹⁴⁸ Plut. *Ages.* 8.3. See also Shipley (1997) 250-253 for discussion of this passage and the manipulation of the sequence of events.
develop the theme of Agesilaos’ confrontation and winning over of his enemies. The Lysander conspiracy highlights the powerful opposition Agesilaos faced from political opponents. The following narrative section continues this theme and provides further examples of how Agesilaos was able to quell the hostility against him by turning his enemies into friends. The opposition to Agesilaos which is revealed in this section connects the episode thematically to the next narrative section, just as the obedience fostered by rearing in the *agoge* linked 20.2.1 to this section that ends with a re-emphasis of Agesilaos’ obedience to the ephors.

20.4-20.6

And those who were opposed to him he did not openly injure, but making sure some of them were sent off—always as generals and commanders—he proved that they were worthless in positions of power and arrogant; and then contrarily helping them when brought to trial and striving on their behalf, he would make kinsmen of adversaries and turned them to himself, so that there was no opposition. For the other king, Agesipolis, since he was in fact the son of an exiled father and he was entirely a youth in age, gentle and well behaved by nature, did not do much in the political sphere. And yet Agesilaos made even this youth accustomed to the hand. For the kings ate together keeping the same *phidition*, whenever they were at home. And so knowing that Agesipolis was liable to love affairs with boys, just as he was, he would always strike up some conversation about some boys in their prime; and even lead on the youth to the same object of love and work with him; Lakonian love affairs being nothing
shameful, but possessing great modesty, rivalry, and emulation, as I have written about in my work on Lykourgos.

The narrator continues demonstrating how Agesilaos was able to contain the opposition against him with two more examples. The first illustrates exactly how the king was able to transform unnamed political enemies into friends by craftily appointing them to high posts in which he apparently could be fairly certain that they would somehow fail or succumb to greed. No details about the posts, the men selected, their experience, nor the circumstances of their positions and trials are given; the narrator condenses all the details into a simple and direct statement to the narratee: Agesilaos knew they would fail and be brought to trial and therein lay his opportunity to defend and win them over. The narrator’s interpretation of the final result of the episode, that there was no opposition to Agesilaos that remained, echoes the theme of chapters 4 and 5 and demonstrates with a concrete, although summary, example of how Agesilaos won all over so that a “false harmony” was created which undermined the principles of competition in the Lykourgian constitution.

The second example of Agesilaos’ taming of opposition centers upon his rival king, Agesipolis the son of Pausanias. The narrator first introduces Agesipolis by emphasizing his political weakness, characterizing him as apolitical, still quite young, and the son of an exiled king. That Agesilaos was able to “make even this boy tame” therefore seems to have been rather a simple task. And indeed, the narrator does not say that Agesipolis was ever opposed to him, as the rival kings often were,149 but turns the theme again to Agesilaos’ fondness for the pursuit of youths, a fondness that he apparently shared with Agesipolis. It was their shared enthusiasm for such pursuits that won the young king over to Agesilaos. The narrator ends the section with a commentary on the nature of Lakonian pederasty and informs the narratee to judge these

149 For the rivalry between Agesilaos and Kleombrotos, see Cartledge (1987), 229-230.
amorous pursuits positively. The narrator then validates his own commentary by referring the narratee to the implied author’s own work, *Lykourgos*, for verification.

21.1-21.3.1

Mégistos n oún dynámenos en tē pōlei diapráttetai Teleutía tōn õmoumētrion ἀδελφὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ ναυτικοῦ γενέσθαι. Kai στρατευσάμενος εἰς Κόρινθον αὐτὸς μὲν ἤρει κατὰ γῆν τὰ μακρὰ τείχη, ταῖς δὲ ναυσὶν ὁ Τελευτίας... 

150 Ἀργείων δὲ τὴν Κόρινθον ἐχόντων τότε καὶ τὰ Ἵθμια συντελοῦντων, ἐπιφανεῖς ἐκεῖνοι μὲν ἐξήλασαν ἀρτι τῷ θεῷ τεθυκότας, τὴν παρασκευὴν ἀπάσαι ἀπολείποντας ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν Κορινθίων ὁσοὶ φυγάδες ἐτυχον παρόντες ἐδὲθησαν αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀγώνα διαθείναι, τούτῳ μὲν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, αὐτῶν δὲ ἐκείνων διατίθεντος καὶ συντελοῦντος παρέμεινε καὶ παρέσχεν ασφαλείαν. “Ὑστερον δ’ ἀπελθόντος αὐτοῦ πάλιν ὑπ’ Ἀργείων ἤξιθα τὰ Ἴθμια, καὶ τινες μὲν εὐκηκασίαν πάλιν, εἰσὶ δ’ οἱ εὐνικηκότες πρὸτερον, ἤττημενοι δ’ ὑστερον ἀνεγράφησαν. Ἐπὶ τούτω δὲ πολλὴν ἀπέφηνε δειλίαν κατηγορεῖν αὐτῶν τοὺς Ἀργείους ὁ Ἀγησίλαος, εἰ σεμνὸν οὕτω καὶ μέγα τὴν ἁγωνοθεσίαν ἡγούμενοι μάχεσθαι περὶ αὐτῆς οὐκ ἐτολμήσαν.

And so, having great authority in the city, he arranged for Teleutias, his half-brother on his mother’s side, to become the nauarch. Meanwhile, Agesilaos, himself leading an army into Korinth, captured the long walls by land, while with the navy Teleutias... 

151 And as the Argives were occupying Korinth then and holding the Isthmian Games, he drove off those out in the open who were just about to sacrifice to the god, forsaking all their equipment; and when some of the Korinthian exiles who happened to be present begged him to conduct the races, but this he would not do, but rather while they ran and finished the games, he stood by and provided security. Later, when he had left, the Isthmian Games were held again by the Argives, and some won again, while others who were registered as having won earlier, lost the second time. And in this Agesilaos declared the Argives brought a great charge of cowardice upon themselves, if they consider hosting the games to be so holy and great an office, but they did not dare to fight for it.

---

150 Cf. Xen. *Hell.* 4.4.19. The account in Xenophon does not offer significantly more information about the attack on Korinth than what is preserved in Plutarch. Xen. *Hell.* 4.4.19 does give fuller details concerning the rebuilding of the long walls in Korinth by Athens, the number of triremes (12) brought by Teleutias to aid Agesilaos, and the delight of their mother at the success of her sons. For suggestions of what could be missing in the lacuna, as based off the narratives of Xenophon, see Shipley (1997) 259-260. For the relationship of *isopolity* between Argos and Corinth at this time, see Shipley (1997) 260-261; Whitby (1984) 295-308; Hamilton (1972) 21-37; Kagan (1962) 447-457; Griffith (1950) 236-256. For dating the *isopolity*, see Tuplin (1982) 75-83; he refutes Griffith’s argument that Xenophon was mistaken and defends dating the unification to after 390 B.C.E.

151 See note 148 above for discussion of lacuna.
The narrator resumes the chronology briefly with some narration of the continued conflicts with Argos and Korinth, but the chapter theme will be Agesilaos’ attitude toward athletic competition and the reputations gained in and by popular culture. 152 The historical events are used as context for atemporal thematic examples of Agesilaos’ shunning of popular entertainment.

The narrator segues via a summary statement (“and so, having authority…”) from the topic of Agesilaos’ authority in the home-political sphere to a specific consequential event: the appointment of his half-brother, Teleutias, as nauarch in 391 B.C.E. 153 This event echoes that of chapter 10, wherein Agesilaos appoints the inexperienced Peisander as nauarch, an appointment which the narrator, enjoying the benefit of hindsight, condemned Agesilaos for his lack of foresight. Here, however, no such condemnation against Teleutias’ appointment comes from the narrator. Perhaps because Teleutias proved to be a successful admiral, the narrator does not question the basis of his appointment as he had with Peisander. Placing the appointment of Teleutias at this point serves to provide an example of the consequences and degree of Agesilaos’ political authority that were developed in the chapter before and brings the narrative back to a chronological context before moving into the next atemporal theme: competitive games and popular entertainment.

The historical events that the narrator summarizes, the attack on Korinth, are interrupted by a lacuna.154 The text picks up again with a summary that sets the time and place as the Isthmian Games of 390 B.C.E. at Korinth, which is occupied by the Argives. Having provided the setting, the narrator slows the rhythm to present the scene of Agesilaos’ arrival and disruption of the sacrifices. The narrator uses this scene to set up a conflict; the Korinthian exiles ask

152 Cf. this section to Xen. Hell. 4.4.19-4.5.2.
153 For the appointment of Teleutias, see Cartledge (1987) 223.
154 See note 137 above for discussion of the lacuna.
Agesilaos to conduct the races, which he refuses to do, but the games are held under his supervision. This will precipitate the next event and provide the occasion for an apothegm of Agesilaos showing his disdain for the Argives’ conduct of the games. The narrator uses an ellipsis to keep to the topic of the Isthmian Games and summarizes the Argives’ actions after the departure of Agesilaos. He thereupon enters into a focalization of Agesilaos, who criticizes the interloping Argives and the sanctity and importance of the Games.

21.3.2-21.5

And he himself considered it necessary to behave moderately in all these matters; and while he celebrated and always attended the choruses and competitions at home filled with an ambitiousness and fervor and was absent from neither the boys’ nor girls’ contest, nonetheless those things which he saw others astonished by he seemed not even to recognize. And when once Kallippidas, an actor from tragedies having name and reputation among Hellenes and courted by all, first met and greeted him, and then annoyingly imposing himself among those walking with him he showed he was thinking that Agesilaos would strike up some friendliness with him, and finally said, “Don’t you recognize me, King?” And he, staring straight at him, said, “Sure, aren’t you Kallippidas the clown?” Thus Lakedaimonians call mimes. And again when invited to hear a man mimicking a

---

nightingale, he declined, saying, “I’ve heard the bird itself.” And when the doctor Menekratos, since he was successful in some hopeless cases he was nicknamed Zeus, vulgarly was employing this nickname and actually even dared to send a letter to Agesilaos like this: “Menekratos Zeus to King Agesilaos, greeting,” and he responded: “King Agesilaos to Menekratos, good health.”

The events at Korinth serve to provide context to the discussion of Agesilaos’ attitude toward popular entertainment, which the narrator exemplifies with three anecdotal examples of Agesilaos’ interaction with “famous men” with each example climaxing with an apothegm.\textsuperscript{156} The three atemporal anecdotes validate the narrator’s characterization of Agesilaos as having a moderate attitude toward games other than the traditional competitions held in Sparta. The narrator portrays Agesilaos as having a complex attitude toward competitive games. In the previous section, Agesilaos declined control over the Isthmian Games and chastised the Argives for their cowardice; both actions revealed Agesilaos’ contempt for such competitions as exhibitionism. Here, a more sophisticated opinion about competition is attributed to the king. Agesilaos pays respect to the traditional Spartan competitions that were a part of the \textit{agoge} system by his regular attendance.\textsuperscript{157} The narrator describes the games as filled with “ambitions and fervor” (\textit{φιλοτιμίας καὶ σπουδῆς}), repeating one of the key terms, \textit{philotimia}, which he most frequently employs to characterize Agesilaos and which had been a aspect of Agesilaos’ character since his own time within the \textit{agoge} (chapter 2). Agesilaos’ enthusiasm for Spartan competitions is balanced by his disdain for popular entertainment and the narrator pauses the chronology in order to present three anecdotal examples of the king’s spurning of such pursuits. None of the examples are of competitive games \textit{per se}, but of those who achieved fame through entertaining others, or in the case of Menekrates, of preserving others’ health. The first and third

\textsuperscript{156} Shipley (1997) 263-265 for discussion of these men.

\textsuperscript{157} These competitions likely refer to the Hyakinthia festival of which Xenophon, \textit{Ages.} 2.17; on which see Richer (2004) 77-102; Parker (1989) 146-147 and 148-149.
examples of Kallippides and Menekrates show men who believe they deserve direct recognition 
by Agesilaos because of their success, which he refuses, and the example of the imitator 
characterizes Agesilaos as having no interest in popular entertainment. Each anecdote ends 
with an apothegm of Agesilaos that displays his wit and his aloof superiority over those who 
were seeking his attention.

22.1-22.4

Diatrībōvntos δὲ περὶ τὴν Κορινθίαν αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ Ἡραῖον ἐληφότος καὶ τὰ 
ἀιχμαλωτὰ τοὺς στρατιῶτας ἄγωντας καὶ φέροντας ἐπιβλέποντος, 
ἀφίκοντο πρεσβεῖς ἐκ Ἡθβῶν περὶ φιλίας. ‘Ὁ δὲ μισῶν μὲν ἔι τὴν πόλιν, 
οἶμενος δὲ τότε καὶ συμπέρειν ἐνυβρίσαι, προσεποιεῖτο μητ’ ὀρᾶν αὐτοὺς 
μήτ’ ἀκούειν ἐνυγχανόντων. Ἐπαθε δὲ πράγμα νεμεσιτόν’ οὔτω γὰρ 
ἀπηλλαγμένων τῶν Ἡθβαίων ἠκό τινις ἀπαγγέλλωντες αὐτῷ τὴν μόραν 
ὑπ’ Ἰφικράτους κατακεκόρθαι. Καὶ πάθος τοῦτο μέγα διὰ πολλοῦ χρόνου 
συνεπενέας αὐτοῖς‘ πολλοὺς γὰρ ἀνδρας ἀγαθοὺς ἀπέβαλον κρατηθέντας 
ὑπὸ τε πελταστῶν ὀπλίτας καὶ μισθοφόρων Λεκεδαιμονίους. Αἰνετήθησε μὲν 
οὖν εὔθυς ὁ Ἀγησίλαος ὃς βοηθήσων ἐπεὶ δ’ ἐγνω διαπεπραγμένοις, αὐθίς 
eis τὸ Ἡραῖον ἦκε, καὶ τοὺς Βοιωτοὺς τότε προσελθεῖν κελεύσας ἐχρημάτιζεν. 
’Ὡς δ’ ἀνθυπορίζοντες ἑκεῖνοι τῆς μὲν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἐμέμνητο, παρεθῆκαί δ’ 
ἥξιον εἰς Κόρινθον, ὀργισθεὶς ὁ Ἀγησίλαος εἶπεν’ ‘Εἴγε βούλευσθε τοὺς 
φίλους ὑμῶν ἰδεῖν μέγα φρονοῦντας ἐφ’ οἷς εὔτυχοις, αὐριον ἀσφαλῶς 
ὑμῖν τοῦτ’ ὑπάρξει.’ Καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτοὺς τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ τῆν τε χώραν 
tῶν Κορινθίων ἐκοπτεῖ καὶ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν αὐτῆν προσῆλθεν. Οὔτω δὲ τοὺς 
Κορινθίους ἔξελγες αἰμανθεῖα μὴ τολμώντας ἀφῆκε τὴν πρεσβείαν.

When he was passing time around Korinth, he seized the Heraion and while 
watching the soldiers lead and carry off the booty, ambassadors from Thebes 
arrived seeking terms of friendship. But as he always hated that city, and thinking 
that it was a useful time to humiliate them, he pretended neither to see them nor to 
hear them when talking. But he suffered just desserts; for as the Thebans were 
leaving, some men arrived reporting to him that a regiment had been cut to pieces 
by Iphikrates. This calamity was the greatest that befell them in a long time; for 
they threw away many good men—hoplites conquered by peltasts, 
Lakedaimonians by mercenaries. And so Agesilaos immediately sprang to bring

---

158 Agesilaos’ apothegm on the nightingale imitator is also found in Plut. Lyk. 20.5, but there Agesilaos is not 
identified by name. Plutarch also included all three anecdotes with their famous apothegms in his Sayings of the 
Spartans, of which the majority are attributed to Agesilaos. Beck (1999) 173-187 examines the Laconic apothegm 
and Plutarch’s manipulation of anecdotes and apothegms in his varied works. He concludes that Plutarch “expands 
anecdotes and alters their content in response to certain themes;” and the more complex the theme, the more likely 
Plutarch elaborates an anecdote.
them aid, but when he learned that it was over, he returned again to the Heraion
and summoning the Boiotians to come before him, he gave them audience. But,
returning the insult, they made no mention of peace, but demanded they be
allowed to pass to Korinth. Agesilaos, enraged, said, “If you wish to see your
friends boasting about their good fortune, you can do this tomorrow safely.” And
taking them along with him the next day he laid waste to the country of the
Korinthians and advanced up to the very city. Thus having the proved the
Korinthians did not dare to make a defense, he dismissed the embassy.

After pausing the story to illustrate Agesilaos’ moderate attitude toward competition and
the fame garnered from it, the narrator returns to chronological action and resituates Agesilaos at
Korinth.159 Within the context of this action, the narrator further characterizes Agesilaos’ hatred
of Thebes, which is becoming a more dominant theme as the story progresses. The historical
events at Korinth and Agesilaos’ seizure of the Heraion serve as a context for the narrator to
elaborate upon and develop the theme of Agesilaos’ overweening hatred of Thebes. The narrator
begins by establishing the setting (around Kornith) and the circumstances (Agesilaos was
observing his men taking plunder) for the main event of the section (the arrival of Theban
ambassadors), which in turn provides the narrator the opportunity to focus upon the relationship
between Agesilaos and Thebes. The narrator directly provides the actorial motivation for both
the ambassadors, who come to seek friendship, and Agesilaos, whose response is motivated by
hatred, before entering into the focalization of the king to provide the intentions Agesilaos
harbored. Within the focalization, the narratee is told that Agesilaos wanted to humiliate Thebes
and therefore pretended not to hear the ambassadors’ address. The narrator immediately
interjects a statement that Agesilaos suffered retribution for this slighting when he received the
news of Iphikrates’ attack at Lechaion.160 Thus, the narrator directs the narratee’s reception of
Agesilaos’ treatment of the ambassadors: the king’s behavior was unjust, motivated by hatred,

159 Cf. Xen. *Hell.* 4.5.3-10.
160 390 B.C.E.

149
and therefore deserved punishment, which is precisely how the narrator interprets the effects of news of the disaster at Lechaion.\footnote{On the Lechaion battle, see Hamilton (1979) 284-286; for more on Iphikrates and his peltasts, see Cartledge (1987) 224-225.}

In order to keep on the topic of Agesilaos’ slighting of the Theban ambassadors, the narrator summarizes the unsuccessful efforts to come to the aid of the Lakedaimonians at Lechaion and quickly returns to the interactions between Agesilaos and the ambassadors. Agesilaos’ slighting of the Theban embassy is now reversed upon him and the Thebans, knowing that the Spartans just suffered a devastating defeat, repay the king’s arrogance by requesting only to pass to Korinth without any mention of the friendship that they originally sought. Thus, the narrator has shown through this action that Agesilaos received his “just desserts” for, as one scholar has put it, his “moral lapse in ignoring them”.\footnote{Shipley (1997) 266.} Although the narrator portrays the embassy’s insult as one that Agesilaos brought on himself by his own behavior, the final image is not of a humbled Agesilaos, but of his ability to blunt their insult by proving their Korinthian allies to be cowardly. The narrator summarizes Agesilaos’ ravaging of Korinthian territory with the embassy in attendance and with the resultant event, proving the Korinthians would not resist him, proves Agesilaos’ generalship, if not his diplomatic savvy, was still intact.

22.4.3

And he himself, having taken up the surviving men from the regiment, returned to Lakedaimon, making the marches before daybreak and pitching camp when dark
again, so that those of the Arkadians who were hateful and slanderous could not exult over them.

The narrator summarizes Agesilaos’ movements leading the regiment that remained after the Lechaion defeat back to Lakedaimonia from the Korinthians’ territory. Agesilaos did not want Sparta’s enemies to exult over his defeated soldiers and so made long marches during the day, pitching and breaking camp only at times when they could escape observation and humiliation by the Arkadians.

22.5

'Ek tou'tou charizomeno tois Achaiois diebainen eis Akarnanian stratia met' autous, kai pollhn mhn hlassato leian, machi de toous Akarnanous enikises. Deoumenou de tois Achaiois, opwos ton xemwona parameinasa afelhetai ton sporon tou polemwv, touvanstion eph poihsin, malloin gar phobhsotha toun polemou autous, en ensparmeven tin gin eis oras eichwov' o kai sunebhe. Paraggeleomenv he gar aubis ep' autous stratiai dihallaghisa tois Achaiois.

After this, in order to indulge the Achaians, he crossed over into Akarnania on an expedition with them, and he took much plunder and defeated the Akarnanians in battle. But when the Achaians asked that he prevent the enemy from sowing their seed by remaining there for the winter, he said he would do the opposite, for the enemy would dread war more if they had their field sown in the spring; and this happened. For when an expedition against them was again announced, they reconciled themselves with the Achaians.

After returning Agesilaos to Sparta, the narrator marks a short ellipsis in the chronology with ek tou'tou and brings the story to the events of 389 and 388 B.C.E. Agesilaos’ movements into Akarnania are introduced by his motivation for action: he wanted to indulge the Achaians,

---

163 The areas which Agesilaos had taken were all recaptured by Iphikrates; Xen. Hell. 4.5.9-10.
164 See Hamilton (1979) 286-287 for more on Agesilaos’ movements and the effects of Iphikrates’ victory upon the “myth of Spartan invincibility.”
who were allies of Sparta suffering from the hostilities of the Akarnanians.\footnote{For the conflict between the Achaians and Akarnanians and Agesilaos’ ravaging of Akarnanian territory, see Cartledge (1987) 224-226; Hamilton (1979) 287.} Once again, the action is quickly summarized and the narrator focuses instead upon the ultimate success of Agesilaos’ strategy as a further demonstration of his military savvy.\footnote{Cf. Xen. \emph{Hell}. 4.6.1-4.7.1.} Indeed, when this version of the Akarnanian episode is compared to that narrated in Xenophon’s encomium,\footnote{Xen. \emph{Ages.} 2.20.} where the narrator focuses upon Agesilaos’ pursuit of alliance, the effort the Plutarchian narrator takes to characterize Agesilaos as militarily sagacious is clear. The Xenophonic narrator concludes the brief episode by stating Agesilaos did not relent his efforts until he succeeded in bringing the Akarnanian, Aetolians, and Argives into reconciliation with the Achaians while securing an alliance with himself. Contrarily, the Plutarchian narrator puts the emphasis upon Agesilaos’ singular foresight into the consequences of allowing the Akarnanians to sow their fields against the wishes of the Achaians while the attention paid to reconciliation is subdued.

The episode, as preserved in both the encomium of Xenophon and the biography of Plutarch, differs markedly in detail and context from that in the historical account of the \emph{Hellenika}. In \emph{Hell} 4.6.1-4.7.1 are preserved background information on the conflict, speeches made in Sparta, the role of the Athenians and Boiotians, and the movements of Agesilaos’ army. Reading the same episode told with three very different emphases in two different authors does much to highlight the markedly diverse narratorial motivations and intentions in the texts, be they encomiastic, moral, biographic, or historical.
Part Six: chapters 23-25

The narrative section discussed here covers the fabula years of 387-378 B.C.E. In the section discussed in Part 5, the narrator covered only five years of the fabula time, but related numerous events loosely contained within the chronology as a means of reiterating positive aspects of Agesilaos and developing story themes. Additionally, the structure of multiple examples given in succession that characterized the previous section created a fast-paced rhythm in the narrative. In this section, on the other hand, nine years of fabula time are covered, but fewer individual events from this period are narrated. The narrator opts for lengthy presentation of more selected events, especially the Phoibidas and Sphodrias affairs, which results in a slower narrative rhythm.

In the previous section, the narrator crafted the fabula event of Agesilaos’ return home as a transitional point mid-way in the story and used it as an opportunity to re-acquaint the narratee with (largely) positive themes of Agesilaos’ character by means of atemporal example events. In this section, the narrator begins to portray a decline in Agesilaos’ reputation and links it to negative aspects of Agesilaos’ character which have been developed as story themes, particularly that of his ambition (philotimia) and immoderate hostility towards Thebes.

The section presented and discussed below contains the narration of three main fabula events (the Peace of Antalkidas, the Phoibidas affair, and the Sphodrias affair) and one major story theme (Agesilaos’ hatred of Thebes) that is contextualized by the selected events. The Peace of Antalkidas is used as a springboard into a discussion of Agesilaos’ excessive hatred of Thebes, for which the narrator offers Agesilaos’ actions after the peace as evidence. The next two events, although enacted by other agents, are related to Agesilaos and given as proof of his excessive hatred as well as his abuse and manipulation of justice.
The focus upon this story theme of Agesilaos’ hatred of Thebes marks a shift in the trajectory of the story. The narrator begins a downward arc in Agesilaos’ story by delicately highlighting contradictions in Agesilaos’ character and actions. The narrator himself, although overt and critical, still maintains his subtlety and is not as disparaging as he could be. Although he does directly affect the reader’s interpretation of events with his own commentary critical of Agesilaos’ actions, which he in turn substantiates structurally by following his commentary with events given in support of his assessment, he attempts to counter-balance his own critical statements by including examples of positive aspects of Agesilaos’ character.

23.1-23.2.2

"Επει δὲ Κόνων καὶ Φαρνάβαζος τῷ βασιλέως ναυτικῷ θαλαττοκρατοῦντες ἐπόρθουσι τὰ παράλια τῆς Λακωνίκης, ἐτείχισθη δὲ καὶ τὸ ἄστυ τῶν Αθηναίων Φαρνάβαζοι χρήματα δόντος, ἐδοξε τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις εἰρήνην ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς βασιλέα καὶ πέμποντος Ἀνταλκίδαν πρὸς Τηρίμαζον, αἰσχιστα καὶ παρανομώτατα τοὺς τὴν Ασίαν κατοικοῦντας Ἐλλήνας, ὑπὲρ ὣν ἐπολέμησαν Αγησίλαος, βασιλεῖ παραδίδοντες. Ὡθεν ἦκιστα συνέβη τῆς κατοδεξίας ταύτης Αγησίλαος μετασχεῖν. Ὅ γαρ Ἀνταλκίδας ἔχθρος ἦν αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν εἰρήνην εξ ἀπαντος έπραττεν, ὥς τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ Αγησίλαον αὐξόντος καὶ ποιοῦντος ἐνδοξότατον καὶ μέγιστον.

But when Konon and Pharnabazos were masters of the sea with the King’s navy they ravaged the coasts of Lakonia, and even the city of Athens was fortified with money given by Pharnabazos, the Lakedaimonians resolved to make peace with the King; and they sent Antalkidas to Tiribazos, surrendering to the King in the most shameful and lawless fashion the Hellenes dwelling in Asia, on whose behalf Agesilaos had waged war. Because of this Agesilaos had no desire to take part in the infamy. For Antalkidas was an opponent of his and did all he could to effect the peace because the war was strengthening Agesilaos and making him of the highest and greatest repute.

This section opens with an analeptic summary of the joint actions of Persia and Athens during the period before 386.168 With this summary, the narrator marks a chronological jump

---

from 389 to 386. The summarized events are presented as the actorial motivation for the Lakedaimonians’ desire for peace with Persia and their subsequent dispatch of Antalkidas for this purpose. The narrator is not concerned with presenting the historical circumstances that led to the Spartan negotiations for peace with Persia, but with contextualizing Agesilaos’ next actions and, specifically, moving the story forward to the Phoibidas affair as a means of proving his statement that Agesilaos wanted Boiotia to be autonomous so as to weaken Thebes. It is informative to compare this treatment of the negotiations to the narrative of Xenophon’s *Hellenika*. At *Hell.* 5.1.33, Agesilaos’ hatred for Thebes is indeed made the actorial motivation for his planned invasion into Boiotia in order to coerce the Thebans to sign the peace independently, which they do before Agesilaos enters their territory. In that version of events, however, Agesilaos is one of several agents who promotes and secures the signing of the peace, whereas in the Plutarchian version, the negotiations for peace as well as its enactment are made relative to the personal and character of Agesilaos solely.

The harsh language that describes the terms of surrendering the Asiatic Greek cities to the King in “the most shameful and lawless fashion” seem at first to come from the primary narrator, but the accusative absolute sets off the phrase and next sentence suggests that the sentiments are focalized through Agesilaos. It was because Agesilaos had waged war on behalf of these betrayed Greeks that he refused to participate in securing this “shameful and lawless” peace, but the narrator, by postponing this statement, shares in this attitude and thus invites his narratee to adopt this estimation as well. The relative adverb ὀδευ ὦ is causal and thus links the conclusion that Agesilaos would take no part in the peace to the statement that the Asiatic Greeks were shamelessly abandoned. The relative adverb heightens the suggestion that the Peace of 386

170 Cf. this use of the relative adverb to Plat. *Prt.* 319b; also Plat. *Lys.* 22.1.
was a personal humiliation of Agesilaos and, as the next sentence shows, it was intended by
Antalkidas to be a personal attack against the Spartan king and his reputation. Thus, the narrator
has cast the historical event (the Peace of 386) as motivated by the personal relationship between
Antalkidas and Agesilaos. The event is made relative to the main subject, Agesilaos, and a result
of the effects of his operating in the larger political sphere. This is the introduction and first
characterization of Antalkidas in the story and the narrator scripts him as an embittered enemy of
Agesilaos, a characterization that will be furthered in chapter 26.171

23.2.3-23.3.1

Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὸν εἴποντα μηδεῖν τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους ὃ
Αγησίλαος ἀπεκρίνατο μᾶλλον τοὺς Μῆδους λακωνίζειν. Τοῖς δὲ μὴ
βουλομένοις δέχεσθαι τὴν εἰρήνην ἀπειλῶν καὶ καταγγέλλων πόλεμον
ηνάγκασαν ἐμμενεῖν ἀπάντας οίς ὁ Πέρσης ἐδικαίωσε, μάλιστα διὰ τοὺς
Θηβαίους, ὡς αὐτόνομον τὴν Βοιωτίαν αφέντες ἀσθενέστεροι γένωνται.

And yet to those who were saying the Lakedaimonians were medizing, Agesilaos
retorted rather that the Medes were laxonizing. And by threatening and declaring
war against those who did not want to accept the peace, he coerced them to abide
by all that the Persian demanded; he did this especially because of the Thebans—
so that they would become weaker by losing a now autonomous Boiotia.

The narrator has steered the story away from the circumstances and motivation for the
Peace of Antalkidas, having presented its negotiation by Antalkidas as a personal attack against
Agesilaos, and has moved the chronology forward by summarizing anonymous Greek reactions
to the peace and Agesilaos’ coercion of reluctant states. The charge that the Lakedaimonians

171 Cartledge (1987) 195 discounts “Plutarch’s view that Agesilaos and Antalkidas were bitter personal enemies.
That is almost certainly an illegitimate inference from Antalkidas’ oft-cited reproof of Agesilaos for his unreasoning
aggressiveness toward Thebes in the 370s…For it is hard to see how Antalkidas could possibly have pursued his
long and for the most part highly successful diplomatic career without at least the passive support of Agesilaos.”
This may indeed be the case and Antalkidas could well have been “Agesilaos’ man,” but Plutarch chose to situate
Antalkidas as an opponent of Agesilaos in order to highlight Agesilaos’ strong reputation and unrelenting hostility to
Thebes at this time. This portrayal of Antalkidas as being an active enemy of Agesilaos also shows that there was
competition among the Spartan policy makers and this competition made Agesilaos react due to his philotimia.
were medizing undoubtedly would have been particularly insulting to Agesilaos, who had recently returned from his campaign in Asia Minor that he envisioned as a panhellenic assault on the Persians. Additionally, the charge of medizing was a very real threat after the Persian invasions of the early fifth-century and, even if antiquated at this point in time, the implications of such a charge were not without weight. Considering that Thebes had barely escaped destruction after they had medized during the Persian Wars, this charge leveled against the Spartans as they coerced Thebes to agree to the King’s Peace would have been a sharp barb indeed. The focalized response of Agesilaos to these insults, that the Medes were lakonizing, not only demonstrates the king’s wit and rebuff of the charge, it also reflects back to the scene of Agesilaos’ and Pharnabazos’ meeting in Asia Minor detailed in chapter 12.

Having presented the negotiation of the peace as “shameful” and lacking the active support of Agesilaos, the narrator next reveals why Agesilaos took a proactive role in securing the Greek states’ adherence to the King’s terms. Agesilaos’ motivation is explained directly to the narratee and the narrator leaves no other option for interpretation: Agesilaos’ goal was to weaken Thebes. Thus, the narrator uses the Peace of Antalkidas to develop the theme of Agesilaos’ hatred of Thebes by confining the context of the peace to the person of Agesilaos himself. Antalkidas negotiated the peace because of his animosity towards Agesilaos and as a means to damage his reputation and Agesilaos championed the peace afterwards because of his own animosity towards the Thebans.172

23.3.2-23.4

Δὴλον δὲ τοῦτο τοῖς ὑστερον ἔποιησεν. Ἐπεὶ γὰρ Φοιβίδας ἐργον εἰργάσατο δεινόν ἐν σπουδαῖς καὶ εἰρήνη τὴν Καρμείαν καταλαβὼν, καὶ πάντες μὲν

172 For discussion of Agesilaos’ insistence that the cities strictly adhere to the terms of the peace, see Hamilton (1979) 321-323.
And he made this clear by what he did later. For when Phoibidas committed an awful deed under treaty and during peacetime by seizing the Kadmeia, and all the Hellenes were angry, even the Spartiates bore it with difficulty; and especially those who were at odds with Agesilaos angrily inquired from Phoibidas under whose orders had he committed the act, turning the suspicion upon Agesilaos. He did not hesitate to say openly in support of Phoibidas that it was necessary to consider whether the act itself was something advantageous; for if something done spontaneously turned out to be profitable for Lakedaimon, then it should be considered good, even if no one gave the orders.

The narrator declares that the next episode in the story, Phoibidas’ seizure of the Kadmeia in 382 B.C.E., acts as proof for the validity of his explanation of Agesilaos’ coercion activities some four years prior at the Peace Conference held in Sparta in 386 for the swearing of oaths. In short, the narrator summarized Agesilaos’ actions after the peace, and then offered his explanation as to why Agesilaos acted in such a manner within the context of story themes, here that of the king’s Theban hatred. Finally, the narrator makes a statement of proof and then moves on to the disclosure of that proof. The proof for Agesilaos’ actions is presented loosely as the next chronological event, yet there is an ellipsis from 386, when the Peace of Antalkidas was negotiated, to 382, when Phoibidas seized the Kadmeia. There is, for instance, no mention of Agesilaos’ decline of the command against Mantineia in 385, a command that Agesipolis takes and thereafter successfully dissolved the synoecism Mantineia, nor Agesilaos’ campaign against Phleious. The narrator has condensed events in order to make the thematic connection between

174 For a narrative of the events from 386 to the Battle of Leuktra in 371, see Cartledge (1987) 369-381.
175 The narrator will make passing mention of Agesilaos’ campaign against Phleious at 24.2 in the context of the restoration of the Theban exiles. See Cartledge (1987) 371 for discussion of Agesilaos’ refusal to take the field against the Mantineians and Agesipolis’ command against Mantinea. For a fuller discussion of and interpretation of
Agesilaos’ coercion activities, his hostility towards Thebes, and Phoibidas’ seizure of the Kadmeia.\textsuperscript{176}

The narrator leaves no doubt in the mind of the narratee that Phoibidas’ seizure of the Kadmeia is to be interpreted negatively; indeed, the event is introduced by the narrator without focalization as “an awful deed [committed] under treaty and during peacetime.” The narratee is thus directed by the narrator to empathize with the Greeks and Spartiates who were enraged by Phoibidas’ act and to share in their condemnation of the act as well as of Agesilaos, whom the narrator indirectly implicates as the one who ordered the seizure by the embedded focalization of “especially those who were at odds with Agesilaos”.\textsuperscript{177} The narrator justifies the focalized condemnation and implies its accuracy by following it with the embedded focalization of Agesilaos who, without hesitation, comes to the defense of Phoibidas. Agesilaos’ defense of Phoibidas’ action is presented as an embedded focalization and while Agesilaos does not explicitly champion Phoibidas, neither does he suggest condemnation. Agesilaos instead interprets the seizure itself as not something that should be considered just or unjust, but whether the Lakedaimonian state would be able to gain any advantage from it. The narrator makes no comment about the proffered excuse at this point in the story; he will, however, repeat this same phrasing in chapter 37 when Agesilaos changes allegiance in Egypt. At that point, the narrator will pause the story in order to offer a condemning commentary on Sparta and Agesilaos’ abuse of this pretext to cloak their imperialistic desires. That the narrator considers Agesilaos’ defense of Phoibidas to be unjust is implied by his attempt in the next section to balance out the image of

\textsuperscript{176} For a discussion of the internal policy changes within Thebes in the years between 386 and 382 B.C.E. as well as Theban reaction to increased Spartan hegemony, see Hack (1978) 210-227.

\textsuperscript{177} For Spartan reaction to the seizure see Hack (1978) 223-225.
the king’s sense of probity by providing counter examples of his adherence to principles of justice and integrity.

23.5-23.6.1

And yet in speech he was always declaring that a sense of justice was the foremost virtue; for valor was useless if unaccompanied by a sense of justice, but if all men were just, there would be no need for valor. And to those saying that these things were decreed by the great King he said, “Why is that one better than me unless he is also more just?” He was rightfully and elegantly thinking it was necessary for justice, as a royal measure, to determine the superiority of the greater. And when the peace was underway the King sent to him a letter seeking xenia and friendship; he did not accept it, saying that the public friendship was sufficient and there was no need for a private one so long as the other one lasted.

The Phoibidas episode is suddenly dropped and there is no mention of how the Spartans and other Hellenes reacted to Agesilaos’ defense of Phoibidas and the Kadmeia’s seizure. Instead, the narrator marks the abrupt departure from the Phoibidas episode with καίτοι and pauses the story-time to remind the narratee that Agesilaos, who appears now inconsistent, was otherwise just and thereby indicates that his defense of Phoibidas’ actions was unjust. The Phoibidas-Kadmeia episode is taken up again only at the chapter’s end where the narrator brings the episode to a summary conclusion by stating that Agesilaos’ overweening philotimia (particularly in a case against Thebes) was the cause for Agesilaos’ unjust actions, though these
demonstrations of injustice may be infrequent, they result from the competitiveness in his character.

As a counterbalance to the injustice exhibited in Agesilaos’ defense of Phoibidas, the narrator gives two atemporal anecdotes in embedded character texts, marked off by indirect discourse, that highlight how greatly Agesilaos valued justice before returning the narratee to forward chronology and the Kadmeia episode. The counterbalance to the Phoibidas-Kadmeia episode begins with the embedded focalization of Agesilaos: he claimed justice to be the highest virtue. Following this embedded focalization are two examples that substantiate Agesilaos’ embedded words and prove that normally he behaved in accordance with justice, but that his devotion to friends and hatred of Thebes could make him depart from his values. The first comes in the form of an apothegm response to anonymous spokesmen of the Persian king: Agesilaos questions the superiority of the former over himself on the basis of a sense of justice. The example is followed by a narratorial commentary on and agreement with Agesilaos’ response: Agesilaos thought correctly that kings should be measured by their justice. The second example loosely belongs to this point in the story-time (that is, after the Peace of 386 was established). The event is introduced by a summary of the context by the narrator and fleshed out by focalizations of the Persian and Spartan kings. Both examples of Agesilaos’ sense of justice serve to mitigate the criticism leveled by the narrator in his relation of the Sphodrias episode.

23.6.2–23.7

Εν δὲ τοῖς ἔργοις οὐκέτι ταύτην διαφυλάττων τὴν δόξαν, ἀλλὰ τῇ φιλοτιμίᾳ καὶ τῇ φιλονικίᾳ πολλαχοῦ συνεκφερόμενος, καὶ μάλιστα τῇ πρὸς Θηβαίοις, οὐ μόνον ἔσωσε τὸν Φοιβίδαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἔπεισεν εἰς ἑαυτὴν ἀναδέξασθαι τὸ ἀδίκημα καὶ κατέχειν τὴν Καδμείαν δι’ αὐτῆς, τῶν δὲ πραγμάτων καὶ τής πολιτείας Ἀρχίας καὶ Λεοντιάδας ἀποδείξαι κυρίους, δι’ ὅν ὁ Φοιβίδας εἰσῆλθε καὶ κατέλαβε τὴν ἀκρόπολιν.
But no longer observing this opinion in his actions, instead often being carried away by his ambition and contentiousness, especially when dealing with the Thebans, he not only rescued Phoibidas, but even persuaded the city to take upon itself the injustice and to occupy the Kadmeia on its own account, and even to appoint Archias and Leontiadas as the authorities over the city’s affairs, the men by whom Phoibidas entered and seized the acropolis.

The narrator now returns to forward chronology of the Phoibidas-Kadmeia affair and casts Agesilaos’ involvement as unjust in simple text. The narrator had reminded his narratee with the examples in 23.5-6.1 that Agesilaos is normally a man of justice, but states here that he abandoned these principles when dealing with the Phoibidas-Kadmeia affair because his philotimia, philonikia, and hatred of Thebes overwhelmed his sense of justice. Thus, the narrator explains Agesilaos’ actions via the story’s themes of ambition (philotimia), contentiousness (philonikia), and immoderate hatred. In the previous passage, the narrator highlighted that “in speech [Agesilaos] was always declaring that a sense of justice was the foremost virtue,” (23.5) and here juxtaposes Agesilaos just words with his unjust actions. The narrator has thus brought to the fore the dichotomy between a man’s logos and his ergon. He concludes the Phoibidas-Kadmeia affair with a summary of the subsequent events of Sparta’s occupation of the Kadmeia and appointment of Archias and Leontiadas, who, the narrator explains, had assisted Phoibidas in the seizure.

24.1-24.2

"Ην μὲν οὖν εὐθὺς ἐκ τούτων ύπόνοια Φοιβίδου μὲν ἔργον εἶναι, βούλευμα δ’ Ἀγησίλαοι τὸ πεπραγμένον’ ἀι δ’ ὑστέρον πράξεις ὀμολογομένην ἐποίησαν τὴν αἰτίαν. Ἡς γὰρ ἔξεβαλον οἱ Ἐθβαῖοι τὴν φρουράν καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἠλευθέρωσαν, ἔγκαλων αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τὸν Ἀρχιαν καὶ τὸν Λεοντιάδαν ἀπεκτόνεσαν, ἔργῳ μὲν τυράννους, λόγῳ δὲ πολεμάρχους ὑπάτας, ἐξήνεγκε πρὸς αὐτοὺς πόλεμον. Καὶ Κλεούμβροτος ἢ δὴ βασιλεύων Ἀγησιπόλιδος τεθνήκτος εἰς Βοιωτίαν ἐπέμφθη μετὰ δυνάμεως ὁ γὰρ Ἀγησίλαος, ὡς ἔτη
Of course, because of this straightaway there was suspicion that even though Phoibidas did the deed, Agesilaos designed its doing; and later actions made the charge commonly held. For when the Thebans expelled the garrison and liberated the city, he brought charges against those who killed Archias and Leontiadas—who were in deed tyrants, but in title polemarchs—and declared war against them. And Kleombrotos, being king now that Agesipolis had died, was sent into Boiotia with forces. For Agesilaos, as it had been forty years since he came of age and was exempt from service by law, avoided this expedition, being ashamed to be seen now by the Phliasians, on behalf of whose exiles he had waged war just a little time before, injuring the Thebans by aid of their tyrants.

Chapter 24 begins by picking up on the last event of chapter 23: Agesilaos appointed Archias and Leontiadas as polemarchs over the Kadmeia; this event is now scrutinized through summarized anonymous embedded focalization and Agesilaos is called into suspicion because of his appointment of Phoibidas’ co-conspirators to the Kadmeia. The narrator does not directly accuse Agesilaos of being the mastermind of the Kadmeia seizure, but instead uses embedded focalization to lay the charge. This anonymous focalization is expanded to become even more generalized (“commonly held”) and the motivation (and validation) of this expanded focalization lay in “later actions” which the narrator immediately embarks upon relating. There is an ellipsis of about four years in the fabula-time at this point to bring the story to the aforementioned “later actions” that motivated the focalizations (Kadmeia seizure in 382; liberation of Thebes in winter 379/378). These “later actions” are presented as a summarized sequence of events (Thebes is liberated, the “tyrants” killed, and Agesilaos declared war) in simple narrator text wherein the narrator directs the narratee’s interpretation so that it coincides with that of the anonymous focalizers above (Agesilaos punished the murderers of the “tyrants” and then declared war.

178 Winter 379/8 B.C.E.
against the liberated Thebes) and interjects his own judgment upon Archias and Leontiades as *ipso facto* tyrants lest the narratee misjudge Agesilaos’ declaration of war as motivated by justice rather than his immoderate hatred of Thebes.

The next event presented follows immediately from the end of the last sentence: Agesilaos had declared war and Kleombrotos was then sent into Boiotia. There is a brief analeptic summary after the introduction of Kleombrotos into the story to explain why there was a new king: Agesipolis had died. There is a complete ellipsis over the event of Agesipolis’ death while on expedition against Olynthos in 480.\(^{179}\) More significantly, the narrator omits narration of the twenty months Agesilaos spent besieging Phleious before the liberation of Thebes by Pelopidas and the exiles. Instead, he condenses the entire Phliasian expedition into an off-hand mention out of its chronological context simply to serve as a point of comparison that highlights Agesilaos’ hypocrisy in declaring war against a Thebes that was now liberated by her exiles.

The reason for Agesilaos’ refusal to lead the expedition into Boiotia is presented as two-fold. The public reason, presented in simple narrator text, was that his age made him exempt from campaigning. The private reason, presented in complex narrator text that incorporates the focalization of Agesilaos, was that Agesilaos feared he would appear the hypocrite by bringing war to the Theban exiles when he had recently brought war on behalf of the exiles of Phleious. Kleombrotos’ invasion will fail to regain Thebes for Sparta; Thebes instead becomes a democracy and reforms the Boiotian Confederacy. These details and events are entirely omitted here—it was Kleombrotos, not Agesilaos, who led the expedition and thus they are outside the narrator’s focus.

\(^{24.3-24.5}\)

\(^{179}\) *Xen. Hell. 5.3.18; Dio. 15.23.2*
And there was a certain Lakonian Sphodrias from the faction\(^{180}\) opposed to Agesilaos who was appointed harmost\(^{181}\) in Thespia, and while he was neither lacking in daring nor an ambitionless man, nonetheless he was always filled with hopes rather than good ideas. This fellow was longing for a great name and was considering that Phoibidas became of high repute and much talked about from his daring deed at Thebes, he was convinced that it would be far nobler and more illustrious if he seized the Peiraieus by himself and cut off the Athenians from the sea by attacking them unexpectedly by land. They say that this scheme was contrived by the Boiotarchs connected with Pelopidas and Melon. For they secretly sent men who were pretending to Lakonize, who—exhorting and extolling Sphodrias as the only one worthy of so great a deed—they excited and urged him to undertake the task that was equally as wrongful and unlawful as Phoibidas’ act, but lacked the daring and good fortune. For daytime overtook and exposed him while he was on the Thriasian plain though he was hoping to come upon the Peiraieus during the night; and they say that soldiers, seeing light coming from some temples at Eleusis, became rattled and exceptionally afraid. And Sphodrias himself lost his nerve, as he was no longer concealed, and taking some little plunder he retreated shamefully and ingloriously into Thespia.

\(^{180}\) Cartledge is quite certain that Sphodrias was Kleombrotos’ man, had received from him the appointment to Thespia, and was used by Kleombrotos “as a tool in his opposition to Agesilaos’ Boiotian policy.” See Cartledge (1987) 230. At another point in the volume, 375, he infers that Agesilaos’ support of Sphodrias at his trial made Kleombrotos indebted to him: “Agesilaos thus put Sphodrias’ patron Klembrotos, who was proving a more obdurate opponent than either his brother or his father had been, heavily in his debt, and it was no accident that Kleombrotos should have died along with Sphodrias on the battlefield of Leuktra in a fatally unsuccessful attempt to carry out the Theban policy of Agesilaos.” MacDonald (1972) 38-44 likewise argues for Diodoros’ account that Kleombrotos had ordered Sphordrias to make an attempt against the Peiraieus.

\(^{181}\) i.e. an appointed military governor.
Kleombrotos’ campaign into Boiotia is dropped for narration of the Sphodrias affair, which emerges from the Phoibidas episode above. The forward chronology is maintained, however, as Kleombrotos’ incursion into Boiotia took place in January and February of 378 and the assault on the Peiraieus by Sphodrias occurred during the spring of the same year, there is a short ellipsis of several months between the two events. The Sphodrias affair is told at length as an illustrative example of wanton ambition and will soon be used to demonstrate Agesilaos’ defense of unjust actions due to his own personal motives (be it hatred of Thebes, as with Phoibidas, or love of his son, as in this case). Sphodrias is introduced via summary in simple narrator text: he was Lakonian, aligned with the faction against Agesilaos, harmost in Thespia, and (the narrator’s unfavorable characterization of the man for his narratee) was more daring than he was wise. Following this brief introduction by the narrator, the narratee is presented with the embedded focalization of Sphodrias and his motivation for the coming events. Phoibidas’ actorial motivation is presented via embedded focalization as the narrator would otherwise be unable to report the man’s internal thoughts: he not only wanted to be famous and gain a reputation like Phoibidas did, but he wanted to out-do Phoibidas by seizing the Peiraieus. The plan and purpose of the attempt on the Peiraieus is likewise presented through the focalization of Sphodrias (plan: attack unexpectedly by land; purpose: cut off Athens from the sea).

The initial motivation for the expedition is attributed to Pelopidas and Melon by collective anonymous spokesmen (“they say”) and support for this attribution of motivation to the Boiotarchs is immediately provided, but entirely unsubstantiated: they secretly sent men pretending to Lakonize to pressure Sphodrias. These anonymous pretenders become secondary narrators who flatter Sphodrias (the secondary narratee) into undertaking the assault. The embedded focalization is suddenly abandoned and the primary narrator steps in to foreshadow
the outcome of Sphodrias’ attack. He first pronounces the assault similar to that of Phoibidas in that it was unlawful and wrong, but dissimilar because it lacked the luck Phoibidas experienced; hence the narratees are presented with an interpretation of both attacks as “unlawful” and are braced for the failure that will confront Sphodrias.

There is an important difference in the presentations of responsibility in this version and that in Xen. *Hell.* 5.420. The Plutarchian narrator attributes Sphodrias’ actions to his own desire to make a name for himself and is careful to characterize him immediately upon introduction as belonging to the faction opposed to Agesilaos. The narratorial motivation for this presentation is more than an attempt to streamline the Xenophonic version, rather, it sets up the conflict of interests that will face Agesilaos when he must judge whether to indulge his son and let Sphodrias off or to punish the man who is also an opponent. The Xenophonic narrator, in contrast, directly attributes all responsibility for the plan to attack Athens to the Thebans, who were motivated by a desire to have Athens engage Sparta in war so that the Thebans would not be the only ones fighting against Sparta. The Plutarchian narrator’s presentation removes the difficulty of needing to explain why Agesilaos, if he was as hostile to Thebes as the narrator has characterized him, could defend Sphodrias who had acted at the Thebans’ request. By removing the Thebans from the episode entirely and attributing the responsibility to Sphodrias himself, whom the reader is told was not *aphilotimos*, the narrator both avoids the problem of Theban involvement and can cast the episode in the light of story themes, namely that immoderate ambitions bring dire consequences.

The primary narrator substantiates his interpretation of Sphodrias’ attack as equally as wrong as those Phoibidas carried out, but without the luck he had experienced with a summary of the expedition presented in complex narrator text. Sphodrias wanted to sneak upon the
Peiraeus during the night, but failed to make the journey quickly enough and was exposed in the light of day; this validates the narrator’s interpretation of Sphodrias’ lack of good fortune. Validation for the narrator’s pronouncement of Sphodrias’ lack of courage then follows: collective anonymous spokesmen (“they say”) report that the soldiers were spooked by light emanating from Eleusis. The narrator then states in simple narrator text that Sphodrias also became filled with dread and withdrew after only taking a bit of plunder. This withdrawal, furthermore, was shameful and inglorious by the narrator’s interpretation; this will be supported immediately below by the reaction of the Athenians and Spartans to Sphodrias’ failed assault.

24.6

Ἐκ δὲ τούτου κατήγοροι μὲν ἐπέμφθησαν εἰς Σπάρτην ἐξ Αθηνῶν, εὗρον δὲ κατηγόρων μηδὲν ἐπὶ τὸν Σφοδρίαν δεομένους τοὺς ἀρχοντας, ἄλλα θανάτου κρίσιν αὐτῷ προειρηκότας, ἦν ἐκεῖνος υπομένειν ἀπέγνω, φοβούμενος τὴν ὁργὴν τῶν πολιτῶν αἰσχυνομένων τοὺς Αθηναίους καὶ βουλομένων συναισθήσει δοκείν, ἵνα μὴ συναϊσθεί δοκῶσιν.

And because of this, men from Athens were sent to Sparta to bring accusations, but they found that the leaders there had no need for their accusations against Sphodrias, but had already brought a judgment of death against him—which he refused to submit to—fearing the anger of the citizens who were ashamed before the Athenians and wanted to seem wronged as well, so that they did not seem to have joined in the wrongdoing.

The next event emerges directly from Sphodrias’ shameful withdrawal: Athens sends men to Sparta. These actors are not named, but their experience is related in complex narrator text with embedded focalization: they found Sparta did not need their accusation as Sphodrias had already been condemned to death in absentia. The actorial motivation for Sparta’s quick condemnation of Sphodrias closes the chapter: Spartan magistrates feared the citizens (who in turn were ashamed and fearful of Athens) and wanted to appear as wronged by Sphodrias as the

182 For the trial of Sphodrias, see Cartledge (1987) 136-138, 157-159, and 375.
Athenians were and thus absolve Sparta of blame for Sphodrias’ actions. The narratee is told that Sphodrias refused to submit himself to the punishment, but how he did this and its resolution is not given until the next chapter wherein the episode will be intimately tied to Agesilaos and thus become an example of his transgression of justice due to his personal relationships and motives.

25.1-25.3

Well now, Sphodrias had a son, Kleonymos, whom, being still a youth and pleasing to the eye, Archidamos, the son of King Agesilaos, desired. And at that time, while he understandably shared in the anxiety with Kleonymos who feared for his father, he could not openly assist or help him; for Sphodrias was one of the opponents of Agesilaos. But when Kleonymos came to him, falling upon him with tears and pleading, that he might make Agesilaos well-disposed, for the king especially was the one causing them fear, for three or four days Archidamos, ashamed and fearful, followed his father about in silence, but finally, when the trial was near, he dared to tell Agesilaos that Kleonymos had besought him on behalf of his father. And Agesilaos knew that Archidamos was in love with Kleonymos and did not put an end to it; for right from childhood Kleonymos was likely, if anyone was, to become serious man. But at the time he did not give any indication for his beseeching son to expect any kindness or understanding, but saying only that he would consider what would be best and most suitable, he left.

The narration of the Sphodrias affair in 378 B.C.E. continues, but the rhythm has slowed to present one of the most descriptive, dramatic, and scenic passages in the story. The episode of Archidamos approaching his father on Kleonymos’ behalf presented here is a compressed
version of what the Xenophonic narrator presents in *Hellenika* 5.4.25-33. The episode is
presented mostly through complex narrator text with several embedded focalizers (Archidamos,
Kleonymos, and Agesilaos), but without any character text as is found in the *Hellenika*. This aids
in the compression of Xenophon’s version and maintains the thematic focus upon Agesilaos’
paternal indulgence. As an example of the ways by which Plutarch was able to compress the
episode without significantly altering it, we can see that he manipulated the frequency of
interactions between Archidamos and his father. In the *Hellenika*, Archidamos approaches his
father, or attempts to, five times and speaks to him twice; comparatively, in Plutarch’s *Agesilaos*,
the son approaches Agesilaos only once after following him about for days.

In *Hell. 5.4.25-28*, the sequence of requests that result in Agesilaos’ support of Sphodrias
at the trial is initiated with Sphodrias himself, who asks his son to approach Archidamos on his
behalf as his political associations prevent him from directly beseeching Agesilaos himself. In
Plutarch’s version, however, the political connotations are replaced with personal ones. Thus,
Kleonymos, out of fear for his father and himself, independently asks Archidamos, evidently
confident in their personal relationship, to ask Agesilaos for pardon. In this way, Sphodrias and
the factional rivalry between Kleombrotos and Agesilaos are almost completely removed from
this episode and the focus instead narrows upon the two sons’ love for one another and, most
especially, Agesilaos’ love for his son.

In *Hell. 5.4.24-25*, the outcome of the trial is presented and the narrator labels it as “the
most unjust trial” ever decided in Lakedaimon. This statement is immediately followed by the
story of Kleonymos and Archidamos as the reason for the injustice. In our story, however, the
narrator does not disclose the outcome of the trial until after narrating the Kleonymos and
Archidamos episode. Thus the narratee is kept in suspense of the outcome of Archidamos’
efforts just as Kleonymos and Sphodrias are and a sense of drama is created. The narrative of this episode is markedly similar to that in Xenophon’s *Hellenika* 5.4.25-33, but, as we would expect, the version in Plutarch’s story is compressed and the emphasis, as well as the actorial motivation, is changed to better suit the story’s themes and focus upon Agesilaos’ character in action. Xenophon’s narrative gives Agesilaos’ motive for supporting Sphodrias as his desire to preserve men like Sphodrias who were excellent Spartans militarily throughout life. Plutarch’s narrative includes this reasoning, but emphasizes a much more personal touch: Agesilaos was primarily motivated by his love for his son, as the last anecdote of the chapter reiterates, and his sympathy for Archidamos’ love of Kleonymos, which itself strongly echoes Agesilaos’ own relationship with Lysander while a young man that was presented in chapter 2.183

25.4-25.5.1

Aιδούμενος οὖν ὁ Ἀρχιδάμος ἐξέλειπε τὸ προσίειν τῷ Κλεωνύμῳ, καίτερ εἰσάγως τούτο πολλάκις τῆς ἡμέρας ποιεῖν πρότερον. Εκ δὲ τούτου κάκεινο τὰ κατὰ τὸν Σφοδρίαν μᾶλλον ἀπέγνωσαν, ἀχρι σὺ τῶν Αγησιλάου φίλων Ἐτυμοκλῆς ἐν τινι κοινολογεῖα πρὸς αὐτούς ἀπεγένωσε τὴν γνώμην τοῦ Ἀγησιλάου: τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἔργον ὡς ἐνα τάλαστα πέφειν αὐτὸν, ἀλλὰς γε μὴν ἀνδρὰ τὸν Σφοδρίαν ἄγαθον ἥγειοθαί καὶ τὴν πόλιν ὑφ᾽ ὧν ὑπέκυκλον στρατιωτῶν δεομένην. Τοῦτος γὰρ ὁ Ἀγησιλαῖος ἐκάστοτε τοὺς λόγους ἐποιεῖτο περὶ τῆς δικῆς τῷ παιδί χαρίζοθαι βουλόμενος, ὡστε καὶ τὸν Κλεωνύμου εὖθὺς αἰσθάνεος τὴν στιμηθήν τοῦ Ἀρχιδάμου καὶ τοὺς φίλους τοῦ Σφοδρίου βαρηούτας ἡδὴ βοήθειν.

So now Archidamos, ashamed, stopped visiting Kleonymos, although before he usually did so many times a day. Because of this even his friends were more in despair of the situation involving Sphodrias, until one of the friends of Agesilaos, Etymokles, in conference with them exposed Agesilaos’ thinking: for while he objected to the deed to the utmost degree, nevertheless he considered Sphodrias to be a worthy man indeed and thought the city needed soldiers like him. For

183 Cartledge (1987) 158 labels Agesilaos’ motives as “paternal and homoerotic sentiments.” He posits that Agesilaos “actively promoted [the relationship], precisely because it might yield him some political dividend in the future…” This may very well be the thinking behind Agesilaos’ actions, though they could never be confirmed. Regardless of the historical motives, Plutarch’s version presents no hint of Agesilaos conniving for political benefit, but instead presents a character driven by his emotions for his son. The structure of this episode and the chapter that contains makes clear the narrator’s preoccupation with analyzing the manifestations of Agesilaos’ character.
Agesilaos made these comments about the trial often wishing to please his son, and as a result Kleonymos immediately perceived the pains taken by Archidamos and Sphodrias’ friends now were mustering the courage to help him.

The interpretation of Agesilaos’ response begins the next sentence and is focalized through Archidamos in complex narrator text: he is ashamed and (resultant event) stops his customary visits to Kleonymos. Thus the narratee is also to assume that Archidamos’ efforts had failed and that Agesilaos was not going to change his stance against Sphodrias; dramatic suspense is maintained. This resultant event (Archidamos’ avoidance of Kleonymos) becomes the actorial motivation for the unnamed associates of Sphodrias who thereupon sink into despair over Sphodrias’ situation. The next event, the conference with Etymokles, will provide these associates with new motivation to return their support to Sphodrias. Etymokles is identified simply as “one of Agesilaos’ friends” who therefore has insight into the king’s thinking. What the narratee is not told is that Etymokles is also member of the gerousia and therefore a participant in the trial of Sphodrias; nor is it mentioned that Etymokles was one of the three Spartan ambassadors in Athens at the time of Sphodrias’ failed attempt. It is enough for the context within the story that the narrator identify him as a philos of Agesilaos; being a friend of Agesilaos is sufficient to authorize his disclosure of the king’s thoughts (embedded focalization) and is sufficient for moving the story forward to the climax of the episode: Agesilaos’ decision to support Sphodrias and the reason he decided to do so. Given the narrator’s iterative mention of Xenophon throughout the story, however, both as a character and a reference, the narratee might well already be cognizant of the broader historical context and have more insight into the significance of Etymokles, however inconsequential to the present story of Agesilaos’ character in action.

184 Xen. Hell. 5.4.22-23.
Agesilaos’ reasons for his surprise support of Sphodrias are presented through a twice embedded focalization: Agesilaos’ thoughts about the trial are disclosed to internal narratees (Sphodrias’ supporters) by Etymokles, who himself focalizes Agesilaos’ response and interprets them as positive for Sphodrias’ supporters. The reasons that Etymokles ascribes to Agesilaos’ decision to support Sphodrias are the king’s desire to preserve worthy generals, of which Agesilaos believes there to be a lack, even though he rejects Sphodrias’ deed. The circumstances through which Etymokles could know these thoughts are then disclosed: Agesilaos often made these comments himself. The private actorial motivation for Agesilaos’ support is given as his wish to please his son; this is stated by the narrator in simple text and directly links the outcome of the trial to the episode of Archidamos and Kleonymos. The resultant event brings the chapter full circle: Agesilaos’ support proves to Kleonymos that Archidamos did indeed petition Agesilaos on behalf of Sphodrias.

25.5.2

'Ἡν δὲ καὶ φιλότεκνος διαφερόντως ὁ Αγγαίλαος, καὶ περὶ ἐκείνου τὸ τῆς παιδιᾶς λέγουσιν, ὅτι μικρός τοῖς παιδίοις οὕτωι κάλαμον περιβεβηκὼς ὡστερ ἵππον οἴκοι συνέπαιζεν, ὀρθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τινὸς τῶν φίλων παρεκάλει μηδὲνι φράσαι, πρὶν ἄν καὶ αὐτὸς πατήρ παιδῶν γένηται. Agesilaos was indeed exceptionally devoted to his children; about his playing around they even say that once when his kids were young, straddling a stick as if it were a horse, he was playing with them at home, and when caught by some of his friends he urged them to say nothing about it until they had become fathers of children themselves.

The forward chronology pauses for narratorial commentary and an internal analepsis that supports the narrator’s comment about Agesilaos’ devotion to his children. The final result of the trial is delayed until the beginning of the next chapter, but the episode that brought about Sphodrias’ acquittal is marked as concluded by the narrator’s comment that Agesilaos was
exceptionally devoted to his children. Beck notes the importance of placing this comment and anecdote at this point in the narrative by which the narratee is directed to reassess the outcome of the Sphodrias affair and Agesilaos’ indulgence of his son’s desires. The analeptic anecdote about Agesilaos playing with his young children proves that the king had always been a devoted father prone to indulging his children and shows the humane side of the king. The emphasis is especially on Agesilaos’ love for his children and this love was the deciding factor in Agesilaos’ decision on Sphodrias, not any political aspirations. As is typical of the narrative, the narrator makes an interpretive comment about Agesilaos’ character and then immediately validates it with an example anecdote.

---

186 This anecdote is repeated nearly verbatim in *Apophthegmata Lakonika* 213e, but without the context of the trial.
Part Seven: chapters 26-29

These chapters form the narrator’s account of the fabula years 378-371 B.C.E. The subtle criticism touched upon in the previous chapters reaches fuller expression in the following narrative sections. In these chapters, the narrator portrays Agesilaos as consumed and driven by his hatred for Thebes, which results in the degradation of his reputation as well as Sparta’s hegemony. As we have come to expect, the narrator uses the context of historical fabula events, such as Sphodrias’ acquittal and the Battle of Leuktra, to develop and illustrate aspects of Agesilaos’ character and the effects of his character upon his decisions and actions as king.

The narrator continues the forward chronological progression by concluding the Sphodrias affair, but this is covered summarily as he uses the event as a springboard to discuss the negative effects of the trial upon Agesilaos’ reputation. It is this focus on Agesilaos’ declining reputation that the narrative of these chapters highlights; negative attitudes towards Agesilaos are explored through the embedded focalization of collective spokesmen, both Greek and Spartan, allies and opponents. These negative attitudes themselves are motivated by Agesilaos’ continued hostility towards Thebes, thus returning the narratee to the central theme of the Spartan king’s immoderate hatred.

It will be this immoderate hatred that the narrator presents as the impetus that pushes Sparta to the brink of collapse; the narrative progresses chronologically from the reaction to Sphodrias’ acquittal to the Spartans’ defeat at Leuktra and at each turn the narratee is told that it was Agesilaos’ unbridled anger at the Thebans that resulted in these events. The introduction of Epaminondas into the story and his characterization by the narrator in this section are key to the development of the remainder of the Bios. In the chapters discussed below in Part 8, his centrality to the events of those years of Agesilaos’ life are made apparent as he is cast as the
king’s most formidable military opponent who is able to humble not only the man, but his polity as well.

26.1

Απολυθέντος δὲ τοῦ Σφοδρίου καὶ τῶν Αθηναίων, ὡς ἐπύθοντο, πρὸς πόλειμον τραπομέκων, σφόδρα κακῶς ὁ Ἑγεσίλαος ἦκουσε δι’ ἐπιθυμίαν ἀτοποῦ καὶ παιδαριώδη δοκῶν ἐμποδών γεγονέναι κρίσει δικαία καὶ τὴν πόλιν παράτιον ἀπειργάσθαι παρανομιμάτων τηλικούτων εἰς τοὺς Ἑλλήνας.

But when Sphodrias was acquitted and the Athenians, when they learned of it, became inclined for war, Agesilaos had the worst things said about him; that because of unwonted and childish desire he seemed to become a hindrance to a just trial and make the city partially responsible for such terrible transgressions against the Hellenes.

The outcome of the Sphodrias affair and his acquittal begins this chapter, but the narrative will focus on the negative effects of the decision upon Agesilaos’ reputation as well as the allies’ growing frustration with the military focus on Thebes’ destruction. This opening sentence introduces the theme of the chapter and the remainder will elaborate on the topic of the results of the acquittal upon Agesilaos’ and Sparta’s reputation, which will be illustrated with anecdote. The forward chronology is maintained and the resultant events, motivated by the acquittal of Sphodrias, are summarized: because of the acquittal, Athens leans towards war and Agesilaos’ reputation suffers deeply because of the role he played in the acquittal, which was the topic of the chapter before. The disparaging remarks made about Agesilaos after the trial are conveyed via embedded focalization of unnamed and generalized persons rather than being directly stated by the narrator in simple text; the embedded focalization itself is marked by the verb of hearing (ἠκούσε) and the causal διά.
And since he did not see Kleombrotos eager to wage war against the Thebans, and therefore letting be the law which he had invoked before about the expedition, he himself then invaded Boiotia and badly damaged the Thebans and suffered himself in turn so that when he was then wounded Antalkidas said, “You are certainly receiving nice instructional fees from the Thebans—whom you taught to fight even though they didn’t want to and didn’t know how.” In fact, they say that the Thebans at that time continually became incredibly skilled in war due to the frequent expeditions of the Lakedaimonians against them as if they were being trained. Which is why Lykourgos of old, in the three so-called rhetras, had forbidden frequent expeditions against the same opponents so that they would not learn how to wage war.

Having opened the chapter with a summary of the Athenians’ and other (anonymous) Greeks’ perspectives on Agesilaos’ involvement in the trial, the narrator jumps forward a couple of months in the chronology and uses the causal ‘Επεὶ δὲ to connect the next event, Agesilaos’ attack on Thebes, with the thematic opening that contemporaries were viewing Agesilaos as an obstacle to peace. Thus, the narrator brings the story-time from the springtime trial of Sphodrias in 378 B.C.E. to the summer and autumn campaigns against Thebes in 378/77 B.C.E.187 The perception of Kleombrotos’ reluctance to fight Thebes is focalized through Agesilaos and this perception motivates him to forego invoking the law that would have exempt him from the

---

expedition due to his age and take up the command himself.\textsuperscript{188} It was this very same exemption by age that, as narrated in chapter 24, he had invoked in the January/February 378 expedition against Thebes. Thus, the narrator suggests inconsistency in Agesilaos’ use of this law by noting that he had previously invoked the law of exemption, but here declined to do so. Rather than directly commenting upon or openly criticizing Agesilaos on this point, the narrator summarizes the results of Agesilaos’ attack on Thebes and transfers criticism to Antalkidas, who chastises Agesilaos’ for his repeated aggressions against Thebes, which will be discussed further below.

First, it is interesting to note the differences in actorial motivation represented in the separate versions presented by the Xenophonic and Plutarchian narrators of Agesilaos’ choice to assume the command against Thebes. In this story, the narrator tells the narratee simply that Agesilaos did not think Kleombrotos would be an eager commander against Thebes and that this motivated Agesilaos to take the command himself. Contrarily, in Xenophon’s \textit{Hellenika} 5.4.35, it is the Spartans themselves who choose Agesilaos as commander over Kleombrotos because they believe he would be more successful against the Thebans. In that version, Agesilaos takes the command saying that he would do whatever the state thought was best and with this presentation the narrator presents an image of an obedient Agesilaos. In comparison with the version above, the Plutarchian narrator states that Agesilaos was the deciding force as well as the impetus for the campaign; in other words, the narrator portrays Agesilaos as instigating the need for the campaign rather than following his state’s order to campaign. The responsibility is completely transferred to Agesilaos in the Plutarchian version of the events; this is fitting at this point of the biographical story wherein the narrator is taking pains to portray the gradual decline

\textsuperscript{188} Cartledge (1987) 229-230 discusses some of the aspects of Agesilaos’ desire to lead this campaign instead of Kleombrotos.
of Agesilaos and Sparta’s authority and the reasons behind this decline, which he attributes to aspects of Agesilaos’ character.

It is in the context of this campaign against Thebes, the events of which the narrator summarizes, that the narrator places the quip from Antalkidas that Agesilaos trained the Thebans to fight with his repeated aggressions against that state. The damages done to the allied and Spartan forces, including the injury sustained by Agesilaos himself, become the motivation for Antalkidas to make his disparaging comment to the king, which is presented in character-text, about receiving his just desserts from the Thebans. This quotation from Antalkidas prompts the narrator to pause the chronology in order to explain Antalkidas’ comment, the explanation being signaled by an emphatic τῷ γὰρ Ὀντῷ, and clarifies that the Thebans were becoming a more formidable military enemy because the Spartans were continually assaulting them, an assessment validated by anonymous spokesmen (φασί). The significance both of Antalkidas’ criticism and the narrator’s explanation is heightened by the external analepsis, introduced by διό, that invokes the Lykourgian warning to the early Spartans not to continually campaign against the same people lest they learn from Spartan military tactics. Not only is Lykourgos invoked, however, but the ancient rhetra, making Agesilaos transgression of these most powerful Spartan authorities tantamount to hybris. This external analepsis by the narrator elaborates upon the Bios’ theme that Agesilaos’ neglect of Lykourgian precepts was the largest contributing factor in Sparta’s decline, the philosophy behind which was laid out for the narratee in chapter 5. As noted by Beck, the

189 Cf. Plut. Pel. 15.1-3. In that passage it is the Thebans who were engaging the Spartans by sea while also fighting battles against them in Boiotia that were “unimportant to them”, but gave them much training. The focalization has shifted to the Thebans in that passage and characterizes them as more aggressive than they are being portrayed here, as victims of Agesilaos’ obsession. In both versions, the Antalkidas criticism is situated after the summary of military action and explanation.

190 Cf. Plut. Lyk. 13.6. It is specifically the “third rhetra” that forbids frequent engagement of the same enemy. To illustrate the consequences of transgressing this rhetra, the narrator uses Agesilaos’ attacks on Thebes, who was subsequently blamed for this “for a long time.” Therefore, there are similar connections made by the narrator in Pel., Lyk., and Ages. of the events, Antalkidas’ criticism, and Agesilaos’ transgression of ancient law.
And Agesilaos was a burden also to the allies of the Lakedaimonians, who said that it was because of no public charge, but due to a certain anger and lust for contention that he sought to annihilate the Thebans. And so they said they had no desire to be ruined in this place and that each year while they, being so many in number, were accompanying the Spartans who were so few in number. At which point it is said that Agesilaos, wanting to prove to them just how great their number was, devised this scheme: he ordered all the allies to sit down all mixed together, and the Lakedaimonians separately by themselves. He then called upon all the potters to stand up first; as these stood up, he next called upon the bronze smiths to do the same, and then the craftsmen one after the other, and each of the other skilled workmen. And thus almost all the allies stood up, but not one of the Lakedaimonians; for it was forbidden for them to work a craft and to learn mechanical arts. And so Agesilaos, laughing, said, “You see, men, how many more soldiers we send out than you.”

The narrator continues with focalized criticism of Agesilaos and returns to the topic of the allies’ discontentment as well as the negative effects that Agesilaos’ Theban campaigning was having on his and Sparta’s reputation. The section begins with an embedded focalization of the Spartan allies in indirect discourse, introduced by ὡς, asserting that Agesilaos became a burden...
to the allies. He follows this with an explanation of and support for his statement, again in an
embedded focalization, that the allies were being continually led to war because of Agesilaos’
personal ambitions rather than any public need to subdue Thebes. The statement and explanation
of allied discontent leads into an embedded focalization of the allies who complain that they
were wary of having their manpower depleted by the Spartans campaigns, especially since the
allies made up the majority of the forces. This collective embedded focalization becomes the
actorial motivation for Agesilaos to perform his next action: separating the “men from the
boys.” 192 This famous anecdote is presented in complex narrator text with focalization that
climaxes in an apothegm of Agesilaos, which makes it the most vivid scene of the chapter. The
focalized actorial motivation is presented first and sets up the resultant event presented in the
anecdote: Agesilaos wanted to prove to the allies that the Spartans were the strongest element of
the allied forces even if they were the smallest in number. The action of the anecdote is
summarily presented with a brief narratorial explanation as to why no Lakedaimonian stood up
with the various craftsmen, explaining to the narratee that Lakedaimonians were forbidden from
working any craft. 193 The anecdote is closed with an apothegm that illustrates Agesilaos’ wit and
shows the allies’ discontent as unwarranted from the perspective of Agesilaos.

27.1-27.2

Ἐν δὲ Μεγάροις, ὅτε τὴν στρατιὰν ἀπῆγεν ἐκ Θηβῶν, ἀναβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ
πρὸς τὸ ἄρχειον εἰς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν σπάσμα καὶ πόνον ἱσχυρῶν ἔλαβε τὸ
ὕγεις σκέλος ἐκ δὲ τούτου διογκωθὲν αἶματος ἐδοξε μεστὸν γεγονέναι καὶ
φλεγμονὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν παρεῖχεν. Ἡσαυρὸν δὲ τινὸς Συρακοσίου τὴν ὑπὸ
tῶν σφυρῶν φλέβα σχάσαντος, αἱ μὲν ἀληθῶν ἔληξαν, αἶματος δὲ πολλοῦ
φερομένου καὶ ῥεόντος ἀνεπισχέτως λυπημαχία πολλὴ καὶ κίνδυνος δὲς ἂπʼ
αὐτῆς περιέστη τὸν Ἁγασίλαον. Οὐ μὲν ἄλλα τότε γε τὴν φορᾶν τοῦ

192 Cartledge (1987) 231.
But in Megara, when he led the army back from Thebes, while going up to the senate-house on the acropolis, a spasm and sharp pain seized his sound leg; and afterwards it became swollen and seemed filled with blood and exhibited excessive inflammation. A certain Syrakusian doctor opened a vein under the ankle, and while the pain let up, there was still much blood that came out and flowed uncontrollably; frequent black-outs and fatal peril came over Agesilaos. But then the profusion of blood finally stopped and after being carried to Lakedaimon, he was for a long time ill and unable to campaign.

The narrator resumes forward chronology with Agesilaos’ return in 377 B.C.E. from ravaging Theban territory with his army without, however, providing any details of the events of the expedition. The time and setting are summarily established in the first sentence before the narrator slows the story-time down to narrate the next event, a rupture in his leg, in scene-tempo. The retardation of the story rhythm here creates a dramatic scene conveying the mortal danger Agesilaos found himself in due to the bleeding in his healthy leg. The event is indeed significant, as the injury will keep Agesilaos from taking the field for seven years; in fact, the next event Agesilaos takes part in is at the peace conference of 375 B.C.E. that is narrated in the second half of this chapter. For Agesilaos to be absent from the military sphere for such an extended period of time, during which Sparta suffers serious losses, the injury must have been severe and this severity is precisely what the narrator conveys by slowing the rhythm to scene-tempo when discussing the details of Agesilaos’ near-fatal injury.\(^{194}\) After the scene narration, the narrator summarizes his transfer to Sparta and the extended seven-year period of his recovery and military inactivity is condensed into the phrase “πολὺν χρόνον”.

---

194 For a brief discussion on ancient medical theory, medical and historiographical diagnosis and prognosis, and the practice of blood-letting as relevant to this passage, see Shipley (1997) 306-308.
And during this time the Spartans experienced many defeats by both land and sea; of these the one at Tegyra was the worst, where for the first time, outdone in a pitched battle, they were defeated by the Thebans. And so it seemed good to everyone to adopt a common peace; and ambassadors from around Hellas came to Lakedaimon in order to establish a truce. Among them was Epaminondas, a man esteemed for his learning and passion for knowledge, but who had not yet given proof of his ability to command. When this fellow was observing all the others giving in to Agesilaos, he alone expressed his thoughts openly and delivered a speech, not on behalf of Thebes, but on behalf of all Hellas in common, showing that the war was strengthening Sparta while all the rest were badly suffering, and urging peace to made equally and fairly, for in this way it would last, when all were equal.

The events of the next seven chronological years, 377-371 B.C.E., are summarized and compressed into a single sentence in simple narrator text. The narrator singles out the defeat at Tegyra in 375 B.C.E. as an example of Sparta’s increasingly desperate situation and Thebes’ growing military expertise. The narrator highlights the significance of this battle by telling the narratee that this was the first time the Spartans were defeated by the Thebans in pitched battle.

The emphasis on this reversal of Sparta’s military fortune at the hands of Thebes creates

---

195 Xenophon omits mention in the Hellenika of the defeat at Tegyra in 375. Shipley (1997) 309 postulates that it would “not have helped Spartan morale to remember” the battle and so omits it and thereby “fails to indicate the growth of the Thebans’ military strength before Leuktra”. Plutarch, by contrast, in Pel. 16-17, “claims Tegyra as the preliminary to Leuktra and, as he does here, as the first victory against Sparta won in a pitched battle.” Plutarch therefore presents a concise and more coherent narrative that demonstrates Sparta’s military decline in the years leading up to Leuktra.
suspense with the narratee, who is likely aware that this may be the first, but not the last or
greatest defeat that Sparta will suffer at the hands of Thebes. The criticism of Antalkidas that
was interwoven into the previous chapter, in which he chastised Agesilaos for training the
Thebans by constant warfare, carries even more weight now as the narratee sees that, indeed, the
Thebans were now outperforming the Spartans in war. All of the details that have been
interwoven into the last chapters—Antalkidas’ quip, the disgruntled allies, the summarized
defeats, and now the Theban victory at Tegyra—have been anticipatory of the imminent disaster
at Leuktra and subsequent invasion of Lakedaimonia by the Theban forces, which will be the
events that dominate the coming chapters.

The sequence of defeats, and particularly that at Tegyra, itself becomes the actorial
motivation for the collective anonymous focalizer (παισοι) who thereupon decide it to be in
everyone’s best interest to adopt a common peace. The motivation (successive battles) brings
action (call for peace) which leads the narrative to the next scene: the conference at Sparta in
June 371 B.C.E. At this point in the chapter, the narrator slows the story rhythm down to
scene-tempo and maintains this rhythm through the first half of the next chapter. He uses the
context of the peace conference to introduce Epaminondas into the story and to admirably
characterize him as one who was respected for his learning (anonymous collective embedded
focalization) but still untested as a field commander (direct statement in simple text). The
narrator tells the narratee that Epaminondas was the only man there brave enough to speak
frankly and thus reiterates the favorable characterization. The content of his speech is given in

196 Cf. Xen. Hell. 6.3.1-2 wherein it is the Athenians, frustrated by the Thebans’ actions against Plataia and Tespiai,
who arrange the peace conference in Sparta.
197 There was a congress at Sparta for the first renewal of the King’s Peace in 375 B.C.E. and it appears that Plutarch
has confused and combined the conferences of 375 and 371 B.C.E., it was at the latter conference where Agesilaos
and Epaminondas verbally sparred. For the Peace of 375 B.C.E., see Cawkwell (1963) 84-95.
198 Empaminondas, one of the Boiotarchs that year, was an essential reason for Thebes’ short-lived period of
dominance.; for discussion of his policies and effect, see Cawkwell (1972) 254-278.
summarized embedded focalization and further characterizes the Theban as phil-Hellenic (as he
speaks for the benefit of all, not just the Thebans), persuasive (proving that Sparta was benefiting
from war at the detriment of the other poleis), and just (emphasizing that only an equal peace can
be a lasting one). The tone and content of the embedded focalization of Epaminondas will
contrast significantly with Agesilaos’ focalized response that begins the next chapter.

In the *Hellenika*, the narrator omits any mention of the defeat at Tegyra and identifies the
Athenians as the agents responsible for convening the peace conference at Sparta in 371
B.C.E. It is the Athenians’ outrage at the expulsion of the Plataians from Boiotia and the
Thespian’s call for aid from Athens against the Thebans actions against the Phokians that
motivated the Athenians to pursue a common peace. There is no mention in the Xenophonic
version of the series of Spartan defeats that the Plutarchian narrator claims as the prime
motivator for the peace conference. By condensing the Xenophonic version and adding events
from other sources, like the Spartan defeat at Tegyra, the Plutarchian narrator is able to present a
cohesive narrative that builds off the events and themes selected for the story. For the last several
chapters of the story, the narrator has taken pains to cast Agesilaos’ hostility towards Thebes as
the font from which Sparta’s actions sprang during these turbulent years. The origin for this
hostility itself was scripted in this story as originating with the Theban officials’ disruption of
Agesilaos’ sacrifice at Aulis in 6.4-6 and elaborated upon in chapter 23 with the Sphodrias affair.
The discontent of the Spartan allies, who were exhausted by the continual warfare, was made a
central event, in the form of anecdote, in chapter 26 as the narrator became more critical of
Agesilaos’ behavior both through direct comments and focalization of internal character. Now

---

199 See notes 130 and 131 above.
the narrator merges these themes as the collective motivation for seeking peace as well, as we will see below, as the reason for its failure.

28.1-28.2

'Ὅρων οὖν ὁ Ἀγασίλαος ὑπερφυῶς ἀγαμένους καὶ προσέχοντας αὐτῷ τοὺς Ἑλλήνας, ἤρωτησεν, εἰ νομίζει δίκαιον εἶναι καὶ ἰσον αὐτονομείσθαι τὴν Βοιωτίαν. Ἀντερωτήσαντος δὲ τοῦ Ἐπαμινώνδου ταχὺ καὶ τεθαρρηκότως, εἰ κάκεινος οἶηται δίκαιον αὐτονομείσθαι τὴν Λακωνίκην, ἀναπηδήσας ὁ Ἀγασίλαος μετ’ ὀργῆς ἐκέλευε Λέγειν σαφῶς αὐτόν, εἰ τὴν Βοιωτίαν ἀφίσιν αὐτόνομον. Τὸ δ’ αὐτὸ τούτο πάλιν τοῦ Ἐπαμινώνδου φήσαντος, εἰ τὴν Λακωνίκην ἀφίσιν αὐτόνομον, οὕτω τραχέως ἔσχεν ὁ Ἀγασίλαος καὶ τὴν πρόφασιν ἤγαπησεν, ὃς εὐθὺς ἔξαλείσατο τὸ τῶν Θηβαίων δυναμά τῆς εἰρήνης καὶ προειπέν πόλεμον αὐτοῖς’ τοὺς δ’ ἄλλους Ἑλλήνας διαλλαγέντας ἐκέλευεν ἄπιναι, τὰ μὲν ἀκέστα τῆς εἰρήνης, τὰ δ’ ἀνήκεσα τοῦ πόλεμου ποιοῦντας. Ἐργον γὰρ ἦν ἀπάσας ἐκκαθήραι καὶ διαλύσαι τὰς ἀμφιλογίας.

Now Agesilaos, watching the Hellenes extraordinarily in awe and enthralled by him, asked if he considered it fair and equal for Boiotia to be autonomous. And when Epaminondas quickly and daringly asked in turn if he thought it fair for Lakonia to be autonomous, Agesilaos, leaping to his feet, angrily ordered him to say plainly whether they would give up Boiotia’s autonomy. And when Epaminondas asked the same thing again, whether they would give up Lakonia’s autonomy, Agesilaos then became hostile and greeted it as a pretext to remove the name of the Thebans immediately from the peace and declared war against them; he then ordered the other Hellenes, having been reconciled, to leave, making some things remedied by peace and others undone by war. For it was a hard task to purge and dissolve all disputes.

The scene is continued, but the narrator switches to Agesilaos’ rather than Epaminondas’ focalization. Agesilaos’ response to Epaminondas is given in complex narrator text. Likewise, Epaminondas’ reply to Agesilaos quickly follows in complex narrator text. The characters spar back and forth, their actions presented in simple text and their responses in complex text, and Agesilaos is depicted as irrationally angered, especially in comparison to the positive assessment of Epaminondas’ address narrated in the section before. The sparring between the two men motivates the next event: Agesilaos’ declaration of war and dissolution of the peace.
conference—all conveyed directly, but dramatically, in simple narrator text. The final
interpretation of the scene is furnished from the narrator directly to the narratee: some issues, like
those between the cities that were reconciled at the conference, were remedied while others,
specifically the single-minded hostility of Agesilaos towards Thebes, were inflamed to the point
of engulfing all in war.

Once again, it is worthwhile to compare the Xenophonic narrative of the peace
conference with that which the Plutarchian narrator presents. In *Hellenika* 6.3.2-20, it is the
Athenian ambassadors who speak at the conference, both against Theban and Spartan actions.
Even more notably, Epaminondas is not even mentioned in passing, much less given a positive
characterization by the narrator, as the Plutarchian narrator does. What is more, there is no
verbal, one-on-one sparring between Epaminondas and Agesilaos; in fact, Agesilaos is not even
mentioned in the Xenophonic version until 6.3.19 when he objects to the Thebans’ eleventh hour
wish to have the treaty signatures changed to read “the Boiotians” in place of “the Thebans”, as
they had sworn the day before. Although at 6.3.19 Agesilaos protests against the Thebans’ wish
and threatens them with exclusion from the treaty, it is the Athenians to whom the Xenophonic
narrator attributes hostility toward Thebes and a wish for continued warfare against them.
Contrarily, the Plutarchian narrator recasts the event with a new actor, Epaminondas, being pitted
against Agesilaos and the entire event hinges upon the reactions of one man to the other.
Whereas Athens and the Athenian ambassadors are made the central agents in the Xenophonic
version and the main aggressor against Theban behavior, the Plutarchian narrator reframes this
event within the themes of the story and its focus upon Agesilaos.
And it happened that at that time Kleombrotos was in Phokis with an army. So immediately the ephors sent him orders to lead the army against the Thebans; and they sent men around to muster the allies, who, although unenthusiastic and distressed about the war, nevertheless did not dare to oppose or disobey the Lakedaimonians. And while many distressful signs appeared, as has been written about in the work on Epaminondas, and although Prothoös the Lakonian was opposed to the campaign, Agesilaos would not listen, but instead brought on the war, as he was expecting that with all of Hellas being joined with them, and with the Thebans being excluded from the treaty, it was an opportune time to take vengeance against them.

The narrator structures the breakdown between Agesilaos and Epaminondas at the conference to motivate the next event of the story: Sparta’s renewed invasion of Boiotia under Kleombrotos. The narrator states, without explaining the context further, that Kleombrotos happened to be in Phokis with an army and so was poised for the invasion. Thebes’ invasion of Phokis in 373/2 B.C.E. and later in spring or summer of 372/1 B.C.E. provided Athens with the impetus to sue for a joint peace between Sparta, Athens, and Thebes, the result of which was the Peace Conference in June 371 B.C.E, the scene narrated above. Kleombrotos had evidently been sent to aid Phokis in 371 B.C.E. and thus was poised for an invasion after the conference had broken down. These details are, however, superfluous to the story; the narratee need only be

---

201 For the preliminary military preparations and the location of Kleombrotus in 371 B.C.E., see Hamilton (1991) 202-204.
told that Kleombrotos was in Phokis with an army, which was the reason for the ephors to send him marching orders against Thebes.

The preparatory actions of Sparta are summarized and the narrator comments on the attitudes of the allies to this new campaign that reflects the helpless dissatisfaction they were experiencing as Sparta’s allies, which was highlighted by the anecdote in chapter 26. Opposition to the campaign is alluded to, but not explained and unfavorable signs are summarily mentioned but not disclosed by the narrator. Instead, the narrator refers his reader to his work on Epaminondas, which unfortunately is not extant, should he want further explanation of what these unfavorable signs were. That the reader may find elucidation as to the nature of these unfavorable signs in another work of the implied author serves to substantiate the narrator’s claim to their existence here.

Only one opposing character, Prothoös, is mentioned by name, although the content of his opposition is not even provided indirectly through embedded narration. The narrator focuses instead upon Agesilaos; that while there were many reasons not to undertake this attack, he would listen to none of it. The reasons for Agesilaos’ headstrong insistence upon the invasion are, however, provided through embedded focalization: he believed that with the peace having been made with the other Greeks and with only Thebes being isolated from this peace, there was no better time to pounce upon his hated adversary. The narrator will directly challenge this belief of Agesilaos that it was good timing, rather than personal motives, that moved him to attack Thebes with the next sentence that begins with the affirmation δηλοῖ.

28.5-28.6

Δηλοῖ δὲ τὸ σὺν ὀργῇ μᾶλλον ἢ λογισμῷ γενέσθαι τὴν στρατείαν ἐκείνην ὁ καιρός. Τῇ γὰρ τετράδι ἐπὶ δέκα τοῦ Σκιροφορίωνος ἐποιήσαντο τὰς σπουδὰς ἐν Λακεδαίμονι, τῇ δὲ πέμπτῃ τοῦ Ἐκατομβαιώνος ἤττήθησαν ἐν
But what makes it clear that the expedition came about from anger rather than calculation is the timing. For on the fourteenth day of Skirophorion they made the treaty in Lakedaimon, and on the fifth day of Hekatombaion they were defeated at Leuktra—an interval of twenty days. A thousand Lakedaimonians fell; even Kleombrotos the king and the best of the Spartiates who surrounded him. Among whom they say even Kleonymos, the handsome son of Sphodrias, fell three times in front of the king and as many times rose back up and died fighting the Thebans.

The focus upon Agesilaos as the sole cause for this renewed war continues. The narrator pauses the story-chronology briefly to comment directly that it was Agesilaos’ anger, rather than good timing that was the reason for the invasion. He claims to prove it by disclosing for the narratee the number of days between the treaty and the defeat at Leuktra, thus attributing the defeat to Agesilaos’ imbalance in character. The battle at Leuktra is not narrated, only the outcome is discussed.203 The narrator focuses his summary of the outcome of the battle upon the significance of the defeat for Sparta—the best Spartiates and even the other Spartan king were killed. It is the death of Kleonymos, however, that the narrator discusses at length in this section. This is a moment of Homeric pathos as the narrator swings the focus away from the general slaughter and to the death of a single, handsome young man, loved by the son of Agesilaos. He was an important character in chapter 25 and played a pivotal role in his father’s acquittal; here the narratee sees that he has repaid his debt for his father’s preservation with the willing sacrifice of his own life. It would not be necessary, although it is likely, that the narratee be aware of the episode in Xenophon’s *Hellenika* 5.4.33, wherein Kleonymos promises to bring Archidamos

---

203 For discussion of the Battle of Leuktra, see Cartledge (1987) 236-241; Busolt (1905) 387-449; for Plutarch on Leuktra, see Buckler (1980b) 75-93.
honor after winning Agesilaos’ support for Sphodrias, for the effect upon the narratee here is similar: Kleonymos proved to be a worthy Spartan even to his death, as Agesilaos had esteemed him to be.204 In our version, Kleonymos had been integrated into the story with the Sphodrias affair and the narration of his death is appropriate because of his role as a character in this story has now been brought to a close.

29.1-29.2.2

Συμβάντος δὲ τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις πταίσματος ἀπροδοκήτου καὶ τοῖς Θηβαίοις [πρὸς δόξαν] εὐτυχίματος οἷον οὐ γέγονεν ἄλλοις Ἐλληνες πρὸς Ἐλληνας ἀγωνισμένοις, οὐδὲν ἦττον ἀν τις ἐξῆλθο τῆς ἄρετής καὶ ἡγάσθη τὴν ἠττημένην πόλιν ἢ τὴν νικώσαν. Ό μὲν γὰρ ξενοφών φησὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἄνδρῶν ἔχειν τι καὶ τὰς ἐν σῶσι καὶ παιδιά φωνᾶς καὶ διατριβάς ἀξιομημονευτὸν, ὀρθὸς λέγων ἐστὶ δ’ οὐχ ἦττον, ἄλλα καὶ μᾶλλον ἄξιον κατανοεῖν καὶ θεάσθαι τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἢ παρὰ τὰς τύχας πράττουσι καὶ λέγουσι διευθημονούντες.

Now with unexpected failure having fallen upon the Lakedaimonians while—against expectation—the Thebans were experiencing a success so great that it never happened to any other Hellenes who fought against Hellenes; no less would one esteem and wonder at the defeated city than the victorious one for its integrity. For when Xenophon said that with honorable men the things said and time spent in wine and sport are worthy of mention, he spoke well; and it is not less, but more worthwhile to consider and examine the things men do and say during misfortune while preserving their decorum.

Rather than narrating the details of the Battle of Leuktra itself, the narrator instead focuses attention upon the conduct of the Spartans when they learned of the disastrous defeat; it is looking at conduct of character in the context of action that is the most telling, the narrator asserts. The narrator employs high-style periodicity in this passage that juxtaposes the expected with the unexpected, the defeated with the victorious, and the worth of examining words and deeds of men during misfortune. The narrator pauses the chronology to establish interpretation of

204 Agesilaos 25.3.
the coming scene for the narratee: Sparta’s conduct in defeat is worthy of the narratee’s esteem, thus the narratee is to read the coming scene as a favorable exhibition of Spartan behavior. The narrator validates his decision to focus the narrative upon the Spartans’ conduct in misfortune by citing Xenophon’s dictum that men of worth reveal their integrity during leisure activities just as much as in times of great action. Rather than focusing upon a single, exceptional man’s display of integrity during leisure activity, it is the Spartan people as a whole who will collectively reveal their virtue in the following scene. The narrator has used a high-style periodicity to set up the coming scene, the worth in presenting such a scene, and how the narratee is to read it.

29.2.3-29.5

"Ετυχε μὲν γὰρ ἡ πόλις ἔστη ἄγουσα καὶ ξένων οὐσα μεστή, γυμνοπαιδια γὰρ ἦσαν ἄγωνιζομένων χορῶν ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ, παρῆσαν δὴ ἀπὸ Λεύκτρων οἱ τὴν συμφορὰν ἀναγγέλλοντες. Οἱ δὲ ἔφοροι, καίπερ εὔθες ὤντος καταφανούς, ὧτι διεφθάρτοι τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπολωλέκασιν, οὐτὲ χορὸν ἑξελθεῖν εἴσασαν οὐτὲ τὸ σχήμα τῆς ἐστίς μεταβαλεῖν τὴν πόλιν, ἀλλὰ κατ’ οἶκιαν τῶν τεθνεῶτων τοῖς προσήκουσι τὰ ὄντα πέμψαντες αὐτοὶ τὰ περὶ τὴν θέαν καὶ τὸν ἁγώνα τῶν χορῶν ἐπράττον Ἀμα δὴ ἡμέρα φανερῶν ἤδη γεγονότων πάσι τῶν τοις σωζομένων καὶ τῶν τεθνεῶτων, οἱ μὲν τῶν τεθνεῶτων πατέρες καὶ κηδεσταὶ καὶ οἰκεῖοι καταβαίνουτες εἰς ἄγοραν ἀλλήλους ἐδειξόντο λιπαροί τὰ πρόσωπα, φρονήματος μεστοί καὶ ἤδη, οἱ δὲ τῶν σωζομένων, ὀσπερ ἐπὶ πένθει, μετά τῶν γυναικῶν οίκοι διήτριβον, εἰ δὲ τὶς ὑπ’ ἀνάγκης προέλθοι, καὶ σχήματι καὶ φωνῇ καὶ βλέμματι ταπεινός εφαίνετο καὶ συνεσταλμένος. Ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον τῶν γυναικῶν ἰδεῖν ἢ καὶ πυθοῦν αὐτὶ τὴν μὲν ξώνα τρελομένην υἱὸν ἀπὸ τῆς μάχης κατηρή καὶ σιωπηλῆν, τὰς δὲ τῶν πεπτωκέναι λεγομένων ἐν τῷ τοῖς ἱερὸς εὔθυς ἀναστρεφομένας καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλας ἱλαρῶς καὶ φιλοτιμῶς βαδίζουσας.

For it happened that the city was celebrating a festival and was filled with outsiders—for there were dances of bare boys and choruses competing in the theater—when men came from Leuktra announcing the bad news. But the ephors, although it was immediately clear that their endeavors were ruined and they had lost their supremacy, they neither allowed the chorus to stop nor the spectacle of the festival to be changed by the city, but sending the names of those killed to the

---

205 Cf. this sentiment to the famous programmatic statement in Alexander 1.3.
homes of their relatives, they themselves carried out the duties for the goddess and choral competition. And as soon as daylight appeared, with those who survived and who died already known to all, the fathers of the dead—along with in-laws and relatives—had come down to the agora and greeted one another with shining faces, filled with pride and bearing; while those of the survivors, as if in mourning, loitered at home with the women, and if someone was forced to show his face, by his bearing, voice and glances, he appeared dejected and abased. And the women were an even greater sight to see; she who learned she would receive her son alive from the battle was downcast and silent, while the mothers of the reported fallen straight away conducted themselves to the temples and visited one another cheerfully and emulously.

The rest of the chapter describes the scene that unfolds at Sparta with the announcement of defeat at Leuktra. It is this scene that the narrator had set up at the start of the chapter and which is included now in order to illustrate how Sparta preserved her decorum in the face of disaster; as is now to be expected, the narrator illustrates his broad moral interpretations with specific historical examples. Most of the scene is conveyed through simple narrator text; the only embedded focalization is that of the ephors’ reaction to the news from Leuktra: it was clear to them that the plans had failed and Sparta was no longer supreme. That the ephors continued the celebration and choral competitions and their fulfillment of their religious duties wins them a favorable estimation by the narrator. So too do the actions of the Spartan parents upon learning the fates of their sons, which are represented in three examples. The first shows the parents of those killed in the battle full of pride and exuberance—they uphold the Spartan ideal of those who die in battle are to be honored while those who survive are to be scorned. The second example shows the parents of the survivors also behaving according to Spartan custom: they are ashamed to show their faces in public. The third example discusses the similar conduct of the Spartan mothers.

The narrator has molded this episode to depict the moral resiliency of the Spartans in the face of disaster; it serves to redeem the character of the state that the narrator has depicted as
upon the threshold of a steep political decline. This becomes more evident when compared to the same version presented in *Hell*. 6.4.16. There, the ephors, unwilling to disrupt the chorus, gave explicit orders to the Spartan women not to make any commotion over the news, but to bear the disaster in silence. This description of the actorial motivation and the ephors’ resultant action is followed by a brief note that on the following day, the Spartans were cheerful or gloomy in response to the news of their children’s death or survival in the battle. The ephors’ order for calm expresses a sense of desperation, which elicits the narratee’s sympathy, to maintain composure in the face of disaster. Moreover, it is the state authorities who compel the Spartans to be this example of calm and dignity.

In contrast, the Plutarchian narrator introduced the episode with his commentary on the significance of men’s words and actions when confronted with disaster as being a prime indicator of their worth. Having thus informed the narratee that the following episode should be read as an indicator of the Spartans’ continued decorum, he begins by describing the festival setting in which this became manifest. The narrator, through embedded focalization, expounds on the ephors’ internal reaction to the news of defeat more fully than the Xenophonic narrator, but he does not attribute to them any order to the women that they bear the news in silence. Instead, the narrator attributes anxieties over the defeat to the ephors and casts the Spartan women, as well as the men, as independently responsible for their decorous reaction to the news of Leuktra; that is, they were motivated by their own Spartan excellence to bear the news lightly, not by any command from the ephors. To enhance the effect of this episode, the Plutarchian narrator descriptively elaborates upon the Spartan reaction with three lengthy examples of the quiet delight of parents of the slain as well as the parents’ shame of those who survived. Additionally, the Plutarchian narrator’s subtle manipulation of events creates a structural
coherence in this compressed version. The narrator’s intention is not to convey the tragedy of Sparta, but to display her resiliency and ability to rebound from calamity because of her strong moral character, like that of Agesilaos as he is presented in this story and like the larger purpose of the Bioi collectively.
Part Eight: chapters 30-33

The narrative of chapters 30-33 covers the events from only three fabula years from 370-368 B.C.E., during which time Lakonia was invaded for the first time by Thebes and unwalled Sparta itself was under the attack from Epaminondas and his forces. The narrator segues from the previous section by continuing the discussion of Spartan reactions to the outcome at Leuktra, but explores the citizens’ broader anxieties about Sparta’s situation. He balances focalization with narratorial commentary and explanation to convey the sense of unease felt by the Lakonians that complements without contradicting the scene of decorum in the face of disaster that was portrayed above. Once the narrative of the invasion has commenced, the narrator slows the story rhythm to scene-tempo at several points in order to heighten the dramatic element of these climactic points of the story.

As we have now come to expect in this narrative, the narrator maintains focus upon the story’s subject, Agesilaos, and uses the context of the fabula events to expose, explore, and comment upon the king’s thoughts and reactions to the events and how these internal ruminations and external actions shaped the outcome of subsequent fabula events. The more far-reaching negative consequences, both at home and among the allies, are incorporated into the story in these chapters, but the main focus remains upon Agesilaos, the Spartans’ continued reliance upon Agesilaos’ counsel, and his admirable administration and conduct during the invasion of Lakonia.

30.1

Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς, ὡς ἀφίσταντο μὲν οἱ σύμμαχοι, προσεδοκᾶτο δὲ νευκηκῶς Ἑπαμινώνδας καὶ μέγα φρονῶν ἐμβαλέιν εἰς Πελοπόννησον, ἐννοια τῶν χρησμῶν ἐνέπεσε τότε πρὸς τὴν χωλότητα τοῦ Ἁγισιλάου καὶ δυσθυμία πολλή καὶ πτοία πρὸς τὸ θεῖον, ὡς διὰ τούτο πραττούσης κακῶς τῆς πόλεως, ὅτι τὸν ἄρτιποδα τῆς βασιλείας ἐκβαλόντες εἰλοντο χωλόν καὶ
And yet many expected, as the allies were standing back, that Epaminondas, now that he had conquered and was boastful, would invade the Peloponnesos; they came to reflect upon the oracles from earlier against the lameness of Agesilaos and there was great despondency and abject fear of the divine, as it was for this reason that the city was in dire straights, that casting out a sound-footed king they chose the lame and mutilated one; that which more than anything else the divinity had been all along instructing them to consider and guard against.

The chapter opens with οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ, which pivots the viewpoint from the Spartans to their allies and compliments the scene in Sparta before. Like much of this chapter that deals with reactions, this first section is in complex narrator text with the embedded focalization of collective anonymous spokesmen (“many”). The motivation for the anxious focalization is the aloofness of the allies and Epaminondas’ victorious demeanor after Leuktra; this motivates the anonymous characters to expect an invasion. This expectation of an invasion, in turn, motivates the characters to remember Deopeithes’ interpretation of the oracle in 400 B.C.E. The remembrance of the oracle itself then creates fear and despondency among the anonymous characters.

The oracle, first incorporated into the story in chapter 3, had been used by the narrator to create tension with his reader. The narrator clearly intended that the oracle, as it was fully quoted in that early chapter, would create suspense and remain in the mind of the narratee so as to be interwoven back into the story at a later point in the chronology. By reintroducing the oracle now as an internal analepsis, and assigning the recollection to anonymous collective characters in the story, the narrator has heightened the sense of despondency and anxiety felt by the Spartans after Leuktra. Furthermore, the narrator need not make the link in the story between the oracle and post-Leuktra Sparta himself, if he can more seamlessly interweave the oracle into the embedded
thoughts of the characters. The effect of this subtle structuring of the narrative is to retain the
dramatic quality of the narration of Spartan reactions to Leuktra, begun in the previous chapter,
while signaling to the narratee that the story has reached the stage that was foreshadowed in
chapter 3 with the oracle: Sparta’s hegemonic decline.206

30.2-30.4

Διὰ δὲ τὴν ἄλλην δύναμιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀρετήν καὶ δόξαν οὐ μόνον ἔχρωντο βασιλεῖ καὶ στρατηγῷ τῶν κατὰ πόλεμον, ἄλλα καὶ τῶν πολιτικῶν ἀπορίων ἱστρῷ καὶ διαίτητῃ, τοῖς ἐν τῇ μάχῃ καταδειλάσασιν, οὗσά αὐτοὶ τρέσαντας ὑπομάζουσιν, οκνοῦντες τὰς ἐκ τῶν νόμων ἀτιμίας προσάγειν, πολλοῖς οὐσί καὶ δυσατοῖς, φοβοῦμενοι νεωτηρισμὸν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν. Οὐ γὰρ μόνον ἄρχης ἀπείρονται πάσης, ἄλλα καὶ δοῦναι τινι τούτων γυναῖκα καὶ λαβεῖν ἀδεξόν ἐστι’ παίει δ’ ὁ βουλόμενος αὐτοὺς τῶν ἐνυγχανόντων. Οἱ δὲ καρπεροῦσι περίοντες αὐχμῆροι καὶ ταπεινοί, τριβῶναι τις προσερραμένους χρώματος βαπτοῦ φοροῦσι καὶ ἔχρωνται μέρος τῆς ὑπηργίας, μέρος δὲ τρέφουσι. Δεινὸν οὖν ἂν τοιοῦτος εν τῇ πόλει περιορίζοντες πολλοὺς οὐκ ὀλίγων δεομένη στρατιωτῶν. Καὶ νομοθέτηι αἰροῦνται τὸν Ἀγησίλαον. Ὅ δὲ μήτε προσθείς τι μητ’ ἄφελων μήτε μεταγράφας εἰσήλθαν εἰς τὸ πλῆθος τῶν Ἀκαδαιμονίων καὶ φήσας, ὅτι τοὺς νόμους δεὶ σήμερον ἐὰν καθεύδειν, ἐκ δὲ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας κυρίου εἶναι πρὸς τὸ λοιπόν, ἀμα τοὺς τε νόμους τῇ πόλει καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐπιτίμους ἐφύλαξε.

But due to the rest of his authority, virtue, and reputation, they not only employed
him as king and commander in the matters of war, but also as doctor and
arbitrator in complications of the state; they were hesitating to bring against those
who showed signs of fear in battle, whom they themselves call “runaways”, the
disgraces required by law, as they were many and able-bodied men, fearing they
might revolt. For they are not only debarred from positions of authority, but also
to give a wife to or take one from them is a disgrace; and he who wishes to strike
them upon encountering them may do so. And they endure having to go about
dirty and submissive, they wear threadbare cloaks stitched up with dyed patches
and they shave half of their beard while growing out the other half. And so it was
a dreadful matter to allow so many men like this in the city while it was in need of
not just a few soldiers. And as lawgiver they selected Agesilaos. And he, neither

206 Hamilton (1991) 212 notes that Plutarch is the only extant author who reports that the Spartans at this time were
ruminating over the oracle and whether they had misinterpreted it to their own detriment; and that this amounted to
open criticism of Agesilaos by those who blamed him for the defeat at Leuktra. It is equally as likely, however,
given that the narrative gains its cohesiveness from its thematic, rather than chronological structure, that this
focalization about the oracle is an embellishment inserted in order to fortify the structure of the story by recalling the
oracle, which was of such great significance in the early chapters, at this later juncture in the story when the
character Agesilaos is depicted as in decline.
adding nor removing nor altering anything, came before the multitude of
Lakedaimonians; and saying that it was right to allow the laws to sleep for today,
but for the rest of time after today they would be decisive; at the same time he
both safeguarded the laws for the city and kept men in possession of their rights.

The narrator follows upon the anxiety-ridden focalization that highlighted the insecurity
of anonymous Spartans contemplating the oracle against Agesilaos’ long-past ascension with an
extended example of the people’s continued confidence in Agesilaos’ leadership even in the face
of invasion. The narrator provides three motivations for the continued confidence in Agesilaos in
simple narrator text: his authority, virtue, and reputation. The confidence in Agesilaos’ authority
and reputation in turn motivates the next action introduced through a narratorial comparison: as
they had trusted Agesilaos, because of his authority and reputation, to be their king and
commander in war, they now turn to him as doctor, as if the city was ill, and arbitrator in a
specific problem that had resulted from the recent military failure: what to do with the
“tresantes”. The nature of the problem is disclosed in complex narrator text with embedded
collective, anonymous focalization: the Spartans hesitated in punishing the runaways with the
customary penalties because they feared, due to their large number, that they would revolt. At
this point, the narrator pauses the chronology briefly to explain the prescribed penalties that the
runaways were to endure; this narratorial explanation supplements the previous embedded
focalization by elaborating upon the shameful nature of the punishment. Thus, the narratee better
understands and can therefore empathize with the anxiety that the anonymous focalizers had in
implementing these penalties for an evidently large body of men at such a sensitive time. Before
returning to the forward chronology, the narrator reiterates the point of his explanation: the
situation was dreadful because they could not safely humiliate so many men at the same time that the city was suffering from a severe deficit of soldiers.\textsuperscript{207}

The resultant event of the actorial motivation (continued trust in Agesilaos) and focalization (the Spartans feared the repercussions of the tresantes if punished) is that the city appointed Agesilaos to decide the issue. Agesilaos’ actions in deciding the issue are given in summary and with his embedded focalization. His judgment and proclamation before the Lakedaimonians is given indirectly in complex narrator text: he announced the laws were fine to be idle for the day, but afterwards would be in full effect. The narrator immediately comments upon the effectiveness of this decision and interprets the results for the narratee: the laws were preserved while the men escaped humiliation.\textsuperscript{208}

30.5

\begin{quote}

\textit{Βουλόμενος δὲ τὴν παροῦσαν ἀθημίαν καὶ κατήφειαν ἀφελεῖν τῶν νέων ἐνέβαλεν εἰς Ἀρκαδίαν, καὶ μάχην μὲν ἰσχυρῶς ἐφυλάξατο συνάψαι τοῖς ἐναντίοις, ἐλών δὲ πολίχνην τινά τῶν Μαντινέων καὶ τὴν χώραν ἐπιδραμὼν ἐλαφροτέραν ἐποίησε ταῖς ἐλπίδιοι καὶ ἤδιω τὴν πόλιν ὡς οὐ παντάπασιν ἀπεγνωσμένην.}

\end{quote}

And wishing to take the attendant despondency and dejection away from the young men, he invaded Arkadia; and while he vigorously kept watch against engaging the enemy in battle, while taking some small town of the Mantineans and assaulting the country, he made the city more light-hearted with hopes and more relieved that they were not entirely abandoned as hopeless.

---

\textsuperscript{207} The tresantes dilemma was likely a serious concern after Leuktra as Plutarch has represented it here. Hamilton (1991) 211-212 gives an overview of the problem.

\textsuperscript{208} In the \textit{Synkrisis} of Agesilaos and Pompey (2.2), the narrator explicitly lauds the good judgement of Agesilaos in this emergency.
Agesilaos’ next action follows upon his resolution of the runaway problem and given in the context of his attempt to alleviate the effects of Leuktra upon Spartan morale. First, the narrator provides the actorial motivation for the event in embedded focalization, Agesilaos wanted to lift the spirits of the young Spartans, thus he invaded Arkadia. The details of this event are given in summary: he avoided pitched battle, raided the countryside, and took a small town. The resultant effects of the invasion, expressed in embedded focalization, close the chapter on a more up-beat note: the city regained some hope that all was not lost. Thus, Agesilaos accomplished the goals of his campaign that had motivated him to undertake the invasion. This chapter reiterates the positive effects of Agesilaos’ character on the city at the brink of disaster; although anxiety over his role in the decline of Spartan hegemony opened the chapter, he retains his good reputation as a commander and arbitrator of crisis.

The narrator is able to mold the Arkadian expedition into an event that redeems Agesilaos’ reputation and buoys the confidence of the Spartans because he omits any explanation of the events, recorded in *Hellenika* 6.5.3-11, that clearly precipitated this campaign. The omitted events, among the more significant of which was the resynoikicism of Mantinea and the factionalism in Tegea, provide unquestionable proof that Agesilaos’ policies in Arkadia, including the desynoikism of Mantinea carried out in 385, had been undone and that Sparta’s allies were falling away and reorganizing against the Lakedaimonians. When factionalism broke out in Tegea, which was Sparta’s oldest ally, one side, aided by Mantinea, was pushing

---

209 The narrator omits from the story several events from the time immediately following the Battle of Leuktra including Archidamos’ mobilization of allied forces into Boiotia and Jason of Pherai’s intervention (Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.22-26), the peace conference convened by the Athenians in 371 B.C.E. (Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.1-3), Mantinea’s political maneuvering and snubbing of Agesilaos (Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.3-5), and the organization of Arkadia into a state by Tegea, Mantinea and Elis that unraveled Agesilaos’ Arkadian policies (Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.3-9). By omitting these events and simplifying the Arkadian campaign as a morale boosting exercise, the narrator keeps the focus upon Agesilaos’ positive actions after the disaster at Leuktra.

for membership in the new Arkadian League and the other maintained loyalty to Sparta. Sparta would use the pretext of helping the exiled Tegeans, who appealed to the Spartans, to launch an attack on Arkadia.²¹¹ It was the resynoikicism of Mantineia, its rebuffing of Agesilaos, and their aid to the Tegean faction which expelled the pro-Spartans from Tegea that motivated the ephors to call out the ban against Mantineia and their appointment of Agesilaos to invade Arkadia. None of these events factors into the Plutarchian narrator’s story, however, and he instead uses the demoralization of the Spartans after Leuktra and Agesilaos’ desire to buoy their spirits as the sole motivation for the raiding campaign. This condensation of the events omits much of what we would expect in a history, which this story is not, but creates structural and thematic coherency by maintaining narrative focus upon Agesilaos personally and only the historical events, like Leuktra, which the narrator selected for inclusion.

31.1

Ἐκ δὲ τούτου παρῆν εἰς τὴν Λακωνίκην ὁ Ἐπαμινώνδας μετὰ τῶν συμμάχων, οὐκ ἔλαττονας ἔχον τετρακισμυρίων ὀπλιτῶν. Πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ ψυλοὶ καὶ ἄνοπλοι πρὸς ἁρπαγήν ἤκολούθουν, ὡστε μυριάδας ἐπτὰ τοῦ σύμπαντος ὀχλου συνεισβάλλειν καὶ καταβαίνειν εἰς τὴν Λακωνίκην.

After this, Epaminondas entered Lakonia with the allies, having no less than forty thousand hoplites. And many light and unarmed men followed him for plunder, so that seventy thousand all together invaded and came into Lakonia.

The narrator sets the context for the coming scene of terror and confusion in Sparta in simple narrator text. The forward chronology continues and having shown in the previous chapter that the Spartans were incredibly anxious, but not yet hopeless about their situation, this chapter portrays the town in absolute panic once the Thebans invaded Lakonia in the winter of

370/69. The narrator is elaborating upon the previous chapter to show the Spartan situation gradually worsening and here has reached its lowest point in history yet. The actorial motivation for many of the invaders is the acquisition of plunder, the abundance of which the narrator next alludes to with the external analepsis summarizing the absence of any previous invasions.

31.2-31.4

Already a time of no less than six hundred years had passed from when the Dorians had settled Lakedaimon; and in all this time since then this was the first time that enemies had ever been seen in the country, as no one had ever before dared this; but rushing upon what was un ravaged and untouched, they burned and ransacked the country all the way up to the river and city, with no one coming out against them. For Agesilaos would not allow the Lakedaimonians to fight against so great, as Theopompos said, “a flood and wave of war”, but surrounding the central and most commanding parts of the city with hoplites he remained steadfast against the boasts and arrogance of the Thebans, calling him out by name and ordering him to fight for his country, he who is responsible for the evils because he was the igniter of the war. Not the least of these things that distressed Agesilaos was the confusion throughout the city and shrieking and running about both of the elders greatly vexed at the circumstances and of the women who unable to keep quiet, but were completely out of their minds from the shouting and fire of the enemy.

The narrator pauses story-time for an external analepsis, followed by analeptic summary, before leading the narrative back to the present chronology. The analepses serve to present the
narratee with broad perspective of the preceding centuries to emphasize the unparalleled situation in which the Lakonians found themselves. Thus, the tragedy unfolding in the scene within Sparta during the invasion is heightened and the narratee sympathizes with the Spartans’ panic when faced with such previously unknown peril. Resuming forward chronology and returning to the narrative of the invasion, the narrator summarizes the devastation to Lakedaimonian territory and reiterates that the allied invaders were ransacking for booty, the motivation for many of the allies to undertake the invasion with Thebes. How the devastation was able to reach all the way to the Eurotas and Sparta itself needs explanation and the narrator provides it by saying that no one came out to do battle with the invaders. The motivation for the lack of a defensive attack is immediately given: Agesilaos would not allow the Lakedaimonians to launch a defense.\footnote{Cf. Diod. 15.65.1 wherein the Spartans elders, rather than specifically Agesilaos, prevented a defensive attack.} The Agesilaos’ motivation for preventing the Spartans from marching out against the invaders follows hard upon its narration and is cloaked in complex narrator text: Agesilaos did not want his forces to go up against so many and so formidable men. The narrator incorporates a quote from Theopompos in disclosing Agesilaos’ motivation against the action which serves to illustrate Agesilaos’ estimation of the threat. As the quotation also echoes the oracle from chapter 3 that warned the Spartans of ‘waves of war’ should they allow their kingship to become lame and thus contributes to the structuring of the text. At this point, the narratee as well as the Spartan, has been reminded of the oracle at the start of chapter 30 and the echo in the Theopompos quote marks chapter 31 as the beginning of irreversible damages done to Spartan hegemony and martial reputation under Agesilaos’ aegis.

After setting the context of the scene, the narrator enters into vivid narration of the chaos that ensued in Sparta during the invasion. Agesilaos’ defensive actions are summarized within the setting of the scene by stating that he secured the most commanding places of the unwalled
city while the invaders taunted him with threats and challenges. The accusations against Agesilaos that he was the cause for the war and the invasion itself are attributed to the Thebans through embedded focalization; thus the narrator suggests Agesilaos’ responsibility for Sparta’s perilous position indirectly without laying the charge himself. This focalization is presented vividly and dramatically with the switch into the present tense (ἐστιν), thus dressing the scene in the trappings of tragedy. The narrator then provides two vivid examples of the panic within the city that starkly contrasts the examples of Spartan dignity that were presented in chapter 29 with the news of the outcome from Leuktra. These examples of panic are given through Agesilaos’ focalization, who was extremely distressed by the scene. The first example is that of the elder men who were upset by the situation; the second is that of the shrieking women who were nearly driven mad by the sights and sounds of the enemy. Why the women would react so passionately to the scene is explained in the next section: Spartan women had never seen such a sight before.

31.5-31.6

Ἀννία δὲ καὶ τὸ τῆς δόξης αὐτὸν, ὅτι τὴν πόλιν μεγίστην παραλαβὼν καὶ δυνατώτατην ἕως συνεσταλμένον αὐτῆς τὸ ἄξιωμα καὶ τὸ αὐχένα κεκολουμένον, ὡ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐχρήσατο πολλάκις εἰπόν, ὅτι γυνὴ Λάκαια κατιόν οὐχ ἔωρακε πολέμιον. Λέγεται δὲ καὶ Ἄνταλκιδᾶς, Ἀθηναίου τινὸς ἀμφισβητούντος ὑπὲρ ἄνδρας πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ εἰπόντος “Ἡμεῖς μὲντοι πολλάκις ύμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ Κηφισοῦ ἐδιώξαμεν,” ὑποτυχεῖν “ΑΛΛ’ ἥμεις γ’ οὐδέποτε ύμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ Εὐρώτα.” Παραπλησίως δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὸν Ἀργεῖον ἀπεκρίνατο τῶν ἀσημιτέρων τις Σπαρτιάτῶν ὡ μὲν γὰρ εἶπε “Πολλοὶ ύμῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀργολίδῃ κεῖνται,” ὁ δ’ ἀπήτυπον “Ὅμων δὲ γ’ οὐδεὶς ἐν τῇ Λακωνικῇ.”

And he was also distressed about his reputation, seeing that having inherited the greatest and most powerful city, he now saw her dignity curtailed and her boasting cut short, which he himself had also many times made use of saying, that a Lakonian woman has never seen an enemy’s smoke. And it is said that even Antalkidas, when a certain Athenian was arguing about valor and said to him, “And yet we have many times driven you away from the Kaphisos,” and he interrupted, “Yes, but we have never driven you from the Eurotas.” And much
like this, a certain unknown Spartan retorted to an Argive who had said, “Many of you lie in the Argolid.” And the Spartan countered, “But none of you are in Lakonia.”

Agesilaos’ focalization continues and now focuses not upon the present situation surrounding him, but upon his own position within and responsibility for the current condition of Sparta. His anxiety is illustrated and substantiated by three anecdotes. Agesilaos’ concern about his own reputation, his δόξα, is a recurring theme in the story: it was the reason for his humiliation of Lysander in 7.3 and the theme is one that interweaves the Agesilaos with its pair, the Pompey.213 Here the narrator shows Agesilaos reflecting upon the condition of Sparta when he inherited the throne in relation to the condition it is in now after thirty years with him as a king. The characterization of Sparta’s weakness in 370/69 B.C.E. is attributed to Agesilaos through focalization, thus the narrator again avoids direct criticism. The irony of Agesilaos’ reflection upon his own boast that he had repeatedly made before about Spartan women never having viewed enemies’ fire is obvious and heightens the pathos of the scene for the narratee. Following Agesilaos’ focalization and reflection, the narrator places two further analeptic anecdotes about Spartan traditional boastings to enemies about never having to drive off or bury enemies in Lakedaimon. Again, the pathos of the situation is heightened by these apothegms.

32.1

“Ἔνιοι μέντοι τῶν Λυταλκίδων φασίν ἐφοροῦ ὡντα τοὺς παῖδας εἰς Κύθνα ὑπεκθέσαθι περίμεθον γενόμενον. Ὁ δ’ Αγησίλαος, ἐπιχειρούντων διαβαίειν τὸν ποταμὸν τῶν πολεμίων καὶ βιάζεσθαι πρὸς τὴν πόλιν, ἐκλιπών τὰ λοιπὰ παρετάζατο πρὸ τῶν μέσων καὶ ύψηλῶν.”

213 For discussion of the thematic structuring in Pompey and the δόξα theme in particular, see Hillman (1994) passim.
And yet some say that Antalkidas, while an ephor, conveyed his children to Kythera for safekeeping as he had become thoroughly afraid. But Agesilaos, when the enemy was attempting to cross the river and force their way to the city, abandoned the rest of the city and drew up men in front of the middle and high places.

The chapter opens with a comparison between the actions of Antalkidas to save his family and those of Agesilaos to save the city. The comparison serves to highlight the theme of fearful desperation felt by the Spartans during the invasion and the resolute Agesilaos who defends the city both from external and internal threats.²¹⁴ It is the internal threats that are narrated in the second half of the chapter; three examples of internal dissention and Agesilaos’ handling of them fill out the bulk of the chapter; these will become the basis of the narrator’s positive estimation in chapter 33 of Agesilaos’ conduct during the invasion.

³².2-³².3

And the Eurotas flowed completely full and deep, as there was snow, and the current became challenging and difficult for the Thebans more because of its coldness than its swiftness. Epaminondas was making his way across at the front of the phalanx when some men pointed him out to Agesilaos; and he, as it is told, for a long time watched him and followed him with his eyes and said nothing other than, “O magnificent man!” But when Epaminondas, being passionately determined to engage battle and to set up a trophy within the city, was not able to bring or summon out Agesilaos, he moved off again and ravaged the countryside,
After the brief opening sentence, the narrator slows the chronology down to present a scene of Epaminondas attempting to cross the swollen Eurotas as Agesilaos looks on. The narrator describes the scene in simple text focusing upon the rapid and swollen Eurotas and Epaminondas’ attempt to cross it in order to attack the Spartan city. The narrator presents two characterizations: one of Epaminondas as a tireless and determined invader, a characterization that is substantiated by the Lakonic utterance of Agesilaos; and the other of a steadfast Agesilaos, undaunted by the personal taunts, who abandons his characteristic ambition in order to preserve the city. When Epaminondas’ attempt on the city proved unsuccessful in drawing Agesilaos onto the field, the narrator ushers him off the scene and summarizes his subsequent actions: he ravaged the countryside while Agesilaos had to turn his attention to internal threats.

32.3-32.5

έν δὲ Λακεδαιμονίων τῶν πάλαι τινὲς ύπούλων καὶ πονηρῶν ὡς διακόσιοι συστραφέντες κατέλαβον τὸ Ἰσσόριον, οὗ τὸ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν ἐστιν, εὔερκή καὶ δυσεκβιστῶν τόπον. Ἐφ’ οὖς βουλομένων εὐθὺς ώθεσθαι τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων, φοβηθεῖς τὸν νεωτερισμὸν ὁ Ἀγησίλαος ἐκέλευσε τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους ἰσχύουσαν ἄγειν, αὐτὸς δ’ ἐν ιματίῳ καὶ μεθ’ ἕνως οἰκῆτος προσῆε, βοῶν ἄλλως ἀκηκοέναι τοῦ προστάγματος αὐτοῦ. οὗ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα κελεύσαι συνελθέν, οὐδὲ πάντας ἄλλα τοὺς μὲν ἐκεῖ (δεῖξας ἐτέρουν τόπον), τοὺς δὲ ἄλλαχος τῆς πόλεως. Οἱ δ’ ἀκούσαντες ἠφθαναν οἴομενοι λανθάνειν, καὶ διαστάντες ἐπὶ τοὺς τόπους οὓς ἐκεῖνος ἐκέλευσεν ἀπεκώρον. Ὁ δὲ τὸ μὲν Ἰσσόριον εὐθὺς ἔτέρους μεταπεμψάμενος κατέσχε, τῶν δὲ συστάντων ἐκείνων περὶ πεντεκαϊδέκα τινῶς συλλαβῶν νυκτὸς ἀπέκτεινεν.

while in Lakedaimon some long treacherous and worthless men, about two hundred banded together, seized the Issorion, where the temple of Artemis is, a well-walled and impregnable place. While the Lakedaimonians wanted to rush upon them at once, fearing a revolution Agesilaos ordered the others to keep quiet, and he himself went to them in his cloak and with a singe house-slave, shouting that they heard the orders wrong: for he did not order them to assemble here nor all together, but that some were to go there (pointing out another place), and others were to go to other parts of the city. And they were relieved to hear this, thinking they escaped discovery, and spreading out to those places which he specified, they went off. And he immediately occupied the Issorion after sending
for his companions and arrested and killed about fifteen of the conspirators during the night.

This nascent rebellion is the first of three examples in the chapter of the decisive actions Agesilaos took against internal threats during the Theban invasion of Lakedaimonia. The narrator sets the scene in simple text that identifies and characterizes the rebellious men: they had long been disloyal to Sparta, but their exact identity and the circumstances for their disloyalty are glossed over by the narrator. The reason for their planned insurrection is extraneous to the narrator’s motivation for including the episode; the narratorial motivation is to portray the levelheaded Agesilaos in moments of crises during the invasion. The motivation becomes clear at the beginning of the next chapter wherein the narrator enters upon a lengthy commentary on Agesilaos’ commendable management of affairs during the unprecedented invasion.

After introducing the characters and setting the scene, the narrator enters into vivid narration using complex narrator text with embedded focalizations. The first focalization is the collective Lakedaimonians who represent the hotheaded response to the threat: they desired to attack the rebels immediately. They serve as a foil to emphasize Agesilaos’ careful and cunning leadership that quickly dissolved the uprising. The actorial motivation for Agesilaos’ response to the threat was that he feared a revolution and thus employed deceit in order to subvert the threat and keep the incident quiet. The rebels’ response to Agesilaos actions, represented in embedded focalization, was of great relief at seemingly being undiscovered. The episode ends with summarized events in simple text: Agesilaos sent for his men, occupied the Issorion, and

---

217 This theme of justified trickery was first introduced in the narrative on Agesilaos’ deception of Tissaphernes (9.2).
arrested and killed fifteen of the conspirators. The narrator makes no comment yet about his estimation of Agesilaos’ actions, he reserves this for the following chapter, and instead he moves on to the next example episode of an even more serious internal threat.

32.6

... But there was another, greater threat revealed: a conspiracy and a meeting of Spartiates coming together secretly in a house to discuss revolutionary plans, men whom it was impractical to bring to trial during such great turmoil as it was impractical to overlook their plotting. And so Agesilaos killed these men, after consulting with the ephors, without a trial, though no Spartiate had ever before been put to death without trial.

The second example of Agesilaos’ actions against internal threats is characterized as far more serious because it involved the conspiracy of full Spartiates rather than unidentified malcontents.\textsuperscript{218} The brief episode is narrated in simple text and with summary. The number or identity of the men, as well as their intentions, remains generalized; the main point is that they were Spartiates and thus their attempt at revolution was a far more serious threat to the state. The conspiracy recalls that of Lysander, but the narrator makes no connection between that threat and this one. The threat presents Agesilaos with a conundrum as he could neither bring the men to trial during the tumultuous times nor could he simply ignore the conspirators and hope that nothing came of their plotting. The dire circumstances therefore motivated Agesilaos to take dire action, the execution of the conspirators, but only after he sought the advice of the ephors. The

\textsuperscript{218} On this conspiracy, mentioned only by Plutarch, see Hamilton (1991) 228-229; Cartledge (1987) 164.
narrator remarks upon the singularity of the outcome that never before had a Spartiate been put to death without trial, but this is used only to emphasize the desperation of the circumstances rather than cast a negative shadow over Agesilaos’ decision. It is, in short, a defense of Agesilaos that the execution was hasty, but necessary to preserve the city in a desperate situation.

32.7

Ἐπεὶ δὲ πολλοὶ τῶν τεταγμένων εἰς τὰ ὀπλα περιοικῶν καὶ εἰλώτων ἀπεδίδρασκον ἐκ τῆς πόλεως πρὸς τοὺς πολέμιους καὶ τοῦτο πλείστην ἀθυμίαν παρεῖχεν, εἴδοδε τοὺς ὑπηρέτας περὶ ὁδόν ἐπιφοιτᾶν ταῖς στιβάδι καὶ τὰ ὀπλα τῶν ἀποκεχωρηκότων λαμβάνειν καὶ ἀποκρύπτειν, ὅπως ἀγνοῆται τὸ πλῆθος.

And when then many of the perioikoi and helots who had been enlisted into the army had deserted from the city to the enemy and this was bringing on the greatest despondency, he instructed his attendants to go around at daybreak to the soldiers’ beds and take the weapons of those who deserted and hide them, so that their number would be unknown.

The third and final example of Agesilaos’ levelheaded action during the invasion was perhaps the most threatening and is the only example of the three wherein Agesilaos only takes indirect action against the deserters. The narrator states in simple text that many of the perioikoi and helots were deserting to join the enemy and that this caused the greatest sense of defeat in the Spartans thus far. Agesilaos does not confront the problem of desertion and attempt to stop it; rather he attempts to alleviate the sense of despondency in the city brought on by the knowledge that soldiers were continually deserting the city at night. Agesilaos’ motivation is to

---

219 The narrator passes over the extraordinary enlistment of a large number of perioikoi and helots into the Spartan army and here supplies it only as background information to Agesilaos’ attempts to disguise the desertions. The narrator was not motivated to explain why these non-Spartans were enrolled in large numbers, namely that Sparta was severely short of full citizens, but only by a desire to show Agesilaos as the savior of Sparta under seige. The Spartans were indeed desperate for soldiers and allowed helots to volunteer for the army in return for their freedom. According to Xenophon (Hell. 6.5.28-29), some 6,000 helots enlisted, although Diodoros records only 1,000 (15.65.6); their large number made the Spartans uneasy once they saw the helots equipped with arms. For further discussion of the helot volunteers, see Hamilton (1991) 226-227; Cartledge (1987) 164, 384-385.
alleviate the despondency by concealing the number of men who were joining the enemy, not to subvert revolution, as in the previous two examples. Once again, Agesilaos employs deceit and has his men simply hide the weapons that the deserters left behind in order to conceal the magnitude of the problem.

As to why the Thebans withdrew from Lakonia, there are some who say that it was because winter came on and the Arkadians were starting to go off and randomly spread out, while others say that it was because they had spent three entire months there and had utterly ruined most of the countryside; but Theopompos says, when the Boiotarchs had already decided to move the army off, Phrixos, a Spartan man, came to them bringing ten talents from Agesilaos as a bribe for their withdrawal, so that doing the things that they had already decided to do, they had the travel expenses for them provided by the enemy as well.

Having given three examples of Spartan peril during the invasion and Agesilaos’ management of each situation, the narrator now comments upon the reasons for the Theban withdrawal in spring 369 and provides three different reported motivations for the end of the invasion. No events of the invasion other than those in which Agesilaos took direct part were even mentioned in the story; the narrator’s focus remained solely upon his subject. The three different reasons for the Theban withdrawal are all given in complex narrator text with embedded focalization and summary. The first is the focalization of anonymous, collective spokesmen who maintained that the invasion ended because of the onset of winter and the
gradual dispersion of the Arkadians. The second focalized explanation, again of collective and anonymous spokesmen, was that the Thebans had been in the Peloponnesos for three months and had done all the ravaging that they could do and left the countryside in ruins. The third focalized explanation is ascribed to Theopompos who maintained that the Thebans had already decided to end the invasion when Agesilaos sent Phrixos to bribe the Thebans to withdraw. The focalization ends with a condemning commentary on the fruitlessness of this action as the Spartans in essence threw away ten talents on the Thebans. The narrator will comment upon Theopompos’ version and derision in the following narrative section.

33.1-33.2

And now I do not know how the others were ignorant of this event, while Theopompos alone knew about it. But all are in agreement that the reason Sparta at that time was saved was Agesilaos, because, abandoning his inborn passions, ambition and rivalry, he conducted affairs safely. And yet he was not able to restore the city’s authority or reputation after the fall, but just like a body that is healthy, having practiced too strict and ascetic a lifestyle at all times, a single error and tip of the scale turned aside all good fortune of the city; and not without reason. For because they applied to a government—best arranged for excellence, peace and concord—dominions and forced sovereignty, none of which Lykourgos considered necessary for his city live prosperously, they fell.
The narrator pauses the story-time to respond directly to Theopompos’ version of the Theban withdrawal and Agesilaos’ futile bribery. The narrator becomes overt and dramatic, referring to himself in the first person, and calls Theopompos into doubt. The narratorial interjection communicates directly with the narratee who, having just received Theopompos’ embedded narrative of the withdrawal, is to stop and question the validity of the version upon reading the primary narrator’s objection. The basis for the narrator’s objection is the singularity of Theopompos’ version in light of all others; thus the narrator calls attention to his own knowledge and consultation of authors whose works formed the basis of his story. His claim that all others were ignorant of this version characterizes the narrator as a discerning and thorough investigator capable of confuting his sources for his narratee. The narrator continues the pause in the chronology to enter upon another narratorial commentary in order to interpret the conduct of Agesilaos during the invasion retroactively. He refutes Theopompos’ account and preemptively validates his positive estimation of Agesilaos’ conduct by citing all other sources besides Theopompos as being in agreement that Agesilaos saved Sparta.

The narratorial commentary serves to structure the story and reiterate themes. The story has reached a climax, the subject has underwent his most demanding trial, and there is a great turning point in the historical context that the narrator incorporates into the larger scope of the story: how Sparta could reach such lows under the leadership of Agesilaos. The narrator’s explanation for the recognition that Agesilaos saved Sparta reestablishes the story’s themes through negative narration. It is precisely because Agesilaos “kept himself from his inborn passions” of philotimia and philonikia—the defining characteristics of Agesilaos as the narrator has thematically presented him—that he was able to make decisions that safeguarded Sparta during the invasion. The narrator continues his commentary and qualifies the preservation of
Sparta that Agesilaos achieved; the city survived physically because of his restraint, but its doxa and hegemonia were irreversibly harmed. The narrator then uses a physical comparison to clarify and support his commentary; like a body kept to too strict a regimen for too long, Sparta adhered to a lifestyle so disciplined that a single error was enough to undo it. Next, the narrator explains his reasoning behind this judgmental commentary: because Sparta veered from its regiment under Agesilaos and compelled his city to undertake policies that were incongruent with the Lykourgian ideal, the scales of health were tipped and Sparta deteriorated.  

33.3-33.4

And so while Agesilaos himself had already renounced going on campaign on account of his old age, his son, Archidamos, having aid come from the tyrant of Sicily, defeated the Arkadians in what is called the “tearless battle”; for not one of the men with him fell, while they killed many of the enemy. This very victory was the greatest proof of the frailty of the city. For before they considered the conquest of enemies so customary and natural a deed for them that they neither sacrificed to the gods anything except a cock as a victory offering in the city nor boasted about brave deeds in battle nor did those learning the news rejoice.

---

220 Shipley (1997) 350-351 contrasts this explanation for Sparta’s decline with that in Agis 3.1 and 5.2-3 that it was money and a concentration of landed property rather than acquisition of empire that was incongruent with the Lykourgian ideal. Indeed, Plutarch gives two different theories on Sparta’s decline in the Agesilaos and the Agis. Rather than an attempt to avoid repetition, as Shipley speculates, it is far more likely that Plutarch adapts his historical explanations to his literary purposes. The characterization of Agesilaos is of a steadfast, traditional Spartan who shunned wealth and thus attributing Sparta’s decline to the accumulation of wealth would be thematically jarring. Agis, in contrast, was directly involved in Sparta’s economic deterioration and sought to address it with reform. For the problems surrounding our understanding of Spartan land ownership and its inheritance, see Hodkinson (1986) 378-406.
exceedingly, and even after the battle at Mantinea, which Thukydides recorded, to the one who first announced the victory, the magistrates sent a piece of meat from the phidition as a reward for the good news, but nothing else;

After the narrator has paused for commentary to reestablish themes and direct the narratee’s interpretation at a climactic point in the story, he returns to forward chronology and the next selected event: the Spartans’ “tearless battle” against the Arkadians in 368 B.C.E. There is an ellipsis of nearly two years, during which time Epaminondas led another invasion into the Peloponnesos and Philiscus, at the urging of Ariobarzanes, arranged a peace conference at Delphi that proved abortive, but the narrator gives no indication of the lapsed time and instead presents the Tearless Battle as though it was the next fabula event. Additionally, little context is provided about the aims and execution of Archidamos’ campaign in Arkadia, instead it becomes the paradoxical proof of weakness shown through victory.

Although Agesilaos did not conduct this campaign—the narrator says he used his age once more to exempt him from service as he did in 378 B.C.E. (chapter 24)—and the narrator usually omits events which his subject did not take direct part, he will figure into the coming scene and therefore the battle is included. After his brief narration of the battle, its support from Dionysios I of Syracuse, and the reason behind the conflict’s appellation, the narrator again pauses the chronology for commentary on the significance of the battle in broad historical perspective. Rather than see the battle as a point of pride for the Spartans or as evidence that Sparta was not irreversibly politically damaged, the narrator directs the narratee to interpret the battle as evidence of Sparta’s desperate state. The reasoning behind this interpretation is then provided through analepses: Spartans never before made much of their victories as they were so

---

221 For narrative of the events omitted from our story, see Hamilton (1991) 231-236; Cartledge (1987) 386-387.
222 Cartledge (1987) 387 concludes that Archidamos must have aimed to prevent the completion of the new Arkadian capital, Megalopolis, and in this respect his campaign was therefore unsuccessful.
accustomed to military success that even after the victory at Mantinea in 418 B.C.E. there was no great celebration of the good news. The narrator includes this commentary with analepses in order to set up a contrast with the scene of jubilation that is to come next. Thus, the narratee is directed to interpret the coming scene with disapproval and as a sign that Sparta truly had deteriorated.

But at this time when the battle-outcome was reported and Archidamos was approaching, no one held back, but first his father, crying from joy, came out to meet him and the magistrates with him, and a multitude of old men and women went down to the river stretching out their hands and calling on the gods, as if Sparta had duly shaken off her disgraces and was seeing the brilliant light once more from of old; since before this they say the men could not look their wives in the face being so ashamed at their failures.

Having provided the context of the Spartans’ traditional behavior after victory as a comparative lens through which the narratee is to interpret the Spartans’ present behavior, the narrator returns to the forward chronology and slows the narrative down to present a scene. The scene of Agesilaos, magistrates, old men and women all streaming out in joy to meet the returning victorious Spartans stands in stark contrast to the dignified reserve displayed in chapter 29 by the Spartans after news of Leuktra had reached them. Rather than sharing in the joy of the Spartans at this juncture, the narratee interprets the scene, as the narrator has directed them to do, as a pitiful example of the deterioration of Spartan ideals. The narrator further guides
interpretation of the scene through embedded focalization of an “as if” statement with a genitive absolute that reflects the embedded thoughts of the rejoicing Spartans. Stating that it was “as if” Sparta had shaken off her disgraces and was returning to her old status in the light reiterates the narrator’s interpretation that in fact Sparta had not returned to the light and was still very much disgraced. The embedded focalization of the anonymous old men reaffirms the low status Sparta had now achieved, as they themselves, before this scene, were ashamed of themselves and their failures that had brought Sparta to this low point.
Part Nine: chapters 34-35

These two chapters primarily cover only the fabula year of 362 B.C.E., but via summary statements the narrator bridges the chronological period between 368 and 362 B.C.E. by alluding to events from that period without explicitly incorporating them into the narrative. The two main events that the narrator has selected for extended narration are the second defense of Sparta from an assault by Epaminondas and the Battle of Mantinea. The narrator does, however, mention at the start of this section the foundation of Messenia by Epaminondas during his 370/69 B.C.E. invasion as well as Sparta’s rejection of the peace negotiated by Thebes in 366 B.C.E. While the inclusion both of these events in the narrative adds to the chronological cohesiveness of the story, the narrator uses these events mainly to introduce other themes or main events of the chapter. As an example, the mention of Messenia’s foundation conveys the circumstances that motivate the Spartans’ harsh feelings about Agesilaos, the topic to which the narrator devotes more story-time than the actual motivating event.

The chapters contain a balance between criticism of Agesilaos, made indirectly through embedded focalizations, and direct praise of Agesilaos’ conduct during Sparta’s defense, delivered directly from the narrator. Much in these sections, however, emphasizes the actions of others, like Archidamos and Isadas, whom the narrator singles out as examples of superlative courage or upon the lasting elation felt by the Lakedaimonians at the death of Epaminondas at the Battle of Mantinea. Much of the narrator’s direct comments on Agesilaos are positive, although in the section that ends chapter 35, the narrator does deliver one of his rare harsh commentaries on Agesilaos in simple text. The commentary centers upon Agesilaos’ refusal of peace after Mantinea as motivated by his continued animosity towards Thebes, fueled by Epaminondas’ settlement of Messene. The narrator will establish this immoderate resentment as

---

223 See Cawkwell (1961) 80-86 for the Peace of 366 B.C.E.
the major contributing factor that compelled Agesilaos to hire himself out as a mercenary to the Egyptians in order to fill the war coffers and foment hostilities at home.

34.1-34.2

Οἰκίζομένης δὲ Μεσσήνης ὑπὸ τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἑπαμινώνδαν καὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων πολιτῶν πανταχόθεν εἰς αὐτῇν συμπορευομένων, διαμάχεσθαι μὲν οὐκ ἐτόλμωσεν οὐδὲ κωλύειν ἐδύναστο, χαλεπῶς δὲ καὶ βαρέως πρὸς τὸν Ἀγεσιλαὸν ἔχουν, ὅτι χώραν οὔτε πλήθει τῆς Λακωνικῆς ἐλάττονα καὶ πρωτεύουσαν ἄρετῇ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἔχουσε καὶ καρποῦμενοι χρόνον τοσοῦτον ἐπὶ τῆς ἑκείνου βασιλείας ἀπολωλέκασι. Διὸ καὶ πρωτευομένην ὑπὸ τῶν Θεβαίων τὴν εἰρήνην ὁ Ἀγεσιλαὸς οὐκ ἐδέξατο. Μὴ βουλόμενος δὲ τῷ λόγῳ προεσθαι τοῖς ἐργῶ κρατοῦσι τῇ χώρᾳν, ἄλλα φιλονικῶν, ἑκείνην μὲν οὐκ ἀπέλαβε, μικροῦ δὲ τῆν Σπάρτην προσαπέβαλε καταστρατηγηθεὶς.

And when Messene was settled by Epaminondas’ associates and its citizens of old came together there from all over, the Lakedaimonians, who neither dared to fight for it nor were able to prevent it, nonetheless had harsh and angry feelings for Agesilaos, seeing that a country that was no less extensive than Lakonia and which was first among Hellenic lands in worth and which they possessed and whose fruits they reaped for such a long time, they now lost during the reign of this man. And therefore Agesilaos did not accept the peace put forward by the Thebans. He was unwilling to give up to them in theory the country that in fact they controlled, but contending on he did not regain possession of it and nearly also threw away Sparta by being out-generalled.

The narrator begins the chapter with an internal analepsis: the settlement of Messene by Epaminondas that had begun in 370/69 B.C.E. and which was now firmly founded after Sparta’s failed attempts to recover the area, although not recognized as autonomous by Sparta.224 He only subtly indicates with aorist genitive absolutes the significant chronological ellipsis of six years between the last narrated event, the return of Spartans after the “tearless battle” in 368 B.C.E., and this point in the story-time when Epaminondas is about to invade the Peloponnesos for the fourth time and make his second attack upon Sparta itself in the spring of 362 B.C.E. The

opening section is an analeptic summary covering the period between 370/69 and 362 B.C.E.;
the narrator summarizes only the events of Messene’s foundation in 370/69 and Agesilaos’
refusal of peace offered by Thebes in 366/5 B.C.E.\(^{225}\) Much has been omitted in the story from
the fabula, including the peace conference in Susa in 367 B.C.E., where Pelopidas won the right
to reaffirm autonomy in Greece, the general snubbing of Thebes’ call for oaths after the
conference, and Epaminondas’ third invasion of the Peloponnesos, an abortive attempt to break
Achaia away from Sparta, in spring 367 B.C.E.\(^{226}\)

Moreover, the narrator mentions that Agesilaos refused the peace offered by the Thebans
as he would not deign to recognize Messene as independent, but without explaining the context
of this proffered peace.\(^{227}\) It was when Athens made a failed attempt to take Korinth by coup in
order to prevent Thebes from seizing the city that the Korinthians asked Thebes to negotiate a
peace in order to secure their safety.\(^{228}\) Korinth received permission to ask others to join in their
peace negotiations and Sparta refused to join, saying they preferred to fight to regain control over
Messenia, but they granted Korinth permission to conclude a separate peace with Thebes, which
they did along with Phleios and Epidauros. At this point, Sparta became more isolated as the
separate peace in effect dissolved the Peloponnesian League.\(^{229}\) Contrary to what our narrator
suggests above, however, it is very unlikely that Agesilaos had granted Korinth the permission to
conclude this peace that signaled the defection of the Peloponnesian allies as he was in the east

\(^{225}\) There are three peace offerings that are mentioned by Xenophon during this period (*Hell.* 7.1.27, 7.1.33-40, and
7.4.8-12). The first was promoted by Ariobarzanes in 369/8, the second dominated by Pelopidas in 367, and the third
was sought by Korinth in 366/5 with Sparta’s permission. It is this last attempt at peace which that is mentioned in
34.2, as noted by Shipley (1997) 362-362, but it was unlikely that Agesilaos had any role in it as he was in all
probability in Asia Minor on behalf of Ariobarzanes. For this, see Hamilton (1991) 241; it was with this defection of
Kornith, Phleios, and Epidauros among others that marked the end of the Peloponnesian League.
226 Cf. Plut. *Pelop.* 30.1-5. For further discussion of the peace conference at Susa of 367 B.C.E. and Thebes’ failed
attempt to take the oaths of the Greek poleis, see Hamilton (1991) 237-239.
227 See note 154 above.
fighting on behalf of Ariobarzanes in 366 and 365, who had revolted from Artaxerxes.\textsuperscript{230} It is more likely that permission was granted to Korinth and the commitment to regain Messene was reaffirmed by the ephors and gerousia, but that the narrator attributed the statement to Agesilaos as characteristic of him and in line with the story’s thematic progression.\textsuperscript{231}

Let us now return to discussing the narrative techniques, other than omission, that shape this passage. Shipley suggests that the narrator’s anachronistic placement of Messene foundation here may be intended to mark the end of the period during which Agesilaos failed to recover Messenia and which then led to Epaminondas’ renewed attack on Sparta in 362 B.C.E., the central event of this chapter.\textsuperscript{232} The analepsis to Messene’s foundation therefore serves as a bridge to span the period that the narrator largely omits to move the narrative from one chronological point in the fabula to the next event selected for inclusion while giving the impression of chronological cohesion and progression. With this, the narrator transitions from relating events to an embedded focalization that resituates the narratee in the thematic development of the story, which reveals a deterioration of Agesilaos’ reputation as well as the Spartans’ own sense of security. He uses embedded focalization of collective anonymous “they” to lay the accusation against Agesilaos that he was at least partly responsible for the state of decline into which Sparta had fallen during the long period of his reign.

It is particularly the loss of Messenia that dealt a near-fatal blow to Sparta, as without the large and rich agricultural possession, Sparta lacked the relative financial security it had previously enjoyed. This lack of funds will drive Agesilaos to hire himself out as a minor

\textsuperscript{230} The dating of Ariobarzanes’ revolt and Agesilaos’ second tenure in Asia Minor is, however, a little uncertain. Cartledge (1987) 388-389 discusses these events and their dating. Agesilaos returned to Asia Minor, most likely as a mercenary commander, in order to secure funds to recapture Messenia.

\textsuperscript{231} In Xen. Hell. 7.4.7-10 it is the “Lakedaimonians” who grant Korinth permission to conclude a peace and refuse to join them until they regained Messene.

\textsuperscript{232} Shipley (1997) 359-360.
commander to the Egyptians near the end of his life in order to secure the resources needed to continue warring against Thebes at home. More to the point, it is the loss of Messene that the narrator makes the actorial motivation for Agesilaos to refuse the peace that Thebes put forward in 366 B.C.E., even though, as discussed above, these events were not directly related and Agesilaos himself was likely in Asia Minor at the time. Nonetheless, the narrator has simplified and condensed the fabula events and remolded the story to give the impression of forward chronology and direct causality. The section ends with the embedded focalization of Agesilaos’ reasoning for refusing the peace (he maintained that Sparta still controlled Messenia) and the narratorial comment that not only did Agesilaos fail to ever regain Messenia, alerting the narratee to Agesilaos’ ultimately futile policy on Messene, but also he almost lost Sparta itself due to nearly being out-maneuvered by Epaminondas. With this last comment, the narrator links two chronologically distant events, leads the narratee to anticipate the coming event (the attack on Sparta), and jumps forward in the chronology to the events of 362 B.C.E.

34.3-34.4

Ἐπεὶ γὰρ οἱ Μαντινεῖς αὐθίς ἀπέστησαν τῶν Θηβαίων καὶ μετεπέμποντο τοὺς Λακεδαίμονιοὺς, αἰσθόμενοι ὅ ἐπαμιθώνδας τὸν Ἀγησίλαον ἔξεστρατευμένον μετὰ τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ προσιόντα, λαθὼν τοὺς Μαντινεῖς ἀνέζευξε νυκτὸς ἐκ Τεγέας ἁγών ἐπ᾽ αὐτὴν τὴν Λακεδαίμονα τὸ στράτευμα, καὶ μικρὸν ἐδέσμη παραλλάξας τὸν Ἀγησίλαον ἔρημον ἑξαίφης καταλαβὲιν τὴν πόλιν. Εὐθύνου δὲ Θεσπιέως, ὦς Καλλισθένης φησίν, ὦς δὲ Ἑυρώπων, Κρητὸς τινος, ἐξαγγείλαντος τῷ Ἀγησίλαῳ, ταχὺ προπέμψας ἵππεα τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει φράσοντα μετ᾽ οὗ πολὺ καὶ αὐτὸς παρῆλθεν ἐς τὴν Σπάρτην. Ὅλιγω δὲ ὑστερον οἱ Θηβαῖοι διέβαινον τὸν Εὐρώταν καὶ προσβάλλον τῇ πόλει μάλα ἑρωμένως τοῦ Ἀγησίλαος καὶ παρ᾽ ἡλικίαν ἐπαμύνουντος.

For when the Mantineans once again defected from the Thebans and sent for the Lakedaimonians, Epaminondas, hearing that Agesilaos had marched out with his forces and was approaching, moved off at night from Tegea without the Mantineans knowing it and led his army to Lakedaimon itself; and, after passing by Agesilaos, he was not far from suddenly seizing upon the city undefended. But when Euthynos of Thespia, as Kallisthenes tells it, or according to Xenophon, a
certain Kretan, had reported this to Agesilaos, he quickly sent cavalry to alert those in the city and arrived not much later in Sparta himself. And a little later the Thebans crossed the Eurotas and attacked the city while Agesilaos was especially vigorous and exerted himself beyond his years during the defense.

The narrator now explains his comment about Agesilaos being out-generalled by summarizing the event that nearly led to Sparta’s capture: it happened when Mantineia defected from Thebes and called upon Sparta for aid. Rifts had begun to form in the Arkadian alliance and the factional strife came to a head in 363 B.C.E. over the use of Olympian funds to pay soldiers and some Arkadian leaders asked Thebes for aid in the matter.233 Furthermore, after a settlement had been reached among the Arkadians and Thebans at Tegea, the Thebans and some Arkadian leaders attempted to imprison the aristocratic Mantineians, but the coup failed when the prisoners escaped and denounced the Thebans.234 Mantineia, Elis, and the Achaians became concerned about Thebes’ objectives in the intervention and sought aid from Athens and Sparta. With this, new alliances were drawn and Epaminondas assembled his forces at Tegea along with the Arkadians, Messenians, and Argives; while Sparta, Athens, Elis, the Achaians, and remaining Arkadians muster at Mantineia. It is at this point in the chronology to which the narrator has brought the story in the section above.

He slows the rhythm to present the scene of Agesilaos and Epaminondas passing one another like ships in the night; the former on his way to Mantineia from where he had camped at Pellene, the latter slipping away to march to Sparta knowing that Agesilaos was away from the city.235 The narrator breaks the rhythm at this point to include two variations in the sources as to who alerted Agesilaos to the danger and, in effect, saved the day. Whether the man who reported the Theban’s movements to Agesilaos was a Thespian or a Kretan is not the main preoccupation

233 Xen. Hell. 7.4.33-35.
235 Xen. Hell. 7.5.9-10.
of the narrator, but the brief pause does serve to bring the narratee’s attention to the importance of the man’s action and the urgency of the crisis, as without him Sparta would have been undefended when Epaminondas arrived. As many of the narrator’s citations are used to validate interpretations or commentaries that he makes or to heighten the authority of his narrative, this double citation serves both to heighten the drama of the scene and to remind the narratee of the narrator’s authority and research on his subject. That the narrator put Kallisthenes’ version before that of Xenophon is most likely due to the fact that Kallisthenes recorded a name as well as the man’s polis, while Xenophon simply identifies “a certain Kretan”. The action quickly resumes after this brief pause and the narratee sees how close Sparta came to be attacked while undefended and thus the importance of the man who alerted Agesilaos. Agesilaos responded quickly, sent cavalry ahead and led his men back to Sparta just before the Thebans crossed the Eurotas and attacked. The narrator ends the scene with direct comment on Agesilaos’ conduct during the defense and guides the narratee to interpret the defense favorably. The narrator’s reasoning behind his favorable comment about Agesilaos’ conduct begins the next section.

34.5-34.8

Oů γάρ, ὡς πρότερον, ἀσφαλείας ἔωρα τὸν καιρὸν ὄντα καὶ φυλακῆς, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἀπονοίας καὶ τόλμης, οἷς τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον οὐδέποτε πιστεύοις οὐδὲ χρησάμενος, τότε μόνοις ἀπεώσατο τοῦ κίνδυνον, ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ Ἐπαμινώνδου τὴν πόλιν ἐξαρπάσας καὶ στήσας τρόπαιον καὶ τοῖς παιδί καὶ ταῖς γυναιξίν ἐπιδείξας τὰ κάλλιστα τροφεῖα τῇ πατρίδι τούς Λακεδαιμονίους ἀποδιδόντας, ἐν δὲ πρώτοι τὸν Ἀρχίδαμον ἀγωνιζόμενον ὑπερηφάνως τῇ τε ρωμῇ τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τῇ κοινοτητὶ τοῦ σώματος, ὀξέος ἐπὶ τὰ θλιβόμενα τῆς μάχης διαβέονται διὰ τῶν στενώπων καὶ παυταχοῦ μετ’ ὀλίγων ἀντερείδουντα τοῖς πολεμίως Ἰσάδαν δὲ δοκῶ, τὸν Φοιβίδου νιόν, ὦ τοὺς πολίτας μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς πολεμίοις θέαμα καλὸν φανῆσαι καὶ ἀγαστόν. Ἡν μὲν γὰρ ἐκπρεπὴς τὸ εἴδος καὶ τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ σώματος, ὥραν δ’ ἐν ἦ τῷ ἥδιστον ἀνθούσιν ἀνθρώποι παριόντες εἰς ἁνδράς ἐκ παῖδων εἰχέ, γυμνὸς δὲ καὶ ὄρεξιν τῶν σκεπόντων καὶ ἰματίων λίπα χρησάμενος τὸ σῶμα καὶ τῇ μὲν ἔχων χειρὶ λόγχην, τῇ δὲ ἕφος ἐξῆλατο τῆς οἰκίας καὶ διὰ

236 Cf. Xen. Hell. 7.5.10.
For he did not, as before, see it as a situation for caution and reserve, but rather for desperation and daring, things in which he had never before trusted nor made use of, but then by means of these alone he drove back the peril, snatching the city from the hands of Epaminondas and setting up a trophy and proving to the children and women that the Lakedaimonians were repaying the fatherland the most beautiful rewards for their rearing; among the fore fighters Archidamos fought outstandingly with both the courage of his soul and the extreme agility of his body, quickly running through the narrow streets to the critical points of the battle and everywhere standing firm against the enemy with but a few men; but I think Isadas, the son of Phoibidas—not only among the Spartan citizens, but also among the enemies—appeared a fine and admirable sight. For he was remarkable for the appearance and size of his body, and the time of life in which mankind flowers most sweetly namely when they are coming into manhood from boyhood, and being naked of protective armor and clothing, having richly anointed his body, and in one hand taking his spear, and in the other a sword he rushed out from his house and pushing through the midst of the fighting he roved among the enemy striking and laying low those he encountered. But he was wounded by no one, either he was protected by a god because of his valor, or appeared to his enemies as something greater and more powerful than a human. And for this, it is told, the ephors wreathed him with garlands and then imposed a fine of a thousand drachmas, because he dared to put himself at risk without his armor.

The narrator explains his favorable estimation of Agesilaos’ conduct by means of embedded focalization. The king’s internal thoughts are revealed: during the earlier attack, he thought restraint to be the best course of action, but he estimated the present situation as desperate and one that called for desperate and daring action. The focalization prompts the narratee to compare Sparta’s present situation with that during the 370/69 B.C.E. invasion and, likewise, Agesilaos’ conduct during both attacks to which the narrator attributes Sparta’s salvation. Both circumstances caused Agesilaos to behave uncharacteristically; during the former attack he quelled his intrinsic philotimia and philonikia and made cautious decisions, now he
abandons caution to take daring courses of action in order to save the city. This throw-caution-to-the-wind attitude, however, is also uncharacteristic of Agesilaos, as the narrator informs his narratee, and in fact Agesilaos had always avoided desperate acts. It was his ability to comprehend the peril and act accordingly each time, whether in accordance to his habits or not, that the narrator brings to the fore for commendation.

That the narrator considers Agesilaos to have successfully saved his city once more is made clear by his comment that Agesilaos’ daring actions snatched the city from Epaminondas’ hands, implying that the Theban had all but captured the city.237 The next event, Agesilaos’ erection of a trophy in his own city, marks the end and outcome of Epaminondas’ failed attack. The Plutarchian narrator is clear in his assessment that he attributes the city’s salvation to Agesilaos’ actions. This is markedly different from what is preserved in Xen. *Hell.* 7.5.12-13 where it is Archidamos who is said to have led the defense of Sparta, to have routed Epaminondas’ forces, and to have set up the trophy “at the spot where he had won the victory.” Our narrator transfers these actions from Archidamos to Agesilaos and, with this manipulation of actors and actions, has recast the event so that Agesilaos is not only involved in the defense, but is also responsible for its success. Without inserting Agesilaos into the event and depicting him as the commander in charge, our narrator would neither be able to credit him with the salvation of Sparta during both invasions nor contrast his conduct in the two assaults so favorably as examples of the king’s ability to comprehend and respond appropriately to the crises, even when it required him to act against his tendencies.

237 Cf. the narrative of the second defense of Sparta here to that preserved in Xen. *Hell.* 7.5.11-14, where no mention is made of the presence of Agesilaos; instead the salvation of the city is attributed almost solely to the actions of Archidamos. Cf. also Diodoros (15.83.2-5), who credits Agesilaos’ defense strategy as the reason for Sparta’s salvation.
After noting that Agesilaos set up the trophy, the narrator comments on the actorial motivation, using the participle ἐπιδείξας in agreement with Agesilaos that implies his internal thoughts, that the victory was proof to the Spartan women and children, those who would have become the Thebans’ victims had they won, that Sparta was indeed still full of worthy men willing and able to defend their homeland. To support this judgment of proof, the narrator provides two examples of the extraordinary lengths to which the Spartan men went to preserve the city and the women and children within.

The first and briefer of the two examples is that of Agesilaos’ son, Archidamos. The narrator states in simple text that he stood out from all others for his courage and ability to be in all places at once. He alone with but a few men was able to hold off the enemy at all critical points. But it is not Archidamos whom the narrator singles out as the extraordinary example of Spartan courage and ability, but a man named Isadas. The narrator mentions that Isadas is the son of Phoibidas, the Spartan who seized the Kadmeia in 382 B.C.E., an event to which the narrator devoted much story-time in chapters 23-24. It may be this relationship that prompted the narrator to devote so much story-time to relating this episode and depicting it as the primary example event of Spartan courage during the defense. Just as he selected Kleonymous’ death at Leuktra for in-depth narration to aid in structuring and closing the Sphodrias affair, Isadas is selected for primacy because of his connection another dominant character in the story, Phoibidas. In a small way, these villains in the story, Phoibidas and Sphodrias, are partially redeemed through the selfless, patriotic actions of their sons.

Not only does the narrator devote more story-time to relate Isadas’ conduct, but he also interjects in the first person, thus becoming overt and dramatic, to claim that he thinks Isadas was the “sight to behold,” although, as he was not an eyewitness, he is signaling that he has adopted
someone else’s account and continues on in the narrative to visually depict the events. Whereas
the narrator summarized Agesilaos’ and Archidamos’ actions during the assault on the city, here
he slows the rhythm to narrate Isadas’ actions in a simple text scene. He begins the scene with a
physical description of Isadas’ body and his initial movements: anointing his body, each hand
grasps a piece of equipment, and rushing out of his house; the detailed description that sets the
scene with vivid narration. Next, the rhythm quickens as the narrator summarizes Isadas’ actions
after leaving his house and closes the narration of his actions with the narratorial comment that
the man was not injured either because he had divine protection or because his enemies believed
he was super-human (embedded focalization of the collective enemy). This comment and
focalization creates a ring-composition for the scene; the narrator began the scene with Isadas’
remarkable size and heroic nakedness and ends it with a focalized confirmation of the narrator’s
description. The scene closes with a rhetorical device of collective anonymous spokesmen: it is
said, and the narrator makes no assertion to the validity of the claim, that the ephors honored
Isadas for his actions (thus validating the narrator’s scene of heroism), but then fined him for
risking his life without armor (hinting at Sparta’s paucity of fighting men and recalling
Agesilaos’ statement about Sphodrias that Sparta was in need of such men).

35.1-35.2.1

ʻΟλιγαις δ’ ύστερον ήμέραις περὶ Μαντίνειαν ἐμαχέσασαν, καὶ τὸν
Ἐπαμινώνδαν ἤδη κρατοῦντα τῶν πρώτων, ἔτι δ’ ἐγκείμενον καὶ
κατασκεύῳντα τὴν δίωξιν Ἀντικράτης Λάκων ὑποστάς ἐπισοε δόρατι μὲν,
ὡς Διοκουρίδης ἱστόρηκε, Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ Μαχαίρινας ἔτι νῦν τοὺς
ἀπογόνους τοῦ Ἀντικράτους καλοῦσιν, ὡς μαχαίρα πατάζαντος. Οὔτω
γὰρ ἐθαύμασαν καὶ ὑπερηγάτησαν αὐτὸν φόβῳ τοῦ Ἐπαμινώνδου ξώντος,
ὡς τιμᾶς μὲν ἐκεῖνῳ καὶ δωρεὰς ψηφίσασθαι, γένει δ’ ἀτέλειαν, ἢν ἔτι καὶ
καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἔχει Καλλικράτης, εἰς τῶν Ἀντικράτους ἀπογόνων.
A few days later they fought near Mantinea, and Epaminondas already had conquered the front ranks, and was still pressing down and rushing upon the enemy in pursuit when the Lakonian Antikrates engaged and stuck him with his spear, as Dioskourides narrated, but the Lakedaimonians still to this day call the descendants of Antikrates “Swordsmen”, since he struck with a sword. For they so revered and exceptionally admired him because of the fear they had of Epaminondas while alive, that they voted honors and gifts to him, and except to his offspring, which even in my own day Kallikrates enjoys, who is a descendant of Antikrates.

After the narration of the heroic defense of Sparta, the narrator marks an ellipsis of a few days and quickly brings the narrative down to the Battle of Mantinea in 362 B.C.E. He does not narrate the battle at length nor does he even make it clear that Sparta lost the battle to Thebes. He begins the battle narrative near the end of the struggle when Epaminondas had already turned the Spartans and allies to flight, which is summarily indicated with participles. The narrator’s focus, however, is on the death of Epaminondas, which he makes the climax and central event of the chapter. He vividly narrates Antikrates striking Epaminondas down and then pauses to discuss the variations in the tradition about which weapon Antikrates used for his task. Rather than being a point to belabor for its own sake or to display narratorial erudition, the narrator’s pause to comment on the different traditions focuses the narratee’s attention to the importance the Spartans had placed upon the event then and since. This Spartan relief at Epaminondas’ death is made explicit with the embedded focalization of the collective Spartans. With this focalization it becomes clear why the narrator focused his battle narrative exclusively upon the death of Epaminondas: this was the battle’s sole matter of import from the perspective of the Spartans.\textsuperscript{238}

The narrator’s account and the embedded focalization are then indirectly validated by the official exemption from taxes which Antikrates’ descendants were awarded by the state. The narrator in

\textsuperscript{238} Shipley (1997) 371-372 notes that the excessive exuberance of the Spartans at Epaminondas’ death is an indirect characterization of the man and the inclusion of the permanence of the tax exemption the the narrator’s own day provides proof that Epaminondas was still glorified during his time.
turn himself substantiates this validation by his own observation that “even in his day”

Kallikrates enjoyed the exemption. The narratorial comment about his own time once more dramatizes his role and conveys the temporal distance from himself and his subject.239

35.2.2-35.4

After the battle and death of Epaminondas, when the Greeks were deciding upon a peace for themselves, the associates of Agesilaos excluded the Messenians from the oath, on the grounds that they did not possess a city. But when all the rest received them and accepted their oaths, the Lakedaimonians withdrew from it and for them alone there was war, hoping to regain Messenia. And so Agesilaos appeared to be vicious, stubborn, and insatiate of war, having dissolved the common peace by undermining and quarrelling at every turn, and again being forced from lack of money to trouble his friends throughout the city and to borrow and collect contributions, he seemed also that he ought to have ceased from his wrongdoings at this critical moment that was at hand, and not give up entirely such great authority as well as cities, land, and sea in order to struggle on behalf of the possessions and revenues of Messenia.

For the remainder of the chapter, the narrator discloses and then directly comments upon the Common Peace that was all but universally sworn to following Mantinea in 362 B.C.E.

Agesilaos was nowhere mentioned in the narrative of the battle of Mantinea, but here the

239 Cf. with Gray (2004) 392-393 where she discusses the use of “continuance motifs” in Xenophon’s Cyropaedia. In addition to adding liveliness, coherence, and distance, she argues that the device gives “another sort of authority to the narration and the praise.”
narrator shows him playing a decisive indirect role in Sparta’s refusal to accept the peace.\textsuperscript{240} This refusal echoes the argumentative dialogue between Agesilaos and Epaminondas at the conference of 371 B.C.E. that precipitated the Battle of Leuktra and Epaminondas’ invasions of the Peloponnesos. This is the second explicit refusal by Agesilaos in the story to acknowledge the existence of Messene as autonomous; the first and briefer narrative of this refusal was included in the summary opening of chapter 34 before Epaminondas’ second assault upon Sparta itself. Here again the narrator presents a hostile Agesilaos whose extreme stubbornness once more isolates Sparta politically and fruitlessly.\textsuperscript{241} The narrator indirectly makes his accusations against Agesilaos by embedded focalization that he seemed (ἐδόκει), presumably to those involved in swearing the peace, to be “vicious, stubborn, and insatiate of war”. Furthermore, it was his constant quibbling that continually undermined the efforts for a common peace and left Sparta as the sole aggressor to continue the war. At this point the narrator turns to another problem, a lack of funds, that will motivate Agesilaos’ next major action: hiring himself out to the Egyptians as a mercenary commander. Still within the embedded focalization signaled by ἐδόκει, the narrator shows Agesilaos shamefully harassing his friends for money and this causes the narrator to launch into a commentary that directly criticizes Agesilaos. It was a critical moment (τὰ καὶ ἐδόκει) in which Agesilaos failed to act properly and the narrator directly places blame on the king as the reason that Sparta lost its hegemony because of Agesilaos’ stubborn insistence that Messenia should be returned to Sparta’s control. It will be Agesilaos’ ability to

\textsuperscript{240} Agesilaos is likewise not mentioned in the narrative of the battle at the end of the Hellenika or in Diodoros’ more detailed account (15.84.4-15.87.6). Hamilton (1991) 250, no. 119 notes that scholars assume that Agesilaos must have been in command of the Spartan forces at Mantinea. Buckler (1980a) 217 argues that Agesilaos was “the real commander of these forces, although Xenophon in deference to the old king mercifully omits all mention of him.”

\textsuperscript{241} Hamilton (1991) 252 writes that Sparta, by refusing the peace, was in an even worse position after Mantinea than before and was “now virtually without allies in Greece.” The Plutarchian narrator seems to share this same judgement on Sparta’s political position after the battle.
seize upon *kairos* while in Egypt that earned him fame there and which will be the theme that the narrator uses to reestablish the king’s reputation before the end of the story.
The final chapters of the story relate the events of Agesilaos’ mercenary service in Egypt during the fabula year of 360 B.C.E. and include a brief account of the end of the subject’s life. The version of events preserved in this story is unique among the surviving accounts for its fullness and comprehensive narration of the Spartan king’s service to the Egyptians Tachos and Nektanebis. Neither Xenophon’s *Agesilaos* nor Diodoros’ text contain as detailed a presentation of events in Egypt nor the actions taken by Agesilaos while in service there as the Plutarchian narrator here presents.242

The previous chapters contained depictions of Sparta in crisis and Agesilaos, although he was credited with preserving the city during two attacks, was being maligned by the citizens as responsible for Sparta’s decline and criticized by the narrator for his stubborn refusal of peace after the Battle of Mantinea. The damage to Agesilaos’ reputation remains a theme in these final chapters of the story and is made the point of departure for the narration of the Egyptian events. In this story, Egypt is the arena in which Agesilaos reaches a new nadir in his life; he is ridiculed by Egyptian commoners, humiliated by Tachos, falls under suspicion for betraying his ally, is distrusted and ignored by Nektanebis, and even berated by the narrator. It is also, however, the setting in which Agesilaos proves himself to be still the most gifted general of the time and whose patience and calm foresight leads to his redemption before his death.

242 Shipley (1997) 375-377 provides a brief comparison of the three accounts and argues that Plutarch’s version is the most reliable. Diodorus, although the main source for the Satraps’ Revolt,-confuses the names of Nektanebis and Tachos, while Xenophon casts the expedition as another attempt by Agesilaos to punish the Persians for their actions against the Greeks. Shipley argues that Plutarch’s version is the most reliable because of his “shrewd analysis and resolution of discrepancies [and] that he may also have had the use of another source, perhaps his teacher, Ammonios the Egyptian philosopher.”
There is admittedly little thematic continuity in these chapters with the rest of the story and one wonders if Plutarch would have included Agesilaos’ Egyptian service if the king had not died during his return. Although there are many echoes of scenes and focalizations presented in earlier chapters, all of which contribute to the general cohesion of the entire story, there is no discussion of Agesilaos’ obsession with Thebes, his ability to win over enemies, or his unwavering loyalty to friends. It is by continuing with the discussion of reputation and the demonstration of Agesilaos’ military acumen that the narrator is able to maintain unity with the chapters previously narrated.

36.1-36.3

“Ετι δὲ μᾶλλον ἡδόξησε Ταχώ τῷ Ἁἰγυπτίῳ στρατηγὸν ἐπιδοῦσ᾿ ἐαυτὸν. Οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν ἄνδρα τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἁριστον κεκριμένον καὶ δόξης ἐμπεπληκότα τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀποστάτη βασιλέως, ἀνθρώπῳ βαρβάρῳ, χρήσαι τὸ σώμα καὶ τούνομα καὶ τὴν δόξαν ἀποδόθαι χρημάτων ἔργα μισθοφόρου καὶ ξεναγοῦ διαπραττόμενον. Κεὶ γὰρ ὁγισθήκων γεγονὼς ἔτη καὶ πάν υπὸ τραυμάτων τὸ σώμα κατακεκομένου ἑκείνην αὐθις ἀνεδέξατο τὴν καλὴν καὶ περίβλεπτον ἡγεμονίαν ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἕλευθερίας, οὐ πάμπαν ἀμειμπτον εἶναι τὴν φιλοτιμίαν τοῦ γὰρ καλοῦ καιροῦ οἰκεῖον εἶναι καὶ ὁρᾶν, μᾶλλον δ’ ὅλος τὰ καλὰ τῶν αἰσχρῶν τῷ μετρίῳ διαφέρειν. Οὐ μὴν ἑρῴντιζε τοὺτων ὁ Ἀγησίλαος, οὐδ’ ὡστο παρ’ ἀξίαν εἶναι λειτουργία δημόσιου σοφίαν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἀνάξιον ἐαυτοῦ τὸ ἐφ’ ἄπρακτον ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ καθῆσαι περιμένοντα τὸν βάνατον. Ὁθεν ἀθροίσας μισθοφόρον ἀφ’ οὗν ὁ Ταχώς αὐτῷ χρημάτων ἔπεμψε, καὶ πλοῖα πληρώσας αὐθῆ, τριάκοντα συμβούλους ἔχων μεθ’ ἐαυτοῦ Σπαρτιάτας, ὡς πρότερον.

His reputation suffered even more when he gave his services as general to Tachos the Egyptian. For it was not thought worthy that the man judged to be the best of Hellas and who had filled the inhabited world with his reputation, should furnish his person, name, and reputation to a rebel against the King—a barbarian man—and to render services for paid wages and make himself a mercenary commander. For even if, although eighty years old and with his entire body stricken with wounds, he had taken up once more that noble and universally admired command on behalf of the freedom of the Hellenes, his ambition would not altogether be blameless; for a fitting time and season is part of noble deeds, nay rather, in fact, the main thing that distinguishes the noble from the shameful is the proper moment. Yet Agesilaos did not reflect upon these things, nor did he consider any public duty for the state beneath his dignity, but rather thought his life worthless if
spent idle in the city and to sit awaiting death. Therefore, having collected mercenaries with the money that Tachos sent him, and having filled up the fleet he set sail, having thirty Spartiate advisors with him as before.

After the direct and indirect criticism of Agesilaos’ stubbornness in chapter 35 that kept Sparta isolated in a state of war, the narrator continues the theme of the deterioration of Agesilaos’ reputation into chapter 36. There, the insistence upon Sparta’s claim to Messenia resulted in him seeming to be vicious and spiteful (35.3); here, his mercenary service to Egyptians for the sake of gaining funds for continuing the war in Greece is presented as the ultimate low-point in the king’s life. The narrator again paraphrases Theophratos’ remarks about Agesilaos being the most illustrious man of the times, which were incorporated into the criticism of Agesilaos’ appointment of Peisander as nauarch in chapter 10.5. This ring composition draws attention to the reduced position of Agesilaos now; in chapter 10 he was commander of all land and sea forces in the panhellenic expedition against Persia, now this most illustrious man is a hired mercenary in the service of a barbarian Egyptian king.

The narrator begins the chapter in simple text and marks the continuation of the theme from the previous section (Agesilaos’ waning reputation) with ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον, but with the circumstances for the continued slide in reputation defined (mercenary commander to Tachos). In this version of the events, Agesilaos offers (ἐπὶ δούση) his services himself to Tachos, but the actorial motivation that moved him to volunteer is not explicit. The only thing close to motivation that the narrator discloses is that Agesilaos thought that being idle at home and awaiting death is a worthless existence and that any public service is worthwhile. In contrast, the version in Xen. Ages. 2.28-29 states Agesilaos was summoned directly by the Egyptian king and Agesilaos accepted the summons because he wanted to repay (χάριν ἀπὸ δῶσε) the Egyptian for services rendered to the Spartans and in the hopes that he would again liberate the Asiatic
Greeks. A third version is given in Diodoros 15.92.3 where the narrator says that Agesilaos was dispatched (ἀπεσταλμένος) by the Spartans with thirty advisers, but no motivation for the dispatch is given and the narrative focus is on Tachos. In both the latter versions, Agesilaos is either summoned or sent by others; in other words, he does not pursue the service on his own initiative. In Plutarch’s version, however, Agesilaos offers his services himself, but is accompanied by Spartan advisors. By presenting Agesilaos as responsible for his own mercenary service assignment, the narrator maintains thematic consistency and, should the responsibility lie with the Spartans or Tachos, he could not use this event as a basis for criticism. The narrator is portraying Agesilaos as his nadir; at this point in the story, Lakonia has suffered invasions, Sparta has lost her dominance in Greece, and is now isolated in war. It is, according to this story, Agesilaos who is responsible for Sparta’s current condition due to his philotimia and aggressive obsession with Thebes; these two characteristics of the man have now brought him to these desperate straights and have compelled him to offer himself as a mercenary commander.

After establishing that Agesilaos offered his services to Tachos, the narrator enters into a lengthy commentary with simple and complex narrator text that guides the narratee’s interpretation of the coming events. The negative estimation of the king’s mercenary service is presented in the embedded focalization of anonymous, collective spokesmen and thus implies that the contemporary Greeks were the originators of this condemnation of Agesilaos’ service in Egypt, not the narrator. After this, the narrator places his own commentary on the events and uses an earlier story theme, panhellenism, discussed in chapter 6 on the eve of Agesilaos’ Asian campaign as the inspiration for his condemnation. Unlike the Asian campaign, the narrator tells his reader, this campaign was not taken up for the noble deed of freeing Greeks (as Xenophon

243 This may be an attempt to reconcile the different accounts. Plutarch depicts Agesilaos as responsible for his mercenary service, but is supported by a Spartan board of elders much as he was when sent to Asia Minor at the beginning of his reign.
presents it in Ages. 2.29), but in order to raise money from barbarians in Egypt and fill the coffers to fight against Greeks at home. After this condemnation of the campaign, the narrator stresses the importance of observing the proper time (kairos) for noble deeds and that, moreover, it is the ability to discern the kairos that differentiates noble from shameful actions.\(^{244}\) The implication is, of course, that the narrator does not believe Agesilaos properly discerned the kairos in accepting this post in the Satraps’ Revolt and thus his otherwise noble action of fighting the Persians was made ignoble because it was not the time for foreign expeditions, but for restoring the lost hegemony of Sparta.

Having given the narratee his own commentary on Agesilaos’ mercenary service, the narrator then enters into an embedded focalization that gives the internal thoughts of Agesilaos. The narratee is told that Agesilaos did not take into consideration the things that the narrator discusses, but rather thought any service to the state was noble and that being idle was the most worthless thing of all. This focalization functions to provide the actorial motivation for Agesilaos’ sojourn to Egypt from the character’s prospective and turns the narratee away from the focalized criticism to the positive defense that Agesilaos was a servant to Sparta and its needs.\(^{245}\) Once this motivation is laid out, the event is narrated: Agesilaos sailed to Egypt with thirty advisors, just as it had happened before in the Asian campaign. The narrator himself makes the connection between the similarity between this and outset of the Asian campaign; this structures the text by recalling the earlier part of the story and calls upon the narratee to compare the circumstances then and now.

\(^{244}\) Plutarch is drawing on Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics* (1098a 16 and 1166a 12) and the exercise of moderation. Shipley (1997) 379-380.

\(^{245}\) Shipley (1997) 380 interprets the focalization that no service was beneath Agesilaos if done in service of the state as a negative judgement, but it is clearly meant to be a positive defense, although focalized through Agesilaos himself, and an echo of the theme on Agesilaos’ obedience and loyalty to Sparta.
And when they put in at Egypt, immediately the Egyptian king’s highest ranking commanders and administrators walked down to the ship to pay court to him. And on the part of the rest of the Egyptians as well there was great excitement and expectation because of the name and reputation of Agesilaos, and everyone ran together to look at him. But when they saw no splendor or arrangements, but an old man lying down in the grass by the sea, shoddy and short, covered in a rough and paltry cloak, they began to jeer among each other and make jokes, saying that it was like the story that’s told: a mountain was in labor, then gave birth to a mouse. They were even more amazed by his oddity; when hospitality gifts were brought forward and offered, he accepted the wheat flour, calves, and geese, but the sweetmeats, cakes, and perfumes he refused, and being compelled and entreated to take them, he ordered men to carry them off and give them to the Helots. However Theopompos says he was delighted by the papyrus used for garlands because of their simplicity and elegance; and he asked for and received the garlands from the king, when he sailed away.

The narrator has thus far subtly guided his narratee to compare the circumstances and aims of Agesilaos’ Asian campaign with his present Egyptian service. Now, he resumes the story chronology and slows the rhythm down to present a scene that is immediately recognizable as similar to that in chapter 12 wherein Agesilaos and Pharmabazos met in a grassy field. The scene in Egypt is markedly different from the earlier one and presents an Agesilaos who is not received honorably, but mocked for his simplicity, whereas in Asia Minor this same simplicity inspired
the Persian satrap to imitate the king. The scene is presented dramatically with the focalizations of the Egyptians who see an old and shoddily clothed man and they compare this sight to the reputation he gained and mock him for the inconsistency, deciding that the man does not measure up to the reputation. This focalized judgment forces the narratee to make the same comparison and reflect upon the character at his pinnacle early in the story and now at his nadir and ponder how he ended up here. The scene continues with the focalization of the Egyptians who then wonder at Agesilaos’ acceptance and refusal of gifts. He accepts the simple and serviceable gifts, but the luxuries he sends to his helots; this action is in line with the characterization that the narrator has presented and reiterates the lifelong dedication to Spartan simplicity that Agesilaos held. Thus, from the Egyptian characters’ perspective, Agesilaos is pitiful, but from the viewpoint of the narrator, Agesilaos was admirable because he maintained his simple style and rejection of luxury throughout his life. Agesilaos accepted one luxury item, the papyrus garlands, but only because he was delighted by the simplicity and the good craftsmanship. It is this simplicity of the papyrus that prevents his acceptance of them from seeming contradictory to his rejection of luxury goods.

37.1-37.2

Στότε δὲ συμμίξας τῷ Τάχῳ παρασκευαζομένῳ πρὸς τὴν στρατείαν, οὐχ, ὡς ἠλπίζε, πάσης στρατηγὸς ἀπεδείχθη τῆς δυνάμεως, ἀλλὰ τῶν μισθοφόρων μόνων, τοῦ δὲ ναυτικοῦ Χαβρίας ὁ Ἀθηναῖος ἤγεμων δὲ συμπάντων αὐτὸς

246 Cf. 12.2.
247 Athenaeus, Deip. 616d identifies Tachos as the one who mocked Agesilaos and joked about his small stature; according to Athenaeus, it was this joke that made Agesilaos betray Tachos. He also attributes the retort of Alkibiades found in Plut. Alk. 2 (“one day you shall think me a lion”) to Agesilaos. As Athenaeus is more concerned with the wit of quips than historical representation, it is hardly the more plausible account.
248 Cf. Plut. Apoph. Lak. 210c. A scene nearly identical to this one is described, but set in Thasos while Agesilaos was marching through their territory (presumably while returning from Asia). As in this account, Agesilaos gives the gifted luxury goods to his helots and, when the Thasians as why he did this, he responds that virtuous men ought not indulge in such things that allure the servile crowd. Flowers (1988) 123-134 and esp. 124-125 examines this anecdote in the Apophthegmata Lakonika.
But then once he had allied himself with Tachos, who was preparing for the expedition, he was not, as he expected, given command over the entire army, but of the mercenary troops alone and Chabrias the Athenian was nauarch and the commander-in-chief was Tachos himself. This was the first thing that vexed Agesilaos, then the second thing was that he was compelled to endure the pretensions and ignorance of the Egyptian, although irritated at him; he even sailed out with Tachos against the Phoinikians, which was beneath his dignity and unlike his nature, but he endured until he could seize the right time.

The presentation of Agesilaos’ decline continues through chapter 37, which opens with Agesilaos focalized discovery that he was only to be a minor commander of the mercenaries in Egypt. This situation also compels the narratee to evoke a comparison of Agesilaos’ command in Asia, where he was made supreme commander of land and sea forces, with his mercenary command in Egypt, where his manners are mocked and his command minor. That the minor command was a frustration to Agesilaos is made clear by the narratorial statement that it was the first thing that troubled Agesilaos, implying that there will be further frustrations ahead for the king, which the narrator then lists. The narrator then summarizes the actions that Agesilaos was compelled to undertake at Tachos’ command, who is characterized by the narrator as pretentious and ignorant; all of these summarized actions were further vexations to Agesilaos. By listing the summarized reasons for Agesilaos’ humiliation and frustration during his service to Tachos, the narrator has set up the actorial motivation for Agesilaos’ coming betrayal of Tachos. That Agesilaos was biding his time before he could somehow find expression for his frustrations with Tachos is signaled to the narratee by the narratorial statement that the Spartan held out until the kairos arrived for him to act. Agesilaos’ astute utilization of “the right time” has been a reoccurring theme in the story and, more significantly, was just listed as the only thing that
separated noble from shameful acts (36.2); with this signal from the narrator, the narratee now awaits the arrival of the *kairos* along with Agesilaos.249

37.3-37.4

For Nektanebis, a cousin of Tachos who had part of the forces under him, revolted; and having been publicly proclaimed king by the Egyptians, sent word over to Agesilaos requiring his aid; he even exhorted Chabrias to do the same, promising them both enormous rewards. When Tachos had learned of these things and turned to entreating them, Chabrias even tried persuading and exhorting Agesilaos to maintain friendship with Tachos, but Agesilaos said that “It’s fine for you, Chabrias, to use your own reasoning, which you arrive at by yourself, but I was given to the Egyptians as general by my fatherland. Therefore, it would not be appropriate for me to make war against those to whom I was sent as ally, unless, of course, my fatherland bids it.”

The awaited “right moment” is now elucidated for the narratee in simple text: Nektanebis revolted from his cousin Tachos and is proclaimed king by the Egyptians.250 How Agesilaos goes about taking advantage of this situation is now fleshed out in complex text with multiple focalizations and ends with character-text of Agesilaos. The deliberation over how to respond to the revolt of Nektanebis is narrated as a series of summarized related event. First, Nektanebis revolts and sends representatives to Agesilaos and Chabrias to seek their aid. Then Tachos hears

---

249 *kairos* appears also at 10.1, 28.4, 35.5, 36.2, and soon in 39.1.

250 Cf. Diod. 15.92.2-15.93.6. Diodoros’ narrative has Agesilaos remain in the service of Tachos against Nektanebis, whom Tachos defeats with Agesilaos’ aid, and there is no mention of the Mendesian rival. Plutarch’s version is considered the most reliable.
about these entreaties and directs his efforts to gaining assurance of continued support from Chabrias and Agesilaos. Chabrias is evidently persuaded by Tachos and in turn goes to Agesilaos and tried to persuade him to remain loyal to Tachos. Agesilaos’ response to the dilemma and particularly to Chabrias’ entreaty is given directly in character text which draws a negative comparison between Chabrias the Athenian, who makes decisions for his state without consultation, and Agesilaos, who claims that he only obeys his fatherland and will not make a decision that belongs to the state. At first, it appears that Agesilaos is in agreement with Chabrias and will not betray Tachos since he was sent to the Egyptian as an ally, but he adds at the end his response that he will remain an ally unless Sparta bids him otherwise. This twist at the end of the quote does more than reiterate the obedience of Agesilaos to the magistrates at home, as Chabrias is meant to interpret it; it also is a seed for the coming scene that builds suspense in the story. Agesilaos is going to abandon his ally for another paymaster and, what is more, he is going to accomplish this betrayal under the pretext of obedience to the wishes of his state.

37.5-37.6

Ταῦτα δ’ εἰπὼν ἔπεμψεν εἰς Σπάρτην ἄνδρας, οἳ τοῦ μὲν Ταχώ κατηγορήσειν, ἐπαινέσσεθαι δὲ τὸν Νεκτάνεβιν ἐμέλλον. Ἐπεμψαν δὲ κάκείνοι δεόμενοι τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων, ὁ μὲν ὡς πάλαι σύμμαχος γεγονὼς καὶ φίλος, ὁ δ’ ὡς εὔνοις καὶ προθυμότερος περὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐσόμενος. Ἀκούσαντες οὖν οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι τοῖς μὲν Αἰγυπτίοις ἀπεκρίναντο μακεδονῶς Ἀγησίλαῷ περὶ τούτων μελήσειν, ἔκεισαν δ’ ἐπέστειλαν ὅραν κελεύοντες, ὅπως πράξῃ τὸ τῇ Σπάρτῃ συμφέρον. Οὕτω δ’ ἦλθαν τοὺς μισθοφόρους ὃ Ἀγησίλαος ἀπὸ τοῦ Ταχῶ μετέστη πρὸς τὸν Νεκτάνεβιν, ἀτόπου καὶ

251 It should be noted, however, that Chabrias was in Egypt as a private citizen after the Athenians voted against sending him on behalf of the state. See Diod. 15.92.3; Hamilton (1991) 254-255.
252 This episode is unique to the Pluarchian version. In Xen. Ages. 2.28-30 Agesilaos is depicted as having to chose between Egyptian kings after Tachos fled to Phoinikia; he makes his decision on whom to support based on his impression of which was a better friend to the Greeks neither Sparta nor the element of betrayal is said to be involved. In contrast, the version preserved in Diod. 15.92.2 contains no betrayal at all: Tachos flees Egypt only to return later and Agesilaos continues in service to him.
Having spoken these words, he sent men to Sparta who were to bring charges against Tachos while they praised Nektanebis. The rival Egyptians also sent men to beseech the Lakedaimonians, the one [Tachos] on the grounds that he had been their friend and ally for a long time, and the other [Nektanebis] that he would be well-disposed and more favorable towards their city. And so when the Lakedaimonians had heard the Egyptians out, they replied that Agesilaos would best see to these matters, but wrote to him with orders that he to see to it that he does what is beneficial for Sparta. And so indeed, Agesilaos took the mercenaries from Tachos and went over to Nektanebis, using the benefit of the fatherland as a screen for an unusual and thoroughly unusual act; indeed when this pretext is removed, the most justified name for the action was betrayal. But the Lakedaimonians give the first share of virtue to benefiting the fatherland and neither learn nor comprehend justice other than what they think strengthens Sparta.

The episode continues in complex narrator text with multiple focalizations as the narrator summarizes the proceedings of the Egyptian representatives sent to Sparta to win over the magistrates and thus gain the support of Agesilaos. The scene is briefly set and begins with Agesilaos’ deceptive action: he sent men to Sparta to promote Nektanebis over Tachos. With this the narratee knows that all which follows in deciding Sparta’s and Agesilaos’ loyalty is deception. The Spartan magistrates, in fact, will act in compliance to Agesilaos’ wishes while operating under the pretense of being an independent authority to which Agesilaos claims obedience.

The narrator first presents in embedded focalization the respective cases put forward by the representatives from the rival Egyptians, Tachos and Nektanebis. The narrator uses this to present a dichotomy of interests: the first calls upon the Spartans to honor the past, the other urges them to plan for the future. The narrator then summarizes the Spartans’ reception of the
Egyptians’ appeals and their resultant action: they publicly claimed the decision to be entirely Agesilaos’ and privately wrote him a letter with instructions. The contents of the letter strike a familiar tone with the narratee; using the pretext of acting in Sparta’s best interests has been a recurring theme throughout the story. Agesilaos used this argument in support of Phoibidas’ capture of the Kadmeia (chapter 23) and as the reason that he switched his position in Sphodrias’ trial (chapter 25). The narratee has been prepared for the resultant event, Agesilaos’ betrayal of Tachos, since the start of the episode. The narrator started guiding the episode to this conclusion with Agesilaos’ disappointment at being given a minor command, followed by negative characterization of Tachos, and the narrative seed that Agesilaos was simply waiting for the “right time” to make his break. Now, at the end of the episode the narrator pauses the story to provide his commentary and his most damning judgment of Agesilaos’ actions yet. The narrator directs the narratee to interpret Agesilaos’ decision as “thoroughly unusual” which the king disguised by using an orchestrated pretext. Then the narrator makes a direct interpretation for the reader: the term for Agesilaos’ actions was betrayal. The narrator just barely pulls back from this condemnation of his subject with a cynical explanation that Agesilaos acted as a Lakedaimonian would; that is, because the ultimate Spartan virtue was to benefit the state, they had an unrefined concept of justice. He makes it clear that this equation of justice with the state’s interests is one which neither he nor the narratee would make.

38.1-38.2

253 He also claimed deference to his polis with the Persian Tiphraustes in 10.4.
And so, having been abandoned by his mercenaries Tachos fled, while out of Mendes another man was declared king and revolted against Nektanebis; and having gathered one hundred thousand men, he attacked. And Nektanebis was encouraging Agesilaos and telling him that while the enemy may be many, they were nonetheless a mixture of craftsmen and easily contemptible due to their inexperience. “Yes, indeed,” Agesilaos said, “but it’s not their numbers, but their inexperience is what I fear and their ignorance, as it’s hard to deceive. For deceptions present the unexpected to those planning a defense, provided that they are suspicious and looking out for them, but if one does not expect them and is not suspicious of them, he gives no hold to the one attempting to deceive him, just as he who does not move gives no fall to the one who is wrestling against him.”

The narrator continues the forward chronology and summarizes the resultant events from Agesilaos’ betrayal in simple text. First, Tachos fled Egypt; this action was motivated by Agesilaos’ abandonment of him; next, an unnamed “man from Mendes” rivaled Nektanebis’ claim to the throne and, having raised an enormous force of 100,000 men, attacked Nektanebis. With the opening sentence, the narrator has summarized the context in which the exchange between Nektanebis and Agesilaos, the main event of the chapter, took place. With embedded focalization of the Egyptian, the narrator summarizes Nektanebis’ attempt to bolster Agesilaos’ attitude about having to confront such a large force in an attempt to prevent Agesilaos from turning coat again and joining the Mendesian. Nektanebis’ description of his rival’s rabble troops echoes back to the scene in chapter 26 wherein Agesilaos confronted the dissatisfied allies. Here, however, Agesilaos does not express confidence in the professionalism of his troops, but rather his fear of the enemy’s inexperience. Agesilaos’ response to Nektanebis is given directly in character-text that demonstrates the king’s retention of his military acumen even in his old age.

254 I follow Perrin’s adoption of the codex Laurentianus for this problematic line. Cf. Lindskog (1906) 53.
He is not concerned with numbers, but with the ability to carry out deception against an enemy that does not expect it. This focus on deception is a seed; Agesilaos will employ a brilliant stratagem of deception in the next chapter that will result in Nektanebis’ victory and the confirmation of Agesilaos’ military greatness even in the desperate circumstances of mercenary service. Agesilaos’ employment of stratagem was first highlighted in the narrative when used against the perfidious Tissaphernes (9.2-3) and later against those planning a mutiny during the siege on Sparta (32.3-5). In each case, Agesilaos is characterized as justified in using trickery against his barbarian or mutinous foes and the narrator uses each event to characterize Agesilaos as strategically astute. In the previous examples, however, the narrator had to defend the use of trickery by characterizing those against whom it was employed as perfidious (Tissaphernes) or outright traitors to Sparta (the mutineers). There will be no such need for a defense in this third example of stratagem as it will be the event that redeems Agesilaos’ reputation before his death.

38.3-38.4

After this event the Mendesian sent word to try his luck with Agesilaos. And so Nektanebis was worried, and with Agesilaos bidding him to fight it out as quickly as possible and not waste time bringing war against men inexperienced in fighting, but who, because of their numerical superiority, were able to enclose and surround him with a trench and outstrip and anticipate him in many ways, Nektanebis became even more suspicious and fearful of him and left for a city that was well-walled and had a large enclosure. But while Agesilaos was incensed at being mistrusted and bore it indignantly, he was nevertheless ashamed to change over to
the other side again and finally to leave Egypt having accomplished nothing; thus he followed and entered the walls with him.

Following upon the quotation from Agesilaos, the narrator presents two resultant events. The first is a bit of indirect praise when the Mendesian rival tries to win over Agesilaos’ support, as if he too heard about Agesilaos and was convinced of his military genius; the second result was that Nektanebis was now worried. This induces the narrator to explain the motivations for Nektanebis’ unease from the character’s viewpoint with embedded focalization: Agesilaos had given Nektanebis advice to attack quickly or risk being surrounded. This advice resulted in Nektanebis becoming even more suspicious of Agesilaos and this suspicion brings on the next resultant event: Nektanebis holes up his army in an unidentified walled city. Next, the narrator gives Agesilaos’ interpretation of Nektanebis’ decision in embedded focalization: he took the Egyptian’s action as evidence of his mistrust of Agesilaos and his advice. The narrator hints that Agesilaos considered again switching paymasters, but was motivated by a sense of shame and fear of lost wages to remain loyal to Nektanebis. These actorial motivations, shame and money, bring on the final resultant event and climax of the chapter: Agesilaos followed Nektanebis into the walled city.

39.1

Επελθόντων δὲ τῶν πολεμίων καὶ περιταφρευόντων τὴν πόλιν, αὐθις δείσας τὴν πολιορκίαν ὁ Ἀἰγύπτιος ἐβούλετο μάχεσθαι καὶ τοὺς Ἐλλήνας μάλα συμπροθεμουμένους εἰχεν· οὗ γὰρ ἵν ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ σῖτος. Ὁ δὲ Ἀγησίλαος οὐκ ἔως, ἀλλὰ καλύσων ἤκουε μὲν ἐτὶ μᾶλλον κακῶς ὁ πρῶτος ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀἰγυπτίων καὶ προδότης ἀπεκαλεῖτο τοῦ βασιλέως, ἔφεσε δὲ πρῶτος ἡ ἰδὴ τὰς διαβολὰς καὶ προσείχε τῷ καίρῳ τοῦ στρατηγῆματος.

255 Cf. Xen. Ages. 2.31 where it was the fear of the Greeks being denied their wages that motivated Agesilaos to chose to fight for one of the rival Egyptian kings.
And when the enemy had come upon and entrenched the city, the Egyptian, again fearing a siege, wanted to engage the enemy; and the Hellenes were as equally zealous since there were no provisions in the area. But Agesilaos would not allow it and instead was a hindrance; and so he suffered hearing himself maligned by the Egyptians even more than before and called a traitor of the king, but for the moment he bore their slanders lightly and sought the right time for his plan.

The narrator has thus far shown Agesilaos to be mocked and ridiculed in Egypt; the king has reached new lows in Egypt and the narrator has not yet finished his presentation of this. Once more, the narrator opens the chapter with a summary of the situational context in which the action of the chapter will take place. This summary, moreover, echoes almost verbatim Agesilaos’ warning to Nektanebis in 38.3, that the enemy would surround and enclose the city with a trench. This narrative echo accentuates Agesilaos’ foresight and corroborates the narrator’s characterization of his military acumen. Agesilaos has followed Nektanebis (here “the Egyptian”) in to the unidentified walled city and the Mendesian rival’s troops have settled themselves outside. Nektanebis’ reaction to this summarized event is presented in focalization: his fear is renewed and this fear motivates him to want a confrontation. Likewise, the mercenary Greeks want to engage the encamped enemies, but the motivation for their desire is the lack of food and provisions within the city. Thus, the narrator has presented a desperate situation: Nektanebis is afraid of being trapped in the city and the troops are afraid they will starve. The Egyptian’s and Greeks’ focalization of the situation is followed by Agesilaos’ reaction: he would not allow a confrontation and hindered attempts to bring this about. His actions, or inactions as they are, result in the Egyptians maligning him even more than previously and they even call him a traitor to Nektanebis (from their focalization, he is called “king”). Agesilaos’ reaction to the Egyptians’ actions is to patiently await “the right time”. The narrator has repeatedly shown Agesilaos in Egypt to be planning for and awaiting “the right time”; when he was slighted by
Tachos, he await the “right time” to do something about it; when discussing the use of deception against an opponent with Nektanebis, he alluded to the need for “the right time” to make a move; here again, Agesilaos is shown to be calculating and planning for something, but the narratee, like the Egyptian, does not yet know what that is. It will be Agesilaos’ astute employment of the *kairos* that will restore his reputation, both with the Egyptians and with the narratee, at the end of the story and his life. The narrator has been gradually building suspense by unfavorably depicting Agesilaos in service to barbarians and being scorned both by the characters and by the narrator himself. By repeatedly insinuating a coming *kairos*, the narrator has prepared the reader for an eventual redemption of Agesilaos and his *doxa*.

39.2-39.4.1

* Ἡν δὲ τοιοῦτο. Τάφρον ἔξωβην ἀνήγον οἱ πολέμιοι περὶ τὸ τεῖχος βαθείαν ὡς παντάπασιν ἀποκλείσωσιν αὐτούς. Ὡς οὖν ἔγγυς ἦσαν αἱ τελευταὶ τοῦ ὀρύγματος ἀπαντῶντος αὐτῷ καὶ περιόντος ἐν κύκλῳ τὴν πόλιν, ἔσπεραν ἁναμείνας γενέσθαι καὶ κελεύσας ἐξοπλίζεσθαι τοὺς Ἑλλήνας ἐλεγεν ἐλθῶν πρὸς τὸν Ἀιγύπτιον ὁ μὲν τῆς σωτηρίας, ὃ νεανία, καιρὸς οὕτως ἔστιν, ὃν ἐγώ διαφθείραι φοβοῦμενοι οὐκ ἔφραζον, πρὶν ἔλθειν. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἤμιὸν οἱ πολέμιοι τὴν ἀσφάλειαν αὐτοὶ διὰ τῶν χειρῶν παρεσκευάσαν τοσαύτην ὀρυζόμενοι τάφρον, ἢς τὸ μὲν ἐξειργασμένον ἐκεῖνος ἐμποδῶν ἐστὶ τοῦ πλῆθους, τὸ δὲ διαλείπον ἤμιὸν δίδωσιν ἴσω καὶ δικαίῳ μέτρῳ διαμάχεσθαι πρὸς αὐτούς, φέρε νῦν, προθυμηθεὶς ἀνήρ ἄγαθός γενέσθαι καὶ μεθ’ ἦμων ἐπιστόμενος δρόμω σωζε σεαυτὸν ἀμα καὶ τὴν στρατιὰν. Ἦμας γὰρ ἄλλοι διὰ τὴν τάφρον οὐ βλαψοσου.”

And it was this: the enemy had led a deep trench outside around the walls that was intended to enclose them entirely. And so when the ends of the trench were almost touching each other and came round the city in a circle, Agesilaos, while waiting for evening and ordering the Hellenes to arm themselves, went to the Egyptian and said, “This is the right time for our salvation, young man, which I didn’t want to mention until the time was right for fear of ruining it. Seeing that the enemies themselves have crafted our salvation with their own hands for us by digging the trench up to the point that the part of it that is finished presents a hindrance to their numbers, but the gap in between gives us the chance to fight it out with them on equal and fair terms; come now, prove yourself a worthy man and by following us into the fray, save yourself together with your army. For
those of the enemy along the front won’t hold their ground and the others won’t harm us because of the trench.”

The narrator now identifies and narrates the *kairos*. First, the enemies’ actions that brought on this awaited moment are summarized in simple text and this is followed by a short summary of Agesilaos’ resultant actions. Thereupon, the narrator slows the rhythm to usher in the main event of this section, Agesilaos’ address to Nektanebis, and, as this is the moment wherein Agesilaos proves his brilliance and redeems himself, the scene is presented with character-text. That the king addresses his Egyptian paymaster as “young man” positions Agesilaos as the more experienced, older, and superior commander. That he tells the Egyptian that he did not want to mention what he had planned until this moment shows Agesilaos had been enduring unjust mockery; he alone had the foresight to see how to bring about victory.

Next, Agesilaos explains his plan to both Nektanebis, who becomes the internal narratee, and primary narratee. Agesilaos’ exhortation that Nektanebis prove himself a “worthy man” by following him and his Greek hoplites into battle once more positions Agesilaos as superior to Nektanebis. The character text ends with Agesilaos’ prediction of the battle’s outcome: the enemy front lines will collapse and the trench will protect our troops. Thus, the setting is primed for the redemption of Agesilaos and his reputation after several chapters of character and narratorial criticism.

39.4.2-39.5

Εθαύμασεν οὖν ὁ Νεκτάνεβις τοῦ Ἀγησίλαος τὴν δεισότητα, καὶ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν εἰς μέσα τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὀπλα καὶ προσπεσόων ἐτρέψατο ῥαδίως τοὺς ἀντιστάντας. Ὡς δὲ ἀπαξ ἔλαβε πειθόμενον αὐτῷ τοῦ Νεκτάνεβιν ὁ Ἀγησίλαος, αὐθίς ἐπήγαγε τὸ αὐτὸ στρατήγημα καθάπερ πάλαισμα τοὺς πολεμίοις. Τὰ μὲν γὰρ ύποφεύγων καὶ ὑπάγων, τὰ δὲ ἀντιπερισσωρῶν ἐμβάλλει τὸ πλήθος αὐτῶν εἰς τόπον ἔχοντα διώρυχα βαθείαν εἰς ἑκάτερα πλευράς παραρρέουσαν, ὥς τὸ μέσον ἐμπράξας καὶ καταλαβὼν τῷ
And Nektanebis was astounded by Agesilaos’ acumen; and putting himself in the midst of the Hellenic hoplites he attacked and easily routed the opponents. And once Agesilaos had regained Nektanebis’ confidence, he again employed the same strategy, just like a wrestling move, against the enemy. For by withdrawing and pulling back from these, while closing around those, he drove their multitude to a place that had a deep canal flowing by on each side; and by blocking up the middle and occupying it with the front of the phalanx, he made it an even match for those fighting the multitude of the enemy, who were not able to come round and encircle him. Where, after putting up a fight for a short while, they routed them; many were killed, and those who fled were scattered and fell away.

Agesilaos’ speech results in the recognition of his military brilliance by an internal character (Nektanebis) and marks the point of redemption for Agesilaos. The action following this recognition is quickly summarized and shows Nektanebis following Agesilaos’ instructions, an action that contrasts with his actions before where he entered the walled city against Agesilaos’ advice. The summarized actions (the attack and routing of enemy) bring about the resultant event that Nektanebis once again trusted Agesilaos. This, in turn, motivates Agesilaos to further action, which is once more summarized in simple text. The narrator compares Agesilaos’ actions to wrestling moves, which echoes Agesilaos’ own words in chapter 38 on the use of deception and *kairos* in wrestling. Having shown Agesilaos redeemed and recognized once more as a brilliant tactician, the narrator summarizes the strategy and actions Agesilaos was repeating like a wrestler and provides a summarized scene so that the narratee may visualize and comprehend the maneuver.256 The chapter ends with a final resultant event, enemy being

---

256 Shipley (1997) 396-397 notes that Plutarch dresses up this final military success of Agesilaos with ornamentation noting the alliteration, rhyming, and “rapid, short sentences.”
defeated, which proves Agesilaos’ military acumen and the accuracy of his foresight and advice. The king has thus been redeemed.

Diodoros’ version of the battle (15.93.3-6) is markedly different; there, Agesilaos escapes from the city, is pursued, and then takes the position between the canals himself rather than driving the enemy onto the strip of land. Plutarch does not mention the pursuit of Agesilaos by the Egyptians, likely because this would have marred the image of Agesilaos redeemed, but does give a more detailed account of the maneuvers.257

After this things went well for the Egyptian and successfully in security; and adoring and treating him affectionately, he asked Agesilaos to stay and spend the winter with him. But Agesilaos was intent upon returning to the war at home, knowing his city needed money and was raising mercenary troops. And so he sent him off with great pomp and ceremony, receiving, in addition to honors and gifts, also two hundred and thirty talents of silver for the war.

The final chapter of the story begins with the summarized resultant event of Agesilaos’ successful military tactics: Nektanebis secured his claim on the throne. The progression of the narrative of Agesilaos in Egypt, from mockery at his arrival and humiliation at his assigned command, to an execution of betrayal and accusations of treason, to his careful calculations and exercise of patience, and his eventual redemption by his actions has served to all but rescue the

---

257 Considering that Diodoros reversed the names of Tachos and Nektanebis, perhaps he was also confused about who performed which action in this encounter.
hero’s character in the final stages of the narrative. The narrator has indeed shown a steady
decline in the effectiveness of Agesilaos in politics and as a leader in Greece. In fact, when the
calculate left Greece, the narrator had directly commented on the stubborn viciousness of his
subject (35.3) and the steady deterioration of Agesilaos’ reputation in the eyes of his
contemporaries. This negative portrayal continued throughout the majority of the Egyptian
narrative, but with hints from the narrator and his narrative that the king would rescue his doxa—at
least as far as the Egyptians were concerned. And indeed, it was Agesilaos’ sagacity alone that
brought Nektanebis and his forces deliverance from a prolonged siege, which he had specifically
warned them against. Now at the start of this final chapter, the narrator succinctly presents the
fruits of Agesilaos’ action: Nektanebis won the throne and Agesilaos won his respect. But still
the narrator hints at that stubborn viciousness with which he had condemned his character before
he left Greece (35.3); Nektanebis asked Agesilaos to stay and winter in Egypt, but Agesilaos still
possessed a single vision and goal: to return to and prolong the deleterious war at home. This
was, after all, the purpose of his expedition to Egypt as Sparta was in dire need of funds for its
war coffers. The amount of money received for his mercenary service, 230 silver talents, is
given among the summarized honors and gifts with which Nektanebis bid Agesilaos farewell.

40.2-40.3

Χειμῶνος δ’ ὄντος ἡδη τῆς γῆς ἔχομενος ταῖς ναυσὶ καὶ παρὰ τὴν Λιβύην εἰς
χωρίον ἐρημοῦ κομισθεῖς, ὃ καλοῦσε Μενελάου λιμένα, θυμησκεί, βιώσας μὲν
ὀγδοίκοντα καὶ τέσσαρα ἐπὶ, βασιλεύσας δὲ τῆς Σπάρτης ἕνι τῶν
teosoarkonta pleon, καὶ τούτῳ ὑπὲρ τριάκοντα πάντων μέγιστος καὶ
dynastwatos genômenvs kai schedv ólvs tis Êllâdos ἥγεμων kai basilevs
komisvēs ἁρρι τῆς ἐν Λεύκτροις μάχης. Ὑπὸς δ’ ὄντος Λακωνικοῦ τῶν μὲν
állonv ἐπὶ ἕτερης ἀποθανόντων αὐτοῦ τὰ σώματα κηδεύειν καὶ ἀπολείπειν,
tα δὲ τῶν βασιλέων οἶκανε κομιζειν, οἱ παρόντες Σπαρτιάται κηροῦ

258 Plut. Ages. 36.2; Cartledge (1987) 328.
259 Compare this to the 1000 talents he brought back from his Asian expedition (chapter 19.3).
And holding by the land with the ships, as it was already winter, and having been
carried along Libya to a desolate place, which is called the Harbor of Menelaos,
he died; having lived for eighty-four years, and having been king of Sparta for the
greater part of forty-one years, and for over thirty of these he was the greatest and
most powerful of all and regarded as leader and king of nearly all Hellas until the
battle at Leuktra. And since it was a custom of the Lakedaimonians to bury and
leave the bodies of those who die in a foreign land there, but to convey those of
their kings homeward, the Spartans who were there melted bees-wax over his
body, since there was no honey, and brought it to Lakedaimon. His son,
Archidamos, inherited the kingship from him, and it remained in his family until
Agis, whom Leonidas killed, when he was attempting to restore the constitution
of the fathers—he was the fifth generation from Agesilaos.

The narrator summarizes in simple text the final movements of Agesilaos as he made his
way back to Sparta during the winter of 360/59. His death is announced by the narrator in simple
text and without scenic drama and only the location of his death is identified in passing, so
fittingly named after the Homeric king of Sparta. Not only does this echo, although imperfectly,
the moment when Agesilaos had imitated Agamemnon before embarking for Asia, but, unlike
Agamemnon, Menelaos met a quiet end to his life. The narrator marks the boundaries of
Agesilaos’ success as being the thirty years between his ascension in 400 until the Battle of
Leuktra in 371. The final narratorial commentary on the story’s hero is favorable, however
qualified by applied chronological limits, and echoes previous focalized and direct assessments
of Agesilaos that had peppered the narrative.²⁶⁰

The narrator ends the story with a short explanation of Spartan royal burial customs and
one last scenic tidbit: there was no honey available to preserve Agesilaos’ body for the return

²⁶⁰ Such as Theopompos’ focalization at 10.5 and the narrator’s statement at 15.6.
trip, so those with him substituted beeswax.\textsuperscript{261} There is an allusion to Alexander here; the body of Agesilaos was sent north to Sparta upon his death, while Alexander’s body was sent to Egypt—the opposite direction. The last sentence is an external proleptic summary of Agesilaos’ family line from Archidamos to Agis, who became one of the Spartan kings in 245 B.C.E. and whose life marked the end of the glory of those who had lived according to the Lykourgian ideal.

\textsuperscript{261} Cf. Diod. 15.93.6 wherein the narrator there says that Agesilaos’ body was preserved in honey in accordance with Spartan tradition. Nepos, however, also notes that the body was preserved in wax instead of honey (\textit{Ages.} 8.7).
Conclusions

The proceeding analysis of the narration and structure of Plutarch’s *Agesilaos* has demonstrated that the work is more than a re-presentation of Xenophonic materials and has far more literary and historical value than being a quasi-historical work from which tidbits of historical information may be selected and picked out by modern scholars. Instead, this story about Agesilaos penetrates into the personal motivations that shaped the course of Spartan and Greek history in the fourth century B.C.E. By analyzing the function of the narrator, his manipulation of the sources, and his commentary on historical events, we begin to understand how this text functions and produces effects upon the reader.

Selection and arrangement of events is the primary means the narrator has control over the story, and this is particularly the case in a historiographical piece where the author can make selections from other sources, like Xenophon. The narrator’s omission of particular events, like that of the conspiracy of Kinadon during the beginning of Agesilaos’ reign, serve to shape the story’s direction and reveal motivations. In that example, the narrator did not want to hint at Spartan internal dissent at this early point in the story, preferring instead to delay discussion of such dissent until later in the narrative when Sparta’s decline became a central theme, nor did he want to contradict his characterization of Agesilaos as the “most harmonious king” that he had provided in the passages just prior. Other omissions, like that of the first encounter of Agesilaos’ cavalry with Pharnabazos, serve to compress the events for a briefer presentation without significant loss in comprehension of the progression of events.

The narrator controlled the direction and rhythm of the text to produce a dynamic story that compels the reader to interact with the narrator’s presentation of the story and mentally

---

262 See commentary on 6.1.1 above for discussion of the omission of the Kinadon conspiracy.
263 See commentary on 9.2.2-9.3.1 for discussion of the omission of this encounter and further discussion of narratorial motives.
participate in the examination of character. The story of Agesilaos was primarily presented chronologically with frequent interruptions of the progression with anachronies, which either provide background information on events or situations or aid in structuring the story by reestablishing themes and narratorial commentaries, which direct the narratee’s attention to specific ideas and shape the interpretation of events. Many anachronies were employed throughout the Agesilaos. One of the first significant anachronies was the analepsis that provided the background story to Timaia’s affair with Alkibiades. This then became the argument used against Leotychides by Lysander that enabled Agesilaos to assume the throne and thus is vital to the Plutarchian narrator’s story progression.\footnote{See commentary on 3.1-3.2 above for analysis of this analepsis.} Other anachronies, like the prolepsis in 13.2-13.3, wherein, while discussing the guest-friendship between Agesilaos and Pharnabazos’ son, the narrator pauses the chronology for an internal prolepsis that completed the scene of the boy’s offer of friendship that came before, and, more importantly, served to illustrate Agesilaos’ loyalty as philos and thus further the narrator’s characterization of Agesilaos as an indulgent friend. The story’s rhythm was effected by the use of summaries and scenes. Summaries, like that of battles of Sardis and Leuktra, condensed events in order to maintain focus upon the narrative’s main character, Agesilaos, as well as move the story forward. Scenes, in contrast, slowed the rhythm and allowed the narrator to provide visual detail and heighten the drama of the selected event, like the defense of Sparta from the invasions of Epaminondas.

Self-characterization by the narrator was an important factor in establishing an influential persona with the authority to analyze historical events, criticize sources, and penetrate character. The Plutarchian narrator is not usually overt in Agesilaos, but that is not to say he maintains covertness as a rule; indeed, he can be quite overt and refers to himself and his research on several occasions, but does not insert himself into the work to the degree that the narrator of
Xenophon’s *Agesilaos* does. Moreover, he is judgmental in that he provides frequent commentary and influences reception; it is his critical use of sources, citations, as well as his use of focalization that enables him to establish an authoritative self-characterization. In contrast, characterization of others within the story, if not commented on directly by the narrator, was often effected through focalization. Focalizations not only were often employed to substantiate comments made directly by the narrator, such as that of Agesilaos being a small man which was supported by the quote of the ephors against Archidamos in 2.3, but they also contributed drama to the story, such as the focalization of the vision at Aulis, or provided the narrator with distance from a judgment, such as the account of Timaia’s affair as focalized through Duris.

The Plutarchian narrator has to convince his reader of his authority and erudition in matters not only of history, but also in his ability to present and astutely comment upon the nature of a man’s *ethos* and the effects of this *ethos* upon the course of history. He builds his authority with the narratee in several ways that have been examined in the commentary. For instance, the narrator frequently invokes the reference level by citing names of his sources, comparing his own research to those of others, employing “to this day” examples of continuity to support his narrative, and references other works he has authored on related subjects. Additionally, he avoids making direct characterizations or presentations of characters’ motives and instead uses focalization to do this; this is especially true when a negative aspect of character is involved. When he does make direct characterizations and presentations of motives, he follows his comments with focalizations or example events that corroborate his narrative.

The analysis was able to demonstrate that several motivations directed the narrator’s presentation of Agesilaos’ story. The first narratorial motivation in constructing the story of Agesilaos was to portray and characterize the king’s *ethos* as a didactic guide to his narratee on
the effects of one’s character on actions and events. The second narratorial motivation was to display the effects of Agesilaos’ *ethos* on his reign and the course of Sparta’s own history. Understanding the smaller pieces of the whole in relation to the whole mirrors the larger authorial motivation of the *Bioi*—examining the course of the world in reference to individuals.
**Glossary**

**actorial motivation**: the “why” in terms of a character’s actions and intentions, usually explicit.

**analepsis**: the narration of an event that took place prior to the time where it appears in the story; i.e. a “flashback.” Analepses can be internal, meaning the event took place within the chronological period covered in the story, or external, meaning the event took place before the chronological point of the beginning of the story.

**atemporal**: an event or anecdote that is not clearly situated in time. Atemporal events often are used to demonstrate a characteristic rather than clarify an event.

**(collective) anonymous spokesmen device**: devices that convey a sense of reported statement, but without the author being identified (“it is said,” “it seems,” “it was believed,” etc.). Thus they function as validations of statements as focalized through anonymous contemporary spokesmen.

**complex (narrator) text**: the parts of the text which are presented by the narrator, but who is presenting a focalization of a character (embedded focalization).

**embedded narrative**: a narrative situated within the main narrative; usually in the form of an analepsis or prolepsis.

---

265 Glossary definitions are adopted and adapted from Prince (1987) and de Jong, Nünlist, and Bowie (2004).
**embedded focalization**: those parts of a text where a narrator presents the perceptions, emotions, or words in indirect speech of a character; embedded focalization in Plutarch’s *Agesilaos* is usually marked by a verb of seeing or perceiving; cf. complex (narrator) text.

**event/ resultant event**: an event is an act or action brought about by a character or characters in the story or a happening not brought about by a character (i.e. “the sun rose”). A resultant event is an act, action, or happening that is the outcome of other events (i.e. Sphodrias is acquitted [event] and the Athenians were thus inclined to go to war [resultant event]).

**fabula**: a series events and situations in their chronological sequence which are caused or experienced by actors; this is the material from which the *story* is drawn (i.e. the biological-historical life of Agesilaos constitutes the fabula).

**focalization**: the perceptional narration of events from the point of view of an internal character (secondary or embedded focalization) or of the narrator (primary focalization).

**main story**: the narrative as presented by the primary narrator-focalizer, minus the analepses and prolepses.

**narratee**: the addressee of the narrator, whether named or implied, who is the ideal receiver of the narrative and will accept the text as it is presented by the narrator.
narrator: the one who narrates the events of the story; the Plutarchian narrator of the Agesilaos is the primary narrator-focalizer and is external to the events he describes, meaning that he does not appear as a character within the events of the story (in contrast to the Xenophonic narrator of the Anabasis).

narratorial motivation: the ‘why’ of the development of the story analyzed in terms of the aims and intentions of the narrator; often implicit.

order/arrangement: the events of a fabula that are arranged in the narrative and whose order may be manipulated in the story or interrupted by analepses and prolepses.

prolepsis: the narration of an event that took place later than the time where it appears in the story; i.e. a “flash-forward.” Prolepses can be internal, meaning the event took place within the chronological period covered in the story, or external, meaning the event took place after the chronological point of the beginning of the story.

reference level: the level between the fabula and the text that constitutes the source materials from which Plutarch derives the events for his story (i.e. Xenophon’s Hellenika and Agesilaos were references for Plutarch when formulating his narrative); the information that is available for an author to build his story.

rhythm: relation between story-time and fabula-time. A scene presents an event or situation in “real time”, i.e. roughly an equal amount of time as in the fabula, a summary quickens the
narrative rhythm and presents a series of events or situations rapidly and with less time than they would have taken in the fabula, an ellipsis skips over events and moves the story forward in the chronology, and a pause halts the progression of the chronology all together and represents no event or situation from the fabula, but usually contains the primary narrator’s perception or comments.

**seed**: the mention of a person, situation, or event in the narrative before she, he, or it have become relevant to the story. (i.e. the mention of Megabates and his beauty in Plut. *Ages*. 11.2 when he will not become relevant to the story until 11.5).

**simple (narrator) text**: the parts of the text that are presented by the narrator directly and without the embedded focalization of a character.

**story**: the events of the fabula as arranged and ordered in the text. The story consists of the main story as well as the embedded focalizations, character-texts, and narratorial commentaries.

**text**: the verbal representation of the story (and hence the fabula) by a narrator.
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