



## Philosophy and Power in the Graeco-Roman World: Essays in Honour of Miriam Griffin

Gillian Clark and Tessa Rajak

Print publication date: 2002

Print ISBN-13: 9780198299905

Published to Oxford Scholarship Online: January 2010

DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198299905.001.0001

## Philosophy in the Second Sophistic

Glen W. Bowersock

DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198299905.003.0009

### Abstract and Keywords

This chapter explores the extraordinary power of philosophy in the 2nd century, when Roman emperors had stopped sneering at philosophy, and intellectuals were high fashion. Philostratus labelled this period the Second Sophistic, because, as in Athens at the time of Socrates, intellectuals who could give a good performance were admired and highly paid. The chapter traces the changing reception in modern scholarship of this 'performance philosophy' and its startling reversals. Philosophers who were (on principle) shabby and hairy had makeovers and presented themselves as the media stars they were, so that nobody knew what an intellectual looked like any more. Philosophers seek knowledge, sophists boldly claim to have it: but now a philosopher with sufficient rhetorical brilliance might achieve the status of sophist. Philosophy brought worldly success.

*Keywords:* Second Sophistic, philosophy, philosophers, sophists

Miriam Griffin and I have known each other for more than forty years, and it is a particular joy to offer her this paper in celebration of a distinguished career. We met at Harvard University in a class taught by Sir Ronald Syme when he was a visiting professor there in late 1956, and we both left America for Oxford to begin further study in the damp autumn of the following year. Philosophy has

always been important in Miriam Griffin's approach to Roman history (I well remember her immersion in Seneca already in 1957), and so her interest in philosophy has prompted me after more than thirty years to revisit some old and familiar territory, the culture of the so-called Second Sophistic.<sup>1</sup>

Dr Griffin published a thoughtful review of my *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Griffin 1971), and at the end she observed: 'the age of the great sophists is largely the product of the fact that the Roman Emperors had ceased to sneer. It is not only that more and more Greeks were admitted to the imperial administration, but also that Greek values were increasingly accepted. The first of the Julio-Claudians could not have written philosophy seriously in Greek ...'. If Marcus Aurelius did precisely that, it is undoubtedly right to suggest that Roman culture had changed. The sophists were both symptom and cause, and in subsequent years a lively debate opened up as to their importance and their relation with the Roman government (see Bowie 1970, 1982). But with a few exceptions philosophers did not figure in this debate until recently.

Yet the sophistic movement was, as Marcus's philosophical writing implies, closely allied with the prevalence and practice of Greek philosophy. For about a generation this issue lay undeveloped, as discussion of the Second Sophistic concentrated on the training of *pepaideumenoí* and the (p.158) possibility of an implied assertion of Greek superiority over Rome.<sup>2</sup> The discussion became repetitive and sterile.<sup>3</sup> But in the last decade the whole subject has been dramatically reinvigorated, in large part by a powerful group of mostly younger scholars. A series of fresh and exciting studies of the Second Sophistic from the perspectives of anthropology, archaeology, art, and gender studies have located the movement within a subtle system of expectations and prejudices, of values and rewards that were embedded in imperial Greek culture and society. For the older generation the credibility of Philostratus had always been the central issue, which some of us had imagined could be persuasively judged through epigraphy. But the new generation has turned to images, self-representation, public display, and personal conduct (even grooming). This illuminating work has emboldened me to attempt a new look at the relation between sophists and philosophers by way of tribute to Miriam Griffin. Most of the work that has inspired me to do this has appeared between 1994 and 2000. The honorand will, I know, take as much pleasure as I do in saluting the progress that has been made.

If we look back, it is plain that study of the Second Sophistic was gravely impeded by the dismissive opinion that Wilamowitz once expressed of the movement. In reviewing Boulanger's work on Aristides Wilamowitz declared (1925: 421): 'Boulanger has not freed himself from the quite useless invention of Philostratus, the Second Sophistic' (von der schlechthin unbrauchbaren Erfindung des Philostratos, der zweiten Sophistik, hat er sich nicht losgemacht).<sup>4</sup> It was all too easy to fault Philostratus for promoting the likes of

himself through his *Lives of the Sophists*, to assert that his heroes were nonentities and that the phenomenon for which he created a name was insignificant and ephemeral. But the burgeoning epigraphical record gradually gave the lie to Wilamowitz's scepticism, and there was no point in fretting over the name. Something of consequence was going on, and it was simpler to take over Philostratus' name for it than to invent another. The role of the sophists in both local and imperial corridors of power proved to be very much as Philostratus had described it.

Curiously an unexpected revival of Wilamowitz's attitude came as late as 1994 in Brunt's provocative paper, 'The Bubble of the Second Sophistic'. Since it appeared just as studies of the topic had indeed become repetitive and unproductive, it was hard at the time not to sympathize with Brunt's (p.159) impatience. But much of his argument looks as if it had been assembled long before. It documents Brunt's profound interest in second-century Greek thought, an interest that extends all the way back to his early days as a student of Hugh Last. It is true that thinkers of the age, including philosophers and the great doctor Galen, had no great opinion of the sophists, and Brunt undertook to read their testimony as an accurate account of the historical situation. He opined that the great majority of sophists whose biographies Philostratus chose not to write 'were probably men of little repute resident in small towns' (Brunt 1994:20).<sup>5</sup> That is simply false. For example, T. Flavius Phylax, called a laughing-stock by Philostratus, was honoured at Olympia and belonged to the Athenian Areopagus. So teros, roughly treated by Philostratus, turns out to have been an eminent person at Ephesus.<sup>6</sup> Athens and Ephesus were not small towns.

The six categories into which Brunt arranged attestations of the word 'sophist' only serve to illustrate an exceptionally rich semantic field, which cannot be accommodated in pigeonholes. The word could be used pejoratively, as Galen used it, or descriptively to indicate a rhetor. But, more than that, it could be used as a term of abuse even by those to whom it applied. Aelius Aristides is a famous case of this. And, as von Steadten (1997) has demonstrated in a brilliant paper on Galen and the Second Sophistic, Galen himself was as much apart of the sophistic phenomenon as any of the professional rhetoricians. His disparaging comments on sophists were part of his own self-representation in a highly competitive environment.

It is precisely the cultural environment and its anthropological coding that the new generation of scholars has been able to expose so persuasively. I think above all of the contributions of Johannes Hahn (1989), Maud Gleason (1995), Thomas Schmitz (1997), Maria Domitilla Campanile (1999), and Stephen Harrison (2000).<sup>7</sup> Their work has been substantially reinforced by that of Paul Zanker (1995) on the image of the intellectual in (p.160) ancient art. Brunt's problem arose from his nearly exclusive emphasis on literary texts and philosophical ideas. Inasmuch as the strength of the sophists did not lie in this

area but in public performance and showmanship, it proved easy to dismiss them. Yet their lives proclaimed a disposition and an attitude of mind that linked them with other intellectuals and pseudo-intellectuals, even if they did not contribute much profound thought to those who consorted with them. As Philostratus, the inscriptions, and even the coins (Münsterberg 1915) all make plain, their careers depended upon the commerce in Hellenic traditions—the history of the Greeks, their philosophy, and their language. The sophists were part not only of local aristocracies and the Roman administration but of a vast and complex cultural fabric that is only now becoming clear. Philosophy, like Galen's medicine, was obviously an essential component of that fabric.

Philostratus had seen this perfectly, although in the past his words have given rise to some perplexity. He believed that sophistic rhetoric was in origin philosophic rhetoric.<sup>8</sup> They shared themes in common, but philosophers were in search of knowledge whereas sophists claimed to possess it. Yet it is clear that what really mattered was not knowledge but style. Among those whom Philostratus chose to commemorate in his *Lives of the Sophists* were six whom he recognized to be philosophers rather than sophists in the full sense of the term (*οἱ κύριοι προσρηθέντες σοφισταί*, 492).<sup>9</sup> These are Eudoxus of Cnidos, who was honoured as sophist in view of his brilliant style and improvisatory skill; Leon of Byzantium, a pupil of Plato whose variety of rhetorical styles entitled him to be called a sophist; Dias of Ephesus, an Academic who used his talent effectively for political advocacy; Carneades of Athens, who spoke as splendidly as he practised philosophy; Philostratus the Egyptian, who was alleged to have studied philosophy with Cleopatra and to have adopted a highly perfumed style of oratory; Theomnestus of Naucratis, another philosopher who spoke exceptionally well; and, from the era of the Second Sophistic, Dio of Prusa (Chrysostom) and Favorinus. In introducing this group at the beginning of his work Philostratus explicitly stated that they were not sophists (*οὐκ ὄντες σοφισταί*) but seemed to be (*δοκοῦντες*) and hence acquired the name. When he completed his account of the six figures, he repeated the same point all over again. He tells us that he has written about philosophers who had the reputation of being sophists (*ὅπερ τῶν φιλοσοφησάντων ἐν δόξῃ τοῦ σοφιστεῦσαι*).

**(p.161)** It sounds very much as if Philostratus and his readers knew how to tell the difference between a philosopher and a sophist, and yet they acknowledged that rhetorical brilliance might entitle a philosopher to the sophistic label. Since neither in Philostratus nor anywhere else is a sophist said to acquire the reputation of philosopher, it would seem as if the titular mobility did not go in both directions. This may perhaps be the result of a sophist's certainty about what he is saying, but there is an implication here that the rank of sophist is actually higher than that of philosopher. That implication is borne out in Lucian's *Rhet. Pr.* 1. where the name of sophist is presented as the pinnacle of success in public speaking:

ἔρωτᾷς ὧ μαιράκιον, ὅπως ἂν ῥήτωρ γένοιο καὶ τὸ σεμνότατον τοῦτο καὶ πάντιμον ὄνομα σοφιστῆς αὐτὸς εἶναι δόξαις.

You ask, my young fellow, how you may become a public speaker and yourself seem to embody this most august and honoured name of 'sophist'.

(Compare *Pseudolog.* 19.10 ἤδη τιμώμενος πρὸς αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ νῦν ῥήτωρ καὶ σοφιστῆς—already honoured by them, but now a rhetor and a sophist.<sup>10</sup>) By contrast, the language that Philostratus used to describe a philosopher who seemed to be a sophist, or enjoyed the reputation of a sophist, is exactly matched by the language of the great second-century sophist Polemo about a philosopher he hated, Favorinus. In his *Physiognomonica* Polemo asserted that Favorinus made use of the Greek language so very well that he was called a sophist (Hoffmann apud Foerster 1893: 163). Although we have Polemo's words only in an Arabic translation, it is clear that he is referring to the dazzling use of Greek in Favorinus' public speaking (*wa kāna qad ta'allama al-lughatal-yunāniyyata wa-l-kalāma 'layhā wa hadhā min kathrati kalāmihi wa kāna yusammā sūfistay*: He had studied the Greek language and its usage, which he mastered so thoroughly that he was called a sophist). He stresses the spoken use (*kalām*) of the language.

But coruscating rhetoric was not the only thing that distinguished the sophists from most philosophers. They looked different, as Philostratus makes embarrassingly plain in his account of the career change of Aris tóeles of Pergamum. This man had begun as a philosopher of the Peripatetic school but was eventually attracted to the sophists, especially Herodes Atticus. 'As long as he was a student of philosophy,' says Philostratus, 'he was slovenly in appearance, unkempt and squalid in his dress, but now he began to be fastidious, discarded his slovenly ways, and admitted into his house all the pleasures that are afforded by the lyre, the flute, and the (p.162) singing voice.' The long unkempt hair and scruffy beard were essential parts of the philosopher's image, as Maud Gleason (1995) has so convincingly shown.<sup>11</sup> That image projected an atmosphere of unmitigated masculinity. Lucian made this all too obvious in his *Demonax*, when the philosopher of the title declares that his ὄρχεις (testicles) constitute his qualifications for doing philosophy. By contrast the sophists were magnificent and fastidious. Polemo travelled in a chariot adorned with silver and accompanied by a grand retinue of animals and slaves (Philost. *Vit. Soph.* 532). Alexander Peloplaton cultivated an elegant appearance that left his audiences gasping. He wore a trim beard, manicured his nails, cleaned his teeth, and always smelt of perfume (*Vit. Soph.* 569–72).

If the categories of philosopher and sophist were traditionally distinct in appearance (and sometimes in odour), the spheres of their activity were distinct as well. In a well-known passage in Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica* philosophers

and sophists, as dream objects, are sharply distinguished. The former are associated with priests and prophets, the latter with public figures who come into contact with the masses (*ὄχλος*) and those who play musical instruments with their mouths (Hahn 1989: 47–8). Philosophers belonged to a closed confraternity, it seems, whereas sophists belonged to the public. Yet it was in the passage into the public arena that these distinctions became confused.

Apuleius confronted the problem directly when he delivered his *Apology* before the proconsul Claudius Maximus at Sabratha. He had a reputation as a philosopher to maintain (*philosophus Platonicus* as he was later to Augustine and was probably styled on an acéphalous inscription, Harrison 2000: 5 n. 19,8 n. 32). The proconsul himself had philosophical interests, to which Apuleius flatteringly alluded. Yet Apuleius was a superb speaker, a Latin sophist, as Harrison rightly calls him, and the very speech he delivered is proof of his prowess. He had, therefore, to look like a philosopher since his accusers had portrayed him as ‘good-looking and as effective a speaker in Greek as in Latin’ (*formosum et tarn Graece quant Latine ... disertissimum*) (*Apol.* 4). Apuleius presented himself to the court as a man of mediocre looks at best, who had become a human wreck through constant **(p.163)** study. He was pale and weak, his hair a tangled mess. He must have given particular attention to preparing his hair in a philosophically sordid fashion: ‘so, I think, the charge against my hair, which they meant to be so-to-speak a capital charge against me, is sufficiently refuted’ (*satis utputo crinium crimen, quod Mi quasi capitale intenderunt, refutatur*).<sup>12</sup>

With Apuleius we have another crossover no less remarkable than Dio of Prusa and Favorinus. The careers of these three, and especially the last, lead us directly to the topic for which the recent work on image and performance in the Second Sophistic has now laid a solid foundation. That is the surprising emergence of certain philosophers as performance artists. Cultural distinctions can often be discerned most sharply when they are violated, as is undoubtedly the case here. The sophist-philosophers ceased to be members of a closed and quasi-sacred confraternity, they ceased to be unkempt, and they performed before the public. The matted hair of Apuleius at Sabratha was, in fact, part of his performance in court. It provided Paul Zanker (1995: 222–9) with a leitmotif of a valuable section of his work on the image of the intellectual: ‘Die ungekämmtten Haare des Apuleius’. Apuleius’ opponents had no doubt observed him on other occasions when he might well have been characterized *asformosus*. The question arises whether these crossover personalities spent their careers switching back and forth between a public sophistic image and a studious philosophical one. This is inherently implausible, and we must assume that Apuleius’ quick change was a unique expedient designed for courtroom consumption.

It would appear that the performing sophist-philosopher behaved as extravagantly as any sophist worthy of the name. In a tantalizing brief scrap from the *Florida* Apuleius congratulates his audience in the theatre for coming to hear him, where they might otherwise have been watching a mime, a tight-rope walker, or a comedy:

Bono enim studio in theatrum convenistis, ut qui sciatis non locum auctoritatem orationi derogare, sed cum primis hoc spectandum esse, quid in theatro deprehen-das. Nam si mimus est, riseris, si funerepus, timueris, si comoedia est, faveris, si philosophus, didiceris. (Apul. *Flor.* 5, see Harrison 2000: 101).

For you have congregated in the theatre with good intent, you who know that location cannot detract from the authority of a speech, but that which you find in the **(p.164)** theatre is something you absolutely must see. For if it is a mime, you will laugh, if a tight-rope walker, you will be frightened and if a comedy, you will applaud; but if it is a philosopher, you will learn.

All good entertainment, but a philosopher provides instruction as well as entertainment. Harrison has properly compared Dio of Prusa's account of the value of his public speeches in his *Olympic*, where he contrasts his mission of imparting wisdom through his oratorical brilliance with that of others who are not philosophically inclined. It is, he asserts, as if he were the owl among birds of varied plumage.

It is fortunate that we have now reached a stage in our understanding of Dio that we have no longer to contend with an unfortunate hypothesis, propagated by Synesius of Cyrene and developed influentially by H. von Arnim (1898), that Dio first had a sophistic phase in his career and then a philosophical one. Four scholars, three of them in the same year, have now independently repudiated this unhelpful notion, as Schmitz (1997: 86 n. 69) correctly observed:

Die von Dion selbst (Or. 13. 12) erzählte Geschichte, er habe sich während seines Exils zur Philosophie bekehrt, wurde in der Neuzeit gerne geglaubt, und manche Philologen meinen, alie seine Schriften in eine 'sophistische' und eine 'philoso-phische' Period unterteilen zu können... Die Arbeiten von Desideri, Moles, Jones, und Swain hätten diese Bekehrungshypothese endgültig ein Ende bereiten soil en.<sup>13</sup>

The tale recorded by Dio himself, that he turned to philosophy during his exile (*Or.* 13. 12), has been readily believed in modern times, and many scholars think that all his writings can be divided into a 'sophistic' and a 'philosophic' phase... The work of Desideri [1978], Moles [1978], [C. P.] Jones [1978], and Swain [1996] should have finally put an end to this hypothesis of conversion.

Philosophy and sophistic were by no means separate compartments or separate evolutionary phases in the cases of the three major crossover figures. The two activities were inextricably meshed because public performance was integral to both. Furthermore, movement from sophistic practice to philosophy was movement in the wrong direction. Dio himself knew that he ranked as a sophist, and a garrulous one at that, when he amusingly cited a mischievous critic who called him the ‘nightingale of the sophists’ (*ἀηδὼν τῶν σοφιστῶν*) because he never stopped talking (*Or.* 47. 16).

The cases of both Apuleius and Dio suggest that when a philosopher (**p.165**) accepted the evidently higher calling of sophist he put aside the masculine squalor that was traditionally associated with philosophy. This violation of conventional external signs is nowhere more conspicuous than in the most remarkable of all the crossover philosophers, Favorinus of Arélate. If Polemo hated him and composed in his *Physiognomonica* what Holford-Strevens (1997:200) has justly called a ‘poison-pen portrait’, he could not, as we have seen, deny him the appellation of sophist. Favorinus was the embodiment of contradictions, as Philostratus recognized. He came from the Latin West and rose to eminence in the Greek East, he was sexually underdeveloped (with undescended testicles, it seems) but found pleasure with women, he quarrelled with an emperor and survived. But above all he was a philosopher who achieved the reputation of a sophist, and he comported himself entirely in the manner of one. There was no trace of the philosopher’s beard, since he had no beard at all, nor, for obvious reasons, could he exude an air of masculinity. As for unkempt hair and a hirsute body, he went to the opposite extreme. According to Polemo, he was greatly concerned with looking after his body, particularly the hair on his head, which he dyed in a manner that would formerly have been thought dissolute and effeminate.<sup>14</sup> He regularly applied allegedly seductive lotions to his otherwise smooth skin, and must have exuded an aura of perfume no less than Alexander Peloplaton. Favorinus calls to mind the great lionized castrati that made their careers in baroque opera. He was much sought after and admired. Both Athens and Corinth at one time had statues of him.<sup>15</sup>

It is all the more astonishing that this singular figure should have been the author of a treatise on the fife tyle of philosophers (*περὶ τῆς διαίτης τῶν φιλοσόφων*). The work is regrettably lost, but the mere fact that Favorinus wrote it is telling enough. When Miriam Griffin wrote of the acceptance of Greek values, she was not perhaps thinking of the Greek values promulgated by Favorinus in his own person, but Greek values they were none the less. These were the distinctive values generated by the Second Sophistic (**p.166**) — ostentation, ornament, and performance in both language and presence. These, as Favorinus (and to some extent Apuleius and Dio of Prusa) must have shown, were no longer incompatible with a philosophical mind. Equally the social success and public anatomical displays of Galen had transformed the image of



the doctor, so that, as von Staden has shown (1997), if Galen sounded the usual notes of scorn for sophists he nevertheless behaved as if he were one of them. There could hardly be a greater tribute to their cultural impact than this.

The philosophical sophists represented the highest level of a phenomenon that Johannes Hahn has well named *das Phänomen des Konzert-philosophen* (1989: 92). Philosophers who performed in theatres, like Apuleius, and presented philosophy in an accessible way for large audiences were by no means uncommon. Most of these performers did not merit the accolade of 'sophist', but it was the sophistic context that gave them their opportunity. Perhaps the best known of these was Maximus of Tyre, whose forty-one philosophical lectures (*διαλέξεις*) survive. Maximus clearly failed to work at a level that attracted the attention of Philostratus, but his lectures show that he aimed at beguiling his audiences with learning, not at instructing them as a teacher in the schools would have done. He stated that he left the fundamentals of philosophy, such as terminology and argument, to the *διατριβαί* since teachers were not hard to find (*Dial.* 1. 8: Trapp 1997: 236–9). Such sophists, as he called them in a purely derisive use of the term, were ubiquitous: *πάντα ὑμῖν μεστὰ τοιούτων σοφιστῶν* (*Dial.* i. 8: Trapp 1997: 239). But as a performer, who appeared in *θέατρα Ἑλληνικά* (*Dial.* 1. 10: Trapp 1997: 315), Maximus was, in fact, following the lead of the professional sophists in abandoning the traditional dress code of philosophers. He felt obliged to excuse himself for being groomed and attractively dressed. One should not judge a philosopher, said Maximus, by his external appearance (*Dial.* 1. 10: Trapp 1997: 290–3). In other words, he is repudiating the traditional coding by asking his listeners to ignore the message conveyed by external signs. He wanted them to assume that he possessed no less wisdom and goodness than those who were properly hirsute and untidy. As Hahn (1989: 96) put it: 'So ist er im Ende, obwohl er sich immer wieder gegen diese Profession verwahrt, doch eigentlich Sophist' (So in the end, although he protests again and again his opposition to this profession, he is after all really a sophist).

The breaking of the visual code is consistent with the blurring of the distinction between philosopher and public speaker. Not surprisingly many philosophers of the time disapproved of what the likes of Maximus were doing. Although a philosopher must naturally be a master of language to (p.167) convey his thoughts, entertaining the public was not part of the contemplative search for truth. Plutarch expressed himself unambiguously on this matter and by doing so documented the world of the concert philosophers: 'In a philosophic discussion we must set aside the repute (*δόξα*) of the speaker and examine what he says on its own. For in lectures, as in war, much of what goes on is without substance (*πολλὰ τὰ κενά*)' (*Plut. Mor.* 41b). Epicurus would have agreed, as Hahn (1989: 86–90) has shown.

The acceptance of sophistic norms of grooming and dress, contrary to traditional coded self-representation, was part of that larger acceptance of Greek values to which Dr Griffin referred in 1971. As in so much, Favorinus is the extreme case. But his naturally smooth skin could be paralleled with a taste for depilation in more naturally hairy sophists. Philostratus tells us that Scopelian was famous for being depilated (*Vit. Soph.* 536). Maud Gleason (1995: 69–70) has admirably examined the traditional prejudice against this practice through the frenetic protests of Clement of Alexandria, who scorned those who renounced the flower of manliness (*τὸ ἄνθος τὸ ἀνδρικόν*). He declared that the cities of the Empire were full of depilators of every kind (*Clem. Paed.* 3. 3). In this, as in other things, Clement cannot be taken as a spokesman of the world in which he lived, but rather, like Plutarch, he actually illustrates what is going on by protesting so vigorously. Depilation, which Tertullian (*Pall.* 3) described as a Greek habit (*Graecatim depilari*), had long since passed from a titillating subject of jibes in Martial (3. 74, 6. 93, 10. 65) or Juvenal (8. 114) to a widespread practice in the Eastern Empire. A recent inscription from Apamea (*SEG* 37. 1434) reveals a company depilator (*δρωπακιστής*) with the Roman troops installed there, and an Easterner may have been responsible for the appearance of the same word on a newly published Greek graffito at Ostia (*SEG* 45. 1451). It is against a background of depilation as commonplace at Antioch that one must read Julian's *Misopogon* two centuries later.

For Clement, as Gleason observed (1995: 68), one can translate grooming and dress into character traits just as a physiognomist can do with physical appearance. The observation is pertinent here because Polemo, a major sophist whose appearance was nothing if not flamboyant, was himself also physiognomist. His treatise on physiognomy, containing the cruel portrait of his enemy Favorinus to which we have already referred, is a lengthy and manifestly professional manual. Maria Domitilia Campanile (1999:288–9) has noticed that there is no reference in Philostratus' ample biography of Polemo to his activity as a physiognomist, and this, she believes, requires an explanation. She suggests that the construction of the image of a sophist, at (p.168) least for Philostratus, implied singularity—a great orator, inimitable and like no other. This construction would be weakened, in her view, by revealing: ‘uno scienzato che viaggia per feste e mercati, concorrente di medici, astrologi e interpreti di sogni’ (a sophist who travels through festivals and markets, competing with doctors, astrologers and interpreters of dreams). It is not inconceivable that Philostratus would have considered Artemidorus unfit company for Polemo, although both were snobs about their audience, but doctors, with Galen as the pre-eminent one, were certainly respectable enough. On the other hand, Favorinus, as an Academic, certainly had no use for astrologers, as we know from his friend Aulus Gellius (*Noct. Att.* 14. i, see Holford-Strevens 1988: 1978–9). Philostratus may have been reluctant to recognize the somewhat disreputable ambience of astrology, physiognomy, and dream interpretation within which the

sophists operated (Barton 1994). With all of Galen's sputtering, both sophistic and science, including what we might call pseudo-science, went well together, and it must have been tempting for hostile auditors to allege the possession of supernatural powers. Apuleius was not the only one to suffer from this. Dionysius of Miletus was thought to have used magic to improve the memory of his pupils (*γοητεύων*: Philost. *Vit. Soph.* 523).

Not surprisingly, therefore, the philosopher sophists and their lesser brethren, such as Maximus of Tyre, found themselves in a world far removed from the contemplative life. With the assault on the traditional signs of masculinity and wisdom it became difficult to construct a recognizable image of a philosopher in the Second Sophistic. Personal characteristics peculiar to one individual, such as those of Favorinus, no doubt allowed the sculptors who created his statues at Corinth and Athens to produce a reasonable likeness. But it would have been difficult to find a general code, as earlier with the bearded philosophers. That may be why, in seeking images of the intellectual in the middle of the second century, Paul Zanker had to concentrate on the textual evidence for Apuleius' reversion to a conventional type during his trial. Clear examples of portraits of intellectuals in this period are prae-ternaturally scarce, as R.R.R. Smith (1999: 452) acutely pointed out in reviewing Zanker's book:

It is most interesting then that while literature is full of references to intellectual self-styling in life, very few second-century portraits have a unitary or primary intellectual expression. Z. ventures no explanation. One obvious explanation is to hand which may be made explicit: intellectuals qua intellectuals no longer or very unusually received public statue monuments under the Roman empire. It might, in this reviewer's opinion, be profitable to look first at the self-representation of Antonine Rome and the Greek East as two separate strands rather than to run them (p.169) together. For the different audiences in (say) Ephesus and Ostia, a beard did not necessarily carry in itself precisely the same meaning.

Marcus Aurelius was well acquainted with the sophists. He heard some of them declaim and presided personally over a trial of Herodes Atticus, one of the greatest of them. His teacher Fronto (van den Hout 1999:141) was enthusiastic about the union of eloquence and philosophy: 'Philosophy will furnish what you say, eloquence how you say it' (*dabit philosophia quod dicas, dabit eloquentia quo modo dicas*). He described *eloquentia* as *comes philosophiae*. But Marcus himself steered clear of all this when he wrote his own philosophy, and yet he wrote philosophy (remarkable enough) and wrote it in Greek. He was not welcoming to the sophistic movement in his book. His aversion he attributed to the Stoic Q. Junius Rusticus, consul suffectus in 133 and consul ordinarius in 162, an aristocratic philosopher solidly rooted in the old Roman tradition. (*Med.* 1. 7. 1–2): *Παρά 'Τουστίκου τὸ λαβεῖν φαντασίαν τοῦ χρήζειν διορθώσεως καὶ θεραπείας τοῦ ἥθους καὶ τὸ μὴ ἐκτραπῆναι εἰς ζῆλον σοφιστικόν* (from Rusticus

[I learnt] to gain a conception of the need for correction and treatment in one's moral character and not to be diverted into sophistic zeal). Unlike many others of his time, Marcus believed that philosophy should not have any taint of sophistic rhetoric. He was certainly not alone in that opinion. He displayed his old Roman mores no less than his Stoic convictions even as he wrote in Greek.

With the luxuriant proliferation of philosophical sects in this age it would be difficult to categorize those sects in terms of their sympathy for concert rhetoric. An Academic such as Favorinus or Platonists such as Apuleius and Maximus seem to have had no qualms about performance philosophy. But it seems obvious that Stoics, Epicureans, and Cynics were allergic to it. Like Marcus, the Stoic Timocrates, another enemy of Favorinus, strongly opposed this kind of career, as doubtless did his teacher, the long-bearded Euphrates of Tyre (cf. Pliny, *Ep.* 1.10, *demissus capillus, ingens et cana barba*). Epicurean suspicion of rhetorical deception is beyond question (Arrighetti 1973: 175–83).<sup>16</sup> Cynics, almost by definition, were never likely to compete with the sophists. Lucian tells a delightful anecdote in his *Demonax* (50) about a Cynic before a proconsul. The Cynic greatly vexed the proconsul by his slanderous charges against a depilated man—one imagines this might have been a sophist—as being a *cinaedus*. When the governor was considering various severe punishments, (p.170) *Demonax* intervened in the Cynic's favour on the grounds that he was doing no more than practising the frank-speaking characteristic of his philosophy. The proconsul relented but asked *Demonax* what the man's fate should be if he committed such an offence again. The answer came back that the Cynic should himself be depilated. This is a powerful example of coded homoeopathy in the Graeco-Roman context.

The acceptance of Greek values in the Roman world was indisputably greater in the time of Marcus than that of Augustus, and Miriam Griffin knows better than anyone that two extravagantly philhellenic emperors, Nero and Hadrian, played a major role in this evolution. But the ambivalent response of Marcus to Hellenism illustrates R. R. R. Smith's point that the extent and manner of that acceptance was by no means the same everywhere. There were, as we can see among the feuding philosophers, internal variations within Greek culture itself as well as changing nuances as one moved from East to West. If Apuleius was, as Harrison (2000) convincingly claims, a Latin sophist, he is still different from Favorinus with his dyed hair and smooth skin or Polemo with his animals and silver-ornamented chariot. If Tertullian was, as T. D. Barnes (1971) suggested, a Christian sophist, he was none the less able to look down upon depilation as a Greek habit. The Second Sophistic had an impact upon the Empire that Wilamowitz never imagined, but that impact cannot have been uniform. In promoting and rewarding a thriving new class of philosopher lecturers, the sophists not only received a few of them into their lofty ranks at the top, where 'sophist' was a term of honour (*σεμνότατον ὄνομα*). It also created opportunities for lesser practitioners in careers where the word 'sophist' was a term of

disparagement. But without the sophists themselves such persons would have been forgotten altogether, toiling in obscurity as schoolteachers or diagnosticians.

Galen and Maximus of Tyre belonged to a generation for which philosophy no longer required a beard and filthy hair. Worldly success and an elegant, even flamboyant appearance had become an acceptable way of life for philosophers who were so inclined. And perhaps one day we shall discover whether Favorinus, who led the assault on the old conventions and codes, chose to celebrate the new dispensation when he wrote his work on the lifestyles of philosophers.

Notes:

(1) Keith Hopkins had briefly tempted me back to this terrain by inviting me to lecture on the Second Sophistic at Cambridge in March of 1997. Since my lecture consisted largely of personal reflections on the work of others, I chose not to publish it. But it signalled appreciatively the new wave of scholarship in the field, and it provoked a lively discussion to which the present paper is indebted. I am also indebted to Christopher Jones for valuable comments on this paper.

(2) Anderson 1989, 1990, 1993. Schmitz 1997 includes a balanced review of these issues.

(3) Cf. Bowersock 1992:640, *crambe repetita*, and 1998: 480, 'There is actually little here that is new or different.'

(4) Boulanger must have been appalled to read these words from so great a scholar.

(5) Observe his remark (Brunt 1994: 25 n. 1), 'Philostratus' chief value is in comments on style; in exact historical scholarship and judgement it is wanting, and it abounds in anecdotes, never to be trusted.' This reminds me of the statement I once heard from Joshua Whatmough that the chief value of the fragments of Sappho is the Greek forms conserved therein. Such confident positivism is, as Housman put it in his Cambridge inaugural, 'the felicity of the house of bondage'.

(6) On both Phylax and Soteris, see the references in Bowersock 1974: 2. For Phylax see the discussion in C. P. Jones 1972: 265–7 and account of the family, including Phylax's brother (Phoenix) and his father (Alexander). All three were sophists. For the inscription praising Soteris at Ephesos, see now *IK, Inschr. Epk.* no. 1548; cf. Schmitz 1997:142.

(7) It is worth noting that in the enormous bibliography of Swain 1996 the work of Gleason is conspicuous by its absence. Swain's denigration of Worrle 1988

(‘the now common Stadt undFest approach to the history of the Greeks under Rome’ (Swain 1996: 8)) is equally disquieting, as indicated in Bowersock 1998.

(8) cf. Brancacci 1985 on *ῥητορικὴ φιλοσοφοῦσα*, concentrating exclusively, however, on Dio of Prusa as if he were unique in his synthesis of philosophy and rhetoric.

(9) All references to the *Vit. Soph.*, are given by the Olean pagination.

(10) For the *σεμνότης* of sophists cf. Dk Chrys. *Or.* 6. 21, *τοὺς σοφιστὰς τοὺς σεμνοῦς*.

(11) In an important study of self-representation as indicative of culture and identity, R. R. Smith (1998: 80) minimizes the idea of an image of the intellectual as such in the 2nd cent. ad. He notes the scarcity of ‘the classic image of the shambling, bedraggled philosopher’ and observes: ‘It is striking that there are no really philosophical or “sophistic”-looking portrait statues surviving.’ He argues that philosophers and sophists would have received statues only in their capacity as local aristocrats, benefactors, or politicians. This may well be true of the statues offered to Dio of Prusa, but one wonders whether the statues of Favorinus would have belonged to that category, or the missing statues on surviving bases—e. g. at Delphi and Ephesus—proclaiming the honorand a sophist. See nn. 6, 12, and 16 of this paper.

(12) Cf. the elaborate defence of his long and unkempt hair that Apollonius of Tyana makes to Domitian in Philostratus’ biography (*Vit. Apoll.* 8.7,6: Kay ser 1870–1:309–1 o) or the pride that Dio of Prusa took in his long hair (*Or.* 12.15, 47.25). It would be interesting to know how he would have been represented in the portrait busts and statue that Prusa offered him (44.2). See C. P. Jones 1978:105.

(13) It should be noted that in arguing for an early date for Dio’s *Alexandrian Oration* C. P. Jones (1973: 308) had already noted the implications for H. von Arnim’s conversion hypothesis: ‘This indicates once more that von Arnim was wrong to characterise Dio before his exile as a pure sophist, like one of Philostratus’ showmen ... Dio’s early development was a more complicated process, in which sophistry and philosophy were closely intertwined.

(14) The revelation that Favorinus dyed his hair comes from a brilliant reading of the Arabic text of Polemo by the late A. F. L. Beeston, as reported in Holford-Strevens (1988: 73 n. 8). (One would like to know how many other sophists or philosophers dyed their hair.) By the simple placement of a dot over the letter *ṣād*, thereby converting it into a *dād*, an ungrammatical expression in the text is eliminated and the word for ‘dyeing’ emerges from the letters *kh-ṣ-b* as printed by Hoffmann in Foerster 1893. The manuscript contains an unpointed Arabic text, and so this solution is not even an emendation but another reading.

A new edition of this fascinating work is badly needed. Hoffmann worked from only one of the five known manuscripts.

(15) We know of the statues from Philost. *Vit. Sopk.* 490 (Athens) and Favorinus, fr. 95B (Corinth). The magistrates of both cities brought down these statues when Favorinus' fortunes had momentarily declined in favour of Polemo.

(16) The passage is cited, from the 1<sup>st</sup> edn., by C. P. Jones 1972: 265–7 in «going against the identification of the Epicurean Alexander in Plutarch's *Quaest. Cotrono.* with the sophist T. Flavius Alexander, honoured on a statue base at Delphi.

PRINTED FROM OXFORD SCHOLARSHIP ONLINE (www.oxfordscholarship.com). (c) Copyright Oxford University Press, 2018. All Rights Reserved. Un  
single chapter of a monograph in OSO for personal use (for details see www.oxfordscholarship.com/page/privacy-policy). Subscriber: Princeton University Lib



Access brought to you by: