, ***De novis libris iudicia*** , Mnemosyne, ser.4:44:3/4 (1991) p.440

1) 257-263 T found these data in T R S Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* (New York 1951-86) and G Niccolini, *I fasti dei tribuni della plebe* (Milano 1934)

2) For a list of these and other *popularis* tribunes of the plebs, see my *Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (ca 80-50 B C)* (Amsterdam 1987), 199-208 (with further references)

3) For a (partial) treatise of this, see *ibidem*, 93-103 and 161-163

J. HAHN, *Der Philosoph und die Gesellschaft* Selbstverständnis, öffentliches Auftreten und populäre Erwartungen in der hohen Kaiserzeit (Heidelberger Althist. Beitr. und Epigraph. Studien, 7). Stuttgart, F. Steiner Verlag, 1989. IV, 236 p. Pr. DM 48,—.

H.'s purpose is to get a grip on the role of philosophers in Imperial society during the period from the late first century to the middle of the third century A.D. Obviously some courage is required for such an undertaking. Ancient writings of a philosophical-historical nature on the period under consideration are almost completely lacking, and the scarce biographical data on some of the more well-known philosophers are not remarkable for historical reliability. Under these circumstances it is understandable that H. has concentrated on reconstructing contemporary expectations with regard to the activities and behaviour of philosophers, an aspect on which the sources have rather more to offer. His basic assumption is that Early Imperial society had an unambiguous conception of what a philosopher was and should be, despite the problems experienced by modern scholars in classifying individual literati, especially as sophists or philosophers[1]). The nucleus of this conception was the philosopher's role as a spiritual guide, *magister artis vitae* Accordingly, the nature of the standards by which philosophers were measured was less intellectual than moral. A philosopher's way of life had to be exemplary (παράδειγμα τοῦ ἀρίστου βίου) and, therefore, radically different from the conduct of his fellow men: the philosopher was, to a certain extent, an outsider. Precisely this position enabled him to instruct and admonish his fellow men with the necessary frankness (παρρησία). The philosopher's otherness was symbolized by a carefully cultivated appearance and behaviour by which he distinguished himself from—as well as communicated with—his environment.

While reconstruction of contemporary expectations is central to H.'s method, he combines this approach with presentation and sen-

Copyright (c) 2005 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) Brill Academic Publishers

sible analysis of those data with regard to the public activities of philosophers which may, with some confidence, be considered reliable—of course the representativeness of such data is, as H. himself emphasizes, quite another matter. The author sets out the findings resulting from these combined approaches in a number of short but well-documented and instructive chapters on the various aspects of the philosopher's role in society, consistently taking into account the consequences of interaction between popular expectations, actual conduct and the development of legends. Thus, among other topics, image-building, educational activities, legal position, relations with colleagues, a philosopher's conduct in his home town and abroad, and contacts with monarchs pass in review. Attention is also given to the presence of philosophers in the urban life of Rome, Athens, Alexandria and in other settings, and to the geographical and social distribution of philosophical activity. The book contains an impressive bibliography, and consultation is facilitated by frequent cross-references, an *index locorum* and a general index.

In the light of cultural-historical scholarship of the last few decades on the Early Empire, H.'s opinion that distinguishing second-century philosophers and sophists would have offered no noticeable problems to contemporary observers, deserves special attention. To make a reasonable case for his contention H. devotes a chapter (p. 46-53) to Philostratus who, in his *Lives of the Sophists*, introduces beside the 'sophists properly so called' the rather confusing category of 'philosophers reputed to be sophists' (*VS* 479 and 492). H. adduces a number of other testimonia from contemporaries which show that sophists—just like philosophers but in a totally different way—distinguished themselves by a carefully maintained image, characterized in their case by a public show of glamour. Here H.'s chief witness is Artemidorus, but he convincingly demonstrates that the oneirocritic's picture is more representative for contemporary perception than the smoke screen put up by the author of the *VS*. He argues that Philostratus' annexation of a number of philosophers as sophists is just another illustration of the author's preoccupation with rhetorical performance and should not be adduced as an argument to deny the existence among contemporaries of an unambiguous conception of the philosopher, distinguished by an austerity totally uncharacteristic of sophists. H.'s relativization of the philostratean evidence on this issue is especially welcome in the light of the recent allegation by A. Brancacci that

Copyright (c) 2005 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) Brill Academic Publishers

Philostratus' conception of 'philosophers reputed to be sophists' was meant to discriminate an important group of intellectuals from the "declamatori che popolano le pagine più numerose delle *Vite dei sofisti*, e con i quali Filostrato stesso non desiderava essere confuso"[2]). Personally I fail to detect in Philostratus' *VS* any indication of the author's inner distance from the 'declamatori', and I am strenghtened in my inability to do so by H., who puts the introduction of the *Lives of the Sophists* into its proper perspective.

Affirming that Early Imperial society had an unambiguous conception of the philosopher is not tantamount to a denial of the fact that figures like Favorinus of Arelate or Maximus of Tyrus moved somewhere on the borderline between philosophy and sophistry. The advantage, however, of H.'s approach is that by reconstructing the contemporary image of the philosopher it becomes possible to analyse in which role speakers or writers present themselves in specific texts. The present reviewer was especially impressed by the apt handling, in the chapters on the philosopher in his home town and abroad (p. 156-171), of a number of orations of Dio Chrysostom. In the Bithynian orations evidence of self-presentation as a philosopher appears to be almost completely lacking; in his native city and province Dio prefers to refer to his position as a prominent member of the urban and provincial aristocracy. In the orations held in Tarsus, Phrygian Apamea and Alexandria on the other hand, Dio constantly emphasizes his vocation as a philosopher and fully exploits the advantages that go with it, namely recognition by the audience of his impartiality and the privilege of free speech.

Given the scope of this book occasional lapses are hardly avoidable. On p. 117 H. suggests that, according to Tacitus, the cynic philosopher Demetrius was exiled after the Pisonian conspiracy. But Tacitus (*Ann* 16.34 f.) only mentions Demetrius' presence during Thrasea's last hours and tells nothing about the cynic being exiled during Nero's reign, which is hardly more than conjecture based on a combination of the fact mentioned by the historian, and the chronologically rambling story told by Philostratus (*VA* 4.42) about a banishment in the early sixties ordered by Tigellinus[3]). On p. 117 f. there is some confusion on the alleged contacts of Apollonius of Tyana with Musonius Rufus. Possibly there was an independent epistolary tradition on these contacts: in the letters quoted in *VA* 4.46 Apollonius "emerges as a man of lesser stature than Musonius"[4]), which makes it rather

Copyright (c) 2005 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) Brill Academic Publishers

improbable that these letters are Philostratean inventions. The story told in *VA* 5.19 about the meeting of Demetrius and Musonius on the Isthmus, on the other hand, does not affect Apollonius' reputation—contrary to what I understand H. contends. On p. 187, n. 30, *Epp Apoll.* 53 (Claudius to Tyana) and 59 (Garmus to Neogyndes) are referred to as examples of Apollonius' contacts with emperors and kings in the epistolary tradition on the Tyanean. However, C. P. Jones has demonstrated that the author of *Ep* 53 is probably not the emperor but a Roman citizen of Greek extraction[5]), while *Ep* 59 is a foreign body in the collection.

But none of these minor criticisms affect the validity of H.'s conclusions on the larger issues involved. This book is a welcome contribution to the cultural history of the Early Empire and deserves to be read by scholars and advanced students interested in the life and literature of the period.

1055 NN Amsterdam, Gibraltarstraat 6″

J. J. Flinterman

1) See i a G W Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1969), 10-15; G R Stanton, *Sophists and Philosophers Problems of Classification*, AJPh 94 (1973), 350-364; C P Jones, *The Reliability of Philostratus*, in: G W Bowersock (ed), *Approaches to the Second Sophistic* Papers Presented at the 105th Annual Meeting of the American Philological Association (Pennsylvania 1974), 11-16, esp 12-14, and cp G Anderson, *Philostratus* Biography and Belles Lettres in the Third Century A D (London 1986), 8-10

2) A Brancacci, *Rhetorike philosophousa* Dione Crisostomo nella cultura antica e bizantina (Napoli 1985), 91

3) Cp M Griffin, *Nero* The End of a Dynasty (London 1984), 171 and 282 n 33

4) E L Bowie, *Apollonius of Tyana Tradition and Reality*, in: *ANRW* 2 16 2 (Berlin/New York 1978), 1657

5) C P Jones, *A martyria for Apollonius of Tyana*, Chiron 12 (1982), 137 ff

F. Hinard (éd), *La mort, les morts et l'au-delà dans le monde romain*. Actes du colloque de Caen 20-22 Novembre 1985. Caen, Université de Caen, 1987. 376 pp.

Death has become popular among historians from the moment Ariès published his magisterial *L'homme devant la mort*. Ancient historians and archaeologists to whom epitaphs and tombs have always been their bread and butter, have no difficulty in joining in

Copyright (c) 2005 ProQuest Information and Learning Company
Copyright (c) Brill Academic Publishers