

# Sophists and emperors: A reconnaissance of sophistic attitudes<sup>1</sup>

JAAP-JAN FLINTERMAN

## Introduction: 'Die Mentorhaltung der griechischen Redner'

In a still influential study of the opinions on Rome and its empire to be found in Greek imperial literature, Jonas Palm observed that Greek orators tended to assume an attitude of superiority *vis-à-vis* Roman emperors. He discovered this attitude in Dio's fourth oration *On Kingship* as well as in Plutarch's *To an Uneducated Ruler*. For the most forceful expression of the ideas underlying it he referred to Dio's *Or.* 49. Here Dio explains to his audience, the council of his native city of Prusa, that kings ...

... ask men of cultivation (*pepaideumenoi*) to become their counsellors (*sumbouloi*) in their most important affairs, and, while giving orders to everybody else, they themselves accept orders from those counsellors about what to do and what not to do.<sup>2</sup>

The speaker goes on to illustrate the inverted hierarchical relationship between rulers and their *sumbouloi* from the alleged position of the *magoi* among the Persians, the priests among the Egyptians, the Brahmans among the Indians and the druids among the Celts:

... in truth it was they who ruled, while the kings became their servants and the ministers of their will, though they sat on golden thrones, dwelt in great houses and dined sumptuously.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 Passages from Dio Chrysostom, Epictetus, Philostratus, and Lucian are quoted in the translations by H. Lamar Crosby, W.A. Oldfather, W.C. Wright, and A.M. Harmon respectively (all in the Loeb Classical Library); for Plutarch's *How to distinguish a flatterer from a friend* and for the *Historia Augusta* I have used the translations by R. Waterfield and A. Birley (both in Penguin Classics). Quotations from Aristides' orations are in the translation by C.A. Behr, 1981. Wherever necessary for reasons of content or style, I have taken the liberty of introducing small changes.

2 D.Chr. 49.3.

3 D.Chr. 49.8.

For the free and self-confident attitude resulting from such ideas Palm coined the phrase ‘die Mentorhaltung der griechischen Redner’.<sup>4</sup>

Although Palm characterized Dio as ‘Rhetor und Philosoph’ in the present context, he did not go into the question of what kind of orators stroke the pose of symbouleutic superiority he described. In scholarly literature on the Second Sophistic, it has sometimes been assumed that advising emperors was integral to the sophist’s role as described by Philostratus, in his *Lives of the Sophists*. For example, Ewen Bowie, in tracing models for the portrayal in the *Life of Apollonius* of the protagonist as a philosophic counsellor of emperors, has argued that “the sophist’s role as imperial adviser is a recurrent theme in the *Lives*”.<sup>5</sup> Such a line of reasoning may give rise to the idea that as far as contacts with emperors are concerned, the self-definition and self-presentation of sophists displayed a considerable overlap with the way in which philosophers defined their role. On the other hand, Johannes Hahn has argued that the public images maintained by early-imperial philosophers and sophists respectively were strikingly different, and that distinguishing between representatives of both vocations would have offered no noticeable problems to contemporary observers.<sup>6</sup> In this paper, I shall argue that accounts and evaluations of the behaviour of sophists *vis-à-vis* emperors in literary texts produced by authors belonging to the sophistic scene suggest that Hahn’s thesis also holds good for the imperial connections of sophists and philosophers respectively. The focus will be on the evidence provided by Philostratus’ *Lives of the sophists*, especially in the portrait of Aristides, and on a selection from Aristides’ own writings: the letter to Marcus Aurelius and Commodus concerning Smyrna (*Or.* 19 Keil) and the reports of a number of dreams about meetings with emperors in the *Sacred Tales* (*Or.* 47-52 Keil).<sup>7</sup>

After presenting a brief sketch of the idealized conception of the relationship between philosopher and monarch in literature from the Antonine and Severan periods, I shall describe a couple of incidents which, at first sight, might be taken to suggest striking similarities between the behaviour *vis-à-vis* emperors of philosophers and sophists. These incidents will serve to introduce a discussion of

4 Palm, 1959, 28.

5 Bowie, 1978, 1668 with n. 62, referring to Philostr. *VS* 488 (Dio), 534 (Polemo), 562 (Herodes), and 583 (Aristides). Cf. Dzielska, 1986, 49 n. 85: “He [Philostratus] shaped his [Apollonius] life according to the patterns taken from the life of Dio Chrysostom and other well-known sophists of the second century.”

6 Hahn, 1989, 46-53.

7 I am, of course, aware that this focus may run up against the objection that Aristides’ status as a sophist is debatable. Sound arguments for classifying Aristides as a sophist have been adduced by Harrison, 2000-2001, 251-252; see also Flinterman, 2002, 199.

the importance of contacts with the imperial court for sophists. The examples adduced will allow us to appreciate in which ways imperial connections appealed to the material interests and the self-esteem of sophists; the discussion will also show that the similarities between sophistic and philosophical behaviour *vis-à-vis* emperors are rather superficial and do not touch on the way in which representatives of both vocations defined their roles in relation to holders of the imperial power. An attempt to summarize the results will conclude this reconnaissance of sophistic attitudes.

### Philosopher and monarch

In a diatribe on freedom from fear, Epictetus pours scorn on people who jostle one another in front of the gates of the imperial palace. “Nothing good is distributed among those who have entered,” the philosopher warns his audience, and he underlines the futility of the pursuit of imperial honours by comparing it with the scramble for dried figs and nuts scattered among children.<sup>8</sup> A philosopher should spurn imperial honours, just as he is expected to defy the means of physical coercion available to emperors. Both his imperviousness towards what the emperor can give and his disdain for what the emperor can do to him result from his superior understanding of what a virtuous life amounts to, a clear insight in what is to be pursued and what to be avoided. In Epictetus’ words, as reported by Arrian:

Seeing, therefore, that I neither fear anything of all that he is able to do with me, nor greatly desire anything of all that he is able to provide, why do I any longer admire him, why any longer stand in awe of him?<sup>9</sup>

The philosopher’s attitude *vis-à-vis* those wielding power finds expression in his willingness to speak his mind, regardless the consequences. This philosophical frankness, *parrhēsia*, makes him a terrifying figure for tyrants as well as an extremely valuable counsellor for virtuous rulers. From the Classical period down to the Imperial age, philosophers define themselves as admonishers in their relations with those in power. Dio’s portrayal of the authority wielded by

8 Arr. *Epict.* 4.7.19-24; the quotation is from 21: ... ἔσω ἀγαθὸν οὐδὲν διαδίδοται τοῖς εἰσελθοῦσιν. Although the subject of 4.7 is freedom from fear of tyrants, there can be no doubt that the autocratic power of Roman emperors is foremost in the speaker’s mind, cf. Millar, 1965, 145: “... Epictetus expatiates on the worthlessness of what the Emperor has to give, or to refuse.”

9 Arr. *Epict.* 4.7.28.

*pepaideumenoi* over kings reflects this idealized conception of the relationship between philosophers and rulers.<sup>10</sup>

It is hardly coincidental that what is perhaps the most eloquent expression of these ideas can be found in the largely fictional account, in Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, of the protagonist's vicissitudes under Nero and the Flavian emperors. The first-century Pythagorean is represented by the Severan sophist as lecturing eager kings and emperors on the way to exercise their monarchic power and as intrepidly braving cruel despots.<sup>11</sup> In real life, the standards implied in the conception of the philosopher as fearless opponent of tyrants and as candid counsellor of virtuous rulers were maintained less easily. Thus, the biographical tradition is replete with anecdotes which portray the protagonists as royal parasites. Philostratus has Apollonius, when pressurized by his pupil Damis to accept gifts offered to him by the Parthian king Vardanes, ironically suggest that his Syrian disciple should come up with examples of philosophers from the past who associated with rulers in the hope of material rewards. Among others, the Pythagorean mentions Aeschines, Aristippus, and Plato.<sup>12</sup> The same names are, with explicit reference to the biographical tradition, mentioned by Lucian as examples of philosophers who applied themselves to the noble art of playing the parasite.<sup>13</sup> The examples from the Classical period had a distinct topicality in the Antonine era. When the Stoic philosopher Apollonius of Chalcedon left with his pupils for Rome in order to teach Marcus Aurelius, Demonax compared the travellers with the Argonauts sailing in search of the Golden Fleece.<sup>14</sup> After his arrival in Rome, Apollonius refused to come to the palace and demanded that Marcus should come to his place for tuition; Antoninus Pius aptly pointed out that the philosopher had made no bones about coming to Rome.<sup>15</sup> Cassius Dio observes that during the reign of Marcus Aurelius philosophy became an attractive vocation for people who hoped to be made rich by the emperor.<sup>16</sup>

10 For the currency of this conception under the Early Empire see Hahn, 1989, 182-191; for an outline of its history Flinterman, 1995, 165-169 and 171-176; on *parrhēsia* cf. Branham, 1996, 97-98 n. 54; Whitmarsh, 2001, 144-145. On Dio's *Or.* 49 cf. Desideri, 1978, 285-287.

11 For a phrasing of the conception see e.g. Philostr. *Ap.* 6.33 (διδάσκαλον τοῦ τῆς βασιλείας ἦθους), 6.43 (βασιλέας, οἱ ξύμβουλον αὐτὸν ἀρετῆς ἐποιοῦντο), and 7.14 (σοφοῖς δὲ οικειότερον τελευτᾶν ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐπετίθεισαν); cf. Flinterman 1995, 162-165.

12 Philostr. *Ap.* 1.34.

13 Lucianus *Par.* 31-35; cf. Nesselrath, 1985, ad loc.

14 Lucianus *Demon.* 31.

15 *Hist. Aug. Pius* 10.4; cf. *Hist. Aug. Marc. Ant.* 3.1.

16 D.C. 71.35.2.

Accusations and insinuations such as these are indicative of the predicament in which philosophers consorting with those in power found themselves. How could philosophers who tried to make an impact on society by associating with a ruler be distinguished from other intellectuals who attempted to secure imperial patronage? And how was the independence required to act as an admonisher affected by the willingness to put oneself under an obligation by accepting imperial friendship and imperial favours? Plutarch, in his treatise *The philosopher should above all discuss with men in leading positions*, admits that philosophers who follow his advice make themselves vulnerable to the accusation of flattering those in power.<sup>17</sup> According to Plutarch, however, a philosopher should disregard these imputations. He should not refrain, moreover, from displaying diplomacy in his attempts to befriend men in leading positions. He should take care not to annoy his powerful friend with inopportune, sophistic disquisitions, but when the great man is willing to share the philosopher's company and spend leisure in civilized conversation, the philosopher should be glad to oblige.<sup>18</sup> Plutarch's readiness to water down the heady wine of philosophical frankness is also obvious from the discussion of *parrhesia* which forms the second part of *How to distinguish a flatterer from a friend*. Here, it is emphasized that candour requires tact and that frankness should not degenerate into insolence.<sup>19</sup> Plutarch tries to salvage the idea that philosophers, by consorting with men in power, can make a significant contribution to the social and political well-being of their fellow-men. To that end, however, they should be willing to compromise as far as the display of their independence is concerned.

It seems a reasonable guess that most Greek intellectuals donning the philosopher's cloak in the imperial presence will have heeded Plutarch's recommendations. Still, the fact that Plutarch acknowledges the risk that such behaviour may give rise to accusations of flattery is indicative of the vitality of the ideal of the frank and fearless philosopher who refuses to fawn upon those in power. Besides, the anecdote about Apollonius of Chalcedon's refusal to come to the palace suggests that at least some philosophers insisted on imperial observance of a significant ingredient of the ritual of the dialogue between power and wisdom: the king should come to the philosopher instead of the other way around, thus openly expressing his acknowledgment of the hierarchical nature of the

---

17 Plu. *Mor.* 776b and 778a-b; cf. Damon, 1997, 250-251.

18 Plu. *Mor.* 778b.

19 Plu. *Mor.* 65e-74e; for a recent discussion of *De adulatione et amico* see Van Meirvenne, 2002.

relationship.<sup>20</sup> In short, even though the pretensions implied in the self-definition of philosophers in their relations with rulers as admonishers were often ridiculed and even though the advisability of specific forms of conduct was open to discussion, the behaviour of philosophers *vis-à-vis* emperors tended to be evaluated on the basis of a clear-cut conception of the philosopher's role.

### Associating with the Great King

Philostratus characterizes sophistic oratory as a *technē filautos te kai alazōn*, an art whose practitioners are prone to the vices of conceit and boastfulness.<sup>21</sup> It is, therefore, only to be expected that sophists held their dignity dear in contacts with rulers, and their biographer provides us with several entertaining anecdotes about the sometimes rather peculiar behaviour of his heroes. When the king of the Bosporeans visited Smyrna, Polemo left a royal invitation unanswered until the king came to his house – with a fee of ten talents, Philostratus adds.<sup>22</sup> Polemo is, of course, Philostratus' prime example of sophistic arrogance: even when addressed by Asclepius, he was not at a loss for an answer.<sup>23</sup> But Aelius Aristides, who can hardly be accused of a lack of respect for Asclepius, kept Marcus Aurelius waiting for three days during a visit of the imperial family to Smyrna. An escort of two imperial dignitaries of consular status was needed to persuade the orator to leave his study.<sup>24</sup> And Chrestus of Byzantium, when offered the candidacy for the imperial chair of rhetoric by the Athenians, declined and ended his speech to the assembly with the aphorism 'a man is not made by the ten thousand drachms'.<sup>25</sup> Later, Chrestus told this story as a rebuke to his overambitious pupil Diogenes of Amastris, who had always 'satrapies, courts, and standing at the side of emperors' on his mind.<sup>26</sup>

20 See Hahn, 1989, 188, who also refers to the anecdote told by Philostr. *VS* 557 about Marcus Aurelius attending the lectures of the philosopher Sextus when already emperor.

21 Philostr. *VS* 616.

22 Philostr. *VS* 535.

23 Philostr. *VS* 535. Besides, as has been pointed out in a full discussion of the incident by Campanile, 1999, 303-305, we should take into account that Polemo's behaviour probably not only reflected his self-esteem as a sophist, but was also influenced by the fact that he himself, as a descendant of the first-century BC client king of Pontus and the Bosporean kingdom, was of royal extraction and, moreover, related to his prospective pupil.

24 Philostr. *VS* 582.

25 Philostr. *VS* 591. 10.000 drachms equals 40.000 sesterces, the salary of the holder of the imperial chair of rhetoric in Athens, on which see Avotins, 1975, 313-315; Rothe, 1989, 22-24.

26 Philostr. *VS* 592.

Chrestus' dressing down of his pupil is strongly reminiscent of Epictetus' admonitions on the triviality of imperial honours, just as Polemo's snubbing of the king of the Bosphorans bears an unmistakable resemblance to Apollonius of Chalcedon's refusal to come to the imperial palace.<sup>27</sup> Still, anecdotes such as these represent only one side of Philostratus' portrayal of the appreciation by his heroes of contacts with monarchs. An entirely different and probably more characteristic attitude can be discerned in the story about Hadrian of Tyre's response to the appointment, on his deathbed, to the post of imperial secretary for Greek correspondence by Commodus:

He invoked the Muses, as was his custom, reverently saluted the imperial letter, and breathed out his soul over it, thus making of that honour his funeral shroud.<sup>28</sup>

Most sophists, who came in a position to enter into contact with the imperial court or to receive imperial honours, did not miss the opportunity. What were the advantages involved? It should be obvious that the material rewards that the emperor could distribute formed a considerable part of the attraction of such contacts. To mention just one example, the income of the holder of the imperial chair in Athens, 40.000 sesterces, equalled the income derived, at a return of six percent, from property worth more than 650.000 sesterces: well above the equestrian census. Even for sophists with substantial wealth of their own, this was hardly a negligible sum.<sup>29</sup>

In addition, the imperial favour, once won, could be tapped in order to benefit others: the phenomenon for which in studies on patronage the term 'brokerage' has been coined.<sup>30</sup> One of the best documented examples from the world of the sophists is Aristides' successful intervention with Marcus Aurelius and Commodus after the destruction of Smyrna by an earthquake in late 170s, for which we have both Aristides' letter to the emperors and Philostratus' account.<sup>31</sup> This dossier offers a unique combination of perspectives on the relations between a sophist and the holders of the imperial power: both the presentation by the sophist directly involved and the interpretation given by the biographer of the sophists can be scrutinized and compared.

27 Note that Rutherford, 1989, 82-83, mentions Apollonius' attitude in the framework of a description of the "arrogant and self-important behaviour (...) common among the great and wealthy sophists."

28 Philostr. *VS* 590. See for detailed discussion of the scene now Campanile 2003, 264-273.

29 For six percent as a 'normal level of return' see Duncan-Jones, 1974, 33 with n. 3.

30 See Saller, 1982, 4 and 74-75 (referring to studies by A. Blok and J. Boissevain).

31 Aristid. *Or.* 19 Keil; Philostr. *VS* 582-583; see also D.C. 71.32.3; cf. Behr 1968, 112-113; Bowersock, 1969, 45-46; Millar, 1977, 10 and 423-424; Winter, 1998, 153.

Aristides starts his letter by referring to the fact that in the past he has sent the emperors samples of his rhetorical prowess,<sup>32</sup> and he modestly but unmistakably justifies his plea with his enjoyment of the imperial favour:

Others who possessed clout with kings acquired gifts for their cities in times of prosperity. If I have any influence with you, I ask and beg you that the city receive this favour, not to be thrown away like a broken utensil, condemned for uselessness, but that it live again through you.<sup>33</sup>

The explanation given by Philostratus for Aristides' influence with Marcus Aurelius is the resounding success of the orator's declamation before the emperor in Smyrna in 176.<sup>34</sup> The biographer does not mention that the orator was in the habit of sending the emperors specimens of his production. Nevertheless, both in Aristides' own and in Philostratus' presentation of his previous contacts with the emperors, the sophist's professional performance is the central element. It is Aristides' reputation as a sophist which gives him the courage to write to the emperors, without waiting for a formal embassy.<sup>35</sup>

Aristides repeatedly emphasizes that the task that he has set himself is a delicate one. He does not want to create the impression that the imperial munificence will manifest itself as the result of his entreaties:

I have not said these things as if advising you and teaching you in your ignorance – I have not been so deranged by this misfortune.<sup>36</sup>

In order to preclude any misunderstandings on this account, Aristides compares his plea to the emperors with a prayer to the gods. After all, the gods are also ready to assist men, and yet we pray to them for their aid.<sup>37</sup> Philostratus displays in his account of the incident a full understanding of the intricacies of the situation:

... I do not want to suggest that the Emperor would not anyhow have restored the ruined city which he had admired when it was still standing, but natures that are truly

32 Aristid. *Or.* 19.1 Keil: ἀγωνίσματα καὶ λόγους ἐκ διατριβῶν, “declamations and speeches from the classroom”.

33 Aristid. *Or.* 19.7 Keil.

34 Philostr. *V.S.* 583 (the occasion that was preceded by the orator's demonstration of reluctance mentioned above, at n. 24): ἐκεῖνό γε μὴν πρὸς πάντων ὁμολογεῖται, τὸν Ἀριστείδην ἀρίστη φορᾶ ἐπὶ τοῦ Μάρκου χρήσασθαι πόρρωθεν τῆ Σμύρνης ἐτοιμαζούσης τῆς τύχης τὸ δι' ἀνδρὸς τοιούτου δι' ἀνοικισθῆναι.

35 Aristid. *Or.* 19.6 Keil: οὔτε πρεσβείαν κοινὴν ἀνέμεινα οὔτ' εἰς ἕτερον βλέπειν ἤξιουν ὃ τι πράξειεν.

36 Aristid. *Or.* 19.5 Keil (καὶ ταῦτα οὐχ ὡς συμβουλευῶν εἶπον); cf. *Or.* 19.14 Keil.

37 Aristid. *Or.* 19.5 Keil.

royal and above the ordinary, when incited by good advice and eloquence, are filled with greater enthusiasm and press on with ardour to doing well.<sup>38</sup>

Although Philostratus in contradistinction from Aristides does not shun the word *xyμβουλία*, ‘advice’, there is no room for misunderstanding about the fact that he regards Aristides’ contribution to the rebuilding of Smyrna as encouraging the emperor to take a decision which also would have been made without the sophist’s intervention. A sophist’s advice to an emperor is meant to offer confirmation rather than guidance. Interestingly, the verb *analampein*, ‘to be filled with enthusiasm’, is also used by Philostratus in the *Life of Apollonius* in order to describe the effect of the hero’s attempt to confirm Vespasian in his bid for power:<sup>39</sup> a policy that Philostratus elsewhere has Apollonius characterize as ‘already decided’.<sup>40</sup> Apparently, it is in playing down Apollonius’ pretensions and achievements as a counsellor of emperors rather than in portraying him as an imperial adviser that Philostratus has drawn on the model of sophistic behaviour.

However, the credit gained by Aristides for his intervention with the emperor is not diminished by the fact that Philostratus considers it essentially superfluous. He even confers on Aristides the title of honour ‘founder’, which the orator himself had reserved for his imperial addressees:

To say that Aristides was the founder of Smyrna is no mere boastful praise but most just and true.<sup>41</sup>

The prestige that resulted from channelling the imperial favour to others can also be illustrated from Aristides’ *Funeral address in honour of Alexander of Cotiaenum*, his former tutor and, what is more important in this connection, the former tutor of Marcus Aurelius. Alexander asked favours for others rather than for himself, both from the families of his other pupils and from his imperial employers. The result was that

... he never caused anyone grief, but passed his life in doing good for kinsmen, friends, his fatherland and other cities.<sup>42</sup>

Although a mere *grammaticus*, Alexander appears in Aristides’ eulogy as a unique figure, the perfect embodiment of all literary and rhetorical skills and social vir-

38 Philostr. *VS* 583: ... αἱ βασιλικοὶ τε καὶ θεσπέσιοι φύσεις, ἣν προσεγείρη αὐτὰς ξυμβουλία καὶ λόγος, ἀναλάμπουσι μᾶλλον καὶ πρὸς τὸ ποιεῖν εὐ ξὺν ὀρμῇ φέρονται.

39 Philostr. *Ap.* 5.30: ... ὁ δὲ ἀνέλαμπέ τε ἔτι μᾶλλον ...

40 Philostr. *Ap.* 5.35: ... περὶ πραγμάτων ἤδη βεβουλευμένων.

41 Philostr. *VS* 582 (οἰκιστὴν ... τῆς Σμύρνης); cf. Aristid. *Or.* 19.4 Keil: ὑμεῖς οἰκιστὰὶ τῆς πόλεως γένεσθε.

42 Aristid. *Or.* 32.15 Keil.

tues. He comes up to the highest standards applied by Aristides, and this is also true of his contacts with the imperial family.

Material rewards for oneself and the possibility to practice brokerage are, however, only part – and arguably not the most important part – of the benefits that sophists might expect from contacts with emperors. Aristides' prose-hymn on Athena, composed in the early 150s, when the orator was 35 years old, is rounded off with the following prayer:

..., grant as you revealed me at night, honour from both our emperors, and grant me to be best in wisdom and oratory. May whoever opposes me repent. May I prevail to the extent that I wish. But in myself, while being the first, may the better part prevail.<sup>43</sup>

Although at the time Aristides was engaged in the struggle for recognition of his immunity, he presents being honoured by Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius as an end in itself, whose significance is independent from the tangible benefits that may go with it.<sup>44</sup> The attitude displayed by Aristides is mocked as totally pointless by Lucian, in *On Hirelings*. After suggesting that men put themselves in the power of the rich in order to escape from poverty, in order to minimize the risks of old age, or in order to indulge a desire for luxury, Lucian mentions a possibility that he finds very hard to believe: some men are apparently motivated

... by the mere name of associating with men of noble family and high social status. There are people who think that even this confers distinction and exalts them above the masses, just as in my own case, were it even the Great King, merely to associate with him and to be seen associating with him without getting any real benefit out of it would not be acceptable to me.<sup>45</sup>

For Aristides, on the other hand, 'merely to associate with the Great King', that is with the emperor,<sup>46</sup> was something to be prayed for and, of course, to be dreamt about. It is to Aristides' dreams about emperors in the *Sacred Tales* that we now turn.

43 Aristid. *Or.* 37.29 Keil: ... ἃ νύκτωρ μοι προὔφαινες, δίδου μὲν τιμὰς παρ' ἀμφοτέρων τῶν βασιλέων, δίδου δὲ ἄκρον εἶναι φρονεῖν καὶ λέγειν. The dating is based on the subscription of the hymn (p. 312 in Keil's edition); cf. Behr, 1994, 1149-1150.

44 Cf. Behr, 1968, 81 n. 66: "The speech does not seem to contain any allusions to the legal battles ..."

45 Lucianus *Merc.Cond.* 9: ..., πλὴν εἰ μὴ κάκεινων τις μεμνήσθαι ἀξιόσειεν τῶν καὶ μόνῃ τῇ δόξῃ ἐπαρομένων τοῦ συνεῖναι εὐπατρίδας τε καὶ εὐπαρύφοις ἀνδράσιν· εἰσὶν γὰρ οἱ καὶ τοῦτο περιβλεπτον καὶ ὑπὲρ τοὺς πολλοὺς νομίζουσιν, ὡς ἔγωγε τοῦ μὲν ἴδιον οὐδὲ βασιλεῖ τῷ μεγάλῳ αὐτὸ μόνον συνεῖναι καὶ συνὼν ὄρασθαι μηδὲν χρηστὸν ἀπολαύων τῆς συνουσίας δεξαίμην ἄν.

46 Cf. Swain, 1996, 176 with n. 125 and 321 with n. 80.

### Dreaming about the emperor

The *Hieroi Logoi* or *Sacred Tales*, composed in the 170s, are Aristides' tribute to the guidance and protection offered to him by Asclepius over more than a quarter of a century.<sup>47</sup> They contain four substantial descriptions of dreams in which the author finds himself in the company of Marcus Aurelius.<sup>48</sup> Three of these dreams are part of the so-called Diary: Aristides' detailed account of his dreams during January and February 166, an account which is inserted in the *First Sacred Tale*.<sup>49</sup> The fourth one, described in the *Fifth Sacred Tale*, occurred when Aristides was pondering a visit to Cyzicus and had asked the god for a sign; it is closer to the time of composition.<sup>50</sup> The idea that the imperial presence is honorific in itself is never missing from these passages. However, it interacts with and is reinforced by the notion that what the emperor says in a dream has predictive value.

This is especially apparent from the dream last mentioned, reported in the *Fifth Sacred Tale*. The orator dreams that he is looking for an opportunity to approach the emperor. While he himself is lying down, the emperor sacrifices a cock, presumably to Asclepius. When the bird in its death struggle comes within Aristides' reach, he grabs it, takes it as an omen (apparently the sign from Asclepius that he had asked for), and with the bird in his hands starts to address the emperor,<sup>51</sup> taking his cue from Odysseus' toast to Achilles in *Iliad* 9.223f. and

47 For recent discussions of the *Sacred Tales* see Cox Miller, 1994, 184-204; Harrison, 2000-2001; Percy, 1988; Pernot, 2002 (with full bibliography); Quet, 1993; Schröder, 1988; Swain, 1996, 260-274; Weiss, 1998. The date of composition is controversial, cf. Swain, 1996, 261 with n. 31. Behr has consistently argued for 170/1; see most recently Behr, 1994, 1155-1163. Behr's argument entails emendation of Σαλβίου τοῦ νῦν ὑπάτου in *Or.* 48.9 Keil, which indicates 175. For a recent defence of the latter terminus post quem see Weiss, 1998, 38-39, summarized by Harrison, 2000-2001, 247.

48 Aristides' dreams about emperors are conveniently listed by Weber, 2000, 57-58 n. 13. See, in addition to the passages discussed below, *Or.* 47.33; *Or.* 49.21; *Or.* 50.106 Keil.

49 *Aristid. Or.* 47.5-58, esp. 23, 36-39 and 46-50 Keil; cf. Behr, 1968, 97-100; Quet, 1993, 220-221; Swain, 1996, 261 with n. 30.

50 *Aristid. Or.* 51.43-46 Keil. The trip to Cyzicus, the second one in the fifth *Sacred Tale*, is labelled 'recent' by Aristides (*or.* 51.42 Keil: ἔναγχος). It is dated to 170 by Behr, 1968, 108; see Behr, 1968, 97 n. 11 and 307 for the arguments supporting his dating of the events described in the Fifth Sacred Tale.

51 *Aristid. Or.* 51.44 Keil: ὡς δὲ πλησίον γενέσθαι τῶν χειρῶν μου ἀλεκτρούνα ἀσπαίροντα, συλλαβεῖν τε καὶ οἰωνίσασθαι καί, ὡς εἶχον ἐν ταῖν χεροῖν, ἄρχεσθαι τῆς προσηύσεως. I prefer Behr's translation of οἰωνίσασθαι, 'regard as an omen' to the suggestion made by Festugière, 1969, 152, 'examiner les entrailles du coq'; this preference entails following Keil and Behr in reading προσηύσεως instead of προρήσεως.

wishing him well.<sup>52</sup> The emperor gives vent to his admiration for Aristides' speech and expresses the wish that an audience of about fifty men would attend.<sup>53</sup> Aristides replies that if the emperor wishes so, an audience will turn up. He adds that Asclepius has foretold him the very words just spoken by the emperor, and he is willing to substantiate his claim by showing the emperor a written record of the god's prediction.<sup>54</sup> Subsequently, the emperor disappears, and Aristides realizes that the occasion of his performance will be in accordance with his dream,<sup>55</sup> and then, still dreaming, he is walking to Cyzicus. The imperial prediction is approximately fulfilled during Aristides' stay in that city: he does not make a public appearance, but when he declaims in a private house, there is a turn out of about fifty people, who belong – superfluous to say – to the most eminent.<sup>56</sup>

A large part of Aristides' dream is suitably enigmatic. The incident interpreted by Aristides as the sign that he has asked from Asclepius is not immediately transparent. Is he joining or assisting the emperor in a sacrificial act? Or is he himself accepting the sacrifice? The former interpretation seems the natural choice. However, Aristides' precise role defies definition, and at the very least this creates room for the latter reading, which finds a certain amount of support in other dreams told in the *Sacred Tales*. In the *First Sacred Tale*, Aristides tells that

52 Aristid. *Or.* 51.44 Keil: ὄρηγο δέ μοι τοῦτο πᾶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὀμηρικοῦ, ὡς Ὀδυσσεὺς τὸ ἐκπωμα πλησάμενος προσαγορεύει τὸν Ἀχιλλεῖα καὶ λέγει· τὰ δὲ ῥήματα οὕτω πως εἶχεν· “ἐπ’ ἀγαθῷ μὲν τῷ βασιλεῖ, ἐπ’ ἀγαθῷ δὲ καὶ ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν, ὡς δὲ καὶ ἡμῖν ἄπασιν.” For the problem involved in ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν see Behr, 1981, 444 n. 69. Since the death of Lucius Verus in the winter of 168-169, Marcus Aurelius was sole emperor. However, Commodus had been Caesar since 166 (*Hist. Aug. Comm.* 1.10 and 11.13), and since 169 he was probably Marcus' sole surviving son, see *Hist. Aug. Marc. Ant.* 21.3-5, with Birley, 1987, 162. Aristides' second-instance mentioning of 'both emperors' may well reflect the situation existing since then, and does not need to be interpreted as a 'prediction' of Commodus' elevation to the rank of co-emperor in 177, as is suggested by Weiss, 1998, 45.

53 Aristid. *Or.* 51.45 Keil: ὁ δὲ ἐθαύμασέν τε [καὶ] πειρώμενος τῶν λόγων ἀντι πάντων τε ἔφη τιμᾶσθαι χρημάτων αὐτούς, καὶ ἐπέειπεν· “τούτοις τοῖς λόγοις εἰ προσήσαν ἄκροαταὶ ὅσον καὶ πενήκοντα.”

54 Aristid. *Or.* 51.45 Keil: κάγω ὑπολαβὼν “σοῦ γε, ἔφην, βουλομένου, βασιλεῦ, καὶ ἄκροαταὶ γενήσονται. καὶ ὅπως γ’, ἔφην, θαυμάσης, ταῦτα ἄ νυνὶ λέγεις, ἐμοὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀσκληπιοῦ προεῖρηται.” καὶ ἔτοιμος ἦν αὐτῷ γεγραμμένα δεικνύναι. For Aristides' record of his dreams and its relation to the *Sacred Tales* see *Or.* 48.2-3 and 8; *Or.* 49.26; *Or.* 50.25 Keil; cf. Behr, 1968, 116, and the discussions by Percy, 1988 and Schröder, 1988.

55 Aristid. *Or.* 51.45 Keil: μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ ὁ μὲν οὐκ οἶδ’ ὅποι ἐτράπετο, ἐγὼ δ’ ἐνεθυμήθην ὅτι οὗτος ἐκεῖνος ὁ καιρὸς εἶη τῆς ἐπιδειξεως.

56 Aristid. *Or.* 51.46 Keil: καὶ σχεδὸν ἐξεπληροῦτο ἡ τοῦ ἐνυπνίου φήμη· ἦν γὰρ εἰς τοὺς πενήκοντα ὁ σὺλλογος. Weiss' suggestion (1998, 45) that 'an audience of about fifty men' in *Or.* 51.45 Keil may refer to the quorum needed for a *senatus consultum* granting imperium to Commodus does not take into account that its primary reference is to this outcome of the imperial prediction.

he once dreamt that a statue of himself turned into a statue of Asclepius,<sup>57</sup> while in the *Fourth Sacred Tale* a dream is reported in which Aristides is addressed by a statue of Asclepius with the cultic formula *heis*, ‘one and only’.<sup>58</sup> The reference to *Iliad* 9 is puzzling, even if one takes into account that at some point in time Aristides composed a declamation based on this episode from the *Iliad*, the *Embassy speech to Achilles*.<sup>59</sup> The imperial admiration for his *logoi* comes as somewhat of a surprise after the orator’s rather simple phrasing of his good wishes, admittedly a paraphrase. What is clear, however, is that Aristides receives from Marcus a true prediction regarding the size of his audience in Cyzicus. In this respect, this dream belongs to the type labelled ‘oracular’ in the five-fold classification of dreams to be found in, among others, Artemidorus’ *Oneirocritica*,<sup>60</sup> and the role played by the emperor is in accordance with one of the rules of interpretation given by Artemidorus, who ranges ‘kings and magistrates’ speaking in dreams with other persons who should be believed and obeyed, such as gods, priests, parents, and teachers.<sup>61</sup> At the same time, it is obvious that the imperial trustworthiness is not confined to utterances on the size of future audiences, but that it applies to the imperial appreciation of Aristides’ achievements as an orator as well.

The last observation is also relevant for the interpretation of the first of the three extended descriptions of ‘imperial dreams’ contained in the Diary. Aristides and Alexander of Cotiaeuum approach the emperor. Aristides introduces himself as a worshipper of Asclepius, and he declines the honour of kissing the emperor,<sup>62</sup> justifying his refusal by referring to a precept of the god. Not only finds the emperor Aristides’ excuse satisfactory, he also gives expression to his respect for the orator’s favourite deity: “Asclepius is better than all to worship.”<sup>63</sup> Thus, in addition to Aristides’ oratorical excellence his devotion to his divine guide finds imperial endorsement.<sup>64</sup> In passing, we should note that his breach of court

57 Aristid. *Or.* 47.17 Keil.

58 Aristid. *Or.* 50.50 Keil.

59 Aristid. *Or.* 16 Behr; cf. Kindstrand, 1973, 215-219.

60 E.g. Artem. 1.2 (6.16-17 Pack); cf. Kessels, 1969, 391-396; Weber, 2000, 40-41.

61 Artem. 2.69; cf. Behr, 1968, 201, and Kessels, 1969, 395 at n. 6, where it is pointed out that this passage refers to oracular dreams rather than to the allegorical dreams which are the focus of Artemidorus’ professional interest.

62 See for honorific imperial kisses Lendon, 1997, 134 with the passages mentioned in his n. 137.

63 Aristid. *Or.* 47.23 Keil: καὶ μὴν θεραπεύειν γε παντός κρείττων ὁ Ἀσκληπιός.

64 Cf. Swain, 1996, 263.

etiquette bears a certain resemblance to the anecdote told by Philostratus about Aristides' failure to turn up during the imperial visit to Smyrna.<sup>65</sup>

Eighteen days later, Aristides dreams that he adds lustre to peace negotiations between Marcus Aurelius and the Parthian king Vologases by a reading from his work.<sup>66</sup> In a short prologue, he explains that it is only owing to his familiarity with divine visions that he is up to facing two monarchs. He decides to bring in his collected works and to leave the choice to his audience, a gracious gesture that has the additional advantage that it enables him to astonish king and emperor alike with his prolific output. One week after this remarkable peace performance, Aristides dreams that he is staying in the imperial palace.<sup>67</sup> He receives miraculous and unsurpassable honours from Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus. Rivals for the imperial attention are conspicuously absent. The emperors take Aristides with them on a tour of inspection of a drainage ditch designed to protect the city against inundations, and again he is the object of unremitting imperial care which *inter alia* finds expression in the imperial assistance he receives when scaling heights: a rather straightforward dream-symbol for imperial advancement.<sup>68</sup> The passage is, as J.E. Lendon has put it, a 'conspectus of imperial tokens of honour'.<sup>69</sup> But there is more to it. When Aristides wants to take his leave and thanks Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus for the care and honour they have lavished upon him, the emperors express their gratitude towards the gods for having met a man whose virtuousness is matched by his oratorical excellence. The emperors turn out to share a cherished tenet of Aristides himself which is central to his second oration, the massive *Defence of oratory* against Plato: noble character and oratorical talent go hand in hand.<sup>70</sup> And Aristides' conviction that he himself is the embodiment of the ideal implied in this tenet, finds imperial endorsement as well. Afterwards, having fallen asleep again, the orator dreams that two of his acquaintances are witness to and marvel at the 'exceedingly great honours' he receives. It comes as somewhat of a bathos when Aristides tells us that he took the excavated earth of the drainage ditch as a symbolic instruction and vomited that evening.

65 See above, at n. 24.

66 Aristid. *Or.* 47.36-39 Keil.

67 Aristid. *Or.* 47.46-50 Keil.

68 Cf. Artem. 2.42 and esp. 4.28, with Behr, 1968, 198.

69 Lendon, 1997, 134 n. 137.

70 Aristid. *Or.* 47.49 Keil: *κακ τούτου ἤρχετο ὁ πρεσβύτερος λέγειν ὅτι τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἶη καὶ ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν εἶναι καὶ περὶ λόγους ἀγαθόν. ἐπεξῆει δὲ ὁ νεώτερος ῥημά τινας λέγων ὅτι ἀκολουθοίη τῷ τρόπῳ καὶ τὰ τῶν λόγων. Cf. *Or.* 2.392 Behr: ἡ παροιμία (...) ἡ λέγουσα οἶος ὁ τρόπος, τοιοῦτον εἶναι καὶ τὸν λόγον. Cf. Sohlberg, 1972, 197-198.*

This cursory reading of imperial dreams in the *Sacred Tales* suffices to demonstrate that for Aristides being honoured by an emperor was tantamount to a confirmation of the things that were essential to him: his devotion to Asclepius, the god who guided his life and his oratorical career; his conception of oratory; the value of his art; and his own achievements in that field. It does not come as a surprise that the *Address concerning Asclepius*, in which the god's benefactions over the years are summarized, culminates in a reference to Aristides' declamation before the court of Marcus Aurelius during the imperial visit to Smyrna in 176.<sup>71</sup> Aristides expresses his gratitude to Asclepius for the god's guidance of his oratorical career and for the fact that he has also taken care of the public renown of Aristides' speeches. Cities, private citizens, and magistrates have praised Aristides:<sup>72</sup>

But the greatest thing in this respect is putting me on such friendly terms with the divine Emperors, and aside from contact with them by letters, by making me a speaker before them and one prized as no one ever had been, and at that equally by the Emperors and by the Princesses, and by the whole Imperial chorus.<sup>73</sup>

And Aristides sums up Asclepius' benefactions in this respect by stating that the god has seen to it that "the most perfect men might hear with their own ears our superior work."<sup>74</sup> For Aristides, being allowed to address the imperial family appears as the acme of public recognition, and a craving for imperial honours seems to be a constant feature of both his waking and his dreaming life, from the *Hymn to Athena* to the *Address on Asclepius*. Keeping the emperor waiting for three days must have been a considerable effort.

### Questioning the emperor's expertise

A problem, to which Aristides apparently turns a blind eye, is that both in the reports of his dreams and in his account of real events the emperor and his family act as a court of connoisseurs. He never asks the question whether the emperor has the expertise to act as a judge of his achievements. Members of the

71 Cf. Behr, 1968, 111 n. 66.

72 Aristid. *Or.* 42.13 Keil.

73 Aristid. *Or.* 42.14 Keil: τὸ δὲ δὴ μέγιστον τῶν περὶ ταῦτα τὸ καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς βασιλεῦσιν εἰς τοσοῦτον οἰκειοῦσθαι καὶ χωρὶς τῆς διὰ τῶν γραμμάτων συνουσίας ἐπιδειξασθαι λέγοντα ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σπουδαζόμενον ἃ μηδεὶς πώποτε, καὶ ταῦτα ὁμοίως μὲν παρὰ τῶν βασιλέων, ὁμοίως δὲ τῶν βασιλίδων γενέσθαι, καὶ παντὸς δὴ τοῦ βασιλείου χοροῦ. Cf. Bowersock, 1969, 49-50.

74 Aristid. *Or.* 42.14 Keil: καὶ ταῦτά τε οὕτως ἐπέπρακτο καὶ τὸ σύνθημα παρὴν ἀνακαλοῦν, ἔργῳ σοῦ δείξαντος ὅτι πολλῶν εἵνεκα προήγαγες ἐς μέσον, ὡς φανείημεν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις καὶ γένοιτο αὐτήκοοι τῶν κρείττωνων οἱ τελεώτατοι.

imperial family are simply labelled *hoi teleōtatoi*; even the possibility of raising the problem of their competence is precluded by an encomiastic effusion.

Witness the story told by Philostratus about Chrestus of Byzantium,<sup>75</sup> other sophists were in fact prepared to question the relation between the bestowal of imperial honours and sophistic eminence. Even more eloquent on the issues involved is a famous anecdote from the *Historia Augusta* about Favorinus and Hadrian. When the emperor criticized a word used by Favorinus, the sophist acknowledged his alleged mistake. His friends pointed out that the word had been used by acceptable authorities. Favorinus retorted:

You don't give me good advice, my friends, when you don't allow me to believe the man who possesses thirty legions more learned than anyone else.<sup>76</sup>

A passage from Plutarch's *How to distinguish a flatterer from a friend* brings out the full implications of Favorinus' rejoinder:

Flatterers (...) make public their view that kings and rich men and political leaders are not only successful and fortunate, but are also intelligent, skilful and so on for every virtue. Some people cannot abide even *bearing* the Stoics claim that the wise man is *ipso facto* a rich, good-looking, well-born king; but flatterers explicitly say that an affluent man is *ipso facto* an orator and a poet, or (if the fancy takes him), a painter and a musician, or a sportsman and an athlete, by letting themselves be thrown at wrestling or fall behind at running ...<sup>77</sup>

Favorinus' witticism characterizes Hadrian as an emperor whose behaviour elicits toadying. At the same time, his self-mockery amounts to exposure of the imperial incompetence in the field where the sophist is sovereign.

The claim to superior expertise in one's own field implied in the anecdotes about Chrestus and Favorinus could result in forms of behaviour towards emperors which shows superficial similarities to the attitude displayed by philosophers. Such similarities should not be taken, however, as symptoms of an affinity between the respective self-definitions of philosophers and sophists. Whereas the ethical expertise claimed by philosophers extended to the emperor's behaviour as a ruler, at least in this respect sophists tended to be more modest. We have seen how Aristides went out of his way to avoid the impression that he was giving the divine emperors a piece of advice. Philostratus' report of the incident reflected a similar reluctance to claim the role of imperial counsellor for a sophist. The author of the *Lives of the sophists*, who for about a decade stayed at the

75 See above, at n. 25 and 26.

76 *Hist. Ang. Hadr.* 15.13: *non recte suadetis, familiares, qui non patimini me illum doctiorem omnibus credere qui habet triginta legiones.* On Favorinus and Hadrian see Bowie, 1997.

77 *Plu. Mor.* 58e-f.

Severan court,<sup>78</sup> presents imperial interest in both sophists and philosophers as nothing more than a commendable form of diversion from imperial concerns proper. This is true of even that most Philhellenic of emperors, Hadrian, who ...

... by turning his mind to sophists and philosophers used to lighten the responsibilities of Empire.<sup>79</sup>

Sophists, for their part, should not pretend to be in a position to admonish emperors – unless they are dealing with points of literary criticism. This is the case in Philostratus' letter to Julia Domna, where the sophist urges the empress to appreciate the style of Gorgias, and where the admonishment is inextricably linked up with a highly complimentary comparison with Pericles' partner Aspasia, implying that the empress is a politically influential woman well-versed in literary studies.<sup>80</sup> Less commendable imperial characteristics, on the other hand, should be passed over in silence. According to Philostratus, it is unwise 'to provoke tyrants and to enrage savage characters'. This piece of advice is occasioned by the apocryphal anecdote about the execution of Antiphon by Dionysius of Syracuse after a display of *parrhēsia* by the sophist.<sup>81</sup> Philostratus' comment of the behaviour of his contemporary colleague Antipater of Hierapolis, who openly criticized Caracalla for murdering Geta under the pretext of plotting against his life, breathes the same aversion to *parrhēsia*:

We may well believe that the emperor was greatly incensed by this, and indeed these remarks would have incensed even a private person, at any rate if he were anxious to gain credence for an alleged plot against himself.<sup>82</sup>

In short, the comments of the biographer of the sophists overlap and complement the attitude displayed by Aristides; taken together, they indicate that the way in which sophists defined their role *vis-à-vis* emperors was markedly different from the self-definition of philosophers.

78 Flinterman, 1995, 19-26.

79 Philostr. *VS* 490: ... διήγε τὰς βασιλείους φροντίδας ἀπονεύων ἐς σοφιστὰς τε καὶ φιλοσόφους.

80 Philostr. *Ep.* 73; for discussion and bibliography see Flinterman, 1997; Hemelrijk, 1999, 124-125.

81 Philostr. *VS* 500: ξυμβουλίαν ἐς πάντας (...) τοῦ μὴ ἐκκαλεῖσθαι τὰς τυραννίδας, μηδὲ ἐς ὄργην ἄγειν ἦθη ὠμά. The same story is told by Plutarch as an example of misguided *parrhēsia* in the second part of *How to distinguish a flatterer from a friend*, *Plu. Mor.* 68a-b.

82 Philostr. *VS* 607: ὅφ' ὦν παροξυνθῆναι τὸν βασιλέα μὴ ἀπιστῶμεν, καὶ γὰρ ἂν καὶ ιδίωτην ταῦτα παρώξυνε βουλόμενόν γε τὸ δοκεῖν ἐπιβεβουλευῆσθαι μὴ ἀπιστεῖσθαι. Pace Puech, 2002, 93 n. 2, I side with Ritti, 1988, 123 in interpreting Philostratus' observation as "una taciuta critica per l'inopportunita del gesto."

---

### Concluding remarks

The singularity of the philosopher's self-definition *vis-à-vis* emperors has been admirably summed up by Elizabeth Rawson:

What rhetors and sophists did was, primarily, to praise – though that might provide a model for the ruler to follow; what envoys did was to request (and praise too). Philosophers might warn.<sup>83</sup>

Reports and discussions by sophists themselves of their relations with emperors clearly show a tendency to keep a profile that emphatically distinguishes them from the philosophic adviser. Claims to the attention of emperors and members of the imperial family are justified by referring to previous contacts of a literary-rhetorical nature. Philosophical frankness, *parrhêsia*, is not considered a sophist's virtue, and the semantic value of the word *symbolleuein*, 'advise', if used at all, is debased to enthralling the addressed for a line of action whose advisability is beyond discussion. Sophists showed little inclination to cast themselves in the role of admonisher.

Still, at least some sophists disparaged the value of being honoured by the emperor and questioned his expertise in literary and rhetorical matters. Where they did so, a mostly latent conflict between contradictory demands emerged. Sophists were practitioners of an art that functioned as a medium for the construction and expression of Greek elite identity. In order to fulfil that function, sophistic oratory had to appear as fully autonomous.<sup>84</sup> Aristides' reluctance to turn up during the stay of the imperial court at Smyrna in 176 and his refusal of the imperial kiss in a dream ten years earlier should be understood against this background: they are expressions of an exclusive devotion to oratory and to his divine guide (the two being interchangeable in his case). As is borne out by Aristides' prayers and dreams, however, the art itself and its practitioners were also in need of public renown, and sophists were part of a society in which the bestowal of honours by the emperor was the acme of public recognition. To be first among the Greeks, being honoured by the emperor was both superfluous and indispensable. In his dreaming and in his waking life, Aristides succeeded in having the best of both worlds.

---

83 Rawson, 1989, 253.

84 Cf. Schmitz, 1997, 31.

## Bibliography

- Avotins, I.: The Holders of the Chairs of Rhetoric at Athens, in: *HSCP* 79, 1975, 313-324.
- Behr, C.A.: *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales*, Amsterdam 1968.
- Behr, C.A.: P. Aelius Aristides, *The Complete Works. Volume II. Orations XVII-LIII*. Translated into English by Charles A. Behr, Leiden 1981.
- Behr, C.A.: Studies on the Biography of Aelius Aristides, in: *ANRW* II 34.2, Berlin/New York 1994, 1140-1233.
- Birley, A.: *Marcus Aurelius. A Biography*. Revised edition, London 1987.
- Bowersock, G.W.: *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*, Oxford 1969.
- Bowie, E.L.: Apollonius of Tyana. Tradition and Reality, in: *ANRW* II 16.2, Berlin/New York 1978, 1652-1699.
- Bowie, E.L.: Hadrian, Favorinus, and Plutarch, in: Mossman, J.M. (ed.), *Plutarch and his Intellectual World*, Swansea 1997, 1-15.
- Branham, R.B.: Defacing the Currency: Diogenes' Rhetoric and the Invention of Cynicism, in: Branham, R.B./Goulet-Cazé, M.-O. (ed.), *The Cynics. The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*, Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1996, 81-104.
- Campanile, D.: La costruzione del sofista. Note sul βίος di Polemone, in: Virgilio, B. (ed.), *Studi Ellenistici XII*, Pisa/Roma 1999, 269-315.
- Campanile, D.: Vivere e morire da sofista: Adriano di Tiro, in: Virgilio, B. (ed.), *Studi Ellenistici XV*, Pisa 2003, 245-273.
- Cox Miller, P.: *Dreams in Late Antiquity. Studies in the Imagination of a Culture*, Princeton, New Jersey 1994.
- Damon, C.: *The Mask of the Parasite. A Pathology of Roman Patronage*, Ann Arbor 1997.
- Desideri, P.: *Dione di Prusa. Un intellettuale greco nell'impero romano*, Messina/Firenze 1978.
- Duncan-Jones, R.: *The Economy of the Roman Empire. Quantitative Studies*, Cambridge 1974.
- Dzielska, M.: *Apollonius of Tyana in Legend and History*, Roma 1986.
- Festugière, A.J.: Sur les "Discours Sacrés" d'Aelius Aristide, in: *REG* 82, 1969, 117-153.
- Flinterman, J.J.: *Power, Paideia & Pythagoreanism. Greek Identity, Conceptions of the Relationship between Philosophers and Monarchs, and Political Ideas in Philostratus' Life of Apollonius*, Amsterdam 1995.
- Flinterman, J.J.: De sofist, de keizerin & de concubine. Philostratus' brief aan Julia Domna, in: *Lampas* 30, 1997, 74-86.
- Flinterman, J.J.: The Selfportrait of an Antonine Orator: Aristides, or. 2.429ff., in: Ostefeld, E. (ed.), *Greek Romans and Roman Greeks. Studies in Cultural Interaction*, Aarhus 2002, 198-211.
- Hahn, J.: *Der Philosoph und die Gesellschaft. Selbstverständnis, öffentliches Auftreten und populäre Erwartungen in der hohen Kaiserzeit*, Stuttgart 1989.

- Harrison, S.J.: Apuleius, Aelius Aristides and Religious Autobiography, in: *Ancient Narrative* 1, 2000-2001, 245-259.
- Hemelrijk, E.A.: *Matrona Docta. Educated Women in the Roman Élite from Cornelia to Julia Domna*, London/New York.
- Kessels, A.H.M.: Ancient Systems of Dream-Classification, in: *Mnemosyne* 22, 1969, 389-424.
- Kindstrand, J.F.: *Homer in der Zweiten Sophistik. Studien zur Homerlektüre und dem Homerbild bei Dion von Prusa, Maximus von Tyros und Ailius Aristides*, Uppsala 1973.
- Lendon, J.E.: *Empire of Honour. The Art of Government in the Roman World*, Oxford 1997.
- Millar, F.: Epictetus and the Imperial Court, in: *JRS* 55, 1965, 141-148.
- Millar, F.: *The Emperor in the Roman World (31 BC–AD 337)*, London 1977.
- Nesselrath, H.-G.: *Lukians Parasitendialog. Untersuchungen und Kommentar*, Berlin/New York 1985.
- Palm, J.: *Rom, Römertum und Imperium in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit*, Lund 1959.
- Pearcy, L.T.: Theme, Dream and Narrative: Reading the *Sacred Tales* of Aelius Aristides, in: *TAPA* 118, 1988, 377-391.
- Pernot, L.: Les *Discours Sacrés* d'Aelius Aristide entre médecine, religion et rhétorique, in: *Atti Academia Pontaniana, Napoli*, N.S. 51, 2002, 369-383.
- Puech, B.: *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d'époque impériale*, Paris 2002.
- Quet, M.-H.: Parler de soi pour louer son dieu: le cas d'Aelius Aristide (du journal intime de ses nuits aux *Discours Sacrés* en l'honneur du dieu Asklépios), in: Baslez, M.-F./Hoffmann, P./Pernot, L. (ed.), *L'invention de l'autobiographie. D'Hésiode à Saint Augustin*, Paris 1993, 211-253.
- Rawson, E.: Roman Rulers and the Philosophic Adviser, in: Griffin, M./Barnes, J., *Philosophia Togata. Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society*, Oxford 1989, 233-257.
- Ritti, T.: Il sofista Antipatros di Hierapolis, in: *MGR* 13, 1988, 71-128.
- Rothe, S.: *Kommentar zu ausgewählten Sophistenviten des Philostratos. Die Lehrstuhlinhaber in Athen und Rom*, Heidelberg 1989.
- Rutherford, R.B.: *The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius. A Study*, Oxford 1989.
- Saller, R.P.: *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*, Cambridge 1982.
- Schmitz, Th.: *Bildung und Macht. Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit*, München 1997.
- Schröder, H.O.: Publius Aelius Aristides. Ein kranker Rhetor im Ringen um den Sinn seines Lebens, in: *Gymnasium* 95, 1988, 375-380.
- Sohlberg, D.: Aelius Aristides und Diogenes von Babylon. Zur Geschichte des rednerischen Ideals, in: *MH* 29, 1972, 177-200 and 256-277.
- Swain, S.: *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50-250*, Oxford 1996.
- Van Meirvenne, B.: Plutarch on the Healing Power of (a Tricky) Παρρησία. Observations in favour of a political reading of *De adulate et amico*?, in: Stadter,

- P.A./Van der Stockt, L. (ed.), *Sage and Emperor. Plutarch, Greek Intellectuals, and Roman Power in the Time of Trajan (98–117 AD)*, Leuven 2002, 141-160.
- Weber, G.: *Kaiser, Träume und Visionen in Prinzipat und Spätantike*. Historia Einzelschriften 143, Stuttgart 2000.
- Weiss, C.G.: *Literary Turns: The Representation of Conversion in Aelius Aristides' Hieroi Logoi and Apuleius' Metamorphoses*, Dissertation Yale University 1998.
- Whitmarsh, T.: *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire. The Politics of Imitation*, Oxford 2001.
- Winter, E.: Strukturelle Mechanismen kaiserlicher Hilfsmaßnahmen nach Naturkatastrophen, in: Olshausen, E./Sonnabend, H. (ed.), *Naturkatastrophen in der antiken Welt*. Stuttgarter Kolloquium zur historischen Geographie des Altertums 6, 1996, Stuttgart 1998, 147-155.