

Cambridge University Press  
978-0-521-82720-1 - Philostratus  
Edited by Ewen Bowie and Jas Elsner  
Excerpt  
[More information](#)

---

I

*Introductory*

Cambridge University Press  
 978-0-521-82720-1 - Philostratus  
 Edited by Ewen Bowie and Jas Elsner  
 Excerpt  
[More information](#)

## CHAPTER I

*A Protean corpus**Jas Elsner*

In the kind of grand generalisation possible only when a great poet is self-confident enough of his own powers to pronounce on the career of a still greater poet, T. S. Eliot once wrote of Shakespeare:

What is the 'whole man' is not simply his greatest and maturest achievement, but the whole pattern formed by the sequence of plays; so that we may say confidently that the full meaning of any one of the plays is not in itself alone, but in that play in the order in which it was written, in relation to all of Shakespeare's other plays, earlier and later: we must know all of Shakespeare's work in order to know any of it.<sup>1</sup>

This claim for the totality of an author's work to be taken as the key to its individual elements (surely as true of Virgil, the poet whom Eliot made his archetype of the 'classic',<sup>2</sup> as of Shakespeare) is particularly interesting in the case of writers whose works seem to exhibit a fundamental self-consciousness about their own relations with each other. Of course, with ancient authors we can never be sure we possess the totality of their works. In the case of Philostratus, we cannot even be sure that many of the works we attribute to him were certainly by him, though we can be sure that we do not have all the works actually written by him.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, despite Eliot's strictures about reading all the works in their order of writing, we do not certainly know the sequence of Philostratean composition. But in the case of Philostratus, his self-consciousness about genre, interrelations within the written corpus and an almost obsessive concern for variety are perhaps more intense than in any other comparable writer. Arguably, however much we may get out of any one of his texts (which is the challenge for most of the contributions collected in this volume), the supreme interest of

<sup>1</sup> From 'John Ford' (1932), in Eliot (1932) 170–80, p. 170.

<sup>2</sup> See 'What is a Classic?' (1944), in Kermode (1975) 115–31.

<sup>3</sup> See Bowie, chapter 2 in this volume.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-82720-1 - Philostratus

Edited by Ewen Bowie and Jas Elsner

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Philostratus' writing lies in a glance at what Eliot called the 'whole man' (which might be said to be the synoptic aim of this volume as a whole).

First, then, my evidence. Like the apparition of Proteus, the 'Egyptian god . . . versatile in wisdom, ever changing his form and defying capture',<sup>4</sup> who appears to Apollonius of Tyana's mother in *VA* I.4 (see below) and announces that he is to be incarnated as her son, Philostratus as writer rarely appears in the same genre twice. And he hardly uses a genre without exacting a piece of transformative panache upon it that leaves it simultaneously traditional and vibrantly innovative. The Philostratean corpus, as it survives, comprises the following texts: *Lives of the sophists* (*VS*), *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* (*VA*), *Heroicus*, *Imagines*, *Letters*, *Gymnasticus* (all more or less likely to be the work of our author) as well as *Nero*, a dialogue transmitted with the manuscripts of Lucian, and two rhetorical 'discourses' (*dialexeis*) one or both of which may be by him. I have no intention of entering the critical maelstrom of precise attribution and dating in respect of these works: suffice it to say that most authorities currently go for a broad view that incorporates the majority of these into the corpus as written by one man.<sup>5</sup> If the authorship is in the final analysis uncertain, the relative datings are still more so – but I find at least plausible a sketch of Philostratus' career which puts what most consider to be his earlier work (*Gymnasticus*, *Letters*, the *dialexeis*) in his period at the Severan court in Rome before the death of Julia Domna in AD 217, and his later works (especially *VA* and *VS*, probably in that order)<sup>6</sup> in his time at Athens after her decease,<sup>7</sup> with *Heroicus* perhaps written early in the reign of Severus Alexander (emperor 222–35),<sup>8</sup> and *Imagines* a movable feast in that it is undatable, even roughly, on internal or external evidence.

<sup>4</sup> ὁ Αἰγύπτιος θεός. ὅστις μὲν δὴ τὴν σοφίαν ὁ Πρωτεύς ἐγένετο . . . ὡς ποικίλος τε ἦν καὶ ἄλλοτε ἄλλος καὶ κρείττων τοῦ ἄλῶναι . . . Apollonius is the perfect sophist, the divinest of divine men. On Apollonius and Proteus, see Flinterman (1995) 52–3. Note that the Suda attributes a text entitled *Proteus* (or *Proteus the Cynic or the Sophist*) to a Philostratus (Bowersock (1969) 3; Whitmarsh (2001) 228, n.184) and that Heliodorus compares his sage Calasiris with Proteus in *Aethiopica* 2.24.4. In *Imagines* 2.17.11–12 Philostratus has Proteus appear in his description of the islands as a decision maker.

<sup>5</sup> See the discussions by Bowie in chapter 2 in this volume; de Lannoy (1997); Flinterman (1995) 5–14; Anderson (1986) 291–6; Bowersock (1969) 2–4. Specifically on *Nero*, see de Lannoy (1997) 2,389–2,404 and Whitmarsh (1999) 143–4, 156–8, 160 for a date of composition after the *Constitutio Antoniniana* of 211.

<sup>6</sup> For reference to *VA* as earlier than *VS*, see *VS* 570 (77.6 in Kayser's Teubner), but much of the composition of both works may have been simultaneous, see Bowie (1978) 1,169–70. For *VA* as commissioned originally by Julia Domna (perhaps more a rhetorical self-valorisation than a factual claim?), see *VA* 1.3. On the 'circle' of Julia Domna, see e.g. Bowersock (1969) 101–7; Brent (1995) 237–48; Hemelrijk (1999) 122–6; Whitmarsh (2007) 31–4.

<sup>7</sup> Basically, I follow Billault (2000) 28–31.

<sup>8</sup> See esp. Jones (2001) 142–3; Aitken and Maclean (2004) xx.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-82720-1 - Philostratus

Edited by Ewen Bowie and Jas Elsner

Excerpt

[More information](#)*A Protean corpus*

5

This catalogue of works offers a systematic resistance to generic repetition. True, *Heroicus* and *Nero* are both dialogues – but the former is contemporary, set roughly at the time of its composition in the first third of the third century,<sup>9</sup> while the latter is set in AD 68 at the end of Nero's reign (his death is announced at the close of the piece, *Nero* 11) probably on the Aegean island of Gyara to which one of the interlocutors, the Stoic Musonius Rufus, had been banished.<sup>10</sup> *Heroicus* belongs to the broadly philosophical genre of dialogue associated with Plato and popular among Second Sophistic writers like Plutarch and Lucian,<sup>11</sup> while *Nero* (if it is by our Philostratus) is a historical fantasy (a typical sophistic exercise in this respect). Both concern issues of identity, but in *Nero* this is a matter of the cultural politics of Greece under Rome,<sup>12</sup> whereas in *Heroicus* it is about the relationship of Greeks (and others, notably a Phoenician stranger clothed in Ionic dress which has come to be regarded as local in Phoenicia, *Her.* 1) to the living sacred past of Greece.<sup>13</sup> Likewise, *VS* and *VA* are both works of biographical history.<sup>14</sup> But *VA*, in eight books, is one of the longest biographies known to antiquity (virtually a prose epic or a hagiographic novel), and is quite exceptional in its concentration on a holy man active about 150 years before the time of writing.<sup>15</sup> *VS*, by contrast, is exceptional in the shortness of its numerous biographies (told in what might be called long chapters rather than whole books), which together constitute the cultural history of an era named by us 'the Second Sophistic', following Philostratus' own characterisation of a prevalent literary and rhetorical style (*VS* 481: 2.25–7 Kayser). Only Herodes Atticus has a large biography in *VS*. Indeed, he is the pivotal figure who straddles the two books of *VS* (as well as attaining the Consulship in Rome and hence straddling the political worlds of Greece and Italy); he appears in relation to Polemo (*VS* 536–9) and gives the funerary oration for Secundus (*VS* 544) in book 1, while his own biography opens book 2.

<sup>9</sup> See Jones (2001) 143–4. <sup>10</sup> See Whitmarsh (1999) 142 and (2001a) 152–5.

<sup>11</sup> See Mantero (1966) 145–68; Rossi (1997) 20–4; Maclean and Aitken (2001) xl–xli.

<sup>12</sup> See esp. Whitmarsh (1999).

<sup>13</sup> See Whitmarsh, chapter 10 in this volume; for a summary of critical positions, see Maclean and Aitken (2001) lxxvi–lxxvii and the essays collected by Aitken and Maclean (2004). On the usefulness of *Her.* for the history of late antique religion, see Rutherford, chapter 11 in this volume on pilgrimage; Betz (1996) (= Betz (2004a)); Pache (2001); Hershbell (2004); Maclean (2004); Skedros (2004).

<sup>14</sup> On biography in Roman antiquity, see Swain (1997) with bibliography.

<sup>15</sup> There is, as a result of this exceptional length and other factors, a significant debate on the genre of *VA*. Its title in Greek (τὰ ἐς τὸν Τυαννέα Ἀπολλώνιον), its eight-book structure, its scale and its use of paradoxography all recall the ancient novel rather than biography as such, beginning with the tradition of Xenophon's eight-book *Cyropaedia*. See esp. Bowie (1978) 1,665 and Bowie (1994) 187, 189–96.

*Letters* and *Imagines* are, like *VS*, collections of shorter prose pieces, neither as thematically unified as *VS*. *Letters* is a brilliant example of rhetorical *variatio*, most in the highly restricted frame of erotic epistles in prose, purporting to be from the male voice of a lover (of both boys and women) to a variety of mainly unnamed recipients.<sup>16</sup> The fact that the arrangement of the individual letters in the different manuscript traditions is wildly erratic (creating nightmares for the modern editor) means that we have no clear authorial order: the very flexibility of the arrangement is itself a signal for the kind of text this is by contrast with the other works in the corpus (although one might assume there was a clear original order, rather than a variety of versions, at the time of publication).<sup>17</sup> *Imagines* extracts from the tradition of rhetorical practice and literary fiction the specific trope of the *ecphrasis* of art and collects together in two books a series of model examples that purport to describe the paintings in a gallery at Naples.<sup>18</sup> *Gymnasticus*, by contrast with the other Philostratean texts, takes the form of a technical treatise but combines this with a defence of the paedagogic skills of the athletic trainer – thus mingling two genres, the treatise and the apology, much favoured in the Second Sophistic.<sup>19</sup> Even more than the multiform corpus of Lucian, this group of texts seems a systematic exercise in parading exemplary pieces, each in a different genre and each with an innovative take on the genre it espouses.

If we move from the different texts' generic differentiation from each other to examine their particular affiliations to the traditions of genre on which they draw, several of Philostratus' works – especially *Imagines*, *VA* and *VS* – were to prove highly influential. While the business of arranging a cluster of short essays around a unifying theme is shared with *Letters* (the majority of which are amatory), *Imagines* was surely the first prose text to elevate the trope of *ecphrasis* to being the co-ordinating structural device and thematic focus of an entire literary work.<sup>20</sup> It is a mark of the brilliance of Philostratus' shape-changing in the matter of genre that he inaugurated a series of imitations in the generic form espoused by more than one of his texts. *Imagines* was emulated by a second Philostratus, whose book claims that he was the grandson of our author and refers explicitly

<sup>16</sup> See Rosenmeyer (2001a) esp. 322–38 and Goldhill, chapter 13 in this volume.

<sup>17</sup> On the textual tradition, see Benner and Fobes (1949) 387–413 and Raïos (1992) and (1997).

<sup>18</sup> For an account of the *ecphrasis* of art as an ancient literary topos and Philostratus' innovative transformation of it, see Elsner (2002) esp. 13–15.

<sup>19</sup> See König, chapter 12 in this volume, with bibliography, König (2005) 301–44 and König (2007).

<sup>20</sup> Posidippus' collection of epigrams from the third century BC uses *ecphrasis* as such a framing focus for a number of grouped poems, with sections dedicated to poems on stones, on tomb-monuments, on temple dedications and on statues.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-82720-1 - Philostratus

Edited by Ewen Bowie and Jas Elsner

Excerpt

[More information](#)*A Protean corpus*

7

to the model of his grandfather's descriptions (Philostratus the Younger, *Imagines*, proem 2), and by the book of *ecphraseis* of statues transmitted under the name of Callistratus.<sup>21</sup> *VS* is explicitly signalled as a model by Eunapius (AD 346–c. 414) whose *Lives of the philosophers and sophists* takes up the succession roughly where Philostratus leaves off towards the end of the Severan age (Eunapius, *VP* 455). *VA*, as an epic hagiography of a non-Christian holy man, not only required extensive refutation in Christian late antiquity (notably in Eusebius' *Contra Hieroclem*) but was translated into Latin more than once by both Christians and pagans (Sidonius Apollinaris, *epist.* 8.3.1) and was ultimately a model for the extensive genre of Christian hagiography (starting with Eusebius' four-volume *Life of Constantine*).<sup>22</sup>

The versatility and variety of the texts within the corpus in relation to each other, and their originality as models for later imitations (which surely constituted the apogee of success in the art of sophistic education), needs to be seen in relation to each text's specific re-workings of the genres in which it is embedded and against which it is constructed. In the case of ancient biographical writing, for instance, both *VA* and *VS* challenge – in radically different ways – the one-book-for-a-life norm of Plutarch's *Parallel lives* or Suetonius' *Lives of the Caesars*. The *VA* extends the form to vast proportions in a kind of semi-fictional panegyric to a holy man that is at the same time an apology or defense of Philostratus' hero against charges of being a mere magician.<sup>23</sup> In many respects the transformation of a traditional biography into so long a work (including the ways its readership is envisaged) is conducted by means of borrowing tropes and patterns from ancient fictional romance – for instance, the paradoxographies of travel.<sup>24</sup> Yet *VA* is also an extended rhetorical eulogy – a typical piece of sophistic encomium but unique and revolutionary in length – characterised by remarkable repeated use of the topos of

<sup>21</sup> See Bertrand (1882) for an account of this heritage leading into Byzantium, Webb (1992) and now the essays in Constantini *et al.* (2006).

<sup>22</sup> For some remarks on Eusebius' *VC* in relation to Philostratus' *VA*, see Cameron (1997) 164–5.

<sup>23</sup> On *VA* as an apology, see Swain (1999). On the holy man in general in the period, see Fowden (1982); Anderson (1994); Francis (1995) 83–129. On the Christian holy man, Brown (1971) is still essential, modified by Brown (1995) 57–78, with discussion by Cameron (1999). On the historical Apollonius, see esp. Bowie (1978); on *VA* as biography, see Anderson (1986) 121–39 and Swain (1996) 381–96; on religious rhetoric in *VA*, see Henderson (2003); on the text's negotiation of sophistry and divinity, see Sfameni Gasparro (2007); on magic, see Ogden (2007a) 462–8; on the late antique reception of *VA*, see Dzielska (1986) 153–83 and now Jones (2006).

<sup>24</sup> On *VA* as *vie romancée* or biographical novel, see Reardon (1971) 189 ('presque un roman'); Hägg (1983) 115–17; Billault (1991); Bowie (1994) 187–96. On paradoxography, see Rommel (1923) 1–59. On travel, see Elsner (1997).

*synkrisis*, whereby its hero is compared favourably with other ancient heroes across the genres of Greek culture from history via mythology to religion and philosophy.<sup>25</sup> Rhetorically, it takes a set of school-boys' exercises (in the technique of *synkrisis*, as *Imagines* takes *ecphrasis*) and turns them to dazzling effect on an exceptionally extended canvas to sustain its mix of apology, praise and protreptic.

The *VS* draws on such models as Suetonius' *De Viris Illustribus*, a now largely lost series of lives of over 100 cultural figures (poets, philosophers, orators, historians and so forth) presented in four or five books, of which the section on teachers of grammar and rhetoric (*De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*) survives.<sup>26</sup> But in focusing on sophists as heroic subjects,<sup>27</sup> Philostratus turned the genre into a cultural history of what he deemed especially important about his own period. It is a defense of the sophists as purveyors of rhetoric and education, in which philosophy must be included (e.g. *VS* 479, 1.1–3 Kayser; *VS* 480, 2.1–2 Kayser, to cite the opening sentences of the proem and the first book) and a formulation of Greek culture that was clearly in some respects self-serving, since it told the story of a tradition leading up to and including Philostratus himself,<sup>28</sup> and contained certain not always oblique critiques of some of Philostratus' most illustrious and literary predecessors – notably Dio Chrysostom.<sup>29</sup> The text is elegant in avoiding too much autobiography or self-promotion,<sup>30</sup> but nonetheless proclaims the family's role in the profession by discussing Philostratus' relative and namesake, Philostratus of Lemnos, in its concluding paragraph:

of Philostratus of Lemnos and his ability in the law courts, in political harangues, in writing treatises, in declamation and lastly of his talent for speaking extempore, it is not for me to write. (*VS* 628)<sup>31</sup>

<sup>25</sup> For instance Alexander (on whom see Anderson (1986) 203, 216, 220 and Elsner (1997) 30, n.49), Odysseus and Pythagoras (on whom see, respectively, Flinterman and Van Dijk (chapters 8 and 9) in this volume).

<sup>26</sup> See Kaster (1995) xxi–xxix.

<sup>27</sup> See Whitmarsh (2001a) 188–90 for the rhetorical *agon* as Homeric *aristeia*.

<sup>28</sup> E.g. Swain (1996) 98–9, 396–400; also Bowersock (2002) 158: 'It is all too easy to fault Philostratus for promoting the likes of himself through his *Lives of the sophists*.'

<sup>29</sup> See Brancacci (1985) 63–110 and Whitmarsh (2001) 225–44 for Philostratus on Dio in both *VA* and *VS*.

<sup>30</sup> For a Second Sophistic defence of praising oneself in passing, see Aelius Aristides *Concerning a Remark in Passing* (*Or.* 28) with the discussion of Rutherford (1995).

<sup>31</sup> Further on Philostratus of Lemnos and his talent for extempore oration and declamation, see *VS* 617, 623, 628. For discussion of Philostratus' own self-portrait in relation to *VA*, see Billault (1993) 271–8.

In modern times VS has proven so dominant a model for conceptualising the Second Sophistic<sup>32</sup> that it has probably caused an over-emphasis on the rhetorical and political aspects of the movement against such issues as cultural antiquarianism and religious revival which are addressed variously in *Gymnasticus*, *Heroicus* and *VA*.<sup>33</sup>

*Letters* picks on an established genre in antiquity (with a particular Second Sophistic efflorescence in the works of Alciphron and Aelian)<sup>34</sup> but, as we might expect, Philostratus subjects the genre to both a probing self-reflection and to typical innovation.<sup>35</sup> In particular, as in *Imagines*, *Heroicus*, VS and *VA*, Philostratus introduces aspects from other rhetorical genres. In the case of *Letters*, dialogue, drama and encomium not only enlarge the scope of epistolarity in general, but might be argued to demolish its specific form and imaginary structure as the single voice of one participant in a relationship to others. Most are amatory,<sup>36</sup> written in the voice of a male lover (which may or may not be Philostratus' own, like the voice of the sophistic interpreter of the paintings in *Imagines*)<sup>37</sup> but the consistency of that voice is fractured in several ways. First the writer speaks not to a single beloved from letter to letter, but to many – both women and boys. Second, he occasionally interpellates the imagined response of his recipient, breaking the illusion of the letter as a literary form. For example (in *Letter* 28, to a woman):

Let us settle the matter by a bargain: Let us both stay here, or let us go off there together. You don't agree to this; well then, let me tell you . . .

Effectively, by performing an imaginary dialogue in the lover's mind, Philostratus stages the subjectivity and self-absorption of his speaker in a medium which 'should' present itself as one of communication: what we get is not a clear picture of the other to whom a letter ought to speak but a range of Sophistic performances cast in, undermined by and undermining of the epistolary genre.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>32</sup> Especially in the key works of Bowersock (1969); Brunt (1994); Schmitz (1997).

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Reardon (1971) 185–98; Anderson (1986) 285.

<sup>34</sup> For a handy and up-to-date introduction to the genre, see Trapp (2003) 1–45. On Greek fictional letters, see Costa (2002) xi–xx and Rosenmeyer (2001a) 255–321, and further on Alciphron, Rosenmeyer (2001b) and Schmitz (2004).

<sup>35</sup> See Rosenmeyer (2001a) 325 on playing with the rules of letter-writing and 330–2 on 'epistolarity undermined'.

<sup>36</sup> On the special interest of *Letters* in visuality, see Walker (1992) and (on *Letter* 26) Morales (2004) 23–7, and on the special interest of *Imagines* in the amatory, see Mathieu-Castellani (2006). For more general accounts of the close correlation of the visual and the amatory in the Roman imperial culture, see Goldhill (2001b) and Bartsch (2006) 57–114.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Webb (1992) 24–7. <sup>38</sup> Cf. Rosenmeyer (2001a) 326–32, 337–8.



*Imagines* takes the rhetorical trope of *ecphrasis*, which was a kind of hyperbolic literary turn of vivid description within a larger text in an ancient tradition reaching back to Homer and had a specific rhetorical set of prescriptions (at least in its prose form) in the *progymnasmata* or ancient rhetorical handbooks.<sup>39</sup> While the *ecphrasis* of works of art had been spectacularly performed in prose by no less a sophistic exemplar than Lucian and by the novelists,<sup>40</sup> Philostratus made of it a prose literary genre in its own right. In doing so and in concentrating on the evocation of art rather than the other kinds of description included within ancient *ecphrasis*, Philostratus focuses the genre around the visual arts in terms that have come (perhaps excessively) to dominate all modern discussion of *ecphrasis*.<sup>41</sup> Again, as in the implicitly over-rhetorical definition of the ‘Second Sophistic’ we have acquired through concentrating on the portraits of sophists as orators in *VS*, so Philostratus’ implicit definition of *ecphrasis* as exclusively art-centred has come to formulate the field for modern scholars. At fault here, ultimately, is a literalist reading of the Philostratean texts which takes them as expressing documentary truths, rather than creatively playing with and against all kinds of cultural presumptions – not only subverting the expectations generated by their own literary genres but also taking surprising positions in the wide variety of themes they address. Philostratus himself, in *Imagines*, having set up his descriptions as works of art, is then able to play brilliantly upon all the other available tropes of *ecphrasis* – from mythical narrative to landscape, from personification to still life – framing these as if they were the subjects of his paintings. This is coupled with the rhetorical bravado of presenting as paintings described within *ecphraseis* the kinds of text – epic, bucolic, tragic – that would normally have contained *ecphraseis* as brief intervals within them. The question of whether his descriptions evoke real things (like the *Marsh* at 1.9, the *Bosporus* at 1.12–13, or the *Islands* at 2.17) or paintings of them – which is to say real things already fictionalised as art and represented at one remove – is made to resonate with typically ingenious playfulness against the problem of whether the paintings in his gallery ever really existed at all.<sup>42</sup> This is itself a commentary on whether the *phantasia* – or

<sup>39</sup> For the range of *ecphrasis*, see Elsner (2002). On the trope within the *progymnasmata* and its ancient meanings, see Webb (1999). For translation of the *progymnasmata*, see now Kennedy (2003).

<sup>40</sup> On Lucian and *ecphrasis*, see esp. Maffei (1994) and Borg (2004b). On the novel, see e.g. Bartsch (1989) for Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius; Zeitlin (1990) for Longus; Morales (2004) for Achilles Tatius.

<sup>41</sup> Webb (1999) 7–11.

<sup>42</sup> Interestingly, Philostratus never offers us a painting within a painting in *Imagines* – all the works of art within the pictures described by the text are sculptures: see Abbondanza (2001). On *Imagines* as a fictional text, see Webb (2006).

*A Protean corpus*

II

vivid visualisation – evoked by the sophist can replace or even outdo in the hearer's or reader's mind the actual impression of a real gallery, a real painting, a real landscape seen directly. The fact that 'truth' and 'wisdom' – which might be said to be reality and its correct discernment – are words that occur in the first sentence of the proem signals these pre-occupations.<sup>43</sup> Effectively, the very notion of description – the technical topos out of which Philostratus has constructed this text – becomes in a deep way its thematic focus. For description is the transformation of the real and material (whether landscape, still life, or picture) into words which in some ways are a false or deceptive rendition of the represented, but in others may reveal the visualisation of what is depicted more directly or effectively perhaps than seeing the real thing itself. The arrangement of the descriptions – both for the sake of variation and also in emulation of the structuring of short poems into literary collections – implicitly elevates a minor rhetorical trope into a miniature art-form in its own right.<sup>44</sup>

The use of genre to turn its characteristic concerns into the theme of the text is a particular feature of Philostratus' corpus. *Heroicus* combines a philosophical–religious dialogue (set in a contemporary *locus amoenus* where vinedressing is philosophy, *Her.* 2.6), with ecphrastic visualisations in the vinegrower's descriptions of heroes and their images (such as Protesilaus (10–11), the statue of Hector (19.3–4), as well as Nestor (26.13–14), Sthenelus and Diomedes (27.13), Philoctetes (28.14) and so forth).<sup>45</sup> This leads to a vibrant evocation of a contemporary Homeric world where the heroes live set in the Greece of Philostratus' own time.<sup>46</sup> The philosophic expectations of dialogue, translated in part as sophistic performance, take a Platonic ideal normally located in the antiquarian past and make it vibrantly present as a highly cultured version of religious experience.<sup>47</sup> Likewise, the move to a religiously valid present or recent past within the world of the Roman empire – steeped in the literary culture of the deep past – when embodied in the biographic genre's heroic focus on Apollonius, allows a narrative of religious revival to unfold through the text's often fictional embroidery of a charismatic individual's personal history.<sup>48</sup> The theme of time is one of the specific interests of the corpus as a whole – especially the dramatic

<sup>43</sup> For the play of these themes and other key wider concerns of the Second Sophistic in *Imagines*, see Graziani (2006) and Quet (2006).

<sup>44</sup> On the Hellenistic practice of creating collections and anthologies out of miniature poems, see Gutzwiller (1998) 15–46, 227–322.

<sup>45</sup> On the vividness of these accounts, see Zeitlin (2001) 255–62.

<sup>46</sup> For this as the refutation and correction of Homer, see Mestre (2004).

<sup>47</sup> As Whitmarsh remarks in chapter 10 in this volume, the text in part makes its attempt to create new meanings a key theme of its own literary performance.

<sup>48</sup> On time in *V4*, see van Dijk (2000).