

Title	Narrator Interventions in Philostratus' Apollonius
Author(s)	Katsumata, Yasuhiro
Citation	神話学研究. 1 P.79-P.90
Issue Date	2017-05-31
Text Version	publisher
URL	https://doi.org/10.18910/66984
DOI	10.18910/66984
rights	
Note	

Osaka University Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/repo/ouka/all/>

Narrator Interventions in Philostratus' *Apollonius*¹

Yasuhiro KATSUMATA

Introduction

Apollonius of Tyana (henceforth *Apollonius*)² written by Flavius Philostratus (c. 170-249 CE)³ is one of the most exciting prose narrative compositions in the Greek world of late Antiquity⁴. This massive work (composed of eight books)⁵ is a detailed biography of Apollonius, a Pythagorean philosopher who is thought to have lived in the early first century CE⁶. Most parts of the work are devoted to the description of the protagonist's worldwide travels, which cover almost all areas known to the ancient people, namely, Greece, India, Ionia, Gadeira, Alexandria, Ethiopia and Rome. What Philostratus emphasises through the presentation of a series of Apollonius' activities during the travels is how respectable a figure the sage is; he is interested in ideal ways of thinking and behaving and so often makes discussions with important figures in the places he visits to share wisdom (σοφία), which he values above anything else⁷. That 'Socratic' stance causes his hostile relationship with the Roman Emperor Domitian⁸, but he never hesitates to tell the enemy what he thinks right, and overcomes the difficulty in the end.

To enjoy this work fully, one should keep in mind the fact that a first-person narrator is responsible for these stories about Apollonius. Some recent critics have focused on the behaviour of the narrator, and for meaningful analysis they have used a narratological perspective and contributed

¹ This is an expanded version of the paper read at the annual meeting of the Nagoya Classical Society held on 10 December 2016. I wish to thank Prof. Masahiro Ogawa and Prof. Sumio Yoshitake for giving me a wonderful opportunity to talk on this postclassical fascinating (but unfortunately underrated) author. I gratefully acknowledge helpful discussions with the attendants of the workshop on several points in the paper.

² Though many scholars call this work *The Life of Apollonius*, I think this to be rejected for the following two reasons. Firstly, we can find in this text itself the expression 'the things concerning Apollonius of Tyana' (τὰ ... ἐς Ἀπολλώνιον τὸν Τυανέα (8.29)). Secondly, in the same author's *Lives of the Sophists*, the work is mentioned as 'the things concerning Apollonius' (τοῖς ἐς Ἀπολλώνιον (570)).

³ The *Suda*'s confusing accounts pose the (unanswerable) question of how many 'Philostrati' there were in antiquity. This causes the problem of attribution of works written by 'Philostrati', but scholars agree that the *Apollonius* is the work by this Philostratus. For more details, see de Lannoy (1997), Solmsen (1940), Anderson (1986), 291-6, Billault (2000), 5-31, Flinterman (1995), 5-51 and Bowie (2009).

⁴ More specifically, the work is a product of the 'Second Sophistic' period, for which see Whitmarsh (2005).

⁵ The standard edition is the two-volume Lobe by Christopher P. Jones (Jones ed. (2005a) and (2005b)), whose text I borrow throughout this paper. Translations are all mine.

⁶ For ancient representations of this figure in general, see Speyer (1974) and Jones (2006).

⁷ Belloni (1980) discusses this important concept in detail.

⁸ Cf. 7.11.

much to our better understanding of the text⁹. This article too is concerned not so much with ‘what’ is told as with ‘how’ the story is told. When discussing the narrator’s ways of presenting a story about the eponymous sage, scholars see his comments at 1.3 as their starting point. There the narrator gives us the reason why he came to work on the life of Apollonius: the details of the sage’s travels were recorded by a man named Damis, who had accompanied Apollonius, always giving heed to his deeds and words. After a certain period of time, the empress ‘Julia’—who the narrator undoubtedly expects us to identify with the historical ‘Julia Domna’ the wife of Septimius Severus—got the document made by Damis and ordered the narrator to ‘rewrite’ (μεταγράψαι) it because it needed sophistication and elaboration¹⁰. It is clear that the episode invites the reader to view the *Apollonius* as a pseudo-documentary fiction, a fiction supposed to be based on a document which, in reality, never existed¹¹.

This paper shares critics’ common belief that the narrator’s story at 1.3 reveals the nature of his work: *Apollonius* is meant to be a ‘reliable’ historical record produced on the basis of the testimony of an eyewitness. I believe, however, that more attention should be paid to the meaning of the narrator’s ‘rewriting’ of the Damis’ document. What does the narrator mean when he defines his job as ‘rewriting’? To answer the question, this paper focuses on the ways the narrator intervenes in his narrative¹². As his use of the verb μεταγράφω suggests, our narrator’s primary aim is to preserve what Damis wanted to say in the document as it is; many times he relates his stories with the stock phrase ‘according to Damis’, which shows his basic composition frame of ‘rewriting’ what Damis is saying in the document¹³. So, on the whole he, as a detached ‘rewriter’, stays away from his own narrative, keeping an objective point of view. At some points, however, he reveals himself by using first-person expressions. This kind of intervention seems to have something to do with our narrator’s alleged act of ‘rewriting’. If we explore the narrator’s strategy of intervention, we can clarify to some degree his intention of using the word μεταγράφω.

So in what follows, I will investigate how our narrator intervenes in his narrative. There are, I would argue, three kinds of intervention: 1) when he mentions his sources other than the Damis document; 2) when he makes clear his narrative procedure in advance; and 3) when he gives his own opinions about his subject matters. Though in some examples these three categories overlap with each

⁹ Especially important are Knoles (1981), 25-62, Whitmarsh (2004), Gyselinck and Demoen (2009) and Kemezis (2014), 63-78, to whose discussions I owe a great deal.

¹⁰ For the picture of Julia Domna in this episode, see Levick (2007), 119-23.

¹¹ For ancient pseudo-documentary fictions, see Hansen (2003) and Ní Mheallaigh (2008). Meyer (1917) is one of the most important studies on the question of fictionality of the *Apollonius* because it argues persuasively that Damis was invented by Philostratus. Bowie (1978), also influential, reasserts the thesis with additional material.

¹² A similar study on Thucydides is done in Gribble (1998), which inspired me to start the research for this paper.

¹³ E.g. 1.35, 3.15, 5.9, 6.22, 7.41.

other, I believe this categorisation is the most rewarding for our understanding of the narrator's behaviour. Through the discussion of these interventions, I aim to provide a clearer picture of our narrator as a 'rewriter'.

Mentioning His Sources

The first category is very simple: the narrator shows himself when he presents some information sources other than Damis' record. As stated at the introductory part of his work (1.2-3), our narrator uses several kinds of source material along with Damis' eyewitness account¹⁴, and from time to time he intervenes and makes discussions on specific themes with the help of these sources. Take the passage at 2.9 for instance. The episode given there is Apollonius' visit to the region where the mountain Nysa rises up. With a view to giving his own answer to the question about an activity of Alexander the Great in this mountain, the narrator refers to a special source available to him; while some people, who believe what Alexander's followers say in their record, hold that the king climbed the mountain, the narrator takes a skeptical attitude by mentioning the eyewitness account of inhabitants in the region denying this idea. Then, he comes to the fore as an *ego* narrator and makes his stance clear, using first-person expressions: he understands (γινώσκω) that his reference to the inhabitants' testimony will displease some people [i.e. those who believe Alexander's having climbed the mountain], and insists that while the king's followers did not record the truth, he (ἐμοί) sees the truth as most important. And then he adds that in his opinion (οἶμαι) it is more respectable for Alexander to ensure his army's endurance by not climbing the mountain than to climb it for a bacchanalian drinking party. In this way, the narrator, presenting an eyewitness account of the people in Nysa as his source, intervenes in the narrative.

A few more examples of the same kind will reveal the nature of the narrator's intervention. At 2.13, the narrator talks about tusks of elephants. The source material he offers here is a work composed by an ethnographer Juba, who, according to the narrator, argues that tusks should be seen as horns. Our narrator, however, opposes this idea, showing himself again with the first-person expressions: 'I (Ἐγώ) do not accept (προσδέχομαι) his [sc. Juba's] reasoning'. Especially important in this intervention is his use of the emphatic pronoun 'I (ἐγώ)'; our narrator highlights his own presence with this pronoun when necessary¹⁵, in this case expecting the reader to distinguish him from Juba

¹⁴ What the narrator mentions there are written (and perhaps oral) records collected at various places that are related in some way to Apollonius, works on Apollonius composed by other authors, and Apollonius' letters sent to socially important figures and to several peoples such as Indians and Egyptians.

¹⁵ Other places in which the pronoun appears are e.g. 3.4, 5.39, 6.27, 6.35.

and to see him as a learned scholar more familiar with ethnographic observations than Juba is. Indeed, after this sudden appearance, the narrator makes an additional discussion about elephants' tusks in order to refute the expert's account¹⁶.

Also the passage at 6.27 is worthy of attention. There the narrator discusses the question of the existence of satyrs. After a short description of a letter written by Apollonius in which the sage insists that he succeeded in calming a satyr in Ethiopia, the narrator invites the reader to believe that the creature is real and characterised by its lustful nature. To bolster his argument, he then appears as an *ego* narrator, saying, 'I know (οἶδα) one of my contemporaries in Lemnus whose mother a satyr was said to haunt'. Here the narrator spotlights a person in Lemnus, where he himself was born¹⁷, as supporting evidence for his claim.

Let us have a look at one more example. At 7.35, the narrator is irritated about some malicious people who wrote about Apollonius, because they, so he tells us, fabricated an uncharacteristically long letter in the Ionic dialect which diminishes Apollonius' courageous resistance against his biggest enemy Domitian. After this the narrator comes to the fore and insists powerfully, 'though I have made a large collection of Apollonius' letters¹⁸, I never came across (προσέτυχον) a letter of his written in Ionic nor found (εὑρον) any verbosity in his letters'. Highlighting his own collection of Apollonius' letters and his careful examination of the sage's dialect¹⁹, the narrator tries to say that he is well qualified to depict 'true' Apollonius; this way of mentioning his source material helps strengthen his reliability as a writer on this problematic subject.

Commenting on His Narrative Procedure

Let us move to the second category: in general our narrator is indifferent to the form of his narrative and just enumerates episodes without specific narrating rules²⁰, but sometimes he becomes careful about what steps he should take or what points he should touch to make his storytelling more satisfying and acceptable for the reader, and it is in these places that we can see him revealing himself.

¹⁶ A few passages later, the narrator mentions this ethnographer once more, again with emphatic self-presentation (2.16: 'I found (Εγὼ ... εὑρον) in Juba's accounts that ...').

¹⁷ This is based on the *Suda*'s accounts. The three 'Philostrati' there are all said to be from Lemnus.

¹⁸ Corresponding remark by the narrator is found at 1.2.

¹⁹ The narrator's rejection of Apollonius' writing in Ionic is connected to his emphasis on the sage's familiarity with the Attic dialect (1.7). In this regard, Philostratus' Apollonius is much the same as his contemporary sophists, who were enthusiastic supporters of Atticism. For Apollonius as a sophist, see Billault (1993).

²⁰ The only rule he follows is that of chronology: he starts with the birth of Apollonius (1.4) and closes with the death of the man (8.30-31). It is noticeable that at the introductory 'methodology' section, he puts stress on his accuracy in time (1.2: ἐξακριβῶσαι τὸν ἄνδρα [sc. Apollonius] τοῖς τε χρόνοις, καθ' οὓς εἶπέ τι ἢ ἐπραξε).

Take the passage at 5.39 for instance. After he finishes talking about the discussion made by Apollonius and the two philosophers Dio and Euphrates in front of the Roman Emperor Vespasian, he mentions Apollonius' letters in which the sage blames Euphrates, and makes us expect that in the next stage he is going to focus on these letters. Here, however, he restrains himself not to make a digression, saying that 'I should not touch the man [i.e. Euphrates], because my aim is not to criticise him but to present the life of Apollonius to people ignorant about him'. In this way, he presents himself as self-aware enough not to take time for the subject irrelevant to his main theme²¹.

Another interesting intervention of the same sort is found at 6.35. After mentioning his previous treatment about Apollonius' always being the same²², the narrator makes explicit his overall writing stance: 'it is equally undesirable that I give lengthy accounts (ἐς λόγων ἴοιμεν μῆκος) by relating in detail Apollonius' philosophical discourses in every place, and that I seem superficial (διαπηδῶντες φαινοίμεθα) in narrating; and so it seems best for me (μοι) to treat only those episodes that are of prime importance or are worth recording among others'. The point he makes here is, in short, that he is unavoidably selective in presenting his narrative; all he needs to do is offer essential items concerning Apollonius with which his readers can get an accurate picture of the sage.

A similar intervention is found also at 1.25, where the narrator says, 'the following is what I found (εὔρον) about things concerning this man [sc. Apollonius] in Babylon and about things related to Babylon which are worth knowing (προσῆκει γινώσκειν)'. The expression 'worth knowing' implies the narrator's thinking that some pieces of information are useful and others not. So in this case too, we find that the narrator aims to make selections, classifying pieces of information according to the criterion of their worthiness²³.

The narrator's intervention found at the beginning of Book 7 is another good example of this category. He opens the book (the very first word is the verb οἶδα) with his own idea about tyranny. He, with Apollonius' defeat of the Roman Emperor Domitian in mind, states that whether a person has enough power to overcome oppression of a tyrant is the surest test of a true philosopher. He then announces to the reader that, in order to highlight the greatness of Apollonius as best he can, before turning to Apollonius himself, he is going to profile some distinguished philosophers, with whom Apollonius is compared. In subsequent sections, his narrative order follows this announcement (7.2-3 deal with such philosophers as Zeno, Plato, Diogenes and Crates and 7.4ff. with Apollonius battling Domitian). In this intervention, he presents himself as a careful arranger of his story line and we can

²¹ A similar stance of the narrator is found at 6.1: 'But so much for these topics [things concerning Ethiopia and India], as the story must go to its subject and let us follow the man [i.e. Apollonius]'. Cf. 6.27, 7.39.

²² As Jones (Jones ed. (2005b), 195 n. 49) says, it is not sure whether this refers to Philostratus' lost work or other parts of the *Apollonius*, because his Greek (ἐν ἑτέροις λόγοις ... εἴρηκα) can be interpreted the both ways.

²³ The narrator's criterion of 'worthiness' for selection is found in other places as well (e.g. 2.4, 5.1, 6.40).

see the narrator take pains to attain the best possible narrative effect; by thus showing himself, he tries, so it seems, to persuade his reader that he is never a boring scribe of the Damis document but an entertaining storyteller who knows how to make his story as readable as possible.

A similar, explanatory self-commentary is found at 1.16, where the narrator talks about Apollonius' visit to the sanctuary of Apollo at Daphne, a suburb of Antioch. He opens the chapter with a brief description of the spot, touching the well-known story about Daphne's transformation into a laurel tree; in this place, so the narrator tells us, there are a river Ladon, which was named after Daphne's father Ladon, cypresses of enormous height, and gentle springs Apollo is said to enjoy. After this account, the narrator makes his sudden appearance and says as follows: 'Perhaps I seem (δοκῶ) to be beginning the story in quite an immature way, inserting such mythical tales, but the goal here is not telling the tales. What then does my (μοι) story mean?' By thus asking a question about his narrative to himself, he creates the chance for him to give an account of his original aim to the reader. So after this intervention, the narrator tells us about Apollonius' unique interpretation of the tale of Apollo and Daphne; the sage, so he recounts, saw in the place 'semi-barbarous and uncultured folk' and, as an instance of this, said to the river Ladon that 'you seem to have become a barbarian after being a Greek'. The narrator's self-questioning intervention helps him offer this kind of Apollonius' 'Hellenocentric' attitude²⁴.

A passage at 6.2 is the same as this example in that the narrator creates the opportunity for him to give additional comments on the subject he has just treated up to the point. Having told us that Apollonius arrived at the crossing point between Ethiopia and Egypt and found various goods (uncoined gold, linen, ivory etc.) left unguarded at a road junction, the narrator shows himself and says, 'I will explain (ἐγὼ δηλώσω) what this means, for it is observed in our time as well (καὶ ἐς ἡμᾶς ἔτι)', and, following this metanarrative announcement, offers the details about the custom on the spot. In this example, we can find what Gray calls the 'continuance motif' in her analysis of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*²⁵; our narrator too emphasises the continuance of the custom into his own time. It may be interesting to think about the narrator's intention in this intervention. According to Gray, the narrator's merit of using the motif is that he can prove what he is saying to be true; the narrator's remark that 'the custom is observed to this day' warrants the existence of the custom in the past. The narrator of the *Apollonius* pretends to be a 'historian', a person who values the 'truth' above anything

²⁴ Swain (1999) is a successful attempt to read the *Apollonius* as a work of 'defence' of Hellenism. Cf. Elsner (1997), 36: '... the Philostratean sacred Greece of Apollonius is depicted as conquering not only its Roman master but also its ethnographic 'others' from Babylon to Egypt, as well as attaining to the pinnacle of wisdom represented by India.'

²⁵ Gray (2004), 392-4. She rightly points out that this motif goes back to Herodotus.

else²⁶, and so takes pains to make his information seem as reliable as possible to the reader. It would be argued that here too, by using the ‘continuance’ motif, he tries to show this custom, which must have seemed strange to the reader, as absolutely ‘true’.

The last, and probably most important, example of this category comes from the passage at 8.29, where the narrator declares both the end of his use of the Damis document and the new start of his own investigation of the sage. In the preceding chapter (namely 8.28) the narrator describes the scene in which Apollonius gives Damis his last piece of advice and bids farewell to the friend. And then at the opening of the next chapter, the narrator comes to the fore and says as follows:

Things concerning Apollonius of Tyana recorded by Damis the Assyrian end with this story [i.e. the story about Apollonius’ farewell to Damis]. As for the manner of his death, if he did die, there are a number of stories. While none of them is given by Damis (Δάμιδι, ἰ ἐμοί) must not omit this question, because this book must have its own ending (δεῖ γάρ που τὸν λόγον ἔχειν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ πέρας).

He thus implicitly tells the reader how his narrative is going to develop in the subsequent sections. As is evident from the latter half of the quotation, more specifically his antithetical use of the two dative pronouns (Δάμιδι and ἐμοί), the narrator consciously separates his own story from Damis’ accounts; he appears to emphasise that it is only he who has the right to close the *Apollonius*. Indeed, from the following chapter onwards, the narrator tackles the difficult question of Apollonius’ death for himself, as if he, together with Apollonius, took his leave of Damis. This intervention is a clear indicator of the narrator’s work of ‘rewriting’ the Damis document, as he attempts to fill the gap found in the eyewitness account.

Giving His Opinions

Finally, let us take a look at the third category of our narrator’s intervention; from time to time, this man puts aside his main task, i.e. offering an account of Apollonius’ life with an objective viewpoint, and starts giving his own opinions related to what he has told us up to a given point. We may start with two ‘smaller-scale’ interventions in which the narrator uses just one word οἶμαι (‘I think’), both of which come from Book 1. The first one is found in chapter 5, where the narrator describes the birth of his protagonist in Tyana. As an episode shared by local people, he tells us that when Apollonius

²⁶ 2.9: δεῖ ... ἀληθείας ἐμοὶ γοῦν. For our narrator as a ‘historian’, see Whitmarsh (2004), 424-6.

was born, a bolt of lightning appeared but without striking the earth went back to the sky. He then intervenes and comments about this miraculous event: ‘the gods, I think (οἶμαι), showed his [i.e. Apollonius’] brilliance, his exaltation above all things on earth, his closeness to the divine, and all the other qualities of this man’. With these words our narrator makes clear his belief that Apollonius is a distinguished figure who is almost equal to a god.

Let us see the other ‘smaller-scale’ οἶμαι intervention. In chapter 9 of the same book, the narrator tells us about an Assyrian youth who indulged himself in drinking. The debauched boy, recounts the narrator, came to see Apollonius because Asclepius had implied there was a chance for him to recover by doing so. Apollonius first scolded the boy for his insolence against the god of medicine and then summarised his shameful behaviour very succinctly. It is just after this that the narrator shows himself, saying, ‘This advice [given by Apollonius], I think (οἶμαι), is clearer than the wisdom of Heraclitus’. He thus briefly expresses his idea that Apollonius is an ideal medical counsellor as well²⁷.

For the ‘larger-scale’ narrator intervention, we can take the narrator’s behaviour at 5.12 as a fine example. There he makes a small digression and gives his ideas about the nature of Apollonius’ ability of prediction. Before entering this part (namely at 5.11), he talks first about Nero’s falling from the throne and subsequent competition for power, and then about Apollonius’ forecast of its result. Apollonius, so the narrator tells us, said the kingship would fall to the ‘Thebans’, meaning Galba, Otho and Vitellius²⁸, which, as we know, turned out to be historically true. Apollonius’ forecast was thus correct. It is after this that the narrator shows himself and starts talking about Apollonius’ prediction in more general terms. He stresses that Apollonius’ correct prediction is due to divine power, not to his being a magician (γόης) and, using the first-person verb ἠγοῦμαι, vehemently accuses magicians of their strong connection with such things of a questionable character as ghosts and incantation. We should not forget the fact that what originally drove our narrator to compose the sage’s biography is people’s ‘ignorance’ (ἄγνοια) and their mistaken idea that Apollonius is a dubious magician (1.2); whether his protagonist is a magician or a god-inspired philosopher is a crucial question for the narrator²⁹. This is why here too he intervenes in the narrative and makes his position

²⁷ Other examples of the οἶμαι-intervention are found at e.g. 2.40, 4.6, 7.3, 7.39, 8.5. Cf. Knoles (1981), 31-2.

²⁸ Apollonius’ comparison of the three emperors to the ‘Thebans’ is based on the fact that the Thebans held their supremacy for a very short time in the mid-fourth century BCE.

²⁹ The association of Apollonius with magic seems to have been more or less common among the ancients. Moeragenes, whose four books on Apollonius the narrator disparages (1.3), is said to have called Apollonius μάγος καὶ φιλόσοφος (Origen. *Cels.* 6.41). For this author, see Raynor (1984), Bowie (1978), 1673-9 and Flinterman (1995), 69-70. In Cassius Dio, Apollonius is mentioned as καὶ γόης καὶ μάγος ἀκριβῆς (77.18.4). In Lucian’s *Alexander the False Prophet*, a follower of Apollonius is called γόης (5) (cf. Dzielska (1986), 86-9). A passage from Eusebius’ *Reply to Hierocles* testifies to people’s deep-seated conception of Apollonius as a γόης (μόνον γόητα πάλαι τε καὶ εἰσέτι νῦν νενομίσθαι, 44.2 Jones). Francis (1995), 90-7 discusses the meanings of

clear.

Another example of this category comes from the passage at 3.41, where the narrator tells us about Apollonius as a writer of books. According to the Damis document, so the narrator says, Apollonius composed two works on the basis of the conversation he had had with the Indian king Iarchas; one is on astral prophecy and the other is on sacrifices. It is after this account that the narrator appears in front of us as an *ego* narrator: again using the verb ἠγοῦμαι, he asserts that ‘things concerning stars and all prophecy of the same kind is beyond human nature’ and then adds that he does not know (οὐδ’ ... οἶδα) if anyone owns Apollonius’ work on astral prophecy. An interesting point about this intervention is that the narrator implicitly rejects Damis’ account that Apollonius wrote the book on stars; since he found (so he alleges) in the Damis document information about a work on astral matters written by Apollonius, he, as a loyal ‘rewriter’, tells us what the document tells him, but this narrator, just like here, sometimes questions what Damis is thought to be saying in his record. The narrator’s intervention in this example suggests to his readers that he has a right to modify some accounts in the Damis record, even if this is the only document which purports to contain the truth about the Tyanean sage, and that it is he, not Damis, who is reliable enough to arrive at reasonable judgement. The narrator’s subsequent comment that he in many places ‘found’ (εὑρον) the other work by Apollonius, namely the work on sacrifices, adds an air of reliability to his personality as a defender of the truth; his consciously keeping his distance from Damis helps him get a kind of authority with which he can say what he wants to say.

The passage found at 8.6 is also helpful for us to understand the narrator’s ways of intervention. This is just before the narrator’s insertion of Apollonius’ extraordinarily long apology in the lawcourt against Domitian (8.7). As a kind of introduction into the climactic scene, the narrator, showing himself, tells us about the nature of Apollonius’ speech. He starts with an ironical concession: he ‘knows well’ (οὐκ ἀγνοῶ) that the most prominent character of Apollonius’ speech is its verbosity³⁰, which skilled speakers are sure to avoid, trying to make their speeches as elaborate and thus as short as possible. He then, however, gives his own idea about great speeches, saying that ‘in his opinion’ (μοι δοκεῖ) a wise man—of course he has Apollonius in mind—would not represent his own character by using calculatedly compact language as seen in the speeches given by lovers of rhetoric; Apollonius’ speech is completely different from that of a lawyer, one of whose goals in speech is to raise pity, because the sage, a brave fighter, never intends to raise pity in his opponent Domitian. This is the narrator’s passionate defence of Apollonius’ apologetic speech. We see here assertiveness of the narrator, who tries to make himself seem a spokesperson of Apollonius, never an invisible medium to

these appellations to Apollonius.

³⁰ The speech is nearly 30 pages long (!) in the Loeb Greek text.

convey the information in Damis' record; we should not overlook the fact that the narrator, as if he was one of the characters in the story, is ready to enter the lawcourt with Apollonius, using the expression 'those who listen to *me and the man* [sc. Apollonius] in a virile way' (τοῖς γε μὴ μαλακῶς ἀκροασομένοις ἐμοῦ τε καὶ τοῦ ἀνδρός). He, if given a chance, attempts to establish his own identity in his narrative.

Conclusion

As has been seen in the above exploration, the narrator of the *Apollonius* never hides himself from the eyes of his readers but often intervenes in his narrative as a self-conscious *ego* narrator; he brings himself to the fore as a man who refers to some other sources than the Damis document, who makes explicit the due steps of his storytelling, and who gives his opinions about the topics in question. With these observations in mind, let us get back to his definition of his work as 'rewriting' (μεταγράψαι) Damis' testimony presented at 1.3. I hope the meaning of that verb now has become clear to some extent: his foregrounding of 'rewriting' is inextricably linked to his showing himself in the course of his narrative; he is not just making a copy of Damis' record, but rather attempting to provide *his own* narrative about the eponymous hero, in many ways different from that primary source. He is as it were an 'impertinent editor', not a slavish copyist. This, I would say, is one important aspect of his job of 'rewriting'.

Bibliography

Texts

Jones, Christopher P., ed. (2005a) *Philostratus The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, I (Cambridge (Mass.)).
---, ed. (2005b) *Philostratus The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, II (Cambridge (Mass.)).

Secondary Sources

Anderson, Graham. (1986) *Philostratus: Biography and Belles Lettres in the Third Century A.D.* (London).
Belloni, Luigi. (1980) 'Aspetti dell'antica σοφία in Apollonio di Tiana' (*Aevum* 54: 140-9).
Billault, Alain. (1993) 'The Rhetoric of a "Divine Man": Apollonius of Tyana as Critic of Oratory and as Orator According to Philostratus' (*Ph&Rh* 26: 227-35).
---. (2000) *L'univers de Philostrate* (Brussels).
Bowie, Ewen Lyall. (1978) 'Apollonius of Tyana: Tradition and Reality' (*ANRW* II 16.2: 1652-99).

- . (2009) 'Philostratus: The Life of a Sophist' in Ewen Bowie and Jaś Elsner eds., *Philostratus* (Cambridge), 19-32.
- de Lannoy, Ludo. (1997) 'Le problème des Philostrate (État de la question)' (*ANRW* II 34.3: 2363-449).
- Dzielska, Maria. (1986) *Apollonius of Tyana in Legend and History*, trans. Piotr Pieńkowski (Rome).
- Elsner, John. (1997) 'Hagiographic Geography: Travel and Allegory in the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*' (*JHS* 117: 22-37).
- Flinterman, Jaap-Jan. (1995) *Power, Paideia and Pythagoreanism: Greek Identity, Conceptions of the Relationship between Philosophers and Monarchs and Political Ideas in Philostratus' Life of Apollonius* (Amsterdam).
- Francis, James A. (1995) *Subversive Virtue: Asceticism and Authority in the Second Century Pagan World* (University Park).
- Gray, V. (2004) 'Xenophon' in Irene de Jong, René Nünlist and Angus Bowie eds., *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden), 391-401.
- Gribble, David. (1998) 'Narrator Interventions in Thucydides' (*JHS* 118: 41-67).
- Gyselinck, Wannes, and Kristoffel Demoen. (2009) 'Author and Narrator: Fiction and Metafiction in Philostratus' *Vita Apollonii*' in Kristoffel Demoen and Danny Praet eds., *Theios Sophistes: Essays on Flavius Philostratus' Vita Apollonii* (Leiden), 95-127.
- Hansen, William. (2003) 'Strategies of Authentication in Ancient Popular Literature' in Stelios Panayotakis, Maaike Zimmerman and Wytse Keulen eds., *The Ancient Novel and Beyond* (Leiden), 301-13.
- Jones, Christopher P. (2006) 'Apollonius of Tyana in Late Antiquity' in Scott Fitzgerald Johnson ed., *Greek Literature in Late Antiquity: Dynamism, Didacticism, Classicism* (Aldershot).
- Kemezis, Adam. (2014) 'Roman Politics and the Fictional Narrator in Philostratus' *Apollonius*' (*CIAnt* 33: 61-101).
- Knoles, Thomas Gregory. (1981) *Literary Technique and Theme in Philostratus' Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, Diss., Rutgers University.
- Levick, Barbara. (2007) *Julia Domna: Syrian Empress* (London).
- Meyer, Eduard. (1917) 'Apollonios von Tyana und die Biographie des Philostratos' (*Hermes* 52: 371-424).
- Ni Mheallaigh, Karen. (2008) 'Pseudo-Documentarism and the Limits of Ancient Fiction' (*AJPh* 129: 403-31).
- Raynor, D. H. (1984) 'Moeragenes and Philostratus: Two Views of Apollonius of Tyana' (*CQ* 34: 222-6).

- Solmsen, Friedrich. (1940) 'Some Works of Philostratus the Elder' (*TAPhA* 71: 556-72).
- Speyer, Wolfgang. (1974) 'Zum Bild des Apollonios von Tyana bei Heiden und Christen' (*JbAC* 17: 47-63).
- Swain, Simon. (1999) 'Defending Hellenism: Philostratus, *In Honour of Apollonius*' in Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman and Simon Price eds., *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians* (Oxford), 157-96.
- Whitmarsh, T. J. G. (2004) 'Philostratus' in Irene de Jong, René Nünlist and Angus Bowie eds., *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden), 423-39.
- . (2005) *The Second Sophistic* (Oxford).

(Kyoto University)