

SIMON SWAIN

FAVORINUS AND HADRIAN

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 79 (1989) 150–158

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

FAVORINUS AND HADRIAN*

The three paradoxes, with which the philosopher and sophist Favorinus summed up his achievements (Philostratus VS 489 Γαλάτης ὦν ἐλληνίζειν, εὐνοῦχος ὦν μοιχείας κρίνεσθαι, βασιλεῖ διαφέρεσθαι καὶ ζῆν), are very much at the bottom of the difficulties we are presented in trying to reconstruct his life, especially his relations with the emperor Hadrian. Favorinus quarrelled with the emperor. The adultery trial may have incited imperial ire, but we do not know. Nor do we know how many disputes occurred, or with what result. We are unsure of the emperor's response to the philosopher's parade of Hellenic learning. The discovery some sixty years ago of a speech Περὶ φυγῆς on papyrus, and the sure attribution of it to Favorinus, has not made matters clearer: it is deduced from the speech that Favorinus was exiled on Chios, but nothing is certain. A better understanding of Favorinus' treatment at Hadrian's hands may better illustrate a philhellenic prince's attested schizophrenia towards Hellenic intellectuals.

The first editors of Περὶ φυγῆς, Norsa and Vitelli, unequivocally accepted the fact of exile, and proposed an outline of events leading to it, which has been followed by others with only a little dissent.¹ It is suggested that the notices in Philostratus and Cassius Dio describing Favorinus' quarrel with Hadrian and his attempt to secure immunity from the office of high priest, together with the exile, as revealed by his own Περὶ φυγῆς, all belong to a chain of events, which took place about 130/1. At this time Hadrian's hostility to Favorinus is evident from his choice of Favorinus' bitter enemy, Antonius Polemon, to deliver the speech at the inauguration of the Olympieion in Athens. Barigazzi, in particular, has wrapped in this parcel as much of the evidence as will go, including Favorinus' surviving Corinthian Oration (Ps.-Dio of Prusa XXXVII); only De fortuna (Ps.-Dio of Prusa LXIV) has escaped, miraculously.

Let us reconsider Favorinus' quarrel with the emperor. Philostratus is the best introduction to our subject. 'The charm of his speech was what proclaimed the philosopher Favorinus to be among the sophists. He came from the Gauls of the West... and was born epicene [διφυσῆς]... He was very fond of sex, to the extent that he was charged with being an adulterer by a man of consular rank. Once a dispute [διαφορά] occurred between him and the emperor Hadrian, and he suffered no harm [οὐδὲν ἔπαθεν]. On account of all this he

* I should like to thank Sir Ronald Syme for his interest in this paper, and especially Dr P.Crone for her translation from the Arabic text of Polemon's Physiognomika.

¹ M.Norsa and G.Vitelli, *Studi e testi* LIII, 1931, ix-x; cf. B.Häsler, *Favorin über die Verbannung*, Diss. 1935,5-6; W.Schmid, *RE Suppl.* VI, 66 (with *RE* VI, 2079); A Stein, *PIR²* F 123; E.Mensching, *Favorin von Arelate*, 1963,2; A.Barigazzi, *Favorino di Arelate. Opere*, 1966,6-9,465. Scepticism is offered by G.W.Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*, 1969,35-6; G.Anderson, *Philostratus*, 1986,103-4, seems to treat the exile as fact.

would pronounce, in the style of an oracle, that his life contained these three paradoxes: he was a Gaul, but lived as a Hellene, he was a eunuch, but was tried for adultery, he disputed with the emperor, and lived' (VS 489). Following the introduction, Philostratus relates (VS 490) how Favorinus was appointed high priest ἐκ τὰ οἴκοι πάτρια, that is, to the flamine of the Narbonensian provincial council,² and sought immunity from the office before the emperor 'because he was a philosopher'. However, 'he saw that the emperor was intending to vote against him, because he was not a philosopher [ὡς μὴ φιλοσοφοῦντι]'. Favorinus quick-wittedly related a dream he had had, in which his teacher, Dio, bade him accept the office with an apposite reminiscence from Demosthenes De corona. Philostratus then relates that, although the emperor himself did not take the affair seriously, the Athenians 'tore down a bronze statue of the man, as if he were bitterly hostile to the emperor [ὡς πολεμιοτάτου τῷ αὐτοκράτορι]'. Cassius Dio also reports a dispute between Hadrian and 'the sophists Favorinus the Gaul and Dionysius of Miletus' (LXIX 3.4-4.1). Hadrian would not tolerate anyone superior to himself in any field, and therefore 'set out to destroy them by various means, particularly by exalting their rivals, of whom some were worth nothing, and others only a very little' (3.4). Dio reproduces Dionysius' caustic response to an exalted rival, Heliodorus, and then records the story, which appears in Philostratus, of Favorinus' attempt to secure immunity 'in his home land' and his saving dream in court (3.5-6). In the end 'Hadrian spared these men, although he was annoyed [ἀχθεθείς] with them, because he could find no specious reason for their death' (4.1).

The report of Dio is interesting. He talks of a general hostility, or rather, envy, on the part of Hadrian. A similar attitude is pointed to by Hadr. 15.10: 'professores omnium artium semper ut doctior risit, contempsit, obrivit.' In this context the biographer records an innocent anecdote about Favorinus' tact before the emperor. Dio's notes are part of a character sketch of Hadrian, placed naturally enough at the beginning of the reign. They could refer to any period. Precision is our goal. The attack on Favorinus and Dionysius is evidently connected in Dio's mind with the attack on Trajan's famous architect, Apollodorus of Damascus, which is detailed at LXIX 4.1-5. According to Dio, 'Hadrian spared these men [τούτων μὲν i.e. Favorinus and Dionysius]... τὸν δ' Ἀπολλόδωρον... τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐφυγάδευεν, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ ἀπέκτεινε'. The connection is logical; why not also chronological? The assault on Apollodorus happens early in the reign, since it begins with Apollodorus' undiplomatic review of the plans for the temple of Venus and Roma, which Hadrian showed to him 'when he became emperor [4.3 αὐτοκρατορεύσας]'.³ Nothing prevents the thought that Favorinus and Dionysius were assailed at the same time. Further proof is available.

² Bowersock, o.c. 35; on the council and the extant lex data organizing the provincial cult, see J.Deininger, Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit, 1965,107-10.

³ The temple itself was initiated on 21st April 121: D.Kienast, Chiron 10,1980,402.

A reason for dating the attack on Dionysius of Miletus early lies in his hurthful jibe at Heliodorus ('Caesar can give you money and honour, but he cannot make you a rhetor'). Heliodorus is not the worthless rival Dio suggests. Rather, he is C.Avidius Heliodorus, ab epistulis graecis (or possibly ab epistulis) under Hadrian and prefect of Egypt under Hadrian and Antoninus Pius (137-42). He was father of the rebel, C.Avidius Cassius, born in 130. The family claimed descent from the kings of Commagene.⁴ Dionysius impugns Heliodorus while Heliodorus is imperial secretary. It was long ago suggested that Heliodorus was secretary in the early 120s.⁵ This is quite possible. Four imperial secretaries are known for certain under Hadrian: Suetonius, L.Julius Vestinus, Heliodorus, Valerius Eudaemon.⁶ Vestinus, from Vienne, comes late in the reign. Suetonius was disgraced early, in 122.⁷ Did Heliodorus succeed, or Eudaemon? Eudaemon succeeds Heliodorus as prefect of Egypt under Pius. Let us suppose he follows Heliodorus as secretary. In which case Hadrian's attack on Dionysius would take place at about the time he harries the foolhardy Apollodorus.

It seems, then, from Dio that Hadrian's campaign against prominent intellectuals, Apollodorus and Dionysius, is in full swing at the beginning of his reign. Favorinus is closely connected with the other targets in Dio. Hadrian's hostility towards him is likely to belong to the same period. Dio mentions no exalted rivals of Favorinus. He simply reports Hadrianic wrath, and the dismissal of Favorinus' suit for immunity. Nothing militates against the view that the suit was early. Hadrian was the first emperor to include philosophers among groups entitled to immunity, and enacted the measure *παρελθῶν εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχήν*.⁸ We may imagine that Favorinus was selected as high priest about 120, when he would be something over forty, an ideal age for many things.

How serious was Hadrian's rebuff? Dio informs us that both Favorinus and Dionysius came close to execution (LXIX 4.1). The statement is odd: Philostratus affirms that Hadrian paid Dionysius the greatest honour, and among other boons 'appointed him satrap over peoples who were by no means obscure' (VS 524). This is confirmed by an inscription identifying Dionysius as having been imperial procurator more than once, albeit over peoples

⁴ H.Halfmann, *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jahrhunderts n.Chr.*, 1979, 179-80 no.100a; R.Syme, *HAC BONN* 1984/5, 1987, 216 = *Roman Papers V*, 1988, 696. If Heliodorus was ab epist., he may have learnt Latin at home in Cyrrhus: Syme, *HAC BONN* 1982/3, 1985, 345 = *Roman Papers V*, 549. Dio's slur might be excused, if he is thinking of Heliodorus' rhetoric, which failed to earn him a place in Philostratus' VS; but his note on Heliodorus at LXXI 22.2 makes his ignorance of the man disturbingly manifest.

⁵ O.Hirschfeld, *Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten von Augustus bis auf Diocletian*¹, 1877, 257 n.4.

⁶ For their careers, see H.-G.Pflaum, *Les carrières procuratoriennes équestres I*, 1960, nos.96, 105, 106, 110; on the Greeks, E.L.Bowie, *YCIS XXVII*, 1982, 57-8. Bowie's no. (iii), Celer, is attributed 'probably to Hadrian'; Aristides L 57 of 147/8 (C.A.Behr, *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales*, 1968, 123, 266) points to Pius, and Celer's connection with Hadrian (Marc.Aur. *Ad se ips.* VIII 25.1 *Κέλερ* [survived] *Ἀδριανόν, εἶτα Κέλερ* [died] need only be in his capacity as tutor to Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (Marc. 2.5; Ver. 2.5).

⁷ Syme, o.c. 1987, 216.

⁸ Bowersock, o.c. 32-3 with Dig. 27.1.6.8; 50.4.18.30.

who it is surmised were obscure enough.⁹ Hadrian clearly had a temper. He grew envious of intellectuals (Hadr. 15.10 quoted above). At some stage he fell out with Heliodorus, and arraigned him 'famosissimis litteris' (Hadr. 15.5). Eudaemon was rendered quite indigent (15.3). This is not the whole story: 'omnes professores et honoravit et divites fecit', says the biographer (16.8). Eudaemon had perhaps to wait for rehabilitation till Pius ruled; Heliodorus becomes prefect of Egypt at the very end of Hadrian's reign. Dio's statement that Hadrian wanted to put Dionysius to death is extreme. Hadrian may have quarrelled with the sophist, but the testimony of epigraphy combines with Philostratus to show that the quarrel was not irremediable. If Dio is wrong about Dionysius, he may just as well be wrong about Favorinus. Philostratus says that Hadrian's reaction to Favorinus' claim and his dream-inspired volte-face was one of amusement: ταῦτα ὁ μὲν αὐτοκράτωρ διατριβὴν ἐπεποίητο (VS 490). We may believe him.

Why was Hadrian due to vote against Favorinus? A clue is found in the reprobation of a witty commentator, the Cynic philosopher Demonax: Favorinus' delivery in lectures was 'vulgar, effeminate, and φιλοσοφία ἥκιστα πρέπον' (Lucian Demonax 12). Favorinus thought of himself primarily as a philosopher,¹⁰ hence the basis of his claim. He might have had more success before Hadrian, had he appealed for immunity as a sophist. Philostratus, who also included him among philosophers, tells us that he acted and sang during performances, comportment characteristic of full-time sophists (VS 491-2). In court Favorinus did not look like a philosopher. Hadrian's face must have registered the discrepancy.¹¹ In fact, Favorinus may not have qualified with ease as a sophist: the unkind depiction of him by Polemon (Physiognomika I, 160-5 Förster [Hoffmann's text of the Arabic and Latin translation]) recalls Pius' scrutiny of the unmanly appearance of the arch-sophist, Alexander Clay-Plato (VS 571), and especially Caracalla's reasons for revoking the immunity of Philiscus the Thessalian (VS 623); except that Hadrian was not angry. And really there is no cause to think that a serious rift occurred between our philosopher-sophist and Hadrian as a result of his claims for ἀτέλεια. The emperor had fun. The joke on Favorinus gave scope to the Stoic and Cynic wags who laughed at the Celt ἐπὶ τῷ ἀτελεῖ τοῦ κόματος (Lucian Eunuchus 7; cf. Demonax 12-13).

The διαφορά Philostratus talks of at VS 489 (οὐδὲν ἔπαθεν), which occasions Favorinus' witticism on surviving a run-in with an emperor, cannot refer to the difficulties

⁹ J.Keil, JÖAI 40,1953,5-7 = I.K. 17. I (Ephesos), 3047. Dionysius' honoured position at the end of his life is attested by his burial 'in the agora in the most important part of Ephesos' (VS 526; F.Eichler, Anz.Oe.Akad.Wiss. 106,1969,136 = I.K. 12 (Ephesos), 426 Τ[ίτος] Κλαύδιος Φλαουτιανὸς Διονύσιος, ῥήτωρ).

¹⁰ Barigazzi, o.c. 21ff.; L.Holford-Strevens, Aulus Gellius, 1988,76ff.; J.Gluckler, Antiochus and the Late Academy, 1978,280ff.

¹¹ At some point Favorinus brought it to Hadrian's attention that he was a philosopher by dedicating to him volume one of his trilogy On Cataleptic Phantasy (Galen De opt.gen.doc. 1, p.83 Marquardt). Perhaps this was after the immunity suit.

over immunity. Philostratus is not stupid: the one dispute looks serious, the other affords imperial merriment.¹² On the other hand, if a serious dispute did occur - and why not believe in it? - it did not last: the passage in Hadr., which admires the emperor for pouring honours and riches on the professors, identifies as cynosure of imperial attention Favorinus himself (16.10). Favorinus' villa in Rome looks like a tangible imperial gift, and one he possessed till his grave (VS 490).

To what does Philostratus' 'he suffered no harm' refer? It is suggested that it means exile (as opposed to death); that is stretching matters.¹³ To find a dispute, *cherchez la femme*. Favorinus enjoyed an adulterous liaison with the wife of a consular (VS 489). Moderns with an interest in these matters assert that he was not a eunuch after all, nor born 'without testicles', as Polemon insists (I, 161 F./H.): he suffered from 'cryptorchidism' or worse 'Reifenstein's syndrome',¹⁴ deceitful conditions ideal for philandering.¹⁵ Lucian anticipates this judgement. If Bagoas in *Eunuchus* is modelled on Favorinus, Favorinus did commit adultery, but convinced the court otherwise ἀπό γε τῆς φανερώς ὄψεως (*Eunuchus* 10).¹⁶ A whiff of sexual scandal is reported by Favorinus himself in the *Corinthian Oration* (32-35). Favorinus' Corinthian audience were angry with him. They had pulled down his statue on the basis of the rumour. Like an adulterer Favorinus denies everything: 'Do you believe that a man, who has lived properly in Greece among so much licence and indulgence, would at Rome change completely under the eye of the emperor himself and his laws?' (34). In 35, a difficult passage, he seems to imply that if the emperor believed such a allegation, full punishment would follow, while if he heard of it (without believing it), he might mention it to others (μηνῶσαι). Whatever the precise meaning of this passage, it is clear that there was no imperial concern other than with gossip (which is understandable).¹⁷

Another statue of Favorinus fell at Athens (VS 490). Philostratus avers that the cause was the attempt to win immunity. He suggests that the Athenians misread the situation totally. Barigazzi suggests rather imperial anger or even notice of exile itself, caused by irritation

¹² Cf. Bowersock, o.c. 35-6. ἀρχιερεὺς δὲ ἀναρρηθεὶς, κτλ. (490) does not continue Philostratus' musings on the serious dispute (489).

¹³ So Bowersock, o.c. 36.

¹⁴ H.J.Mason, *Janus* 66,1979,1-13; Holford-Strevens, o.c. 72-3. In severe cases Reifenstein's syndrome (male pseudohermaphroditism; other eponyms are available) generates cryptorchidism as well as female somatic traits, some of which (lack of facial hair, unbroken voice) suit Favorinus well, others (gynaecomastia) less so (but cf. Aulus Gellius 12.1). Both conditions are associated with infertility, Reifenstein's syndrome with impotence in later life (*Oxford Textbook of Medicine*² I, 10.98-9; *Stedman's Medical Dictionary*²⁴ 1393).

¹⁵ Cf. Polemon *Physiogn.* I, 163 F./H. 'What with his figure, he made ridiculous jokes, and used to do whatever came to his mind' ('Mustazhi/a 'l-hazl' could be taken as a passive - 'he was the object of ridiculous jokes', but the continuation seems to favour the active).

¹⁶ On the name Bagoas, cf. E.Maass, *RhM* 74,1925,458-60. For a possible echo of Favorinus' adultery trial in Hermogenes, see D.A.Russell, *Greek Declamation*, 1983,52 n.42. The ancients were aware of cryptorchidism: Mason, o.c. 6 n.33; M.H.Marganne, *Inventaire analytique des papyrus grecs de médecine*, 1981, no.161.

¹⁷ There is no cause to adopt von Arnim's μηνῶσαι in 35.

over the claim to immunity and the wrangling between Favorinus and Polemon before 131.¹⁸ This begs the question. There is no cause to associate the two statue fellings. Philostratus' biographies 'were done in Athens.'¹⁹ Believe Philostratus on the Athenian statue. On the Corinthian, believe Favorinus: scandal has brought down many other men in the public eye, beginning with Socrates (Corinthian Oration 32). Favorinus' placid reaction to the Athenians' behaviour ('Socrates would have benefited, had he lost a bronze statue to the Athenians, rather than drinking their hemlock' VS 490) is comfortably flippant. As for the infighting between Favorinus and Polemon (VS 490-1, cf. 536,541), there is no evidence that either this or other similar disputes between the professionals of the Sophistic provoked imperial intervention (the enlisting of Marcus Aurelius by the enemies of Herodes Atticus is a different matter).²⁰

Sexual scandal and toppling icons do not cover the *διαφορά* asserted by Philostratus. We are left with Favorinus' exile. If we can believe in it, we might just subordinate fact to theory and accommodate *οὐδὲν ἔπαθεν* in the sense of exile, but not execution. Editors are won over by the thought that Hadrian's invitation to Polemon to inaugurate the Olympieion (VS 533) is proof of Favorinus' journey into exile. The inaugural speech required a professional sophist. Favorinus was a philosopher. Philostratus files him among the class of philosopher-sophists, which begins with the fourth century Eudoxus of Cnidus. They are included in the biographies partly for their own value, partly for their value to Philostratus' thesis that the Second Sophistic descended directly from the classical age.²¹ For all Favorinus' sophistic manners, Philostratus stresses that he was not one of those who were 'correctly styled sophists' (VS 492, cf. 489). There is no cause for worry that Favorinus was not on hand to open the Olympieion. But we must ask, Could he have been there? No ancient testimony alludes to exile. The absence of a report in Philostratus is in fact particularly acute. Philostratus was hampered 'per riguardo alla dignità imperiale',²² which is to say that he was too sensitive to imperial feelings to suggest that Hadrian could have exiled a proglottidean Gaul. Yet, the exile of Dio of Prusa is tackled (488), the possibility of Herodes' aired (562-3). What of Polemon's spiteful description in his *Physiognomika*? The work was written probably towards the end of Hadrian's reign.²³ It should have mentioned an exile under Hadrian. There is no word. It is alleged that the imperfect tenses used to

¹⁸ Barigazzi, o.c. 7-9.

¹⁹ Bowersock, o.c. 5-6.

²⁰ On the disputes (including Herodes), see Bowersock, o.c. 89-100. It is suggested that Polemon's 'conversion' of Hadrian from Ephesus to Smyrna (VS 531) reflects Hadrian's quarrel with Favorinus; but intimacy with Polemon does not have to signal hostility towards Favorinus (cf. Marcus Aurelius' friendship for the adversaries Fronto and Herodes).

²¹ A.Brancacci, *Rhetorike philosophousa: Dione Crisostomo nella cultura antica e bizantina*, 1985,89-90.

²² Barigazzi, o.c. 8.

²³ R.Förster, *Scriptores physiognomici I*, 1893, lxxix.

picture Favorinus show that Polemon thought of him as 'un uomo finito'.²⁴ Perhaps; but every schoolboy knows that the imperfect is the tense of description. Nothing is proved thereby.²⁵ The problem must stand or fall on the evidence of Favorinus' own *Περὶ φυγῆς*, which inconveniently raised the issue.

Περὶ φυγῆς is an important disquisition.²⁶ How important was it to Favorinus? The attribution to him is sure: three passages from the speech appear in Stobaeus' *Florilegium* under the lemma *Φαβωρίνου*.²⁷ But does Favorinus really reveal an exile hidden for so long in the sands of Egypt? The speaker laments his incarceration ἐν μιᾷ νήκῳ (25.36-7, 407 B.). The island stands identified in a passage where Favorinus expatiates on the disappointment exiles can expect from old friends, and the hope they may have of new ones. 'Does it seem to you [κοι] that Theseus would have shrunk from crossing the short sea from Mimas over to Chios, a man who willingly sailed Acheron for his friend and sat on the Rock of Forgetting?' (14.39-42, 392 B.). There is no mythological basis for mentioning Cape Mimas and Chios in connection with the story of Theseus and Pirithous.²⁸ Favorinus must be talking about himself (and his friend). *Quod erat demonstrandum*.

There are other clues. The speaker is no longer young. He talks wistfully of his parents and of his sister (ἡ φιλότατη μοι πάντων) as being alive in the past, while admitting he took no notice of them when they were (11.21-5, 388 B.). This man could be Favorinus. Nor is the speaker too old. He talks confidently of his future progeny (τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐμοῦ γεννηομένοις), who will look to Chios as the land of their father (9.1-3, 385 B.). This man could not be Favorinus. The speaker says that most of his life has been spent on the move among people who speak foreign tongues (11.8-10, 388 B.). This, with a little forgiveness, could be Favorinus. Further, the speaker avers that, when young, he prided himself ἐπ' ἀξιόματος δῆθεν λαμπρότητι, which presumably refers to equestrian rank. Favorinus himself was certainly an equestrian (*Corinthian Oration* 25, 27).²⁹ The equestrian *Περὶ φυγῆς* congratulates himself ὅτι ἐτέρων ἦρχον (11.33, 388 B.). This does not sound like the Favorinus who sought to wriggle out of the high priesthood.³⁰

²⁴ Barigazzi, o.c. 74 n.1.

²⁵ The tenses used in the Arabic suggest no more than that Polemon was writing of someone he observed at some point in the past.

²⁶ Citation is by papyrus column and line and the pages of Barigazzi's edition.

²⁷ Barigazzi, o.c. 349.

²⁸ For security on this point the original editors sought the authority of Wilamowitz (Norsa and Vitelli, o.c. x n.2).

²⁹ This is confirmed by the flaminiate of the Narbonensian concilium: priests had to be equestrians (Deininger, o.c. 109), ideally of the better sort, if we may judge by the first, Q. Trebellius Rufus, who served at Rome as summus Caeninensis and became archon eponymus at Athens under Domitian (IG II-III² 4193; McCrum-Woodhead 129).

³⁰ Favorinus must have performed some offices at home before being adlected to the flaminiate: cf. IG II-III² 4193; McCrum-Woodhead 129 (with Deininger, o.c. 30); CIL XII 392; 3183; 3184; 3212; 3275 (with 3274); but would he have boasted of them?

I am inclined to dismiss the exile. Favorinus is a different species from the commander. Of descendants there is no trace, which is what we might expect. The speech is a fine example of characterization and impersonation - hence the circumstantial details - and no more. One can imagine its effect as Favorinus 'charmed his audience with the resonance of his voice, the suggestiveness of his glance, and the flow of his words' (VS 491).

What does the history of Favorinus tell us of Hadrian? Hadrian's last years were strained,³¹ mirroring the first. It is suggested that Hadrian turned upon certain of the 'greater sophists' in his last years, by which is meant Dionysius, Eudaemon, Favorinus, Heliodorus.³² The quarrel with Dionysius can be placed early. Heliodorus must have crossed swords later, but not in the final years. Eudaemon's fall may have been late, since he was not restored. I have suggested that Favorinus' hard luck with immunity should also be placed early; his own *διαφορά* with Hadrian cannot be dated. That does not matter. Hadrian was 'semper in omnibus varius' (Hadr. 14.11). Greek intellectuals who worked with him (Heliodorus, Eudaemon), or thought they should have (Dionysius), found out. Others, Polemon, Marcus of Byzantium (VS 539),³³ had no trouble.

Favorinus did not want a job, yet there was friction. He very clearly lacked the cordiality with Hadrian enjoyed by Polemon, which we would know of even without Philostratus, for Polemon tells us himself of his travels with the prince (*Physiogn.* I, 139-41 F./H.).³⁴ Whence the awkwardness between Favorinus and the emperor? Speculation must be resorted to. Favorinus was truly erudite - his philosophical oeuvre is more than respectable testimony. But like all self-educated men, he lacked pace. The *Suda* diagnosed his real complaint (Φ 4): *ἀντεφιλοτιμείτο γούν καὶ ζῆλον εἶχε πρὸς Πλούταρχον τὸν Χαιρωνέα εἰς τὸ τῶν συνταττομένων βιβλίων ἄπειρον*. His three surviving speeches show well enough that he did not know when to stop. They are choked by scholarly and otiose allusion. Favorinus was worshipped by another pedant, Aulus Gellius. Gellius reports that Favorinus was often in and around Rome. This was doubtless true also during Hadrian's tenure of office. Familiarity breeds contempt. Hadrian may have found the preposterous Academic cloying, being inclined himself to the Stoics and Epicureans.³⁵

³¹ R.Syme, *Tacitus II*, 1958, 600-1; H.-G.Pflaum, *HAC BONN* 1963, 1964,95-122.

³² Bowersock, o.c. 52; for 'sophists' read 'intellectuals'.

³³ Probably Memmius Marcus, hieromnemon between ca. 147-61 (E.Schönert-Geiss, *Griechisches Münzwerk: die Münzprägung von Byzantion II*, 1972,9).

³⁴ The date (123) and itinerary (Aegean and Asia) determined by Bowersock, o.c. 120-3 should be treated as approximate: H.Halfmann, *Itinera principum*, 1986,201-2.

³⁵ So Hadr. 16.10 ('in summa familiaritate Epictetum et Heliodorum philosophos') with Syme, o.c. 1985,343-7 = *Roman Papers*, V, 547-51; Heliodorus is probably not Avidius Heliodorus, but rather the Epicurean philosopher attested from the Athenian epigraphy in 125, whose nomen or second cognomen is -rus (J.H.Oliver, *TAPA* 69,1938,494-9; S.Follet, *Athènes au IIe et au IIIe siècle*, 1976,23-4). Note also Hadrian's correspondence with Plotina on the Epicurean school and Plotina's letter to her Epicurean friends lauding the imperial generosity (121-2) in F.Martin, *La documentacion griega de la cancelleria del emperador Adriano*, 1982, no.12.

Another sort of familiarity may have elicited jealousy. Hadrian had a declared penchant for the lower class (Hadr. 17.8), and was 'in colloquiis etiam humillimorum civilissimus' (20.1). Favorinus also had a pull on the plebs. Polemon cries foul play (magician, go-between, toxicologist, *Physiogn.* I, 163 F./H.). A more down-to-earth effect is affirmed by Lucian: one would have been amazed at Favorinus' popularity and fame (*Eunuchus* 7 *καταπλαγαίς αὐτοῦ τὴν παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς δόξαν*). It may be that at times Hadrian was not amused by Favorinus. Who would blame him?

Politics is a mutable and insincere trade. It has been recognized that Hadrian's philhellenism has a political dimension.³⁶ That does not mean that it must be revalued. The emperor had a genuine affection for Greeks. His relations with Favorinus, Dionysius, and the others, do not discover doubts on that score. They reflect rather the fact that in some real sense Hadrian was averse from élites, at least those within his sights.

Oxford

Simon Swain

³⁶ See J.Beaujeu, *La religion romaine à l'apogée de l'empire*, 1955,164-207, on Hadrian's reorganization of religious cults in Greece, including emperor cult, to focus on himself as the link between Rome and the East. Cf. further on Rome's interest at this time in promoting archaizing and classicizing tastes in the poleis, O.Andrei, *A.Claudius Charax di Pergameno. Interessi antiquari e antichità cittadine nell'età degli Antonini*, 1984,128-35; A.Spawforth and S.Walker, *JRS* 75,1985,78-105, *JRS* 76,1986,88-105 on Hadrian's Panhellenion.