dell’immaginazione visiva per Aristotele può essere testimoniato, per esempio, anche dalla sua dimestichezza con gli stratagemmi della composizione tragedia.\(^1\)
Anche per questa ragione, il volume di King non viene a sostituirsi a quello di Sorabji (né del resto aspira a farlo, come attesta l’omaggio di p. 8): ma certo entrambi saranno, d’ora in poi, immancabili sul tavolo del lettore e interprete del *De memoria et reminiscentia* di Aristotele.

Maria Michela Sassi

---


Despite a recent increase in interest,\(^2\) the *Heroikos* is still a relatively little studied text. The work is a dialogue between a Phoenician merchant and a viticulturist who regularly communes with the hero Protesilaus, at whose tomb the conversation takes place. The initially sceptical Phoenician is quickly converted to a belief in the continued existence of the heroes of the Trojan War, and is instructed by the viticulturist in the ‘true’ events of the conflict. The text thus belongs to the genre of ‘Schwindelliteratur’ or ‘Homer-Korrektur’. Though there remains some uncertainty as to the authorship of the various works in the *Corpus Philostraceum*, it is generally agreed that the *Heroikos* is by the same Philostratus who wrote the *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* and *Lives of the Sophists*. This Philostratus was a member of the literary ‘circle’ of Julia Domna, under whose patronage he wrote the *Life of Apollonius*.

Grossardt’s is by far the fullest and most detailed study of the *Heroikos* available in any language. As might be expected with a work of this sort, much of the value of G.’s study lies in the detail, and in the positioning of the text relative to an impressively wide range of earlier literature. Those interested in the *Heroikos* and in Greek literature under the Roman Empire in general will find endless riches to enjoy here. It will become the first point of reference for information on a vast range of topics connected with this intriguing dialogue for many years to come.

G. bases his translation on the Teubner text of L. de Lannoy,\(^3\) though with some variations, which are listed at the beginning of the second volume. His translation is more accurate than the English of Maclean and Aitken or the German of Beschorner, and G. frequently offers justified criticism of both of these translations. It would be arrogant of me as a non-native reader of German to comment on the literary qualities of the translation, but it certainly reads easily and conveys the meaning of the Greek more accurately than anything previously

---

\(^{1}\) Op. cit., XIV.


\(^{3}\) L. de Lannoy, Flavii Philostrati Heroicus (Leipzig 1977).
available. Certainly, to reproduce the adventurous and erudite style of Philostratus in any other language would be impossible. For that, readers will always have to turn to the Greek. Nonetheless, the assistance and analysis which G. offers in the commentary substantially extends our appreciation of this style through a careful examination of Philostratus’ imitations of earlier models, both lexically and syntactically, and his departures from those models.

G.’s ‘Einführung’ is a substantial contribution in its own right to scholarship on the *Heroikos*. Beginning with the still difficult questions of attribution of the texts and the possible dates at which the various Philostratean works were written, G. considers, among other topics, the religious content of the text, its literary qualities and structure, its similarities to other ‘Schwindelliteratur’, ancient and modern ideas of fiction in so far as they are relevant to our understanding of the *Heroikos*, and the uses of earlier literature in the dialogue. G. states quite rightly that the *Heroikos* defines itself as an essentially intertextual text (96), and he assembles a great deal of detail both in the introduction and in the commentary on the uses to which the prior tradition is put. As G. himself observes, it is difficult to draw a line between intertextual inquiry and traditional Quellenforschung (97). At any rate, G.’s tracing of these echoes and allusions is more than simply a collection of information. He is clearly as much at home with contemporary literary theory as with the more traditional tools of philology, and the methodological rigour which G. demonstrates is exemplary.

G.’s understanding of the *Heroikos* challenges several dominant positions in the existing scholarship. Unlike Eitrem and Mantero (among others),¹ he does not see the *Heroikos* as a serious work of religious propaganda which was intended to promote the cult of heroes, nor as a work written to ingratiate Philostratus with Caracalla. Rather, G. argues for a reading of the text which sees Philostratus as more interested in the living heroes of epic than in the dead souls of hero cult (37), and the *Heroikos* as a text which maintains an ironic distance from its subject matter. In this respect G.’s approach to the text is quite close to that of Thomas Schirren’s study of the *Life of Apollonius*,² though G.’s theoretical discussions are not so extended as Schirren’s. G. also challenges the view³ that the *Heroikos* asserts the value of local traditions over the Panhellenic literary tradition (115–116). For all of these positions G. presents strong arguments.

Less convincing, to this reviewer at least, is the attempt to identify an Epicurean viewpoint in the text. To this end G. discusses the *Life of Apollonius* as well as the *Heroikos*, finding a similar philosophical tendency in both. In both texts, G. sees «epikureische Lehrsätze und Schlüsselbegriffe» (41) juxtaposed with the texts’ religious content, bringing the religious subject-matter into question. In his discussion of the *Life of Apollonius* G. notes the Epicurean tendencies of Apollonius’ first philosophy teacher, Euxenus, to whom the young Apollonius persuades his father to give gardens and fountains (41–42). Apollonius’ attitude towards Euxenus certainly is, as G. notes, mild, but this is in spite of his Epicurean viewpoint in the text. To this end G. discusses the *Life of Apollonius* as well as the *Heroikos*, finding a similar philosophical tendency in both. In both texts, G. sees «epikureische Lehrsätze und Schlüsselbegriffe» (41) juxtaposed with the texts’ religious content, bringing the religious subject-matter into question. In his discussion of the *Life of Apollonius* G. notes the Epicurean tendencies of Apollonius’ first philosophy teacher, Euxenus, to whom the young Apollonius persuades his father to give gardens and fountains (41–42). Apollonius’ attitude towards Euxenus certainly is, as G. notes, mild, but this is in spite of his Epicurean viewpoint in the text. To this end G. discusses the *Life of Apollonius* as well as the *Heroikos*, finding a similar philosophical tendency in both. In both texts, G. sees «epikureische Lehrsätze und Schlüsselbegriffe» (41) juxtaposed with the texts’ religious content, bringing the religious subject-matter into question. In his discussion of the *Life of Apollonius* G. notes the Epicurean tendencies of Apollonius’ first philosophy teacher, Euxenus, to whom the young Apollonius persuades his father to give gardens and fountains (41–42). Apollonius’ attitude towards Euxenus certainly is, as G. notes, mild, but this is in spite of his Epicurean viewpoint in the text. To this end G. discusses the *Life of Apollonius* as well as the *Heroikos*, finding a similar philosophical tendency in both. In both texts, G. sees «epikureische Lehrsätze und Schlüsselbegriffe» (41) juxtaposed with the texts’ religious content, bringing the religious subject-matter into question. In his discussion of the *Life of Apollonius* G. notes the Epicurean tendencies of Apollonius’ first philosophy teacher, Euxenus, to whom the young Apollonius persuades his father to give gardens and fountains (41–42). Apollonius’ attitude towards Euxenus certainly is, as G. notes, mild, but this is in spite of his Epicurean viewpoint in the text. To this end G. discusses the *Life of Apollonius* as well as the *Heroikos*, finding a similar philosophical tendency in both. In both texts, G. sees «epikureische Lehrsätze und Schlüsselbegriffe» (41) juxtaposed with the texts’ religious content, bringing the religious subject-matter into question. In his discussion of the *Life of Apollonius* G. notes the Epicurean tendencies of Apollonius’ first philosophy teacher, Euxenus, to whom the young Apollonius persuades his father to give gardens and fountains (41–42). Apollonius’ attitude towards Euxenus certainly is, as G. notes, mild, but this is in spite of his Epicurean viewpoint in the text. To this end G. discusses the *Life of Apollonius* as well as the *Heroikos*, finding a similar philosophical tendency in both. In both texts, G. sees «epikureische Lehrsätze und Schlüsselbegriffe» (41) juxtaposed with the texts’(751,937),(962,996)
anism. It is quite clear that Euxenus’ Epicurean leanings are part of what is wrong with him as a philosopher: διδάσκαλος μέν γάρ ἦν αὐτῷ τῶν Πυθαγόρου λόγων ὦ πάντες σπουδαίος, οὕτω ἐνεργῇ τῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ χρώμενος, γαρ τοῦ γὰρ ἔττον ἦν καὶ ἀφροδισίων καὶ κατὰ τὸν Ἐπίκουρον ἅγιομίτιστο (VA 1,7,2). This is simply a use of the stereotype of Epicureans as addicted to food and sex, and hardly presents the school in a positive light. Though the gardens and fountains are certainly an appropriate gift, given their status as Epicurean «Schlüsselbegriffe», they and the episode as a whole do not help to establish an Epicurean viewpoint on Philostratus part. If anything this chapter of the VA would seem to indicate the opposite.

G. also points to the statement that Apollonius quoted and extended the Epicurean maxim λάθε βίωσας (λέγεται δὲ καὶ προφθεραγεγοτε «λάθε βίωσας, εἰ δὲ μὴ δύναναι, λάθε ἁποβίωσας» VA 8,28). This is an intriguing echo, which has also attracted the attention of Schirren in his study of VA.1 Though Apollonius’ words clearly do echo the Epicurean saying, I am not sure that this in itself does much to establish an Epicurean perspective, and to say that just as Apollonius, moving from youth to adulthood freed himself from Epicurean influence, now on the point of death he «stellt sein ganzes Leben unter das Banner Epikurs» (43) is surely excessive.

G. turns from the VA to discuss what he believes to be a similarly Epicurean viewpoint in the Heroikos, interpreting the garden setting of the dialogue as an indication of Epicurean influence. G. finds perhaps the strongest support for this reading (43) in a line spoken by the Phoenician: καὶ τί μὲν ἀναβώσῃ ἕν τις ἐντύπῳ, ὅτε οὐκ ἑκατάκτη ἣν καὶ ἅλλοτά ἔξωλον τοῦ ὁμιλοῦ (1,2). The connections with Epicureanism which G. sees in these lines are developed at greater length in the commentary ad loc. This appears to me to be the most convincing argument for an Epicurean Philostratus that G. presents, but it still seems too little on which to base a quite radical reading of the text. Escape from the urban crowds to an idyllic place is hardly the exclusive property of the Epicureans, nor are gardens. The garden setting is indeed crucially important in the Heroikos, but more for its evocations of pastoral (and of the Phaedrus, on the intertext with which G. offers many perceptive comments), and as a medium through which Protesilaus manifests himself. This use of the garden for the heroic manifestation appears most clearly in the trees of Protesilaus (9,1–3), but also in the garden’s divine (Θησέως (3,4)) quality generally. G. argues further that the passages which he sees as Epicurean are regularly juxtaposed with Platonic concepts and expressions (44). These allegedly Epicurean expressions do indeed appear beside others which may be called broadly Platonic (like ἀναβώσῃ above), but this is to my mind not so surprising, given that these Platonic expressions are part of the dialogue’s establishment of Protesilaus’ return to life, on which the text’s description of the events of the Trojan War and of the heroes’ afterlives, is based. Granted that this anabiosis is describable as loosely Platonic, the appearance of references to it alongside the description of the garden, in which this return takes place, and through which Protesilaus manifests himself, is not really

1 Schirren, 106–107.
surprising. The garden and the return to life are both important features of the 'frame' section of the dialogue, and consequently appear alongside each other.

I have addressed at some length these arguments for a concealed, Epicurean perspective in the text because it is central to the original and learned reading which G. presents, but I must stress that my disagreement on this particular point does not vitiate the commentary's many merits. It is to G.'s credit that he directly addresses the central questions regarding the dialogue, especially its 'seriousness' in relation to the religious ideas and practices which it presents. His answers to these questions may not convince all informed readers, but they are nonetheless a valuable contribution to the reading of the *Heroikos*.

It is, of course, impossible to summarise the commentary in the space of a review, but suffice to say that it offers a great many insights and careful readings of the text. Exemplary in this regard is the analysis of the 'Ode to Echo' (55,3). G. assembles the relevant earlier literature very methodically and does not stop at a bare collection of material, but rather produces a fine reading of this complex passage (744–749). Similarly insightful, to take just a few examples among many, are the observations on the *Heroikos* character as an epic catalogue (102), and on the use of the seasons to represent the epic age (spring), the classical period (summer) and Philostratus' own time (autumn) (126). It may be added that G.'s overview of the reception of the *Heroikos* (131–179) offers the fullest available account of the text's Nachleben.

This reviewer has found much by which to be stimulated in G.'s work, and it is to be hoped that G.'s contribution will sharpen and extend debate of some of the text's central issues. The ease of use of the two volumes is increased by good indices: to the introduction there are indices of 'Namen und Sachen', and of passages cited. To the commentary similar aids are appended, with the addition of iconographic and linguistic indices, the latter being subdivided into three sections ('Die sprachliche Entwicklung im nachklassischen Griechisch', 'Das literar-kritische Vokabular von Flavius Philostrat' and 'Grammatische und stilistische Phänomene'). The very full and well-organised bibliography (785 items), will also prove invaluable for future researchers. Volume one also includes five appendices: 'Die Tradition der Schwindelliteratur', 'Die Heldenkataloge im *Heroikos* und in der *Ilias*', 'Die Gleichsetzung mythischer Helden mit historischen Personen oder Typen in *Her.* 10 und 26–52', 'Die Rezeption des *Heroikos* in Antike, Mittelalter und Renaissance' and 'Der *Heroikos* in Arno Schmidts Roman Zettels Traum'. The last of these offers an intriguing (and rare) example of a modern author’s engagement with the *Heroikos*.

The volumes are attractively produced and sturdy, which is just as well, as those interested in this text and in the Second Sophistic more generally will want to make frequent and detailed reference to them.

Hobart, Australia/Gent

Graeme Miles