

depending on the degree of genital ambiguity and the type of androgen receptor mutation present. In some cases it is possible to use large doses of androgens to stimulate sexual development.²⁸ Where this is not possible, contemporary treatment practice recommends that the child be reared as the sex most appropriate to the degree of genital and physical abnormality displayed, usually the female.²⁹ Clinical practice used to suggest that it was often best for the child's long-term development to have plastic surgery and be raised as a female,³⁰ but such decisions often assumed a simplistic diametric male/female definition of gender.³¹ Modern practice now recognizes the wide range of variations that are possible within the PAIS spectrum and individualized treatment plans are recommended.³² With counselling for both the child and the parents and possible hormonal and surgical interventions it is today possible to give those affected an awareness of the syndrome and help them to make decisions that will contribute to their living healthy lives with their condition.³³

University of Liverpool

ALAN M. GREAVES

greaves@liv.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S000983881200047X

²⁸ W. Weidemann et al., 'Response to androgen treatment in a patient with partial androgen insensitivity and a mutation in the deoxyribonucleic acid-binding domain of the androgen receptor', *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism* 83 (1998), 1173–5.

²⁹ Wass and Shalet (n. 1), 978–9.

³⁰ Summit (n. 25); C.W. Bardin, *Current Therapy in Endocrinology and Metabolism* (St Louis, MO, 1997⁶), 380–3.

³¹ Kessler (n. 2); R. Sorenson, 'Borderline hermaphrodites: higher-order vagueness by example', *Mind* 197 (2010), 393–407, at 397.

³² C.E. Brain et al., 'Holistic management of DSD', *Best Practice and Research Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism* 24 (2010), 335–54; P.T. Cohen-Kettenis 'Psychosocial and psychosexual aspects of disorders of sex development', *ibid.* 325–334; S.F. Ahmed and M. Rodie, 'Investigation and initial management of ambiguous genitalia', *ibid.* 197–218; I. Vidal et al., 'Surgical options in disorders of sex development (dsd) with ambiguous genitalia', *ibid.* 311–24.

³³ In some circumstances, for example, there is an increased risk of certain types of testicular cancer and a prophylactic gonadectomy may need to be considered. See L.H.J. Looijenga, 'Gonadal tumours and DSD', *Best Practice and Research Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism* 24 (2010), 291–310.

LIBANIUS THE FLATTERER

Eunapius of Sardis' *Lives of Philosophers and Sophists* includes a biography of the deceased Libanius.¹ In the course of it, he provides a character sketch of the

¹ Discussed at some length in R.J. Penella, *Greek Philosophers and Sophists in the Fourth Century A.D.: Studies in Eunapius of Sardis*, ARCA: Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 28 (Leeds, 1990), 100–7, and more recently in S. Swain, 'Sophists and emperors: the case of Libanius', in *id.* and M. Edwards (edd.), *Approaching Late Antiquity: the Transformation from Early to Late Empire* (Oxford, 2004), 373–9.

Antiochene sophist. I give the Greek text of this sketch (*Lives* 16. 1.9–11 [495–6] Giangrande), followed by my own translation:

Οὐδεὶς τῶν συλλεγόντων Λιβανίῳ καὶ συνουσίας ἀξιωθέντων ἀπήλθεν ἄδηκτος· ἀλλὰ τό τε ἦθος εὐθὺς οἷός τις ἦν ἔγνωστο, καὶ συνείδεν αὐτοῦ τὰ τε τῆς ψυχῆς ἐπὶ τε τὸ χεῖρον καὶ τὸ κρείττον ῥέποντα, καὶ τοσοῦτος ἦν ἐς τὴν πλάσιν καὶ τὴν εἰς ἑκάτερον ἐξομοίωσιν, ὥστε ὁ μὲν <πολύπους> λήρος ἦν αὐτῷ, τῶν δὲ συνόντων ἕκαστος ἄλλον ὄραν ἑαυτὸν ὑπελάμβανεν. ἔφασκον γοῦν αὐτὸν οἱ πεπειραμένοι, πίνακά τινα καὶ ἐκμαγεῖον εἶναι παντοδαπῶν ἠθῶν καὶ ποικίλων οὐδ' ἂν ἦλω ποτὲ πολλῶν καὶ διαφόρων συνεληλυθῶτων ᾧ μᾶλλον τέρεται, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐναντίοις ἐπηρεῖτο παρὰ τῶν τὸν ἐναντίον ἐλαυνόντων βίον, καὶ πᾶς τις αὐτὸν τὰ σφέτερα θαυμάζειν ᾤετο· οὕτω πολὺμορφόν τι χρῆμα καὶ ἀλλοπρόσαλλον ἦν.

No one of those gathered around Libanius and deemed worthy of associating with him went away unaffected by him. Every man's character, whatever sort of person he was, was immediately understood by Libanius. He knew the condition of every person's soul, whether it was inclined towards the bad or the good. He was so skilled at conforming and likening himself to the other that, as far as he was concerned, the <octopus> was not to be taken seriously. Each individual who associated with him thought that he saw an alter ego in him. In any case, those who experienced him used to say that he was a canvas and wax tablet that received the picture or imprint of all sorts of diverse characters. When many different types of individual gathered together with him, one could never have determined whom he enjoyed more. People who led opposite lives would praise him for opposite qualities, and all thought that he admired their own qualities. That is the sort of multiform and adaptable creature he was.

In my comments on this passage in 1990, I remarked on the uncertainty of how to interpret Eunapius' judgement of Libanius: the portrait 'seems to be intended as a compliment'.² But Eunapius may be hinting at 'superficiality or cunning ... he may have intended his readers to respond to the ambiguous nature of the quality of adaptability'.³ Maurizio Civiletti agreed with my second thoughts, i.e. my inclination to interpret any elements of praise in the passage ironically: Eunapius wanted to 'mettere in dovuta evidenza l'astuzia e l'ambiguità, e forse anche la superficialità, del personaggio'.⁴

I now believe that in this passage Eunapius is hinting that Libanius was a flatterer. Conforming and likening oneself to the other is a key feature of the flatterer, as we learn, for example, from Plutarch's essay on the difference between a flatterer and a true friend (*Quomodo adulator* esp. 51b–4b). Like-mindedness is a basis for true friendship, but the flatterer feigns like-mindedness, pretending to any interests or values that conform to those of the person he is cultivating at a particular time (*Quomodo* 51b–c; cf. Plut. *De amic. multitud.* 96d, 96f–7a). In the fourth century, Basil remarks that, if a person praises justice to those who honour justice and then proceeds to praise injustice to those who are given to injustice, he is playing the role of the flatterer (*Ad adolosc.* 9). Eunapius writes of Libanius 'likening himself' to others. The Greek word he uses is ἐξομοίωσιν. Words formed on the root ὅμοι- and applied to the flatterer occur repeatedly in Plutarch's discussion in *Quomodo adulator* (51c–d, 52a, 52e, 53c–d, 54a, 54d).

² J.F. Boissonade and D. Wytttenbach, *Eunapii Sardiani Vitas sophistarum et fragmenta Historiarum* (Amsterdam, 1822), 1.401, implicitly understood the portrait as positive, as they reveal by comparing Porphy. *Plot.* 11: περιῆν δὲ αὐτῷ τοσαύτη περιουσία ἠθῶν κατανοήσεως.

³ Penella (n. 1), 103.

⁴ M. Civiletti (ed.), *Eunapio, Vite di filosofi e sofisti* (Milan, 2007), 631.

Cf. *συνεξομοιοῦσθαι* in Plutarch's discussion of Alcibiades as flatterer (*Alc.* 23.4). For the 'conforming' of oneself to the other, Eunapius' *ἐς τὴν πλάσιν*, cf. Plut. *Quomodo* 51c, *αὐτὸν ... περιπλάσαι*; 52b, *πρὸς ἕτερον πλάττων ... ἑαυτόν*. In contrast, the character of a true friend is *ἄπλαστος* (ibid. 62c). Eunapius calls Libanius a *χρῆμα ἀλλοπρόσαλλον*; the Byzantine Homeric commentator Eustathius tells us that that adjective was applied to flatterers, *τὸν κολακικόν* (on *Il.* 5.832–4, 2.211.13–14 van der Valk; cf. on *Od.* 14.145, 2.66.5 Stallbaum). The opposite of flattery in a relationship is frank speaking (*parrhēsia*), the willingness to tell the other what he needs to hear rather than what will ingratiate him;⁵ in suggesting that Libanius was a flatterer, Eunapius is also hinting that he avoided *parrhēsia*.

Let us turn now to Eunapius' reference to the octopus, *πολύπους*, which is relevant to his discussion because it changes its colour.⁶ Giuseppe Giangrande, the editor of the standard edition of Eunapius' *Lives* (Rome, 1956), regards the word, which appears only in the version of Eunapius' life of Libanius that is found in Georgios Lacapenos' fourteenth-century collection of Libanius' letters, as Lacapenos' conjectural supplement. If Lacapenos' reading is tradition rather than conjecture, or if he correctly restores what Libanius wrote, then we may note both Plutarch's (*Quomodo adulator* 52f) and Basil's (*Ad adolesc.* 9) comparison of the flatterer to the octopus with its changing colours. If Lacapenos' reading is conjectural, one might also propose the supplement *χαμαιλέον*, another changing creature to which Plutarch also compares the flatterer (*Quomodo* 53d, *Alc.* 23.4).

Unlike the true friend, the flatterer is motivated by self-interest.⁷ I would agree with Civiletti that in the Eunapian passage under discussion, with its references to those gathered around him (*τῶν συλλεγόντων, συνουσίας ἀξιοθέντων, συνόντων, συνεληλυθόντων*), what is being suggested is that Libanius used flattery to recruit and retain pupils.⁸ Furthermore, Eunapius claims that Libanius was attracted to glory and reputation, one of the pursuits of flatterers:⁹ he did not want to be obscured by fellow pupils or teachers at Athens, and it was a desire for prominence that took him from Athens to Constantinople (*Lives* 16.1.2, 6 [495]; cf. 16.2.9 [496]).

It was not unreasonable to waver in the interpretation of Eunapius' description of Libanius' 'flexible' character. Similarly, Eunapius does not make clear in his account of Libanius what he thought about the latter's strict lexical Atticism. Nor does Eunapius commit himself on the charge of pederasty, which he says drove

⁵ Dio Chrys. *Or.* 3.2: *τυγχάνεις χαίρων ἀληθεία καὶ παρρησία μᾶλλον ἢ θωπεία καὶ ἀπάτη*; 3.13: *οὔτε παρρησίας οὔτε κολακείας καιρόν*. Plutarch in his treatise on the difference between a flatterer and a [true] friend appropriately discusses flattery and *parrhēsia* as opposites (see T. Engberg-Pedersen, 'Plutarch to Prince Philopappus on how to tell a flatterer from a friend', in J.T. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Friendship, Flattery, and Frankness of Speech* [New York, 1995], 62–3). 'Flatterer' is contrasted to '[true] friend' (Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 10.3 [1173b32]; Plut. *Quomodo adulator* 50c; Them. *Or.* 22.276c; C.E. Glad, 'Frank speech, flattery, and friendship in Philodemus', in Fitzgerald [n. 5], 24–6, 29), but 'friend' is the generic. When it comes specifically to the issue what A tells B about B, the specific contrast is 'flatterer vs. frank speaker': the flatterer as false friend tells the other what he might like to hear; the frank speaker as true friend tells him what he needs to hear. Note the remarks of D. Konstan et al., *Philodemus, On Frank Criticism*, Society of Biblical Literature, Texts and Translations 43, Graeco-Roman Series 13 (Atlanta, Georgia, 1998), 6–7, with the helpful notion of the triad of frankness, flattery and friendship.

⁶ Plin. *HN* 9.46 [87]; Ath. 7.316f–17a. On the octopus' adaptability, see Thgn. 213–18.

⁷ Dio Chrys. *Or.* 3.14–17; Plut. *Quomodo adulator* 49d, 58d; Them. *Or.* 22.276c–d.

⁸ Civiletti (n. 4), 631.

⁹ See Dio Chrys. and Plut. (n. 7).

Libanius out of Constantinople and then Nicomedia. His charge that Libanius was ignorant of most of the ordinary rules of declamation is simply wrong. The biographical sketch does contain laudatory as well as ambiguous and critical remarks: Libanius was a successful teacher and speaker at Constantinople; in some of his works he reaches the level of ancient models; his works display a well-regarded charm, wit and elegance; his orations display much learning; he was good at public affairs; it was to his credit that, if he sought after renown, it was oratorical renown that was his goal. But we are left with a less than satisfactory overall assessment of Libanius. Eunapius' inclination to criticize Libanius and to hint ambiguously and suggestively about him is a symptom of his abiding irritation over the fact that the emperor Julian had been ill-disposed towards his beloved teacher of rhetoric, Prohaeresius, whom he extols in the *Lives*, and had favoured Libanius over Prohaeresius. Eunapius is pulled in opposite directions, on the one hand by that irritation and on the other by the undeniable competence and success of the Antiochene sophist.¹⁰

Fordham University, New York

ROBERT J. PENELLA

rpenella@fordham.edu

doi:10.1017/S0009838812000481

¹⁰ On all of this, see Penella (n. 1), 83–108. I am grateful to the journal's outside reader, who helped me improve this paragraph.

FLAVIUS BONOSUS AND THE CONSULS OF A.D. 344

The epigraphic evidence shows that the western emperor Constans recognized Leontius and Bonosus as the consuls for 344 until sometime between 3 May and 28 July.¹ In contrast, the papyrological evidence reveals that his eastern colleague and brother Constantius II recognized Leontius and Sallustius as the consuls for this year from a date early enough for this information to have been circulated within Egypt by 17 April, so probably from the start of the year.² However, sometime after 3 May, Constans recognized Leontius and Sallustius as the consular pair also, so that the two halves of the empire were restored to harmony once more. Scholars have long puzzled over the political significance of Constans' initial decision to recognize Bonosus as the *consul posterior* for 344, and subsequent decision to remove him in favour of the candidate recognized by his brother, and Salway has

¹ The latest inscription dating by Leontius and Bonosus dates to 3 May (*CIL* 3.9563, 12867 = *ILCV* 3042 Salona) whereas the earliest dating by Leontius and Sallustius dates to 28 July (*CIL* 11.7788 = *ILCV* 2960, Capena, Etruria). A law issued by Constans on 28 May (*Cod. Theod.* 12.1.37) dates Leontius and Sallustius as consuls also, but this may represent a retrospective correction of its original consular pair.

² *P Neph.* 32, l. 1.