INTRODUCTION

1 LUCIAN

Except for a brief reference in Galen, Lucian is mentioned by no contemporary, though his elegant and voluminous works must have made him famous during his lifetime.[1] Perhaps this is not surprising: light prose literature in general receives little notice, so that the Greek novelists, for example, are mere names to us.[2] The chief features of his life as he tells it are stories of conversion. In *The Dream* he says that as a boy he was destined to follow the trade of sculptor, but that after dreaming of a contest between Sculpture and Culture he determined instead to continue his education (see pp. 93–7). Elsewhere he claims that at about the age of 40 he became disillusioned with the rhetoric that he had practised all too successfully, and that he decided to move towards philosophy. This move he connects with his invention of the comic dialogue, which combined a philosophical literary form with the humour and mockery found in such authors as Aristophanes, Eupolis and Menippus.[3]

These conversion narratives help to define the nature of Lucian's work, but they are unlikely to be literally true.[4] Other facts, mentioned incidentally, make it possible to construct a brief outline of his career. He was born, probably near the end of Trajan's reign (AD 98–117), in the Syrian city of Samosata, a place of strategic and commercial importance on the right bank of the Euphrates.[5] His native language may have been Aramaic;[6] but in all parts of the eastern empire elementary schools taught Greek literature and culture, and he will have learnt Greek from an early age. After advanced study of rhetoric in Ionia, he may have practised as an advocate at Antioch.[7] Peripatetic rhetorical performers

[1] Galen reports a literary hoax perpetrated by Lucian: Strohmaier (1976). Probably the anecdote derives from a lost work. P. Oxy. 4738, from *Dialogues of the Gods*, is almost contemporary.

[2] We know biographical details of the Latin novelists Petronius and Apuleius. But the *Satyricon* is nowhere mentioned in ancient sources, and the *Golden Ass* receives only a single notice, by Augustine (*C.D.* 18.18).

[3] *Twice Accused* 32–4 (see p. 97), *Fisher* 19, 25–7, *Hermot.* 13.

[4] On revelation and conversion narratives in autobiography see Sturrock (1993). Synesius saw the life and writings of Dio 'Chrysostom' (*c.* 50–*c.* 120 AD) as divisible into an earlier sophistic and a later philosophic period, and Dio in his account of his mid-life exile figures himself as Socrates (cf. pp. 94–7 on Lucian as Socrates): Dio, *Oration* 13, Synesius, *Dio*.

[5] Suda s.v. Λουκιανός for his birth-date; for Samosata ibid. and *How to Write History* 24.

[6] See however *Dream* 8 διαπταίουσα . . . n.

[7] Ionia: *Twice Accused* 27. Antioch: Suda s.v. Λουκιανός.

were common at the time. Lucian travelled in Ionia, Italy, Gaul, Thrace and Macedonia, and spent a period in Athens.[8] He claims to have witnessed the suicide of the charlatan philosopher Peregrinus, which took place at Olympia in the year 165.[9] In late life he held an administrative post in Egypt.[10] Probably he died about 180, having lived through the reigns of Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Verus and Marcus Aurelius.[11]

If Lucian's account of his mid-life conversion were accurate, it would be possible to separate earlier 'rhetorical' pieces from later satirical dialogues, but in fact his works, around 70 in number, present a great variety of forms, and all are influenced by his rhetorical training. That variety results to a large extent from permutations of recurring elements: of genre, of scale, of tone, of objects for ridicule, of texts for quotation and imitation familiar to an educated audience. It is likely that most of his works were declaimed in public before being circulated in written copies. Some will have been composed for special occasions; many will have gained a reputation in advance of Lucian's arrival, and have been performed by popular demand.[12] Many of the shorter pieces will have served to whet an audience's appetite.[13] In the dialogues the declaimer's rhetorical training will have equipped him to give the various speakers distinctive voices. In forensic pieces he could adopt an oratorical or mock-oratorical delivery; in descriptive works a tone of vivid engagement with his subject; in the autobiographical *Dream* the relaxed attitude of a raconteur. Little more than this can be inferred or conjectured about the circumstances of performance and publication.

Some of Lucian's works fall into categories familiar from ancient handbooks of rhetoric and from contemporary authors such as Dio and Aristides: *The Fly* and *Praise of One's Native Land* are formal encomia (see pp. 142–3); *Phalaris I* and *II* are speeches of prosecution and defence of a tyrant, of a type practised by every budding rhetorician, and *Sigma vs Tau* is an amusing variation on the same theme; *Hippias*, *Zeuxis* and *On His House* are or contain set-piece descriptions (*ecphrases*), pictures in words which display the ability of rhetorical language to evoke a scene. Other works, and in particular the comic dialogues, are difficult to categorise, and are described by Lucian himself as hybrid (see p. 116). Many of these are set in the past, either the remote past of myth or the classical past of the fifth century BC. Those from the world of myth poke fun at the gods by exposing them to the uncomfortably rational criteria of philosophic questioning: in *Zeus Rants*, for example, Zeus looks on in exasperation as humans argue about the gods' existence. Often the joke depends on seeing

[8] Italy and Gaul: *Twice Accused* 27. Thrace: *Fugitives*. Macedonia: *The Scythian*.
[9] *Peregrinus*; cf. *Book-collector* 14 n.
[10] *Apology*, esp. §12; Van der Leest (1985).
[11] There is an extraordinarily tenuous biography of Lucian by Schwartz (1965); see also Baldwin (1973), Jones (1986).
[12] See *Apology* 3.
[13] See p. 109 on προλαλιαί.

familiar facts from a new perspective: in *Charon* the ferryman of the dead is taken by Hermes to a mountain peak and looks down with mingled indignation and incomprehension on human vanities; and in *Anacharsis*, *Toxaris* and *The Scythian* Scythians question such Athenian institutions as gymnastics as training for war.

Lucian is now best known for the inventive fantasy of *A True History*, a parody of mendacious travel writing, and for dialogues set in times long past; but he also addresses a number of contemporary issues, in particular the humiliation of reliance on rich patrons and the hypocrisy of pseudo-philosophers. In *The Parasite* fawning dependency is ironically raised to the level of an art, and *On Salaried Posts* catalogues the humiliations of a client; these are topics familiar from Lucian's older contemporary Juvenal and from the epigrams of Martial (*c.* 40–*c.* 102 AD). In *Alexander* he exposes the tricks of a false prophet who died in the 160s; in *The Death of Peregrinus* is described the self-immolation of another impostor who died in 165; in *Images* and *In Defence of Images* he praises Panthea, mistress of the emperor Verus (161–9). Other works deal with linguistic usage, how to speak well, how to write history, and the hopelessness of philosophical certainty. In these and in most of Lucian's compositions the elements of irony, satire, humour, dialogue, rhetorical commonplaces and literary allusion are combined in varying ways: a characteristic tone pervades a diverse collection of works.

2 EDUCATION, CULTURE AND THE SECOND SOPHISTIC

Throughout the Roman Empire the educational system was remarkably uniform.[14] Latin was spoken and studied in the west, Greek in the east. Education was not compulsory, and had to be paid for. School exercises survive on papyri and writing tablets, and from them it is clear that over the centuries little change took place in teaching methods or in the range of authors read. Between the ages of about 7 and 14 boys and girls could attend an elementary school run by a γραμματιστής or *litterator*. In *The Dream* Lucian presents an allegorical dramatisation of the decision to be made next: he must choose between apprenticeship in a manual trade and secondary education, and he is won over by the allurements of Culture. Between the ages of 14 and 18 the small minority of boys whose parents could afford the fees attended the school of a γραμματικός or *grammaticus*. Since the fourth century BC the ideal had been an all-round education (ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία) which would produce men of culture and refinement. The emphasis on rhetoric in higher education meant that literature and composition increasingly took precedence in secondary schools over such subjects as music, dance, athletics, mathematics and astronomy. As the spoken languages continued to change and

[14] Marrou (1956), Cribiore (2001); see also *CHCL* I 22–41. Morgan (1998) places more emphasis on the fluidity of the system.

develop, writers and educators became ever more conscious of correct usage, and so-called Atticists opposed the use in prose and formal speech of vocabulary and syntax without precedent in 'good' Attic writers of the fifth and fourth centuries BC (see pp. 6, 157). Pupils learnt to write in an idiom far removed from their everyday speech; and it was possible for a Lucian, living in a remote part of the Roman Empire and perhaps not a native speaker of Greek, to learn to express himself in an elegant approximation to the classical language. In secondary education there was a broadly predictable range of texts with Homer at the core; Euripides, Menander and Demosthenes were also popular.[15] These were read for their fine style and their ethical content. In the east the superiority of Greek art and culture was never questioned, and Latin was taught in schools only to a basic level, if at all. Educated Romans, by contrast, were expected to be familiar with Greek language and culture.

For further education after the age of about eighteen young men whose families could afford it paid to attend the lectures of a σοφιστής (*philosophus*) or ῥήτωρ (*orator*).[16] Experts tended to gather together in certain cities, which came to have the atmosphere of university towns. Athens, Alexandria and Rome were thriving centres of learning. In the first and second centuries AD Rhodes, Smyrna, Ephesus and Ionia in general had many 'schools', and Lucian will probably have attended one of these.[17] Teachers of rhetoric aimed to produce pupils who could compose or extemporise speeches; they read Demosthenes as a model of style, and through graded series of exercises (προγυμνάσματα) led their students from the telling of simple narratives and fables to full-blown rhetorical compositions. As practice for forensic oratory, pupils were required to write and declaim speeches for both defence and prosecution in preposterously improbable hypothetical cases. Each type of speech was prescriptively divided and subdivided into constituent sections; sententious wit and verbal point were highly valued. Constant practice made it possible for some sophists to declaim extempore (σχεδιάζειν) on any topic suggested by their audience.[18] Lucian performed before men familiar with the literary canon and sensitive to every rhetorical and lexical nuance.[19]

Sophists and rhetors were particularly prominent in the second century, not only as educators but also as public performers of display rhetoric and sometimes as representatives of their cities at the highest levels of government. The period AD 60–230 is commonly referred to as the Second Sophistic, a term coined by the third-century writer Philostratus in his *Lives of the Sophists* to claim

[15] Cribiore (2001) 192–215. In Latin the most popular authors were Virgil, Terence, Sallust and Cicero.

[16] Kaster (1988), Bowersock (1969).

[17] *Twice Accused* 27 περὶ τὴν Ἰωνίαν . . . πλαζόμενον . . . ἐπαίδευσα, says Rhetoric.

[18] Not all had this facility; Aristides needed time for preparation (Philostr. *VS* 583).

[19] Although he does attack over-fastidious speakers (see p. 00) and the debasement of oratory (*Tips for Orators*), the chief contemporary object of his satire is not rhetoricians but the hypocrisy of sham philosophers.

a link between the sophists of the Classical period and those nearer to his own times who were noted for their public performances or outstanding rhetorical abilities.[20] Philostratus' work gives a vivid picture of these notable practitioners, who operated particularly in Athens and the cities of western Asia Minor. Some practised in court; others gave master-classes in rhetoric; many performed in lecture-halls, theatres and palaces, attracting vast crowds of well-informed and critical auditors. Performances seem often to have begun with a short preliminary talk (προλαλιά, διάλεξις) delivered from a seated position; then for his main piece (μελέτη) the sophist would stand.[21] His deportment, clothing, physiognomy, voice and delivery would all be carefully scrutinised. He would be expected to be able to modulate his tone and to vary his style in accordance with the topic; to use metaphor, apostrophe, hyperbole and all the devices of rhetoric to give new life to hackneyed themes; to adopt the persona of historical characters of the Classical period in order to argue for or against a course of action in a deliberative speech; to bestow elegant praise on the city in which he performed or on the governor of a province; to reinforce the notion of shared culture through suitable allusion to well-known authors and texts; and in general to mingle pleasure with instruction, to season the devices of rhetoric with a soupçon of philosophy, history or science. A passionate performance could evoke wild applause and adulation;[22] a solecism, a hesitation or a slip of the tongue could lead to unwelcome hilarity and embarrassing failure.[23] Often a sophist's pupils would attend him as claqueurs, or conspire to discompose a rival.[24] Eminent sophists like Herodes, Scopelian, Polemo and Aristides were fêted by their native cities,[25] were employed as ambassadors on their behalf,[26] and were granted professorial chairs and immunity from taxes by the philhellene Antonine emperors.[27]

Philostratus makes no mention of Lucian, who presumably did not fit his idea of a sophist; but Lucian is none the less a product of the Second Sophistic, exploiting the shared culture and rhetorical training sometimes in more conventional descriptive or forensic works but more often to satirise the excesses of contemporary rhetors, grammarians, and in particular philosophers, whose hypocrisies he never tires of holding up to ridicule. In the majority of his works

[20] On the Second Sophistic in general see Bowie (1974), Whitmarsh (2005). Philostratus says that in the First Sophistic abstract philosophical themes were treated, whereas the Second Sophistic specialised in declamation based on historical events (*VS* 481).
[21] Philostr. *VS* 519.
[22] Philostr. *VS* 537.
[23] On details of these performances see Anderson (1986), Ghiron-Bistagne and Schouler (1987), Pernot (1993), Gleason (1995), Schmitz (1997).
[24] Philostr. *VS* 579–80.
[25] Ibid. 589, 595, etc.
[26] Ibid. 520, 531, 600. Whether they went on embassies *qua* sophists, or whether only those who were in any case members of high-born families were chosen, is disputed: see Bowersock (1969), Bowie (1982), Anderson (1989), Brunt (1994). Puech (2002) provides a handlist of rhetors and sophists.
[27] Philostr. *VS* 589.

conventional rhetorical techniques are used to produce not, as in the ideal sophistic performance, a comfortable effect of smoothly cultured advocacy or jovial praise, but instead fundamentally negative attacks on the pretensions, excesses, self-contradictions and inconsistencies of the contemporary world, of the Classical past idealised in the schools of rhetoric, and of the world of myth. This unique subversiveness may have helped to ensure the survival of Lucian's works.

3 LANGUAGE AND STYLE

From the Hellenistic period onwards educated Greeks became increasingly aware of change in their language. The *koine*, Greek as commonly spoken and as employed in written documents and non-literary treatises, was clearly different from Classical Attic in pronunciation and in certain aspects of vocabulary and syntax. The dual number, for example, had fallen out of use; contracted nouns like νοῦς and πλοῦς were moving from the second to the third declension; οὐ and μή were less clearly differentiated in use; the optative mood was less common than in Classical Attic, and was often used not in accordance with earlier norms; and Attic ττ in words like θάλαττα had long ago given way to σσ.[28] Grammarians compiled prescriptive works in an attempt to define correct usage.[29] At the same time, oratory in particular was seen as categorisable between the poles of 'Atticist' and 'Asianist'. Extreme Atticists, purists in language, avoided all vocabulary unattested in Classical authors, affected exclusively Attic words such as ἁμηγέπηι, δήπουθεν, μῶν, ἄττα and ἦ δ' ὅς, and criticised in the speeches and writing of others any falling away from purist norms. No one seems to have claimed the title 'Asianist'; but those less concerned with the minutiae of Attic usage and who cultivated a florid and exuberant style of rhythmical prose which aimed for emotional effect through assonance, word-play and hyperbole, ran the risk of being criticised for tumid Asianist bombast.[30] In reality most writers combined these characteristics in varying degrees. In so far as he lacks florid exuberance, Lucian may be classified as an Atticist writer;[31] but he does not affect recherché Attic vocabulary, and his usage, for example in respect of οὐ vs μή and in the moods in conditional clauses, has *koine* elements.[32] In *Lexiphanes* and *A Slip of the Tongue* he mocks contemporary hyperatticists. He writes with an easy grace, and in a style that can make

[28] On ττ ~ σσ see pp. 151–60.
[29] See Whitmarsh (2005) 43–5.
[30] On Atticism in general see Horrocks (1997) 79–101, Swain (1996) 17–64, Anderson (1993) 86–100, Schmitz (1997) 67–96, Whitmarsh (2005) 41–56.
[31] On Lucian's Atticism see Schmid I (1887) 216–432, Deferrari (1916), DuMesnil (1867).
[32] On οὐ ~ μή see *Fly* 6 τῆι πτήσει . . . , *Timon* 20 μή, 26 οὐκ ἀνέχεσθαι, nn.; on the moods *Dream* 8 οὐ . . . γένοιο, *Lit. Prom.* 5 ἦι . . . , *Fly* 5 ὡς μὴ . . . , *Timon* 37 βούλει . . . , 44 εἰ . . . ἴδοιμι . . . , 51 ὁπόσα ἂν ἐθέλοι, 54 καταλίποι, *Sea-gods* 11.1 ἔστ' ἂν . . . nn.

even mundane material entertaining. This apparently artless simplicity (ἀφέλεια) extends to syntax: his sentences are generally paratactic (καὶ . . . καὶ . . . καὶ . . .) rather than elaborately periodic. In the dialogues, which are already a combination of Platonic and comic elements, he exploits a further range of literary works, subsuming and renewing earlier genres: *Dialogues of the Sea-gods* rework scenes from Theocritus and Homer, *Dialogues of Courtesans* are inspired by New Comedy, and *A True History* alludes to paradoxographical literature and the novel. His vocabulary is chiefly derived from Plato, Xenophon, and Old and New Comedy;[33] this confirms his claim to have combined dialogue and comedy on the level of genre.

Lucian's construction of the past comes from his reading of literature and from the schools of rhetoric. In works such as *Timon* he evokes in a version of Classical Attic Greek a picture of Classical Athens. There are errors of detail and anachronisms,[34] some of which may be deliberate 'breaches of the dramatic illusion' comparable to the asides and topical references in Aristophanes.

No stylistic criteria have yet been devised which might help to put Lucian's works in chronological order.

4 PAST AND PRESENT IN LUCIAN

Atticism and the imitation of Classical models may be seen as one aspect of an attempt to keep alive or re-enact the past glories of Greek culture. Greek writers of the Second Sophistic make surprisingly few references to Roman power and institutions. In part this is the result of their rhetorical education: speeches practised in the schools of rhetoric were set in Classical times or in the reign of Alexander, when Greeks still had the power to influence political events. It has been argued that this affirmation of Greek culture and neglect of the reality of Roman power was one way in which educated Greeks, living prosperously in peace but without influence on world events, could come to terms with their place in the empire.[35] It is possible also to see the relationship between ruling Romans and politically subordinate but culturally superior Greeks as one of constantly negotiated exchange: the ideal is enlightened patronage, the endowment of chairs of rhetoric by philhellene emperors, and official imperial acknowledgment of the

[33] Schmid 1 (1887) 401. Householder (1941) catalogues Lucian's allusions; Anderson, (1976) and (1978), argues that many of these are either from the openings of works or from quotations in well-known texts; Macleod (1974) shows, however, that Lucian's style is based on a close familiarity with Plato, Menander and Aristophanes. Camerotto (1998) 261–302 argues that his Cynicism could be appreciated by πεπαιδευμένοι and ἰδιῶται alike. On Lucian and Homer see Bouquiaux-Simon (1968), Kindstrand (1973).

[34] See *Timon* 49–51 nn. On Lucian's relationship with Classical Athens see Delz (1950); but also the criticisms of Bompaire (1958) 519–27.

[35] Bowie (1974). But this lack of power should not be overemphasised; notable Greeks held the consulship and other high offices: Bowersock (1969) 30–58, Schmitz (1997) 50–63.

excellence of Greek oratory and philosophy; the reality, as depicted by Lucian in *On Salaried Posts*, might be an altogether grubbier relationship, in which the wealthy but despotic Roman patron, eager to retain a Greek man of learning as a status symbol, inflicts a thousand humiliations on his wretched but conniving dependant.[36]

But Lucian's works are hardly the place to look for a balanced view of the relationship between Greek cultural nostalgia and the realities of Roman economic power; though important in his writings, these themes too undergo characteristic treatment. In *The Dream*, for example, Lucian bases his narrative on Xenophon's story of the Choice of Heracles and on the early career of Socrates (see pp. 93–7); but these allusions to the Classical past, far from lending authority to Lucian's choice, draw attention to his shortcomings in comparison with these distinguished predecessors. *Timon* is set in Classical Athens; but the existence there already of spongers, charlatans and ingratiating hangers-on gives the lie to idealising views of that time. The language of Attic Greece is turned against its own origins, and a new Old Comedy arises, burlesquing the gods and treating self-important citizens with irreverence. Charlatans, parasites and impostors certainly existed in Lucian's day, but it is significant that these were objects of ridicule already in Classical times: Aristophanes has undignified gods in *Birds* and *Frogs*, mocks philosophers in *Clouds*, and has spongers humiliated in *Wealth*, while the Platonic Socrates systematically strips bare the pretensions of his sophist interlocutors. Conversely, Lucian neglects potential objects for satire which might seem particularly characteristic of his own age: he may follow Aristophanes in mocking the traditional Olympian gods, but he ignores popular contemporary cults such as Mithraism, the fashion for incubation in temples, the worship of spiritual beings or daimons, the official cults of imperial Rome, and above all astrology, a controversial and fashionable 'science' which could have lent itself to satiric treatment.[37]

In recent scholarship Lucian's engagement with contemporary issues has been much debated. He has been portrayed as a facile journalist and as a serious critic of morals; as a writer closely tied to his own times, and as a practitioner of literary *mimesis* more concerned with the revivification of Greek literature than with morality.[38]

[36] For a discussion of *On Salaried Posts* see Whitmarsh (2001) 279–93.

[37] Caster (1937) is a useful discussion of Lucian and contemporary religion. On astrology see Barton (1994), Long (1982), Cumont (1912). In the *Alexander* Lucian touches on the subject of cults. *On Astrology*, part of the Lucianic corpus but possibly not by Lucian, is in any case uncritical.

[38] There is a survey of these views in Goldhill (2002) 93–106. On German attitudes to Lucian see Holzberg (1988) and Baumbach (2002). Bompaire (1958) was highly influential in advocating *mimesis* (cf. Anderson (1994)), but Baldwin (1973) and Robert (1980) 393–436 continued to argue for close links with contemporary affairs.

5 PHILOSOPHY

Lucian satirises philosophers in a number of works. In *The Sale of Lives* their value is shown to be very low, in *Twice Accused* they are arraigned at length, and in *Hermotimus* all sects are shown to be equally unreliable. But he reserves his greatest scorn for the self-styled Stoics who preach ascetic virtue while practising vice and indulgence (cf. *Timon* 56–7). The object of his attacks is chiefly hypocrisy, and he does not engage with specific tenets of the philosophical schools in detail. Exempted from his general mockery and raised to heroic status as its instruments are the Cynics, in particular Diogenes and Menippus, who in works such as *Icaromenippus* and *Dialogues of the Dead* fearlessly challenge men and gods alike.

Cynicism or 'Doggishness' owed many of its characteristics to Diogenes (fourth century BC). Exiled from his native city of Sinope on the Black Sea he moved to Athens and Corinth, and evolved a way of life with tenets based on a variety of sources. Above all things he prized the distinction between virtue and vice, and he held all else subordinate to this; he lived in accordance with nature rather than with custom or convention, having few possessions, begging for his food, living in a tub, and performing all natural functions in public. Like Socrates, he practised his philosophy in the streets, rejecting education and culture and attacking social conventions, intellectualism, wealth, power and the family. A life of self-sufficiency, poverty and asceticism, he argued, was most likely to bring about happiness and virtue. He named his way of life after the dog, a creature shameless in its behaviour but clever at discriminating between true and false (e.g. Odysseus' Argos). Living his life in the city's public space, he engaged with his fellow-citizens using a combination of wit, insult, and physical and verbal obscenity. His quips and ripostes, though at first hearing gross, naive or perplexing, were designed to cut through pretension and to get to the essence of right living. He is said to have written a *Politeia* and tragedies expounding his beliefs, and his followers published voluminously. Cynicism was a widely influential way of looking at the world, and every city had its mendicant practitioners as well as citizens who professed Cynicism while living more conventional lives.[39]

Lucian's links with Cynicism are extensive and obvious. His essentially destructive mockery of humankind and its institutions, both social and religious, owes much to Cynic philosophy, and the famous Cynics Menippus and Diogenes appear in several dialogues: in *Icaromenippus* the philosopher takes upward flight and shamelessly criticises both gods and men; in *Zeus Confuted* a certain Cyniscus annoys Zeus by questioning divine omnipotence; and in *Dialogues of the Dead* both Menippus and Diogenes interrogate and mock deceased celebrities and statesmen. Menippus indeed may have influenced Lucian more than is now apparent. A Cynic writer of the third century, he composed satirical works, now lost, in a

[39] On Cynicism see Dudley (1938), Goulet-Cazé (1990), Branham and Goulet-Cazé (1996).

mixture of prose and verse with titles such as *Sale of Diogenes* and *Nekyia*, which presumably influenced Lucian's *Sale of Lives* and underworld scenes.[40]

Diogenes mocked with a serious protreptic purpose; can Lucian, too, be seen as σπουδογέλοιος? The case is put neatly by Photius, a ninth-century patriarch of Constantinople, who, having read some of Lucian's works, observed 'although he mocks and makes fun of the opinions of others, he does not make any positive statement about his own preferred creed; unless one argues that his philosophy is to have no philosophy'.[41] Many of Lucian's works can be read as 'serio-comic' in the Cynic mould; and if it is objected that he has nothing positive to affirm, he might reply that Cynicism is opposed to systematised philosophy, that living virtuously without the hypocrisy satirised in his works is the most important thing for a human being, and that many a true word is spoken in jest. It might further be argued that Lucian, in his peripatetic performances throughout Europe and Asia Minor, might have seemed a Cynic voice yapping at the polished sophists who were later found worthy of record by Philostratus and employing the philosophical dialogue form against the philosophers themselves. But if this is an important aspect of Lucian, it is not a consistent one. Not all his works are marked by a Cynic tone, and the urbane Atticism of his style is deployed in Cynic and non-Cynic works alike.

6 A NOTE ON THE TEXT

Copies of individual works by Lucian probably began to circulate from the time when each was delivered in public.[42] It is unlikely that he ever himself arranged them as a collection. Perhaps as early as the fifth century a corpus of works by or attributed to him was put together. He was popular in the Byzantine period as a model for good Attic style,[43] and in the Renaissance as a moralist,[44] so that more than 125 manuscripts containing all or a significant part of this corpus survive, the earliest dating to the tenth century. They fall into two sub-groups, generally

[40] Although Lucian does not as a rule mingle prose and verse like Petronius in the *Satyricon* or Seneca in the *Apocolocyntosis*, he does have Zeus quote poetry at length in *Zeus Rants*, and he did compose epigrams and a mock tragedy entitled *Gout*. On Menippus see Helm (1906), who argued for close imitation by Lucian, McCarthy (1934), who conclusively disproves this, and Hall (1981) 64–150.

[41] τὰς γὰρ ἄλλων κωμωιδῶν καὶ διαπαίζων δόξας, αὐτὸς ἢν θειάζει οὐ τίθησι, πλὴν εἴ τις αὐτοῦ δόξαν ἐρεῖ τὸ μηδὲν δοξάζειν (*Bibl.* 128, II 102 Henry).

[42] On 'publication' in the ancient world see pp. 2, 120.

[43] Several manuscripts of Lucian contain marginal annotations (scholia). Some of these are elementary explanations of less familiar words; others provide information on historical and mythological characters. In his own copy of the text (MS *E*) Arethas, bishop of Caesarea in the late tenth century, wrote short essays on philosophical points and abusive attacks on Lucian's unenlightened folly. The scholia were edited by Rabe (1906). On Arethas: Wilson (1983) 120–35.

[44] For Lucian's influence on European literature see Robinson (1979) 65–163, Ligota and Panizza (2007); on his popularity in the Renaissance Deligiannis (2006).