

Lucianea et Pseudo-Lucianea

Studies on pseudepigrapha of Lucian
and works by Lucian sometimes
considered spurious

Francesca Mestre, Pilar Gómez,
Cristian Tolsa (eds.)

DES. ERAS. ROTEROD. INTERPRETE.

139

Præterea & illud iam didici non esse tutum, cui non sit opus, cum eius-
modi philosophis agitare conuiuium.

LVCIANICI CONVIVII SIVE LAPITHAE. DES

ERAS. ROTEROD. INTERP. FINIS.

LVCIANVS DE A

STROLOGIA, DES. ERAS. ROT. INTERP.



UBe

E cælo, deq; astris est nobis institutus sermo. Non
de ipsis quidē astris, neq; ipso de cælo, uerū de di-
uinatione ac ueritate, quæ ab illis in hominum uitā
proficiscitur. Neq; rursus mihi libellus hic se tradi-
turū aut docturum profitetur, quo pacto diuina
tionem hāc assequi liceat. Sed illud queror, doctos
omneis cū in cæteris omnibus exercent se, suisq; omnibus tradant, so-

Filologia UB

Lucianea et Pseudo-Lucianea

Lucianea et Pseudo-Lucianea

Studies on pseudepigrapha of Lucian
and works by Lucian sometimes
considered spurious

Francesca Mestre, Pilar Gómez,
Cristian Tolsa (eds.)



UNIVERSITAT DE
BARCELONA

Edicions

Filologia UB

Contents

Preface	9
Introduction. A Lucianic universe	11
FRANCESCA MESTRE	
1. La transmission des pseudo-Lucien : le cas du <i>Charidèmos</i> et du <i>Néron</i>	33
ÉMELINE MARQUIS	
2. La tradición impresa del corpus de epigramas atribuidos a Luciano.....	53
MATÍAS SEBASTIÁN FERNANDEZ ROBBIO	
3. Luciano y el ave fiel: <i>Alción o Sobre metamorfosis</i> , entre diálogo socrático y escritura poética.....	75
PILAR GÓMEZ	
4. Characterizing Lucian's <i>De astrologia</i>	101
CRISTIAN TOLSA	
5. Die Ἑρωτες und ihre Stellung in Lukians Gesamtwerk	121
PETER V. MÖLLENDORFF	
6. Transforming Lucian in Late Antiquity: the cases of the Pseudo-Lucianic <i>The Solecist</i> and <i>The Cynic</i>	151
MARKUS HAFNER	
7. Las metamorfosis de la fábula esópica en <i>Lucio o El asno</i>	173
IVANA SELENE CHIALVA	
8. Defending «the more awkward cause» (<i>Am.</i> 52): women in <i>Amores</i> , Lucian, and schools of rhetoric.....	203
MORENA DERIU	
9. Siguiendo (o no) los pasos de Peregrino	227
M. TERESA FAU	
Index locorum.....	239
Index nominum	255

Preface

Lucian of Samosata has been regarded as one of the main representatives of 2nd century Greek literature and of the Second Sophistic movement in a broad sense, despite being quite a singular individual among his contemporaries. Unlike the intellectuals of his time, including sophists and writers in general, he has enjoyed uninterrupted attention from the Middle Ages to the present day, passing through the Renaissance and Humanism. Many of his works have been translated, reworked, or imitated repeatedly in numerous languages. Lucian's creativity, innovation, satire, humor, and universal interpretation of all aspects surrounding human beings have made him a continuous source of themes, characters and situations, and, at the same time, the preservation of his writings has deeply contributed to our knowledge of the most important traits of Greek intellectual life and literature. Understandably, a significant number of studies have been devoted to the Syrian writer, either examining his thought and works from a strictly literary perspective or seeking a better understanding of the broader revival of Classical Greek culture in the 2nd century.

An issue that arises occasionally when approaching his works, and which involves different aspects of scholarship, such as analysis of the manuscript tradition and the study of style or language, is whether they are truly by Lucian or should be considered spurious. The aim of this volume is to closely examine some of these allegedly or truly spurious pieces, and to evaluate them on the basis of their own merit and interest, while always keeping in mind the general framework of Lucian and his tradition. Our goal is not to resolve all the questions related to attribution issues, nor to address the entire corpus. Rather, this volume's nine contributions focus on various aspects of doubtful or spurious works and attempt to shed light on them and their relationship with Lucian's corpus, not necessarily with the aim of proving their authorship.

This is a path that must be traveled, and the present book represents only a small contribution in a field that deserves much more attention. Nonetheless, after considering these approaches collectively, we should probably acknowledge the existence of a 'Lucian universe'; a notion that will undoubtedly enrich our understanding of the author from Samosata.

As editors of the volume, we would like to express our gratitude to all contributors for accepting the plan we presented to them four years ago, and for their gracious patience with the lengthy publication process.

We would also like to extend our appreciation to Edicions UB for approving our proposal, and for handling our work with exquisite care.

The work has received the financial support of the research project FFI2016-77969, funded by the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (MINECO).

The editors
Barcelona, May 2024

Introduction

A Lucianic universe

Francesca Mestre
Universitat de Barcelona

1. WHO IS LUCIAN?

Greek literature after the Archaic and Classical periods experienced an extraordinary flourishing under Roman Imperial administration: from the Flavian dynasty to the Severans (and even beyond), we witness a peak moment of literary production—in a broad sense—written in Greek, or more specifically, in Attic Greek. Far from the spoken Greek of the time, Attic Greek became the language of prestigious culture, reclaiming the Attic dialect of a Thucydides or a Sophocles. We have a vast sample of this phenomenon, comprising a large number of authors and preserved works, among whom Lucian (Λουκιανός) stands out, a Greek writer of Syrian origin, probably born around the year 120 AD in the city of Samosata—in the region of Commagene, which was then part of the Roman province of Syria—and who must have died around the year 180.

What we know—or rather, what we think that we know—about Lucian does not provide us with much precise or certain data. His contemporaries hardly mention him: he is not present in Philostratus' catalogue of sophists—although neither is this very significant, since Philostratus' aim was surely not to present a realistic portrait of the sophistic movement, but rather to please his friends¹—and the sophists or renowned intellectuals whose works have been preserved almost never mention him. His name does appear, however, in the works of scholars who are more distant from the spotlight of fame and power described by Philostratus, but, of course, not much from these authors has been preserved. Nevertheless, it seems significant that grammarians also from the same 2nd century, such as the paroemiographers Diogenianus and Zenobius,²

1 Cf. K. ESHLEMAN, *The Social World of Intellectuals in the Roman Empire*, Cambridge 2012, 128–139.

2 Diogenian. 1.52; 1.90 and Zen. 2.1, quoting Luc. *Philops.* 32.10; Diogenian. 2.89, quoting *DMeretr.* 3.3; Diogenian. 5.22, quoting *JTr.* 25.18, and again Diogenian. 2.89 (cod. Vindob. 133), quoting *Sat.* 19.12—though the text of the paroemiographer says that the quote is found in *DMort.* (ἐν νεκρικοῖς † διαλόγοις); the last proverb mentioned by these paroemiographers is found in Zen. 3.68, quoting *Musc. Enc.* 12.12.

mention his works and annotate the proverbs he uses,³ and Phrynichus the Atticist also mentions a passage from Lucian⁴ when providing examples in his treatise of rhetoric *Praeparatio sophistica* (whose epitome is transmitted by Photius: ἐκ τῶν Φρυνίχου τοῦ ἀραβίου τῆς σοφιστικῆς προπαρασκευῆς).

Lucian's contemporary grammarians are the sources for Byzantine lexicographers and scholars; this is the reason—among other factors that we will discuss later—why mentions of Lucian among them is not uncommon. The paradigm is undoubtedly Thomas Magister, secretary to Emperor Andronicus II (13th–14th centuries), who cites the Attic forms and expressions of Lucian extensively, as well as his specific usages, and many other aspects of his language. Thomas Magister⁵ is primarily based on Phrynichus—as well as on Aelius Herodianus, a contemporary of Lucian who, in turn, followed in the steps of Aristarchus' disciple, Ammonius. Thomas Magister's fundamental interest lies in the characteristics of the Attic language, in which, according to him, Lucian excels. Lucian is adduced as a witness on the same level as, to give just a few significant names, Thucydides, Plato, and Demosthenes.

Lucian is also presented as an authority in numerous scholia of Classical authors: Hesiod, Aeschylus, Aristophanes, and those of Apollonius of Rhodes; reference is made to him also in the comments on the *Iliad* by Eustathius as one of the 'late Atticists' (τῶν ὕστερον Ἀττικιστῶν).⁶

However, in matters other than his formal excellence—rhetoric, Atticism, literary prowess—Lucian enjoys another kind of fame related to his ability to take everything lightly and to his sense of humor. We have two testimonies from the early 4th century that reflect this: on the one hand, Eunapius of Sardis, a pagan sophist and anti-Christian activist, praises Lucian's ability and skill to make

3 In fact, as W. SCHMID (*Der Atticismus in seinem Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus*, Stuttgart 1887 [Hildesheim: Olms 1964]) rightly points out, the use of proverbs (παροιμία) is very common among the writers of the period of the Second Sophistic, and of them, especially in Lucian (vol. I. 411).

4 Specifically, Phrynichus (*PS* 122) cites Lucian as an example of the typically Attic expression φιλοτησίας προπίνειν, which means to drink to someone's health, and, indeed, we find this expression several times in his works, literally (*Gall.* 12.19; *Mer. Cond.* 16.17; *Pseudol.* 31.6; *Sat.* 33.12; *Herm.* 11–21), and also, *ad sensum*, *Symp.* 15.2; *Sat.* 18.4; *Gall.* 26.4.

5 Especially in Thom. Mag., *Ecloga Vocum Atticarum*, there is a significant number of entries in alphabetical order where a piece by Lucian is mentioned as an example of the use of the word in question. However, the works mentioned do not distinguish between those that are securely attributed and those that are not (he mentions, for example, *Dem. Enc.*).

6 Eust. 3.880.

people laugh with his works; in fact, he defines him as «Lucian of Samosata, who usually took serious pains to raise a laugh»,⁷ but he adds that he can also be serious when necessary. On the other hand, Lactantius the Christian rhetorician and apologist, when criticizing the violence, lust, and lack of restraint of the hero Heracles—clear examples of morality contrary to the values of Christianity—states that Lucian, who spared no one in his criticisms (*Lucianus, qui diis et hominibus non pepercit*),⁸ not only does not ridicule Heracles but dedicates hymns to him and holds him in great respect. With the mention of these two testimonies from the 4th century, we can already imagine that Lucian, despite the respect he earned for his style, did not have a very good reputation among the Byzantines—i.e., Christians. Again, a couple of examples (the *Suda* and Photius) will suffice. Both the lexicon from the late 10th century and the Byzantine scholar and patriarch consider him an atheist because he mocks his own gods, but also—and this is even more serious—Christianity and Christ himself. An unequivocal example is the entry Λουκιανός in the *Suda* where, in a few lines, apart from applying to him the epithets of blasphemer, shameless, and atheist (βλάσφημος ἢ δύσφημος, ἢ ἄθεος), and highlighting the inherent humor in his dialogues (ἐν τοῖς διαλόγοις αὐτοῦ γελοῖα εἶναι) targeting divine matters (καὶ τὰ περὶ τῶν θεῶν εἰρημένα), it explains that he died from rabies (ἐλύττησεν) after seriously offending Christians, for which he «will deserve the fire of Satan for ages to come» (κληρονόμος τοῦ αἰωνίου πυρὸς μετὰ τοῦ Σατανᾶ γενήσεται).⁹ Photius expresses a similar sentiment, adding that «he seems to be one of those people who take nothing seriously, ridicule others' opinions, and mock them, but does not state his own opinion, unless it is to have none on anything».¹⁰

Criticism of pagan religious attitudes by Christians—starting from the 2nd century AD, but also in Byzantine times—is not exclusively applied to Lu-

7 Eun. *VS* 2.1.9: ἀνὴρ σπουδαῖος ἐς τὸ γελασθῆναι (transl. by W.C. Wright); however, it is important to consider the context of Eunapius: the sophist from Sardis aims to supplement, by writing the lives of important philosophers, what Philostratus did not do in his *Lives of the Sophists*, and he mentions Lucian to vindicate the importance of Demonax—about whom Lucian writes a life (Luc. *Demon.*)—arguing that, although Lucian laughs at everything and everyone, when he speaks of Demonax, he does so in a serious way: «in that book and a very few others [Lucian] was wholly serious throughout» (ἐν ἐκείνῳ τε τῷ βιβλίῳ καὶ ἄλλοις ἐλαχίστοις δι' ὅλου σπουδάσας).

8 Lact. *inst.* 1.9.8.

9 Cf. Suid. *s.u.* Λουκιανός.

10 Phot. *Bibl.* 128.96a: ὅμοιος δὲ αὐτὸς τῶν μηδὲν ἄλλως πρεσβεύόντων εἶναι· τὰς γὰρ ἄλλων κωμῶδων καὶ διαπαίζων δόξας, αὐτὸς ἦν θειάζει οὐ τίησι, πλὴν εἴ τις αὐτοῦ δόξαν ἐρεῖ τὸ μηδὲν δοξάζειν. However, it should be noted that Photius, as a good professional, also speaks of Lucian setting aside matters of belief and competently discusses the authorship of a work problematically attributed even in his time, *Asinus* (Phot. *Bibl.* 129.96b), praising literary and stylistic aspects extensively, albeit lamenting that he applies them to inconvenient subjects.

cian. However, from the Christian perspective, he is an atypical case because, they say, he ridicules equally the pagan gods as the Christians do, implying that it is the very idea of divinity that is at stake.¹¹ His bad reputation among Byzantine Christians primarily comes from the only two explicit mentions of them in two of his works. These mentions are in *Alexander or the False Prophet* (Luc. *Alex.* 25), and in *The Death of Peregrinus* (Luc. *Peregr.* 11-13), where, in fact, he *just* describes them as foolish and peculiar (κακοδαίμονες, ιδιώται ἄνθρωποι)—which may well be the general impression among a large number of Lucian's contemporaries—and labels their teacher «the crucified sophist» (ἀνεσκολοπισμένον ἐκεῖνον σοφιστήν, *Peregr.* 13). Such words no doubt would not have seemed horribly offensive in Lucian's time, especially coming from a writer who satirizes his fellow sophists in a quite cruel manner, but they would become unforgivable a couple of centuries later.

So far, this is what we know about Lucian from his contemporaries and from the later tradition.

However, most of the information that comprises the commonly accepted biography of Lucian is found within Lucian's works and in the interpretation thereof. These data can be divided into three main areas: origin, activities, and relationships.

Regarding origin, the opusculum *The Dream or Life* (Luc. *Somn.*)—and the first person that it employs—provides us with a series of data that very often have been considered autobiographical: Lucian was born into a humble family,¹² from which he decided to distance himself in order to receive rhetorical training and engage in intellectual activities that usually brought good reputation, economic well-being, and a certain proximity to circles of power. The place of origin and the native language are indicated by references to Samosata, in the Roman province of Syria, a remote place on the eastern borders of the Empire. Indeed, another first person refers to Samosata as 'homeland' (πατρίς) in the essay dedicated to criticizing the historians of his time (*Hist. Conscr.* 24), and the adjective ἐπευφρατίδιος ('dweller by the Euphrates') is applied to a character in the dialogue *The Dead Come to Life or The Fisherman* called Parrhesiades, easily iden-

11 A relatively recent study sheds some new light on this issue, not only addressing the ridiculing of religious and philosophical thoughts by Lucian but also relating it to some aspects of popular culture: cf. I.N.I. KUIN, *Lucian's Laughing Gods: Religion, Philosophy, and Popular Culture in the Roman East*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press 2023.

12 The word is πένης ('poor') in *Somn.* 11; *BisAcc.* 27; *Ind.* 4.

tifiable with the author himself; this character is introduced as «a Syrian, one of those who dwell by the Euphrates» (Σύρος... τῶν Ἐπευφρατιδίων, *Pisc.* 19), using the appellation 'Syrian' presumably as a self-description, as occurs in other places in Lucian's work (*BisAcc.* 30-34; *Ind.* 19).

We also must take note of the references made to their native language—not Greek, but rather barbaric (*Pisc.* 19; *Bis Acc.* 27; *Ind.* 4; *Pseudol.* 1)—by the first persons or the characters created by Lucian as alter egos.¹³ Nevertheless, the Greek education of this man from Samosata becomes evident in allusions to the common language, the one understood by everyone, the most universal: thus, we find that the fantasy characters in *True Stories* speak Greek (*HV* 1.8; 2.4; 2.46), or even the Carthaginian Hannibal who confesses to having learned Greek (*DMort.* 25.2); or, conversely, all the problems that come with not speaking it, for example, Zeus feels uneasy with the new divinities that do not speak Greek (*JTr.* 13; 27; *Deor. Conc.* 9). In characterizing strange or ridiculous people, or circumstances outside the norm, non-Greek language is a frequently trait (for example, *Alex.* 51; *Philops.* 31; *Vit.Auct.* 10). Ultimately, therefore, despite flaunting a certain marginal character due to his origin, in contrast with most of his colleagues, we still find in Lucian's works the usual ingredients of defense of Hellenism and *paideia*.

It is worth adding a brief comment regarding a Lucianic work that has not received much attention, and which some have even considered spurious: *Praise of the Fatherland* (*Luc. Patr.Enc.*). This short essay is an unconventional praise, since we do not know who is speaking, to whom it is addressed, to which geographical location it refers, or even if it is set to any specific period. Beginning with the almost literal quote from the Homeric episode of Odysseus among the Phaeacians when he says that «there is nothing sweeter than the fatherland» (*Od.* 9.34), Lucian praises everybody's birthplace allegedly because, as for Odysseus, no other richer or more fertile places can compensate for everything that each person receives at birth, language included; and even when one must move away to acquire new experiences, education, and wealth (as was frequently the case among scholars by Lucian's time), one always wants to return, if only to enrich the homeland with what has been achieved. This is an interesting text that we can interpret in a positive sense, or as a biting satire of the life of many intellectuals of the Empire.¹⁴

13 In Lucian's place of origin, the native language was likely Aramaic, and, therefore, this was very possibly his mother tongue.

14 Cf. F. MESTRE, «Luciano y la patria. En torno al concepto de *patris* entre algunos escritores griegos del siglo II», in A. CAMEROTTO & S. MASO, *La satira del successo. La spettacolarizzazione della*

The activities carried out by Lucian—following the details provided in his works—are typical of a sophist;¹⁵ following the text of *The Double Indictment*, we are aware that from a very young age he dedicated himself to rhetoric and that through this education he entered the usual circles of the Second Sophistic,¹⁶ leading him as an itinerant lecturer to a large variety of places in the Empire, including Athens and other cities in Greece (such as Olympia¹⁷) and in Asia Minor (such as Abonuteichos, in Paphlagonia, where he had the opportunity to see the exhibitions of the thaumaturge Alexander [*Alex.*]), Rome (*Nigr.* 2), Alexandria in Egypt (*Apol.* 12), and even Gaul (*Herc.*; *Apol.* 15; *BisAcc.* 27). His career as a sophist, of which we have no contemporary testimony (except perhaps the not very laudatory one from Galen¹⁸), is possibly referred to in his own works, although, again, we must take these allusions with a certain caution. Indeed, the first person of the *Apology*, chatting with his friend Sabinos, defines himself as follows in his defense against the possible attacks for accepting a position in the administration in Egypt¹⁹:

Πρὸ δὲ τῶν ὅλων μεμνησθαι χρή τοὺς ἐπιτιμῶντας ὅτι οὐ σοφῶ ὄντι μοι—εἰ δὲ τις καὶ ἄλλος ἐστὶ που σοφός—ἐπιτιμήσουσιν ἄλλὰ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ πολλοῦ δήμου, λόγους μὲν ἀσκήσαντι καὶ τὰ μέτρια ἐπαινουμένῳ ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς, πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἄκραν ἐκείνην τῶν κορυφαίων ἀρετὴν οὐ πάννυ γεγυμνασμένῳ. καὶ μὰ Δί’ οὐδ’ ἐπὶ τοῦτ’ ἀνιᾶσθαι μοι ἄξιον, ὅτι μηδὲ ἄλλῳ ἐγὼ γοῦν ἐντετύχηκα τὴν τοῦ σοφοῦ ὑπόσχεσιν ἀποπληροῦντι. σοὺ μέντοι καὶ θαυμάσαιμ’ ἂν ἐπιτιμῶντός μου τῷ νυνὶ βίῳ, εἴ γε ἐπιτιμῶης, ὃν πρὸ πολλοῦ ἦδεις ἐπὶ ῥητορικῇ δημοσίᾳ μεγίστας μισθοφορὰς ἐνεγκάμενον, ὁπότε κατὰ θέαν

cultura nel mondo antico (tra retorica, filosofia, religione e potere), Milano & Udine 2017, 458-476; cf. also E. KIDD, «Lucian's Fatherland Encomium and the Meaning of Samosata», *American Journal of Philology* 143.3, 2022, 447-473, whose thesis asserts that the homeland mentioned is undoubtedly Samosata.

15 On his previous activity as a lawyer in Antioch, the data is only given by the Suda.

16 On a lifetime dedicated to the craft of words (λόγους ἀσκήσαντι), cf. *Apol.* 15.

17 We are aware of his presence at the Olympic Games of the year 165, where he witnessed the public immolation of Peregrinus (*Peregr.* 35); in the same piece, he indicates that he had attended the Games on three other occasions (*ibidem*); on *Peregr.*, see below.

18 Galen refers to it in his commentary on the *Epidemics* by Hippocrates (2.26.9) in a passage not preserved in Greek but translated into Arabic: he compares the malpractice of a physician from Pergamon with the literary imposture carried out by Lucian, who, with the aim of mocking philosophers and grammarians, fabricates an obscure text and gives it to them to interpret, telling them it is from Heraclitus; the anecdote and the texts, in Greek and in Arabic, are well explained in G. STROHMAIER, «Übersehenes zur Biographie Lukians», *Philologus* 120, 1978, 117-122.

19 On the chronology of Lucian in Egypt, and details and rank of the position, cf. A. MARTIN, «Lucien et l'Égypte», in F. MESTRE & P. GÓMEZ, *Lucian of Samosata. Greek Writer and Roman Citizen*, Barcelona 2010, 191-201.

τοῦ ἑσπερίου Ὠκεανοῦ καὶ τὴν Κελτικὴν ἄμα ἐπιὼν ἐνέτυχες ἡμῖν τοῖς μεγαλομίθοις
τῶν σοφιστῶν ἐναριθμουμένοις. (*Apol.* 15)

Above all, those who censure me must remember that it is not a wise man—if such there be anywhere—whom they will censure but one of the common people, one who has trained himself in words and received moderate praise for them, but one completely unpractised in that acme of the virtues that the cream of men display. And surely I ought not to be grieved even on this account, for I at any rate have met no other who fulfilled the promise of wisdom. However, I should be surprised if you were to condemn me for my present life—you knew me long ago when I was commanding the highest fees for the public practice of rhetoric, at the time when you went to see the Western Ocean and the lands of the Celts and met me: my fees were as high as those of any professor. (transl. Kilburn)

This text contains some relevant elements that help in explaining Lucian's *persona*: on the one hand, he modestly states that he is just a sophist, not a wise man, and that like all sophists, he earns a living by making public speeches, traveling from one end of the Empire to the other. This description seems to fit perfectly with that of the Syrian rhetorician in *The Double Indictment*, especially the part shared with the female character named Rhetoric (*BisAcc.* 26-32). However, as we also infer from this same work, there came a moment—around the age of forty—when the Syrian rhetorician felt disappointed with this way of life and went in search of more serious, quieter, and less frivolous activity. It is probably the time when he wanted to get better acquainted with philosophy, which was not as lucrative as rhetoric: this would justify accepting a public position. It is also worth noting that, considering the satirical invectives launched by some of Lucian's works against those who engage in philosophy, he must have been disillusioned with it as well (for example, in *Pisc.*, *Herm.*, *Symp.*, etc.).

Lucian's career path was thus (always from what we can gather from his works) truly unconventional, whether we compare it to that of a sophist, according to Philostratus' description of them in *VS*, or to that of a reputed philosopher, that is, a member of one of the philosophical schools. The eccentric character of this person must have led to few friendships among intellectual circles, which, combined with the constant satire of his potential colleagues and fellow literati (sophists, philosophers, historians, etc.), would explain his isolation and the scarcity of news we have from his contemporaries. In this sense, we can briefly focus on another short work which can also probably be interpreted, in a loose

sense, as autobiographical. I refer to the essay titled *Slander or not being quick to put faith in it* (Luc. *Cal.*). Unlike other texts by Lucian that include large doses of humor satirizing the customs of his time and his colleagues, this brief moral treatise allegorically describes the bitter experience of one who is a victim of slander and falls into disgrace because of the malice of unscrupulous liars and the ignorance of the people who believe them.²⁰

Surely, such a treatise could be interpreted as an expression of the resentment felt by someone who is not appreciated by his colleagues and who feels sidelined, not because he lacks commendable intellectual skills but simply because he dares to deviate from the general norm. Moreover, in the case of a sophist who needs close ties with power to achieve fame and renown, being the target of unjustified criticism and slander are circumstances that can only worsen his isolation.²¹

In summary, the biographical portrait we can extract from the data provided by Lucian's works would be as follows: a man who, despite being from the outskirts of the Empire, leaves his homeland and his people to make a name for himself as an intellectual. He achieves this, travelling profitably everywhere. However, disillusioned by the superficial nature of this task and the imposed constraints, he makes satirical descriptions of the world around him the main theme of his writings. This leads to a certain isolation and perhaps even to disdain for not conforming to the conventions of the elites. This is especially true if, after mocking those who work for others, he himself accepts a hired position in Egypt.²²

Certainly, this portrait likely corresponds to the writer Lucian, but it could also apply to others in his circle who found themselves in a similar situation. Therefore, it is very difficult to know if what is described in Lucian's works and the traits of the characters that appear in them—whether in the first person or

20 Given what I argue about Lucian's isolation, it is tempting to think that *Cal.* is a bitter cry of denunciation of what he himself suffered; but on the other hand, it is equally possible to find in other works Lucian himself acting as a full-fledged slanderer, following step by step what he denounces in *Cal.*: the most blatant example is *Ind.*, where we perceive a clearly malevolent intention to discredit a colleague of unknown identity to us, but surely easily identifiable by his audience.

21 Cf. F. MESTRE, «Lucian in Sophistopolis», in E. Poddighe & T. Pontillo (edd.), *Resisting and Justifying Changes. How to Make the New Acceptable in Ancient, Medieval and Early Modern World*, Pisa: Pisa University Press 2021, 279-299.

22 It should be noted, however, that the main justification for this fact, which we find in the *Apolo-*
gy, is that we should distinguish between being paid by a private individual and working in public service: cf. *Apol* II: ...ἢ δημοσίᾳ πράττοντά τι τῶν κοινῶν καὶ ἐξ δυνάμιν πολιτευόμενον ἐπὶ τούτῳ παρὰ βασιλέως μισθοφορεῖν («...entering public service, when one administers affairs as well as possible and is paid by the Emperor for doing it» [transl. Kilburn]).

as dialogue interlocutors—constitute a portrait of himself, of someone else, of both simultaneously, or if it is all part of a rhetorical fiction portraying an environment and its associated customs.

2. LUCIANIC (AND PSEUDO-LUCIANIC) WORKS

The manuscript tradition has handed down to us a significant number of works under the name of Lucian—around eighty. This collection of works includes a great variety of forms and themes, with overlaps and intersections.

One characteristic that is immediately evident in all these works is the imprint of *paideia*, as is often the case among authors of this period, although, as we will see, the end-results achieved by Lucian are usually different. Within the Lucianic corpus, we can easily detect examples covering the majority of the exercises typically practiced in the schools of rhetoric (*progymnasmata*): encomium (*Musc.Enc.*, *Dem.Enc.*, etc.), comparison or *synkrisis* (again *Dem.Enc.*, and *Dips.*, *Herod.*, *Zeux.*), *gnōmē* and *chreia* often serving as the starting point for *prolaliai*, narration or *diēgēma* (present in a large number of dialogues, e.g., *Tox.* or *Nav.* or in the *prolaliai*, e.g., *Electr.*), *ethopoeia* (*Phal.* 1), *mythos* (*Halc.*), or even *nomos* (decrees in *Sat.*, *Nec.*, or in *Deor.Conc.*). Nevertheless, description or *ekphrasis* is by far the most visible and versatile progymnasmatic element: we find descriptions of works of art (*Cal.*, *Im.*, *Herc.*, *Herod.*, *Zeux.*), descriptions of dreams or fantastic visions (*Somn.*, *VH*, *Asin.*), of extraordinary beings (*Dips.*, *VH*), or simply of spaces (*Dom.*, *Hipp.*).

The judicial or epideictic *meletai* (*Abd.*, *Tyr.*, *Bacch.*, *Patr.Enc.*) are also clear legacies of the rhetorical school.

From a formal point of view, Lucian also takes up the more traditional types of prose: *bios* (*Demon.*), letter (*Nigr.*, *Sat.*), historiography (*Syr.D.*, *Hist.Concr.*), treatise (*Astr.*), and, obviously, dialogue. He adapts in prose genres of poetry (*DMar.*, containing poetic reminiscences ranging from Homer to Hellenistic poetry of Theocritus or Herodas), iamb and invective (*Ind.*, *Pseudol.*), and dramatic poetry in the dialogues (especially comedy, both old and new, but also many aspects of tragedy). Furthermore, he incorporates into his repertoire his specific application of ‘new’ forms, especially the novel (*VH*, *Asin.*).

However, the most characteristic feature of Lucian’s work is a series of new hybrid forms of his own creation. Of course, other contemporary writers also make their own reinterpretations of traditional forms. For instance, among many other examples, Dio Chrysostomus’ *Or.* 7 (*Euboean Discourse*) is a combination of narrative as *exemplum* and moral essay; or *The Sacred Tales* by Aelius