

The Love of Wisdom and the Love of Lies: The Philosophers and Philosophical Voices of Lucian's *Philopseudes*¹

DANIEL OGDEN
University of Exeter

Tychiades' extended monologue in Lucian's *Lover of Lies*² describes a symposium in the house of Eucrates. There philosophers of different schools had attempted to persuade the disgusted Tychiades of the efficacy of magic and the reality of ghosts with nine tales of their own supposed experiences, to which Tychiades had added a counter-tale of his own. The text is the original home of the famous tale of *The Sorcerer's Apprentice*, and this conveys the flavour of the ten. Amongst its other engaging tales a Babylonian miraculously blasts snakes with his scorching breath; a Hyperborean mage draws a woman to her admirer with an animated cupid doll; a Jewish sorcerer exorcises a demon; an animated statue punishes a thief; a man is mistakenly taken down to the underworld before his time and returned to life; and a Pythagorean cleanses a haunted house of its monstrous ghost. The text's key model is the *Symposium*, but there are strong inputs also from the *Phaedo* and Plutarch's *Daimonion of Socrates*.³

In this paper we will consider the various characters of Tychiades' monologue, including Tychiades' own, and contextualise them against the stock character-types Lucian constructs across his wider oeuvre. The philosophers are specifically characterised for their schools in line with their projection in the rest of the Lucianic corpus.⁴ The tales they are given to tell

¹ This paper is largely extracted from the introduction to my book *In Search of the Sorcerer's Apprentice. The Traditional Tales of Lucian's Lover of Lies* (2007).

² The title is better read as singular: see Ogden 2004a, 484 n. 1.

³ For the last of which see now the important study of Wälchli 2003.

⁴ Thus Schwartz 1951, 8–9 and 38–39, rightly. Pace Robinson 1979, 31. For Lucian's attitudes to the philosophical schools in general, see principally *Sale of Lives, Fisherman*

are all in some way linked with their school or their character-type.⁵ An appreciation of the broader Lucianic types to which the characters, philosophical and other, conform will give us access to some intriguing back-stories to the tales they tell. Conspicuous by their absence from the symposium are representatives of Lucian's two favourite philosophical schools, the Cynics and the Epicureans. However, it will be found that Tychiades himself exhibits some signature Epicurean tendencies, in Lucianic terms, whilst a disembodied Cynic voice speaks intermittently through distinctive imagery and language in the dialogue's various tales. For the most part this voice speaks in concert with Tychiades, without being identifiable as his own voice.

Before we proceed, it will be useful to bear in mind the overall lay-out of the dialogue, the general contents of the various tales, and the speakers responsible for them:

- 1–6 *Outer frame.* Tychiades and Philocles in dialogue. The category of lies in question – tales of the supernatural – is defined.
- 7–10 *Inner frame.* Cleodemus the Peripatetic and Dinomachus the Stoic debate animal-product amulets. Cleodemus urges a lionskin amulet for gout. Dinomachus objects that it should be a deer, a characteristically fleet animal. Cleodemus confutes: lions are faster than deer because they catch them.
- 11–13 *A. Ion the Platonist's first tale.* Midas the slave is bitten on the toe by a viper whilst vine-dressing. As his flesh necrotises a Chaldaean heals him instantaneously by tying a fragment of a virgin's tombstone to his foot; he jumps up and carries his own stretcher home. The Chaldaean then summons together the snakes from the farm, breathes over them, and burns them all up.
- 13–15 *B. Cleodemus the Peripatetic's first tale.* Cleodemus' pupil Glaucias falls in love with the married Chrysis. Cleodemus brings in a Hyperborean mage who first calls up the ghost of Glaucias' father Alexicles to get permission to proceed, and then, summoning Hecate, the Moon, and Cerberus, animates a cupid doll which drags Chrysis to Glaucias' door.

and *Lapiths*, and cf. Helm 1902, Tackaberry 1930, Caster 1937, Jones 1986 (the last two reviewed by Macleod 1994, 1371–1372 and 1377) and Nesselrath at Ebner *et al.* 2001, 136–140.

⁵ Cf. Georgiadou & Larmour 1998, 40–44, who contend with some plausibility that philosophers and philosophical doctrines are parodied by means of the fantastic tales in the *True Histories*.

- 16–17 *C. Ion the Platonist's second tale.* A Syro-Palaestinian exorcises the possessed and the ghosts are expelled in smoky form. (The formal narrative element here is weak).
- 18–20 *D. Eucrates' first tale.* Eucrates' disease-healing statue of Pellichus comes to life and maddens a Libyan slave who has stolen coins dedicated to it.
- 21 *E. Antigonus' (vestigial) tale.* Antigonus' statuette of Hippocrates overturns his medical equipment if his offerings are overdue. (The formal narrative element is weak here too).
- 22–24 *F. Eucrates' second tale.* Eucrates' ring, given him by an Arab, averts a manifestation of Hecate and permits him vision of the underworld as she returns to it.
- 25–26 *G. Cleodemus the Peripatetic's second tale.* Hermes takes the ailing Cleodemus down to the underworld in mistake for the neighbouring smith Demylyus. He witnesses its sights, but the mistake is recognised when he is brought before a tribunal. He is allowed to scurry back to the world of the living, where he successfully predicts Demylyus' imminent death.
- 27–28 *H. Eucrates' third tale.* Eucrates is visited by the ghost of his wife Demainete, who asks for the burning of her lost sandal, so that she can be at peace. The ghost disappears when her Maltese lapdog barks.
- 29–31 *I. Arignotus the Pythagorean's tale.* Arignotus faces down a ghost in a haunted house, and locates the site of the body that has produced it.
- 32 *J. Tychiades' tale.* Democritus lives and writes in a tomb and is irritated but not frightened when the local wags dress up as ghosts and dance around him.
- 33–37 *K. Eucrates' fourth tale.* The Sorcerer's Apprentice. Eucrates becomes apprentice to the Egyptian sorcerer Pancrates and attempts his spell to animate a pestle to fetch water, with the familiar results ...
- 38 *Inner frame.* Eucrates' aborted tale of his consultation of Amphilocheus at Mallus.
- 39–40 *Outer frame.* Tychiades and Philocles concede the infectious joy of tales of the supernatural.

Our discussion will omit consideration of the minor characters here: Dinomachus the Stoic, who has no tale of his own to tell, and Antigonus the (we presume) Hippocratic, who contributes only a vestigial tale. Nor will we say anything of Tychiades' interlocutor in the dialogue-proper parts of the text, his cypher 'friend', Philocles.

Tychiades: The Author? The Epicurean?

It has been conventional in Lucianic studies to identify a series of speakers in the dialogues with the author himself. There are *prima facie* cases for identifying the author at some level with two of his speakers in particular. In the *Twice Accused* the figure of the Syrian ostensibly shares the Syrian-born Lucian's biography and defends himself and Lucian's literary career against the charges of mistreatment brought by Rhetoric and of *hybris* brought by Dialogue. In the *Fisherman* the figure of Parrhesiades ('Free Speech') is seemingly identified as the author of Lucian's *Sale of Lives*.⁶ But Lucian is also commonly identified wholly with the series of speakers named Lycinus, a name that bears a passing resemblance to Lucian's own.⁷ This has been particularly true of the *Ship*, the dialogue that offers the most obvious structural and thematic parallels with the *Philopseudes*.⁸ It has also been normal to identify Tychiades' voice in the *Philopseudes* wholly with that of Lucian himself.⁹

⁶ Cf. Schwartz 1951, 34, Nesselrath in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 140.

⁷ Lycinus appears in *Banquet, Dance, Dispades, Hesiod, Eunuch, Hermotimus, In Defence of Portraits, Lexiphanes, Portraits, and Ship*, and also in the probably spurious *Cynic* and the definitely spurious *Loves*. 'Lucius of Patrae' identifies himself as the author of the *Ass* (55), which may be able to claim Lucian's authorship at some level. 'Lucian' himself features as an interlocutor in the *Solecist*, but this dialogue is probably spurious too.

⁸ Thus Radermacher 1911, 22 ('Lycinus (d. i. Lukian selber)'), Bompaire 1958, 593, Anderson 1976b, 158 and Nesselrath in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 21 ('Lukian/Lykinos') and 157 (Lycinus is Lucian's 'alter ego'; at 150 he makes the same claim of the Lycinus of the *Parasite*). Robinson 1979, 28–29, however, noting that the distance between an authorial voice, as in Lucian's 'treatises' and 'pamphlets', and genuinely dramatic presentation is a substantial one, observes of the *Ship* that Lycinus 'to some extent puts himself into the wrong by taking the game of wishes seriously'.

⁹ Thus Müller 1932, 27 ('Tychiades, qui scriptoris ipsius vice fungitur'), Caster 1937, 94 ('Lucien/Tychiadès'), Schwartz 1951, 3, 8, 9, 34 *etc.* ('Lucien-Tychiadès'), Bompaire 1958, 465 ('Tychiadès-Lucien'), Betz 1961 ('Tychiades, d.h. Lukian'), Reardon 1971, 239 ('Tychiade-Lucien'), Anderson 1976a, 32 (where he even attributes the narrated actions of Tychiades directly to Lucian himself) and 54 (Tychiades is Lucian's 'spokesman'), Longo 1976–1993, iii 245 n.47 ('Luciano-Tichiade'), Hall 1981, 510 n.59 (Tychiades is Lucian's name for himself), Fuchs 1993, 239 ('alter ego'), Stramaglia 1999, 73 ('Luciano-Tichiade'), Nesselrath in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 166 ('Alter Ego'), Ebner in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 173, 178 ('Tychiades/Lukian', 'Lukian/Tychiades') and Ribbat in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 183 ('Tychiades, offenbar Lukians alter ego'). In fact Caster 1937, 328–329 and 334 goes so far as to find in the personality of Tychiades the general character of Lucian's satire, and so concludes that Tychiades is the nearest we have to a notion of what Lucian the man was like! Hall 1981, 510 n.59 (building on Schwartz 1951, 34) flirts with the idea that Tychiades' name may mean 'Fortune's son' or 'self-made

Such an approach would remain unsophisticated even if one were to specify whether by ‘Lucian’ one meant to denote our author’s personal position or that of some sort of authorial persona constructed and projected across the oeuvre as a whole. But the tension between Tychiades’ censure of the tales told and the author’s obvious aspiration to entertain his readers through them compels us to differentiate Tychiades from the author, at least in part. We may think of the image of Plato’s ‘bizarre Eurycles’, the stomach-inhabiting demon that speaks through the mouths of the people it possesses and contradicts their own words as they speak.¹⁰

The figure of Tychiades is broadly comparable to the Tychiades of the *Parasite*¹¹ and so the name can be said to denote a Lucianic character-type.¹² In the *Parasite* the dialogue between Tychiades and Simon remains vigorous throughout, without descent into monologue. As in the *Philopseudes* Tychiades begins by asking his interlocutor a ‘why-oh-why’ question, in this case, why Simon appears to have no art of his own. He at first scoffs at Simon’s claim that being a parasite is an art, but by the end of the dialogue has been fully convinced of this by Socratic-style elenchus. The *Parasite*’s Tychiades does in this respect differ from the *Philopseudes*’, in that he is persuaded to change his view.

The Tychiades of the *Philopseudes* is not explicitly presented as an Epicurean, but, in Lucianic terms, there is much of the Epicurean about him.¹³

man’, but thinks it more likely that the name salutes ὁ τύχων and means ‘any chance person’, ‘the man in the street’, ‘Mr Commonsense’.

¹⁰ Pl. *Sph.* 252c.

¹¹ It is no longer doubted that this is a genuinely Lucianic work: see Nesselrath 1985 and Macleod 1994, 1391–1392.

¹² Cf. Schwartz 1951, 34. Albin 1993, 31–32 considers there to be no pressing need to identify the two figures named Tychiades strongly. For her the Tychiades of the *Philopseudes* has little in common with that of the *Parasite*, who is in any case a much more ‘passive and banal’ figure.

¹³ Thus Tackaberry 1930, 46–51 (especially 47), Caster 1937, 95–96, 148, 318 (especially), 326–331 and 334 (cf. also, for Lucian and the Epicureans in general, 84–106) and Hall, 1981, 202–203. Schwartz 1951, 38–39 rather characterises Tychiades as an amalgam of Epicurean, Cynic, and Sceptic philosophers on the subtractive basis that these are the three principal schools (amongst those listed at *Hermotimus* 14 and 48) unrepresented amongst the liars. There certainly is a distinctive Cynic voice in the *Philopseudes*, but this cannot be simply equated with that of Tychiades (see below). It is difficult to find any positive indication of Scepticism in Tychiades, but then Sceptics seldom feature in the front rank of philosophical schools across Lucian’s oeuvre (see Tackaberry 1930, 51–58, Caster 1937, 59–64 and Nesselrath in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 149–151 for Lucian and the Sceptics). When Reardon 1971, 239 characterises Tychiades as a ‘sceptic’, I presume that the term is not intended in its formal sense.

He is implicitly aligned with Epicurus and his followers when Ion sets the latter up as the notional opponents of himself and his fellow ‘liars’ (23).¹⁴

But Tychiades’ projection as a man of Epicurean tendencies emerges most clearly from the thematic and even verbal parallels between the *Philopseudes* and the *Alexander*, which is addressed to the Epicurean Celsus.¹⁵ In the concluding chapter of the *Alexander* Lucian, ostensibly in his own words, presents his foregoing attack upon the ‘lying’ Alexander, the *pseudo-prophētēs*, as a defence of Epicurus:

... avenging Epicurus, a man truly sacred and divine in his nature, who alone knew what was fine, and the truth too, and handed these things down to us, a liberator of all who frequented with him. And I think that my piece will be considered to be of some use to its consumers, refuting some things whilst strengthening others in the minds of right-thinking men.¹⁶

We are told that Alexander hates the work of Epicurus, and dreads the prospect of Epicureans interesting themselves in his rites. He burns Epicurus’ book of *Kyriai Doxai* on figwood in the marketplace, as if burning the man himself, and casts the ashes into the sea, as if casting out a scapegoat. When one of his frauds is exposed by an Epicurean, he seeks to have him stoned to death, again in scapegoat fashion. Lucian indirectly aligns himself with this Epicurean when he tells how he too exposed one of Alexander’s oracular frauds by putting the same question to him twice under different names and eliciting different responses.¹⁷ It is at this point in his oeuvre, incidentally, that Lucian most directly portrays himself as acting in the fashion attributed to him as characteristic by Galen, in the only extant contemporary reference to him. The Arabic version of Galen’s commentary on the Hippocratic *Epidemics* (2,6,9) describes how a contemporary LÛQIYÂNÛS discredited incompetent philosophers. He made up a book of dark meaningless sayings, which he passed off as Heraclitus’. He passed it on to others, who took it to a

¹⁴ Cf. Caster 1937, 318.

¹⁵ Cf. Caster 1938, 16, 44–45, and 67–68, Albini 1993, 94 n.12, Ebner & Nesselrath in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 128 (nn.140 and 146) and 146–147, Victor 1997, 14 and above all Branham 1984 especially 150–162 for Lucian’s articulation of an Epicurean stance against Alexander.

¹⁶ Lucian *Alex.* 61.

¹⁷ Lucian *Alex.* 25, 38, 44, 47 and 53–54. And was it the Syrian Lucian that was responsible for putting questions to Alexander ‘in Syrian’ at *Alex.* 51? For Lucian claiming Syrian identity within his oeuvre, *The Twice Accused*; cf. also *Syrian Goddess* 1.

famous philosopher, who managed to make sense of it. He similarly discredited some grammarians by getting them to elucidate meaningless expressions he had made up himself.¹⁸

The particular points of contact between the Tychiades of the *Philopseudes* and Lucian's attack upon Alexander are as follows:

- Eucrates applies the word ἀδαμάντινος to the stubbornly unpersuaded Tychiades (29). In the *Alexander* Lucian asserts, seemingly in his own voice, that Alexander's signature trick, with his humanoid snake-puppet Glycon, needed exposing by a Democritus, an Epicurus or a Metrodorus or someone else 'with an adamantine mind' (ἀδαμαντίνην ... τὴν γνώμην ἔχοντος).¹⁹
- Tychiades makes Democritus the hero of his own 'positive', anti-superstition story (32). As just seen, in the *Alexander* Democritus is projected by Lucian as a precursor of Epicureanism.²⁰
- At the end of the *Philopseudes* Tychiades describes himself as 'a refuter of their lies' (ἀντισοφιστής τῶν ψευσμάτων, 39). This is strongly reminiscent of Lucian's description of Epicurus in the *Alexander* as 'an opponent and refuter of his magery' (ἀντίτεχνον καὶ ἀντισοφιστὴν τῆς μαγγανείας αὐτοῦ, 43).²¹
- Alexander's burning of Epicurus' *Kyriai Doxai* prompts from Lucian, again ostensibly speaking in his own voice, an impassioned defence of the book, in terms that might very well be applied to the 'liars' of the *Philopseudes*:²²

The accursed man did not know how many benefits that book confers on its consumers, or how much peace, philosophical tranquillity

¹⁸ See Strohmaier 1976, 118–119 for a translation of the Arabic text into German, and cf. Macleod 1979 (noting the particular parallelism of this *Alexander* passage) and 1994, 1383, Hall 1981, 4–6, 436–440 and Nesselrath in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 14.

¹⁹ Lucian *Alex.* 17. However, note Branham 1989, 197–200, especially 199: 'This [the *Alexander*'s] narrator's emphatically Epicurean loyalties and his adulation of the philosopher as the sole guide to truth set him apart from other Lucianic voices.'

²⁰ Cf. Caster 1937, 95–96; Albini 1993, 94 n.12. Lucian may also align himself with Democritus at *Peregr.* 7.

²¹ Cf. Schwartz 1951, 59. The Lucianic-only term ἀντισοφιστής ('one who seeks to refute', in the translation of *LSJ*) is also used, however, at *On the Importance of Not Placing Casual Trust in Slander* 16 of the *Platonic* Demetrius, a suspected opponent of the decadent lifestyle of Ptolemy Dionysus, ἀντισοφιστής ὢν καὶ ἀντίτεχνος τῆς Πτολεμαίου τρυφῆς. Lucian evidently uses the term to indicate someone who uses their intelligence to oppose various forms of folly.

²² Cf. Schwartz 1951, 45.

and freedom it produces in them. It frees them from the fear of apparitions (φάσματα)²³ and monstrosities (τέρατα), from empty hopes and superfluous desires. It gives them intelligence and truth and truly purifies their thoughts, not with the torch and the squill and that kind of rubbish,²⁴ but with straight argument, truthfulness (λόγῳ ὀρθῷ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ) and directness.²⁵

And indeed these words align with the closing words of the *Philopseudes*, where Tychiades appeals to the protective power of straight reason (τὴν ἀληθείαν καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι λόγον ὀρθόν, 40).²⁶

The parallelism of these passages with the themes of the *Philopseudes* perhaps offers a better reason than any yet considered for finding in Tychiades a refraction either of Lucian himself or of an Epicurean philosopher.

Eucrates: The Host

It is at the house of Eucrates, probably to be identified as the ‘Lover of Lies’ of the work’s singular title, that the narrative core of the *Philopseudes* is set. He holds court among his various friends as he supposedly recuperates from an attack of gout. Although quiet at first, Eucrates strongly dominates the second half of the story-telling session. Of the ten principal tales he is responsible for no less than four (no one else has more than two): (i) his animated, house-guarding statue of Pellichus, who turns a thieving slave insane; (ii) his aversion of a manifestation of Hecate in the woods with an Arab’s ring-amulet; (iii) his visitation by the unquiet ghost of his wife Demainete; (iv) the Sorcerer’s Apprentice. He is also responsible for the aborted (as far as the reader is concerned) eleventh tale about Amphilochochus at Mallus.

We learn much about Eucrates from Tychiades directly, and indirectly from the supposed autobiographical information reflected in these five tales (including the one about Amphilochochus). Lucian quietly constructs a well-rounded picture of him and his life that far surpasses anything he does for any of the other characters in the dialogue. Tychiades begins by identifying

²³ Note that at *Philopseudes* 16 Ion talks about the Syro-Palaestinian singing out φάσματα.

²⁴ A reference again the scapegoat imagery that Alexander had himself supposedly attempted to apply to Epicurus.

²⁵ Lucian *Alex.* 47.

²⁶ Schwartz 1951, 60; Albin 1993, 105 n.71.

him as ‘the great’ (τοῦ πᾶν), evidently a man of wealth and importance.²⁷ The tale of Pellichus tells us much of Eucrates’ rich, comfortable house. The gilded Pellichus itself aside, his peristyle contains at least five other statues and a fountain too (18–19). Some of the statues were supposedly made by the greatest of sculptors, Demetrius of Alopece, Myron, and Polyclitus (18). Also indicative of great wealth is the very lavish burial Eucrates had given his wife, for all that it was inadequate: even jewellery was burned with her. Her clothing had included her beloved golden sandals (27).

Eucrates has only a small family but a large household of slaves. His father Deinon²⁸ is dead (17, 24), as, of course, is his beloved wife Demainete (27). He has two sons, who go to the wrestling school. The younger, Eucratides, is fifteen (27). The elder, Mnason, is in the ephebic class and therefore, presumably, between eighteen and twenty (27);²⁹ he is also old enough to hunt (22; cf. also 5). The wider household is referred to as containing young and old (18–19). Eucrates has teams of workers to pick grapes out on his farm (22). One of these, Pyrrhias, also, it would appear, serves at table (24). The errant Libyan groom likewise appears to have had duties within the house (20). As a young man Eucrates had been able to take more than one servant with him on his tour of Egypt (34). He keeps animals. The groom’s job was to look after horses. There are dogs with which Eucrates’ elder son Mnason hunts (22), and the family pet, the Maltese lapdog (27).

Eucrates had fostered his interest in the supernatural during his youthful travels. Deinon had sent his son to Egypt as part of his education, where he fell in with the sorcerer Pancrates (33). Whilst there he received an oracle from Memnon (33), and he went on from him to visit the oracle of Amphilocheus at Mallus, and also oracles at Pergamum and Patara (38–39). These trips suggest a particular interest in prophecy. Was it also in the course of such travels that he encountered the Arab who gave him the ring-

²⁷ Jones 1986, 79 and 94 notes that Lucian always uses this expression with a tinge of irony; it is found also at *Demonax* 24 (where it is applied to Herodes Atticus), *Alexander* 5, *Apology* 5, *Hermotimus* 11, *Icaromenippus* 2, *Ship* 22, and *Sale of Lives* 22. Baldwin 1973, 27, basing himself upon *Demonax*, *Sale of Lives*, and *Apology*, opts less persuasively for ‘the famous’. Xenophon *Memorabilia* 3,5,1 refers to τοῦ πᾶν Περικλέους; cf. Santini 1994, 500 and Ebner in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 117 n.41.

²⁸ The name may salute Eucrates’ interest in terrors: note the use of δεινῶν (the terrors from which the Syro-Palaestinian frees people) at 16; cf. Ebner in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 124 n. 105.

²⁹ For the significance of Mnason’s belonging to the ephebic class, and of his wrestling, cf. Schwartz 1951, 52.

amulet with which he was able to avert Hecate (17 and 24)? We are not told whether he went all the way to Arabia to get it.

The company Eucrates keeps as we meet him speaks eloquently of his current devotion to philosophy, in his own mind at any rate. He is now sixty years old (5). According to the *Hermotimus*, this is the threshold of wisdom.³⁰ He wears the long beard that is for Lucian always the ridiculous trademark of the philosopher (5; cf. 23, 26 and 29).³¹ No attachment to a particular philosophical school is explicitly claimed for him. If a case is to be made for such an attachment, then the Platonic school may suggest itself. First, he chose to read a Platonic text, the *Phaedo*, to console himself on the death of his wife (27), although excessive weight need not be given to such a platitudinous choice. Secondly, the formal coincidence between the name of Eu-crates and that of So-crates may be significant.³² The latter is, be it noted, the star of Plato's *Symposium*, the most immediate formal model for the *Philopseudes*, where he dominates, as does our Eucrates, the latter part of the conversation.³³ But the nature of the *Philopseudes*' gathering suggests rather that Eucrates has an eclectic disposition. His familiar guests include, alongside the self-regarding Platonist Ion, the Peripatetic Cleodemus, the Stoic Dinomachus, the Pythagorean Arignotus, and the probably Hippocratic Antigonus, although the latter is present in at least a semi-professional capacity (6, 26). His luxurious lifestyle suggests that he is not a serious devotee of the more austere schools.³⁴

But the Eucrates of the *Philopseudes* is not Lucian's only Eucrates. The name is used for minor characters in three other dialogues, and related names are used in a similar way in a fourth and fifth. These characters have a great deal in common, without being completely identifiable with each other. We must conclude that, at one level, the name Eucrates served as a generic one in Lucian for a very rich, generous, and salon-keeping elderly man.³⁵ These five dialogues may suggest further ways of looking at our own Eucrates:

³⁰ Lucian *Herm.* 13 and 77, as noted by Schwartz 1951, 37–38 and Ebner in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 117 n.44.

³¹ See also *Fisherman* 37, *Eunuch* 9, *Demonax* 13, *Lapiths* 28, and *How to Write History* 17; cf. Müller 1932, 29–30, Caster 1937, 319, Schwartz 1951, 37, Albin 1993, 93 n. 10.

³² Cf. Helm 1906, 267–269; *pace* Schwartz 1951, 37.

³³ I do not accord much weight to the fact that people 'frequently visit' (φοιτᾶν) both Eucrates here (6) and Socrates at Plato *Phaedo* 59d: see Helm 1906, 268 and Ebner in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 57.

³⁴ His lifestyle may prompt us to think, tentatively, of the Cyrenaic school, which was devoted to luxury: see Lucian *Sale of Lives* 12 (Aristippus), *Twice Accused* 23, *Menippus* 13, and *Parasite* 33–34.

³⁵ Cf. Schwartz 1951, 37 and Albin 1993, 102 n.52.

- 1 In *Hermotimus* Peripatetic and Stoic philosophers are invited to the house of Eucrates for a birthday dinner for his (only?) daughter, and they argue late into the night.³⁶ This Eucrates is described as ‘the great man’ and the term is identical to that applied to the Eucrates of the *Philopseudes* (5). Amongst the philosophers present at the *Hermotimus* gathering, the Peripatetic Euthy-demus seems to correspond broadly with the *Philopseudes*’ Peripatetic Cleo-demus.³⁷
- 2 In the *Dream/Cock* the poor cobbler Micyllus tells his pet cock, a reincarnation of Pythagoras, how the day before the rich Eucrates (*plousios*) had invited him to his daughter’s birthday dinner, complete with musicians and clowns. Among fellow guests was a tedious bearded philosopher, Thesmopolis. This Eucrates superficially resembles those of both the *Philopseudes* and the *Hermotimus*, the latter particularly in the detail of throwing a birthday dinner for his daughter (there is also a son). However, on the night after the dinner Micyllus dreams that Eucrates lies dying in a state of childlessness and makes him his sole heir, whereupon he throws himself into the lifestyle of a rich man.³⁸ The Eucrates of the *Philopseudes* has gout and is attended by the doctor Antigonus (6); the Eucrates of the *Dream/Cock* is indirectly associated with gout and the attendance of doctors.³⁹
- 3 In the *Dialogues of the Dead* 15 Pluto and Hermes plot the premature death of the fortune-hunting flatterers of a rich (*plousion*), childless, ninety-year-old Eucrates, together with the rejuvenation of the man himself. The *Philopseudes* Eucrates is similarly said to be elderly (sixty years old). We are told that the flatterers fuss over the *Dialogues* Eucrates particularly when he is ill, in which respect he aligns with the *Philopseudes* Eucrates, who has gout in his feet (6). Furthermore, the *Dialogues* Eucrates is said to overplay the extent of his illness to draw his flatterers on, and Tychiades implies that the *Philopseudes* Eucrates too is pretending to be in a weaker state than he is, dropping the volume of his voice to suggest invalidity when Tychiades enters (6).⁴⁰ The *Dialogues of the Dead* Eucrates presides over huntsmen, no less than 50,000 of them in fact, whilst the *Philopseudes* Eucrates lets his sons go out hunting with their friends (22).

³⁶ Lucian *Herm.* 11–12.

³⁷ Schwartz 1951, 38–39.

³⁸ Lucian *Dream/Cock* 7–12. At 32 this Eucrates and his wife are seen to pursue (separate) sexual adventures.

³⁹ Lucian *Dream/Cock* 23. Cf. Betz 1961, 198.

⁴⁰ Cf. Caster 1937, 319 and Albin 1993, 34.

- 4 In *Lapiths* the rich host is not Eucrates but Aristaenetus. However, he invites a range of philosophers, including a Peripatetic Cleodemus and a Platonist Ion, characters shared with the *Philopseudes*, together with Stoics and an Epicurean, to the wedding of his *daughter* to the son of the rich Eu-critus, the latter's name somewhat resembling 'Euclates'.⁴¹
- 5 In *Dialogues of the Dead* 16 we find a similar situation to that of *Dialogues of the Dead* 15.⁴² Terpsion the fortune-hunting flatterer has been brought down to the underworld before his time after cultivating and spending all his money on the more-than-ninety-years-old Thu-critus, a name, admittedly, two stages removed from that of Eucrates. Thucritus, he tells us, was always ill and always seemed as if he was about to die. Whenever Terpsion came in he would be croaking with the weak voice of a newly hatched bird (cf., again, Eucrates at *Philopseudes* 6).

As we can see, the issue of the succession to the rich man's estate looms prominently in the other appearances of the Eucrates character-type. This seems to be absent from the *Philopseudes* at an explicit level at any rate, and indeed this dialogue's Eucrates has the security of two sons (22 and 27). However, the attentiveness of the *Philopseudes'* philosophers to their Eucrates in his illness, and his own attempts to secure sympathy from Tychiades by speaking in a weak voice (6), do preserve a strong trace of a fortune-hunting background. We may then wonder whether his philosophers are to be imagined as telling or moulding their tales in order to humour their attention-seeking patron.

None of these dialogues can be dated absolutely or even relatively within Lucian's career. There is no way of knowing at what point in this group the *Philopseudes* Eucrates came into being, but we have no strong reason for believing that he was the first. Indeed, if the philosophers' response to Eucrates' illness is thought to be conditioned by the fortune-hunting paradigm, then there would be a strong reason for believing that it was not the first. It is safer (if only in terms of statistical probability) to assume the existence of this name and its character-type prior to the composition of the *Philopseudes*, and therefore to consider it to be a determining factor in the

⁴¹ Lucian *Lapiths* 5; cf. Ebner in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 59 n. 64. Schwartz 1951, 38–39; 1965, 87; and 1982, 262 notes these correspondences of name and contends that the *Lapiths* came first and influenced the *Philopseudes* and the *Hermotimus*. An apparently unrelated Euclitus appears in *Dialogues of the Courtesans* 6, where he is a rich but young man courted by Corinna.

⁴² *Dialogues of the Dead* 17–19 also deal with the theme of fortune-hunting flatterers trying to win the inheritances of rich old men.

selection and deployment of the related name Pan-crates in the tale of the *Sorcerer's Apprentice* (33–37).

Ion: The Platonist

Ion the Platonist receives a striking introduction from Tychiades: ‘the one who thinks he should be admired for his command of Plato’s works, as if he’s the only one to have understood the man’s meaning correctly and to be capable of expounding it to others’ (6). He is given two stories of his own to tell, the first, that of the Chaldaean snake-blaster (11–13), and the third, that of the Syrian exorcist (16). We hear relatively little of him in the central part of the text, and nothing in the later part of it. He is keen to know how Pellichus punished the sacrilegious Libyan slave (20), and keen also to learn what Eucrates saw the souls doing when he peered into the underworld, and to discover whether the souls of Socrates and Plato were amongst them. He triumphantly seizes upon Eucrates’ sight of the souls as a rebuttal of Epicurus (24).

Ion the Platonist is a Lucianic character-type, appearing alongside another Peripatetic Cleodemus at the symposium in the *Lapiths*.⁴³ This Ion projects gravity and dignity and has acquired the name of ‘Ruler’ (*Kanōn*) because of his straight-thinking. When he enters the gathering the other philosophers treat him reverentially, as if receiving a visit from a god (6–7).⁴⁴ He takes little part in the further, boisterous, action of this text, but he does express his keenness to talk about bodiless entities and immortal souls (39). It is this interest in souls that forms the most obvious link between the two Ions. We may also tentatively compare the divine image the *Lapiths* Ion seeks to project with the *Philopseudes* Ion’s anxiety to see sacrilege punished.

Ion also fits into Lucian’s more general projection of Platonists as superstitious (6).⁴⁵ His attachment to Plato depends less upon intellectual conviction than it does upon a religious reverence for ‘holy Plato’. He finds proof of Plato’s doctrines less in the arguments of his texts themselves than in

⁴³ Cf. Caster 1937, 38, Schwartz 1951, 38–39, and Albin 1993, 93 n. 11.

⁴⁴ For Robinson 1979, 36 this magnificent entrance is then bathetically undermined by his subsequent inconsequential and inappropriate remarks.

⁴⁵ Platonists are disparaged also at *Icaromenippus* 25, *Sale of Lives* 15–18, *Hermitimus* 16, and *Twice Accused* 16–18. See Helm 1902, 188–213, 263–278, 351–369, Tackaberry 1930, 25–27 and 62–87, Caster 1937, 29–40, especially 38, and Nesselrath in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 144.

Eucrates' autopsy of the souls of the dead in the underworld, which may be viewed as a sort of Gnostic revelation (24).⁴⁶ It is often held that Lucian's superstitious Platonists, and the *Philopseudes* Ion in particular, reflect the character of Platonism in Lucian's own day. It has even been implausibly suggested that Ion more specifically reflects Lucian's contemporary, Numenius of Apamea, who belonged to both the Platonic and the Pythagorean schools and, according to Origen, told miraculous tales.⁴⁷

Ion's two tales seem to be selected for him advisedly. Both of them exhibit a significant degree of Judaeo-Christian imagery and so belong appropriately in the mouth of a Platonist at a time when Platonism was beginning to merge with Christianity, as in the case of Lucian's contemporary, Athenagoras. The Chaldaean tale offers us the motif of the cured Midas carrying home his own stretcher. This motif, which graphically expresses the speed and completeness of the recovery, finds well known parallels in the descriptions of Jesus' miraculous healings in all four of the Gospels, as, for example, in Matthew: "Get up, pick up your bed and go off home." And he got up and went home.⁴⁸ Does Lucian allude to or parody the New Testament,⁴⁹ or do Lucian and the New Testament alike draw upon a common Hellenistic tradition of healing narratives, so that no specifically Christian reference need be intended?⁵⁰ The difficulty with the latter line, which has proven the more popular, is that no pre-Christian examples of the motif are known.

⁴⁶ Reitzenstein 1906, 5 n. 1 (Gnostic revelation), Caster 1937, 39–40, 322, Schwartz 1951, 38–39, Ebner in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 127 n. 137.

⁴⁷ The notion of Jones 1986, 51, who finds the semi-Pythagorean Numenius to be reflected in Arignotus also. He further points to Apuleius of Madaura, a self-proclaimed Platonist who was content to recount miraculous tales of magic and ghosts in his *Metamorphoses*. For Numenius see Origen *Contra Celsum* = F29 des Places. Cf. Nilsson 1950, ii 414–415, Dillon 1977, 361–79 and Georgiadou & Larmour 1998, 10–13.

⁴⁸ Matthew 9,6–7; so too Mark 2,9 and 11–12, Luke 5,24–25 and John 5,8–9; Betz 1961, 158 further adduces Mark 1,31 and 44, but these are much vaguer parallels.

⁴⁹ Allusion without parody: Betz 1961, 158. Allusion with parody: Des Guerrois 1920, 317, 'an unworthy parody of the evangelist.' For a review of Lucian's explicit references to Christians see Betz 1961, 5–13.

⁵⁰ Thus Reitzenstein 1906, 3, Weinreich 1909, 174, Müller 1932, 41, Koeffler 1949, 165, Schwartz 1951, 42, Albini 1993, 96 n. 24, Ebner *et al.* 2001, 167–182, esp. 167–171, and Wälchli 2003, 148 n. 232. Müller insists on a significant level of linguistic parallelism between Lucian and the Gospels, but the only word they actually have in common is αἴρω. Thiessen 1990, 53 and 57–89 reviews the motifs of New Testament healing narratives. Amongst these the motif of the summoning of the miraculous healer (59 no. 5) seems to match the summoning of the Chaldaean at *Philopseudes* 11. Thiessen finds further minor parallels between the *Philopseudes* tale and his early Christian miracle narratives at 62, 68, 70, 72.

Ion's tale of the Syro-Palaestinian exorcist offers us Judaeo-Christian imagery in the figure of the sorcerer himself and indeed in the rite of exorcism itself (in fact all ancient narratives of exorcism have a Judaeo-Christian context of some sort).⁵¹ The term 'Syrian from Palaestine' in effect means 'Jewish'. The phrase is as old as Herodotus, whose geographical description of the 'Palaestine' in question indicates that it included Judaea.⁵² Ovid speaks of 'the seventh-day festival celebrated by the Syrian from Palaestine' (i.e. the Sabbath).⁵³ Lucian associates exorcism more directly with the Jews in *Gout* when speaking of the people to whom sufferers of gout resorted for a cure: 'The Jew takes on and sings-out another fool'. Some of the *Gout*'s phraseology matches that applied to the *Philopseudes* exorcist (Ἰουδαῖος ... ἐξάδει λαβών, *Gout*; ἐξάδοντες ... παραλαβών, *Philopseudes*).⁵⁴ Indeed the Judaeo-Christian context of Lucian's tale was so manifest to the Byzantine scholiast commenting upon it, that he was moved to condemn Lucian for blasphemous mockery of Christ:

A curse on you, godless Lucian! Was my Lord and God a sophist then, and did he take fees for curing the sick? Since the earth had the capacity to open up, when you were gibbering out this rubbish, why did it not open up and swallow you down, accursed one? It can only have been because it abominated you.⁵⁵

More recent scholars dispute whether Lucian had Christ himself specifically in mind at this point.⁵⁶ But it is precisely Lucian's application of the term

⁵¹ For possession and exorcism in general in antiquity see Thraede 1967, Edwards 1989, Trunk 1994, and Kotansky 1995.

⁵² Hdt. 7,89: 'The Syrians in Palaestine ... This part of Syria, together with the country which extends southward to Egypt, is all known as Palaestine.'

⁵³ Ov. *Ars* 1,416; cf. Hollis 1977 *ad loc.* and Schwartz 1951, 45.

⁵⁴ Lucian *Gout* 173; cf. Dickie 2001, 232–233. Lucian offers us another magical Syrian (*tout court*), a woman, at *Dialogues of Courtesans* 4,4, but there is no reason to think she is supposed to be Jewish. Rather, she is a bawd-witch, and her portrait fits well into the tradition of these: cf. Tibullus 1,5,39–59, Propertius 4,5,1–18, and Ovid *Amores* 1,8,1–20 and *Fasti* 2,572–583, with Dickie 2000 and 2001 *passim*.

⁵⁵ Cf. Betz 1961, 11 and Jones 1986, 48. It was a commonplace of Byzantine scholarship that Lucian was an anti-Christ. The notion was based primarily upon his (mild) attack on Christianity in the *Peregrinus*. The *Suda*'s note on him is hysterical in tone, and confidently continues his biography after death into the fires of hell. Cf. Baldwin 1973, 97–105.

⁵⁶ Zahn 1873, 592–593, Albini 1993, 97 n. 28 and 98 n. 36 think so. But Norden 1898, 519 n. 1, Herzig 1940, 22 n. 67, Betz 1961, 12, and Ebner *et al.* 2001, 123 n. 99 (cf. 171–174) think not. Schwartz 1951, 45 sits on the fence.

sophist (*sophistēs*) to his exorcist that may indicate that he does indeed have Christ in mind, for he applies the term to him in the *Peregrinus*, where he appears as ‘that crucified sophist’.⁵⁷

The Chaldaean tale is also significantly given to Ion because its viper-bite imagery salutes the Platonic text, the *Symposium*, that is the principal model of the *Philopseudes*. Here Alcibiades compares his passion for philosophy to the experience of one bitten by a viper.⁵⁸ So the viper that bites Midas – significantly in the first episode of the first story-proper of the *Philopseudes* collection – constitutes a salute to the Platonic passage, and serves to project the *Philopseudes* as a whole as antithetical to the *Symposium*.

Cleodemus: The Peripatetic (and Dinomachus: The Stoic)

Cleodemus is first found arguing with the Stoic Dinomachus about animal-part amulets, and seemingly confutes him, when he notes that lion-skin is more properly used to endow fleetness of foot than deer-skin, since lions can catch deer (7). He is then responsible for two tales, and gives himself a central role in each. First, he tells the tale of the Hyperborean mage, in which he is tutor to Glaucias in the works of Aristotle, and the man who introduces the mage to him (13–14). Secondly, he tells the tale of his own premature descent to the underworld, when Hermes mistakes him for the cobbler Demylus (25–26). In the course of this we learn that he and the doctor Antigonus entertain a social or business relationship outside the immediate context of Eucrates’ house. When the Pythagorean Arignotus arrives, Cleodemus deferentially gives up his couch so that he can recline, taking a chair himself (29).

Cleodemus the Peripatetic constitutes a character-type for Lucian.⁵⁹ He appears, alongside another Platonist Ion, in the similarly *Symposium*-based *Lapiths*, where he is introduced as follows:

⁵⁷ Lucian *Peregrinus* 13. So Albini 1993, 97 n. 28 and 98 n. 36 (where she also sees a possible anticipatory reference to Christ in Lucian’s earlier reference to the Hyperborean mage’s ability to walk on water, 13). Ebner *et al.* 2001, 123 n.100 note the various ways in which Lucian can deploy the term *sophistēs*: ‘professional orator’, ‘expert’ in a particular field, and ‘charlatan’. Ion presumably uses the term honorifically, but Lucian may be inviting us to hear ‘charlatan’, as at *Dialogues of the Dead* 11,5, *Zeus Confuted* 19 and *Peregrinus* 32.

⁵⁸ Pl. *Smp.* 217e–218b.

⁵⁹ Thus Caster 1937, 57–58. Helm 1906, 271 argued (speculatively) that the use of the name ‘Cleodemus’ for a Peripatetic character derives from Menippus.

There was Cleodemus from the Peripatetic school, you know the man, the wordy chap always trying to confute people. His pupils call him “Sword” and “Axe”.⁶⁰

He is peculiarly hostile to the Stoic guest Zenothemis, and the drunken wrangling between the two forms the core of the dialogue. At an early stage Cleodemus whispers maliciously to fellow guests about the way in which Zenothemis greedily stuffs himself with food and passes it to his servants (11). When he gets the chance, he opens a blistering attack on Zenothemis and his school, starting with abuse of its abstruse terminology (30). He goes on to accuse the Stoics of preaching disregard for money whilst hanging around the rich, stuffing themselves at their expense, demanding huge sums, and profiteering (36). In the final descent into chaos Cleodemus gouges out Zenothemis’ eye and bites off his nose, whilst himself being struck over the head by the Cynic Alcidas with his staff (44). In the course of their exchange Zenothemis casts two *ad hominem* allegations at Cleodemus of particular interest. The first is that he was once beaten up after being discovered having an affair with the wife of his pupil Sostratus and the second is that he sold another pupil, Crito, some poison, or perhaps a spell (*pharmakon*), to use against his father (32). The former allegation is made plausible by the fact that we have already witnessed him attempt but fail to bribe a slave boy into having sex with him, the host Aristaenetus discreetly hushing the matter up (15).

The *Lapiths* Cleodemus chimes well with the *Philopseudes* one and suggests an intriguing possibility for him. As in the *Lapiths*, the *Philopseudes* Cleodemus is seen in debate with the Stoic rival, albeit a debate of a more amicable kind. The *Lapiths* Cleodemus is introduced as being devoted to confutation, and he attempts to achieve a confutation of sorts in his attack on Stoic hypocrisy over money; the *Philopseudes* Cleodemus seemingly successfully confutes his Stoic Dinomachus in the argument about fleetness of foot and animal amulets. The *Lapiths* Cleodemus has supposedly had an affair with his pupil’s wife, and seeks to deploy money for sex; the *Philopseudes* Cleodemus abets his pupil in seducing the wife of a third man, with emphasis on the payments involved. The *Lapiths* Cleodemus supposedly sold poison or a spell to his pupil to get rid of his father; the *Philopseudes* Cleodemus engineers the sale of a spell to his pupil Glaucias to seduce Chrysis.

⁶⁰ Lucian *Lapiths* 6.

The intriguing possibility that the *Lapiths* Cleodemus raises for his *Philopseudes* counterpart lies in the suggestion that he abetted his pupil in getting rid of his father. The supposition that the pupil of the *Philopseudes* Cleodemus, Glaucias, had killed his father Alexicles helps to make good sense of the otherwise puzzlingly unmotivated episode in which he calls up his father's ghost to make peace with it before proceeding to make the love spell, with which the ghost is given no connection. The *Lapiths* comparison invites us to imagine that the *Philopseudes* Cleodemus has left some detail out of his Hyperborean mage story: namely that he had previously abetted Glaucias in the murder of his father, so that the young man could squander his fortune on philosophers and love affairs, and that he himself could become a prime beneficiary of this. Here it is worth noting that Lucian's Peripatetics more generally are characterised by greed and avarice.⁶¹

Cleodemus can also be contextualised more broadly against other Peripatetic characters in Lucian's oeuvre. In the *Hermotimus* we find, at the party of another Eucrates, another Peripatetic engaged in angry debate with a Stoic, and this time the Peripatetic's name is the closely related Euthydemus.⁶² When the Stoic begins to lose the argument, he hits Euthydemus on the head with a cup (11–12).⁶³

The *Philopseudes* Cleodemus' association with the two tales assigned to him is not an arbitrary one. The tale of the Hyperborean mage exploits, as we have just seen, aspects of the Cleodemus character-type in an integral fashion. Furthermore, it is imbued with New Comic imagery of a sort that displays the distinctively Peripatetic interest in character. The rich young man's placation of an irascible father over an inadvisable love affair is centrally at home in the world of New Comedy, and constitutes a very clear allusion to that genre. And the allusions continue. The expression ὡς ἂν ἐκμανέστατα ἐρῶσα ('as she would if sexually desiring him in the most insane way'), corresponds exactly (with appropriate change of gender) to a

⁶¹ See, e.g., Lucian *Hermotimus* 16 and *Dialogues of the Dead* 13; cf. Caster 1937, 55 and Nesselrath in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 145.

⁶² Cf. Schwartz 1951, 38–39.

⁶³ The Peripatetic figure gets off lightly at *Sale of Lives* 26. For Lucian and Peripatetics in general see Tackaberry 1930, 85–88, Caster 1937, 53–59 (especially 58 for lack of consistency) and Nesselrath in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 145. Householder 1941, 65 notes that, amid the vast slew of prominent literary quotation and allusion in Lucian's works, Lucian demonstrates no direct acquaintance with any of Aristotle's works, or indeed those of Theophrastus. He is much better acquainted with Platonic and Epicurean writings, and also with the Cynic world view, although, in Householder's view, the latter required no study.

phrase in the prologue of Menander's *Misoumenos*, ὡς ἂν ἐμμανέστατα/ἐρῶν.⁶⁴ The name Lucian gives to the seduced woman's husband, Demeas, is actually given to one of the characters in this same play. Chrysis, 'Goldie' (i.e. 'Golden beauty' or 'Having sex to get gold?'), is a characteristic and indeed characterising name for courtesans in New Comedy: there were courtesans of this name in Menander's *Samia*, which even contains its own Demeas alongside her, as well as in his *Eunuch* and, almost certainly, the *Dis Exapatōn*.⁶⁵

Meanwhile, the tale of Cleodemus' own descent to and return from the underworld reflects the distinctively Peripatetic interest in *deuteropotmoi*, those of double death. A fragment of Aristotle preserved only in Arabic tells of a Greek king whose soul was caught between life and death for several days, whilst he experienced souls and forms. On his recovery, he correctly predicted the lifespans of his friends.⁶⁶ In an influential tale told by the Peripatetic Clearchus of Soli, the Athenian philosophy student Cleonymus grieved for a dead friend, deteriorated, and died himself. As he was being carried out his mother detected signs of life. When he had recovered, he recounted all the things his soul had seen and heard once it had been released from the bonds of his body. It had flown aloft and come to a sanctuary of Hestia. There it met another soul, that of the Syracusan Lysias, and together they witnessed the judgements over and punishments of souls, overseen by the Eumenides. They were bidden depart from the place, whereupon they agreed to look each other up should they ever visit their cities. Soon afterwards Lysias arrived in Athens, and Cleonymus and he recognised each other from afar, shouting out to this effect before any introduction.⁶⁷ A more general interest in extra-corporeal soul-flights on the part of both Aristotle and Clearchus is testified to in the latter's report that his master had watched a man with a 'soul-drawing stick' (ψυχουλακὸς ῥάβδος) draw the soul out of

⁶⁴ Menander *Misoumenos* A11 Sandbach.

⁶⁵ For courtesan names in New Comedy see Webster 1974, 95. For Lucian's appeal to New Comedy, see Radermacher 1927, 10, Schwartz 1951, 41–43; 1965, 43–47, Anderson 1976b, 51–52 (also comparing, at a bit of a stretch, the onomasticon of the *Toxaris*: Deinias, Charicleia, Demonax, and Agathocles), and Albini 1993, 97 n. 30.

⁶⁶ Aristotle, Arabic fragment translated at Ross 1952, 23 (F11). In Varro's tale of his relative Corfidius, proof of the anticipatory death is provided not by the prediction of another's death, but by the location of buried treasure. The tale is reported by Plin. *Nat.* 7, 176–177 and Granius Licinianus *Book* 28 (p.7 in the 1981 Teubner ed. of N. Criniti); cf. Hubaux 1939, 105.

⁶⁷ Clearchus F8 Wehrli, preserved by Procl. *In R.* 16, 113–116 (on 614b4–7); cf. Müller 1932, 91 and Habermehl 1996, 523–533.

a boy into the air. The boy's body then remained motionless whilst it was beaten.⁶⁸ Is it significant that Cleodemus shares the first element of his name with Clearchus and his Cleonymus?

Arignotus: The Pythagorean

Arignotus makes his belated entrance only in the final quarter of the text. Tychiades gives an exaggerated account of the hopes he invested in him upon his arrival in order, of course, to prepare for the bathetic disappointment that will follow (29, 32).⁶⁹ He soon embarks upon his own single but substantial tale, that of the Corinthian house he freed from haunting (30–31). Arignotus subsequently intervenes in Eucrates' tale of the *Sorcerer's Apprentice* to note that the Egyptian sorcerer Pancrates had been his own teacher (34), and this casts retrospective light on the Egyptian books he had used whilst facing the ghost (31). In coming late to the symposium Arignotus plays the role of Alcibiades in Plato's *Symposium*,⁷⁰ but the contrast between the two could not be more extreme: instead of the beautiful, gilded youth, we have a shabby, dirty, hairy Pythagorean (as indicated at 32).

The name Arignotus does not attach to a Lucianic character type. The notion that the figure may parody a historical Neo-Pythagorean Arignotus in the second century AD seems speculative,⁷¹ and the notion that the figure specifically parodies the first-century AD Neo-Pythagorean Apollonius of Tyana also now seems difficult to defend.⁷² But we should note that the name is an all-too suitable one for a Pythagorean, since Pythagoras himself had a daughter named Arignote.⁷³

⁶⁸ Clearchus of Soli *On Sleep* F7–8 Wehrli.

⁶⁹ As noted by Müller 1932, 93. For the theatrical imagery used to express Tychiades' overblown hopes, cf. Schwartz 1951, 52–53 and Albini 1993, 103 n. 57.

⁷⁰ Pl. *Smp.* 212d; cf. Caster 1937, 323, Jones 1986, 48 and Ebner in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 57.

⁷¹ The notion of Caster 1937, 323.

⁷² The case is championed by Reitzenstein 1906, 5 and 40 (which depends on the now discredited belief in the historicity of Damis and his biography of Apollonius: for which see Bowie 1978) and Gascó 1986 and 1991; the notion is dismissed by Caster 1937, 333 but welcomed, with qualification, by Stramaglia 1999, 158; it is difficult to see on what specific basis Gascó's case depends. Cf. above for Jones's notion that Arignotus may salute Numenius of Apamea.

⁷³ Porph. *VP* 4; cf. Herzig 1940, 27 and Dickie 2001, 351 n. 5.

Lucian elsewhere provides us with some full portraits of Pythagorean types.⁷⁴ In the *Sale of Lives* Pythagoras himself is similarly long-haired and Egypt-educated, and associated with the Pythagorean commonplaces of reincarnation, vegetarianism, soul-purification, geometry, and music theory, *inter alia*. He is also portrayed as a *goēs* and a *mantis*.⁷⁵ Most of these themes recur in the *Dream/Cock*.⁷⁶ The *Alexander* is devoted to an extended attack on a man Lucian regards as a fraudulent Neo-Pythagorean of his own day.

Arignotus is well chosen as the teller for his assigned story. Not only are Pythagoreans keen on detached souls, but it is clear from the descriptions of Arignotus and his ghost that the two are remarkably similar in appearance: both are long-haired and squalid (29, 31; the term κομήτης is used in both cases). The ghost's series of animal transformations – an unexpected feature of such traditional haunted-house stories⁷⁷ – also appears to salute the Pythagorean doctrine of reincarnation. The Pythagorean figure in Lucian's *Sale of Lives* makes much, in the context of his discussion of reincarnation, of the same person manifesting himself in different bodies. Indeed, Agorastes actually asks him, 'Are you saying that I will be immortal and will be transformed into a number of shapes (ἀλλαττόμενον ἐς μορφὰς πλείονας)?' (5–6).

The Cynic Voice

It is initially surprising that no Cynic philosopher is present at the gathering: contrast the distinctive role given to the Cynic Alcidas in the gathering of philosophers in Lucian's other symposium-piece, the *Lapiths*. The Cynic was Lucian's favourite and most satirically and comically productive phi-

⁷⁴ For Lucian on Pythagoreans in general see Tackaberry 1930, 28–30, Caster 1937, 40–52, Papanikolaou 1993 and du Toit 1997, 212–218, Stramaglia 1999, 158, and Nesselrath in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 145.

⁷⁵ Lucian *Sale of Lives* 2–6.

⁷⁶ See especially Lucian *Dream/Cock* 4 (*goēs*), 16–20 (reincarnation), 17 (beans), 18 (Egypt). Respectful remarks about Pythagoras are found at *Alexander* 4, *Runaways* 9, and *In Defence of an Error in Greeting* 5 (ὁ θεσπέσιος Πυθαγόρας); *Dialogues of the Dead* 6 is less respectful.

⁷⁷ Other haunted-house tales in this venerable tradition are to be found at Plautus *Mostellaria* 446–531, Plin.*Ep.* 7,27,5–11, Constantius of Lyon *Life of St Germanus* 2,10, Gregory the Great *Dialogues* 3,4,1–3. For discussion of this traditional tale, see Nardi 1960, Felton 1999, and Stramaglia 1999, 133–169, especially 154–162.

losophical type, as can be seen from his numerous ‘Menippean’ works.⁷⁸ The Cynic perspective was often a conveniently strategic one for the satirist to adopt, although individual Cynics could also fall foul of him, as most notably in the case of Peregrinus (*Peregrinus*).⁷⁹ Whilst some have argued that Tychiades speaks in part from a Cynic point of view, there is nothing of the more extreme Cynic character-type about him. This character-type is economically expressed in the figure of Diogenes in the *Sale of Lives*: he is ‘doggish’, vituperative, goes about half-naked, is shameless in matters of sex and the toilet, wields a staff, eats lupines from the wallet he carries, and lives in a squalid and narrow place, such as a tomb or a *pithos*-jar.⁸⁰ In the *Lapiths* the Cynic Alcidas is presented as a drunken, gluttonous, belligerent, shameless, and lecherous bore.⁸¹

However, there is a great deal of Cynic imagery in the *Philopseudes*. This seemingly begins within Tychiades’ own scornful retorts to the tales he has heard (Tale C, the Syro-Palaestian exorcist [16], and Tale E, Eucrates’ vision of Hecate [18–20]), but it then intriguingly gravitates within the ‘lying’ tales themselves and is found in all the remaining tales to the end of the dialogue (Tales D and F–K). I tabulate the examples of this imagery in order of clear-cutness of case:

- 1 In tale H, the tale of Eucrates and Demainete, the ghost disappears before the bark of the *kynidion* ... *Melitaion*, the little Maltese lapdog (27). It was with a very similar phrase that Diogenes described himself, *kyōn* ... *Melitaios*.⁸² The ghost, the thing of foolish imagination, disappears before the coarse bark of the Cynic.⁸³

⁷⁸ I.e. *Menippus*, *Downward Voyage*, *Dialogues of the Dead*, *Charon*, *Icaromenippus*, *Tragic Zeus*, *Zeus Confuted*, *Assembly of the Gods*, *Dream/Cock*, *Lapiths*, *Sale of Lives*, *Fisherman*, *Runaways*, *Twice Accused*, *Saturnalia*, *Timon*. See Bernays 1879 (*non vidi*), Tackaberry 1930, 30–45, Caster 1937, 64–84, Francis 1995, 53–81, and Nesselrath in Ebner *et al.* 2001, 147–150.

⁷⁹ Hornsby 1933, 66 contends that Cynics were generally opposed to soothsayers, mysteries, oracles, images, and the notion of life after death, on the basis of Diogenes Laertius 6,24 and 39 and Lucian *Demonax* 11, 32, 39.

⁸⁰ See in particular Lucian *Sale of Lives* 7–11 (Diogenes). Note that Lucian’s *Sale of Lives* was modelled on Menippus’ *Sale of Diogenes*.

⁸¹ Lucian *Lapiths* 12 (introduced), 13–14, 16 (gluttony), 18–19 (fights Egyptian dwarf), 35 (urinates in the room), 46 (mauling a flute-girl, gluttony). It is not clear to what extent the remarkable Cantharus, Dung-Beetle, of the *Runaways* should be regarded as a Cynic type. He is, after all, portrayed as a bogus Cynic. This runaway slave, a foul-mouthed fuller, keeps gold in his wallet and organises the kidnapping and gang-rape of a man’s wife before being tortured and executed by the gods.

⁸² D.L. 6,55.

⁸³ The case is argued in detail in Ogden 2004a.

- 2 The story of the Pythagorean Arignotus' exorcism of a haunted house, tale I (30–31), is set in Corinth. When we are told that the house in question is beside the 'Cherry Tree Hill (Gymnasium)' (*to Kraneion*), we recall that Diogenes famously lived there, and indeed that this was the site of his famous encounter with Alexander.⁸⁴ The ghost in itself salutes the figure of Diogenes, the '*daimōn*' that came to a Corinthian house. Xenocrates of Corinth famously proclaimed 'A good *daimōn* has come into my house.'⁸⁵ And Antigonus' lamp reminds us of the one with which Diogenes used to go looking for an honest man.⁸⁶
- 3 In tale E (18–20) the physical description of the sinister animated statue of Pellichus seemingly assimilates him to the stereotype of a Cynic philosopher, not least in the use of term 'half-naked', ἡμίγυμνον, and the detail of his wind-blown hair. In the *Lapiths* Lucian applies the term ἡμίγυμνος to the particularly coarse Cynic Alcidamas as he casts himself down on the floor to eat (14). A known Cynic statue-type portrays its subject with a bare torso and clutching his cloak round his midriff. The hair of these images could also be described as 'wind-blown.'⁸⁷
- 4 In tale J (32) Democritus' residence in a tomb is a motif familiar from the lives of Cynic philosophers. In Lucian's *Sale of Lives* the Cynic Life, i.e. Diogenes, promises its potential buyer, 'You will abandon your ancestral home and you will live in a tomb or a lonely tower or even a *pithos*-jar.'⁸⁸
- 5 The figure of the sorcerer Pan-crates in tale K (33–37), that of the *Sorcerer's Apprentice*, may evoke the Cynic Crates.⁸⁹ In other words, his name might be construed, at one level, as signifying 'All-Crates'. Or it may salute a pre-existing historical or literary Cynic figure actually called Pancrates, of whom we know from Alciphron's *Letters*. Here, Pancrates the Dog (Παγκράτης ὁ κύων, i.e. Cynic), bursts in upon a dinner party, shoves the guests to one side, makes water on the floor, and prepares to have sex openly with a courtesan in a typically Cynic display of contempt for good manners; we are reminded of the Alcidamas of

⁸⁴ D.L. 6,38 and 77. Cf. Stramaglia 1999, 159 n. 4.

⁸⁵ D.L. 6,74.

⁸⁶ D.L. 6,41, etc.

⁸⁷ See von den Hoff 1994 nos. 115–116, 118. For further aspects of the Pellichus tale, see Ogden 2005.

⁸⁸ Lucian *Sale of Lives* 9. For Lucian's tendency to assimilate Democritus and Diogenes, see Rütten 1992, 43–49.

⁸⁹ The principal source for whom is Diogenes Laertius (6,85–93).

Lucian's *Lapiths*.⁹⁰ And the pestle that Lucian's Pancrates animates may evoke the pestle of a well known Cynic anecdote about Hypereides, 'Pestle-son'.⁹¹

- 6 In tale G (25–26) of Cleodemus' descent to the underworld, the figure of the smith Demylus seems to be evocative of the smith/cobbler figures who frequently found themselves in the underworld in the Cynic tradition.⁹²

To whom is such a recurring Cynic voice within the tales supposed to belong? Or, to put a perhaps simplistic question more simply: who or what are we to understand to have 'inserted' the Cynic elements into the text of the tales? Consideration must be given to the level of supposed actuality, and to three levels of narrator: first, the original 'lying' tellers of the tales, Eucrates *et al.*; secondly, Tychiades, reporting them to his friend Philocles; and thirdly, a disembodied author, whether or not we should call him 'Lucian', relaying the Tychiades-Philocles dialogue to us as listeners or readers. If the Cynic material is held to have originated at the level of supposed actuality, then we must conclude that the 'liars' are after all reporting events truthfully, whether or not they appreciate the Cynic imagery latent in them, and that Tychiades is misguided in his condemnation of the liars. If the Cynic material is held to originate at the first level of narration, with the 'liars', then we must conclude that they are playing a sophisticated game with Tychiades, and telling him tales that they do not themselves believe after all. If the Cynic material is to be understood as originating at the second level of narration, with Tychiades as an unreliable narrator, then he appears to undermine his own general representation of the liars as credulous fools, insofar as he himself attributes the Cynic material to them. None of these suggestions, for all that some may briefly intrigue, seems finally satisfactory. It is easiest, perhaps, to understand the material as originating at a third level of narration with the disembodied author, working, as it were, in partial alliance with Tychiades.

⁹⁰ Alciphr. 3,19 Benner and Fobes (Loeb).

⁹¹ Lucian *Demon*. 48. The points made here are argued in greater detail in Ogden 2004b, 114–123; cf. also Ogden 2006.

⁹² See Plutarch F176 Sandbach (περὶ ψυχῆς Bk. 1), *apud* Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* 11,36,1 and, in part, Theodoret *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio* 11,46 (Nicandas the cobbler in a tale parallel to Cleodemus'); Lucian *Downward Voyage/Tyrant* (the cobbler Micyllus, who pairs up with Cyniscus, 'Little Cynic') and *Dream/Cock* (the cobbler Micyllus in Cynic mode again).

Bibliography

- Albini, F. (ed.). 1993. *Luciano. L'amante della menzogna*, Venice: Marsilio.
- Anderson, G. 1976a. *Studies in Lucian's Comic Fiction*, Leiden: Brill.
- Anderson, G. 1976b. *Lucian: Theme and Variation in the Second Sophistic*, Leiden: Brill.
- Baldwin, B. 1973. *Studies in Lucian*, Toronto: Hakkert.
- Bernays, J. 1879. *Lukian und die Kyniker*, Berlin: Hertz.
- Betz, H.D. 1961. *Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament*, Religionsgeschichtliche und paränetische Parallelen Texte und Untersuchungen der altchristlichen Literatur vol. 76, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Bompaire, J. 1958. *Lucien écrivain: Imitation et création*, Paris: De Boccard.
- Branham, R.B. 1984. 'The comic as critic: revenging Epicurus – a study of Lucian's art of comic narrative', *CA* 3, 143–163.
- Branham, R.B. 1989. *Unruly Eloquence. Lucian and the Comedy of Traditions*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Caster, M. 1937. *Lucien et la pensée religieuse de son temps*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Caster, M. 1938. *L'Alexandre ou le faux prophète*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Des Guerrois, C. 1920. *Lucien ou de la décadence*, Paris: A. Lemerre.
- Dickie, M.W. 2000. 'Who practised love-magic in classical antiquity and the late Roman world?', *CQ* 50, 563–583.
- Dickie, M.W. 2001. *Magic and Magicians in the Greco-Roman World*, London: Routledge.
- Dillon, J. 1977. *The Middle Platonists. A Study in Platonism 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*, London: Duckworth.
- Du Toit, D.S. 1997. *THEIOS ANTHROPOS. Zur Verwendung von θεῖος ἄνθρωπος und sinnverwandten Ausdrücken in der Literatur der Kaiserzeit*, Tübingen: Mohr.
- Ebner, M., Gzella, H., Nesselrath, H.-G., & Ribbat, E. 2001. *Lukian. Die Lügenfreunde*, Scripta antiquitatis posterioris ad ethicam religionemque pertinentia (SAPERE) iii, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Edwards, M.J. 1989. 'Three exorcisms and the *New Testament* world', *Eranos* 87, 117–126.
- Felton, D. 1999. *Haunted Greece and Rome*, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Francis, J.A. 1995. *Subversive Virtue. Asceticism and Authority in the Second-Century Pagan World*, University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Fuchs, E. 1993. *Pseudologia. Formen und Funktionen fiktionaler Trugrede in der griechischen Literatur der Antike*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Gascó, F. 1986. 'Magia, religión o filosofía, una comparación entre el *Philopseudes* de Luciano y la *Vida de Apolonio de Tiana* de Filóstrato', *Habis* 17, 271–281.
- Gascó, F. 1991. 'Arignoto el pitagórico (Luciano, *Philopseudes* 29 ss.)', *Gerión* 9, 195–198.
- Georgiadou, A. & Larmour, D.H. (eds.). 1998. *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel True Histories*, Leiden: Brill.
- Habermehl, P. 1996. 'Jenseitsreise (B iii)', *RAC* 17, 490–543.
- Hall, J. 1981. *Lucian's Satire*, New York: Arno Press.
- Helm, R. 1902. 'Lucian und die Philosophenschulen', *Neue Jahrbucher für das klassische Altertum* 5, 188–213, 263–278, 351–369.
- Herzig, O. 1940. *Lukian als Quelle für die antike Zauberei*. Diss. Tübingen 1933, Tübingen.
- Hollis, A.S. 1977. *Ovid. Ars Amatoria Book I. Edited with an Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Householder, F.W. 1941. *Literary Quotation and Allusion in Lucian*, New York: King's Crown Press.

- Hubaux, J. 1939. 'Déiphobe et la Sibylle', *AC* 8, 96–109.
- Jones, C.P. 1986. *Culture and Society in Lucian*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kotansky, R.D. 1995. 'Greek exorcistic amulets', in: M. Meyer & P. Mirecki (eds.), *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, Leiden: Brill, 243–278.
- Longo, V. (ed.). 1976–1993. *Luciano*. 3 vols., Turin: UTET.
- Macleod, M.D. 1979. 'Lucian's activities as a *misalazōn*', *Philologus* 123, 326–328.
- Macleod, M.D. 1994. 'Lucianic studies since 1930', *ANRW* 2.34.2, 1362–1421.
- Müller, L. (ed.). 1932. *In Luciani Philopseuden commentarius*, Eos Supplement vol. 13, Leopoli.
- Nardi, E. 1960. *Case 'infestate da spiriti' e diritto Romano e moderno*, Milan: Giuffrè.
- Nesselrath, H.-G. 1985. *Lukians Parasitendialog. Untersuchungen und Kommentar*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Nilsson, M. 1950. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* ii. 2nd ed., Munich: Beck.
- Norden, E. 1898. *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, 2 vols., Leipzig: Saur.
- Ogden, D. 2004a. 'Eucrates and Demainete: Lucian *Philopseudes* 27–8', *CQ* 54, 484–493.
- Ogden, D. 2004b. 'The Apprentice's Sorcerer: Panocrates and his powers in context', *Acta Classica* 47, 101–126.
- Ogden, D. 2005. 'The function of the Pellichus sequence at Lucian *Philopseudes* 18–20', *Scripta Classica Israelica* 24, 163–180.
- Ogden, D. 2006. 'Lucian's tale of the Sorcerer's Apprentice in context', in: A.B. Lloyd & K. Szpakowska (eds.), *Dreams and Magic in Ancient Egypt*, Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 121–143.
- Papanikolaou, A.D. 1993. 'Pythagoras nach den Zeugnissen des Lukianos', in: A. Dihle hon., *Philanthropia kai eusebeia*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 341–344.
- Radermacher, L. 1911. 'Lukians $\pi\lambda\omicron\iota\omicron\nu\ \eta\ \epsilon\upsilon\chi\alpha\iota$ ', *WS* 33, 224–232.
- Radermacher, L. 1927. *Griechische Quellen zur Faustsage. Der Zauberer Cyprianus. Die Erzählung des Helladius. Theophilus*, Sitzungberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaft in Wien 206.4, Vienna: Hölder–Pichler–Tempsky.
- Reardon, B.P. 1971. *Courants littéraires grecs des II^e et III^e siècles après J.-C.*, Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Reitzenstein, R. 1906. *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Robinson, C. 1979. *Lucian and his Influence in Europe*, London: Duckworth.
- Ross, D. (ed.). 1952. *The Works of Aristotle Translated into English. XII. Select Fragments*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Santini, L. 1994. Review of Albin 1993, *Eikasmos* 5, 495–500.
- Schwartz, J. (ed.). 1951. *Lucien de Samosate. Philopseudès et De morte Peregrini, avec introduction et commentaire*, Textes d'Études. Publ. Fac. Lettres Univ. Strasbourg, no. 12, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Schwartz, J. 1965. *Biographie de Lucien de Samosate*, Brussels: Latomus.
- Schwartz, J. 1982. 'Onomastique des philosophes chez Lucien de Samosate et Alciphron', *AC* 51, 259–264.
- Stramaglia, A. 1999. *Res inauditae, incredulae. Storie di fantasmi nel mondo greco-latino*, Bari: Levante.
- Strohmaier, G. 1976. 'Übersehenes zur Biographie Lukians', *Philologus* 120, 117–122.
- Tackaberry, W.H. 1930. *Lucian's Relation to Plato and the Post-Aristotelian Philosophers*, University of Toronto Studies no. 9, Toronto.

- Thiessen, G. 1990. *Urchristliche Wundergeschichten. Ein Beitrag zur formgeschichtlichen Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien*, StNT 8, Gütersloh.
- Thraede, K. 1968. 'Exorzismus', *RAC* 7, 44–117.
- Trunk, D. 1994. *Der messianische Heiler. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den Exorcismen im Matthäusevangelium*, Freiburg: Herder.
- Victor, U. (ed.). 1997. *Lukian von Samosata. Alexandros oder der Lügenprophet*, Leiden: Brill.
- Von den Hoff, R. 1994. *Philosophenporträts des Früh- und Hochhellenismus*, Munich: Biering & Brinkmann.
- Wälchli, P. 2003. *Studien zu den literarischen Beziehungen zwischen Plutarch und Lukian*, Munich and Leipzig: Saur.
- Webster, T.B.L. 1974. *An Introduction to Menander*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Weinreich, O. 1909. *Antike Heiligungswunder: Untersuchungen zum Wunderglauben der Griechen unter Römer* RGVV 8.1, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Zahn, T. 1873. *Ignatius von Antiochien*, Gotha: Perthes.