Lives and Afterlives of Lucian of Samosata

DANIEL RICHTER

BIOGRAPHY

As pleasing and useful as [Lucian] was in his writings, in the opinion of the most candid judges, he has left so little of his affairs on record that there is scarce sufficient to fill a page from his birth to his death."[1] So John Dryden warned readers towards the beginning of his *Life of Lucian*, a biography which runs to an excess of sixty pages. Dryden was not the first to attempt a *Life of Lucian* drawn entirely from evidence internal to Lucian's corpus. Beginning with Suidas' remark that the blasphemer Lucian, the Anti-Christ, is burning in Hell with Satan for all time, Lucian of Samosata has arguably suffered more from the excesses of biographical criticism than any other author from Greek antiquity. Given Lucian's tendency to structure his texts around figures whose names echo his own ("Lukianos,"[2] "the Syrian,"[3] "Lucius,"[4] "Lukinos"[5]) this is perhaps to be expected. The distinction between author and persona is further blurred in Lucian's texts by the fact that his characters speak as satirists who poke fun at the intellectual world of the early Roman Empire. Since antiquity, as in the case of Roman satirists like Horace and Juvenal, readers of Lucian have moved seamlessly from the conflation of the speaking *persona* and the author to the creation of the author's "biography" from internal evidence, the elements of which have been remarkably stable over the centuries.

Lucian was ignored by Philostratus, but since antiquity, admirers and detractors have written scores of biographies and *Lives* of the Syrian sophist, versions of which can still be found prefaced to translations, editions, and monographs of

Lucian's works.[6] As a representative sample of both the method and the content of Lucian biographies, I cite Gilbert Cousin's (1563) succinct *Life of Lucian*:

> In the book *How One Should Write History,* Lucian says that Samosata is his *patria* and that it is not far from the river Euphrates. Moreover, in the *Fisherman*, he says that Syria is next to the Euphrates, and writing in *On the Syrian Goddess*, he says that he is an Assyrian. In the *Doubly Accused*, he calls himself a Syrian rhetor. In his *Dream*, he gives an account of his birth, his childhood, and his studies, as well as how he began the career of sculptor. In the assembly of all of Macedon, he began his career and offered some specimen of his ability. In the *Herodotus,* or *Etios* (from the Gallic Hercules, perhaps) one might conjecture that in Gaul, he publicly claimed to be a rhetor. In his *Apology for "The Salaried Posts in Great Houses*," he says that he has a place among the well-paid rhetors. In the *Fisherman*, he is called a rhetor and a lawyer; but he also explains in the same text why he ceased to plead cases and turned his mind to writing. Against him who had said, *You are a Prometheus in Words*, he defends his usage and his mode of speaking. In the *Hermotimus*, he is unfamiliar with the Latin language, and at the age of forty, he begins to study philosophy. In *On the Dance*, he is said to have been nourished by the liberal arts, in addition to being versed in the study of philosophy. In the *Fisherman*, he professes himself a philosopher, and also says that he has adorned his own writings with the buds of philosophy. In the *Apologia for Those Who Serve in Great Houses*, now an old man, he has brought himself to the court and the household of Caesar, and has accepted the post of procurator of the Princeps in Egypt.[7]

Cousin, like so many of Lucian's readers, believes that the many voices of Lucian's dialogues are each somehow Lucian's own. A "biography" of the sophist takes shape as Cousin organizes these various "clues" into a coherent whole. The character of Lucian is essentially a distillation of each of the personae who inhabit the satirical universe of Lucian's corpus.

This is a paper about how biographical criticism conditioned reading of Lucian's texts in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. I am indebted to several recent studies of Lucian's European *Nachleben*, each of which has described various aspects of the teaching, reading, translating, and imitating of Lucian's texts from the Byzantine period until the present. This essay, however, is less concerned with the reception of Lucian's texts than with the reception of the figure of Lucian himself, both as an individual and as a "type." We shall see that this question of the biographical subject as "type" is especially interesting with regard to Lucian, an author who "thematizes" throughout his corpus the complexities and ambiguities of a hybrid cultural identity. This paper explores the sorts of interpretative difficulties Lucian's "Syrianness" presented to his readers and biographers. Is Lucian a Greek or a Syrian (not always self-evident issue, as we shall see)? If the latter, as certain of Lucian's readers will formulate the question, how can the literary production of a self-styled "*barbaros*" manifest "the Greek genius"?

By way of introduction, this paper begins with a brief sketch of the history of a mistake—a (conveniently) erroneous belief in Lucian's Greek origins which arguably forestalled the sorts of culturally loaded questions which occupied Lucian's later readers. The second section of this paper turns to those readers who accepted Lucian's Syrianness but nevertheless sought ways to substantiate the "Greekness" of his texts. For Lucian's German readers, beginning with Christoph Martin Wieland, culture is something tied closely to the land of Hellas itself. As a consequence, Wieland and those who followed him substantiated the Greekness of Lucian's texts by positing the physical proximity of Lucian himself to the land of Hellas. Finally, the last section of this paper examines how academic notions about Lucian's "oriental mind" contributed to and reflected the gradual decline of Lucian's popularity in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

LUCIAN OF PATRAS

FOR THE PAST 150 years, the Syrian origins of both Lucian and his family have not been a matter of the slightest doubt. The issue of Lucian's ethnicity, however, presented serious interpretative difficulties for generations of scholars. Though the question of Lucian's parentage was settled by the 1820s, it is worth unearthing the traces of this now forgotten conversation for the light it throws on subsequent attempts to define (or deny) Lucian's Greekness. In 1780, Thomas Francklin (1721–84), Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge, prefaced his translations of Lucian's works with an original *Dialogue of the Dead*, modeled on Lucian's own short satirical sketches of the same name. Francklin's *Dialogue* imagines a conversation between his late friend, the first Baron Lyttelton (himself a well-known imitator of Lucian) and Lucian as they come across each other in the Underworld. Lyttelton asks after the origins of Lucian's family, to which Francklin's Lucian replies:

> Know then, my dear Lord, my family, I must confess, none of the noblest, was originally Grecian, and came from Patra [*sic*] in Achaia, from which place, for some prudential reasons, not necessary to be mentioned, they retired to Samosata, a city of Commagene in Syria, on the Euphrates, which had the honor, for so I know your Lordship would call it, of giving birth to your friend Lucian.[8]

Lytellton is perplexed; he asks, as Francklin's readers might well have done, why it is that Lucian, given his Greek parentage, speaks so often in his works of his Syrian nativity "as if . . . proud of it." Francklin's Lucian explains:

> I know my enemies, of whom I always had a sufficient number, would certainly take notice of it, if I did not; would have talked perpetually of Syria, and thrown it in my teeth, that I was not a Grecian, but a Barbarian. I was resolved, therefore, to be before-

hand with them, and to let them know, that a native of Samosata could write as well as the best of them.[9]

As odd and improbable as Lucian's Patrensian origins seem to Lucian's modern readers, Francklin's assertion of Lucian's Greek ethnicity would not have been new to eighteenth century readers of various biographies of Lucian. John Dryden, in his 1696 *Life of Lucian*, published as a preface to Samuel Briscoe's 1711 translations of several satires, had made the following claim regarding Lucian's origins: "He was born in Samosata, a city of Syria, not far from the Euphrates; and for this reason he calls himself more than once an Assyrian, or a Syrian; but he was derived from a Greek original, his forefathers having been citizens of Patra in Achaia."

Nor was Dryden the originator of the Greek Lucian; as Francklin followed Dryden, so Dryden was repeating a claim made by Francis Hickes in his own *Life of Lucian* of 1663:

> Howbeit at other times he [Lucian] derives himself from Patras, a city of Achaia, as says Beroaldus, he would hereby intimate one to be the city of his nativity, the other of his descent, according to that of Livie [*sic*], *nati Carthagine, oriundi Syracusis*. Secondly, for his kindred: his father's name was Lucius and his brother's Caius, who, as he says, was an elegiac poet and a soothsayer.[10]

With Hickes' reference to Beroaldus' fifteenth-century commentary on Apuleius, the origins of the odd and now forgotten belief in Lucian's Patrensian parentage begin to come into focus. A version of the *Ass* story is found in Lucian's works, a text whose original authorship had been in question since at least the Byzantine period—the original of which some attributed to Lucian, others to Lucius of Patras. Whatever the truth of the matter of original authorship might be, readers of Lucian's *Onos* have had to somehow interpret the claims of a first person narrator who identifies himself as Lucius of Patras.[11]

Beroaldus conflated Lucian of Samosata with at least one and possibly two figures by the name of Lucius of Patras, the one being the putative author of a version of the *Ass* story thought by Photius to be the model for Lucian's own text of that name, and the second being the narrating *persona* of Lucian's own text, the *Onos*.[12] It is from this last text (Lucius of Patras' text, if it ever existed, is lost) that Hickes derives his biographical information for Lucian: Lucian wrote, "My father's name is Lucius[13] and that of my brother is Gaius, and the other two names we share with our father. I write histories and other prose works, while he is an elegiac poet and a skilled prophet. Our native city is Patras in Achaia."

Like Beroaldus, Hickes has clearly understood the narrating voice of the *Ass* story to be that of its author, Lucian. Recognizing the difficulty of reconciling Greek birth with the myriad claims for Syrian origins elsewhere in Lucian's corpus, Hickes transmits the tradition that although a Syrian by birth, Lucian was, nevertheless, ethnically Greek.

It is tempting to read an ideological agenda into these claims for Lucian's Greek parentage. However, in the absence of more explicit reasoning on the part of Dryden, Hickes, *et al.*, such an interpretation could never be more than speculative. Whatever else they may have been thinking, these readers of Lucian reconciled seemingly contradictory but nevertheless credible claims for both Syrian and Greek origins throughout Lucian's corpus; in doing so, they made an erroneous claim which was forgotten soon after its fallacy was recognized. [14]

The interest of this error, however, lies in its aftermath. Once Lucius of Patras achieves an existence independent from that of Lucian of Samosata, the issue of Lucian's own Greekness becomes fundamentally unstable. Lucian's Patrensian origins had been essential not only to Lucian's own Greek identity but also, less obviously, to the Greekness of his texts. Once the sophist himself comes unmoored from his Greek ancestry, several of Lucian's readers, Wieland promi-

nent among them, develop other strategies of anchoring Lucian and his texts to the land of Hellas. In what follows, I demonstrate how these men refine and elaborate Lucian's "biography" in an effort to accommodate and explain new ways of understanding the Greekness of Lucian's texts.

LUCIAN OF SAMOSATA

IN 1781, THE ABBÉ MASSIEU published a French translation of Lucian's work in six volumes. The translation was popular enough to be reissued three years later, slightly corrected and modified.[15] Four years after that, in 1788, Christoph Martin Wieland, whose own satirical writings prompted Goethe to dub him, "the German Lucian," published his own collection of German Lucian translations.[16] In his extended introductory essay, *Über Lucians Lebensumstände, Charakter, und Schriften*, Wieland criticizes Massieu's conjectural biography of Lucian at length. In particular, Wieland strenuously objects to Massieu's claim that after his sojourn in Gaul, Lucian returned to his native Samosata where he set to writing his most successful dialogues until the emperor Marcus Aurelius ultimately rewarded him with an imperial post in Egypt. Wieland rejects Massieu's hypothesis as absurd—Lucian, Wieland feels, would never have consented to living out his days in such a provincial backwater as Samosata. No, Wieland will argue—Lucian would not have returned to Samosata for any extended period of time after he had tasted the fruits of Greek culture. "Lucian came back to his fatherland," Wieland writes, "this is established;[17] but in which epoch of his life and for how long a period?"[18]

Wieland assumes that the movements of Lucian's career are dictated by a consistent need to *distance* himself from his Syrian origins. Lucian leaves Greece for Gaul, Wieland writes, on account of the prejudice which he, as a "halbbarbarischer Grieche" would have encountered in the fiercely agonistic culture of professional Greek rhetoricians. Gaul, Wieland suggests, would have offered the Syrian Lucian the more level

playing field of a non-Greek audience, one on which he might compete more equitably with his Greek rivals.[19]

Ultimately, however, Syria was not a land where a man of Lucian's "Geist und Charakter"[20] could have possibly hoped to practice his art. And so, at the end of Lucian's extended career in Gaul, Wieland argues, Lucian returns to Greece, most probably to Athens, and that it is there, "einer von der Hauptsitzen der Musen," that Lucian produces his most profound work. Wieland writes:

> It seems probable to me that he [Lucian] produced the largest part of them [his best writings] in Greece, namely at Athens, where, he assures us, he lived for many years with the then elderly Demonax, his ideal of a true wise man, and where many of his noblest works (as I believe I have shown in my remarks) received their existence (*Dasein*).[21]

Before Wieland, where Lucian actually *wrote* his texts had never been an issue. Lucian himself certainly never indicates at any point in his corpus where he composed a particular work. Neither does he offer information as to where he lived during his periods of literary activity. Perhaps for this reason, the issue which had preoccupied Lucian's European readers prior to Wieland had been where Lucian himself *was from*—Lucian's *own* ethnic identity. Wieland is quite clear on this latter point: "Lucian was born in Samosata, situated on the west bank of the Euphrates, then an important city of the Syrian province of Commagene";[22] everyone is agreed on this much—the issue is ancestry. It is important to note that for Wieland, Syrian birth does not preclude Lucian from producing work which seems somehow essentially Greek.

However, Wieland does address the question which is in fact central to so many of Lucian's own writings about ethnic and cultural identity. Wieland, somewhat like Lucian himself, seems to understand the issues of the cultural identity of the text and the ethnicity of the author as related

but, in the final analysis, somehow separate issues. But whereas Lucian raises the question with a certain irony, preferring to leave the problem of identity as open and ambiguous as possible, Wieland sees a way to resolve the issue. Given the impossibility of ignoring Lucian's Syrian origins, Wieland Hellenizes the texts by planting them, so to speak, in Greek soil.

Many of Wieland's contemporaries shared a belief in some sort of essential relationship between the texts of the ancient world and the landscapes in which they had been produced—that somehow landscape and climate determined the cultural disposition of the people who lived there and, ultimately, the art and literature which that culture produces.[23] The year 1773 (thirteen years prior to the appearance of Wieland's translation of Lucian) saw the publication of two enormously influential essays, Johann Hermann von Riedesel's *Remarques d'un voyageur moderne au Levant* and Robert Wood's (posthumous) *Essay on the Original Genius of Homer*. Both insisted that the texts of ancient Greece could only be understood by those who had actually experienced the unchanging landscape which had produced them. The *Odyssey*, Wood suggested, when read in the comfort of a Cambridge drawing room, was simply a moralizing tale. Only when read on the wine dark sea itself could one truly come to understand its power. The same held true, Riedesel claimed, for the great works of the Athenians.[24]

We see a similar belief in the power of place informing Wieland's claims for the Athenian genesis of Lucian's texts. For Lucian's texts to *be* Greek, Lucian must have written them *in* Greece—the Syrian Lucian becomes no more than a gifted cipher for the *genius loci* of Greece. For centuries prior to Wieland, Lucian's readers had chosen to Hellenize the author by conflating Lucian of Samosata with Lucius of Patras. Wieland's essay of 1788 shifts the terms of the conversation about Lucian's Greekness and in doing so, essentially causes the Patrensian Lucian to disappear. Beginning in the late eighteenth century, Lucian's readers came to see the

Greekness of Lucian's texts as the necessary consequence of their having been planted, nurtured, and harvested from the soil of Hellas itself.

Wieland's assertion that Lucian wrote in Athens was to have long innings. In 1827, the same year in which he started teaching at Heilbronn, August Pauly (d. 1845) published his own translations of Lucian's works. Pauly's short biography of Lucian borrows freely from Wieland's introductory essays of 1788. Like Wieland, Pauly situates Lucian's literary activity itself, and by extension his work, in the Greek cultural milieu. Greece, for Pauly, is the cultural antithesis of Lucian's Syrian origins: Samosata, Pauly remarks, though located on the near bank of the Euphrates, was nevertheless an outpost of the civilized world, located at "the farthest boundary of Greek culture."[25]

For Pauly (as for Wieland), Lucian's progress towards civilization is a trajectory which points ever westward. Pauly is much more effusive than Wieland on the subject of Roman Athens' peculiar qualities:

> It was Athens above all, favored as much from every circumstance as from preference, which Hadrian cherished as the cradle of truth and beauty and quickly raised once more to an eminence of appearance. More than before, here was the gathering place of scholars and artists of every sort, and only the degree of intellectual education defined, in this city of the Muses, the worth and the importance of each, while bare station and riches not once sheltered any from biting satire, in which the Athenians were past masters. The stay in this city, and the very trusted friendship with his fatherly friend Demonax, the noble Cynic, for whom he creates in his writings so beautiful a monument, was the most essential period in Lucian's educational history, and *fundamental for the purpose, spirit, and character, as much as for the form of his literary production* [my italics].[26]

Both Pauly and Wieland claim that Lucian wrote his noblest works in Athens under the benign influence of Demonax, an elderly Cypriot philosopher whom Lucian immortalizes

in an *encomium* of the same name. However, Lucian nowhere offers any evidence which would confirm Pauly and Wieland's confident assertions. In the *Demonax*, Lucian simply states that he "associated with Demonax for a long time" [*Demonax* 1.2]. If, in fact, Demonax ever existed (and we should leave this question open, given the number of fictive characters populating Lucian's corpus),[27] one might reasonably assume that Lucian spent a good deal of time with him, most probably at Athens, since this city provides the context for the majority of Lucian's anecdotes about Demonax. However, there is no evidence at all to substantiate claims for the location of Lucian's literary activities during this period. We simply do not know where Lucian lived or wrote.

The claim for Lucian's literary activity in Athens is motivated, I suggest, by a need to establish the cultural identity of the texts as distinct from the ethnic identity of their author. Close inspection of both Wieland and Pauly's language is telling. While Wieland writes that in Athens, Lucian's *writings* "derived their existence" (*ihr Dasein empfangen haben*), Pauly similarly suggests that one sees the influence of Athens in the "purpose, spirit, and character, as well as the form of [Lucian's] literary production" (*Zweck, Geist und Charakter, so wie auf die Form seiner [Lucian's] schriftstellerischen Produktionen*).

Wieland's "Dasein" and Pauly's "Geist und Charakter" refer not to Lucian himself but to his texts. These most influential readers of Lucian emphasize that the brilliance of his texts reflects not so much the genius of the author as of the *genius loci*. What makes these texts special is peculiar to the Attic soil—they could not have been written anywhere else. The logic is strikingly circular—Athens is the "Wiege des Wahren und Schönen," Samosata is a "halbbarbarischer Provinzialstadt,"[28] Lucian's writings contain truth and beauty, therefore, they must have been composed in Athens. Strangely absent from this line of thinking is any essential understanding of Lucian's own artistic identity—the idea

seems to be that Lucian could not have produced works of such genius in his native Samosata.

Five years after Pauly's translations appeared, Karl Georg Jacob (1796–1849) published his *Characteristik Lucians von Samosata*. Perceiving a growing tendency among the German intelligentia to avoid Lucian, Jacob conceives his *Characteristik* as a defense of the satirist aimed at a wide, non-specialist public. Jacob's book was enormously influential and, for the most part, well-received by the academic establishment. Nevertheless, the popularizing tone of the book and its sweeping assertions about Lucian's serious and civic-minded aims provoked Karl Friedrich Hermanns to direct his student Gottfried Wetzlar to write a more scholarly dissertation as a corrective to Jacob. In 1834, Wetzlar published his Marburg dissertation, *De Aetate, Vita, Scriptisque Luciani Samosatensis*.

Like Pauly, Wetzlar frames his discussion in the terms which had been set by Wieland. Wetzlar takes Wieland and Pauly one step further, however, by locating various groups of texts at various points of Lucian's career. Having first warned his readers that Lucian's works lack all indications of the place of composition (much like Dryden), Wetzlar nevertheless feels confident enough to assert that it was in Gaul that Lucian produced, "the greatest part of his writings which have a rhetorical and natural form."[29]

From Lucian's presence at the Olympic Games of 165, Wetzlar conjectures that by this time, Lucian had moved back to Greece from Samosata.[30] As confirmation of his theory, Wetzlar points out that only in Athens could Lucian have written works of such brilliance. Wetzlar quotes Karl Ludwig Struve (1785–1838) on the matter:

> Although he [Karl Ludwig Struve] says that he [Lucian] never explicitly says that he lived in Athens, nevertheless, *his writings themselves everywhere attest to the fact*—those writings, I say, which are the best and most beautiful of that age, those dialogues which are festive and full of urbanity (which are always going on in

Athens)—*all of them everywhere breathe an Attic elegance*, and whomever he [Lucian] mentions as contemporary with himself, to whom he might have been bound either by habit or intimacy, or whose manner and way of life he may have accurately observed, [these] make it known that at that very time he lived in Athens.[31]

Wetzlar's small book was important enough sixteen years later to be criticized by the school teacher Adolph Planck in his address to the faculty of Württemberg *Gymnasium* on the feast day of St. Guilielmo. Planck had taken the side of Lucian in the mid-nineteenth century debate over whether or not Lucian's texts should be taught in the schools—a question which revolved primarily around the suitability for impressionable minds of Lucian's mocking of gods. Planck's project is thus defensive—in the following year (1851) Planck would argue for Lucian's presence in the *Gymnasium* curriculum in a pamphlet, *Lucian und das Christenthum*.[32] Planck's *Quaestiones Lucianeae*, published in Tübingen in 1850, look forward to his fuller defense of Lucian of the following year. For Planck, the decisive moment in Lucian's career takes place in Rome, after his years practicing rhetoric in Gaul. In a passage reminiscent of Lucian's own account of his conversion to *paideia* in the *Dream*, Planck tells us how, "in fact, Rome having been abandoned on account of the degeneracy of its customs and way of life, he [Lucian] turned back to Greece, where he devoted himself entirely to philosophy."[33]

Planck's claims for Lucian's conversion to philosophy seem to be loosely based on the *Nigrinus*, a text in which Lucian details the absurdity and hypocrisy of Roman intellectual culture. Likewise, Planck enlists Lucian's *Demonax* as well as the *Nigrinus* as so-called "evidence" for Lucian's extended stay in Athens: "That Lucian chose the city of the Athenians for himself as the most ancient seat of the liberal arts is demonstrated by the *Nigrinus*, where he describes this city with the highest praises, as well as from the *Demonax*, where he tells how he was in the company of that Athenian philosopher for a great length of time."[34]

Planck's claims here are entirely fanciful. Demonax, Lucian tells us, was not Athenian, but rather a Cypriot. Nor, as already noted, does Lucian in either the *Demonax* or the *Nigrinus* ever claim to have lived for any length of time in Athens. But the force of the traditional cultural assumptions which lay behind Planck's work enable him to claim not only that Lucian lived for almost twenty(!) years in Athens, but that Lucian's "most excellent books, those which today all admire, were written in Athens, as almost everyone agrees."[35]

". . . *A BEATING ALWAYS PUTS AN ASIATIC TO FLIGHT*"

TOWARDS THE END of the nineteenth century, Lucian's popularity in Europe, especially in Germany, began a steep descent from which it has still only partially recovered. Several factors, external to Lucian's own merits, contributed to his surprisingly rapid fall from favor. First, the genre of satire itself came to be associated with low literary art and anti-social behavior.[36] Continental intellectuals began to distinguish *good* satire, designed to attack sin and corruption *per se*, from *bad* satire, aimed in a mean-spirited way at individuals.[37] Lucian found himself in the latter group for a variety of reasons, not the least of which being notions regarding his "character." Perhaps more relevant, however, to Lucian's declining fortunes within the European academy was the rise of orientalist discourse.

Orientalist cultural politics, as Maurice Olender has convincingly argued, played a central role in the formation of the disciplines of classics and Indo-Europeanism.[38] Indo-European linguists posited two antithetical *continua*—on the one side, the ancient Aryans, whose mobility and dynamism passed to the modern West via the Greeks, and on the other, the ancient Semites, whose immobility and geographical stagnation in the Near East could still be discovered in the inferior peoples of the modern Orient. The eastern landscape is no less stable and continuous than the western.

It is precisely this stability of the "Orient" and the "orien-

tal mind" which enabled scholars to see in its contemporary manifestations the characteristics which would have defined the authors of ancient "oriental" texts. The relationship is dialectic—observations on the "Orientals" enable one to sensitively read Lucian while at the same time, the reading of Lucian legitimates theories concerning the Orientals themselves. What is more, for readers of Lucian, one result of this essentializing of Lucian's "Oriental Mind" is the ultimate rejection of his Greekness.

There is a fascinating example of this dialectic. Lieutenant Colonel Henry Hime, an officer in her Majesty's Royal Artillery Corps and the author of several authoritative treatises on the history of munitions,[39] published a book entitled *Lucian, the Syrian Satirist* in 1900, one year before the death of Queen Victoria. Hime's book, because the work of a well-read amateur scholar whose real work was in the daily running of the British Empire, is a particularly important document. Hime saw the works of Lucian as typical products of "the oriental mind"; for example, in response to Lucian's account of how his sculptor uncle's beating caused him to turn to the bright path of Greek *paideia*, Hime writes that "he was evidently not made of the stuff that artists are made of. A beating would not have driven Rafael from his canvas, Mozart from his piano, or Thorwaldsen from his marble . . . the course he took, however, was the natural one: a beating always puts an Asiatic to flight."[40] True art, Hime continues, is beyond the reach of Lucian's "restless and shallow mind."[41] Rhetoric was more suitable for a man of Lucian's temperament: "There was a brilliancy and a glitter about rhetoric that naturally attracted the admiration of an Asiatic."[42] Summarizing "Lucian's Character" (in a chapter by that name), Hime writes, "his character was essentially oriental, and (for this reason) defies analysis beyond a certain point . . . he was a western Asiatic. Such transformations are thoroughly characteristic of the regions where he sprung."[43]

A comparison of Wieland and Hime on the source of Lucian's "inspiration" is instructive and highlights an essential

aspect of Lucian's gradual eclipse in nineteenth and twentieth century Europe. Wieland and Hime, in different ways, read Lucian in light of their ideas about climatic determinism and the cultural power of landscape. To a large measure, Wieland locates the genius of Lucian's texts in the cultural environment which nourished them. As an author, Wieland's Lucian is strangely absent—less essential to the character of his texts than the place in which he wrote. Hime similarly elides Lucian's presence as an author, but whereas Wieland understands Lucian's texts as entirely Greek products of a Greek landscape, Hime's Lucian, as an example of the "oriental mind," writes texts which are entirely oriental. Hime and Wieland's logic is curiously similar, even if their conclusions are antithetical.

The turn of the century witnessed another response to Wieland's Lucian, this time in the form of a brief section of Eduard Norden's enormously influential *Die antike Kunstprosa* of 1898. Norden addresses again the issue of whether Lucian, as a Syrian, could have been even a cipher for Attic elegance. Norden's response is similar to that of Hime. For Norden, Lucian is

> the Oriental without depth and character, but full of humor and nimbleness of mind, in fact characterized by the *Menippean Graces*, but from Attica he derived no grace—only a sneer with which he conscripted the lofty and the holy into the frivolous. Once, I read him with great pleasure, now I return to him only with deep reluctance. He has no soul and for this reason, despite all virtuosity, degrades the most soulful language to a joke.[44]

Prior to Norden, two generations of scholars had attributed the beauty of Lucian's language to his ability to channel the presence, the *Dasein*, of his adopted homeland. By contrast, for Norden and those who followed him, Lucian's "Oriental Mind" pollutes the Greek language itself—what is more, the texts themselves are unredeemed by their author's proximity to Greece.[45] Whereas Wieland spoke of the Greek *Dasein* which one could find in Lucian's work, and

August Pauly explained the *Zweck, Geist, und Charakter* of Lucian's best work as the result of Lucian's living in the "city of the Muses," and Wetzlar argued for Lucian's Athenian residence on the basis of the "*elegantia attica*" of the work, for Norden, Lucian's ethnic identity gives the lie to his cultural claims.[46]

Although Wilamowitz never devoted any work to Lucian, in 1906, eight years after the publication of Norden's book, Wilamowitz's young assistant Rudolf Helm published his *Lucian und Mennip*, quite possibly still the most influential study of Lucian's works and the text which may have contributed the most to Lucian's exclusion from the canon. The purpose of Helm's book is to prove that the third-century-BCE satirist Menippus of Gadara, the "inventor" of prosimetric satire, is in fact the literal author of many of the texts which bear Lucian's name. Helm argues that Lucian fraudulently republished Menippus' texts as his own creations and escaped the notice of his contemporaries because copies of Menippus' satires were so difficult to find in the second century BCE. Helm's demonstration of the importance of Lucian's wholesale appropriation of Menippus is closely linked with his intention to pull Lucian from the pedestal where Wieland and Jacob had placed him.

Helm's response to Jacob, who had compared Lucian to Euripides, and to Schmidt, who had compared Lucian to Ulrich von Hutten, is instructive:[47]

> Both [Euripides and Hutten] had a holy seriousness which is lacking in the thoughtless Syrian; he [Lucian] possesses none of the soul of the tragedian, consuming itself in inner contradiction, nothing of the enthusiastic faithfulness and conviction of the noble "enemy of the clerics." [Jacob] himself has correctly objected to a parallel with the satirist Voltaire. A fitting comparison presents itself, although it too is clumsy like all comparisons, with Heinrich Heine, the mocking-bird of the German poet-forest—Heine, who is much superior to him in terms of lack of character, geniality and originality, but also in terms of malice.[48]

When Helm looks at those who would praise Lucian as a champion of reason, virtue, etc. (he mentions Wieland and Jacob by name), Helm attacks them for praising Lucian's "love of truth and his hatred for deceit and the unnatural," while failing to recognize "how much of this is to be attributed to his [Lucian's] debt to his model [Menippus]."[49] Helm is appalled that, "in a modern collection entitled *Books of Wisdom and Beauty*, one can find Lucian next to the Bible and Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*."[50]

Helm's culturally loaded rejection of Lucian as the "thoughtless Syrian" seems odd, given the fact that Menippus, in whose (plagiarized) works Helm sees some genius, is himself from Syrian Gadara—a paradox which Helm does not seem to have recognized and which I do not claim to resolve. I would, however, draw attention to the ways in which Helm seems to be criticizing less the texts of Lucian themselves, but rather their undeserved eminence in the German "Dichterwald." For Helm and many of his contemporaries, Lucian is not Greek, but Syrian.

CONCLUSION

IN THE LAST FEW DECADES, renewed interest in the literature and culture of the so-called Second Sophistic has brought with it a re-evaluation of Lucian's texts, and Lucian has finally taken his place alongside the sophists fortunate enough to have been deemed worthy of inclusion by Philostratus. Lucian has certainly had a long time arriving. As late as 1962, Gilbert Highet could still remark that Lucian was simply "a foreigner . . . who wished to be more Greek than the Greeks themselves"; a man whose satires on the Greek myths reminded Highet of a "Hindoo" poking fun at the "medieval cult of relics." If nothing else, we can appreciate the scholarly pedigree of Highet's culturally loaded dismissal of Lucian. Lucian, the Syrian, bears the same relation to Greece that a Hindu would to the venerable, if odd, traditions of Western Christianity.

Given the amount of biographical speculation which Lucian's corpus has fostered, it is ironic that Philostratus, the great biographer of the sophists and the originator of the term "Second Sophistic" itself, never mentions Lucian. We possess a single, doubtful reference to Lucian by a contemporary in Galen's story of the sophist who fooled the learned experts with his forgery of an "ancient" Ionic text. If this witty forger is in fact Lucian (and the presence of pseudo-Ionic texts in Lucian's corpus—*De Syria Dea*, *Astrology*—is suggestive), the anecdote seems particularly appropriate; Lucian's texts are never quite what they seem. And yet, for centuries, Lucian's readers have seen in his fictive *personae* —Lukinos, "the Syrian," etc.—the "real" speaking voice of Lucian himself.

I have tried to suggest in this paper that this process of creating "Lucian" from his texts has evolved and shifted in ways which have reflected the various needs and preoccupations of his readers—Romantics, Theists, Orientalists. I am not unaware that the Lucian who has begun to emerge in recent years is no less a product of our own academic and political agenda. As previous generations resolved Lucian's identity by making him *either* Greek *or* Syrian, the Anglophone academy has discovered a post-colonial Lucian—a cultural hybrid whose texts address issues of identity, ethnicity, culture, and imperialism. The eighteenth century's comparisons with Voltaire are giving way to our (my?) own likening of Lucian to Chinua Achebe and Jamaica Kincaid—writers who self-consciously use the language of the dominant other as a vehicle for the exploration of their own ambiguous cultural identities. Our justification for doing so will certainly be examined by another generation. That said, it does seem clear that the value of tracing the reception of Lucian's ethnic identity, in large part, lies in the light it sheds on the cultural assumptions of his readers.

NOTES

Versions of this paper were read at the University of Chicago and Northwestern University. I am grateful to both audiences for their insights, particularly to Robert Germany. Thanks also to Ann Marie Yasin, Morton Richter, Jaś Elsner, Jonathan Hall, Chris Faraone, Shadi Bartsch, and Ahuvia Kahane, all of whom have read and commented on earlier manifestations of the project. My indebtedness to Manuel Baumbach and his work on the reception of Lucian's corpus since the Renaissance is profound. I have also benefited immensely from the criticism of *Arion's* editorial staff and anonymous readers.

1. John Dryden, *The Works of Lucian, Translated from the Greek by several eminent hands, the first volume, with The Life of Lucian, a Discourse on his Writings and a Character of the Present Translators* (London 1711 [orig. 1696]), 5.

2. Lukianos: *Verae Historiae*; *Peregrinus Proteus*; *The Solecist*; *Affairs of the Heart*.

3. The Syrian: *The Dead Come to Life* 19; *Bis Accusatus* 25; *Adversus Indoctum* 19; *De Syria Dea* 1; *Mistaken Critic* 20.

4. Lucius: *The Ass*.

5. Lukinos: *The Lapiths*; *Essays in Portraiture*; *Essays in Portraiture Defended*; *The Dance*; *Lexiphanes*; *The Eunuch*; *A Conversation with Hesiod*; *Hermotimus*; *The Ship*; *The Cynic*.

6. Recent summaries of Lucian's life drawn from internal evidence include: *Lucian, On the Syrian Goddess,* J. L. Lightfoot, ed. (New York and London 2003), 205–7; Manuel Baumbach, *Lukian in Deutschland: Eine forschungs- und rezeptionsgeschichtliche Analyse vom Humanismus bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich 2002), 20–21; S. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism and Power in the Greek World* AD *50–250*(Oxford 1996), 298–99; Barry Baldwin, *Studies in Lucian* (Toronto 1973), 7–20; Bracht Branham, *Unruly Eloquence: Lucian and the Comedy of Traditions* (Cambridge, MA 1989), 28–37; C. P. Jones, *Culture and Society in Lucian* (Cambridge, MA 1986), 8–23; and Lionel Casson, ed., *Selected Satires of Lucian* (New York 1968), xiii–xv.

7. Gilbert Cousin, *ΛΟΥΚΙΑΝΟΥ ΑΠΑΝΤΑ: Luciani Samosatensis opera quae quidem extant omnia, Graece at Latine in Quattuor Tomos Divisa* (Basel 1563), 1.3: "Lucianus Samosata patriam suam esse, et ab Euphrate fluvio non procul distare, in libro *Quomodo Scribenda sit Historia*, dicit. In *Piscatore* autem, Syriam iuxta Euphratem: et in *de dea Syria* scribens, se esse Assyrium ait. In *bis Accusatus*, se Syrum rhetorem vocat. In *Somnio* suo, generis, educationis, ac studiorum suorum rationes, tum quomodo statuariae initiatus fuerit, exponit. In conventu totius Macedoniae se exhibuit ac speciem aliquod sui praebuit. In *Herodoto, seu Etio, ex Hercule Gallico*, coniecturam facere licet, in Gallia publice rhetoricam professum fuisse. Sub fine *Apologiae pro Mercede Conductis*, inter quaestuosos rhetores locum sibi fuisse ait. In *Piscatore* dicitur rhetor et causidi-

cus; sed causas cur agere defierit, et animum ad scribendum appulerit, ibidem docet. Contra eum qui dixerat, *Prometheus es in Verbis*, dictionem et dicendi genus suum indicat. In *Hermotimo*, non est sermonis Latini imperitus: et quadrigenarius philosophari coepit. *De Saltatione*, disciplinis liberalibus innutritus dicitur, nec non in philosophiae studiis versatus. In *Piscatore*, se philosophum profitetur, atque philosophiae flosculis sua scripta illustrasse ait. In *Apologia pro iis qui mercede conducti serviunt*, iam senior, in aulam atque familiam Caesaris sese contulit, et conditionem procuratoris Principis in Aegypto accepit." [Note: all translations in the essay are my own.]

8. T. Francklin, *The Works of Lucian from the Greek*: *On the Life and Writings of Lucian, a Dialogue between Lucian and Lord Lyttelton in the Elysian Fields* (London 1780), x.

9. T. Francklin (note 8), xi.

10. Francis Hickes, *Certain Select Dialogues of Lucian: Together with his True History, Whereunto is added the life of Lucian, gathered out of his own writings, with brief notes and illustrations upon each dialogue and book* (Oxford 1663), preface.

11. The bibliography on the subject is vast and growing. Ben Edwin Perry, "On the Authorship of *Lucius sive Asinus* and its Original," *CP* 21 (1926) 225–34 is still important, though H. J. Mason covers almost every aspect of the question in the following papers: "Lucius at Corinth," *Phoenix* 25, (1971), 160–65; "Apuleius and *Lucius sive Asinus* since Rhode," abstract in *Erotica Antiqua,* B. P. Reardon, ed. (Bangor, UK 1978); "*Fabula Graecanica*: Apuleius and his Greek Sources," *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass,* B. L. Hijmans and R. Th. van der Paart, eds. (Groenigen 1978; rpt. 1999), also in S. J. Harrison, *Oxford Readings in the Roman Novel* (Oxford 1999); "The Distinction of Lucius in Apuleius' *Metamorphosis*," *Phoenix* 37 (1983), 135–43; "Greek and Latin Versions of the Ass Story," *ANRW* II.34.2 (1994), 1665–1707; and "The *Metamorphosis* of Apuleius and its Greek Sources," *Latin Fiction*, Heinz Hoffman, ed. (London 1998 and 1999).

12. P. Beroaldus, *Commentarii a Philippo Beroaldo Conditi in Asinum Aureum Lucii Apulei* (Bologna 1500): "Sometimes Lucian says that he is from Patras and at other times he says that he is an Assyrian—as if to say, he was born here but raised there, as in that passage of Livy, 'born at Carthage, raised at Syracuse.' Suidas relates that Lucian was the Samosatan, from the city in Syria." (*Lucianus ait modo se patrensem, modo assyrium esse dicit. tamquam natus hic oriundis illic fuerit; ut illud livianum nati Carthagine oriundi Syracusis. Suidas refert Lucianum fuisse Samosat eum ex Syriae f. civitate.*)

13. M. D. Macleod in his Loeb edition (*Lucian in Eight Volumes*, A. M. Harmon, trans. [Cambridge, MA and London 1968–1988, c. 1913–1967], 8.140–41) follows Gesner's suggestion (*Opera. Cum nova versione Tiber. Hermsterhusii, & Io. Matthiae Gesneri, Graecis scholiis, ac notis omnium proximae editionis commentatorum, additis Io. Brodaei, Io. Iensii, Lud. Kuster. Aliisque ineditis, ac praecipue Mosis Solani & I. M. Gesneri. Cujus*

priorem partem curavit & illustravit Tiberius Hemsterhusius. Ceteras partes ordinavit, notasque suas adjecit Ioannes Fredericus Reitzius [Amsterdam 1743], 622) that a lacuna follows "πατήρ"in the text. For Gesner, the existence of the lacuna hangs on what he perceives to be a lapse in logic: in response to a request for his own name and then that of his parents and relations, Lucius gives his father's name, his brother's name, and finally, his own in an elliptical fashion. Gesner writes: "quomodo ista cohaerent? . . . Praeses primo de nomine novi ex asino hominis, tum de parentibus et cognates. Nomen itaque suum debebat dicere ante omnia: nomen deinde fratris sui indicare voluisse, satis ipsa structura orationis indicat . . . . Verum hoc ipsum quoque fortasse affectavit, ut truncatam esse orationem melius intelligerent lectores. Fortasse, et aliquid plus quam fortasse!"

14. J. F. Reitz, *ΛΟΥΚΙΑΝΟΣ: Luciani Samosatensis Opera Graece et Latine* (Leipzig 1822), 23–24, exposes the erroneous conflation most succinctly: "Patria Samosata, Syriae civitas, non longe ab Euphrate, ut se ipsum Syrum et Assyrium non semel cognominet: alibi etiam Patrensem, quae civitas est Achaiae: tamquam natus hinc, oriundus illinc, ait Beroaldus in octavum Apuleji [locus, quem Zwingerus ob oculos habuit, est. T. H. in Asin. c. 55 ubi ait: 'Patria nobis patrae, urbs Achaiae; sed errare virum doctum, et alium esse istum Lucium Patrensem, et Biogaphi, et nostri commentators satis indicaverunt']."

15. Jean Baptiste Massieu, *Œuvres de Lucien, traduction nouvelle, par M. l'Abbé Massieu* (Paris 1781–1787).

16. Christoph Martin Wieland, *Lucians von Samosata Sämtliche Werke aus dem Griechischen übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen und Erläuterungen* (Leipzig 1788). See Baumbach (note 6), 89–120. W. Tooke, *Lucian from the Greek* (London 1820), published an English translation of Wieland's essay as a preface to his own versions of Lucian's Dialogues.

17. W. Tooke (note 16), vii. Tooke translates: "This is an ascertained fact."

18. Wieland (note 16), 14.

19. Wieland (note 16), 7: "Vermutlich wegen der allzugrossen Concurrenz und der Vorurtheile die er als ein Syrischer, d.i. halbbarbarischer Grieche anfangs gegen sich haben musste."

20. Wieland (note 16), 14.

21. Wieland (note 16), 13: "Mir ist wahrscheinlich, dass er einen grossen Theil derselben in Griechenland, und vornehmlich zu Athen zugebracht habe, wo er mit dem damals schon bejahrten Demonax, seinem Ideal eines ächten Wiesen, viele Jahre gelebt zu haben versichert, und wo viele seiner schönsten Werke (wie ich in meinen Unmerkungen gezeicht zu haben glaube, ihr Dasein empfangen haben)."

22. Wieland (note 16), 4: "Lucian wurde zu Samosata, einer am westlichen Ufer des Euphrates gelegnen, damals ziemlich ansehnlichen Stadt der syrischen Provinz Kommagene, geboren."

23. Climatic determinism is not an invention of the eighteenth century. Hippocrates' *On Airs, Waters, and Places* makes much the same point

about the way in which climate affected the ethnic characters of the Greeks, Scythians, Persians, et al. See Rosalind Thomas, *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science, and the Art of Persuasion* (Cambridge 2000), esp. chap. 3. For the evolution of the idea in the eighteenth century, Clarence J. Glacken's magisterial work is still important, *Traces on the Rhodian Shore: Nature and Culture in Western Thought from Ancient Times to the End of the Eighteenth Century* (Berkeley 1967).

24. Johann Hermann von Riedesel, *Remarques d'un voyageur moderne au Levant* (Amsterdam and Stuttgart 1773), 285–86: "L'inconstance, la finesse, la légéreté, la sagacité Grecque, tant ancienne que moderne, la valeur meme et le courage ancien s'expliquent fort biens par les influences d'un climàt temperé, plus froid que chaud, sec, serein, et d'un air vif et picquant." See David Constantine, *Early Greek Travelers and the Hellenic Ideal* (Cambridge 1984), for an excellent discussion of this issue.

25. August Pauly, *Lucians Werke* (Stuttgart 1827), 5: "Sein Geburtsort war Samosata, eine unfern des Euphrat's an den *aussersten Gränzen griechischer Kultur* gelegen Syrische Stadt, an deren Stelle heut zu Tage ein gänzlich unbedeutender Ort, Semisat, befindlich seyn soll."

26. Pauly (note 25), 5: "Besonders war es Athen, welches sich von jenen Umständen, so wie von der Vorliebe begünstigt, die Hadrian für diese Wiege des Wahren und Schönen hegte, schnell wieder zu einer bedeutenden höhe des Unsehens emporhob. Mehr als je war hier die Sammelplatz von Gelehrten und Künstlern aller Art, und nur der Grad der Geistesbildung bestimmte in dieser Musenstadt den Werth und die Achtung des Einzelnen, während bloser Rang und Reichthum nicht einmal vor jenem beissenden Spotte schützten, in welchem die Athener von jeher Meister waren. Der Aufenthalt in dieser Stadt, und daselbst der vertraute Umgang mit seinem väterlichen Freunde Demonax, dem veredelten Cyniker, dem er in einem seiner Aussätze ein so schones Denkmal setzt, war die wesentliche Epoche in Lucian's Bildungsgeschichte, und höchste einflussreich auf Zweck, Geist und Charakter, so wie auf die Form seiner schriftstellerischen Produktionen."

27. Wieland (note 16), 13; see W. Tooke (note 16), viii. Both the factuality as well as the authenticity of the *Demonax* were questioned as early as the seventeenth century by scholars who pointed primarily to the fact that we possess no other reference to *Demonax* outside of Lucian's own text. Interestingly, Tooke excises Wieland's reference to *Demonax* in the passage quoted above (the untranslated portion of Wieland is in brackets). Tooke's text reads: "All circumstances taken together, it seems highly probable that Lucian, immediately after his return from Gaul, lived for some years in Greece, and principally at Athens, where he composed the greater part of his finest dialogues [*wo er mit dem damals schon bejarhrten* Demonax, *seinem Ideal eines ächten Wiesen, viele Jahre gelebt zu haben versichert*]."

28. Pauly (note 25), 7.

29. Goddfried Wetzlar, *De Aetate, Vita, Scriptisque Luciani Samosatenis* (Marburg 1834), 45: "Maxima pars eorum . . . scriptorium . . . quae rhetoricam formam atque indolem habent, ut Tyrannicida, Bis Abdicatus, alia."

30. Wetzlar (note 29), 46.

31. Wetzlar (note 29), 49: "Quamvis enim, inquit, se Athenis vivere diserte nusquam eloquitur, tamen ubique ipsa id scripta testantur, illa, inquam, illius aetatis optima et pulcherrima, dialogi illi festivi et urbanitatis pleni, qui Athenis semper agunt, et omnes omnino Atticam spirant elegantiam et quoscunque sibi aequales memorat aut quibus aut consuetudine et familiaritate fuisset conjunctus, aut quorum mores vitamque bene perspexisset—illo ipso tempore Athenis vixisse, notum est."

32. Baumbach, (note 6), 164–67. As a schoolteacher, Planck was heavily involved in the debate over Lucian's suitability as a text for impressionable schoolboys.

33. Adolph Planck, *Quaestiones Lucianeae: Libelli Lucianei tempore atque ordine disponuntur, eorumque argumenta ita enarrantur, ut, quid de Luciani satira, philosophia, librorumque nonnullorum, qui videbantur historici, fide judicandum sit, appareat* (Tübingen 1850), 8: "Roma vero propter morum vitaeque turpitudinem relicta in Graeciam se convertit, ubi totum se daret philosophiae."

34. Planck (note 33), 8: "Athenarum vero urbem ut antiquissimam atrium libralium sedem elegisse sibi Lucianum, ut ex *Nigrino*, ubi summis hanc urbem affert laudibus, ita ex *Demonacte* demonstratur, ubi Atheniensi illi philosopho per plurimum tempus interfuisse se narrat."

35. Planck (note 33), 9: "Athenis per viginti fere annos versatum Lucianum, Athenis egregrios libros, quos hodie mirantur omnes, conscriptos, omnes fere consentiunt."

36. On the genre of satire in eighteenth and nineteenth century Germany, see Ann Taylor Allen, *Satire and Society in Wilhelmine Germany* (Lexington, KY 1984); Edson Chick, *Dances of Death: Wedekind, Brecht, Dürrenmacht, and the Satiric Tradition* (Columbia, SC 1984); Peter Carels, *The Satiric Treatise in Eighteenth Century Germany* (Berne and Frankfurt 1976).

37. E.g., Karl Ludwig Roth, *De Saturae Natura* (Erlangen 1843), 2–3: "However, no one could compose true and just satire except one burning with eagerness for right living and teaching, one who attacks with a certain indignation all depravity and perversity, for true satire cannot exist without indignation" (. . . *satiram contra nemo iustam veramque condiderit, nisi qui acriore veri vivendi docendique studio incensus cum quadam indignatione in prava omnia et perversa invehatur . . . nulla est nisi cum indignatione vera satira*). When Roth comes to distinguish between good satirists and bad, he places Lucian in the latter category and Horace in the former—the good satirists he describes as "those who pursue vice rather than the wicked" (*hi vitia potius quam improbos insectantur*). Hate the sin and not the sinner?

38. Maurice Olender, *Les langues du paradis: Aryens et Sémite, un couple providential* (Paris 1989; tr. Arthur Goldhammer, 1992: *The Languages of Paradise: Race, Religion and Philology in the Nineteenth Century*).

39. Henry W. L. Hime, "Natural Selection in War," *Journal of the Royal*

United Service Institution 21 (1878), 588–610. Hime adduced theories of social Darwinism as a justification for the superiority of the British Empire.

40. Henry W. L. Hime, *Lucian, The Syrian Satirist* (New York, London, and Bombay 1900), 2.

41. Hime (note 40), 2.

42. Hime (note 40), 2.

43. Hime (note 40), 45–46.

44. Eduard Norden, *Die Antike Kunstprosa* (Leipzig 1898; Stuttgart 1958), 1.394: "dem Orientalen ohne Tiefe und Charakter, aber woller Witz und Beweglichkeit, eigneten zwar die Μενιππειοι Χαριτες, aber von Attika besass er nicht die Χαρις, nur den μυκτηρ, mit dem er Hohes und Heiliges ins Frivole gezogen hat. Einst las ich ihn gern widerholt, jetzt gehe ich nur mit innerem Widerwillen an ihn heran. Er hat keine Seele und würdigt daher trotz aller Virtuosität die seelenvollste Sprache zum παιγνιον herab."

45. J. Bernays, *Lucian und die Kyniker* (Berlin 1879), 42: "Es bedurfte einer Kenntnis der Tiefen und Höhen der Menschennatur, wie Epiktet sie besass, um der doppelartigen Erscheinung der Kynismus Tadel und Lob gerecht zuzumessen. Ein Mann wie Lucian war dazu unfähig. Man darf vielleicht behaupten, dass er echte Kynismus dem Lucian war noch unleidlicher gewesen als der erheuchelte."

46. Assumptions about Lucian's "eastern" character have played a central role in arguments over the authenticity of various of his works. The *De Syria Dea* (ironically) is a case in point. In his 1927 entry for Pauly's *Real Encyclopädie*, Helm wrote: "Lucian kann es unmöglich gewesen sein wegen des ernsten Tones, der in der Schrift herrscht . . . die lange und durchauss ernst gehaltene Erzählung von Kombabos zeigen von lukianischen Geiste nicht die geringste Spur . . . in Lucians Leben ist kein Raum für eine derartige Phase gläubigen Gessinung, wie diese Schrift vorausetzt; man könnte nur in die frühe Jugend setzen."

47. Rudolf Helm, *Lucian und Menipp* (Leipzig 1906), 160–61. Bernays (note 45), 42–43. Bernays also objected to Jacob's comparison of Lucian and Voltaire : "Seine [Lucian's] modernen Bewunderen wie Tadler pflegen ihn mit Voltaire zu vergleichen, ein Vergleich der gegen Voltaire an jeder Beziehung ungerecht ist." Bernays referred to Karl Georg Jacob's *Charakteristik Lucians von Samosata* (Hamburg 1832) as "viel zu enkommiastischer."

48. Helm (note 47), 6–7: "Beide hatten einen heiligen Ernst, der dem leichtfertigen Syrer abgeht; er besitzt nichts von der sich in inneren Widerspruch verzehrenden Seele des Tragikers, nichts von den begeisterten Treue und Überzeugtheit des ritterlichen "Pfaffenfeindes." Selbst gegen die Parallele mit dem Spötter Voltaire hat man Recht Einspruch erhoben. Ein passender Vergleich drängt sich auf, obschon auch er hinkt wie alle Vergleich, der mit Heinrich Heine, der Spottdrossel im deutschen Dichterwalde, der ihm nur an Charakterlosigkeit, an Genialität und Originalität, aber auch an Malice weit überlegen ist."

49. Helm (note 47), 7–8: "Liebe zur Wahrheit, seiner Hass gegen Betrug und Unnatur . . . wieviel davon etwa auf Rechnung seiner Vorbilder zu schreiben ist."

50. Helm (note 47), 8–9: "In einer modernen Sammlung, die sich *Bücher der Weisheit und Schönheit* betitelt, kann man neben der *Bibel* und Kants *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* Lucian finden."