

# Two Enemies of Lucian

C. P. Jones

THOSE WHO MOCK the foibles of others tend to be reticent about themselves, and Lucian is no exception. For all his comments on the world around him, he has little to say about his background, family or education; there is not even agreement about his profession. But sometimes modern ignorance is due not to Lucian's reticence but to the loss of information that was readily available to his public. In what follows it will be argued that two enemies, whom he chooses not to name in his attacks on them, can be identified from other sources, notably from Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*.<sup>1</sup>

## I. *Lexiphanes*

The *Lexiphanes* is a dialogue between Lucian and a sophist (23) satirized under the clearly fabricated name of 'Lexiphanes'. The sophist's conversation and (as soon appears) his writing betray an obsession with linguistic novelty, whether familiar words used in strange senses, or outright neologisms. Thus in his opening remarks (1), *τητινός* 'yearling' is known only from the grammarians; *νεοχμός* 'newen' was already archaic in the classical period; *ἀρτιγραφής* 'new-writ', *κυψελόβυστος* 'wax-stopt', and *ἀντικυμποσιάζω* 'I counter-tain', all appear to be novel coinages, presumably of Lucian himself. After their preliminary conversation (1), *Lexiphanes* reads Lucian part of his recently completed *Symposium*, in which naturally his linguistic peculiarities are displayed to the full (2–15). Eventually Lucian interrupts him with an outburst against his "swarm of strange and awkward words, some of which you made up yourself, others you grubbed up from wherever they were buried" (16–17). At that

<sup>1</sup> I wish to thank Professors T. D. Barnes, G. W. Bowersock and J. F. Gilliam for their criticisms. The following abbreviations will be used: BOWERSOCK, *Sophists*=G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1969); HELM=R. Helm, "Lukianos," *RE* 13 (1927) 1725–77; SCHWARTZ, *Biographie*=J. Schwartz, *Biographie de Lucien de Samosate*, Collection Latomus 83 (Brussels 1965).

moment (18), Sopolis the doctor arrives, and on hearing of Lexiphanes' disorder applies an emetic; Lexiphanes drinks, vomits a large number of hyperatticisms and neologisms, and Sopolis hands him over to Lucian to be educated afresh (19–21). Lucian advises Lexiphanes to read the ancients (22), not merely the sophists of the preceding generation (23); he should no longer try to drag in every “outlandish word” (ῥῆμα ἔκφυλον) he finds or makes up (24); above all, he should not hope to be thought the last word in Atticism when he makes mistakes that even schoolboys avoid (25).

Lucian gives practically no information about the sophist's circumstances. There is perhaps a hint that he was from a region not too remote from Lucian's own Commagene when the author says, “You cannot imagine how I prayed for the earth to swallow me” on hearing Lexiphanes make his blunders in public (25): that sounds like the discomfort of an assimilated foreigner at the uncouthness of a fellow-immigrant. Lexiphanes has variously been identified as Herodian the grammarian, Phrynichus, Pollux, Pompeianus of Philadelphia (an otherwise unknown sophist mentioned by Athenaeus), Ulpian of Tyre (one of Athenaeus' ‘Deipnosophistae’), and the unnamed Phoenician mocked in Lucian's *Pseudologista*.<sup>2</sup> Yet there is a sophist who does not seem to have been considered, and yet may be held to fit Lucian's portrait more closely than any of these.

The clue is given in the course of Lexiphanes' *Symposium*, of which he himself is the narrator. One of the interlocutors asks him whether he was dining in town on the previous evening, and Lexiphanes replies that he had been in the country: οἰσθα δὲ ὡς φίλαγρός εἰμι (3). Now φίλαγρος as an adjective, ‘country-fond’, appears to be another invention of Lucian.<sup>3</sup> But as a name Φίλαγρος is not uncommon and has by far its most conspicuous representative in a sophist of Lucian's own day, Philagrus of Cilicia. Lucian's audience can hardly have failed to hear a pun in Lexiphanes' words: not only “You know how country-fond I am” but also “You know that I am Philagrus.” The sly revelation of the victim's real name has a parallel in Lucian's *Rhetorum praeceptor*, where the victim is revealed as Pollux of Naucratis by his

<sup>2</sup> For the first three, see the references in Helm 1748; for Pompeianus and Ulpian (Athen. 97E), A. M. Harmon, *Lucian* V (LCL 1936) 291; for the ‘Pseudologista’, M. D. Macleod, *CQ* N.S. 6 (1956) 109–10, who also entertains some of the other possibilities.

<sup>3</sup> LSJ cite only one other instance of it, *Mnemosyne*, SER. III 4 (1936) 11 (= *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 13163: Athens, “s. III p.”), where it means ‘fond of hunting’ (ἄγρα).

remark, "I am no longer called 'Pothinus' but have become a namesake of the sons of Zeus and Leda."<sup>4</sup>

All that is known about Philagrus is found in Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*.<sup>5</sup> He was a pupil of the Ephesian sophist Lollianus, presumably in Athens, since it was there that Lollianus held the municipal chair.<sup>6</sup> As a sophist he travelled extensively, and later in life returned to Athens to hear Herodes Atticus, though according to Philostratus his visit was a failure. He finally held the chair of rhetoric at Rome and died there, or at sea, early in old age. It will be recalled that Lucian's victim appeared to be from the vicinity of Lucian's Commagene. It may even be that Lucian heard Philagrus precisely in Athens: that would cohere with his claim that 'the best people' called Lexiphanes a 'Hellene' and 'Attic' only in irony, while secretly laughing at his barbarisms (23). Two details in Philostratus' account of Philagrus' later visit to Athens closely fit Lucian's sketch. One is the story of his angry exchange with a pupil of Herodes, in which he let slip an ἔκφυλον ῥήμα: Lucian taxes Lexiphanes precisely with using any ῥήμα ἔκφυλον he can.<sup>7</sup> The other is Philostratus' description of Philagrus' style as "giving offence because it was considered new-sounding and disjointed in its ideas" (προσέκρουε . . . νεαρορηχῆς δόξασα καὶ ἐπασμαμένη τὰς ἐννοίας): Lucian confirms not only the first of Philostratus' charges but also the second, since he blames Lexiphanes for "not preparing your thoughts before your words" (οὐ πρότερον τὰς διανοίας τῶν λέξεων προπαρεσκευασμένος).<sup>8</sup> It seems, however, from the extracts of Philagrus given by Philostratus that Lucian has enormously exaggerated the frequency of his oddities; and Lucian does not appear to have tried to imitate Philagrus' rhythms, which Philostratus thought so striking.

If it is conceded that Lucian's *Lexiphanes* is an attack on Philagrus of Cilicia, it remains to bring the work into conjunction with what is known of the satirist's career. By his own account, Lucian took up rhetoric in Ionia as a young man and travelled widely as a successful

<sup>4</sup> *Rhet.pr.* 24. This identification is now generally accepted: see E. Bethe, *RE* 10 (1917) 775; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> I 474.

<sup>5</sup> Philostr. *VS* 2.8 (p.83 line 24–p.86 line 21 K.); 2.22 (p.106 line 22 K.).

<sup>6</sup> On Lollianus see Philostr. *VS* 1.23 (p.38 line 29–p.40 line 6 K.); O. Schissel, *Philologus* 82 (1927) 181–201; J. Keil, *JOAI* 40 (1953) 7–12; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> H 203; Bowersock, *Sophists* 18, 26; A. Henrichs, *ZPE* 4 (1969) 214–15.

<sup>7</sup> Philostr. *VS* 2.8.1 (p.84 line 11 K.): Lucian, *Lex.* 24.

<sup>8</sup> Philostr. *VS* 2.8.2 (p.84 lines 27–29 K.): Lucian, *Lex.* 24.

sophist.<sup>9</sup> He claims to have given up this career at forty, and so (very approximately) about the year 160.<sup>10</sup> Part of this sophistic period was spent in Athens, since Lucian shows a detailed knowledge of the city and its antiquities, and his account of the Athenian philosopher Demonax, who flourished under Pius and M. Aurelius, claims to be based on a long personal acquaintance.<sup>11</sup> Moreover, his statement that the Olympic games of 165 were the fourth he had attended implies frequent visits to Greece previously and perhaps residence there.<sup>12</sup> Hence Lucian might well have been present in Athens when Philagrus of Cilicia revisited the city and made an unfavourable impression with his neologisms and *non sequiturs*. If this is right, the *Lexiphanes* should be a comparatively early work. Another of Lucian's early targets, as it happens, was Philagrus' teacher Lollianus: in a mocking epigram he depicts the departed sophist trying to enroll Hermes *psychopompus* among his pupils.<sup>13</sup>

## II. *Pseudologista*

The Mistaken Critic (*Pseudologista*) is again an attack on a sophist, though it is much more violent than the *Lexiphanes*, and the description of the victim is more circumstantial. By Lucian's account the quarrel between them began at a celebration of the Olympic games when he laughed at one of the sophist's speeches (5–7). Later, not long before the composition of the treatise, they had met again in Ephesus on a third of January, "when the Romans by some ancient custom make certain prayers in person for the whole year and perform sacrifices, of which the ritual was established by their king Numa" (8): the reference is clearly to the annual prayers for the well-being of the ruling house.<sup>14</sup> On this occasion Lucian had made a gibe at the sophist

<sup>9</sup> *Apol.* 15 is crucial: ἐνέτυχες ἡμῖν τοῖς μεγαλομίθοις τῶν σοφιστῶν ἐναριθμουμένοις. There is no merit in Sommerbrodt's ἐνέτυχον ὑμῶν, though it is accepted by Schwartz, *Biographie* 12. Cf. also *Bis acc.* 27, *Somm.* 15. E. J. Putnam, "Lucian the Sophist," *CP* 4 (1909) 162–77, is still worth reading.

<sup>10</sup> *Bis acc.* 32, cf. *Rhet. pr.* 26. For the date of Lucian's birth cf. Helm 1727, "etwa 120."

<sup>11</sup> Athens: cf. J. Delz, *Lukians Kenntnis der athenischen Antiquitäten* (diss. Basel 1947, 1950). Demonax: *Demon.* 1.

<sup>12</sup> *Peregr.* 35. On the date see *infra* p.484.

<sup>13</sup> Lucian, *Epigr.* 26 = *Anth. Pal.* 11.274.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny* (Oxford 1966) 611–12; P. Herrmann, *Der römische Kaisereid* (Göttingen 1968) 73, 110. That the scene is Ephesus follows from §§ 10 and

in which he used the word ἀποφράς 'evil day', and his enemy accused him of employing it barbarously (1, 8).<sup>15</sup> Lucian's reply is divided between a defence of his usage and an attack on the sophist's character and history, which he claims to know 'at first hand' (οἴκοθεν, 2). The Critic was from "the fairest and largest of all the cities in Phoenicia" (19). He had allegedly begun his career as a prostitute (18), a minor actor (19, 25), and a petty schoolmaster (25): all these items are from the common stock of invective and need not be taken very seriously.<sup>16</sup> The man had then moved to Antioch (20), presumably to complete his education in rhetoric, though Lucian is naturally not interested in any respectable motive. It may have been here that Lucian came to know him, since as a great cultural centre Antioch could easily attract students from Commagene as well as Phoenicia: a late tradition maintains that Lucian began his career as a barrister there.<sup>17</sup> After getting himself into debt by buying expensive clothes, the Critic had moved to Alexandria (21) and thereafter to Greece and Italy (10, 27). In Italy he had entered the service of a man "among the best of the Romans," whose name Lucian declines to reveal "since everyone knows whom I mean" (21). According to Lucian he had been dismissed for immorality and was now established as a sophist in Ephesus (10, 22): this need be no more than a malevolent interpretation of the fact that he was now no longer living in the great man's household but pursuing an independent career. At the time of Lucian's assault the Critic was at least in middle age (27, 31); Lucian reproaches himself for trying "to change an old man's ways" (γέροντα ἄνδρα μεταπαιδεύειν, 13), which taken strictly would imply an age of at least sixty, but he seems to be thinking of some proverb as much as of literal fact.<sup>18</sup> It also seems that the Critic either was a pederast or

22: for some reason B. Baldwin, *CR* n.s. 12 (1962) 3 n.1, supposes it to be Rome. Lucian's treatise was not, however, necessarily written in Ephesus, as assumed by Helm (1757) among others.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. the similar story told about Philagrus of Cilicia, Philostr. *VS* 2.8.1 (p.84 lines 2–15 K.).

<sup>16</sup> M. Kokolakis, *Platon* 11 (1959) 46–51, has an elaborate discussion of the Critic's acting career. The *loci classici* are of course in Demosthenes' attacks on Aeschines: *Dem.* 18.129, 180, 242; 19.337.

<sup>17</sup> Antioch: cf. already Cic. *pro Arch.* 4. Lucian: *Suda*, A 683.

<sup>18</sup> E.g. of Soph. *OC* 395, γέροντα δ' ὀρθοῦν φαῦλον ὅς νέος πέση, which became proverbial: *Corpus paroemiograph. graec.*, edd. E. L. von Leutsch and F. G. Schneidewin (Göttingen 1839–1851) I p.358 § 97, II p.106 § 51, etc. On the age implied by γέρων, see Schwartz, *Biographie* 15 n.2; C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford 1971) 20 n.1.

might easily pass for one, since Lucian dwells on this charge with such ferocity and insistence that it seems more than merely factitious (20–22, 27–28).

It has been widely held that the sophist's real name was 'Timarchus' from Lucian's remark that the Athenians "honoured you with the addition of one letter and called you 'Atimarchus': for you had to outdo him too" (27). But Lucian is clearly referring to the Timarchus attacked by Aeschines in his famous speech, where again perversion is the principal charge;<sup>19</sup> as a rule, moreover, Lucian prefers to allude anonymously to prominent men among the living whether friend or foe. More recently the name of Lucian's victim has been declared beyond recovery.<sup>20</sup> Yet, as with the *Lexiphanes*, help may be forthcoming from extraneous sources.

The Mistaken Critic was from "the fairest and largest of all the cities in Phoenicia" (19). That description, as has long been observed, should denote Tyre, the metropolis of the region.<sup>21</sup> Now there is a very eminent sophist of Lucian's time who came precisely from Tyre, Hadrian.<sup>22</sup> The possibility that this man was Lucian's Critic has recently been raised and rejected,<sup>23</sup> but it deserves further investigation.

Hadrian's birth can be dated around 110.<sup>24</sup> There is no evidence that his early career had taken him to Antioch or Alexandria, though that is not unlikely for a sophist born in a region adjacent to Syria: thus Alexander the Clay-Plato was born in Cilician Seleuceia and spent most of his life in Antioch, Rome, Tarsus and Egypt.<sup>25</sup> The Critic next went to Greece: Hadrian is said by Philostratus to have been "trained

<sup>19</sup> Thus, rightly, Harmon, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 404 n.1. For the other view, see (for instance) Helm 1757.

<sup>20</sup> Baldwin, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.14) 4: "Who was the sophist concerned? . . . A negative answer must be given."

<sup>21</sup> Thus Macleod, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 109; Schwartz, *Biographie* 117 (Tyre or Beirut). On Roman Tyre see now M. Chéhab, *MélUSJ* 38 (1962) 13–40.

<sup>22</sup> The basic text is Philostr. *VS* 2.10 (p.89 line 32–p.94 line 28 K.). Cf. W. Schmid, *RE* 7 (1912) 2176–77; *PIR*<sup>2</sup> H 4; Bowersock, *Sophists* 55, 82–84, 91–92.

<sup>23</sup> Schwartz, *Biographie* 117 n.1: "il ne paraît pas possible de songer sérieusement au sophiste Claudius Hadrianus de Tyr, même pour quelques détails de ce portrait féroce." Cf. Bowersock, *Sophists* 116: "nowhere in the vast surviving corpus of his writings does [Lucian] attack sophists such as Polemo, Hadrian, or Damian."

<sup>24</sup> He is said to have died at eighty under Commodus, which in itself would allow a range of 100–113, Philostr. *VS* 2.10.6 (p.94 line 6 K.). But since his teacher Herodes was born about 101 (Groag, *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 802, p.177), Hadrian ought to have been born at least a decade later.

<sup>25</sup> Philostr. *VS* 2.5.2 (p.77 lines 23–25 K.).

by Athens.”<sup>26</sup> Lucian’s references to the Critic’s stay in Italy and to his service with a man “among the best of the Romans” fit Hadrian particularly closely. For he appears in Rome attending Galen’s anatomical lectures “when still not a sophist” (*οὐπω σοφιστεύων*), that is, before he had begun his public career as a virtuoso speaker.<sup>27</sup> These lectures of Galen can be dated roughly to the period from 161 to 164.<sup>28</sup> At this time Hadrian was attached to the household of the consular Flavius Boethus, whose *patria*, Ptolemais, was very close to his own.<sup>29</sup> As an eminent patron of learning Boethus may be the unnamed “employer” of the Critic. But not necessarily: another consular who attended this same set of lectures was Cn. Claudius Severus, the son-in-law of M. Aurelius,<sup>30</sup> and Severus was certainly Hadrian’s patron later, when the sophist set up a statue to him on the base of which he calls him his *προστάτης*.<sup>31</sup> In the same text Hadrian also calls Severus *ἔξοχος Ἑλλήνων, πρόκριτος Ἀυσονίων*. Similarly Herodian comments that Marcus married his daughters *ἀνδράσι τῆς κυκλήτου βουλῆς τοῖς ἀρίστοις*, which recalls Lucian’s characterization of the Critic’s employer as *ἀνὴρ ἐν τοῖς ἀρίστοις Ῥωμαίων*.<sup>32</sup> Lucian’s description might seem to fit Severus more precisely even than Boethus. If so, it may be inferred either that Hadrian had consorted with both men in Rome, which in view of their connection with Galen is not unlikely, or else that Hadrian’s later friendship with Severus caused Lucian to believe him Severus’ client in Rome as well.

Lucian’s enemy had left his patron’s household and was currently posing as a sophist in Ephesus: Philostratus records that Hadrian taught for a time at Ephesus and was the rival of Aelius Aristides, who taught in Smyrna.<sup>33</sup> By a curious coincidence Ephesus provides striking proof of Hadrian’s eminence in the monument already mentioned, which he set up to Claudius Severus after his friend’s marriage with a daughter of M. Aurelius.<sup>34</sup> The inscription on this can be dated

<sup>26</sup> Philostr. VS 2.10.1 (p.90 line 1 K.).

<sup>27</sup> Galen, ed. C. G. Kühn vol.XIV p.627. For this explanation of Galen’s phrase, see Bowersock, *Sophists* 13–14.

<sup>28</sup> The limits are provided by the date of Galen’s arrival in Rome (see *infra* n.45) and by the presence of M. Civica Barbarus (cf. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 602).

<sup>29</sup> Galen 14.627. On Boethus, see *PIR*<sup>2</sup> F 229.

<sup>30</sup> Galen 14.629. Cf. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> C 1024.

<sup>31</sup> J. Keil, *JOAI* 40 (1953) 14 = *SEG* 13.505.

<sup>32</sup> *Hdn.* 1.2.2; Lucian, *Pseudol.* 21.

<sup>33</sup> Philostr. VS 2.23.2 (p.107 lines 24–26 K.).

<sup>34</sup> Keil, *loc.cit.* (*supra* n.31).

on internal evidence between about 163 and 169.<sup>35</sup> It therefore emerges that when Galen met him in the early 160's Hadrian was just about to begin his public career by taking his first chair, at Ephesus. Severus, who was himself related to dynastic families of the Greek East, is likely to have had a hand in the appointment, just as he later intervened in Hadrian's appointment to the chair at Athens.<sup>36</sup> Even when Galen met him Hadrian must have been not less than fifty and probably more: that accords with Lucian's reference to his "grey hairs" (31), even if his "old man" (13) is a slight exaggeration.<sup>37</sup>

Lucian's treatise can certainly be dated to Hadrian's Ephesian period, since the quarrel that inspired it had taken place there. Later Lucian must have had the dissatisfaction of seeing his enemy advance even higher. When Marcus visited Athens in 176, Hadrian was already holding the imperial chair of rhetoric, having been appointed by the emperor merely on the strength of his reputation. Severus, who may have been travelling with Marcus, encouraged the emperor to make a personal trial of the sophist: the mild criticism of Hadrian's style that Severus expressed on the occasion does not show that he had broken with his former client but is merely the judgement of a connoisseur on a recognized master.<sup>38</sup> Hadrian declaimed before the emperor with great success and was rewarded with a shower of gifts and privileges. Later he ascended the chair of rhetoric at Rome. On his death-bed, when he was about eighty, he was allegedly appointed by Commodus to the position of *ab epistulis Graecis* but died before he could assume his duties. In fact Commodus may not have cared very much for Hadrian.<sup>39</sup>

Naturally, since he is writing about Hadrian as a great sophist and the successor of Herodes Atticus, Philostratus does not provide details

<sup>35</sup> R. Syme, *Historia* 17 (1968) 102–03. Severus seems to have married Marcus' eldest daughter, Annia Galeria Faustina (*PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 714), ca. 163, and since the inscription refers to "emperors" it should be earlier than L. Verus' death in the winter of 168/9.

<sup>36</sup> Philostr. *VS* 2.10.4 (p.93 lines 2–10 K.). On this incident see further *infra*.

<sup>37</sup> See *supra* p.479.

<sup>38</sup> Philostr. *VS* 2.10.4 (p.93 lines 2–10 K.). Philostratus' verb *διαβάλλοντος* need imply nothing stronger than a reproof, cf *LSJ* s.v. v 1. Cf. Bowersock, *Sophists* 84.

<sup>39</sup> Philostr. *VS* 2.10.6 (p.93 line 32–p.94 line 5 K.), with the discussion of this incident by Bowersock, *Sophists* 55. The *Suda* (A 528) states that Hadrian actually held the post (*ἀντιγραφεὺς . . . ἐγένετο*): since its ultimate source is likely to be Philostratus (F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer literarischen Form* [Leipzig 1901] 256–58), this looks like a compiler's error.



about his private life to match those in Lucian. Nevertheless, he dwells on Hadrian's extravagant style of living, and among other things mentions his ἐσθῆτα πλείστου ἀξίαν: Lucian also alleges that his Critic bought ἐσθῆτας πολυτελεῖς on credit in Antioch.<sup>40</sup> Similarly Lucian's charges of pederasty perhaps find a remote echo in Philostratus' description of Hadrian consorting with his pupils "at play, over wine, in the hunt . . . and by accompanying them to Greek festivals, so that they were disposed to him as children to a sweet and gentle father, one who joined them in maintaining Greek frivolity."<sup>41</sup> That Hadrian made other enemies than Lucian is confirmed by Philostratus' report that he was accused of murdering another sophist's pupil; and the biographer is also concerned to defend his hero against the charge of ἀναιδεία.<sup>42</sup> The picture of Hadrian would be sharper still if by any chance he were one of the sophists whom Aristides attacks in an extant speech for their devotion to wordly pleasures, in the first place pederasty: this speech is likely to have been delivered just when Hadrian was teaching in Ephesus as a rival of Aristides.<sup>43</sup> Nor is the possibility to be discounted that Hadrian's lost *Metamorphoses* was the salacious original on which Apuleius based his romance of the same title.<sup>44</sup>

If the identification of Lucian's Critic as Hadrian of Tyre is accepted, it may be used to supplement what is known about the satirist himself. It has been seen that when the *Pseudologista* was written Hadrian was in Ephesus. It cannot therefore be earlier than 161, the earliest possible date for Galen's lecture which Hadrian attended,<sup>45</sup> or later than 176, when he was already established at Athens. Since Lucian might have passed through Ephesus at almost any time during this period, it might not seem wise to delimit the date further.

<sup>40</sup> Philostr. VS 2.10.2 (p.91 lines 18–19 K.): Lucian, *Pseudol.* 21.

<sup>41</sup> Philostr. VS 2.10.2 (p.91 lines 25–30 K.).

<sup>42</sup> Philostr. VS 2.10.3 (p.92 lines 3–27 K.); 2.10.6 (p.94 lines 12–20 K.).

<sup>43</sup> Aristid. 33 K., esp. § 20: ἄλλοις μὲν οὖν ὁμιλία παιδικῶν ἡδύ, τοῖς δ' εἰς πλῆθος πιεῖν, τοὺς δ' ἵπποι καὶ κύνες ἐξέπληξαν. On the date of 33 K., note esp. §§ 30–32 referring to the plague of the late 160's as still rampant (cf. C. A. Behr, *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales* [Amsterdam 1968] 102–03). Aristides and Hadrian: Philostr. VS 2.23.2 (p.107 lines 24–26 K.).

<sup>44</sup> Hadrian's *Metamorphoses*: *Suda*, A 528. Cf. now H. van Thiel, *Der Eselsroman. I: Untersuchungen* (Munich 1971) 38–39.

<sup>45</sup> Galen's stay in Rome lasted from soon after the beginning of Marcus' reign (2.215) to shortly before Verus' return from the East in 166 (14.649). J. Ilberg argued for 162 as the date of his arrival, but had to emend Galen's text (ed. Kühn vol. XVIII.1 p.347) to fit: *NJbb* 15 (1905) 286 n.1, *Sudhoffs Archiv für Geschichte der Medizin* 23 (1930) 290.

Nevertheless, a suggestion may be advanced which, if wrong, does not affect the question of the Critic's identity.

It so happens that the first half of the 160's is the best known part of Lucian's career. The crucial date, unfortunately attested only by translations of Eusebius' *Chronicle*,<sup>46</sup> is 165: for that is the year when the Cynic Peregrinus immolated himself after the Olympic games, and Lucian was present at the festival for the fourth time.<sup>47</sup> Around this date several other items can be arranged. Lucian was almost certainly in the entourage of L. Verus at Antioch during the Parthian War. Two of his works, the *Imagines* and the *Pro imaginibus*, are written in praise of Verus' mistress Panthea, whom the emperor presumably had with him in Antioch before his marriage to Lucilla, the daughter of Marcus, in about 164.<sup>48</sup> Similarly, Lucian's treatise *De saltatione* was apparently composed in Antioch to gratify Verus' taste for pantomimes.<sup>49</sup> Lucian must have returned to Greece before the end of the war, however, to be at the Olympic games of 165. This return journey is presumably the one described in the *Alexander*, which took him from Cappadocia along the Pontic coast to Bithynia; he then appears to have gone south to Ionia before crossing to Achaëa.<sup>50</sup>

It has already been seen that some of Lucian's early career was spent in Athens, and that he gave up his sophistic ambitions about 160.<sup>51</sup> Since he next appears in the entourage of L. Verus in the East, it is a reasonable inference that his renunciation of sophistry and his attachment to the new emperor are connected. Now Verus is known to have visited Athens in the late autumn of 162, since illness prevented him from attending the Eleusinian mysteries, normally celebrated in September or October, and they had to be repeated for his benefit.<sup>52</sup>

<sup>46</sup> Hieron. *Chron.* p.204 lines 24-26 Helm<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>47</sup> Lucian, *Peregr.* 35.

<sup>48</sup> On Verus in Antioch cf. H.A. *Verus* 7.3-4; G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria* (Princeton 1961) 226; T. D. Barnes, *JRS* 57 (1967) 71-72. On Panthea: H.A. *Verus* 7.10; *PIR*<sup>1</sup> P 69; Barnes, *art.cit.* 72. Verus' marriage is dated only by H.A. *M.Ant.* 9.4, *medio belli tempore*: Barnes argues for 163 on the ground that the inscription *AE* 1959.13 does not call Verus 'Armeniacus', but the context does not demand the emperor's full titulature.

<sup>49</sup> D. S. Robertson, *Essays and Studies presented to William Ridgeway* (Cambridge 1913) 180-85; cf. Helm 1760, M. Kokolakis, *Platon* 11 (1959) 3-54.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. *Alex.* 55-57 (Cappadocia to Bithynia), *Hist.conscr.* 14 (Ionia, Achaëa). Cf. A. Stein, *Strena Buliciana* (Zagreb 1924) 264-65; *PIR*<sup>3</sup> H 40.

<sup>51</sup> See *supra* p.478.

<sup>52</sup> *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 869= *IG* II<sup>2</sup> 3592; cf. T. D. Barnes, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.48) 71. E. Kapetanopoulos, *REG* 83 (1970) 69 and n.23, argues that the Mysteries into which Verus was initiated were the Lesser

This visit, it may be suggested, gave Lucian the impulse to abandon his career as a sophist and to put his hopes in imperial patronage. If this is correct, it may provide the background for Lucian's encounter with his Critic in Ephesus, since Verus stopped there also, presumably around the end of the same year.<sup>53</sup> The incident took place on a third of January, the day of the annual prayers for the safety of the imperial house. Lucian's insistence on the sanctity of the day and his abomination of his Critic would be particularly appropriate if the emperor were there in person, all the more so if he were on his way to a theatre of war. The quarrel may, therefore, have taken place precisely on the third of January 163, when Lucian had recently left Athens and arrived in Ephesus with his imperial patron. He will then have accompanied Verus on to Antioch, the setting of his works in praise of the emperor's mistress and other entertainments. If this reconstruction is not right, however, there is still room for Lucian to visit Ephesus with the emperor later, since Verus is known to have returned there to meet his intended wife Lucilla.<sup>54</sup>

Although Lucian confines his attack on Hadrian to charges of immorality, the quarrel between them, it may be suspected, was ultimately a professional one. Hadrian had just left his patron's establishment to hold the first in a series of appointments which was to bring him to the peak of sophistic success, the chair at Rome: Lucian had just given up the same career in disgust at his own failure. Hadrian must also have been among the courtiers of L. Verus, since at some stage he composed a funeral oration for a favourite pantomime of the emperor.<sup>55</sup> The last embers of this quarrel appear in Lucian's *Rhetorum praeceptor*, a satirical lesson on how to become a sophist without really trying. His target here is evidently the lexicographer

---

ones, "perhaps in late spring or summer of A.D. 162." That is unlikely, if only because of Verus' illness at Canusium (H.A. *M.Ant.* 8.11, *Verus* 6.7) and his slow progress (H.A. *Verus* 6.9).

<sup>53</sup> H.A. *Verus* 6.9 (*per singulas maritimas civitates Asiae*): *JOAI* 44 (1959) Beibl. 257ff, no.3 (*AE* 1959.13). Cf. A. R. Birley, *Marcus Aurelius* (London 1966) 167-68; Barnes, *op.cit.* 71.

<sup>54</sup> H.A. *Verus* 7.7. Cf. *PIR*<sup>2</sup> A 707; Barnes, *op.cit.* 72.

<sup>55</sup> Liban. 4 p.445 lines 7ff F., presumably identical with the Paris of H.A. *Verus* 8.7, despite the doubts of E. Wüst, *RE* 18 (1949) 1538 no.4. Note also that Hadrian, like Lucian, wrote a *Phalaris* (*Suda*, A 528). It would not be wise, however, to connect Hadrian's *Metamorphoses* with the extant *Lucius sive Asinus*, which might be derived from it (*supra* n.44), since Lucian is very unlikely to be the author (so, rightly, H. van Thiel, *op.cit.* [*supra* n.44] 37-38).

Pollux, a pupil of Hadrian and like him an incumbent of chairs at Athens and Rome.<sup>56</sup>

The argument may be summarized. It has been maintained here that for the first part of his career Lucian was indeed a sophist, as he himself admits. He had taken up the career in Ionia and pursued it mainly in Athens. The *Lexiphanes*, aimed at Philagrus of Cilicia, seems to be from this sophistic period. Roughly at the age of forty, Lucian abandoned the attempt to become a great sophist; this decision may have been signalized by his departure from Athens, perhaps in the entourage of L. Verus in 162. At Ephesus, possibly in the following winter, he met his old enemy Hadrian of Tyre, and this meeting gave rise to the bitter invective of the *Pseudologista*. From Ephesus Lucian proceeded, presumably with Verus, to Antioch and there wrote works extolling the emperor's mistress and his cherished pantomimes. About 164 or 165 Lucian left Antioch and returned to Greece; why he should have abandoned his patron is unclear, though it could be surmised that the panegyrist of the emperor's mistress was not welcome to his new wife. Back in Greece Lucian composed his treatise on how to write history, an oblique encomium of Verus' Parthian victories. If he thought that his friendship with the emperor might lead to rapid advancement, he seems to have been disappointed; after Verus' death too close a connection with him might have been a handicap,<sup>57</sup> and Lucian's character was not of a type to appeal to Marcus. In compensation, he was left free to vent his disappointment in satire. Only in old age, when he had "one foot in the grave" (*Apol.* 1), did he achieve some recognition by securing a position on the staff of the prefect of Egypt.<sup>58</sup> The emperor who rescued Lucian from

<sup>56</sup> See *supra* p.477 and n.4.

<sup>57</sup> Marcus was allegedly estranged from Herodes Atticus because of Herodes' friendship with Verus: Philostr. *VS* 2.1.11 (p.68 lines 22–23 K.). If this is true, however, they were soon reconciled; cf. Philostr. *VS* 2.1.12 (p.69 line 24–p.70 line 27 K.), and see now the inscription of Marcus from Athens published by James H. Oliver, *Hesperia* Suppl. 13 (1970) 8, lines 87–94 (cf. C. P. Jones, *ZPE* 8 [1971] 181–82).

<sup>58</sup> Since the article of H.-G. Pflaum, *MélRome* 71 (1959) 281–86, it has been generally assumed that Lucian's position was that of *archistator praefecti Aegypto* (thus *PIR*<sup>3</sup> L 370, *e.g.*). But Lucian's description of his duties, *Apol.* 12, agrees very closely with Philo, *In Flacc.* 131, and in both the reference seems clearly to be to the *ὑπομνηματογράφος*. Hence it seems better to adhere to the old view, not mentioned by Pflaum, that this was Lucian's post: see, most recently, J. F. Gilliam, *CP* 56 (1961) 103, Addendum, to whom I owe especial thanks for guidance on this point.

obscurity may have been one who by his name and style of life recalled his uncle rather than his father—Commodus.<sup>59</sup>

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO *and*  
INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY  
*July, 1972*

<sup>59</sup> Schwartz, *Biographie* 12–13, places Lucian's service in Egypt in the early 170's, but his arguments are without weight: see Bowersock, *Sophists* 114 n.6 (on p.115). That Lucian lived past 180 is shown by *Alex.* 48.