Originalveröffentlichung in: PCPhS 47, 2001, 117-140

# FRIGID ENTHUSIASTS: LUCIAN ON WRITING HISTORY*

Lucian's singular role within the socio-cultural context of the period known as the Second Sophistic has found increasing appreciation amongst scholars, particularly over the last fifteen years.[1] Although not a sophist in the true sense,[2] Lucian can be regarded as an outstanding *pepaideumenos*, meaning this: during an era in which being Greek was less a matter of political than of cultural definition, and in which membership in the upper administrative echelons was dependent on academic qualifications, on the mastery, that is, of a code which consisted of broad general knowledge and rhetorical activity partnered by thorough conversancy with the literary heritage and language of Attic Greece – during this age, then, Lucian proved himself not only a worthy representative of such *paideia*,[3] but also contributed with his literary works to its development and adaptation.

This explains why Lucian frequently tenders criticism or good advice in his writings, directing the like at (more or less qualified) contenders in the *paideia* discourse, and thus at the greater part of his intended audience.[4] While most of his texts deal with the exponents proper of classical training – the rhetors and philosophers –, Lucian's *How to Write History* is singular in three respects. First, the theoretical treatise is an unusual choice of genre for this author.[5] Secondly, by singling out historians as a special group

* For their constructive advice and helpful discussions I would like to thank the following friends and colleagues: Niklas Holzberg, Martin Hose, Sven Lorenz, Ulrich Rütten, and Sabine Vogt. I am also most grateful to Christine Jackson-Holzberg, who translated the paper into English and contributed with her critical queries to the final cohesion of my arguments, and to the anonymous reader who improved it by acute remarks.

1 Cf. for example Jacques Bompaire, *Lucien écrivain*, Paris 1958; Simon Swain, *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50–250*, Oxford 1996, on Lucian 299–329; R. Bracht Branham, *Unruly Eloquence. Lucian and the Comedy of Traditions*, Cambridge, Mass. etc. 1989; Anna Beltrametti, 'Mimesi parodici e parodia della mimesi', in: D. Lanza, O. Longo (edd.), *Il meraviglioso e il verosimile tra antichità e medioevo*, Florence 1989, 211–25. For a detailed study see Thomas Schmitz, *Bildung und Macht. Zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit*, Munich 1997 [= *Zetemata* 97]. Cf. also the summary in Peter v. Möllendorff, *Auf der Suche nach der verlogenen Wahrheit. Lukians* Wahre Geschichten, Tübingen 2000, 1–11, (further lit. there), and Albrecht Dihle, 'Literaturkanon und Schriftsprache', in: J. Dummer, M. Vielberg (edd.), *Leitbilder der Spätantike*, Stuttgart 1999, 9–30.

2 Cf. Swain (n. 1) 311f., 314.

3 This seems to be the case even if we know nearly nothing about his life and his career, apart from occasional remarks in Eunapius, Lactantius and Galen; also the polemic *Vita* in the *Suda* s. v. Λουκιανός. His own remarks to be found in his texts should not easily, and surely not completely, be trusted, as has been shown by B. Baldwin, *Studies in Lucian*, Toronto 1973, 7–20.

4 Cf. for example Michael Weissenberger, *Literaturtheorie bei Lukian. Untersuchungen zum Dialog Lexiphanes*, Stuttgart/Leipzig 1996, esp. 85–150.

5 On the form see Margarete Riemenschneider, 'Die Abhandlung Lukians "Wie man Geschichte schreiben soll"', in: *Acta Conventus XI, 'Eirene'*, Warsaw 1971, 399–404. That this is a treatise is made clear in (6), immediately after the introductory anecdote, when the arrangement of the text to follow is presented: 6–32 will show what the historian must avoid, 33–63 what he must achieve.

amongst the *pepaideumenoi* he departs from the usual frame of reference. And, thirdly, although Lucian's text is, in keeping with the demands of *paideia*, decked out with allusions to older (historiographical) literature,[6] his attacks against the inferior historians of his own age can scarcely convince his modern readers that the targets of such ridicule ever actually existed: none of the accusations he makes or of the (few) names he specifically mentions are borne out by other sources.[7] It cannot, of course, be ruled out that Lucian is referring here to ephemeral works of such inferior quality that none of them saw the ancient light of day for very long, and that the names he cites represent witty allusions to authors who, for his well-versed contemporaries, were perhaps not the no-name writers they are for us today.[8] Even so, one might still wonder whether such historians would have been at all suitable as objects of Lucian's ridicule and addressees for his 'rules and regulations': he tells us himself in (5) that neither these inferior *pepaideumenoi* nor their followers will take his suggestions to heart.

Why Lucian chose this particular subject is a question that can perhaps be approached by considering the opening and concluding sections of the treatise, which have to date been read simply as an amusing framework for the actual contents. A closer look could, however, shed new light on Lucian's intentions.

> Ἀβδηρίταις φασὶ Λυσιμάχου ἤδη βασιλεύοντος ἐμπεσεῖν τι νόσημα, ὦ καλὲ Φίλων, τοιοῦτο· πυρέττειν μὲν γὰρ τὰ πρῶτα πανδημεὶ ἅπαντας ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης εὐθὺς ἐρρωμένως καὶ λιπαρεῖ τῷ πυρετῷ, περὶ δὲ τὴν ἑβδόμην τοῖς μὲν αἷμα πολὺ ἐκ ῥινῶν ῥυέν, τοῖς δ' ἱδρὼς ἐπιγενόμενος, πολὺς καὶ οὗτος, ἔλυσεν τὸν πυρετόν. ἐς γελοῖον δέ τι πάθος περιίστα τὰς γνώμας αὐτῶν· ἅπαντες γὰρ ἐς τραγῳδίαν παρεκίνουν καὶ ἰαμβεῖα ἐφθέγγοντο καὶ μέγα ἐβόων· μάλιστα δὲ τὴν Εὐριπίδου Ἀνδρομέδαν ἐμονῴδουν καὶ τὴν τοῦ Περσέως ῥῆσιν ἐν μέλει διεξῄεσαν, καὶ μεστὴ ἦν ἡ πόλις ὠχρῶν ἁπάντων καὶ λεπτῶν τῶν ἑβδομαίων ἐκείνων τραγῳδῶν, 'σὺ δ' ὦ θεῶν τύραννε κἀνθρώπων Ἔρως', καὶ τὰ ἄλλα μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ ἀναβοώντων καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ πολύ, ἄχρι δὴ χειμὼν καὶ κρύος δὲ μέγα γενόμενον ἔπαυσε ληροῦντας αὐτούς. αἰτίαν δέ μοι δοκεῖ τοῦ τοιούτου παρασχεῖν Ἀρχέλαος ὁ τραγῳδός, εὐδοκιμῶν τότε, μεσοῦντος θέρους ἐν πολλῷ τῷ φλογμῷ τραγῳδήσας αὐτοῖς τὴν Ἀνδρομέδαν, ὡς πυρέξαι τε ἀπὸ τοῦ θεάτρου τοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ ἀναστάντας ὕστερον ἐς τὴν τραγῳδίαν

[6] Cf. Gert Avenarius, *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung*, Meisenheim 1956; Helene Homeyer (ed.), *Lukian. Wie man Geschichte schreiben soll*, Munich 1965; Aristoula Georgiadou, David H. J. Larmour, 'Lucian and Historiography: "De historia conscribenda" and "Verae historiae"', in: *ANRW* II.34.2 1994, 1448–1509.

[7] Cf. the list based entirely on Lucian in *FGrHist* 203–10.

[8] *Sic* Riemenschneider (n. 5); for Crepereius Calpurnianus of Pompeiopolis (*HC* 15) see Christopher P. Jones, *Culture and Society in Lucian*, Cambridge, Mass. etc. 1986, 161–5 (with further lit.), who argues that this author is genuine. Homeyer (n. 6) 21–3 believes that the general target of Lucian's criticism, i.e. historiography on the Parthian War, is genuine, but that he invented the authors he mentions specifically (and probably also the quotations he uses).

παρολισθαίνειν, ἐπὶ πολὺ ἐμφιλοχωρούσης τῆς Ἀνδρομέδας τῇ μνήμῃ αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ Περσέως ἔτι σὺν τῇ Μεδούσῃ τὴν ἑκάστου γνώμην περιπετομένου. (2) Ὡς οὖν ἕν, φασίν, ἐνὶ παραβαλεῖν, τὸ Ἀβδηριτικὸν ἐκεῖνο πάθος καὶ νῦν τοὺς πολλοὺς τῶν πεπαιδευμένων περιελήλυθεν, οὐχ ὥστε τραγῳδεῖν – ἔλαττον γὰρ ἂν τοῦτο παρέπαιον ἀλλοτρίοις ἰαμβείοις, οὐ φαύλοις κατεσχημένοι. ἀλλ' ἀφ' οὗ δὴ τὰ ἐν ποσὶ ταῦτα κεκίνηται – ὁ πόλεμος ὁ πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους καὶ τὸ ἐν Ἀρμενίᾳ τραῦμα καὶ αἱ συνεχεῖς νῖκαι – οὐδεὶς ὅστις οὐχ ἱστορίαν συγγράφει· μᾶλλον δὲ Θουκυδίδαι καὶ Ἡρόδοτοι καὶ Ξενοφῶντες ἡμῖν ἅπαντες, καί, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἀληθὲς ἄρ' ἦν ἐκεῖνο τό Πόλεμος ἁπάντων πατήρ', εἴ γε καὶ συγγραφέας τοσούτους ἀνέφυσεν ὑπὸ μιᾷ τῇ ὁρμῇ.

Lucian, *HC* 1–2

They say, my dear Philo, that in the reign of King Lysimachus the people of Abdera were smitten by an epidemic. These were its symptoms: at first every one of them fell ill of a fever, violent and obstinate right from the start; about the seventh day it was broken, in some cases by a copious flow of blood from the nostrils, in others by heavy sweating; but their minds were left in a ridiculous state; they all went mad with tragedy, shouting iambics and creating a din; and they mostly sang solos from Euripides' *Andromeda*, rendering Perseus' speech in song; the city was full of these seventh-day tragedians, all pale and thin, roaring, 'Love, you tyrant of gods and men' and the rest in a loud voice, hour after hour, day after day, until winter and a severe cold spell stopped their noise. Archelaüs the actor seems to me to be to blame for such goings on. He was popular then, and in the middle of summer in the blazing heat had played the *Andromeda* for them, so that most of them brought their fever away from the theatre with them, and later when they left their beds relapsed into tragedy; the *Andromeda* kept haunting their memory, and his Perseus with Medusa's head still flitted round everyone's brain. To make as they say a comparison, that Abderite complaint has now taken hold of most of the literary world. They don't act tragedy – they would be less out of their wits if they were in the grip of other men's verses, not shoddy ones at that. No, ever since the present situation arose – the war against the barbarians, the disaster in Armenia and the run of victories – every single person is writing history; nay more, they are all Thucydideses, Herodotuses and Xenophons to us, and very true, it seems, is the saying that 'War is the father of all things' since at one stroke it has begotten so many historians.

(Loeb translation)

Let us first ask ourselves whether Lucian invented his Abderite anecdote himself, or whether he took (and perhaps modified) it from a source. In order to answer this question we must consider whether the events in Abdera display any parallels to the historiographical *status quo* targeted by Lucian. As it happens, there *is* ample material

for comparison. Let us begin with the Abderites' πάθος which can be divided into two phases. First, widespread fever, which leads after seven days to varying crises: some suffer heavy nosebleeds, others profuse sweating. The illness then enters its second stage, and here too the symptoms differ. The Abderites start reciting tragic verse, *mainly* passages from Euripides' *Andromeda*. The wording – μάλιστα δὲ τὴν Εὐριπίδου Ἀνδρομέδαν (1) – suggests that this was not the only tragedy to be declaimed, but that verses from other plays could be heard too; it possibly even indicates that the Abderites could henceforth only converse in the style of tragedies. This is significant, because the cause of the epidemic was, in conjunction with the excessive summer temperatures, a performance of only that one single tragedy, Euripides' *Andromeda*. Whereas a somatic crisis ends the fever after seven days, the second stage, which could be diagnosed as a form of mania, is only cured with the arrival of winter and the accompanying cold weather (κρύος). On the other side of the analogy the Abderites find their counterparts in, of course, the *pepaideumenoi*. Lucian likens their *pathos*, i.e. their history-writing habit, to the Abderites' recitation of tragic verse. The behaviour of the latter – prancing about pale as their shirts and bawling verse – is, given their normal circumstances, neither befitting for them nor for tragedy and its cultural status, and this is the very point being made in the satirical aspersions cast by Lucian on historians: the offerings of these supposedly educated men rise neither to the occasion (the Parthian War), nor to their classical models. It is noticeable, however, that the attention to detail displayed by Lucian in his account of the Abderites' sufferings is not quite as pronounced when it comes to the *pepaideumenoi*. There are two possible explanations for this. It is, of course, entirely conceivable that Lucian supplemented his anecdote with details which were meant to make events seem more realistic, which – rhetorically speaking – served the purpose of *enargeia*; in this case no parallels would have to be sought for such items in an application of the tale to the situation of historiography. Comparable to this would be, for instance, Lucian's account of the Gallic Hercules (*Hercules*) or of Dionysus' Indian expedition (*Bacchus*). In these examples too Lucian does leave it to the discerning reader to draw the more specific parallels (cf. e.g. *Bacch.* 8), or provide foundering interpreters with a hermeneutic helper (*Herc.* 4), showing that he expects the reader to put some personal effort into solving the riddle.[9] However, there still remain certain features there which can certainly be taken as extra colouring for the picture presented, as details that have no allegorical function. Another explanation – and which of the two is applicable cannot be determined *a priori*, but only on the basis of detailed analysis of each item – could, on the other hand, be that

[9] In *Herc.* 3, for instance, the chain linking Hercules' tongue to his followers' ears is described as being made of gold and amber, whilst the Celt's exegesis merely talks of the binding power of the *logos* (5f.) Gold and amber, however, are not extra-thematic details which slot nice and neatly into the overall picture – they are conspicuous and require explanation. The text offers none, readers must therefore think for themselves. Is this an allusion to the famous poetological dichotomy between truth (clear, transparent amber) and lies (shining, bedazzling gold), or more widely to the beguiling powers of language in general, a theme which also crops up later in the interpretation of the image? Lucian occasionally makes explicit calls upon the readers' hermeneutic capabilities, as in *Ver. hist.* 1.2.

Lucian was using a particular source. If the greater detail on the former side of the equation were perhaps not enough to upset the balance, but nevertheless found to be unduly ample, one might conclude that Lucian followed this source more or less faithfully and then functionalised only items suitable for his purposes. As Lucian does not expressly define other quantities in the equation, we must, in order to decide between the two explanations proposed above, delve further and see whether any present themselves logically and without discrepancy to the 'forward-thinking' reader, or whether there are indeed remainders for which no equivalents can be found.

First of all, the locating of the anecdote in Abdera clearly represents a satirical thrust at the alleged educated elite of his day. The Abderites were looked upon in antiquity as 'Gothamites', that is to say, the exceptionally foolish citizens of a chaotically governed *polis*,[10] so that, by comparing them to the *pepaideumenoi*, Lucian is virtually saying that their *paideia*, their knowledge of classical literature, is in fact ἀπαιδευσία,[11] meaning – as we can see in his *Adversus indoctum* – that they may indeed outwardly display a reverence of classical authors (e.g. by collecting books), but that they have not truly inwardly digested these writings. This tallies with later passages in *HC* where Lucian criticises the would-be historians for simply borrowing specific expressions and copying prominent characteristic features from their models (especially Thucydides), rather than attempting a more profound form of imitation.[12] Continuing our comparison, we see that Lucian offers a *twofold* explanation for the epidemic in Abdera: a combination of extreme heat and the recitation of *Andromeda*. For the corresponding phenomenon amongst the *pepaideumenoi*, by contrast, he seemingly names only *one* cause: ὁ πόλεμος ὁ πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους καὶ τὸ ἐν Ἀρμενίᾳ τραῦμα (2). But it is quite evident that there is another 'craze' behind this too: the kind of *paideia* gained from frequent and sustained study of the classics, over and above the one-off prescribed reading as rhetoric students – in this case, then, close acquaintance with the cited historians Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon. This constitutes the foundation on which the obsession with historiography triggered by the war rests: Θουκυδίδαι καὶ Ἡρόδοτοι καὶ Ξενοφῶντες ἡμῖν πάντες (2). The analogy 'extreme heat/recitation' and *paideia/polemos* is in its corresponding terms not immediately obvious, but parallels could be drawn between the one-time-only recitation and the one occasion of the πόλεμος ὁ πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους, and between the extreme heat – a climatic factor underlying actual events in Abdera – and the form of literacy underlying current

[10] To our certain knowledge for the first time in the Χρεῖαι of the comedian Machon (3rd century BC), in Ath. 8.349b–c; = XI (Stratonikos), 119–33 Gow (A. S. F. Gow, *Machon. The fragments*, Cambridge 1965); before this possibly in Herondas: cf. Rainer Klimek-Winter, *Andromedatragödien*, Stuttgart 1993, 102f., who also discusses the whole tradition of Abderite foolishness, listing further examples and lit. See also K. Kraft, *Die Abderitenfabel*, (ms. thesis) Giessen 1924, and the very informative survey of the motif's history in Hans Jürgen Tschiedel, 'Hic Abdera. Gedanken zur Narrheit eines Gemeinwesens im Altertum – oder: Wie dumm waren die Abderiten?', in: P. Krafft, H. J. Tschiedel (edd.), *Concentus hexachordus. Beiträge zum 10. Symposion der bayerischen Hochschullehrer für Klassische Philologie in Eichstätt (24.–25. Februar 1984)*, Regensburg 1986, 169–95.

[11] Cf. *HC* 32, and Tschiedel (n. 10) 184, 186.

[12] Cf. *HC* 16, 18, 19, 23, 26.

historiographical activities. Such a parallel would only have been possible if the image of great heat was at least possible as a metaphor used to refer to an emphatic or even passionate notion of *paideia* and literature. With the help of various examples from early Greek poetry, René Nünlist has been able to show that this was indeed the case.[13]

As regards the illness itself, Lucian differentiates, as we have seen, between *two* phases, but as far as the corresponding 'affliction' of the *pepaideumenoi* is concerned there seems again at first glance to be only *one* effect, i.e. the production of historiographical texts. We must therefore first establish whether or not the would-be historians display a symptom that could be seen as equivalent to the Abderites' fever and ensuing nosebleeds/profuse sweating. Lucian does seem at least to hint at some such sign in (2) and again in (5). In (2) he talks of αἱ συνεχεῖς νῖκαι, which to my mind suggests that the learned contemporaries appear to him intoxicated, as it were, with victory. This impression is corroborated in (5), where Lucian expresses the hope that his treatise will be in some measure effective, if only for historians who may one day have to write about a war between the Celts and the Getae or the Indians and the Bactrians: οὐ γὰρ πρὸς ἡμᾶς γε τολμήσειεν ἄν τις, ἁπάντων ἤδη κεχειρωμένων.[14] Lucian will later be stressing the need for historians to leave emotions out of their writing, thus the heatedness which drives the *pepaideumenoi* to their desks could equate at least to the Abderites' fever.[15] The latters' nosebleeds and sweating, however – both common enough in medical literature as signs of fever-abating crises[16] – remain, as far as I can see, without parallels on the other side of the analogy.

What about the outbursts of tragic verse? It is striking that Lucian does not have the Abderites bringing forth their own tragedies, but instead giving a poor and inadequate rendering of others' verses or making a mockery of the tragic mode: in abstract terms, then, an unsuccessful imitation. A closer look at the wording in (2) suggests that the *pepaideumenoi* are being charged with the same 'crime'. Here Lucian's phrasing in (1) reappears as a sort of *stretto*. There he wrote: ἅπαντες γὰρ ἐς τραγῳδίαν παρεκίνουν καὶ ἰαμβεῖα ἐφθέγγοντο καὶ μέγα ἐβόων, μάλιστα δὲ τὴν Εὐριπίδου Ἀνδρομέδαν ἐμονῴδουν ...; and here he says: οὐδεὶς ὅστις οὐχ ἱστορίαν συγγράφει, μᾶλλον δὲ Θουκυδίδαι καὶ Ἡρόδοτοι καὶ Ξενοφῶντες ἡμῖν ἅπαντες (2). The correspondence between the genres mentioned (tragedy/historiography) is sustained in the more specific reference to particular exponents (*Andromeda* and the three classic historians). And indeed one of the most serious accu-

[13] R. Nünlist, *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, Stuttgart/Leipzig 1998, 162–77, esp. Pindar, *Ol.* 9.21f., *Fr.* 52b, 66f., *Fr.* 52s.4f., Bacch. *Fr.* 4.80.

[14] Swain (n. 1) 313 detects no irony here, but a sincere personal identification with Rome on the part of Lucian, but this cannot account for the apparent exaggeration.

[15] πυρετός can refer to something which causes one to become hot with excitement, as for example in Arist. *Vesp.* 1038.

[16] See Volker Langholf, 'Lukian und die Medizin. Zu einer tragischen Katharsis bei den Abderiten (*De historia conscribenda* §1)', *ANRW* II.37.3 1996 2793–841, here: 2815f. On the association of these symptoms specifically with Abdera see Tschiedel (n. 10) 185f. and Hipp. *Ep.* 3.6–10, 13. The entire pathology described by Lucian can be found in the Hippocratic case-histories 3.7 and 3.9.

sations Lucian will later variously bring forward against contemporary historians is, as mentioned above, that they consider themselves in the same league as their great models on the strength alone of their crude imitations, or even just by virtue of quoting them.[17] The different reactions amongst the Abderites could be a parallel to the different models imitated – *primarily* just the classic triad, but occasionally or for more specialised areas other historians too;[18] alternatively they could function as equivalent to Lucian's contention that the pseudo-historians generally speaking produce travesties of good historical prose. It remains unclear, however, why Lucian is so keen to stress the two phases of the disease that he underlines the distinction again at the end of the Abdera anecdote (1): ὡς πυρέξαι τε ἀπὸ τοῦ θεάτρου τοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ ἀναστάντας ὕστερον ἐς τὴν τραγῳδίαν παρολισθαίνειν. There is no immediate parallel to this differentiation on the *pepaideumenoi* side of the equation.

### *A version of the Abdera anecdote in Eunapius: a parody of enthusiasm*

Whilst most elements of the Abdera anecdote can be seen without too many contortions to correspond to the distressed state of historiographical affairs targeted by Lucian, there remain, nevertheless, a few conspicuous quantities that cannot be explained as part of the analogy.[19] We have seen that the motif 'extreme heat' can be interpreted with a certain amount of effort, but that both the critical nosebleeds and sweating, and the two-phase course, the 'development', of the illness have no parallels on the would-be historians' side. Similarly there is nothing that equates to the secondary motif of a seven-day period between the outbreak of the disease and the crisis,[20] or to tragic actor's presentation specifically of *Andromeda* and the direct quotation from this tragedy.[21] Some, although not all, of these points could be explained if we assume that Lucian did not make this anecdote up himself, but took it from an existing text. No such source actually survives, but we do have another version of the story, one that is – in my opinion – not directly related to Lucian's text. This can be found amongst the fragments of the *Historika hypomnemata* compiled by the historian, Platonist and orator Eunapius of Sardis (345-about 420 AD):[22]

[17] See above p. 120.

[18] See, for example, Gabriele Marasco, 'Lo storico e il suo publico: Luciano e gli storici della guerra partica di Lucio Vero', *Itaca* 9–11, 1993–95, 137–49, who supposes an affinity between contemporary historiography and tragic-mimetic literature to have been the background here. See also Delfino Ambaglio, 'Luciano e la storiografia greca tradita per citazioni', in: *Mélanges Gasco*, Turin 1996, 129–36.

[19] For the significance of the *kruos* motif see below pp. 138–140.

[20] The seventh day as turning-point is, however, a commonplace in case-histories such as those described in the *Corpus Hippocraticum*; see Langholf (n. 16) 2815.

[21] *Andromeda* F 136 Klimek-Winter (n. 10); see below pp. 128f.

[22] R. C. Blockley, *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire. Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus*, II, Liverpool 1983 = *Hist. Gr. Min.* I.246–8 Dindorf = *Exc. Sent. Const. Porph.* Fr. 52 (IV.87.21 Boissevain) = *Test.* IV b.2 Klimek-Winter (n. 10). For reasons of space only a translation is offered here, but with the Greek wording at crucial points. The translation is essentially that of Blockley, but various changes have been made.

It is said that something similar happened in Nero's reign, but in one whole city. For they say that a certain tragic actor, having been exiled from Rome on account of Nero's own ambitions in this area, decided to go off <to ...> and to exhibit his outstanding voice to men who were half-barbarian; and he came to this great and populous city[23] and invited them to the theatre. When they gathered on the first day the performance was a failure, since the audience could not endure the sight, which they then saw for the first time, but fled, crushing and trampling each other in the process. But when the actor had taken the leading men aside and showed them the nature of the mask and the boots which increased his height impressively, he persuaded them in this way to endure the sight and he came on stage again. Since the people could still hardly bear the spectacle, he at first very properly gave them a mild taste of his voice and its repertoire (he was performing Euripides' *Andromeda*) and as he proceeded he increased his volume, then lowered it, then introduced a severe harmony, and concluded with a sweet one. It was one of the hottest days of the summer [ὥρα δὲ ἦν θέρους], and the theatre was fully exposed to the sun [τὸ θέατρον κατείχετο].[24] [The actor offers to interrupt his performance, but the audience is utterly spell-bound and will not hear of an interval. The actor holds back the full blast of his artistry in front of these ἄνθρωποι ἀσύνετοι after this, but even still they worship him as if he were a god and shower him with gifts.] After the seventh day of this performance [μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἑβδόμην τῆς ἐπιδείξεως ἡμέραν] disease fell upon the city, and, since it brought with it an uncontrollable diarrhoea [διαρροίας ἀκράτους], they all lay about feebly in the streets, shouting [ἐκβοῶντες] not the actual words but the tunes, as best they could. Thus they were horribly destroyed by the *Andromeda*,[25] and the city was denuded of its men and women, so that it had to be repopulated from the neighbourhood. In their case [i.e. that of the semi-barbarians] the [sc. actor's] vocal prowess and the excessive warmth of the air [ἀέρος ὑπερβάλλουσαν θερμότητα] were to blame, which caused the singing to dissolve through the ears and burn into the seat of the vital organs. But amongst our contemporaries / people in our part of the world [ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ἀνθρώπων], the causes of the ailment were easy to see in that they were all centred upon the intestines and the parts below the belly; although the fact that some people who are by no means fools [τινας τῶν οὐκ ἀνοήτων] fall into this

[23] Bernays (based on Philostr. *VA* 5.9; see below n. 58) Ἰσπαλιν [Seville], Niebuhr Ταρσόν, Meineke Τάπην; Blockley (n. 22) 142, on the other hand, thinks it possible that Abdera could be meant here, but that the name was not mentioned at this particular point; it appeared, he thinks, earlier, in the lost section preceding this fragment. But see below n. 58.

[24] It is not clear exactly what the meaning of κατέχειν is here; the context (summer heat) would suggest that we translate 'the theatre was exposed to the sun with no cover', whilst the phrase τὸ θέατρον κατέχειν could also mean 'to hold the audience under its spell'. Perhaps the reader is supposed to think of both possible meanings.

[25] The phrase κακῶς ὑπὸ τῆς Ἀνδρομέδας ἐπιτριβόμενοι suggests an obscene *double entendre* here, which would be in keeping with the satirical tenor of the text as a whole.

> [ὠλισθηκέναι] would reasonably be ascribed not to natural causes but to a more divine motion [θειοτέραν ... κίνησιν]: quite evidently mankind is being pursued by the Furies [ποινηλατεῖσθαι σαφῶς τὸ ἀνθρώπινον].
>
> (Eunapius, *Hist. hypomn.* Fr. 48 Blockley)

The anecdote in Eunapius, the original context of which would seem to have been a condemnation of the theatre,[26] displays *prima facie* so many similarities to Lucian's version that it has quite rightly long been regarded as a twin of sorts (for the first time by Müller *FHG* IV. 54 (p. 38)). The whole course of events – a tragedy performed at the height of summer before a semi-barbarian audience, the play in question being Euripides' *Andromeda*, the outbreak of a disease with somatic (diarrhoea) and mental (pseudo-reciting) symptoms, polemic use of the anecdote to criticise some current phenomenon – tallies to such a degree that it makes little sense to read the two versions as otherwise unconnected examples of an itinerant narrative.[27] In Eunapius, however, there is no direct quotation from *Andromeda* – instead there is a lengthy description of the tragic actor's art, with nothing corresponding to this in Lucian; instead of fever, nosebleeds and sweating it is uncontrollable bowels; the illness knows only one stage, no crisis and a fatal outcome, while in Lucian there are two phases, a crisis and in the end recovery; finally, in the place of the seven days that pass in Lucian between the outbreak of fever and the critical turning-point we find in Eunapius a seven-day duration of the performance, which directly precedes the outbreak of disease.

Exactly how these two versions are related, then, is a question that cannot be properly considered until we have established what the author of the version in Eunapius is actually trying to say.[28] The inhabitants of his unnamed city are semi-barbarians. They are therefore especially receptive as regards the emotional and mental effects produced by stage tragedy, because they absorb all that is presented to them directly, without filtering it through a mind schooled in the criticism of art (a mind, then, like the one mirrored here in the anonymous source author's observations). Being bombarded for seven days with extreme summer heat and emotion-laden tragedy results for them in an illness which manifests itself in diarrhoea and the bellowing of snatches from the play. This is the death-knell for the entire polis. The explanation for this particular outbreak of the disease is strictly physical, and it is not until the final sentence that the mystery of other such cases is solved. For a more intelligent audience similarly affected by a play a physical cause could not be assumed, but rather a θειοτέρα κίνησις: after all, the whole human race is known to be pursued by the Furies.

This somewhat surprising parting shot can best be understood if we assume that the author of this version intended the whole story as a parody of the ἐνθουσιασμός theory. His use of the term κίνησις, in ancient teachings the common term for

[26] Blockley (n. 22) 142 notes the parallel in Zosimus 4.33.3–4 (disapproval of the theatre's renewed popularity under Theodosius).

[27] But *sic* Langholf (n. 16) 2832f., n. 174.

[28] See also the fuller discussion at n. 58.

'ecstasy',[29] would already seem to suggest this. That the motions of the afflicted are 'divine' in origin also suggests an allusion to enthusiasm. The concept itself can be taken to cover a broad spectrum of emotional states:[30] in the anecdote related by Eunapius it is not so much a religious phenomenon that is the subject, but – and this still quite in keeping with ancient perceptions – an intense emotion which exceeds all norms and which could be brought on by sudden and (in a negative or positive sense) shocking occurrences,[31] but which could also be the result of listening to a speech or a lecture.[32] Such enthusiasm can manifest itself in mental and physical signs. The latter include bellowing and shouting[33] (which we find in the *polis* in Eunapius and in Lucian's Abdera). Clearly, then, a fit of enthusiasm always borders on the pathological, and its violent physical reactions in particular can be diagnosed as symptoms of a medical disorder.[34] In Plato's *Ion* 533d–536d the ἐνθουσιασμός theory is applied in detail to the production and consumption of literature. The common term for such 'possession' is, as we are told *ibid.* 536a8, κατέχεσθαι[35] – a word we find used in connection with the θέατρον of the anecdote in Eunapius. The audience arrested by the rhapsodist's recitation is the last link in a chain which joins the poetry-inspiring Muses to the poets, the poets to the poetry-reciting rhapsodists and, finally, the rhapsodists to their listeners. This is Plato's explanation for the tears that fill not only the rhapsodist's eyes when he comes to a particularly moving part, but also those of his audience. This last effect is portrayed quite clearly, in fact all but expressly both by Lucian in his Abdera anecdote, and in Eunapius.

The anonymous author of the anecdote in Eunapius is evidently critical in his view of the theatre,[36] and aims with his composition a double satirical blow, targeting two types of theatre-goers.[37] On the one hand there are the uneducated θεαταί, who merely

[29] Cf. *RAC* s.v. 'Ekstase' (F. Pfister) 951. Similar use of (παρα)κινεῖν (cf. *HC* 1): Plato, *Phdr.* 245b4, Plut. *Solon* 8.2, *Quaest. Rom.* 112 (291B).

[30] 'The meaning of "enthusiasm" thus ranges – in ancient and in modern usage – from feelings of joy, fear, and sadness to pathological madness and divine possession in the religious sense' (*RAC* (n. 29) 945. It also covers Plato's θεῖαι μανίαι.

[31] *RAC* (n. 29) 964.

[32] *RAC* (n. 29) 964f. and, for example, *Od.* 11.334 = 13.1; Plato, *Mx.* 235a7–b1, *Phdr.* 228b6–7, 234d4–6, *Smp.* 215e1–216a2.

[33] *RAC* (n. 29) 971.

[34] Sweating as a sign of deep emotion brought on by some divine power perhaps in Eur. *Bacchae* 620f.: there Pentheus is breathing heavily and sweating, fooled by Dionysius' optical illusions.

[35] καὶ ὁ μὲν τῶν ποιητῶν ἐξ ἄλλης Μούσης, ὁ δὲ ἐξ ἄλλης ἐξήρτηται – ὀνομάζομεν δὲ αὐτὸ κατέχεται, τὸ δέ ἐστι παραπλήσιον· ἔχεται γάρ – ... (Plato, *Ion* 536a7–b1). For the Platonic concept of enthusiasm cf. Stefan Büttner, *Die Literaturtheorie bei Platon und ihre anthropologische Begründung*, Tübingen, 2000, 255–365.

[36] See above n. 26.

[37] Or even, if οὐκ ἀνόητος is to be understood in a broader sense (cf. Lucian who compares theatre-goers and *pepaideumenoi*), generally educated people. But the narrator of the anecdote does not seem to me to leave the thematic field of the theatre. And why should he? Enthusiastic reactions to theatre-like performances (not only chariot-races but also citharodes) were common enough at this time, even with a more sophisticated audience; cf. D. Chr. *Or.* 32.41, 50, 55f., 69, and 30.30, 42, 59f. and Christopher P. Jones, *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom*, Cambridge, Mass. 1978, 41f.

sense the beauty and art in the performance, but cannot understand it; they are nonetheless enthused – at cothurnus point, one might say, after a seven-day tragedy marathon in the hot sun. The author's explanation for this is purely medical: the only presence behind their raptures is not that of divinity but of sickness. The caricaturing effect is achieved by grossly exaggerating the reactions: not tears, but diarrhoea, not quiet entrancement at hearing the words, but inarticulate bellowing of the same. For his account of the physical consequences the author even consulted a description like that of the *Morbus sacer* – now in the *Corpus Hippocraticum* – which also lists uncontrollable diarrhoea[38] and loud shouting[39] as symptoms; the cause of such fits is named there as a sudden warming of the brain due to an increase in the flow of blood, as induced, for example, by a shock.[40] In Eunapius the initial audience reaction is shock, a motif described at some length, and only gradually giving way to the equally intense raptures. For the other targets of satire here, the οὐκ ἀνόητοι, matters are not quite the same. The author acknowledges that a more intelligent, but similarly afflicted[41] theatre-audience must have more control over their bodies than the not-too-bright rabble. One must therefore 'naturally' (εἰκότως) assume that a κίνησις of a different kind is at work in them: this is ecstasy of divine origin. But the humorous element in the closer definition of this *kinesis* actually lies not so much in the choice of 'divine' as attribute, as in the notion that comparable physical symptoms should have such diverse causes. The author of the anecdote takes, then, a sarcastic view of the concept of enthusiasm right from the start, and his sarcasm is intensified by the fact that it is not Apollo and the Muses who take hold of the οὐκ ἀνόητοι: instead the divinities behind a form of enthusiasm which has such extreme consequences are clearly harassing humanity, pursuing it like the Furies (ποινηλατεῖσθαι).

### *Enthusiasm in Lucian: traces of parody*

In Lucian's Abdera episode we also have, I believe, traces of an ἐνθουσιασμός parody, something which, after all, he does considerably more explicitly in other places.[42] All aspects of the Abdera case that have parallels in the version found in Eunapius can therefore be seen to have a bearing on the theme of

[38] Hp. *Morb. sacr.* 6.

[39] Hp. *Morb. sacr.* 1.7, 15.5.

[40] Hp. *Morb. sacr.* 15.5–6.

[41] I.e. with pathological enthusiasm, as is clear from the first sentence of the fragment; this possibly refers to a previously reported fatal case of enthusiasm in a theatre-goer.

[42] *Adv. Ind.* 15: λέγεται γὰρ καὶ Διονύσιον τραγῳδίαν ποιεῖν φαύλως πάνυ καὶ γελοίως, ὥστε τὸν Φιλόξενον πολλάκις δι' αὐτὴν ἐς τὰς λατομίας ἐμπεσεῖν οὐ δυνάμενον κατέχειν τὸν γέλωτα, οὗτος τοίνυν πυθόμενος ὡς ἐγγελᾶται, τὸ Αἰσχύλου πυξίον εἰς ὃ ἐκεῖνος ἔγραφε, σὺν πολλῇ σπουδῇ κτησάμενος καὶ αὐτὸς ᾤετο ἔνθεος ἔσεσθαι καὶ κάτοχος ἐκ τοῦ πυξίου, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκείνῳ μακρῷ γελοιότερα ἔγραφεν ..., and in the critical discussion of enthusiastic poetic licence in *Hes.* 4f., 9. Enthusiastic fascination provoked by philosophical teaching is – perhaps also parodically – described in *Nigr.* See also below p. 136f.

enthusiasm.[43] Furthermore, Lucian uses the terminology of ecstasy: he talks in (1) of παρεκίνουν, in (2) he takes κατεσχημένοι for the Abderites' obsession with tragic verse.[44] He illustrates their behaviour with the image of Perseus and Medusa fluttering around in their heads, and this is possibly a direct allusion to Plato, who in *Ion* 534b1–3 has the divinely possessed poets fluttering (πετόμενοι). Just as the poet–bees fly from the gardens of the Muses to bring their poetry–honey to their listeners, so the picture of Perseus and Medusa evoked by the recitation hovers around the protractedly enthused Abderites. Also, the motif of great external heat, doubled by the motif of (internal) fever, could be a kind of *index* to the concept of enthusiasm, as used by Ps.-Longinus, *De subl.* 9.11.[45]

Finally, there are two more indications that Lucian did mean his Abdera anecdote to betray overtones of an ἐνθουσιασμός parody. One is the direct quotation from *Andromeda*, and, as luck would have it, we know a little more of the original text here:[46]

> σὺ δ' ὦ θεῶν τύραννε κἀνθρώπων Ἔρως,
> ἢ μὴ δίδασκε τὰ καλὰ φαίνεσθαι καλά,
> ἢ τοῖς ἐρῶσιν εὐτυχῶς συνεκπόνει
> μοχθοῦσι μόχθοις ὧν σὺ δημιουργὸς εἶ.

The speaker has fallen victim to the god Eros, who is, in his eyes, responsible for him seeing beauty in what appears to him as beautiful. In other words, finding something so beautiful that one cannot free oneself of it is interpreted as being possessed by the gods, as, then, a sort of mania.[47] When the Abderites rend the air in the streets with this particular verse, then they do so not simply because it is good, stirring stuff.[48] Seen in

[43] We noted above that the ἡμιβάρβαροι in Eunapius were predestined to suffer an extreme reaction to literary recitation on account of their naïvety. We can see a correspondence to this in Lucian, where the Abderites' proverbial Gothamite nature (see above n. 10) and the (in reality deficient) *paideia* of the *pepaideumenoi* make both groups similarly susceptible.

[44] Eunapius' source and Lucian use similar terms for the audience's captivation and from spellbound to 'enthused' reaction to the tragedy: ὠλισθηκέναι (Eunapius' source) and παρολισθαίνειν (Lucian).

[45] Ἀλλὰ γὰρ Ὅμηρος μὲν ἐνθάδε οὔριος συνεμπνεῖ τοῖς ἀγῶσιν, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλο τι αὐτὸς πέπονθεν ἢ 'μαίνεται ὡς ... ὁλοὸν πῦρ / οὔρεσι μαίνηται ...' (*Il.* 15.605f.).

[46] F. 136 Klimek-Winter (n. 10); cf. the other version in Ath. 13.561BC, which offers seven verses and in which the word-order is slightly different from the one cited by Lucian.

[47] Eros is for Plato one of the *theiai maniai*, albeit as the philosophers' Eros of the forms; cf. for example *Phdr.* 249d4–e4. In early Greek poetry we frequently find the Eros of pederasty or of heterosexual love rendering victims 'possessed': cf. *Anacr.* 31, 53, 68, *Theogn.* 1231. That Longus (*Proem* 4) prays to Eros to let him write his story in a mood of σωφροσύνη shows this to be exactly *not* the state of mind Eros usually provokes.

[48] Intense emotional reactions to performances of Euripides' plays in general are mentioned in Plut. *Mor.* 33c (Aeolus), *Mor.* 756c and Lucian, *JTr.* 41 (Melanippe), Sen. *Ep.* 105.12 (inc. fab.); see Niall W. Slater, 'Making the Aristophanic Audience', *AJP* 120, 1999, 351–68, here: 354 n. 5, and Robert W. Wallace, 'Poet, Public, and "Theatrocracy": Audience Performance in Classical Athens', in: L. Edmunds, R. W. Wallace (edd.), *Poet, Public, and Performance in Ancient Greece*, Baltimore/London 1997, 97–111, here: 102 and n. 20. For the ancient view of the violent effect specifically of the Andromeda myth see Heliod. *Aeth.* 4.8, and John Hilton, 'An Ethiopian Paradox: Heliodorus, Aithiopika 4.8', in: R. Hunter (ed.), *Studies in Heliodorus*, Cambridge 1998, 79–92, esp. 84–9 (further lit. there).

its proper context, it is rather a sort of coded cry for help: as they are unable to talk in any other 'language' than tragic verse, this is the one way the Abderites can beg to be cured of their ecstatic ailment (συνεκπόνει ...). Only the reader who knows how Euripides' text continues will recognise this shift into the implicit mode, a move characteristic of Lucian's method of allusion. Similarly implicit, and also sarcastic, is the parallel – never actually drawn, but perhaps left to the reader to guess – between the Abderites and the *pepaideumenoi*: they too should be begging Eros either not to thrust upon them any longer the ecstatic, but unfulfilled and therefore hopeless, love of classical models, or at least to give them a hand with their courtship (in this case the pursuit of historiographical mimesis).

The second, likewise disguised, indication that *enthousiasmos* is lurking behind all this is itself hanging over the whole anecdote, since we ought not to suppose that, when Lucian picked Abdera as his setting, he did not have a perfectly good reason for doing so. I believe that a line can be traced from the opening introduction of the Abderites to the end of the anecdote. Lucian says there that 'war is the father of all things', quoting Heraclitus 22 B 53.[49] For the educated reader this reference could now have rung the other bell associated with Abdera: the city's famous son, Democritus.[50] Heraclitus and Democritus were paired before Lucian's day as the 'weeping' and the 'laughing' philosopher,[51] but Lucian too introduces them himself at some length as the 'odd couple' in *Vit. auct.* 13f.[52] There both declare the world and all that goes on in it to be totally pointless, with the one difference that this insight causes Democritus to break out in uncontrollable laughter, while Heraclitus is reduced by it to unstanchable tears. Their implicit convergence in *HC* could therefore be taken to suggest that one may be unhappy about the sound and fury of the history-writing practised amongst the *pepaideumenoi*, or laugh at it, but that it is definitely mere sound and fury. But, over and above this, Democritus is, of course, Plato's crucial forerunner for the theory of enthusiasm;[53] we still have faint traces of his thoughts on this in Fragments 68 B 17

[49] It is the continuation of this fragment that provides the satirical twist here: war proves some to be gods, others mortals, some it turns into slaves, others it sets free – and others, we may surmise, it turns into historians. The irony in Lucian could also be linked to Heraclitus' well-known aversion to πολυμαθίη (22 B 40: the mention of Hecataeus here does indicate that historians too perhaps have more knowledge than sense).

[50] The allusion would perhaps explain the (pseudo-)dating of the anecdote to the reign of one of the Diadochi, Lysimachus of Thrace and Macedonia; we encounter neither Abdera nor Lysimachus in the other extant versions of the story, but both could, of course, have appeared in a common source; cf. below n. 58. When Lucian mentions Abdera elsewhere (*Macr.* 18, *Vit.auct.* 13, *Philops.* 32, *Fug.* 9), the subject is *always* Democritus; of the other 'great' Abderites (see Tschiedel (n. 10) 181) Lucian mentions only Anaxarchus (*Par.* 35), but without naming his home city. Lysimachus is otherwise mentioned only in *Icar.* 15 and *Macr.* 11. Democritus *and* Lysimachus feature together in *Macr.*, which could mean that the mention of the former in *HC* is to be read as an automatic allusion to the latter, for Lucian: *the* Abderite.

[51] Cf. Democritus 68 A 21 [= Sotion Περὶ ὀργῆς $\beta^1$ (= Stob. *Ecl.* 3.20.53)].

[52] Cf. *Sacr.* 15 and *Peregr.* 7, also *Fug.* 9. For this argumentation see also below n. 61. On 'laughing Democritus' cf. below n. 60, on 'weeping Heraclitus' cf. M. Fattal, 'La Figure d'Héraclite qui pleure chez Lucien de Samosate (Les sectes à l'encan 14)', in: M. Guglielmo, G. F. Gianotti (edd.), *Filosofia, storia, immaginario mitologico*, Alessandria 1997, 175–80.

[53] Cf. for example Hor. *AP* 295–301, 309.

and 68 B 18. The choice of Abdera as setting, together with the quotation from Heraclitus, is therefore perhaps meant to ensure that the text will be read as it is meant to be, i.e. that the underlying allusion to the theory of enthusiasm will be properly taken into account.

The vocabulary, the allusion to Plato, the reference to the enthusing power of Eros, the particular choice of a Euripidean tragedy with its typical strongly emotive effect, the double motif of heat and fever reminding us of the 'fervent' emotion of enthusiasm, finally the connection (via Abdera and Heraclitus) with Democritus, the philosopher of enthusiasm – all of these provide, taken separately, cautious indications and, taken together, ample evidence of the underlying concept of enthusiasm. Lucian is clearly addressing here – as considered briefly above and now apparently substantiated – readers like those he assumes in the proem to *A True Story* will be reading his work: readers whose knowledge and education will enable them to solve a (not too taxing) enigma. The intellectual standards set by the Second Sophistic would create active *pepaideumenoi* whose ever-present learning meant that they could respond immediately even to allusions which did not take the form of direct, literal quotations, whose ability to abstract would leave them equipped to decipher classical motifs transposed into new settings and also to transpose motifs themselves.[54] And such readers would represent genuine *pepaideumenoi*, not merely pseudo-scholars like the historiographers ridiculed in the following who only know how to misuse their classical models, rifling through the texts for quotable loot. We shall be looking presently at another reason for Lucian's masking of this allusion. Let us first, however, apply the pattern of enthusiasm discovered in the anecdote to the situation of the *pepaideumenoi*. The picture that presents itself is as follows. As we have already seen,[55] the extreme summer heat behind the epidemic corresponds for Lucian to the *paideia* of contemporary historians, whilst the recitation of *Andromeda*, which actually triggered the outbreak, corresponds to the Roman wars in the East, these having provoked historiographical mania. In terms of the *enthousiasmos* pattern, *paideia* is the equivalent of a certain natural 'disposition' without which the 'possession' inspired by a specific occurrence could not come about at all.[56] *Paideia* is, however, an artificially created disposition, a state which is caused by repeated contact with classical literature, and which is manifested in a sort of habitual tendency towards excitability and ensuing production of one's own literature. The notion that a familiarity with authors perceived as classical and ideal can bring on a sort of latent chronic enthusiasm in their imitators is eloquently corroborated in Ps.-Longinus, *De subl.* 13.2–3: ... ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀρχαίων μεγαλοφυΐας εἰς τὰς τῶν ζηλούντων ἐκείνας ψυχὰς ὥς ἀπὸ ἱερῶν στομίων ἀπορροιαί τινες φέρονται, ὑφ' ὧν ἐπιπνεόμενοι καὶ οἱ μὴ λίαν φοιβαστικοὶ τῷ ἑτέρων συνενθουσιῶσι μεγέθει (13.2). In 13.4 Ps.-Longinus calls such contact ἀποτύπωσις, differentiating it quite

[54] On this active aspect of *paideia* cf. the concept of *askesis* in *A True Story* 1.1 as in *Dom.* 2f.

[55] See above p. 121f.

[56] For this distinction see *RAC* (n. 29) 959f. and esp. Plato, *Lg.* 7.790e8–791b2, Plut. *Pyth. orac.* 404F–405E, *Quaest. Rom.* 112 (291B).

clearly, then, from κλοπή, mere copying: an 'impression', broadly speaking the moulding, adapting, and adjusting of one's own creative abilities in imitation of the great ideal. There can therefore be no doubt that he means συνενθουσιᾶν not as a one-off transport, but as a more permanent state which permits flashes of true greatness.[57] And, just as the Abderites, already sweltering under the summer sun, fell victim to sickness and mania on experiencing a stirring recitation, the victories at war inspire in the *pepaideumenoi*, who are already 'psyched up' from all that reading of the historiographical classics, a rush of enthusiasm and prompt them to write their history books.

Before considering all this within a wider context, we must take a look at one significant difference between the course of events in Abdera and the pattern of *enthousiasmos* upon which these are based. It is an element which Lucian stresses sufficiently to make it noticeable, and one in which he also diverges from the version of the anecdote found in Eunapius – two reasons for thinking that it might lead us to an understanding of the true purpose behind Lucian's parodistic colouring of the underlying *enthousiasmos* theme. There can be no doubt, especially when one compares the Abdera anecdote to the events described in Eunapius, that Lucian watered down the parody of enthused audiences considerably. The Abderites are not such dullards that going to the theatre actually kills them in the end. They do not babble unintelligible snatches of words in which only the melody is at all reminiscent of the tragic iambics these are meant to be; they manage instead to utter whole verses and have even understood parts of the contents. Above all, there is for them no seven-day sustained firing with tragic ammunition such as the city-dwellers in Eunapius have to endure. Theirs is a two-phase disorder, the first stage of which is much milder than the diarrhoea that prostrates the victims in Eunapius: Lucian's Abderites are, physically at any rate, more or less up and about again after seven days and only suffer nosebleeds and sweating for a limited time. And the second stage does not end fatally, nor does it seem to prevent the 'patients' from going about their usual daily business of staying alive. Also, the very pronounced differentiation between physical and mental symptoms does make it at the very least more difficult to interpret events here as an outbreak of enthusiasm. A two-stage strain of this divinely transmitted 'illness' is unlikely to have been a familiar phenomenon. No, the whole course of events in Lucian reads, as Langholf (n. 16) has demonstrated, like the account of a *curable* epidemic, and its author incidentally says as much himself at the end of *HC* 5, directly before the beginning of the treatise proper. Lucian notes that he will be describing a standard to which potential historians can adhere: εἰ δὲ μή, αὐτοὶ μὲν καὶ τότε τῷ αὐτῷ πήχει ὥσπερ καὶ νῦν μετρούντων τὸ πρᾶγμα· ὁ ἰατρὸς δὲ οὐ πάνυ ἀνιάσεται, ἢν πάντες Ἀβδηρῖται ἑκόντες Ἀνδρομέδαν τραγῳδῶσι. The *pepaideumenoi* could, then, be cured by taking to heart the rules about to be set forth; if they neglect to do so, it will not matter to the physician Lucian: for him it is enough to know that his patients could be helped, but do not want to be – the responsibility lies with them.

[57] Cf. for example Ps.-Longinus, *De subl.* 33.5.

This representation of the behaviour of the *pepaideumenoi* as curable is, in my opinion, the reason why Lucian dilutes the *enthousiasmos* parody. It is not his intention to condemn ardent devotion to the fine arts, as the author of the version in Eunapius does. Lucian's criticism is rather that most writers seem to think that history more or less writes itself (5): καίτοι οὐδὲ παραινέσεως οἱ πολλοὶ δεῖν οἴονται σφίσιν ἐπὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα, οὐ μᾶλλον ἢ τέχνης τινὸς ἐπὶ τὸ βαδίζειν ἢ βλέπειν ἢ ἐσθίειν, ἀλλὰ πάνυ ῥᾷστον καὶ πρόχειρον καὶ ἅπαντος εἶναι ἱστορίαν συγγράψαι, ἢν τις ἑρμηνεῦσαι τὸ ἐπελθὸν δύνηται· τὸ δὲ οἶσθά που καὶ αὐτός, ὦ ἑταῖρε, ὡς οὐ τῶν εὐμεταχειρίστων οὐδὲ ῥᾳθύμως συντεθῆναι δυναμένων τοῦτ' ἐστίν, ἀλλά, εἴ τι ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἄλλο, πολλῆς τῆς φροντίδος δεόμενον, ἢν τις, ὡς ὁ Θουκυδίδης φησίν, ἐς ἀεὶ κτῆμα συντιθείη. The notion that one only needs to sit down and write the first thing that comes into one's head is, says Lucian, a dangerous fallacy, but one that most believe; what really is needed, however, is on the one side τέχνη and on the other φροντίς. And these are the two very aspects omitted as a matter of principle from the poetics of *enthousiasmos*, as once noted at various points by Plato in his *Ion*. A caricature of such poetological notions is therefore eminently suitable as backdrop for Lucian's criticism. However, his goal is to cure the condition, and so the caricature cannot, like the one in Eunapius, be so cruel as to make things appear irreversibly catastrophic.[58] Lucian has to dilute the individual

[58] The relationship between the two texts remains unclear, even if my choice of wording has already betrayed my own personal opinion – founded on all the evidence here – that Lucian based *HC* 1 on a text which either corresponded to the version in Eunapius, or was very similar to it. Matters are further complicated by the existence in Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii* 5.9 of a narrative which is in parts comparable. It is set, like the version in Eunapius, in the reign of Nero and tells of a wandering tragic actor who gives recitations from tragedies (possibly Neronian ones) for a barbarian audience in Ipola (Seville?), and whose appearance, cothurni, and voice prompt his listeners to flee. Klimek-Winter (n. 10) 104f. assumes that Eunapius, who knew both Lucian and Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius* (cf. Eun. *VS* 2.1.9 and 2.1.4), combined the two accounts (and thus implies, of course, that Lucian, being the earlier of the two, is the original author of the story). Although Eunapius could conceivably have used Philostratus, I consider it highly unlikely that he drew on Lucian's *concealed* allusions to the ἐνθουσιασμός of poetics – concealed in particular by the two-phase course of the epidemic – to create this almost grotesque satire on a specific interpretation of audience reactions, i. e. one based *entirely* on the theory of ἐνθουσιαμός. If we assume that he did, then we also have to assume that Eunapius himself added the reference to θειοτέρα κίνησις (which Lucian does not mention at all), that he turned Lucian's elaborate and subtle comparison of the Abderites and the *pepaideumenoi* into the simple sequence ἡμιβάρβαροι and οὐκ ἀνόητοι, and, finally, that he changed the familiar, even almost commonplace case-history with seven-day fever, crisis, and second stadium, into the daring construction of a seven-day drama recitation. These modifications seem, by contrast, even quite logical if one assumes that they were made, as it were, the other way round, i.e. by Lucian (and if one assumes that his intentions really were the ones I have postulated for him): the 'typical' case-history in particular would actually have been necessary in order for Lucian to introduce himself metaphorically as physician (see Tschiedel (n. 10) 185f., who rightly rejects Homeyer's interpretation). Klimek-Winter does not mention, for example, the aetiology of the disease given in Eunapius, which, in this form, could be derived neither from Philostratus nor Lucian. The city's inhabitants in Eunapius do not fall ill of fever (although Klimek-Winter seems to think otherwise), as they do in Lucian, but of diarrhoea (which Lucian's Abderites are spared entirely). The differences between Philostratus' restrained description of the tragic actor's performance and Eunapius' very detailed account are striking. The actor's attempt to win his audience over by letting their leaders in on his theatrical secrets is only found in Eunapius, not in Lucian or Philostratus. This all leaves me convinced that the three versions are based on one source (second half of the 1st century) to which the account in Eunapius is probably most similar, whilst Philostratus reduced

components of the caricature: he changes the entire outbreak of enthusiasm into a controllable epidemic and inserts the seven-day period between the primary and secondary reactions, thus allowing the initial symptoms gradually to let up and pass. The onset of mania, which in the case of the Abderites is perhaps excusable, is, then, for the *pepaideumenoi* really and truly, as it says in (1), a γελοῖόν τι πάθος: it could, after all, be avoided by taking the proper remedy, which Lucian will administer in the form of his treatise, even if he does foresee that his patients will hardly be inclined to try it.[59]

### *Another odd couple: enthousiasmos parodied and a model for literary rhetoric*

In the light of these findings a reconsideration of the instructions given by Lucian in his treatise would be the next step, but that obviously cannot be executed within the bounds of this paper. Before ending this study for the moment there remains, however, one question to be answered. If Lucian's express purpose is to provide a cure, why then

it to the simple barb about un-Hellenic barbarism – which fits nicely into his narrative proper: cf. Philostr. *VA* 5.8 and 5.10, where this very 'barbarian ignorance' motif is introduced and later taken up again. Lucian changed the setting in the source to the Abdera of Lysimachus (Klimek-Winter's idea (103) that this has something to do with later criticism of tragic-mimetic tendencies in contemporary historiography – see above n. 18 – would make sense here), and modified as described above. Langholf (n. 16) 2834f. n. 174 rejects the possibility of a definite link between Lucian and Eunapius, postulating instead an itinerant narrative – consistent with his theory (here n. 59, with some arguments to the contrary) that Lucian's Abderite anecdote is based on a Hellenistic catharsis parody which Lucian did not actually recognise as such: this could scarcely apply to Eunapius as well.

[59] This interpretation makes Langholf's very lucidly presented argument (n. 16; 2814–22) that the Abdera anecdote is an early Hellenistic parody of the Aristotelian theory of catharsis hard to accept. True, the course of the illness as described by Lucian would fit in with this reading: the fever caused by extreme summer temperatures is, writes Langholf, purged with a dose of tragic recitation (purging too soon can be harmful and worsen the symptoms, as is noted at various points in the *Corpus Hippocraticum*), and after the crisis on the seventh day the body rids itself of undigested cathartic substances, i.e. bits of tragic verse (at the risk of appearing pedantic, I would like to ask whether these bits should not then have been from *Andromeda* alone?). For his argumentation, however, Langholf has to deny any link between the anecdote in Eunapius and the Abdera version, but, as we saw above (p. 125 and n. 58), an (indirect) connection must exist; he also has to assume the existence of a lost and, in terms of context, not very easily imaginable parodistic anecdote which could only have been appreciated by readers with extremely specialised knowledge; he has to see Lucian's version as the only ancient response to Aristotle's theory of catharsis (2836), but at the same time maintain that Lucian has absolutely no idea what this theory actually means – and this entangles Langholf in the rekindling of some well-nigh anachronistic prejudices about the standard of the author's education (2810): here Langholf fails to appreciate that Lucian's mimetic aesthetics require the reader to be able to identify his (Lucian's) models, which would seem unlikely in the case of Aristotle's *Poetics* (as Langholf admits), but likely as far as Democritus and Plato are concerned, not to mention the fact that *enthousiasmos* was common poetological currency (cf., for example, above n. 42 and p. 130f). Langholf does not take into account the wider context of the quotation from *Andromeda* or the possibility of an allusion to Democritus. Finally, at one crucial point, he interprets Lucian in my opinion wrongly: the theatrical performance in Abdera is not, as he suggests, a cathartic event, but it is instead the combination of inner emotion, and thus inner heat, caused by the recitation, and the outer body temperatures caused by the hot weather that trigger the outbreak (πυρέξαι ἀπὸ τοῦ θεάτρου in *HC* 1 is to be read in the temporal *and* in the causal sense). The arguments which Langholf bases on the naming of Lysimachos (see above n. 50) and of the (now unknown) actor Archelaus have little weight here (2813f.; cf. Klimek-Winter (n. 10) 103).

does he colour his entire undertaking in shades of senselessness? Not only does he – at least implicitly, as shown above – frame the anecdote and the situation illustrated by it with allusions to (the laughing) Democritus and (the weeping) Heraclitus, both of whom voice in *Vit. auct.* their disdain for the world and its senseless mechanisms: Lucian also allows himself no illusions about his targets here, most of whom are neither interested in nor capable of improving their writing skills. And, finally, he puts down the value of his own contribution by adding, after the allusion to Heraclitus, another anecdote: when Corinth was facing a siege and its inhabitants were all rushing around preparing to defend the city, the Cynic Diogenes began rolling his tub up and down the Craneum; asked why, he answered: κυλίω ... κἀγὼ τὸν πίθον, ὡς μὴ μόνος ἀργεῖν δοκοίην ἐν τοσούτοις ἐργαζομένοις (3). Lucian finishes in (63) with an allusion to this and to the above-cited physician metaphor in (5): οὗτός σοι κανὼν καὶ στάθμη ἱστορίας δικαίας. καὶ εἰ μὲν σταθμήσονταί τινες αὐτῇ, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι καὶ εἰς δέον ἡμῖν γέγραπται, εἰ δὲ μή, κεκύλισται ὁ πίθος ἐν Κρανείῳ. Telling people how to write history is, then, pointless and superfluous. Furthermore, he knows – as he explains in (4) – how flimsy his own advice is.

For an answer to this question we must take another look at Lucian's implicit allusion to Democritus. The Abderites may be the immediate cause of the philosophers' eternally echoing laughter, but it is then directed at the human race in general. The reasons for his mirth are described in detail in an epistolary novel written before or during Augustus' reign and purporting to be the correspondence of Hippocrates,[60] and especially in Letter 17. Hippocrates is asked by the Abderites to cure Democritus, who has apparently gone mad. However, in his consultation with the patient Hippocrates is forced to acknowledge that it is not Democritus who is insane, but his fellow humans. Their actions and behaviour are all riddled with contradictions, they strive for things which are of no importance and cannot recognise what is really important. Sometimes they act one way, the next minute they are doing the very opposite. They never allow in their schemes for what experience and history prove to be the very real possibility of failure. Democritus' reaction is to laugh and twiddle his thumbs, and Hippocrates agrees with his assessment of the situation. Thus on the one side it is very much in keeping with this tradition for Lucian to have the Abderites (!) suffer from a genuine form of insanity, the result of which is that they do not know what they are doing and imitate in their actions and behaviour useless models and notions.[61] On the other hand,

[60] See N. Holzberg, 'Der griechische Briefroman. Versuch einer Gattungstypologie', in: N. Holzberg (ed.), *Der griechische Briefroman. Gattungstypologie und Textanalyse*, Tübingen 1994, 1–52, on the Hippocrates novel 22–8. On Democritus as laughing philosopher see Th. Rütten, *Demokrit – lachender Philosoph und sanguinischer Melancholiker. Eine pseudohippokratische Geschichte*, Leiden etc. 1992, and Reimar Müller, 'Demokrit – der "lachende Philosoph"', in: S. Jäkel (ed.), *Laughter down the Centuries I*, Turku 1994, 39–51.

[61] The tenth epistle of the novel – the first letter from the council and people of Abdera to Hippocrates with their urgent request for him to help Democritus – also contains some details which match Lucian's Abdera anecdote, but this observation does not, as far as I can see, seem to lead to any further conclusions. The Abderites identify themselves fully with Democritus. His illness is an illness of the polis: τοὺς νόμους ἡμέων δοκοῦμεν νοσεῖν, Ἱππόκρατες, τοὺς νόμους παρακόπτειν ... πόλιν, οὐκ ἄνδρα

Lucian's demonstrative reserve as far as his chances of curing the *pepaideumenoi* are concerned reflects both Democritus' and Hippocrates' final inaction. The foolishness of man cannot be cured, only laughed at, as – and again the puzzle of allusions fits together perfectly – the Diogenes anecdote also illustrates. And when Lucian suddenly calls himself a physician at the end of his preliminaries (5), then this too can perhaps be accounted for by the Hippocrates novel and its protagonist who, in the end, is on Democritus' side, but does not – so it seems in 17.10 – really enlighten the Abderites, preferring simply to rub their noses in their mistake: Ἄνδρες, ἔφην, τῆς πρὸς ἐμὲ πρεσβείης χάρις ὑμῖν πολλή. Δημόκριτον γὰρ εἶδον, ἄνδρα σοφώτατον, σωφρονίζειν ἀνθρώπους μοῦνον δυνατώτατον.

On the face of it, then, and especially if seen only in the context of historiography, the advice Lucian is giving in his treatise may appear unimportant, and he himself seems to underline this, refusing to write historiography himself (*HC* 4), which, of course, would be the best way to prove the validity of his suggestions. Instead he admits that his treatise merely scratches at the surface of history-writers' οἰκοδομία, meriting no mention of his name in the ἐπιγραφή (*HC* 4): ὡς κοινωνήσαιμι αὐτοῖς τῆς οἰκοδομίας, εἰ καὶ μὴ τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς, ἄκρῳ γε τῷ δακτύλῳ τοῦ πηλοῦ προσαψάμενος. But on a more profound level Lucian does assign greater significance to his work, as becomes clear at the end of the text. There, in (62), he brings up the Pharos lighthouse, the architect of which had the king's name put on the finished structure as ἐπιγραφή, but his own carved directly in the stone under the plaster; this layer crumbled away with the years, bringing the architect's name to light, thus he attained belated, but more lasting fame. The anecdote is embedded in the suggestion that historians should think of future generations and stick to the truth for their sake; but the thematic linking with (4)[62] and the prominent positioning of the Pharos anecdote at the very end of the treatise, show that Lucian is thinking here – over and above its

θεραπεύσεις, βουλὴν δὲ νοσοῦσαν καὶ κινδυνεύουσαν ἀποκλεισθῆναι μέλλεις ἀνοιγνύναι (10.2). However, the Abderites see themselves as representatives of *paideia*, which they value more than money and which they endeavour to express in their thinking and style. And, in fact, their behaviour towards Hippocrates is more fitting than, for example, that of the Persian king who, as shown in earlier letters, thought he could bribe and threaten the physician into becoming his obedient servant. At the same time, the Abderites fail to appreciate the reality of the situation: their *paideia* is inferior to that of Democritus, he is sane, they are the true madmen. This matches in my opinion the portrayal intended by Lucian, in which the Abderites, with their love of theatre, are not wholly barbarian, but merely of limited *paideia*, like his *pepaideumenoi*, who – as their historiographical writing shows – are not truly educated. When the Abderites of the Hippocrates novel decide that Democritus is suffering from an excess of wisdom (10.1: ὑπὸ πολλῆς τῆς κατεχούσης αὐτὸν σοφίης νενόσηκεν), then it is really their own inadequate *paideia* that prevents them from seeing the truth. Comparable to this in Lucian is, perhaps, the fact that the anecdote is used to illustrate the discrepancy between true and false *paideia*. The search for such parallels produces no further results in terms of content, but there are no contradictions to be found either: proof that Lucian was extremely careful when combining his sources. Just for the record, Horace, *Ep.* 2.1.194–200 links Democritus' laughter with the subject of 'theatre performances' for his own polemic: theatre now only serves to satisfy a craving for showy pageantry, it no longer listens to the words of the poet; for Democritus, then, as for Lucian, the audience represents a public display of human foolishness (Müller (n. 60) 43), itself stupid and deaf to the meaning of the words.

[62] Marked by the echo of οἰκοδομίας (4) in οἰκοδομήσας (62).

immediate and explicit function – of the fate of his own text, the special quality of which goes far beyond its superficial content.

What I think Lucian tries to do in *HC* is not to present a pattern for historiographical composition but to assign to historiography a place within the frame of the rhetorics of prose-writing under the Empire. Prose-writing has, in Lucian's opinion, in the first place to be aesthetically acceptable, that is: it must be formed according to the terms of an aesthetic of harmony, which are not spelled out in *HC* but in other places as *Prom. es* 2–5 or *Dom.* 2–9: εὔρυθμον, εὔμορφον, ἐναρμόνιον and σύμμετρον.[63] It seems understandable that Lucian should be interested in allotting to ἐνθουσιασμός a well-defined role within the actual production of such an aesthetically acceptable writing. Even if Lucian does so in *HC* itself – I shall turn to this passage presently –, it first might be illustrative to adduce here the explanation he gives in *Prom. es* 3: καὶ τὸ μὲν ὅλον ἀρχιτέκτων αὐτὸς ἦν, συνειργάζετο δέ τι καὶ ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ ἐμπνέουσα τὸν πηλὸν καὶ ἔμψυχα ποιοῦσα εἶναι τὰ πλάσματα. Like Prometheus, Lucian has divine help with his pottery, and it is this help that makes his figures appear so life-like, although they are not actually taken from real life, as are the subjects chosen by forensic orators whom Lucian presents at the beginning of his work as antithesis (*Prom. es* 1): καίτοι πόσῳ δικαιότερον ὑμεῖς ἂν εἰκάζοισθε τῷ Προμηθεῖ, ὁπόσοι ἐν δίκαις εὐδοκιμεῖτε ξὺν ἀληθείᾳ ποιούμενοι τοὺς ἀγῶνας; ζῶντα γοῦν ὡς ἀληθῶς καὶ ἔμψυχα ὑμῖν τὰ ἔργα, καὶ νὴ Δία καὶ τὸ θερμὸν αὐτῶν ἐστι διάπυρον· καὶ τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ Προμηθέως ἂν εἴη, πλὴν εἰ μὴ διαλλάττοιτε, ὅτι μὴ ἐκ πηλοῦ πλάττετε, ἀλλὰ χρυσᾶ ὑμῖν τοῖς πολλοῖς τὰ πλάσματα. Animation (τὸ ἔμψυχον εἶναι) is, then, in the case of literary production the result of divine help, of the 'inspired-ness' of the work. The poetological model of inspiration thus takes its proper place within Lucian's literary theory. It no longer stands at the beginning of literary creation as prime mover, but is an aid, a συνεργία: it is not the trigger that renders the activities, the τέχνη of the ἀρχιτέκτων[64] possible, it is not a substitute for his own φροντίς, it is the crowning touch, providing the true effect.[65] The ability to endow a literary figure with animation, to make it ἔμψυχος, is attributed by Lucian to something like inspiration, but to sit down and write with, so to speak, divine fire blazing merrily away inside as the would-be historians do (cf. *HC* 5) is pure madness.

Lucian also allots to ἐνθουσιασμός a well-defined role within the actual production of aesthetically acceptable writing (*HC* 45): καὶ ἡ μὲν γνώμη κοινωνείτω καὶ προσαππέσθω τι καὶ ποιητικῆς, παρ' ὅσον μεγαληγόρος καὶ διηρμένη καὶ ἐκείνη, καὶ μάλισθ' ὁπόταν παρατάξεσι καὶ μάχαις καὶ ναυμαχίαις συμπλέκηται· δεήσει

[63] More on this in James S. Romm, 'Wax, Stone, and Promethean Clay: Lucian as Plastic Artist', *CA* 9, 1990, 74–98; v. Möllendorff (n. 1) 17–23.

[64] It might perhaps be significant that in the Pharos anecdote Lucian seems to compare himself with the ἀρχιτέκτων of the lighthouse. It is not by chance that in the four other instances where Lucian uses the term *architekton* he is always describing the planning and working of an artist: cf. *HC* 12 (= *Pr. im.* 9), *Herm.* 20 and esp. *Char.* 4, where it is Homer himself who is called *architekton*.

[65] Cf. the discussion of enthusiasm in oratory in the early chapters of (Ps.-)Lucian, *Dem. enc.* (5–8).

γὰρ τότε ποιητικοῦ τινος ἀνέμου ἐπουριάσαντος τὰ ἀκάτια καὶ συνδιοίσοντος ὑψηλὴν καὶ ἐπ' ἄκρων τῶν κυμάτων τὴν ναῦν. ἡ λέξις δὲ ὅμως ἐπὶ γῆς βεβηκέτω, ... ξενίζουσα δὲ μηδ' ὑπὲρ τὸν καιρὸν ἐνθουσιῶσα· κίνδυνος γὰρ αὐτῇ τότε μέγιστος παρακινῆσαι καὶ κατενεχθῆναι ἐς τὸν τῆς ποιητικῆς κορύβαντα, ὥστε μάλιστα πειστέον τηνικαῦτα τῷ χαλίνῳ καὶ σωφρονητέον, εἰδότας ὡς ἱπποτυφία τις καὶ ἐν λόγοις πάθος οὐ μικρὸν γίγνεται. This passage is interesting because in it Lucian not only explicitly focuses on ἐνθουσιασμός as a theme, but also represents it as a completely controllable emotion (μηδ' ὑπὲρ τὸν καιρὸν ἐνθουσιῶσα).[66] Controllability here means that, when the γνώμη inspired in certain situations – e.g. where a naval battle is to be described – by the ποιητικὸς ἄνεμος[67] is converted into the written word, language and style are not to exceed the appropriate bounds with high-flown affectation. A lively imagination, which is fired by such inspiration and can quite feasibly enthuse the reader too, hardly interferes with the actual prose.[68] If allowed to do so, then it runs the risk of breaking elementary rules (just as the Abderites' yelling of verse is in every respect inappropriate and unsuitable) and thus laying itself open to ridicule: γελοῖόν τι πάθος (*HC* 1), or, as Ps.-Longinus puts it in *De subl.* 3.2, πολλαχοῦ γὰρ ἐνθουσιᾶν ἑαυτοῖς δοκοῦντες οὐ βακχεύουσιν, ἀλλὰ παίζουσιν. Lucian uses a comparison with ἱπποτυφία, where an unbridled style can easily become unsaddled.[69] This refers to a general rhetorical *vitium*: exaggeration, stylistic inflation, bombastic pomposity that exceed the harmonious measure (particularly in the choice of diction) and offends τὸ πρέπον. Enthusiasm is thus moved by Lucian to a new poetological location entirely within the realm of style. This is a quite logical step on the path already (as we saw above) signposted *ironice* by Plato, later taken by Aristotle and followed into the Imperial Age by post-Aristotelian theorists: by associating enthusiasm ever closer with poetic *techne*, i.e. with what is (largely) an acquired skill, it could be watered down on the one hand to a special ability of the talented disposition, on the other to a rhetorical *officium*, i.e. the appropriate deployment of πάθος (impassionedness).[70] Lucian may not actually have taken this any further than, for example, Ps.-Longinus did, but to set forth this poetological notion within the discussion of a field where one would least expect to find it – historiography – is, in my opinion, an unusual and original idea.

Lucian's reference here to this conception of enthusiasm is very much in line with the general character of the treatise, which offers little in the way of historiographical theory, but assigns to history-writing a well-defined place within the rhetorical

[66] See Homeyer (n. 6) 259f.; on Lucian's disapproval of Corybantic style *Lex.* 16, 20, 24 – cf. Weissenberger (n. 4) ad loc. – and *Bacch.* 5. For the treatment of the ἐνθουσιασμός theory in Pythagorean and Peripatetic thought see Hermann Koller, *Die Mimesis in der Antike*, Bern 1954, 219–21. Rejection of 'inspired' poetry-writing that neglects its τέχνη also in Horace, *AP* 295–301, 309; for other parallels between Lucian's and Horace's thinking here cf. Homeyer (n. 6) 63–81.

[67] Cf. v. Möllendorff (n. 1) 73–6.

[68] Cf. e.g. Cic. *De orat.* 2.194–97.

[69] Cf. Homeyer (n. 6) 260.

[70] Cf. here B. Kositzke, 'Art. "Enthusiasmus"', in: *HWRh* 2 (Tübingen 1994) 1185–97, esp. 1185–9.

system.[71] The biggest problem for historians (then as now), i.e. finding the truth, is not neglected by Lucian, but he has a simple solution for it: the historian only needs to be unbiased and fond of the truth, the material is there or can at least be easily found (*HC* 51), and when in doubt, the historian may apply the principle of πιθανότης (*HC* 11, 20, 25, 47).[72] The real difficulty in composing a historical work lies not in the question of ethics, it is a matter of rhetoric:[73] οὐ γὰρ ὥσπερ τοῖς ῥήτορσι γράφουσιν, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν λεχθησόμενα ἔστι καὶ εἰρήσεται· πέπρακται γὰρ ἤδη· δεῖ δὲ τάξαι καὶ εἰπεῖν αὐτά ... τοιοῦτο δή τι καὶ τὸ τοῦ συγγραφέως ἔργον, εἰς καλὸν διαθέσθαι τὰ πεπραγμένα καὶ εἰς δύναμιν ἐναργέστατα ἐπιδεῖξαι αὐτά (51). What is required is a style that corresponds to the ethical ideal of παρρησία and ἀλήθεια, a style characterised above all by σαφήνεια and the *genus medium*.[74] Historiography being in rhetorical terms purely *narratio*/διήγησις (*HC* 55), it must keep to the rules of style for this *pars orationis*.[75] Such observance – generally speaking – of what is πρέπον includes a harmonious arrangement, in which each part has its properly measured portion of space.[76] Historiography is thus allotted a specific place within a rhetorical system that covers all *genera dicendi*.[77]

## *Frigid enthusiasts*

Now, infringements of these rules, particularly those with regard to diction and style, can be listed under the heading ψυχρόν. And indeed Lucian singles out this particular *vitium* strikingly often in *HC* – three times in all:[78]

a) A certain physician, Kallimorphos, who is supposed to have written about the Parthian War, is criticised by Lucian for, amongst other things, the following: καὶ νὴ

[71] See E. Mattioli, 'Retorica e storia nel *Quomodo Historia Sit Conscribenda* di Luciano', in: A. Pennacini (ed.), *Retorica e storia nella cultura classica*, Bologna 1985, 89–105; F. Montanari, 'Ekphrasis e verità storica nella critica di Luciano', *Ricerche di filologia classica* 2, Pisa 1984, 111–23; F. Montanari, 'Virtutes elocutionis e narrationis nella storiografia secondo Luciano', *Ricerche di filologia classica* 3, Pisa 1987, 53–65. On parallels between Lucian's notions of the ideal orator and the ideal historian see Homeyer (n. 6) 251f.

[72] On the latter see Montanari ((n. 71) 1987) 59f.

[73] See Mattioli (n. 71) 100ff.

[74] See Mattioli (n. 71) 94; cf. also Lucian, *Pr.im.* 20f. and Gerlinde Bretzigheimer, 'Lukians Dialoge Εἰκόνες – Ὑπὲρ τῶν εἰκόνων. Ein Beitrag zur Literaturtheorie und Homerkritik', *RhM* 135, 1992, 161–87.

[75] See Mattioli (n. 71) 98f.

[76] See Mattioli (n. 71) 96f. and Montanari ((n. 71) 1984) 116f. On all problems regarding the conflict reality/fiction in historiography, the selection of historical facts and their organic arrangement, and rhetoric and ethics see M. J. Wheeldon's carefully considered '"True Stories"': The Reception of Historiography in Antiquity', in: A. Cameron (ed.), *History As Text: The Writing of Ancient Historiography*, London 1989, 36–63, who allots to Lucian's treatise its proper place within this debate.

[77] Montanari ((n. 71) 1987) 62, Mattioli (n. 71) 100.

[78] On ψυχρόν see L. van Hook's informative 'ψυχρότης ἢ τὸ ψυχρόν', *CPh* 12, 1917, 68–76; on the metaphorical use of the *frigus* 'motif' see Kirk Freudenburg, *The Walking Muse. Horace on the Theory of Satire*, Princeton, N.J. 1993, 191f. and, for example, Hor. *Sat.* 1.1.80–3, 2.5.39–41.

Δία καὶ τὸ προοίμιον ὑπέρψυχρον ἐποίησεν οὕτως συναγαγών· οἰκεῖον εἶναι ἰατρῷ ἱστορίαν συγγράφειν, εἴ γε ὁ Ἀσκληπιὸς μὲν Ἀπόλλωνος υἱός, Ἀπόλλων δὲ Μουσηγέτης καὶ πάσης παιδείας ἄρχων· καὶ ὅτι ἀρξάμενος ἐν τῇ Ἰάδι γράφειν οὐκ οἶδα ὅ τι δόξαν αὐτίκα μάλα ἐπὶ τὴν κοινὴν μετῆλθεν, ἰητρείην μὲν λέγων καὶ πείρην καὶ ὁκόσα καὶ νοῦσοι, τὰ δ' ἄλλα ὁμοδίαιτα τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ τὰ πλεῖστα οἷα ἐκ τριόδου (16). What is condemned here as 'cold' is the argument that, because Apollo is the god of the Muses, a follower of the god's son Asclepius should be particularly good at writing history – reasoning that is more than far-fetched and wholly inappropriate. Regarding the style of the writing, Lucian notes as inappropriate that Kallimorphos seems to consider a few scraps of Ionic sufficient to make him a second Herodotus, even if he lapses into the common koine for the rest.

b) In (19) Lucian mentions another historian, this time one who thought himself comparable to Thucydides because he was lavish in his use of ecphrasis: τὸ δὲ ἐς ἐχθρῶν κεφαλὰς ὁ ἀλεξίκακος τρέψειε· τοσαύτη ψυχρότης ἐνῆν ὑπὲρ τὴν Κασπίαν χιόνα καὶ τὸν κρύσταλλον τὸν Κελτικόν; samples follow. The connection between such *excursus* and the actual historical facts, which ought to stand in the foreground, is, according to Lucian, completely lost in this author: hence his 'frigidity'.

c) A third case: ἐγὼ γοῦν ἤκουσά τινος τὴν μὲν ἐπ' Εὐρώπῳ μάχην ἐν οὐδ' ὅλοις ἑπτὰ ἔπεσι παραδραμόντος, εἴκοσι δὲ μέτρα ἢ ἔτι πλείω ὕδατος ἀναλωκότος ἐς ψυχρὰν καὶ οὐδὲν ἡμῖν προσήκουσαν διήγησιν, ὡς Μαῦρός τις ἱππεὺς Μαυσάκας τοὔνομα ὑπὸ δίψους πλανώμενος ἀνὰ τὰ ὄρη καταλάβοι Σύρους τινὰς τῶν ἀγροίκων ... (28). An inserted narrative, nothing to do with the main line of events, and far too protracted for something so trivial – a classic example of *inventio* missing the *aptum* mark and of incongruous imbalance between *res* and *verba*.[79]

Even in passages where the terms ψυχρόν or ψυχρότης do not occur, Lucian still very often complains that the selection of material and its expression in words are not appropriate to the genre chosen, i.e. historiography. 'Frigidity' in quite a broad sense[80] is, then, one general target of his criticism.

In declaring ψυχρότης in its diverse forms a widespread *vitium*, Lucian, it seems to me, returns to our as yet unexplained motif from the Abderite anecdote: μέγα κρύος. The 'big chill' had put an end to the Abderites τραγῳδομανία; a direct analogy to this cure – a spectacular one, even if it is reported in a no-nonsense, matter-of-fact (cool!) manner – is, however, nowhere to be found in *HC* 2 with its account of the *pepaideumenoi* situation, and neither the version in Eunapius nor Philostratus offer any parallels. But, just because of the motif being spectacular and, as it seems to me, enigmatic, the reader should and will feel engaged in trying to provide the analogy himself.[81] And, I think, it must be the treatise proper – the discussion that names the

[79] Cf. here for the basic aspects of ψυχρόν in the sense of exaggerated *amplificatio* H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*, ed. 3, Stuttgart 1990, sec. 1076.

[80] The terms can also be applied to shallow, fatuous and insipid literary products or their authors: see LSJ s.v. ψυχρόν II.4; s.v. ψυχρότης II.

[81] Cf. above n. 9.

historians' *vitia* by name (in the first place by the name of ψυχρότης) and will thus silence the perpetrators – that is analogous to the μέγα κρύος in Abdera: there is hope that the historians' ψυχρότης will be cured by being named – or that they will be silenced forever.[82]

The opening sections of *HC* prove, then, to be no mere 'teaser': they are instead closely interwoven with the main body of the treatise by way of two thematic threads – the parody of ἐνθουσιασμός and the κρύος/ψυχρόν strands. Lucian not only presents a plea for literature based on his aesthetic of harmony, he also practises what he preaches – and this even, or perhaps with a vengeance, in a theoretical treatise.

INSTITUT FÜR KLASSISCHE PHILOLOGIE DER UNIVERSITÄT MÜNCHEN PETER VON MÖLLENDORFF

[82] Given that Lucian warns readers right from the start that his expectations for the success of his treatise are low, the ψυχρόν motif is perhaps also supposed to suggest that the 'frigidity' of the historians' vapid products will in the long run be the end of them, because they will attract no (educated) readers.