

# THE AESTHETICS OF PARADOX IN LUCIAN'S *PROLALIAÍ*

Valentina Popescu\*  
*University of California, Davis*

**RESUMO:** Este artigo explora o emprego, por Luciano, de material paradoxográfico em suas introduções retóricas, *prolaliaí*, como uma retórica oblíqua de autorreferência. Especialmente, mostra que o material paradoxográfico, gradualmente estabelecendo sofisticados paradigmas para a recepção do novo e da alteridade, é parte de uma estratégia requintada, um sistema referencial complexo, através do qual Luciano define sua poética e reflete o clima cultural multifacetado de sua época, em que tenta estabelecer a si mesmo como, paradoxalmente, uma identidade tanto heterodoxa quanto ortodoxa.

**PALAVRAS-CHAVE:** Luciano; automoldagem; identidade cultural; poética; paradoxo.

ἀλλὰ τί πρὸς τὸν Διόνυσον ὁ Διόνυσος οὗτος;  
*What has this Dionysus to do with Dionysus?*  
(Lucian, *Bacchus*, 5.1)

*L*ucian frequently describes his literary novelty as a marvel – *parádoxon* –, a term typical for paradoxography, the literature of wonders. Yet, in his rhetorical introductions – *prolaliaí* –, the paradoxographical hypotext is pervasive and deserves a more systematic examination, within the broader cultural and literary context.<sup>1</sup> Lucian exploits the

---

\* vpopescu@ucdavis.edu

<sup>1</sup> On Lucian's *prolaliaí*, see Thimme, *op. cit.*; Stock, *op. cit.*; Mras, *op. cit.*; Anderson, *op. cit.*, 1977; Branham, *op. cit.*, 1985, republished in Branham, *op. cit.*, 1989; Nesselrath, *op. cit.*; Georgiadou; Larmour, *op. cit.*; Villani, *op. cit.* References can also be found in more general studies: Bompaire, *op. cit.*, p. 286-288; Reardon, *op. cit.*, p. 165-166; Robinson,

aesthetical and rhetorical functions of marvels (*parádoxa*), by using them as paradigms for his exoticism, in terms of cultural identity, and the exoticism of his work, in terms of generic identity.<sup>2</sup>

However, the rich and diverse paradoxographical material does more than just presenting the author as exotic; and exotic still sells in the Second Sophistic.<sup>3</sup> It amounts obviously, in Lucian's case, to more than just a conventional rhetorical repertoire. It goes beyond just equaling the generic novelty of the comic dialogue, or the *míxis* of genres in it, of prose and verse, of serious and comic, to a *parádoxon*. Lucian constantly focuses on earning *dóxa* (*fame*) through *parádoxa* from an audience of *pepaideuménoi* expected to sublimate the experience of *ékleipsis* (*astonishment*) from bewilderment to aesthetic pleasure. His use of paradoxographical material is part of a more sophisticated strategy. Through the oblique rhetoric of *parádoxa*, Lucian defines his poetics and reflects the multilayered cultural climate of the era, in which he attempts to establish himself as a, paradoxically, distinct and orthodox identity.

I will limit my study to the eight texts established as *prolaliaí* by Rothstein, given their consistency in scholarly classifications.<sup>4</sup> The purpose of my study is not to establish taxonomy based on genre purity, which seems a paradoxical attempt for an author who revels with impunity in generic 'impurity'. I only attempt to investigate Lucian's modes of self-presentation filtered through the culture of *parádoxa* in texts that are self-referential and indisputably introductory. I will discuss Lucian's *prolaliaí* in approximately the same order as Nesselrath (1990), yet not a strictly chronological one, acknowledging that committing to even a loose chronology may prove risky. I divide them into three groups, not completely separate, but in a rather fluid continuity and cross-referential correspondence, based on the development of Lucian's rhetorical skills in incorporating paradoxographical material and on the

---

<sup>op. cit.</sup>, p. 7-8, p. 13; Anderson, *op. cit.*, 1993, p. 53-55; Pernot, *op. cit.*, p. 547-554; Camerotto, *op. cit.*, p. 266-274 and *passim*; Whitmarsh, *op. cit.*, 2001, p. 77-78; Brandão, *op. cit.*, p. 75-88, p. 91-96, p. 134-138. Cf. Bompaire, *op. cit.*, p. 286, n. 5; Russell, *op. cit.*, p. 77-79.

<sup>2</sup> Anderson, *op. cit.*, 1977, points, in a summary observation, to the presence of paradoxographical material in Lucian's *prolaliaí*, while Branham, *op. cit.*, Camerotto, *op. cit.*, and Brandão, *op. cit.*, briefly discuss it.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Branham, *op. cit.*, p. 183-184; Anderson, *op. cit.*, 1993, p. 55, p. 171-199; Whitmarsh, *op. cit.*, 2005, p. 35-37. Cf. Gleason, *op. cit.*, *passim* on Favorinus and his three paradoxes (Phil. VS 489) and p. 39-40 on the possible use of *parádoxa* in Polemo's introductions.

<sup>4</sup> Rothstein, *op. cit.*, p. 116-123.

self-referential statements concerning cultural identity: a first group, in which the author is concerned with establishing an audience and blending in with the Greek culture (*Harmonides*, *Herodotus*, *The Scythian*, *The Dipsádes*), a second, with establishing a degree of difference in the reception of his work not as mere novelty, but also as exquisite artistry (*Amber or Swans*, *Zeuxis or Antiochus*), and a third, with reestablishing himself after an alleged absence from the rhetorical arena (*Heracles*, *Dionysus*).

\*\*\*

*Harmonides* has earned only very short treatments, at most a few lines. Not only is its artistic value obviously inferior in comparison with the rest of Lucian's *prolaliaí*, but it also proves hard to fit into any compositional pattern.<sup>5</sup> *Harmonides*, a hopeful young pipe player, asks Timotheus, who has already taught him perfectly the art of pipe playing, to teach him also how to acquire general fame, for him the final purpose of art.<sup>6</sup> *Harmonides* wants to be distinguished (ἐπίσημον) among men like his teacher, whom people admire just as day birds regard a night owl (ὢσπερ ἐπὶ τὴν γλαῦκα τὰ ὄρνεα, 1), i.e. Timotheus teaches his disciple that the shortest path to glory is not to seek the admiration of the crowds, but of the knowledgeable élite (τοὺς ἀρίστους καὶ ὀλίγους). They, as leaders of opinion, are able to influence the masses, people of bad taste who are unable to appreciate value (ἀγνοοῦσι τὰ βελτίω,

---

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Anderson, *op. cit.*, 1977, p. 314-315; Nesselrath, *op. cit.*, p. 121; Anderson pairs it with *Somn.* and distinguishes three common thematic elements: "the would-be artist prefers fame to a life of obscurity", "his first youthful essay is his last", and "a trial scene".

<sup>6</sup> There is no other extant source for this anecdote. Timotheus is a famous fourth century Boeotian pipe player (Diphil. fr. 78 Kassel-Austin; Dio Chrys. *Or.* 1. 1-3; Athen. *Deipn.* 12.54.34; Phot. 243. 372 a 37-40. His musical performance produced a strong impression on Alexander the Great (Dio Chrys. *Or.* 1. 1-3; cf. *Suda* τ 620, 7-13, where Timotheus of Thebes is confused with Timotheus of Miletus (*Suda* τ 620, 1-7); cf. *Suda* α 1122, ο 573; Anna Comn. 4.1.16-21; Eust. *Comm. ad Il.* 3.137.12-13. The story is celebrated by Dryden and adapted by Hamilton to a libretto for Handel's *Alexander's Feast*). This Timotheus needs to be distinguished from the 5-4 c. musician and citharode Timotheus of Miletus (Luc. *Harm.* 1. 24; cf. Arist. *Metaph.* 993 b15; Diod. 14.46.6.5; Plut. *De Alex. fort.* 334 b; Steph. Byz. 452.16-453.4; Phot. *Bibl.* 239. 320 b 10-11; see West, *op. cit.*, p. 361-364; Campbell's *Greek Lyric*, vol. 5, 1993, p. 70-121; Hordern, *op. cit.*). On Timotheus of Thebes/ Miletus see Bélis, *op. cit.*, 1998 and 2002.

βάναυσοι ὄντες, 2). In his very first and last attempt to acquire glory in a competition, Harmonides blows too ambitiously and breathes out his life into his pipe, thus dying uncrowned.<sup>7</sup> In a disproportionately long *sýncrisis* Lucian claims to apply Timotheus' principles to himself and his *epídeixis* on a short road to fame. He launches into excessive and rather clumsy flattery of an unnamed patron, whose opinion exceeds everyone as the sum of all excellence (τὸ κεφάλαιον ἀρετῆς), an expert (γνώμων), and the most appropriate critic (ὁ ὄρθος κανών, 3-4). The utmost expression of *dóxa* is articulated here through a *parádoxon*. The élite's admiration of the artist is illustrated by the wonder felt by birds at the strange daylight appearance of an owl (ῶσπερ ἐπὶ τὴν γλαῦκα τὰ ὄρνεα, 1).<sup>8</sup> The artist's ultimate goal is, therefore, to be regarded as a marvel, as a surprising, astonishing, exotic entity. *Herodotus or Aëtion* is a diptych *prolalia*. In the two illustrative stories, the historian Herodotus and the painter Aëtion gain universal recognition by displaying their talents at Olympia. Herodotus travels to mainland Greece to gain quick and easy fame. He allegedly decides to perform at Olympia, during the games, before an élite audience representing the entire Greek nation.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Paradoxically, although Harmonides dies without glory, he nevertheless gains posthumous fame through this story, whether as part of a shared tradition, or through Lucian's invention. Lucian uses here elements of the common stock sophistic material later recommended by Menander Rhetor for introductory speeches, e.g. the mention of famous citharodes and pipe players (Men. Rhet. 392.19-20). Lucian speaks here of the two Timotheuses, of Marsyas, the legendary Phrygian *aúlos*-player, and of Olympus, Marsyas' legendary pupil (cf. Pl. *Symp.* 215 c). Timotheus of Thebes, Marsyas, and Olympus appear all in one of Dio Chrysostom's *prolalia* (Dio Chrys. *Or.* 1. 1-3). One of Apuleius' introductions tells the story of Marsyas, while another makes mention of another famous *aúlos*-player, Antigenidas (Apul. *Fl.* 3 and 4).

<sup>8</sup> Arist. *Hist. anim.* 609 a: τῆς δ' ἡμέρας καὶ τὰ ἄλλια ὄρνιθια τὴν γλαῦκα περιπέταται, ὁ καλεῖται θαυμάζειν. Here θαυμάζειν has an ironic use, since in fact the little birds pluck the feathers of a confused owl (τίλλουσιν). There are also references to the bad treatment of the owl (τὴν γλαῦκα τωθάζουσι, *Com. Adesp.* fr. 724 Kock; cf. Ael. Dion. τ 15; Phot. *Lex.* τ 586), and to the owl's strange walk, like a dance, during the day (*Suda* αι 137 on Call. *Hec.* fr. 326; cf. Hesich. *Lex.* γ 610). On the seducing power of the owl see Ael. *NA* 1.29. Lucian seems to employ here a paradoxographical imagery, that of the exotic sight of an owl during the day.

<sup>9</sup> See Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 240-242 and Nesselrath, *op. cit.*, p. 117-118 on the improbability of these facts; cf. Euseb. *Chron. Arm.* 83; Didyllus *FGrH* 73 F3; Plut. *Herod. mal.* 862 A 6-8.

Herodotus prefaces his display by affirming his status as a performer competing for recognition, not a passive spectator (*οὐ θεατὴν, ἀλλ’ ἀγωνιστὴν*, 1). His statement serves as a prologue to his performance, through which he obliquely aims at the audience’s attention and their favorable judgment, a metaliterary paradigm for Lucian’s own *prolalia* and its function.<sup>10</sup>

Herodotus enchants his audience with the recitation of his *Histories* (*ἀδων τὰς ἱστορίας καὶ κηλῶν τοὺς παρόντας*, 1). The magical aspect of the performance makes it extraordinary, thus equivalent to a marvel. As magic charming is associated with both pleasure and deceit, the charm of *parádoxa* is transferred for Herodotus – the “father of history”, but also “of lies” – to his performance of a text whose fabric is dappled, in the spirit of *poikilía*, with marvels (*θώματα*).<sup>11</sup> In Lucian’s case, on the other hand, the expression of *dóxa* lies in the beholding of a charming performance perceived as an aesthetic marvel. Paradoxically, in both *Harmonides* and *Herodotus*, Lucian represents the élite’s ideal reception as a reaction characteristic of the masses: shocked and curious little birds flocking around an owl in the middle of the day, or crowds bewitched by the marvellous stories of a mendacious charmer. The paradoxographical imagery evokes strong irrational emotions, attributed elsewhere by Lucian to a rather untrained audience.<sup>12</sup> Here, however, it vividly translates the intensity of aesthetic emotions. The *epídeixis*, perceived as an aesthetic *parádoxon*, produces not just a cerebral reaction, but also a strong emotional response, as admiration for *téchne* is elevated to wonder and awe.

These two *prolaliaí* share striking similarities in terms of theme and motifs. They are both articulated on the idea of fame (*τιμή*, *δόξα*), particularly on the shortcut (*ἡ ἐπίτομος*) to universal renown. This shortcut is facilitated by the élite, whose *paideía* makes them not only appropriate judges, but also leaders of opinion, able to shape the artistic and cultural judgments of the non-élite.<sup>13</sup> While in *Harmonides* Lucian avoids the issue of ethnicity and cultural identity altogether, in *Herodotus* he seems to be one step further on his cultural homecoming journey. Following on Herodotus’ steps, Lucian crosses the sea from

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Dio Chrys. *Or.* 8.11 on Diogenes’ similar attitude.

<sup>11</sup> Cic. *Leg.* 1.5, *Div.* 116; cf. Luc. *VH* 2.5, 2.31. Evans, *op. cit.*; Hartog, *op. cit.*

<sup>12</sup> Luc. *Zeux.* and *Prom. es.*

<sup>13</sup> Luc. *Harm.* 2.13; *Herod.* 3.1. Cf. Luc. *Rhet. praec.* 3.11, where Lucian satirizes the shortcut to rhetorical fame facilitated not by *paideía*, but by simulation of *paideía*.

the east to his own Olympia, in fact Macedonia.<sup>14</sup> Herodotus comes from a marginal area, therefore he is perceived as foreign to mainland Greece and mainstream Hellenism. However, not only is he able to enchant the Greek élite, but he also sets the foundations of a new cultural pattern, thus paving the way for other artists who will display their work at Olympia. The list of Herodotus' followers on this shortcut to fame opens, suggestively, with the name of Hippias of Elis. In virtue of the Eleans' control of the Olympic Games, Hippias appears as a native of the sacred ground that stands for Greekness as the cement of a nation. Thus, he epitomizes the very core of the Greek élite. By making Hippias a follower of Herodotus, Lucian affirms the ability of an Asian to bring innovation to all Greece and become a model for all Greeks. Not only does an outsider conquer Greece, but he also teaches Greeks a cultural lesson, thus incorporating fringe elements previously perceived as foreign and marginal.

In his praise of the Macedonian host city Lucian, in zealous flattery, disparages Olympia and its spectators in favor of the present location and audience. Thus, sacred old symbols of Greekness are reduced to primitivism and lack of *paideía*. It is time for new symbols and new canons, the inclusion of the marginal areas of the Greek world. In changing the center from Olympia to Macedonia, Lucian points to a pattern for other fringe territories that can be incorporated and usurp the old center's birthright. On the other hand, Herodotus' path is a paradigm for Lucian's own path from the margin to the center, for his cultural homecoming. Thus, Lucian's *λόγος ἐπιβατήριος* before a Macedonian audience becomes from a visitor's speech a cultural homecoming speech, in an attempt to change his cultural status, from a *visitor* to a *native* of Greek letters.<sup>15</sup>

Aëtion exhibits at Olympia his representation of the wedding of Alexander and Roxana, a painting that Lucian claims to have seen in Italy.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>14</sup> The performance has been placed in Thessalonica (Gallavotti, *op. cit.*, p. 6) or Beroea (Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 11 n. 25).

<sup>15</sup> In Menander's taxonomy, this introductory speech, if taken individually, would fit well into the category of *λόγοι ἐπιβατήριοι*, in this case a speech occasioned by the rhetor's visit to a city other than his native one. As such, it should, as it does, contain praise of the host city and its leadership (Men. Rhet. 377.31-378.3); cf. Nesselrath, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Nesselrath, *op. cit.*, p. 119-120. For Aëtion cf. Luc. *Merc. cond.* 42.2, *Imag.* 7.16, 7.26-8.1; Pl. *NH* 35.78, 34.50.

Proxenides, one of the judges, is so pleased by such a display of talent, that he offers his daughter in marriage to the painter. Displaying his own skills of “painting with words” in an *ékphrasis*, Lucian does not address the relevance of this story.<sup>17</sup> Aëtion’s skills make possible the transfer of art that imitates reality (i.e. the wedding of Alexander and Roxana) to a new reality that involves the artist himself (i.e. his own wedding). This anecdote becomes paradigmatic of Lucian’s hope to emulate the painter and to transfer, through his rhetorical skills, fame from *lógos* to actuality. The Olympian judge who marries his daughter to the stranger (οὐκ ἐπιχωρίω) Aëtion is Προξενίδης, the son of a πρόξενος (host/friend/ protector of foreigners; patron). Therefore, his inclusion of Aëtion into the family expresses Lucian’s expectation to be embraced, as a *xénos* (friend), by his influential audience/ hosts/ patrons into the family of Greekness.<sup>18</sup>

In *The Scythian*, also delivered in Macedonia, Lucian develops further the concept of *proxenía*. He compares the cultural relationship between himself and his *próxenoi*, Macedonian father and son, to the relationship between the Scythian Anacharsis and his *próxenoi*, Toxaris and Solon, one a former compatriot now completely Hellenized, the other a genuine Athenian epitomizing the best of Greece.<sup>19</sup> Lucian works here with two different forms of *parádoxa*: exotic, illustrated by the contact between two different cultures, Greek and barbarian; and aesthetic, represented by Greek *paideía*, especially in the form of rhetorical display.

---

<sup>17</sup> Luc. *Dom.* 21.14, *Calumn.* 2.1-2.

<sup>18</sup> It is also significant that Lucian invokes Zeus Φίλιος, the god of friendship (Luc. *Herod.* 7).

<sup>19</sup> Both of the names ‘Anacharsis’ and ‘Toxaris’ appear in two other Lucianic works, the dialogues *Anacharsis or On Athletics* and *Toxaris or Friendship*. Visa-Ondarçuhu, *op. cit.*, argues for the same identity of the characters bearing these names; cf. Anderson, *op. cit.*, 1976, p. 267-269. While the character of Toxaris seems to be entirely Lucian’s invention in both cases (cf. Kindstrand, *op. cit.*, p. 13-14 n. 27; Gorrini, *op. cit.*), Anacharsis is well established as a Scythian wise man in the earlier Greek literary tradition, with a notable resurgence in the Imperial literature; cf. Hdt. 4.46, 76-77; Hermipp. (*apud* Diog. Laert. 1.101-105); cf. Ps.-Anacharsis *Ep.*; Plut. *Sol.* 5.1-6, *Mor.* 146b-164d; Athen. *Deipn.* 4.49, 10.32, 50, 64, 14.2; Max. Tyr. *Or.* 25.1; Dio Chrys. *Or.* 32.44; Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F104; Gal. *Adhort. ad artes* 17; Ael. *VH.* 2.41, 5.7; Fronto *Ep. Graec.* 1.5; etc. For a complete list of sources, see Kindstrand, *op. cit.*, and Ungefehr-Kortus, *op.cit.*

Anacharsis, enamored with Greece, comes to Athens, reenacting the journey of Toxaris. While the Athenians make fun of his barbarian appearance, he is perplexed and frightened at the encounter with a new world (*τεταραγμένος*, *ψοφοδεής*, 3.4-5; *ἐτεταράγμην*, 4.20). Entrusted by Toxaris to Solon, his patron, Anacharsis is initiated in Greek *paideía* and thus, conquering novelty through understanding, his bewilderment changes from cognitive to aesthetic, as he is astonished (*τεθηπώς*, 8) by Solon's *sophía*. While the theme here is still the shortcut to fame, the focus subtly shifts from the idea of *dóxa* to that of *proxenía*, from achieving literary glory to achieving a more inclusive cultural embracing, not just as an artist, but – more importantly – as culturally Greek.

Travel and displacement lead to the experience of the otherness, to the shock of novelty, which those writers of *parádoxa* who claim autopsy confess to have undergone themselves and to which they attempt to expose their readership. Anacharsis' journey is not just physical, but also cultural. He is engaged in *theoría*, in seeing the world, here reduced to Greece.<sup>20</sup> His interests in foreign customs echo those of a paradoxographer.<sup>21</sup> Although Lucian emphasizes the emotional effect of *parádoxa* on Anacharsis, he also refers to them in terms of their intellectual aspect (*πάντα ἀγνοῶν*, 3.4; *ἄπαντα ἔγνω*, 8.10-11). He, thus, makes the Scythian's effort distinctive from that of the paradoxographer proper, who records marvels aiming at creating shock, not understanding. His readership enjoys the pleasure of the emotional effect and escapes the rationalizing effort. For Anacharsis, however, *parádoxa*, to which he is keen to be exposed, represent a novel world that fascinates him, yet which he attempts to understand.

While for Anacharsis, Toxaris, and Solon, Lucian stresses the idea of displacement by using compounds with *ἀπο-* (*ἀποδημήσας*, 4.17, 5.11; *ἀποδημία*, 7.16), in his own case he uses an *ἐπι-* compound (*ἐπεδήμησα*, 9.13), thus emphasizing not the idea of dis-location, but rather that, which comes as its possible consequence, of re-location, of putting down roots in a new place. One could even stretch the use of the verb *ἐπιδημέω* here to deliberately imply the idea of (cultural) homecoming.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Luc. *VH* 1.2.4; cf. Hdt. 1.30 on Solon's journey and *theoría* (*τῆς θεωρίης ἐκδημήσας ὁ Σόλων εἴνεκεν*, 1.30.1; *γῆν πολλὴν θεωρίης εἴνεκεν ἐπελήλυθας*, 1.30.2); Arist. *Ath. pol.* 11.1 (*ἀποδημίαν ἐποιήσατο κατ’ ἐμπορίαν ἄμα καὶ θεωρίαν*); see Baslez, *op. cit.*, p. 164-165, on “tourisme intellectuel”.

<sup>21</sup> Hdt. 4.76-77; Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F104.9.11; Dio Chrys. *Or.* 32.44; Diog. Laert. 1.101; Ps.-Anacharsis *Ep.* 10.1-3.

Lucian, who identifies with Anacharsis, confesses to have had a similar emotional experience when he first came to the Macedonian city where he is performing:

ἐξεπλάγην μὲν εὐθὺς ἵδων τὸ μέγεθος καὶ τὸ κάλλος καὶ τῶν ἐμπολιτευομένων τὸ πλῆθος καὶ τὴν ἄλλην δύναμιν καὶ λαμπρότητα πᾶσαν ὥστε ἐπὶ πολὺ ἐτεθήπειν πρὸς ταῦτα καὶ οὐκ ἐξήρκουν τῷ θαύματι (9.13-17).<sup>22</sup>

The object of Lucian's bewilderment is an aesthetic *parádoxon* (τῷ θαύματι): the beauty (τὸ κάλλος) and the sublimity (τὸ μέγεθος) of the Macedonian city.<sup>23</sup> Indeed, the marvelous beauty of Greek *paideía* is the defining quest of both Toxaris (φιλόκαλος ἀνήρ, 1) and Anacharsis.<sup>24</sup> We find its greatest expression in Lucian's young Macedonian *próxenos*, with whom the city is passionately in love and whose physical beauty is matched by speech:

εἰ δὲ καὶ φθέγξαι το μόνον, οἰχήσεται σε ἀπὸ τῶν ὕπαρχων ἀναδησάμενος, τοσαύτην Ἀφροδίτην ἐπὶ τῇ γλώττῃ ὁ νεανίσκος ἔχει (11.6-8).<sup>25</sup>

Lucian's construction of *parádoxa* develops fully here from exotic to aesthetic, to astonishing beauty epitomized by Greek *paideía*,

<sup>22</sup> “I was immediately so astonished when I saw the greatness and beauty of your city, its huge population, all its might and splendor, that I was in amazement for quite a long time and my marveling could not match the marvel itself”. Cf. Lucian' anticipated amazement at getting to know his patrons (μᾶλλον θαυμάσης, 11.1).

<sup>23</sup> For the ancient rhetoricians μέγεθος is sublimity of style: Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 17; Dem. *Eloc.* 5; Hermog. *Id.* 1.5; Ps.-Long. 4.1. In his taxonomy of marvels, Giannini, *op. cit.*, p. 249-251, recognizes under the category of aesthetic θαύματα the extraordinariness of beauty or greatness (θαύμα = περικαλλές *vel* παμμέγεθες), found either in a work of art (τέχνη) or in a person (εἶδος) that can thus be described as θαύμα ἰδεσθαι. Cf. Luc. *Herod.*, where a Macedonian city compared with a famous place of Greece, Olympia, is in the end deemed even superior to it; here the greatness of the Macedonian city, indirectly compared with Athens, is not emphasized by contrast, but only by positive association, by building up upon the greatness of Athens.

<sup>24</sup> Luc. *Scyth.*: τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν Ἀθηνησιν, 4.24; τὰ Ἐλλήνων καλά, 5.9-10; τὰ κάλλιστα τῆς Ἑλλάδος, 7.3-4; τοῖς Ἐλλήνων καλοῖς, 8.5; cf. τὰ κάλλιστα, 8.3-4; the young patron also is described as both great and beautiful (μέγας ἐστὶ καὶ καλός, 11.5).

<sup>25</sup> “If he only opens his mouth, he will leave you enchain'd by your ears, so much of Aphrodite the young man has in his tongue”. Cf. Luc. *Herc.* 3.

particularly by rhetoric, Lucian's own craft. It inspires *ékleipsis*, the typical response to marvels, as well as love, here a higher form of *ékleipsis*.<sup>26</sup>

Lucian's relationship with his *proxenoi*, one of cultural patronage, takes expression in a mixture of *proxenia* and *philía* (11), both inner- and inter-cultural friendship. Thus, he claims to be at the same time a foreigner and a citizen of Greece as a cultural paradigm. However, unlike Anacharsis, whose experience of Greekness starts from ignorance and evolves to complete familiarity, for Lucian Greekness – here represented by the city and by his patrons – is a *parádoxon* only in terms of beauty, not of novelty. Therefore, he already feels Greek; he only needs to be acknowledged as such.

While in *The Scythian* Lucian uses the imagery of marvels for *paideía* and rhetorical performance, in *The Dipsádes* he describes the relationship between the performer and his audience as a *parádoxon*. Lucian invites the audience to explore the North African desert with its oddities and to walk a fine line between fact and fiction.<sup>27</sup> This blending epitomizes the essence of the rhetorical art, the skill of incorporating subjective reality into the objective. After a long list of *parádoxa*, he comes to the greatest: ἡ διψάς – the thirst-snake, into which the features of the parched desert landscape are sublimated. Besides emphasizing it with a double mythological *parádoxon*, the water related punishment of Tantalus and the Danaids,<sup>28</sup> Lucian articulates the story of the *dipsás* also as a logical paradox that leads to *aporia*:

καὶ τὸ παραδοξότατον, ὅσωπερ ἀν πίνωσι, τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ὄρεγονται τοῦ ποτοῦ· καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία πολὺ ἐπιτείνεται αὐτοῖς. οὐδὲ ἀν σφέσειας ποτε τὸ δίψος, οὐδὲ ἦν τὸν Νεῖλον αὐτὸν ἡ τὸν Ἰστρὸν ὅλον ἐκπιεῖν παράσχης, ἀλλὰ προσεκκαύσειας ἐπάρδων τὴν νόσον (4.9-14).<sup>29</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Segal, *op. cit.*, on love as *ékleipsis* and forgetfulness of *nómos* in Gorgias' *Helen*; cf. Belfiore, *op. cit.*, p. 137-138, p. 144.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Hdt. 2.32 and 4.181-199 for the description of North Africa; on the *dípsas*, Nic. *Ther.* 124-127 and 334-342; Ps.-Diosc. *Ther.* 13 (ed. Sprengel, in Künn, *Medici Graeci*, vol. 26); Philum. *Vén.* 20.1-3; Aret. *CD* 2.2.5; Ael. *NA* 6.51; Alex. *Aphr. Pr.* 1.152; Afric. *Cest.* 3.30; cf. Dio Chrys. *Or.* 5 on the myth of a monstrous Libyan creature, half woman-half snake (cf. *Or.* 4.73); for a comparison between Luc. *Dips.* and Dio Chrys. *Or.* 5 see Nesselrath, *op. cit.*, p. 122 n. 19; cf Arist. *Hist. an.* 606b 9-14 on monstrous snakes of Libya.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Giannini, *op. cit.*, p. 250 and n. 12 on mythological marvels (“meraviglioso fiabesco: nella μυθολογία, θάυμα ≠ ἀλήθεια”).

<sup>29</sup> “And the strangest thing of all is that the more the victims drink, the more they yearn for water and their craving increases terribly. You could never quench their thirst, not even if you give them the Nile itself or the entire Ister to drink dry, but instead you would only grow the burning by watering the disease”.

The *parádoxon* is expressed in hyperbolic images and uses geographical references familiar to the literature of marvels. Both the Nile and the Ister border exotic, unexplored lands.<sup>30</sup> The logical paradox is anticipated by the startling statement that water causes fire:

ἄφυκτα γάρ ἐστιν ἦν ὁ ἥλιος ἀνασπάσας τὴν ἵκμάδα καὶ τάχιστα  
ξηράνας τὴν χώραν ὑπερζέσῃ, ἀκμαιοτέραν τὴν ἀκτίνα προσβαλὼν  
ἄτε πρὸς τὴν νοτίδα παρατεθηγμένην· τροφὴ γὰρ αὕτη τῷ πυρί<sup>31</sup> (2.17-21).

On these *parádoxa* Lucian projects his own: he feels for his audience the same unquenchable thirst (*δίψος ἄσχετον*). Yet his bite is not physical, but spiritual (*τὴν ψυχήν*), not poisonous and sickening, but sweet and healthy (*ἡδίστω καὶ ύγιεινοτάτω*).<sup>32</sup> The pure water fueling his thirst is his élite audience, more precisely, his coming before them in a rhetorical performance (*παρίω ἐς ύμᾶς*). The flowing streams of water represent the image of an audience flocking to hear him perform and eagerly listening to his speech (9). Lucian's own *parádoxon* is loosely fit to the *dipsás* story (*ὅμοιόν τι*). The author affirms clearly that he is the victim and the audience is the ever desired water that causes both relief and longing, sick desire and health. Yet the *dipsás* is absent from the equation of the *applicatio*. The sweet poisonous snake is arguably the unresolved metaphor for literary fame. Just as the *dipsás* bites its victim inflicting thirst for water, the desire for fame drives Lucian to perform before the élite again and again. His thirst for rhetorical performance implies positive reception that builds fame.

The story of *The Dipsádes* lies on the fringe between paradoxographical and scientific/ didactic discourse. Its factuality is challenged by the comparison with other well-known texts that claim not only more reliable sources, but also the status of true discourse. Nesselrath makes a commendable effort to explain the incongruence of Lucian's account on the North African desert with that of Herodotus and Pliny the Elder.

<sup>30</sup> For the Ister, cf. *Mir. ausc.* 105, 168. For the Nile, cf. *Antig.* 162; *Mir. ausc.* 166; cf. *Hdt.* 2.33-34; *Arist. Hist. an.* 7.4.584b; *Plin. HN* 1.33,39,272; *Gellius NA* 10.2. Cf. Beagon 2005, 150-151, 164-166; 185. See Fraser, *op. cit.*, 1, p. 176-177 on the Ptolemaic expeditions in exploration of the Nile.

<sup>31</sup> “There is no escape from the desert if the sun boils over, drawing out the moisture and quickly parching the land, casting stronger rays, as if sharpened by humidity; for moisture fuels the fire”.

<sup>32</sup> *Luc. Nigr* 38 and *Philops.* 40.

He attributes it to an inconsistent mixture of the sources, some of which give conflicting information themselves.<sup>33</sup> Yet this approach tends to read too much into Lucian's account and to attribute to him serious intentions regarding the factuality of his report.

On the contrary, Lucian repeatedly makes the effort to separate himself from this information and to undermine its reality. The paradoxographer proper does not rely on autopsy, as paradoxography offers only "a tour effectuated within the walls of a great library", thus just an inquiry into written sources.<sup>34</sup> He, nevertheless, emphasizes the documentation of his accounts by producing plausible sources and/ or by critically evaluating them. Therefore, he acknowledges his focus mostly on reporting information based on inquiry into sources (*ἱστορία*), rather than on attempting a reasonable explanation (*εξήγησις*).<sup>35</sup> Lucian too confesses lack of autopsy and, even more, in an ironical turn, the absolute lack of desire for autopsy:

ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν οὐδένα τούτο πεπονθότα εἶδον, μηδέ, ὡς θεοί, ἴδοιμι οὔτω κολαζόμενον ἀνθρώπον, ἀλλ' οὐδέ ἐπέβην τῆς Λιβύης τὸ παράπαν εὖ ποιῶν (6.1-4).<sup>36</sup>

Yet, on the other hand, Lucian is deliberately far more evasive and less credible when it comes to his sources: he heard the report from a friend, who had seen a funerary monument and its inscription, both representing, in artistic form, the story of a *dipsás* victim (6). Thus the reality itself is twice filtered before reaching Lucian, who himself gives now his own artistic version of it. The process of his inquiry is, therefore, severely – yet deliberately – compromised.

While his documentation is, therefore, poorer than that of the paradoxographer proper, Lucian still squeezes in, however under the guise of *historía*, some sort of scientific explanation, *exégesis*. This, because attributed to doctors, may present the appearance of authenticity (5). Although not the result of the author's own rationalizing attempt, it may falsely give the impression of such design on his part. Thus, Lucian skillfully plays on the edge between paradoxography and paradoxographical discourse incorporated into other genres, where the historiographer,

<sup>33</sup> Hdt. 2.32 and 4.181-199; Plin. *HN* 5.26. Nesselrath, *op. cit.*, p. 123-124.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Schepens, *op. cit.*, p. 388.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Schepens, *op. cit.*, p. 382-390, especially 390 with the discussion of Antig. 60.

<sup>36</sup> "I have seen nobody suffering this torture and, oh gods!, may I never see a man punished in this way; but then, fortunately for me, I have never set foot in Libya".

for instance, who makes use of *parádoxa*, besides often backing up inquiry with autopsy, addresses – at least sometimes and even if poorly – the question of causality. Lucian even flirts, again within the realm of *historía*, with the idea of autopsy, yet not his own, but of his source. Moreover, even the eyewitness saw not the reality of a *dipsás* victim, but a stone relief and an epigram, both art objects testifying to it, as Lucian identifies ironically here autopsy with reading (ἔλεγεν αὐτός). This, combined with anonymity (τῶν ἔταιρων τις), undermines the authority of his alleged eyewitness source (6).

Furthermore, in this playful rope-walking between fiction and the appearance of truthfulness, Lucian claims he only remembers part of the sepulchral epigram, specifically the four lines that describe in mythological similes the terrible suffering of the *dipsás* victim. Thus, not only is the evidence limited to reproducing a friend's ekphrastic report of a funerary monument and his recollection of its epigram, both art objects already one step removed from the *parádoxon* itself; it also becomes questionable when Lucian acknowledges his poor memory of the source. Yet the final blow to any deceiving illusion that he might claim factuality for his report is the strong statement through which Lucian overtly separates himself and his design from scientific/ didactic discourse (9).

Thus, although obliquely criticizing the literature of *parádoxa* as avowed true discourse, Lucian uses *parádoxa* himself here at two separate levels. He exploits them, just like a paradoxographer, to please the audience with strange stories. What better *captatio* than in an introduction? However, without making any strong statement on the truth-value of *parádoxa*, he gives the appearance of factuality only to undercut it through subtle inconsistencies with the paradoxographer's methods. On the other hand, he exploits a different, sublimated value of *parádoxa*, of stylistic order, when he applies them as sophisticated similes and metaphors for self-reference.

In *Amber or Swans*, Lucian plays again on a slim edge between factuality and fiction and projects a deceiving self-image. While in *The Dipsádes* he leaves classical Greece, the ambiance of the presumably earlier *prolaiaí*, for an exotic Libya with anachronistic Hellenistic savor, here Lucian engages the audience in his alleged travel to northern Italy, mixing up mythological time and space with his present reality. Although repeatedly claiming naïve credulity with respect to mythological stories, Lucian ironically hints at their ludicrousness.<sup>37</sup> The illustrative story

---

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Nesselrath, *op. cit.*, p. 126-127; Camerotto, *op. cit.*, p. 183 n. 39.

contains mythological *parádoxa* focused on metamorphoses from human shape into a river (Phaëthon), into poplars dropping amber tears (the Heliades), and into sweet singing swans (Cycni), all concentrated around the mythical river Eridanus.<sup>38</sup> Thus, mythological marvels are built on natural and aesthetic *parádoxa* (miraculous physical changes and the sweet song of the swans).

The key-terms in *Amber or Swans* are credulity, expectation, and finally disappointment.<sup>39</sup> Lucian tells here a story of enchantment and disenchantment. Under the spell of poetic *mýthoi*, of ‘wretched tales of poets’, he goes in search for amber and swans. Instead, the locals laugh at him, showing that all these stories about their land were lies and nonsense. His disenchantment is presented in terms of a strong contrast between expectation and reality. His childish credulity and the propensity to transfer mythical marvels into reality and historical time are in discrepancy with the poverty and toil of the people living in a land allegedly rich in amber.<sup>40</sup> With their ironical laughter, they shake off the spell of *parádoxa* for the naïve traveler. For the readers of *parádoxa*, marvels are their only measure of a remote reality which they cannot check, because they do not travel to exotic lands unless through books. Lucian attempts the impossible journey to the reality of *mýthoi*, to experience in real life the wonder he felt as a credulous reader. The reality check however is disappointing, since the literary space filled with *parádoxa* is identified with a desolate real space.

His own experience of brutal change from enchantment to disenchantment is transferred by Lucian from his own story to his audience:

---

<sup>38</sup> Eur. *Hipp.* 732-751; Diod. 5.23; Ov. *Met.* 2.324-380, 7.371-379, 12.64-171; Pl. *Phaed.* 85; Plin. *NH* 10.32; Cic. *Tusc.* 1.30; Hyg. *Fab.* 152, 154; Luc. *Dial.D.* 24.3.

<sup>39</sup> πέπεικεν, 1; πιστεύσας, 3; πιστεύοντας, 6; ἥλπιζον, 1; ἐλπίδος οὐ μικρᾶς, 4; ἐλπίσαντες, ἐλπίσας, τῆς ἐλπίδος, 6; ἀπατεών, ψευδολόγος, ψευδομένοις, 3; ἐψευσμένος, 4; καταψευδόμενος, 5; ἐξαπατηθῆναι, τοῖς πρὸς τὸ μεῖζον ἔκαστα ἐξεγουμένοις, 6; οὐ μετρίως μου καθίκετο, 3; ἡνιώμην, 4; ἀνιῶνται, 6.

<sup>40</sup> “If there were such a thing [i.e. amber], do you think that, for two obols, we would row or pull our boats upstream, if we were able to get rich by picking up the tears of the poplars?” (3); cf. Lucian’s reaction: “It was truly childish (παιδίου τινός ὡς ἀληθῶς ἔργον) to have believed the poets who falsely speak about unbelievable things” (ἀπίθανα οὔτως ψευδομένοις, 3).

ώστε κάγω τὴν δέδια ὑπὲρ ἐμαυτοῦ μὴ ὑμεῖς ἄρτι ἀφιγμένοι, καὶ τοῦτο πρῶτον ἀκροασόμενοι ἡμῶν, ἥλεκτρά τινα καὶ κύκνους ἐλπίσαντες εὑρόσειν παρ’ ἡμῖν, ἔπειτα μετ’ ὀλίγου ἀπέλθητε καταγελῶντες τῶν ὑποσχομένων ὑμῖν τοιαῦτα πολλὰ κειμήλια ἐνεῖναι τοῖς λόγοις (6.3-8).<sup>41</sup>

An important element is present in both cases: there is always a third, a mediator between the perceiver and that which is perceived, the authors who lie in *mýthoi*, on the one hand, and the people who wrongly exaggerate Lucian's qualities, on the other. Thus, Lucian and his rhetoric become the *mýthoi*. The text ends with yet another illustration of false perception due to a third. Objects seen under water are distortedly enlarged and one needs to remove the distorting lens to see their real dimension. Lucian stresses, therefore, the importance of *autopsía* and of the use of one's own critical judgment in forming *dóxa*.<sup>42</sup>

The text opens itself to two levels of reading, one based on what it says, another on what it conceals, or rather subtly pours into the ears of the audience. At one level it deals with the expectations of a new audience and serves what Brandão calls "uma retórica da diferença".<sup>43</sup> Lucian clearly separates himself from other authors, the poets who tell lies and the sophists of his time whom he ironically praises in terms of gold.<sup>44</sup> He also separates himself from his own fame created by others and thus, by destroying an existing false expectation, he creates a new one, an

---

<sup>41</sup> “Therefore, I too am now afraid on my account that you, who have just arrived and are about to hear me now for the first time, expecting to find in me some amber and swans, may later leave laughing at those who promised that many such treasures were in my speeches”. Cf. the preceding gnome: “With respect to many such things people can be deceived, while they believe those who relate everything exaggeratedly” (πολλὰ τοιαῦτα ἐξαπατηθῆναι ἔστι πιστεύοντας τοῖς πρὸς τὸ μεῖζον ἔκαστα ἐξηγουμένοις, 6.1-2); cf. Gorg. *Hel.* 11: “But those who have persuaded and still persuade so many people, about so many things, are forgers of false discourse” (ὅσοι δὲ ὄσους περὶ ὄσων καὶ ἔπεισαν καὶ πείθουσι δὲ ψευδῆ λόγον πλάσσοντες). This is the only *prolaliá* in which Lucian himself is the key-character in the anecdote that serves as *applicatio* for the context of performance; Nesselrath, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

<sup>42</sup> Lucian himself incurs the risk of being a third when he narrates the mythological stories to the locals who, however, have the advantage of *autopsía* and do not fall victim to his enchantment, but on the contrary disenchant him.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Brandão, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Luc. *Prom. es* 1 where the same praises are showered on the forensic rhetors.

expectation of the difference.<sup>45</sup> Lucian addresses here mainly a new audience. They are, however, already under the spell of a false *dóxa*. His attempt to educate a new public, therefore, turns into an act of re-education, of disenchantment. Lucian makes Eridanus, as the setting of deceiving *parádoxa* tales, the paradigm for authors who claim the reality of the marvels they write, a guild from which he clearly separates himself.<sup>46</sup> In his use of *parádoxa* stories, he does not exploit their alleged factuality, but their obvious lack of reality. He claims that his search for mythological marvels was not the purpose itself of his voyage, but only a marginal diversion from it, an accessory of his main rhetorical journey. He, thus, reduces his marvel stories to their traditional role of mere entertaining digression in more noble literary genres. Yet, this is an inverted manner of *paradoxo-graphía*, in which the astonishment effect is undermined by revealing the falseness of *parádoxa*. *Ékplexis*, however, as aesthetic emotion, is transferred from these pseudo-*parádoxa* to the author himself, in a paradoxical self-introduction. The author becomes the *parádoxon* here, defying the *dóxa* that his audience has of him.

At another level, Lucian uses the paradoxographical hypotext to hint at his own deceit in self-presentation. In an alleged demystification of his *dóxa*, he describes his art as simple (ἀπλοϊκόν), without mythic tales (ἄμυθον) and without song (οὐδέ τις ὡδὴ πρόσεστιν).<sup>47</sup> Yet he emphasizes that his audience must have already noticed these qualities during the current performance (όρατε ἥδη, 6). However, up to this point, his text has been all but simple – in fact, full of metaphors that bridge intricate correspondences; all but ἄμυθον – since mythical marvels are its foundation; and all but non-musical – one has only to listen to its first sentence and notice its exquisite rhythmic construction.<sup>48</sup> Thus, by claiming to disenchant his audience, he enchants them even more.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Brandão, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Luc. *VH* 1.1-4.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Villani, *op. cit.*, p. 228.

<sup>48</sup> Ηλέκτρου πέρι καὶ ὑμᾶς δηλαδὴ ὁ μῦθος πέπεικεν, αἰγείρους ἐπὶ τῷ Ἡριδανῷ ποταμῷ δακρύειν αὐτὸ θρηνούσας τὸν Φαέθοντα, καὶ ἀδελφάς γε εἶναι τὰς αἰγείρους ἐκείνας τοῦ Φαέθοντος, εἴτα ὁδυρομένας τὸ μειράκιον ἀλλαγῆναι ἐς τὰ δένδρα, καὶ ἀποστάζειν ἔτι αὐτῶν δάκρυον δῆθεν τὸ ἥλεκτρον (“About amber, you too, certainly, believe the story that poplars on the banks of the river Eridanus shed it in their tears, lamenting Phaëthon, and that those poplars are the very sisters of Phaëthon, and that, while mourning their young brother, they were turned into trees, and that the amber, clearly their tears, still drips”, 1). The sentence

In *Amber or Swans* we have an incipient Lucianic trend of correcting widespread false *dóxa* formed around him. He evades the literary categorization to which his familiar audience has subjected him and, while indirectly reorienting this reception too, he specifically guides his new audience by performing a subtle correction. Yet, within this orientation process, he cunningly works with the paradoxographer's deceiving pen. He defines himself through what he is not – an artist inventively lying, and his work through what it is not – mere lies. However, his stories here seem to contradict this assertive discourse of difference. By deceitfully ignoring the threshold between denotative and connotative, Lucian creates a sophisticated discourse in which *parádoxa*, obvious lies that others pass around as truth, are used for what they really are: exposed lies no longer masquerading as true stories. While they acquire a new value, almost inconceivable in a culture where value and truth are inseparable, the author himself appears as a *parádoxon*, one who condemns lying while, at the same time, enjoyably working and entertaining with naked lies. He still addresses, in a tacit conspiracy between storyteller and listener, the audience's concealed desire for pleasant lies. Instead of their searching far and wide for marvelous treasures and artistic pleasures, Lucian offers himself to the audience as an aesthetic *parádoxon*, unwrapped from the deceiving package of altering *dóxa*, yet wrapped in his own mystery as artist, resisting an easy perception while all the while cunningly claiming it.

As *dóxa* precedes him for the first time, a now established Lucian no longer looks for the approval of his audience, but for establishing a degree of difference in his reception.<sup>49</sup> He has overcome the complex of the fringe, of the barbarian not yet completely integrated into the

has a ring composition, starting with (at the expense of an inversion) and ending in the same word (*ἡλέκτρου / ἡλεκτρον*) with equal metrical value, a sequence of three long syllables (the last syllable in *ἡλεκτρον* is long by necessity because the next period starts with a consonant). There are also other repetitions of the same metrical value, like *σιγείρους / αιγείρους*, *δακρύειν / δάκρυον* (followed by consonant) and *τὸν Φαέθοντα / τού Φαέθοντος*, the last one equaling in both cases the end of a dactylic hexameter. The rhythm gains elevation through the careful use of other prosodic bits, like the sequence of four trochees in *ἀλλαγῆναι ἐς τὰ δένδρα*. Homoioteleuton also confers musicality to the text: *τῷ Ἡριδανῷ ποταμῷ*. The passage immediately following offers an even better example: *τοιαῦτα γάρ ἀμέλει καὶ αὐτὸς ἀκούων τῶν ποιητῶν ἀδόντων ἥλπιζον*. Obviously, even from the beginning, the text proves not to lack melodiousness.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Nesselrath, *op. cit.*, p. 125-126.

core of Greekness. In *Amber*, Lucian is the Greek traveler in a remote, barbarian land. The locals laugh at him, just as the Athenians laughed at Anacharsis the barbarian, a sign that otherness is equally perceived as *parádoxon* by both sides, no matter the degree of cultural progress. In *Amber*, unlike *The Scythian*, the perspective of the wondrous, the exotic, is no longer that of a barbarian. It is Lucian's own perspective as culturally Greek, nourished by Greek myths. Lucian's eye for the *parádoxon* is here that of a Greek, reflecting the Greeks' perception of *parádoxa*, just as in *The Dipsádes*. Thus, Lucian seems to feel already embraced now into Greekness as its entitled citizen.

In *Zeuxis or Antioch*, part of Lucian's audience is in awe of his novelty:

὜ τῆς καινότητος. Ἡράκλεις, τῆς παραδοξολογίας. εύμήχανος ἀνθρωπος. οὐδέν ἄν τις εἴποι τῆς ἐπινοίας νεαρώτερον (1.13-16).<sup>50</sup>

He aims to correct this perception and be admired not just for his literary exoticism, but also for his artistry, for creating an aesthetic marvel.

In the first illustrative anecdote, Lucian again displays his “painting with words”,<sup>51</sup> in the *ékphrasis* of a celebrated painting by Zeuxis. The famous painter, as an innovator in art, is the perfect example for Lucian's breaking with the literary generic tradition. Zeuxis' art is paradigmatic for its audacious novelty (*καινοποιεῖν*, ἀλλόκοτον, *ξένον*, 3) and a particular example of it is the innovative representation of a family of centaurs, a copy of which Lucian claims to have seen in Athens.

In his detailed description of the painting, Lucian pays a keen eye to the painter's skills (*τέχνη*), specifically to the precision of line, the suitable blending of colors and perfect brushwork, the masterful use of the effects of shadow, the perspective, proportion, and harmony of the parts. However, he particularly admires Zeuxis' variety and skillful combination. On the one hand, he is in awe (*θαυμαστόν*, 6) of the manifold genius of the painter's art (*ποικίλως* 5), illustrated by the diverse attitudes and emotions of the characters in the painting, from tenderness to wildness, especially in the image of the baby centaurs:

---

<sup>50</sup> “Oh, what novelty! Heracles, what strange stories! What an inventive artist! No one could be more ingenious!”

<sup>51</sup> *Luc. Dom. 21.14, Calumn. 2.1-2.*

τῶν νεογυνῶν δὲ τὸ ἐν τῷ ηπίῳ ὅμως ἄγριον καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀπαλῷ ἥδη φοβερόν (6.10-11).<sup>52</sup>

On the other hand, he praises the subtle technique of the chiaroscuro, of contrasts and transitions, perfectly exemplified by the beautiful image of the female centaur, in which the harmonious blending and joining of human and animal shapes (ἡ μίξις δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀρμογή, 6) is extremely smooth and gentle.<sup>53</sup>

Zeuxis expects to astonish his public with this display of his art (ἐκπλήξειν ἐπὶ τῇ τέχνῃ). However, although his admirers are in awe, their response is due exclusively to the strangeness of his art object (τὸ ξένον). Therefore, seeing that the novelty of the subject matter (ἡ ὑπόθεσις καινὴ οὐσα, 7) overshadows, in an improper act of reception, his exquisite technique and detailed accuracy, Zeuxis decides to have the picture covered and taken back to his workshop. He protests with symbolic withdrawal, concealing art meant for display, thus de-creating the art object and abandoning the creative process.

In the second anecdote, Antiochus wins a spectacular victory against the Galatians by using elephants.<sup>54</sup> The unexpected sight of the strange beasts (τὸ παράδοξον) brings the enemy into a state of shock and confusion.<sup>55</sup> To the astonishment produced by the novel subject in the Zeuxis story, the centaurs, corresponds here astonishment from another novel sight, that of the unfamiliar elephants (τὸ καινὸν τοῦ θεάματος ἔξεπληξε, 11). The *applicatio* compares the perception of Lucian's display with an inadequate army saved only by elephants, or other strange monsters (ξένα μορμολύκεια), or by the use of marvels (θαυματοποία), all epitomizing novelty and strangeness (καινὸν καὶ τεράστιον, 12).

This *prolaliá* echoes *A Literary Prometheus*, a text most probably close in date, where Lucian talks in similar terms about his generic innovation, the *míxis* of dialogue and comedy.<sup>56</sup> There too, Lucian uses

<sup>52</sup> "As for the young ones, in their gentle infancy there was nevertheless something wild and in their tenderness something frightening".

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Rouveret, *op. cit.*, p. 158-159.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. Xen. *Hipp.* 8.17-21 on surprise in military tactics.

<sup>55</sup> See Luc. *Laps.* 9 for a different version on the battle; cf. Just. *Epit.* 25; cf. Pol. 5.84-85 for the reaction of the African elephants to the Indian elephants in the battle of Raphia, 217 B. C., between Ptolemy IV and Antiochus III; Scullard, *op. cit.*, p. 122; Sage, *op. cit.*, p. 208-210.

<sup>56</sup> Zeuxis is likely close in date not only to *A Literary Prometheus*, which is probably earlier, but also to other texts that discuss more specifically Lucian's literary innovation (Luc. *Bis acc.*, *Pisc.*); Hall, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

paradoxographical imagery and vocabulary to define his novel art object, which is associated with hybrid creatures, monstrosities of nature. Yet in *A literary Prometheus*, Lucian expresses his apprehension that his hybrid novelty might not be well received just as the blending of its conflicting parts might not be perceived as skillfully natural, but as an inconsistent mixture of genres, of familiar and unfamiliar, tradition and novelty. There, novelty as the result of literary hybridism still needs the author's advocacy and its salvation lies in the art of blending.

In *Zeuxis*, on the other hand, the author expresses strong confidence that he has already resolved the conflict of the elements combined in his literary melting pot, that he has already tamed his monster and attenuated its wild demeanor. In fact, his art of mixing, illustrated by Zeuxis' mastery of the palette, so competent that it creates the impression of the natural, is now accomplished. On it Lucian wishes to direct the focus of the audience's critical evaluation and enjoyment. Once innovation is acknowledged as the essential and distinguishing feature of his art, it is *téchne* – the ever-proper aesthetic criterion – that measures the value of the art object. At this level of judgment, novelty becomes only circumstantial (Ὥσπερ ἐν προσθήκῃς μοιρᾳ, 2.17).

Lucian wants his audience to overcome the stage of perceiving his work as a generic *parádoxon*, a match for natural marvels, and to acknowledge it as an aesthetic *parádoxon*, a marvel of *téchne*. The artist himself shares the fortune of his art-object, which is the expression of self. Therefore, just as his art-object shifts its paradoxical nature, from novel and strange to an artistic marvel, the author too develops his cultural identity from non-Greek to Greek, from a *parádoxon* as a barbarian inventor to a *parádoxon* as an amazingly skillful artist working with the consecrated Greek canons. The reaction to novelty is purely emotional, while the response to an aesthetic marvel, equally strong emotionally, is filtered through *paideía*. While a passive *paideía* remains within the beaten path of fixed canons, which it sustains in an act of obedient *mímesis* that equals slavery,<sup>57</sup> Lucian enacts here, for his audience, an active form of *paideía* as creative response to tradition, an artistic form of reflection on the familiar through the lens of otherness.

In *Heracles*, Lucian describes a painting of Heracles as Celtic Ogmios, which he claims to have seen in Gaul.<sup>58</sup> The *ékphrasis* is gradually

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Mestre; Gómez, *op. cit.*

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Luc. *Apol.* 15 and *Bis acc.* 27 for his journey to Gaul. For an outline of the scholarly debate on the reality of such a painting and on the significance of the Celtic name see Nesselrath, *op. cit.*, especially p. 133-134.

built on *parádoxa*. Heracles is depicted as extremely old – a *hýbris* towards Greek *dóxa*. Very strangely (παραδοξότατον), he drags after him a cheerful crowd, bound by their ears with delicate cords of amber and gold. Yet, as the strangest thing of all (πάντων ἀτοπώτατον, 3), the painter – supposedly in an aporetic gesture, since both of Heracles' hands are occupied with his traditional Greek attributes, the club and the bow – attached the chains to the pierced tongue of Heracles. This ingenious solution, the *deus ex machina* of his artistic craft, is the key point of the story. What now seems to the stranger an ingenious solution to a perplexity will be revealed as the painter's deliberate artistic choice of expressing his own culture. Lastly, as a final delicate touch to the climactic *parádoxon*, Heracles is turned towards his followers smiling, sealing with serene contentment the unconceivable, joyful association and conferring the *parádoxon* the status of pleasant norm (3).

The artist's *aporia* is transferred to Lucian the beholder (θαυμάζων καὶ ἀπορῶν). He also feels a strong vexation (ἀγανακτῶν, 4) that, in contrast with Heracles' peaceful smile, expresses his sense of *hýbris*. A vexed Lucian, coming from the Greek tradition, claims to feel his familiar world threatened. A local old man solves his perplexity by explaining that for the Celts Heracles is the god of speech, and thus reveals the painting as an allegorical representation of charming *lógos*.<sup>59</sup> The explanation of Heracles' old age lies in the fact that *lógos* attains perfection at this stage in life, after a long process of maturation. Thus, the old Celt offers the rationalization of what was perceived as a *parádoxon*, undoing it and solving the stranger's *aporia* (λύσω ... τὸ σίνιγμα, μὴ θαυμάσῃς, 4).<sup>60</sup> Therefore, what seemed to the foreign beholder an expedient is now revealed as an artistic expression that requires a hermeneutical exercise. It becomes the

---

<sup>59</sup> Amato, *op. cit.*, proposes the identification of the old Celt with Favorinus and suggests that the art object may be a literary text, Favorinus' *De senect.* (9-17 Barigazzi).

<sup>60</sup> On allegorical painting see Rouveret, *op. cit.*, p. 346-354; cf. *Tabula Cebetis*, in which the painting represents a philosophical allegory and its explanation is associated with the enigma of the Sphinx: ἔστι γὰρ ἡ ἐξήγησις ἐοικυῖα τῷ τῆς Σφιγγὸς αἰνίγματι (3.2); cf. Luc. *Merc. cond.* 42, *Rhet. praec.* 6. See Fitzgerald; White, *op. cit.*, on the problem of the association between Cebes of Thebes, the Socratic apprentice (Pl. *Phaed.*) and the *Tabula*. Cf. Max. Tyr. *Or.* 4.3-5 on the development of forms of expression from art, specifically poetry, to philosophy, from allegorical to straightforward discourse. Cf. Porph. *Antr.* 3-4 on fiction (πλάσμα) using σίνιγματα (αἰνίττεσθαι) not for mere entertainment (εἰς ψυχαγωγίαν), but as a form of argumentation for both philosophers and ordinary people (οὐ τοῖς σοφοῖς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἰδιώταις); cf. Luc. *VH* 1.1.

essence of the artistic creation and serves as a skillful allusion to the problems of interpretation of Lucian's own work. Thus, Lucian hints to his audience not to dismiss his rhetorical/ literary *parádoxa* as crafty expedients, but to exercise *paideía* in an attempt to understand them as valid and deliberate artistic means and to appreciate the subtleness behind them.

The old Celt is himself the result of a cultural *míxis*, being well educated in Greek culture, for which mastery of Greek language is both the key and the measure (*οὐκ ἀπαίδευτος τὰ ἡμέτερα, ως ἔδειξεν ἀκριβῶς Ἑλλάδα φωνὴν ἀφιεῖς*, 4). The Celt's Greek *paideía* lies not only in the perfect Greek he speaks, or in his ability to quote from Greek literature in order to support the arguments of the barbarian perspective on the matter of *lógos*. It also finds its expression in his understanding of a Greek's perplexity when confronted with otherness. After Heracles, he is the second illustration for Lucian, himself of non-Hellenic ethnicity and claiming to be now old too. They are both the result of a cultural *míxis*, have a more acute feeling of the otherness, and are able to translate it between different cultures.

The old Heracles represents the maturation of *lógos* through *paideía*. Lucian confesses to a certain apprehension about returning to rhetorical *epídeixis*, submitting himself again (*αὐθίς*, 7) to the judgment of a large educated audience. He anticipates that some of them, especially the young, might object to his daring (*τολμῶν*, 7), to his paradox of an old man acting in the spirit of the youth, in spite of his ripe age. Their objections, expressed – typically for *pepaideuménoi* – in literary quotations, contradict the argument built by the old Celt, and are then contradicted by Lucian himself in a classic sophistic exercise of *díssoi lógoi*. He supports his decision to start performing again, it is not clear after how long a hiatus, with the argument of the old persuasive Heracles. The flower of youth is spent in a long effort towards *paideía* and distilled in the blooming flower of *lógos*. In a grand rhetorical manner, Lucian says farewell to youth and love: it is time now for the seasonably late and splendid bloom of eloquence to enthrall the audience in the manner of the Celtic Heracles.

Rhetorical persuasion in the realm of ideas, already undermined by the first sophists' skillful play with opposite arguments, has long lost its prominence through changes in the socio-political circumstances. Rhetorical display, *epídeixis*, targets now a different sensibility in the audience, the need for entertainment through *paideía*. Persuasion is often reduced to convincing the audience of the rhetor's skills. Lucian sees persuasion, now aesthetic in nature, as a type of rapture with words, similar to the forceful magic power of poetry and fiction/ fictitious

discourse in general, such as Gorgias discusses in his *Helen*.<sup>61</sup> Lucian puts a final touch on the *prolaliá* through his comparison with Odysseus disguised as an old beggar, who astonishes the suitors when his might is unveiled from under the rags (*Od.* 18.66-74). Just like Odysseus, Lucian is πολύτροπος, *much travelled* on the seas of rhetoric, having acquired *multifaceted, versatile* artistic skills, and master of a *crafty, deceitful* discourse.<sup>62</sup>

After an alleged hiatus, Lucian returns to the rhetorical performance to re-establish himself by displaying and reaffirming his *paideía* before this audience of *pepaideuménoi* who, although silent, testify through their presence, to their long approval of his paradoxical stance and artistic worth. Willingly and cheerfully, they have long let themselves be enslaved to this barbarian Heracles, who smiles peacefully while dragging them by the ears through an enthralling adventure of amber and gold, beauty and *paideía*, the voyage of his toiling Greek *lógos*.

In *Dionysus*, Lucian revisits the problem of reception through two Dionysiaca *mýthoi* with pronounced paradoxographical features.<sup>63</sup> The first *mýthos* narrates the Indian perception of the Dionysiaca *thíasos* as a complex of *parádoxa*. While Dionysus and his troops approach their territory, the Indians send scouts to inspect the invaders. Lucian offers his audience a detailed description through their eyes, culturally unaccustomed to such a vision.<sup>64</sup>

Learning of an effeminate and hybrid army, the Indians do not find it a match for their military prowess. They avoid confrontation with such an unfit enemy, against which they consider, at most, to dispatch their women. However, when they learn that Dionysus' troops have set fire to their country, they hastily set out for battle, but encounter

---

<sup>61</sup> Gorg. *Hel.* 11-12; cf. Zeno fr. 278 (Diog. Laert. 7.24); cf. Plut. *Rect. rat. aud.* 37.f11-38.b3 (on Theophr. fr. 91 W).

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 14. Cf. Luc. *Zeux*. 5.11; Hom. *Od.* 1.1, 10.330; Pl. *Hp. mi.* 369e 5-370a2.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Branham, *op. cit.*, 1985 (and 1989), p. 43-46, p. 89-90; Nesselrath, *op. cit.*, p. 135-139; Georgiadou; Larmour, *op. cit.*, p. 34-36; Ureña Bracero, *op. cit.*, p. 49, p. 74-79, p. 81; Camerotto, *op. cit.*, p. 120-129; Villani, *op. cit.*; Brandão, *op. cit.*, p. 137-142; Santini, *op. cit.*, p. 75. On attempts to couple it with a Lucianic text for which it served as *prolaliá* see cf. Thimme, *op. cit.*; Anderson, *op. cit.*, 1976, p. 262-264; Georgiadou; Larmour, *op. cit.*, p. 51-52.

<sup>64</sup> See Branham, *op. cit.*, p. 44-45 on the formalist concept of *estrangement* applied to this passage.

terrible surprises, *parádoxa*. The frenzied, disarrayed *thíasos* becomes suddenly a well-organized army, while their noisy strategy still bears the marks of the boisterous Dionysiac revel. The Indians react to the description of the strange *thíasos* (ἀλλόκοτα) with laughter, derision, and even sympathetic condescendence (καταφρονήσαι, καταγηλᾶν, ἐλεεῖν, ἐγέλων, 1, 3), but when they confront this bizarre enemy on the battleground their immediate reactions are fright and disarrayed flight (σὺν οὐδενὶ κόσμῳ ἔφευγον, 4).

The Indians' reactions are paradigmatic of the different human responses to different types of *parádoxa*. Laughter mixed with condescendence is the typical response to human freaks, perceived always through the comparison not only with normality, but especially with one's own sense of self-normality.<sup>65</sup> At the direct contact with the Dionysiac *parádoxa*, the Indians become terrified and run away in an irrational fashion, as humans usually do when encountering animal monsters.<sup>66</sup> These different reactions are also illustrative of human response to the degree of their contact with *parádoxa*, whether real or, at least partly, fictional, whether of autoptic perception or perceived through an intermediary (e.g. the writer of marvels or, here, the scouts).<sup>67</sup> The distinction between reality and report, nature and *lógos*, makes *parádoxa* entertaining, as in the case of paradoxography. In art, unlike in nature, *parádoxa* filtered through the creative genius of the artist become enjoyable and produce laughter. Yet this laughter is of a different sort: not derision, but the laughter of pleasure given by the experience of *lógos* and *paideía*.

Lucian deals here with two different levels of audience and *paideía*. Many (οἱ πολλοί) are tempted to snub his novel performance (τοὺς καινοὺς τῶν λόγων), as the Indians snub Dionysus, having formed a wrong *dóxa* based on its comic appearance. Others, on the other hand, may come to enjoy exclusively the comic aspect of the performance. Bewildered by the author's subtly veiled serious stance (τῷ παραδόξῳ τεθορυβημένοι, 5),

<sup>65</sup> Pliny says that nature created strange creatures of the human race as a jest, amusement for herself and novel marvels for us (*haec atque talia ex hominum genere ludibria sibi, nobis miracula ingeniosa fecit natura*, HN 7.2.32).

<sup>66</sup> In Luc. *Prom. es* 4, the Egyptians manifest derision and repulsion towards a human freak (οἱ μὲν πολλοί ἐγέλων, οἱ δέ τινες ὡς ἐπὶ τέρατι ἐμυσάττοντο), while they are frightened and shun an unusual black camel (ἐφοβήθησαν καὶ ὀλίγου δεῖν ἔφυγον ἀναθορόντες).

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Luc. *Prom es; Zeux*.

they do not even dare to praise his display. Paradoxically, here Lucian calls the élite οἱ πολλοί as the majority of his established audience, those many who, having forgotten the sacred communion they shared with him long ago as παλαιοὶ συμπόται, due to his pause, need to be re-educated.<sup>68</sup> He invites them to rekindle their communion and reminds them of the values of his paradoxical *spoudogéloion*.<sup>69</sup> These are the usually serious audience, the *pepaideuménoi* earnest about *paideía*.<sup>70</sup> The πρώτη ὁκοή (4) is, in their case, the first level of perception of his utterance that can induce a false *dóxa*. Those who come only for the comic appearance are instead biased either by a false report, or again by a mistaken interpretation.<sup>71</sup> They, however, are not serious with respect to *paideía* and thus represent the non-élite. These need to be educated through the *prolaliá*. Their bewilderment and hesitation are the expression of their lack of *paideía*. All, however, will end up – Lucian confidently professes (θαρρῶν ἐπαγγέλλομαι, 5) – like the Indians of the story, captured by his mixed, paradoxical *lógos*.<sup>72</sup>

Both the élite and the non-élite have incomplete, although different, responses to Lucian's *spoudogéloion*, with some looking exclusively for the serious, others for the comic elements. A comprehensive reaction to *spoudogéloion* is attainable by an ideal élite, the *pepaideuménoi*, which Lucian does not always feel fortunate enough to have as audience.<sup>73</sup> Yet he never stops, not even in his old age, encouraging *pepaideuménoi* to perfect themselves and to attain the level of subtlety and *paideía* that would allow them to grasp all the facets of his display.

---

<sup>68</sup> Santini, *op. cit.*, p. 76-81 assumes that both groups represent the non-élite, usually referred as οἱ πολλοί, since the *pepaideuménoi* are clearly free from misconceptions. She argues that the *pepaideuménoi* are only the target of the second *mýthos*, deliberately left without an *applicatio*, because the élite would not need an explanation (on the lack of expressed *applicatio* for the second *mýthos* see also Villani, *op. cit.*, p. 222). Santini misses the point that Lucian's invitation to be rejoined in the sacred rites of Dionysus by his old “revel companions” addresses the groups that she interprets as non-élite (ἀλλὰ θαρρῶν ἐπαγγέλλομαι αὐτοῖς, 5). However, she later identifies the συμπόται as *pepaideuménoi*.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Camerotto, *op. cit.*, p. 128-129; Santini, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Luc. *VH* 1.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Luc. *Electr.* Camerotto, *op. cit.*, p. 275.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Luc. *Herc.*

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Santini, *op. cit.*, p. 76; Camerotto, *op. cit.*, p. 128-129.

The second Dionysiac *mýthos* is focused on an Indian marvel. Old men drink once a year, during the festival of Dionysus, from a spring consecrated to Silenus and, becoming drunk and inspired, speak incessantly, yet charmingly. Yet the strangest thing of all (*τὸ παραδοξότατον*) is this:

ἢν γὰρ ἀτελῆ ὁ γέρων μεταξὺ καταλίπη ὃν διεξήει τὸν λόγον, δύντος ἥλιου κωλυθεὶς ἐπὶ πέρας αὐτὸν ἐπεξελθεῖν, ἐς νέωτα πιὼν αὐθίσις ἔκεινα συνάπτει ἢ πέρυσι λέγοντα ἡ μέθη αὐτὸν κατέλιπεν (7.20-25).<sup>74</sup>

This *mýthos* is left without an *applicatio*, in the spirit of the sacred and unutterable rites of Dionysus, yet understood by his audience as his fellow initiates and *sympótai*. Lucian associates himself with Silenus, thus with the Dionysiac mysteries, as well as with the *lógos* of Socrates, whom Alcibiades likens, in a sympotic context, to the old companion of the god.<sup>75</sup> The sequence of silence and eloquence is illustrative of Lucian's break followed by the comeback to rhetorical performance.<sup>76</sup> It is also a reference to his consistency, in spite of the hiatus, in practicing in old age the same type of rhetoric he professed when younger. It may also be an ironical anticipation of a long performance to follow. This *prolaliá*, whether or not Lucian's last, bears testimony to his continuous struggle to validate his generic *míxis*, including the serio-comic, as well as the *míxis* of enthrallment and thoughtful *lógos*. He invites his *sympótai* to drink from his *cratér*, to have their fill of his literary mixing bowl.

\*\*\*

So what has *this* Dionysus to do with Dionysus? What has *this* Lucian – with his ever-changing faces, from the young inexperienced

<sup>74</sup> “If an old man stops in the middle of his discourse, interrupted by the sunset, next year, drinking again, he resumes it, where drunkenness/ inspiration left him the year before”. On water, wine and/ or madness see Luc. *VH* 1.5-7; *Antig.* 145, 149, 164; *Par. Flor.* 1, 12, 13, 14, 18, 20, 24; *Par. Pal.* 5; *Par. Vat.* 12, 22.

<sup>75</sup> Pl. *Symp.* 215a-b; Ureña Bracero, *op. cit.*, p. 76-77; Camerotto, *op. cit.*, p. 129 n. 222; Santini, *op. cit.*, p. 84 (Lucian's “modelli di eloquenza sono il ‘divino’ Socrate e il trascinante Odisseo”); for a detailed parallel reading of Pl. *Phaedr.* and Luc. *Bacch.*, including the interminable speech of Socrates vs. that of Silenus see Santini, *op. cit.*, p. 85-86.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Villani, *op. cit.*, p. 221.

Harmonides to the old, seducing Heracles – to do with Lucian?<sup>77</sup> The *prolaliaí* offer a glimpse at different stages of his rhetorical career, from the hesitant young barbarian looking for the *proxenía* and *philía* of the Greek élite, to the accomplished Greek looking for approval for his harmoniously blended hybrids, from the bewildered stranger to the bewilderment of the Greeks. If *parádoxa* are equally a favorite delight and an instrument of seduction, Lucian uniquely makes them his own.<sup>78</sup>

In these little pieces that serve as “hors-d’œuvre au repas verbal”,<sup>79</sup> Lucian uses *parádoxa* for their value per se, to shock and please, as useful tricks from the sophist’s rich bag, but also as paradigms for his work and its reception. He constantly addresses the *pепаideuménoi* from whom he expects a reaction different from that of the non-élite, whom he usually sets in parallel with barbarians (Egyptians, Galatians, and Indians). His intended effect upon the audience is a more complex form of *ékleipsis* coming both from novelty and from *téchne*. This different type of reception is illustrated by another sort of barbarian, presented not as an ethnic group, but individualized and named, bewildered by Greek *paideía* (Anacharsis, Toxaris). He elevates the pleasure produced by *parádoxa* from the level of a (pseudo-)cognitive emotion to an aesthetic one. Ekphrastic discourse, a favorite rhetorical exercise in the Lucianic corpus, praises other art objects for their beauty, their marvelous *eídos*. Lucian, in turn, elevates discourse itself to a *parádoxon* as aesthetic marvel, both as paradoxical genre *eídos* and *téchne*.<sup>80</sup>

## Bibliography

- AMATO, E. Luciano e l’anonimo filosofo Celta di “Hercules” 4: proposta di identificazione. *SO*, Oslo, vol. 79, p. 128-149, 2004.
- ANDERSON, G. Some alleged relationships in Lucian’s “Opuscula”. *AJP*, Baltimore, vol. 97, n. 3, p. 262-275, 1976.
- ANDERSON, G. Patterns in Lucian’s “prolaliaí”. *Philologus*, Göttingen, vol. 121, p. 313-315, 1977.

---

<sup>77</sup> *Luc. Bacch.* 5.1-2.

<sup>78</sup> Lucian’s *parádoxa* are more prominent and more sophisticated than the famous triple paradox of Favorinus; Philostr. *VS* 489. 11-16; Gleason, *op. cit.*

<sup>79</sup> Reardon, *op. cit.*, p. 165.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Giannini, *op. cit.*, p. 249-250.

- ANDERSON, G. *The Second Sophistic: a cultural phenomenon in the Roman Empire*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- BASLEZ, M.-F. *L'étranger dans la Grèce antique*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1984.
- BEAGON, M. *The Elder Pliny on the human animal: "Natural History", Book 7*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005.
- BELFIORE, E. Ovid's encomium of Helen. *CJ*, Provo, UT, vol. 76, n. 2, p. 136-148, 1980-1981
- BÉLIS, A. Un "Ajax" et deux Timothée: (P. Berol. n° 6870). *REG*, Paris, vol. 111, n. 1, p. 74-100, 1998.
- BÉLIS, A. Timothée, l'aulète thébain. *RBPh*, Bruxelles, vol. 80, n. 1, p. 107-123, 2002.
- BOMPAIRE, J. *Lucien écrivain, imitation et création*. Paris: E. de. Boccard, 1958.
- BRANDÃO, J. L. *A poética do Hipocentauro: literatura, sociedade e discurso ficcional em Luciano de Samósata*. Belo Horizonte: UFMG, 2001.
- BRANHAM, R. B. Introducing a sophist: Lucian's prologues. *TAPA*, Cleveland, OH, vol. 115, p. 237-243, 1985 (republished in BRANHAM. *Unruly eloquence*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989).
- CAMEROTTO, A. *Le metamorfosi della parola: studi sulla parodia in Luciano di Samosata*. Pisa: Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali, 1998.
- EVANS, J. A. S. Father of History or father of lies: the reputation of Herodotus. *CJ*, Provo, UT, vol. 64, n. 1, p. 11-17, 1968.
- FITZGERALD, J. T.; WHITE, L. M. *The tabula of Cebes*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.
- FRASER, P. M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- GALLAVOTTI, C. *Luciano nella sua evoluzione artistica e spirituale*. Lanciano: Giuseppe Carabba, 1932.
- GEORGIADOU, A.; LARMOUR, D. H. J. The "prolaliae" to Lucian's "Verae Historiae". *Eranos*, Oxford, GA, vol. 93, p. 100-112, 1995.
- GIANNINI, A. Studi sulla paradossografia greca, I. Da Omero a Callimaco: motive e forme del meraviglioso. *RIL*, Milano, vol. 97, p. 247-266, 1963.
- GLEASON, M. W. *Making men: Sophists and self-presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- GORRINI, M. E. *Toxaris, ὁ ξένος ἱστρός*. *Athenaeum*, Pavia, vol. 91, n. 2, p. 435-443, 2003.
- HALL, J. A. *Lucian's satire*. New York: Arno, 1981.
- HARTOG, F. *Le miroir d'Hérodote: essai sur la représentation de l'autre*. Paris: Gallimard, 1980.
- HORDERN, J. H. *The fragments of Timotheus of Miletus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

- JOHNSON, W. A. Oral performance and the composition of Herodotus' "Histories". *GRBS*, Durham, NC, vol. 35, n. 3, p. 229-254, 1994.
- JONES, C. P. *Culture and society in Lucian*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986.
- KINDSTRAND, J. F. *Anacharsis: the legend and the "Apophthegmata"*. Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 1981.
- MESTRE, F.; GÓMEZ, P. Retórica, comedia, diálogo: la fusión de géneros en la literatura griega del s. II d.C. *Myrtia*, Murcia, vol. 16, p. 111-122, 2001.
- MRAS, K. Die προλαλία bei den griechischen Schriftstellern. *WS*, Wien, vol. 64, p. 71-81, 1949.
- NESSELRATH, H. G. Lucian's introductions. In: RUSSELL, D. A. (org.). *Antonine literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990, p. 111-140.
- PERNOT, L. *La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde gréco-romain*. Paris: Institut d'études augustiniennes, 1993.
- REARDON, B. P. *Courants littéraires grecs des IIe et IIIe siècles après J.-C.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1971.
- ROBINSON, C. *Lucian and his influence in Europe*. London: Duckworth, 1979.
- ROTHSTEIN, M. *Quaestiones Lucianeae*. Berlin: Mayer und Müller, 1888.
- ROUVERET, A. *Histoire et imaginaire de la peinture ancienne: Ve siècle av.J.C.-Ier siècle ap. J.C.* Rome: École Française de Rome, 1989.
- RUSSELL, D. A. *Greek declamation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- SAGE, M. M. *Warfare in ancient Greece*. London/ New York: Routledge, 1996.
- SANTINI, L. Autoritratto dell'artista: Luciano nella prolaliá "Dioniso". *AUFL*, Ferrara, n. s. 2, p. 73-97, 2001.
- SCHEPENS, G.; DELCROIX, K. Ancient paradoxography: origin, evolution, production and reception. In: PECERE, O.; STRAMAGLIA, A. (org.). *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino*. Cassino: Università degli studi di Cassino, 1996, p. 375-460.
- SCULLARD, H. H. *The elephant in the Greek and Roman world*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1974.
- SEGAL, C. P. Gorgias and the psychology of the "Logos". *HSPh*, Cambridge, MA, vol. 66, p. 99-155, 1962.
- STOCK, A. *De prolalarum usu rhetorico*. Königsberg Diss. Königsberg: Hartung/ Regimonti, 1911.
- THIMME, A. Zwei Festvorlesungen des Lukianos. *Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie*, Leipzig, vol. 37, p. 562-566, 1888.
- UNGEFEHR-KORTUS, C. *Anacharsis, der Typus des edlen, weisen Barbaren: ein Beitrag zum Verständnis griechischer Fremdheitserfahrung*. Frankfurt am Main/ New York: P. Lang, 1996.

UREÑA BRACERO, J. *El diálogo de Luciano: ejecución, naturaleza, y procedimientos de humor.* Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert, 1995.

VILLANI, B. L'ironia nelle "prolaliac" di Luciano. *Quaderni del Dipartimento di filologia linguistica e tradizione classica*, Bologna, p. 217-233, 2000.

VISA-ONDARÇUHU, V. Parler et penser grec: les scythes Anacharsis et Toxaris et l'expérience rhétorique de Lucien. *REA*, Paris, vol. 110, n. 1, p. 175-194, 2008.

WEST, M. L. *Ancient Greek music.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

WHITMARSH, T. *Greek literature and the Roman Empire: the politics of imitation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

WHITMARSH, T. *The Second Sophistic.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.