

Icons, Images, Interpretations: Arrian, Lukian, their Relationship, and Alexander at the Kydnos^{*}

by Sabine Müller
Philipps-Universität Marburg
sabine.mueller@uni-marburg.de

ABSTRACT Alexander was the most prominent Argead and one of the major figures in Second Sophistic literature. The Second Sophistic authors had their own respective images of Alexander, treatment of their sources, and intention to write about him. This paper aims at exploring Lucian's ironic response to the historiographical Alexander images in his time. It will be argued that by ridiculing the current Alexander images in Second Sophistic literature, particularly Arrian's Alexander, Lucian did not mean to make fun of the historical Alexander but of his reception and the bias and artifice involved.

KEYWORDS Historiography; Arrian; Lukian; Second Sophistic; Images of Alexander; Kydnos.

INTRODUCTION

In scholarship, the relationship of the satirist Lukian of Samosata (ca. 120-180 A.D.) to his contemporary writer Arrian from Nicomedia has always been a topic of concern and interest. There are speculations that they met during the years they spent in Athens¹. However, it is unclear whether they were in contact at all². Furthermore, the question of Lukian's opinion of Arrian, knowledge of his works, and possible ironical references to them is a matter of debate. Thereby, the suggestion predominates that Lukian knew Arrian's writings such as the *Periplus Ponti Euxini*, *Parthika* or *Anabasis Alexandrou* and reacted to them³, a view also shared by Brian Bosworth⁴.

However, there is no consensus regarding the nature of Lukian's reaction. On the one hand, it is presumed that Lukian was basically critical of Arrian for, in his eyes, Arrian exactly represented the type of self-confident intellectual priding himself with

^{*} Being a tribute to the much-missed Brian Bosworth and his groundbreaking studies that influenced generations of scholars, this paper's subject touches upon one of Brian's special fields of interest, Arrian in a socio-cultural context.

¹ NISSEN 1888, 241, 243.

² ANDERSON 1980, 124; WIRTH 1964, 232.

³ Cf. MÜLLER 2013a, 184; KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 184-185; MACLEOD 1987, 257; ANDERSON 1980; ANDERSON 1976, 27; WIRTH 1964, 231-234, 245.

⁴ Cf. BOSWORTH 1988b, 24.

his *paideia*, socio-political status, and benefactions for mankind. Lukian constantly made fun of them, unmasking them as superficial vainglorious hypocrites only interested in their political career, wealth, and social rank⁵. Hence, as Anderson puts it, there “is a strong case that Lucian did indeed ridicule Arrian along with the herd”⁶.

On the other hand, it is argued that Arrian was neither Lukian’s enemy nor his victim but his ideal historiographer⁷. According to this opinion, however, Lukian’s admiration for Arrian did not prevent him from making fun of the writer from Nicomedia integrating him into his “rogues’ gallery”⁸ of intellectuals of his times.

This paper aims at re-assessing Lukian’s literary relationship to Arrian. In this matter so far, the focus was on Lukian’s *Alexander the False Prophet*, *Dialogues of the Dead* in which Alexander appears, and *How to Write History*, mocking the shortcomings of contemporary historiographers writing about the Parthian war⁹. This paper aims at examining a work by Lukian that received less attention: *The Hall*. As the introduction starts with a reference to Alexander, namely his fatal encounter with the river Kydnos (also treated in Arrian’s *Anabasis*), it may be revealing with regard to Lukian’s relationship to Arrian. At least, as it is Lukian’s practice to consciously blur the evidence on his person and hide behind his literary *alter egos*¹⁰, it might cast a light upon his literary pose.

LUKIAN AND ARRIAN

Whatever Lukian’s personal opinion of Arrian might have been, whether or not they had ever met in person, the features of Arrian as a writer revealed in his works are in accordance with the major stock elements of Lukian’s mockery of the boastful, vainglorious intellectuals of his time.

In general, Lukian’s main theme is the relationship of truth and truthfulness with lies and hypocrisy¹¹. He deals with his central concern in different ways. Thus, he makes fun of certain types of hypocrites, frauds, pretenders, liars, impostors, in short, pseudo-

⁵ NISSEN 1888, 245-256; BALDWIN 1973, 30-33.

⁶ ANDERSON 1980, 124. Cf. MÜLLER 2013a, 184.

⁷ Cf. BOSWORTH 1988b, 24.

⁸ MACLEOD 1987, 257. Cf. WIRTH 1964, 233-245.

⁹ The question whether Arrian (and his *Parthika*) was ridiculed along with the historiographers writing on the Parthian war (*Hist. Conscr.* 14-19) is a matter of debate. VIDAL-NAQUET 1984, 370 argues in favor of it. Cf. WIRTH 1964, 234-237, 240-241. *Contra*: STROBEL 1994, 1337; JONES 1986, 59. For an overview see MÜLLER 2014d, 125, n. 53; POROD 2013, 20-21. See also KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 183-184 (indecisive). In addition, it is debated whether the cited authors are real writers of Lukian’s time (POROD 2013, 191-196; BALDWIN 1973, 80-85), a blend of reality and fiction (ANDERSON 1994, 1434; HALL 1981, 316, 320) or ironic inventions reflecting certain types of historiographers and their shortcomings (cf. MÜLLER 2014d, 125; STROBEL 1994, 1334-1360; SCHMITT 1984, 451-455; HOMEYER 1965, 20-23; WIRTH 1964, 235). See also ZIMMERMANN 1999, 53 on the real dimension of Lukian’s irony. On the ironic dimension of *How to Write History* see OVERWIEN 2006, 194; RÜTTEN 1997, 36-37; GEORGIADOU – LARMOUR 1994, 1450-1482, 1484, 1505-1506 pointing at the connection to *Verae Historiae*. When Lukian states that the historiographer just has to adorn his material like Pheidias his statues (*Hist. Conscr.* 50-51), the irony is manifest.

¹⁰ Cf. BAUMBACH – VON MÖLLENDROFF 2017, 13; MÜLLER 2014b, 164; MÜLLER 2013a, 171-172; MÜLLER 2013b, 27, 32; BERDOZZO 2011, 213; SIDWELL 2010; ZWEIMÜLLER 2008, 209-210; WHITMARSH 2005, 82-83 (a web of playful Lukianisms).

¹¹ Cf. MÖLLER – MÜLLER 2016, 151; MÜLLER 2014b, 152; POROD 2013, 94; MÜLLER 2013b, 27-29, 35; BERDOZZO 2011, 194-195; PETSALIS-DIOMIDIS 2010, 55-56, 65; SCHLAPBACH 2010, 253; ZWEIMÜLLER 2008, 44-45, 130, 138; GUNDERSON 2007, 479, 482-483; KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 184; SWAIN 2007, 23; RÜTTEN 1997, 35-37.

authorities in different fields of social activity: education, philosophy, historiography and rhetoric, religion and cult, medicine, and politics¹². Mainly, these pseudo-authorities are stock characters embodying recognizable features characteristic of Lukian's times. Thus, there is an underlying real dimension casting light upon certain contemporary socio-cultural conditions. As Lukian refers to existing contemporary phenomena, necessarily, on the base of his irony and parody, there are real developments, problems, phenomena, grievances, and shortcomings of his time his audience could recognize. Arrian and the self-praise in his works was one of these current and characteristic phenomena.

Unmasking pseudo-authorities and their selfish striving for wealth, glory, reputation, or rank, Lukian reveals the harmfulness of such arrogated religious, intellectual or political leaders betraying the people by demonstrating their alleged superiority without possessing the inner qualities to be real moral, political or educative examples. Lukian shows that their *paideia* was either wrong, superficial, or faked. Instead of embodying the lessons of the true *paideia*, hence striving for abstract goods such as wisdom, maturity, inner balance while trying to improve the students and listeners morally by good teaching, the pseudo-authorities just care for themselves. Selfishly, they long for material goods, fame, wealth, and *dolce vita*.

In order to unveil their pretensions, Lukian often uses theatrical metaphors comparing them to tragic actors wearing their *habitus* of alleged authority and superiority like theatre masks and costumes¹³. For example, Lukian's pseudo-philosophers usually dress up as a sage by wearing an extremely long beard and very hairy brows meant to hide their real ambitions that are mostly in contradiction to the ideals of their philosophic schools¹⁴. Lukian's would-be orators want to be famous, rich, and admired, and try to catch the attention of their audience by their extravagant style, behaviour or hairsplitting syllogisms (rather than by the content of his words). The historiographers Lukians makes fun of compare themselves immodestly to "classical" literary authorities like Herodotus, Thukydides, and Xenophon¹⁵, indulge in name-dropping in order to show off their expertise, unscrupulously copy from classical works and (mis)use the famous ancient authors as testimonies to their claims, especially the most absurd¹⁶.

Of course, Lukian is not critical of the knowledge of the Greek "classics" as such. Certainly, he does not intend to diminish their literary rank and achievements. Thus, while in his *True Stories*, he ironically locates Herodotus at the Island of the Damned as a punishment for his lies¹⁷, he will have respected his work at the same time. Lukian criticizes the reception of these literary authorities in his time: the predominant use of them as indisputable testimonies of the sheer truth. He mocks the tendency of contemporary writers to accept everything these ancient authorities wrote as true without thinking twice and their practice of citing them as markers of truth in order to verify their own claims. Thus, Lukian is critical of a kind of misleading and misdirected reception of the Greek literary past: Instead of critically studying the works from the

¹² Cf. SWAIN 2007, 23: Lukian assaulted all who made any claim to intellectual merit, truth, or virtue.

¹³ F.e. Luk. *Ikaron*. 30; *Pisc.* 11, 31, 37, 41, 42; *DM* 10; *Nec.* 16. Cf. MÜLLER 2014b, 157; ZWEIMÜLLER 2008, 131-134, 138.

¹⁴ Beard/brows: f.e. Luk. *DM* 10.9; *Hist. Conscr.* 17. Cf. Porod 2013, 98. Hypocrisy: i.e. Luk. *Symp.* 11-47. Cf. MÜLLER 2013b, 32-34; SCHLAPBACH 2010, 253. HOPKINSON 2008, 9 argues that only the Cynics were exempted from his mockery but this was not the case. Cf. MÜLLER 2014b, 157-160.

¹⁵ Luk. *Hist. Conscr.* 2.

¹⁶ Cf. Luk. *Hist. Conscr.* 14-15.

¹⁷ Luk. *VH* II 31. Cf. MÜLLER 2013a, 181; ANDERSON 1976, 68-69, 72-78 (he respected Herodotus); GEORGIADIOU – LARMOUR 1998, 21, 28.

past, learning from their knowledge *and* errors, Lukian's stock historiographer only treats them as factors of legitimization for his own claims. However, Lukian makes clear that even the heroes of the Greek literary past have to be viewed with critical eyes¹⁸.

Similarly, Lukian was surely not critical of the historical persons of philosophers such as Diogenes of Sinope or Sokrates at whose expense he also joked. Rather, he makes jokes about their reception reflecting the erroneous ways in which the “classical” philosophers served his contemporaries as justifications of their lifestyle. He points out that the contemporary pseudo-philosophers use their references to them as pretexts without having embodied their lessons. In order to reflect this phenomenon of misguided reception, for example, Lukian who knows Plato's works extremely well, consciously and blatantly misinterprets the lessons of Sokrates¹⁹. Lukian uses the past in order to point out shortcomings of the present²⁰. One factor of this critical use of the past was his ironic way of deliberately disappointing general expectations²¹.

Certainly, also the ironic treatment of iconic figures in the collective memory such as Alexander III of Macedon was no proof that Lukian was critical of the historical persons as such. Rather, he was critical of their reception, perception, and use by contemporary historiographers as symbols of their own status, reputation and literary skills²². Aiming at becoming famous by writing about them, such historiographers could be suspected to sacrifice the “historical truth” in favour of a colourful storyline or an idealized portrait of their protagonists.

Significantly, Arrian's “second preface” of his *Anabasis Alexandrou* reflects the phenomenon that historiographers tried to increase their symbolic capital by writing about iconic figures from the past. Explaining his reasons for writing the *Anabasis Alexandrou*, Arrian compares himself to Homer commemorating Achilles' deeds and emphasizes his devotion to *paideia* that made him the only one qualified to write the true history of Alexander:

καὶ εὐδαιμόνισεν ἄρα, ὡς λόγος, Ἀλεξανδρος Ἀχιλλέα, ὅτι Ὄμήρου κήρυκος ἐς τὴν ἔπειτα μνήμην ἔτυχε. καὶ μέντοι καὶ ἦν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ οὐχ ἥκιστα τούτου ἔνεκα εὐδαιμονιστέος Ἀχιλλεύς, ὅτι αὐτῷ γε Ἀλεξάνδρῳ, οὐ κατὰ τὴν ἄλλην ἐπιτυχίαν, τὸ χωρίον τοῦτο ἐκλιπές ξυνέβη οὐδὲ ἐξηνέχθη ἐς ἀνθρώπους τὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔργα ἐπαξίως (...) ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις ἄλλος εἰς ἀνήρ τοσαῦτα ἢ τηλικαῦτα ἔργα κατὰ πλῆθος ἢ μέγεθος ἐν “Ελλησιν ἢ βαρβάροις ἀπεδείξατο. ἐνθεν καὶ αὐτὸς ὄρμηθῆναι φημι ἐς τήνδε τὴν ξυγγραφήν, οὐκ ἀπαξιώσας ἐμαυτὸν φανερὰ καταστήσειν ἐς ἀνθρώπους τὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔργα. ὅστις δὲ ὃν ταῦτα ὑπὲρ ἐμαυτοῦ γινώσκω, τὸ μὲν ὄνομα οὐδὲν δέομαι ἀναγράψαι, οὐδὲ γάρ οὐδὲ ἄγνωστον ἐς ἀνθρώπους ἔστιν, οὐδὲ πατρίδα ἡτις μοι ἔστιν οὐδὲ γένος τὸ ἐμόν, οὐδὲ εἰ δή τινα ἀρχὴν ἐν τῇ ἐμαυτοῦ ἥρξα: ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο ἀναγράψω, ὅτι ἐμοὶ πατρίς τε καὶ γένος καὶ ἀρχαὶ οῖδε οἱ λόγοι εἰσί τε καὶ ἀπὸ νέου ἔτι ἐγένοντο, καὶ ἐπὶ τῷδε οὐκ ἀπαξιῶ

¹⁸ Cf. HOPKINSON 2008, 8; BRACHT BRANHAM 1989, 214. See also MÜLLER 2014b, 29. Cf. KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 184: In Lukian's eyes, *mimesis* means the description of the truth, not the imitation of the works of the Greek literary heritage.

¹⁹ Cf. SCHLAPBACH 2010, 274. Sokrates seems to have been one of Lukian's real champions. On Plato's importance for Lukian see BERDOZZO 2011, 191, 202-203; BRACHT BRANHAM 1989, 67-80.

²⁰ Cf. GILHULY 2007, 67-68; RÜTTEN 1997, 42-44, 133; BRACHT BRANHAM 1989, 4; Cf. MÜLLER 2013a, 189.

²¹ Cf. HOPKINSON 2008, 2-3; GILHULY 2007, 68; RÜTTEN 1997, 26-28; BRACHT BRANHAM 1989, 44, 149.

²² Cf. MÜLLER 2013a, 188-189; GEORGIADOU – LARMOUR 1998, 2-3. On the iconic status of Alexander in Lukian's time see BURLIGA 2013, 79; BILLAULT 2010, 633-634; KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 179; WHITMARSH 2005, 66-68; STROBEL 1994, 1338.

έμαυτὸν τῶν πρώτων ἐν τῇ φωνῇ τῇ Ἑλλάδι, εἰπερ οὖν καὶ Ἀλέξανδρον τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις.

“Alexander, so the story goes, blessed Achilles for having Homer to proclaim his fame to posterity. Alexander might well have counted Achilles happy on this score, since, fortunate as Alexander was in other ways, there was a great gap left here, and Alexander’s exploits were never celebrated as they deserved (...) no other single man performed such remarkable deeds, whether in number or magnitude, among either Greeks or barbarians. That, I declare, is why I myself have embarked on this history, not judging myself unworthy to make Alexander’s deeds known to men. Whoever I may be, this I know in my favour; I need not write my name, for it is not at all unknown among men, nor my country nor my family nor any office I may have held in my own land; this I do set on paper, that country, family, and offices I find and have found from my youth in these tales. That is why I think myself not unworthy of the masters of Greek speech, since my subject Alexander was among the masters of warfare”²³.

Moles points out that Arrian’s wording concerning his background evokes the genealogic boast of the Homeric hero: Thus, he claimed “heroic” status and emphasized “the heroic nature of his attempt to write a history worthy” of Alexander: “Great deeds can only be properly commemorated by great literature”²⁴.

Perhaps, Lukian felt challenged by self-praise like that. When he wrote *Alexander or the False Prophet* about the success of a wicked fraud posing as an oracle founder²⁵, the otherwise not attested protagonist of the indeed existing cult seems to carry the name Alexander for a reason: in his introduction, Lukian echoed Arrian’s self-representation in the *Anabasis* claiming that he and Arrian both wrote biographies of criminals:

καὶ Ἀρριανὸς γὰρ ὁ τοῦ Ἐπικτήτου μαθητῆς, ἀνὴρ Ἐρωμαίων ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις καὶ παιδείᾳ παρ’ ὅλον τὸν βίον συγγενόμενος, ὅμοιόν τι παθὼν ἀπολογήσαιτ’ ἀν καὶ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Τιλλορόβου γοῦν τοῦ ληστοῦ κάκεινος βίον ἀναγράψαι ἡξίωσεν. ἡμεῖς δὲ πολὺ ὀμοτέρου ληστοῦ μνήμην ποιησόμεθα, ὅσῳ μὴ ἐν ὕλαις καὶ ἐν ὅρεσιν, ἀλλ’ ἐν πόλεσιν οὗτος ἐλήστενεν, οὐ Μυσίαν μόνην οὐδὲ τὴν Ἰδην κατατρέχων οὐδὲ ὀλίγα τῆς Ασίας μέρη τὰ ἐρημότερα λεηλατῶν.

“Arrian, the disciple of Epiktetos, a Roman of the highest distinction, and a life-long devotee of letters, laid himself open to the same charge, and so can plead our cause as well as his own; he thought fit, you know, to record the life of Tilloboros, the brigand. In our case, however, we shall commemorate a far more savage brigand, since our hero plied his trade not in forests and mountains, but in cities, and instead of infesting just Mysia and Mount Ida and harrying a few of the more deserted districts of Asia, he filled the whole Roman Empire, I may say, with his brigandage”²⁶.

²³ Arr. *An.* 1.12.1-5. Transl. P. A. BRUNT. Cf. KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 179. On the “second preface”, see BURLIGA 2013, 106; MOLES 1985. On the devotion to *logoi* see MARINCOLA 1989, 187, 189: Arrian’s source-criticism is intended to suggest his superiority.

²⁴ MOLES 1985, 165, 167.

²⁵ Cf. MÜLLER 2015; PETSALIS-DIOMIDIS 2010, 43-66; GUNDERSON 2007, 479-510; SWAIN 2007, 41-43; JONES 1986, 133-148.

²⁶ Luk. *Alex.* 2. Transl. A. M. HARMON. This is the only explicit reference to Arrian by Lukian.

There is no consensus concerning the question whether this reference was a respectful gesture and “complimentary flourish after Arrian’s death”²⁷ or a mocking parody²⁸. Mostly, it is assumed that Arrian served Lukian as an excuse for his subject: if Arrian could devote a biography to such an unworthy figure as a brigand, Lukian was excused²⁹.

However, Arrian’s alleged biography of a robber terrorizing Asia is not attested elsewhere. In addition, unless Arrian used the same self-representation by habit in his works, Lukian clearly alludes to the *Anabasis*. Furthermore, judged against the background that as a writer, Arrian defined himself as such through his subject, he would hardly ever have chosen a minor brigand as his protagonist. “Alexander did the greatest deeds; therefore the *Anabasis* must be a supremely great work of literature”³⁰. However, a biography of a villain who looted parts of Asia is not in accordance with this ideology and cannot be regarded as being written for the good of the mankind as Arrian claims at the end of his *Anabasis*³¹. In consequence, the book will never have existed. It will be nothing but an ironical allusion to Arrian’s *Anabasis*³². The image of the robber is in accordance with Alexander’s reception as a brigand by Roman writers³³. The name Tilloboros/Tilliborus which is attested epigraphically³⁴, may have been associated with a brigand known in his times and therefore chosen by Lukian. In consequence, the name of the false prophet reveals that he makes fun of Arrian’s treatment of Alexander as an iconic figure in his *Anabasis*. The portrait of the *pseudomanus* Alexander is more than “an inversion of encomiastic portrayals of Alexander”³⁵. By paralleling his authorial *persona* with Arrian and associating *Alexander* with Arrian’s *Anabasis*, Lukian reverses Arrian’s way of approaching an iconic figure³⁶. While Arrian claims to write the truth when creating an idealized iconic portrait while in addition emphasizing his own skills as a historiographer, Lukian strips off the idealized features of this Alexander, hence deconstructing the iconic image.

²⁷ ANDERSON 1980, 122. This view is shared by POROD 2013, 20; BURLIGA 2013, 82-83 (an *epitaphios logos*, written seriously and without any irony); BOSWORTH 1980, 37; WIRTH 1964, 233-234, 245. See also CARLSEN 2014, 211. *Contra*: MACLEOD 1987, 258; STADTER 1980, 18.

²⁸ Cf. MÜLLER 2013a, 185-187; KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 184-185; MACLEOD 1987, 258. See also JONES 1986, 134 (a sardonic comparison).

²⁹ Cf. BURLIGA 2013, 82; BILLAULT 2010, 629; VICTOR 1997, 9.

³⁰ MOLES 1985, 167.

³¹ Arr. *An.* 7.30.2. Cf. BURLIGA 2013, 121: Arrian wants to be useful. SWAIN 2007, 42 argues that the ancient elites’ fascination with bandits makes it plausible that Arrian wrote such a biography. However, this is not really convincing.

³² Cf. MÜLLER 2013a, 186-187; KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 177; BADIAN 1997; TONNET 1988, 73, 83; WIRTH 1964, 233. See also WHITMARSH 2005, 68, n. 43. However, in great parts, it is indeed taken for granted that Arrian wrote this biography on Tilloboros, cf. BURLIGA 2013, 81; BILLAULT 2010, 629; GRÜNEWALD 1999, 9, n. 19; VICTOR 1997, 133; SWAIN 1996, 326, n. 101; BOSWORTH 1972, 164, 166-167; NISSEN 1888, 241.

³³ Sen. *De ben.* 1.13.3; *Ep.* 94.62; Luc. *Phars.* 10.20-21; Luk. *Navig.* 28. Cf. KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 177; VON MÖLLENDORFF 2006, 322; ANDERSON 1977, 367.

³⁴ PIR² T 210. Cf. VICTOR 1997, 133; STADTER 1980, 162.

³⁵ WHITMARSH 2005, 68, n. 43. Cf. GERLACH 2005, 179, n. 73; KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 184-185 (it is a negative interpretation of Arrian’s biography of Alexander); BRACHT BRANHAM 1989, 190-195. GUNDERSON 2007, 488 characterizes the false prophet also as “something of a conqueror.” Cf. MÜLLER 2013a, 184-187.

³⁶ Not surprisingly, there are several ironic references to Alexander III in *Alexander*, predominantly concerned with charges of his hubristic longing for divinity Arrian tried to neutralize: Luk. *Alex.* 1; 6; 7 (cf. Plut. *Alex.* 2.4; Just. 11.11; Arr. *An.* 4.10.2); 16 (cf. Plut. *Alex.* 76.4; Arr. *An.* 7.26.1); 41 (indirect). Cf. MÜLLER 2013a, 184-187; PETSALIS-DIOMIDIS 2010, 45; OGDEN 2009, 279-300; JONES 1986, 133, 136. Cf. Arr. *An.* 3.3.2; 7.29.3-4. However, alternatively, BILLAULT 2010, 630-633 argues that Lukian made fun of Plutarch’s biography of Alexander instead of Arrian’s *Anabasis*.

While Arrian ends his *Anabasis* claiming that it was written for the good of the mankind and divinely supported like Alexander's deeds³⁷, Lukian ends his *Alexander* with the comment that it might be useful for all men of sense to be able to face the truth³⁸. The difference is significant: The claim of divine protection is missing and the text will only be useful to people of sense.

Arrian's *Periplus Ponti Euxini* might have provided Lukian with other material to ridicule. Written in the early 130s, the literary letter to Hadrian describes Arrian's voyage of inspection along the coast of the Black Sea commemorating his governorship of Kappadokia as well as hinting at his close relationship with the emperor and distinguishing Arrian as a connoisseur of Greek literature, art, and history³⁹. Thus, he styled himself as a loyal and capable Roman magistrate and Greek man of letters. Continuously, he referred to famous representatives of the Greek cultural heritage—Homer, Aischylos, Herodotos and Xenophon—, touched upon famous myths and artefacts and called himself (the new) Xenophon⁴⁰. The last part of the letter is devoted to the island of Leuke which Arrian himself did not visit. He dwells on the local cult of Achilles associated with Patroklos and proves to be credulous concerning unproven stories about their epiphanies of Achilles and Patroklos attested by second- or third-hand witnesses⁴¹. Probably, he was motivated by the belief in the subject's special significance for Hadrian associating him with Achilles and his recently (130 AD) deceased favorite Antinoos with Patroklos⁴². Summing up, Arrian's *Periplus* echoes Lukian's mockery that the intellectuals of his time tend to indulge into name-dropping and myth-telling, see themselves as a new Thukydides, Herodotos or Xenophon, try to flatter their patrons, and aim at reputation and status.

Now, the similarities might have been caused by the fact that Arrian was a child of his time and as such, necessarily reflects the contemporary phenomena of the intellectual circles in the Roman Empire. In addition, as the demonstration of *paideia* by proving intense familiarity with the Greek cultural heritage, ability to imitate the language and style of the past literary celebrities, and art of rhetorical performance formed part of the symbolic capital of the intellectuals in the time of the Second Sophistic⁴³, thus being their “identity card” and legitimization regarding their political career and social status, certainly, they were expected to show such an attitude. As Kate Gilhuly comments: “In a world where one's public activity in the political, social and civic spheres was subject

³⁷ Arr. *An.* 7.30.2.

³⁸ Luk. *Alex.* 61.

³⁹ Cf. MÜLLER 2014c. The literary character of the letter is manifest when Arrian mentions that the real official report(s), written in Latin, were already sent to the emperor (*Per.* 6.2-3). The *Periplus* is an artificial brainchild intended for a wider audience. Cf. BOSWORTH 1993, 242-253 (a literary supplement to the official report).

⁴⁰ Homeric epics: Arr. *Per.* 3.2; 8.2-3; 23.4; Aischylos: Arr. *Per.* 19.2; Herodotos: Arr. *Per.* 18.1-2; Xenophon: Arr. *Per.* 1.1; 1.2-3; 2.3; 3.2; 8.2; 11.1-2; 12.5; 13.5; 14.4-5; 15.1; 16.3; 25.1; myths and artefacts: Arr. *Per.* 8.3; 9.1-2; 11.5; 15.3; 21.1. The view that Xenophon was one of Arrian's names (cf. STADTER 1967) is mostly rejected, cf. MACLEOD 1987, 258, n. 6; WIRTH 1964, 228-229. He will have called himself the new Xenophon. See LIDDLE 2003, 91; FEIN 1994, 181-182; BOSWORTH 1993, 234-243, 273-274 (unclear whether he was granted this name or assumed it himself); OLIVER 1972 (a double herm found near the Acropolis may represent Xenophon and Arrian).

⁴¹ Arr. *Per.* 21.1-3.

⁴² Cf. BOSWORTH 1993, 249.

⁴³ Cf. ZWEIMÜLLER 2008, 107; GALLI 2007, 10-14; CONOLLY 2003, 341-342, 349; VON MÖLLENDORFF 2000, 3; SCHMITZ 1997, 44-67, 83-90, 101-109; ANDERSON 1993, 101-114; JONES 1986, 149. On the imitation see SWAIN 2007, 21; KARAVAS 2005, 10; BRACHT BRANHAM 1989, 4.

to fluctuating and capricious forces, the cultivation of the self became an increasing object of concern”⁴⁴.

Hence, it is possible that for Lukian, Arrian was but one of the exponents of the intellectual vanity fair of his times and thus treated as such. But there might also have been more behind it.

THE HALL

Lukian’s *The Hall* is about the question whether the impact of sight is stronger than the impact of words drawing mental images in the mind of the audience⁴⁵. Thereby, he touches upon one of the major themes of the Second Sophistic: the image and art of word-painting, ήγραφή τῶν λόγων⁴⁶. It was central in the “public displays of word power”⁴⁷ of sophists.

A speaker talks about his wish to perform in a beautiful, sumptuously decorated and adorned hall aiming at forming part of this beauty by adding his words. He is opposed by a personified *logos*⁴⁸, a second speaker who intervenes and uses the first speaker’s very arguments in order to prove the contrary. According to him, any sumptuous surrounding is a bad place for a speech. Distracted by the decoration, the supposed listeners turn into mere spectators thus lacking attention to the spoken words. Attracted by the visual sensation, they prefer the physical sight to the metaphorical images painted by the speaker with words in their imagination.

As usual in the time of the Second Sophistic, the speaker starts his oration by referring to a historical example that was widely known:

εῖτα Ἀλέξανδρος μὲν ἐπεθύμησεν ἐν τῷ Κύδνῳ λούσασθαι καλόν τε καὶ διαυγῆ τὸν ποταμὸν ιδὼν καὶ ἀσφαλῶς βαθὺν καὶ προσηνῶς ὄξὺν καὶ νήξασθαι ήδὺν καὶ θέρους ὥρᾳ ψυχρόν, ὥστε καὶ ἐπὶ προδήλῳ τῇ νόσῳ ἦν ἐνόσησεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ, δοκεῖ μοι οὐκ ἂν τοῦ λουτροῦ ἀποσχέσθαι.

“Alexander longed to bathe in the Kydnos on seeing that the stream was fair and clear, safely deep, agreeably swift, delightful to swim in and cool in the height of the summer; even with foreknowledge of the fever which he contracted from it, I do not think he would have abstained from his plunge”⁴⁹.

The beginning refers to a famous incident also mentioned by Arrian in his *Anabasis*:

Ἀλέξανδρος δέ, ως μέν Ἀριστοβούλῳ λέλεκται, ὑπὸ καμάτου ἐνόσησεν, οἱ δὲ ἐς τὸν Κύδνον [τὸν]ποταμὸν λέγουσι ρίγαντα νήξασθαι, ἐπιθυμήσαντα τοῦ ὄντος, ιδρῶντα καὶ καύματι ἐχόμενον. ο δὲ Κύδνος ρέει διὰ μέσης τῆς πόλεως: οἴα δὲ ἐκ

⁴⁴ GILHULY 2007, 63.

⁴⁵ Cf. WEBB 2009, 172-173; VON MÖLLENDORFF 2006b, 230; NEWBY 2002. On *The Hall* in general see MÜLLER 2018.

⁴⁶ Cf. VON MÖLLENDORFF 2006b, 240; FRANCIS 2003, 582, 592.

⁴⁷ SWAIN 2007, 27. On the importance of public declarations see also HOPKINSON 2008, 4-5; ZWEIMÜLLER 2008, 145; WHITMARSH 2005, 73.

⁴⁸ Cf. WEBB 2009, 173.

⁴⁹ Luk. *De Domo* 1. Cf. Curt. 3.5.1-4; Arr. *An.* 2.4.7-8; Just. 11,8,3-9; Val. Max. 3.8.ext. 6; Plut. *Alex.* 19.1-2. Diod. 17.31.4-6 only mentions that he fell ill. On the episode see BICHLER 2013, 303-306; HECKEL 2006, 13; HAMMOND 1981, 92-93; BOSWORTH 1980, 55.

τοῦ Ταύρουνδρους τῶν πηγῶν οἱ ἀνισχουσῶν καὶ διὰ χώρου καθαροῦ ῥέων, ψυχρός τέ ἐστι καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καθαρός σπασμῷ τε οὖν ἔχεσθαι Ἀλέξανδρον καὶ θέρμαις ἰσχυραῖς καὶ ἀγρυπνίᾳ ἔννεχεῖ.

“Here Alexander fell ill, from fatigue according to Aristoboulos, but others tell the following story. Alexander dived into the river Kydnos and had a swim; he wanted to bathe as he was in sweat and overcome by heat. The Kydnos runs right through the city, and as its springs are in Mount Tauros and it runs through open country, it is cold and its water is clear. Alexander therefore caught a cramp, and suffered from violent fever and continuous sleeplessness”⁵⁰.

It is no surprise that Aristoboulos, “a blatant apologist” for Alexander⁵¹, told a version favorable to his idealized protagonist instead of blaming him for an imprudent swim. According to Lukian, Aristoboulos was noted for his flattering style—even by Alexander himself⁵². This story about Alexander throwing Aristoboulos’ writings in the Hydaspes because of his inventions is an ironical exaggeration serving as an example of certain shortcomings of historiography⁵³. Probably not coincidentally, Lukian’s image of Aristoboulos as a flattering liar contradicts Arrian’s opinion of the man from Kassandreia: Writing his *Anabasis*, Arrian names Aristoboulos as one of his two main sources he regarded as trustworthy and testimony to the truth⁵⁴. Thus, it is no surprise that Arrian mentioned Aristoboulos’ apologetic version first before citing the consensus of the other sources. As Arrian also idealized his protagonist, presumably, he cited Aristoboulos in order to oppose the general impression that Alexander acted irresponsibly and without the sense of duty that suited a commander by plunging directly in a river fed by the snow of the Tauros. As Brian Bosworth observed: “He may have been attempting to exculpate Alexander from charges of folly in blindly diving into the Cydnus without testing the water temperature”⁵⁵.

Lukian aims at exactly the opposite underlining that not even foreknowledge would have prevented Alexander from carelessly diving into the icy river. As Macleod pointed out, the passage in Lukian shares Arrian’s use of the aorist infinitive *νήξασθαι*, an aorist form of *ἐπιθυμῶ* and the adjective *ψυχρός*⁵⁶. Thus, it may have been no coincidence but a pun on Arrian’s image of Alexander in his *Anabasis*.

Regarding the outcome of the plunge, the speaker’s choice of the historical example and comparison of Alexander’s desire to dive into the river with his own desire to deliver a speech in the beautiful *oikos*—here again, Lukian uses the word *ἐπιθυμῶ*—does not seem to be wise. As the tragic and nearly lethal outcome of Alexander’s bathing fun is clear, the speaker foreshadows his own “drowning”. While Alexander was seduced by the sparkling stream and plunged into disaster, the speaker is blinded by the beautiful adornment of the hall and likely to shipwreck as an orator. Even worse,

⁵⁰ Arr. *An.* 2.4.7-8. Partly, it is suggested that the disease was malaria Alexander had contracted before entering Kilikia. Cf. HECKEL 2006, 13; BORZA 1987, 37; BOSWORTH 1980, 55. However, MACHEI 2016, 219-226 opts for hypothermia.

⁵¹ HECKEL 2006, 46. See also MÜLLER 2014a, 95-98; BERVE 1926, 65.

⁵² Luk. *Hist. Conscr.* 12. Cf. HECKEL 2006, 294, n. 111; BERVE 1926, 64.

⁵³ Cf. POROD 2013, 95, 125, 127.

⁵⁴ Arr. *Pr.* 1.1. Cf. KOULAKIOTIS 2006, 184. On Lukian’s different image of Aristoboulos see WIRTH 1964, 239.

⁵⁵ BOSWORTH 1980, 190-191. Cf. BICHLER 2013, 303; PEARSON 1960, 157.

⁵⁶ MACLEOD 1987, 260-261.

when stating that also with foreknowledge, Alexander would have jumped into the cold river, he implies that he is aware of the possible failure but ignores it⁵⁷.

This is underlined by the other arguments he utters in favor of speaking in beautiful surroundings. Unconsciously making clear that his wish to deliver his speech is motivated not by reason and consideration but on impulse, he compares himself to Achilles whose anger was enhanced by the sight of his armor⁵⁸. Thus, he gave in to his desire to avenge Patroklos' death. In consequence, he died young and bewailed the loss of his life in the *Odyssee* when, on his *katabasis*, Odysseus met him in Hades and tried to cheer him up⁵⁹. Lukian refers to this scene in his *Dialogues of the Death* portraying Achilles as hopelessly sad⁶⁰.

Next, the speaker draws an inappropriate comparison. Demonstrating his ignorance, he parallels the plane tree under which Sokrates sits down to converse with Phaidros in Plato's *Phaidros* with the golden plane tree of the Achaemenid kings, a prime marker of their display of luxury and thus lack of *sophrosyne* in Greco-Roman literature⁶¹. First of all, the setting of the *Phaidros* being the free landscape outside the walls of Athens is not comparable with the images of the luxurious Achaemenid court, especially in Greek perception. In addition, the attitude of the protagonists in the respective settings differs: While Sokrates praises the beauty of the idyllic setting at the Ilissos⁶², he does not fall for its charms⁶³. Contrarily, according to the stereotypical depiction of notoriously luxurious Achaemenid kings in Greek and Roman sources, the Persian kings were corrupted by wealth and decadence. The plane tree is another signal word. This special artwork—the wealthy Lydian Pythios —thus, in Greek eyes, the representative of a region known for its luxury—is said to have given to Dareios I became a famous symbol of the Persian king's indulgence in luxury⁶⁴. The orator characterizes this golden plane tree as “βαρβαρικὸν τὸ θέαμα, πλοῦτος μόνον”⁶⁵. According to him, it symbolizes the difference between the perspective and visual experience of intellectuals on the one hand and poor people (in the sense of less educated and refined persons) as well as “barbarians” on the other hand. While as a spectator, a cultured man is able to see more than mere outer beauty and judge wisely as an expert in art, “barbarians” and less educated people do not apply thought to what they see but are only impressed and astounded by the sheer sight:

⁵⁷ Cf. GOLDHILL 160; THOMAS 2007, 229-230; NEWBY 2002, 127. According to NEWBY 128, also an agonistic rivalry with the beautiful hall is implied.

⁵⁸ Luk. *De Domo* 4. Cf. Il. 19.15-6. Cf. VON MÖLLENDORFF 2006, 298. In VH II 20, Lukian makes fun of the famous motif of Achilles' wrath and the contemporary scholarly debate about it. When his narrator meets Homer at the Isle of the Blessed asking him why he began with the wrath of Achilles, Homer answered that it just came to his mind without any further thought.

⁵⁹ Od. 11.487-491.

⁶⁰ Luk. *DM* 15.1.

⁶¹ Luk. *De Domo* 5. Cf. Plat. *Phaidr.* 230 B. See LAPLACE 1996, 162-163, 165 on the influence of Plato and Pindar. On the golden plane tree cf. KUHRT 2010, 540; CURTIS 2010, 55; BRIANT 2002, 235-236. Mostly, it is mentioned in connection with the equally famous golden vine (Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.38). The artefacts were said to have been spared and adopted by Alexander for his representation. Phylarchos even mentions more than one golden plane tree (Athen. 12.539 D) and accuses Alexander of having surpassed the Persian display of luxury. See MÜLLER 2014, 110. On the display of enormous wealth and luxury as a characteristic feature of the Greco-Roman images of the Persian court see BICHLER 2010, 155-187; JACOBS 2010, 377-409.

⁶² Plat. *Phaidr.* 230 B-C. Cf. GÖRGEMANNS 2013, 140-141. On the historical setting see LIND 1987, 15-18.

⁶³ GÖRGEMANNS 2013, 142. Cf. FADEN 2005, 197 (an ironical praise of the idyllic scenery).

⁶⁴ Hdt. 7.27. It is unclear whether the Great King used to sit under the golden plane tree holding court or whether it was displayed as a royal treasure. See KUHRT 2010, 540, n. 3.

⁶⁵ Luk. *De Domo* 5.

οὐ φιλόκαλοι γάρ, ἀλλὰ φιλόπλουτοι εἰσιν οἱ βάρβαροι.

“The barbarians are no lovers of beauty but of wealth”⁶⁶.

However, lumping together poor and less educated (obviously Greek and Roman) people with “barbarians” such as the Parthian Arsacids he mentions, seems to be slightly precarious. Whether he also exposes his ignorance by associating the golden plane tree attested for the Achaemenids with the Arsacids is unclear as in Greco-Roman literature, the Parthians were usually paralleled to the Persians, even labelled as Persians and the Arsacids were regarded as the heirs of the Achaemenids.

In any case, Lukian makes fun of the ideology of different abilities of sight depending on the cultural context of the spectator. Even more so as ironically, his literary alter ego referred to himself as a “barbarian” and “Syrian” because of his origin and mother language⁶⁷. In consequence, according to the speaker’s opinion, Lukian, being himself a master of refined *ekphraseis*, would have not been able to view any beautiful architecture or artwork in a reasonable way. It may be coincidental but one is reminded of Arrian’s comment in the *Periplus* that the local “barbarians” at Trapezous were unable to create refined altars, accurate inscriptions, and beautiful statues of the emperor Hadrian worthy to bear his name and deities⁶⁸. Hence, Arrian as a man of *paideia*, Roman citizen and Greek man of letters had to correct these shortcomings.

Similarly, the metaphor that the ceiling in its reserved decoration is compared to a modest and beautiful woman who does not need much adornment to show her beauty, points at vanity and shallowness: No matter whether the woman decorates herself in a modest way, her aim is still to demonstrate her beautiful looks —instead of her inner qualities.

Next, the speaker comments that the sight of the hall is as seductive as a soft, sloping plain to a horse that wants to run⁶⁹. Hence, he compares his longing to deliver a speech with the instincts of an animal that, according to ancient thought, did not possess the ability to act rationally. In addition, Lukian might have thought of the anecdote that the Scythian king Ateas, a contemporary of Philip II, revealed himself as an uncivilized, un-Greek low-brow by preferring the sound of a horse to music⁷⁰.

Significantly, Lukian compares the orator who longs to form part of the beauty of the hall to a peacock posing in the sunlight⁷¹. Due to its being imported from the East, in antiquity, the peacock was known as “Median bird” (μηδικὸς ὄρνις)⁷² and thus associated with Eastern decadence⁷³. While being an object of fascination⁷⁴, in symbolic terms, the peacock was credited with negative attributes such as vanity, malevolence, and impertinence⁷⁵. Thus, the peacock represented a contrast between its

⁶⁶ Luk. *De Domo* 5. On the ideology of the difference between the perspective of well-educated versus less educated people in Rome see GOLDHILL 160-162; THOMAS 2007, 230.

⁶⁷ Luk. *Bis Acc.* 14, 27, 34; *Pisc.* 19; *Ind.* 19. Cf. POROD 2013, 10; SWAIN 2007, 30-34; KARAVAS 13; SWAIN 1996, 299; BRACHT BRANHAM 1989, 32. It is debated whether Aramaic was his mother language. This is suggested by HOPKINSON 2008, 1; JONES 1986, 7. *Contra*: SWAIN 2007, 34 who argues that there is no proof that Aramaic was his first language; cf. SWAIN 1996, 302 presuming that he spoke Syriac.

⁶⁸ Arr. *Per.* 1.2-3.

⁶⁹ Luk. *De Domo* 10.

⁷⁰ Plut. *Mor.* 334 B-C.

⁷¹ Luk. *De Domo* 11.

⁷² Diod. 2.53.2; *Suda* sv. μηδικὸς ὄρνις; Clem Alex. *Paed.* 3.4. Cf. HÜNEMÖRDER 2000, 689.

⁷³ Cf. WIESEHÖFER 2004, 303.

⁷⁴ Plut. *Perikl.* 13.13; Ael. *HA* 5.21; Aristoph. *Av.* 102, 269. Cf. WIESEHÖFER 2004, 303.

⁷⁵ Aristot. *HA* 488 B; Ov. *Met.* 13.802;

outer beauty and inner badness⁷⁶, a treacherous promise. His inner qualities are not in accordance with his outer appearance, the peacock symbolizes a superficial kind of deceiving beauty. This is also true for the orator who is that ignorant to compare himself to a peacock, hence unmasking himself as a fake: a speaker just aiming at outer beauty of words and admiration while ignoring the content and educational effect of his speech. In consequence, he is another one of Lukian's pseudo-authorities selfishly striving for glory and status instead of deeper inner knowledge and an educational impact on the audience.

The superficiality of the orator's aims also becomes clear when he comments that the colors of the peacock twisting and turning change in the light: The tips of his feathers turn from bronze to gold⁷⁷. Obviously, Lukian refers to the famous passage in Plato's *Symposion* (making recourse to a Homeric quote)⁷⁸ when Alkibiades offered Sokrates his beautiful body in exchange for Sokrates' wisdom. The philosopher turned him down by responding that he intended to exchange gold (wisdom) for bronze (erotic pleasure)⁷⁹. He made clear that he regarded the offer as an unequal transaction⁸⁰: Sokrates' pedagogical *eros* was concerned with Alkibiades' soul instead of the superficial physical sensual pleasures⁸¹.

Given this, the pun is clear: The peacock as a symbol of superficiality and vanity glitters gold in the light while its feathers were previously bronze. It is a double metaphor hinting at treacherous promises and shallowness. It foreshadows the kind of speech that the orator will deliver. Like the peacock in the right light, he poses in the beautiful room trying to enchant his audience by mere beauty—instead of wise words. What they will get is bronze instead of gold: mere sensual pleasure, not wisdom.

The impression that the speaker is driven by vanity is also hinted at before when he refers to the *Parthenos* who answers all who sing and shout, hence the nymph Echo⁸². As Newby points out, by associating the hall with Echo, he associates himself with Narkissos⁸³. Again, the impression prevails that due to his vanity and self-praise, the speaker will fail.

The hint that he was motivated by emotion rather than by reason is underlined by his comment that coming to the hall, he was attracted to it as by a Siren⁸⁴. Again, there is the association of the speech with the risky adventure of seafaring, in antiquity regarded as unsafe and dangerous. Lukian emphasizes the impression of danger and risk by adding the element of the Siren who charms sailors by her music, makes them lose their senses ending in shipwreck. Thus, unconsciously, the speaker admits that the sight of the beautiful hall blew away his senses. In consequence, he will start his speech while being out of his mind—clearly not the best precondition.

⁷⁶ HÜNEMÖRDER 2000, 690.

⁷⁷ Luk. *De Domo* 11: ὁ γὰρ ἐώς χαλκὸς ἦν, τοῦτο ἐγκλίναντος ὀλίγον χρυσὸς ὥφθη, καὶ τὸ ὑπὸ τῷ ἡλίῳ κιναναύγές, εἰ σκιασθείη ἔλοιανγές ἐστιν οὕτω μετακοσμεῖται πρὸς τὸ φῶς ἢ πτέρωσις.

⁷⁸ Il. 6.232-236.

⁷⁹ Plat. *Symp.* 218 E.

⁸⁰ GILHULY 2007, 75.

⁸¹ Plat. *Symp.* 218 E-219 A; *Alk.* 135 E; Plut. *Alk.* 4,3. In general see Plat. *Phaidr.* 253 C-256 E; *Symp.* 215 A-219 D. Cf. JOHNSON 2012, 7, 11-14; BLYTH 2012, 40; WOHL 1999, 352. Lukian often parodizes the Socratic *eros* and its misinterpretations, see Luk. *DM* 20.6; *VH* II 19; *Peregr.* 43-44; *Alex.* 5; *DM* 20.6; *Symp.* 39. Cf. MÖLLER – MÜLLER 2016, 152; MÜLLER 2015, 41; BERDOZZO 2011, 194-196, 200; GUNDERSON 2007, 499-500.

⁸² Luk. *De Domo* 4.

⁸³ Cf. NEWBY 2002, 128.

⁸⁴ Luk. *De Domo* 13.

However, according to his pessimistic opinion of the less educated people, all these who might happen to be among the audience, will not be able to apply any thought to his word-painting anyway.

At this point, the speaker voices his irritation because of the interruption by an oratorical opponent who then takes the stage. Lukian styles the scene as a trial, one of his favored forms of scenario⁸⁵.

Trying to prove that the first speaker is wrong, the second argues against all of his statements. However, by taking the first speaker's problematic arguments seriously, he unveils himself as ignorant, too. Furthermore, his comments are as unconvincing and revealing, too. This aspect reminds of Lukian's ironic advice in the *Rhetorum Praeceptor* when the disillusioned teacher claims that laughing at and objecting to all the other speakers is the most important and necessary thing in the contemporary art of rhetoric⁸⁶.

Referring to his opponent's claim concerning the beauty of women, he also exclusively focuses on the superficial aim to find the best strategy to show off with their good looks⁸⁷. Similarly, according to his opinion, in a beautiful surrounding, a speaker vanishes and drowns⁸⁸. Here, he adapts the naval metaphor of shipwrecking the first speaker involuntarily touched upon by referring to the Siren. In addition, he argues that the listeners transform into spectators being so distracted and absorbed by the sight of the hall that they stop listening to the speech⁸⁹.

Stunningly, just like the first speaker, the second's primary concern is not the content of the speech that ought to be the important aspect, but only the place and the effect on the audience. Thus, they both pay attention to mere superficial and shallow factors instead of caring for moral improvement by wisdom. Strikingly, the second speaker also thinks quite negatively about the intellectual qualities of his audience attributing to the recipients only visual skills.

Concerning the first speaker's mentioning of the oral charms of the Siren, he quips by pointing at the visual impact of the Gorgons turning their beholders to stone⁹⁰. He also accepts the precarious argument concerning the peacock replying that it was famous for its looks and not for its voice⁹¹. Next, he pretends to ask a fictitious crier to summon Herodotus in person to be his testimony that the visual impact dominates the oral. Ironically, Lukian makes fun of a central characteristic of his intellectual contemporaries inevitably and regularly citing authorities of the Greek literary heritage in order to underline their arguments⁹². Of course, the speaker delivers Herodotus' testimony in Ionic, imitating the ancient language, and isolates his words from their context. Moreover, it seems awkward that Herodotus who in great parts relied on oral tradition now takes a stand against its impact. In addition, as Goldhill proposes, it might be a pun at Herodotus' debated status as a truth teller⁹³. However, Lukian may in fact defend Herodotus against such accusations: Herodotus does not confirm the second

⁸⁵ Cf. VON MÖLLENDORFF 2006, 298.

⁸⁶ Luk. *Rh. Pr.* 22. Cf. SCHLAPBACH 2010, 254: The loudest seems to be the fittest to impress the masses.

⁸⁷ Luk. *De Domo* 14-15. According to him, she ought not to wear any jewelry or gold in order to avoid any distraction from her looks.

⁸⁸ Luk. *De Domo* 16.

⁸⁹ Luk. *De Domo* 18-19.

⁹⁰ Luk. *De Domo* 19. However, he refers to their stunning beauty (cf. Ov. *Met.* 4.604-5.249) instead of their ugliness (Luc. 9.624-733).

⁹¹ Luk. *De Domo* 19.

⁹² Later on, the speaker does not fail to drop the names of also Euripides and Sophokles (Luk. *De Domo* 23).

⁹³ Cf. GOLDHILL 2001, 164. Cf. Luk. *VH II* 31.

speaker's argument but obviously, he tricks him. For the last clause of this Ionic testimony that really is Herodotean emphasizing the importance of the sight stems from the story of Kandaules, his wife, and Gyges⁹⁴. The words form part of Kandaules' attempt to persuade Gyges to spy on his wife when she is naked. The story ends with Kandaules' violent death⁹⁵. Thus, Herodotus' testimony contradicts the words of the speaker who summons him⁹⁶. And the speaker again unveils his lack of knowledge by failing to notice this contradiction. Apparently, he does not know the *Histories* too well.

Similarly, Lukian unmasks the second speaker by making him cite the Homeric phrase "winged words"⁹⁷, thus reminding the audience of the undying epics as the most famous examples of a literary genre that, initially, was transmitted by the performance of *rhapsodes*. Ironically, simultaneously, Lukian lets him claim that the spoken word will not last⁹⁸.

His "jury", the people around, also seem to be not convinced as they started regarding the hall and its decoration. The second speaker takes the chance to prove his knowledge by describing the subjects of the paintings exhibited. However, he only comments on the identification of the portrayed persons failing to prove his skills in word-painting by describing the colors, lights, dynamics, and settings⁹⁹.

In the end, both speakers aim at the same and morally wrong outcomes: fame and glory¹⁰⁰. Similarly, in Lukian's *Rhetorum Praeceptor*, two ways lead to the personified Rhetoric located on the top of a metaphorical mountain. While one way is easy (symbolizing a superficial education) and the other is exhausting (reflecting the intense study of the literary heritage), the destination is the same: a corrupted Rhetoric styled as a *hetaera* promising wealth and fame¹⁰¹.

In the case of *The Hall*, the two orators fail to care for the educational effect of their speeches. They do not think about the content of their speeches but concentrate upon the splendor of their words, the surroundings, and admiration of the audience. Furthermore, they are only concerned with the outer form of their word-painting. They do not give a thought about convincing by arguments instead of form. This is even more striking, as rhetoric education in this age was designed to train students for civic participation in politics¹⁰².

Water seems to be a key element in *De Domo*. It serves as a marker of danger and (too) high risk. Therefore, the work opens with the scene of Alexander failing to resist the temptation of the Kydnos—and promptly drowning. This motif is adapted again when the first speaker compares himself to a sailor charmed by a Siren and thus doomed to shipwreck. His opponent adds to this image by commenting that in such a beautiful hall, a speaker will drown "as the sea drowns chanty-men when they undertake to sing for the rowers against the noise of the surf"¹⁰³.

While Alexander and the Sirens' victims drown literally, the speaker will drown metaphorically. Driven by, blown up by self-praise and scorn for his audience, without any embodiment of the true lessons of *paideia* but instead just aiming at glory and

⁹⁴ Hdt. 1.8.2.

⁹⁵ Hdt. 1.12.2.

⁹⁶ Cf. MÜLLER 2018, 424.

⁹⁷ Od. 1.122. Cf. VON MÖLLENDORFF 2006, 299.

⁹⁸ Luk. *De Domo* 20.

⁹⁹ Luk. *De Domo* 22-31. On the gallery of the paintings see VON MÖLLENDORFF 2006b, 241-242.

¹⁰⁰ Luk. *De Domo* 1, 32. Cf. GOLDHILL 2001, 166.

¹⁰¹ Luk. *Rh. Pr.* 6. See also Luk. *Bis Acc.* 30-31. Cf. MÜLLER 2013b, 30-32; ZWEIMÜLLER 2008, 47-67.

The figure of the corrupted Rhetoric is comparable with the Paideia in Lukian's *Somnium*.

¹⁰² Cf. CONOLLY 2003, 342.

¹⁰³ Luk. *De Domo* 16.

admiration, he will fail. Interestingly, in his *Deipnosophistes*, Lukian's contemporary Athenaios uses the term (ἐξοκέλλεινεῖς τρυφήν, “to shipwreck onto luxury”), not a literal but a metaphorical shipwreck reflecting moral failings¹⁰⁴. Similarly, Lukian creates images of his speakers shipwrecking onto the treacherous beauty of the hall. His opponent only criticizes his arguments concerning the suitability of the surrounding, not his shallow aims or missing educational insight. In the end, he admits that he himself seeks glory and admiration.

As the opening scene introducing the theme of shipwrecking onto temptation, the incident of Alexander at the Kydnos has a major function. Lukian's and Arrian's respective treatment of the episode instructively reflects their different approach to Alexander as an iconic figure and attitude towards his reception and cultivation of his image in the cultural memory.

Arrian recreates the iconic status of Alexander idealizing him (and himself as his biographer). Thus, he mentions Aristoboulos' apologetic version first, adds the consensus about Alexander's unhappy plunge into the cold river and quickly transforms the story into a hagiographic anecdote about Alexander's loyalty to an old friend, the Acarnanian physician Philip¹⁰⁵. Perhaps, he knew and wanted to correct Curtius' sardonic version of the incident. Styling the scene as particularly embarrassing for Alexander, Curtius reports that he took off his clothes and dived into the river right before the eyes of his assembled troops, trying to show that he was content with a simple way of personal hygiene. Probably, he also intended to demonstrate his physical fitness and excellence. However, he ended up stiffened with chill and had to be carried nearly unconscious to his tent by his servants¹⁰⁶. This is just not like the Roman ideal of a warrior and general who ought to be tough and manly enough to stand the cold of a “barbarian” river in the sun.

While Arrian tries to heroize Alexander even in this moment of failure, Lukian's speaker drops the episode of Philip the Acarnian, focuses on Alexander giving in to temptation as an emotional act and even claims that he would have been as careless again if he knew about the risk. However, one might wonder how the speaker could know about Alexander's thoughts. But this might reflect the intention of Lukian's image of Alexander in *The Hall*. The speaker is not interested in presenting any historical truth about him. He just uses him as a famous example in order to start his speech with a celebrated icon. He uses Alexander in order to define himself as such through his fame. Ironically, thanks to his lack in real knowledge, he chooses a wrong example (among his other fatal examples), thus foreshadowing his metaphorical shipwreck.

CONCLUSION

Exemplarily, Lukian's treatment of the episode of Alexander at the Kydnos as the starting-point of his first speaker in *The Hall* shows the difference of his literary dealing with iconic figures of the past as compared to Arrian.

¹⁰⁴ GORMAN – GORMAN 2007, 41-42. Cf. WILKINS 2008.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. HECKEL 2006, 213; BERVE 1926, 388-389.

¹⁰⁶ Curt. 3.5.1-4. Cf. BAYNHAM 1998, 141: Alexander wanted to demonstrate his physical healthcare. See also BICHLER 2013, 305. According to ATKINSON 1980, 147-148, Curtius wanted to contrast Alexander's (still) simple lifestyle to the luxury of Dareios III. On Curtius' critical attitude to Alexander see MÜLLER 2014, 135-144; SPENCER 2002, 80-81.

Arrian idealized Alexander, thus following the contemporary trend in the Roman elite triggered by Trajan and Hadrian, while simultaneously defining his own status as such through Alexander's fame. Doing so, he showed an attitude towards history and historiography Lukian ridiculed in his works. Therefore, he will have been among the suspects Lukian had in mind when he made fun of the pretensions of his pseudo-intellectuals longing for fame, wealth, and political offices as the wrong approach to writing history.

In contrast, Lukian deconstructs the larger than life-sized artificial images of Alexander in various ways, thus pointing at the misguided ways of his reception making him a useful icon instead of examining his history. In *The Hall*, Lukian demonstrates how a vainglorious orator (mis)uses Alexander as an example in order to justify his desire to deliver a speech in a sumptuous surrounding. However, the example is badly chosen, foreshadowing the failure of the speaker. In addition, in order to legitimize his wish to speak, the orator ascribes thoughts to Alexander he could not have known. It becomes clear that Alexander is only treated as an instrument serving the needs of the intellectuals who refer to him. Lukian mocks this deliberate treatment of historical persons like Alexander by contemporary intellectuals. Probably, he implies that one has to be careful regarding the bias of the authors from the past, too.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANDERSON, G. (1976): *Lucian. Theme and Variation on the Second Sophistic*, Leiden.
— (1977): “Some Notes on Lucian’s *Navigium*”, *Mnemosyne* 30: 363-368.
— (1980): “Arrian’s *Anabasis Alexandri* and Lucian’s *Historia*”, *Historia* 29: 119-124.
— (1993): *The Second Sophistic*, London.
— (1994): “Lucian. Tradition versus Reality”, *ANRW* II 34.2: 1422-1447.

ATKINSON, J. E. (1980): *A Commentary on Q. Curtius Rufus’ Historiae Alexandri Magni. Books 3 and 4*, Amsterdam.

BADIAN, E. (1997): “Arrianos von Nikomedea”, *DNP* 2: 28-29.

BALDWIN, B. (1973): *Studies in Lucian*, Toronto.

BAYNHAM, E. (1998): *Alexander the Great. The Unique History of Quintus Curtius*, Ann Arbor.

BAUMBACH, M. – MÖLLENDORFF, P. von (2017): *Ein literarischer Prometheus. Lukian aus Samosata und die Zweite Sophistik*, Heidelberg.

BERDOZZO, F. (2011): *Götter, Mythen und Philosophie: Lukian und die paganen Göttervorstellungen*, Berlin.

BERVE, H. (1926): *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, Vol. 2, München.

BICHLER, R. (2010): “Der Hof der Achämeniden in den Augen Herodots”, in B. JACOBS – R. ROLLINGER (eds.): *Der Achämenidenhof*, Wiesbaden: 155-187.
— (2013): “Konnte Alexander wirklich nicht schwimmen? Überlegungen zu Plutarch, *Alex.* 58,4”, in P. MAURITSCH – C. ULF (eds.): *Kultur(en). Formen des Alltäglichen in der Antike. FS Ingomar Weiler*, Vol. 1, Graz: 301-314.

BILLAULT, A. (2010): “Une biographie singulière: *Alexandre ou le faux prophète de Lucien*”, *REG* 123: 623-639.

BLYTH, D. (2012): “Socratic and Platonic Models of Love”, in M. JOHNSON – H. TARRANT (eds.): *Alcibiades and the Socratic Lover-Educator*, Bristol: 30-44.

BOMPAIRE, J. (1958): *Lucien Écrivain*, Paris.

BORZA, E. N. (1987), “Malaria in Alexander’s Army”, *AHB* 1: 36-38.

BOSWORTH, A. B. (1972): "Arrian's Literary Development", *CQ* 22: 163-185.

— (1980): *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander*, Vol. 1, Oxford.

— (1988a): *Conquest and Empire. The Reign of Alexander the Great*, Cambridge.

— (1988b): *From Arrian to Alexander. Studies in Historical Interpretation*, Oxford.

— (1993): "Arrian and Rome: The Minor Works", *ANRW* II 34.1: 226-275.

BRACHT BRANHAM, R. (1988): *Unruly Eloquence: Lucian and the Comedy of Traditions*, Cambridge, Mass.-London.

BRIANT, P. (2002): *From Cyrus to Alexander. A History of the Persian Empire*, Winona Lake.

BURLIGA, B. (2013): *Arrian's Anabasis. An Intellectual and Cultural Story*, Gdánsk.

CARLSEN, J. (2014): "Greek History in a Roman Context: Arrian's *Anabasis of Alexander*", in J. MAJBOM MADSEN – R. D. REES (eds.): *Roman Rule in Greek and Latin Writing. Double Vision*, Leiden-Boston: 210-223.

CONOLLY, J. (2001): "Problems of the Past in Imperial Greek Education", in Y. LEE TOO (ed.): *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, Leiden-Boston: 339-372.

CURTIS, J. (2010): "The Palace", in J. CURTIS – S. J. SIMPSON (eds.): *The World of Achaemenid Persia*, London: 50-103.

DUSINBERRE, E. R. M. (2003): *Aspects of Empire in Achaemenid Sardes*, Cambridge.

FADEN, G. (2005): *Platons didaktische Phänomenologie*, Würzburg.

FEIN, S. (1994): *Die Beziehungen der Kaiser Trajan und Hadrian zu den Litterati*, Stuttgart-Leipzig.

FRANCIS, J. A. (2003): "Living Icons. Tracing a Motif in Verbal and Visual Representation from the Second to Fourth Centuries C.E.", *AJPh* 124: 575-600.

GALLI, M. (2007): "Processi della memoria nell'età della Seconda Sofistica", in O. D. CORDOVANA – M. GALLI (eds.), *Arte e memoria culturale nell'età della Seconda Sofistica*, Catania: 8-14.

GEORGIADOU, A. – LARMOUR, D. H. J. (1994): "Lucian and Historiography: *De Historia conscribenda* and *Verae Historiae*", *ANRW* II 34.2: 1448-1509.

— (1998): *Lucian's Science Fiction Novel True Histories*, Leiden.

GERLACH, J. (2005): "Die Figur des Scharlatans bei Lukian", in P. PILHOFER et al. (eds.): *Lukian: Der Tod des Peregrinos: Ein Scharlatan auf dem Scheiterhaufen*, Darmstadt: 151-197.

GÖRGEMANNS, H. (2013): "Zur Deutung der Szene am Ilissos in Platons *Phaidros*", in R. HIRSCH-LUIPOLD – M. BAUMBACH (eds.): *H. Görgemanns, Philologos Kosmos*, Tübingen: 135-162.

GOLDHILL, S. (2001): "The Erotic Eye: Visual Stimulation and Cultural Conflict", in S. GOLDHILL (ed.): *Being Greek under Rome – Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, Cambridge: 154-194.

GORMAN, R. J. – V. B. GORMAN (2007): "The *tryphe* of the Sybarites: A Historiographical Problem in Athenaeus", *JHS* 127: 38-60.

GRÜNEWALD, T. (1999): *Räuber, Rebellen, Rivalen, Rächer*, Stuttgart.

GUNDERSON, E. (2007): "Men of Learning: The Cult of *paideia* in Lucian's *Alexander*", in T. C. PENNER – C. VANDER STICHELE (eds.): *Mapping Gender in Ancient Religious Discourses*, Leiden: 479-510.

HALL, J. (1981): *Lucian's Satire*, New York.

HAMMOND, N. G. L. (1981): *Alexander the Great. King, Commander and Statesman*, London.

HECKEL, W. (2006): *Who's Who in the Age of Alexander the Great*, Oxford.

HOMEYER, H. (1965): *Lukian. Wie man Geschichte schreiben soll*, München.

HOPKINSON, N. (2008): *Lucian. A Selection*, Cambridge.

HÜNEMÖRDER, C. (2000): "Pfau", *DNP* 9: 689-690.

JACOBS, B. (2010): "Höfischer Lebensstil und materielle Prachtentfaltung", in B. JACOBS – R. ROLLINGER (eds.): *Der Achämenidenhof*, Wiesbaden: 377-409.

JOHNSON, M. (2012): "The Role of Eros in Improving the Pupil", in M. JOHNSON – H. TARRANT (eds.): *Alcibiades and the Socratic Lover-Educator*, Bristol: 7-29.

JONES, C. P. (1986): *Culture and Society in Lucian*, Cambridge, Mass.–London.

KARAVAS, O. (2005): *Lucien et la tragédie*, Berlin.

KUHRT, A. (2010): *The Persian Empire. A Corpus of Source from the Achaemenid Period*, London.

LAPLACE, M. M. J. (1996): "L'ecphrasis de la parole d'apparat dans l'*Electrum* et le *De domo* de Lucien, et la representation de deux styles d'une esthétique inspire de Pindare et de Platon", *JHS* 116: 158-165.

LIDDLE, A. (2003): *Arrian. Periplus Ponti Euxini*, Bristol.

LIND, H. (1987): "Sokrates am Ilissos IG I³ 1 257 und die Eingangsszene des Platonischen *Phaidros*", *ZPE* 69: 15-19.

MACHEREI, A., "Die Medizin in Curtius' Tarsos- und Mallerstadtepisode", in H. WULFRAM (ed.): *Der römische Alexanderhistoriker Curtius Rufus*, Wien: 209-217.

MACLEOD, M. D. (1987): "Lucian's Relationship to Arrian", *Philologus* 131: 257-264.

MARINCOLA, J. M. (1989): "Some Suggestions on the Proem and 'Second Preface' of Arrian's *Anabasis*", *JHS* 109: 186-189.

MÖLLENDORFF, P. von (2000): *Auf der Suche nach der verlogenen Wahrheit: Lukians Wahre Geschichten*, Tübingen.

— (2006a): *Lukian. Gegen den ungebildeten Büchernarren*, Düsseldorf–Zürich.

— (2006b): "Verdichtungen des Alltags. Lukians *Meergötter-Gespräche*", in S. WODIANKA – D. RIEGER (eds.): *Mythosaktualisierung*, Berlin–New York: 227-246.

MÖLLER, M. – MÜLLER, S. (2016): "A Modern Myth – 30STM und die Heilung der Welt nach dem Modell des θεῖος ἀνύπ", in C. HOFFSTADT *et al.* (eds.): *Nur Emotionen? Einblicke aus Medizin, Kunst und Geisteswissenschaften*, Bochum–Freiburg: 145-164.

MOLES, J. L. (1985): "The Interpretation of the 'Second Preface' in Arrian's *Anabasis*", *JHS* 105: 162-168.

MÜLLER, S. (2013a): "Trügerische Bilder? Lukians Umgang mit Tyrannen – und Orienttopoi in seinen Hadesszenen", *Gymnasium* 120: 169-192.

— (2013b): "Die Schule(n) der Lügen: Lukian über schlechte Vorbilder und ihre Konsequenzen", in C. HOFFSTADT – S. MÜLLER (eds.): *Von Lehrerkritik bis Lehrermord*, Bochum–Freiburg: 25-37.

— (2014a): *Alexander, Makedonien und Persien*, Berlin.

— (2014b): "Denn wer weiß schon, was nach dem Leben kommt? Lukian zu Tod und Jenseits", in C. HOFFSTADT *et al.* (eds.): *Der Tod in Kultur und Medizin*, Bochum–Freiburg: 151-166.

— (2014c): "Arrian and Visual Arts", *JAC* 29: 87-101.

— (2014d): "Lukian, Ammianus Marcellinus, der Ausbruch der Antoninischen Pest und die literarische Tradition von Götterzorn und Krankheit", in C. HOFFSTADT *et al.* (eds.): *Zwischen Vorsorge und Schicksal. Über die Beherrschbarkeit des Körpers in der Medizin*, Bochum–Freiburg: 117-134.

— (2015): "Making Money with Sacredness: The Case of Lucian's Alexander of Abonuteichos", *Global Humanities 2: Religion and Poverty*: 35-51.

— (2018): “Wie man vor Publikum untergeht. Rezeptionsblüten und rhetorisches Kentern in Lukians *De Domo*”, in K. RUFFING – K. DROß-KRÜPE (eds.): *Emas non quod opus est, sed quod necesse est*, Wiesbaden: 413–428.

NEWBY, Z. (2002): “Testing the Boundaries of Ekphrasis: Lucian on the Hall”, *Ramus* 31: 126–135.

NISSEN, H. (1888): “Die Abfassungszeit von Arrians *Anabasis*”, *RhM* 43: 237–257.

OGDEN, D. (2009): “Lucian, Glycon, and the Two Alexanders”, in M. ÇEVİK (ed.): *International Symposium on Lucianus of Samosata*, Adiyaman: 279–300.

OLIVER, J. H. (1972): “Herm at Athens with Portraits of Xenophon and Arrian”, *AJA* 76: 327–328.

OVERWIEN, O. (2006): “Lukian als Literat, Lukian als Feind”, *RhM* 149: 185–213.

PEARSON, L. (1960): *The Lost Histories of Alexander the Great*, New York.

PETSALIS-DIOMIDIS, A. (2010): *Truly Beyond Borders: Aelius Aristides and the Cult of Asklepios*, Oxford.

POROD, R. (2013): *Lukian Schrift Wie man Geschichte schreiben soll. Kommentar und Interpretation*, Wien.

RÜTTEN, U. (1997): *Phantasie und Lachkultur*, Tübingen.

SCHLAPBACH, K. (2010): “The *logoi* of Philosophers in Lucian of Samosata”, *ClAnt* 29: 250–177.

SCHMITT, W. O. (1984): “Bemerkungen zu Lukians Schrift *Wie man Geschichte schreiben muss*”, *Klio* 66: 443–455.

SCHMITZ, T. (1997): *Macht und Politik*, München.

SIDWELL, K. (2009): “The Dead Philosopher’s Society”, in A. BARTLETT (ed.): *A Lucian for Our Times*, Cambridge: 109–118.

STADTER, P. A. (1967): “Flavius Arrianus: The New Xenophon”, *GRBS* 8: 155–161.

— (1980): *Arrian of Nicomedia*, Chapel Hill.

STROBEL, K. (1994): “Zeitgeschichte unter den Antoninen: Die Historiker des Partherkriegs des Lucius Verus”, *ANRW* II 34.2: 1315–1360.

SWAIN, S. (1996): *Hellenism and Empire*, Oxford.

— (2007): “The Three Faces of Lucian”, in C. LIGOTA – L. PANIZZA (eds.): *Lucian of Samosata Vivus et Redivivus*, London–Turin: 17–44.

TONNET, H. (1988): *Recherches sur Arrien*, Vol. 1, Amsterdam.

THOMAS, E. (2007): *Monumentality and the Roman Empire. Architecture in the Antonine Age*, Oxford.

VICTOR, U. (1997): *Lukian von Samosata. Alexandros oder der Lügenprophet*, Leiden.

VIDAL-NAQUET, P. (1984): “Flavius Arrien entre deux mondes”, in P. SAVINEL (ed.): *Arrien, Histoire d’Alexandre*, Paris: 311–394.

WEBB, R. (2009): *Ekphrasis, Imagination and Persuasion in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Practice*, Farnham.

WIESEHÖFER, J. (2004): “Persien, der faszinierende Feind der Griechen: Gütertausch und Kulturtransfer in achaimenidischer Zeit”, in R. ROLLINGER – C. ULF (eds.): *Commerce and Monetary Systems in the Ancient World: Means of Transmission and Cultural Interaction*, Stuttgart: 295–310.

WILKINS, J. (2008): “Athenaeus the Navigator”, *JHS* 128: 132–152.

WIRTH, G. (1963): “Αρριανός ὁ φιλόσοφος”, *Klio* 41: 221–233.

— (1964): “Anmerkungen zur Arrian-Biographie: Appian – Arrian – Lukian”, *Historia* 13: 209–245.

WHITMARSH, T. (2005): *The Second Sophistic*, Oxford.

WOHL, V. (1999): “The *Eros* of Alcibiades”, *CA* 18: 349–385.

ZECCHINI, G. (1983): “Modelli e problemi teorici della storiografia nell’ età degli Antonini”, *CS* 20: 3-31.

ZIMMERMANN, M. (1999): “Enkomium und Historiographie”, in M. ZIMMERMANN (ed.): *Geschichtsschreibung und politischer Wandel im 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr.*, Stuttgart: 17-56.

ZWEIMÜLLER, S. (2008): *Lukian Rhetorum praeceptor. Einleitung, Text und Kommentar*, Göttingen.