Classical Quarterly **35** (ii) 475–490 (1985) *Printed in Great Britain*

LUCIAN'S *TRUE HISTORIES* AND THE *WONDERS BEYOND THULE* OF ANTONIUS DIOGENES

I

The 166th codex of the *Bibliotheke* of Photios comprises a summary of a peculiar work written by one Antonius Diogenes, entitled τὰ ὑπὲρ Θούλην ἄπιστα.[1] This told the story of an Arkadian named Deinias, who travelled the world κατὰ ζήτησιν ἱστορίας (109a13–14), coming eventually to Thule, where he met Mantinias and Derkyllis, a brother and sister from Tyre, and struck up an erotic relationship with Derkyllis (109a26). A narrative of Derkyllis, told to Deinias, seems to be inset at this point (109a29–110b15), relating her own travels and including much Pythagorean material associated with her wonder-working companion, Astraios, which was authentic-seeming enough for Porphyrios to make use of it in his biography of Pythagoras. The *Apista* was a long work, running to 24 books, and it seems likely that a sizeable proportion of its length was devoted to paradoxographical material related to the places and peoples visited by the various narrators, but largely omitted from Photios' summary; the plot itself, though both complex and episodic, does not seem capable of sustaining such length.[2]

At the end of his summary Photios has a short discussion of the place of the *Apista* in literary history (111b32ff.). Detailed analysis of this passage will form an important part of this paper, but for the moment it will suffice to say that Photios saw the work as germinal for Greek fiction, and in particular expresses the view that it was the 'source and root' (πηγὴ καὶ ῥίζα, 111b36–7) of Lucian's *True Histories*. This view has been accepted by modern scholarship, beginning with Erwin Rohde's monumental study of the Greek novel,[3] and it now passes for orthodoxy in this obscure corner of

[1] Photios' summary is cited from the Budé edition of R. Henry (Paris, 1960). This epitome can be supplemented from three sources: (i) references in Porphyrios' *Life of Pythagoras*, which cites Antonius by name in sections 10 and 32, and no doubt makes use of him elsewhere without specific acknowledgement; (ii) a single reference in Iohannes Lydus, *de mens.* 3.5, quoting Antonius as evidence for the longevity of Egyptians; (iii) two papyrus fragments, both dated 2nd–3rd century A.D.: PSI 1177 (= Zimmermann, *Griechische Romanpapyri und verwandte Texte*, 85ff.) and P. Oxy. 3012. For commentary on these two fragments and discussion of their place in the work as a whole, see, respectively, F. Zimmermann, 'Die Ἄπιστα des Antonius Diogenes im Lichte des neuen Fundes', *Hermes* 71 (1936), 312–19, and A. Borgogno, 'Sul nuovo papiro di Antonio Diogene', *Grazer Beiträge* 8 (1979), 239–42.

[2] One suspects that, as with his summary of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*, Photios has attempted to iron out various complexities and temporal convolutions resulting from multiple framed narratives. Derkyllis' narrative concluded with the end of Bk 23 (110b17), but what follows, though apparently confined to the last book, seems to contain more substance than what precedes the inset. Furthermore, the wonders beyond Thule, which gave the book its name, seem not to appear until this last book. One possible answer might be that Derkyllis' relation of her experiences was not continuous, but fragmented like Kalasiris' narrative in the *Aithiopika*. Photios will then have simplified the structure by pulling together the experiences of Derkyllis and her brother.

[3] *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (3rd edn., ed. W. Schmid, Leipzig 1914, reprinted Hildesheim & New York, 1974), 206 (192) n. 4, 277(258) – the figures in brackets refer to the pagination of the first edition. Photios' statement was one of the pillars of Rohde's view that the *Apista* was a kind of missing link between travel stories and romance proper, now rendered untenable by the discovery of papyri which show that fully fledged romances predate Antonius Diogenes.

literary history that Antonius Diogenes was a source for the *True Histories*. Opinions do vary as to the extent of the debt which Lucian owes the *Apista*. At one extreme K. Reyhl has attempted to use the *True Histories* as a frame on which to reconstruct the work of Antonius;[4] at the other Graham Anderson and Jennifer Hall tend to minimise the use Lucian made of him, while accepting that there remains a not insignificant core of parody of the *Apista*.[5] No one, however, has questioned at its root the assumption that the *True Histories* is in some degree dependent upon the *Apista*. The aim of this paper is to challenge that consensus.

Reyhl's thesis can, I think, be quickly dismissed. In the preface to the *True Histories* Lucian says that each motif of his narrative is a humorous allusion to the work of ancient poets, historians and philosophers who wrote of incredible occurrences. But he declines to identify his sources, saying that the reader will be well capable of spotting the allusions for himself. He does, however, in this preface name Ktesias and Iamboulos as archetypal lying paradoxographers; and in the second book, when the narrator's ship puts in at the Isle of the Damned, he sees Herodotos and Ktesias being subjected to eternal torment as penalty for the lies they perpetrated in their writings.[6] In effect we have here a clear statement that the *True Histories* is composed as a mosaic of parodistic references. To sustain his view that its structure and substance derive almost exclusively from Antonius Diogenes, Reyhl is driven to dismiss Lucian's prefatory statement as a bluff. There is no real reason to do so: true, we have been denied the pleasure of identifying many of Lucian's allusions because so much of the fringe of Greek historiography, including Ktesias, has been lost; but we can still sense enough of writers like Ktesias, Iamboulos and Herodotos behind Lucian's account to guarantee that his preface is to be taken at face value. The *True Histories* had no single primary source. But if not *the* source, does the *Apista* remain *a* source?

The problem here seems to me to be bound up with the very word 'source'. We ought in fact not to be talking of Lucian's 'sources' at all, but of his 'targets'. The *True Histories* is essentially a satire directed at poets, historians and philosophers who narrate fanciful falsehoods while all the while claiming to be telling the truth.[7] For a satirist there is no point in simply lifting incidents and motifs from various sources and forming them mosaic-like into a new story: such a procedure would allow the reader the pleasure of identifying allusions, but would ultimately do no more than tickle his literary self-esteem. To make the allusions satirical they must be given a critical edge. For instance, an historian's incredible lie can be mocked by exaggerating it to such an extent as to make it manifestly absurd; or a motif that strains credulity can be made to seem ridiculous by transposing it to a context which is far-fetched and

[4] K. Reyhl, *Antonios Diogenes: Untersuchungen zu den Roman-Fragmenten der 'Wunder jenseits von Thule' und zu den 'Wahren Geschichten' des Lukian* (Diss. Tübingen, 1969).

[5] G. Anderson, *Studies in Lucian's Comic Fiction* (= *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 43, Leiden, 1976), 1ff.; J. Hall, *Lucian's Satire* (New York, 1981), 339ff.

[6] *Ver. Hist.* 1.2ff.: ...ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ τῶν ἱστορουμένων ἕκαστον οὐκ ἀκωμῳδήτως ᾔνικται πρός τινας τῶν παλαιῶν ποιητῶν τε καὶ συγγραφέων καὶ φιλοσόφων πολλὰ τεράστια καὶ μυθώδη συγγεγραφότων, οὓς καὶ ὀνομαστὶ ἂν ἔγραφον, εἰ μὴ καὶ αὐτῷ σοι ἐκ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως φανεῖσθαι ἔμελλον ⟨ὤν⟩ Κτησίας... The Isle of the Damned is in *Ver. Hist.* 2.31.

[7] This can be neatly illustrated by a passage from Photios' summary of Ktesias' *Persika* (cod. 72, 49b39–50a4): ταῦτα γράφων καὶ μυθολογῶν Κτησίας λέγει τἀληθέστατα γράφειν, ἐπάγων ὡς τὰ μὲν αὐτὸς ἰδὼν γράφει, τὰ δὲ παρ' αὐτῶν μαθὼν τῶν ἰδόντων, πολλὰ δὲ τούτων καὶ ἄλλα θαυμασιώτερα παραλιπεῖν διὰ τὸ μὴ δόξαι τοῖς μὴ τεθεαμένοις ἄπιστα συγγράφειν. Claims of this kind are mocked by Lucian's explicit disavowal of veracity at *Ver. Hist.* 1.4: γράφω τοίνυν περὶ ὧν μήτε εἶδον μήτε ἔπαθον μήτε παρ' ἄλλων ἐπυθόμην, ἔτι δὲ μήτε ὅλως ὄντων μήτε τὴν ἀρχὴν γενέσθαι δυναμένων. For the last part of the Ktesias passage, cf. *Ver. Hist.* 1.13, 1.18, 1.25.

clearly unreal. Examples of both these types of parody are easily to be found in the *True Histories*. Consequent upon this is a second important observation: Lucian (in this work at least) is primarily a humorist: those in search of his sources have often seriously misconstrued his humour. *οὐκ ἀκωμῳδήτως ἥνικται*: we must beware of an overliteral *Quellenforschung* which tends to remove both the fun and the cutting edge from Lucian's invention.

To illustrate: the first staging-post in Lucian's voyage is an island where he finds a river of wine, complete with alcoholic fish, and an inscription set up by Herakles and Dionysos recording the limit of their travel (*Ver. Hist.* 1.7). On this island are two footprints impressed in the rock, one an acre in extent, the other rather smaller, which Lucian solemnly deduces must have been left by Herakles and Dionysos respectively. It has long been recognised that this is directed at Herodotos, who records that in Skythia there is a footprint of Herakles two cubits in length (Hdt. 4.82). By exaggerating absurdly Lucian is both criticising Herodotos for his gullibility (or dishonesty) and making a good joke at his expense. Obviously the one thing that we should *not* look for amongst Lucian's sources is a writer who recorded a footprint an acre large: to do so would spoil the fun. This is obvious and uncontested, but commentators have been curiously literal and straight-faced in the way in which they have approached some of Lucian's larger-scale jokes.

For example, in the first book of the *True Histories* the hero's ship is caught up by a waterspout, sails through the air for seven days and seven nights, and is eventually carried to the moon, where the crew are caught up in a colonial war between the moon and the sun (modelled on the Epidamnos episode of Thucydides 1, and complete with cod treaties quoted verbatim on the model of Thucydides 5). Hostilities concluded, there follows a lunar ethnography in the course of which we are regaled with details of the moonmen's diet and methods of reproduction.

The first is the less convincing. Mantinias tells Derkyllis (who passes the tale on to of Antonius Diogenes. Since even those who are inclined to reject other examples of Antonius' influence on Lucian believe that the moon episode is an undoubted debt owed by the latter to the former,[8] we must examine these passages in some detail before resuming our discussion.

The first is the less convincing. Mantinias tells Drekyllis (who passes the tale on to Deinias) of marvellous things learned in his travels: *καὶ πολλῶν ἀπιστοτάτων θεαμάτων περί τε ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἕτερα ζῷα περί τε αὐτὸν ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην καὶ φυτὰ καὶ νήσους μάλιστα ἐξηγητὴς αὐτῇ καταστάς κτλ.* (110 a10ff.). Here, while of course it is impossible to know exactly what form the *ἀπιστότατα θεάματα* took, I can see nothing in the Greek that suggests that Mantinias had actually *visited* the moon and the sun. It seems much more likely that either he has witnessed some unusual astronomical event, or else he has simply acquired some exotic lore on these subjects.

The second passage is at first sight more promising. It occurs in the twenty-fourth book, and Photios' patience with the succession of incredibilia seems to be wearing thin. He summarises rather testily:

> He (i.e. Deinias) claims to have seen other similar things, and tells tall tales of having seen men and other things which no one else claimed to have seen or heard of, or even imagined. And the most incredible thing of all – that journeying to the north they came close to the moon as if to a very bare (?) country (*ὡς ἐπί τινα γῆν καθαρωτάτην*), and when they came there (*ἐκεῖ τε γενόμενοι*) they saw what it would be quite natural for a man who has already invented such an excessive amount of fictions to see.[9]

[8] Anderson, op. cit. 1 n. 3; Hall, op. cit. 349.

[9] 111a4–11: *καὶ ἕτερα δὲ ἀπαγγέλλει ἰδεῖν ὅμοια, καὶ ἀνθρώπους δὲ ἰδεῖν καὶ ἕτερα τινὰ*

Even here I can see nothing that compels us to believe that Deinias and his son went to the moon, though that is how all the critics appear to have read it. The phrase *ἐκεῖ τε γενόμενοι* in particular is taken as referring to the moon itself,[10] but the run of the sentence as a whole more logically makes it apply to the region in the far north of the earth close to the moon. We seem in fact to have here a view of the world whereby one approaches the moon by travelling north, apparently a revival of an archaic belief that the northern part of the world was literally higher than the southern, night being caused by the shadow cast when the sun passed behind the northern heights, the Rhipaian mountains.[11] An interesting parallel guarantees that Antonius Diogenes might have been working with a conception of this nature: according to Diodoros, Hekataios of Abdera wrote that the inhabitants of the far northern island of Helixoia could see the moon not very far distant from the earth, with prominences on its surface like those of the earth.[12] Hekataios of Abdera is a fine specimen of the kind of romanticist, Utopianising pseudo-historian that Lucian was attacking: it is all too plausible that Antonius Diogenes might have chosen to base his hero's experiences on a world-view he found in a source like this.[13] So Deinias in the high north was so close to the moon that it seemed to him not like a planet but just like a faraway place: the words *ὡς* and *τινα* in Photios, both qualifying *γῆν*, make more sense on the assumption that he did not actually visit the moon. And as for the wonders that Deinias saw, wherever it was that he went, there is simply no evidence to suggest that he recounted a series of marvels which could be paralleled in Lucian's lunar ethnography. In particular the word *καθαρωτάτην* need not mean that the moon was a locality of great moral purity (thus implying a visit to find out); it could mean 'bare' or even, as Rohde suggests,[14] 'an earth pure and simple'.

Thus far we have been arguing that the alleged visits to the moon in the *Apista* are a poor model for what we find in the *True Histories*. But these observations, though they must be made, are less conclusive than a more general consideration analogous

τερατεύεται, ἃ μηδεὶς μήτε ἰδεῖν ἔφη μήτε ἀκοῦσαι, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ φαντασίαις ἀνετυπώσατο. καὶ τὸ πάντων ἀπιστότατον, ὅτι πορευόμενοι πρὸς Βορρᾶν ἐπὶ σελήνην, ὡς ἐπί τινα γῆν καθαρωτάτην, πλησίον ἐγένοντο, ἐκεῖ τε γενόμενοι ἴδοιεν ἃ εἰκὸς ἦν ἰδεῖν τὸν τοιαύτην ὑπερβολὴν πλασμάτων προαναπλάσαντα. Note particularly Photios' contemptuous repetition of *ἰδεῖν*: it is the claim to autopsy that he finds so hard to swallow, even in a work of fiction.

[10] E.g. Rohde, op. cit. 206 (192) n. 4.

[11] The *locus classicus* for this doctrine is Aristot. *Meteor.* 354a 23ff., where he says that ancient meteorologists believed *τὸν ἥλιον μὴ φέρεσθαι ὑπὸ γῆν, ἀλλὰ περὶ γῆν καὶ τὸν τόπον τοῦτον* (the northern mountain), *ἀφανίζεσθαι δὲ καὶ ποιεῖν νύκτα διὰ τὸ ὑψηλὴν εἶναι πρὸς ἄρκτον τὴν γῆν*. There is a lengthy discussion of this topic by Kiessling in *RE* s.v. *Ῥίπαια ὄρη*, Reihe 2, Hlb.1 (1920), col. 846ff., who finds traces of the ancient belief in writers such as Herakleitos, Anaximenes, Sophokles (*OC* 1248f.) and Virgil (*Georg.* 1.240ff.); in particular it is explicitly expounded by Avienus (*Ora Marit.* 649ff.) and finds its apotheosis in the *Topographia Christianike* of Kosmas Indikopleustes (2.31ff.), who presses it into service as part of an extensive polemic to support the notion of a flat earth which he derives from Holy Scripture. Kosmas, however, appears to have combined the primitive idea of northern shadow-casting mountains with a more scientific one concerning the inclination of the plane of a flat earth relative to the movement of the planets. Thus for Kosmas the entire surface of the earth slopes upwards from SE to NW so that one is literally going higher as one travels northwards. This is also why all rivers flow from north to south, except the Nile, whose slowness is due to the fact that it is flowing uphill. Cf. W. Wolska, *La Topographie Chrétienne de Cosmas Indicopleustes* (Paris, 1962), 230ff.

[12] Diod. 2.47.5: *φασὶ δὲ καὶ τὴν σελήνην ἐκ ταύτης τῆς νήσου φαίνεσθαι παντελῶς ὀλίγον ἀπέχουσαν τῆς γῆς καί τινας ἐξοχὰς γεώδεις ἔχουσαν ἐν αὐτῇ φανερὰς*.

[13] This is not to suggest that Hekataios was in fact Antonius' model here. He may have been, but perhaps a more likely candidate is Antiphanes of Berge, who we know was actually cited in the *Apista* (112a 5).

[14] Op. cit. 288 (268) n. 2.

to that advanced above in connection with Herakles' footprint. Travellers like Iamboulos had strange and unbelievable tales to tell about their visits to unknown and perhaps non-existent lands. To hint that such voyages were indeed the product of fantasy, Lucian parodies them by exaggeration, and makes his travellers visit the strangest and most foreign place of all – the moon! The moon in Lucian, in other words, stands in the same relation to the lands visited by Iamboulos and his like as the acre-large footprint does to Herodotos' two-cubit one. Just as we should not look for a source with a footprint an acre in extent, so we lose the point of Lucian's satire by trying to find a literal model for the visit to the moon. Whatever his source (which is to say, whatever his target) may have been, the one certain thing about it is that it had nothing to do with the moon. In this perspective it is immaterial whether Deinias actually visited the moon or, as I have argued, merely went to the place on earth closest to it. In short, what has often been taken as the clearest indication that Lucian was working from Antonius Diogenes becomes, in this view, almost proof positive that he was not.

A second type of parodistic humour actually depends for its full effect on the moon being recognised as an outrageous piece of fiction on Lucian's part. There are at least two places in Lucian's account of life on the moon where he seems to have taken over, not without exaggeration and distortion, material from Ktesias' *Persika*. At *Ver. Hist.* 1.23 we are told that the moonfolk neither urinate nor defecate, 'nor do they have their orifices in the same place as we do, nor do their boys provide an opportunity for intercourse in their bottoms, but behind their knees just above the calf; for that is where their holes are'.[15] Now compare Ktesias, epitomised by Photios, on a strange tribe in India: 'when a child is born to any of them it has no hole in its anus, nor does it pass stools. It has buttocks, but the hole is closed over, and this is why they do not defecate'.[16] Lucian has parodied this firstly by exaggerating it and adding an element of sexual obscenity, secondly by transferring it to a context – the moon – where nothing can be true. Ktesias goes on: 'it is said that their urine is like cheese, not very thick but cloudy'.[17] Lucian takes this and elaborates it in a humorous way: 'whenever they work hard or take exercise, they sweat milk all over their bodies: from this they make cheese, with the addition of a little of the honey (that runs from their noses)'.[18] The same processes are at work here. It would not have been particularly funny or pointed if Lucian had taken his description of the moon from a pre-existing source and just incorporated a few details from Ktesias. On the other hand, it is both funny and pointed for Lucian to undercut Ktesias by transferring his material to a setting so fantastically absurd that it could not conceivably be true. In effect he is saying to his reader: 'if you believe what Ktesias says, you might as well believe in men in the moon. It's all equally imaginary'. If this reading of Lucian's humour is correct,

[15] *οὐ μὴν ἀπουροῦσίν γε καὶ ἀφοδεύουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τέτρηνται ᾗπερ ἡμεῖς, οὐδὲ τὴν συνουσίαν οἱ παῖδες ἐν ταῖς ἕδραις παρέχουσιν, ἀλλ' ἐν ταῖς ἰγνύσιν ὑπὲρ τὴν γαστροκνημίαν· ἐκεῖ γάρ εἰσι τετρημένοι.*

[16] 48b10ff.: *ὅταν δὲ γένηταί τινι αὐτῶν παιδίον, οὐ τέτρηται τὴν πυγήν, οὐδ' ἀποπατεῖ, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ἰσχία ἔχει, τὸ δὲ τρῆμα συμπέφυκε· διὸ ἀποπατοῦσι μὲν οὔ.*

[17] 48b13ff.: *οὐρεῖν δὲ ὥσπερ τυρὸν αὐτούς φασιν οὐ πάνυ παχὺν ἀλλὰ θολερόν.*

[18] *Ver. Hist.* 1.24: *κἀπειδὰν ἢ πονῶσιν ἢ γυμνάζωνται, γάλακτι πᾶν τὸ σῶμα ἱδροῦσιν, ὥστε καὶ τυροὺς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ πήγνυνται, ὀλίγον τοῦ μέλιτος ἐπιστάξαντες.* It is interesting to note that Lucian has modified Ktesias' milky urine into milky perspiration; by alluding to the Pythagorean belief that the inhabitants of the moon were too pure to pass any waste matter from their bodies (see below p. 480), Lucian has denied himself the opportunity of describing their urine. Ktesias was too good a butt to pass over, and perspiration was virtually the only appropriate bodily fluid left.

then we would have further indications ruling out a model where the moon was recounted as a place actually visited, a model as precise and literal as that which Antonius Diogenes has been pressed into service to provide.

However, our analysis has not yet exhausted the moon joke. Various philosophers and religious mystics postulated an inhabited moon: this belief is ascribed by Stobaios to the Pythagoreans, in particular a certain Philolaos, who suggested that the plants and animals of the moon were fifteen times larger and more beautiful than their earthly counterparts and had no need to purge themselves of bodily wastes – presumably because of the purity of their environment and metabolisms.[19] This was taken up and developed by Herodoros of Herakleia,[20] who suggested that the women of the moon lay eggs which hatch into children fifteen times larger than earth children. References to a moon inhabited by superior beings or by the souls of the dead persist throughout antiquity. The shamanistic nature of this belief (it being impossible to visit the moon in body, information can be gathered only by a freed spirit) has been demonstrated by Walter Burkert:[21] the moon emerges as a counterpart to the earth, ἀντίχθων (Aristot. Fr. 204 Rose), better in every respect. It is as an example of greater purity that the absence of excretory functions recorded by Philolaos among the moonfolk is best seen, while the laying of eggs presumably reflects an asexual method of reproduction. These were philosophers of the kind that Lucian had in mind in the preface to the *True Histories*: they present an excellent target. What rich fun for Lucian's hero to reach the moon and find it just as the mystics had described, then to set it down in the dry ethnographic manner, as if this spiritual Utopia were no more than another exotic country! The humour here arises from the incongruity between the mystic, imaginative subject-matter and the manner of its presentation by a matter-of-fact eye-witness. A number of details of Lucian's moon begin to make sense: the moonfolk are nourished not by corporeal food but by the smoke from roasted frogs (1.23); they drink dew squeezed from air.[22] Even the vultures ridden by the lunar police (1.11) are part of this complex: Aristotle (*Hist. Anim.* 563a7) reports that Herodoros said that vultures came from another world – apparently the griffins of the Hyperboreans[23] (γρῦπες) have been rationalised into vultures (γῦπες). It might be conceivable for extra-terrestrials to ride griffins, but how much funnier for them to ride vultures instead!

Lucian, then, has contrived to hit two targets simultaneously: historians with far-fetched tales of foreign parts, and mystic philosophers whose ecstatic imaginings are ridiculed by being presented so prosaically.[24] On both counts it appears methodologically wrong to look for his source in a putative visit to the moon in Antonius Diogenes. To do so reduces effective satire to insipid borrowing.

[19] Stob. *Ekl.* 1.26.4 = DK 44 A 20.

[20] *FGrHist* 31 F 21.

[21] W. Burkert, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism* (Harvard, 1972), 345ff. For further references in ancient writers cf. W. Gundel in *RE* XVI.1 (1933), s.v. Mond, esp. coll. 77–80.

[22] The dead are also nourished by smoke (Herakleit. Fr. 98, Luc. *Charon* 22); Pythagoreans told of creatures nourished by ὀσμαί (Aristot. *de sens.* 445a16 = DK 58 B 43); Lucian is also tilting at Herodotos' cannabis-sniffing Skythians (Hdt. 1.202, 4.75) and the ἄστομοι reported by Megasthenes (Strab. 15.1.57). For moonmen nourished by very little substance, compare especially Plut. *de fac. in orb. lun.* 940c, a very interesting passage. The frogs in Lucian are a deliberately bathetic and deflating touch. For dew-drinking see below, p. 485.

[23] A people living in the far north who had many links with the moon.

[24] Lucian works the same joke again with the Isles of the Blessed and Damned in Bk 2, except that there the material derives from mythology and epic poetry rather than from mystic philosophy.

II

The argument about Lucian's supposed debt to Antonius Diogenes can be approached from a different direction by asking whether the *Apista* would in fact have been a suitable target for Lucian's parody. The satire of the *True Histories* is directed against writers who maintain that they are telling the truth while all the time relating the most outrageous falsehoods. In such a work there would clearly be no point in satirising a writer who did not disguise the fact that he was a writer of fiction. So it is vital to examine the extent to which the *Apista* presented itself as literal truth.

The work was endowed with an elaborate machinery to give an impression of authenticity. The main narrator was Deinias, who tells his story to the Arkadian ambassador Kymbas.[25] At the end of his narrative (into which was set at second hand the narrative of Derkyllis, which, in its turn, contained at least two subsidiary narratives) he produces some tablets of cypress-wood and asks Kymbas' companion, Erasinides the Athenian, to engrave his story on them. Two sets of tablets are engraved, one for Kymbas to take back to Arkadia, the other to be buried with Deinias. Later, Deinias' coffin is unearthed during Alexander's siege of Tyre and the wooden tablets rediscovered. The narrative was preceded by a letter from a Macedonian, Balagros, to his wife, Phila,[26] telling the story of the discovery of the coffin and introducing a transcription of the wooden tablets, which formed the bulk of the book (111a20–b31).

At first sight all this seems to be designed to establish that the *Apista* really was a true and ancient account, recently discovered. The discovery of books in graves was indeed a well worn ploy in ancient forgery.[27] We can cite as parallels Agesilaos' 'discovery' of a bronze tablet engraved with peculiar hieroglyphs in the tomb of Alkmene (clearly a politically motivated fabrication),[28] the works of Pythagorean philosophy 'found' in the grave of Numa, but later conveniently destroyed;[29] or, from Christian times, the discovery of the so-called Apocalypse of Paul[30] or of an 'autograph' of Matthew's Gospel in the grave of Barnabas.[31] These were all intended to impose themselves on the public as works of genuine antiquity.

Somewhat more equivocal are the narratives of the Trojan War written under the names of Dictys of Crete and Dares of Phrygia. The Greek original of 'Dictys' purported to be a transliteration of a work in Punic (i.e. Phoenician) letters discovered in the grave of Dictys in Crete, while 'Dares' is prefaced by a letter from Cornelius Nepos to Sallust recounting his discovery of a manuscript in Athens. Whatever their original intentions, these works were long accepted as genuine. However, it may be that we are asking the wrong question if we enquire whether their apparatus of authenticity was or was not meant to be believed literally. Even if they were intended solely as literature of entertainment,[32] they would still have much to gain from giving

[25] Photios is at constant pains to remind us of this frame: cf. 109b3ff., 110a16, 110a40f., 110b15f., 110b22, 110b39, 111a20.

[26] Both real personages, though not elsewhere recorded as man and wife; cf. Arr. *Anab.* 2.12.2, Diod. 18.22; id. 19.59.

[27] Discussed at length by W. Speyer, *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike* (= *Hypomnemata*, 24) (Göttingen, 1970), esp. 43–124.

[28] Plut. *Mor.* 577f, 578f.

[29] Plin. *NH* 13.84–7, Augustin. *de civ. Dei* 7.34.1–15, Liv. 40.29.3–14, Plut. *Numa* 22.

[30] Sozomen. *Hist. Eccl.* 7.19.10ff.

[31] Theodor. Anagnost. *Hist. Eccl.* 2.2 (= PG 86.i.184), Kedren. *Hist. Comp.* PG. 121. 673b, Nikeph. Kallist. *Hist. Eccl.* 16.37 (= PG. 147.200c).

[32] Although it is hard to believe that anyone could be much entertained by the version of Dares that we have.

an impression of authenticity: the story would be made more real, hence more important and more involving; and, not least, it would be given a degree of acceptability in a literary culture that still often tended to confuse fiction with lying.

Thus it may have been with Antonius. The reader need not be supposed to have accepted the archaeological apparatus as true in any literal sense. Many modern novels are furnished with a provenance for the narratives they contain, but they are none the less intended to be read as novels. Such things have more to do with the 'suspension of disbelief' than with the creation of positive credence: this is part of the rules on which the game of novel-writing and novel-reading is played.[33]

In the case of Antonius, however, we can go further. It is clear from what Photios says that he did not simply present his text as an ancient narrative rediscovered and leave it at that.

> This Diogenes, also called Antonius, having presented Deinias telling all these tall stories to Kymbas, nevertheless (ὅμως) writes to Faustinus that he is composing a work on the Wonders Beyond Thule, and that he dedicates his story (τὰ δράματα) to his sister Isidora, who is a lover of learning. He says of himself that he is a poet of Old Comedy (λέγει δὲ ἑαυτὸν ὅτι ποιητής ἐστι κωμῳδίας παλαιᾶς), and that even if he is inventing incredible fiction (εἰ καὶ ἄπιστα καὶ ψευδῆ πλάττοι), he nevertheless has the testimony of the ancients for most of his wonderful tales (ἀλλ' οὖν ἔχει περὶ τῶν πλείστων αὐτῷ μυθολογηθέντων ἀρχαιοτέρων μαρτυρίας), and from them he has compiled this work. At the start of each book he lists those men who described such things before, so that his miraculous story does not seem to be without authority (ὡς μὴ δοκεῖν μαρτυρίας χηρεύειν τὰ ἄπιστα) (111a30–40).

This prefatory (?) letter invites several comments. The first is that Antonius seems to be admitting openly that he is the author of the work – which is to say that it was not really an ancient text rediscovered. He even describes it as 'incredible fiction', which seems to be his phrase, not Photios'. Furthermore, in claiming that he has ancient sources for *most* of his material, he is implying that there remains a residue of pure fiction: perhaps the plot itself as distinct from the paradoxography which it frames. Secondly the fact that he claims to be working from earlier written sources, which he cites by name at the beginning of each book, is incompatible with the whole tendency of the archaeological apparatus. Either device by itself would have given the work verisimilitude, but together they cancel one another out (unless we are prepared to believe that the citations were engraved on the tablets with the rest of Deinias' narrative, which is hard to do since the one source that Photios names – Antiphanes – is of a date later than that at which the plot is set).[34] The archaeology then is a device to give the fiction verisimilitude: it makes the story realistic (as Photios realised, the main pleasure to be had from such a work is that it describes unreal events in an authentic-seeming way, 109a10ff.), but it is undercut in such a way that it cannot make the fiction seem objectively fact. That Photios saw this to be the effect of the letter to Faustinus seems to be confirmed by his use of the word ὅμως.

If the fictionality of Antonius' work was as transparent, whether by accident or by design, as Photios' summary suggests, then Antonius is immediately ruled out as the target of a work directed against writers who claim to tell the truth while really lying

[33] Photios himself comes rather close to saying just this when he says that the *Apista* gives pleasure because it deals with incredible material in a way that gives it credibility (109a10–13): ταῖς δὲ διανοίαις πλεῖστον ἔχει τοῦ ἡδέος, ἅτε μύθων ἐγγὺς καὶ ἀπίστων ἐν πιθανωτάτῃ πλάσει καὶ διασκευῇ ὕλην ἑαυτῇ διηγημάτων ποιουμένη.

[34] The dramatic date is fixed early in the fifth century B.C. by the reference to Ainesidemos, tyrant of Leontinoi (110a6); cf. Paus. 5.22.7; probably the same Ainesidemos as in Hdt. 7.154, 165, Pi. *Ol.* 2.46, 3.9.

outrageously. But I think we can press this argument one stage further yet: there are signs that the *Apista* itself contained elements of comic parody.

(i) Antonius called himself a writer of Old Comedy. Despite changes in the meaning of the word κωμῳδία,[35] the phrase can hardly refer to anything but comedy of the Aristophanic type. Reyhl suggested that Antonius was adverting here to others of his compositions, thus characterising himself as a man of antiquarian learning, but the cast of the paragraph as a whole implies rather that it was the *Apista* itself that he had in mind.[36] Just what Aristophanic elements the work may have contained, we cannot say: it may be that there was some obscenity in the original which the devout Photios has silently suppressed,[37] or perhaps fantastic parody the subtleties of which he failed to penetrate; in which case the patriarch's righteous indignation about the incredible nature of the work would acquire a new perspective.

(ii) Photios mentions only one of the sources cited by Antonius: Antiphanes (112a5). This must be Antiphanes of Berge, who wrote a work on the far north, late in the fourth century B.C., just possibly called *Ἄπιστα ὑπὲρ Θούλην*.[38] Antiphanes' tall stories were generally considered so preposterous that the verb βεργαΐζω was coined from the name of his home town to denote the telling of such falsehoods.[39] Of all the sources that Antonius could have chosen to cite, Antiphanes was the one least calculated to confirm the veracity of his work. Moreover, his reputation as a liar was so widespread in antiquity that Antonius can hardly have been unaware of what he was doing. Again some sort of humorous, probably parodistic, motive seems the likeliest explanation.

(iii) The Greeks never quite came to terms with pure literary fiction. Even the canonical romances for the most part provide themselves with a provenance or some other link with reality; the pretence is maintained that one is reading a work of fact.[40]

[35] Cf. Rohde, op. cit. 270(251), n. 2, who is, however, at fault in arguing that Antiphanes of Berge was described as κωμικός. This is rather the result of the misattribution of a particular anecdote to a different individual, Antiphanes the comic playwright; see O. Weinreich, 'Antiphanes und Münchhausen', *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, 220 (4) (1942), 11–13.

[36] Cf. L. di Gregorio, 'Sugli *Ἄπιστα ὑπὲρ Θούλην* di Antonio Diogene', *Aevum* 42 (1968), 199–211, esp. n. 1 on pp. 199–201.

[37] Though elsewhere he is vociferous in his criticisms of what he considers indecent. Compare his judgements on Achilleus Tatius (cod. 87, 66a21ff.) and Iamblichos (cod. 94, 73b25ff.).

[38] This is the suggestion of G. Knaack, 'Antiphanes von Berge', *RhM* NF 61 (1906), 135–8, who argues that Antiphanes' work was itself a parody of the travel narrative of Pytheas of Massilia.

[39] Steph. Byz. s.v. *Βέργη*; cf. Polyb. 34.5.10. Strab. 1.3.1, 2.3.5, Skymnos 653ff. (= Müller *GGM* 1.221), Marcian. *proem. ad Menipp. Peripl.* (= *GGM* 1.565), P.Oxy. 1801 (from the *Hesione* of Alexis), and perhaps the quotation from the *Meliboia* of Eriphos at Athen. 3.84b (= Frg. 2 Kock), if we accept Kaibel's *Βεργαῖε* for the corrupt *βερβεαι* of the MSS. On Antiphanes in general see Weinreich art. cit., who usefully gathers material on Antiphanes' career and reputation, but is perhaps over-generous in suggesting that his work was a moralising aretalogy rather than a collection of interesting and amazing 'facts' associated with the far north.

[40] For example, Chariton's heroine, Kallirhoe, is the daughter of the Syracusan statesman, Hermokrates, and his plot is carefully placed in an historical milieu, though not with total consistency. In both Xenophon of Ephesos (5.15.2) and the *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* (rec. β. § 51), the hero writes an account of his adventures, which he lodges in a temple or library; we are left to presume that this is the source of the story we have just read. Iamblichos' *Babyloniaka* purported to be an old Babylonian tale told to the author by his Babylonian τροφεύς (see Habrich's edition, p. 2). In Achilleus Tatius, the first-person narrative serves in a sense as its own source, presenting Kleitophon's *ipsissima verba* as told to the author. Heliodoros occasionally pretends to be an historian by feigning uncertainty about the events he is narrating; cf. J. R. Morgan, 'History, Realism and Romance in the *Aithiopika* of Heliodoros', *CA* 1 (1982), 227ff.

Yet Antonius' prefatory letter to Faustinus admits authorship and concedes the work to be fictional. Is it possible that by referring to his work as 'incredible fiction' (or 'lies'; ἄπιστα καὶ ψευδῆ, his words, not Photios') he was playing much the same game as Lucian (*Ver. Hist.* 1.4), forestalling criticism by stressing the invented and untruthful character of a story which presented the features of normal travel narrative in an intentionally exaggerated form?

(iv) Like the romances, the *Apista* had a device to secure verisimilitude, but one so extreme that it is tempting to see it as a parodistic exaggeration of the procedure of the novels. The kernel of the book, the story of Derkyllis and Mantinias, was presented at several removes: what Photios had before him purported to be Balagros' transcription, in a letter to his wife, of wooden tablets from Deinias' coffin, which were carved by Erasinides the Athenian to record Deinias telling to Kymbas the story which Derkyllis had told to him.

The *Apista* was clearly a work of some complexity, and it would be wrong to see it solely as a parody: the Pythagorean sections at least were perfectly acceptable biographical material even to so serious a neoplatonist as Porphyrios. But if there was a note of parody in even some of the travel sections, it is hard to believe that Lucian would have chosen the work as a butt of the particular satire of the *True Histories*.

III

The next stage in our enquiry must be to examine some specific resemblances that have been noted between the *Apista* and the *True Histories*. It will be clear that the case for dependence is no more secure in particulars than it is in generalities. The most thorough investigation of the sources of the *True Histories* remains the dissertation of A. Stengel,[41] who noted the following as possible references to Antonius.

(i) Luc. *Ver. Hist.* 1.3–4 (Stengel, p. 13): one way to establish the truth of an apparently incredible story is to claim that it is the fruit of autopsy. Lucian parodies the paradoxographer's *ipse vidi* first by exposing the falsity of the device in Ktesias, 'who wrote a history of the land of India and its characteristics, which he had neither seen himself nor heard from anyone else who was telling the truth' (1.3), and then by stressing that the story we are about to read is definitely *not* based on any first- or even second-hand evidence: 'I am writing about things which I have neither seen nor experienced nor heard about from others'.[42] With this Stengel compares some passages of Herodotos, and most pertinently a claim to eye-witness veracity from Ktesias.[43] He then goes on to compare a phrase from Photios' summary of Antonius where Deinias 'is brought on narrating what he had seen himself in his travels or had heard from others who had seen it' (109b7ff.). However, there is an obvious and important difference between an ostensible historian using a claim of autopsy to guarantee his veracity and a character in a work of fiction narrating his experiences. Deinias' experiences do not purport to be those of the author: they are as fictional as the character himself. This is not an example of the trick that Lucian is mocking. In any case, the joke is sufficiently explained by the allusion to Ktesias.

(ii) *Ver. Hist.* 1.5 (Stengel p. 14): Lucian's journey was undertaken from curiosity (ἡ τῆς διανοίας περιεργία καὶ πραγμάτων καινῶν ἐπιθυμία), Deinias' κατὰ ζήτησιν ἱστορίας (109a13–14). There is no real similarity here. Deinias' motives are those of

[41] A. Stengel, *De Luciani Veris Historiis* (Berlin, 1911).

[42] *Ver. Hist.* 1.4: γράφω τοίνυν περὶ ὧν μήτε εἶδον μήτε ἔπαθον μήτε παρ' ἄλλων ἐπυθόμην.

[43] Hdt. 1.52, 66, 22, 2.99; Ktes. *ap.* Phot. 49b39–50a4 (quoted above, n. 7).

any reputable tourist or explorer, such as Solon in Herodotos (1. 29). Lucian's parody is two-edged: there is a joke centring on the bare-faced admission of a motive which is trivial and not altogether admirable. As such it is aimed perhaps at Iamboulos, whose adventures were cloaked in the fiction of a trading voyage.[44]

(iii) *Ver. Hist.* 1.11ff. (Stengel pp. 18–19): this is the visit to the moon discussed at length above.

(iv) *Ver. Hist.* 1.23 (Stengel p. 34): for drink Lucian's moonmen squeeze air to produce dew. Stengel compares two passages for this, the first from Lucian's own *Ikaromenippos*, where Menippos, flying to heaven, stops off at the moon, where he encounters Empedokles living on dew (*Ikaromen.* 13). The second is a passage from Porphyrios' biography of Pythagoras (10), for which Antonius is named as source, describing how Mnesarchos discovered the infant Astraios lying on his back and looking at the sun without blinking, feeding from the moisture dripping from a poplar tree. Of these two passages that from the *Ikaromenippos* has an obvious relevance in that it is located on the moon, and, like *Ver. Hist.* 1.23, is a joke aimed at the lunar purity envisaged by Pythagoreans and other mystics.[45] Nowhere among the surviving testimony are we told what Pythagorean moonfolk ate or drank, but since their purity is a result of their proximity to αἰθήρ, it is a reasonable supposition that they gained their moisture in its purest form: dew.[46] On the other hand, there is no joke apparent if we take the drinking of dew to be a reference to Antonius Diogenes. There is, of course, a general connection of thought: Astraios is being worked up as a θεῖος ἀνήρ of superhuman purity and power; his dew-drinking is part of this picture, a sign of his oneness with nature.[47] But such a general similarity is no sure sign of parody, especially when we can see a better and funnier target for the joke.

(v) Luc. *Ver. Hist.* 1.25 (Stengel p. 37): the inhabitants of the moon have miraculous eyes: they can be removed and stored safely until needed; some, the rich, have a great many eyes in store. Stengel links this with Astraios' miraculous eyes in Antonius: they waxed and waned with the moon (109b28), and could stare at the sun without blinking (Porph. *Vit. Pyth.* 10). It is hard to see any connection here; would one really choose to satirise and criticise a description of an ocular calendar, which showed the phases of the moon, by talking of removable eyes and speculative dealing in eye-currency?[48]

(vi) *Ver. Hist.* 2.12 (Stengel p. 58): Lucian and his companions have reached the Isle of the Blessed, a land of perpetual twilight, without real day or night. On this passage a scholiast remarks, εἰς τὰ ὑπὲρ Θούλην τερατολογούμενα ἐπισκώπτει, which is taken as independent testimony linking Lucian and Antonius. Two points need to be made. First, the scholiast's comment is *not* a specific reference to Antonius or any other author. One of the paradoxa regularly associated with Thule and the

[44] Diod. 2.55.

[45] See above, p. 480. It may be that Menippos himself had written a parodistic *Himmelfahrt* on which the *Ikaromenippos* is partly based, in which case Lucian might be recycling Menippean jokes. Cf. R. Helm, *Lukian und Menipp* (Leipzig & Berlin 1906, reprinted Hildesheim, 1967), 80ff.; despite important reservations on the extent to which Lucian's dialogue form was derived from Menippos, B. McCarthy, 'Lucian and Menippus', *YCS* 4 (1934), 51ff. agrees that much of the substance of the *Ikaromenippos* may derive from a Menippean visit to heaven.

[46] The moon was often connected with the formation of dew; cf. esp. Plut. *de fac. in orb. lun.* 940a, τὸν ἀέρα καλεῖ Δία καί φησιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῆς σελήνης καθυγραινόμενον εἰς δρόσους τρέπεσθαι; also Aristot. *Probl.* 937b4, Plin. *NH* 20.1, Virg. *Georg.* 3.337, Stat. *Theb.* 1.338, Nonn. *Dionys.* 40.376.

[47] Cf. W. Fauth, 'Astraios und Zamolxis: über Spuren pythagoreischer Aretalogie im Thule-Roman des Antonius Diogenes', *Hermes* 106 (1978), 220–41, esp. 237–8.

[48] Much closer to Lucian in any case is the story of Lamia; cf. Diod. 20.41, Plut. *Mor.* 515f.

far north was the six-month-long day and night, which emerges in various degrees of distortion in a number of authors but can be traced back to Pytheas of Massilia.[49] It is indeed present in Photios' summary of Antonius (110b42–111a3). There is no need, however, for the scholiast's use of the word τερατολογούμενα to be taken as an allusion to Antonius' title Ἄπιστα or connected with Photios' mention of Deinias τερατευσάμενον his story to Kymbas (111a31); only a few lines further on we find the same scholiast tracing another joke (in *Ver. Hist.* 2.14) to τὰ περὶ τῶν Βραχμάνων τερατολογούμενα τῶν Ἀσσυρίων; no one would see a reference to any particular work here. There is no precision in the scholiast's vocabulary, and in both cases he is alluding to scraps of paradoxography that had entered general currency. Second, even if we assume that the scholiast's comment is intended as a reference to Antonius and to Antonius alone, we must still ask what independent value it might have. The answer is very little. It occurs in only four of the MSS of Lucian, and, according to Rabe's classification, only one of these[50] is not a mere apograph of an existing body of scholia. Even this one manuscript does not fall into either of Rabe's two primary classes of scholia transmitting scholarly comment from antiquity. It looks very much as if the comment first appeared in a latish manuscript: it originates with a scribe, whose authority is not above question. Even admitting, then, that there is a reference to Antonius here, there is a strong possibility that it could be wrong.

(vii) *Ver. Hist.* 2.29ff. (Stengel pp. 79–80): Lucian arrives at the Isle of the Damned, where his senses are assailed by a stench of pitch and sulphur and burning flesh, and the sound of whips and screams. Stengel, following Rohde, traces this whole episode back to Antonius, whose heroine Derkyllis saw τὰ ἐν Ἅιδου with her slave Myrto as guide (109a39ff.). This position was developed by Reyhl, who argued that it was possible to discern in Lucian various Orphic and Pythagorean themes; we know (the argument continues) that Antonius had a Pythagorean section and that he included a katabasis: why not then a Pythagorean katabasis for Lucian to parody?[51] There are several drawbacks in this. Firstly the phrase that Photios uses of Derkyllis' vision need not imply any hellish punishments as witnessed by Lucian's narrator; τὰ ἐν Ἅιδου could equally well be a vision of incorporeal Homeric ghosts, or a vision of the afterlife in general, somewhat on the line of Virgil's underworld. We are not compelled to suppose that there was anything especially Pythagorean about this episode; as Anderson remarks,[52] one Pythagorean sequence would not make the *Apista* a Pythagorean work any more than it does Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Second, we know a little more about the slave Myrto than Rohde did. She appears in one of the papyrus fragments,[53] where she is unable to speak but tries to warn her mistress of the evil intentions of the Egyptian priest by writing on a tablet. Paapis has apparently taken Myrto as his lover, and, using his magic powers, has struck her dumb; this is one stage in his plan to ensnare Derkyllis. Presumably he must have brought about Myrto's death after Derkyllis and her brother fled from Tyre. Thus, although duped by Paapis, Myrto was far from being an evil character and her rôle in the story as we now see it indicates that she would have been out of place as part of a vision of hellfire and infernal punishment.

[49] Cf. Geminus 6.9, Serv. ad Virg. *Georg.* 1.30, Plin. *NH* 2.186–7, 4.104; Pytheas is named by Pliny at 2.187.

[50] Rabe's V = Vaticanus Gr. 89, written in the 13th century.

[51] Reyhl, op. cit. 67ff. [52] Anderson, op. cit. 6–7.

[53] PSI 1177; cf. Zimmermann art. cit. (supra n. 1) and id. 'Die stumme Myrto. Eine Szene aus des Antonios Diogenes Τὰ ὑπὲρ Θούλην Ἄπιστα', *Philologische Wochenschrift* 55 (1935), 474–80.

(viii) *Ver. Hist.* 2.35 (Stengel pp. 82–3): on the Island of Dreams Lucian and his friends are entertained by the dreams for thirty days and nights while asleep (*καθεύδοντες εὐωχούμενοι*). This is an excellent joke. It was commonplace for travellers in foreign lands to be lavishly entertained in the local fashion; if one is visiting the land of dreams how else can one meet one's hosts except in sleep? The joke is only spoiled by tracing the motif to earlier references to people who sleep for a long time, whether it be the parents of Derkyllis and Mantinias under Paapis' spell (110b32, 111a17) or the strange northerners in Herodotos (4.25) who sleep for six months at a time.

IV

So far we have seen that there are reasons to doubt whether Lucian was making any use at all of the work of Antonius Diogenes. But we are left with Photios' statement that the *Apista* was the 'source and root' of the *True Histories*. Just what did he mean, and how much weight is to be attached to his testimony? The phrase 'source and root' is puzzling in itself: it cannot easily be understood to mean that Antonius was, in Photios' view, just one target among many; and yet a stronger sense (as proposed by Reyhl) is ruled out by what Lucian says himself. It is my view that Photios' statement has been misinterpreted by being isolated from its context. Here is the whole paragraph:

> He (i.e. Antonius) is, it seems, earlier than those who have pursued the invention of such fictions, such as Lucian, Lucius, Iamblichos, Achilleus Tatius, Heliodoros and Damaskios. Indeed this work appears to be the source and root of Lucian's *True Histories* and Lucius' *Metamorphoseis*. Not only that, but Derkyllis and Keryllos and Throuskanos and Deinias seem to have been the model for the stories of Sinonis and Rhodanes, Leukippe and Kleitophon, and Charikleia and Theagenes,[54] and the inventions about them and their travels, loves, abductions and adventures. As for the date at which Antonius Diogenes, the father of fictions of this type, flourished, we cannot yet tell for sure, except that one might conjecture that it was not long after the time of king Alexander.[55]

The most immediately striking thing about this is that, if Photios regarded the *Apista* as the 'source and root' of Lucian's *True Histories*, he equally regarded it as the 'source and root' of the work he calls the *Metamorphoseis* of Lucius. Photios had read this work and gives it a short notice (cod. 129, 96b11–35). He remarks that the content of the first two books is identical with Lucian's short work called the *Ὄνος*, although he detects, rightly or wrongly, a difference of tone; he is uncertain which of the two works came first but eventually decides that the *Ὄνος* (included in the Lucianic corpus, but not now generally believed to be an authentic work) is the more likely to be derivative. The *Ὄνος* tells the same story as Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, though without the inset narratives or the Isiac climax. The exact relationship between these

[54] I.e. the novels of Iamblichos, Achilleus Tatius and Heliodoros.

[55] 111b32–112a4: *ἔστι δ', ὡς ἔοικεν, οὗτος χρόνῳ πρεσβύτερος τῶν τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐσπουδακότων διαπλάσαι, οἷον Λουκιανοῦ, Λουκίου, Ἰαμβλίχου, Ἀχιλλέως Τατίου, Ἡλιοδώρου τε καὶ Δαμασκίου. καὶ γὰρ τοῦ περὶ ἀληθῶν διηγημάτων Λουκιανοῦ καὶ τοῦ περὶ μεταμορφώσεων Λουκίου πηγὴ καὶ ῥίζα ἔοικεν εἶναι τοῦτο· οὐ μόνον δὲ ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν περὶ Σινωνίδα καὶ Ῥοδάνην, Λευκίππην τε καὶ Κλειτοφῶντα, καὶ Χαρίκλειαν καὶ Θεαγένην, τῶν τε περὶ αὐτοὺς πλασμάτων καὶ τῆς πλάνης ἐρώτων τε καὶ ἁρπαγῆς καὶ κινδύνων ἡ Δερκυλλὶς καὶ Κήρυλλος καὶ Θρουσκανὸς καὶ Δεινίας ἐοίκασιν παράδειγμα γεγονέναι. τὸν χρόνον δέ, καθ' ὃν ἤκμασεν ὁ τῶν τηλικούτων πλασμάτων πατὴρ Διογένης ὁ Ἀντώνιος, οὔπω τι σαφὲς ἔχομεν λέγειν, πλὴν ἔστιν ὑπολογίσασθαι ὡς οὐ λίαν πόρρω τῶν χρόνων τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀλεξάνδρου.*

three works is much disputed,[56] as is the content of the Greek *Metamorphoseis* read by Photios. However, the present argument does not depend on a solution to these notorious *cruces*. We can be certain that the Greek *Metamorphoseis* of Lucius contained the well known story of a man's transformation by magic into an ass. If it contained nothing else (the majority view) it is extremely difficult to see how the *Apista* might be said to have influenced it as it is generally held to have influenced the *True Histories*, that is by providing a butt for parody and satire. No one has ever suggested that Antonius' work contained the story of a man turned donkey, or even anything that could be parodied by such a story. If, on the other hand, the Greek *Metamorphoseis* contained more than the ass-story,[57] its contents will still have been linked by the theme of metamorphosis, a theme conspicuously absent from the *Apista*. It is methodologically unsound to look for detailed parallels between the *Apista* and the *True Histories* without also looking for detailed parallels with the *Metamorphoseis* of Lucius, as reflected by Apuleius and the *Ὄνος*. But the second set of parallels is simply not there to be found. Obviously the resemblances that Photios saw between the *Apista* and the works of Lucian and 'Lucius' must be ones of general character rather than close similarities of theme and detail.[58]

The key to the nature of this general resemblance is given by the way in which Photios classifies the works he mentions. Antonius is closely related ('source and root') to Lucian and 'Lucius', more distantly linked to a coherent group of three erotic romances.[59] Love interest is absent from Lucian and 'Lucius', and occupies a subordinate rôle in Antonius. The similarity between these three then is that they wrote fiction of a type different from the canonical romance, dealing largely with *θαύματα*,[60] and perhaps more episodic in overall structure. However, there was a romantic element in a few episodes of the *Apista*. Photios mentions three of them: his rather bare statement suggests that the central female character, Derkyllis, had erotic

[56] Cf. Anderson, op. cit. 34ff., Hall, op. cit. 414ff.; B. E. Perry, *The Ancient Romances* (Berkeley, 1967), 211ff.; H. van Thiel, *Der Eselsroman, I. Untersuchungen* (= *Zetemata* Heft 54.I) (Munich, 1971); G. Bianco, *La fonte greca delle Metamorfosi di Apuleio* (Brescia, 1971); H. J. Mason, 'Fabula Graecanica: Apuleius and his Greek Source', *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass*, ed. B. L. Hijmans & R. Th. van der Paardt (Groningen, 1978), 1–15; G. M. Browne, 'On the *Metamorphoses* of Lucius of Patrae', *AJP* 99 (1978), 42–6. The majority of modern scholars believe that Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and the Lucianic *Ὄνος* derive independently from the *Metamorphoseis* noticed by Photios, although his attribution of the work to 'Lucius of Patrai' is usually thought to be the result of a failure to distinguish author from narrator.

[57] As I tend to believe it did: Photios' reference to the first two books does seem to imply that there were more; the plural of the title is puzzling if only one case of metamorphosis was recounted; and it is hard to see why anyone should want to produce an abbreviated version of a story very little shorter than the complete original, whereas it is quite plausible that a single story might be excerpted from a collection for separate circulation. Hall's discussion of this point (op. cit. 414ff.) is excellent.

[58] I know of only two attempts to explain Photios' statement that the *Apista* was the source and root of 'Lucius': (a) A. Scobie, *Aspects of the Ancient Romance and its Heritage* [= *Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*, 30] (Meisenheim am Glan, 1969), 32ff. suggests that Photios is classifying all three works as paradoxography, which is only part of the truth; (b) Fauth art. cit. 222f. sees a connection in the curiosity of the narrators of the three works; but the curiosity that leads Lucian's narrator and some of Antonius' characters to travel is very different from Lucius' fascination with black magic.

[59] Damaskios, a writer of paradoxa and ghost stories, who is given a brief and ill-tempered notice by Photios (cod. 130, 96b37–97a7), is quietly dropped from the discussion. It would be interesting to know why Photios did not include him in this group of non-erotic fiction writers. The most probable answer is that Damaskios wrote not a continuous narrative but a series of anecdotes, and so was felt to be fundamentally different in his generic form.

[60] This point is made also by Hall (op. cit. 345f.).

intrigues involving three male characters. The mention of Keryllos is a mystery: it corresponds to nothing in Photios' summary. Presumably something occurred between him and Derkyllis after they were separated from their friend Astraios (109b39ff.). We know more about Throuskanos, a man of Thule who fell violently in love with Derkyllis, killed the wicked Egyptian priest Paapis because of the sufferings he was inflicting on his beloved, and then committed suicide over the apparently dead (but really only bewitched) Derkyllis (110b4–10). Finally we know of an erotic involvement between Deinias and Derkyllis, which began in Thule (109a25–6), and apparently ended in marriage, since we learn at the end that Derkyllis is with Deinias in Tyre as he recounts his story to Kymbas (111a23ff.).

So what made Photios see these episodes as the παράδειγμα of Greek romance, and, more particularly, why did he think that the *Apista* as a whole had an even closer causal ('source and root') relationship with the works of Lucian and 'Lucius'? The answer is clear, I think, but the sad truth is that Photios is not saying anything very illuminating. His discussion is dominated by the question of relative chronology: for him it is a simple case of *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*. He thought that Antonius wrote considerably earlier than any other writer of fiction; in fact he dates the *Apista* close to the time of Alexander.[61] It has long been recognised that this is impossibly early (the very form of his name places Antonius Diogenes in the Roman period), and that Photios has been misled by the story of the discovery of Deinias' coffin by Alexander's troops.[62] There is, admittedly, something odd about Photios' reaction here; elsewhere he seems perfectly well aware, sometimes indignantly so, that Antonius was a writer of fiction. Perhaps he was clutching at straws to answer a question on which he confesses he had no clear evidence. The crucial point is that the 'source and root' thesis depends on the priority of Antonius, but that this priority depends, in its turn, on Photios' wrong assumptions concerning Antonius' early date, assumptions for which he had no external corroboration. The two statements must stand or fall together: if we reject Photios' dating of Antonius (as we must), we must also reject the conclusion about literary influences which he draws from it. He may be right in saying that Antonius wrote before Lucian, but if he is right it is only by accident and for reasons which invalidate his inferences. His statement is not in itself strong evidence, indeed it is no kind of evidence at all, that the *Apista* was influential on Greek fiction in general or on Lucian's *True Histories* in particular.

[61] Photios does not give us a lot of information on the dating of the other fictional works he had read. His notices of Damaskios and Achilleus Tatius have no chronological reference at all. He debates the priority of 'Lucius' and Lucian (96b20ff.), concluding that the Lucianic Ὄνος was more probably modelled on the *Metamorphoseis* of 'Lucius' than vice versa; but his equivocation on this question suggests that he thought the two works were more or less contemporary. At the end of his notice of the *Aithiopika* he mentions without comment the story that Heliodoros in later life became a Christian bishop (51b40f., based on the report in Sokr. *Hist. Eccl.* 5.22); so he can hardly have conceived of Heliodoros writing before the second century A.D., and in all probability would have dated him rather later, as did Theodosios Melitenos in the 11th century (Test. XIV in Colonna's edition of the *Aithiopika*, misattributed to Georgios Kedrenos; cf. Colonna's note in *Athenaeum* n.s. 28 [1950], 86–7). The novelist most precisely dated in the *Bibliotheke* is Iamblichos, who claimed in his *Babyloniaka* to have predicted the course of the war waged by Verus against the Parthians when Antoninus was emperor (75b27–41).

[62] Cf. Rohde, op. cit. 271 (252). For Antonius' date see also F. Böll, 'Zum griechischen Roman', *Philologus* 20 (1907), 1–15; A. Hallström, 'De aetate Antonii Diogenis', *Eranos* 10 (1910), 200f.; E. Schwartz, *Fünf Vorträge über den griechischen Roman* (Berlin, 1896), 136f.; T. Sinko, 'De ordine quo erotici scriptores Graeci sibi successisse videantur', *Eos* 41 (1940–6), 23–45. These scholars agreed that the *Apista* was written in the first or second century A.D., which is not contradicted by the papyri.

It is important to stress that the theory that the *Apista* was at the root of the development of Greek fiction is an inference of Photios' own. His argument is based entirely in his own reading; in his discussion he mentions only writers whom he had read and summarised in the *Bibliotheke*.[63] He did not have information lost to us. Photios' own deductions and critical judgements are of a completely different order of authority from his generally careful and accurate summaries of the contents of the texts he read.[64] What I am proposing to reject is not the testimony of someone better placed to know the truth than we are.

The only concrete evidence we have for the dating of Antonius Diogenes is furnished by two papyrus fragments, both dated around the year A.D. 200.[65] It may therefore be objected that there is a significant 'fit' of dates tending to confirm Photios' statement: if the *Apista* was composed around the middle of the second century, it would have been available for Lucian to parody. However, even if Antonius Diogenes does slightly predate Lucian, that is no proof that Lucian knew the *Apista*, far less that he was in any way dependent on it. The theory of dependence rests on the testimony of Photios, which we have seen reason to reject. After all, if the works are completely unconnected, there was always a fifty per cent chance that Photios was right in thinking the *Apista* came first: the 'fit' is hardly a statistically significant one. Moreover, the *Apista* cannot have been composed long before the *True Histories*, but, generally speaking, Lucian's literary parody tends not be aimed at contemporary or near-contemporary figures.[66] In particular, in the preface to the *True Histories* he identifies his targets as *ancient* poets, historians and philosophers; this is borne out when we can identify a specific allusion, but the description 'ancient' could hardly be applied to Antonius Diogenes.

The rejection of Photios' inferences removes the last support from the received view that Lucian was in some sense dependent on Antonius Diogenes: the general considerations outlined in the first two sections of this paper tell against it, and none of the details examined in the third section can be said to substantiate it. The *True Histories* in fact emerge as both a funnier and a sharper satire if the *Apista* is not foisted on them as source or target. That is one compensation for an otherwise negative conclusion. The other is that it is salutary to be reminded how a guess based on the flimsiest of evidence can acquire unquestioningly accepted authority simply by being repeated often enough. I cannot help feeling that Lucian himself would have been pleased with that thought.

University College of Swansea J. R. MORGAN

[63] 'Lucius' cod. 129, 96b11–35; Damaskios cod. 130, 96b37–97a7; Iamblichos cod. 94, 73b24–78b3; Achilleus Tatius cod. 87, 66a14–28; Heliodoros cod. 73, 50a6–51b41.

[64] Cf. T. Hägg, *Photios als Vermittler antiker Literatur* (= *Studia Graeca Upsalensia*, 8) (Uppsala, 1975).

[65] See supra n. 1.

[66] Cf. J. Bompaire, *Lucien Ecrivain* (Paris, 1958), *passim*.