

Double Standards in the Ancient and Medieval World

Edited by Karla Pollmann



— DUEHRKOHF & RADICKE —

Wissenschaftliche Publikationen

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Double Standards in the Ancient and Medieval World

/ edited by Karla Pollmann.-

(Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft – Beihefte ; 1)

Göttingen: Duehrkohp und Radicke, 2000

ISBN 3-89744-110-1

Illustration taken from A. Henkel/A. Schöne (Hgg.), *Emblemata. Handbuch zur Sinnbildkunst des XVI. und XVII. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart 1967)



FA

41A 14662

Das Werk ist in allen seinen Teilen urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig.
Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen
und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronische Systeme.

Copyright DUEHRKOHP & RADICKE 2000
Satz & Layout: Frank Duehrkohp
Druck: klartext, Göttingen
Printed in Germany
ISBN 3-89744-110-1

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements 7

Notes on Contributors 8

Introduction 11

I. "Some animals are more equal than others"

1. Kenneth DOVER: Are Gods Forgivable? 23

2. Annette KLEDT: Double Standards in the Myth of Kore? 33

3. Elke HARTMANN: 'Bastards' in Classical Athens 43

4. Christoph PAULUS: Double Standards within the Legal Profession? 55

5. Ruth E. HARDER: Double Standards in the Romances of the Roman
Principate 63

6. Ulrike BETHLEHEM: Double Standards in Medieval Arthurian Literature:
the Odd Triangle and the Emergence of a Literary Genre 77

II. Claim versus Reality

7. Friedemann BUDDENSIEK: Why Socrates Was Sentenced to Death.
Some Thoughts on Double Standard Behaviour 95

8. Gregor VOGT-SPIRA: "The Pervasive Inconsequence of
All Morality": the Example of Cato the Elder 107

9. Heike NIQUET: The Ideal of the Senatorial Agriculturist and Reality
During the Roman Republic and Empire 121

worse. Why do we even need to argue that it is a case of *akrasia* and nothing else, when a master is intimate with a female slave? Everyone knows this.

Whether Marriage is an Impediment to Doing Philosophy (extract)

When someone said to him that marriage and life with a wife seemed to be an impediment to doing philosophy, Musonius said that it wasn't an impediment to Pythagoras, or to Socrates, or to Crates, each of whom lived with a wife. And yet one could not find better philosophers than these. Indeed, Crates married despite the fact that he was utterly without an estate or goods or property. Then, since he did not have a residence of his own, he spent his days and nights with his wife in the public stoas of Athens. And do we, who set out from a household, and some of us have servants to wait on us, nonetheless dare to assert that marriage is an impediment to philosophy? In fact, the philosopher is surely a teacher and leader of all human beings with regard to what is fitting for a human being by nature. And if there is anything that is in accordance with nature, marriage clearly is. For what purpose, after all, did the craftsman of the human species in the beginning cut our kind into two, and then make two types of genitals, the one female and the other male, and then make in each a strong desire (*epithymia ischyra*) for the other, for association (*homilia*) and partnership (*koinonia*), and mix into both a strong longing (*pothon ischyron*) for one another, in the male for the female and in the female for the male? Is it not clear that he wanted them to be together (*syneinai*) and to live together and to devise together (*symmechanasthai*) things for one another's livelihood, and to engage together in the reproduction and rearing of children, so that our species will be eternal?

Irmgard Männlein

What Can Go Wrong at a Dinner-Party: the Unmasking of False Philosophers in Lucian's *Symposium* or *The Lapiths*

In the literary work of Lucian of Samosata the satire of philosophers is a well-known and important feature.¹ For this kind of satire Lucian often uses a specific form of literary dialogue, in which he combines elements and subjects from Attic comedy, Menippean satire and Platonic dialogue in a most splendid and original manner.² Using the significant example of the *Symposium* or *the Lapiths*³ I want to demonstrate how phenomena of double standards as displayed by contemporary philosophers are detected and mocked by the author in a highly condensed and literary way.

I would like to examine first (I.) how Lucian creates tension between his chosen genre of symposium literature and the content of his *Symposium*. Secondly (II.) I want to explore how the philosophers, despite their high social reputation, are strikingly represented as especially ridiculous and bad-mannered. Thirdly (III.) I will show that all the philosophers portrayed in the dialogue are nothing more than epigones. In addition, the dramatic character of the *Symposium* will have to be taken into account (IV.). My paper aims particularly at calling attention to the neglected narrative strategy of the dialogue. For many aspects of double standards as seen in the various philosophical sects are exaggerated by Lycinus, who describes the events from his own perspective (V.). Finally I would like to discuss whether there are links and parallels between Lucian's *Symposium* and the contemporary social and cultural background (VI.).

I. Lucian wrote his pastiche in the genre of sympotic literature, a form that had been established since the time of Plato and Xenophon, and had already been varied in many ways. The introductory dialogue unmistakably echoes Plato⁴ in its account of

¹ Bruns 161-196; Hall 151-193.

² Relihan 185f.

³ This paper is based on the OCT-edition by Macleod. For a short summary of content see Bompaigne (1998) 194-196.

⁴ Lycinus' pretended hesitation (ch.4: *thryptesthai*) is a verbal reminiscence of the beginning of Plato's *Phaedrus*, as *epithymein* and *deisthai* (Pl. *Phdr.* 228 c 2-4) are too; cf. Luc. *Symp.* 1 with Pl. *Phdr.* 227 b 6; Luc. *Symp.* 2 and Pl. *Phdr.* 227 b 7; Pl. *Ly.* 211 c 11; compare Luc. *Symp.* 12 with Pl. *Smp.* 174 b-c. For further reminiscences of Plato's dialogues in greater detail see Helm 202-206. Explicitly following Plato: Luc. *Dips.* 9, *Salt.* 70. See in general Bompaigne (1958) 309f.

a notable symposium years earlier as reported by an especially authoritative narrator. Similarly, there are characters taken from Xenophon's *Symposium*: the clown and the flute girl.⁵ These and later symposia,⁶ for example those composed by Plutarch, Athenaeus and Porphyrius, show an arrangement of established topics which are also to be found in Lucian's *Symposium*. These topics include the narrative technique of one of the guests giving a report of what happened during the symposium,⁷ and the explicit introduction of seven prominent intellectuals and philosophers at the beginning. In this case we can see a topical hint about the Seven Wise Men (Plat. *Prt.* 343 a), whereas a large number of other guests are not named at all.⁸ Besides, some conventional scenic topics⁹ are repeated: the character of the doctor who comes late (Dioniscus), the uninvited guest (the Cynic Alcidas), and the stock figure of the offended guest who threatens to leave. This last role is played by the uninvited and therefore annoyed Stoic Hetoimocles.¹⁰

Arguments between guests belong to the traditional repertoire as well. Here they start with the insuperable aversion of the Peripatetic to the Stoic philosopher.¹¹ Though Lycinus' account echoes the narrative structure of a dinner (*deipnon*), where the separate courses of a meal determine the structure of the narration, he does not want to describe all the delicacies served in detail (ch. 11). He concentrates exclusively on conversation and actions, which is a typical concern of literary symposia. But there is an important difference from other pieces of the same genre that are not satirical in intention: unlike these, in Lucian's *Symposium* philosophers reveal themselves as untrustworthy caricatures of real philosophers. Their abnormal behaviour is stressed even more by the fact that this happens precisely in the context of a philosophical symposium, where serious and educated men traditionally hold learned discussions. In the classical symposia we also find amusing and jovial sce-

⁵ X. *Smp.* 1,11-16; 2,1f.

⁶ See Bompaire (1958) 314f. n. 5.

⁷ For example, in Plutarch (*Conv.sept.* 146 B-F), Athenaeus (4,128 A-130 D); for personal experiences as topics of narration see further Gellius (for example, 7,13; 17,8), Porphyrius (in Eus. *PE* 10,3,1); Ullrich 51,62; Martin 181f. and 275f.; cf. Branham 106, who compares Lycinus with Socrates in Plato's *Euthydemus*.

⁸ Cf. Luc. *Symp.* 8 and passim; Pl. *Smp.* 176 c 2; 177 e 2f.; 177 e 7; 180 c 1f.; Plut. *Quaest.conv.* 9,747 B; Porph. in Eus. *PE* 10,3,1.

⁹ Cf. Bompaire (1958) 316f.

¹⁰ See Martin 103f. The nouveau riche host is a stock figure as well, cf. Nasidienus in Horace's *S.* 2,8,2f.

¹¹ Just as Porph. in Eus. *PE* 10,3,25.

nes combined with serious conversation.¹² But in Lucian a special tension can be observed between the earnest façade of the philosophers and their unintentionally comical behaviour.

Unmasking unworthy philosophers in the genuinely philosophic context of a literary symposium is a satirical element in itself.¹³ In addition, we should take into account that Lucian might be mocking symposium literature itself, a genre cultivated intensively during imperial times. A similar tendency can be seen in the *Lexiphanes*, where the hero wants to compete with Plato, but in fact recites a highly ridiculous 'banquet' (*Lex.* 1).

II. In Lucian's *Symposium* criticism of philosophers is presented in an especially concentrated way. The dialogue shows an assembly of philosophers of various sects, who without exception behave out of place during the wedding. From the beginning of his report Lycinus concentrates on intellectuals (ch. 6).¹⁴ I would like to emphasize some remarkable and significant features of inconsistency and double standards as revealed by philosophers of the various sects. In this context I shall focus especially on some comedy-like effects employed by the author. Double standards are to be observed, in the first place, in the behaviour of the Cynic philosopher Alcidas.¹⁵ Though he demonstrates his contrariness to the established customs of weddings and symposia, he nevertheless makes the most of the occasion, for example, its culinary pleasures. Though imitating histrionically a certain pose of Heracles¹⁶ well known from contemporary paintings (ch. 13; 14) he does not seem to be willing to meet the necessary requirements of a consistent imitation of this hero.

Self-representation of a different kind is shown in the character of Ion the Platonist.¹⁷ His dignified, even godlike appearance (see ch. 7: "in short it was a regular

¹² As in Plato and Xenophon; see the advice in Hermog. *Meth.* 456 (= p. 454,20-22 Rabe); Weissenberger 159; Bompaire (1958) 315 with n. 3.

¹³ For intended contrasts in the theory of intertextuality see Pabst 137 (and passim). According to Branham 108-112 the reason for the comic effect is the combination of (platonist) symposium tradition with the tradition of brawls.

¹⁴ Cf. ch. 1; ch. 3; ch. 5 (about the bridegroom Eucritus).

¹⁵ Cf. Luc. *Symp.* 13f.; *Icar.* 30f.; *VH* 2,18, and Helm 351-358; Frazier 129.

¹⁶ For Heracles as ideal hero of the Cynics cf. Luc. *Vit.Auct.* 7f.; Branham/Goulet-Cazé 16-18.

¹⁷ For the reproach of pride and arrogance against Platonists see Luc. *Herm.* 16; *Pisc.* 43,49; *Philops.* 6,11; cf. Dörrie/Baltes III *98.1-98.7 with 358-374. Furthermore Ion seems to resemble the self-satisfied figure Ion in Plato's dialogue of the same name and in addition possibly refers to the Platonist Favorinus of Arelate, who was well-known for showing-off; Lakmann 241.

divine visitation, the advent of Ion the marvellous¹⁸) first gives the impression of a man who has already reached the goal of the philosopher's similarity to God as expressed in Plato's *Theaetetus* (176b).¹⁹ But this impression almost instantly disappears, when in the manner of comedy and quite unsuitably for a wedding he gives advice on pederasty and having wives in common.²⁰ Besides, in the turbulent last scene (ch. 46) Ion is about to steal a skyphos, a scene that reminds the reader of a comedy of Eupolis in which Socrates is accused of having stolen a wine cup.²¹

From the beginning the Peripatetic Cleodemus is portrayed as a person fond of having discussions (ch. 6).²² He vents his anger and quarrelsomeness on the hated Stoics in questioning their school's founders and their credibility as philosophers as well (ch. 11; 30). First he aggressively spits at and beats the Stoic Zenothemis (ch. 33), and later, after having lost his inhibitions completely, he puts out the Stoic's eye and bites off his nose (ch. 44).²³ Cleodemus obviously attacks only Stoics, who are rivals in logic and other philosophic matters. So he transfers dogmatic disagreements into private life (ch. 32). The Epicurean Hermon is shown as a peaceable (cf. ch. 33) and humorous person, who is only interested in getting some food (for example, ch. 43). So he comes up to the usual expectations for Epicureans.²⁴ But to find an Epicurean as a priest of the Dioscuri seems to be a very remarkable feature (ch. 9). Though Lucian's *Symposium* is essentially fictitious, it could reflect, like other pieces of philosophical satire from the same author, authentic features of historical persons, at least at the level of caricature.²⁵ So there is no doubt that by showing the Epicurean as a priest Lucian perverts the special Epicurean kind of religiosity which is only internalised care for oneself. But the idea of an Epicurean priest is not impossible, as contemporary evidence proves. For

¹⁸ All translations of Luc. *Smp.* cited in this paper are by Harmon.

¹⁹ Already on arrival Ion is described as extraordinarily dignified: "a grave and revered person to look at, with great dignity written on his features. Indeed, most people call him 'Rule'" (ch. 7).

²⁰ For Plato as an enemy of marriage in comedy see Philippides frg. 6 Kassel-Austin VII 338. For Plato's state and especially for the motif of having wives in common: Luc. *VH* 2,17; *Vit.Auct.* 15; 17; *Fug.* 18; Helm 203f.

²¹ Eupolis frg. 395 Kassel-Austin V 516. For the Platonist as a figure in comedy see Antiphanes (frg. 35 Kassel-Austin II 328); Ephippus (frg. 14 Kassel-Austin V 142f.), and Helm 207 n. 1.

²² There he is called "the mouthy, argumentative fellow, whom his pupils call 'Sword' and 'Cleaves' ". See Neef 40; Helm 212f.

²³ Cf. Luc. *Herm.* 11. For the probably topical quarrel between Stoic and Peripatetic see Cic. *Fin.* 2,68; Gellius 18,1; cf. Porph. in Eus. *PE* 10,3,24f.

²⁴ Cf. Luc. *Herm.* 16; *VH* 2,18; *Vit.Auct.* 19; *Pisc.* 43; *Par.* 11; see Neef 41.

²⁵ See Lucians *Alexander*, with Clay 3438-3445.

a (contemporary) epigraphic dedication from Apameia in Syria shows an Aurelios Belios Philippos as "priest and head of the Epicurean school in Apameia".²⁶

Besides this, the Epicurean priest Hermon swears (ch. 31: "By Jove"),²⁷ and by doing so he obviously reflects the traditions of comedy.²⁸ But here the motif is applied to an Epicurean, who does not believe in gods influencing human life or history at all and who teaches this as well; thus the comical effect is intensified. He and the Peripatetic harshly attack their Stoic opponents by explicitly accusing them of double standards because they want to make other people give up *hedone* without giving it up themselves (ch. 37).²⁹ After the fight (cf. ch. 44) he mocks the Stoic Zenothemis, who is hurt and wailing, on the grounds that pain should be an *adiaphoron* from the Stoic point of view (ch. 47).

Because of his insatiable gluttony (ch. 11; 43)³⁰ and demonstrative hostility towards the Epicurean (ch. 6; 9; 32) and the Peripatetic as well (ch. 32), the old Stoic Zenothemis stands out against them all.³¹ Nothing is left of the Stoic *tranquillitas animi*, since he is the first to replace the battle of words by violence. While he is quarrelling with the Peripatetic, he is not able to defend himself with arguments, but only with an angry attack (ch. 33).³² He engages in the fight very aggressively, throwing a cup that hurts the bridegroom on the head (ch. 44).³³

But most striking is the Stoic Hetoimocles, who has not been invited but reveals himself in his letter (ch. 21-27).³⁴ He conspicuously uses philosophic, especially Stoic,³⁵ terms in order to attract disciples for his sect, but he applies all the terms only to symposiastic issues. So he claims that his happiness (*eudaimonia*) does not

²⁶ For the inscription Rey-Coquais 66-68; 79, illustration 84; for that Robert/Robert 566; Hahn 125 n. 24. For the philosophical context see Erler 167-169; for Lucian's mockery of Epicurean freethinkers see *Bis.Acc.* 2; *JConf.* 7f. Epicurus as a fighter against superstition in Lucian's *Alex.* 17,25 and 61 with an "apotheosis of Epicurus".

²⁷ Cf. the perjured Epicurean Hermodorus in Luc. *Icar.* 16; 26.

²⁸ Cratinus frg. 249 Kassel-Austin IV 246f.

²⁹ For Epicurean hedonism in Lucian see *Bis.Acc.* 20f., in comedy for example, Hegesippus (frg. 2 Kassel-Austin V 551), Damoxenus (frg. 2, 62 Kassel-Austin V 5f.); cf. Baton (frg. 5, 7f. Kassel-Austin IV 33).

³⁰ Cf. Luc. *Tim.* 54f.; *Herm.* 11.

³¹ Comprehensive treatment of Stoics in Lucian is Helm 266-278.

³² About the quarrelsomeness of the Stoics see Luc. *Herm.* 9. Supposed morality in contrast to immorality; Luc. *Icar.* 21.

³³ Cf. the brawl between Centaurs and Lapiths in Ov. *Met.* 12,235f. (a wine cup is thrown); 242f. (cups are thrown); see Luc. *Herm.* 12, and Helm 274.

³⁴ Cf. Plut. *Conv.sept.* 151 B-C: The letter of Amasis is read out, Martin 226.

³⁵ See Tackaberry 17f.

depend at all on the delicious meal he cannot enjoy now. He asserts that he could get one anyway from his students, who know their 'duties' (ch. 22).³⁶ But, as he says, Aristainetus the host is not yet able to define and distinguish what is better,³⁷ nor does he possess the essential "faculty of cognitive impression" (ch. 23).³⁸ In a crude attack he blames his – invited – colleagues Zenothemis and Diphilus for this. With a single syllogism, he boasts, he could silence them all.³⁹ Moreover he demonstrates his supposed superiority by distinguishing between "transient state" (*schesis*) and "permanent state" (*hexis*), and by exposing some fallacies as well.⁴⁰ Being fully aware that "only what is honourable is good" he has no problems in coping with the shame of being uninvited (ib.).⁴¹ In order to justify his anger, he compares himself with the goddess Artemis, who was the only one to be passed over by Oineus in sacrifice. This myth is then illustrated by – more or less – appropriate literary and poetical quotations (ch. 25). Hetoimocles thus tries to interpret it in allegorical terms, a significant method of Stoic hermeneutics. In this way he hints at the possible consequences of the failure to invite him. Finally he denounces his colleague the Stoic Diphilus for having an affair with a student, who turns out to be the son of their host. But almost immediately he reveals the true reason for his anger: Diphilus had wooed two students away from him (ch. 26). In all this Hetoimocles contravenes crucial precepts of Stoic doctrine by showing strong emotion, for instance 'annoyance' (ch. 22) and 'anger' (ch. 25).⁴² Other terms of Stoic epistemology and ethics prove to be empty phrases that can be applied to any other context as well. The discrepancy between the strict rules of Stoic doctrine and the actual behaviour of the Stoic philosopher is heightened by the fact that Hetoimocles unmasks himself in his own letter, even though in his salutation he claims to be *philosophos* and at the beginning emphasizes the credibility of his way of life (ch. 22).

The characteristic groupings and contrasts of the philosophers show themselves especially in the great battle-scene at the end of the dialogue (ch. 43-45): on the one

³⁶ See SVF IV s.v. *kathekon*; for the philosophically complex content of this term see Forschner 184-196.

³⁷ Cf. SVF II 225 p. 75,15-17.

³⁸ See SVF II 56 p. 22,28-30; cf. ib. 105 p. 33,4; Luc. *Vit.Auct.* 21; *Herm.* 82. Cf. DL 7,54.

³⁹ For the syllogisms of Stoics Luc. *Pisc.* 51; *Herm.* 81; *Gall.* 11 (cf. DL 7,79); *Vit.Auct.* 24; *Bis.Acc.* 22.

⁴⁰ For *schesis* and *hexis* see, for instance, SVF II 393 p. 129f. About the Stoic apories DL 7,187.

⁴¹ For the phrase *monon to kalon agathon* see SVF III 29 p. 9,24-26, cf. Luc. *Vit.Auct.* 20; *Herm.* 16. 81.

⁴² For these *pathe* see Nesselrath 467f.; Branham 114f.

side the Peripatetic and the Epicurean philosopher stand together against the Stoics,⁴³ on the other side both Stoic and Cynic philosophers fight against the others. The Platonist Ion is the only one standing in the middle. Finally the Cynic Alcidas has his *aristeia* hitting anyone coming his way.

III. By arranging his symposium deliberately as a literal imitation of classical symposia, Lucian intends to build up a certain tension between actual events and the expectations associated with the literary genre. This becomes most evident in the fact that his figures act without exception as paradigmatic epigons. Some of them explicitly refer to the founders of their school or their archegetes (for example the Platonist, the Cynic and the Stoics), though they do not harmonise their behaviour with the respective doctrines and the moral demands they place on philosophers.

While in other works concerned with satirizing philosophers Lucian makes fun of the founders of philosophical schools and their doctrines (for example, *Vitarum Auctio*), in his *Symposium* he concentrates on epigons and reduces complicated philosophical systems to a few commonplaces which all (reasonably) educated people must have been able to assign to the relevant sect (for example, the Stoic *adiaphora* and Plato's proposal for having wives in common).⁴⁴ In the *Symposium* he is not primarily interested in caricaturing philosophic dogmas, but in casting doubt upon philosophers who are not able to translate precepts of their own sect into everyday life.⁴⁵ This represents a shift from abstract and more dogmatic discussions to typical conflicts in real situations like a symposium. Comical effects are suggested by the significant names of the supposed philosophers, who are thus reduced to an assembly of typical comedy-figures. Hetoimocles' name, for instance, signals his willingness to accept any invitation for dinner, an attitude revealed by his own letter. On the other hand, Alcidas the Cynic's behaviour is contrary to the significance of his name, as he is especially brilliant in offence, but less in defence. In comparison with the similar cast of the dialogue *Philopseudeis*, where philosophers outdo one another in telling ghost-stories, at least the Peripatetic Cleodemus and the Platonist Ion, who play a part there as well, are to be seen as stereotyped figures in Lucian.⁴⁶ In the guise of philosophers all these figures take advantage of the symposium for self-portrayal, but, playing their part badly, they

⁴³ Cf., for example, Eus. *PE* 4,2,13; 4,3,14; Hall 499 n. 24.

⁴⁴ Cf. Billerbeck 128.

⁴⁵ Cf. Arist. *EN* II 1103^b26-31: For a philosopher it is not enough to know what is good, but he must become good himself as well. See Zimmermann, esp. 258f.

⁴⁶ For a survey of figures of philosophers in Lucian see Schwartz 106.

unmask themselves unintentionally. As in his bitter satires against Peregrinus Proteus and Alexander of Abonuteichus, Lucian makes the pretended philosophers appear like actors on stage, and consequently uses many theatrical metaphors. This may also be a way of alluding to the contemporary custom of attending philosophic lectures in the same way as theatrical performances.⁴⁷

IV. In this context the dramatic conception of Lucian's *Symposium* must be taken into account. The introductory dialogue already contains all the information essential for a complete exposition of the plot,⁴⁸ while the structure of Lycinus' narration is determined by specific questions asked by Philo. Then there is a suggestion that a fight might arise during the feast; attention is thus directed mainly to the 'process' of the *Symposium*. To begin with, Lycinus' account seems to be very extensive and detailed, but later there is an evident *accelerando* of the narrative tempo. This is to be noticed after the wrestling match of the Cynic with the clown (ch. 19), which serves as a first and playful anticipation of the already indicated escalation of events. The account of the doctor arriving late because of a fight with a mad patient is just another reference to the philosophers' fight at the end of the *Symposium* (ch. 20). When the last course is served, the situation comes to a dramatic climax. Lycinus explicitly draws Philo's attention in this direction: "follow me closely, Philo, for we have now reached the crisis of events" (ch. 43). And immediately events reach their climax in the fight of the philosophers, though finally "after the tears, it ended in a new burst of laughter" (ch. 47). Given Lycinus' explicit hints at the dramatic structure of his narration, the philosophers can be seen as actors in a comedy *en miniature*.

V. The discrepancy between pretensions and actual behaviour is further intensified by the perspective of Philo and Lycinus, the figures of the frame dialogue:⁴⁹

a) Expectations are raised high by a remark Philo made in the introduction. After Lycinus has enumerated the names of all the main participants in the symposium, Philo bursts into spontaneous admiration: "Heavens, Lycinus, it's a learned academy, this dinner party that you are recounting" (ch. 10).⁵⁰ Furthermore, he enthusiastically stresses the fact that representatives of the various philosophical sects were invited together (ib.), a mixture that proves to be highly explosive later on.

⁴⁷ Plut. *Aud.* 43 E-F, Sen. *Ep.* 108,6. In full Clay 3416f.

⁴⁸ On Lucian's dramatic technique in general, without reference to the *Symposium*, Bellinger 3-40; cf. Schwartz 86.

⁴⁹ On complementary dialogue roles see Hess-Lüttich 610f.

⁵⁰ Cf. Müller-Graupa 811.

Contradictions and discrepancies between the philosophic precepts claimed by the individual philosophers and their naive self-esteem are ironically intensified by Philo's repeated references to common sense. His basic assumption is that philosophers are supposed to cultivate an exemplary way of life. Behind his position we see the concept of the ideal philosopher, who is to be identified especially by his practical way of living.

b) The analytic reflections incorporated in the narrative perspective of Lycinus – Lycinus is often regarded as a mask of Lucian himself in his platonizing dialogues⁵¹ – are an important means for exposing the dubious philosophers. Lycinus takes on the role of the eyewitness typical of the literary symposium. His reflections⁵² are interpolated at dramatically important nodal points to retard the action. Thus he is the only one to feel embarrassed by the letter from the Stoic Hetoimocles (ch. 28: "the sweat poured off me for shame") and he is surprised that the other guests were laughing when the letter was read out. Admiring Hetoimocles' image and attitude as a philosopher, they had not recognised his true character till that very moment. A crucial point is reached when, taking their cue from Hetoimocles' letter (ch. 30), the Peripatetic and the Stoic philosopher make verbal attacks against each other (ch. 34; 35). At this juncture Lycinus draws an important conclusion. Addressing Philo he expresses the realisation that all the contents of erudite knowledge are completely irrelevant if "one doesn't improve one's way of living too" (ch. 34). As the words of the philosophers do not agree with their deeds, and their learned education does not produce an exemplary way of life, Lycinus concludes that "education leads men away from right thinking" (ch. 34).

Lycinus metaphorically compares the letter from the uninvited Stoic with the myth of Eris, who had thrown the famous apple during the wedding of Peleus that had eventually provoked the Trojan war and its terrible results. By this comparison the fight, which actually is to follow, is alluded to in an amusing way.⁵³ In addition to the Cynic's⁵⁴ wrestling match and the doctor's reported fight, this mythical account

⁵¹ To the (genuine) Lycinus-dialogues belong (apart from the *Symposium*): *Navigium*, *Imagines*, *De Imaginibus*, *Eunuchus*, *Lexiphanes*, *Hermotimus*; cf. Christ/Stählin/Schmid 567-570 and Schmid (1891) 306f. For the masks of Lucian see Dubel 19; 24f.

⁵² On the critical reporter and his inner monologues see Pabst 139f.

⁵³ Bompaire (1958) 596 calls it "disproportion grotesque".

⁵⁴ The first implicit hint of the final fight can already be seen when Alcidas lies down on the floor in that position (Luc. *Symp.* 13f.) in which Heracles lay down when he drank wine with the Centaur Pholus; see Stesichorus frg. 4 Page; Theoc. 7,148-150 (Gow); Diod. Ath. 4,12,3-8; cf. Verg. *G.* 2,456; *A.* 8,294; *Serv. A.* 8,294 (Thilo); for an index of the numerous (vase-)paintings Schmidt 518-521; cf. Branham 114.

is to be interpreted as a third anticipation of later events. Lycinus seems to be the only one able to evaluate the Stoic's letter as a reason for the later loss of inhibitions and the trouble that ensues. During the philosophers' fight, while he is standing next to the wall trying to avoid becoming involved, and looking at overturned tables and bloodshed, Lycinus again uses a mythological picture by comparing the present situation to the fight between Lapiths and Centaurs (ch. 45). This fight too had broken out at a wedding, the one between Pirithous and Hippodamea, and there as well the guests had already drunk lots of wine.⁵⁵

In the terms of this comparison, parallels can be seen between the aggressive, barbaric Centaurs and the philosophers on the one hand, and the peaceable and victorious Lapiths and the perpetually laughing laymen on the other. At the very end Lycinus addresses his dialogue-partner Philo and concludes that it is quite dangerous for "a man who is not experienced in terms of philosophy"⁵⁶ to have dinner together with philosophers like these (ch. 48). Besides, Lycinus emphasizes how surprised and shocked he was by the events, and by the philosophers in particular. He uses stereotyped closing verses known from some Euripidean tragedies to illustrate the 'unexpected' turn of events, "while those we looked for did not come about."⁵⁷

A very important aspect, which has not been considered until now, seems to be the fact that Lycinus, who is a critic of education and philosophy, gets his place at the wedding feast on the left-hand side of the door (between the bridegroom and the Stoic Diphilus). There the eminent guests and philosophers are placed, while the women sit down on the right-hand side, the other guests opposite the door (ch. 8; 9). A probable interpretation of this arrangement is that the way of life Lycinus stands for is to be regarded as equal to the various philosophic sects (*haireseis*), but without claiming a philosophical programme and the obligations attached to it. In general Lycinus, at least in the *Symposium*, seems to have an intermediate position between philosophers and laymen, although elsewhere he promotes the life of a layman (*idiotes*) as the ideal one.⁵⁸ But here he is the only one with analytical perspicacity and the ability to anticipate the explosive situation in mythological meta-

⁵⁵ Hom. *Od.* 21,295-304; Ov. *Met.* 12,210-535.

⁵⁶ My own translation; cf. Luc. *Gall.* 27; Branham 107; see Arist. *Rh.* II 1381^a25f.; Pl. *R.* 620 c 6f.; Photius about Dion Bibl. Cod. 209 Henry III 108,26.

⁵⁷ Euripides' *Alcestis*, *Andromache*, *Bacchae*, *Helena*; cf. *Medea*.

⁵⁸ Cf. Luc. *Salt.* 2, where the dialogue-partner says about Lycinus: "a life-long friend of letters, moreover, and moderately conversant with philosophy." About the ideal of *idiotes* in Lucian see *Nigr.* 24; *Pisc.* 34; *Nec.* 21.

phors. While the other guests, who are not educated in terms of philosophy, behave themselves very well, in contrast to the philosophers (ch. 35),⁵⁹ and react to every *faux pas* of a philosopher with laughter,⁶⁰ Lycinus nowhere explicitly remarks that he indulged in laughter. Evidently he makes quite careful distinctions between the behaviour of philosophers, of laymen and of himself.⁶¹ In contrast to Philo, his dialogue partner who represents public opinion, Lycinus therefore appears to be the man who, faced with all the escapades of the so called 'philosophers', is able to draw clear conclusions for himself. Above all, he approves of a credible way of life concentrated on moral improvement, and accentuates a purely ethical focus of philosophic concern. In doing so Lycinus refers to no famous precursor or school founder or to any orthodox doctrine at all, but orientates himself without exception *ex negativo* towards his own observations: his remarkable gift for observing has already been activated at the very beginning.⁶² This ethical recourse⁶³ to his own power of judgement is not unparalleled in the works of Lucian. In the description of the life of Demonax Lucian stresses the fact that Demonax never orientated himself towards examples, but rather made himself a paradigm (*Demonax* 2,7).⁶⁴

VI. Finally, one may ask to what extent reflections of contemporary circumstances of the second century AD can be traced in Lucian's *Symposium*, notwithstanding the skilful arrangement of literary commonplaces and scenic elements from the traditional symposium genre, the elements from Menippean satire⁶⁵ and comedy, and the general presence of literary stylisation. Lucian's remarks about philosophers in

⁵⁹ On the praise of laymen already in comedy see Helm 363 n. 3; for different lifestyles Nesselrath 462-467, for effective contrasts id. 314f.

⁶⁰ Ch. 16; 19; 28; 35; 40; 42; 47. See Hor. *S.* 2,8,63f.: *Varius mappa compescere risum / vix poterat*; cf. ib. 79f. and 83; Pabst 137 calls this laughter of the laymen "gesellschaftliche Geste mit Abwehrfunktion".

⁶¹ Cf. the differences between the educated and the philosopher in Arist. *PA* I 639^a1-15; *EN* I 1095^a1f.; for contrasts between laymen and philosophers compare Simplicius' commentary on Epictet's *Enchiridion* (in *Epict.* 66 Hadot 440-443) as well.

⁶² Ch. 2, 11; 15; 28; 29; 34; 35; 45.

⁶³ A principle held already by Isocrates, for example, *Panath.* 30-32; *Antid.* 270; 285; see Caster 120; Hall 174f.

⁶⁴ Just as Hor. *Ep.* 1,13-19.

⁶⁵ For example, mythological comparisons, interpolation of verses; the first part of the title (*Symposium*) indicates the (abstract-philosophical) genre, the second part (*or the Lapiths*) a concrete mythological implication. For Lucian's *Symposium* Helm 364 suspects the *Symposium* of Menippus as a model. But it seems to be rather problematical to prove Lucian's dependency on Menippus, which goes beyond the title. For Menippus the only testimony, Ath. 14,629 F, mentions this work only in the context of a dance. In general, Menippean features can be reconstructed from works by Varro, Seneca (*Apocolocyntosis*) and Lucian; for the *Symposium* we have parallel elements in Horace's description of the dinner at the house of the rich Nasidienus (Hor. *S.* 2,8); see Schwartz 84-88 as well.

his time (for example, *Bis.Acc.* 6) can indirectly be confirmed by the known support the philosophic sects received from Hadrian and Antoninus Pius onwards, and by the transmitted institution of chairs for rhetoric and philosophy brought into being by Marcus Aurelius in 176 AD, which receive probably their earliest literary reflection in Lucian's *Eunuchus*.⁶⁶ Together with the increasing number of philosophers, the number of pseudo-philosophers (cf. *Luc. Bis.Acc.* 6) and their critics was increasing as well.⁶⁷ So we find criticism of philosophers, for example, in Lucian's contemporary Aelius Aristides, who denounces the hypocrisy and arrogance of false philosophers, and in Favorinus of Arelate, who follows Epictetus in attacking ostensible philosophers.⁶⁸ In a similar way Lucian shows the close connection between fashionable philosophy and philosophic fashion by beard, coat and satchel (especially for Cynics, for example, *Peregrinus* 15); this concern with externals had already been illustrated by Herodes Atticus and Epictetus.⁶⁹

It may be briefly mentioned that Lucian treats the fashionable trend to philosophy ironically in his satirical story about Nigrinus's 'conversion' to philosophy in the dialogue of the same name.⁷⁰ In particular the Stoics, who were very popular in early imperial times (*Hermitimus* 16) and in Lucian's *Symposium* are the sect which most of the prominent guests belong to (3), were criticised because of their narrow-minded erudition.⁷¹ If compared with Stoic-Cynic popular philosophy as represented, for instance, by Dio Chrysostomus, where, in the discussion about good manners at symposia, guests who are calm and collected (*sophrones*) are contrasted with the ignorant (*anoetoi*) who get carried away, Lucian's *Symposium* appears almost as a dramatised version of this moralising commonplace. Dio also refers to the mythical example of the fight between Centaurs and Lapiths (*Or.* 32,52-53; cf. *Or.* 27,3). The ideal figure of a sensible man described there, who directs events at the symposium in a balanced, but impressive way, is the reverse of Lucian's figure of the uninvited and therefore annoyed Stoic Hetoimocles, who be-

⁶⁶ See *Hist. Aug. Hadr.* 16,10; *Pius* 11,3; D. C. 71,31f; 35; Philostr. *VS* II 566,21-567,7; *Aur. Vict. Caes.* 16,9; *Clay* 3413 with n. 15.

⁶⁷ Criticism of the discrepancy between philosopher's life and teaching can be found, for example, in Dio Chrysostomus *Or.* 70,1-7 (esp. 7); 10 (von Arnim); *Epict. Ench.* ch. 49,12-15; cf. *Simp. in Epict.* 64,22-24 Hadot 437; Marc Aurel (1,16,5), too, highly regards only 'true' philosophers; comprehensive treatment in Hall 190-193.

⁶⁸ *Aristid. Or.* 46,306-309 Dindorf II 396-405; *Gel.* 17,19 (on Favorinus of Arelate), cf. Lakmann 240.

⁶⁹ Herodes Atticus in *Gel.* 9,2, cf. 1,2; *Epict. Diss.* 4,8,15; cf. 3,22,9-12 and 3,22,50. About that see *Plut. Is.* 352 C and *Max. Tyr.* 1,9f. as well; cf. *Clay* 3415.

⁷⁰ *Clay* 3420-3425.

⁷¹ *Epict. Diss.* 3,2,6; 2,19,8-10; *Gel.* 1,2.

cause of his letter had decisively influenced the progress of events negatively.⁷² So Lucian seems to have taken up a timeless motif, but one which was nonetheless especially popular at this date, and to have staged it in literal form.

Summing up, I would emphasize that the unmasking of the double standards of philosophers in Lucian's *Symposium* results from a combination of well-directed literary composition with significant literary reminiscences. The unmasking is presented dramatically, and the behaviour of the philosophers reminds us of figures in comedy. Moreover, a game is played with the expectations aroused by the symposium-genre. By analysing and exposing the behaviour of the philosophers in society, Lycinus makes them appear increasingly as caricatures. Considering how fashionable philosophy became in Lucian's time, one may conclude that mocking dramatisation of double standards could well be a criticism of the contemporary situation, in spite of making highly skilful use of established commonplaces of the satire of intellectuals.⁷³ When we compare him with the critical remarks made by other authors of the first and the second century AD, it is obviously only Lucian who makes both contemporary and timeless criticism⁷⁴ of would-be philosophers, and who, exploiting various literary topics and reminiscences, has created a very elaborate miniature drama which, despite some moralising undertones, has been put into a literary form whose primary aim is to offer sophisticated entertainment (see *Verae Historiae* I proem).⁷⁵

⁷² Cf. the terms used in D. Chr. *Or.* 27,3-4 (von Arnim) with those of Hetoimocles.

⁷³ For such satire in detail see Zimmermann 255-280.

⁷⁴ Hall 151-193: mixture of tradition and contemporary phenomena, see Macleod 1377; rather sceptical is Anderson 1433.

⁷⁵ A well-known imitator of Lucian is Alciphro: cf. his Cynic Pancrates (for example, *Alciph. Ep. Par.* 3,19,5. 9), who is very similar to Alcidas in Lucian's *Symposium*; *Alciph. Ep. Par.* 3,9,1: quarrel at drinking wine; *ib.* 3,7,3f: fight in the end; *ib.* 3,19: well-mannered behaviour of laymen. The so-called *Cena Cypriani* is written in dependence on and in purposeful contrast to Lucian, on which see Pabst 141.